UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 11

MAY 25, 1967, TO JUNE 8, 1967
(PAGES 13967 TO 15308)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1967

J
11
.R
V. 113
pt 11

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, on the threshold of a new day, send us forth armed with Thy power, to right wrong, to overcome evil; if need be to endure hardship, but in all things to serve Thee bravely, faithfully, joyfully; that, at the end of the day's labor, kneeling for Thy blessing, Thou mayest find no blot upon our shield.

Grant us Thy truth to make us free and kindling hearts that burn for Thee; Thy gentleness makes us great.

We turn to Thee, driven by our tension, deep concern about ourselves, our Nation, and our world. As we play our part in days of destiny, with all mankind standing in the valley of decision, we seek the sanctuary of prayer.

For those who here serve as the representatives of the people who have put their trust in them, we pray for deliverance from the lures of office and from the arrogance which lurks in power.

We pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor for freedom's greatest venture.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 24, 1967, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the director, the American Legion, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial statement of that organization, as of December 31, 1966, which, with an accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Nebraska Legislature; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 41

"Whereas, the Great Plains Conservation Program (PL-1021) is restricted for operations in Nebraska to sixty western counties; and

"Whereas, the Great Plains Conservation Program has proved to be eminently successful in converting crop land to permanent grass and in other conservation practices which insure greater economic stability of farms and ranches through complete conservation planning; and

"Whereas, the thirty-three counties in eastern Nebraska which lie outside of the area of eligibility need an accelerated conservation program tailored to Nebraska farming and ranching conditions for present development and future welfare: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in seventy-seventh session assembled:*

"1. That the Congress of the United States enlarge the area of eligibility of PL-1021 to include the thirty-three counties in eastern Nebraska.

"2. That copies of this resolution be sent to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each member of Congress from Nebraska."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 978

"A resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to make a public investigation into the apparent existence of a Soviet-dominated Communist regime in the Republic of Cuba

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida:

"That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to instruct its appropriate committees to hold hearings and to conduct a public investigation into the apparent existence of a Soviet-dominated Communist regime in the Republic of Cuba, located only ninety miles from the coast of Florida.

"Be it further resolved that the congress of the United States recognize the fact that Florida, over many miles of its coastline, is geographically close to this menace, that into the state of Florida have poured many thousands of refugees escaping from Communist domination in Cuba and for whom this state has furnished a haven and much money for their support; that there is every indication that Cuba is attempting now to export the Soviet revolution into other neighboring areas as well as into the United States through the state of Florida, something which our national administration has promised never would be tolerated; that this state and its people, along with every other area in this country, have a right to know what the federal administration is doing diplomatically, economically and from a military standpoint at this moment to counteract Communist domination of Florida's neighbor and the attempted spread of Soviet influence; and what plans, if any, the national administration has to expunge this menace and liberate our nearest foreign neighbor.

"Be it further resolved that the congress of the United States be urgently requested to take tangible steps toward reviving and implementing the Monroe Doctrine as the United States understood this doctrine applied prior to the time when Cuba was surrendered to the Soviet regime.

"Be it further resolved that copies of this senate resolution de dispatched to the president of the United States, to the president of the United States Senate, to the speaker of the United States house of representatives and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States congress."

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 10

"Relative to the San Felipe Division of the Central Valley Project

"WHEREAS, It is the purpose of the San Felipe Division, Central Valley Project, California, to provide, among other things, irrigation and municipal and industrial water supplies, conservation of fish and wildlife resources, and enhancement of outdoor recreation opportunities within the Counties of Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz and Monterey; and

"WHEREAS, The proposed San Felipe Division will make use of a tunnel to be constructed from San Luis Reservoir westward under Pacheco Pass into said service area and will, by reason of its location, harmonize with and assist the State of California's water plan; and

"WHEREAS, The report recommending the project has now been cleared at all possible levels of government, including the United States Department of the Interior, the United States Budget Bureau, the State of California, and is recommended favorably to the Congress by the present administration; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to expedite authorization of the San Felipe Division, Central Valley Project, California; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Chairmen of the Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Senate of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

"Whereas, there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, H.R. 2158, the proposed federal Interstate Taxation Act; and

"Whereas, the proposed legislation, if enacted, would seriously curtail the rights of the several states and their political subdivisions from fully exercising their taxing powers against businesses engaged in multistate activities; and

"Whereas, in the hearings held by the Special Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, United States Congress, in the year 1966, to consider H.R. 16491, the predecessor bill of H.R. 2158, nearly all of the states which were represented at the hearings, opposed the passage of the said H.R. 16491; and

"Whereas, the various states have been, and are taking, positive remedial actions to combat many of the alleged evils arising in state taxation of interstate commerce; and

"Whereas, it is in the best public interest that the federal government permit and allow the various states more time to work together and arrive at a solution which will have as its ultimate goal, equity and uniformity of treatment between businesses engaged in multistate operations and businesses engaged locally; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1967, the Senate concurring, that the Congress of the United States and Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to reject and defeat H.R. 2158, the proposed federal Interstate Taxation Act; and

"Be it further resolved that duly authenticated copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, the Honorable Hiram L. Fong and the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, United States Senators from Hawaii, and the Honorable Spark M. Matsunaga and the Honorable Patsy T. Mink, Members of Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTION NO. 8

"A resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take no action inhibiting the power of the States to tax

"Whereas, an interstate taxation bill, H.R. 2158, was recently introduced in the Ninetieth Congress; and

"Whereas, the power of the several States to impose taxes on business entities engaged in multi-state activities will be materially restricted under the provisions of H.R. 2158; and

"Whereas, in imposing such taxes, the several States are in no wise fettering or inhibiting interstate commerce, and are not exercising any power which the Constitution has conferred upon the Congress; and

"Whereas, it is not the purpose of the commerce clause to relieve those engaged in interstate commerce of their just and equitable share of state tax burdens despite the incidental effect of the tax resulting in an increase in the cost of doing business; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota that the Congress of the United States be requested not to enact into law H.R. 2158; and

"Be it further resolved that the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota furnish copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to all members of the Minnesota Congressional Delegation in Washington, D.C."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Florida, to the Committee on Judiciary:

"SENATE MEMORIAL 558

"A memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for election of the President by a direct vote of the people

"Whereas, the constitutional convention of 1787 adopted the electoral college as a means to facilitate the election of the president of the United States in an era of primitive education, transportation and communication and to designate intelligent citizens acting as free agents who would then independently select the chief executive, and

"Whereas, the convention adopted this system prior to the development of political parties, which by their nature and practical function render the electoral college system outdated and unnecessary, and

"Whereas, the present electoral college system assigns all presidential electors on a "winner-take-all" basis to the party in each state which receives a plurality of votes, thus depriving the voters of any other party of any voice whatsoever in the selection of the president, and

"Whereas, the present electoral system makes it possible for the candidate who receives a majority of the popular vote of the people to fail to be elected chief executive, and

"Whereas, the present system artificially and unnecessarily removes the people from the direct selection of their chief executive and thus frustrates their true wishes, and

"Whereas, the electoral college system tends to discourage presidential candidates from campaigning in many states because of the "all-or-nothing" method of tabulating electoral college votes, thus giving the desires and needs of residents in the smaller states less attention proportionately in national politics than the few large states, and

"Whereas, the present system is archaic in the context of the founding fathers' original intent due to the development of modern transportation and communication techniques, and a more knowledgeable and literate society, and

"Whereas, the United States supreme court would not consider the case, *Delaware* v. *New York,* to apply the "one-man-one-vote" interpretation to the electoral college and thus insure the same protection under the law as provided voters in the court's previous decisions, and

"Whereas, the legislature of the state of Florida expressing the sentiments of its constitutents, is vitally concerned with the inequities of the present electoral college, Now, therefore,

"Be It Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

"That the legislature of the state of Florida publicly acknowledges the anachronistic and inequitable nature of the electoral college, and

"Be it further resolved that said legislature hereby petitions the congress of the United States, through the duly elected senators and representatives of this state, that this anachronism should be given expedient and appropriate congressional review toward the end of alleviating the aforementioned inequities of the electoral college by providing for the election of the president by a direct vote of the people, and

"Be it further resolved that congress following deliberate and exhaustive public hearings be requested to act upon the results of these hearings toward the formulation of a constitutional amendment which would provide the best method of electing directly the chief executive of the United States, and

"Be it further resolved that this amendment then be submitted at the earliest possible date to the various states for ratification as an amendment to the constitution of the United States upon the approval of three-fourths of the states.

"Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be dispatched to the president of the United States, to the president of the United States senate, to the speaker of the United States house of representatives and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States congress."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts; ordered to the Committee on Public Works:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO TAKE ACTION ESTABLISHING RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND PREVENTING FURTHER RECURRENCE OF OIL POLLUTION ON CAPE COD BEACHES

"*Whereas,* Tourism is the second most important industry in Massachusetts; and

"*Whereas,* Cape Cod is a most popular vacation region in the State; and

"*Whereas,* Forty miles of Cape Cod beaches have been polluted with oil; and

"*Whereas,* Marine wildlife in countless quantities have been killed because of this oil pollution; and

"*Whereas,* Marine fisheries are vital assets to Cape Cod and to the entire Commonwealth; therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts urgently requests the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary for fixing the responsibility for the source of this pollution and for preventing further recurrence of such damaging incidents in the future; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth."

Resolutions adopted by the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Beaumont, Tex., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to a penalty for violators of the Flag Code, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Two resolutions adopted by the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board, Atlanta, Ga., relating to the breeder reactor program, and the international traffic of radioactive materials, respectively; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated May 12, 1967, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1870. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to provide for acid pollution control demonstration projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. RANDOLPH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS):

S. 1871. A bill to designate lock and dam numbered 14 on the Arkansas River as the W. D. Mayo lock and dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1872. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1873. A bill to create an additional judicial district in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself and and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 1874. A bill to officially designate the Totten Trail Pumping Station; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1875. A bill for the relief of Dr. Adel G. Nafrawi; and

S. 1876. A bill for the relief of Margaret H. Johnston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1877. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1878. A bill to provide for the establishment of an Advisory Commission on Indonesian Economic Development authorized to formulate a comprehensive plan for developing a viable, self-sustaining economy in Indonesia based upon free economic institutions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOWER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1879. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for certain expenses incurred by professional nurses to enable them to perform nursing services; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARTHY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 1880. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; and

S. 1881. A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. CANNON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution authorizing the operation of an amateur radio station by participants in the XII World Boy Scout Jamboree at Farragut State Park, Idaho, August 1 through 9, 1967; to the Committee on Commerce.

RESOLUTION

TRIPARTITE ACTION BY THE WESTERN POWERS TO PRESERVE THE PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. DODD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 131), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:.

S. RES. 131

Whereas the massing of troops on the Arab-Israel frontiers and the mining of the Gulf of Aqaba by the United Arab Republic have brought Israel and the Arab nations to the very brink of war; and

Whereas an Arab-Israel war would be a disaster for the peoples of the Middle East and might soon expand into a larger war involving the major nations; and

Whereas the Secretary-General of the United Nations has regrettably capitulated to President Nasser's demand that the United Nations Emergency Force be withdrawn from Egypt; and

Whereas there is little reason to hope that the United Nations can or will intervene in time to prevent disaster; and

Whereas in the absence of United Nations intervention, the peace of the Middle East can be preserved only if the diplomatic efforts of the Western nations are backed up by a demonstrable willingness to use force to prevent aggression from either side; and

Whereas only such a demonstration can give Nasser and the Arab extremists reason for pause; and

Whereas the impartiality displayed by the United States in 1956 when it opposed the British-French-Israel intervention against Egypt and rescued Nasser from certain defeat, established a precedent for acting with equal impartiality to prevent Arab aggression against the State of Israel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports President Johnson's declaration of May 23 that the United States remains "firmly committed to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all the nations in the area;" that we "strongly oppose aggression by anyone in the area in any form, overt or clandestine;" and that we regard the announced blockade of Israeli shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba as "illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace": and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate:

(1) That the Administration should immediately seek British and French concurrence for a tripartite warning to both sides in the Middle East crisis to abstain from aggression—in conformance with the assurances given at the time of the Suez settlement in 1956 and with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations at that time;

(2) That the United States should seek British and French participation in a token naval task force to be dispatched without delay to the Gulf of Aqaba to insure that this international waterway remains open for shipping of all nations, and that this action should not wait on the United Nations, although United Nations approval should be sought for it;

(3) That the administration should call upon all the member governments of the United Nations, including the Soviet government, to use every diplomatic resource to prevent the calamity of an Arab-Israel war;

(4) That every effort should be made to involve the United Nations and to work through it, and to bring about the reestablishment of the United Nations Emergency Force as a peace keeping buffer between Arabs and Israelis.

AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate referral, an amendment to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide funds for a new catagory of demonstration projects in the field of acid mine pollution abatement.

This amendment is generated by the need to demonstrate at the earliest opportunity the technological and economic feasibility of new methods for treating acid mine pollution, a condition which seriously impairs the quality of water in approximately 4,000 miles of streams east of the Mississippi. I am convinced on the basis of the best technical and professional opinion of Federal officials in the field of water pollution abatement, as well as independent experts, that we now have the technological means to control acid mine pollution in certain kinds of situations. We assuredly do not have all the answers to all kinds of acid mine pollution, but we do have sufficient answers to proceed now with a substantial demonstration program.

On May 12 I examined a demonstration project in the vicinity of Clarksburg, W. Va., in the drainage basin of the west fork of the Monongahela River, in the company of Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior Frank C. De Luzio and Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, Director of the Bureau of Mines. We were accompanied by other officials and technicians from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and the Bureau of Mines. The project, which was developed from the recommendations of a Federal pollution abatement conference held in Pittsburgh in December of 1963, demonstrated a new and highly effective method of cement grouting to seal the fissures of an abandoned bituminous coal mine. The consensus of all of the responsible Federal officials on the field trip was that this method warranted further demonstration in terms of the economic feasibility of treating an entire watershed or stream segment.

Therefore the amendment which I send to the desk would provide further authority and funds for demonstrating this technique as well as other methods of abatement of acid mine pollution. The first part of the amendment would add to section 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act specific authority for

Federal expenditures on research and demonstration projects in the field of acid mine pollution, not to exceed $250,000 for "a single unit application of technology."

The second part of the proposed amendment would add a new section 7 to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act providing authority for area acid pollution control demonstration projects within a specific watershed or drainage area. The proposed program would require State as well as Federal participation, and would be predicated on assurances by the State to the Federal Government that legal and practical protection of such demonstration areas would be provided to insure against any activities which might cause future acid pollution in the area. The amendment would authorize $15 million for these purposes for fiscal 1968 to be available until expended.

I have been assured by the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution [Mr. MUSKIE] that hearings will be conducted on this proposal in early June, and I would hope that we would have enactment by the Congress this year in order that we might move quickly and effectively toward solution of one of our major water pollution problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1870) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to provide for acid pollution control demonstration projects, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. CLARK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I join in cosponsoring this bill offered by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee to correct a serious problem in acid water pollution. I am hopeful this demonstration program which authorizes $15 million for sealing deep mines will receive speedy approval.

It seems to me the time is long past when Congress could duck the question of correcting acid water pollution by relying on the lame excuse there is no solution to the problem. There are solutions available to acid mine pollution which appear to be feasible and economical. I think the Senator from West Virginia is using the proper approach in this instance by attacking the sealing of deep mines in a demonstration program.

As I understand it, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and the Bureau of Mines are quite interested in using a new grouting method to seal fissures in deep mines to prevent the escape of water which has become polluted with acid. The acid when it enters streams, lakes, and ponds, kills aquatic life and makes the water unfit for domestic purposes.

I appreciate the vigor with which the chairman is following up on the acid mine pollution problem which plagues an estimated 2,000 miles of streams in my State of Pennsylvania, and perhaps twice as much in other coal producing States in Appalachia.

Additionally, I should like to point out that S. 602, the Appalachia bill, recently approved by the Senate and now pending in the House Public Works Committee, contains a provision for a 2-year study to develop an action program to cleanup acid mine pollution in Appalachia. I think it is safe to say the Appalachia study and this bill which I join in cosponsoring are designed to complement each other, looking toward the day when the streams of Appalachia are as free from pollution as is practical.

AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes. This is a companion bill to H.R. 7099, which was introduced in the House by Congressman MORGAN, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I am introducing this bill in order that the Committee on Foreign Relations will have a specific piece of legislation before it during its hearings on foreign aid, since it now appears unlikely that the House will pass a foreign aid bill for at least several weeks. I expect to have a number of amendments to offer to the bill in committee and I, of course, reserve my right to support or oppose the bill or any parts of it.

I also wish to announce at this time that tentative arrangements have been made to receive testimony on Tuesday, June 6 from Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Mr. William S. Gaud, Administrator of the Agency for International Development. The committee hopes to hear Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara sometime during that week also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1872) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CREATION OF ADDITIONAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT IN LOUISIANA

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the efficient administration of justice should be one of the principal concerns of government, and Congress should be alert to further this goal at every possible opportunity. Therefore, I am introducing today, for appropriate reference, a bill which would remove the Baton Rouge District of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana from that district, and which would cause it to become a new Middle District of Louisiana.

The eastern district is presently comprised of the Baton Rouge division and the New Orleans division, and has its administrative headquarters in New Orleans. But for most purposes, the Baton Rouge division already is in effect a separate district. It has its own courthouse and other facilities. The judge who is assigned to the Baton Rouge Division resides in that city and does not hold court elsewhere. The clerk, court reporter, referee in bankruptcy, crier, law clerk, and secretary who are assigned to the Baton Rouge division do not serve elsewhere, and they reside in Baton Rouge.

Yet, there are ways in which the Baton Rouge Division does not function as a separate district, and they are not consistent with the good administration of Justice. The division has only a deputy clerk of court who is supervised by the clerk of court in New Orleans, although he should be responsive to matters as they apply to Baton Rouge. It has only a deputy marshal, with the marshal residing in New Orleans. The grand jury meets in New Orleans and hears matters pertaining to the Baton Rouge Division and which are to be tried in that division.

Each week, on criminal day, it is necessary to have Assistant U.S. Attorneys to come from New Orleans to handle arraignments and other criminal matters. Assistant U.S. Attorneys must also come from New Orleans to try criminal cases which must be held in Baton Rouge. It is necessary for the probation department to send its officers to handle investigations and probation matters arising from the court functions in Baton Rouge.

All of these matters could be better handled by personnel permanently located in Baton Rouge.

The enactment of this bill would require no new facilities or additional personnel. The move would only necessitate that certain personnel be upgraded, and I view this consequence as being desirable, especially since most of the employees concerned have put in long years of faithful and efficient service, and are doing the same work as their superiors in New Orleans.

There is no question that the caseload of the Baton Rouge division warrants it being a separate district. The nine parishes which compose the division include not only Baton Rouge, but also a big booming area along the Mississippi River were industrial growth has gone on the rampage. Litigation is heavy, and is increasing at a rapid rate. Already, it has a caseload of substantially more than that of 29 of the 93 districts in the United States. It is entitled to all of the advantages of a separate district.

All of the judges of the eastern district are in complete agreement with the purposes of the bill.

It would cost very little money, but it would be of considerable benefit to the people of the nine parishes involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1873) to create an additional judicial district in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REQUIREMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORM SERVICES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, when Congress enacted Public Law 85-422 in 1958, it departed from a principle that had been practiced for almost 100 years:

that of basing military retired pay on military active duty pay rates.

This 1958 legislation was followed in 1963 by Public Law 88–132 linking military retirement pay to the consumer price index. The practical result of this legislation was to introduce further confusion and inequality into computation of retirement pay for military personnel.

Members on the retired rolls or those due for retirement within the next few years, almost without exception entered the active service and served their careers under a more favorable retirement system. They now must retire under a system which I believe can be improved by a bill I propose to introduce.

By enactment of Public Law 85–422, we increased active military pay rates an average of 10 percent, but accorded retired personnel only a 6-percent cost-of-living increase. Military personnel who, heretofore, had been able to count on a retirement income which would compensate them in some degree for their below-average rates of pay during active duty, were suddenly faced with the prospect that retirement pay would not keep up with increases accorded their counterparts in active service. It is acknowledged that during the 20 to 30 years of active duty they served, their pay was below the standard of their civilian contemporaries.

It is thought by some that this act has had the effect of discouraging reenlistment, aggravating the retention problem which has been plaguing the military in recent years.

Enactment of Public Law 88–132 in 1963 further compounded the problem, I believe. The result of this law has, it now appears, been to introduce further confusion. Let me give an example.

We now have situations in which military retirees of the same grade, with the same length of service, who have suffered the same hardships, are drawing seven different rates of pay, depending on the date of their retirement.

Both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy committed themselves to the principle of recomputation of retired military pay.

In his budget message to Congress in 1960, President Eisenhower urged that retirement pay rates be computed on the basis of active duty rates. I quote:

> Traditionally, rates of pay for retired military personnel have been proportionate to current rates of pay for active duty personnel. The 1958 military pay act departed from this formula . . . I endorse pending legislation that will restore the traditional relationship between retired and active duty pay rates.

President Eisenhower had provided $24 million in the 1960 budget to accomplish this.

In his 1960 campaign, President Kennedy committed himself to the principle of recomputation, as did his Vice Presidential candidate.

Furthermore, military retirees are not considered, under law, as pensioners in any sense of the word, but as officers subject to recall in the event of conflict requiring their services. Thus the Court of Military Appeals ruled in the case of the United States against Hooper, "officers on the retired list are not mere pensioners in any sense of the word. The salaries they receive are not solely recompense for past services, but a means devised by Congress to insure their availability, in future contingencies."

The course we have set ourselves with the enactment of Public Law 85–422 and Public Law 88–132 seems at odds with the principle of "pay comparability" for civil service employees and active members of the armed services, which we are trying to effect. It works hardships on older retirees, whose incomes will not keep pace with those of newly retired personnel and active duty personnel.

Mr. President, I believe we need to give greater recognition to the moral obligation which exists by virtue of the fact that recent retirees and those retiring in the near future entered the armed services with the understanding that their retired pay would be computed on active duty rates. While that policy was in effect, we in Congress understood the situation and took into consideration the favorable retirement system, setting active duty rates at a lower figure than would have been adopted otherwise.

Because I believe the time has come for Congress to provide better treatment for our service personnel and restore full retirement benefits under which so many members of our present Military Establishment came into the service, I shall introduce legislation to recompute retirement pay on the basis of active duty pay.

At this time, I shall only ask that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD. I shall not introduce the bill until about June 13. It is my intention to ask for cosponsors since a number of colleagues in the Senate have expressed interest in the bill.

In enacting this bill, the Congress will not only improve on its 1958 legislation but also reemphasize the Government's good faith and confidence with those who so faithfully served. And we will demonstrate to all active duty personnel of the armed services that their earned rights will be protected and their Government will live up to its responsibilities and obligations after they have completed their active service.

The bill which I will submit will change the code by eliminating language relating to retired pay computation which was inserted by the Pay Act of 1963 and by restoring that section to the form existing prior to 1963.

It also contains a section—section 3—which will provide an opportunity for those persons retired by reason of physical disability prior to the effective date of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and who are receiving retired pay based on the law in effect prior to the effective date of that act, to elect to receive disability retirement pay under the current law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1877) to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1877

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Uniformed Services Retirement Pay Equalization Act".

SEC. 2. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) section 1401 is amended by inserting ", and adjust to reflect later changes in applicable permanent rates" immediately before the period in footnote 1 to the table.

(2) section 1401(a) is repealed.

(3) by striking out the following item in the analysis to chapter 71:

"1401(a) Adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay to reflect changes in Consumer Price Index."

(4) section 1402(a) is amended—

(A) by striking out "monthly basic pay" at the beginning of Column 1 and inserting in lieu thereof "monthly basic pay",

(B) by striking out "retainer pay" at the end of Column 2 and inserting in lieu thereof retainer pay[1]",

(C) by striking out all of footnote number 1,

(D) by striking out "[2]" before the remaining footnote and inserting in lieu thereof "[1]", and,

(E) by striking out all of the matter following the footnote.

(5) section 3991 is amended—

(A) by amending Column 1 of formula A in the table to read as follows:

"Monthly basic pay to which member would be entitled if he were on active duty in his retired grade.[1]"

(B) by amending footnote 2 to the table to read as follows:

"[2] Compute at rates applicable on date of retirement and adjust to reflect later changes in applicable permanent rates. However, if member's retired grade is determined under section 3963(a) or 3963(b), or if member has served four years as Chief of the Medical Service Corps, use pay to which member would be entitled if he were on active duty in his retired grade."

(6) by inserting the following new section immediately after section 6148:

"§ 6149. Retired pay: computed on basis of rate of pay for officer on the active list.

"Except for officers whose retired pay is computed under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 359), the retired pay of each retired officer of the Navy or the Marine Corps shall be computed on the basis of rates of pay provided by law, at the time of his retirement, for officers on the active list. If after the retirement of any such officer the rates of pay for officers on the active list are changed, the retired pay to which the officer is entitled shall be recomputed on the basis of the new rates."

(7) by inserting immediately below "SEC. 6148" the following new item in the analysis to chapter 561:

"6149. Retired pay; computed on basis of rates of pay for officers of the active list."

(8) sections 6151(b), 6323(e), 6325 (a)(2) and (b)(2), 6326(c)(2), 6381(a)(2), 6383 (c)(2), 6390(b)(2), and 6394(h) are amended by striking out "basic pay of the grade" and inserting in lieu thereof "basic pay to which he would be entitled if serving on active duty in the grade."

(9) section 6327(b) is amended by striking out the words "of the grade in which retired" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "to which he would be entitled if on active duty".

(10) sections 6396(c)(2), 6398(b)(2), 6399(c)(2), and 6400(b)(2) are each amended

by striking out "basic pay of the grade" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "basic pay to which she would be entitled if serving on active duty in the grade".

(11) section 8991 is amended—

(A) by amending Column 1 of formula A in the table to read as follows:

"Monthly basic pay to which member would be entitled if he were on active duty in his retired grade.[1]"

(B) by amending footnote 2 to the table to read as follows:

"[2] Compute at rates applicable on date of retirement and adjust to reflect later changes in applicable permanent rates. However, if member's retired grade is determined under section 8963(a) or 8963(b), use pay to which member would be entitled if he were on active duty in his retired grade."

SEC. 3. A member or former member of a uniformed service who was retired by reason of physical disability and who is entitled, in accordance with section 411 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 823), to retired pay or retainer pay computed under provisions of law in effect on the day preceding the effective date of that Act, may elect within the one-year period following the effective date of this Act, to receive disability retirement pay computed under provisions of law in effect on the effective date of this Act in lieu of the retired pay or retainer pay to which he is otherwise entitled.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a member of an armed force who was entitled to pay and allowances under any of the following provisions of law on the day before the effective date of this Act shall continue to receive the pay and allowances to which he was entitled on that day:

(1) The Act of March 23, 1946, chapter 112 (60 Stat. 59).

(2) The Act of June 26, 1948, chapter 677 (62 Stat. 1052).

(3) The Act of September 18, 1950, chapter 952 (64 Stat. A224).

SEC. 5. The enactment of this Act shall not reduce the retired pay or retainer pay to which a member or former member of a uniformed service was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 6. This Act becomes effective on the first day of the first calendar month beginning after the date of its enactment.

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INDONESIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the yoke of a Chinese-style communism has been successfully discarded by Indonesia. General Suharto became Indonesia's chief executive in March of this year. He assumed the leadership of a nation undermined by years of lavish spending and capricious mismanagement of national resources by President Sukarno.

Few nations in modern times have suffered such a complete economic breakdown as has Indonesia since it achieved its independence from the Dutch scarcely 20 years ago. Faced with ramping inflation, sinking exports, escalating unemployment, a bankrupt treasury, and a corrupt officialdom, General Suharto has assigned top priority to economic policy in an effort to repair the devastation and somehow salvage the nation's economy from the wreckage left by former President Sukarno.

The new President Suharto has turned to the West for help. Earnest planning had already been done not only here in our own Federal agencies in Washington, but by the World Bank and its associated agencies as to how a nation in financial and economic trouble can most effectively be aided by the Western community.

In Indonesia itself President Suharto has used an economic brain trust, a quintet of young Indonesian experts largely trained in the United States, to concern themselves with current urgent problems rather than long-range planning. The main thrust of their economic measures has been toward curbing runaway inflation and releasing the power of market forces by scrapping the anomalous mass of rules and regulations instituted by the previous regime. Harmful currency controls have been repealed. Credit has been wisely tightened, and widespread speculation curtailed.

In addition to drastic domestic policies directed toward increasing production and trade, President Suharto has also taken positive steps to rebuild Indonesia's tarnished reputation abroad. I refer briefly to such steps.

Suharto has promulgated a new liberal foreign investment law so as to attract foreign capital. This law permits direct foreign investments in all areas except defense industries. Although foreign capital may not exercise "full control" in the fields of public concern, such as transportation, energy, telecommunications and so forth, joint ventures are encouraged. Foreign management is encouraged, till such time as domestic personnel can be trained.

Suharto has reached an agreement in principle concerning the criteria to be applied in rescheduling Indonesia's debts to its free world creditors. This agreement involved nine nations, the United States, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Japan, Italy, Germany, France, Belgium, and Australia. The total debt involved was $1.2 billions. These nine decided to grant a moratorium until the end of 1971 on any of Indonesia's debts to or guaranteed by them which were already in arrear or will fall due between July 1, 1966, and December 31, 1967. The amounts due would be repaid after 1971 over 7 years.

Suharto has signed an investment guarantee agreement with the United States against the risk of inconvertibility of Indonesian rupiahs, expropriation, war, insurrection, and revolution.

Indonesia has reached an agreement with the same nine creditors that they would accord assistance to Indonesia for essential import requirements. Indonesia's foreign exchange requirements for 1967 would comprise $200 million. Currently bilateral agreements are being negotiated for meeting this gap. The United States has committed itself to supply one-third, provided the other eight creditors supply the rest. The nine creditors are keeping the matter of import requirements under continual scrutiny and will also soon meet in Amsterdam to discuss the problem of those Indonesian debts which will fall due between 1968 and 1970.

Suharto has signed an agreement with the Soviet Union to reschedule $1 billion in debts to be repaid only after 1970.

The Indonesian Government has also promulgated a decree returning to all previous foreign owners properties taken over by the previous regime. A special agreement was concluded with the Dutch.

The Government has also decided to discontinue the special subsidies granted state enterprises so as to force them to produce on more competitive terms.

Officially Indonesia is also requesting renewal of its membership in the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Bank and all its agencies.

Finally, steps have been taken to liberalize foreign trade and exchange practices.

Mr. President, one thing is certain. The Indonesian economy is completely run down in all its aspects. Agriculture, mining, transportation, communications, housing, and so forth, will all need not only a new infusion of capital for rehabilitation, but a new and enlarged vision to supply the needs of the people.

Indonesia is one of the most strategically located countries of the world, lying across the trade routes of the Pacific. She is also blessed with vast potential wealth. She was one of the world's largest suppliers of natural rubber and tin and could regain that position. She has the world's third largest oil reserves. She has enormous quantities of bauxite, iron ore, nickel, manganese, copper, gold, and silver. Her agricultural products comprise copra, palm oil, tobacco, rice, coffee, tea, sugar, cinchona bark, pepper, cocoa, and hard fibers.

Yet most of her resources are unexploited today; production is down to minimal quantities. Now, the urgent question is: What must be done?

Mr. President, today there are very few Western-trained economists in Indonesia who can devise an overall-economic plan to make the Indonesian economy viable again. In 1959, an Indonesian National Development Council was established to devise an 8-year plan for the economic, social, and cultural development of the country. The plan was inaugurated in 1961. Early in April 1961, President Sukarno visited us here in Washington, D.C. In a subsequent press release about this visit the following statement occurred:

> President Kennedy stated that the Indonesian Eight-Year Development Plan provides further opportunity for the two nations to work together. He offered to provide the services of a top-level economic team to consult with their Indonesian counterparts regarding the best way in which the United States might assist in achieving the goals of their Plan.

At that time, their plan concerned research, rice production, textiles, antibiotics, land and air transport, shipping, and telecommunications.

Mr. President, President Kennedy's offer of assistance was never acted on. At that time Indonesia felt that Western advice was not needed and continued to implement her plan in her own way. The results are evident today in an economy practically prostrate and with a cost-of-living index nearly 3,000 times higher than in 1958, and currently rising at a rate of 10 percent per month.

I think the time has come for enlightened action on our part. Indonesia needs us now and has shown a disposition to accept help. I respectfully suggest formation of an expert team of economists to go to Indonesia, make a survey in conjunction with the relevant Indonesian experts and recommend measures to stem inflation, create a stable environment in which private industry can flourish, maximize trade, induce foreign investment, and put the Indonesian economy on a viable footing again. If this offer is made now, I am sure it will be gratefully accepted and acted on immediately.

Considering the urgency of the matter, I am introducing a bill directing the President to appoint a mission of U.S. businessmen—authorities in industrial, agricultural, and commercial enterprise—to go to Indonesia, study the present situation, and make recommendations to the Indonesian Government for stabilizing the economy. All this would be at the formal request of the Indonesian Government, of course. A part of this mission would be comprised of authorities in international development assistance from the Department of State or the Agency for International Development.

My bill would direct such mission to study ways of increasing foreign private investment and allowing a buildup of private domestic capital investment. I would hope the commission would concern itself in no small way with making recommendations to the government of ways by which it might create an atmosphere favorable to private industrial and commercial and agricultural growth, free from government competition. I feel that a stable currency, a stable political situation, creation of a climate on which private investors can rely, would do much toward making that nation solvent.

The opportunity of Indonesia is too important to ignore. I hope the bill—which I now send to the desk—can be acted upon with a minimum of hesitation. We must show that a nation which can throw off the sort of collectivist regime which is bleeding other nations white will not be met with folded arms by nations which believe in economic freedom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1878) to provide for the establishment of an Advisory Commission on Indonesian Economic Development authorized to formulate a comprehensive plan for developing a viable, self-sustaining economy in Indonesia based upon free economic institutions, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO PROFESSIONAL NURSES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow a deduction for certain expenses incurred by professional nurses to enable them to perform nursing services.

The purpose of this bill is to help meet the serious shortage of nurses. There has been a shortage for several years and the problem has been increased by the increased demand arising from enactment of the medical care program for the aged.

Congress acknowledged the need for more and better trained nurses by enacting the Nurses Training Act of 1964, which authorized grants for rehabilitation or construction of nursing schools and funds for a student nurse loan program. In 1965 we amended the Medical Professions Training Aid Act to make nursing schools eligible for grants for expansion, and in 1966 we added funds in the allied health professions program for grants to schools of nursing for providing scholarships to undergraduate students of exceptional financial need.

These are constructive steps, but the demand for professional services of nurses is increasing in hospitals, in extended care facilities and in nursing homes. There is a strong effort to improve the standards of nursing homes and this will require the services of more nurses.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two tables, one showing the total number of registered nurses employed in 1966 and the other showing the total number of professional registered nurses by age group, marital status, and professional employment in 1962.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Registered nurses:	
Total employed, 1966	621,000
Hospitals and institutions	403,700
Nursing homes	17,400
Public health, including school nursing	40,200
Nursing education, including professional and LPN programs	22,700
Professional	18,500
Practical nurse	4,200
Occupational health	18,000
Others, including private duty and office	119,000

Professional registered nurses, by age group, marital status, and activity status, 1962 [1]

Marital status	Total number of nurses	Total percent of nurses	Nurses by age group					
			Under 30	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 and over	Not reported
			Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*
Total with current license to practice	[2] 847,531		190,722	230,653	181,732	130,033	64,274	50,117
			Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Single	148,504	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed	131,768	88.7	93.5	92.6	91.7	89.2	68.7	77.4
Not employed	14,509	9.8	4.3	7.1	7.8	10.0	29.7	15.1
Not reported	2,227	1.5	2.2	.3	.5	.8	1.6	7.5
Married	549,235	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed	313,993	57.2	59.0	50.6	61.6	65.3	48.7	51.8
Not employed	231,119	42.1	40.5	49.0	37.7	33.7	49.3	43.0
Not reported	4,123	.7	.5	.4	.7	1.0	2.0	5.2
Widowed, divorced, or separated	70,710	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed	56,790	80.3	89.8	86.5	87.5	86.0	63.7	73.9
Not employed	13,040	18.5	9.6	13.2	11.9	12.9	34.3	21.1
Not reported	880	1.2	.6	.3	.6	1.1	2.0	5.0
Not reported	51,424	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed	12,345	24.0	41.4	28.8	41.5	52.9	40.4	9.0
Not employed	14,131	27.5	46.1	60.1	46.0	35.1	46.7	11.3
Not reported	24,948	48.5	12.5	11.1	12.5	12.0	12.9	79.7

[1] Percentages based on age group and marital status.

[2] The sum of the totals by marital status does not equal the total number of nurses since information on the marital status of the nurses in Texas was not available and Texas was excluded from these totals.

Source: ANA, Research and Statistics Unit, 1964.

Mr. McCARTHY. The nationwide survey of employment of nurses in 1962 showed that only 14,509 of the 148,504 single registered nurses were not professionally employed, while 231,119 of the 549,235 married nurses were not employed as nurses. A survey was made in 1966 of registered nurses in Hennepin County, which includes the city of Minneapolis. It showed that there were over 1,000 registered nurses in the county who were not professionally employed and of these, 95 percent were married.

Estimates provided by the American Nurses' Association indicate a shortage of about 125,000 nurses today and that this shortage will continue to be the same through 1970. It is clear that if the urgent need for nurses is to be met, the nurses will have to come from the group of married registered nurses who are willing to work at least part time.

One of the principal obstacles to the married nurse working is the cost for competent child care and for domestic help which the family incurs if she returns to work. It is my view that if married nurses are to make this effort to meet the nursing shortage, there should be an adjustment of the tax laws to permit them to deduct the costs they incur for care of dependents and for domestic help.

The law at present does permit some married women to take deductions for care of certain dependents if such care is required to enable the taxpayer to be employed. The amount of the deduction is limited to $600 to $900, depending upon the number of dependents, and the deduction is reduced by the amount which the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer and his spouse exceeds $6,000.

The bill I am introducing today would permit professional nurses to take a deduction for expenses for caring for a dependent or for domestic service in her household if these expenses are incurred for the purpose of enabling the taxpayer to perform the services of a professional nurse. The amount to be deducted shall not exceed $2,600 or an amount equal to one-half of the taxable income for the taxable year for performing services as a professional nurse, whichever is the lesser, and there would be no gross income limit.

The special need for the services of nurses and the special importance of their work to the health of the citizens of the Nation require an adjustment in the tax laws. I believe that enactment of this bill would be a most constructive step in helping to meet the problem of the national shortage of nurses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1879) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for certain expenses incurred by professional nurses to enable them to perform nursing services, introduced by Mr. McCarthy, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes.

This administration bill is intended to remedy many of the defects in existing law. Present limitations on contributions and expenditures are ineffective and unrealistic.

Broadened definitions of terms will include all elections and all political committees which receive or spend in excess of $1,000 during a calendar year.

The primary rationale of the bill, Mr. President, is that of full public disclosure in the financing of campaigns for Federal office.

Each candidate for Federal office, and each political committee which supports a candidate for Federal office and which accepts contributions or makes expenditures exceeding $1,000 during a calendar year, is required to file a detailed report of those receipts and expenditures.

Full and complete disclosure is, in the final analysis, the only proper method of informing the American voter, the ultimate judge, of the means by which money is obtained, the amounts expended, and the manner in which such moneys are expended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1880) to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Cannon, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO ENABLE CITIZENS WHO CHANGE RESIDENCES TO VOTE IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes.

American citizens have become very mobile, with millions of voters moving to and fro in the United States every year. An analysis of the 1960 election indicates that between 5 and 8 million otherwise eligible voters were disfranchised by the varied residence requirements operating in the 50 States.

It is regrettable that such substantial numbers of citizens should be unable to cast their votes for President and Vice President simply because they exercise their constitutional right to move from one part of this country to another.

Mr. President, this bill is sound in its purposes and meritorious in its goals. It will restore to unknown millions of Americans the privilege and the unquestioned right to vote for their presidential and vice-presidential candidates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1881) to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Cannon, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

THE NEED FOR UNITED ACTION BY THE WESTERN POWERS TO PREVENT WAR IN THE MIDEAST CRISIS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a resolution declaring the support of the Senate for President Johnson's statement of May 23, on the Mideast crisis, and calling for tripartite action by Britain, France, and the United States to preserve the peace in the Mideast until the United Nations can effectively take over the peacekeeping role.

I listened with great interest to the remarks of the Senator from Maryland. I know we would all like to see United Nations take charge of this crisis situation.

I am sure that all of us would support every effort to that end. But, to be realistic, we have to admit that the present political complexion of the United Nations gives only marginal reason for hoping that it can act effectively to prevent war.

The political limitations of the United Nations are all the more serious because Secretary General U Thant has, in a sense, made himself the embodiment of those weaknesses and limitations. I can think of no other explanation for the scandalous manner in which he capitulated to Nasser's demand that the U.N. Emergency Force be withdrawn from Egypt, without even troubling to consult the Security Council.

Mr. President, I hope and pray that my misgivings about the United Nations are mistaken. But even if the United Nations proves itself politically capable of acting in this crisis situation, its machinery is so cumbersome that I simply cannot conceive of it acting in time to prevent the outbreak of hostilities.

The situation in the Gulf of Aqaba presents the single greatest danger of war. My resolution recommends that the United States "should seek British and French participation in a token naval task force to be dispatched without delay to the Gulf of Aqaba to insure that this international waterway remains open for shipping of all nations, and that this action should not wait on the United Nations, although U.N. approval should be sought for it."

In urging that we act in advance of any decision by the United Nations, I am simply recommending that we do what we did in Korea where the situation also made it imperative that we act without delay. Moreover, I believe that affirmative action by the major Western powers will encourage affirmative action by the United Nations, just as our immediate response to North Korean aggression played a major role in encouraging the massive U.N. majority which voted in favor of intervention.

The morning papers report that we are seeking Soviet participation in joint action by the Big Four Powers to prevent war in the Middle East. I think this is an essential diplomatic exercise, and I am in immediate favor of it. But time is so short and the chances of an immediate and affirmative Soviet response are so slim, that I favor immediate action by the Western Big Three. Such action would in no way preclude cooperation with the Soviet Union at a later date; but it might very well make the difference between peace and war in the Middle East.

My pessimism about Soviet intentions is based on the record of Soviet meddling and subversion in the Middle East in recent years.

The crisis we are today witnessing in the Mideast has caught us unprepared because for several years now, despite the war in Vietnam, the Western World has sought comfort in the delusion that there is a growing detente, as it is called, with the Soviet Union. The belief in this phony detente has, indeed, become so widespread and obsessive that anyone who denies its existence is automatically labeled an extremist.

Mr. President, since 1964 certainly, and perhaps earlier—I cannot recall exactly—I have spoken out repeatedly, here on the floor of the Senate, against the myth of the detente, and on several occasions in recent years I have specifically warned against Soviet designs in the Middle East. I do not think I was very persuasive or effective about it, but at least it is on the record.

Most recently, a few weeks ago, in a speech here in opposition to the Consular Convention I brought up the subject again, and I quote from what I said at that time:

> In 1966 and in this year of 1967 Soviet arms shipment to the leftist regimes of Syria, Algeria, the U.A.R., Iraq and Somalia, and Soviet political activities have posed a serious threat to the security of every country, all the way from Gibraltar to Aden.
>
> We have been warned by King Hussein of Jordan, and by other Arab moderates, and even by prominent anti-communists in the UAR, that the current epidemic of unrest in the Middle East must not be viewed as a rash of unrelated incidents—that each of these many incidents, in fact, is an integral part of a coordinated plan designed to give the Kremlin control of the whole of North Africa, and to give them control as well of Arabia's fabulous oil deposits, which are estimated to contain ⅔ of the world's known reserves.

Let there be no mistake about it, the Mideast crisis is not made in Cairo. It is made in Moscow. Not only has Moscow provided the Egyptian and Syrian Governments with the massive modern armaments they are now preparing to use again Israel, but it has blatantly supported these Governments through its propaganda and its diplomacy.

Despite all the wishful thinking of recent years, the cat is now out of the bag. The Soviet Union, in its statement of 2 days ago, made it clear that it stands foursquare behind the Arab extremists. The key sentence in the Moscow statement is—and I urge my colleagues to ponder the significance of these words carefully:

> He who would venture to unleash aggression in the Near East would encounter not only the United strength of the Arab countries, but also resolute resistance to aggression on the part of the Soviet Union and all peace-loving states.

I do not mean to say that the Egyptian and Syrian Governments are total puppets of Moscow. I have no doubt that they think they are acting as their own agents and in their own interests. It is to Moscow's advantage that they should think so and that the rest of the world should also think so. The really important thing, from Moscow's standpoint, is that the overall policy of the Arab extremists subserves the ends of Soviet imperialism.

Nasser may think that he is cleverly using the Soviet Union to advance the cause of Arab nationalism. The chances are, however, that he and the other Arab extremists will ultimately share the fate of the man who tried to ride the tiger.

The Soviet Union is playing a fiendishly clever game in the Middle East. I do not think, and I am not suggesting, that the Soviet Union at this hour wants total, all-out war—at least, I seriously doubt it. But, short of such a war, they stand to gain no matter how things develop from here on in.

If the Arab nations, at Western insistence, abandon their much-heralded invasion of Israel, then Moscow will certainly use this to reinforce its propaganda that American imperialism is the archenemy of the Arab peoples, while the Soviet Union is their true friend.

If the Arab state should embark on military action against Israel and then be constrained to desist, Moscow would exploit this situation in precisely the same way.

And if the ultimate tragedy were by some miracle to occur and the Arab legions succeeded in overrunning Israel in blitzkrieg manner, then absolutely nothing could prevent the Soviet-Nasser combination from taking over throughout the Arab countries, from Morocco to Saudi Arabia. I am as sure of this as I am that I am living.

The Soviets are playing a dangerous game, however, because once hostilities break out in as crucial an area as the Middle East, it may prove impossible, despite the finely devised plans of the men in the Kremlin, to limit the conflagration.

I pray that my estimate of Soviet intentions proves in error despite the consistent pattern of recent years. However, I am sure that history will show it is so and that at some hour in this Senate Chamber someone will stand at his chair and say it was so. It will then be too late, as it has too often been too late. So, they are playing a dangerous game, and the crisis does originate in Moscow. It does not originate anywhere else.

We have been fooling ourselves year after year with this nonsense. Nobody wants to speak up about it. Nobody wants to talk about it, and anyone who does so is denounced and will face severe trouble if he dares to do so.

I pray that my estimate of Soviet intentions proves in error despite the consistent pattern of recent years. But meanwhile, it behooves us all to reexamine the myth of the detente that has been preached and preached in almost every quarter of this land now for several years until our people, I fear, are mesmerized by it, because, so long as we remain under the spell of this myth, we shall not be able to devise a strategy broad enough and realistic enough to cope with the many dangers that today confront us and the many more that will confront us in the coming years, in various parts of the world until we do face up to it.

And it would also behoove us to rethink our entire policy with regard to dictatorial aggressors like Nasser.

We have sought to appease Nasser by lavishing on him some half-billion dollars of the taxpayers' money in foreign aid, by rescuing him from disaster at the time of the Suez crisis, and by recognizing with indecent haste the quisling regime he set up in Yemen after his forces invaded the country.

Once again the lesson has been driven home that one cannot appease or conciliate dictators of the ilk of Nasser. Every concession, every gesture of conciliation, every turning of the other cheek, only emboldens them to engage in further aggression because they construe these things as signs of weakness on the part of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope that the distinguished Senator will add to those kind things which have been done by our Nation for Nasser and his people, the fact that we have furnished them hundreds of millions of dollars worth of foodstuffs which have stood between Nasser and the hunger of millions of his people.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator made that suggestion. He is absolutely correct. We have done that, and it should be made part of the record. It is part of the lesson to be learned.

I am glad that the Senator has pointed it out.

Mr. President, it is devoutly to be hoped that our foreign policy will in future be guided by the lesson we have again learned so dearly.

Mr. President, I have not any doubt that this is a true analysis and estimate of the situation, and I will not stop talking about it. I may talk alone, but I am confident that I am telling the truth and that someday history will show that someone did tell the truth about the situation at an hour when, for some reasons that I do not understand, not enough of us were willing to do so.

We are on the verge of a grave disaster, and this situation in the Middle East is abundant proof of it.

Nobody can tell me that it arises in Cairo or the Middle East. What nonsense. How could Nasser, by himself, acquire the massive, modern armaments of war with which to start his aggressive threat in the Middle East?

Where do these armaments come from? They come from the Soviet Union with the object of taking over the whole Mediterranean basin, north Africa, and the riches of the oil of the Middle East, with the added object of outflanking southern Europe.

It will be a bad day for the free world if they ever succeed.

I hope that the resolution is given serious consideration by the Senate. That is my reason for submitting it at this late hour. I am sorry that I have detained other Senators in order to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 131) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES. 131

Whereas the massing of troops on the Arab-Israeli frontiers and the mining of the Gulf of Aqaba by the United Arab Republic have brought Israel and the Arab nations to the very brink of war; and

Whereas an Arab-Israeli war would be a disaster for the peoples of the Middle East and might soon expand into a larger war involving the major nations; and

Whereas the Secretary-General of the United Nations has regrettably capitulated to President Nasser's demand that the United Nations Emergency Force be withdrawn from Egypt; and

Whereas there is little reason to hope that the United Nations can or will intervene in time to prevent disaster; and

Whereas in the absence of United Nations intervention, the peace of the Middle East can be preserved only if the diplomatic efforts of the Western nations are backed up by a demonstrable willingness to use force to prevent aggression from either side; and

Whereas only such a demonstration can

give Nasser and the Arab extremists reason for pause; and

Whereas the impartiality displayed by the United States in 1956 when it opposed the British-French-Israeli intervention against Egypt and rescued Nasser from certain defeat, established a precedent for acting with equal impartiality to prevent Arab aggression against the State of Israel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports President Johnson's declaration of May 23 that the United States remains "firmly committed to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all the nations in the area;" that we "strongly oppose aggression by anyone in the area in any form, overt or clandestine;" and that we regard the announced blockade of Israeli shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba as "illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace": and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate:

(1) That the Administration should immediately seek British and French concurrence for a tri-partite warning to both sides in the Middle East crisis to abstain from aggression—in conformance with the assurances given at the time of the Suez settlement in 1956 and with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations at that time;

(2) That the United States should seek British and French participation in a token naval task force to be dispatched without delay to the Gulf of Aqaba to insure that this international waterway remains open for shipping of all nations, and that this action should not wait on the United Nations, although United Nations approval should be sought for it;

(3) That the Administration should call upon all the member governments of the United Nations, including the Soviet government, to use every diplomatic resource to prevent the calamity of an Arab-Israeli war;

(4) That every effort should be made to involve the United Nations and to work through it, and to bring about the reestablishment of the United Nations Emergency Force as a peace keeping buffer between Arabs and Israelis.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTING

AMENDMENT NO. 202

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on February 17, 1964, the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the case of Wesberry against Sanders, a case challenging Georgia's congressional districting.

We hold—

The Court said—

> that, construed in its historical context, the command of Article I, Section 2, that Representatives be chosen by the people of the several states means that as nearly as practicable, one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's.

In the 3 years since that opinion, there have been many more suits, many new redistricting plans formulated by State legislatures all over the country, and many court orders to redistrict. All of this activity has produced substantial progress. As I pointed out to the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee the other day, four of their States had been in the leadership in this progress. In Mississippi, the home of our chairman, the legislature redistricted last year and came up with a plan in which the variance between the population of the largest and smallest districts was 7.1 percent. In the State of the Senator from Arkansas, the 1965 redistricting produced a plan with a maximum variance of 2.2 percent. In Senator HART's State, the redistricting in 1964 resulted in a maximum variance of 3.4 percent. And many other examples, such as Maryland, Utah, Oklahoma, Kentucky, and South Dakota can be cited, as examples of what a State legislature acting in good faith can do to carry out the promise of the one-man, one-vote principle embedded in our Constitution.

Now this progress and this spirit of cooperation and constructive adherence to the law of the land is threatened by a bill which has been passed by the House of Representatives and which will be reported by the Senate Judiciary at the end of next week. I refer, of course, to H.R. 2508.

This bill has a long and proud history. Fifteen years ago a similar bill was introduced in the House by the eminent chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. CELLER. At that time the principles embodied in the bill, if enacted, would have placed Congress in a leadership role in assuring that the one-man, one-vote principle would be applied to congressional elections. In those years before the Supreme Court's decision in Wesberry, such legislation would have constituted a significant reform in the existing congressional districting practices. If it had been passed then, there might never have been a necessity for the Supreme Court to enter into this difficult area. Thus, it is a tribute to Chairman CELLER's foresight and imagination that he was able to anticipate by over a decade the direction in which history would move us.

There are many features of the bill as supported over the years by Chairman CELLER and as passed by the House which merit the support of all of us. The mandate for one-member districts for contiguous boundaries and for compact districts is one which is sorely needed and clearly deserving of enactment. Unfortunately, even this mandate has been diluted by the House, against the wishes of Chairman CELLER. Where the Celler bill had directed that the districts be in "as compact form as practicable," the House changed this clause to read "in as reasonable a compact form as the State finds practicable." It is not clear what this change means. Some have argued that the States would thereby have complete discretion on the compactness issue and that the Federal courts would not be able to review this aspect of districting plans. Others have said that the new language could only be read as requiring the courts to give significant weight to the States' decisions on compactness. As with so many features of the bill, we have no sure answer because there have been no real hearings held on the subject since the courts began implementing the Wesberry decision in 1964. My own belief is that whatever this provision means or is intended to mean, in some places it will be construed as an invitation to gerrymander, and especially to gerrymander at the expense of minority group populations in urban areas.

The most difficult provision of the House-passed bill is its temporary provision as to district populations for the 1968 and 1970 congressional elections. The bill says that the population disparity should not exceed 30 percent, in the House version, and 35 percent, in the Senate version. Again there is great debate about what this provision means. If it means that the State would have unfettered discretion to establish districts as long as the population variance does not exceed 35 percent, then I am convinced on the basis of the best information available to me, that districting plans utilizing such discretion, would be found unconstitutional. For the Supreme Court has said that the State legislatures, in drawing congressional districts, must make a good-faith effort to make their population as equal as practicable, that variations can only be minor and must be justifiable on the basis of some rational State policy such as compactness, contiguity, adherence to geographical boundaries, or recognition of natural barriers. These are constitutional provisions. They are based on principles clearly enunciated over 3 years ago. This Congress cannot and should not seek to postpone the Constitution for 5 more years.

I shall be saying much more about this subject in the weeks to come, but for today I send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 2508 which I will be proposing when the bill is considered. I ask that the amendment and an analysis of the differences between H.R. 2508 and the amendment be printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD, together with the analysis.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, very briefly, this amendment seeks to embody in the legislation itself the constitutional principles which I believe will have to be followed in any event under whatever legislation is passed if future districting plans are to be upheld.

It maintains the language of the House bill on one-member districts, and on contiguity, and restores the House subcommittee language on compactness. It adopts the permanent House standard of 10 percent as the maximum permissible variance between the largest and smallest district in a State, but applies this standard, as the courts have, immediately, that is, beginning with the 1968 congressional elections. It also makes explicit what I believe to be necessarily implicit in the House bill, if any part of it is to be upheld; namely, that the districts be as equal in population as possible, except for variations justified by the kind of rational and uniformly applied State policies to which I have already referred.

Mr. President, I want to make clear my strong desire that a bill on congressional districting be passed this year. But the bill we pass should not be a bill which invites the State legislatures to put themselves at odds with the Supreme Court. The best favor we can do our colleagues in the House is to pass a bill which is clear and clearly constitutional.

I believe that my amendment would make H.R. 2508 such a bill.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning with line 3, page 1, strike out all to and including line 4, page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled 'An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives' (46 Stat. 26, as amended; 2 U.S.C. 2) is amended by striking out subsection (c) and inserting in place thereof the following:

" '(c) In each State entitled in the Ninety-first Congress or in any subsequent Congress to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative. Each district shall at all times be composed of contiguous territory, including adjoining insular territory, in as reasonably compact a form as practicable, and the districts within each State shall contain substantially equal numbers of persons, as determined under the then most recent decennial census, except as provided in subsection (d) of this section. A State may make reasonable deviations from numerical equality in order to take into consideration the factors of contiguity, compactness, extraordinary natural boundaries, and the maintenance of the integrity of political subdivision lines, but only if such criteria are uniformly applied. No such deviation may cause the population of the district with the largest population in a State to exceed by more than 10 per centum the population of the district with the smallest population in that State, as determined under the then most recent decennial census, except as provided in subsection (d) of this section.

" '(d) Districts in compliance with subsection (c) of this section shall be established for the regular election of Members of the House of Representatives next following the year in which each decennial census of the United States is taken. Nothing in this section shall prohibit a State from reestablishing such districts more often than once in each ten-year period. Any reestablishment of such districts within any State which is to take effect for any regular election other than the regular election next following the year in which a decennial census of the United States is taken, shall be based upon population figures compiled by a census of that State taken pursuant to the Act of August 26, 1954, as amended (71 Stat. 481; 13 U.S.C. 8), not more than two years prior to the election to which such districting will first apply.

" '(e) Any person in any State meeting the qualifications for voting in an election of a Member of the House of Representatives from that State may bring an action in the district court of the United States for the district of which he is a resident, without regard to any amount in controversy, or in any court of competent jurisdiction of the State of which he is a resident, to enforce the provisions of this section with regard to the State in which he resides, and the court in which such action is brought shall have authority to issue all orders and decrees necessary to bring such State into compliance with this section.'

"Sec. 2. Each State entitled in the Ninety-first Congress to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled 'An Act to provide for apportionment of Representatives' (46 Stat. 26), as amended, shall have or establish districts complying with the provisions of that section, as amended by section 1 of this Act, before the time of the election of Representatives to that Congress, except that such districts of any State shall be deemed to be in compliance with that section as so amended if they meet the criteria set forth therein as computed on the basis of the Eighteenth Decennial Census of the United States or of any subsequent special census of that State conducted pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1954, as amended (71 Stat. 481; 13 U.S.C. 8)."

ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2508 AND THE BILL AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE

1. One-member districts: no change from House bill, except that temporary exceptions for Hawaii and New Mexico are eliminated.

2. Contiguity; no change except that language is added to make it clear that adjoining insular territory is to be considered contiguous.

3. Compactness: no change except that to avoid any confusion about the reviewability of compliance with this requirement, the reference to the State finding is deleted.

4. Population: The House bill's implicit requirement that districts contain substantially equal populations unless deviations are justified by legitimate and uniformly applied factors is made explicit. The House bill's limit of 10% on such deviations is retained.

5. Censuses: The House bill is clarified by making explicit the requirement that, if a decennial census indicates the need for redistricting, the redistricting must take place in time for the first regular election after the year of the census. The amendment retains the House bill's requirement that redistricting for any other election be based on special statewide censuses taken within two years before the election to which the redistricting is to apply.

6. Suits: A specific provision is added giving jurisdiction to both federal and state courts and restricting standing to sue to those meeting the qualifications for voting in the state whose districting is sought to be questioned.

7. Temporary provisions: As in the House bill, redistricting for the Ninety-First Congress may be based on either the 1960 census or a special statewide census, but the five year suspension of the permanent figure for maximum deviation is eliminated.

ESTABLISHMENT ON THE BASIS OF THE 18TH AND SUBSEQUENT DECENNIAL CENSUSES OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 202

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 1863) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1965 with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1282) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1283) to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 1796) to impose quotas on the importation of certain textile articles, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the following bills and joint resolution, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] be added as a cosponsor:

S. 1484. A bill to establish a Small Business Crime Protection Insurance Corporation, and for other purposes;

S. 1502. A bill to provide assistance to students pursuing programs of higher education in the field of law enforcement; and

S.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 1789) to authorize demonstration projects designed to help young adult criminal offenders through the services of members of VISTA and the Teacher Corps or other qualified teachers, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the following bills, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] be added as a cosponsor:

S. 854. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; and

S. 1294. A bill to reclassify certain key positions and increase salaries in the postal field service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF CHANGE OF DATE FOR HEARINGS ON SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATION

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the date for hearings before the Small Business Subcommittee on S. 1862, a bill to amend the authorizing legislation of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes, has been changed from 10 a.m., June 2, 1967, to 10 a.m., June 1, 1967. The hearings will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building. Any person desiring to testify on this bill should notify Mr. Reginald Barnes, Assistant Counsel, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, 5200 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, telephone: 225-3921.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Jefferson County Chamber of Commerce honors West Virginia's oldest newspaper with its outstanding service award.

THE SAD PLIGHT OF GREECE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, 20 years ago President Harry S. Truman made the decision to commit our military might and our economic resources to save Greece from the serious threat of a Communist takeover. His historic action, which came to be known as the Truman Doctrine, resulted in the defeat of the Communist-led insurrection and the establishment of democratic government in Greece. Since that time, we have continued to give billions of American taxpayers' dollars to Greece to help enable that nation to remain a bastion of freedom and democracy.

The Truman Doctrine laid down a global policy of "supporting free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities." It held that every nation faces a choice between two ways of life—one based upon the will of the majority, expressed through free elections and institutions, the other based upon the will of the minority, relying on "terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedom."

Greece is no longer free. In Greece, the cradle of democracy, militarists have overthrown the duly elected Government and have established a military junta which rules by decree. These rightwing generals have thrown more than 6,000 political opponents in jail, suppressed personal freedom, established control over press and radio, abrogated the Constitution and canceled free elections. We have accepted these actions.

There have been no crisis meetings of the National Security Council. There have been no expressions of profound concern from President Johnson or from Secretary of State Rusk for the murder of democracy in Greece. There have been no special ambassadors dispatched to Athens to help the Greeks restore self-government. There has been no mobilization of American armed power for intervention in behalf of the right of the Greek people to choose their own form of government. There has been no exertion of pressure through economic military aid to restore constitutional government in Greece.

Mr. President, if instead of rightwing generals, a ragtag group of leftwing extremists and Communists had staged a coup d'etat and established a Communist government or quasi-Communist government in Greece, it would be interesting to note whether we would have taken action—military or otherwise—to restore a democracy to that land. The fact that we have not done so is remarkable in light of the Truman Doctrine which was invoked to justify intervention in the Greek civil war 20 years ago and which is frequently cited as a justification for our intervention in the civil war in Vietnam.

It is ironic that the military takeover in Greece was accomplished with NATO resources. In fact, reportedly, the strategy used by the generals was originally a defensive NATO strategy to be used in the event of an attempted Communist insurrection or coup. Unfortunately, this plan was used offensively against the democratic government of Greece.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, what happens in Greece in the next few months will depend to a large extent upon the attitude of the U.S. Government. Thus far we have indicated our displeasure, but only very, very mildly. We have given to the world the definite impression that the United States is far more permissive toward Fascist dictatorships, so long as they are anti-Communist, than toward leftwing revolutionary forces, even when they are not Communist.

Very definitely, we should withhold further military and economic aid to Greece until its present dictators give firm assurances that free elections to restore democratic government to their country will be held as soon as possible. We should exert our influence to the utmost to restore freedom to the birthplace of democracy.

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, at this time when the so-called Kennedy round of tariff negotiations has been brought to a conclusion in Geneva, it seems fitting and proper to pause and recognize the efforts of the distinguished public servant, Christian A. Herter, who in 1962 was named our Government's chief planner and negotiator on foreign trade and whose untimely death last winter made it impossible for him to see his unremitting efforts on behalf of international trade come to fruition.

Christian Herter's work in Geneva was, however, but one of so very many brilliant accomplishments that saw him move successively from the post-World War I period when he was Herbert Hoover's assistant in Paris and later in Washington, to his political apprenticeship in the Massachusetts Legislature, becoming speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, then to his five terms in the Congress, followed by two terms as Governor of his State, and, of course, as Secretary of State under President Eisenhower. In every responsibility he assumed—and these are almost too numerous even to catalog—Christian Herter acquitted himself magnificently.

To each task he brought a selfless devotion, together with a profound intellect which never overlooked the human factors involved. His service was always characterized by a determination to follow the course he believed the right one and by the highest measure of shining integrity. And yet his approach was that of a man of quiet humility and deference to the convictions of others. These qualities of mind and character earned for him international respect and admiration.

Had he been vouchsafed more years among us, one has no doubt whatsoever that Christian Herter would have added even greater luster to an already outstandingly illustrious record of public service. None who had the privilege of association with him can help but miss his wise counsel and firm hand in these troubled days.

Mr. President, at the time of Christian Herter's death, I did not have the privilege of being a Member of the U.S. Senate. I did not want to let this opportunity pass, therefore, without placing on record my abiding appreciation for all this truly great man did for his country during a period of our history that spanned so many momentous events. His career in public office, and no less the contributions he made as a private citizen, exemplify that which is truly fine and good in American life. His example will long remain as an inspiring example for those of us who follow.

SENATOR BROOKE DELIVERS SPEECH ON TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on May 22, Senator EDWARD BROOKE delivered a most impressive speech to the annual conference of Mutual Savings Banks on the truth-in-lending bill. Senator BROOKE was extremely kind in referring to the activities of Senator DOUGLAS and myself on behalf of this long delayed reform. Senator BROOKE is an expert in his own right on truth in lending in that he was the attorney general of Massachusetts and was one of the principal sponsors of the Massachusetts truth-in-lending law which was enacted last year.

As our hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee indicated, the predictions that a truth-in-lending bill is unworkable simply has not been borne out by the facts. We have had a number of witnesses from Massachusetts testify that the Massachusetts law has had no adverse effect on business; on the contrary it has had a favorable effect.

Senator BROOKE has been a most constructive member of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee, and I am sure that with his extensive experience on this subject he will have a lot to contribute when we meet on June 8 and June 9 to consider the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BROOKE's excellent speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR EDWARD W. BROOKE, REPUBLICAN OF MASSACHUSETTS, DELIVERED TO THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS, BOSTON, MASS., MAY 22, 1967

I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before the Annual Conference of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. I have been involved in Washington affairs in general, and in Senate Banking and Currency Committee matters in particular, for only a brief period of time. But I have already become familiar with some of the activities of your Association and of its officers and representatives. I have had occasion to study the continuing attempts to secure Federal charters for mutual savings banks, and have studied the excellent remarks delivered on that subject to the National Savings Conference of the American Bankers Association by your distinguished Executive Vice President, Dr. Grover W. Ensley.

In addition, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, of which I am a member, has had the privilege of hearing testimony in support of federal truth-in-lending legislation presented by Mr. Morris D. Crawford, Jr., Chairman of your Association's Committee on Federal Legislation. Mr. Crawford made a number of very relevant suggestions as to how Senate Bill #5, this session's truth-in-lending proposal, could be improved. I plan to seek incorporation of these suggestions when the Subcommittee meets in executive session early in June to draft the final version of the bill.

But I am especially pleased to have been invited to this conference because of the opportunity it provides to speak on a subject which has been of great concern to me—that is, the role of the business community in the legislative process. The National Association of Mutual Savings Banks has clearly recognized its responsibilities in this area, and has participated to an admirable extent in creative, constructive and helpful ways. I regret that this cannot be said about much of the rest of the business community. This is particularly true in so far as legislation designed to assist and to protect the American consumer is concerned.

One of the first lessons which any freshman senator learns is that there are exceedingly few certainties in the legislative process. The practice of predicting which laws will be passed, and which bills will be rejected, can be an embarrassing pastime. Congress, and the state legislatures as well, are amalgams of conflicting objectives, philosophies and pressures. They effectively resist most attempts at forecasting the direction they will take in any given problem area.

But there are a few realities in the legislative process which are capable of identification. And so I will ignore my own warning against attempting to predict legislative developments, and suggest where Congress (and perhaps the state legislatures as well) are heading upon a series of questions of vital importance to America business.

We are upon the threshold of what I believe will be an era of increasingly dramatic and increasingly successful efforts to protect the American consumer through the legislative process. The advent of such a period is long overdue. The warning, "caveat emptor—let the buyer beware," has for too long been the dominant factor in the relationship between the seller and the buyer.

I do not mean to imply that the United States government has done nothing in this area. We have far-reaching and sophisticated laws designed to protect people from injury or from illness caused by items which they purchase. We have created a multitude of federal and state agencies which regulate a wide variety of businesses and professions. And we have developed agencies such as the Massachusetts Consumers' Council whose task it is to observe the purchasing process and to assist those whose experiences with it may have been unfortunate.

I applaud these developments. Yet, I reiterate my thesis—we have seen little compared to what is coming. Most consumers have little contact with the administrative structure which we have built to protect them. There may be a rather abstract, intellectual appreciation of the benefits conferred by the care with which the Food and Drug Administration—to cite a single example—inspects and examines the widest range of commodities before they reach the marketplace for sale. There may be a vague understanding of the role which our giant regulatory agencies play in 20th century America. But, for the most part, the average American consumer is not aware of the ways in which such organizations touch his life. Despite the existence of such agencies, the average consumer is very likely to ask, "What is government really doing to protect me in the marketplace?" And, make no mistake about it, this sentiment is being communicated to Congress and to the legislatures of the fifty states.

Legislatures on both the federal and the state level are reacting. The 89th Congress enacted a "truth in packaging" law designed to protect the customer from misleading statements and claims placed upon boxes and other containers. This session of Congress is presently considering "truth in lending" legislation and committee hearings have been concluded. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings upon the administration of mutual funds on June 19. Truth-in-lending legislation pertaining to installment sales has already been enacted in Massachusetts and in the State of Washington. Seven other states have adopted truth-in-lending laws applicable to small loans. And such legislation is being considered by the legislatures of a number of other states. It is my belief that a major breakthrough in this field is in the offing. We are about to provide the consumers of this country with much greater protection from misleading advertising claims and with much greater control of quality in the marketplace.

You gentlemen do not need a lecture from me on consumer problems or of attempts to resolve them. You know the realities of the marketplace. I raise these questions because I am convinced that the business community as a whole should have a key role to play in the period of consumer legislation which is about to begin. Up to now, this has not been the case. The business community has chosen, for the most part, to remain aloof from the problems faced by the consumer in the marketplace. Business has, up to now, tended either to ignore legislative developments in this area, or to oppose them.

It is in this connection that I wish to direct some remarks to the subject of truth-in-lending legislation. I do this for two reasons. First, it is a subject which I believe is of interest not only to bankers specifically, but to the business community and to the public in general. Secondly, I believe it serves as an excellent example of the all too prevalent failure of the business community to participate in a constructive way in the policy formulation and draftsmanship of legislation which vitally affects the business community. I believe this failure should be remedied both in the interest of the public at large and in the interest of the business community.

I became particularly concerned with the problem of protection of the retail installment buyer and the small borrower during my terms as Attorney General of Massachusetts. The numerous and varied contacts with the public which characterize the operation of the Department of the Attorney General make the Department an unusually accurate barometer of community sentiment. A number of Assistant Attorneys General deal, almost exclusively, with consumer problems.

A steady stream of reports from these lawyers indicated to me that complaints by installment buyers and small borrowers were reaching an all-time high. Such complaints were brought to the Department's attention by personal visits by the complaining parties and by a heavy amount of correspondence and telephone communication.

A very high percentage of the complaints arose because the buyer or purchaser did not fully understand the real cost of his purchase or loan. In many cases what had been represented as a bargain turned out to be no such thing. Many if not most consumers did not understand how much interest, either in percentage terms or dollar terms, they had agreed to pay.

The mail, telephone calls and personal visits received by the Massachusetts Consumers' Council with which the Department of the Attorney General works closely, reflected the same degree of consumer concern and illustrated a similar lack of understanding on the part of many buyers and borrowers.

The Department of the Attorney General and the Massachusetts Consumers' Council were by no means the only agencies or individuals who were conscious of and concerned with the problem. By 1965, when the truth-in-lending drive was really only beginning in Massachusetts Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois was already a veteran of a five-year struggle in trying to persuade Congress to enact a Federal truth-in-lending law. A number of years earlier, during its deliberations upon the Uniform Commercial Code, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws had recognized the need for uniform state legislation on the subject. By 1965, the National Conference had begun its own study of the matter. A variety of consumers' groups, better business bureaus and business and trade associations produced case histories, statistics and sound arguments to support the proposition that there was an immediate need for legislation directed to the problems confronted by the installment buyer and the small borrower.

Our objectives as we began to draft a bill early in 1965 were very limited ones. We sought no major changes in the methods of business of sellers or lenders. What we sought was simple—legislation which would give the consumer full knowledge of the terms of the agreement into which he had entered. We felt that there would be little or no disagreement in so far as our objectives were concerned. We were convinced that once our objectives were explained, the Massachusetts business community would support us.

History has shown that we were mistaken. The filing of a truth-in-lending bill by the Department of the Attorney General in 1965 was met by an avalanche of opposition by reputable businessmen.

The opposition took a variety of forms. There were those who adamantly insisted that the legislation was not necessary, even though the records of a variety of organizations which had dealt with consumer problems indicated that such an evaluation was unrealistic. Certain groups concentrated their fire on specific sections and provisions of the bill, such as the section which required a statement of simple annual interest or the decision to include revolving credit accounts within the scope of the legislation. A few agreed that legislation on this subject matter was indeed necessary, but argued that its drafting should be left to the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. Some even cited the Douglas proposals which were being considered by Congress, and urged that Massachusetts defer to the Federal government and let the Congress resolve the problem.

I do not wish to give the impression that I am condemning opposition to truth-in-lending legislation. The fact of the matter is that a variety of meetings were held with representatives of the objecting organizations. We made every effort to understand the reasons for opposition, and in fact incorporated a number of suggestions in the bill which was eventually adopted.

Nevertheless, I must in all candor make the following observation. Confronted with the possibility of adoption of a statute which would insure full disclosure of the terms upon which installment buyers and small borrowers transacted, the business community of Massachusetts in the main tried to defeat such legislation. Even certain organizations which ultimately participated in the final drafting of the statute did so, in my opinion, only after they had concluded that their first objective, which was to block truth-in-lending legislation altogether, could not be realized.

The present attempts to enact truth-in-lending legislation on the Federal level reflect the Massachusetts experience. Truth in lending is hardly a new issue for United States Senators and Representatives. The truth-in-lending proposals of Senator Douglas were first introduced in 1960, and have been resubmitted in each new session of Congress since that time.

It is a by-product of our political system that frequently two highly qualified men run for an office which only one can hold. I believe that this occurred last November in our state, if you will forgive the personal reference, and in the State of Illinois. I applaud the election of Senator Charles Percy. He is already making his presence felt in highly constructive ways in the United States Senate. But, at the same time, the defeat of Senator Paul Douglas threatened to leave the cause of truth in lending without its most ardent champion.

We need not have been concerned. Senator William Proxmire, the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Wisconsin and Chairman of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee, has succeeded to the leadership in the drive for truth in lending, and has conducted himself with great skill and dignity. Senator Proxmire drafted Senate Bill #5, the truth-in-lending version presently before the Senate, and may well achieve the victory which eluded his distinguished predecessor.

Senate Bill # 5 is quite similar to the truth-in-lending law enacted in Massachusetts. It is fundamentally a disclosure bill. The bill requires that, at the time of the making of a cash loan or the extension of credit in connection with an installment sale, the lender or seller must provide an itemized list of all components of the newly created debt. Thus, the list must contain the cash or delivered price of a given commodity or service; amounts to be credited as downpayment or trade-in; all charges to be paid which are not incident to the extension of credit; and the total amount to be financed. The seller or lender must clearly state the amount of the finance charge in terms of dollars and cents; and this charge must also be expressed in terms of an annual percentage rate calculated on the basis of the ratio which the finance charge bears to the money actually used during the period in question. Thus the bill requires both "dollar" disclosure and "percentage" disclosure.

Revolving credit accounts are handled by expressing a periodic rate of finance or service charge; a date when the charge will be imposed; and the annual percentage rate of the finance or service charge. The annual percentage rate is derived by multiplying the periodic rate by the number of periods in a year. (Since most department stores charge 1½% per month on revolving credit accounts, the annual rate will ordinarily work out to 18%.)

This method of regulating revolving credit accounts is perhaps the chief bone of contention at the present time. Finance charges in connection with revolving credit accounts vary depending upon the time of purchase and the time at which payment is made. In addition, most stores allow the customer a period of thirty, or even sixty days in which payment may be made without incurring a finance charge of any kind. Thus, in many instances, the customer will pay less than the full annual rate. And department stores are understandably concerned about being required to state a finance charge which is substantially higher than what may actually be imposed.

The Act would be administered by the Federal Reserve Board, which would be empowered to promulgate interpretative regulations. State laws, such as those in Massachusetts, would not be disturbed unless they are totally inconsistent with the Federal statute. In fact, the Federal Reserve Board may exempt transactions from coverage by the Federal statute if the Board determines that the transaction in question has been effectively regulated by the laws of a state. Finally, the statute exempts altogether securities transactions and credit which is extended to business firms and to governments.

Most businessmen insist that they have no objection to the principle of full disclosure. They agree that the customer is entitled to be informed, in terms which he can easily comprehend, of exactly what it costs to borrow money or to purchase on credit. Yet, substantial opposition on the part of the business community to truth-in-lending legislation still exists. A certain degree of the opposition flows, I think you are aware, from American bankers, with the members of this Association being a notable exception.

I am firmly on record in support of the principle of truth in lending. However, I am well aware that the drafting of legislation of this nature is not a simple matter. We are concerned with the regulation of a highly complex area of commercial affairs. There are subtleties and practical considerations which are exceedingly difficult for legislators to handle alone. Constructive assistance from the business community could be extremely helpful in wrestling with these problems. Although hearings have been formally concluded, I am sure that members of the Subcommittee would still welcome the submission of constructive recommendations. I have already mentioned that hearings on the administration of mutual funds will begin on June 19. Businessmen can bring to these deliberations a practical knowledge of the affairs which are being regulated, and of the problems inherent in certain regulatory approaches, which is otherwise unavailable to those who must draft and enact the final legislation. It is my hope that representatives of the business community will be prepared to make constructive suggestions and recommendations which will assist the Committee in the handling of this difficult regulatory problem.

I do not wish to leave the impression that business has boycotted the hearings of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee. On the contrary, we have heard testimony delivered by a number of representatives of the business community, by banking associations and by individual retailers of varying sizes. Some of the testimony has been beneficial, but much of it has not been helpful in significant ways. Many witnesses concentrated upon what they believed to be negative aspects of the proposed legislation, without providing the kind of practical, business oriented suggestions for improvement which would have been valuable to the Subcommittee members. The Subcommittee hoped to be able to profit from the expertise of the representatives of business; but, in many instances that expertise was denied us.

Let me give just a few examples of questions which have arisen in connection with truth in lending upon which the assistance of the business community could have been, and still could be, valuable. What is the most practical way in which to regulate revolving credit accounts? The Subcommittee has still to decide whether regulation is warranted, and, if so, the precise method which is to be used. Retailers who use forms of revolving credit have a substantial interest in whether there is to be regulation and, if so, whether the method selected operates to their disadvantage. Constructive suggestions and recommendations with respect to this problem would be welcomed by the Subcommittee.

There is still controversy over the proposed requirement that a statement of an "annual percentage rate" accompany each credit transaction. Those who favor such an approach argue that this form of "percentage" disclosure (as opposed to "dollar" disclosure, in which only the dollar amount of interest is indicated) is desirable because it provides a means by which the customer can easily compare the cost of doing business on credit with different establishments. Yet, I know that there is disagreement within the business community upon this point. If the business community has a serious view on this question, it should participate in attempts to resolve the controversy and to develop acceptable solutions.

To cite just one further example, there is the problem of cost of such legislation to the lender or retailer. It has been frequently suggested that legislation of this nature would impose unmanageable amounts of paperwork upon businessmen, and severe burdens upon their clerical and sales personnel. If this is the case, then businessmen should indicate specifically why this will happen, and how it can be avoided without sacrificing the interests of the buying or borrowing public.

Gentlemen, I believe that Federal truth in lending is inevitable. The experience with this legislation in Massachusetts will undoubtedly serve as a guide for Congress. I am aware that the Massachusetts truth-in-lending law has not been in existence long enough to take a completely accurate reading of its total effect and value. I am also aware that there may be problems with some sections of the law, and that certain sections may have to be reconsidered and re-written in the light of practical experience. But, in general, it would appear that the dangers envisioned by those who opposed the legislation have failed to materialize. Installment buying has not suffered. In fact, it has increased since the statute became effective. Some of the most outspoken critics of the proposed legislation have now admitted that many of their fears with respect to the practical application of truth in lending have turned out to be groundless.

If I am correct with respect to the inevitability of this legislation at the Federal level, the American business community faces a very real challenge.

It can choose one of two alternatives. It can follow the lead of its enlightened members and take an active, constructive role in the development of consumer protection legislation.

Or the business community can choose the other path. It can take the negative approach. But, in doing so, it forfeits its right and its obligation to participate in a constructive way, and to help develop the guidelines and controls of its own industries. Both business and the general community suffer if business chooses this course.

American business must choose to be a participant, not just a spectator.

The consumer cannot be helped by legislation which is formulated without regard to the realities of the marketplace. And the legitimate businessman can never be harmed by legislation which imposes his own standards of fairness and honesty upon the remainder of his competition. I would like to see an era in which consumer legislation represented the best that could be developed by business by the purchaser and by the legislator, so that all relevant interests and viewpoints may receive full consideration. I congratulate the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks for taking the lead in this direction, not only for bankers, but for all of American business. I hope your lead will be followed.

AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG AGAIN STRESSES THE CASE FOR SENATE RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—LXXIX

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as one who has advocated Senate ratification of the human rights conventions during every session of the 90th Congress, I am most pleased to be on the same side in this crucial fight as our exceptionally distinguished Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg.

On March 21 of this year, Ambassador Goldberg addressed the annual meeting of the Conference of United Nations Representatives of the United Nations Association of the United States of America.

In this speech Ambassador Goldberg made, in my judgment, the most singularly compelling case for Senate ratification of the human rights conventions.

Arthur Goldberg has both deserved and received great praise for his considerable talents and energies as a gifted advocate, a respected jurist, and a skillful diplomat. However, in this speech once again Arthur Goldberg shows himself to be a decent, compassionate, and exceptional human being, totally dedicated to the noble cause of human dignity.

I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Goldberg's speech of March 21, 1967, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, at the Annual Meeting of the Conference of United Nations Representatives, UNA–USA, New York City, March 21, 1967

I appreciate greatly this opportunity to meet once again with the leaders of the United Nations representatives of so many key organizations in American life. I am especially glad to join you as you plan your participation in the observance of Human Rights Year in 1968.

It is a privilege also to share this platform with my good friend and distinguished predecessor at the United States Mission, Ambassador Ernest Gross, and to pay tribute to his important services not only in the United States Government but also as a private citizen.

Perhaps the best way in which I can contribute to your proceedings today is to share with you my reflections on two basic questions:

First, what has the United Nations achieved, and what may it achieve in the future, in the field of human rights?

And second, why should the United States be involved in these United Nations actions—particularly, in adherence to international human rights conventions?

THE U.N. AND HUMAN RIGHTS

As for the United Nations it is often mistakenly assumed that the UN's commitment in the human rights field began with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights whose 20th anniversary will be celebrated in 1968. This is not the case. The United Nations has a prior—and more legally binding—commitment to human rights in the Charter itself, which commits all member states to foster "human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without regard to race, sex, language or religion."

This Charter provision was an important advance over the League of Nations. It was the first time that such an undertaking, embracing the entire scope of human rights, had ever been entered into by the community of nations. It was an undertaking born in the wartime pledge of the Four Freedoms—and it expressed the conviction that basic guarantees of human rights are among the essentials of enduring peace.

Of course, such broad undertakings have to be implemented. Within a soverign state they can be translated into laws, executive actions, and judicial decisions. In the international community, on the other hand, the implementation is more difficult. Yet it has to be attempted, and it has been. Through a number of agencies, but most of all through the Commission on Human Rights, the United Nations has framed one instrument after another to clothe with flesh and blood the bare bones of the Charter's pledge.

You all know the list. First came the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This is surely one of the most influential statements that ever came out of the United Nations. It has been drawn on in the drafting of constitutions for new nations; in the writing of regional conventions on human rights in Europe and Latin America; in court decisions of many nations including the World Court. We Americans, of course, have a particular reason to take pride in the Universal Declaration, because the individual most instrumental in bringing it into existence was one of the great Americans of all time, Eleanor Roosevelt.

In that same period, too, many instruments have been drawn up having the force of binding international agreements. After many years the General Assembly was able to agree last December on the Human Rights Covenants—the first major attempt to embody in international agreements a comprehensive code of human rights. Through the years the U.N. has also developed a notable series of other and more specific human rights conventions. Among these are the conventions against genocide, slavery, and forced labor and the convention on the political rights of women. More recently there was added to the list the convention on the elimination of racial discrimination. And only this month the Human Rights Commission unanimously recommended a new draft convention against religious intolerance.

Now, as we consider all these conventions—and indeed all the other work of the United Nations in this field—we must not be afraid to face, candidly and realistically, the question of their actual value. Agreements and laws are important only to the extent that the promises in them are fulfilled by actual performance—and this fulfillment is far from automatic.

But this is no reason for a scornful attitude toward the instruments of law. Our own 14th Amendment is 100 years old, and we are still working to assure the "equal protection of the laws" to all citizens regardless of their race. In the same way, I believe, the international conventions will bear fruit in due time. The making of an international commitment is in itself a foundation stone on which the nations can build.

On the international plane, of course, the obvious difficulty is the lack of means of enforcement. The ideal way would be through the international judicial process, such as the international writ of habeas corpus advocated by my former colleague, Mr. Justice Brennan. I supported this method long before coming to the United Nations. I also advocated the removal of the Connally Reservation from the United States instrument of ratification of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. And my view has not changed on either of these questions.

Regrettably, however, the fact must be faced that governments are not yet ready to accept international adjudication of human rights cases—inevitable though I believe that step to be in the long run. So we have to look for other and less ambitious means of progress.

One way, which the United States has favored and which is on the agenda of the Human Rights Commission, is the creation of a new office, that of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. The High Commissioner would serve as, in effect, an international Ombudsman in the human rights field. He would be available for a very important and creative mediating function, helping governments to define and carry out their commitments in the human rights field. Lest governments too greatly fear the consequences of such an innovation, let me point out that the Ombudsman in Scandinavia not only causes the government to respect the rights of citizens; he also protects the good name of the government against unfounded complaints.

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Now I turn to my second question, the one which particularly concerns us as Americans: Why should the United States be associated with these United Nations activities in the human rights field?

In essence, I believe, the answer is simply this: Because it serves our national interest to do so. In particular I believe United States adherence to the international agreements on human rights would definitely serve our national interest. This is true for a number of reasons. Before reviewing them, it may be well to remind ourselves of one reason which does not apply.

These agreements will not create a new standard, or a new commitment, to secure the rights of the American people. From its very founding this nation has been blessed with such a standard: namely, the Constitution of the United States, including the Bill of Rights—the greatest and most effective human rights document ever written. Through successive generations the rights enumerated in the Constitution have been amplified by amendment, spelled out by legislation and implemented by executive action and judicial decree. Political and civil rights once denied to a portion of the people are now, by law, available to all. And the Constitution has proved ample enough to develop new safeguards for the economic and social rights that are essential to freedom in our industrial age.

The task of securing the rights of the people is never finished, and we can never claim to have achieved perfection. We must always be mindful of the truth that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and that, as Thomas Paine said, "those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men undergo the fatigue of supporting it." But in this task the United States is blessed with a constitutional foundation and a popular tradition unexcelled anywhere in the world. Americans whose rights may be threatened have no need to appeal to international authority for redress, because the means of redress are amply provided for in our own laws—more so, indeed, than in any international instrument.

And let me add with complete candor that the first and greatest duty which the United States owes to the cause of human rights in the world is not the ratification of any convention or agreement—essential though this is. Our first duty is the faithful discharge of our Constitutional commitment to our own people in the field of human rights. In my very first address to the General Assembly after coming to this post, I expressed the belief that the test of any country's dedication to human rights is not what it says in the General Assembly for all the world to hear, but what it does at home for all the world to see.

Holding these beliefs, I cannot base my support for United States adherence to the international human rights conventions on any ground of shallow legalism or utopian dreaming. My reasons are, I think, quite realistic.

1. The United States commitment to the cause of universal human rights responds to our oldest tradition. Our nation was born in the faith that certain God-given rights were the heritage not just of Americans but of "all men." In ratifying the United Nations Charter we formally rededicated ourselves to that faith in the presence of the community of nations. We are not entirely faithful to this commitment when we show concern for human rights at home and yet appear indifferent to the same rights abroad.

2. The cause of human rights is inseparable from the cause of peace. Enduring peace cannot be founded on injustice. This is all the more true in our time, when aspirations for full equality have swept through the formerly colonial regions of the world. Peoples whose ancestors took oppression for granted now demand that their rights be fulfilled, and the withholding of these rights is one of the prime causes of dangerous international friction. As President Kennedy said, "Is not peace in the last analysis basically a matter of human rights?"

3. There are strong reasons to believe that, in countries where a long tradition of human rights is lacking, these international conventions provide a meaningful standard and a target for future development. Their fulfillment will take time—just as it has in our own country. But many nations tend to look to the community of nations for help in developing their own modern standards, in human rights as in many other fields. Thus the human rights conventions effectively serve a real and substantial purpose—a purpose worthy of our nation's wholehearted support.

4. Finally, the decision of the United States regarding the human rights conventions will carry tremendous weight. It will go far to determine the future effectiveness of the conventions, the extent of adherence to them, and the respect which their provisions will command. Without our support, they will appear far less significant to others. If the conventions fail to gain the adherence of the nation that was born proclaiming "certain unalienable rights" as the birthright of "all men," then why should other nations take these instruments seriously? Even if they adhere to them, why should they be faithful to their provisions? Our adherence will breathe new life into the international human rights movement. And no more fitting time for this step could be chosen than now, as we prepare to observe International Human Rights Year.

These, I submit, are the essential considerations that argue for United States adherence to the human rights conventions. There have been arguments on the other side, but I do not think they stand up to analysis. It is argued, for instance, that conventions in the human rights field would infringe on the rights of the states under our federal system. But it seems to be forgotten that the United States has been a party to human rights conventions for many years—specifically, the convention against slavery which was ratified during the Administration of President Hoover, and the convention on the nationality of women which was ratified during the Administration of President Franklin Roosevelt. Neither of these conventions has done any damage to states' rights or to any other part of our Constitutional system—nor would the pending conventions do so. They do not set any precedent in this regard.

Nor do I think it can be argued that there is a lack of citizen support for action on the conventions. Indeed, the widespread interest in the conventions among the great majority of national organizations which you represent here today gives ample testimony to the extent of public support behind them.

In brief, the arguments against the conventions are not substantial or valid. The arguments for them are compelling and overwhelming. Yet it is an inescapable fact that the United States has thus far lagged behind in this matter. By doing so we have conveyed abroad an impression which is far from helpful to the foreign policy of the United States—an impression that, while we work to perfect freedom in our own country, we don't really care much whether other peoples live in freedom or not. The result has been to confuse our friends, give ammunition to our enemies, and embarrass our country in the councils of the world.

For all these reasons, this Administration is determined to press forward vigorously for ratification of all the United Nations conventions that have been signed but not yet ratified by his country.

We must, of course, proceed pragmatically. In this spirit we have given priority to three conventions: the supplementary convention on slavery; the convention on forced labor; and the convention on the political rights of women. It was on these conventions that I testified last month before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This was in itself a notable event, since it was the first time in many years that hearings have been held in the Senate on a human rights convention.

Our choice of these three conventions for priority treatment does not in the least indicate any lessening of our commitment to ratification of the remaining conventions, particularly the genocide convention.

Finally, I would mention two conventions which this Administration has approved but which have not yet reached the stage of submission to the Senate. One, which I was privileged to sign last September on behalf of the United States, is the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Our signing of it has come in a period when our own Government is taking unprecedented actions to end racial discrimination in America and to assure an equal chance to every citizen. By this convention we would, in effect, be reaffirming in the presence of the international community the same promises of equal justice for all citizens to which we are already pledged among ourselves.

In doing so, moreover, we would not bind the United States to any action not already comprehended in our own Constitution and laws. To leave no room for doubt on this score, I made a statement at the time of signing, ruling out any interpretation of the convention that would conflict with our own Constitutional freedoms, specifically the fundamental right of free speech. Under our system we cannot forbid any expression of opinion, however odious, unless that expression becomes an incitement to some overt unlawful act. We believe the convention, subject to this understanding of it, is consistent with our Constitution.

Last on the list is a convention which is still in draft form—but which, if it becomes a reality, will be equal in importance to any of its predecessors in the human rights field. This is the "Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance," which was just approved this month by the Human Rights Commission at its last session in Geneva. It is the first attempt to extend the sanction of international agreements to the individual's freedom of conscience—his freedom to believe or not to believe, to change his belief, to manifest it in acts of worship, to teach it to his children—without suffering any civil disabilities. It pledges the signatories to take positive educational measures to combat religious prejudice, specifically including anti-Semitism. And it provides that acts of violence against adherents of any religion, or incitement to such violence, or incitement to hatred likely to lead to such violence, shall be punishable by law.

All these provisions of the draft convention are in harmony with the Constitution and laws of the United States, and with our best traditions of religious toleration and pluralism. Not all countries are so fortunate. Full religious toleration is still unrealized in many areas even in this enlightened age. Thus this new convention is a further pioneering step in the world-wide cause of human rights.

I would like to pay a word of tribute to one of the principal authors of this convention, our own distinguished United States Representative in the Commission on Human Rights, my able friend Morris Abram. His skill and persuasiveness had much to do with the unanimous adoption of the convention in the 32-member Human Rights Commission. That unanimity is a good augury for its final adoption by the General Assembly.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion I would like to say a word about an entirely different aspect of the human rights cause: namely, the great movement toward self-determination and equality that is now in progress in the southern part of the African continent.

This movement, in its own way, is every bit as important to the cause of human rights as the making of international agreements and conventions. Here the problem is not merely one of general principles but of concrete facts—namely, the persistence in various forms of an outdated and indefensible colonialism and of the racial discrimination and subordination that go with it. The system called apartheid, in particular, constitutes one of the greatest offenses against human rights still existing in the world.

It is well for us Americans to remind ourselves that, from the very founding of our nation in the Declaration of Independence, the cause of individual rights and the cause of decolonization have been inextricably linked together. Because of this, and because of our position as a leading world power with a deep interest in peace, we cannot fail to be firmly committed in this matter. We seek all possible peaceful and practical ways to end the evil of racial discrimination in southern Africa and to bring about true self-determination for all the peoples involved—not just for the white minorities.

There are some who believe the United States is not doing enough in this situation. Others say we are doing too much. It should be clearly understood on both sides of the argument that the United States commitment to the twin causes of racial justice and self-determination in Africa is unshakable and irrevocable. We shall pursue these courses by all appropriate peaceful means in keeping with our obligations under the Charter.

We live in an age of many troubles. But it is also an age of hope, and of new beginnings. We have lived to see the colonial era approaching its end. Perhaps the children of today will live to see not only the final end of colonialism, but also the end of the era of dictatorship and the beginning of an age in which human rights will become a reality in all parts of the world. Certainly the world is stirring today with aspirations toward freedom on a scale unknown to any former age.

Today more than ever, therefore, it is time for America to be a leading advocate and ally, in the international community, of the human rights which we inherited at our nation's birth. It is in our fidelity to these principles that our true strength lies. In the 190 years of our country's history many powerful empires which sought to deny these freedoms, or to reserve them for a privileged few, have passed away.

Every generation, not excepting our own, is required to uphold these enduring principles in new circumstances. For the sake of liberty we have already had to do many things far more novel, more costly, more unprecedented, than adherence to the conventions on human rights. If we shrink from novel solutions then indeed we are lost. A hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln—on the verge of issuing another great document in the history of human rights, the Emancipation Proclamation—stated this truth for all time: "As our case is new, we must think anew and act anew."

And indeed, the manner in which we face the issue of freedom in our time will, as Lincoln wrote of the great issue of slavery that he had to face—"light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation."

AIRCRAFT CARRIER "JOHN F. KENNEDY" TO BE CHRISTENED MAY 27, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, Saturday, May 27, will be an interesting and important day in Virginia.

At the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., situated in the great port area of Hampton Roads, the aircraft carrier *John F. Kennedy* will be christened by the late President's daughter, Caroline. Present, too, will be President Kennedy's widow, and his two able brothers, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, EDWARD M. KENNEDY, and the junior Senator from New York, ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

All of Virginia is proud that the great aircraft carrier named for the late President has been built in a Virginia shipyard.

Virginians are delighted, too, that so many members of the Kennedy family will visit Newport News and Hampton. I am pleased to take this opportunity to extend what I know will be a warm welcome to the Senators KENNEDY and their family.

The occasion will be made even more noteworthy by the presence of the President of the United States and Mrs. Johnson. They, too, will find a most cordial welcome from the citizens of the State I have the honor to represent.

Saturday will be the first time in the long history of this shipyard, dating back to January 1886, that a President of the United States has attended the christening of a ship built by that yard.

This will truly be a memorable occasion for Newport News with the families of two Presidents present at one time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 18 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 11 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SPONG in the chair).

THE SENATE—THEN AND NOW

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, one of our distinguished colleagues from New England, from the great State of New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has, for many years, written to his constituents a newsletter, I think on the basis of once every 2 weeks.

His newsletter, which he labels No. 9, dated May 18, 1967, was, to me, very impressive.

Mr. President, rather than have the newsletter inserted in the RECORD, and because it is short, I should like to read it, because I think it certainly speaks for Washington and Congress:

This week Ruth and I celebrated our 40th wedding anniversay. Here was the place to do it for it was in Washington on Capitol Hill that we met when she was a secretary to Senator McKeller of Tennessee and I was on the committee staff of Senator Moses of New Hampshire. I couldn't help but think of life here, then and now. The contrast might interest you, too.

In those days Washington was a sleepy, oversized Southern town. The old brick and musty wooden buildings strewn haphazardly along its avenues had not been replaced by the present massive edifices of marble and granite. Visitors were few, and native Washingtonians viewed the minions of government with lofty indifference. President Coolidge, who loved to stroll up F Street window-shopping attended by only a couple of Secret Service men, was accorded hardly a passing glance.

Capitol Hill was almost an ivory tower in which Senators led a sheltered, leisurely existence, their tranquility rarely disturbed by probing letters, fact-finding constituents, or crusading delegations. One pennypinching bachelor Senator saved the cost of a hotel room by setting up a bed behind a screen in his office and got away with it for several months.

All this has changed so incredibly that looking back on it seems like reading a Thackeray novel. The Nation's population has nearly doubled. Radio and television have made people more conscious of their government. The airplane, the bus and, above all, the family automobile have made Washington a mecca for tourists who flock through the Capitol—20,000 a day. Huge concentrations of population have created problems beyond the power of local communities to solve and made people dependent on their Federal Government even for the water they drink and the air they breathe. Two World Wars, with the resulting regimentation and controls, have put the government in everybody's hair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky is making a very interesting speech and I therefore ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

To continue reading the newsletter:

When Ruth and I met here, Senator Moses was not only one of the Senate's seniors but its President Pro Tempore and a national figure. Yet, one secretary and two stenographers were quite adequate to handle his mail. Today senatorial staffs are determined by the population of their states, and a Senator from New York or California requires a personal staff of 30 to 45 people to deal with the problems of constituents, help in research, and handle the bulging mail sacks delivered daily to his office. A Senator from a small state like New Hampshire requires at least a dozen.

In the 1920's a Senator's job was strictly part time. Sessions began in December and never ran into mid-summer—no air conditioning then. Every second year the session had to close March 4th when the terms of the old Congress expired. Thus, Senators spent more than half their time at home where they engaged in their regular vocations. More important, they remained a part of their home communities and never lost touch with their people. Today this is a full-time job with at best only a month or two at home. No matter how many flying trips we make to our state, we can personally contact only a small segment of our people and the rest wonder why they rarely see us. This is especially true in the Senate where, unlike the House, debate is unlimited and we can't know in advance when crucial votes are coming Whenever we take a chance and absent ourselves, we are liable to be caught off base.

I might say that the other day, when we had the draft bill up, there were a good many absentees. We had thought it would be a routine measure, but we had eight rollcall votes.

I continue to read:

The most striking change is that Senators are now brisk, efficient specialists drawn from many fields. Gone are the swallow-tail coats and flowing locks. Gone are the rounded periods of classic oratory. Speeches are more likely to be crisp, to the point, and frequently highly technical.

A Senator's work is infinitely more challenging than in the leisurely days of the 20's. The driving force of controversy, the heat of public opinion, the spur of criticism, the stimulation of clashing opinions here and at home release the last drop of adrenalin and add to the zest of living.

A beautiful illustration of the difference between the old Senate and the new is a tidbit from Reader's Digest. A mother and her teen-age daughter were watching a 1930's film on TV. As it ended with the usual romantic embrace of that era, the daughter observed:

"Gosh, Mom, your movies ended where ours begin."

Mr. President, it was probably a good thing for this country that a young man—a young Yankee from New Hampshire—married a young rebel from Tennessee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I commend the Senator from Kentucky for the fine statement which he has just made on the floor. As a boy, I was here slightly after the days to which the Senator has referred, when my father was a Member of this body. I was very impressed by the wide streets, which permitted one to go anywhere in a hurry. When the stop lights were put on Pennsylvania Avenue, it was to slow people down and to prevent them from driving at 60 or 70 miles an hour to work.

When I came back as a Senator, I found it hard to believe that the streets were absolutely jammed with traffic, so that one could hardly move at all. That was 18 years ago. It is even worse than that today.

Thinking back, it must have been wonderful to have been a Senator back in those days.

CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST—SPEECH BY SENATOR KENNEDY OF NEW YORK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, earlier this week, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY in a speech at the Concord Hotel, Kiamesha Lake, N.Y., offered a new and, in my judgment, highly imaginative proposal for dealing with the crisis touched off by the withdrawal, at Egyptian insistence, of the United Nations peace force from the Sinai Desert.

Senator KENNEDY urged that we explore the possibility of establishing a United Nations sea patrol to guarantee passage to vessels of all nations through the Strait of Tiran. This patrol would have to remove mines which have been placed in the strait by Colonel Nasser. The effect of Senator KENNEDY's suggestion for such a U.N. presence on the sea could be most constructive. It could make possible the peaceful frustration of the Egyptian blockade, which the President condemned, quite properly, as illegal. And it would demonstrate the flexibility of the United Nations as an instrument for keeping the peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator KENNEDY's remarks be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY FOR THE 115TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, DISTRICT LODGE NO. 1, B'NAI B'RITH, MAY 23, 1967

We meet tonight in an hour of crisis. A third of a world away, the state of Israel stands surrounded by her enemies—the target of terrorism and menacing troop concentrations—her borders and ports in the shadow of hostile armies—her very existence at hazard. I come here tonight, at this late hour, to join with you in assessing this dangerous situation; and to join also in a determination that we shall do all that is necessary to ensure that Israel shall not succumb to these threats—but that she shall continue to survive and prosper in independence and freedom and security.

Let us be clear, at the outset, why we are so concerned. You who are at this dinner tonight have played a great part in the building of Israel—a saga of courage and determination to inspire our children for generations to come. I saw in Israel—during the War of Independence, and in my other visits there—how much your work in this country helped, to settle the refugees of forty countries, and make the desert bloom.

But for all that you have done for Israel, others have joined with you. For the success of Israel has not been a concern just of American Jews; it has been a concern of all Americans. And it is a concern of all Americans tonight.

America believes that disputes should be settled, not by aggression, but by peaceful means; and Israel, though she has proven beyond question her ability to defend herself, and despite the provocations of the last week, is attempting to settle this dispute with her neighbors in peace—while those neighbors tonight stand committed to aggression against Israel. Premier Eshkol's offer to Egypt for a mutual withdrawal of forces from the border is only further evidence of Israel's pacific intent.

America believes in democracy—and Israel is an island of democracy in a sea of dictatorship.

America believes in development—and throughout Asia and Africa and Latin America, the new nations have turned to Israel for example and guidance, precept and performance. Israel has shown them that development and democracy are not incompatible—but are mutual partners. And Israel has committed her resources and her talent, in astounding proportion, to the development of dozens of other countries, and thus to a better world for us all.

Finally, we as Americans share a responsibility with all humanity—to the survivors, those who remained from history's greatest example of man's capacity of senseless cruelty to his fellow man. For the world to fail these survivors now would be—in the deepest sense—against the national interest of the United States; against our heritage as free men; against our basic morality.

This responsibility has been recognized by four American Presidents—by every President who has served during the existence of Israel. Just last August, on the occasion of the visit here of President Shazar of Israel, President Johnson made clear the opposition of the United States "to the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East."

Earlier, on May 8, 1963, President Kennedy said that "in the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations, (and) adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or put a stop to such aggression . . ."

Why is this commitment now being tested? What is the source of Egyptian and Syrian bellicosity and threats? In large part, we must realize, the current tension does not arise from a true clash of interests between Israel and the Arab states, as indeed several Arab nations have recognized. Rather the tension arises from the internal strains and conflicts within and between the nations of the Arab world. The current governments of Egypt and Syria, after all, were born in revolutions brought on at least in part by their crushing defeat at the hands of Israel in the war of Independence. Having come to power on a promise to avenge their humiliation, these governments have never wavered in their hostile propaganda and actions, for fear of being toppled by elements even more chauvinistic than themselves.

Furthermore, almost all governments find it expedient from time to time to blame internal shortcomings and failures on a foreign enemy. Unfortunately, many Arab nations have surrendered to this temptation.

Israel is also the unwitting victim of struggles between Arab nations. A major element in the current crisis is Egypt's demand that the United Nations Emergency Force withdraw from its positions between Israel and Egypt, and that demand seems to have been brought about largely because Saudi Arabia and Jordan, at odds with Egypt, have accused Egypt for some months of hiding behind the UN force so as to avoid confrontation with Israel. And thus do internal Arab struggles result in danger to Israel—with each Arab nation constrained to outbid the other in hostile proclamations and acts.

But though Egypt and Syria may serve their internal interests by propaganda and anti-Israel proclamations, they cannot believe—and they must not be permitted to imagine—that their interests would be served by actual conflict. In fact, no nation probably intends that war come in the Near East. But equally certain is that too many nations underrate the danger of war which is not intended—war by mistake or miscalculation or inadvertence.

At this very moment, Egyptian forces are at Sharim el-Shiekh overlooking the Gulf of Aqaba; her naval forces have been sent to the Gulf. These force dispositions are the result of demanding the withdrawal of UN forces; and once in position, Egypt may feel compelled, by the dynamics of the Arab world, to use these forces—perhaps, all the while, not intending war. But this is grave provocation indeed. The Gulf of Aqaba is recognized by the United States, as by the other principal trading nations, as international water, in which the right of innocent passage must be preserved; our government so solemnly declared in 1957. The port of Elath, moreover is critical to Israel's economy and development, as well as to her exports of fertilizer to the developing nations of Asia and Africa. And Israel has made unmistakably clear her intention to retaliate for any interference with its shipping to that port.

Further danger of war by miscalculation is ever-present on the Syrian border, where terrorist raids from Syria have often led to Israeli retaliation. In the present situation, with repeated Egyptian statements of military support for Syria if Israel should retaliate again, a minor terrorist raid—even one, perhaps which the Syrians themselves did not desire but could not control—could start the chain toward war.

In all this—in the factors underlying the present crisis, and in the danger of miscalculation or mistake—is the guide for United States policy in the days ahead. The United States must make clear the limits of permissible activity in the Near East. And we must make clear beyond any doubt the consequcnces of miscalculation in that part of the world—the certainty that conflict could not benefit those who begin it. Egypt and Syria must understand that their actions could easily lead to war—and that no conflict in the Near East could remain a local one. Especially in this period of rising tensions elsewhere in the world, war in the Near East would constitute a direct threat to the peace of the entire globe. Not only Israel, but the entire Near East, is a region of great strategic importance in the global balance. Its vital reserves of oil, its place on the trade routes, its ties to other nations—and its stature as the birthplace of three great religions—all these command the vital interest of the entire world community in peace in the area.

All these interests—those of the United States, of all the nations of the Near East, and of world peace—would best be served now by a firm understanding of our policy: as President Johnson said in 1964, that the United States is committed to the "territorial integrity and political independence" of Israel, as of all nations in the Near East—and that that commitment will be kept. Such understanding can only strengthen the hand of Secretary-General U Thant, in his vital mission to restrain Egyptian actions and preserve peace.

Therefore, I commend the efforts of the United States government to make our position clear to all nations, and to enlist the assistance of the United Nations, and of other interested countries, in a peaceful resolution of the crisis. And, to ensure that the peace and the rights of all nations are preserved in the Near East, I urge:

First, that the United States government must continue to make clear the consequences of conflict in the Near East, and our interest in the prevention of any aggression.

Second, that we continue to seek the concurrent and cooperative action of all other interested parties, such as Britain and France, the signers of the 1950 Tripartite Declaration, and including the Soviet Union, to impress on all nations the need of a peaceful solution.

Third, that we continue to seek a restoration of the United Nations presence in the area. There are serious difficulties in the way of stationing UN ground forces where neither party wishes them on its territory. But a UN naval presence could safeguard free passage through the Gulf of Aqaba, in recognized international waters. I urge therefore that we immediately explore the possibility of such a *United Nations sea patrol.* The presence of UN vessels in international waters does not raise many of the same problems as stationing ground troops within the territory of any country. And with the support of most—hopefully all—of the great powers, such a UN naval presence in the Gulf of Aqaba might materially lessen the threat of war. This and any other suggestion for an increased UN presence should be pursued with the greatest vigor in the United Nations, and with the Secretary-General.

Fourth, even as we strive to defuse the present crisis, we must also admit, as the Secretary-General has said, that we have too long ignored the basic long-term issues in the area—especially the need for internal development of the Arab nations, so that the frustrations of poverty and misery do not endanger peace in the region and in the world. The more advanced Arab states have long since abandoned any overt hostility to Israel, and live in peace with their neighbors. That must be our aim for the entire Near East.

This is a grave hour. But it is not entirely without hope. For if we do these things—if we stand firmly in the pursuit of peace and justice in the Near East—then I believe that Israel and her neighbors will live without war; and that what President Kennedy called "the shining light of the Near East"—the light of Israel's freedom, traditions, and people—will continue to glow, increasing in importance as its contributions to the world increase.

That is your aim, as you have expressed it in the resolutions which I heartily endorse. I know you will continue to work for it. I know we will all work for it.

WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW—STATEMENT ON MIDDLE EAST

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday, the monthly luncheon of the Members of Congress for World Peace Through Law took place in the Capitol. This organization, which now includes 13 Senators and 44 members of the House of Representatives, is naturally very much concerned about the crisis in the Middle East. As a result of the discussions which took place at that luncheon, and in conformity with our policy of not making statements in the name of the organization—that is to say, the Members of Congress for World Peace Through Law—seven Senators and 24 Members of the House have joined in the following joint statement on the Middle East crisis, which I should like to read into the Record:

> As members of the United States Congress concerned with the development of strong international institutions within the United Nations to keep the peace, we strongly endorse President Johnson's May 23 statement regarding the Arab-Israeli crisis.
>
> In the language of the President, "We earnestly support all efforts, in and outside the United Nations and through its appropriate organs, including the Secretary General, to reduce tensions and to restore stability."
>
> Specifically, we agree with President Johnson that:
>
> 1. We must in the first instance place reliance upon the United Nations to resolve the crisis;
> 2. The maintenance of peace in the Middle East is a matter of the gravest concern for all nations;
> 3. As the President said, "a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace." Therefore, the right of free, innocent passage should be guaranteed to shipping of all nations through the Straits of Tiran; and
> 4. All of the nations of the Mideast have a special responsibility to moderate their words and actions so as to help to create a climate in which a peaceful resolution of the crisis can be obtained.
>
> We call upon all concerned to exercise their solemn responsibility to the international community in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations for the development of world order.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the cosigners of this statement may be printed in the Record following the statement I have made.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Endorsing Members of Congress are:

SENATORS

Daniel B. Brewster, Edward W. Brooke, Joseph S. Clark, Robert F. Kennedy, Gale W. McGee, Walter F. Mondale, Frank E. Moss, Edmund S. Muskie, Gaylord Nelson, Stephen Young, and Philip Hart.

CONGRESSMEN

Jonathan Bingham, Edward P. Boland, John Brademas, George E. Brown, Jr., Don Edwards, Donald M. Fraser, Jacob H. Gilbert, Gilbert Gude, Seymour Halpern, Henry Helstoski, Robert W. Kastenmeier, William S. Moorhead, Patsy T. Mink, F. Bradford Morse, Richard D. McCarthy, Richard Ottinger, Claude Pepper, Thomas M. Rees, Ogden R. Reid, Joseph Y. Resnick, Henry S. Reuss, George M. Rhodes, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, William F. Ryan, James H. Scheuer, Richard S. Schweiker, Fred Schwengel, William St. Onge, Herbert Tenzer, Morris K. Udall, Charles W. Whalen, Jr., James C. Corman, and Robert L. Leggett.

DELINQUENT UNITED NATIONS MEMBERS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, with the crisis in the Middle East, we hear many voices asking that the United Nations do something about it. Even if the United Nations, by a vote without a veto on the part of the Soviet Union, were of a mood to do something about the situation, what many people do not realize is that the United Nations is financially unable to do something about it.

The reason why it is financially unable to do something about it is that a majority of the members of the United Nations are delinquent in the payment of their dues and assessments. In fact, of the 117 members, 108 are delinquent in the payment of their dues and assessments one way or another.

Adding to the difficulty is the fact that of the at least 108 delinquent members of the United Nations, the United States has furnished foreign aid to 96 of those members.

Senators will remember that last year the Senate adopted an amendment to the foreign aid bill which I sponsored, which would have prevented foreign aid being extended to those nations which were more than 1 year in arrears in the payment of their dues and assessments, with the proviso that the President of the United States could make an exception to this rule.

Recently, I had occasion to present my proposed amendment to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, which is now deliberating the foreign aid bill. In turn, my presentation was picked up by one of the more knowledgeable editorial writers in my State of Iowa.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on this subject, which appeared in the May 22 issue of the Mason City Globe-Gazette, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Miller Questions Foreign Aid to Delinquent U.N. Members

> Sen. Jack Miller of Iowa is a believer in foreign aid. He has called it "a natural development in keeping with our national character . . . a commitment from the hearts of our people."
>
> He also is a firm backer of the United Nations as an organization that has "the potential of helping secure a more orderly and peaceful world."
>
> But the senator is troubled by what he considers an inconsistency in our foreign-aid policy—the extension of millions of dollars to nations that are delinquent in paying United Nations dues.
>
> This is a long-standing position by Senator Miller.
>
> He first introduced a corrective amendment to the foreign assistance act in 1962. At that time, "only 25 nations receiving our foreign aid were more than one year delinquent (in U.N. payments)."
>
> There was no action.
>
> In 1963, Miller offered the amendment again. The number of nations had risen to 35. No action.
>
> In 1963, Miller was back again. The number had increased to 41. No action.
>
> In 1964, the figure was 46 nations. No action.
>
> The number of delinquent nations receiving American aid remained at 46 when he submitted his amendment again in 1966. Today, it has risen to 56.
>
> And there are 40 more "of our foreign aid recipients which, though not more than one year in arrears, are still in arrears in one way or another."
>
> How would Miller correct this?
>
> His amendment is quite simple and not coercive. It would affect only those nations getting American aid that are more than one year behind in payment of dues and peacekeeping or other assessments.
>
> Furthermore, the Miller amendment provides that this aid could be extended any-

way if there is a finding by the President that it is in "the national interest to do so."

In such an instance, the President would be required to report the circumstances to the foreign relations committees of Congress.

By putting it on this basis, Miller believes that many of the offending nations would pay up.

Miller told a House Foreign Affairs Committee last week that most of the unpaid U.N. dues and assessments owed by most nations are "insignificant" when compared to the American aid they get.

He cited two as examples.

Afghanistan was in arrears some $122,000 in U.N. payments last Dec. 31, but this amount was only $64,000 "in excess of one year" as required under his amendment.

On the other hand, the United States sent $40.4 million in foreign aid to Afghanistan in fiscal 1966.

The same story is true in Argentina. Its delinquency in excess of one year was about $1.46 million; the aid she received during fiscal 1966 was $44.9 million.

Miller can see no reason why the United States continues to pay 30 per cent of the cost of the U.N. and its 11 agencies, nearly 40 per cent of peace-keeping forces in the Middle East, 40 percent of the U.N. Development Program and Children's Fund, and up to 70 per cent of special relief programs—and still sends aid to most delinquent nations.

The Iowa senator points out that 108 of 117 members of the U.N. were delinquent in one form or another as of last Feb. 8.

He adds that the Soviet Union and its bloc "must bear the primary responsibility for the financial crisis," as Russia owes $76 million and other Eastern bloc nations about $27 million.

"However, it should not be overlooked," said Miller, "that there are 96 members of the United Nations which have been receiving foreign aid from us and which by their very numbers and delinquencies of $65 million contribute materially to the crisis."

A year ago, the Miller amendment finally was adopted by the Senate, by was dropped in the Senate-House conference.

That is why the senator is working hard to convince members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee of its validity.

It is difficult to argue with Senator Miller's doubts that the U.N. can live up to its great promise "unless there is a commitment by every member to the Charter."

And that means paying dues, among other things.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there is further morning business.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

RETIREMENT OF DR. ALTON OCHSNER

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the May 19 issue of Medical World News carried an article regarding the retirement of Dr. Alton Ochsner from the operating room at 70 years of age. The distinguished surgeon and teacher is the founder of the famed Ochsner Clinic of New Orleans, which is acknowledged as one of the greatest medical centers in the world.

His career has been a long and distinguished one, but to me one of his greatest contributions lies in his linking of smoking and disease. He was at the vanguard of the movement to protect the public from the harmful effects of smoking, and the future good health of many Americans will in large degree be due to his efforts.

Is is a source of comfort to us all that Dr. Ochsner is not retiring altogether. He will continue to see patients and serve as a consultant, and I am sure that he will continue to exert his influence upon the course of American medicine.

Within the last few months my daughter and one of my former secretaries had occasion to visit the Ochsner clinic—now known as the Ochsner Foundation Hospital—and their praise for the way that the Ochsner Hospital is run was almost unbelievable.

It is said that at the Ochsner Foundation Hospital in New Orleans, they serve better food than in the famous New Orleans French restaurants—food, may I say, which tastes better as well as being healthful food—and that is a strong claim for anyone on earth to make. The attention, the cleanliness, the routine of the hospital, and the manner in which the hospital proceeds with its operations, are probably no less than futuristic.

When an operation is being conducted, the patient's family can sit in the room and hear a stroke by stroke account, one might say, of precisely how the operation is proceeding, related by someone who is well enough informed to translate a description of the procedure into ordinary language for the benefit of laymen.

The Ochsner Hospital enjoys the benefit of all the latest techniques for instructing interns and young doctors in surgery, including the use of television and about every other technique that human ingenuity has thus far devised.

Dr. Ochsner has made a tremendous contribution to medical science, and to the State of Louisiana, the city of New Orleans, and the surrounding area in particular. It is with very great pride, Mr. President, that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article entitled "Laying Down the Scalpel After 20,000 Operations," published in Medical World News for May 19, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dr. Alton Ochsner: Man of Medicine—Laying Down the Scalpel After 20,000 Operations

On a spring day late in April, orderlies wheeled a 46-year-old El Salvador woman out of the green-walled operating room at the Ochsner Foundation Hospital in New Orleans, after a routine cholecystectomy. But for the surgeon in charge, the operation had been far from routine.

As the stretcher disappeared down the hall, Dr. Alton Ochsner Sr. untied his mask and peeled off his gloves for the last time as a surgeon. Because of a rule that he personally set 25 years ago, when the Ochsner Clinic was founded, he was retiring from the operating room.

The rule, which Dr. Ochsner still believes is a good one, stipulates that a clinic surgeon must stop operating at the end of the fiscal year during which he turns 70. Since Dr. Ochsner become 70 on May 4, 1966, and the clinic's fiscal year begins May 1, he was entitled to carry on as a surgeon until he was almost 71.

But after 45 years as a teacher and surgeon, the energetic Dr. Ochsner is not retiring altogether. He will continue to see patients and will enter the operating room when called in as a consultant.

MY JUDGMENT IS STILL GOOD

"To show that I can still take it," Dr. Ochsner scheduled seven operations for his last day. "My judgment is still good," he says, "and I feel I haven't lost my touch. But maybe younger men can do the job better."

There is no complete record of the number of surgical operations Dr. Ochsner has performed since 1922, when he carried out his first unsupervised procedure, a stomach resection. A good estimate, he believes, would be 15 operations a week. "Certainly, there have been more than 20,000."

As with every surgeon, a few operations stand out in Dr. Ochsner's memory. In 1927, in the stifling heat of the Charity Hospital operating room, he performed his first operation as chairman of the surgery department at Tulane University School of Medicine. It was a suboccipital craniotomy for removal of a left-sided neurofibroma of the eighth nerve in the posterior fossa, and it required six hours. "The first thing I asked for afterward was a slice of watermelon, well-salted. We didn't think of salt tablets in those days."

Seven years later, in 1934, he became the first surgeon in the South to remove a lung. The patient is alive today. In 1949, as part of a surgical conference, Dr. Ochsner performed the first live televised operation in New Orleans. During the procedure, undertaken to remove a lung tumor, the pulmonary artery tore, and the surgeons watching the telecast at the conference witnessed a life-and-death struggle as Dr. Ochsner worked to control the bleeding. After the successful operation, his audience told him, "We were glad we were not in your shoes."

Dr. Ochsner's career is studded with the names of celebrities. He remembers when his surgical skills helped golfer Ben Hogan survive serious injuries suffered in an automobile accident. Twice he operated on the late Gary Cooper to repair hernias. Shortly after Pearl Harbor, the U.S. government sent Dr. Ochsner to Panama to perform surgery on a former president of the republic. And the care he gave the late jazz trumpeter Muggsy Spanier is reflected in the song, "Oh Doctor Ochsner."

Over the past 45 years, Dr. Ochsner has seen surgical techniques improve steadily. "In the early days, anesthesia was not so good and technique had to be sacrificed for the sake of speed. Now we have better anesthesia and we realize the importance of minimizing injury to tissues.

"But the great gain is in making a patient safe for a procedure and then keeping him in good condition afterward so as to overcome the trauma of the operation. When I started, we would see a patient for the first time in the afternoon, give him a dose of castor oil, and operate the next morning. Now we take time preoperatively to know all about him. We have learned to take no chances. You cannot compromise now."

The former chief of surgery at Tulane—he is now professor emeritus—hopes he will be remembered more as a teacher than as a surgeon. "My greatest pleasure has come from influencing young people who can do the job better than I. Everywhere I go in the world, I see Tulane men who tell me they never forget their day in the 'bull pen.'"

He recalls one amphitheater session in which he was throwing a withering barrage of questions at a senior medical student. "Why? Why? Why?" he thundered, demanding a reason for every assumption. The bealeaguered student suddenly fainted. "I don't know who was more scared, he or I," Dr. Ochsner says.

A disciplinarian with himself as well as with others, he believes that these harrowing bull-pen experiences were important. "A surgeon has to be able to think under pressure. We are all human and make mistakes, but we should never make the same one twice. If we admit a mistake, we probably will not make it again. If we excuse it, we will repeat it."

In the early weeks of World War II, Dr. Ochsner and four other members of the Tulane faculty pooled their resources and founded the Ochsner Clinic. The concept of group medicine was new then, and from some quarters came opposition and predictions of disaster. Instead of meeting disaster, the clinic has grown to be one of the world's foremost centers and one of the three or four largest private clinics in the U.S. (MWN, Feb. 16, '62).

Its 375-bed hospital, staffed by 110 physicians and 65 Fellows receiving postgraduate training, provides diagnostic work-ups and therapy for at least 80,000 patients every year. The institution attracts thousands of patients from Latin America as well as the U.S.

Dr. Ochsner gives two reasons for the clinic's success. "One, dedication on the part of all of our staff. Two, all of us are on salary. A man's income does not depend on the number of patients he brings in. My salary is no greater than that of others in the same category. This is no dog-eat-dog institution. I have no criticism of those who don't like to work in a group. But I feel that one of the reasons why this clinic has been successful is that everybody has the philosophy that the organization is bigger than any of us."

At 71, Alton Ochsner has lost little if any of his fabled energy. Up at 5 a.m., he puts in a rigorous half hour of calisthenics, has breakfast with Isabel—his wife of 43 years—and then heads for the clinic.

Although he no longer spends his customary several hours a day in surgery, Dr. Ochsner's working hours are still jammed with activity. Soon after he arrives at the hospital, he makes rounds, then returns to his office for morning conferences with staff members and goes over the day's mail. Around noon, he often journeys downtown for civic luncheons.

MORE PATIENT INTERVIEWS NOW

Now that he no longer operates, Dr. Ochsner spends the afternoons seeing more patients, usually in his office. There are often new arrivals at the clinic, uneasy in their strange surroundings away from their families and afraid of what the future may hold. But after a short talk with the genial, gray-haired physician, they are infused with confidence. As one of Dr. Ochsner's sons says, "He can take a case with the most fatal outlook and instill hope in the patient, and still be honest. He always holds out a ray of hope."

At about 6 p.m., Dr. Ochsner's working day at the clinic ends, but at home, in his library, he often labors into the night on scientific papers and speeches. Family life means a great deal to Dr. Ochsner. His three sons—Alton Jr. and John Lockwood are surgeons and Mims Gage is a urologist—are on the clinic staff. His daughter, Isabel, is married to a public relations executive. The Ochsners, who have 17 grandchildren, frequently gather the family at their home.

Throughout a career of dealing with sickness and death, Dr. Ochsner has remained an unshakable optimist who infects his patients with that same spirit. But he learned long ago that there is nothing to be gained from emotional involvement or second-guessing one's self.

"I do the best I can when I'm working, but when I leave the hospital, I leave," he says. He never forgets what his cousin and mentor, the late Dr. A. J. Ochsner of Chicago, once told him: "Never take your patients to bed with you, either literally or figuratively."

Dr. Alton Ochsner Sr. has made his last incision. But as a dynamic, moving force in American medicine, his work is far from finished.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—(H. DOC. NO. 129)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask that the message be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message will be read.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

THE POLITICAL PROCESS IN AMERICA

To the Congress of the United States:

I. INTRODUCTION

Public participation in the processes of government is the essence of democracy. Public confidence in those processes strengthens democracy.

No government can long survive which does not fuse the public will to the institutions which serve it. The American system has endured for almost two centuries because the people have involved themselves in the work of their government, with full faith in the meaning of that involvement.

But government itself has the continuing obligation—second to no other—to keep the machinery of public participation functioning smoothly and to improve it where necessary so that democracy remains a vital and vibrant institution.

It is in the spirit of that obligation that I send this message to the Congress today. I propose a five-point program to:

Reform our campaign financing laws to assure full disclosure of contributions and expenses, to place realistic limits on contributions, and to remove the meaningless and ineffective ceilings on campaign expenditures.

Provide a system of public financing for presidential election campaigns.

Broaden the base of public support for election campaigns, by exploring ways to encourage and stimulate small contributions.

Close the loopholes in the Federal laws regulating lobbying.

Assure the right to vote for millions of Americans who change their residencies.

II. THE ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1967

In our democracy, politics is the instrument which sustains our institutions and keeps them strong and free.

The laws which govern political activity should be constantly reviewed—and reshaped when necessary—to preserve the essential health and vitality of the political process which is so fundamental to our way of life.

In my 1966 state of the Union message I called attention to the need for a basic reform of the laws governing political campaigns in these words:

> I will submit legislation to revise the present unrealistic restrictions on contributions—to prohibit the endless proliferation of committees, bringing local and state committees under the act—and to attach strong teeth and severe penalties to the requirement of full disclosure of contributions.

A year ago this month, I submitted my proposals to the Congress in the Election Reform Act of 1966.

That measure reflected my concern, as one who has been involved in the process of elective government for over three decades, that the laws dealing with election campaigns have not kept pace with the times.

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act was passed 42 years ago. The Hatch Act was passed 27 years ago. Inadequate in their scope when enacted, they are now obsolete. More loophole than law, they invite evasion and circumvention.

A sweeping overhaul of the laws governing election campaigns should no longer be delayed.

Basic reform—with an emphasis on clear and straightforward disclosure—is essential to insure public confidence and involvement in the political process. On the cornerstone of disclosure we can build toward further reform—by charting new ways to broaden the base of financial support for candidates and parties in election campaigns.

I again ask the Congress to take positive action in this field as we work together to insure continued and increased public confidence in the elective process.

I recommend the Election Reform Act of 1967 to correct omissions, loopholes, and shortcomings in the present campaign laws.

This act embodies many of the same positive measures I proposed last May. Last October, after hearings, the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration reported out substantially the bill I proposed "favorably and with bipartisan support." The subcommittee report called those measures "a vast improvement over existing law."

FULL PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

The heart of basic reform is full disclosure. This measure would, for the first time, make effective the past efforts of the Congress and the Executive to achieve full disclosure of political campaign funds.

Complete disclosure will open to public view where campaign money comes from and how it is spent. Such disclosure will help dispel the growth of public skepticism which surrounds the present methods of financing political campaigns.

Full disclosure efforts are frustrated today by gaps in the law through which have passed an endless stream of national, State and local political committees.

To insure full disclosure, I recommend that:

Every candidate, including those for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, and every committee, State, interstate, and national, that supports a candidate for Federal office be required to report on every contribution, loan, and expense item over $100.

Primaries and convention nomination contests be brought within the disclosure laws.

EFFECTIVE CEILINGS ON THE SIZE OF CONTRIBUTIONS

Closely related to full disclosure—the basic step in any election reform—is another equally demanding task. It requires that we make political financing more democratic by recognizing that great wealth—in reality or appearance—could be used to achieve undue political influence.

Current law limits to $5,000 contributions to a single candidate for Federal office or contributions to any national political committee supporting a candidate.

But the law does not prohibit an individual from making a $5,000 contribution to each of several national committees supporting a candidate or party—and there is no limit to the number of such committees. Moreover, State and local political committees are not even covered by existing law.

I recommend that a $5,000 limit be placed on the total amount that could come from any individual, his wife, or minor children, to the campaign of any candidate.

REPEAL OF ARTIFICIAL LIMITS OF CAMPAIGN EXPENSES

With full disclosure and an effective ceiling on contributions we can move forward to cure another defect in our election campaign laws—the artificial limits on campaign expenditures.

Under present law, for example:

National political committees can raise and spend no more than $3 million. But the law does not limit the number of national committees.

Senate candidates are limited to expenses of $25,000 and House candidates to $5,000. But the law does not limit the number of committees that can spend and raise money on the candidate's behalf.

These legal ceilings on expenditures were enacted many years ago, when the potential of radio in a campaign was virtually unknown and when television did not exist. They are totally unrealistic and inadequate. They have led to the endless proliferation of political committees.

I therefore recommend a repeal of the present arbitrary limits on the total expenditures of candidates for Federal office.

BARRING POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS

Present law prohibits corporations and labor organizations from making contributions to campaigns for Federal office.

But there is an anomaly which must be corrected in the law relating to contractors with the Federal Government.

Noncorporate Government contractors are now prohibited from making political contributions at all levels of Government—Federal, State, and local.

The bar on corporations with Government contracts, however, extends only to political contributions at the Federal level. These corporations are free to make political contributions at the State and local levels where finances are often intertwined with national political campaigns.

In the interests of consistency and good sense, I recommend that corporations holding contracts with the Federal Government also be prohibited from making political contributions at the State and local level.

ENFORCEMENT

To insure that these reforms are strictly enforced, the Election Reform Act of 1967 would provide criminal penalties for violations of the law.

III. CAMPAIGN FINANCING

The proposed Election Reform Act of 1967 is corrective, remedying present inadequacies in the law. It goes hand in hand with the pursuit of another goal—to provide public support for election campaigns.

THE BACKGROUND

Democracy rests on the voice of the people. Whatever blunts the clear expression of that voice is a threat to democratic government.

In this century one phenomenon in particular poses such a threat—the soaring costs of political campaigns.

Historically, candidates for public office in this country have always relied upon private contributions to finance their campaigns.

But in the last few decades, technology—which has changed so much of our national life—has modified the nature of political campaigning as well. Radio, television, and the airplane have brought sweeping new dimensions and costs to the concept of political candidacy.

In many ways these changes have worked to the decided advantage of the American people. They have served to bring the candidates and the issues before virtually every voting citizen. They have contributed immeasurably to the political education of the Nation.

In another way, however, they have worked to the opposite effect by increasing the costs of campaigning to spectacular proportions. Costs of such magnitude can have serious consequences for our democracy:

More and more, men and women of limited means may refrain from running for public office. Private wealth increasingly becomes an artificial and unrealistic arbiter of qualifications, and the sources of public leadership is thus severely narrowed.

Increases in the size of individual contributions create uneasiness in the minds of the public. Actually, the exercise of undue influence occurs infrequently. Nonetheless, the circumstance in which a candidate is obligated to rely on sizable contributions easily creates the impression that influence is at work. This impression—however unfounded it might be—is itself intolerable, for it erodes public confidence in the democratic order.

The necessity of acquiring substantial funds to finance campaigns diverts a candidate's attention from his public obligations and detracts from his energetic exposition of the issues.

The growing importance of large contributions serves to deter the search for small ones, and thus effectively narrows the base of financial support. This is exactly the opposite of what a democratic society should strive to achieve.

It is extremely difficult to devise a program which completely eliminates these undesirable consequences without inhibiting robust campaigning and the freedom of every American fully to participate in the elective process. I believe that our ultimate goal should be to finance the total expense for this vital function of our democracy with public funds, and to prohibit the use or acceptance of money from private sources. We have virtually no experience upon which to base such a program. Its risks and uncertainties are formidable. I believe, however, that we are ready to make a beginning. We should proceed with all prudent speed to enact those parts of such a program which appear to be feasible at this time.

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS

THE PROBLEM

The election of a President is the highest expression of the free choice of the American people. It is the most visible level of politics—and also the most expensive.

For their free choice to be exercised wisely, the people must be fully informed about the opposing candidates and issues. To achieve this, candidates and parties must have the funds to bring their platforms and programs to the people.

Yet, as we have seen, the costs of campaigning are skyrocketing. This imposes extreme and heavy financial burdens on party and candidate alike, creating a potential for danger—the possibility that men of great wealth could achieve undue political influence through large contributions.

In recognition of this problem, the Congress last year enacted the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. By so doing, it adopted the central concept that some form of public financing of presidential campaigns would serve the public interest.

I did not submit or recommend this legislation. It was the creation and the product of the Congress in 1966. As you will recall, it was added as an amendment to other essential legislation. When I signed that act into law last November, I observed that "it breaks new ground in the financing of presidential election campaigns" and that the "new law is only a beginning." It was my belief then, as it is now, that the complex issues involved in this new concept required extensive discussion and penetrating analysis.

Over the past 6 weeks, we have heard men of deep principle and firm conviction engage in a spirited and searching debate on the law. While there were honest and vigorous disagreements, they were voiced by those who share a common faith in the free ideals which are the bedrock of our democracy.

THE ISSUES

The course of the debate has illuminated many of the issues which underlie the matter of presidential campaign financing. For example:

In what amount should Federal funds be provided for these campaigns?

What limitations should be placed on the use of these funds?

Should there be a complete bar on the use of private contributions for those aspects of campaign financing which would be regularly provided through appropriations?

Can the availability of public funds result in an undue concentration of power in national political committees? If so, what steps can be taken to prevent it?

Is the tax checkoff method a sound approach or is a direct appropriation to be preferred?

How can equitable treatment of minor parties be assured?

What sanctions would be most effective to insure compliance with the law?

Whatever the ultimate formula, how can we preserve the independence, spirit and spontaneity that has hallmarked American political enterprise through the years?

THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Against this backdrop of concern for the political process, the protection of the public interest, and the issues that have been raised, I make these 11 recommendations to improve and strengthen the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act:

1. Funds to finance presidential campaigns should be provided by direct congressional appropriation, rather than determined by individual tax checkoffs.

This approach would:

Provide the opportunity for Congress to make a realistic assessment, and express its judgment, of what it would cost presidential candidates or parties to carry their views to the voters. This assessment should consider the recommendations of the special Advisory Board to the Comptroller General, created under the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. The Board consists of representatives of both major political parties. Based on this review and recommendation, Congress could then appropriate the necessary funds.

Make the amount appropriated for the campaign fund more stable, by removing its uncertain reliance on tax checkoffs, whose numbers might bear no reasonable relationship to the amount required to bring the issues before the public.

2. The funds should be used only for expenses which are needed to bring the issues before the public.

Under the procedure I recommend:

The funds so appropriated would be used to reimburse specified expenditures incurred during the presidential election campaign itself, after the parties have selected their candidate.

The amount appropriated should be adequate to defray key items of expense to carry a campaign to the public and thus be limited to the following items: radio and television, newspaper and periodical advertising, the preparation and distribution of campaign literature, and travel.

The amount of the fund for the major parties as finally determined by the Congress, would be divided equally between them.

3. Private contributions for major parties could not be used for those items of expense to which public funds could be applied.

Private contributions, however, could be used to defray the costs of other campaign expenses. These would include the salaries of campaign workers, overhead, research and polls, telegraph and telephone, postage, and administrative expenses.

Citizens who want to make contributions to the party or candidate of their choice will be free to do so. Party workers at the grassroots will be able to pursue their neighborhood activities, a responsibility which is deeply woven into the fabric of American political tradition.

But under the measures I have proposed, the major burden of raising money for soaring campaign costs will be lifted from a presidential candidate's shoulders. No longer will we have to rely on the large contributions of wealthy and powerful interests.

4. A "major party" should be defined as one which received 25 percent or more of the popular votes cast in the last election.

A percentage-of-votes test is more realistic than the fixed number of votes—15 million—now in the present law. It recognizes our growing population with more Americans entering the voting ranks each year.

5. A "minor party" should be defined as one which received between 5 and 25 percent of the popular votes cast in the current election.

For the same reasons I described above, the eligibility test for Federal support should not be based on a fixed number of votes—5 million for "minor parties" in the current law—but rather on the percentage of votes received.

Third party movements can support the rich diversity of American political life. At the same time some reasonable limitations should be developed so that Federal financial incentives are not made available to parties lacking a modicum of public support—or created solely to receive Government funds.

Under this proposal, "minor parties" would receive payments based on the number of votes they receive in the current election. The payment for each vote received by a minor party would then be determined so as to be the equivalent of that made to the major parties.

For example, assume that two major parties received a total of 80 million votes in a prior election, and Congress had appropriated a $40 million campaign fund for those two parties. Although the major parties would share equally in that fund—$20 million each—the allocation would amount to 50 cents per vote cast for those parties. Using the 50 cents per vote as the guideline, a minor party receiving 5 million votes in the current election would be entitled to $2.5 million for its recognized campaign expenses.

6. A "minor party" should be eligible for reimbursement promptly following an election.

A "minor party" should be able to qualify promptly for Federal funds, based on its showing in the current election, rather than waiting 4 years until the next election. This added source of funds should enhance a minor party's opportunity to bring its programs and platforms into the public arena.

7. The percentage of Federal funds received by a major or minor party which could be used in any one State should be limited to 140 percent of the percentage the population of that State bears to the population of the country.

This would prevent the concentration of funds in any particular State and would minimize the ability of national party officials to reduce the role and effectiveness of local political organizations. At the same time, it would retain the flexibility necessary to carry a party's programs to the public. The Comptroller General should be empowered to issue rules for the equitable allocation, on a geographic basis, for national campaign expenses, such as network television.

8. The Comptroller General should be required to make a full report to the Congress as soon as practicable after each presidential election.

This report should include:

Payments made to each party from the fund;

Expenses incurred by each party;

Any misuse of the funds.

9. The Comptroller General should be given clear authority to audit the expenses of presidential campaigns.

It is imperative that the strictest controls be exercised to safeguard the public interest. The General Accounting Office is the arm of the Government which I believe is best suited to monitor the expenditures of the fund.

Payments from the fund would be made only upon the submission of certified vouchers to the Comptroller General.

If the Comptroller General's audit reveals any improper use of funds, the following sanctions would be applied:

The amounts involved would have to be repaid to the Treasury; and

If the misuse is willful, a penalty of up to 50 percent of the amount involved would be imposed.

10. To bring greater wisdom and experience to the administration of the act, the Comptroller General's special Advisory Board on the Presidential Election Campaign Fund should be expanded from 7 to 11 members.

This Advisory Board is faced with a heavy and demanding task. It must "counsel and assist" the Comptroller General in the performance of his duties under the act.

The membership of the Board now consists of two members from each major political party and three additional members. I recommend that the Board be enlarged to encompass the wisdom and experience of four distinguished Americans: The majority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the House.

11. Criminal penalties should be applied for the willful misuse of payments received under the act by any person with custody of the funds.

The penalties should be a fine of not more than $10,000, or 5 years imprisonment, or both. Criminal penalties would also be applied against any person who makes a false claim or statement for the purpose of obtaining funds under the act.

OTHER CAMPAIGN FINANCING

We should also seek ways to provide some form of public support for congressional, State, and local political primaries and campaigns.

Here, the need is no less acute than at the presidential level. But the problems involved are as complex as the elections themselves, which vary from district to district and contest to contest.

Because the uncertainties in this area are so very great, and because the issues have not received the benefit of the extensive debate that has characterized presidential campaign financing, I pose for your consideration and exploration a series of alternatives.

In 1961, President Kennedy appointed a distinguished, bipartisan Commission on Campaign Costs to take a fresh look at the problems of financing election campaigns. Although the Commission devoted its attention to the problems of campaign costs for presidential and vice-presidential candidates, it pointed out that the measures proposed "would have a desirable effect on all political fund-raising."

The Commission's 1962 report and recommendations were endorsed by Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman as well as leading presidential candidates in recent elections.

Based on the Commission's recommendations and the later reviews and studies of campaign financing, there are several alternatives which should be considered. These alternatives all involve public financing of campaigns to a greater or lesser extent. Among them are:

A system of direct appropriations, patterned after the recommendations made herein for presidential campaigns, or modeled after recommendations pending in the Congress.

A tax credit against Federal income tax for 50 percent of contributions, up to a maximum credit of $10 per year.

A matching incentive plan in which the Government would contribute an amount up to $10 for an equal amount contributed by a citizen, whether or not a taxpayer, to a candidate or committee.

A "voucher plan" in which Treasury certificates for small amounts could be mailed to citizens who, in turn, would send them to candidates or committees of their choice. These vouchers could then be redeemed from public funds, and the funds used to defray specified campaign expenditures.

I believe these deserve serious attention along with other proposals previously recommended and suggested to the Congress. Each alternative offers particular advantages. Thorough review may reveal that one is to be clearly preferred over the others, or that still other courses of action are appropriate. Whatever the outcome, any such review should reflect a realistic assessment of the amount of funds needed in these campaigns and the extent to which the funds should be provided by public means.

I recommend that Congress undertake such a review.

I have asked the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General to cooperate fully with the Congress in its exploration of these alternatives in order to give all the help the executive branch can to the Congress as it seeks the best congressional election campaign financing program.

These recommendations represent my thoughts on the issues at stake. I believe they highlight the problems in an area so new and complex that there is little experience in our national life to guide us.

I hope that these proposals will serve as guidelines for discussion and debate in the coming weeks. A penetrating and orderly review of these vital public issues, with all the wisdom that the Congress can summon, will in itself be an important educational process for the Nation in the art of government and politics.

I hope that Congress will proceed to consider promptly the problem of campaign financing and will enact appropriate legislation.

I make no recommendation as to the effective date with respect to such legislation. I leave that entirely to the judgment and wisdom of the Congress. I have no desire to ask that the provisions be made applicable to any campaign in which I may be involved. On the other hand, I have no desire to request that any such campaign be exempted from modernizing legislation which Congress might enact.

Public financing of political campaigns presents the American people with an issue that is both significant and complex—departing as it does from the familiar practices of the past. It transcends partisan political considerations. I urge the American people and the Congress to consider this issue thoughtfully, on its merits, and on the highest and most objective plane, independent of any personalities now in office or seeking office.

IV. STRENGTHENING FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING

Full disclosure can serve the integrity of Government in another important area—the regulation of lobbying.

Lobbying dates back to the earliest days of our Republic. It is based on the constitutionally guaranteed right of the people to petition their elected representatives for a redress of grievances.

Yet to realize the American ideal of government, our elected representatives must be able to evaluate the varied pressures to which they are regularly subjected. In 1946, Congress responded to this need by enacting the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Its purpose was not to curtail lobbying but to regulate it through disclosure. For the first time, individuals and groups who directly attempted to influence legislation were required to register.

More than 20 years of experience with the act have highlighted its flaws. Through loopholes in the law, immune from its registration provisions, have passed some of the most powerful, best financed and best organized lobbies. Although engaged in constant and intensive lobbying, they are not legally required to disclose their existence—because lobbying is not their "principal" purpose, the narrow test under current law.

The Congress has properly taken the initiative to meet this problem. Two months ago, the Senate passed S. 355 by a decisive vote. In that measure, Federal regulation of lobbying has been strengthened by:

Supplanting the "principal purpose" test with the broader test of "substantial purpose," thus extending the reach of the act by a wider definition of those required to register.

Transferring the responsibility for administration of the law from the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate to the Comptroller General.

I strongly endorse the Senate's action in strengthening Federal regulation of lobbying as an important step toward better government, and I urge the House to take similar action.

V. THE RESIDENCY VOTING ACT OF 1967

Voting is the first duty of democracy. H. G. Wells called it, "Democracy's ceremonial, its feast, its great function."

This Nation has already assured that no man can legally be denied the right to vote because of the color of his skin or his economic condition. But we find that millions of Americans are still disenfranchised—because they have moved their residence from one locality to another.

Mobility is one of the attributes of a free society, and increasingly a chief characteristic of our Nation in the 20th century. More American citizens than ever before move in search of new jobs and better opportunities.

For a mobile society, election laws which impose unduly long residence requirements are obsolete. They serve only to create a new class of disenfranchised Americans.

An analysis of the 1960 election, the last election for which studies are available, shows that between 5 and 8 million otherwise eligible voters were deprived of the right to vote because of unnecessarily long residency requirements in many of the States. Almost half the States, for example, through laws a century old, require a citizen to be a resident a full 12 months before he can vote even in a presidential election.

These requirements diminish democracy. The people's rights to travel freely from State tc State is constitutionally protected. The exercise of that right should not imperil the loss of another constitutionally protected right—the right to vote.

I propose the Residency Voting Act of 1967 which provides that a citizen, otherwise qualified to vote under the laws of a State, may not be denied his vote in a presidential election if he becomes a resident of the State by the 1st day of September preceding the election.

VI. CONCLUSION

Seventy years ago, the great American historian Frederick Jackson Turner wrote these words:

> Behind institutions, behind constitutional forms and modifications, lie the vital forces that call these organs into life and shape them to meet changing conditions. The peculiarity of American institutions is the fact that they have been compelled to adapt themselves to the changes of an expanding people.

This represents a valid exposition of

the vitality of our democratic process as it has endured for almost 200 years.

Over those two centuries Presidents and Congresses have strengthened that process as changing circumstances presented the clear need to do so. History has spared few generations that continuing obligation.

Today, that obligation poses for us the requirement—and the opportunity as well—to bring new strength to the processes which underlie our free institutions.

It is in keeping with this obligation that I submit the proposals in this message.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 25, 1967*.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in due course, I shall move that the President's message be jointly referred to the Committee on Finance, and Rules and Administration. The legislative proposals made by the President in his message may go beyond the jurisdiction of these two committees and involve jurisdiction of other committees. It would be my hope, that each committee would act within its own legislative responsibility rather than one committee seeking to act in all respects. But, that is for the committees and for the Senate to decide. In any event, I have had expressions of interest from the Committee on Rules and Administration about this matter. I would not for a moment desire to foreclose this committee from acting within the area of its responsibilities.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the President has sent to us a historic message. To a large degree, it is a product of congressional debate. I see in the message a great number of items which have really never been explored before. They were debated in this Chamber. It has been said to me by some of those at the White House, that those working on this message learned more from the Senate debates over the past 6 weeks than from all the advice they were able to muster from the learned political scientists in this country.

I believe that one reason for that is Senators who were debating the issue had concrete, firsthand knowledge of the situation, much of which is not to be found in print anywhere as to what really goes on in a campaign, and how such campaigns are financed, with the result that the give-and-take debate which occurred—sometimes with more passion than light—brought a great deal of information to the record which, may I say, even some of us in the Senate had never thought of before.

I know that in the course of debate a number of important facts came to my attention which I had never known before. As one who has served in this body for 18 years, having been in politics, one might say, since the day I was born, I did not recognize a number of things that were involved, although I had helped to finance presidential, senatorial, and congressional campaigns, had been up to my ears both in helping to finance candidates, supporting them and speaking for them, and helping to arrange details of their campaigns through the years.

Thus, I think the President has taken advantage of everything the Senate could bring to him in this area. He did seek the advice of Senators in arriving at his own conclusions involving the kind of things he should recommend.

In my judgment, there has been no message in this Congress to which Members have contributed more. Certainly on this side of the aisle, we have had an opportunity to know about it, to ask about, and to advise about it.

Accordingly, I feel that we should move forward now and do our job. This could well be the most significant bill passed in Congress, in my judgment. It could be the greatest landmark bill in this Congress, if it can adequately deal with the issues raised in the message.

So far as the Committee on Finance is concerned, I expect to call early hearings. While it may inconvenience some Senators, I am hopeful to meet next Wednesday, when the Senate returns from its recess, to begin the hearings and then proceed as expeditiously as possible to obtain all the information to which the President has referred with regard to presidential elections, so that we can proceed to write a bill which will encompass the best thoughts of us all.

Other problems in this area may be more difficult to solve because they have not been considered in the same depth. They raise entirely new issues which have not been thought through or have not been explored before. I do not suppose anyone will say of the President's recommendations with regard to financing a presidential election this year, that it was done hastily without full and thorough debate and consideration by the Senate.

I believe it will be agreed that this matter has been debated until Senators, by now, should understand what they are voting on. As a matter of fact, coming down the home stretch of debate on the rider to the investment credit bill, Senators have been saying that debate on it was so thorough, they were sick of hearing about it. Thus, this matter will be one which will be adequately and thoroughly considered. If we do not reach the correct solution, it will only be because we are incapable of doing so.

Mr. President, the President today proposes a number of changes and amendments to the Long act. There is much to be commended in his message concerning amendments to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966.

In brief, here is what the President proposes:

First, he eliminates the tax checkoff and provides a direct appropriation to finance presidential election campaigns. The President leaves up to Congress how much money is to be made available in the presidential election campaign fund for political parties, but he wants the two major parties to share equally in the fund as they would under last year's law.

Mr. President, may I say that that recommendation more or less splits the difference between what I originally proposed and what the Finance Committee agreed to, when we legislated on this matter in 1966. The proposal I originally made was that this should be a direct appropriation and that it should be related to the number of votes each candidate received. In the committee, it was decided that it would be best that both parties know how much money they could rely upon, so that they could make their plans and budgets accordingly Therefore, the committee agreed that both major parties should receive the same amount, and that a formula be worked out to decide what that amount should be.

Very simply, the President's recommendations would provide that we would decide how much money would go to the major parties in order to make their campaigns and cover the cost of the expenses involved and that, having done so, we would treat them both alike.

The President's recommendation may be a better solution of the problem than that which I recommended to the Senate last year, or that which the Senate Finance Committee agreed upon. In my judgment, it shows that when one has had a year to think about it, and has had the benefit of 6 weeks' debate on the Senate floor, as well as the crosscurrents that developed during the interim in various committee reports, arguments before committees, statements, editorials in the press, one can arrive at a better conclusion than if he had not had the benefit of that advice.

There is additional benefit for a minor party under the President's proposal. A minor party is one which receives 5 percent of the popular vote in the current presidential election. If in 1968, as there was in 1964, approximately 70 million votes are cast, a minor party must receive 3½ million votes to qualify for payment.

This compares favorably with the 5 million votes needed to qualify as a minor party under last year's law. In addition, however, note that a third party benefits by being able to receive a payment based on its vote in a current presidential election. Thus, a third party getting 5 percent of the vote in 1968 gets a payment from the fund in 1968, after the election. Also, under the President's proposal, if a party receives 5 percent of the vote to qualify as a minor party, it receives reimbursement for its qualified expenses based on the same amount of money per vote as would be given to the major parties, including that first 5 percent. There is no deductible such as the 5 million in the Long Act which a party must surmount before it can start getting money from the fund.

I claim no pride of authorship in the 5 million figure which appeared in the law last year. My original suggestion was that the number should be 1.5 million, but in conference the concept was pressed on us that the number should be at least 5 million votes, placing the level so high that even Bob La Follette or Theodore Roosevelt would not have qualified as a candidate of a minor party. It was against my good judgment that the

5 million figure ever got into the law to begin with, but it was a compromise in the conference between the Senate and the House. I am pleased to see that the President's recommendation moves in the direction I felt it should.

To be fair, a third party which receives enough votes to be a factor would receive the same payment, on a pro rated basis, as the major parties.

In my judgment, it is a fine improvement the President is asking of what is on the statute books.

The President also redefines a major party to be one which received 25 percent of the popular vote in the preceding presidential election and again there is no deductible of $5 million per majority party. The major parties will simply share equally in a fund based on an amount decided upon by Congress.

To overcome any possibility that under last year's law much, if not all, of the fund money could be concentrated in just a few States, the President recommends that no more than a certain portion of the payment to a party can be used in any one State. In one State a party cannot spend more than 140 percent of the proportion of the entire fund payment that the State's population bears to the population of the Nation.

This particular provision is another one which probably was derived from the debate here in the Senate. It was debated and contended by the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] that funds could be concentrated in one State. While from the point of view of one candidate it is possible to concentrate funds where the decision in that State would decide the outcome of the election, it could conceivably create problems for candidates for other offices. Suggestions were made to meet the criticism of the Senator from New York, and this proposal undoubtedly appeared in the President's recommendations as a result. I would certainly expect to support it, understanding the arguments on both sides.

The presidential election campaign fund money can be used to defray only certain types of expenses—expenses that account for the major costs of a political campaign, such as advertising in its various forms and travel. For these types of expenses, under the President's recommendation, a major party can use money only from the fund and cannot spend private contributions.

A minor party is not so limited, for the reason that one would not know whether a minor party was going to qualify for any funds at all. However, it can receive from the fund only such money which together with its private contributions does not exceed its expenses.

Other revisions of the Long Act suggested by the President provide: audits by the Comptroller General of all political party expenditures for which payment can be made from the fund; repayments by political parties of fund payments used erroneously; complete disclosure of how fund payments are used; civil and criminal penalties for violations of the act by political parties and by individuals; extensive regulatory authority vested in the Comptroller General; and certain definitional changes to clarify the intent of last year's act. In addition, the President suggests that the advisory board to counsel the Comptroller General in his administration of the act should be expended to include the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the Speaker and minority leader of the House.

While we may wish to change some of the details of the President's proposal, by and large it is a strong and worthwhile recommendation which I hope will attract full support of the Senate. The President's message also includes much of what he proposed last year in the area of election reform and suggests a number of alternatives for financing the elections of other than presidential candidates. Since the Congress has not gone on record in either of these two areas, it will probably want to take a much harder, more cautious look at these subjects and perhaps to propound its own recommendations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's message be ferred to the Committee on Finance and to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have read with interest these Presidential recommendations. It occurs to me that much of the legislation proposed here would not be within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee of the other body and of the Finance Committee of the Senate. Am I correct in that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is, however, a recommendation for a tax credit of a limited sort which would place at least one of the bills suggested by the President within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee of the Senate and of the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say that under the provision of the Mansfield motion the Senate Finance Committee has jurisdiction at this moment of everything in the report, but I would prefer that the Senate Finance Committee would yield to the Rules and Administration Committee on the corrupt practices portions of the bill. I would hope the Senate would feel that way about it. I would rather defer to the committee that has jurisdiction over the corrupt practices area rather than insist on the Finance Committee taking jurisdiction. But that is up to the Senate to decide.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield further, I was not thinking about where the present jurisdiction is, because I remember the provisions of the Senate's action in recommitting this bill with instructions, which were certainly very broad; but I was thinking about where the origin of this legislation can be. It occurs to me that the origin of much of the legislation proposed here can be in the Senate, because it would not be affected by the constitutional provision that the origin of revenue legislation must be in the other body. I do not know whether legislation as proposed in the President's message is being introduced today; I am sure the Senator can advise me on that; but it seems to me much of that legislation can constitutionally originate in the Senate. That puts us in a much stronger position here than we would be in if everything had been attempted as part of a revenue measure.

Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. There is much in the President's message—I would say at least half of it or perhaps more—that does not involve revenue at all; so certainly there are areas in which the Senate can initiate legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. My quick analysis of the message would indicate that certainly the amendments strengthening the Corrupt Practices Act could originate in the Senate. The Senator would agree with that, would he not?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. My analysis of the message further indicates that legislation in accord with the presidential election part of the President's message could constitutionally originate in the Senate, because it has no reference to any tax matter, but instead suggests direct financing by appropriation. Does the Senator agree with me on that point?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A bill which eliminates the tax checkoff would be, in my judgment, subject to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance, by virtue of the fact that it eliminates the tax checkoff.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not disturbed about the committee matter. I am thinking in terms broader than that. It would occur to me that whatever committee of the Senate deals with this matter, if it brings forth legislation under the corrupt practices part of the message and the presidential election part of the message, such legislation can constitutionally originate in this body, and is not subject to the rather narrow rule we were confronted with in the preceding debate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is partially correct, but I would like to explain further.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, my impression is that the President will recommend perhaps three bills.

Mr. HOLLAND. I so read the message.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of the three bills, in all probability the Committee on Finance would have jurisdiction of only one.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator means except for the recommittal action?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; exactly. The Committee on Finance would, in pursuance of the Mansfield motion, have jurisdiction of the entire area. But I am not anxious to exercise all that jurisdiction. I hope that other committees will legislate in that area, insofar as they may wish to do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want the RECORD to show very clearly that I am not interested at all in the question of which Senate committee handles the legislation; that is, whether the matter is handled as a group of bills coming within the terms of the recommittal, or as a single bill, or how it is handled.

What I am talking about is that if it is handled as different bills, clearly two of the measures recommended by the President can originate constitutionally in the Senate. To that extent, I think we are well ahead of the position we occupied during the recent extended debate, in which the Senator from Louisiana took some part.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I understand the Senator.

Frankly, I would rather hope that the Committee on Finance would not be required to legislate beyond our traditional area of jurisdiction. But this is a type of matter in which a committee chairman really does not have the power to make the decision; that is for the committee and for the Senate to decide. As the Senator so well knows, it is always possible for someone to walk into the Chamber and put an amendment on an appropriation bill or a tax bill, an amendment which has nothing whatever to do with the particular bill.

The 6 weeks of debate we had over the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act involved a rider which was not germane to the bill in any respect whatsoever. The Senator well knows that it is completely within the rights of any Senator to offer an amendment which has nothing whatever to do with matters within a committee's jurisdiction.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield further, speaking for myself, I hope we will have no more such riders to deal with, as we have had last year and this year.

I think the message of the President, whether dealt with by the Senate or not, certainly points the way to a more orderly procedure than under the preceding situation, and I am most happy that that appears to be the case.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is certainly most kind. The Senator from Louisiana hopes he has learned to be tolerant of other Senators during his service in this body. I must confess that from time to time I tend to feel outraged that another Senator wishes to attach a completely irrelevant rider to a tax bill. My anger is diminished, however, when I recollect that in earlier years, prior to the time when I became the senior member of the Committee on Finance, I would sit back and wait for some bill that had to pass, such as a bill to increase the debt limit or a bill to provide revenue for the Government, to offer my amendment to increase grandma's old age pension, or for some other such worthy purpose.

Sometimes I would vote for irrelevant riders of that sort proposed by other Senators.

So while I might wish that these irrelevant proposals might not become a part of a bill reported by the Committee on Finance, I must cheerfully concede the right of every Senator, and perhaps even myself on occasion, to attempt to add to a tax bill something that is not a revenue measure at all.

I believe that the appropriate and necessary procedure for the Committee on Finance to follow would be to add our measure as an amendment to a House-passed revenue measure, in the event the Senate wanted to act first. That would not mean that the House could not originate some recommendation. I merely say that if the House did not initiate a measure on campaign financing and therefore did not send us one, I would expect, in due course, to add one in the Senate to a House-passed revenue bill. The only way the Senate can pass a campaign financing proposal which either amends the tax checkoff provision or institutes a tax incentive is to add it to a House-passed tax bill.

By now, the Senate is immeasurably better informed in this area than is the House of Representatives. The Senate has debated the subject at such length, as I said previously, before the Senator from Florida entered the Chamber, that Senators are saying that they are sick and tired of hearing about it. So the Senate is well informed in this area now, and every Senator is familiar not only with the subject but with every other Senator's views, as well.

For the most part, proposals to reform election laws have been referred in the past, in the Senate, to the Committee on Rules and Administration; therefore, it is appropriate that that committee take a look at the subject again this time. Because of the activity of the Committee on Finance in the campaign financing area last year, and because of the motion of the majority leader this year, instructing the Committee on Finance to submit recommendations concerning the so-called Long Act, which motion has been defined as giving the Committee on Finance jurisdiction over all the area of campaign financing and election reform, it is appropriate that the message be referred also to the Committee on Finance.

It is my intention to schedule hearings on the proposal in the Committee on Finance to start next Wednesday, May 31. We shall discuss the subject of election reform and presidential campaign financing. It is the intention of the Committee on Finance to conduct as intensive and thorough a study of the subject as time will permit. We realize that we are under an injunction to report to the Senate by a certain date. But working within that deadline, we shall do everything in our power to bring back to the Senate worthwhile, farsighted recommendations. Any Senator may submit his comments on this subject, either in person or in writing, to the Committee on Finance, so that we can consider his thoughts in trying to decide what to report to the Senate.

Likewise the committee hopes to hear from every Representative who chooses to make himself known on this subject. The committee is also anxious to hear from persons who have been involved in the financing of political campaigns, the financial officers and treasurers of the parties, and from practical politicians. In addition, the committee hopes to hear from persons who have written and worked in this area and who can make available to the committee the benefit of their research and experience.

In other words, the Committee on Finance takes seriously the responsibility that has been given to it by the Senate. For my part, I am bent on giving to the Senate the very best and most constructive of recommendations and legislation. As I have said, the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966, to my way of thinking, was the most important legislation enacted by the 89th Congress. I believe that whatever is passed on this subject in the 90th Congress may well be the greatest achievement of this Congress.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I am not authorized to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who is now functioning not only in his important capacity as chairman of the Committee on Finance but also as assistant floor leader of the majority, about the legislative program ahead. But on this day, before the Senate recesses for the Memorial Day holiday I felt that, in fairness, I ought to make this query.

We shall have only one full week of sessions before we begin the consideration of the case involving the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. Is that not approximately correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from Louisiana knows, of course, as we all know, that the case of Senator DODD must be considered most carefully and conscientiously. Accordingly, that matter is likely to continue almost to the close of the month of June. That being so, the Senator from New Hampshire is curious to know when the Senate is likely to consider the debt ceiling measure.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should think that we would consider the debt ceiling bill just as soon as the House gets it to us and the committee can report the measure to the Senate.

The Senate Committee on Finance has never taken more than 2 or 3 days to move a debt ceiling bill to the Senate floor. In fact, we sometimes report the measure on the same day on which we get it.

I should imagine that if time becomes of the essence in regard to extending the debt ceiling, we may have to lay aside the Dodd case if we have not voted on it by that time.

Mr. COTTON. I beg the distinguished Senator to understand that today I am speaking most calmly and dispassionately and that this is in no sense an ultimatum or a threat of any kind. However, and I do not say by design, repeatedly over the years we have found ourselves dealing with increases in the debt ceiling which seem to come to us when we have only a few hours to act.

From what I read in the RECORD, the increase that is likely to come to us from the House is an extremely substantial one, although perhaps necessary, and is likely to be permanent. Rather than wait, and be put in the position of being an obstructionist, the Senator from New Hampshire wants to make it very clear that if we find ourselves thrown into the situation of having just a day or one afternoon in which to deal with the measure before the July 1 deadline, the matter of getting unanimous consent agreements to expedite the measure, limit debate, and limit the time on amendments may not be easy.

The Senator from Louisiana is considerably burdened these days. He has to carry the ball on the measure dealing with pure elections, he must carry the ball in a sense in the consideration of the case involving the Senator from Connecticut, and he must carry the ball on the debt ceiling bill. The Senator from New Hampshire recognizes the burdens of the Senator from Louisiana.

It is only fair now, before the planning is done, to express the hope that we are not going to be forced to deal with this debt limit under the gun, as we have been frequently compelled to do in the past.

I wanted to express that hope and do it now rather than to wait and be placed in the position, as I have stated of at the last minute appearing to be an obstructionist.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am aware of my duties and I will do the best I can.

The Senator well knows that the reason we are always being asked to legislate at the last moment with respect to the debt ceiling is that the House never sends us a bill until the last minute. The record of the Senate Finance Committee with respect to reporting a debt ceiling bill to the Senate is absolutely exemplary. If anything, we would be subject to the charge of proceeding with too much haste, because we move rapidly to dispose of debt ceiling bills.

We might perhaps sometime in the future attach a debt ceiling bill to another measure and send it to the House and let them worry about the time element rather than us.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from New Hampshire will agree 100 percent that the Senate Finance Committee has not been responsible for these delays, but has been most prompt in getting debt ceiling increase measures to the Senate.

However, the Senator from New Hampshire is not convinced that all the fault lies in the House. He is not convinced that there is not some tendency to put us under the gun without ample time being afforded for adequate consideration, by those who make the recommendations in the executive branch of the Government. But, I do not want to go into that aspect today. I am not finding fault.

I am just expressing a hope. If the situation arises, the Senator from New Hampshire, for one, will find himself extremely reluctant to swallow all that it appears that he will be expected to swallow on the debt ceiling increase measure in terms of precipitous action.

We must act on the House measure before July 1, and rather than waiting until the last minute, I want to raise the question now and serve notice that the Senator from New Hampshire does not intend to be pushed into any unanimous-consent agreement that would shut off debate too quickly when this important matter reaches the floor of the Senate.

I know the Senator will understand the completely friendly spirit in which the Senator from New Hampshire says this. He felt it would be only fair to make these observations in timely fashion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I hope I have been in the Senate long enough to understand the situation when Senators insist on their rights.

I have done so many times myself, and I have done so to the complete irritation of the Senate on a number of occasions. I would expect the Senator from New Hampshire to do likewise. That is his privilege, and I cheerfully accord it to him.

I do not think that he could possibly be as great an irritant to the Senate as I have been on a number of occasions. The Senator need have no feeling that I will be irritated because the Senator from New Hampshire insists on his rights.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

THE UNITED STATES AND AFRICA

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, 4 years ago today a new start was made in an ancient land. Thirty newly independent African states banded together in Addis Ababa to establish the Organization of African Unity. This regional body, symbolic of the new Africa, has since grown to embrace 38 members. It represents an effort by the new Africa to achieve more effective control over its own regional affairs and thus deserves our commendation and support.

The problems this young organization faces in attempting to bring economic and social progress to Africa are immense. The sheer size of the continent alone demonstrates the scope and complexity of the effort required. Comprising 11,500,000 square miles, 310,000,000 people and 39 independent nations, Africa is a challenge that stuns the imagination.

The immensity of this challenge is compounded by the fact that the continent is undergoing a radical social transformation as it moves into the 20th century. The speed and breadth of this upheaval is making even the smallest task of government incredibly difficult.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, these and other African questions have been too long ignored. By virtue of its natural resources, its geographic location and its vigorous leadership, Africa demands our attention. Still, in the minds of many Americans, it remains a dark continent, as mysterious and unknown as it was in the days of Livingstone.

To understand the need for an imaginative and sensitive U.S. foreign policy toward Africa, therefore, we must first understand the continent itself and to understand Africa, we must examine its policies and problems in detail.

The foremost problem confronting the leadership in Africa is the enormous ethnic diversity of the continent. There are more than 250 tribes in Nigeria alone and over 800 languages are spoken in Africa south of the Sahara.

Though some progress is being made, the extreme ethnic heterogeneity makes any attempt to instill a sense of national pride and identity agonizingly difficult. African leaders, with help and encouragement where necessary, must find ways to develop equitable programs that will gradually extend the concept of tribal loyalty to encompass a sense of nationhood. For until an Ibo learns to think of himself as a Nigerian first and an Ibo second, countries such as Nigeria will be torn by tribal strife, and economic and social progress will be more by accident than by design.

This ethnic and linguistic diversity is paralleled by a rural-urban conflict which severally complicates the problems of nation building. For as tribesmen leave the village area and move to the city, they are uprooted, not only from their homes, but from an entire way of life. The impersonal, fast-paced life of the big cities, without the comforting family relationships which gave village life its stability, is disquieting to men who are attempting to find a place for themselves in a new world.

Mr. President, the governmental turmoil and the tendency toward one-party states which characterize Africa today flow from the attempt to lessen and control the effects of this social upheaval and ethnic diversity. Older, more established democracies must, therefore, be aware of the severe social difficulties facing the newly formed African governments and demonstrate a sensitivity toward their difficulties when formulating foreign policy.

Another problem which is hampering economic and political development is the need for large numbers of trained professional men and technicians at all levels of governmental and civilian life. Many African states are fortunate enough to have excellently qualified men as presidents, cabinet ministers, ambassadors, and other officials. Unfortunately, even these are plagued with a lack of trained personnel at the lower levels of government.

Any program of assistance to Africa must emphasize the need to develop large-scale training programs to provide these states with the highly qualified men they need to maintain the machinery of government and industry at all levels. Their economic and political integrity can be assured only by eliminating the necessity to rely on foreigners to staff their bureaucracies.

Mr. President, in their desire to achieve economic as well as political independence from their former colonial masters, many African states are insisting on government controlled economics as the most efficient means of developing their manpower and industries quickly.

This insistence has been alarming to many Americans. One must always remember however, that socialism and centralized economies are words often used loosely. In Africa, socialism means something quite different from the economic systems found in the Communist bloc. For African socialism often entails the promotion of private enterprise under the general direction of the government. Thus, many African countries actively welcome the participation and help of private business in their development plans.

This does not mean they encourage private investment without reservation, however. As a result of their colonial experience they are understandably reluctant to permit foreign control of their natural resources without some form of government supervision.

Another African policy which confuses many is that of neutralism or nonalinement. All African States are pledged through the OAU to avoid alinement with any bloc outside of Africa. This posture offends some, both in the free world and the Communist bloc, who feel the least these states can do in return for economic aid is to aline their foreign policy with that of the donor, be he Russian, British, or American. However, the fact remains that the policy of neutralism serves many purposes for African leaders.

For example, it enables Africa to acquire aid and technical assistance from both sides in the cold war struggle, thus increasing the total amount available. In addition, such a posture allows the leadership to command more domestic unity, and support than might otherwise be the case by acting as mediators of global conflicts and diverting attention from domestic responsibilities.

In general, one can say this flexibility of posture is both profitable and expedient and thus it is not likely to be soon abandoned.

But this need not be disturbing. For true neutralism in cold war issues is in the interest of the United States. We do not seek to create models of our society in every quarter of the globe, but rather seek only to ensure freedom of development for all. Genuine neutralism fulfills this objective.

Africans are not neutral in every instance, however; they are fiercely anticolonial, and resist extensive political and economic influence by any outside power as being a threat to their fragile independence.

Another challenge with which foreign policymakers must contend is the issue of race relations. The Africans are very much aware of the domestic racial problems which currently confront the United States. Fortunately they are also aware of the complexity of the issue, and tend to be understanding of the difficulties we face in finding a just and equitable solution.

In addition, the racial problem posed by Rhodesia, South Africa, and the Portuguese colonies clouds the international atmosphere. Needless to say, the problem of reconciling the legitimate African demand for universal suffrage with the rights of white settlers to full citizenship and equal economic opportunity in Negro-controlled states remains one of the most critical challenges facing the continent today.

In dealing with the complex problems which face these fiercely independent nations the United States has certain advantages. For example, in spite of the African emphasis on neutralism, the fact remains that Africa's historical, cultural, military, economic, educational, and other ties are with the West, rather than the East.

Furthermore, Mr. President, in addition to the common value system we share with Europe and Africa, the United States possesses the distinct advantage of not being a former colonial power.

On occasion, these new members of the world community may exasperate us in their determination to avoid political entanglement and in their demands for economic assistance. They often give the appearance of believing that America is a bottomless source of aid. To reconcile Africa's ambitious requests with her absorptive capacity requires a sensitive and articulate foreign policy which emphasizes a realistic concern for Africa's economic and social problems of adjustment. All too often such a sensitivity has been lacking.

Mr. President, I hope the foregoing observations have served to indicate the enormous complexity of the challenge facing American foreign policy in Africa. The continent is rich in diversity, but its potential is as great as its problems.

In sum, Africa is a challenge we cannot ignore. Our political principles impel us to help Africans achieve meaningful political freedom and economic prosperity for themselves. Our role as leader of the free world requires that we endeavor to insure that Africa is spared the bloody battle for supremacy with communism now ravaging Southeast Asia.

While United States concern with African affairs is thus both legitimate and desirable, considerable thought must be given to the nature of our involvement if the interests of all are to be served.

Mr. President, the United States could begin a massive and direct aid program in Africa, perhaps involving an overall regional effort such as the Alliance for Progress. Such a step is considered tempting by some, given the vacuum left by the rapid European withdrawal and the danger of communist penetration it has created. But we must ask, is such involvement in our interest or in Africa's? Could it not lead to the United States being drawn unwittingly into situations where our influence would be marginal and the goals not worth the price?

On the other hand, the United States could intensify its efforts to encourage the Europeans to develop more programs of regional scope, drawing on their wealth of African experience to minimize the economic and social dislocations of modernization. In such a situation, the United States would still provide assistance, but it would be multilateral and subordinate to the European aid programs. Our concern would be demonstrated, but our involvement would be less intimate.

Mr. President, we must ask again, is such an approach in our interests? Would it lead to a further diminution of U.S. influence in an area of the world that will continue to grow in importance, or would it actually further our objectives by preventing our involvement in fierce internal struggles which could only hinder the economic and social development we seek?

Perhaps an artful blending of these more extreme approaches would be more desirable. Perhaps not. Such a program could stress long-term multilateral aid through a new world development consortium which would be concerned with creating more stable international commodity markets as well as with internal development.

Regardless of the policy eventually adopted, it is important that we recognize the necessity of thorough study and debate; first, to identify the various alternatives and second, to decide which of these will best serve our interests within the limits of our capabilities.

Mr. President, there are no easy answers to the challenges of Africa. Yet some solutions must be found if the United States is to play a constructive role in the future of Africa, while avoiding the overinvolvement that can only frustrate the interests of everyone concerned.

Regardless of the amount or type of assistance offered by the United States, it must be given without the expectation of immediate reward, either financial or political. It must be given simply because we, as Americans, profess certain philosophical beliefs and because our security depends upon their protection and promulgation. As Abraham Lincoln said:

> Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere.

BUILDING AMERICAN YOUTH

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, President Johnson has consistently made the needs, hopes, and ideals of youth a central concern of his administration from his first days in office.

He described this effort in 1964 when he wrote:

> A compassionate government keeps faith with the trust of the people and cherishes the future of their children.

He has brought to this task not only the energy of the Federal Government, but that of the mayors and local officials of cities and towns across the country as well. For it is at the local level that youth opportunity is created. That is where opportunity is fulfilled.

Building in a determined and planned manner, President Johnson has inaugurated a series of summer opportunity programs for the underprivileged.

The President's youth opportunity campaign last summer, for example, found jobs for more than a million young people, ages 16 to 21.

Swimming, camping, and outdoor recreation opportunities were created for a million children. Last summer, Neighborhood Youth Corps across the land offered work and training to more than a quarter of a million young people.

Millions of schoolchildren have received new books, additional teachers, smaller classes, more challenging programs under Federal aid to education programs in the last 2 years.

This is the past. What of the future summers for our youth? The statistics indicate the degree of importance this administration has given to summer youth opportunity in all forms.

In the past 3 years, summer funds for the Neighborhood Youth Corps doubled from $73 million to $143 million.

Funds dedicated to Project Headstart rose from $85 million to $110 million. Upward Bound—the creative project to prepare young poor people for college—went from an initial $3 million to $27 million in this fiscal year.

Funds for summer youth projects under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the last 2 years alone approached the half-billion mark.

Overall, the Johnson administration in the last 3 years has invested over $600 million in summer youth programs for less fortunate young people.

That is still not enough. The President knows it. The Congress knows it. A few days ago the President asked the Congress for a supplemental appropriation of $75 million to mount a more intensified program of summer programs this year in education, recreation, job training, and libraries for the disadvantaged youth.

The cities are ready for it. Our children need it. The country can afford it. There is no resource more precious than America's youth. Let us join the President as he tries to build a better America for those who will lead it into the future.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, the action taken by President Nasser in announcing a blockade of shipping to and from Israel through the Gulf of Aqaba represents a clear threat to the peace of the Middle East. An executed blockade would be not only a violation of international waters but also a violation of negotiated settlements, including ones which have been discussed in the United Nations.

I commend President Johnson for reiterating the U.S. "firm commitment to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity" of all nations of the Middle East.

Yet, the challenge to peace cannot be met effectively by one or even two nations. All nations must look beyond the narrow confines of nationalism and accept the reasoned responsibility required of membership in the world community.

I believe that the United States should continue its efforts to secure action through the United Nations. The Middle East situation is not only a threat to peace but a threat to the institution designed to maintain that peace. We should leave no doubt as to our desires to settle the dispute within the U.N., for the failure to settle the problem there would undoubtedly raise serious questions concerning the efficacy of the organization. At the same time, the United States cannot fail to meet a challenge to a sovereign nation's integrity and independence, without raising concern about the security of all sovereign nations. Thus, if the U.N. fails to meet the crisis, the United States must take steps.

Prior to that, however, the Soviet Union in particular should be encouraged to take positive action to mitigate the Arab threat. The Soviet Union has a special influence with President Nasser and the United Arab Republic and thereby has not only a special opportunity but also a special responsibility to the other nations of the world to help preserve the peace. A failure of the Russians to act either within or outside the U.N. will only give evidence to suggestions that recent Soviet activities from the Sea of Japan to the Mediterranean are not calculated to promote world peace.

If these moves do not succeed, the United States, together with the other nations who recognize the blockade as a breach of international law, should notify President Nasser of its intention to test the blockade.

As a nation committed to the preservation of the freedom and integrity of sovereign nations, we can do no less.

CRIMINAL REHABILITATION

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, on Tuesday, May 9, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and I introduced S. 1789, a bill to establish criminal rehabilitation demonstration programs in several prisons.

Since that time the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice has issued its "Task Force Report on Corrections." In its comprehensive study of this field, the task force has supplied numerous cogent reasons why projects of the type that S. 1789 calls for are desperately needed.

In its opening remarks the task force notes that—

> Most [jurisdictions] lack capacity to cope with the problems of preventing recidivism—the commission of further offenses. Some fail even to meet standards of humane treatment recognized for years.

When it turns to a review of correctional institutions, the task force finds:

> Deficiencies in resources, inadequate knowledge, and lack of community support [that] handicap institutions. . . . Institutional corrections suffer also from long and indiscriminate use simply for punishment and banishment, purposes which inspire in the system little imagination, hope, or effort to improve.

Our prisons, reports the task force have built up an "exaggerated concern for security"; they have remained "isolated, punitive, and regimented," thereby developing "a monolithic society, castelike and resistive to change." In the institutions of all but a few States, such as New York and California, "academic instruction is provided mainly by inmate teachers. Often a majority of them lack a college education and some have not completed high school."

And even when civilian teachers are employed, "those hired are sometimes the castoffs of public school systems. Like the inmates, they are primarily interested in putting in their time with a minimum of effort."

These same qualities of lack of concern and of a willingness to tolerate the status quo have marked the type of job training provided by most of our prisons. The task force aptly sums up the failure to instill habits of industry when it notes that:

> When labor is forced and unrewarded either in money or in pride of accomplishment, there is little motivation to strive for diligence or skill. These features have characterized most of the drudgery to which prisoners have been subjected. When the period in which assigned work is expected to be done is several times the period really needed to complete it, there is little motivation to work diligently. When "work" involves only the most menial tasks or is carried out with antiquated equipment and methods, it is of little help in training offenders for later employment.

When it turns to the problem of releasing convicted offenders, normally on parole, the task force finds other, equally serious problems:

> Offenders typically lack information about the local labor market; parole officers simply do not have the time to locate adequate employment opportunities for all their charges or to help them meet day-to-day difficulties.
>
> Average supervision loads vary among States which have separate parole services as well as among States that combine probation and parole supervision. . . . Caseloads range from 37 to 245 in the States with mixed caseloads and from 40 to 93 in the States with separate caseloads.

As a consequence of this faulty and overworked corrections system, our recidivism rate has remained too high. All too many young offenders who have once run afoul of the criminal process are not helped to avoid the pitfalls of a continued life of crime.

It is to deal with this problem of recurrent criminal behavior that Senator PROUTY and I introduced S. 1789. The bill provides for a demonstration program offering intensive education, training, and counseling to young adult criminal offenders during the 6 to 8 months prior to release, and employment aid and guidance during the first 6 to 8 months immediately following release. It is hoped that with teachers based at the institutions and VISTA volunteers in the communities, a new dimension can be brought to the rehabilitative process which will result in a substantially reduced recidivism rate for released offenders.

Last week, I received a letter from George F. McGrath, New York City's commissioner of corrections. Because his comments on S. 1789 are extremely relevant, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF
CORRECTION, CITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., May 24, 1967.

Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: We in the New York City Department of Correction feel that your bill involving the Teacher Corps and VISTA personnel in the rehabilitation programs dealing with youthful offenders is a most exciting, promising and realistic proposal, and we would hope that this legislation will be enacted by the Congress, and further that New York City would be one of the cities designated if this become a reality.

From the materials which I have given you, I am sure that you are aware of the enormous numbers of young people in the sixteen to twenty-five year age bracket who are committed to the care of this Department either in detention awaiting trial and disposition or in our sentenced institution every year. We all know, too, that the recidivism rate for this age group is certainly over fifty per cent. As a matter of fact in a recent informal survey which we conducted at the Brooklyn House of Detention, which houses all of our adolescent detention cases, we discovered that almost exactly two-thirds of the young men at that institution, in the age bracket eighteen to twenty-one, had been at that very same institution on one or more prior occasions. Nothing could be clearer to me than the fact that we need to expand our efforts toward providing individualized attention to these young people to reduce this unconscionable rate of recidivism and have a direct effect on the crime rate in our community.

Your outline, with respect to the Teacher Corps personnel, suggests that this staff be given a "pre-service training program with special emphasis on criminology and correction's problems". We here in the City of New York are admirably equipped to provide this kind of training. We have our own training institute in the Department and it has close affiliation with the John Jay School of Criminal Justice and other universities in the City.

This kind of training could be readily and most adequately provided.

With respect to educational programs for inmates, we have found that young men in our care are far more desirous of obtaining education and much more willing to work at it while confined than they were when they were back in the community. This is so for many reasons which we can discuss sometime, but the point is that for the dollars and energy expended in education for this age group I think we are far more effective than dealing with the same kinds of young people in the open community.

These are just some thoughts that occurred to me after reading through your outline. If we can be of further assistance in providing you with additional information or some views on the subject, please let me know.

I am very hopeful the Congress will see the wisdom of your proposal and you may be assured that we will do all that we can to assist you in your efforts to have this bill become law.

Sincerely yours,

George F. McGrath,
Commissioner.

SHARING OF FEDERAL REVENUES WITH LOCAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS

Mr. **BAKER**. Mr. President, recently two important units of local government in Tennessee, the Knoxville City Council and the Hawkins County Quarterly Court, officially endorsed proposed legislation in Congress that would begin a program of sharing Federal revenues with State and local governments. I invite this action to the attention of the Senate to emphasize the often-overlooked fact that local as well as State governments would benefit immeasurably from revenue-sharing and that various local governments in the Nation are behind our efforts to secure the immediate enactment of such legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the two resolutions be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 3501

Resolution endorsing the tax-sharing bill introduced in the United States Senate by Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr.

Whereas, Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr. has introduced in the United States Senate a bill designed to permit a sharing of Federal Revenue on a "no strings attached" basis; and

Whereas, Senator Baker's bill for tax-sharing would not interfere with national defense spending or obligations on the national debt; and

Whereas, Senator Baker's tax-sharing plan will improve the financial bases of states and cities; and

Whereas, Senator Baker's tax-sharing bill will assist in the revitalization of state and local governments; and

Whereas, the Council of the City of Knoxville has found and determined that Senator Baker's tax-sharing bill should be enacted into law.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Council of the City of Knoxville:

Section 1: That the Council of the City of Knoxville urges support for and recommends the adoption of Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr.'s tax-sharing bill.

Section 2: That a copy of this Resolution be submitted to Senator Albert Gore, Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr., and Congressman John J. Duncan.

Section 3: Be it further resolved, that this Resolution shall take effect immediately from and after its passage, the public welfare requiring it.

Howard N. Kelsey,
Vice Mayor,
Presiding Officer of the Council.
Ralph D. Longmire,
Recorder.

Resolution Urging Adoption of Tax Sharing for Education

Left to local initiative and control, the educational process in these United States of America has achieved unparalleled results in both quality and quantity. It has harnessed the maximum of individual freedom with a strong sense of the common good. For nearly two centuries our schools have produced civic-minded, enlightened young Americans and provided the groundwork for a productive, orderly, and free society. Much of the credit for America's unique success story must go to her equally unique system of education, and it is with this in mind that we, the undersigned, submit the following resolution, designed to preserve and rejuvenate this system.

Whereas, all local governments in the United States of America are firmly committed to the maintenance of the principle of local control of education; and,

Whereas, this historic principle is meaningless unless counties, cities, and school districts are financially self-reliant; and,

Whereas, the common property tax and general sales tax are now the universally overloaded mainstays of local government finances and cannot be further strained to meet ever expanding demands for educational services; and,

Whereas, acceptance of Federal monies, under existing assistance programs, invariably involves surrendering appreciable measures of local control and local responsibility in the field of education; and,

Whereas, the Federal Income Tax is the greatest and most efficient single source of national revenues and is contributed to by all productive individuals and organizations in our society; and,

Whereas, local governments composed of, and representative of, these individuals and organizations need additional independent sources of revenue in order to enable proper home rule performance of educational services; and,

Whereas, the community school is the keystone of our educational system and should in accordance with the traditions of our Republic remain free from external influence and control;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by Hawkins County Quarterly Court that support is hereby expressed for the return of specified amounts of Federal tax revenues, free of restrictive conditions and controls, to the States for use in financing educational activities; and,

Be it further resolved that support is hereby expressed for immediate implementation of this concept as embodied in H.R. 308 now before the Congress of the United States; this measure being commonly referred to as "Tax Sharing for Education".

McINTYRE TAKES FORTHRIGHT STAND BEFORE BANKERS

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, our colleague, the junior Senator from New Hampshire, is rapidly developing a reputation for courage and candor.

Last week, he spoke before the New Jersey Bankers Association. As chairman of the Senate Small Business Subcommittee, he discussed several controversial issues, frankly pointing out that the views of the banking community on these issues should be reconsidered. This required a considerable degree of courage and determination.

Since I feel that we could all benefit from his remarks, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by U.S. Senator Tom McIntyre to the New Jersey Bankers Association, Atlantic City, N.J., Friday, May 19

Less than 24 hours ago my good friend and neighbor, Senator Ed Muskie, called to tell me that he would be unable to speak with you gentlemen today. He asked me, as a fellow member of the Banking and Currency Committee, to try to fill in for him.

I told Ed that, as a long time borrower, there were few things in the world that I would enjoy as much as having the opportunity to speak to a whole room full of bankers. So, here I am and I hope you will all pardon me if I might strain your hospitality just a little with a few comments not necessarily all favorable about the banking profession in America today.

Commercial banking in this decade and in the years ahead offers, as I see it, great opportunities for innovation and for imaginative contributions to the betterment of our nation's economic life. Bankers by and large, have already produced evidence of their ability to change with the times and to lead in the search for new economic solutions. I am certain that very few bankers of a century ago could possibly imagine the many changes that have already taken place in your profession.

Banking today has been among the first of the various occupations to take advantage of technological change.

Many of your banks use the latest in automatic data processing systems. You have led in the financing of our new space age industries: electronics, nuclear technology or oceanography. Commercial banks have developed new money market instruments such as the negotiable certificate of deposit and new means of financing, such as check credit plans and sale and lease-back financing.

Another area of innovation is one in which I have played somewhat of a central role. I refer to the development of bank managed collective investment funds, for individual investors or for the management of pension funds or H.R. 10 self-employed individuals retirement funds.

Last year, working closely with the American Bankers Association, I was the principal sponsor of a bill designed to make it easier for banks to enter and operate in that field.

While all of these innovations have been the product of the work of individual banks and bankers, it has been heartening to note that the organized banking industry has also played a role in their formulation.

Bankers, by and large, are innovative people. I have been continuously impressed by the high caliber of bankers who have appeared in the past to testify on various matters before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Bankers are imaginative people, who look forward to the needs of the future. I am certain, for example, that if the next generation brings us into what has been called the "checkless society" in which all transactions will be handled by the automatic transfer of funds without any need for checks, or cash, or further paperwork, the commercial banks of our nation will play a decisive role in shaping the workings of that financial system.

But despite all of this forward-looking philosophy, despite the banking profession's demonstrated ability to change with the times, I still find myself dismayed, absolutely dismayed, by the negative attitude with which the banking fraternity reacts towards change imposed from outside the profession.

This is disheartening. I know many bankers as personal friends. They are all fine, decent people. I know of many great accomplishments in the field of banking. But despite all this, I know, and you know, that bankers have a very unfavorable image in this world of ours. I believe that much of this unfavorable publicity is generated by bankers themselves, by their total resistance to anything which they perceive, mistakenly or not, as attempted outside interference with their own private preserve.

I want to give you some examples today of what I mean. Probably some of you are guilty of these faults, and I would hope that you would take my comments not as harsh words from an opponent, but simply as friendly criticism from an admirer of our banking system as we know it today.

The first criticism deals with a topic which is before the Senate Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, on which I sit, this year. It is the so-called Truth in Lending bill.

The banking fraternity has opposed this bill in the past. I too have opposed it in the past. It has been an unworkable bill; it has moved very close to what should be the proper concern of the state governments, and it has been a confusing bill.

Times have changed now. The individuals in the Senate who have been working hardest for passage of this bill have changed. Senator Douglas of Illinois is no longer a member of the Committee. Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin, who is the principal sponsor of the new legislation, is I believe, a man who is willing to sit down with the industries affected to try to work out a workable, practical bill.

Because of Senator Proxmire's attitude, I am convinced that the United States Senate, after years and years of doing nothing, is going to pass a Truth in Lending bill, and it will do so during the present Congress.

There are many industries which will be affected by the Douglas bill. Most of them will not be harmed by the Proxmire bill. The reason for this is that the various industries affected, the mortgage bankers, the retailers, the savings and loan associations, and many others, have seen the handwriting on the wall and have decided to cooperate with the Congress.

They, through their representatives, have come in to sit down and make constructive suggestions. They have proposed amendments. They have been able to convince the members of the Committee of the justice of their cause through careful, logical, reasoned arguments. And these groups, I am convinced, are going to be able to live with the Truth in Lending Act.

But how have the commercial bankers—how has your industry—behaved? Let me tell you. The American Bankers Association has simply stated that it is unalterably opposed to this bill. That may have been a good position to take last year, when there was no chance that any bill would be passed. But this is not a good position to take this year.

There will be a Truth in Lending bill this year, and I am convinced that its ultimate effect will be felt more strongly by commercial bankers than by any other industry. And yet, the American Bankers Association has been totally unwilling to so much as sit down and offer constructive suggestions for improvements to this bill.

Let me tell you why I think that commercial bankers have more of a stake in the Truth in Lending bill than any other industry. Most of you know what this bill sets out to do. Its aim is to make lending more competitive, by enabling borrowers to make more rational comparisons of the cost of borrowing money from alternative sources.

I expect that this competition will be found between, and not among, different classes of lenders. I mean by this that competition will not necessarily be intensified as between one bank and another, or one consumer loan company and another. Rather, competition will become more intense between the banks, and the consumer loan companies, and the retailers extending credit. In such a competition, commercial banks are going to be the winners. The Truth in Lending Bill is going to help commercial banks more than it will help any other sector of the lending community.

Let's look at this in terms of dollars and cents. According to the Federal Reserve, there is some 93 billion dollars worth of consumer credit outstanding now. "Consumer credit," by the Fed's definition, covers loans to individuals for household, family, and other personal expenditures, except real estate mortgage loans.

Only five years ago, total consumer credit stood at 63 billion, so in the past five years there has been a fifty percent increase in the total consumer debt outstanding.

This is a tremendous increase. It is my belief that the present 93 billion in consumer credit might well double in not too many years. And the commercial banks which now hold some 38 billions of this debt, or roughly 40 percent of the total, will be given the opportunity through the Truth in Lending Act and through new types of financing, to more than double their share of this rapidly growing market.

I am certain that commercial banks through check credit plans, bank credit cards, and the other techniques which your ingenuity can devise, will find themselves making the greatest increase in their profits over the next 10 years in the field of consumer credit.

And yet you take a blind position of all-out opposition to the Truth in Lending bill, when its primary effect is going to be to strengthen commercial banking.

But my irritation with bankers over Truth in Lending does not stem from your reluctance to see the advantages of this legislation. Rather it comes from your unwillingness to help the Congress make this a better bill than it is. Let me give you one specific example, dealing with the effect of Truth in Lending on state usury laws.

One of the real problems with the present draft of the Truth in Lending bill lies in the questions which it raises about potential conflicts with state usury laws.

Most state usury laws, as you know, are worded in terms of a maximum percentage rate, often about 6 or 7 percent. A line of state judicial decisions and local practice has construed these statutes as applying only when the cost of credit is likewise worded in terms of percentages. Thus, a lender who prices his loans in terms of "dollars per hundred" or uses add-ons or discounts in computing his prices, escapes the force of the usury law. This is a simple and straightforward process.

Under the Truth in Lending bill, lenders will have to express their charges in terms of an annual percentage rate, computed in accordance with the requirements of the bill.

The result of this will be that lenders will have to disclose, in writing, an interest rate which will generally be higher than the rates permitted under many state usury laws. I am not familiar with the situation in New Jersey, but I am informed that this conflict will arise under the laws of over thirty states.

This is obviously an intolerable situation. We simply cannot enact a new federal law which will have the immediate effect of placing bankers and others lenders in thirty states in jeopardy under local usury laws.

Obviously, the Truth in Lending bill will have to be amended. I am certain that the Subcommittee is unanimously in favor of supporting an appropriate amendment if one can be drafted. Our only problem is—what kind of statutory language will do the job properly?

You might think, with our full willingness to cooperate in this area to protect bankers, that the American Bankers Association would be happy to offer us their technical expertise and know-how to fashion an appropriate amendment. Unfortunately, this is not the case.

The ABA members want to take a position of complete opposition to the Truth in Lending bill and so they cannot cooperate with the Subcommittee in fashioning appropriate amendments.

We are honestly trying to be of assistance to the banking industry, but we are hindered by our own unwillingness to cooperate. And that is what I mean when I say that I am dismayed by the tendency of the banking profession to engage in all-out opposition to proposals from outside of banking which might interfere with your accustomed ways of doing business.

Before I leave this train of thought, I would like to point out that I am not an enthusiastic supporter of the Truth in Lending bill. My position is simply that, if the bill is going to be enacted, I want it to be a workable bill. But my experiences over the years with your opposition to the Truth in Lending bill have given me cause for concern about the banking profession.

I have one other area of unhappiness with bankers which I would like to discuss with you today. Fortunately, this is an area in which I have seen great changes for the better even in the past few years. I refer to the concept that banks have special obligations to the public service to serve the communities in which they do business.

I know too many bankers who forgot too long ago that their business was a special privilege granted by the government for a public service. There are too many bankers who forget that they enjoy a quasi-monopoly, granted by and regulated by the government, not for the exclusive private gain of the banker or his shareholders, but for the good of the entire community.

I am personally upset, therefore, when I am told by bankers that certain proposed banking legislation is undesirable because it represents *"interference with the free enterprise system of banking"*. The banking industry is an essential foundation of our system of free enterprise. It deserves all the support and assistance which our nation can give. But banking itself—with a strict prohibition on new banks which might compete with too much vigor—banking itself partakes much more of the nature of a regulated public utility than of a participant in the competitive market of free enterprise.

And so, as a friend of banking in the Senate, I hope that all of you can see yourself as bearing a primary responsibility to the public itself. In the growing economy of today, we simply do not have room any longer for bankers who are motivated purely by considerations of their own private gain. For our nation to continue to prosper, you must see your responsibilities in terms of a constant need to strengthen the business of your community and your customers. Banking has had its greatest triumphs when it brought new solutions to economic problems. It has had its darkest days when it refused to recognize that times were changing and new techniques were needed.

I hope that any criticism which I may have delivered about banking today can be taken in the same friendly spirit in which it has been offered. As a United States Senator, I have the responsibility of trying to find acceptable, workable solutions to existing problems. We all need your cooperation, your suggestions, and your work for your own communities and customers. If we all can work together, banks and businesses, and workers, and consumers, and government, we can continue at our task of keeping America the strongest, and best nation in the history of man.

Together, our nation can meet any challenge, accomplish any task. Divided, we can only hurt ourselves. The bankers of America have traditionally played their constructive role, and my hope for you today is that you will continue and enlarge upon your partnership with the American people.

"THAT WE MIGHT LEARN TO LIVE AS BRAVELY AS THEY DIED"—A MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY GEN. OMAR BRADLEY, AT LONGMEADOW, MASS., 1948

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, next Tuesday, May 30, the graves of America's departed heroes will be decorated throughout this land that they gave their lives to preserve.

Eloquent memorial addresses have been made throughout our history in memory of those gallant ones who died to preserve the freedom we enjoy today.

One of the most eloquent in my memory was the address by Gen. Omar Bradley, who commanded our ground forces in the long, hard campaigns that took the American forces from Africa to England and to France, to breach the Siegfried line, and then to bring the victory of World War II.

General Bradley was known as the GI's general. He was one of America's greatest commanders. He understood the meaning and the suffering of war. He lived with his men and was loved by them. As Chief of Staff of the Army, he gave the Memorial Day address at Longmeadow, Mass., in 1948. He spoke in the churchyard of the First Church as Cpl. Edward G. Wilkins, a soldier of the famous 45th Infantry Division, a Medal of Honor winner, was buried there.

Looking forward as always, General Bradley warned of the folly of peace-loving people who turn their backs on the ills of the world.

General Bradley's advice at the graveside in Longmeadow, Mass., needs to be remembered for its wisdom and courage, for such advice applies today.

He warned:

> If the United States ever again stoops to expedients to avoid the difficult decisions that come with leadership and the heavy burdens that come with defense, we shall once more run the dangers of all half-way measures and waste our strength and conscience as a weathervane rather than a force.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

That We Might Learn To Live as Bravely as They Died

(A Memorial Day address, Gen. Omar Bradley, Longmeadow, Mass., 1948)

(Foreword.—On April 18, 1945—one month after he was cited for the Congressional Medal of Honor, Corporal Edward G. Wilkin, a rifleman with the 45th Infantry Division, was killed by enemy action east of the Siegfried Line he had helped to break. Memorial Day, 1948, the body of Corporal Wilkin was carried on a caisson between the colonial homes of his neighbors to a final resting place in the quiet churchyard of Longmeadow's historic old First Church. Among the men who walked in the procession that day was another soldier, General Omar Bradley, wartime commander of the ground troops in Europe and now the Army's Chief of Staff. Because his words are worth repeating whenever and wherever Americans may honor their soldier dead, they are published here by the friends and neighbors of Corporal Wilkin.)

Here on the long green meadows of this tranquil New England town, we have come to do honor—not alone to one brave soldier—but to the generations of earnest young men who left their homes to defend them at Concord, Antietam, San Juan, the Argonne—and in the snows of the Ardennes.

For as long as free men have lived, worked, worshipped, and reared their families under these elms, so long have their sons been summoned to arms against those who would covet or destroy them. In generation after generation they have been forced to quit these quiet homes in this peaceful valley to fight—and sometimes to die—in conflicts visited upon them by issues remote from their everyday lives.

From the chancelleries of London, Paris, Berlin—Rome, Tokyo, and Moscow, those bitter struggles that have scarred the progress of all mankind eventually spanned the seas to invade the snug parlours and warm kitchens of these colonial homes. And as these world struggles have wasted the youth and resources of nations, they have also left behind them sorrowing women and empty chairs in the houses on this green.

It is easy for us who are living to honor the sacrifices of those who are dead. For it helps us to assuage the guilt we should feel in their presence. Wars can be prevented just as surely as they are provoked and therefore we who fail to prevent them must share in guilt for the dead.

I have not come here today to consecrate war and its evils for the sacrifices war has produced. For every man in whom war has inspired sacrifice, courage, and love, there are many more whom it has degraded with brutality, callousness, and greed.

Rather we are gathered here to take comfort and strength from those of our dead who have already given this nation so much. We have come to learn—if we can—how men might live as charitably together in peace as they died for each other in war.

We have come to ask why it is that our young men must spend their bodies against the Siegfried Line—why it is men cannot live as bravely as they die.

In our hatred and renunciation of war, we must not forget that the roots of conflict flourish in the faults and failures of those who seek peace just as surely as they take shape from the diseases and designs of aggressors.

While the American people have within themselves the moral strength, the power, and wisdom to marshal their forces against aggression in whatever form it affects—we cannot feign innocence through indifference or neglect of struggles that bring on wars. We have suffered enough in two world wars to know that non-involvement in peace means certain involvement in war.

Either we shall employ our strength, power, and conscience boldly and righteously in defense of human dignity and freedom or we shall waste those reserves for peace and default to the forces that breed new wars.

This lad we buried today is partly the victim of your folly. He is the victim of your folly and the folly of all peace-loving peoples who turned their backs on the ills of the world. For at the very time those aggressors at whose hands he met his death conspired against the peace of the world, we blinded ourselves to their threats and by our shameful inaction countenanced their starting attack.

Secure in distant and peaceful towns like these, clinging to comforts, refusing risks, seeking safety in refuge and refuge in words, we recanted power and conscience to side with those who sought peace at any price. Too late we discovered the price was too high; and to keep our freedom we paid in the bodies of our young sons.

If the United States ever again stoops to expedients to avoid the difficult decisions that come with leadership, the heavy burdens that come with defense we shall once more run the dangers of all half-way measures and waste our strength and conscience as a weathervane rather than a force.

If we cringe from the necessity of meeting issues boldly with principle, resolution and strength, then we shall simply hurdle along from crisis to crisis, improvising with expedients, seeking inoffensive solutions drugging the nation with an illusion of security which under those conditions cannot exist. If we are to scamper from crisis to crisis, fixing principles and policies to the change of each day, we shall place ourselves supinely and helplessly at the mercy of any aggressor who might play on our public opinion and decimate our forces at will.

To live bravely by convictions from which the free peoples of this world can take heart, the American people must put their faith in stable long range policies—political, economic, and military—programs that will not be heated and cooled with the brightening and waning of tension.

The United States has matured to world leadership; it is time we steered by the stars, not by the lights of each passing ship.

On this Memorial Day, as we take leave of this brave soldier—Corporal Edward Wilkin, Army of the United States, Medal of Honor—we pay homage as he would have us do, to all his fallen comrades—to the strong, the weak; the leaders, the led; the brave, the fearful; to all who perished where only God could witness their charity to their fellow men.

Proudly—but reverently, sadly—we honor them. We pray they will ever rest in peace.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON ELECTION REFORMS: A LANDMARK PROPOSAL TO AID IN STRENGTHENING DEMOCRACY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, President Johnson today has submitted a landmark proposal to strengthen the most basic institutions in a democracy: its campaign and election machinery to insure full and fair participation of the people.

I commend the President for focusing on the need for reform and improvement of our system of campaign financing, election regulations, and voter participation. Each of these vital areas is related to one another. And each is long overdue for reappraisal and refinement to reflect the needs of a modern, vibrant society of free men and women.

The President has rightly noted that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act was passed 42 years ago; the Hatch Act passed 27 years ago; and that both of these outdated laws encourage circumvention.

The meaning is clear: the time is long overdue for a thorough review and revision of our entire system of campaign regulations and election processes.

The President's proposal seeks to close existing loopholes and more clearly define regulations regarding campaign financing. I believe Congress will take a long, hard look at both of these vital elements in our democratic process. I believe, too, that we will give priority attention to the President's recommendation for congressional financing of presidential campaigns.

I think the American people will overwhelmingly support President Johnson's proposals to modernize our political campaign system. The country—and the Congress—owe him a debt of gratitude for his forthright and courageous recommendations to strengthen the very heart of our democracy.

I hope the 90th Congress will act promptly and positively on this historic measure.

ALLEGED ATROCITIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the press this morning calls attention to testimony being received in Fort Jackson, S.C., during the court-martial of Capt. Howard B. Levy. Testimony relates to atrocities allegedly taking place in Vietnam.

In this connection, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Defense 2 years ago, on May 23, 1964, and received a reply from him on June 12, 1964. I believe these letters should be made part of the public record, so I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record along with the New York Times account of May 25, 1967.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Green Berets Called Tolerant of Brutality by South Vietnam

(By Homer Bigart)

Fort Jackson, May 24.—Defense witnesses in the courtmartial of Capt. Howard B. Levy testified today that the Green Berets had a permissive policy toward the torture of Vietcong prisoners by the South Vietnamese.

But the "Little Nuremberg" hearing on alleged war crimes, a hearing believed to be unprecedented in American military justice, failed to produce a witness with first-hand knowledge of torture or any atrocious act committed directly by an American in Vietnam.

Donald Duncan, a former master sergeant in the Green Berets, testified that he had once been ordered by radio to "get rid of" four Vietcong prisoners taken near An Khe.

Recounting the incident that he related in an article for the February, 1966, issue of Ramparts magazine, he said that he had known that the order meant "shoot 'em or stick a knife in 'em" but that he had pretended that he had not understood.

When he finally delivered the prisoners to base camp, he said, he was chided by a major: "You know we almost told you right over the phone to do them in."

He protested to the major that he could not "kill guys with their hands bound." The major replied, he said, "Oh, you wouldn't have to do it; all you had to do was give them over to the Vietnamese."

Another witness, an Army psychiatrist who had observed Special Forces (Green Berets) in combat in Vietnam, said that when he had tried to protest against an act of brutality by a Vietnamese officer he was told by a Green Beret captain: "Don't rock the boat."

And when he insisted on filing a report of the incident, he said, the captain told him that it would never get higher than the Special Forces commander in the corps area.

AREA POLITICALLY SENSITIVE

"I was told I was intruding on a politically sensitive area," said Capt. Peter G. Bourne, research psychiatrist at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington. "I was told it would simply be filed away and 'Why waste your time?' "

Two other witnesses, Robbin Moore, author of "The Green Berets," a flattering portrait of the Special Forces, and Donald Duncan, a former master sergeant in the Special Forces, said that the Green Berets encouraged the mutilation of enemy dead by paying a bounty on ears clipped off the heads of slain Vietcong.

It was a $10 bounty for every right ear, according to Mr. Duncan, who is now military editor of Ramparts magazine.

The bounty money was supplied to the Special Forces by the Central Intelligence Agency, he testified.

Ear clipping was first proposed by a Vietnamese district chief when the Green Berets began to suspect that the montagnards, the mountain tribes of Vietnam were exaggerating their claims of enemy dead, according to Mr. Moore. Thereafter, a montagnard had to produce an ear to get his money from the intelligence agency.

Testimony by these three witnesses was the core of the efforts by the defense to prove that the Green Berets were guilty of war crimes, and that Captain Levy, a 30-year-old dermatologist from Brooklyn, was justified in refusing to train their medical aid men in the treatment of skin diseases.

RULING DUE TODAY

The testimony was received in an out-of-court hearing by Col. Earl V. Brown, the law officer or judge, of the general court-martial. Colonel Brown said that he would rule tomorrow on whether the testimony should be heard by the 10 career officers who form the court.

If he decides that Charles Morgan Jr., the chief defense counsel, has failed to make a prima facie case of war crimes, the "Nuremberg aura" of this proceeding will be shattered, and the court-martial will revert to the issues of whether Captain Levy is guilty of willful refusal to obey an order, of attempting to incite disloyalty, and of conduct unbecoming an officer and gentleman.

According to the three major witnesses who testified today, it was American policy in Vietnam to turn all prisoners over to the South Vietnamese even though the Americans knew that the prisoners would be mistreated.

Mr. Moore said that whenever an American happened to be present at the torture of a Vietnamese prisoner "there was only one way he could express dissent—his only recourse, by our own rules, was to walk out on it.

"If he tried to stop it [the torture] he would be relieved, and his career would suffer. He is in a very difficult situation. Brutality is a way of life over there."

The calling of Mr. Moore as a defense witness was a surprise, for his best-selling book was highly laudatory of the Green Berets. Testifying today, he called the Green Berets "an armed and mature Peace Corps." And in the cross-examination by Capt. Richard M. Schusterman, the trial counsel, he said that the Green Berets opposed "needless killing" because "it loses friends."

Pentagon Has No Comment

Washington, May 24.—The Department of Defense had no comment today on the charges made at Captain Levy's court-martial about the Green Berets.

May 23, 1964.

Hon. Robert S. McNamara,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I enclose a picture from this morning's Washington Post with the cutline "Vietnamese soldiers hitch a Communist Viet Cong guerrilla prisoner to an armored truck carrier before dragging him through a stream to make him talk."

I want to know if this is the kind of advice the numerous American advisers are giving the Vietnamese. If we are not advising this procedure, why are we not using our considerable influence with the Vietnamese to prevent it?

The fact that torture is morally repugnant ought to be sufficient reason not to practice it. But if there are those who think it is required as part of a "realistic" approach to a tough and dirty war, let them ponder the fact that so far as I know, it has never really achieved its purpose, but on the contrary has frequently served to strengthen the sympathizers of those on whom it is practiced while degrading its practitioners. The experiences of the Romans with the Christians, of the Spanish Inquisition with presumed heretics, and of the German Gestapo with the European underground are prominent examples chosen at random from history.

I think we are all agreed that a major part of the problem in Vietnam is political. The sort of activity pictured in the enclosure can only aggravate the political problem. It is all the more disturbing because it follows reports of napalm bombing of innocent villagers simply because the presence of Viet Cong is suspected.

I have been gravely concerned over the situation in Viet Nam even without reports of torture and indiscriminate bombing. In the best of circumstances, it is difficult to foresee a satisfactory solution. If the civilian population of Viet Nam—and the people of the United States—are to be alienated by such tactics, then it seems to me a satisfactory solution becomes impossible. Despite my concern, I have been restrained in my public comments and have supported the Administration's policy because, frankly, I have seen no alternative. However, I cannot support a policy such as that pictured in the enclosure, nor do I believe the Congress or the American people will support it.

I will welcome your early and candid comments.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman.

The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, June 12, 1964.

Hon. J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I share the concern you have expressed in your letter of 23 May concerning the reported mistreatment of a

Viet Cong prisoner, and assure you that our U.S. military advisors neither advise nor condone such practices. To the contrary, our advisors at all levels have emphasized the necessity for humane treatment not only because of the moral factors involved, but because of the very real psychological and propaganda benefits that can accrue to the Government of Vietnam cause in combatting the Communist insurgency and terrorism. Indeed, during the last eighteen months we have made major efforts to influence the Vietnamese military and civilian leadership to deal humanely with prisoners. Practical measures which have been fully accepted and supported by the Vietnamese High Command include intensive training in proper handling and interrogation of prisoners, and a widely-publicized amnesty program ("Chieu Hoi" program)—under which some 12–15,000 Viet Cong voluntarily turned to support of the Government.

Prisoner procedures provide for minimum routine interrogation at the time of capture in order to gain information of immediate tactical value. The prisoner is then moved to Division or Corps level where more detailed interrogations are conducted. Prisoners believed to have knowledge of important information are transferred to Saigon where they are further questioned by expert interrogators.

On March 7, 1964 the Vietnamese High Command issued a directive controlling upon all Vietnamese forces on the subject of prisoner interrogation which states, in part: "Mistreatment or killing of prisoners of war is forbidden. Each unit is responsible for the handling of its prisoners. Mistreatment, beating or killing of prisoners will be severely punished."

Despite determined efforts to assure humane treatment of prisoners, we must recognize that in the heat and excitement of battle against any enemy who uses murder, terror and atrocity as his standard weapons, exceptions to the rule will occur. This is especially the case when Viet Cong atrocities or the results thereof have been seen by Vietnamese troops.

The particular incident to which you refer was investigated by the U.S. Military Assistance Command in Vietnam. We cannot tell definitely whether the incident actually occurred, inasmuch as no U.S. personnel were present and the Associated Press representative states he was given the picture by a Vietnamese stranger. However, the area in which the action allegedly occurred is one in which numerous Viet Cong atrocities have been committed and in which many bloody battles have been fought.

With regard to the use of napalm, this weapon is not employed indiscriminately by the Vietnamese air force. It is used when it is considered to be the most effective available ordnance against a specific target. U.S. advisors continue to emphasize the need for care and discrimination in target selection and use of weapons.

Please accept my assurance that the importance of these matters is fully recognized by the Vietnamese High Command and that our U.S. advisors will continue their efforts to see that the Vietnamese High Command directive of March 7 is followed.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

URBAN PROBLEMS—REHABILITATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development, of which I am ranking minority member, now has before it for consideration over 30 bills touching upon the many urban problems confronting American cities today. Many ideas have been put forward concerning such varied topics as rat control, fire prevention, mortgage credit, street lighting, low-income housing rehabilitation, research and planning, and others. Of course, the underlying theme running throughout these areas of inquiry revolve around the increasing problems of certain of our cities in the area of urban affairs and a recognition of the urgent need for solutions to these problems.

Despite the many innovations incorporated in housing legislation in recent years the urban environment in many cities has deteriorated to crisis proportions. This situation demands an extensive inquiry into the causative factors involved and the practical relationship to some of existing housing programs. We have had several years of extremely heavy activity in the field of housing legislation and many new programs have been initiated and put into operation. Accordingly, it is my feeling that time will be well spent by this Congress in looking to the experience gained in the implementation of these new programs and giving our main attention to those areas in obvious need of correction.

While our urban problems seem overwhelming in many instances, I do not feel that the only solution offered our cities should be that of total surrender to the Federal Government. Likewise, in seeking to arrive at workable solutions through the legislative process we must restrain the increasingly apparent inclination to solve these massive problems by the sole expedient of massive amounts of legislation. To the contrary, existing laws and programs must be reviewed with an eye to eliminating duplication and injecting workability.

At the beginning of the 90th Congress I was pleased to join with many of my Republican colleagues in expressing our sincere concern over the plight of those entrapped in an environment of slums and poverty. We advanced our party's intent and desire to inject realism, action, and initiative into a problem area long dominated by promises, inertia, and theorizing, and expressed our feeling that the future of our cities depends on how well and how soon we bring about an application of the vast knowledge and resources of our great free enterprise system. It has been estimated that some 5 million substandard houses are standing in the blighted areas of U.S. cities today. Additionally, the demand for housing will probably double in the decade from 1967 to 1977. This certainly illustrates the enormity of the problem that we are attempting to cope with.

Probably the greatest challenge ever faced by America's building industry is that of its participation in blighted neighborhood rebuilding programs. With land and construction costs progressing steadily upward, rehabilitation is becoming the most attractive route to providing decent housing at the lowest possible cost, particularly in those instances where substandard structures are basically sound from a structural point of view but simply are standing monuments to years of neglect and misuse.

Our subcommittee is currently preparing for the holding of hearings on the topic of rehabilitation early this summer. A broad inquiry will be made into the concepts and considerations involved in this relatively unexplored subject. The operation of existing programs, such as housing for the elderly, moderate-income housing at below-market interest rates, the "turnkey" innovation, multifamily housing in urban renewal areas, conversion of rental apartments into cooperative housing, and others, and their relation to the rehabilitation concept, will undoubtedly be discussed at length. All of these programs present the prospective means for the carrying out of urban rehabilitation projects. I am certainly hopeful that we can close the gap between the fine wording of our laws on the one hand and the practical considerations faced by you, the industry, on the other.

Webster's definition of "rehabilitation" reads in part: "to restore to a state of efficiency, good management, or solvency."

I would suggest to you that the words "efficiency," "good management," and "solvency" most appropriately describe what should be foremost in our thinking in this area. Nothing in this definition can be construed to mean that urban rebuilding can be approached only by first tearing everything down to the ground and building anew. This "bulldozer syndrome" is, in my opinion, present to a distressing degree in many programs today. There is an obvious lack of logic when basically sound structures are bypassed and no effort is made to apply the skills and ingenuity of the building industry.

There are many obstacles to be overcome if we are to succeed in bringing about a maximum involvement of business and industry in this rebuilding task. Any legislation, both existing and contemplated, that does not take cognizance of the practical problems faced in the field by industry is simply an exercise in futility.

Of course, the one big underlying problem that is painfully familiar to everyone in this room is the matter of mortgage credit. The 1966 "tight money" crisis had catastrophic repercussions throughout the building industry. Never has there been a more vivid demonstration of the susceptibility of the mortgage money market to swing from one extreme to another in reacting to monetary and fiscal policies. And, housing caught it right in the face.

I am pleased that this 1966 experience will shortly receive a thorough review and analysis by our subcommittee. Hearings have been scheduled for mid-June to make a comprehensive inquiry into the subject of mortgage credit. Papers on this vital subject have been requested from some 30 sources, including Government agencies, industry groups, and other public-interest organizations and I am hopeful that the hearings will produce meaningful suggestions for the long-term availability of adequate mortgage funds. The time is long overdue for lasting solutions rather than stop-gap reactions.

There are numerous other problems demanding of recognition if the private sector is to be given the tools with which it can give comprehensive attention to the task at hand.

It must be recognized that we are only paying lipservice to the potential of private industry in the area of housing rehabilitation if we do not inject some allowance for the economic facts of life in our thinking. It is entirely inconsistent to take a stand for the involvement of free enterprise but at the same time not make some allowance for the basic element underlying the success of our free enterprise system, that is, a reasonable profit. There is no way to estimate the amount of private capital that would be pumped into the rehabilitation industry if some assurance could be given for a reasonable investment return.

And, project costs must be kept at the lowest possible level. If the end result of the cost of renewing neighborhoods is only the dislocation of the families intended to be benefited because they cannot afford the resulting rentals or mortgage payments, then we have accomplished nothing and have simply moved the problem from one neighborhood to another. This balancing of profits, construction costs, and affordable living expenses is admittedly easier said than done. But, these problems cannot be ignored if rehabilitation is to be sold as an effective housing mechanism.

Then there is that area of concern affectionately referred to as redtape. With the initiation of each new program there seems to be a further entanglement of rules, regulations, and guidelines, many of which seem to be little understood at the community level. By the time a program has progressed from congressional intent to local implementation it is thoroughly scarred up by the bureaucratic process. The processing of applications and other paperwork has become a maddening experience. Months can be involved in just receiving a yes-or-no answer. It certainly is not hard to understand how an attitude of discouragement can result from this situation. There is not a person present in this room who is not keenly aware of the impact that such time-consuming procedures can have upon the limited budgets usually involved in these projects. When private industry puts its money on the line it simply just cannot be content to sit on its hands for an indeterminate period while the bureaucratic process grinds away. Future legislation should take note of this problem and an effort should be made to streamline existing programs so as to minimize this frustrating process.

If rehabilitation is to be the answer for urban improvement much thought will have to be given to the development of new products and building techniques. Research and technology offers the shortest route to cost reduction and every possible encouragement must be given to industry in this area. Existing legislation does very little to encourage the development of building technology and much effort must be made in the future along this line.

No less important a consideration is that of the widening manpower gap. The 1966 "tight money" crisis, and the resulting fall of construction activity, has caused the building industry to lose much of its skilled manpower to other areas of employment. The rebuilding of this lost force of manpower, to say nothing of compensating for the labor demand that will be generated by any large-scale rehabilitation effort, will be a major factor in future considerations. The construction trades should be encouraged to broaden their efforts in the area of apprentice training programs and urged to participate in the advancement of building technology. Certainly, failure to do either can only result in a further aggravation of the trend toward spiraling construction costs.

Prospects for the advancement of technology in the building industry have been dimmed considerably as a result of the Supreme Court's recent decision affirming the right of union workers to boycott prefabricated building components and materials. There is no way to tell how far such thinking may be extended but it is certainly hard to picture how modern-day research and technology can be applied to the overwhelming problem of urban rebuilding with such a backward attitude in the ranks of labor.

I can assure you that I will oppose any legislation that would seek to do away with the present ban on secondary boycotts and further penalize the development of improved products, materials, and construction techniques.

The President in his March 15 message on urban and rural poverty said:

> Rehabilitation is the key to many of our successful urban renewal programs. It is crucial to the success of the Model Cities Program.

The model cities program, as authorized by the Demonstrations Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, has been described as a demonstration program designed to encourage and test innovative ways of solving urban problems. The concept of the program has been expanded to encompass housing, job training, health, welfare, education, and just about every other element of the daily lives of the inhabitants of our cities. The massive powers of the Federal Government will be evoked to change the lives of these people, and thereby the lives of the neighborhoods.

I cannot help but be fearful that our cities are being asked to sign a blank contract in urban experimentation to be filled in at the Government's whim and fancy.

In its rush to experiment and innovate, the program would empower itself to pass judgment on almost every local decision. I take little comfort in the prospect of such a demonstration. Decent housing could very easily take the background to other considerations.

At the time of the enactment of this legislation, I expressed my concern over inflationary pressures being exerted on our economy, including the cost of maintaining our commitment in Vietnam. I felt that if we were to be fiscally responsible that the model cities program should be confined to its planning aspects and operating authorizations withheld until the economy showed favorable signs and experience could be gained by an initial implementation of the program's planning criteria. Such considerations are as applicable today as they were when this program was initiated.

Some 193 cities have applied for planning funds under the May 1 deadline, and of this number approximately 70 cities will be approved. That there will be a considerable degree of selectivity is obvious, and I would suggest that close scrutiny be made of the considerations advanced in the selection process. This is certainly an appropriate opportunity for a demonstration of the application of rehabilitation to the problem of urban housing and I hope that this consideration will be evident in the plans approved.

In its consideration of requests for the funding of model cities programs for fiscal year 1968, the Congress should take a good look at the experience gained in the program to this point and not be compelled to buy promised results on a sight unseen basis. Planning should continue to receive the main emphasis. And as was the case last year, the appropriation of further funds should be considered in context with continuing inflationary considerations and the cost of successfully pursuing our country's objectives in Vietnam.

Mr. President, one of the most encouraging trends in the area of urban affairs and the battle to overcome neighborhood blight and decay is the increasing involvement in this problem area by private business and industry.

As I have just noted, every effort must be made to bring about the full application of the ingenuity and resourcefulness of the free enterprise system to this problem area.

I intend to introduce legislation designed to knit together the favorable aspects of existing housing programs and give recognition to the many practicalities necessary to provide incentive for the entry into this latent giant of a rehabilitation industry by our business and industrial community.

Efforts will be made to provide the trigger mechanism whereby the private sector will receive adequate recognition of problems faced in the decision to join in the renovation and rebuilding of our blighted neighborhoods to the degree necessary to make an recognizable impact in this one of the most pressing of our national problem areas.

LYLE CAMPBELL WILSON

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, today's Washington Post pays an editorial tribute to a great newspaperman who chose to remain a reporter of the Washington scene rather than becoming a part of the political or economic life of the Capital.

Lyle Wilson was known as one of those rare newspapermen who loved all types of reporting but loved the political side better than any other. His long service, from graduation from the University of Missouri School of Journalism until his death, was devoted to the United Press. He was tops in his chosen field and covered the story as he saw it without fear or favor.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lyle Campbell Wilson

For 45 years Lyle Campbell Wilson, United Press International columnist, who died Tuesday, kept a journalist's watch on the world scene.

His life-long commitment was to his own craft from which he never was enticed by the countless opportunities that public life and private enterprise hold out to successful newspapermen. He was basically a news man, with a mind open to opposing sides of controversies and an instinct for getting the story told in the crisp, clear and coherent style that wire services encourage. But he was no mere spectator of events who was emotionally untouched by the great events he viewed and the great men he watched in public life. He worried over the worrisome issues of his day. He had his own opinions on national and international policies. He was in the middle of the stream of public affairs and he was influenced, touched, bruised and battered by them and not merely an aloof and disinterested onlooker. So he wore himself away in the pursuit of the news as he viewed it and the truth as he saw it.

After relinquishing his place as chief of the Washington Bureau of the United Press International, he contributed a column that allowed him greater play for his opinions on public affairs, and he continued to follow the news with the same interest it had always held for him.

Few men had more friends in public life and probably none a wider circle of friends in the newspaper profession. He will be particularly missed in Washington where he was for so many years a vigorous competitor, an alert editor and reporter and a colleague who was never indifferent to the claims that his fellow craftsmen made upon him.

THE MAINSTREAM OF NEW ENGLAND

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the April issue of American Heritage includes an article by Ellsworth S. Grant entitled "The Mainstream of New England."

Mr. Grant, in a moving and well-written story, depicts the early history of the Connecticut River, particularly that part running through my home State of Connecticut.

Many who have traveled the reaches of this river consider it one of the most beautiful in this country, indeed in the whole world.

I would like to encourage my colleagues to read Mr. Grant's interesting article for much of the early and important history of our country took place around the Connecticut River Valley and its tributaries.

I ask unanimous consent to have this memorable article printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Mainstream of New England

(By Ellsworth S. Grant)

(NOTE.—*Flowing from the Canadian border to Long Island Sound, nourishing both industry and agriculture, and carrying on its back sailing sloops, steamships, and pleasure craft, the Connecticut River has been for three hundred years the main stream of New England.*)

"A river is the most human and companionable of all inanimate things," wrote the famous clergyman-educator Henry van Dyke. "It has a life, a character, a voice of its own." Everyone, therefore, has his favorite stream, from Father Tiber to the mighty Pedernales. Ancient man revered and defied great rivers like the Ganges and the Nile, and along them have grown trade, settlement, and civilization.

The Connecticut River, to be sure, is neither one of the longest nor in any way the most ancient of this great company, but it fits van Dyke's description like a glove. Some artists have thought it compares for beauty, in places, with the Hudson and the Rhine. It is the only body of water which runs the full length of New England, some four hundred miles from mountain lakes near the Canadian border to Long Island Sound. Once the hunting and fishing grounds of peacefull river Indians—among them the Podunks, Wongunks, and others—then a trading post for the enterprising Dutch, and finally a new territory for land-hungry English settlers, the Connecticut River valley saw many firsts in the history of the new land. Most of these occurred along the seventy miles of riverway within what is now the state of Connecticut. Here were born both the Puritan divine Jonathan Edwards and the inventor of the steamboat, John Fitch; the first cigars, the first canal, the first vessel to engage in the West Indian trade, the first American-built warship (the *Oliver Cromwell*, out of Essex), the first bicycle factory, all these came into being along the Connecticut. The valley is also the home of the oldest continuously published daily newspaper in America, the Hartford *Courant* (originally the *Connecticut Courant*), which dates back to 1764. Perhaps most significant, this is the place where, in drawing up the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut, the founders of the colony brought to birth the world's first written constitution which created a representative government.

The little colony of Connecticut had an impact upon the development of the United States far beyond its size and population. In the nineteenth century, that keen observer of America Alexis de Tocqueville summed up this fact in a speech to Americans celebrating the Fourth of July in Paris in 1835. Recounting, in his heavily accented English, an illuminating experience he had had in the gallery of the House of Representatives in Washington, he recalled:

> . . . I held one map of the Confederation in my hand. Dere was von leetle yellow spot day called Connect-de-coot. I found by the Constitution he was entitled to six of his boys to represent him on dat floor. But ven I make de acquaintance person*elle* with de member, I find dat more than tirty of the Representatif on dat flor was born in Connect-de-coot. And then ven I was in the gallery of the House of the Sen*at*, I find de Constitution permits Connect-de-coot to send two of his boys to represent him in dat Legislature. But once more . . . I find nine of de Senator was born in Connect-de-coot. . . . the leetle yellow spot . . . make de clock-peddlerd, de school master, and de senator. De first, give you time; the second, tell you what you do with him; and de sird make your law and your civilization.

In his recollection of Tocqueville's remarks, quoted here, the Congregationalist historian William S. Fowler may have made the accent a bit theatrical, but the sentiments are undoubtedly genuine.

But let us return to where the story begins: the river was called the Quinnehtukqut by the Indians, meaning "long estuary" or "long tidal river," because the tide rises and falls as far north as the Enfield rapids, almost at the Massachusetts line, sixty miles from its mouth. The Connecticut twists and eddies through stretches of woods, meadows, and marshes that delight the eye of the modern adventurer as much as they must have pleased the Dutch explorer Adriaen Block when he sailed upstream in 1614. Block had been preparing to return to Holland from the island of Manhattan with a cargo of furs when his ship burned. He and his crew then built the *Onrust* (the name means "unrest" or "restless") and continued along the coast to the Connecticut, which he called De Versche, "the Freshwater" river. (The explorer is memorialized by Block Island, just outside the point where Long Island Sound meets the Atlantic.)

In the state to which it gave its name the river varies in width from 600 to 2,100 feet; it is creased with shifting shoals that have always made navigation difficult for all but vessels with the shallowest draft, while the sand bar at its exit into the sound—formed by the conflux of river and tidal currents—prevents any great port from rising at its mouth. The historian Benjamin Trumbull once observed that "as its banks are generally low, it forms and fertilizes a vast tract of the finest meadow," the unique sandy soil of which proved ideal for growing the Indian plant called tobacco, still an important crop in the Connecticut Valley. Especially in the last thirty miles of its course the river is an impressive spectacle: the rugged cliffs of the Middletown Straits, the gentle hills that turn purple in the twilight, the tree-covered islets, and everywhere the quiet villages with their tall white church spires and gracious homes built by river captains and merchants.

Immense schools of fish once populated the river. Salmon were so plentiful in colonial days that it was prohibited to feed them to bond servants more than thrice weekly. During the spawning season, one legend has it, a man with snowshoes could cross the river on their backs. In Old Saybrook's South Cove one Elias Tully caught 3,700 salmon in one haul. Herring, striped bass, and shad also ran in great numbers. The latter sold for as little as a penny apiece, and people who would eat them were considered of pretty mean estate. Indians fertilized their cornfields with shad, but later the ingenious colonists found a market for them by salting and packing the fish in hogsheads and shipping them as far as Portugal.

What attracted the white man to the Connecticut River valley was, first of all, trade and, soon after, land. Block's voyage upstream as far as the Enfield rapids had resulted in the exchange of goods for beaver pelts which the Indians had brought downriver in their long narrow dugouts. But no sooner had the Dutch erected—in 1633—a little fort and trading post called House of Hope, just below the present site of Hartford, than the English, both by sea and land, descended upon the valley. At the same time that the Pequots, a warlike division of the Mohegan, were making the initial sale of riverfront property to the Dutch (for, it is said, "1 piece of duffel . . ., 6 axes, 6 kettles, 18 knives, one sword blade, 1 pr. of shears, some toys, and a musket"), Podunk sachems were journeying to Boston and Plymouth to solicit English settlers with promises of corn and beaver skins and glowing descriptions of the "exceeding fruitfulness of the country." What the Indians along the river wanted was protection against the hostile neighboring Pequots. The bait was taken when, in the fall of 1633, William Holmes and his followers settled at what became Windsor, Connecticut.

During the next few years groups from Massachusetts led by Thomas Hooker and others made settlements along the river at Hartford and Wethersfield. Thus was established the nucleus of the Connecticut colony. One eminent historian, Charles M. Andrews, maintains, in the face of some skepticism, that "every acre . . . was honestly obtained." In any case, the land was worthless to the unwarlike river tribes without the Englishman's musket. Soon the settlers and their Indian friends had to contend with and later decimate the Pequots. Eventually most of the red men disappeared before the onslaught of the white man's diseases and the conversion of their hunting and fishing paradise into a land of villages and cultivated fields. Now the English had only the Dutch to deal with.

Considering their different objectives, it was inevitable that the English in their new settlements and the Dutch in their little fort would clash. Rarely on the frontier have agricultural and trading societies been able to live peacefully together. Out of this confrontation came the word that is now universally applied to citizens of the United States, "Yankee." It probably derives from the Dutch diminutive of Jan, Janke (Johnny in English), and then, as now, one of the implications of the term was "rascal" or "brigand." It was a common nickname among the Dutch buccaneers along the Spanish Main. Thus, it was natural for the Dutch traders to brand the Englishmen who coveted the rich meadowland around their post *janke* pirates.

With families to feed, the Yankee newcomers soon commenced to encroach on Dutch territory, planting life-giving corn and other crops. The Dutch were too few and the English multiplying too fast for the struggle to be even; unable to resolve their legal claims and unwilling to risk open warfare, the Hollanders finally sailed downriver for good in 1654. A hundred years later the Yankee, by then a trader par excellence, was the butt of jokes everywhere he appeared. But he always bore proudly the nickname which had come to connote, in addition to "rascal," one who was shrewd, inventive, and practical; and some would proclaim, as did the hero of Mark Twain's *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court:* "I am an American. I was born and reared in Hartford, in the state of Connecticut. . . . So I am a Yankee of the Yankees. . . ."

One of the warmest debates over American history has been centered around the question of whether or not Thomas Hooker's concept of government and the Fundamental Orders which he persuaded the Connecticut colonists to adopt in 1639 were really democratic. It is undoubtedly too much to claim that they were democratic in the modern sense of the world. Hooker's departure from Massachusetts was primarily motivated by a desire, not to abolish the Puritan state, but to found a less rigidly theocratic one of his own. Hooker's ideas were much closer to our modern notions than were those prevalent in Massachusetts Bay. "The foundation of authority," Hooker theorized, "is laid, firstly, in the free consent of the people." Even if by "people" Hooker meant the "admitted inhabitants" and freemen who were competent, church-going Congregationalists and land owners, his scheme was much more inclusive than that of the Boston theocrats who limited the control of government to those few church members who were, in their eyes, "spiritually elect."

Affairs in Connecticut towns were initially conducted by committees appointed in a meeting of the whole electorate; later this function was taken over by elected town officers, subsequently called selectmen. In practice, a very few men—ministers, merchants, and lawyers from the leading families, the so-called Standing Order—controlled the government well into the nineteenth century. Town meetings were held monthly, called at nine in the morning by the beating of a drum or the blowing of a trumpet from the top of the meeting house. Since the same building was used for both religious and civic functions, practically speaking Church and State were one until the constitution of 1818 disestablished the Congregational Church as the state-supported religion. But the town meeting survives: 118 of Connecticut's 169 towns retain this form of self-rule.

The next settlement after the three original river towns was Saybrook, which played a leading role in the river's history because of its strategic location near the mouth. In 1635 a group of Puritan lords, having obtained a grant from Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick, to the Saybrook territory, sent over a tough but fair-minded soldier and military engineer, Lion Gardiner, at a salary of 100 pounds per annum, to build a fort and take charge of the defenses of the colony. In April 1636, during an Indian siege, a son was born to Gardiner and his Dutch wife, the first recorded birth of a white child in the colony. William Fiennes, First Viscount Saye and Sele, and Robert Greville, Lord Brooke, and their fellow adventurers hoped to make Saybrook a Puritan refuge from royal persecution. But though a number of prominent Puritans were interested in the scheme, only George Fenwick and his lovely redheaded lady, Alice, ever came to claim their share of the land. The Fenwicks' dream of building a manor house was shattered by the marauding Pequots, while the fickle sandbar at the river's mouth spoiled their plan of making Saybrook Point a port.

Finally, in 1644, Fenwick sold the fort to the General Court at Hartford. The terms required the colonists to pay him twopence per bushel for "all graine that shall be exported out of this River for ten years ensueing" sixpence per hundredweight for "Biskett," and twenty shillings for each hogshead of beaver. Later, the terms were changed to a flat payment of 180 pounds annually, one third in good wheat, one third in peas, and one third in rye or barley. After Lady Fenwick's death in 1645 George Fenwick returned to England. But Lion Gardiner bought an island off the tip of Long Island, named it after himself, and thus established a manor which has remained in the Gardiner family to this day.

The deal between Fenwick and the General Court at Hartford was typical of the barter system which the Yankees used from the beginning along the river highway and, in time, refined to the highest degree. The first building erected at the confluence of the Farmington and Connecticut rivers, at Windsor in 1633, was the Plymouth trading house, which in prefabricated form had been transported over water by William Holmes from Plymouth, Massachusetts.

William Pynchon, at Springfield, Massachusetts, was the first Englishman to establish a thriving river trade; because of the rapids at Enfield he built, in 1636, a warehouse just above Windsor, where he could unload his shallops and pinnaces and move the goods overland to Springfield or transfer the cargo to flatboats poled by a dozen stout men who, their labors eased by ample consumption of West Indian kill-devil, braved the rapids and reached Springfield by water. Pynchon's trade with the Indians was mostly in pelts, which he shipped to Boston. In fact beaver skins were such a common medium of exchange that when merchants struck the first coins or tokens, long before the issuance of government currency, that specie bore a crude image of the valuable little animal and the coins were popularly called beavers.

It was not long before Indian maize, tobacco, and other crops were being exported, not only to Massachusetts but after 1650 to England and the West Indies. Sailing masters found that the voyage upriver was in many ways more hazardous and certainly more frustrating than the ocean passage to the Indies. It usually took as long to sail from Saybrook to Wethersfield, two weeks, as to reach the mouth of the river from the land of rum and sugar. There was no dependable channel, there were no markers, no cuts through the sand bars—and no sailing was allowed on the Sabbath; they had to contend against strong tidal currents and fickle southwest winds impeded by the hills. To beat to windward in such a narrow body of water was nigh impossible. Frequently, a vessel had to be towed by the crew, who carried a line ashore or who "walked" the ship by kedging an anchor upstream. Captain Lord of Glastonbury, in his sloop *Speedwell,* took twenty-six days to cover the ten miles from Glastonbury to Rocky Hill and wrote in his journal: "We can neither warp, tow, nor sail, and I feare me we never schalle." Next to the big bar at Saybrook, which had only six feet of water over it, the greatest obstacle in the seventeenth century was the double oxbow bend at Wethersfield, with its 180 degree turns, which forced river captains to anchor below Hartford for days and weeks at a time—and, incidentally, made Wethersfield the leading port of the period. Nature solved this problem in 1698, when a spring flood almost straightened the course of the river.

The colonists' dependence upon the river as the main artery of trade and travel for two centuries stimulated the growth of a prosperous shipbuilding industry. The first ship was launched at Wethersfield in 1649. She was the *Tryall,* built by Thomas Deming, whose yard was to keep busy until the middle of the nineteenth century. By 1700 small shipyards from Saybrook to Windsor were turning out vessels up to 100 tons. They started by copying the chunky, high-pooped English design, but soon turned to building the distinctive river sloops with their sharply raked masts and long bowsprits set at a sharp angle. Sometimes they were rigged with a square topsail and topgallant and carried an enormous square foresail to run before the wind.

Although seaworthy, the river sloops were hard to handle. Even so, often sailed by only a man and a boy, and with livestock on deck, they made regular trips to the Caribbean, where they cruised from island to island, bartering Connecticut produce. They then returned to river wharves, where they became floating stores. Advertising their wares in the *Courant,* the owners offered to exchange them for salt pork, wheat, lumber, tobacco, onions, horses, and cloth, which they carried south on their next voyage. Rum was by far their leading import, and tippling was so prevalent that an early almanac contained this ditty:

> "Ill husbands now in taverns sit
> And spend more money than they git.
> Calling for drink, and drinking greedy
> Tho many of them poor and needy—"

While their sloops were venturing to distant horizons, the colonists had to find ways of crossing the river itself in order to carry on their daily tasks. There was no bridge until 1808. Cable-operated ferries quickly appeared. The first was Bissell's at Windsor in 1648; it was operated by the family for three generations. For a while the Hartford ferry used a horse on a treadmill—enclosed in a cage to prevent contact with passengers—which turned a paddlewheel amidships. On a 1794 map of the state six ferries appear; as many as fifteen existed from time to time, including private ones like that of gunmaker Sam Colt (the largest employer on the river), which transported employees from the Colt armory across to East Hartford. (There are still two ferries in operation.) The Chester-to-Hadlyme ferry was originally a sailboat belonging to a man named Warner, who presented it to his son as a wedding present with the stipulation that if he earned more than thirty dollars a year in tolls, the excess must be returned to his father. When a traveler wished to cross there, he blew on a tin horn attached to a large maple tree near the landing.

By the middle of the eighteenth century shipbuilding on the river had reached its peak, and it continued to prosper almost without interruption for another hundred years, despite two wars and the introduction of competing forms of transportation. Over seventy vessels, locally built and owned, and employing nearly 500 men in their crews, were in service in the mid-seventeen-hundreds. Haddam had "nine great shippes" on her ways at one time, Essex thirty. At this time the sloops were giving way to larger craft like the new schooners and brigs. An English officer visiting Hartford in 1764 wrote in his journal; "Here they build vessels, for the Lumber Trade to the West Indies, from 100 to 150 tons, and float them down in Freshes, in Spring and Fall." When the Revolution came, the town of Essex gave the colonies their first homemade warship, the 24-gun *Oliver Cromwell*, built by Uriah Hayden. Her twelve-foot draft made her the largest craft to cross the Saybrook bar, and before being captured by the British three years later she succeeded in taking nine prizes. In the course of the war, the Connecticut navy comprised thirteen vessels, in addition to nearly three hundred commissioned privateers. The river itself was defended by the fort at Old Saybrook, with a battery of six guns and a twenty-man garrison.

After the victory of the colonies, river commerce revived. The increasingly larger and heavier ships plying the Connecticut forced merchants to do something about the main obstacle to more profitable cargoes—the lack of a dependable channel from Hartford to the mouth. In 1773 the first real move to improve navigation had been made by the assembly when, goaded by the Hartford merchant Jeremiah Wadsworth, it had voted to raise money by lottery for marking the Saybrook bar. Still, the average depth was less than six feet. In 1784 one of Wadsworth's captains advised him that he had brought a load of salt to New London and there engaged two small craft to carry about a thousand bushels to Hartford, and he hoped this action would "lighten ship so she will go over Saybrook Bar with a common Tide." Even at high tide loaded sloops and schooners could not reach Hartford under sail. At great expense and delay it was often necessary to warp them across the sand bars or unload their cargoes into lighters below Middletown. As a result of Wadworth's petition to the legislature, the Union Company was chartered in 1800 to deepen the river bed below Hartford, to construct wharves, and to collect tolls to pay for the improvements.

The War of 1812, highly unpopular in New England, brought about a coastal blockade and caused the Connecticut River merchants severe hardships. During the conflict English men-of-war boldly invaded the river, set fire to Essex, and burned twenty-three ships. To reduce their risks, the Hartford merchants entered into partnerships, taking shares in various vessels and adventures. There was even joint underwriting of ship insurance, at 5½ or 6 per cent interest, with individual liability commonly limited to 100 pounds. These experiences were an important factor in making Hartford a world insurance capital.

The river merchants were the center of the power structure of this period; they made up what Vernon Parrington called "a small, interlocking directorate [that] controlled religion, business, and politics." Staunch Federalists, good Congregationalists, they were the bulwark of a social system that did not change until the Industrial Revolution. Their fortunes, based in most instances on smaller ships, were not as impressive as those of the great Massachusetts shipping moguls with their ocean ports; but in proportion to the total population of the colony there were more shipping fortunes. Called the "river gods," these shipowners and merchants supplied the American armies of several wars, helping to make Connecticut famous as the arsenal of the nation.

A new era arrived suddenly for the Connecticut in 1815, when the steamboat *Fulton* churned upriver between the scows and sloops cluttering the channel and docked in Hartford for thousands to see. Rigged as a sloop, in case sales were needed—as indeed they often were—she made a dreadful din with her wood-fired engine, which gave off sharp, staccato blasts of steam. The *Courant* enthused: "Indeed it is hardly possible to conceive that anything if its Kind can exceed her, in elegance and convenience." She was designed by Robert Fulton, the man popularly acknowledged to be the inventor of the steamboat, despite the fact that John Fitch, a native of Windsor who died by his own hand in penury, had successfully used steam to propel vessels seventeen years before Fulton. "The day will come," Fitch had prophesied, "when some more powerful man will get fame and riches from my invention but nobody will believe that poor John Fitch can do anything worthy of attention."

Four years after the *Fulton's* debut a steamboat was launched at Hartford and functioned as a towboat along the river. There quickly followed regular steamboat service thrice weekly on the *Enterprize* of Captain James Pitkin, who advertised that passengers could be landed "at any place on the river at their pleasure." The *Oliver Ellsworth*, in 1824, was the first of a long line of "floating palaces" that cruised the river in the next half century. Built by the Connecticut Steam Boat Company, she was 112 feet long, 24 feet in beam, had an eight-foot draft, and weighed nearly 230 tons. Her 44-horsepower engine enabled her to average eight knots. Sleeping 62 persons and carrying 400 passengers, at five dollars a piece, she made three trips a week between Hartford and New York, the approximately 140-mile voyage sometimes taking as little as eighteen hours. This same year, "amidst the salute of cannon and the shouts of thousands of gratified and grateful spectators," the aged Marquis de Lafayette left Hartford aboard her during his last, triumphal visit to America.

Travel on the early side-wheelers, with their crude cross-head engines and undependable copper boilers, was at best a hazardous undertaking. Three years later, when in the sound about four miles from Saybrook light at seven thirty in the evening, the *Oliver Ellsworth's* boiler exploded, and the steam injured several persons and killed a fireman. She managed to sail into Saybrook, whence an excited postrider galloped to Hartford, burst in upon the legislature sitting in the old statehouse, and shouted: "The Eliver Ollsworth . . . biled her buster!" Not long after, the *New England* blew up at Essex, killing or maiming fifteen out of seventy people aboard. Despite these disasters, the number of steamboats on the river increased sharply after 1840. River traffic, although the railroad whistle was already sounding its death knell, was then at its peak, and three competing steamboat lines served New York. In 1846 there were over 2,000 arrivals and departures of sail and steam vessel at Hartford's twenty-odd wharves, even though the town's population was barely 13,000.

In the 1820's the Enfield rapids limited traffic above Hartford to flatboats carrying less than ten tons, and Hartford's merchants were frustrated by their inability to make the fullest use of the river for trade northward with Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont. Further, their business was threatened by the granting of a charter, in 1822, to a New Haven group to build the Farmington Canal, paralleling the river route. The ditch, which was actually built (and is now a weed-grown freight railroad track), headed north, bypassing all the river ports some miles to the west, and finally joined the Connecticut at Northampton, Massachusetts. In 1824 the Hartford interests formed the Connecticut River Company and obtained a charter for the purpose of improving upstream navigation above Hartford. Eager to demonstrate that the river was far superior to the canal for economical transportation, they at once decided to prove it with a steamboat. In mid-November of 1826 a stern-wheeler called the *Barnet*, only seventy-five feet long and drawing less than two feet, arrived at Hartford, having been towed from New York. She was to cause a tremendous sensation. It was reported that one man followed her some distance along the shore and exulted that the boat went just as fast as he could walk. Fearing the river would soon freeze, her owners wasted no time. Leaving Hartford November 17, she reached Warehouse Point, site of Pynchon's warehouse, where the larger scows still unloaded their cargoes; her first attempt to climb the rapids failed. Two days later, with a scow lashed to each side and manned by thirty fallsmen with poles, she succeeded, and at Springfield "twice 24 guns announced and welcomed her arrival. . . ." At every stop during the two-week trip she was met with cheers and the firing of cannon. Most of the country folk had never seen a steamboat before. At Bellows Falls, Vermont—the northern terminus of her trip—a banquet was tendered the crew and effusive toasts were drunk: "Connecticut River—Destined yet to be the patroness of enterprise, and to bear upon her bosom the golden fleece of industry," and "The grand highway from Canada to the seaboard. Give us steam!" Her backers were ecstatic. For the first time a steamboat had ascended 200 miles above the tidewaters of the river at the marvelous speed of six miles per hour against current and head wind.

Thus encouraged, the merchants proceeded with the building of the Enfield canal, a six-mile-long, seventy-foot-wide ditch to get around those rapids, deep enough to accommodate large flatboats and steamboats up to seventy-five tons. (In 1795, with the construction of the canal at South Hadley, Massachusetts, to bypass the Hadley Falls, the Connecticut had become the first river in the United States to be so improved.) Four hundred Irishmen arrived as workmen, their worldly goods tied in red bandannas, and in 1829 the Enfield canal opened to traffic. Fifteen boats passed through the first day, including Thomas Blanchard's new stern-wheeler *Vermont*. Soon stern-wheelers were chugging daily between Hartford and Springfield, going up through the canal and down over the rapids. Tolls were one dollar per passenger and fifty cents per ton of freight. In February of 1842, Charles Dickens made a downstream trip in the *Massachusetts*, which he described as having "about half a pony power." Actually, it was nearly twenty. In his *American Notes*, he wrote:

"Fortunately, however, the winter having been unusually mild, the Connecticut River was 'open,' or in other words, not frozen. The captain of a small steamboat was going to make his first trip for the season that day (the second February trip, I believe, within the memory of man). . . . Mr. Paap, the celebrated Dwarf, might have lived and died happily in the cabin, which was filled with common sash-windows like an ordinary dwelling-house. . . . But even in this chamber there was a rocking-chair. It would be impossible to get on anywhere, in America, without a rocking-chair. . . . I may state that we all kept the middle of the deck, lest the boat should unexpectedly tip over. . . . The river was full of floating blocks of ice, which were constantly crunching and cracking under us; and the depth of water . . . did not exceed a few inches. . . . The Connecticut River is a fine stream; and the banks in summer-time are, I have no doubt, beautiful."

Dickens was less enamored of the lending citizens of Hartford whom he met upon arrival: "Too much of the old Puritan spirit exists in these parts to the present hour; but its influence has not tended, that I know, to make the people less hard in their bargains, or more equal in their dealings."

Two years after his voyage the completion of the railroad between Hartford and Springfield signalled the eventual end of the boom days for both the upper river and the steamboats which used it. But the Enfield canal still had its uses; it was converted to a source of power for the paper and textile companies springing up along the river. Even today its four locks are operable, and powerboats go through them to return to the mouth of the Connecticut at the start of each yachting season. On the lower river, between Hartford and the sound, however, travel only increased.

In the years before the Civil War river steamers were transporting more than ordinary passengers and goods. With abolitionist sentiment strong in New England, many a shipowner, like Jesse G. Baldwin of Middletown, Connecticut, found room on his vessel for runaway slaves and thereby made the river a link in the underground railroad. Steamboats bringing southern cotton to Connecticut mills not infrequently carried fugitives, and Old Lyme was an active underground railroad center. In Hartford the most prominent abolitionist was Francis Gillette, a United States senator and father of the famous actor William Gillette. At his Nook Farm, which later became the focus of the city's intellectual life and where Charles Dudley Warner, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Joseph Hawley, and Mark Twain were to live, Gillette gave food and shelter to dark-skinned travellers who came and went in secrecy. The slave trade never played a significant role in Connecticut's economy. In 1784 the legislature had provided for gradual emancipation of the 6,500 slaves then in the state; by 1830, there were only 23 slaves left out of a Negro population of some 8,000, and in 1848 the legislature abolished slavery.

After the Civil War, thanks to the excellent steamboat service, the river developed into a popular resort area for the carriage trade of New York City. The Haddams in particular attracted summer visitors. At East Haddam was Goodspeed's Hotel, one of the many enterprises of an unusual Yankee fireball by the name of William Goodspeed, who was, besides being a hotel-keeper, a successful shipbuilder, merchant, and banker. To capture and hold the tourists arriving by steamboat at his hotel, he conceived the idea of an opera house ornately decorated in the manner of a steamer saloon. Finished in 1877, Goodspeed's Opera House was an instant success. Entire shows were brought from Broadway often for a one-night stand. Josh Billings, Bloodgood's Minstrels, and orators of note, such as Henry Ward Beecher, all played Goodspeed's. The large drop curtain depicted the steamer *State of New York*—the last and most elegant of the side-wheelers—passing below East Haddam. Ironically, in 1881 the *State of New York* struck a hidden snag and was beached with a big hole in her bottom at almost the identical spot shown on the curtain. A promoter at heart, Goodspeed was more than equal to the occasion. He raced to the balcony of the Opera House which overlooked the river and instructed the captain of the ferryboat *Goodspeed* to bring the 150 passengers to see the show at his expense and to spend the night at his hotel. It is said that the next day he offered a twin bill: *Uncle Tom's Cabin* at the Opera House and a visit to the wrecked steamer. Her wreck forced the Hartford & New York Steamboat Company into receivership, and from then on, in diminishing numbers and elegance, the steamboat continued to fight a losing battle against the railroad and the highway, until the *Hartford* made its last trip during the early 1930's. Goodspeed's Opera House has recently been beautifully restored, and operates as a theatre, but the great passenger steamers whistle up no more.

The first half of the twentieth century on the Connecticut, as on many American rivers, was memorable mainly for a series of disastrous floods. In November, 1927, a great flood swept down the Connecticut Valley from Vermont, killing some twenty-one people and causing a property loss estimated at fifteen million dollars. Another terrible flood hit the valley in March of 1936, when eleven lives were lost and more than thirty-five million dollars in property was destroyed. This finally led to a public outcry for flood-control dams on the tributaries of the Connecticut, and many of these have now been constructed. The hurricane of 1938 struck the valley particularly hard. New England had not had a hurricane since 1815, and advance warnings were few. The river rose, covering highways and railroads, and the high winds denuded the towns of the valley of most of their trees.

Today, beneath the fine new skyline at Hartford and through a maze of superhighways, the river runs almost forgotten. Here no docks remain, only a few old pilings and bulkheads that give mute testimony to what used to be, and the dikes shut out any view of the stream itself. Worse than man's neglect of the river has been his abuse of it, especially of this upper section, where the tide is almost imperceptible, and where no cleansing salt water sweeps in from ocean and sound. The Connecticut has earned the unsavory reputation of being dirty, smelly, and unfit for man, fish, or bird. Concern over the river's condition was expressed as early as 1884 by J. B. Olcott of South Manchester, who wrote: "A land with its rivers running filth instead of pure water, is like a body with its veins running filth instead of pure blood . . . Hartford sits nervously in the lap of what was once one of the fairest and sweetest, and is now one of the filthiest valleys in the world." Nevertheless the Connecticut is still vital to agriculture, industry, and power. Along its banks Yankee farmers produce thirty million dollars' worth of shade-grown and broadleaf cigar tobacco annually, while factories use millions of gallons of the river daily for cooling and processing.

Surprisingly, the old Valley Railroad still serves river industry also; twice a week it runs from Middletown to Essex though the bed of the single track has become so bumpy that the maximum speed limit has been cut to twenty miles per hour. But the panorama from the diesel cab of the little freight train, as it rumbles along close to the river, is breathtaking. Below a feldspar quarry and a power station is a lonely stretch of woodland and hills that seems to have changed little since Block sailed by. The train cuts its way through the branches and brush on either side, occasionally scaring a partridge or rabbit, whistles by the deserted private crossings, and passes summer cottages facing the river, marinas, and boat-launching ramps. At the stops there are none to greet the train, there is no bustle of activity, only a car or two to drop off or pick up. The ride seems to lead one right back into the past.

More essential to Connecticut industry than the railroad is the river highway itself, and the tugboats, barges, and tankers that ply it year round, carrying three million tons of cargo upriver annually, more than half of it oil. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers maintains a fifteen-foot channel from Old Saybrook to Hartford, and the Coast Guard sees to it that over 100 navigation lights are kept in working order, including—since 1839—the sentinel guarding the mouth. In winter, the Coast Guard also keeps the channel open, using 100-foot tugs that can easily slice through two feet of ice.

With tens of thousands of pleasure craft now registered, and boating recognized as the Number One family sport, the river is fast becoming a great and noisy recreation highway. Numerous public launching sites, yacht clubs, marinas, small shipyards, and state parks dot the lower river, mostly below Middletown, where the water is saltier and a little cleaner. Army engineers are debating opening up the Connecticut above Hartford by dredging a channel for small boats all the way to Holyoke. At the same time, the water resources of the entire basin are being studied by the federal government to consider its recreational future and the possibility of preserving it as a unique kind of national park. Thus, despite the pollution and other changes, in many ways the river is being used for the sports and pleasures of yesteryear. Over 100,000 shad a year are still caught in the Connecticut, college crews race at Hartford, and diesel excursion boats cruise daily in good weather between Hartford and Middletown or give sightseers a peek at the lotus lilies of Selden's Creek just above Brockway's Landing and at the bygone splendor of the Haddams, where the picturesque castle of William Gillette sits atop the hill known as the Seventh Sister. Gliding past, one can almost hear again the cry of the bosun on the steamboat creeping upriver, calling out the landings: "Hadlyme, Haddam, North Haddam, East Haddam, Middle Haddam, Wish the devil had 'em!"

Between Essex and the entrance the marshes remain a naturalist's paradise, even though the onslaught of civilization has reduced them to two thirds of their former size. Here, on land washed twice a day by salty tides, muskrats scamper through waist-high grasses and bulrushes; sandpipers poke about in search of insects; and wild duck and heron and osprey make their seasonal visits. Slip down in a sailboat past the marshes, the little towns, and the neat lighthouses, and you are in Long Island Sound, still pulsing with the same currents that carried in Adriaen Block over three and a half centuries ago. What vast changes all that time has seen!

(*Ellsworth S. Grant, a Hartford businessman and a descendant of Thomas Hooker, is vice chairman of the Connecticut governor's Clean Water Task Force. He sails the river and in the summer lives at its very mouth, at Fenwick.*)

MEDICARE HELPFUL TO WEST VIRGINIA CITIZENS—LUTHER R. JONES, NEWSPAPERMAN AND FORMER STATE SENATOR, RECOVERING FROM STROKE—HOSPITAL AND DOCTOR BILLS LARGELY PAID BY MEDICARE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, which provided for medicare, I am always gratified to read of senior citizens being helped by provisions of this legislation.

Luther R. Jones, a longtime friend and highly respected newspaperman in Madison, W. Va., suffered a crippling stroke at Christmas last year. He is making satisfactory progress and his medical bills are being paid largely by medicare. It is pleasing to know that older citizens do not lose life savings, or become financial burdens to relatives, through illness, if they have taken advantage of medicare.

The Sunday Gazette-Mail, Charleston, W. Va., in its May 21 issue, featured an article on medicare and Mr. Jones.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MEDICINE: FORMER STATE SENATOR ON PATH TO RECOVERY

(By Edward Peeks)

MADISON.—A former state senator and Boone County publisher is making a comeback after suffering a crippling stroke last December.

"I hope to get back to writing editorials and back on the golf course before the end of summer," said Luther R. Jones of Madison, who helped his father, M. L., start the weekly Coal Valley News in 1924.

"About that time I changed political parties, from Republican to Democrat," he recalled. "I have been a Democrat ever since."

Jones, who will be 75 June 10, is a member of the State Civil Service Commission. He was appointed by Gov. Barron in 1961 and reappointed by Gov. Smith in 1964.

He was elected to the House of Delegates from Boone County in 1916. He enlisted in the Army during World War I and attained the rank of sergeant.

In 1933, Jones was the first state senator elected from the 7th District comprising Boone, Lincoln and Logan counties. He is a former mayor of Madison.

He was stricken last Christmas and was hospitalized for several weeks. He came out of Marmet Hospital March 16 on crutches, but now he walks with the help of a cane.

"The Marmet Hospital is due a lot of credit for my improvement," Jones said of special medical treatment and extended nursing care.

He was transferred to Marmet from Charleston Memorial Hospital, where he spent 12 days under surgical and other medical treatment.

The combined hospital bills amounted to $2,420.31, of which medicare paid $2.011.08.

"If we had had to pay the total hospital bill, we would have been in very bad financial condition," Jones said. "My wife is now figuring up doctor bills as they come in. Medicare will help us take care of them."

He said of Mrs. Jones, "She really takes good care of me."

Their two sons—Luther and Ferris—live in Madison. Another son, Vester, is a federal employee in China Lake, Calif.

Persons in the Charleston area who have received medicare benefits include Mrs. Eva Shepherd of 405½ Jacob St. and Mrs. Fanny Burnette of 233 Sixth Ave., South Charleston.

Mrs. Burnette, a 75-year-old widow, suffered a broken wrist last year.

"I wore a cast, but I missed only one week of bowling," she recalled.

Medicare covered her hospital bill after she paid the $40 deductible. Other medical expenses came to $132.52 of which medicare paid $88.32.

Mrs. Shepherd, a widow, has a heart condition. She receives medical care and nursing services at home through the Kanawha-Charleston Home Health Agency.

She is uncertain of her age, but thinks she is 100. She says she remembers when her family moved to Ronceverte from Danville, Va., after the Civil War.

"I'm not tired of living and I'm not looking for a man," Mrs. Shepherd said. "I just want to live in my own home and take care of myself until I die."

COATTAILS

Mr. **SCOTT**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from this morning's Baltimore Sun, which comments on the significance of Michigan's special election be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COATTAILS

In a special legislative election, Republican Anthony Licata defeated Democrat James P. Hoffa, son of the Teamsters boss, in what is traditionally a Democratic district in Detroit. Voters in the area have consistently voted Democratic in both legislative and congressional elections. The only Republican who has scored consistently in the area is Gov. George Romney.

In a sense Romney scored again in this week's election. He campaigned hard for Licata, who is a moderate like himself. After Vice President Humphrey and Senator Robert Kennedy urged a Democratic victory in the race, Romney emphasized that his own coattails were at the disposal of the Republican. Thus he reminds Republicans outside of Michigan again, as he did in 1966, that he not only can get votes for himself, but for his fellow Republicans. Party functionaries consider this important in a presidential candidate, which Romney is.

The Republican victory has narrower, more immediate political implications. Romney's tax reform plans have passed the State Senate. In a closely divided State House, Licata's support of the Romney proposals will be helpful.

THE NEEDS OF THE CHILDREN OF VIETNAM

Mr. **MONDALE**. Mr. President, modern warfare, however limited in purpose, necessarily affects combatants and noncombatants alike. Nowhere in recent times has the validity of this unhappy fact been more evident than in South Vietnam. Thousands of children have been left homeless and without parents in the crisis now gripping their country.

It is my privilege, Mr. President, to invite the attention of the Senate to a person-to-person, voluntary effort to relieve the terror and tragedy which has befallen the children in Vietnam.

Beginning last fall a nonsectarian, nongovernmental effort was organized by Lt. William Van Doren II, of Edina, Minn., who is stationed in Vietnam, and his fiance, Susan Gardner, who is a student at Macalester College, in St. Paul, Minn. Together they forged a link between the children of Can Tho and Macalester College.

While Lieutenant Van Doren and other U.S. servicemen worked with the children, Susan and her cochairman, Carol O'Conner, of Cleveland, Ohio, another Macalester College student, organized the effort to provide the money and supplies which were needed to meet the needs of the children. Other student members of the Macalester committee are Sue Kuyper, Huong Norton, and Andy Sarvis.

To date, through the work and cooperation of students, faculty and members of the community over $3,000 has been raised, and large quantities of supplies have been collected.

Mr. President, Can Tho is a city of about 85,000 people on one of the mouths of the Mekong River, at the broader end of an area still considered the strongest remaining Vietcong-controlled portion of South Vietnam. Can Tho is the capital, and the largest city of the province. Owing to its size and location, it has become a vast refugee center. Can Tho has two orphanages jointly operated by the Sisters of Charity.

The efforts of Lieutenant Van Doren and his friends at Macalester symbolize, I believe, the identification of our own free people with the orphans of Vietnam whose parents have been lost in the fight for that nation's liberty.

Mr. President, the best hope of every nation rests with its children. I am, therefore, highly encouraged and deeply proud of the interest and deep personal concern for the children of Can Tho manifested in recent weeks by members of the Macalester community. I ask unanimous consent that three articles describing this effort be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mac Weekly, Apr. 14, 1967]

FUND DRIVE BEGINS APRIL 17—MAC WEEK TO AID ORPHANS

(By Sue Kuyper)

Political Emphasis Week, Sno-Week, Fine Arts Week, International Week—all have become established traditions on the Mac campus. This year another week to be added; appropriately enough, it is to be called MAC week. Mac Aids the Children, formally known as the "Mac-Mekong Project for the Children of Can Tho," will begin on Monday, April 17.

Can Tho, Macite Huong Norton's home town, lies at one of the mouths of the Mekong River on the Ca Mau peninsula in South Vietnam. Can Tho, the largest city and capital of Phong Dinh province, has become an area with a steadily increasing refugee and orphan population. Over two hundred orphans (there are as many as 110,000 in South Vietnam today) have found aid at an orphanage in Can Tho, built by the French and run since 1963 by the Sisters of Charity. Aid to this orphanage is the goal of MAC week.

The Can Tho Children's Relief Fund was begun under Lieutenant Will Van Doren, a former Macite currently stationed in Vietnam, under whose initiative the various military, missionary, and orphanage officials decided to consolidate their efforts. The Relief Fund is represented at Mac by Susan Gardner, a Mac senior. Susan, as chairman of the student committee to aid the children of Can Tho, has launched MAC week in an effort to raise the one thousand dollars which Lieutenant Van Doren says is needed to properly staff and equip the orphanage.

MAC week will consist of the efforts of at least fourteen groups on campus to sponsor fund raising events. The week is sponsored by President Rice, Minnesota Governor Harold Le Vander, Senators McCarthy and Mondale, and Congressional Representative Karth. Faculty adviser is Al Currier, and the student committee consists of Susan Gardner, Carol Lee O'Connor, Sue Kuyper, Huong Norton, and Andy Sarvis.

Events of the week will include:

Monday: Mulford Q. Sibley at NoExit, 9 p.m. Mr. Sibley will be available for informal conversation on all subjects relating to Vietnam.

Tuesday: Summit House will have a bake sale at noon in the lower union.

Tuesday–Thursday: Bigelow Hall's Women's Association of Slaves will be available to do ironing, mending, and similar tasks for the fellows.

Wednesday: Dayton Hall's "Activity on the Mall." A note of mystery here because it is not quite certain what it is exactly that Dayton will be doing on the mall.

Friday: Kurios House will present a program on the orphanage site, photos and talks by Susan Gardner and Huong Norton. Proceeds from refreshments will go to the orphanage.

Other organizations participating either by way of donations or activities still in the planning stage include Community Council, Doty Hall, International Club, the junior class, Kirk Hall, Dupre Hall, YGOP, and Wallace Hall.

ENGAGED COUPLE "ADOPT" 340 VIET ORPHANS

(By Carol Rolloff)

Sue Gardner and Bill Van Doren are engaged, and they have 340 children.

But their children are Vietnamese war orphans, whom they've taken under their "wings"—she at Macalester college, and he in Vietnam.

It all started when Susan Gardner, a Macalester senior from Milwaukee, Wis., was dressing for her role as a French cabaret girl at a SPAN (Student Project for Amity Among Nations) benefit night at Macalester college. "I decided to do something about my Miss Four Point (straight-A average) image," Sue said. She dressed in black tights, used lots of eye makeup, and wore a black lace dress.

That night, William (Bill) Van Doren II, a former Macite home on leave from army language training, paid to talk to her during the whole event.

Sue is now heading a drive to get money and materials for an orphanage in Can Tho, Vietnam, where Van Doren, now her fiance, is stationed. Sue had "always loved kids," as had Van Doren. "The night before he left for Vietnam, he called me from San Francisco, and said, 'When I get there, I want to do something for the civilians.' "

Then she quoted his Dec. 23, 1966, letter when he'd been in Vietnam about a month and had just discovered the orphanage: "I know that I'll need your help, for there just isn't enough stuff to be had in Can Tho and I can't get any from Saigon. So that means that in a little while you will receive an impossible list of things to send to the children. Somehow, you will succeed."

Sue's involvement with the orphans really began in January, Sue said, "and it's mushroomed since then." Its culmination is the week of April 17–23 at Macalester, when college groups and organizations will aid Sue's drive for money and materials.

Orphan work began for 2d Lt. Van Doren, son of Mr. and Mrs. William O. Van Doren, 4700 Phlox Lane, Edina, when he arrived in Can Tho last December as a member of an advisory group of the fourth army corps.

Can Tho is a city of about 85,000 people on one of the mouths of the Mekong river, at the broader end of an area still considered the strongest remaining Viet Cong-controlled portion of South Vietnam. Can Tho is the capital of, and largest city in, the province, which is estimated 60 per cent loyal to the Saigon government.

Because of its size and location, it became a refugee center.

"South Vietnam has officially registered 80,000 orphans," Sue said. "But unofficial estimates range from 110,000 and upward. So you can understand that the orphanage is swamped.

"Somehow, Bill just gravitated to the city's two orphanages," Sue continued. The orphanages are jointly run by a Roman Catholic order, the Sisters of Charity. The larger building houses some 200 "full-time" orphans, many of whom are racially mixed. The smaller building services 140 day residents, "part-time" orphans, whose parents are refugees.

Van Doren began spending his lunch hours, off-duty hours, and week ends at the orphanage. "He plays the piano and organ for them, and plays with them. Sort of a glorified baby-sitter, I guess. Mainly, he administers tender loving care," Sue said.

Other Americans were interested in the orphans, too—an army doctor, Capt. James Errico of Suffern, N.Y.; a French-Canadian sergeant, Sgt. Philiber (Papa) Paquette of the U.S. Army; a Protestant chaplain, Lt. Col. James Miller; a Roman Catholic chaplain, Father Lukoczevski; an AID doctor, Dr. Herbert Krohn; and a Protestant missionary couple who had been in the Mekong delta since 1959, the Rev. and Mrs. Richard Pendell.

"Bill got them together and said, 'If we pool our efforts, we can do a lot more,' " Sue said. "So they formed the Can Tho Children's Relief fund, a non-profit, nondenominational charitable organization." All members devote free time—apart from other duties—to the orphans.

The group is set up with a bank account in San Francisco, so only committee members can withdraw money for the fund. Its mailing address is to Van Doren's or Lt. Col. Miller's APO box, only.

"This way supplies and money can be strictly controlled," Sue said. "They feared that if supplies or money were channeled through Saigon, they'd never see them."

Immediate goal of the committee (and of the Macalester week) is $1,000, to build an addition to the orphanage, so more children can be taken off the streets.

"And they need evaporated milk," Sue said. "Children are actually dying from starvation. And they need used baby bottles, a clothes dryer for the rainy season, and other utensils."

Besides having pathetically inadequate housing for the orphans, the staff is overworked. The sisters can do little teaching, since their time must be spent in helping the children survive. As one of Van Doren's letters said: "We hope that, in time, the younger people, the children of Vietnam, can be educated. They are the hope of Vietnam.

"You can't imagine how a country is prostituted by war. These people are backward, true, but proud of their race and history. Now an estimated 350,000 Viets have been killed so far, mostly men. Can you imagine what that does to the women? Then what about all the orphans? There is not enough money for keep, education, or anything else for them. What will happen to them? Especially the unfortunate ones that are half American, Korean, Australian, or what have you? Their plight is worst of all."

Since the committee's founding, Sue has been their American representative. Cochairman with her in the Macalester activities is Carol O'Connor, Cleveland, Ohio, who has been doing photographic promotion of the orphanage.

Since Sue began working on the orphan project, her academic life has been altered.

"I used to do nothing political, or active—just study," she said. "But I think orphans are more important than maintaining my grade point average." But she admits that she'll probably make her grade point average.

"This orphan work has brought out something in me that I never thought I had," she said. She has forced herself to speak in public ("I never turn down a speaking engagement") and has learned to handle many business matters.

The unpopularity of the war has brought her into some pretty sticky situations, she said. "But these children are hurt by both sides. These children don't know who hurt them—just that they were hit when a mine went off, or they were shot by a soldier, or burned. People may be against the war, but they're not against children.

"I think a lot of the soldiers there really wonder if they're doing any lasting good," she said. "Perhaps that's why they work so hard at the orphanage. When they leave Vietnam, they can feel that something has been accomplished."

She quoted a letter from her finance—"I'm caught between the misery and the beauty of this planet's people. It is pathetic—yet still majestic—how they resemble each other—the farmer in the North Carolina hills, or Vietnam rice paddies, or African bush. All are similar in so many ways. All are wretched, wonderful, tragic, magnificent people. That's why I love them, for there's a little bit of me in each of them and little bit of each of them in me."

Sue's French major has served her in good stead, for the nuns write to her in French, telling her what they need. "Bill always has to go through Papa Paquette," she said.

When Van Doren returns from Vietnam, the couple will adopt at least one mixed-race child from Vietnam. "Bill's scouting for the right one now," Sue said. The couple plan to marry in July in Hawaii.

Highlight of the Macalester college week will be a benefit performance for the orphans April 21 of the Uppa Trio Plus One at No Exit, the non-alcoholic night club on the campus.

Sens. Eugene McCarthy and Walter Mondale have to be honorary sponsors of the orphan work in the U.S. Vice President Humphrey, and Gov. LeVander have not yet responded to their invitations to be honorary sponsors.

Checks for the orphan's fund can be made to: Can Tho Children's Relief fund. Donations of articles may be sent or brought unpackaged, to the chaplain's office at Macalester college.

On Behalf of the Orphans—Macalester College Students Work and Entertain To Aid Orphans in Vietnam

The campus of Macalester College, St. Paul, recently was the scene of a piano-playing marathon, a "slave market" in which coeds did laundry and mending, a car wash, auctioned dinners by faculty members and other like events. It was all part of student-led drive for funds to aid South Vietnam orphans at Can Tho.

The idea originated with a former Macalester student, Lt. William Van Doren II of Edina, now serving in Vietnam. He wrote his fiancee—Susan Gardner, Macalester senior from Milwaukee, Wis.—and asked her to organize an on-campus drive. She got the entire campus into the act, including all seven Macalester dormitories. The original drive was to have been for one week, with a goal of $1,000, but it went so well that it will be continued to the end of the term, May 29. The drive is now open to everyone. Interested persons may make contributions payable to Can Tho Children's Relief Fund, Chaplain's Office, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.

Van Doren's initial idea was to raise enough money to build an addition to the orphanage at Can Tho, but the increased amount will permit a larger addition with more furnishings and equipment. The faculty raised $300, including $36 from auctioning a Persian dinner for four couples at the home of Prof. Yahya Armajani and $16 from auctioning a dinner at the home of Dr. Harvey M. Rice, Macalester president.

Van Doren wrote from Vietnam: "I would like to extend our heartfelt thanks to the Macalester College community for your compassion and generosity. You have made it possible to assist the orphans far beyond what could otherwise have been done on their behalf . . . We know of no other college community in the country that has been so united in any cause so worthy."

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE FOR SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Department of State publishes what are known as Information Notes. One of these, dated April 1967, is entitled "Free World Assistance for South Vietnam." It begins with a quotation from the Secretary of State, as follows:

> A large majority of the governments of the free world are sympathetic to our efforts in Southeast Asia and would be alarmed were they to fail.

The "Information Note" then proceeds, in its words, to "document the impressive scope of the genuinely international aid program."

I was interested in the so-called documentation which referred to "more than 30 free nations" as participating in the "free world aid program" and the reference to the fact that "of these—30 nations—13 have sent some 500 civilians to work in Vietnam." The document then lists what are described as "the other nations giving aid to South Vietnam," and relists not only the 30 free world nations, but enough other nations to bring the total number to 36.

Being interested in the accuracy of the information contained in this Government-published "Information Notes," I wrote to the Department of State for information as to the dollar aid to South Vietnam being given by each of the nations listed and received in reply a most revealing communication.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that my letter of May 4, 1967, to the Secretary of State, Assistant Secretary Macomber's reply of May 15, with its enclosure, and a portion of the publication at issue, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, the letters and the pertinent portions of the paragraph speak for themselves. I do, however, wish to note one point. The opening paragraphs of the State Department publication, which are reprinted here, are clearly designed to leave the reader with the impression that the nations listed support the United States' Vietnam policy. France, Pakistan, Canada, and other nations may be somewhat surprised to find themselves so portrayed. Both France and Pakistan, fellow members of SEATO, have left no doubt about their objections to our policy. Canada, an impartial member of the International Control Commission, should be embarrassed to be lumped with Korea, Thailand, Australia, and New Zealand, as an implied supporter of the military effort in Vietnam. This type of propaganda is not likely to enhance Canada's influence with North Vietnam as a peacemaker.

This is one of the most misleading items of supposedly factual information I have seen put out by our Government in many years. The public is confused enough about this complex, bloody conflict without being subjected to this kind of distortion of the facts.

EXHIBIT 1

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of May 3 concerning other nations' assistance to Viet-Nam.

In response to your request for the dollar value of aid provided by the thirty-six countries listed in the Department's Information Note on Free World Assistance to Viet-Nam, I enclose a table of the estimated value of commodity assistance and relief supplies from these countries. It is based on information from our Mission in Saigon which shows the value of this aid for the period of June 1964 through December 1966. Of the total value of nearly 27 million dollars, approximately 17 million dollars were contributed in 1966. We have not attempted to assign a valuation to these nations' contribution to the cost of supporting about 500 non-U.S. civilians and 56,000 non-U.S. military free world personnel serving in Viet-Nam or to the cost of some 3,000 scholarships granted by foreign governments to Vietnamese for study or training abroad during this period.

With respect to your question about the flood relief assistance provided by Ireland, Israel, Pakistan and Norway, we list this aid as well as that of France and Switzerland in a separate category from the Free World Assistance Program. As is explicitly noted in the Information Note we do not construe this aid as representing political support by the governments concerned for the free world effort in Viet-Nam. Neither do we believe that one would be justified in construing this humanitarian assistance as representing any criticism of the policy of the United States in Viet-Nam.

If I can be of any further assistance on this or any other matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Summary of material free world assistance to Vietnam, June 1964 through December 1966

[Value in thousands of U.S. dollars]

Contributor nation	Commodity aid [1]	Relief aid [2]	Total
Free world assistance program:			
Argentina	290	....	290
Australia	5,779	225	6,004
Belgium	....	12	12
Brazil	70	13	83
Canada	1,908	15	1,923
China	744	31	775
Denmark	....	26	26
Ecuador	....	2	2
Germany	11,010	875	11,885
Greece	....	15	15
Guatemala	....	8	8
Honduras	....	10	10
Iran	200	....	200
Italy	250	....	250
Japan	2,050	200	2,250
Korea	....	....	....
Laos	....	6	6
Liberia	....	50	50
Luxembourg	....	20	20
Malaysia	....	10	10
Netherlands	700	3	703
New Zealand	639	56	695
Philippines	....	11	11
Spain	....	2	2
Thailand	....	94	94
Tunisia	....	....	....
Turkey	....	2	2
United Kingdom	387	227	614
Uruguay	....	22	22
Venezuela	100	....	100
Subtotal	24,127	1,935	26,062
Other assistance:			
France	536	30	566
Ireland	....	3	3
Israel	....	5	5
Norway	....	4	4
Pakistan	....	5	5
Switzerland	....	10	10
Subtotal	536	57	593
Grand total	24,663	1,992	26,655

[1] Equipment, supplies, and commodities for all projects and programs other than those dealing with relief program. Medical supplies provided to support free world medical teams are included in this category.

[2] Primarily flood and refugee relief assistance in the form of supplies such as medicines, blankets, foodstuffs, and shelters.

MAY 4, 1967.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has been brought to my attention that a recent *Information Note* issued by the Office of Media Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, lists, on page one, 36 "other nations giving aid to South Viet-Nam . . ."

I would be interested in the dollar value of "aid to South Viet-Nam" being given by each of these nations. I note, for example, Turkey's contribution is further described on page four as "medicines and the offer of a substantial quantity of cement" and that Denmark "has provided medical supplies and has offered to train Vietnamese nurses in Denmark." I also note on page six that "Ireland, Israel, Pakistan and Norway contributed money, clothing, and pharmaceutical supplies to the victims of the floods of 1965." Does humanitarian assistance to flood victims constitute an expression of support for our efforts in Southeast Asia or an implied criticism of our actions there?

Sincerely yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE FOR SOUTH VIETNAM

"A large majority of the governments of the free world are sympathetic to our efforts in Southeast Asia and would be alarmed were they to fail," Secretary Rusk has stated. The free nations of Asia are deeply concerned about the security of the area and have been in the forefront of those nations contributing military assistance. In addition, many countries of Europe and the Western Hemisphere, and several countries of Africa and the Middle East, are providing to the Republic of Viet-Nam substantial economic, technical, and humanitarian assistance.

This paper documents the impressive scope of the genuinely international aid program for the Republic of Viet-Nam. Aid from the United States will be described in another paper of this series, and is not included here.

Some 52,000 troops from 5 Asian nations (Australia, New Zealand, Korea, Thailand, and the Phillippines) are now in Viet-Nam fighting alongside the Vietnamese and U.S. Armed Forces, and more are expected in 1967. More than 30 nations are participating in the free world aid program. Of these, 13 (Australia, Canada, Republic of China, Germany, Iran, Italy, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, the Philippines, and the United Kingdom) have sent some 500 civilians—doctors, nurses, teachers, agricultural advisers, engineers, and other technical personnel—to work in the cities and rural areas of Viet-Nam to help bring a better life to the people.

For example, 23 medical and surgical teams from a dozen nations, not including the United States, are providing medical care—largely in provincial hospitals. These and many other countries have provided substantial material help, including medical supplies, textbooks, construction materials and equipment, refugee relief supplies, and foodstuffs. They have also provided generous scholarship aid to Vietnamese students, so that they may obtain vitally needed training which will enable them to participate more effectively in building a free and prosperous country.

The other nations giving aid to South Viet-Nam are:

Asia-Pacific: Australia, Japan, Korea, Laos, Malaysia, New Zealand, Philippines, Republic of China, Thailand.

Middle East: Greece, Iran, Israel, Pakistan, Turkey.

Europe: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Switzerland, U.K.

Western Hemisphere: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Africa: Liberia, Tunisia.

THE SITUATION IN THE NEAR EAST

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we are seeing in the Middle East today another example of Communist-inspired troublemaking in a world already burdened by aggressive acts which are spill-ing the blood of Americans and thousands of innocent persons. There is no doubt in my mind that this new crisis has the approval and support of the Soviets, and is an instance where they are once again using a third party to implement their goal of domination of the world. One call to Egypt from Moscow could reverse what has rapidly become a critical situation involving not only the well-being of the nations of the Middle East but the freedom loving nations of the world as well.

Mr. President, we also have an example of the Secretary General of the United Nations failing to stand firmly in the face of an obvious act of aggression, the closing of the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli and foreign shipping. Here we have a case of a clear aggressive act being committed and almost immediately the U.N. peacekeeping force has been withdrawn and not one word of criticism or censure is leveled against the forces which have precipitated the crisis.

This also seems an appropriate time for all freedom-loving nations to join with the United States in making every effort possible to preserve the peace in the Middle East. This country cannot continue to carry alone the burden of meeting Communist aggression around the globe. This fight is the fight of all nations who value their liberty. We cannot be expected to take unilateral action each time the Communists turn on the heat in some nation in the world. We must stand together or we shall surely perish separately. Until such unity is demonstrated we will see more and more trouble created by the Communists wherever they can develop such difficulties.

I would not doubt that the pressure of our air attacks on North Vietnam have caused the Communists to look for ways to create new trouble spots in the world in hopes of diverting our attention or weakening our resolve in Southeast Asia. Some examples of such actions would be the sideswiping of our ships in the China Sea, attacks against United States and South Korean troops in South Korea and the instigation of riots in Hong Kong and other places throughout the world.

Mr. President, I would like to see the United Nations preserve the peace in the Middle East. This is an opportunity for the United Nations and the free world to serve notice that such conduct will not be condoned. The feelings of many people in this country on this matter were stated in a succinct manner by an editorial entitled "Middle East Powderkeg" which appeared in the Wednesday, May 24, 1967 issue of the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDDLE EAST POWDERKEG

With his threat to close the Gulf of Aqaba, Israel's southern outlet on the Red Sea, Dictator Nasser of Egypt has challenged the Israelis to fight and vastly widened the danger of a big war in the Middle East.

Without free passage through the Gulf of Aqaba, Israel's trade with Africa and the Orient would come to an end, economic crisis would hit Israel, and the future of the country would be in jeopardy.

While Nasser is providing the war threat, Americans should be mindful that Secretary General U Thant set the stage for incendiary action by ordering immediate withdrawal of the U.N. peace-keeping force from positions on the Gulf of Aqaba. This precipitate action was an invitation to the Egyptians to blockade Israel.

U Thant has gone to Egypt on a "peace mission." The damage, however, already has been done. The free world has little cause for optimism regarding his mission. U Thant invariably defines "peace" in ways destructive to the interests of the Western countries.

The pressure campaign against Israel cannot be regarded simply in terms of Arab hostility to Israel. Col. Nasser has a Big Brother in Moscow. The Soviet Union is supporting the Egyptians because it hopes to dominate the Middle East and its vast wealth in oil. Russia would gladly drive all Western countries from access to the energy resources of this strategic region.

Because of U Thant's swift affirmative response to Egyptian demands, the United States in all likelihood will be confronted with a heavier burden of peace-keeping. No one can accurately predict exactly how heavy it will be, but the growing magnitude of the Middle East crisis indicates the U.S. will have to make risky and possibly costly decisions.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON IMPROVEMENTS IN POLITICAL PROCESSES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President's message to Congress on improving our political processes represents the essential basis for an understanding of the forces which shape political campaigning in this country.

It is a remarkable fact that we do not really know how much campaigns for Federal office cost and we do not really know who pays those costs.

The reporting provisions of the present Federal Corrupt Practices Act are virtually meaningless. All we have ever been able to do is estimate. It is time that we had the facts.

The same situation exists under the present Registration of Lobbying Act. The so-called "principal purpose" test allows some of our most influential lobbyists to avoid registering. It is time we had the facts.

Another highly significant aspect of the President's message is the proposed legislation to make it easier for a citizen who moves his residence to vote for President and Vice President. The right to travel among the States and to change our residence is a constitutional right. It should not result in a loss of the right to vote for the Nation's leaders.

SAFETY HAZARDS IN THE ATOMIC INDUSTRY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a vital address recently delivered on the occasion of a memorial luncheon honoring the late Congressman John Fogarty, of Rhode Island. The speaker of the occasion, which was held under auspices of the District of Columbia Public Health Association and the American Public Health Association, was Leo Goodman, an acknowledged expert on the hazards of atomic radiation. Mr. Goodman has attended many international as well as U.S. meetings dealing with radiation hazards over the past 10 years, has testified often before congressional committees in this area, and has developed an expertise which reflects intensive study. His address deserves attention beyond the circle of those who are professionally concerned with atomic energy and its peaceful uses and problems.

Mr. Goodman has long been skeptical of the levels of radiation permitted by agencies of the Federal Government, contending that they have been set unrealistically high, to the detriment of workers and others who are exposed. Not only so, but he has been critical of the failure of Government agencies, including the Atomic Energy Commission, to recognize the very real dangers of atomic accidents and even to downgrade their significance where they have occurred by designating them for many years as "incidents" rather than by their true name. In fact, as he notes in his address, it has been a common practice in the past to classify reports on such occurrences—and they have happened—in order to withhold the true facts and significance involved.

Mr. Goodman's address includes a detailed account of one such accident which occurred at the United Nuclear Corp. in 1964, in which a worker was splattered with radioactive liquid due to his following of dangerously faulty techniques. The chain of circumstances which followed reveals, as Mr. Goodman makes plain, the shocking failure of preparation in the vicinity of nuclear establishments to cope properly with the results of such an occurrence, with even doctors exposing themselves through working with the injured man, who died as a result of his injuries, without gloves.

In recent weeks the plight of uranium miners and the extremely high incidence of their deaths from cancer as a result of exposure to radon gas in the mines has come to forcible public attention. Because we have allowed standards of exposure far above those set by the International Commission on Radiation Protection, it now seems probable, and this is Mr. Goodman's considered expert opinion, that we shall eventually see the deaths of some 6,000 uranium miners from this cause. As long ago as the early 1950's, radon concentrations in these Colorado and Utah mines were found to range from 20 to 230 times higher than the international standard, levels which have now resulted in the deaths of miners who succumb after periods ranging from 7 to 27 years, as shown by studies made of European miners similarly exposed before the atomic era.

Here, and this is a vital fact bearing upon the radiation levels and the necessity for their observance at the international standard, rather than with the uncontrolled negligence which has prevailed, it was shown that miners in the Erzgebirge Mountains dying up to 1935 succumbed in nearly half of all cases to lung cancer, and 80 percent of the rest from such lung diseases as tuberculosis, silicosis, and emphysema.

In the past we have not heeded the warnings of such people as Leo Goodman, who pointed out nearly 10 years ago that for 1 percent of the operating cost of an underground uranium mine, ventilation could be provided to completely eliminate the hazards of radon gas.

Now, belatedly, we have been recently jolted into understanding and acceptance of the realities in connection with radon deaths, since they have begun to occur. But what about the victims' families? There have been widows made and orphans left without a father because in our vital uranium industry we failed to apply knowledge that was available to eliminate the hazard. There will be more deaths. Who will assume any burden of monetary recompense for what can fairly be called criminal negligence?

Mr. Goodman points out that at least 10 widows have received compensation from the Industrial Commission of Colorado in varying sums, and he names the individuals and amounts. He further concludes, on the basis of the Woodward and Fondiller report, that this commission could be expected eventually to face claims totaling $8,500,000 from the prospective widows of men already so exposed as to make their deaths from cancer inevitable. But the State of Utah does not have such a structure.

In any case, uranium has been produced at the behest of the U.S. Government and used primarily in the National Defense Establishment. For that reason, it is my belief that at the earliest opportunity we must have legislation to provide for compensation in such cases under the provisions already established for war claims. In doing so, I hope and expect the cooperation of concerned agencies of the Government.

I might point out that the revealing speech to which I have referred did have some after effects. Subsequent to the revelations, the Department of Labor issued an order under the Walsh-Healey Act applying the international standard, which is universally considered as a safe level for radiation exposure. The Federal Radiation Council, I understand, has moved significantly also for the first time toward adopting those same standards, which have not been adopted previously by them.

The problems of atomic radiation are not confined to the mining of uranium. The Goodman speech discusses other aspects—the loss of radiation materials in transport, of which Mr. Goodman has a record of no less than 88 instances; the problems in the increasing use of beryllium in industry; the pollution of both air and water by radiation; the more than 1,000 instances in which there has been accidental release of radioactivity in concentrations, such as the Chalk River and Windscale accidents. These, of course, were the largest; but the potential for their repetition in the peaceful use of atomic energy continues to exist. In the British experience of Windscale in 1957, the quantity of radioactivity release is estimated to have been more than that of a Hiroshima-type atom bomb.

Mr. President, we must safeguard our population and our industrial workers in the atomic industry to the best of our ability. We have not done so in the past, but we must do so in the future. I commend the address by Mr. Goodman, and ask unanimous consent that it may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIATION HAZARD IN MODERN INDUSTRY

(By Leo Goodman, April 26, 1967, Washington, D.C., John Fogarty Memorial, Under the Auspices of American Public Health Association, Medical Care Section, and District of Columbia Public Health Association)

I am proud, indeed, to have been asked to speak to the first John Fogarty Memorial Luncheon. Like John Fogarty, I came to my interest in public health and medical care without the benefit of a medical degree or, for that matter, without the benefit of any degree.

John Fogarty came to the Congress in 1940 and in his modesty inserted the shortest biography in the Congressional Directory of any member of Congress. John Fogarty said merely that he was "a Democrat of Harmony, Rhode Island, elected in 1940 and to the succeeding Congresses." But what a great career in health that short biography encompasses.

We in organized labor like to think that John Fogarty, in serving as a member of Congress with only the background of a high school education, ten years as a bricklayer and union official, had great impact on the development of a high standard of health both through medical research and through the establishment of facilities to apply the knowledge gained in that research for the benefit of mankind.

John Fogarty was courageous. He began his impact on the Federal allocations for health research under the chairmanship of Congressman Clarence Cannon. Congressman Cannon was not one to trifle with the Federal budget merely for the improvement of health. I can remember the personal experience when my testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in behalf of the Hill-Burton bill was delayed so that Congressman Cannon, with his personal doctor by his side, could advise the Committee that the purposes of the bill were worthwhile but, because the Federal government was practically bankrupt, we could not afford to provide assistance for the construction of hospitals in virtually every county in America.

John Fogarty succeeded in persuading the Congress to provide the funds to make the NIH the great institutions that they are today in spite of Congressman Cannon's objection.

In a lead editorial in *Science* shortly after his death, Philip Abelson, AAAS Editor, said "Fogarty built skillfully and well. He understood the vital relationship between the support of fundamental science and practical objectives. He built for permanence. . ."

The people of Rhode Island knew the impact of his work. In recent years, rather than chasing about his district in Rhode Island, campaigning for reelection, each month of October and the first week of November in the even years, John Fogarty assembled the awards and plaques and certificates which he received from virtually every segment of the medical and public health community in the United States and tastefully displayed these in the windows of a shop at the corner of Washington and Eddy Streets in Providence.

Following his death, his colleague in the House of Representatives from the State of Rhode Island, the Honorable Fernand J. St Germain, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation of these awards, and they appear in three solid pages of fine type beginning on page 785, January 18, 1967.

Yet, of all of the impacts which John Fogarty had on public health, I believe that the greatest and, in the long run, the most important, will be the reorganization of the U.S. Public Health Services, which for many decades had attempted to operate basically through a structure known as the Bureau of State Services. Under constant prodding by John Fogarty this Bureau has now reorganized its main function into the field of environmental health. John Fogarty was deeply concerned about the inadequacies under the old arrangement and sought to bring into existence an effective operating division to meet the problems of people in the modern age, in modern industry and in modern employment, because he recognized the new hazards that modern industrial activity brings to the worker on the job and the community where the industry is located.

John Fogarty was interested in the structure of the Federal health program. He was also interested in what happened to the individual worker on the job. Long after it became clear that the recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on Radiation to the Surgeon General, issued in March of 1959, were not going to be implemented under the Eisenhower Administration, John Forgarty assured me that under the reorganization establishing the Environmental Health Services a new structure would replace the inadequate Division of Radiological Health in the Bureau of State Services, which originally had had a budget of $260,000 a year. In the original draft of its first report, NACOR recommended a minimum budget to meet the needs for radiological health program of $50 million. The Eisenhower Administration refused to endorse the proposed budget so the Committee revised its recommendations to recommend that the funding "will reach a level of approximately $50 million in a period of five years" and that this sum "be developed gradually perhaps at a level of approximately $2½ million in the fiscal year 1959–1960 and increasing in magnitude until full development is reached in 1965."[1]

We all know what happened. The AEC insisted that it continue as the major agency of responsibility. The Department of Defense proposed legislation to exempt it from the standards adopted by any agency of government. The Washington pattern was followed. A cabinet-level committee was formed first by executive order followed by legislation sponsored by the AEC to revise the executive order. The Federal Radiation Council was established, not to look into the radiation hazards and do something about them, not to analyze the difficulties of radiation hazard in modern employment, but to make recommendations which the President would then pass on to the agencies for their consideration.

The Department of Defense took its marbles and went home. It refused to play in that yard. The Committee capitulated and in order to attract the Department of Defense back to the game wrote a memorandum to the President which Dwight Eisenhower signed on May 13, 1960, to vitiate any effect of the establishment of the Federal Radiation Council. The memorandum did this in one sentence. The sentence in paragraph No. 7 reads: "The guides may be exceeded only after the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the matter has carefully considered the reason for doing so in light of the recommendations of this paper." What Defense could not get from the Congress—a total exemption from any standards—they had secured from the Federal Radiation Council by their mere absence from the meetings of the Committee. What an incredible performance!

---

[1] Report to the Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service, on "The Control of Radiation Hazards in the United States," prepared by The National Advisory Committee on Radiation, March 1959, page 19.

Congressman Fogarty knew the effects of that memorandum out of the occurrences in the atomic energy industry in the State of Rhode Island. After consultation with him, I had begun a study of case histories of accidents in the atomic industry. In the early days, the leads to the dates and locations and the types of accidents had been made available to me from some of the reports filed with the Congress by the Atomic Energy Commission. It was possible also to find some leads of atomic accidents in the public literature. But to my amazement most of the data was contained in classified reports and those interested in occupational health and safety were denied access to the facts. The mere possession of the classified reports—and I show you two published long after the war as restricted data: one, CF-56-2-105, "Radiation Incident of February 1, 1956," published at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory on February 15, 1956; and two, ORNI-2359 entitled "Metal Recovery Plant Radiation Report, January-March 1957," published by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and distributed October 9, 1957—would have put me in jail. I took a sample of these to the Congress and asked how the occupational safety profession could possibly arrange procedures to avoid the repetition of these types of accidents if the facts regarding them were being kept in the nature of military secrets.

Great changes have taken place since. The AEC has dropped the exclusive use of the word "incident," and they now admit to the existence of the word "accident." They even publish reports which fit their definition of the word "accident." [2]

This has been a continuing problem and I am happy to report that the Journal of the American Public Health Association recently published a discussion of this problem by Robert Longood of the New York State Department of Health in Albany, New York, under the heading of "Radiation Accidents—The Public's Right to Know." [3]

But the AEC maintains membership in the National Safety Council and at first there seemed to be an arrangement to give the AEC an annual plaque as the safest industry in the country, only once a year. Later, as I sought hearings on this subject from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the rate of the awards increased. For a while it was only once a year and then just prior to the occasion of the hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress. Later, the rate of the awards increased further.

I refuse to take credit for the rate of the increase. All I did was periodically publish revisions of the tabulations which I was making of various types of accidents which occurred in atomic industry. These lists were made available to the Joint Committee in the Congress,[4] the European Nuclear Energy Agency,[5] Euratom,[6] the Study Center of the Permanent Commission on Atomic Risks of the European Committee on Insurance,[7] and the entire tabulation was reprinted in 1966 in Germany by Erich Schultz.[8]

Requests for this information have come from all over the world, because contrary to the conditioned thinking among professionals in the United States, there is concern throughout the industrial world about the effects on environmental health which the misuse of atomic science is bringing to mankind.

In the past few weeks, we have finally seen the impact of radon gas on underground uranium miners. John Fogarty knew this story. But John Fogarty knew that the deaths of workers in atomic industry were not confined to underground uranium miners in the Colorado Plateau. When we met with the leaders of the Rhode Island State AFL–CIO in November of 1965, to discuss the events which had followed the death of one Robert Peabody in Charlestown, Rhode Island, John Fogarty bemoaned the failure of the Joint Committee and the AEC for their failure to take any steps of enforcement or punishment of the criminal policy which led to Peabody's death.[9]

Peabody worked for one of the largest nuclear corporations in the United States—the United Nuclear Corporation. They had established a plant to chemically reprocess enriched radioactive materials. Peabody had no training in this field whatsoever. Yet, he was given a plastic container, five inches in diameter and 60 inches high, to rock on his shoulder to bring about the chemical mixture desired. This instruction was criminal. But even more so was the decision to speed up the process following mixture on the human shoulder by pouring the contents from the safe shape of that plastic container into a mixing jar 18 inches in diameter and 26 inches high, a shape capable of containing a liquid critical mass. This is the technical term for a mass capable of a runaway chain reaction which gives off a lethal dose of radiation and creates sufficient energy to cause an explosion.

The operation of this plant did not, in my opinion, fit into any of the descriptions of modern technology, and certainly not within the description of Admiral Rickover's proposed "Humanistic Technology,"[10] because Robert Peabody poured the liquid into the sodium carbonite makeup tank between 5 and 6 p.m. on July 24, 1964, and he died from the effects of the runaway chain reaction at 7:20 p.m. Sunday, July 26, 1964. His death was an unnecessary tragedy to his family, a crime to all of industry in Rhode Island and a shame to all of atomic industry in the United States. But an equally great shame must be expressed about the sequence of events between 5 p.m. July 24 and 7:20 p.m. July 26. For these events:

1. As the radioactive liquid had splattered over his body, he ran out of the plant screaming but had enough presence of mind to disrobe as he approached the plant gate, prancing around because of the effects of the radioactive liquid on his body. There were no facilities to meet his immediate medical needs until a volunteer ambulance from Westerly, Rhode Island, could be called and have time to drive to the plant. Shame No. 1 therefore is the absence of medical facilities near the plant to meet the needs of any possible occurrence.

2. The ambulance driver logically drove to the nearest hospital. On arrival, he advised the admitting officer of the nature of the patient's illness. The hospital refused to admit the patient. Only after telephone communication was the decision made as to where the patient should be taken for possible treatment. This occurrence in spite of the fact that five years earlier, Congressman Fogarty had endorsed the proposal of the Rhode Island State AFL–CIO that facilities in Rhode Island and New England be established to meet emergencies in the developing atomic industry in that state and region. Shame No. 2 is the failure to plan a medical program to handle accidents in an area where atomic industry is rapidly developing.

3. After an extensive automobile ride to Providence, Rhode Island, the patient, Mr. Peabody, was admitted to the Rhode Island Hospital in Providence. A fellow worker named Spencer rode with the driver, and both received extensive contamination from radioactivity on the patient's body. No facilities for transporting radioactive patients were available. The medical reports regarding the following 45 hours, signed by Dr. Roy E. Albert (New York University Medical Center) states that "Dr. Karas and others did the decontamination without gloves and had considerable difficulty cleaning themselves later. Shame No. 3 is that the medical profession in Rhode Island had had no training and made no preparation for the treatment of radioactive contamination on patients.

Extensive inquiries were held subsequent to the accident. Nothing new or surprising occurred except that the U.S. government gave the company involved an extensive contract to help pay the costs of decontamination of the plant and to expand its facilities at Charlestown, Rhode Island.

When Congressman Fogarty asked the officials of the Rhode Island State AFL–CIO to review for him the developments following this accident, I joined at a review luncheon and heard him say he was appalled at the pressures which resulted in rewarding United Nuclear for having had the accident. He was also appalled at the failure to accept the recommendations which had been submitted by organized labor in 1959 and 1964 that a New England regional program be established for the medical treatment of victims of radiation accidents.

Robert Peabody's death represents the inadequacy of the technology in atomic industry in the East but what about the inadequacy of the nuclear mining industry throughout the industrial world. Some of you have seen the stories in the *Washington Post* last month regarding this problem. The first article on March 9, stated the problem of John Morrill of Nucla, Colorado, with the subheading on that story of "Uranium Miners Are the Hidden Casualties of the Atomic Age." Then on April 14, the revelation that the Colorado Industrial Mining Commission had hired the firm of Woodward and Fondiller Inc. of New York to make a study of the probability of the total claims by cancer-stricken miners or their widows which would be filed as a result of the failure to provide protection against radon gas in underground uranium mining. The report, of course, was highly restricted, but the conclusion that the Industrial Commission of Colorado could expect to face $8,500,000 in claims for compensation was an electric shock. The Commission has paid a number of claims.[11] It paid:

---

[2] TID-5360, "A Summary of Accidents and Incidents Involving Radiation in Atomic Energy Activities, June 1945 Through December 1955," August 1956. Also TID-5360 (Supplement) published August 1957; TID-5360 (Supplement 2) published September 1959; TID-5360 (Supplement 3) (Revised) published December 1961; TID-5360 (Supplement 4) published December 1963; TID-5360 (Supplement 5) published December 1965. See also "Operational Accidents and Radiation Exposure Experience Within A.E.C. 1943–1964," U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1965.

[3] *American Journal of Public Health*, Volume 56, No. 10, October 1966, "Radiation Accidents—The Public's Right to Know," by Robert J. Longood, A.B., pages 1751–1755.

[4] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 86th Congress, March 10, 1959 entitled: Employee Radiation Hazards, and Workmen's Compensation, page 589 ff; and Hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 86th Congress, February 16–19, 23–25, 1960 entitled: Development, Growth, and State of the Atomic Energy Industry, page 466.

[5] Progress in Nuclear Energy, Series X, Law and Administration. Volume 3, Nuclear Liability, editor Jerry L. Weinstein, published by The Macmillan Company, New York, 1962, "Review of Nuclear Incidents," by Henri B. Smets, page 89, n.b. page 165.

[6] *Medical Supervision of Workers Exposed to Ionizing Radiations*, EUR 421, Proceedings of the International Symposium held in Stresa, Italy, May 2–5, 1961, published by Euratom in September 1963, page 86 and 359.

[7] "List of Reactor & Radiation Accidents," by Study Center of the Permanent Commission on Atomic Risks of the European Committee on Insurance, July 1, 1962.

[8] *Accidents and Incidents in Atomic Industry*, by Erich H. Schulz, published by Verlag Karlthiemig Kg Munchen, Germany, n.b. page 412.

[9] *Evening Bulletin*, Providence, Rhode Island, series entitled "Chain Reaction—By Mistake," November 9–13, 1964.

[10] Vice Admiral H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy to the British Association for the Advancement of Science, London, England, October 27, 1965.

Mrs. Shirden G. Blood, Colo	$22,858
Mrs. Carey Athey, Naturita, Colo	19,541
Mrs. Robert C. Williams, Nucla, Colo	18,367
Mrs. Lloyd Reed, Redvale, Colo	16,700
Mrs. Sheldon Houle, Salida, Colo	16,664
Mrs. Frederick R. Graham, Gateway, Colo	16,017
Mrs. Kermit Burbridge, Nucla, Colo	14,958
Mrs. Charles E. Trask, Idaho Springs, Colo	14,194
Mrs. Virgil S. Nidiffer, Grand Junction, Colo	15,010
Mrs. Robert D. Johnson, Uravan, Colo	13,520

But the State of Utah, to date, has not paid any claim and today, April 26, 1967, the national interest in the Utah case is being expressed by the filing of briefs amicus by a number of parties urging the Supreme Court of Utah to require the State Industrial Commission to accept the expertise of the U.S. Public Health Service in determining which miners died from radon gas as distinguished from those whose lung cancers had a different etiology.

While the *Washington Post* was reporting some of these cases, staff members of the Working Committee of the Federal Radiation Council were sitting in conflict here in Washington and in an inability to agree on a proposed standard for the future for air contamination with radon gas in underground mining. This was not a case of locking the barn door after the horse was stolen but rather of nailing down the casket lid on miner after miner who have been exposed and who are continuing to be exposed in the present procedures of the uranium mining industry.

Meanwhile, the AEC for the Executive; the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the Legislative; and Judge Robert Taylor of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee, for the Judicial Departments of the U.S. government continue to deny to the widows of the men whom we in the IUD call the "Atom's Peaceful Soldiers"—the men who die working in this industry but whose widows can not get even a measly workmen's compensation because the AEC's funds are used instead to create a national psychology that they have the safest industry in the country and besides no single person has ever been hurt. The AEC lies; the others accept the lies.

As a matter of fact, when I first began publishing the list of atomic science fatalities, the safety section of the Industrial Relations Division of the AEC sought to ridicule our case histories by publishing an anlysis of fatal accidents with the lead-off case of the man who died because he fell into the soup. I would suggest that today the AEC is in "the soup." They have to account to the American people for the failure to require ventilation in the underground mines which could have totally eliminated the problem of radon deaths. Almost 10 years ago, I personally presented to the AEC and to the Congress the fact stated in a report written for the French government and publicized at the Second Atoms for Peace Conference[12] in Geneva that ventilation costing only 1 percent of the operating cost of the mine could totally eliminate the hazards of radon gas in underground uranium mining.

HISTORY OF THE RADON GAS PROBLEM[13]

First substantial evidence of the hazards of radon gas in the underground mining of uranium resulted from studies regarding the fate of workers in the Erzgebirge Mountains identified in Germany as Schneeberg and in Czechoslovakia as Joachimstal. Mining had been carried on in this area for close to 400 years when Lange reported that lung cancer accounted for *65 percent* of the deaths of the miners. Between 1935 and 1939, following further investigations Brandt, Hueck and Peller reported that approximately one-half of all the miners of Schneeberg and Joachimstal dying up to 1935 died of lung cancer and that 80 percent of the non-cancer deaths were from lung diseases including tuberculosis, silicosis, emphysema and chronic bronchitis. About 90 percent died of lung involvement!

As a result of these studies, the International Commission on Radiation Protection established a concentration of radon in air which they recommended as maximum permissible for occupational exposure in underground radon mines. This value measured in curies of radioactivity per cubic meter of air was one of the lowest levels of exposure established by any standards association. It was the equivalent of 0.0000000000001 curies of radioactivity of radon gas per cubic meter of air in the workplace. Tests were continued up through 1948 of the Erzgebirge Mountains by many authorities including the British National Physical Laboratory.

In 1948 on April 9 the United States AEC issued its first price schedule for uranium as part of an effort to induce uranium prospecting and mining.

The U.S. Public Health Service, aware of the European studies, immediately began checking the atmospheric concentrations of radon and its disintegration products in the uranium mines and mills established in the Colorado Plateau. Of 400 samples taken in 75 mines, it was found that the radon concentrations ranged between 20 and 230 times the internationally acceptable level. In reporting this fact to the First United Nations Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy held in Geneva, Switzerland, August of 1955, the International Labor Office characterized the findings in the following term: "and thus give cause for considerable disquiet."[13]

The following year, the U.S. Public Health Service issued Publication No. 494 entitled "Control of Radon and Daughters in Uranium Mines and Calculations on Biologic Effects." This publication opened with the conclusion that "Surveys of Colorado Plateau uranium mines have shown that 65 percent of the miners were exposed to concentrations of radon and its daughters comparable to those reported to exist earlier in European mines." Samples were taken from mines located in a number of states, including the State of Utah. Studies showed maximum concentrations of radon in mine atmospheres in 1952 ranged from 59 times the permissible level to twice the permissible level as follows:

Area	Number of mines	Times permissible level
Bull Canyon	11	59.0
Long Park	17	48.7
Marysvale	2	25.9
Gypsum Valley	3	18.0
Calamity Mesa	6	23.0
Slick Rock	11	22.0
Cottonwood Wash	4	9.9
Polar Mesa	3	7.3
Uravan	4	7.1
Monument Valley	3	6.1
Paradox Valley	2	3.8
Gateway	4	3.2
East reservation	6	2.2
Grants	3	2.0

As of 1960, there were nearly 1000 active underground uranium mines in the western United States.[14] There were over 10,000 underground miners exposed to one or more units of what I shall call a "holifield". I define one "holifield" as that amount of underground exposure which is sufficient to give the statistical chance of 60 percent of lung cancer development following the latent period of 7–27 years. Thus, the recently revealed figures of the Woodward and Fondiller study are a minimization of the estimate of those underground miners who are potentially subject to the development of lung cancer or other lung conditions. What a deep tragedy resulting from bureaucratic avoidance. The AEC used a technicality in the law to evade the responsibility for health and safety of the underground uranium miners. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy accepted this fallacious reasoning and evaded even when I personally called the problem to their attention almost ten years ago.

When proposals were made that the United States Department of Labor exercise its authority under the Walsh-Healey Act to set protective standards, they also agreed to comply with the AEC's desires and permit AEC's will to prevail in regard to standards for underground uranium miners. Many other agencies of government have fallaciously cooperated with the AEC. One official in ICC told me that though apparently adequate standards were established for the transportation of radioactive materials, that the staff of the ICC had been advised to "play ball" with AEC and not be too tough with the application of the standards and the regulations. How many shipments of radioactive materials have been lost or broken in transit?

Last summer in 1966, the Public Health Service revealed the extensive efforts which they made to find two of the shipments which had been lost. The first of the lost capsules was sought along the right-of-way between Ft. Worth, Texas, and Newark, New Jersey, and subsequently undefined truck route between Newark, New Jersey, and long Island City in Queens, New York. The package was shipped July 26, 1966, from the Gearhart-Owen Company of Ft. Worth, Texas, to the Radium Chemical Company, Inc. of Woodside, Queens. The crate apparently was smashed open during transit which took three weeks. The shipment by rail went via Dallas, St. Louis, Pittsburgh and Newark. From Newark it was shipped by truck across the George Washington Bridge to Long Island City.

The second lost shipment reported last summer was shipped from a doctor's office in Seattle, Washington, to the same Radium

---

[11] Digest of Lung Cancer Cases filed with the Colorado State Compensation Insurance Fund, December 14, 1966.

[12] Proceedings, Second United Nations Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, Geneva, 1958, Volume 21, page 62.

[13] Proceedings, First United Nations Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, Geneva, 1955, Volume 13, page 168.

[14] Public Health Service Publication No. 843, HEW, Government Printing Office, page 10.

Chemical Company in Woodside, Queens. This one was shipped on August 15, also in a container called a lead pig but again when the crate arrived at the Woodside plant, the radioactive capsule was missing. I am told that several hundred thousand dollars were spent trying to find these two capsules. These two reported losses out of over a million shipments in the industrialized western world. Two reported widely following brief discussions which I had with the Surgeon General regarding the failure to report any losses in the United States even though the Mexican government had made available a report early in 1963 regarding the consequences of such a loss of a similar capsule and the subsequent death of virtually an entire family.

I translated and made available to the technical community in this country, and any who requested it, a translation of the "First Report About a Radiation Accident" issued by the Mexican National Nuclear Energy Commission and dated November 1962. Subsequently, I talked with Surgeon General William Stewart and through his cooperation secured the translation from *Revista Medica,* Supplement No. 1, Volume 3, 1964, of the most comprehensive article published anywhere regarding "observations on the accidental exposure of a family to a source of cobalt 60," by a group of doctors associated with the Mexican Institute of Social Security. This comprehensive study of the effect of callousness on the part of a nuclear engineer trained as a six-week wonder in the United States where he learned about industrial radiography. The cobalt which he purchased from Atomic Energy of Canada Limited was sold to him on August 3, 1961 in the form of seven pellets one millimeter cubes. They were enclosed in a container and shipped to Baja, California. The container was apparently disposed of or thrown away in Mexico City where it landed on top of the town dump near where the Espindola family lived.

Henry Espindola, playing in the town dump, found the container and brought it home in his pants pocket. Somehow between March 21 and April 1, 1962, the capsules were removed from the container. When Henry's mother removed the container from his pocket, it was placed on the table and then on a piece of furniture in the kitchen. By April 17, the grandmother, Augustina Ibarra, noticed that the drinking glasses in the kitchen were darkening. By April 29, Henry was dead at the hospital. The mother died July 19; the cause of the deaths were recognized too late and the capsule was removed from the house on July 22. Henry's sister died on August 18 and the grandmother on October 15. Only the father survived, presumably out of the practice in Mexico under which the father lives around the corner in another house.

How many capsules have been lost in the United States. Our tabulations show 88 lost or stolen. How many more have been picked up by little Henrys or Toms or Dicks or Harrys. We don't know how many have been found but it is interesting that there is no single reference in the medical literature in the United States to the consequences such as those which the Mexican technicians have so carefully documented in *Revista Medica.*

Not all of these losses were due to industrial use of nuclear science and radiation. The Public Health Service in its Environmental Health Series No. 999–RH–16 has recently documented a few cases of the effect of the loss of radioactive materials from medical use. I have avoided as much as possible in my tabulations case histories involving loss of radioactive materials from hospitals and clinics. This is difficult to avoid when transportation is also involved, but I refer you to the Public Health Service document listed above and entitled "Medical Uses of Radium and Radium Substitutes," particularly pages 15 through 19.

We have reviewed uranium mining, transportation and loss of radioactive materials, the deaths which occur from criticality, and now we must move on to the hazards in the air as well as in the water systems of this country.

The release of uranium hexafluoride occurred too many times in the gaseous diffusion operations of the uranium enrichment plants at Oak Ridge, Paducah and Portsmouth. I was able to find 139 documented cases. In addition, we were able to locate 80 releases of other isotopes.

Dr. Malcolm Peterson of Washington University has done a thoughtful piece entitled "Environmental Contamination from Nuclear Reactors,"[15] and recently he has predicted that one byproduct of nuclear power, krypton 85, *alone* may exhaust our present margin of permissible exposure to radioactivity in the air within the next 100 years.

There are some who would deny that such releases have or can occur but the fact is that both the NRX reactor accident at Chalk River, Canada, on December 12, 1962, and the Windscale accident on October 10, 1957, in Cumberland released large quantities of radioactivity to the atmosphere and I am sure that it would be news to most of the men making decisions regarding nuclear power in this country that the Windscale reactor released, and I quote from the Manchester Guardian of March 19, 1958, "The quantity of the radioactivity released in the Windscale No. 1 reactor during the accident in October was probably considerably more than that released during the explosion of an atomic bomb of the Hiroshima type."

Recently I negotiated with Governor Nelson Rockefeller in regard to a proposed $8 billion power program which he recommended to the Legislature should be subsidized into early construction. When we came to the question of location of the proposed plants as it affected safety, the Governor stated that his personal atomic advisor, Mr. Edward Teller, warned him that someday one of these plants was going to explode and spray a city or even an entire watershed with excessive radioactivity which will require the evacuation of the area.

BERYLLIUM

Dr. Harriet Hardy, Director of the Occupational Medical Service of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, reported at length in the New England Journal of Medicine (December 25, 1963), of the effects of the rapid expansion of the beryllium industry whose product is so urgently needed in nuclear science. Here was a case where the hazard of berylliosis not only threatened the worker in the plant but also the residents in the neighboring community. Yet the space industry requirements have multiplied the use of beryllium in industry by twenty times.

WATER

I believe the Muskie committee has shown the impact of radioactive pollution of our water systems. The hearings of May 6, 1966, which were held based upon the work of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration in the Colorado Basin Water Quality Project revealed the callous accumulation of tailing piles in the millions of tons each containing disintegration products of uranium and radium families which polluted the Colorado River with isotopes whose half-lives ranged up to 1620 years. These isotopes leached by the weather from the piles polluted the river as well as the atmosphere.

AIR POLLUTION

Just last week the Surgeon General, testifying before the U.S. Senate Committee on Public Works, said "Air pollution is a problem of many dimensions. . ." Each of four types of studies, considered alone, present impressive evidence of air pollution damage to health. Taken together, they add up to a disturbing and convincing portrait of a major health menace. He talked of Donora, Pennsylvania, and New York and London. I could have talked to you today about Aberfan, Torrey Canyon, Thresher and Apollo. These were similar tragedies and much needs to be done to avoid their occurrences. But the story of over 1,000 case histories of releases of radiation or fires or explosions in the presence of radiation, or fires or explosions of the new exotic metals developed for use in nuclear science all add up to an increase in the background radioactivity with which all of mankind must wrestle.

This fact is a matter of major health importance. No longer can we leave decisive control to those assigned the task of developing a nuclear power industry. No longer can we rely on the same agencies who failed to take timely action to prevent the 6,000 deaths which are coming to the underground uranium miners. Nor can the control of the health problem in the nuclear plants be left to physicists even if they camouflage their function by calling themselves health physicists.[16] Those interested in medical care must rise up and insist on the priority to which their role in society entitles them.

The hearings called again by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy regarding health hazards were previously held in May and August of 1959 but the Committee didn't act on the testimony before it and it shares the shame on our government for failing to take action in time to protect those who contributed so much to the stockpile of weapons in our nuclear arsenal. They have announced the witnesses to be heard[17] who will be representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Interior, Labor and HEW Departments as well as the Federal Radiation Council. These are the men who have known the problem all along, who have been in continuous session these recent months and are still unable to agree on steps to adequately protect underground miners.

I propose instead the following witnesses: Mrs. Carey Athey, Mrs. Shirden G. Blood, Mrs. Kermit Burbridge, Mrs. Douglas Garner, Mrs. Frederick R. Graham, Mrs. Sheldon Houle, Mrs. Robert D. Johnson, Mrs. Virgil S. Nidiffer, Mrs. Lloyd Reed, Mrs. Charles E. Trask, and Mrs. Robert C. Williams.

Each of these know more than all of the bureaucrats now scheduled to testify. They know what their husbands lived through before they died. They know what their friends and neighbors now are living through in fear and dread of the similar consequences to their husbands. They know the obligations of the Federal government. Following their testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I propose that the Public Health Service introduce a bill before their standing committees in the Congress and give these widows an opportunity to discuss the effects on the health of their husbands. Prior to any final action by the Congress, I propose that these women be invited to visit him in Washington by the Secretary of Labor and that he discuss with them while they are here at his Department's expense, a fair and proper compensation system to relieve them from the anxieties of the future now that the family breadwinner is no longer able to provide for them.

---

[15] *Scientist and Citizen,* November 1965, page 1, St. Louis Citizens' Committee for Nuclear Information, St. Louis, Missouri.

[16] In a revealing statement, one health physicist wrote (volume 11, June 1964, *Health Physics,* "The Professional Responsibilities of the Health Physicist or Virtue in Compromise," by H. J. Dunster, page 308) as follows:

"Just as in conventional safety the slogan of the 1930's, 'Safety First,' has since been discarded in favour of a balance between accident prevention and operational convenience or economy, so in the radiological field a balance has always been necessary between radiation risks and operational considerations. It is the ability to reach a rational and satisfactory balance or compromise that is the fundamental test of the health physicist's professional ability."

[17] *Washington Post,* Monday, April 24, 1967, page A19.

I propose that the President of the United States issue a new executive order to supplement the one that established the Federal Radiation Council that would make its recommendations binding on all departments of the Federal government, not merely advisory, to be ignored at will. I propose that the truth about atomic accidents be told, that the case histories I have tabulated be analyzed, that the public be told the truth, and that from that knowledge we adopt in our society a prudent program for the peaceful uses of the nuclear sciences.

FOOD STAMP ACT AMENDMENT

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Mondale in the chair.) The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The Assistant Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

THE DODD CENSURE RESOLUTION

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, a very learned and deserving article in defense of Senator Thomas Dodd which appeared in the Shreveport Times on Monday, June 27, 1966, has recently come to my attention.

It has occurred to me that in addition to my needing some time to prepare a case against the pending censure resolution, the thought occurred to me that a little time to think about and evaluate this matter could be very helpful toward a proper decision by the Senate.

Because one syndicated columnist has continuously, in some 600 newspapers, attacked Senator Dodd in most severe fashion over the past year and a half, it occurs to me that now that the evidence is all in, the thoughtful editorial writers of America should have the opportunity to analyze the matter and to draw their own conclusions. I am confident that the majority of them will conclude Senator Dodd has done nothing to warrant censure by the Senate, if indeed he has done any wrong whatever.

This is a very strong editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Times. I would assume that Mr. Don Ewing, who was once a writer with the Washington Star, wrote this editorial because of the very strong, forceful language which is used. Mr. Ewing is a very hard hitting writer, an intelligent, learned man, who is famous in Louisiana for his editorials, and one can see that in this editorial he leaves no doubt whatever that he is strongly on Tom Dodd's side.

I ask to be excused from any reference in the editorial that might appear to be unduly strong, or which might reflect upon anyone or take issue with any Senator.

I will editorialize myself to the extent of eliminating from the editorial a few abbreviated words which caused considerable alarm when then President Harry Truman used them with reference to Drew Pearson. I am aware of the consternation that occurred among some Members of the Senate when President Truman was reported as having made such a reference to Mr. Pearson.

I will simply say that President Truman referred to Mr. Pearson as an "unworthy person"—in brackets—and say that that is where I deleted the abbreviation.

I wish to make it clear, Mr. President, that although in this instance I disagree with Mr. Pearson, I personally like him. He is a very charming and friendly individual and I often find myself in agreement with him. Mr. Pearson has been both critical and complimentary of me, and I appreciate any and all small kindnesses from the press. Even though a writer may suggest on one day that I am unworthy of serving in the Senate, when he says something nice about me the next day, I appreciate it.

I believe that Mr. Pearson has, by and large, been fair to me, and I do not wish to take issue with his treatment of the way I have conducted myself in the Senate.

During the course of the debate, I may make some remarks that Mr. Pearson may not appreciate, but I want it understood that I have nothing against Mr. Pearson. Any difference he may have with Senator Dodd is purely his own affair, not mine.

Mr. Pearson reminds me of the character that appeared in a Disney cartoon entitled "Peter Pan." In the show was a crocodile which had swallowed an alarm clock, and whose presence was always known by its ticking sound. By the time the show was over, one felt he really knew the old crocodile. The young people even came to regard the crocodile as a very lovable character. I have often thought of Mr. Pearson in that context—as a lovable crocodile.

So I simply place this editorial in the Record as the statement of a very distinguished and learned writer, whose editorials have had tremendous impact upon the State of Louisiana. I might add that on occasion I have felt the sharp pen of Mr. Ewing as well as that of Mr. Pearson. Both are men of strong opinions, and they certainly have a right to express themselves.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Shreveport Times be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Shreveport Times, June 27, 1967]

The Case of Senator Dodd

If Democratic U.S. Senator Thomas E. Dodd is guilty of any illegality in collecting or handling political funds raised in his behalf, or in giving or receiving funds of any kind in an illegal manner, he should be prosecuted to the hilt under whatever laws apply.

If he has acted in a manner which is perhaps unethical in the handling of funds contributed in his political behalf, it is well to bring out the facts.

But what is brought out should be facts and not oral garbage spread publicly, through a public Senate committee hearing, before television, newspaper and radio reporters as well as before television and newspaper cameras without so much as one word of documentation of the so-called "testimony" of witnesses.

This is especially true since much "scandal" testimony was ordered later to be stricken from the records of the Senate committee hearing the case. It was ordered stricken because it was merely spiteful gossip, or hearsay, or obviously just bunk.

* * * * *

The practice of raising money via banquets or otherwise for political candidates or office holders to use in behalf of personal expenses as well as for campaign expenses—especially when they are not wealthy—is one that has been practiced for decades. This is true not only in the federal government, but at governmental levels in the states and even in municipalities.

The fact that there is voluminous precedent for such money raising does not make the practice right, but neither is it right for a Senate committee to center on Senator Dodd in slanderous manner on the basis of some stolen letters published by a gossip columnist whom Senator Dodd has sued for a million dollars for libel; with the Justice Department called on to take perjury action against one of the anti-Dodd witnesses, and perhaps burglary action against others.

It is common practice—probably at some time or other in most states of the union—for friends to reimburse a candidate for personal income he loses in making a race for public office. There are such things as $100 a year and $200 a year clubs for political office holders—persons called on to contribute certain sums not in one shot, but every year, to help an office holder keep himself in office. At times, lump sums are raised and donated to an office holder by groups of friends. None of these things necessarily involve favors or patronage or anything in return to the donors except—perhaps—their own satisfaction over their part in either electing or keeping in office a man they consider worthy.

Concededly, crooked advantages can be taken of such a system and probably are. But somebody must figure out a better system, or a law that will make such a system proof against improper use, before trying to pin blame for it on one man—and simply on testimony that thus far has been in part undocumented gossip, and in some cases lacking even the foundation of gossip.

The Dodd case is simply this up to now:

Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson, who conduct a Washington newspaper column, which is often of the gossip, or scandal type, published the contents, or the claimed contents, of documents—mostly letters or carbon copies of letters—which, it is stated, were stolen from Senator Dodd's office. These dealt with collections for Senator Dodd of funds at "political banquets" held in "tribute" to him, the contention being that the Senator pocketed some of the money. The columnists also allege that Senator Dodd was helpful to a retired Army General who now handles public relations on an international basis; that Senator Dodd traveled to Europe at government expense to help the General on his accounts with certain foreign countries.

Drew Pearson has been called a liar so many times by so many people that it would be hard to keep count. Harry S. Truman referred to Mr. Pearson as an [unworthy person]. Others have used the same initials about him. Mr. Pearson once wrote a *Saturday Evening Post* article entitled *Reminiscences of an* [unworthy person]. Senator Dodd's former administrative aide, a man, and his former personal secretary, a woman, are the chief witnesses against him so far and presumably played major parts in getting either the documents, or knowledge of them, from Senator Dodd's office to Mr. Pearson and Mr. Anderson.

The former Dodd secretary testified Thursday that she overhead two employees of Dodd talking together and that one of them said that Dodd *might* have gotten as much as $10,000 from the retired general for helping on public relations in a certain manner. They were simply guessing at whether Senator Dodd got anything. Thus, her evidence was merely hearsay of speculative conversation, with no facts of any kind involved in actions or utterances by any of the trio. Yet all of this was spread into perhaps millions of homes by communications media. The ex-secretary testified that she and the administrative aide had maintained a "social relationship" since 1963. Each is a divorcee.

Somehow the fact that the two persons that she said she overheard talking about the alleged $10,000 immediately took the stand and, under oath, denied that any such conversation ever was held, did not seem to gain a prominent place in much of the communications media and was not used at all in some television accounts of the hearing.

The former administrative aide said under oath on the witness stand that Senator Dodd "misappropriated hundreds of thousands of dollars." Now that's a stiff allegation. The ex-aide didn't say how or where or when or for what; or how hundreds of thousands of dollars came to be in some place where Senator Dodd could "misappropriate" them.

Then, the Chairman of the Investigating Committee ordered all of this testimony stricken from the record. But he couldn't strike it from the airwaves or the television films or the printed newspaper pages. Nor have we seen any particular display on TV, although it has been printed locally, that Senator Dodd called on the Justice Department to bring perjury charges against his former administrative aide.

In the meantime, the Pearson-Anderson column continues to carry data from documents which supposedly were stolen from Senator Dodd's office. The administrative aide says that he gave documents and information to Mr. Pearson as a sort of patriotic act; that he was serving his country. Why didn't he go to the Department of Justice? Was he aware that some gossip columnists pay well for "scandal" information? Does the endless activity of Senator Dodd as a long time anti-Communist figure in the case and the present hearing?

SOLUTION STILL NEEDED

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the Record a learned editorial that appeared in the Shreveport Times of May 6, 1967, supporting the position I took—at least, in general terms—with regard to the presidential campaign election law. The editorial contends that we should keep and improve upon what we have, rather than wipe it out and start all over again.

The editorial is entitled "Solution Still Needed." I submit that this perceptive editorial certainly looked well to the future with regard to developments that have occurred.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Solution Still Needed

Something is still lacking in the apparently ended dispute over the merit of the Long Law. The law is dead or near dead, and foes of Senator Long are congratulating themselves, but nobody has put forward an alternative.

The present system of financing presidential campaigns is hypocritical and dishonest. Federal law limits expenditures of the two national committees, Republican and Democrat, to $3 million. The actual amount spent may be as high as $20 or $30 million. Senator Long's plan to end this fraud was to let each taxpayer give a dollar of his income tax to his party. The party's presidential nominee would have control of the money and the national committee would be barred from taking private contributions.

Opponents of the law didn't quarrel so much with the method of fund raising as they did with the power it would give the presidential nominee. As matters stand now, big donors can influence presidential elections by gifts that fall outside the spending limits imposed on the national committees. The national committees, in fact, resort to all sorts of dubious shifts whereby this money, while not given to them directly, is spent in the "right place."

So, if $20 million is spent on an election for president by one party, about $17 million will have been spent in this fashion. Is this any worse than the abuse that might result from putting too much money in a nominee's hands? Yes, say foes of the Long Law. The nominee rather than the national committee would control the money. With it, he could subvert state party organizations. They and national committeemen would be given the choice of going along with his policies and his choice of nominees for other federal elective offices campaigned for in presidential years, or they would get no money. A rival "presidential" committee would rule party and patronage from another headquarters.

So, the squabble is more over who controls the money than over who gives it and how. Legal party campaign funds are now raised by quotas imposed on each state by both parties. This money is recorded and kept up with under federal law. As for who gives it, the GOP has the better record. It is now a party of many small givers rather than one of big givers, though it has those, too. Barry Goldwater wrought the change. The GOP's Sustaining Membership Committee numbers about 250,000—a membership jump of 350 per cent since 1962. Donations have risen more than 500 per cent in that time. Over 80 per cent of the money received by the national committee comes from this group. The Democrats are now the party of the big givers.

Neither party, actually, has much worry over presidential campaign money (the GOP Senate delegation voted to kill the Long Law), but those who oppose the tax checkoff system aren't complaining about the current dishonest one of getting their money from the "citizen" groups that spring up during presidential campaigns.

And nobody is complaining either about the fact that it is the man with the heaviest wallet that travels furthest and fastest in the period leading up to the national conventions.

The "poor man" doesn't suffer in running for President. He seldom gets that far. He suffers in trying to get the nomination because he lacks the money to go all out. But the fact remains that six to ten times as much money is actually spent on both campaigns than the law nominally allows. It's idle to try to keep citizens out of politics; they belong there. It's idle, too, to pretend that it costs only $3 million to run for President.

Given these two truths, what is the proper solution? Well, it isn't a new idea. It's to lift the limit on what can be spent on presidential races—set no limit, in fact; but do set a limit on what the individual can give. Make the Rockefellers and the Smiths equal by limiting the individual gift to a hundred dollars or two hundred dollars. Allow income tax credit. Let the national committee handle all the money instead of setting up fronts and committees to evade the law.

That lets the individual into select company, encourages him to support his party and his candidate. It throws out pretense and lets in honesty—something lacking so far in all the attacks on the Long Law.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule on germaneness be waived so that I may speak with reference to H.R. 2508.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPORTIONMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, legislation which attempts to modify the constitutional standards governing congressional districting is rushing toward the Senate floor and will probably arrive, I am told, the week after next.

The legislation, which passed the House on April 27 by a vote of 289 to 63, will be among the most important and far reaching that Congress considers in this session, because it involves the composition of the House of Representatives and the jurisdiction of the Federal judiciary.

The House-approved version of the bill, H.R. 2508, would, first, establish temporary and permanent guidelines defining what variation is permissible from the one-man, one-vote constitutional principle of equal apportionment; and second, attempt to discourage gerrymandering by requiring that districts be composed of contiguous territory in as reasonably a compact form as the State finds practicable.

Far and away the most important part of the bill as passed by the House is section (2) which would make permissible until 1972 a deviation of 30 percent between the most-populated and least-populated districts in a State. After 1972—the beginning of the 93d Congress—the permissible deviation would drop to 10 percent.

On Tuesday of this week, the Senate Judiciary Committee, by a reported vote of 11 to 4, approved the House bill with amendments which would, among other things, raise the temporary deviation standard to 35 percent.

Only four States—California, Ohio, West Virginia, and Georgia—have congressional districts so badly malapportioned that they would be exempted from constitutional redistricting requirements under the generous 35-percent standard.

Seventeen other States—which are clearly malapportioned according to the stricter constitutional standards established by the Supreme Court—would not be required to redistrict until 1972 under the standards set by the legislation.

The legislation, therefore, presents a question of the greatest magnitude: whether the Congress may validly, or should desirably, modify the constitutional one-man, one-vote principle in a way that would postpone for 5 years fair congressional districting in 17 States which have 214, or about one-half the total, seats in the House of Representatives.

While a serious constitutional question exists, as I shall discuss later, the question that most concerns me is: Is it desirable, simply as a matter of policy, for Congress to interject itself at this time and in this way into the process of reapportioning congressional districts? I strongly believe that the answer is "No."

This belief proceeds from the proposition that the House of Representatives is the keystone of our Nation's representative form of self-government. The process of electing Congressmen is the most effective means the majority of the people have of regularly imposing their will upon the central government, the dominating government in our federal system.

The primary means of determining what set of beliefs will be imposed upon the central government is, of course, our traditional system of partisan political competition in which two national parties contend for the right to express the ambitions, desires, aspirations, and dissent of all Americans.

Our Nation comes closest to true representative government expressed through political party competition when each man's vote counts as much as the next man's.

If a man has only part of a vote, the candidate of his political party has only a part of a fair opportunity to compete for the right to speak for him in the House of Representatives, and his Nation has a Government which represents only a part of the people.

These abstract principles can be expressed most eloquently in practice, and can be expressed most competently by me by reference to the situation with which I have the most familiarity, my home State of Tennessee.

Tennessee has been the pioneer State in reapportionment because of the landmark decision by the Supreme Court in Baker against Carr. Members of the Tennessee Republican Party were the instigators of that successful litigation because the party had been locked into a minority position in our State because of unfair reapportionment. A quick glance at the congressional districting developments during the last 15 years explains that situation graphically. The 1951 Tennessee Apportionment Act had two major inequities. Shelby County, with a population of 627,019, and which includes the city of Memphis, comprised the Ninth Congressional District. The Seventh and Eighth Districts had populations, respectively, of 232,652 and 223,387, or a combined population which was less than that of the Ninth District alone.

The second major inequity was that the three easternmost districts in the State, where the voters are predominantly Republican, had an average population of 456,789, while the three districts in middle Tennessee, where the voters are predominantly Democrat, had an average population of 371,221.

A court-ordered reapportionment in 1965 corrected most of the population disparities between the ninth district and the seventh and eighth districts. This realinement in district lines unquestionably helped make it possible for the Republican Party to elect a Representative from the ninth district and to run its strongest race in history in the seventh district. Further reapportionment, which would necessarily shift Republican strength from the three east Tennessee districts into the middle three districts, would bring our party to a position of fair competition and, for the first time, allow Tennessee to have vigorous competition between two strong parties.

I offer no apologies for saying that reapportionment of congressional districts in my State has been desirable because it has promoted the development of the Republican Party in Tennessee. In other States, fair apportionment of districts will benefit the Democratic Party. Two, or 5, or 10 years from now, fair apportionment may benefit the Democratic Party in Tennessee. And, although I intend to do all I legitimately can through the partisan political process to see that my party continues to grow strong, I will not object if fair districting helps my opposition. For I do not ask for my party, and I do not intend to permit another party, a handicap conferred by malapportioned districts. The handicap falls squarely upon the people.

One might expect that a matter of such far-reaching importance to our system of government would have had careful, public scrutiny before being presented to the House and Senate. The fact is, that there have never been hearings in the Senate on the legislation, with the exception of a 1-day hearing in 1965 at which two Congressmen testified and which has gone unreported. The most recent hearings in the House were in 1964, which was the year in which the Supreme Court signaled the beginning of fair congressional districting by its landmark decision in *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1 (1964).

Between now and the week beginning June 5, when I understand the legislation is scheduled to come to the floor of this Chamber, I hope that Members of the Senate will carefully consider these consequences and will initiate independent study of the bill which has received too little attention.

The best course for the Senate, in my opinion, would be to defeat the bill outright; this would avoid confusing and impeding the swift movement in the Nation toward assuring each person that his vote for a Congressman counts the same as his neighbor's vote. The next best course would be to recommit the legislation for extended public hearings. At least the bill should be amended to eliminate completely temporary standards of permissible deviation that in any way conflict with what the Supreme Court has said the constitutional standards are.

Because the report of the Judiciary Committee is not yet available, I do not propose at this point to make an extended analysis of the bill. However, I do think it might be helpful to outline briefly why, in my judgment, the legislation is unconstitutional.

The constitutional argument begins with the Supreme Court's 1964 decision in Wesberry against Sanders, which established that the Constitution's plain objective is that of making "equal representation for equal numbers of people the fundamental goal of the House of Representatives." 376 U.S. 1, 18.

The Court held that:

> The command of Act I, sec. 2, that Representatives be chosen "by the People of the several states" means that as nearly as is practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's. Id. at 8.

Language in the Court's later holding in *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 578 (1964) made clear the suggestion in Wesberry that there is a more exacting standard of equality required in congressional districting than in State legislative election districts:

> Some distinctions may well be made between congressional and state legislative representation. Since, almost invariably, there is a significantly larger number of seats in state legislature bodies to be distributed within a state than congressional seats, it may be feasible to use political subdivision lines to a greater extent in establishing state legislative districts than in congressional districting while still affording adequate representation to all parts of the state.

Perhaps because population is so clearly the central, and probably exclusive, factor of importance in congressional redistricting, the Supreme Court has moved more swiftly than in State legislative redistricting toward requiring near exactness of population equality among the districts. Thus, on January 9 of this year, the Supreme Court indicated that a 10-percent variation from the State average district population is too large to meet the Court's one-man, one-vote rule. In an Indiana case, *Duddleston* v. *Grills*, 385 U.S. 455 (1967), the Court ordered a lower court to reconsider its approval of a congressional redistricting plan which permitted deviations up to only 12.8 percent of the State average district population. The Court cited a Florida decision involving legislative reapportionment to the effect that no good reasons were presented why the State could not have come much closer to providing districts of equal population than it did. The other January 9 order of the Court affirmed a lower court ruling that Missouri's 1965 congressional redistricting plan was unconstitutional, although it kept deviations from the average district population to within 10.4 percent, *Kirkpatrick* v. *Preisler*, 385 U.S. 450 (1967).

In 21 States, congressional districts vary from the average district population by 10 percent or more. In eight of these States—New York, Tennessee, Massachusetts, Indiana, Texas, Missouri, North Carolina, and New Jersey—courts already have ordered redistricting before the 1968 elections. In two others—Ohio and Florida—court challenges are underway or pending. Certainly in these 10 States, and probably in most of the others, there is time to achieve a fair apportionment of districts before the 1968 elections. But all 21 of these States—except California, Ohio, West Virginia, and Georgia—are to be protected from redistricting until 1972 by enactment of H.R. 2508.

In 1951, during the 82d Congress, when the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. CELLER, began his efforts to enact legislation that would have required fair apportionment, Congress may have had the power to establish permissible deviation standards other than those now proclaimed by the Judiciary.

But since the Supreme Court's decision in Wesberry in 1964, it seems clear that Congress' power in this area is limited only to establishing standards which are not at variance with constitutional standards.

There was some lively debate in the House on April 27 when this constitutional question was discussed. Mr. CELLER suggested that the legislative standards would not be mandatory on the Court:

> We could not issue a mandate to the court, as the gentleman from New Jersey said. This language is permissive. When the court would interpret the nature of the lines, it would undoubtedly take the guidelines into most serious consideration, but that would not be absolute. That would be persuasive, and I am inclined to agree that the courts would not likely disregard the admonition laid down by the Congress when it devised the guidelines, but one cannot say that the court of necessity must follow the guidelines.

But others disagreed, such as Mr. MATHIAS who said:

> We are not here, let me say, to lay down guidelines for the courts in future cases, we are here, as I conceive of the bill, to eliminate the necessity of the future cases. We are not laying down guidelines, we are laying down the law. And we have the constitutional authority and the constitutional responsibility to do that. We have not discharged that constitutionality responsibility for far too long.

I hope and I trust, before the Senate acts on this proposal and the proposed legislation, that there will be extensive debate on the merits and the underlying philosophy of the proposal.

I respectfully suggest that whether the 35-percent deviation standard is permissive or mandatory is of no consequence. If Congress is setting a permissive 35-percent guideline, then the Supreme Court will ignore it. If Congress is laying down the law, then the Supreme Court will rule the law unconstitutional.

As a lawyer, I am quite aware of the vagaries and uncertainties that accompany the process of predicting the development of constitutional law. Nevertheless, I think in this case it is crystal clear that the Supreme Court, which has been moving swiftly toward requiring nearly absolute equality between populations in congressional districts, will not tolerate an attempt to force a retreat in this process.

The respected Committee on Federal Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York observed in 1964 that—

> In view of the pronouncements in Wesberry, it would seem highly doubtful that a variation of as much as 15 percent from the average—which could mean a 30-percent variation between districts from the average—is permissible.

Dean Robert B. McKay, of New York University School of Law, probably the leading authority on reapportionment, wrote in 1965:

> It must be taken as a starting point that Congress cannot now redefine the concept of election of Representatives "by the People" to mean something other than the Court when it called for equality "as nearly as is practicable."

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the House has just voted on the conference report on H.R. 6950, restoration of the investment tax credit, I am told.

In the interest of saving time, because many Senators have made plans to be elsewhere, I am going to explain what is in the conference report. If Senators wish to ask further questions, they can ask them either now or when the conference report comes before the Senate. I think that might expedite disposition of the conference report.

There were four Senate amendments. The House receded on two of them, the Senate receded on one, and one was compromised as follows:

Restoration of investment credit and accelerated depreciation: The Senate bill would have restored the investment credit and accelerated depreciation only with respect to property ordered—or the construction of which began—after March 9, 1967. The House bill would have applied with respect to property acquired or the construction of which was completed after March 9, regardless of when it was ordered or begun.

The conferees agreed to compromise this provision. Under the compromise, property ordered during the suspension period—October 10, 1966–March 9, 1967—and acquired prior to May 24, 1967, is to be ineligible for the credit or the use of accelerated depreciation.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at that point?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. By that, does the Senator mean that companies which went ahead on their own, without benefit of the 7-percent credit during the period it was suspended, and ordered capital goods, and if they received them before sometime in May, the credit will not be retroactive to assist them with the offset costs?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct. Let me say that I am not happy about that particular compromise. So far as I am concerned, we accepted that only after we had made diligent efforts to persuade the House. This compromise would mean that if, during the suspension period, someone placed an order for goods, if he got delivery of the goods before May 24, which was yesterday, or any time prior to that time, he would not get the 7-percent investment credit.

But if he ordered an item that took longer to deliver, and therefore his delivery date occurred after May 24, he would get the full 7-percent investment tax credit.

It was with a heavy heart that I surrendered on that one and that the Senate conferees generally surrendered on that one, because it discriminated against the fellow who held back——

Mr. NELSON. Does the Senator mean it discriminated in favor of the fellow who held back?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No; it discriminated against the one who did what the Government wanted him to do. In other words, the Government suspended the investment credit because we wanted manufacturers, for example, to delay the placing of orders for airplanes, because it was inflationary at that moment, because of the scarce material and scarce labor and skills that we needed to produce helicopters and planes for Vietnam. Some companies went ahead and placed their orders, anyhow. The Wall Street Journal reported that the increase in prices which occurred during the suspension period made up more than the amount involved in the suspension of the 7-percent tax credit.

Nevertheless, the conference agreement would give the people who went ahead and placed orders, contrary to what the Government wanted them to do, the full investment credit if they received delivery after May 24. To that extent, this would discriminate against companies which delayed placing orders. It would deny it only to someone who had already taken delivery and not to those who have not yet received the property.

Mr. NELSON. There is another aspect of the problem. Let us assume that there are two competing industries in machine tools, or whatever it may be, in the same city, and they order the same equipment, with the same value, on the same day. One of them got delivery on May 24. He cannot take the 7-percent credit. If one of them got delivery on May 23, he does not get it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. NELSON. But across town, another manufacturer ordered the same equipment and he gets it 1 day later; he gets the benefit of the tax credit.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was not for that. However, the Senate conferees felt we had to reach agreement, because the matter was urgent, even though there was a retroactive date. That being the case, they felt we should sign the conference report.

Let me explain that provision perhaps with regard to three companies, because it is better understood if we look at it with regard to three instead of two companies. Let us say three companies ordered a plane, company A, company B, and company C. Company A ordered the airplane and got its delivery on May 23. Company A does not get the 7-percent tax credit. Company B ordered the airplane and got delivery after May 23. Company B gets the full 7-percent tax credit. Company C, in response to the Government policy of suspending investments, did not put an order in until manufacturers could manufacture more helicopters and more planes for our fighting men in Vietnam. It did not order at all. So then company C comes along and places an order. In view of the fact that prices have gone up, as a result of increased labor costs, and other reasons, company C finds the increased cost might be 20 percent. So it would have been much better off if it had joined company A and company B. Oddly enough, the company discriminated against the worst is the company which did what the Government urged it to do.

If we were right in giving the investment credit back, we must have been wrong in permitting it to those who did not get delivery prior to May 24 who were denied it. If it is wrong in one direction, perhaps it is right in the other direction. If we were right in the other direction, then we were wrong in this direction. There are wheels within wheels involved in this. There is no logic or justice or equity in it. It is just something that we had to do to get a conference report.

Mr. NELSON. The reason my questions arise is that I have not seen the conference report, and have not had an opportunity to study it. I have not seen copies of it on any Senator's desk. Is the report available?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was printed this morning and delivered at 10 o'clock. I suppose it was delivered to the House at 10 o'clock. It is a House report, which was delivered to the House at 10 o'clock this morning.

Mr. NELSON. Is it the conference report?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is the conference report and the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. NELSON. Where is the conference report of the Senate and House conferees?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is no statement of the managers on the part of the Senate. That will be changed under the Reorganization Act. The tradition has been that the report of the managers of the House is the explanation of the conference report.

Mr. NELSON. The report which I hold in my hand is the one that has been approved by both Senate and House conferees?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. I believe the House has acted, and we are waiting for the papers.

Mr. NELSON. I do not know under what pressure the conferees worked, but I have not had a chance to read the conference report. I do not see it on the desks of Senators. I have many questions to ask about it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would hope I might satisfy the Senator's inquiries. I know he is concerned about it.

To continue with my statement, the conferees agreed that such property acquired on or after that date, however, is to qualify for these benefits. The compromise related only to property ordered during the suspension period; property ordered after the termination of this period will be eligible for the credit or accelerated depreciation regardless of when it is acquired.

In the case of property whose construction by the taxpayer commenced during the suspension period, the credit and the use of accelerated depreciation is to apply with respect to that portion of the basis attributable to work done on and after May 24, but not to that portion attributable to work done before that date.

Fifty percent limitation on the investment credit: The Senate bill made the provision in existing law which raises the limit on the use of the investment credit from the present 25 percent of tax liability—over $25,000—to 50 percent, effective for taxable years ending after December 31, 1967. This retains the effective date provided by the existing law. Under the House bill, the increase was effective for taxable years ending after March 9, 1967. The conferees agreed to the House version.

Investment credit for Vietnam airlift aircraft: The conferees agreed to an amendment added to the bill by the Senate to assure that the investment credit will not be denied with respect to certain aircraft ordered before the suspension period for use in the Vietnam airlift, even though the use is wholly outside the United States. If the aircraft is registered by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and is operated outside the United States under a contract with the United States, it would be eligible for the investment credit.

Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act: The conferees agreed to a Senate amendment, under which the tax checkoff and the distribution of funds under the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act must be deferred until after the adoption by law of guidelines governing the distribution of those funds. However, the Advisory Board created by the act would remain in effect and operative.

The estimated revenue loss under the House bill is $1,860,000,000. Under the Senate version of the bill it is $1,085,000,000. Under the conference agreement it is $1,710,000,000. As Senators will see, where the Senate bill by its amendments picked up $775 million, I regret to say that in conference we lost all but $150 million of this. From the Senate point of view, it was not a good compromise dollarwise.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I did not quite follow that. How much more tax loss is there in the conference report versus the Senate version of the bill we passed?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We lost $625 million in conference.

Mr. NELSON. Under the conference report, the estimated loss total is how much?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. $1,710,000,000. That, as I say, is $625 million above the amount we had hoped we would reduce the revenue loss by the bill.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. What was the loss under the original House bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would be $1,860,000,000. The House bill would have validated retroactively, for investment tax purposes, all orders placed during the suspension period, if delivery came after the end of the suspension period. The Senate bill took the view that if orders were placed during the suspension period, the taxpayers have no right to the investment tax credit, no matter when deliveries were made.

Mr. NELSON. No matter when the goods arrived?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No matter when delivery occurred. These were people who did not expect to receive the investment tax credit when they placed their orders. The reason we suspended the investment tax credit was that we did not want them to place orders. We wanted them to withhold them, and provided that they would pay more taxes if they did place orders.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. Am I correct in my recollection that under the suspension bill we passed, if the order was made before the suspension date, they received the 7-percent credit, even though the goods were received during the period of suspension?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; the Senator is entirely correct. So all we are really legislating on is orders placed during the suspension period.

It was the administration's point of view, and my point of view, that it would not be a good idea to permit those people to receive the 7-percent investment tax credit. But the House conferees were adamant about the matter; and, in my judgment what we agreed to has actually discriminated against the people who cooperated. In some respects the conference agreement, in effect, says that if you just ignore what Congress and the President ask you to do, you might be a lot better off than if you had cooperated. It looks as though we do not mean what we say when we pass laws here. Nevertheless, unfortunately, the House was adamant on the point, and there was not much we could do but agree to it.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. What kind of a precedent are we setting if the same situation should occur again? Suppose it becomes necessary, Congress thinks it is necessary and the President thinks it is necessary, to take off inflationary pressures in this country, and, at some future date, in accordance with a recommendation of the President, Congress suspends the investment tax credit again: Will anybody pay any attention to it? And if they do not, are we not faced with a situation where all the industries which made purchases during the suspension period will say, "You certainly ought to treat us as fairly as you treated those who purchased during the suspension period on the previous suspension." Is that not the precedent we are setting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend to receive a message from the House of Representatives?

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, that is the conference report to which we are referring, and as soon as I receive the Senate papers, I shall call it up.

In answer to the Senator's question, I certainly do not think we set a good precedent. If we pass a law to tell somebody he should not do something, and if he does it generally he would have to pay more taxes. Then, when some people cooperate with us and withhold placing orders, we just proceed, after the period is over, willy-nilly to give many of those who went ahead and placed the orders anyway the same tax benefit as though they had withheld the placement of orders.

This places us in a very bad position for the future, because it is in effect says to American industry, "Look, that does not mean anything; you go up and talk to the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, and see if those fellows would not just go ahead and give it to you anyway."

If we are to do that, frankly, it would be the part of fairness and justice to proceed to pass a relief bill, to make payments to the people who withheld their orders, taking us at our word, sums necessary to reimburse them for what they lost because they did not place the orders, relying upon the intent of Congress and the purposes of the administration to try to resist inflation and to try to restrain the placing of the orders.

The situation is not quite that bad, because we do not give it back to everybody. We say that if one had received his delivery prior to May 24, he does not receive the investment tax credit, which some can contend means, "Well, you never can tell what Congress is going to do, so a businessman acts at his peril in relying on Congress, inasmuch as Congress is unpredictable." It can be argued that it is more simple administratively just to say that everybody gets it back if he receives delivery after May 24. But it is not equitable, and I am not contending that it is. In many respects it is unfair.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, I yield.

Mr. NELSON. Of course, it would be equitable, I take it, in the Senator's judgment, if credit were given to nobody who purchased during the suspension period?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course. That, I remind the Senator from Wisconsin, is what we did in the Senate bill. We thought we were acting on conscience, honor, and principle. But we could not make it stick in conference.

Mr. NELSON. I would assume that apart from the conference committee itself, and a tiny handful of Senators who may have looked at the conference report, the vast majority of Senators are not aware of this new compromise provision in the report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I assume that not 10 percent of the Senate, aside from the conferees themselves, are aware of it. But I am here to debate it and defend it as best I may, as one who signed the report.

Mr. NELSON. To the best of my knowledge, the conference report has not yet been delivered to my office, and it is not on the desks here in the Chamber.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator cannot deny that he knows about it, because I handed him a copy a few minutes ago.

Mr. NELSON. That is true, which I have not yet had a chance to read.

Just one further question: If this conference report is agreed to, there will be a rollcall, so that the names of all the Members of the House and all the Members of the Senate who vote for the conference report will be a matter of record and I would assume the vote would be practically unanimous. But the record of the rollcall will be there; so the next time the President says and Congress agrees that we have to take some inflationary pressure off, and therefore we suspend the investment credit, and then we restore it at a later date, every Senator or Representative who has a constituent who purchased during the period of suspension will have that constituent able to say, "Well, now, you cast your vote to relieve other businessmen the last time; what prejudice do you now have against me?"

Is that not the situation that will arise?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I regret to say it, but I can only say that the answer is yes. In future times, after we take anti-inflationary measures, when we get ready to relieve them, this sets the stage to say, "Fellows, who do we want to take care of and who do we not want to take care of in this bill? Which industry do we want to favor? Which taxpayers do you think wear white hats, and which do you think wear black hats?" Or, "Let's flip a coin and see who we want to look after."

It sets almost that kind of precedent. But unfortunately, there is a lot of feeling that this bill should be passed and sent to the President's desk, right or wrong, immediately; and, that being the case, we were under even greater pressure. I shall vote for it.

Mr. NELSON. If too many such things occur, I might change my mind. However, I do not see any good reason, after all the delay, to say that we have to take up the measure now, if that is the position of the Senator, and in a matter of an hour or so dispose of the measure and vote on it.

I think the measure ought to be laid over for a week to give Senators a chance to find out what is in the conference report.

I think it is a dangerous precedent. The fact of the matter is that those individuals who made purchases during the suspension of the investment tax credit—and I have talked to businessmen in my State—did not expect to get any credit.

Some of them were in the machine tool business. It was said: "I have to get another machine, and I have to get it now, or I cannot meet my production. I am buying the machine, even though I will not get any benefit from the 7-percent investment tax credit." That individual regrets that very much.

I think that most people either purchased at the time of the suspension because as a business matter they had to do so, or as far as they were concerned in their business it really did not make too much difference, anyway.

A small percentage of business people in the country either had to purchase the equipment then or they purchased it because it did not make much difference.

The next time this occurs we will have every single business in the United States buying equipment, and enough businessmen will be buying so that the suspension will not mean anything when Congress comes back. We will have a rollcall. People will say: "You did it before." There will be 50 times as many industries that will purchase with the expectation that Congress will give them the benefit of the tax investment credit, and Congress will do so.

We will then have lost this tool with respect to holding back inflationary pressures.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think the Senator is correct. I think that with the exception of the first section the conference report can be very easily defended, and defended with complete merit.

However, I must concede to the Senator that I am not very happy about the first section of the report. I would also concede that that is the section that involves the money. The section involves approximately $570 million.

I must confess that that is a very poor position to be in, but it was felt that we could get on with the business and bring back a conference report to both Houses as early as we could in the hope that we might agree at the earliest possible date and send the matter to the President.

Mr. NELSON. When the bill was first before the Senate, I voted against it for a very specific reason. I thought the idea was all right in general, but I voted against it for the reason that in terms of the public utilities are regulated industries, and in many States—including my own—they have their rates established by a utilities commission. As I recall it, the bill provided that this profit, so to speak, received by a power or telephone utility, could not be computed in the rate base.

If a State had a policy that a telephone or electric utility should make a 6- or a 7-percent return, we would be in effect legislating the rate for that particular State.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe there has been some misunderstanding about that. The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] had the same impression, but I believe that the impression was in error.

We said, I believe in section 203(e)(1) of the Revenue Act of 1964, that a Federal regulatory agency could not take into account this 7-percent investment tax credit and require that that be the subject of a rate reduction.

We did not, however, say that a State regulatory agency could not do so, and we do not so provide. In other words, it is still within the power of the Wisconsin commission to require a rate reduction which would include requiring a utility to reduce its rate by that 7 percent. That is purely a matter for the State to decide for itself. We did not feel it would be proper for us to tell a State agency what it could do.

We did not do so, but we did tell the Federal agencies that they could not do that without the consent of Congress. I do not know why any companies would want to consent to it, frankly.

Mr. NELSON. I am relying upon my memory, but I accept the explanation of the distinguished Senator as to what the law is.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It does make a lot of difference. I thought it was good legislation. I voted for it. It does make a lot of difference, and in some cases, for example, if two companies are competing in the building of new pipelines or electric lines, they will offer to run it back by the 7 percent in order to get customers at the other end where the jurisdiction would be in the Federal regulatory agency.

I believe that was the case, for example, with two pipeline companies which were competing to serve a customer in California.

Mr. NELSON. I received a letter at the time the point was at issue, when the very distinguished chairman of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission—who is a very fine lawyer—and the other lawyers on that commission interpreted the legislation to mean that they could not include the 7 percent in determining the rate base. Perhaps their interpretation was wrong, or perhaps we changed the law.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I think they just erroneously concluded that section 203(e)(1) and 203 (e)(2) applied to them. It does not.

I think that if they were to read the language more closely they would find that this applied to Federal regulatory agencies and not to State regulatory agencies.

RESTORATION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT AND ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am still puzzled about that aspect of the bill, and since I am relying upon my memory and still have a number of other questions which puzzle me, I request that the Senator agree to postpone the vote on this measure until next week so that I may have a chance to check out some of these matters and satisfy myself concerning them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the Senator feels that way about it—and I know he is concerned about the conference report and has a long list of questions he wants to ask concerning the matter—and will make those questions available to me, I will undertake to provide him with the information he seeks.

I hope that by the time we return on Wednesday, the Senator will be at least satisfied that he has the information he wants, and I would hope that, having it, he would do as I propose to do, and that is to reluctantly vote for the report.

I will not seek to press the Senator to vote, with as many absentees as we have today, if he feels that the measure should be studied further.

Mr. NELSON. I appreciate the chairman's consideration. I should like to have answers from his staff, or otherwise, in any event, before we proceed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT PAMPHLET—"FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE FOR SOUTH VIETNAM"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has inserted in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence he had with the Department of State concerning assistance being provided to South Vietnam by other countries.

This exchange was prompted by a propaganda piece issued by the Department, entitled "Free World Assistance for South Vietnam," which starts off with this statement by Secretary Rusk:

> A large majority of the governments of the free world are sympathetic to our efforts in Southeast Asia and would be alarmed were they to fail.

The paper then goes on to list on the first page 36 nations which are giving aid to South Vietnam, leaving the strong implication that these nations support the United States-Vietnam policy. Nothing could be further from the truth. This piece is typical of how the State Department distorts the facts about this war.

The list contains a number of countries which would be somewhat surprised to learn that they are being pawned off as supporters of the U.S. position. Pakistan and France, members of the SEATO alliance, are on the list. Both countries not only have very strong opinions against our policies but also view their obligations under the SEATO Treaty in a far different light from the way the Department of State views ours. The Department's propagandizers even had the audacity to include Canada, an impartial member of the International Control Commission, set up to supervise the carrying out of the 1954 Geneva agreement, an agreement which we have flagrantly violated since its inception. This casting of Canada in a pro-U.S. position is not likely to make her representatives more welcome or more trusted by Hanoi.

It is true that on the next to the last page—for those who get that far—the document softens somewhat the earlier implication of support. Following a country-by-country listing of aid, the pamphlet states:

> In addition to the support of the 30 countries listed above, there are a number of other nations aiding Vietnam whose assistance should not necessarily be construed as representing governmental support for the free world effort in Vietnam.

It then lists France, Ireland, Israel, Pakistan, Norway, and Switzerland in that category, seeking once more to leave the impression that all those not singled out are stanch supporters of U.S. policy. I wonder if the Government of Japan, one of the nations in the remaining 30, welcomes this characterization of its position or if, indeed, very many of the nations listed—except for those whose military forces are involved—would feel comfortable with a pro-U.S. label.

The correspondence which the chairman inserted in the RECORD reveals that the total value of the aid provided to South Vietnam by these 36 countries over the last 2½ years totals less than $26 million. This grand sum is about one-fiftieth the total for the U.S. economic aid for that period—and only about one twenty-fifth the aid we are providing this year. I also point out that 20 of the 36 countries listed have given only humanitarian relief aid for refugees and flood victims.

If one checks the misrepresentations of the U.S. Department of State, he will find that if a country gives an ambulance or sends over drugs or provides any medical aid, that country is on the list. That is why I want to stress the point I just made, that 20 of these countries have done just that—they have provided so-called humanitarian relief, carrying out the obligations that we all owe to the suffering when we are in a position to be of assistance to them. Sending over an ambulance, sending over drugs, sending over food does not mean that the people of a country that follows that course of action approve of the U.S. outlawry in Southeast Asia. It is unfortunate that our State Department would engage in that kind of propaganda and deception.

This attempt at deception reveals why the people of this country are confused and frustrated about what is happening in Vietnam. The facts about this war are complex and difficult enough standing alone without the Department of State adding to the confusion by promoting such propaganda as this pamphlet. Over the years the people have been fed a steady diet of misinformation about this war. It comes from the State Department, it comes from the Pentagon Building, and too frequently it comes from the White House. It is no wonder that the consequence is a growing distrust of Government officials by our citizens.

The "credibility gap" is a misnomer; the situation is really more comparable to a Grand Canyon filled with distortions. This propaganda pamphlet—like the numbers games played by the executive branch on infiltration rates, civilian casualties, pacification progress, and so on—is an insult to the intelligence of the people. And I think the public is becoming more aware with each passing day that they are being taken for suckers by the administration's handout writers.

In spite of the impression this propaganda piece seeks to leave, the United States has been—and still is—on essentially a unilateral course in Vietnam, a course leading us steadily toward a major land war in Asia. It is well past time for the executive branch to face up to the reality that the people deserve and demand the truth about the war.

I ask unanimous consent that certain exhibits related to this propaganda piece be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 15, 1967.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of May 3 concerning other nations' assistance to Viet-Nam.

In response to your request for the dollar value of aid provided by the *thirty-six* countries listed in the Department's *Information Note* on Free World Assistance to Viet-Nam, I enclose a table of the estimated value of commodity assistance and relief supplies from these countries. It is based on information from our Mission in Saigon which shows the value of this aid for the period of June 1964 through December 1966. Of the total value of nearly 27 million dollars, approximately 17 million dollars were contributed in 1966. We have not attempted to assign a valuation to these nations' contribution to the cost of supporting about 500 non-U.S. civilians and 56,000 non-U.S. military free world personnel serving in Viet-Nam or to the cost of some 3,000 scholarships granted by foreign governments to Vietnamese for study or training abroad during this period.

With respect to your question about the flood relief assistance provided by Ireland, Israel, Pakistan and Norway, we list this aid as well as that of France and Switzerland in a separate category from the Free World Assistance Program. As is explicitly noted in the *Information Note* we do not construe this aid as representing political support by the governments concerned for the free world effort in Viet-Nam. Neither do we believe that one would be justified in construing this humanitarian assistance as representing any criticism of the policy of the United States in Viet-Nam.

If I can be of any further assistance on this or any other matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Summary of material free world assistance to Vietnam, June 1964 through December 1966

[Value in thousands of U.S. dollars]

Contributor nation	Commodity aid [1]	Relief aid [2]	Total
Free world assistance program:			
Argentina	290		290
Australia	5,779	225	6,004
Belgium		12	12
Brazil	70	13	83
Canada	1,908	15	1,923
China	744	31	775
Denmark		26	26
Ecuador		2	2
Germany	11,010	875	11,885
Greece		15	15
Guatemala		8	8
Honduras		10	10
Iran	200		200
Italy	250		250
Japan	2,050	200	2,250
Korea			
Laos		6	6
Liberia		50	50
Luxembourg		20	20
Malaysia		10	10
Netherlands	700	3	703
New Zealand	639	56	695
Philippines		11	11
Spain		2	2
Thailand		94	94
Tunisia			
Turkey		2	2
United Kingdom	387	227	614
Uruguay		22	22
Venezuela	100		100
Subtotal	24,127	1,935	26,062
Other assistance:			
France	536	30	566
Ireland		3	3
Israel		5	5
Norway		4	4
Pakistan		5	5
Switzerland		10	10
Subtotal	536	57	593
Grand total	24,663	1,992	26,655

[1] Equipment, supplies, and commodities for all projects and programs other than those dealing with relief program. Medical supplies provided to support free world medical teams are included in this category.

[2] Primarily flood and refugee relief assistance in the form of supplies such as medicines, blankets, foodstuffs, and shelters.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has been brought to my attention that a recent *Information Note* issued by the Office of Media Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, lists, on page one, 36 "other nations giving aid to South Viet-Nam . . ."

I would be interested in the dollar value of "aid to South Viet-Nam" being given by each of these nations. I note, for example, Turkey's contribution is further described on page four as "medicines and the offer of a substantial quantity of cement" and that Denmark "has provided medical supplies and has offered to train Vietnamese nurses in Denmark." I also note on page six that "Ireland, Israel, Pakistan and Norway contributed money, clothing, and pharmaceutical supplies to the victims of the floods of 1965." Does humanitarian assistance to flood victims constitute an expression of support for our efforts in Southeast Asia or an implied criticism of our actions there?

Sincerely yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

[From Vietnam Information Notes, Office of Media Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State, No. 4, April 1967]

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE FOR SOUTH VIETNAM

(NOTE.—This is the fourth in a series of short papers which provide data on various aspects of the struggle in Viet-Nam. The following previously released Viet-Nam Information Notes may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, at 5¢ each (with a 25 percent discount for quantities of 100 or more of the same Note sent to one address): *Basic Data on South Viet-Nam* (Dept. of State pub. no. 8195); *The Search for Peace in Viet-Nam* (Dept. of State pub. no. 8196); *Communist-Directed Forces in South Viet-Nam* (Dept. of State pub. no. 8197). Several other Notes will be made available to the public in the near future.)

"A large majority of the governments of the free world are sympathetic to our efforts in Southeast Asia and would be alarmed were they to fail," Secretary Rusk has stated. The free nations of Asia are deeply concerned about the security of the area and have been in the forefront of those nations contributing military assistance. In addition, many countries of Europe and the Western Hemisphere, and several countries of Africa and the Middle East, are providing to the Republic of Viet-Nam substantial economic, technical, and humanitarian assistance.

This paper documents the impressive scope of the genuinely international aid program for the Republic of Viet-Nam. Aid from the United States will be described in another paper of this series, and is not included here.

Some 52,000 troops from 5 Asian nations (Australia, New Zealand, Korea, Thailand, and the Philippines) are now in Viet-Nam fighting alongside the Vietnamese and U.S. Armed Forces, and more are expected in 1967. More than 30 nations are participating in the free world aid program. Of these, 13 (Australia, Canada, Republic of China, Germany, Iran, Italy, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, the Philippines, and the United Kingdom) have sent some 500 civilians—doctors, nurses, teachers, agricultural advisers, engineers, and other technical personnel—to work in the cities and rural areas of Viet-Nam to help bring a better life to the people.

For example, 23 medical and surgical teams from a dozen nations, not including the United States, are providing medical care—largely in provincial hospitals. These and many other countries have provided substantial material help, including medical supplies, textbooks, construction materials and equipment, refugee relief supplies, and foodstuffs. They have also provided generous scholarship aid to Vietnamese students so that they may obtain vitally needed training which will enable them to participate more effectively in building a free and prosperous country.

The other nations giving aid to South Viet-Nam are:

Asia-Pacific: Australia, Japan, Korea, Laos, Malaysia, New Zealand, Philippines, Rep. of China, Thailand.

Middle East: Greece, Iran, Israel, Pakistan, Turkey.

Europe: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Switzerland, U.K.

Western Hemisphere: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Africa: Liberia, Tunisia.

MILITARY AID

Understandably, the nations closest to the threat of Communist expansion are making the most substantial contributions in military assistance after that of the United States. Korea has contributed two divisions. Four of the Asia-Pacific SEATO members (Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, and Thailand) have military forces in South Viet-Nam as well as military advisers, technicians, and supplies. Other Asian countries are contributing their expertise in counterinsurgency operations or psychological warfare by training Vietnamese in these special skills.

The following list indicates the extent of the military assistance being contributed by Asia-Pacific nations:

Australia

4,500 combat troops currently in Viet-Nam, being increased to 6,300 with the addition early in 1967 of army, navy, and air force units.

100 combat advisers (primarily specialists in jungle warfare).

73-man air force unit with 6 Australian Caribou planes flying daily logistical transport missions in support of Vietnamese military forces.

Korea

45,000 troops, including 2 combat divisions, a 130-man Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (MASH), 10 military instructors in Korean karate for training Vietnamese military in hand-to-hand combat, and a 2,200-man Task Force Unit.

Malaysia

2,000 Vietnamese military and police officers have been trained by Malaysia since 1962. Groups of 30–60 are sent regularly for a month's training in counterinsurgency with the Malaysian Police Special Constabulary. Substantial amounts of counterinsurgency materials, primarily military and police transport such as armored vehicles, have also been provided.

New Zealand

125-man artillery battery of 6 howitzers.

25-man army engineer detachment.

A 210-man infantry company and supporting elements will join these forces in 1967.

Philippines

2,000-man military engineering unit with security support personnel, a station hospital, and rural health and civic action teams.

Thailand

1,000-man independent force will be sent this year.

200-man Thai naval group manning an LST and PGM patrol craft.

35-man air force contingent has been flying operational transport missions for the Vietnamese forces.

Jet training for Vietnamese pilots in Thailand.

ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Asian and Pacific nations

The free Asian and Pacific nations have been particularly generous in their nonmilitary aid to Viet-Nam.

Australia has contributed nearly $10 million. This includes:

3 surgical teams totaling 37 medical personnel in 3 provincial hospitals. These teams, in addition to performing major operations, have established a blood bank and are providing training for nurses.

A group of civil engineers working on water supply and road construction projects.

3 experts in dairy and crop practices and radio techniques.

Training of 130 Vietnamese (including nurses and pilots) in Australia at universities and technical institutions.

In goods and materials—1,125,000 textbooks in Vietnamese for rural schools; 3,300 tons of corrugated roofing for Vietnamese military dependents' housing; 6 large community windmills; 15,750 sets of hand tools; 400 radio sets and 2,400 loud speakers; 16,000 blankets; 14,000 cases of condensed milk; a 55-kilowatt broadcasting station at Ban Me Thuot.

The Republic of China has provided a variety of nonmilitary aid, including:

An 80-man agricultural team.

A 12-man electrical power mission.

A 10-man surgical team.

Training in Taiwan for more than 200 Vietnamese in the fields of agriculture, industry, education, public health and sanitation, transportation, and public administration.

In goods and services—26 aluminum prefabricated warehouses, agricultural tools, seeds and fertilizers, 500,000 copies of mathematics textbooks, and an electrical power substation.

Japan has contributed more than $55 million in economic assistance, chiefly through reparations. This includes technical personnel and funds for the construction of a large power dam across the Da Nhim River and an electrical transmission line. Japan has also sent:

2 medical teams and considerable quantities of medical goods (4,544 cases).

20,000 transistor radios.

25 ambulances.

Japan has also agreed to participate in the construction of a bridge over the Mekong River near Vinh Long.

Korea has 7 civilian medical teams totaling 118 doctors, nurses, and support personnel working in provincial health programs. In addition, Korean military medical personnel are providing some medical care to the local population in areas where ROK (Republic of Korea) troops are stationed.

New Zealand has sent an 8-man surgical team and, for the University of Saigon, a professor in English language. That Government presently is training 62 Vietnamese in New Zealand; has provided $21,000 for equipment for a technical high school, and approximately $600,000 for a science building at the University of Saigon. A second 16-man medical team is being sent to Binh Dinh province.

The Philippines has had approximately 60 Philippine civic action personnel, including military and civilian medical teams, working in Viet-Nam for several years.

Thailand has provided rice for refugees, cement, and zinc roofing materials. At the Manila Conference (October 1966) Thailand offered South Viet-Nam a $20 million rice credit. The Thai Government has announced recently that it will send a medical unit to Viet-Nam.

Middle East nations

Countries of the Middle East have given medical and material aid as follows:

Greece—$15,000 in medical supplies.

Iran—1,000 tons of petroleum products, plus sending a 20-man medical team to work in a provincial hospital.

Turkey—medicines and the offer of a substantial quantity of cement.

European nations

The countries of Western Europe have given generously in the field of humanitarian assistance, providing medical personnel and supplies, and are expanding their assistance to Vietnamese universities and technical institutions. They have also aided in construction and social projects in Viet-Nam.

Austria has offered medical supplies, blankets, and tents through the Austrian Red Cross.

Belgium has provided medicines and an ambulance, as well as scholarships for 9 Vietnamese to study in Belgium.

Denmark has provided medical supplies and has offered to train Vietnamese nurses in Denmark.

Germany is providing substantial aid. The Federal Republic has on duty in Viet-Nam a 3,000 ton, 145-bed hospital ship, the "Helgoland," staffed with 8 doctors and 30 other medical personnel.

There are 7 Germans, a director and 6 instructors, teaching at the new Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc near Saigon. At Hué University there are 5 Germans: 3 physicians in the Medical School, a professor of music, and a professor of German language. There is a German forestry expert working at the Department of Rural Affairs, Saigon. Germany also is training 40 Vietnamese, primarily as future instructors in the technical high school, and has agreed to accept 30 more.

In goods and materials, the Federal Republic has provided credits as follows:

(1) $3.75 million for import of German products, such as machine tools, fertilizers, etc. The piastre funds generated through sales of these products to Vietnamese importers are made available to the National Office of Agricultural Credit to aid farmers, particularly with loans.

(2) $12.5 million for development of the major industrial complex at An Hoan-Nong Son.

(3) $5 million for construction of a slaughterhouse at Saigon-Cholon, and 3 coastal vessels.

(4) $125,000 for equipment at the Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc.

In April 1966, Germany announced a gift of $4.4 million of pharmaceuticals, the first shipments of which have arrived. The Federal Republic has also provided 2 mobile dental clinics and 30 ambulances for the Vietnamese Ministry of Health.

New aid for Viet-Nam was voted by the German Cabinet on June 29, 1966, including:

(1) provision of 25 experts to establish a refugee center;

(2) construction of a home for wayward youths;

(3) expansion of 8 existing social centers and construction of a 9th;

(4) establishment of a training center for social workers; and

(5) the gift of 100 buses and a maintenance and repair facility in Saigon.

Italy has provided a 10-man surgical team and has offered science scholarships to 10 Vietnamese to study in Italy.

Luxembourg has given plasma and blood transfusion equipment.

The Netherlands has undertaken to build 5 tuberculosis centers in Saigon, and sites for 3 have already been selected. In August 1966 the Netherlands announced a contribution of $355,000 for a 4-year U.N. project in social welfare, part of the $1 million they have earmarked for U.N. projects in Viet-Nam.

In 1964 the Netherlands Government gave antibiotics, and 4 scholarships for Vietnamese doctors to study in the Netherlands. They previously provided a dredge for canal clearing in the Mekong delta area.

Spain has provided 800 pounds of medicines, medical equipment, and blankets and has sent a 12-man medical team to South Viet-Nam.

The United Kingdom has provided 6 civilians for a British Advisory Mission in Saigon and a Professor of English at Hué University. In the United Kingdom 21 Vietnamese are receiving training under Colombo Plan and British Council auspices. A pediatric team of 4 British doctors and 6 nurses went to Viet-Nam in August 1966.

In goods and materials, the British provided: laboratory equipment for Saigon University; a typesetting machine for the Government Printing Office; a cobalt deep-ray therapy unit for the National Cancer Institute; various equipment for the Faculties of Medicine, Science, and Pharmacy at Saigon University the Meteorological Service and the Agricultural School at Saigon, the Atomic Research Establishment at Dalat, and the Faculty of Education at Hué.

In 1965–66 British economic aid included $226,800 for roadbuilding equipment, diesel fishing-boat engines, and portable anaesthetic machines.

Western Hemisphere

Western Hemisphere countries have also made contributions to South Viet-Nam in the categories of humanitarian aid and training of personnel.

Canada has provided almost $6 million in assistance. A Canadian supervisor at Quang Ngai is directing the construction of a small tuberculosis clinic which the Canadians are funding and staffing with 2 doctors and 4 nurses. Canada has provided a professor of orthopedics for Cho Ray Hospital, Saigon, and a teacher for the University of Hué.

Canada is currently training 231 Colombo

Plan trainees in Canada. Altogether, it has trained 380 Colombo Plan trainees and 463 trainees under all programs, including those sponsored by other agencies and third countries.

Since 1958, Canada has provided $850,000 worth of food aid for Viet-Nam. Funds generated by sales are used for capital construction projects in Viet-Nam, such as the new $333,000 science building for the medical faculty at Hue University.

In addition, Canada has agreed to construct an auditorium for the Faculty of Sciences at Hué University which will cost approximately $215,000.

This fiscal year Canada has allocated $1 million for medical assistance, including provision for ten 200-bed emergency hospital units. Canada has given Viet-Nam more than 500,000 doses of polio vaccine for Vietnamese school children and another 150,000 doses are being prepared for shipment.

Argentina sent 5,000 tons of wheat flour; *Brazil*, a substantial quantity of medical supplies and coffee; *Ecuador*, medical supplies; *Guatemala*, 15,000 doses of typhoid-paratyphoid serum; *Honduras*, drugs and dry goods for refugees sent via the Honduran Air Force; *Uruguay*, refugee relief supplies and medicines; and *Venezuela*, 500 tons of rice and 2 civilian doctors.

Africa

Two countries of Africa have been contributors to the Republic of Viet-Nam:

Liberia, which gave $50,000 for the purchases of hospital equipment and other medical supplies; and

Tunisia, which has recently made available a number of scholarships for Vietnamese.

Other nonmilitary aid

In addition to the support of the 30 countries listed above, there are a number of other nations aiding Viet-Nam whose assistance should not necessarily be construed as representing governmental support for the free world effort in Viet-Nam:

France since 1956 has contributed approximately $111 million in assistance. There are nearly 500 French civilians serving in South Viet-Nam. Among them are 65 experts under France's program of economic and technical assistance, including 32 physicians, professors, and other medical personnel.

Under its cultural programs, 471 professors (350 French and 121 Vietnamese) are teaching at 9 French institutions, and 30 French professors are at Vietnamese institutions. In 1965 France provided 55 fellowships for technical training and 55 academic fellowships for Vietnamese to study in France.

Low-interest credits of $20 million for financing imports of French equipment for Vietnamese industry, and a grant of $100,000 for equipment for L'Ecole Nationale d'Ingenieurs des Arts Industriels have been provided by the French Government.

In 1960 France extended a low-interest credit of $14 million to aid construction of the major coal and chemical complex at An Hoa-Nong San, south of Da Nang, which is now well under way. It also made available a low-interest 5-year credit of $12 million for construction of Viet-Nam's largest cement-producing complex, with plants at Ha Tien and Thu Duc. In 1964 France provided an $186,000 grant for the installation of a training center for electrical technicians, and in 1965 a gift of $250,000 for teaching equipment, primarily in the medical field.

Ireland, Israel, Pakistan, and Norway contributed money, clothing, and pharmaceutical supplies to the victims of the floods of 1965.

Switzerland has provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. The Swiss Red Cross has sent an 11-man medical team to work in a provincial hospital in South Viet-Nam's central highlands.

United Nations aid

Under the U.N. Development Program (UNDP) at least 37 technical assistance programs are being implemented in South Viet-Nam this year and more are being planned for 1967–68. These programs range from maternal and child health, soil survey, and labor administration, to educational planning, telecommunications, and postal services.

Several major projects financed by the Special Fund of the UNDP are about to get under way. A National Technical Center (total international contribution approximately $1.5 million), with UNESCO as the executing agency, has been approved by the Governing Council of the UNDP and is now becoming operational. Near agreement has been reached on a Fisheries Institute, and on a Social Welfare Training Center. The Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) is also pressing ahead with projects of benefit to all the nations in the Lower Mekong Basin, and has undertaken surveys of irrigation, hydroelectric facilities, and bridge construction projects in Viet-Nam.

Private voluntary aid

Voluntary aid from private nonprofit organizations in third countries has come from the United Kingdom, Switzerland, Canada, and New Zealand. Voluntary priviate aid from the United States, which is substantial, is discussed in another paper in this series.

The following organizations in third countries have contributed:

The Save the Children Fund of Great Britain, which is helping refugee families; the Terre des Hommes of Switzerland which is dedicated to aiding Vietnamese children, particularly those injured by the war; the Quebec Medical Aid Association which solicits contributions to be used for shipment of medical supplies; and the New Zealand National Council of Churches, which has sent a 6-man team to assist in refugee problems.

RECENT DEPARTMENT OF STATE PUBLICATIONS CONCERNING VIETNAM

Copies of the following Department of State publications concerning Vietnam may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. The Government Printing Office gives a 25 percent discount on orders for 100 or more copies of any one publication mailed to the same address. Remittances, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, must accompany orders.

Title of publication	Publication No.	List price
Viet-Nam in Brief	8173	$0.15
The Promise of the New Asia: United States Policy in the Far East as Stated by President Johnson on His Pacific Journey	8166	1.00
The Other War in Viet-Nam: A Progress Report	8151	.20
The Essentials for Peace in Asia	8113	.15
The Legality of U.S. Participation in the Defense of Viet-Nam	8062	.15
The Heart of the Problem: Secretary Rusk, General Taylor Review Viet-Nam Policy in Senate Hearings	8054	.20
The Pledge of Honolulu	8051	.15
Viet-Nam: The 38th Day	8050	.15
Viet-Nam: The Struggle To Be Free	8048	.15
The Issue in Viet-Nam	8043	.15
Quiet Warriors: Supporting Social Revolution in Viet-Nam	8041	.40
Viet-Nam Today	8039	.15
Geographic Aspects of the Struggle in Viet-Nam	7976	.10
We Will Stand in Viet-Nam	7937	.15
Viet-Nam: Four Steps to Peace	7919	.15
South Viet-Nam: Reality and Myth	7912	.05
Viet-Nam: The Third Face of the War	7897	.15
A Pattern for Peace in Southeast Asia	7872	.10
Aggression From the North: The Record of North Viet-Nam's Campaign to Conquer South Viet-Nam	7839	.40
Our Policy in Southeast Asia: A Perspective	7832	.05
U.S. Policy in Viet-Nam	7691	.05
A Threat to the Peace: North Viet-Nam's Efforts to Conquer South Viet-Nam (pt. II)	7308	.55

VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that during the past week American casualties in Vietnam totaled 2,650. This figure establishes a record for the number of casualties which our country has suffered during the time we have been in Vietnam.

Mr. President, the Roanoke World-News, in an editorial on Tuesday, May 23, 1967, discussing the administration role in Vietnam, stated in part as follows:

> There is growing sentiment in Congress favoring White House pressure on the United Nations to take a hand—if not in support of the American position, then in seeking to bring about a peaceful settlement.
>
> Up to now the U.N. has dodged the issue while directing all its energies to stupid and futile efforts to bring Rhodesia to its knees and compel South Africa to yield a mandate received from the League of Nations 47 years ago.
>
> True, the threat of a new war in Palestine between Arabs and Jews suddenly has taken the spotlight and forced *Sec. Gen. U Thant* into desperate maneuvers, but Vietnam remains a prime consideration. If the U.N. continues to shirk its responsibility in Asia its days of possible effectiveness are numbered.

Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], on several occasions has called upon the United Nations to assume its obligation in Southeast Asia. I might add that on a number of occasions I, too, have pointed out that the United Nations, designed to keep the peace, has taken no action whatsoever in regard to the war which is now raging in Vietnam.

The casualty figures of the past week, which became available today, dramatize again that the United States is deeply involved in a major war in Vietnam; and yet, our Nation is getting very little help from other nations throughout the world, and is getting no help from the United Nations.

During the past 2 years the number of Americans sent to Vietnam has increased from 29,000, who were there in April 1965, to 442,000 who are fighting in Vietnam in May of 1967.

I cannot help but believe that it is a very tragic situation when our Nation is unable to obtain effective help from a world organization which has as its purpose for being in existence to preserve peace and to seek to stop aggression.

As I have done in the past, and as the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has done on many occasions, I call upon the administration, upon the executive branch of our Government, to take formal, definite steps to get help for the American military people from the United Nations. I cite again the casualties which the United States suffered last week in Vietnam: a total of 2,650 American casualties in Vietnam for 1 week, the highest total of casualties during the entire time that this war has been in progress.

I believe one of the great failures of the administration insofar as the war with Vietnam is concerned is that it has been unable to obtain effective help either from other Asian nations or from those nations with which this country has mutual defense agreements, totaling 44 nations, or from the United Nations itself.

I hope that not too many days will go by before the administration will seek formal help from the United Nations in the struggle in which the United States finds itself involved in Vietnam.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before suggesting the absence of a quorum, I want to advise the Senators present that the other body has just adopted the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill. The bill should be here for action shortly, so that interested Senators are being advised in advance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the meantime could we not proceed to the conference report on the income tax credit and dispose of that?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Delaware, I must say that we cannot proceed to the consideration of that conference report. It is my understanding that the majority whip has asked that it be laid aside, to be brought up on Wednesday next. He is not here. I certainly would not want to enter into any agreement without his acquiescence. Thus, I would just have to say to the Senator from Delaware, in answer to his question, that we cannot take it up.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought we were going to dispose of it today, and I am sure other Senators thought so, too. I wonder whether there is any special reason for carrying it over until next week?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator from Delaware will have to make that inquiry of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as much of a reply as I can make to the Senator from Delaware is that I heard colloquy on the floor between the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], indicating that there would be a rather long debate, calls for quorums, and various other actions. I think that the Senator from Louisiana has decided that the course he adopted was the only possible course under the existing situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before the distinguished majority leader left, I had a conference with him in the Marble Room and I got the clear impression that before we adjourned for the Memorial Day holiday, we would dispose of the conference report on the investment tax credit. I thought that was the clear impression I got. I remained here, scarcely moving away from the Chamber at any time, believing, of course, that we would dispose of it before we took up further business. I got the impression also that this was done in the utmost of good faith, that no one would ask for a record vote, perchance that there should be a quorum present.

I would be the last to inflict that embarrassment upon the Senate, or any of its leaders.

A conference report is, of course, of the highest privilege and can be called up by any Member of the Senate; but that would be usurping the function and the prerogative of the leadership. I will be the last to set that kind of awkward precedent. Thus, having just conferred with the acting majority leader, or the deputy majority leader, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and also with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], it is quite certain now, from the discussion we have had, that the conference report is not going to be called up until some time next Wednesday.

Now we will be moving into the month of June. We have a great deal before us. We have the debt ceiling to deal with. Here is the campaign financing matter, and here is the matter of the Senator from Connecticut which is set for the 13th of June. The Senate is going to find itself in a very embarrassing situation. That is the tragedy of not disposing of this matter now, so we can proceed with other business. But I shall not press the privilege. I shall not insist that it be called up. If we can do no more than complete action on the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill, that will have to be it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to ask a question. The conference report has been approved by the House of Representatives. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. All of the conferees agreed to the report?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was a unanimous report by the conferees.

Mr. CURTIS. By all the individual conferees?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. I express the hope that the report could be disposed of and the bill sent to the President. After all, it is a matter of keeping faith with the taxpaying public. It has been pending a long time. I favor the reinstitution of the tax credit. I think it should be done. I think it is a matter of absolute necessity to the confidence of the taxpaying public. I would hope we would get a chance to pass on it so the bill could be sent to the President.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] had that hope when he called up the conference report; and I am sure the procedures which took place on the floor, which I cannot quote, because I did not hear all of them, were as much of a surprise to him as to other Senators. I am sure he took the only course he could in withdrawing the conference report he had called up. He felt, under the conditions, that he was forced to recall it at that time, and he gave notice that he hoped to dispose of it as the first item of business when the Senate convened Wednesday morning.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] now makes it abundantly clear there will be no action on that conference report on investment tax credit until Wednesday.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I recognize the fact that a conference report is a privileged matter and can be brought up at the request of any Member of the Senate. The majority leader is not here. The majority whip is not here. The majority whip is the chairman of the committee and would be the floor manager of the conference report. I am not at liberty to permit this matter to come to the floor, if I can possibly keep it from coming to the floor, until next Wednesday. I appreciate the assurance on the part of the distinguished minority leader that he will not press the matter. I would have to do everything I could to oppose it, because I am honored to protect the rights of the majority leader and the majority whip.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator that I will not press it; and, speaking for myself, there will not be any effort to have a live quorum that would embarrass the Senate at this good hour when we are getting ready for the Memorial Day weekend.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished minority leader, because, insofar as the supplemental appropriation bill and the conference report on it are concerned, the bill embraces a very large sum for payment to the States under the welfare system. Many States have exhausted their appropriations. I am sure Senators on both sides of the aisle would want to join in making sure that that report was agreed to, when it came up, without unnecessary delay.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the minority leader know when the hearings on the debt ceiling will take place?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I urged the chairman of the committee to give top priority to hearings on the debt ceiling in order that the committee could act promptly and have the bill reported to the Senate at least prior to taking up the question of the Senator from Connecticut.

I think it should be done, because this is a bill which has a time limit and must be acted on by June 30. Otherwise the debt limit goes back to $285 billion, which would invalidate about $50 billion worth of bonds.

We hear rumors—I hope they are in error—to the effect that the chairman of the committee is going to schedule the campaign financing proposals ahead of the debt ceiling and try to dispose of that bill first, letting the debt ceiling bill go until after disposition has been made of the Dodd matter. I hope this rumor is not accurate. I am in favor of the committee acting in the area of campaign funds, but we must give top priority to the question of the debt ceiling. There is no need for these last minute emergency actions. But, again, I could get no assurance from the chairman of the committee as to what his plans will be.

CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, one international situation is paramount in the minds of many of us today. Crises in the Middle East are familiar to us all. We have faced them before. We know what our obligations are, and where we stand.

I should like, first of all, to commend President Johnson for his handling of the situation so far. Very rapidly in the last few days, events reached the point where the United States could no longer remain silent.

At this crucial point, the President broke the official silence with a wise and realistic statement. His words brought reassurance to all of us who are deeply concerned over peace in the Middle East.

Yesterday, many Senators made public their views on the problem. I believe it is the responsibility of the Senate to make itself heard at times like this, and I was pleased to find myself substantially in agreement with much that was said here yesterday.

At the risk of repeating some of what has already been said by my esteemed colleagues, I should like to state, in skeleton form, my position on the Middle East crisis.

It seems to me that our involvement in this particular situation centers about four elementary points.

First, we have a tremendous commitment, both moral and political, to maintain stability in the Middle East. We share this commitment with France and Great Britain, and, needless to say, it involves the unwavering support of the integrity and independence of Israel.

In 1950, we pledged, together with France and England, to preserve the frontiers of Israel and the adjacent Arab countries, and to oppose armed aggression designed to alter those frontiers. Thus, we are committed to opposing an Israel attack on an Arab country as well as an Arab attack on Israel. This is only fair.

Israel was born a free and independent nation 19 years ago with the full support of the United States. We have observed with pride the development of this country against tremendous obstacles during these 19 years. Israel is our strong ally, but she resides in a very troubled neighborhood.

The events of the last week prove that the Middle East is as much a tinderbox as it was in 1956 and 1948. Stability in this region has always been temporary and precarious. This is my second point.

Our policy in the Middle East must account for the flexibility of the political situation in the region, and must, above all, be tempered to superimpose calm on a most troubled, heated surface, for our commitment is not a vague pledge that might be called on someday; we know that it is a living promise that can be called on any day. I think recent events make the immediacy of our position quite clear.

My third point is that this particular crisis has been given an added dimension by the action of the United Arab Republic in closing the Gulf of Aqaba to Israel shipping, thereby denying Israel access to the Red Sea, her southern outlet.

As President Johnson has said, this action clearly violates the international character of the Gulf of Aqaba. In the absence of the withdrawal of the blockade, it clearly calls for action from the rest of the world.

The Gulf of Aqaba must be kept open to all shipping, either through international agreement or international action. It cannot remain closed to the ships of Israel.

In 1957, Secretary of State Dulles said:

> The United States believes that the gulf comprehends international waters and that no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage in the gulf and through the straits giving access thereto.

This is a tenable position, consistent with principles of freedom of the seas, and, together with the rest of the world, we should uphold it.

Last, we come to the question of how we should uphold our commitment. It seems to me beyond question that the burden to act rests first and foremost with the United Nations.

I would echo President Johnson's dismay "at the hurried withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force from Gaza and Sinai after more than 10 years of steadfast and effective service in keeping the peace."

I think that, first, President Nasser's request for withdrawal fell far short of insistence, and second, that either the General Assembly or the Security Council should have been consulted.

Now that the troops have been removed, the ability of the United Nations to act effectively in this crisis has diminished, and the stability of the Israel Egyptian border has become all the more imperiled.

Still, the United Nations must act. Paralysis at this time would completely destroy the faith of the world in the effectiveness of the United Nations as a peacekeeping body.

Also, in a very real sense, Israel is the child of the United Nations. It was, after all, by a vote of the U.N. General Assembly that the eastern border of Israel was drawn in 1947.

Now, what must the United Nations do? The first thing is to dismantle the blockade. We and the British should place our naval power in the Mediterranean at the disposal of the United Nations for this purpose. Already, of course, our Mediterranean fleet stands ready.

It is absolutely clear that a settlement of the current crisis cannot begin in any meaningful way until Israel ships are permitted the free use of the Gulf of Aqaba. The first step toward dismantlement must be taken by the United Nations acting with the full cooperation of the United States and Britain.

I think we are certainly in harmony with the British on this point. Furthermore, newspaper reports this morning would indicate real possibilities for a diplomatic settlement without firing a shot. I hope it can be done, but I believe the United Nations will suffer greatly if a settlement is not reached primarily in her name.

Second, the removal of the U.N. forces from Egypt serves as a reminder of how much they are needed in the Middle East, not only on the Israel-Egyptian border, but also on the Israel-Syrian border.

I believe that the United Nations should negotiate to restore her troops to Egypt, and to install them in Syria and Israel as well. It is clear that they are needed in all three countries.

It will not be easy to accomplish this objective. For one reason, of course, Israel has not permitted peacekeeping troops on her side of the border since 1956. Be that as it may, they are needed, and the United Nations should negotiate to place them there.

The point is that every effort must be made to prevent small border raids from taking place in the first instance; but if they do take place, to prevent them from mushrooming into full-scale diplomatic crises.

Mr. President, a few days ago, the New York Times printed a short article that gives a very clear statement of our joint pledge to maintain stability in the Middle East. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 22, 1967]

U.S. PLEDGE ON ISRAEL-ARAB BORDERS DATES TO '50

WASHINGTON, May 21.—The United States has a commitment dating from 1950, when Harry S. Truman was President, to preserve the frontiers of Israel and the adjacent Arab countries.

The commitment has not been emphasized by Administration officials during the current period of acute tension in the Middle East. But, in the absence of any statement to the contrary, it stands.

The underlying United States policy has been restated, in varying degrees of precision, by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson. The commitment to oppose armed aggression applies to an Israeli attack on any Arab country as well as to an Arab attack on Israel.

The most formal statement of the commitment was in a declaration by Britain, France and the United States May 25, 1950.

OPPOSE "USE OF FORCE"

The statement said:

"The three governments take this opportunity of declaring their deep interest in and their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the area and their unalterable opposition to the use of force or threat of force between any of the states in that area.

"The three governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation."

Subsequently, on June 1, 1953, after the Republicans had assumed power, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles recalled the declaration in a radio address and said, "The present U.S. Administration stands fully behind that declaration."

He had preceded this remark by saying, "that declaration when made, did not reassure the Arabs."

ECHOED BY EISENHOWER

In his State of the Union Message to Congress on Jan. 5, 1957, President Eisenhower said: "We have shown, so that none can doubt, our dedication to the principle that force shall not be used internationally for any aggressive purposes and that the integrity and independence of the nations of the Middle East should be inviolate."

Speaking of the Middle East in a press conference on May 8, 1963, President Kennedy said:

"In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations, adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or to put a stop to such aggression; which, of course, has been the policy which the United States has followed for some time."

President Johnson has twice reiterated the basic pledge. On June 2, 1964, a joint communiqué with Israel's Premier, Levi Eshkol, stated:

"He [Mr. Johnson] reiterated to Prime Minister Eshkol U.S. support for the territorial integrity and political independence for all countries in the Near East and emphasized the firm opposition of the U.S. to aggression and the use of force or the threat of force against any country."

KENNEDY STAND RECALLED

More than two years later, on Aug. 2, 1966, when President Zalman Shazar of Israel visited Washington, President Johnson said:

"As our beloved, great late President, John F. Kennedy, said on May 8, 1963, as a declaration of the leader of this country and as a spokesman for this land: 'We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors. We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East.' We subscribe to that policy."

In addition, the United States has a special commitment to free access to Israel's southern port of Elath, on the Gulf of Aqaba. On Feb. 1, 1957, Secretary of State Dulles said in an aide memoire to Israel's Foreign Minister, Abba Eban:

"With respect to the Gulf of Aqaba and access thereto, the United States believes that the gulf comprehends international waters and that no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage in the gulf and through the straits giving access thereto. We have in mind not only commercial usage, but the passage of pilgrims on religious missions, which should be fully respected.

"In the absence of some overriding decision to the contrary, as by the International Court of Justice, the United States, on behalf of vessels of United States registry, is prepared to exercise the right of free and innocent passage and to join with others to secure general recognition of this right."

U.S. DECLARATION URGED

Two American Jewish groups urged yesterday that the United States reaffirm its commitment to Israel.

The American Jewish Committee, ending its 61st annual meeting at the Waldorf-Astoria approved a resolution calling for "the immediate and unequivocal reaffirmation" of what it termed "the fundamental United States commitment to Israel."

The National Governing Council of the American Jewish Congress, meanwhile, urged President Johnson to make an "unequivocal declaration that the United States will not tolerate attempts by Arab states to act out their repeated threats to overwhelm Israel by force of arms."

The council acted at a meeting at the Stephen Wise Congress House, 15 East 84th Street.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 18, 24, 25, 30, 35, 36, 44, and 46 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 20, 47, and 55 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I submit a report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the bill (H.R. 9481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the total for the second supplemental appropriation for 1967 as arrived at in conference yesterday afternoon is $2,197,931,417, which is $59,673,235 under the budget estimates; $156,105,284 over the House version of the bill; and $62,315,516 under the Senate version.

I think I should say that this measure is bigger than the House bill because the Senate considered something over $120 million in supplemental estimates which were not considered by the House, but which reached Congress after the House acted.

Briefly, the principal changes from the Senate version consist of a reduction from $10,000,000 to $3,823,700 for the National Teacher Corps, including a proviso:

> That none of the funds appropriated . . . shall be available until the authorization to pay teachers in fiscal year 1968 is enacted into law.

The Senate version of the bill contained $20,000,000 for impact aid in impacted school districts—Public Law 874; in conference the managers on the part of the Senate receded at the insistence of the managers on the part of the House, but without prejudicing action by the Senate on the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, 1968 which is still pending. For assistance for school construction—Public Law 815—there is included $30,000,000 instead of the $48,831,216 proposed by the Senate.

I am pleased to announce that the conference bill includes the full budget estimate of $75,000,000 for the summer programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In the field of air pollution, on the item of desulfurization of coal, which in the House bill was $3.6 million, and $10.4 million in the Senate bill, a compromise of $4.5 million was arrived at and approved in conference. This item was of particular importance to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

In grants for airport construction for 1968, the House bill had provided $61 million, the Senate bill had provided $71 million, and the compromise amount agreed to in conference was $66 million.

Mr. President, I will be happy to answer any further questions regarding the bill or the conference report for the information of Senators. I wish to add that the Senate conferees were in complete accord.

I am glad to see in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking Republican member on the Committee on Appropriations, who, I am sure, will verify what I have said about the agreement of the Senate conferees.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the conference report was signed by all members, both Democrat and Republican. I feel that the bill adopted by the conference committee was better in practically all respects than the Senate bill. It is $62 million less than the Senate bill, and I feel that it is better because we are considering too many appropriations in supplemental bills rather than in regular appropriation bills. The first supplemental bill for 1967 which I recall the Senate assessed earlier, contained $5,025,264,579; and then we had the Vietnam supplemental for $12,196,520,000, now we have another supplemental for 1967 appropriating $2 billion plus.

There are many items in this bill which start new programs which should have been considered in regular bills rather than in supplemental bills. However, I feel that the conference report is better in every respect except one, and I think the Senator from Florida agrees, and that is with respect to aid for impacted areas for schools. The conferees did not agree to the full amount necessary to finance this important and necessary program. The cut was made without prejudice to any increase being granted in the regular appropriation bill in order to take care of this item.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. I am glad to agree completely with the Senator from North Dakota.

While the Senate conferees agreed to the omission of the $20 million in the Senate bill for operation in the impacted school districts, we would not agree to the elimination of the amount included for school construction because some of that construction was already underway. We insisted on inclusion of $30 million as a compromise amount for construction in these impacted school districts where Federal employees, both of the armed services and otherwise, have been brought in in large numbers and placed in the local schools.

Considering the fact that we are not prejudiced in any way in the action on the pending appropriation bill yet to be passed in both Houses, we have dealt in an adequate way for the present with these programs.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. We shall have at least two more opportunities to include any necessary funds for the impacted area program, either in a regular appropriation bill or a supplemental appropriation bill which may be considered later in the session.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; and before either of those bills, we shall have a chance to consider the authorization bill, which I am sure will not meet with an unfriendly response from the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his helpfulness, as always.

Mr. President, unless there is further comment, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House numbered 1, 20, 47, and 55.

The amendments are as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$25,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

"NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

"For an additional amount for 'National Teacher Corps', $3,823,700: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph for training purposes shall be available until the authorization to pay teachers in fiscal year 1968 is enacted into law."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$235,000" named in said amendment, insert "$200,000", and in lieu of the sum of "$185,000" named in said amendment, insert "$150,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$400,000" named in said amendment, insert "$200,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on Friday, May 19, during the consideration of H.R. 9481, the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1967 the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] asked certain questions concerning the $100 million appropriated for loan to the United Nations. The information was not immediately available, and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr Pastore] indicated that he would supply it for the Record. We have received the data requested, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

May 22, 1967.

Hon. John O. Pastore,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Pastore: On May 19, 1967 during consideration of H.R. 9481, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, Senator Byrd of Virginia raised questions concerning (1) the loan of approximately $76.3 million to the UN from the $100 million appropriated for this purpose, and (2) the status of repayment of that loan to the United States by the UN.

With regard to the loan itself, the United States has purchased six UN bonds totaling $76,263,276, repayable in 25 unequal annual installments at 2% interest annually on the unpaid balance, as follows:

Bond No. 33, Nov. 2, 1962	$44, 103, 000
Bond No. 43, Dec. 21, 1962	15, 569, 840
Bond No. 53, Mar. 27, 1963	5, 543, 000
Bond No. 64, June 25, 1963	6, 854, 082
Bond No. 82, Dec. 31, 1963	3, 423, 975
Bond No. 88, June 19, 1964	769, 379
Total	76, 263, 276

To date there have been five repayments totaling $18,455,601.17, of which $12,765,186.39 constituted principal and $5,690,414.78 interest. Each of the repayments were made on the January 15th anniversary date starting with January 15, 1963. In accordance with the terms and conditions of Public Law 87-731, approved October 2, 1962, the annual repayments were made in the form of a credit against our annual contribution to the United Nations.

If I can be of further service please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Idar Rimestad.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am handling the conference report at the request of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], who was called to his home because of serious illness in his family.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record a tabulation of the bill, reflecting the amounts in the budget estimates for each item, the amounts agreed to in the House, the amounts agreed to in the Senate, and the final conference figure.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

2d supplemental bill for fiscal year 1967 (H.R. 9481)

H. Doc. or S. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	TITLE I				
	CHAPTER I				
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
	AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE				
	Salaries and Expenses				
83	Research	$2, 595, 000	$2, 595, 000	$2, 595, 000	$2, 595, 000
83	Plant and animal disease and pest control	2, 577, 000	2, 077, 000	2, 077, 000	2, 077, 000
	Total, Agricultural Research Service	5, 172, 000	4, 672, 000	4, 672, 000	4, 672, 000
	EXTENSION SERVICE				
83	Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses (by transfer)	*(166, 000)*	*(166, 900)*	*(166, 000)*	*(166, 000)*
	AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE				
83	Cropland adjustment program	12, 500, 000	12, 000, 000	12, 000, 000	12, 000, 000
83	Conservation reserve program	750, 000	700, 000	650, 000	650, 000
	Total, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	13, 250, 000	12, 700, 000	12, 650, 000	12, 650, 000
	Total, ch. I	18, 422, 000	17, 372, 000	17, 322, 000	17, 322, 000

2d supplemental bill for fiscal year 1967 (H.R. 9481)—Continued

H. Doc. or S. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	TITLE I—Continued				
	CHAPTER II				
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY				
	Operation and Maintenance				
83	Operation and maintenance, Army	$93,000,000	$93,000,000	$93,000,000	$93,000,000
83	Operation and maintenance, Navy	67,000,000	67,000,000	67,000,000	67,000,000
83	Operation and maintenance, Air Force	66,000,000	66,000,000	66,000,000	66,000,000
	Total, ch. II	226,000,000	226,000,000	226,000,000	226,000,000
	CHAPTER III				
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
	FEDERAL FUNDS				
83	Federal payment to the District of Columbia, general fund	10,000,000	6,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
83	Loans to District of Columbia for capital outlay, general fund	3,850,000	2,896,000	6,196,000	6,046,000
	Total, Federal funds	13,850,000	8,896,000	14,196,000	14,046,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS				
	Operating Expenses				
83	General operating expenses	*(806,500)*	*(550,500)*	*(550,500)*	*(550,500)*
83	Public safety	*(4,936,400)*	*(4,507,400)*	*(4,507,400)*	*(4,507,400)*
83	Parks and recreation	*(856,200)*	*(561,200)*	*(311,200)*	*(311,200)*
83	Settlement of claims and suits	*(18,600)*	*(18,600)*	*(18,600)*	*(18,600)*
	Total, operating expenses	*(6,617,700)*	*(5,637,700)*	*(5,387,700)*	*(5,387,700)*
83	Capital outlay	*(5,287,000)*	*(3,000,000)*	*(4,750,000)*	*(4,600,000)*
	Total, District of Columbia funds	*(11,904,700)*	*(8,637,700)*	*(10,137,700)*	*(9,987,700)*
	CHAPTER IV				
	FOREIGN ASSISTANCE				
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
	Economic Assistance				
S. 22	Administrative and other expenses (by transfer)	*(840,000)*		*(840,000)*	*(840,000)*
	Total, ch. IV	*(840,000)*		*(840,000)*	*(840,000)*
	CHAPTER V				
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
83, S. 22	Alaska mortgage indemnity grants	2,600,000		2,600,000	2,600,000
83	Disaster relief	10,000,000	8,000,000	9,550,000	9,550,000
	Total, funds appropriated to the President	12,600,000	8,000,000	12,150,000	12,150,000
	CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION				
83	Salaries and expenses	818,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	By transfer from trust funds	*(321,000)*	*(331,000)*	*(331,000)*	*(331,000)*
	Travel limitation	(Language)		(Language)	
83	Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits	4,914,000	4,914,000	4,914,000	4,914,000
	Total, Civil Service Commission	5,732,000	5,414,000	5,414,000	5,414,000
	COMMISSION ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL				
83	Salaries and expenses	125,000	75,000	100,000	100,000
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION				
83	Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	6,522,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
83	General supply fund	48,200,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000
	Total, General Services Administration	54,722,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
	INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION				
S. 27	Payment of loan guaranties	17,400,000		17,400,000	17,400,000
	NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION				
83	Salaries and expenses	(Language)	(Language)	(Language)	(Language)
	SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM				
83	Salaries and expenses	7,309,000	6,500,000	7,309,000	7,000,000
	VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION				
83, 91	Compensation and pensions	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
83	Loan guaranty revolving fund (limitation)	*(26,750,000)*	*(26,750,000)*	*(26,750,000)*	*(26,750,000)*
83	Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	850,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
	Total, Veterans' Administration	100,850,000	100,750,000	100,750,000	100,750,000

2d supplemental bill for fiscal year 1967 (H.R. 9481)—Continued

H. Doc. or S. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	TITLE I—Continued				
	CHAPTER V—Continued				
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT				
	PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAMS				
	Annual contributions:				
83	Fiscal year 1966	$21,597,000	$21,597,000	$21,597,000	$21,597,000
83	Fiscal year 1967	9,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development	30,597,000	26,597,000	26,597,000	26,597,000
	Total, ch. V	229,335,000	197,336,000	219,720,000	219,411,000
	CHAPTER VI				
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
	PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT				
	Bureau of Land Management				
83	Management of lands and resources	7,426,000	7,426,000	7,426,000	7,426,000
	Bureau of Indian Affairs				
83	Resources management	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
	National Park Service				
83	Management and protection	1,550,000	1,550,000	1,550,000	1,550,000
83	Parkway and road construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	4,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
	Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands				
S. 22	Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	5,000,000		1,700,000	1,700,000
	OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH				
83	Salaries and expenses	2,391,000	16,000	16,000	16,000
	Total, Department of the Interior	21,467,000	12,592,000	14,492,000	14,292,000
	RELATED AGENCIES				
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
	Forest Service				
	Forest protection and utilization:				
83	Forest land management	27,557,000	27,557,000	27,557,000	27,557,000
83	Forest research	746,000	746,000	746,000	746,000
83	State and private forestry cooperation	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000
	Total, Forest protection and utilization	28,357,000	28,357,000	28,357,000	28,357,000
	Temporary Study Commissions				
83	National Visitor Center Study Commission	60,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
	Total, related agencies	28,417,000	28,367,000	28,367,000	28,367,000
	Total, ch. VI	49,884,000	40,959,000	42,659,000	42,659,000
	CHAPTER VII				
	DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
	Wage and Labor Standards				
83	Employees' compensation claims and expenses (by transfer)	*(12,196,000)*	*(12,196,000)*	*(12,196,000)*	*(12,196,000)*
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	Food and Drug Administration				
83	Salaries and expenses	1,685,000	1,685,000	1,685,000	1,685,000
	Office of Education				
83	National Teacher Corps	12,500,000		10,000,000	3,823,700
S. 22	Higher education facilities construction	2,679,000		2,122,775	2,122,775
83	Educational improvement for the handicapped	2,500,000	2,475,000	2,475,000	2,475,000
	Payments to school districts			20,000 000	
	Assistance for school construction			48,831,216	30,000,000
	Vocational Rehabilitation Administration				
83	Grants for rehabilitation services and facilities	14,500,000	14,500,000	14,500,000	14,500,000
	Public Health Service				
83	Health manpower education and utilization	750,000	750,000		500,000
83	Health professions education fund	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
83	Nurse training fund	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
83	Air pollution	3,904,000	3,664,000	10,439,000	4,500,000
83	Hospital construction activities	(Language)	(Language)		
83	Mental health research and services	2,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
83	Comprehensive health planning and services	4,500,000	4,250,000	4,250,000	4,250,000
	Social Security Administration				
83	Limitation on salaries and expenses	*(13,976,000)*	*(13,976,000)*	*(13,976,000)*	*(13,976,000)*
83	Payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged	91,103,000	91,103,000	91,103,000	91,103,000
	Welfare Administration				
83	Grants to States for public assistance	470,000,000	470,000,000	470,000,000	470,000,000

2d supplemental bill for fiscal year 1967 (H.R. 9481)—Continued

H. Doc. or S. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	TITLE I—Continued				
	CHAPTER VII—Continued				
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—continued				
	Special institutions				
83	Freedmen's Hospital	$446,000	$446,000	$446,000	$446,000
	Office of the Secretary				
83	Higher education for international understanding	350,000		150,000	
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	618,917,000	602,373,000	689,501,991	638,905,475
	RELATED AGENCIES				
	Railroad Retirement Board				
83	Limitation on salaries and expenses (increase)	*(1,800,000)*	*(1,800,000)*	*(1,800,000)*	*(1,800,000)*
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
	Office of Economic Opportunity				
S. 24	Economic opportunity program	75,000,000		75,000,000	75,000,000
	Total, ch. VII	693,917,000	602,373,000	764,501,991	713,905,475
	CHAPTER VIII				
	LEGISLATIVE				
	SENATE				
	Contingent Expenses of the Senate				
	Miscellaneous items			90,000	90,000
	Stationery (revolving fund)			53,400	53,400
	Total, Senate			143,400	143,400
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES				
	Gratuity to widow of deceased Member		30,000	30,000	30,000
	Contingent Expenses				
	Furniture		1,885,000	1,885,000	1,885,000
83	Telegraph and telephone	1,152,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
83	Stationery (revolving fund)	261,600	261,600	261,600	261,600
83	Attending physician's office	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
	Total, House of Representatives	1,418,600	2,631,600	2,631,600	2,631,600
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL				
	Capitol Buildings and Grounds				
	Capitol buildings		64,000	64,000	64,000
	GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE				
	Superintendent of Documents				
83	Salaries and expenses	200,000	150,000	200,000	175,000
	Total, ch. VIII	1,618,600	2,845,600	3,039,000	3,014,000
	CHAPTER IX				
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE				
	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				
	Family Housing				
83	Homeowners assistance fund, Defense	11,000,000		5,500,000	
	Total, ch. IX	11,000,000		5,500,000	
	CHAPTER X				
	PUBLIC WORKS				
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL				
	Department of the Army—Cemeterial expenses				
83	Salaries and expenses	2,245,000	2,050,000	2,050,000	2,050,000
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
	Bureau of Reclamation				
83	Construction and rehabilitation	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
83	Operation and maintenance	1,500,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000
	Total, Bureau of Reclamation	1,950,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
	Total, ch. X	4,195,000	3,850,000	3,850,000	3,850,000

2d supplemental bill for fiscal year 1967 (H.R. 9481)—Continued

H. Doc. or S. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	TITLE I—Continued				
	CHAPTER XI				
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
	ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS				
83	Salaries and expenses:				
	By appropriation	($1,350,000)			
	By transfer	*(3,000,000)*	*($3,900,000)*	*($3,900,000)*	*($3,900,000)*
	INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES				
S. 22	Contributions to international organizations (by transfer)	*(3,300,000)*		*(3,300,000)*	*(3,300,000)*
	Loans to the United Nations			(Rescission language)	
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
	FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION				
83	Salaries and expenses	6,860,000	6,860,000	6,860,000	6,860,000
	IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE				
83	Salaries and expenses	3,654,000	3,335,000	3,335,000	3,335,000
	FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM				
S. 22	Support of United States prisoners (by transfer)	*(230,000)*		*(230,000)*	*(230,000)*
	Total, Department of Justice	10,514,000	10,195,000	10,195,000	10,195,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
	BUREAU OF THE CENSUS				
83	1968 sample household survey	1,000,000			
	BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION				
83	Salaries and expenses	213,000	163,000	163,000	163,000
	PATENT OFFICE				
83	Salaries and expenses	1,615,000	1,550,000	1,550,000	1,550,000
	NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS				
83	Research and technical services	676,000	576,000	576,000	576,000
	Total, Department of Commerce	3,504,000	2,289,000	2,289,000	2,289,000
	RELATED AGENCIES				
	NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REFORM OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS				
S. 22	Salaries and expenses	235,000		235,000	200,000
	SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD				
83	Salaries and expenses	14,000	9,500	9,500	9,500
	U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY				
83, S. 22	Salaries and expenses	3,620,000	3,420,000	3,420,000	3,420,000
	Total, ch. XI	19,237,000	15,913,500	16,148,500	16,113,500
	CHAPTER XII				
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
	FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION				
15	Grants-in-aid for airports (1968)	71,000,000	61,000,000	71,000,000	66,000,000
	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION				
	Bureau of Public Roads				
83	Limitation on general administrative expenses	*(1,782,000)*	*(1,782,000)*	*(1,782,000)*	*(1,782,000)*
83	Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
83	Studies of territorial highway needs	100,000	100,000		
	Total, ch. XII	75,500,000	65,500,000	75,400,000	70,400,000
	CHAPTER XIII				
	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY				
	BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS				
83	Fund for payment of Government losses in shipment	265,000	265,000	265,000	265,000
	BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT				
83	Administering the public debt	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
	U.S. SECRET SERVICE				
83	Salaries and expenses	1,003,000	1,003,000	1,003,000	1,003,000
	Total, Department of the Treasury	3,168,000	3,168,000	3,168,000	3,168,000

2d supplemental bill for fiscal year 1967 (H.R. 9481)—**Continued**

H. Doc. or S. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	TITLE I—Continued				
	CHAPTER XIII—Continued				
	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT				
	Out of Postal Fund				
83	Operations	$367, 600, 000	$334, 600, 000	$333, 600, 000	$333, 600, 000
83	Transportation	40, 000, 000	35, 700. 000	35, 700, 000	35, 700, 000
83	Building occupancy and postal supplies	3. 500, 000	3, 500, 000	3, 500, 000	3, 500, 000
83	General provision	(Language)			
	Total, Post Office Department	411, 100, 000	373, 800, 000	372, 800, 000	372, 800, 000
	RELATED AGENCIES				
	ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PARCEL DISTRIBUTION SERVICES				
S. 22	Salaries and expenses	200, 000		200, 000	
	JOINT COMMISSION ON THE COINAGE				
S. 22	Salaries and expences (by transfer)	*(400, 000)*		*(400, 000)*	*(800, 000)*
	Total, ch. XIII	414, 268, 000	376, 968, 000	376, 168, 000	375, 968, 000
	CHAPTER XIV				
	CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS				
109, S. 25	Claims and judgments	21, 343, 762	10, 978, 173	21, 343, 762	21, 343, 762
	Total, title I	1, 778, 770, 362	1, 568, 991, 273	1, 785, 848, 253	1, 724, 032, 737
	TITLE II				
	INCREASED PAY COSTS				
91	Increased pay costs	[1] 478, 834, 290	472, 834, 860	474, 398, 680	473, 898, 680
	Grand total	2. 257, 604, 652	2, 041, 826, 133	2, 260, 246, 933	2, 197, 931, 417

[1] Includes $1,062,230, Senate items in H. Doc. 91, not considered by the House.

Second supplemental appropriation bill for 1967—Title II, increased pay costs (H. Doc. No. 91)

	Budget estimate (1)	House version of bill (2)	Senate version of bill (3)	Conference action (4)
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH				
SENATE				
Compensation of the Vice President and Senators	$2, 570		$2, 570	$2, 570
Salaries, officers and employees	749, 735		251, 325	251, 325
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate	8, 665		8, 665	8, 665
Contingent expenses of the Senate:				
Senate policy committees	11, 730		11, 730	11, 730
Automobiles and maintenance	1, 040		1, 040	1, 040
Inquiries and investigations	147, 590		147, 590	147, 590
Folding documents	1, 185		1, 185	1, 185
Miscellaneous items	82, 715		82, 715	82, 715
Total, Senate items	1, 005, 230		506, 820	506, 820
Joint items:				
Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures	1, 100	$1, 100	1, 100	1, 100
Contingent expenses of the Senate:				
Joint Economic Committee	11, 000	11, 000	11, 000	11, 000
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy	9, 000	9, 000	9, 000	9, 000
Joint Committee on Printing	5, 000	5, 000	5, 000	5, 000
Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation	13, 300	13, 300	13, 300	13, 300
Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy	725	725	725	725
Joint Committee on Defense Production	2, 000	2, 000	2, 000	2, 000
Education of Senate and House pages	6, 395	6, 395	6, 395	6, 395
Detailed Metropolitan Police	71, 500	71, 500	71, 500	71, 500
Total, joint items	120, 020	120, 020	120, 020	120, 020
HOUSE				
Office of the Speaker	3, 750	3, 750	3, 750	3, 750
Office of the Parliamentarian	3, 125	3, 125	3, 125	3, 125
Compilation of precedents	290	290	290	290
Office of the Chaplain	455	455	455	455
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—Con.				
HOUSE—con.				
Office of the Clerk	$49, 700			
Sergeant at Arms	39, 950			
Doorkeeper	50, 900			
Postmaster	15, 225	$15, 225	$15, 225	$15, 225
Committee employees	122, 000	100, 000	100, 000	100, 000
6 minority employees	3, 550	3, 550	3, 550	3, 550
Democratic steering committee	835	835	835	835
Republican conference	835	835	835	835
Majority floor leader	2, 900	2, 900	2, 900	2, 900
Minority floor leader	2, 650	2, 650	2, 650	2, 650
Majority whip	1, 950	1, 950	1, 950	1, 950
Minority whip	1, 950	1, 950	1, 950	1, 950
Printing clerks	485	485	485	485
Technical assistant to attending physician	425	425	425	425
Official Reporters of Debates	7, 700	7, 700	7, 700	7, 700
Official reporters to committees	7, 725	7, 725	7, 725	7, 725
Appropriations investigating committee	21, 000	21, 000	21, 000	21, 000
Legislative counsel	9, 280	9, 280	9, 280	9, 280
Members' clerk hire	1, 000, 000	500, 000	500, 000	500, 000
Special and select committees	90, 000	90, 000	90, 000	90, 000
Coordinator of information	4, 100	4, 100	4, 100	4, 100
Revision of the laws	850			
Speaker's auto	370	370	370	370
Majority leader's auto	370	370	370	370
Minority leader's auto	370	370	370	370
Total, House items	1, 442, 740	779, 340	779, 340	779, 340
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL				
Office of Architect of the Capitol: Salaries	11, 800	11, 800	11, 800	11, 800
Capitol buildings and grounds:				
Capitol buildings	18, 900	18, 900	18, 900	18, 900
Capitol grounds	7, 800	7, 800	7, 800	7, 800
Senate office buildings	56, 000		56, 000	56, 000
Senate garage	1, 000		1, 000	1, 000
House office buildings	60, 000	60, 000	60, 000	60, 000
Capitol Power Plant	10, 400	10, 400	10, 400	10, 400
Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care	19, 800	19, 800	19, 800	19, 800
Total, Architect	185, 700	128, 700	185, 700	185, 700

Second supplemental appropriation bill for 1967—Title II, increased pay costs (H. Doc. No. 91)—Continued

	Budget estimate (1)	House version of bill (2)	Senate version of bill (3)	Conference action (4)
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—Continued				
BOTANIC GARDEN				
Salaries and expenses	$8,700	$8,706	$8,700	$8,700
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS				
Salaries and expenses	334,000	[1] *(308,500)*	[1] *(308,500)*	[1] *(308,500)*
Copyright Office: Salaries and expenses	66,200	[1] *(63,000)*	[1] *(63,000)*	[1] *(63,000)*
Legislative Reference Service: Salaries and expenses	80,200	[1] *(72,500)*	[1] *(72,500)*	[1] *(72,500)*
Distribution of catalog cards: Salaries and expenses	84,600	[1] *(84,600)*	[1] *(84,600)*	[1] *(84,600)*
Books for the blind: Salaries and expenses	10,100	[1] *(9,100)*	[1] *(9,100)*	[1] *(9,100)*
Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)	5,200	----------	----------	----------
Total, Library of Congress	580,300	[1] *(537,700)*	[1] *(537,700)*	[1] *(537,700)*
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE				
Office of the Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses	93,800	93,800	93,800	93,800
Total, legislative	3,436,409	1,130,560	1,694,380	1,694,380
THE JUDICIARY				
Supreme Court of the United States: Care of buildings and grounds	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: Salaries and expenses	8,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Customs Court: Salaries and expenses	27,500	----------	----------	----------
Court of Claims: Salaries and expenses	19,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:				
Salaries of judges	12,000	----------	----------	----------
Salaries of supporting personnel	1,140,000	940,000	940,000	940,000
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts	50,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Salaries of referees (special account)	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500
Expenses of referees (special account)	170,000	170,000	170,000	170,000
Total, the judiciary	1,436,600	1,181,100	1,181,100	1,181,100
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
Council of Economic Advisers: Salaries and expenses	10,000	----------	----------	----------
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
Economic assistance:				
Administrative expenses, Agency for International Development (*by transfer*)	*(1,194,000)*	*(1,194,000)*	*(1,194,000)*	*(1,194,000)*
Administrative and other expenses, Department of State (*by transfer*)	*(60,000)*	*(60,000)*	*(60,000)*	*(60,000)*
Total, funds appropriated to the President	*(1,254,000)*	*(1,254,000)*	*(1,254,000)*	*(1,254,000)*
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
Cooperative State Research Service: Payments and expenses	36,000	36,000	36,000	36,000
Extension Service: Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(74,000)*	*(74,000)*	*(74,000)*	*(74,000)*
Farmer Cooperative Service: Salaries and expenses	29,000	29,000	29,000	29,000
Soil Conservation Service:				
Conservation operations (and transfer)	115,200	115,200	115,200	115,200
Watershed planning	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Watershed protection	130,700	130,700	130,700	130,700
Flood prevention	41,400	41,400	41,400	41,400
Great Plains conservation program	4,300	4,300	4,300	4,300
Resource conservation and development	90,600	90,600	90,600	90,600
Economic Research Service: Salaries and expenses	289,000	289,000	289,000	289,000
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—Continued				
Statistical Reporting Service: Salaries and expenses	$310,000	$310,000	$310,000	$310,000
Consumer and Marketing Service:				
Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs (*by transfer*)	*(2,191,000)*	*(2,191,000)*	*(2,191,000)*	*(2,191,000)*
Packers and Stockyards Act	67,300	67,300	67,300	67,300
Foreign Agricultural Service: Salaries and expenses	223,000	223,000	223,000	223,000
Commodity Exchange Authority: Salaries and expenses	36,000	36,000	36,000	36,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: Expenses (*by transfer*)	*(1,394,000)*	*(1,394,000)*	*(1,394,000)*	*(1,394,000)*
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Administrative and operating expenses	246,000	246,000	246,000	246,000
Rural Electrification Administration: Salaries and expenses	223,800	223,800	223,800	223,800
Farmers Home Administration: Salaries and expenses (and transfer)	553,600	553,600	553,600	553,600
Rural Community Development Service: Salaries and expenses	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Office of the Inspector General: Salaries and expenses	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Office of Information: Salaries and expenses	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000
National Agricultural Library: Salaries and expenses	46,000	46,000	46,000	46,000
Office of Management Services: Salaries and expenses	67,000	67,000	67,000	67,000
General administration: Salaries and expenses	93,000	93,000	93,000	93,000
Total, Agriculture	3,097,900	3,097,900	3,097,900	3,097,900
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
General administration: Salaries and expenses	95,000	74,000	74,000	74,000
Office of Business Economics: Salaries and expenses	70,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Bureau of the Census:				
Salaries and expenses	394,000	394,000	394,000	394,000
1967 census of governments	30,000	----------	----------	----------
1964 Census of Agriculture	46,000	46,000	46,000	46,000
International activities:				
Salaries and expenses	140,000	108,000	108,000	108,000
Export control	86,000	43,000	43,000	43,000
Transfer to customs	*(20,000)*	*(20,000)*	*(20,000)*	*(20,000)*
Office of Field Services: Salaries and expenses	36,000	----------	----------	----------
Environmental Science Services Administration:				
Salaries and expenses	3,468,000	3,313,000	3,313,000	3,313,000
Research and development	287,000	287,000	287,000	287,000
Maritime Administration: Maritime training (*by transfer*)	*(88,900)*	*(88,900)*	*(88,900)*	*(88,900)*
Total, Commerce	4,652,000	4,315,000	4,315,000	4,315,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY				
Military personnel:				
Military personnel, Army	78,500,000	78,500,000	78,500,000	78,500,000
Military personnel, Navy	77,700,000	77,700,000	77,700,000	77,700,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps	24,300,000	24,300,000	24,300,000	24,300,000
Military personnel, Air Force	81,300,000	81,300,000	81,300,000	81,300,000
Reserve personnel, Army	6,200,000	6,200,000	6,200,000	6,200,000
Reserve personnel, Navy	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Reserve personnel, Air Force	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
National Guard personnel, Army	8,520,000	8,520,000	8,520,000	8,520,000
National Guard personnel, Air Force	1,910,000	1,910,000	1,910,000	1,910,000
Retired pay, Defense	59,000,000	59,000,000	59,000,000	59,000,000
Operation and maintenance:				
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
Operation and maintenance, defense agencies	20,300,000	20,300,000	20,300,000	20,300,000
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
Total, Defense, military	364,130,000	364,130,000	364,130,000	364,130,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Second supplemental appropriation bill for 1967—Title II, increased pay costs (H. Doc. No. 91)—Continued

	Budget estimate (1)	House version of bill (2)	Senate version of bill (3)	Conference action (4)
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL				
Department of the Army:				
Corps of Engineers, civil:				
General expenses	$464,000	$464,000	$464,000	$464,000
Ryukyu Islands: Administration	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000
U.S. Soldiers' Home: Limitation on general and administrative expenses (increase)	*(252,000)*	*(252,000)*	*(252,000)*	*(252,000)*
The Panama Canal:				
Canal Zone Government	1,342,000	1,342,000	1,342,000	1,342,000
Panama Canal Company:				
Limitation on general and administrative expenses (increase)	*(278,000)*	*(278,000)*	*(278,000)*	*(278,000)*
Total, Defense, civil	1,861,000	1,861,000	1,861,000	1,861,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
Office of Education:				
Salaries and expenses	740,000	740,000	740,000	740,000
Civil rights educational activities	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000
Public Health Service:				
Hospitals and medical care	2,478,000	2,478,000	2,478,000	2,478,000
Foreign quarantine activities	180,000	180,000	180,000	180,000
Indian health activities	1,865,000	1,865,000	1,865,000	1,865,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital: Salaries and expenses	995,000	995,000	995,000	995,000
Howard University: Salaries and expenses	190,000	190,000	190,000	190,000
Gallaudet College: Salaries and expenses	22,000	22,000	22,000	22,000
Office of the Secretary:				
Salaries and expenses:				
Appropriation	163,000	163,000	163,000	163,000
Transfer	*(23,000)*	*(23,000)*	*(23,000)*	*(23,000)*
Office of Audit:				
Salaries and expenses:				
Appropriation	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000
Transfer	*(10,000)*	*(10,000)*	*(10,000)*	*(10,000)*
Surplus property utilization	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Office of Field Administration:				
Salaries and expenses:				
Appropriation	72,000	72,000	72,000	72,000
Transfer	*(25,000)*	*(25,000)*	*(25,000)*	*(25,000)*
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare	6,858,000	6,858,000	6,858,000	6,858,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT				
Office of the Secretary:				
Salaries and expenses	215,000	215,000	215,000	215,000
Urban renewal program	395,000	395,000	395,000	395,000
Administrative expenses, urban transportation activities	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Rehabilitation loan fund	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000
Public housing programs:				
Administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, public housing programs (increase)	*(150,000)*	*(150,000)*	*(150,000)*	*(150,000)*
Limitation on administrative expenses, college housing loans (increase)	*(54,000)*	*(54,000)*	*(54,000)*	*(54,000)*
Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, housing for the elderly or handicapped (increase)	*(32,000)*	*(32,000)*	*(32,000)*	*(32,000)*
Limitation on administrative expenses, public facility loans (increase)	*(30,000)*	*(30,000)*	*(30,000)*	*(30,000)*
Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration (increase)	*(150,000)*	*(150,000)*	*(150,000)*	*(150,000)*
Total, Housing and Urban Development	801,000	801,000	801,000	801,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
Bureau of Indian Affairs:				
Education and welfare services	1,789,000	1,789,000	1,789,000	1,789,000
General administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: Salaries and expenses	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
Geological Survey: Surveys, investigations, and research	1,557,000	1,577,000	1,577,000	1,577,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued				
Bureau of Mines:				
Conservation and development of mineral resources	$355,000	$355,000	$355,000	$355,000
Health and safety	105,000	105,000	105,000	105,000
General administrative expenses	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Office of Oil and Gas: Salaries and expenses	25,800	25,800	25,800	25,800
Fish and Wildlife Service:				
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:				
Management and investigations of resources	298,000	298,000	298,000	298,000
Federal aid for commercial fisheries, research, and development	4,300	4,300	4,300	4,300
General administrative expenses	21,000	21,000	21,000	21,000
Administration of Pribilof Islands (appropriations of receipts)	27,700	27,700	27,700	27,700
Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan fund (increase)	(7,000)	*(7,000)*	*(7,000)*	*(7,000)*
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:				
Management and investigation of resources	856,000	856,000	856,000	856,000
General administrative expenses	64,000	64,000	64,000	64,000
National Park Service:				
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	1,051,000	1,051,000	1,051,000	1,051,000
General administrative expenses	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200
Office of the Solicitor: Salaries and expenses	117,000	117,000	117,000	117,000
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	167,000	167,000	167,000	167,000
Bureau of Reclamation: General administrative expenses	267,000	267,000	267,000	267,000
Total, Interior	7,002,000	7,002,000	7,002,000	7,002,000
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
Legal activities and general administration:				
Salaries and expenses, general administration	143,000	143,000	143,000	143,000
Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	431,000	131,000	131,000	131,000
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division	186,000	86,000	86,000	86,000
Salaries and expenses, U.S. attorneys and marshals	804,000	404,000	404,000	404,000
Salaries and expenses, community relations service	25,000	----------	----------	----------
Federal prison system: Salaries and expenses	2,212,000	2,112,000	2,112,000	2,112,000
Total, Justice	3,801,000	2,876,000	2,876,000	2,876,000
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
Manpower administration:				
Office of Manpower Administration:				
Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(97,000)*	*(97,000)*	*(97,000)*	*(97,000)*
Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (*by transfer*)	*(79,000)*	*(79,000)*	*(79,000)*	*(79,000)*
Bureau of Employment Security: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(245,000)*	*(245,000)*	*(245,090)*	*(245,000)*
Labor-Management Relations:				
Labor-Management Services Administration: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(68,000)*	*68,000)*	*(68,000)*	*(68,000)*
Wage and labor standards:				
Wage and Hour Division:				
Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(481,000)*	*(481,000)*	*(481,000)*	*(481,000)*
Bureau of Labor Standards (*by transfer*)	*(45,000)*	*(45,000)*	*(45,000)*	*(45,000)*
Women's Bureau (*by transfer*)	*(23,000)*	*(23,000)*	*(23,000)*	*(23,000)*
Bureau of Employees' Compensation: Salaries and expenses (*by transfers*)	*(143,000)*	*(143,000)*	*(143,000)*	*(143,000)*
Bureau of Labor Statistics: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(243,000)*	*(243,000)*	*(243,000)*	*(243,000)*

Second supplemental appropriation bill for 1967—Title II, increased pay costs (H. Doc. No. 91)—Continued

	Budget estimate (1)	House version of bill (2)	Senate version of bill (3)	Conference action (4)
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Con.				
Bureau of International Labor Affairs: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*($20,000)*	*($20,000)*	*($20,000)*	*($20,000)*
Office of the Solicitor: Salaries and expenses (*by transfers*)	*(144,000)*	*(144,000)*	*(144,000)*	*(144,000)*
Total, Labor	*(1,588,000)*	*(1,588,000)*	*(1,588,000)*	*(1,588,000)*
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT				
Administration and regional operation	2,500,000	1,500,000	2,500,000	2,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
International organizations and conferences: Missions to international organizations (*by transfer*)	*(70,000)*	*(70,000)*	*(70,000)*	*(70,000)*
International commissions:				
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(20,000)*	*(20,000)*	*(20,000)*	*(20,000)*
Total, Department of State	*(90,000)*	*(90,000)*	*(90,000)*	*(90,000)*
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Coast Guard:				
Operating expenses	5,216,000	5,034,000	5,034,000	5,034,000
Retired pay	660,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Reserve training	466,000	466,000	466,000	466,000
Federal Aviation Administration:				
Operations	18,700,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
Operations and maintenance, Washington National Airport	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000
Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport	105,000	105,000	105,000	105,000
Total, Department of Transportation	25,237,000	24,195,000	24,195,000	24,195,000
TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	127,000	127,000	127,000	127,000
Bureau of Customs: Salaries and expenses	2,485,000	2,485,000	2,485,000	2,485,000
Bureau of Narcotics: Salaries and expenses	137,000	137,000	137,000	137,000
Internal Revenue Service:				
Salaries and expenses	296,000	296,000	296,000	296,000
Revenue accounting and processing	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Compliance	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
By transfer	*(5,107,000)*	*(5,107,000)*	*(5,107,000)*	*(5,107,000)*
Total, Treasury	12,545,000	12,545,000	12,545,000	12,545,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
General Services Administration:				
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	4,091,000	4,091,000	4,091,000	4,091,000
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	321,000	321,000	321,000	321,000
Strategic and critical materials (receipts)	244,000	244,000	244,000	244,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000
Veterans' Administration:				
General operating expenses	3,787,000	3,787,000	3,787,000	3,787,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	312,000	312,000	312,000	312,000
Medical and prosthetic research	629,000	629,000	629,000	629,000
Medical care	27,438,000	27,438,000	27,438,000	27,438,000
OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
American Battle Monuments Commission: Salaries and expenses	$85,000	$68,000	$68,000	$68,000
Civil Aeronautics Board: Salaries and expenses	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: Salaries and expenses	79,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Farm Credit Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses (increase)	*(62,000)*	*(62,000)*	*(62,000)*	*(62,000)*
Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses	513,800	513,800	513,800	513,800
Federal Maritime Commission: Salaries and expenses	52,000	44,000	44,000	44,000
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: Salaries and expenses	110,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
Federal Power Commission: Salaries and expenses	220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000
Federal Trade Commission: Salaries and expenses	378,000	378,000	378,000	378,000
General Accounting Office: Salaries and expenses	900,000	850,000	850,000	850,000
Indian Claims Commission: Salaries and expenses	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: Salaries and expenses	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
Interstate Commerce Commission: Salaries and expenses	720,000	720,000	720,000	720,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities: Salaries and expenses	19,500	19,500	19,500	19,500
National Labor Relations Board: Salaries and expenses	588,000	588,000	588,000	588,000
Renegotiation Board: Salaries and expenses	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
Securities and Exchange Commission: Salaries and expenses	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Smithsonian Institution:				
Salaries and expenses	176,000	176,000	176,000	176,000
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art	104,000	104,000	104,000	104,000
Tariff Commission: Salaries and expenses	72,000	62,000	62,000	62,000
Total, independent agencies	41,466,300	41,342,300	41,342,300	41,342,300
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
(Out of District of Columbia funds)				
Operating expenses:				
Education	*(5,856,000)*	*(5,082,000)*	*(5,082,000)*	*(5,082,000)*
Health and welfare	*(1,809,000)*	*(1,480,000)*	*(1,480,000)*	*(1,480,000)*
Highways and traffic	*(106,000)*	*(105 000)*	*(125,000)*	*(125,000)*
Sanitary engineering	*(560,000)*	*(560,000)*	*(560,000)*	*(560,000)*
Total, District of Columbia	*(8,331,000)*	*(7,227,000)*	*(7,227,000)*	*(7,227,000)*
Total, title II	[2]478,834,290	472,834,860	474,398,680	473,898,680
Consisting of—				
Direct appropriations	477,393,090	471,393,660	472,957,480	472,457,480
Indefinite appropriations	995,000	995,000	995,000	995,000
Appropriation of receipts	271,700	271,700	271,700	271,700
Special accounts	174,500	174,500	174,500	174,500

---

[1] To be derived by transfer.

[2] Includes $1,062,230 for Senate items, not considered by the House.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the action just taken in approving the conference report and in concurring in the amendments of the House.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK A.M. MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order of May 24, 1967, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3

o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 29, 1967, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 25, 1967:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term expiring June 30, 1971 (reappointment).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Covey T. Oliver, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Lincoln Gordon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Walter G. Letham, First Presbyterian Church, Muskogee, Okla., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the God and Father of us all, we acknowledge Thee as the sovereign Lord of life. Our destinies are in Thy hands, and in the doing of Thy will lies the secret of life and peace. We are grateful for the splendid inheritance that is ours in this land in which we are privileged to live. May the thought of it keep us humble and inspire us to give our best in the preserving of those moral and spiritual values that have made our Nation great and strong.

We invoke Thy continued blessing on the Members of this House. May they ever be aware of the heavy responsibility that lies upon them, and may they find satisfaction in the thought that they are serving the cause of justice and freedom. May they have the courage that comes from deep conviction, and may their judgments and decisions be prompted by a deep desire to uphold justice and truth.

Almighty God, in these days of grave uncertainty and confusion, guide us as a nation in the ways of righteousness until a brighter day shall dawn for the whole world of men. So may Thy kingdom come and Thy will be done.

In the name of Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 12, 1967, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8363. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 399. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain real property to the city of Batavia, N.Y.;

H.R. 4374. An act to remove a cloud on the title of certain real property in the State of Oregon owned by John Johnson; and

H.R. 7965. An act to transfer title to tribal land on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1788. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND THE COUNTRY AT WAR

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, Americans should be kept fully abreast of the Vietnam war; however, I believe when future lives are affected by a news story, it should be censored. I refer to the fortunate young Americans who played dead after a Vietcong overrun and lived to tell the story. This was a good news story and the news media gave every detail of how the individual soldier played dead and lived.

I feel sure this exciting event has gotten back to the Vietcong, and I am sure that the North Vietnamese commanders will instruct their soldiers to insure that this does not happen again. Americans in the future will be systematically murdered. Possibly lives would have been saved if this news story had not been told until some future date.

We talk about constitutional rights, but have we gone too far? We let a few Americans dodge the draft, burn and spit on our flag; and, it seems to me, to eliminate criticism we release every war story out of Vietnam. I hope it is not too late when we all fully realize our country is at war.

THE ARAB-ISRAEL CRISIS

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, the President is to be commended for his forthright and firm message to all sides in the Arab-Israel crisis. The magnitude of the problems in that troubled area cannot be overstated.

More than the sovereignty of nations is involved. More than narrow regional interests are at stake. More than United Nations survival is involved. If this conflict is escalated to war, civilization itself will be on trial.

If we cannot resolve the problems of nations and peoples by the rule of law, then all of man's progress over 5,000 years of history will be threatened with a general conflagration that could easily lead to world war III.

The President's tempered words have served notice to the world that we must, if we are to survive, abide by our agreements and respect the sanctity of international law.

UNIFORM NATIONWIDE FIRE AND POLICE REPORTING NUMBER

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I informed the House that I would today introduce a concurrent resolution. I am doing so at this time. The concurrent resolution reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should have one uniform nationwide fire-reporting telephone number and one uniform nationwide police-reporting telephone number.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this concurrent resolution will receive due attention by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States.

MIDEAST CRISIS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I read in the newspapers last night and again this morning that the United States has privately but firmly informed the Government of Egypt that we would not stand for a blockade of international waters.

I applaud this position. I am interested to note, Mr. Speaker, that none of the numerous doves around here has asked, up to now at least, that the 6th Fleet be withdrawn from the Mediterranean.

THE POLITICAL PROCESS IN AMERICA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the message from the President—which come in increasing numbers—and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 106]

Adams
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Baring
Battin
Blanton
Bolling
Bolton
Burleson
Carter
Celler
Corbett
Dawson
de la Garza
Dorn
Ford, William D.
Gray
Hagan
Hansen, Idaho
Heckler, Mass.
Holifield
Jones, Mo.
Kleppe
Kuykendall
Kyl
Long, La.
McClure
McEwen
Minshall
Morgan
Myers
Nedzi
Ottinger
Pool
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Resnick
Ruppe
St. Onge
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Willis
Younger

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). On this rollcall, 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE POLITICAL PROCESS IN AMERICA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 129)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I. INTRODUCTION

Public participation in the processes of government is the essence of democracy. Public confidence in those processes strengthens democracy.

No government can long survive which does not fuse the public will to the institutions which serve it. The American system has endured for almost two centuries because the people have involved themselves in the work of their Government, with full faith in the meaning of that involvement.

But government itself has the continuing obligation—second to no other—to keep the machinery of public participation functioning smoothly and to improve it where necessary so that democracy remains a vital and vibrant institution.

It is in the spirit of that obligation that I send this message to the Congress today. I propose a five-point program to:

Reform our campaign financing laws to assure full disclosure of contributions and expenses, to place realistic limits on contributions, and to remove the meaningless and ineffective ceilings on campaign expenditures.

Provide a system of public financing for presidential election campaigns.

Broaden the base of public support for election campaigns, by exploring ways to encourage and stimulate small contributions.

Close the loopholes in the Federal laws regulating lobbying.

Assure the right to vote for millions of Americans who change their residences.

II. THE ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1967

In our democracy, politics is the instrument which sustains our institutions and keeps them strong and free.

The laws which govern political activity should be constantly reviewed—and reshaped when necessary—to preserve the essential health and vitality of the political process which is so fundamental to our way of life.

In my 1966 state of the Union message I called attention to the need for a basic reform of the laws governing political campaigns in these words:

> I will submit legislation to revise the present unrealistic restrictions on contributions—to prohibit the endless proliferation of committees, bringing local and state committees under the act—and to attach strong teeth and severe penalties to the requirement of full disclosure of contributions.

A year ago this month, I submitted my proposals to the Congress in the Election Reform Act of 1966.

That measure reflected my concern, as one who has been involved in the process of elective government for over three decades, that the laws dealing with election campaigns have not kept pace with the times.

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act was passed 42 years ago. The Hatch Act was passed 27 years ago. Inadequate in their scope when enacted, they are now obsolete. More loophole than law, they invite evasion and circumvention.

A sweeping overhaul of the laws governing election campaigns should no longer be delayed.

Basic reform—with an emphasis on clear and straightforward disclosure—is essential to insure public confidence and involvement in the political process. On the cornerstone of disclosure we can build toward further reform—by charting new ways to broaden the base of financial support for candidates and parties in election campaigns.

I again ask the Congress to take positive action in this field as we work together to insure continued and increased public confidence in the elective process.

I recommend the Election Reform Act of 1967 to correct omissions, loopholes, and shortcomings in the present campaign laws.

This act embodies many of the same positive measures I proposed last May. Last October, after hearings, the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration reported out substantially the bill I proposed "favorably and with bipartisan support." The subcommittee report called those measures "a vast improvement over existing law."

FULL PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

The heart of basic reform is full disclosure. This measure would, for the first time, make effective the past efforts of the Congress and the Executive to achieve full disclosure of political campaign funds.

Complete disclosure will open to public view where campaign money comes from and how it is spent. Such disclosure will help dispel the growth of public skepticism which surrounds the present methods of financing political campaigns.

Full disclosure efforts are frustrated today by gaps in the law through which have passed an endless stream of National, State and local political committees.

To insure full disclosure, I recommend that:

Every candidate, including those for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, and every committee, State, interstate, and national, that supports a candidate for Federal office be required to report on every contribution, loan, and expense item over $100.

Primaries and convention nomination contests be brought within the disclosure laws.

EFFECTIVE CEILINGS ON SIZE OF CONTRIBUTIONS

Closely related to full disclosure—the basic step in any election reform—is another equally demanding task. It requires that we make political financing more democratic by recognizing that great wealth—in reality or appearance—could be used to achieve undue political influence.

Current law limits to $5,000 contributions to a single candidate for Federal office or contributions to any national political committee supporting a candidate.

But the law does not prohibit an individual from making a $5,000 contribution to each of several national committees supporting a candidate or party—and there is no limit to the number of such committees. Moreover, State and local political committees are not even covered by existing law.

I recommend that a $5,000 limit be placed on the total amount that could come from any individual, his wife or minor children, to the campaign of any candidate.

REPEAL OF ARTIFICIAL LIMITS ON CAMPAIGN EXPENSES

With full disclosure and an effective ceiling on contributions we can move forward to cure another defect in our election campaign laws—the artificial limits on campaign expenditures.

Under present law, for example:

National political committees can raise and spend no more than $3 million. But the law does not limit the number of national committees.

Senate candidates are limited to expenses of $25,000 and House candidates to $5,000. But the law does not limit the number of committees that can spend and raise money on the candidate's behalf.

These legal ceilings on expenditures were enacted many years ago, when the potential of radio in a campaign was virtually unknown and when television did not exist. They are totally unrealistic and inadequate. They have led to the endless proliferation of political committees.

I, therefore, recommend a repeal of the present arbitrary limits on the total expenditures of candidates for Federal office.

BARRING POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS

Present law prohibits corporations and labor organizations from making contributions to campaigns for Federal office.

But there is an anomaly which must be corrected in the law relating to contractors with the Federal Government.

Noncorporate Government contractors are now prohibited from making political contributions at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local.

The bar on corporations with Government contracts, however, extends only to political contributions at the Federal level. These corporations are free to make political contributions at the State and local levels where finances are often intertwined with national political campaigns.

In the interests of consistency and good sense, I recommend that corporations holding contracts with the Federal Government also be prohibited from making political contributions at the State and local level.

ENFORCEMENT

To insure that these reforms are strictly enforced, the Election Reform Act of 1967 would provide criminal penalties for violations of the law.

III. CAMPAIGN FINANCING

The proposed Election Reform Act of 1967 is corrective, remedying present inadequacies in the law. It goes hand in hand with the pursuit of another goal—to provide public support for election campaigns.

THE BACKGROUND

Democracy rests on the voice of the people. Whatever blunts the clear expression of that voice is a threat to democratic government.

In this century one phenomenon in particular poses such a threat—the soaring costs of political campaigns.

Historically, candidates for public office in this country have always relied upon private contributions to finance their campaigns.

But in the last few decades, technology—which has changed so much of our national life—has modified the nature of political campaigning as well. Radio, television, and the airplane have brought sweeping new dimensions and costs to the concept of political candidacy.

In many ways these changes have worked to the decided advantage of the American people. They have served to bring the candidates and the issues before virtually every voting citizen. They have contributed immeasurably to the political education of the Nation.

In another way, however, they have worked to the opposite effect by increasing the costs of campaigning to spectacular proportions. Costs of such magnitude can have serious consequences for our democracy:

More and more, men and women of limited means may refrain from running for public office. Private wealth increasingly becomes an artificial and unrealistic arbiter of qualifications, and the source of public leadership is thus severely narrowed.

Increases in the size of individual contributions create uneasiness in the minds of the public. Actually, the exercise of undue influence occurs infrequently. Nonetheless, the circumstance in which a candidate is obligated to rely on sizable contributions easily creates the impression that influence is at work. This impression—however unfounded it might be—is itself intolerable, for it erodes public confidence in the democratic order.

The necessity of acquiring substantial funds to finance campaigns diverts a candidate's attention from his public obligations and detracts from his energetic exposition of the issues.

The growing importance of large contributions serves to deter the search for small ones, and thus effectively narrows the base of financial support. This is exactly the opposite of what a democratic society should strive to achieve.

It is extremely difficult to devise a program which completely eliminates these undesirable consequences without inhibiting robust campaigning and the freedom of every American fully to participate in the elective process. I believe that our ultimate goal should be to finance the total expense for this vital function of our democracy with public funds, and to prohibit the use or acceptance of money from private sources. We have virtually no experience upon which to base such a program. Its risks and uncertainties are formidable. I believe, however, that we are ready to make a beginning. We should proceed with all prudent speed to enact those parts of such a program which appear to be feasible at this time.

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS

THE PROBLEM

The election of a President is the highest expression of the free choice of the American people. It is the most visible level of politics—and also the most expensive.

For their free choice to be exercised wisely, the people must be fully informed about the opposing candidates and issues. To achieve this, candidates and parties must have the funds to bring their platforms and programs to the people.

Yet, as we have seen, the costs of campaigning are skyrocketing. This imposes extreme and heavy financial burdens on party and candidate alike, creating a potential for danger—the possibility that men of great wealth could achieve undue political influence through large contributions.

In recognition of this problem, the Congress last year enacted the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. By so doing, it adopted the central concept that some form of public financing of presidential campaigns would serve the public interest.

I did not submit or recommend this legislation. It was the creation and the product of the Congress in 1966. As you will recall, it was added as an amendment to other essential legislation. When I signed that act into law last November, I observed that "it breaks new ground in the financing of presidential election campaigns" and that the "new law is only a beginning." It was my belief then, as it is now, that the complex issues involved in this new concept required extensive discussion and penetrating analysis.

Over the past 6 weeks, we have heard men of deep principle and firm conviction engage in a spirited and searching debate on the law. While there were honest and vigorous disagreements, they were voiced by those who share a common faith in the free ideals which are the bedrock of our democracy.

THE ISSUES

The course of the debate has illuminated many of the issues which underlie the matter of presidential campaign financing. For example:

In what amount should Federal funds be provided for these campaigns?

What limitations should be placed on the use of these funds?

Should there be a complete bar on the use of private contributions for those aspects of campaign financing which would be regularly provided through appropriations?

Can the availability of public funds result in an undue concentration of power in national political committees? If so, what steps can be taken to prevent it?

Is the tax checkoff method a sound approach or is a direct appropriation to be preferred?

How can equitable treatment of minor parties be assured?

What sanctions would be most effective to insure compliance with the law?

Whatever the ultimate formula, how can we preserve the independence, spirit, and spontaneity that has hallmarked American political enterprise through the years?

THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Against this backdrop of concern for the political process, the protection of the public interest, and the issues that have been raised, I make these 11 recommendations to improve and strengthen the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act:

1. Funds to finance presidential campaigns should be provided by direct congressional appropriation, rather than determined by individual tax checkoffs.

This approach would:

Provide the opportunity for Congress to make a realistic assessment, and express its judgment, of what it would cost presidential candidates or parties to carry their views to the voters. This assessment should consider the recommendations of the special Advisory Board to the Comptroller General, created under the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. The Board consists of representatives of both major political parties. Based on this review and recommendation, Congress could then appropriate the necessary funds.

Make the amount appropriated for the campaign fund more stable, by removing its uncertain reliance on tax checkoffs, whose numbers might bear no reasonable relationship to the amount required to bring the issues before the public.

2. The funds should be used only for expenses which are needed to bring the issues before the public.

Under the procedure I recommend:

The funds so appropriated would be used to reimburse specified expenditures incurred during the presidential election campaign itself, after the parties have selected their candidate.

The amount appropriated should be adequate to defray key items of expense to carry a campaign to the public and thus be limited to the following items: radio and television, newspaper and periodical advertising, the preparation and distribution of campaign literature and travel.

The amount of the fund for the major parties as finally determined by the Congress, would be divided equally between them.

3. Private contributions for major parties could not be used for those items of expense to which public funds could be applied.

Private contributions, however, could be used to defray the costs of other campaign expenses. These would include the salaries of campaign workers, overhead, research and polls, telegraph and telephone, postage and administrative expenses.

Citizens who want to make contributions to the party or candidate of their choice will be free to do so. Party workers at the grassroots will be able to pursue their neighborhood activities, a responsibility which is deeply woven into the fabric of American political tradition.

But under the measures I have proposed, the major burden of raising money for soaring campaign costs will be lifted from a presidential candidate's shoulders. No longer will we have to rely on the large contributions of wealthy and powerful interests.

4. A "major party" should be defined as one which received 25 percent or more of the popular votes cast in the last election.

A percentage-of-votes test is more realistic than the fixed number of votes—15 million—now in the present law. It recognizes our growing population with more Americans entering the voting ranks each year.

5. A minor party should be defined as one which received between 5 percent and 25 percent of the popular votes cast in the current election.

For the same reasons I described above, the eligibility test for Federal support should not be based on a fixed number of votes—5 million for "minor parties" in the current law—but rather on the percentage of votes received.

Third party movements can support the rich diversity of American political life. At the same time some reasonable limitations should be developed so that Federal financial incentives are not made available to parties lacking a modicum of public support—or created solely to receive Government funds.

Under this proposal, "minor parties" would receive payments based on the number of votes they receive in the current election. The payment for each vote received by a minor party would then be determined so as to be the equivalent of that made to the major parties.

For example, assume that two major parties received a total of 80 million votes in a prior election, and Congress had appropriated a $40 million campaign fund for those two parties. Although the major parties would share equally in that fund—$20 million each—the allocation would amount to 50 cents per vote cast for those parties. Using the 50 cents per vote as the guideline, a minor party receiving 5 million votes in the current election would be entitled to $2.5 million for its recognized campaign expenses.

6. A "minor party" should be eligible for reimbursement promptly following an election.

A "minor party" should be able to qualify promptly for Federal funds, based on its showing in the current election, rather than waiting 4 years until the next election. This added source of funds should enhance a minor party's opportunity to bring its programs and platforms into the public arena.

7. The percentage of Federal funds received by a major or minor party which could be used in any one State should be limited to 140 percent of the percentage the population of that State bears to the population of the country.

This would prevent the concentration of funds in any particular State and would minimize the ability of national party officials to reduce the role and effectiveness of local political organizations. At the same time, it would retain the flexibility necessary to carry a party's programs to the public. The Comptroller General should be empowered to issue rules for the equitable allocation, on a geographic basis, for national campaign expenses, such as network television.

8. The Comptroller General should be required to make a full report to the Congress as soon as practicable after each presidential election.

This report should include: Payments made to each party from the fund; expenses incurred by each party; any misuse of the funds.

9. The Comptroller General should be given clear authority to audit the expenses of presidential campaigns.

It is imperative that the strictest controls be exercised to safeguard the public interest. The General Accounting Office is the arm of the Government which I believe is best suited to monitor the expenditures of the fund.

Payments from the fund would be made only upon the submission of certified vouchers to the Comptroller General.

If the Comptroller General's audit reveals any improper use of funds, the following sanctions would be applied: The amounts involved would have to be repaid to the Treasury; and if the misuse is willful, a penalty of up to 50 percent of the amount involved would be imposed.

10. To bring greater wisdom and experience to the administration of the act, the Comptroller General's special Advisory Board on the Presidential Election Campaign Fund should be expanded from seven to 11 members.

This Advisory Board is faced with a heavy and demanding task. It must "counsel and assist" the Comptroller General in the performance of his duties under the act.

The membership of the Board now consists of two members from each major political party and three additional members. I recommend that the Board be enlarged to encompass the wisdom and experience of four distinguished Americans:

The majority leader of the Senate;

The minority leader of the Senate;

The Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

The minority leader of the House.

11. Criminal penalties should be applied for the willful misuse of payments received under the act by any person with custody of the funds.

The penalties should be a fine of not more than $10,000, or 5 years imprisonment, or both. Criminal penalties would also be applied against any person who makes a false claim or statement for the purpose of obtaining funds under the act.

OTHER CAMPAIGN FINANCING

We should also seek ways to provide some form of public support for congressional, State, and local political primaries and campaigns.

Here, the need is no less acute than at the presidential level. But the problems involved are as complex as the elections themselves, which vary from district to district and contest to contest.

Because the uncertainties in this area are so very great, and because the issues have not received the benefit of the extensive debate that has characterized presidential campaign financing, I pose for your consideration and exploration a series of alternatives.

In 1961, President Kennedy appointed a distinguished, bipartisan Commission on Campaign Costs to take a fresh look at the problems of financing election campaigns. Although the Commission devoted its attention to the problems of campaign costs for presidential and vice-presidential candidates, it pointed out that the measures proposed "would have a desirable effect on all political fundraising."

The Commission's 1962 report and recommendations were endorsed by Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman as well as leading presidential candidates in recent elections.

Based on the Commission's recommendations and the later reviews and studies of campaign financing, there are several alternatives which should be considered. These alternatives all involve public financing of campaigns to a greater or lesser extent. Among them are:

A system of direct appropriations, patterned after the recommendations made herein for presidential campaigns, or modeled after recommendations pending in the Congress.

A tax credit against Federal income tax for 50 percent of contributions, up to a maximum credit of $10 per year.

A matching incentive plan in which the Government would contribute an amount up to $10 for an equal amount contributed by a citizen, whether or not a taxpayer, to a candidate or committee.

A voucher plan in which Treasury certificates for small amounts could be mailed to citizens who, in turn, would send them to candidates or committees of their choice. These vouchers could then be redeemed from public funds, and the funds used to defray specified campaign expenditures.

I believe these deserve serious attention along with other proposals previously recommended and suggested to the Congress. Each alternative offers particular advantages. Thorough review may reveal that one is to be clearly preferred over the others, or that still other courses of action are appropriate. Whatever the outcome, any such review should reflect a realistic assessment of the amount of funds needed in these campaigns and the extent to which the funds should be provided by public means.

I recommend that Congress undertake such a review.

I have asked the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General to cooperate fully with the Congress in its exploration of these alternatives in order to give all the help the executive branch can to the Congress as it seeks the best congressional election campaign financing program.

These recommendations represent my thoughts on the issues at stake. I believe they highlight the problems in an area so new and complex that there is little experience in our national life to guide us.

I hope that these proposals will serve as guidelines for discussion and debate in the coming weeks. A penetrating and orderly review of these vital public issues, with all the wisdom that the Congress can summon, will in itself be an important educational process for the Nation in the art of government and politics.

I hope that Congress will proceed to consider promptly the problem of campaign financing and will enact appropriate legislation.

I make no recommendation as to effective date with respect to such legislation. I leave that entirely to the judgment and wisdom of the Congress. I have no desire to ask that the provisions be made applicable to any campaign in which I may be involved. On the other hand, I have no desire to request that any such campaign be exempted from modernizing legislation which Congress might enact.

Public financing of political campaigns presents the American people with an issue that is both significant and complex—departing as it does from the familiar practices of the past. It transcends partisan political considerations. I urge the American people and the Congress to consider this issue thoughtfully, on its merits, and on the highest and most objective plane, independent of any personalities now in office or seeking office.

IV. STRENGTHENING FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING

Full disclosure can serve the integrity of government in another important area—the regulation of lobbying.

Lobbying dates back to the earliest days of our Republic. It is based on the constitutionally guaranteed right of the people to petition their elected representatives for a redress of grievances.

Yet to realize the American ideal of government, our elected representatives must be able to evaluate the varied pressures to which they are regularly subjected. In 1946, Congress responded to this need by enacting the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Its purpose was not to curtail lobbying but to regulate it through disclosure. For the first time, individuals and groups who directly attempted to influence legislation were required to register.

More than 20 years of experience with the act have highlighted its flaws. Through loopholes in the law, immune from its registration provisions, have passed some of the most powerful, best financed, and best organized lobbies. Although engaged in constant and intensive lobbying, they are not legally required to disclose their existence—because lobbying is not their principal purpose, the narrower test under current law.

The Congress has properly taken the initiative to meet this problem. Two months ago, the Senate passed S. 355 by a decisive vote. In that measure, Federal regulation of lobbying has been strengthened by:

Supplanting the "principal purpose" test with the broader test of "substantial purpose," thus extending the reach of the act by a wider definition of those required to register.

Transferring the responsibility for administration of the law from the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate to the Comptroller General.

I strongly endorse the Senate's action in strengthening Federal regulation of lobbying as an important step toward better government, and I urge the House to take similar action.

V. THE RESIDENCY VOTING ACT OF 1967

Voting is the first duty of democracy. H. G. Wells called it "Democracy's ceremonial, its feast, its great function."

This Nation has already assured that no man can legally be denied the right to vote because of the color of his skin or his economic condition. But we find that millions of Americans are still disenfranchised—because they have moved their residence from one locality to another.

Mobility is one of the attributes of a free society, and increasingly a chief characteristic of our Nation in the 20th century. More American citizens than ever before move in search of new jobs and better opportunities.

For a mobile society, election laws which impose unduly long residence requirements are obsolete. They serve only to create a new class of disenfranchised Americans.

An analysis of the 1960 election, the last election for which studies are available, shows that between 5 and 8 million otherwise eligible voters were deprived of the right to vote because of unnecessarily long residency requirements in many of the States. Almost half the States, for example, through laws a century old, require a citizen to be a resident a full 12 months before he can vote even in a presidential election.

These requirements diminish democracy. The people's rights to travel freely from State to State is constitutionally protected. The exercise of that right should not imperil the loss of another constitutionally protected right—the right to vote.

I propose the Residency Voting Act of 1967 which provides that a citizen, otherwise qualified to vote under the laws of a State, may not be denied his vote in a presidential election if he becomes a resident of the State by the first day of September preceding the election.

VI. CONCLUSION

Seventy years ago, the great American historian Frederick Jackson Turner, wrote these words:

> Behind institutions, behind constitutional forms and modifications, lie the vital forces that call these organs into life and shape them to meet changing conditions. The peculiarity of American institutions is the fact that they have been compelled to adapt themselves to the changes of an expanding people.

This represents a valid exposition of the vitality of our democratic process as it has endured for almost 200 years.

Over those two centuries Presidents and Congresses have strengthened that process as changing circumstances presented the clear need to do so. History has spared few generations that continuing obligation.

Today, that obligation poses for us the requirement—and the opportunity as well—to bring new strength to the processes which underlie our free institutions.

It is in keeping with this obligation that I submit the proposals in this message.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 25, 1967*.

The message was, without objection, referred by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

REFORM OF ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has proposed a sweeping reform of election campaigns that will make financial support of our electoral processes more realistic.

This is a farsighted and far-reaching proposal that will modernize the outmoded machine now employed to fulfill democracy's cherished obligations of citizenship.

The two major points of this proposal are full disclosure of campaign contributions by candidates and full participation of the body politic in the financial support of elected officials.

The President has wisely noted that large contributors have too often placed elected officials in the uncomfortable position of being beholden for funds received. By limiting the amount contributed to any one candidate and by calling for congressional financing of presidential elections, President Johnson has recommended sound remedial action to insure more equitable public support for political candidates.

I also endorse the President's recommendation that the Comptroller General be authorized to undertake a long-range study of campaign expenditures and the practices of funding solicitations of our political parties.

Certainly there will be debate and controversy over some of the President's proposals.

But the 90th Congress is dutybound to make a searching and studied appraisal of the President's recommendations. It is clear that reform of our electoral procedures is long overdue.

The American people have the right to expect intelligent debate and prompt action on the President's proposals.

I commend President Johnson for showing us the way toward real reform of the most vital elements in our political system. I am sure the Congress will give speedy and thorough consideration to the recommendations made by the President.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, today the President has sent to Congress recommendations for new legislation which I believe are significant in that they reaffirm our dedication to the fundamental principles upon which this Nation was founded.

It is our duty to reexamine these principles periodically in order to test whether we are meeting our goals as a nation in light of modern circumstances. The most basic tenet of our system is that our Government rests on the consent of the governed.

The recommendations of the President proposed here today constitute a landmark effort to preserve this fundamental principle. It seeks to improve the conduct of our political campaigns and the method of electing Federal officials. It strives to assure public confidence in and respect for all federally elected officials. Moreover, it is intended to provide greater opportunity for fuller popular participation in these political processes.

This entire program is a significant step in what is essentially an evolutionary plan to improve the basic framework of our republican form of government. For the next several years we as a people will be assessing what we have achieved during our first 200 years of existence as a nation. We must go beyond this to determine what we want to accomplish in the years ahead. The knowledge we can gain from the enactment of this legislation will vitally assist us in this effort.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the proposal offered by President Johnson in his message to the Congress on behalf of the Election Reform Act of 1967.

On February 27, 1967, I introduced legislation, H.R. 6185, to revise the Federal election laws in my Election Reform Act of 1967. The message of the President today outlines legislation very similar to H.R. 6185, and I urge the Members of the House to give immediate attention to this very important matter.

Briefly here is an outline of my proposal:

Title I amends the Criminal Code, title 18, by revising the definition of election, candidate, Federal office, political committee, contribution, and expenditure. It also places a limitation of $5,000 on the contributions which can be made by an individual, and amends the contributions by Government contractors section.

Title II creates a comprehensive full disclosure law for political campaign contributions and expenditures including conventions, caucuses, primary and general elections; creates a Federal Elections Commission with powers delineated; provides for the organization of political committees, the registration of political committees and the necessary reports by said committees; states that expenditures or contributions in excess of $100 are reportable and would cover all committees which anticipate making expenditures or receiving contributions; covers convention financing in detail; prescribes the duties of the commission; provides for the applicability of State laws and repeals the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

Title III provides for the disclosure of gifts, assets and liabilities, and certain compensation by all Members of Congress, Federal executives, and candidates for Federal office; details the information required and the process of filing said information with the commission.

Title IV amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a tax deduction for a contribution of up to $100 for an individual, $100 for a joint return, or $50 for a separately filed return by a married individual.

Title V establishes a Joint Committee on Ethics with seven members from the Senate and seven from the House and details the powers and duties of said Joint Committee.

The provisions of the full disclosure sections for campaign expenditures and contributions and the creation of a Federal Elections Commission are very similar to the legislation proposed by Congressman GOODELL (H.R. 631) and supported by the Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I fully support the President's efforts to improve our political processes on the national level. I wish to add my special approval and praise for the legislation dealing with mobile voters. I salute the President for this meaningful effort to end what has been an increasingly unfortunate punitive discrimination against, and disenfranchisement of, millions of potential eligible voters.

The 1960 census revealed that five to eight million persons could have qualified to vote for President and Vice President that year but for the maze of residence requirements in the various States. It should be noted that the presidential election is the only nationwide election where the people as a whole realize their cherished and sacred opportunity to reexpress their will through the selection of the two highest ranking national leaders. But ours is a Nation on the move. We move for various reasons. With modern means of transportation we can move quickly. In fact we have the constitutionally protected right to travel. It is a sad commentary on our political system that the exercise of this right so often carries with it the loss of the right to vote for a President and a Vice President.

Many of our citizens move so often, especially during the economically productive periods of their lives, that they never have an opportunity to settle in one place long enough to meet legal voting residency requirements in any State. Many of our States have taken the progressive step in shortening their voting residency requirements, but these have not been uniform.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, America's political processes move in a constant evolution. Changes in our society, in our economics, create new problems constantly. Yet the approach of Congress to the never-ending political changes has been sporadic at best, and our present laws in many instances are unrealistic and obsolete. America has developed one of the most highly advanced systems of technological developments known to man, and yet our society has not scientifically approached the problem of developing a sound political process to meet modern requirements.

President Johnson's program is based on making needed revisions now but, equally as significant, he says that these changes will provide the basis for future action. Just as America is never static, our approaches to the changes in our political processes must not be static. I congratulate the President in his effort to "oil the machinery" of the political "industry." In one area of his five-point program is suggested an election reform measure in which I am particularly interested. During the 89th Congress, I proposed a measure to reform our campaign financing laws and I reintroduced this bill early in this first session of the 90th Congress. The majority of the Executive proposals parallel the bill which I introduced. During the month of June, I intend to hold further hearings on this measure in the Subcommittee on Elections of the House Administration Committee.

I am glad to know that the political process is receiving attention, and I will certainly devote much of my energy to help improve it.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, one aspect of the President's message on the political process in America deals with the need for a uniform system to enable citizens to vote in presidential elections even though they may not meet the technical grounds of residence to vote on State issues in their new State of residence.

It is estimated between five and eight million otherwise eligible voters are disenfranchised by the varying resident requirements in the 50 States. Merely because citizens leave their homes in one part of the country and travel to other parts should not be reason for depriving them of the right to vote in a presidential election. We have made great strides trying to insure that voting is not denied to persons on grounds of race or color. To deny a person a right to vote on technical grounds of residence in a presidential election is unjust. As the President stated, it is difficult to conceive of any State or local interest which leave millions of citizens unable to vote for President and Vice President. The legislation proposed by the President would provide that citizens, otherwise qualified to vote under State law, may not be denied their vote in a presidential election if they become residents of the State by September 1 preceding the election. We must allow this neglected group to participate in the selection of our national leaders.

RESIDENCY VOTING ACT OF 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the President, in his message on improving the election process, has taken into consideration persons who have moved from one jurisdiction to another and therefore do not qualify under State statutes as to residents and are unable to vote in presidential elections.

It is time to recognize that large numbers of people have effectively lost their votes by being unable to fulfill certain technical voting requirements. The voice of approximately 8 million people has not been heard. These people have been precluded from voting not because of inability to exercise their inalienable right to vote but rather because of artificial distinctions of residency.

If the rights of our citizens had been tied to a certain specific residence we would never have explored this vast country of ours. Mobility of all kinds is a highly cherished right and persons should not be penalized because of their desire to move freely within the United States. National elections decide issues which are of vital importance to all the people of the United States.

The penalties provided in the proposed legislation are sufficient to prevent abuse of the proposed enlargement of the right to vote. The legislation is consistent with the search to insure that every citizen is not discriminated against.

I endorse the President's proposal and welcome these citizens into their rightful place as voting Americans.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message on improving our political processes requires the urgent attention and support of the 90th Congress.

We have known for years that our present election laws are inadequate. They do not cover local political committees and they do not cover primaries. As a result, the American people are unaware of the financial burdens which campaigning for public office places on individual candidates.

We have known for years that the registration requirements for voting in many of our States unfairly deny millions of our citizens the right to vote for President and Vice President merely because they have changed their residences.

The President, in his message on improving the election process, has taken into consideration this ever present problem of persons who have moved from one jurisdiction to another and therefore do not qualify under State statutes as to residents and are unable to vote in presidential elections.

In our continual battle to prevent a class from being disenfranchised it is time to recognize that large numbers of people have effectively lost their votes by being unable to fulfill certain technical voting requirements. The voice of approximately 8 million people has not been heard. We all know of national elections which have been closely contested and where far less than 8 million votes might have been significant. These people have been precluded from voting not because of inability to exercise their inalienable right to vote but rather because of artificial distinctions of residency.

If the rights of our citizens had been tied to a certain specific residence we would never have explored this vast country of ours. Mobility of all kinds is a highly cherished right and persons should not be penalized because of their desire to move freely within the United States. National elections decide issues which are of vital importance to all the people of the United States.

The penalties provided in the proposed legislation are sufficient to prevent abuse of the proposed enlargement of the right to vote. The legislation is consistent with the search to insure that every citizen is not discriminated against.

I support the President's program as essential to the expansion of our democratic system.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. The President of the United States and the Vice President of the United States are the only officials elected by all the people to represent all the people. In the performance of their duties they do not act for individual States or regions of the Nation. They act for the whole country. Harry Truman once described himself as a lobbyist for the people and he did not mean just some people. He meant them all.

It is for this reason that I support President Johnson's proposal with respect to mobile voters. I suppose some sort of case can be made for delaying the right to vote in local elections until a new resident has time to learn what the local issues are. No such argument can be made for delaying that right in a presidential election.

A man in California knows who he wants to see elected President, and he knows why. His position becomes no less valid because he moves to West Virginia. The President represents a citizen as directly in Florida as in Oregon.

I commend the President, also, for his fine comments concerning the lobby control provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, and the recommendations which support the findings of the joint committee on which I have the honor to serve.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message has brought a new impetus into the movement for a reasonable, responsible system of campaign financing.

He has recognized how essential it is to halt the upward spiral of political spending and also the need to broaden the base of campaign contributing. I have in the past addressed myself to these problems and have expressed myself in favor of effective ceilings on size of contributions. There may be differences in the details; however, the objectives merit widespread support.

The President has pointed out the weakness of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act and made recommendations to strengthen it without impairing any individual's right or the right of any group to petition the Congress.

He has pointed out the gross inequity of denying an otherwise qualified citizen the right to vote for President and Vice President merely because that citizen changes his residence.

The Residency Voting Act of 1967 brings into proper focus the ever-present problems of persons who have moved from one jurisdiction to another and do not qualify under State statutes as to residency and therefore are unable to vote in presidential elections.

In our continual battle to prevent a class of citizens from being disenfranchised, it is time to recognize that large numbers of people have effectively lost their votes by being unable to fulfill certain technical voting requirements. The voice of approximately 8 million people has not been heard. We all know of national elections which have been closely contested and where far less than that number of votes would have been significant. These citizens have been precluded from voting, not because of inability to exercise their inalienable right to vote, but rather because of artificial distinctions of residency.

If the rights of our citizens had been tied to a certain specific residence we would never have explored this vast country of ours. Mobility of all kinds is a highly cherished right and persons should not be penalized because of their desire to move freely within the United States. National elections decide issues which are of vital importance to all the people of the United States.

The penalties provided in the proposed legislation appear to be sufficient to prevent abuse of the proposed enlargement of the right to vote. The legislation is consistent with the search to insure that every citizen is not discriminated against.

I endorse the President's proposal and hope it will be enacted into law, so that those citizens who for one reason or another will be obliged to move from one place to another, will not be denied their rightful place as voting Americans.

President Johnson's message requires the careful consideration of Congress and, I believe, the enactment of the substance of his recommendations.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, of the many important matters discussed in the President's message on "The Political Process in America," I want to particularly express my support for the proposal to protect the right to vote of these Americans who happen to move to a different State during a presidential election year.

Congress has done much in recent years to guarantee to all Americans their right to vote, regardless of skin color or economic condition. The entire country has become much more aware in recent years that in order to safeguard democracy, we must protect the most basic and precious right in a democracy, the right to vote.

However, millions of Americans are still arbitrarily disenfranchised because they happen to change their place of residence. In the 1960 elections, between

5 and 8 million Americans, otherwise eligible to vote according to State law, were deprived of the right to vote, even for President of the United States, because of the unnecessary long residency requirements in many of the States. Almost half of the States have antiquated laws which require a citizen to be a resident for a full 12 months before being eligible to vote—even for President.

At the very least the Federal Government should assure all of its citizens, regardless of where they live or for how long, the right to vote for the Chief Executive of their country. It is certainly outrageous that an American citizen can be denied the right to vote for President merely because he happens to move from one State to another during a presidential election year, and even, in some cases, from one election precinct in a State to another precinct in the same State.

Lengthy residency requirements penalize those Americans who move in search of new jobs and better opportunities for themselves and their families. The American tradition is one of encouraging its citizens to reach out for better opportunities and also of encouraging its citizens to participate in their government. President Johnson's proposed Residency Voting Act of 1967 is part of that tradition. It very simply provides that a citizen, otherwise qualified to vote under the laws of a State, may vote for President if he becomes a resident of the State by September 1 of the election year, even though the State may have a much longer residency requirement for voting in its own State elections.

In recent years we have moved ever closer to the democratic ideal of a full franchise—of every qualified citizen, regardless of his race or station, being permitted and encouraged to vote. We have sought to eliminate arbitrary barriers based on prejudice or unsupportable local customs which undermine the ideal of a free government, freely chosen by a free people.

Congress should approve President Johnson's proposal in this session of Congress so that the law could be easily applied in time for the 1968 presidential election. I want to commend President Johnson for this proposal which is so much a part of his overall efforts to protect and extend the franchse so that every American citizen will truly be an active participant in this Government.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD following the reading of the President's message on election reform.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Respectfully yours,
PETER N. KYROS,
Member of Congress.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1967

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is requested that my resignation from the House Agriculture Committee be accepted.

Sincerely,
W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 492) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 492

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on the District of Columbia: E. S. Johnny Walker, New Mexico.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: W. S. (Bill) Stuckey, Georgia; Peter N. Kyros, Maine.

Committee on Science and Astronautics: Robert O. Tiernan, Rhode Island.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORATION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT AND THE ALLOWANCE OF ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman will take ample time to explain and to answer questions concerning the conference report.

Mr. MILLS. That is our intention. I will ask, if the request is agreed to, to dispense with the reading of the statement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 302)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That sections 48(j) and 167(i)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining suspension period) are each amended by striking out 'December 31, 1967' and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 9, 1967'.

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 48(h)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining suspension period property) is amended by striking out subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(A) the physical construction, reconstruction, or erection of which (i) is begun during the suspension period, or (ii) is begun, pursuant to an order placed during such period, before May 24, 1967, or

"'(B) which (i) is acquired by the taxpayer during the suspension period, or (ii) is acquired by the taxpayer, pursuant to an order placed during such period, before May 24, 1967.

In applying subparagraph (A) to any section 38 property, there shall be taken into account only that portion of the basis which is properly attributable to construction, reconstruction, or erection before May 24, 1967.'

"(b) Section 167(i)(1) of such Code (relating to limitation on certain methods of depreciation) is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'if—' and all that follows in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'if the physical construction, reconstruction, or erection of such property by any person begins during the suspension period, or begins, pursuant to an order placed during such period, before May 24, 1967.'; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In applying this paragraph to any property, there shall be taken into account only that portion of the basis which is properly attributable to construction, reconstruction, or erection before May 24, 1967.'

"SEC. 3. Section 48(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to property used outside the United States) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B)(i) 'or is operated under contract with the United States'.

"SEC. 4. The amendments made by the first three sections of this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after March 9, 1967.

"SEC. 5. (a) Funds which become available under the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 shall be appropriated and disbursed only after the adoption by law of guidelines governing their distribution. Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall become applicable only after the adoption by law of such guidelines.

"(b) Guidelines adopted in accordance with this section shall state expressly that they are intended to comply with this section."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. D. Mills,
Cecil R. King,
Hale Boggs,
John W. Byrnes,
Thos. B. Curtis,
Managers on the Part of the House.
Russell B. Long,
G. Smathers,
Clinton P. Anderson,
Albert Gore,
John J. Williams,
Frank Carlson,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

SUSPENSION PERIOD

For purposes of the suspension of the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, sections 48(j) and 167(i)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 define the term "suspension period" as the period beginning on October 10, 1966, and ending December 31, 1967. Under the bill as passed by the House, the Senate amendment, and the conference agreement, the last day of the suspension period is March 9, 1967.

SUSPENSION PERIOD PROPERTY

Under existing law, "suspension period property" (property which is subject to the suspension of the investment credit) is defined in general as (A) property the physical construction, reconstruction, or erection of which either begins during the suspension period or pursuant to an order placed during such period, and (B) property acquired by the taxpayer either during the suspension period or pursuant to an order placed during such period.

Under the bill as passed by the House, the definition is limited to property the physical construction, reconstruction, or erection of which begins during the suspension period and to property acquired by the taxpayer during such period. Where the construction, reconstruction, or erection begins during the suspension period, the suspension is to apply only to that portion of the basis which is properly attributable to construction, reconstruction, or erection during the suspension period.

Under the Senate amendment, the definition under existing law would not be changed.

Under the conference agreement, "suspension period property" is defined in general as property (1) the physical construction, reconstruction, or erection of which is begun during the suspension period or is begun, pursuant to an order placed during such period, before May 24, 1967, or (2) which is acquired by the taxpayer during the suspension period or is acquired by the taxpayer, pursuant to an order placed during such period, before May 24, 1967. In applying the definition to property described in clause (1) of the preceding sentence, there is to be taken into account only that portion of the basis which is properly attributable to construction, reconstruction, or erection before May 24, 1967.

ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION

Under existing law, accelerated depreciation under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of section 167(b) of the 1954 Code is not applicable in the case of real property the physical construction, reconstruction, or erection of which by any person begins during the suspension period or with respect to which an order for such construction, reconstruction, or erection is placed by any person during such period. Under the bill as passed by the House, only the portion of the basis of the property attributable to construction, etc., during the suspension period is denied accelerated depreciation and the rule applicable to orders placed during the suspension period is eliminated. Under the Senate amendment, no change in existing law would be made. Under the conference agreement, accelerated depreciation is not to apply if the construction, etc., by any person begins during the suspension period or begins, pursuant to an order placed during such period, before May 24, 1967. This rule is to apply only to that portion of the basis which is properly attributable to construction, reconstruction, or erection before May 24, 1967.

LIMITATION ON CREDIT

Under an amendment made by Public Law 89–800, enacted November 8, 1966, where the tax liability exceeds $25,000, the limitation on the amount of the investment credit allowed for a taxable year was increased from $25,000 plus 25 percent of the tax liability in excess of $25,000, to $25,000 plus 50 percent of such excess. Under Public Law 89–800, the increase applies to taxable years ending after the last day of the suspension period (December 31, 1967) and is prorated where the taxable year begins in 1967 and ends in 1968. Under the bill as passed by the House, the increase would automatically (that is, by reason of the termination of the suspension period on March 9, 1967) take effect for taxable years ending after March 9, 1967. Under the Senate amendment, the increase would take effect for taxable years ending after December 31, 1967. Under the conference agreement, the increase is to take effect as under the bill as passed by the House.

CERTAIN AIRCRAFT

Under existing law property used predominantly outside the United States does not, in general, qualify for the investment credit. One of the exceptions to this rule applies to any aircraft which is registered by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and which is operated to or from the United States. The Senate amendment extends this exception to any aircraft which is so registered and which is operated under contract with the United States. This provision is included in the bill as agreed to in conference.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND

The Senate amendment provides that funds which become available under the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 shall be appropriated and disbursed only after the adoption by law of guidelines governing their distribution. The Senate amendment also provides that section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (which permits an individual taxpayer to designate that $1 of his income tax be paid into the Presidential Election Campaign Fund) shall become applicable only after the adoption by law of such guidelines. In addition, the Senate amendment provides that guidelines adopted in accordance with the provisions of the Senate amendment shall state expressly that they are intended to comply with such provisions.

These provisions of the Senate amendment are included in the bill as agreed to in conference.

W. D. Mills,
Cecil R. King,
Hale Boggs,
John W. Byrnes,
Thos. B. Curtis,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, what is before the House is the conference report accompanying the bill H.R. 6950, which the Members, by stretching their memory and recollection, will recall is the bill that passed the House by almost unanimous consent on March 16 last. That was a Thursday, as this is a Thursday, but it was some 10 weeks ago. This was a matter that we thought should be handled expeditiously, one which involved a principle, to us at least, of whether or not the Congress itself could, when called upon to perform expeditiously, legislate within a short period of time a necessary change in the law.

We did our part. The message came to us. We had hearings, we had executive sessions, and we passed the bill, all within the short period of time of 1 week. However, I restate that we are bringing back to you a conference report accompanying that bill 10 weeks to the day after it passed the House.

The bill, as passed by the Senate, contained four amendments to the House bill. In the conference, your conferees accepted two of the Senate amendments, retaining all of the House language on one of the others, and retaining the major portion of the House language on the remaining provision. The amendments where the House prevailed in whole or in large part were in my estimation, the most important investment credit provisions in conference.

The first of these major issues relates to the timing of the restoration of the investment credit and the accelerated depreciation provision. The bill as passed by the House provided for the restoration of the investment credit in the same manner in which the investment credit was originally provided in 1962, at the time of its adoption.

In the case of property ordered from others, where these orders were placed during the suspension period, the House bill provided that the investment credit would be available where the taxpayer acquired the property after the end of the suspension period—that is, after March 9, 1967.

Where the property was constructed by the taxpayer or ordered constructed by him, the House version of the bill provided that where this construction began or the order for construction was placed during the suspension period, the investment credit was to be available with respect to that portion of the construction which occurred after March 9, 1967.

This, too, is in accord with the rules followed in 1962 when action was first taken on the investment credit.

The rules for restoration of accelerated depreciation were substantially the same as the construction rules that I have outlined to you in the case of the investment credit. By this I mean that if the construction was begun by the taxpayer or ordered by him during the suspension period, that portion of the construction completed before March 10, 1967, would be ineligible for the rapid methods of depreciation, such as the sum-of-the-years digit method and the double-declining-balance method.

The Senate modified this House provision to provide that in the case of orders placed during the suspension period, the investment credit was not to be available—no matter when the property was acquired. In the case of construction begun by the taxpayer or orders for construction placed by him during the suspension period, the Senate bill would have provided that the investment credit would not be available with respect to any part of the construction—no matter when it was completed.

Mr. Speaker, this Senate version was in line with the idea that I had had initially when I introduced the bill that accompanied the message from the President on March 9. The bill I introduced had not been submitted to the Treasury Department or anyone else. It was not an administration proposal in all regards. In the Committee on Ways and Means it became quite clear, though, that if we really wanted to create uncertainty and confusion in tax law and an inability on the part of the taxpayer ever to know exactly what his situation was, we would restore the 7-percent investment credit solely on the basis of orders entered after March 9 of 1967, no matter when delivery was made.

Those of you who are lawyers know the ease with which you can get out of orders in cases where you are dealing with the same supplier you have dealt with for some 30 years. In these cases you can obtain his acquiescence in canceling an order that is disadvantageous to you and then renewing that order at a time when it would be advantageous for you to do so.

So the committee and the House, following the recommendation of the committee, took this very firm position with respect to how this matter would be handled.

While your conferees were unwilling to accept the Senate version of this provision, we found the Senate conferees also were reluctant to accept the House version of this provision. As a result, we did what the conferees usually do in cases like this—we compromised.

In this compromise we retained the basic principle of the House provision with one modification.

The conference agreement—as do both the House and Senate bills—provides that the suspension period for the investment credit and accelerated depreciation provisions is to terminate on March 9, 1967. In the case of orders placed during the suspension period, the conference agreement provides that the investment credit is to be denied not only if the acquisition of the property occurred before March 10, but also where it occurred in the period up to May 24, 1967, the day the conferees reached agreement on this provision. Orders placed during the suspension period where acquisition of the property—that is, possession and control—occurs on or after May 24 will be eligible for the investment credit.

The **SPEAKER**. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. **MILLS**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. **MILLS**. This rule maintains the administrative simplicity of the House provision in that it avoids the issue of tracing new orders back to see whether there were cancellations and whether the order could be traced to one place during the suspension period. At the same time, however, this rule leans in the direction of the Senate version of this provision since acquisitions up through Tuesday of this week will be ineligible for the investment credit if ordered during the suspension period.

The investment credit rules in the case of construction, or orders for construction, follow essentially the same concept expressed in the case of the order rule. By this I mean that if the construction was begun or ordered during the suspension period—that is, on or before March 9—then the portion of the construction which was completed before May 24, 1967, is to be ineligible for the investment credit. The portion of the construction completed on or after May 24, 1967, will be fully eligible for the investment credit. In the case of construction begun after the end of the suspension period—that is, after March 9, 1967—or in the case of orders for construction placed after that date, the investment credit will be fully available, both with respect to construction occurring before and after May 24, 1967. Of course, this does not mean that when a taxpayer buys items off the shelf of a retailer or other person and this occurs after March 9 that the investment credit is to be denied even though the construction of the item may have occurred before that date since the work in these cases was not done specifically for the taxpayer.

In effect by not making the investment credit available where orders were placed before March 9, but acquisitions occurred any time up to May 24, the conference agreement goes part of the way to meet the Senate's contention that it is unfair to businessmen who complied with the Congress' request to restrain investment during the suspension period for the Congress to turn around and grant the investment credit to businessmen whose profit considerations made it possible for them to ignore the loss of the credit. Your conferees believed they could take that consideration into account by limiting the credit to acquisitions of property on or after May 24. However, we were convinced that the administrative complications which would arise if the investment credit were allowed only in the case of orders placed after the suspension period prevented us from going too far in the Senate's direction. We did not feel that we should deny the credit for acquisitions in the future.

In connection with the simplification that I have been referring to, the Members will recall that last year when the investment credit was suspended a number of companies might have had difficulty in identifying under their accounting systems whether a particular item was acquired before October 10, 1966, or not. At that time it was indicated that where companies regularly acquire, or manufacture themselves, and maintain a large stock of identical or similar pieces of property to be placed in service as needed and the accounting systems do not identify item by item the date of acquisition, then the companies are to assume that the first items which were put in service after October 9, 1966, were those they had on hand earlier. It is understood that this same rule is to apply at the end of the suspension period.

Mr. **JONAS**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. **MILLS**. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. **JONAS**. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the gentleman mean physically acquired or title thereto? The gentleman means physically acquired?

Mr. **MILLS**. Acquired, as we use the term here means the taxpayer has obtained possession and control.

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **MILLS**. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I believe that to some Members this matter with reference to the dates of October 10 and March 9 may be somewhat confusing. It is my opinion that perhaps we should say, for the purpose of simplification, that for an item of equipment to be ineligible for the investment credit, two conditions must occur: First, that it was ordered between October 10 and March 9. Then it also has to meet a second test, and that is the test that it was acquired and it was delivered—they took possession and control of the equipment—sometime between October 10 and May 24.

Mr. **MILLS**. That is correct.

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Arkansas will yield further, unless it meets those two tests, then the equipment is eligible for the investment credit.

Mr. **MILLS**. I appreciate the gentleman's observation. The gentleman is eminently correct.

Mr. Speaker, there are other matters contained in this conference report.

The Senate receded in full with regard to the second Senate amendment in conference. The Members will recall that under present law the amount of investment credit which can be charged against tax liability in any one year is the full tax liability up to $25,000 plus 25 percent of the tax liability over $25,000.

The law which suspended the investment credit last year liberalized this investment credit limitation. It provided that after the offset in full of the first $25,000 of tax liability, the investment credit could offset 50 percent of the liability in excess of $25,000, instead of 25 percent. This change was to become effective when the suspension period ended, which then was December 31, 1967. The House bill by moving up the end of the suspension period to March 9 automatically also moved up to that same date the time when the 50-percent limitation would become effective. The Senate bill, on the other hand, separated the effective date of this provision from the end of the suspension period and made the 50 percent effective as of December 31, 1967—the date it would have been effective in the absence of any action restoring the investment credit.

The Senate agreed to the House March 9 date for applying the new 50-percent limit. This is appropriate since there was a general understanding last year that the 50-percent limit would come into play as soon as the end of the suspension period was reached. This more liberal treatment for the investment credit was designed in part to eventually restore much of the loss of the credit realized by taxpayers during the suspension period.

The benefits of this provision provide advantages primarily to any business firm which has a high ratio of investment to tax liability. Such firms are in the position of possibly losing some of the investment credit they have earned when the appropriate carry-forward period expires. They also are denied the use of the funds in the current period. In effect, the industries engaged most intensively in modernization or expansion programs would be the major beneficiaries. These are the firms for whom the investment credit was primarily designed. Among the industries most needful of the benefits of the 50-percent limitation, and which would be most helped by it, are the transportation industries.

The two provisions I have dealt with up to this point represented Senate modifications of House provisions. The Senate also added two entirely new provisions.

One of these amendments by the Senate is a relatively minor one. I call this the Vietnam airlift amendment. It extends the investment credit to aircraft operated outside the United States under contract with the U.S. Government, where the aircraft also is registered with the Federal Aviation Agency.

Under present law, the investment credit generally is available only for property used predominantly in the United States. In the case of aircraft, however, it is available for aircraft, operating to and from the United States where the aircraft also is registered with the Federal Aviation Agency.

Presently, there are several U.S. airlines under contract with the Defense Department to provide transportation for personnel and/or cargo between Vietnam and other points outside the United States. These planes are registered with the FAA, but some of them do not return to the United States during the space of any given year. The airlines operating under these conditions are placed under a competitive disadvantage with other airlines which are able to rotate their planes between the United States and other parts of the world. Their ability to purchase large new jets is reduced because they cannot receive the investment credit. In addition, the unavailability of the credit to these airlines may reduce the supply of fast, large jet carriers to the Defense Department. The Defense Department believes that this amendment would aid it in assuring flexible means of obtaining the amount and type of air transportation services it requires between Vietnam and other places outside the United States.

The Senate amendment provides that the investment credit will be available for aircraft registered with the Federal Aviation Agency and operated outside of the United States under a contract with the U.S. Government. This exception is not to apply unless the contract constitutes the predominant use of the airplane outside the United States. The House conferees receded with respect to this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that last year in the Foreign Investors Tax Act, under the rules of the other body it decided to add other materials to the bill.

And it did so to such an extent that some of our good friends who write columns in the newspapers referred to it as the Christmas tree bill. One of the items included was the suggestion by a very eminent Member of the Senate that we resolve this matter of political campaign contributions by allowing the taxpayer to indicate on his income tax return, by a checkmark in a box, that $1 should go to a trust fund from which appropriations of moneys would be made to both major political parties, and even to a third party under certain circumstances, on an equal basis to meet the cost of presidential campaigns. This is the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966.

I think we are also aware of the fact that the Senate later on during the course of this session decided that it did not want that campaign fund to go into effect, insofar as disbursements and the checkmark on the income tax return were concerned, until certain guidelines were developed and enacted into law. The provisions of the bill as it passed the Senate relating to the campaign financing amendment provides that funds under that act are to be appropriated and disbursed only after the adoption by Congress of guidelines to govern their distribution. It also provides that the checkoff on tax returns is to be applicable only after the adoption by Congress of such guidelines.

We have accepted that amendment, Mr. Speaker, so that until something is done no funds may be spent under this act and no checkoff may be placed on the income tax return.

The Senate now has instructed its Committee on Finance to hold hearings and draft appropriate legislation on the whole subject of campaign financing. It also instructed the Committee on Finance to report out such a bill in the near future. This legislation is to provide guidelines indicating how, if at all, the tax checkoff and disbursement provisions of the present campaign act are to operate.

Since the House has not yet had an opportunity to go into the subject, we believed that the course of wisdom called for your conferees to recede to this amendment and to give the Senate an opportunity to come up with its recommendations on campaign financing. The House will then be in a position to consider the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House conferees have returned with a bill that carries out the will of the House as expressed in the version of H.R. 6950 which it adopted.

The bill as passed by the House would have entailed a revenue loss of $1,860 million during the 4-year period, 1967 through 1970. This revenue loss arises because under present law the suspension of the investment credit would continue until December 31, 1967. The conference report—because of the continuation of the suspension of the credit for orders placed during the suspension period where the property is acquired before May 24, 1967, and also because of the related rules—will produce a revenue loss of $1,710 million. The net result of the conference action, therefore, as compared to the House bill, will be a net reduction in revenue loss of $150 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this conference report, since it is unanimously agreed to by all Members of the conference committee, is worthy of acceptance by my colleagues, and I would urge that it be agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am particularly concerned with this provision dealing with campaign funds. I do not know whether it is strictly a coincidence that we received a message on this subject here this morning.

Mr. MILLS. I cannot enlighten the gentleman on that.

Mr. GROSS. But I am disappointed that the committee, the managers on the part of the House, accepted any part of this provision.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is not referring to the provisions in this conference report, I take it, because the provisions in this conference report prevent the provisions accepted by the House as a part of a conference report last year from becoming operational. Under this amendment there can be no checkoff, and there can be no appropriation of funds until further legislation is passed by the Congress providing guidelines.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that. But a vote for this conference report will put a Member on guard as justifying the action taken in the other body.

Sure it has to be implemented with guidelines that the other body will pass upon. There have been no hearings held so far as I know in the House of Representatives on this issue of whether we want to even go this far with the deduction.

Mr. MILLS. Let me ask my good friend if he is not entrapping himself—which I know he normally does not do. I am so prone always to accept his evaluations on matters, but in this instance I believe just the reverse of what he thinks is the situation.

If you do not vote for this conference report, if the conference report is not accepted, then the provisions of the law written last year will continue in full effect, and there will be, in connection with tax returns filed in the course of the next calendar year, a place for a checkoff of a dollar on each return, that money being deposited in a fund, and then being made available for these political campaigns.

If you agree to this conference report, that cannot happen, until you act again on something that establishes so-called guidelines with respect to the operation of the campaign fund.

So I think the gentleman finds himself in exactly the position he wants to be in, by voting in favor of the conference report rather than the reverse.

Mr. GROSS. I understand perfectly. This thing is in a state of suspension. I understand it perfectly. But I do not know why we should permit ourselves to be boxed in—and I think if this conference report was rejected and sent back to the other body, they would do something about the situation that they are trying to box us in on now. Let them go back and settle this issue instead of using this subterfuge that they have adopted and stuck on this bill.

Mr. MILLS. Let me reason with my friend again.

The other body in connection with this amendment on the floor committed itself to holding hearings and reporting back amendments to the existing campaign fund act. Now, whether or not that action will be effected by following the approach taken in the message just read on this problem of financing campaigns, I do not know. But I do know that we are not going to gain anything by refusing to adopt this conference report and asking the other body to keep this bill in abeyance again until something can be written into it that will suit the gentleman's fancy, or my fancy, with respect to campaign elections.

Here is what we would be doing if we followed that course. We would be keeping in limbo and uncertainty the question of the restoration of the 7-percent investment credit during all that period of time. My friend from Iowa, I know, joins me in the hope that we can get that matter settled and get it settled now, as we had hoped earlier that we would be able to get it settled before the end of the month of March.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I am not blaming or putting the responsibility for this on the House of Representatives for what is in the cards with respect to the investment tax credit.

Mr. MILLS. Absolutely not. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do think that the gentleman from Iowa should be reminded that if this conference report is voted down—or if the House had refused to accept the Senate amendment on the campaign funds—all in the world you would be doing would be putting into full force and effect the so-called Long Act which was passed last year with reference to the funding of presidential campaigns, which I gather from what the gentleman is saying is the opposite objective of what he wants to obtain.

So if he wants to make at least as much progress as possible, in the direction at least that he gives us the impression he wants to move, then you have to not only accept the conference report but accept the Senate amendment, which the House agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. I think the gentleman is eminently correct, and I appreciate his making that statement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. What I resent is the House of Representatives being placed in this kind of a box. I oppose having anything to do with this kind of proposition. Here we are—caught indirectly in a box in this bill and that is what I resent.

Mr. MILLS. I would want my friend to recognize the fact that he is not in a box in the sense that we have not given him the opportunity to lift the lid of the box. We are giving you an opportunity now to get out of that box by agreeing to this conference report. You were in effect nailed in under existing law but now we are saying, if you want to, you can lift the top and get out, as I see it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, we handle tax bills over here under closed rules. We have a strict rule on germaneness and I resent the other body cramming something down our necks piecemeal like this.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas has yielded to me. As one of the vigorous opponents of the campaign financing act which the Congress passed last year, I have had very serious reservations about the way that act would operate. As a matter of fact, the debate in the Nation reveals a grave concern on the part of a mounting proportion of our people that the multimillion-dollar fund set up for national presidential campaigns would provide a huge corrupting force in American politics.

For this reason, I was very pleased with the attention given to this subject by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the relentless effort he made to alert the country to the dangers in this act. I commend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and the other conferees for their acceptance of the amendment of the other body which effectively postponed the date this financing act could go into operation until such time as guidelines could be set up.

I personally hope that this monstrous bill will simply and quietly die without any further discussion. But I feel that the conferees have taken a very sound position in accepting the amendment of the other body. I therefore urge adoption of the conference report.

As one who voted against the action of the House last year on the subject under discussion, the presidential campaign fund, I would just like to congratulate the conferees on accepting the Senate position on this provision or issue, for instance, of convertibility. I have grave reservations about this entire position.

Mr. MILLS. But the gentleman does think the conference report should be adopted?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I support the conference report despite the fact that I opposed the action that was taken last year.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my respects and compliments also to the conferees because also, like the gentleman from West Virginia, I was opposed to this bill last year and so voted.

I would like to see it die a natural death. But I think in the conference report you have done the only thing you could do, to sustain it, at least; otherwise, if you had not agreed to the amendment, that provision would have been in effect right now. So I think you are doing those of us who are opposed to the legislation a favor by what you have done in this conference report. I am personally indebted to you.

Mr. MILLS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I only wish to point out that the conferees ended up at the point at which the House conferees were in complete agreement. There is no controversy with respect to this report that is brought before the House. I think it is a good report, extremely good, considering the very adamant attitude that was taken at certain stages of the deliberations by the conferees appointed by the other body. So I would recommend this conference report to the House for adoption.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I gather there was no definition in the conference report relating to "acquired."

Mr. MILLS. There is a description of the word "acquired" in the regulations on the 7-percent investment credit.

Mr. CRAMER. Let me give you an example.

Mr. MILLS. Let me say to the gentleman that "acquired" means having possession and control.

Mr. CRAMER. It means both?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. In other words, if I send something f.o.b. New York is that acquired or not acquired?

Mr. MILLS. Not until it arrives and you have control over it.

Mr. CRAMER. Both possession and control over; not just title?

Mr. MILLS. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 301)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9481) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 22, 31, 38, 39, 40, 45, and 54.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21, 29, 32, 33, 34, 43, 50, 52, 57, 58, 59, and 60: and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,046,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "To carry out section 861 of the Public Health Service Act, $500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1968."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,040,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "IX"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "X"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "XI"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$66,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "XII"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "RELATED AGENCY"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "XIII"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 9, 18, 20, 24, 25, 30, 35, 36, 44, 46, 47, and 55.

Elford A. Cederberg
(reservation on No. 20),
George Mahon,
Jamie L. Whitten
(with reservations),
John J. Rooney
(except as to amendments Nos. 20, 22, and 23),
Joe L. Evins,
William H. Natcher,
Daniel J. Flood,
Tom Steed,
Melvin R. Laird,
Managers on the Part of the House.

John O. Pastore,
Spessard L. Holland,
Carl Hayden,
Allen J. Ellender,
John L. McClellan,
Robert C. Byrd,
Mike Monroney,
E. L. Bartlett,
Karl E. Mundt,
Milton R. Young,
Margaret Chase Smith,
Thomas H. Kuchel,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

Chapter I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service

Amendment No. 1: Reported in disagreement. The House managers will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to permit $25,000 to be used for the administration of Public Law 89–544. The funds so provided for the animal welfare Act's administration are to be limited to travel expenses of existing departmental personnel. The program for fiscal year 1968 will be acted upon in the regular appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968.

Conservation reserve program

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $650,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House.

Chapter II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Amendment No. 3: Corrects printing error.

Chapter III

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Federal funds

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $8,000,000 for Federal payment to the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $6,046,000 for loans to the District of Columbia instead of $2,896,000 as proposed by the House and $6,196,000 as proposed by the Senate.

District of Columbia funds

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $311,200 for parks and recreation as proposed by the Senate instead of $561,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $4,600,000 for capital outlay instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,750,000 as proposed by the Senate. Included is $1,600,000 for initial expenses of a sanitary landfill, as proposed by the Senate, to be expended only if a suitable site is obtained; $150,000 for a preliminary survey for construction of a new detention facility, as proposed by the Senate, is not included.

CHAPTER IV

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Amendment No. 8: Inserts chapter heading.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in technical disagreement. The House managers will offer a motion to provide transfer of $840,000 for additional expenses for relocation of the Mission to NATO from France to Belgium, as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Amendments Nos. 10 and 11: Insert chapter heading and appropriate $2,600,000 for Alaska mortgage indemnity grants, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $9,550,000 for disaster relief as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Amendment No. 13: Deletes the Senate proposal to provide additional funds for travel expenses of the Civil Service Commission.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $100,000 for the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel, as proposed by the Senate instead of $75,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $17,400,000 for the Interstate Commerce Commission (payment of loan guaranties) as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $7,000,000 for the Selective Service System instead of $6,500,000 as proposed by the House and $7,309,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Inserts chapter number.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 18: Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment which appropriates $1,700,000 for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Amendment No. 19: Inserts chapter number.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment, to appropriate $3,823,700 for the National Teacher Corps instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, with a proviso making the use of such funds contingent upon the enactment of certain legislation.

Amendment No. 21: Deletes House language which permitted the Commissioner of Education to make certain determinations.

Amendment No. 22: Deletes the Senate proposal to appropriate $20,000,000 for payments to school districts for operation and maintenance. The managers on the part of the Senate receded at the insistence of the managers on the part of the House, but without prejudicing action by the Senate on the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation bill, 1968.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $30,000,000 for assistance for school construction instead of $48,831,216 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to appropriate $2,122,775 for higher education facilities construction.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to permit the allotment of an additional $100,000 to the District of Columbia for vocational rehabilitation services.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $500,000 to carry out section 861 of the Public Health Service Act instead of $750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Appropriate $4,500,000 for air pollution instead of $3,664,000 as proposed by the House and $10,439,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide that $4,040,000 shall remain available for obligation until December 31, 1967. It is the intention of the conferees that in the use of these funds emphasis be placed on research on the problems in connection with coal sulphur detoxification.

Amendment No. 29: Deletes House language with reference to hospital construction activities.

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment, which will permit funds for mental health research and services to remain available through December 31, 1967.

Amendment No. 31: Deletes the Senate proposal to appropriate $150,000 for higher education for international understanding.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $75,000,000 for the economic opportunity program as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Inserts chapter number.

CHAPTER VIII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendment No. 34: Inserts heading.

Amendments Nos. 35 and 36: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer motions to concur in the Senate amendments which will appropriate $90,000 for miscellaneous expenses of the Senate; and $53,400 for stationery for Senators.

Amendments Nos. 37 and 38: Appropriate $175,000 for the Office of the Superintendent of Documents instead of $150,000 as proposed by the House and $200,000 as proposed by the Senate; and delete the Senate proposal to provide an additional amount of $2,500 for travel expenses.

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40: Delete the Senate proposal to appropriate $5,500,000 for family housing (Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense).

Amendment No. 41: Inserts chapter number.

Amendment No. 42: Inserts chapter number.

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Amendment No. 43: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 44: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to provide, by transfer, $3,300,000 for contributions to international organizations.

Amendment No. 45: Deletes the Senate proposal to rescind the unobligated balance of the appropriation for loan to the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Amendment No. 46: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment, to provide by transfer, $230,000 for support of U.S. prisoners.

RELATED AGENCIES

Amendment No. 47: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to appropriate $200,000 instead of $235,000 as proposed by the Senate for the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws; and provides that $150,000 shall not be available until July 1, 1967.

Amendment No. 48: Inserts chapter number.

CHAPTER XI

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $66,000,000 for grants-in-aid for airports instead of $61,000,000 as proposed by the House and $71,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Deletes the House proposal to appropriate $100,000 for studies of Territorial highway needs.

Amendment No. 51: Inserts chapter number.

CHAPTER XII

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates $333,600,000 for operations as proposed by the Senate instead of $334,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 53: Inserts heading.

RELATED AGENCY

Amendment No. 54: Deletes the Senate proposal to appropriate $200,000 for Advisory Commission on Parcel Distribution Services.

Amendment No. 55: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide $200,000, by transfer, for the Joint Commission on the Coinage instead of $400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Inserts chapter number.

CHAPTER XIII

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

Amendments Nos. 57 and 58: Appropriate $21,343,762 for claims and judgments, including those in Senate Document, Numbered 25, instead of $10,978,173 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II

INCREASED PAY COSTS

Amendments Nos. 59 and 60: Insert miscellaneous Senate items of increased pay costs, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Appropriates $2,000,000 for administration and regional operation of the Post Office Department (additional pay costs) instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House and $2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN
(with reservations),
JOHN J. ROONEY
(except as to amendments Nos. 20, 22 and 23),
JOE L. EVINS,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
TOM STEED,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
(résumé on No. 20),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

OVERALL APPROPRIATIONS OF THE SESSION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I plan to insert a more precise statement of the particulars in the RECORD later in the day, but may I just preface my remarks by saying that thus far at this session, in appropriation bills which have been reported to the House from the Appropriations Committee, we are about $1.5 billion—$1,499,000,000—below the budget estimates.

The committee has taken action on about $50 billion of the President's roughly $163 billion appropriations budget. The remaining portions of course, will be before the House in the coming weeks.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL CONFERENCE REPORT

With respect to the pending conference report, Mr. Speaker, the report includes $2,197,931,417.

This is under the budget estimates by $59 million-plus.

It is over the House figure by $156 million-plus.

It is under the Senate figure by $62 million-plus.

The other body considered budget estimates in the sum of $122 million-plus, that were not considered in the House bill.

As Members know, we passed the original version of this second supplemental on May 3. Major items in the conference report include: $470 million for public assistance grants to States; about $369 million for the Post Office Department on account of additional needs; $100 million for veterans' pensions brought about by higher caseloads and new laws; $91 million for health insurance for the aged; $75 million for the economic opportunity summer aid to youth program; $66 million for grants-in-aid for airports; $30 million for federally impacted area school construction, out of a total of $48 million added in the other body; $7 million additional for selective service; $4 million for air pollution; $3.8 million for the Teacher Corps; and $473.8 million for Pay Act increased costs, the largest single item of cost in the bill.

The explanatory statement accompanying the conference report covers each item that was in conference and is printed in the RECORD and also available down at the clerk's desk, so I see no need of taking the time of the House to mention each and every item.

Mr. Speaker, I include a summary of the totals for the bill:

Comparative summary of the conference bill

Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Recommended in Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I							
CHAPTER							
I. Agriculture	$18,422,000	$17,372,000	$17,322,000	$17,322,000	−$1,100,000	−$50,000	
II. Defense	226,000,000	226,000,000	226,000,000	226,000,000			
III. District of Columbia	13,850,000	8,896,000	14,196,000	14,046,000	+196,000	+5,150,000	−$150,000
IV. Foreign Operations	[1](840,000)		[1](840,000)	[1](840,000)		[1](+840,000)	
V. Independent offices and housing	229,335,000	197,336,000	219,720,000	219,411,000	−9,924,000	+22,075,000	−309,000
VI. Interior	49,884,000	40,959,000	42,659,000	42,659,000	−7,225,000	+1,700,000	
VII. Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare	693,917,000	602,373,000	764,501,991	713,905,475	+19,988,475	+111,532,475	−50,596,516
VIII. Legislative	1,618,600	2,845,600	3,039,000	3,014,000	+1,395,400	+168,400	−25,000
IX. Military construction	11,000,000		5,500,000		−11,000,000		−5,500,000
X. Public works	4,195,000	3,850,000	3,850,000	3,850,000	−345,000		
XI. State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary	19,237,000	15,913,500	16,148,500	16,113,500	−3,123,500	+200,000	−35,000
XII. Transportation	75,500,000	65,500,000	75,400,000	70,400,000	−5,100,000	+4,900,000	−5,000,000
XIII. Treasury, Post Office	414,468,000	376,968,000	376,168,000	375,968,000	−38,500,000	−1,000,000	−200,000
XIV. Claims and judgments	21,343,762	10,978,173	21,343,762	21,343,762		+10,365,589	
Total, title I	1,778,770,362	1,568,991,273	1,785,848,253	1,724,032,737	−54,737,625	+155,041,464	−61,815,516
TITLE II							
Increased pay costs	478,834,290	472,834,860	474,398,680	473,898,680	−4,935,610	+1,063,820	−500,000
Grand total	2,257,604,652	2,041,826,133	2,260,246,933	2,197,931,417	−59,673,235	+156,105,284	−62,315,516

---

[1] By transfer.

I yield 5 minutes to the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I did not agree with the conference action on this bill and I did not sign the conference report. Last year in this House we did not appropriate any funds for the Teachers Corps, and we went to conference with the instruction of the House not to appropriate funds for the Teachers Corps. In the conference with the other body, they had put in money for the Teachers Corps, it was agreed by the House conferees and the Senate conferees that we would put in the $7.5 million for the purpose of phasing out the Teachers Corps. This was the complete understanding of the conference.

But, because the House had refused to appropriate any money, I did not sign that conference report. I felt duty-bound to the House to follow its instructions that there should be no funds. However, it was the understanding of everyone of the conferees that the $7.5 million was to phase out the program and there would be no other appropriations at any time.

I should like to call to the attention of the House the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 21, 1966, when we reported back conference action on the HEW bill. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] handled the bill because the gentleman from Wisconsin had an engagement out of the city. This is what we said in the House at that time:

> Mr. SHRIVER. It is my understanding from the conference that $7,500,000 is the final appropriation for the National Teacher Corps in a phasing out of this program.

And again on the same page, the same gentleman said:

> The amount contained here is $7,500,000 for the phasing out of that program.

I do not feel that I could go back to a conference this year, after we had an understanding with the House and the conferees last year that there would be no further appropriations, and put money in this bill—and there is money in this bill, although there is some limitation on it. But it seemed to me that we were breaking faith with the House of Representatives when we had come back with some money in and when we had made the statement here that there would be no additional money.

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the reasons why I have not signed the conference report.

It seems to me when conferees of the House meet with the other body and come back and make the statement that "this is the end; there will be no more," I cannot in good conscience come back to this House with a report with money in the bill. So I did not sign it.

The gentleman from Kansas is the one who made the statements, and I shall be delighted to yield to him.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On that particular day, October 21, Mr. Fogarty was handling the bill for the majority side, and I was handling the bill for the minority side, inasmuch as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] was not present.

What the gentleman has said is accurate and completely true. It was the understanding that this program was to be phased out. The gentleman has stated it most accurately. I wanted to verify his comment.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for his corroboration. He was a conferee at that time and sat in on the conference. Many of those who were in the conference yesterday were conferees on the bill on which we made that agreement.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. Does the gentleman not believe it significant that on yesterday the House took out of the bill the authorization for the Teachers Corps, which reaffirms the positions stated?

Mr. BOW. That is exactly correct. We have no authority to appropriate a dime for the Teachers Corps.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I, of course, appreciate the point the gentleman is making, and I do not rise with respect to that.

The higher education bill will be before the House. The issue will be before the House in that bill. It can be settled by the House during the consideration of that bill. If the House should at that time adopt the Teacher Corps provisions of the act, it would leave the House in a pretty bad light not to have the money available. This would make it necessary to come in with another supplemental. The time problem is involved. I for one think the Teacher Corps program is one of the finest things we have come up with in a long time. But that is not the point I am trying to make now. I think the money should be available to carry out the program, so that the Department can proceed, if the House in its wisdom, as I think it will, authorizes a continuation of the program in the Higher Education Act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BOW. I sincerely hope that the distinguished majority leader is not suggesting that the Appropriations Committee should appropriate funds which are not authorized to be appropriated.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am not suggesting that, except in cases such as this, when the situation is well known and the House will act in the near future on an authorization act. We have done this under similar circumstances in appropriation bills before.

This was not put in by the House, this money for the Teacher Corps.

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. ALBERT. It is germane to the conference report.

Mr. BOW. It would have been subject to a point of order in the House.

Mr. ALBERT. It would have been.

It would be the part of wisdom, in view of the action by the other body, to leave the amount in and to settle the issue when the higher education bill is before the House.

Mr. BOW. That is the time to settle it, but not after the agreement of last year until the House has spoken. It seems to me we are bound by our agreement with the House.

Let me go to another matter as to why I did not sign the conference report.

There is $75 million in this bill for the poverty program. The House never had an opportunity to consider it at all. They well knew downtown that they were going to have a hot summer. That request could have been submitted to the House and we could have held hearings.

There have been no hearings. If Members will check the record of the other body, as to hearings, they will find most of it was letters. There is very little information as to what this $75 million is going to be used for.

I submit that these bills should have been before the House, so that we could see what they were doing.

Actually, the $75 million is a restoration of funds which we took out of the original bill. If we are getting in a position where we take out funds in an original bill and then permit them to go to the other body, to deprive this House of the opportunity of a determination, I just cannot go along with that kind of a conference. There is no question—the full amount of $75 million is in this bill, and the House had no opportunity to consider it.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] spoke on this at the time. It seems to me this is not the kind of a report we should bring in here involving an amount such as $75 million for a restoration to the poverty program, which program is in disrepute. Simply because some people say we may have a hot summer on the streets of some of our cities is no reason why we ought to appropriate $75 million. I do not like to appropriate with a gun at my back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], a member of the conference.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, while I was a conferee and participated in the deliberations up to the final markup. I did not sign the conference report. The reason I did not sign it is because this is not the kind of a conference report that I care to approve. Some of the reasons were those mentioned by my colleague from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Another reason is because the funds in the bill as agreed to in conference are above the budget in several instances. It is above the budget as submitted by the President last January with respect to the restoration of $75 million of poverty funds. That item was not in the budget as originally submitted to the Congress. So, when we adopt this conference report we are exceeding the budget of the President submitted to the Congress last January by $75 million in this one item. Of course, the President modified that budget. He sent up a modified estimate the day before, the very day before, we were considering in this Chamber the supplemental bill that is now before us in the form of a conference report, as it was approved by the House Committee on Appropriations.

As the gentleman from Ohio said, the House committee had no opportunity to consider this item or to question any witnesses. As he pointed out, the hearings in the other body were very sketchy. Absolutely no information was developed in that hearing except statements by Mr. Shriver that he needs that $75 million restored. The request last year was for $1,750,000,000 and $137 million of that was cut by the Congress. The hearing before the subcommittee in the other body was very brief. There is no statement in the record indicating where this money is going to be spent. There is no table on record indicating who is going to get the money; $47 million of it is to be distributed around the country for use in Neighborhood Youth Corps activities. Then $28 million will be transferred from title I to title II, which is the community action program. There is not a word in this hearing indicating the amount of unobligated balances they have or anything to indicate there is a need for this $75 million except the mere statement of Mr. Shriver that he does need it. Of course, there is also the statement of the President when he submitted the supplemental request.

I think that this conference report ought to be recommitted. I would be making a motion to recommit if it were not for the fact that it contains $470 million in public assistance funds that will have to be dispensed in June unless the Federal Government is to default on its obligation in this area.

It is somewhat similar to the situation with which we were confronted a few months ago when the Secretary of the Treasury told the Committee on Ways and Means that he would not be able to mail out social security checks unless he were given the authority to borrow an additional $6 billion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they have run out of public assistance money. Unless this conference report is approved, which includes $470 million for that purpose, the checks for public assistance that are due to be mailed out in June will not be mailed.

Mr. Speaker, not only that, but the bill approved in conference, and which is the subject of this report, contains $100 million in veterans' pensions and compensation. No one would contend that we are not obligated to pay these pensions. They accrue by law. If we do not adopt this conference report, the veterans who are entitled to and who have already had their claims approved, will not receive their compensation and pensions.

Mr. Speaker, there is another item in here to the extent of about $270 million designed to take up some of the deficit in the Post Office Department.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are some very key and sensitive programs funded in this bill. If we recommit the conference report, another conference cannot be held until late next week, because the House of Representatives will not be in session and therefore, it could only be held sometime during the month of June. If it were not for these circumstances, and the need for haste, a strong effort would be made to recommit this report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I made the point when the bill as it came from the House Committee on Appropriations was on the floor for consideration, that we would be faced with this situation, without having been given the opportunity to even consider this $75 million.

Mr. Speaker, I predicted then that this item would be placed in the bill in the other body; that it would be brought back here in a conference report; and that we would have to either accept it or reject the entire conference report, a conference report which contains a lot of very sensitive and important items and certain expenditures that the Government is obligated to make.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are placed in an untenable position. I do not believe that the House Committee on Appropriations should stand for this sort of procedure. It is unreasonable to believe that the administration did not know long before May 2, 1967, that this money would be requested. It does not represent anything except a restoration of funds that the House of Representatives cut out of the bill last year. I do not believe that funds should be restored that the House cut out after due deliberation, in a supplemental bill, a bill which the House never had an opportunity to even consider. It has not even been developed how much in unobligated funds are available.

Mr. Speaker, I just do not believe that the House of Representatives should be treated this way by the executive branch.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I did not sign the conference report. I do not approve of it generally, and there are several other reasons which I could cite; but I do not intend to try to have it recommitted for the reasons that I have already stated.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I can sympathize with the statements which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] with reference to this conference report. They refer back to an agreement which was reached in the conference between the House and the other body in the last session of the 89th Congress. This agreement is not being fulfilled insofar as the other body is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, it was absolutely necessary and vital to come to some sort of an understanding on this important supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1967. I cautioned my colleagues in the House of Representatives not to be too fast in making any decision to recommit this conference report today. Twenty-nine of our States run out of funds on Monday next, insofar as aid to dependent children is concerned, insofar as title XVIII money is concerned, and insofar as aid to the totally and permanently handicapped is concerned.

This is also true in the veterans' pension area, and in other areas of vital public concern that affect many millions of people in the United States.

The Senate added $12.5 million to this bill for the Teacher Corps. There is authorization for the Teacher Corps for fiscal year 1967, and this authorization provides for the continuation of the summer training programs in the event the Teacher Corps is continued for school year 1967–68.

The Senate provided for $12.5 million to be used to carry on the 883 present Teacher Corps members through the summer months and through the next fiscal year, and also included funds for 2,000 new members to be hired and trained at universities and colleges throughout the United States during the summer period under the terms of the authorization passed by the Congress last year.

We sat in conference starting at 10 o'clock yesterday, and were in conference continuously until almost 5 o'clock last evening. The understanding which was offered in this bill was that we would give funds only for 1,200 trainees this summer, and that none of these funds would be available until a full authorization to place teachers was enacted into law as far as the school year 1967–68 is concerned.

The language in this conference report reads that none of the funds appropriated in this section for summer training purposes shall be available until the authorization to place teachers in fiscal year 1968 is enacted into law.

I say to you that the Teacher Corps will not be authorized before June 30, 1967, and these funds will lapse on June 30 because it is impossible for the higher education bill to be enacted into law by that date.

So in order to get a conference report, and in order to get any kind of an agreement with this language, I say to you that we have not let down the position of the House of Representatives in regard to this item in this bill.

I am sure when the authorization does come out in the higher education bill, that that authorization will completely rewrite the Teacher Corps program providing for State control by the chief educational officer in the State. It will also provide for at least 10 percent local financing. It will do away with national recruiting so far as the teacher training program is concerned. And it will do away with the overhead expenses of the program which has burdened this program during its first year of operation. And unless those four conditions are met, I can assure my colleagues here on the floor of the House that there will be no funds included in the regular appropriation bill for this purpose in fiscal year 1968.

So I say to my friend from Iowa that he should read this language, and I can assure him the higher education authorization bill will not pass both Houses by June 30, and I believe that he will find that these funds will lapse on that date.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman now address himself to the $75 million to be spent this summer for projects as yet unspecified?

Mr. LAIRD. I will be happy to discuss that section of the bill with the gentleman from Iowa as soon as we have completed this section on the Teacher Corps.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for whom I have such great respect and admiration as the ranking minority member of the full committee.

Mr. BOW. I wish the gentleman would not take all my time with the accolades. I would like to ask him a few questions.

The gentleman was a conferee on the HEW bill last year. He sat in during the conferences. Does the gentleman deny that when we accepted the Senate funds in that bill; we went over with none in this bill for the Teacher Corps and when we accepted it, it was with the understanding that that money was to phase out the program—and there were to be no further appropriations?

Mr. LAIRD. That was the understanding that the conferees had. I would say to the gentleman from Ohio, his memory is correct.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult conference report so far as these items are concerned, because of the funds included for the Headstart program during the summer months and the summer work-training programs. There have not been exhaustive hearings on this item that there should have been. I agree with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Did we not also agree that they had funds provided in the bill last year for these programs and that this $75 million is to supplement the funds they have on hand to take care of the 200,000?

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct.

This brings up the Headstart program for the summer months to the full amount that was in the request and was turned down by the House of Representatives during the regular bill. It brings up the summer work program, to a level slightly below the original budget request which was justified in our regular hearings last year.

But the work-training program and the work programs for the summer months is still not at the full amount justified for our hearings on the Office of Economic Opportunity budget last year.

Mr. JONAS. What the gentleman means is that it is not quite up to what they asked for; is that correct?

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct. This is not up to the justifications which they submitted. We reduced that amount here in the House of Representatives by some $350 million. These funds were restored last year in the Senate and a compromise was arrived at in conference someplace halfway between the House and Senate figures.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman—or the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, whoever would care to respond—and I appreciate the gentleman yielding—whether or not there is in this conference report any of the funds that were struck on a point or order by the gentleman from Missouri on May 3, 1961, and to be found on page 17, lines 6 through 16, which point of order was sustained.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. There is no money in the bill for that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has expired.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the second supplemental appropriation, and particularly for the $75 million to be delegated in the Office of Economic Opportunity for its summer recreation, education, and Neighborhood Youth Corps programs.

I think that in making this supplemental appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity, we of the Congress must be sure that the country's smaller cities are not lost in the wave of concern over our 27 major cities.

Our moderate-size cities also need help. They, too, have hot streets and young people who will be without recreation facilities and summer jobs if the Office of Economic Opportunity does not extend its assistance.

Fortunately, many of our cities are surrounded by towns with camps, museums, and historic sites. These recreation resources might be used by the community action agencies if they had but a little money to provide for busing out of the cities to them. In this type of situation a little money can go a long way in providing a better summer for many young Americans. These children must not be forgotten.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to approve the conference report. It is necessary that it be approved expeditiously.

Some reference has been made to the Teacher Corps and to the fact that in past times the conferees of the House and the Senate had felt that the program should be phased out after the expenditure of certain funds.

I think it is fair to say that the House is free to work its will at all times, and it can modify its position from day to day or even from hour to hour. This is a question that is before us now—for decision now.

The other body put in certain funds for the Teacher Corps for the current fiscal year. These funds are authorized not for the next fiscal year, but for the current fiscal year, which ends on June 30. They will be available in the event Congress enacts legislation continuing the Teacher Corps.

The Appropriations Committee does not want to be used as a battleground for a decision of the question of the Teachers Corps. This is not the place where that future of the decision ought to be made. We rebel against the idea of making the decision here. It should be made in an authorization bill. That is the time-honored procedure when considering the future of a program that needs further authorization.

This conference agreement simply makes the money available until June 30 in the event the Teachers Corps is authorized and continued by the Congress beyond June 30. This is the best compromise we could work out. I think it is a good compromise, and the House can work its will with respect to the matter when we reach amendment No. 20 which relates to the Teacher Corps.

With respect to the $75 million which was put in the bill for the Office of Economic Opportunity, no one came to me and asked that a hearing be held on this issue. The Committee on Appropriations could have held a hearing had a request been made and insisted upon. The facts are, however, quite simple. We have a great deal of unemployment of students—principally in the summertime. We all know that idleness is the devil's workshop. We all know that it is increasingly difficult in this modern age to keep all of the millions of children out of school in summer employed or otherwise usefully occupied.

We know that there is a program called the Neighborhood Youth Corps which has some virtue, and there is in this bill—in the $75 million in the conference report—$47 million for the Neighborhood Youth Corps to give summer jobs principally in the cities, and more or less disadvantaged areas, to the teeming thousands of youth throughout the Nation.

There is also in the bill about $19 million for keeping swimming pools open, baseball diamonds lighted, and recreational facilities operational to try to help make better Americans, and to assist in giving employment and some new tone to American cities during the summer season.

There is $9 million in the bill for guidance purposes and general projects. I submit that the $75 million summer program—about $1.5 million per State—is worth the investment in the youth of the country, and I make no apology for it.

I predict that the overwhelming majority of the Members on both sides of the aisle will be willing to do this, not as an effort to kowtow to lawlessness, but as an effort to promote the well-being of the young men and women of our country who do need to have something useful and healthful to do during the summer session. This is especially helpful in view of the fact that business throughout the Nation has gone all out in seeking to give youth summer employment. What the U.S. Government does is relatively small in relation to what the local patriotic businessmen in the various cities and neighborhoods and farms of the Nation will undertake to do in this connection during the summer.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Texas yield for a brief statement?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the fact that when I signed the pending conference report I did not agree to the action of the other House-Senate conferees with regard to amendments Nos. 20, 22, and 23. I felt that the House conferees should have receded to the other body on the appropriation of $10 million for the National Teacher Corps. I felt that we should also have receded on amendment No. 22 appropriating $20 million for payments to school districts for operation and maintenance and on amendment No. 23 appropriating $48,831,216 for assistance for school construction. I regret that these amounts are not included in the report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that the request for the $75 million went to the other body?

Mr. MAHON. It is. This sort of procedure is followed every year, many times. It is standard procedure. There is nothing wrong about it. There is nothing improper about it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that that request was made only a very short time ago?

Mr. MAHON. It is true.

Mr. GROSS. A matter of days?

Mr. MAHON. It was submitted on May 2.

It is true that the President breached his January budget when he sent up the $75 million request.

It is true that conference after conference was held in the executive branch for the purpose of scraping up funds for carrying out the summer program.

It is true that finally, after much soul searching and many conferences, including three at the White House, it was finally determined a request would have to be made of the Congress for the additional $75 million.

I see nothing inappropriate or wrong about this procedure. It is a standard type of procedure followed in all administrations.

Mr. GROSS. So, as a cold matter of fact, the House never had an adequate opportunity to hold hearings on this?

Mr. MAHON. The House could have held any hearings it wished to hold.

Mr. GROSS. If it had had the request in time, yes.

Mr. MAHON. There is nothing complicated about this. I do not think there is any Member of the House who reads the papers who does not understand this appropriation, and understand what the $75 million is for.

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised that the Appropriations Committee would bring to the floor a bill of this kind without the justification it deserves.

Mr. MAHON. We have had justifications, and we have given the matter consideration, and the House now has an opportunity to work its will.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question, on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1, page 2, line 8, insert: ", and in addition not to exceed $150,000 of the amount made available under the appropriation head 'Payments to States and Puerto Rico' of Public Law 89-556 may be transferred to and merged with this appropriation for the administration of Public Law 89-544, approved August 24, 1966."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$25,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9, page 6, after line 9, insert:

"FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

"Economic assistance

"For an additional amount for 'Administrative and other expenses, for additional expenses necessary for relocation of the Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from France to Belgium, $840,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Loan to the United Nations' and to remain available until June 30, 1968."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18, on page 12, line 1, insert:

"Office of Territories

"Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

"For an additional amount for 'Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands', $1,700,000, to remain available until expended."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20, page 13, after line 16, insert:

"NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

"For an additional amount for 'National Teacher Corps', $10,000,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

"National Teacher Corps

"For an additional amount for "National Teacher Corps", $3,823,700: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph for training purposes shall be available until the authorization to pay teachers in fiscal year 1968 is enacted into law."

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24, on page 14, after line 18, insert:

"Higher Education Facilities Construction

"For an additional amount for 'Higher education facilities construction', $2,122,775, for payments under section 408 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as amended: *Provided*, That the Federal contribution shall not exceed 50 per centum of the eligible costs: *Provided further*, That section 408(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after the parenthetical phrase '(subject to the provisions of this section)' the following ', but not to exceed one-half of the costs of such restoration or replacement,'."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25, on page 15, line 13, insert: ": *Provided*, That an additional allotment, not exceeding $100,000 for grants under section 2 of said Act may be made, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, to the District of Columbia for vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30, on page 17, line 7, insert: ", to remain available through December 31, 1967."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35, on page 19, after line 12, insert:

"Miscellaneous Items

"For an additional amount for miscellaneous items, $90,000, including $30,000 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87-82, approved July 6, 1961: *Provided*, That effective January 1, 1967, and thereafter, the contingent fund of the Senate is made available for the reimbursement to each Senator of strictly official telephone service charges incurred outside of the District of Columbia in each fiscal quarter not exceeding $300, said payment to be made in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 36, on page 20, line 1, insert:

"Stationery (Revolving Fund)

"For an additional amount for stationery for Senators and the President of the Senate, $53,400: *Provided*, That effective with the fiscal year 1967 and thereafter the allowance for stationery for each Senator and the President of the Senate shall be at the rate of $3,000 per annum."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44, on page 23, after line 1, insert:

"Contributions to International Organizations

"For an additional amount for 'Contributions to international organizations', $3,300,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Loan to the United Nations'."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 46, on page 23, after line 20, insert:

"Federal prison system

"Support of United States Prisoners

"For an additional amount for 'Support of United States prisoners', $230,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals'."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 47, on page 24, after line 14, insert:

"National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws

"Salaries and Expenses

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of November 8, 1966 (Public Law 89-801), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, $235,000, to be available from March 16, 1967, and to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That $185,000 of the foregoing amount shall not be available until July 1, 1967."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$235,000" named in said amendment, insert "$200,000"; and in lieu of the sum of "$185,000" named in said amendment, insert "$150,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 55, on page 28, line 1, insert:

"Joint Commission on the Coinage

"Salaries and Expenses

"For necessary expenses of the Joint Commission on the Coinage, as authorized by Public Law 89-81, approved July 23, 1965, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and for compensation of members of the Commission from private life at the rate of $100 per diem when actually employed, to remain available until expended, $400,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of the Mint' 1967."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$400,000" named in said amendment, insert "$200,000".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

TO CODIFY PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 89-487

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, at the direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, H.R. 5357, to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89-487, with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 6 over to and including line 8 on page 5 and insert:

"(a) Each agency shall make available to the public information as follows:

"(1) Each agency shall separately state and currently publish in the Federal Register for the guidance of the public—

"(A) descriptions of its central and field organization and the established places at which, the employees (and in the case of a uniformed service, the members) from whom, and the methods whereby, the public may obtain information, make submittals or requests, or obtain decisions;

"(B) statements of the general course and method by which its functions are channeled and determined, including the nature and requirements of all formal and informal procedures available;

"(C) rules of procedure, descriptions of forms available or the places at which forms may be obtained, and instructions as to the scope and contents of all papers, reports, or examinations;

"(D) substantive rules of general applicability adopted as authorized by law, and statements of general policy or interpretations of general applicability formulated and adopted by the agency; and

"(E) each amendment, revision, or repeal of the foregoing.

Except to the extent that a person has actual and timely notice of the terms thereof, a person may not in any manner be required to resort to, or be adversely affected by, a matter required to be published in the Federal Register and not so published. For the purpose of this paragraph, matter reasonably available to the class of persons affected thereby is deemed published in the Federal Register when incorporated by reference therein with the approval of the Director of the Federal Register.

"(2) Each agency, in accordance with published rules, shall make available for public inspection and copying—

"(A) final opinions, including concurring and dissenting opinions, as well as orders, made in the adjudication of cases;

"(B) those statements of policy and interpretations which have been adopted by the agency and are not published in the Federal Register; and

"(C) administrative staff manuals and instructions to staff that affect a member of the public;

unless the materials are promptly published and copies offered for sale. To the extent required to prevent a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, an agency may delete identifying details when it makes available or publishes an opinion, statement of policy, interpretation, or staff manual or instruction. However, in each case the justification for the deletion shall be explained fully in writing. Each agency also shall maintain and make available for public inspection and copying a current index providing identifying information for the public as to any matter issued, adopted, or promulgated after July 4, 1967, and required by this paragraph to be made available or published. A final order, opinion, statement of policy, interpretation, or staff manual or instruction that affects a member of the public may be relied on, used, or cited as precedent by an agency against a party other than an agency only if—

"(i) it has been indexed and either made available or published as provided by this paragraph; or

"(ii) the party has actual and timely notice of the terms thereof.

"(3) Except with respect to the records made available under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, each agency, on request for identifiable records made in accordance with published rules stating the time, place, fees to the extent authorized by statute, and procedure to be followed, shall make the records promptly available to any person. On complaint, the district court of the United States in the district in which the complainant resides, or has his principal place of business, or in which the agency records are situated, has jurisdiction to enjoin the agency from withholding agency records and to order the production of any agency records improperly withheld from the complainant. In such a case the court shall determine the matter de novo and the burden is on the agency to sustain its action. In the event of noncompliance with the order of the court, the district court may punish for contempt the responsible employee, and in the case of a uniformed service, the responsible member. Except as to causes the court considers of greater importance, proceedings before the district court, as authorized by this paragraph, take precedence on the docket over all other causes and shall be assigned for hearing and trial at the earliest practicable date and expedited in every way.

"(4) Each agency having more than one member shall maintain and make available for public inspection a record of the final votes of each member in every agency proceeding."

Page 5, line 9, strike out "(e)" and insert "(b)".

Page 6, line 10, strike out "(f)" and insert "(c)".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume all the amendments are germane to this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, sir; they are, because they were put in in the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. That is the reason why I raise the question. If the other body amended it, I would like to know whether the amendments are germane.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. They are germane.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There were no objections.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 26) designating February of each year as "American History Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand the gentleman has about three resolutions to present to the House at this time?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I have.

Mr. GROSS. Do any of these resolutions cost the taxpayers of this country any money on the face of them?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. They do not.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, and withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 26

Whereas the study of history not only enlivens appreciation of the past but also illuminates the present and gives perspective to our hopes;

Whereas a knowledge of the growth and development of our free institutions and their human values strengthens our ability to utilize these institutions and apply these values to present needs and new problems;

Whereas Americans honor their debt to the creativity, wisdom, work, faith, and sacrifice of those who first secured our freedoms, and recognize their obligation to build upon this heritage so as to meet the challenge of the future;

Whereas February 1967 has been designated by the President as "American History Month"; and

Whereas it is appropriate to encourage a deeper awareness of the great events which shaped America, and a renewed dedication to the ideals and principles we hold in trust: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That February of each year is hereby designated as "American History Month", and the President of the United States is requested and authorized to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such month in schools and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. **McCLORY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **McCLORY**. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to lend support to Senate Joint Resolution 26, to designate February 1968, as "American History Month." This measure, sponsored by 35 Members of the other body, headed by my colleagues from Illinois, the minority leader, Senator Dirksen, will serve to focus broad national attention upon the great American heritage that is represented in the history of our Nation.

The rights and privileges that we enjoy in this land of freedom and opportunity are frequently taken for granted. Many citizens appear not to appreciate or understand the struggles that preceded the acquisition of our American rights and privileges.

The increased emphasis on the study of American history will foster the moral and spiritual strength of our people and give assurance that our Nation will endure to benefit future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Daughters of the American Revolution for their leadership in promoting adoption of this resolution. I also wish to pay tribute to all of the other patriotic organizations that supported this measure.

As a Representative from the great State of Illinois, from whence Abraham Lincoln emerged as one of the greatest Americans of all time, I am particularly proud that the action taken today by this House will designate the month of his birth, as well as the birth month of George Washington, the father of our country, as "American History Month."

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read the amendments, as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Rogers of Colorado: On page 2, line 3, strike "of each year" and insert ", 1968".

On page 3, line 5, strike "annually".

Strike all "Whereas" clauses.

The amendments were agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Designating February 1968 as 'American History Month'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL COAL WEEK

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20), to declare the week of June 18 "National Coal Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 20

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That inasmuch as President Woodrow Wilson, at the outbreak of World War I, called upon United States bituminous coal operators to organize an association to meet the urgent fuel demands of a nation at war, and that out of this national need the National Coal Association was created in 1917, the President of the United States is hereby requested to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning June 18, 1967, as "National Coal Week", in honor of the golden anniversary of the founding of the National Coal Association; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby requested to invite the Governors of the various States to issue proclamations for like purposes, recognizing the outstanding contribution the National Coal Association has made to the Nation and to the industry it has served for fifty years.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF KENTUCKY TO THE UNION

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 204), marking the 175th anniversary of the admission of Kentucky to the Union, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 204

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States extends its greetings and felicitations to the Commonwealth of Kentucky upon the occasion of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the admission of Kentucky into the Union and joins with the people of the Commonwealth of Kentucky in commemorating this anniversary.

Sec. 2. A copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. **NATCHER**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this year 1967 marks the 175th anniversary of Kentucky's official admission into the Federal Union and certainly it is most appropriate that Kentuckians everywhere pause to properly commemorate this historic occasion. On the 1st day of June 1792 our Commonwealth proudly became the 15th State in the Union and from that day forward has, with dignity and honor, kept her house in order.

Kentucky is, of course, many things to many people but I think all of us see anew the fabulous vision that was Daniel Boone's when he first entered into the wilderness where few white men had ever dared to set foot. Historically, we instinctively recall our Commonwealth as the birthplace of Abraham Lincoln, President of the Union, at Hodgenville, and Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederacy, at Fairview. It is the birthplace of a great many other outstanding Americans, just a few of whom are Henry Clay, a brilliant legislator who was a Member of the House and Senate and served for a number of years as Speaker of the House; Henry Watterson, one of the great journalists of all times, who served in the House from 1876 to 1877 and is the author of many famous editorials, one of which incorporated the phrase "40 years of shine and shower have passed over the good gray head of the 'Old Lady at the Corner' " and thus, the Louisville Courier-Journal became affectionately known as the "Old Lady at the Corner"; our beloved Alben W. Barkley, distinguished statesman and Member of the House and Senate and later Vice President, and the inimitable Irvin S. Cobb.

It was within our Commonwealth, at Bardstown, Ky., that Stephen Collins Foster was inspired to write the beloved and endearing melody known the world over as "My Old Kentucky Home," the immortal words of which have kept ever alive in the heart of every absent son and daughter a tender sentiment for their old Kentucky home.

Kentucky is the magic word which annually spells out the Derby, affectionately styled the "run for the roses," when thousands upon thousands gather to witness a contest of courage, stamina and speed among our thoroughbreds. Our scenic wonders, including Mammoth Cave, Cumberland Gap, and Cumberland Falls, plus our wide areas of State parks, historic shrines, lakes, and mountains make understandable the fact that, for nearly two centuries our great

Commonwealth has been famed around the world as a charmed region, blessed with many unusual and attractive characteristics. Its natural environments, its glorious traditions, its peoples and its customs have been the cause of countless recitals. All Kentuckians are well aware of our State's scenic excellence, its enviable history, its renowned institutions and overall fertility, and, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that despite whatever other shortcomings Kentuckians may have, a lack of pride and pardonable boasts for their homeland's numerous virtues have never been counted among them.

Every true Kentuckian is firmly convinced that his particular home area is the real garden spot of the world, whether it be the mountains, the bluegrass, the beargrass, the Pennyr'ile or the Purchase and he is only willing to grant second place to any of the other regions within his own State.

Traditionally, to most Americans, Kentucky means bluegrass, fast horses, beautiful women, and bourbon whisky. No Kentuckian would ever deny his pride in these assets but in addition, our Commonwealth is today rapidly becoming an industrial empire and a tourist mecca. Our energies are directed toward not only maintaining this type of development, but to expand it still further and thus translate into reality the Indian's word for Kentucky—"land of tomorrow."

Kentucky's 55th Governor is the Honorable Edward T. Breathitt. He is a true Kentuckian and has established an outstanding record.

It is a distinct honor and privilege for me to be the author of House Concurrent Resolution 204 which provides for the extension of greetings and felicitations to the Commonwealth of Kentucky upon the occasion of the 175th anniversary of the admission of Kentucky into the Union.

Mr. Speaker, I think the following poem by that beloved Lexingtonian, James H. Mulligan, tells you, in his unique and colorful style, a great many things about the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

The moonlight falls the softest in Kentucky;
The summer days come oftest in Kentucky;
Friendship is the strongest,
Love's light glows the longest,
Yet, wrong is always wrongest in Kentucky.

Life's burdens bear the lightest in Kentucky;
The home fires burn the brightest in Kentucky;
While players are the keenest,
Cards come out the meanest,
The pocket empties cleanest in Kentucky.

The sun shines ever brightest, in Kentucky;
The breezes whisper lightest in Kentucky;
Plain girls are the fewest,
Their little hearts are truest,
Maiden's eyes are the bluest in Kentucky.

Orators are the grandest in Kentucky;
Officials are the blandest in Kentucky;
Boys are all the fliest,
Danger ever nighest,
Taxes are the highest in Kentucky.

The bluegrass waves the bluest in Kentucky;
Yet bluebloods are the fewest in Kentucky;
Moonshine is the clearest;
By no means the dearest,
And, yet it acts the queerest in Kentucky.

The dovenotes are the saddest in Kentucky;
The streams dance on the gladdest in Kentucky;
Hip pockets are the thickest in Kentucky,
Pistol hands are the slickest,
The cylinder turns quickest in Kentucky.

The song birds are the sweetest in Kentucky;
The thoroughbreds are fleetest in Kentucky;
The mountains tower proudest,
Thunder peals the loudest,
The landscape is the grandest,
And politics the damnedest, in Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS BY MIDNIGHT SATURDAY, MAY 27, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight Saturday, May 27, 1967, to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FLAG DAY—AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON JUNE 14, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, June 14 will mark the 190th anniversary of Flag Day. On Saturday, June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress adopted a resolution providing:

> That the flag of the thirteen United States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white: That the Union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation.

During the ensuing 189 years, that blue field has been buttressed by 37 additional stars and the American flag has truly become the symbol of liberty.

During the war-torn year of 1917, President Wilson issued the first Presidential proclamation calling upon the entire Nation to hold appropriate ceremonies on June 14 to honor our flag. For many years our now deceased colleague, Louis C. Rabaut, provided the inspiration and impetus for Flag Day ceremonies in this Chamber.

In these troubled days, I believe it important that this House, on June 14, should again give honor to our stars and stripes and to the principles our flag represents.

Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, June 14, 1967, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of observing and commemorating Flag Day in such manner as the Speaker may deem appropriate and proper.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished gentleman, and I hope the gentleman will not think it is presumptuous on my part to suggest to the leadership that a very appropriate action on the part of the House on that day might be the passage of one of the antiflag-desecration bills now pending before Congress.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion, and I suggest that he take it up with the appropriate committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may state for the information of the Members of the House that after consultation with the distinguished minority leader the Chair has informally designated the following Members to constitute a committee to make the necessary arrangements for appropriate exercises in accordance with the unanimous consent agreement just adopted:

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Nichols], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall].

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10196) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10196, with Mr. Thompson, of New Jersey, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I approach you and this committee today, as you can well imagine, with a very heavy heart, indeed, because standing here for many years—my mind's eye sees him now, as does yours—our late distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. Fogarty, presented this bill.

Not only was he my colleague, but as many of you older Members know, he was one of my best and dearest friends. If you would doubt that, recall our many trips to Ireland together—the last one as recently as last year. As my grandfather, God rest his soul, would say, "There's only a few of us left."

Mr. Chairman, in this bill there is a provision for a memorial to John Fogarty. That proposal was made by the distinguished ranking minority member of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird]. Under the circumstances, I shall defer to him, when he speaks, to have him outline to you the provisions in this bill for that memorial to our late and beloved friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island.

So you can imagine how I felt when, on the morning that we convened this session, just a few hours before noon, like you, I received the shocking and tragic news of his sudden death.

I am sure that he is looking down on us today—and especially on me—with some trepidation. But I am pleased to believe also with some encouragement.

Now I would like to make this clear. I have only served on this subcommittee for 2 years. My job, as most of you know, has been defense. But 5 years ago I had a most serious and almost fatal operation. It was because of your prayers and good wishes and with the help of God that I am here. So I acquired an entirely different outlook upon hospitals and doctors and nurses and that whole spectrum of our world. I also learned, Mr. Chairman, never to turn your back on a nurse—do not do that. Why, toward the end of my stay in the hospital, which was very long, the minute a nurse would walk in that room, I would automatically turn over—and you talk about a dart game—they could aim at me from 15 feet away and never miss.

You remember me as a man maybe 50 to 60 pounds heavier than I am today. That is quite a waistline, but do not get it the way I got it. That is the wrong way. All my life I went around as an athlete, bragging when I heard that one of my friends or one of my relatives or somebody was ill. I would look down my nose and sneeringly say, "Why, I have never been to see a doctor in my life." Now that is the language of an utter fool—an utter fool. If I would leave this floor at this minute, I hope that if you would do nothing else because of what I say, it would be my fervent hope and prayer that every one of you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, that once a year, without fail, you have a physical examination starting tomorrow. And go back every year. I do not mean merely to have a blood test and a thermometer placed in your mouth in a doctor's office. I mean have a real thorough, once-a-year, complete physical checkup, and do not be the fool that I was, saying that you never went to a doctor. If you do not, you are out of your mind

Mr. Chairman, the bill that we bring to you today is the culmination of 4 months of steady, concentrated work on the part of eight members of this Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare of the great parent Committee on Appropriations, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon]. He has given me great help and great advice during these months.

I have been here a long time, but on the Appropriations Committee it is like working in a bank: somebody has to die before you move up one slot. Let me show you what I mean, at least the younger men, for the older men have heard me say this before. But for you younger fellows, I have been on the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Defense since the Department was organized, and I am low man on the Democratic side after 22 years of service. Of course, my position today on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee was the result of an extraordinary election reaction and the death of my friend. This is in the nature of a minor miracle.

I think of the language of my distinguished friend from Alabama [Mr. Andrews], who is also a member of the Defense Subcommittee and chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee, and who has sat next to me on Defense for many years. He has been here 24 years. He said, "Flood, it is going to be awfully different when you are chairman. You know, when you are just sitting on that subcommittee you can come and go when you feel like it, or do not come and go at all. But the chairman is there every minute, every hour, day and night."

And Mr. Andrews said that it reminded him of that ad of a well-known bus company, something about, "Bla, bla, bla, but leave the driving to us."

Well, when you are chairman, you are the driver, and that is the way it is. And I would never have believed it. We heard 329 Government witnesses. You lawyers who try lawsuits, what about that? Three hundred twenty-nine Government witnesses, and 118 Congressmen and interested individuals from outside the Government.

Note this: The record of our hearings is in six volumes containing over 5,000 pages. Look at them on that desk in front of me. So we were not playing games.

Now, I want to make this statement. There is one member of this committee who has forgotten more about this bill than I will ever know. He has sat on the committee for many years. That is the distinguished Republican, the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird]. I have heard from some of his friends that there are more cows in his district than there are people. I know he sent me a package of very good cheese from Wisconsin. It is all used up. I could use some more.

Now, I do not know what he thinks about cows, but I know what he thinks about people. He has a great heart, filled with compassion and understanding about what this bill does for people. He has held my hand through 4 difficult months, and without him there could not have been as good a bill or report. I am convinced of that. So I am very grateful to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no doubt that the massive volume of information I have referred to concerning the items in this bill was sufficient to form a good basis for making very sound decisions. Whether our decisions are wise or not is, of course, a matter of opinion. I have mine and other Members may have theirs. That is a matter of individual judgment.

As is the case with almost every appropriation bill of this size and of this magnitude, there is no member of this subcommittee or the full committee who is satisfied with everything in it. But the action of the subcommittee was unanimous. I was going to say "absolutely unanimous," but that would shock the purists—but it was absolutely unanimous, and that was no mean trick with this bill. I believe the Members know what I mean.

Now, many changes have been made in the budget requests, but I assure the committee today that I never saw a more responsible performance than these men gave. I am not going to name the members of the subcommittee, because they do not want me to. I am not going to praise this tremendous clerk by name, because he asked me not to. These are hard-working people.

This is an appropriations bill, and I have not yet talked much about money. In total, this bill—now listen to this—is $185,115,000 less than the budget request. Did any Member ever think we would live long enough to see that done with this bill, with me as chairman? I did not. But the circumstances are such—and I will not recite them because they are known to you all—that they almost dictated this figure.

On the other hand, and I feel bitter about this, the amount carried in the bill is $142,522,000 above the total appropriated for these extraordinarily important programs in 1967. There is not a man, woman, or child in this country who is not touched every hour of the day or night by this bill. Not one.

It is important to note that this bill gives an extraordinary opportunity for phony cuts in the budget. We could have made phony cuts here that would make us look, on the surface, like the greatest economizers of the current generation. We decided we would not do it, and we did not do it. Over $5.5 billion contained in the various requests are appropriations required by basic legislation, for which the funding level is completely beyond any administrative control. These budget requests are nothing but simple mathematical estimates made by experts in their respective areas as to what the basic legislation will require.

These programs include grants to States for public assistance, what we call in Pennsylvania the DPA. They include grants for vocational rehabilitation, for payments to the social security trust funds, for unemployment compensation, and so forth. These are your laws. That is the way you want it. That is the way it is.

Let me add this: It is our experience that the estimates in the budget for all of this type of program—believe it or not—more often are lower than higher than the actual requirement turns out to be. That would never happen in the Department of Defense—aie-yie-yie—but it does here with these people.

The committee could easily cut $500 million from these programs, just by saying, "We estimate the requirements will be that much less," just by throwing it up and letting it come down, "Let us make it $600 million," or "Let us make it $500 million." Such a cut would be absolutely phony, because you and I know any such phony cut like that would have to be restored sooner or later in a deficiency appropriation bill. Well, we are not going to do it that way. The committee is not recommending a cut of one dollar in any of the type of programs that I have just mentioned to you, that you made law—not a dollar.

Mr. Chairman, the committee could very well also have been tempted to disallow, by affirmative action, all requests lacking authorization at this time, and taking credit for them all as reductions in the name of economy, and I could come down here and say, "What a great little boy am I." That would be phony. It would be a fraud, in our judgment. We did not do it.

There were many requests in the Health, Education, and Welfare budget for programs that are now in operation for which legislation will expire at the end of this fiscal year and for which authorization has not as of this day been extended.

These are listed on page 3 of the report. I know you are up to your ears in all kinds of mail and other reading, but because of what this means to you and your family and friends and constituents, I wish you would read this thing. If you do not read it, take it home and have your wife read it.

On page 3 we list all of these that we could have disallowed. They are not authorized. Instead of disallowing these amounts, we simply set them aside. We deferred action on them. The result is they do not show up in this appropriation bill but, also they are not shown in the report as a reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I mention these things just to make this clear—and this is repetition for the purpose of emphasis—to make this fact clear: I told you that we reduced this budget $185 million, and, Mr. Chairman, these are authentic, these are real reductions.

Also, Mr. Chairman, in these summary remarks I should mention the fact—and listen to this—not one single appropriation, not one item, is for more than was requested in the budget. We did not exceed the budget in any one instance on over 100 items. Now, I thought I would get a rising ovation on that. In this bill? Well, maybe the right fellows are not here.

Let me tell you also we were practically implored—now implored is a nice word—we were practically implored by mail, by phone, in the hallways, in the formal hearings, to increase this bill by hundreds of millions of dollars. These pleas came from people who were interested in medical research, in training programs, in educational improvement for the handicapped, elementary and secondary education programs, schools in the federally impacted areas, libraries, and many others. If you see anybody going around here looking a little crippled for the next few days, those are members of my subcommittee. Talk about getting your arm twisted. I thought organized labor and the chamber of commerce were tough lobbyists. They are boys, amateurs.

Let me add this: Without exception these people who are after us are some of the finest people in this country. They are motivated, dedicated, with no axes to grind, and in most cases there is nothing in it for them personally, but they just believe in what they are doing. You know the causes. These were not fakers but are the finest kind of people who believe in their hearts what they are trying to do. We just could not do it, though. There just is not that much money. "Oh," they would say, "we know about the war in Vietnam. We know money is short." They all made this speech, and I would sit there waiting for that "but." And I always got it. They would say, "But our program is different. We must have priority." So this has been a tough 4 months for the men on this subcommittee. It is hard to say no to these pleas.

And, now, members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, I make a plea to you—I now am a special pleader in this matter for my subcommittee. I make the plea, that in view of this extraordinary performance by the men of this committee that you stand behind us on this bill today. We think we have a right to ask you to stand behind us, and I hope you will.

Mr. Chairman, I caution the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that if you break the line on this bill for one item, then the lid can go off. You break this line for one item and this thing can go right through the dome. I have seen it happen. I do not know how many of you people are sitting around with amendments for some program in your pocket—I will bet that there are a hundred—but keep them there; keep them there.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to me at this point?

Mr. FLOOD. Indeed, I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] seeks our support in maintaining the bill as it is. I would hope that we might have the assurance of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his subcommittee as well as the full Committee on Appropriations that when the gentleman goes to the other body—sometimes called the "upping body," that the gentleman will give us assurance that the spending for these agencies will not be ballooned out of all proportion.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] that we have just had for the consideration of the House a supplemental appropriation bill. It was ballooned to the extent of about $156 million above the House bill, as I remember the figures—and I hope to be corrected if I am wrong. So, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania can give us assurance that the bottom is not going to fall out over in the other body, it would be appreciated.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Iowa knows that I cannot give him that assurance, and the gentleman from Iowa knows why. The situation in the House of Representatives has changed considerably, and the situation in the other body, if the gentleman knows what I mean, has not changed very much. We are headed for trouble the minute we leave this hall, and please do not forget it.

However, Mr. Chairman, I will assure the distinguished gentleman from Iowa of this fact: When these men on this subcommittee say they will stand up, mister, they will stand up. If we go down in defeat on some items it will be with flags flying, if that makes the gentleman from Iowa feel any better.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield further, I will say to the distinguished gentleman that such a statement does not ease my fear.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I understand that. Nor will it ease my fear either.

Let us go on to some of the specifics concerning the bill. Mr. Chairman, the first appropriation in the Department of Labor is for the manpower development and training program. This is by a long shot the largest program in that Department, insofar as the disbursement of funds from the Treasury is concerned. As a matter of fact, it accounts for more than one-half of the entire Department's request for general funds. You will notice the committee recommends a reduction of $6,857,000 from the budget request. Most of this is accounted for by the reduction of a little less than $5 million from the amount requested for the expansion of services by the State employment security agencies. Do not let this worry you. I am as much concerned about the great State of Pennsylvania as you are the great State of Iowa or the great State of Kansas. I do not wish the members of the committee to misunderstand this action. This cut is slightly less than one-half of the increase requested in this area. But, listen to this—this is what your mail is on—there is no cut at all, not a dime, in the $347 million requested for training and allowance payments.

This I am interested in, too. We have

to retrain miners. You try and retrain 55-year-old men. And you have to pay them an allowance while you are training them. So I am just as worried about that as anybody. So you tell them not a dime cut, they are all right.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics asked for a rather substantial increase to expand their statistical service. Of course, there is absolutely no limit to the demand for statistics. But we were not convinced of the necessity of much of this now, this year. And you know why. We did approve two, and both of these requests had to do with the consumer price index. This is important to you and to your businessmen back home, to your chambers of commerce and to your merchants' associations, your labor unions—practically everyone. The consumer price index increase we went along with, because why? We want to improve not so much the quantity of the statistics as their quality. We are looking to improve the quality of these statistics.

Now, I think those being the two major items, that we should go to HEW.

The first item, and a very important one, is the Food and Drug Administration. While the requested increase of approximately $5 million is rather large for a salaries and expenses item, the activities of this agency are, literally, vital to every man, woman and child in the Nation. The committee made a modest reduction of $524,000 and directed in the report that none of this reduction be applied to the most important work of approving new drug applications and evaluation of efficacy of drugs, nor to the new drug abuse control program.

Let us talk about education. The total budget of the Office of Education—and I never saw numbers like this except on the side of a box car or a mine car until I came to Congress and went on this Committee on Appropriations. Wait until you hear this. Office of Education, total, $3.9 billion. Three billion, nine hundred million dollars. During the war we had a meeting in the Congressional Library, a very secret meeting with Admiral King and General Marshall. And we all remember Admiral King, a great admiral, but he had a face like a Basset hound dog. No humor. He was making this report for the Navy. And he spoke about a billion dollars. They had a picture of the Washington Monument and were stacking up a billion dollars to show you how much a billion dollars is. Somebody asked him "Admiral, what is a billion dollars?" And of all people in the world, without batting an eye, he said, "I do not know, Senator, but it is a hell of a lot of money."

Now, coming from King, that is something. Of course it is. And this is $3.9 billion.

In our report we set forth in detail—and whatever you are interested in, it is in that report—there is no intelligence gap here, and there are no secrets here. It is in the report. Pick it up. It is in English. Read it. There are no secrets. It is there in detail.

Now I want to say this, because you are interested in these things, there is absolutely no reduction in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Now, remember that, because that is what they are complaining about. When you go home this weekend, you can tell them there is no reduction, the full amount of the authorized portion of the request, $1.191 billion, is in the bill. So you can go home and be safe. This is an increase of $137 million over what you appropriated for 1967.

Second, there is no reduction in the request for vocational education. That is a great thing in many of your areas. No, sir; there is no reduction in vocational education.

There is no reduction in library services, and no reduction in funds for library construction. Remember that. You got mail on that.

There is no reduction in funds requested for educational improvement for the handicapped. And you all have very active civic leaders and organizations for the education and training of the handicapped. And you are hearing from them from all over the country. There is no reduction in that item.

And finally this. You got a lot of mail on this. There is no reduction for the construction of facilities for higher education.

Why, after this report you are going to have the best weekend that you ever had back home.

Now, going on to the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, we made some reductions in research and training and salaries and expenses.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] and his subcommittee, for retaining the amounts requested for the programs provided for in title I of the education bill. I am disappointed that title III has been reduced $30 million.

I believe the gentleman has helped this Congress and this administration to carry out its total commitment to education in America. If President Johnson had not done anything else during his administration, the fact that he has been able to marshal his forces and persuade the gentleman now in the well as well as Congress to make good on our Nation's total commitment to education, would constitute a living memorial to President Johnson for his outstanding leadership in behalf of the young people of America.

Mr. FLOOD. Dziekuje, nie ma zaco. Thank you. You are welcome.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of this fellow. I trained him. Many years ago we had a special House committee to conduct an investigation of the Katyn massacre—the massacre of 5,000 Polish reserve officers by the Russians, by the Communists.

I took the committee to Europe and we were there for a month conducting hearings from Berlin down to Rome and Naples. I needed an interpreter. In the district from which I come you have to talk Polish in self-defense, but I am not that good. This young man came to our committee as our chief investigator, and he was absolutely brilliant. He worked 20 hours a day and, by golly, a couple of years later I walked in here, Mr. Chairman, and he is a Member of Congress from the great State of Illinois. That is a good story. I like it.

This vocational rehabilitation program has gone great, and it will get greater. Let me give you a couple of statistics. I have become enamored with statistics. The 154,000 persons rehabilitated, under the basic program, in 1966 marks a new high in achievement. The rate of rehabilitations to the general population rose from 70 persons rehabilitated per 100,000 people in the United States in 1965 to 78 per 100,000 in 1966, just under the basic support program. Another 2,100 disabled persons who were not clients of the State rehabilitation agencies were rehabilitated as a result of Vocational Rehabilitation Administration sponsored research and demonstration projects. There seems to be no doubt that this progress is continuing during 1967 and, under this budget will progress still further in 1968. While the entire cost of the program can easily be justified on the basis of human values alone, it is noteworthy that it can be mathematically proven that the economic benefits deriving from the reduction in such expenses as public assistance and other costs of dependency, on the one hand, and increases in taxes paid by these persons on the other, are several times the cost of the program.

The Public Health Service includes many, many very important programs. We reviewed these sections carefully, and I mean carefully. And I wish to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare they had heard about my reputation in the subcommittee for the Department of Defense. They knew it is said that I eat at least one admiral and one general with my ham and eggs every morning. Colonels—they are for dessert, dozens of them.

So these fellows got a going over, believe me. It will not hurt them a bit. They are really great people. The hearings record on public health items totals over 1,700 pages. It was very difficult but we made selected reductions that total $36,728,000, or a little more than 1 percent of the total request of $2,705,702,000.

The people in the gallery who come here every day until we adjourn will never hear a bill discussed that means as much to them as this one. They are all interested in public health and in health services.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inform the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he has consumed 45 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the Chairman.

I regret that the table at the back of the report is rather confusing this year due to a reorganization of activities in the Service. The committee's first impression of this reorganization was that it presented undue and unnecessary complications. However, after detailed study and hearings, the committee is convinced that, after the transition period, the budget will present a much clearer picture of the level of funding for both broad functions and specific activities than it has in the past. In the narrative of the committee's report we have attemped to set forth sufficient detail to give a meaningful comparison of the bill and budget with the appropriation for 1967.

There is so little question in most people's minds concerning the importance of the programs in the Public Health Service budget such as health manpower education and utilization, hospital construction, control of venereal disease, control of tuberculosis, construction of health educational facilities, air pollution control, and many others; but for the last 12 or 15 years, in fact, going back to the days when Frank Keefe, of Wisconsin, was chairman of the subcommittee, there has been no part of this bill that attracted as much interest as the National Institutes of Health. The 1968 budget for the National Institutes of Health, for other than construction, is $1,152,750,000, or an increase of only about 8 percent. The committee is well aware that there are many desirable and worthwhile research activities which cannot be supported within the limits imposed by the budget. At the same time, the committee believes that the funds provided will not impair the effectiveness of the current programs and that a necessary temporary restraint on the selective growth of these programs will not seriously impede the steady advance of biomedical research.

Within the total amount, it appeared to the committee that a good balance and a good priority rating among activities had been achieved in the budget. The committee has therefore made no change in either the total amount or the distribution of this amount requested for any one of the institutes except to earmark $2 million in the appropriation for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases to be used for research on cystic fibrosis. The committee was encouraged to hear that some progress is being made in research on cystic fibrosis and believes that greater effort should be made to accelerate this research. Cystic fibrosis is a very serious disease which affects one child in every thousand live births. It is estimated that there are 30,000 victims of this disease and that between four and five thousand new cases occur each year.

Because no single area of this vast appropriation touches so many lives as the health research aspect of it, I would like to concentrate a few remarks upon the appropriations recommended for the National Institutes of Health and for the John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences, to be established at the National Institutes of Health.

Acting on the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], the ranking minority member of our subcommittee, at the time of the eulogies for our late colleague, John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island, the committee has provided funds to plan a lasting memorial to a man who for more than a quarter of a century worked tirelessly for a healthier America in a healthier world.

This year, for the first time, I had the heavy responsibility for following in John Fogarty's steps and conducting the hearings on the NIH programs and for reviewing the swift progress being made in medical research in these changing years. It was a heartening experience and I wish I could share it with each of you.

Some who are not so wise as they are vocal are always asking when we will have "the answer to cancer." Well, one form of cancer—choriocarcinoma—can be cured, and, when testing and treatment centers are set up in sufficient numbers, it should be wiped out in this country. Another form of cancer, uterine cancer, could be practically eliminated if women could be persuaded to take the "pap" tests regularly and if the necessary technical and medical manpower for nationwide testing could be provided. And, while it is too early to speak of a cure for leukemia, the committee was informed that in another 5 years investigators hope to be able to speak confidently of cures in both acute and chronic leukemia.

In the development of artificial kidneys, in which the committee has long had a great interest, lives are being saved while devices are being improved. A compact, economical and more efficient artificial kidney has been developed, thus increasing the handling capacity of artificial kidney treatment centers and saving more patients.

In the area of development of what is loosely called "the artificial heart," everyone has heard of the first clinical successes of the DeBakey artificial-heart-bypass device. Similar successes by Dr. Kantrowitz have received public attention and his new mechanical auxiliary ventricle is now ready for clinical evaluation. Incidentally, what is not so well known is that the work of these distinguished scientists has been in large measure supported by NIH with funds appropriated by previous Congresses. The lifesaving potential of these devices remains to be evaluated but is believed to be great.

In dental research, the committee was informed of the successful implantation of plastic teeth in baboons. So promising is this research that clinical trials of this method of tooth replacement in human patients is now justified. So rapid is the pace of progress in medical research that history's first real advance over dentures is obscured from public view by the more dramatic things we hear about, yet it has the potential for revolutionizing the practice of prosthetic dentistry.

Mr. Chairman, it was a good year for health research. You may recall that this committee reported last year that a research team at NIH had developed an experimental vaccine for German measles. During this past year studies and clinical trials with the experimental strain confirmed that it produces immunizing infections in recipients without danger of communicating the infection. From the testimony we heard, I think it is safe to predict that this vaccine will be perfected within the very near future so that it may be made available for general use. At the same time, the same research team developed a rapid, sensitive and reliable diagnostic test for the individual's resistance to and immunity from German measles. The test, inexpensive and easy to perform, is expected to become routinely available in hospitals and health departments.

But to present a balanced picture, it is necessary at this point to recall that the areas of ignorance remain more extensive than our areas of knowledge. For example, in the neurological and sensory disorders, for cerebral palsy, epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, Parkinsonism, muscular dystrophy, blindness, and others, the ultimate solution must be prevention. The continuing need for new knowledge concerning these and many other problems demands continuing support. This support is expensive and escalating.

However, Mr. Chairman, I must not fail to mention that the substantial amounts requested for the two newest NIH programs were reduced by the committee. One of these, regional medical programs, represents a new and innovative effort to make the best practices of modern medicine more readily available to the American people wherever they live.. The goal is to link medical research, medical education, and medical practice and service in a voluntary partnership for speeding up the transfer of advances in diagnosis and treatment from the research centers of the Nation to local practicing physicians. The committee is concerned over the proper local involvement represented here, and has expressed its intention to keep a close watch on this vexing and difficult matter because it believes local representation is absolutely essential to the success of the program.

The appropriation for the regional medical programs has been reduced from the $64.3 million requested to $54.3 million. However, under the legislative authority for this program an unobligated balance of $21 million will be carried forward from fiscal year 1967. The program will thus have a total of $75.3 million available for obligation in fiscal year 1968. This compares with a total of $34.3 million available for obligation during the current fiscal year. Despite some acceleration, the program is behind schedule and the committee is convinced that the amount provided will adequately cover actual needs.

I want to emphasize that the members of the committee expressed their conviction of the great importance of this program. No one should take the fund reduction as an indication of anything but a reflection of the committee's belief that the amount authorized will be sufficient to cover the actual needs of the program during the coming fiscal year because of the program having fallen behind schedule.

To my mind, the regional medical programs concept is the best answer we have had yet to the continual criticism we hear about the difficulty of getting research results into medical practice. I recall a period in defense appropriations during the war when we had a great proliferation of plans and designs. Every time we had a hearing we had new designs for new fighters and bombers and we sat 12 hours a day listening to them, but finally the time came when we had to say, "Gentlemen, we needed fighters and bombers in England last night. Let us not hold up production until we have more planning." That is a variant on the old question, "When do we get from the laboratory to the bedside?" As we have said in the committee report:

> The concept of regional medical programs must be made to work, and no effort should be spared to insure that it does.

The other reduction is in the appropriation for the new Division of Environmental Health Sciences which has been reduced from the $20.6 million requested to $17.3 million. This compares with $13.5 million which the Division has available for obligation during fiscal year 1967. The amount allowed is thus 28 percent above the current operating level. The reduction recommended by the committee represents one-half of the program increase requested.

Mr. Chairman, we very seldom praise officials of the agencies in our reports or in debate on appropriation bills when they are before the House. However, before I leave the subject of the National Institutes of Health, I think there is ample reason for making an exception at this point. Dr. James Shannon, Director of the National Institutes of Health, is a truly outstanding scientist and a truly outstanding administrator. In my estimation he comes close to genius. Dr. Shannon is nearing the age for mandatory retirement. Personally, I hope very much that a special exception is made and that he continues in his present position for several more years. However, in connection with his prospective retirement, there is an editorial in the April 28 issue of Science magazine that is quite complimentary, and justly so. Under leave that I will secure in the House, I make this editorial a part of my remarks at this point:

> THE SUCCESSION AT NIH
>
> The choice of a worthy successor to James Shannon, director of the National Institutes of Health, is a matter of profound importance to medical research scientists. It is also a matter of concern to other scientists and of consequence to all humanity. Research funded by NIH brings knowledge and medical progress that gradually will be applied everywhere. Such progress can relieve suffering not only in this generation but in generations to come. Measured against the annual cost of all medical care in this country ($43 billion), the amount NIH devotes to support and conduct of medical research is not large (about $0.8 billion) Of this, a smaller sum is used for support of research at medical schools and in universities. These funds, however, constitute a substantial fraction of all the money available for support of all academic research.
>
> Finding a proper replacement for Shannon will be especially difficult because his directorship is a tough act to follow. Shannon has been able to bring about an exponential expansion in the total budget of NIH, from $82 million in 1955 to $1.2 billion in 1966. A key factor in achieving this has been his facility in the art of the possible.
>
> Shannon has done more than increase quantity. He has built quality. This is evident in the extramural program at academic institutions and was obvious in the excellent program for support of research overseas which for a time included many of the best foreign investigators. It is especially evident in the intramural research program at Bethesda. Shannon has been able to build good research teams and programs because he understands research, has judgment as to what is significant, and can quickly perceive where new opportunities lie. He has these abilities because early in his career he devoted nearly 2 decades to distinguished personal research activities.
>
> During most of his regime Shannon was able to keep detailed government management of grant funds to a minimum. He preferred to operate on what amounted to an honor system. However, university administrators and faculties were not always diligent, and there was slight but highly visible carelessness. It became necessary to institute more control over funds. Overzealous accountants at universities have used the new regulations as an excuse for prodigious empire building. One of the pressing tasks of the next director of NIH will be to arrest and reverse this agency's contribution to the bureaucratization of the universities.
>
> The next director will also face the difficult problem of trying to strike the right balance between increasing knowledge and applying it. Shannon has been energetic in fostering applications, but he has also been deeply convinced that the key to medical progress is better understanding of biological processes. Today there are widespread demands for quick solutions of difficult medical problems. A successor succumbing to the political pressures of the moment could, with a few ill-judged moves, destroy much of what Shannon has built.
>
> The choice of a successor to Shannon will not be easy. It is one of the most important tasks John Gardner will face during his tenure as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.—PHILIP H. ABELSON

Most of the rest of the items in the bill are rather routine although some large amounts of money are involved, such as over $4 billion for grants to States for public assistance and $906 million for payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged. Both of these, as mentioned before, are uncontrollable.

The two items in the remaining portion of the bill which probably command the most attention, even though the amount of funds is relatively small, are civil rights and the international education program. Civil rights activities are financed under the Office of the Secretary. As you all know, this is a most controversial activity in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The committee heard a considerable amount of testimony on this subject, including testimony of Members of Congress who desired that some very strong language be included in the bill and report to prohibit the Department from conducting certain activities in this area. The committee has included a paragraph in its report on page 44 which represents a compromise that probably does not completely satisfy any one on either side of the issue. This paragraph reads as follows:

> This appropriation finances the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act with regard to the programs administered by the Department. Testimony before the committee indicated clearly that the Department has gone beyond the law in these enforcement activities and in requirements under the so-called guidelines. The committee cautions that the Department will be expected to follow the law, and will be expected to administer the law with equal firmness and fairness among all the States.

I mentioned that the other item of particular interest in this section of the bill is the international education program. Last year when the authorizing legislation passed this House, I had no idea the program was so controversial. Certainly there was no indication of that in the debate. However, the committee has taken the same action with regard to this bill that was taken with regard to the supplemental appropriation requested for 1967. This item is not included in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, there are items in this bill that, if I had my own personal way, would be higher than they are. As with the last item that I mentioned, there were actions that were taken by a majority of the committee that are at variance with actions I would take if I had the power to act on them as an individual. But, taken as a whole, I think it is not just a good bill; it is an excellent bill. I support it wholeheartedly and I trust that the House will approve it overwhelmingly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I do this to express my appreciation and my commendation for the outstanding work which has been done by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of this important subcommittee.

I note that a goodly number of my colleagues share my sentiment and have so expressed themselves.

It has been my great pleasure to work closely with him for a number of years—for many years—on that great Committee on Appropriations. Together we have fought many battles for an improved military service and for a stronger national defense, and I know firsthand how much he has contributed in this field. I have always been impressed by his dedication, his sincerity and his ability, and I am tremendously proud that he now is chairman of a great subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, a work which he is performing in magnificent manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has presented us today an outline of this bill.

Before going into a discussion of it, I would like to call attention of the Members of the House, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania did, to the fact that this is the first time since the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare became a separate agency, operating as an agency, that the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. Fogarty, is not with us representing the other side of the aisle in presenting this bill to the House of Representatives. We on the committee who served with Congressman Fogarty indeed missed him in this first session of the 90th Congress. I would be less than frank if I did not say that the tribute which we pay to Congressman Fogarty in this bill is but a small recognition of the work that he did as a Member of the House in the very important work of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare since it became an agency.

I went on this subcommittee the year that the Department was created as a separate agency, and this is the most rapidly growing agency in the Federal Government. It has gone from a budget of $1,400,000,000 to a budget today of over $13,000,000,000 in this bill as we submit it to you, plus $2.5 billion of yet-to-be-authorized programs in this fiscal year, plus appropriations authorized here today from the trust fund in excess of $37 billion.

This bill, if it were not for the war in Vietnam, would be the largest appropriation bill considered in the Congress. As one projects these programs through the year 2000, this bill will be at least twice the size of the defense budget by that date.

If there is any evidence needed, all one needs to do is look at the vote here last night, in which we doubled the amount of money for elementary and secondary education as compared with the figure carried in this bill. We took that action last night, knowing full well the nature of the national security commitments this country has all over the world, and knowing full well that our deficit for fiscal year 1968 will be in excess of $25 billion.

Within the last few months we are facing the most severe crisis in the balance of payments that this Nation has experienced since World War II. We have just gone through a month in which a new record has been set in the increase in the cost of living, so that the administration's projection that we can get from the budget figures and the Economic Report of a 4.5-percent increase in the cost of living has really gone out the window as far as the next 12 months are concerned.

This national sales tax we call inflation which would be levied upon our people would be in excess of 5 percent. This is the most regressive kind of tax that can be levied on the people of our country.

The important thing for us to bear in mind, as we consider this bill, is that authorization after authorization is going to come before the Congress, and we shall have to stop some of these authorizations and some of this doubling up of programs if we are to have any control over this bill as we go forward into 1969 and 1970 and beyond.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania took over a very difficult assignment in handling this bill and the hearings on this bill during this session of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Our distinguished new chairman was not in the best of health during the last session of Congress, but since he has taken over this responsibility I believe he is ready to go out and run a couple of miles every morning, because it has added a great deal to his appearance, to his health, to his vigor, and to his vitality. It has been good for him to serve as chairman of this very important committee and he has done an outstanding job. Those of us who serve on this committee appreciate the diligent work he has done in regard to this bill, taking over at a very difficult time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. This is a very happy day in the House of Representatives, in that one of the senior Members of the Congress and one of the ablest Members ever to grace this Chamber has presented a major bill to the House. He has presented it brilliantly and well.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has said that this arduous assignment has been good for Dan Flood. I would add that his work has also been good for the country.

We pause to pay tribute to the memory of one of the all-time greats, John Fogarty. But we realize that when faced with the responsibility, another has stepped into his place of special responsibility on the committee and discharged it very well indeed.

All of us are happy that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in fine spirits, is in fine health, and is doing a fine job for his district and the Nation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to join the gentleman from Wisconsin and others in a salute to Dan Flood of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.—the one and only Dan Flood.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Even though we have a terribly tight and very crowded schedule today, I believe I would be remiss if I did not add a word or two to what has been said by the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Texas concerning my dear and longtime friend Dan Flood.

A little more than 2 years ago I got kicked off the Committee on Appropriations, but while I served on that committee for a good many years I had the privilege of working with Dan Flood on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for a number of years.

He was able, articulate, fair, and objective, and it was a pleasure to have that association. I miss it very much, and particularly my association with him and the others.

All of us were concerned—we were apprehensive—a few years ago when Dan was ill. It is really nice to see him back in harness, doing the kind of job he has done for the Congress and the country on this important legislation.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I cannot let this moment pass without also saying a word. I am sure all of us feel that way. Considering the length of service I have had on the Appropriations Committee, perhaps this excuses me for breaking in at this time.

I listened to Dan as he presented this matter. He referred to the knowledge that the gentleman from Wisconsin has of this bill and the subject, and I am sure that is true. However, having served with Dan Flood on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee—and I take nothing away from our very able and capable chairman when I say this—I just do not know of any subject that Dan Flood ever dealt with on which he was not as well informed as anyone who dealt with it. So just give him 1 more year—I do not say any great length of time but just 1 year—and he will know everything the gentleman from Wisconsin knows.

In addition to that, may I say Dan Flood is a man; his word is good; his integrity is beyond reproach; and his contributions to this Congress are outstanding. I am glad to join with my colleagues in making this statement.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I, too have had the privilege of serving with Dan Flood on the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for 22 years. There is not a more able man in this Congress than Dan Flood. Even though he is a novice as a chairman of a subcommittee, he has done a wonderful job on this bill, and I predict that next year he will be more outstanding than he is today.

Dan Flood is a great American—loves America—and is an excellent Congressman. He is one of the ablest men in this House and a good chairman. I think it has done him good to sit in the driver's seat this session. We are proud of you, Dan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for that statement.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TIERNAN. I would like to take this opportunity, as the successor to John Fogarty, to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] and also the minority leader and the members of the committee who have done a splendid job particularly in the area of the program that the minority leader so ably led the committee in; that is, the international center to be named after John Fogarty. I know if John were here there would not be anyone on our side of the aisle he would rather see chairing this committee than Dan Flood.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for joining me in paying tribute to a fine American, an able Congressman, a true statesman, and an outstanding chairman of one of the most important subcommittees in this Congress.

I suggest and predict that this body will display its confidence in his great ability by overwhelmingly supporting H.R. 10196 as it was reported out of our committee.

The able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has done an outstanding job in summarizing the actions of the committee in this, the second largest appropriation measure that will be considered by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, in light of our chairman's able presentation, I would like to confine myself to three or four areas covered in the committee report which will be of particular interest to many Members of this body.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

After many days of exhaustive hearings, the subcommittee recommended in its report that the National Institutes of Health be funded in the amounts requested in the budget submission of the President with the exception of the two newest NIH programs, the regional medical programs and the environmental health sciences program.

For these two programs, our committee felt that adequate support could be given at somewhat reduced budget levels.

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, I fully concur with the recommendations contained in our report and urge all Members of this House to give the bill their wholehearted support.

Having served as a member of this subcommittee ever since the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created, I can assure my colleagues that the great confidence they have placed in NIH over the years has been entirely justified.

I, for one, Mr. Chairman would rather see our Nation become first in health before committing top priority resources to becoming first on the moon. We are running a good race against disease and I would like to outline some of the accomplishments that document this but much more remains to be done.

The many and important contributions made to the Nation's health through NIH are well known to this body. As a result of testimony heard during this session, I was impressed once again that our continuing investment in medical research, training, and related programs is a sound one and that this investment is being wisely and effectively managed by NIH.

Because of the progress of medical science in this country, the life expectancy of Americans has increased 23 years since 1900. Much of this added lifespan can be attributed to the virtual eradication of the epidemic infectious diseases in our time. However, now that we are living longer, we are surviving to become victims of other diseases.

MAJOR DISEASES

Our changing social, cultural, and technological environments are contributing still other great problems to challenge the ingenuity of our physicians and research scientists. Yet, even against these complex and formidable enemies of health we are making heartening progress. While cancer continues to be the second major cause of death in this country, many forms of this insidious killer are being brought under significant control through methods of early diagnosis and improved treatment. Although cardiovascular diseases claimed nearly 1 million lives during 1965, during the past decade death rates have declined substantially for every major cardiovascular-disease category except arteriosclerosis. Important discoveries have been made during the past year that hold promise for more effective control of diabetes, kidney failure, cystic fibrosis, infant mortality, and certain neurological disorders.

To insure that the promise of this recent progress is borne out, our continued commitment to medical research and training is essential. Those of us on the Appropriations Committee are fully aware of the current necessity to limit Federal expenditure wherever possible. Yet, as the subcommittee report states, the funds requested by NIH for the coming year "do not permit reductions without seriously affecting the scope and quality of the Nation's medical research activity. The well-established partnership between the Federal Government and the biomedical research community in the pursuit of more effective protection against disease and disability clearly serves broad public purposes and must not be weakened by a curtailment of Federal support."

I would state the case even more strongly: these funds are the absolute minimum that we can obligate if we are to deal in any meaningful way with nearly 300,000 annual cancer deaths; over 900,000 cases of cancer under treatment; nearly 1 million deaths from heart and blood vessel disease, with over 2,670,000 more people disabled by cardiovascular disorders; 33,000 deaths from diabetes; over 42,000 from gastrointestinal disorders; and 218,000 from neurological disorders.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on, but the tragedy of this great personal loss to families and great economic loss to the Nation is too easily obscured in an overwhelming mass of statistics.

The appropriations bill calls for an increase of 8 percent over the 1967 level of obligations for research grants. The need for an annual increment in research funds to offset the cost of price and wage increases, the increasing complexity of research methods, and the need for bringing more young scientists into research has been often discussed before the Congress. The 8-percent increase is admittedly not an optimum one, but I think we can consider it at least adequate to maintaining the stability of the research-support programs.

The increases provided for research in NIH's own laboratories and for the support of research training are conservative indeed, and do not allow for any great expanded activities in these areas. However, here again I believe the level of support is entirely sufficient for the full functioning of the ongoing efforts included in these vital activities.

JOHN E. FOGARTY CENTER

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the special attention of the Members of the House, the provision in the appropriations bill for $500,000 to be used in planning for the establishment and construction of the John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply gratified for the inclusion of funds for this International Center. As you and many of our colleagues may recall, the Center was originally the idea of John E. Fogarty and was one of his fondest dreams. He first presented his concept before the Third National Conference on World Health in Washington on September 26, 1963, when he told the panel on health for peace:

> I should like to see a plan to bring into being at Bethesda a great international center for research in biology and medicine dedicated to international cooperation and collaboration in the interests of health of mankind . . . This center would encompass conference facilities, laboratory and study space, and living quarters to permit the assembly for discussion, study, and research of the outstanding health scientists of the world.

Although the proposal was enthusiastically endorsed by NIH administrators and several of us in the Congress in addition to Mr. Fogarty, it did not survive the budget review process when included in requests for fiscal years 1965, 1966, and 1967.

In January of this year, John E. Fogarty died, leaving this, and many other great projects he had planned, unfulfilled. As a close associate and personal friend, I was determined that his dream of an International Center would not die with him. I had shared his hopes for this project and as I stated on January 18 before this body:

> I can think of no more fitting and lasting tribute to this great humanitarian than the establishment by this Congress of such a center—the John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences . . . Not only will such an institution be a living embodiment of the spirit and aspirations of John Fogarty, but it will serve a needed and valuable role in securing the progress of science in the cause of the well-being of all mankind.

I was pleased shortly thereafter to hear of the President's support for the Center in his message to Congress on education and health in America on February 28.

Further support for the Center came from the Association of American Medical Colleges which endorsed particularly the idea of fellowships as a part of the Center's program which would make it possible for scientists and physicians from the United States and from foreign countries to spend periods of study and research at NIH or other American institutions.

Preliminary plans for the Center, to be constructed at NIH, include conference and assembly rooms, with facilities for simultaneous translation and the use of audiovisual aids; office and reference space for resident and visiting scholars and Center staff; living apartments for resident scholars; overnight quarters for the accommodation of temporary visitors; and a cafeteria. It is estimated that the construction of these facilities will cost between $4 and $6 million.

The principal functions of the John E. Fogarty Center will be:

To provide facilities and support for a limited number of scholars for advanced study who will be in residence at the Center for a period of 1 or 2 years;

To conduct international conferences, seminars, and other scientific working sessions to explore major scientific problems, review research developments, and assess their social implications;

To provide international fellowships for the exchange of outstanding individuals for research, teaching and study in the health and related sciences; and

To serve as a central point for receiving and ministering to the large number of distinguished foreign scientists, guest workers, and foreign representatives who visit NIH.

As the subcommittee report states:

> The new programs envisaged for the John E. Fogarty Center and the creation of an effective focal point for NIH International activities should greatly facilitate cooperative enterprises with other countries for the advancement of health research, research planning and research training; help to raise the status of health sciences both in the United States and abroad; add further luster to the already prestigious National Institutes of Health; and, most important of all, stimulate innovative approaches to the advancement of the health sciences and the solution of biomedical problems that will contribute to the health of the American people.

I am proud to have had a small part in helping to get this program started after nearly 4 years of delay. The project was a noble concept of a noble man; its realization will be his most significant and eloquent tribute.

Mr. Chairman, I know that John Fogarty would also have been well pleased with the many reports of major progress in medical research during the past year.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN MEDICAL RESEARCH

During the appropriations hearings witnesses from the NIH Division of Biologics Standards reported on the development of a rapid and reliable test for immunity to rubella—German measles. This test was developed by the same research team which last year perfected a promising experimental vaccine for rubella. As many of you know, rubella is a major hazard to the unborn children of women who may become infected with the disease during pregnancy. With the new immunity test it can be determined whether an expectant mother who has been exposed to rubella is in danger of passing on the disease to her child. The test will also be valuable in evaluating the effectiveness of the experimental vaccine.

The National Cancer Institute reported progress in the treatment of acute leukemia, particularly in children. Survival time, previous to the advent of drug treatment, was only 6 months. Today, an increasing number of patients survive many months or years, some of them 5 years or longer, without evidence of the disease. Witnesses told the committee that in another 5 years, scientists hope to speak confidently of actual cures in both acute and chronic leukemia.

The first clinical success with a partial heart bypass device by Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, a grantee of the National Heart Institute, highlighted progress in the treatment of heart disease last year. Another promising design by Dr. Adrian Kantrowitz, also a Heart Institute grantee, is ready for clinical evaluation. A national blood resource program for the support of research and development to improve the processing, fractionation, storage, and distribution of blood and blood products is now in operation. The program was begun after Congress appropriated special funds last year for its establishment.

Significant advances in dental health, reported by the National Institute of Dental Research, include a fluoride gel which, applied directly to the teeth in a specially fitted mouthpiece, has reduced dental decay in children by 80 percent. The Dental Institute reported the development of a new dental adhesive for fastening porcelain teeth to denture bases without the use of metallic pins, making a more permanent, stronger, less expensive denture possible. The successful implantation of plastic teeth in baboons has led to planning for trials of this method of tooth replacement in human patients.

New evidence in diabetes research, related by witnesses from the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, has lead to a new line of attack on this disease. Scientists have found that abnormal carbohydrate metabolism may not be the primary cause of diabetes, but rather small blood vessel disease may represent its first manifestation. The Arthritis Institute also reported on the development of a compact, economical, and more efficient artificial kidney that can cleanse a patient's blood in 8 to 10 hours, compared to the 12 to 14 hours required by the conventional device. During the past year a unique chemical substance was isolated from the blood of cystic fibrosis patients and their parents which may be the basis for this metabolic disease. The subcommittee adopted an amendment which directed the Institute to devote $2 million of its appropriation to exploit this and other promising areas of research on this fatal, disabling disease.

Research on slow-acting or "latent" viruses as a possible cause of neurological disorders was reported by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness. A neurological disorder called kuru, found among natives of New Guinea, has been experimentally transmitted from patients to chimpanzees, and then on to other chimpanzees, suggesting that a transmissible agent may be responsible for other related disorders such as multiple sclerosis and Parkinson's disease.

Considerable progress was reported by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases in the transplantation of human kidneys, especially in overcoming the rejection of the transplanted organ due to the body's immune defense mechanisms which has been a major barrier to successful kidney and other organ transplantations. Refined methods now offer promise that kidney transplants from nonrelated donors will attain a success rate similar to that of transplants from brother, sister, or parent donors.

Substantial support for biomedical engineering which seeks to apply to biological and medical problems the principles and techniques of modern engineering is being given by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences. The Institute also has awarded 15 grants under a new program funded last year to train clinical anesthesiologists who are in desperately short supply.

The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development has now become a national focal point for the coordination, stimulation, and support of basic research related to lowering our shocking infant mortality rate which is higher than twelve other nations. The Institute reported significant achievements already in the management and prevention of Rh blood disease, a condition that is responsible for a large number of newborn infant deaths.

These few examples only give a glimpse of some of the many accomplishments made possible during the past year by continuing congressional support of national medical research programs. And since formal honor by colleagues is always a good indication of the quality of work a man has done, it is noteworthy that a longtime grantee of the National Institutes of Health, Dr. Charles B. Huggins, of the University of Chicago, was a corecipient of the 1966 Nobel Prize for medicine. Another NIH grantee, Dr. René Jules Dubos, of Rockefeller University, was named as the 1966 winner of the Arches of Science Award of the Pacific Science Center. The award, which includes a $25,000 prize and gold medal, is often referred to as "an American Nobel prize." These are only two of many prizes and awards received by NIH scientists and NIH grantees during the past year.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, these achievements are excellent reasons why this health research appropriations bill should receive unanimous backing from the Members of the House. The broad-ranging program of Federal support for biomedical research is our strongest bid for winning the health race—a race we run, not with other nations, but with disease and disability. I for one, would rather see this Nation first in health, than first on the moon. To our unborn generations, to our great medical pioneers and humanitarians, and to ourselves, we can work toward no more worthy achievement.

FDA RESEARCH LAB NO. 2

Mr. Chairman, I would like briefly to discuss one or two other significant portions of the appropriations measure we have before us. The Food and Drug Administration has long sought additional facilities for the important work it does in the area of food and drug research. Specifically, FDA needs additional facilities to house the Bureau of

Science Divisions of Pharmacology, Microbiology and Nutrition.

Appropriations for this facility, as our report points out, "have been controversial for the past few years solely on the basis of whether or not it should be located in the Washington metropolitan area."

In my own case and that of many Members of this House, there is a strong feeling that too large a percentage of the Federal research dollar is being concentrated in the coastal States of our Nation. As a matter of fact, more than 80 percent of all Federal research dollars have gone to these coastal States in recent years.

The result has been a "brain drain" among other things from the middle western regions of our country. Outstanding Ph. D.'s produced at the University of Wisconsin, Ohio State University, Michigan State, and the other great colleges and universities in our area have been attracted to the coastal States because that is where the "Federal research action is." In the view of many Members of Congress, there ought to be a more evenly distributed balance in this equation.

It is for this reason and others that I will not go into now that members of the Appropriations Committee have attempted on occasion to redress the balance with regard to the placement of such facilities as the FDA research laboratory No. 2.

It was also for this reason that I offered an amendment in committee which prohibited the laboratory under discussion from being built at Beltsville as the President had requested.

As the committee report stated:

> Appropriations for this facility have been controversial for the past few years solely on the basis of whether or not it should be located in the Washington Metropolitan area. The situation has been almost exactly the same as with regard to the National Environmental Health Sciences Center. The controversy with regard to the Center was settled to the satisfaction of practically everyone by simply requiring that it be built outside of the 50-mile radius of the District of Columbia. The committee is proposing exactly the same solution to the stalemate that has prevailed regarding the proposed Food and Drug Laboratory No. 2. Such restrictive language has been placed in the Bill.

Mr. Chairman, because of the controversy over the Beltsville location in recent years, FDA did an independent study of possible alternative sites for the new lab. The result of their field studies and investigations led to the conclusion that the University of Wisconsin at Madison would be the best suited environment for location of the new laboratory.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like briefly to outline the reasons FDA felt that the University of Wisconsin offered the best alternate site for the new laboratory.

They first felt that the site should be in the immediate vicinity of one of their planned new field facilities because it would afford an opportunity to have both regulatory and research functions together. Their examination of the seven field facilities left, in their view, only one possible alternate—St. Louis. They then made a full on-site exploration of the scientific supportive disciplines of the area that would be compatible with the missions of the research activities which will be undertaken in Laboratory No. 2, plus, of course, the possibilities of obtaining sufficient land in proximity to these. St. Louis is outstanding in the field of life sciences, they found, but has no biological-agricultural sciences closer than Columbia, Mo. It was for this reason that St. Louis was ruled out.

In considering other possible locations for Laboratory No. 2, they placed primary emphasis on access to a scientific environment which will aid in supporting the programs that will be underway in Laboratory No. 2 at the time it is constructed and in the future. At the present time, Laboratory No. 2 is intended to house the Bureau of Science Divisions of Pharmacology, Microbiology, and Nutrition. The environment most suitable for supporting these three disciplines together would be one containing existing programs in microbiology and nutrition, and in medicine. Support for the Division of Pharmacology entails the possibility of close association with a medical school, since the programs in the Division of Pharmacology are essentially concerned with the medical aspects of drugs and toxic substances. Support for the Divisions of Microbiology and of Nutrition should be based on access to an environment strong in the agricultural sciences since their primary interests in both microbiology and nutrition are related to food technology, food microbiology, and animal nutrition.

FDA therefore, sought an academic area which would contain established centers of pharmacological research, food microbiological research, and nutrition research. To obtain these requirements, they felt it desirable to find a location adjacent to a university campus where these three disciplines were present. FDA reviewed the major university centers of the United States to determine if they contained, in one integrated area, the three disciplines with which they are concerned. They also inquired into the accessibility of suitable land, the availability of skilled personnel for recruiting purposes, and the general academic stature of the university in the three scientific areas in question.

In this review, it was soon realized that a desirable site in any of the major cities would present difficulties with respect to the availability of land at or near the academic facilities that were desired. Many desirable sites from one point of view or another were found, but few which met all of the criteria presented above. The search finally narrowed down to a detailed consideration of the University of Wisconsin, Michigan State University, and Ohio State.

These three universities offered the possibility of available land in proximity to an environment which contains the medical and biological disciplines under consideration.

The next step was to make an on-site visit to each of these three universities and to discuss with top university officials the possibility of establishing Laboratory No. 2 on or near the campus. Of the three universities mentioned, only Michigan State University appeared to offer the possibility of a satisfactory location, directly on campus, and immediately adjacent to a Life Sciences Health Center which will soon be under construction. The University of Wisconsin has land available in the form of various farms located a short distance away from the campus itself. Ohio State university likewise has land available within the confines of the university campus or a short distance away, but neither Ohio State University nor the University of Wisconsin offered the possibility of direct integration into a growing complex of laboratory buildings which include support for the medical and biological sciences. Only Michigan State University appeared to have this capability.

When FDA considered the academic stature of the three universities mentioned with particular respect to eminence in the scientific fields in which they are interested, they felt, quite rightly, that there is no question but that the University of Wisconsin is outstanding. Other things being equal, they decided that the University of Wisconsin should be their first choice. A disadvantage of the University of Wisconsin is the lack of available land on the university campus proper.

Nevertheless, they felt that locating Laboratory No. 2 directly on campus might carry with it obligations as well as benefits and were also fearful that an on-campus site would not be readily susceptible to future expansion in research capabilities should this be necessary.

In view of the various considerations that have entered into this picture, they finally concluded that a site on readily available land, suitable for possible expansion in the future, and within reasonable distance of the campus facilities, would met their requirements. On this basis, they selected the University of Wisconsin as their first choice. Second choice is the life sciences complex at Michigan State University, and third choice is Ohio State University.

Mr. Chairman, I was certainly pleased that FDA in its exhaustive site-selection investigation chose the University of Wisconsin as best suited when all factors are considered for location of Research Laboratory No. 2.

WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly on one other action the committee took in considering this bill. The President in his budget recommended the elimination of the work-study program that has worked so well in the Vocational Education Administration and proposed that it be transferred to the Neighborhood Youth Corps in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In our report, we said:

> The only reduction proposed in the budget which affected the basic program was the elimination of the work-study program. This was proposed in the budget on the basis that it would be absorbed by the Neighborhood Youth Corps financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The committee is convinced that the latter program is a less desir-

> **able way of providing for the needs of vocational education students and in addition would cost the Federal Government more money. The committee therefore recommends, and has included in the bill, language which would transfer $10 million from the Office of Economic Opportunity's appropriations to the vocational education work-study program.**

Mr. Chairman, the work-study program under vocational education is directed to the educational objectives of the student whereas the Neighborhood Youth Corps in-school program in many instances is not related primarily to educational objectives.

Briefly, I would like to describe the work-study program as it has evolved under the Vocational Education Administration and compare it to the costs being borne under the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Authorization for the operation of the work-study program for vocational education students is included under section 13 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963—Public Law 88-210. Funding authorization is provided under section 15 of the same act. Of the total amount allotted to a State, an amount not to exceed 1 percent of any such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is greater, may be expended for the development of the State plan and for the administration of the plan.

The work-study program for vocational education students is administered by the State board for vocational education in accordance with the approved State plan.

Participation in vocational education work-study programs is available only to needy students—aged 15 to 20 inclusive—who have been accepted or are enrolled as full-time students in a vocational education program which meets the standards prescribed by the State board and the local vocational education agency. Students must be in need of earnings from such employment to commence or continue their vocational education program and capable of maintaining good standing in their programs while employed. Work-study programs operate through established State and local vocational education agencies. They usually bear a direct relationship to the vocational education program in which the student is enrolled and provide a continuum of educational and work experience for both rural and urban youth.

PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In fiscal year 1965, the first time Federal funds were authorized for work-study, 18,563 students participated in the program. Total expenditures of $2,829,497 were reported, of which $29,703 were State and local funds.

In fiscal year 1966, the first full year of program operation, 68,386 students participated in work-study programs. Of this number 25,000 were enrolled in summer programs. Total expenditures of $20,874,000 were reported in fiscal year 1966, of which $528,594 were State and local funds.

For fiscal year 1967, at the request of the President, an appropriation of $10 million instead of $25 million was authorized to provide 75 percent Federal support for the program. An estimated 35,000 students will be supported with this appropriation together with State and local funding to provide the required 25 percent matching of Federal funds.

COST EXPERIENCE

Work-study programs under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 have averaged $305 per student for both school and summer employment with 97 percent of the available funds accruing to the students.

Mr. Chairman, as the following chart points out, a transfer of the work-study program from vocational education, an on-going and successfully administered program, to the Neighborhood Youth Corps would more than double the cost per enrollee from approximately $305 under vocational education to some $722 under the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Comparison of vocational education work-study programs and Neighborhood Youth Corps in-school program, average cost per enrollee, fiscal year 1966

	Vocational education work-study	Neighborhood Youth Corps in-school [1]
A. Average earnings per enrollee	[2] $297	[3] $538
B. Average administrative cost per enrollee	[4] 8	[5] 29
C. Supervision		145
D. Program cost (transportation, work tools)	0	10
E. Total cost per enrollee	305	722
F. Federal share	297	650
G. State and local share	[6] 8	72

[1] Information furnished by the Department of Labor, Budget Office.

[2] Based on the total amount of student earnings reported by the States divided by the total number of enrollees.

[3] Based on wages of $1.25 per hour times 9 percent (fringe benefits) times 11 hours times 36 weeks.

[4] Includes B and C and is for State supervision only. The act specifies that not to exceed 1 percent of the States allotment or $10,000, whichever is greater, may be expended for the administration of State plan for the work-study program.

[5] Includes salaries for project director and clerical staff, rent, etc.

[6] The 25-percent matching requirement was not effective until fiscal year 1967.

Mr. Chairman, I think the action our committee took in this and in the many other elements in this bill merit the support of all Members of this House and I urge the passage of H.R. 10196.

However, Mr. Chairman, I feel I should point out that this bill is underfunded. This might take you by surprise coming from me, but I think it is only fair for us to point out there is not enough money appropriated in this bill in the area of aid to the States to carry on these programs for the full 12 months. There is a shortage in title 19 of the medicare program. There is a shortage as far as aid to dependent children and a shortage as far as the totally and permanently disabled are concerned.

This budget submitted by the President of the United States does not fully provide for these programs I mentioned, and there will have to be a supplemental before the first session of the 90th Congress closely or early in the second session of the 90th Congress.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Do I understand from what the gentleman has just said that the budget which was submitted to us in January with respect to the programs the gentleman from Wisconsin enumerated is underfunded as far as the recommendations from the White House are concerned?

Mr. LAIRD. They are obviously underfunded. These are matching programs in which the State goes ahead with a program—your State of Michigan and my State of Wisconsin and the other 48 States, the District of Columbia, and our territories. These States have every reason to expect under these matching grant-in-aid programs for welfare that the Federal Government will match their funds as provided for under the basic legislation. This bill already is underestimated in these welfare fields by $500 million.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is the gentleman's statement in this regard corroborated by the testimony of witnesses who sought—and I underline the word "sought"—to justify the President's budget?

Mr. LAIRD. Well, Mr. Chairman, it was very difficult to draw this out of the witnesses, because they were told to come up here and say that this was the budget they needed, and every consideration was given to their estimates. Our record clearly shows an admission on their part in the amount of $400 million in this area. However, it will be considerably greater than that, but by their own admission in this record as to the budget which was submitted to this Congress in this area it is underestimated by at least $400 million.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to me for the purpose of discussing that particular point?

Mr. LAIRD. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I have reference to the underfunding to which the gentleman from Wisconsin has referred insofar as title XIX is concerned.

Might it not be that the decision of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to go along with an estimate which is questionable—if the gentleman's interpretation is correct—that to be underfunded really represents a concern on the part of this Congress that we may not be willing to fund all of the sums that might conceivably become necessary to be paid by the Federal Government under the title XIX program which, insofar as I know, now has almost no ceiling placed upon it?

Mr. Chairman, there is pending in the Committee on Ways and Means a number of proposals, one of which I have introduced, designed to restrict the application of title XIX and put some limitation upon it.

Mr. Chairman, I would think that, perhaps, that what the gentleman's committee has done insofar as title XIX is concerned is a good thing—that it will represent a warning to several States that they cannot automatically come back here and collect everything they might ask to collect for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman fom New York that the gentleman makes a good point, except that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has approved these State programs and they have committed themselves to pay these States upon the basis of State-approved programs.

Mr. Chairman, if the Department had withheld approval or had placed certain conditions upon these requests for approval, then the gentleman's point would be a valid point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from New York that when these bills are submitted, we must do as we just did a few minutes ago in the supplemental appropriation bill: we appropriated another $470 million for the rest of this fiscal year. There was not very much we could do about it. The States would not have been able to make the payments, even next week, unless those funds were appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee on Ways and Means will try to tighten up this program. But it will take legislative action on the part of the Congress to tighten it up. It will not be done by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I might state further to the gentleman from New York that even in the gentleman's own State of New York, this Department approved and crossed every "t" and dotted every "i" in this program or for this program in the State of New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin. I have been urging the Department down here in Washington not to approve the program which the Department in New York has inaugurated, until there was brought about a little more uniformity and until it was brought a little more in line with the thinking of the Committee on Ways and Means and with the thinking of other committees of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I have warned the State Department of Welfare of the State of New York that they might not automatically receive all of the appropriation of funds that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare tells them they will receive.

Mr. Chairman, while I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that it is unfortunate that the Department has approved this program, they still ought to be on notice that this Congress is not going to just automatically appropriate every expense that occurs—and some of them will be beyond the budget estimates, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has indicated.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] will join with me in voting against some of these authorizations. I did not support title XIX. I foresaw what was happening when we opened the door in that legislation. However, the time to stop it was when it was authorized. And, Mr. Chairman, the time to stop some of these programs and expenditures is when the authorizations for them are being considered.

The problem occurs when you open that door for the first time with the authorization. The door was opened for the authorization and title XIX opened that door very broadly and very wide.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield further?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman from Wisconsin may have voted against titles XVIII and XIX, but the gentleman will recall that we never even debated title XIX and never had an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. LAIRD. We had a rollcall vote on the conference report when it came back here, and the RECORD is very clear who voted for it, and who voted against it.

Mr. STRATTON. There is no reference to title XIX.

Mr. LAIRD. The bill came back here for a vote, and we voted it right here on the floor in that conference report. I do not know how the gentleman voted. But my point is that the time to stop it is when it is being authorized. That is the time to make corrections. That is the time to put the curtailment on the program that the gentleman talks about. The only action we can take now is through additional legislation amending the authorization.

Mr. STRATTON. I believe that is necessary, but I believe perhaps the appreciation of the excess cut which the gentleman has referred to will help to expedite this legislation.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make here is that this bill is underfunded, as it comes here to the House of Representatives, in these very important areas. It will only add further to the deficit when these programs are funded for the various States.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in line with the gentleman's statement that the bill is underfunded, I would like to point out particularly the fact that that occurred in title III of the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it was demonstrated in this Chamber yesterday, last night and early this morning that there is considerable confusion and doubt among the Members as to the shape and form of future Federal aid to education. There is no doubt, however, that efforts in this area must be stepped up to meet the growing demands and the needs of our Nation's children. But we must be very careful to see that these funds are spent where they will most benefit education. Sensible priorities must be set up to emphasize those programs that work best.

I wish to call the Members' attention, particularly, to one phase of this aid that is severely—and I maintain—unjustly cut in this bill. It is title III of the National Defense Education Act.

While this bill calls for the full budget figure of $50 million for this title in fiscal 1968, this is a reduction of $38 million from last year.

I should like to call to the Members' attention that during the last school year, only about 70 percent of the Nation's eligible school districts participated in title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This, of course, calls for straight grants. Meanwhile, funds available from the National Defense Education Act, title III, which must be matched by the States, are consistently oversubscribed. In fiscal 1966, for instance, 36 States asked for more funds—a total of $22 million more than was available in this program.

At a meeting in Chicago early this year, called by the U.S. Office of Education and attended by State personnel responsible for federally assisted education programs from 12 States, there was 100-percent agreement that title III of the National Defense Education Act was the most heartily endorsed and accepted by the school districts. Personnel from the Office of Education have been unable to answer questions as to why a proven program such as this was being phased out in favor of the newer unproven programs about which there is considerable doubt as to the ultimate value.

While, as a member of the committee myself, I surely recognize that one of the first ground rules established in the consideration of this bill was to stay within the budget; I, none the less, hope that in the conference, steps might be taken so that funds may be increased for this particular title, perhaps by transfer from some other less necessary program.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] that title III of the National Defense Education Act is much more important than the similar provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and better use is made of the moneys in the National Defense Education Act. There was a vote of our subcommittee, however, not to go above the budget. I had a couple of amendments to go above the budget, and they were not included in the bill. One of them had to do with transferring money from another area and using those funds under title III of the National Defense Education Act. I am hopeful we can make such an adjustment before this bill finally passes in the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, if I may I would just like to expand slightly on the very pertinent remarks made by the gentleman from North Dakota on the differences between the National Defense Education Act title III and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, we are confronted today with one of the most incomprehensible paradoxes ever brought before this body. We are asked to reduce a program, not because it has not worked, and not because it is not wanted, but because it does not seem to be in fashion with the present administration. We are asked to cut funds for the purchase of equipment and materials by the local schools by over 40 percent and erase altogether State supervision of instruction in spite of evidence that the equipment and supervisory leadership are needed, are desirous, and have proved to be fundamental causes for progress in education during the past 8 years.

Let me remind my distinguished colleagues that they have been standard bearers in the successful efforts to improve instruction through the National Defense Education Act title III program. When the National Defense Education Act was first passed in 1958, title III covered three subjects considered most critical at that time: science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. To support the purchase of laboratory equipment and instructional materials for these subjects, Congress authorized $70 million, and to insure State leadership through supervisory services, it authorized $5 million.

In 1964, Congress became convinced that by assisting these subjects alone, other subjects essential to a balanced and complete education were suffering. Therefore it amended title III of the National Defense Education Act by adding five additional subjects to be supported: history, civics, geography, English, and reading. At the same time, it increased the authorization for the purchase of equipment to $90 million and for supervisory services to $10 million.

In each of the two sessions of the 89th Congress my distinguished colleagues reviewed the subjects supported by the program and added a subject on each occasion: economics in 1965 and industrial arts in 1966. Again, with the addition of each subject, Congress was forthright in authorizing an additional $10 million.

Until recent years, appropriations have increased somewhat as the program expanded, but at a slower rate than the authorization. Never in the life of the program has the authorization been fully appropriated. The most inconceivable development occurred, however, when the 1967 budget proposal showed a reduced level of funding for the National Defense Education Act title III. In spite of the fact that economics was added to the subjects and an additional $10 million was authorized, the budget request for the purchase of equipment was reduced from $79.2 to $54.2 million.

Thanks to the alertness of Congress, it appropriated a sum equal to that of the previous year. But this lesson in the will and mood of Congress did not move the administration to alter its reckless course of undercutting a valuable educational program. In spite of the fact that Congress added a 10th subject—industrial arts—which requires much expensive equipment, and in spite of the fact that Congress authorized an additional $10 million to support it, the administration's 1968 budget has requested only $47 million for the purchase of equipment, a reduction of $32.2 million—41 percent—from the current year's appropriation. At the same time, it deleted all funds for supervisory services, leaving only $2 million for administration at the State level.

How could the administration be so foolish as to reduce the appropriation request in the face of such obvious need? It cites the following reason: equipment and materials are already included in the newer educational programs—titles I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. With this additional support, the reasoning continues, funds for equipment have more than doubled.

This reasoning, I am the first to admit, has just enough substance to be accepted by the unwary reader. But let us examine the facts a little more closely. Title I of ESEA does allow the purchase of materials and equipment, but only for the economically and educationally deprived students in the large cities and rural areas. And administrators of the program have advised school districts not to emphasize equipment in the project and in no case to exceed the 10-percent authorized limit for equipment in any project.

Title II of ESEA is clearly a materials program. But an examination of its provisions makes the difference between it and the National Defense Education Act title II immediately apparent. The National Defense Education Act title III includes support for the purchase of equipment, an item expressly ineligible under ESEA title II. Even the materials differ. Those supported under ESEA title II emphasize school library resources and textbooks. Neither of these two categories is eligible under the National Defense Education Act title III. Thus although each supports the purchase of materials, different categories are involved.

Finally, equipment is theoretically eligible under ESEA title III as a part of supplementary centers and services. But again the administrators of this program discourage the purchase of equipment with ESEA title III funds. After stating that additional equipment funds are available under ESEA, administration spokesmen engage in a kind of circular reasoning by advocating that equipment used in supplementary centers be purchased with the National Defense Education Act title III funds. If the purchase of equipment under ESEA title III were encouraged, however, it would serve a different purpose, since the supplementary centers supported by ESEA title III serve a relatively small number of pupils. In contrast, the National Defense Education Act title III serves all pupils in the regular ongoing instructional program.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on. Let me simply say that I hope we can in conference make a transfer of money to title III of the National Defense Education Act, a tried and tested and successful program.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I appreciate that, and I am sure our students back in North Dakota appreciate the gentleman's concern, because it is a very important section.

Mr. LAIRD. We did continue the vocational education work-study program. In order to stay within our rule as set forth and discussed earlier by our chairman, this money is transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity so that the work-study program can be maintained at the level of the current fiscal year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman if there is not another area in which this appropriation bill is underfunded, and that is in the Public Law 874 funds? If I understand correctly, the action that has preceded this point, Public Law 89-750, was signed into law last year after the adjournment of the session.

Mr. LAIRD. I believe it was signed on or about November 4.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. At that time the Congress had appropriated full funds for what was on the books at the time we adjourned, but then when this program was added, it provided for lowering of the barrier for 874 entitlement, but made no demands on 874 funds. In the action just taken in the House earlier today, wherein we passed the supplemental appropriation, funds added in the Senate were not included, as I understand, to provide funds for this lowered entitlement.

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct. Funds were not included for the new amendments that were passed after the school year had started, and after the budgets of these schools had been approved. That would have been a windfall, especially now when the school year is almost completed.

As far as the 1968 program is concerned, this bill contains approximately 90 percent of the entitlement.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I submit a list of the school districts which would have received funds had the amendment been agreed to.

PUBLIC LAW 81-874 APPLICATIONS (AMOUNTS) PENDING, WHICH CANNOT BE PAID FROM REGULAR 1967 APPROPRIATION (AS OF C.O.B. MAY 31, 1967)

Ala-67-E-818, Jefferson Co. S.D., $62,053.
Ala-67-E-1801, Birmingham, $78,013.
Ariz-67-E-1801, Tempe E.S.D. #3, $54,815.
Ariz-67-E-1806, Phoenix Union High School System, $260,029.
Calif-67-E-1024, Los Angeles City Jr. Col., $155,164.
Calif-67-E-1208, Covina Valley Unif. S.D., $79,471.
Calif-67-E-1809, Newport-Mesa Unif. S.D., $91,698.
Calif-67-E-1831, Solano Co. Jr. Col. Dist., $158,937.
Calif-67-E-1839, Montebello Unif. S.D., $68,009.
Calif-67-E-1840, San Jose Unif. S.D., $68,773.
Calif-67-E-1843, Norwalk-La Mirado Unif. S.D., $143,965.
Conn-67-E-1002, Bloomfield City, $21,201.
Conn-67-E-1301, City of Hartford, $160,982.
Fla-67-E-401, Palm Beach Co., $49,905.
Fla-67-E-1805, Broward Co., $75,631.
Fla-67-E-1806, Polk Co., $49,309.
Ill-67-E-1711, City of Chicago, $2,200,817.
Ill-E-67-1634, City of East St. Louis, $56,136.
Iowa-67-E-1801, Des Moines I., $157,803.

Iowa–67–E–1805, Council Bluff Comm., $110,673.

Iowa–67–E–1806, City of Sioux City, $168,324.

Maine–67–E–1801, City of Portland, $74,794.

Mass–67–E–1020, City of Newton, $128,110.

Mass–67–E–1810, Worcester City, $235,103.

Mich–67–E–1804, City of Ann Arbor, $65,350.

Mich–67–E–1811, City of Detroit, $577,343.

Minn–67–E–1808, City of Minneapolis, $295,343.

Mo–67–E–210, North Kansas City, $126,999.

Mo–67–E–1810, City of Springfield, $92,544.

Mo–67–E–1805, City of St. Joseph, $61,934.

N.J.–67–E–1802, City of Camden, $132,096.

N.J.–67–E–1804, City of Newark, $257,543.

N.Y.–67–E–1701, City of New York, $5,583,162.

N.Y.–67–E–1803, City of Syracuse, $119,711.

N.Y.–67–E–1807, City of Buffalo, $297,213.

N.C._67–E–1801, City of Greensboro, $47,999.

N.C.–67–E–1802, Rowan Co., $72,058.

N.C.–67–E–1806, Forsyth Co., $74,083.

N.C.–67–E–1807, Buncombe Co., $103,264.

N.C.–67–E–1808, City of Raleigh, $49,428.

Ohio–67–E–216, City of Toledo, $90,407.

Ohio–67–E–1805, City of Cleveland, $302,099.

Ohio–67–E–1806, Cincinnati, $284,790.

Ohio–67–E–1807, City of Akron, $135,882.

Oreg.–67–E–1404, Jefferson Co., S.D., #509J, $222,575.

P.R.–67–E–1801, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, $458,316.

R.I.–67–E–1801, City of Providence, $149,930.

S.C.–67–E–803, Greenville Co., $84,684.

S.D.–67–E–1805, Sioux Falls, ISD #1, $121,500.

Tenn.–67–E–204, City of Kingsport, $56,813.

Tenn.–67–E–603, City of Chattanooga, $99,929.

Tenn.–67–E–1802, Hamilton Co., $166,747.

Tenn.–67–E–1803, City of Nashville, $321,583.

Tex.–67–E–1803, City of Dallas, $308,005.

Tex.–67–E–1812, City of Houston, $303,621.

Va.–67–E–1801, Chesterfield Co., $202,002.

Va.–67–E–1803, City of Roanoke, $126,537.

W. Va.–67–E–1801, Wood Co., $86,751.

W. Va.–67–E–1802, Kanawha Co. (Charleston), $63,721.

Wisc.–67–E–1804, Green Bay City Jt. SD #1. $73,505.

Wisc.–67–E–1806, City of Milwaukee, $495,369.

NOTE.—In addition to the estimated entitlements listed above by applicant district, totalling $16,820,551, it is anticipated that there will be about $3,000,000 additional entitlement for school districts which meet the minimum eligibility requirements only because of liberalized criteria other than the reduced average daily attendance provision.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The point I would like to make is that, since the administration asked for the same funds as last year, in effect all 874 school districts, not including the new 36 districts that were added by 89–750, and the 874 school districts are now being reduced in the amount of money they receive; is that correct?

Mr. LAIRD. Their entitlements will only be 90-percent funded. Some will receive more money if they have more children. But their entitlement will be approximately 90-percent funded. It may go down to 85 percent but in the testimony before the committee I think they used the figure 90 percent. I believe they are overestimating that by about 5 percent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The committee went along with the administration recommendation on cutting this?

Mr. LAIRD. The committee went along and supported the budget figure as submitted by the President.

So far as the elementary and secondary education is concerned, which is under title I, there is only 46 percent of entitlement under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provided in this bill.

So there are many programs that are underfunded as compared with the authorizations. They are underfunded as compared with the authorizations but they are somewhat different than the aid to States in welfare categories because these programs provide a proration formula. When you get into welfare programs like ADC and aid to the totally and permanently disabled and other categorical aids there is no proration formula involved.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of this bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The gentleman spoke of a windfall that would have resulted in 36 school districts under Public Law 874 had not the committee taken some action. Would the gentleman briefly explain that statement?

Mr. LAIRD. Very briefly, the committee last year appropriated funds and provided that these funds would be made available to school districts on the basis of what the law was at the time the appropriation bill was passed.

There were amendments adopted and they became law in November. This was during the school year. The budgets of these schools had been approved by the local school boards in all of these cases months before these amendments were enacted. So this additional money had not been anticipated at the time the budgets were approved by the school districts in question.

Now the situation is somewhat different in this school year because the budgets have not been approved for the school year 1967–68. And when I referred to the windfall I was referring to the fact that the legislation was passed after the school budgets had been approved for the school year 1966–67.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Are they included in this year's bill?

Mr. LAIRD. They are included in this year's bill, but under the appropriation level requested by the President they will be receiving approximately 90 percent of full entitlement.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, no program receives more funding than the President's budget request. Is that correct?

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct. There are no programs funded above the President's budget request.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The committee is recommending a reduction in obligation authority for the fiscal year 1968 of $185,115,000. Is that correct?

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct. There are no increases above the budget level in this bill. However, I do want to caution the gentleman from Michigan and my colleagues that this bill as submitted and the budget as submitted by the President is not a credible document in the field of HEW for the fiscal year 1968 and it is not a credible document in the field of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1968.

This fiscal plan which was submitted in the form of a budget request by the President of the United States does not cover full funding for Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year.

It does not cover the costs of our national security and defense programs for the fiscal year 1968. We have a budget deficit based upon this document of $22 billion. But I caution my friends that upon the basis of the testimony being developed in our Appropriations Committee, this budget deficit could go considerably in excess of the $22 billion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, and then I am going to yield the floor. I have been here too long.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is saying that this will have to be followed with a supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. LAIRD. It will have to be followed with a supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. In the next fiscal year?

Mr. LAIRD. For the next fiscal year, either in the latter part of the first session of the 90th Congress, or early in the second session of the 90th Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman, if he will yield further, that we had quite an unhappy experience with a supplemental appropriation bill only an hour or so ago. Permission was obtained to file at midnight last night. We were up early this morning, as the gentleman will recall, so that most of the Members of the House had no opportunity until we came to the floor of the House this noon even to look at the report in connection with the conference.

I will say to the gentleman that I, for one, if I am around here and kicking when the next permission is asked to file a conference report, will see to it that all the time possible is available to Members to have a look at the conference report before it is taken up on the House floor, which we did not have this afternoon on the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. LAIRD. I think the gentleman from Iowa makes a very good point. I will certainly try to help him to see that there is more time for Members to study all committee reports.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN].

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, briefly and quickly I wish to pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee. At the proper time I shall offer an amendment *to strike the rider against building the* Food and Drug Administration's second headquarters laboratory in Beltsville, Md., which is contained in H.R. 10196, the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for fiscal year 1968.

If this rider prohibiting construction within a 50-mile radius of the District of Columbia prevails, the FDA has reported that the cost of the laboratory could rise from $17.5 million to $22.9 million, an increase of $5.4 million just to build in a midwestern location. I do not believe that this is the type of economy we are seeking in Congress and I am opposing this rider primarily on these grounds. I do not believe that the Congress is acting in a manner consistent with the demands of the taxpayers when a rider dictating the location of a new building can add another $5.4 million to the construction cost.

Mr. Chairman, I know how difficult it is to amend an appropriations bill because the committee is so diligent and painstaking in its work on this legislation before it is reported to the floor for consideration. I had hoped that this 50-mile rider could have been prevented in subcommittee and I asked the distinguished chairman of the Labor-HEW Subcommittee and all the majority members to oppose the rider.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to outline my position in favor of the amendment to strike the restrictive rider in H.R. 10196. One, the Food and Drug Administration wants to build its second headquarters laboratory in Beltsville and the FDA has said so continually. As late as April 28, 1967, I received a letter from Dr. James L. Goddard, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, stating that—

> The Agency's first choice for location of such a new facility is in Maryland near the existing laboratory.

In a later meeting in my office Dr. Goddard told me that the Beltsville location was the "optimum site," to use his terminology.

Secondly, there is more than adequate congressional precedent for appropriation of planning funds for the second FDA laboratory in Beltsville. In Senate Report 537, first session, 89th Congress, the Senate Appropriations Committee stated:

> This Committee feels that the planning of this enlarged facility in nearby Maryland alongside other similar facilities is a proper one.

In House Report 1464, second session, 89th Congress, the House Appropriations Committee stated:

> The most significant item included is $950,000 to plan a second laboratory building to house approximately 650 scientific personnel at the Beltsville site. With the greatly increased responsibilities under legislation which Congress has passed in recent years, plus the great expansion in the development of new drugs, the headquarters laboratory facilities of the Food and Drug Administration are already inadequate and will be critically so in the near future.

Thirdly, the Food and Drug Administration itself has demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that to move this research laboratory away from Beltsville, or outside a 50-mile radius of the District of Columbia, would increase the cost of the facility from $3.7 million to $6.5 million depending on the location.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee I am fully aware of our commitments in Southeast Asia, how much it is costing us to meet them, and of the great need to pare the administration's budget intelligently in order to maintain a balance short of all-out wartime budgeting. I strongly believe that it is unconscionable to spend an additional three to five million dollars simply by adding 40 words, three commas and a period to H.R. 10196. The way I figure it, each word in this rider is worth approximately $135,000, or a total of $5.4 million, the added cost to build this laboratory in the Midwest.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to recount a little background of my interest in this laboratory.

I had noticed the request for planning funds in the administration's budget packages in fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968. In fiscal years 1966 and 1967, the administration stated that the money was to plan a second headquarters laboratory to be built in Beltsville near existing facilities. Although the administration deleted any reference to Beltsville as its site in the fiscal year 1968 budget request for planning funds, the administration continued to go on record in favor of this site. I have seen no change in this position.

I had no knowledge of any moves to locate an alternative site, until I received an anonymous telephone call stating that the alternative site had been announced on March 15, in the Milwaukee Sentinel. The newspaper, attributing its information to the ranking minority member said:

> He agreed to sponsor the FDA's stipulation that the laboratory would not be built near Washington after the FDA assured him that the laboratory would be built at Madison.

In the subcommittee hearings 2 days before the newspaper article, on March 13, Dr. Goddard was asked his reaction to a rider on the bill requiring construction outside a 50-mile radius of Washington. He had already testified for the Beltsville site.

In his words:

> We have gone out, looked over the country for alternative sites and we have selected a second site that would be, in our opinion, a rational place to have the facility. We are prepared to accept that. It happens to be in Wisconsin.

Later in the exchange he said:

> We have been to Madison and it does offer the combination of skills in the area of new drugs, pharmacology, and animal husbandry and chemistry that we need to have to work with our staff.

The very next day, on March 14, Dr. Goddard was informed by the ranking minority member of the subcommittee that:

> I am going to propose an amendment along the same lines as the amendment we had with regard to the Environmental Health Center, when we mark up this bill. It provides that the second Food and Drug Laboratory will not be built within a 50-mile radius of the city of Washington. Last night I wrote in my newsletter that I am going to propose this amendment. I did not want it to come as a shock to you so I mention it now.

Mr. Chairman, I can see no evidence that the FDA stipulated a position in favor of the 50-mile rider and no evidence that the agency asked for it. There is no word in the hearings to this effect.

In fact, I have already mentioned Dr. Goddard's letter of April 28, 1967, written to me more than a month after he was informed that a rider would be introduced, in which he reiterated the FDA position in favor of Beltsville, Md. In fact, with his personal knowledge of the rider, he wrote me that:

> However, in consideration of the possibility of language in the appropriations bill which would prohibit construction of the new lab in the Washington area, other sites have also been deemed adequate for our needs.

I feel it is a fair conclusion to draw that it was only in the face of such a rider that the FDA selected the Madison alternative. And, as far as I can determine from a detailed perusal of the hearings, committee reports, and budget requests, I can see no substantial reason to force this agency to build—against its wishes—in a location outside Beltsville. I give the Food and Drug Administration credit for knowing what its needs are for a second headquarters research laboratory and where it should be built.

Certainly it is not this agency that is advocating that the Congress spend an unnecessary $5.4 million just to locate its second major laboratory in distant location.

The extra $5.4 million that the Food and Drug Administration states it would cost to relocate the new lab is just the beginning. Many other unnecessary expenses would accrue. They would involve relocating a large number of FDA personnel from the Washington area to another site. There would be long distance travel and communication expenses between the new laboratory and headquarters here in Washington. There would be recruiting expenses that would be steeper because of the other location.

And, there is an expense in loss of efficiency that cannot be measured in dollars and cents, but possibly may be measured in lower and slower output by the agency.

Congress has made it clear that the Food and Drug Administration must be efficient and effective to fulfill its statutory responsibilities, which are growing by leaps and bounds.

Mr. Chairman, it is on all these grounds that I am proposing this amendment. I feel it would be unwise for this Congress to go on record in favor of spending one extra cent that is unnecessary, illogical and inefficient. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment in order that the Food and Drug Administration may proceed with all possible speed to construct a laboratory it so desperately needs in the location it so clearly favors.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not think the gentleman meant this, but his statement implied it. He realizes this committee is not recommending any site.

I say to the distinguished chairman,

with the placing of this rider, the study conducted at the request of the gentleman's committee shows that it will cost anywhere from $3 million to $5.4 million more ultimately to construct this building at any other site than the one that is available at Beltsville, that is now owned by the Federal Government. I believe the record is complete that the administrative cost in operating laboratories halfway across the country from each other is not in the best interest of the Government. I believe that is particularly true, as was commented upon by the distinguished chairman, of the ever-expanding requirements by laws that are being directed toward this very important agency. So I feel it should be consolidated in one area.

I compliment the committee and the National Institutes of Health, with their new International Center for Advanced Study in Health Sciences going in there. With the interrelating operations, they are placing that building there.

They are not separating that by many thousands of miles.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks being made by the gentleman from Maryland and commend him on his alertness in proposing this amendment.

I certainly do not quarrel with any of our colleagues who would like to zero in on that particular area for any new attractive Federal facilities, but I believe it is not in the best interests of the Federal Government to preclude the construction of any Federal facility in any area of the country, whether it be Washington, D.C., or some place else.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I want first to pay tribute likewise to the chairman of our subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], who certainly treated those of us in the minority with extreme fairness, in the same fashion in which his distinguished predecessor did. In our subcommittee we operate on an alternating basis in questioning and interrogating witnesses, first the chairman and then alternating to the minority, and then back and forth. We appreciate the chairman's consideration of us.

In all, I believe as we look at this particular bill and the fact that it is under the budget—for the first time, at least in my recollection, since I have been serving on this subcommittee—part of that is due to our looking down the barrel of a $25 billion deficit in this coming fiscal year 1968. It has to be a consideration for those of us who serve on the Appropriations Committee to look down the road and see what a momentous deficit we are up against.

This bill totals $13,137,488,000, as the chairman indicated, and more than $185,000,000 under the budget. But, I should add, it is $142,522,500 over the appropriation level for the year 1967.

In our report we show $5.5 billion of appropriations in this bill which is required by basic legislation for which the funding level is not subject to administrative control.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] made a point on the underfunding. I suppose we need only point to that area of grants to the States for public assistance as a prime example. While in this bill we have a total of $4,124,300,000 of grants to the States for public assistance, earlier today we passed a supplemental appropriation for the current fiscal year of 1967, and that one item was $470 million in the supplemental bill. If my memory serves me correctly, in 1966 there was a supplemental request for that one item of $460 million. So the chances are that when we come back a year from now, or in the early months of next year, there will be a supplemental request for grants to the States for public assistance.

There is an item here of $906,631,000 for payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged, as a result of the medicare proposition passed some time ago. Have no illusion that that figure is going to be coming down in the years to follow. Likewise, it will go up.

There is an item for grants for maternal and child welfare of $235,600,000.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that although we have cut the Department of Labor bill as proposed in the President's budget nearly $18 million in fiscal year 1967, the Department of Labor expenditures will be $132 million below our appropriation in the present fiscal year. The Manpower Administration accounts for more than $124 million of this unexpended figure.

I will insert, under a previous approval, a table showing where the expenditures are running below the appropriations in the Department of Labor budget.

The following table shows just where the expenditures are running below the appropriations in the Department of Labor budget:

Analysis of 1967 appropriations and expenditures

	Appropriations	Expenditures	Difference
Manpower Administration	$502.0	$377.6	−$124.4
Labor management relations	8.6	8.2	−.4
Wage and labor standards	88.4	86.4	−2.0
Bureau of Labor Statistics	20.6	19.7	−.9
Bureau of International Affairs	1.3	1.3	
Office of the Solicitor	5.6	5.6	
Office of the Secretary	5.1	4.9	−.2
Miscellaneous expenditures from advances, and reimbursements expired accounts, etc		−3.9	+3.9
Total general funds	631.6	499.8	−131.8

NOTE.—Includes proposed supplementals and Bureau of the Budget reserve; excludes comparative transfers.

I should like to turn for a moment to the employment figures.

In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the request was for 4,580 increased personnel. We allowed in this bill a total of 3,476. The Department of Labor asked for 570 new people. We allowed them 199. The related agencies involved in this bill asked for 135 additional people, and we provided 131.

The total of asked increases, compared to last year, was 5,285, and we allowed 3,806. That is a reduction from the budget figures of 1,479 people.

Actual employment figures

	June 30, 1965	June 30, 1966	June 30, 1967	June 30, 1968
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	87,316	90,810	105,500	106,600
Department of Labor	7,939	8,167	8,329	8,851

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. JONAS. I am pleased that the chairman of the subcommittee is present, because I want him to hear this question.

I had the privilege of sitting in on the markup of this bill as a substitute for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. I was quite impressed by the thoroughness with which the subcommittee had considered this bill, and was pleased with the results.

But since that time I have had an opportunity to develop some figures. I am just wondering whether the gentleman in the well and the chairman of the subcommittee would offer any strenuous objection if an effort were made to reduce employment a little further?

I find that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for example, just a month ago had 7,530 vacancies. The Department of Labor about a month ago, on April 30, had 848 vacancies. The NLRB had 80 vacancies. If they were able to operate a month ago with 8,500 vacancies in these activities, I wonder why we need to increase the employment level?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I would say to my distinguished friend from North Carolina, even though my friend from Ohio was in the hospital—belonging to my club now, although I do not like to have people "queering my act," since I am the local invalid—he sat in and helped us a great deal on two important items.

Mr. JONAS. I remember we collaborated on one or two.

Mr. FLOOD. That is right. We did, but you took the lead on one. That is the way we got it through.

I want to say this, though: All Government agencies—and I know the gentleman is a watchdog on personnel, and somebody has to be—all Government agencies, and even companies like the Hecht Co., Garfinckel's, the First National Bank, have a turnover in people. You just cannot stop that sort of thing. I look at these items where these cuts would be made and in view of the help you have been—and you were a help—I would hope you would not do this, now, especially in this kind of a bill.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will permit, I have not fully decided to offer such an amendment; but am considering it.

Mr. FLOOD. I know, but I know the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I am raising this question during the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], because I would like some assurances, if they are available, that there is some satisfactory explanation of the vacancies I cited. I cannot image the Department having 7,500 vacancies a month ago and needing 6,000 new positions now. I am seeking information and explanations for what appears to be a peculiar situation.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, as the gentleman from North Carolina knows, as long as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]—as long as these two gentlemen are sitting there and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] is backing them up, you have strong spokesmen. These people over here cannot push them around.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. If I may respond to the gentleman from North Carolina, I will say that I share his concern when we hear in answer to our questions so and so many unfilled positions when at the same time they are requesting additional new positions. In part there may be two answers for this. One was a Presidential freeze on personnel. Another is that there is more hiring in this field in the months of May and June than in the prior months of the fiscal year. If my memory serves me correctly, in the Public Health Service in the last year we lost over 500 doctors through attrition in 1 year. Now, where do you find them? Where do you get the kind of people we are looking for who are good people? In part this is it.

Number of doctors leaving Public Health Service, 1962–66 [1]

	Average strength	Number leaving
Year:		
1966	2,371	575
1965	2,306	517
1964	2,281	526
1963	2,151	381
1962	1,927	378

[1] Includes those serving military obligation.

Mr. JONAS. That sounds like a reasonable explanation. My special interest in jobs developed largely as a result of the freeze order last September. I thought if the departments and the agencies of the Government could reduce employment to the levels of the past July or 2 or 3 months prior to the issuance of the order by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—and I have not heard of any agencies folding up or closing down because of that—then I thought maybe we could do a little in the Congress in this field and this might be a way to reduce unnecessary spending.

Mr. MICHEL. I will say to the gentleman, as the chairman indicated, we held a pretty hard line here on these increases of new personnel. We held out for some very low figures. Of course, you know, in the interests of compromise you cannot always have your own way. So I am down here today supporting this bill in the interests of the entire subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We are hearing a good deal here this afternoon about cystic fibrosis. Is that something contagious? Could you catch that at 2 o'clock in the morning in a session here in the House? What is cystic fibrosis?

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman what is cystic fibrosis?

Mr. MICHEL. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that cystic fibrosis is an inherited generalized metabolic disorder characterized by the production of abnormal secretions by the various exocrine glands of the body. The disease is characterized primarily by malnutrition and lung disease. Although in the past cystic fibrosis was confined to the pediatric age group by its high mortality in infancy and early childhood, the disease is now recognized with increasing frequency among adolescents and adults. Recent studies have shown that there are far more adults than previously believed who carry a partial genetic endowment for the disease. The studies also have suggested that variants of cystic fibrosis may be responsible for some chronic lung and gastrointestinal disorders in adults usually not recognized as due to cystic fibrosis.

Our committee was encouraged to hear that some progress is being made in research on cystic fibrosis. During the past year a unique chemical substance was isolated from the blood of both cystic fibrosis patients and the parents of such patients which, when applied to cells of the type lining the respiratory tract in animals, prevents the normal, protective sweeping action of the brushlike hairs extending from these cells that help to expel mucus from the lung's air conduits. In cystic fibrosis, the failure of this cleansing action contributes to the accumulation of mucus in the lungs, which is characteristic of this disorder, and results in its ultimately fatal lung involvement.

Our committee believes that a greater effort could be made to accelerate research on cystic fibrosis which affects one child in every thousand live births. It is estimated that there are 30,000 victims of this disease and that between 4,000 and 5,000 new cases occur each year. The committee therefore directs that $2 million of the appropriation for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases be devoted to research on cystic fibrosis.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, if I might make several other points, because yesterday we were considering, for example, on this floor the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—we were authorizing legislation for which we ultimately on this committee will have to appropriate the money—and I believe it would be well advised for this Congress to take note of what Secretary Gardner had to say with respect to the Great Society legislation when new proposals are being considered. I would like to cite one of our exchanges during that hearing:

> Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Secretary, what would be the effect of a 5-percent cut across the board?

In this exchange bear in mind the several bills that we have had for our consideration which carry this kind of cut proposals.

> Secretary GARDNER. Right across the board?
>
> Mr. MICHEL. Yes.
>
> Secretary GARDNER. I think it would produce the loudest public howl you have heard in quite a long time. These programs are very deeply rooted in the schools and hospitals and clinics and institutions of the country. They build these programs into their budget, and it would be quite a serious thing.
>
> Mr. MICHEL. Would you say we have locked ourselves inextricably into some of these problems?
>
> Secretary GARDNER. We have locked ourselves into many of them, and it is inherent in the Federal-State partnership that we do in many of them, because the essence of a partnership is some kind of predictability. If we pull the rug out we hear from them.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I need not emphasize that point because this is the bill that touches so many homes, so many hospitals, so many schools, so many communities and other local areas at their very heart.

Mr. Chairman, although in our report we show $261 million for requests in the 1968 budget for which legislative authority is due to expire before 1968—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that this bill does not include a total of $179 million for proposed new legislation.

And, Mr. Chairman, in addition to this in our report we show a total of $31.7 billion for the Social Security Administration trust fund. But, again, it should be pointed out that this does not include $4.1 billion for President Johnson's proposed increases to this program.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like at this point to include tables as well as new legislative proposals and the amount which they might ultimately cost, if enacted as taken from pages 78 and 79 of the hearings.

I. Education legislation:	
A. Elementary and secondary educational activities	$15,000,000
Comprehensive educational planning. Legislation will be proposed amending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide grants to State and local education agencies for critical evaluation of existing educational programs, analysis of possible alternatives and long-range planning for necessary improvements.	
B. Expansion and improvement of vocational education	30,000,000
Innovative vocational education programs. Legislation will be proposed for project grants to finance innovative programs for occupational education, including special attention to needs at the junior high school level, work experience opportunities for high school youth, curriculum improvement, and cooperative relationships with the U.S. Employment Service.	
C. Higher educational activities	2,000,000
Sale of NDEA student loans to participations sales pool. Legislation will be proposed to authorize colleges and universities to borrow loan capital for their NDEA direct student loan funds and to authorize sale of certificates of participation in pools of these loans. It is proposed that proceeds from the sale (estimated at $100,000,000 for 1968) be placed in a revolving fund, and that such receipts be made available for new loans to colleges and universities. The Federal National Mortgage Association will be authorized to serve as trustee for these sales.	
D. Educational television facilities	20,000,000
Legislation will be proposed to extend and broaden Federal support for educational television.	
II. Health and welfare legislation:	
A. Comprehensive health planning and services	25,000,000
Partnership for health. Legislation will be proposed to expand the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Act of 1966 to provide increased grants for use by the States, and other public and nonprofit agencies, in such problem areas as family planning, laboratory licensing, and the development of improved methods of delivering health services.	
B. Grants to States for public assistance	25,000,000
Title XIX revisions, −$35,000,000. Improvements in cash assistance programs +$60,000,000. Legislation will be proposed to assure that public assistance payments more nearly meet the economic needs of recipients, to require all States to provide assistance to families with children who are impoverished because of unemployment of a parent, to provide incentives for employment, and to improve work and training programs to help restore recipients to independence. In addition, legislation will be proposed to improve the medicaid for children and bring medical payments made under this program in line with those of other public assistance categories. Because of the time required to fully implement this new legislation, additional Federal costs in 1968 will begin at $60,000,000 and will be offset by anticipated savings in the medical vendor program by $35,000,000.	
C. Grants for Maternal and Child Health	$38,000,000
Improvements in child health programs. Legislation will be proposed to provide under the crippled children's program periodic health examinations and followup treatment for needy children (coordinated with services to be financed under title XIX) to prevent or lessen the severity of crippling childhood illnesses; establish pilot projects to concentrate on innovation in delivering child health care and in training professional personnel and medical assistants; develop dental care programs for children; and increase funds available for maternity and infant projects to expand the attack on high infant mortality rates.	

III. Social security legislation:

	Trust fund	
A. Increased retirement and survivors benefits	$3,619,000,000	
B. Increased disability insurance benefit payments	276,000,000	
C. Increased health insurance benefits	185,000,000	24,000,000
D. Administrative expenses	60,000,000	
Total	4,140,000,000	179,000,000

Legislation will be proposed for a major improvement in the social security system and to extend the health insurance program to disabled beneficiaries. The General Fund amount above is the contribution required to pay the $3 per month Federal matching premium to cover doctor bills for the disabled. The proposed increases in social security payments is expected to reduce the need for some individuals to be assisted under other existing State and Federal income maintenance programs.

It is a good thing our national population is not growing as fast as that of the Office of Education—for the number of authorized personnel there has more than doubled since 1964, rising from a figure of 1,180 in that year to 2,735 in fiscal 1968.

Yesterday, I placed in the RECORD a summary of the authority, functions, and duties of the Commissioner of Education granted him under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Today we are considering the appropriations bill which funds all the programs under the Office of Education. I think it is important that we all realize the extent of the power and influence this Office holds over our State and local educational systems. The following summary, which is concerned only with the laws enacted by the 88th and 89th Congresses, totals 45 pages and amply illustrates the far-reaching authority of the Commissioner of Education:

I. 88TH CONGRESS

PUBLIC LAW 88–126—AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 35, TITLE 38, U.S.C.

This Act amends chapter 35 of title 18, "War Orphans' Educational Assistance," with respect to approval of courses under that program by State approving agencies.

["Sec. 1775"] The Commissioner is authorized to publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting bodies which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered by an institution. The State approving agency will utilize these bodies in determining whether courses will be approved under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance program.

PUBLIC LAW 88–129—HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Amends title VII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. chapter 6A), adding a new Part B which authorizes the Surgeon General to make grants for construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental, and other health personnel.

["Sec. 721"] The Commissioner will approve a list of recognized accrediting bodies, which bodies will determine the accreditation status of institutions applying for grants under Part B. If he determines that new facilities will, at the completion of construction, meet the standards of approved accrediting bodies, he may designate the new facilities as accredited for the purposes of this Part.

["Sec. 725"] The Commissioner will serve as an ex-officio member of the National Advisory Council on Education for Health Professions. The Council advises the Surgeon General on the administration of this Part.

PUBLIC LAW 88–164—MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1963

Title III of this Act amends the Act of September 6, 1958 (P.L. 85–926), an Act to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies.

The scope of the program of grants is broadened by Sec. 301 of the 1963 Act. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education to help them provide professional training for persons engaged or preparing to engage as teachers of handicapped children, supervisors of such teachers, speech correctionists, and other such specialists. The amendments also broaden the 1958 Act by allowing for training for the education of children who are deaf, hard of hearing, blind, crippled, emotionally disturbed, and other handicapped children, as well as mentally retarded children.

The Commissioner is also authorized by the amendments to make grants to institutions to allow them to establish scholarships for training teachers of the deaf.

[Sec. 302] Title III also authorizes the Commissioner (over a 3-year period beginning f.y. 1964) to make grants to States, State and local educational agencies, colleges and universities, and other educational and research agencies for carrying out research and demonstration projects relating to the education of handicapped children. He may appoint such advisory committees as he deems necessary to advise him concerning education of handicapped children, and he may appoint panels of experts to evaluate the research and demonstration projects carried out under this section.

PUBLIC LAW 88-204—HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

The Commissioner is the chief administrative officer for the 3 substantive titles of this Act, and he is charged with prescribing the regulations governing the operation of programs under the Act.

Title I—Grants for construction of undergraduate academic facilities

The Commissioner is authorized to carry out over a 5-year period (beginning f.y. 1964) a program of grants to institutions of higher education for the construction of undergraduate academic facilities.

Application, States [Sec. 105] A State desiring to participate under this title must designate or create a State commission which will submit a State plan to the Commissioner. He will approve any such plan which—

(1) provides it will be administered by the State commission;

(2) sets forth (consistent with criteria to be established by the Commissioner) methods for determining relative priority of eligible projects and for determining the Federal share of each project;

(3) provides that funds allotted for projects at public community colleges and technical institutes will be used only for such projects, and that funds allotted for 4-year schools will be used only for projects at such schools. [This provision altered in the amendments to this Act made by title VII of P.L. 89-329, the Higher Education Act of 1965.]

(4) provides for assigning priority and determining Federal share only by the methods set forth by the State commission;

(5) provides for fair hearings by the State commission of all institutions applying for grants; and

(6) provides for such fiscal control procedures and reports as are necessary.

Application, institutions [Sec. 108] An institution desiring a construction grant from its State's allotment under this title must submit to the Commissioner an application containing such information as he requires. The Commissioner will approve each such application for a construction project if—

(1) the project is eligible in terms of this title;

(2) the project has been approved and recommended by the State commission;

(3) the State commission has set the Federal share, and the State allotment is sufficient to finance that share;

(4) the project has a higher priority than any other in the State;

(5) he determines the project will be undertaken economically; and

(6) he determines that Federal funds will be used only to cover the cost of the project described in the application, that the institution has available the requisite non-Federal share of financing, and that the facility will be used as an academic facility for at least 20 years.

Title II—Grants for construction of graduate academic facilities

The Commissioner is authorized to carry out over a 5-year period (beginning f.y. 1964) a program of construction grants to assist institutions to improve existing graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers, and to assist in the establishment of graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers of excellence.

Application.—Grants under this title will be made only upon approval by the Commissioner of applications submitted to him by institutions of higher education and the boards of cooperative graduate centers. The applications must contain such information as the Commissioner requires. In ruling on applications, the Commissioner will be advised by the Advisory Committee on Graduate Education (of which he will serve as Chairman); and he will give consideration to the extent to which projects will help achieve the objectives of this title and to the extent to which they will aid in attaining a wider distribution of graduate facilities throughout the Nation.

Title III—Loans for construction of academic facilities

The Commissioner is authorized to carry out over a 5-year period (beginning f.y. 1964) a program of loans to institutions of higher education for the construction of academic facilities. Before making a loan under this title, the Commissioner must determine—

(1) that at least 25 percent of the cost of the project will be financed from non-Federal sources;

(2) that the applicant cannot obtain the loan from other sources with terms and conditions as favorable as those under this title; and

(3) that the project will be undertaken economically.

PUBLIC LAW 88-210, PART A—THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to the States to assist them in maintaining, improving, and extending existing vocational education programs and in developing new programs.

He is charged with allotting the basic appropriation among the States, which may use the funds for the following purposes:

(1) vocational education for high school students;

(2) vocational education for persons not in school who are available for full-time study;

(3) vocational education for those persons already in the labor market who need training or retraining;

(4) vocational education for persons with academic, socio-economic, or other handicaps;

(5) construction of area vocational facilities; and

(6) ancillary services and activities.

The Commissioner may reserve up to 10 percent of the basic appropriation for use in supporting research and experimental and demonstration projects carried out by colleges and universities, State and local educational agencies, or other institutions and organizations.

Application [Sec. 5] A State desiring to receive its allotment under this Act must submit through its State board to the Commissioner a State plan which, for approval by the Commissioner, must—

(1) assure that the State board will administer or supervise the plan;

(2) set forth procedures to be used in allocating the funds for each of the allowable uses (see list above) and in allocating funds among local agencies in the State, and guarantee maintenance of effort;

(3) provide minimum qualifications for teachers and others having responsibilities under the plan;

(4) provide for cooperative arrangements between the State board and the public employment offices in the State so that the latter may inform the State board regarding employment outlook;

(5) provide for such fiscal control procedures, records, and reports as are necessary; and

(6) guarantee compliance with the usual conditions governing Federally-assisted construction projects.

[Sec. 13]—The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to the States (from a Separate appropriation under sec. 15) to help them institute work-study programs for youths who need the earnings from part-time employment to continue their vocational education.

Application. To receive funds for this purpose, a State must have in effect a State plan approved under Sec. 5 (above), and it must submit to the Commissioner for approval a "supplementary plan." The supplementary plan must—

(1) assure that the State board will administer or supervise the supplementary plan;

(2) set forth policies to be followed by the State in approving work-study programs and guarantee that Federal funds will be used only to pay students employed under such programs and to cover costs of developing and administering the supplementary plan;

(3) set forth procedure for determining priority of applications submitted by local agencies for work-study programs; and

(4) provide for such fiscal control procedures, records, and reports as needed.

[Sec. 14]—The Commissioner is further authorized to make grants (from funds under the sec. 15 appropriation) to colleges and universities, educational agencies and to other organizations and institutions for the construction, equipment, and operation of residential vocational education facilities.

PUBLIC LAW 88-210, PART B—AMENDMENTS AND EXTENSION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

By terms of this Act, several titles of the NDEA of 1958 (for which the Commissioner is chief administrative officer) were amended and extended. This Act—

(1) included American Samoa for participation under NDEA programs and extended certain benefits of the 1958 Act to schools operated by Federal agencies;

(2) extended the student loan program for 1 year and altered several of its provisions;

(3) extended for 1 year the program of grants to States for improving instruction in certain subject areas;

(4) extended the fellowship program for 1 year;

(5) expanded the program of assistance for guidance, counseling, and testing services;

(6) extended the program of aid for modern foreign language centers;

(7) extended the program of research in using television and other teaching aids; and

(8) extended for 1 year the program of aid for improving State educational statistics systems.

[For further description of P.L. 88-210, Part B, please see the enclosed "Enactments by the 88th Congress . . .", pp. 67-75.]

PUBLIC LAW 88-210, PART C—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874, 81ST CONGRESS

Public Laws 815 and 874 authorized Federal assistance for public school construction and maintenance and operation in Federally affected areas. Both programs are administered by the Commissioner. This Act extended the nonpermanent provisions of both programs for 2 years (through June 30, 1965).

PUBLIC LAW 88-269—LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

This Act amends the Library Services Act of 1956 (P.L. 597, 84th Congress; 20 U.S.C. 351) which is administered by the Commissioner. By terms of the LSCA, Federal assistance for improving and developing public library service is extended to urban as well as rural areas.

Section 7 of the 1964 Act adds 2 new titles to the earlier Act. Title II authorizes the Commissioner to make grants to the States to assist them in the construction of public libraries.

Application ["Sec. 203"] To receive an allotment under this title, a State must submit for approval of the Commissioner a State plan which—

(1) provides that Federal funds under this title will be received and safeguarded by the State Treasurer (or similar officer) who will assure that such funds are expended only for purposes of this title;

(2) provides for administration or supervision of the plan by the State library administrative agency;

(3) provides for necessary reports;

(4) provides that library services of libraries aided under this title will be furnished free of charge;

(5) sets forth procedures assuring approval for projects in areas in the greatest need of library facilities;

(6) provides for fair hearings by the State agency of local agencies whose applications for funds have been denied; and

(7) guarantees compliance with the usual conditions governing Federally-assisted construction projects.

PUBLIC LAW 88-352—CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Title IV, "Desegregation of Public Education," authorizes the Commissioner to—

(1) conduct a national survey concerning the lack of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion or national origin in public schools of all levels, and to report his findings to the President and Congress within 2 years of the enactment of this title;

(2) render technical assistance to any governmental unit operating public schools in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of desegregation plans;

(3) arrange through grant or contract with colleges and universities for the operation by them of institutes to help elementary and secondary school personnel deal with special problems occasioned by desegregation; and

(4) make grants to school boards, on their application, to help them pay for (a) inservice training for their personnel in problems related to desegregation and (b) employment of specialists to advise in such problems.

Title VI, "Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs," states that no person shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

Each Federal department or agency empowered to extend Federal financial assistance to any program or activity is authorized and directed to effectuate the provisions of the paragraph above with respect to such program or activity by issuing rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability which shall be consistent with achievement of the objectives of the statute authorizing the financial assistance in connection with which the action is taken.

PUBLIC LAW 88-581—NURSE TRAINING ACT OF 1964

The Commissioner will serve as an ex-officio member of the National Advisory Council on Nurse Training established under Part C of this Act. The Council will advise the Surgeon General concerning the administration of this Act.

The Commissioner is also delegated authority in determining the accreditation status of programs of nursing education.

PUBLIC LAW 88-665 (TITLES I-X)—NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1964

Amended the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (administered by the Commissioner) so as to extend the Act for 3 years (through f.y. 1968) and—

(1) increase authorization for title II student loans, expand the loan forgiveness feature, and increase the individual loan ceiling;

(2) expand title III critical subject program to include 5 new subject areas;

(3) increase the number of title IV fellowship available;

(4) expand the title V guidance, counseling, and testing program to cover elementary and secondary schools and public junior colleges;

(5) raise authorization for title VI language development program; and

(6) establish a new title XI, "Training Institutes," incorporating old title VI-B.

[For further description of P.L. 88-665, please see the enclosed "National Defense Education Act of 1958, as Amended. . .", esp. pp 1-7.]

PUBLIC LAW 88-665, TITLE XI—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874, 81ST CONGRESS

Title XI of this Act extends Public Laws 815 and 874 for 1 year (through f.y. 1966) and extends assistance under them to Federally affected schools in the District of Columbia.

II. EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

PUBLIC LAW 89-10—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

The Commissioner is designated as the chief administrative officer for all 5 of the substantive titles of this act, and he is charged with formulating the regulations governing the operation of programs carried out under this act.

Title I—Financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families

Under the Act of September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 236-244), as amended by this title, the Commissioner will make payments in accordance with the terms of this title to State educational agencies for basic grants (f.y. 1966, 1967, 1968) and special incentive grants (f.y. 1967, 1968) to local educational agencies which serve areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families.

Application [*Sec.* 206] He will approve or disapprove the application submitted to him by each State for participation in the program under this title. Such application must give assurances that grants under this title will be used by local agencies only for carrying out and administering programs approved by the State agency; that the State agency will use the necessary fiscal control and fund accounting procedures; and that the State agency will furnish the Commissioner with such reports as are necessary.

(The State agency is charged with approving plans submitted by local educational agencies within it. Approval must be consistent with basic criteria established by the Commissioner.)

Title II—School library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials

The Commissioner will carry out for a period of 5 fiscal years (beginning f.y. 1966) a program making grants for acquisition of library resources, texts, and other instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in elementary and secondary schools.

Application [Sec. 203] He will approve or disapprove a State plan submitted to him by each State which desires to receive grants under this title. Such State plan must designate the State agency which will administer the plan; undertake to use grants only for acquisition of resources and for administering the plan; set forth criteria to be used in allocating resources throughout the State; set forth criteria to be used in selecting resources and for determining the proportion of the grant to be expended for each type of resource; guarantee maintenance of State effort; and provide for fiscal control and fund accounting procedures and for such reports as the Commissioner may require.

Title III—Supplementary educational centers and services

The Commissioner will carry out for a period of 5 fiscal years (beginning f.y. 1966) a program for making grants to local educational agencies for supplementary educational centers and services.

Application [Sec. 304] He will approve or disapprove applications for grants submitted to him by local educational agencies. Such applications must assure that the applicant will administer the program; describe the program to be carried out; guarantee maintenance of effort; provide special assurances with regard to any construction of facilities; and provide for necessary fiscal procedures and reports. In addition, the application must be consistent with criteria developed by the Commissioner regarding equitable distribution of assistance under this title within each State, and it must have been submitted to the appropriate State educational agency for review and recommendations.

Title IV—Educational research and training

Under the Act of July 26, 1954 (20 U.S.C. 332), as amended by this title, the Commissioner will provide, through grants or contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with colleges and universities and other agencies, institutions, organizations, and individuals, for research, surveys, and demonstrations in education, and for the dissemination of information derived therefrom. He will make grants to public and nonprofit private colleges, universities, organizations, agencies, and institutions to assist them in providing training in educational research. He will arrange, over a period of 5 fiscal years (beginning f.y. 1966), for the construction and operation of national and regional facilities for educational research and related purposes, and he will make grants to or contracts with colleges, universities, or other appropriate organizations to pay all or part of the cost of construction or operation of such facilities.

Title V—Grants to strengthen State departments of education

The Commissioner will carry out for a period of 5 fiscal years (beginning f.y. 1966) a program for making grants to the States to assist them in improving the State educational agencies.

Application [Sec. 504] He will approve or disapprove applications submitted to him by States which wish to receive grants under this title. Such applications must describe the specific projects or activities to be undertaken with the grant and provide for maintenance of State effort and for necessary fiscal control procedures and reports.

The Commissioner is also authorized to use 15 percent of appropriated sums for grants to State agencies for projects and activities which, in his judgment, will contribute to the solution of problems common to several or all of the State agencies, and to arrange for the assignment of employees of State educational agencies to work in the Office of Education, and of employees of the Office of Education to work in the State agencies for periods not in excess of 2 years.

PUBLIC LAW 89-36—NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF ACT

[Sec. 3(b)] For the purpose of determining the accreditation status of institutions of higher education which might wish to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of HEW to establish and operate a National Technical Institute for the Deaf, the Commissioner will publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

[Sec. 6(a)] The Commissioner will serve as an ex-officio member of the National Advisory Board on Establishment of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. This Board will advise the Secretary of HEW and make recommendations to him concerning the establishment and operation of the Institute.

PUBLIC LAW 89-77—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874, 81ST CONGRESS

P.L. 815 is amended so that the Commissioner is authorized to provide for the construction of minimum school facilities in certain outlying areas (Puerto Rico, Guam, Wake Island, the Virgin Islands) for the education of children who reside with a Federally employed parent but not on Federal property. The Commissioner may so provide only if, after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency, he determines that the construction will be consistent with the purposes of this Act; that no local agency is able to provide suitable education for such children; and that English is not the primary language of instruction in local schools.

PUBLIC LAW 89-209—NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES ACT OF 1965

[Sec. 9(b)] The Commissioner will serve as a member of the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities established within the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. The Federal Council will advise and consult with the Chairmen of the Endowments for the Arts and Humanities, coordinate the policies and operations of the two Endowments, and coordinate the activities of the Foundation with related programs of other Federal agencies.

[Sec. 12] The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to State educational agencies for purchasing equipment for use in providing education in the arts and the humanities and for carrying out minor remodeling of laboratory or other space necessary for using such equipment; and to make loans for these purposes to nonprofit private schools.

Application. He will approve or disapprove a State plan submitted to him by the educational agency of each State wishing to receive grants under this section. Such plan must—

(1) provide that the State agency will administer all programs funded with grants under this section;

(2) guarantee that grants will be used solely for projects approved by the State agency;

(3) set forth methods for determining the priority of proposed projects to be carried out within the State;

(4) provide opportunity of a hearing for all applicants before the State agency;

(5) establish a State standard for equipment to be purchased with funds under this section; and

(6) provide for necessary fiscal control procedures and reports.

[Sec. 13]—The Commissioner is authorized to arrange, through grants or contracts, with colleges and universities for the operation by them of institutes for advanced study for persons involved in the teaching of the arts and the humanities in elementary and secondary schools.

PUBLIC LAW 89-287—NATIONAL VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE ACT OF 1965

The Commission is given full administrative authority over all the programs to be carried out under this Act, and he is charged with prescribing such regulations as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of the Act.

[Sec. 3]—He is authorized to make advances to the States or to nonprofit private agencies with which he has agreements for the purpose of establishing or strengthening reserve funds to be used for insuring low-interest student loans made to students in eligible business, trade, technical, and vocational schools.

Agreement [Sec. 9(b)]—A State or nonprofit private agency wishing to receive advances from the Commissioner for its loan insurance program may enter into an agreement for that purpose with the Commissioner if he determines that the program—

(1) will insure at least $1,000 to a student for an academic year;

(2) will insure loans for at least 2 years of study;

(3) provides for acceleration of repayment without penalty, for a loan period not in excess of 9 years from the execution of the note, and for default provisions as authorized by the Commissioner's regulations;

(4) provides for repayment of loans over a period of from 3 to 6 years beginning 9 months to 1 year after the student leaves school;

(5) limits interest to 6 percent per year;

(6) will insure not less than 90 percent of unpaid principal;

(7) does not charge excessive insurance premiums;

(8) provides that no student will be denied benefits of the program from lack of need if his adjusted family income is less than $15,000;

(9) provides insurance for a loan to a student for any year of study; and

(10) if it is a State program, will be administered by or under supervision of a single State agency.

The agreement must provide that loan holders will furnish the Commissioner with such information as he needs and must contain provisions to protect the financial interest of the U.S.

[Sec. 2(a), Sec. 5]—He is authorized to institute a program of Federal insurance on loans made by eligible lenders to students who do not have reasonable access to an adequate State or nonprofit private loan insurance program covered by an agreement under sec. 9(b).

[Sec. 13]—The vocational student loan insurance fund established by this section will be available to the Commissioner without fiscal year limitation for making payments in connection with default of loans insured under this Act.

[Sec. 9]—The Commissioner is authorized to pay on behalf of the borrower a portion of the interest on loans insured under this Act or under a State or nonprofit private loan insurance program covered by an agreement with the Commissioner.

[Sec. 10]—Over a period of 5 years (beginning f.y. 1966), he is authorized to make direct loans to eligible students who are unable to obtain low-interest insured loans from other sources.

PUBLIC LAW 89-290—HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Amends title VII of the Public Health Service Act, adding a new Part E which authorizes the Surgeon General to carry out a program of grants to assist schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, and podiatry to improve the quality of their educational programs.

["Sec. 773"]—To be eligible for a grant under Part E, an institution must be accredited by a recognized accrediting body approved by the Commissioner. If an institution is not accredited but, in the opinion of the Commissioner, will soon meet the appropriate body's accreditation standards, he may designate the institution as accredited for the purposes of this Part.

PUBLIC LAW 89-313—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAWS 315 AND 874, 81ST CONGRESS

[Sec. 1]—P.L. 815 is amended so that the Commissioner is authorized to provide Federal funds to a local school agency for the construction of school facilities to replace facilities destroyed or severely damaged by a major disaster. Until appropriations are made for this section, he may use funds appropriated for other sections of P.L. 815 to provide immediate assistance under this section.

Before making payments under the section, the Commissioner must determine that the local agency in question is making every reasonable effort to restore its facilities but is unable to obtain sufficient funds; that projects to be undertaken are consistent with the overall State plan for school construction; and that private school pupils whose schools have been disrupted will be given access to programs carried out in the facilities restored by aid of grants under this section.

Application ["Sec. 16(c)"]—The Commissioner will approve or disapprove an application submitted to him through the appropriate State agency by each local agency wishing to receive grants under this section. Such application must contain the same information and assurances as required in sec. 6(b)(1) of P.L. 815 (applications by a local agency for basic construction grants under P.L. 815).

[Sec. 2]—P.L. 874 is amended in complementary manner to authorize the Commissioner to provide assistance to a local agency in a major disaster area for the operation and maintenance of its schools. Until appropriations are made for this section, he may use funds appropriated for other sections of P.L. 874 to provide immediate assistance under this section. Before making payments under this section, the Commissioner must determine that the local agency in question is making every reasonable effort to secure funds sufficient for providing education to the children in its schools, but is unable to secure sufficient funds; and that private school pupils whose schools have been disrupted in the area of the agency will have access to public school programs carried out by the agency.

Application ["Sec. 7(d)"]—The Commissioner will approve or disapprove an application submitted to him through the appropriate State agency by each local agency wishing to receive assistance under this section. The application must be in accord with regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner.

[Sec. 3]—Amends P.L. 815, adding a new section authorizing the Commissioner to disregard an announcement made on November 19, 1964, concerning a decrease or cessation of Federal activities in certain areas. [As a result of this amendment, a few school districts which had undertaken extensive building programs relying on P.L. 815 assistance will not be adversely affected by the 1964 announcement ordering base closings.]

[Sec. 5]—Amends sec. 5(e) of P.L. 815, allowing the Commissioner to waive the minimum number eligibility requirement (i.e., the number of Federally-connected children necessary to establish eligibility for construction assistance) so that a school district with a small enrollment but a high percentage of Federally-connected children can receive assistance.

PUBLIC LAW 89–329—HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

The Commissioner is charged with administering the 7 substantive titles of this Act and with prescribing the regulations which will govern the operation of the programs carried out under each of the titles.

Title I—Community service and continuing education programs

The Commissioner will carry out over a 5-year period (beginning f.y. 1966) a program of grants to the States for the purpose of strengthening the community service programs of colleges and universities.

Application [Sec. 105] A State desiring to receive grants under this title must create or designate a State agency which will submit to the Commissioner a State plan. Such State plan must—

(1) provide that the designated State agency will administer the plan;

(2) set forth a plan for a statewide system of community service programs, none of which may be undertaken without the State agency's approval;

(3) contain procedures to be used for allocating Federal funds among the colleges and universities in the State;

(4) guarantee maintenance of fiscal effort by State and local agencies and by institutions of higher education; and

(5) provide for such fiscal control procedures, reports, and records as are necessary.

Title II—College library assistance and library training and research

Part A—College Library Resources

Over a 5-year period (beginning f.y. 1966) the Commissioner will carry out a program of making grants to colleges and universities to help them acquire library resources such as books, periodicals, documents, tapes, etc. Three types of grants are authorized: basic grants, supplemental grants, and special purpose grants.

Application for Basic Grants [Sec. 202] Applications will be submitted to the Commissioner by individual institutions or combinations of institutions. Applications must—

(1) assure maintenance of fiscal effort for all library purposes exclusive of construction, and guarantee dollar-for-dollar matching of the Federal grant;

(2) assure maintenance of fiscal effort in the acquisition of library resources; and

(3) provide for such fiscal control procedures, reports, and records as are necessary.

Applications for Supplemental Grants [Sec. 203] Applications will be submitted to the Commissioner by institutions or combinations thereof. Such applications must—

(1) meet the requirements outlined for applications for basic grants (sec. 202, above), except for the matching requirement;

(2) describe size and quality of applicant's present library resources in relation to present and expected enrollment;

(3) set forth circumstances impeding development of library resources; and

(4) describe how grant would be used to improve applicant's library resources.

The Commissioner will approve applications for supplemental grants on the basis of criteria prescribed by him after consultation with the Advisory Council on College Library Resources.

Application for Special Purpose Grants [Sec. 204] Applications will be submitted to the Commissioner by institutions or combinations. Applications must—

(1) assure maintenance of fiscal effort for all library purposes exclusive of construction; and

(2) assure 1-for-3 matching of Federal grants.

Part B—Library Training and Research

Over a 5-year period (beginning f.y. 1966) the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to colleges and universities to assist them in training persons in librarianship. *Applications* ([Sec. 223]) for such grants will be submitted to the Commissioner by institutions of higher education. The Commissioner will approve those applications which he finds will lead to increasing opportunities for training in librarianship.

The Commissioner is further authorized to make grants to colleges, universities, and other public and nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions for research and demonstration projects for the improvement of libraries and librarianship. In administering such grants, he will be advised by a special advisory committee.

Part C—Strengthening college and research library resources

Over a 5-year period (beginning f.y. 1966) the Commissioner is authorized to transfer funds to the Librarian of Congress for use in—

(1) acquiring those library resources from throughout the world which are of value to scholarship; and

(2) cataloguing such materials, distributing bibliographic data on them, and exchanging such of the materials as the Library of Congress does not need for its own collection.

Title III—Strengthening developing institutions

For the purpose of strengthening developing institutions, the Commissioner is authorized to—

(1) make grants to developing institutions and other colleges and universities to help develop and carry out cooperative arrangements between developing institutions, between developing institutions and other colleges and universities, or between developing institutions and organizations, agencies and business entities; and

(2) award national teaching fellowships to encourage graduate students and junior faculty members to teach at developing institutions.

Application for Cooperative Arrangement Grant [Sec. 304] Applications will be submitted to the Commissioner by institutions. An application must—

(1) provide for administering and carrying out such projects as faculty and student exchange, faculty and administration improvement programs, curriculum reform, development and operation of cooperative education programs, joint use of facilities, and other arrangements for strengthening developing institutions;

(2) guaranty maintenance of fiscal effort; and

(3) provide for such fiscal control procedures, reports, and records as are necessary.

The Commissioner will establish criteria as to eligible expenditures for which cooperative arrangement grants may be used.

Application for National Teaching Fellows [Sec. 305] The Commissioner will assign national teaching fellows to teach at developing institutions only on approval of application submitted by the developing institutions. The Commissioner will determine whether the program of teaching described in the application is reasonable and merits approval. He will also determine the period of the fellowship (not to exceed 2 academic years) and the stipend for the fellow (not to exceed $6,500 per year, and additional amounts for dependents).

Title IV—Student assistance

Part A—Educational Opportunity Grants

The Commissioner will enter into agreements with institutions of higher education and make payments to them for use by them in making educational opportunity grants to qualified high school graduates of exceptional financial need.

Agreement [Sec. 407] An institution of higher education which desires to obtain funds for educational opportunity grants must agree to use such funds for the purposes specified; to consider carefully the student's source of income and make appropriate review of the student's assets; in cooperation with other institutions of higher education, where appropriate, to make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths of exceptional financial need and encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school; to maintain its efforts in its own scholarship and loan program; to guarantee that the grants will be made reasonably available to all eligible students of the institution; and to assure that the financial interest of the U.S. will be protected.

Application [Sec. 406] Funds under this title will be allocated among the States according to a formula based on the relative number of students enrolled in colleges and universities in each State. Individual institutions will apply to the Commissioner for allotment of funds from the allocation of the State in which they are located. The Commissioner will rule on such applications in accordance with basic criteria to be established by him to assure equitable allotment of funds among the eligible institutions in a State.

Selection of individual students to receive opportunity grants is left to the participating institutions, subject to the terms of this part.

The Commissioner is further authorized to enter into contracts with State and local educational agencies and other public or nonprofit organizations for identifying qualified, needy youths and encouraging them to finish high school and go on to postsecondary education; for encouraging dropouts to reenter educational programs; and for publicizing existing forms of financial aid for students.

Part B—Federal, State, and Private Programs of Low-Interest Insured Loans to Students in Institutions of Higher Education

The Commissioner is authorized to make advances to States or nonprofit private agencies with which he has agreements for the purpose of establishing or strengthening reserve funds to be used for insuring low-interest student loans to students in eligible institutions of higher education.

Agreement [Sec. 428(b)] A State or nonprofit private agency wishing to receive advances from the Commissioner for its loan insurance program may enter into an agreement for that purpose with the Commissioner if he determines that the program—

(1) will insure not less than $1,000 nor more than $1,500 in loans to a student in 1 year;

(2) will insure loans for at least 6 years of study;

(3) provides for acceleration of repayment without penalty, for a loan period not to exceed 15 years from the execution of the note, and for default provisions as authorized by the Commissioner's regulations;

(4) provides for repayment of loans over a period of from 5 to 10 years beginning 9 months to 1 year after the student leaves school;

(5) limits interest to 6 percent per year;

(6) will insure not less than 80 percent of unpaid principal;

(7) does not charge excessive insurance premiums;

(8) provides that no student will be denied benefits of the program from lack of need if his adjusted family income is less than $15,000;

(9) provides insurance for a loan to a student for any year of study; and

(10) if it is a State program, will be administered by or under supervision of a single State agency.

The agreement must provide that loan holders will furnish the Commissioner with such information as he needs and must contain provisions to protect the financial interest of the U.S.

The Commissioner is further authorized to institute a program of Federal insurance on loans made by eligible lenders to students at eligible institutions who do not have reasonable access to an adequate State or nonprofit program covered by an agreement under sec. 428(b).

The Commissioner is authorized to pay on behalf of the borrower a portion of the interest on loans insured under this Act or under a State or nonprofit program covered by an agreement with the Commissioner.

Sec. 431 establishes a student loan insurance fund which will be available to the Commissioner without fiscal year limitation. He will use this fund for making payments in connection with the default of loans insured by him under this part.

Part C—College Work-Study Program Extension and Amendments

The College Work-Study Program (Part C, Title I, Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; P.L. 88–452) is transferred from the authority of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to that of the Commissioner.

Agreement ["Sec. 124"] The Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with colleges and universities under which he will make grants to such institutions to help them operate work-study programs. Such agreements must—

(1) provide that work done under the program will be for the institution itself or in the public interest, will not displace employed persons, will be governed by reasonable conditions of employment, and will not be related to sectarian instruction or worship;

(2) provide that Federal funds will be used only to pay students and to cover administrative costs;

(3) provide that preference will be given to students from low-income families;

(4) limit employment to 15 hours per week per student when the student's classes are in session;

(5) guarantee maintenance of spending by the institution in student employment programs;

(6) provide for 1-to-9 institutional matching of Federal funds;

(7) assure reasonable availability of the program to all eligible students; and

(8) include such other provisions as the Comissioner finds necessary.

Part D—Amendments to National Defense Education Act of 1958

The definition of the term "institution of higher education" as given in sec. 103(b) of the NDEA is amended to give the Commissioner broader discretion in determining the accreditation status of institutions.

Clause (3) of Section 204 of the NDEA (Conditions of Agreements) is amended so that an institution may use money from its student loan fund to pay routine administrative expenses incurred in operating the loan program. The amount of the loan fund used for meeting such routine expenses may not exceed the lesser of (1) ½ the amount of the administrative expenses, as estimated by the Commissioner, or (2) 1 percent of the amount of outstanding loans made from that fund.

The loan cancellation for teachers provision in Section 205(b)(3) of the NDEA is amended so that persons teaching in schools designated by the Commissioner as having a high concentration of children from low-income families can cancel their entire obligation at the rate of 15 percent per year of teaching. The Commissioner may so designate only those schools in districts eligible for assistance under title II of P.L. 874 (title I, P.L. 89–10) in that year, and he cannot make such determination for more than 25 percent of the elementary and secondary schools in a State for any one year.

[For further description of these amendments to the NDEA, please see p. 14 of the attached document, "The Higher Education Act of 1965."]

Title V—Teacher programs

Part A—General Provisions

The Commissioner will establish, appoint, and serve as Chairman of an Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation. The Council will review administration and operation of programs under this title and of other Federal programs for complementary purposes.

Part B—National Teacher Corps

A National Teacher Corps is authorized for the purpose of improving the educational opportunities available to children in areas with concentrations of low-income families and encouraging institutions of higher education to broaden their teacher preparation program.

The Commissioner will select and enroll both experienced teachers and teacher interns who have a bachelor's degree for a period of service of up to two years. He will provide, through grant or contract with colleges, universities, or State or local educational agencies, for training members of the Teacher Corps.

Upon the request of local educational agencies in poor areas, the Commissioner will assign members of the Corps for service in the schools of the requesting agency. The Commissioner will pay to a local educational agency the amount of money necessary for compensating Teacher Corps members employed by that agency. An experienced teacher will be paid at a rate equal to the rate paid by the local agency for a teacher with similar training, experience, and duties. An experienced teacher who is also the leader of a teaching team will be paid at a rate agreed upon by the local agency and the Commissioner. A teacher intern will be paid at the lowest rate paid by the local agency for full-time teachers in the school system and grade to which the intern is assigned. The Commissioner will also pay members a stipend during periods of training and the necessary expenses (e.g., travel and transportation of household goods) incurred by members as a direct result of their service.

If requests for Teacher Corps members exceed the number of teachers available, the Commissioner will allocate available teachers among the States as follows—

(1) not more than 2 percent to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs;

(2) the remainder among the other States in proportion to the number of children from low-income families (as defined in Title I of P.L. 89–10, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) within each State.

Part C—Fellowships for Teachers

The Commissioner is authorized to institute a program of fellowships for persons who are pursuing or preparing to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education. Such fellowships are to be used for graduate study leading to an advanced degree other than the Ph.D. or its equivalents.

Application [Sec. 524]—Fellowships will be allocated to institutions which apply to the Commissioner and which have programs of graduate education for the purposes of this part approved by him. For program approval, he must find—

(1) that the program is suitable for persons pursuing or intending to pursue careers in elementary-secondary education.

(2) that the program emphasizes substantive courses;

(3) that the program is of high qality and is in effect or readily attainable; and

(4) that only persons seriously intending careers in elementary-secondary education will be accepted in the program.

To obtain appropriate geographic distribution of quality teacher training programs, the Commissioner may make grants to and contracts with institutions to help them strengthen graduate programs approved under this part.

The Commissioner will award the fellows such stipend as he finds to be consistent with prevailing practices under similar Federal programs.

Title VI—Financial assistance for the improvement of undergraduate instruction

Part A—Equipment

Over a 5-year period (beginning f.y. 1966), the Commissioner is authorized to carry out a program of grants to institutions of higher education to help them acquire laboratory, television, and other special equipment for use in classroom instruction.

Application, States [Sec. 603] A State desiring to participate under this Part must designate or create a State commission which will submit a State plan to the Commissioner. He will approve those plans which—

(1) provide that the program will be administered by the State commission;

(2) set forth (consistent with criteria to be prescribed by the Commissioner) methods for determining relative priority of eligible equipment acquisition projects and for determining the Federal share for each project;

(3) provides for assigning priority and determining Federal share only by the methods set by the State commission;

(4) provides for fair hearings by the State commission of all institutional applicants; and

(5) provides for such fiscal control procedures and reports as are necessary.

Application, Institutions [Sec. 605] An institution desiring to finance a project under this part must submit to the Commissioner an application containing such information as he requires. The Commissioner will approve each such application for a project if—

(1) it has been approved and recommended by the State commission;

(2) the State commission has set the Federal share, and the State allotment is sufficient to finance that share;

(3) the project has a higher priority than any other in the State;

(4) he determines it will be undertaken economically; and

(5) he determines that Federal funds will be used only to cover the cost of the project described in the application, that the institution has available the requisite non-Federal share of financing, and that the institution will maintain its spending effort for equipment acquisition.

Part B—Faculty Development Program

Over a period of 5 years (beginning f.y. 1966), the Commissioner is authorized to institute a program of Federal grants or contracts with institutions of higher education to allow them to operate short-term workshops or short-term or regular session study institutes. Such workshops and institutes will be for persons engaged in (or preparing to engage in) the use of educational media equipment in teaching in institutions of higher education, or for persons who are serving (or preparing to serve) in such institutions as specialists in educational media or librarians or other specialists using such media.

Title VII—Amendments to Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963

Under Title III of the 1963 Act, the Commissioner makes loans to institutions for construction of academic facilities. Interest on such loans is determined by the Commissioner within limitations stated in the Act. The present title amends this section to put a 3 percent per annum ceiling on interest to be charged by the Commissioner.

[For further description of amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, please see pp. 20–21 of the attached document, "The Higher Education Act of 1965."]

II. Eighty-Ninth Congress

Public Law 89–358—Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966.—This enactment added a new chapter 34 to title 38, U.S. Code. The new chapter establishes a program of educational assistance for veterans of service in the Armed Forces since 1955. The Act authorizes the Commissioner of Education to publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations. The State approving agencies may, upon concurrence, utilize those agencies designated by the Commissioner in determining whether or not courses will be approved for the enrollment of veterans under the educational assistance program. [Prior to this enactment, the Commissioner was authorized to perform an identical function under the War Orphans Educational Assistance Program. See P.L. 88–126, p. 1 of the December memo.]

Under the 1966 act, the Commissioner is also designated to serve as an ex officio member of the advisory committee established under "Sec. 1788." The committee will advise the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs with respect to the administration of chapters 31 (vocational rehabilitation), 34 (veterans' educational assistance), and 35 (war orphans' educational assistance of title 38, U.S. Code).

Public Law 89–429—Participation Sales Act of 1966.—This Act authorizes the Commissioner of Education [among other heads of Federal departments and agencies with loan program responsibilities] to enter into a trust agreement with the Federal National Mortgage Association with respect to the program of loans for construction of academic facilities administered by him. Under such agreement, the Commissioner may subject to a trust obligations held by him under the academic facilities construction loan program authorized under Title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. The FNMA, acting as trustee, is authorized to issue and sell to investors participation certificates based on pools of such loans and the loans of certain other Federal credit agencies. Proceeds from such sales will be available to the Office of Education for making further loans under the academic facilities construction program (and to other participating Federal agencies for their loan activities).

Establishes in the Treasury a separate revolving fund for academic facilities construction loans, into which will be paid sums appropriated under Title III of the 1963 enactment. From this fund, the Commissioner will make construction loans and pay other expenses pursuant to his activities under the title, including expenses and payments in connection with the sale of participations by the FNMA under the trust agreements described above.

Public Law 89–511—Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966.—This Act amends the Library Services and Construction Act, P.L. 88–269, which is administered by the Commissioner. The 1966 act extends Title I, dealing with library services, and Title II, dealing with library construction. Public Law 89–511 also adds two new titles, one providing for interlibrary cooperation and the second providing for specialized State library services.

Under Title III—Interlibrary Cooperation the Commissioner is authorized to make payments to the States for establishing and maintaining local, regional, State, or interstate cooperative networks of libraries [Secs. 301–302]. To receive an allotment under this title, a State must submit for approval of the Commissioner a *State Plan* which meets the following conditions:

Sec. 304(a) To be approved for purposes of this title a State plan must—

(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(a);

[The above sections are detailed on p. 7 of the enclosed memo of December 28, 1965.]

(2) provide policies and objectives for the systematic and effective coordination of the resources of school, public, academic, and special libraries and special information centers for improved services of a supplementary nature to the special clientele served by each type of library or center;

(3) provide appropriate allocation by participating agencies of the total costs of the system;

(4) provide assurance that every local or other public agency in the State is accorded an opportunity to participate in the system;

(5) provide criteria which the State agency shall use in evaluating applications for funds under this title and in assigning priority to project proposals; and

(6) establish a statewide council which is broadly representative of professional library interests and of library users which shall act in an advisory capacity to the State agency.

Under Title IV—Part A—Specialized State Library Services payments may be made to a State when it has submitted and had approved by the Commissioner a *State Plan* for establishing and improving State institutional library services.

The Commissioner shall approve a State's plan when it meets the following conditions:

Sec. 404(a) To be approved for purposes of this part a State plan must—

(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(a);

(2) provide policies and objectives for the establishment or improvement of State institutional library services;

(3) provide assurance that all eligible State institutions will be accorded an opportunity to participate in the program pursuant to this part;

(4) provide criteria which the State agency shall use in evaluating applications for funds under this part and in assigning priority to project proposals;

(5) provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that expenditures made by such State in any fiscal year for State institutional library services will not be less than such expenditures in the preceding fiscal year; and

(6) establish a council which is broadly representative of State institutions eligible for assistance under this part which shall act in an advisory capacity to the State agency.

Under Part B—Library Services to the Physically Handicapped the Commissioner shall approve a State's plan when it meets the following conditions:

Sec. 414(a) To be approved for the purpose of this part a State plan must—

(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(a);

(2) provide policies and objectives for the establishment or improvement of State plans for library services to the physically handicapped;

(3) provide assurance that all appropriate public or nonprofit libraries, agencies, or organizations for the physically handicapped will be accorded an opportunity to participate in the program pursuant to this part;

(4) provide criteria which the State agency shall use in evaluating applications for funds under this part and in assigning priority to project proposals;

(5) provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that funds available from sources other than Federal sources in any fiscal year for expenditures under State plans for library services to the physically handicapped will not be less than actual expenditures from such source in the second preceding fiscal year; and

(6) establish a council which is representative of eligible agencies which shall act in an advisory capacity to the State agency.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve, after consultation with the Librarian of Congress where appropriate, any State plan which meets the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

PUBLIC LAW 89–698—INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

The major provisions of this act are to be administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The act provides for Federal assistance in the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research.

Under the act [Sec. 202] amends Title XI of the National Defense Education Act, which is administered by the Commissioner, by providing for the establishment of international affairs institutes for secondary school teachers. This amendment authorizes the Commissioner to arrange through contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation of short-term or regular session institutes and authorizes the Commissioner to pay stipends to any individual to study in such institutes.

PUBLIC LAW 89–750—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966

These amendments added certain functions to the Commissioner of Education's administration of the Elementary and Secondary Acts of 1965, in the following manner:

Under Title I—"Sec. 203"—

The Commissioner shall allot the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective need for such grants. In addition he shall allot from such amount to the Secretary of the Interior the amount necessary to make payments pursuant to subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the amount necessary to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children on reservations serviced by elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior.

The Commissioner is further authorized in fiscal year 1967 (1) to allot funds to the Secretary of the Interior for use in meeting the special educational needs of Indian children in Department of Interior schools and (2) make grants to State educational agencies for use in programs for migratory children of migratory agricultural workers. Under the latter program—

The Commissioner may approve such an application only upon his determination—

(A) that payments will be used for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers, and to coordinate these programs and projects with similar programs and projects in other States, including the transmittal of pertinent information with respect to school records of such children;

(B) that in planning and carrying out programs and projects there has been and will be appropriate coordination with programs administered under part B of title III of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; and

(C) that such programs and projects will be administered and carried out in a manner consistent with the basic objectives of clauses (1)(B) and (2) through (8) of subsection (a), and of section 206(a).

The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove an application of a State educational agency under this paragraph except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State educational agency.

(2) If the Commissioner determines that a State is unable or unwilling to conduct educational programs for migratory children of migratory agricultural workers, or that it would result in more efficient and economic administration, or that it would add substantially to the welfare or educational attainment of such children, he may make special arrangements with other public or nonprofit private agencies to carry out the purposes of this subsection in one or more States, and for this purpose he may set aside on an equitable basis and use all or part of the maximum total of grants available for such State or States.

Under "Uses of granted funds and coordination with other programs" it is provided that—

(c) In administering the provisions of this Act and any Act amended by this Act, the Commissioner shall consult with other Federal departments and agencies administering programs which may be effectively coordinated with programs carried out pursuant to such Acts, and to the extent practicable for the purposes of such Acts shall (1) coordinate such programs on the Federal level with the programs being administered by such other departments and agencies, and (2) require that effective procedures be adopted by State and local authorities to coordinate the development and operation of programs and projects carried out under such Acts with other public and private programs having the same or similar purposes, including community action programs under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Under Title II—School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials—the Commissioner is authorized to make allotments to (1) the Secretary of Interior, for use in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools; and (2) the Secretary of Defense, for use in Department of Defense overseas dependents schools.

The *State Plan* was amended for Section 203(a) to read as follows:

"Sec. 203(a) Any State which desires to receive grants under this title shall submit to the Commissioner a State plan in such details as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

"(1) designates a State agency which shall, either directly or through arrangements with other State or local public agencies, act as the sole agency for administration of the State plan;

"(2) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 202 will be expended solely for (A) acquisition of library resources (which for the purposes of this title means books, periodicals, documents, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials), textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials for use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools in the State, and (B) administration of the State plan, including (i) the development and revision of standards relating to library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials furnished for the use of children and teachers in the public elementary and secondary schools of the State and, (ii) the distribution and control by a local educational agency of such library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials in carrying out such State plan for the use of children and teachers in schools referred to in clause (A), except that the amount used for administration of the State plan for any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount equal to 5 per centum of the amount paid to the State under this title for that year or $50,000, whichever is greater;

"(3) sets forth the criteria to be used in allocating library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials provided under this title among the children and teachers of the State, which criteria shall—

"(A) take into consideration the relative need determined from time to time, of the children and teachers of the State for such library resources, textbooks, or other instructional materials,

"(B) provide assurance that to the extent consistent with law such library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials will be provided on an equitable basis for the use of children and teachers in private elementary and secondary schools in the State which comply with the compulsory attendance laws of the State or are otherwise recognized by it through some procedure customarily used in the State, and

"(C) provide assurance that, in order to secure the effective and efficient use of Federal funds, there will be appropriate coordination at both State and local levels between the program carried out under this title with respect to library resources and the program (if any) carried out under the Library Services and Construction Act (20 U.S.C. ch. 16)."

Title III—Supplementary Educational Centers and Services was amended to allow for allotments by the Commissioner to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Defense for their respective education programs mentioned in Title II above.

Effective in fiscal year 1968 the Commissioner is directed to give special consideration for local educational agencies which are financially overburdened, as follows:

"Sec. 134. Section 304 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"'(c) In approving applications under this title for grants for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1967, the Commissioner must give special consideration to the application of any local educational agency which is making a reasonable tax effort but which is nevertheless unable to meet critical educational needs, including preschool education for four and five year olds, because some or all of its schools are seriously overcrowded (as a result of growth or shifts in enrollment or otherwise obsolete, or unsafe.'"

The 1966 act amended the Cooperative Research Act (as amended by title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965) as follows:

"Gives authority to the Commissioner to enter into contracts or arrangements with public or private agencies—whether profit or non-profit—for programs of training in educational research. Also requires the Commissioner to make a report to the Congress by January 31, 1968, with respect to contracts made with private agencies."

The 1966 amendments added a new title VI—Education of Handicapped Children—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (and redesignates the existing title VI as title VII). The new title VI authorizes appropriations for f.y. 1967 and f.y. 1968 to allow the Commissioner to make grants to the States for use in initiation, expansion, and improvement of preschool, elementary, and secondary school level programs for the education of handicapped children.

Under Title VI—Grants will be made to State educational agencies on approval of *State Plans* submitted by them to the Commissioner.

"Sec. 604. The Commissioner shall not approve a State plan unless the plan meets the following requirements:

"(1) assure that grants will be used for the purposes of this title. [A State may use for administrative expenses the greater of (a) $75,000, or (b) 5 percent of its total allotment in any fiscal year];

"(2) assure that provision will be made for participation of handicapped children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools;

"(3) provide that a public agency will control and administer funds under this title and property derived from such funds;

"(4) assure that Federal funds will supplement, not supplant, State, local, and private funds for the education of the handicapped;

"(5) provide for evaluating effectiveness of programs carried out under the title;

"(6) provide that the State educational agency will administer or supervise administration of the plan;

"(7) provide for necessary reports and records;

"(8) provide assurances regarding necessary fiscal control and fund accounting procedures;

"(9) assure that funds under this title will not be made available to schools for handicapped children eligible for aid under Sec. 203(a)(5) of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

"(10) assure that construction projects are consistent with overall State plans for facilities construction; and

"(11) assure that the results of educational research relating to handicapped children will be disseminated among teachers and administrators."

The Commissioner is directed to establish a National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, consisting of the Commissioner as Chairman and not more than 12 other members, at least half of whom must be affiliated with educational or research programs for the handicapped. The Committee will review Federal programs for the handicapped administered by the Commissioner and make recommendations for their improvement. It will make a report of its findings and recommendations by January 31, 1968, and annually thereafter.

The Commissioner is directed to establish in the Office of Education a Bureau for the Education and Training of the Handicapped, which will serve as the principal agency of the Office with respect to programs for the education and training of the handicapped.

The 1966 Amendments added a new section to Title VII ("General Provisions") of the 1965 Act (as designated by the amendments) authorizing appropriations for fiscal years 1967 and 1968 to enable the Commissioner to employ a variety of means for disseminating information pertaining to activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to State and local educational agencies and other appropriate agencies.

Part H of the 1966 Amendments added language to Sec. 704 of the 1965 Act (as designated by these amendments) prohibiting any agency or official of the Federal government (acting under the 1965 Act) from requiring the assignment or transportation of teachers or students in order to overcome racial imbalance in the schools. Part H also contained the following new language:

"COMPLIANCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

"Sec. 182. The Commissioner of Education shall not defer action or order action deferred on any application by a local educational agency for funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act, by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), by the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress), or by the Cooperative Research Act, on the basis of alleged noncompliance with the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 for more than 60 days after notice is given to such local agency of such deferral unless such local agency is given the opportunity for a hearing as provided in section 602 of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, such hearing to be held within 60 days after notice, unless the time for such hearing is extended by mutual consent of such local agency and the Commissioner, and such deferral shall not continue for more than 30 days after the close of any such hearings unless there has been an express finding on the record of such hearing that such local educational agency has failed to comply with the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

Title II of the 1966 enactment (P.L. 89–750) amended P.L. 874 (Federal assistance for operation and maintenance to school districts in federally affected areas) and P.L. 815 (Federal assistance to school districts, for school construction, in Federally affected areas).

Part A amended P.L. 874 as follows:

Amends Sec. 3(c)(2)(B) so that an agency is eligible to receive payments if the number of eligible children equals (a) 400 such children *or* (b) 3 percent of total average daily attendance, whichever figure is the lesser. [Previously the number of such children had to be at least 10 *and* had to be equal to at least 3 percent of the agency's total ADA.]

Effective fiscal year 1968, amends Sec. 3(d), requiring the Commissioner to place each local school district in a group made up of other comparable districts in the same State for purposes of determining the local contribution rate. [Previously, each local district was given fairly broad discretion in choosing those other districts with which it claimed to be comparable for determining the LCR.]

Amends provisions concerning computation of average per-pupil expenditure so that direct current expenditures by the States for the operation of local agencies, as well as expenditures by local agencies themselves, would be considered in the computation.

Amends Sec. 3(b) so that all children whose parents are on active duty in the armed services will be counted in determining an agency's entitlement, whether or not the parent works on Federal property.

Provides that, in determining the number of eligible children under Sec. 3(b), the Commissioner will count those children whose attendance at the schools of a local agency is the result of a change in residence from land transferred to Mexico pursuant to the relocation of the international boundary between the U.S. and Mexico.

Amends Sec. 3(e) so that, in making deductions from an agency's total entitlement because of other Federal payments to the agency from programs involving Federal property, the Commissioner will not count such other Federal payments unless the property for which they are made has connected with it children who may be counted in determining entitlements under P.L. 874.

Amends Sec. 5(b) so that funds appropriated in any fiscal year for payments under title I of P.L. 874, but not used in that year, would remain available for obligation in the next succeeding fiscal year.

Adds a new subsection to Sec. 5 providing that the entitlement of a local agency in any State will be reduced if the State reduces its current per-pupil educational expenditures below the level of the second preceding fiscal year.

Adds a new subsection to Sec. 6 providing, where a local agency cannot legally furnish education for children living on Federal property, that such property may not be used by the agency in establishing eligibility for payments under Sec. 3 or 4; and providing, where the local agency will not educate children living on Federal property, that its entitlement will be reduced by an amount equal to the amount by which the cost to the Commissioner for providing education for each such child exceeds the local contribution rate of the agency, multiplied by the number of such children. [In cases where this amendment would have reduced a local agency's payments for fiscal year 1966 (if it had been in effect for that year), the amendment will not become effective before fiscal year 1969.]

Adds language to Sec. 301(a) of P.L. 874, prohibiting any agency or official of the U.S., in administering the Act, from requiring the assignment or transportation of teachers or students in order to overcome racial imbalance in the schools.

Amends Sec. 303 so that any Federal property (rather than only housing, as at present) would still be considered Federal property for the purposes of the Act for up to one year after title to the property had been transferred by the Federal government to another party.

Deletes language in Sec. 303(1) which provides that property used primarily for provision of local services or benefits is not to be considered Federal property for the purposes of P.L. 874.

Amends subsection (10) of Sec. 303, authorizing the Commissioner to draw up regulations to be used uniformly in determining average daily attendance for purposes of Secs. 3 and 4 of P.L. 874.

Part B amends P.L. 815 as follows:

Extends the non-permanent provisions of P.L. 815 through one additional year, setting a new expiration date of June 30, 1967.

Changes the percentage increase in Federally connected pupils necessary for establishing eligibility under Sec. 5 from 5 percent of base-year average daily membership to 6 percent, and lengthens the increase period from 2 to 4 years.

Reduces the non-Federal growth requirement from 7 percent to 6 percent in each increase period.

Allows the Commissioner, during an increase period, to estimate the number of unhoused children as of the close of the second year after the end of the increase period (rather than for the end of the increase period itself, as presently), in determining the number of children on whose behalf he will make payments to a district.

Makes permanent the provisions of Sec. 14 relating to grants for the construction of school facilities for Indians residing on Federal reservations.

Provides that children who have a parent in the uniformed servies are to be considered Federaly connected for purposes of P.L. 815.

Provides that, in determining a local agency's entitlement under Sec. 5 for fiscal year 1967, the Commissioner will count as eligible children those children whose attendance at the schools of that agency is the result of a change of residence from land transferred to Mexico pursuant to the relocation of the international boundary between the U.S. and Mexico.

Allows the Commissioner to transfer title to facilities constructed on Federal property under Sec. 10 to local educational agencies upon his determination that such transfer would be in the Federal interest.

Adds new subsection to Sec. 10 providing that, if State or local tax revenue cannot be used to provide education for children residing on Federal property, or if no tax revenues are allocated for that purpose, then the property on which such children reside cannot be considered Federal property for the purposes of Sec. 5 of P.L. 815. [In cases where this amendment would have reduced a local educational agency's payments for fiscal year 1966 (had the amendment been in effect for that year), the amendment will not become effective before fiscal year 1969.]

Deletes language from Sec. 15(1) which excludes real property used by the U.S. primarily for the provision of services or benefits to a local area from the definition of "Federal property" for the purposes of P.L. 815.

Directs the Commissioner to expand the regulations governing the definition of "minimum school facilities" so that such regulations—

(1) require the local agency to give consideration to excellence of architecture and design;

(2) allow for inclusion of works of art in minimum school facilities built under P.L. 815 (if cost of art works does not exceed 1 percent of project cost); and

(3) require compliance with standards to assure that facilities will be usable by handicapped persons.

Includes American Samoa in the definition of the term "State" in Sec. 15(13).

Title III of the 1966 enactment (P.L. 89–750) provided for the Adult Education Act of 1966. The purpose of this program is to encourage and expand basic educational programs for adults to enable them to overcome English language limitations, to improve their education in preparation for occupational training and better employment, and to become more responsible and productive citizens.

Under the Adult Education Act it is provided that not less than 10 nor more than 20 percent of the sums appropriated will be reserved for use by the Commissioner in support of special demonstration projects and teacher-training activities related to the purposes of this title.

It provides that the remaining sums will be granted to the States for paying the Federal share of adult basic education programs to be carried out by local educational agencies. Of such remaining sums, not more than 2 percent will be allotted among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific. The remainder will be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative number of adults in each State who have completed not more than 5 grades of school.

Grants are to be made to State educational agencies by the Commissioner on approval of *State Plans* submitted by them to the Commissioner.

Such plans must—

(1) set forth a program for use of the grants;

(2) provide for administration of the plan by the State agency;

(3) provide for cooperative arrangements between the State educational agency and the State health authority;

(4) provide for grants for special projects, teacher-training, and research;

(5) provide for cooperation with programs in the anti-poverty effort;

(6) provide for necessary reports and records;

(7) provide for necessary fiscal control and fund accounting procedures; and

(8) provide further information and assurances as required by the Commissioner through regulations.

The Act established the Federal share of expenditures under State plans as 90 percent for fiscal years 1967 and 1968; and requires maintenance of State effort in expenditures for adult education.

The Act further provided for the appointment by the President of a National Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education, consisting of the Commissioner as Chairman and 7 other members. The Committee will advise the Commissioner with respect to the operation and administration of this title. It will review the operation of this title and of other Federal programs in adult education and make annual reports of its findings and recommendations to the President.

The Act prohibits Federal control of education; and prohibits grants under this title for any educational program related to sectarian instruction or religious worship, or provided by a school or department of divinity.

The Act repealed Part B of title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

PUBLIC LAW 89—751—ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS PERSONNEL TRAINING ACT OF 1966

Mentions the Commissioner of Education ["Sec. 795(D)"] in connection with the definition of a "training center for allied health professions" and provides that a junior college, college or university be accredited "by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purposes by the Commissioner of education . . ."

PUBLIC LAW 89-752—HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966

This enactment consists of various amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, in part—

Extended authority for making grants under title I ("Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities") for 3 additional years, or through f.y. 1971.

Authorized the Commissioner to make payments of up to $7,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969 for—

(1) administrative expenses incurred under title I of the 1963 construction Act, and under Part A of title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Financial Assistance for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction—Equipment"); and

(2) grants to State commissions to finance comprehensive planning for higher education construction needs.

Expenditures under (1) above, are limited to $3,000,000 in any fiscal year. This new provision also deletes language from Part A of title VI of the 1965 Act which provided for grants to State commissions for administrative expenses under that title.

Extended authority for making grants under title II ("Grants for Construction of Graduate Academic Facilities") for 3 additional years, or through f.y. 1971.

Extended authority for making loans under title III ("Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities") for 3 additional years, or through f.y. 1971.

Amended the definition of "development cost" with respect to construction under the 1963 Act, so that the Commissioner, in determining such cost for a project, may include expenditures for work of art (up to one percent of total project cost).

Repealed the authority of the Commissioner to prescribe a schedule of fees to be paid by applicants for loans under title III to cover the cost of inspections carried out in connection with projects under the title.

Amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965, in part—

Added a new section to Part B of title IV of the Act authorizing the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish a student loan insurance program meeting the requirements of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965; authorizes the Board to enter into agreements with the Commissioner of Education under the 2 programs cited.

Directed the Commissioner to make a study to find means of improving the loan insurance program under Part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; directs him to report his findings and recommendations to the President and Congress by January 1, 1968.

Amendments to the National Defense Education Act of 1958, in part—

Provided for the cancellation of a student loan at the rate of 15 percent of the amount of the indebtedness for each year the borrower serves as a full-time teacher of handicapped children in a public or other nonprofit elementary and secondary school system.

Amended the definition of the term "State" so as to extend the loan cancellation provisions under title II to teachers in the schools of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Added industrial arts to the subject areas for the improvement of which grants may be made under title III [effective f.y. 1968].

We hope this information will be of assistance to you.

Mr. Chairman, in many instances, the Office of Education is providing the major share of funds for expenditure by the various State departments of education for administrative expenses. For example, in fiscal 1966 the Federal share in Indiana was 58.6 percent, in Mississippi it was 58 percent, followed by 49.8 percent in Ohio, and 47 percent in Arkansas.

I will place in the RECORD at this point a table showing the percent of Federal funds for State department of education personnel and expenditures for 31 selected States in fiscal 1966. It is enlightening to see the actual dollar control the Office of Education has over our States in just this one area.

State administration: State department of education (SDE) personnel and expenditures for 31 selected States and other jurisdictions, fiscal 1966 [1]

State (1)	Number of SDE personnel [2]		Federal funds expended for SDE administration for programs analyzed in this chapter (4)	Total administrative expenditures for SDE (5)	Percent Federal funds of col. 5 (6)
	Professional (2)	Nonprofessional (3)			
Total	5,573	7,499	$35,889,373	$132,221,023	27.1
Total, 28 States and District of Columbia	5,492	7,400	35,616,288	130,991,665	27.2
Alabama	83	119	1,017,539	2,166,597	47.0
Arkansas	87	128	682,666	1,621,740	42.1
California	676	1,191	3,460,688	22,774,190	15.2
Colorado	77	95	650,859	1,860,654	35.0
Connecticut	118	174	685,471	2,460,945	27.9
District of Columbia	169	258	399,843	3,669,337	10.9
Florida	274	248	2,022,439	4,831,921	41.9
Georgia	[3] 316	[3] 475	1,454,954	7,753,960	18.8
Idaho	27	41	271,945	640,829	42.4
Illinois	202	426	2,011,081	4,638,770	43.4
Indiana	72	117	934,417	1,594,715	58.6
Iowa	125	151	743,113	2,196,517	33.8
Kansas	75	67	355,058	1,140,808	31.1
Kentucky	150	244	1,145,800	3,797,890	30.2
Massachusetts	264	340	828,185	6,066,775	13.7
Mississippi	85	81	883,977	1,523,361	58.0
Missouri	95	100	795,344	1,923,257	41.4
New Jersey	320	321	1,712,213	7,725,288	22.2
New York	754	1,307	6,028,048	22,810,150	26.4
North Carolina	295	283	1,363,681	5,339,504	25.5
Ohio	231	213	2,144,402	4,308,352	49.8
Oklahoma	89	84	608,139	1,692,059	35.9
Oregon	97	99	544,545	2,187,735	24.9
Tennessee	256	253	1,281,206	4,496,873	28.5
Virginia	195	154	500,221	3,135,233	16.0
Washington	82	134	1,122,077	2,949,190	38.0
West Virginia	87	76	603,345	1,422,123	42.4
Wisconsin	114	153	849,588	3,121,615	27.2
Wyoming	77	68	515,444	1,141,277	45.2
Total, outlying areas	81	99	273,085	1,229,358	22.2
Guam	28	48	139,395	531,385	26.2
Virgin Islands	53	51	133,690	697,973	19.2

[1] Does not include vocational rehabilitation.

[2] State agency staff positions (full-time equivalent) whether headquarters or regional, and whether or not currently filled as of June 30, 1966. Staff positions for the direct operation of any school, college, university or similar direct service are excluded.

[3] Information provided for total personnel. Estimation of professional and nonprofessional personnel based upon ratio of staff distribution in resources material for fiscal year 1965.

I believe it is interesting to note the number of college professors or assistants receiving grants or other assistance from the Office of Education will come close to doubling between fiscal years 1966 and 1968. In fiscal year 1966 there were 10,755 receiving training assistance under "Higher educational activities." But the OE projection for fiscal year 1968 is 18,725. And it is important to note that these figures do not include those receiving research grants.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point the enrollment in vocational education classes for the fiscal year 1966, broken down to show secondary, postsecondary, adult, and special needs.

Enrollment in vocational education classes, fiscal year 1966

	Total	Agriculture	Distribution	Health	Home economics	Office	Technical	Trades and industry
Secondary	3,169,709	514,354	101,580	9,730	1,395,430	798,433	28,853	306,413
Postsecondary	442,451	5,914	15,717	34,029	2,188	165,486	104,421	108,183
Adult	2,544,962	386,400	300,559	39,478	610,065	270,081	124,629	784,956
Special needs	59,557	700	2,337	315	24,533	3,086	70	27,417
Total	6,216,679	907,368	420,193	83,552	2,032,216	1,237,086	257,973	1,226,,969

NOTE.—Also included is 51,322 for enrollments in basic adult education, multioccupational programs, and research and demonstration projects.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to place in the Record the table showing the training cost per enrollee, as follows:

Vocational education: Federal, State, and local expenditures reported per trainee [1]

	Fiscal year 1964			Fiscal year 1965			Fiscal year 1966		
	Federal share per trainee	State and local share per trainee [1]	Total reported per trainee [1]	Federal share per trainee	State and local share per trainee [1]	Total reported per trainee [1]	Federal share per trainee	State and local share per trainee [1]	Total reported per trainee [1]
Agriculture	$15.94	$74.08	$90.02	$23.01	$74.83	$97.84	$28.04	$69.54	$97.58
Distribution	7.72	36.82	44.54	13.78	50.99	64.77	16.53	48.88	65.41
Health	80.68	130.43	211.11	80.12	214.98	295.10	74.30	187.71	262.01
Home economics	4.39	40.05	44.44	4.65	42.24	46.89	5.39	48.69	54.08
Nonwage earning							(4.82)	(48.60)	(53.42)
Wage earning							(36.37)	(53.00)	(89.37)
Office				16.58	56.85	73.43	18.52	50.57	69.09
Technical	61.46	96.32	157.78	93.15	184.22	277.37	76.56	150.43	226.99
Trades and industry	10.66	85.61	96.27	31.28	101.90	133.18	41.47	110.22	151.69

---

[1] The State and local expenditures are based on amounts reported by the States. However, this does not reflect the total expenditures by the States and local schools for vocational and technical education since the amounts reported in most instances are in excess of the required matching and usually do not include most operational costs with the exception of teachers salaries.

One more group of figures, Mr. Chairman is significant.

The average cost of hard-cover books has gone up by $2 per volume since 1962 when the cost was $5.90. Today, the same book would cost $7.92.

Average publisher list price of selected hard cover books

1966	$7.92
1965	7.65
1964	6.94
1963	6.55
1962	5.90

Sources: Publisher's Weekly. Annual book publishing statistics issue published during January, 1963–1967. Excluded are data for paperbacks; government documents; encyclopedias; publications under 49 pages; specific categories: General Works, Philosophy, Sociology, Language, Home Economics, and Travel. Since libraries are eligible for discount from list price, cost to libraries is lower than that of list price.

Mr. Chairman, the following excerpt from the hearing record gives us some idea of the increases in hospital and medical costs from part II of the hearings:

Mr. Michel. Has the increase been 8 or 9 percent this past year?

Mr. Cohen. Our best guess is that it will show about a 12-percent increase on hospital costs.

Mr. Michel. Is this this year or last year?

Mr. Cohen. Last year.

Mr. Michel. What about this year?

Mr. Cohen. There are two different kinds of figures used. In the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, where they are having testimony in medicare and medicaid, some of the hospital people have said 15 to 16 percent. I do not think it will be that high in our reimbursement formula for medicare or medicaid, but obviously it is somewhere in that area.

Mr. Michel. What does that 10- or 12-percent increase this past year and maybe 15 percent this year all mean to this budget we are talking about here in the field of health and related items?

Mr. Cohen. If it were to continue for the next 3 or 4 years at that rate, for medicare it would require an increase in contribution rates. When Mr. Mills fixed the contribution rates for medicare in 1965, he assumed that medical costs would increase an additional 2.7 percent over the average wage. Wage increases are about 4 percent so that means that medical costs were expected to increase about 6 or 7 percent a year. There is no question in my mind that part of the increased cost for medicare and the increased cost expected in the future is also due to increased costs in hospital care and physicians' services. The question is how can we bring better efficiency and economy in those areas. That is one of the things we are going to study in this National Center for Health Services Research.

Secretary Gardner. This is what I consider to be one of the most serious problems we face, these rising costs. One of the problems is that the hospitals are not managed efficiently. They have not developed the techniques and procedures that would permit them to be managed efficiently. And secondly, there is no incentive for lowering costs. I hope you will have an opportunity to take a look at the medical cost study. It is a very good study and we will be pursuing this as far as we can.

And then on page 562 of volume V we read:

HOSPITAL COSTS

Mr. Michel. Let me go back to be sure I got the figure correct. Did you say hospital costs this past year, or in this coming year, are increasing at the rate of 16 percent?

Dr. Shannon. It is estimated they will increase this year, I think the figure is 16 percent. I will be very glad to furnish a precise figure and the source of the figure. It is estimated they will increase by a comparable amount next year. I would be very glad to quote the precise figure and the source of the figure.

(The information follows:)

In 1966 hospital daily charges rose 16.5%, according to "A Report to the President on Medical Care Prices," from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, February 1967.

Dr. Shannon. I said that of the $30.5 million for the general clinical research centers 70 percent is for reimbursement of hospital costs.

Mr. Michel. Any program where you have this reimbursement of hospital costs involved, we are faced with the prospect that the built-in increases will have to be reflected in one way or another.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to submit the following information on participation sales authorizations:

Office of Education, title II	$100,000,000
Public Health Service, title II	15,000,000
Total	115,000,000

Payment of participation sales insufficiencies

Office of Education—Permanent authorization and general and special fund	$1,700,000
Office of Education, title II	925,000
Public Health Service, title II	250,000
Total	2,875,000

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND PARTICIPATION SALES CERTIFICATES

EXPLANATION OF PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966, PUBLIC LAW 89–429, AND THE PURCHASE OF CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION BY THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND

The Participation Sales Act of 1966 empowers several Federal Departments and Agencies; e.g., the Departments of Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, Veterans' Administration, and the Small Business Administration, to pool direct loans made by these agencies. The Federal National Mortgage Association is empowered as trustee, to sell guaranteed participation in such loans. The act provides for an indefinite appropriation to cover any difference between principal and interest payments received on the pooled loans and the contractual services owed to holders of participation certificates. It also requires the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury of all other sales of financial assets.

The Unemployment Trust Fund will buy in FY 1967 participation certificates in the assets of these departments and agencies in the amount of $100 million. The purchase of these certificates is a capital outlay and will increase the investment assets of the fund by $100 million while reducing the U.S. securities balance by the same amount. No change in the overall assets of the fund is involved.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Abbitt].

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee, and to all the members of the committee, for a good job well done. They particularly deserve the wholehearted thanks of the people in many, many sections of America for having gone exhaustively into the hearings regarding the activities of some of the people in the Office of Education.

I also deeply appreciate being permitted to come before this committee, along with other Members of the Congress, to reveal and bring out on the table just what has been done by certain employees in the Office of Education.

I want to thank this committee further in seeing in my opinion certain positions which have been taken downtown which I hope will redound to the benefit of our educational efforts throughout the United States.

Mr. Chairman, again I express my appreciation to the chairman and the members of the committee for a splendid job well done.

The evidence before the subcommittee, as developed so well by the members of the subcommittee and testified to by certain Members of the House of Representatives, demonstrates conclusively, as pointed out so cogently in the report of the subcommittee, that "testimony before the committee indicated clearly that the Department has gone beyond the law in these enforcement activities and in requirements under the so-called guidelines. The committee cautions that the Department will be expected to follow the law, and will be expected to administer the law with equal firmness and fairness in all the States."

The action of this subcommittee and other Members of the House have resulted in the removal of Commissioner of Education Howe from promulgating and enforcing the civil rights provisions so far as our schools are concerned. I am sure that almost everyone realizes that the guidelines set up by Commissioner Howe, and supposedly enforced by his associates in the Office of Education, set back education in our Nation tremendously. It is admitted now by practically everyone that the Office of Education and the Commissioner greatly exceeded its authority both under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act passed by the House last year. I am pleased that Commissioner Howe has been shorn of his authority to further administer these guidelines, which are so oppressive upon school officials in many sections of the country.

I am sure that the action of the House of Representatives this week clearly demonstrates that at least a majority of the Members of the House resent the fact that many sections of our country were discriminated against in enforcing the so-called civil rights guidelines. I do not know yet what the future holds for us so far as our school problems are concerned but at least I would say we have made a step in the right direction. I do not know how we will share under the new regime but at least it cannot possibly be any worse than we have had in the past.

I just hope that Mr. Libassi, and those working under and with him, will take heed from what has happened under Commissioner Howe; that they will use commonsense and good judgment in trying to carry out the intent of the Congress. I just hope that those now having charge of the enforcement of the civil rights criteria for the schools will realize that the funds provided for the education of our youth come from all of our taxpayers, that we need to get on with educating our young people and that the reorganization is going to be worthless unless those in charge are prepared to make changes in the methods and procedures under which the enforcement program has operated in the past. If Federal money is going to continue to flow to the Office of Education it will have to be received and administered with more realism than has been the case in the past.

I call upon the officials who have just been placed in charge of the enforcement program to realize that we are trying to educate our young people; that we are doing the best we can to get ahead with the job and we need their help and understanding rather than harassment and blackjacking of the public school officials. They need to realize that when we have an actual, real freedom of choice wherein every school pupil is permitted to go to the school of the choice of his or her parents then there can be no discrimination, and it must be in compliance with the laws as passed and intended by the Members of the Congress of the United States of America.

We need to throw out the idea of the past, that there could be no compliance and was no compliance unless rapid desegregation was achieved regardless of freedom of choice in its real and true sense. The people of our area have always gotten along splendidly. There is no animosity among us. We have worked together, progressed together and have built up a great society and we need to continue this good will and progress and it will continue if we are left alone from dictatorial, ambitious, power-grasping Federal bureaucrats whose main purpose seems to be to mold and direct our youth into the whims and fancies and political philosophy of the bureaucrats. Our Federal officials must realize that the money that is appropriated to their departments come from all of the people in all sections of our country. I hope these officials will forget those things that are behind us and look toward those things before us and let us all together get on with the job of educating our young people.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to express my appreciation to the chairman and the members of the subcommittee who have rendered a real service to the people of this Nation in permitting Members of the House to come before this committee and bring into the open exactly what has been happening in the Office of Education and in delving into the real facts. This, in my opinion, has had a real bearing on shearing Mr. Howe of the enforcement authority over the civil rights and in at least bringing effectively to the attention of the Secretary of HEW that his Mr. Howe was going far beyond the law in his endeavor to enforce the guidelines; that officials in the Office of Education were discriminating against the people of certain sections of our Nation; also it has greatly assisted the Members of this House in amending the school education bill which was before us this week so that the so-called civil rights of schoolchildren will be enforced uniformly throughout the width and breadth of our Nation and that before guidelines can be promulgated the statutes and other legal authority must be cited so that the people back home will know what they are charged with violating. This is one of the many real services that this committee has rendered for the people of our country.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I first would echo and emphasize the contribution of the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. FLOOD]. He has indeed been a very fine chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriations bill contains over $13 billion for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1967. It represents a substantial commitment by the Federal Government and the American taxpayer. Thirteen billion dollars is a substantial sum. But like last year, we only have a part of the total spending picture for these programs before us.

Congressional authorization must come on a number of important and costly programs before the Committee on Appropriations can recommend funds.

For example, legislative authority has not yet been cleared for appropriations to the Office of Economic Opportunity for 1968. Some constructive alternatives have been offered by members of the minority party on my side of the aisle which should be carefully considered at the appropriate time.

Of course, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967 were passed earlier today and now go before the Senate. There are several other authorizations which must be acted upon before appropriations can be made.

The appropriations that are included in this bill today have been reduced by the committee by over $185 million under the administration's request. However, they are $142.5 million higher than the amount appropriated for fiscal 1967.

In recent months, substantial mail has come from all over the Nation to members of the Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations, expressing concern over any reductions in certain elementary and secondary educational activities. This appropriations measure includes over $1.6 billion for such programs. It should be emphasized that this is an increase of $303,297,000 over the amount appropriated for 1967. In addition, there was a total of over $10 million included in the formal budget for which there was no authorization at the present time.

Of concern to many Members, who represent congressional districts which participate in provisions of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, is the amount of money provided for school assistance in federally affected areas. This bill includes $439,137,000, which is the amount requested by the administration.

The committee report states:

> While there appears to be little doubt that the estimates in the budget are less than full entitlement this is the only official request before the committee. When a budget amendment is received the committee will take prompt action on it.

During our subcommittee hearings the matter of providing full entitlement under both Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 was discussed with administration witnesses. When I discussed the request made by the Office of Education for fiscal 1968 with Mr. Norman Karsh, Assistant Commissioner for Administration, he advised me that the Department had asked the Bureau of the Budget for $476,909,000. However, the Bureau reduced the request to the $439,-

137,000, which now has been recommended by the Appropriations Committee. Following is an excerpt of my discussion with Mr. Karsh:

APPROPRIATION REQUESTED OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. Shriver. How much did you ask the Budget Bureau for?

Mr. Karsh. The total amount we asked the Bureau of the Budget for this appropriation was $476,909,000.

Mr. Shriver. That would be your estimate of full entitlement?

Mr. Karsh. At this time that is right.

Mr. Shriver. And that is where the reduction was made by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. Karsh. This was somewhat less than full entitlement. This was pretty much related to the continuing level we had last year.

Mr. Shriver. I am wondering why the Department did not ask for full entitlement.

Mr. Cardwell. Mr. Shriver, as you will recall, in our testimony last year we indicated that following the Stanford study and other reviews of this program, and in light of the increased attention now being given to elementary and secondary education through other programs, we thought the time had come to slow this one down, and the Department's action follows the concept that we carried to this committee last year.

You will also recall the committee increased the request last year.

Mr. Shriver. I do.

Mr. Chairman, another item which has been a matter of great concern is the amount provided for libraries and community services.

The committee has recognized the importance of this program, particularly as it is applied for regular library services and construction programs. The bill includes $155,500,000 for fiscal 1968, which is nearly $80 million more than appropriated for the current fiscal year. It is slightly under the administration budget request; however, no part of the reduction was made in regular library services or construction programs.

Today our Nation is involved in a serious war in Southeast Asia. War clouds are boiling in the Middle East. Defense spending has escalated substantially. We have long advocated that at such a time the administration must establish certain priorities to meet both our domestic needs and to fulfill the urgent needs of our boys fighting in Vietnam.

One area on the domestic scene where most Americans would agree that we must continue to expend substantial moneys is in the battle against disease. Our subcommittee and the committee recognized the importance of the research efforts being waged by the National Institutes of Health and the Public Health Service in the appropriations contained in this bill.

These are popular programs. We all would like to see cancer conquered; to do more in the field of heart and stroke; to ease the pain of arthritis; to progress in fighting diseases of the kidneys, and overcome mental illnesses.

The hearings on the NIH programs provided us with sufficient evidence of the dramatic progress being made in medical research. The appropriations measure provides an overall increase of 8 percent over the 1967 level of obligations for regular research grants.

We have approved funds in the amount requested for the Division of Biologics Standards; the National Cancer Institute; National Heart Institute; National Institute of Dental Research; National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases; the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness; National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases; National Institute of General Medical Sciences; the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; and the National Institute of Mental Health.

Mr. Chairman, I continue to share the concern of many members of the committee over the large amount of appropriations for public assistance grants to the States by the Welfare Administration.

We are including in this bill over $4.1 billion for public assistance payments to the States. The committee has deferred action on over $115 million of the request because authorization was lacking.

Despite the multitude of programs which have been advocated because they would reduce dependency, and the inclusion of more people under social security, we have seen this program grow from $20 million in 1936, the first year in which grants were made, to next year's record $4.1 billion.

This is alarming, particularly during a period of high economic activity and low unemployment.

This is a generous appropriations bill. Of course, there are many areas in which we would like to do more. But there are also areas where I am confident further economies could be made.

The $13.1 billion included in this bill is only part of the picture. Other appropriations requests will be forthcoming as soon as authorizing legislation has been approved by Congress.

Another part of the picture must be the rising expenses of the war in Vietnam, and the necessity of increased defense spending. Still another part of the picture is the danger of spending money we do not have. The House Ways and Means Committee only yesterday agreed to another substantial increase of $29 billion in the Federal debt ceiling. It was only a few weeks ago that we were asked to raise the ceiling by $6 billion to $336 billion. Very soon we will have another bill to increase it even more, to $365 billion.

It has been said many times before, but it is worth repeating again and again. The administration must decide what programs in the nondefense category are to be given priority during this time of war, crisis, and fiscal uncertainty. Then the Congress can act responsibly and prudently with the total picture before it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand from the exchange that you just read from the committee hearings had with the Deputy Secretary of the Budget, Mr. Cardwell, this must represent then a shift of policy in the Office of Education from such tried and true and, I think, politically sanitary formula programs as the impacted school program to the more susceptible, that is, politically susceptible, aid to education programs such as this Elementary and Secondary Education Act program. Is that a fair conclusion to draw?

Mr. SHRIVER. I think it is. And I would refer the gentleman to page 278 of the hearings, part 3, where the Deputy Secretary stated, as I mentioned a moment ago.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then those of us who have impacted school districts in our area are facing not only the problem of increasing entitlement while we have the same amount of funds appropriated, but also a policy change in the Office of Education away from impact programs and pressures of a record budget and a record deficit—that really puts these impacted area schools in the areas concerned, I would say, over the amount of money that they will be receiving.

Mr. SHRIVER. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to share the concern of my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, in this respect.

The apparent new thrust of some thinking down at the Education Department, is to the effect that some cutback in the Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 impact programs should be considered—in light of the new general education aid programs.

This matter must be considered very careful, in my opinion. There may be some school district programs eligible for impact funds under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, where abuse can be charged.

However, I have public schools in my district—such as Leavenworth, Junction City, Manhattan—that are vitally affected by Federal installations. A change in the number of military and civilian personnel in this type of facility creates extremely difficult problems for the local school boards and taxpayers. I am referring to the staff and command school at Fort Leavenworth—and the permanent Army facility at Fort Riley, located between Junction City and Manhattan.

The new general aid programs in the field of education, such as EASA, are of help in some ways, but most certainly do not get at the tremendous financial burdens which are peculiar to a true impact area problem.

I am happy I have been assured by committee members—that the specific districts I have mentioned will ultimately get upward of 100 percent of their requested legitimate needs.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, we have one more request for time. I yield the remainder of the time to the gentlemen from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, during the last Congress I offered an amendment to the so-called war on poverty bill that would preclude funds being paid to any employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity that participated in or helped to create any riot or civil disturbance that would result in harassment and trouble for local police forces. The amendment was offered as a result of a request on the part of members of the police force in Arlington County, who had been harassed by certain so-called demonstrators that were picketing certain residential developments over there in that community, and who were disrupting various business establishments, preventing customers of the business from going in and making purchases.

When they were asked by the local police officials to cooperate somewhat with them, they had a finger pointed in their face and they said:

> We are going to continue to disrupt the businesses and the people of your community and you are going to protect us.

They came to me because the leaders of these demonstrations were on the payroll of the Office of Economic Opportunity. I offered this amendment and it was adopted unanimously.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I find it necessary to offer a similar amendment today. It may be necessary to offer similar amendments to other appropriation bills.

There is no need for me to call to the attention of the Committee the serious era in which we are living, the continued increase in crime rate, and a situation in which we find employees of Members of Congress being murdered within four blocks of the House Office Building and congressional secretaries being stabbed while praying at noon within the shadows of the Capitol. Every day we hear more and more about the challenges to law and order.

I receive calls and communications every day demanding that something be done about it. I have even received visits from the wives of the members of the Metropolitan Police department to tell me that their husbands are going out every day and trying to enforce the law and being spat upon and being stoned. Then when they try to protect themselves, they are called before trial boards and charged with police brutality.

The reason why I feel it is necessary to offer this amendment here today is the fact that I have discovered that one of the leaders of these movements to incite riots and to challenge the police department in trying to carry out their duties, resisting arrest and provoking actions on the part of the police department, happens to be a high-salaried employee of the office of Social Security.

The Congress of the United States, as well as the Civil Service Commission, has a long history of demanding exemplary conduct on the part of those employed by the Federal Government. Less historic, however, are the efforts to enforce those demands for decent conduct on the part of people paid from the Federal Treasury. I propose to do something about this oversight.

Since the Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912, regulations have been enforced that no employee of the Federal Government with a record of criminal activity, or conduct considered unbecoming of ordinary citizens, shall have the right to serve his country in any capacity.

We need only stand on almost any street corner in Washington, D.C., today, Mr. Chairman, in order to witness the full extent of how these standards of conduct are being breached with impunity. We need only read the daily newspapers to confirm the fact.

A government that permits its own employees to assist, encourage, incite, or instruct anyone to commit a riot or other civil disturbance in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to preserve the peace, is fueling the fires of its own destruction.

We in the Congress must demand that all Federal agencies rid their payrolls of any Government employees whose violation of the standards of decent conduct lead to riots and threats of insurrection on the streets of our Nation's Capital.

One of our Federal employees I mention today, Mr. Chairman, is an example of a paid public servant violating the oath of his office by leading street mobs and urging people, including juveniles, to arm themselves against the police of this city.

Recently, a Julius Hobson, an employee of the Social Security Administration—a high-salaried employee, I understand—urged a mob composed mostly of youngsters to incitement to take the law into their own hands, in protest over the conduct of a policeman, an officer who, even by the judgment of the dimwitted, was performing the duty he is authorized by law to perform. Pamphlets were distributed throughout the neighborhood, pamphlets specifically designed to incite mob violence, and the crowd, which had been urged by Hobson to arm themselves and shoot it out with the police, marched on a police precinct in response to this agitation.

Let me examine this Mr. Hobson, for a moment, this salaried servant of the American people. Unfortunately, he is but one of many who roam our streets from coast to coast, working by day as an employee of his government and rallying at night the forces determined to destroy that government.

He has led numerous marches in protest of one thing or another throughout Washington, D.C., for several years. He has demanded that police dogs be removed from one precinct and placed in another. He has demonstrated immediately before police headquarters, alleging police brutality and urging citizens to follow police by day and night and record instances of such brutality. His mission has been, and is, constant harassment of the Washington police as the attempt to maintain law and order in our community.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hobson, and Federal employees everywhere who act as he does, are termites of public destruction, and must be stopped.

I propose to examine all the Hobsons, one by one, as they emerge in lockstep to scorn the nation that provides their sustenance.

I consider it a public service to do so.

I consider it essential to our security to do so.

I consider it an act of faith in my Government to see that it is done.

That it must be stopped is obvious—that we must stop it at once is equally obvious.

I call upon those charged with doing so to take action within their own agencies immediately, and on this Congress to call to account those who fail to enforce regulations of conduct and behavior they are charged with enforcing.

The amendment I offer today will prohibit the payment of a single public dollar to any employee of these agencies, including Hobson, who violates the code of conduct with blatant disregard for common decency and commonsense.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to review the most recent incident which is a result of an unfortunate accident that occurred last Monday night, where a policeman was being attacked, being assaulted by two hoodlums whom the police had asked to leave the playground, after these hoodlums were charged with harassing and disturbing and picking on an 8-year-old youth.

These two hoodlums came back and jumped on the policeman, grabbed his blackjack, and started beating on him. They knocked him to the ground. This police officer, in self-protection, had to use his revolver.

This fellow, Julius Hobson, has come up with the statement that the Police Department has declared open war on the Negro population. The two hoodlums happened to be Negroes. Interesting enough to note, however, was the fact that the officer was also a Negro. But Julius Hobson said the Police Department of Washington had declared open war on the Negro population, and he has suggested that the Negroes of Washington buy guns and protect themselves against the police brutality.

What should this policeman have done? Incidentally, I have a very interesting editorial that appeared in the Washington Post yesterday morning. They ask the question also about what Mr. Hobson would have Private Jefferson do. That is the name of the officer who was charged with police brutality. Should he have turned and run when he was attacked, thus setting an example for children present as to the way the policeman behaves?

Mr. Hobson and the Police

> The absurdity of some reactions to the use by the police of their guns reached a zenith Monday night. Julius Hobson, chairman of the civil rights group ACT, denounced a Negro policeman for shooting two men and declared that since the police have "declared open war on the Negro population," Negroes should buy guns to protect themselves.
>
> The policeman, Pvt. Jefferson, was responding to a citizen's complaint that his son had been mistreated on a playground. He ordered three men off the playground but, five minutes later, two of them returned and attacked him. They apparently had him on the ground and were choking him when he drew his gun. What would Mr. Hobson have had Pvt. Jefferson do? Turn and run when he was attacked, thus setting an example for the children present as to the way policemen behave? Lie on the ground and let the men beat him unconscious or even to death? (Pvt. Jefferson is in the hospital as a result of the fight.) Or not approach the two men in the first place and let a small child be driven off a playground?
>
> There seems to be an idea loose in this community that a policeman must take an unlimited amount of physical abuse from those he is trying to arrest if he is to avoid

> being accused of "police brutality." While we have often criticized individual policemen for using their guns in situations in which such action seemed unjustified, no policeman can be asked to risk his life in physical combat. It is clearly a justified act for a policeman to draw his gun and use it when his life is in danger. It is just as clearly an act of gross irresponsibility for Mr. Hobson to fan racial unrest by damning the police regardless of the facts. And it is beyond belief that anyone with any intelligence or any judgment at all would ever suggest that the way to get peace and order in a city is to turn it into an armed camp.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. **CAREY**. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat intrigued by the language in the committee report that confirms the inadequacy of the appropriation for the impacted areas school districts in fiscal 1968.

> The bill includes $439,137,000, the amount of the request and the same amount as was appropriated for fiscal year 1967. While there appears to be little doubt that the estimates in the budget are less than full entitlement, this is the only official request before the committee. When a budget amendment is received the committee will take prompt action on it.

I would remind the Committee that we are at least $20 million short of meeting the maintenance and operation requirements of eligible districts for fiscal 1967. The second supplemental appropriation bill for 1967 that we considered today on the recommendation of the conference committee, shorted those school districts who became eligible under the new provisions of Public Law 874 for the first time in 1967 by denying any funds that logically could have been expected under the authorization legislation. In the case of the city I represent, the 1967 budget will be short some $5,000,000. The eligibility of these districts is beyond question, and in most instances has been determined on the basis of a costly survey that has required an expenditure of from $75,000 to $100,000. These districts that have been qualified under the provisions of the act the Congress enacted should be treated equally with all other impacted areas school districts.

I trust the Committee will include the necessary appropriation for these districts in fiscal 1967 in the third supplemental that we denied them in the second supplemental. The amounts in the Senate version of the bill accurately reported the figure at the $20,000,000 level, a small sum in terms of the usual requests we pass so often.

The committee has recommended an appropriation of $416,000,000 for fiscal 1968 in spite of the record before the committee documenting the need for $461,000,000. The fact the Bureau of the Budget has not requested the sum, in spite of the known need, has never before stopped this Committee from taking prompt action to meet the actual appropriation requirements of the eligible school districts.

I would also remind my colleagues who support so faithfully the impacted-areas legislation, that the construction requirements under Public Law 815 were shorted $18,000,000 in the second supplemental for fiscal 1967 on the basis of known qualified applicants, but also $45,000,000 in fiscal 1968. I intend to see these requirements met in the third supplemental for 1967, and will assume that the 1968 requirements will be met by the committee in 1968. We have had too much talk about bureaucratic restraints on school districts when we, ourselves, through inadequate appropriations, have placed hardships on school districts that logically expected the Congress to fulfill the commitments we made through our continued improvement of these laws since 1950.

We are talking about school districts that have qualified for funds under a simple formula that can be computed by most fifth-grade pupils. We are talking about school districts, large and small, that are meeting the defense needs of our Nation.

The Congress, with or without the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, should carry out the declared dollar commitments of the educational components that are now the very basis of our democratic existence.

Mr. **BRADEMAS**. Mr. Chairman, the International Education Act is a domestic program of grants to American colleges and universities to strengthen international studies and research here in America. It was passed by overwhelming bipartisan majorities in both the House and the Senate. It has the warm endorsement of colleges and universities through the country.

The House Appropriations Committee has reported to us a bill, H.R. 10196, which make no provisions for funds for the IEA in fiscal year 1968: This omission flies directly in the face of the strong bipartisan support for the IEA.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government for many years has relied upon our colleges and universities for knowledge, research, and trained personnel for its international activities. But that reliance has not been accompanied by sufficient concern or financial support for the programs in the institutions of higher education which produce the trained people and knowledge of the world beyond our borders that we so badly need. The International Education Act was designed to correct the imbalance created by the previous lack of Federal support.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not today present an amendment for the $20 million appropriation which was requested for the IEA. I am aware of the great difficulty of amending an appropriations bill on the floor of this House and of the confusion in the minds of far too many of my colleagues as to the act's purposes. The International Education Act is not foreign aid. It is, I repeat, a domestic program. I hope we shall have another opportunity to consider an appropriation for the IEA.

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Chairman, I take strong exceptions to the language on page 44 of the report which contends that the Department has gone beyond the law in enforcing title VI and in drafting the guidelines. The facts are clearly to the contrary. I am distressed that the report contains this concession to the diehards.

Mr. **VANIK**. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to oppose the amendment submitted by the distinguished gentlemen from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN], which would have for its purpose the appropriation of planning funds for the construction of a public Food and Drug Laboratory on public land at Beltsville, Md. The Federal ownership of land in Beltsville, Md., or any other place does not of itself justify the establishment of additional Federal agencies in the Greater Washington area. This community is already overloaded with Federal facilities which concentrate over 300,000 Federal civilian jobs within this confined area. Many public employees do their hardest work traveling to and from their jobs. The Federal service receives what is left after the public employee is drained of energy in getting to work.

I believe that a well-trained and dedicated bureaucracy is essential to efficient Government service. It is also necessary that these public employees have convenient and quick access to their employment.

It is also important for the taxpaying communities throughout the country to be more intimately familiar with the responsible work of bureaucrats and their valuable contribution to community life. If Federal bureaucracies were more widely distributed throughout the Nation, public support for essential Government would be more widespread and secure.

It is my hope that the Appropriations Committee will continue its vigilance in this area and utilize every effort to insure that only those functions of Government essential to the Capital City and its environs are permitted to develop and remain within this area.

The **CHAIRMAN**. There are no further requests for time.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. **FLOOD** (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there appears on page 44, the third paragraph of the report, this statement:

> This appropriation finances the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act with regard to the programs administered by the Department Testimony before the committee indicated clearly that the Department has gone beyond the law in these enforcement activities and in requirements under the so-called guidelines. The committee cautions that the Department will be expected to follow the law, and will be expected to administer the law with equal firmness and fairness among all the States.

The reason I direct the Committee's attention to this particular paragraph is that most Members are aware the Rules Committee authorized the House Committee on the Judiciary to look into certain allegations of the activities of the Commissioner of Education. It was my duty and responsibility as chairman of that committee to cross-examine, not only the Commissioner, but also his staff in connection with their activities in carrying out their duties and responsibilities under the Civil Rights Act.

I state to the Committee that the Commissioner and his employees, together with an Assistant Attorney General, appeared before the committee and testified that any action thay had taken was based upon a legal opinion they had received from the Attorney General, that all of the so-called guidelines and requirements thereunder issued by him met with the approval and the sanction of the legal department of HEW and of the Attorney General.

I merely call to the attention of the Committee of the Whole that we cannot permit statements of this type to go unchallenged. If there is an indication that the Commissioner of Education is in violation of law as it relates to his requirements in carrying out his responsibilities under the so-called guidelines, I shall be most happy to receive that information and to consider it along with the other allegations which have been made against him.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I should like to ask a question of the gentleman.

On page 17 of the bill under the title "Expansion and Improvement of Vocational Education", beginning in line 19, there is the language: "in addition, $10,000,000 for work-study programs under section 13 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to be derived by transfer from funds available to the Office of Economic Opportunity for fiscal year 1968."

I shall not make a point of order on this language, but I do want to get some clarification, since we in the Committee on Education and Labor have not as yet reported out the authorization for the poverty program for the year 1968.

Mr. FLOOD. I believe the gentleman from Illinois has made a perfectly proper inquiry of the subcommittee. He sits on the great Committee on Education and Labor. We know how he works. I especially do.

I wish to repeat and reaffirm that under no circumstances, at any time, so far as the subcommittee exists as it now is, while I am chairman, will we appropriate unless there is law and legislation. This is simply "if and when."

Mr. PUCINSKI. I trust that if we provide for this in the authorization bill it will meet no objection from the committee.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course not.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROYHILL OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia: On page 55, after line 15, insert the following:

"SEC. 907. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to provide payments, assistance, or services, in any form, with respect to any individual who—

"(1) incites, promotes, encourages, or carries on, or facilitates the incitement, promotion, encouragement, or carrying on of, a riot or other civil disturbance in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to preserve the peace of the community concerned or to protect the persons or property of residents of such community; or

"(2) assists, encourages, or instructs any person to commit or perform any act specified in paragraph (1)."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. My good friend from Virginia is clearly on the side of the angels. I have told the subcommittee, and they will accept your amendment.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee a question concerning the language which appears on page 12 of the bill wherein it is provided that "not to exceed $45,000 for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, to be authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his own accounting." What is the purpose of this blanket authority to the Secretary?

Mr. FLOOD. I think this is a very proper inquiry. Perhaps I am derelict in that I should have explained that language. I may say to my friend from Iowa what this is—and unless he insists on it I do not want to explain it in too great detail, but this has to do with enforcement of the drug abuse control program. It is necessary under such circumstances. I do not want to go into details but this is needed for cash to make drug purchases for purposes of evidence and that sort of thing.

Mr. GROSS. The expenditure is solely for enforcement?

Mr. FLOOD. And the various operations that are incident and necessary to such enforcement.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will turn to page 55 of the bill, he will note there is $7,500 in two instances for representation allowances. The other day we had the independent offices appropriation bill before the Committee of the Whole, and the largest entertainment fund allowed any agency under that bill was $2,500. Do hors d'oeuvres and cocktails cost more in Health, Education, and Welfare and the Labor Department, or what is the story as to why each of these must have $7,500?

Mr. FLOOD. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa if he had not raised this inquiry, he would have spoiled my entire day.

This is different than the independent offices. I say this in deadly seriousness now. This is largely for foreign visitors, scientists, labor leaders and so forth. These men are not freeloaders, they are not chiselers, and they are not some of the people we see around these cocktail parties and consuming these hors d'oeuvres. If this money were not requested, I would put it in. We are so fortunate as to have the kind of men we have in these departments. I have never been so impressed, I want to say, by the caliber of the witnesses in my life as these heads of these bureaus and departments. How we hold them here I do not know. But the thing is they should not have to pay for all this sort of thing themselves. I do not want these men, and I am sure my friend does not want them, to go down into their pockets in order to entertain these foreign visitors from these countries who are helping us.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, we have to take care of foreigners both——

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. GROSS (continuing). Abroad and at home?

Mr. FLOOD. I know all about that.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, apparently, we cannot spend enough on the entertainment of these people?

Mr. FLOOD. With reference to this inference, I know my friend, and he is very good at it. And, I am no amateur myself. However, this is not that kind of situation.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations is not on the floor now because it looks like he is getting short changed in this deal. Apparently none of the elite visit the agencies under the jurisdiction of the independent offices appropriation bill. It seems that the elite visit the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. FLOOD. The chairman of that subcommittee is entirely capable of taking care of himself on that.

Mr. GROSS. I would warn the gentleman from Pennsylvania not to look around because, evidently, there is another gentleman about to move into this colloquy.

Mr. FLOOD. I doubt that very much.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is right back of you now, the gentleman from New York, who calls funds for this purpose the "tools of the trade."

Mr. FLOOD. I understand that. I understand further that the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from New York have engaged in this colloquy in the past, but this is a different breed of cats.

Mr. GROSS. That is what the gentleman from New York says, that he has a different breed of cats, and his bill carries about $1 million for this purpose for the State Department.

Mr. FLOOD. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that this is a lot of penny-ante stuff and not worth spending a lot of time on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MACHEN

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACHEN: On page 13, strike out lines 2 through 5 and insert in lieu thereof "expended."

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I indicated in the general debate I would offer and what I am asking the Committee to do is to strike a restrictive rider that states that plans for Laboratory No. 2 for the Pure Food and Drug Administration cannot be located within a radius of 50 miles of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I make this request, not provincially and not because it would in all probability have gone into my district, but because the Agency itself has stated consistently that their first choice for a location for such new facility is in Maryland, near the existing laboratory.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee questioned me as to the mentioning of another site. And, I can only state that I have no knowledge of any move to locate to an alternative site, until I received an anonymous telephone call stating that the alternative site had been announced on March 15 in the Milwaukee Sentinel, and this information was attributed to the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee that Madison, Wis., had been selected. The newspaper story stated that the ranking minority member said, and I quote:

> He agreed to sponsor the FDA stipulation that the laboratory will not be built near Washington after the FDA assured him that the laboratory would be built at Madison.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman called me and questioned my making a release on that and stated that I was wrong in my interpretation of the matter. However, I have heard nothing further from him on that.

Mr. Chairman, as late as April 28, Dr. Goddard, in another letter to me still informed me that he preferred the Beltsville site. He stated further as follows:

> However, in consideration of the possibility of language in the appropriations bill which would prohibit construction of the new lab in the western area, other sites have also been deemed adequate for our needs.

Mr. Chairman, the statement which I made with reference to the savings of $5.4 million was predicated upon the FDA's request to the Appropriations Subcommittee.

That is, if it was located in Madison, Wis., it would cost a minimum of $5.4 million for the same facility that should be located in Beltsville next to the Laboratory No. 1 that is being built, and within 10 miles of their administrative offices in the District of Columbia. I say to you I am asking not that it go there, let them determine it later, but let us take this rider off so that this building can honestly and actually be placed where it will be of the best interests for the Government, as well as all of its employees.

I would also say we are dealing with scientific personnel, with doctors with degrees, and many others that will possibly quit Government service. Thus, we have a situation where we may lose personnel if this forced move is made.

I say the record is complete, and I heard no denials that it is headed for Madison, Wis., unless we strike this rider from the bill. Thus, I say let it be decided without any restrictions as to where this building should be built for the best interests of everyone concerned.

I certainly hope this amendment is adopted. I am sure it will ultimately save the Government money.

Does the distinguished chairman dispute the record that ultimately the construction of this facility in Beltsville will save the Government money? I believe that is true, is it not, Mr. Chairman? I ask the chairman that question.

Mr. FLOOD. I would say to the gentleman I was watching the Chairman's gavel. I thought the gentleman had run out of time. I will answer the gentleman on my own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee does not need to be admonished about saving money. You have the record of our action on this budget and how it was acclaimed by all the speakers today as in the best interests of economy. And we have not exceeded the budget on any item.

Secondly, appropriations for this facility have been proposed three times in the Washington metropolitan area, and have been rejected three times.

Third, it is inconceivable to the subcommittee how these cost figures that we just heard could be bandied about in the nature of extra cuts that could be arrived at when nobody has even started to plan the building up until this minute.

Finally, this House has been through this kind of problem before, and in this bill, with the National Environmental Health Center. That went on for years. Finally it was disposed of, apparently to almost everybody's satisfaction, by establishing the same language as we have established in this bill.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, this has been debated pro and con down through the years. There is no difference between this laboratory and the other building. I submit in view of the amity and the atmosphere that prevails here today, in the best interest of time and in the best interest of everything, that the amendment be defeated. This is no aspersion upon the distinguished gentleman from Maryland who made this presentation.

I would say to the gentleman, if I came from Maryland so would I, and so would anyone.

Mr. MACHEN. Will the distinguished Chairman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Why, yes, of course, I will yield.

Mr. MACHEN. Is it not true that the Food and Drug Administration had reported to the committee that the cost of the second laboratory could rise from $17.5 million to $22.9 million?

Mr. FLOOD. I am sure it could be. I do not remember it.

Mr. MACHEN. That would be an increase of $15.4 million just to relocate this and to build at that new location.

Mr. FLOOD. May I say to the gentleman we have experience in the Department of Defense and it has taught us that if you are going to build something do it fast, because if you work with the Federal Government by contract if you do not do that the prices will go up. The sooner they build it as the subcommittee has indicated, and we have selected no site, the more money you will save.

Mr. MACHEN. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield for one further question.

Mr. MACHEN. You mentioned the inconsistency in this same bill. There is an appropriation for the international center for the—International Center for Advanced Study of Health Sciences. And I congratulate you on that. That is just being built several miles away. Why did you take into consideration building it in Bethesda; yes, because it is related to their activity, just like Laboratory No. 2 is related to Laboratory No. 1 at Beltsville?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, the gentleman does not understand the bill as well as the subcommittee does. Let me explain.

Mr. MACHEN. I will be glad to hear the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. FLOOD. First of all, this is a memorial to John E. Fogarty. If anybody wants to fight the subcommittee on that just name the time and place.

Second, it will be an integral part of the National Institutes of Health. There is no question as to the site. There is no question as to the location. And as to the money that is allowed, that is clear. There is no analogy, whatever, between the purposes of the Fogarty Center at the National Institutes of Health, and this laboratory.

Mr. MACHEN. I concur with you on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes, but since my name was mentioned in connection with the 50-mile proviso in this bill, I would like to make it very clear that Madison is not in my district.

Last year I supported the funds in the HEW appropriations bill to construct this laboratory at Beltsville, Md. The U.S. Senate struck out every dollar. It said, "Come back when you decide to build this laboratory some place other than the area surrounding or in the District of Columbia."

We have concentrated too much in the way of research facilities in this area.

The Senate, in effect, said, "We want to give FDA the money, but not for construction in this area." We went to the House and Senate conference and the House finally yielded to the position of the Senate.

John Fogarty and myself, and other members of the committee, had supported the Beltsville site and had provided the money for it. At the request of Congressman Fogarty and myself, the Food and Drug Administration agreed to set up a site-survey committee to investigate sites throughout America.

This survey team went out to Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, and other places in the United States. The site survey committee, it is true, came up with the recommendation of Madison, Wis., as the No. 1 site selection provided the University of Wisconsin could provide a site at no cost to the Government in Madison, Wis. This was the same request that was made of Ohio State, and it was the same request that was made of Michigan. And I think you will find this site survey committee recommended the sites on the basis of Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 priorities.

We must resolve this site selection now so we can go forward with this vital food and drug laboratory. This laboratory is so needed and necessary now. Your committee has resolved this problem just the way we did with the communicable disease laboratory at Atlanta, and just the way we did in the case of the environmental health center in North Carolina, and the way we did with the dental center in California. We put language in this bill providing that it would not be built within a 50-mile radius of District of Columbia because we are going forward here with so many construction projects. There is a lot of expansion of Government activities in this area. It is true that the effect of this amendment is to build this laboratory in Madison, Wis.

With modern communications, we find that the communicable disease laboratory has worked well in Atlanta, Ga. We will find that the environmental health center in North Carolina and the Taft center in Cincinnati will and are working out well.

We have found out that we can communicate in an effective and efficient way, and there is no need to locate all these research facilities in the District of Columbia. On this premise, I rest my case.

The committee amendment is a good amendment and it will move forward this laboratory now.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I believe the gentleman refers to the language of the act, not the amendment.

Mr. LAIRD. The effect of my committee amendment, which we used on the environmental health center, is exactly the same language. The amendment of the gentleman from Maryland to strike that language from the bill should be rejected.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take my full 5 minutes. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that there is too much concentration of the type effort for which the funds appropriated by this bill will be used in favored parts of this country.

It is in the national interest that we start thinking about and start doing something about this undue concentration of laboratories and research facilities in just certain sections of the country. This section of the country and I am referring to the Washington area, does not have a monopoly on good sites, on human resources, on mental resources. They are scattered throughout the country. It is in the national interest that we start placing some of these laboratories and some of these research centers in various sections of this country. Although I appreciate the loyalty of the gentleman from Maryland to his district, I am constrained to oppose his amendment. I hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10196) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the appropriation bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate, numbered 1, 20, 47, and 55 to the above-titled bill.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, JUNE 3, 1967, TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 10328

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight, June 3, to file a report on H.R. 10328, along with any supplemental or minority views.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it is the bill having to do with the debt ceiling.

Mr. GROSS. The $29 million debt increase?

Mr. MILLS. It would, under the bill, be $365 billion.

Mr. GROSS. That is $29 billion increase.

Mr. MILLS. Over the $336, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 485, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 485

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 107]

Adams
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Baring
Bolton
Brock
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Carter
Celler
Corbett
Curtis
Dawson
Dent
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Hansen, Idaho
Jones, Mo.
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Kyl
McMillan
Madden
Morgan
Pool
Reinecke
Riegle
Ronan
Rostenkowski
St. Onge
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Willis
Younger
Zion

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. **COLMER**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 485 provides an open rule with 3 hours of debate for consideration of S. 1432, a bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes. The resolution further makes it in order to consider the committee substitute in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The principal purpose of S. 1432 is to extend the induction authority of the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the authority to make special calls for the induction of persons in the medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, until July 1, 1971. Other amendments to the act would: provide standby authority for direct induction into Reserve and National Guard units whenever authorized strengths cannot otherwise be maintained; and assure more uniform application of deferment policies and procedures throughout the country.

The legislation also provides for continued suspension for the same period of various statutory limitations on active military strengths, continued authority to pay allowances for quarters under the Dependents Assistance Act for the same period, and to authorize special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians, who are called to active duty or appointed after July 1, 1967, and before July 1, 1971. Under present law, all of these authorities would expire on July 1, 1967.

Finally, the legislation would make permanent the authority presently provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 1967 to call to active duty those reservists who are not fulfilling their obligations satisfactorily.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 485 in order that S. 1432 may be considered.

Mr. **SMITH** of California. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 485 will permit 3 hours of debate on an open rule for the consideration of S. 1432 as reported by the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment. The basic purpose of the legislation is to authorize a continuation of the induction provisions of the draft law.

S. 1432 was approved by the other body on May 11, 1967, and referred by the House to the Committee on Armed Services.

The Committee on Armed Services has amended this legislative by striking all after the enacting clause and substituting its own language in lieu thereof.

The bill as reported by the committee will extend for 4 years, from July 1, 1967, through July 1, 1971, the following provisions of law:

First. The authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces;

Second. The authority to issue Selective Service calls for physicians, dentists, and allied specialists;

Third. The suspension of permanent limitations on the active duty strength of the Armed Forces;

Fourth. The authority to pay a quarters allowance to all enlisted members of the Armed Forces who have dependents, irrespective of the rank of these members, if the dependents are not furnished Government quarters; and

Fifth. The authority for special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians.

In addition to extending the expiring authorities in the Draft Act and related laws, the committee amendment effects a substantial number of additional changes to the Draft Act and recommended changes in policy for implementation by the President.

I will attempt to briefly review these major changes, which are as follows:

1. STUDENT DEFERMENTS

The committee bill prescribes a uniform system of providing college student deferments and requires their exposure to induction in the same manner as their nondeferred contemporaries after they finish their college training, or age 24, whichever is the earlier.

The committee report will, in addition, emphasize that graduate student deferments should be continued as recommended by the newly established National Manpower Resources Board. During the interim pending recommendations from the National Manpower Resources Board, the committee report recommends continuation of graduate student deferments.

2. REVERSING THE ORDER OF INDUCTION

The committee bill makes no change in the ages of liability for induction. However, the report strongly recommends that the modified young age group system be adopted and implemented by the President. This means that priority for future draft calls would be levied against I–A eligibles in the 19-to-20 age group.

3. ORDER OF CALL

The committee included in the bill a provision which supports the present "oldest first system" in selecting individuals for call to active duty. However, this language would permit the President to institute his so-called FAIR system if in the future he believed that this was in the national interest and so informed the Congress. The new system could then go into effect in 60 days if the Congress had not adopted a resolution rejecting the proposed system.

4. OCCUPATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEFERMENTS

The committee bill establishes a National Manpower Resources Board which will establish at the highest levels recommendations for the future deferment of individuals in professions and occupations deemed critical in the national interest, both as they affect the Armed Forces and the civilian economy. Thus, the establishment of this Board emphasizes the committee's conviction that deferments in the various occupations shall continue, but should be narrowly restricted and continually reviewed to those fields in which such deferment action is in our national interest.

5. ENFORCEMENT OF THE ACT

The committee bill continues a number of provisions designed to improve the enforcement of the Draft Act. Among other things, the committee bill would provide that a registrant who had failed to report for induction and litigates this action beyond age 26 would nonetheless remain liable for induction regardless of the age at which the litigation was completed.

The committee bill also provides that all actions in the courts relating to enforcement of the provisions of the act will be given priority by the court before which the matter is being heard. This provision had previously been in the law, but required a request from the Attorney General to this effect. The committee eliminates this requirement and these cases would therefore automatically receive top priority.

The committee also added a provision which would require the Attorney General to report to the Congress on his failure to initiate prosecutions on alleged violations of the Selective Service Act whenever the Director of Selective Service so requests.

6. UNIFORMITY IN DRAFT BOARD ACTIONS

The adoption by the committee of the uniform standards for college student deferments together with a recommendation that we look to the younger age group—19 and 20—for future inductees, will, in the committee view, immensely improve the uniform handling of future registrants by local boards. In addition, the action of the committee establishing the National Manpower Resources Board will insure currency in the identification of critical skills and occupations together with more precise criteria for identifying registrants who can qualify for such deferments.

In addition, the committee included a provision in the bill which emphasizes that the President in carrying out the provisions of the law shall establish whenever practicable national criteria for the classification of persons subject to induction under the Draft Act, and, to the extent that such action is determined by the President to be consistent with the national interest, require that such criteria be administered uniformly throughout the United States.

7. COMPOSITION OF LOCAL DRAFT BOARDS

The committee added language which would limit the tenure of board members to 25 years or age 75, whichever is earlier, and would also permit the appointment of women to these positions.

8. PUBLIC INFORMATION

The committee recommended the establishment of a Deputy Director of Selective Service for Public Affairs to insure faster and more accurate dissemination of information on Selective Service matters to the country.

9. SUPERVISION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The committee has also included in the bill a provision which would require regular reports to the Congress on the administration and operation of the Selective Service System. These reports would be submitted at least quarterly and would provide the Committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate with an opportunity to act as a "watch dog" committee on the act.

10. ALIEN PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS

Alien physicians and dentists are liable to age 35 if admitted for permanent residence.

11. CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

The committee included language in the bill which would require service from all conscientious objectors who are selected for induction.

Among other things, the new language differs from existing law in that it would eliminate the requirement of an investigation of each case and advisory opinion from the Department of Justice. Committee hearings indicate that referral to the Department of Justice of these conscientious objectors cases has resulted in processing delays of as much as 27 months. Registrants claiming conscientious objection will therefore be afforded the same appeal procedures and administrative remedies that are available to all other registrants.

The Committee on Armed Services has, I believe, done a remarkably good job on a very complicated legislative problem. I therefore urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise merely to express what I have heard from a great many Members.

It is not surprising that there is some difficulty in maintaining order in this Chamber at this late hour, considering that we were in this Chamber at about 2 o'clock this very morning.

But I rise to state the views of a great many Members.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I find it highly unfortunate, and I resent it personally, that at this late hour of 5:30 in the afternoon, after spending some 3 days of debate on a very important piece of legislation, we are obliged to consider what is probably the most important bill that will be considered by this first session of the 90th Congress.

We had a lot of talk yesterday and the day before and on Monday about the fact that we were debating a bill which would touch or had touched and affected the lives of 8.3 million schoolchildren. This is a bill which is going to touch the lives of almost 2 million young Americans every year for the next 4 years, if it is extended for that long a period.

Yet, with 3 hours of general debate, at this hour of the evening, when many Members are tired—and one can accuse me of being a little crotchety, and perhaps I am, because I have lost sleep, as other Members have—I do not believe that these are the best circumstances under which to work out the provisions of this bill.

Please do not misinterpret this as any criticism of the distinguished members of the Committee on Armed Services. I believe they have done their work well. I have had more of an opportunity than most Members of the House to review their work, because we at least had the advantage of a brief hearing before the Rules Committee.

I do not know how many thousands of pages of testimony there were in connection with the $13 billion appropriation bill which was before the House earlier this afternoon. We have no sooner digested that than we find ourselves considering another bill with respect to which the testimony, if we include the hearings held by the committee last July, covers something like 3,000 pages.

This is a bill on which there are differing views. At least four Members have appended additional views to the report on this bill. I know that amendments will be offered to this bill.

I know what the temper and the mood of the House is when the hour is late and Members are tired. The tendency is to limit debate, to close off time for debate, and so on, and that is perhaps understandable.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. We are dealing here with a tremendously important subject affecting, as I have said, millions of lives of young Americans.

I know that the chestnut blossoms may be in bloom along the banks of the Seine, and there may be interesting things over in Paris which may be calling for the attention of Members in the next few days, but those are not so important that we could not have arranged, I believe, to schedule this bill on Wednesday, the 31st of May, when we come back here, or at some time when we would not be under the pressures of time and in the temper and mood we are in this evening.

I repeat that I regret very much it has been found necessary and desirable to schedule this bill at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I did not anticipate I would get into this, but will you please advise me when 5 more minutes have expired, and I think maybe I can quit at that time.

I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of work has gone into this bill. Of course, I do not impugn anything that the gentleman from Illinois has said, but if he would approach this with the same dedication and the same motivation and the same sincerity by which he approached his speech here where he received the encomiums to which he is entitled, I am sure he would join with me in meeting tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock and finish this legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of California. I certainly will.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina that I certainly would join with him. I would feel in much better condition to do it at that time.

Mr. RIVERS. I came here to work. Those boys in Vietnam do not work by the clock. I will be very glad to put the same dedication into the bill that we put into the bill yesterday afternoon on the subject which involved the people where this howling is coming from.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to have that kind of consideration given to it. I think this bill is even more important than that one on yesterday.

Mr. RIVERS. It is by far the most important bill to be brought up at this session, and it is third on the calendar today. It should have been taken up much earlier. Let us finish it tomorrow if you are animated by the same thoughts you have expressed here before with so much eloquence.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services will agree that this bill raises broad questions of war policy for which the House of Representatives has a grave responsibility. I hope that the gentleman will agree with me, and I am sure and I trust that the sentiment of the gentleman from Illinois would show he would agree with me, it would be far better for us either to take it up tomorrow or to delay it until next week when a more thorough consideration can be given to it. This involves deep questions of war policy affecting the lives of so many American citizens I hope that the leadership will find a way at least to permit a leisurely, extended, adequate debate, even if it takes all night, and not persist in what I know is the danger which exists of shutting off debate.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any further requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1432, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman for Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, on May 18, 1967, the Committee on Armed Services reported to the House of Representatives its legislative recommendations for a continuation of our draft law.

As Members of the House are aware, the induction provisions of the draft law are due to expire on July 1 of this year and, therefore, in the absence of positive legislative action, the induction authority for new registrants would lapse. This aspect of the draft law has therefore been given considerable attention.

On the other hand, there are also a number of other existing authorities in the law which, without legislative action, will also lapse on July 1 of this year.

These matters include:

First. The authority to issue selective service calls for physicians, dentists, and allied specialists;

Second. The suspension of permanent limitations on the active duty strength of the Armed Forces;

Third. The authority to pay a quarters allowance to all enlisted members of the Armed Forces who have dependents irrespective of the rank of these members; and

Fourth. The authority to provide special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians.

Each of the foregoing authorities, which are directly related with the operation of our Draft Act, are due to expire and therefore require comparable action to extend their provisions for 4 years, until July 1, 1971.

The Committee on Armed Services, after very careful and comprehensive hearings, has recommended the continuation for 4 years of all the authorities which I have mentioned so as to insure that our Armed Forces will be able to meet their manpower requirements both qualitatively and quantitatively into the future.

The Universal Military Training and Service Act presently provides the President of the United States with extraordinary discretionary authority in issuing regulations implementing the administration of the act. The Committee on Armed Services acknowledges that the President should continue to retain this discretionary authority in various provisions of the act so as to provide him with essential administrative flexibility and latitude.

On the other hand, the committee feels strongly that in certain areas of the act this flexibility is not necessary and therefore believes that the President's authority should, in those areas, be restricted so as to insure that the will of Congress is observed in implementation and administration of the Draft Act.

The bill, as amended and reported by the Committee on Armed Services reflects this philosophy. Thus, the committee proposes to incorporate into the law more specific guidelines for Presidential action in the future. In other instances in which the committee believes that Presidential discretion must remain, it has nonetheless expressed its recommendations on the direction and manner in which the President should dispose of certain existing problems arising from the draft law.

The President of the United States in his message to Congress of March 6, 1967, recommended three principal changes in the administration and operation of the Draft Act, each of which could be implemented by the President within the discretionary authorities already vested in him by the law. These recommendations involve:

Going to a young age group; that is, 19 to 20, for future inductees;

Selecting future inductees from this age group on the basis of random selection; and

Eliminating all graduate student deferments other than those for medical and dental students.

In addition, the Presidential message requested that Congress by public debate resolve the question of undergraduate college student deferments.

The Committee on Armed Services gave very careful consideration to the recommendations made by the President, and has therefore included in this bill, as reported, its views and recommendations on these matters.

I will now attempt to briefly summarize the committee's actions not only in respect to the Presidential recommendations, but all other actions taken by the committee.

First. Going to the young age group; that is, 19 to 20, for future inductees.

The Committee on Armed Services has endorsed the Presidential recommendation that future priority for induction be concentrated on a younger age group, that is, registrants between the ages of 19 and 20.

The advantages in this proposed revision in the priority of age groups liable for induction are clearly evident. It will tremendously reduce the uncertainty presently confronting registrants until they attain either age 26 or are ordered for induction, and therefore will, if adopted, permit them once they have passed age 20 to make reasonably permanent plans for their future.

It is important to note, however, that adoption of this system will not result in any significant change in the average age level of inductees. At the present time the average age of inductees is approximately 20.2 years.

It is also important to note that this change does not alter the ages of draft liability for young men which is now 18½ to 26, and if deferred during this period, the young men remain draft liable to age 35.

It will simply mean that priority for future draft calls would first be levied against 1–A eligibles in the 19- to 20-year age group.

Second. Selecting future inductees from this age group on the basis of random selection.

The committee has not endorsed the President's recommendation for the institution of the so-called fair system of random selection for future inductees who are in the prime age group for induction; that is, 19 to 20. The committee took this action since the executive branch, as yet, has actually not completed development of this system. Therefore, pending the development of this system, the committee included in the bill a provision which supports the present "oldest-first" system in selecting individuals from the various age groups for orders to active duty.

However, the committee language would permit the President to institute his so-called fair system if in the future he believed that this was in the national interest and so informed the Congress. The new system would then go into effect in 60 days if the Congress had not adopted a resolution rejecting the proposed system.

Third. Student deferments.

As a consequence of the committee's comprehensive study and review of the student deferment question, it, by a vote of 32 to 4, recommended that college student deferments be continued. The committee bill prescribes a uniform system of providing college student deferments which should preclude any possible criticism that these young men are, by virtue of obtaining a delay in their exposure to induction, be permitted an opportunity to avoid military service.

Briefly, there is language in the bill which provides that young men attaining age 19 will be permitted to make an election to either request a college student deferment, if they otherwise qualify therefor, or, in lieu thereof, remain in the prime age group liable for induction; that is, 19 to 20.

In the event the registrant elects to request a college student deferment, he then would be granted this deferment without regard to his relative class standing, or other testing indicia. This deferment would remain in effect only until the student thereafter terminates his undergraduate student status, receives his undergraduate degree, or reaches the age of 24, whichever occurs earlier.

Upon termination of his student status, he would then revert to the 1–A pool of draft eligibles and would be considered for induction by his local board with equal exposure to the draft as others in the pool in the prime age group; that is, 19 to 20.

It is important also to note that by electing to accept a student deferment, students would be required to waive any possible entitlement to a subsequent deferment based on other than a student status—for example, paternity—except in extreme hardship cases as determined by the local board.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I would much prefer to complete my statement but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I have asked the gentleman to yield while he is on the subject of college deferments because I want to ask a question on that subject.

At the bottom of page 13 of the bill beginning on line 22 it says:

> *Provided*, That unless such person is deferred for graduate study under the provisions of this subsection such deferment shall terminate on completion of requirements for his baccalaureate or first professional degree, * * *

And so on.

Mr. RIVERS. I am coming to that. We have set up a manpower board to advise the President. This is not binding on the President but he may act if it is in the national interest.

Mr. JONAS. Does this mean that the President can in his discretion set up a procedure by which graduate students may be deferred?

Mr. RIVERS. If he finds it to be in the national interest. I am coming to that if the gentleman will bear with me.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question comes up with some draft boards when you have students in community colleges and they want to change their college and go to another college or a more senior college; or where they may go to a small college that is not on as high a level academically and they want to go to a better college or university or when they want to change their college course and then in the situation where they lose credit or are set back some draft boards immediately induct them into the service.

I would like to make sure the legislative intent is against that practice under this particular statute so that there is no penalty when the student, through no fault of his own, because he has good marks, loses standing either in a class or certain credits.

Mr. RIVERS. On page 26 of the report, if the gentleman would look at that language, the following appears:

> The committee would like it clearly understood that a full-time student status includes one who completes an academic year within a calendar year. The committee does not wish the law interpreted to penalize students at institutions where the academic program is organized on a quarterly system. * * *
>
> The committee also would make clear, however, that the law is not intended to penalize students who in good faith must transfer between colleges because of the nature of the program.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am very glad the gentleman is making that legislative history.

Mr. RIVERS. Keep your eye on the age 24. When a man reaches the age of 24, he **has had it.**

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. The committee agrees with the general observation that existing graduate student deferment policies have permitted many such students to effectively avoid military service. However, it does not agree with the President's recommendation that all such graduate student deferments be terminated save for medical and dental students. The committee recommends that graduate student deferments be drastically reduced.

However, your committee recommends that the specific identification of professional training which would qualify for graduate student deferment should be based upon findings of the proposed new National Manpower Resources Board which we set up in this act.

During the interim, pending recommendations from the National Manpower Resources Board, the committee recommends a continuation of graduate student deferments.

Occupational and professional deferments. The committee bill establishes a National Manpower Resources Board which will establish at the highest levels of our Government recommendations for the future deferment of individuals in professions and occupations deemed critical in the national interest, both as they affect the Armed Forces and the civilian economy. Thus the establishment of this Board emphasizes the committee's conviction that deferments in the various occupations shall continue but should be narrowly restricted and continually reviewed and restricted to those fields in which such deferment action is in the national interest.

Now, as to the enforcement of this act. The committee bill continues a number of provisions designed to improve the enforcement of the Draft Act. Among other things, the committee bill would provide that a registrant who has failed to report for induction and litigates this action beyond the age of 26 would nonetheless remain liable for induction regardless of how old he may be when the litigation is completed. He may ultimately get as old as I am. If this should happen, he would still be liable.

I cannot conceive of how he would, but if he did, he would still be liable.

So he cannot litigate himself out of responsibility.

The committee bill also provides that all actions—now listen to this, this is very important—in the courts relating to enforcement of the provisions of the act will be given priority by the court before which the matter is being heard. This provision had previously been in the law but required a request from the Attorney General to this effect. The committee eliminates this requirement, and these cases would, therefore, automatically receive top priority, the Attorney General to the contrary notwithstanding.

The committee also added a provision which would require the Attorney General to report to the Congress on his failure to initiate prosecutions of alleged violations of the Selective Service Act whenever the Director of the Selective Service requests that he do so. In other words, if the Attorney General is dragging his feet, as he is now doing, the Director of Selective Service shall request a report, and he shall make it to this Congress, giving his reasons for so dragging his feet—as he is now doing. Many people share my view in this regard, as is evidenced by the following correspondence:

NOTRE DAME LAW SCHOOL,
Notre Dame, Ind., May 18, 1967.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Martin Luther King as well as Stokely Carmichael should be prosecuted, and I say so categorically in the enclosed copy of an address delivered on the occasion of our commemoration of law Day 1967. The inflammatory speeches and interviews of Messrs. King and Carmichael, urging young men not to bear arms for their Country, are a violation of two sections of the United States Code, namely, Title 18, section 2388 and Title 50, section 462.

I.

Section 2388 is in full force and effect by virtue of section 2391. An examination of the relevant materials discloses that the national emergency, referred to in the latter section, has not been terminated.

Section 2388 was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Schenck* v. *United States*, 249 U.S. 47 (1919). The case grew out of an indictment charging, among other things, a conspiracy to obstruct the recruiting and enlistment service of the United States by distributing a circular, which attacked conscription in impassioned language. "Do not submit to intimidation," it urged (p. 51); "[A]ssert your opposition to the draft." *id.* Mr. Justice Holmes, writing for the Court (which included Mr. Justice Brandeis) enunciated for the first time the clear-and-present-danger rule. The First Amendment, he said (p. 52)

"[D]oes not . . . protect a man from an injunction against uttering words that may have all the effect of force. . . . The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent. It is a question of proximity and degree. When a nation is at war many things that might be said in time of peace are such a hindrance to its effort that their utterance will not be endured so long as men fight and that no Court could regard them as protected by any constitutional right."

Thirty-one years later the rationale of *Schenck* was followed in *American Communications Assn.* v. *Douds*, 339 U.S. 382 (1950), which involved a conviction under the so-called non-Communist affidavit provision of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947.

II.

Section 462 provides penalties for any person "who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces . . .". That section was applied and upheld in *Warren* v. *United States*, 177 F. 2d 596 (10th Cir. 1949); *Gara* v. *United States*, 178 F. 2d 38 (6th Cir. 1949) aff'd without opinion 340 U.S. 857 (1950), rehearing denied 340 U.S. 893 (1950); *Ayres* v. *United States*, 193 F. 2d 739 (5th Cir. 1952); *United States* v. *Miller*, 233 F. 2d 171 (2nd Cir. 1956). The *Gara* case was ex-publicly followed in *United States* v. *Bartell*, 144 F. Supp. 793, 796 (D.C., S.D., N.Y., 1956).

In a *per curiam* opinion in the case last cited, the Court said (at p. 172) that Mrs. Miller's

"[C]onstitutional objections have been met by the overwhelming weight of well-settled and unanimous authority. . . . Congress in fulfillment of its constitutional duty has enacted this legislation to provide for the national security; that defendant disapproves the Congressional action and has frequently and vehemently stated her position on this and other matters of public importance lends no weight to the validity of her arguments, which are without legal merit. Like the conviction of her husband this day affirmed, . . . this is a sad case where self-delusion has carried defendant to the point where she apparently believes her own warped ideas of patriotism, interlarded with distressing racial, religious, and political biases, can justify her in the crudest of law violations."

III.

The press has quoted Assistant Attorney General Fred Vinson as saying, with particular reference to Carmichael, that he had committed no offense. I venture to suggest that what is lacking is not a violation of law but the will to prosecute.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH O'MEARA,
Dean.

REMARKS OF DEAN O'MEARA AT THE LAW HONORS BANQUET OF THE NOTRE DAME LAW SCHOOL ON MAY 1, 1967

What I have to say seems to me relevant in view of the theme of this year's Law Day: "No man is above the law and no man is below it"—Theodore Roosevelt's magnificent capsule statement of the Rule of Law. Far more eloquent, however, is John Courtney Murray's expression of the meaning, the intent and the effect of the Rule of Law. "Western man," Father Murray says, "has sought in the idea of law a manifold redemption—from the arbitrary despotism of uncontrolled power; from the threat or fact of injustice to his person or his property, from dispossession of his human and his civil rights; from the degredation that ensues upon social inequalities destructive of his personal significance and worth; from disruption of his life by the irrational forces of passion, caprice, and chance."

What would happen to these values, so highly prized by us, if Communist aggressors should carry the day? We are locked in mortal combat with them at this moment—in Viet Nam. There, in that hot and distant land, we are waging an escalating war, a war that is horrible and tragic as, indeed, all wars always have been.

Why are we fighting a war in that faraway corner of the earth? First of all, because we have made commitments, which have been and are being relied on; and because we are not, and cannot afford to become welshers.

We are fighting that war, moreover, to preserve the Rule of Law and the values it protects.

We are fighting that war, finally, as a matter of self preservation. If we do not stop Communist aggression in Viet Nam, where shall we stop it? After the Reds have engulfed or neutralized Indonesia? Overwhelmed the Philippines? Reduced or isolated Japan? Established a beachhead in Hawaii? Or shall we wait until they have landed in Central America or Mexico?

To stop the Communist aggressors *now*, while they are still far from our own shores, American men are dying in Viet Nam; American women are losing their sons, husbands and sweethearts. At the same time there are many in this Country who are fighting another and different war, a war against what is called our "involvement" in Viet Nam. Some of these are motivated by strongly held moral principles. They are entitled to respect, and nothing I shall say is directed against them.

For the most part, however, I am persuaded, the objectors are either Communists, or traitors or cowards. Or they are persons of large good will but little insight who have been euchred into being stooges, or persons who are seeking some end of their own (ambition, revenge or whatever) at the expense of their Country. To be specific I am referring to Martin Luther King, Stokely Carmichael and others like them. Such persons are doing irreparable harm to the cause of civil rights by seeking to link the Civil Rights movement with their own criminal attempts to persuade young men to avoid military service. Like other malefactors they should be prosecuted. And that goes for anyone else—white or black—who is urging young men to "become" conscientious objectors—a vicious absurdity, which is nothing less than urging them to become perjurors and hypocrites. They should be prosecuted, I repeat, and there is no excuse for not doing so. As the record shows, I profoundly believe that no man should be discriminated against because of his color. I am equally convinced that no man should be protected by his color.

What I have said may be denied indignantly. But the persons I have named, and others like them, let the cat out of the bag, they give themselves away. For never once do they condemn the terrorist tactics of the North Vietnamese; never once do they condemn Hanoi's rejection of all peace proposals, not only those put forward by the Administration but also those advanced by neutral powers, by the Secretary General of the United Nations and by the Vatican; never once do they lament the suffering and death borne by our forces in Vietnam. These persons weep only for the enemy.

Let them criticize to their heart's content. To do so is their right under the First Amendment. But let it be understood that the Constitution gives no right to obstruct the war effort, as by attempting to persuade young men to refuse to bear arms for their Country. Such attempts are forbidden by Federal statutes. Those who defy this statutory prohibition are giving aid and comfort to the enemy, and should pay the penalty which the law appoints. "No man is above the law and no man is below it"—no man is below the law and no man is above it.

MAY 22, 1967.

Dean JOSEPH O'MEARA,
Notre Dame Law School,
Notre Dame, Ind.

DEAR DEAN O'MEARA: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated May 18, 1967, in which you outlined your personal views on those individuals who have counselled and urged young men not to bear arms for their country.

The position you have taken on this matter reflects my own views. Therefore, if the occasion permits, I intend to make reference to the fact that responsible and prominent members of the law community, like yourself, share my indignation over the outrageous actions being pursued with impunity by people like Stokely Carmichael and Martin Luther King.

Your thoughtfulness in making your views available to me is appreciated.

Sincerely,

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman.

The committee has also recommended uniformity. When we had this hearing last year, many of the Members of this House told us they wanted greater uniformity in actions of these draft boards. The adoption by the committee of a uniform criteria for college student deferments, together with the recommendation that we look to the younger-age group first, the 19- to 20-year-olds, will, in the committee view, immensely improve the handling of future registrants by local boards.

In addition, the action of the committee in establishing the National Manpower Resources Board will insure currency in the identification of critical skills and occupations, together with more precise criteria for identifying registrants who can qualify for such deferments.

In addition, the committee included a provision in the bill which emphasizes that the President, in carrying out the provisions of the law, shall establish, wherever practicable, national criteria for the classification of persons subject to induction under the draft act, and to the extent that such action is determined by the President to be consistent with the national interest, and he shall require that such criteria be administered uniformly throughout the United States.

Now, the composition of the local draft board: The committee added language which would limit the tenure of board members to 25 years or age 75, whichever is earlier, and would also permit the appointment of women to these positions.

The committee also recommended the establishment of a Deputy Director of the Selective Service for Public Affairs, to insure faster and more accurate dissemination of information on Selective Service matters to the country.

We do not believe the selective service is close enough to the Congress and to the people, and we want them to provide someone who can handle this. It will give us an opportunity to appoint a watchdog committee to see that this is done.

Now, on the supervision of the Selective Service Board system, the committee has also included a provision which would require regular reports to the Congress every 90 days. These reports would be submitted to Congress and this will give the Congress the opportunity to create an oversight committee, which we refer to as a watchdog committee.

There are certain alien physicians and dentists who come to America. These alien physicians and dentists would, under the bill, become liable for induction until age 35 if admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

Now, conscientious objectors. The committee included language in the bill which would require service from all conscientious objectors who are selected for induction. Among other things, the new language differs from existing law, in that it would eliminate the requirement of an investigation of each case and an advisory opinion from the Department of Justice. Committee hearings indicate that referral to the Department of Justice of these conscientious objector cases has resulted in processing delays of as much as 27 months.

Registrants claiming conscientious objection will therefore be accorded the same appeal procedures and administrative remedies that are available to all other registrants.

Later I propose to offer an amendment which will eliminate a technical objection to the language presently in the bill relating to conscientious objection. The present law gave rise to the Seeger case, which in substance says a man can decide what war he is opposed to, when, the time and the place, and does not have to conform to any religion. He could worship a rock, if he wanted to.

In summary—and I am about finished—the bill recommended to the House for action is, in my judgment and in that of the vast majority of the committee, since it was reported out 34 to 1, the most equitable resolution of the shortcomings and difficulties that may now exist in our draft laws. I therefore strongly recommend it for your unanimous support and endorsement.

We started last year reviewing this act. We digested our hearings over the last year and brought them up to date this year with extended hearings. Moreover, we appointed a blue ribbon panel to look into this and to advise. In addition, we had the advantage of a group in the Department of Defense who looked into it, plus the Presidential Panel. We have digested all these things. We have heard a lot of witnesses. This is what we recommend, and we recommend it be accepted.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. NEDZI. I have a question I should like to direct to the gentleman. Could the gentleman state for the record whether there is anything in the bill which would prevent draft boards from according deferred status to individuals taking either vocational training, apprenticeship training, or perhaps NDEA training?

Mr. RIVERS. We would not prevent that. That would be left to the discretion of the President.

I do not believe, and the committee does not believe, that in the day of critical skills and great technology, in which this country finds itself going to the moon, developing MOL and all those things, that we should tie his hands if he finds a certain group of people should be deferred in the national interest.

Mr. NEDZI. In other words, there is no intention to outlaw vocational type deferments?

Mr. RIVERS. No. We leave this to the President, because he must have latitude in this area.

Mr. NEDZI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. KAZEN. I notice that alien physicians and dentists will be subject to the draft until the age 35. Are alien laymen treated in the same manner—just any alien?

Mr. RIVERS. No. We do not treat American laymen in the same manner, either.

Mr. KAZEN. This is what I want to know. This is what I want clarified.

Mr. RIVERS. We treat American physicians the same. We have had numerous cases where alien physicians have come to this country, at about the age of 26 and avoided the draft. We have now extended this to 35.

Mr. KAZEN. This is the same provision as applies to American doctors?

Mr. RIVERS. That is right.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. RIVERS. Why, certainly.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, during the First World War the right of conscientious objection was recognized but confined to members of the traditional and historical peace churches; such as the Quakers, Brethren, and Mennonites.

In 1940 the definition of "conscientious objector" was broadened to mean one who by reason of "religious training and belief" was opposed to participation in war in any form.

Several cases at the appellate level, such as *U.S.* v. *Kauten* 133 F. 2d 703 (1943) and *Berman* v. *U.S.* 156 F. 2d 377 (1946), interpreted and applied this language to individual cases, and distinguished objection to war based on "religious training and belief" recognized by the law from objection based on philosophical, sociological, and political beliefs.

In 1948, Congress amended the military draft law. It retained the definition of conscientious objector as one opposed to all war on the basis of "religious training and belief," but supplemented this definition by this additional language:

> Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code.

The language of this supplementary definition in several instances reflected words and phrases used by the courts in interpreting the 1940 definition.

In 1965 the Supreme Court in the Seeger decision applied the "Supreme Being" clause and said that—

> The test of belief in relation to a Supreme Being is whether a given belief that is sincere and meaningful occupies a place in the life of its possessor parallel to that filled by the orthodox belief in God of one who clearly qualifies for the exemption. Where such beliefs have parallel positions in the lives of their respective holders we cannot say that one is "in a relation to a Supreme Being" and the other is not.

The language of the committee bill as reported to the House floor returns to the test of the 1940 act—"religious training and belief"—and removes the additional language added in 1948.

Whatever the committee's motives in recommending this change, the change itself is, in many ways, an improvement. When the Congress attempts to define the indefinable and to plumb the depths of a man's mind and conscience, the simplest language is best. The words "religious training and belief" have already been interpreted in many court cases. These cases will be available to future courts. Additional congressional attempts at definition may only confuse and compound matters further. The trend of recent court decisions such as Seeger is in line with modern theology which is constantly broadening man's concept of religion. In fact, a number of religious groups testified this year before the Armed Services Committee in favor of dropping the religious test altogether. In such imprecise and subjective matters, the test should be simple, inclusive, and capable of application to a wide and varying range of beliefs. This simple definition is broad enough to be useful in our pluralistic culture which includes nontheistic Eastern religions as well as traditional Western ones.

The removal of the "Supreme Being" definition and the return to the language of the 1940 act should therefore be welcomed as a distinct improvement over the present law.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. Why, certainly I yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to say that while I have not had a chance to read the report I know that the committee has had some extensive hearings on this subject. I appreciate the attention which has been given to the testimony of the witnesses.

There was one matter that has concerned me a great deal because of actual experience in my district. The distinguished chairman will remember I testified on this. This is the subject of the lack of uniformity in draft board actions. I note there is a section on page 2 of the report and also a section in the bill which has been pointed out to me by the staff of the Committee on Armed Services which deals with this. I would like to have a little more assurance than the general language which is contained in the bill and in the report. Now, maybe it is not possible for the chairman to give it to me.

My criticism as I gave it to the committee was that in my district, for instance, in one building we had four draft boards handling four different sections of the city area which is outside the city of Los Angeles. Now, each one of those boards was classifying boys with different criteria. For instance, one board would have a quota, let us say, of 15 single men for a certain time period. Another draft board might have 35 or 40 single men. But when this one board would run out of single men they would dip into the married men class, in the place of having the privilege of going to a board in the same building and in an adjoining territory where they would have plenty of young single men.

This has caused a tremendous amount of criticism of me as the Congressman in the area, of course. It comes about from a lack of uniformity and with consideration of the complement of men within a single draft board as the only unit to be considered, while maybe just across the street there is a draft board with a complement of young single men that could fill the statewide quota.

The question I want to ask is, Is there

anything either in the report or in the language of the bill that would allow that type of nonuniformity to be corrected?

Mr. RIVERS. Let me say this to the gentleman: Of all those who appeared before our committee last year I know of nobody who contributed more than the gentleman from California. You impressed the committee equally as much, if not more than anybody else who appeared before the committee. You brought something to us that we were determined to cure. We are determined that there will be uniformity. Moreover, we are going to get reports every 90 days and we are going to have a watchdog committee.

I remember vividly what the gentleman told us. They took a boy out of college who was just about ready to receive a degree in California, if he will remember. We are going to watch this very closely. If it is not carried out properly, we are coming back here with additional legislation. We are determined that this sort of thing will be stopped. Then, too, we are recommending to the President what he has asked—that they go to the 19- and 20-year-olds first. I do not think we will have this problem any more, but, if we do, we are determined to do something about it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I certainly thank the gentleman for his assurances. I still am somewhat at a loss as to whether my question has been answered or not, because I do not find in the report or in the bill any specific language on uniformity except the language at the top of page 32.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if we were to undertake to write criteria to cover all of these contingencies, it would be almost impossible to do so.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that if the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] will turn to page 16 of the bill, the gentleman will find on page 16, line 20, a statement to the effect:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the President shall, in carrying out the provisions of this title, establish, whenever practicable, national criteria for the classification of persons subject to induction under this title, and to the extent that such action is determined by the President to be consistent with the national interest, require such criteria to be administered uniformly throughout the United States.

This means, Mr. Chairman, that these criteria be administered uniformly throughout the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of the committee said, we have also established in this record the legislative intent and the purpose of this new legislation. It has as its prime purpose the requirement that it be applied in a uniform manner in order to make certain that all rules and regulations are actually applied uniformly. In addition to that, we will have this watchdog committee which is provided for in the bill providing for the consideration of this very question.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this is as far as we can go.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I, too, have read this language to which the gentleman from Massachusetts has referred, and I appreciate his contribution. However, I am still concerned because when I tried to get uniformity in the application of criteria at several different boards in my district, I found out, first, that I cannot get uniformity, because each board——

Mr. RIVERS. Acts on its own.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Because each board has this discretionary authority within itself. Then, when I appealed to the State director of selective service, I found out that he had no power to go back to the local board and establish uniformity of criteria.

Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about imposing policy upon the local board. However, I am talking about the establishment of uniformity of criteria which would apply to the registrants of that board. I am not talking about policy. However, I am talking about the establishment of a uniform policy within a State. However, upon inquiring further into the matter I learned that the director or his aide had been appointed by the Governor and he disclaimed authority within which to act, although I undertook to get him to do something about it.

Mr. RIVERS. The Selective Service was sitting in on all of our hearings, and if the gentleman from California will think ahead a little bit and understand that when this law goes into effect, the first thing we will do is to direct letters to the Selective Service in an effort to determine just what is being done in this area and demand reports thereon. They know this. We are determined that this area shall be defined, just as we are determined to define the powers of the clerk of the board, since a lot of trouble comes from these areas. We shall watch these areas very, very carefully.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have that assurance, but at the risk of consuming too much time, I would like to bring up another important point and that is the medical examination of these boys. They receive a very superficial examination when they are called for induction. However, sometimes there are anywhere from 300 to 400 boys who are run through these examinations. They feel their pulse and take their heartbeat and then declare that they are all right. Then the boy is called in and it subsequently develops that he has a legitimate medical examination and other tests from doctors outside the service to the effect that the boy had had a rheumatoid heart or asthma, with certificates of disability which were ignored. However, the boy was in fact found to have this condition when he was first summoned for induction and at a time when he had to write his Congressman and ask for a thorough examination.

By that time he had achieved the position of a veteran. He was entitled to certain veteran's benefits, and so forth, and it resulted in a lot of wasted time and a lot of wasted money.

It seems to me it would be economical from the standpoint of Government to give these boys a thorough examination first before they are called for induction rather than these cursory examinations which are not examinations at all. Then if these problems develop that I am talking about which really cost the Government a lot more money than it would cost to have the first medical examination when they are first called, be a real examination, one where they could find out and take into consideration the different doctor's certificates and X-rays and that sort of thing, which they could produce to show disability. I am not talking about goldbrickers, people who are trying to get out of the service, I am talking about real cases, and I have had a number of them.

Mr. RIVERS. The problem is not the Selective Service, it is the military.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But it has to do with the Selective Service.

Mr. RIVERS. The Selective Service is a procurement office.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I understand.

Mr. RIVERS. The Selective Service sends these young men to the military for this physical examination.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. RIVERS. Now we can look into this area more fully with this special watchdog committee, and receive reports from the Selective Service upon this problem as to people who have been accepted or who have passed their physical examinations. However, as I had mentioned, this is a fault of the military.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize that, but it is still part of the system.

Mr. RIVERS. That is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is part of the system which determines whether these boys shall serve or not. And whether it is in a different section of the Government or not it has to do with taking disabled men or men who are physically deficient, then finding out that they are deficient, and then causing costs of pensions, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. RIVERS. It is an area that has to have the attention of the watchdog committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I hope the gentleman and his subcommittee will look into it.

Mr. RIVERS. It is a very important thing.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Because I know from my own experience the type of cursory examination before induction which goes on, and they take them if they are warm, in other words, and I think it is time we did something about it.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for allowing me this time.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to support the gentleman from South Carolina by saying in the national standards amendment it is interesting to note that we deleted prior language which had been called the Kilday amendment. That is why on page

60 of the report they killed that amendment, because of the trouble, because it gave total autonomy to each local draft board to ignore the President, Director Hershey, or anyone. That language on page 60 of the old bill is stricken. At the same time the new language is substituted. So we did strike that section, as well as adding new language that the gentleman from Massachusetts has read

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. Section 6(a)(2), as I believe the gentleman is aware, provides an exemption for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and members of the reserve of the Public Health Service while on active duty, and along with them—and this is what I am going to ask the gentleman about—it says: "and assigned to staff the various offices and bureaus of the Public Health Service, including the National Institutes of Health."

There are a great many Public Health Service officers who are on active duty today, but in fact are assigned to the Peace Corps and other Government units overseas.

Are these persons to be included?

Mr. RIVERS. That is a very important situation. We do not believe we should, in effect, draft dentists or doctors to serve in the Peace Corps. We do not believe we should use the draft to obtain doctors to serve in the Food and Drug Administration. Dr. HALL has a grandfather clause to protect these people who have so served in the past, but in the future we think when drafting a physician or a dentist or whomever you bring into this provision in the intendment of this act, that they shall serve in the military or something close to it. We do not consider that the Peace Corps happens to be one of them.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I would like to say at this time, for the benefit of the gentleman and many others who have inquired about this particular section, that in this area we must differentiate between the Public Health Service regular corps officer who is a career specialist in professional medicine in this very vital Service wherever they may be assigned, including AID, the Peace Corps, or the Institutes of Health, or wherever else they may assigned; and the reserve U.S. Public Health Service officer who is commissioned and serves on extended active duty for 2 years in the Public Health Service, and who may be commissioned in order to serve his active duty—or not. But in these instances he is "detailed to duty with" another branch of Government. And under the old legislation he has met his military requirement.

All this bill will do, with the amendment which will clarify the situation that I will subsequently offer under the 5-minute rule, is to simply say that all those now assigned to duty anywhere in the Public Health Service, whether they be reservists or regular corps, will continue to serve and get their constructive military credit, but that hereafter the reservists will be assigned to duty only within the U.S. Public Health Service or the National Institutes of Health, the Coast Guard, and the originally conceived mission and objective of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. OTTINGER. As I understand the gentleman, you would oppose extending this exemption to Public Health Service career officers assigned to various duties?

Mr. RIVERS. No, no. They have it in now, and we will keep it. But the intendment of the statute has been stretched to these other areas, and we do not think it should be. We know the Public Health has changed the intention of that act, the terms of it, but we let them serve in the Public Health.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. DOWNING. I would like to go a little bit further in this proposition with reference to the gentleman from Missouri, Dr. HALL, preparing to offer an amendment, and I would like to have some information on it.

In the case of a young pharmacist who goes into the Public Health for 2 years and is told that this service is draft-exempt, and he has been in there for 1 year as of the time that this law becomes effective, can he continue for his second year and get his credit?

Mr. RIVERS. He gets the credit. Under the grandfather clause of the Hall amendment, he gets credit for it.

Mr. DOWNING. Is that the amendment to be offered or is it in the bill?

Mr. RIVERS. It will be offered and it will be accepted.

Mr. DOWNING. I shall support it.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, the former great majority leader and very outstanding member of our committee [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Those are the finest words I have heard in a long time.

I am a freshman member of this committee, but I think this might be as good a time as any to say this. There are 41 Members on the Committee on Armed Services. We have struggled with this problem for days and days, and for weeks and weeks. So far as we know, we have listened to everybody who has wanted to be heard. The committee, composed of 41 Members, represents practically one-tenth of the membership of the House of Representatives. We are North, South, East, and West. We are Democrats and we are Republicans, although I hasten to add that never once in my time on this committee have we divided on any political line. We represent, I guess, all shades of social and economic viewpoint.

Now, this measure has come out here after careful consideration, item by item and line by line. We have reported it to the House. I can understand the questions that have come up in respect to the deferments for certain people, such as medical people, for example. I have towns in my congressional district, pretty good sized places, where they do not have any doctor at all. I want everybody to be taken care of all over the world, but I have a kind of strong sympathy with my people back home. I do not think there is one of us here, except maybe Members from city districts, who has not been importuned by their people back home to see if they could get a doctor there in order to take care of the people at home who are sick.

May I close by saying the hour is late. I recognize that, and I do not propose to say anything more. But there are just a few questions really that are important in this matter. The first is whether we should have any draft at all. I am convinced that we have got to have one. We have had one since 1939 or 1940, along about the time I came here. Whether it is 2 or 4 years, personally I think the committee in its wisdom selected the 4-year extension, and I think that is right.

I think on the whole—and I am happy and proud to be a member of this committee—we have done a pretty good job in a very difficult and complex situation. Everyone would maybe fix it a little differently. Everything in here is not just the way I would want it. But the final result, in my opinion, is a good one and ought to be adopted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I have one question. On page 13 of the bill, specifically, section 6(h), there is reference to student deferment, and the language states:

> *Provided*, That unless such person is deferred for graduate study under the provisions of this subsection such deferment shall terminate on completion of requirements for his baccalaureate or first professional degree, failure to pursue satisfactorily a full-time course of instruction or on attainment of the twenty-fourth anniversary of the date of his birth, whichever first occurs:

I am thinking of the young man who is in law school. The young man who is 23 or 24 years of age and is not due to complete his studies until he is 25 or 26. What would happen to his deferment? Will he be permitted to finish his schooling?

Mr. BATES. That actually is in a different section of the law, but specifically anyone who is in graduate school at the present time, it is the recommendation of our committee that they be continued. In fact, anyone who has even been accepted for the fall term, will, under the provisions of our recommendations, be draft deferrable.

Mr. FINO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, there is no legislation which comes before this body that transcends in importance the bill brought before you today for your consideration. Any legislation that affects any part of the human experience, whether its imprint is in the field of social development or material advancement must be seriously entertained. This bill, however, has no equivalent because it touches the question of life itself.

Your committee, in long hours of hearings, provided a ready audience to every conceivable point of view. I know of no approach to this subject that was not carefully weighed or any proponent or opponent who was denied an opportunity to be heard. Our hearings last year and this year covered over 13 days and 1,400 pages of testimony and exhibits. We had presented to us nearly two hundred different statements either in person or for the record.

In addition, your committee had the benefit of the carefully considered views of the distinguished panel headed by the very capable Gen. Mark Clark. The panel was composed of respected and competent individuals drawn from a variety of professions and backgrounds:

Hon. Sterling Cole was the vice chairman of the panel, an attorney and former Member of Congress, also former Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Earl H. Blaik, former football coach, U.S. Military Academy, presently chairman of the executive committee of the Avco Corp.; Dr. Jerome S. Holland, president of Hampton Institute; Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president of Purdue University; Hon. Robert D. Murphy, former Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs; Rt. Rev. Maurice S. Sheehy, former head of the department of religion at Georgetown University and dean of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Catholic Church until his retirement; Charles E. Saltzman, former Assistant Secretary of State and now a partner in Goldman, Sachs and Co.

From a careful study of all of the positions and recommendations presented, we have decided that the wisest policies to recommend to the House are those contained in this bill. During our hearings and our deliberations we made great efforts to arrive at basic considerations which would be acceptable to all. On most issues, our committee was unanimous in its judgment.

As best we could, we tried to supplant uncertainty with certainty. We tried to write a bill that provided lasting solutions for problems presented to us. We attempted to establish uniformity when situations permitted uniformity. Yet, with a full recognition of the inevitability of circumstances developing which even the closest scrutiny would not divulge at this time, we provided for a degree of flexibility to meet contingencies.

To be sure, there is more than one answer to the problems involved in draft legislation. We made many changes but discarded those recommendations which represented "change for the sake of change." In the 18 years I have been a member of the committee, I doubt if we made as many changes or considered as many alternatives as we did this year. In times past, there were those occasions when we hardly did more than extend the expiration date of the law.

In this bill, we started in by changing the title from "The Universal Military Training and Service Act" to the "Military Selective Service Act of 1967." The old bill was universal in name only. The process of induction and classification is on a selective basis and the new title is so labeled.

At the outset, I would like to address myself to some of the basic problems that confronted us.

In the first place we decided that it was necessary to extend the draft since there was nothing to suggest that we would not continue to need a high level of manpower in our armed services or that there was any better or surer way of obtaining that manpower. From this we moved on to the position of continuing the present selective service system as much as possible since it had, overall, been an effective and efficient operation. The changes which we are recommending to the existing law are in the direction of having the Congress, instead of Presidential discretion, set forth the basic rules for the operation of the draft.

From the overall world situation, we could see no real credible sign that our military operations would be lessening to any degree which would permit the relaxation of our military efforts within the foreseeable future. On the contrary, there seems to be every indication that the Communist bloc countries are going to try to increase the pressures on this Nation, not only through Southeast Asia, but in other parts of the world as well. The latest moves by Nasser indicate that the Communists will encourage other situations to develop in order to divert our attention from our present course in Vietnam.

Recent history, too, shows that the Soviets will try to initiate trouble as they already have in Cuba, in the Dominican Republic, in Venezuela, and in the Congo. We cannot forget that we still have military commitments in Korea which we cannot relax at this time. With so much of our interest—and the Soviet interest—in missiles, there is still much that has to be done on the ground, on the seas, and in the air. We must have the manpower ready and available to meet any other situation which may arise.

To meet our worldwide challenges, the Department of Defense has projected a requirement of close to three and a half million officers and men for our armed services through 1974. There has been nothing presented to your committee from which I can find any different opinion as to this projected need.

If there is going to be this need, then why did we recommend that we raise our Armed Forces through a draft system? It has been suggested that we use a volunteer approach to the problem. Certainly this would appear to be the ideal situation. However, over the past 20 years there have been many efforts to increase the benefits accruing to our military personnel so that military service would be more attractive as a career. Aside from the departmental actions, there have been no less than 58 specific statutes since 1950 designed to attract and retain an adequate permanent force. A mere listing of the basic statutes does not indicate the variety or extent that a particular piece of legislation may have effected improvements, often of sweeping character.

At this point I request permission to include the list of such statutes as set forth on pages 1961–1963 of our hearings this year:

PERSONNEL BENEFITS: 1950–1966

The following enactments during the period from 1950 through 1966 provided significant improvements in the conditions of military service, for members generally, or for specific categories of members. Enactments which extended lapsing laws without substantial change are not included, and a number of minor enactments are omitted because of narrow or technical application.

Public Law 81–506, 2 May 1950: Uniform Code of Military Justice

Public Law 81–609, 12 July 1950: Franking Privilege for Servicemen in certain areas (Korea)

Public Law 81–771, 8 September 1950: Dependents Assistance Act

Public Law 82–346, 19 May 1952; Military Pay Increase

Public Law 82–476, 9 July 1952: Armed Forces Reserve act

Public Law 82–488, 10 July 1952: Combat Pay Act of 1952 (DOD Appropriation Act, Title VII)

Public Law 83–239, 8 August 1953: Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act (Survivors' benefits, retired personnel)

Public Law 83–379, 29 May 1954: Warrant Officer Act of 1954

Public Law 83–506, 16 July 1954: Increase in Reenlistment Bonuses

Public Law 83–560, 2 August 1954: Servicemen's Home Mortgage Insurance

Public Law 83–773, 3 September 1954: Reserve Officer Personnel Act

Public Law 84–20, 31 March 1955: Career Incentive Act (Increase in military pay)

Public Law 84–245, 5 August 1955: Household Goods Military Personnel, Transportation and Storage

Public Law 84–305, 9 August 1955: Reserve Forces Act of 1955

Public Law 84–497, 30 April 1956: Procurement Incentives for Medical and Dental Officers

Public Law 84–569, 7 June 1956: Medical Care for Dependents of Military Personnel

Public Law 84–571, 7 June 1956: Amend Military Personnel Claims Act

Public Law 84–676, 9 July 1956: Readjustment Pay for Reservists released from active duty

Public Law 84–770, 24 July 1956: Amend Armed Forces Leave Act—Payments to Survivors

Public Law 84–777, 24 July 1956: Legal Assistance for Military Personnel Overseas

Public Law 84–879, 1 August 1956: Medical and Hospital Care, and Death Benefits, ROTC and Flight Training

Public Law 84–881, 1 August 1956: Survivor Benefits, dependents of deceased active duty personnel

Public Law 85–30, 14 May 1957: Gifts, Free importation for members of the armed forces

Public Law 85–155, 21 August 1957: Career Program for Nurses and Medical Specialists

Public Law 85–422, 20 May 1958: Military Pay Increase

Public Law 86–635, 12 July 1960: Amendment of Law pertaining to incentive pay for submarine duty

Public Law 87–188, 30 August 1961: Emergency Evacuation of Military Dependents, Advance Pay

Public Law 87–374, 4 October 1961: Allowances for transportation of house trailers, Military personnel

Public Law 87–381, 4 October 1961: Amendments to Contingency Option Act

Public Law 87–500, 27 June 1962: Increased per diem and payment of actual travel expenses for Military Personel

- Public Law 87–509, 28 June 1962: Increased lump-sum readjustment payments for Reservists released from active duty
- Public Law 87–531, 10 July 1962: Increased quarters allowances for armed forces personnel
- Public Law 87–555, 27 July 1962: Acceptance of fellowships, scholarships or grants by members of the armed forces
- Public Law 87–771, 9 October 1962: Prohibit imposition of personal property taxes on serviceman's property
- Public Law 88–132, 2 October 1963: Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1963
- Public Law 88–238, 23 December 1963: Authorizing travel allowances for service members under orders which are later cancelled
- Public Law 88–406, 7 August 1964: Increased allowances for transportation of house trailers
- Public Law 88–422, 11 August 1964: Military pay increase
- Public Law 88–428, 14 August 1964: Extension of Missing Persons Act to cold-war situations
- Public Law 88–431, 14 August 1964: Authorization for advance movement of dependents and personal effects
- Public Law 89–26, 22 May 1965: Authorizing allowances for evacuation of military dependents from overseas stations
- Public Law 89–132, 21 August 1965: Military pay increase
- Public Law 89–149, 28 August 1965: Authorizing incentive pay for performance of certain duties on flight decks
- Public Law 89–150, 28 August 1965: Transportation of remains of deceased military dependents
- Public Law 89–160, 1 September 1965: Dependent language training
- Public Law 89–193, 21 September 1965: Authorizing advanced pay days for military personnel
- Public Law 89–198, 22 September 1965: Armed Forces cash awards (inventions, beneficial suggestions, and scientific achievements)
- Public Law 89–214, 29 September 1965: Authorizing a servicemen's group life insurance program
- Public Law 89–278, 20 October 1965: Authorizing incentive pay for qualified personnel serving on submarine command staffs
- Public Law 89–315, 1 November 1965: Authorizing free mailing privileges for personnel serving in combat areas
- Public Law 89–358, 3 March 1966: Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 (including extension of certain benefits to in-service personnel)
- Public Law 89–501, 13 July 1966: Military Procurement and RDT&E Authorization (included a general military pay increase)
- Public Law 89–538, 14 August 1966: Expanded and enhanced savings deposit program for military personnel overseas
- Public Law 89–614, 30 September 1966: Expansion of medical benefits authorized for dependents of military personnel
- Public Law 89–725, 2 November 1966: Extension of special mailing privileges and rates for mail to and from military personnel overseas
- Public Law 89–735, 2 November 1966: Special leave and transportation for members extending a tour of duty in a hostile fire area
- Public Law 89–739, 2 November 1966: Increase in income tax exclusion for commissioned officers serving in a combat area
- Public Law 89–754, 3 November 1966: Demonstration Cities Program (included relief for homeowners for losses incurred through closure or curtailment of military installations)

This listing by principal purpose of the enactments in a number of cases does not reflect all of the important content of the Acts. This is particularly true of the Acts on military compensation. The 1955, 1958, 1963, and 1965 Acts went far beyond mere adjustments of the pay level and revised the pay structure with the objective of enhancing the career attraction of the pay scales. The 1963 Act authorized the payment of special pay for service when subject to hostile fire; the 1965 Act increased this special pay. The 1965 Act included authorization for payment of increased and variable reenlistment bonuses.

Despite all of these efforts to better the conditions of our Armed Forces, there has not been any great flood of volunteers sufficient to do away with the draft. It is from the background of having worked with these legislative efforts over the past years that I do not see how any further increase in these benefits will assure this Nation of the Armed Forces that it will need.

At this point, I must say that I have very carefully read and studied the many arguments that have been made for voluntary service. I understand and appreciate the spirit with which these thoughts have been proposed, and the care with which they were researched and analyzed before they were presented to us. However, I still do not believe that they would give us the strength we need, and with the perils that confront us at this moment, it is too important a matter to leave to chance.

There have been those who have said that more persons in the lower economic levels would be attracted to military service if there were more remuneration. This might be all right in times of peace, but when many men are dying on the battlefields, is this to suggest that those in the lower economic brackets should carry the burden of the defense of our country?

Having examined the need for our force levels and the necessity of continuing the draft, the next matter was the problem of how the draft should be administered. I have very carefully listened to all of the problems which our present selective system has created, or which it is believed to have created. Carefully weighing the benefits from continuing a system which is in operation and has produced the required manpower through various emergencies, against the benefits of reshaping the entire Selective Service System into fewer local boards and fewer regional centers, I felt that the benefits of retaining the present system outweighed the chaos of establishing a new bureaucracy.

We have, however, recommended that the tenure of local board members be limited to 25 years or to the age of 75 whichever is earlier. We have also recommended that there be national guidelines for the deferment of students, and that other deferments be made on as nearly a national basis as is practicable.

Your committee was particularly impressed with the difficulty of sending either the files or the names of persons to Washington for processing or selection in a central office. The difficulties of keeping up with enlistments, illnesses, or college status of the local citizens is great enough without being compounded by having information sent to a central point for further processing in any way.

This brings me to the increased role that Congress is exercising in the bill before you. The President has set forth certain policies which he would propose to carry out within his executive discretion. We did not believe that the entire draft should be handled within the discretion of the President. Hence it was that instead of merely extending the laws which expire on June 30, we went into many extensive substantive provisions embodied in the bill before you. We believed that it was more proper for the Congress to set forth its desires in specific language in many instances than to rely on Executive discretion.

In one area we have continued the present provisions of the law, but have allowed the President to come back to us with his proposal which would be effective unless the Congress passed a concurrent resolution. This is in the method of selecting, within a particular age group, those who shall be called to serve. The President has said he would like to have the FAIR program as the basis for this selection. The Clark Panel suggested the conveyor belt which is very much like the present method. Since the details of the FAIR method have not yet been established even within the executive branch, we are continuing the present method of making the choice. However, we would permit the President to present any other method which he might devise to the Congress, giving the Congress the right to veto the new method by concurrent resolution if it is not persuaded that the new method is better than the present.

One thing more. The Selective Service System is being required to report back to the Congress on its operation at least once in every quarter. Our committee will establish a special watchdog subcommittee to make an immediate and thorough review of these reports. At the same time it will be able to review any further complaints or problems that may arise in the administration of the law.

I would now like to proceed to some of the other substantive portions of the bill and particularly portions of it which have been controversial.

There are those whose judgment leads them to the conclusion that college deferments are not justified.

I would like first to suggest that the decision is not whether students should be permitted to go to college, but rather, since most of them are already in college at the age of 19, should they be permitted to continue in college? For the most part, then, the deferment is not for 4 years but rather for 2.

There are those who say or infer that college students are shrouded with an indecent and unwarranted parole from their obligation to serve. They are depicted as escapees, evaders of a responsibility to their country. Yet, those deferred in 1962, will go to Vietnam today. There was no Vietnam war in 1962. Of course there are college students who are professional students who are out to beat the draft. By the same token, there are those who are not students who exercise every gimmick in society and the law to postpone or prevent their induction. This bill will not change the inclinations of human nature but it makes it more difficult for some to practice the art. However, the facts are that 85 percent of the college students who pass the physical examination serve in the Armed Forces. This compares to 84 percent for high school graduates.

Your committee examined the student deferment problem very carefully and decided overwhelmingly that there should be continued a blanket deferral for students attending recognized colleges for their baccalaureate degrees Except for extreme hardship cases, the student would have to waive any further deferments unless he were to proceed to further study in an area of importance to our national security. This means that at the end of college, each student would most likely be placed back into the pool of those most vulnerable for service. If the student is dropped by the college, whether for conduct or grades, he will automatically go back into this same pool.

In addition to maintaining our college programs as they are now, this policy will assure the armed services of the necessary quantity of personnel who can be made into officer material. This also stops the academic life of the student at the time when most students stop—and at a time before there is any serious interruption to any professional or specialized study that the student might want to pursue.

All agree, for example that doctors, dentists, and the specialists in the allied medical fields need to be trained in our national interests. If men who were interested in these fields were drafted into the armed services before they had completed their professional training, they would be liable again for induction in accordance with the provisions of the doctor draft law. This would be double jeopardy.

There are, therefore, good and sufficient reasons for having some kinds of deferments—in this instance for the continued education of doctors and dentists. The committee could not see with clarity all the other precise kinds of roles which might be vital to the Nation's security for which other deferments might be necessary. Physicists and electronics engineers come to mind. There might be skills which do not require college training but which might be of as much importance to our Nation, such as tool and die makers. Rather than attempting to write into the law all of the possible deferments, it was decided to establish a National Manpower Resources Board which, under the guidance of the National Security Council, would be able to make current appraisals of our national needs and so advise the Selective Service System. Those who would study for graduate degrees within the fields so specified, or who might even serve apprenticeships in some of them, would be eligible for deferment in the interest of our overall national security.

In order to keep this new system of allowing deferments for graduate work from wreaking complete havoc on our educational institutions, the committee recommends that the Selective Service System permit those who have already been accepted, or who will be accepted by next fall, by any accredited institution for graduate study to complete the course of study for the degree for which they are then accepted, but no more unless the Manpower Board so decrees.

On an overall basis, I am firmly convinced that the provisions your committee has recommended in this bill are the best solutions to the many varied and difficult problems facing us in connection with the draft. These matters should not be left to Presidential discretion, but should be acted upon by the Congress so that the Congress takes its proper role in establishing the legislation needed for this field. The bill may not be perfect but we have removed many imperfections from present law. It does not eliminate uncertainty but it reduces it in a variety of ways. It does not assure absolute equality but it reduces many areas of inequality. It does not purport to solve every problem but it will reduce their numbers and provide an effective watchdog committee in the Congress and a new position in the Selective Service System which shall continue to monitor the operation of the draft law and correct that which can be corrected.

We have taken a law that has been tempered by the test of time and adjusted it to fit the modern era.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the product of our efforts is worth your most earnest consideration and its enactment by the House.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. BATES. I am glad to yield briefly.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Would the gentleman be good enough to inform me what is the present rate that the enlistee gets or the inductee gets when he starts service?

Mr. BATES. I am glad the gentleman raised this point. I suggest that if he will look at the back of the committee report he will find a very interesting comment with respect to this figure. We refer in the report to a situation in Australia, where the rate is $163 a month for the inductee. In this country it is just about half of that.

In Australia they raised the rate to that level in the hope that they could attract 14,000 more men into the armed forces. At that time they had 52,000 men in their Armed Forces. Even though they doubled their rate, that we have, up to $163 a month for the enlistee, they were not able to raise the 14,000 they were looking for.

The answer to the question is $81 a month.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. That scarcely seems ample in terms of inducing men to enlist, if this is the sum total of the 50-some-odd statutes. Certainly this is not a going wage contemporarily in this country.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman has been here for several years. We have had several pay bills up for consideration. I do not recall that the gentleman rose to offer an amendment in this regard.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Indeed, two years ago I did rise to offer an amendment in the House, and I commented on the pay bill at great length at that point.

Mr. BATES. What was the specific recommendation? How much would the pay have been increased?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. At this time I cannot tell the gentleman. I would be pleased to make it a part of the debate. It would have to be substantial.

Mr. BATES. It would have to be.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I say to the gentleman further, it would have to be on the order of $100 a week, probably $5,000 a year.

Mr. BATES. Let me say to the gentleman that they did have this experience in Australia, where they doubled the rate over what we have, and it did not work.

What would be the situation if we did raise the rate for the enlistee to $400 a month and it did not work, as it did not work in Australia? What would we do then?

This problem has been before our committee.

I appreciate the position of the gentleman.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Is the question rhetorical?

Mr. BATES. I do not wish to yield further, but I understand what the gentleman is saying.

I have been on this committee for 18 years, and our committee has tried to do the best it can to increase the pay of those in the Armed Forces.

As a matter of fact, the last bill we presented to this committee was a half billion dollars more than what President Johnson requested. So our committee has gone out of its way in this regard. We increased the pay bill that came before us 2 years ago from $450 million to $960 million, almost a half billion dollar increase in 1 year.

I do not know how far we can go or what we could attain regardless of how far we go. But I say to the gentleman that we have worked hard. We have increased the pay bills significantly beyond what the administration requested. I think we have done a pretty good job overall in other areas.

The net result has been we have not attracted any more people to the Armed Forces than we had previously.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. If the gentleman will yield further, still we are paying, as the gentleman points out, $81 a month. How many men can we expect to attract into the services at $81 a month? We cannot do it.

Mr. BATES. Basically we are not a military Nation. Many of our people came from overseas to avoid the militarism of Europe.

I do not know what will attract young men of 19. When I was a young man I went into the armed services as an apprentice seaman. At that time we did not get any pay.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I wish the gentleman would withhold his question.

Mr. CAREY. I just want to remind the gentleman of some of the discussions he and I have had on the possibility of getting a living wage for servicemen. He has given me in the past some indication of what this might encompass. I think these are very important considerations. The fact that the gentleman is addressing himself to this subject is to me wholesome, because if we do look to this cost-of-living emolument to the servicemen we might answer a great many questions bothering us right now, including the gentleman from Wisconsin. In the course of the offering of amendments I do hope to introduce one that will pay the enlistee or the inductee the minimum wage existing in our country. I do not see how you can avoid doing this, and I believe the fairness and equity of paying a living wage to those whom we ask to do the job of dying is self-evident.

Mr. BATES. I want to thank the gentleman very much for his contribution. The only point that I have tried to make was that since 1950, that we have passed 58 individual pieces of legislation in the hope that we will make the service more attractive. We have fought for comparability of pay as between civilians and the military. The last time the bill was before us we did increase the figure by half a billion dollars over what the President of the United States recommended. We thought we were going pretty far in doing that. Of course, there are many of us who believe we ought to have some responsibility for our debt. Some of us feel we ought to start paying our bills, but I do not see a bill around here asking for an increase in taxes to pay for all of these things we are proposing day in and day out.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. As has been discussed here, there have been many Members of this House and many people in the country who feel a so-called professional military structure would be better than the draft. If we could provide this, I am sure most everyone would welcome this type of arrangement. However, there is one thing that disturbs me. Let me put this in the form of a question. Has anyone given any thought to the present situation wherein the young man who volunteers is actually penalized because by volunteering or enlisting he is obliged to spend more time in the service than the chap who sits by and waits to be drafted? It seems in many cases that I have been aware of a young man finished his college and recognized that he has a military obligation, but he sits and waits until he is drafted because he knows that if he enlists—and he well knows that he faces his military obligation—he will merely extend the tenure of his service. So by adding the penalty of tenure, which is really what the present system provides, it seems to me we discourage at least in that respect the volunteer or the enlisted man.

Mr. BATES. I will say to the gentleman that we have not, of course, devised a duplicate pay system, but we have provided certain benefits to those who enlist. For instance, they can attend service schools. A draftee only receives basic training. They do not get into advanced training or derive as much benefit out of the military programs as those who enlist. I understand and appreciate the gentleman's point of view, but a dual pay system would present some problems. We do not change the system. What we do is train the people a little bit more in the hope that they can be advanced quicker and move to better rates.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BATES. I will be glad to yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HALEY. May I say to the gentleman in the well I think a young man has an obligation to serve his Nation when a crisis develops. As I stand here in this House and talk about the base pay and all of these things I will tell you what my base pay was. I served my country for $15 a month and I got $3 a month for combat pay.

I think I owe that to my country and to know that I served at a time of crisis.

Mr. Chairman, I think some of these young people and some of the Members of Congress ought to begin to think about what do you owe this great Government of yours.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, referring to the statement of the Committee on Armed Services, which appears on page 31 of the committee report, relating to conscientious objectors, there are two paragraphs pertaining thereto. The first paragraph reads as follows:

> The Director of Selective Service advised the Committee on Armed Services that in his judgment this undue expansion of the provision of the law relating to conscientious objection could very easily result in a substantial increase in the number of unjustified appeals for exemption from military service based upon this provision of law.

Mr. Chairman, did the Director of the Selective Service tell the Committee on Armed Services how much of an increase there was likely to be in the conscientious objectors category and how many cases there are of conscientious objectors? Did he state that he had that information before the committee? Did he state that there were a considerable number involved?

Mr. BATES. I do not recall the exact figure.

Mr. HALL. Two hundred and thirty-seven.

Mr. RIVERS. There were 900 inducted.

Mr. BATES. Perhaps the staff members have that information.

Mr. RIVERS. I believe the figure is more than that.

Mr. BATES. Anyway, it was not a great number.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BATES. I yield further to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. That is why I was wondering about the decision of the committee in making these changes in the existing law.

Mr. BATES. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] that it is not a question of numbers. It is a question of what is right and wrong.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, in his remarks a while ago, touched upon this very point. I presume the gentleman from Illinois heard those remarks?

Mr. YATES. Yes; and I realize that the gentleman intends to offer an amendment on this subject. However, the report also says:

> This circumstance coupled with the committee's awareness that the processing of conscientious objector appeals has resulted in delays exceeding 2 years, prompted the committee to completely rewrite this provision of the law.

Do the hearings disclose how many such appeals were pending?

Mr. BATES. There were a good number of these appeals pending.

Mr. RIVERS. All of this information, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, is contained in the hearings.

Mr. YATES. I know this, but there are several volumes of hearings involved in the consideration of this matter by the committee.

Mr. BATES. That information is contained in one of the volumes of the hearings.

Mr. YATES. That is fine, but the gentleman from Massachusetts does not remember which volume that information is contained in and, if so, does the gentleman from Massachusetts remember what it said?

Mr. BATES. No; I did not think it was important insofar as the draft is concerned. If there is any man, if there is any individual who is evading service to his country, I think he ought to be prosecuted and prosecuted forthwith.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts but the gentleman would not feel that one who because of his religious convictions should be compelled to go to war?

Mr. BATES. The gentleman is putting the question on another foot. We are talking about those who are dodging the draft. The gentleman from Illinois knows this. These are the people whom we are after. However, anyone who conscientiously feels that he cannot serve, certainly we are not going to change the law with respect to that.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the gentleman's ready and eager response to these questions, but I wanted to bring up this point: Based upon the gentleman's immediately past remarks with respect to service in the military, I am aware, as the gentleman has pointed out, that it would be undesirable to have our military composed of an army of poor people. Further, I am aware that at the present time the poor people do not apparently make up the majority of inductees and may have a somewhat higher rate of rejection for military service.

I hope the gentleman will comment upon the fact that in the upper enlisted levels they have a tendency to reenlist.

There is a tendency to reenlist from persons coming from minority groups, and others who are historically very poor. We have made it a point of fact we do not want to make this a professional army. We do not want to pay what the prevailing wage is, yet I note on page 39 of the report a section on special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians. That section concludes by saying:

> These special payments are intended to make military medical compensation more competitive with incomes received by persons in civilian life with similar qualifications and experience.

Are we going to do this only for a very small group, or are we not entitled to do this for all persons who are willing or who are required to lose their life in the service?

Mr. BATES. Of course, we do it for doctors, and we do it for doctors because the doctors are the only group who are drafted by profession. We do not draft any physicists. We do not draft any engineers. We do not draft any teachers. The only profession we draft are doctors. So it is a special situation. And this committee and this Congress has for several years handled it specially.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDALL. It is for their professional attainments and their pay is not any greater in the army than their pay in civilian life would be for their attainments in civilian life, and it is exactly comparable in the service.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], who has so ably described the important provisions of this bill.

The gentleman from Massachusetts and the chairman of our committee have provided this committee with excellent leadership during this very difficult period.

The Military Selective Service Act of 1967, as proposed by our committee, reflects a review of past operation and an appraisal of current objectives. We desire to provide an efficient and fair method of assuring adequate manpower for our national defense.

Our study, which has extended over many months, makes very clear that attainment of complete equality is not easy. Our roles in society will inevitably be of wide disparity. Some will sacrifice much, others very little. However, it is essential that the system under which we operate be guided by sound and equitable principles with due recognition of the national interest.

Two questions loomed large in the public mind, namely, should student deferment continue and should we have a lottery?

We approached the question of student deferment strictly from the angle of national goals, and concluded that the long-range interest of our Nation was better served if the basic educational process is allowed to continue. This is true both with respect to long-range civilian needs and the shorter range of military requirements. The strength of our society depends largely upon this educational foundation which can be supported without undue exemption from service.

In addition, our committee found that continued student deferments are vital to military officer procurement programs. The military services require about 40,000 new officers a year. Without the advantage of student deferments and, particularly, when the selection of men to serve is made in the 19-year-old age group, the incentive for young men to enter ROTC programs or to otherwise meet their military obligations as an officer, would be severely reduced.

It is interesting to note that the American Council on Education, which represents the vast majority of institutions of higher learning, supports the position that student deferments should be continued. The council told the committee students are deferred for the national not individual interests.

Having determined that student deferments should continue in the national interest, it was then necessary for our committee to assure maximum equity in the system. We discovered an interesting thing, Mr. Chairman; namely, that the conception that student deferments were providing escape for military service was in error. We discovered that a higher percentage of college graduates completed military service than did other groups in the population. We found, however, the likelihood of service was considerably reduced in the groups progressing beyond the baccalaureate level. It is the pyramiding of deferments by those who continue in graduate study which has provided an escape from service. It appears that only 27 percent of graduate students serve in the Armed Forces, compared to around 70 percent of college graduates.

Mr. Chairman, we have taken care of this problem in the bill by providing that student deferments shall terminate either on completion of the requirements of the first degree or attainment of age 24, whichever occurs first. Those who fail to successfully pursue a full-time course of instruction will automatically lose their deferment.

Those receiving college deferments will not thereafter be eligible for other deferment with rare exception of cases of extreme hardship.

After completing the college work, the student will become liable for induction within the prime age group irrespective of his actual age. That is, if the youngest first system is instituted so that the primary age group is made of 19-year-olds, the student would be considered 19 years old for the purpose of the draft.

Merely deferring a man's service to a later date cannot be considered an inequity, since one is unable to predict the future. There is no way of saying whether the numerical probability of service or the risks or such service will not be greater 4 years from now than it is today. Young men deferred to attend college in 1963 are undoubtedly leading platoons in combat in Vietnam today.

As to the fairest method of selection, there is general agreement among the groups who have studied the draft that the priority of induction should call the youngest men first, beginning with the 19-year-old age group. This would replace the present oldest first system which sees the 26-year-old getting first call.

The committee has given its stamp of approval to this approach. In this, the committee supports the President who presently has the authority to call the younger age group first and who indicated in his message to the Congress that he intends to revise the order of call by concentrating on 19-year-old registrants.

This change alone, Mr. Chairman, will eliminate the principal criticism that has led many people to support a lottery: that is, that the present system has caused unnecessary uncertainty for all young men between 18½ and 25.

The President could introduce a lottery or the so-called "random selection system" among the prime age group under the present law. However, the committee concluded not to support a lottery or the so-called "FAIR"—impartial random—system because it was unable to determine how such a system could work. In fact, there was some disagreement between the Director of the Selective Service and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower as to just how such a system would be implemented.

In addition, the committee found most of the alleged inequities that a lottery would eliminate were confined to the actual classification process and the "FAIR" system would be applied only after classification.

The committee was concerned about the possibility of the random system being introduced in the future and having adverse effect on voluntary enlistments and officer procurement without having any demonstrative salutary effect.

The committee therefore included language in the bill continuing the present system of picking the oldest first among the primary age group unless the President determines that a new system of priorities would be in the national interest. If the President makes such a determination and so advises the Congress, the new system would become effective within 60 days unless the Congress adopted a resolution rejecting the proposed change.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, we leave the door open for a lottery type system in the future if it is proven advantageous but we continue to require that the Congress have an opportunity to express its will on such a change.

In this and other provisions, the committee has sought to reflect the best advice available. I trust the bill will have full support.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield.

Mr. LLOYD. Will the gentleman respond to this question, as to whether any change is contemplated in the present interpretation of the ministerial exemption provisions of the current law under which persons called as ordained ministers of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—Mormon—and who are assigned to serve in the missions of the church qualify for such exemption so long as they are performing such service. At the end of their service as ordained ministers in the missions of the church, which is usually for 2 years, these persons are subject to service as regular registrants. Could the gentleman tell me if there is any change contemplated in this regard?

Mr. BATES. I want to say to the gentleman that the committee made no changes whatsoever in this section of the old law, and I know that it subscribes to the section of the Senate report that addresses itself to this matter.

Mr. LLOYD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I want to commend the chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee. I think they have done a wonderful job, and I certainly intend to support the bill.

However, I think in one case, as I read the bill, maybe you do not go far enough. And this is my question.

I know of the case of a young man who is a pay clerk for the Office of Economic Opportunity of this Government. He was drafted and was asked to step forward and take the oath of office. He refused to take the oath of office, and several Members of the Congress have asked the Director of the OEO to suspend this man until something is done and he has had a chance to plead his case. But the man has not been suspended and he is still on the payroll of the Government and waiting on some action. I cannot find anywhere in this bill where any action would be taken as to someone like this, and I certainly think an amendment should be put in here where if somebody works for the Federal Government and refuses to be drafted, he should be suspended.

Mr. BATES. I am sure the gentleman has read of the considerable amount of time and attention that has been directed in the prosecution of cases by the Attorney General. Also the provision in the bill which gives precedence on the docket for consideration of these cases, so that any draft-evading individual who is being charged by the Attorney General can be tried expeditiously. The language of the bill requires that they have first priority on the dockets of the various courts.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Is there any provision in the bill which states that anyone working for the Federal Government will be suspended until his case has been decided? That is my question.

Mr. BATES. I do not believe we have jurisdiction over civilian employees. I would think that the important thing would be to prosecute the case. Of course, I share the gentleman's views. I suggest that he get in touch with the Attorney General and have this matter resolved in the courts. That is where the situation should be resolved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that a new board is to be created in the Government to be known as the Manpower National Resources Board in connection with this legislation?

Mr. BATES. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Where in the bill is there any indication of the powers and the duties of this board, as well as the manning table of the board? Where do you deal with the personnel that will constitute the board?

Mr. BATES. The committee addresses itself to that question in the early section of the bill, page 7. The President shall establish the board to which the gentleman refers. We indicate it shall be composed of people from civilian life with a variety of backgrounds so that they will understand the various problems and be able to entertain them.

Mr. GROSS. What is the number of the membership of the board? Who appoints the board? The President, I assume, but on what basis?

Mr. BATES. I will say to the gentleman that on page 7 of the bill, line 3, paragraph (g), it states that the President shall establish a National Manpower Resources Board.

Mr. GROSS. I see that.

Mr. BATES. Then we go further and we indicate the various pursuits in life in which we hope these people have experience, and from these various backgrounds, the President shall select people who will be able to sit on this board and have some real background to decide upon these matters.

Mr. GROSS. How many people will be on this board?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. We do not limit the board, because if we did, we might overlook some area to which the President should go to get assistance. These shall be people outside the Government, civilians contributing something to the country. We feel sure the President could select a group that could advise. The board would work in unison with the National Security Council, which the President appoints. We feel that if we were to proscribe certain areas, we could be accused of overlooking something, and I do not think we should limit it.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will yield further, this is rather extraordinary. We would create a board in the Government and we would give the President carte blanche authority to go ahead. I do not know where the money is coming from to support the Board or anything else. I do not know how many supergrades it will have.

Mr. RIVERS. It will have no supergrades at all.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. We would take it from the hands of the HEW, the Labor Department, and the Commerce Department, and we would put it in the National Security Council, the highest echelon of national interest. We would put it in the hands of those people along with this Board which we would create, and the Board would consist of people who have no axes to grind. This is a fine standard, one of the most progressive steps we have ever taken.

Mr. GROSS. I hope you are right.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Do I correctly understand that there will be an amendment offered to section 6(j) which will take care of the so-called old line conscientious objectors and so-called historic peace seekers? Is that correct?

Mr. BATES. The gentleman is correct. A committee amendment will be offered to that effect.

Mr. DOLE. The amendment would restore it——

Mr. BATES. To its current status.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana as much time as he wishes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, this is not an easy bill to vote on because it combines into one package proposals with which Members can agree and others with which they disagree. While I will vote for this measure I believe it can and should be amended in several important respects, as I will indicate in the course of my remarks.

Proposals have been made, Mr. Chairman, to abolish the draft in favor of an all-volunteer military service. These proposals have been carefully considered and uniformly rejected by a number of well-staffed and qualified groups, including the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service and the Civilian Advisory Panel on Military Manpower Procurement.

A Department of Defense study on manpower concludes that the cost of maintaining an all-volunteer force would range from $4 to $17 billion annually. These estimates are based on pre-Vietnam force requirements, so the figures would undoubtedly be higher today. But the significant point here is not just the additional cost, which is substantial, but the high degree of uncertainty in making economic projections of this type.

The Marshall Commission has noted that a dependency on voluntary enlistments would not provide the flexibility in meeting military manpower requirements which is necessary for our national security.

Perhaps more important is the point made by Secretary of Defense McNamara that even if we could obtain the required number of men by means of voluntary service, which he doubts, he would still not recommend it.

I don't believe—

The Secretary said last November—

> that kind of army would be the best kind of army for our Nation. I think it would gradually separate itself from the life of our Nation. It is far better for all of us that we pour through the army, civilians who go into the army and come out of the army and who in a sense civilianize the military service and thereby tie it more closely to the fundamental elements of our National life.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we have any reasonable alternative, after considering all of these factors, but to extend a system of compulsory service. I regret, though, that the committee has recommended a 4-year extension. I think it would be far wiser to limit the extension to 2 years, both to encourage further study and review of this whole system and to allow the next Congress an opportunity to work its will on this program, which so deeply affects the lives of so many of our young men and future leaders.

On the other hand, I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I think several sections of the committee's bill, and several of the committee's endorsements, make important, needed, and warranted improvements in the present draft law.

Reversing the present "oldest first" order of call should remove considerable uncertainty in the minds of our young men about whether or not they will be drafted, and permit them to plan their educations and careers more realistically.

The committee's recommendation to continue undergraduate deferments is a clear recognition that a well-educated citizenry is in the national interest. As the American Council on Education has stated:

> Students are deferred for the national, not individual, interests.

But the committee has added important safeguards to insure that a college deferment does not become a means to secure a permanent deferment from the draft. It has eliminated such questionable deferment devices as college qualification tests and relative class standing.

In effect, the new system would offer a 19-year-old the choice of placing his name in the pool of eligibles at that point, or waiting until he has completed his undergraduate education, or reached the age of 24, whichever comes first. It would not defer him from the draft, but it would allow him to make a decision and then to pursue it with a great deal more certainty than is possible now.

Some have argued that student deferments in a time of war are unconscionable. But the fact is that this bill would permit the President to defer college student deferments if such action were in the national interest. And the fact is as well that it makes little sense to deny young men the opportunity to pursue, and complete a college education—as long as they then become eligible for military service—when there is no national manpower requirement to do so.

In principle, Mr. Chairman, I believe that a random selection of those qualified for the draft is completely in keeping with our efforts to insure fairness and consistency. But, the committee has pointed out that the administration has not yet indicated, or at least made public, how this fair system would work. It makes sense, then, that the Congress should have an opportunity to review this new system once the procedures have been developed.

I particularly want to urge support for the committee's provision requiring the President to establish national criteria for the classification of persons subject to induction. It makes little sense that draft boards in different States, let alone boards in neighboring communities, would use different standards. A boy in California should be judged the same as a boy in New York. And a boy in Berkeley, Calif., should be evaluated on the same criteria, with the same relative degree of emphasis, as a boy in the adjacent city of Oakland. The requirement that criteria would be administered uniformly—the absence of which has been primarily a national and not a local failure—is a major step forward in my judgment.

Mr. Chairman, the President's Commission on Selective Service recommended the complete abolition of postgraduate deferments for other than physicians and dentists. It also would eliminate all occupational and agricultural deferments. Both actions, I believe, would be too restrictive.

I am well aware that students pursuing postgraduate studies have performed, relatively, far less military service than other young men. I in no way condone the use of a graduate education as a means to "beat" the draft. I feel that at some time all eligible men should have their names subjected to the chance of selection.

But deferments, whether they be academic or occupational, have traditionally been provided out of regard to the national interest and not in view of the individual's interest. The setting up of a National Manpower Resources Board which, in conjunction with the National Security Council, would identify those occupations, professions, and areas of postgraduate study that are critically required in the national interest, seems much more reasonable and logical than a sweeping abolition of all such deferments.

Mr. Chairman, my principal objection to this bill is to the section which would change the law as it affects conscientious objectors. Under our present law, those who are determined by their selective service boards to be conscientious objectors may be ordered, in lieu of induction, to perform civilian work of national health, safety, or interest for a period of time equal to the time draftees spend in the military service.

The committee's bill would significantly change this. It would require that all conscientious objectors actually be inducted into military service before any could be "furloughed" to appropriate civilian work. Throughout this period they would be subject to military authority.

The members of the historic peace churches—such as the Quakers, Amish, Mennonites, and Church of the Brethren—because of their religious convictions, have traditionally refused induction and military authority, although they have been willing to perform alternative civilian service. This proposed change would result in most, if not all, of these sincerely motivated people being made subject to criminal prosecution with potential 5-year sentences and $10,000 fines for violation of the draft law.

I do not think that Congress should approve, sanction or encourage such action. Offered this consequence, I believe it would be far wiser for Congress to retain the provisions of the present law, although I am in great sympathy with the committee's desire to prevent the use of conscientious objector status by those who would shirk or avoid their responsibilities as citizens. I urge the House to delete this section of an otherwise generally balanced bill.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, one of the great concerns to the public is whether or not the selective service law is being adequately enforced. A widespread conviction that evasion of the requirements of this law were not promptly and properly punished, undermines public confidence in the fairness of the draft law and in the Government itself. Nothing is more galling to the parents of a son who complies with the law and enters service when he is reached than the endless stream of publicity about individuals who by one means or another are delaying or avoiding meeting their obligation to participate in the national defense.

Information developed by the Armed Services Committee during its hearings, as well as by some studies of selective service operations, indicate that there is considerable basis for dissatisfaction with the enforcement of the act. The committee determined that no inadequacies of the statute should contribute in any way to the public impression that draft evaders are treated gently. The committee identified several areas where it appeared necessary to modify the law to leave no doubt that insofar as Congress is concerned and insofar as its influence can be made effective there shall be an evenhanded application of the requirements of this law to all individuals.

Those areas where the law was amended in the interests of better enforcement are:

First. Some registrants, having failed or refused to comply with the law, are indicted and prosecuted for this offense. However, through the utilization of procedures provided in law, a registrant with means to employ a resourceful attorney can prolong such litigation in some cases until he attains an age at which the prospect of service is highly unlikely. Whatever the outcome of the court proceedings, he has for practical purposes, evaded service.

To meet this situation, although it may be an infrequent one, the committee has proposed an amendment to section 4 of the act which would continue the liability of such a registrant irrespective of his age. Under the proposed amendment, whatever the outcome of the court proceedings and whenever they were finally terminated, the registrant would still be liable and would be immediately inducted, when available. This means in the case of a conviction and a prison sentence that upon his release from confinement and discharge from any parole or probation such a registrant would be available and would be immediately inducted.

Second. The committee received testimony that recently the courts have intervened in some cases prior to the time the registrant has either refused to report for induction and is under prosecution or has been inducted and seeks release through a writ of habeas corpus.

Section 10 of the draft law clearly enunciates the intention of the Congress that the decisions of local boards, appeal boards, and the President on classification of registrants shall be final. The finality provision is to avoid unfettered court interruptions with selective service processing which holds the possibility of effectively preventing the Congress from carrying out efficiently and effectively its constitutional duty to raise and support armies. This finality principle is well established in Supreme Court cases which have stated the law to be that the courts should not take jurisdiction until selective service processing has been been completed and the registrant has either been inducted or faces prosecution for failure to comply with the law. This is the only proper point in selective processing at which the courts should enter the case. Established law further provides that the validity of the classification assigned to the registrant by the local board, the appeal board, or the President, shall be an issue only if there is no basis in fact for the classification in the registrant's file when the classification was assigned.

To emphasize this established law on finality for the edification of some of the lower courts, the committee bill amends section 10 of the act simply to restate the established law as outlined above.

Third. The present law in section 12 provides that precedence shall be given to cases in the courts arising under this title and that they shall be advanced on the docket at the request of the Attorney General. The committee received testimony from the Department of Justice indicating that no use had been made by the Attorney General of this authority.

To insure prompt court proceedings in cases arising under this law, the committee bill amends that provision to direct that precedence shall be given by the courts to such cases and eliminates the requirement that the Attorney General must request that they be advanced on the docket.

Fourth. The committee also received considerable information to the effect that the U.S. attorneys and the Justice Department declined to prosecute cases of alleged violation of the act on grounds, to the committee, appeared to be outside the authority or the competence of the U.S. attorney or the Justice Department. For example, in a number of cases the U.S. attorney has given as a reason for not prosecuting, the fact that he disagreed with the classification given by the local or appeal board. In such a case, not only is the U.S. attorney taking to himself the resolution of an issue which is reserved for the courts, but is modifying the law on the point as stated by the Supreme Court, that is, that the courts will not question a classification if there is any basis in fact in the file to support the classification when it was assigned.

In other cases, U.S. attorneys have declined to prosecute for such reasons as a change in the registrant's status since his offense; the fact that he has been prosecuted for a previous violation of the draft law, either the same or different violation; the fact that the registrant has a criminal record which would make him unacceptable to the military service; the fact that there was no showing of actual knowledge of the requirements of the law and for similar reasons, none of which in the committee's opinion, are valid reasons for a determination of the U.S. attorney not to prosecute. In the committee's view, the U.S. attorney should decline to prosecute only where there is insufficient evidence to make out a prima facie case of the violation of the law.

The committee was also informed that the Department of Justice had generally declined to seek prosecution of cases where there was evidence of a violation of those provisions of section 12 which make it an offense to counsel, aid, or abet, any person to evade registration or service under the draft law. The impression the committee gained was that the Department of Justice had practically predetermined in every such instance that the first amendment to the Constitution precluded even presentation of such a case to a grand jury.

In an effort to meet this reluctance to present to the courts issues which the courts and not the U.S. attorneys should decide, the committee bill proposes an amendment to section 12 which would require the Attorney General to proceed with a prosecution or an appeal of a case arising under this title upon the request of the Director of Selective Service, and if the Attorney General determines not to honor such a request that he shall report in writing, to the Congress his reasons for not honoring the request.

These four changes in the law should have a salutory effect upon enforcement of the act and compliance with those provisions.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE], a member of the committee, 10 minutes.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that in voting for this bill in the committee—which I did—I did so because I thought it was a fine bill and the finest that we could bring out of the committee. But such is not the case. I was one of those who did vote for it, but I voted for it on the grounds that I thought its necessity outweighted its inequity. I would ask the Members to look at the additional views which are filed on pages 48 and 49 of the report.

I have heard from both sides of the aisle the cry "Vote! Vote!"

I would like to give a few dull statistics in answer to that cry. In January, we lost 520 American dead; in February, 662; in March, 944; in the first days of this month, 772; and it appears likely that this month we will lose more than 1,000 American lives. In wounded, there have been 5,161 in the first 20 days. So I believe it is wholly justified that we take some sober time to talk about the equity of what we are doing here. I particularly want to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] for his remarks on this subject.

The question we are concerned with—and nobody is concerned more than anybody else—is that of fairness. Everybody wants to be fair. We have talked an awful lot about how to achieve this fairness. We have talked about whether a lottery is the fair way, or whether the present system is a fair way. We have talked about changing the system of picking the people.

But essentially what we have been talking about is how the names are picked out of the hat, and what we have not talked about is how many names are left out of the hat in the first place.

I have no quarrel with student deferments in time of peace but this is not a time of peace. The majority say—and I will quote now from page 23 of the report—as follows:

> The clear inference being that all young men do not have an equal opportunity to make an election as to whether they should go on to college or serve their country in a military uniform.

I do not want there to be any question about it. I am not making an inference. I am stating that not all men have an equal opportunity to go to college. I do not want there to be any inference about it.

There are all kinds of statistics on this. Of those who were in the top 10 percent of their class, five times as many people who had incomes under $3,000 did not go to college as those who had income over $3,000.

There are all kinds of statistics on the fact that it is more likely that a rich man will go to college than that a poor man will go to college. I do not believe anybody in this room really in his heart denies this or doubts this. More children of rich people wind up in college than children of poor people wind up in college.

The majority, on the same page, quote the Commissioner of Education on the subject of scholarships that are available, and, quite frankly, it is nice to have the Commissioner of Education being quoted in a favorable light on this floor. This is almost a unique situation. But if we are going to talk about student deferment—and that is what we are concerned with—let us talk about what the Commissioner said about student deferment.

He said he was opposed to student deferments. He said he was emphatically opposed to them on the graduate level and he was personally opposed to them on the undergraduate level.

I believe that what we are doing in this bill is locking into it and freezing into it some inequities which have haunted us ever since the draft calls went up. I believe we are going to make the inequities harder to get rid of by the language proposed on student deferments.

I will, at the proper time, move to strike that language out.

Several Members have raised a question on the National Manpower Resources Board. One might get the impression, from reading the report, that the only student deferments we will continue to have will be deferments for undergraduates. Oh, no, that is not the case. Read the law. Read the bill.

The National Manpower Resources Board will have the power to recommend student deferments for graduate students. Here we are once again, compounding the injustice of student deferments piled upon student deferments.

It is perfectly true that a man who was deferred in 1962 as a student might well be going to Vietnam today.

As I said, in time of peace I have no objection to student deferments. But in time of war the question is not whether one gets his education now or gets his education later. The question in time of war is not whether to serve now or to serve later.

At the present rate of casualties for the first 20 days of the month of May, what we are talking about, spread over the next 4 years, which this bill would cover, is approximately 48,000 boys who are going to be killed.

We are talking about something more than when to serve in the service.

All men are going to die. Half of what we talked about in the bill before this was how we could postpone the time. This is what life is all about. When do we die?

I suggest that in time of war there is no justification whasoever for saying to a group of our citizens which is wealthier than the rest of our citizens, "Others will take their chances on dying now, but you take your chances on dying 4 years from now." It is saying that those who are wealthier shall postpone for 4 years the risks of being one of the 48,000 dead or one of the 300,000-some wounded.

I submit that in time of war we have an obligation to take care of our Nation's interest.

Education is important to all of us, but nothing is more important than being just to all our people.

As to this National Manpower Resources Board, some were concerned yesterday about a little bit of Federal control over education. This Board is going to have the power to say, "If you study this subject you will be deferred. You study in this field of work, and you do not take the risk of being one of the dead."

That is the power which this National Manpower Resources Board is going to have over determining who lives and who dies.

This is not simply Federal control over what school one goes to or with whom one sits in school. This is Federal control over who lives and who dies.

I submit to you in time of war we have an obligation to be just.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. I am sure the gentleman wants to be accurate. This Board has not power to do anything save and except advise the President.

Mr. PIKE. Of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state I am in favor of this bill and associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the members of this committee in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill to extend and amend the draft law.

I am particularly glad to see that the Armed Services Committee has decided to continue the policy of granting deferments to those of our Nation's young men who are pursuing their education. Otherwise, where would we get our leaders of tomorrow?

I am afraid that many young men would never go back to school if they were taken away from their books at age 19 or 20. Therefore, I think we are well advised to let young men continue their education at age 19, while still remaining liable to the draft—in the same fashion as 19-year-olds—at age 24 or such younger age at which they complete 4 years of college.

I am confident that this new policy will prove workable, and will not facilitate de facto draft evasion, as has sometimes been the case with our old policy.

I also hope that liberal provision will be made for postgraduate-school deferments where these are in the best interest of the country. I do not think these deferments should be limited to medical, dental, technical, or scientific training. What about lawyers? Who would make the laws if there were no lawyers? Who would defend people in need of lawyers?

One of the most praiseworthy changes to be made in the draft system is that by which 19-year-olds will be inducted ahead of 25-year-olds, just the opposite of the present system. According to expert testimony, the younger men make better soldiers, largely because they are more flexible and less set in their ways. It is also far better to induct young men at 19 than to leave them up in the air regarding their military obligation until age 23 or 24. I hope that the President will draw up his Executive order to begin drafting 19-year-olds first as soon as possible.

Lastly, I would like to urge the President to relax some of the restrictions under which the services reject young men with minor criminal or juvenile offense records. Often, these offenses are minor, but they serve to keep the young men in question out of the Army. I fail to see why our Nation's punks and hoods should be excluded from service. I do not necessarily advocate mingling them with our regular military units, but in view of the fact that the draft offers a chance to take our Nation's punk population off the street for 2 years, I think we ought to use it. Frankly, it would be a lot cheaper than the Job Corps—and a lot more effective.

I can just see some of our Nation's young punks shaping up fast when confronted with a drill sergeant and not one of Sargent Shriver's bleeding-heart social workers. I think it is a sorry state of affairs when the average young American is jerked out of his home life and career to fight in the malarial swamps of Vietnam so that the punk population can live a life of ease in the Job Corps at a per capita expense of $30,000 to the American taxpayer. This is no belt tightening in my book. I hope that the President will use the draft to take the punks off the street.

In summation, this is a good bill, and I urge its passage, but I hope the President will implement it in the manner I have suggested.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, the great Committee on Armed Services has been wrestling with the problem of who shall serve when not all must serve and has concluded that the best solution is an extension of selective service.

Because we are now fighting a war in Vietnam, I suppose there is no other immediate or short-term alternative.

However, Mr. Chairman, we should not allow the fact of the Vietnam war to confine our consideration of military manpower practices to the short-run needs created by that war, but rather, we should work toward a long-run solution.

Selective service is not such a solution. During an all-out war such as World War I or World War II, the draft was not only essential, but workable. It was workable because almost all young men had to go.

At the other extreme, in peacetime, with no conflicts anticipated, a voluntary armed service composed of volunteers at low rates of pay was workable.

Mr. Chairman, today we have neither all-out war nor all-out peace and neither the draft nor a low-pay voluntary armed service seems to be the ideal solution.

Therefore, I urge the Armed Services Committee to give consideration to:

First. Designating a system of military manpower procurement which places maximum reliance on volunteers; and

Second. Raising base pay and fringe benefits for servicemen in order to eliminate the financial inequity of both voluntary and involuntary military service.

Selective service causes a huge, wasteful turnover of personnel and interrupts tens of thousands of careers. A cumbersome and inefficient training apparatus must be maintained to train the 380,000 persons now drafted each year.

Undoubtedly, the draft cannot be abolished immediately. For one thing, it would be impossible to secure sufficient volunteers to meet unforeseen emergencies like 1965's massive buildup for Vietnam. For another, it will take several years of experimentation with varying levels of pay and fringe benefits to determine what combination of inducements will best attract and hold the needed volunteers.

Within the existing framework of military service, volunteers could be encouraged by increasing salary levels for volunteers above those for draftees and vastly upgrading on-base living conditions and educational opportunities.

Furthermore, within the next decade, the pool of potential volunteers will greatly increase. Last year 1.79 million American men turned 18; by 1974, more than 2.1 million youths will turn 18.

The Pentagon estimates that if the draft were dropped immediately, the annual input of military manpower would almost immediately decrease by 50 or 60 percent, and the powerful reserves would soon deteriorate.

If steps were taken to implement steps toward a volunteer force while the draft still operates, this would not be the case. Draft quotas could be adjusted to reflect the growing number of volunteers, and, if peace is restored, could be dropped to near zero.

Estimates on the additional costs of an all-volunteer military establishment range from $4 billion to $20 billion a year. The Pentagon says these costs would be "prohibitive."

But it now costs the Government $18,000 a year to keep a soldier in uniform, a figure derived mainly from the overhead inherent in a high personnel turnover—only 7 percent of draftees reenlist—and extensive training facilities.

This figure could very well be reduced in spite of the increased salaries and fringe benefits that will be needed to attract skilled volunteers. The specialized and inefficient training facilities now necessary could be greatly reduced, because a high proportion of volunteers would already have the required skills and the current turnover in high-skill positions would be greatly decreased.

A study by Prof. Walter Y. Oi of Washington University estimates that a volunteer level of 334,000 men a year would be sufficient to maintain a voluntary active duty military force of 2.65 million, provided that pay and fringe benefits were increased as follows:

Monthly pay rates for first-term recruits would have to be raised by a whopping 167 percent, Professor Oi estimates, to lift the base pay of a private from $1,200 to $3,200 a year, his overall earnings from $1,900 to $3,900 a year.

To prevent those enlisted men and noncommissioned officers who have been serving for 4 or 5 years from getting less than new recruits under the new pay scale, rates for career soldiers and noncoms would be raised by 17 percent. Rates for commissioned officers would climb by 21 percent.

Professor Oi estimates that these pay increases would result in a $4 billion increase in annual military expenditures. This estimate does not take into account several potential savings.

A "system of variable enlistment bonuses or pay differentials across services" could be established to balance volunteers between the services that normally have a surfeit of volunteers—the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines—with the Army, which has a chronic deficit of volunteers, Professor Oi says.

Additional savings would result from having fewer men in a training status and by continuing to substitute civilians for military personnel in clerical and other nonmilitary jobs. Professor Oi concludes by saying that:

> If the pay of military service can be put on a footing comparable to pay in the civilian sector, it should not be difficult to attract one man in five—and that is all we need to staff a force of 2.65 million men.

It is more than obvious that military pay levels are far below those for comparable jobs in civilian life—even for comparable jobs in other branches of the U.S. Government.

To illustrate, let us assume that an Army captain and a State Department FSO–8, both with 6 years of experience and regular within-grade promotions, both married and the father of two children, are assigned to Saigon. They must both leave their families behind, and there is no Government-owned housing available for them abroad.

They start out on their trip having roughly the same monthly base pay: $611.10 for the captain, and $626.34 for the FSO–8. But when they arrive, the FSO–8's earnings skyrocket in comparison to the captain's. The FSO gets "hardship differential" amounting to 25 percent of his monthly pay, an extra $156.57, while the captain, like every other member of the Armed Forces, from General Westmoreland to the newest E–1, gets $65 a month in "hostile fire pay."

Both men go looking for quarters in the private market. The FSO has a quarters allowance of $266.67 a month to work with, the captain las less than half that much, $130.05. However, he can make up a little bit of the gap by using his $47.88 a month subsistence allowance. The FSO does not get any cost-of-living differential in Saigon, because it is cheaper than in the United States.

Because both men must maintain families back in the States, they have separations allowances. But the FSO, for his wife and two children, gets $275 a month, the captain, with the same number of dependents, a mere $30 a month.

If you add it all up, the FSO, whose base pay is just $15 a month higher than the captain's, makes a cool $1,324.58 a month in Saigon, nearly double his base pay, while the captain gets a total of $884.03 a month to maintain himself under nearly identical circumstances.

It is obvious that if an Army captain, like our FSO–8, could be sure of earning $15,895 volunteering for service in Vietnam, he probably would do so. Under present pay scales, he will earn a maximum of $10,608, a far smaller inducement than that offered to any civilian employee for service in Saigon.

By a judicious combination of increases in base pay and combat pay I believe that we can reduce, and maybe someday eliminate, our reliance on the draft. This is to be highly preferred over a system, however fair, which exposes a minority of our young people, on an involuntary basis, to a danger which the majority of his peers escape.

MILITARY

The pay and allowances of members of the armed services of the United States are determined according to section 203, of title 37 of the United States Code—"Pay and allowances of the uniformed services."

The following information comes from Col. J. R. Burkhart and Maj. Robert Serra of the Compensation Administration Directorate, Military Personnel Policy Division, in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower.

According to the above regulations, the following is the monthly compensation that a U.S. Army captain with 6 or more years of service would receive if he were assigned to Vietnam. Obviously, he is not allowed to have his family with him, but we shall assume he is married and has two children.

Base pay (for officers assigned to hostile fire zones, up to $500 a month of their normally taxable income becomes tax-free)	[1] $611.10
Hostile fire pay (flat rate for every soldier, sailor and fly-boy in a hostile fire zone; not taxable for enlisted men or warrant officers, taxable for officers subject to proviso above)	65.00
Separation allowance (flat rate for both officers and enlisted men in any post away from their families; taxable for officers and enlisted men in nonhostile fire zones; not taxable for enlisted men and warrant officers in hostile fire zones)	[2] 30.00
Quarters allowance (not taxable under any circumstances; varies according to rank, number of children, etc.)	130.05
Subsistence allowance (not taxable under any circumstances; varies according to rank, number of children, etc.)	47.88
Monthly total	[3] 884.03

[1] Section 112, Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

[2] Separate allowance can be larger if two homes must be maintained.

[3] Monthly total taxable income equals $206.10.

There is no education allowance for the dependents of military personnel, primarily because most bases and posts have their own schools. However, there are cases in which there are no schools suitable for the soldiers' children to attend, and in order to take care of these cases, there is a bill (H.R. 2082) scheduled for hearings before the Armed Services Committee soon, which would grant privileges similar to those now granted to civilians to soldiers.

Because the "hostile fire pay" is a flat rate differential, every effort is made to make sure that those who bear the brunt of the fighting get every possible pay break. For example, the entire income of any enlisted man or warrant officer assigned to a hostile fire zone is exempt from taxation for as long as he is in that zone. Officers, however, may treat only $500 a month of their taxable income as tax free when assigned to hostile fire zones. Also, enlisted men get from $8 to $22.50 monthly in "foreign" or "sea" pay. Officers get nothing.

"Hostile fire pay" replaces the old "combat pay" which was originally intended only for the "foxhole soldiers," the men who actually were shot at. Combat pay proved administratively unworkable, because the Navy and Air Force began to claim they deserve it, too. Furthermore, it was difficult to determine who actually was being fired at all the time.

Finally, hostile fire pay was created for anyone serving in a zone where hostile fire could be expected. In Vietnam, for example, the desk jockey in Saigon's safest building gets the same as the dogface on a long-range patrol in the DMZ. Also, sailors on ships in the waters off Vietnam and Air Force pilots in South Vietnam or who fly from Thailand on missions over North or South Vietnam get hostile fire pay.

From 1963 to 1966, hostile fire pay was $55 monthly. There are no current bills aimed at raising the combat pay premium, mainly because of the cost implications.

CIVILIAN

The Overseas Differentials and Allowances Act—Public Law 86-707, 5 U.S.C.—governs the differentials and allowances for all U.S. Government civilian employees assigned to foreign posts.

According to Mr. Joseph W. Lethco, director of the allowances program in the office of the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, and to one of his regulations assistants, the following is the monthly compensation that a Foreign Service officer, grade 8, who had received five within-grade promotions in his 6 years of service, would receive during his assignment in Saigon. The information assumes that he is married and the father of two children and has been forbidden to bring them with him because of the dangers of Saigon life today. It assumes further that he cannot get living quarters in Government-owned buildings and must find quarters in the private market.

Base pay (taxable)	$626.34
Hardship differential (25 percent of base) (also taxable)	156.57
Quarters allowance (not taxable)	266.67
Separation allowance (not taxable)	275.00
Subsistence allowance (this covers cost of living differentials in posts more expensive than United States; however, Saigon is cheaper)	
Monthly total	[1] 1,324.58

[1] Of this total, only $782.91 is taxable income. On a yearly basis, the monthly total amounts to earnings of $15,895, of which only $9,395 is taxable. It is interesting to note that this same FSO-8 would earn a grand total of only $7,516 a year if he were posted in Washington. This is comparable to a GS-7.

Another interesting feature of the allowance system for civilian employees overseas is the so-called education allowance. If our FSO were to send his two children to an "adequate" school in the Saigon area—there are none, according to the State Department—he would receive $350 per child per school year through the first eight grades, $500 per child per school year for the ninth through 12th grades. If our FSO had his family with him in Saigon, but had to send his children away to school, he would receive a flat $2,000 per child per school year to help him out with the expense. If he had his family with him, he would also get a whopping $4,200 annual quarters allowance, but no separation allowance.

Type of compensation by monthly rate for assignment to Saigon, South Vietnam	FSO-8 with 6 years' within-grade experience	Notes	U.S. Army captain with 6 years in the rank	Notes
Base pay	$626.34	Taxable	$611.10	Taxable (but up to $500 deductible in hostile fire zones).
Hardship differential or hostile fire pay.	156.57	25 percent of base pay, also taxable.	65.00	Flat rate for all servicemen, regardless of rank; taxable for officers.
Quarters allowance (without dependents).	266.67	Not taxable	130.05	Not taxable.
Separation allowance	275.00	Not taxable; varies by rank, number of dependents at home.	30.00	Flat rate for all servicemen, regardless of rank; taxable for officers in hostile fire zones.
Subsistence allowance (or cost-of-living differential).		Based on relative cost of living; Saigon is cheaper than the United States.	47.88	Not taxable, varies according to rank, number of dependents.
Total monthly	1,324.58	($782.91 taxable)	884.03	($206.10 taxable).

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, no question has received more widespread public debate than the question of student deferments, which was just discussed by the previous occupant of the well of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

There is virtually general agreement that graduate student deferments should be terminated except for physicians, dentists, and other critical skills.

There remains, however, the question of undergraduate student deferments. The overwhelming majority of our committee, the Clark panel, and a minority of the President's Commission support continuation of undergraduate deferments. The President himself delayed a decision on the matter pending further congressional debate.

Four members of the committee found, in good conscience, that they could not support continued student deferments. Of course, we respect their decision of conscience in this area.

But it is not right, Mr. Chairman, to say that because some, unfortunately, must die and others do not, that this is the fault of a selective service system. This is a selective service system. Some are selected and some are not. That is just the way the ball bounces.

These members feel that student names are, to use their phrase, "left out of the hat in the first place," when the names are pulled for those who must go into service. We are, they say, in time of war saying to certain young men, "you do not have to go to war."

Mr. Chairman, I think it has to be emphasized that the names of those who go to college are not being left entirely out of the hat. It is a question of the time at which their names will be in the hat. But they will be there. At some point in time, they will face a liability to service to the same degree as other 19-year-olds.

We are not saying to these young men "you do not have to go." What we are saying to them is "we are delaying your time to go so that you can gain an education that will make you of greater value to your country when you do go."

It should be recognized that those who are deferred to go to college, and those who eventually serve as officers, are serving a longer period than those who are drafted now. As officers, they will render 4 years of active duty as opposed to 2 for a draftee. The four members of the committee who opposed the student deferments implied that the committee was minimizing the criticism of the draft by maximizing privileges from it. In all honesty, I do not think that remark is justified. The committee was thinking not of the equity of individual students and certainly not of silencing any student criticism, but merely in the interest of the Nation.

The students who have been most critical of the draft and of our national involvement in Vietnam, are certainly not going to be any less critical of it because we provide students deferments. In this bill we are closing the loophole to escape the draft which existed in the past through the pyramiding of deferments.

The four who opposed student deferments accused the majority of falling victim to an easy cliche in saying that education is essential to our national interest. But I am afraid they fell victim to their own rhetoric when they say that education is just as valuable after military service as before. The fact is that many young men find it difficult to go back and pursue their education after service. Many of them take on added family responsibilities while in service. And it is a simple fact that the Nation does need a steady input of college-trained men into the Armed Forces, an input that would be extremely difficult to achieve without student deferments. At the heart of the concern of student deferments is the feeling that the war might be over in 4 years, and students who have been deferred from combat while other men would supposedly have done their fighting for them.

Our four colleagues say that in the

next 4 years the war might escalate to where everyone is involved or it might be over, and the question of who should be called when would be academic.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, certainly, we all hope and pray that it will be over, but we cannot predict the future. We cannot say whether that engagement or other situations might require draft calls to the same extent that we have them today or to a slightly increased level. A student deferred in 1964 when we were initially engaged in Vietnam might find in 1968 that he is facing a much greater risk during his time of military service than he would have in 1964. Who of us can say what conditions will prevail in 1971? Even without student deferments, not all men would be called, and the percentage of those who do go to war is always a small percentage of those who wear the uniform. Absolute equity is a noble ideal, but it is unattainable.

In the name of an ideal of equity which is really unattainable, should we end student deferments which are truly in the national interest?

Mr. Chairman, I do not think so, and I do not believe this House thinks so.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote for the military Selective Service Act of 1967—as reported to the House by the Committee on Armed Services together with any amendments enacted through the wisdom of this body. But I would like the record to show that support of this legislation should in no way be interpreted as a rejection on my part of the goal of an all-volunteer Armed Forces.

Conscription for military service is inherently at odds with the basic precepts of democratic government. The goal of the Congress, of the Defense Department, and of the administration should be continually to strive for maximum voluntary enlistment in the Armed Forces and minimum reliance upon the compulsion of the draft.

Unfortunately, the present administration has not seen fit in my opinion to supply the Congress with adequately detailed information upon which it can make a final judgment on the feasibility of an all-volunteer service. The President's Commission on Selective Service had precious little to say on this subject. What the Department of Defense has had to say has been highly selective and has failed to convince me that an all-volunteer service could not evolve if the Congress and the administration were to adopt the appropriate reforms.

In particular, I seriously doubt the accuracy of Defense Department cost estimates for an all-volunteer service which have been presented to the House Committee on Armed Services. The prohibitive nature of those estimates has unfortunately stunted a productive debate on the merits and feasibility of an all-volunteer Armed Forces.

On the other hand, even if an all-volunteer army could evolve, and even if it were possible today, I would still support legislation to provide a Selective Service System, which could continue to register all young men—and could be an emergency source of manpower for the Armed Forces under crisis conditions.

Therefore, support for the draft law now before the House should in no way be interpreted in my opinion as opposition to the evolution of an all-volunteer army. On the contrary, each Member who votes to continue any program of military conscription obligates himself, in my judgment, to a most searching review of all potential reforms in the military services which might raise voluntary enlistment to the highest level possible and reduce draft calls to the lowest level possible.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to associate myself with the comments of my good friend from the State of Vermont.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the urgency connected with this action to extend the Selective Service Act and, I am also aware of the great amount of careful study and planning that went into this bill we are considering today. However, I do not believe that all of the questions regarding selective service have been answered satisfactorily, nor have all the controversies been resolved. I do not believe that this body would be meeting its responsibilities if we simply pass this legislation and then forget about it for another 4 years. Therefore, I wish to associate myself with those Members who would limit extension of this draft law for 2 years so that we might continue congressional attention to the equity of this legislation and the administration of it.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my view that conscription into the military should be used as a tool of necessity, not a crutch of convenience, and every step should be taken to encourage voluntary enlistments.

Finally, while it is my intention to vote in favor of this extension of the present Selective Service System, I look forward to the day when I may rise in support of legislation designed to establish an all-volunteer armed force.

This spring, I wrote to the chairmen and members of every draft board in the State of North Dakota. These are conscientious and dedicated people who contribute freely of their time to what is, at best, a thankless task. I asked them for their opinions of the various proposals that had been made to overhaul the Selective Service. Nearly all of them, I am pleased to say, responded to my letter and these people are almost unanimous in their feeling that the local draft boards must be maintained. They point out, and I certainly agree, that only at the local level can the real merits of deferments and classifications be determined fairly and responsibly. Very often local draft board members are able to draw upon their own knowledge of the problems military service may present to individuals in their own area, thereby insuring equitable treatment to all. I was proud to pass on their individual recommendations to our colleagues on the committee who drafted the legislation.

In short, Mr. Chairman, our local draft board members continue to do a difficult job—and do it well. Therefore, I wish to take this opportunity to commend them for the important service they provide and to urge that the responsibility vested in them be continued, but with reasonable guidelines established so they may guide their separate decisions toward the goal of better understanding and more uniform application across the Nation.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be very glad and happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman yielding to me. I would like to associate myself with his remarks with respect to the need for giving further consideration to an all voluntary force.

Mr. Chairman, the way things have been going around here these past few days—no legislative business, week after week, or anyway nothing of any importance—and then, all of a sudden, a legislative week as full and clogged up with activity as this one has been, with all bills important bills, one requiring, as our physical appearances still testify, our staying into session until the wee, small hours of this morning, followed by a day as active as this one has been, and now ending up with such an important measure as the pending extension of the Selective Service Act, one would think we were approaching final adjournment rather than just a short, Memorial Day weekend.

I recognize the fact that we are operating under a deadline of sorts, insofar as this bill is concerned but, in view of its great importance—in view of the fact that all of us other than those on the committee have had precious little time to seriously and fully consider its provisions—I must say I am reminded for all the world of a cartoon I once saw, showing two trains running full tilt toward each other on the same track and toward an obvious head-on collision, with two bystanders watching, one saying to the other: "Isn't this a heck of a way to run a railroad?"

I really do not see, Mr. Chairman, why this bill could not have gone over to next week when we could better have given it the attention and care it deserves, but, then, I suppose I am only a passenger on that "railroad," and so have to go on doing the best I can.

Now, permit me to say that I have great respect for this Committee on Armed Services—and for those who serve thereon. It is a good committee, a hard-working and a knowledgeable committee, and I am sure its members have done their usually thorough job in coming up with the bill before us—a somewhat modified version of S. 1432, as already passed by the other body.

But what the committee has produced is obviously a compromise and, after the nature of all compromises, not wholly satisfying to anyone—either to the Joint Chiefs, to our very much concerned college students and their parents, to the dropouts, as they might be called, or even, as we may find out, to the Congress.

This does not mean that the committee product is bad—nor do I find it bad—for it may well be that, under the circumstances, a compromise of this sort was the best that anyone could do. And, certainly, no one can say that the present draft system has not been studied enough; just counting the various advisory commissions or panels that have been constituted to do so in recent years, would seem to indicate it has.

However, I think one has to ask whether that studying process was as broad and as much in depth as a subject such as this really demands, touching as it does not only upon matters involving national security but also touching the very lives and fortunes of so many young Americans.

I ask this because it seems to me quite clear—and please understand I mean no disrespect to those who took part in any of these studies, for those various commissions and panels have been composed of some of our leading, most able, and experienced citizens—that most of our attention, as was theirs, has been directed not to whatever alternatives, if any, exist for the present system or some modification thereof, but rather to the more obvious defects in the present system and the best method for correcting them in the light of our immediate needs.

In other words, those who have taken part in these studies—just like us, tonight—have been focused in on the inequities of a draft system rather than on the question that so intrigues me which is, whether or not a voluntary system is a workable alternative to conscription.

To be sure, caught in the present military emergency that requires as it does so much of our attention, this is not an auspicious time, perhaps, and certainly not the best of times to suggest alternatives to meeting our defense manpower needs other than through the presently operating system.

This is because, in a time of war such as now, undeclared though it may be, we are all subjected quite strongly to what James Madison called "the impulse of self-preservation," or—put another way—to the overriding demands of national security.

At such a time no one wishes—no one really dares to suggest—upsetting the status quo any more than absolutely necessary.

But at the same time, Mr. Chairman, our problems and our needs are more than those of moment. The question we face, in addition to the bill now before us, is what is the best mechanism to recruit—and to keep—the range of manpower needed not just for our present purposes, such as they may be, in Southeast Asia and, perhaps, in the Near East, but also in that hopefully not so distant future when some resolution of our immediate problems has been reached, and America's responsibilities and challenges in the world of toworrow have assumed, as inevitably they will, new dimensions.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know—I cannot know—at this moment that a voluntary military force would be either practical or financially attainable, or even sufficient to our future defense needs, whatever they may prove to be.

But I think we ought to find out.

I think we ought to make a better effort to find out than we ever have before if for no other reason than the fact that conscription is something that most Americans would generally tend to automatically reject, even though we have come to tolerate it as necessary in a time of national emergency. And, in these difficult years, we seem to live in a continuing, never-ending time of emergency.

As one who served nearly 4 years—though as a volunteer not a draftee—in the military service during World War II, I have some personal knowledge of the waste, not just of dollars but of manpower, that is involved in any large military force. Again, I am not at all sure that a voluntary, smaller force, would be more efficient—though I suspect it would be—or more economical to operate, supplemented as it might need to be with some form of conscription if and when a larger force was needed, but I think we ought to try to find out.

Looking at the committee report on the bill before us, it would appear that the committee has done its best to go at least into the fringe areas of the matters that would be involved in any consideration of an all-volunteer, regular force—and has heard from some of the proponents of such an idea as well as from some of its opponents. But, again, the committee appears to have been working—even as we are tonight—against a self-imposed deadline of sorts, and one can only speculate about the effect on its deliberations in this respect that the evidently adverse Department of Defense study may have had, along with the similarly adverse finding of the so-called Marshall Commission and Clark Panel, on which my distinguished, able and experienced predecessor, the Honorable Sterling Cole, served.

May I again make it clear: These comments are in no way intended, nor should they be so understood, as critical of either the committee or the aforementioned Commission and Panel, or any other group that has, heretofore, studied this problem, my point again being that I am not sure in my own mind that the feasibility of an all-volunteer force has been considered on its own merits and outside of the context of the inequities existing in the present system and how those might be immediately corrected.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that this House, in its wisdom, will move, tonight—if we must vote tonight—to extend the present system as modified and hopefully improved in the legislation before us, not for the 4 years recommended by the committee, but for 2 years, at most, and that, during that period, a separate study commission or panel could be constituted to study, in the range and depth it deserves, the idea of an all-volunteer force as something in and of itself.

I see no particular reason or justification for a 4-year extension of the draft, now—especially if, in the interim, we found there was some further reason for giving more serious consideration to a volunteer force. On the other hand, a 4-year extension will almost surely lull us all back into the feeling that, now this had been done, there would be plenty of time to look, if we wished, at alternatives for the future. And, 4 years from now, with the pressure off in the meantime, we would find ourselves right back in the position we now are, with no real alternative beyond that of the good, old status quo once again.

Mr. Chairman, our responsibilities go beyond satisfaction with the status quo—and I would hope that, tonight, we would begin to measure up to those responsibilities.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Vermont yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD] and commend him for his fine statement.

Mr. Chairman, I fully support the objective he has outlined in his comments on the establishment of an all-volunteer Army.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Vermont for the work he has done in this very vital facet of this problem, and to say I hope he will continue his research in relation to a volunteer force for our military needs.

I would say I believe it is regrettable that the Clark Panel referred to the personnel that might be brought about by this concept as mercenaries. I do not consider that that is a very fair observation. I believe there are many boys in this country who would like to make the Army a career, but who just have been unable to get into one of the Academies and are not attracted under existing financial conditions. I believe this is a concept that certainly should be explored, and I commend the gentleman for his activities in this regard.

It seems to me that a study should include a consideration of the possible integration of the Reserves and the National Guard with the Regular Army. Many of our citizens are questioning the assignment of young draftees to Vietnam after 6 months in the armed services, when the Reserves, who are experienced, trained, and mature military men, are yet to be called to active duty.

While I shall join the gentleman in supporting the bill, I shall also support the amendment limiting the extension to 2 years, so that continued study may be permitted.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Vermont for his fine statement and to associate myself with his views.

I have worked with the gentleman from Vermont for approximately a year and a half in connection with the problems of the draft and possible solutions. I want to indicate my support for the volunteer army approach and to indicate to the gentleman that the gentleman from New York is grateful for his efforts in this field and for his leadership.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I also want to take this opportunity to applaud the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] with whom I have also worked in connection with these problems.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD]. No Member of this body has devoted more time and attention to the future of our military manpower policy. I agree with the gentleman that we should support the recommendations of the Committee on Armed Services, however they be amended here on the floor. But I also am in accord with his insistence that we continue to strive for greater voluntarism in our manpower procurement policy.

We should not forget that it was not until fairly late in our national history that we found it necessary to institute conscription, a practice previously deemed contrary to our democratic system, but made necessary by the aggression of Hitler in Europe. We have found it necessary to keep this system essentially intact for the past 25 years. But we need not foreclose future opportunities for a return to a volunteer army.

Population changes, the need for new skills and abilities in our Armed Forces, and the need for more efficient management of our manpower policies have outstripped the mechanism we now use. This was ably pointed out in a series of papers issued by a group of colleagues on this side of the aisle last year.

I hope that in passing this bill today, we will not forget and fail to heed the admonitions of the gentleman from Vermont. He is pointing the way toward more enlightened military personnel management in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BATES. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER].

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that this measure does more than merely extend the Selective Service System for 4 more years. It brings some much needed reform to our draft system.

It provides, that, for the first time, there must be a high degree of uniformity among the Nation's 4,084 local draft boards. I cannot overemphasize the importance of this provision.

On February 7, I introduced the Draft Reform Act of 1967—H.R. 5017—the first major bill to overhaul our draft system to be introduced in this Congress. It contained nine points for much needed reform and modernization. I am happy to report that the measure before us today either contains, or permits the implementation of, a majority of the reforms called for in my bill.

But of all the points, none is more significant, none is more far-reaching, than the committee amendment adopted at my urging which, for the first time, provides for creation of national classification standards to be administered uniformly throughout the Nation.

This amendment gives the Selective Service System the predictability and national uniformity that it utterly lacks now.

I want to say to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] that he has my deep thanks, and I am sure those of the Nation's young men, for his acceptance in committee of my amendment to provide for uniform national classification criteria.

I want to say to the gentleman, that as a relatively junior member of the committee minority, I greatly appreciate the fairness and understanding he has shown to me in my efforts to bring meaningful reform to our draft system.

The Constitution puts national defense solely in the hands of the Federal Government. Yet the present draft system produces the men to serve by using 4,084 different sets of policies and practices, depending on which local board has the registrant's file.

The Marshall Commission report is replete with examples of how the particular local board with which a man is registered can determine his draft situation

Equity requires that if one family's son receives a draft deferment in the Nation's interest, so must the son of another family with virtually the same individual circumstances.

As the law now stands, one local board does not have to agree with another, or with Selective Service System headquarters. And two identical cases before the same board need not be decided alike. More public criticism has been leveled at this point than at any other. That criticism has been justified.

The other body seems to have been ready to extend the present system without remedying its greatest weakness. But an amendment which I proposed in committee, and which our distinguished chairman accepted, would provide for specific, tightly drawn, national standards for local boards in classifying men as available, deferred, or exempt.

This language would modify the last sentence of section 6(h) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, since it is that sentence which tells local boards they can ignore national standards. Uniform national standards would be a dead letter if we did not modify this section of the law.

The new language provides that the President, in carrying out the provisions of the draft law, shall establish, whenever practicable, national criteria for the classification of persons subject to induction. The President shall, to the extent that such action is consistent with the national interest, require that such criteria be administered uniformly throughout the United States by all local boards.

Without this change, we would perpetuate a national pattern of inequity, a crazy quilt of inconsistent deferment policies from one board to another.

This is not an unreasonable amendment. I have gone to great pains to see that it would permit any desirable discretion by local boards. The President would be required to promulgate national standards. And the President would be directed to require that those national standards be followed to the extent that following them would be in the national interest. Thus, a local board exercising desirable discretion would be able to deviate from national standards in an individual case when such deviation was determined by the President to be consistent with the national interest. This change in language, approved unanimously by the committee, would merely provide for reasonable national standards, uniformly administered, consistent with the national interest.

It is my intent, in pressing for inclusion of such language, to assure that we have national classification standards and that each local board will have to work within the framework of applying those standards. It is my belief that the language would require the executive branch to ascertain whether such standards are being uniformly applied, to the extent that such action is in the national interest. Further, it seems to me that this language imposes upon the President, through the Director of Selective Service, an obligation to initiate action to correct, through the appeals procedure or through an order to reopen, those cases in which it does not appear that national criteria are being uniformly administered.

But I would emphasize again that this language does not do away with any desirable discretion at the local board level.

This language is not the same as that which was proposed on the floor of the other body. That attempt to provide for national standards in the other body included repeal of that part of section 6(h) which states that no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status.

The language of the bill reported by the House Committee does not repeal the "individual status" proviso. That proviso remains in the law. Thus we are making an attempt here to achieve a highly desirable balance. We are saying consider the man as an individual within the framework of national standards. On the other hand, the attemot in the other body would have established national standards and at the same time eliminated the requirement that a man be considered on the basis of his individual status.

The amendment offered in the other

body also directed the President to require uniform administration of the criteria "to the maximum extent possible." The House language directs instead that the President require uniform administration "to the extent that such action is determined by the President to be consistent with the national interest."

I believe that this change, probably more than any other, will let us achieve meaningful reform and modernization of the draft system.

At the appropriate time, Mr. Chairman, I shall request permission to extend my remarks at this point and to include additional material, which follows herewith:

[From the Penn State Alumni News, May 1967]

It's Time To Alter the Draft

(The "antiquated, unfair Selective Service System" must be modernized, and college deferments, the 10-day appeal period and local boards should reflect policy changes.)

(By Congressman R. S. Schweiker, 1950)

The time has come to modernize our antiquated, unfair Selective Service System.

The time is now because major portions of the draft law expire July 1.

The time is now because the recent major buildup of manpower for the Vietnam conflict has brought the worst features of the draft home to hundreds of thousands of American families.

The young man turning 18 and registering for the draft now faces a virtual crazy-quilt of inequities and uncertainties.

Around him he can see many men his age planning to "beat the draft" through a number of loopholes which our draft laws leave wide open.

The young man subject to the draft starts a bureaucratic journey to military service with as many blind and unpredictable turns as an "Alice in Wonderland" maze.

I think these are the draft's major faults:

Because the draft first calls the oldest men from its pool of eligible men between 19 and 26, the youngest men are not reached when the draft quotas are low. Young men face up to eight years of uncertainty in making career and family plans, because their draft liability increases as they near 26.

The draft is not administered uniformly across the nation because each of the 4084 local Selective Service Boards has such extreme latitude to interpret and administer the draft laws. Cases with similar facts receive quite different treatment, depending on which local board in which particular locality is hearing the case. Instead of operating under national standards, the draft system allows the chance of geography to make a difference. It's where you live that counts.

The present college deferment system permits some students to escape the draft by parlaying one student deferment into another until they are past 26. This favors the student with the financial means to go to college and then on to graduate school. In addition, it gives him time to marry and become a father, which also means deferment.

If a man's circumstances change after he has been classified in such a way that he would be entitled to a deferment, he is given no right to have the local board reconsider his case, and no right of appeal. Instead, it is entirely up to the discretion of the local board of Selective Service higher-ups to decide whether they want to re-open the man's case.

The ten-day appeal period is too short. Often it takes the board almost that long to tell the man he has been classified, and the ten days includes the time it takes for the local board to draw up and mail the notification.

I first became alarmed by the operation of our draft system in October, 1965, when I discovered that Pennsylvania was being called upon to supply 10.3 percent of the nation's draftees even though our state has only 6.4 percent of the country's draft-age men.

Following my investigation, Selective Service System officials revised their draft quota formula and Pennsylvania's share of national draft calls was reduced substantially.

Since that time I have undertaken a complete review of our draft system. I haven't liked what I've found.

ELIMINATE UNCERTAINTY

Uncertainty is the essence of the present draft system. In time of low manpower demand, such as the years between Korea and Vietnam, the youngest men are destined to sit and wait for several years, not knowing whether they will eventually be drafted or not.

The youth entering college simply goes, aware that not too long after graduation he will be in the most draft-vulnerable age bracket. Graduating at age 22, before the Vietnam buildup, however, he would have had more than sufficient time to marry and become a draft-exempt father. The 1963 average draft age was 23.7 years.

The boy without college plans faces a job market in which prospective employers hesitate to hire and train a youth who has not completed his military service.

I propose that the draft induct all the youngest eligibles first, then the men a year older than the youngest, and so on. Men from ages 18½ to 19½ would be the first age category called. If a man stayed eligible for the draft until he was 19½ without being called, he could not be conscripted after that until all the eligible men under 19½ had been called.

This new draft-age policy would let young men plan their futures with more certainty. There is another advantage. Younger men make the best servicemen because they find it easier to adapt to military training and conditions.

The public, too, appears to favor the drafting of men at younger ages. Last summer a Gallup Poll showed 54 percent want military service to start at 18 or younger. Another 20 percent said it should start at 19 or 20.

Under my plan, no draftee could be sent into a combat zone before he was 19.

The military already draws a young group of volunteers. Eighty percent of the volunteers are between the ages of 17 and 20. Draftees as a group tend to be much older.

President Johnson, in his message to Congress on Selective Service March 6, also favored taking youngest men first. But my bill, introduced in the House on February 7, would, in addition, shorten the overall time that a young man remains eligible for the draft. It is now 7½ years, from age 18½ to 26. Under my bill it would only be four years, from age 18½ to age 22½.

It makes no sense to keep our young men on the string all the way up to 26. Some two million men turn 18 each year, more than half of them qualified for military service. Yet our annual draft during the massive Vietnam buildup has been only 340,000 men. It is expected to fall to 200,000 men, at the most, once the buildup for Vietnam is completed.

With such a huge pool of draft-age men, in large part because of the post-World War II baby boom, we can easily afford to shorten the period of draft liability to a four-year span. In simple terms, the military just doesn't need anywhere near the number of qualified men who are now available.

WHAT ABOUT COLLEGE STUDENTS?

I think it is very important to the nation that we continue the college deferment program. My plan would do so, but with this major difference:

Upon completing his studies, a man would be placed in the top-priority draft pool, just as if he were 18½ to 19½.

From the pool of 18½-year-olds, the former college student would pass after a year to the 19½-year-old pool, then on to the 20½ and 21½-year-old pools. After he had put in his own four-year period of being draft liable, the former college student would cease to be liable, just as the non-student's liability ends after four years at the real age of 22½.

This would assure equal treatment for the college student and the non-college. Both groups would be draft-liable for four years with liability decreasing each year.

Today a man in college or graduate school has a good chance of missing the service completely, if he can stretch out his deferment until the draft-safe-age of 26. True, only a very small minority of students are motivated to stay in school simply to avoid the draft, but that has often been the result regardless of the students' intentions.

Another built-in advantage for the college student under today's draft laws is the fatherhood deferment. A student who goes through college or graduate school obviously gets closer to marrying age. If he becomes a father before he completes his education, he gets a draft deferment on that score and will not have to serve in the military at all.

My bill would seal that loophole by barring any fatherhood deferment to the man who has used an educational deferment.

Thus, under my plan, a college *deferment* would be just that—a postponement but not a cancellation of draft liability.

TIGHTER CONTROL FOR DRAFT BOARDS

Young men today enter the manpower pipeline through one of the 4,084 separate local draft boards. These boards are the backbone of the Selective Service System and herein lies much of what is wrong with the way in which the draft is administered.

For the draft has an administrative backbone of 4,084 scattered vertebrae, each interpreting loosely drawn national regulations in its own, autonomous fashion. The result is a crazy-quilt pattern of fragmented decision making by 4,084 local boards across the country.

For example, a young pilot for a Pennsylvania-based airline which carries substantial Defense Department cargo was refused an occupational deferment and was classified available for induction by his local board. Two other pilots for the same airline, with less experience than the first pilot, were given deferments because their work was deemed critical to the national interest by their local boards.

The widespread differences among local boards is not really the fault of the dedicated men who voluntarily serve on them without compensation. Instead the blame can be placed squarely on the failure of a national manpower system to issue specific standards to which local boards must adhere.

The local boards are asked, not required, to defer a civilian whose work is "found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest."

Just how 4,084 scattered local draft boards can be expected to arrive at uniform decisions using such fuzzy-phrased, ill-defined and broad guidelines, I don't know. The fact of the matter is that they don't.

Apparently, each of the 4,084 local boards must come up with its definition of the "national health, safety, or interest" and then develop its own interpretation of just what meets its definition. Uniformity is all too rare. Chaos is perhaps a mild word for what happens.

One California draft board not long ago decided that it was more in the national interest to draft Peace Corpsmen than to wait until they had finished their tours of duty in Peru and the Philippines. This despite the fact that the government had just invested substantial sums in their Peace Corps training and the majority of draft boards would have deferred them until their Peace Corps duty was finished.

The particular draft board with which a young man registers at age 18 is probably the most important factor in determining when, and even whether, he is drafted. Aside from what a local board thinks is "the national interest," each board presides over its own separate manpower pool and the chances of being drafted vary from pool to pool.

WHY NOT A NATIONAL MANPOWER POOL?

One board might have so many volunteers for the draft that it has no need to go beyond its volunteer lists to fill its quota. Another board might be quite stingy with its student deferments because it does not have enough volunteers or nonstudents to meet its quota.

The maze of 50 state quotas with 4,084 local board quotas superimposed upon them makes the national task of inducting draftees a highly unfair, unpredictable business that operates entirely too much by geographical chance.

It makes little sense to try to muster manpower for a national army by using 4,084 separate local manpower pools. Why not one nationwide pool of available manpower?

My bill would abolish these separate draft calls and provide for one single national manpower pool of all men classified 1–A (available for the draft). There is no reason why a man who is 1–A in one part of the country should be treated differently from another 1–A man the same age somewhere else. This national pool would be confined to men classified 1–A, and would not clash with the system of deferments for students, men with critical jobs, or men with hardships.

If, as is very likely, there were more men in the 18½-to-19½-year-old category in the national manpower pool than would be required to meet a draft call, those to be drafted would be selected at random by computer.

Only if there were insufficient men in the first priority (18½-to-19½-year-old) group, would men be drafted from the second priority group of men between 19½ and 20½.

All registrants in the first-year group who had been classified 1–A would stand an equal chance of being inducted under this computerized random selection method regardless of where they happened to live.

NEW ROLE OF THE LOCAL BOARDS

The local draft board would certainly not go out of existence under my bill. A young man would continue to register with his local board at age 18 and be given a prompt appointment for his physical examination. The local board would classify him well prior to age 18½. It would forward his name, Selective Service number and classification to national headquarters, where the information would be placed in the center computer from which the national draft call would be selected at random.

The local boards, however, would no longer have the sole authority to decide which students are deferred and which men are kept at home due to their "critical" civilian jobs.

The Selective Service System does give the local boards "guidelines" to follow in awarding deferments. But our present draft laws give the boards *carte blanche* to follow or ignore what national headquarters guidelines tell them.

My bill would bring all local boards in line with clearly defined national policies. It would direct Selective Service headquarters to spell out in detail the criteria for student and critical job deferments.

Then men across the country with the same grounds for being deferred would get the same treatment from their draft boards, regardless of where those boards were located and what personal attitudes the board members might have.

A registrant would still be assured of being able to have his story heard by a board consisting of members of his community. Dependency and hardship deferment cases would still be decided in full by local boards.

The master computer for draft manpower could quite simply be updated as local boards told national headquarters of any change which they had made in an individual registrant's classification.

Instead of Penn State and the nation's hundreds of colleges each having to supply thousands of scattered draft boards throughout the nation with academic information on their students, each college could merely forward information on all its students to the central manpower.

MODERNIZE OR TRY A DIFFERENT SYSTEM?

Other critics of the draft have argued that what we need is not a modernized draft but a wholly new system for recruiting men for military service. Some prefer universal military training. Some suggest a period of "national service," in military or civilian activities, for every youth.

Many others feel we should halt compulsory military service and rely solely on volunteers for the Armed Forces.

I do not support either universal military training or national service as replacements for our present draft system. Universal military training would saddle the Armed Forces with huge quantities of men they do not need.

The bumper crop of young men turning 18 each year is far in excess of the number of men required by the military. While some may see universal military training as a panacea for the current inequities of the draft, I view it as a "cure" that is far worse than the disease itself.

National Service, with two-year stints for all young men and women in either military or civilian projects, would be an invasion of the young person's freedom without the overriding justification that it was for defense purposes.

Programs like VISTA and the Peace Corps should be strengthened and expanded, but not through national service. These projects have succeeded and have captured the imagination of our youth because they are strictly voluntary. If youths were recruited against their will to work in such programs, we would only be instituting compulsory service in the social welfare field, where it is hardly welcome.

The proposal I like best as a draft alternative is that of the "volunteer army." Its supporters point out that the supply of available draft-age men far exceeds the needs of our modern Armed Forces, and therefore any compulsory military service sends some boys to war while others stay home.

The Defense Department has estimated the additional yearly cost of an all-volunteer force at $8 or $9 billion or more. But those in favor of such a force refuse to accept such a high figure. They say the Pentagon is considering only the extra military pay needed to draw volunteers, not the savings to come from greater military efficiency once the volunteers were enlisted.

For example, under the draft, new men must constantly be trained since 92 percent of draftees will not re-enlist. If these masses of here-today-gone-tomorrow draftees could, indeed, be replaced by dedicated career men, millions of dollars in training costs could be saved every year.

We should be raising military pay and fringe benefits to attract more volunteers. As we develop ways to increase the number of men volunteering for military service, we could also be continuing to replace military men with civilian employees in those jobs which are essentially nonmilitary.

But none of these steps could increase overnight the number of volunteers to the strength level we now need. It will take a period of years for these steps to work.

And certainly, with our commitment in Vietnam, we cannot scrap the draft in the near future. But we can and should modernize it, as we lay the groundwork for an all-volunteer military in the future.

NINE POINTS TO A FAIR, MODERN DRAFT

The nine-point plan which I propose would, I think, be a big step in the right direction. It boils down to this:

1) The first group of men drafted should be 18½-year-olds, reversing the present policy of taking the oldest men under 26 first.

2) A man would be eligible for the draft for only four years (18½ to 22½) instead of the present seven-and-a-half (18½ to 26). This would allow men to plan their futures with more certainty.

3) College students would still get deferments but as soon as they finished school, their four years of eligibility would begin and they would be placed in the top priority group as 18½-year-olds, regardless of their actual age, up to 35.

4) College students would not be permitted a fatherhood deferment if they had been granted a student deferment.

5) Separate draft calls of the Selective Service System's 4,084 local boards would be replaced by a single national manpower pool to wipe out all differences in the type and number of men drafted that now exist from one board to another.

6) Men would be selected at random from the national pool of those available for induction.

7) Local boards would be bound to apply national standards in deciding which students receive deferments and which civilian jobholders are deferred because of the critical nature of their work.

8) Local draft boards would be compelled to reopen the case of a man classified 1–A if he submits new facts which, if true, would entitle him to a different draft status.

9) The period of time given a man to appeal his local board's draft classification should be lengthened from the present 10 days to 15.

ANALYSIS OF SCHWEIKER DRAFT REFORM ACT OF 1967—H.R. 5017

(A bill to provide for a more effective and equitable draft system by amending the Universal Military Training and Service Act, introduced in the House of Representatives, 90th Congress, first session, on February 7, 1967)

SECTION 1

Establishes the short title of the Act as the "Draft Reform Act of 1967."

SECTION 2

Amends various provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (UMTSA) that relate to the age period of liability for induction.

A. Section 2(a) reduces from 18–26 to 18–22½ the age period during which the time for registration is fixed.

B. Sections 2(b)(2) and 2(b)(5) reduce the age period from 18–26 to 18–22½ with respect to establishing minimum standards for physical acceptability that are no higher than those applied to men inducted in January 1945, and with respect to registrants volunteering for induction.

C. Sections 2(b)(1) and 2(b)(4) reduce the age period from 18½–26 to 18–22½ with respect to persons liable for training and service, and with respect to the opportunity registrants are given to enlist in the regular army.

D. Sections 2(b)(3), 2(c)(1), and 2(c)(2) reduce the upper age limit from 26 to 22½ with respect to induction without consent, with respect to enlisting or accepting appointment in the Ready Reserve, and with respect to induction liability if obligations of service in the Ready Reserve are not met.

E. Section 2(d) substitutes 18–22½ for 18–26 in defining specifically the terminology applied to age groups that are referred to in UMTSA.

SECTION 3

Deals with priority for induction and selection for induction from a national manpower pool. Section 3 amends UMTSA in the following ways:

A. Section 5(a)(1) sets down provisions for the transmission of data from local boards to the Director of Selective Service. [This is part of the centralization of the Selective Service System that the bill would accomplish.]

B. Section 5(a)(2) provides that registrants shall be liable to induction for 4 years, unless a registrant has been exempted or deferred, in which case his liability will terminate whenever he has been liable for 4 years or has become 35 years of age. [This alters the present 19–26 age span of liability. or liability to age 35 if deferred or exempted before age 26.]

C. Section 5(a)(3) establishes 4 age-priority categories in a national manpower pool of registrants who are not exempt or deferred, from which pool 18½-year-olds will be called first. "The first priority category shall consist of (i) men between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 19 years and 6 months [19½-20½, 20½-21½, and 21½-22½ in the second, third, and fourth categories, respectively] who have not been exempted or .deferred from induction under the provisions of this Act, and (ii) men not presently so exempted or deferred who are less than 35 years of age and with respect to whom, if the aggregate of all periods they were so exempted or deferred were subtracted from their age, the difference would be less than 19 years and six months [19½ or more but less than 20½, 20½ or more but less than 21½, and 21½ or more but less than 22½ in the second, third, and fourth categories, respectively.]" [This section is designed to serve the objective of centralizing draft calls and avoiding regional variations in their size and nature. Present policy is to take the older men under 26 first. This section reverses present policy by providing that 18½-year-olds not exempt or deferred be called first. In addition, it "returns" an older man to the manpower pool if he was deferred or exempt during all or part of his years from 18½ to 22½ and ceases being deferred or exempt any time before he is 35. The older man "returns" to the age-priority category corresponding to his age at the time he first became deferred or exempt. Under present draft policy, men taking deferments incur liability up to age 35 but men over 26 are not called by a local board until it has taken all those under 26 and over 19.]

D. Section 5(a)(4) establishes procedures incumbent on the Director of Selective Service for placing in the first age-priority category the name of each registrant who, on the date the Act becomes law, is 19½-26 years of age and who has not received an exemption or deferment, or who "on such date was not exempted or deferred and was between the ages of 19 years and six months and 35 years and had received an exemption or deferment under this Act after attaining the age of 19 years and 6 months but not before attaining such age.

"While he is not exempted or deferred under this Act and before he attains the age of 35 years, insofar as possible, each person shall, after remaining in the first priority category for one year, be placed in each succeeding higher priority category established under paragraph (3) for a period of one year."

E. Section 5(a)(5) provides that each registrant who, on the date the Act becomes effective, was exempted or deferred, was between 19½ and 35, and had not been exempted or deferred between 18½ and 19½, shall, upon the termination of his exemption or deferment, be placed in the first age-priority, "remain in such category for one year and in each succeeding higher category established under paragraph (3) for a period of one year; except that such person shall not be in any such category during any period while he is exempted or deferred from selection for induction or after he attains the age of 35 years." [Sections 5(a)(4) and 5(a)(5) prevent this legislation from giving any windfall draft benefit to draftable men who are over 19½ at the time the act becomes effective. Many of these men will be too young to have been reached by the draft under the present system. Yet without these special provisions assigning them to the 18½-year-old, first-priority category, the new law would pass them by with its emphasis on drafting men at 18½. These sections prevent men who waited until 19½ to take a deferment under present law from "counting" that year of draft eligibility (between 18½ and 19½) as a basis for their "returning" to the 19½-year-old pool under this legislation. If allowed to count that year, they would escape the top-priority (18½-year-old) draft pool under the new system while having been too young to be reached under the present system.]

F. Section 5(b) provides that the Director of Selective Service shall select inductees at random in the order of the age-priority categories in which their names are entered. Before random selections are made from within a category, every man available for induction from a lower numbered priority category must have been drafted. [Random selection of draftees would be a major change in the Universal Military Training and Service Act.]

SECTION 4

Establishes uniform national standards for occupational and educational deferments.

A. Section 4(a) amends UMTSA so that section 6(2) provides that the President shall set forth specific rules and regulations governing the bases of deferment from induction. Rules and regulations pertaining to occupational deferments "may incorporate any listing of critical skills and industries prepared by any department or agency of the Federal Government." Rules and regulations pertaining to educational deferments "shall set forth standards of performance in . . . [college level] courses of instruction, scores on tests conducted under the supervision of the Director, and other necessary criteria which must be complied with in order to qualify for such a deferment." Every registrant shall conform to these rules and regulations "in every respect" before a local board can grant him a deferment. [Present system is changed in that local boards would be required to apply national standards.]

B. Section 4(b) amends UMTSA so that a registrant deferred to pursue a full-time college-level course of instruction may not be deferred subsequently "on account of a marriage contracted or a child conceived after the date of enactment of the Draft Reform Act of 1967." [Under present system an educational deferment can be followed by a deferment based on marriage or fatherhood.]

C. Section 4(c) repeals an express provision of Section 6(h), UMTSA, that local draft boards and appeal boards cannot be bound by any Federal guidelines in the granting of student and occupational deferments. The repealed language reads as follows:

"Notwithstanding any provisions of this Act, no local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by an agency or department of the Federal Government."

SECTION 5

Makes certain procedural provisions. Section 5 amends UMTSA so that:

A. Section 6(n)(1) requires local boards to reopen the cases of men classified I–A whenever new information comes forth which, if proven, would entitle them to a deferment or exemption. The Director shall not induct such men while reconsideration is being made. [Local boards now reopen cases at their discretion, unless the State or National Director of Selective Service orders them to do so.]

B. Section 6(n)(2) provides that registrant has at least 15 days in which to appeal an action taken with respect to him. [Lengthens by 5 days the minimum period during which a registrant can appeal.]

SECTION 6

Pertains to the extension of UMTSA by amending subsection (c) of section 17 of that act so as to extend induction authority to July 1, 1971.

SECTION 7

Sets effective dates for the Act by stating that "except for section 6 which shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, this Act shall take effect on the ninetieth day after the date of its enactment."

Testimony of U.S. Representative Richard S. Schweiker Before House Armed Services Committee, Hearings on the Draft, May 22, 1967

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today in support of meaningful modernization and reform of our antiquated and unfair draft system. On February 7, I introduced the Draft Reform Act of 1967, (H.R. 5017) the first comprehensive draft reform legislation to be presented to the 90th Congress. My nine-point plan boils down to this:

1. The first group of men drafted should be 18½ year olds, reversing the present policy of taking first the oldest men under 26.

2. A man would be eligible for the draft for only four years (18½ to 22½) instead of the present 7½ years (18½ to 26). This would allow men to plan their futures with more certainty.

3. College students could still get deferments, but as soon as they finished college, their four years of draft eligibility would begin, and they would be placed in the top priority group as 18½ year olds, regardless of their actual age up to 35.

4. College students would not be permitted a fatherhood deferment if they had been granted a college (2S) deferment.

5. Separate draft calls for the Selective Service System's 4084 local boards would be replaced by a single national manpower pool to wipe out all differences in type and number of men drafted that now exist from one board to another.

6. Men would be selected at random once a month from a national computerized pool of those available for induction in the 18½ to 19½ top priority age bracket. Only in the unlikely event that the number of 1–A's in this age group was too small to meet draft calls, would men in the second-year, third-year, or fourth-year age groups be subjected to call.

7. Local boards would be bound to apply national standards in deciding which students receive deferments and which civilian jobholders are deferred because their work is critical.

8. Local draft boards would be compelled to reopen the case of a man classified 1–A if

he submits new facts which, if true, would entitle him to a different draft status.

9. The period of time given to a man to appeal his local draft board's classification should be lengthened by statute.

Most major proposals for draft reform suggest induction at age 19 or 20. I believe it would be wiser to begin the draft earlier—at age 18½ to 19½. At age 18 only one man in five is still in high school. Thus about 80 percent of young men at 18 are finished high school. By age 19, only one man out of 15 is still in high school.

A draft that would not take them until at least age 19, would make the job prospects for men under 19 even more hopeless than those prospects are today in the unskilled labor market.

I am strongly in favor of continuing student deferments, both for undergraduate and graduate work. But my bill contains safeguards to keep these temporary student deferments from turning into permanent exemptions.

There seems no valid reason why some of our young men should not pursue higher education at 18½, as long as they will be fully draft-vulnerable on completion of that education. The National Advisory Commission recommended abolishing all undergraduate deferments, but called at the same time for a look at the feasibility of letting a man choose to serve as late as four years after he was selected.

My bill would accomplish the same end as such postponed service, but would be more flexible while keeping student deferments. An ex-student under 35, whose deferment has expired, would return to the highest draft-priority pool—along with the 18½ to 19½-year-olds. The ex-student would then have a four-year period of draft liability, with his first year after school being the most likely year for being drafted.

Abolition of undergraduate student deferments could have a serious adverse effect on procurement of junior officer candidates, a majority of whom are now obtained from the ranks of recent college graduates. In addition, the flexibility inherent in my plan seems to me more desirable than a postponement system, which would draft an initial group of men in 1967 and then let some choose to serve several years later, after finishing college.

Today it is possible for a student to remain in college, become a father before his student deferment expires, and hence obtain a permanent exemption from military duty. My bill eliminates this possibility. In 1964 a survey of men between 27 and 34 showed that 74 percent of the men whose education stopped at high school graduation had served in the military. For men whose education stopped with a college undergraduate degree, the figure was 70 percent. But for men who had gone on to graduate school, only 27 percent of the men surveyed had served.

These statistics do not make every graduate student a willful draft dodger. On the contrary, I am disturbed at some of the blanket charges leveled at graduate students. What we need, simply and without emotionalism, is a draft system in which the number of years a man remains in school will not affect his likelihood of being drafted.

My bill contains measures that would give the Selective Service System the predictability and national uniformity that it has utterly lacked before now. The Constitution puts national defense solely in the hands of the federal government. Yet the Selective Service System produces the men to serve by using 4,084 different sets of policies and practices, depending on which local board has the registrant's file.

The National Advisory Commission Report is replete with examples of how the particular local board with which a man is registered can determine his draft situation. For example, childless married men have a lower draft priority than single men if they were married on or before August 26, 1965. If you were one of those childless married men of draft age in Connecticut in the first five months of 1966, you would not have been drafted, regardless of which Connecticut local board held your file. But in Alabama and Washington State, 90 percent of the boards had to induct men from that same childless married group.

In the cases of men reclassified from 1–A and into II–A (the critical skills deferment) about half were in neither a critical occupation on the Department of Labor's list, nor in an essential industry on the Commerce Department's list.

This shows how little weight the guidelines of the two departments carry throughout the Selective Service System. My bill would provide for specific, tightly drawn, national standards for local boards in classifying men as available, deferred or exempt. It would repeal the last sentence of Section 6(h) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, since it is that sentence that tells local boards they have full autonomy from national Selective Service guidelines.

Uniform national standards for deferments will be a dead letter if that sentence of Section 6(h) is allowed to stay in the law. Through that sentence, General Hershey explained to this Committee last June, "The Congress has made certain that the key decisions of classification shall be left to civilian boards of the registrant's community."

Congress has amply protected the authority of local boards to classify, and the result, Mr. Chairman, is a national pattern of inequity, a crazy quilt of inconsistent deferment policies from one board to another. Equity requires that if one family's son receives a draft deferment in the "national interest," so must the son of another family with virtually the same individual circumstances. As the law now stands, one local board does not have to agree with another, or with Selective Service System headquarters. And two identical cases before the same local board need not be decided alike. More public criticism of the draft has been levelled at this point than at any other. That criticism is justified.

Repealing the last sentence of Section 6(h) will not alone guarantee national standards in the granting of deferments. It would, at least, force local boards to defer every man covered by Federal deferment standards. But it would not stop individual boards from deferring large numbers of men who fall short of the standards. This is happening now. The National Advisory Commission reports that half the men holding critical employment deferments are not engaged in critical employment as defined by the Departments of Commerce and Labor.

Hence we should repeal the last sentence of Section 6(h) to guarantee that every man entitled to a deferment under Federal standards receives one. But my bill, in addition, directs the President to set down specific rules for deferments which must be met by every individual registrant receiving a deferment. Thus deferments would go to all men who qualified but only to those who qualified. In addition, under the present system, distinctly different policies exist from state to state in the contradictory and confused system that is today's draft machinery. For example, Pennsylvania's State Director of Selective Service has told local boards that when a student changes his course of study while in college, and takes longer than four years to earn his degree, he may not receive a student deferment beyond the fourth year.

Yet next door in West Virginia, the State Director has told his boards to study each case on its own merits, since some students might deserve a deferment for undergraduate schooling beyond the normal four years.

Oklahoma, New York City, Louisiana, Tennessee and Texas say a full-time student is one who takes 12 hours of course work a semester. But Alabama, Oregon and Utah insist that their students carry 15 hours of work a semester.

Four states tell their local boards that no student can qualify for a deferment with less than the class rank or test score set forth in the National Selective Service guidelines. But eight other states counsel their local boards that the guidelines from Washington are purely advisory, and not binding on local board action.

This tangle of contradictions, local variations and absolute confusion for the unfortunate draft registrant must be resolved.

My bill would abolish the state-by-state and board-by-board draft quotas and replace them with a single national monthly draft call by random selection from a central computerized pool of 1–A men's names. My proposal does not contemplate elimination of the 4,084 local draft boards, since they would still serve a valuable function registering men, classifying them (but under strict national standards) and also making determinations in such subjective types of classification as hardship situations.

Today, one local board might have so many volunteers for the draft that it has no need to go beyond its volunteer lists to fill its quota, while another board might be quite stingy with its student deferments because it does not have enough volunteers or nonstudents to meet its quota.

The national manpower call is met by levying a specific quota against each state based, not upon its population, but upon its percentage of the Nation's draft-eligible men classified available for induction by the local boards.

A State with inefficient draft boards who have not promptly classified its registrants will obviously have fewer men classified available for induction, and therefore, will receive draft calls for fewer men. Thus, the present State-by-State quota system has at times worked to reward inefficiency and penalize states like my own Pennsylvania which have processed and classified their registrants promptly.

It makes little sense to try to muster manpower for a national army by using 4,084 separate local manpower pools. Why not one nationwide manpower pool of available manpower? This, together with uniform national standards applied by local boards, would guarantee the same treatment for young men from coast to coast.

A man remains under the jurisdiction of the local board with which he registers at age 18, even if he moves from the area or from the state. In this day of substantially increased family mobility, therefore, the State-by-State quota system makes little sense.

I favor local boards continuing to examine and classify our young men. But after that step, we will almost surely have many more men without deferments than the military needs. Today we have 1,350,000 men classified 1–A. We drafted only 393,500 men during 1966, a high draft year.

If not all of the qualified men without deferments in a particular age bracket are needed to fill the draft call in a particular month, how will we distinguish among these equals? I propose that we select the men needed at random from among those who have been classified 1–A in the top-priority age group, 18½ to 19½.

The draft would continue to draw from a "moving river" of manpower each month, not a static pool with only one or two selection processes per year. Monthly calls, as under the present system, could be tailored to current needs. After his first year of draft eligibility, a man would move into the lower priority, second-year, group from which men would not be drafted unless the first-year pool was exhausted.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciated this opportunity to present my thoughts on draft reform.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier].

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I take this 1 minute, and that is all I asked the chairman for, for the purpose of making my remarks as concise as possible in view of the late hour.

I do want to state, as a result of the colloquy I had with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates], who asked if I had a proposal of my own on a military pay increase, and if so, what was the amount, I can now report to him that I did, and it is in the July 15, 1965, Record, and it provided for, after 4 months, $121.80 monthly for enlistees, which of course, while sizable and more than the present, is still far short of what would be required in terms of attaining a volunteer army. On the other hand, I do wish to point out that it was offered, and I refer you to the debate on the floor on July 19, 1965. I need not add that it was not accepted by the Committee of the Whole then.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like to say that there will be a number of amendments offered tonight. I hope they will be seriously considered. I hope we will accept them.

Mr. Chairman, on April 27, 1917, Wisconsin's distinguished Senator, Robert M. La Follette, spoke on the Senate floor against the enactment of a draft law. He said:

> I cannot see how any man who loves his country and cherishes her institutions can be willing to call into existence this awful autocratic and despotic power the exercise of which nothing can justify except the extremist necessity.

The Committee is now deliberating the provisions of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967. There have already been some changes made this year in the present law through Executive order by the President and further changes will be made through legislation by the Congress. But, let us acknowledge the fact that the extension of any selective service law will serve only to further integrate compulsory military service into the fabric of American life.

Daniel Webster said in the House of Representatives on December 9, 1814:

> A free government, with an uncontrolled power of military conscription, is a solecism, at once the most ridiculous and abominable that ever entered into the head of man.

A peacetime draft is absolutely opposed to the principles which have always been considered a part of American democracy. Compulsory military service not only results in a severe deprivation of civil liberties; it is also a wrenching departure from the traditional American ideal of liberty and this Nation's most cherished heritage, that of personal freedom.

Since 1940, with the exception of one brief period from March 1947 to June 1948, this Nation has had a draft law. An entire generation has reached maturity without knowing a time when compulsory military service did not exist. The selective service law, although originally intended to be temporary, is fast becoming institutionalized as a permanent fixture in American life. Furthermore, we have been told that we will need a draft law for the foreseeable future.

A peacetime conscription, however, can be justified only under conditions similar to those that James Madison described as "the impulse of self-preservation." In the absence of a grave national emergency or what La Follette called the "extremist necessity," the burden of justifying a military conscription rests with the Government. In the recent years in which our military system has relied on the principle of compulsory service, no such justification, however, has really been made. The bill, as reported by the House Armed Services Committee, would be a further commitment to a permanent compulsory military service.

Furthermore, the committee bill is insensitive to the demonstrated inequities which the present Universal Military Training and Service Act contains. Despite the language which states that "in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces and the Reserve components thereof should be shared generally, in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just," the obligation to serve in the Armed Forces has not been shared generally. The percentage of the 26-year-old draftable age men who have entered the service voluntarily or otherwise, has declined from 57.7 percent in 1962 to 46.4 percent in 1966. The Department of Defense estimates that this figure will be only 34 percent in 1974. The committee bill, however, makes no provision to provide for a fair and just method of selection for those that will be called upon to serve.

The present deferment policies perpetuate the discrimination resulting from economic and educational disadvantages. The draft falls heaviest on the Negro and those individuals from lower income backgrounds who do not have access to such deferments. The committee bill, however, would retain the deferments.

Under the present law, the granting of the college deferment has resulted in only 40 percent of the 26-year-old college graduates having any military experience as compared to 60 percent of the college dropouts, 57 percent of the high school graduates and 50 percent of the non-high-school graduates. For those students who are financially able to continue with their education, the deferment becomes an exemption by allowing these young men to remain in the limitless labyrinths of higher education. Only 27 percent of the graduate students, aged 27 through 34, have served in the Armed Forces. The committee bill, however, would retain the college deferment for undergraduates and, also for the graduate student if his study was found to be "in the national interest."

Under present law, judgments as to occupational deferments, on the basis of engagement in vital occupations, are far from consistent. Secretary Wirtz has estimated that about half of the 268,000 persons who received these deferments in 1966 had neither vital occupations nor critical skills. Furthermore, the selective service is directing individuals, through their "channeling" process, into deferred occupations which might otherwise never have been chosen. This manipulation in individual career choices by a government agency has been freely admitted. The committee bill, however, would retain the deferment for those occupations that were found to be "in the national interest."

The draft, by calling people whose profession is not the military, is economically wasteful. The old-fashioned conscript army, in which many men serve short terms of duty, has become less suited to the needs of modern times and it is becoming more expensive to maintain. The turnover of conscripts currently exceeds 90 percent. Few inductees show any inclination to reenlist to obtain the technical skills that are required to handle the complex instruments of the armed forces. Compulsory military service compels the men who are asked to risk their lives for their country to bear the financial costs of maintaining the Armed Forces as well. The draftee, in effect, subsidizes our defense budget by accepting low pay during his two years of service, a condition which calls for a complete revision of the military pay structure. The committee bill, however, would extend the draft for 4 more years.

Under present law, the selective service registrant has neither the right of a personal appearance nor the right to counsel at an appeal hearing. He is, in effect, outside the due process of law which should protect him as an American citizen, and is effectually deprived of rights which are his under constitutional guarantees. The committee bill, however, would make no provision for extending these rights to the registrant.

The committee bill, as reported, would return to the World War I practice of inducting conscientious objectors into the Armed Forces and be required to perform noncombatant duties. This procedure in World War I created many difficulties, court martials, long imprisonments, and even death sentences, though no executions were carried out. This procedure would work serious hardships on many conscientious objectors today, as is evidenced by the communications Members of the House have received in the past few days from organizations such as the Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church; United Church of Christ, Council for Christian Social Action; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Unitarian Universalist Association, Department of Social Responsibility; American Civil Liberties Union, and the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors.

In view of this widespread opposition by religious and civil liberties groups, the Armed Services Committee amendment which has been prepared for consideration on the floor is most welcome. It would permit those conscientiously opposed to noncombatant military service to perform alternative civilian service under civilian control, without induction into the armed services. This is the present system which has worked satisfactorily for some 15 years.

The language of the committee bill regarding the definition of conscientious objector returns to the test of the 1940 act—"religious training and belief"—and removes the additional language added in 1948 which stated:

> Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code.

Whatever the committee's motives in recommending this change, the change itself is, in many ways, an improvement. When the Congress attempts to define the indefinable and to plum the depths of a man's mind and conscience, the simplest language is best. The words "religious training and belief" have already been interpreted in many court cases. These cases will be available to future courts. Additional congressional attempts at definition may only confuse and compound matters further. The trend of recent court decisions such as Seeger is in line with modern theology which is constantly broadening man's concept of religion. In fact, a number of religious groups testified this year before the Armed Services Committee in favor of dropping the "religious" test altogether. In such imprecise and subjective matters, the test should be simple, inclusive, and capable of application to a wide and varying range of beliefs. This simple definition is broad enough to be useful in our pluralistic culture which includes nontheistic eastern religions as well as traditional western ones.

The removal of the Supreme Being definition and the return to the language of the 1940 act should therefore be welcomed as a distinct improvement over the present law.

In regard to the appeal procedure for conscientious objectors, since the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, the law has provided special appellate procedures for the determination of claims of conscientious objection. In addition to the standard opportunity to have a personal appearance before a local board, and an appeal to an appeal board—not in person—the present statute provides for a thorough investigation by the Department of Justice, as well as a special hearing before a Department of Justice hearing officer. The investigation is conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and, in a large number of cases produces additional evidence relevant to the claimant's sincerity and prior behavior. The hearing before the Department of Justice hearing officer is important, inasmuch as it is the only stage in the entire appellate process where there is a bona fide face-to-face confrontation between the conscientious objector claimant and a decisionmaker. The hearing officer is customarily a mature attorney, frequently a former assistant U.S. attorney, he is invariably more informed and sophisticated about the law and the meaning of conscientious objection; and there is opportunity to be represented by counsel and to present witnesses, documentation, and oral testimony. The committee bill, however, would eliminate this appeal procedure for the conscientious objector.

The retention of these existing provisions in the Selective Service Act however will result in sounder decisions on appeals of conscientious objectors. Local draft boards vary widely in their familiarity and experience with conscientious objectors; some have been known to give all objectors a 1-A classification and require them to appeal so that someone else will have to exercise judgment and make a decision. In such instances, very little evidence gets into the record, the advantage of face-to-face discussions is often lost, and the appeal board has a very limited basis on which to reach a judgment.

The present investigation and hearing by officers of the Department of Justice bring to light both favorable and adverse evidence which otherwise would have been unknown. The conscientious objector is provided with an opportunity to know and to answer material adverse to his claim, and the Government hearing officer is able to examine him orally about the facts and about his convictions.

Since decisions of the selective service boards finally determine the classification of conscientious objectors and since such decisions can lead to orders to report for induction, care should be taken to maintain an appeal procedure which will safeguard the rights of sincere persons. The present provisions have demonstrated that they can operate effectively both in time of peace and in time of conflict when emotions may threaten to affect administrative procedures.

Mr. Chairman, a return to our traditional system of voluntary recruitment would solve many of the problems with which we are presently concerned. The compulsion element that is so alien to our democratic ideals would be eliminated. The discrimination associated with the deferment would no longer exist. And, a far more skilled and effective defense force would be established.

I am not, however, under any illusion that the draft can be eliminated overnight. But, the Congress must be called upon now to make a resolution assuring the American people that the goal of a free and voluntary service will be achieved and that it will take some steps to move in that direction. The committee bill makes no such assurance. If, however, such a commitment is not made now, this may be our last chance for freedom in these terms.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Hicks], a member of the committee.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, if this bill provided the same fairness and equity that our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, does when he runs the committee, I would have no trouble in accepting the bill. It does not. I voted against this bill in committee and probably will vote against it again tonight.

I think it is worth while to give a few reasons why. One of the first reasons is just exactly what has happened. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier], gets up and says that there are a number of amendments that he will offer. He hopes they will be seriously considered. You know they will not, not with the lateness of the hour. It is ridiculous to put this measure, which is as important to the country as it is, before the House at this hour of the night, after the experience we went through last evening on the education bill. And yet, that is exactly what we are doing. We are going to shove this bill through. The cry has been, "Vote, vote," without any consideration or discussion at all.

I wish to join in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike], and those of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Stafford], except for his remark that he was going to vote for the bill. I do not join him in that.

What should have been done? One of the things is that there should have been serious consideration given to the possibility of a volunteer military establishment for the security of this Nation. Maybe we cannot have a volunteer military force. I do not know, but I know this: There has been no serious consideration given to it.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Can the gentleman recall any time that the committee prevented any amendment on any bill to provide for a voluntary army, or anything else?

Mr. HICKS. No, Mr. Chairman. The chairman runs our committee as fair as it is possible to run a committee. I have nothing but the highest regard and admiration for the way he runs the committee. But, to continue, when Under Secretary Morris was asked regarding a voluntary army, he said:

> We have looked into the matter and it would cost from $4 billion to $17 billion more than it is costing us today.

You know in the Defense Department they have made no serious study of the question when they come up with a figure of from $4 billion to $17 billion more than it costs today.

Possibly we cannot have a voluntary military force, but it is a serious enough question and there are enough people around the country who think it is practical that, it is a question that deserves serious study, and we have not had a serious study of this matter.

Another point that I wish to make is that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] came before our committee with a suggestion that this matter should be looked at from the standpoint of the country as a whole. That is our job. A composite committee should look at the situation. It would consist of members from the Armed Services Committee and members from the Committee on Labor and Education, who would look at it from the national manpower standpoint. And I would go further and say that the Foreign Affairs Committee should be represented. Why do we need an army or a military establishment? We need an army or a military establishment as one of the arms to carry out our foreign policy. Nevertheless we get locked in concrete on a foreign policy and we go on and on and on with it. The other body evaluates our foreign policy and this House ought to occasionally evaluate our foreign policy also.

This is a wonderful opportunity to look at what we are doing and where we are going. We are in Vietnam now. We are going to stay there until we reach our objectives. I am for that. But whether we should go into future Vietnams or not, I think, is a question that should be carefully considered. This bill would be an excellent vehicle that could be used to consider where we are going in our foreign policy.

We should consider why we are going where we seem to be headed instead of just automatically taking this law and extending it. That is just about what we are doing. We are automatically extending it rather than taking a look at the whole situation carefully. Are we forever to be bound to a system of conscription without periodically reexamining.

With only 3 hours of consideration given to the bill in debate and thereafter to shout down amendments and pass it, we will not give consideration to the measure that its importance to the Nation warrants.

If we have to have it—and I assume we do have to have a selective service bill—then there are one or two things wrong with this one.

Student deferment is one of the things that is wrong. I do not care how thin we slice it, when we get down to it, when a boy gets out of high school and is capable of going to college, we are saying to him, "Do you want to go to college, or do you want to go to Vietnam, and you may determine what the choice is going to be." There is nothing fair about that when a shooting war is going on.

Another thing, we maintain a pretty sizable reserve establishment. My committee spends a great deal of time on the Reserve and this Congress spends a lot of money on Reserve forces. I am tired of getting letters saying, "My boy was drafted in May and killed in October in Vietnam. Why are they not using the Reserves?"

Whether or not it gets the consideration it should tonight, I am going to offer an amendment which will provide a figure of 300,000 as being the figure we can induct in one calendar year and that thereafter we cannot induct any more in that calendar year unless we induct on a one-to-one basis, unless we call in some reserves. In other words, if we desire 360,000 inductees, 30,000 have to be reserves.

I believe that it is the purpose of a reserve program and organization to serve in time of emergency. We are now in an emergency situation when we are inducting 340,000 a year. That is what we are inducting this year. I feel this is the time to look at the Reserves and see if we can't begin to use them. If it served no other purpose, the country would better understand the condition in which we actually find ourselves if some Reserves are called up.

My strongest opposition to the bill is that we are going ahead and ramming it through tonight without adequate consideration. Our committee held lots of hearings. Can we go on holding them? It may be said that the act is about to run out so what can we do? We can extend it 6 months and look into all the matters to the extent that they deserve to be looked into.

I thank the chairman for yielding to me and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, this is a tremendously important piece of legislation that we have before us tonight. I believe it is too bad that we are here at this time. I have looked over the law, and I am not really so worried about what is in the bill or about what is going to happen in the draft.

I believe the committee has done a good job in many ways. I am really more worried about the Congress of the United States and the circumstances that bring us here tonight at this late hour after meeting until 1:45 this morning. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], on his discussion of the rule at an earlier hour in that regard.

I also would like to associate myself with the remarks that have been made by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD], with regard to the consideration of a volunteer army. I believe this is a major deficiency in the consideration of the committee.

Perhaps it is not the committee's fault, but certainly it is the concern of the Congress in that it fails to relate the draft policy of this country with the entire manpower policy of this country.

When I was in this Congress in 1963–64, along with other members of the Education and Labor Committee, I went into this and had a study made, which was pigeonholed, just as a later study of the Congress was pigeonholed, by an executive department investigation on its own.

I shall not hesitate to support this bill, because I believe under the circumstances we find ourselves in, we have to support an extension of the draft law. I do believe we might well consider—and I wish there were going to be enough Members here in a spirit in which we could consider—whether or not a 4-year extension of the draft is a wise policy.

I am aware of what was stated with regard to it in the committee report, and I am not overly impressed by it.

I would like to abolish one myth with regard to this measure, and I ask that the Members will go along with me on the bill for a moment in discussing this statement that has been made, that the Congress has taken responsibility in this measure and has not in effect just handed over the entire area to the President.

Oh, we have established the principle of uniformity, and I believe that is a good principle, but it is an exception.

On page 8, section (3) of the bill, the section on induction into the armed services is pretty much left up to the President.

Although Congress did reserve a veto in the provisions there, it is true.

But then let us move over to page 9, section (4) of the bill. We find there the President makes a determination as to whether or not the Reserve may be maintained without enlistment.

On page 12, section (5), we find again, on the 18 months service exemption, there is broad rulemaking power under which the President may determine who has served 18 months and who is eligible and who is not.

Then, moving to page 13, section (6) of the bill, we find college exemptions are subject to rules and regulations—made again by the President, not determined by the Congress of the United States.

Then on page 14, in section (6), line 15, we find that the employment exemption is up to the President as well, not under standards set by the Congress of the United States.

On page 18, still in section (6), we find the President is authorized to prescribe the rules and regulations as to dependency.

Under subsection (6) on line 18 of page 15, the health factors are covered, and again this is entirely up to the President.

Finally, on page 17, section (7) relating to conscientious objectors, here the President is the one who determines what is noncombatant duty.

If we say that the Congress has put its imprint on this bill, I wonder if we must not take into consideration some of these things which show that the bill continues to give a blank check to the President. Perhaps this has been brought about by the very procedures by which we find ourselves here tonight. Perhaps this makes it inevitable.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I open my remarks with a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORTON. Would it be in order to move that the Committee rise and sit again on Wednesday, the 31st of May?

The CHAIRMAN. At this time that motion would not be order.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot pass this opportunity during the consideration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to express my feelings on the whole subject of compulsory military training, as it affects not only the military posture and current military commitments of our country, but as it affects, long range, the development of our Nation.

I have always felt compulsory military training should be avoided, if possible, in the United States. I say this even though at the outset I am aware there are times and protracted periods when there are no alternatives.

But I am afraid as a country and as a Congress we have come to accept the proposition of the draft as an unalterable fact of American life. This disturbs me.

The purpose of our military posture and the necessity for it have been well articulated and have been accepted by the vast majority of Americans. This is not at issue here.

For a good many years, I served on a high-level civilian advisory board dealing with the problems of the Air Training Command. This work actually became involved in many problems of the Air Force itself. The Air Training Command is that branch of the Air Force assigned the responsibility for manpower development in this great arm of our Military Establishment. Based on the work and evaluations of this board, and based on my conversations not only with military people, but with interested civilians, I am left with considerable doubt as to the merit of universal military training as a continuing national policy.

Admittedly, if we are to use a method of recruiting and retaining hard-core military personnel capable of rapid and effective response to national emergencies, changes will have to be made in the military system, including decided adjustments in pay and total compensation. I am convinced it is almost impossible under any accounting system to determine the high cost of our low rate of retention in the sevices. I do not believe there are any authorities, however, who would deny that a great portion of the cost of our overall military posture can be attributed to the "in and out" system of personnel management which prevails.

If we could bring our armed services into a higher degree of professionalism, which would inevitably substitute career manning for the "in and out" conscriptee, we would, in my opinion, undoubtedly reduce by large amounts total military costs in proportion to a given level of military effectiveness.

At a time when there are so many demands for each tax dollar, at a time when we have an apparent and dangerous gap in the condition of our total physical environment relative to what it should be to support the civilization we envision, it seems to me there is every reason to maximize the effectiveness of each dollar appropriated to the military. I am convinced this achievement cannot be made while we are under a program of universal military training.

I know there are those who attach and assign many collateral benefits to our draft program. I am not at all sure these so-called benefits could stand the acid test of accurate evaluation.

In the first place, there are ways of beating the draft, and thousands of young men have been successful in this effort. Some of their efforts have been motivated not to beat the draft per se, but to pursue a course of life and training which incidentally happens to be insulated from induction into the service. Others have deliberately worked up a program for themselves simply to avoid serving. This is obvious.

Another fact is that the services themselves exclude a large number of those presented by the draft boards for minor physical defects or illiteracy. Certainly no one can say those rejected are in any way benefited by the program.

If it is assumed we must have universal military training in order to provide for our society a training ground or an accelerator in the evolution of our society toward the development of better citizenship, a higher degree of patriotism, or the establishment of a more acceptable moral plateau, the results are not compatible with the assumption.

Mr. Chairman, let us develop a better analysis of our military manpower needs. Let us put our military services in an honest and functional light. Let us make them professional. Let us maximize the career opportunities within them, but let us not expect them to provide the solution to the social problems or the educational problems which face us as a nation. Long range, if we expect more than national defense and more than efficient military performance from our armed services, we will inevitably reduce the true effectiveness of our national defense posture.

Let us consider universal military training only a stopgap in our national history and examine now the very fiber of the organizational relationships, the personnel structure, and the comparative way of life in our military with other branches of public service as well as opportunities in the private sector.

It will only be after we have faced this problem, examined it in its true light, and have been willing to accept the responsibility of our national defense for what it really is that we can reach the day of better balance between appropriations for the services and appropriations for the other necessities of a nonmilitary nature in the total environment of our country.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding me this time. I want to pay tribute to his unfailing courtesy and cooperation in allowing me to speak and express ideas which I am sure he feels are not only unreasonable but impractical and possibly even worse.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] who just spoke, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD], and to others who have discussed the idea of a volunteer Army.

I recall the debate 4 years ago upon this subject, and I wish to say that, based upon my recollection of the paucity of expression at that time, despite the lateness of the hour and the difficulties which face us, a much more constructive debate is now being held than we had 4 years ago.

I wish to make clear at this time my position on this subject. I have introduced a bill providing for a substantial raise in the rate of pay for members of the armed services. In addition, I have introduced legislation that would materially strengthen and improve the economic and other benefits of our servicemen by raising their status generally and by developing and maintaining a system of manpower procurement based on the free choice of the individual rather than on involuntary service. Both of these bills would phase out the Selective Service System to the point where it is on a standby basis only for use in an emergency. Both of these bills, however, contain adequate safeguards to guarantee our national security while we are making the transition to a voluntary military system.

I am prepared to support this type of procedure designed for the purpose of maintaining the strength and capability of our armed services needed to accept the multitude of responsibilities at any place throughout the world. I am convinced this procedure would allow us to achieve this goal without the infringement on individual liberties which is intrinsic in the present system of military conscription.

Mr. Chairman, I see absolutely no sign that the Congress is ready to move in that direction and, therefore, I intend to vote against this Military Selective Service Act which is pending before us today. I regret that many of my colleagues who have spoken so well with respect to the merits of a volunteer Army, have, in most cases, decided—that having made their speech—they will go ahead and vote for this bill. Because then we will have for another 4 years the continuation of a peacetime draft which we consider to be a temporary expedient but which has been with us for the last 27 years, with some brief interruptions.

Mr. Chairman, when is the time to consider the termination in this scheme which is so foreign to the history of this country of free men?

The Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union may very well say that today is not the time. They may well say that we are in the midst of a war. What was the excuse 4 years ago? What was the excuse 8 years ago? What will be the excuse 4 years from now? Eight years from now? Are we prepared to embark upon a road of permanent military conscription for this democracy, when the balance of the free world has departed from it, and when even our enemies of the last war have departed from it?

We have embarked upon a program which, as I have mentioned before, enhances the dangers contained in the military authorization bill and presents this country as a paramount example of a military garrison in the family of nations of the entire world.

Tonight we are considering ways to make compulsory military service more palatable to the American people. But I think we should stop and ask ourselves if our primary consideration is not our foreign policy and methods by which that policy can best be furthered. The draft, which was once a temporary measure, has been transformed to a permanent system of military procurement. Initially designed as a necessity to meet the threat of a national emergency that called for the mobilization of a massive land army, we are seeing its metamorphosis into an efficient machine designed to meet the long-range needs of a continuing policy of intervention and occupation within the framework of limited warfare.

I feel this situation is foreign to the philosophy of this country. Therefore, I do not feel that I can sit silently and vote time after time for act after act which merely leads to a continuation of this situation.

I have stood on the floor of this Chamber before and have warned against the tragedy of the garrison state dominated by the military mind. In our efforts to make the draft more equitable and to maintain it as a permanent institution, we are further militarizing our society and foreign policy. All phases of the draft reform movement—its initial motivation, the language of the proposed legislative changes, the operation of its administrative machinery—point the way to increasing military pressures and priorities on our free society.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that today is one more day in which you may take some action with respect to this predicament. I do not know how you will vote, but I remember that 4 years ago there were three of us who voted against this bill, and two of them were from the minority side. I appreciate that fact. I hope that that number will be multiplied many times today.

Mr. Chairman, I have looked at this bill from some other standpoints. There is a provision contained in this bill to which I propose to offer an amendment. I remember the colloquy of a few weeks ago with respect to the permanent ceiling on the force levels for the armed services. There was quite a bit of confusion on that question. The permanent ceiling is about 2 million people but, according to the committee report, we have about 3.5 million in the Armed Forces today. Why? Because this bill suspends the permanent ceiling. It is like the temporary debt limit. It is a fiction. We have no ceiling insofar as the military is concerned. This bill suspends the permanent ceiling and sets up a temporary ceiling of 5 million men.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to offer an amendment at the proper time during the consideration of this legislation which, if adopted, would reduce that figure to 4 million men.

Your support thereof would demonstrate that the Congress at long last wants to take some action with respect to asserting some control of that which is, for all practical purposes, the largest aspect of the Government of the United States; namely, the military. I urge those of you who have so eloquently expressed your concern for the continuing erosion of the powers of Congress by the Executive to show that concern by your vote for this amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. WALKER] who is a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the present legislation is quite properly referred to as the most difficult decision facing the Congress in the present session. It is more than that. It is the most difficult decision that faces the Congress at any time and it is a decision which, more than any other, troubles the conscience of a Member of Congress. This is true because, quite simply, it is the decision by which a Member of Congress gives his voice to determining which American boys serve and which may not serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. And by extension, it is the decision which determines who faces the trials of combat and the risk of the ultimate sacrifice.

There are some points in this decision on which we all agree. The United States of America must have an armed force adequate to its defense—adequate to carry out its part of the policies adopted by the Congress and the American people. In raising an armed force sufficient to meet these purposes, the burden of service will be spread among the young men of the country as equitably as possible. We are all agreed on these two points: that we will supply the forces necessary and that we will spread the burden as equitably as we possibly can.

But we all realize also, Mr. Chairman, that spreading the burden so as to provide complete equity among all the young men of the country, particularly at a time when not all are required, is well nigh impossible. Voting in such a situation, there is one thing more than any other which tugs at the conscience of a Member of Congress.

And that is quite simply, "Have we done all we can do to provide equity?" Have we examined every possibility? Is there another way by which the force might be provided equally well if we but took the time to study and understand it?

I know, Mr. Chairman, that thought is running through the minds of Members of the House today and because I have had those thoughts too, I would like to take my brief time to impress upon Members of the House the exhaustiveness of the study out of which the present legislation evolved. I know of no subject that has received more detailed or thorough study or has been the subject of more concentrated attention by distinguished citizens. As one who has been charged with digesting all of the study material provided, I am satisfied that no more desirable alternative exists than that before the House today.

The Draft Act was initially subject to a review before our committee on June 22, 1966. Following that, the Department of Defense conducted a thorough professional study of the continuing requirement for the draft and of the possibility of substituting an all-volunteer force—a study which concluded that it would not be practicable to eliminate the draft. The results of this study were made available to our committee.

Last year the President appointed a National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, which was composed of a distinguished group of citizens of various walks of life, under the chairmanship of Mr. Burke Marshall, the distinguished former Assistant Attorney General. Serving with Mr. Marshall on the Commission are the following distinguished Americans: Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University; Thomas S. Gates, Jr., chairman of the board of Morgan Guarantee Trust Co.; Oveta Culp Hobby, editor and chairman of the board of the Houston Post; Anna Rosenberg Hoffman, president of Anna Rosenberg Associates; Paul J. Jennings, president of International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL–CIO; John H. Johnson, president of Johnson Publishing Co., Inc.; Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., project director, Voter Education Project, Southern Regional Council, Inc.; Daniel M. Luevano, director of Western Region, Office of Economic Opportunity; John A. McCone, Joshua-Hendy Corp.; James H. McCrocklin, president of Southwest Texas State College; John Courtney Murray, S. J., professor of theology of Woodstock College; Jeanne L. Noble, associate professor, Center for Human Relations Studies, New York University; George E. Reedy, Jr., president, Struthers Research and Development Corp.; David Monroe Shoup, General, U.S. Marine Corps, retired; Florindo A. Simeone, professor of surgery, Western Reserve University Medical School, Cleveland, Ohio; James A. Suffridge, international president, Retail Clerks International Association; Frank S. Szymanski, judge of probate, Detroit, Mich.; Luther L. Terry, vice president, University of Pennsylvania; Warren G. Woodward, vice president, American Airlines.

The Commission had a sizable staff and was served by 13 able consultants. The results of this study were made available to our committee.

The Committee on Armed Services appointed its own Civilian Advisory Panel on Military Manpower Procurement under the chairmanship of the very distinguished Gen. Mark W. Clark, retired, president emeritus of The Citadel. Serving with General Clark on this Panel were the Honorable Sterling Cole, a former distinguished Member of the House and the former Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency; Dr. Jerome H. Holland, president of Hampton Institute; Earl H. Blaik, chairman of the executive committee of Avco Corp.; Dr. Frederick Hovde, president of Purdue University; the Honorable Robert D. Murphy, former Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, and now president of Corning Glass International; Msgr. Maurice S. Scheehy, former Chief of Chaplains of the U.S. Navy; and Charles E. Saltzman, a member and former vice president of the New York Stock Exchange.

This Panel reported to the Committee on Armed Services in February.

The committee also had available to it the recommendations of the President of the United States which included certain of the recommendations of the Marshall Commission.

The Committee on Armed Services then held its own exhaustive hearings—hearings which filled 806 pages. The hearings included testimony from over 100 individuals or organizations among which were 12 Members of Congress.

The Members of the House can see just from this listing that the subject has received the most complete study possible.

Two things impressed me more than any other in this long process. The first is that all of the major studies came to the conclusion that the selective service is necessary and that alternative proposals that seem very attractive at first glance, such as an all-volunteer force or universal national service, were not feasible.

The second is that while there were some differences, the major studies were so much in agreement on the desirable fundamental changes in the running of the Selective Service System.

I think it can be truly said that the bill before the House today is the best distillation of the thinking of some of the best minds in the country on the subject of how to provide adequate military manpower for the United States. It is an outstanding bill and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, and a former member of the committee [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, when I first came to Congress I was a strong believer in a volunteer, professional fighting force. Since that time, the war in Vietnam has heated up, and I have been forced to take a new look at my former position. A volunteer, professional force would be a more effective force than what we have—on pure economic grounds and from the viewpoint of fighting effectiveness. However, I do not see how we can justify it on moral grounds. I see an unholy alliance here between certain liberals and the representation of the upper middle class who would just love to dump the obligation of defending this country on a few gung ho young fellows who are willing to go out and fight and die for their country, and on the sons of the poor who find the military to be a more remunerative deal than what they can get in ordinary life. I believe it is completely wrong to allow the well-to-do and the smart people of this country to shrug off these responsibilities onto the poor or the patriotic.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

First let me say that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] had planned to participate in this debate, but, regrettably, a minor illness has prevented him from being here. He has worked hard and long, and most effectively, on the subject of the national manpower problem, both civilian and military. He has contributed greatly to the meaningful dialog on the national manpower needs.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes.

The Committee has dealt with a most difficult subject, a complicated one. I certainly claim to be no expert on this subject. My remarks will be restricted to two or three aspects of the subject.

I testified before both the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and submitted some 15 to 20 insertions and statements in the record discussing the question of military manpower problems.

Let me make my position perfectly clear: There will be a draft, a compulsory selective service mechanism in this country. Let there be no doubt about it. That is not the issue here. This country requires a level of military manpower for the foreseeable future, and even if we had an all-volunteer military, we would have to have superimposed above that voluntary military an involuntary draft mechanism available to be triggered in in the event we were not able to get the manpower we needed for this country's national security needs through a voluntary mechanism.

So no one is suggesting that this country should jeopardize its security.

I personally feel that in a free system, compulsion is excusable and reasonable only when there is a demonstrated need. Now, I am saying that we should use this selective service mechanism to the minimum extent possible. We should trigger it in only when the national security requires it.

This is a principle that is widely accepted in the country. But, some will disagree, as some have, on the floor.

Further, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON], and commend him on an excellent statement on a very difficult subject.

There is a lack of information as to what our military manpower needs are, and by what various ways we can meet these needs.

This lack of information has been testified to in the committee, it is in the committee report, and it is in the Clark panel report and by repeated statements by Department of Defense witnesses before both the House and Senate Armed Services Committee. They admit that they do not know exactly what the revision of pay and personnel policies could or could not do. And I do not know, I do not know if a totally voluntary system is feasible. I do feel it is inexcusable for us not to try to find out. I think we can work toward gaining on and closing this information gap in the coming 2 years.

I would like to comment briefly on one or two things that have been said. There have been some comments made about the cost estimates of a voluntary military. It was quoted that the Department of Defense said it would cost between $4 billion and $17 billion, assuming a 2.7-million-man military. The way I do arithmetic, if you divide a 2.7-million-man force into $17 billion you get a sum of money in excess of a $6,000 pay increase per man. No one has even begun to suggest that. I cannot conceive how the Department of Defense could come up with a figure such as that. But I think it demonstrates that the Department of Defense does not have the answers, and they clearly do not if they give Congress information saying it would cost $4 billion to $17 billion—a range that wide. They do not have the answers. And we need the answers.

During the amending process when the bill is being read for amendment, I intend to offer two amendments. Neither amendment is complicated and neither amendment goes to any of the difficult and complicated work that has been done in the Committee on Armed Services over a long period of time.

One amendment will simply add to the statement of policy, in the beginning of the Selective Service Act, a statement of intent and purpose of the Congress. The statement was expressed in the President's message to the Congress—the statement is in the committee report where they quote the Department of Defense representatives indicating they are trying to maximize the number of volunteers and minimize the number of individuals conscripted. It simply would express a preference for voluntarism.

There will be an amendment also, my second amendment, which is a simple one. It simply recognizes that there are information gaps, and that we do not have all the answers.

There are in excess of 2 million young Americans coming to draft age each year. The amendment would simply say that we will extend the Selective Service Act, as amended by the committee, for 2 years, to 1969, instead of for 4 years to 1971.

Some have said that this might be interpreted as showing a lack of will on the part of the Congress with respect to the conflict in South Vietnam or the problems in the Middle East. I disagree. We do not pass Department of Defense appropriations or authorizations for 4-year periods. This matter, I believe, deserves the attention of the Congress at least every 2 years.

There is nothing fixed as to the manpower that is available each year. It is changing and growing.

There is nothing fixed about the problems of our country in the civilian manpower field. These things are changing, and I do not believe the Congress is so busy that we cannot find our way clear in 1969 to again consider this extremely important bill, and consider this very difficult subject matter and see that it does, in fact, do what the people of this country and the members of this committee and of this House of Representatives feel that it should do.

Mr. Chairman, because my time was limited, I will ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD, my testimony before the House Committee on Armed Services on this subject:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DONALD RUMSFELD OF ILLINOIS, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to present my views on the issue of military manpower recruitment.

In assessing the United States military manpower procurement system, I am handicapped by the lack of a comprehensive and accurate assessment of the cost of the present draft, and of such alternative systems as an all-volunteer system.

An extensive manpower study by the Department of Defense, requested by the President in response to growing criticism of the draft, was withheld upon its completion, then revised in light of the escalation in Viet Nam, and finally reported to the Congress in 1966 by Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas D. Morris in brief summary form only. The study and working papers on which the conclusions were based have never been made public to my knowledge.

More recently, the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, also initiated by the President and headed by Burke Marshall, issued a 219 page evaluation of the draft and its alternatives. The Commission, in its own words, "spent more than 100 hours in meetings in Washington alone, which are recorded in more than 3,500 pages of transcript; and the members read, considered, and discussed in detail hundreds of pages of staff memoranda." However, none of these working papers has been made public.

On March 24, 1967, I joined with the Honorable Thomas B. Curtis in urging the President to release the information necessary to make an adequate evaluation of his draft proposals. Our letter concluded: "Without supporting data and working papers, the strength of your proposals is seriously diminished. Thus we respectfully request that working papers of your National Commission on the points discussed be made available to us in the Congress." Thus far, the only response from the President has been a brief acknowledgement of our letter by an aide.

A copy of the letter we sent to the President was forwarded to the distinguished Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. Rivers, who sent it to Burke Marshall on April 10 for his reply. In response to our request for the working papers and data, Mr. Marshall stated: "We chiefly examined the materials prepared by the Department of Defense, which I understand have also been made available to you." These materials have not been made available to me, nor have they been made available, to the best of my knowledge, to the public.

AREAS OF AGREEMENT

I appear today in a dual role—as both an advocate and an inquirer. Before I embark on either role, I would like to set before you what seem to be certain premises on which most can agree:

Military conscription is repugnant to a free society except in time of demonstrated need. President Johnson in his recent Message on Selective Service underscored this point when he said: "The volunteer tradition is strong in our Armed Forces, as it is in our national heritage. Except for the periods of major war in this century, it has been the chief source of our military manpower since the earliest days of the Republic."

Any system of involuntary military service is inherently inequitable when not all qualified men are required to serve. President Johnson in the same message declared: "For the unavoidable truth is that complete equity can never be achieved when only some must be selected and only some must serve."

Given the basic undesirability as well as the inherent inequity in military conscription, every effort must be made to make the rewards for military services commensurate with the rewards in civilian employment. No one would argue, I believe, that, in addition to the other sacrifices that Armed Forces personnel must make, they should also be obliged to subsidize their own service.

There is a point at which—given a combination of pay increases, liberalized fringe benefits, improved recruitment and retention policies, extension of education opportunities in and through the Armed Services, and greater utilization of civilian personnel, male and female, in noncombatant posts—that conscription would no longer be necessary to fill military requirements. There may be differences of opinion as to exactly where that point is, but it is there nonetheless.

The Viet Nam conflict has both focused attention on and beclouded the issue of the draft and its alternatives. Selective Service was extended in 1963 with scarce attention from the Congress and the public. With the extension of the war effort and increased involuntary induction, the draft became more directly important to more families.

I accept the obvious fact that the United States, during this period of its history, requires a sizable military capability. The question to be answered is: what is the best mechanism to recruit the range of manpower required, not only during the present situation in Southeast Asia, but also, hopefully, in the not too distant future when a settlement is reached. We must investigate, plan, and take action for the anticipated range of the military manpower needs of the foreseeable future.

A REASONABLE PROPOSAL

In the full realization that the time is short between now and June 30, when the Selective Service Act expires, I would suggest consideration of the following possible course of action:

That the Selective Service Act should be extended for a maximum of two years.

That conscription procedures should be modified, insofar as possible, to remove the most serious inequities.

That Congress should declare its intention to establish a volunteer military force and conduct the necessary investigation and study to determine the best means to establish such a force. At the end of the two-year extension of Selective Service, and to the extent that study so indicates, the Congress should either terminate conscription or set a definite termination date for conscription.

That Congress should raise immediately the pay scales and fringe benefits for military personnel, with the goal of providing the increases necessary to bring military rewards up to a more competitive posture with respect to civilian rewards.

That the Department of Defense should intensify its efforts in the recruitment and retention of military personnel and continue to expand its utilization of civilian manpower in noncombatant posts.

There are three principal questions which must be answered regarding such a course of action and, particularly, in relation to the establishment of a volunteer military.

IS IT FEASIBLE?

The question of the feasibility of attracting and maintaining an adequate voluntary armed force centers primarily on the issue of costs. Cost estimates have ranged from $4 to $20 billion for maintaining a volunteer force of approximately 2.7 million men.

The Department of Defense seems to be in the position of both estimating the cost of a voluntary army and of judging whether that cost is justified, even though it has stressed that as a "user" of personnel it is concerned only with the attraction of sufficient quantity and quality of manpower. Thomas D. Morris, Asst. Secretary of Defense (Manpower), testifying before the House Committee on Armed Services in 1966, had the following colloquy with Congressman Otis Pike:

"Mr. Pike: '. . . So long as there aren't any Federal guidelines, aren't you going to have this same inequality which is the basic objection to the draft in this country today?'

"Mr. Morris: 'Sir, again, I should limit my comments to our responsibilities as to the user of manpower and the setter of physical mental, and moral standards.'

"Mr. Pike: 'So, as the user of manpower, you are not concerned about the inequalities in the draft system which is the basic complaint which I receive in my mail regarding the draft?'

"Mr. Morris: 'We think these are matters beyond our responsibility, sir.' "

Notwithstanding the above, Mr. Morris, in the same 1966 hearings, concluded categorically: "Increases in military compensation sufficient to attract an all-volunteer force cannot be justified." I disagree.

DOD claims that a volunteer army is impractical because it is too costly. However, whether a program can be financed and should be financed—given known Federal revenues and spending priorities—is a determination which must be made by the Congress and the people. DOD, and other departments and agencies, must supply facts; Congress must evaluate those facts and translate them into policy.

If DOD studies the feasibility of developing a necessary new weapons system, it would not conclude that it is impractical *only* because it cost between $4 and $20 billion. One would suspect that other considerations entered into its judgment on the draft.

Or, to put it another way, if the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Central Intelligence Agency discovered urgent needs which demanded the recruitment of thousands of additional personnel, neither agency would recommend conscription of that manpower. Rather, they would present proposals for attracting the needed manpower based on the competitive market rate and on modern personnel recruitment and retention practices.

The point is this—we can afford to attract a volunteer army if we want to. And the cost very likely will not be as prohibitive as the Department of Defense suggests.

Dr. Walter Y. Oi, a manpower expert who was with the Department of Defense in the early stages of the manpower study and is now Professor of Economics at the University of Washington, has conducted a comprehensive study of the costs of an all-volunteer force. Dr. Oi's conclusion:

"An all-volunteer force offers a polar alternative to the draft. With its lower personnel turnover, a voluntary force of the same size could be sustained by recruiting only 27.5 per cent of qualified males. The budgetary payroll cost would, however, have to be raised by $4 billion per year."

I will submit for the record, following my remarks, the complete analytic text of Dr. Oi's study which was submitted at the University of Chicago Conference on the Draft in December, 1966, as well as a monograph he has prepared recently which outlines a program designed to move toward a volunteer system.

I have focused exclusively on the payroll cost necessary to attract a volunteer force. However, considerable savings might accrue from such factors as a lower turnover rate, more skilled personnel and a reduction in basic training needs.

But, most important, whether we turn to volunteerism or retain the draft with substantial pay boosts, military personnel would no longer be forced to subsidize their own service by accepting compensation less than they could draw in open job competition. Dr. Oi illustrates the "hidden tax" placed on military personnel in the following passage:

"In 1964, the typical recruit to regular enlisted ranks (volunteers) could as a civilian have earned $3,450 per year, while the typical draftee who is older could have earned $3,810 per year. The average military income (for the first three years of service and including the value of subsistence and quarters) was only $2,400 per year. Each draftee or draft-induced volunteer was thus burdened with a hidden tax averaging roughly $1,200 per year. . . . The inordinately low levels of first-term pay thus impose a considerable burden on a minority of youths—those who happen to be drafted or who were coerced to enlist by the threat of a draft. Put in another way, the men who serve in the Armed Forces are compelled to pay a hidden tax twice as high as the average tax burden placed on all adults, and by this process a part of the real cost of procuring military manpower is concealed."

Bruce Chapman, author of the ***Wrong Man in Uniform***, put the same point well in these words:

"Even if some draft were necessary, financial relief and bettered living conditions for the draftee would be essential for maintaining any pretence of justice in the draft's rationale."

In brief, the pay of draftees and reluctant-recruits is unreasonable. Ironically, the farther we can move in the direction of removing this serious injustice, the less the need for the draft—to the point where it may not be necessary at all.

IS IT FLEXIBLE?

I now turn to an examination of the second basic question concerning the voluntary approach. Would such an approach provide sufficient flexibility to meet the anticipated range of military manpower requirements?

To answer this question I should like to again stress that I certainly am not opposed to conscription under all circumstances. Sudden and/or massive military build-ups, such as those required in World War II, could not be accomplished without compulsion.

Therefore, even if we accept a voluntary system as our goal, we must keep a workable draft system ready to be superimposed on the voluntary system when a clear need is demonstrated for greater manpower than the volunteer system can reasonably provide. We should undoubtedly retain some semblance of a Selective Service System, even to the point of registering, examining and classifying young men as they come of military age. Our national security and leadership in the free world calls for no less.

A strengthening of the ready reserve and national guard to make these forces truly ready for immediate response would also contribute to U.S. military flexibility.

In addition, the voluntary concept can have a built-in flexibility of its own. If military service is made attractive enough, we might very well have excess numbers of volunteers. Dr. Milton Friedman explained this flexibility concept at the Chicago Conference:

"Recruitment by voluntary means could provide considerable flexibility—at a cost. The way to do so would be to make pay and conditions of service more attractive than is required to recruit the number of men than it is anticipated will be needed. There would then be an excess of volunteers—queues. If the number of men required increased, the queues could be shortened and conversely."

Obviously, the flexibility here is not as great as with the draft but such an approach could easily accommodate moderate increases in military demand. For a fuller explanation of this concept, and of other arguments for volunteerism, I will submit for the record Dr. Friedman's full text at the conclusion of my remarks.

In short, the statement by the President in his message to Congress suggesting that a voluntary system might be gambling with the nation's security is absolutely without foundation.

Harold Wool, Director of the Office of Procurement Policy and General Research (Manpower) in the Department of Defense testified before the Joint Economic Committee recently. The Joint Committee was examining the impact of "Vietnam Deescalation and Military Manpower Alternatives." I questioned Mr. Wool concerning the Department's attitude toward volunteerism. I asked Mr. Wool point-blank whether the "Department of Defense favors a voluntary system?" Without hesitation Mr. Wool replied, "I think I can say categorically—and this is on the record—that the Department of Defense has had as its objective to obtain as many or all of its personnel through voluntary means."

Concerning whether the voluntary approach would provide sufficient flexibility to meet our manpower requirements, a series of questions directed to Mr. Wool by myself, Mr. Curtis, and Chairman Proxmire revealed that the basic issue of flexibility revolves on the retention of a draft mechanism to be available when and if needed. The Department of Defense apparently fears that the draft authority will be taken away from it, and, thus, the Nation will be vulnerable if the need arises for more men than the voluntary approach can provide. This fear is implicit in the following dialogue:

"Mr. Rumsfeld: 'You and the Administration are suggesting that a volunteer system would be inflexible, might not meet our national security needs, and to use the President's words, would be "gambling with the Nation's security."

" 'I don't believe that is the case. If you have in mind, as has anyone I know who has suggested moving towards a voluntary system, retaining a compulsory mechanism, to be triggered in to the extent it is needed, do you see any flexibility problem here or do you stand on the statement in your testimony?'

"Mr. Wool: 'I think that we in part have a semantics problem here.'

"Mr. Rumsfeld: 'You mean not to extend the Selective Service Act would be gambling.'

"Mr. Wool: 'Certainly.'

"Mr. Rumsfeld: 'Not to provide any mechanism.'

"Mr. Wool: 'The authority for induction, which is the context in which these statements were made.'

"Mr. Rumsfeld: 'Then you agree that a proposal for a voluntary system as put forward is flexible and is not gambling with the Nation's security, as long as that compulsory mechanism is available and is sufficiently flexible to be triggered in, and there is no allegation these proposals are inflexible. Thus, the flexibility argument disappears.'

"Mr. Wool: 'As far as the intention of the induction authority and using it as little as needed, if this is the essence of the recommendations, and of a continuing positive effort to maximize volunteers, if this is the thrust of the argument, I don't think there is any issue.'

"Mr. Rumsfeld: 'Then the argument about flexibility goes out the window.'

"Mr. Wool: 'Because we have the draft authority and you have a draft system, so we have that flexibility and we want to continue it.'

"Chairman Proxmire: 'In giving the Department's position on the opposition to, as you put it, a completely voluntary system, you talked about the risks involved. Why is there any risk involved . . . if you leave the draft law on the books and provide a very big increase in pay, $325 or more, and see if this works.

" 'If it works, you have lost nothing because you have all the advantages we have discussed of a voluntary army. If it doesn't work, certainly you have better morale, better equity—you have all these other advantages.'

"Mr. Wool: '. . . Since you are not taking away any authorities but adding an incentive, there isn't any risk, and it is a matter of defining terms here.'

"Mr. Rumsfeld: 'To clarify your answer to Senator Proxmire, you said if we are taking away the authority there might be a risk, but if we are not taking away any authority for the compulsory system, then there is no risk.

" 'What sort of authority are you thinking about that might be taken away, and what sort of risks could flow from the taking away of such authority? . . . Are you suggesting that one of the results of such a proposal might be that for the Administration to trigger in the draft it might require coming before Congress?'

"Mr. Wool: 'At the present time, there is a legislative proposal which has certain very specific provisions. One of them is the extension of the authority to induct men into service, which expires this coming June. Now if there is no change in that authority and related legislation, and simply an expression of sense that it would be a good thing, if we could get as many volunteers as possible, all volunteers, or if there were accompanying pay legislation which increased pay, then in fact the Department of Defense with appropriate guidance from the Congress would continue its efforts to maximize the use of volunteers.' "

So, if the draft mechanism is retained, the issue of flexibility disappears. However, once we return to normal peace-time military needs which can be supplied by the voluntary system, there may be a question of whether the draft mechanism can be used at the discretion of the Administration or whether authority to use the draft must first be granted by the Congress upon demonstration of need.

Congress has the responsibility "to raise and support Armies" and "to provide and maintain a Navy" as established by the Constitution. The Congress should establish the mechanism for maintaining such an armed force. Under normal circumstances, how much discretion should be granted the Commander-in-Chief in this area is a question yet to be debated and resolved.

But, whether authority to conscript is retained by the Congress or we confer such authority to the Administration, clearly our national security needs must and will be recognized and met.

SOCIALLY DESIRABLE?

A third basic question concerning volunteerism is whether or not it is socially desirable. Does it present a threat to existing political institutions, and will it attract an "all-Negro army" as some have charged?

Certainly, any fear of threat to our political institutions merits careful attention. Such a threat, however, has historically come from the officer corps, rather than enlisted personnel, and in the United States, officers of all services have always been career or voluntary. Our proper tradition of civil control over the military has thus far been sufficiently strong so that there has been no serious threat of military takeover.

Further, history seems to show in other nations that military threats to political institutions have come from conscript armies as well as from volunteer armies, and that many nations have *not* had such threats regardless of whether they had conscript or volunteer armies.

I believe that such a threat is a serious matter—to be watched and prevented—but that with attention and care, it can be as readily avoided in a volunteer system as in a conscript army, by building in some turnover in the system.

The charge that increasing the military wage and fringe benefits to a point sufficient to attract a volunteer military force would result in a predominantly Negro-army is not supported by the facts. It seems clear, since Negroes are found in disproportionate numbers in the low-income groups, that making military service more attractive by equitable pay and other incentives will attract a larger percentage of this group. However, even if every Negro qualified to serve would enlist in the armed services, the majority of personnel would remain white.

It is impossible under any circumstances to have an "all-Negro army," or nearly so. Bruce Chapman, writing in the National Review on March 21, expressed the mathematical absurdity of this argument:

"Negro-poor exploitation by high pay is surely one of the most impoverished arguments the povertarians have ever put forward. Dr. Oi's analysis of the employment market and common sense suggest otherwise. If, for example, every Negro male who could pass the Army physical and mental tests were to choose to enter service, only one-fourth of the annual personnel accessions required by the military would be met thereby; there just aren't enough Negroes to fill up the armed forces under any pay situation."

And, as Dr. Milton Friedman has emphasized:

"The military services require a wide variety of skills and offer varied opportunities. They have always appealed to people of varied classes and backgrounds and they will continue to do so. Particularly if pay and amenities were made more attractive, there is every reason to expect that they would draw from all segments of the community."

ADVANTAGES OF A VOLUNTARY SYSTEM

A volunteer system, assuming it to be feasible, offers the following advantages:

Preservation of the freedom of the individual by avoidance of the compulsion inherent in either the present system, a lottery, or universal military training.

Greater efficiency in the military services resulting from a lower turnover rate, and, thus, dollar savings, in man-hours currently spent in training.

Avoidance of the arbitrary discrimination and inherent inequities of the present system.

Elimination of the difficult Constitutional questions relating to conscientious objectors.

Military personnel would be fairly compensated for their services.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

I am deeply concerned that the alternatives to the draft have not been sufficiently explored by the several Presidential commissions. The Marshall Commission, for example, dismisses the possibility of moving to volunteerism in two pages of loose argument. A report to the House Committee on Armed Services, prepared by a civilian advisory panel headed by General Mark Clark, disposes of a volunteer army in one paragraph.

To conclude: A voluntary system is wholly compatible with the principles of a free society and offers numerous advantages over a compulsory system. It appears that a volunteer military force may be feasible, that the necessary flexibility can be maintained, and that no serious threat would be posed to our political institutions. Therefore, Congress should declare its intention to establish a voluntary system and take the necessary steps toward that goal.

The Democratic and Republican promises of 1964 should be paramount in the discussions of 1967. The Democratic Convention promised in its platform to "pursue our examination of the selective service program to make certain that it is continued only as long as it is necessary and that we meet our manpower needs without social or economic injustice."

The Republicans pledged in their platform a "re-evaluation of the armed forces' manpower procurement programs with the goal of replacing involuntary inductions as soon as possible by an efficient voluntary system, offering real career incentives."

Such bipartisan commitments cannot be easily swept aside.

I recognize the difficulty of the task facing us today. Military manpower requirements and the recommendations to meet them pose broad and complex questions. Based upon the information available thus far, the case for moving toward a voluntary military force seems to be overwhelming.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Committee to several related items.

First of all, article I, section 8 of the Constitution, to which we do not often turn, gives to the Congress the right to declare war and also to raise and support armies.

On a yellow mimeographed sheet a little earlier today I am sure many of you saw the statistics from last week. Three hundred and thirty-seven American boys were killed in Vietnam, and the war toll has now exceeded 10,000.

To put this in perspective, we might observe that the death toll last week was up in the range of the total membership of this body, wiped out in one single week. Many of the men who were killed in the process of the war so far were brought there by the authority of the Selective Service Act.

Now, this act is to raise an army, a responsibility of Congress. And I commend the gentleman who is the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the other members of it for an excellent technical job on the Selective Service System legislation. In my view they have done an excellent job.

I would not have expected them to go to the more basic question of the use of the forces brought into being by this act. That properly is a subject for the entire membership of this body, and it is not one that has been explored or considered, in my view, in any adequate detail since I have been a Member of this body.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation under consideration will authorize the taking of young men from private life to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. This is an obligation made necessary by the requirements of the world situation today. No one feels more deeply than I over the necessity of this action. No one wishes any more fervently than I do for an alternative to military force in securing a peaceful world. Nonetheless, this action must be taken.

There is no one who is more conscious of the necessity of defending this country. My question however is whether or not the dispatch of combat troops over the world is the best means of achieving or insuring peace. I can see situations in which more and more combat troops may be dispatched unilaterally to serve in foreign countries. I believe that every one of my colleagues can see this potential as well.

I am concerned about the use of war powers. What disturbs me, Mr. Chairman, is the possibility that combat troops will be dispatched and will fight without any sanction from Congress except what might be collaterally given after the fact by means of appropriations. This is an area, Mr. Chairman, in which the Congress itself has primary responsibility and this is the time when it should be asserted. The Constitution very wisely gave to Congress, and to the Congress alone, the power to declare war. Yet, rightly or wrongly, we are today engaged in a war without a declaration from Congress. Let us be realistic. Death is just as permanent whether it occurs in a declared or undeclared war. And the toll of war climbs higher and higher. This is not the first instance, but I would hope that the adoption of the amendment that I am proposing would to some extent at least insure that any future undertaking of this type would require the prior consent of Congress unless it was an undertaking required pursuant to a treaty to which the United States was a party. But even then, Mr. Chairman, I would not visualize the use of that authority by the Chief Executive in a unilateral undertaking. If a treaty requires that we furnish military assistance then that assistance should be provided only when there is an assumption of responsibility by the other parties to the treaty.

This amendment is quite simple. It would require authorization by the Congress before any inductees called into service pursuant to this measure could be sent abroad as combat units. You will note that there is no restriction on the use of the Navy or Air Force or strategic weapons. With their mobility they are fully capable of meeting the needs of an urgent situation without the necessity for land involvement by foot soldiers. This in itself should make it easier for the Chief Executive to utilize the force of this country when necessary but at the same time leave him in a much better position successfully to conclude such an undertaking without the necessity of massive troop withdrawal.

I see no possibility that the national security of this country could be jeopardized in the least by the adoption of this amendment. With Naval and Air Force available the President should be able to act and to act immediately to repel any threat to the national security wherever it might occur, but in the event combat troops were required I can see no impairment of their use if Congress were not in session so as to give the necessary approval. In this day and time Congress can, as it has in the past, be called back into session upon hours' notice. I do, however, think, Mr. Speaker, that adoption of this amendment would do a great deal to restore self-confidence in the people that combat troops will not be sent abroad without the Congress having been convinced that there was absolute necessity for such action.

It is the genius of our constitutional system that ours is a government of checks and balances, applicable under the Constitution to the warmaking powers. When statecraft fails and the question becomes the ultimate one of war or peace, the Constitution imposes a tight rein upon the President. His participation ends, under article I, section 8 of the Constitution at the threshold of the decision whether or not to declare war. That power is confided exclusively to the Congress, but a President may seek to bypass this constitutional requirement by the dispatch of combat personnel in the absence of either a treaty or declaration of war thus confronting the Congress with a fait accompli. The Constitution did not intend the President to have sole power in determining the existence of a threat to the United States.

This amendment would restrict the unilateral decision of the President to send combat personnel inducted under this act except where we are obliged to do so under a treaty. This amendment is in keeping with a recent Supreme Court decison—Youngstown Steel against Sawyer—that "Nothing in our Constitution is plainer than that declaration of war is entrusted only to Congress." The Constitution says, therefore, in effect, "Our country shall not be committed formally to a trial of force by armies with another nation until the House, Senate, and President shall agree."

This constitutional requirement, according to the great constitutional authority, Joseph Storey, was derived from the historical experience of England. In England, the King possessed the power of raising armies in the time of peace according to his own good pleasure. Parliament sought to avert England being thrust into war by the King's fancy alone by controlling jealously the war powers.

With this historical precedent in mind, President Jefferson in 1801 sent a Navy squadron to Tripoli to protect our commerce, but with orders not to fight unless attacked. Alexander Hamilton wrote—

> It is the peculiar and *exclusive* province of Congress *when the nation is at peace* to change that state into a state of war; whether from calculations of policy, or from provocations, or injuries received; in other words it belongs to Congress only to go to war.

It cannot be said that Congress has said "go to war in Vietnam." The Gulf of Tonkin resolution is not a declaration of war. In fact, it doesn't even mention Vietnam. It merely expresses the view that "maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia is vital to the national interest of the United States." The resolution declares the readiness of the United States to take all necessary steps including the use of the Armed Forces to assist any member or protocol SEATO state to defend its freedoms. However, the resolution provides that all such steps shall be "consonant with the Constitution of the United States."

The necessity of effective action to prevent the unilateral employment of U.S. combat personnel on the sole discretion of the President was succinctly stated by Abraham Lincoln while a Member of this House. Writing his law partner, Lincoln said:

> Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion and you allow him to do so whenever he may choose to say he deems it necessary for such purpose, and you allow him to make war at pleasure. Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power in this respect after having given him so much. . . . If today he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada to prevent the British from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, "I see no probability of the British invading us;" but he will say to you, "Be silent: I see it, if you don't."

I am sure my colleagues agree with me that this action could be taken promptly.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to a member of our committee [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, the people of this Nation have expressed themselves loud and clear on the inadequacies and inequities of the Selective Service System. General Hershey has had no peer in this subject area for the past 30 years, but I think it is time now to effect some real change.

In the report filed by my committee, there is a statement made that there has been no scandal under the existing law and, therefore, the inference is that it cannot be too bad. The report of the committee appears to reflect the view that the basic draft problems are all superficial and will be resolved by compressing the draft age jeopardy area to age 19. I commend this change in the law because it will result in more certainty in young people's making plans for their careers. However, I do not think that you resolve the remaining problems that the public has with this law by appointing a Deputy Director to handle public information to give the Selective Service System a new image. As evidence of the real problem which the general public has with the administration of the current draft law is the fact that two public committees—the Mark Clark Panel and the National Advisory Committee on Selective Service, chaired by Burke Marshall—have been appointed Both panels did an outstanding job.

The major inequity addressed by the Marshall committee was the student deferment. During World Wars I and II, we had no such device to avoid or defer service. We have now escalated to a point of all-out war in Southeast Asia. That several hundred thousand young people should have the option if they are smart to defer their military service for 4 years is most inequitable and unusual. The Department of Defense has stated that they only need 10 percent of the college graduates for military duty. To defer needlessly the other 90 percent makes no real sense.

The college deferment enacted after World War II at a time when colleges were short of manpower had as a purpose, the maintenance of our campus student bodies which were threatened with depletion. This is not the case at the present time. College populations have doubled in the past 10 years, and the problem today is not where do we get the students but where do we get the classrooms.

The college deferment during the Korean war was grossly inequitable. That war lasted from June 25, 1950 to July 27, 1953. Students deferred at the outset of the war were never called under the draft until 1 year after the war ended. Better than 54,247 young Americans died in the Korean war and several hundred thousand were wounded and careers were disrupted. Thousands of young men are alive today merely because they were born smart enough to go to college and to elect that they contribute to the defense of this country during the cool of peace.

Similarly, if young men had elected a 4-year deferment in 1861, 1898, 1914, and 1941, the whole effort would have been over for the boys bright or rich enough to go to college for 4 years had the deferment policy been then in effect. And I mean rich enough, because while it might be technically true that every boy can today go to college, statistics recently published by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare show that of the lower 50 percent of high school graduates, only 19.6 percent of the youngsters from $3,000 income homes go to college, while 49.7 percent of the youngsters from the $12,000 bracket homes go to college.

The President in his message on the draft has requested that the question of college deferments be debated. I do not believe the public interest would be served were this matter swept under the rug with little discussion.

The argument that the deferment is necessary such that there be available doctors, dentists and lawyers is also beside the point since the Department of Defense has indicated that these billets can be fully satisfied by a special deferment for critical service specialties and by maintaining the ID type classification for Reserve officer trainees.

The idea that college students should be drafted in due course after their college career smacks of unreality. Why do you need a college education to shoot a gun or wade through a swamp? Sure we need technical people but we certainly do not need 300,000 college graduate chiefs every year in the military service. Since it is Indians that we need primarily, the great education is superfluous.

As far as the individual is concerned, evidence shows that interruption of a college program to fulfill a military obligation does not decrease the chance that the student will get the degree—past evidence indicates that chances increase.

To more explicitly show the gross inequity and, I think, mismanagement of the college deferment system, I would next like to read into the RECORD the Marshall findings and analysis of memorandum and directives issued by State directors of selective service, section VI, pages 167 through 173 of the report.

SECTION VI—ANALYSIS OF MEMORANDA AND DIRECTIVES ISSUED BY STATE DIRECTORS OF SECTIVE SERVICE

The state headquarters of the Selective Service System issue a wide variety of memoranda and directives to local boards for guidance. These are transmitted to national headquarters for information and review.

A count by subject of the 2,265 state directives issued in the first 9 months of 1966 is shown on table 6.1, and a more detailed analysis of the deferment policy guidelines was made. State directives were furnished by national headquarters for 47 of the states.

In 1966, 39 state headquarters issued 173 directives, bulletins, or memoranda to their local boards which dealt with deferment policies. These figures show, of course, that many state offices sent no directives, at all dealing with deferment policy. Of those offices that did send directives, some sent only 1 or 2, others sent 7 or 8, and one headquarters sent 13. Clearly the amount of guidance a local board gets depends at least to some extent on the state it is in.

Over half of the directives (196) dealt with some aspect of student deferment policy. The remaining ones covered other major areas—occupational deferments, dependency deferments, agricultural deferments. A review of these directives shows that the various state headquarters do not give uniform advice. In some instances, indeed, advice on a subject coming from one state headquarters is opposite to the advice on the same subject coming from another state headquarters. Obviously this may lead to local boards in different states doing very different things.

With the renewed use in 1966 of the Selective Service College Qualification Test and rank in class information (and also because of substantially higher draft calls), a number of states sent information and advice to local boards concerning student deferments. A review of the directives issued by the various state headquarters shows considerable inconsistency and contradiction in the advice being given about the criteria used in judging registrants' eligibility for the student deferment classification. Three major questions have been answered in different ways:

(1) How are selective service college qualification test scores and/or rank in class information to be used? Some state headquarters seemed to take the position that these criteria should be strictly followed by local boards. Others explicitly said the criteria were only advisory.

(2) What constitutes full-time student status? In some states, local boards are told that 12 hours is a full-time load; in other states, the minimum full-time load is 15 hours; in still other states, the college's definition of a full-time load is accepted.

(3) Are students in business, trade, or vocational schools eligible for the student deferment classification? Some state headquarters say that the II–S is not appropriate but that the I–S(C) may be given. Local boards in other states are told that the II–S should be given and that the I–S(C) cannot be given. One state headquarters said that the II–A should be given.

The excerpts from state headquarters directives which are quoted below illustrate the variability.

Are the criteria merely advisory?

"As discussed previously, students who fail to complete a year's study in the prescribed percentage of their class (or who fail to achieve a score of 70 or 80 on the college qualification test) do not qualify for class II–S. Upon receipt of notification of class ranking (and/or college qualification test score), such students must be immediately removed from class II–S." Alabama, Local Board Letter No. 761, June 30, 1966.

"The new regulation sets criteria as to grade level or college qualification test scores which boards may use in deciding the classification of college students. Note that such criteria is advisory only as stated in section 6(h) of the law and section 1622.25(b) of the regulations." Idaho, Memorandum No. 1353, April 26, 1966.

"Local boards may place a registrant in class II–S regardless of class standing or test scores if it is determined that there are extenuating circumtances in the case." Illinois, State memorandum No. 6–21, revised, June 3, 1966.

"Regardless of college qualification test score, or class standing, if a registrant can complete his course work and obtain his bachelor's degree within the 4-year period, this headquarters would recommend continued deferment for that purpose." Minnesota, Memorandum No. 4–10, August 15, 1966.

"Section 1622.25(a) publishes criteria deemed appropriate for classification purposes—keep in mind that no local or appeal board is required to deny or defer any student solely on the basis of class standing or examination test score. The absence of either or both does not prevent a local board from granting a class II–S deferment if in their opinion the registrant's activity in study is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest." Kansas, Classification Bulletin No. 72, November 1, 1966.

"Operations Bulletin No. 296, issued March 31, 1966, sets forth section 1622.25(a) which is the criteria promulgated by the Director of Selective Service * * * and this criteria is advisory only." Louisiana, Administrative Circular, No. 502.11, August 10, 1966.

"To qualify for deferment the students must be satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction, and after the first or freshman year, must meet the criteria of class standing or have attained a score of 70 or above on the Selective Service Qualification Test." Mississippi, Local Board Advice, No. 174, June 10, 1966.

"All other undergraduate college students should meet the criteria set forth in Operations Bulletin 296 (SSR 1622.25(a)) in order to be eligible for class II–S." North Carolina, Circular Letter No. III–2–e–3, June 3, 1966.

"Under the provisions of section 1622.20(d) of the regulations, no local board, or appeal board, is compelled to defer any person solely on the basis of the test or class standing outlined in section 1622.25(a). However, we recommend that local boards generally follow the criteria set forth by the director in appropriate cases." Texas State Director's Advice to Local boards (No. 525), amended May 13, 1966.

"A registrant's college qualification test score or his class ranking does not automatically obligate the local board either to defer or withhold deferment, but should be considered along with all other information in the registrant's cover sheet." Utah, Bulletin No. 10–66, June 6, 1966.

"In the consideration of further undergraduate student deferment, local boards may use either the college qualification test score or the class standing, or may decline to use either." Wyoming, Selective Service Instructional Bulletin, No. 1622–1, June 7, 1966.

"Local boards, when considering registrants who are undergraduates and who have not yet entered graduate school, must have the registrant's class standing or the results of the college qualification test to determine whether the registrant qualifies for a II–S classification. If the registrant does not authorize the school to furnish this information to the local board, and he fails to take or pass the college qualification test, he will not qualify for a deferment as a student under the provisions of section 1622.25(a) of Selective Service Regulations." New York, Administrative Memorandum No. 4, June 20, 1966.

What does full-time student status mean?

"Except for the summer months, students must be currently pursuing a full-time course of instruction. In order to be considered a full-time student a registrant must attempt a minimum of 15 quarter hours or 15 semester hours of study or its equivalent. In order to progress normally, a student must earn a minimum of 30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours of study per academic year." Alabama, Local Board Letter 761, June 30, 1966.

"A full-time course of instruction is that number of credit hours determined to be full time by the college or university." Florida, Circular 426.1, June 1, 1966.

"A full-time course of instruction for the purposes of this circular ('Policy on Student Deferments') shall be enrollment for at least 12 semester hours during a regular session and 6 semester hours during the summer session." Louisiana, Administrative Circular 502.11, August 10, 1966.

"A full-time student is one who has been accepted as a regularly enrolled student in a recognized college, university, or similar institution of learning and is taking at least 12 semester hours of course work." New York City, Local Board Advice No. 65–3, July 11, 1966.

"It is the determination of the institution of higher learning involved to make the decision as to what constitutes a full-time course of instruction; however, no undergraduate taking less than 12 credit hours of instruction should be considered a full-time student." Oklahoma State Memorandum No 294, September 15, 1966.

"A full-time course of instruction is one which will permit a registrant to complete his course of study in a normal period of time. Generally, this will demand that a registrant be enrolled for a minimum of 15 credit hours, or equivalent, in undergraduate study. Similarly a registrant will be expected to complete a 4 year course in 4 successive academic years." Oregon, Memorandum No. 499, May 4, 1966.

"Students now taking 12 or more credit hours a week but less than the normal full-time load but planning to attend school on a year round basis should certify this to their local boards to be considered for student deferment at this time." Tennessee, Memorandum to all local and appeal boards, September 27, 1966.

"Because of the reduced period of summer school, 10 credit hours have been interpreted as constituting a full course of instruction." Utah, Bulletin No. 10–66, June 6, 1966.

"The UMTS Act provides that upon presentation of proper information to this local board, any registrant who is ordered to report for induction while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of study (minimum of 15 credit hours) at a college, university, or similar institution of learning, should be deferred in Class I–S(C) until the end of the academic year or until he ceases to satisfactorily pursue his course of instruction * * *." Utah, Bulletin No. 13–66, October 15, 1966.

"A registrant who is placed in Class I–S(C) has to be retained in Class I–S(C):

(1) Until the end of his academic year or

(2) Until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue a full-time course of instruction, or

(3) Until he drops below a full-time course, whichever of the three is earlier.

For the purpose expressed in this paragraph, a full-time course of instruction should be considered to be 12 semester hours in the fall and spring semesters, and 6 semester hours in the summer session." Texas, State Director's Advice to Local Boards (No. 525), May 13, 1966.

What about the student who changes his program of study thereby extending it?

"A registrant who fails to meet the requirements for graduation within the time established by the catalog is not eligible for further deferment in class II–S since he has not satisfactorily pursued his course of instruction. A change in college courses which requires additional semesters to complete degree requirements, is not sufficient basis for registrants to expect their eligibility to be continued or extended." Pennsylvania, Local Board Advice (No. B–7–2), August 31, 1966.

"The necessity of taking 4½ or 5 years to complete a 4-year course might be justified in some cases and not in others. Such a situation might occur because a registrant changed majors and lost acceptable credits, or it could occur because of being a poor student with several failures. In the first instance continued deferment might be justified, and in the latter, further deferment might be doubtful." West Virginia, Lettergram, June 14, 1966.

What should be the classification status of students in business, trade, or vocational schools?

"When local boards receive information that a registrant has entered upon, and is satisfactorily pursuing, a full-time course of training at a trade school or business college, they should continue to process the registrant for physical examination and induction. When reached for induction, if the local board finds that the registrant started the course of instruction without undue delay following his last year of high school, such registrant will normally be classified I–S(C)." Alabama, Local Board Letter No. 761, June 30, 1966.

"Attendance at a business school or similar institution may qualify a registrant for class II–S under [specified] conditions. Attendance at a trade school may qualify a registrant for class II–S under [specified] conditions." Arkansas, Local Board Advice No. 66–7, April 4, 1966.

"Only schools approved by the State department of education or recognized by a State University may be considered in the deferment of a registrant in class II–S * * *. A registrant enrolled in these schools is not entitled to class I–S(C)." Hawaii, Transmittal Memorandum No. 129, June 15, 1966.

"Any registrant enrolled in a vocational, technical, business, trade school, or any institution of learning below college or university degree granting level, need not take the college qualification test for the purpose of obtaining or continuing deferment in class II–S * * *. A registrant attending a school of this type should be considered for a student deferment when he is a full-time student making normal progress towards completion of the prescribed course of instruction." Kansas, Classification Bulletin No. 69, May 24, 1966.

"Registrants who are pursuing a full-time course of instruction and are making satisfactory progress in other schools below college level, should be considered for class II–A, in accordance with section 1622.22 of the regulations." Kentucky, Operations Memorandum No. 1622.251, June 1, 1966.

"Deferment of registrants for study at such schools will be the prerogative of the local board and the determining factor will be whether or not the student-registrant's activity in study is essential to the national interest." Indiana, Reference Manual File II-1622.25, June 13, 1966.

"Temporary deferment of such students should be based in each individual case on the local board's determination as to whether or not the registrant's activity in study is essential to the national interest at this time." Michigan, no file number, June 23, 1966.

"Any registrant enrolled in a vocational, technical, business, trade school, or any institution of learning below the college or university degree granting level, need not take the College Qualification Test for the purpose of obtaining or continuing in class II–S * * *. Submission of SSS form 109 or 109–A indicating the registrant is a full-time student making normal progress toward completion of a prescribed course of instruction is sufficient information to consider the registrant for deferment as a student." Minnesota, memorandum No. 4–9.7, April 12, 1966.

"Students who are enrolled in a vocational, trade, or business school which is a public institution, or, if private, has the approval of the State department of education or this headquarters, and who are pursuing a course of study found by local boards to be necessary to the national health, safety, or interest, may be deferred in class II–S, provided the school certifies that they are currently enrolled and are making satisfactory progress, the length of the course, and when they may be expected to finish." Mississippi, Local Board Advice No. 174, June 10, 1966.

"This headquarters recommends that local boards defer students in business and trade schools to complete the course in which they are enrolled if they are reached for induction while they are satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course at such school." Nebraska, Administrative Bulletin No. 47, May 24, 1966.

"A registrant may be termed an undergraduate student and eligible for consideration for classification in class II–S when he qualifies for such classification by meeting the criteria as established in Operations Bulletin No. 296: * * * (2) a person engaged in a course of study on a full-time basis in a trade school, business school, or similar institution who will receive a certificate or diploma upon successful completion of an established program of study. The first year of study considered as beginning in September, following registrant's graduation from high school." New Jersey, Local Board Memorandum No. 357, September 21, 1966.

Identical language is in Pennsylvania Local Board Advice No. B–7–2, August 31, 1966.

"In considering deferment for business or commercial college students, we recommend generally that you grant deferments in the case of full-time students at those schools which have agreed to abide by standards set by the Texas Association of Commercial Colleges or other known reliable business colleges * * *. A registrant cannot [emphasis in original] be placed in class I–S (C) if he is a student in a business or commercial college, or a trade or vocational school." Texas, State Director's Advice to Local Boards (No. 525) May 13, 1966.

"Section 1622.25(a) provides ample authority for class II–A deferment of students who are enrolled in technical, vocational, business, and other trade schools. Local boards are encouraged to give serious consideration to class II–S deferment for any such registrant who demonstrates to the board's satisfaction that he is a competent student and making normal progress. Students enrolled in this type of school do not qualify for a I–S classification." Wisconsin, WSS 140.9, September 30, 1966.

"Registrants attending technical schools and trade schools will not qualify for a II–S classification unless the school is considered a college, university, or similar institution of learning. This means that the registrant must be a candidate for a degree or the courses offered must be acceptable for credit toward a degree by a college." New York, Administrative Memorandum No. 4, June 20, 1966.

ADVICE FROM STATE HEADQUARTERS ON OTHER KINDS OF DEFERMENTS

Advice from state headquarters to local boards in 1966 concerning deferments other than student deferments was not as frequent and covered a wide variety of subjects. Perhaps because advice was not as frequent and perhaps also because other areas were not changing as much as student deferment policy disagreement among states was not as common. But it existed. In the area of teacher deferments, for example, the instructions given below obviously differ.

"An appropriate time for an individual to fulfill his military obligation should be upon the completion of his educational goals. No consideration should be given unless the local board is convinced that he is accepting a teaching job in a 'critical' area and proof has been made that no replacements are available." Illinois State Memorandum No. 6–2c, revised July 1, 1966.

"It is recommended that all teachers be considered for deferment to complete the first year of teaching." New York Operations Circular No. 104, amended August 15, 1966.

It was also clear that a man ordered for induction who produced a certificate testifying that his wife was pregnant would be treated differently in different states.

"Effective this date, an order to report for induction shall not be canceled when a registrant submits a pregnancy statement. If the pregnancy statement is submitted prior to the issurance of the order to report for induction the registrant is entitled to consideration for class III–A." Illinois State Memorandum No. 9–8, Revised August 19, 1966.

"If a registrant who has received an order to report for induction presents evidence in the form of a certificate signed by a physician stating that his wife is pregnant and the probable delivery date of the child, the local board shall postpone the induction of the registrant and prepare the usual postponement of induction (SSS Form No. 264) and cite therein as authority for its action 'State Headquarters Memorandum No. 64.'" New Mexico State Headquarters, Memorandum No. 64, May 25, 1966.

"On the assumption that there has been some contact or activity in a registrant's case within a reasonable period prior to the issuance of an order to report for induction, whereby the individual would have been alerted to the need of reporting any change in status, it will no longer be the policy of this office to cancel the order based on the subsequent receipt of a pregnancy certificate." Missouri, memo to all local boards, November 16, 1966.

To these specific examples of inconsistency and disagreement should be added a brief general comment. A review of the memoranda and bulletins shows that where one state headquarters gives quite specific and detailed advice, another gives general instructions. Indeed, where one state headquarters sends advice another may choose to remain silent. This point is made because what state headquarters do not tell their local boards may be as important as what they do tell them. And what the state headquarters do not say, as well as what they do say, varies from state to state.

I say the inconsistency of these regulations is scandalous and can only be corrected by a retraction of the college deferment.

Particularly is this deferment critical and important at the present time. When we drafted oldest first, beginning with age 26, many young people would not really be in jeopardy until they completed their college degree program and approached the upper age limit. With a new emphasis on 19-year-olds, the effect will be that noncollege students will serve at age 19 and college students will serve at age 24 promoting a further inequity.

And how about the college graduate deferments? The effect of the bill before us would be to "grandfather" into deferred status every current graduate student until he receives his degree. As an example, the deferment would apply for a full 3 years for all who are accepted for law graduate school at the present time even though they would not start school until next September.

After World War II, the bar examiners of most States enacted special laws and regulations to blanket into the bar those persons whose careers were interrupted. This is a much better procedure for handling these inequities.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the evidence is overwhelming that the college deferment should be repealed or at least limited to the 2 years recommended by the Marshall report.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON].

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Armed Services brings before the Congress today a bill to extend the draft for another 4 years. It does that because it has found no feasible alternative to the draft.

Probably no idea is more charming to those who have a cursory knowledge of our military forces than the idea of an alternative to the draft, such as an all-volunteer force. Recently I read a speech by a college president in which he said:

> I do not believe in a world without alternatives.

What I noticed about his speech particularly, however, was that he himself did not provide any feasible alternative to the draft. I have studied a great many of the statements made by educators, newspaper writers, and others calling for an all-volunteer army. The list of those who are enamored of such an idea runs the entire spectrum of political thought from extreme conservatism to extreme liberalism. I notice, however, that they all have a few things in common. For one, they seem to lack an intimate knowledge of our military forces and how they work. For another, they tend to distrust in advance just about everything the military and civilian leaders in the Pentagon say. They inevitably seem to feel that the leaders in government for some reason are refusing to give their ideas detailed study and they are convinced that the ideas would prove workable if just studied long enough. They share an ability to be eloquent in detailing the shortcomings and drawbacks, and unfairness of a system of conscription—for reasons that I have not determined, the word "conscription" which seems to have fallen generally into disuse, is a great favorite of those who propose an all-volunteer army.

Two things above all else I notice about these people, however—first, none of them explain just how an all-volunteer force could be achieved; and second, none of them seem to consider that the inequity of an all-volunteer force might be as great as the inequity of the draft system itself.

The simple fact is, Mr. Chairman, the idea of an all-volunteer force has been thoroughly studied and examined in great detail. The Department of Defense conducted an extensive study in 1966 and came to the conclusion that if an all-volunteer force could be recruited the additional costs would range from between $4 to $17 billion. In commenting on these cost estimates in Reporter magazine, Mr. Bruce Chapman stated:

> The Department of Defense has either found the computation of cost of this alternative to the draft inordinately complicated or has not given it serious consideration.

This is an example of the willingness to disbelieve in the Pentagon's efforts that one finds so frequently on the part of advocates of an all-volunteer force. The simple fact is that the Defense estimates covered a variety of force levels and economic situations which the Nation might face in trying to maintain an all-volunteer force. In addition, it should be understood that presenting these estimates in a probability range from low to high was designed to estimate the uncertainty in any economic projection of this type.

I like to say, Mr. Chairman, as one who serves on the committee dealing with the Armed Forces, that the idea of a sufficient amount of money either in pay or other benefits is going to make a large number of young men choose a military way of life is, in my opinion, an illusion. There are things in the military world—long family separations, the continual responsibility of military discipline, the dangers of isolations—for which no amount of money is going to be an adequate incentive.

It should be added that the Defense study looked at the feasibility of maintaining a military force of 2.7 million men, the pre-Vietnam level, and the Defense study concluded that maintaining a force at the current strength level, 3.3 million, was simply unfeasible.

As I emphasized, this was a thorough study staffed by highly qualified economists and manpower experts. One of the conclusions they came to is that there is no scientific way of predicting a precise relationship between increased pay and increased recruitment.

Those who propose an all-volunteer force continually deride us for being unwilling to pay the cost or for using the draft to obtain cheap labor. Leaving aside the thought that we have not seen these people in the committee room when military pay raises are being considered, it should be kept in mind that the main burden of the Department of Defense study was that it is simply not practicable to fill our military manpower needs on a voluntary basis. It was found that an all-volunteer recruitment method would not give us the flexibility needed to provide temporary increases in military strength; it would make it extremely difficult to recruit the quality of enlisted personnel required for many of the technical skills needed in the Armed Forces; it would make it well-nigh impossible to retain an adequate Reserve; and it would leave us with no way whatsoever to procure a sufficient number of military medical officers.

The Marshall Commission, the Clark Panel, and our committee reviewed the findings of the Defense study and heard extensive additional testimony on the idea of an all-volunteer force, and all came to the conclusion that it would not be feasible.

But beyond these practical and economic considerations, Mr. Chairman, the overriding argument against an all-volunteer force for me, and I think this would be true for virtually all members of the committee, is the consideration of morality. As I said, those who attack the inequities of the draft never seem to be bothered about the inequity of an all-volunteer force. But the questions of morality involved are considerable. For the life of me, I cannot see why it would be more equitable to excuse some men from any obligation to their country as long as we can spend enough dollars to buy this service from somebody else.

It sounds very nice to say "all-volunteer army"; it does not sound nearly as nice to say "mercenary army," but really it says the same thing. Our Government would be in a morally untenable position if its international policies in defense of freedom were in any way equated with the ability to buy sufficient forces. Many of those who are criticizing the draft are also criticizing the Government and its involvement in Vietnam. How much more temptation would there be to get involved in what some people call "international adventures" if we had an all-professional army? You will recall that the Senate, in rejecting the FDL—fast deployment logistic ships—concept said that it would encourage us to act like policemen to the world. How much more ready might we be to act like policemen of the world; how much less would be the call for restraint if we had an all-volunteer army? Would the French Government in times past have used a conscript army as freely as it used its famed Foreign Legion?

I would call your attention to a sentence in the committee's report which bears repeating: If the national purposes for which we commit men to the deprivations of military life and the hazards of actual combat are just, then it is only just that the young men of the country should share a liability for the burdens of such service.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, we believe with Thomas Paine, that:

> Those who expect to reap the blessing of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it.

The draft is necessary and let us have the courage to say so to the American people.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I have grave misgivings about many aspects of the selective service measure before us.

For one thing, the act is continued for 4 additional years. I believe that each Congress should take a new look at selective service law, and that a 2-year extension is as long as is desirable.

What disturbs me perhaps most is the provision in the bill before us for a statutory deferment for students pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college or university. What this means is that a young man who is financially able to go to college will skip military service for the next 4 years. Other young men, who either cannot afford college tuition or need to go to work after high school in order to support themselves and their families, will be inducted. If Vietnam is quieted down in a couple of years, as I hope and pray it will be, this means that the young man who cannot go to college serves under fire, while the young man who goes to college is at worst exposed to service in a peacetime army. I find no justification for this discrimination.

In its treatment of conscientious objectors, the bill is both good and bad. Requiring the actual induction of conscientious objectors goes directly counter to the valid principles of conscientious objection. I hope that this change in the law will be rejected.

On the other hand, the bill gives as the simple test of conscientious objection, "religious training and belief." This is a considerable improvement over the confusing "Supreme Being" language in the existing law. I welcome this as a distinct improvement over present law.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for S. 1432, the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, but I do so without any conviction that this bill represents satisfactory answers to the problems raised by the draft.

In recent months, there has been throughout the country much debate on the question of whether a democratic society should rely on compulsion in providing adequate armed services. I tend to share the committee belief that in these troubled times we cannot rely solely on volunteers, although I believe this matter should be kept under constant review.

The question of continuing student deferments was a most critical issue for many of my constituents. They will be pleased by the committee's decision that most student deferments will be continued, at least for the time being.

In order to deal with the difficult problem of identifying those occupations, professions, and areas of postgraduate study that are required in the national interest and therefore justify future draft deferments for those engaged in them, S. 1432 would establish the National Manpower Resources Board. In conjunction with the Director of Selective Service, this Board will have the duty of promulgating uniform criteria—to be applied by all local draft boards—for the granting of these special deferments. I think this is a wise and reasonable way to deal with what is, at best, a very arduous task.

I remain concerned with some of the inequities of the present draft system, and I do not believe the present bill goes very far to correct them. In fact, in some respects, it may intensify them. However, the President is given authority to propose changes, subject to disapproval by the Congress, and I hope he will do so. Moreover, the committee's original proposals with regard to conscientious objectors will be considerably improved by an amendment I understand will be proposed by the chairman.

Finally, I want to join with those who have expressed their dismay at the hasty way in which this bill is being dealt with. At least 2 days should have been set aside for the consideration of such a vital bill.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, there is one provision of this bill which gives me great concern. It is the one which I understand will remove draft exempt status from commissioned officers of the Public Health Service who are assigned to duty in the Food and Drug Administration.

As chairman of a subcommittee which has been studying the drug safety activities of the Food and Drug Administration for several years, I am keenly aware of that agency's long-standing difficulty in recruiting and retaining qualified and competent medical officers to protect the American public against unsafe or ineffective drugs. Within the past year this difficulty has been alleviated in part by the assignment of 150 Public Health Service doctors and pharmacists to FDA's Bureau of Medicine. The enactment of the provision in question would end this procedure and set FDA back considerably.

I, too, am concerned about the shortage of medical officers in other areas of need, such as the armed services and civilian practice—especially rural communities. I am in complete sympathy with the objective which the committee is trying to accomplish through this provision. But as the provision is now stated, it does not guarantee that there will be fewer medical doctors enjoying draft exempt status through the Public Health Service or that the Armed Forces will get a greater share. Because PHS officers who stay within the Public Health Service or who are assigned to the National Institutes of Health will continue to be exempt from the draft, I do not think that PHS will take any fewer doctors. I believe they will simply retain more within their own divisions and assign more to NIH rather than to FDA or other agencies.

Therefore, it seems to me that a more logical solution to this problem would be to place an upper limit on the number of doctors and pharmacists which the Public Health Service can take in a given year for purposes of fulfilling their military obligation, a proportionate share of which could still be assigned to the Food and Drug Administration.

But even if this is not done, I would favor the removal of FDA from the list of agencies to which PHS officers may not be assigned without losing their draft exempt status.

I sincerely hope that the Chairman and members of the Committee will give consideration to these views and will consider making appropriate changes when the bill is read for amendments.

I understand that a grandfather clause provision will be offered to take care of PHS officers now assigned to the FDA. This may be alright for the present, but I seriously question whether it will enable the FDA to keep an adequate number of doctors and pharmacists on the job in this—one of the most serious and sensitive areas of need.

The very life and health of countless millions of our people are dependent upon the safety of the drugs they must use.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, the importance of maintaining the high standards of education that this Nation has worked so hard to achieve has been stressed again and again in the discussion now taking place on the modification of the Selective Service System. This is as it should be. The outstanding leaders and scholars from universities throughout the land are evidence of the regard we have had for the principle that the education of the young is a key to the future.

But that includes all of the young, not a select few. It includes those who would succeed in their lives if they had the income to match their aspirations, as it does those who are able to go to college because their family background and income affords them that opportunity. The youth who come from a deprived background deserve an opportunity. Their circumstances should not make them miss a chance at deferment, for they have already been denied so much.

I therefore support the view that those economically deprived young citizens who are already engaged in organized training programs to further their careers should be availed of the same deferment as is given to college students. An interruption of that training program would cause them the same hardship as would the interruption of the college course. It would do the same harm to our future as to theirs; for we cannot, in view of our expanding economy, look to a future with a large, unskilled labor force. The young men who are now enrolled in Federal, State, industrial training programs, such as Job Corps, have subjected themselves to a discipline in order to become productive, independent citizens. Most of these young men, if they do not have this training, will be unable to obtain worthwhile employment in the future.

They must be given a chance to improve their skills equal with that given to the college student. This is a reasonable and fair way of doing things. By providing this incentive for self-improvement, these young men will be far more useful to themselves, far more useful to the armed services, and when they are discharged, far more useful to the communities in which they will live.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that I will be unable to be present when the vote on this bill is taken. I have been appointed by the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as a member of the study mission which leaves this evening for London to secure information for the committee on the progress of the development of the SST in England, France, and by the Russians. Our travel arrangements have already been completed and it is necessary for me to leave.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. Rivers, as well as the members of his committee for the excellent job they did in handling this bill and for bringing to the House legislation which is badly needed and well devised.

I believe a particularly good job has been done in the matter of student deferments and I quote from a report by our colleagues, Mr. Pollock and Mr. Pettis:

> We believe that a system of carefully controlled student deferments must be continued. As noted by the American Council on Education, "Students are deferred for the national, not individual interests." If student deferments were abolished the future supply of doctors, lawyers, college professors, research scientists, graduate engineers, and other specialists could be seriously threatened. Moreover, in order to insure a maximum degree of fairness, those receiving student deferment shall not be eligible for another deferment except in extreme hardship cases. And on termination of the student deferment, the individual shall be immediately liable for induction as a registrant within the prime age group regardless of his actual age.
>
> The proposed National Manpower Resources Board, in conjunction with the National Security Council, will identify those occupations, professions and areas of postgraduate study that are critically required in the national interest and that warrant a deferred status. Under this procedure, the number of deferments presently granted to students engaged in graduate study would be sharply reduced. The board also would identify skilled trade areas critical to the national interest which require continuation of apprenticeship programs. Trainees in such programs would be provided a deferred status similar to that provided college undergraduate students.
>
> In the past, diverse classification actions by local boards have created certain inequities. The changes in the law embodied in the proposed bill should materially reduce, if not eliminate, this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the conclusions of my colleagues on this measure and fully support the committee bill.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, we support the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 as it has been amended and reported by the House Committee on Armed Services. This legislation updates and improves the present Selective Service System in a number of important respects.

In addition to extending the present Draft Act and related laws for a period of 4 years, the committee bill includes the following major provisions:

First. A National Manpower Resources Board is established which in conjunction with the National Security Council will identify those professional, scientific and critical skill areas that justify a draft deferment.

Second. Before any change in the existing method of determining the relative order of induction for registrants within the various age groups may be effected, the President is required to advise Congress that such change is in the national interest. The proposed change will become effective after the expiration of a 60-day period unless Congress adopts a resolution rejecting the change.

Third. A method of maintaining the authorized strengths of the Reserve and the National Guard is provided.

Fourth. Uniform criteria for future undergraduate college student deferments are established. Students receiving such deferments shall be placed in the prime age group liable for induction after they leave school, receive a degree or attain age 24, whichever occurs first.

Fifth. The President is required to establish, whenever practicable, national criteria for the classification of persons subject to induction. Such criteria shall be administered uniformly by all local boards.

Sixth. Those opposed to participation in war in any form by reason of religious training and belief shall be exempt from service in the Armed Forces. Conscientious objectors will be required, if selected for induction, to perform noncombatant duty or two years of civilian service if they are conscientiously opposed to both combatant and noncombatant training and service.

Seventh. Individuals are prohibited from serving on local or appeal boards after they have completed 25 years of service or attained age 75. Also, women may be appointed to serve on such boards.

We support the recommendation that the order of call for eligible registrants be revised so that those in the younger age group would be called to active duty first. Under the present system of priorities for induction, the oldest are selected first from the age group of 26 years and under. This system has resulted in considerable uncertainty. An individual classified as available at 18½ remains subject to possible induction until he reaches his 26th birth date. Moreover, the degree of his exposure to induction increases directly with his age and reaches its maximum point on the day before he reaches age 26. The younger men, as a group, are more adaptable to the routines of military training and there are fewer dependents' problems at these ages. Also, a man who is awaiting a draft call has greater difficulty in finding and keeping suitable employment.

We believe that a system of carefully controlled student deferments must be continued. As noted by the American Council on Education, "Students are deferred for the National, not individual interests." If student deferments were abolished, the future supply of doctors, lawyers, college professors, research scientists, graduate engineers and other specialists could be seriously threatened. Moreover, in order to insure a maximum degree of fairness, those receiving student deferments shall not be eligible for another deferment except in extreme hardship cases. And, on termination of the student deferment, the individual shall be immediately liable for induction as a registrant within the prime age group regardless of his actual age.

The proposed National Manpower Resources Board, in conjunction with the National Security Council, will identify those occupations, professions and areas of postgraduate study that are critically required in the national interest and that warrant a deferred status. Under this procedure, the number of deferments presently granted to students engaged in graduate study would be sharply reduced. The board also would identify skilled trade areas critical to the national interest which require continuation of apprenticeship programs. Trainees in such programs would be provided a deferred status similar to that provided college undergraduate students.

In the past, diverse classification actions by local Boards have created certain inequities. The changes in the law embodied in the proposed bill should materially reduce, if not eliminate, this problem. Certainly, the uniform standards for student deferments together with the recommendation that future draft calls concentrate on the younger age group should improve the handling of future registrants. Also, the President is required to establish, wherever practicable, national criteria for the classification of persons subject to induction under the Draft Act.

Although there is an acknowledged need for certain improvements, we believe that the Selective Service System has, for the most part, operated successfully over the last 26 years. The soundness of the system has been proven through its demonstrated ability to meet rapidly fluctuating conditions. During this 26-year period, approximately 14 million men have been inducted into the Armed Services without any adverse effect on the economy of the nation. There has never been a scandal arising out of the administration of this law and there is today public confidence in the basic honesty of the system. The continued use of local Boards and the appointment of individuals to such Boards on the recommendation of the Governor insures that the control of the system shall remain at the local and state level.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I was deeply distressed, as I am sure every other Member of this body was, by the statistics on the casualties in Vietnam issued recently by the Department of Defense.

The total number of combat deaths, 7,823, between January 1, 1961, and March 1, 1967, is bad enough. But, what really appalled me was the revelation that 2,241 of those combat deaths, or 29 percent of the total, involved soldiers younger than 21 years of age.

It is my considered opinion, Mr. Chairman, that we have no business sending boys to fight men's wars. Boys under the age of 21 are not permitted to participate fully in the life of the Nation. They are not permitted to participate in the decisions of war or peace. Therefore they should not be ordered to face death in a combat for which they have no personal responsibility.

I believe it should be a firm national policy that no youngster under the age of 21 should be sent into combat.

I am not opposed to drafting and training young men 19 or 20 years of age. I think this should continue. But no boy should be sent into combat until he has reached legal and political adulthood.

In making this recommendation I want to make it perfectly clear that I support the war in Vietnam. It is an ugly war, a nasty war, in many ways a regrettable war, but it is also a necessary war, basic to the eventual peace of the free world. But, the fighting of a war is man's work; it should not be relegated to boys.

I append the Defense Department's computerized figures showing the distribution of fatal casualties in the war so far, by rank, by locality and, most important of all, by age groups:

TABLES ON U.S. DEAD

A table of U.S. fatalities in connection with the conflict in Vietnam by rank or pay grade. This table and the others below includes casualties in North and South Vietnam as well as neighboring countries such as Laos, Cambodia and Thailand, between Jan. 1, 1961, and March 1, 1967.

Officers—First rank in line is Army, Air Force or Marine; second is Navy:

Colonel-captain	1
Lieutenant colonel-commander	27
Major	81
Captain-lieutenant	363
1st lieutenant-lieutenant (jg.)	247
2nd lieutenant-ensign	122

WARRANT OFFICERS

W. 4.C.	0
W.O. 3.C.	3
W.O. 2.C.	23
W.O.	54

Enlisted men—By pay grade; E9 is highest:

E9	2
E8	36
E7	171
E6	522
E5	868
E4	1, 599
E3	2, 641
E2	972
E1	62

Here is a table of fatalities by home state of record:

Alabama	196
Alaska	3
Arizona	68
Arkansas	72
California	683
Colorado	85
Connecticut	96
Delaware	16
Dist. of Col.	31
Florida	276
Georgia	200
Hawaii	66
Idaho	31
Illinois	378
Indiana	217
Iowa	102
Kansas	80
Kentucky	160
Louisiana	123
Maine	57
Maryland	152
Massachusetts	204
Michigan	311
Minnesota	117
Mississippi	94
Missouri	177
Montana	29
Nebraska	43
Nevada	11

N. Hampshire	30
New Jersey	228
New Mexico	54
New York	529
North Carolina	228
North Dakota	16
Ohio	338
Oklahoma	115
Oregon	93
Pennsylvania	483
Rhode Island	27
South Carolina	135
South Dakota	22
Tennessee	211
Texas	442
Utah	35
Vermont	8
Virginia	172
Washington	146
West Virginia	122
Wisconsin	138
Wyoming	19
Guam	12
W. Germany	2
Mexico	2
Philippines	11
Puerto Rico	65
Virgin Islands	3
Canada	6
Peru	1

Here is a table of U.S. combat deaths by age:

Age 17	1
Age 18	128
Age 19	781
Age 20	1,331
Age 21	1,226
Age 22	893
Age 23	643
Age 24	50
Age 25	358
Age 26	262
Age 27	207
Age 28	165
Age 29	165
Age 30	127
Age 31	134
Age 32	131
Age 33	116
Age 34	110
Age 35	102
Age 36	109
Age 37	92
Age 38	78
Age 39	39
Age 40	41
41 and over	81
unknown	2
Total	7,823

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss S. 1432, one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before this body this session.

Since the beginning of the war in Vietnam and the ensuing increased inductions, no law has been the subject of such widespread public discussion, criticism, and confusion as the Selective Service Act.

On June 30 of this year, the present law will expire, and it is incumbent upon the Congress to extend the present system, modify it, or enact some new and different system to fulfill our military manpower requirements. The present bill will modify the existing law. Although it does not go far as I would prefer in writing draft procedures into law, it does represent a consensus of the committee, which has spent many hours in hearing and work and it is one which I can vigorously support.

The law under which the youth of our Nation are drafted to serve our country today in a military capacity is now almost two decades old. It was passed by the 80th Congress at the conclusion of World War II when Communist aggression throughout the world reared its head as a new and dangerous hostile threat to the security of the free world. Since that time our Nation has undergone many sweeping changes. We are in many ways a different Nation. We are wealthier, more technological, more mobile, more urban and more populous.

In 1948, when the present act was passed, there were only about 1.2 million Americans reaching the age of 18 each year. Today, we have almost 2 million reaching 18 and becoming eligible for the draft each year.

Today we have about 3.3 million men under arms scattered throughout the world. This is compared with an average force of about 2.7 million between the Korean conflict and the beginning of the buildup in Vietnam.

Today, as has always been true since the conclusion of World War II, we rely primarily upon a voluntary Army, rather than inductees. From 1959 through 1965 we had an on-board count of approximately 200,000 inductees as compared with a count of almost 500,000 in September of last year.

No doubt a great many of the voluntary enlistments in the past, as well as today, enlisted to escape the draft. Although there has been much agitation in many quarters for the repeal of the draft and the substitution of a voluntary military establishment, all responsible research concludes that this is more idealistic than practical. At most, we could not expect to man a force of more than 2 million men. Even if we could raise the pay sufficiently high to attract 3.3 million men—and I think there is merit in further increasing compensation to enhance reenlistment rates—it would be exorbitantly expensive and we would risk jeopardizing the security of America by substituting an uncertain method of meeting our military manpower requirements.

I also feel it would be repulsive to the American psychology in that we would be placing a monetary value on American lives, and our armies would have the same weakness which plagued the British in the American Revolution. We would be relying upon mercenaries for the defense of the Nation. This, I am sure, is one concept which the House of Representatives will not accept.

Today, much of the discontent with the draft arises out of the fact that in the midst of war we have more manpower than we need. Our need today and in the foreseeable future ranges from 100,000 to 300,000 men annually. We have almost 2 million men reaching draft age every year.

"Why should I or my son be one of those 100,000 or 300,000." "Why shouldn't he be one of the 1.7 million or 1.9 million who are not needed to serve?"

Many people have tried to answer this gnawing question by coming up with the proposal of universal national service, where eligible young men are drafted for either military service or other service such as the Peace Corps, VISTA, or a National Teachers Corps. Most of us, however, are overwhelmed with the new gigantic problems this would generate and how can one devise an acceptable formula for equating nonmilitary service with military duty, and particularly so in time of war.

Others have attempted to answer this perplexing question with a proposal of universal military training. But how long would the people of America be willing to bear the inordinate and expensive burden of training so many unneeded men. The current rejection rate of those unfit for military service is running about 34 percent; therefore, on the basis of current standards this proposal would mean the training of 1,320,000 new eligibles each year.

Others in answer to the question "Who serves when not all serve" have proposed various forms of a lottery which vary from a true lottery, abolishing all deferments, to a more limited form of lottery simply to establish the sequence of induction calls for those who have been classified 1–A.

The lottery method, of course, is nothing new. It was used during the Civil War amidst charges of fraud, manipulation and favoritism. It was tried during World War I and during World War II when it finally broke down and was abandoned because of insurmountable classification problems.

A true lottery would obviate the objective of selective service. There would be no way of allocating and using skilled workers or scientists in essential defense industries. All deferments would be eliminated. A lottery would not appear to be the answer to our problem.

A thorough study of military requirements in the light of present world conditions leads to the unescapable conclusion that as disagreeable as the selective service system may be to some, the Congress has no real alternative except to modify and extend the present system. This has been the conclusion of every responsible panel appointed and charged with the duty of studying the problem and making recommendations. Therefore, the Committee on Armed Services in this amended Senate bill, which differs greatly from the bill that passed the Senate has extended the present system in a modified form.

The bill as amended by the committee has retained the local draft boards whose members have rendered the Nation a great patriotic service by volunteering their time and devotion to the Nation so long. We have placed a limitation on the length of service on the boards of 25 years and required mandatory retirement at the age of 75 years in order to more equitably spread the duty of service, broaden the base of familiarity with the job and incorporate new blood into the system. But abolish the draft boards? No! Despite the shortcomings of the present system, it has been a flexible system, responsive to the needs of the Nation. It should be improved but not abandoned.

The present Selective Service Act is very broad and depends upon Executive order of the President for implementation. In the bill before you, we have reduced administrative discretion by codifying more draft procedures. The codification, in my opinion, could well have been more extensive as it is desirable that all citizens know what the law is, how it is to be applied, and that it can only be changed by the people-elected "lawmaking" representatives. However, I am aware of the need for flexibility in this area which made it very difficult to codify more of the draft law. Therefore we did not write the changes in the order of call into law. The present procedure calls for the selection of draft-eligible men from 26 on down to 19. The President has already announced that he intends to reverse the order of call by drafting those from the 19 and 20 age brackets first. We have left this to administrative discretion but all who have studied the problem agree that this should be done in order to reduce the uncertainty inherent in the present law.

We have written into law one provision of great interest to the enrollees in our Nation's colleges and universities. College student deferments are not only continued but are to be automatically granted by local boards to persons who are satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction. At the conclusion of his undergraduate study or the time he attains the age of 24, he goes back into 1-A pool and faces the hazards of being drafted the same as any other person who was not deferred. The time of deferment is deducted from his age so as to give him a constructive age. Thus, college deferments are true deferments and no intervening development such as marriage or paternity will permit him to be the beneficiary of what is in effect an exemption. Deferments for graduate students are limited to those preparing themselves for professions for which the Nation has a critical need as determined by administrative rules and regulations to be formulated. Some people have argued that the draft discriminates against those who cannot afford to attend college. This, however, seems to be more fancy than fact, since in recent years 60 percent of the college student group has served in the Armed Forces either as volunteers or inductees as opposed to only 57 percent of noncollege students. I would also point out that we are faced with the hard fact that four out of five of our officers entering the service each year are coming from the colleges of the Nation. Where shall we obtain the required number of officers? Although I am reluctant to offer a possible temporary haven for the faint of heart and less patriotic during the midst of war, at the same time I do not believe that we have any better alternative as an answer to the question—who is to serve when not all are required to serve?

Mr. Chairman, I have not attempted to discuss all the many paramount provisions of this far-reaching piece of legislation, but I can say that I believe that all the provisions of the proposal have been carefully reviewed by the committee. Of course, it may be improved by amendments not thought of by the committee as no legislation is perfect, but I do feel that S. 1432 warrants the support of each member as a well-reasoned answer to a very difficult problem.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee. Among my constituents are Friends, Mennonites and others who for genuinely and sincerely held religious convictions cannot in their good religious conscience engage in military service. I associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the report of the President's National Advisory Commission on Selective Service recommended that:

> A draft law should be continued to provide the nation with a flexible system of manpower procurement which will assure the Armed Forces' ability to meet their national security commitments under all foreseeable circumstances.

The Commission, in effect, recommended a lottery-type selection process with few deferments from its operation. The local draft boards, as we know them, would be abolished and a large measure of uniform national control over the process substituted.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt that there are many who would defend the draft system as it now operates. It discriminates between the haves and the have-nots—both economic and mental. It operates to exempt the rich and subject the poor. It leaves the student—or pseudostudent—and takes the worker.

There is no realistic basis for many of the deferments that are now granted. Why should a young man in college be exempted when a young man working in a factory is not? Why should a graduate student be relieved and the foreman of a construction job not?

There have been many alternatives to the present draft put forth since the great debate began—universal military service, an all-volunteer Armed Forces, a national lottery and other variations of the above.

It seems to me that a draft system based on a national lottery presents a realistic means to keep our Armed Forces at necessary strength while at the same time giving fairness and flexibility to the system.

A national lottery should provide that a young man go into a pool for 1 year. Probably ideally when he reaches his 19th birthday. If after 1 year in the pool he has not been called, his name would be dropped and he would be free from the hanging suspense which he is subjected to under present regulations.

The national lottery should not give deferments for college students. After all, college deferments seem to say that those people who go to college are more important and are performing a more valuable service than the person running a lathe in a plant. However, in the case of college students, those men who are not called could continue in college, just as those not called from their jobs could continue in their jobs. Those college students called would have to put off completion of their college courses until after service. As a matter of fact, under the laws in effect now the Government would help to pay the veterans' educational expenses after service.

Mr. Chairman, there would, of course, have to be some exemptions from this lottery. The physically and mentally handicapped, the true conscientious objector, the ministry and, possibly, those young men with total dependents.

As the New Republic recently said editorially:

> Everyone would take his chances and no one would have to spend eight years . . . when, or if, he would be called . . . There would be no favoritism expressed towards students over drop-outs, whites over negroes, chemists over artists.

Arthur Krock has said of the lottery proposal:

> The history of the Crowder lottery (World War I) does suggest that its renewal could remove that part of the unpopularity . . . which derives from the gross injustices of selection for service in Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, the President, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, has the means to best know the requirements to maintain our necessary military posture. He has shown his concern for the presently existing inequities in the draft. I believe that we should extend the law for another 4 years, similar to the action taken by the Senate. I would, however, most strongly urge that the President institute through his power of Executive order a national lottery to replace the present system.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that we have to maintain large Armed Forces and it is sad that young men must be sent out to fight with other young men. But this is a defect of our human nature which we have not yet overcome. I hope that those young men drafted for military service throughout the world might realize, as it appears some have not, that war is folly and peace is our ultimate aim. Perhaps the men drafted today can indeed bring the world peace in the future. But, if we must draft, we should call to service men on an equal footing and with the least discrimination.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support for the committee bill. While I am not in total agreement with all aspects of the bill, I believe it represents a reasonable compromise.

Faced with a critical military situation in Vietnam and elsewhere, and the need to take steps to continue our program of manpower mobilization beyond June 30, I believe the committee bill should be adopted. However, under the pressure of this deadline, the House has not fully taken the opportunity to study all reasonable ideas.

To enhance in-depth consideration by the House at the earliest possible date, I am supporting an amendment to limit the extension of the draft law to 2 years. Failing the adoption of this amendment, I favor the committee's recommendation to extend this act for 4 years.

Thus, I do support the adoption of the committee bill, and welcome future opportunities for more extensive exploration of selective service reforms.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I rise in support of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967. Nearly every member of the committee would have had certain preferences for provisions to be included in the bill which were omitted. Too, every member would have preferred to see omitted somethings that were included. Legislation coming from a committee as large as our committee must be by mutual give and take and in the last analysis an agreement upon a single draft.

It is significant there was only one dissenting vote in the committee. Only one committee member voted against the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 which we are considering tonight under description of S. 1432 by taking the Senate's bill striking all after the enacting clause and supplying our own substitute.

When we commenced consideration of this measure, the hour was late. However there is a matter of urgency because the induction features of the act expire on June 30. After meeting past midnight last evening, it is no pleasure to meet again tonight until nearly midnight but it should be remembered our boys in Vietnam do not work by the clock. In fact, they work all night long, night after night.

The principal provision of the bill is to extend Selective Service for 4 years until July 1, 1971. The other details of the bill have been enumerated and thoroughly discussed. That, Mr. Chairman, reminds me that the President said there should be "serious debate" on extension of the draft. There are those who will argue that a rule which granted only 3 hours of debate is not adequate time. This is a most important measure but Mr. Chairman the committee cannot be charged with any lack of thoroughness. The House Armed Services Committee held hearings in the fall of 1966 and then again during the month of May in 1967. The hearings total 2,719 pages. The record will show over 100 witnesses representing organizations all the way from the American Medical Association to the AFL–CIO were heard, over 20 Members of Congress appeared as witnesses. The American Civil Liberty Union was heard. Such religious groups as the Mennonites, Church of the Brethren, Methodist Church, several Jewish representatives, the Seven Day Adventists, Disciples of Christ were all given ample time to express their views. The American Farm Bureau Federation, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, all veterans organizations, including the American Legion, American Veterans Committee, VFW and others were heard. The National Council of Churches had a representative as well as the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

No, Mr. Chairman, there was no disposition upon the part of the committee to refuse to hear anyone. The committee appointed its own panel headed by Gen. Mark Clark who made an exhaustive study of military manpower procurement. It just does not add up to a very persuasive argument for those who say there has not been ample debate on this issue.

We heard witnesses who proposed alternatives to the draft or an all volunteer force. Hours and days were spent upon the subject of college deferment. Again, there was no effort to limit the number of witnesses or time they would be given to testify. No one can say the committee gave short shrift to this bill.

Some of us would have preferred more time be given to the consideration of the granting of deferments as to particular occupations or professions. Those of us who represent agricultural areas felt there should be some consideration given to agricultural deferments. However, the majority of the committee concluded these matters could be further considered by creating what was provided for in the final version of the bill, the National Manpower Resources Board. Although some of us felt that more specific provisions should have been written into the law, we must concede that the final bill provided for a rational, analytical and equitable evaluation of deferment needs of the Nation couched within the national interest and security of the country.

More than that, our committee in its report called for the creation of an oversight committee or watchdog committee to require reports from the Director of the Selective Service.

In the debate over whether the Selective Service Act should be extended for 2 or 4 years, there is proven again the value of the National Manpower Resources Board. It can require reports on the operation of the act and conduct a continuing study of manpower and deferment needs. The charge that the committee has given too much discretion to the President is properly answered by saying the committee can at any time report out a bill to repeal any of the provisions of this present version of the Selective Service Act or the measure we enact tonight. We can amend as well as repeal at any time. The power is vested in the Congress to do that. We should not tie the President's hands in a matter so sensitive as manpower procurement at a time of emergency, because we can prescribe changes at any time.

In recapitulation, the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 is not a thing of perfection and admittedly there is room for improvement, but there is contained within the bill the machinery for continued evaluation by the creation of the National Manpower Resources Board. The House should immediately approve this measure so important to the national security of this country.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, the debate on the draft has not been our finest hour. An effort was made to equate the seriousness of our purpose with the length of time for which we are willing to extend the draft. This is completely irrelevant. What is relevant is that we are making some substantial changes in draft procedures which should be reviewed by this body before 4 years are up. The misgiving I have is a historical one. For 3 years, a substantial number of Congressmen have been asking for a review of the draft. Nothing has happened in Congress during this period. Nothing would be happening now if the basic law were not expiring on July 1, 1967. The only way we can insure a frequent comprehensive review of this tremendously important law in a quickly changing world is to have the law expire more often than every 4 years. The kind of debate we had on the extension of the draft was more a sweeping under the rug than a debate. The draft should be extended and I voted for it, but I deeply resent the House leadership's failure to permit the kind of meaningful debate that would have proved we are willing to keep faith with our young men and our world commitments without fear of possible dissent. This country is strong enough and determined enough to be able to afford reasonable debate and frequent review of draft procedures.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I am voting against S. 1432, to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act. I do this realizing that, with our present military commitments throughout the world, especially in Vietnam, a selective service system is necessary to provide manpower for our armed services. While at times I might question some of our Government's policies in Vietnam, the fact is that we are committed there and this commitment demands a system of military procurement.

It is my belief that S. 1432 does not provide the rational and equitable system which the youth of this Nation deserve if they are to be asked to serve in the Armed Forces. The problem of the student deferment is of major importance, and on this point I would like to quote the minority views of the committee report:

> More fundamental, we believe, and a greater problem of morality and conscience, is the overriding question of whose names are left out of the hat in the first place. In time of war to whom shall we say, "You don't have to go to war."
>
> The majority feels that education is essential to our national interest and so do we. Behind this easy cliche, however, there lurks the unavoidable fact that admission to college is more easily achieved by the wealthy than the poor. A poor man helping to support his family by day and going to college part time by night would be sent to fight in Vietnam, while his wealthy fellow citizen going to college full time by day . . . would be exempt.

The bill before us does nothing to correct this inequity. No attempt is made to define that fine line separating those who will serve and those who will not in such a manner as to be fair to our youth regardless of their education, financial resources, or backgrounds.

Another unresolved matter is the status of the Reserves. Too often it appears that the Reserves remain exempt from duty while their draftee colleagues do the bulk of the fighting in Vietnam. There might well have been considered a system established to rotate the Reserves in and out of active duty without an actual call-up of specific Reserve Force units.

I also believe that the present draft board system is inequitable. In too many cases draft boards have been arbitrary and capricious in their decisions over the lives of our youth. There is no requirement that draft board members be rotated periodically or that members reflect the sociological makeup of their communities. Relatively little discipline is exercised over local draft boards by Selective Service Headquarters, and few strong national standards exist governing who is and who is not to be drafted.

Another feature of the bill which I find questionable is the committee amendment which requires that all court actions relating to enforcement of provisions of the Selective Service Act be given priority by the court before which the case is being heard. While I believe that persons violating the act should be tried and, if found guilty, punished, I cannot see why these cases should be given priority over the bulk of other criminal cases such as murder, kidnaping, robbery, and fraud. It appears that the committee is writing law as a reaction to the antics of Cassius Clay rather than in recognition of the need to provide a uniform system of justice throughout our Nation.

Finally, I am disturbed by the manner in which the bill, perhaps the most important measure of this session in terms of its effect on millions of American youth and their families, is being rushed through the House with insufficient discussion punctuated by motions limiting debate time. Last night we worked until 1:50 a.m. on the elementary and secondary education amendments. The Universal Military Training and Service Act was taken up at 5:30 p.m. today, although this important measure should have been scheduled for at least a day of full debate with another day for amendments and passage. Why, when Congress has spent nearly 5 months doing practically nothing, must such important legislation be shoved through in a late night session with Members not operating at peak efficiency?

Mr. Chairman, it is for the above reasons I have seen fit to vote against the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Mr. **EDWARDS** of California. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned today as we consider the extension of the Selective Service System with the definition of conscientious objection. Legally, it seems clear that the status of conscientious objection is allowable now only on religious grounds and only with respect to all wars. This definition is open to challenge in many respects, and I call attention particularly to the inequity of the pending legislation in not recognizing moral and religious obligations of Christians to abstain from participating in a particular unjust war.

The doctrine of the just war has a long tradition in Christian thought—dating from the writings of St. Augustine in the fifth century, A.D. The blanket requirement that conscientious objectors must disapprove of all war arbitrarily discriminates against those who prescribe to the just war tradition. Under unanimous consent I include the following letter from three members of the American Pax Association in the RECORD at this point. The American Pax Association is an association of Catholics and other persons who seek to promote peace and to encourage the practical application of Christian principles to the question of war. Their comments are reflective and deserve considerable weight in discussing the Selective Service System.

The letters follow:

AMERICAN PAX ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., May 19, 1967.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Unless certain provisions of the current Selective Service law are changed, a grave case of religious discrimination and denial of human rights will be continued. The Senate has already passed this legislation in its present form.

The law arbitrarily recognizes as conscientious objectors only those who believe all wars to be wrong. Yet the absolute moral obligation for a Christian to abstain from participation in a war which he cannot convince himself is just is of equal religious weight.

The conditions necessary for a just war are a long established and central Christian teaching. They were first formulated by St. Augustine, a seminal theological thinker for both Catholics and Protestants alike. The chief conditions of this formulation are that a war must be—

Declared by lawful authority and only as a last resort;

Just in its cause, methods, and intentions;

Certain of success and of correcting more evil than it will cause.

A reaffirmation of the duties of conscience was made by the Catholic bishops of the entire world at the Second Vatican Council in 1965, and they declared that "... it seems right that laws make humane provisions for the case of those who for reasons of conscience refuse to bear arms ..."

Spokesmen for other Christian groups, such as Dr. John M. Swomley, professor of Christian Ethics at a Protestant school of theology, have pointed out that the draft law is unfair to those who follow the just war tradition, in particular, Catholics. Said Dr. Swomley: "The Roman Catholics then permitted Congress to pass a law discriminating in favor of the Protestant position."

It has been pointed out that the techniques for classifying those who base their position on just war principles is not necessarily any more difficult than for those who object to all wars. It is unworthy of the American tradition of responsible citizenship to perpetuate a situation in which some citizens are denied the right of conscientious judgment on so serious a matter as war while the right of others is explicitly preserved.

In order to remedy this injustice we propose that the Selective Service law be amended to include the following concept: The consciences of those who follow the just war tradition should be respected.

We trust that in the short period before the law is voted upon in the House of Representatives and dealt with by the Conference Committee, men of conscience will address themselves to the ending of this long-standing inequity.

Respectfully yours,
SR. M. BRENDAN, R.S.H.M.,
Marymount College, Tarrytown, N.Y.
HOWARD EVERNGAM,
Chairman, PAX.
PHILIP SCHARPER,
Sheed & Ward.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIVERS) there were—ayes, 46, noes 71.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1(a) (50 App. U.S.C. 451(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) This Act may be cited as the 'Military Selective Service Act of 1967'."

(2) Section 4 (50 App. U.S.C. 454) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) This Act may be cited as the 'Military Selective Service Act of 1967'."

(2) Section 4 (50 U.S.C. 454) is amended by:

(a) Inserting after the first proviso of subsection (a) the following: "*Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any registrant who has failed or refused to report for induction shall continue to remain liable for induction and when available shall be immediately inducted.", and

(b) Adding the following new subsection (g) to read as follows:

"(g) The President shall establish a National Manpower Resources Board, which, after consultation with the National Security Council, shall periodically advise the Director of the Selective Service System and coordinate with him the work of such State and local volunteer advisory committees which the Director of Selective Service may establish, with respect to the identification, selection, and deferment of needed professional and scientific personnel and those engaged in, and preparing for, critical skills and other essential occupations. The members of the National Manpower Resources Board on professional, scientific, and critical skills shall be selected from among individuals outside the Federal Government who are outstanding in such fields and shall include, but not limited to, representatives in the fields of health resources, agriculture, industry, science, engineering, public administration, law, skilled trades, education, and transportation. In the performance of their function, the National Manpower Resources Board on the selection of professional, scientific, and critical skills and such other voluntary advisory committees as may be appointed by the Director of Selective Service shall give appropriate consideration to the respective needs of both the Armed Forces and the civilian economy."

(3) Section 5(a) (50 App. U.S.C. 455(a)) is amended as follows:

(a) Designate the existing section 5(a) as subsection 5(a)(1).

(b) Add a new subsection 5(a)(2) to read as follows:

"(a)(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding subsection, the President in establishing the order of induction for registrants within the various age groups found qualified for induction shall not effect any change in the method of determining the relative order of induction for such registrants within such age groups as has been heretofore established. However, if in the discretion of the President such a change in priority of induction is deemed necessary in the national interest, such a change may be effected provided that a determination to this effect is reported to the Congress by the President together with information justifying the proposed change. The proposed modification or change in the order of induction will then become effective on the first day after the expiration of a period of sixty days from the time such a report had been received by the Congress while in continuous session during that period: *Provided,* That Congress has not, during that period, adopted a resolution rejecting the proposed change. For the purposes of this subsection a session may be considered as not continuous only if broken by an adjournment of Congress sine die. However, in computing the period that Congress is in continuous session, days that the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are not counted."

(4) Section 6(c)(2)(A) (50 App. U.S.C.

456(c)(2)(A)), is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) Any person, other than a person referred to in subsection (d) of this section, who—

"(i) prior to the issuance of orders for him to report for induction; or

"(ii) prior to the date scheduled for his induction and pursuant to a proclamation by the Governor of a State to the effect that the authorized strength of any organized unit of the National Guard of that State cannot be maintained by the enlistment or appointment of persons who have not been issued orders to report for induction under this title; or

"(iii) prior to the date scheduled for his induction and pursuant to a determination by the President that the strength of the Ready Reserve of the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve cannot be maintained by the enlistment or appointment of persons who have not been issued orders to report for induction under this title;

enlists or accepts appointment, before attaining the age of 26 years, in the Ready Reserve of any Reserve component of the Armed Forces, the Army National Guard, or the Air National Guard, shall be deferred from training and service under this title so long as he serves satisfactorily as a member of an organized unit of such Reserve or National Guard in accordance with section 270 of title 10 or section 502 of title 32, United States Code, as the case may be, or satisfactorily performs such other Ready Reserve service as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. Enlistments or appointments under subparagraphs (ii) and (iii) of this clause may be accepted notwithstanding the provisions of section 15(d) of this title. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (h) of this section, no person deferred under this clause who has completed six years of such satisfactory service as a member of the Ready Reserve or National Guard, and who during such service has performed active duty for training with an armed force for not less than four consecutive months, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this Act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress after August 9, 1955. In no event shall the number of enlistments or appointments made under authority of this paragraph in any fiscal year in any Reserve component of the Armed Forces or in the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard cause the personnel strength of such Reserve component or the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, to exceed the personnel strength for which funds have been made available by the Congress for such fiscal year."

(5) Section 6(a) (50 App. U.S.C. 456(a)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) EXEMPTIONS FROM REGISTRATION AND SERVICE.—

"(1) Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Naval Academy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserves; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense; members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and the Coast Guard, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President who are not citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4, except that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall not be so exempted. Any person who subsequent to June 24, 1948, serves on active duty for a period of not less than eighteen months in the armed forces of a nation with which the United States is associated in mutual defense activities as defined by the President, may be exempted from training and service, but not from registration, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, except that no such exemption shall be granted to any person who is a national of a country which does not grant reciprocal privileges to citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That any active duty performed prior to June 24, 1948, by a person in the armed forces of a country allied with the United States during World War II and with which the United States is associated in such mutual defense activities, shall be credited in the computation of such eighteen-month period: *Provided further*, That any person who is in a medical, dental, or allied specialist category not otherwise deferred or exempted under this subsection shall be liable for registration and training and service until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of his birth.

"(2) Commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and members of the Reserve of the Public Health Service while on active duty, and assigned to staff the various offices and bureaus of the Public Health Service including the National Institutes of Health, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4."

(6) Section 6(h) (50 App. U.S.C. 456(h)) is amended to read as follows:

"(h) OCCUPATIONS: DEPENDENCY: FITNESS: EXTENSION OF AGE OF LIABILITY: AUTHORITY OF SELECTIVE SERVICE BOARD.—Except when the President finds that the needs of the Armed Forces require substantial restriction or termination of student deferments provided for by this subsection, the President shall under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of persons satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of learning and who request such deferment: *Provided*, That unless such person is deferred for graduate study under the provisions of this subsection such deferment shall terminate on completion of requirements for his baccaulaureate or first professional degree, failure to pursue satisfactorily a full-time course of instruction or on attainment of the twenty-fourth anniversary of the date of his birth, whichever first occurs: *Provided further*, That no person deferred under the provisions of this paragraph shall thereafter be deferred under this subsection except for extreme hardship to dependents under regulations governing such deferment: *Provided further*, That any person who requests and receives a student deferment under this paragraph shall upon the termination of such deferment if not otherwise deferred under one of the two preceding provisos, and if qualified, be liable for induction as a registrant within the prime age group irrespective of his actual age.

"Except as otherwise provided in this subsection the President is authorized under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in graduate study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: *Provided further*, That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces under the provisions of section 4(a) of this Act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferrable under any other provisions of this Act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the President shall, in carrying out the provisions of this title, establish, whenever practicable, national criteria for the classification of persons subject to induction under this title, and to the extent that such action is determined by the President to be consistent with the national interest, require such criteria to be administered uniformly throughout the United States."

(7) Section 6(j) (50 App. U.S.C. 456(j)) is amended to read as follows:

"Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form, but no person so exempted shall be exempted from service in the Armed Forces in any capacity that the President shall declare to be noncombatant. Any person found by his local board or on appeal, under regulations governing appeals, by the appeal board or the President, to be conscientiously opposed to both combatant and noncombatant training and service may immediately upon induction into the Armed Forces, be furloughed by the Secretary of the armed force concerned, without pay and allowance, to perform twenty-four months of civilian service contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest as his local board may deem appropriate: *Provided,* That no person furloughed under the provisions of this subsection shall be entitled to any benefit provided under any provision of law for service in the Armed Forces of the United States. Inductions under this subsection shall be accomplished by the local board."

(8) Section 10(a)(3) (50 App. U.S.C. 460 (a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Director shall also appoint a Deputy Director who shall serve under the direction of the Director and be responsible for public affairs and such other matters as may be assigned to him by the Director."

(9) Section 10(b)(3) (50 App. U.S.C. 460 (b)(3)) is amended by:

(a) Inserting the following new proviso at the end of the first sentence thereof: "*Provided,* That no person shall be disqualified from serving as a counselor to registrants, including service as Government appeal agent, because of his membership in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces."

(b) Deleting the colon immediately preceding the first proviso, substituting a period therefor and inserting the following: "No member shall serve on any local board or appeal board for more than twenty-five years or after he has attained the age of seventy-five. No citizen shall be denied membership on any local board or appeal board on account of her sex. The requirements outlined in the preceding two sentences shall be fully implemented and effective not later than January 1, 1968."

(c) Inserting before the last sentence of the subsection the following: "No judicial review shall be made of the classification or processing of any registrant by local boards, appeal boards, or the President, except as a defense to a criminal prosecution instituted under section 12 of this title, after the registrant has responded either affirmatively or negatively to an order to report for induction, or for civilian work in the case of a registrant determined to be opposed to participation in war in any form: *Provided,* That such review shall go to the question of the jurisdiction herein reserved to local boards, appeal boards, and the President only when there is no basis in fact for the classification assigned to such registrant."

(10) Section 10(b)(4) (50 App. U.S.C. 460(b)(4)) is amended by deleting the semicolon at the end of the subsection, substituting a colon therefor, and adding the following: "*Provided further,* That an employee of a local board having supervisory duties with respect to other employees of one or more local boards shall be designated as the 'executive secretary' of the local board or boards: *And provided further,* That the term of employment of such 'executive secretary' in such position shall in no case exceed ten years except when reappointed;"

(11) Section 10(g) (50 App. U.S.C. 460 (g)) is amended by deleting the period at the end, inserting a colon in place thereof, and adding the following: "*Provided,* That the Director of Selective Service shall report, to the Congress, at least quarterly on the operations of Selective Service including such specific kinds of information as may be requested by the Congress."

(12) Section 12 (50 App. U.S.C. 462) is amended by:

(a) Deleting the last sentence of subsection (a) and substituting the following in lieu thereof: "Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this title, and such cases shall be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing, and an appeal from the decision or decree of any district court or circuit court of appeals shall take precedence over all other cases pending before the court to which the case has been referred."

(b) Adding a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) The Department of Justice shall proceed as expeditiously as possible with a prosecution under this section, or with an appeal, upon the request of the Director of Selective Service System or shall advise the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing the reasons for its failure to do so."

(13) Section 17(c) (50 App. U.S.C. 467(c)) is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

Sec. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter 537, as amended (77 Stat. 4), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

Sec. 3. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2216), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

Sec. 4. Section 9 of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public Law 85–62, as amended (77 Stat. 4), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

Sec. 5. Sections 302 and 303 of title 37, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" whenever that date appears and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

Mr. RIVERS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hall: On page 13, line 7, insert before the comma the words: "and the Coast Guard", and

On page 13, line 9, after the period and before the quotation marks, insert the following:

"Commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and members of the Reserve of the Public Health Service, who prior to the enactment of this subsection had been detailed or assigned to duty other than that specified in the preceding sentence, notwithstanding the preceding sentence, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4."

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment will continue in effect the existing language in subsection (5) of the bill, but in addition it would rewrite the existing section 6(a) of the draft law which provides an exemption from registration and military service for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and members of the Reserve of the Public Health Service on active duty.

The effect of the language change is to remove this exemption for those individuals commissioned in U.S. Public Health Service Reserve, on active duty with the Public Health Service who are detailed to duties outside the Public Health Service and the various offices and bureaus of the Public Health Service. The National Institutes of Health, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the Surgeon General's own assignees such as the Merchant Marine Hospital, and so forth, are considered proper assignments of the U.S. Public Health Service.

The enactment of this language would therefore result in precluding, for example, the constructive military crediting of service with the Peace Corps—135 assigned; the World Health Organization—one assigned; Food and Drug Administration—63 assigned; Pan American Health Organization—30 assigned; U.S. Department of Agriculture—four assigned; Bureau of Prisons—52 assigned; Office of Economic Opportunity—eight assigned; St. Elizabeths Hospital—13 assigned; U.S. AID overseas, Department of the Interior, 20, pollution; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—outside USPHS—for air pollution, and so forth.

I do not believe that the Congress ever intended service with the Peace Corps, the World Health Organization, or the Food and Drug Administration to constitute equivalent service which would permit discharge of a physician's military obligation.

Therefore, this amendment has no other purpose but to eliminate this rapidly growing abuse of the exemptions now provided commissioned Reserve officers in the Public Health Service, from the provisions of the draft law.

Stated another way, to the extent that we provide a draft exemption to physicians in the Public Health Service detailed to duties outside the Public Health Service, we diminish the supply of physicians available for the draft and consequently increase the burden on those remaining physicians in our country.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS. This is the amendment that we had referred to which defers Reserve officers and commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and gives them credit for their service that they have had. Is that correct?

Mr. HALL. That is correct, I say to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I and the committee accept this amendment.

Mr. HALL. I thank the chairman.

This has as its purpose to give consideration to the Reserve officers that have been assigned on duty and give them military credit but also protects the regular corps of the U.S. Public Health Service in their regular assigned duties.

I appreciate the chairman and the members of the committee accepting the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will this exempt them from service without regard to age or service?

Mr. HALL. This does not exempt them from service. It exempts only the regular USPHS corps officers from the "draft." It puts the misassigned Reserve officers back into the draft pool. The doctors draft is especially, and admittedly, discriminatory because they are in short supply. I might add, to the Reserve officers who are not now serving but who in the future might serve and be detailed to duty as medical corps officers in such things as the NIH, AID, FDA, the anti-air-pollution department of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the anti-water-pollution department of the Department of the Interior, and the other detailed duties with nonmilitary services for which these physicians are primarily drafted; would not be exempted.

The end result will be that this amendment, if adopted, will make more physicians available for the civilian pool, as well as give constructive military credit to those in the regular Public Health Service for assignments, and would broaden and keep the military service medical personnel available and abreast of this situation.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RIVERS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on behalf of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Rivers: On page 17, delete lines 5 through 25 inclusive, and substitute the following:

"Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, if he is inducted into the Armed Forces under this title, be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or shall, if he is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, in lieu of such induction, be ordered by his local board, subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe, to perform for a period equal to the period prescribed in section 4(b) such civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest as the local board pursuant to Presidential regulations may deem appropriate and any such person who knowingly fails or neglects to obey such order from his local board shall be deemed, for the purposes of section 12 of this title, to have knowingly failed or neglected to perform a duty required of him under this title."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the present language which is in the committee bill and the subject of this amendment briefly would accomplish three purposes:

First. It deletes from the law the language which has been used by the U.S. Supreme Court—*U.S.* v. *Seeger*, 380 U.S. 163—to unduly expand the basis for conscientious objection—the Supreme Court decision established a "conviction" test which permitted, in effect a personal moral code to replace the test of religious training and belief."

Second. It deletes from the law the existing requirement that in those cases in which a claim for conscientious objection has been denied by a local board, the case in being acted upon by the appeal board first requires a referral to the Department of Justice for a complete background investigation and advisory opinion. The committee change would delete this referral requirement which in many cases has taken more than 2 years. A delay in processing of this kind is obviously excessive, but perhaps more importantly if this investigative and processing delay were permitted to remain in the law, going to the younger age group with exposure to induction for only a year would permit individuals entering conscientious objections to completely evade military service.

Third. The committee language would require that all conscientious objectors, regardless of their views, be required to technically enter military service. Thus, insuring that in the event a conscientious objector had failed to perform his assigned civilian service he could then be subject to military discipline as would be all his non-conscientious-objector contemporaries. Under existing law failure to perform assigned civilian service could only be punished if the Department of Justice elected to prosecute the offender.

The language now proposed as the substitute for the reported committee language in the bill would retain the first two objectives, but would delete the third—which technically makes all conscientious objectors subject to military law.

The committee believed that all registrants selected for induction whether or not they are "conscientious objectors" to war in any form should nonetheless be required to perform service for their country.

Under existing law those conscientious objectors who are found to be conscientiously opposed to war and military service in any form are authorized in lieu of induction to be ordered by the local draft board, subject to regulations issued by the President, to perform 2 years of civilian work "contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest as the local board may deem appropriate."

This requirement in the law as implemented has worked well. However, the committee was concerned with those exceptional situations in which an individual had been assigned to such civilian work in lieu of induction and had failed to fully perform such service.

Under existing law the failure of a registrant to perform such "civilian work" is deemed, for the purposes of the criminal section of the existing draft law, to constitute a willful failure to perform such duty and consequently subject to the criminal provisions and penalties of the law.

The committee has encountered situations in which the Justice Department appears reluctant to prosecute such offenders. Consequently, the committee sought to insure performance of service by making such conscientious objectors liable to military prosecution.

For illustrative cases I refer the Members of the House to pages 2524 and 2525 of the printed committee hearings, Committee Document No. 12.

There is, therefore, ample justification for the committee action. However, concurrently with the drafting of this section, the committee has also included as subsection 12(b) of the bill—page 20, lines 13 to 19—a provision which reads as follows:

(c) The Department of Justice shall proceed as expeditiously as possible with a prosecution under this section, or with an appeal, upon the request of the Director of Selective Service System or shall advise the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing the reasons for its failure to do so.

The inclusion of this provision in the bill will largely offset the requirements written into the section relating to conscientious objectors which would place them under military law.

Consequently, in view of the very serious objections that church groups, such as the Mennonites, appear to have to being "technically" subject to military law, my amendment would delete this objectionable requirement without affecting the basic objectives of the committee language.

I, therefore, urge unanimous adoption of this substitute language.

Mr. Chairman, I might state to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the amendment is acceptable to the members of the committee on this side of the aisle.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. How would this apply to Cassius Clay?

Mr. RIVERS. It does not apply to Cassius Clay.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If adopted, would it put him in service?

Mr. RIVERS. The reason he is not now in service is because the Department of Justice has not tried to put him into service.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, the minority is in full agreement with the chairman of the committee in offering this amendment.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I thank my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers], for supporting this amendment after I had called to his attention the severe effect which the committee language would have had on such groups as the Mennonites, Brethren, Amish, and Quakers.

Representatives of the Mennonite Central Committee discussed with me Monday the drastic effect which the language in the committee bill would have upon members of the so-called historic peace churches. I immediately called this to the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers]. Our efforts to overcome this serious problem are represented by the amendment which the distinguished chairman now offers.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that for the great body of religious objectors the objection is not merely to war and killing, but to induction into the Armed Forces, and to service under the military arm of the Government. This is the case for example of the Mennonites who at this moment represent about two-thirds of all men engaged in alternative service under the present draft law. They have consistently taken this position through 442 years of history, a conviction for which thousands died as martyrs in Europe in the 16th century, a conviction for which they migrated to America in search of religious liberty.

The tragic result of not accepting the amendment now offered could well be the imprisonment of thousands of religious objectors sincerely desiring to be loyal to their Nation but unable to violate their higher loyalty to that which they believe God requires of them.

Those religious groups with long-held deep-seated convictions against service under the military cannot in conscience do other at this time than to advise their young men to remain true to their faith, whatever the cost.

The amendment now before us would solve this problem and I strongly urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PIKE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. PIKE: On page 7, line 11, after "engaged in", strike out the comma and the words "and preparing for" and the comma.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that bothers me most about this legislation is the fact that we say we are not going to allow any more pyramiding of deferments and we say that we are going to get rid of the graduate school deferment, and that is not what we are doing.

If we look at the language in the bill itself on page 13, line 22, it says:

> *Provided*, That unless such person is deferred for graduate study under the provisions of this subsection such deferment shall terminate. . . .

These words in my amendment are the guts of deferment for graduate study. These words here about preparing for critical skills. We are talking about drafting people at age 19 and age 20, and people are not doctors and they are not dentists at age 19 and 20. What this is the loophole by which educational deferments will continue to be pyramided, by which undergraduates will continue to go on to graduate school, by which the poor people will continue to be drafted while the wealthy people continue to go to school. I believe in time of war we have an obligation to be just not only to the bright and to the wealthy but to the poor, yes, and even to the dumb.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, if I might say directly, the gentleman from New York is offering an amendment to eliminate the graduate deferments, not undergraduate deferments?

Mr. PIKE. I am indeed.

Mr. STRATTON. May I ask whether the amendment is merely directed to the wording on page 7, line 11?

Mr. PIKE. The wording on this line 11, page 7, is of course, referred to on page 27 of the committee report when they say:

> . . . the committee has viewed with concern the abuses that have heretofore existed in the provision of deferments for students pursuing postgraduate studies.

I want to do more than view with concern. I would like to eliminate postgraduate deferments. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. STRATTON. I agree with the gentleman, but does the gentleman not have another amendment to offer?

Mr. PIKE. I do have another amendment which would apply not only to postgraduate studies, but also to all student deferments.

Mr. STRATTON. I believe if the gentleman would look carefully, the section that actually binds is section 6, on page 13. I have an amendment to offer to that section that would not only make changes in the recommendations of the advisory committee——

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield any further.

That would apply to undergraduate deferments, but when you look at the report, on page 26, they are talking about this commission here, this National Manpower Resources Board. These are the people who will recommend who can be deferred. If they study what the Federal Government tells them to study, then they will get the graduate school deferment. That is the language right here which creates the loophole for a deferment at the postgraduate level.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Would the language of the gentleman's amendment prevent doctors and dentists from being deferred for graduate school?

Mr. PIKE. It would, indeed, but I suggest to the gentleman that if he really means what he says, that we are going to take the youngest first, and they are going to take them at age 19, and they are going to take them at age 20, there are not many doctors or dentists at age 19 and age 20. That is what the committee said it meant.

Mr. BATES. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PIKE. Certainly.

Mr. BATES. Would the gentleman then propose, because there is a shortage of doctors throughout the country, that once these young men have served and later go to graduate school to become doctors, would he then subject them to the draft?

Mr. PIKE. I doubt that would be necessary.

Mr. BATES. The country would have to have some source of doctors.

Mr. PIKE. We do have a doctor's draft. My amendment does not interfere with those who are engaging in the practice of medicine or dentistry.

It is only striking out the language for those who are preparing.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

The majority makes the point that percentagewise, facts show that college graduates serve their country in excess of 70 percent. These figures, however, are misleading because they do not show whether the graduate served his country before, during, or after his college training. It would be interesting to have statistics on the actual number of young people who serve, who first obtain a college deferment. Of course, today only a small percentage of those young people deferred since 1965 for college have been called to duty, and therein lies the inequity.

To the mother who has lost her son in Vietnam, who questions why the boy across the street continues his college career, it is little solace to explain that someday, provided he does not marry or become laden with children or qualify for graduate school, he, too, will serve. The arguments in the majority report that any boy with a nickle in his jeans can go to college rings rather hollow to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I support the objective of trying to nail down clearly that graduate students should not be deferred.

I am afraid the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York, however, would not actually accomplish that purpose since it is merely a change in a recommendation of the National Advisory Commission.

The section which really governs graduate student deferments appears on page 14 of the bill at line 24. I intend to offer an amendment at the appropriate time which will eliminate college graduate deferments except in the categories of doctors, dentists, and allied professions, which are already subject to military call under present law. I think that will be the proper way to deal with the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the allegation just made, I simply refer you to the committee's own report and ask you to read the language on page 27, because it is in that language under the heading of "Graduate Student Deferments" that they say this National Manpower Resources Board will, in conjunction with the National Security Council, and so forth, identify those disciplines, occupations, and so on, and the Board would then be in a better position to intelligently determine policies relating to not only occupational deferments but postgraduate student deferments as well.

This is the language and this is the section. And if you want to do anything about postgraduate deferments, this is the place to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, this language does not authorize anybody to be deferred. All it does is merely to permit this new Board to consider and recommend to the Director of Selective Service whether people in certain categories shall be deferred.

I also want to indicate here that this will put your doctors in double jeopardy and require them first to serve as enlisted people before going to college, and then be drafted again by the draft board, as doctors. In addition, many union leaders throughout the country have written to us about apprentice training. This would destroy apprentice training. Many people think that individuals who are being trained in certain skills should be deferred until they have finished that schooling. This amendment would prevent that. How could we permit individuals to go to college on the one hand and deny apprentice training on the other?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, we have considered this amendment in the committee. It was rejected. Even the proponents are confused on this. When sputnik went up, everyone went into a tailspin. They wanted to defer everyone. We must permit the President the opportunity to defer critical skills and those future scientists who will give us developments to keep us going along in the technocracy that is about us. This would deny the board the opportunity to make any recommendation so that the President might act.

This is a dangerous amendment, arrived at after a great deal of confusion. I ask that it be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUMSFELD

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUMSFELD: On page 6, after line 17, insert the following:

"(2) Section 1(c) (50 App. U.S.C. 451(c)) is amended to read as follows:

" '(c) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations of serving in the armed forces should be enforced through the provisions of this Act only when necessary to insure the security of this Nation, and the opportunities and privileges of serving in the armed forces and the reserve components thereof should be shared generally, in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.' "

Redesignate paragraphs (2) through (13) (on pages 6 through 20) as paragraphs (3) through (14), respectively.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not see how the amendment would hurt anything, and I will be glad to accept it.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am delighted to have the chairman accept the amendment.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this matter with the gentleman from Illinois. I believe it is in accord with the views of the committee, and I accept the amendment.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the gentleman. I would like to make one comment about it. The amendment affects the intent and policy of the Congress, not the statute as such. I would simply report that it is consistent with the President's message, it is consistent with the committee report, and it is consistent with the platforms of both political parties.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 21, after line 14 add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 6. Military personnel inducted under the authority of this Act can be dispatched to a foreign country as a part of combat personnel units of the United States Army or United States Marine Corps only if authorized by specific act of Congress except in military operations required pursuant to a treaty to which the United States is a party."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes, because very recently I had the opportunity to explain this amendment. It goes to the heart of constitutional war powers. We have the constitutional responsibility to raise an army, which we do by this act today.

We also have a constitutional responsibility, the awesome and grave responsibility, of war decision under the Constitution of the United States.

I feel that up to now at least we have not assumed it, even in the most reasonable or realistic manner. Therefore, I suggest that the bill be amended in a manner which would have the effect of requiring congressional approval in advance before the President could dispatch combat units to foreign soil.

Of course, it goes only to the draftee elements of those units, but as a practical matter, if it were enacted, this would have the effect of requiring advance congressional approval before combat units could be sent overseas. In my view, it is the responsibility, the grave burden, of the Congress to deal with this question, which we have not up to now.

I would like also to observe this amendment would leave in the hands of the President adequate authority to use the mobile units of the Navy and Air Force and other strategic units to deal with emergency problems, pending consideration of the combat commitments by the Congress.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, what does this do with regard to the use of draftees in South Vietnam?

Mr. FINDLEY. It would require that before additional units—I say "additional," and it would have nothing to do with rotational units—could be dispatched to Vietnam, Congress would have to give authority for that dispatch.

Mr. DINGELL. What would it have to do with sending individual draftees for replacements?

Mr. FINDLEY. As I interpret it, it would have no effect. As I see it, "dispatch of additional units" would not require additional authority if the U.N. should assume responsibility in Vietnam and we would act under orders of the U.N.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment says this:

> Only if authorized by specific Act of Congress except in military operations or pursuant to a treaty to which the United States is a party.

If General Westmoreland sent a dispatch tonight about the need for 100,000 troops, how would we get them to him under this amendment?

Mr. FINDLEY. I would assume that the Congress would take up the question, perhaps at midnight hour, if need be, and deal with it. I anticipate very little delay in response.

Mr. RIVERS. It would have to go to the Senate, and they would have to debate it, and then they would have to pass it, and then would it have to be signed by the President?

Mr. FINDLEY. I can recall, and I am sure the gentleman can recall, when the Congress has acted with dispatch when required.

Mr. RIVERS. What about NATO?

Mr. FINDLEY. On regional groupings, authorized under the U.N. like NATO, we have an automatic defense agreement there, and I presume this would be covered.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the gentleman's purpose, but I think in the administration of it, of trying to keep volunteer units separated from those who might be inducted, and keeping units on that basis, it would indeed be a hardship on the military of the United States.

Mr. FINDLEY. If I may respond, for that reason I acknowledge that if this were to have effect, it would apply to all combat units and not just to certain units. I think that is the intent.

Mr. HOSMER. It is very difficult when we get to the Marine Corps, because they have combat units floating around in the Mediterranean today, and I do not know whether this would apply to those.

Mr. FINDLEY. My purpose in offering this amendment is in the hope it will cause some people to think seriously about this fundamental and important question of who should have the responsibility for the awesome decision of combat action.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, if it were necessary to dispatch marines on a ship to protect American property and lives, would this make it necessary to have the corps divided into selectees and volunteers to be dispatched for that purpose?

Mr. FINDLEY. I would anticipate no such division, and I am sure individual military personnel could be dispatched for such purposes.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I merely want to share a story with the gentlemen here in the House, because the suggestion that we should rely upon a group of nations, even so great as the United Nations, reminds me of an exchange I was privileged to have with Mr. Carlos Romulo on my trip to the Philippines. Mr. Romulo, as Members know, was the first President of the United Nations. He said this to me:

> Mr. Congressman, you will recall that I have great interest in the United Nations, since its inception, and I make you this observation: When there is a problem between a weak nation and another weak nation and the United Nations acts, the problem disappears. But if there is a problem between a weak nation and a strong nation and the United Nations acts, the weak nation disappears. But if there is a problem between a strong nation and another strong nation and the United Nations acts, the United Nations disappears.

So I suggest we cannot rely on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do this not to delay proceedings, because I realize this would cause me to be tarred and feathered in the cloakrooms.

I merely point out to the Members the fact that we are taking into consideration this draft bill, exhausted from the last three days of debate on the Federal aid to education bill, we are rushing these amendments through and shouting and demanding votes as if this matter before us were merely perfunctory.

This is all predictable. I understand some of you have plane schedules. But I would like to point out that this is a poor way to run a railroad.

I say this without criticizing anyone. I merely point out that a subject of this importance should be treated with more attention and more debate.

For example, the gentleman from Illinois, I thought, had a poor amendment. I believe it was impractical and visionary. But he deserved much more attention.

If the House were in a normal atmosphere, under normal conditions, his amendment could have provoked three or four hours of a great debate on constitutional government and foreign affairs of today. Just because he stood up at the wrong time, at this late hour, under the emotional exhaustion we feel after yesterday's ordeal, he is shouted down.

He might even have an amendment with merit, and no one will pay attention to him.

I do believe the Record ought to read that the House, in a complete state of anxiety to rush home for the Memorial Day holiday, with complete frustration after 3 days of debate on aid to education, is not treating this subject with the respect, detail, and objectivity it deserves.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I have several questions to ask the chairman of the committee on this legislation.

I am sure all of us will receive considerable mail asking about changes in the act voted tonight. I do not believe the report is quite clear on many of the points contained in the bill.

The committee is recommending in this legislation that we give preference and priority to calling 19 and 20 year olds first, but this priority will not become effective, until such time as the President establishes his FAIR system. Assuming this is accepted in the other body, would the gentleman care to indicate when the new priorities would become effective?

Mr. RIVERS. This has nothing to do with the FAIR system. This recommendation is directed to the President relative to his proposal on the 19- and 20-year-olds. Under this proposal the President may install a FAIR system after he notifies the Congress and 60 days elapses and we do not veto it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The President has indicated he would do that before January 1, 1969. Is that correct? He has instructed his Selective Service Director to bring forth this FAIR system by January 1, 1969.

Mr. RIVERS. That is right.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Do I understand the gentleman correctly that if this legislation before us becomes law and is signed by the President, local draft boards across the country would start giving priority to 19- and 20-year-olds without waiting for the so-called "FAIR system?"

Mr. RIVERS. Not necessarily. The law does not require the President to do it. He may do it. The only thing in this law which gives anybody any right is a boy or a young man accepted or who decides to go to college.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am not talking about college deferment. I want to know what changes this committee has made now because I had hoped that this House would come up with substantial changes to the draft law which has been on the books for many years. As I read this—and I have read it—I see a lot of language in here, but actually no substantive changes in the law even though many changes are needed.

Mr. RIVERS. No.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I want to find out under what circumstances the committee's recommendation that 19 and 20 year olds would be drafted first would come into play.

Mr. RIVERS. We recommend to the President that he take these 19 or 20 year olds. We have not written it into the law. He can draft them according to any priority he wants to.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Does not the gentleman think that the time has come when Congress ought to assert its own responsibility and start writing some guidelines and criteria into this law?

Mr. RIVERS. No.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Four years ago on this floor, I moved that we reduce the age limit to 22. We are the only country in the world which still keeps men in the shadow of the draft until the age of 26. If they take deferment, they are in it until the age of 35. We are the only country in the world that has the highest number of unemployed among the young groups.

The other day Secretary Wirtz pointed out that we are the only nation in the world that has the highest number of young men unemployed simply because employers do not want to hire them if they are in the shadow of the draft. That is not because the employers feel they will be lost to the draft, but it is because they assume a 2-year obligation for this man's employment when he returns from military service. So I hope we will make some substantial changes in the bill. But as we look at it we have given everything to the President. He can either do it or he does not have to. The same thing applies to deferment for postgraduate students in college. From the colloquy that we heard a little while ago I could not figure out and I still do not know and I am sure the draft boards all over the country will not know under what circumstances we defer a student who is in postgraduate work. I wish I could get some answers to this. I will yield to the gentleman for an answer.

Mr. RIVERS. I thought I explained this.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman has an excellent way of explaining it and leaving one right where he started. I want to know when do the 19 and 20 year olds get drafted first and under what circumstances do postgraduates not get deferments. Those are the questions I would like to have answers to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Pucinski was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. RIVERS. Let us start with the 19 year olds.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Right.

Mr. RIVERS. This is prospective. When this act takes effect the President has asked us to look into the 19 year olds first. *We have agreed that he should* go to this age group.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But he has that right now and he has had it for years.

Mr. RIVERS. He has it all right.

Mr. PUCINSKI. So we are not doing a thing here.

Mr. RIVERS. Not a single thing, and we are not for this reason: If we wrote into the law that he shall draft 19 and 20 year olds and nothing else, then some condition may come up where he could not meet a possible emergency.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man in my high respect and regard for the chairman of the committee, but I say that if you read the legislation carefully the only thing we are doing here tonight is extending this law for 4 years. You really have not changed a thing. *I believe we owe the young men* of this Nation more careful consideration and am very disappointed that the committee did not spell out guidelines more definitively than it has.

Mr. RIVERS. We have not changed it.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. RUMSFELD

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer several amendments and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. RUMSFELD: On page 20, line 22, strike out "1971" and insert "1969".

On page 21, line 2, strike out "1971" and insert "1969".

On page 21, line 6, strike out "1971" and insert "1969".

On page 21, line 10, strike out "1971" and insert "1969".

On page 21, line 14, strike out "1971" and insert "1969".

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of ascertaining as to whether or not we can arrive at an agreement upon a time limitation for the debate of these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina have a unanimous-consent request to propound to the Chair?

Mr. RIVERS. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to have that request arrived at after I make my initial statement on the amendments and then I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, in 1966, 2 million young Americans reached the age of draft vulnerability. In this year 1967, more than 2 million young men will reach that age.

In 1968, probably more than that will reach that age and in 1969, even more. In fact, if we extend this act for the 4 years as has been proposed, from 1967 to 1971 during that 4-year period of time, in excess of more than 9 million young men will have moved into the draft age.

Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that we *owe them something more than a 4-year* extension. Do we not owe them and their families at least a 2-year extension so we can look at this act again in 1969?

Mr. Chairman, this committee bill makes changes in the existing statute and, if adopted, would give the President great powers.

Mr. Chairman, should we not give to these young men at least an extension of 2 years so the Congress can take another look at it after the expiration of that period of time?

I ask the members of the Committee: are we so busy that the Congress cannot reexamine this act in 1969, rather than to commit ourselves to a fixed period of 4 years, especially upon such an important piece of legislation as this?

The manpower needs of this Nation, *both civilian and military, are changing;* they are not fixed. The number of available young men is not fixed. The pool is expanding rapidly. The pool is not static and will not remain static for a period of 4 years.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment is agreed to. In fact, I hope that it will be accepted by the Committee. If it fails, I am hopeful that I shall be able to offer it as a motion to recommit so that each Member will have an opportunity to endorse the proposition as to whether he wants a 4-year or a 2-year extension of the act, and to present an opportunity to those that feel that they are not completely satisfied and want to use the 2-year period to gather further experience in an effort to develop an even better piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the Committee will support this amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman, a member of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the gentleman has offered a most meritorious amendment to this bill bearing upon a proposition which I submit should be reexamined within the period of 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Illinois for his amendment and I certainly shall support it.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his statement in support of my amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment were to pass, there would exist an element of false hope all over this country. There would be uncertainty in the minds of every young man with reference to this matter. This was testified to before the committee in 1963. It would create an element of uncertainty in the minds of *millions of young men in this country* as to the future of their military service and the likelihood as to whether they would be needed in the service of their country.

Mr. Chairman, any such uncertainty, I believe, would be most unwarranted. I say this based upon the hard facts which have been made available to the Committee on Armed Services.

Let me tell the members of the Committee something in addition thereto, Mr. Chairman: It is always easy to say, "Let us do it tomorrow." You can make your *decision today.*

Mr. Chairman, this world is in an uproar. We do not know what the future will bring. We have got to make our decision based upon long-range planning. It would be easy to cut it short today. I *do not like this approach, however.* But *these things* have to be planned far into the future. You cannot prepare for the eventuality of war in this day and time overnight.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. *RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished* gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I hope and trust that this amendment is defeated. I think one thing we need to consider in this country now is our determination of purpose.

I am for peace, but I have an abiding conviction the only way we are going to get peace is to convince some people who want to make war on us, and the free people of the world, that our will is firm.

Mr. Chairman, I do not by saying that undertake to suggest disrespect to anybody, but I know—because, as I said earlier, I have voted for the Selective Service Act for a long time. One time before Pearl Harbor I voted against an extension. I did not know then we had virtually declared an ultimatum on Japan. I know it now, but that is beside the point.

I believe we have to meet this situation that is before us. As far as I am concerned I trust that the committee's position which was firmly supported by the overwhelming majority of the committee, who have struggled with this problem, will be sustained by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no Member of this body in my determination to support America's commitments throughout the world. As a matter of fact, I was a draftee already in the service when this body, by one vote, extended the draft in 1941, and although I had some mixed feelings about it at that time I have come to realize the wisdom of the decision. But in expressing this determination, I see no conflict in expressing the additional determination that we shall deal as fairly as possible with the 2 million young kids of draft age. I think we have got to give this the fullest possible consideration. I do not feel such consideration has yet been given the national dialog which is developing on this subject.

I do hope this amendment is adopted.

The gentleman's proposal, to cut the term of the Selective Service Act extension from 4 to 2 years, would increase congressional control over—and responsibility for—the military draft.

Because Members of Congress are closer to the public than other Federal officials, the provision suggested by the gentleman is an eminently desirable one. If people are unhappy with the Selective Service Act, they can make their opinions known through their Congressmen. As a matter of fact, I seriously question the hasty manner in which this bill is being considered today. But the gentleman from Missouri—and the gentleman from Illinois—are on the right track in urging that Congress take another look at the bill within 2 years, instead of 4.

Mr. Chairman, this Selective Service Act extension will deeply affect the lives of the 2 million young Americans reaching draft age this year.

Obviously, this House and this Congress owe it to these youths to give the most careful consideration to any legislation for determining how and when they will be called into uniform.

I wonder, frankly, whether we are really meeting this fundamental obligation in trying to pass on this bill tonight.

We were in session until 1:49 this morning, debating and finally approving the school aid amendments.

Now, weary and irritable, we are asked to pass on the Selective Service bill, an important appropriations measure, and two conference reports—all within the short span of a single afternoon.

Many of our colleagues are poised to depart for the 10-day legislative hiatus that is just ahead. A sizeable number, in fact, will be enjoying the delights of springtime in Paris, at the International Air Show.

No one has to be reminded, of course, that while our colleagues are so pleasantly engaged, thousands of other Americans will be fighting on remote Asian battlefields.

The new Selective Service Act will determine, to a very large degree, who will be designated to replace our brave troops in Vietnam and other dangerous trouble spots.

Why, then, are we rushing to complete action on this critical legislation? The existing draft law, does not expire until June 30, 5 weeks from now.

Why is it necessary to cut off the national dialog that is just developing on the overall purpose and methods of the Selective Service System?

Must we just continue the same old system, with a few amendments, when the world itself is changing so drastically? Have we given adequate thought to the armed services' current manpower requirements, which bear little if any resemblance to the military manpower needs of 25 years ago? Do we know that there is no practical alternative to the military draft?

Surely, these questions could have been more thoroughly explored—not for our own sake, but for the benefit of the millions of young men who will have to answer for what the House does tonight.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, to hear from the debate, one would believe that a lot of the people here are against a volunteer army, and a lot of people here love to have a draft. That simply is not the case.

I would say every person in this room would love to have a wholly volunteer army. Every person here, if it was feasible, would love to do away with the draft. I would say perhaps I would more than almost anyone else for certain very firm religious reasons, I have a deep desire to be able to do away with the draft, but I am a realist and I know that we cannot at this time do away with the draft.

Some people say we should depend on a volunteer army. The other day at an eastern university there was a group of about 150 students who listened to a speech there, and they demanded that we rely on volunteers entirely for our armed services. And then they were asked if any one of those present would volunteer, and none of them would. It is a great idea for somebody else to volunteer.

As far as being a soldier, I spent about as many years in that field as I expect almost anyone in this room has. I did not like war, and I do not like war now, but I do not believe we can do anything to more endanger this country than to show for one moment that we are showing the white feather, and that we are not backing the President in this present war. Regardless of past errors, we are in a most serious war at this time, and crying over past errors will not give us security.

As for not attempting to get a volunteer army by magic is simply absolutely wrong. For many years in this committee we have been attempting to make conditions in our armed services so desirable that we could depend entirely on a volunteer army. I will tell you we cannot just pass a magic wand and pass a bill and say now we have a volunteer army.

Two years ago a pay raise was put in by this committee. The Secretary of Defense did everything he could to block it, but the committee, and later this body, passed it. I think the pay raise for our armed services should have been more than it was. We are going to put in another pay raise bill for our servicemen this year.

Housing is one of the greatest things that we need to build up a strong volunteer professional Army. We certainly do have the best professional Army in the world but it is not large enough to do away with the draft.

But this committee every year has put in a demand and authorization and later appropriations have been given for housing. In every year but one, in the last 7 or 8 years, the Secretary of Defense has cut down the number of family housing units for the military. In the years 1953 to 1961 there are three times as many units of military family housing built as there has been in the entire history of our country.

We have worked out the very best medical service we can have for military families and for retirees wherever they are in the country. We have worked many months on that legislation. We have done everything we can to give our military a good retirement.

At the time that this war really started, the draft was almost down to nothing. Now we have built the best professional army anywhere in the world, but anyone who would say that we can have a professional army of 11 million men as we had in World War II is absolutely erroneous.

I asssure you that every Member of the committee means to build the very best professional military force.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it ought to be understood in connection with this amendment that is now pending that the Congress of the United States meets every year. If we do not need a draft any more, all right, then we can repeal it. If it does not work the way we think it ought to work, then we can change it. We do not need to set a deadline in that respect. We can always do whatever we want to do as the legislative branch of our Government to correct whatever shortcomings and failings there may be or we can even terminate the draft if the situation in the world permits that.

Mr. BRAY. The gentleman is entirely correct.

I do not like the statements that have been made from which one could infer that there are people in this Congress who would like to have a draft. But that is simply not true. If there is one man or woman in this body who wants to have a draft, I simply do not know who it is.

We all desire to have a volunteer army and not to resort to the draft. Many of us have been working a long time to this end.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I feel as the former minority leader and the chairman of the committee have stated, that a 2-year period would be an unnecessary burden to put upon this system at this time. We can always amend this bill any time we wish to do so. We can do that tomorrow or on any other day.

We have given a lot of thought to this. Some thoughts have been given here tonight about a volunteer army, but the facts show that then we would not have sufficient ability to meet an emergency if we did that.

This is not entirely a matter just of money. It is a question of being able to meet an emergency should the country be faced with that situation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill as it has been drawn.

I call to your attention the fact that the committee's bill, in the main, is consistent with the recommendations of the

President and with the action of the Senate.

In submitting his message on Selective Service to the Congress on March 6 of this year, the President recommended three principal changes in the operation of the draft—each of which are presently within the discretionary authority of the President. These are:

First. Drafting the youngest first—that is, the 19- to 20-year-olds.

Second. Selecting future inductees by a random system known as FAIR—fair and impartial random.

Third. Elimination of all graduate student deferments other than medical-dental students.

The President deferred the recommendation on undergraduate deferments and requested the Congress to resolve the matter following future debate.

The committee concurred in the President's first recommendation to go to the youngest age group—that is, registrants between the ages of 19 and 20.

While the President can take the step under his own authority, the committee indicated its support of the proposal in its report.

The committee found, in relation to the President's third point, that graduate student deferments were the real loophole by which some people were avoiding service. Therefore, we concluded that graduate deferments should be largely eliminated. We provide that in all but the rare and exceptional incidents where the national interest dictates to the contrary college deferments will depend on the baccalaureate degree or attaining age 24 whichever comes first. This will prevent the pyramiding of deferments through graduate school which in the past has been an avenue of escape from the draft.

The committee, however, was not willing to conclude that there would never be a time when advanced deferments for other than doctors and dentists would be required in the national interest. The committee's primary concern, it should be emphasized, was the interest of national security and not that of individual registrants. The committee felt the President should have the flexibility to provide occupational, professional, and postgraduate deferments should changing national requirements so dictate. It is recognized that these deferments would be the rare exception of those truly required in the national interest, and that for the overwhelming majority, graduate deferments would effectively be ended.

To assure that these limited advanced deferments are properly determined, the bill sets up the National Manpower Resources Board which, in conjunction with the National Security Council, would identify those areas of post graduate study where a critical requirement would justify a deferred status.

In relation to the President's second point, the random selection system, the committee found that no agreement exists in the executive branch as to just how such a program would be implemented. In addition, the committee was disturbed by the very real possibility that the so-called random system would have an adverse impact on voluntary enlistments and on officer procurement.

The committee, therefore, requires in the bill that among the new prime age group of 19-year-olds the method will be the present oldest-first system or so-called conveyor belt. That is, the 19-year-olds will have maximum liability to call the day before his 20th birthday.

The committee, however, did not wish to foreclose the possibility of a random selection system at some time in the future if it could be shown that such a program would be feasible and would be preferable to the present proven method. The bill provides, therefore, that if the President makes a determination in the future that a new system of priorities, such as a random selection system, would be in the national interest and so advises the Congress, the new system would become effective within 60 days unless the Congress, in the interim, adopted a resolution rejecting the charge.

In other words, we refused to go to a lottery system because it could not be shown to us that one was preferable to the oldest-first system, but we provide a means by which it could be instituted in the future if it is really shown to be desirable.

Finally, on the matter of student undergraduate deferments, we debated the subject at length as did the Members of the other body. The Members of the other body came to the conclusion that student deferments should continue.

Our committee came to the conclusion that student undergraduate deferments should be continued. We came to this conclusion in the interest of the country—not in the interest of any group or individual. We have provided that following his deferment, the student will become a constructive 19-year-old for the purpose of the draft and shall have the same liability for call as those who do not go to college. We found that undergraduate deferments of themselves do not provide a haven for escaping the draft and that those with a baccalaureate degree had a higher incidence of service than the general population. We found, however, that those who go on to graduate study have a much lower incidence of service. We have effectively closed this loophole.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, after the most thoughtful consideration the committee has ever given to any piece of legislation, the committee has come up with an outstanding bill and I think it is clearly a bill that the President can support. I hope all Members will vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of this amendment. We are dealing with human life here. And I refer not only to the great risks of the military, but to the drastic effects on the life patterns of countless young Americans. This is too serious a matter to prelegislate for 4 years. Surely a 2-year extension would be adequate to meet our needs and at the same time allow for a full-scale study for improvements and possibly an equitable alternative such as a voluntary service system.

Of course we all recognize the necessity for military manpower. We in Congress have an obligation to make a realistic assessment of our Nation's requirement for a strong and effective military organization.

The question is: What is the most equitable and most efficient means of supplying this manpower? This question must be answered with minimum disruptions of our young men's freedom of choice, their desire for education, the direction of their careers, and their pursuit of family life.

I believe there is considerable merit to the arguments advanced by those advocating voluntary service obligation, particularly the views as frequently expressed by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], and so eloquently advocated by the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

I associate with their views that our present Selective Service System is archaic and inequitable. The inherent discrimination against the poorer nonstudents, or even against our working, part-time students is obvious.

The wide discretionary authority given to local boards, results in varying interpretations in different communities, tending toward blatant favoritism and discrimination.

One of the prime reasons the draft quotas are so high now is that there is practically no reenlistment of our present active-duty personnel. Recent statistics tell us that the figure is 8 percent for all draftee reenlistments.

Thus, the vast majority of all the manpower obtained by the services is temporary, and the skills of these men, which took about $6,000 per draftee to develop, are wasted in the process. The cost, in wasted training and lost skills alone, is approximately $2.4 billion a year for the privilege of depending on compulsion to secure manpower. This is the very expensive penalty we pay for our inefficient manpower-procurement system.

The solution is now apparent. We must keep as many trained men in the Armed Forces as possible, and we must attract the countless others who would join if service were made appropriately attractive.

We must give them meaningful incentives to make them want to stay in the services long enough and try hard enough to gain the skill and experience levels the Nation so vitally needs to give the services the full benefit of their skills.

We must provide the essential elements of a good career, such as:

First, better pay;

Second, better housing; and

Third, certain other benefits that would make military life comparable with civilian jobs employing the same skills.

We could reduce the costs of these benefits by taking other steps toward greater efficiency:

First. Coordination between military and civilian sectors in the training and use of available manpower, including use of civilian personnel in military jobs as much as possible and making full use of civilian training and educational establishments in producing military technicians, scientists, and skilled workers.

Second. Lowering physical standards where appropriate to utilize less than

A-1 physical specimens in noncombat jobs.

Third. Improving the capabilities of Reserve units so that they may serve as a means of retaining and maintaining needed skills for potential military use.

In arguing the case for voluntary service we must consider its advantages for morale. Since under the present system only 46 percent of those eligible are selected, this is bound to result in an attitude by some of the draftees that they were gyped and the other fellows were lucky. A voluntary service would obviously eliminate this factor.

The Department of Defense claims it would cost too much to rely entirely on volunteers. It gives the estimated cost of hiring 500,000 new men annually at somewhere between $4 billion and $17 billion. These figures are misleading for they fail to take into account the higher reenlistment rate which would result from the improved voluntary system, thus making it unnecessary to hire 500,000 "new" men each year.

We must make service more desirable, with the goal of maximizing voluntary enlistments, and thus, minimizing reliance on the draft. Then we would be in a position of using conscription only when absolutely necessary.

It is with this system in mind that I heartily support this amendment to this bill which provides that any extension of the Selective Service System should be for 2 years, rather than 4 years. During this 2-year period, Congress would have ample opportunity to fully explore every aspect of the voluntary service system and make its recommendations for future enactment.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

Mr. **OTTINGER**. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the limitation that we see in the debate on this important amendment is as good a reason as any to limit this bill to 2 years. I think it is just shameful to schedule a bill of this importance with such little opportunity for debate. This bill is arousing sentiments, animosities, and anxieties in the entire youth of this country, and it deserves a full hearing. It deserves a chance for everyone to be adequately heard on it. If the bill is going to get this kind of short shrift treatment, it should not last more than 2 years.

I do not know what all the demagoguery on this amendment is about. The people who are for the amendment, its proposers, are not trying to eliminate the draft. They see that great changes are being made in the draft by this legislation. For the first time 19 year olds are to be drafted first. New rules with respect to college deferments are being proposed. These changes and others are far-reaching. We do not know how well they will work. They deserve another examination in at least 2 years' time.

Furthermore, deeper questions about draft changes deserve far more consideration than has been given them. Whether draftees should be paid a minimum wage should be explored; so should the possibility of substantially reducing or eliminating the draft by this means; so should possible remedies for discrimination on draft boards; so should variations on student deferments.

With the time limits set on this bill, these questions either will not be considered at all or, at best, can be debated for a maximum of 1 minute.

The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] should be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MAYNE].

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, as in all wars, it is the young men of this country who are being asked to die today in Vietnam. I do not think it is too much to ask the Congress of the United States to exercise its responsibility to those young men to review their situation at least once every 2 years. I ask this body not to abdicate that responsibility. I speak in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. RYAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I rise to support the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD], and to echo the sentiments of Mr. OTTINGER, of New York.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman has made a motion that the Committee rise, and he was recognized to speak in support of his motion. He now states that he is speaking in support of the amendment that is before the House. My point of order is that his text is out of order. It is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is constrained to state that this motion would open the entire field of the bill, and therefore the Chair holds that the gentleman is proceeding in order.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, our colleague [Mr. OTTINGER] pointed out that the fate of millions of young Americans is being debated here tonight. This debate is being curtailed, and we are being asked to vote on this very crucial issue—literally an issue of life and death—at a time when tempers are short and emotions are high.

I believe it is important to ask some very fundamental questions. The distinguished chairman said that we must avoid uncertainty by continuing the draft for 4 more years. We would avoid greater uncertainties, I suppose, if we extended it for 10 years or 20 years. I do not see any particular magic in 4 years. The fact is that there are many questions which remain unanswered which the committee has simply not faced.

Last year I introduced a resolution to set up a joint committee to study the ramifications of the draft as it relates to the Nation's military needs, and also to inquire into the concept of national service and alternate forms of service within the Selective Service System.

I regret that such a committee was not set up, because I believe this whole area deserves the attention of the Congress in a much more fundamental way than the Armed Forces Committee can possibly give it. Basic questions concerning our actual manpower needs and our national requirements remain unanswered.

If the objective is to meet the Nation's military needs, then a volunteer Army should certainly be considered. It has been talked about this afternoon. I do not believe that the argument that it is prohibitively expensive should be an obstacle. The estimates of the expense range from $4 billion to $20 billion. We do not know just what it would cost. But if indeed a voluntary army makes the most sense in the Nation's interest, the cost should not stand in the way.

Again, if we are going to consider a volunteer Army, this requires a transition period. Two years certainly would be a period during which it could be studied and examined, and the questions which have been raised here could be thoroughly explored. If we want to consider the question of universal service, including national service, that too could be explored.

All of these questions should be faced. If, on the other hand, it is determined that neither of those alternatives makes sense in the light of the international situation, the many inequities in the present system should be confronted. And those inequities have not really been confronted. There is the question of student deferments. Some go to college. Some go to war. "Why me?" That is the question that young men all over the land are asking. They are entitled to an answer.

As we proceed tonight, we should, and I hope that we will, debate at some length the question of student deferments and not cut off debate on it.

There is another question which is very important, and that is the question of the composition of the local draft boards. Are they representative of every one in the community? Do they reflect a cross-section of the community? Or do they reflect the prejudices of a certain segment of the community? This is a question which we should ask.

There are many inequities that simply have not been confronted. I would suggest that during the next 2 years, a real effort be made to face these questions and to come up with answers. In 2 years perhaps the committee will come back with proposals which will be more fair to all American young men.

The bill before us provides a 4-year extension without any provision for a review of the inequities. It is being rushed through without adequate debate or opportunity for full consideration. A 2-year extension will provide an opportunity to study thoroughly the issues which have been skirted tonight, and which must be faced.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I

rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], made reference to a very historic debate, an event that took place in this very House 3 months before Pearl Harbor. Well do I remember it, because I was majority leader at the time, and it fell upon my shoulders to lead the fight on the floor of the House for the passage of that bill.

Every man who voted against the extension of the selective service was just as good an American as I, or anyone who voted for it, and everyone here who votes for a 4-year extension or a 2-year extension is just as good an American as anyone, no matter what his views might be on the pending question.

I, of course, am sure the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], will be defeated, and I address myself particularly to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

When we entered the rollcall on that historic day, I did not know what the outcome would be. All that Sam Rayburn, the late Speaker, and I had in reserve was two live pairs. It was not two shifts, which would have meant a shift of four votes, but two live pairs, and, in the event of a tie, the Speaker's vote. That is how close that vote was.

The feeling of isolationism was intense in those days, honestly entertained but very intense.

I refer to that merely to say that the question of weakness or of firmness and strength was involved then, and men honestly differed. The same question basically is involved on this amendment today.

The 4-year extension represents the views of the Committee on Armed Services. Whether or not my friend from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD], and others who feel as he does believe 2 years is sufficient, it does not represent the position of strength.

We have not only arrogant aggression in South Vietnam but also another arrogant individual who has come across the horizon. We have known he was here for many years, but he suddenly came across the horizon a few days ago in the Middle East.

In the 1930's we had arrogant aggression and nazism under the leadership of Hitler, and there was weak leadership in Britain and France. Under Chamberlain there was the hope that Hitler would be satisfied. He was not. He got away with the Saar, then Austria, then the Sudetenland, then the rest of Czechoslovakia, and after the so-called permanent peace at Munich there came Poland and the war.

All that time there was in England a man by the name of Churchill, warning the people against arrogant aggression represented by nazism, who said that Hitler would never be satisfied where weak leadership existed. But his was a voice in the wilderness.

Churchill represented strength in those days, just the same as Roosevelt did.

We were called the "war mongers" in those days, those of us who tried to prepare our country to look a little into the future, and to see the direction that history might take in terms of the national interest of our country.

While I respect the views of our friend from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] and others who feel as he does, I seriously believe, based upon my experience in this body, that their judgment might well be wrong. It is hard for you and for me to look into the future and see history in the making. All we can do is the best we can as human beings to see the natural and probable consequences of our action or inaction.

Certainly a 4-year extension of the Selective Service Act would be a step in the direction of firmness and strength. It will bring about stability, but it will be a message not only to the arrogant aggressor in Southeast Asia but also the arrogant aggressor in the Middle East.

I hope the Rumsfeld amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. To resume the debate on the pending amendment, offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN].

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Charles Dudley Warner said:

> Public opinion is stronger than the legislature, and nearly as strong as the ten commandments.

In a vote such as that before us today, I know Members want particularly to be responsive to public opinion, to support a manpower selection system that has public support and public understanding.

The draft has been the subject of intensive public discussion, and naturally so, for it goes to the heart of how we run our democracy. But the chorus of criticism is such that it must sometimes seem to Members of the House that the public has lost confidence in the system of selective service. I would remind you of something that Edmund Burke once said:

> Because a half-a-dozen grasshoppers under a fern make the field ring with their importunate chink, whilst thousands of great cattle chew the cud and are silent, pray do not imagine that those who make the noise are the only inhabitants of the field.

There are many people, of course, who have raised questions about the draft; they have every right to do so; and their questioning has helped in many cases to bring about the improvement in the system wrought by the present legislation.

But the overwhelming majority of all segments of the population recognizes the need for an effective Military Establishment and high-caliber personnel to fill that establishment. And they recognize the need for some kind of draft to provide the needed manpower.

In public opinion polls by the Louis Harris organization over the last several years, support for the draft has been expressed by the vast majority of citizens. The last such poll, which I believe was taken in August 1966, showed 79 percent of the people supported the draft.

The Harris poll showed that less than one-third of the people—only 27 percent—favored a lottery. Over seven out of 10 favored continuation of student deferments. Even a majority of those with a less than high school education favored student deferments.

It is interesting to note that a majority of those polled favored standard student deferments and opposed class standing or test score criteria. The present legislation would eliminate use of these questionable criteria.

The general conclusion by the Harris organization was that people generally support the system, and consider it to have worked fairly well in the past.

Only 12 percent of those polled felt the military should go to strictly voluntary recruitment.

In another sampling of opinion, this one among the young people of the country, the U.S. Youth Council, which works through 35 national youth groups, polled some 700 young people at the invitation of Mr. Burke Marshall, Chairman of the President's National Commission on Selective Service. The details that have been made available from this survey indicated that two-thirds of the young people felt there should be more uniform national guidelines for draft boards. Such are called for in the bill.

Eighty percent of the youths favored student deferments. Less than 2 percent felt that special tests should be used for determining deferments.

Over 70 percent felt the Government should require military service. Only one-seventh favored a lottery.

There was considerable support for a volunteer army, but many of those who did so admitted it was because they opposed the U.S. military commitment, and they were not convinced a voluntary army would be a success. And the great majority of those who favored a voluntary army said they would not enlist.

A slim majority of the young people favored compulsory national service for all.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the American people and the youth of America do understand the need for the draft and do support it. They are aware the system is not perfect, and they want it improved. We have improved it in this bill. I hope the legislation will have the support of all Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the opposition to this amendment has been interesting. It has been implied that a 2-year extension would abrogate the draft. Of course, that is not true.

It has been said that there must be a 4-year extension in order to convince the rest of the world we mean business. The very fact that Congress will continue the Draft Act is notice to the rest of the world of our position. We do not need a 4-year extension of the draft to convince anyone of our position.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will adopt the 2-year amendment. Let the Congress come back 2 years from now and review this program. This is deadly serious business. This Nation is drafting more men than any other nation in the so-called free world. Let us have another look at this 24 months from now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I am a veteran of the only war in the history of the United States that was fought entirely by volunteer soldiers and sailors. It so happens that I come from a period when many people were coming to our shores fleeing from the draft in Europe. That is my background.

But I feel that the amendment offered by my beloved and distinguished friend from Illinois is an academic exercise. I wish we did not have to have a draft at all. When I came here, I supported the idea of a 2-year draft because that seemed an avoidance. Oh, yes; I am against the draft. That is why I voted for 2 years instead of 4 years. It is academic.

I may not be a Member of the Congress next year. Who can say? Life is uncertain. Who knows who will be here next year? But if we are here next year and the sun of peace is over our heads, we can end the draft then.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the principal reason given by the proponent of this amendment was to study selective service, and look at it again in 2 years instead of 4. I think this bill provides for a thorough review. There is created by the bill the Manpower Resources Commission, which reviews manpower needs and deferments. It seems to me the nail has been hit squarely on the head by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], when he pointed out this measure can be repealed and amended at any time. Let us vote down this amendment and demonstrate a show of strength by extending military selective service for 4 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I hate to think it, but I do think this war will be with us for 20 years if we continue to fight it as we have in the past. The French were down there for 10 years with over 300,000 troops, some of which were the best in the world—the members of the French Foreign Legion. They did not win. They had to get out. I am sick and tired of having the greatest and most powerful and most affluent nation in the world pinned down—and when I say "pinned down" that is an understatement—by a little nation that has no air force and no navy.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would give those people in Hanoi 30 days' notice during which to get out of South Vietnam. And, Mr. Chairman, if they are not out at the end of that period of time, then let them have it with both barrels.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, a moment ago the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MAYNE] said that we ought to think about the young men of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I have just had the privilege of coming back from a trip to the fighting fronts in Vietnam with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and under the leadership of the able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE].

Mr. Chairman, I can state categorically to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, that the young men whom we have out there—and there are almost 500,000 of them—all of them are doing an outstanding job. However, the one thing about which they wonder, is whether we back here are backing them up.

Mr. Chairman, one of the outstanding leaders in our military effort in Vietnam, General Walt, is coming back to this country within the period of just a few days.

Mr. Chairman, today on page 3 of the Daily News, there is an interview with General Walt, in which General Walt says that in his opinion the only reason the forces of Hanoi and the Vietcong are hanging on is that they believe we will give up in 1968.

Mr. Chairman, if the draft expires in 1969, this will give them that hope. Let us not let them be confused about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, this is the fifth time since I have served on the Committee on Armed Services that this bill has been presented to the Members of the House. And, Mr. Chairman, upon each occasion there has been a wide divergence of opinion as to the number of years that should be encompassed within the scope of the proposed bill.

Mr. Chairman, some Members thought that the period of extension should be 6 years. Others thought it ought to be 4 years. Still others thought it ought to be 5. And even some of them wanted an extension of 3 years.

But, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that upon five separate occasions we have extended this bill during the period of time in which I have served on the Committee on Armed Services for a period of 4 years. So, Mr. Chairman, we have had consistency.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me if there is anything which exists in our society today and about which our young people are concerned, is the effort to try to obtain as much certainty as we can for them in this very uncertain world.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing on the horizon today which would indicate that the world situation is lessening and that it is improving.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] to close debate on the amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my mind as to what we should do. We cannot give the slightest hope to Hanoi that we are weakening in any aspect of our effort or exhibit whatsoever any sign of weakness. A sign of weakness will be imputed if we fail to act upon this 4-year extension of the Draft Act today.

Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Armed Services has been more cooperative with you than any committee in the Congress of the United States. We have given to you more respect in the executive branch of the Government than any other committee of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, last year, we did not have to hold hearings on the draft bill. But pursuant to your request this year, as well as last year, we did hold hearings on this problem.

Mr. Chairman, we are responsive to the Members of this House of Representatives. And, if you as Members of this body deny the 4-year extension, then you would be repudiating your committee.

Mr. Chairman, let us not give comfort to those who are looking for weakness in the fabric of our will of determination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RUMSFELD) there were—ayes 77, noes 160.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could come to some kind of agreement on the rest of the amendments?

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, can anyone tell us whether the engines are hot on the junketing plane for Paris, or what is the situation?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I can tell the gentleman, pursuant to agreement, the reason we are meeting here tonight is so that the Members who will come in on Wednesday may leave. I would say further to the gentleman I stay here 30 days a month.

Mr. GROSS. So do I.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes?

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many amendments are at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state there are six amendments pending on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move

that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 10:15.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion made by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hungate].

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Hicks].

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hungate].

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Hicks].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HICKS

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hicks: On page 20 after line 19 and before line 20 add the following: "Section 17(c) (50 App. USC 467 (c)) is further amended by deleting the period at the end thereof, substituting a colon and adding the following: *"Provided*, That in any calendar year no more than 300,000 persons may be inducted without thereafter calling into active service members of the Reserve components on a minimum basis of one reserve member for each person inducted in excess of 300,000."

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment means just exactly what it says, that we would use some of our Reserve Forces so that the country will know the condition we are actually in, instead of pulling young kids in and putting in 4 months and sending them to Vietnam where a goodly number of them are being killed within a very few months, and then we have to respond to letters, "Why is it that my boy was drafted in May and killed in October and the Reserve people are still walking around town?"

We spend a lot of time in our Committee on Armed Services on the Reserves. This Congress appropriates a lot of money for them. We do not use them. We should use them. This amendment will be given about the same consideration that all the rest are tonight, and it is a travesty that this bill is being rammed through the way it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Hicks].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bingham].

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I take this moment, if I may have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee, to ask about the amendment that was adopted dealing with conscientious objectors. I am somewhat concerned that the amendment as adopted removes any reference to the possibility of an appeal by a man whose claim was rejected.

Would the chairman clear that up?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted that the gentleman has asked that question, Mr. Chairman.

This does not affect the rights of any conscientious objector, and my authority for that is the Director of Selective Service.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to reiterate that it is my hope to be able to offer a motion to recommit which will be the same as the amendment to extend the act for 2 years rather than 4 years.

If I am recognized, it will be a motion to recommit with instructions to extend the draft for 2 years.

It is not a vote on whether or not you believe there is going to be a draft. There is going to be a draft and I said so in my previous remarks. We need a draft mechanism available to maintain our military manpower requirements for the foreseeable future. Hopefully we will use it as little as possible.

The question is whether or not the Congress has the time to look at this act again in 2 years or whether we are so busy that we have to extend it for 4 years and lock ourselves into a situation which is changing, with more and more young men becoming available to supply our manpower needs.

It seems to me that the least Congress can do to demonstrate that we do in fact want to have the best possible military manpower recruiting system is to extend this for 2 years and to support the proposed motion to recommit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PIKE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Pike: On page 13, lines 10 to 24, and page 14, lines 1 to 14, strike all of the language.

On page 14, lines 23 and 24, strike out the words "graduate study".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike] is recognized.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States requested that there be serious debate on the subject of student deferments, and the amendment which I have offered would abolish the student deferments. The serious debate, as far as I am concerned, will be approximately 1 minute. I believe that this is the most disgraceful way to legislate a bill of this magnitude which I have ever seen. I simply say that this amendment does do away with student deferments. That is all I have time to say.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STRATTON TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PIKE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Stratton as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Pike: On page 14, line 24, after the word "study" and before the comma, insert the following: "in medicine, dentistry or allied specialties".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply throw out the postgraduate deferments except for doctors, dentists, and allied specialties who are subject to military call. As a practical matter, the evidence presented to the committee shows that college graduates serve in 71 percent of the cases, but postgraduates serve in only 28 percent of the cases. If we really are concerned about a haven from the draft, then what we want to do is to nail down that elimination of graduate student deferments. We do not have to throw out college deferments, because we still need officers and, as a matter of fact, this recommendation was supported by the Clark Panel, by the President's Panel, by the President himself, and by the other body. I think this substitute should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton] to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Pike) there were—ayes 41; noes 140.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAREY

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Carey: On page 17, after line 25, insert the following:

"(8) Section 9 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(k) Each person shall, upon being honorably discharged or released from the armed forces, be paid, in addition to any other pay and allowances to which he may be entitled, an amount equal to the amount by which the pay and allowances received by him as a member of the Armed Forces for the period of service from which he is being discharged or released was less than the aggregate amount he would have received for the period of such service if (1) for 40 hours of each seven-day period of such service, he had been compensated at the then highest rate prescribed in section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and (2) in addition, for 20 hours of each seven-day period of such service served in a combat zone, he had been compensated at 1½ times such rate.'"

Redesignate paragraphs (8) through (13)

(on pages 18 through 20) as paragraphs (9) through (14), respectively.

Mr. CAREY (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I have no time to explain my amendment. This points up, I believe, the infidelity of our service to the American people at this hour. I have 60 seconds in which to tell you that all I want to do is to pay the men entering our military service the minimum wage in this country. I ask you, both doves and hawks, to put your money where your mouth is. If you are not paying the men who enter our military service the minimum wage, you are taxing their lives. If you are not paying the minimum wage, you are taking their lives and using their services at less money than they would have earned if they had been back here with us.

I rise not as a dove but as a former infantry soldier. I enlisted in the service and I have nine sons who will also enlist in the service. They do not need the draft. But we need this amendment so that you will put your money where your mouth is.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, in his message to Congress on the Selective Service System, the President requested that all local boards of the system be truly representative of the communities they serve. To this end a proposed amendment to section 10 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act was made to the House Armed Services Committee, which would have required the local boards to be representative of the economic and sociological composition of the communities they serve. The committee rejected this proposed amendment.

Currently, feeling is very strong about the lack of representation of minority groups—principally, Negro and Mexican-Americans as local board members throughout the Selective Service System, particularly in Southern States.

The current law provides that local board members be recommended for appointment by the Governors of the several States or comparable executive officials. They are appointed by the President. The appointing authority is delegated to the Director of Selective Service.

Two States, notably, Alabama and Mississippi have never recommended any Negroes. Alabama, in the 1960 census population report, showed a Negro population of 30 percent of the total and Mississippi showed 42 percent of the total. South Carolina with 34.8 percent of its population Negro had only one Negro local board member out of a total of over 150 members on March 1, 1967. Louisiana with 31.9 percent of its population Negro had none on their local boards, with over 400 in membership, until five were appointed in April 1967. Missouri with 9 percent of its population Negro, and over 575 local board members had only one Negro local board member. Georgia with over 500 local board members and the Negro population 28.5 percents has less than 15 Negroes represented on their local boards.

The same type of statistics holds true for all the South Atlantic, East and West South-Central States. California's representation is very poor also considering their large minorities of Spanish-Americans, Negroes, and Orientals—11, 13, and 16 respectively are board members out of a total board membership of over 600.

Each county or comparable subdivision of a State has at least one local board except in very rare instances. In a number of counties in Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, Louisiana, and South Carolina, Negroes comprise more than 50 percent of the population with no local board representation.

This is just a thumbnail sketch of what Negroes are becoming more and more resentful of day by day and the reason for the hue and cry, why accept induction into the Armed Forces when those of my own race, such a large segment of my community, have no voice in my selection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of California: On page 20, line 23, insert "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 2."

On page 21, after line 2, insert the following:

"(b) Section 2 of such Act of August 3, 1950, is amended by striking out 'five million persons' and inserting in lieu thereof 'four million persons.'"

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the section of the bill to which this applies is described on page 38 of the report. The effect of this bill, as we know, I am sure, is to suspend the permanent strength limitations on the armed services, which are approximately 2 million persons. This is rather like the temporary debt limit: it is a fake. When this bill is enacted, it suspends the permanent ceiling and puts in a temporary ceiling set at 5 million, which, in effect, is no ceiling at all.

What I am asking by this amendment is a very simple matter. Reduce it to 4 million, to show the Congress is desirous of exercising some control. The distinguished Member from Massachusetts, the ranking minority member of the committee, said throughout the period to 1974, it was not expected the armed services would exceed 3.5 million, so this amendment gives ample provision for that contingency.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to deplore this dreadfully brief consideration that we are giving this matter. This is not a debate. It is a mockery. It is a travesty. It is a burlesque.

We are asking young men to give up 2 years of their lives, and we will not give them 2 days of our time to consider this matter.

The chairman said something about the "Tuesday-to-Thursday" boys. I want it known that I am ready to stay here Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and as long as necessary.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: On page 20, after line 22, insert the following:

"(14) Section 10(b)(3) is amended by inserting immediately before the colon preceding the first proviso thereto a period and the following: 'Insofar as practicable, each local board shall consist of members of each race constituting a substantial portion of the population (as determined by the President) in the county, political subdivision, or other area with respect to which such board has jurisdiction, so that the members on such local board of each such race bear the same ratio to the total membership of such board as the number of members of each such race in such county, political subdivision, or other area bears to the aggregate number of members of all such races in such county, political subdivision, or other area.'"

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple.

Members have already heard the words of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS], in which he pointed out how Negro citizens are unrepresented on local draft boards. This applies across the Nation. It also applies to Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and other Spanish-speaking citizens.

If we mean what we say when we talk about democracy in America, let us recognize that young men of all races and of all creeds are being drafted by these local draft boards. The local draft boards themselves should be representative of a cross section of the population. They should not reflect the prejudices of a particular segment of the community.

What the amendment provides is that there shall be a representation of a given race in proportion to its population in the area of the draft board.

It is very simple. I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RYAN) there were—ayes 22, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the leadership is enjoying every minute of these night sessions. I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, mention was made earlier about a lack of debate on this bill. True, there was an agreement to finish the bill tonight, but we have been here 5 hours already.

Not only have we been debating this bill for 5 hours now, but your committee held hearings last fall, and during much of the month of May this year. About 20 Members appeared before our committee. Nearly 3,000 pages of testimony were taken. There were 150 separate organizations that appeared by representatives. The only proposals we heard were those on alternatives to the draft by an all-volunteer military force. I submit to you as far as the committee is concerned the measure reported out has been thoroughly debated. All of us would prefer to have more time, but we have had nearly 5 hours and the charge that there has not been sufficient time for debate is baseless and without foundation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the question that the distinguished Member from California [Mr. HAWKINS] raised and which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] raised and that I would like to make sure is recorded prominently in the debate, is the disparity in the number of Negro members on the draft boards across the country. The South is not the only guilty area. My State of Michigan, with approximately a 10-percent Negro population has about 2 percent of the members of the boards who are Negro. I want to start off with that. There are also States, though, with 42 percent of their citizens composed of black Americans, my friends, who do not have a single Negro member on any one of the boards in those States. There are States with 30 percent Negro population and 28 percent Negro population, 34 percent and 31 percent Negro population without one Negro member on the draft boards that have this awesome power over American citizens. I think in all justice, the Congress should immediately move to correct this situation which I consider one of the gravest abuses of the brave and courageous Negro soldiers fighting in Vietnam.

I submit the figures on this matter, as follows:

Percent of local board members and percent of State population Negro and of other racial and ethnic groups

State	Board members			State population	
	Number of board members	Percent Negro	Percent other racial and ethnic groups [1]	Percent State population Negro	Percent State population other racial and ethnic groups [1]
Alabama	275			30.0	(2)
Alaska	20		5.0	3.0	19.8
Arizona	124	0.8	4.8	3.3	21.8
Arkansas	239			21.8	(2)
California	618	1.6	4.4	5.6	11.5
Colorado	203		2.0	2.3	9.7
Connecticut	163	1.2		4.2	.1
Delaware	26	19.2		13.6	.3
District of Columbia	80	36.2		53.9	.9
Florida	340	.9		17.8	.2
Georgia	509	.2		28.5	(2)
Hawaii	61		37.7	.8	67.3
Idaho	218		.4	.2	1.2
Illinois	1,056	2.6	.1	10.3	.3
Indiana	775			5.8	.1
Iowa	328			.9	.1
Kansas	249			4.2	.3
Kentucky	641	.2		7.1	(2)
Louisiana	442		.2	31.9	.1
Maine	66			.3	.3
Maryland	220	2.7		16.7	.2
Massachusetts	614	.6		2.2	.2
Michigan	654	2.0		9.2	.2
Minnesota	589			.7	.5
Mississippi	302		.3	42.0	.2
Missouri	581	.2		9.0	.1
Montana	192		.5	.2	3.3
Nebraska	304	1.0		2.1	0.5
Nevada	55			4.7	2.9
New Hampshire	59	1.7		.3	.1
New Jersey	176			8.5	.2
New Mexico	140		31.4	1.8	34.4
New York State (excluding New York City)	612	1.5		3.7	.3
New York City	454	3.3	1.3	14.0	.7
North Carolina	355	1.4	.3	24.5	.8
North Dakota	213		.9	.1	1.9
Ohio	403	3.5	.5	8.1	.1
Oklahoma	264	.4	1.5	6.6	2.8
Oregon	150	.7		1.0	1.0
Pennsylvania	662	1.5		7.5	.1
Rhode Island	51			2.1	.3
South Carolina	161	.6		34.8	(2)
South Dakota	264		1.1	.1	3.9
Tennessee	330	3.0		16.5	(2)
Texas	656	1.1	5.3	12.4	15.0
Utah	109			.5	1.4
Vermont	70			.1	(2)
Virginia	401	2.2		20.6	.2
Washington	125	2.4	.8	1.7	1.8
West Virginia	183	.5		4.8	(2)
Wisconsin	390	.8	.2	1.9	.4
Wyoming	109			.7	1.5

[1] "Other racial and ethnic groups" contains Spanish American and Puerto Rican who are classified as white by the census; Japanese, Chinese, and Indians are classified nonwhite in both sources.

[2] Less than 0.1 percent.

Mr. Chairman, the great disparity between the number of Negroes on local draft boards and the Negro population in general results in serious questions in the mind of many of our fightingmen in Vietnam regarding the fairness of the entire system. The racial discrimination in the very makeup of draft boards gives added poignancy and force to the overall question of whether Negro American soldiers in Vietnam are suffering from discrimination and are carrying a disproportionate share of the burden.

Much has been said recently about Americans at home being careful about their words and actions so that they do not affect the morale of our brave fightingmen in Vietnam. I would suggest, my distinguished colleagues, that we must immediately root out racial discrimination in the draft system—and use loud words and strong actions—if we are to protect the morale of our Negro American fightingmen in Vietnam.

As for just one example of the views of some of our Negro American soldiers in Vietnam, I would ask my colleagues to read a letter from one of those soldiers that was printed in the most recent issue of the Chicago Daily Defender. I believe that the concern expressed in that letter is most relevant to our consideration of whether the draft should be extended for another 4 years with so few changes. The letter follows:

A PLEA FROM VIETNAM

(NOTE.—The poignant letter reproduced below was written in Vietnam by Pfc. Michael L. Williams, of the 8th Regiment of the 1st Air Cavalry Division. Williams sent it to the Daily Defender. But he didn't address it to this paper. Rather, he addresses it to all Americans who are lucky enough to be in America. Hopefully, someone in Congress will hear his cry.)

I call out a plea of help! Not just for myself, but for all my Negro brothers who are fighting two wars in Vietnam.

I may go to jail for what I am about to say, but if just one person would stop, look and listen to the voices of the Negro GI's in Vietnam, then dying would be a small price to pay even after going through hell and knowing how precious life is.

If someone would just ask small questions like: Why are Negro soldiers sent to the field after only working a job a month or two—a job that they were trained for in the United States? A rear area job they should have held for 12 months instead of for one or two months?

Why are white soldiers with infantry m.o.s (specific military skill) taken out of the field and placed in rear area jobs without medical profiles after being in Vietnam for one or two months?

Why are Negro soldiers being called number one fighting men in the field and "niggers" in base camp?

Why is it? A Negro soldier tries to find answers to so many small questions, such as: why is he transferred to another unit; sent to the field or kept in the field, or sent to jail on any small charge that can be thought of?

We don't ask for sympathy, or think the world owes us something. We only ask what we pay for in blood and death—and to be treated as soldiers of the United States Army.

There are many Negro GI's that won't speak up because they have families and can't afford to jeopardize their rank for fear of losing the money that comes along with it. But there more who are tired of fighting two wars.

I close with two questions: Are we dying for a false freedom? How long must we fight two wars in Vietnam?

Pvt. MICHAEL WILLIAMS.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, under the unanimous-consent request. Are there any further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PIKE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PIKE: On page 18, line 8, after "amended by" insert a new paragraph (a) as follows:

"To the extent practical, the members of each board shall accurately represent the economic and sociological background of the population which they serve, but no induction shall be declared illegal on the ground that any board failed to conform to any particular economic, racial or religious quota."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PIKE) there were—ayes 61, noes 95.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Will the Chair state how I can receive permission to insert my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. By a unanimous-consent request, and if there is no objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, at this time of armed conflict I oppose a policy of deferment of all college students and hope this Committee will support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

Two principal factors lead me to this position: (1) The fact that we are in an armed conflict in which the time and lives of many of our young men are being employed and risked to carry out our national policy; and (2) that only about one-third of our young men are presently needed for service in our military forces.

Under these circumstances, a decision has to be made as to which of our young men will be called to serve, when all are not needed, and which will not.

In determining the policy of who shall and who shall not be called for service, the issue is joined on the policy of deferring all college students in the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York.

Proponents of the college deferment plan urge that our educated manpower is our most valuable national asset, and that as such, it should be encouraged, enhanced and husbanded—in other words, managed and wisely protected for the future.

This so-called wise management theory of deferment from service obviously means the protecting of the time and lives of men pursuing a college education. But, this "wise management" policy says nothing about our other young men who are apprentices as electricians, plumbers, carpenters, or who are working and attending college part time.

Stated another way, this deferment-of-students plan, at this time in our history, results in a national policy that says we should expend our manpower that is not receiving full-time college education in order to protect and conserve our manpower that is.

We must conclude from such a policy that its proponents place a higher value on the lives of full-time college students, whether they be studying nuclear physics or interior decorating, than on the lives of those young men not so enrolled.

I cannot support such a policy.

Some defend the policy of student deferments by pointing to statistics which show that a little larger percentage of college graduates serve in our Armed Forces than any other group. While this may be true, it says nothing about the time when a young man serves. Students deferred today will not face a possibility of service until 4 years from today at which time there may be no fighting at all. A 4-year college period of deferred protection from service would more than cover the period of all armed conflicts we have had since World War II. Had there been 4-year college deferments during World War II, a young man who started college in September of 1941—before this country was even in the war—could not have been drafted before V–E Day and could not have seen combat by V–J Day. No young man who graduated from high school during the war and who was allowed to enter college under a student deferment plan could have been drafted during the war.

So, my point is that the critical question is when a young man is exposed to the possibility of service and not whether he may serve at some time or other, and that deferment of students from having to face the possibility of serving in the Armed Forces at this time is not fair—is not defensible.

Another way in which this so-called wise management theory of student deferment can be challenged is in its gross inefficiency.

First, this deferment program encourages the investment of time and money in students and protects them above all others from the dangers of war; and then, after the investment of thousands of dollars in them and after they have become more valuable to society through higher education, says they shall be exposed to the possibility of military service and the risk of loss of all this investment.

If there are shortages of certain critical skills, let us determine them and defer men having or acquiring such skills.

Otherwise, let us recognize the inherent dignity, value, and equality of all of the lives of our young men—let us not say that the life of a young man receiving a college education is more valuable than the life of a young man not privileged to receive such education—and, finally, let us recognize that fairness is not only a question of whether or not a man serves his country, but the time when he may be called to serve.

I also cannot agree with the theory of college deferments on the practical grounds of experience of our Nation and of other nations. This has shown that educational resources are often better used by those who have had the experience of military service. Mature students are generally better students because they have clearer career objectives and approach the task of studying more seriously.

There is a related effect for the higher education institution which benefits from greater maturity on the part of the students. A student who is attending college largely to avoid the draft is wasting a valuable resource and is not very useful to the life of the college. One who has completed his military obligation, or at least who has taken his chances for military service with everyone else, goes to college for positive reasons and is more of an asset to the college as a result.

Therefore, I feel that the elimination of student deferments will result in a more rather than less effective use of our valuable educational resources and of the substantial investment of public funds that colleges and universities represent.

For these reasons, I join the gentleman from New York in urging this Committee to strike the language from this bill which would place the stamp of approval of this House of Representatives upon a grossly inequitable plan of student deferments.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If not, the question recurs on the committee substitute amendment, as amended.

The committee substitute amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 485, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments to the committee amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'KONSKI moves to recommit the bill S. 1452 to the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 362, nays 9, answered present 1, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—362

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews,
  N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen,
  Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
  William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goodell
Goodling
Green, Pa.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-
  schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Henderson
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kupferman
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McDade
McDonald,
  Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson,
  Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—9

Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Conyers
Foley
Gonzalez
Hicks
Kastenmeier
Rees
Ryan

ANSWERED PRESENT—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING—61

Adams
Anderson,
  Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Baring
Battin
Boggs
Brock
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Carter
Celler
Clawson, Del
Corbett
Curtis
Daniels
Dawson
Dent
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Evins, Tenn.
Feighan
Friedel
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Heckler, Mass.
Herlong
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
McCulloch
Macdonald,
  Mass.
Madden
Mink
Pollock
Pool
Reinecke
Riegle
Ronan
Rostenkowski
St. Onge
Shipley
Smith, Calif.
Steiger, Ariz.
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Watts
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Younger
Zion

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Burleson for, with Mr. Adams against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Zion.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Bush.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. St. Onge with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Reigle with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Kyl.

Mr. Daniels with Mr. Kleppe.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Reinecke.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Younger.

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Eckhardt.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Pool.

Mr. Friedel with Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Karth with Mrs. Mink.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Ashley.

Mr. Shipley with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. SNYDER changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON]. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RIVERS, PHILBIN, HÉBERT, PRICE of Illinois, BATES, ARENDS, and O'KONSKI.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of asking the majority leader for the legislative program for this week, if any, and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry by my distinguished friend, we have finished the legislative business for this week.

I advise the Members of the House it will be our purpose, after announcement of the program, to request unanimous consent to go over to Monday.

The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday there is no legislative business.

Tuesday is Memorial Day.

Wednesday, the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and Department of Commerce and Judiciary appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968.

On Thursday and the balance of the week: Thursday is District day, and there are two bills. The first is H.R. 8718, to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and the ceiling on the District of Columbia's borrowing authority. The second is H.R. 3973, to exempt from licensing physicians and dentists employed by the District of Columbia.

Also for Thursday and the balance of the week, the legislative appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 29, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, and that when the House adjourns on Monday next, it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the distinguished gentleman, the majority leader, anticipate any midnight sessions next week?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I feel quite sure that unless there is a major change in the situation, there will be no extraordinary late sessions next week.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the distinguished majority leader that when one gets to be around 70 years old, it gets to be a little bit more than a little bit wearing and tearing to have these consecutive midnight sessions. I would hope that if there is to be one, the gentleman will be able to give some of us "ancient ones" a little notice. That would be very much appreciated.

Now, with respect to the unanimous-consent request to go over, it would be my hope that the gentleman would ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday, so that I would not have to object.

Mr. ALBERT. I have made that request.

Mr. GROSS. But there was also a request that on Monday the House go over until Wednesday next.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I will revise the request, if the gentleman insists.

Mr. GROSS. It will be appreciated if the gentleman will do that.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that the previous information given to the House, that we would work on Friday next following Memorial Day, has now been withdrawn, unless conference reports should be added?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, when we made the announcement that there was a likelihood of a meeting on Friday—and of course it is still a possibility—we had thought we would have another important District of Columbia bill, which the District of Columbia Committee is not ready to bring to the floor.

Mr. HALL. That is the revision, this year's crime bill for the District of Columbia, which the President vetoed last year; is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. It is the District of Columbia crime bill. We have since been advised by the distinguished chairman of the committee that the bill will not be called up next Thursday, and the District bills which are on the program will probably be disposed of in time to dispose of the legislative branch appropriation bill that same day.

Mr. HALL. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I will say that this is the third week in a row that I have remonstrated about the programing and the scheduling of business. I should certainly like to join my friend and colleague from Iowa in what he has said, and I would say further, if I may, that the leadership has narrowly escaped a privileged resolution of censure. I hope it will cease and desist.

Mr. ALBERT. I wish to advise my friend that the leadership has undertaken to make the program conform to the interests and the convenience of Members, and the requirements with which the leadership is confronted.

Mr. HALL. Vague requirements of the leadership, which must indeed be austere. I am sure they are nebulous and sometimes hard to bring into focus.

I believe we all appreciate that.

To repeatedly have to work as we do—even though young, virile, physically able—to spend the midnight hours, to cancel airplane trips and speeches in the District, is unconscionable, in the opinion of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY NEXT TO WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY FOR CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE AND FOR SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PASSED AND FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISCUSSION OF ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY NEXT UNTIL WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I request my friend from Iowa to reconsider his objection, in the light of the fact that Tuesday is Memorial Day, a historic and important day in the history of our country, and that we have no legislative business on Monday and we have a program which is, I would say, moderate for next week?

Mr. GROSS. Is it not planned that the House will meet on Monday?

Mr. ALBERT. It will meet pro forma, yes, just for the purpose of not adjourning by resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Then why not adjourn from Monday over until Wednesday when the House meets on Monday?

Mr. ALBERT. We could do that, of course, but I believe the Members are entitled to be positively assured that they will not have to come here on Memorial Day. Many Members have speeches in their districts.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman, you can adjourn from Monday until Wednesday, can you not?

Mr. ALPERT. We will make that request on Monday. There is no question about that. I would ask that the gentleman cooperate with us to the extent of settling the issue now if he will.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa is perfectly willing to cooperate on Monday noon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill S. 1432 and include indicated charts, tables, and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection

to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, during the debate in the committee I indicated that it would be my intention to offer a motion to recommit. At the point when we reached that motion to recommit I was on my feet seeking recognition and would have offered the motion to recommit that I indicated I would during the debate had it not been for the fact that the Speaker properly recognized a senior member of the Committee on Armed Services who asserted his prerogative to offer a motion to recommit. I want the RECORD so to indicate.

MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a series of aggressive and antagonistic actions in the Middle East have brought yet another crisis-ridden sector of the world to the brink of war. This new and most serious crisis, like so many of those crises which have shaken international relations over two decades, can be traced in large part to encouragement and impetus provided by the Communist world.

The situation in the Middle East today finds the Soviet Union alined with Syria and Egypt in their conflict with Israel. This recurring communistic influence in acts of aggression brings into clearer focus what is meant by the need for the United States to carry out with determination its commitment to help maintain peace and defend freedom throughout the world.

I have long been convinced that American presence in Vietnam is essential if peace is to be restored and freedom preserved in the Far East. Today, in the Middle East, the United States once again must stand firm in the face of the series of menacing moves by nations commonly obsessed with aggression and oppression.

The blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba is a violation of the recognized right of free passage through international water and is a suppression of our own right of free trade with Israel. The mining of the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba is an intolerable act directed at Israel and every nation which trades with Israel.

We are confronted in the Middle East with what may be the beginnings of another armed confrontation of communism and the free world, the beginnings of another Vietnam or Korea. The chain of Communist efforts to aggravate and create tensions around the world is endless.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we must make it unmistakably clear now to anyone and everyone bent on the destruction of Israel, that the United States is prepared to take whatever action is appropriate and necessary to resist aggression and to strive to preserve peace in the Middle East.

DEDICATORY EXERCISES FOR THE NEW U.S. ARMY COLLEGE BUILDING, ROOT HALL, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, 1967, I had the privilege of attending the dedicatory exercises for the new U.S. Army War College Building, Root Hall, Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, Root Hall very appropriately honors Elihu Root, for it was he who founded the U.S. Army War College while he was Secretary of War in President McKinley's Cabinet. Several very fine addresses were delivered on that auspicious occasion. These speeches, along with some very interesting data on the U.S. Army War College's birth, growth, and development, are as follows:

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE: BIRTH, GROWTH, AND DEVELOPMENT

In 1901, Elihu Root, Secretary of War in President McKinley's cabinet founded the US Army War College. Initially it was utilized to provide a planning agency where senior officers of the Army would be better able to handle the problems of mobilization and communications as well as problems of strategy and logistics.

At that time students of the College worked on problems facing the War Department. Gradually the concentration on purely military matters shifted and a change in the curriculum which focused more upon theory, abstract problems and doctrine was introduced. On the eve of WWI the College closed its doors to answer the mobilization call.

In 1919 the College reopened at Fort Lesley J. McNair in Washington. As evolutionary changes in the curriculum were introduced into the entire Army school system, the Army's senior school concerned itself increasingly with broad operations of field armies and included in its curriculum political, economic, and social matters which influence the conduct of war. In 1940 classes were once more suspended, this time for ten years, as WWII drew near.

Reopening for the second time in the wake of a world conflict the College found itself operating for one year at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. This location proved to be a temporary one, however, as the site for continued academic study for the selected students at the Army War College. Meanwhile, special attention was being given within the curriculum or the interdependence of the land, sea and air forces in modern warfare which in turn pointed out the need for joint instruction in all service schools. Particular emphasis was given to the need for joint participation in the fields of mobilization of natural resources, overall intelligence, and strategy.

Currently operating under direct supervision of the Department of the Army, the Army War College each year, in August, receives 165 selected Army officers. In addition, representatives from the Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Department of State and other governmental agencies compose the student body. The mission of the school is to prepare these 205 senior officers for command and high level staff duties with emphasis upon Army doctrine and operations and advancement of interdepartmental and interservice understanding.

And so today as this august and vital military citadel of education officially honors the man whose foresight, initiative, and wisdom altered the course of world history we can look proudly and fondly at our achievements and accomplishments during the past 66 years. At the same time we here at the Army War College look forward with confidence and enthusiasm to the decades ahead. The dynamic and constantly changing curriculum nurtured by the most dedicated and experienced faculty available in the United States Army today will continue to . . .

". . . preserve peace by intelligent and adequate preparation . . ."

REMARKS BY HON. GEORGE N. WADE, STATE SENATOR, 31ST DISTRICT, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE BUILDING, ROOT HALL, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA., APRIL 29, 1967

No outward insignia or identification should stimulate and fire pride in the heart of a red-blooded American more than the great privilege of wearing the military uniform of the United States. Our flag and the uniform are synonymous. They are the banners of our Nation and indicate the highest degree of freedom, security, and opportunity ever attained by any group of humans who have occupied space on this globe.

Today we dedicate the opening of an additional facility for the servicemen and the service of our country through the building we are dedicating at this fine institution—the United States Army War College.

Our country, our flag, and all civilians should want our defending forces, which includes all of you here in uniform—admittedly a very select group—to have, by all measure of standards, the finest in facilities and accommodations.

We spend millions for highways, for health and education, for urban renewal, for relief of the unfortunate, for slum decrease, for recreation, for material help to many nations—for this and for that. At the same time, we know that all falters and all falls—our future and our hopes—should our military forces fail.

Rome, Greece, and other great empires of yesteryear now live only in history. They were great and outstanding in their time! Why did they fall? Did they neglect or fail to encourage their military men who dedicate their lives to this important and fundamental part of our national being.

The obligation of public life known as government, is protection, within or without. You of the military are a very fundamental part of our Nation.

Can we Americans—the greatest of all—enjoying the highest standard of living ever attained by civilized man, the leader of the world, the envy of all the rest of the world's people, afford to do anything but furnish our fighting forces with anything second rate?

But a few years ago we were conscious and alert to the ever present danger of a full nuclear holocaust. Now, we seem to relax and hopefully rest in peace, behind the wall of protection furnished by our military forces. We cannot expect more from them than we give. Ever alert, ever watchful and ever advancing—they have a right to expect our full support in every respect.

Today we are alarmed at some few who burn their cards—I say, and you say, why did they burn their draft cards? They turn yellow the world says—they lack vision or enthusiasm and are blind to opportunity that their names might be embossed on the plaques of time, with our founders, builders, and defenders like Washington, Grant, Pershing, Eisenhower, and thousands of great Americans who stepped forward at the time of need and the call of duty to defend their country!

One extremely unfortunate phase of these despicable cases, and thank God they are few, is that many of these cowards come from those institutions of higher learning so generously supported by taxpayer's funds. To them, we say for shame! You deserve much less than this great Nation offers!

We are proud of you our defenders!
It's your flag—it's my flag
And oh how much it holds!
Your land and my land
Secure within its folds.

Your heart and my heart
Beat faster at the sight
Of your flag and my flag
The red, the blue, the white.

They're the defenders of your flag, your security, and your future and the future of your loved ones—let's give them modern, workable and satisfactory facilities.

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. ULYSSES S. GRANT III, U.S. ARMY RETIRED, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE BUILDING, ROOT HALL, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA., APRIL 29, 1967

Not to promote war, but to preserve the peace by intelligent and adequate preparation to repel aggression, this institution is founded.

Over sixty years have passed since Secretary of War Elihu Root used these words at the cornerstone ceremony for the new Army War College building in Washington, D.C. In the six decades since, the United States has been involved in two world wars as well as the armed conflicts in Korea and Vietnam. There have been many changes in that time. Revolutionary developments in communications and in transportation have shrunk the world in the time required for our normal activities. Man has been catapulted into the nuclear age by revolutionary technological discoveries.

Of necessity, the Army has changed as well. Our debate at Columbia in 1898 on increasing to 100,000 the small regular army of 1903 has given way to a new army—an army far larger in size with new weapons, with new doctrines, with new tactics. And yet, throughout the years, the army has remained dedicated to its primary mission of safeguarding this nation, not by promoting war, but by preserving the peace: And the Army War College has played a very important role in guiding these developments as Mr. Root intended.

(Here General Grant spent about five minutes delving into the personality and character of Mr. Root as only he, as son-in-law could do. He referred to General Emory Upton's research which played a large part in Mr. Root's eventual founding of the college. He mentioned Mr. Root's writing of the Cuban constitution in one sitting and his role and success in our actions at that time in the Philippines.)

This institution today is the achievement of the efforts and labors of a succession of selfless and dedicated officers who were determined that the students at the Army War College should receive the best possible education needed to qualify them for high command and staff duty in the years following their graduation. Today I welcome the opportunity to honor the officers who have been the faculty of our Army War College, who for the most part labored without newspaper notoriety or other publicity and yet to them must go the credit for the successful achievement of the purposes for which it was founded.

The first American Army commander to lead an American Army to victory in a world war, General Pershing said: "It is my firm belief that those whose success as instructors is greatest in peace give the highest promise of leadership in war."

General Pershing referred to the officer faculty of this war college—to men like Bliss and Goethals, Liggett and Craig, Bolte and McNarney, Collins and Trudeau, Polk and Westmoreland. But for each of these men so well-known to all of us here today, there were ten others who were just as well-known to their contemporaries. Each contributed fully to the accomplishment of the mission of this Army War College: the preparation of the student officers for positions of high command and staff duty.

The true measurement of the success of any academic institution is the quality of its graduate and his achievements after graduation. In this respect, the Army War College is no different from any other academic institution. I need only to mention the names of but a few of these officers to show that the war college meets this criteria. From its students come Eisenhower and Bradley of the Army, Vandenberg and Stratemeyer of the Air Force, Lejeune and Cates of the Marine Corps, and Halsey and Fletcher of the Navy. These men and many, many others have served the Nation in positions of great responsibility in war and in peace alike. The graduates of this war college have fought when necessary and have fought well. But these graduates also have served with equal distinction in many other ways: as diplomats, educators, industrial leaders and administrators both at home and abroad. It is these men, great and small, who have sustained this institution, who have fulfilled the dream of Elihu Root. From them has come the greatness and the stature which the Army War College wears today:

"Not to promote war, but to preserve peace by intelligent and adequate preparation to repel aggression."

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. EUGENE A. SALET, COMMANDANT, U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE BUILDING, ROOT HALL, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA., APRIL 29, 1967

General Grant, General Train, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, to open my remarks I would like to give you a rather long quotation from one of the Army war college's most distinguished architects, Major General S. B. M. Young, who served as its first president. General Young said:

"It is said by one of the most careful writers and military students of our century that, 'the main qualities which characterize the American soldier are shrewdness, strength, valor and personal intelligence. The natural initiative of the American, and general fearlessness of responsibility, are as conspicuous among the soldiers as in the nation at large.'

"When we contemplate the colossal sacrifice of human life of our armies on the altar of patriotism and love of country for the principles dear to our hearts, we are profoundly impressed with the continued inheritance of the grand quality of our people which enable them to give their lives as a willing sacrifice for their country. This unselfish patriotism displayed by the soldiers of our country has commanded the admiration of the world."

Then General Young said: "The children of these men are, as much as may be, to become the beneficiaries of the war college, directly, indirectly, or remotely. We owe it to them that they shall have fair opportunity for discipline of the mind, for improving and fostering those inherent qualities which gave birth to our nation, which guarded us in our infancy, which sustained us in childhood and which has carried us to where we stand today, the leading nation in the world. We owe it to the memory of these brave patriots who sacrificed their lives on the field of glory, that we might live and enjoy the government of the most benevolent of nations. Rather than assume that soldiers are consumed by an inordinate and bloodthirsty ambition, it is better to believe that a man who has been brought up from his youth to render loyal obedience is less likely to run counter to consolidated authority than one who has not. Our armies, therefore, turn over their conquests to civil officers as soon as the wars cease."

General Young then continues: "The solid foundation of the unselfish patriotism of the American soldier is his great pride in the manhood of his race. Having gained this prominence among nations, we must continue to be diligent and vigilant to maintain this supremacy by a studious, righteous, and just system of national administration and international understanding."

And then General Young concludes: "In all nations war is the instrument of diplomacy; in our country the soldier is the servant of the state. The art of war is difficult and knowledge gained by study or born of experience, or that which is better, study and experience, is essential in preparation for war. The best means to avert a war is to be fully prepared and it is the duty of the war college to see to it that the young officers of our army shall have full opportunity for attaining a high grade of efficiency in their chosen profession."

None of us here today can know for sure whether or not Major General Young realized how prophetic his message would prove to be when he spoke those preceding words in the shadow of the capitol of our nation on 21 February 1903 at the ceremonies marking the cornerstone laying for the original war college building. But his ringing call for continued research, study, and academic excellence in the army was the basis for establishing the original faculty and gathering together the ablest and most competent officers in the US Army.

Your Army War College has continued in that tradition and has built upon that steadfast dedication in the ensuing years since 1903.

On February 2nd, 1965, in the very area upon which we now are gathered, I was privileged, along with General Train, to break ground for this impressive edifice which towers over us here today. Together we looked forward to the time when we could officially walk through the doors of this facility which is dedicated in the memory of the Honorable Elihu Root.

But, in addition to Mr. Root, in brief historical perspective we also pay homage today to the handful of brilliant and foresighted men who between the Civil War and the turn of the 19th century devoted themselves to an exhaustive and thorough study of the military art, the forerunner of today's War College faculty.

Men like General Henry W. Hallech who argued for the maintenance of a suitable system of military instruction as early as 1840; and Brevet Major General Emory Upton, who following a world-wide tour in 1875 to examine the tactics, organization, discipline and maneuvers of Asian and European armies, wrote a comprehensive analysis of the ones he visited. Among Upton's critically important conclusions was a statement recommending as follows: ". . . A War Academy to educate officers in the art of war, and to prepare them for the staff and to hold high command."

General Upton's recommendations had all the prestige of his brilliant military career, they had the support of the great soldier who then commanded the American Army, General Sherman, and they embodied the practical lessons of the Civil War and the results of military science throughout the world. Yet his voice was as the voice of one crying in the wilderness. This report was not promulgated by the Government, but rather read and filed in manuscript along with the millions of documents in the archives of the War Department.

General Upton subsequently printed the report himself through a private publisher and more than a quarter of a century later and long after death had ended the restless striving of his farseeing intelligence, other men working on the same problems with which he dealt found the sanity and wisdom of his conclusions and gave them effect. One of these who truly did something about them was Elihu Root.

Today we are filled with pride at the record which Army War College graduates have compiled. We are humble when we think of the years of toil, study and perseverance which were spent in establishing the systems from which we all have benefited, and we are thankful for the foresight, intelligence and brilliance of those who could not only see the need but could create the fact.

So today, as Commandant of the U.S. Army War College, I formally acknowledge the dedication of Root Hall on behalf of the Secretary of the Army and we, of the staff and faculty, on this day, pledge to continue to carry out the intentions and purposes of our Commander-in-Chief. We shall see to it that the young officers of our Army shall have full opportunity for attaining a high grade of professionalism. And then we who are charged with this responsibility can assure the citizens of this great Nation that every soldier down there on that "thin cutting edge" who finds himself one time or another at the forward edge of the battle line has the finest and most professional and able leadership available—bar none.

I thank you.

REMARKS BY LT. GEN. WILLIAM F. TRAIN, COMMANDING GENERAL, FIRST U.S. ARMY, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE BUILDING, ROOT HALL, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA., APRIL 29, 1967

General Salet, General Grant, distinguished guests, members of the Army War College and Carlisle Barracks, friends of Carlisle, ladies and gentlemen, thank you, General Salet, for your kind introduction.

To begin, I must first thank General Salet for inviting us here today and for permitting me to address a few remarks to this distinguished company.

Since I am probably making my last official appearance here, for I retire next month, I am especially pleased to be here.

We have gathered today to dedicate the new home of the US Army War College in whose conceptual stages, I played a creative and rewarding role.

As I walk through this building, I am reminded of the two dowagers visiting a new edifice and trying to identify its architecture.

One thought it "ancient Gothic", the other, "late reminiscence."

My remarks will be focused on "late reminiscences" on Carlisle Barracks and the War College.

Probably more than any other Army post, Carlisle Barracks has been devoted to Army education, for since 1757, 12 schools have been quartered here.

Carlisle Barracks was best known as the Indian Industrial School, which was here from 1879–1919.

However, one other school with a long tenure was the medical field service school which was here for 27 years (1919–46).

My father-in-law, the late Colonel H. C. Gibner, M.C., was commandant of the medical school from 1937 to 1940.

Charlotte and I visited here, during his incumbency, and learned to love this gracious post and established enduring friendships with many Carlisle citizens.

It was during his regime that much of the red-brick construction was accomplished and the gray stone building (formerly Root Hall) was built.

The brilliant Secretary of War, Elihu Root, established the Army War College Board, to study inadequacies in Army organization and planning, revealed by the Spanish American War.

It was soon evident to the board that the administration and operations of the Army had to be separated from the educational aspects of strategy.

The board's initial recommendation for a War Department General Staff was quickly adopted and implemented.

In a sense, the Army War College spawned the Army General Staff.

The board continued its deliberations and fostered the establishment of the Army War College in 1904—one year after our principal speaker graduated from West Point.

By 1907, the Army War College occupied a building designed and built for its purposes at Washington Barracks, now Fort Lesley J. McNair.

In 1945 Fort McNair, intact, was relinquished to the National War College.

After World War II, the US Army did not reactivate the Army War College.

Instead it relied on the National War College to prepare its officers for senior assignments.

By 1949 the Department of the Army recognized the need to reopen the Army War College.

So in 1950 it was reconstituted at Leavenworth but was moved to Carlisle Barracks in 1951.

Although I had already graduated in 1947 from the I.D.C. (equivalent to the N.W.C.) it was my good fortune to be a student in the first Army War College class at Carlisle Barracks in 1951–52.

At that time, on-post housing was inadequate for the student body and some students had to commute for 30 to 40 miles.

When I returned to Carlisle Barracks as commandant in May 1962, I was impressed by the progress in housing made by my predecessors.

At that time, $1 million in improvements were being invested in the Wherry housing (college arms) and the 36 quarters on Marshall Ridge were under design.

At this time, all students live on post.

The new chapel was also constructed and dedicated during my tenure.

With that brief historical résumé I now turn my reminiscing to this new building.

Upon arrival here in 1962, I learned that a plan had been forwarded to Washington to expand the gray stone building back through the Thorpe Gymnasium and encroaching on the parade grounds.

In August 1962, there was a fortuitous turn of events: Carlisle Barracks was made a permanent post.

Using this information as a basis, I made the decision to scrap previous planning on modifications to existing facilities and to initiate planning immediately for a building designed and built to meet modern War College requirements.

I sought a building which would be in keeping with the mission and importance of the War College and a worthy replacement for the old Army War College building at Fort McNair.

After some doubts were disposed of, full cooperation and support were marshaled to the highest levels of Government.

In the early 19th century, Johann von Goethe observed: "Three things are to be looked into in a building: That it stand on the right spot, that it be securely founded; That it be successfully executed."

In this instance, I believe all three items have been satisfied.

To select the proper spot for this building, several groups of architects studied the post of Carlisle Barracks.

Several locations were examined, but it was quickly agreed that the site of the old stables (Bliss Hall) was the appropriate and only one.

This recommendation resulted in two decisions:

One to demolish Bliss Hall, which, although constructed in 1861 as two stables, was still classified as a permanent building.

We received reluctant approval to demolish old Bliss Hall, which was more of a curiosity than a feasible building.

The second decision concerned the delay of the demolition until the students could be moved into the new building.

Retaining Bliss Hall until the new building was completed, dictated the architectual design and the construction of the new building in series.

Goethe's second point about being securely founded needs no elaboration.

Last year's students and long-term residents remember vividly the extensive, earth-rocking blasting which was required to put in the foundation in solid rock.

Goethe's third point is that it be successfully executed.

It is quite obvious that it was well designed both inside and out.

To attempt to recite the list of personnel who contributed would be impossible.

Naturally, the architects deserve every recognition.

Their patience and forbearance in the face of our constant scrutiny deserves our admiration.

Praise for their talents came from a nation-wide group of architects who were introduced into the problem at my request to insure that the new Army War College design and location were unexcelled.

I extend to the architects my highest compliments.

I might add that Charlotte's fine Italian hand can be recognized in the field-stone faced terrace and stone feature strip at each floor level to vary the monotony of the brick.

Every section of the faculty had an opportunity to contribute to his area of interest.

Hence, the interior has been designed functionally, usefully, and graciously.

Colonel Hal Nelson, Beau McCutchen, and Charlie Steele deserve great credit for their diligence in engineering support in addition to their other duties.

There is one man who deserves our greatest applause.

I had him assigned here to take advantage of his competence in the audio-visual field.

He did more than that. No detail was too small for his personal attention. Only 16 hour days were too short to achieve his purpose. In the end he dedicated his life to this building—naturally, I refer to the late Colonel Will Washcoe.

That completes my reminiscing of Carlisle Barracks and the new Army War College building.

In closing, I want to quote from the Seven Lamps of Architecture by John Ruskin:

"We require from buildings as from men, two kinds of goodness:

"First, the doing their practical duty well:

"Then, that they be graceful and pleasing in doing it, which last is itself another form of duty."

THE 180TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, each day

is a bicentennial of an event, or at least of the evolving attitude and spirit, leading to the Declaration of Independence. By 1767, there was growing resentment of increasingly unbearable treatment on the part of Great Britain's colonial administration, and the move toward freedom was underway.

To restore appreciation for the values instilled by those pioneers who were to curtail foreign domination over the Colonies, America will, in 1976, enjoy its outstanding celebration in history to mark the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. Meanwhile, we must not overlook a single opportunity to call attention to every landmark in the glowing history fashioned by our Founding Fathers.

Nor should we neglect the traditional ceremony that belongs to every birthday of an important occasion in the development of this Nation. Today—May 25—is the 180th anniversary of the U.S. Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, where delegates from the several States met for the first time with a quorum "to render the Constitution of the Federal Government adequate to the exigencies of the Union."

In "Miracle at Philadelphia—the Story of the Constitutional Convention, May to September 1787," Catherine Drinker Bowen has presented a vivid and exciting description of the drama that was to produce the world's most important document. The article from that publication that appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer last Sunday—May 21—should be a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this anniversary. I include it at this point:

CELEBRATING A BIRTHDAY—U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION IN PHILADELPHIA—AFTER 180 YEARS

Jealousies amounting almost to xenophobia and bitter, blood-tempered distrust of central authority set the mood of many of the leaders and legislators of the 13 sovereign American States 11 years after the Revolution had begun. Their bond was the Articles of Confederation, operative since 1781, after five years of struggle. States built tariff walls against their neighbors. Some refused even to support the Congress. Diplomatically, almost stealthily, 12 of the 13 (Rhode Island abstained) sent delegates to Philadelphia for the purpose of revising the Articles, saying little—for fear of opposition—about the historic task of forging a single Nation which many of them envisioned. On May 25, 1787—180 years ago next Thursday—a quorum of seven delegations was assembled in the Pennsylvania State House, today called Independence Hall.

(By Catherine Drinker Bowen [1])

On the twenty-fifth of May, when a quorum was obtained, Washington was unanimously elected president of the Convention and escorted to the chair. From his desk on the raised dais he made a little speech of acceptance, deprecating his ability to give satisfaction in a scene so novel. "When seated," wrote a member, "he declared that he never had been in such a situation he felt himself embarrassed, that he hoped his errors, as they would be unintentional, would be excused. He lamented his want of qualifications."

There is something touching in the way Washington always lamented his want of qualifications and called on God to help, whether it was a nomination as Commander in Chief of the army, as president of the Federal Convention or as President of the United States. One feels he meant it, this was not false modesty. To his colleagues it must have been reassuring. Washington was everywhere known as "the greatest character in America"—a man of prestige, with a landed estate and a magnificent physical appearance. An English traveler, impressed, wrote a detailed account, beginning with the General's commanding height and going on to say that "his chest is full and his limbs, though rather slender, well shaped and muscular. His head is small . . . his eyes are of a light gray color . . . and, in proportion to the length of his face, his nose is long. Mr. Stewart, the eminent portrait painter, told me there are features in his face totally different from those he had observed in that of any human being. The sockets of the eyes, for instance, are larger than what he ever met with before, and the upper part of the nose broader. All his features . . . were indicative of the strongest passions, and had he been born in the forest . . . he would have been the fiercest man among the savage tribes."

GREAT DIFFIDENCE

A person of such passions had need of control. "This Vesuvius of a man," the biographer Beveridge has called him. Washington's self-discipline is legendary, as is his anger when aroused. Officers who served under him in the war testified they had never seen him smile, that his countenance held something austere and his manner were uncommonly reserved. Certainly, Washington was not a ready talker. "He speaks with great diffidence," wrote a foreign observer, "and sometimes hesitates for a word . . . His language is manly and expressive."

It is odd that such a man should come down in history marked with a slight taint of the Sunday school; perhaps Parson Weems will never be lived down. Yet in spite of the General's almost glacial reserve and dignity, one sensed that he would never be overbearing, power would not turn his head. One knew it by the troubled lines in his brow, a quality of melancholy when his face was in repose.

Through four months, Washington was to sit silent in the convention, even when they went into Committee of the Whole and he came down from the chair. He voted with the Virginians; before the convention met he had made clear that his sympathies lay with a national government. Yet only on the last day, September 17, did Washington rise to take part in the debate. Silence in public debates was, it seems, natural to him. Jefferson, who served with Washington in the Virginia Legislature and with Dr. Franklin in Congress, testified afterward that he "never heard either of them speak ten minutes at a time, nor to any but the main point which was to decide the question. They laid their shoulders to the great points, knowing that the little ones would follow of themselves."

Washington showed himself firm, courteous, inflexible. When he approved a measure, delegates reported that his face showed it. Yet it was hard to tell what the General was thinking and impossible to inquire. In his silence lay his strength. His presence kept the Federal Convention together, kept it going, just as his presence had kept a straggling, ill-conditioned army together throughout the terrible years of war.

In the front row near the desk, James Madison sat bowed over his tablet, writing steadily. His eyes were blue, his face ruddy; he did not have the scholar's pallor. His figure was well knit and muscular and he carried his clothes with style. Though he usually wore black, he also has been described as handsomely dressed in blue and buff, with ruffles at breast and wrist. Already he was growing bald and brushed his hair down to hide it; he wore a queue and powder. He walked with the quick bouncing step that sometimes characterizes men of remarkable energy.

As a reporter Madison was indefatigable, his notes comprehensive, set down without comment or aside. One marvels that he was able at the same time to take so large a part in the debate. It is true that in old age Madison made some emendations in the record to accord with various disparate notes which later came to light; he has been severely criticized for it. Other members took notes of the convention: Hamilton, Yates and Lansing of New York, McHenry of Maryland, Paterson of New Jersey, Rufus King of Massachusetts, William Pierce of Georgia, George Mason of Virginia. But most of these memoranda were brief, incomplete; had it not been for Madison we should possess very scanty records of the convention.

STORM BREWS

When the convention was in full swing, Francis Hopkinson, of Philadelphia—signer of the Declaration, pamphleteer, musician, designer of the American flag—wrote to Jefferson outlining some of the troubles into which the States had fallen, and expressing his feelings about the secret transactions which were taking place within the State House walls. Matters were more serious even than Hopkinson reported. Martial law had been declared in Georgia. Savannah was fortified against the Creek Indians supposed to be incited by Spain. There was a rumor that a certain group in the New York Legislature—"the seditious party"—had "opened communications with the Viceroy of Canada." No doubt, said Hopkinson, Jefferson had read in the papers about the insurgents in Massachusetts. Rhode Island at present was "governed by miscreants . . . A serious storm seems to be brewing in the South West about the navigation of the Mississippi."

Hopkinson went on to tell of the convention. "From all the States," he wrote, "except Rhode Island, delegates are now setting in this city. George Washington president. Their business is to revise the Confederation, and propose amendments. It will be very difficult to frame such a system of Union and govern-

believed the Union needed saving and needed it quickly."

Mrs. Bowen, born in suburban Philadelphia in 1897, is one of America's most distinguished biographers, an eminent writer of popular history and an accomplished amateur musician. She studied the violin as a girl, with little thought to a career in writing. In 1919 an article based on her honeymoon was accepted by a boating magazine, her first published work. Soon after, she began a regular column for the Easton (Pa.) Express, the title of which—"Over the Fence With a Friendly Gossip"—seems monumentally improbable in thinking of her today, full of honors and distinctions, both scholarly and literary.

Mrs. Bowen's first book was "History of Lehigh University," of which her father was president. There have followed a prodigious number of volumes, including biographies of Justice Holmes, of John Adams, of Francis Bacon and of Sir Edward Coke. "Miracle at Philadelphia" is her most recent book.

---

[1] This evocation of the events and atmosphere of the convening of the Constitutional Convention on May 25, 1787, was written by Catherine Drinker Brown in her book "Miracle at Philadelphia. The Story of the Constitutional Convention, May to September 1787" (Atlantic-Little, Brown. 346 pages, $7.50). In her preface, she describes the book, and thus these excerpts, as "a narrative, taken from source, from contemporary reports of the Federal Convention, from newspapers, diaries, the letters and utterances of delegates and their friends. To these men the situation in the states was critical and they said so, repeatedly and often; they

ment for America as shall suit all opinions and reconcile clashing interests. Their deliberations are kept inviolably secret, so that they set without censure or remark, but no sooner will the chicken be hatche'd but every one will be for plucking a feather.". . .

DEBATE BEGINS

Wednesday, May 30, General Washington stepped down from the chair and Nathaniel Gorham, of Massachusetts took his place, having been duly chosen by ballot. The convention was now in Committee of the Whole, at liberty to debate measures and even to vote without binding themselves—without, as it were, pledge or engagement.

The Committee of the Whole House was an ancient device, invented long ago in England to give the Commons freedom of debate under an autocratic ruler. Down came the mace—symbol of royal authority—from the table before the Speaker. As long as the mace remained out of sight, votes were not recorded but counted merely as a test, a trial of opinion, a way of taking the sense of the meeting. Back in the 1590's, Queen Elizabeth's royal councilors had not liked this invention of the Commons. It gave plain men—merchants, lawyers, country squires—a leeway to discuss affairs of state, grandia regni which properly were the concern of noblemen and princes. It was a point of view which died hard. During the American Revolution, Lord George Germain had remarked testily that he "would not have men of the mercantile cast every day collecting themselves together and debating about political matters."

The convention in Philadelphia had no mace, and "men of a mercantile cast" led the country. Yet from their experience in colonial assemblies or in their State Legislatures, delegates knew well the Committee of the Whole and its uses. On May 30, debate in the convention opened by Randolph's suggesting an amended version of his first three resolves. Plainly, the Virginia members had been at work out-of-doors. A union of the States "merely federal," said Randolph, would not accomplish the object for which they were met. He therefore proposed "a national government, consisting of a supreme legislative, executive and judicial."

QUESTIONS OF DEFINITION

Silence followed, complete and ominous. A government of three separate parts was entirely acceptable; six of the new State constitutions specified such separation of powers. But a government national, supreme? How were the words to be defined, what powers did they comprehend? The small-State men seemed frozen by the words, stunned. There must have been a shifting of chairs, a restless movement in the room. Chancellor Wythe of Virginia was quick to seize advantage. "From the silence of the House," he said, "I presume that gentlemen are prepared to pass on the resolution?"

It was a shrewd move but it failed. The House was not so prepared! countered Butler of South Carolina. He desired Mr. Randolph to show that a "national" government was necessary to the continuance of the States . . . But we are a nation! said John Dickinson of Delaware. "We are a nation although consisting of parts or States." Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, expressed himself as wary of this distinction between a federal and a national government. To acknowledge it and to pass Mr. Randolph's resolution would be to destroy the Confederation, which the convention had no right to do. He proposed therefore that "provision should be made for the establishment of a federal legislative, judiciary, and executive."

On these words, federal . . . national . . . supreme, the convention would stick for days to come. Did gentlemen, it was asked at once, indeed propose to overthrow State governments? No! said Randolph. There was no such intention. Gouverneur Morris rose, attempting to explain the terms. A federal government, he said, was a mere compact, resting on the good faith of the parties, a national government on the other hand had "a complete and compulsive operation". . . .

BICAMERAL AGREEMENT

Before the Committee of the Whole adjourned on the last day of May, it had voted aye upon Randolph's original Resolve 3: "That the national legislature ought to consist of two branches." Among the States only two, Pennsylvania and Georgia, possessed one-chamber Legislatures. Both would soon amend their Constitutions to include both Senate and Representatives, though in Pennsylvania Dr. Franklin opposed the change; to the end of his life he would remain staunch in defense of the radical one-chamber house. Resolve 3 was agreed to, therefore, "without debate or dissent," wrote Madison, "except that of Pennsylvania, given probably out of complaisance to Docr. Franklin." On June 21 the question would, however, come up again in Committee of the Whole, and pass seven to three (with Maryland divided), after striking out the offending word "national."

Resolve 4 of the Virginia Plan, for popular election of the Federal House of Representatives also passed—surprisingly—in the affirmative, though in a week's time it too would be reconsidered. It would seem that in these first days of the convention, the small-State men were not ready, not organized for resistance. New Jersey and South Carolina had voted no to Resolve 4, with Connecticut and Delaware divided. Even more surprisingly, the first part of Randolph's Resolve 6, giving Congress authority over State laws, went through without dissent; this was later to cause heated disagreement and be voted down. It was well indeed that convention rules allowed these repeated votes in Committee of the Whole, tests of what delegates thought and felt, before the entire body of Resolves should be presented for final official vote in full convention, with Washington in the chair.

POWER DISPUTE

On the last clause of Resolve 6: "to call forth the force of the Union against any member of the Union failing to fulfill its duty under the articles (of Confederation)"—Madison asked for a postponement. He was, he said, strongly in favor of enumerated, distinct powers granted to Congress. The more he reflected, the more he doubted the practicability, justice and efficacy of using force against a State. It would look "like a declaration of war," Madison said.

On the motion of postponement, "Agreed," said Madison's notes, "nem. con." In the end the Constitution was to contain no clause calling forth a national army against State or section. "The Committee (of the Whole)," wrote Madison, "then rose and the House adjourned."

It was three o'clock in the afternoon. Members left the State House, strolled out to Chestnut Street or through the south doors to the yard with its serpentine graveled walks, where the young trees were still too slight for shade. Here one could hope to feel air moving in from the river, six blocks to the east, or from green country to the westward; the city stopped at Ninth street.

The State House was not at its best that summer. The steeple had been taken down some years ago when it grow shaky. Nevertheless the building was attractive with its two wings and the tall arcades between; the eighteenth century called them piazzas. In the narrow street the whole was set back from the brick sidewalk, giving it dignity and importance. There was a closed well in the pavement near each corner, with a wooden pump standing high. At the west end—Sixth street—work had begun on the new county courthouse; so far it was no more than a large hole in the ground. Fifth street was noisy with hammering, blocked here and there with piles of lumber; the Philosophical Society's building was going up. Across Walnut street, fronting directly on the State House yard, rose the stone prison, four stories high.

LOCAL ATMOSPHERE

As convention members emerged from the State House yard, prisoners thrust through the barred windows long begging poles of reed, with a cloth cap at the end. Calling out for alms, they cursed any who ignored them. "Foul and horrid imprecations," some one said, from "this cage of unclean birds."

Convention members had not far to walk to their lodgings. Washington and Robert Morris were only a block from Morris' home on Market street, just east of Sixth. Like many other delegates the General had brought his coach and horses, a servant and a groom. Elbridge Gerry had taken a house on Spruce street and sent to Cambridge for his family: a handsome young bride and infant son. Other members boarded with the well known landlady, Mrs. Mary House, at Fifth and Market, or in hostels such as the Indian Queen on Fourth street, often crowded two in a room.

Philadelphia was hospitable. Diaries show delegates dining with Dr. Franklin, with Jared Ingersoll and Robert Morris, or with those indefatigable Pennsylvania politicians, Thomas Mifflin and George Clymer, themselves members of the convention. There were bookshops and stationery shops, where one could buy, that May, Bell's edition of the "British Poets" in 109 volumes, or Blackstone's "Commentaries" in four. A new poem by Joel Barlow was advertised: "The Vision of Columbus," ready now for its subscribers. The Library Company kept its books on the second floor of Carpenters' Hall, only a block from the State House: members found it convenient. Many of them knew well this brick building, where the Continental Congress first had met in '74. On the right as one entered were models of mechanical instruments and devices: plows, harrows, machines for cleaning grain and dressing flax. A Philadelphian wote to Jefferson that the city abounded, that summer, with schemers and projectors. "One Fitch" had this twelvemonth been endeavoring to make a boat go forward by a steam engine. He had "spent much money in the project and has heated his imagination so as to be himself a steam engine." The writer, Francis Hopkinson, had "no doubt but that a boat may be urged forward by such means, but the enormous expense and complexity of the machine must prevent its coming into common use."

PHILADELPHIA COLOR

Philadelphia offered much to interest the delegates. One could visit Mr. Peale's Museum to view the fossil bones, the stuffed animals, the portraits, and not least Mr. Peale himself, an agreeable gentleman, described as "very complaisant," who had fought in the Revolutionary War, had taken active part in local politics and painted five portraits of Washington; he was shortly to be at work upon a sixth. The Delaware riverfront was a colorful sight; it reached for miles. The west side was lined with warehouses; dozens of quays were noisy with vessels loading and unloading. Three years ago the "Empress of China" had sailed to Canton—a pioneer voyage—and now one could find in the shops everything from tea, cocoa, China silk and ivory fans to Spanish oranges, French soap balls or South Carolina rice. Now and again a load of redemptioners came ashore, well advertised beforehand in the newspapers, strong young men or likely young women from Ireland, Scotland or the German states, indentured servants whose time would be sold to the highest bidder.

On Wednesday and Saturday mornings the market opened, a sight in itself. It was under cover and reached straight down Market street to the river, "neat and clean as a dining-hall," with newly caught fish laid out, fresh meat, butter, vegetables, fruits, and by daylight so crowded a man could scarcely make his way through. America, restless to be self-sufficient, was more and more manufacturing her own products and proud of it. In the Pennsylvania Packet, Mr. Long, "Cabinet-Maker, late of London," advertised French sofas in the modern taste; the elegant product as pictured was enough to make a visitor's mouth water. Gordon on Arch street would fashion a pair of boots complete in nine hours for any person choosing to leave his measure. Dr. Baker sold his "well known antiscorbutic dentifrice and Albion essence." Toothbrushes were coming into fashion, though considered somewhat effete; if a gentleman wished to sweeten his breath he rubbed his teeth with a rag dipped in snuff.

SLAUGHTERHOUSE AIR

Along the streets at brief intervals stood the famous Philadelphia pumps with their iron handles. But the city was not healthy in summer and the drinking water far from tasty. Flies and mosquitoes were a continual torment, and when the wind was right it brought a whiff of the shambles, tainted and heavy. Nor were householders particular where they threw their slops, and there were complaints of dead animals lying in the gutters. Prisoners from the jail were put to cleaning the streets and privies. Known as "wheelbarrow men," they were shorn and wore fetters.

Evenings were spent by convention members in talk at the City Tavern, the Indian Queen, the George, the Black Horse, often enough in preparation for tomorrow's meeting; the work before them was hard and continuous. There was much conviviality. After the fashion of the day and perhaps of conventions anywhere, large amounts of drink were consumed; an account of a dinner for 12 notes 60 bottles of Madeira ordered. To certain delegates Philadelphia was a city dangerously lax in morals and rife with luxury, fond of dancing, clamoring after a new theater to be built. George Mason had not been in town 10 days when he wrote his son complaining that he began "to grow heartily tired of the etiquette and nonsense so fashionable in this city." To French visitors like Chastellux and Brissot de Warville, Philadelphia was alarmingly virtuous, its maidens unbelievably prim. "The men are grave, the women serious. There are no finical airs to be found here, no libertine wives, no coffeehouses, no agreeable walks."

CITY OF VARIETY

The Federal Convention, in short, found itself in a busy, thriving, growing town, where one met upon the streets all nations and all classes: Germans from the farms beyond the city, sailors jabbering in outlandish tongues, French noblemen returned since the peace to tour the country they had fought for, frontiersmen in fringed leggings, Quakers in their broad hats, Indians from the backlands—Shawnees or Delawares.

And always, bells rang and chimed above the city roofs. Twice a week, the evening bell announced next morning's market; after dinner a church bell signaled that the library was open in Carpenters' Hall. Hawkers rang their hand bells along the morning streets, and on Sundays the church bells made the day seem even quieter. At night from bed one heard the watchman call the time and the weather every hour until dawn. If a man desired to catch the early coach for out of town at 2 or 3 after midnight, the watchman would wake him—a service peculiar to the city and much appreciated by visitors.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE CHARTER OF AFRICAN UNITY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to join with my colleagues in the Congress in extending felicitations on the fourth anniversary of the signing of the Charter of African Unity.

It was just 4 years ago at Addis Ababa that the leaders of 30 African states had the foresight to take this important step toward the objective of promoting the unity and the solidarity of the African nations. We know that in the long run this effort will achieve a better life for all the peoples of Africa. I have every confidence that as the years go by the OAU will play an increasingly important role toward making the continent of Africa one of the greatest the world has yet known.

The first test of the importance of the OAU in its principal role of promoting unity and solidarity came a few months after its birth. In February 1964, a seven-nation commission of the OAU promulgated a demilitarization agreement stopping open conflict between Algeria and Morocco.

There may be some in today's world who feel that the OAU has not adequately performed its functions because strife exists in some parts of Africa. Let me remind those who so doubt that Africa is relatively peaceful compared to other areas of the world; that the African nations and their great leaders, very young in world history, have achieved an unbelievable degree of political maturity and wisdom in just a few short years.

Because there are those apt to forget, in the hectic whirl of today, what the Africa Charter of Unity set out to do, I am placing in the RECORD, in full, the purposes and principles as contained in the charter for all to study. I commend it to my colleagues:

B. PURPOSES

Article II: The organization shall have the following purposes:

1. To promote the unity and solidarity of the African States.

2. To coordinate and intensify their collaboration and efforts to achieve a better life for the peoples of Africa.

3. To defend their sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence.

4. To eradicate all forms of colonialism from the continent of Africa.

5. To promote international cooperation, with due regard for the U.N. Charter and the universal declaration of human rights.

To these ends, the member states shall coordinate and harmonize their general policies, especially in the following fields: (1) political and diplomatic cooperation, (2) economic cooperation, including transport and communications, (3) educational and cultural cooperation, (4) health, sanitation, and nutritional cooperation, (5) scientific and technical cooperation, and (6) cooperation in defense and security.

C. PRINCIPLES

Article III: The member states, in pursuit of the purposes stated in Article I, solemnly affirm and declare their adherence to the following principles:

1. The sovereign equality of all African States.

2. Noninterference in the internal affairs of states.

3. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each state and for its inalienable right to independent existence.

4. Peaceful settlement of disputes by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, or arbitration.

5. Unreserved condemnation of political assassination in all its forms as well as of subversive activities on the part of neighboring states or any other states.

6. Absolute dedication to the total emancipation of the African territories which are still dependent.

7. Affirmation of the policy of nonalignment with regard to all blocs.

I am proud, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to be able to express from the heart my warmest congratulations on the anniversary of this historic date.

It is especially fortunate that Under Secretary of State Katzenbach on this natal day is in Addis Ababa, the birthplace of the Charter of African Unity. I close my remarks with the statement given today by the Under Secretary of State on the fourth anniversary of the Organization of African Unity at Addis Ababa, as follows:

> Nothing gives me more pleasure than to be able in this City to convey my best wishes and those of President Johnson to the Organization of African Unity on the fourth anniversary of its birth. My Government attaches great importance to the OAU for the role which it plays and will play in the development of this great Continent. It will be particularly satisfying, therefore, to have the opportunity to express personally these sentiments to officials of this Organization.

GUN LAWS SHOULD BE FOR CRIMINALS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Washington newspapers over the weekend reported some startling facts about crime in the District of Columbia which, in my opinion, have a distinct bearing on one of the most controversial subjects now before the Congress. That is the subject of firearms control legislation.

On Monday morning, the Washington Post carried a front-page story reporting that the Metropolitan Police Department has issued fewer than 30 permits to carry guns in Washington in the last year, but has accumulated more than 5,000 guns, most of which were possessed illegally, during the same period.

Two days before, on Saturday, May 20, the same newspaper reported on its front page that the crime rate in the District of Columbia in April was up a startling 59.7 percent over April 1966.

Mr. Speaker, these statistics speak for themselves. They say: To require permits for guns will not reduce the crime rate, yet the Post has been a militant advocate of restrictive gun laws.

Assistant Chief Howard V. Covell said Saturday the police had confiscated guns during the last year in 934 cases involving persons who had no permit to carry them. Capt. Ernst Winters, head of the robbery squad, said a record 477 robberies were reported in April, and the robbers were armed with guns in 85 percent of those crimes.

Most of these gun holders have come by them illegally—through theft or purchase on the street corner from a thief, the Washington Post reported.

Police have no control over these, officials say, according to the Post.

The newspaper goes on to make the point that it is not the 400 firearms purchased monthly in the Washington area for protection of home or business or for game hunting that concern the Police Department. Buyers of these firearms at gun and secondhand stores are given a police check and their purchases are legal, according to the news story.

In his message to Congress on crime in the Nation's Capital, delivered February 27, 1967, President Johnson asked for strict new laws to require a license to be granted only if the purchaser can show that he needs the weapon to protect his person or property. He also asked legislation to prohibit purchase or possession of any firearm by minors, chronic alcoholics, and the mentally ill, as well as felons and drug addicts who are already covered by the law.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to the point of this discussion: In their explanation of the phenomenal rise in crime in the Capital, the police said a primary factor in the increase is the difficulties they encounter in keeping the hard core criminals off the streets. They say in a number of instances robbery suspects have been arrested twice in the same week for the same crime.

A great many of these violators are prohibited from purchasing or possessing firearms of any kind by existing law—yet the President, in setting forth his reasons for asking even more restrictive legislation, said:

> Almost anyone who is willing to fill out a form and wait for 48 hours can buy a hand gun.

The only persons, he says, who may not purchase handguns are minors, the mentally ill, drug addicts, and convicted felons.

Thus, the President implies, it should be no trouble for the law-abiding citizen to obtain a gun, whereas a new law would prohibit criminals and other social misfits from possessing them.

Now we find the Washington Police reporting that most of those who held the 5,000 guns they confiscated in the last year obtained them illegally.

President Johnson also said that experience in cities that regulate the purchase and possession of handguns and the studies of the Crime Commission "clearly show that strict controls can strengthen our efforts to reduce violent crimes."

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the evidence we read over the weekend and this morning clearly shows that strict controls in no way have been shown to reduce violent crimes—nor, for that matter, a reduction in the number of cases of violent crime in which guns are used.

On this basis, I see no reason for passage of legislation to provide for regulation by licensing of the purchases of firearms by law-abiding citizens, when present law, if adequately enforced, provides police with the authority to prevent legal purchase of firearms by known criminals.

I have always maintained that it is not the firearms that are purchased legally that are the cause of trouble, but that it is the guns obtained through illegal channels by the criminal element that are at the root of the problem. The statistics reported by the Metropolitan Police Department support this strongly.

Additional evidence is found in a study of the sources of guns in crime made by the Los Angeles district attorney's office last January.

That study showed that guns were involved in 263 crimes in the Los Angeles area. Of these, 39 were stolen, 37 had been obtained by suspects from private individuals, and 95 guns could not be traced. This means that 171 guns used in 263 crimes were apparently obtained illegally.

The Los Angeles study also shows that two-thirds of the guns used in these 263 crimes were handguns. State law in California requires that a handgun purchaser must sit out a 5-day "waiting period" before obtaining the firearm to permit police time to check with the criminal identification and investigation bureau on the purchaser's background.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the studies made by two of our largest police departments, in areas plagued by unusually high rates of crime, show clearly that strict regulation of the possession and purchase of firearms has no beneficial bearing on the reduction of crime, and that to enact such laws is to bypass and ignore the real problem, which is one of enforcing the statutes already on the lawbooks. Therefore, I urge every Member of the House of Representatives to study these figures closely before deciding whether passage of restrictive new gun control legislation is in the public interest.

I do not now and I have not opposed the passage of legislation designed to keep weapons out of the hands of those who clearly should not possess them—the criminals, the delinquent, the unsupervised juveniles, and others in whose possession weapons may become a menace. But I do uphold the right of the law-abiding citizen to own weapons for protection or for sport without harassment and hounding by bureaucracy—harassment and hounding which many criminals apparently are able to avoid. Gun laws should be for criminals.

LET THE SECURITY COUNCIL DECIDE THE NEAR EAST CRISIS

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I just read a dispatch where the Soviet Union has told the British they would not be willing to discuss the Near East crises unless we show an equal eagerness to discuss the Far East.

There are two significant points here to consider. It seems to me we are in substantial agreement. Egypt has no right whatsoever to close an international waterway. An attack on Israel could set fire to the world. Second, we do have an equal eagerness to discuss Vietnam with anyone, anytime, anywhere. Therefore, since Russia has indicated a continued interest in peace in the Near East, this might be a fortuitous time to call a meeting of the Security Council of the United Nations to find a way to reduce the tensions in the Near East.

The United States has already indicated to the United Nations that the Security Council is an appropriate forum for settlement of tensions in the Near East. I believe it also to be highly appropriate for the Security Council to work for a settlement in the Far East. I think the stakes are sufficiently important for all members of the Security Council to proceed with dispatch within the Security Council for a meeting for peace. We want peace in the Near East and it is essential to the world community that the integrity of Israel be maintained. It is unthinkable to permit Egypt to close an international waterway. Our desire for peace in the Far East is broadly understood by all.

It seems to me that the waterway issue alone is sufficient justification to the United Nations. If we can resolve these problems through the United Nations, I think we will have built a great foundation for a lasting peace throughout the world.

I believe that Secretary General U Thant should call on both sides to allow the peacekeeping forces to reenter the Near East and to establish an international naval force to keep the international waterway open. Having done that we should convene a meeting of the Security Council immediately.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. I would like to congratulate my colleague on his fine statement.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York.

MILITARY DRAFT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, we are considering today the extension and revision of the military draft, but the true agenda is not conscription, but freedom and justice. We must decide whether this bill is in the interests of freedom and justice, because these two ideals go hand in hand. There can be no true freedom without justice, and no true justice without freedom.

It is not enough for us to proclaim that we love our country, and love freedom, unless we proclaim, as well, that we believe in justice.

There are profound issues before us.

This is the second time that Congress has had to act on military conscription in time of emergency in less than 20 years. In such times it is easy to overlook the hard questions, and it is easy for us to forget how fragile the liberties are that we profess to defend. Yet I say to my colleagues that these are times when we can least afford to overlook these matters, and that we must now, more than ever, be vigilant in our defense of the liberties we have inherited, and which we would pass on to our children.

We are responsible for what we do, responsible before our constituents, and before our own good conscience. We must, therefore, address ourselves to hard questions.

Mr. Speaker, better than 10,000 young men have been killed in Vietnam. Today we are conscripting vast numbers of men and sending them into combat, and this act before us will continue that conscription. Yet there is no war declared. It profoundly disturbs me that we have empowered our Government to conscript any number, without limit, of men and send them into war without setting any declaration of war forth. And while we do this, we also fail to resolve other matters as well.

We so easily say to a young man that he must leave home, school, family, and life, because it is his duty, without setting forth the duties that we should also expect of our other citizens. We say to the unlucky few, "Go, and Godspeed," but we say nothing to the rest of our people of the sacrifices that they should make. We conscript and we risk and take human life and limb, while here at home we do not say to war profiteers that they should act more from patriotism and less from greed. We have expanded our defense procurement by billions of dollars without adding one iota to the powers of such bodies as the Renegotiation Board, so that it could exert some control and some influence over excessive profits by war suppliers. How can we do this, in the name of justice? Dare we say to history that we value human life so little, and property rights so much? There must be a balance, there must be justice. I say that if we must conscript people into military service and send them into war that is not even declared, then we must also see to it that unfair and excessive profits do not accrue to those who furnish the goods of war. But what have we done? We have stripped away the powers of the Renegotiation Board to even go into contracts valued at less than a million dollars, and we do not even permit them to look into contracts for the supply of certain kinds of materials, and yes, even certain kinds of suppliers. We have whittled away our powers to control unscrupulous and unjust contractors, even though the need for this kind of effort has been repeatedly proved.

There is the question, too, of the morality of our failure to bring home to the people the sacrifices of this war. This is a war in which only the widows, the mothers and fathers, and the dead and maimed seem to be paying the price, while it seems that here we at home know and care little about their service, about their valor, other than lip service, speeches, and so forth.

Our concern seems to be not how to solve the war, not how we can help, but how to forget that it exists at all. A few weeks ago, the commander of American forces in Vietnam made a tour of this country, to tell the people and Congress about the war, and bring it home to them. Gen. William Westmoreland came here into this Hall and made a speech that is without precedent in all our history. There were guards everywhere, there were reporters all about, and television crews with all their equipment. It would have seemed that every man and woman in the country would have known that this was a moment rare in history, and would have waited and listened to learn of the war. But even as General Westmoreland spoke, not a hundred yards away in this building, a man in the uniform and paste jewels of a festival king, accompanied by a beautiful young lady, prowled the Halls of the House, spreading good cheer and good will for who knows what enterprise. If they knew that a solemn occasion was taking place they did not seem to be aware. And at the same time, across the street, a beautiful girl in a micro dress was posing for publicity pictures on the steps of the Longworth Building, a banner "Miss Washington" draped across her. General Westmoreland probably wondered what was happening as he drove past, and realized that not everyone cared what he had said, not even people here in this most politically aware of cities.

I do not condemn these people, but say to you that they represent the problem that is before us. There is a war on, undeclared, which we, by and large, try not think about. The country seems either afraid to think about it, reluctant to recognize that it exists. We hide in our games of commercial promotion, and worry about how many automobiles will be sold this year. And in the meanwhile we give young men orders to go, and sacrifice, in the name of all we hold dear.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this is a solemn moment. We are doing more than extending military draft laws. We are weighing the future of freedom and justice, not freedom alone. If there be no justice in our land, we will be making this law in vain. Our defense must be a reaffirmation of both freedom and justice, and history will judge us by our success in promulgating these twin ideals. I believe that in the name of justice, we must examine whether we are exacting the same sacrifice of all our people when we have failed to control excess war profits, failed to declare war, but nevertheless expect unquestioning service of the ones called to military duty. We expect too little of ourselves, and too much of some, and still wonder why there are doubts in the land. We will not extinguish those doubts unless we address ourselves to the real issues before the House today, and those issues are bound up in the single question: Is what we have before us representative of freedom and justice?

RUMORED CENSURE OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reference was made here a little while ago about *the fact that the leadership of this* Chamber narrowly escaped a report on censureship.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House is welcome to his own opinion, and I would never intrude upon another Member's opinion.

However, Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself, and speaking for the vast majority of the Members of this Congress on both sides of the aisle, it seems to me that the conduct of the Members of this House, the leadership, which includes the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], working in close harmony with the Speaker of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], I believe their conduct in the last 4 days has been most exemplary under most difficult conditions.

Mr. Speaker, we have disposed of four most controversial measures, measures that have created a great deal of discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the leadership of this House of Representatives, on both sides of the aisle, for recognizing the problems of the Members thereof and in trying to accommodate the membership of this body and for patiently working with both sides of this body, under very difficult conditions, in an effort to bring about the passage of this most important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I say this: If there is any thought about censureship of the leadership of the House of Representatives, I do not know about whom they are talking. They are not talking about the distinguished majority leader, they are not talking about the distinguished minority leader, they are not talking about the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the Illinois delegation, for the most part, today passed up a very important banquet in the city of Chicago, a banquet to be held in tribute to our great mayor, Mayor Daly, who has just recently been reelected to a third term by more than 500,000 votes. All of us would have liked to have been present to pay tribute to this outstanding mayor of one of our greatest municipalities in America.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, we are here, and I am sure that any Member of this Chamber who does not want to make the sacrifices that are necessary to be here, there will be someone waiting in the wings to relieve them of that responsibility.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader, and the distinguished Speaker of this House for their exemplary conduct, under most difficult conditions during the last 4 days of the sessions of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank them for their patience which they have shown to all of us during a time when passions have been running high around here in the last 4 days.

TWENTY-FOUR MEMBERS JOIN TO CRACK DOWN ON STOLEN CREDIT CARD RACKET

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1967, I introduced a bill, H.R. 8144, to amend chapter 113 of title 18 of the United States Code, to prohibit the transportation, use, sale, or receipt, for unlawful purposes, of credit cards in interstate or foreign commerce.

There has long been a need for such a law, to help the forces of law enforcement to fight back against the underworld traffic in stolen, lost, and counterfeit credit cards which has grown to such proportions that the losses to issuers have been estimated at $40 million or more a year.

Today, I have introduced a new bill, to achieve the same purpose. However, new wording in the legislation broadens its scope and tightens its effectiveness. I am honored to have the following distinguished colleagues as cosponsors of this bill:

Mr. Delaney, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Kupferman, Mr. Hicks, Mr. McDade, Mr. Findley, Mr. Lukens, Mr. Burke of Florida, Mr. Grover, Mr. Sandman, Mr. Tenzer, Mr. Button, Mr. Wolff, Mr. McEwen, Mr. Dent, Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania, Mr. Horton, Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania, Mr. Watson, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. McClory, and Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

ANSWER TO CHARGES AGAINST THE NEW JERSEY COMMUNITY ACTION TRAINING INSTITUTE AND ITS DIRECTOR

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to answer the charges which my distinguished colleague, and friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Hunt], made on Monday of this week against the New Jersey Community Action Training Institute and its director, Mr. Barry Passett.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman charged that a pamphlet recently prepared by Mr. Passett in preliminary draft form and forwarded to all members of the New Jersey congressional delegation for comments, represented some sort of diabolical Democratic plot, and, in the gentleman's words, "a flagrant misuse of poverty program funds." The pamphlet in question, Mr. Speaker, is designed to encourage citizens to communicate effectively and constructively with their elected representatives, to let them know what policies, programs, and governmental actions they support, and which they oppose. The pamphlet is predicated on the far from revolutionary notion that—and I quote—"your Congressman works for you."

The gentleman's quarrel with this pamphlet was premised on the assumption that OEO funds had been allocated to support it. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Passett had always intended that printing and distribution of the pamphlet would be paid for with private funds, in light of the obviously undesirable situation of having OEO funds support an attempt to encourage correspondence on legislative issues. But that is a situation, Mr. Speaker, which was never in danger of arising, not only because of Mr. Passett's intention to the contrary, but also because of OEO policy against using its funds for such purposes.

Once this question is laid aside, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to object to in this pamphlet. It is designed to encourage a perfectly legitimate and responsible facet of good citizenship—the process of communication with democratically chosen representatives on issues of great interest. The pamphlet encourages a courteous and fairminded approach on the part of correspondents, as well as a healthy respect for the independence and judgment of elected officials. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, the pamphlet supports the peaceful and orderly expression of ideas and concerns, and represents a heartening contrast to airing views through demonstrations in the streets, or worse. In short, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Passett's little pamphlet would help the poor to find a constructive voice in their Government, and, as such, is an object lesson in good citizenship.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman did not confine himself to criticism of the pamphlet—which could be attributed to misinformation—but went on to deliver an attack on the community action training institute itself, and suggested that the pamphlet "represents the only accomplishment of this organization." That, Mr. Speaker, was an incredible statement to make on the floor of the House. The fact of the matter is that the institute is operating one of the most comprehensive and successful training programs ever launched with OEO funds. Extensive projects to strengthen antipoverty activities in virtually all of New Jersey's major urban areas have been undertaken by the institute. Special training efforts among the State's Spanish-speaking citizens have been launched. Extremely successful training and informational materials have been developed on such subjects as tenant action, public assistance rights and responsibilities, the use of surveys in antipoverty projects, and the invitation and development of no-cost or low-cost self-help projects. An article appearing recently in the Philadelphia Inquirer observed that these CATI manuals have "tuned into a bestselling 'must' for the bookshelves of community action programs across the country."

Even more significant, Mr. Speaker, is the outstanding job the institute has done in training antipoverty workers, including job counselors, fiscal officers, community action agency directors and their staffs, neighborhood center staff and out-reach workers who are serving with local projects around the State. Between January 1966, and April 1967, 1,469 institute trainees received a total of 31,582 man-days of training; an additional 3,456 trainees were scheduled to receive an additional 19,346 man-days of training in proposed projects, many of which are now underway. This means that the CATI program accounts for about 10 percent of all OEO-supported training of antipoverty workers.

Mr. Speaker, CATI is a vital and essential part of New Jersey's over-all war on poverty. Each of the State's 24 local community action agencies is represented in the institute, and it is closely involved in one way or another with most of the really effective neighborhood projects being operated by these agencies. The institute has the strong support of State and municipal officials, and is considered by OEO to be an extremely successful project. And I might add that CATI's director, Mr. Barry Passett, is an immensely able and effective young man, whose experience with the Alliance for Progress in Latin America and with the northeast regional office of OEO has given him unique qualifications for the responsibilities which he has been discharging so imaginatively and so well.

So I deeply regret, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman saw fit to attack such a worthwhile and successful antipoverty project, and I do hope that he will take a little trouble to check his facts before he addresses this body again on a subject of such importance to so many New Jersey citizens.

I think that even a slight review of the facts would indicate that the antipoverty programs have in many areas met with extraordinary success under sometimes impossible conditions. I think, too, that this country has been fortunate in having Sargent Shriver bring to this difficult task all the great qualities of leadership that made the Peace Corps one of America's proudest accomplishments.

Perhaps not all of our society is yet great, but since President Johnson's massive attack on poverty life has become good instead of hopeless for millions of Americans who heretofore had no chance at all. I think history will record that the poor, the ignorant, the hopeless never had a better friend than Lyndon Johnson. And I believe that history will record that Lyndon Johnson's courage was the best asset the cause of peace found when the idea of peace was given its greatest test.

EDUCATION IN A CHANGING WORLD

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in the fast-moving world of today, with the tremendous progress being made in modern technology, increasing concern has been expressed both in the Congress and in the private sector, over the ability of our society to prepare the individual to cope with his rapidly changing environment. Since the major part of a child's early years are spent in the schoolroom, the educational system has naturally taken on this role. In recent years, however, a great many educators, and those involved in the educational field, have expressed their fears that the school systems in the United States have not kept pace with the technological changes. Too many of today's teachers are using outmoded methods and equipment, the results being a lack of interest in the learning process on the part of the student, a high truancy and dropout rate particularly in our lower income areas, and a wasted natural resource in unawakened potentials.

The Congress of the United States has itself become increasingly interested in the problems of education. The subject of debate on the floor of the House for this entire week is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In June of last year, the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am the ranking minority House member, held hearings on technology in education, which added necessary and useful information to the growing materials on this subject.

In line with this expressed congressional interest, I have had recently brought to my attention by Mr. N. T. Horton, a constituent of mine and manager of a General Electric plant in northern New Jersey, several very interesting and informative articles in the General Electric Forum, on "Education and the Manpower Challenge." There are two sections of the Forum which I thought would be of particular interest to my colleagues in the Congress:

The first is a special section on educational innovations, which includes five case studies, beginning with the Headstart program, and including high school, university, technical institute, and management training. These are fine examples of what could be done on a larger scale with the proper initiative and assistance from both the Federal Government and private organizations. The second article is a panel discussion, on "The New Education: Teaching Tomorrow Today," analyzing today's increased need for knowledge and the impact of education on future economic and social progress. The distinguished panelists are: Francis Keppel—moderator—chairman of the General Learning Corp., and former U.S. Commissioner of Education; Sister Jacqueline Grennan, S.L., president of Webster College; Dr. Samuel Gould, president of the State University of New York; Dr. John Fischer, president of Teachers College, Columbia University; Devereaux Josephs, former chairman of the New York Life Insurance Co.; and Representative CHARLES GOODELL, my good friend and colleague from New York, and one of the House's leading authorities on the subject. The articles follow:

CASE EXAMPLE: PROJECT HEADSTART

(By Jule M. Sugarman, Associate Director, Project Headstart)

Approximately 20 per cent of the Nation—some 35 million people—live under adverse circumstances. Of these, 17 million are children. Each year, almost one million enter school for the first time, bringing with them a lack of self-confidence, a built-in mistrust of adults, and a deep fear of the whole operation.

To fall behind or lose the will to progress at this critical stage of schooling could result in a hopeless and helpless situation which will only be compounded in the years ahead.

In a report which became the springboard for Project Head Start, Dr. Robert Cooke, Pediatrician-in-Chief of Johns Hopkins Hospital, wrote: "There is considerable evidence that the early years of childhood are a most critical point in the poverty cycle. During these years, the creation of living patterns, emotional development, and the formation of individual expectations and aspirations take place at a very rapid pace."

For the child of poverty, there are clearly observable deficiencies in these processes, which lay the foundation of a pattern of failure, and thus a pattern of poverty, throughout his life.

BREAKING THE POVERTY CYCLE

Head Start was therefore designed to be the first vital step toward breaking the cycle of poverty. The comprehensive program would relate directly to every child's future. It would be the foundation of his full-term education, employment potential, and often, his health and social well-being. The program contains these five major components.

1. *Health*. Since poverty and poor health frequently go hand in hand, Head Start centers provide a complete medical examination, including visual acuity and hearing tests, dental examinations, immunizations, periodic examinations, and follow-through to ensure correction of defects. For many children, this is the first time they have seen a doctor or dentist.

2. *Nutrition*. Head Start children are frequently undernourished. Included in every center's daily progam is at least one, often two full meals.

3. *Education*. Children are introduced to the world around them and to the world of words, with emphasis on doing rather than listening. With one teacher and two aides to every 15 children, individual problems can receive individual attention. Withdrawn children are made to feel part of a group. Self-reliance, self-esteem, and self-confidence are encouraged and fostered. Thus, a solid groundwork is laid for the future school experience.

4. *Parental Involvement*. Parents of Head Start children are encouraged to participate in every phase of planning and operation. (One-third of the teacher aides working in the summer 1965 program were mothers of Head Start children.)

Classes are held for parents in such subjects as home economics and child care, and in language for non-English speaking parents. Such active participation by parents can change an entire family's relation to the school.

5. *Social Services*. When working with young children and their families, individual problems and behaviors may be encountered which are hard to understand, and even harder to solve. These situations make the social service part of the Head Start program one of the most important.

The social worker attached to the center may recommend that certain cases need the assistance of the mental health clinic, or family counseling service. Others may be referred to the public housing authority, social hygiene department, or church counseling service.

A BEGINNING FOR 1.5 MILLION

Operation Head Start is now 18 months old. It grew from what was considered an overly-optimistic 100,000 children to a nationwide program which will have given 1.5 million children from low income families a sound beginning for their school life. During the first two summer programs last year, nearly half of the more than 3000 counties in the United States operated at least one Head Start center. Now, greater emphasis is being placed on full-year programs.

The 1967 budget will be about $820 million and will include 175,000 children in full-year programs and an additional 500,000 this coming summer. Preliminary reports show that Head Start children with only an eight-week preschool training entered regular school more ably prepared, with greater self-confidence and with a considerably advanced mental capacity, compared to other children from similar backgrounds.

Yet, there is a very real possibility that Head Start can be a false start. Whether this will happen or not depends largely on the interests and efforts of public and private schools to build on the program's foundation.

What are the implications for the school system? First, all school administrators and teachers should know what is happening in the Head Start program.

This is not to say that the program should be considered simply an earlier version of school. In fact, many early childhood experts discourage the notion of trying specifically to prepare a child for the activities of kindergarten or first grade. In their view, it is not as important that the child learn to cut, paste, and color some assigned project, as that he may be made comfortable with and attracted to the notion that he can create something of beauty.

SOME DEFICIENCIES WILL REMAIN

The child's Head Start experience may have been as little as six weeks or longer than a year, and the effect of the program on his development may range from modest to extensive. It is clear, however, that virtually all Head Start children in the current generation will continue to reflect such deficiencies as language problems and cultural barrenness.

Thus, important consideration must be given to the child's potentials as he moves into formal education. School systems need to consider whether changes should be made in their own style of operation. Among the questions which ought to be considered are these:

What is being done to individualize the approach to each child? Are changes in teaching style in order? Are a greater variety of materials and resources needed? How can the interest of parents be maintained and expanded? Can health and nutritional gains of the child be continued? In what ways might the school and teacher roles change in working with the total family? How can the cultural horizons of the child be continually expanded?

Perhaps most important and fundamental to all educational changes is the matter of teacher attitude. What can the system, its administrators, and teachers themselves do to: (a) help the entire teaching staff see the creative challenge of each child and the unique opportunities to help that child; and (b) increase the sense of optimism about that child's future?

A NEW CHANCE FOR HOPE

As a consequence of Head Start, Communities all over America are now developing an awareness that not only can poverty-stricken children be helped, but that this is the time to help them.

Fifty-one per cent of the communities visited by OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity) consultants reported that they plan to revise their elementary school programs in areas with a high percentage of economically deprived children.

Philadelphia, for example has finally won community approval of special curricula in slum areas. And West Virginia is beginning a comprehensive kindergarten program to reach the children of remote hollow farms and destitute mining towns.

The benefits of Head Start's 1 to 15 teacher/child ratio are reflected in many school systems' new policy of providing aides for their teachers in low grades.

Head Start parents are now attending adult education classes in unprecedented numbers. For example, the demand for adult education courses in Minneapolis has tripled, and the school supervisor attributes this growth directly to Head Start.

TRAINING INCREASES

Interest in early childhood education is shown by vast increases in college and university enrollment. At the State University of New York Agricultural and Technical College at Cobleskill, there are now 1200 applicants in Early Childhood Education for 200 openings. The University of Louisville, which previously enrolled 17 people in this field, now has 154.

Operation Head Start cuts across varied groups and classes of people. Communities now have a new understanding of themselves and of the fact that the total community effort can reach, at last, the child of poverty and his family. Above all, it has proved that a multi-faceted approach to aiding these children is the only one that can substantially change their hopes in school and in life.

CASE EXAMPLE: THE NONGRADED HIGH SCHOOL

(By Dr. B. Frank Brown, Principal, Melbourne High School, Melbourne, Fla.)

The launching of the first Sputnik was the motivating factor for change at Melbourne High School. Within weeks after the Russians punched the first hole in space, the faculty at Melbourne High School reached an agreement to the effect that if the school was to keep abreast of change, it must become so experimental that just as soon as a new project is put into operation, planning should begin to make it obsolete.

The other impact of the Sputnik launching on the school was the explosion of student population. The proximity of Melbourne to the Cape Kennedy complex 20 miles has brought several hundred new students in each of the past five years. Twice the school has been split to form new high schools as the influx of Cape workers engulfed the area again and again.

This nearness to the Cape gives rise to the assumption that the high school's 1700 students are mostly the offspring of space scientists. But actually, the majority of students are the children of technicians and laborers. Much of the creative genius behind the U.S. missile industry is concentrated elsewhere in the nation at various missile design and space centers.

WHAT IS A NONGRADED SCHOOL?

The incentive for continuing innovation at Melbourne has been the exciting spin-offs which have come from reorganizing the school from a conventional graded operation to a highly unconventional nongraded organization.

Just what is a nongraded school? The nongraded school is a remodeled system of learning designed to accommodate the requirements of all types of individuals. It is built around the learning needs of all youngsters the bright, the average, the uncommitted. And it is based upon the belief that there is nothing so unequal as the equal treatment of unequals. So here at last we have the miracle of unequal students doing unequal things.

NEW CHALLENGE TO TEACHERS

The nongraded school has a special commitment to youngsters who have not learned well in the past. In any school, the more challenging teaching positions should be those concerned with the learning problems of the more indifferent students.

In the nongraded school these positions are made even more challenging in three major ways. (1) The textbook has been abandoned as ineffective. In its place, the teacher is furnished with new materials to jar and excite students' learning. (2) Teachers are encouraged to develop more materials through their own initiative. (3) The response of students who have been rejuvenated for learning by this new process provides great self-satisfaction to teachers who once were content only when teaching talented students.

For the first time expert teachers cease demanding accelerated students. Instead, they are coming forward and saying, "Give me the ungifted and the unlearned, for I am a professional and I can teach—the more difficult the student the better." Teaching reluctant learners in a new setting and under less hackneyed learning conditions makes a vast difference in the attitude of the more talented teachers.

In addition, in gradeless education, the able student has been freed from academic restraint, and has proved that he can learn better when allowed to move ahead on his own. Studying independently, he no longer has to rely upon recourse to teachers. He is able to spend many hours searching and learning on his own before commanding teacher attention. Thus, talented teachers can be released to generate new curricula for reluctant learners. The intent is not to just upgrade students and the organization, but the teachers and the curriculum as well.

STUDENTS SET THEIR OWN PACE

The nongraded program is organized according to the students' general knowledge of each of the basic subjects, with such criteria as the past student performance, style of learning, and student preference also taken into account. Nationally standardized achievement tests are used to measure the students' general knowledge.

The structure of the curriculum is set up so that students phase themselves on the basis of accomplishment in individual courses. It is composed of five verticals of learning:

Phase I (achievement ranges 0 to 20th percentile) is designed for students who need special assistance in small classes.

Phase II (20th to 40th percentile) is planned for students who need more emphasis on the basic skills of a subject.

Phase III (40th to 60th percentile) is arranged for students who have an average background of achievement in the subject area.

Phase IV (60th to 80th percentile) is geared to challenge extremely well prepared students who desire education in depth.

Phase V (80th to 99th percentile) is a learning situation in which students assume complete responsibility for their own learning, and pursue college-level courses while still in high school.

Phase X is used to designate classes such as typing, home economics, etc.

Phase Q is a nongraded component designed to encourage individual fulfillment. Here a student may detour from the conventional class instruction at any point and research an area in which he is deeply and broadly curious. The intent is to allow students to develop creative powers or quest for special knowledge. A student may spend from one to three hours a day in phase Q.

Purpose of the phased learning arrangement is to provide an innovative curriculum which is linked to what the student actually knows, rather than what he is assumed to know because he has been promoted to a particular grade.

RESULTS SO FAR

What have been the results of Melbourne's nongraded program? One indicator is that the drop-out rate has been reduced from 18 per cent in 1959 to 4 percent today, largely as a result of the nongraded program. In addition, the more talented students have reached much higher levels of achievement than before.

The Research Department at the University of Miami has just completed a research study on the performance of students at Melbourne High School compared to a nearby school with the same student population but which is graded in organization. The result of the study conducted that "the Melbourne students scored better in the English, mathematics, science, social studies, and aptitude test sections when compared with similar groups from the comparison high school."

The authors of the report wrote further that, "the most distinctive idea at the school is that students are respected as individuals, whether they are geniuses or slow-learners, and efforts are being made to fit them and their studies together."

INTRODUCING UNCERTAINTY

When the educational process is loosened learning is approached in violently different ways. Subject matter for some students consists of studying the basic skills. For others, subject matter is almost entirely problem-solving.

The object of nongradedness is to place the students in learning situations which are guaranteed to provide a curriculum with different variations. The intent is to jar students by the unexpected, to force them to an unusual or creative curiosity which is excited when a reasonable amount of uncertainty is introduced into the learning situation.

If too little uncertainty is introduced, students may become bored; when too much uncertainty is brought in, they become frustrated. The skillful teacher knows just how much uncertainty is enough.

The significant factor about the new organization for phased learning at Melbourne High School is that any student in any phase can move to a higher phase whenever his achievement warrants a change. The entire effort of the school is in the direction of forward placement.

CASE EXAMPLE: NEW APPROACH TO TECHNICAL TRAINING

(By Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, chairman of the board, Opportunities Industrialization Center)

The educated, well-trained individual in America has little problem in pursuing a career. If anything, his principal headache is choosing between a number of promising job opportunities.

But there is another manpower resource that presents an entirely different scene. There are thousands of untrained, unskilled people who lack only the proper preparation, the encouragement and the opportunity to make a valuable contribution to the economy and the nation.

These are not forgotten people in our society. The nation has been vividly aware of their presence. Rather they have been the "ignored" people, and this pattern of avoiding them has been socially and economically expensive.

OIC ESTABLISHED IN 1964

On the belief not that these people could be helped, but that they could help themselves, the Opportunities Industrialization Center was established in Philadelphia in 1964. The OIC was set up with the help of industry, private contributions and leaders in the underprivileged community itself. Our object was to train and retrain the idle and the underemployed on a qualitative and massive scale in practical preparation for employment in industry.

We felt it was imperative that such a program be developed in the urban areas of America so that Negroes, as well as other citizens, might become more aware of their productive abilities and become directly involved in the economic main stream of the city and the nation.

This OIC concept, now spreading to other cities around the nation, is not a "school" as such, for it has no academic awards.

The diploma at OIC is a job.

When the young people leave the variety of training they receive, their next stop is a regular job in business or industry. The entire focus of the program from good grooming to practical skill training is on the matter of getting a job.

TEACHING "EMPLOYABLE SKILLS"

We started in an abandoned police station in North Philadelphia. We determined to teach only employable skills. We selected drafting, machine shop, power sewing, teletype operation, restaurant practices and other similar efforts. We have now expanded to include a half dozen locations in Philadelphia and added such training as plumbing and heating, refrigeration, merchandising, typing, keypunch, small business management, machine maintenance, electronics and many others.

All of these skills are taught by accredited instructors and the goal in each case is simple and easy to focus upon—get that job, keep it, and grow on it.

The manpower waste and dislocation of the urban labor market is a problem of almost unimaginable proportions. OIC serves both teenagers and adults of almost every educational level. Although it welcomes all who need its services, the vast majority of its applicants are Negroes.

Only three months after OIC classes started, the pressure for registration had become so great that center directors decided to open supplementary training programs in other quarters in the North Philadelphia area. Supplementary classes accommodate as many as 1000 students at a time.

SEVEN OIC AIMS

There are two major elements that must be pursued to establish and carry out a program such as OIC's. There can be no compromise on either. The first point is that you must have a set of clear-cut objectives. You must know what you want to do. And to this point OIC set up seven such aims:

1. To train or retrain thousands of men and women with untapped talents and unknown skills, who are unemployed and underemployed.

2. To involve the total community in the awareness of the value of preparation, thereby stimulating and inspiring individuals to seek higher levels of productivity, creativity and achievement.

3. To develop among our trainees and associates a sense of increased economic security.

4. To foster and nurture a sense of self pride which will give the trainee confidence in himself and enable him to participate with dignity in the total society.

5. To stimulate loyalty and pride in the community . . . a sense of brotherhood involving all religious, racial, cultural, economic, political and other groups.

6. To adopt the training program to meet the challenge of changing technological advances and current needs.

7. To develop an awareness of man's relationships and responsibilities to his fellow man, along with the ability to act in a constructive manner in the community and the world.

THREE-POINT ACTION PLAN

The second major element is that you must decide to do something about it. Lofty aims are fine, but action is essential. Three suggestions help here:

1. Be resourceful. There are facilities available in most urban areas that can be converted to training purposes, and there are usually some sympathetic ears if the story is told properly.

2. Tie in the business community immediately. These are the people with the resources, the intelligence and most important, the jobs. At OIC we train skilled, alert adults and industry has a need for skilled, alert adults. It's a sound marriage. Industry participation in OIC has taken four forms—direct financial assistance, contributions of equipment, employment of trainees, and membership on the advisory groups.

3. Start the action from within. The OIC concept is not one that can be superimposed upon a community. The community leaders must begin it from within. Industry, Government can help later, but first the program must be started at home. The program's ultimate success depends upon the interest and support of the community.

There are numerous examples of OIC's success in those early stages.

For example, of the first 500 "graduates," nearly 90 per cent were placed on good paying, essential jobs. These people have been trained in electronics, sheet metal work, power sewing and a variety of other skills, and many of them have received additional promotions since taking these jobs.

Better than one third of OIC's people, who are being placed in meaningful jobs, are actually coming off the relief rolls, a pattern that any major city burdened by welfare costs would welcome.

INDUSTRY'S SUPPORT

Industry has not only been enthusiastic in its support, but has found OIC to be a creditable, valuable source of manpower.

One of the most splendid bonuses of the program is the "pre-job" training that each student experiences. This special training helps them to speak better, to write better, to dress neatly and to interview for a job.

In summary, the OIC program is one part preparation, one part inspiration, and one part perspiration. We not only believe a young man or young woman must have employable abilities, but that they must believe in themselves and have confidence they can contribute. It has long been our belief that ability and genius is color blind, and once this thought becomes established among those thousands of urban people who lack feelings of equality, then the benefits to all Americans will be substantial.

At OIC we believe we can offer hope and a practical path to follow. The rest is the easiest part—hard work.

Case Example: Quantity and Quality

(By Dr. Clark Kerr, president, University of California)

On one of the warm, sunny days this past September, an 18-year-old Californian became the 87,000th member of the student body of the University of California.

Along with many of his fellow students, he will probably attend graduate school. And even after he has left the University, he will still look to it to keep him abreast of the exploding new knowledge in his field.

But as he enters the University in 1966, his major academic concern will probably center on the quality of the education he will receive. Therein lies one of the most pressing challenges to today's large university—how to provide quality education to the increasing *quantities* of students. In the University of California, we believe we are meeting head-on the two imperatives of *quality* and *quantity*, largely through several innovations at the undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate levels.

QUALITY AT THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL

At the undergraduate level, three major innovations are under way. First, we are organizing our new campuses in such a way as to make the education more personal to the individual student. At Santa Cruz and San Diego, we are setting up the *cluster college* concept, in order to make a large campus seem small and orderly to the student, and to allow a more intimate student-faculty relationship.

These campuses consist of small, but broadly-oriented, undergraduate colleges, all making use of common laboratory, library, and cultural facilities. Students and teachers study and live in the intimate environment of a small school, but have all the advantages of a large university. Ultimately, there will be some 20 or 30 colleges on the Santa Cruz campus, each with about 600 students. San Diego's colleges will be somewhat larger, accommodating about 2300 students each.

Irvine, our third new campus, is set up in such a way that each individual student gets his own tailored program, with great flexibility. There are no across-the-board requirements for anyone. In addition, we have also been experimenting with pass-fail grading to a limited extent at Irvine, and more broadly at one college at Santa Cruz.

Second, throughout the University, we are putting much more emphasis on seminars for undergraduates, following the graduate-school pattern of individualized instruction under close faculty supervision.

The third area of innovation is in the use of technology. We are moving ahead rather rapidly, especially on the new Irvine campus, in the use of computer-assisted instruction. Out of 2000 students at Irvine this fall, 1000 will be taking some work in a course or independent study which is computer-assisted.

As yet, it is still too early to talk about definite results from these three innovations. The San Diego campus opened in the fall of 1964, and Santa Cruz and Irvine opened in 1965. The one indicator we do have is that, thus far, the student drop-out rate for the three new campuses is quite low.

QUALITY AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL

There are now 25,000 graduate students on the University's nine campuses, and by 1975 we expect to have between 40,000 and 45,000. However, to some extent, quality and quantity go together at the graduate level. They are not in conflict. When you have a large graduate enterprise, it makes it possible to have more specialized faculty, and the student can have access to large research laboratories, extensive libraries, internationally known specialists, and all the other facilities that go with size.

As a matter of fact, a recent two-year study of graduate education at 106 major universities by the American Council on Education found the Berkeley campus to be "the best-balanced, distinguished university in the country."

Much of the innovation in the University's graduate education has been a beginning toward a more relaxed, individualized doctoral program. There is a great deal of ferment in the graduate curricula of the various departments, with a re-examination of the requirements for a doctoral dissertation to see if they can be improved or changed without altering the quality.

One of the innovations we are concerned with is a shortening of the time of study for graduate degrees. Most doctoral programs in social science and humanities, for example, require too long a period of study. And often, there seems to be a negative relationship between the time spent in a graduate program and the intellectual growth of the student.

Therefore, we are currently considering a new degree on the Berkeley campus for those who do not choose, or are unable for one reason of another, to go all the way to the traditional Doctor of Philosophy degree, complete with thesis. This new degree is the Doctor of Arts degree, which would involve the same studies as the Ph. D., but would require no dissertation.

In engineering, however, where there has historically been a great deal of emphasis on the Master's level, we are shifting to the Doctorate level, to the Doctor of Engineering degree, which is a much more professional degree. This does require greater specialization.

QUALITY AT THE POST-GRADUATE LEVEL

One important role the University will be called on to fill increasingly in the coming years is in the area of post-graduate study. With the rapidly expanding body of knowledge in every field, many of our large corporations are becoming universities in themselves, and they are turning to us for help. Similarly, more and more individuals are turning to the University to improve their skills after graduation. We have particular requests for continuing education from lawyers, doctors, and engineers, for example.

University extension, therefore, is being investigated closely as a means of taking education into corporations and into individual homes around the state. It may be possible in the near future to put whole courses on audio tape cartridges for broad distribution. Or further out, we may see similar developments in television, where the doctor, businessman, teacher, or other professional man can slide a tape cartridge into his television set and receive instruction in the new developments in his field right in his home or office.

FUTURE UNIVERSITY EMPHASIS

For the future, I would identify six principal areas which the large university—and especially the University of California—must concentrate on if it is to continue to meet the quality-quantity challenge.

The first of these is the eternal problem of getting enough money. A second is to maintain the quality of the faculty, and to maintain our current student-faculty ratio of approximately 16 to 1.

A third need is to make the quality of undergraduate life more effective. How do we make residence halls more than hotels? What cultural stimulation can we provide?

As students come to the University better prepared and more serious about their academic studies than those who came before them, they want a greater voice in their academic lives and in the nature of the institution. Often this voice can be quite helpful, although the faculty must make the final decision.

Fourth, the University must maintain contact with the population as a whole. Many people have seen science bring so much change to their lives that they have become "gun-shy" with respect to new ideas. And they are beginning to look at the University—which is sort of a "machine for change"—with some suspicion. This involves not only the University's scientific discoveries, but also the new activism by students for social change, which is especially hard for the public to accept.

A fifth major need is to determine exactly how technology can be used by the University in its education at all levels. We are already using technology extensively, especially at Irvine, but I think we have barely scratched the surface. What will a university library look like in 1980, for example? Will it have books, or will it be mainly a bank of computerized information from which a student receives what he needs via a television screen? We need to be searching out answers to questions like these.

Finally, a sixth need has to do with the administration of a large university, or any large enterprise, for that matter.

It isn't enough to have small, fairly autonomous units, unless they are also *diverse* units. In engineering, for example, although each of our general campuses will have a College of Engineering, each will have a different emphasis—agricultural engineering at Davis, aeronautical at U.C.L.A., electrical at Berkeley, environmental engineering at Riverside, etc.

SKILLS TO SERVE SOCIETY

In the late 1700's, the first of the modern economists, Adam Smith, wrote that the true wealth of any nation essentially rested on the skill of its people. His thought was that the secret of national wealth was not in natural resources, or climate, or geography, but in human capital.

In California, we feel that this theory has been proved fairly conclusively. The resources of the state are not particularly outstanding, by any means. In fact, water resources in Southern California are quite deficient. Yet per capita income in California is about 20 per cent higher than the average for the rest of the country, and a high proportion of America's scientifically-oriented industry is located here.

Clearly, the state's economy rests in large measure on its highly-regarded system of education, on the skills of its people. We are hopeful that we can continue to keep it that way.

Case Example: International Management Development

(By Frank Pace, Jr., president, International Executive Service Corps)

In the incredible spectrum of long-range problems which face the United States, the widening economic gap between the "have" and "have-not" nations must be placed close to the top. We have spent many billions of dollars in the effort to close it.

Several years ago, David Rockefeller, recognizing that money alone could never solve this problem, described "managerial experience" as a basic and urgent need to bridge the gap among all nations. He issued a challenge to the private sector in the United States to provide talent to help guide business management in the developing countries. Although it was to be a business-to-business venture, the proposed program, because of its public nature and magnitude, would require public support.

So, at an historic meeting in Washington in 1964, The International Executive Service Corps was launched. Although it received Federal support and the President's blessing, it was understood that the Corps' operation was to be completely private.

Since no program comparable to IESC had been attempted previously, there were many unanswered questions. Developing nations, we realized, were not accustomed to paying for aid from the U.S. Would we be able to recruit volunteer businessmen without pay beyond their expenses? How long should an assignment last to be most beneficial to a client firm? Were foreign businesses really interested in this kind of service?

Today, after almost two years of operation, these questions have been answered. We do charge a modest monthly fee and air fare for our man and his wife. The foreign firms are willing to meet these costs and the relationship is the better for this arrangement. We have found in seeking volunteers that the United States businessman is patriotic and unselfish—ready to serve his country by serving others.

TIME WILL BE THE JUDGE

A four-month stay for the adviser has usually proven adequate. In fact, returning executives have consistently cautioned us against longer assignments, since our purpose is to help the client run his own operation. Given a longer period, the U.S. executive would be managing, not guiding.

In our working relationships with these host companies there have been some immediate and spectacular successes in terms of cost reduction and increased profits or growth. But the material impact of most of our efforts may not be felt for a year or more. Time will be our judge.

The problem of selection of IESC volunteers has proven to be more psychological than technical. We have not sent abroad a single man who has not been fully qualified technically. In each case, the adviser's experience is in much the same business as the client's—perhaps as a top executive in a U.S. corporation, perhaps as a middle management specialist, sometimes as a founder and head of his own enterprise.

The real question however, is whether he can win the confidence of his opposite number in the company to which he is assigned. Almost every client has said, in effect, "Don't send us a businessman who will tell us how you do it in the U.S. Send us a man who can understand our strength and our limitations and who can build a bridge between your managerial technology and ours."

When we find such a man, even the lack of foreign language qualifications proves to be no barrier to true understanding.

A FAVORABLE RECEPTION

Client reactions have been almost uniformly favorable—often enthusiastic. They have recognized the human as well as the technical contribution of their IESC advisers. In fact, foreign businesses have responded beyond our greatest expectations. After only 24 months of operation, we have approved over 400 applications from overseas firms for U.S. business volunteers.

Likewise, the number of requests for a volunteer to return for a follow-up visit is increasing. Recognition of our performance with individual concerns is even bringing their suppliers and customers to us. And many of the practices which we have introduced are being discussed in the business community. So although our operation will never be massive, it is like a stone thrown in a pool—creating an ever-widening impact.

REVERSE BENEFITS OF IESC

What does the International Executive Service Corps gain for American businessmen, American businesses, and America?

We have requests from universities for our returning executives to spend a week on their campuses discussing their experiences with the students. Not only the discussions themselves, but the knowledge that these successful businessmen have served as volunteers, will have a valuable impact on the educational community. Also we hope that case studies of our executives' business experiences can be made available to this country's business schools.

For the retired man the benefits are obvious. With lengthening age spans, improving health, and increasingly early retirement, there is a gap in the American career system that leisure pursuits do not fill. That IESC is one answer is proven by the fact that almost every returnee describes his tour as one of the outstanding experiences of his life, and almost to the man, volunteers for service again.

Although the larger number of our volunteers are retired, about 15 per cent are active members of middle management. We hope to increase this to about 30 per cent, as U.S. companies begin to work this operation into their personnel programs.

So far, General Electric, IBM, ATT, Detroit Edison, and Chase Manhattan Bank have begun to work with us on a regular basis over an extended period. Several other companies have cooperated on the basis of specific requests.

We ask this not as a contribution on the corporations' part, but in the honest belief that their men can get experience here that is available nowhere else. In really getting to know a country, its business people and practices, a man can learn more on a four-month IESC assignment than in two years of reading reports. Further, the reservoir of good will he builds for himself and his company is enormous.

When I suggested to David Rockefeller that we needed a middle-management Chase man for a foreign assignment, I was aware that international know-how was in the shortest supply of all. "Why not take a top-notch stateside man and turn him into an internationalist?" I asked. So today, after two months of intensive preparation in the Chase foreign department, a Chase man is working with a top bank in Paraguay to upgrade its management practices; at the same time, a truly understanding international businessman is being created.

NO RULES OR PRECEDENTS

Finally, in the American corporation's constant search for the right top officers, one of the main requirements is the ability to make sound decisions where there are no precedents. Where our executives go, there are no rules, no precedents, and innumerable danger points. The middle-management volunteer who successfully meets this challenge returns a broader and wiser man. And his company, with the benefit of our performance assessment, has a broader base for evaluating him.

As the IESC program grows, it would seem reasonable for U.S. businesses to take advantage of it as a training ground. If they do, the company, the IESC, and the entire international business community will profit.

In less than two years of operation, the IESC has given true promise of significant achievement. It holds promise for effective working partnerships between Government and business in other undertakings. It can yield dividends of experience and goodwill to American business. It can provide fresh fulfillment to men who may have thought they were no longer needed. And primarily, as a private institution, it can contribute to economic growth of the developing nations, and thereby further one of the aims of U.S. foreign policy.

Above all, the International Executive Service Corps can achieve these ends by drawing on the hearts and minds of people—not by simply applying more machines and more money. It is nice to know that people still count.

The New Education: Teaching Tomorrow Today

Moderator Keppel: Sister Jacqueline and gentlemen, the editors of Forum have asked us to present our views on the major challenges facing education in the years ahead, and what can be done to meet these challenges.

As we begin our discussion, it might be useful to cite some of the raw statistics for the period 1965–75, to help put the "quantity" challenge in perspective. In the next decade, approximately 30 million young men and women will leave school to embark upon the adventure of looking for their first jobs. Unless current projections are changed, at least 2 million of these youngsters may never enter high school, and at least another 7 million may not receive a diploma.

Thus, nearly one third of the crop of this American resource may be unprepared to make the contribution to the economy that the nation will require. Surely as important, they may well lead unsatisfying and drab lives, confined to uninteresting jobs and inadequate wages.

The demands on education are, therefore, huge and they grow increasingly urgent. The pressures of our revolutionary age, coupled with the vast numbers of students who must equip themselves to handle these pressures, call upon us as never before in our history to give meaning, stability, and continuity to the role of education in the future.

Sister Jacqueline, as President of Webster College, and perhaps more important for our purposes today, as an educator, what do you see as the great challenges facing education today?

Sister Jacqueline: I would like to address myself to what may first seem to be a general, perhaps philosophical, aspect of this problem. Yet I am convinced it is one of the most critical.

We must take a broader view of the role and meaning of education than we have in the past. And by "we" I mean the whole society, not only a group we call the "experts."

Modern civilization is really a laboratory for people learning, serving, acting, reacting, and pushing the limits of the known—using the patterns of history to suggest ways to reshape the future.

I think we can no longer make such categorical distinctions as the difference between formal and informal education. Where and when does school life end and work begin? We must accept the reality of man learning as long as he is man.

THE "UNIVERSE-CITY"

As we consider the problems in educating great numbers of people, we cannot view the teaching and learning process as simply training and indoctrination. Modern man today lives in a "universe-city." Only if we allow, encourage, and press everyone, taxi-cab drivers and suburban housewives, union shop stewards and corporation executives, altar boys and archbishops to share in the practical scholarship of this universe-city will we ever fulfill the potentials of education.

The classroom and textbook will continue to be important only if we recognize that they are only one part of a continual, lifelong learning process. And education with a capital "E" will continue to be important only if we respect the potentials within all groups to share in team teaching and group learning for people of all ages.

Moderator Keppel: John, as President of Columbia Teachers College, you are helping to prepare the new generation of educators. What do you consider to be our important priorities?

Dr. Fischer: I agree with Sister Jacqueline that one of the major difficulties will be to avoid narrowing the purposes of education. From the standpoint of education, developing "manpower" is really a matter of finding better ways to release and cultivate the power of the individual person. To assume that we can meet our needs simply by preparing larger masses of people for various employment categories would serve neither the economy nor the individual.

Since no one can hope to possess full knowledge in any field, a principal aim of education should be to give the student competence in academic disciplines. The most important vocational skill that any school can help to foster is the skill of learning.

Another challenge is to expand educational opportunity. Secondary education, which is now universal only in theory, must be made so in fact. Collegiate and other post-high school education must be made available to many more than now receive it, possibly to two-thirds or more of our young people the proportion that now graduates from high school.

MEETING THE QUANTITY CHALLENGE

Moderator Keppel: Sam Gould, as President of the State University of New York, you certainly have a great deal of experience in educating large numbers of students. I presume you feel this is one of the major challenges for the future.?

Dr. Gould: I do indeed, Frank. The State University of New York will have about 260,000 full-time students, spread over more than 60 campuses, by 1974.

Yet the expanding number of students in the 1970's should neither dilute nor lower the quality of education. This is not only unthinkable, it is unnecessary.

In fact, the very reverse may be true. The pressures of numbers may well cause us to change our traditional notions about how education should be conducted. They may even cause us to do what we should have done more carefully long since—namely, to probe deeply into the learning process itself and to take advantage of our findings by reshaping the present patterns by which students and teachers interact. I would hope that we would see developing a new kind of teacher and a new kind of student, both of whom would see acquisition of knowledge merely as the starting point toward true learning.

There is another challenge which is equally important. It is one of selectivity. Man's knowledge is now doubling every ten years. In addition, a great deal of what he has accepted as authentic knowledge is rapidly becoming obsolete.

This means that we will have to develop an awareness of what knowledge is pertinent and relative and should be retained, and what knowledge should be discarded. It means also that new patterns of teaching must concentrate more upon the student's ability to search out the knowledge he requires rather than having that knowledge directly disseminated to him. As far as I am concerned, this is what education should always have been.

THE GOVERNMENT VIEWPOINT

Moderator Keppel. Thus far, we've discussed some important educational challenges from the professional educator viewpoint. Two of our participants, though not immediately within the educational circle, nevertheless are directly concerned with education and manpower problems. Congressman Goodell, your membership on the House Education and Labor Committee keeps you abreast of the Nation's pressing educational needs. What do you see as the most important of these?

Mr. Goodell. I'm especially concerned with finding ways to overcome the social and intellectual deficiencies of the millions of our very young children, in order to give them a real chance to profit from our educational system.

Each year about 1.1 million youngsters from poor families reach five years of age. And when a child comes from a family where he has had no language orientation, and where he doesn't understand the symbols used by the teachers, he finds himself very disabled.

That kind of youngster is off the track when he first goes to school and he may well stay off the track throughout his school years, until he either drops out or completes school as a functional illiterate. As a result, these children continue a cycle of poverty that magnifies the social problems with which we are all too familiar.

The only major Federal effort to stimulate a breaking of this cycle has come through Project Head Start. Some additional funds are also available under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. But the total effort is negligible compared to what is needed.

Beyond the pre-school area, I think our entire educational system must be oriented better to the continuing revolution in technology. One important aspect of this involves the education and quality of the teachers. We need better programs to enable teachers to upgrade their skills on a regular basis, perhaps every four or five years, paying them their salaries and expenses. It is no longer enough for a teacher to teach the rest of his life on the basis of what he learned in school.

Dr. Fischer: Let me agree with Mr. Goodell on the critical importance of the early years in a child's life. But I would add that unless the good start is followed by an equally good program in every succeeding school year, the early benefits are almost certain to be lost.

Moderator Keppel: Devereux Josephs, as a former Chairman of the President's Commission on Education and as a spokesman from the business community, where do you feel we should focus our attention?

Mr. Josephs: I think you have all defined the major challenges pretty well. But one thing no one touched on is the need for a fundamental change in social attitudes toward the learning process.

There was a time when a "highbrow" was almost considered dangerous, you know. It seems to me that we are hopefully entering a period when learning and continuing education will be more "stylish" or socially acceptable.

In addition, it is becoming more apparent that education in our society can no longer be left solely to the educators. The influential public is going to have to take a lot more personal interest in the *procedures* of education than they do today. I think we are pretty much agreed on what we want education to be in the 1970's, what the challenges and obstacles are on the way to that goal. But how do we overcome these obstacles? What are the steps we can take to bring our goals about? As far as I'm concerned, one of the biggest challenges is to identify these steps and procedures.

HOW DO WE GET THERE?

Moderator Keppel: Thank you, Dev. I think you have used a word which may be the key word for the rest of our discussion—the word "procedures." It suggests the essentials of the question: "How do we get there?" What are the procedures we have to adopt to make education what we know it must be in 1975?

Dr. Gould: One urgent need is more and better educational research. To put it in the simplest terms, we need to find out more about how people learn.

It is quite obvious, for example, that the way people learn by television has not really been established in any definite way. Therefore, if we are going to invest millions of dollars and millions of hours of energy, and if we are going to put the lives of our young people on the line, then we had better find out what takes place in learning. I'm not convinced that it is impossible to find out.

One area that has always interested me very much is the interpersonal relationship of the faculty member and the student. The idea has always been that unless the faculty member is sitting hand in hand with the student, hour after hour, nothing is really happening that is educationally worthwhile. I'm perfectly willing to agree that this is *probably* true, but I'd like to see a little more proof. I've had personal experiences—as some of you may have had—where every personal contact I had with a faculty member set me back about six months. I just don't think we know enough about what kind of students and what kind of faculty members should have close working relationships, and what kind should not.

Sister Jacqueline: I think we need a great deal more research in all kinds of "way-out" ways to teach people. This is the kind of research that is in the most danger right now.

We have to have more of the kind of R&D that industry has capitalized on, where they do way-out studies and know full well when they start the research project that they may have to throw out 90 per cent of their findings.

Dr. Fischer: I would add that just doing *more* research will not be enough. We can't assume that the knowledge explosion we have seen in space technology can be repeated in education merely by pouring in more and more money. What we need is more imaginative and better designed investigation than we have had.

Sister Jacqueline: But the imaginative people must be supported in some continuing way.

Rep. Goodell: That's right. It's going to take more than just additional Federal funding.

I think one of the biggest problems is overcoming the reluctance to apply the results of educational research at the State and local level. Unless we begin to see an educational ferment at the local level, all the Federal efforts will be for naught.

HOW MUCH SHOULD INDUSTRY TEACH?

Dr. Gould: One area we do not seem to know too much about is how much we in education should teach and how much of the teaching should be left to industry. My own view is that the schools should teach the principles and industry should take care of the rest. The work-study concept where students work for a quarter or a semester and study for another is one way to approach this question. But there must be others. This is an area of research that has hardly been touched and I think it could be enormously valuable.

Rep. Goodell: I'm not sure whether this is the school's responsibility or industry's responsibility, but too often the product of our secondary schools is unable to qualify for a productive job in industry. The skills he learned in school are obsolete by the time he graduates, because the production methods in industry have passed him by.

So I would agree that we ought to find out more about what the educational system should teach and what should be left to industry to teach.

Moderator Keppel: Closely associated with Dr. Gould's desire for studies of how people learn, is curriculum research what is taught in a school and how it is taught. We are already learning that children can learn earlier and better, provided we know what to teach and how to teach it.

What we are reaching for here is not just a few items of new materials and equipment, but *systems* of materials for the use of teachers and learners including relating the books of the little red school house to the audio-visual materials, computers, programmed instruction, and other things that were never dreamed about in the little red school house.

This kind of study on the *systems* of education is perhaps where industrial researchers can make the greatest contribution to education the kind of systems analysis which includes all these tools in the proper sequence.

EDUCATIONAL "THINK TANKS"?

Mr. Josephs: Is there anything in education that corresponds to the RAND Corporation's kind of "think tank"? These types of organizations have done a lot of excellent research for the U.S. Military, free from the cliches and habits of the past.

Moderator Keppel: There is nothing like this in education today that I know of. Do you know of anything? What do the rest of you think? And would it be a good idea, anyway?

Dr. Gould: If an independent research organization could be established with sufficient financial backing to research thoroughly some of these important areas without having to produce an immediate return, it would be a great step forward.

Someone, somewhere, ought to be looking far ahead all the time, without having to worry about what's happening today or next week. So many of us, you know, are so busy putting out little fires here and there that we don't get a chance to dream a little about where the world of education is headed.

Moderator Keppel: Presumably such an idea would have to be backed by all three sectors: education, government, business: Is this correct?

Mr. Josephs: Absolutely. It would become suspect if it were not.

Sister Jacqueline: I agree, because I welcome any kind of pluralistic input to education. But I would hate to see us let the systems design man from a "think tank" take over not only the implementation decisions, but also the decisions of the policymakers.

For example, I'm one who feels that along with the Departments of State and Defense, we also need organizations like the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions on the West Coast, to give us a check and balance.

Now, believe me, I wouldn't want either of these two organizations to be directing defense or foreign policy. But I do want a system of systems, not something that is grand-architected from above, with the parts passed out.

The only thing I fear in both the body Politic—with a capital "P"—and the body Education—with a capital "E"—is that the systems mentality will become the new arch-priest of society.

Mr. Josephs: Well, I don't feel there is much danger of that happening. Maybe 20 years from now, we may have to convene a panel to discuss how to get the educational world out of the hands of the systems analysts, but I would worry about that later on. I think it is more important to try to capitalize now on a willingness to see some change.

Moderator Keppel: One of the things we seemed to agree on in our opening statements was that it is possible to combine quality and quantity in education. This was a matter of the gravest doubt in the whole world until very recently.

QUANTITY OUR GREATEST ALLY

Sister Jacqueline: I love what Dr. Gould said about quantity being our greatest ally, because it is forcing us to let the individual student take responsibility for his own learning. If we begin to get students to do that, this will help some administrators like you and me let the encrusted academicians take their chances and be forced to change. And it will also force us to change.

Dr. Gould: I might add a footnote to that. Just as important as the pressure of numbers is the pressure of the so-called student activist movement in this country, which you touched on.

I recently took part in a student leadership conference with students from all over the State University, at which I am afraid I probably said some very revolutionary things, as far as some of my faculty and other administrators are concerned. I urged the students to take a good solid look at the curriculum in which they were engaged, to tell those in authority whether or not it is time to be teaching something else, or teaching the same thing differently.

I don't know whether or not they will take up that challenge, but I have an idea that I shall be hearing very soon from some of my colleagues who may be most unhappy over the fact that I have encouraged students to do this.

But this is really the way change is going to take place. And it is going to take place regardless of what the "establishment" wants.

THE STUDENT ACTIVIST MOVEMENT

In fact, I think the student activist movement is the greatest breath of fresh air we have had in education recently, even with all the problems and naive opinions that it reflects. Certainly I'm not advocating that all the curricula of our State University be thrown in the ashcan, or that it be turned over completely to the students. But their complaints do indicate a dissatisfaction based on reality, which all too often the educational profession is unwilling to face up to.

Moderator Keppel: Are you suggesting then that it would be desirable for colleges and universities consciously to go about the task of creating a larger voice on the part of the learner in what he is taught?

Dr. Gould: I am indeed. It is not only desirable, philosophically, but I think we are sticking our heads in the sand if we don't offer to take the students into our counsel and use constructively the ideas they have to offer, rather than waiting for the roof to come off some day, as it will.

The problem is that it is very hard to get young people to understand that they must be patient. They want *instant* democracy and they do not realize that there isn't any such thing, that democracy is a slow, tortuous process that is still developing. This is where we get the real abrasiveness between the so-called adult generation and the activist generation of students. The end results—the changes they seek—are not going to be as immediate as they might expect them to be.

Sister Jacqueline: Nor is the result going to be as gradual as some of us think either.

Dr. Gould: That's right, too.

PRESSURE FOR CHANGE

Mr. Josephs: I think that unless you can get the opinion leaders of the community—those outside the world of education to accept the need for change, the changes will be very slow in coming.

I suspect that the heads of some of our largest corporations, for example, probably take a very dim view of the student activist movement. And until they understand the reasons why students ought to take a look at the curriculum—do they need 794 courses—there really won't be enough effective pressure for change. If there is a proper "beef" on the part of the student, I don't believe the older people in the community know this yet, or at least they haven't accepted it. Unless we get the leaders of the community involved, we are really all talking to ourselves.

Dr. Gould: I think you put your finger on the real heart of the problem.

Sister Jacqueline: I agree. But we also have to demonstrate to the student that we at least hear what he is saying. Only then will we have a chance to get at his yearning to learn. Only if we open up the system and let him see that there is no absolute morality, no absolute truth, but only an awful responsibility to try to find it—only then I think can we open up the dialogue and have the student share responsibility with us.

Moderator Keppel: What we're saying, I think, is that the educational community suffers from the problem of communicating with others, not only with government and business, but sometimes as Sister Jacqueline says—with students as well. Is this correct?

Dr. Gould: I believe there is more to it than that. We also have a problem communicating with ourselves. In research, for example, a physicist or a chemist can usually come up with a statement of his findings, and other physicists or chemists can see quite specifically what he is talking about. This is not quite so true in education.

I have had occasion recently to read several proposals for research projects submitted by relatively eminent educators. I have worked all my life in education and I admit, quite frankly, that I couldn't understand what these proposals were all about. I recognize that in educational research you cannot draw the same kind of conclusions that you can in the physical sciences. There are more gray areas. But we *can* expect the same kind of rigorous approach, the same kind of effort, and the same kind of stretching of the mind that we see in the other sciences. And I don't see that happening.

Moderator Keppel: One solution to this communications problem could be to encourage and improve the flow of personnel among education, government at all levels, and private enterprise. All of these sectors are searching for solutions to education's challenges, yet none of them thoroughly understands each other's language. Neither education nor government nor industry has had the intimate experience with the problems of the others to assure the kind of teamwork needed.

I might add that a comparable need exists between the federal and state departments of education, and between local education and the colleges.

Mr. Josephs: When I first became involved in educational affairs in 1946, this type of interchange would have been very difficult to stimulate. Educators had a great fear of industrialists, who still had the old cartoon-type of image. Because of their unfamiliarity with the world of education, the industrialists were also wary of the educators.

Today there is a great difference of attitude. There are many more people who are ready to move from industry to education to government and back again.

WE HAD TO GIVE THE MONEY BACK

Dr. Gould: I agree that things have changed in this area. I can recall a situation eight or nine years ago at a small college where I was, in which we set up a program for faculty members to take time off and go out in industry and work for a while. We had about $1 million behind the program, but we couldn't get any faculty members to go. We had to give the money back and you know how that hurts a college president!

I would say, however, that this type of program could be emphasized today with much more success.

I would like to suggest that at every educational conference some kind of representation from business or industry be included. I think these meetings should be planned in such a way as to provide a better interchange between government and industry and education. Maybe this means having businessmen on the list of speakers or maybe it means something else. But at least a conscious effort should be made in this direction.

Mr. Josephs: This problem of communication also applies to the average private citizen too. The public is beginning to be much more interested in education than ever before. We need to plan a much better way of capitalizing on this interest and on their willingness to get involved. To put it simply, we need a much better answer when somone says, "Well now, tomorrow morning, what can I do?"

Rep. Goodell: One of the things the private citizen can do tomorrow morning is to take an interest in his own local school system and be sure that it has the support it needs.

It's very easy to have a dead hand of negativism in a community's educational system, mainly because the negative people speak up. Those who are anxious to promote and expand the educational opportunities too often are quiet and do nothing to help determine the direction of their local school system. The biggest role the interested private citizen can perform is to make sure that the positive elements are encouraged to speak up and act.

Dr. Fischer: The private citizen—and the corporation—can also play an important role in the financial support of higher education. Only with enough private funding can our independent institutions maintain and strengthen their independence. Unless they get this kind of support, they may become mere weather vanes responding to whatever short-term interests happen to be popular in successive sessions of the Congress. To serve the country best—even to use public funds most effectively—the independent university must never be forced to depend on public funds as its main support.

"WINDS OF CHANGE" ARE BLOWING

Moderator Keppel: Well, as Dev has said, and to use Harold MacMillan's phrase, "the winds of change" are indeed blowing today. One senses them in industry, in education, and in government. We have suggested a number of procedures which could be adopted in the next several years to take advantage of these winds of change to get us from the educational world of 1966 to that of 1975.

One of these is certainly more and better educational research, with emphasis on the question of how people learn. Another is better long-range planning, and perhaps a "systems" type of analysis of education's needs and of ways to improve it.

We also seem to agree that educational institutions should consciously seek out the attitudes of the learner on what he is being taught, to make constructive use of the new student activism. Finally, we have suggested better communication within the educational community, and among education, business, and government including more interchange of personnel.

Dr. Gould: I have one more to add to that list. I think we need to stimulate a new responsibility for education in the home, because this is where youngsters of the future are going to get a good part of their education. I am not naive enough to believe that there will be sufficient physical facilities in 1980 or 1985 to take care of all the millions of new students and all the millions of those who will be continuing their education—at least not in the same manner as we do now, for the same number of hours. Therefore a certain amount of the work that is now done in school will have to be done at home.

If this is true, the parent must be aware of it. And he must be willing to involve himself. Will he look upon this prospect with horror, or as an opportunity? I don't think anyone knows, and I don't think much is being done to find out.

Sister Jacqueline: I can just imagine the problems this kind of situation would create. Today, you know, many teachers are saying, "Now, don't read at home, because you'll undo everything we have taught."

I'm afraid we are going to have to tolerate a lot more "messiness" in our educational structure in the years ahead.

Dr. Gould: I think that's a pretty good slogan, Sister Jacqueline, in terms of a lot of things we discussed today. We *are* going to have to tolerate a lot more "messiness" in many more areas. But that is one of the characteristics that is basic to democracy.

THE GEORGIAN REPUBLIC

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1918, 49 years ago, the people of the independent nation of Georgia proclaimed their independence in Tiflis, the capital of the Georgian Republic. The official act of independence was proclaimed by the Georgian Parliament, meeting in that city as duly constituted representatives of the people. Unfortunately, the Russian Communists overran their nation before their independence could be maintained.

I should like to remind the Members, Mr. Speaker, that the Georgians have a long and honorable history. The people have been Christians since the fourth century and have maintained their national identity throughout the ages. After their forcible integration into the Russian Empire, they developed and to this day maintain an ardent anti-Russian nationalism. A democratic-minded people, they are still vehemently opposed to the dictatorial policies of communism.

The people of Georgia have persistently maintained their unique nationalistic spirit since their reannexation to the Soviet Union, and are looking forward to the day when legitimate freedom and independence shall be restored to their land. This year throughout the free world Georgian leaders are holding commemorative meetings to keep alive the flame of hope in the hearts of their people to maintain their persistent struggle against Communist oppression.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that the freedom of the United States and all parts of the free world remain threatened as long as the Communists maintain their imperial policy and their aggressive designs aimed at world control. The legitimate nationalism of the people of Georgia and other captive lands under communism represent the true weakness in the Red apparatus.

We must encourage leaders of the Georgian people to continue to work for the restoration of freedom of their people, realizing as they do that as freedom is restored to their land, it will undoubtedly be restored to their neighboring states in Eastern Europe which share their present confinement in the Soviet colonial empire.

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, May 28 will mark the 49th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Armenian people from Soviet and Turkish domination. The Armenians united their forces in an attempt to maintain a free Armenia on May 28, 1918. They were not able to achieve their goal, however, due to the fortunes of war, the indifference of World War I Allied Powers, and their statesmen.

It is important to note the vigorous support which Americans of Armenian extraction have been giving to the creation of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations. They have recognized the practical contribution which such a committee would make to exposing Soviet colonialism over Armenia and the neighboring countries under Soviet domination.

Mr. Speaker, as we address ourselves to the Armenian question which typifies the failure of 20th-century diplomacy, we note that the Soviet Union is actively involved in maintaining tension in the Near East, just as it is greatly a chief instigator of aggression against South Vietnam. The apathy which too many Americans display toward the international Communist conspiracy would not be a problem if they understood and appreciated the suffering of the people of Armenia and the other captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. It is also important for us to note that the Armenians have a dual problem in that they have yet to receive justice after suffering from the persecution and genocide conducted by the Turks.

Armenian-Americans have made tremendous contributions to our national political, economic, educational, and artistic successes. As loyal Americans they have maintained a very proper and steadfast interest in the restoration of freedom to the brave Armenian people still held in bondage. On this anniversary of Armenian independence, let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of Armenia and all other peoples who are still deprived of the right of self-determination.

EXCESSIVE MEAT IMPORTS MUST BE CURTAILED

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to control the excessive importation of meat and meat products into this country.

U.S. livestock producers are faced with increasing quantities of price-depressing meat imports, and our present import quota law is not adequate to provide the protection which is needed in this situation.

Domestic beef cattle producers are working diligently to do something about the supply and quality problems here at home which they all realize must be corrected. It will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, however, for them to solve these domestic problems satisfactorily, as long as the import volume is allowed to fluctuate as widely as it has been.

Meat imports subject to U.S. import quota restrictions in 1966 were more than 34 percent higher than in 1965, and during the first 3 months of this year, these imports were over 22 percent greater than the comparable period in 1966.

Livestock producers have been faced with an onslaught of difficulties. Rising costs have forced up their production expenses and narrowed their profit margins. Their long-range planning has been upset by the Agriculture Department's recent livestock estimate errors. And, on top of this, increased meat imports have adversely affected the prices they receive for their livestock in the market. Clearly, it is time to take action wherever we can to improve conditions in this important sector of our agricultural economy.

The bill which I am introducing today would do several things to help remedy this serious import problem. The 10-percent "over-ride" provision would be removed, making the quota level, in effect, the trigger level. The base period for which quotas are calculated would be shifted from 1959–63 to 1958–62, eliminating 1963, when imports were especially high. This would have the effect of reducing the base by about 20 percent.

Certain meats purchased by the Defense Department with appropriated funds for use in combat zones would be included under the quota, and the quotas would be set up on a quarterly basis. In addition, the President would have the discretion to add several other types and varieties of meat to the quota should circumstances require it.

Meat imports have a significant price-depressing effect on our domestic markets, and are contributing to the steadily worsening economic crisis in U.S. agriculture, evidenced by the farm parity ratio which currently stands at a depression-year low of 72. As I have repeatedly emphasized, this constitutes a state of emergency in our farm economy, and immediate, effective action to help alleviate this situation is vital.

MINK INDUSTRY BEING "PELTED" FROM ABROAD

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota mink industry, which stands second in national mink production, is being pelted by rapidly rising foreign imports. So are hundreds of mink producers in other States.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the necessity for establishing an annual quota on foreign mink pelts. Imports of mink last year increased 16 percent over 1965, helping drive domestic mink pelt prices down about $4.50 a skin.

The National Board of Fur Farm Organization has estimated mink imports last year captured 41.92 percent of the American market. The total volume of 1966 mink imports—5,675,000 pelts—amounts to the total U.S. production as recently as 1959.

When foreign importers take over this much of the domestic market, it's plain the future business of domestic producers is jeopardized. American mink ranchers have spent over $22 million since World War II trying to build up a healthy market for their pelts. To permit foreign mink producers to usurp this market to the tune of $73 million in 1966 while American mink growers have been fighting soaring production costs is unfair.

Minnesotans alone account for more than 12 percent of U.S. mink production, providing in excess of one million pelts a year. They, and other mink farmers of the Nation, deserve the protection of legislation such as I have introduced.

My bill would place a yearly quota calculated on domestic consumption on foreign mink shipped into the United States.

applicable to both dressed and raw skins, it would also require a 50-percent ad valorem duty on imports in excess of the quota allotment.

It is my hope the Congress will act with facility upon this legislation.

CIVIL RIGHTS INJUNCTIVE RELIEF ACT OF 1967

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, along with several Republican colleagues, I am introducing today the Civil Rights Injunctive Relief Act of 1967.

This bill, which is identical to title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1966 as passed by this House last year, would safeguard the constitutional guarantees of free speech and the right of assembly of those engaged in promoting the civil rights of all Americans.

Specifically, it would enable an individual citizen or the Attorney General to institute a civil action in the Federal courts to seek a temporary restraining order or a permanent injunction against any persons who plan to prevent or hinder the exercise of free speech or free assembly by civil rights spokesmen or workers.

This is the so-called old title III provision that Republicans in the Congress have sought to write into civil rights legislation since 1957 and that my able colleague from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] introduced earlier in this session. Regrettably, the President did not include these provisions in the civil rights legislation that he has recommended to the Congress this year.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to wait for further unrest and disorder during the coming months before we enact this long-overdue measure which will clearly protect the rights of those who, acting fully within the law, attempt to secure for all Americans the equality of opportunity which they have been so long denied.

STANS TELLS FEARS OF BIG GOVERNMENT

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there is an old adage about not being able to see the forest for the trees. This certainly applies to the manner in which new programs are authorized and old ones expanded, each considered independently and without regard for the others. And as we act on the separate appropriation bills it is invariably without regard to the sum total of all the appropriations.

That we may have some conception as to where we are headed under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the Record an article from the Chicago Tribune of May 22 which embodies excerpts from a speech recently made by Maurice H. Stans, former Budget Director, whom I consider the most informed person in the United States today on our national fiscal policy.

Stans Tells Fears of Big Government

(Excerpts from a recent talk by Maurice H. Stans, Budget Bureau Director in the Eisenhower administration, now president of the securities firm of Glore Forgan, Wm. R. Staats, Inc.)

Current discussion of government fiscal policy seems to center mostly on the question of whether a tax increase or less spending would provide the better prescription for the economy for 1967.

But this issue of whether the economy can be managed by "fine tuning" to maintain a constant state of prosperity, however attractive that may be, is only one small facet of a much-larger substance. That larger substance is the enormous recent growth of the federal government, and of its taxing and spending, and the long-term direction in which it is taking the country.

There are a few simple figures that set the stage for these views, and these data come from the President's 1968 budget now before Congress:

1. Since 1960 the population of the United States has grown by 10 per cent;
2. Since 1960 the personnel comprising the civilian bureaucracy of the federal government has grown by 25 per cent;
3. Since 1960 the cost of government payrolls, including military, has grown by 75 per cent;
4. Since 1960 the total of all government spending has grown by more than 83 per cent.

Next, to forestall argument, the effect of the Viet Nam war on these figures should be identified, and this produces the following:

1. The 1968 budget contains 22 billion dollars for Viet Nam;
2. Since 1960, including that 22 billions, expenditures for national defense are up 68 per cent;
3. Since 1960, nondefense expenditures of the government are up 97 per cent;
4. Since 1960, expenditures for national welfare and health programs are up 21 per cent.

There are a few more color touches to add to this picture:

1. The deficits for the eight years since 1960 will total 50 billion dollars and for the decade will probably be about 75 billions.
2. The national debt will be up approximately the same amounts.
3. Forty-two million persons now receive regular checks from the federal government—either directly, or from the states under aid programs financed largely with federal government funds.

From these simple figures, some easy deductions can be made:

1. The major thrust of the higher outgo since 1960 is not due to Viet Nam, but is in the civilian nondefense activities of the government.
2. Government spending will more than double during the decade of the 1960s, regardless of the outcome of the Viet Nam conflict.
3. There is little likelihood of a balanced budget at any time in the foreseeable future.
4. There is a strong probability that government spending will double again in the 1970s, unless a major change in attitude takes place.

That means a 300-billion-dollar budget in 1980; while this may seem extreme today, it is no less likely than 160 billions seemed in 1960.

Clearly, a nuclear-size explosion in government spending is ahead. What has transpired up to now is merely a prolog to what will happen in the years to come if these forces are not held in check.

There are some possible antidotes. One is for government to abandon the "crash" approach to all the country's problems—the attitude that money in unlimited quantities will solve anything overnight. The maximum future of our country and its people will require the slow processes of education, training, research, and development of men and resources. There is no such thing as an instant tomorrow.

Another antidote would be a concerted effort to bring under control the proliferation and splintering of federal programs—by consolidating, by forebearing, by transferring to private sources or to lower levels of government, by helping the states to do more on their own. A new Hoover commission is badly needed.

A 300-billion-dollar budget by 1980 will provide a lot of government. Do you want that much?

PRESTON DAVIE, LAWYER AND PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Preston Davie, a familiar figure in Republican politics in New York, and my constituent, died at the ripe old age of 86, but he will be missed.

Member of a well-known law firm, and public servant, his wife Eugenie Mary—known to all as May—joined him in his interest in government and politics, and later she served as cochairman of the New York County Republican Committee.

His obituary from the New York Times of Monday, May 22, follows:

Preston Davie, Lawyer, 86, Dead—Colonel on General Staff in World War I Held D.S.M.

Preston Davie, a retired lawyer and a descendant of distinguished early American families, died last night in his home at 71 East 71st Street. He was 86 years old and maintained a summer home at Newport, R.I.

Mr. Davie's widow, the former Eugénie Mary Ladenburg of New York and Westbury, L.I., is chairman of the board of the Robert Taft Institute of Government, and former cochairman of the New York Republican County Committee.

Mr. Davie, a native of Louisville, Ky., was a descendant of Gen. William Richardson Davie of the Continental Army, founder of the University of North Carolina, Governor of that state and Minister to France.

His grandfather, Maj. Gen. William Preston of the Confederate Army, was a member of Congress and Minister to Spain.

GRADUATE OF HARVARD LAW

Mr. Davie graduated from Harvard College and from Harvard Law School. He later received an honorary LL.D. degree from the University of North Carolina, to which he had contributed an extensive library on the history of the state.

After a brief partnership in law with his father, George M. Davie, in Louisville, Mr. Davie became in 1907 a partner in the New York law firm now named Conboy, Hewitt, O'Brien & Boardman. He retired from practice in the nineteen-twenties.

In World War I, Mr. Davie served as chairman of the Remount Committee and as assistant director of the Council for National Defense. He then served as colonel on the Army's general staff. Later he received the Distinguished Service Medal, and from the Belgian government the Chevalier Order Crown and from Finland the Order of the White Rose (Grand Office).

He was a member of the Society of the Cincinnati, The Brook, the Knickerbocker Club and the Metropolitan Club.

Surviving, by an earlier marriage, are a son, E. T. Bedford Davie; a daughter, Mrs. Emily Davie Kornfeld, and two grandchildren. His first marriage, to the former Emily H. Bedford, ended in divorce.

AMENDING THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION BILL

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, because of the lateness of the hour I did not offer my amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act last night. I am, however, serving notice that when the higher education bill comes to the floor I shall offer an amendment similar to the one I have prepared for the secondary educational bill.

The amendment I had prepared to offer is as follows, and I quote:

> None of the funds authorized herein shall be available to any school district wherein anti-American demonstrations and riots have occurred during the past school year or where any enrolled student or teacher burns their draft card or desecrates the American flag on the school premises, providing no definite action is taken by the school authorities to prevent such action.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for Congress to stop taking money away from good red-blooded Americans through taxation, and then pouring it into some of these educational ratholes under the guise of helping the so-called culturally deprived to degrade their Nation, to desecrate the American flag, to burn their draft cards, and to carry on riots like the ones staged last week and last month out at the East Capital Street school here in Washington. Probably every one of these students fall within the category of educationally deprived students and the Department of Education is pouring money into the school, and yet this Congress is taking money from good, well-meaning Americans in my district and every other district in the country to finance this sort of disgrace.

ON THE QUIE AMENDMENT TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Taft] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, during the debate of May 24, on the Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I referred to letters from Mr. Paul Miller and Mr. Paul E. Weis, superintendents of schools in my district, and asked leave to introduce this correspondence. Because of the lateness of the session yesterday, this material was not included and I therefore submit it today for the Record.

Cincinnati Public Schools,
Cincinnati, Ohio, May 8, 1967.

Hon. Robert Taft, Jr..
First District Office of U.S. Representative,
U.S. Post Office and Courthouse.

Dear Congressman Taft: I greatly appreciated hearing you at the annual luncheon of the Elementary PTA Council. I am curious about one thing relative to the Quie Bill. I believe you said Ohio would get more money under this bill than under the present ESEA Act. Would this occur for a large city such as Cincinnati with the approximately 50/50 split of Title I—half for general aid and half for the poverty programs?

Secondly, I hope your bill relative to May 1 appropriations comes through. However, knowing the deliberate speed with which the wisdom of Congress moves, I know this will take some real effort. On this one point, I am sure every school superintendent in America would give you support.

Best wishes for your success.

Sincerely,

Paul A. Miller,
Superintendent of Schools.

May 12, 1967.

Mr. John Brademas,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Brademas: I greatly appreciate your letter of May 4 concerning H.R. 7819 as related to the Quie Amendment.

Any dramatic alterations in ESEA, at the moment, would be very traumatic to school systems, particularly those representing core cities. If changes are to be made, they should be preceded with careful thought and deliberations rather than political expediency.

As far as the State of Ohio is concerned, I note it gains over-all. I heard Congressman Taft review the Quie Amendment and point out this fact. I raised a question with Mr. Taft relative to the application to Cincinnati inasmuch as Title I was roughly a 50/50 split between poverty funds and general aid.

It is a curious circumstance to find southern states who lose money join with northern states where central cities, by and large, would lose money too. It doesn't make practical educational sense even though, by stretching one's imagination, it may make some political sense which at the moment escapes me.

I would appreciate any details relative to the administration bill as it might apply to core cities in particular.

Thank you for keeping me advised.

Sincerely yours,

Paul A. Miller,
Superintendent of Schools.

May 18, 1967.

Mr. Paul A. Miller,
Superintendent of Schools,
Cincinnati Public Schools,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Dear Superintendent Miller: Thank you very much for your letter of May 8 making inquiry about the effect of the Quie Amendment upon grants to Cincinnati.

It is, of course, impossible to answer your question because we cannot foresee in advance the exact form which an Ohio plan submitted by the State and approved by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare would take. As you know, the present Bill under Title I is allocating approximately 85 percent of the Title I money to areas with children who are economically and educationally deprived. Just how much Cincinnati is getting under this provision, I am not aware. The Quie Amendment does, however, provide a total of three hundred million dollars more for educationally deprived children than is presently the case. And there is also a provision in the Amendment which would guarantee that those States' contribution in 1969 would be lower than contributions in 1968. Presumably a State plan would also contain in it some feature pertaining to a local self-help effort upon which I feel sure Cincinnati would rank favorably.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Robert Taft, Jr.

Elmwood Place Public Schools,
Cincinnati, Ohio, May 22, 1967.

Hon. Robert A. Taft, Jr.,
U.S. Representative,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: A recent newspaper account quotes the superintendent of the Cincinnati Public Schools as favoring the Administration School Aid Bill rather than the Republican School Aid Program.

As the superintendent of a school district in the Cincinnati area and as an educator well acquainted with the thinking of a number of other superintendents I wish to state emphatically that we are wholeheartedly in support of the Republican proposal.

We believe that the control and operation of the schools should be as near to the people as possible. "Categorical School Aid" seems to us to be a very inefficient and ineffective means of solving our school problems. I am certain that I speak for a great many other school officials, when I say that we do not want to see categorical aid continued into the distant future.

Anything that you can do to insure additional, soundly programmed aid for the children in our public schools will be deeply appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Paul E. Weis,
Superintendent.

LET US PAUSE TO REMEMBER

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Steiger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today signals the start of the Memorial Day weekend for Members of this body as well as Americans throughout the world.

Since the issuance of Gen. John Logan's Memorial Day order in 1868, Americans have paused during Memorial Day to remember, honor, and pay tribute to hundreds of thousands of patriotic Americans.

Memorial Day over the past few years has become less of a holiday. In many parts of the country, we no longer have huge parades and all-day picnics. We cannot, over this weekend, bring back the picnics and parades—nor can we bring back those Americans that have died fighting for our country.

What we can do on Memorial Day, Mr. Speaker, and what I urge my colleagues to do, is pause and remember those that have died in battle—those who have fought to maintain our freedom. And, as we pause, let us also review our commitment as a nation to individual freedom, to individual liberty.

I include as part of my remarks at this point an editorial from Stars and Stripes-The National Tribune and an editorial from the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter.

[From the Stars and Stripes-The National Tribune, May 25, 1967]

MEMORIAL DAY, 1967

Since the issuance of General John Logan's Memorial Day Order on May 5. 1868, in all parts of the world American war dead have been remembered by countless thousands of patriotic Americans.

In wars covering the last century American dead are buried in the Philippines, Cuba, China, France, England, Italy, Okinawa and in every state in the Union. These are men who gave their lives on the altar of freedom and certainly have earned the respect and admiration of the American people.

Perhaps it is fitting that this day of remembrance is observed in May when Spring is in the air, flowers and trees are in full bloom. Spring is symbolic with the youth of our Nation whose exuberance and spirit of patriotism combine to urge them to answer the call of their country in time of war. They perhaps compose a larger percentage of honored dead than any other group.

In these days of violence and misguided dissent the observance of Memorial Day is a splendid lesson to the youth of America in that they gain a spirit of loyalty and patriotism which will always remain with them.

We should remember however that a single day's dedication to the memory of our honored dead is not sufficient. We must carry on the gigantic task for which they laid down their lives and dedicate ourselves to the building of a great democracy that gives all, rich and poor alike, an equal opportunity to enjoy the benefits of such an institution.

[From the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth Reporter, May 3, 1967]

LET'S REMEMBER THIS YEAR

Memorial Day, observed each year on May 30, first was designated by Maj. Gen. John A. Logan in 1868, as a special day for honoring the graves of Union soldiers in the War of The States.

Logan served as commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, an organization of Union veterans. None is left in once bulging ranks. The American Legion took over the duties and responsibilities for the observance of Memorial or Decoration Day after World War I.

Strangely, even before General Logan's "order of the day," Southern women honored the dead of both the Union and Confederate armies. The selection of the date involved French origin because in France the date was "The Day of Ashes." It commemorated the return of Napoleon Bonaparte's remains to France from St. Helena.

Memorial Day is a legal holiday. Most business suspends. People place flowers on the graves of servicemen, as well as on the graves of members of their families, and relatives.

National guard and reserve units, veterans of past wars, boy scouts, girl scouts, bands, and fraternal organizations march in parades and take part in a special program, generally at a community auditorium.

There usually is a speaker and Abraham Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address" is read by a high school student in loud and clear voice. Military exercises and special programs are held at Gettysburg National Military Park and at the National Cemetery in Arlington, Va. Some years ago women identified with auxiliaries of the Grand Army of The Republic would go to Lakeside Park and toss bouquets of flowers into the lagoons to honor the nation's fighting men who died at sea.

Fond du Lac has a Civil War monument in front of the Courthouse; there is another one at the inside entrance to Rienzi Cemetery. There is a Spanish-American War memorial—"The Hiker"—at the entrance to Lakeside Park. There also are other memorials in rural cemeteries and on private burial plots.

Fond du Lac has had a Memorial Day parade and a special program ever since the original order was issued by General Logan. Programs were held in front of the Courthouse, at Goodrich School, at Armory E, at Roosevelt Auditorium and Taylor Park.

At the start it was the G.A.R. which was in charge of the observance, then the Spanish-American War Veterans, and now the American Legion. Graves were decorated.

The Sunday before Memorial Day was known as Memorial Sunday and each year one of the city's churches invited the veterans to participate in nondenominational services.

People lined Main Street for the parade, participated in by guard units, bands, veterans and civic, patriotic and fraternal organizations.

The climax was the solemn services at a public auditorium at the conclusion of the parade. Audiences have been small for many years—200 or 300.

The Military Band marched in because it was a part of the ceremonial. But the attendance by the rest of the participants in the parade was pathetic. There were a few men in uniform. Some of the participants in the parade were paid regular drill fees.

Fond du Lac, as well as hundreds of communities across the country, does not have much of a record so far as actual participation in the solemn services is concerned.

This year Fond du Lac will pay tribute to all of its war dead, as well as the living, who served in the Revolutionary War, the War Between the States, the Spanish-American War, the Phillippine Insurrection, World War I, the Korean War, World War II and the present conflict in Vietnam.

Fond du Lac owes a great debt of gratitude to the men and women who have served in these wars to preserve the United States.

It might be wishful thinking to expect every participant in the May 30 parade to march into the auditorium where the services are held and stay until the closing notes are played by the Fond du Lac Military Band. It might also be wishful thinking to expect several hundred of those who line Main Street to watch the parade to go to the auditorium and attend the services.

We are sympathetic, apathetic, and shed tears when the nation is actually engaged in a war, but seem to forget about all that the country's freedom means at other times.

Real participation in the Memorial Day services this year would be a real tribute to those we only casually recognize once or twice a year.

ARGUMENTS FOR THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I did so for two basic reasons. One, because several amendments were adopted which I feel greatly improved the bill. While I was disappointed that the Quie amendment failed, other amendments, such as were offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, were adopted. Since those who opposed the Quie amendment contended that it had not had sufficient study on hearings, I supported a motion to refer the Elementary and Secondary Education Act bill back to the Education and Labor Committee where much study and hearings could take place.

I reject the arguments of those who said such a move would kill any legislation for elementary and secondary education this year. There is no reason why the Education and Labor Committee could not hold the necessary hearings on the Quie and other amendments and report legislation back to the House.

The second basic reason I voted for the bill was to fulfill a commitment of help for elementary and secondary education in this country. While I would have preferred to see this aid administered under a program such as outlined in the Quie amendment, it is my feeling that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, with the amendments adopted, was preferable to no aid at all.

It is my earnest hope that the proposal made by Congressman Quie will undergo further study, will be the subject of extensive hearings, and will be further refined so that next year we can again examine its merit. I hope that within the next 2 years it will be adopted.

SABBATICAL LEAVE FOR FOREIGN SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which proposes a sabbatical leave program for Foreign Service officers.

The legislation I have introduced would amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946 by permitting the Secretary of State to assign or detail officers or employees of the Foreign Service to educational institutions, trade, labor, agricultural, or other organizations.

I make this proposal because I feel strongly that there is a great need for more direct communication between the Foreign Service people and the American people at the grassroots concerning the objectives of our Government in the field of foreign affairs.

The sabbatical leave program that is

envisaged in this bill would provide for a closer association between the people who represent our country on the foreign front and the people back home.

The strength of any nation's foreign policy lies in broad national understanding and support of that policy. I believe that if the legislation I introduce today is enacted, it will contribute immeasurably to a better understanding on the part of the American people of our involvement in foreign affairs.

But, above and beyond the benefits to the American people, the Foreign Service personnel themselves would be helped immensely by a sabbatical leave program. By going out to the grassroots, these people would get a feel of what the American people are thinking by talking to PTA groups; to civic organizations such as the Lions Club, chamber of commerce, and others; and to farm organization meetings. After talking to these groups our Foreign Service people would be better prepared to represent this country on the foreign front.

I can envisage such personnel being assigned to a college in the First District such as Iowa Wesleyan or Parsons where they could teach some college courses according to their qualifications and where they could meet and talk to college students.

You will notice that my bill provides that institutions or organizations which utilize Foreign Service personnel in the manner described will help pay for the program through contribution to salary and travel expense. This would reduce the cost of the program.

The cost of the program will be worth every cent to the American people who will become better acquainted with our foreign affairs and to our Foreign Service officers who will be better prepared to represent us.

I sincerely hope that the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House will give prompt and serious consideration to my bill.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a recent thought-provoking column by the capable author and syndicated columnist, Ralph De Toledano, brings to public attention an issue which is certainly worthy of inquiry—the disposal of radioactive waste. Through the efforts of one concerned citizen, Malcolm Kildale, some disturbing aspects of this issue are being presented to the public in the hope that a solution more consonant with public health will be effected. With the ascendancy of atomic energy plants as suppliers of industrial power, the problem of disposing of radioactive waste is certain to become a matter of great concern.

From all indications there is much to be learned regarding this aspect of radioactivity, and to provide some background information I place the De Toledano column of May 8, 1967, entitled "The AEC's Gift to America: Radioactive Waste," in the Record at this point:

The AEC's Gift to America: Radioactive Waste

(By Ralph de Toledano)

The Congress of the United States, in all its glory, has been devoting much of its time and energy to legislation that will present to the politicians of both major parties a $60 million fund for financing Presidential elections. After five votes, the answer seems to be in the negative, but some of the boys are still in there, fighting for the big prize.

Meanwhile, such minor matters as the health and genetic welfare of thee and me—voters and taxpayers all—go by the board. As an advocate of republican government, I would set no limit on the amount of fiddle and faddle the Congress is entitled to. But I also like to believe that the national legislature has the best interests of the country at heart. I am therefore calling to its attention—and to the American people's as well—what one citizen is doing.

His name is Malcolm Kildale, and you won't read about him on page one of your newspaper. Mr. Kildale, however, has been spending his own time and money doing research on certain activities of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Establishment, and a whole congeries of companies. He has begun to put his findings into a series of bulletins which he has placed in the rack at the National Press Club where government agencies and others offer their publicity releases to the nation's press.

These findings indicate that Americans are being led down the garden path to national radioactive poisoning. (He has made other discoveries which he will also offer in due time to the Washington press corps.) Mal Kildale's documentation is of the kind that brings joy to a newspaperman's heart. It comes from thick and fact-packed official reports that no one bothers to read, from the Library of Congress, from experts in the field, and from highly confidential sources. I have seen his files and they are impressive. His facts are incontrovertible enough to give some of the corporate muscle involved a public-realtions Charleyhorse.

Bear with me while I spell it out.

For some years, the country has seen a proliferation of atomic energy power plants, constructed on technological lines that some engineers say are faulty and at best experimental. Every one of these plants, in producing energy, also produces radioactive waste. Now there is no way of neutralizing that waste. Its radioactivity has a deadly lifespan running into the hundreds of years. Therefore, the AEC—at taxpayers' expense—has been creating vast "cemeteries" in various parts of the country. There is one near Hanford, Washington, and another near Buffalo, N.Y.

But the radioactivity won't stay put. Buried in concrete canisters, sometimes only three feet deep, it seeps into the soil. Since these "cemeteries" must be near running water—to prevent them from getting too "hot"—the radioactivity affects plant and marine life. Not too long ago, a radioactive whale was discovered off the Pacific coast. It had been feeding on plankton infected by Columbia River water—the water flowing past Hanford.

The AEC, however, isn't telling the American people about this. Twenty years ago it discovered that radioactive waste was poisoning fish. So the AEC, in a report that is still so secret even its title is classified, buried the facts as it continues to "bury" the waste. The AEC claims that it is burying this waste in "perpetuity," but its ghost is walking.

Ironically, the atomic energy power plants are being touted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as the answer to the air pollution caused by coal-and-oil-fueled thermal power plants. But no mention is made of the possible effect on the nation's genetic configuration by the increasing radioactive waste. There is a second irony. Atomic power is being used in desalinization plants now under construction. These plants will purify sea water so that it can be used for drinking purposes. But in doing so, it will contribute heavily to the poisoning of America's rivers, specifically those that are contiguous to the radioactive waste cemeteries.

So far, the silence of the AEC and the companies concerned has been deafening. But the word is spreading, and Mr. Kildale is now being referred to as "the Ralph Nader of radioactive waste." Unless the Congress hardens its heart and its political arteries, the truth will out. Either the case as presented is in error, or Congress has been derelict in its duty—as when it held those building the atomic power plants free of legal and financial responsibility from the lawsuits of those who may sustain damage from any malfunctioning of this still-primitive process.

"FAMINE, 1975"—"THE MOST IMPORTANT WASHINGTON BOOK OF THE YEAR"

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today Little Brown Publishing Co. releases "Famine, 1975" by William and Paul Paddock. This volume has received national attention because of the urgency of its message. The thesis developed by the authors, and supported by persuasive evidence, is that in 1975 the world's food requirements will have outstripped the food production capacity of the United States. It will then be our fateful decision to determine which nations we will be able to save from famine with our agricultural production.

This theme has the most ominous connotations. If widespread famine stalks a nation it will result in political and social turmoil. We still have time—through our vast resources—to avert this disaster. But we must realize that adequate food production and population control in the underdeveloped nations should be the principal priorities. We must direct our Public Law 480 programs and foreign aid to challenge these countries to use self-help to meet their own problems.

The Washington Evening Star on May 25, 1967, reviewed this book by the Paddock brothers. The reviewer, Frank Getlein, called this "the most important Washington book of the year." Because of the timeliness of the reviewer's comments, I place it in the Record at this point in my remarks:

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 25, 1967]

Ingenuity, Generosity, Famine Aids

(By Frank Getlein)

There is a general feeling in this country that the basic problems of feeding the hungry nations of the world have been solved or are about to be solved by modern ingenuity and American generosity.

This is not true. The case can be made that both modern ingenuity and American generosity have contributed on a large scale to fending off solutions.

The case is made in what ought to be the most important Washington book of the year. Published this week, written by two brothers, William and Paul Paddock, who are respectively an agronomist and a diplomat, the book is titled, simply, "Famine—1975!" and it means exactly what the title says.

In the book, the twin good fairies of our time—modern ingenuity and American generosity—both come out as less beneficent than we have all supposed. Modern ingenuity, in fact, is the principal cause of the impending world famine in or about 1975. In the old days of not really very long ago, famine was held off in most of the world by the traditional method of having an awful lot of people die young. Many died at or before birth and others died as very young children.

Modern medical ingenuity has changed all that. Modern medical ingenuity has also brought forth a theoretical solution—birth control. But while the world at large has watched with interest the intellectual minuet of the Roman Catholic Church on the question, world population has kept on growing and growing and growing. The Paddock brothers are not talking about a famine that can happen if we all don't take certain measures. They're talking about a famine that will happen no matter what anyone does. The most depressing news in the book is the assurance that the starving people of 1975—eight years from now—are already born.

A universal birth control program initiated tomorrow morning would be too late. In any case, there is little sign that such a program will be started. The graceful movements of Pope Paul and his advisory commission are only one reason for despair. They must assume some responsibility for the coming starvation in Latin America. But Asia and Africa have their own reasons for inaction in the face of impending disaster, most of them, like that of the Pope, stemming from a time lag in thought processes originally conditioned by the fact of widespread early death.

If modern medical progress has created the situation that will mean famine in 1975, American generosity, far from ameliorating that situation, has probably made it worse. This country seems to have accepted responsibility for feeding any and all nations unable to feed themselves. The message of the Paddocks' book is that as of 1975 we will not be able to do it any more. No matter how generous we want to be, we simply won't have that much food.

In the meantime, American gifts of grain—thinly disguised as "sales" for funny-money credits—have helped the leaders of the underdeveloped countries to ignore their most basic problem, that of producing enough food to feed their people. Most such leaders have shown a marked preference for flag airlines or for showy industrial plants or, as with Nasser now, for romantic military posturing as against the hard, unglamorous work of improving native agriculture. In effect we have been subsidizing the grasshoppers of the underdeveloped nations and ignoring the need for hard-working ants.

All of this is water over the Aswan Dam. The most difficult thing in the Paddock's book is their proposed solution. Facing up to our inevitable inadequacy of 1975 and thereabouts, the brothers ask for a national policy of hard decisions. They want the United States to examine the starving countries, decide which ones can be saved and ought to be saved and put our effort into those countries, ignoring the misery of the others. Only in this way can any real and lasting improvement be accomplished.

Under their plan, food would go only to those countries willing and demonstrably able to institute effective birth control programs on the one hand and, on the other, to begin the agricultural reforms now so long overdue.

On the grounds of basic rationality, something like what the brothers propose should have been operating since 1954, when our present food giveaway plan began. By 1975, it will be unavoidable. But in the field of humanitarian endeavor, this country has never shrunk from wasting time trying to avoid the unavoidable.

CRIME CONTROL

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, today's Roll Call contains an excellent editorial discussing the urgent problem of the challenge of crime to organized society. As a member of the Republican Task Force on Crime, I commend Mr. Yudain's editorial to the attention of all who are concerned by the increasing seriousness of this problem.

There are some things that we can do now that would go a long way toward helping. These are:

First. The courts of the land, both State and Federal, should be firmer and tougher in sentencing and probation.

Second. The U.S. Supreme Court should give society and the police a better break in their opinions.

Third. Police everywhere should be backed up by Congress and the press when they are clearly right as, for example, was the officer the other day in the District of Columbia who pulled and used his gun only as a last resort in coping with vicious criminals who physically assaulted him.

Fourth. Congress should enact interstate riot control legislation without further delay as a matter of urgent necessity.

At least this much can be done now. Those who murder, mug, rob, and riot should be forewarned by both State and Federal enforcement authorities, with the assistance of the courts, that they will receive the full book without exception from one end of this country to the other.

If the war in Vietnam is being conducted as badly and irresponsibly as the President's war on crime, then this nation is in bad shape. If the President's advisers on the Vietnam war are as unrealistic and as stubborn as his advisers on the war on crime, then the bloom of American youth is being sacrificed recklessly.

Since the average citizen is not privy to the myriad decisions and strategies of the military planners, we can only hope and pray that the professionals are providing sound advice, intelligent planning, and tough execution of plans to repel the enemy at every turn and to offer the utmost protection to our boys.

On the other hand, we know that the war on crime is a flop. Nowhere is that more apparent than in the District of Columbia—the Nation's Capital where crime figures have been rising fantastically despite the ostriches, who attempt to lull us into complacency by pointing out that we're not (yet) first in the nation, that crime is increasing because the population is increasing (that's a nice way to look at it) and that criminals are entitled to their uncivil rights (something new has been added to the Bill of Rights—the right to commit crime).

The President answers the growing wave of citizen protest against crime by vowing he is doing all he knows how, and asking for suggestions. The Congress presented him with a bill, which, despite the compromises made to the ostriches, contained enough provisions with enough meat in them to make a start towards coping with the problem. On the advice of his District of Columbia advisor, he turned it down. His highly-touted Crime Commission spent months of study and came up with a load of the old fuzzy answers which only postpone needed action.

Readers may think it incongruous that this newspaper devote editorial space to a subject not ordinarily tackled by a Congressional-political newspaper. We admit that in this instance we have negated our long-standing policy. But when we decided to bring the crime problem to the attention of the Congress, no major newspaper in Washington recognized it. We predicted the rise in crime four years ago, while other newspapers were minimizing it. Week after week we editorialized forcefully, and other newspapers (the Knight chain, for instance) followed our lead. Our editorial drive succeeded in improving conditions in the Capitol area which was becoming a hotbed of muggings, stabbings, robberies and other crimes. With proper leadership, this could be accomplished throughout the District and eventually throughout the nation.

Parks, playgrounds and schools can help in the future. But right now there is an air of permissiveness in the District and in the nation which encourages crime. We predicted four years ago that following the prevailing drift, law and order would change into anarchy. With the unruly sit-ins (at the Pentagon, no less), marches, riots, demonstrations and crimes against citizens, our prediction, unfortunately, could well materialize.

The apologists can minimize the problem all they want to. Which of them would attempt to explain their high-sounding theories to Mr. and Mrs. Mark Robeson, grieving in Kansas over the brutal slaying of their 25-year-old daughter?

We predict that the drift away from law enforcement and crime prevention will be a major issue in the coming campaigns for Congress.

Perhaps the voters, living in fear from day to day and disgusted with the permissiveness of their elected officials, will demand that this nation be returned to a land of laws—laws that are respected, obeyed and enforced; where civil rights again means not only the guarantee of rights for minorities, but also the right to the protection of the law, and the guarantee of security to the individual on the streets of his community or in what used to be referred to as the safety of his home.

We call upon the Congress to lead the way.

ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Gude] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GUDE**. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that many Members of the House of Representatives have been as distressed as I by the February 10 ruling of the Department of the Army which excludes veterans from burial in Arlington National Cemetery unless they are on active duty at the time of death, elected Federal officials, or members of several other limited groups. During the months that have passed since the ruling was made, I have given considerable thought to the problem. Now, during our annual Memorial Day commemoration of those who have died in the service of our country, I think it is particularly appropriate to call upon the Army to rescind its order, and once more make Arlington Cemetery available to all veterans of past wars regardless of their active or inactive status at the time of death.

I realize that the facilities at Arlington Cemetery are not without limit, but I feel it is an injustice to our veterans to make space at the cemetery a matter of rank or preferential selection. Those who have served honorably in past wars must receive the same consideration as those on active duty now when it comes to the gratitude of their country.

I believe that all veterans who have served this great country of ours are entitled to the secure knowledge that we have a carefully drawn plan governing cemeteries for veterans and servicemen that is equitable now and will sustain in the future. To accomplish this, I am sending a telegram to the Secretary of the Army requesting that the February 10 ruling be rescinded, and I am introducing legislation which will create an 11-man commission to study laws and regulations governing the use of national cemeteries. The Commission will be composed of three Members of the Senate, three Members of the House of Representatives, and five members appointed by the President. The Presidential appointees will have at least four members representing national veterans organizations. The Commission will report to the Congress and recommend legislation to establish an equitable set of regulations to govern national cemeteries that will justly serve our veterans and servicemen now and in the future.

I hope that my colleagues in the House will give this legislation careful study and support its passage. The text of my bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to create a commission to conduct a study with respect to cemeteries of the United States in which servicemen or veterans are or may be buried

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SECTION 1. There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on National Cemeteries (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of eleven members as follows:

(1) Five appointed by the President of the United States, at least four of whom are representatives of national veterans' organizations;

(2) Three Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate; and

(3) Three Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(b) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 4. Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) The members of the Commission from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service.

(b) The Commission may obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall make a full and complete investigation and study of cemeteries in the United States and abroad in which servicemen or veterans of the United States are or may be buried, including Arlington National Cemetery, the administration of such cemeteries by the various departments and agencies of the United States responsible for their administration, and laws of the United States and regulations and policies applicable to such cemeteries and burial therein, including any regulations and policies relating to their expansion and to the establishment of new cemeteries.

(b) The Commission shall submit a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies to the President and to the Congress on or before December 31, 1967, at which time it shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission shall contain such proposed legislative enactments as, in the judgment of the Commission, are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

TO SAVE THE DOMESTIC MINK RANCHER

Mr. **MILLER** of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, I introduced a bill, H.R. 10274, which is designed to save the domestic mink rancher from destruction by the unrestrained import of mink skins from foreign countries.

Generally, the bill would provide that whole skins of mink, whether dressed or not dressed, could continue to come into this country free of duty until such imports equal 40 percent of the estimated domestic consumption. At that point, such skins would be subject to a duty of 50 percent ad valorem. The estimate of domestic consumption would be made each year by the Secretary of Agriculture and he would certify his estimate to the Secretary of the Treasury. The foreign mink producer would thus have the same access to the American market as at present and, in addition, a percentage of any increase in consumption of mink in the American market. The bill also provides that plates made of two or more whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed, would be subject to an ad valorem duty of 50 percent.

In March of 1959, the National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, a nationwide trade association of mink ranchers and others, sought relief from imports from the U.S. Tariff Commission in an escape clause investigation. The relief was denied, but the Tariff Commission did concede that mink ranching is predominantly a small family type operation. In its findings it stated:

> It is generally accepted that a mink ranch is not a commercial operation unless it has, at least, 350 female breeders and an annual production of, at least, 1,000 skins. On the basis of information available to the Commission, it appears that only about 20 percent of the known mink ranches in the United States can be described as commercial operations. Most of these commercial producers have fewer than 1,000 female breeders each and produce annually fewer than 3,400 fur skins each. Only a dozen or so mink ranchers have more than 3,000 female breeders each and produce annually more than 10,000

mink skins each. Of the 5,000 non-commercial mink producers, about 2,000 have fewer than 50 female breeders each.

Although the number of ranches in existence has changed, much ranching is still typically a small operation. For instance, I have 118 mink ranches in my district. By far the majority of them are husband-and-wife operations, with little or no hired help. Mink ranches are found in most States, with the greatest concentration in Wisconsin, followed by the States of Minnesota, Utah, Washington, Ohio, and Oregon. In Wisconsin alone, total cash income from mink exceeds cash income from chickens, turkeys, sheep, and wool combined, and it exceeded egg income by some $8 million. For the RECORD, I would like to insert at this point a chart showing the number of ranches by States, the total pelts produced, and the average value of production:

Mink ranches—Pelt production and gross value of production by States, 1965

State	Number of ranches	Pelts	Value of production
Arkansas	19	3,000	$61,000
California	42	57,000	1,110,000
Colorado	42	70,000	1,365,000
Connecticut	70	82,000	1,597,000
Delaware	3	300	6,000
Georgia	11	9,000	176,000
Idaho	87	147,000	2,867,000
Illinois	184	340,000	6,622,000
Indiana	92	110,000	2,142,000
Iowa	180	246,000	4,792,000
Kansas	38	19,000	364,000
Kentucky	22	7,000	130,000
Louisiana	10	1,000	24,000
Maine	29	7,000	136,000
Maryland	11	3,000	56,000
Massachusetts	79	154,000	3,006,000
Michigan	200	357,000	6,945,000
Minnesota	420	995,000	19,386,000
Missouri	30	14,000	268,000
Montana	58	84,000	1,628,000
Nebraska	66	49,000	958,000
New Hampshire	15	55,000	1,074,000
New Jersey	57	57,000	1,106,000
New York	172	367,000	7,152,000
North Carolina	38	33,000	635,000
North Dakota	24	12,000	232,000
Ohio	219	421,000	8,205,000
Oklahoma	20	9,000	167,000
Oregon	159	390,000	7,588,000
Pennsylvania	258	334,000	6,497,000
Rhode Island	4	4,000	80,000
South Dakota	70	170,000	3,304,000
Tennessee	14	300	6,000
Texas	45	4,400	87,000
Utah	336	628,000	12,237,000
Vermont	19	39,000	768,000
Virginia	27	30,000	575,000
Washington	217	520,000	10,121,000
West Virginia	25	7,000	139,000
Wisconsin	989	2,378,000	46,323,000
Wyoming	21	14,000	274,000

Source: National Board of Fur Farm Organizations.

As can be seen from these figures, there are approximately 4,458 ranches in the United States, and they produced a total of 8,225,000 mink skins in 1965. This averages out to only about 1,845 skins per ranch which brought a gross income of about $35,041.70 per ranch. However, I must immediately point out that this is a gross sales figure from which production expenses, such as selling costs, feed, labor, taxes, interest, depreciation, and a small management fee must be deducted. To further emphasize that the mink rancher is not making large profits and in most cases is not getting cost of production, I would like to insert at this point the statistics for 1965 showing the average profit per ranch during that year:

Average profit per mink ranch, 1965

State	Number of ranches	Gross sales	Production costs	Average net profit per ranch
Arkansas	19	$61,000	$58,000	$157.88
California	42	1,110,000	1,056,000	1,285.71
Colorado	42	1,365,000	1,298,000	1,595.23
Connecticut	70	1,597,000	1,518,000	1,128.55
Delaware	3	6,000	5,600	133.33
Georgia	11	176,000	169,000	636.36
Idaho	87	2,867,000	2,704,000	1,837.56
Illinois	184	6,622,000	6,291,000	1,798.90
Indiana	92	2,142,000	2,035,000	1,163.04
Iowa	180	4,792,000	4,553,000	1,327.77
Kansas	38	364,000	348,000	421.05
Kentucky	22	130,000	124,000	272.72
Louisiana	10	24,000	23,500	50.00
Maine	29	136,000	130,000	206.89
Maryland	11	56,000	53,900	190.90
Massachusetts	79	3,006,000	2,861,000	1,848.22
Michigan	200	6,945,000	6,598,000	1,735.00
Minnesota	420	19,386,000	18,418,000	2,304.76
Missouri	30	268,000	256,000	400.00
Montana	58	1,628,000	1,548,000	1,379.31
Nebraska	66	958,000	910,000	727.27
New Hampshire	15	1,074,000	1,021,000	3,533.33
New Jersey	57	1,106,000	1,052,000	947.36
New York	172	7,152,000	6,793,000	2,087.20
North Carolina	38	635,000	609,000	684.21
North Dakota	24	232,000	220,700	470.83
Ohio	219	8,205,000	7,795,000	1,872.14
Oklahoma	20	167,000	160,000	350.00
Oregon	159	7,588,000	7,209,000	2,383.64
Pennsylvania	258	6,497,000	6,173,000	1,255.81
Rhode Island	4	80,000	77,000	750.00
South Dakota	70	3,304,000	3,141,000	2,328.57
Tennessee	14	6,000	6,000	----------
Texas	45	87,000	84,000	66.66
Utah	336	12,237,000	11,626,000	1,818.45
Vermont	19	768,000	729,000	2,052.63
Virginia	27	575,000	547,000	1,037.03
Washington	217	10,121,000	9,614,000	2,336.40
West Virginia	25	139,000	133,000	240.00
Wisconsin	989	46,323,000	44,006,000	2,342.77
Wyoming	21	274,000	261,000	619.04

Source: National Board of Fur Farm Organizations.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that mink ranching is basically a small agricultural enterprise. The family-size ranch is the rule and not the exception. It is almost identical to the family-size farm about which we hear so much.

The mink farmer today faces a crisis which he cannot solve himself. He has become the pawn in an international chess game in which he has little or no voice. He is the unwilling victim of international trade negotiations which have resulted in his losing over 40 percent of the domestic market to foreign-bred mink. Dressed mink furs and fur skins were originally dutiable under the provisions of paragraph 1519(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 at 25 percent ad valorem if not dyed, and at 30 percent ad valorem if dyed. Those rates were reduced to 15 percent and 20 percent ad valorem, respectively, effective January 1, 1939, pursuant to a concession in the bilateral trade agreement negotiated with the United Kingdom, and reduced further to 7½ percent and 10 percent, respectively, effective January 1, 1948, pursuant to a concession initially negotiated with Canada—on not-dyed skins only—and the United Kingdom—on both dyed and not-dyed skins—under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The rates of 7½ percent and 10 percent reflect the prevailing concessions granted on dressed mink furs and fur skins under the general agreement.

Undressed mink furs and fur skins—in the trade, generally referred to as raw mink skins, or mink pelts—are duty free under the provisions of paragraph 1681 of the Tariff Act of 1930. Their duty-free status has been bound continuously since 1936, when the first bilateral trade agreement with Canada was negotiated. The binding of the duty-free status of mink furs and fur skins in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, effective January 1, 1948, reflects the prevailing concession granted on such furs and fur skins. The concession in the General Agreements was initially negotiated with Canada.

It is in the area of raw or undressed mink skins that the domestic rancher is having his major problem. The foreigners sell few dyed or dressed mink skins in this country.

What has happened since these agreements were entered into is tragic. There has been a steady erosion of the domestic producer's market until today, the foreign mink raiser has over 40 percent of our domestic market. This is true despite the fact that breeding of mink in foreign countries did not even get started on any large scale until the 1950's. The table shows how the trade agreements have enabled foreign breeders to take more and more of the domestic market for mink skins.

Imports related to domestic consumption, 1950–66

Year	Total imports	Domestic consumption
1950	1,058,000	3,109,000
1951	865,000	3,128,000
1952	1,164,000	3,655,000
1953	1,269,000	3,956,000
1954	1,422,000	4,122,000
1955	1,657,000	4,587,000
1956	1,865,000	6,210,000
1957	2,763,000	6,985,000
1958	2,591,000	7,116,000
1959	2,775,000	8,001,500
1960	2,846,000	8,764,000
1961	4,131,000	10,137,000
1962	3,825,000	10,100,000
1963	4,460,000	10,815,000
1964	4,445,000	11,375,000
1965	4,882,000	12,194,000
1966	5,675,000	13,538,000

Source: National Board of Fur Farm Organizations.

As the table shows, low-cost foreign mink ranchers have been relentless in taking over our domestic market, and in the process, our smaller domestic ranchers are being driven out of business. At the present rate of disappearance, 500 mink ranchers go out of business each year, or about 10 percent of the total mink ranches. In 1959, the Tariff Commission found that there were about 7,200 mink ranches or farms in the United States. By 1963, this number had been reduced to 5,575 ranches. In 1964, it was reduced further to 5,075 and, in 1965, another 617 were liquidated to bring the total ranch census to only 4,458. Thus, it is abundantly clear that as more foreign mink skins are coming into this country, domestic ranchers are being forced out of business at an accelerated pace. It goes without saying that it is the small rancher who is being forced out of business. The small operator who lacks capital or access to credit is the one who is forced to the wall soonest because of imports.

In the past, the American mink rancher could produce a few more pelts at a smaller profit and remain in business, but this is no longer true. Excessive imports have so swamped the domestic market that even the best efforts of the domestic ranchers to develop the American market cannot take care of the domestic production plus the increasing imports. Small American ranchers have spent over $20,000,000 to develop consumer markets, but the flood of imports from Scandinavia has been so great that even the expanding domestic market cannot absorb the foreign production. If the American rancher had more time, he could probably create sufficient demand to take care of both the domestic and foreign rancher, but as I shall point out later, the rate of increase of imports from the Scandinavian countries far exceeds the rate of increase of American production. The American rancher is being pushed out of the market he created at great expense because the Scandinavian rancher is breeding for the American market at a rate faster than the market can absorb.

When the mink farmer goes out of business, other aspects of our agricultural economy feel it most dramatically. It is not only the mink rancher who suffers. Agriculture and marine byproducts are used by the mink ranchers to feed the mink. These feed costs support other phases of our agricultural economy. A mink is fed cereals—dry ingredients—fish, poultry byproducts, meat scraps, liver, and fortifications. In 1965, the total feed bill for mink in the United States was $68,892,000, practically all of which consisted of byproducts from other agricultural or marine operations. This $68,892,000 produced 8,225,000 pelts and the feed bill alone, and I emphasize again mink eat primarily agricultural byproducts, amounts to about $8.37 per mink, totaling over a billion pounds of mink feed per year. It takes from 100 to 130 pounds of these byproducts to produce a single mink pelt. This 100 to 130 pounds per mink helps to utilize byproducts of packinghouses and poultry and fisheries plants, thus helping to give a greater margin of profit to several other segments of American business and agriculture. About one-half of the cost of production of a single mink is the cost of his food. When a mink rancher goes bankrupt because of imports, it deprives the chicken farmer, the fisherman, or the hog or steer raiser of a ready market for his byproducts. If there is no market for these byproducts, the fisherman, chicken, cattle, or hog raiser is going to get less for his chicken, fish, hogs, or cattle from the buyer. It is that simple.

When a rancher goes out of business because of imports, what happens to his investment? Mink ranching requires a relatively high capital investment. Authorities estimate that the total investment in land, pens, refrigeration equipment, meat grinders, electric motors, trucks, feeding facilities, and related capital expenditures of the 4,458 ranches still in business is about $187,992,000. There is almost no market for the capital goods required for mink ranching. When a mink rancher goes out of business, it is a tragic event, since in most instances, the mink rancher has already plowed back his entire capital into more facilities to produce more mink in an effort to survive. Thus, on failure of the project, the entire life savings of the husband and wife are lost because of the nonconvertibility of these assets. The following figures will demonstrate the loss, almost all of it capital loss, when a fur farm goes out of business in the various States.

Average capital investment by ranch, 1965

State	Number of ranches	Capital investment	Average value per ranch
Arkansas	19	$72,000	$3,789.47
California	42	1,303,000	31,023.80
Colorado	42	1,602,000	38,142.85
Connecticut	70	1,874,000	26,771.40
Delaware	3	8,000	2,666.66
Georgia	11	207,000	18,818.18
Idaho	87	3,363,000	38,655.17
Illinois	184	7,770,000	42,228.26
Indiana	92	2,514,000	27,326.08
Iowa	180	5,623,000	31,238.88
Kansas	38	427,000	11,236.84
Kentucky	22	152,000	6,909.09
Louisiana	10	28,000	2,800.00
Maine	29	160,000	5,517.20
Maryland	11	66,000	6,090.00
Massachusetts	79	3,525,000	44,620.25
Michigan	200	8,150,000	40,750.00
Minnesota	420	22,747,000	54,159.52
Missouri	30	314,000	10,466.66
Montana	58	1,910,000	32,931.03
Nebraska	66	1,124,000	17,030.30
New Hampshire	15	1,260,000	84,000.00
New Jersey	57	1,297,000	22,754.38
New York	172	8,392,000	48,790.69
North Carolina	38	745,000	19,605.26
North Dakota	24	273,000	24,375.00
Ohio	219	9,627,000	43,958.90
Oklahoma	20	196,000	9,800.00
Oregon	159	8,903,000	55,993.71
Pennsylvania	258	7,623,000	29,432.43
Rhode Island	4	94,000	23,500.00
South Dakota	70	3,877,000	55,385.71
Tennessee	14	8,000	571.42
Texas	45	102,000	2,266.66
Utah	336	14,359,000	42,735.11
Vermont	19	901,000	47,421.05
Virginia	27	675,000	25,000.00
Washington	217	11,876,000	54,728.11
West Virginia	25	164,000	6,560.00
Wisconsin	989	54,354,000	54,954.49
Wyoming	21	322,000	15,333.33

Source: National Board of Fur Farm Organizations.

Let me make clear, at this point, that, although mink is an agricultural product, the industry has not received one dime in subsidy. It is true that the Department of Agriculture has provided invaluable assistance in breeding and other types of research, but no single mink rancher has received price support or any direct assistance. This is the way the mink industry wants it, and I commend them for it. At the same time, I feel the least that can be done for them is to assure them they will not be driven out of their own market by imports. The American mink rancher is ingenious enough to more than hold his own in the domestic market without Government price support if merely given a fair chance at that domestic market.

Mr. Speaker, for the most part, mink pelts are sold at auction. Before the market price is set, the mink farmer has put his money on the line to raise a new crop. This large investment is made with the hope that the prices received several months hence will be sufficient to pay all expenses and return a small profit. He does not put a price tag on his year's production. As has been pointed out, keeping and feeding mink is extremely expensive. The rancher has to guess what his market will be. If he keeps the mink instead of selling, he has to feed it. He does not know until the auctions start what the mink will be worth, but by then the animal has been pelted and the rancher is at the mercy of the buyer. The buyer does not need to buy domestically since he can go to the auctions in the Scandinavian countries and buy his mink at auction at less than the cost of production of domestic mink and bring the pelts back into the United States duty free.

Foreign mink are coming into the United States today duty free and without quotas at less than the domestic cost of production. The feed bill alone for one mink is approximately $8.37 per animal and the total cost of production for one mink, not including total capital investment in ranch facilities, is another $9.88, which makes the average cost of production for one mink in the United States $18.25. The following chart shows the average value of imports and the average domestic auction price.

Average value of mink skins—Import price and U.S. auction price

Year	Average value of imports	Average U.S. auction price
1956	$16.28	$19.54
1957	13.28	19.38
1958	15.97	20.96
1959	16.99	21.48
1960	15.62	16.41
1961	11.83	18.11
1962	13.51	16.66
1963	13.86	18.08
1964	14.03	17.57
1965	13.16	19.48
1966	12.87	[1]15.00

[1] Estimated.

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce and National Board of Fur Farm Organizations.

It is true that the U.S. prices are higher than the foreign prices, but the point is, that if it were not for the price of imports the domestic prices would be higher, thus, giving the rancher a small margin of profit. It is the large volume and price of imports that is depressing the domestic market to the point that the domestic mink rancher is unable to obtain even his basic costs of production.

Not only are these foreign mink skins coming in at less than the cost of production, but the Scandinavian countries, the chief foreign suppliers, are actually taking over our domestic market at a faster rate than domestic producers are accelerating production to take advantage of the expanding market. Denmark, Sweden, Finland, and Norway have swiftly increased mink production for the American market. The result has been a loss of the market by domestic producers. The following chart shows how devastating these imports have been in the past few years.

Scandinavian countries acceleration of exports to the United States, 1962–66

Year	U.S. production	Percent increase	Scandinavian exports to the United States	Percent increase
1962	7,251,500	----------	2,615,300	----------
1963	7,443,000	2.6	2,980,000	13.8
1964	7,831,000	5.2	3,143,000	5.4
1965	8,512,000	8.6	3,551,000	12.9
1966	8,987,000	5.5	4,387,000	23.5

Source: National Board of Fur Farm Organizations U.S. Department of Commerce.

I would like to call attention to the 1966 import figure of 4,387,000 skins for just a moment. This is almost equal to the total mink production in the four leading mink producing States of the United States, and more mink than are produced in 37 of our mink-producing States. To look at it another way, the 4,387,000 mink imported from the Scandinavian countries equals the total production of 2,721 American ranches which is over half the mink ranches in the United States. This is not the whole story. Fur Age Weekly on April 17, 1967, carried a story datelined Oslo, Norway, reading as follows:

> Norwegian fur farmers exported furs worth about 236 million N. Krones (11.8 million sterling—$33.7 million) last season, a new all-time high, through Oslo Fur Auctions, Ltd.
>
> A further 20% increase in quantity is expected for 1967, while the value of exports is not likely to rise as much since prices have recently shown a marked downward trend.

This 20-percent predicted increase in Norwegian production of mink skins further illustrates an illogical expansion of production since the U.S. market is in a depressed state already, and this increase will only make it worse unless we take immediate legislative action.

I do not mean to infer that the Scandinavians are doing anything illegal. They are only doing what any alert group of businessmen would do. The tariff laws of the United States are bent in their favor and they are taking advantage of them. This is just good business sense, but it is working a very great hardship on the small, family-sized mink rancher in the United States. As I have mentioned, the American market for mink is an expanding market due to the ranchers' own market development program. This is fortunate since it has given the small mink rancher, at least, a portion of each year's volume increase. However, the domestic mink rancher is not anywhere near maintaining his proportion of the increased market. For instance, in 1966, Scandinavian imports were 48 percent of domestic production. The following chart will show how Scandinavian imports compare with domestic production.

Imports from Scandinavian countries as related to U.S. production

Year	U.S. production	Scandinavian imports	Percent
1962	7,251,000	2,615,000	36
1963	7,443,000	2,980,000	46
1964	7,831,000	3,143,000	40
1965	8,512,000	3,551,000	41
1966	8,978,000	4,387,000	48

Source: National Board of Fur Farm Organizations and U.S. Department of Commerce.

The raising of fur-bearing animals—chiefly silver fox and mink—on ranches or farms was started in this country about 1905, but did not become important until the late 1920's. The principal growth of the mink ranching industry has occurred since the end of World War II. Since that time, the domestic mink ranchers have levied a self-imposed assessment on all mink skins sold. These funds are used to develop the mink market in the United States and elsewhere. To show the success of this operation, which has cost the ranchers over $20 million, today mink is the most desired fur in the trade. This market development activity has not been easy. With profits the past several years cut to almost nothing, the levy has worked a real hardship in many cases, but the ranchers know they have to create an expanding market in order to stay in business. Not only have the ranchers developed the market for mink from practically nothing, but, in addition, they have improved their product to the extent that the word "mink" is synonymous with quality. But what has happened? This domestic market which was developed by the hard work and the money of the small domestic rancher is being deluged by foreign mink breeders who have spent little or nothing to develop the market. Surely those who have developed a market should be entitled to keep, at least, a fair share of it for themselves.

The heart of the problem is that the domestic mink industry is in a depression caused almost solely by the ability of the American buyers to purchase mink skins in Europe at less than the cost of production in the United States and then bring the skins back into this country duty free.

The tragic situation facing the domestic mink rancher was well told in a story in Women's Wear Daily of April 21. In a section called Salesroom Talk, referring to the complete lack of activity at a New York sales session the article said:

> The session served once again to point up the difficulties that may be in store for ranchers this year. The fact that their skins are moving less freely than in previous years—and bringing lower prices where they are selling—means less income with which to pay off their advances from the auction companies and the loans from feed and other suppliers. These obligations are now coming due.
>
> The problem of diminishing returns has been plaguing ranchers more each year as the crop has increased, particularly the producers of commercial and lower grades which bear the brunt of the price pressure. The continuing price drift in these grades has put such ranchers in a steady squeeze, forcing many to live from crop loan to crop loan.
>
> These loans by the auction houses generally amount to about half the rancher's average price for the previous year. They are usually granted following the official kit count in June.
>
> Because of experiences of the past year, it is expected the auctions will tighten up their loan policies for the coming crop. For one thing, they'll be more selective, weighing the risks more carefully. But the loans they do grant will necessarily be smaller, since they'll be based on lower averages.
>
> As a result, qualified observers see a big shakeout especially among the ranchers who've been struggling to stay alive in recent seasons. Not right now, since the females they hold are already bred. But unless the picture changes drastically before the year is out, the number of ranchers is expected to show a bigger decline next year.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is in a position to do something about this. There is still time for action since the mink are already bred. If we pass legislation such as I have introduced, we can prevent bankruptcy now on the horizon for many, many small mink ranchers.

This Congress—the Nation—is rightly concerned about our serious balance-of-payments problem. We are running a steady deficit in our balance-of-payments accounts. Imports of foreign mink are making a substantial and growing contribution to that deficit each year. The following chart shows that, since 1956, our hard currency expenditures overseas for mink skins have increased almost 2½ times. It is now at an annual rate of over $73,000,000.

Value of mink imports 1956–66

Year	Total imports	Average value	Total value not including freight and insurance
1956	1,865,000	$16.28	$30,362,000
1957	2,763,000	13.28	36,692,640
1958	2,591,000	15.97	41,378,270
1959	2,775,000	16.99	47,107,250
1960	2,846,000	15.62	44,454,520
1961	4,131,000	11.83	48,869,730
1962	3,825,000	13.51	51,675,750
1963	4,460,000	13.86	61,815,600
1964	4,445,000	14.03	62,363,350
1965	4,882,000	13.16	64,247,120
1966	5,675,000	12.87	73,037,250

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

If the 50 percent ad valorem duty is added to the cost of the fur, the foreign mink skin can still compete with the domestically produced pelt in most instances. Yet the gap will be closed sufficiently to enable the domestic rancher to have a chance at his primary market. When I speak of a 50-percent ad valorem duty I am speaking of much less than that actually. Since 40 percent of the predicted consumption of skins will come into this country duty free, only the balance of the imports will be subject to the 50-percent ad valorem and it follows that the effective duty on the total imports would be negligible and still would leave the total imports in a strongly competitive position.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair bill. It is a necessary bill. I urge that it receive prompt consideration by the House.

For the information of Members of the House, the text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 10274

A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) schedule 1, part 5, subpart B of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by inserting after item 123.50 the following new items:

"		Whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed:		
	123.60	In each calendar year before the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption of the number of such skins which equals 40% of the domestic consumption of such skins during that year, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture under headnote 5 to this subpart....	Free	Free

123. 62	In each calendar year after the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption of the number of such skins which equals 40% of the domestic consumption of such skins during that year, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture under headnote 5 to this subpart....	50% ad val.	50% ad val.	
123. 65	Plates made of two or more whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed..............	50% ad val.	50% ad val.	"

(b) The headnotes for schedule 1, part 5, subpart B of such Schedules are amended by adding at the end thereof the following headnote:

"5. The Secretary of Agriculture, for each calendar year after 1967, shall, before the beginning of such year, estimate, publish, and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the number of whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed, that will be domestically consumed during such year. Estimations made by the Secretary of Agriculture under this headnote shall be final."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1968.

SALUTE TO THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I speak at this time in support of the Presidential proclamation designating the week of May 21 as Small Business Week. The greatness and the strength of America is a direct result of ceaseless energy on the part of the American businessman. The history of our Nation was deeply influenced by the fact that the first Virginia Colonies were a joint-stock venture.

These ventures alone brought new dimensions to both personal and economic freedom. Over the course of the century, our Nation has developed from an agrarian republic to an industrial giant. This change was brought about by the small businessman, who has consistently been the innovator and the risk taker.

Today, the number of small businesses is estimated at 4.8 million out of a total of slightly more than 5 million businesses, serving a public of nearly 200 million people. Although the number of small businesses is dramatically higher than large businesses, small businesses operate with distinct disadvantages. In order to assist the Nation's small businesses, Congress in 1953 passed the Small Business Act, which created the Small Business Administration. This act stated that it was the intent of Congress that the Government was to "aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free, competitive enterprise."

Subsequently, Congress has passed significant measures to meet the growing needs of small business. The various acts of Congress have recognized the leadership role the small businessman has in our economic and community life. The operator of a small business is oriented to the community in which he lives; and by the nature of his operation, has a unique and personal relationship with his neighbors with whom he worships, works, and relaxes.

All businesses start out small; and it is my belief that the guarantee of economic growth in a free enterprise system depends upon keeping the door wide open for new, aggressive, small concerns to start in business.

WE CANNOT FIGHT AIR POLLUTION WITHOUT THE FCC'S HELP

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, this country has been concerned for some time, and rightfully so, with the problems of both air and water pollution. As a result, Congress has placed a high priority on solving the pollution problem. For example, to combat water pollution in my district, I introduced a bill, H.R. 1481, early in this session of Congress, to prevent pollution of San Francisco Bay by any interceptor drains from service areas of reclamation projects.

Congress has enacted three laws since 1963 designed to abate pollution of the air we breathe. The Clean Air Act of 1963 is an example of such legislation. Yet, in spite of these new laws and the tax-supported programs created by them, air pollution continues to choke our citizens, damage and destroy their property, and radically reduce the enjoyment of modern urban living.

One of the major causes of air pollution is the increased quantity of solid waste—garbage and refuse—which is being collected and disposed of each day by burning.

Our increased standard of living and economic activity have caused an increased consumption of goods and materials, and this has resulted in a 40-percent increase in per capita production of refuse since 1920. Three years ago it was estimated that based on an urban population of 130 million people, 520 million pounds of refuse had to be disposed of every day of the year in our urban areas. If as anticipated, our population doubles by the year 2000, in order to provide the clean air necessary to the health of both present and future generations, our need to give greater attention to the development and application of improved methods and systems for the economical and sanitary disposal of solid wastes is clearly indicated.

In a report issued in October 1964, the Senate Committee on Public Works discussed this problem of collecting refuse. At page 18 of the report, the committee stated:

> The failure of many communities to maintain adequate collection systems virtually forces householders and businesses to resort to backyard burning of refuse, creating for themselves and their neighbors smoke and odor nuisances and, collectively, contributing importantly to communitywide air pollution problems.

Since this is undoubtedly a problem for many communities, I should like to insert at the end of my remarks, a letter from an enterprising small business firm from my district in San Mateo, Calif. This letter sets out the results of the firm's experiment in the use of two-way radio to improve the efficiency of its refuse collection operations.

According to this letter, the company installed two-way radio in 10 of their trucks on an experimental basis for a period of 8 months. During this period, the company discovered that two-way radio reduced the time, mileage, and wasted motion of their refuse collection operations.

That is important for a company which provides service to over 166,000 customers, including hospitals, schools, government offices, and business concerns as the letter states:

> Two-way radio communications has shown us that it can save us a lot of time, mileage, and wasted trips. Now, if one of our trucks is making a disposal box exchange in downtown San Francisco and another call comes in for a pick up of a box in the same area, we are able to contact our driver while he is still in the same area and save his having to backtrack to make the second call.

Now, the management of the company would like to equip 90 of their trash collection trucks with mobile radio units. Unfortunately, as the letter points out, the overcrowded conditions on the frequency channels available for two-way radio make the fulfillment of the company's plan impossible. There is too much congestion on the radio channels to make the installation of a complete mobile radio communications system useful.

Mr. Speaker, the lack of available frequency space which prevented this enterprising company from installing two-way radio in its vehicles has two deplorable results. First, an industrious small business concern was prevented from increasing its efficiency of operations, reducing its cost and providing better service to its customers. Second, the people in the community served by this company were deprived of a better, more efficient system of refuse collection and hence forced to suffer the loss of this potential way to reduce air pollution.

Now, the Federal Communications Commission has known of this crisis in frequency space for many years, but it has done very little until recently. At long last, the Commission has shown indications that it is willing to come to grips with the problem. In fact, not long ago, when the FCC appeared before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, the Chairman of the Commission stated that the Commission was working very hard to find a solution in the near future to the frequency congestion problem.

While the use of two-way radio in refuse collection will not entirely abate air pollution, it certainly can help in reducing the pollution caused by improper disposal of refuse due to inadequate methods of collection. Just as it does for many other businesses, and for police work, firefighting, school administration and municipal management, two-way radio provides the communications to make the tasks performed safer, more efficient, and more productive. It is important to all of us that this tool is available to make its contribution to a cleaner, more healthy community.

I urge the Commission to proceed with all speed to provide adequate frequency space for the land mobile radio services so that we can make sure that our refuse collectors have the necessary frequencies to help in the fight against air pollution.

Sunset Scavenger Co.,
San Francisco, November 21, 1966.

Hon. Arthur J. Younger,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Younger: We have read that there are efforts being made to obtain more radio frequencies for two-way radio users in order to eliminate the problem of interference caused by too many people being forced to use the same radio channels. For about 8 months, we have been experimenting with ten mobile radio units in our trucks to determine if two-way radio could help our business and increase the quality of our service to our customers. In this short length of time, we have discovered two things about two-way radio—it definitely would help our business if we could use the radios without any interference, and there is so much interference on the frequency we use that expanding our use of radio at this time under these circumstances is impossible.

Two-way radio communications has shown us that it can save us a lot of time, mileage, and wasted trips. Now, if one of our trucks is making a disposal box exchange in downtown San Francisco and another call comes in for a pick up of a box in the same area, we are able to contact our driver while he is still in the area and save his having to backtrack to make the second call. Since it costs $8.00 an hour to operate one of our trucks, eliminating the amount of backtracking our drivers must do will substantially lower our costs of operation.

In addition to our use of radio to route our trucks, we also use our radios for the safety of our employees and the people we serve. Not long ago, one of our men was injured while working on Geneva and Market Streets in San Francisco. Using two-way radio, the other man radioed a supervisor who was at 46th and Taraval about 6 to 8 miles away. The supervisor lost no time in getting to the scene of the accident and taking care of the employee and then getting the truck back onto its scheduled route.

Our customers include hotels, government offices, schools, hospitals (such as St. Mary's, San Francisco General, Mount Zion), golf clubs, and other establishments—in all about 166,000 accounts. Prompt box pick ups or box exchange means a cleaner and healthier environment for the people we serve, and increasing our efficiency means lower costs of operating our business.

We would like to equip 90 trucks with two-way radio, thereby expanding our radio-dispatched service to all the people we serve. However, the excessive amount of interference we now experience on our frequency makes it impossible to consider adding the radios at this time.

Though we have used two-way radio only a short time, the benefits to our business and our customers are obvious. We think the public interest requires more frequency space to be allocated by the FCC, and we encourage you to do whatever is necessary to convince the responsible officials of the government about the need for two-way radios for businessmen.

Very truly yours,
Sunset Scavenger Co.,
Louis Bertone,
Vice President.

THE FEEBLE U.S. MERCHANT FLEET

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Mailliard] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, to Members who share my deep concern at the lack of administration of merchant marine policy or program, the editorial reaction of one of San Francisco's daily newspapers to the recent Republican policy committee statement on this subject may be of interest.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, May 19, 1967]

The Feeble U.S. Merchant Fleet

The House Republican Policy Committee ominously reports on the American merchant marine:

"Today the United States has fewer privately owned seagoing merchant ships than in 1936." (Incredible!)

"The percentage of American goods moving overseas on American ships is one half what it was three decades ago." (Shameful!)

"The United States has dropped to fifth among the nations in size of active merchant fleets and presently ranks 14th in shipbuilding." (Frightening!)

The neglect of the American merchant fleet is at the same time the neglect of an essential arm of national defense. While the airlift to Vietnam has been justifiably praised, 98 percent of the supplies carried there are borne by sea, in vessels four-fifths of which are more than 20 years old.

At the time our merchant fleet more and more takes on the silhouette of a bunch of tubs, Soviet Russia's commercial carriers vastly increase in number and quality. Her shipyards, and those of her satellites, are operating near capacity.

From 1950 to 1966, the Soviet fleet grew from 432 ships of 1.8 million deadweight tons to 1422 ships of 10.4 million tons.

Our fleet shrank from 1900 ships of 22 million tons to fewer than 1100 of 14.8 million tons.

America, whose proud Clippers roamed the trade routes everywhere, now can move only seven percent of its world commerce in its own ships.

But the U.S. is not left bobbing in the wake of only the Russians. Other nations are gaining too. Last year another annual record was set in world merchant ship launchings.

Labor, capital and government must team to restore the American flag to world ports of trade. The House Republicans have their teeth in a sound issue. They must not let it go.

CONCERN ABOUT FUNDS FOR TITLE III OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my concern about the funds for title III of the National Defense Education Act. I am disturbed to see the heavy cutbacks proposed in programs under the National Defense Education Act at the same time that increases are proposed for programs which have yet to prove their merit.

It is only natural, I suppose, for this administration to demonstrate great favoritism for everything that comes under the label of "Great Society." What is not so easily understood is its patent attempt to destroy the National Defense Education Act title III program, a bipartisan program which was soundly conceived and which—according to testimony received from the States—is perhaps the most effective of the Federal assistance programs. To me such action seems irresponsible. Do we not provide quality education by building on the solid programs already established and working to the satisfaction of the States and the schools? In our recent exchange of views over questions concerning the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Quie bill was labeled by the President as a "reckless effort to rewrite our laws for partisan political advantage." Could not the same be said of the administration's effort to phase out National Defense Education Act title III through the Appropriations Act a whole year before the National Defense Education Act expires and before its expected extension and expansion?

But since the executive branch of the Government is not acting responsibly, the Congress should. For the past 3 years we have been adding to the scope of the National Defense Education Act title III program and authorizing additional funds. With the addition of industrial arts in fiscal year 1968 the schools are counting on more money, not less. Last year 36 States needed $22 million more than was appropriated. This year the State administrators of the program report that they have received approvable projects far in excess of the available funds. Is it not illogical to increase the number of subjects eligible for support under the program while reducing the already insufficient funds available to support existing subjects? I therefore want to state that I regret very deeply that the appropriation for acquisitions of equipment and materials and minor remodeling was not set at the full amount authorized: $110 million.

URGES REJECTION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McClure] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the House is in the process of succumbing to blackmail.

Why should we be faced with a take-it-or-leave-it proposal on the additions attached to this bill? I think it is very apparent that the other body attached the $75 million additional for the poverty corps and the $12.5 million revival for the Teacher Corps to this measure because they were pretty sure each of these had rocky sledding ahead if they were moved forward on their own. They were afraid to have the House judge them on their merits.

The House has not even had hearings on the need for the money nor how it will be used in the poverty program, yet we are asked to approve. Why hold hearings when we all read newspapers, they say.

Just yesterday this House took action to remove the Teacher Corps from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and yet today we appropriate $12.5 million for its extension. Surely there are those who hope, and some who expect, that the Teacher Corps will be revived as a part of the Higher Education Act, but the House has not yet worked its will in this respect.

It is said that we must "go along" because funds for veteran's pensions and welfare payments to the States will not be available after June 1 if we do not. I say that this is blackmail and that if we pay the first installment, we will be called upon to pay again. If we allow the other body to slip this over on us they will be emboldened and encouraged to try again. Our Appropriations Committee is completely ignored and our appropriating procedures are effectively disregarded by this tactic. The time to stop this practice is now. The responsibility for the consequences is theirs, not ours.

And what of the taxpayers' cry for economy and our pledges to cut down on domestic spending during this time of crisis and war? Where is our resolve and devotion to principle? How many on this floor will deserve the continued confidence and support of the electorate if we give in this easily?

I have the utmost respect for the other body and for our conferees, but I submit that we are making a serious mistake with lasting consequences if we agree to the conference report. I urge that it be rejected.

SUPPORT FOR CRAMER AMENDMENT TO HUD APPROPRIATION BILL IN CONFERENCE ESSENTIAL TO PREVENT FEDERAL CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICA'S CITIES

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1967, this body adopted an amendment I offered to the Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill relating to section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 which has the effect of preventing the use of Federal funds for implementation of that section of the act. I am taking this opportunity to explain the significance of this amendment so that its ramifications can be clearly understood and hopefully sustained in conference.

Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 effectively forces through Federal dictation a form of "metro" government, on some 240 presently designated standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States. It accomplishes this in the following manner:

First. It requires the establishment of regional comprehensive planning agencies for these statistical areas;

Second. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has the power to:

First. Review and approve or disapprove the makeup of the planning agency;

Second. Determine the area to be included in it;

Third. Determine overall planning as to nature and content; and

Fourth. Wield carte blanche power of review over all applications made by all affected cities for projects relating to a wide array of Federal aid programs including, but not limited to, basic water and sewer facilities, public facility loans, waste treatment facilities, highway development, health research facilities, libraries, public works and economic development facilities, beach erosion control and flood prevention, and water resources planning.

Third. In reviewing applications relative to these programs, HUD has authority to determine if in its opinion the applicant conforms to what HUD believes should be proper comprehensive planning. HUD has the power to cause the withholding of approval of applications should the applicant not "conform."

This presents the following dangers: First, the establishment and operation of these regional comprehensive planning agencies can be accomplished without consultation with local elected officials and decisions affecting cities can be made contrary to the wishes of duly elected city officials.

Second, this would result in a breakdown of control by local government of local development and would effectively force "metro" government on cities in the 240 presently designated metropolitan statistical areas. Put another way, the Federal Government can effectively control the urban development of every major metropolitan area in the Nation.

Third, at the same time local governmental control of local planning is destroyed, State lines are completely ignored. This is adequately supported by a glance at the metropolitan statistical areas in the United States as determined by the Bureau of the Census and on which HUD relies. For example, Columbus, Ga., and a part of Alabama are considered a part of the same metropolitan statistical area. Augusta, Ga., and a part of South Carolina; Chattanooga, Tenn., and a part of Georgia; Davenport, Iowa, and Rock Island County, Ill.; St. Louis, Mo., and a part of Illinois; Evansville, Ind., and a part of Kentucky; Providence, R.I., and a part of Massachusetts are just some examples of metropolitan statistical areas which are interstate in character.

The objective of my amendment is to prevent the expenditure of Federal funds to implement section 204. Without my amendment, as a practical matter, HUD has authority, after July 1, 1967, to require as a condition for granting any and all funds requested by cities located within the 240 presently designated statistical metropolitan areas, that these cities conform to HUD's concept of comprehensive metropolitan-wide planning. By not appropriating funds to implement this section, HUD will not be able to carry forth its provisions.

While I favor forward looking planning by metropolitan areas to effectuate certain programs, I do not believe a supercity chief in Washington is needed, for example, to tell the local officials in St. Petersburg, Fla., that a library there is or is not in accord with the Federal Government's concept of what is required so far as libraries are concerned in the Tampa Bay area of Florida.

I do not believe the Federal Government should have the power to dictate local planning and to be able to cause the withholding of basic grant funds under existing programs as punishment to areas of the country which do not conform to HUD's concept of metropolitanwide planning. Nor do I think that a superreviewing agency should be set up on top of existing agencies which still must review grant applications and thereby create additional and endless redtape.

The Appropriations Committee refused to fund section 203, demonstration expediters, and section 205, incentive bonuses for areas that conform; but left section 204 in full force. Thus, such areas must conform but get no bonuses for doing so, and yet suffer full penalties for failure to conform. This is inequity at its worst. Also, the punitive penalty of refusal to consider grant applications under the many existing grant-in-aid programs unless these conditions are met is far too severe. It could destroy the basic objective of those programs such as building highways, hospitals, and cleaning up our rivers.

It will be my objective in the future to have section 204 of the basic law repealed so that we will not witness areawide planning agencies composed of individuals, not elected by or answerable to the people, determine all community planning. Presently, I urge support for retention of my amendment in conference.

For the information of the Members I am including table No. 31 from the 1960 census which sets out the standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States that must conform through a federally dictated comprehensive planning agency for all or each of such areas or lose funds, as well as an article from the April 28 issue of the Congressional Quarterly which discusses and points out the problems created by section 204 of the Demonstration Cities Act:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 20, 1966]

TABLE 31.—*Population of standard metropolitan statistical areas and component areas in the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1960*

United States (212 areas)	112, 885, 178
Abilene, Tex	120, 377
Jones County	19, 299
Taylor County	101, 078
Akron, Ohio	513, 569
Summit County	513, 569
Albany, Ga	75, 680
Dougherty County	75, 680
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N.Y	657, 503
Albany County	272, 926
Rensselaer County	142, 585
Saratoga County	80, 096
Schenectady County	152, 896
Albuquerque, N. Mex	262, 199
Bernalillo County	262, 199
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa.-N.J.	492, 168
Lehigh County, Pa	227, 536
Northampton County, Pa	201, 412
Warren County, N.J	63, 220
Altoona, Pa	137, 270
Blair County	137, 270
Amarillo, Tex	149, 493
Potter County	115, 580
Randall County	33, 913
Ann Arbor, Mich	172, 440
Washtenaw County	172, 440
Asheville, N.C	130, 074
Buncombe County	130, 074
Atlanta, Ga	1, 017, 188
Clayton County	46, 365
Cobb County	114, 174
De Kalb County	256, 782
Fulton County	556, 326
Gwinnett County	43, 541
Atlantic City, N.J	160, 880
Atlantic County	160, 880
Augusta, Ga.-S.C	216, 639
Richmond County, Ga	135, 601
Aiken County, S.C	81, 038
Austin, Tex	212, 136
Travis County	212, 136
Bakersfield, Calif	291, 984
Kern County	291, 984
Baltimore, Md	1, 727, 023
Baltimore City	939, 024
Anne Arundel County	206, 634
Baltimore County	492, 428
Carroll County	52, 785
Howard County	36, 152
Baton Rouge, La	230, 058
East Baton Rouge Parish	230, 058
Bay City, Mich	107, 042
Bay County	107, 042
Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex	306, 016
Jefferson County	245, 659
Orange County	60, 357
Billings, Mont	79, 016
Yellowstone County	79, 016
Binghamton, N.Y	212, 661
Broome County	212, 661
Birmingham, Ala	634, 864
Jefferson County	634, 864
Boston, Mass	2, 589, 301
Essex County (part)	308, 051
Beverly City	36, 108
Lynn City	94, 478
Peabody City	32, 202
Salem City	39, 211
Danvers town	21, 926
Hamilton town	5, 488
Lynnfield town	8, 398
Manchester town	3, 932
Marblehead town	18, 521
Middleton town	3, 718
Nahant town	3, 960
Saugus town	20, 666
Swampscott town	13, 294
Boston, Mass.—Continued	
Essex County (part)—Con.	
Topsfield town	3, 351
Wenham town	2, 798
Middlesex County (part)	973, 481
Cambridge City	107, 716
Everett City	43, 544
Malden City	57, 676
Medford City	64, 971
Melrose City	29, 619
Newton City	92, 384
Somerville City	94, 697
Waltham City	55, 413
Wolburn City	31, 214
Arlington town	49, 953
Ashland town	7, 779
Bedford town	10, 969
Belmont town	28, 715
Burlington town	12, 852
Concord town	12, 517
Framingham town	44, 526
Lexington town	27, 691
Lincoln town	5, 613
Natick town	28, 831
North Reading town	8, 381
Reading town	19, 259
Stoneham town	17, 821
Sudbury town	7, 447
Wakefield town	24, 295
Watertown town	39, 092
Wayland town	10, 444
Weston town	8, 261
Wilmington town	12, 475
Winchester town	19, 376
Norfolk County (part)	442, 150
Quincy City	87, 409
Braintree town	31, 069
Brookline town	54, 044
Canton town	12, 771
Cohasset town	5, 840
Dedham town	23, 869
Dover town	2, 846
Holbrook town	10, 104
Medfield town	6, 021
Milton town	26, 375
Needham town	25, 793
Norfolk town	3, 471
Norwood town	24, 898
Randolph town	18, 900
Sharon town	10, 070
Walpole town	14, 068
Wellesley town	26, 071
Westwood town	10, 354
Weymouth town	48, 177
Plymouth County (part)	74, 290
Duxbury town	4, 727
Hanover town	5, 923
Hingham town	15, 378
Hull town	7, 055
Marshfield town	6, 748
Norwell town	5, 207
Pembroke town	4, 919
Rockland town	13, 119
Scituate town	11, 214
Suffolk County	791, 329
Boston City	697, 197
Chelsea City	33, 749
Revere City	40, 080
Winthrop town	20, 303
Bridgeport, Conn	334, 576
Fairfield County (part)	292, 914
Bridgeport City	156, 748
Shelton City	18, 190
Fairfield town	46, 183
Monroe town	6, 402
Stratford town	45, 012
Trumbull town	20, 379
New Haven County (part)	41, 662
Milford town	41, 662
Brockton, Mass	149, 458
Plymouth County (part)	119, 751
Brockton City	72, 813
Abington town	10, 607
Bridgewater town	10, 276
East Bridgewater town	6, 139
Hanson town	4, 370
Brockton, Mass.—Continued	
Plymouth County (part)—Con.	
West Bridgewater town	5, 061
Whitman town	10, 485
Norfolk County (part)	20, 629
Avon town	4, 301
Stoughton	16, 328
Bristol County (part)	9, 078
Easton town	9, 078
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, Tex	151, 098
Cameron County	151, 098
Buffalo, N.Y	1, 306, 957
Erie County	1, 064, 688
Niagara County	242, 269
Canton, Ohio	340, 345
Stark County	340, 345
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	136, 899
Linn County	136, 899
Champaign-Urbana, Ill	132, 436
Champaign County	132, 436
Charleston, S.C	216, 382
Charleston County	216, 382
Charleston, W. Va	252, 925
Kanawha County	252, 925
Charlotte, N.C	272, 111
Mecklenburg County	272, 111
Chattanooga, Tenn.-Ga	283, 169
Hamilton County, Tenn	237, 905
Walker County, Ga	45, 264
Chicago, Ill	6, 220, 913
Cook County	5, 129, 725
Du Page County	313, 459
Kane County	208, 246
Lake County	293, 656
McHenry County	84, 210
Will County	191, 617
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky	1, 071, 624
Hamilton County, Ohio	864, 121
Campbell County, Ky	86, 803
Kenton County, Ky	120, 700
Cleveland, Ohio	1, 796, 595
Cuyahoga County	1, 647, 895
Lake County	148, 700
Colorado Springs, Colo	143, 742
El Paso County	143, 742
Columbia, S.C	260, 828
Lexington County	60, 726
Richland County	200, 102
Columbus, Ga.-Ala	217, 985
Chattahoochee County, Ga	13, 011
Muscogee County, Ga	158, 623
Russell County, Ala	46, 351
Columbus, Ohio	682, 962
Franklin County	682, 962
Corpus Christi, Tex	221, 573
Nueces County	221, 573
Dallas, Tex	1, 083, 601
Collin County	41, 247
Dallas County	951, 527
Denton County	47, 432
Ellis County	43, 395
Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, Iowa-Ill	270, 058
Scott County, Iowa	119, 067
Rock Island County, Ill	150, 991
Dayton, Ohio	694, 623
Greene County	94, 642
Miami County	72, 901
Montgomery County	527, 080
Decatur, Ill	118, 257
Macon County	118, 257
Denver, Colo	929, 383
Adams County	120, 296
Arapahoe County	113, 426
Boulder County	74, 254
Denver County	493, 887
Jefferson County	266, 315
Des Moines, Iowa	266, 315
Polk County	266, 315
Detroit, Mich	3, 762, 360
Macomb County	405, 804
Oakland County	690, 259
Wayne County	2, 666, 297
Dubuque, Iowa	80, 048
Dubuque County	80, 048

TABLE 31.—*Population of standard metropolitan statistical areas and component areas in the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1960*—Con.

Duluth-Superior, Minn.-Wis	276, 596
St. Louis County, Minn	231, 588
Douglas County, Wis	45, 008
Durham, N.C	111, 995
Durham County	111, 995
El Paso, Tex	314, 070
El Paso County	314, 070
Erie, Pa	250, 682
Erie County	250, 682
Eugene, Oreg	162, 890
Lane County	162, 890
Evansville, Ind.-Ky	199, 313
Vanderburgh County, Ind	165, 794
Henderson County, Ky	33, 519
Fall River, Mass.-R.I	138, 156
Bristol County, Mass. (part)	128, 695
Fall River city	99, 942
Somerset town	12, 196
Swansea town	9, 916
Westport town	6, 641
Newport County, R.I. (part)	9, 461
Rivertown town	9, 461
Fargo-Moorhead, N. Dak.-Minn	106, 027
Cass County, N. Dak	66, 947
Clay County, Minn	39, 080
Fitchburg-Leominster, Mass	82, 486
Middlesex County (part)	5, 202
Shirley town	5, 202
Worcester County (part)	77, 284
Fitchburg city	43, 021
Leominster city	27, 929
Lunenberg town	6, 334
Flint, Mich	374, 313
Genesee County	374, 313
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla	333, 946
Broward County	333, 946
Fort Smith, Ark	66, 685
Sebastian County	66, 685
Fort Wayne, Ind	232, 196
Allen County	232, 196
Fort Worth, Tex	573, 215
Johnson County	34, 720
Tarrant County	538, 495
Fresno, Calif	365, 945
Fresno County	365, 945
Gadsden, Ala	96, 980
Etowah County	96, 980
Galveston-Texas City, Tex	140, 364
Galveston County	140, 364
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind,	573, 548
Lake County	513,269
Porter County	60, 279
Grand Rapids, Mich	363, 187
Kent County	363, 187
Great Falls, Mont	73, 418
Cascade County	73, 418
Green Bay, Wis	125, 082
Brown County	125,082
Greensboro-High Point, N.C	246, 520
Guilford County	246, 520
Greenville, S.C	209, 776
Greenville County	209, 776
Hamilton-Middletown, Ohio	199, 076
Butler County	199, 076
Harrisburg, Pa	345, 071
Cumberland County	124, 816
Dauphin County	220, 255
Hartford, Conn	525, 207
Hartford County (part)	501, 466
Hartford city	162, 178
Avon town	5, 273
Bloomfield town	13, 613
Canton town	4, 783
East Hartford town	43, 977
East Windsor town	7, 500
Enfield town	31, 464
Farmington town	10, 813
Glastonbury town	14, 497
Manchester town	42, 102
Newington town	17, 664
Rocky Hill town	7, 404
Simsbury town	10, 138
South Windsor town	9, 460
Hartford, Conn.—Continued	
Hartford County (part)—Con.	
Suffield town	6, 779
West Hartford town	62, 382
Wethersfield town	20, 561
Windsor town	19, 467
Windsor Locks town	11, 411
Middlesex County (part)	6, 780
Cromwell town	6, 780
Tolland County (part)	16, 961
Vernon town	16, 961
Honolulu, Hawaii	500, 409
Honolulu County	500, 409
Houston, Tex	1, 243, 158
Harris County	1, 243, 158
Huntington-Ashland, W. Va.-Ky.-Ohio	254, 780
Cabell County, W. Va	108, 202
Wayne County, W. Va	38, 977
Boyd County, Ky	52, 163
Lawrence County, Ohio	55, 438
Huntsville, Ala	117, 348
Madison County	117, 348
Indianapolis, Ind	697, 567
Marion County	697, 567
Jackson, Mich	131, 994
Jackson County	131, 994
Jackson, Miss	187, 045
Hinds County	187. 045
Jacksonville, Fla	455, 411
Duval County	455, 411
Jersey City, N.J	610, 734
Hudson County	610, 734
Johnstown, Pa	280, 733
Cambria County	203, 283
Somerset County	77, 450
Kalamazoo, Mich	169, 712
Kalamazoo County	169, 712
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans	1, 039, 493
Clay County, Mo	87, 474
Jackson, County, Mo	622, 732
Johnson County, Kans	143, 792
Wyandotte County, Kans	185, 495
Kenosha, Wis	100, 615
Kenosha County	100, 615
Knoxville, Tenn	368, 080
Anderson County	60, 032
Blount County	57, 525
Knox County	250, 523
Lake Charles, La	145, 475
Calcasieu Parish	145, 475
Lancaster, Pa	278, 359
Lancaster County	278, 359
Lansing, Mich	298, 949
Clinton County	37, 969
Eaton County	49, 684
Ingham County	211, 296
Laredo, Texas	64, 791
Webb County	64 ,791
Las Vegas, Nev	127, 016
Clark County	127, 016
Lawrence-Haverhill, Mass.–N.H.	187, 601
Essex County, Mass. (part)	175, 476
Lawrence City	70, 933
Haverhill City	46, 346
Andover town	15, 878
Groveland town	3, 297
Methuen town	28, 114
North Andover town	10, 908
Rockingham County, N.H. (part)	12, 125
Plaistow town	2, 915
Salem town	9, 210
Lawton Okla	90, 803
Comanche County	90, 803
Lewiston-Auburn, Maine	70, 295
Androscoggin County (part)	70, 295
Auburn City	24, 449
Lewiston City	40, 804
Lisbon town	5, 042
Lexington, Ky.	131, 906
Fayette County	131, 906
Lima, Ohio	103, 691
Allen County	103, 691
Lincoln, Nebr	155, 272
Lancaster County	155, 272
Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark.	242, 980
Pulaski County	242, 980
Lorain-Elyria, Ohio	217, 500
Lorain County	217, 500
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	6, 742, 696
Los Angeles County	6, 038, 771
Orange County	703, 925
Louisville, Ky.-Ind	725, 139
Jefferson County, Ky	610, 947
Clark County, Ind	62, 795
Floyd County, Ind	51, 397
Lowell, Mass	157, 982
Middlesex County (part)	157, 982
Lowell City	92, 107
Billerica town	17, 867
Chelmsford town	15, 130
Dracut town	13, 674
Tewksbury town	15, 902
Tyngsborough town	3, 302
Lubbock, Tex	156, 271
Lubbock, County	156, 271
Lynchburg, Va	110, 701
Lynchburg City	54, 790
Amhurst County	22, 953
Campbell County	32, 958
Macon, Ga	180, 403
Bibb County	141, 249
Houston County	39, 154
Madison, Wis	222, 095
Dane County	222, 095
Manchester, N.H	95, 512
Hillsboro County (part)	95, 512
Manchester City	88, 282
Goffstown town	7, 230
Memphis, Tenn	627, 019
Shelby County	627, 019
Meriden, Conn	51, 850
New Haven County (part)	51, 850
Meriden City	51, 850
Miami, Fla	935, 047
Dade County	935, 047
Midland, Tex	67, 717
Midland County	67, 717
Milwaukee, Wis	1, 194, 290
Milwaukee County	1, 036, 041
Waukesha County	158, 249
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	1, 482, 030
Anoka County	85, 916
Dakota County	78, 303
Hennepin County	842, 854
Ramsey County	422, 525
Washington County	52, 432
Mobile, Ala	314, 301
Mobile County	314, 301
Monroe, La	101, 663
Ouachita Parish	101, 663
Montgomery, Ala	169, 210
Montgomery County	169, 210
Muncie, Ind	110, 938
Delaware County	110, 938
Muskegon-Muskegon Heights, Mich	149, 943
Muskegon County	149, 943
Nashville, Tenn	399, 743
Davidson County	399, 743
New Bedford, Mass	143, 176
Bristol County (part)	137, 178
New Bedford City	102, 477
Acushnet town	5, 755
Dartmouth town	14, 607
Fairhaven town	14, 339
Plymouth County (part)	5, 998
Marion town	2, 881
Mattapoisett town	3, 117
New Britain, Conn	129, 397
Hartford County (part)	129, 397
New Britain City	82, 201
Berlin town	11, 250
Plainville town	13, 149
Southington town	22, 797
New Haven, Conn	311, 681
New Haven County (part)	311, 681
New Haven City	152, 048
Branford town	16, 610
East Haven town	21, 388

TABLE 31.—*Population of standard metropolitan statistical areas and component areas in the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1960*—Con.

New Haven, Conn.—Continued	
New Haven County (part)—Con.	
Guilford town	7,913
Hamden town	41,056
North Haven town	15,935
Orange town	8,547
West Haven town	43,002
Woodbridge town	5,182
New London-Groton-Norwich, Conn	156,913
New London County (part)	156,913
New London City	34,182
Norwich City	38,506
East Lyme town	6,782
Groton town	29,937
Ledyard town	5,395
Montville town	7,759
Preston town	4,992
Stonington town	13,969
Waterford town	15,391
New Orleans, La	868,480
Jefferson Parish	208,769
Orleans Parish	627,525
St. Bernard Parish	32,186
New York, N.Y	10,694,633
New York City	7,781,984
Bronx County	1,424,815
Kings County	2,627,319
New York County	1,698,281
Queens County	1,809,578
Richmond County	221,991
Nassau County	1,300,171
Rockland County	136,803
Suffolk County	666,784
Westchester County	808,891
Newark, N.J	1,689,420
Essex County	923,545
Morris County	261,620
Union County	504,255
Newport News-Hampton, Va	224,503
Newport News City	113,662
Hampton City	89,258
York County	21,583
Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va	578,507
Norfolk City	305,872
South Norfolk City	22,035
Portsmouth City	114,773
Virginia Beach City	8,091
Norfolk County	51,612
Princess Anne County	76,125
Norwalk, Conn	96,756
Fairfield County (part)	96,756
Norwalk City	67,775
Westport town	20,955
Wilton town	8,026
Odessa, Tex	90,995
Ector County	90,995
Ogden, Utah	110,744
Weber County	110,744
Oklahoma City, Okla	511,833
Canadian County	24,727
Cleveland County	47,600
Oklahoma County	439,506
Omaha, Nebr.-Iowa	457,873
Douglas County, Nebr	343,490
Sarpy County, Nebr	31,281
Pottawattamie County, Iowa	83,102
Orlando, Fla	318,487
Orange County	263,540
Seminole County	54,947
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J	1,186,873
Bergen County	780,255
Passaic County	406,618
Pensacola, Fla	203,376
Escambia County	173,829
Santa Rosa County	29,547
Peoria, Ill	288,833
Peoria County	189,044
Tazewell County	99,789
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J	4,342,897
Bucks County, Pa	308,567
Chester County, Pa	210,608
Delaware County, Pa	553,154
Montgomery County, Pa	516,682
Philadelphia County, Pa	2,002,512

TABLE 31.—*Population of standard metropolitan statistical areas and component areas in the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1960*—Con.

Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.—Continued	
Burlington County, N.J	224,499
Camden County, N.J	392,035
Gloucester County, N.J	134,840
Phoenix, Ariz	663,510
Maricopa County	663,510
Pittsburgh, Pa	2,405,435
Allegheny County	1,628,587
Beaver County	206,948
Washington County	217,271
Westmoreland County	352,629
Pittsfield, Mass	73,839
Berkshire County (part)	73,839
Pittsfield City	57,879
Dalton town	6,436
Lenox town	4,253
Lee town	5,271
Portland, Maine	120,655
Cumberland County (part)	120,655
Portland City	72,566
South Portland City	22,788
Westbrook City	13,820
Cape Elizabeth town	5,505
Falmouth town	5,976
Portland, Oreg.-Wash	821,897
Clackamas County, Oreg	113,038
Multnomah County, Oreg	522,813
Washington County, Oreg	92,237
Clark County, Wash	93,809
Providence-Pawtucket, R.I.-Mass.	816,148
Providence County, R.I. (part)	558,074
Central Falls City	19,858
Cranston City	66,766
East Providence City	41,955
Pawtucket City	81,001
Providence City	207,498
Woonsocket City	47,080
Burrillville town	9,119
Cumberland town	18,792
Johnston town	17,160
Lincoln town	13,551
North Providence town	18,220
North Smithfield town	7,632
Smithfield town	9,442
Washington County, R.I. (part)	22,421
Narragansett town	3,444
North Kingstown town	18,977
Kent County, R.I. (part)	111,450
Warwick City	68,504
Coventry town	15,432
East Greenwich town	6,100
West Warwick town	21,414
Providence-Pawtucket, R.I.:	
Bristol County, R.I. (part)	37,146
Barrington town	13,826
Bristol town	14,570
Warrentown	8,750
Newport County, R.I. (part)	2,267
Jamestown town	2,267
Bristol County, Mass. (part)	50,294
Attleboro City	27,118
North Attleboro town	14,777
Seekonk town	8,399
Norfolk County, Mass. (part)	27,799
Bellingham town	6,774
Franklin town	10,530
Plainville town	3,810
Wrentham town	6,685
Worcester County, Mass. (part)	6,697
Blackstone town	5,130
Millville town	1,567
Provo-Oren, Utah	106,991
Utah County	106,991
Pueblo, Colo	118,707
Pueblo County	118,707
Racine, Wis	141,781
Racine County	141,781
Raleigh, N.C	169,082
Wake County	169,082
Reading, Pa	275,414
Berks County	275,414
Reno, Nev	84,743
Washoe County	84,743

TABLE 31.—*Population of standard metropolitan statistical areas and component areas in the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1960*—Con.

Richmond, Va	408,494
Richmond City	219,958
Chesterfield County	71,197
Henrico County	117,339
Roanoke, Va	158,803
Roanoke City	97,110
Roanoke County	61,693
Rochester, N.Y	586,387
Monroe County	586,387
Rockford, Ill	209,765
Winnebago County	209,765
Sacramento, Calif	502,778
Sacramento County	502,778
Saginaw, Mich	190,752
Saginaw County	190,752
St. Joseph, Mo	90,581
Buchanan County	90,581
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill	2,060,103
St. Louis City, Mo	750,026
Jefferson County, Mo	66,377
St. Charles County, Mo	52,970
St. Louis County, Mo	703,532
Madison County, Ill	224,689
St. Clair County, Ill	262,509
Salt Lake City, Utah	383,035
Salt Lake County	383,035
San Angelo, Tex	64,630
Tom Green County	64,630
San Antonio, Tex	687,151
Bexar County	687,151
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif	809,782
Riverside County	306,191
San Bernardino County	503,591
San Diego, Calif	1,033,011
San Diego County	1,033,011
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif	2,783,359
Alameda County	908,209
Contra Costa County	409,030
Marin County	146,820
San Francisco County	740,316
San Mateo County	444,387
Solano County	134,597
San Jose, Calif	642,315
Santa Clara County	642,315
Santa Barbara, Calif	168,962
Santa Barbara County	168,962
Savannah, Ga	188,299
Chatham County	188,299
Scranton, Pa	234,531
Lackawanna County	234,531
Seattle, Wash	1,107,213
King County	935,014
Snohomish County	172,199
Shreveport, La	281,481
Bossier Parish	57,622
Caddo Parish	223,859
Sioux City, Iowa	107,849
Woodbury County	107,849
Sioux Falls, S. Dak	86,575
Minnehaha County	86,575
South Bend, Ind	238,614
St. Joseph County	238,614
Spokane, Wash	278,333
Spokane County	278,333
Springfield, Ill	146,539
Sangamon County	146,539
Springfield, Mo	126,276
Greene County	126,276
Springfield, Ohio	131,440
Clark County	131,440
Springfield - Chicopee - Holyoke, Mass	478,592
Hampton County (part)	414,770
Chicopee city	61,553
Holyoke city	52,689
Springfield city	174,463
Westfield city	26,302
Agawam town	15,718
East Longmeadow town	10,294
Longmeadow town	10,565
Ludlow town	13,805
Monson town	6,712
Palmer town	10,358
West Springfield town	24,924
Wilbraham town	7,387

TABLE 31.—*Population of standard metropolitan statistical areas and component areas in the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1960*—Con.

Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Mass.—Continued	
Hampshire County (part)	60,439
Northampton city	30,058
Eesthampton town	12,326
Hadley town	3,099
South Hadley town	14,956
Worcester County (part)	3,383
Warren town	3,383
Stamford, Conn	178,409
Fairfield County (part)	178,409
Stamford City	92,713
Darien town	18,437
Greenwich town	53,793
New Canaan town	13,466
Steubenville-Weirton, Ohio-W. Va	167,756
Jefferson County, Ohio	99,201
Brooke County, W. Va	28,940
Hancock County, W. Va	39,615
Stockton, Calif.	249,989
San Joaquin County	249,989
Syracuse, N.Y.	563,781
Madison County	54,635
Onondaga County	423,028
Oswego County	86,118
Tacoma, Wash.	321,500
Pierce County	321,590
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla	772,453
Hillsborough County	397,788
Pinellas County	374,665
Terre Haute, Ind	108,458
Vigo County	108,458
Texarkana, Tex.-Ark.	91,657
Bowie County, Tex	59,971
Miller County, Ark	31,686
Toledo, Ohio	456,931
Lucas County	456,931
Topeka, Kans.	141,286
Shawnee County	141,286
Trenton, N.J.	266,392
Mercer County	266,392
Tucson, Ariz.	265,660
Pima County	265,660
Tulsa, Okla.	418,974
Creek County	40,495
Osage County	32,441
Tulsa County	346,038
Tuscaloosa, Ala.	109,047
Tuscaloosa County	109,047
Tyler, Tex.	86,350
Smith County	86,350
Utica-Rome, N.Y.	330,771
Herkimer County	66,370
Oneida County	264,401
Waco, Tex.	150,091
McLennan County	150,091
Washington, D.C.-Md.-Va.	2,001,897
Washington, D.C.	763,956
Alexandria City, Va	91,023
Falls Church City, Va	10,912
Arlington County, Va	163,401
Fairfax County, Va	275,002
Montgomery County, Md	340,928
Prince Georges County, Md	357,395
Waterbury, Conn.	181,638
New Haven County (part)	160,951
Waterbury City	107,130
Naugatuck Borough	19,511
Beacon Falls town	2,886
Cheshire town	13,383
Middlebury town	4,785
Prospect town	4,367
Wolcott town	8,889
Litchfield County (part)	20,687
Thomaston town	5,850
Watertown town	14,837
Waterloo, Iowa	122,482
Black Hawk County	122,482
West Palm Beach, Fla	228,106
Palm Beach County	228,106
Wheeling, W. Va.-Ohio	190,342
Ohio County, W. Va	68,437
Marshall County, W. Va	38,041
Belmont County, Ohio	83,864
Wichita, Kans	343,231
Sedgwick County	343,231
Wichita Falls, Tex	129,638
Archer County	6,110
Wichita County	123,528
Wilkes-Barre—Hazleton, Pa	346,972
Luzerne County	346,972
Wilmington, Del.-N.J	366,157
New Castle County, Del	307,446
Salem County, N.J	58,711
Winston-Salem, N.C	189,428
Forsyth County	189,428
Worcester, Mass	323,306
Worcester County (part)	323,306
Worcester City	186,587
Auburn town	14,047
Berlin town	1,742
Boylston town	2,367
Brookfield town	1,751
East Brookfield town	1,533
Grafton town	10,627
Holden town	10,117
Leicester town	8,177
Millbury town	9,623
Northborough town	6,687
Northbridge town	10,800
North Brookfield town	3,616
Oxford town	9,282
Shrewsbury town	16,622
Spencer town	7,838
Sutton town	3,638
Upton town	3,127
Westborough town	9,599
West Boylston town	5,526
York, Pa	238,336
York County	238,336
Youngstown-Warren, Ohio	509,006
Mahoning County	300,480
Trumbull County	208,526
PUERTO RICO	
Mayagüez, P.R	83,850
Mayagüez Municipio	83,850
Ponce, P.R	145,586
Ponce Municipio	145,586
San Juan, P.R	588,805
San Juan Municipio	451,658
Cataño Municipio	25,208
Bayamón Municipio	72,221
Guaynabo Municipio	39,718

[From the Congressional Quarterly, Apr. 28, 1967]

LACK OF AREAWIDE PLANNING THREATENS FEDERAL URBAN AID

A little-known provision of last year's "model cities" law has caused a severe legal tangle.

The disputed provision, Section 204 of the 1966 Demonstration Cities Act (PL 89-754), seeks greater coordination of federal aid to cities and suburbs. Effective July 1, it directs local officials within a metropolitan area to submit their applications for most kinds of federal aid to an areawide planning group for review. While it does not grant veto power, the statute allows the reviewing body a wide latitude to make its opinions known.

The focal point of the hassle is the wording of the provision and what it fails to say. Metropolitan areas without planning bodies receive no guidance as to whether they must create them. Where planning groups exist, the provision does not stipulate what steps will be taken if local officials bypass the review.

In some areas, there is no constitutional authority to appoint such agencies, while in certain other areas that have them, they are vigorously opposed by the separate localities. In either case, the provision poses the same possibility—a lengthy tie-up in federal aid.

Effect of Provision.—The areas covered would be those that the Budget Bureau has defined as "standard metropolitan statistical areas" (SMSA)—areas made up of a core city of 50,000 or more people, plus all contiguous areas economically or sociologically integrated with the core city. A total of 230 SMSAs currently are designated.

Often the SMSA includes more than one large city. In Florida, for instance, the St. Petersburg-Tampa complex has three—Tampa (the core city) with 340,000, St. Petersburg with 205,600 and Clearwater with 40,700. Despite their similarites, such component cities have conflicting interests that can make cooperation on planning difficult.

Richard H. Bryant, attorney-adviser for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), told Congressional Quarterly that fears of a tie-up of federal aid were well-grounded. An application not reviewed, he said, likely would be submitted for a legal advisory opinion. The opinion would have to come from the General Accounting Office (GAO), he suggested, or perhaps from the Attorney General.

For any metropolitan area, a delay in aid would come as a staggering blow. Categories covered include all federal loans or grants for the following: open-space land projects, planning or construction of hospitals, airports, libraries, water supply and distribution facilities, sewerage facilities and waste treatment works, highways and transportation facilities, and water development and land conservation projects. Aside from the urban renewal and various housing programs, these activities form the hub of federal urban aids.

ORIGINS OF PROVISION

Reference—*1966 Weekly Report p. 2821.*

The coordination requirement that became Section 204 originally appeared in the 1965 Intergovernmental Cooperation Act (S 561) which was passed by the Senate in 1965 but languished in the House. The provision's stated purpose was to develop coordinated metropolitan planning so that projects built in one part of the metropolitan area neither duplicated nor interfered with those placed in another. The plan was sponsored by Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D Maine) and was first recommended by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in 1961. The Commission represents federal, state and local governments.

The Committee report on S 561 (S Rept. 538, 89th Congress) gave this justification for the coordination requirement: "The need for legislation providing for local review of federal loan and grant-in-aid applications for projects in metropolitan areas is created by (1) the rapid population growth in these areas, (2) the many federal programs available affecting the development of such areas and (3) the number of local units of government in metropolitan areas independently initiating such applications. These applications for federal assistance are often made without reference to other federal, state, local or private development programs or to their impact on the over-all urban area which they are designed to serve. . . Given this situation, areawide planning agencies can serve as an effective grassroots vehicle for the coordination" of the many types of developmental activities.

No further action was taken on the coordination requirement until Muskie, after a strong push from the Administration, agreed to manage President Johnson's "model cities" package. The Administration, which had had great difficulty in finding a suitable floor manager, agreed to allow Muskie to insert some of his favorite programs in the legislation. Among them was the language that became Section 204. Although the Administration's original reaction to the provision still has not been revealed, HUD sources now indicate that they consider the plan a useful urban tool.

The House, pressed to clear the "cities" bill in the closing days of the session, overlooked Section 204 in a heated debate over other aspects of the model cities bill. During floor discussions, only one Representative—William C. Cramer (R Fla.)—rose to contest the plan. In his own state, Cramer said, the Governor had no authority to appoint or designate the necessary areawide agency. Because the Florida Legislature would not convene in time, he added, enforcement of the provision would leave Florida's metropolitan areas without a substantial amount of their normal federal aid.

REGULATIONS

The Budget Bureau, charged with administering the Section 204 requirement, April 11 issued regulations setting forth the specific programs covered (*see box on next page*) [not printed in the Record], and suggesting across-the-board application to all metropolitan areas. For areas that did not have areawide agencies, the regulations directed the HUD Secretary to request the state Governor, in consultation with local officials to appoint or designate one. No machinery was included to enforce the procedure, however, and no clarification was made as to what action would follow when an application was not reviewed.

A Budget Bureau official told CQ that the Bureau's approach went as far as it was possible to go under the existing statute. "Anything more," he said, "would be legislating by regulation."

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST

GOP Criticisms. Republican staff members on the House Banking and Currency Committee—the panel with jurisdiction over urban affairs—reacted to the regulation by expressing fear that enforcement of the controversial requirement would change "the entire course of local government."

Mandatory compliance with the plan, they said, would result in increasing federal control. "The areawide agencies will learn pretty quickly that they will have to follow HUD guidelines and priorities," one source said. "If an agency doesn't play ball, its applications will go right to the bottom of the heap."

Where the localities buck the areawide agencies, the source suggested, the outcome would be much the same. A negative agency comment, he said, would be tantamount to outright veto. "This would be a black mark in the record of that application that HUD could hardly overlook."

The over-all effect of the provision, the GOP sources said, would accomplish the same objectives sought by "metro"—the controversial 1966 plan to reward good area-wide planning—which House Republicans fought. (The metro plan, included in Section 205 of the 1966 Demonstration Cities Act, authorized supplemental grants of up to 20 percent of the required local share of the cost of selected federal projects. To receive the bonus grant, an area was required to demonstrate a high level of comprehensive and current metropolitanwide planning. Funds for the program were denied in 1966.)

"The irony of this situation," one source concluded, "is that 204 won't cost HUD a cent. Metro, if they get the funds this year, will cost them a cool $30 million."

HUD Response. Housing officials, while pleased with the planning requirement, discounted the GOP's suggestions of its overall effect. One official told CQ the areawide agencies were "not equipped" to overrule local officials on routine plans. "They're too involved with transportation corridors and problems of that sort of import to give too much thought to where a sewer gets placed," he asserted.

The official also said Section 204 was far from a substitute for the far-reaching metro plan. "They're at different ends of the spectrum," he said. "Metro requires intensely detailed planning, while advisory review is just a start. The review procedure imposes no real requirement for any planning at all."

OUTLOOK

One GOP Representative who opposes the entire metro concept told CQ, through a spokesman, that GOP House Members might move to repeal the disputed section when the Administration's new housing bill (H.R. 8068) comes to the House floor. (*For description of bill, see Weekly Report p. 601; coverage of House hearings, which began April 18, will be carried in a subsequent Weekly Report.*)

A HUD spokesman told CQ the Administration would propose, probably to the House Committee, an amendment to clarify the provision. He said the amendment would impose a mandatory, across-the-board review requirement and also—"to be completely realistic"—a six-month to one-year extension of the July 1 effective date.

Federal-Aid Programs Covered by Review Requirement

Under Section 204 of the 1966 "Model Cities" Act, city and suburban officials within standard metropolitan areas must submit their applications for numerous federal-aid programs to the area's metropolitanwide planning agency for review. The provision takes effect on July 1.

The Act outlined coverage for 10 broad aid categories, leaving it to the Budget Bureau to formulate detailed coverage. The Bureau April 11 issued regulations covering 36 separate programs. The programs follow, listed under the Department or agency administering them:

1. Department of Housing and Urban Development: Open-space land program; basic water and sewer facilities; urban mass transit; public facility loans; public works planning; urban planning assistance; and advance acquisition of land.
2. Department of the Interior: Outdoor recreation; waste treatment facilities; irrigation and reclamation; and river basin pollution control and abatement.
3. Department of Transportation: Highway landscaping and scenic enhancement; highway development; and airport planning and construction.
4. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Hill-Burton hospital facilities; Health research facilities; community mental health facilities and centers; vocational rehabilitation facilities; libraries; solid waste disposal; comprehensive state and areawide health planning.
5. Department of Agriculture: "Greenspan" program; rural water and waste disposal facilities and planning; watershed protection and flood prevention; soil and water conservation loans; and rural renewal and resource conservation and development.
6. Department of Commerce: Public works and economic development facilities; regional action planning; and economic development planning.
7. Army Corps of Engineers: Beach erosion control and flood prevention.
8. Appalachian Regional Commission: Health facilities construction; sewage treatment works; Appalachian development highway system; and mining area restoration.
9. Water Resources Council: State and regional water resources planning.

TRADE WITH THE COMMUNIST BLOC NATIONS

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Snyder] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the moral justifications of the Vietnam war have been of late the subject of extensive public controversy. Everyone from the bearded Vietniks to peace-loving college professors has seen fit to decry the immorality of American involvement in Vietnam. The public has been subjected to sit-ins, lie-ins, draft card burnings and every imaginable kind of protest against Vietnam policy and the "immoral war."

But what of our moral responsibility to those American sons, fathers, and husbands whose blood is being spilled in the jungles of a small country thousands of miles from their homeland? The very administration which has committed this country and its fighting men to this conflict would have us increase trade with nations who supply our enemies. Regardless of one's political or moral opinion of our presence in the Vietnam conflict, one principle should be eminently clear to everyone—and that is that nothing could be more immoral or even criminal than for the leaders of this country to trade with the very nations who are aiding in the slaughter of America's young men.

Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from the brother of one of America's fallen fighting men which I feel eloquently expresses the feelings of most Americans with regard to trade with Communist bloc nations. Under unanimous consent, I include this letter:

May 16, 1967.

Hon. Gene Snyder,
Congressman, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: It is beyond my comprehension to understand why officials in authority can advocate trade to Communist bloc nations while the blood of our youth is being spilled on foreign soil against those to whom they advocate trade. Premeir Ky would not lower himself to such a fallacy.

Last week the first hurdle was successfully taken by those capitalists who would profit, momentarily, by financing a Fifty Million Dollar automobile plant within the Soviet Union. Machinery to be installed in this plant would be purchased from American manufacturers. Such a plant could easily be converted to produce war materials.

It is my opinion that all those who would give aid and comfort to our arch enemies, and make no mistake about it they are our arch enemies, are traitors to the American cause. I cannot in conscience support individuals or groupe that would jeopardize our freedom or heritage for the sake of a dollar.

My brother, Pfc. Victor H. Van Vactor, United States Marine Corp., gave his life fighting the communists in Vietnam. The least the United States Government can do is to support our men in Vietnam and throughout the world 100%. There is much dissent among the government officials in Washington over the war in Vietnam whether we are right or wrong. While it is an issue with some, they should not lose sight of the fact that their dissent openly, which is their God given right, is killing our men in Vietnam by prolonging the war and supplying propaganda to the enemy.

Any allied country of the United States who directly or indirectly trades with North Vietnam should be cut off of American aid immediately. The pilot who shot up, so they say, a British freighter off the coast of Vietnam, whether he was right or wrong, in my opinion should have received a medal for his action. The ship should have been sunk by our naval superiority.

The communists are out to eventually control the world whether it be by aggression or from within the borders of a nation, through elections or revolutions the end will justify the means. Once a nation is enslaved by communist suppression there is little hope for them to return as free men.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD E. JONES.

THE U.S. ROLE IN THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the Gulf of Aqaba blockade by the United Arab Republic in an act of naked aggression. Nasser has perpetrated an act of war and has issued a challenge to peace that we cannot disregard. Nor can we meet this defiance with statements of generalities.

The question is one the United States must face squarely. We must assure the reopening of the Gulf of Aqaba. We must not leave this one-sided challenge to Israel. We must be unequivocal that we will not desert our Israel friends.

The Soviet Union has made it clear that it does not wish to get involved in four power talks unless the United States gets out of Vietnam.

England and France say they are not inclined to get involved. They have enough of their own problems.

The United States says the solution should go to the United Nations.

The United Nations has done nothing in recent developments except to turn over the areas protected by UNEF to the Egyptian aggressors—paving the way for the present tinderbox.

Commendable as the current recommendations for United Nations action may be—and even as laudable as Senator KENNEDY's proposed United Nations Naval Patrol may be—at this point the feasibility of this is questionable because of the realties at the U.N.

Let us face it. The history of the United Nations in recent years has been anything but fair in regard to Israel. The Russian-Arab combination has predominated. This was only too blatantly illustrated by the immediate acceptance of Nasser's demands to pull out the UNEF.

The blockade of Aqaba, I should point out, also threatens pro-West Jordan by sealing off its only port and making that country vulnerable to Nasser—a goal, incidentally, which the Egyptian dictator has long sought.

So this is not just a question affecting the destiny of Israel. The fate of the whole Arab Peninsula is at stake.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that our President should announce an inequivocal reassurance of our Middle East commitments. The United States is most definitely committed by international agreements, by repeated declarations in acts of Congress, and by strong moral commitments. Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson have repeatedly and unmistakably made it clear that we will honor our border guarantees.

If we do not make this clear again in forthright language, United States prestige and influence in the entire Middle East will be dead, and Nasserism—the front for communism—will win by default. And elsewhere American guarantees to small countries menaced by aggression—especially when the aggressors are armed by the Communist bloc—will have no meaning whatsoever.

I see in the timing of Nasser's aggression a tie to Communist diversions elsewhere, including Vietnam. With the war in Vietnam, I am certain the United Arab Republic President feels our commitments there are such that this would be no time for the United States to spread elsewhere.

There are other developments of Communist diversion that I think link with Nasser's moves—the riots in Hong Kong, for instance, the blowing up of an army barracks in Korea earlier this week, and so forth.

The United States must be consistent in its foreign policy. If it is proper to oppose aggression in Vietnam, we cannot use another standard in the Middle East. Is Saigon more sacred than Jerusalem? Is the principle here any different?

The President should emphatically restate that the United States will honor its commitments—that we will not stand by in this crisis.

And, of course, we should take bold, relentless leadership on this issue in the United Nations for a firm, effective action. But we must be fully cognizant that we cannot at this time rely on a solution there.

And indeed, Mr. Speaker, the President should ask Congress for a Gulf of Aqaba resolution, just as he did when he asked for a Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

We should make clear that we mean what the administration repeatedly has been saying, and I quote Secretary Rusk, "aggression unchecked is aggression unleashed."

COALITION FOR IGNORANCE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the decimation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by the House today is nothing short of tragic. The results will be tragic for the poor and tragic for the Negro. The action of the House is a travesty of educational improvement and progress in civil rights.

Poor children in New York stand to lose heavily. Under the Gibbons amendment, New York State will lose $19,558,336 in title I funds, more than any other State. Furthermore, nationally this amendment will eliminate any incentive for the States to spend more on education. It will decrease consideration of variations in education costs in different parts of the country.

Elimination of the Teacher Corps will deprive our most needy school districts of teacher aides they cannot afford to hire. The teacher shortage is critical, particularly in poor areas. What an unnecessary and cruel blow at needy children everywhere.

Perhaps the cruelest blow, however, was at the Negro child in the South. The combination of the Green amendment wreaking havoc with the guidelines for gradual integration of the southern dual school systems, the Fountain amendment eliminating the Commissioner of Education's power to effectively withhold funds from schools not complying with the Civil Rights Act, and finally, the Green amendments turning title III and title V over completely to the States, constitute a devastating blow at school integration and educational improvement in the South.

The Negro of America must feel terribly abandoned by this Congress as a result of the action taken on this education bill. He already had reason to doubt our willingness to treat him, his aspirations and his needs fairly. Now, as the prime inhabitant of the community of poverty and the prime beneficiary of school desegregation, the Negro knows that this Congres simply does not care about providing educational opportunity for his children. The chances that he will reject Congress, our society, and our system of laws as means of achieving his legitimate aspirations have been greatly enhanced. The summer of the Negro's discontent will be no cooler as a result of this House's actions.

Catholic and other private school children are hard hit by the Green amendments, and particularly so in States like New York where State funds cannot be spent for private school children. Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, these children could participate in the educational centers and receive the benefits of equipment and materials because the benefits were being financed by the Federal Government, not by the States. Now that the funds for these programs are to be turned over to the States for distribution, private school children will be left out. This is unfair discrimination which might well destroy the fabric which held together the landmark Federal school aid program. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was designed to benefit children, not institutions, and thus preserved the constitutional principle of church-state separation.

These biased, destructive amendments were passed by a renewed unholy alliance of Republican reactionaries who oppose any Federal aid to education and southern Democrats opposed to school desegregation—even though it means deprivation of all poor children, white and Negro—even though the South receives proportionally the largest financial benefit from the bill.

This Republican-southern coalition certainly made a mockery of the minority leader's recent declaration that Republicans were breaking with the anticivil rights forces of the South and were off on a constructive new tack. Can he still dare to stand before us and claim that his party cares about the decay of our cities, progress in education, or equal opportunity for Negroes in the North or the South? Time and time again the Republicans filed down the aisle with their southern cohorts to gut the provisions of this bill, to deprive the poor, the Negro, the cities, and whole educational establishments. The only Republicans deserving of tribute were the small group, led by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid], who from his position on the Committee on Education and Labor led a small revolt against the leadership and majority of his party and in support of his committee's bill.

The sad role of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] simply cannot be overlooked. One may charitably grant her sincerity and good intentions, but one cannot forgive the harm her amendments will do to innocent, needy children, to education, and to civil rights. Her credentials in these vital areas are seriously tarnished. Like people, one must judge amendments by the company they keep. It cannot have been lost on Mrs. Green that the basis for support of her amendments came from reactionaries and segregationists.

The damage done by these amendments will be profound. It will not be easy to rectify such far-reaching errors in future Congresses. The important gains of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act were hard won over many years. One can only hope that corrective action will be taken in the Senate and in conference, and that a majority of this Congress will return to its senses and restore the vital benefits of this legislation to the children of America.

JOINT STATEMENT ON THE MIDEAST CRISIS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in the Middle East has raised the specter of war in that area of the world. I am encouraged to be associated with 41 other Members of the Senate and the House as cosigners in the following statement in support of a multilateral approach to the resolution of the difficulties we now face there:

Joint Statement on the Mideast Crisis

As members of the U.S. Congress concerned with the development of strong international institutions within the United Nations to keep the peace, we strongly endorse President Johnson's May 23 statement regarding the Arab-Israeli crisis.

In the language of the President, "We earnestly support all efforts, in and outside the United Nations and through its appropriate organs, including the Secretary General, to reduce tensions and to restore stability."

Specifically, we agree with President Johnson that:

1. We must in the first instance place reliance upon the United Nations to resolve the crisis;
2. The maintenance of peace in the Middle East is a matter of the gravest concern for all nations;
3. As the President said, "a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace." Therefore, the right of free, innocent passage should be granted to shipping of all nations through the Straits of Tiran; and
4. All of the nations of the Mideast have a special responsibility to moderate their words and actions so as to help to create a climate in which a peaceful resolution of the crisis can be obtained.

We call upon all concerned to exercise their solemn responsibility to the international community in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations for the development of world order.

MEMBERS OF THE SENATE COSIGNING STATEMENT

Senator Daniel B. Brewster, of Maryland.
Senator Edward W. Brooke, of Massachusetts.
Senator Joseph S. Clark, of Pennsylvania.
Senator Robert F. Kennedy, of New York.
Senator Gale McGee, of Wyoming.
Senator Walter Mondale, of Minnesota.
Senator Edmund Muskie, of Maine.
Senator Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin.
Senator Stephen Young, of Ohio.
Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COSIGNING STATEMENT

Jonathan Bingham, of New York.
Edward P. Boland, of Massachusetts.
John Brademas, of Indiana.
George E. Brown, Jr., of California.
Don Edwards, of California.
Don Fraser, of Minnesota.
Jacob Gilbert, of New York.
Gilbert Gude, of Maryland.
Seymour Halpern, of New York.
Henry Helstoski, of New Jersey.
Robert W. Kastenmeier, of Wisconsin.
William Moorhead, of Pennsylvania.
Patsy Mink, of Hawaii.
F. Bradford Morse, of Massachusetts.
Richard McCarthy, of New York.
Richard Ottinger, of New York.
Claude Pepper, of Florida.
Thomas M. Rees, of California.
Ogden Reid, of New York.
Joseph Y. Resnick, of New York.
Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin.
George M. Rhodes, of Pennsylvania.
Benjamin Rosenthal, of New York.
William F. Ryan, of New York.
James Scheuer, of New York.
Richard Schweiker, of Pennsylvania.
Fred Schwengel, of Iowa.
William L. St. Onge, of Connecticut.
Herbert Tenzer, of New York.
Morris K. Udall, of Arizona.
Charles W. Whalen, Jr., of Ohio.
Robert L. Leggett, of California.
James Corman, of California.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS AND OUR DUTY TO DETOUR AGGRESSION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the United States has made two important statements on the Middle East crisis in the past 2 days. The first was the statement by President Johnson Tuesday night; the second was Ambassador Goldberg's speech to the Security Council yesterday. I believe the key elements of our policy are clear: We oppose any aggression in the area, either overt or clandestine; we are urging all states to avoid any action which might worsen the already tense situation when the Secretary General left for Cairo; we support efforts through the United Nations to work out a peaceful solution; we urge all states—the great powers in particular—to exercise their responsibilities in this situation; and we ourselves stand ready to join with the other great powers, either within or outside the United Nations, in a common effort to restore and maintain peace in the Near East.

I support this policy. In this tense situation we must actively seek a peaceful solution. The Soviet Union has not been willing to cooperate with us in this task. The Soviet statement of May 23, which was repeated yesterday in the Security Council, concluded that the U.S.S.R. would do everything in its power to prevent a violation of peace and security in the Near East and safeguard the legitimate rights of the peoples. But the Soviet Union refused even to cooperate in informal consultations with other Security Council members.

We all hope that the Secretary General is returning from Cairo with something which will open the way to an easing of the situation. I am sure that the United States will do everything within its power to assure a peaceful solution; war in the Middle East would benefit no one—and most likely would be disastrous to all, East and West alike.

Mr. Speaker, as we all are acutely aware, the United States has been meeting and thwarting the threat of aggression in south Asia for a number of years; and I do not think I exaggerate when I point out the huge sacrifice in blood and resources that we are committing to that area of the world, nor would I like to underestimate the strain and frustrations in our domestic society that this commitment entails. However, are we being entirely consistent with our stated and declared national policies by saying that the threat of aggression in one part of the world does not deserve as much condemnation and forthright action as aggression in another part of the world? Who amongst us has taken the well of the House to defend the United Arab Republic's declaration that as a right of national sovereignty the Gulf of Aqaba is to become an Egyptian preserve? Yet how many of us, by word, deed, or silence, would acquiesce in the conquest of South Vietnam by North Vietnam?

Mr. Speaker, I think our duty, our honor, and our responsibility to peace on this earth demands the firm stand taken by our President in the Middle East; he deserves, and is receiving, our unified support. He also deserves—and should be receiving—the same unified support for our like policy of defending the peace in south Asia.

MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the President's statement made it clear that the United States is ready to work for a reduction in tension in the Middle East. Now it is for other major powers to face up to their responsibilities in this situation.

In the highest tradition of the policy "walk softly, but carry a big stick," President Johnson has laid down the law to a greedy and reckless dictator named Gamal Abdel Nasser.

I have watched with disbelief the rapid developments of the crisis in the Middle East, and may I say that the U.N. Secretary-General's hasty action in removing U.N. forces from their border post is definitely no credit to his good judgment.

But President Johnson has reaffirmed the position of this country to assure the political independence and territorial integrity of all nations of that area, with or without U.N. assistance. Four Presidents have publicly expressed their concern over the security of Israel. France and England have done the same. Upon Israel's withdrawal from the Sinai, the United States, France and England echoed this sentiment. This, in my opinion, is still our position. Of course, the responsibility is presently that of the United Nations to work for reduction of tensions, to face up to their responsibilities in this situation, and to exert whatever influence they have on the parties concerned.

At the same time the President clearly hopes, as I do, that the U.N. can head off what will surely be a disastrous but conclusive defeat of President Nasser by Israel, if Egypt carries out its blockade threat.

The world has had its fill of Nasser's arrogance and aggressive attitude. It is time the line was drawn and I sincerely believe the President of the United States has done it in a way that makes all of us proud of his leadership.

A TRIBUTE TO A JEWISH AMERICAN LEADER: RABBI DR. BERNARD BERGMAN

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Religious Zionists of America saw fit to honor one of their finest leaders, Rabbi Dr. Bernard Bergman, at a banquet in New York City. The occasion was both the 25th anniversary of the Religious Zionists' National Council for Torah Education, which Dr. Bergman heads, and also his own 25 years of leadership to religious Zionism, including four terms as national president.

Mr. Speaker, because of my own personal knowledge of this truly distinguished citizen and religious leader, I would like to describe briefly some of the many words of well-deserved praise that were delivered at this memorable affair on behalf of Dr. Bergman, as well as adding a few heartfelt words of my own.

I have had the great honor of knowing Dr. Bergman personally and in public service for more than 25 years. Having worked with him on many vital issues affecting both the United States and Israel, I have come to respect him as a man of almost staggering range of activities. Scholar, religious activist, Zionist, and rabbinic scholar—all of these are combined in the person of Dr. Bergman. This was recognized by President Lyndon Johnson in his letter to the affair which honored Dr. Bergman, in which he stated:

> I am grateful to you for this fine opportunity to express our admiration for Rabbi Bergman and our appreciation for his exceptional service to the public trust.
>
> The courage and the comfort of our religious leaders have always been most welcome in the house. And throughout our history they have been a source of our national strength.
>
> The accomplishments of Rabbi Bergman are in the highest tradition of this enlightened leadership. He sets an example that is worthy of the nation he has served so long and so well.
>
> I am proud to join you and all who are gathered in tribute to a great American.
>
> LYNDON JOHNSON.

But perhaps the best example of the man Dr. Bergman is, can be gleaned from the remarks he made in response to the tributes rendered him. At the banquet, Dr. Bergman rose to say:

> I am very grateful to all of you my dear good friends, who came here to honor me tonight, and I am deeply moved by the beautiful sentiments and most eloquent comments of the esteemed speakers, directed to me; and accept them not as an expression of personal esteem, but rather as a tribute to the organization, with which I have been associated these past 25 years, and the ideals which it represents.
>
> This is not the time to speak on the present crisis in Israel. Nevertheless, the gravity of the situation prompts me to make one brief but urgent observation and appeal.
>
> I strongly urge all the Zionist groups to launch a special campaign for the purchase of Israeli products by the American people. Such a campaign, if successful, will relieve the serious unemployment situation in the Holy Land and help provide jobs for Israeli workers. A meeting of all these groups should be held immediately in order that the details be worked out.
>
> For 25 years, we have labored diligently, not only for the material building of the Holy Land, but also for the conquest of the heart, of our greatest treasure, our youth in Israel, and in America.
>
> We were always mindful of the Biblical verse, "When thou shalt come unto the land, thou shalt plant . . . ." Our sages thereupon comment that this passage refers to the child, the youth. And it is to this element to which we have consecrated our planting, our program and efforts:
>
> "On behalf of my brothers and comrades, I shall speak of Peace."
>
> Surely, today, there is no theme which has greater popularity than peace. The war in Viet Nam, anarchy in Red China, turmoil in Africa, Arab attacks on Israel, the threat of a rising neo-Nazism in Germany, make us realize that everyday. we are facing the spectre of war and destruction.
>
> Therefore, all agree that there is nothing more important today than *the attainment of peace*. But, we live in a paradoxical age, when those nations which are often the first to condemn violence, are often themselves motivated by selfish belligerent impulses, while many of those who are forced to embark upon *militant* policies, are in reality determined to achieve peace, for *themselves* and *all mankind*. However, peace must depend essentially upon the most positive facets of society.
>
> We are all familiar with the famous prophecy of peace in Isaiah—"The wolf will live in peace with the sheep and a small child shall lead them." And the Lubliner Rabbi asked: "What is the novelty of this prophecy? Did not such harmony exist in the days of Noah when the wolf and the lamb sought shelter together in the Ark?" "But, he said, "in the time of Noah—unity was achieved only in an hour of crisis and danger—when the flood was about to drown them all." In the Messianic period. however, when the prophecy of "the knowledge of G-d will cover the earth," will be realized, then permanent unity will be attained by truth, faith and brotherly love. Such a peace would truly be a lasting peace.
>
> Unfortunately, the leaders of today's world have not been successful in attaining this peace. They offer us conferences, assemblies, mixed armistice commissions and resolutions. But the ultimate aim of all these things remains beyond their ability to give us—peace itself.
>
> Why? What is lacking? The Spirit of G-d! And I wish to add one thing to the beautiful thought of the Lubliner Rabbi. At the end of the above mentioned verse, Isaiah concludes with: ". . . and a little child will lead them." Isaiah indicates forcefully that peace and harmony will be achieved only when the "little child" will be brought into the struggle for peace. War will continue to pulverize the home, hatred will still menace our progress unless and until we concentrate upon religious education for our youth. All our efforts in diplomacy and scientific progress will be abortive, unless we make sure that our aspirations, and ambitions, are channeled toward our youth. The world's dictators have understood this power of youth. Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union, Red China, all achieved great strength by concentrating their efforts on mobilizing the youth. Revolutions are inaugurated by students, hatred has invaded the temples of learning, and we Americans, too, tremble at the moral upheavals brought about by our youth.
>
> Yes, true messianic peace is obtainable only when a "little child shall lead them" only when we have instilled in our children religious education, which will result in dedication to the noblest pursuits of human existence; only then may we truly hope for an enduring peace.
>
> At the very beginning of Jewish history, the Patriarch Abraham, speaking of his son said: "I and the lad shall go 'Ad Koh' which means to the appointed place." The Hebrew word "Koh" also stands for 25. So tonight at our 25th anniversary, let us emulate our Father Abraham and walk with our youth, let us gird ourselves for the great battle before us—the conquest of heart and the victory of the spirit: the rehearing of a Jewish youth in America and Israel which will be dedicated to the principles of Torah, a youth steeped in the prophetic visions which alone can guarantee and assure a lasting peace. And

may we, in our time, see our daily prayer and realize: "He who makes peace in his Heavens will bring peace to us, to Israel and to all humanity."

Warm words of praise for Dr. Bergman came from Rabbi Hershel Shacter, president of the Religious Zionists of America, who said:

On this auspicious occasion, it is altogether fitting and proper that we pay tribute to the distinguished President of the Vaad, our eminent and revered leader and mentor, Rabbi Dr. Bernard Bergman, the honorary chairman of Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi.

In behalf of the Religious Zionists of America, I am delighted to extend our warmest greetings and profound gratitude to Rabbi Bergman for his dedicated and genuine devotion to the ideals of Religious Zionism, which have been a source of true inspiration to us all. His constant and generous dedication to every phase of our great movement, to its many Yeshivot, and varied educational, social and welfare programs, richly merit their recognition and esteem.

We are proud to join his legion of friends and admirers, who have been blessed by his sage counsel and wise guidance, in the fervent hope and prayer that Almighty G-d continue to bestow his abundant blessings of good health and happiness upon Rabbi Bergman and his exemplary family. May he continue his inspired leadership and rich achievements in behalf of the perpetuation of the sacred ideals of Torah and Zion which all cherish.

In addition many messages from leading religious and political leaders of the State of Israel were received, heaping praise upon Rabbi Bergman.

In a warm message from Zalman Shazar, President of the State of Israel, he said:

I implore you that you greet, salute and bless heartily my friend Rabbi Dr. Bernard Bergman to the occasion of the 25th Anniversary of the National Council for Torah Education.

In the words of the Ashkenazi chief rabbi, Issar Yehuda Unterman:

Heartfelt blessings to the National Council for Torah Education and its honored President, the man of vision and of constructive deeds, the scholarly Rabbi Dr. Bernard Bergman....

May it be the will of Heaven that you merit raising a generation faithful to G-d and His Torah, filled with love for Israel and raising high the banner of justice and law that will profoundly influence the community around you.

The Sephardi chief rabbi of Israel, Rabbi Yitzhak Nissim, said:

The public activities—so varied and so successful—of Rabbi Bergman are well known and there is little doubt that they are most pronounced in the area of Torah education....

To my good friend, Rabbi Bergman, I send blessings for his work. May the Al-Mighty Strengthen and Support him to increase his activities on behalf of Torah and communal activities.

Among the prominent political leaders of the State of Israel, Minister of Interior Chaim Moshe Shapiro stated:

My dual greetings from the bottom of my heart to the 25th anniversary affair of the National Council for Torah Education and its President, Rabbi Dr. Bernard Bergman, who is so deserving of recognition and appreciation for his widespread and successful efforts for Torah and Zion and toward educating his community toward Torah and piety. May you go from success to success and may the Al-Mighty send you His blessing from Zion.

Another cabinet minister, Dr. Josef Burg, Minister of Social Welfare, declared:

I am happy to send my sincere greetings to the leaders of the National Religious Zionists at whose head stands their President, Rabbi Bergman, well known internationally, working untiringly for the glory of Torah and its spread. He comes from ancestors who were among the leaders of the Hassidic movement and merited learning that incomparable Torah study—the study in the Land of Israel . . .

And Minister of Religions, Zerach Warhaftig, added his praise in stating:

Upon the anniversary of the National Council for Torah Education and in honor of our great personal friend, Rabbi Dr. Bernard Bergman, be blessed by the G-d of Zion, thusly:

"May it be that the Holy Spirit rest upon all your deeds and merit glorifying Torah and activities for our people and the Holy Land. . . ."

A message from the Deputy Minister of Interior, Rabbi Dr. Solomon Ben-Meier, said:

I am extremely happy to greet the guest of honor, my good friend and colleague, Rabbi Dr. Bernard Bergman, the president of the Vaad Hachinuch.

Rabbi Bergman has achieved distinction in many areas of Jewish communal endeavors. His major contribution, however, has been on the platform of Religious Zionism. He is a recognized dynamic leader of Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi and a source of inspiration to so many colleagues in the movement. He always serves our cause—the cause of Zion—with great dedication and selfless devotion.

May the Almighty extend His blessings upon Dr. Bergman and his dear family so that we and they may be blessed to share in the comforting of Zion and Jerusalem.

Finally, I would like to mention the beautiful message of Member of Parliament Yitzhak Rafael, who said:

The lofty aspiration of our sages: A heart that is good unto Heaven and good unto humanity is characteristic of and symbolizes the essence of my truly great friend, Rabbi Dr. Bernard Bergman. But this aspiration is not merely a thing that man attains through his efforts at perfection. Over and above this, it is a spiritual gift from the Almighty Himself, that is implanted in the nature of a person.

It is this characteristic that guides our friend in his public endeavors and in his private life. The doors of his home are always open wide and his hand is never closed to the needy. His soul responds to all cries for his heart is good and receptive to the concept of Judaism and humanism—because of this his friends are legion and his admirers are many . . .

From every area of religious Jewish life, representing the leading institutions of Jewry, prominent spokesmen greeted and praised Rabbi Bergman.

Dr. Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University, declared:

It is indeed a pleasure to extend greetings to the New York Council of the Religious Zionists of America as you observe the 25th anniversary of the Vaad Hachinuch Hatorani and honor its illustrious president, Rabbi Dr. Bernard Bergman, an esteemed alumnus of Yeshiva University.

Dr. Bergman, has occupied, with distinction, many important posts of leadership in your own movement and in the total Jewish community. I am pleased to join in congratulating and extending best wishes to him. May the Almighty grant him vigor of mind and body to continue his capable leadership and devoted service to Torat Yisrael, Am Yisrael and Eretz Yisrael, and may the Vaad Hachinuch, under his dynamic direction, go from strength to strength.

On behalf of his colleagues at the Jewish Agency, Rabbi Mordecai Kirshblum, who is also honorary president—together with Dr. Bergman—of the Religious Zionists of America, stated:

I am very happy to extend my heartiest good wishes on this festive occasion. The Vaad Hachinuch Hatordni has accomplished much during these 25 years. Inspired by the leadership of your president, Rabbi Dr. Bernard Bergman, this holy organization has organized the College of Torah Educators and has conducted a weekly radio program enhancing the work of our Movement.

I am especially proud to congratulate my good friend Rabbi Bernard Bergman. We have worked shoulder to shoulder these many years for the cause of Torah and Zion. May G-d bless Rabbi Bergman and his dear family with many years of health and happiness . . .

And from the assistant to the president of Yeshiva University, Rabbi Emanuel Rackman, spiritual leader of the Fifth Avenue Synagogue in New York City, came the following words of warmth to his personal friend:

Very few of our contemporaries have achieved for Torah and for Israel in the measure that you have. You have thus achieved not only because you cherish Torah and the Land of our Fathers, but because you happen to be in addition a warm, generous person and a very loyal friend.

Perhaps you yourself do not realize how someone else in your position could have cultivated genuine arrogance and how immune you are to that vice. If you agreed with me you would not be so humble; so I do not ask you to agree.

That is why it is so appropriate that you should be honored and I deem it a privilege that I can greet you on this occasion and pray with you and all your friends that you and your charming wife will enjoy many happy, healthful years of togetherness with boundless nachas from your already distinguished offspring and continue to do so much for so many.

Justice Birdie Amsterdam, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, addressed the assembled and voiced the following thoughts:

As a former member of Rabbi Bergman's congregation, I first gained knowledge of his qualities as a spiritual leader. I have followed his career with keen interest and can say that he is truly one of American Jewry's leading spokesmen and communal leaders. He is totally dedicated to the advancement of Torah. He is a renowned Talmudic scholar and his activities in the Rabbinate are manifold.

Rabbi Bergman received his rabbinical ordination at Yeshiva University. His secular studies were at New York University, M.A.; and his Doctorate from the Graduate School of Yeshiva University. He was a member of the faculty at New York University. He is president of the Alumni of the Graduate School, Yeshiva University.

He is an outstanding member of the Union of Orthodox Rabbis and the Rabbinical Council of America. Rabbi Bergman is Chairman of the Smicha Evaluation Committee for the Rabbinical Council and was appointed by this rabbinic group to tour the Soviet as an important member of the special Commission to Jews behind the Iron Curtain.

Rabbi Bergman has been a leader of the Religious Zionists of America for twenty-five years. In this capacity as President of Hapoel Hamizrachi he helped forge a merger with Mizrachi. The merger was very important to him because he is devoted to the ideal of unity. He was elected national President of the United Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi. Amongst his colleagues Rabbi Bergman is known as the "Ish Hamaseh," the man of action and deed.

The future of American Jewry, he correctly believes is in the Yeshiva trained boy and girl. Because of the great emphasis that he places on education he accepted the presidency of the National Council for Torah Education. During the two years that he is at the helm of this organization an intensive program was conducted. This includes the opening of new Yeshivot throughout America and the establishment of the College for Torah Educators which qualifies Yeshiva graduates as teachers in the Torah schools. He has also conducted a weekly radio program which brings the message of the Yeshiva to American Jewry.

Rabbi Dr. Bergman is a member of the Actions Committee of the Jewish Agency and has participated as a delegate at a number of World Zionist Congresses addressing the Plenary Sessions and serving on its important committees.

His dedicated efforts have benefitted institutions of learning in America, Israel and throughout the world.

In addition to working zealously for the group—as a religious activist, rabbinical leader, Zionist spokesman, scholar, author and teacher, he believes and practices concern for and help to the individual. He is a source of inspiration and a pillar of strength to his host of friends.

The two largest orthodox rabbinical organizations in America added their voices, too. Rabbi Meyer Cohen, head of the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada, declared:

Rabbi Bernard Bergman has in the course of many years rendered outstanding services to the American Rabbinate and to various sacred Jewish causes generally and to the causes of Eretz Israel and Torah education in particular. We extend to him our cordial felicitations and best wishes for long life and much happiness and success.

At the same time, Rabbi Pesach Z. Levovitz, president of the Rabbinical Council of America, said:

I am indeed pleased and proud to be afforded the privilege to bring you the greetings from more than 900 members of the Rabbinical Council of America in tribute to our distinguished and eminent colleague, Rabbi Dr. Bernard Bergman, who is being feted by your organization for his indefatigable efforts in behalf of Torah and Eretz Yisrael.

Through his brilliant stewardship as President of the Religious Zionists of America and the National Council for Torah Education, Rabbi Bergman chartered many areas of activity which immeasurably enhanced the causes of Torah and Zionism; forging a new image of responsible leadership in the Orthodox community. His inexhaustible relentless zeal and genuine dedication brought to Religious Zionism and Harbotzas Torah new dimensions which spelled overwhelming success.

His enviable record of accomplishment truly earned for him the honors that you are conferring upon him. You have chosen well.

The president of the Greater New York Council of the Religious Zionists of America, Rabbi Abraham Kellman, spoke to the assembled and tied the recent growth of the National Council for Torah Education directly to its new president, Dr. Bergman:

During the past year, with the election of Dr. Bernard Bergman as President, the Vaad has intensified its program and is attempting to assume an even more vigorous role in the field of education. The Council is delighted to pay this public and well deserved tribute to our guest of honor. Dr. Bergman has an outstanding record in the work of Religious Zionism. He has held every high office in the movement, and has capped his fine record of service with an extraordinary display of hard work, devotion and cooperation in making this Dinner an outstanding success.

Simultaneously, the general chairman of the affair, Israel Bonds Director, Shragai Cohen stated in his address:

Our guest of honor and our dear friend, Dr. Bergman, is warmly deserving of our tribute for his 25 years of outstanding activity in our movement. He has brought to his work—and ours—the zealous idealism of Hassidism; its enthusiasm and warmth. As President of Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamirachi and later, as President of the united Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamirachi movement, he fulfilled his duties honorably, effectively and constantly.

He has, in the face of heavy responsibilities, given of himself most fully to his post as President of the Vaad Hachinuch Hatorani. He has followed the edict of Moses, "And I make them know the Statutes of G–d and His Laws." Rabbi Bergman feels strongly that all the problems that confront the modern Jew can—and must—be solved through a proper understanding of the Torah. He finds pleasure and comfort in aiding the Day School Movement and everything that is concerned with the Jewish education both of our children and the training of teachers to assure the Jewish future of the young people. He can always be counted on as an understanding friend. For these virtues—and many more—we are proud to honor him tonight.

From distinguished political leaders in the United States, recognition and appreciation of Rabbi Bergman's achievements were obvious. In the words of New York's Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller to Dr. Bergman:

It is most fitting that you be the guest of honor at the dinner celebrating the 25th anniversary of the National Council for Torah Education.

This is an appropriate recognition of the lifetime you have dedicated to the advancement of religious scholarship and faith.

While the senior Senator from New York, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, spoke highly of Dr. Bergman "who has so selflessly devoted himself to keeping alive and vital for our youth the study of the law in the finest traditions of our faith," the mayor of New York City, John V. Lindsay, told the assembled:

You do well to honor Rabbi Bergman, an outstanding leader in the Zionist movement and ardent advocate of religious training and education.

My warmest and best wishes to the distinguished Jewish leader Rabbi Bernard Bergman.

The bipartisan endorsement of Rabbi Bergman's achievements was completed with the words of New York State attorney general, Louis J. Lefkowitz:

In honoring Rabbi Bergman on this occasion you pay a well deserved tribute to one who has earned the affection and esteem in his chosen career and at the same time has kept uppermost in his thoughts and actions the welfare of his Congregation and the implementation of Jewish education.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the tributes and praises of distinguished national and world leaders. I should like at this time to insert an article about Dr. Bergman that appeared in the Jewish Press, largest Anglo-Jewish weekly publication in the United States, in the issue of March 17, 1967, of this year:

It was a Sabbath morning in the summer of 1965 and the Great Synagogue in Moscow was filled to overflowing—an unusual occurrence in the Soviet Union. All eyes were fixed on the speaker standing on the bima (platform). His words, in yiddish, were spoken softly:

"We have not come here for political or diplomatic reasons. We have come to affirm that when a Jew in America hurts, the Jew of Russia feels the pain." The people looked at each other. They understood what the speaker really meant and his words brought hope to their heavy hearts. He had affirmed Jewry's unity in time of sorrow, he had told the Russian Jews that America felt their pain.

"No, we have not come for political reasons. We have come simply because of the words of the Bible: Es achai ancohi mikavesh; it is my brothers whom I seek!" The words were electric. People, young and old, burst into tears and, later, as the speaker carried a Torah past the aisles, many reached out to kiss his hand in silent thanks.

The speaker, that morning, was Rabbi Dr. Bernard Bergman, clearly one of American Jewry's leading spokesmen and communal leaders. He was in Russia that day as a member of the Rabbinical Commission to Russia sponsored by the Rabbinical Council of America. "One of the clearest impressions I brought home with me," Rabbi Bergman said, "was that Soviet Jewry was telling us in the free world: Cry out! Help us! Protest!"

His Soviet trip was only one of Rabbi Bergman's almost staggering range of activities on the American and international Jewish scene. Scholar, religious activist, Zionist and rabbinical leader—all these are combined in the person of Rabbi Bergman being honored March 19th by the Religious Zionists of America at the Hotel Americana in New York. The occasion is both the 25th anniversary of the Mizrachi National Council for Torah Education which Rabbi Bergman heads and also his own 25 years of leadership to religious Zionism, including four terms as national president.

Sitting with Rabbi Bergman in his immense library (he is, incidentally, the owner of one of the world's largest private collections of Judaica), he recalled the years with the Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi:

"Unity has always been my ambition. The more religious Jews are unified the more we can accomplish. I cannot say that everyone has agreed with me in this," he said with a smile, "but I have never swerved from this goal."

When asked what his thoughts were concerning the most effective way to strengthen religion in Israel, Rabbi Bergman will always say:

"The time has come to stop talking and begin doing. The future, both in Israel and America, lies in education and yeshivas. This is why in the past I have taken a close interest in the Yeshivot Bnei Akiva in Israel and have taken on the task of president of the National Council for Torah Education."

What were his main accomplishments in the latter since he took over?

"Aside from the establishment of new yeshivas, the proudest feat has been the establishment of the College for Torah Education which takes learned yeshiva graduates and qualifies them to be teachers in Torah institutions. This has been the greatest vacuum in the Torah community in America. We have filled it."

Rabbi Bergman was born in Yasina, Czechoslovakia. Ordained at Yeshiva University (he later continued his studies at the famous Hebron Yeshiva) he is active in the two leading Orthodox rabbinical bodies in the United States, the Union of Orthodox Rabbis and the Rabbinical Council of America.

It is Zionist and world Jewry's problems that are his first interest, however, and he has just returned from a meeting of the Actions Committee of the Jewish Agency, of which he is a member.

"As for other 'achievements' you want to know about—forget those and look at one of my proudest possessions."

At this point, Rabbi Bergman went to a shelf and came back with an ancient-looking book. "See this," he said excitedly, "it is an original manuscript, a prayer book of the Smak (a great scholar of the Middle Ages) and along side the text are commentaries by leading commentators of the middle ages."

The scholar in Rabbi Bergman was out now and, despite his failure to publicize it, his home has long been a meeting place for scholars, the needy, and guests of all kinds. He, himself, put it this way: "In doing public service one must never lose sight of the individual. As a group or leader gets too big the individual often finds no place to turn to."

Rabbi Bergman is, himself, the publisher of the Raabad and contributed commentaries to it. He also is the author of a commentary on "Piskei Chala". One of his most famous works—a book of sermons entitled "Hadrash V'haraayon."—reflects his fame as an orator.

BROOKLYNITES PETITION FOR SOCIAL SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased today to file with the Clerk of the House a petition signed by many of my constituents in the 13th District of New York urging improvement of the social security laws.

The petition, which follows, supports President Johnson's request to the Congress and emphasizes the importance to the present retirees of an immediate increase in benefits.

The petition follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

A petition to improve and modernize the Federal Social Security System.

We, the undersigned, support President Johnson's request to the Congress of the United States to raise Social Security benefits to a level that will more nearly equal needs.

We agree that the biggest increases should go to the two and a half million retirees who now get only woefully inadequate minimums.

We believe that the United States, now surpassed by 13 Western European nations in the field of social welfare, can and should provide its citizens with a realistic and sound Social Security system consistent with our resources.

UNIFORM ANNUAL OBSERVANCES OF CERTAIN NATIONAL HOLIDAYS ON MONDAYS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 30, our Nation will observe Memorial Day—a day first set aside following the Civil War to honor the soldiers who died in that terrible conflict.

No one has been able to determine just why the date May 30 was chosen for this most deserved observance. There is no historical significance for choosing this date. It came about arbitrarily, and there is no logical reason why a different date might not be chosen.

It is my feeling and conviction that it is the homage we pay our honored dead that is of deep significance, not the day of the week on which this homage is paid.

It is also my hope that the Congress will see fit to schedule the observance of other arbitarily set holidays so that they, too, will fall on Monday.

Earlier in this session I introduced H.R. 6787, a bill which would provide for uniform annual observances of certain national holidays on Mondays.

Under this proposal, Washington's Birthday would be observed on the third Monday in February; Memorial Day on the last Monday in May; Independence Day on the first Monday in July; and Veterans' Day on the second Monday in November.

November 11 was initially observed as Armistice Day, marking the end of World War I, yet it was changed to Veterans' Day under President Eisenhower as a day on which we might officially pay tribute to the veterans of all our wars.

Independence Day, which is now celebrated on July 4 is another arbitrary set date. Many accept July 4, 1776, as the day on which the Declaration of Independence was signed. However, some think July 2 would be more significant, since that was the date on which the resolution of independence was adopted. Others suggest July 19, the day the Continental Congress ordered the document engrossed and passed a resolution seeking signatures for ratification.

There is even a variance on the date on which we celebrate Washington's Birthday. Under the calendar in use at the time of his birth, the date was February 11. That date was jumped to February 22 when the British introduced the Gregorian calendar in the colonies. Some have suggested that the observance of Washington's Birthday might ultimately become President's Day in honor of all our Presidents.

The significance of some holidays lies in their present purpose, rather than the specific day on which they fall. Their significance would not be lessened by seeing that their observance came on a Monday.

There is social as well as economic good sense in having these holidays create 3-day weekends.

Socially, such holidays would benefit the general public by providing a better opportunity for rest and relaxation.

Economically, the 3-day weekends reduce absenteeism that sometimes occurs when holidays fall during midweek.

Uniform Monday holidays avoid the production interruptions caused by midweek holidays. Many of our industries would gain increased demands for their products and services if we were to adopt uniform annual observances of our holidays on Mondays.

Public sentiment endorses the idea of 3-day holidays and the changing of some holidays to Monday. The Research Institute of America, in a survey of businessmen, reported that 90 percent favored the idea.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce conducted a survey of its members. Nearly 10,000 responded to the survey, and 85 percent favored the proposal of changing certain holidays so they would fall on a Monday.

The National Association of Travel Organizations gives an effective answer to those who say 3-day holidays increase highway accidents. They report that National Safety Council results show that 1-day midweek holidays are the most potent producers of accidents, with an average danger rating of 1.83, as compared with 1.18 for 3-day holiday weekends and 1.16 for 4-day holiday weekends.

Economically, socially, historically, and even in the area of traffic safety, there is sound logic in giving approval to the 3-day holiday on Monday proposal.

If we follow this logic, this May 30 will be the last time Memorial Day will be only a 1-day observance.

EXTENSION OF NO-STRIKE DEADLINE IN RAILROAD DISPUTE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 the House voted in support of House Joint Resolution 543 to extend the no-strike deadline in the railroad-labor dispute for an additional 47 days.

At the time the vote was taken in the House I was attending a noon function at the White House. The vote came very early in the afternoon, around or shortly after 1 p.m., and I, being unaware the matter would be acted upon with such dispatch, was not present.

Later, when polled by the Congressional Quarterly, I indicated that had I been present my vote would have been against the resolution.

This is not because I opposed a settlement through collective bargaining or additional time to reach a settlement.

However, the resolution had not been offered primarily for the purpose of providing needed additional time for settlement. The purpose of the resolution was to provide the administration with time to formulate and propose legislation to settle the dispute. I am opposed to legislated settlements of labor-management disputes.

On the day of the vote it was clear, as it had been for sometime, that the administration and the Congress were being forced into the position of having to settle the dispute even though it was not at all clear that every effort had been made at the bargaining table to reach accord.

It was also very apparent that any legislation proposed in light of the atmosphere which permeated the bargaining table at that time would, of necessity, require some form of compulsory arbitration. I was and remain opposed to any solution of this type.

Since passage of the resolution the administration has offered a proposal which is, in essence, a call for compulsory arbitration.

In the long run no one benefits from compulsory arbitration; not labor, not management, not the public.

That is why I would have voted against the resolution of May 1 and why I will not support future legislation in this dispute involving compulsory arbitration.

MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, all free men hail President Johnson's strong and forthright statement reiterating the United States' commitment in the Middle East to insist upon the right of access to the ports in the Gulf of Aqaba.

I vigorously support the President in his efforts to maintain the peace in this troubled area and to urge the United Nations to reassert its role in this long-standing dispute.

I would like at this point to associate myself with the position taken by the Minnesota Rabbinical Association, their position is expressed explicitly in the statement that follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
May 24, 1967.

Representative JOSEPH KARTH,
Washington, D.C.:

It is with a sense of shock and horror that the Minnesota Rabbinical Association views the menacing and warlike maneuvers of the Arab countries against the State of Israel. Israel, since its establishment, has continually manifested a sincere desire for peace with its neighbors. In the face of overwhelming and systemic harassment Israel has practiced fair-treatment of all peoples and has continually advanced programs of peace and social progress. A conflagration now in the Near East can well set off world war III. In light of this and in consideration of the commitments made by the United States and the United Nations, we call upon the Government of the United States and the United Nations to aid the cause of peace by reaffirming their commitments to the State of Israel.

When the concentration camps were formed in Europe and the grossest forms of barbarity were practiced on the Jewish people, it was maintained that there was no knowledge of these atrocities now, the entire world knows that the Arabs wish to destroy every Jewish man, woman and child in Israel and to practice genocide. The real challenge today is before the people and the religions of the world. Can the world sit idly by today and say nothing? Will the world be worthy of survival in the views of God and history if it does not speak up and act now? The time has come for all human beings who have a sense of decency, fairness and compassion to make their views known and their presence felt. The time has now come for all men, and particularly the religious groups of the world who are concerned with the survival of moral values and, indeed, the survival of man to make a commitment to defend Israel and guarantee peace. We pray that the American government, the United Nations, and all religious groups now unite and make their views known in order to help prevent the atrocity rather than deplore it afterward.

The Minnesota Rabbinical Association; Rabbi Kassel Abelson, Rabbi Gerrold Goldstein, Rabbi Arnold Goodman, Rabbi Jerome Herzog, Rabbi Eli J. Kahn, Rabbi Milton Kopstein, Rabbi Marc Liebhaber, Rabbi Louis Milgrom, Rabbi Albert G. Minda, Rabbi Bernard S. Raskas, Rabbi Herbert S. Rutman, Rabbi Moses Sachs, Rabbi Nahum Schulman, Rabbi Frederick Schwartz, Rabbi Max A. Shapiro, Rabbi Benjaman Silman.

FACTS ABOUT THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, when foreign aid legislation is pending congressional action, we are sometimes presented with the problem of finding quick and concise answers to questions on the aid program without wading through volumes of detailed information. I would like to call attention to a handy booklet published by the Agency for International Development entitled "Facts About the Foreign Aid Program for Fiscal Year 1968."

This booklet gives an excellent explanation of the aid program in a few short illustrated pages and makes an ideal response to requests for information on foreign aid.

My copy came to me from the congressional liaison staff of the Agency for International Development, and I understand they will be happy to furnish copies on request.

For the benefit of my colleagues who are not acquainted with this informative publication, I should like to insert the text in the RECORD at this point:

FACTS ABOUT THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968—COOPERATION BETWEEN NATIONS AND THEIR PEOPLES

THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT PROPOSAL TO CONGRESS

The President's proposal to Congress for fiscal year 1968, outlined in his message on Foreign Aid of February 9, 1967, covers economic assistance administered by the Agency for International Development (AID), an agency in the Department of State, and military assistance administered by the Department of Defense under the policy control of the Department of State.

The following is a breakdown of the economic assistance request for FY 1968 compared with appropriations for FY 1967:

Category	Appropriations request, fiscal year 1968	Appropriated by Congress, fiscal year 1967
Development loans	$774,000	$500,000
Technical assistance	242,815	200,000
Alliance for Progress:		
Loans	443,000	420,300
Grants	100,000	87,700
Supporting assistance	----------	690,000
General	170,000	----------
Vietnam	550,000	----------
Contingency fund	31,000	35,000
Contributions to international organizations	140,980	140,433
American schools and hospitals abroad	13,900	11,989
Survey of investment opportunities	2,000	3,255
Administration, AID	59,325	55,814
Administration, State	3,400	3,255
Total economic	2,530,420	2,144,491
Total military	[1] 596,000	792,000
Total	3,126,420	2,936,491

[1] This figure excludes programs for Laos, Thailand, NATO infrastructure and international military headquarters and agencies, which have been transferred to the defense budget.

"We have seen the energy and determination of the emerging peoples transform our aid into the seeds of prosperity." (1967 foreign aid message.)

Cooperation for Freedom and Development—The major objective of the U.S. foreign assistance program is to assist other countries that seek to maintain their independence and develop into self-supporting nations.

In his Foreign Aid Message to the Congress, the President stressed the need to make the foreign aid program "reflect the circumstances of the late sixties, not those of the past." This includes recognition that the United States cannot do the job alone; that only earnest self-help can assure security and development in the developing countries; and that we must work with the other advanced nations of the free world in cooperation for freedom and development.

Guidelines of Aid Policy—The President outlined the "basic thrusts of our aid policy" in six guiding principles.

Self-Help: Nations develop primarily through their own efforts.

Multilateralism: Developed nations must share the burden and coordinate assistance efforts.

Regionalism: Neighboring nations must cooperate to develop shared resources.

Agriculture, health, and education: The critical areas of want must be relieved in order to achieve development.

Balance of payments: The aid dollar must be spent for the export of American goods to prevent dollar outflow.

Efficient administration: The aid program must be carefully managed to assure efficiency.

Proposals for AID, FY 1968—To implement his guidelines, the President proposed:

Establishment of a *National Advisory*

Committee on Self-Help, composed of eminent Americans from diverse fields, to review the performance of recipient countries;

A statutory objective that 85 percent of Development Loan funds be spent in a *regional or multilateral* framework. The new *aid policy for Africa* will emphasize this concentration on regional and multi-national projects;

Program emphasis on *agriculture, education, and health,* with a 25 percent increase in funds budgeted for these purposes in FY 1968;

The creation within the Agency for International Development of *two new offices* to consolidate all food, nutrition, and population activities in the *War on Hunger,* and to promote the participation and development of *private resources;* and

Two-year authorizations for economic assistance programs, to improve continuity and sound management.

There is no such thing as instant development. We still have a long hard task. That is why the President is proposing that the Congress authorize all aid activities for two years—as a sign of recognition that the foreign aid program *is* in our national interest, that the program *does* occupy an established place in our overall foreign policy, that there *is* a long term job to do, and that we *are* prepared to follow through where we have wisely begun.

Certain parts of the AID program—Development Loans and the Alliance for Progress—have traditionally been authorized for more than one year. These programs are now authorized through FY 1969. A two-year authorization for other AID programs would bring them into line with Development Loan and Alliance for Progress authorizations.

A two-year cycle of authorizations for the entire program would provide each Congress with an opportunity to review the aid program in the light of changing world circumstances, while demonstrating our dedication to the task of long-term development.

SELF-HELP

"Self-help is the lifeblood of economic development. No sustained progress is possible without it. Aid provided as a substitute is aid wasted." (Foreign aid message.)

The Hard Work of Development—No amount of outside aid can help a country develop unless it is itself trying hard to do the job. The United States and other donors supply only a small part of the immense resources needed for succcessful development. The major effort—the will, the leadership, the labor and most of the money—comes from the less developed countries.

For every dollar the United States provides for programs in major aid-receiving countries, those nations contribute an average of $9 for their own development.

Self-Help Requirements—The President has said that "the only obligation tied to our aid is the recipient's obligation to itself." The proposed Foreign Assistance Act will make it clear that in meeting that obligation to itself, an aid-recipient should:

Have sensible programs for mobilizing its own resources;

Show a responsiveness to the vital economic, political, and social concerns of its people, and be prepared to make and carry out reforms and improvements;

Take measures to increase food production and improve its storage and distribution;

Establish conditions which stimulate its own people, as well as foreign investors, to undertake new and expanded private initiative; and

Build democratic institutions to ensure wide popular participation.

Reviewing Self-Help Performance—Though the aid program is now reviewed by the Agency for International Development and by committees which include representatives from other involved government agencies, there is "an urgent need for a permanent, nonpartisan, public body to evaluate self-help performance." Citing this need to the Congress, the President proposed establishment of a *National Advisory Committee on Self-Help,* composed of eminent Americans from business, labor, universities, and other fields.

AID Techniques in Self-Help—Stimulation of self-help is an intrinsic part of the AID program.

Project loans require conditions such as cost-sharing, specific reforms to be made before disbursement of funds, and a commitment to provide adequate budgeting, staffing and administration for the completed project.

Disbursement of a $7.7 million highway loan to Afghanistan required the Afghan Government to create a national highway maintenance department, because previous AID-sponsored highway projects had depreciated for want of adequate maintenance. The department was established, and disbursement is underway.

Program loans are made to a limited number of countries to finance the import of American products needed for general development in various sectors. The economy-wide impact provides leverage to encourage overall policy changes and reforms.

A recent $10 million program loan to Korea committed the Korean Government to five financial targets: improved budgeting; better foreign exchange management; restraint on private sector credit; increased domestic revenue collection; and higher domestic savings. For each of the five conditions $1 million was to be released in each of two quarters if Korean performance was up to prescribed standards. The Koreans met the conditions.

WAR ON HUNGER

"Next to the pursuit of peace, the greatest challenge to the human family is the race between food supply and population increase." (State of the Union message, 1967.)

Who Will Fill the Food Deficit?—The less developed countries now have a food deficit of 16 million tons of grain annually, met by imports from the developed countries. Over half the U.S. cropland reserve is being returned to production to help cover the growing food deficit.

If present trends continue, that deficit will be 88 million tons by 1985. Even with all reserve acreage in production and the use of much improved techniques, the United States could not fill such need. We'd be foolish to try.

The President has made it clear that our main effort should be "to enable the developing countries to supply their own food needs through their own production or through improved capacity to buy in the world market." This effort can be successful only if the developing nations make an equally strong commitment through self-help measures.

Aid Priority, FY 1968—The AID program for next year gives highest priority to the War on Hunger which the President announced last year. In FY 1968, AID proposes to invest $668 million—compared to $504 million in FY 1967—to support efforts of the developing countries to feed themselves.

In addition, AID plans to stress programs for family planning and nutrition improvement. To coordinate this three-way effort, the President has created a central staff office in AID devoted to the War on Hunger.

The food aid program is also involved in the War on Hunger. Shipments made under the Food for Peace Act will fill the food gap while local output is being expanded, and local currency generated from the food sales will be re-invested in agricultural development. An essential feature of the food aid program is the insistence that those we help with food also help themselves to lessen their dependence on external food aid in the years ahead.

Emphasis on Agricultural Production—In transforming traditional agriculture into a more productive system, AID and host country programs will concentrate on four key areas.

Agricultural materials and resources, such as water, fertilizer and seeds, farm-to-market roads, tools and warehouses, are the main ingredients of increased production and distribution. AID-financed exports of commodities and technical assistance for the development of resources constitute the main thrust of assistance.

Agricultural institutions, such as cooperative or credit associations, extensive services, training schools, and marketing outlets, provide the farmer with the knowledge and the means to use new methods. AID brings 2,000 agriculture specialists to the U.S. each year to train them to develop such institutions.

Applied research will adapt seed varieties, fertilizer mixtures, and pesticides to specific lands and climates. American universities, under contract to AID, are a good source for this research.

National policies will provide incentives to the independent farmer to increase his food output. Land reform, food price supports, and subsidies to credit unions and private banks can provide these incentives. AID self-help conditions tied to programs and project loans emphasize such measures.

Emphasis on Nutrition—Each year, malnutrition is a major factor in the death or physical and mental retardation of half the children in the less developed countries before they reach the age of six. Thus it robs these nations of the productivity and creativity of their human resources.

AID will concentrate on child-feeding programs, training professionals in nutritional health and specific country needs that have been defined by exhaustive nutrition surveys, and encouraging the growth of foods with nutrients designed to meet specific country needs.

Technical assistance to local food processing industries will promote methods for improving nutrient quality, particularly in proteins. AID-assisted commercial fisheries will add a wealth of protein from the sea to meager diets.

Emphasis on Population Planning—More than 20 developing nations have requested and are now receiving U.S. assistance in population problems. The AID program in this area provides:

Training for foreign demographers, statisticians and technicians;

Advice to developing countries in establishing information-gathering and educational programs; and

Educational materials, medical instruments, and equipment and supplies for use in health clinics and family planning centers.

AID assistance is only at the request of individual nations, and only for programs of voluntary family planning.

EMPHASIS ON HUMAN RESOURCES

Economic and social progress in any country must include freedom from hunger, disease, and ignorance. In addition to the War on Hunger, the AID program for FY 1968 will press the initiatives begun in health and education, with an increase of 25 percent in both areas.

Program in Health—AID support to public health programs in many less developed countries will emphasize the strong start made in:

Control and eradication of killing and crippling diseases that sap the human resources otherwise available to development; and

Development of training programs to provide the manpower to run their own health programs.

Program in Education—Though hundreds of thousands of teachers have been trained, classrooms constructed and textbooks distributed with AID assistance, there continue to be basic flaws in the educational systems themselves. Traditional curricula, rote learning methods, and unrelated cycles and levels, in addition to the vast social and economic problems, all contribute to the critical dropout rate—in Latin America less than 20 percent complete the sixth grade.

AID now emphsaizes technical assistance to planning and strong self-help measures in educational policy to modernize and integrate school systems to make them more productive.

Improved curricula and more vocational schools will relate systems to country requirements for trained manpower.

Increased education budgets will include planning projections to show how to maximize effectiveness in the balance between basic literacy and the need for advanced technical skills.

New techniques such as educational radio and television will "stretch" the limited number of teachers in countries which already have transmitting stations.

POPULAR PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT

A Sense of Involvement—Development is neither stable nor effective unless the people identify with and participate in the economic, social and political life of their country. The enactment last year of Title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act focused attention on the political and social dimensions of development. In FY 1968, AID will intensify efforts to encourage popular participation in democratic private and local institutions.

Framework for Initiative—Though central government policies can provide incentives for local and private initiative, that initiative requires a framework of private institutions through which to operate.

Cooperatives, labor unions, savings and loan associations, and community development organizations supplement individual effort and develop democratic skills. In addition, development requires local governments to supply basic services, and voluntary organizations to diffuse knowledge, stimulate self-help, and pool technical ability.

In the past two years, in Central America alone, AID helped organize 479 credit unions, with 76,000 members.

In the last year, $7.2 million in AID-assisted projects increased the capabilities of labor unions to serve their members effectively.

With AID support, 12 community development programs in Africa were begun.

Building Responsive Government—Equal in importance to the development of private initiative is the need to develop governmental institutions at all levels which are responsive to popular needs and demands. This is a slow and complex process, in which AID will emphasize:

Efficient and responsive public administration, with particular attention to the capabilities of local government units. It is at this level that public attitudes toward government are formed. Such units can provide effective communication between people and their national government.

Progressive legal institutions, to support the efforts of the people through a just, accessible, and stable legal system.

Examination of the needs in these areas will enable AID to assist host governments to achieve the objectives of Title IX—to build democratic institutions for meaningful popular participation in development.

CREATIVE USE OF AMERICAN PRIVATE RESOURCES

Effectiveness of Private Initiative—AID emphasis on the importance of the private sector is based not only on the American experience, but on the experience of the less developed countries themselves. Those countries which are developing most rapidly are those where public policy, investment and external assistance have combined to bring the dynamic forces of private initiative into development. These include Taiwan, Israel, Greece, Pakistan, and Korea—and the list continues to grow.

Moreover, much of the external assistance has been in the form of participation by American private groups—State and local governments, private business and nonprofit organizations. Their vital contribution of capital, skills and technology is stimulated by AID in its role as a catalyst.

U.S. Commodities and Services—In carrying out its programs of direct assistance, AID relies on private U.S. resources through export of millions of dollars of commodities and services. In FY 1968, almost 97 percent of AID commodities will be purchased in the United States.

Exports of U.S. goods from all 50 States totaled over $1.2 billion in FY 1966.

In September of 1966, AID had 1489 technical service contracts with private groups with a total value of $509 million to carry out projects in 73 countries.

Within this group, 127 American universities held 307 contracts for research, training, surveys, and technical assistance.

AID's emphasis on U.S. goods and services helps to create several hundred thousand American jobs and opens up markets for American business and industry all over the world.

Encouraging Private Initiative—Recognizing the importance of its role as a catalyst, AID has established an Office of Private Resources to coordinate, stimulate and support the participation of private groups in the development process. Within that Office, a Private Investment Center will be set up to administer all of AID's investment incentive programs for present and potential U.S. private investors in the developing countries.

Through the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, the Technical Assistance Clearing House, the Partners of the Alliance, and others, AID endeavors to broaden the contribution by private non-profit groups.

Private Investment: AID incentive programs for American private investors have continued to expand and improve. The new Private Investment Center will offer information services, investment survey insurance, specific risk political insurance, extended risk guaranties, and local currency and dollar financing for U.S. business ventures in less developed countries.

Non-Profit Groups: Foundations, voluntary agencies and similar organizations continue to increase their assistance, which now approaches $750 million annually. The American people have maintained a long tradition of help to people overseas in the form of technical assistance and emergency relief. AID provides increasing support to these private efforts.

Responsible voluntary agencies receive agricultural goods from the Department of Agriculture for donation in their own overseas programs. The AID budget annually covers ocean transport costs of these and privately donated goods.

AID encouraged the creation, and supports the development, of the International Executive Service Corps, which provides direct management assistance by a volunteer corps of experienced American businessmen.

Partners of the Alliance, an AID program, provides a means for State and local groups to cooperate with their counterparts in Latin America. At present 31 States are arranging exchanges, investments, and development programs with 31 States or local areas in Latin America.

Private Cooperative Organizations: U.S. cooperatives, credit unions, savings and loan associations, labor unions and farm groups now play a particularly important role in developing similar institutions in other countries, supplying two-thirds of the advisers on AID cooperative projects in 54 countries.

AID has a close relationship, through contracting organizations, with all major national, regional and local cooperatives in the United States, and has world-wide agreements with several international unions.

In 1966, AID assistance through these groups helped 30,000 cooperatives and credit institutions with 9.8 million members in 46 countries. Some 2500 new cooperatives with 500,000 members were organized, most of them agricultural.

CONCENTRATION OF ASSISTANCE

The proposed FY 1968 AID program continues the policy of recent years of concentrating AID programs in a relatively few countries.

This program concentration will be accelerated under the new U.S. aid policy for Africa which will reduce the number of countries in which AID will carry out bilateral programs.

AID development assistance—Development Loans and Technical Assistance—is concentrated in countries whose size, population, resources and self-help performance give them the best development prospects.

Most supporting assistance funds go to a few countries that have strong requirements for outside help to support political and economic stability, and where the United States has a strong interest in that stability.

Vietnam will be the single largest recipient of U.S. aid, with over $550 million in supporting assistance.

MULTILATERAL AND REGIONAL COORDINATION

"Development is a world problem. No single country has all the resources required. Equity demands that no single country be asked to carry the bulk of the load." (Foreign aid message.)

Multilateralism covers two main policy issues in foreign aid:

Burden-sharing—the United States continues to press for more generous and effective aid from other free world donors. Some of these, notably France and Belgium, now spend a larger percentage of their GNP on aid than does the U.S. The total volume of free world aid is about $6 billion.

Coordination—The effectiveness of this huge commitment can best be assured by the use of multilateral arrangements and institutions. The use of consortia and consultative groups for negotiation and review, and of international lending institutions for pooling resources will heighten coordination and efficiency, and provide more equitable sharing of the cost of assistance.

In recent years there has been a marked trend toward providing more free world economic assistance through multilateral means. There are an increasing number of multilateral financial institutions, new forms of coordinating groups, and larger foreign assistance budgets for multilateral use.

To encourage this trend, the President asked that the United States set a "statutory objective that 85 percent of development loans be undertaken in a regional or multilateral framework."

Regionalism: Sharing Common Resources. The President pointed out that "resources know no national boundaries," and that "economic advance in every part of the world has required joint enterprises to develop shared sources of wealth."

Regionalism includes formal and informal groups, institutions such as regional banks, and arrangements to integrate countries physically through development of joint transportation, communications, and power facilities. Regional universities can provide a setting for the development of international understanding.

The success of regional efforts can be seen in the work of the Alliance for Progress, the

Central American Common Market, and the creation of the Asian and African Development Bank.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

U.S. Procurement—Because today most of AID's funds are tied to purchases of U.S. goods and services, the impact of the AID program on the U.S. balance of payments has been drastically reduced. Whereas only 41 percent of economic aid funds were spent in the United States in FY 1961, 90 percent of AID funds for FY 1968 will be spent in this country. In this time, AID will have reduced its net expenditures abroad from $934 million to an estimated $107 million in FY 1968.

Use of Loans—In addition, our aid today is overwhelmingly in the form of dollar repayable loans. The repayment record on loans made by AID and predecessor agencies has been excellent. Since the beginning of the Marshall Plan in 1948, the foreign aid program has lent approximately $8 billion; almost $2 billion has been collected in repayments on principal and interest. These are a positive factor in the balance of payments.

Creating Future Markets—In fact, AID direct procurement and loan financing help to boost future U.S. exports, thereby contributing to a deduction in the balance of payments deficit. As a result of the Marshall Plan and related postwar aid, our exports to Europe have more than doubled and our exports to Japan more than quadrupled.

Developed nations are much better customers than poor nations. The developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which we are aiding today, contain more *than a billion people and represent a potential* market for American exports many times the size of our present major overseas customers.

Offshore Expenditures—Some minimum offshore expenditures will remain, principally the local expenses of our employees over*seas, the contribution of the United States* to international organizations, and a few special cases where tying to U.S. procurement is unfeasible.

The President, advised by his Cabinet Committee on the Balance of Payments, has concluded that this small remaining element under the aid program is a cost to our country which is far outweighed by the benefits that will come to us from the achievement of economic and social progress in the less developed countries.

[Charts accompanying this report not included in the Record.]

THE ENEMY IS POVERTY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Nick Kotz, a member of the Minneapolis Tribune's Washington bureau, authored a truly outstanding report of the gradual transformation in economic opportunity and human spirit being wrought in three impoverished counties of the rural South, which appeared in the Tribune on May 14. Mr. Kotz' article, entitled "In the Deep South, the Enemy Is Poverty," describes both the enormous barriers to opportunity confronting the Negro poor of Lowndes and Wilcox Counties, Ala., and Coahoma County, Miss., and the courage and dedication of local leaders of both races who, even at the risk of their own lives, are building the foundations for victory in the war against poverty in these areas of truly desperate need.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kotz tells how hope, faith, and courage are beginning to replace hopelessness and utter privation among thousands of American citizens. It is a story which needs to be told and retold as we contemplate the future of the war on poverty. I salute Mr. Kotz for this excellent contribution to informed discussion of economic opportunity programs, and with permission I insert his article at this point in the Record:

In the Deep South, the Enemy Is Poverty

(Editor's note.—Nick Kotz, a member of the Minneapolis Tribune's Washington bureau, has visited the Deep South to study government rural poverty programs there. He reports here on the efforts being made by Negroes and white leaders to combat poverty in several counties in Alabama and Mississippi.)

(By Nick Kotz)

Hayneville, Ala.—Former Gov. George Wallace temporarily blocked the first rural poverty program here by charging it would be run by black-power racists. White extremists slowed the program by burning its headquarters and intimidating white supporters.

Yet several hundred adult Negroes have started learning to write, read—and hope.

This is Lowndes County, the original base of Stokely Carmichael and the Freedom party, better known by its voting ballot symbol—the black panther.

Lowndes and neighboring Wilcox County are also home for 34,156 people, including 27,037 Negroes. The people are desperately poor, with 24,436 Negroes and 2,411 whites from families earning less than $3,000 per year.

Yet statistics alone cannot tell the story of the thousands of illiterate, underfed Negroes living in the flimsiest wooden shacks—and working irregularly, if at all, as farm hands at $4 a day.

Nor can abstract white fears of "black power" explain adequately:

How these programs became all-Negro;

How the local power structure fought tooth and nail to stop the programs, and

How these programs—insufficient as they are—got started only because a few Negro leaders and federal officials resisted terror and enormous political pressure.

In July 1966, the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) announced two programs to provide basic education and limited vocational training for migrant and seasonal workers in Lowndes and Wilcox.

The programs—they would involve $302,000 in Wilcox and $241,000 in Lowndes—applied if the household head earned less than $1,000 annually and had less than a sixth-grade education. The 550 families involved would receive stipends of about $30 a week during the 36-week course.

Several thousand persons clamored eagerly to join, and several hundred of these are taking the courses without pay.

BLACK PANTHERS, WALLACE CRIES

After the initial OEO announcement, Wallace loudly and dramatically protested that the Lowndes program was dominated by Black Panther politicians and that the board chairman was a convicted murderer.

He complained that the Wilcox leadership came from the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

OEO suspended the grants. It conducted an investigation in which it found Wallace's charges without base. It reinstated the programs after the November election—in which the Wallace family triumphed and the Black Panther party fizzled.

Wallace, joined by the state's congressional delegation, then complained that the governing boards were all-Negro instead of being integrated.

(Gov. Lurleen Wallace and most of the Alabama congressional delegation last week claimed black-power domination in protesting a new $390,000 OEO grant to help the farmers in Lowndes, Wilcox and eight neighboring counties improve their farm income through use of a cooperative. Again, OEO said the Wallace charges are without foundation.)

What about Wallace's charges? And what about the facts of life here in the Black Belt?

Robert Strickland, the Lowndes poverty board president, did—in fact—serve five years in prison for murdering a white man. But he also received a full pardon—after his lawyer finally convinced state officials that he was provoked by the murdered man and two companions, who had hounded and threatened him for weeks.

Strickland and John Hulett, another board member, were—in fact—actively involved in Black Panther politics. They rose as tough, natural leaders from a downtrodden Negro majority that had got nothing from local white officials.

But Strickland resigned from the party when he was appointed chairman, and young Hulett now is learning how to administer rural poverty programs in a federally supported school at the University of Wisconsin.

A MOST PARLIAMENTARY PANTHER

These former Black Panthers appeared neither racist nor dangerous as they conducted a poverty board meeting recently in a house trailer in a middle-class white neighborhood.

Strickland, a bricklayer, presided over the meeting with elaborate dignity and attention to Roberts' Rules of Order.

The meeting's agenda:

Hiring a doctor to give medical exams;

Arranging for the summer visit of an integrated group of VISTA volunteers;

Urging program employees to keep better records and hold down nonessential expenses.

Hulett, on a practical-training trip from his Wisconsin school, offered suggestions about improving training programs, bookkeeping and leadership.

Why did whites, with two exceptions, refuse to serve on the Lowndes board, and why did white appointees to the Wilcox board suddenly decide they had made no commitment to serve?

The first program headquarters was an abandoned church at the present site of the house trailer. The church was burned to the ground after the group met there.

The organization met the next day at another church. It also was burned.

Several days later a white church burned.

The first church was owned by a white cafe owner who was warned about what would happen if he rented to the poverty group. The lease had been arranged by a county probate judge who soon found his cattle poisoned. In the white church congregation was a doctor who had been bold enough to suggest that a federal health program should be initiated for the poor.

There are a few whites who have not been afraid to help, particularly the Rev. Francis Walters, a soft-spoken, steel-willed Southerner who is on four poverty boards in the area.

"Francis integrates all our boards," said one Negro admirer of the young minister, who serves as director of the Selma interreligious project.

These embryonic poverty programs in action show the sorry state of the rural Negro poor. They also show their determination to make something of this chance.

"Some of our pupils have even learned to count a little," Strickland commented wryly. "Some have started figuring their debts to the landowner—and discovered they didn't really have any."

WHAT ABOUT A VACATION IN FINLAND?

Down the road from Hayneville, there's a Wilcox County training center. It's in a ramshackle house in the Negro section of Camden.

The two young Negro teachers are late, but the 20 pupils—weather-beaten farm hands age 30 to 70—have started the class without them. You can hear them pray and then sing, off key, "We Shall Overcome."

The crowded room has crudely hung wallpaper. A bright yellow poster advertises vacations in Finland.

The reading lesson, like most, involves Negro history and is designed not only to improve reading skills but also to stimulate interest. Its aim is to build pride, to whet the students' appetites to learn—about themselves, about civics, about the vast world outside the Black Belt.

Today's lesson is the story of how Toussaint l'Ouverture freed Haitian Negroes from French rule and set up an independent republic.

The text is accurate, but it would make a Southern segregationist squirm.

Some of the pupils read haltingly, others with obviously little comprehension, and a few with considerable fluency. The teachers help them along line by line and then ask each student to summarize the story.

"The planters thought those slaves were just having a big time, but they was planning a revolution."

"The planters made a lot of money on those crops. Those slaves came from Africa. The cry of those poor people was liberty, equality and brotherhood."

Earlier in the day, there was another class, conducted for mothers and young children. In one room, the mothers learned reading, writing, home economics and child rearing. In the other, the children played with watercolors and blocks.

In the evening, several hundred teenagers meet at the program centers to discuss their problems, their schooling, and their aspirations for the future.

That future is uncertain. The power structure still rigidly rejects all change. Local government will not request programs for housing or vocational education. Farm jobs are disappearing in the wake of machinery, weed-control chemicals and the $1-an-hour minimum wage.

But there is potential for industry in a new dam and new paper mill—and therefore for jobs, if Negroes can get trained for them—and hired. And there is the ultimate potential of the Negro vote.

The poverty program students have registered to vote.

As one Negro minister puts it: "Things are finally happening in Wilcox County."

PRIMITIVE SHACKS ABOUND AMONG THE MANSIONS

Lexington, Miss.—"Relocation is a dirty word to Negroes here in the Delta," said Joseph Wheatley, education director of a Coahoma County poverty program. "The white politicians think it is the social remedy," he said. "Our people want to build decent homes and stay here."

"The jack rabbits have stopped running," said Robert Strickland, president of the poverty board in Lowndes County, Ala. It was his way of saying that frightened Negroes have left, that those remaining intend to stay put and fight for a better life.

Poor Negroes in the Deep South have so far been thwarted in their desire for better housing.

As one travels across the Black Belt of Alabama and the Delta of Mississippi, the housing picture unfolds dramatically.

Thousands of Negroes (and some whites) live in primitive wooden shacks;

A number of middle-class white families live in neat white bungalows;

A few wealthy white landowners and businessmen live in neo-colonial mansions that match the most glamorized versions of life in the Old South.

The Negroes have additional problems. Many thousands are being forced off plantations where they are no longer needed. Hundreds remaining on plantations have discovered that their tenancy rights are endangered if they register to vote, support civil rights activities or express dissatisfaction with 50-cents-an-hour wages.

The basic housing problem is how to finance even the most modest dwellings for Negroes who have little if any income.

The Agriculture Department briefly operated a small grant program. It helped several thousand families. But congressional appropriations subcommittees, dominated by southern segregationists, have adamantly refused to fund this program for several years.

Is self-help romantic?

Now, the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) is attempting to get the rural poor into brick houses under a self-help concept. Poverty workers would provide building supervision while enrollees in training courses would work together to build their new homes.

OEO officials are fighting desperately for this plan as the only one that, at the moment, is feasible. Agriculture Department officials brand the plan romantic and have fought against making necessary loans because they regard the concept as financially unsound.

Housing and Urban Development Secretary Robert C. Weaver told a presidential commission that the self-help idea was impractical. Weaver quickly added that his department doesn't have any programs to help the rural poor into housing.

Impractical and romantic or not, several hundred Negro farm hands are eagerly constructing a model home at the OEO migrant training school on the Saints College campus in Lexington.

The Lexington plan is simple enough in theory. The trainees use a mold to make special interlocking, air-dried bricks that fit together like the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. OEO officials say the homes can be built for $2,500—if the Negroes make their own bricks and perform the labor.

Warren Booker, vocational teacher at the project, said:

"We have about 15 who would start building tomorrow if they could get their hands on the brick molds.

"One fellow is so excited he has already started collecting sand from a creek to make the bricks. All he needs is the cement and brick molds and he's ready to go."

If the project fails, many will be sadly disappointed, said the Rev. R. M. Stevens, assistant director of the training program.

"These men had chopped a little cotton and loafed the rest of the year. Now they are learning they have abilities and skills they never dreamed of," Mr. Stevens said. "They are having the thrill of putting up a floodlight, of holding a skil saw for the first time, of wearing a white carpenter's uniform instead of blue overalls."

The 277 enrollees receive $30 a week during the 36-week program. They spend two-thirds of their time in basic education courses, the rest in vocational training.

Tom Karter, national director of the OEO migrant division, says the plan will work if the Farmers Home Administration will grant the trainees $2,500 loans, repayable at $20 or $25 a month.

Karter and his projects officer, Kenneth Vallis, have journeyed to the South almost weekly in an effort to make their training and helf-help housing programs work. They are advising local program directors in Lexington, in Wilcox County, Ala., and elsewhere to have their trainees apply for the loans.

Agriculture or social service?

As matters now stand, OEO is supplying training funds for a self-help housing program the Farmers Home Administration will not approve.

"The Agriculture Department simply is not a social service agency," commented Joseph Doherty, the administration's special assistant for economic opportunity programs established under the antipoverty law.

"Thirty-six weeks of guaranteed income is just not enough to justify a loan," Doherty said of the OEO plan. "At the end of the 36 weeks, they might not get jobs. If they do, they generally will be located somewhere else. Loans must be repaid. These are a lot of romantic notions—making your own bricks."

Doherty said his office might approve loans if OEO or another agency established a program entirely devoted to building the homes and welfare agencies guaranteed that the home buyer could use welfare funds to make repayment.

Doherty's suggestion would eliminate any possibility of homes for several hundred able-bodied male family heads now in the training program, since they are not eligible for welfare payments in either Mississippi or Alabama.

"These people are now paying $10 to $40 per month rent for shacks unfit for human habitation," said Karter. "Now they finally have the opportunity to learn, to get the opportunity to learn, to get jobs, and to own decent homes. The government should give them that chance."

Aside from federal financing problems, poverty program officials here say that the white resistance to the possibility of Negroes' building permanent, brick homes is increasing.

These whites fear that Negroes—who make up two-thirds of the Delta population and are registering to vote—now may remain permanently and keep voting.

Sue Geiger, a poverty worker at Freedom City located outside Greenville, criticized a plan to move 300 Negro families to the predominantly white Gulf Coast area.

"We see this as a plan to move Negroes to an area where they will have no political power," she said.

"This is their home. We say they have a right to jobs and homes here."

AFTER A MAN LEARNS, WHAT HAPPENS TO HIM?

Clarksdale, Miss.—It was an unusual graduation ceremony. The 450 graduates ranged in age from 25 to 65. Almost all were poor Negroes from the cotton fields of the Mississippi Delta.

An overflow audience in the city auditorium listened intently as the graduates delivered short speeches about what school meant to them:

"Many of us couldn't read or write when we entered the program. Now we don't have to make an X to sign our names."

"I used to go to the back room when the children had company. Now I stay and take part in the conversation."

"Forty-eight of 52 in our group have registered to vote. Our ideas about citizenship have improved."

The proud graduates had raised their average educational level by 3½ grades during the 36-week basic education course financed by an Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) program for migrant and seasonal farm workers.

Board members of Coahoma Opportunities, Inc., the sponsoring community action agency, listened proudly—and momentarily forgot their deep worries.

But the next morning the board met federal and state officials and once again banged head-on into the realities of poverty programs in the Deep South.

The big question: What next?

OEO's Migrant Division—knifing through red tape and bypassing state and local government resistance—has worked with willing local leaders to improve the education and raise the hopes of thousands of rural Negroes.

Most need further vocational training before they can qualify for even semiskilled jobs. Job discrimination is still a reality and jobs in the rural South are scarce enough for anyone.

Federally sponsored but state-operated vocational training programs are accepting few of them. Low-cost homes are not available for Negroes who now believe life owes them something better than a plantation shack.

The Coahoma board meeting was typical—federal and local poverty program officials allied on one side, federal and state labor department representatives on the other.

Dr. Aaron Henry, a Negro Coahoma board member and Mississippi president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, got to the point quickly. Directing his comments to a U.S. Labor Department official, Henry asked:

"What are you going to do about the guy who is dumb and the guy who needs more education? I'm concerned about the casualty rate."

Andred Carr, white board member and plantation owner, chimed in: "OEO has done its job. What's the Labor Department going to do?"

Specifically, the board wanted the Labor Department to offer a year of basic education in its manpower training program, so that more graduates of the OEO migrant school might qualify for vocational training.

"Literacy is your job," replied a state labor official, H. A. (Sawdust) Sanders, a heavy-set former football star who is typical of Mississippi officials who are finally but slowly accepting change.

"Congress says it's your job, too," shot back Tom Karter, national director of OEO's Migrant Division. "Your job doesn't just consist of teaching a man to turn a bolt one way. We're dealing with the hard-core unemployed."

Carr and Henry said 150 of the previous night's graduates could meet present education requirements for manpower training, and asked: "How many will you take?"

Sanders replied skeptically: "I've seen them. I'll wait for their applications with a great deal of interest. I'm here to serve, but I'm here on a businesslike basis."

The Carrs, Henrys and Karters don't believe that any neat businesslike solutions exist for the multiple problems that have grown out of 300 years of slavery and stark poverty.

James Townsend, the U.S. Labor Department representative, stated repeatedly that he could make no commitments.

The meeting ended inconclusively, as have countless similar discussions held in Washington and in the Deep South.

Fallen crowd the wayside

Wherever one looks at rural poverty programs in Alabama and Mississippi, the problems and complaints are the same: OEO programs provide a start, but programs of the labor, agriculture and education departments move slowly, if at all, through rigid federal-state-local channels—channels dominated in the South by the established white power structure.

Scores of available federal programs administered by the Departments of Labor, Agriculture and Health, Education and Welfare have never been approved by Southern state and local officials for the rural Negro poor.

In Clarksdale, Lexington and Greenville, Miss., poverty directors express concern about what Aaron Henry calls the casualty rate:

At a converted bowling alley in Clarksdale, a Negro instructor teaches 20 OEO trainees how to operate woodworking machines but asks: "Where are we going to get them jobs?"

At Lexington, Robert Clark, director of the OEO basic education program, comments: "Seventy-seven of our last 300 graduates got jobs. Only 13 were accepted into manpower training programs. I guess the rest will try farming and finding whatever odd jobs they can."

Also at Lexington, 10 Negro women, attractive in starched blue-and-white uniforms, busily study the duties of a nurse's aide, but their teacher says: "Only one is assured of a job."

At a poverty meeting in Greenville, board secretary Thelma Barnes asks indignantly: "Just what are these people supposed to do after they become auto mechanics?"

At Freedom City—home of displaced Negro farm workers outside Greenville—Walter Abney, neatly attired in his first suit, struts proudly about, smiling and shaking hands with everyone in sight.

Abney, who is enrolled in a 12-week church-operated and state-approved literacy program, tells how he earned $2.50 a day chopping cotton—until the plantation owner booted him out for asking for food during the workless and payless winter.

"I couldn't read or write my own name when I started school," says Abney. "I want to be a carpenter. They talk like there's going to be jobs for us."

A local poverty worker expresses doubt whether Abney will make it and notes acidly: "Walter is one of those instant new men they're turning out in a 12-week course that is much too short to accomplish much."

What are the answers?

One obvious need expressed everywhere is for longer, more comprehensive federal programs in which the various departments pool their programs and funds.

Relocation is no answer. No one thinks semiliterate rural Negroes can improve themselves in already overcrowded northern city slums.

Ship men out or bring work in?

The Rev. R. M. Stevens, Negro assistant director of the Lexington literacy program, commented on two other suggested solutions:

"The power structure's idea is to ship 5,000 Negroes out of the Delta and cut down that 2–1 Negro population ratio. Our idea is to bring in more industry and have the federal government supply public works jobs."

Then Stevens turned to lesser objectives, also unfulfilled:

"Right now, we're reduced to such ideas as forming co-ops to rework used furniture and sell it in Jackson. That might not work either. But at the least, the upholstery class students are improving their own furniture and can teach their neighbors how to do it."

Sue Geiger, a young white woman from Davenport, Iowa, working in the Freedom City program, took the discussion one step further:

"Some of these people will never get jobs. That's why we're so concerned about the inadequate food-stamp and welfare programs. Our real hope is in the next generation, if we don't starve them to death first."

And what of civil rights?

"The federal government is not moving fast enough." Only when the government becomes truly resolute can we effect change. People in Washington make a lot of pretty plans but they either backtrack on them or they get lost in the bureaucratic shuffle."

These words, radical for Mississippi, were spoken by Carr, the rich white plantation owner.

Carr and Henry are twin forces propelling a poverty program that may some day change the face of conservative, segregationist Clarksville.

They are the most unlikely pair one could find in Mississippi.

Henry, a dentist and pharmacist, formal and reserved, probably is the most skilled, pragmatic Negro leader in the state.

Carr, 40, owner of a 2,500-acre plantation and a bank, looks every inch the Southern aristocrat. He is a handsome man with clear blue eyes and wavy brown hair. He speaks in the relaxed soft drawl of a wellbred Southern gentleman.

President of a poverty program violently opposed by the local white power structure, Carr looks instead like the golf chairman from the local country club.

In a sporty multicolored sweater, regimental necktie and white button-down shirt, he lounges easily in a hard metal chair at a meeting of Coahoma Opportunities, Inc.

But when he starts to speak, he projects a different picture—the first white man to come to the aid of the poverty program when it was being systematically boycotted by every white leader in Clarksdale.

Carr and Henry, the program vice-president, speak almost with one voice in protesting that the federal government isn't doing enough to help the local poverty program.

They also kid each other in a comaraderie shared by few Negroes and whites in the Deep South.

Dreams and open doors

After Henry made an impassioned appeal for federal aid in bringing jobs to Clarksdale, Carr smiled and said: "You've got a dream, too." He referred to the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King's famous speech in which he chanted repeatedly: "I have a dream."

Henry smiled back: "And you've got a nightmare, baby."

Bennie Gooden, assistant director of the poverty program, analyzed Carr's contribution:

"He opened doors of the power structure. We couldn't get the Board of Supervisors or any local officials to meet with us.

"He's rich enough, and influential enough, and brave enough not to have to give in to the pressure."

It was pressure against the program that brought Carr into it.

"I didn't even know what community action was until 1965, when Henry asked me to serve on a Head Start board to help little children," he related. "Then, the 14 white segregationists on the board resigned, and he asked me whether I could get 11 white members in four days."

Carr said he thought the job was an easy one until he was turned down by one friend after another. When a prominent minister refused to serve, Carr's deep commitment began.

"If you as a minister won't serve," Carr told him, "that gives me all the more inspiration to make this program work."

Carr finally rounded up 10 new white board members by the deadline the project faced to get federal funding.

Carr does not speak like a zealot and he discourages any notion that he is one.

"I've always believed personally in equal rights, but I probably wouldn't be interested if there weren't such gross injustice against Negroes," he said.

Adding another motive, he said: "I've got five children, I want peace here."

He said his family has not suffered repercussions from his poverty work.

"As a matter of fact," he said, "our 10-year-old daughter worked last summer as a volunteer in the Head Start program.

"We haven't been harmed because 95 per cent of our people here are sheep, 4 per cent are bigots and 1 per cent are with us. The bigots are cowards, like most gangsters."

Nothing could be worse

Smoothly and quietly, Carr gave his views on various issues involved in civil rights and the poverty program.

On housing: "Nothing could be worse here than housing. It's so horrible it's not fit for animals." (Carr is building brick, air-conditioned housing for his 10 permanent plantation workers.)

On city government: "Our mayor has a fifth-grade education. I can't get him to apply for a federal work experience program."

On the school system: "There's not a single Negro in our schools. No one has a workable plan for integration. The schools have turned down federal school aid."

On the need for strong federal support: "The Negro vote will eventually take care of these problems. But what do you want us to do now—solve these things through our own little riots?"

On solving the housing problem: "I would cut off all Farmers Home Administration and Federal Housing Authority loans. The builders would decide immediately they support integration and poverty programs. Aside from OEO, Farmers Home Administration has the greatest potential for helping the poor. But it doesn't. The Agriculture Department is just helping the commercial farmer.

On politics: "Things are never really going to change until Sens. Eastland and Stennis and the governor are changed."

But Carr and Henry already are leading the way toward change.

They are creating a series of services for the poor—education, job training, a credit union, recreation—which rival functions of the official government.

And other white men are coming forward to serve.

The county board of education is slowly starting to help the program.

Gustav (Gus) Roessler, a former stockbroker and member of the White Citizens Council, is the director of the program. He, too, is respected by the Negro participants.

Dr. Frank Marascalo, an obstetrician, serves on the poverty board. Commenting on the first poverty trainees, he said:

"Two or three hundred of those people were barely breathing when they came through the door. These people had never received any major treatment. Some had hernias in their stomachs as large as footballs, others had severe prostate trouble."

"We (the Coahoma poverty organization) are the only representative body of democracy in the whole State of Mississippi," Carr stated matter-of-factly.

But he quickly added that individual white leaders are fighting for justice elsewhere in the state.

One finds them in the Delta—newspaper editors like Hodding Carter III at Greenville and Hazel Brannon Smith at Lexington, and attorney Jimmy Christenberry in Rolling Fork.

But for a Northerner, the most lasting impressions of the Delta—the flat, rich cotton country—are of the pathetic Negro poor, of their rising determination to overcome and of the white leaders who have chosen to stand beside them.

READER'S DIGEST ARTICLE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today because of my great concern over the attack on our Nation's great water resource program appearing in the June issue of the Reader's Digest. It is a most grave matter when a magazine in this country, with the distribution that it enjoys, attempts to influence public opinion on a vital program through distortions and misrepresentation of facts. The result is a most unfair indictment of our entire water resources development program which has been so vital to our progress. I realize the necessity to slant articles at least to a degree to sell more copies. I sincerely feel, however, that reputable publishers have a responsibility to avoid misleading the public to the detriment of essential activities of the Government. Unfortunately, as you know, there is no practical way to reach the same readers and set the facts straight. Incidentally, apparently Reader's Digest does not think it is a "boondoggle" to receive a subsidy of over $8 million a year from the U.S. Treasury to mail its issues to the newsstands and homes of the American taxpayers.

During the recent hearings held by our subcommittee on the pending 1968 public works appropriation bill, over 150 Members of Congress and 1,400 public witnesses appeared in support of funds for public works projects. These public witnesses were sincere, dedicated citizens who came to Washington at their own expense to plead with the committee to expedite the construction of needed flood control, water supply, navigation, and other water resource projects in their areas. Yet, according to the article these projects are only "political pork" that serve only to reelect Members of Congress.

The article makes no effort to point out that the public works projects, before they are eligible for funding, are subject to a most exhaustive review process to assure they are economically justified. After a thorough study by the responsible agency and clearance with all other agencies involved, they are carefully reviewed by the legislative committees of Congress before they are authorized by law. Each project must meet stringent criteria to assure benefits will fully justify the cost. Numerous projects are found unjustified during the study process.

I know all of you join me in strongly denouncing the article for its most unfair attack on the Corps of Engineers. Since 1824, the corps has served this Nation with distinction and is generally accredited with being the outstanding engineering organization in the world. One only need to point to the accomplishments achieved by its dedicated and highly qualified personnel to put the lie to this indictment of the Corps of Engineers. The entire Nation has benefited from the Army civil works construction. In the short time their flood control reservoirs and local protection projects have been operating, they have prevented more than $14 billion in flood damages compared to an investment of only $4.4 billion in the projects. These benefits are shared by all—the city dwellers, the farmers, the manufacturers, and the transportation industry. The flood waters stored in corps reservoirs are generally conserved for later release to increase low flows. These releases relieve drought conditions, improve the quality of our waters, and help to increase industrial production. The storage in corps reservoir projects supplements the water supply for more than 2 million people in 100 cities, towns, and rural areas of the Nation. These stored waters also develop electric energy. Corps projects now have installed generating capacity of over 9.4 million kilowatts and generate 42.5 billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually. And yet Reader's Digest calls this "pork barrel."

As our population grows and uses more and more raw materials to manufacture goods, our transportation facilities have to meet the need. The waterways improved by the Corps of Engineers since 1824, like other forms of transportation, are carrying increased amounts of goods. The inland waterways, exclusive of the Great Lakes, are carrying about 140 billion ton-miles of bulk commodities annually, or about 10 percent of the total intercity movement of the Nation. Recreational attendance at corps reservoir projects and waterways has shown a phenomenal growth. Attendance at reservoirs alone has grown from 30 million in 1952 to 193 million in 1966. Yet, again the article labels this "pork barrel."

LAKE ERIE-OHIO RIVER CANAL

I am not surprised that the article contains a vicious and most distorted attack on the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal project. The railroads, as they have in the past in each instance of proposed waterway projects, have launched a well-financed, no-holds-barred attack on the merits of the project. The article merely parrots the distorted "facts" which the railroad economists and lawyers have flooded the news media in an effort to discredit the project. The article makes no effort to set forth for review by the reader the findings of the Corps of Engineers based on extensive and exhaustive study of the project. The corps report, which involves five volumes and over 700 pages, considered and answered the claims made by the project opponents. Unfortunately, the corps' findings are not "news," they do not make "headlines," so they never seem to get publicity.

It is interesting that one leading opponent of the project, whose attack on the recommendations of the corps is quoted in the article, is at the same time requesting unbudgeted funds for his district for another project studied and recommended by the same Corps of Engineers. In this instance, he strongly supports the findings of the corps as to benefits, cost, engineering feasibility, and so forth. Likewise, other opponents of the project, including the railroads, are now actively supporting and promoting corps projects which will serve their interests. We have spent millions of dollars developing Conneaut Harbor on Lake Erie. A company which benefits from this development and enthusiastically endorsed the engineering and economic findings of the corps in this instance, now questions the corps' analysis on the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal project. But we cannot and should not have a double set of standards. We should not condemn the corps when we oppose a project, and then praise them when a project is to our benefit.

I do not feel that it is necessary for me to answer here the personal attack contained in the article. I have dedicated myself over the years to the natural resource development of our country, whether it be in the Northwest, the Southwest, the Northwest, or the Southeast. I believe the record will show that our subcommittee, under my chairmanship, has made every effort to fund objectively, within the limited funds available, the highest priority projects regardless of area from among the great backlog of over 400 authorized projects.

I believe you will agree that it is ironic that after years of promoting needed projects in other areas, I am now being bombarded by special and selfish interests because I support a major, badly needed project for the development of my own region. We have encountered similar resistance from selfish interests to every other major waterway project that has been constructed down through the years. The success of these projects now speaks for itself with the benefits realized far exceeding the original corps estimates. I am glad that our committee has had the objectivity and foresight to realize that with the expansion of our great country, there is and will continue to be more business for all, whether it be the railroads, neighboring cities or ports, or competing industries. Certainly it is obvious where our country would be today if our committee had buckled under to the opposing minorities and voted down funds for justifiable projects to placate the selfish interests.

In conclusion, I would like to briefly set the record straight on some of the distortions of facts contained in the article in reference to the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal.

PURPOSE OF PROJECT

Without the low-cost transportation advantages the canal would bring to the coal and steel industries located in the upper Ohio River Basin, the economy of the region will continue to decline—being unable to compete favorably with areas enjoying cheap water transportation for the movement of coal and iron ore. The canal, only 120 miles long, would provide the vital missing link between Lake Erie and the Ohio River near Pittsburgh. It would make possible a free flow of low-cost waterborne commerce between the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Great Lakes, the Ohio, the Mississippi, and the Gulf intercoastal navigation systems. I think it is obvious the benefits that low-cost barge transportation, representing an annual saving of $46.1 million compared to current freight rates, would bring to this large area, and the Nation, compared with the present water route of 2,400 miles around the Great Lakes, down the Illinois Waterway to the Mississippi River and back up the Ohio River. In addition, the project would provide major flood control and recreational benefits in the area.

I would like to emphasize that the present budget request provides only for continuation of planning on the project, which will require a minimum of at least 4 more years to complete. There is no intention by the supporters of the project that any consideration be given to the initiation of construction as long as our Nation is faced with the current defense emergencies and the current budgetary situation.

I think it is generally agreed, however, that this is the appropriate time to undertake study and planning of public works projects, with the small current expenditures involved, in order that we might have a reservoir of projects for consideration in the future when larger capital expenditures in the economy are warranted.

In this connection, I would like to point out that the current public works budget pending before our committee totals $2.1 billion, not $4 billion as used in the article. Typical of the accuracy of the writer, he apparently decided to throw in the Atomic Energy Commission budget to double the figure.

LAND TAKING

The principal land area to be acquired is for the Summit reservoir. About 5 percent of the area is residential; 38 percent is cultivated agricultural land; and the remaining 57 percent is in timber, pasture, brush, and wasteland.

It is regrettable that almost every construction project requires land acquisition with the accompanying hardship on the land owners involved. However, the land requirements on the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal project are not unusual. It is common for land acquisition on even single reservoir projects to involve in excess of 40,000 acres. Land acquisition requirements on most other waterways has been far in excess of that required for the Lake Erie-Ohio project. Perhaps I should note that land acquisition underway for the Tocks Island Reservoir and the adjacent Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, a project supported by the canal opponents from these areas, involves acquisition of a total of 72,875 acres.

NO DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE ERIE

The Corps of Engineers has testified that "studies show conclusively that adequate water is available for filling the reservoir and operation of the navigation locks without any adverse effect on Lake Erie. Water from the Mahoning River, a tributary of the Ohio River, will be used for the project and this method of operation may well result in improved lake levels and added stream flow which will be available for power generation at Niagara and Massena."

STUDIES BY PRIVATE CONSULTANTS

The Corps of Engineers has advised that:

> The rates supplied by a private economist were developed for typical trade areas. Applying these rates to traffic projected for the canal led to certain modifications, such as those resulting from back haul opportunities. During review the barge rates were re-examined and adjusted to reflect the most recent conditions. No arbitrary reduction was made in the rates furnished by the economist.

The A. D. Little report covered all economic aspects of the proposed canal. It stated that:

> In conclusion, other than the transportation cost savings involved, we consider the major transportation contribution to be made by the proposed canal to be the provision of an alternative mode of transportation for steel industry raw materials that would insure needed reductions in raw material cost disadvantages—reductions which would benefit a regional economy which has serious long-term economic problems.

COST ESTIMATES

The so-called "errors" in the corps' report refers to items in the initial analysis which were revised and updated by the corps itself during its extensive review process before issuing the final report. During the review all cost estimates were carefully scrutinized with particular emphasis on items of cost questioned by local interests. Costs were increased by $21,000,000 including $11,000,000 added for bridges, some of which are only in the planning stage by the local jurisdictions.

Essential access roads for recreation areas were included in the recreation costs. Any additional recreational access roads would be a local responsibility as is the standard practice.

The construction costs of loading terminals are never included in the project estimates as they are the responsibility of the industries and port authorities involved.

The corps' estimate of $53,372 for relocation of the gas pipeline in Beaver County, Pa., is properly limited to the additional cost of excavation required after the new canal excavation is completed. The estimate by the owners is based on the assumption the excavation and relocation of the pipeline would be made before the new waterway cut is made.

The cost estimates for the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal were made in the light of experience gained by the Corps of Engineers over a period of many years in conducting a civil works program now costing more than a billion dollars a year. A recent study indicated actual construction costs of $3,144,000,000 for 184 recently completed major projects was $706,000,000 less than the preauthorization report costs as adjusted for price level changes.

INTEREST RATE

The 3⅛-percent interest rate used in the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal evaluation is the standard rate currently prescribed by the Bureau of the Budget for the evaluation of all projects in accordance with Senate Document No. 97 of the 87th Congress. The rate is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury based upon a periodic review of the average rate of interest payable by the Treasury on outstanding interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States which, upon original issue, had terms to maturity of 15 years or more.

RECREATION BENEFITS

The figure of half a million sportsmen on a normal summer Sunday does not recognize that the actual visitor capacity required would amount to only 381,000 in view of the minimum turnover factor of 1.5. This design load is based on an estimate by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The estimated density of use in the intensive use area compares favorably with that now occurring in the local area and within the region. Density of use for the total area would be considerably less and would be consistent with that needed to maintain good quality in each of the planned recreational activities.

HOMEOWNERSHIP FOR LOW INCOME FAMILIES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Barrett] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pride that I attended the ceremony yesterday marking the first allocation of homes under the program enacted last year to provide 3-percent financing under FHA for homeownership for low income families. This plan, known as the "Sullivan program," was the fruit of long, hard work by our beloved colleague, Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan of Missouri. Building on the experience of a nonprofit group in her home city of St. Louis, the Bicentennial Civic Improvement Corp., Lee Sullivan worked out an amendment last year to provide a combination of FHA mortgage insurance and 3-percent financing so that private civic, labor, religious, and similiar organizations could rehabilitate rundown housing and make it available for purchase by low income families. These groups also provide guidance to the home buyers and assist in improving the neighborhood generally to assure a decent environment and stable values.

Mr. Speaker, this program has tremendous potential for improving our cities and for making the dream of homeownership a reality for families who could not otherwise afford it. Mrs. Sullivan and the people of St. Louis cannot be commended too highly for the leadership they have shown and this program will prove its value throughout the country. Already a number of groups in my own city of Philadelphia are working toward this goal.

An excellent description of the program and its goals was given by Assistant Secretary Philip N. Brownstein, of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, at the meeting yesterday. I offer it for inclusion in the Record so that all of my colleagues can see the potential of this provision of law and be sure that their own communities participate in it:

Remarks of P. N. Brownstein, Assistant Secretary-Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, at 221(h) Ceremony, May 24, 1967

Since the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration in 1934, America has become a Nation of home owners. Now, nearly two of every three American families either own their homes or are in some stage of purchase.

Of the one-third, some families do not want home ownership. To others, home ownership is an elusive goal, always out of reach of their financial capabilities.

Today the Department of Housing and Urban Development is taking an historic first step towards bringing a common aspiration closer to those of modest income.

We have a new program tailored to the needs of the poor families, and we are making the first allocation of funds under that program.

Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan, who introduced the 1966 housing amendment that provided this program, and Philip F. Lichtenstein, director of the nonprofit sponsor which will receive the first allocation, are here with us today. We congratulate them for their work in creating a new aid to housing the poor and for the first fruit it bears today.

There are several reasons why this program offers promise to low-income families, their neighborhoods, and their communities.

The housing is developed by nonprofit groups who are motivated by the desire to help low-income families become home owners.

But the role of the nonprofit sponsor cannot stop with the completed home. The sponsor must also give guidance and advice to the new owners, and steer them into proper channels for realizing their goal. Well motivated sponsoring organizations, such as the Bicentennial Civic Improvement Corporation here today, can go a long way toward making this and similar programs work successfully.

The housing under this program is provided by major rehabilitation of sound but rundown structures, upgrading the inventory of existing housing.

The program can improve and stabilize neighborhoods that are starting down hill.

It offers poor families a choice in housing, and most importantly, it gives them a chance to own a decent home.

The project we get under way today with the allocation of $68,000 will provide eight St. Louis low-income families with a sound home and a way to buy it with FHA mortgage insurance.

A small beginning, but most beginnings are small.

We are started along the path that the world's most affluent and productive society must take.

The problems involved in providing decent housing for low-income families do not lend themselves to easy solutions.

We, in Government, have sought to expand the supply of such housing. We have made considerable progress in the field, although we have suffered casualties.

We cannot adequately house the poor by trimming our national efforts.

I see great promise for the program we are inaugurating today.

Mrs. Sullivan and the Bicentennial Civic Improvement Corporation have given evidence of their imaginative and dedicated work to put home ownership within the reach of the poor.

There is great merit in this effort.

President Johnson summed it up well just two months ago when he said, "For many American families, home ownership is a source of pride and satisfaction, of commitment to community life. . . . We must learn how best to help low-income families to own their own homes."

This is an excellent example of the response to the President's call.

UNEXPLAINED DELAY IN ANNUAL REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS BY THE BUREAU OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Federal law requires that, and I quote section 14 of title 12 of the code:

The Comptroller of the Currency shall make an annual report to Congress.

In simple terms, this official is commanded to report annually the results of his stewardship with respect to the Nation's 4,800 national banks which hold nearly one-half of the public's money supply.

However, between September 1, 1965, and May 1, 1967, a period of almost 2 years, no annual report at all was furnished to the Congress as required by law. The report for 1964 was filed on the former date, but the 1965 report was not filed with the Congress until 16 months after the close of that year. This is an intolerable situation, Mr. Speaker, and I have been assured by Comptroller Camp that as long as he occupies that high office that it will never happen again.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the archives of this House show that the "combined annual report for 1965 and 1966" filed by the Comptroller of the Currency which contains a letter of transmittal dated November 15, 1966, from then-Comptroller of the Currency Saxon, was actually filed with the Congress on a different date almost 6 months later, in violation of the law.

THE DOLLAR IS STRONGER THAN GOLD, INSISTS BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN WRIGHT PATMAN

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, gold is universally recognized as a means of settlement of international financial transactions for the principal reason that the world price of gold is supported by the world's strongest full faith and credit obligation—the U.S. dollar. Gold has very little intrinsic value and its glitter is more psychological than anything else.

Still, we find gold useful as a medium of exchange and a store of value internationally speaking simply because the United States of America supports the price of gold by promising to pay foreign holders at a fixed rate of exchange of $35 per ounce.

Therefore, it should be clear to all that the usefulness of gold is utterly dependent upon a fixed rate of exchange for some hard currency, and our dollar has assumed that role because we have the largest, steadiest, and strongest economy in the entire world. Thus, it is our economic power, coupled with our Government's taxing power, that stands behind the dollar. It is the full faith and credit of the United States specifically guaranteeing our dollars that protects and supports the value of gold—not the reverse. Without fixed hard-currency support, I suspect gold would have some substantial value as a mere commodity, but not a whole lot in comparison with its present monetary value.

So as long as we continue to successfully strive toward the great national goals clearly set forth in the Full Employment Act of 1946, of maximum production, employment, and purchasing power we will have a sound economy and a sound dollar, with or without gold.

Probably our main problem as world banker is due to an excessively rapid foreign investment program by our large banks and large corporations seeking to carve out profitable positions for themselves in the Common Market countries and other international markets.

If we decide to continue indefinitely to prop up the monetary price of gold, it will probably be necessary to impose stricter controls over the huge outward flow of dollars for investment in Western Europe.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD a very intelligent letter to the editor, written by Mr. Walter C. Louchheim, appearing May 23 in the Washington Post newspaper:

GOLD FOR DOLLARS

Your financial editor, Hobart Rowen, was perpetuating a fallacy when he wrote in his article of Sunday, May 14, about the apprehension of European bankers as to a possible suspension of gold purchases or sales by the United States. I must also take issue with his statement that "there isn't a country in Europe that wouldn't like to buy gold for dollars."

Mr. Rowen is really referring to a few central bankers in a few European countries. Anyone who has visited Europe recently and has discussed the dollar with bankers in a broad sense, knows that confidence in it has never been higher. They also learn that this confidence is not dependent upon how much gold there is in Fort Knox but rather upon the resources and prosperity of our economy, the stability of our government and the free convertibility of our currency at all times, for all purposes and in any amounts.

Apparently Mr. Rowen's article was based upon the views of a malcontent member of the French Embassy staff who has been using his office to spread financial Gaullism around Washington. It ill behooves a representative of France to imply, as this man does in the story quoted by Mr. Rowen, that the United States is a defaulter on its international obligations while history is still so recent and so clear as to what countries have failed to pay their foreign debts.

If we had a representative in France who was engaged in spreading such unjust and unfriendly allegations as this Frenchman is reported to be doing we would, I believe, call him home.

WALTER C. LOUCHHEIM.

WASHINGTON.

BANK PROFITS INCREASE 11.7 PERCENT IN FIRST QUARTER

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was on December 6, 1965, that the Federal Reserve Board followed the recommendation of the bankers and raised interest rates to the highest level in about 40 years. On September 20, 1966, the profits of leading banks for the 6 months following this action were set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The bankers had increased their profits more than 13¼ percent in the first half of 1966 while 11 savings and loan organizations had shown a decrease of 45½ percent in their earnings for the same period.

Data Digests, Inc. recently published the earnings for 64 leading banks for the first quarter of 1967. These 64 banks increased their earnings more than 11.7 percent in the first quarter 1967. Much has been reported recently about the lower earnings of industrial corporations for the first quarter of 1967—in fact a report was recently published by a New York Stock Exchange firm covering earnings and estimated earnings of 28 of the 30 companies included in the Dow-Jones industrial stock average, commonly referred to as blue chip stocks. These figures reveal that the earnings and estimated earnings of these 28 companies dropped an average of 11.4 percent in the first quarter of 1967 as compared to the first quarter of 1966.

The reduced earnings of 11.4 percent for these leading industrial companies are in sharp contrast to the 11.7 percent increase in earnings for 64 leading banks. Although the profits of these banks increased 11.7 percent for the first quarter of 1967, this was the first time since the opening quarter of 1961 that the real gross national product did not advance in the first quarter, and the banks were in a position to influence the high interest rate policies.

While the banks are enjoying these benefits from high interest rates the public is being told that high interest rates are necessary to control inflation. Yet, the high interest rates actually contribute to the cost of doing business and to increased prices for the consumer. Both the wholesaler and the retailer who pays a higher interest rate to the banker must pass this increased cost of doing business on to the consumer in the form of higher prices.

The earnings of the 64 leading banks which were published in the May report of Data Digests, Inc., are as follows:

List of banks	Earnings for 1st 3 months	
	1967	1966
Bank of New York	$1.44	$1.42
BT New York	1.24	1.14
Charter New York	.83	.75
Chase Manhattan [1]	1.23	1.14
Chemical Bank, N.Y. Trust	1.13	1.01
First National City	1.08	.94
Franklin National	.87	.70
Manufacturers Hanover	1.05	.89
Morgan Guaranty	1.91	1.61
United States Trust	1.21	1.09
First National (Boston)	1.38	1.20
New England Merchants	1.09	1.08
State Street Bank & Trust	.98	.94
Continental Illinois National	.82	.75
First National (Chicago)	1.25	1.21
Harris Trust & Savings	1.25	1.10
Northern Trust	1.96	1.69
Central National	1.08	.86
Cleveland Trust	2.73	2.26
National City	1.10	.98
Union Commerce Bank	.96	.91
Detroit Bank & Trust	1.51	1.43
Manufacturers National	1.44	1.52
National Bank of Detroit	1.25	1.10
Bank of America N.T. & S.A	1.02	.92
Bank of California N.A	.88	.72
Crocker-Citizens	.56	.54
First National (Oregon)	.82	.80
Seattle-First National	$1.18	$.99
Security-First National	.88	.80
Union Bank (Los Angeles)	.58	.67
United States National (Oregon)	.66	.65
Valley National (Phoenix)	.29	.28
Wells Fargo Bank	.71	.64
Fidelity Bank	2.16	1.65
First Pennsylvania Banking	.83	.69
Girard Trust Bank	1.11	1.07
Philadelphia National	1.30	1.11
Provident National	1.63	1.56
Bank of S.W.N.A. (Houston)	.71	.63
First National (Dallas)	.70	.60
Republic National (Dallas)	.38	.34
American Fletcher (Indianapolis)	1.19	1.06
Citizens & South'n (Georgia)	.65	.63
Connecticut Bank & Trust (Hartford)	1.62	1.41
County Trust (White Plains)	.76	.73
Fidelity Union Trust (Newark)	1.30	1.05
First Bank Trust (Minneapolis)	.92	.81
1st & Merchants (Richmond)	.93	.81
First National (Maryland)	1.24	1.11
1st National State (Newark)	.86	.77
Hartford National	.75	.69
Indiana National Bank	1.27	1.02
Industrial National (Providence)	1.29	1.01
Lincoln Rochester Trust	1.10	.93
Manufacturers & Traders (Buffalo)	.53	.49
Maryland National Bank	1.33	1.16
Mellon National (Pittsburgh)	1.38	1.40
Mercantile Trust (St. Louis)	1.55	1.37
North Carolina National	.76	.69
Pittsburgh National	1.24	1.05
Riggs National (Washington, D.C.)	1.43	1.27
Union Trust (Maryland)	2.01	1.90
Wachovia Bank & Trust	.63	.55
Total	71.93	64.29

[1] Fiscal year.

The earnings of 28 of the 30 companies making up the Dow-Jones industrial average, and published by Hayden, Stone, Inc., for the first quarter 1967 and the first quarter 1966, were as follows:

List of companies	Earnings for 1st 3 months	
	1967	1966
Allied Chemical	$0.67	$0.74
Alcoa	1.24	1.12
American Can	.77	.70
American Telephone	[1].88	.86
American Tobacco	.60	.63
Anaconda	[2] 2.40	2.38
Bethlehem Steel	.70	.80
Chrysler	.40	1.38
Du Pont	1.64	2.17
Eastman Kodak	.75	.74
General Electric	.81	.90
General Foods	[2] 1.15	1.07
General Motors	[2] 1.40	2.07
Goodyear	[2].70	.74
International Harvester	[2].66	.86
International Nickel	1.11	1.31
International Paper	[2].55	.55
Johns-Manville	.54	.75
Owens-Illinois	.50	.80
Procter-Gamble	[1] 1.05	.94
Sears, Roebuck	[2].30	.33
Standard of California	[2] 1.25	1.20
Standard of New Jersey	1.36	1.36
Texaco	1.41	1.30
Union Carbide	.80	1.02
United Air	[2].90	.89
United States Steel	.76	.93
Westinghouse Electric	.63	.75
Swift	-------	-------
Woolworth	-------	-------
Total	25.93	29.29

[1] Fiscal quarter.
[2] Estimated.

OUR OLDER CITIZENS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection

to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills which will be of particular assistance to our older citizens. One of these bills would extend the provisions of the Older Americans Act of 1965, and the other would prohibit arbitrary age discrimination in employment.

In a sense, this Nation's extraordinary economic development has left our older citizens in its backwash. Compared to other age groups, their incomes have increased far less in the last 20 years, and their opportunities for useful employment have shrunk with the growing emphasis upon youth and technical training.

The social and psychological costs of these trends are heavy, and the dimensions of the problem are large and growing. In 1940, 7 percent of the Nation's population—9,121,000 people—were over the age of 65. Today, that number has more than doubled to 19 million, and now represents 10 percent of the population. Of these 19 million elderly, some 40 percent has assets of less than $1,000 and incomes which fall far below the poverty line.

It does not take much imagination to visualize how a large number of our older citizens live. Because of their straitened circumstances, many do not even get the proper foods essential for maintaining health. Those who live in senior citizens' housing projects are often condemned to a sterile existence. And others who are forced to live alone generally do so in loneliness and sadness. Such conditions cannot be condoned in a country as affluent as ours. We have a profound responsibility to draw the elderly back into the mainstream of our national life.

We recognized that responsibility when Congress passed the Older Americans Act in 1965 and established the Administration on Aging to administer its provisions. But it is now time that we extend these provisions to insure that the work begun is continued and expanded.

Specifically, one of the bills which I am introducing today would raise the funding levels above those presently authorized. For fiscal year 1968, the bill provides that the State grants program be increased from $8,000,000 to $10,550,000; and the research, demonstration, and training grants from $3,000,000 to $6,400,000.

This additional money would enable the States to supplement their existing programs with 240 to 300 new community projects for older people. Such projects include programs in senior activity centers, employment and health counseling, recreation programs in senior housing projects, consumer information and guidance services, and a wide variety of other programs to improve the lives of thousands of our older citizens.

A large portion of the $6,400,000 to be authorized for research and demonstrations will go to a study of the nutritional needs of older people. Pilot demonstration projects will seek to find new ways of providing nutritious meals and companionship in senior centers, school lunchrooms, government and private plant cafeterias during off-peak hours; special cooperatives for the elderly; and such services as home delivery of meals. This is an area where much still needs to be done if we are to insure that our older people live out their last years in the best possible health.

Just as there are many older Americans who need various kinds of special assistance, so there are many who are still healthy, productive and potentially self-sufficient. But under existing employment practices, it is not unusual for them to be forcibly retired at an age when they still have many years of productive work ahead of them. This is not only sad and undesirable for them, but also deprives the Nation of skills and experience which ought to be utilized. To help deal with this problem, I am introducing a bill to make it unlawful for employers, employment agencies and labor unions to discriminate against individuals because of their age, except in circumstances where necessary.

Passage of these two bills is a small but essential step in improving the lives of our older citizens. I hope the Congress gives them favorable consideration.

RESIDENCY VOTING ACT—VOTING IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson today sent to Congress his message on the political process in America and proposed the Residency Voting Act of 1967.

In his message, the President emphasized that the right to vote in presidential elections is a fundamental right of all American citizens. Yet, as the data cited by the President clearly indicate, millions of our citizens who change residence are unable to vote because of the patchwork of variable residence requirements under the laws of the several States.

The Residency Voting Act of 1967 is intended to cure the inequities caused by the conflicts between State voting requirements and the needs of a mobile population.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the bill would aid many American citizens temporarily residing abroad who are unable to vote in presidential elections. A serious and highly artificial barrier to voting faced by Americans in the Armed Forces, in Government service, in business and in teaching is their inability to register by an absentee procedure, even though the States of which they are residents would permit them to vote by absentee ballot. Elimination of this unfair disenfranchisement will greatly enhance the democratic process of free presidential elections.

Mr. Speaker, I think it important to note that the bill the President is today recommending would apply to members of the armed services. It is particularly fitting that we begin to consider the Residency Voting Act on a day when we extend the Selective Service System.

Mr. Speaker, the Residency Voting Act is consistent with my own bill, H.R. 8176, which would amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act to recommend—and I repeat, only to recommend—to the States that they permit absentee registration for all elections to citizens temporarily abroad. My bill does not require that the States have such absentee registration; it recommends, it facilitates it.

The Residency Voting Act, which President Johnson proposes, would require that the States which do permit absentee voting in presidential elections also permit absentee registration. To permit one and not the other is clearly to nullify the good intentions embodied in absentee voting procedures.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there may be sensitive problems of State-Federal relations connected with this proposal and I introduce it in order to make possible full study by the Members of this House, many of whom are expert in this complex area. But I am also aware of the pernicious barrier to the full exercise of the franchise in presidential elections engendered by our conflicting pattern of voting and registration laws.

I insert at this point the message of the President on the political process in America, the letter of the Attorney General concerning the Residency Voting Act of 1967, and the act itself:

THE POLITICAL PROCESS IN AMERICA

To the Congress of the United States:

I. INTRODUCTION

Public participation in the processes of government is the essence of democracy. Public confidence in those processes strengthens democracy.

No Government can long survive which does not fuse the public will to the institutions which serve it. The American system has endured for almost two centuries because the people have involved themselves in the work of their Government, with full faith in the meaning of that involvement.

But Government itself has the continuing obligation—second to no other—to keep the machinery of public participation functioning smoothly and to improve it where necessary so that democracy remains a vital and vibrant institution.

It is in the spirit of that obligation that I send this message to the Congress today. I propose a five-point program to:

Reform our campaign financing laws to assure full disclosure of contributions and expenses, to place realistic limits on contributions, and to remove the meaningless and ineffective ceilings on campaign expenditures.

Provide a system of public financing for Presidential election campaigns.

Broaden the base of public support for election campaigns, by exploring ways to encourage and stimulate small contributions.

Close the loopholes in the Federal laws regulating lobbying.

Assure the right to vote for millions of Americans who change their residences.

II. THE ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1967

In our democracy, politics is the instrument which sustains our institutions and keeps them strong and free.

The laws which govern political activity should be constantly reviewed—and reshaped when necessary—to preserve the essential health and vitality of the political process which is so fundamental to our way of life.

In my 1966 State of the Union message I

called attention to the need for a basic reform of the laws governing political campaigns in these words:

"... I will submit legislation to revise the present unrealistic restrictions on contributions—to prohibit the endless proliferation of committees, bringing local and state committees under the act—and to attach strong teeth and severe penalties to the requirement of full disclosure of contributions. . . ."

A year ago this month, I submitted my proposals to the Congress in the Election Reform Act of 1966.

That measure reflected my concern, as one who has been involved in the process of elective Government for over three decades, that the laws dealing with election campaigns have not kept pace with the times.

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act was passed 42 years ago. The Hatch Act was passed 27 years ago. Inadequate in their scope when enacted, they are now obsolete. More loophole than law, they invite evasion and circumvention.

A sweeping overhaul of the laws governing election campaigns should no longer be delayed.

Basic reform—with an emphasis on clear and straightforward disclosure—is essential to insure public confidence and involvement in the political process. On the cornerstone of disclosure we can build toward further reform—by charting new ways to broaden the base of financial support for candidates and parties in election campaigns.

I again ask the Congress to take positive action in this field as we work together to insure continued and increased public confidence in the elective process.

I recommend the Election Reform Act of 1967 to correct omissions, loopholes, and shortcomings in the present campaign laws.

This Act embodies many of the same positive measures I proposed last May. Last October, after hearings, the subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration reported out substantially the bill I proposed "favorably and with bipartisan support." The Subcommittee Report called those measures "a vast improvement over existing law."

Full public disclosure

The heart of basic reform is full disclosure. This measure would, for the first time, make effective the past efforts of the Congress and the Executive to achieve full disclosure of political campaign funds.

Complete disclosure will open to public view where campaign money comes from and how it is spent. Such disclosure will help dispel the growth of public skepticism which surrounds the present methods of financing political campaigns.

Full disclosure efforts are frustrated today by gaps in the law through which have passed an endless stream of national, state and local political committees.

To insure full disclosure, I recommend that:

Every candidate, including those for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, and every committee, state, interstate, and national, that supports a candidate for federal office be required to report on every contribution, loan and expense item over $100.

Primaries and convention nomination contests be brought within the disclosure laws.

Effective ceilings on the size of contributions

Closely related to full disclosure—the basic step in any election reform—is another equally demanding task. It requires that we make political financing more democratic by recognizing that great wealth—in reality or appearance—could be used to achieve undue political influence.

Current law limits to $5,000 contributions to a single candidate for federal office or contributions to any national political committee supporting a candidate.

But the law does not prohibit an individual from making a $5,000 contribution to each of several national committees supporting a candidate or party—and there is no limit to the number of such committees. Moreover, state and local political committees are not even covered by existing law.

I recommend that a $5,000 limit be placed on the total amount that could come from any individual, his wife or minor children, to the campaign of any candidate.

Repeal of artificial limits of campaign expenses

With full disclosure and an effective ceiling on contributions we can move forward to cure another defect in our election campaign laws—the artificial limits on campaign expenditures.

Under present law, for example:

National political committees can raise and spend no more than $3 million. But the law does not limit the number of national committees.

Senate candidates are limited to expenses of $25,000 and House candidates to $5,000. But the law does not limit the number of committees that can spend and raise money on the candidate's behalf.

These legal ceilings on expenditures were enacted many years ago, when the potential of radio in a campaign was virtually unknown and when television did not exist. They are totally unrealistic and inadequate. They have led to the endless proliferation of political committees.

I therefore recommend a repeal of the present arbitrary limits on the total expenditures of candidates for federal office.

Barring political contributions by Government contractors

Present law prohibits corporations and labor organizations from making contributions to campaigns for federal office.

But there is an anomaly which must be corrected in the law relating to contractors with the Federal Government.

Non-corporate Government contractors are now prohibited from making political contributions at all levels of Government—federal, state and local.

The bar on corporations with government contracts, however, extends only to political contributions at the federal level. These corporations are free to make political contributions at the state and local levels where finances are often intertwined with national political campaigns.

In the interests of consistency and good sense, I recommend that corporations holding contracts with the Federal Government also be prohibited from making political contributions at the state and local level.

Enforcement

To insure that these reforms are strictly enforced, the Election Reform Act of 1967 would provide criminal penalties for violations of the law.

III. CAMPAIGN FINANCING

The proposed Election Reform Act of 1967 is corrective, remedying present inadequacies in the law. It goes hand in hand with the pursuit of another goal—to provide public support for election campaigns.

The background

Democracy rests on the voice of the people. Whatever blunts the clear expression of that voice is a threat to democratic government.

In this century one phenomenon in particular poses such a threat—the soaring costs of political campaigns.

Historically, candidates for public office in this country have always relied upon private contributions to finance their campaigns.

But in the last few decades, technology—which has changed so much of our national life—has modified the nature of political campaigning as well. Radio, television, and the airplane have brought sweeping new dimensions and costs to the concept of political candidacy.

In many ways these changes have worked to decided advantage of the American people. They have served to bring the candidates and the issues before virtually every voting citizen. They have contributed immeasurably to the political education of the nation.

In another way, however, they have worked to the opposite effect by increasing the costs of campaigning to spectacular proportions. Costs of such magnitude can have serious consequences for our democracy:

More and more, men and women of limited means may refrain from running for public office. Private wealth increasingly becomes an artificial and unrealistic arbiter of qualifications, and the source of public leadership is thus severely narrowed.

Increases in the size of individual contributions create uneasiness in the minds of the public. Actually, the exercise of undue influence occurs infrequently. Nonetheless, the circumstance in which a candidate is obligated to rely on sizable contributions easily creates the impression that influence is at work. This impression—however unfounded it might be—is itself intolerable, for it erodes public confidence in the democratic order.

The necessity of acquiring substantial funds to finance campaigns diverts a candidate's attention from his public obligations and detracts from his energetic exposition of the issues.

The growing importance of large contributions serves to deter the search for small ones, and thus effectively narrows the base of financial support. This is exactly the opposite of what a democratic society should strive to achieve.

It is extremely difficult to devise a program which completely eliminates these undesirable consequences without inhibiting robust campaigning and the freedom of every American fully to participate in the elective process. I believe that our ultimate goal should be to finance the total expense for this vital function of our democracy with public funds, and to prohibit the use or acceptance of money from private sources. We have virtually no experience upon which to base such a program. Its risks and uncertainties are formidable. I believe, however, that we are ready to make a beginning. We should proceed with all prudence speed to enact those parts of such a program which appear to be feasible at this time.

Presidential campaigns

The Problem

The election of a President is the highest expression of the free choice of the American people. It is the most visible level of politics—and also the most expensive.

For their free choice to be exercised wisely, the people must be fully informed about the opposing candidates and issues. To achieve this, candidates and parties must have the funds to bring their platforms and programs to the people.

Yet, as we have seen, the costs of campaigning are skyrocketing. This imposes extreme and heavy financial burdens on party and candidate alike, creating a potential for danger—the possibility that men of great wealth could achieve undue political influence through large contributions.

In recognition of this problem, the Congress last year enacted the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. By so doing, it adopted the central concept that some form of public financing of Presidential campaigns would serve the public interest.

I did not submit or recommend this legislation. It was the creation and the product of the Congress in 1966. As you will recall, it was added as an amendment to other essential legislation. When I signed that Act into law last November, I observed that "it breaks new ground in the financing of Presidential election campaigns" and that the "new law is only a beginning." It was my belief then, as it is now, that the complex issues involved in this new concept required extensive discussion and penetrating analysis.

Over the past six weeks, we have heard men of deep principle and firm conviction engage in a spirited and searching debate on the law. While there were honest and vigorous disagreements, they were voiced by those who share a common faith in the free ideals which are the bedrock of our democracy.

The Issues

The course of the debate has illuminated many of the issues which underlie the matter of Presidential campaign financing. For example:

In what amount should Federal funds be provided for these campaigns?

What limitations should be placed on the use of these funds?

Should there be a complete bar on the use of private contributions for those aspects of campaign financing which would be regularly provided through appropriations?

Can the availability of public funds result in an undue concentration of power in National Political Committees. If so, what steps can be taken to prevent it?

Is the tax check-off method a sound approach or is a direct appropriation to be preferred?

How can equitable treatment of minor parties be assured?

What sanctions would be most effective to insure compliance with the law?

Whatever the ultimate formula, how can we preserve the independence, spirit and spontaneity that has hallmarked American political enterprise through the years?

The Recommendations

Against this backdrop of concern for the political process, the protection of the public interest, and the issues that have been raised, I make these eleven recommendations to improve and strengthen the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act:

1. *Funds to finance Presidential campaigns should be provided by direct Congressional appropriation, rather than determined by individual tax check-offs.*

This approach would:

Provide the opportunity for Congress to make a realistic assessment, and express its judgment, of what it would cost Presidential candidates or parties to carry their views to the voters. This assessment should consider the recommendations of the special Advisory Board to the Comptroller General, created under the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. The Board consists of representatives of both major political parties. Based on this review and recommendation, Congress could then appropriate the necessary funds.

Make the amount appropriated for the campaign fund more stable, by removing its uncertain reliance on tax check-offs (whose numbers might bear no reasonable relationship to the amount required to bring the issues before the public.

2. *The funds should be used only for expenses which are needed to bring the issues before the public.*

Under the procedure I recommend:

The funds so appropriated would be used to reimburse specified expenditures incurred during the Presidential election campaign itself, after the parties have selected their candidate.

The amount appropriated should be adequate to defray key items of expense to carry a campaign to the public and thus be limited to the following items: radio and television, newspaper and periodical advertising, the preparation and distribution of campaign literature, and travel.

The amount of the fund for the major parties as finally determined by the Congress, would be divided equally between them.

3. *Private contributions for major parties could not be used for those items of expense to which public funds could be applied.*

Private contributions, however, could be used to defray the costs of other campaign expenses. These would include the salaries of campaign workers, overhead, research and polls, telegraph and telephone, postage and administrative expenses.

Citizens who want to make contributions to the party or candidate of their choice will be free to do so. Party workers at the grass roots will be able to pursue their neighborhood activities, a responsibility which is deeply woven into the fabric of American political tradition.

But under the measures I have proposed, the major burden of raising money for soaring campaign costs will be lifted from a Presidential candidate's shoulders. No longer will we have to rely on the large contributions of wealthy and powerful interests.

4. *A "major party" should be defined as one which received 25% or more of the popular votes cast in the last election.*

A percentage-of-voters test is more realistic than the fixed number of votes (15 million) now in the present law. It recognizes our growing population with more Americans entering the voting ranks each year.

5. *A "minor party" should be defined as one which received between 5% and 25% of the popular votes cast in the current election.*

For the same reasons I described above, the eligibility test for Federal support should not be based on a fixed number of votes (5 million for "minor parties" in the current law), but rather on the percentage of votes received.

Third party movements can support the rich diversity of American political life. At the same time some reasonable limitations should be developed so that Federal financial incentives are not made available to parties lacking a modicum of public support—or created solely to receive Government funds.

Under this proposal, "minor parties" would receive payments based on the number of votes they receive in the current election. The payment for each vote received by a minor party would then be determined so as to be the equivalent of that made to the major parties.

For example, assume that two major parties received a total of 80 million votes in a prior election, and Congress had appropriated a $40 million campaign fund for those two parties. Although the major parties would share equally in that fund ($20 million each), the allocation would amount to 50 cents per vote cast for those parties. Using the 50 cents per vote as the guideline, a minor party receiving 5 million votes in the current election would be entitled to $2.5 million for its recognized campaign expenses.

6. *A "minor party" should be eligible for reimbursement promptly following an election.*

A "minor party" should be able to qualify promptly for federal funds, based on its showing in the current election, rather than waiting four years until the next election. This added source of funds should enhance a minor party's opportunity to bring its programs and platforms into the public arena.

7. *The percentage of federal funds received by a major or minor party which could be used in any one state should be limited to 140 percent of the percentage the population of that state bears to the population of the country.*

This would prevent the concentration of funds in any particular State and would minimize the ability of national party officials to reduce the role and effectiveness of local political organizations. At the same time, it would retain the flexibility necessary to carry a party's programs to the public. The Comptroller General should be empowered to issue rules for the equitable allocation, on a geographic basis, for national campaign expenses, such as network television.

8. *The Comptroller General should be required to make a full report to the Congress as soon as practicable after each Presidential election.*

This report should include:

Payments made to each party from the fund;

Expenses incurred by each party;

Any misuse of the funds.

9. *The Comptroller General should be given clear authority to audit the expenses of Presidential campaigns.*

It is imperative that the strictest controls be exercised to safeguard the public interest. The General Accounting Office is the arm of the Government which I believe is best suited to monitor the expenditures of the fund.

Payments from the fund would be made only upon the submission of certified vouchers to the Comptroller General.

If the Comptroller General's audit reveals any improper use of funds, the following sanctions would be applied:

The amounts involved would have to be repaid to the Treasury; and

If the misuse is willful, a penalty of up to 50 percent of the amount involved would be imposed.

10. *To bring greater wisdom and experience to the administration of the act, the Comptroller General's special Advisory Board on the Presidential Election Campaign Fund should be expanded from 7 to 11 members.*

This Advisory Board is faced with a heavy and demanding task. It must "counsel and assist" the Comptroller General in the performance of his duties under the Act.

The membership of the Board now consists of two members from each major political party and three additional members. I recommend that the Board be enlarged to encompass the wisdom and experience of 4 distinguished Americans:

The Majority Leader of the Senate;

The Minority Leader of the Senate;

The Speaker of the House of Representatives;

The Minority Leader of the House

11. *Criminal penalties should be applied for the willful misuse of payments received under the Act by any person with custody of the funds.*

The penalties should be a fine of not more than $10,000, or 5 years imprisonment, or both. Criminal penalties would also be applied against any person who makes a false claim or statement for the purpose of obtaining funds under the Act.

Other campaign financing

We should also seek ways to provide some form of public support for Congressional, state and local political primaries and campaigns.

Here, the need is no less acute than at the Presidential level. But the problems involved are as complex as the elections themselves, which vary from district to district and contest to contest.

Because the uncertainties in this area are so very great, and because the issues have not received the benefit of the extensive debate that has characterized Presidential campaign financing, I pose for your consideration and exploration a series of alternatives.

In 1961, President Kennedy appointed a distinguished, bipartisan Commission on Campaign Costs to take a fresh look at the problems of financing election campaigns. Although the Commission devoted its attention to the problems of campaign costs for Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates, it pointed out that the measures proposed "would have a desirable effect on all political fund raising."

The Commission's 1962 report and recommendations were endorsed by Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman as well as leading Presidential candidates in recent elections.

Based on the Commission's recommendations and the later reviews and studies of campaign financing, there are several alternatives which should be considered. These alternatives all involve public financing of campaigns to a greater or lesser extent. Among them are:

A system of direct appropriations, patterned after the recommendations made herein for Presidential campaigns, or modeled after recommendations pending in the Congress.

A tax credit against federal income tax for 50 percent of contributions, up to a maximum credit of $10 per year.

A matching incentive plan in which the government would contribute an amount up to $10 for an equal amount contributed by a citizen, whether or not a taxpayer, to a candidate or committee.

A "voucher plan" in which Treasury certificates for small amounts could be mailed to citizens who, in turn, would send them to candidates or committees of their choice. These vouchers could then be redeemed from public funds, and the funds used to defray specified campaign expenditures.

I believe these deserve serious attention along with other proposals previously recommended and suggested to the Congress. Each alternative offers particular advantages. Thorough review may reveal that one is to be clearly preferred over the others, or that still other courses of action are appropriate. Whatever the outcome, any such review should reflect a realistic assessment of the amount of funds needed in these campaigns and the extent to which the funds should be provided by public means.

I recommend that Congress undertake such a review.

I have asked the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General to cooperate fully with the Congress in its exploration of these alternatives in order to give all the help the Executive Branch can to the Congress as it seeks the best congressional election campaign financing program.

These recommendations represent my thoughts on the issues at stake. I believe they highlight the problems in an area so new and complex that there is little experience in our national life to guide us.

I hope that these proposals will serve as guidelines for discussion and debate in the coming weeks. A penetrating and orderly review of these vital public issues, with all the wisdom that the Congress can summon, will in itself be an important educational process for the nation in the art of government and politics.

I hope that Congress will proceed to consider promptly the problem of campaign financing and will enact appropriate legislation.

I make no recommendation as to the effective date with respect to such legislation. I leave that entirely to the judgment and wisdom of the Congress. I have no desire to ask that the provisions be made applicable to any campaign in which I may be involved. On the other hand, I have no desire to request that any such campaign be exempted from modernizing legislation which Congress might enact.

Public financing of political campaigns presents the American people with an issue that is both significant and complex—departing as it does from the familiar practices of the past. It transcends partisan political considerations. I urge the American people and the Congress to consider this issue thoughtfully, on its merits, and on the highest and most objective plane, independent of any personalities now in office or seeking office.

IV. STRENGTHENING FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING

Full disclosure can serve the integrity of government in another important area—the regulation of lobbying.

Lobbying dates back to the earliest days of our Republic. It is based on the constitutionally guaranteed right of the people to petition their elected representatives for a redress of grievances.

Yet to realize the American ideal of Government, our elected representatives must be able to evaluate the varied pressures to which they are regularly subjected. In 1946, Congress responded to this need by enacting the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Its purpose was not to curtail lobbying but to regulate it through disclosure. For the first time, individuals and groups who directly attempted to influence legislation were required to register.

More than twenty years of experience with the Act have highlighted its flaws. Through loopholes in the law, immune from its registration provisions, have passed some of the most powerful, best financed and best organized lobbies. Although engaged in constant and intensive lobbying, they are not legally required to disclose their existence—because lobbying is not their "principal" purpose, the narrow test under current law.

The Congress has properly taken the initiative to meet this problem. Two months ago, the Senate passed S. 355 by a decisive vote. In that measure, Federal regulation of lobbying has been strengthened by:

Supplanting the "principal purpose" test with the broader test of "substantial purpose," thus extending the reach of the Act by a wider definition of those required to register.

Transferring the responsibility for administration of the law from the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate to the Comptroller General.

I strongly endorse the Senate's action in strengthening Federal regulation of lobbying as an important step toward better Government, and I urge the House to take similar action.

V. THE RESIDENCY VOTING ACT OF 1967

Voting is the first duty of democracy. H. G. Wells called it, "Democracy's ceremonial, its feast, its great function."

This Nation has already assured that no man can legally be denied the right to vote because of the color of his skin or his economic condition. But we find that millions of Americans are still disenfranchised—because they have moved their residence from one locality to another.

Mobility is one of the attributes of a free society, and increasingly a chief characteristic of our Nation in the 20th Century. More American citizens than ever before move in search of new jobs and better opportunities.

For a mobile society, election laws which impose unduly long residence requirements are obsolete. They serve only to create a new class of disenfranchised Americans.

An analysis of the 1960 election, the last election for which studies are available, shows that between 5 and 8 million otherwise eligible voters were deprived of the right to vote because of unnecessarily long residency requirements in many of the states. Almost half the states, for example, through laws a century old, require a citizen to be a resident a full 12 months before he can vote even in a Presidential election.

These requirements diminish democracy. The people's rights to travel freely from State to State is constitutionally protected. The exercise of that right should not imperil the loss of another constitutionally protected right—the right to vote.

I propose the Residency Voting Act of 1967 which provides that a citizen, otherwise qualified to vote under the laws of a state, may not be denied his vote in a Presidential election if he becomes a resident of the state by the first day of September preceding the election.

VI. CONCLUSION

Seventy years ago, the great American historian Frederick Jackson Turner wrote these words:

"Behind institutions, behind constitutional forms and modifications, lie the vital forces that call these organs into life and shape them to meet changing conditions. The peculiarity of American institutions is the fact that they have been compelled to adapt themselves to the changes of an expanding people . . ."

This represents a valid exposition of the vitality of our democratic process as it has endured for almost two hundred years.

Over those two centuries Presidents and Congresses have strengthened that process as changing circumstances presented the clear need to do so. History has spared few generations that continuing obligation.

Today, that obligation poses for us the requirement—and the opportunity as well—to bring new strength to the processes which underlie our free institutions.

It is in keeping this obligation that I submit the proposals in this Message.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 25, 1967.*

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Enclosed for your consideration and appropriate reference is a legislative proposal "To enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes."

The right to vote in presidential elections occupies an area of special sensitivity for all American citizens. In 1963, the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation concluded that:

"No American should be deprived of the right to vote for President and Vice President because he changed his address before the election and did not have time to meet State residence requirements."

Yet, an analysis of the 1960 election, the only presidential election year for which reliable figures are available, indicates that between five and eight million otherwise eligible voters were disfranchised by the helter-skelter residence requirements operating in the fifty states. In many cases, the difficulties of voting are compounded by unreasonable requirements of voter registration. According to census data, population mobility in the United States has increased continuously in every decade since 1900. The data reveal that the groups who change their residences most frequently are migratory and agricultural labor, professional and technical personnel, semi-skilled workers, craftsmen, and foremen. It is these groups who suffer the greatest prejudice from the various state residence laws. The only fault of these citizens is their exercise of the constitutionally protected right to travel freely from state to state, to pull up stakes and seek a new life. Ironically, many of the individuals who are disfranchised are among our best educated and most responsible citizens.

Until recently, it has been accepted constitutional doctrine that a remedy for this disfranchisement could come only through amendment of the Constitution or enactment of uniform state laws. The recent decision by the Supreme Court in *Katzenbach v. Morgan*, 384 U.S. 641, however, sheds new light on the constitutional power of Congress to legislate in this area, and permits Congress to accomplish this much-needed reform in the area of voting rights by direct legislative action.

Section 3(a) of the proposed statute deals with residence requirements. It provides that citizens who are otherwise qualified to vote under the laws of a State may not be denied their right to vote in a presidential election if they have resided in the State since the first day of September next preceding the election. The section thus restricts State residence requirements to a specified maximum time period of approximately 60 days. Section 3(a) is also applicable to residence requirements at the county and local levels. However, the citizen who seeks to vote under this section will be obliged to comply with the requirements of voter registration available to him after the first day of September preceding the election.

Section 3(b) of the bill deals with absentee registration. It requires any State with absentee voting procedures in presidential elections to provide absentee registration procedures as well. The section would not require States to establish absentee voting procedures in the first instance. Once a State has decided to permit absentee voting, however, the section would require the State to follow through by providing for absentee registration. The provision is a modest step toward enfranchising mobile American citizens in the Armed Forces, Government service, business, teaching and other activities at home and abroad. The section would thus reinforce the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955, 50 U.S.C. 1451, *et seq.*, which encourages States to provide convenient absentee voting and registration procedures for servicemen and government employees.

Section 4 of the proposed statute directs the Attorney General to institute such legal actions as he deems necessary to implement the Act, including actions for injunction or declaratory judgment against the enforcement of State residence or registration requirements. The section provides that such actions are to be expedited and will be heard by a three-judge court, with a direct appeal to the Supreme Court.

Section 5 of the bill authorizes the Attorney General to institute actions in the district courts to enjoin violations of the Act and to obtain other relief that may be necessary. Section 6 of the bill establishes severe criminal sanctions for voting frauds under the Act, as well as for the deprivation of any rights secured by the Act.

Without abrogating any significant state interests, the proposed statute will eliminate the unfair disfranchisement suffered by a large number of our citizens in presidential elections. I urge its prompt consideration and enactment.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

Attorney General.

TEXT OF DRAFT BILL

A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Residency Voting Act of 1967".

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that to enhance the right under the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of citizens who change their residences to enjoy equal access to the right to vote in the election for President and Vice President of the United States and to be free of discrimination in public services, it is necessary to prohibit the States from conditioning the right to vote on the fulfillment of unfair requirements of residence or registration.

SEC. 3. (a) No citizen of the United States who is otherwise qualified to vote in any election for the purpose, in whole or in part, of choosing electors for President and Vice President of the United States shall be denied the right to vote for such electors in such election because of any requirement of residence or registration, provided that such citizen has resided in the State or political subdivision, with respect to which the requirement of residence applies, since the first day of September next preceding such election, and has complied with the requirements of registration to the extent that such requirements provide for registration after such date.

(b) No citizen of the United States who is otherwise qualified to vote by absentee ballot in any election for the purpose, in whole or in part, of choosing electors for President and Vice President of the United States shall be denied the right to vote for such electors in such election because of any requirement of registration that does not include a provision for absentee registration.

SEC. 4. (a) In the exercise of the powers of the Congress under section 5 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to institute forthwith in the name of the United States such actions, including actions against States or political subdivisions, for declaratory judgment or injunctive relief against the enforcement of any requirement of residence or registration as a precondition to voting, as he may determine to be necessary to implement the purposes of this Act.

(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section, which shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code, and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court. It shall be the duty of the judges designated to hear the case to assign the case for hearing at the earliest practicable date, to participate in the hearing and determination thereof, and to cause the case to be in every way expedited.

SEC. 5. (a) Whenever any person has engaged, or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage, in any act or practice in violation of the rights conferred by section 3, the Attorney General is authorized to institute for the United States, or in the name of the United States, an action for preventive relief, including an application for a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order, or other order, and including an order directed to the State and State or local election officials to require them to (1) permit persons benefited by this Act to vote and (2) count such votes.

(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether a person asserting rights under the provisions of this Act shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

SEC. 6. (a) Whoever knowingly or willfully gives false information as to his name, address, or period of residence in a State or political subdivision for the purpose of establishing his eligibility to register or vote under this Act, or conspires with another individual for the purpose of encouraging his false registration to vote or illegal voting under this Act shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever shall deprive or attempt to deprive any person of any right secured by this Act shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

ALLENTOWN, PA., BAND CITY, U.S.A.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for more than a quarter century the city of Allentown, Pa., has been widely known as a center of musical achievement and appreciation. Few American cities support more than one community band. Allentown supports four.

The world famous Allentown Band was organized in 1828. For the past 41 years, under the direction of an outstanding conductor, Dr. Albertus Meyers, this fine musical organization has won accolade upon accolade.

The Allentown Pioneer Band was organized 40 years later and today is directed by Gerald J. Reinsmith. The Marine Band, conducted by Raymond S. Becker Jr., and the Municipal Band, conducted by Albert M. Geary, are the younger members of the Allentown band family.

To trace the frame of Allentown in musical prowess, one must return to the early years of the Allentown Band. In 1836 this organization played for the entertainment of Gen. William Harrison and, 3 years later, the President of the United States, Martin Van Buren. Through the years, it has presented concerts in cities from coast to coast and in Canada.

In 1928, during a Canadian tour, the band was acclaimed in the Montreal Gazette. The newspaper reported, "20,000 people heard the finest concert ever presented in Montreal."

Annually, these four musical organizations participate in a memorable event—the Allentown festival of bands. The 15th of these festivals was presented in February of this year. Its proceeds are used to help the mentally retarded.

Recently, the sponsor of this event, Allentown Music Festivals, Inc., an organization of individuals dedicated to the advancement of music in this community, has registered the name, "Allentown, Band City, U.S.A." with the Department of the Commonwealth in Harrisburg, Pa.

This title, I firmly believe, is one well deserved by a city whose history has been threaded with the musical achievements of its bands.

A MODERN UNION ON THE MOVE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I have served the past three decades as an active member of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.

Early this month this international organization met for the Ninth Quadrennial Convention in Minneapolis, Minn. The grand president of the brotherhood, Mr. C. L. Dennis, sounded the keynote for this convention and the future of this organization in a fine speech titled "A Modern Union on the Move." In this keynote address President Dennis traces the history of the railroad industry and especially as it relates to the brotherhood since it was formed in 1899. He looks to organized labor in the industry and at the same time he calls for cooperative efforts, not only among the various railway organizations but among labor and industry in all branches of transportation and government to meet the many challenges which decades ahead hold for this industry which is so vital to our Nation.

President Dennis' remarks indeed are a keynote to the whole future of the transportation industry and accordingly I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the RECORD.

A MODERN UNION ON THE MOVE

(By C. L. Dennis)

Grand Lodge officers, delegates, visitors and honored guests, I take great pleasure in welcoming you to this twenty-third regular and ninth quadrennial convention of the greatest transportation union of Canada and the United States, the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes.

We come together in this fine hall from every part of our two democratic nations to review the course of our recent history—four eventful years in the life of our Brotherhood—and to establish a program that should, with hard work on our part, improve the overall welfare of all of our members and their families.

I am extremely proud of the record our Brotherhood has made in this four year period. But let us start this convention on the right foot and give credit to those who helped build that record . . . my team!

The wages of our members could not have been increased as they have been without the full cooperation of the Brotherhood team, the Vice Presidents sitting up here with me this morning!

Each and every one of them contributed substantially to this record. Our Express problems could not have been solved without Brother Dan Sullivan's team play.

Our legislative activities could not have improved without Brother Ken Shaw's quarterbacking in Washington.

Our airline negotiations could not have developed without the fine frontline work of Brothers Jim Bearden and Dave Ligon.

Our grievance handling at the National Railroad Adjustment Board would have bogged down completely without Brother Charles Kief's contribution to the team.

The many merger protective arguments we made in 1963, 64, 65 and 66 would be quite inferior if it were not for Brothers J. B. Haines and Charles Moore at the negotiating table.

Brother Ray Clark, our newest addition to the team, is making an excellent record in his short tenure.

With respect to Canada, I need only mention two names, Frank Hall and Ed Downward, everyone on both sides of the border is fully aware of their contributions to the team.

The names that I have just mentioned are only a part of my team, your team, the Brotherhood team. Grand Secretary-Treasurer George Gibbons and the Chairman and Members of the Grand Lodge Board of Trustees also play important roles on the Brotherhood team. They too, along with the headquarters and field staff of this Brotherhood, deserve a full share of honors in the records accomplished.

By all standards, the record of the team in the past four years ranks with the best. We must not rest on this record though, but learn from the lessons of the past, focusing our full emphasis and attention not on what has been done but on what can be done.

For we come together, brothers and sisters, not with the primary purpose to look back but to look ahead.

Winston Churchill once declared, "if we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future." The future should be the keynote of this convention.

We must look to the future, we must try to plan, we must try to adjust to the relentless demands of change. This convention is concerned with the responsibility for a great trade union, and for the economic welfare of hundreds and thousands of men, women, and children and the communities in which they reside.

We cannot afford self-satisfied reflection on the glories of the past. The future is our responsibility and one that I know we accept as a matter of personal honor and organizational necessity.

Your Brotherhood, which I have been privileged to lead these past four years, was created just months before the dawn of this fantastic twentieth century. Challenged by this new era, for many decades we have kept pace under the leadership of Brother George Harrison. Almost from its start, the Brotherhood has stood in the first rank of American and Canadian trade unions. We recognize a debt to Brother Harrison's long and distinguished leadership.

No one who believes in this union can fail to appreciate his leadership and the work of his team, on which I served for many years prior to my election as President.

On the solid foundation which was built in those early years, we are moving ahead and taking the lead. As the slogan on this convention platform proclaims to all the world, the Brotherhood is indeed "A Modern Union On The Move."

Together all of us in this hall, should have one overriding aspiration for this Brotherhood: we must be sure that in a modern age, ours is a modern union, a modern union that can set the pace for the future.

We must be determined that in these years of change and progress the Brotherhood is on the move toward new successes . . . achievements that will double and re-double the record of the past four years.

The Brotherhood must be on the move toward new success . . . achievements that wil bring worthwhile and significant benefits directly into the lives and homes of the working men and women who give this union their strength and their support.

We want the members of this great union to enjoy substantial increases in wages and fair pay for their labors.

We want the families of members of this union to have and enjoy full and complete security from the uncertainties of unemployment and displacement.

We want the members of this Brotherhood and their dependents to be able, when stricken by illness or accident, to have the best doctor and hospital protection available.

We want every member and his spouse to enjoy decent living standards and security in the golden years of retirement.

That is what we want in this union, "The Modern Union on the Move", and that is what the delegates assembled at this convention can set in motion this week.

We cannot move forward if we permit ourselves to be anchored to the past in this era of changes.

The scope of this era of change must be seen in two perspectives to be fully understood.

First of all, we live in an era of tremendous population growth. Do you realize that, out of all the masses of human beings who have inhabited this globe since the dawn of history, one out of every four is alive today?

The population explosion leads to transportation difficulties in every big city and in wide areas of the nation. It leads to a poisoning of the atmosphere, from millions of gasoline engines and from the smokestacks of big industry. It leads to a poisoning of the waters of our rivers, lakes and harbors.

Second, we live in an era of automation and science—jobs are being abolished, new jobs being created, and every job is being changed—all because of new machines and new technologies. This will continue.

Look to our own sphere of the world's economy as an example. Since our Brotherhood was formed in 1899, transportation of persons and products has not only changed but it has grown—grown substantially. Today, in the United States, fully one-fifth of the gross national product—the measure of our economy—is transportation in one form or another.

We can talk about the impact that a drop in automobile sales has upon the economy, we can talk about the impact that variations in the basic steel industry have upon the nation's economy, but none of these, as we well know, can compare with the impact the transportation industry has upon the economy.

In both Canada and the United States, we are told that transport workers cannot strike because the economy will come apart if trains, trucks or planes stop. If this is so, and I personally take issue with it, then the workers in the transportation industry deserve the best in the way of wages, rules, working conditions and fringe benefits—not the second best, but the very best.

It is my belief because transportation unions generally, and our Brotherhood in particular, are so vital to the economy of the United States and to the economy of Canada, that transportation workers and our members should rank at the top in earnings and other benefits.

With the help and aid of all members in the Brotherhood, the delegates at this convention can make this possible. Your team, the Grand Lodge Officers, can achieve this goal.

When our Brotherhood was formed back in 1899, the steam engine was approaching its golden age.

Over ribbons of steel extending over the entire American and Canadian landscape, great locomotives thundered along the roadbeds—bearing the title "the most magnificent mechanical work of man".

But magnificent as they were, these locomotives lost the war of competition. Today not a single Class I railroad uses steam as motive power—except perhaps to maintain a few curios for tourists or railroad "buffs".

In the year when our union was formed, there could not have been 50 "crazy" men in all the world who were experimenting with powered flight through the air.

How long ago was that?

Here's how long: Men who will retire next year at the age of 65 were born the same year the Wright brothers managed to make an airplane fly 120 feet in 12 seconds.

Today we have thousands of members in airline jobs, and programs to organize thousands more in the years ahead, and I think I must be one of the airlines' best customers.

When we started in 1899, we sought to be a union of railroad clerks—men and women working with the tools of their day—the pen and ink pot, the huge ledger books, the classic green eye-shade visor and the arm-band shirt protector.

Today we are a broad-based transportation union. Now we represent clerical and related employes working in all modes of transportation: railroads, airlines, express, freight forwarding, motor bus, steamship and trucking.

Today, our members still work with pen or pencil and manually wrestle with freight—as I did in the 1930's—but they are increasingly more likely to be found at an IBM keyboard, or a computer control panel or operating freight conveyor belts.

Today we have grown—and will continue to grow. We are a transportation union. Our future, our organizational security, lies in the direction of increasing our transportation-wide base. This we must do with your help and support, this we will do for the benefit of all our members.

It must have been as recently as 1946 or 1948 that we first heard a far-fetched story about a gadget called a "computer." Today, it is changing our jobs and changing our lives.

In this modern world, economic progress would be impossible without the computer. If we did not have computers in our banks—to take one example—all employable women between 18 and 60 would be needed merely to sort checks!

Our job—the job of our Brotherhood—is to make sure that workers get their fair share of the benefits of the computer, and that they are protected from the harm it can bring to the displaced.

The computer is here to stay—a vital part of the American and Canadian industrial and Commercial world—and as a "Modern Union On The Move" we must adapt ourselves to the new conditions that the computer brings about.

One expert has said that by 1970, "If all goes as predicted, computers will be managing the rating, routing, sizing, packaging, billing and auditing of freight movements by all modes of transportation."

In other words, virtually all the work of our craft or class will be done by computers. So be it—but remember this: I pledge to you that each and every one of those computers will be manned by members of only one union—The Brotherhood of the Railway Clerks.

You don't have to go back too far to understand some of the other problems. Just look back four short years—to our Los Angeles Convention.

There, you gave me your trust and honored me with election to the highest office in the Brotherhood. At Los Angeles, I pledged to you my untiring efforts to attack and try to find solutions to the problems that we were facing.

What were these problems? I think you can remember them well.

We were faced with a constant elimination of jobs.

We were faced with a destruction of our union through the erosion of its base.

We were faced with raids on all fronts.

We were faced with the need for a supplemental retirement program for career railroad and express employes.

We were faced with the need for immediate wage increases. And on and on and on.

That's why our slogan says, "On the Move". We've already begun. We've been moving ahead these past four years, but we've just started.

How our Brotherhood team met these problems is already known to you. So we are "On the Move", as the slogan says, and in the future I pledge to you . . . we shall move even faster and further!

The old ways and the old days are gone for good, and I say "That's good." Let us turn now with hope and renewed dedication and confidence to meeting the problems of today and tomorrow.

Furthermore I say, it is essential that our governments and our transportation industry also look to the future. Fortunately, there are hopeful signs of change.

Under the leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson, the Administration in Washington has created a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation.

We salute that decision. To Secretary Boyd we pledge our cooperation and help in trying to build a better transportation system, and constructive transportation policy for the government of the United States.

The railway industry has never been more prosperous.

It has achieved a high rate of return on its invested capital. But it has also thrown scores of thousands of people out of jobs, and in large areas of the country it has shown indecent haste in its efforts to abandon completely the important job of transporting passengers from one place to another.

I believe that in the America of tomorrow, there is a proud and important place for the railroad passenger train.

With traffic clogging the highways, there must be room for the inter-city passenger railroad and commuter railroad. There must be! Or, we face the grim prospect of statewide highway jams and costly never-ending race to build more and more super-highways across the scarred face of our beautiful country.

Between New York and Washington, between Boston and New York, and between Montreal and New York, the congestion on air lanes is so heavy that each day without collision becomes a miracle. The whisper-jet, the fat-jet, can fly 250 miles in 30 minutes, too often spends another 30 minutes waiting to take off and another 45 minutes waiting to come down!

In the face of this congestion, who can claim that the high speed railroad passenger train has no future?

We salute Senator Pell of Rhode Island and his many colleagues who have worked so hard to get 120 miles-an-hour trains running from Washington to Boston—through the crowded northeast section of our country.

Last year I had the privilege of visiting Japan as a member of the U.S. government delegation, and of riding the high-speed express train that runs regularly from Tokyo to Osaka.

It is an exciting experience for an old railroader. But for an American railroader, the experience has a touch of sadness, remembering that it should have happened here first!

I hope and pray that the American transportation industry—railroads, express buses, trucks, freight forwarding, steamships, airlines—will live up to their public responsibilities in these coming years of change.

We in the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks are wholeheartedly in the concept of free enterprise. But we know just as strongly that the concept of public service to nation and community is a responsibility for every corporation and business in our nation.

The financial rewards for successful service in a free enterprise system are very great—as the transport corporations know from first hand experience. But with the privilege of profit goes the responsibility of service.

On that score, the railroads—in the eyes of a great many American citizens—do not have the best possible record. That record must change, and change now!

Since our common destiny is shared with transportation management we must raise our united voices to make certain that in modern America, and in modern Canada, the transportation industry meets its full responsibilities. Our railroads, our airlines, the whole transportation industry can do no less.

Another problem stemming directly from the advance of technology in the railroad industry is the fact that we now have many unions with increasingly overlapping jurisdictions. There is a great need for the merger of unions in the transportation industry. Nobody likes to face that fact, but we must.

We must look to the possibility of some form or merger among many different unions or groups of unions. We have 24 different unions in the railroad industry. That is just too many for the work involved. We find ourselves being increasingly diverted into battles over jurisdictional rivalry. This must stop.

I call on the leaders of all transport unions to meet together and see if we can't work out our differences. See if there isn't an equitable solution for bringing about closer merger or identification. We must get moving on this job.

We presently cooperate through the Railway Labor Executives Association, but this is not enough.

In the airlines industry, there is a great need for closer cooperation between unions. We began effectively cooperating with each other in the 1966 Machinists strike. We must continue this cooperation if we are to build an effective labor movement in the airline industry. I believe this convention should go on record in favor of the creation of an Airline Employees Department within the structure of the AFL–CIO. I pledge my full support to that endeavor.

This great convention has a full agenda of work during the next few days, as we in the Brotherhood meet our responsibilities to develop sound policies and realistic programs for the years that lie ahead.

Fortunately we gather together in a time of strength and opportunity for this union.

Directly because of this union, a third of a million families are better off.

Indirectly, the benefits of our union are enjoyed by millions of persons—the people who sell you groceries, or cut your hair, or sell the gas for your car.

But we cannot stop. We must keep moving, working with all our might to represent the interests of our members and our countries.

Now: We must prepare for the negotiations that lie ahead.

Now: We must improve the wages of all our members.

Now: We must organize, and negotiate, so that everyone in our craft or class, regardless of employer, enjoys the benefits of our working agreements.

Now: We must seek to negotiate a vacation schedule that gives employes adequate vacations with enough funds to enjoy a vacation.

Now: We must seek additional holidays with pay.

Now: We must establish a guaranteed annual wage for the entire transportation industry.

The era of the sweatshop is long since past.

Now: Let us also put behind us the era of the furlough and layoff.

I say we must insist that transportation management find the way to plan ahead, plan ahead so that the era of layoffs becomes as obsolete as the steam locomotive. In American industry, the guaranteed annual wage must and will become part of our democratic way of life.

Brother and Sister delegates: As we open this great convention, I have tried to present to you a review of our accomplishments and the challenges that lie ahead.

Throughout this week, we will be discussing every aspect of this union. It is your union. Its strength cames from your belief and your support. In years past, your belief and your support have made this a great union.

I have confidence that your deliberations in the days ahead, here in Minneapolis, will forge new strength into the bonds of fraternity and honorable purpose that hold us together in this Brotherhood.

Your International Officers are proud to be working together as a team in your service.

We will speak up, at various times in these deliberations, with comments and suggestions on the questions that come before this great convention.

Today, let me conclude merely with a few words of my appreciation for your help and support in these difficult years of transition. We have faced our problems like men. We have tried to act with honor. We have had successes and gains. We have had some disappointments, of course.

But in these years, we have continued forward progress of this union. We are now on the move. Now, as the period of transition comes to its end, we are better prepared to cope with the challenges of the present and the future.

We are today's union!

We are the now union!

We are better prepared to serve our members. We are better prepared, as good Americans and Canadians, to make this great union an ever more effective instrument of service to all the people of our wonderful, democratic nations.

With your support, and with God's help, we shall go forward . . . a modern union on the move.

Thank you.

THE APPROPRIATIONS BUSINESS, 90TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, including the two bills reported to the House today, which are scheduled for floor action next week, budget requests for appropriations of about $50,282,000,000 have been considered at this session in connection with bills for both fiscal years 1967 and 1968. Including the two bills reported today, these requests for appropriations have been reduced by $1,499,000,000; this amount could change when the two bills are taken up on the floor next week.

I might add here that the $50.3 billion of requests represents about one-third of the total appropriations which it is tentatively indicated will be submitted. It is now indicated that Congress will be asked to appropriate, during the current session, largely for fiscal years 1967 and 1968, something on the order of $163,000,000,000, more or less, for administrative budget purposes, counting roughly $15,200,000,000 of so-called permanent appropriations such as interest on the debt that must be counted in the totals although such permanent appropriations do not come before us for a vote in the annual bills.

In other words, nearly $100 billion in requests are still pending in the Committee on Appropriations. They are scheduled to be brought before the House in the coming weeks in bills dealing with agriculture, defense, public works, military construction, foreign assistance, transportation, and a supplemental for items deferred for lack of legislative authority and for necessary supplementals otherwise. We hope to keep to our schedule for getting all the regular bills to the House by June 30, and plan to do so unless there is disruption because of delays in the authorization bills not going through on a timely basis.

The Senate has adopted four appropriation bills this year—the two supplementals for 1967 and two regular bills for 1968, involving $23.6 billion in requests. They made reductions of $195 million in those requests.

Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking only of the outgo side of the budget and then only of the appropriations bills which do, however, encompass most of the spending actions. Actions on certain authorization bills have some budget impact, although thus far at this session the impact has been relatively insignificant.

Mr. Speaker, I include a supporting tabulation of the appropriation bills:

Summary of action on budget estimates of "appropriations" in appropriation bills, 90th Cong., 1st sess., as of May 25, 1967

[Does not include any "back-door" type appropriations, or permanent appropriations[1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

	Budget estimates considered by House	House	Budget estimates considered by Senate	Senate	Enacted	(+) or (−), latest action compared to budget
Bills for fiscal 1968:						
Treasury-Post Office	$7,613,787,000	$7,499,230,000	$7,615,148,000	$7,555,167,000		−$59,981,000
District of Columbia:						
Federal payments	63,499,000	59,499,000				−4,000,000
Federal loan appropriation	49,600,000	48,100,000				−1,500,000
Interior	1,443,793,000	1,365,310,150	1,458,218,000	1,399,359,550		−58,858,450
Loan and contract authorizations	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)		(−14,500,000)
Independent Offices-HUD	[2] 10,804,642,700	[2] 10,013,178,782				−791,463,918
Contract authorization	(40,000,000)					(−40,000,000)
Labor-HEW	13,322,603,000	13,137,488,000				−185,115,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	2,342,942,000	[3] 2,194,026,500				[3] −148,915,500
Legislative	231,311,132	[3] 228,089,952				[3] −3,221,180
Agriculture	[4] (5,021,097,400)					
Loan authorization	[4] (859,600,000)					
Defense	[4] (71,584,000,000)					
Public works	[4] (4,867,813,000)					
Military construction	[4] (2,987,000,000)					
Foreign assistance	[4] (3,824,436,000)					
Transportation	[4] (1,718,618,772)					
Supplemental (NASA, poverty, other deferred items; usual supplementals)	([5])					
Subtotal, 1968 bills	35,872,177,832	34,544,922,384	9,073,366,000	8,954,526,550		−1,253,055,048
Supplementals for fiscal 1967:						
Defense supplemental (Vietnam)	12,275,870,000	12,196,520,000	12,275,870,000	12,196,520,000	$12,196,520,000	−79,350,000
2d supplemental	2,134,932,833	2,041,826,133	2,257,604,652	2,260,246,933	2,197,931,417	−59,673,235
Subtotal, 1967 bills	14,410,802,833	14,238,346,133	14,533,474,652	14,456,766,933	14,394,451,417	−139,023,235
Cumulative "appropriation" totals for the session:						
House	50,282,980,665	48,783,268,517				−1,499,712,148
Senate			23,606,840,652	23,411,293,483		−195,547,169
Enacted			14,533,474,652		14,394,451,417	−139,023,235

[1] Permanent "appropriations" were tentatively estimated in January budget at about $15,212,066,000 for fiscal year 1968. (All forms of permanent "new obligational authority" for 1968 were tentatively estimated in the January budget at $17,452,899,000.)

[2] Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for urban renewal and mass transit grants (budget, $980,000,000; House bill, $925,000,000). And participation sales authorizations are as follows: Budget estimates, $3,235,000,000; House bill, $881,000,000.

[3] As reported from committee.

[4] These are the amounts presently pending consideration in the committee.

[5] Several billions.

Source: Prepared May 25, 1967, in the House Committee on Appropriations.

THE SOUTH-WEST AFRICA CASE: WHAT REALLY HAPPENED

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RARICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, with the

United Nations organization continuing its unprecedented action to usurp authority in South-West Africa, despite the United Nation's own charter provision to the contrary, and the loss of its ill-starred lawsuit before the International Court, I want our colleagues to have the other side of the story—the one that prevailed over myths, wild charges, and emotional outbursts before a court of law—so we may better understand the utter fallacy of the charges and attacks against South Africa and South-West Africa.

For some strange reason, the once fearless press—that always demanded freedom of the press to cover every murder, rape, and other sensational trial in the United States—has never found the other side of the South-West Africa story newsworthy.

Mr. Speaker, I supply the prepared statement of Mr. D. P. de Villiers, S.C., counsel for the South African legal team in the proceedings before the International Court of Justice in the South-West Africa case, the letter from Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of Foreign Affairs, and Mr. de Villier's response, for insertion in the RECORD:

THE SOUTH WEST AFRICA CASE: WHAT REALLY HAPPENED—A REPLY TO "FOREIGN AFFAIRS" ARTICLE OF OCTOBER 1966

The October 1966 issue of the American Quarter Review, "Foreign Affairs", carried an article entitled, *"The South West Africa Case: What Happened"* by *Ernest A. Gross,* recently Chief Counsel to Liberia and Ethiopia in the South West Africa Case before the International Court of Justice.

In the light of Mr. Gross's association with the South West Africa Case, his article engaged the closest attention of Mr. D.P. de Villiers, S.C., who was South Africa's Counsel in that Case. Mr. de Villiers and his colleagues on the South African legal team felt that Mr. Gross's exposition was one-sided, that it contained misstatements of fact and that it cast unwarranted reflections on eminent judges of the International court. Mr. de Villiers therefore set down a reasoned analysis of Mr. Gross's exposition. This was submitted to the Editor of "Foreign Affairs", in December 1966. The hope was expressed that it would be published in "Foreign Affairs" in the interest of fairness and objectivity and in pursuit of the Journal's stated objective of affording a broad hospitality to divergent ideas.

The Editor of "Foreign Affairs" however declined to publish the reply explaining that the Journal had "a long established policy of not publishing rebuttals to previous articles". The Editor added that he could find no sufficient substantive reason for making an exception in this case, "and a number which argue against it"; and he proceeded to state the latter, being for the greater part comment on the contents of Mr. de Villiers's manuscript.

While the policy difficulties of "Foreign Affairs", in declining to publish Mr. de Villiers' response are accepted in good faith, the practical result in this instance is unfortunate in the sense that wrong impressions on the part of readers of "Foreign Affairs" cannot be corrected through the medium by which they were conveyed. Furthermore, Mr. Gross' article has also given rise to a number of queries which require answers.

For these reasons the text of Mr. de Villiers' article is now being released by the South African Embassy. A copy is enclosed for your convenience (Annexure A).

Also attached is a copy of the full text of the letter of 16th January, 1967, of the Editor of "Foreign Affairs"[1] (Annexure B) and comments by Mr. de Villiers on some of the substantive arguments made by the Editor (Annexure C).

Washington, D.C.,
19th May, 1967.

[Annexure A]

THE SOUTH-WEST AFRICA CASE: WHAT REALLY HAPPENED

(By D. P. De Villiers, S.C.)[1]

In general I consider it undesirable for Counsel who appeared in legal proceedings to debate in public the merits of the judgment delivered by the Court, or the procedure adopted by it in reaching its conclusions. By this I do not mean that Judges are to be immune from criticism. I firmly believe that proper scientific discussion of judicial decisions, including criticism where necessary, is essential for healthy jurisprudential development. Moreover, there is every reason why practising lawyers should play their full part in this important process, and should not leave it entirely to the academicians. But it is always invidious for Counsel to comment in public on the particular merits of a case upon which he has recently been engaged. We are all human: and the risk of yielding unduly to the subjective feelings of the moment is a very real one. Usually, therefore, Counsel should in my view desist from such comment. This would normally be the best way of complying with his duty towards the proper administration of justice—a duty which is, of course, even more basic than that which he owes to his client.

It is, consequently, with considerable reluctance that I make an exception in the present instance in presenting a brief reply to the article in the previous issue of this Magazine entitled: The South West Africa Case: What Happened? I feel compelled to do so for various reasons. The article in question is not only very heavily one-sided, but I regret to say that it contains many serious misstatements of fact, some of which have subsequently been repeated elsewhere, such as before the United Nations. Even more important, it casts unwarranted reflections on eminent judges of the International Court, judges who represent the highest legal traditions of countries such as Great Britain, France, Italy, Greece, Poland and Australia. It is accordingly only fair to the Court, the parties to the case, and the readers of this Magazine, that the record should be set straight.

The article under reply was written by Mr. Ernest A. Gross who had been Chief Counsel for the Applicant States, Liberia and Ethiopia, in the South West Africa Case. Despite my personal compunctions, it therefore seems appropriate that the reply should come from me, who had the honour of representing South Africa, the Respondent in the Case, in a similar capacity. I wish to emphasise, however—though it should scarcely be necessary to do so—that my reply is addressed to the contents of the article and not to the person of its author.

SUGGESTION OF UNFAIR SURPRISE

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of the article under reply is the suggestion that the Applicants were unfairly taken by surprise in regard to the ground upon which the Court founded its 1966 Judgment, viz. the absence of a legal right or interest on the part of the Applicant States in the subject matter of their claims The article suggests that this particular question was treated by the parties as having been disposed of by the 1962 Judgment in regard to jurisdiction, and that it was, after that Judgment, not raised again in "submissions and arguments, both of fact and law", until the Court, "upon its own motion," resuscitated it in the 1966 Judgment, without prior notice to the Applicants. No representation could be further from reality, as reference to the records of the proceedings will show.

After the delivery of the 1962 Judgment, South Africa submitted its written pleadings on the merits. These pleadings contained, *interia alia,* a long and detailed dissertation on the main issues dealt with in the 1962 Judgment, including the question of the Applicant's legal right or interest in the subject matter of their claims. A systematic analysis was presented of the arguments employed in the Judgment and the concurring Opinions, together with a fully-reasoned reply to those arguments. South Africa contended, with reference to authority, that these issues had not been finally settled by the 1962 Judgment, and were open to reconsideration by the Court at the merits stage.[2]

Applicants' reaction was an interesting one. They replied in part to South Africa's above contentions, *inter alia* in a section of their pleadings devoted to establishing the proposition that—

"The Compromissory Clause in Article 7 of the Mandate is in effect, and the said clause assures the judicial protection of the legal interest of the organized international community in respect of the 'sacred trust'."[3]

This, in essence, was the contention rejected by the Court in its 1966 Judgment.

With respect, however, to South Africa's analysis of the 1962 Judgment and Opinions, Applicants declined to reply. They said:

". . . . in rearguing the law of the case as declared by the Court, the *Counter-Memorial* does not merely maintain positions inconsistent with several of these Opinions. In many cases, Respondent singles them out for critical analysis.

"Without suggesting that Respondent is not at liberty to proceed in this manner, Applicants would prefer not to join issue with the *Counter-Memorial* in its critical analyses of Opinions by members of this Honourable Court. It is one thing to maintain positions inconsistent with Opinions expressed by Judges now sitting. Applicants themselves will respectfully maintain views in this Reply that may not always be consistent with all these Opinions. It is quite a different thing to place such Opinions in controversy. Applicants do not believe that any useful purpose would be served by replying to what the *Counter-Memorial* has to say about them."[4]

It is, incidentally, a strange paradox that Applicants' Counsel shrank from replying in the ordinary course of the proceedings to reasoned criticism of an interlocutory judgment and opinions, but nevertheless now, through the medium of an article in a public magazine, casts unsubstantiated slurs on the "fairness and commonsense" of the Court in regard to its final judgment and the "procedures" followed by it.

However, be that as it may, the important point is that the above reference to the pleadings dispels completely and by itself the suggestion that the matter of Applicants' standing was not raised again after the 1962 Judgment. And the matter does not end there. This issue was again specifically argued by South Africa during the Oral Proceedings on the merits, as the record plainly shows.[5] Applicants in their oral presentation also replied to some of South Africa's contentions on this topic.[6] It is true that they did not do so at great length. But, as will be evident from what has been stated above, this was entirely a matter of their own predilection. They have no basis whatever for suggesting that they were taken by surprise or that the Court acted "upon its own motion" or in any way unfairly towards them.

---

[1] The Editor's letter is released with his permission and may be reprinted only subject to the conditions stated. The material in Annexures A and C may be freely used.

[1] Leader of the South African Legal Team in the proceedings of the International Court of Justice in the South West Africa Case.

[2] Respondent's *Counter Memorial* Vol. II, pp. 103 to 104, pp. 185 to 276 especially pp. 185 to 204; Vol. IV, pp. 5–6; and Respondent's Rejoinder Vol. I, pp. 94 to 109, and 159 to 175. Brief reference to these arguments is made in the Court's 1966 Judgment at p. 19.

[3] Applicants' *Reply*, pp. 321–327.

[4] Applicants' *Reply*, p. 303.

SUGGESTION THAT THE COURT SHIRKED ITS DUTY

The second main point of criticism contained in the article under reply is that the Court should not have rested its judgment on the point decided by it, but should (apparently as a matter of policy) have decided some of the other substantive issues between the parties. In respect of these issues, the article gives its readers to understand that the merits were overwhelmingly in favour of the Applicants.

To understand this criticism, it is necessary to have some clarity about the nature of the issues in question.

Alleged militarization and incorporation

Reference may first be made to the issues which are not specifically mentioned in the article, but which nevertheless related to matters regularly raised before the United Nations, and in respect of which condemnatory resolutions were passed in the "perennial autumn rite" referred to by the learned author. The main ones of these were whether South Africa had established military bases in South West Africa or had otherwise militarized the Territory, and whether she had attempted unilaterally to incorporate it.

Applicants' charges of militarization were refuted by facts set out in South Africa's pleadings and admitted as true by the Applicants, as well as by the undisputed evidence of an eminent American military expert, General S. L. A. Marshall. It was therefore obvious that the charges were wholly untenable. In respect of incorporation, Applicants were also compelled to accept the truth of South Africa's factual averments, which included a demonstration that South Africa at no stage attempted or intended to incorporate the Territory. Consequently these charges, too, were rendered either insupportable or at least completely trivial. Ultimately Applicants all but abandoned these charges as well as the militarization charges. Presumably the learned author does not criticize the Court for not deciding these issues.[7]

Well-being and progress

The issue to which the greater part of Mr. Gross' article is devoted relates to what he describes as

". . . the incompatibility of an official policy of extreme racial discrimination with the international obligation 'to promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants of the Territory' (Mandate Article 2)".

I regret to say that this is a most misleading way of describing the Applicants' contentions, or at any rate, the contentions finally advanced by them. It is true that in their first pleadings (*Memorials*) Applicants contended that South Africa's policy of apartheid or separate development as applied in South West Africa was an oppressive one designed to subordinate the interests of the Native or indigenous inhabitants to those of a White minority. It was on this ground that Applicants originally sought condemnation of South Africa's policy as violative of Article 2 of the Mandate, the relevant provisions of which are contained in the above quotation.

South Africa conceded that, if the policy were indeed, as claimed, an oppressive one, it would constitute a violation of the Mandate. However, South Africa said, the allegations of oppression were refuted by the true facts. In lengthy and fully-documented pleadings, South Africa set out the factual background to the policy in question, the correct content and purpose of the measures complained of by the Applicants, and the standards of well-being and progress achieved in the Territory, comparisons being provided with other states and territories in Africa. In passing it may be noted that standards in South West Africa compare more than favourably with other states in Africa (including the two Applicant States) save the Republic of South Africa itself. In addition to this exposition on the pleadings, South Africa invited the Court to visit the Territory, and gave notice of its intention to call a substantial number of witnesses and experts to give oral evidence at the hearing. The purpose of this extensive treatment was to provide abundant proof that the policies in question were intended to serve, and did in fact serve, the best interests of all the inhabitants of the Territory.

Faced with this challenge, Applicants retreated. They vigorously opposed the proposal for an inspection, and ultimately accepted as true all statements of fact contained in South Africa's pleadings. By formal amendment of their Submissions they now based their case entirely on a so-called norm or standard of "non-discrimination or non-separation", which terms were defined as follows:—

". . . the terms 'non-discrimination' or 'non-separation' are used in their prevalent and customary sense: stated negatively, the terms refer to the absence of governmental policies or actions which allot status, rights, duties, privileges or burdens on the basis of membership in a group, class or race rather than on the basis of individual merit, capacity or potential: stated affirmatively, the terms refer to governmental policies and actions the objective of which is to protect equality of opportunity and equal protection of the laws to individual persons as such."[8]

It is clear from this definition that Applicants' complaint was no longer one of oppression, but rested on the proposition that *any* official allotment of status, rights, etc. on the basis of membership in a group, class or race, was unlawful. Indeed, they expressed explicit agreement *inter alia* with a passage in South Africa's pleadings reading as follows:

"If indeed Article 2 of the Mandate must be read as containing an absolute prohibition on 'the allotment, by governmental policy and action, of rights and burdens on the basis of membership in a group', Applicants would sufficiently establish a violation of the Article by proving such an allotment, irrespective of whether it was intended to operate, or does in fact operate, for the benefit of the inhabitants."[9]

It is not necessary to consider in detail the legal argument presented by Applicants in support of this contention. The basic contention was that the suggested norm or standard had been created by formal acts of the "organised international community," and, more particularly of the United Nations Organisation. The Court, it was said, was obliged to apply condemnations of apartheid embodied in resolutions of the United Nations. In so doing the Court was not entitled to ascertain for itself whether the policies in question were beneficial or detrimental, or, indeed, whether the version of apartheid presented to the United Nations was a correct one. In the words of the Applicants, the Court was not entitled to "second-guess" the organs which had established the norm or standards.

It is not proposed to consider the correctness in law of this contention—which is obviously extremely questionable, to say the least, as indeed appeared from the treatment accorded to this topic in the 1966 Judgment and Opinions (including the dissenting ones). My present purpose is only to dispel the suggestion in the article under reply that the Court was asked to decide on the merits of the South African policies, and that the result was a foregone conclusion. Indeed the learned author himself, as Counsel, expended much ingenuity on giving reasons during the oral proceedings why the Court should not consider those merits, and why material necessary for such consideration (such as an inspection or oral evidence) should not be produced before it. By means of the formal amendment of his Submissions mentioned above, he succeeded in excluding such material from the attention of the Court. Thereafter the proceedings were confined to the question whether the suggested norm or standard existed and was applicable to the Mandate.

In these circumstances it will readily be appreciated why I say the article under reply is misleading in suggesting that the Court was faced with the issue whether "an official policy of extreme racial discrimination" was contrary to the Mandate. On the basis upon which Applicants rested their case, "discrimination" was relevant only in the sense as defined in the passage quoted above, namely as a colourless type of distinction in the official allotment of rights, burdens, etc. The question whether or not the South African policies in fact amounted to discrimination in the pejorative sense, i.e., as involving an element of oppressive intent or detrimental effects, was deliberately removed by the Applicants from the ambit of the issues before the Court. On the record as it stood, and especially in the light of the admission by the Applicants of the truth of all South Africa's expositions of fact, it seemed evident that such a question, if it had still been presented, could not have been answered in the Applicants' favour.[10]

Particular factual allegations

In the above connection attention has to be drawn to another remarkable feature of the article under reply. It contains a number of purported propositions of fact, which, however, were either not submitted to the Court by the Applicants at all, or, if submitted, were subsequently abandoned in the process of admitting the truth of the expositions, corrections and controversions presented by South Africa.

This applies to various propositions of alleged repressive conduct on the part of South Africa, and particularly to an astonishing paragraph reading as follows:

"It was known—and confirmed out of the mouths of South Africa's own witnesses at the lengthy Court hearings on the merits—that, in the more than forty years of the conduct of this trust, not one 'native' ever has been qualified in law, medicine, engineering, dentistry, or registered nursing; none may form or join a labor organisation with rights of collective bargaining; none may be employed in a skilled occupation; none may move from place to place without official permission; none may reside (except for purposes of labor) in areas designated as

---

[5] *Verbatim* Records No. 65/17, 13 April, 1965, pp. 34–37 and 39 and C.R. 65/18, 14 April, 1965, pp. 6–32; and see also Judge van Wyk's concurring Opinion, p. 69.

[6] *Verbatim* Record C.R. 65/6, 24 March, 1965, pp. 5–17.

[7] It may, however, be noted in parenthesis, in regard to the issue of incorporation, that in the historical introduction to the article certain statements and suggestions are made which are unfounded and are indeed at complete variance with the facts admitted during the Court proceedings.

[8] Applicants' *Reply*, p. 274.

[9] Oral Proceedings 30 April, 1965, p. 17.

[10] See Judge van Wyk's Separate Opinion, 1966, p. 173, footnote 1.

'White'; and none has a voice in government or in the administration of 'Native' affairs."

It will not be possible within the compass of this article to deal with these allegations in detail. Some of them create misleading impressions by being divorced from their context, whereas others are totally unfounded, and in direct contradiction to the admitted facts. And they were most certainly not confirmed by South Africa's witnesses at the Court hearings.

One example may be provided of the extent to which a false picture is painted in the above-quoted paragraph, viz. the allegation that no Native "may be employed in a skilled occupation". The admitted evidence was that no legislative impediment existed to the employment of Natives in skilled occupations, save in respect of a small number of positions in mines owned by Europeans. Moreover, large numbers of Natives throughout South West Africa in fact occupied skilled or semi-skilled positions. In South Africa's pleadings it was shown, *inter alia*, that 21,230 Natives were engaged in 1960 in skilled or semi-skilled occupations in spheres other than agriculture alone. This figure represented 4.95 per cent of the total Native population, and 12.69 per cent of all Natives economically active in that year[11] These figures were admitted as true by the Applicants, and were in any event also confirmed by the uncontradicted evidence of Prof. D. D. Krogh, an expert of the economy of South West Africa.[12] The statement in the article under reply is therefore inexplicable. Only considerations of space prevent me from demonstrating the incorrectness, to a greater or lesser extent, also of the other allegations contained in the quoted paragraph.

Existence of the mandate and accountability to the United Nations

The article refers to two further issues in the case, viz., whether the Mandate still subsists and whether South Africa is accountable to the United Nations for its administration of the Territory. These were issues on which the Court had expressed an Opinion in 1950, as the author correctly points out. He errs, however, in saying that the issue of existence of the Mandate was again decided by the Court in 1962.[13]

In regard to the issue of accountability, the learned author limits himself in his article to suggesting that the 1950 Opinion was clearly correct in finding by a majority that such accountability existed, and that South Africa is unreasonable or perverse in failing to accept that finding. He does not, however, mention that a great deal of relevant evidence was not placed before, or apparently considered by, the Court in 1950, that the Opinion has been strongly criticised by many jurists of international standing, and that all the Judges, four in number, who in 1962 expressly dealt with this question, concluded that the 1950 Opinion had been wrongly decided and that the United Nations had not succeeded to the supervisory powers formerly exercise by the Council of the League of Nations. Nor does the author mention that Applicants themselves in Court conceded the untenability of some of the vital reasoning of the 1950 Opinion on the question of accountability.

An analysis of the 1966 Judgment and Opinions (including the dissenting Opinions) again reveals how weak the case for United Nations succession really is. Although the Judgment does not deal expressly with the issue, there are certain passages which clearly imply that, in the view of the Judges concerned, the United Nations did not succeed to the supervisory powers formerly exercised by the Council of the League of Nations. This was expressly so held by Judge van Wyk in his separate Opinion. Of the minority Judges, only two sought to support by argument the contrary view. They were Judges Wellington Koo and Tanaka. It would be going beyond the intended compass of this article to analyse their opinions. I would accordingly only suggest that any person who is interested in this topic should read these two Opinions and compare each of them with the 1950 Opinion. The comparison would disclose that three entirely different and contradictory lines of reasoning were employed; and it is respectfully submitted that each of these was clearly at variance either with the true facts or with the law traditionally applied by the International Court of Justice.

Other aspects of the treatment of the above subjects in the article under reply are also seriously at fault, e.g. the account of the negotiations between the United Nations and South Africa in the 1950's. But space limitations prevent a detailed discussion of all these points.

Suffice it to say that the suggestion that the merits in respect of the substantive issues were on the side of the Applicants, overwhelmingly or at all, is entirely unjustified.

The function of the Court

As was shown above, apart from the various substantive issues, the question of the Applicants' standing was at all times in issue in the South West Africa case, and was treated as such by both parties and by the Court.

What then should a Court do when a majority of its members is satisfied that an Applicant's claims should be dismissed on the grounds of lack of standing? Should each Judge then proceed to express his own views on matters falling outside the Judgement of the Court? In this regard it must be kept in mind that in a case like the South West Africa case, in which there were a number of different issues, wide differences of opinion and shifting majorities could be expected. This is well illustrated by the Separate Opinions delivered in 1966. Each minority Judge and two members of the majority delivered separate Opinions. Seven of these Opinions traversed issues outside of the question of the Applicants' standing. They disclosed differences on most points, even as to the result proposed. Where there was agreement, it did not necessarily coincide with the division in the Court on the Judgment as such. Thus, e.g., of the three Judges who dealt with (and unanimously dismissed) the Applicants' charges regarding militarization, two were otherwise in the minority and one in the majority. From the Declaration handed in by the President of the Court, Sir Percy Spender, one gains the firm impression that when a decision was reached on the question of the Applicants' standing, there had as yet been no full discussion by the Court in regard to the various substantive issues. In all these circumstances it seems clear that if each Judge should have proceeded to give an Opinion on the substantive issues, this would merely have amounted to a proliferation of individual, *obiter* views.

In the result one is bound to conclude that the Court's attitude, viz. to decide no more than was required for the determination of the dispute before it, was a perfectly proper and judicial one in the circumstances. For a lawyer this is a natural conclusion. And I say so despite my view that on the substantive issues the case of my client, the South African Government, emerged very favourably from the proceedings, and despite the consideration that a judgment for South Africa on those issues would no doubt have been of much greater practical value to it than the judgment in fact pronounced. Such considerations do not and cannot in any way detract from the propriety of the course decided upon by the Court.

The learned author of the article under reply, however, objects to the approach of the Court; and he goes so far as to suggest that members of the Court should in future be elected inter alia for what he calls "an additional dimension: an outlook which accepts the Court's relevance to the settlement of disputes in accordance with justice and the rule of law."

In this way he proposes ensuring that, in future, the Court will play its "proper role . . . in the judicial settlement of major disputes among nations".

What this all means, is not clear. It would seem to mean at least that the Court should decide disputes even where it is satisfied that the Applicant States have no *locus standi* in respect thereof. But the impression is gained that there is an additional dimension also to the author's proposal, and that "justice and the rule of law" correspond in his view to the attainment of the political and social aims which were sought to be advanced by means of the South West Africa case. In other words, his plea for reconsideration of "the standards which should govern the selection of Judges of the Court", apparently means nothing less than that some political standard is to be applied. For my part, I can think of no more certain way of destroying the International Court. A tribunal to which a high judicial function is assigned, cannot be a political puppet and, at the same time, a worthy instrument for the advancement of the rule of law.

The honourable members of the International Court who participated in the 1966 Judgment, have left no doubt about their adherence to the finest traditions of the law, as the only sound basis of advancement also in the sphere of international adjudication. They state in their Judgment:

> "Law exists, it is said, to serve a social need: but precisely for that reason it can do so only through and within the limits of its own discipline. Otherwise, it is not a legal service that would be rendered."[14]

This beacon light shines high above the storms of the moment. It requires to be heeded not only by the Judges but also by their electors. What is at stake for the International Court is all the difference between floundering on the rocks and setting a course for greatness and glory.

[Annexure B]

Text of letter released with the permission of the author on condition that any publication which reprints this letter should be required to do so textually in full and secondly that it be stated in all cases that "Foreign Affairs" has given permission for the letter to be reprinted in that form, and in that form only.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS
(An American Quarterly Review, Hamilton Fish Armstrong, Editor)

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 16, 1967.

The Honorable H. L. T. TASWELL,
Embassy of South Africa,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 30 enclosing the duplicated copy of a manuscript by D. P. de Villiers, S. C.

Foreign Affairs has had a very long-established policy of not publishing rebuttals to previous articles. A quarterly, with its long intervals between publication dates, does not lend itself to this kind of debate. This is the more true in this case, where Mr. de Villiers' manuscript was not received until two weeks after the issue following Mr. Gross' article had appeared in print. Even if at considerable inconvenience we were to make space for Mr. de Villiers' article in our April issue, an interval of six months would have elapsed and most readers would have forgotten the particulars of Mr. Gross' article. And a demand by Mr. Gross for the right of surrebuttal would extend the debate to a still more unprofitable extent.

---

[11] Respondent's *Rejoinder*, Vol. II, pp. 198–9.

[12] Verbatim C.R. 65/69 28 September 1965, p. 6.

[13] See 1962 Judgment pp. 330, 332–3; 1966 Judgment p. 19.

[14] 1966 Judgment, p. 34.

Nevertheless, I have studied Mr. de Villiers' manuscript very carefully to ascertain whether there were substantive reasons why we should make an exception in this case. I have been unable to find any that I consider sufficient and a number which argue against it.

Whatever arguments may have been presented for the record as to the qualification of the Applicants to appear before the Court, the fact remains that the entire international community—and this includes South Africa—was surprised by the grounds on which the Court chose to render its 1966 Judgment, and by the failure of the Court to question Counsel for the Applicants on this score.

As to whether the Court "shirked its duty," this is clearly a matter of opinion in which Mr. Gross is as entitled to his opinion as is Mr. de Villiers. But Mr. de Villiers' argument on this point does not support his contention that the article "contains many serious misstatements of fact." Moreover, except in passing, Mr. Gross did not deal with the merits of the case; therefore I feel no special obligation to allow Mr. de Villiers to do so in our pages.

More serious is Mr. de Villiers' contention at the top of page 7 that the applicants "ultimately accepted as true all statements of fact contained in South Africa's pleadings." It is my clear understanding that, faced with further delay and mounting costs, Mr. Gross argued that *even if* everything South Africa said on the facts were true, South Africa would still be in breach of her obligations.

On page 9, Mr. de Villiers quotes what he calls "an astonishing paragraph" from Mr. Gross' article, alleging that it contains statements which "are totally unfounded." Yet his one point of rebuttal is so weak as to place in doubt his statement that "only considerations of space prevent me from demonstrating the incorrectness . . . of the other allegations. . . ." I refer specifically to his allegation that a "false picture" is painted by Mr. Gross in the statement that no native "may be employed in a skilled occupation." To support this allegation the author states that 21,230 natives were engaged in 1960 in skilled or semi-skilled occupations. His omission to state how many of these were in fact skilled, the term used by Mr. Gross, destroys the accusation.

As to the "Existence of the Mandate . . ." this is a point which Mr. Gross alluded to but did not develop. Therefore, as in other comparable sections of Mr. de Villiers' manuscript, I would feel obliged to give Mr. Gross an opportunity to state his viewpoint if Mr. de Villiers' article were to appear.

The final section on "The Function of the Court" is again a matter of opinion and it is not surprising that Mr. Gross and Mr. de Villiers disagree. But again, it does not support the initial contention that Mr. Gross' article "contains many serious misstatements of fact."

The foregoing is my own opinion and no doubt unexpert. But I believe the points I have raised are sufficient to support my decision that there is no inherent reason why we should make an exception to our established rule of not printing rebuttals in Foreign Affairs. I should particularly like to make clear that I have not shown Mr. de Villiers' manuscript to Mr. Gross nor consulted him in any way with regard to it.

That Foreign Affairs does afford "a broad hospitality to divergent ideas" is, I believe, evinced by the fact that the last article prior to Mr. Gross' involving South Africa was that by C. A. W. Manning, which was, I believe, as effective a case for the policies of the South African Government as could be presented to a foreign audience.

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH ARMSTRONG.

[Annexure C]

Mr. de Villiers has commented as follows on two points in the letter of the Editor of "Foreign Affairs" which seemed to question statements of fact made in his article. Other points raised by the Editor about contents of the article were of the nature of argument only and it is not considered necessary to deal with them, the article in its original form being left to speak for itself.

"1. The Editor of Foreign Affairs has drawn into question my statement, at the top of p. 7 of the above article, that the Applicants ultimately accepted as true all statements of fact contained in South Africa's pleadings. He says in this regard:

" 'It is my clear understanding that, faced with further delay and mounting costs, Mr. Gross argued that *even if* everything South Africa said on the facts were true, South Africa would still be in breach of her obligations.'

"However, such understanding, whatever its source may be, is not in accordance with the actual events in Court, as known to all who were present and as evidenced by the official record. This is already manifest from the very terms of the relevant statement made to the Court by Mr. Gross on 27 April, 1965, as follows:

" 'The Applicants have advised Respondent as well as this Honourable Court that all and any averments of fact in Respondent's written Pleadings will be and are *accepted as true,* unless specifically denied. And the Applicants have not found it necessary and do not find it necessary to controvert any such averments of fact. Hence, for the purposes of these proceedings, such averments of fact, although made by Respondent in a copious and unusually voluminous record, may be treated *as if incorporated by reference into the Applicants' pleadings.*' (Italic added) (C.R. 65/22, 27 April 1965, at p. 39)

"It will be observed that the statement in my article is fully borne out by Mr. Gross' own statement to the Court, and indeed very closely follows its wording.

"Moreover, the context in which the statement was made confirmed that the wording expressed exactly what was intended. The purpose of the statement was to avoid, if possible, the need for an inspection and for oral evidence. The inspection and oral evidence were being tendered by Respondent in order to refute the charges of oppression made in Applicants' pleadings and incorporated in their Submissions as originally formulated. Consequently the need for such inspection and evidence could not be avoided merely by presenting an 'even if' argument: for that purpose it was necessary to do away altogether with the oppression charges and the allegations that had been made in support of them. This the Applicants did in two stages, viz.

"(a) by accepting as true all statements of fact in Respondent's pleadings, which statements controverted the allegations that had been made in support of the oppression charges, and

"(b) by amending their formal Submissions so as to exclude all reference to charges of oppression and to rely solely on a contention concerning a so-called norm or standard of 'non-discrimination or non-separation'.

"A detailed discussion of this whole subject, with copious references to the record of the Court proceedings, is contained in *United Nations Document A/6480 of 20 October 1966,* the relevant portion of which is reprinted as *Annexure C* to South West Africa Survey 1967, a recent publication of the Department of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of South Africa. The matter is also dealt with in an article published in *The International Lawyer,* Vol. I, No. 3, April 1967, under the title 'The South West Africa Case—A Reply from South Africa', by D. P. de Villiers and E. M. Grosskopf, in the section featuring Communications.[1]

"2. The Editor has also questioned my statement, on p. 9 of the above article, that a 'false picture' was painted by Mr. Gross in saying that 'It was known—and confirmed out of the mouths of South Africa's own witnesses . . . that' no Native 'may be employed in a skilled occupation'. The Editor's comment is as follows:

" 'To support this allegation the author states that 21,230 Natives were engaged in 1960 in skilled or semi-skilled occupations. His omission to state how many of these were in fact skilled, the term used by Mr. Gross, destroys the accusation.'

"In the first place this comment ignores my first point, viz. that no legislative impediment existed save in one very minor sphere, and that this was part of the admitted evidence. I might have added that the point had been repeatedly emphasized by certain of the expert witnesses, especially in answer to cross-questioning by Mr. Gross himself. Secondly, it is true that I did not present a break-down of the figure of 21,230 as between skilled and semi-skilled positions. But it is difficult to see why this 'destroys the accusation'. In fact I was merely avoiding unnecessary detail. I did, however, give page reference to the pleadings and the evidence, where the details are to be found. In the Rejoinder, at the cited pages, the figure was broken down into component groups of occupations mentioned by name, as follows:

	"Number
"1. Professional, technical and related worker	1,348
2. Administrative, executive, managerial worker	140
3. Clerical worker	212
4. Sales worker	606
5. Miner, quarryman and related worker	64
6. Worker in transport and communication	1,038
7. Craftsman, production worker	2,040
8. Service, sports and recreation worker	14,597
9. Fisherman, lumberman, hunter, etc	1,185
Total	21,230

"From this alone it was evident that a considerable number would by any classification have to be regarded as skilled. And, as for the evidence, Prof. Krogh was specifically questioned on this point by Mr. Gross, and estimated the number of skilled occupations at several thousands. (*Verbatim* C.R. 65/69 28 September, 1965, pp. 10, 12 *et seq.*)"

THE POLITICAL PROCESS IN AMERICA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just read with great interest the President's message entitled

---

[1] The International Lawyer, (quarterly publication of the Section of International & Comparative Law, American Bar Association) pages 457 to 471.

"The Political Process in America," and I commend it to my colleagues. I would like to comment briefly on two important portions.

In the first place, I wish to commend the President on his proposal to correct an injustice which now exists with respect to mobile voters. We have recently taken action to insure that citizens are not denied their right to vote on account of their race or color. It is anomalous for us at this time to permit otherwise eligible voters to be disenfranchised merely because they happened to change their place of residence.

As indicated by the President, his proposal would provide that citizens, otherwise qualified to vote under the laws of a State, may not be denied their vote in a presidential election if they become residents of the State by the first day of September next preceding the election This provision appears to me to be both sound and workable. It will permit many more citizens to participate in the elections and it is certainly in the national interest for as many citizens as possible to register their vote in national elections.

I strongly recommend that the Congress take prompt action on this measure.

Second, Mr. Speaker, the President's message clearly points out the need to reform all our outdated Federal election laws on the regulation of campaign financing.

It makes small sense to me to provide a method by which presidential elections can be conducted free from undue influences, or even the appearance of undue influence, and not do something about increasing the public's financial participation in congressional elections. The President has said, and I concur, that that task must be pursued with even greater urgency.

I hope that we will not turn away from these obvious steps. The problem is well known and the time to legislate long past due.

NEGRO WAR HEROES DIM STOKELY'S PITCH

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Bevill] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Thursday, May 18, edition of the Daily Mountain Eagle, published in Jasper, Ala.

I consider it a most timely article, Mr. Speaker, and at this point enter it in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

Negro War Heroes Dim Stokely's Pitch

And here was Stokely Carmichael on Huntley and Brinkley leading his chanters in "Hell, no, we won't go!"

And here was the story in the Daily Mountain Eagle of the posthumous medal (Purple Heart) to the mother, Mrs. Hattie E. Mickens, Parish, Route 2, in behalf of her son, Sp. 4 Eddie Mickens, who gave his life for his country in Vietnam.

That there is stark contrast is not surprising. The great, great majority of this nation's Negroes do not subscribe to Carmichael's unpatriotic, pink-tinged tirades.

They know better.

But we are in a time in which the radical left does take the spotlight.

It should not, however, delude us into categorizing all into a bracket that only a few follow.

Many of our finest fighting men in Vietnam are Negroes.

On the same front page yesterday was a picture of a Negro Marine aiding a wounded buddy during fierce fighting in Vietnam.

Alabamians are proud of the contributions to the war effort of our troops—both Negro and white.

The Carmichaels may be able to run loose in this country and stir up trouble, but let us not forget that, without fanfare, thousands of patriotic Alabamians, of both races, are doing their duty as good Americans.

THE CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Rees] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the world is again facing the threat of armed aggression in the Middle East, the worst turmoil in this troubled part of the world since the Suez crisis of 1956. The years from 1956 to the present have been filled with similar but more restricted crisis consisting of bombings, border raids, and killings all apparently instigated by the Arab League nations and their puppet, the Palestine Liberation Army, aimed at harassment of Israel.

Now, with the nations of the Middle East mobilizing, an irrational move might well plunge us all into an unnecessary world war. The question is now not only one of how to prevent the continual harassment of Israel by her neighbors—we must also face the question of how long the peace of the world is to be threatened by these warlike acts. Even though, hopefully, the present crisis may well be solved by peaceful means, I believe the United States must strongly commit itself to a policy of developing permanent peacekeeping machinery within the United Nations so that crises involving threats to the general peace will not so continually recur.

Our first step should be an attempt to strengthen the existing United Nations peacekeeping functions which are currently dangerously weak. I was distressed by the precipitous action of Secretary General U Thant in quickly, and apparently without consultation, yielding to Egyptian President Nasser's demand that United Nations Special Forces be withdrawn from the Egyptian Sinai Peninsula. There should have been extensive consultations, first, with the U.N. Security Council, and, second, with President Nasser himself, before a single United Nations soldier was ordered removed from his peacekeeping duties. Mistakes of judgment such as this could be remedied by a strengthening of the United Nations apparatus for preserving and insuring the peace.

Second, the United States should at all times be working with major powers such as the Soviet Union, Britain, and France in an effort to lessen Middle East tensions. Obviously, a general war in this area would be destructive to the interests of all major nations involved as well as the allies we are pledged to support.

Third, the United States should be ready to back up the 1950 tripartite pledge made by us together with France and Great Britain declaring that we would take steps to prevent all aggression in the Middle East. It would be unconscionable for us to stand idly by while the Arab nations attempt to dismember Israel by force.

In recent days I have joined many of my colleagues in signing two statements regarding the current Middle East crisis. The first urges the development of strong international institutions within the United Nations for the purpose of preserving the peace. The text of this statement is as follows:

Joint Statement on the Mideast Crisis

As members of the United States Congress concerned with the development of strong international institutions within the United Nations to keep the peace, we strongly endorse President Johnson's May 23 statement regarding the Arab-Israeli crisis.

In the language of the President, "We earnestly support all efforts, in and outside the United Nations and through its appropriate organs, including the Secretary General, to reduce tensions and to restore stability."

Specifically, we agree with President Johnson that:

1. We must in the first instance place reliance upon the United Nations to resolve the crisis;
2. The maintenance of peace in the Middle East is a matter of the gravest concern for all nations;
3. As the President said, "a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace." Therefore, the right of free, innocent passage should be granted to shipping of all nations through the Straits of Tiran; and
4. All of the nations of the Mideast have a special responsibility to moderate their words and actions so as to help to create a climate in which a peaceful resolution of the crisis can be obtained.

We call upon all concerned to exercise their solemn responsibility to the international community in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations for the development of world order.

The second statement supports our present policy to take steps to prevent aggression in the Middle East and asks that we be prepared to take whatever action may be necessary to resist aggression against Israel and to preserve the peace. The text is as follows:

Egypt and Syria are now threatening Israel and we fear that war in the Near East is inevitable unless the United States acts firmly and vigorously to prevent it. President Nasser's speech to his troops in Sinai yesterday was in effect a declaration of war. We note with dismay that the Soviet Union is encouraging and arming Egypt and Syria in a bold move to win influence and power in the Middle East. Once again the Soviet Union appears to be testing American resolve to defend the peace.

The United States Government, speaking through Presidents Truman, Eisenhower,

> Kennedy and Johnson, and through the Congress of the United States has repeatedly declared its determination to act against aggression in the Middle East. And we note with appreciation the declaration of a White House spokesman that—
>
> "This country is, of course, committed to the principle of maintaining peace in the Middle East. This has been our position over the years. It is still our position."
>
> Consistent with that declaration, we pledge the fullest support to measures which must be taken by the Administration to make our position unmistakably clear to those who are now bent on the destruction of Israel, that we are now prepared to take whatever action may be necessary to resist aggression against Israel and to preserve the peace.
>
> We are confident that the people of the United States will support such a policy.

Mr. Speaker, the suddenness and the seriousness of this current crisis should again impress on all of us the necessity for strengthening the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations. A crisis such as this in the Middle East might well occur in any part of the world and we must have the means to deal with these situations which continually threaten peace.

With the proliferation of the weapons of war and terror, the creation of a permanent peace where differences can be worked out in a rational manner becomes the primary task of mankind.

CRIMES AGAINST BANKS

Mr. **MONTGOMERY.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FASCELL.** Mr. Speaker, in a recent article published by the American Banker, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover cited the rise in bank burglaries as evidence that we need to reappraise present security measures and take action to increase their effectiveness. The constant increase in the number of crimes against banking institutions and particularly those which violate Federal laws has been of continuing concern to the FBI and to the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee.

As chairman of that subcommittee, I called for hearings into crimes against banking institutions, and those hearings were held on October 15, 1963. In our report, approved and published on February 20, 1964, we noted that a number of means and security measures to prevent bank crimes were available but that many bankers resisted the use of maximum security measures and devices. No Federal supervisory agency had made any study regarding physical security needs of banks, their branches, or their equipment, nor had any study tested the efficacy of available security measures and devices.

Furthermore, with the exception of certain required audit procedures, Federal supervisory agencies had issued neither rules nor regulations concerning bank crimes nor standards and requirements for bank structures, design, vaults, safes, alarm systems, or for any security procedures, devices, or means. Responsibility for providing and using adequate security procedures and devices was left entirely with the management of the individual banks.

We recommend in 1964 that the Federal supervisory agencies responsible for banks and banking make the necessary studies and establish by rules or regulations specific guidelines for the prevention of external and internal crimes against banking institutions. The subcommittee's correspondence with Federal supervisory agencies since 1964 has indicated their increased interest and, in some cases, their efforts to persuade banks to increase security, but there are still no compulsory regulations.

The security and integrity of banking institutions continues to be a subject of great interest to the subcommittee, and we are giving special attention to the advances in bank design and the technological improvements which yield more effective security devices.

In his article Mr. Hoover remarked:

> It is surprising that, while it is not uncommon for burglary teams to use sophisticated but inexpensive communications equipment to facilitate their crimes, more banking institutions have not used similar equipment in the security of their enterprises.

We share Mr. Hoover's opinion, and we urge bankers to be constantly on the lookout for the newest, most sophisticated, and most effective techniques, means and devices for preventing bank crimes. We also reiterate our hope that the Federal supervisory agencies will develop rules and guidelines making certain types of security protection mandatory for all banks.

ASSURING ADEQUATE FREE SILVER FOR THE ORDERLY TRANSITION IN COINAGE

Mr. **MONTGOMERY.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FASCELL.** Mr. Speaker, in 1964 the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, began public hearings into the drastic coin shortage which then faced the country. On the day before the hearings began the Treasury Department announced a crash program of coin production which was designed to erase the shortage. The committee report which followed urged full implementation of that program, and made other recommendations for assuring the commerce of the Nation would no longer suffer for lack coins.

In 1965 after another set of hearings to test the effectiveness of the Treasury's program, we were pleased to report that the crash program had been effective, and that the coin shortage by that time had been alleviated to a great extent.

In both sets of hearings, the subcommittee studied the Treasury's supply of silver, because it was fast declining. At the March 1965 rate of silver use, the Treasury estimated that redemption of silver certificates and coinage operations could continue for 3 or 4 more years before the Treasury's silver supply would be exhausted. We urged the Treasury to report to Congress as soon as possible its recommendations for changing the metal content of coins. Shortly thereafter, the Treasury presented its report to Congress, and following hearings, the Coinage Act of 1965 was passed. One result was to remove silver entirely from new dimes and quarters, and reduce to 40 percent its content in half dollars.

Further hearings held by the subcommittee in February of 1966, reviewed the progress which had been made in meeting the need for coins and assessed the effect of the Coinage Act of 1965. Happily we found that there was no longer any real coin shortage in the land, and we strongly urged the adoption of suggested measures which we felt would prevent any recurrence of a coin shortage at any time in the future.

Silver consumption for coinage has been greatly reduced by the Coinage Act of 1965, even though great quantities of 40-percent silver half dollars have been minted.

In spite of these savings, Treasury projections, based on the rate at which its supply of free, unobligated silver is being used by Government in coinage, and in sales to industry, disclose that the supply is continuing to diminish, to the point at which the Treasury will have insufficient free silver to meet these needs, and still retain all the silver necessary to redeem outstanding silver certificates.

The subcommitee's report dated March 22, 1965, issued after the second set of hearings on the coin problem, took note of the Treasury's attitude and policy of allowing unrestricted silver outflow, and foresaw the development of the problem of silver shortage. We recommended at that time, in light of the continuing drain and limited supplies of silver, that the Treasury consider: First, the advisability of or necessity for legislation to prevent, minimize, or regulate the hoarding of, or speculation in large quantities of coin, and the export and melting down of coin, and, second, reporting and recommending to Congress on whether the stockpiling, hoarding, or exporting of, or the speculation in silver need be prohibited or regulated, in any measure, in the interest of conserving the Treasury's silver stock.

The Coinage Act approved on July 23, 1965, included specific authority for the Secretary of the Treasury to insist on certain terms and conditions left to his discretion on sales of silver from Treasury stocks. The Secretary was also authorized to prohibit the melting, treatment, or export of coin.

Nevertheless, the Treasury's attitude and policy remained unchanged, and silver outflow continued unrestricted. The prospects for a shortage of free silver became so serious, and the acceleration of the outflow of silver so great last week that the Treasury on May 18, 1967, announced and issued regulations under the Coinage Act of 1965, restricting sales of silver to domestic manufacturers who certify that the silver is needed for normal, domestic, manufacturing uses and that the silver applied for together with stock on hand will not exceed normal requirements for a 2-month period, and limited the exchange of silver for currency to silver certificates.

In addition, the export of subsidiary silver coins was prohibited with the exception of numismatic coins not exceeding $100 in value in one shipment. The regulations also prohibit the melting and treatment of coin and provide penalties for violations of the regulations in connection with exporting, melting, and treating and the making of false and fraudulent statements.

We are gratified that the Treasury has apparently come to share our view that a silver shortage could have critical consequences and that it has taken some measures to prevent such an occurrence.

The Treasury has also requested legislation which would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to determine from time to time the amount of outstanding silver certificates which he can assume will not be presented for redemption for silver for various reasons, including that they have been destroyed, irretrievably lost, or are frozen in collections. By declaring such amounts to be nonexistent as currency, a corresponding amount of silver could be released for redemption and sale. Also it proposes that 1 year after enactment, no silver certificates would any longer be redeemable in silver, although they would remain as legal tender. Amendments which have been added to the bill, H.R. 7476, as reported by the House provide restoration of mint marks on coins, and the set-aside of 165 million ounces of silver bullion to the GSA for stockpiling purposes.

The maintenance of adequate quantities of free silver to enable sales to be made at a price which prevents the older 90-percent silver coins from being withdrawn from circulation, or even melted for their silver content, as an imperative need. Our older silver dimes and quarters circulate side by side with the new silverless clad coins of those denominations, and there are even some of the 90-percent half dollars in circulation, although this is rarer.

The simple fact is that we have got to maintain the older coins in circulation side by side with the new clad coins until there are enough of the clad coins produced, and in inventories in the Treasury and in the Federal Reserve banks, and in the normal channels of circulation to guarantee that there will never be another coin shortage in this country. It took the best efforts of the administration and of the Congress to obliterate the coin shortage of just 2 and 3 years ago. I am proud that the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee played a part in assuring the country of again having adequate supplies of coin.

The inventories of new clad coins are swelling, and the time when the transition from the older coinage to the new would have been fully accomplished is not far ahead. The precise judgment of when that point is reached is a matter for the determination of the Joint Commission on the Coinage, the public members to which have just recently been appointed by the President.

Until that transition is fully made, all steps that are necessary to assure a continuous and adequate supply of coin with which to conduct business must be taken. The passage of H.R. 7476 should have that effect, and afford the Coinage Commission ample opportunity to deal with coinage for the future.

DAMAGE TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the recommendations made by the committee regarding title III of the National Defense Education Act which provides matching grants for the purchase of educational equipment and for State level supervisory services. This program, which has gained the support and confidence of teachers and principals and continually demonstrated its effectiveness in the schools, will be seriously damaged by the excessive budget reduction which is proposed.

The recommended budget of $47 million is 41 percent less than the 1967 appropriation of $79.2 million and 48.5 percent less than the 1968 authorization contained in the legislative itself. It would appear that there are ill-considered moves to starve a program which has continuously proven its effectiveness in raising the level of American education. The State records and the value of the program allow no logical justification for the proposed cut. On the contrary, additional funds for the program have been continually requested by the States. In fiscal year 1966, 36 States requested additional funds and this year many States reported that their applications far exceed their allotments. In a recent title III study of 12 States prepared by the U.S. Office of Education, 10 of the 12 reported a total overmatching of Federal funds allotted to them for this program by more than $1.5 million. When you consider that these sums only represent one-half of the amount which would have been devoted to the educational programs in these States, it is obvious that the present NDEA funding level is inadequate.

With the addition of the new subject category of the industrial arts which will become effective July 1, additional funding, not a reduction, is an urgent necessity to meet the needs of the States.

The 41 percent reduction for the matching grant equipment program is compounded by the failure to provide funds for the supervisory services which have been so vital to the success of this program. More than 450 instructional supervisors in State departments of education are involved in planning and evaluating title III projects, and working toward improving the quality of instruction. Not only are these specialists effective in NDEA title III, but, in the same 12-State USOE study which I referred to above, it was shown that the States utilized the services of these specialists in 11 other Federal programs including all titles of ESEA, other NDEA programs, National Science Foundation, and the Arts and Humanities. The States have undoubtedly extended the services of these title III specialists to their fullest capacity in correlating the resources available under all Federal programs.

The administration is justifying the proposed repeal of part B of title III by transferring $5.5 million from this program to title V of ESEA which would supposedly assume these same supervisory services. But in order to continue the work of these specialists under title V, States would have to submit project proposals to Washington for approval, and there is no doubt that the added redtape here would immediately cause a breakdown in the program. But more important, one-half of this supervisory program, since it is 50–50 matching, is now paid for by the States. If they were to continue their present operations, the cost to the Federal Government would be twice the $5.5 million which is being provided in title V, since under that title no matching is required. However, many of these services would, in all probability, simply have to be eliminated, since there will not be twice the $5.5 million available in title V in ESEA.

It is unwise to jeopardize a successful program by substituting one which is untried, especially since Federal funds available are not adequate to support it at this time. The spirit of NDEA title III dictates close ties between acquisition and the supervisory program. Both have been effective, necessary, successful programs for the improvement of the education of our children.

I very strongly recommend an appropriation of $110 million for the acquisition of instructional materials and equipment under title III(a), and $7.5 million vital supervisory services which have been contributed to the continuing success of this program.

ENDING ELECTRIC POWER BLACKOUTS: LEGISLATION IS NEEDED

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, last February President Johnson called for legislation to protect America against disastrous electric power failures. I fully supported the position taken in the President's consumer message; indeed, I have repeatedly introduced bills that would help accomplish this end, including H.R. 2311 in this Congress.

Just recently, we were dramatically reminded that this national problem is still very much with us. On Thursday, May 11, a failure on the Gulf States Utilities Co. system blacked out the cities of Beaumont and Port Arthur, Tex., and all of the company's other customers in Texas. Several counties—a quarter million people—were without power for up to six and a half hours.

I am particularly concerned about this failure because it is the second that has taken place on that system within 18 months. In December 1965, some of the same customers were without service for approximately 26 minutes. The May 11 blackout was much more serious, involving as it did some 40 percent of the company's total load.

I believe also that the May 11 blackout was a clear object lesson demonstrating the dangers of inadequate interconnection. The Gulf States' system depends heavily on two 138-kilovolt transmission lines running from Baton Rouge westward into Texas. It has interconnections with other utilities at the Louisiana end of its system, but almost none at the Texas end. Consequently, if the flow of power over the company's "backbone" lines between Baton Rouge and Beaumont-Port Arthur is interrupted, the Texas portion of the system is for practical purposes isolated. If for any reason the Texas portion cannot supply its own load, a blackout is nearly inevitable.

This is in fact what happened on May 11. First, damage to a transformer at one of Gulf States' generating plants in Texas caused a large generator to be taken out of service. This loss of generating capacity meant that power had to flow into Texas over the "backbone" lines I spoke of a moment ago. Shortly thereafter, one of these lines failed, throwing all the burden on the other. The second line could not carry the entire load, and therefore it too was disconnected by automatic control equipment. Thus the Texas part of the system was islolated, and with the loss of a large generator could not support its own load.

I have discussed these events in some detail because, in my opinion, they point up very clearly the need for interconnection at the Texas end of the system. Had such an interconnection existed, and been of adequate strength, power could have been fed in from neighboring systems to make up the difference between load and generating capacity in the Texas portion of the Gulf States' system.

That such an interconnection did not exist is especially distressing in view of the fact that this very situation has been studied by the Federal Power Commission, and the need for interconnection lucidly pointed out. In the FPC's report on the December 6, 1965, Gulf States blackout, one of the principal recommendations reads:

> As the system is now operated, the Texas part of the two-state system has no operating interconnections with any of the adjoining utilities. Properly planned interconnections would appreciably enhance the reliability of service on the Texas section of the Gulf States System. Several opportunities exist for economic interconnections with adjoining utilities. We are recommending an examination of these opportunities by all parties in the area.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me quite clear that when the lessons of one power failure are not put to use to prevent the next one, something has gone wrong with the decisionmaking structure of the power industry.

I am deeply disturbed by the apparent unwillingness of electric utilities to cooperate with one another. I realize that in some areas of the country, the relatively progressive managements have constructed power pools which include at least the major investor-owned systems. Unfortunately, I do not believe that this type of realism will spread rapidly enough to prevent future disasters like the great Northeast blackout of November 1965.

Nor am I certain that in the absence of public supervision every system—whether private, public or cooperative—will have access on equitable terms to the benefits of interconnection and coordination.

We in Congress must be responsive to technological changes in the electric industry, just as we are to advances in the technology of defense, medicine, or agriculture. Thirty-two years ago, when the Congress rose to the challenge of dismantling vast, unwieldy, and unstable holding company empires by passing the Public Utility Holding Company Act, we lived in an age of short-distance transmission, small generators, and localized utility companies.

It seemed, and was, natural and proper that common control of utilities should be restricted to relatively small geographical areas. Acting under our mandate, the Securities and Exchange Commission strove to reach that objective. However, the fact that the Gulf States Utilities Co. was detached from one holding company by SEC order did not have any bearing on the recent blackout, since the companies in Texas with which it could today be interconnected were formerly subsidiaries of another holding company system.

Today, we are able to transmit energy hundreds if not thousands of miles; we have built huge generators far more efficient than any that existed in 1935; and we have ingenious and complex automatic control systems. No one, of course, would suggest bringing back the old-style holding company with its myriad financial abuses and its pernicious effects on the efficiency and financial health of operating utilities. The pluralism of our electric utility industry is a great national asset. What we do require is greater cooperation and more complete operating coordination among electric utilities.

When we have insured that sound interconnections will be built where needed, that one system will not undertake new projects that will work to the detriment of another, and that all members of the power industry, regardless of size or nature of ownership, have a fair chance to profit by our advanced technology, we will have gone a long way toward meeting our responsibilities to the American utility consumer.

ENDORSEMENT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FORTHRIGHT STATEMENT ON MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record as wholeheartedly endorsing the forthright and wise statement which the President made on May 23 on the grave situation which threatens peace in the Middle East. In statesmanlike fashion he has clearly, soberly, and objectively stated our concern and the course which this great Nation intends to follow.

He has made clear our support of United Nations' and particularly the efforts of the Secretary General "to reduce tensions and restore stability" in this important part of the world. This is fitting and proper as surely the United Nations which has been seized with Arab-Israel problems for the past 20 years should be the organ through which efforts to calm the present situation should be made. It is the only common denominator to which all nations can and must adhere.

He notes that "the world community has a vital interest in peace and stability in the Middle East." It is not enough for nations to rely solely on the United Nations or the United States to bring about a return to calm. It is essential that all nations assume their share of the responsibility in effecting that end. This, of course, applies to the parties directly involved in the present crisis whom the President calls upon to reduce their troop concentrations. He suggests to them that the observance of their solemn responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations and the general armistice agreements would provide an honorable means of preventing hostilities.

I suggest that the President in his statement has himself made a significant contribution toward the reduction of the present tension in the Middle East.

A SOUND APPOINTMENT OF A NEW SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified at the news of President Johnson's nomination of Alexander B. Trowbridge to be Secretary of Commerce. As chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have had an opportunity to observe this able young man during the past 4 months while he has been serving as Acting Secretary of Commerce. The Department of Commerce is, in many ways, a complex and farflung department of Government. Its activities range from business and economics to science and technology. It has programs in the depths of the oceans, in the atmosphere, and in outer space. It counts our population and it measures our yard and our pound. Its mission is to promote the healthy growth of the American economy for the benefit of all segments of our society. No one person can possibly come to the job of Secretary with a full and deep background knowledge of the many activities carried on in the Department of Commerce. Mr. Trowbridge, however, brings to this demanding job a good education, intelligence, an inquisitive and retentive mind, an appreciation of the importance of our free enterprise system, and a keen sense of public service. These qualities help assure that he will more than meet the challenge of directing the programs of the Department of Commerce in the future.

A native of New Jersey, Mr. Trowbridge received his early education at Phillips Academy and was a cum laude graduate of Princeton University in the class of 1951. He was commissioned in the Marine Corps in 1952 and served as a platoon leader and tactical air observer in the Korean conflict. The quality of his military service is attested to by the fact that he was awarded the Bronze Star. Before being named Acting Secretary of Commerce earlier this year, Mr. Trowbridge served as Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic and International Business. In private business, Mr. Trowbridge has been an executive in several overseas petroleum companies in the Caribbean, Latin America, and the Far East. His last private job before entering Government service in 1965 was president and division manager of the Esso Standard Oil Co. of Puerto Rico.

I anticipate and I confidently predict that Secretary-Designate Trowbridge will bring new ideas, new strengths, and renewed vitality to the Department of Commerce. Based upon my observations and experience with him, I know that the relationship between the Department of Commerce and the committee of which I am chairman will be characterized by cooperation, mutual respect, and a sense of partnership. I look forward to working with Mr. Trowbridge in his new assignment.

TITLE III OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this House an educational program of great importance to the welfare of this Nation—title III of the National Defense Education Act. Many of you have shared with me the experience of helping this program develop into one of the most successful educational endeavors ever considered by Congress. It is a program about which there should be no controversy, for it has everything to recommend it. It is purely a bipartisan program; it was sponsored by a Republican administration and passed by a Congress with a Democratic majority. And it is interesting to note in passing that the majority leader of the Senate who guided its passage in that Chamber now resides in the White House. Besides its bipartisan sponsorship, the program is intensely popular among persons who know it best: the State and local education agencies who are its beneficiaries. We can cite at least three reasons for this popularity. First, it is uncomplicated for the schools, and easy to administer. Second, it benefits all students in all major subjects of the curriculum—it is the nearest form of general Federal aid for education that exists. And third, State and local education agencies take pride in the fact that because they contribute at least 50 percent of the funds for the equipment and supervisory services supported under the program, they are true partners with the Federal Government in an effort to improve education.

Considering all of these advantages, there should be no other reason for me to be speaking except to boast about the NDEA title III program. Unfortunately, this is not possible. Instead, I must point out to Members of Congress with alarm that the program is in grave danger. It is being threatened by being gradually whittled away in order to concentrate almost full attention on the more fashionable Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The present alarming example is the fact that the committee has reported out a recommendation to uphold the President's request to reduce appropriations for the program. In hard and simple terms, this means that instead of the $79.2 million appropriated for the purchase of laboratory and other equipment this year, schools throughout the Nation can expect only $47 million next year, a reduction of $32.2 million or almost 41 percent.

The experience of my Rhode Island schools during the past few years indicates that an increase, not a reduction, of funds is needed. With the addition of the subject of industrial arts in fiscal year 1968, the schools need at least the additional $10 million which Congress authorized. Last year, 36 States needed $22 million more than was appropriated. This year the State administrators of the program report that they have received approvable projects far in excess of the available funds. I find it incomprehensible on the one hand to increase the number of subjects supported by the program while on the other hand we reduce the already insufficient funds to support them. Such an unreasonable action should not find this Congress standing idly by.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record as deploring this action in making an arbitrary and unjustified reduction in an important program of aid to our schools.

TRADE AND PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Matsunaga). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in a few short days the President will sign the new tariff-cutting trade agreements commonly known as the Kennedy round. It may be prophetic that he signs this devastating international declaration of war on the U.S. marketplace on Memorial Day.

Memorial Day has been set aside to honor the dead. In this case the President may well be honoring the dead, the dying, and those about to be marked by the grim reaper in the form of international greed, cartels, and unfair trade practices.

The free trade theory reaches its climax at this point in history with the President's action on Memorial Day.

In spite of every economic factor in trade being completely ignored, some U.S. industries have been able to sustain life and still maintain a relatively high corporate income. However, for those industries land locked into the U.S. market, the new agreements may be the final blow needed to completely annihilate them as industrial producers.

The American trade story is one of frustration, double talk, double standards, outright piracy by foreign competitors for our product lines, styles, methods, and markets. Any Member of Congress who will read and study the hearings on the impact of imports on employment—1952–53, Steed; 1961–62, Dent; and 1966-67, Dent—must draw the same conclusion that I have: U.S. labor is being sold down the road of unemployment in spite of the promises of the free traders that labor will be retrained and paid out of the Treasury while he is unemployed because of import injury.

At this point, I present the statement of Ambassador Roth, our chief negotiator in the Kennedy round. He freely admits that industry will be destroyed, labor will be displaced by the added imports because of his trade concessions. I quote from the Evening Star of May 22, 1967:

PLAN TO AID FIRMS HIT BY TARIFF CUTS STUDIED

(By Lee M. Cohn, Star staff writer)

The Johnson administration may propose legislation to increase government aid for American companies and workers hurt by Kennedy Round tariff cuts, the chief U.S. trade negotiator said today.

Ambassador William M. Roth, who led the U.S. team in the tariff negotiations concluded last week, told a press conference here that there is a good chance the administration will request interim trade legislation when the present law expires June 30.

If there is interim legislation to handle routine trade matters, Roth said, it probably will include liberalized provisions for "adjustment assistance" to companies and workers who may be injured by rising imports as tariffs are reduced.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 provided for assistance in such cases, including job training, tax breaks and business loans. But Roth noted that the standards for proving injury are so tight that no one has qualified for aid.

Therefore, he said, legislation may be proposed to make assistance more readily available, perhaps following the pattern of a separate law dealing with U.S.-Canadian trade in auto parts. Assistance has been given under that law.

Roth said the United States came out "very well" in the Kennedy round negotiations. He said President Johnson will sign the agreement June 30.

Then, Roth said, his office will begin a study of U.S. trade policy, "looking forward to another major trade initiative some time ahead." The study will not be concluded until 1968 at the earliest, he said.

Mr. Speaker, there have been 18 appeals made to the Tariff Commission under the Kennedy agreements law—1962—and every appeal was denied. Not one industry received the promised help and not one worker received 1 cent of relief.

However, Mr. Speaker, when the Fram auto parts plant was closed by the Canadian auto pact, aid was given to the workers and I assume the corporation. Why this was done is a simple political fact of life. The injury was kept quiet by paying the workers in order that Congress would approve the President's action in signing the agreement.

This carrot has been held out to labor in order to get labor support. The truth of the matter is that labor will never be able to get back the jobs already lost and there just will not be enough jobs to train for when the new act goes into effect.

We have the foregoing admission that U.S. labor and industry will suffer. This blows up one of the free trade claims. The next weapon in the free traders arsenal has always been the deliberate and proven lie that free trade makes friends and forestalls international conflict.

We have cut tariffs for 30 years and we have had nothing but crises ever since. The longest period of international peace in our history was from the War of 1812 to the Spanish War of 1898. During all those years we were protecting our industries and markets, raising wages, industrializing our agricultural economy, and building up economy.

The claim that free trade makes a free world is a figment of the imagination and is the red herring of the exploiters both American and foreign. I have time and time again pointed out that free trade in its ultimate form would create more dissension and distrust than any other known device.

The proof is here and now. First, if an American industry hurt by imports can be aided under the Kennedy round to the point where it can compete with the foreign products, retrieve its lost market and successfully stop the importation of products, what happens when the foreign plant shuts down and lays off its workers?

I can imagine how happy our foreign friends will be. If we had not urged them to overproduce for our market, they certainly would not resent being thrown out. If this makes friends and promotes peace, then by all means, Mr. President, sign the agreement.

Second, Mr. Speaker, are we naive enough to believe that American labor exploiters are putting their plants on foreign shores to exploit the poor, unorganized, starving peoples of that land? They produce goods, ship said products to the United States of America displacing their own higher priced labor and yet pay so little to their foreign labor that they cannot even buy the products they produce.

I have said many times that the would-be dictators, the Castros, and others in many lands have a built-in revolution in the ranks of the exploited workers. The riots we read about may be inspired by Communists but the exploited worker makes an easy target for the anti-Americans all over the world.

Few writers find the real cause of these disturbances, but apparently Victor Reisel has at least lifted the rug from the hidden dirt swept there by many years of false propaganda and faulty reporting.

Reading the following Victor Reisel story on the Honk Kong riots might be indeed enlightening. It does not take a genius to blend cheap wages, overseas ownership, and a large nation barred from the rich free U.S. market into a bitter brew of discontent.

Oh yes, there are Communists, but even if there were not they would riot at the right moment. No nation of peoples will for long allow itself to be exploited for the ease and comfort of another nation of peoples.

All nations are trying to build their economy upon the false illusion that this Nation will forever allow our markets to be taken by any nation regardless of costs of wages or costs of production. Every nation can live at the level it wants to live at if it does not allow its markets to be plundered by the exploiters who would in the end have cheap labor and high prices for all the world's workers.

I present the Reisel report at this point:

WHY NO CIA MONEY—AMERICA'S LABOR OPERATIVES CRUSHED IN HONG KONG

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It is something to ponder. If Leong Fook Kee had gotten CIA money the riot-ripped streets of Hong Kong might not have been so tumultuous and bloody. Like myself, Leong is one of a handful in that island who would sit around Jimmy's Kitchen off Queen St. and predict the riots would come—and start as labor demonstrations.

But Leong got no CIA money. He is a labor organizer—if he's still alive—working with the anti-Communist Hong Kong and Kowloon Trades Union Council. His budget is penny ante because there's been much screaming over the use of American labor funds to subsidize anti-Communist unions abroad. So Leong spent pennies while waiting for the British and American textile and garment unions to raise $100,000.

Insiders knew that the Peking-controlled Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions were awaiting the signal from Peking.

Peking's strategists knew that our young soldiers love to rest up from battle fatigue in Kowloon and on the Hong Kong island community of Victoria. And the excuse, the insiders knew, would be labor riots as there were in Macao, to harass our troops on "holiday."

So the U.S. and British unions, affiliated with the International Textile and Garment Workers Federation, met in London and Paris to launch unionization drives in Hong Kong—for many reasons. At least 46 per cent of the Crown Colony's industrial employment is in soft goods manufacture. Workers there earn as little as 12 cents an hour. They go in three eight-hour shifts round the clock. There are some rest days for women—none for men. So they were hungry—and ready for revolt.

Imports from Hong Kong to the U.S. based on this brutal labor pay and work schedule rose from $41 million in 1961 to at least $125 million annualy last year. Labor and manufacturers in New England, the South and the far West have been hurt badly by this slave labor competition.

Alongside my typewriter is a Hong Kong document showing that the Hong Kong producers were cutting in on hard goods markets here, too.

This is a memo from the General Engineering Corp. of Hong Kong. It offers prices based on a dollar's pay for an eight hour day—compared with $16 in the same industry in the U.S. and somewhat less in such areas as Puerto Rico (which also has been hurt by the runaway shops in Hong Kong).

These Hong Kong producers offer a "line of electronics such as medical equipment, navigational aids, radar traffic controls, sound equipments, radio and TV receivers . . . plastic containers."

But, since the bulk of Hong Kong's industry is in the textile field, the London-based labor federation launched what it hoped would be a unionizing drive in Kowloon. Overall strategist is Minoru Takita, president of the Japan Federation of Textile Workers Union and head of the big anti-Communist Japanese labor federation. He put Leong Fook Kee in direct charge of organization in Kowloon to work with the puny anti-Peking Trades Union Council.

But they had no chance against the massive manpower and money supplied the Communist labor organization, whose chief arrived in an expensive auto the other day to lead a demonstration in front of the governor's house.

The Communists had more little Red books than Leong had dollars. The Peking labor federation started slowly, however.

On May 5 they pulled their people out of a Green Island Cement Co. In rushed the thousands in the Red book brigade to reinforce the 350 workers who screamed against "imperialism." The rioting built up. Six days later, the Peking labor crowd hit an artificial flower plant. Up went the Red books. Down went the prestige and influence of the anti-Communist Trades Union Council.

There were mighty few trained and organized Chinese—among the more than 3,000,000 in the colony—who could whip up counterdemonstrations or take any kind of action such as the unions had done back in 1945–48 in West Berlin, West Germany, France and the Lowlands when the Western Communists also moved en masse.

Some of those skeletonized anti-Communist European unions then were aided by such AFL specialists as Henry Rutz, Irving Brown and Jay Lovestone. They used money from U.S. unions. Some say that there was CIA money and the AFL men deny it. But what difference? It was still pennies compared with the Soviet's $250 million spent annually on labor and other fronts.

Those Western unions soon were able to fight back. And today they are mighty powerful—owning billion dollar banks and their own corporations in full capitalist style.

But the Asian unions are dying of financial anemia. And there are those who say that transfusions at such a moment are immoral. But someone should ask Leong Fook Kee. He is watching an entire society die.

I may not be around when the sword falls, but fall it will. However, much damage will be done before we awaken to the truest of all economic truths.

No high-priced wage economy can live

in a free trade world with low wages and exploited workers. Our industrial economy is based upon production, distribution, and consumption within the economy.

All nations must look inward for their economic well-being. All nations should trade freely, without barriers or penalties in products needed by nations and not needed by others. There cannot be any other kind of trade unless prices are competitive in the marketplace.

A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Internal Security Act is our major antisubversive law. The essential purpose of the Congress in enacting this legislation was to provide for the Government and the people of the United States a reliable public register of the organizations in this country which are controlled by the international Communist conspiracy, whose basic aim is to destroy democratic, representative government, and also a public register of individuals who are Communists and thus parties to this conspiracy.

As is well known, the Supreme Court in 1961 upheld the constitutionality of the basic registration concept and provisions of the act. In a later decision, however—a decision with which I agree—the Court held that the fifth amendment, when invoked, protects a person from being compelled to register as a Communist in compliance with an order of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Today, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 10390, amending the Internal Security Act in such manner as to conform to the decisions of the Court but at the same time restore the effectiveness of its registration provisions. This bill eliminates self-registration but requires the Attorney General to keep a register of organizations and individuals found to be Communist by the Subversive Activities Control Board after adversary proceedings which include all the elements of due process.

The bill fully recognizes fifth amendment rights. It does not offend, or collide with, any decisions of the Court concerning the Internal Security Act and, at the same time, it accomplishes the original intent of the act.

I am most pleased to be able to state that I am not alone in introducing this bill. Twenty-four Members from the Democratic side of the House have joined me in sponsoring the bill. In addition, my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Un-American Activities, has introduced a companion bill, and 24 other Members from the Republican side have joined him in sponsoring it.

The fact that 50 Members of the House have joined in this effort—and that more have already indicated support of this bill—is, I believe, an indication that the people of this country and their Representatives in the Congress feel strongly that steps must be taken to control Communist fifth column operations in our land.

In addition to meeting the problem created by invocation of the fifth amendment in the face of an order to register, my bill also strengthens the Internal Security Act in a number of other ways. It amends the definition of a Communist front to remedy a court of appeals decision which tended to weaken one of the provisions of the act; it requires organizations found to be Communist to so identify themselves when soliciting funds; it provides that the dissolution of an organization, following the institution of proceedings against it, will not abate those proceedings; it grants the Subversive Activities Control Board the power to prosecute persons who misbehave before it; it provides for an immunity grant to enable the Board to acquire certain testimony and evidence over a claim of self-incrimination; and provides a bar to the delay of SACB proceedings by the filing of dilatory collateral actions.

The Committee on Un-American Activities will hold hearings on this bill in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point a synopsis of the provisions of the bill:

The principal purpose of the bill is to restore the efficacy of the Internal Security Act of 1950 with regard to establishing a system of registration of members of Communist-action organizations. The amendments to the Act proposed by this bill have been necessary because of a recent decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Albertson and Proctor* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board*, 382 U.S. 70 (1965) which on Fifth Amendment (self-incrimination) grounds held invalid an order of the Board requiring members of the Communist Party to register themselves. The bill repeals provisions of the Act which require the member to register himself. The amendment proposed by the bill now requires the Board to make a determination as to membership in Communist-action organizations and requires the Attorney General to maintain a register of individuals who in proceedings before the Board are by final order determined to be members.

The holding of the Supreme Court in the case of *Communist Party* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board*, 367 U.S. 1 (1961) which upheld the order of the Board requiring the Communist Party of the United States to register as a Communist-action organization is not affected, except that the penalty provisions for failure of the organization to register itself or its members is repealed to conform with a 1967 holding of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, which reversed the conviction of the Party for failure to register on the ground that criminal enforcement proceedings against the Party are invalidated upon Fifth Amendment (self-incrimination) claims.

In addition to other conforming amendments, the bill also contains new provisions which are designed to strengthen proceedings under the Act. Of particular importance are provisions which give the Attorney General the power to compel testimony and the production of evidence over self-incrimination claims, under grant of immunity; provisions to preserve the Board from harassment in the conduct of its proceedings by authorizing prosecutions for misbehavior in hearings before the Board; and provisions to protect the due administration of justice by denying jurisdiction to courts to entertain certain dilatory collateral or fragmentary proceedings.

A summary of the principal provisions of the bill follows:

Section 1. This amends the definition of a Communist-front organization to include those organizations which are substantially directed, dominated or controlled by one or more members of a Communist-action organization. This amendment is designed to remedy a 1963 holding of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in the case of the *National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board*, 322 F. 2d 375, requiring proof, under existing provisions of the Act, of an agency relationship between the Communist Party and its members in the control of a Communist front.

Section 2. This amends section 8 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 which relates to the registration of members of Communist-action organization. Under the existing provisions of the Act when a Communist-action oganization required to register failed to register its members, the section imposed a duty upon members of the organization to register themselves with the Attorney General as members of such organization. The section as amended by the bill only requires the Attorney General to petition the Board for a determination as to each individual who is a member of such an organization, and does not impose any duty upon the individual member to register himself.

Section 3. This requires the Attorney General to maintain a register of Communist-action, Communist-front, and Communist-infiltrated organizations, in conformity with the amendments proposed relating to registration.

Section 4. This amends section 10 of the Act principally to include a new paragraph (2) requiring a disclosure of identity of Communist organizations which use a facility of interstate or foreign commerce in soliciting money or property.

Section 5. This amends section 13 of the Act to conform to the registration proceedings as affected by the amendments of the bill, and also to accomplish the following: (1) to expedite actions in determining individual membership in Communist-action organizations by authorizing inclusion of two or more members in one petition; (2) to require the Board to proceed to a determination as to the nature of the organization, action or front, when the organization "dissolves" subsequent to the filing of a petition; (3) to authorize the compelling of testimony and production of evidence over a claim of self-incrimination by grant of immunity on request of the Attorney General; (4) to strengthen the due process provisions of the section by eliminating default judgments and requiring the Board to proceed to a determination of the issues where an organization or individual declines or fails to appear; (5) to grant the Board the power to prosecute persons who misbehave in the course of a hearing; (6) to deprive courts of jurisdiction to entertain certain dilatory collateral actions and to require all objections to be made before the Board, or in the courts, or on review, in main proceedings; and (7) certain conforming amendments.

Sections 6 and 7 are conforming amendments.

Section 8. This amends the penalty provisions of section 15 of the Act so as to repeal penalties for failure of individuals or organizations to register. This is a conforming amendment, in light of the provisions of the bill which repeal provisions of the Act requiring organizations and individuals to register themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. **ASHBROOK**. Mr. Speaker, it is a great source of pride and pleasure for me to say that 24 of my Republican colleagues have joined with me today in introducing H.R. 10391, a bill to strengthen the Internal Security Act which is identical to that introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The committee has been carefully studying all court decisions affecting the Internal Security Act which have been handed down in recent years.

The bills introduced today, in the committee's judgment, conform to the constitutional requirements set forth in those decisions and at the same time make the Internal Security Act a far more effective vehicle for the control of subversive activities.

There can be no political partisanship when it comes to protecting this country and its people against its enemies. The action taken by 50 Members of the House today in sponsoring my bill and the bill of the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities is convincing evidence that this House, like the American people and regardless of political affiliation, stands united in defending our Nation against those who would subvert it.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 10391

A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 relating to the registration of Communist organizations, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

SECTION 1. Paragraph (4) of section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(4) The term 'Communist-front organization' means any organization in the United States (other than a Communist-action organization as defined in paragraph (3) of this section) which (A) is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by a Communist-action organization, or (B) is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by one or more members of a Communist-action organization, and (C) is primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist-action organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title."

SEC. 2. Section 8 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"REGISTRATION OF MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST-ACTION ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 8. (a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring any organization to register under section 7(a) as a Communist-action organization and such organization has not filed a statement of its members as required by subsections (d) and (e) of section 7, it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to petition the Board for a determination as provided in section 13(a) as to each individual whom the Attorney General has reason to believe is at the time of the filing of his petition under section 13 (a) a member of such organization.

"(b) When any organization files a statement of its members pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) of section 7 it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to petition the Board for a determination as provided in section 13(a) as to each individual whom the Attorney General has reason to believe is at the time of the filing of his petition under section 13(a) a member of such organization but whose name was not included upon the statement filed by the organization.

"(c) Any individual as to whom there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such individual to be a member of a Communist-action organization and who is no longer a member of such organization may file a petition for a determination as provided in section 13."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 9 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Attorney General shall keep and maintain separately in the Department of Justice—

"(1) a 'Register of Communist-Action Organizations', which shall include (A) the names and addresses of all Communist-action organizations registered or by final order of the Board required to register under the provisions of this title, (B) the registration statements and annual reports filed by such organizations thereunder, and (C) the names and last-known addresses of individuals who by proceedings under section 13 are by final order of the Board determined to be members or officers of such organization;

"(2) a 'Register of Communist-Front Organizations', which shall include (A) the names and addresses of all Communist-front organizations registered or by final order of the Board required to register under the provisions of this title, and (B) the registration statements and annual reports filed by such organizations thereunder; and

"(3) a 'Register of Communist-Infiltrated Organizations', which shall include the names and addresses of all Communist-infiltrated organizations determined by final order of the Board to be such by proceedings under section 13A."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 9 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Upon the registering of each Communist organization by the Attorney General under the provisions of this section, the Attorney General shall publish in the Federal Register the fact that such organization has been registered by him as a Communist-action organization, or as a Communist-front organization, or as a Communist-infiltrated organization, as the case may be, and the publication thereof shall constitute notice to all members of such organization that such organization has been so registered."

SEC. 4. Section 10 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. It shall be unlawful for any organization which is registered under section 7, or for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring it to register under section 7, or determining that it is a Communist-infiltrated organization, or for any person acting for or on behalf of any such organization—

"(1) to transmit or cause to be transmitted, through the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, any publication which is intended to be, or which it is reasonable to believe is intended to be, circulated or disseminated among two or more persons, unless such publication, and any envelope, wrapper or other container in which it is mailed or otherwise circulated or transmitted, bears the following, printed in such manner as may be provided in regulations prescribed by the Attorney General, with the name of the organization appearing in lieu of the blank: 'Disseminated by ———, which has been determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist organization'; or

"(2) to use the United States mails, or any means, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, to solicit any money, property, or thing unless such solicitation if made orally, is preceded by the following statement, and if made in writing or in print, is preceded by the following written or printed statement, with the name of the organization in lieu of the blank: 'This solicitation is made for or on behalf of ———, which has been determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist organization'; or

"(3) to broadcast or cause to be broadcast any matter over any radio or television station in the United States, unless such matter is preceded by the following statement, with the name of the organization being stated in place of the blank: 'The following program is sponsored by ———, which has been determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist organization'."

SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (a) of section 13 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whenever the Attorney General shall have reason to believe that any organization which has not registered under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 7 of this title is in fact an organization of a kind required to be registered under such subsection, or that any individual is of the type referred to in subsection (a) or (b) of section 8 of this title, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such organization or individual, as the case may be, a petition for an order requiring such organization to register, or determining such individual to be a member of such organization, pursuant to such subsection or section. Each such petition shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts upon which the Attorney General relies in support of his prayer for the issuance of such order. Two or more such individuals, members of such organization or of any section, branch, fraction, cell, board, committee, commission, or unit thereof, may be joined as respondents in one petition for an order determining each of such individuals to be a member of any such organization. A dissolution of any organization subsequent to the date of the filing of any petition requiring it to register shall not moot or abate the proceedings, but the Board shall receive evidence and proceed to a determination of the issues: *Provided, however*, that if the Board shall find such organization to be a Communist-action or Communist-front organization as of the time of the filing of such petition and prior to its alleged dissolution, and shall find that a dissolution of the organization has in fact occurred as aforesaid, the Board shall enter an order determining such organization to be a Communist-action or Communist-front organization, as the case may be, and the Attorney General shall register it as such in the appropriate register maintained by him pursuant to subsection (a) of section 9 of this title, together with a notation of its dissolution. No such organization found to be dissolved as aforesaid shall be required to file any registration statement or annual report, nor shall any member or officer thereof be registered or required to register as a member or officer of such organization under the provisions of this title."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 13 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any organization registered under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 7 of this title, or any organization which by final order of the Board has been required to register, and which no longer is an organization of such type, or any individual who by final order of the Board has been determined to be a member of a Communist-action organization, and who no longer is a member of such organization, may file with the Board a petition for a determination that such organization no longer is an organization of such type, or that such individual no longer is a member of such organization, as the case may be, and for appropriate relief from the further application of the provisions of this title to such organization or individual. Any individual authorized by section 7(g) to file a petition for relief may file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for an order requiring the Attorney General to strike his name from the registration statement or annual report upon which it appears. Each petition filed under and pursuant to this subsection shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts relied upon in support thereof. Upon the filing of any such petition, the Board shall serve upon each party to such proceeding a notice specifying the time and place for hearing upon such petition. No such hearing shall be conducted within twenty days after the service of such notice."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 13 of such Act is amended by inserting the following sentence immediately preceding the last sentence thereof: "No person, on the ground or for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to criminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture, shall be excused from testifying or producing documentary evidence before the Board in obedience to a subpena of the Board issued on request of the Attorney General when the Attorney General represents that such testimony or evidence is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title; but no natural person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he, under compulsion as herein provided, may testify, or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, before the Board in obedience to a subpena issued by it: *Provided*, That no natural person so testifying shall be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying."

(d) Subsection (d) of section 13 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Amend paragraph (2) of said subsection to read as follows:

"(2) Where an organization or individual declines or fails to appear at a hearing accorded to such organization or individual by the Board in proceedings initiated pursuant to subsection (a), the Board shall, nevertheless, proceed to receive evidence, make a determination of the issues, and enter such order as shall be just and appropriate."

(2) Add the following paragraphs:

"(3) Any person who, in the course of any hearing before the Board or any member thereof or any examiner thereby, shall misbehave in their presence or so near thereto as to obstruct the hearing or the administration of the provisions of this title, shall be guilty of an offense and upon conviction thereof by a court of competent jurisdiction shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 or more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Whenever a statement of fact constituting such misbehavior is reported by the Board to the appropriate United States attorney, it shall be his duty to bring the matter before the grand jury for its action.

"(4) The authority, function, practice, or process of the Attorney General or Board in conducting any proceeding pursuant to the provisions of this title, shall not be questioned in any court of the United States, nor shall any such court, or judge or justice thereof, have jurisdiction of any action, suit, petition, or proceeding, whether for declaratory judgment, injunction, or otherwise, to question such, except on review in the court or courts having jurisdiction of the actions and orders of the Board pursuant to the provisions of section 14, or when such are appropriately called into question by the accused or respondent, as the case may be, in the court or courts having jurisdiction of his prosecution or other proceeding (or the review thereof) for any contempt or any offense charged against him pursuant to the provisions of this title."

(e) Paragraph (1) of subsection (f) of section 13 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) the extent to which persons who are active in its management, direction, or supervision, whether or not holding office therein, are active in the management, direction, or supervision of, or as representatives or members of, any Communist-action organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2; and"

(f) Paragraph (2) of subsection (g) of section 13 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such individual an order determining such individual to be a member of such organization."

(g) Paragraph (2) of subsection (h) of section 13 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) that an individual is not a member of any Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its finding as to the facts; issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying his petition for an order determining such individual to be a member of such organization; and send a copy of such order to such individual."

(h) Paragraph (2) of subsection (i) of section 13 of such Act is amended by inserting the words "or officer" following the word "member" in the first clause thereof, and striking the numeral "8" in clause (B) and substituting in lieu thereof the numeral "9".

(i) Paragraph (2) of subsection (j) of section 13 of such Act is amended by inserting the words "or officer" following the word "member" in the first clause thereof, and striking the numeral "8" in clause (B) and substituting in lieu thereof the numeral "9".

SEC. 6. Section 13A of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any organization which has been finally determined under this section to be a Communist-infiltrated organization may thereafter file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for a determination that such organization no longer is a Communist-infiltrated organization, and that its name be stricken from his register maintained under section 9 hereof."

(2) Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The provisions of subsections (c) and (d) of section 13 shall apply to hearings conducted under this section."

SEC. 7. Clause (B) in the sixth sentence of subsection (a) of section 14 of such Act is amended by striking the numeral "8" and substituting in lieu thereof the numeral "9".

SEC. 8. Section 15 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 15. Any organization which violates any provision of section 10 of this title shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not more than $10,000. Any individual who violates any provision of section 5 or 10 of this title shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUPPE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), from May 29 through June 14, 1967, on account of official business with House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Mr. KORNEGAY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for May 25 through June 2, on account of official business.

Mr. CORBETT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, on May 31.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DENT, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WILLIS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ADDABBO, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. LAIRD and to include charts and tables during debate on HEW appropriation bill.

Mr. MICHEL and to include charts and tables during debate on HEW appropriation bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia and to include extraneous matter during debate on HEW appropriation bill.

Mr. FLOOD to include an editorial with his remarks in Committee of the Whole in debate on the appropriation bill.

Mr. SCHWEIKER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to include charts and tables and extraneous matter in his remarks in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. RUMSFELD to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter during debate on S. 1432.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. WHALEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

Mr. WALKER.

Mr. GRAY.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. FLYNT.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1788. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 399. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain real property to the city of Batavia, N.Y.;

H.R. 4374. An act to remove a cloud on the title of certain real property in the State of Oregon owned by John Johnson; and

H.R. 7965. An act to transfer title to tribal land on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 29, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

776. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of "Hydroelectric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1965"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

777. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for the medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ending March 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

778. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1966–March 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

779. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of subsurface exploration for and design and construction of foundations of public buildings, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

780. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

781. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the Federal elections laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. S. 1649. An act authorizing the change in name of certain water resource projects under jurisdiction of the Department of the Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Third review of market promotion activity of Foreign Agricultural Service (first report by committee) (Rept. No. 311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROONEY of New York: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 10345. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 10368. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 173. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis G. Dediot (Rept. No. 304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 439. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Jacinto Nobo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo) (Rept. No. 305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 501. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernando O. Garcia-Hernandez (Rept. No. 306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1517. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Matteo Groppo (Rept. No. 307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1532. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfredo A. Navarro (Rept. No. 308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3221. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Cross (Rept. No. 309). Referred to Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5862. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan F. Chaves (Rept. No. 310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1612. A bill for the relief of John Joseph Shea (Rept. No. 312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1703. A bill for the relief of Angiolina Condello (Rept. No. 313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MacGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1763. A bill for the relief of Dr. Raul E. Bertrán; with amendment (Rept. No. 314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1764. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ernesto M. Campello; with amendment (Rept. No. 315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1765. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ubaldo Gregorio Catasús-Rodriguez (Rept. No. 316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MacGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1769. A bill for the relief of Luis Tapia Dávila; with amendment (Rept. No. 317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1814. A bill for the relief of Giovanni and Francesco Urga-Ferraro; with amendment (Rept. No. 319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3522. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael F. Suarez (Rept. No. 320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MacGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3523. A bill for the relief of Chang-You Wu, M.D. (Rept. No. 321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5224. A bill for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Fresco De Jongh; with amendment (Rept. No. 322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 10328. A bill to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 10329. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that certain fish glue may be imported free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 10330. A bill to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 10331. A bill to repeal the authority for the current wheat and feed grain programs and to authorize programs that will permit the market system to work more effectively for wheat and feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 10332. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 10333. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 10334. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 10335. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct from gross income the expenses, not exceeding $300 a year, paid for transportation to and from his place of abode and his place of business or employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10336. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the tariff treatment of certain imported dress gloves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 10337. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Act to authorize the computation of overtime compensation for hospital employees on the basis of a 14-day work period; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 10338. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide additional beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals for the care and treatment of veterans afflicted with alcoholism; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 10339. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 10340. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 10341. A bill to promote safe driving and eliminate the reckless and irresponsible driver from the streets and highways of the District of Columbia by providing that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District while apparently under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of certain of his body substances to determine the alcoholic content of his blood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R.10342. A bill to authorize the payment of allowances to defray commuting expenses of civilian employees of executive agencies assigned to duty at remote worksites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10343. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 10344. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 10345. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 10346. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 10347. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 10348. A bill to establish a National Commission on Public Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KAZEN:

H.R. 10349. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 10350. A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of articles imported into the United States, to establish a flexible basis for the adjustment by the U.S. economy to expanded trade, and to afford foreign supplying nations a fair share of the growth or change in the U.S. market; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 10351. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to provide that the issue of just compensation may be tried by a jury in any case involving the condemnation of real property by the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 10352. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 10353. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 10354. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 10355. A bill relative to age discrimination in employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10356. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 10357. A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 10358. A bill to provide for the detail of Foreign Service officers to private institutions and organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 10359. A bill to incorporate the Young Engineers & Scientists of America, for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85–875; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10360. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to make certain metropolitan areas eligible as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 10361. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer from $600 to $1,000 over a 4-year period beginning with 1968; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 10362. A bill to guarantee freedom of speech, assembly, and petition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 10363. A bill to guarantee freedom of speech, assembly, and petition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 10364. A bill to guarantee freedom of speech, assembly, and petition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 10365. A bill to guarantee freedom of speech, assembly, and petition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 10366. A bill to guarantee freedom of speech, assembly, and petition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 10367. A bill to guarantee freedom of speech, assembly, and petition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 10368. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 10369. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 10370. A bill to establish an emergency program of direct Federal assistance in the form of direct grants and loans to certain hospitals in critical need of new facilities in order to meet increasing demands for service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 10371. A bill to guarantee freedom of speech, assembly, and petition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10372. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 10373. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN (for himself, Mr. Delaney, Mr. Findley, Mr. Tenzer, Mr. Burke of Florida, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. McDade, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Kupferman, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Lukens, Mr. Grover, Mr. Sandman, Mr. Button, Mr. Wolff, Mr. McEwen, Mr. Dent, Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania, Mr. Horton, Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania, Mr. Watson, Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Cunningham, and Mr. McClory):

H.R. 10374. A bill to amend chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation, use, sale, or receipt, for unlawful purposes, of credit cards in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 10375. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 10376. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for additional positions in certain executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 10377. A bill to establish a National Science and Technology Center for Crime Prevention and Control; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 10378. A bill to revitalize the American gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 10379. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 10380. A bill to amend section 5 of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act to provide a definition of the term "age" as used with respect to the labeling and advertising of whisky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10381. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 10382. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10383. A bill to establish a National Commission on Public Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 10384. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Negro History Museum Commission; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 10385. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 10386. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H.R. 10387. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 10388. A bill relating to the conservation of natural resources upon lands of the United States and amending certain provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and the Mineral Leasing Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 10389. A bill relating to the conservation of natural resources upon lands of the United States and amending certain provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and the Mineral Leasing Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS (for himself, Mr. Abernethy, Mr. Abbitt, Mr. Ashmore, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Colmer, Mr. Dorn, Mr. Downing, Mr. Edwards of Louisiana, Mr. Fascell, Mr. Haley, Mr. Hébert, Mr. Ichord, Mr. Landrum, Mr. Lennon, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Pool, Mr. Rarick, Mr. Rivers, Mr. Rogers of Florida, Mr. Selden, Mr. Stephens, Mr. Tuck, Mr. Waggonner and Mr. Williams of Mississippi):

H.R. 10390. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 relating to the registration of Communist organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. ASHBROOK (for himself, Mr. Del Clawson, Mr. Roudebush, Mr. Watson, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Goodling, Mr. Dole, Mr. Watkins, Mr. Mize, Mr. Winn, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Scherle, Mr. Ayres, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Devine, Mr. Hall, Mr. Utt, Mr. Gross, Mr. Schadeberg, Mr. Wylie, Mr. Miller of Ohio, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Adair):

H.R. 10391. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 relating to the registration of Communist organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself, Mr. Corman, and Mr. Johnson of California):

H.R. 10392. A bill to provide for family winter recreational use of a portion of the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area, San Bernardino National Forest, Calif., without reducing the area set aside for wilderness preservation within such forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 10393. A bill to amend the act of July 19, 1940, to vest the administration of that act in the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 595. Joint resolution to designate Columbus Day, the 12th day of October in each year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H. Con. Res. 360. Concurrent resolution concerning peace if Communists will cooperate; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSH (for himself, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Davis of Georgia, Mr. Anderson of Tennessee, and Mr. Reuss):

H. Con. Res. 361. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should have one uniform nationwide fire reporting telephone number and one uniform nationwide police reporting telephone number; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H. Con. Res. 362. Concurrent resolution proposing uniform nationwide telephone numbers to call fire and police departments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 363. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

207. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relative to the establishment and maintenance of an adequate and permanent national cemetery system, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 10394. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Monteroso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 10395. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mario Guillermo Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 10396. A bill for the relief of certain property owners in Oconto County, Wis.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 10397. A bill for the relief of Nguyen Van Be (James Be Roellig); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10398. A bill for the relief of Gioacchino Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10399. A bill for the relief of Antonino Taourmina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 10400. A bill for the relief of Else M. van Gulik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 10401. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Guedes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 10402. A bill for the relief of James W. Jadul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10403. A bill for the relief of Maria Jesus Cascais Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10404. A bill for the relief of Won Chan Lowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 10405. A bill for the relief of Chagit Atlasz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 493. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 9326) entitled "A bill for the relief of Dr. Abraham Ruchwarger" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims, pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

94. Mr. MULTER presented a petition of Miss Leila Brand and others, of Brooklyn, N.Y., relative to supporting President Johnson's request to raise social security benefits, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Residency Voting Act of 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. S. JOHNNY WALKER

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the President has directed his attention to legislation dealing with a problem whereby many millions of our citizens have been unfairly disenfranchised.

Citizens who move from one area of the country to another are unable to vote in national elections because of a failure to meet the residence requirements of the States. If we are to strengthen our democratic system we must always seek new methods to expand citizen participation in every aspect of our political processes.

It is noteworthy that the legislation has included stiff criminal penalties for persons who falsely register as to their eligibility.

President's Middle East Statement Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in support of the President's statement of the Arab-

Israel crisis. The President is to be commended for speaking forth and placing the United States behind the attempts of the United Nations and Secretary General U Thant to secure a reduction in tension in the Near East.

The President, in restating America's traditional policy of assuring the independence of any nation from aggression by her neighbors, has served notice in tempered but firm and unmistakable language, that neither we nor the rest of the world can tolerate the hostile and warlike acts now being taken in the Gulf of Aqaba.

The President has the support not only of the American people but of its congressional representatives in this time of world crisis.

Commerce Department Strengthened by Trowbridge Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, there are two requirements which are necessary to assure the successful working of a democratic republic such as we have in the United States. One is the willingness of good men and women to serve their country in appointive public office. The other is wise choice of the right persons for the right jobs. Both of these requirements are fully met in President Johnson's nomination of Alexander B. Trowbridge to be Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Trowbridge will bring the vigor of youth as well as the moderating influence of experience to this new position. At the age of 37, he has been Acting Secretary of Commerce for the past 4 months. Prior to that, he had served as Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic and International Business. During his tenure in that office he traveled extensively in three other continents, promoting U.S. economic interests throughout the world. He also played an important role in the Federal Government's relationships with the U.S. business community.

In private life, Mr. Trowbridge was an executive in the oil industry—specifically, in the overseas operations of American petroleum firms. He worked in Latin America and Asia, and at the time he entered public life, he was president and division manager of the Esso Standard Oil Co., of Puerto Rico.

Born in New Jersey, Mr. Trowbridge received his early education at Phillips Academy, and was a cum laude graduate of Princeton University. Indicative of his interest in public service, Mr. Trowbridge was a member of the International Interne Group at the United Nations between school years. During the Korean conflict, he served as a commissioned officer in the Marine Corps and won the Bronze Star. He is currently a major in the Marine Corps Reserve.

To sum up, it would be difficult to imagine a person better qualified for this office. This nomination reflects credit upon the President, upon Mr. Trowbridge, and upon the Nation as a whole.

The Crisis in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, on May 15 the State of Israel observed its 19th anniversary as an independent and sovereign state. On that occasion, I joined with many of my colleagues in the House to extend our wishes for peace and prosperity in Israel and in the entire Middle East area. I stated then as follows:

> It is most unfortunate for the peoples of the Near East that Israel's Arab neighbors insist on maintaining a state of war and are constantly threatening to annihilate the Jewish state. This situation only continues to heighten the tension in the area and to encourage an arms race instead of bringing peace and economic development, and political stability to the Near East. Escalation of the arms race, the reckless incursions and attacks on Israel's borders, and the continued harrassment of its population only serve to create a dangerous situation which may lead to conflict and bloodshed.

Mr. Speaker, it was not in a spirit of prophecy that I uttered those words, but the dangerous situation leading to conflict and bloodshed came even sooner than I had anticipated. Today the Near East is on the brink of bloodshed. Egypt's armed troops are poised on the borders of Israel waiting for the order from Cairo to invade a neighboring country and embark on a bloody conflict which may well have wider repercussions and consequences. In fact, Egypt and Syria may unwittingly touch off by their reckless and irresponsible action the next world war.

Needless to say, I am gravely concerned over this deteriorating situation and the possibility of a new war in the Middle East, resulting from Egyptian and Syrian aggression against a peaceful people and a fellow member of the United Nations. I hope and trust that the U.S. Government will take the necessary steps to make it clear in no uncertain terms to the two Arab aggressor nations that we will not tolerate any acts of aggression in that area and that we will hold those two countries, Egypt and Syria, and their impetuous leaders, completely responsible for such acts.

A beginning in that direction has already been made by President Johnson in his statement of May 23 in which he expressed our Government's earnest support of all efforts, in and outside the United Nations, "to reduce tensions and restore stability."

The President also forewarned Egypt that "a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace." I am pleased to support the President's statement and to associate myself with his views on the need for maintaining peace in the Middle East.

The President's statement is in accord with traditional U.S. policy, repeatedly affirmed by his predecessors in the White House: Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy. This policy has always had the support of Congress and our two major national political parties.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of Israel are entitled to live in peace, without the interference of their hostile neighbors and without the constant threats to the existence of Israel on the part of the Arab countries. Israel is entitled to the free and unrestricted use of international waterways such as the Gulf of Aqaba.

During the 19 years of Israel's existence our country has developed the most cordial relations with Israel, so much so that the United States has come to regard Israel as one of its stanchest friends in the Near East: a sincere, responsible, and dependable ally in the cause of freedom and democracy. We have made certain commitments in the Tripartite Agreement of 1950, and in 1957 after the Suez conflict, to help maintain the integrity of Israel and other states of the Near East. We must now fulfill this commitment and it can best be done by making it crystal clear to Egypt and Syria that we shall oppose all efforts to inflame the area.

I believe that firmness is the order of the day. Only when the aggressors are convinced that we are serious and determined will they stop to think before taking any precipitous steps leading to bloodshed. This is the only way to prevent a calamitous war in that area which is bound to spill over to the rest of the world and engulf all of humanity.

The Near East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I share a deep concern with the people of Delaware over the critical situation in the Near East. What happens there will be a severe test of diplomacy, of the United Nations, and of United States commitments.

Because of this concern, I have wired the President urging him to use the full prestige of his office to insure peace in that increasingly troubled area and to insure the integrity of the boundaries of Israel.

I have also expressed to him my concern over the hasty withdrawal of United Nations troops from the Gaza strip, as I fear the withdrawal not only contributes to the difficulty there, but is another sign of the impotency of the United Nations.

It is hoped that the President will explore, at the highest levels with other interested nations, means of lessening tensions in the Near East, and will make every effort to help insure that the United Nations becomes an instrument for restoring peace in that troubled area.

Jefferson County Chamber of Commerce Honors West Virginia's Oldest Newspaper With Its Outstanding Service Award—Distinguished Lady President of State Press Association Makes Presentation—Wayne Hopkins Gives Cogent Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, economic progress and the recognition of a newspaper providing community service were highlighted in Harper's Ferry, W. Va., as the Jefferson County Chamber of Commerce held its eighth annual banquet.

Especially honored at the May 24 event was West Virginia's oldest newspaper, the Spirit of Jefferson-Farmers Advocate, published at Charles Town. This distinguished newspaper which, within a few weeks, will be observing its 124th anniversary, was awarded the chamber of commerce annual award for outstanding service as a community industry and as a leading promoter of industrial development.

Mrs. Jane Price Sharp, of Marlinton, president of the West Virginia Press Association, and a member of a pioneer publishing family of our State, presented the special award to Max Brown, editor and general manager of the Jefferson Publishing Co., publisher of the Spirit of Jefferson-Farmers Advocate. He accepted on behalf of the owners, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Dorsey, and the staff and shop personnel of that newspaper and its commercial printing establishment.

Mrs. Price, the talented daughter of a former famed owner-editor of the Pocohontas Times, and the present owner-editor of that newspaper, told the more than 200 citizens who attended the banquet that the Spirit of Jefferson-Farmers Advocate is recognized by the newspaper fraternity as a publication which is informative to its readers and couples integrity of reporting with coverage of events in an interesting style.

It was a privilege for which I am grateful, as a former newspaper editor and as a friend of Max Brown and Jane Price Sharp, and as a West Virginia Senator, to have been present for the event at the Hilltop House overlooking one of the Nation's most picturesque panoramic views as the Shenandoah and Potomac Rivers junction at Harper's Ferry, surrounded by majestic mountains, and situated in the same community with the famed Harper's Ferry Historical National Park.

It was also gratifying to me, as it was to his Jefferson County friends and neighbors, to greet the veteran newspaperman, C. S. Musser—perhaps the State's oldest newspaper owner-editor—who came from Shepherdstown to share in the recognition of Max Brown and the Spirit of Jefferson-Farmers Advocate family. Mr. Musser, who publishes the Independent, was a deserving recipient of another of the Jefferson County Chamber of Commerce awards presented by that organization's vice president, C. Manning Smith, who is postmaster of Charles Town.

F. S. Woodford, president of the Jefferson County Chamber of Commerce, presided. The address of the evening was a humorous, informative, and cogent one by Wayne Hopkins, manager, local chamber of commerce department of the Washington staff of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Officers and directors of the Jefferson County Chamber of Commerce for the 1967–68 year were presented—the new president, Marvin A. Brooks; the new first vice president, C. Manning Smith; the new second vice president, Norman W. Kisner; the reelected treasurer, Herman W. Willis; and the renamed manager, S. Brooke Blackford, all of whom are directors, along with: Joseph P. Christian, James M. Davis, C. C. Hammann, Jack R. Huyett, D. D. Kilham, Dr. D. C. Master, A. S. Nerhood, T. W. Steptoe, and Thruman A. Whitacre.

Mr. President, Editor Max Brown, speaking for the owners and personnel of the Spirit of Jefferson-Farmers Advocate in accepting the outstanding service award, noted that in its long history, the newspaper received many honors—local, State and National—for professional competence and achievements in its field, but none more cherished than the award for community service by the community itself.

It was six score and three years ago, on July 17, 1844, that the first edition of the Spirit of Jefferson newspaper was turned off of a hand-fed press. And today, some 123 years later, it is the sole survivor of all the newspapers that were then being published in the western counties of what was then western Virginia.

Since that day almost 124 years ago, the Spirit of Jefferson has been witness to and has reported on many innovations and also on the changes and growth of its ownership and makeup. In its growth, it is a product of two newspapers, the name of the Farmers Advocate having been added in 1948 to make up what is now the newspaper's present masthead, the Spirit of Jefferson-Farmers Advocate.

The Spirit of Jefferson was established on July 17, 1844, by James W. Beller and weekly editions came from its press until a period during the Civil War. For 6 months during that war-torn period, publication had to be suspended as a result of damage to the newspaper's machinery and plant when wrecked by Union troops. That was the only period in the long and eventful history of the Spirit of Jefferson when the newspaper missed publication.

During its long life, the Spirit of Jefferson has had only five owners—Mr. Beller, John Dalgarn, George Haines, John S. Alfriend, and now Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Dorsey.

The Farmers Advocate was founded in Charles Town in February 1885, by D. S. Eichelberger and Everett W. Bedinger and it was known as the West Virginia Democrat. Two years later the newspaper passed into the hands of James M. Mason, Sr., and in 1890, it was purchased by R. W. Morrow and the name was changed to the Farmers Advocate. This newspaper, like the Spirit of Jefferson, did not change hands often. It has had only six owners in its long life—others, in addition to those already mentioned, having been: J. F. Engle, Robert C. Rissler, and John S. Alfriend.

At the present time, after some 6,375 editions, the Spirit of Jefferson-Advocate holds many distinctions besides being the State's oldest newspaper. It has increased in size, in circulation, and in composition until it is among the top examples of all of West Virginia's 85 weekly newspapers in makeup and composition. And it ranks as the second largest weekly newspaper in the State in circulation. Its subscription files contain the names of subscribers in every State in the Union and in a number of foregn countries. So, truly the Spirit of Jefferson-Farmers Advocate goes wherever Jefferson Countians or former Jefferson Countians go. The nearly 5,000 papers that roll off its presses each week are read by an estimated 25,000 persons.

Max Brown, in accepting the award, concluded his acceptance with these remarks:

> And so, with a humble, but grateful nod to the past and those who founded and fostered both the Spirit of Jefferson and Farmers Advocate into the present age, our thoughts now turn to the 124th year. And let me assure you, the management and staff will begin it in the same manner we have each week, month and year in the past—by taking one thing at a time, one week at a time. Our short range goal is next week's edition. Our long range purpose is service to the people, business and industrial complex of Charles Town, Jefferson County and neighboring communities.

Direct-Mail Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago I addressed the House on the subject of direct-mail advertising. At that time I suggested that the phrase "junk mail" is an unfortunate choice of words which libels the entire direct-mail industry.

I would not want to speculate about the motives of those who continually attack this great industry, but in my opinion an overwhelming case can be made that third-class mail is a highly effective advertising medium. For example, bulk third-class mail generates more than $35 billion in sales each year.

In my judgment, this proves that Americans do read and respond positively to direct-mail advertising.

Third-class mail is thus an important instrument of commerce, and statistics clearly indicate that its impact is increasing from year to year.

In an area adjacent to my own congressional district, Sunset House provides us with an outstanding example of how the direct-mail industry is contributing to an expanding economy. Sunset House, the world's largest specialty mail-order firm, does an annual business of more than $20 million. A member of the American and Pacific Coast Stock Exchanges, this 16-year-old company has its headquarters in Los Angeles. Because mail-order buying is both convenient and enjoyable, Sunset House has more than 4 million customers.

Even more important than its high annual sales, Sunset House provides many jobs for the people of the Los Angeles area. An equal opportunity employer, Sunset House has demonstrated its strong sense of social responsibility by hiring unskilled workers and training them for productive careers in industry.

I believe that the Sunset House example illustrates the extent to which the direct-mail industry contributes to our Nation's economy, both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Results of Third Congressional District Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently conducted an opinion poll of the third Ohio district. I sent 150,000 questionnaires to the residents of the district.

I am pleased to report that the response was overwhelming, and that over 25,000 replies were received by my office. In fact, they are still trickling in.

This demonstrates to me the interest of the public in government and in the serious questions facing us today.

For the information of my colleagues, I include a tabulation of the responses:

OVERALL TOTALS OF THIRD OHIO CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT POLL

(By Congressman Charles W. Whalen, Jr.)

[In percent]

1. What should we do about Vietnam?

(*a*) Continue our present course	21.78
(*b*) Escalate further our military effort	47.34
(*c*) Hold key positions and try to negotiate a settlement	32.59
(*d*) Withdraw as soon as possible	20.00

(Total exceeds 100 percent due to multiple selections.)

2. What should be done about the administration's projected $12.6 billion deficit?

(*a*) Adopt its recommended 6-percent surtax on personal and corporate income tax	14.67
(*b*) Reduce nonessential spending	87.57
(*c*) Accept the deficit	9.96

3. Do you think the war on poverty has been successful in improving the condition of the poor?

Yes	14.67
No	77.99
Undecided	7.34

4. Should a tax credit be allowed parents supporting students in College?

Yes	70.27
No	29.27
Undecided	0.46

5. Do you favor removing the ceiling on earnings of persons receiving social security or veterans' pensions?

Yes	71.89
No	28.11
Undecided	0.00

6. What should we do about social security retirement benefits?

(*a*) Increase benefits 8 percent (this would not require additional social security taxes)	70.73
(*b*) Increase benefits 20 percent (this would require increasing the withholding tax rate to 5.5 percent on an expanded base of $10,800)	19.31

Water Resource Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, again, Congress' champion of clean water has taken the time from his busy schedule to address a most important conference on water. This time it is the 90-nation International Conference on Water for Peace, at Washington's Sheraton-Park Hotel. As in the past, Congressman JOHN BLATNIK shares his vast knowledge and experience in the field of water with these delegates, and I am proud to include his remarks in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN A. BLATNIK AT THE WOMEN'S LUNCHEON OF INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WATER FOR PEACE

It is a pleasure to be with you here today and to address such a charming audience. And it is also an honor for me to participate with the distinguished representatives from so many countries in this tremendously important International Conference on Water for Peace.

For a number of years I have been personally interested, and involved, in the water resource problem. I feel that the blending of two such necessary ingredients of human progress as peace and water holds rich promise for the future. I urge you and your sisters back home, and the other women throughout the world to support the efforts for peace and for water. I especially urge you to promote the concept of water as another powerful bond of mutual interest and understanding among peoples and as another channel towards world peace.

And whose support could be more effective than yours? If it be true that "the hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world"—and who can deny this, even in our sophisticated nuclear age?—then it is true that your contribution can be most valuable in the efforts towards world peace and abundant water.

Who—since the very dawn of civilization—have been more intimately concerned with both peace and water than women? It is the woman who mourns her men slain in battle, and it is the woman who depends on water for the operation of her household.

INDISPENSABLE ITEM

Mankind has by necessity always ranked water together with food as essential priorities. So, it is not surprising that water—indispensable for life—has determined the founding of whole civilizations, such as, for example, the early cultures born between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers in the land appropriately named Meso-Potamia.

One entire country, Egypt, was so completely dependent upon the waters of a river for its very existence that ancient writers referred to Egypt as "the gift of the Nile." And the ancient Egyptians themselves, recognizing the source of their life, used to exclaim: "Hail to thee, O Nile . . . that comes to keep Egypt alive."

Ancient Egyptians believed that their river was in two parts, one was the Nile of Egypt, and the other was the celestial Nile that flowed across the heavens as the milky way.

So indispensable for life and prosperity was the annual inundation of the Nile that "nilometers" were erected at several spots along the river to measure maximum levels—and for centuries these were used as both flood control measurements and as economic indexes.

FRIEND OR FOE

In Egypt, as elsewhere, water was early recognized as being both friend and foe. And while water was used and stored and channeled as a friend, nevertheless devastating floods have taken their toll and have aroused fear among men down through the centuries.

In ancient civilizations water was not only intimately connected with survival and prosperity, but the necessity of solving water-related problems, such as irrigation, flood control and submerged farm-lands, figured importantly in the origins of arithmetic, geometry, coordinated government and the calendar.

As in the Old World, so too in the new, water was usually the determining factor in selecting the sites of cities, such as, for example, Mexico City. In About 1325, history tells us, the wandering Aztecs came upon an eagle perched on a prickly pear holding a serpent in his talons. Beyond him lay a beautiful blue lake, one of five lakes in that area. The Aztecs knew they had found their "promised land," as foretold by an ancient prophet, and they established their capital city on the spot, later to become the bustling metropolis of Mexico City.

Similarly, water was the principal determinant in founding Buenos Aires and Montevideo, as well as Buffalo, Chicago, St. Louis and hundreds of other cities and towns in North America. My own district in Minnesota includes Lake Superior which is the world's largest body of fresh water. Because of water supply the Great Lakes areas are population and industrial centers.

However, the second big water problem that man has faced down through the centuries is what to do with the water after he has once obtained and used it. From the earliest days, long before the advent of bacteriology, man realized, at least in a vague sort of a way, that his used water, his waste water, was polluted, offensive to the senses and often dangerous to health.

SEWERS DATE BACK TO 3700 B.C.

The disposal of used waters became a public problem, growing more acute as communities grew larger and the concentration of population increased. Archeologists have unearthed the remains of public sewers in ancient Sumeria, dating as far back as 3700 B.C. Public sewers were also in use in Tell Asmar, near Bagdad, in 2600 B.C. and at

Nineveh and Babylon centuries before the dawn of the Christian era.

But the master-plumbers of antiquity were the Cretans; before 1500 B.C., their palace of Minos at Knossos had facilities comparable to those of a modern hotel.

The Roman aqueducts, built to bring water from a distance, still stand and are admired as great feats of engineering skill. Less well known, but just as remarkable, was Rome's great sewer, built about 180 B.C. and called the *cloaca maxima*, which continued to serve Rome down to the present century.

So the water problems your husbands are grappling with during this conference are as old as man himself. Basically, the water problem has always been and is two-fold: how to get enough good water for all required uses; and, secondly, what to do with the water after it is used.

However, today a variety of modern conditions—an exploding population, increased industrialization, urban concentrations and other factors—have given a new urgency to these problems.

It is estimated that almost a billion people in the world lack even the simplest dependable supplies of clean water for personal and domestic uses. Most of these people suffer from diseases that are either water-borne or are at least attributable to a lack of water for personal hygiene; and an estimated ten million, about half of them infants, die from these diseases. Millions suffer undernourishment and starvation because water supplies are not properly used or developed for food production.

WATER—HUMANITY'S MOST CRITICAL PROBLEMS

The grim paradox is that even though water covers no less than three-fourths of the earth's surface and an enormous amount of water is actually available to man, nevertheless nature's distribution has been so capricious and man's use so wasteful that water is still one of humanity's most critical problems.

There is, throughout the world, an increasing and urgent requirement for water for drinking, water for washing and bathing, water for cooking, for food production, for industry, for commerce, for electric power generation and water for pleasure and recreation.

Water management is a problem in both advanced and developing countries of the world. Here in my own country, our water problems are so acute that we are simultaneously pushing forward on several important fronts. In addition to flood control, ground water development and upstream watershed management, we are working on a variety of projects such as desalination, evaporation control, weather modification and water pollution control.

Particularly noteworthy is the area of water pollution control because, by treating used waters to render them suitable for reuse, a new source of water can, in effect, be created over and over. Water quality and water quantity are interrelated. If the quality of water in a given stream is sufficiently degraded as to become unusable downstream, this is, in effect, a quantitative loss. But there will be no quantitative loss if the quality of waters is maintained or enhanced for repeated reuse by downstream communities, industries, farms and recreation areas.

MONUMENTAL LEGISLATION ON WATER

Here in the United States our water pollution has become so serious and our need for quality waters so acute that we have launched a massive attack against water pollution supported by two monumental pieces of legislation, the Water Quality Act of 1965 and the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

The underlying philosophy of these laws is this: With our exploding population and expanding industries, increased demands on water are inevitable. We cannot prevent the increased use of water. But we can rehabilitate and revitalize our dying waters. By proper treatment we can reuse water many times on its way to the sea.

POLLUTION PREVENTION IS KEY

Through the establishment of water quality standards, together with plans for their enforcement in each State through Federal assistance for construction of more waste treatment facilities, and in many other ways, we aim to prevent further pollution of our waterways and to restore our polluted waters to their earlier purity and beauty. That, in a word, is what the water pollution control effort in the United States is all about.

Other industrialized nations, especially in Europe, have many of these same pollution problems, and they are coping with these problems in various ways with varying degrees of success. In many developing countries the most urgent problem in water pollution control is the reduction in waterborne and water-related diseases.

But all of us can benefit by sharing our past problems and experiences and by participating in joint research and study to develop both additional knowledge and more effective measures to make use of the knowledge we have.

GOAL IS GLOBAL COOPERATIVE EFFORT

The International Conference on Water for Peace can lay the foundation for a global cooperative effort to attack and solve the several aspects of the critical water problem throughout the world.

And your role—the role of women throughout the world—can be crucial in supporting and promoting this vital effort that will contribute so much to world-wide health, prosperity, happiness and lasting peace on earth that we all long for.

Power Politics—The Deadliest Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT TENZER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, 1967, more than 100 Members of the House joined in a statement pledging our fullest support to measures which must be taken by the administration to make our position unmistakably clear to those who are now bent on the destruction of Israel, to resist aggression against Israel, and to preserve the peace. The full text of the statement read by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is as follows:

> Egypt and Syria are now threatening Israel and we fear that war in the Near East is inevitable unless the United States acts firmly and vigorously to prevent it. President Nasser's speech to his troops in Sinai yesterday was in effect a declaration of war. We note with dismay that the Soviet Union is encouraging and arming Egypt and Syria in a bold move to win influence and power in the Middle East. Once again the Soviet Union appears to be testing American resolve to defend the peace.
>
> The United States Government, speaking through Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, and through the Congress of the United States has repeatedly declared its determination to act against aggression in the Middle East. And we note with appreciation the declaration of a White House spokesman that—
>
> "This country is of course, committed to the principle of maintaining peace in the Middle East. This has been our position over the years. It is still our position."
>
> Consistent with that declaration, we pledge the fullest support to measures which must be taken by the Administration to make our position unmistakably clear to those who are now bent on the destruction of Israel, that we are now prepared to take whatever action may be necessary to resist aggression against Israel and to preserve the peace.
>
> We are confident that the people of the United States will support such a policy.

As one of the Members who endorsed and cosponsored this statement of congressional resolve, I was most pleased with the forceful and responsible statement made by the President on the new crisis in the Middle East. President Johnson made it very clear that the United States considers the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba an illegal act and potentially disastrous to peace.

The President has acted firmly and his reaffirmation of U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East was most welcome. His actions provide the American people and the nations of the world with the necessary understanding of our foreign policy at this most crucial moment.

The dangers involved in the game of power politics is set forth in an editorial which appeared in the May 23, edition of Newsday. I insert the text of the editorial at this point in the RECORD.

THE DEADLIEST GAME

> Power politics has always been a deadly game, but in the nuclear age, it has become more deadly still. In the shadow of the bomb, methods of aggression have grown more subtle. Propaganda, guerrilla warfare and terrorism are now the tactics of the expansionists.
>
> In the Middle East, tension has been sustained since the 1948 Arab-Israeli War through unrelenting propaganda warfare and through terrorist raids across the Israeli borders. The same type of pressure prompted the Israeli invasion of the Sinai Peninsula in 1956 and the massing of armies in that region again this week.
>
> The world must develop effective means to offset these tactics. The stationing of the United Nations Emergency Force on the border between Egypt and Israel was a 10-year experiment in peacekeeping. Although this small neutral force was no real barrier to armed conflict, its connection with the UN—a major forum of world opinion—gave it tremendous psychological leverage. For propaganda reason alone, neither side wished to endanger the lives of neutrals. Secretary General Thant may have responded too quickly to Egyptian President Nasser's demand that the force be withdrawn. Even a short delay would have enabled the pressure of world public opinion to be brought to bear on Nasser. Thant's immediate task in his mission to Cairo is to reduce the war hysteria that now grips the region. We hope he is successful. But the Palestine Liberation Organization, with even a handful of terrorists, can make Thant's task impossible if it proceeds with its threat to step up its raids into Israel.
>
> This is the great menace of these tactics. They involve the most extreme elements in a society in a type of warfare that suits them well. In Vietnam, large sections of the South came under the sway of the Viet Cong because a terrorist minority was willing to enforce its will through murder, mutilation and kidnaping. In Vietnam, however, the U.S. has stood firm against these tactics.

This, in turn, has forced the expansionists from the North, who have the backing of world communism, to fall back on more classic modes of warfare. Increasing numbers of North Vietnamese regulars are being thrown into the war.

The Communists call the events in Vietnam a "war of national liberation." In this new and more subtle game of power politics, such wars, coupled with strong propaganda efforts, are their main strategy. That is why the outcome of Vietnam is so vital. The U.S. has been learning to meet the new style of Communist expansionism in Vietnam. To blunt the propaganda war, we have tried to help the Vietnamese peasant. To defeat the terrorists and the guerrillas, we have evolved new military tactics.

The power play by the East, however, is not confined to Vietnam. The Communists are active wherever it is possible to provoke unrest and violence. The rioting in Hong Kong is a good example. From their base in Cuba, the Communists have been training and dispersing guerrillas and terrorists to the nations of Latin America. Their propaganda offensive talks of "Yankee imperialism." And some listen to them because guerrillas and terrorists are relative newcomers to the balance of power equation.

Too many people look for the old elements of the equation-massed armies and great alliances, in assessing what is happening in the world today. This makes the propaganda and tactics of the extremists that much more difficult to recognize. But it is still the irresponsible game of power politics being played by power-hungry men that is at the root of much of the unrest in today's world.

Congressman Frank Horton Salutes the Volunteer Firefighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, there are 250,000 volunteer firefighters throughout this country who daily give up their time and, in many cases, endanger their own lives, for the sake of the safety of their neighbors.

These groups of civic-minded men and women have banded together in the spirit of selflessness which is a heritage in the United States.

The loosely gathered, uncoordinated groups of men who hauled buckets to the scenes of fires in the early days of our history are a far cry from the volunteer companies of our modern era. Volunteer fire companies in the 36th Congressional District are skilled and well led. Through their efforts, they have acquired the best and most sophisticated modern firefighting equipment.

I know firsthand of the exemplary work done in Monroe and Wayne Counties by volunteer firefighters. They have saved countless lives and thousands of dollar in property.

Seldom do we have the time to stop in our busy schedules to pay honor to these men who, because they are always present, seldom are noticed.

Recently, I had the opportunity to speak before a group of volunteer firefighters from Marion, N.Y., a community in my district. It gave me the opportunity to laud the dedication and public service which they render daily to the communities in which they live.

I should like to offer it to my colleagues today:

FIREFIGHTING: A NOBLE PURSUIT

Ever since man discovered fire, he has been struggling to control it. And the tried and true method of fighting fires with able-bodied volunteers, which reaches back to the earliest days of civilization, is still employed today in thousands of communities across the United States.

I am here tonight to pay tribute to the Marion Fire Department and to the more than 250,000 volunteer firefighters throughout this country who give their time and their efforts, without compensation, to their community so that it may be a safer place in which to live. The role of the volunteer firefighter is well symbolized by the motto which appeared on a United States commemorative stamp issued some 20 years ago in honor of the 300th anniversary of the passage of the first law setting up the rudiments of a volunteer firefighting organization. It read: "Unselfish Public Service—Courage—Duty." What words could better describe the men who dash from their homes on a moment's notice to save houses, property, and even lives? I think it is fitting indeed that we take time out here tonight to give all of you a well deserved word of thanks.

Firefighting has a long and rich tradition. In the early days of Rome, guards were posted to watch for the outbreak of fire, and slaves were volunteered by their masters to put out the blaze. Emperor Augustus had so organized volunteer firefighting that he had a 7,000 man fire department at his command. The Middle Ages, however, saw a decline in firefighting techniques, and the larger cities of the period had to depend on a rough and not always too-ready volunteer service. Following the great London fire of 1666, it became apparent that a more organized regular volunteer fire protection service was needed.

In colonial America, the first specialized equipment for fighting fires was the leather bucket. In the better organized communities, a watchman would run through the streets of the town shouting, "Throw out your buckets!" which would then be collected by the volunteers rushing to put out the fire. This, of course gave rise to the well-known "bucket brigade," by which one line of persons filled the buckets in the nearest river or stream and passed them up to the location of the fire, and the other line passed the empties back in the opposite direction.

The first volunteer fire company was formed in Philadelphia in 1736, largely as a result of the writings of Benjamin Franklin in his *Pennsylvania Gazette*. He called for a volunteer fire organization to do away with "riots and fool's play" at fires. Firefighting was an even more hazardous occupation in those days than it is today. Because of the lack of good communications, the fires were usually out of control before the volunteers could even reach the scene. Then the engines pumped so feebly that the men had to stand virtually on top of the flames in order to extinguish them, and there was a constant and continuing threat that the uncertain water supply would run out at any minute.

But the heyday of the volunteer firefighters was during the 19th century, and many a glorious story of the heroic deeds of the "smoke-eaters" came out of those days. The volunteer firefighters were an individualistic, free-thinking lot, and the rivalries that developed between the different companies were fierce. Each would try to outdo the other in fancy uniforms, "customized" equipment, and breakneck speed. In many cases collisions would occur on the way to a fire, with ensuing fights between the rival companies, and the flames would have to go unchecked until they died of their own accord. But it was not all brawling and boasting for those community heroes, the volunteer firefighters. They made themselves a vital and prominent part of community life by taking in persons who were homeless and helpless as the result of a fire, and by holding "specials" to raise money for the benefit of those who had suffered through such a tragedy.

Fire insurance companies worked right alongside the volunteer firefighters to help the victims and protect personal property from fire. Unwittingly, it was they who helped spur on the rivalries between the different firefighting groups, by offering prizes to the one which arrived at the scene of the fire first with water on the flames! It had been quickly recognized in the American colonies that steps had to be taken to protect the community and its citizens from loss of wealth through fire. The first such venture into fire insurance was short-lived, but the second, the Philadelphia Contributorship For the Insurance of Houses From Loss By Fire, is still in business today. Other companies soon joined the field.

Fire marks were placed on insured buildings to alert the "smoke-eaters" to the possibility of rewards for putting out a fire in that building, and to let vandals know that there was no use in destroying the property for the owner would be reimbursed. The insurance companies also organized volunteer groups to remove personal property from burning buildings to protect it from further damage. In time, of course, special salvage corps were formed by insurance underwriters to perform these functions, many of which are carried out in smaller areas by volunteer fire companies today. Other contributions of the insurance companies to the science of firefighting were the encouragement of the development of improved firefighting equipment and the education of the public to the dangers of fire and on methods of prevention.

Eventually and inevitably, the old volunteer fire companies gave way to professional fire departments in the large cities and towns, and gradually the system as we know it today developed. But where the volunteers were not supplanted by professionals, these unpaid men continued to risk life, limb, and job for the service of the community. They are no longer "curious outlets for pioneer exuberance that combined firefighting with quarreling among themselves," as they were once characterized, but they still perform the same services as their red-shirted predecessors of bygone age. With improved firefighting equipment and new technology, inspired by the professional departments in large measure, the volunteers have had to learn a lot more about the science of fighting fires. And this they have done, to such an extent that one writer would say: "Today many volunteer companies have apparatus that would shame most professional departments. Special paint jobs and other features of some such equipment are inferior to none in the land."

I am proud of the efforts of our volunteer firefighters and of the personal sacrifices they make in order to carry out their duties. I have, therefore, introduced two bills this year which I hope will make it easier for organizations such as yours to serve the community. One provides that a volunteer fire company shall not lose its tax exempt status by carrying on business with the general public, by reason of fund raising activities, or by reason of social activities for the pleasure and recreation of its members if the net earnings of all such activities are used for firefighting purposes. The other proposal extends to volunteer fire companies and volunteer ambulance and rescue companies the rates of postage on second-class and third-class bulk mailings applicable to other nonprofit organizations. This, I think, is the least we can do to show our gratitude. You may be sure that I shall continue to press for action on this legislation by the Congress.

The struggle to control fire continues. And in the small towns and rural areas of the United States, volunteer organizations are in the vanguard. In such communities the volunteer firefighter is the same respected citizen he was in the days of the mid-1800's. He is more law-abiding, and his competitiveness is restricted to special days, but those same old virtues of courage and unselfish service to the community are just as evident today as they were then. Firefighting is a serious business.

I know that you gather here tonight primarily to honor sixteen of your most valued members—men who have dedicated uncounted hours to their fellow citizens in service to the Marion Fire Department.

Our communities could not operate without men such as you, who devote so much time and energy to unselfish work. And such as these who have been decorated tonight form the nucleus of a community which can truthfully say "this is a good place to live."

I know first-hand of the exploits of firefighters in Wayne County, Rochester and Monroe County. Every day, at the risk of bodily injury, they work to save lives and property. The work of our fire departments at recent major fires in our area reaffirms my confidence in these great men.

And there have been those, we know, who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the pursuit of their duties. I am sure that you shared with me a deep sadness over the deaths of the 12 brave New York City firefighters who gave their lives recently when a building collapsed as they faithfully did their jobs.

The nearby City of Syracuse maintains a monument to its nine brave firefighters who died in the infamous Collins Block fire in 1939. Their memories will again be honored on this Memorial Day.

These are events which keep the communities of this nation always mindful of the debt they owe to their firefighters.

Despite the great advances in technological know-how and improved equipment, tremendous losses as a result of fire occur every year in this country. The per capita death rate from fires in the United States is higher than that of any of the world's major nations, and in 1965 $1.75 billion in property was lost as a result of fire. The job of educating the public in fire prevention methods and of obtaining their cooperation in the field of firefighting must be pursued on an even larger scale. We must reduce the awful waste of lives and property caused by fires. I know we can count on you, the willing volunteers, to continue to press the fight on all sides as you have in the past. And we, the citizens of the communities you serve, will support you in any way we can.

"Public Service—Courage—Duty"—a well earned tribute to you, the members of the Marion Volunteer Fire Department.

Address of Representative W. S. (Bill) Stuckey, Jr., Before the Georgia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 29, 1967, the Honorable W. S. "BILL" STUCKEY, JR., Member of Congress from the Eighth District of Georgia, made an address to the annual meeting of Georgia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in Waycross, Ga.

The content of this masterful address so clearly states some of the problems faced by Americans today that I am pleased to commend his remarks to the attention of our colleagues:

It is a very great pleasure and an honor for me to visit here again in Waycross—and especially to meet with and pay my highest respects to the members of your great organization.

I appreciate this chance to be here with you today because I know . . . as I believe you know also . . . that we are gathering together at an important time in our history.

This crucial year . . . when segments of our society are thumbing their noses at our government under law which has cost so many patriotic Americans if the Sons of the American Revolution don't care . . . or don't dare?

When the home-front Vietcong wear as many masks as they do today, who will alert us if the sentries sleep?

I know people may ask "what's the idea behind the Sons of the American Revolution?" What is the star you steer by? What is the bond that's held almost 10 generations of dedicated men together? What keeps free men of all sizes and shapes and cultural backgrounds pulling in the same direction. . . saluting the same flag?

This is no small miracle in this age of compromise and accommodation and retreat. Some new organization or well-intentioned association of men is somewhere every day born only to fade away . . . and yet the sons of the sons of the sons of the American Revolution march on and on in an unending column across the decades of American history. So we have a right to ask "Why?" "How did this come about?"

You know, a great American President, Theodore Roosevelt, said many years ago that a man must be a good patriot of his country before he can become a good citizen of the world, and that we must lead by *example.*

Our example was set even before this great country became a nation. The ideal for which so many early Americans had paid so much in arms and legs and eyes and lives was a divinely inspired concept that men must govern from the bottom up . . . that centralized governmental power corrupts.

This was what our forefathers fought for over 190 years ago . . . . and this is what our nation has fought to preserve in every war and every conflict ever since.

But shortly after the close of World War II, a new kind of war emerged—a cold war. And patriotic men throughout our land soon came to realize that they were not really out of the trenches yet—nor would they ever be. For now . . . just as in the earliest days of this Nation . . . eternal vigilance must forever be the price of liberty.

Just within this century alone, in World War I and World War II, Americans fought once again shoulder to shoulder, seeking to defend those things which we hold precious—God and country.

But even now we are fighting a battle right here at home—we are fighting those spokesmen of an alien, totalitarian philosophy who are seeking to subvert both our heritage of God and of Country.

And half-way around the world today American fighting men of yet another war are wanting to get it over and get home.

They don't quite understand it when they hear of American warplanes that are ordered to fly past an enemy missile base only to bomb a wooden bridge . . . and then fly home only to have to return again the next day.

They don't quite understand it when they are sent 2,000 miles away and are asked to die to repel Communism . . . when just 90 miles from our own shore we don't dare!

It is true that as a Nation our arms are mostly strong—but our hearts are becoming weak. And the precious heritage of our Country was born to live in the *hearts* of men.

I think we have a right to ask: Where did we get off the track?

Just look back.

I believe you and I will agree that it was the day we first began to drift away from reverence to God and loyalty to Country—the two basic traits which have always distinguished Americans as Americans.

God, as you know, has already been evicted from the classroom . . . and may soon be excluded from the courthouse and the halls of government . . . and even from his own churches.

And as for *Country?* . . . well, patriotism today seems to have been supplanted by a new, unworthy allegiance to a growing super-government. Preachers and Professors and certain self-styled national leaders are eager to join with enemy agents and hooligan student drop-outs who seek to subvert the international posture of our Country . . . while openly inciting disregard for the domestic laws of our land.

Too many Americans today have begun to subscribe to an "ism" alien to what ours once was. Too many Americans are urging now that Big Government force feed the poor and force bleed the rest.

Too many Americans demand now that Big Government administer their charity and prescribe their medicine and get them a job—and even pay them for not working at all! And for all these increasing services we are asked to pay with an increasing number of cheaper dollars.

Too many Americans have stood by too long and witnessed the Federal Government veto state and individual prerogatives in areas such as voting . . . education . . . employment . . . welfare . . . wage rates . . . and even our highway billboards.

I say that as government takes it upon itself to assume responsibility for our daily bread, then government seeks to become a religion—and the graveyard of history is already overflowing with governments of that type.

I believe that if we would live as a Nation it is your formula which must become ours again.

If we would lead . . . as Teddy Roosevelt said . . . we must lead by example.

Too many Americans don't seem to realize that the American Revolution was not an event over and done with in the past. Rather, it is a revolution which is continuing . . . and must continue for as long as there are those among us strong enough to fight and courageous enough to think.

We are a revolutionary people who are not afraid to meet or to make change—yet while never losing sight of our deeply-rooted foundations in Christianity and in a philosophy of constitutional government.

I say we are revolutionary enough to believe for example that progress can never be *legislated* . . . but rather that it must come . . . first of all . . . from the hearts of men and women who are *aware* . . . and who are *involved*.

As Americans in this modern age, we are all involved more deeply than ever before . . . and more dependent than ever before . . . upon the military might of our country . . . and upon the quality and devotion of our military men in uniform.

I believe all of us have a direct involvement, therefore, with one particular aspect of our military establishment which is coming under heavy fire today from concerned, patriotic groups all over this Country. I refer, of course, to the present system of military selective service—the draft.

In one way or another, I believe, the present military draft laws have an effect—and often place a burden—on almost every member of our society . . . regardless of age or sex or position in life.

Obviously, it places a burden on the young man who is drafted and thereby compelled to postpone the hopes and plans of his life for the period of time he serves in the armed forces.

But also it places a burden on our business economy when business firms are forced to be reluctant to hire capable young men in the 20-to-26 age group simply because the demands of military service might carry them away at any moment.

And then, too, it places a burden on the taxpayer who is forced to spend approximately $2.4-billion dollars each year to train those men who are drafted—92 per cent of whom are unwilling to re-enlist once their period of service is over.

I believe it can be said that our present system of military draft is *obsolete* . . . *unfair* . . . and plain *wasteful*.

It is *obsolete* because it was designed to meet the needs of twenty-five years ago.

It is *unfair* because thanks to the population explosion, the proportion of draft-eligible young men who are actually called upon to serve has steadily gone down. To illustrate this, the number of draft-eligible young men has grown from 20-million in 1951—when the present draft system went into effect—to almost 40-million today. As a result, the percentage of these men who are actually called upon to serve has declined from 70 per cent to 46 per cent in just ten years.

Finally, the present draft system is *wasteful* because the military services presently spend approximately $6,000 per man to train unwilling draftees in skills they are rarely able to use in later life . . . and skills which they usually forget once their tour of duty is over.

Now, if the draft is really as undesirable as this, and if it ought to be replaced, the obvious question is "what are we going to replace it with?"

Well, I for one, have always believed that the lessons of the past provide the best advice for the future. I believe that just as in the earlier days of this Republic we can and should man our armed forces with volunteers—just as the United States has traditionally done except in major wars.

I realize that those who oppose this idea will immediately reply that a volunteer army is not feasible because . . . at the present time . . . too few men volunteer.

I grant that this is true, but there is little wonder that too few men volunteer when the starting pay, including cost of keep, comes to about $45 dollars a week. In fact, the financial conditions are so bad that thousands of draftees are forced to go on welfare while they are in the service just to support their wives and children back home.

Ordinary common sense will tell you that more volunteers could be attracted—and in the same way could be persuaded to remain in the service—if we simply paid decent market wages.

Now, estimates of how much the total military pay would have to go up vary from $4 to $17-billion dollars a year. But though these may seem like high figures, we are presently paying a much greater amount under the present selective service system.

Not only are we virtually wasting billions of dollars to train men who don't want to be trained and who are eager to get out of the service and forget all their training as soon as they can . . . but we are paying a much greater tax in a concealed form.

When you look at it in terms of economics, conscription is a hidden tax. It is forced labor which the government collects from the men who serve involuntarily. The monetary amount of this hidden tax varies from individual to individual—depending upon how much the particular draftee would have made had he not been drafted.

My friends, as men with a respect for our Country's great heritage, we believe in basing our actions upon sound, proven experience. I believe this proposal for a volunteer army has a firm basis in the experience of history . . . and I hope to support this proposal in Congress at the earliest suitable opportunity.

But in the meantime, I want to assure each and every one of you that I have always had . . . and I shall continue to have . . . the most profound respect for the Sons of the American Revolution. And because we share so many of the same values and fundamental American beliefs, I invite your counsel and advice in my work as a member of the United States House of Representatives.

In conclusion, I just want to say that I have appreciated this chance to get together with you here . . . and I look forward to the chance to work together with you even more closely in the future.

I hope that I will soon be a member of your esteemed organization.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 29, 1967

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senate, under the previous order, will now stand adjourned until noon Wednesday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 1967

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 8 seconds a.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order of Wednesday, May 24, 1967, until Wednesday, May 31, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 29, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

MAY 29, 1967.

I hereby designate the Honorable MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Rev. Jack P. Lowndes, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

This day shall be unto you for a memorial.—Exodus 12: 14.

Down the path of national life we have come, our Father, through wars and difficulties to victories. As we come today we glory not in war but the unselfish sacrifice of all those who gave and are giving "the last full measure." At this memorial season we are filled with gratitude for Thy blessings upon us in the past.

Not unmindful of the past we remember that Thou art present now. Make us conscious of Thy present power to help. Overrule all councils of men and nations that plan war, either presently or ultimately. Help us to learn to live at peace with one another in our world and with Thee.

Remembering the past and Thy blessings we live with confidence as we face the future. We depend upon Thee as we seek to find peace on earth. As a memorial to our brave men of the past help us to devote our energies to building a peaceful world.

Give, we pray, special wisdom, guidance and strength to our President, the Members of Congress, and all of our national leaders. Make us to realize that only those lands are truly prosperous and happy whose leaders are led by the spirit of God. Give us men in these troubled days in whose hearts is the fear of the Lord and whose greatest ambition is to serve and do Thy will.

"Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 25, 1967, was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY GRANTED MAY 25, 1967

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker on Thursday, May 25, 1967, the Speaker did, on May 26, 1967, sign the following enrolled bills of the House:

H.R. 5357. An act to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89–487; and

H.R. 9481. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL RESERVE CONTINUES ITS ANTIPUBLIC MONETARY POLICIES

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Board, contrary to the impression it attempts to leave, has not rolled interest rates back. Long-term bond yields and rates remain at their alltime modern highs.

Short-term rates are down principally because investors remain unconvinced of the Federal Reserve Board's intent to stabilize the long-term Government bond rates at reasonable and low levels.

Top-grade corporate bond yields are once again back to a 6-percent level, and even tax-exempt bonds are above 4 percent. Several large municipalities and corporations have delayed bond sales and several more bond sales which have taken place since mid-April have been unsuccessful.

The housing market, which was forced into a depression by the action of the Federal Reserve Board in December 1965 when they raised interest rates by 37½ percent, remains in a relative depression, and unless the Federal Reserve Board takes appropriate action, it will get worse.

With the now predicted large Federal deficit required to fight the Vietnam war, the Federal Reserve must move immediately to support the long-term Government bond market or else the Federal Government will soon find itself paying $20 billion a year in interest on the Federal debt instead of the now already exorbitant $14.2 billion. Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks—ever since the Secretary of the Treasury in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee called for a redefinition of maturity terms of U.S. notes and partial elimination of the 4¼-percent statutory ceiling on long-term Government bonds—I have been communicating with Members of this body on this subject. I am highly encouraged by the response from the Members of the House in opposition to any attempt to remove the 4¼-percent statutory ceiling which has been in effect for 50 years. I feel equally certain that any move to redefine a Treasury note so that in principle the 4¼-percent statutory ceiling will be eliminated will also be defeated. It is most unfitting, Mr. Speaker, for a Democratic administration at any time to be arguing for higher interest rates and especially at this time when such rates on long-term Governments are again approaching alltime highs.

The primary responsibility, however, for the plight we now find ourselves in as far as monetary policy is concerned rests with the Federal Reserve Board. I would not call it treasonable, Mr. Speaker, but I do charge that the Federal Reserve Board has broken faith with the American people when—at this time of war—it allows such chaos to rein in the money market. Unless the Federal Reserve takes immediate action to correct this situation, we in the Congress and the administration will have to bear the sole responsibility for the actions of this unelected group of men who consider themselves to be above the people, the Congress, and the President.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to report on the fine progress being made by the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In just the short time they have been in operation they have already proved their worth with every expectation they will be even more successful in the years ahead.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is providing useful and constructive job opportunities for 1,135 young people within the First District and 660 others are working in multicounty programs serving both the First and Fourth Districts.

These NYC projects are providing urgently needed wages to the young participants as well as the job skills so important for self-improvement in today's world, and many of them have been given the boost they have needed to stay in school and complete their high school education. Mr. Speaker, the longrun value of these projects seems to me to be clearly beyond doubt, and they are being administered in a highly effective fashion, chiefly through the local community action agencies serving the counties where the projects are operating. I have been very favorably impressed by this ability of the poverty program to effectively combine and coordinate, on both the national and local levels, the various projects which help poor people to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, there are three community action agencies within my district—the Rusk-Cherokee Cap, Inc., the Bowie County Economic Advancement Corp., and the Net Opportunities, Inc., which serves Hopkins, Franklin, and Titus Counties in my district, and Rains County in the Fourth District. These locally developed and locally directed antipoverty agencies have received a total of $209,787 during this fiscal year, a very modest sum when measured against the degree of need in several of our counties. With these funds, locally planned projects have been developed and put into action, including some very promising housing assistance and job training projects. I earnestly hope that my distinguished colleagues will support an adequate level of community action funding in the next fiscal year, so that these worthwhile local projects may continue and grow.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, three Headstart projects—which are such a blessing to underprivileged children and their families—have been approved for my district this fiscal year, and more assistance in this area is greatly needed. Headstart is a marvelous program, and I want to stress my support for what it is doing for deprived families in east Texas.

It is not simply the young who are being helped to help themselves, Mr. Speaker. There are several effective adult basic education classes operating in my district, providing greater opportunity to 330 disadvantaged adults. And 59 separate rural opportunity loans—totaling $110,660—have been extended to individuals and families in the First District, under a program administered by the Farmers Home Administration in cooperation with OEO.

Mr. Speaker, in my district the war against poverty is proving to be an extremely worthwhile investment, which promises to make a crucial difference in the future lives of thousands of my constituents, whose families have previously been locked into the grim cycle of chronic poverty. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute the job the program is doing, and the way in which it is being guided and directed here in Washington by Sargent Shriver at the OEO. We in east Texas have been particularly fortunate in having had Bill Crook as our regional director for 2 years—he did so well he is now in Washington as head of VISTA—his successor, Walter Richter, is living up to the Bill Crook legend in the best tradition of the West. Based on the sampling of OEO administrators with whom I have worked, and whose accomplishments I have observed, I feel that this program is a remarkable blend of what is practicable and what is morally and socially right and desirable. We should consider no form of retreat in this vital effort, Mr. Speaker, and I trust that my distinguished colleagues will join me in supporting the proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 later this year.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EAST TEXAS BAPTIST COLLEGE

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of East Texas Baptist College, one of the Nation's outstanding educational institutions, located at Marshall, Tex., in the heart of the piney woods. The significance of the occasion has been well noted and described in the May 24 issue of that distinguished weekly publication, the Baptist Standard, as follows:

Baptist General Convention of Texas—East Texas Baptist College Finishes 50 Years of Service

(By Don McGregor)

In the beautiful piney woods of deep East Texas, nestled among the trees on top of Van Zandt Hill in Marshall, is East Texas Baptist College.

The school has served Texas and Texas Baptists for 50 years, for its first opened its doors for an eight-week session in the summer of 1917. Its first regular semester session began that fall.

W. T. Tardy is credited with being the originator of the idea of beginning a Baptist college in East Texas, and he began his efforts as early as 1911. In 1912 the school received a charter.

The Van Zandt Hill name is due to the obtaining of the 100-acre Van Zandt homestead as the school site. Fifty acres of the land on top of the hill was retained for the campus, and the remainder was sold as city lots.

Later a plot of 43 acres adjoining the campus to the north was acquired, giving the school an area of 93 acres.

On Sept. 1, 1913, T. C. Gardner became president. That year the Baptist General Convention of Texas agreed to build and maintain a school in Marshall if a campus and $30,000 for a building would be provided.

A successful fund-raising campaign was held in Marshall in 1914, and ground was broken on July 5, 1915 for Marshall Hall, the first building on the campus of what was then named the College of Marshall.

Gardner left the presidency during 1916 and began his long career as Training Union secretary for the state convention. H. E. Watters became president, and during that year the first building was completed.

SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

In 1944, under the presidency of H. D. Bruce, two significant changes were made. The name was changed to East Texas Baptist College, and the status was changed from a junior college to a four-year institution.

There were eight in the first graduating class in 1945.

Enrollment has continued to climb until there is a need for more dormitory space. During the last full school year the enrollment was more than 800.

The purpose of the college is based on two guiding principles. They are that the liberal arts form the surest foundation for education and that the Christian faith provides the surest foundation for life. Thus it is that East Texas Baptist College is a four-year liberal arts college that seeks to provide a Christian education.

Degrees offered are the bachelor of arts, the bachelor of science, and the bachelor of music.

The college is accredited and holds membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the Association of American Colleges, and the Association of Texas Colleges and Universities. It has been approved by the Texas Education Agency for teacher certification and holds membership in the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Howard C. Bennett became president of the college in 1960.

The campus and buildings are now valued at more than $3.5 million. There are 10 buildings on the campus. These include four dormitories and a dining hall that also contains a recreation center. There are also several apartments on campus for married students.

The original structure is still in use as a classroom and administration building, and it was remodeled in 1957. Then there is a science hall, a library building that also contains offices, a music building and chapel, and a gymnasium.

TOTAL ASSETS

Total assets of the school are $5.7 million and increasing. Endowment funds reported in the 1966 BGCT *Book of Reports* were almost $1.3 million. Also the college recently was successful in matching a $500,000 challenge gift from Carr P. Collins Sr. of Dallas for additional endowment, making an eventual total of more than $2.3 million.

East Texas Baptist College serves a large segment of the state and beyond the borders of Texas. The nearest Baptist school to the west is in Dallas, to the south its is in Houston, and to the east it is in Arkadelphia, Ark. There is no Southern Baptist affiliated school to the north.

Texas Baptists have a part in the ministry of education being conducted at East Texas Baptist College as they ssupport it through regular channels and through additional gifts and efforts.

TEXAS SMALL BUSINESSMAN OF THE YEAR—DUDLEY H. SNYDER III, OF MARSHALL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the high honor of being selected Small Businessman of the Year for the State of Texas has been awarded Mr. Dudley H. Snyder III, of Marshall. I consider this a really exceptional achievement because our small businessmen are the shock troops of industry—single entrepreneurs who are willing to commit their own limited financial resources in the competitive arena of the American free enterprise system which is only too often dominated by the giants of industry.

In this challenging but difficult environment the small businessman must depend upon his own managerial skills and business acumen for survival. A successful small business which also serves the community through constructive projects and the employment of local residents is a tribute both to its ownership and to our society which continues to offer opportunity for independent self-advancement in the business world. The following news article from the Marshall News Messenger of May 25, 1967, describes Mr. Snyder's inspiring accomplishments which merit the congratulations of all Americans:

TOP SBA PRIZE—SNYDER GETS STATE AWARD

D. H. Snyder, III, of Marshall was named here Thursday as the Texas Small Businessman of the Year.

Snyder was cited at an award ceremony held in the Small Business Administration Regional Office in Marshall. Robert E. West, area administrator of SBA, Dallas, was in Marshall to make the announcement.

This award is presented annually to the head of an independently owned small business which has had more than routine success during the previous year.

President Johnson has proclaimed the week of May 21 as "National Small Business Week," and in addition to the different state awards, a "National Small Businessman of the Year" will be selected and the award presented in Washington, D.C. this week.

Nominations for the Texas award were made by Regional Offices of the Small Business Administration located in Dallas, Houston, Lubbock, Marshall, and San Antonio, Texas.

The award in the form of a certificate signed by Bernard L. Boutin, Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C. was presented to Snyder Thursday morning by West and local SBA officials Harry Martin, regional director, and Samuel D. Beaver, chief, financial assistance division. When presenting the award, the SBA officials cited several accomplishments which won this outstanding award for Snyder.

Snyder is president and 99 per cent owner of D. H. Snyder & Company which is his principal business interest. This business was established in 1955 with its major interest being in the construction of commercial and residential buildings. Sales for this concern have shown a rapid increase during the last three years. In 1964 the corporation had sales of about $49,000; in the year 1965, $396,000; in the year 1966, in excess of $600,000. Profits generated by the company have shown an upward trend in direct proportion to the increased sales.

As recently as 1964, the company's average employment was less than ten. Today the company has in excess of 20 employees. "This rise is amazing when you take into consideration that the expansion has been accomplished at a time when the building industry was on a downward trend," SBA officials said.

D. H. Snyder & Company has been the general contractor on two large projects in this area within the last year. The projects consisted of an office building in Marshall, Texas having a project cost of approximately $250,000 and a building for the Carthage Cup Company, with the contract being in the neighborhood of $125,000. The company has been awarded contracts on two large projects recently. These projects consist of renovation and additions to the South Marshall Elementary School having a project cost of $250,000 and the construction of the Alamo Square Shopping Center having a project cost in the neighborhood of $250,000.

Two of the projects which Snyder has been involved in are located in an area which was formerly razed through an urban renewal project. Officials said new construction in this area has and will do much to rejuvinate an area in the City of Marshall "which heretofore had been less than desirable, both from an economic and beautification standpoint.

"This small businessman's belief in the future of the local economy is well evidenced by his substantial investment in these new projects," they said.

The new office building located at 505 E. Travis St. represents the only major new commercial office space which has been constructed and financed through private capital in Marshall within the last few years.

Snyder has been instrumental in establishing four other businesses which compliment the D. H. Snyder & Company operations. These businesses consist of Barney's Electrical Service, Quality Woodcraft, Inc., Snyder Realty, Inc., and Colonial Art & Decorating, Inc.

These additional businesses furnish employment to eight persons. Even though the sales of these four additional businesses do not amount to half of the sales generated by D. H. Snyder & Company, the establishment of these businesses has given D. H. Snyder & Company ready access to the necessary services which are needed in the operation of his principal business interest.

Local SBA officials stated that in addition to the success which Snyder has achieved in the operation of a small business concern his relations with his employees and his contributions to the community were also recognized in making the award to him. They stated Snyder had not only advocated fair and equal employment standards for all workers but had practiced this same principle in the hiring of his own employees which are composed of several persons belonging to minority races."

Snyder's outside activities include membership in community and civic organizations and church affiliation. He is a past member of the city commission; presently serves on the Board of Directors of the Peoples State Bank; is an active member of the Rotary Club; and has been elected president of the Maverick Boosters Club for the coming year.

He is a member of the Trinity Episcopal Church where he served as building chairman for the church's All Saints Hall. He was named Marshall's Realtor of the Year in 1966 and was elected president of the Board of Realtors for the year 1967. The SBA officials stated they believed Snyder's introduction which he was given when receiving the Realtor of the Year Award best summed up this small businessman's philosophy and was well worth repeating. In this introduction he was described as "a young man with a fancy to build a better Marshall."

INTRODUCTION OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATIVE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, by request of the Small Business Administration, two bills to amend the Small Business Act, the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The first of these bills, which amends the Small Business Acts, is divided into two titles.

TITLE I

SECTION 1

Section 1 of title I provides that, when the bill is enacted, this title may be cited as the "Small Business Act Amendments of 1967."

SECTION 2

Section 2 of title I would effect four amendments to the provisions of section 4(c)(4) of the Small Business Act governing the amount of loans, guarantees, and other obligations or commitments which may be outstanding at any one time from the business loan and investment fund of SBA. The first of these amendments would increase from $1,400,000,000 to $1,900,000,000 the amount which may be outstanding from the fund at any one time under sections 7(a), 7(b)(3), 7(e), and 8(a) of this act, and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The second amendment would increase from $400,000,000 to $450,000,000 the amount which may be outstanding at any one time under title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The third amendment would increase from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 the amount which may be outstanding at any one time under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The fourth amendment would increase from $100,000,000 to $200,000,000 the amount which may be outstanding at any one time under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The Congress has indicated its intent that, at the first session of each Congress, SBA is to submit an estimate of the needs of the business loan program, authorized by section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, not merely for the coming fiscal year but for the two succeeding fiscal years as well—House Report No. 1974, 87th Congress, second session. Accordingly, a review has been made of the probable requirements of the program through June 30, 1970, based on a straight-line projection of fiscal year 1968 budget estimates for this program. However, the amount of the limitation applicable to this particular program—$1,400,000,000—also limits in addition the maximum outstanding amount for displaced business loans under section 7(b)(3), trade adjustment assistance loans under section 7(e), prime contracting activities under section 8(a) and business loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Consequently, in order to determine the increased limitation amount adequate as of June 30, 1970, to cover the probable requirements for all the activities covered by the one specific limitation, straight-line projections of the 1968 budget estimates have also been made for the other loan programs identified above—no prime contracting activities under section 8(a) have been entered into nor are any presently contemplated.

These projections indicate that a limitation of about $1,816,000,000 is needed for the combined loan activities. In order to provide a reasonable reserve for contingencies, it is recommended that the limitation amount be increased from $1,400,000,000 to $1,900,000,000.

INCREASED TO $200,000,000

The projected amount outstanding at June 30, 1970, for business loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as included in the figure of $1,816,000,000 cited above, is slightly in excess of $176,000,000. Allowing in this instance also a reserve for contingencies, it is recommended that the present limitation of $100,000,000 for title IV loans be increased to $200,000,000. With further reference to this limitation, the budget estimates for 1968 indicate that this is the only one of the four under discussion which will be exceeded prior to June 30, 1968. This makes it essential that congressional action on an increase be taken during the first session of the 90th Congress, if the program is not to be curtailed.

Section 4(c)(4) establishes a separate limitation of $400,000,000 on the amount of loans, guarantees, and so forth, which may be outstanding at any one time under title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. Estimates have been made of transactions through June 30, 1970, also. These indicate a need for a limitation of about $430 million without any provisions for contingencies. Allowing for a small reserve, it is recommended that the limitation of $400,000,000 be increased to $450,000,000.

Section 4(c)(4) establishes an additional separate limitation of $200,000,000 on the amount of loans, guarantees, and so forth, which may be outstanding at any one time under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958—loans to States and local development companies. The budget estimates for 1968 indicate that for all practical purposes this limitation will have been reached by June 30 of that year. Accordingly, straight-line projections through June 30, 1970, of probable limitation requirements for these loans have been made. These projections indicate a need for a limitation of $272 million, without any provision for contingencies. Including a small reserve, it is recommended that the present limitation of $200,000,000 be increased to $300,000,000.

Estimated business loan limitation requirements, fiscal years 1967–70

[In millions]

		Budget estimates		Projected	
		Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
Outstanding loans and commitments, start of year		$1,004.5	$1,135.6	$1,399.7	$1,630.3
Plus new loan approvals:					
7(a) business		308.7	476.6	476.6	476.6
Economic opportunity		50.0	60.0	60.0	60.0
Displaced business		30.0	35.0	35.0	35.0
Trade adjustment		1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Total		389.9	572.8	572.8	572.8
Minus repayments and cancellations:					
7(a) business		247.1	285.4	308.4	342.1
Economic opportunity		7.0	14.4	21.5	28.9
Displaced business		4.7	8.9	12.3	15.8
Trade adjustment					
Total		258.8	308.7	342.2	386.8
Outstanding loans and commitments, end of year		$1,135.6	$1,399.7	$1,630.3	$1,816.3
Plus contingency reserve				69.7	83.7
Recommended limitation				1,700.0	1,900.0
Memorandum:					
Outstanding by program:	June 30, 1966				
7(a) business	$947.7	1,009.3	1,200.5	1,368.7	1,503.2
Economic opportunity	17.9	60.9	106.5	145.0	176.1
Displaced business	38.9	64.2	90.3	113.0	132.2
Trade adjustment		1.2	2.4	3.6	4.8

Estimated investment company limitation requirements, fiscal years 1967–70

[In millions]

		Revised estimate, fiscal year 1967	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1968	Projected	
				Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
Outstanding loans and commitments, start of year		$300.9	$315.0	$350.0	$390.0
Plus new loan approvals		25.0	55.0	55.0	55.0
Purchase of SBIC debentures (sec. 302)		8.9			
Loans to SBIC's (sec. 303)		16.1			
Minus repayment and cancellations		10.9	20.0	15.0	15.0
SBIC debentures (sec. 302)		7.4			
SBIC loans (sec. 303)		3.5			
Outstanding loans and commitments, end of year		315.0	350.0	390.0	43.0
	June 30, 1966				
SBIC debentures (sec. 302)	$158.9	160.4			
SBIC loans (sec. 303)	142.0	154.6			
Plus contingency reserves				10.0	20.0
Recommended limitation				400.0	450.0

Estimated development company limitation requirements, fiscal years 1967–70

[In millions]

	Budget estimates		Projected	
	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
Outstanding loans and commitments, start of year	$120.1	$157.1	$198.1	$236.4
Plus new loan approvals	47.0	55.0	55.0	55.0
Minus loan repayments	6.6	10.2	12.9	15.6
Cancellations	3.4	3.8	3.8	3.8
Total	10.0	14.0	16.7	19.4
Outstanding loans and commitments, end of year	157.1	198.1	236.4	272.0
Plus contingency reserve			13.6	28.0
Recommended limitation			250.0	300.0

SECTION 3

Section 3 of title I would extend from 10 years to 15 years the maximum term covering any portion of a business loan made, pursuant to section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, to assist a small firm in financing construction activities.

The operating experience of SBA under the business loan program contains indications that it is not uncommon for the size of the installment repayments to be so large, as a result of the existing 10-year limitation, as to create an excessive drain on the working capital of the borrower. In some instances the agency has felt it necessary, because of the prospect of such a drain, to deny construction loans to applicants who were otherwise eligible. The provisions of section 3 of title I, permitting repayments in smaller installments spread over a longer period, should serve to eliminate or at least reduce such financial strain.

While the proposed 15-year maximum is in conformity with recent real estate lending trends and is in keeping with the recognition given in SBA disaster and development company loan legislation to the need of long amortization periods for construction loans, the agency would continue to be highly selective in granting loans for the maximum term. There would be no departure from its firmly established policy of relating amortization schedules to repayment ability rather than to any legislative maximum.

SECTIONS 4 AND 8

Sections 4 and 8 of title I would correct certain technical errors in the Disaster Relief Act of 1966—Public Law 89–769—and in the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966—Public Law 89–794. These sections have no substantive effect on the law.

SECTION 5

Section 5 of title I would authorize SBA to pay the transportation expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 5703, for travel by any individual or group of persons who, although not employed by the agency, are cooperating with it in providing management advice and guidance to small business concerns. Such payments could be made, however, only for travel undertaken at the request of SBA in connection with such cooperation.

The principal purpose of the amendment is to facilitate the work of the Service Corps of Retired Executives—SCORE. About 3,000 retired business executives have volunteered to cooperate with SBA in providing management advice and assistance to small businessmen on a person-to-person basis. Such advice and assistance is generally furnished without cost to the recipient.

Not infrequently a small firm is confronted with managerial or technical problems calling for skills or experience which can be found only in a SCORE member residing beyond commuting distance. It will be much easier to induce that member to visit the concern, if SBA can offer him reimbursement for expenses.

The requested authority will be particularly helpful in extending the benefits of SCORE to small firms in rural areas—such as Appalachia and the Upper Peninsula region of Michigan—where the program has been relatively ineffective because of distances and the lack of qualified volunteers nearby. SBA's plans for sending SCORE circuit riders into such places will be furthered by the ability to offer these volunteers reimbursement for expenses.

Another factor to be considered in connection with this amendment is that, notwithstanding their broad knowledge and experience in business matters, most or many of these volunteers are not conversant with the best counseling techniques and relatively few of them are familiar with SBA's programs and procedures. To remedy these deficiencies the agency plans to authorize at least some of its regional directors to assemble volunteers from their respective areas, during the current year, for a 2-day training meeting. The response of the volunteers to such a call will, of course, be larger if they are assured of reimbursement for the resulting expenses.

SECTION 6

Section 6 of title I would make it clear that the Administration has authority to establish such advisory boards and committees as may be necessary to achieve the purposes of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as well as the purposes of the Small Business Act.

Section 6 would also make it clear that the Administration has authority to, first, reimburse the members of such boards and committees in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 5703, for travel and other expenses incurred in attending the meetings of such boards and committees; and second, rent temporarily, within the District of Columbia or elsewhere, such hotel or other accommodations as are needed to facilitate the conduct of such meetings.

The members of the advisory councils serve without compensation in the course of making valuable contributions to the programs of the agency. It is believed they should be reimbursed for reasonable costs incurred in attending the meetings.

Unless specifically authorized by legislation, agencies including SBA, are prohibited from renting conference rooms and related facilities in the District of Columbia. This restriction has imposed limitations on the way in which meetings can be planned and conducted, to the detriment of desirable objectives.

SECTION 7

Section 7 of the bill would extend to SBA discretionary authority, identical to that possessed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, to disregard the general rule—39 U.S.C. 4154—prohibiting Government agencies from using the mails to distribute information to people who have not requested it.

The desirability of the general rule needs little discussion. Nevertheless exceptions should be made for Government agencies which, like OEO and SBA, are charged with responsibility to alert underprivileged persons to the assistance available to them from the Government. A good many of the people in this category do not request information about such assistance, because they are unaware of its existence. In such cases the responsible Government agency can fulfill its mission only by taking the initiative, only by carrying the message to the people.

An outstanding illustration of the need for the requested authority is to be found in the management training programs conducted or sponsored by SBA, in collaboration with educational institutions, for the benefit of small businessmen. When a conference or course is scheduled for a particular city or area, it is vitally important that small business concerns in that locality be given advance notice. The only satisfactory medium for providing such notice and related information is the mails.

The growing number of small business concerns being displaced by Federal, or federally aided, construction activity provides another illustration of the need for such authority. It is essential that such firms be promptly apprised of the special loan program established for their benefit by section 7(b)(3) of the Small Business Act. Under existing law, SBA can use the mails to provide such notice only where the displacement is caused by urban renewal activity. Section 7 of the bill would permit mailings by the agency when the displacement is caused by other forms of construction, such as the Federal highway program.

The table below outlines the effect that title II would have on existing law:

Title II

New section	Present law	Proposed law
Sec. 2	$300,000 now required, $150,000 may be Government money.	For new licensees, $1,000,000 private capital. For present licensees: (a) those less than $300,000, up to $300,000 by Feb. 28, 1969; up to $500.000 by Feb. 28, 1971; and up to $1,000.000 by Feb. 28, 1975; (b) licensees between $300,000 and $500,000, up to $500,000 by Feb. 28, 1971 and up to $1,000,000 by Feb. 28, 1975. (c) those between $500,000 and $1,000,000, up to $1,000,000 by Feb. 28, 1971.
	No provision	Exemption of group or category by Administrator.
	do	Noncomplying company in violation of act.
Sec. 3	Bank shares in SBIC's limited to 2 percent of its capital and surplus.	Bank shares in SBIC's limited to 5 percent of its capital and surplus.
Sec. 4	2 instruments. Authorized to buy subordinated SBIC debentures up to 100 percent of private capital or $700,000, whichever is less. Also, could make loans to SBIC up to 50 percent of total private capital and Government-purchased debentures or $4,000,000, whichever is less.	Only 1 instrument. Authorized to buy (up to 15 years) subordinated debentures of SBIC: (a) For SBIC below 65 percent equity, limit is lesser of 200 percent of private capital or $7,500,000; (b) for SBIC 65 percent or over in equity and over $2,500,000 private capital, limit is up to $5,000,000 plus 300 percent of private capital over $2,500,000 or overall limit of $10,000.000.
Sec. 5	Gives option to small business concern to purchase SBIC stock of up to 5 percent of equity financing.	Deletes such provision.
Sec. 6	Limits investment of SBIC to 20 percent of total of private capital and Government debenture purchases in any one small business concern.	Limits such investment to 20 percent of SBIC's private capital.
Sec. 7	SBIC subject to examination, but no requirement.	Requires annual examinations of SBIC.

The second bill, which amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, is summarized in the existing table below:

Tax bill

New section	Present law	Proposed law
Sec. 2	Sec. 165 of code permits ordinary loss treatment on certain loans made by SBIC's.	Will permit loss and reserve treatment on registered and coupon debt instruments issued by small concerns to SBIC's.
Sec. 3	Sec. 542 (c)(8)imposes penalty tax on SBIC as personal holding company in cases of as little as 5 percent direct interest in small concern by any shareholder in SBIC, and by "attribution" of SBIC's stock in small concern to an SBIC shareholder.	Will use SBA's criteria re control situations and conflicts of interest. Regulations to be jointly issued by SBA and Treasury.
Sec. 4	Subchapter M permits untaxed pass through of regulated investment company profits, if stringent diversification of portfolio sales are observed—not over 5 percent of investment company assets in 1 concern and not over 10 percent of the stock of that concern.	Changes 5 percent diversification to 20 percent, and not over 50 percent of the small concern's stock, but limits the privilege to 10 years.
Sec. 5	Sec. 1242 permits SBIC shareholders to take unlimited ordinary loss on sale of SBIC stock. Gains on such sales are capital gains.	Limits such loss to $25,000 single or $50,000 joint return in 1 year, but can carry forward as capital loss to be netted against capital gains, but if not so used, as ordinary loss, within same dollar limits.
Sec. 6	Sec. 1243 permits SBIC to take ordinary loss on disposition of convertible debentures (or converted stock) of small concerns.	Broadens to provide ordinary loss treatment on all equity investments but limits loss to $100,000, with provision to carry forward as a short-term capital loss. Defines equity securities and clarifies establishment of cost basis. Provides ordinary loss treatment on stock converted prior to passage of amendment. Gains on sale of debt instruments will be taxed as ordinary income.

I do not foresee any problems with title I of the small business bill, but there are a number of questions surrounding a portion of the bill which deals with the small business investment company program. At the present time there are slightly more than 600 small business investment companies in operation. More than 90 percent of these companies entered the program when the private capital requirements were only $150,000. A small percentage came into the program after the private capital requirement was raised administratively to $300,000. In fact, during the past 9 months, only five new licenses have been issued under the new capitalization requirements.

The Small Business Administration's legislative proposal would increase the private capitalization from $300,000 to $1 million for new licenses. In addition, all present licensees would have to reach the $1 million private capital minimum by 1975, depending on their present private capitalization.

Of the more than 600 small business investment companies in operation today, only 45, less than 8 percent of all small business investment companies, have private capital of a million or more dollars. Thus, if this legislation is enacted, the SBIC program could conceivably be reduced to 45 companies, unless new groups applied for licenses, or the existing companies below the million-dollar private capitalization are willing to meet that figure.

SBA officials estimate, however, that although the capitalization is being increased, the other benefits in the bill, plus the tax incentives, will ultimately lead to a small business investment company industry of from 200 to 250 companies. This legislation may have the effect of removing some 350 companies, if SBA estimates are correct, from the small business investment company program. Most of these companies which will leave the program, according to SBA, would be the smaller companies.

SBA has determined that the smaller companies are the most prone to failure in the program, and that a vast majority of the regulatory problems have cropped up in the minimum-size companies. Congress must make certain, in considering this legislation that it is not killing off these small companies without giving them a fair chance for survival. I do not believe that "bigness" alone is the answer to the small business investment company industry's problems, since a number of the big companies have become involved in ownership struggles.

Another area which must be studied is the vast increase of Government funds which will be made available to small business investment companies under this legislation. Under present law, the ceiling on Government money which a small business investment company may obtain is $4.7 million. The new proposal is to increase that figure to a maximum of $10 million, an increase of more than 100 percent.

Only recently, the Small Business Administration announced that it has set up a reserve of more than $50 million to cover losses to the Government on loans made to small business investment companies. It is imperative that before an increase in borrowing is permitted to small business investment companies that a full and complete accounting of the $50 million be made and that SBA come forward with a well-founded estimate of how much money will actually be lost to the Government.

While it may be true that the small business investment companies responsible for the $50 million loss will not be able to obtain funds under the new legislative proposals, Congress must make certain that losses of this proportion cannot occur in the future and that adequate arrangements are made to recoup the existing losses wherever possible.

I sincerely hope that a full and complete study of the small business investment company program will be undertaken in conjunction with this legislation so that all questions raised by Members of Congress concerning the small business investment company program can be answered before additional Goverment funds are invested.

OUR MILITARY POSITION IN THE WORLD TODAY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to honor our dead who have given their lives in combat for our country, I think it is timely that we analyze our military position in the world today.

We now have almost a half million young Americans fighting in Vietnam to stop Communist aggression in the Far East. There are few people in our country who completely understand how we gradually became involved in such a war of this proportion. Certainly, no satisfactory answer has ever been given to me how we became committed to a land war halfway around the world. However, the time has passed for us to debate this decision, because our flag is committed and we must strive for a victory. Now that we are there, we cannot afford to fight a limited war. All vital military targets must be hit and we must have a total commitment to the honorable conclusion of this war as soon as possible.

Now that we are on the brink of a third world war in a different part of the world, we must take note and be guided by our experience in Vietnam. I was not in Congress when we became committed in Vietnam, but now I have a vote, and I would be negligent in my duties if I did not call for caution in this time of crisis. We cannot let hysteria, emotion, or haste commit our country to another war. My military training has taught me a sad but true lesson, no one wins a war. To the mothers and fathers of this country, I pledge that my vote and influence will be used to insist that our country do everything possible to bring peace to the Israel and Egyptian crisis.

I seriously believe that negotiations should be continued with all the power and influence of the United States to be used to resolve this situation in a peaceful manner.

I urge my esteemed colleagues to be consistent when American lives are at stake. On future Memorial Days, the dead will not be identified by which war they gave their lives. Some who have opposed the Vietnam war have openly advocated immediate action by the United States on the behalf of Israel. We must let the world know and understand that our country is committed to the ideal of peace and freedom, and that we will fulfill our commitments, but we must support equally as strong the value of the conference table in preventing future wars.

We must never forget that we are committed in one war without the support of our most powerful allies. I urge the President to be sure that our allies will be committed and will support our course of action in the Middle East, whatever it may be. These are critical days for our country, but we are a strong people and I firmly believe that with a commitment to peace and firmness, we will survive this new crisis.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN PROPOSES NEW FEDERAL AGENCY FOR CREDIT UNIONS

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, has long been known as "Mr. Credit Union" in Congress. During his 40 years in Congress, Chairman PATMAN has authored every major piece of credit union legislation and has consistently supported the activities of the Nation's nearly 23,000 Federal and State credit unions.

Last week Chairman PATMAN addressed the Founders' Club of CUNA International, during that association's annual meeting in Dallas. The Founders' Club is made up of some 8,000 people who have helped organize a credit union.

In his address, Chairman PATMAN pointed out that there are more Federal credit unions than any other federally chartered financial institution. Yet, supervision of Federal credit unions is handled by a bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Chairman PATMAN suggested that a new agency be formed to be headed by a qualified American, selected by the President, and confirmed by the Senate. This would provide Federal credit unions with their much-deserved recognition, Chairman PATMAN explained.

The gentleman from Texas also praised credit unions for the outstanding job they have done during the Nation's tight-money crisis, and suggested that it is time to expand the activity of all credit unions. I am including a copy of Chairman PATMAN's address in my remarks so that all Members may have an opportunity to see the outstanding work performed by State and Federal credit unions.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE WRIGHT PATMAN, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE FIRST DISTRICT OF TEXAS, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE FOUNDERS' CLUB OF CUNA INTERNATIONAL, INC., DALLAS, TEX., MAY 24, 1967

I have adressed many credit union groups, but I can truly say that being asked to address the Founders' Club is one of the high spots of my 40 years in the Congress.

You people are the heart of the credit union movement. For without your willingness to organize new credit unions, there would be far less than the nearly 23,000 credit unions that are in operation today. I salute you for the excellent job you have done in the past, and I sincerely hope that you will not only continue to organize new credit unions, but will encourage others to follow your example.

Not only am I honored to speak to the Founders' Club, but the State of Texas and the City of Dallas are honored that CUNA International is holding its Annual Convention here.

I would like to take a few minutes this afternoon to discuss the state of the art of credit unions and also to look to the future of credit unions.

FINANCIAL STORIES MAKE NEWS

The United States is slowly coming out of one of the worst tight-money periods in recent history. There was a time when stories concerning monetary matters were buried on the financial pages of our daily newspapers. But lately, the American public has become far more interested in what happens to its dollar and the current tight-money period has whetted the public's appetite for more detailed financial news. Read almost any newspaper in the country for one week and at least once during that 7-day period there will be a story on the front page concerning monetary matters. Unfortunately, most of the stories that have appeared in the past year tell of tight money, high interest rates, and a critical shortage of mortgage funds.

We read of banks and other lending institutions increasing their interest rates to borrowers and severely limiting the amount of funds available for borrowing. During 1966, mortgage credit was at its lowest in decades. Residential mortgage loans dropped about $18 billion in 1966 over the previous year and housing starts, which already were running at a rate below the needs of our nation, fell off 20 percent from 1965.

During this period, many financial institutions came to Congress for help in solving the money shortage problem. Some mortgage lenders, fearful that they might be forced out of business, sought assistance from various legislative bodies.

A number of State legislatures were asked to raise the State usury rates so that lenders could extract more interest from borrowers. Governors were requested to call emergency sessions of their State legislatures in order to raise usury rate limitations.

In short, most every financial institution in this country was asking for outside assistance in solving its problems. However, there was one financial institution which, I am happy and proud to say, did not ask for outside assistance and has weathered the financial storm in the finest of styles. I, of course, refer to the credit unions in this nation, which once again demonstrated that they play a major role in the stabilization of our economy.

CREDIT UNIONS HOLD THEIR OWN

The Federal Reserve Board, which has never been known for its pro credit union philosophy, had this to say of the role of the nation's credit unions during the tight-money crisis:

"Credit unions continued to improve their position in 1966. They were the only holder group that increased its penetration in every major type of installment credit. Credit unions apparently were not so much affected as other lenders last year by the problem of limited funds . . ."

This quote is not from one of your own publications, whose disinterested view might be questioned, but is from the March 1967 *Federal Reserve Bulletin*. It is the highest type of praise that can be paid to credit unions.

Let no one question the strength, the importance, or the safeness of credit unions, for in the most critical financial period of our nation in the past 30 years, credit unions alone have shown that they can, not only withstand such experiences, but actually grow during these adverse times.

Credit unions represent one of our greatest financial institutions, ranking in importance to those who are aware of their importance with the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. Credit unions serve more than 18 million people in the United States. Measured by the good that this great financial institution does for the deserving, the poor and credit-deprived individuals and families, this good work of the credit unions is surpassed only by the church; in other words it is second only to religious groups in accomplishing the greatest good for the greatest number in our country.

As a matter of fact, this great financial institution should not be administered as an adjunct of another agency. It should have its own national agency administered by a qualified outstanding American, selected by the President and confirmed by the Senate. This would give to our credit unions the national recognition, stature and dignity they so richly deserve.

The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions reports an increase of nearly 500 credit unions during the year ending February 1967, and during the same period, more than 1.5 million new credit union members were added. These are impressive totals and clearly show the faith that the American people place in credit unions.

Because credit unions have shown that they can prosper during extremely critical periods, it is time that we look to expanding the area of credit union activity. Why should such a responsible group of financial institutions be restricted to such a narrow channel of operations? To this end, I have introduced a number of bills during the 90th Congress which would increase the scope of operations of credit unions. One of these bills, H.R. 9682, was reported favorably by the Banking and Currency Committee on May 9th, and should be passed by the House of Representatives shortly. A similar version of the bill has already passed the Senate and thus the legislation should become law within a very short time.

H.R. 9682 provides for increased borrowing privileges for Federal credit union directors and members of the supervisory and credit committees. Previous to this legislation, these people could borrow only up to their share holdings or shares pledged by a cosigner. It was a highly unfair requirement and one that seriously handicapped many credit unions.

Perhaps the best example of how unfair this provision was is contained in a letter that I received recently from the President of a credit union. In part the letter read:

"When leaving his home to go to work, the chairman of our supervisory committee suffered a heart attack and died. Approximately two months prior to his death, he purchased a new car. Since he could not borrow from the credit union without having a pledge of shares from another member, he had his wife borrow the $2,400 which he needed. His wife was a member and regularly employed. His widow is now obligated to repay this loan. If the credit union official were eligible to borrow, his widow would not have this debt, since our Loan Protection Insurance would have liquidated this obligation. We feel that this experience points out the unfairness of the current regulation. Individuals who are willing to sacrifice their time and devote their talents and ability to operating the credit unions are restricted to the use of the services they provide the membership and in reality are actually penalized. In the instance cited, the burden of the penalty falls on the widow and her three school-age children."

Passage of H.R. 9682 would prevent this type of situation from happening in the future, since the officer would be able to borrow the amount of his share holdings plus any shares pledged on his behalf, or $5,000, whichever is greater.

OTHER CREDIT UNION LEGISLATION

I have introduced three other credit union bills during the 90th Congress, and I sincerely hope that the Banking and Currency Committee will be able to hold hearings on the legislation. The first of these bills, H.R. 6155, is the so-called, "Federal Credit Union Omnibus Bill." This legislation covers seven points. It would:

1. Allow Federal credit unions to invest up to 25 percent of their reserves in credit union stabilization funds;
2. Permit Federal credit unions to purchase the notes of individual members of liquidated credit unions;
3. Require the establishment of an educational committee in each Federal credit union;
4. Permit the credit committee of a Federal credit union to delegate any of its functions to a loan officer;
5. Change the reserve requirement by basing it upon loans outstanding, rather than on members' share holdings, and decrease the statutory requirement from 10 percent to 7 percent;
6. Provide for quarterly dividends; and
7. Allow dividend credit to apply for share purchases made during the first ten days of a month.

H.R. 6156 would allow Federal credit unions to invest up to 25 percent of their assets in mortgage loans with maturities of up to 30 years.

H.R. 6157 would permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal and State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotments.

This is a vast legislative program which your organization has undertaken. Passage of any of these bills will require a great deal of grass roots-level work on the part of credit unions. It will require the help of every Federal credit union to secure passage of this legislative package. One of the most effective ways that individual credit unions can contribute to the legislative process is to inform their Congressmen and Senators of their feelings on particular pieces of legislation. A well-written letter to a Congressman, pointing out exactly why the legislation is needed, goes a long way towards gaining favorable consideration for the bill. The credit unions throughout the country did a commendable job in expressing their support for the officer-borrowing bill. I believe that all 33 Members of the House Banking and Currency Committee received a number of letters from credit unions in their District supporting the bill. Passage of the remaining three bills on the credit union legislative agenda will be far more difficult than the adoption of the officer-borrowing bill.

NEW BILL PROVIDES PAYMENT TO GOVERNMENT

The Treasury Department has consistently opposed the payroll deduction plan for credit unions. Even though the new version of the bill would provide for payments to the Government by the credit unions to cover the administrative costs of making the payroll deduction, Treasury is still opposed to the bill. The basic reason that Treasury opposes this measure is that it is worried that such deductions would hamper the savings bond program of the Federal Government. Credit unions must show that this is not the case if they are to overcome the Treasury's objection.

I, personally, feel that such an allotment program would not affect the savings bond program. Members of the Armed Services have allowed payroll allotment privileges for years, yet our military men are among the leaders in the savings bond purchasing area. Perhaps this argument can be fully documented and used to persuade Treasury that payroll deduction legislation would help, not hinder, the Government's savings bond program.

Grass roots support, and lots of it, will be needed if credit unions are to become mortgage lenders of any great significance.

There may be a reason in law, but certainly not in logic, why Federal credit unions should not be allowed to make real estate loans. Actually, the law does not preclude real estate loans; but because the Federal Credit Union Act limits loan maturities to five years, it would be impractical to attempt to make a real estate loan on such a short-term basis. H.R. 6156 would allow credit unions to invest up to 25 percent of their assets in real estate loans with maturities of not more than 30 years, in amounts not greater than 80 percent of the appraised value of the real estate.

This legislation was brought about because many credit union members seeking mortgage funds found them unavailable from banks, savings and loans, and other mortgage lenders during the recent tight-money period. At the same time, the credit unions to which these individuals belonged had excess funds which could have been made available in the form of mortgage money had there been a law allowing such a transaction.

Not only would passage of the real estate legislation assist credit union members in obtaining mortgage loans, but it would be a shot in the arm for the sagging building industry. It would provide an instant source of mortgage credit that overnight could start the homebuilding industry back on the road to recovery.

I do not want to suggest that every credit union would immediately go into the mortgage lending business, nor perhaps would some credit unions—because of their size—ever make mortgage loans. But there are a number of credit unions which are in a position—because of surplus funds—to make a significant contribution to the mortgage market. At the end of 1965, there were more than 1,200 credit unions with assets of from $1-to-$2 million; there were 767 credit unions with assets from $2-to-$5 million; and there were nearly 300 credit unions with assets of more than $5 million. The 1966 figures are not yet available, but I am told that there will be an increase in each of the three categories I have listed. Thus, we have more than 2,100 credit unions which, based on their size, could enter the mortgage market. I am certain even those who oppose allowing credit unions to enter the mortgage field would agree that the addition of 2,100 new mortgage outlets would highly stimulate our economy in general, and our building industry in particular. Of course, there may be hundreds of other credit unions with assets of less than $1 million that might also go into the mortgage market.

Mortgage lending is a sound business, and even during our most critical tight-money period, less than 5 out of every 1,000 mortgaged non-farm structures were foreclosed, and foreclosure does not mean that the loan was a total loss. If Federal credit unions were allowed to enter the mortgage field, I do not feel that their foreclosure rate would even approach the national average, because of the excellent repayment records that credit union members in general possess.

"POINTS" FINANCIALLY HANDICAP HOMEBUYER

There are a number of other reasons why Federal credit unions should be allowed to go into the real estate mortgage market. If any of you have purchased a new home recently, I am certain you have run into a little item in the financing called "points". This is money which is paid to the lender at the time the loan is granted, in addition to the interest rate. Actually, points are nothing more than a percentage of the loan. For example, if a $20,000 loan were obtained and the borrower were required to pay 5 points, he would have to pay $400 for the privilege of obtaining the loan, plus the interest rate. It is a way that lenders get around the usury laws. Although points are always objectionable, they are the most objectionable in periods of tight money, since the borrower must pay the maximum legal interest rate, plus points, in order to obtain a loan.

If Federal credit unions were allowed to invest in real estate mortgages, they could not charge points because the Federal Credit Union Act prohibits the payment of any fees above the maximum interest rate specified. No matter how scarce money became credit unions would not be allowed to charge points. Even if this restriction were not in the law, I know that credit unions would not seek to extract extra money from the borrower. Many credit unions charge far below the maximum rate allowed by law, even during money-shortage periods, and credit unions also have done a remarkable job in rebating interest to borrowers at the end of the year, if the financial condition of the credit union can justify this practice.

I would like to see more credit unions begin the interest rebate practice. It is excellent public relations, and you would be surprised at the selling job it can do on members for repeat loans. The savers in the credit union might be unhappy with an interest rebate program, but you must remember that credit unions are not set up to favor one category of credit union members over another. An attractive saving rate, plus the interest rebate, is not hard to effect; and although there may be some initial mutterings by your savers, a large majority of your members will applaud such an arrangement.

I am happy to note that your 1967 legislative package does not contain a proposal for Federal share insurance. The subject of Federal share insurance is a perennial one and unfortunately is given more consideration than it merits. A look at the loss record of Federal credit unions for the past quarter of a century confirms the belief that Federal share insurance is not needed by credit unions. From 1936 through 1964, only $1.2 million has been lost in Federal credit unions. To provide a comparison for that figure it is necessary to look at other financial institutions.

During the ten-year span, 1956 to 1965, commercial bank losses in insured accounts amounted to more than $12 million, while losses in insured savings and loan accounts were slightly more than $11 million. Of course, these figures do not accurately depict the losses to the banking and savings and loan industries because they do not include the losses on accounts that were in excess of the insurance ceiling, nor is consideration given to the losses suffered by stockholders of failing institutions. Since credit union members are in a sense both stockholder and depositor, it is quite remarkable that the loss figure is so low. If the stockholders' losses were added to the figures for other financial institutions, many more millions of dollars would have to be added to their totals.

What would a program of Federal share insurance have cost Federal credit unions if it had been in effect in the past ten years? By using a premium of 1/12th of one percent of shares annually, Federal credit unions would have paid during the last decade alone nearly $25½ million for share insurance. The premium figure approximates the rates imposed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation on commercial banks and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation on savings and loan associations.

A BIG INSURANCE PAYMENT FOR A LITTLE LOSS

Thus, credit unions would have paid at least $25½ million to cover a $1.2 million loss. And the insurance might not have covered all of the losses, since shares in excess of the insurance maximum would not have been covered.

In addition, Federal share insurance would bring red tape to the credit union operation. Credit unions have long prided themselves on their non-bureaucratic methods of operation. But Federal share insurance would require a mountain of paperwork, a constant audit of every share account and needless expense. The simplicity of the credit union cannot be overlooked as a prime reason more than 18 million Americans have become credit union members.

Credit unions have built a reputation for safety because of their neighbor-lending-to-neighbor philosophy. If one credit union member gets behind on a loan repayment, all members of the credit union have an interest in that delinquent loan and they can get after the poor payer with a sharp stick. But in an insured institution there is no interest on the part of the depositors as to whether or not a borrower repays a loan. In addition, I am certain that credit union borrowers feel a far deeper sense of responsibility for repaying loans than do borrowers from insured financial institutions. In short, the best insurance that credit unions have is their lack of Federal share insurance.

Except in one area, credit unions are fully covered by insurance. The excellent bonding program adopted by credit unions insures against losses from burglary, robbery, embezzlement and virtually every other type of occurrence which would cause a credit union to lose funds. The only way that a credit union can lose money and not have it covered by insurance, is due to bad loans. However, the possibility of a credit union making bad loans is greatly minimized because of the use of a credit committee to approve major lending activities. The minimal loss record that credit unions have established is a fitting tribute to the outstanding job that these credit committees and loan officers have done, and clearly shows that credit unions are extremely careful with their members' funds.

BANKS SEEK TO GOUGE STUDENTS

In 1965 the Congress passed the Federal Higher Education Act. The purpose of the Act is to provide loans for students so that they can attend college. The ink had barely dried on the law before some banks started complaining that they couldn't make these loans because the interest rates were not high enough.

Last month, Dr. Charles Walker, the hired hand of the American Bankers lobby, appeared before a Congressional Committee to ask that the Government pay the banks a placement fee at the time each loan is made. Of course the Government is already giving the banks billions of dollars in subsidies, but that is not enough for the American Bankers Association. This organization is interested in only one thing—how to make bigger profits for the banks, regardless of what effect it has on the American people.

You know the big banks have opposed Truth-in-Lending legislation, because they say they will be unable to compute the annual interest rate required by the bill. These same banks that argued that they can't make a simple interest computation, spend thousands of dollars a year advertising savings programs in which they will compute the borrowers' savings on a daily basis, and they have installed huge computers to handle the task. But when it comes to computing loan interest rates, these banks suddenly discover they don't have the ability to do the job.

The banks claim they can't compute honest interest rates, but they have no trouble computing dishonest rates—rates that include points and finder's fees and other burdensome charges.

But while some banks were trying to gouge college students and their parents, the nation's credit unions were quietly setting up student loan programs under the new law. Many credit unions had been making similar loans for years and they had found no trouble living with the 6 percent allowable interest rate.

I think the whole credit union movement

can take pride in the fact that the first loan made by any financial institution under the Higher Education Act in the State of Hawaii was granted by the Pearl Harbor Federal Credit Union. And in four months after that credit union had begun its student loan program, it had made 44 such loans, and as of December 31, 1966, a total of 1,644 student loans had been made by credit unions in America. Credit unions have shown that they don't follow the leader—they are the leader.

You know some banks always jump at a chance to increase their loan rates. You never hear of a bank asking not to be included in legislation raising loan rates. Whenever they open the trough, up wallow the big banks.

But credit unions hold a different philosophy and, in fact, have fought to prevent their loan rates from being raised. Perhaps the best example of this occurred here in Texas, when the Texas Legislature passed a bill that would have raised most interest rates on loans obtained from all lenders. Somehow credit unions were included in this provision, but they wanted no part of it. In short, they raised more sand than the alligator when the pond went dry.

TEXAS CREDIT UNIONS LEAD FIGHT

The Texas Credit Union League and its capable president, P. G. Gooch, staged an all-out fight to knock credit unions out of the rate increase legislation. Car and bus loads of credit union members from cities and towns across the State descended on Austin to fight for credit unions. Letters poured into legislators from thousands of credit union members. When the bill passed, the credit unions and the little people of Texas had won—credit union rates for loans were not increased.

Credit unions can be proud of what happended in Texas, and perhaps, if credit union members throughout the nation will take up the fight for their legislative programs, you can obtain passage of much needed credit union legislation.

But, at the same time, you must be on guard against attacks from your enemies. At every opportunity, the bankers try to slip stories into the papers pointing out that credit unions charge 12 percent a year interest. But they don't point out that the rate is only a maximum of 1 percent a month on the declining balance, which is really only an effective rate of 6 percent. You must take action to correct these distortions when they are printed.

We have talked about some of the areas of legislative expansion for Federal credit unions, but at the same time, I wonder if credit unions are utilizing the maximum authority granted them under law. In other words, are credit unions extending all the possible services to members that are allowed by law? If not, credit unions may be driving potential members to other financial institutions.

CREDIT UNIONS CAN PAY MEMBERS' BILLS

There is nothing in the Federal Credit Union Act that prohibits a Federal credit union from paying certain bills for members out of the member's share account. This type of operation is used extensively by other financial institutions to attract customers, but only a few credit unions have adopted the idea.

The operation of the plan is very simple. A special account is set up by the member from which bills, such as insurance premiums, utility, tax or mortgage payments are made. The company rendering the bill sends it to the credit union, which pays the bill from the money in the special account. If there is not enough money in the account, the bill is sent directly to the member for payment.

Not only does the member receive the benefit of having the credit union handle his bill paying, but funds in the special account draw interest at the credit union's regular rate.

The plan will encourage credit union members to increase their savings and will also help to entice new members.

I understand that the Dearborn Federal Credit Union in Michigan has used the bill-paying plan with a large degree of success.

Some credit unions, on the other hand, drive away members because of highly restrictive practices.

I know of a credit union that will not allow members with loans to draw funds from their share accounts without the approval of the board of directors or credit committee.

While this may sound as if it is a smart move on the credit union's part to decrease the possibility of loan loss, it also means that many members will no longer save at the credit union after obtaining a loan, because there is too much red tape to go through in order to make a withdrawal. Thus, the credit union members will borrow from their credit union but will save some place else.

It was particularly pleasing for me to read the "New Ideas" section in the May issue of *Credit Union* Magazine. One of the new ideas expressed was that of the point of purchase loans, a program recently installed by the Los Angeles County Employees No. 11 Federal Credit Union. In reality, these loans are merely a line of credit, which enables the credit union member to obtain a loan prior to his need for the funds. Thus, a credit union member who spots an item on sale that he wishes to purchase, can make that purchase without submitting a new loan application, which might result in a delay causing him to miss the bargain.

In closing, I want to once again commend the members of the Founder's Club for the excellent work you have done in organizing new credit unions, and at the same time suggest, if you earnestly seek the enactment of any additional credit union legislation, that you organize a nation wide grass roots campaign to fairly and accurately tell the credit union story at every level of Government in the nation.

Credit unions were founded for little people. And it is fitting that you should seek the little people for help in expanding the wonderful work that credit unions perform.

Thank you for inviting me to speak to you this afternoon.

SPACE AND SCIENCE AS VIEWED BY CHAIRMAN OF SPACE COMMITTEE'S SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include an article by the distinguished and able gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], in the May 1967 issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, which is published in the district that I have the honor to represent:

Congress Faces Space Policies

(In the following article Congressman Daddario (D–Conn.) analyzes the attitudes of Congress toward space, in doing so he proposes: "Perhaps, since the space program has taken about one per cent of GNP in recent years, the approximate share could be fixed for the next several years as a reasonable goal. This would permit the space program to grow with the economy, and yet leave room for growth in other areas of research and development as well. It would require that Nasa and other agencies active with space projects manipulate their many projects so that totals stayed reasonably steady. This might help to stabilize expectations for careers in the industry and give a more reliable basis for companies planning their own growth." Emilio Daddario was elected to the House of Representatives in 1958 and assigned to the Committee on Science and Astronautics; he is now chairman of its Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development. He is the sponsor of the Daddario Bill to revise and update the National Science Foundation.)

(By EMILIO Q. DADDARIO)

Science cannot as such be isolated from broader aspects of public policy. There is a reciprocal relationship which might couple two truisms, both paraphrased from an old quotation: "Public policy is too important to be left to the politicians," and "Science is too important to be left to the scientists." The consequences of science in this age are so sweeping that all of us must be concerned with it, and the increased activity in the Congress respecting scientific matters is properly reflective of that concern.

The space program and science are not synonymous. Scientists will recognize this, and may writhe when they hear everyone connected with the space program labeled "space scientist." Yet there are also many scientists who persist in judging the space program as if its only goals and purposes were scientific, or at least as if they ought to be. As a member of Congress for many years, I am acutely aware of how wide of the mark such an attitude is. But if space activity and science are not identical, they are intimately related.

There are two distinct types of space science. One is the science necessary to operate in the space environment, for building propulsion, guidance, and life support. The second is the use of space technology as a scientific tool in the study of astronomy, geophysics, and so forth. So far, most of our effort has gone into creating the capability to operate in space and its resulting engineering. Ahead of us lie many decisions on the use of this capability, with policy questions to be tested by cost-effectiveness standards. That is, should a particular experiment be conducted on the earth or in space, considering costs, timing, and meaning of the results? The intermixing of these distinct functions of science within the space program has tended to confuse some of the debate within the scientific community on the size of space expenditures.

Those making space policy and administering the program must work closely with the scientific community. In many respects, the division between science and engineering has blurred in practical application even if the purists can still write separate definitions of each; the tools, the knowledge, the techniques are pretty much intermixed. Science must be consulted to insure that the best and newest developments in science are applied to solving problems of space development. The analytical techniques, the instrumentation, the special knowledge of forces and properties and interactions must all be brought to bear from many sciences.

While the attainment of scientific ends is not the only goal of space flights certainly both broad questions and specific, narrow ones may be partially answered through this program. These range from the most fundamental inquiries on the origins of the earth, the solar system, evolution of the universe, and the origins of life, to thousands of details needed in many scientific disciplines. Some programs and much money for space have built their justification upon this service to the scientific community. The direct beneficiaries have generally been glad enough to have the opportunity to run their experiments, but other elements of the scientific community have often felt that their own activities were not receiving proper support as a result. An economist would recognize potential multiplier effect whereby money and manpower put into space work could expand what is done in other fields, rather than being done at their expense. Recent studies and statistics support this theory.

Science, therefore, must be involved in space planning and space operations because of possibilities both of shared opportunities and of serendipity. If space flights are going to be made for nonscientific goals, science might as well go along for the almost free ride, and the opportunities to stumble across new findings and to exploit them must not be missed.

Science must also be involved because of the possibility that some space activities will have unwanted side effects which must be identified early in planning. One example would be the risk, not yet fully measured, that a large number of flights might leave combustion products of propulsion in the upper atmosphere with effects on weather and climate or other geophysical relationships inimical to our well-being.

SPACE AND GOVERNMENT INTERESTS

Government interests in space are very broad, and I am not sure that any group within our society has a special right to be the final judge of the relative values and priorities of these multiple goals even though everyone has a right to hold views and to express them.

Scientific advancement: Certainly scientific advancement is a goal of some prominence in our space plans; for many projects it is a primary purpose, for many others it is an inevitable concomitant.

A push to technology: Second, we look to the space program to give a push to our technology across a broad front, in materials and manufacturing, in instrumentation and computer building, in chemistry, in fact across the whole spectrum of modern industrial life. Some of the impetus to technology may come in the direct form of applications such as weather reporting, communications by satellite, and so forth. Some may come in conscious applications to other earthbound fields of new techniques learned in space work. Still other applications, though less direct, will be the general enhancement of our ability to prepare new materials and use them. Some will be our new confidence in applying the systems approach in analysis and solution of very complex major problems, and the creation of new forms of management for the resultant enterprises.

National defense: National defense undoubtedly has a valid connection with the space program. This is reflected in the prevailing pattern of both the United States and the Soviet Union where two-thirds of all launches are consistently for the military.

National stature: Attention to our position of progressive leadership undoubtedly has also figured in our plans, and Soviet plans as well. This is more than an empty gesture to national prestige or pride. In an uncertain world of many rivalries, a successful program of space achievement and the felicitous choices we have made in selecting astronauts who have turned out to be ambassadors of goodwill have been some of the better things working for us. Space also affords opportunities for international cooperation which we hope are useful to all participants. It also provides a means of living and working together in friendly ways with other countries.

The place of exploration: Finally, there is the possibility that space flight is a continuation of a long historical process by which men, being men, have looked beyond just providing the next meal or the immediate need to a more philosophic or emotional interest in exploration for its own sake. Perhaps man has always been ready to go as far and do as much as his capabilities permit, and now we can extend these activities throughout the solar system. From a very long-range point of view, having men spread to other worlds may be as important to stimulating our intellects, and to insuring survival of the race as, in a smaller way, the opening of the Americas once did for Europeans.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Congress has certain responsibilities for making our basic space policy, and then implementing it through legislation and appropriation of necessary money. It has also proved useful for Congress to exercise an oversight and public information program concerning the activities it has helped to create. Except for releases of news from executive agencies, which cannot always be considered objective, the medium of congressional hearings and reviews is a major way for information which involves the public's business to reach the public attention.

Congress is not in a position to make the detailed decisions on every aspect of the space program. It does not have a staff of the size and with the detailed kinds of experience required to engage in that degree of participation in any case. On the other hand, Congress does have the right to study policy issues and to measure the degree to which its policies are being implemented effectively by the administrators of the agencies active in the space program. It would be derelict if it accepted without question any claim and assertion made by agency personnel, however experienced and however well-intentioned these men. I think one could characterize the relationship between the two branches of government concerned with space as friendly but wary, with each always ready to protect its vital interests and constitutional powers; certainly both branches are dedicated to the conduct of a successful program which meets national needs.

Congress now faces the current issues of the space program from a much stronger position of experience than prevailed in 1958 when the Space Act was written. It has a better feel for the use of technology, for what is possible and not possible, at least in the near future. It understands something about leadtimes for research and development. It now faces new problems with the heavy existing commitment of resources, manpower, and facilities to the space program; these cannot be dealt with in abstraction but must consider national, regional, and corporate effects of major shifts in the direction and pace of the program. It has developed stronger staffs and wide advisory capabilities.

WHAT ARE THE ISSUES?

One major set of issues is economic in character. Fiscal trends of the space program itself, of total research and development, and of total federal expenditures must be studied for their possible interactions, their effects on price levels and on employment. Space cannot be considered in isolation from questions of how much is to be available for oceanography, high-energy physics, medical research, and so on, both because of at least limited competition for manpower and more direct competition for funds. In balance, programs may prove complementary rather than competitive. Nor can these programs be considered in isolation from questions of expenditures for Vietnam, for the Poverty Program, and many others. The relation, in turn, of expenditures to receipts has its broader connection with price trends, employment levels, capital expansion, foreign trade, and the balance of payments. It is not easy to generalize about any of these things because the relationships are not wholly understood even though their connection is very real. This obscurity gives much room for difference of opinion as to how to proceed and what priorities to fix.

A changed climate: Looking to the immediate future of the space program, there is now an element which was not present a relatively short time before. We had moved through several years of rapidly expanding funds for space. This made it fairly easy to recruit new talent, to start interesting projects, to add facilities as they seemed useful. But now things are different. For two or three years the total appropriations have leveled out, and now actual expenditures are turning down. Any program accustomed to increases and then confronted with a shift of direction has painful adjustments to make. Manpower ceilings affect hiring of help.

Not only projects left behind by events but also many still useful programs have to be terminated, and with these terminations in some cases go jobs. Other times we lose the morale of dedicated people who were doing a good job and believed sincerely in the importance of their work. They often cannot understand why they were the ones to be hit by cutbacks. The whole climate of decisionmaking changes when funds available level off or turn down. Overruns of costs cannot be passed along but result in slowdowns of work or outright cancellations. New starts of major projects are hard to win, even though in some cases a failure to make them results in major gaps in activity later because leadtimes cannot be shortened for some kinds of work.

When there are no major new starts, some of the excitement goes out of a program, and people become defensive about what they are doing. Existing programs lose their vitality and become subject to criticism because such programs automatically occupy the total time of personnel and the total available funds, whatever these funds may be. Money may end up supporting an existing overhead burden rather than accomplishing significant new results. Also painful for our total progress, this leveling or downturn makes it harder to get money for advanced research and technology without specific end use, even though future progress requires adequate support for this advanced work. But it is easier to make a case for a hardware end product with a mission than it is for the indefinite kind of thing that stockpiles knowledge or components. This has been labeled the requirements merry-go-round; absence of firm requirements blocks advanced research and technology, while absence of advanced knowledge and components blocks approval for new requirements for hardware programs.

Timing and pace: Another type of economic issue which faces the Congress relates to the pace of the program. There are, for example, those who point out that the moon and planets have been where they are for a long time, and whether we explore them in one decade or century or another really does not make much difference. This attitude, of course, reflects a very limited view. In the conduct of the Apollo mission, Nasa has contended that it hit upon close to the correct technological pace to conduct its work. If it went much faster, it would have to pay out a lot in overtime, and would run into selected bottlenecks which its charts have identified. It also contends that if the program were to be slowed down with the idea of saving money now, the total cost of the program would go up because of the heavy burden of overhead costs to maintain both government and industry activities, spread over a longer time.

This latter argument then touches a broader issue: Should worthwhile space programs be selected, and then conducted in a manner to achieve greatest efficiency in their execution, by letting funds be expended at a rate which matches minimum costs? This may very well result in the appearance of peaks and valleys in total space expenditures if all the component parts of the total program happen to combine in that particular way. One cannot always guarantee that when one program is climbing up in expenditures another of the same magnitude will be on the decline in the same degree, although we did see this happen with Gemini. An alternative approach is to decide almost arbitrarily upon a selected level or percentage of GNP, since some decisions cannot really be based upon a quantified analysis in the process of weighing alternatives. Perhaps, since the space program has taken about one per cent of GNP in recent years, this approximate share could be fixed for the next several years as a reasonable goal. This would permit the space program to grow with the economy, and yet leave room for growth in other areas of research and development as well. It would require that Nasa and other agencies active with space projects manipulate their many projects so that totals stayed reasonably steady. This might help to stabilize expectations for careers in the industry and give a more reliable basis for companies planning their own growth.

POST-APOLLO PLANNING FOR NASA

For the past few years the Congress has shown its concern about Nasa's inability to look to the future after the moon flight has been accomplished. An Apollo Applications Program (AAP) has been proposed, but no firm definition of it can be found; every month or so it seems to have new scope. The basic choices revolve around extensive earth orbital operations, or further lunar exploration, or the beginnings of manned interplanetary flight. It may be that these choices are not mutually exclusive. One important development which the Ninetieth Congress will be asked to support is a workshop in a fixed position above the earth which will include a telescope for solar observation among other experiments.

Earth orbit: Earth orbital work as an end in itself is thought of as an application of space flight to serving advanced missions in weather reporting and communications, in gathering geophysical data, and in operating a natural resources program through which space flight might locate resources, measure their condition, support their management, and even apply them in new ways. An orbiting station might also be a fresh way of looking out into the universe from beyond the blanket of the earth's atmosphere and ionosphere, widening the window of our vision into new parts of the electromagnetic spectrum, so that broader forms of optical astronomy and radio astronomy could be conducted. The argument is that we have invested so much in space development that now a major use should be a variety of practical applications which bring back a directly measurable cash dividend to the taxpayers in the form of services rendered from space. There is a special excitement about new natural resources applications. We are finding that faster and cheaper reporting may be possible from space not only on valuable resources, but on weather, on the status of ice packs in bays and oceans, and on the status of crops or trees in a forest. Forest fires may be located before they grow to large size. Water management can be improved by measurement of snow fields from space. Perhaps fisheries can be better managed when information on currents and temperatures is gathered from space.

Lunar developments: The argument for pursuing further lunar work is that so much has been put into building a lunar landing capability that it would be false economy not to go ahead to learn quite a bit more about the moon. A very few landings with a minimal stay time may leave most of the mysteries untouched. We may not answer conclusively whether there are active volcanoes, gas wells, ice below the surface; whether in caves we might even find water; whether any traces of life exist in special places on the moon even if the majority opinion now is that it is probably a biologically dead world. Better exploration of the moon might turn up resources which would overcome some of the logistics problems of maintaining a permanent scientific station there. We might find that lunar resources could supply rocket fuel and thus eliminate part of the weight problem which causes so much anguish.

Planetary exploration: The argument for going on to the planets is couched in terms of the pressure it would put upon us to extend our present capabilities and to test our technological skill. Lesser missions might not be the same kind of challenge. We would have to build a far greater reliability into our craft so that they would operate safely for months and years instead of just for days or weeks. The planets, it is argued, offer a far wider range of environmental conditions for exploration than the moon. There is no more reason to assume that everything of scientific and economic interest is only here on earth than to assume that such is true of some single small region of earth.

A full-fledged simultaneous assault upon all three objectives in the same few years probably would have a price tag beyond our reach. But the three missions are not mutually exclusive. As we apply space technology to practical ends in earth orbit, we could also be checking out our technology and even our spacecraft for ambitious missions to other parts of the solar system. As we conduct further exploration of the moon we could be testing in considerable degree the systems to be used in planetary landings.

Potential duplication of civilian and military efforts: A second policy issue which may be of concern to Congress is that of management of earth orbital manned operations with maximum effectiveness and minimum duplication of effort and expenditures. This question has been raised with regard to the Nasa space station plans and the Manned Orbiting Laboratory (MOL) of the Department of Defense. The amount of duplication might or might not be serious. Defense is using the Gemini hardware with some modification, for the re-entry portion of their station, rather than developing something entirely new. Also, its not-publicly specified missions may require a configuration and spacecraft volume which are not easily reconciled with the kind of work Nasa is proposing. Nasa has proposed most often for its own missions the use of the Apollo command and service modules, with the lunar module reconfigured to hold scientific experiments or other sensors. It may be that the costs of modifying the Nasa items for the Defense missions would be about as great as optimizing new hardware for the mission module of the Defense MOL. The secrecy which has surrounded the MOL has made final judgments difficult in public discussion, but top officials of Defense have felt as a matter of principle that so long as the department has a mission to perform, it has the same right to protect the privacy of its technical competences in space as it would on board a ship or a submarine. One certainty is that the United States is pledged not to use MOL as a carrier of weapons of mass destruction. This is established national policy at the highest level and agreed to in the new U.N. treaty. Nasa and Defense have compared plans and exchanged technical personnel, and still found that there are separate roles for MOL and for AAP. This may be partial evidence in itself that there is a place for both projects. Although some critics in and out of Congress have questioned this, those who have had the full briefings seem to agree that a reasonable case has been made for separate projects.

Civilian and military roles: The debate over MOL raises a broader issue of the civilian and military roles in space. This was hotly contested when the Space Act was written in 1958, was revived in small degree in 1961, and with a few protagonists still lingers. Over the years, however, Defense and Nasa have found their separate places in space activity, and have made various accommodations in the sharing of personnel and facilities. There appears to be a coordinated review of all development plans, with each informed of what the other is doing and how both can pool their resources. The remaining arguments over the general coloration of our space effort can be caricatured in the extreme positions of a few people. We have one view that assumes that anything of a military nature in space is automatically a threat to the peace, and perhaps in violation of the new international space treaty. They see a largely civilian program as one which would do more for science and for our favorable international image, without the threat of wasteful duplication. The other view is that we have indulged our desire for scientific prestige long enough, and the real need now is for a far greater military operational flexibility and capacity. This should be obtained by shifting resources into a military manned space program which includes the ability to maneuver, inspect, and defend in space. The argument is that if Nasa continues manned efforts, it should be doing the long-range studies for lunar and planetary work, but without a set timetable. One can assume that these conflicting views are those of minorities, but if the budget squeeze became tight enough, some individuals normally willing to recognize complementary spheres might become more partisan.

Manned and unmanned flight: Another issue which has always been with us becomes more serious in the period ahead. This is the question of the relative roles of manned and unmanned space flight. The scientific community has not been loath to express views on this subject. We have those who argue that introducing man into the system complicates it and runs up the costs; and there is the danger of shifting the emphasis from science to human exploits and prestige. These advocates believe that for the next several years programs like that of Voyager to the planets and various automatic devices for near-earth applications will be more cost-effective. They note that we do not know enough of the environment of the planets and the space in between to be well advised to send men without some years of unmanned experience. The other side of the argument is that we have built a capacity to fly man through space, and now we should exercise it.

They argue that manned flight comes closer to meeting general public aspirations, and that man can bring his judgment to resolving the unexpected, and his skill to overcoming malfunctions of many kinds, as already exemplified on past flights. Further, they argue that if space flight is ever to become just another means of transportation, to be put to really useful work over the whole of the solar system, it would be unlikely that all development on other planets or moons would be done with automatic devices. The only certainty is that man must be used somewhere in the technological system. The question is whether man should be with the forward sensors, or manipulating by remote or programed control.

Applications and exploration: Another issue is that of the relative emphasis to be given space flight practical applications, as opposed to those of a more general exploratory nature. This is not unrelated to my earlier discussion of goals for AAP, but is more generalized in this context. The applications people point to the great burden which the taxpayers have carried in financing the space program, and say it is now time that a tangible dividend be returned. They would apply cost-effectiveness tests to proposals for new space projects. The other side of the argument is that we are just at the threshold of answering some of the most fundamental questions we have asked, and just gaining some ability to make parts of the solar system available to exploration. Some feel it would be inconceivable that we would turn our backs on this great adventure now, and that to do so would be a betrayal both of our nature and of those creative individuals who have built the present system of space flight.

SOURCES OF SPACE LEADERSHIP

Our movement into space is the result of many forces. There had to be a broad base of technology in many disciplines and an understanding of many scientific principles. There had to be people who visualized what was possible and who were then willing to work to make it come about. These have included leaders in the technical societies, writers of a scientific bent, the latter often using the medium of fiction. There had to be others in government and industry laboratories who shared this faith and enthusiasm. And then there had to be political leaders who could grasp what was technically possible, and what the social, political, and military implications of space flight were. Fortunately, in my opinion, there was support from the people that the United States should have a space program. Pushed in that direction by Soviet successes beginning with Sputnik, the American people will want to develop our capability in space. It is the direction, the purpose, and the nature of the program that are at issue.

Working in a nonpartisan way with a broad base of support, the majority leaders of both the House and the Senate headed the select or special committees which considered the legislation. President Eisenhower was not particularly space-minded. Even so, he had earlier asked for funds for Vanguard, and after Sputnick he sent to Congress the original draft of the Space Act. Kennedy was of a different generation, and perhaps better understood what space flight could mean. It was he who won from Congress and the people support for the far more ambitious plans, of which Apollo and Rover were central. Even this was just part of the shaping process which continues to this day.

The Space Council and Executive Office of the President: The Space Act created a Space Council to centralize policy planning for the multi-faceted space program. In 1961, the then Vice-President Johnson, who had taken such an interest in space while in the Senate, became the Chairman of the Space Council. Vice President Humphrey now occupies the post of Chairman of the Council and his enthusiasm for the space program is a result of his detailed exposure to its workings and its potentialities.

But even with a President and Vice-President who are firmly on record as advocates, the program is not automatically guaranteed clear sailing in the executive branch. The Executive Office of the President is not an open door to budget suppliants in NASA and Defense or other agencies who have space plans to push. Of course their requests are heard. But these requests are screened for the President by a variety of institutional safeguards whose very purpose is to protect a President from his own enthusiasms and from the persuasiveness of a particular subordinate official. The Bureau of the Budget is a professional "no" agency; otherwise the limit to federal expenditures would be almost impossible to fix short of disaster. The Office of Science and Technology and the President's Science Advisory Committee are careful guardians of the needs of total science and technology, and they are not about to let the space program win too large a share at the possible risk of cutting funds for other important programs. The Space Board of the National Academy of Sciences is also consulted, as another significant source of advice.

The consequence is that it is most difficult to establish new forward commitments in the executive branch. The desire is there, perhaps, but the realities of total national needs are a strong constraint. The Space Council can make a case for new projects, and it can explain why certain priorities should be set within the space program, but that is about all it can do. The decsion on what to recommend to the Congress is a prerogative of the President, and his advice comes from many quarters.

Role of Congress: Congress is also a maker of space policy, and has acted with a singular lack of partisanship. The program generally has won overwhelming support and the record votes will show only slight opposition over almost a decade of space authorization and appropriations.

Congress not only played a very active role in the writing of the Space Act, but through its committee has been active ever since. The first report calling for a manned lunar landing and return before 1970 came from the House Committee on Science and Astronautics in 1960. Congress may not have resources of the same size as the executive in science and technology, but it does have the power to get to the heart of issues and to marshal opinion and support. And it can move with amazing speed when the stakes are high and it understands the issues.

I speak from a known position of advocacy, but even so, I think these points in favor of a congressional role in space policymaking can be considered valid. Running for office every two years, in frequent close touch with our constituencies, we have a pretty good collective view of what the American people want. We have a variety of investigative tools which can often look beyond the self-serving positions of federal agencies. We have developed limited but select sources of expertise within our committee staffs and agencies. We have an open door to any private citizen, university, laboratory, or corporation to make a case for new projects or to hear criticisms of existing ones or the management of these projects. Congress cannot re-examine every detail of our space programs, but at the same time its powers of investigation are sufficiently broad that issues bearing on legislative powers can be studied when desired, and witnesses and evidence subpoenaed if they are not available voluntarily.

The making of space policy is a shared responsibility between the President and the Congress. A few people think that Congress is primarily negative or reactive, that it is limited in what it can do by many checks and balances. But the record contradicts these observers when one reviews what Congress has actually done in making space policy. It has been thorough in its probing, progressive and creative in its actions which bear on the full sweep of space policy.

The years ahead will continue to supply fresh critical issues of space policy. I believe the Congress, with the help of the executive, and of the American public, is equal to the challenge of continuing to make positive contributions to this important area of scientific and technical endeavor.

COMMENDABLE RESTRAINT SHOWN BY ISRAEL

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, as the Middle East crisis moves into its second week we can be thankful for the commendable restraint shown by Israel's Government in face of President Nasser's dangerous act of provocation in restricting free passage in the Gulf of Aqaba.

United Nations Secretary General U Thant, expressing fear that a clash between the United Arab Republic and Israel in the Strait of Tiran would touch off a war, has pleaded for time for diplomacy to cool off the dispute. U Thant undoubtedly is correct in his present appraisal of the situation but he helped fuel the tinderbox. If Mr. Thant had not been so hasty in withdrawing the U.N. Emergency Force from the Gaza strip and the Sinai Peninsula, the present negotiations would not have had to be conducted in such an inflammatory atmosphere and Israel's patience would not have had to be so sorely tested.

U Thant has proposed that the U.N. Security Council order an unconditional ceasefire in the Middle East. France earlier proposed that the Soviet Union join the United States, Britain, and France in imposing a "big power" settlement of the crisis. I would like to be optimistic that these moves will succeed but the Soviet Union's predictable reaction in urging the Western powers to "exert their influence on Israel to make it stop its provocation" gives us little reason to be hopeful.

I believe General Eisenhower was right in saying "it would be a serious mistake" for any nation to attempt unilaterally to settle the Arab-Israel confrontation. There is no evidence that our Government plans any precipitate action. Israel has responded to our admonitions by refraining, for the time being, from testing Nasser's blockade. There is still hope that peace in the Middle East, sacred to Christian, and Jew alike, may be preserved.

Nevertheless, the danger to the peace of the world once again lies in the possibility that the depth and extent of U.S. commitments will not be understood until it is too late. Too often in the past quarrels between nations have expanded into major conflicts because of miscalculations of this sort.

I hope, therefore, that the threatening gestures which Nasser and his Kremlin friends are making toward Israel are not rooted in an erroneous belief that the United States is so deeply involved in Vietnam that it cannot use its great strength in assisting to counteract aggression on a small country like Israel with which it has inviolable ties of friendship.

APOLLO: CAN OF WORMS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Washing Star of Sunday May 21, 1967, provides another excellently written and informative article on the manipulations that have made many of the administrative activities and decisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration more than suspect.

I commend to all my colleagues the reading of this article by Mr. William

Hines, whose several previous articles on the Apollo tragedy and the failures and malfunctions leading up to it make it completely evident that he is well qualified to write on this subject.

The article follows:

Apollo: A Shining Vision in Trouble

(By William Hines)

In the six years since John F. Kennedy set the moon as America's space target for the 1960s, Project Apollo has undergone what might be termed a metamorphosis in reverse.

Unlike the lowly caterpillar that in time becomes a beautiful moth, Kennedy's shining vision of May 25, 1961, has degenerated into a can of worms. Apollo is years behind schedule, billions over original cost estimates and three men are dead as a direct result of what has been officially labeled carelessness and overconfidence.

Manned earth-orbital flights which five years ago had been planned for 1964 now will not begin until 1968; round-the-moon missions originally planned for last year and this year have been scrubbed entirely, and lunar landings hopefully projected for 1967 probably have slipped out of this decade.

A program which NASA hoped would be completed for something under $20 billion has cost very nearly that much already with first-flight still a year off, and it seems unlikely that astronauts will feel the cindery lunar soil beneath their boots before $25 billion has been spent.

It all began six years ago this week, in an atmosphere of hope and inspiration.

"I believe that this nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and and returning him safely to earth," the then-new President Kennedy told Congress on May 25, 1961.

Of this bold leap across the space frontier, Kennedy said, "No single space project in this period will be more impressive to mankind, or more important for the long-range exploration of space; and none will be so difficult or so expensive to accomplish."

The task was assigned to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, a relatively new agency then operating at a budget level below $1 billion a year. Today NASA—then as now headed by Administrator James E. Webb—is one of Washington's most solidly entrenched bureaucracies, with an annual budget of $5 billion.

NASA had high hopes in 1961 and 1962, and still talks optimistically, even in the wake of the Jan. 27 Apollo spacecraft fire that killed three astronauts at Cape Kennedy, Fla. But optimistic talk aside, NASA is in a parlous state, and Project Apollo along with it.

How did things get into such a condition that even before Jan. 27 the moon program was running three years late and 15–20 percent over budgets? Was management at fault, and if so, where did (and does) the responsibility lie?

Almost by accident into the course of congressional hearings into the Apollo fire, something called the "Phillips Report" came to light. This document named for its principal author, Maj. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips, USAF, program manager for Apollo at NASA headquarters, dealt harshly with a giant industrial concern called North American Aviation, Inc.

More than anything else before Jan. 27 or since, it raised profound questions about the quality of government and industrial management in the space program, and about the candor and good faith of people.

North American is one of the largest manufacturers in the "aerospace" field. Sixty percent of its income is derived from NASA contracts—$110 million a month. Among government agencies, NASA is North American's biggest customer, and for years North American has been NASA's biggest contractor.

The Phillips Report first came to general public notice on Feb. 27, when Sen. Walter F. Mondale, D-Minn., started digging for it.

A month and a half elapsed before the report finally came out (via what Mondale called "the underground" rather than through official channels). In the interim witnesses danced a "semantic waltz"—to use Mondale's term—offering doubletalk, evasions, half-truths and even falsehoods in response to quests for details.

At length Webb on May 9 told Mondale that when the matter first was broached in February, "I did not know (about) an over-all strong admonition by Gen. Phillips to the managers of North American with respect to the total operation of the company . . ."

FAR-REACHING

There is nothing in the record to refute Webb's statement that he was ignorant of Phillips' stern warning to North American Aviation's President J. Leland Atwood on Dec. 19, 1965. But to persons familiar with NASA's organization, it is utterly inconceivable that Webb would not have known about such a far-reaching denoument as the Phillips Report.

This document consisted of a two-page covering letter from Phillips to Atwood; a 20-page summary of findings entitled "NASA Review Team Report," and several hundred pages of appendices and supporting papers. The letter and Team Report were obtained last month by Rep. William F. Ryan, D-N.Y., from an undisclosed source and were made public by him.

They reveal Phillips' dissatisfaction—to the point of exasperation—with a huge industrial corporation that seemed to be operating loosely and laxly at every level of supervision.

The situation was so bad that the Review Team expressed "serious concern that fully qualified flight vehicles will not be available to support the lunar landing program," and Phillips told Atwood, "I could not find a substantive basis for confidence in future performance . . ."

It can be stated quite without question that this sort of letter simply would not be written, or such a report rendered, to the agency's largest contractor without the knowledge of the agency's administrator. It is clear from other testimony, including Phillips' own, that the top NASA management was fully and currently informed of troubles with North American in that period.

From the outset Webb opposed public discussion and examination of the Phillips Report and other critical material, and at one point decried the disclosure of documents that "are thrown into the public arena so as to require the production of large amounts of data that destroys the system on which our success is built."

It was ironic that Webb should mention "success" in the context of a hearing into a disaster that killed three men, cost untold millions of dollars, and set the space program back at least a year.

NOT FIRST CHOICE

Webb's sparring with Mondale was at least matched by his encounter with Sen. Margaret Chase Smith, R-Maine, on the subject of the Apollo spacecraft contract under which North American eventually will receive $3.5 billion.

On April 17, Mrs. Smith asked Webb about the selection of North American. She wanted to know whether this company, or some other bidder among five submitting proposals, had been the first choice of a source evaluation board which had examined managerial, technical and financial qualifications.

"Yes," said Webb, "it was the recommended company."

But on May 9, Mrs. Smith called Webb to account for his earlier answer. Was it not true, she asked, that the source evaluation board actually had ranked the Martin Co. number one, with North American in second place?

Webb acknowledged that this was true, but explained that he and his advisers questioned the source evaluation board closely and then decided to overrule the board. He cited various items attesting to North American's "know-how." But the lingering suspicion was left that "know-who" may have had something to do with what transpired.

In the last three months of 1961, starting about 3½ months after Kennedy issued his moon message, the first four or five major contracts in Project Apollo were let. Two of these went to North American Aviation Inc.

On Sept. 11, North American won a directed award to build the second stage of a giant moon rocket now known as Saturn V. Then, on Nov. 28, North American nosed out Martin to get the juiciest plum of them all, the Command-Service Module (Spacecraft) contract.

COSTS SKYROCKET

When the awards were announced, NASA estimated the contract values at $140 million for the rocket stage and $400 million for the spacecraft.

Today, NASA's estimates of the total cost of these jobs are: Rocket stage, $1,656,600,000; spacecraft, $3,645,600,000. The former represents an 11-fold escalation, the latter 9-fold.

At the same time as NASA was letting contracts to North American, some coincidental side business was going on on a much smaller scale. It involved, among other interesting persons, Robert G. Baker, the Senate aide who made a name for himself in the late 1950's as Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson's "strong right arm . . . the last man I see at night, the first I speak to in the morning."

By 1961 Johnson had left the majority leadership for the vice presidency, and Baker—a protege in search of a protector—latched onto Sen. Robert S. Kerr, D-Okla., often called "the uncrowned king of the Senate." Baker's star remained in the ascendancy until Kerr's death at the start of 1963, then quickly began to set.

Kerr's "kingship" derived from his talent for amassing power, and from his unabashed use of muscle and "clout," or influence. He was a senior member of the Senate Public Works Committee and chairman of the Public Works subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. He was ranking Democrat (after the late Chairman Harry F. Byrd) on the Finance Committee. Finally, he was chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Science (the "Space Committee").

Kerr had succeeded his friend Johnson in the Space Committee chairmanship at the start of the Kennedy administration, and the two strong men proposed as space administrator Kerr's friend and business associate, Jim Webb. In a subsequent confirmation hearing, Kerr said fondly of Webb, "He is probably the greatest Oklahoman that North Carolina ever produced."

LONG PUBLIC SERVICE

Webb had been a director and "assistant to the president" of Kerr's huge oil-uranium empire, Kerr-McGee Oil Industries Inc. of Oklahoma City. He was also a director of the McDonnell Aircraft Co. of St. Louis, which had been chosen in 1959 to build the Mercury capsule for America's first manned flight venture. (After taking office Webb late in 1961 authorized the start of a new manned flight project called Gemini—and more than three quarters of a billion dollars worth of business fell McDonnell's way.

Webb had a long career of public service. As he told the Senate committee in his confirmation hearing, he had decided fairly early in life that he could make enough money in one-third of his time so he could devote the other two-thirds to public affairs.

Though Webb was energetic, he was not, at this time, rich. In 1949 when he was changing jobs in the Truman administration from director of the Budget Bureau to undersecretary of state, he told an interviewer he had no independent means and that he was living in a bungalow for which he had paid $15,000. Friends said he was a man with absolutely no interest in money.

During the Eisenhower years, while he was out of public office, Webb amassed a considerable fortune. His association with Kerr-McGee, among other activities, made him at least a millionaire. According to a study made by the House Banking and Currency Committee in 1964 based on May 1962 data, Webb was one of 20 principal stockholders in the Fidelity Bank & Trust Co. of Oklahoma City, of which Kerr was No. 3 stockholder and Kerr's partner, Dean McGee, was No. 1. Webb's bank stock alone had a paper value in 1962 of $790,000.

Webb did not publicly disclose his stock holdings, but assured the Senate that he would "resign from every association, organization or interest not consistent with my full-time devotion of the duties of administrator of the NASA." He added that his affairs would be handled, during his incumbency, by the Fidelity Bank, which he said "I will instruct . . . to make no investment in any field related to the programs of NASA."

The Fidelity Bank was to figure prominently in financial operations that brought Bobby Baker, his sponsor Senator Kerr, North American Aviation and a "Washington consultant" named Fred B. Black Jr. into an involved series of business dealings.

FEE OF $100,000 A YEAR

Black later came to be one of the key figures in the Senate Rules Committee's inquiry into the far-reaching activities of Baker while secretary to the Senate majority. Black was employed by North American, at a fee of about $100,000 a year, to keep an ear to the ground in Washington. North American's president, Atwood, told the Baker investigators about Black in these terms:

"He has been an adviser to us in the general area of his predictions and his observations on governmental activities, stemming largely from Washington. And he has from time to time and frequently advised us as to his opinion on what might develop in the way of congressional action, governmental action of various kinds. He, in my opinion, has been an astute and reliable observer."

Black maintained a palatial house in Washington's finest neighborhood, just around the corner from "Les Ormes," which Lyndon and Lady Bird Johnson had bought from Perle Mesta and renamed "The Elms." Atwood used to come to dinner at Black's when in Washington and met any number of interesting, important people—among them Bobby Baker.

Baker and Black had met, the latter told the Senate investigators, back in 1959 at the behest of one Frank Roberts, who in 1964 was a vice president of Sperry-Rand, the successor corporation to the Sperry Gyroscope Co. in which Webb was an up-and-coming young official from 1936 to 1943.

Why did Roberts want Black and Baker to meet? "Baker was a good friend of his," Black explained. "I was a good friend of his, and he thought the two good friends should meet."

Baker and Black indeed became good friends, and their relationship continued even after Baker's star had become eclipsed and the onetime Senate aide was reduced to borrowing small sums for walking-around money. But in 1961, with the moon program bright on the horizon, the days of the mid-sixties seemed exceedingly remote.

ENTER SERV-U

Late in 1961, when North American was getting into Project Apollo with both feet, Black was visited by a small group with a novel proposition. One of the group was a man with Florida interests and gambling connections in Las Vegas and the Caribbean; another was Ernest Tucker, who shared a law office in Washington with Baker.

The proposition they brought related to a vending machine venture represented as a spinoff of a Florida canteen operation, to be known as Potomac Vending, Inc. Black and Baker each bought 1,500 shares (at $1 a share), but decided to keep their ownership secret, Tucker became owner of record, but Black and Baker together were beneficial owners of 30 percent of the venture.

Black told the Senate committee he "didn't really have any reason at all" for this arrangement, adding: "I trust Mr. Tucker. That is the only reason there could have been."

Before long, Black was talking with Atwood about the new company's moving into Los Angeles and taking over the lucrative canteen business in some of North American's plants. The name was changed from Potomac Vending to Serv-U about this time.

Black did not reveal his hidden financial interest in Serv-U, and Atwood never thought to inquire why his $100,000-a-year Washington consultant would be troubling himself about a vending machine contract.

Atwood told Black whom to see, and in short order Serv-U elbowed an old-established vending contractor out of several North American factories including the one where Apollo spacecraft were to be built. In time, Serv-U was doing several million dollars business annually.

How did a brand-new company with only $10,000 capitalization get financing for the equipment needed to run a large-scale vending operation? In Serv-U's case the source was Fidelity National in Oklahoma City, the bank dominated by the Kerr-McGee interests. Black said he gained entree to the bank's president, Grady Harris, by means of a telephone call placed by Kerr in his Capitol Office while Black sat beside him.

In time, Black borrowed several hundred thousand dollars from Fidelity National, sometimes on nothing more than his own signature, and at least once with a nonexistent power-of-attorney signed a $50,000 note for Baker.

One of the dealings with Fidelity National involved the capitalization of another bank, Farmers & Merchants State Bank of Tulsa.

ACQUIRED LAND

Tulsa, the second city of Oklahoma and a prominent "oil capital," was a place greatly favored by Kerr. He had worked and fought for years to get a navigable waterway connecting Tulsa with the Mississippi River via the Arkansas River, and people used to say that if Kerr lived long enough Tulsa would be a seaport.

The Arkansas River improvement plan was not happening in a vaccum, of course. The Kerr-McGee interests acquired land outside Tulsa that subsequently turned out to be along the future course of a navigation canal. Some of this land was later optioned to a large industrial corporation planning to conduct certain Project Apollo manufacturing operations in Tulsa. The company: North American Aviation, Inc.

As time passed, the acquaintance between Kerr and Black ripened; they introduced each other to friends—this is how Black met Webb. They enjoyed, so Black's testimony indicates, an association characterized by frankness and mutual understanding. When the Tulsa bank deal materialized, it was not surprising that Kerr should call Black into conference.

Kerr apparently advised Black that Kerr-McGee was planning to invest heavily in Farmers & Merchants State Bank and suggested that a piece of the action might profitably be acquired by Black and Baker. Accordingly, Black went to Oklahoma City and on March 20, 1962, borrowed $175,000 from Fidelity National to buy 6,400 shares of the Tulsa bank stock.

In a completely informal, unwritten arrangement, he told the Senate committee in 1964, Baker "could purchase half of it at any time that he could come up with the money." Baker, on the other hand, had not been required to put up any of the capital; the loan was solely Black's responsibility.

Farmers & Merchants turned out to be a money-maker, thanks to numerous large and active accounts, one of which was maintained by North American's Tulsa operation. In time, Black cut back on his holdings by selling a piece of his bank stock to Edmund Levinson, a Las Vegas gambler who cropped up in the news this month in a federal tax case.

Levinson, Black explained, "is a great personal friend of mine" whom he met "the day before Kennedy's inauguration." Levinson was also a business associate of Black's by virtue of silent ownership of shares in Serv-U, along with another Las Vegas type, Edward Torres, named this month in the tax matter.

Serv-U thrived, and in time Black and Baker owned a 57 percent controlling interest, all still in Tucker's name. Black never could "see any reason" for disclosing Baker's role.

Except for a small hassle at the outset about the quality of coffee, North American Aviation apparently had no complaint about its canteen contractor.

This is more than could be said about NASA's relationship with North American. By the time Gen. Phillips joined the space agency early in 1964, some two years after North American and Serv-U started their respective operations, things were pretty sadly unglued at Downey and Seal Beach, the two suburban Los Angeles plants where North American respectively builds the spacecraft and the Saturn stage.

Things apparently went from bad to worse in the ensuing year and a half. Schedules were going out the window, as were cost estimates. Webb's optimistic prediction of an Apollo flight in 1964 was gone with the wind; so was 1965 as a target year. Phillips confronted the agency's top management—certainly including Webb—with word of the crisis.

He took a task force to Downey in the fall of 1965 and conducted what amounted to a two-week shakedown inspection. What he found was not pleasant, and even subsequent efforts of Webb and his chief aides to interpret events kindly do not take the sting out of Phillips' findings.

SLAP ON THE WRIST?

One of the milder admonitions in the Team Report (on Page 17) was that North American should "halt the alarming trend of crisis operation and neglect of future tasks because of concentration on today's problems."

In view of Phillips' sharp comment in his letter to Atwood that "even with due consideration of hopeful signs I could not find a substantive basis for confidence in future performance," the question arises about possible plans for dumping North American. The record is not clear on whether Webb was ever frontally approached with a recommendation to get rid of the crisis-ridden contractor.

The record is clear, however, that North American was not dumped, and Webb says the reason why is that after the Dec. 19, 1965 jacking-up North American made a rapid and excellent recovery and by April 1966 was on the proper track.

This does not, of course, explain away the ill-fated Spacecraft 012, which was not completed at Downey until August 1966 and which was tinkered with at Cape Kennedy for 21 weeks thereafter until it caught fire on Jan. 27 and killed three astronauts.

Not until May 8, 1967—almost 17 months after the Phillips Report and more than three months after the fire—did NASA make any public move to change its relationship with North American. Even then the action was sugar-coated and in financial terms probably will not amount to more than a slap on the wrist.

What NASA did, in effect, was to minimize future damage North American will be able to inflict on the program. It did this by restricting North American's future role to a strict assembly-line operation for the production of standardized spacecraft. Vital follow-on work like spacecraft modification and pre-launch checkout will be done by other contractors.

This will cost a great deal of money, but it is not clear how much of this, if any, will come out of North American's corporate pocket. And there remains considerable doubt as to the penalty, if any, which North American will suffer for the Jan. 27 disaster.

Questions remain, even after weeks of technical investigation and a month of hearings on Capitol Hill. North American's favored position in the space program is interesting; is it significant? And if so, what is the nature of that significance?

How did things get into the state that prevailed at the time of the Phillips Report, that prevailed on Jan. 27, 1967, that—for all one knows to the contrary—may prevail today?

And possibly the most intriguing question of all goes back to a statement in the Phillips Report: "NASA has been forced to accept slippages in key milestone accomplishments, degradation in hardware performance, and increasing costs."

Why forced? By whom, and how, and for what motive? The answers to these questions may reveal the true nature of Project Apollo's metamorphosis in reverse.

SITUATION IN THE NEAR EAST

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Near East and specifically with regard to the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba this morning remains serious. Time certainly is of the essence if diplomacy is to defuse this critical situation.

The significance of the United Arab Republic's decision regarding the Gulf of Aqaba is, I believe, clear. President Nasser said in a speech last Monday:

> The armed forces yesterday occupied Sharm el-Sheikh. What is the meaning of the armed force's occupation of Sharm el-Sheikh? It is an affirmation of our rights and our sovereignty over the Aqaba Gulf. The Aqaba Gulf constitutes our Egyptian territorial waters. Under no circumstance will we allow the Israeli flag to pass through the Aqaba Gulf.

Yesterday, in an article in the New York Times datelined May 28, President Nasser is quoted as saying that he had not "budged one inch" from his decision to enforce a blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba.

Israel Prime Minister Eshkol has made plain the vital importance to Israel of free and innocent passage in the gulf and explicitly stated on May 23:

> What is at stake here is a formal and clear international undertaking on compliance [with the right of free passage] and on this depends the maintenance of international law and order.

I have this morning talked with Arthur H. Dean, who negotiated the U.S. position with respect to the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, signed in Geneva in 1958, and ratified by 33 nations. In particular, Mr. Dean pointed out that article XVI, paragraph 4, of that convention states:

> There shall be no suspension of the innocent passage of foreign ships through straits, which are used for international navigation between one part of the high seas and another part of the high seas or the territorial sea of a foreign state.

This provision is plainly applicable inasmuch as the Straits of Tiran separate the Red Sea, which is part of the high seas, from both that part of the Gulf of Aqaba which constitutes part of the high seas and that part which constitutes the territorial sea of Israel bordering on Eilat.

In other words, this article makes explicit the right of shipping to pass from high seas through territorial waters to high seas, and the right of innocent passage for ships from high seas, through territorial waters to territorial seas. Although the Arab States did not ratify the convention, it nonetheless constitutes clear and strong evidence of a principle of international law of general application.

In addition, the resolution unanimously adopted by the United Nations Security Council on October 13, 1956, should not be forgotten in connection with the right of transit through the Suez Canal. The six principles of that resolution included the statement that:

> The operation of the Canal should be insulated from the politics of any country.

Secretary of State Dulles said on October 16, 1956, with regard to this unanimous resolution:

> There has, I believe, been progress toward achieving a just and peaceful solution of the Suez crisis. The Security Council of the United Nations adopted unanimously six principles which ought to govern the solution. These are sound principles and if they are effectively implemented will accomplish what the principal users of the Canal have sought. To me a most significant principle is that which says that the operation of the Canal shall be insulated from the politics of any nation. That was in the proposals which we made in London last August and that principle was opposed by the Soviet Union at that time. Also the Security Council specifically said that there should be no discrimination overt or covert.

Unfortunately, no Israel ships or cargoes have transited the Suez Canal since 1956 and certain rights of belligerency have been maintained by the United Arab Republic.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said on this floor twice during the past week, I believe that we should pursue all diplomatic initiatives, at the highest levels, including serious discussions with the Soviets, to insure the maintenance of free and innocent passage into the Gulf of Aqaba.

We should, Mr. Speaker, urge the parties involved to consider taking this serious matter before the International Court of Justice, although such a step is not mandatory. Of course, such proceedings could not be undertaken in good faith unless the United Arab Republic guaranteed free and innocent passage into the gulf, pending the Court's determination.

In the event that such a formula is not considered, and if the Security Council is unable to resolve the matter, if United States and Soviet diplomacy and efforts in other capitals do not make progress, and if the United Arab Republic makes effective its announced decision to block the Strait of Tiran—the United States must be prepared to stand by its commitment to free and innocent passage in the Gulf of Aqaba in concert with other nations.

Specifically, Secretary Dulles wrote in an aide memoire to Israel Foreign Minister Abba Eban, on February 1, 1957:

> In the absence of some over-riding decision to the contrary, as by the International Court of Justice, the United States, on behalf of vessels of United States registry, is prepared to exercise the right of free and innocent passage and to join with others to secure general recognition of this right.

U.S. SUPPORT OF GREECE

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come for the State Department to approve complete U.S. support of Greece as a necessary step to deter Soviet encouraged, Egyptian aggression in the Middle East.

It is obvious that the Soviet Union has everything to gain and nothing to lose through its present role of encouraging Egyptian and Syrian threats against Israel. By expanding its position in Egypt, Syria, and Algeria the Soviet Union will have outflanked NATO at a time when the administration is pursuing a shortsighted policy toward Greece thus adding to free world complications in the Mediterranean.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the United States must launch a diplomatic counteroffensive in the present Middle East crisis and we must reaffirm our alliance with and support of Greece which would strengthen the eastern flank of NATO and clearly indicate our determination not to be forced out of the Mediterranean by Soviet encouragement of the leftist Arab governments.

The present Israel crisis is not an isolated situation but is intricately involved in Soviet power plays for a major role in the Middle East, consistent with the historic Russian desire for expansion in that area.

The present Government of Greece emerged when the threat of a Communist conspiracy became known in that land. Consistency dictates that we give full cooperation to this proper Government, especially when Red involvement in the Nasser-led maneuver against Israel dominates the headlines. Application of a firm U.S. policy in place of the present inconsistency and vacillation of the administration is clearly needed.

Since World War II the Soviets have demonstrated their determination to achieve by deceit and rebellious means gains that would never be accepted by various peoples in a direct Communist move. Nasser and the Syrian ruling clique with their anti-Israel moves are becoming pawns in a much broader Soviet power play. Their own internal weakness makes their manipulation by Moscow relatively easy but an effective U.S. presence can deter present threats of aggression and hopefully restore some degree of calmness to the eastern Mediterranean.

NUCLEAR PROPULSION FOR NAVAL WARSHIPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order, the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, May 27, we launched our latest aircraft carrier, the *John F. Kennedy*. Godspeed to all who sail in *Kennedy*. Our freedom depends on the brave men who will man such ships, but I wonder if we are doing, as a nation, what we should to provide these brave men with the best to do this job.

Kennedy, the aircraft carrier, was obsolete when it was launched. It is a second-best aircraft carrier. It could have been a first-class aircraft carrier if the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Congress had been in agreement and had listened to the advice of the most knowledgeable men in the Navy on the importance of nuclear propulsion.

These men were the Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Anderson and Admiral McDonald who followed him as Chief of Naval Operations. Adm. Charles Hayward who commanded the carrier task group which included our first nuclear propelled carrier, the *Enterprise*, during the Cuban crisis, and Admiral Rickover, the man who has been charged with the building of a hundred nuclear propelled submarines and the nuclear propulsion engines of the cruiser *Long Beach*, frigate *Bainbridge*, the destroyer *Truxtun* and the only modern aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise*.

Admiral McDonald, Admiral Hayward and Admiral Rickover and the skippers of all the nuclear propelled surface ships testified before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and strongly urged that the *Kennedy* be nuclear propelled. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy strongly urged that the *Kennedy* be nuclear propelled. Our hearings showed that it could sustain top speed almost without limit, that with nuclear propulsion it would be free from fuel tanker support, that it would have 50 percent more aircraft fuel capacity and aircraft ammunition and that over a projected lifetime of 20 to 30 years she would cost less than 3 percent more.

What a tragedy that a ship which will have the responsibility of serving, as President Johnson said, "In the year 2000 and beyond" has to be shackled with the obsolescence of the oil propulsion methods of another century, the early decades of the 20th century.

What a tragedy that the name of one of our most brilliant and forward-looking Presidents could not have been borne by a modern nuclear propulsion aircraft carrier greater in capability even than the *Enterprise*.

Why did this tragedy occur? The answer is very plain to any person who will search the record. The Secretary of Defense insisted that the *Kennedy* be oil propelled. The Congress yielded to the will of the Secretary of Defense.

This same battle against obsolescence continues. The House of Representatives is now standing up to the challenge by refusing to build any more ships of the line unless they are nuclear powered. The Armed Services Committee has recently directed that two new frigates be nuclear propelled. The Joint Committee unanimously supports that position and the House by a vote of 401 to 3 concurred on May 9, 1967.

On the day that the *Kennedy* was launched another memorable event took place for the Navy. This was the commissioning of our latest warship, the *Truxtun*, whose job will be to escort aircraft carriers such as the *Kennedy*. There is one fundamental difference between these two warships which saddens me. The *Truxtun*, the escort vessel, is powered by nuclear energy, the *Kennedy* by oil.

I recall in 1963, just before the keel of the CVA-67, subsequently named the *Kennedy*, was laid, that we of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy pleaded that the right thing be done and that this ship be fitted with the only type of powerplant which makes sense in the nuclear age—nuclear power. I also recall how a number of Members, after the untimely death of President Kennedy, recommended that CVA-67 be fitted with nuclear power and named after our late beloved President. This was thought to be a most fitting memorial to a farsighted leader.

The report to the Congress which the Joint Committee issued in December 1963 summarized our findings and stated our conclusions. It might be well on this occasion to recall some of the pertinent points of that report:

> On the basis of its investigation, the committee concludes that the decision announced by the Secretary of Defense on October 25, 1963, against the utilization of nuclear propulsion in the next aircraft carrier, CVA-67, was incorrect. If this carrier, with a life expectancy of up to 30 years, is built with conventional power, it will reduce its capabilities from now until the 21st century.
>
> More tragically, such a decision means that the Navy may be committed to a future of planned obsolescence with grave implications for the national security.
>
> We must plan for time of crisis. It is precisely in such situations that the superior mobility, maneuverability and reliability of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled naval striking force. It is fundamentally illogical and wasteful to fit our new first line warships with power plants that are, perhaps, already obsolete * * *
>
> In light of our experience with nuclear surface ships, their demonstrated military advantages, and the relatively small additional costs properly attributable to nuclear power, the committee concludes that CVA-67 should be nuclear powered * * *
>
> The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recommends:
>
> 1. That the decision to install conventional propulsion in the new aircraft carrier, CVA-67, should be set aside and plans made to install nuclear propulsion in this ship.

And, Mr. Speaker, that could have been done at that time. It was not too late even at that time to have made the *Kennedy* nuclear propelled.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] for his excellent statement.

Mr. Speaker, we have McNamara's "flying Edsels" in the F-111A and F-111B. Now, we have McNamara's "floating Edsel" in the carrier *Kennedy*.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] has been a stalwart in support of this administration. I am sure the gentleman finds nothing pleasant about the task which he is performing here this afternoon in calling attention to the failure of this administration to adequately provide, when it had the opportunity in the construction of this carrier, to adequately provide for national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I again wish to commend the gentleman from California for his statement and say that I agree with him completely.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, feel that I can certainly say that I have been a stalwart supporter of the administration. However, I do feel that in many things the administration has not done the right thing. However, my conscience and my background of knowledge on this particular point leads me not to remain silent, but leads me to point out that this is a mistake that has been made, and I hope that by pointing it out, we shall be able to make sure that we make no further mistakes along this line.

And, Mr. Speaker, both these great aircraft carriers, efficient as any conventional carrier, would probably be much improved over the efficiency of the older ones. And, I am sure they are. They are still not first-class ships. We are not giving our men the best. And I say that in terms of military equipment we cannot afford to be second class. We have got to be first class.

Our one and only nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise*, is now deployed for the second time in Vietnam. She has set record after record since she joined the fleet 5 years ago. She has proven so effective in battle that the Secretary of Defense finally asked for another nuclear-powered atomic carrier last year, but the sad commentary is that a decade will go by between the time our first and second nuclear-powered carriers go to sea. In the meantime, two conventionally powered carriers—the *America* and the *Kennedy*—will go to sea.

The other event to which I refer, the commissioning of the nuclear-powered *Truxtun*, is an example of the way we should be going with all of our first-line warships. Any capital warship in the future which does not have nuclear propulsion is doomed to obsolescence early in its life. One of the most discouraging things to me is that the Congress has had to force nuclear power upon the Defense Department in each class of warship. This was true in the case of the submarine; it was also true of aircraft carriers—our latest conversion to nuclear power. The Congress also forced nuclear power on the Defense Department when it changed the *Truxtun* to nuclear power 6 years ago.

But, unfortunately, the job is still not done. Congress is still taking the lead in getting the Navy to use 21st century propulsion plants. Although the Congress has now persuaded the Department of Defense to build nuclear-powerd submarines and they have now agreed to build the follow-on aircraft carriers with nuclear propulsion, there is still a reluctance on the part of the DOD to use nuclear power in all of our first-line warships—those ships that will escort our nuclear-powered carriers.

The Congress took another important step last week. Last week the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services in conference agreed to limit all advanced design work for future major fleet escorts to the use of nuclear power. The Congress this year must do one more thing: this is to fund the nuclear ships which have been authorized.

Let me emphasize once again by saying I hope the Committee on Appropriations will follow the judicial authorization which has been made by this House under the leadership of the Committee on Armed Services and its chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers], and confirmed by this House, as I said a few minutes ago on last May 9 by a vote of 401 to 3.

In my opinion Congress is discharging its responsibility of leadership in this field.

So I say Godspeed the *Kennedy*, and those who sail on it, and anchors aweigh.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my distinguished colleague I think he is absolutely right, and this House and this Congress as well, I am sure, will overwhelmingly join him in appreciation of the courage of the gentleman in bringing this important matter to the attention of the House this morning.

The Congress does have a responsibility. I believe it is discharging its responsibility. Something must be done to restrain some of these people who want to relegate the defense of this country back to the days of the horse and buggy. I would say to my distinguished colleague again by way of commendation that I remember being on a television program, since I have been in the House of Representatives, right here in Washington, with one who would have reactivated the horse cavalry. I also received a letter not long ago from a person who should know better who wants to reactivate the battleships. Such things as that are a defense of the past. We must look to the future. And I of course regret that this great aircraft carrier which was just launched could not have been nuclear powered.

We must look to the year 2000, and plan to insure the defense of this great country of ours and the free world.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I want to just call attention to the fact that within the next week or 10 days the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is going to release a report of some 427 pages which gives the complete history of nuclear propulsion for naval vessels of all kinds. It will be a document that will be useful to every university and to every person who is interested in the national defense of our country. It is well documented. It has been read and reread for accuracy of statement. It will furnish the complete story on this problem of whether we should go back to the days of the sailing vessels, you might say, by using oil, because oil today in the propulsion of our naval vessels is just as obsolete as sails were when oil took over. We should go to that element of propulsion which we have now, and which has demonstrated so brilliantly in the war in South Vietnam and in the confrontation around the island of Cuba that it has possibilities and capabilities which so far exceed that of a conventional carrier that from a military, logistic, and strategic standpoint there is absolutely no comparison.

As I have said, over the lifetime of the vessel the nuclear propelled aircraft carrier will be within 2 to 3 percent of the cost of a conventionally powered aircraft carrier. It will furnish twice the amount of fuel to aircraft authorities. It can go at top speed from here to Japan and back without any regard to the amount of fuel it is using. It does not have to spend time having to be refueled in midocean on long trips by escort vessels. It does not have to hold back its speed to nonnuclear propelled escort ships. It can maneuver and can go at top speed almost indefinitely. The aircraft carrier that we have planned now will have 9 years of fuel supply in the first loading of the reactor.

It will run for 9 years without refueling. Think of that. And then think of us spending millions and hundreds of millions of dollars on a second-class aircraft carrier that is dependent upon the speed of its escort vessels and upon resupply of its fuel from escort vessels.

This is why I felt constrained to make this speech today.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALIFORNIANS BACK H.R. 7819

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Van Deerlin] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, 12 days ago I reserved 1 hour of time on the House floor to urge my fellow Californians to lay aside their political differences and unite behind H.R. 7819, the school aid bill reported by the Education and Labor Committee.

I pointed out that passage of the bill was vital to the welfare of the school systems of California. H.R. 7819 had been endorsed by both the California Association of School Administrators and the State board of education. In addition, I had been reliably informed that the schools in my own county of San Diego would lose about $1.3 million a year in Federal aid if Congress adopted H.R. 8983, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie].

I did not dream up the estimate of the potential cost in San Diego of the Quie amendment. The figure was given me by one of the most eminent educators in my district, Dr. Ralph Dailard, the superintendent of San Diego city schools.

Mr. Quie's proposal, as we all know, was rejected by the House on May 24. Later that same night, H.R. 7819, the measure of such paramount importance to California, was approved on a rollcall vote of 294 to 122.

An examination of that rollcall reveals that a majority of the California Republicans who were present put their State and its children ahead of purely partisan considerations and voted for H.R. 7819.

The bill was supported on final passage by 19 of the 20 voting Democrats from California and by eight of the 15 Republicans. The Record shows our GOP colleagues voted in the following fashion:

For H.R. 7819: Mr. Mailliard, Mr. Gubser, Mr. Charles M. Teague, Mr. Robert B. Mathias, Mr. Wiggins, Mr. Bell, Mr. Hosmer, and Mr. Pettis.

Against H.R. 7819: Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. Talcott, Mr. H. Allen Smith, Mr. Del Clawson, Mr. Lipscomb, Mr. Utt, and Mr. Bob Wilson.

OHIO UNIVERSITY HONORS CONGRESSMAN WAYNE HAYS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor in the House of Representatives of the International Education Act of 1966, I have naturally followed with keen interest the leadership of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman Wayne L. Hays, the cosponsor of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, commonly known as the Fulbright-Hays Act.

The International Education Act, of course, is focused on strengthening colleges and universities here in the United States in the field of international studies and research. The Fulbright-Hays Act focuses on exchange of teachers and students between the United States and other countries.

Both measures are of great significance in strengthening our resources for higher education in international affairs.

Last year on December 2, 1966, Ohio University held a convocation to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Fulbright Act and to give recognition to Congressman Wayne L. Hays, who was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the Record excerpts from remarks made at this ceremony by Vernon R. Alden, president of Ohio University, Congressman Hays, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

The excerpts follow:

Ohio University Honors Congressman Hays

Dr. Alden. On this occasion we are recognizing Congressman Wayne L. Hays of Ohio, whose deep interest in education and foreign affairs led him to cosponsor the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, known popularly as the Fulbright-Hays Act. This act, which expanded and consolidated previous legislation on the international educational and cultural exchange program, assures the continuation of the centuries-old tradition of free exchange of ideas and men among institutions of higher learning throughout the world. . . .

The event which started the United States on the international exchange program in 1946 was an amendment, sponsored by Senator William Fulbright, authorizing an exchange of scholars financed by the sale of surplus U.S. war materials abroad.

At a White House ceremony in 1961 marking the 15th anniversary of this program, the late President Kennedy made the following statement on the origins of the act:

"Of all the examples in recent history of beating swords into plowshares, of having some benefit come to humanity out of the destruction of war, I think that this program in its results will be among the most preeminent."

With major improvements made possible by the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961, this program has indeed achieved outstanding prominence and results. Last year 110 countries and geographical areas participated in educational and cultural exchanges. . . .

Through independent Fulbright-Hays Commissions composed of equal numbers of American and foreign citizens, the participating countries play a role of equal weight, both in the initiation and the administration of the exchange program. This is surely one of the program's greatest assets: that it is not a unilateral one—although financed almost entirely by the United States—but founded and conducted on the principle of mutual respect and mutual responsibility.

A second outstanding aspect of this program is the great amount of private support and cooperation which it has elicited. In scholar or teacher exchanges among universities, for instance, almost all expenses exclusive of travel are paid for by participating institutions. The value of this support last year alone was approximately $9 million. In addition, elementary and secondary schools in the United States spent approximately $1.5 million on the salaries of exchange teachers.

This great private effort cannot be measured by dollars alone. The time and effort of countless distinguished and dedicated volunteers is perhaps the program's greatest asset. Almost 5,000 school, college, and university teachers and others in the academic, professional, and cultural world in the United States and abroad devote many hours each year to serving on screening committees that pass on grantee applications.

The immediate and long-range effects of this enormous effort are extremely difficult to measure. We know that since the beginning of this program about 4.5 million schoolchildren in the United States have been taught by foreign exchange teachers or by American teachers who have participated in an overseas exchange. We know that thousands of elementary and high schools here and abroad have participated. And we know also that almost every accredited college and university in the United States, as well as the major universities throughout the world, have been deeply involved.

We do not, however, have concrete answers to the most important questions. What impact will this program have upon the quality and purpose of our own society? And upon the many great societies and civilizations other than our own? Perhaps most important of all, what influence will this program have in shaping a world in which all people live in peace and prosperity?

President Johnson offered one answer a year ago. He said:

"We know certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth:

"Ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace.

"The conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms.

"The knowledge of our citizens is one treasure which grows only when it is shared."

Another answer is more immediately evident at Ohio University. Seated in the audience today are faculty members and students from numerous countries throughout the world. Many of our American faculty members and students have been abroad. They have been team members in our educational assistance projects in Nigeria and Viet-Nam. They have been Peace Corps Volunteers. They have been teachers and students.

Surely this is an indication that we are becoming more international in our outlook, less parochial in our beliefs. I believe that we can be equally sure that, now and in the future as never before, knowledge is power. It is our sincerest wish that, through vastly increased exchanges of ideas and of men, our knowledge will increase until we have achieved the greatest power, the power to live in reason, justice, and peace.

If this goal is ever realized, we will owe an enormous debt to those men whose faith and foresight inspired them to initiate the first worldwide program of international educational and cultural exchange. . . .

Congressman Hays: I would just like very briefly to share a thought with you that occurs to me nearly every year around appropriations time. It's some kind of a commentary upon your Congress and upon you who send us to Congress that we can approve in one afternoon, with a minimum of debate, a budget of from $40 to $60 billion for defense—and I vote for it because I believe in defense. With a minimum of debate and no argument we can approve this vast expenditure for a machine that we hope we will never have to use. . . . And yet that same House of Representatives and Senate will spend a week arguing whether they should spend one one-thousandth or, if you will, one one-hundredth of one percent as much for the act which I had the honor to coauthor.

There is a great movement of protest in this country which is exhibited in various ways and which seems to be at its apex among people of the age of the students here and in other universities. And I suppose it would seem prosaic and impossible, but if somehow or other the students of America could urge—and Congress listens, believe me—that we spend, instead of this miniscule sum, maybe one percent of what we spend on defense upon international understanding . . . maybe we could make it possible through understanding that this great military juggernaut of ours would never have to be put into high gear. This is kind of a challenge.

I would just like to end . . . by saying to the youth of America . . . that you do have it within your hands, within your power, to shape the destiny of this country, and that your Congress, which is a great cross-section of America, on the average no better and no worse than the people they represent, will listen to you. . . . It is something that we can do; it is something we must do; and with the faith that I have . . . I believe that it is something we will do; to create international understanding and to be the leaders of a peaceful and slowly evolving, more knowledgeable and prosperous world.

Secretary Rusk. . . . Today we take special note of [Congressman Hays'] contributions to international exchange. I think all of us would agree with President Kennedy's judgment that the enactment of the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961 was an event of historic significance. . . .

Under the programs authorized by that act we are conducting exchanges with some 130 countries and territories. And each year on the average some 11,000 persons receive grants that take them to other countries or bring them here. Large as these figures may seem, they represent only a fraction of the flow of students and teachers, scientists and artists, between the United States and other lands. And, with reference to Congressman Hays' remark about the budget, this flow is not beginning to keep pace with rising demands and needs.

Education is the essential foundation for economic, social, and political development. We know that from our own experience. From our very beginnings in North America we recognized the importance of education—general education, education in the practical, agricultural, mechanical arts, and in the professions. For us it is not a luxury but a necessity—a necessity for the functioning of a democratic society, for economic progress, for a civilized society, and for a good life for the individual. And other people now are being caught up in a revolutionary interest in just these processes. The thirst for knowledge is worldwide and is demanding. President Johnson has reminded us that education lies at the heart of every nation's hope and purposes and it must be at the heart of our international relations. The American colleges and the universities are performing a historic service in helping the so-called developing countries to lay the educational foundation for progress. At the same time, exchanges of knowledge—and of people who have knowledge or desire it—among the scientifically and technically advanced nations have continued to increase in importance. The great international communities of knowledge are growing and spreading. Science and technology are international. And the various peoples of the world are learning more and more about each other's way of life.

In September 1965 President Johnson proposed the development of a broad new international education program. He appointed a committee to make recommendations and he set forth his program this year in his message to Congress. One element in it is the strengthening of education in world affairs in American institutions. Grants under this act will be made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Some years ago when we were both foundation executives the present distinguished head of that department, Dr. John W. Gardner, and I served on a committee of nine organized by the Ford Foundation to study the role of the American universities in world affairs. That committee made a report in 1960 which, among other things, emphasized that the government should do only what the universities could not do unaided, that it must respect the integrity and the pursuit of free inquiry. And when the government has done its essential part it should get out of the way and let the educators get on with their work. And you may rest assured that that principle will guide the administration of the International Education Act of 1966 just as it has guided our educational exchange program.

International understanding, yes—but something that runs more deeply than simply a vague feeling of amiability toward people from other lands—an understanding based upon knowledge, and knowledge in as much depth as possible. And thereby we hope to spin some of the infinity of threads that bind peace together. . . .

LAW AGAINST CRIME

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, generations of neglect and indifference have contributed greatly to the massive crime problem now facing the United States. And that problem will grow worse every day we dally.

There should be quick action by the Congress for the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967 that was proposed by President Johnson. It would give vitally needed assistance to police departments throughout the country, and fight the criminals now. In addition, it would make a meaningful contribution to eliminating some of the worst causes of crime.

The Baltimore News American said recently in an editorial that there should be as little hairsplitting as possible over the bill. It is vitally important for American citizens to be safe from assault and robbery, the newspaper added.

The editorial is a timely reminder of a great need, and I respectfully ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Record as part of my remarks:

Law Against Crime

Attorney General Ramsey Clark has urged that Congress grant swift passage to the administration's proposed Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967, and he seems to be getting a sympathetic reception.

Sen. John McClellan (D., Ark.), chairman of a committee studying the measure, hinted approval would be forthcoming for whatever expenditures were necessary to "get results."

This is encouraging, for there should be as little hair-splitting as possible over this bill or others like it. It is as important for American citizens to be safe from assault and robbery as it is for them to enjoy any benefit of social reform.

The Congress should, therefore, examine the measure with all deliberate speed with a view to getting all, or at last most, of its provisions firmly enacted into law.

A SALUTE TO SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH—THE CHALLENGE OF THE LATER YEARS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss some of the progress we have made in recent years to secure new opportunities for the older residents of Florida. It is particularly appropriate that we review these achievements during May which the President of the United States has proclaimed in honor of America's older people. The Nation pauses in May, as it has since 1963, to pay tribute to each of our senior citizens and pledges to continue to find ways of helping to secure the dignity and independence we all desire to have.

Let me say that I believe the later years are not a time in which men and women who have helped to build our communities and country should be "put out to pasture." In our older population there are represented a tremendous wealth of knowledge and experience which no community can leave untapped at a time when there is so much to be done, and so few to accomplish it.

Florida can expect by the next census to have the largest concentration of older people in its population of any of the States of the Union. One out of every eight Floridians you meet today is over the age of 65. It is particularly important, therefore, that each of us recognize not only the need to provide new and meaningful opportunities for our senior citizens, but also we must guarantee that the special needs which many of these people have are met with the same enthusiasm with which we confront the needs of all Americans.

Florida is a leader among the States in recognizing the contribution which older Americans have to offer society. We have undertaken many innovative and imaginative programs designed to encourage older residents of other States to move into Florida because we believe that this contribution will help to make our State an even better place in which to live.

I have had the privilege for many years to express to my colleagues in the Congress on behalf of the people of Florida your many excellent ideas and suggestions on how to expand opportunities for older people in communities across the land. Many of these ideas not only have originated here in Florida, but also have been tested and found to have practical and meaningful results for young and old alike. I have had the further privilege of introducing or supporting legislation which marks new milestones for older Americans, such as medicare, improvements in social security, the Older Americans Act which offers new challenges for older people to serve their communities, antidiscrimination legislation to fight unjust consideration for employment opportunities, and many other programs which are or will help to meet the challenge of the retired years.

This year I am sponsoring legislation to make major improvements in the social security program. Economic independence is the foundation upon which the opportunities to continue community service must be built. People who must struggle to make ends meet, even when many of the day-to-day expenses associated during our working years are gone, cannot be expected to utilize their newfound leisure in ways which benefit the entire community. It is absolutely essential, therefore, that older people are able to provide for themselves adequately in retirement without the need to have special assistance. Retired Americans clearly deserve to share in the increased productivity which they have helped to make possible.

I have also introduced measures to further the development of programs now begun in Florida to provide meaningful opportunities for our older residents to contribute toward making the State an even better place in which to live. If we look about our State, we feel a great sense of pride and accomplishment in what we have helped build here in Florida. But this pride cannot stand in the way of our ability to recognize the many problems we still face. Each of us must do what he can to meet these problems squarely and with no slack in our enthusiasm. Older people have an important role in this effort—in fact, because of their wealth of experience and knowledge together with their increased leisure, we must expect a great deal more from them. To accomplish our goal, we must assure two things. First, older citizens themselves must see their retirement not as a retirement from life or from the community, but as an opportunity for self-development and the exploration of new interests. Second, and even more important, our communities must find ways in which older people can take part in this personal development and in so doing help to make community contributions. In order to make such programs possible, I have urged my colleagues to support a national senior service program for older people. This program would enable communities throughout the State and the country to develop ways in which the talents and skills of millions of our older citizens could be utilized in public service community projects. We have already experimented with a variety of programs which have proved that older people want and are more than able to make improvements to community life in our school systems, hospitals and medical facilities, businesses, and recreational and conservation programs. I believe that the time has come when we must reevaluate the needs of our older people and of our communities—I think that we will find that each has something very important to offer the other. All we need now is the will to accomplish it.

Major achievements in improving the lives of older Americans have indeed been made in recent years, but a great deal more needs to be done. The citizens of Florida, in supporting these achievements, are today recognized leaders in turning what was once considered the "twilight" of life into the "highlight" of modern living. A great deal of this credit goes to those of you who have taken the time and energy to encourage your Representatives in Congress and the State legislature to help communities strengthen programs for older persons. Your ideas and suggestions are, in the end, our major source of proposals to improve the welfare of the American people and the citizens of Florida.

I appreciate this opportunity to make this report to you, and hope that in the near future I can report that we are well on the road toward achieving the theme set for Senior Citizens Month in 1967—that of meeting the challenge of the later years.

YOUNG AMERICANS ABROAD

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, we are very proud to have in our area in Florida the international headquarters of the junior chamber of commerce and through this, to have contact with many of the outstanding young men in America today. One of these outstanding Americans who has made a notable contribution to the cause of international understanding is Mr. Louis DeThomasis, of Washington, D.C. He recently turned his attendance at an overseas meeting of printers into a good-will mission for America, to Israel, Turkey, Greece, and Spain. The following article by Mr. Donald Saltz in the Washington Daily News on May 5, regarding Mr. DeThomasis' visit, will, I think, be of interest to my colleagues:

NOT SO INNOCENT ABROAD

(By Donald Saltz)

An enthusiastic Louis De Thomasis has returned home after more than three weeks abroad meeting printers in Israel, Turkey, Greece and Spain to discuss common problems of their industry. He also served as an unofficial emissary of American good will.

Mr. De Thomasis, 26, and his brother Chic, 31, own Metro-Graphics Inc., 1522 K-st nw.

The welcome extended Mr. De Thomasis was tremendous. His picture was on display around Ankara, Turkey, and he was presented to the Grand National Assembly, equivalent to our Congress. Additionally he met ministers for separate talks and he got together with officials of Turkey's largest printing firm, Ajans-Turk, with whom the De Thomasis brothers have been corresponding.

Turkish newspapers carried the story of the American printer in all editions and Mr. De Thomasis said that although he couldn't understand what was being said, he could hear his name on radio news broadcasts throughout the day.

Mr. De Thomasis was an honored guest in Israel and the Junior Chamber of Commerce International held a dinner for him.

Similar treatment was accorded in Greece and Spain. Everywhere, he was escorted by police and other personal aides assigned to him.

Mr. De Thomasis found that all the printers he saw—and they represented six firms—were anxious to discuss business with him.

"We were surprised," he said, "to learn that similar problems are faced by printers all around. These people are just like us."

"One of the difficulties foreign printing firms have is in finding and keeping qualified people. Workers learn the business and then leave and start their own."

Mr. De Thomasis returned with beautifully embossed printing from Turkey and Israel. The work is actually superior to whatever is being done in the United States, he said.

An Israeli item that the De Thomasis brothers may market here is a children's story book in which brightly painted animals move as the pages are turned. Production price here would be considerably above the cost abroad.

Mr. De Thomasis naturally discussed politics with the new-found friends.

"They like Americans," he noted, "but they think we are too good and very naive. They said they realize communists are out to take over the world.

"The people there take a more active interest in politics. They especially admire our Vice President Humphrey."

Mr. De Thomasis feels that an avenue has been opened for regular discussion between printers. He hopes that next year he can go to Moscow—again, all at his own expense.

The Commerce Department has asked him to join a trade mission but he prefers his own way.

NEWSPAPERS THROUGHOUT AMERICA OPPOSE H.R. 2508, THE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTING BILL

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I strongly opposed H.R. 2508, the congressional districting bill, when it passed the House of Representatives on Thursday, April 27. I felt that the bill would undermine the Federal courts' one-man, one-vote decisions regarding congressional districting; that it was unconstitutional and unwise; and, instead of promoting fair and reasonable shaping of congressional districts, it would actually give State legislatures an open license for gerrymandering congressional districts.

The bill did not gain much newspaper attention, either in news columns or on the editorial pages, up until the time it passed the House. However, that situation has now drastically changed. On my request for editorial opinion on this bill from a random sample of about 13 major newspapers around the country, the Legislative Reference Service found that eight of these newspapers have written editorials about this bill, some of them twice. Every single one of these papers has written strong editorials against the bill.

And let me immediately respond to any concern that this might have been a weighted and biased sampling of newspaper editorial opinion. Certainly many newspapers, normally considered more liberal, such as the New York Post, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, have strongly opposed this bill. But many other papers, normally considered more conservative, such as the entire Scripps-Howard chain and the Detroit News, have also strongly opposed the bill.

In order that my colleagues might have an opportunity to examine these editorials for themselves, I have asked unanimous consent that they be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks:

[From Scripps-Howard newspapers, as printed in the Washington Daily News of Friday, April 21, 1967]

"ONE MAN, ONE VOTE" AGAIN

Besetting Congress in one way or another are two questions having to do with the "one-man-one-vote" theories laid down in Supreme Court decisions in recent years.

One is the question of whether state legislatures may be set up as Congress is—one house elected on a population basis, one house chosen by geography or some other basis.

The other question deals with the districts by which members of the United States House of Representatives are elected. At the moment, this is the liveliest of the two in Congress. The House Judiciary Committee has approved a bill to dilute court decisions on this question.

Three years ago the Supreme Court said in a Georgia decision that Congressional districts must be drawn as equally as possible. This principle was corroborated by like decisions covering other states.

Georgia's districts had been set up with a variance of 550,000 in population. Justice Black, writing the main opinion, said this violated Article I of the Federal Constitution, which describes how Congress shall be elected and organized.

The bill now before Congress (sponsored by Rep. Celler of New York) would permit a population variation of as much as 30 per cent among a state's Congressional districts until 1972, and thereafter 10 per cent.

This obviously is an attempt to give the states more time to tinker with Congressional districts and has the effect of watering down the principle in the Black decision and the requirement of the Federal Constitution. It would tend to perpetuate some of the disproportionate Congressional districts now existing.

It may not be possible to establish Congressional districts which are precisely equal across the land; but certainly each state can be divided more evenly than the 30 per cent standard proposed by the Celler bill. Every citizen has a Constitutional right to representation in the House on the same basis as any other.

This is a quite different question than the makeup of state legislatures, which are the business of the states themselves. The Supreme Court, reaching far beyond the principles of the Black decision in the Georgia case, has insisted on the "one-man-one-vote" idea for both houses of state legislatures, regardless of state constitutions or the wishes of the state voters.

As a result, 32 state legislatures have petitioned Congress for a Constitutional convention to modify the court's order. If two more states join this petition, Congress will be required to call the convention.

But let's not involve this issue with the error the Celler bill proposes to compound.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Apr. 24, 1967]

STANDARDS FOR THE HOUSE

We have long sympathized with the efforts by Chairman Celler of the House Judiciary Committee to get the House to adopt fair rules for its own districting, but the bill now reported out of the committee sets weak standards too late.

The bill would limit population deviations in congressional districts to 30 per cent in 1968 and to 10 per cent in 1972. A decade ago this would have been progress. Even now, it turns out, there are five states with districting variations that range from a shocking 69 per cent to 32 per cent.

Today, however, federal court actions have compelled redistricting in most states to standards far closer to the one man, one vote principle than this bill provides. For example, a Missouri Senate measure would hold congressional districts to about a 5 per cent variation, though the measure contains weaknesses of a different nature.

Representative Hungate dissented in the Judiciary Committee, contending that its bill would permit "presumptive malapportionment." That has not been Representative Celler's purpose, but we think the House would now be wiser to let the courts proceed in setting the standards. They have proved better for popular representation.

[From the New York Post, May 13, 1967]

LAST STAND AGAINST REAPPORTIONMENT

A last-ditch effort is under way in Congress to reverse the spirit and meaning of the recent court order to end gerrymandering of New York's Congressional districts.

The counter-attack is based on a bill sponsored by Judiciary Committee chairman Celler (D-N.Y.) and hastily rushed through the House last month without hearings. It sets guidelines at sharp variance with court rulings.

The bill is now before the Senate Judiciary Committee and House Speaker McCormack has reportedly implored Sen. Eastland to speed action on the measure. (McCormack's district happens to be involved in the redistricting).

We urge Mr. Celler to reconsider his stand. The battle for equity in apportionment has been a long historic fight. And momentous victories have been won. This is no time to call retreat.

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1967]

CONGRESSIONAL MALDISTRICTING

Congress is on the verge of rushing through a badly drawn, confusing bill on the vitally important subject of reapportioning Congressional districts.

Under the leadership of Representative Celler of Brooklyn, the House last month passed a bill setting standards for Congressional redistricting which could have the effect of reversing the Federal court decision in the New York gerrymandering case. The House held no hearings this year on the bill.

Senator Eastland, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, yesterday appointed an *ad hoc* subcommittee to consider the bill. It met and immediately reported the measure to the full committee, which is expected to approve it today—also without hearings.

The bill will then be sped to the floor for passage. This cavalier procedure in the Senate is defended under the doctrine of comity—one house does not tamper with a bill that exclusively concerns the other.

But this bill is not a matter of mere parochial concern to the members of the House. By undercutting the "one-man, one-vote" principle of representation, it compromises a fundamental right of all citizens as defined by the Supreme Court.

In the New York case the three-man Federal court threw out the 1961 redistricting because of its failure to provide compact districts. The court criticized many of the state's Congressional districts as "bizarre" in shape. The Supreme Court, which has rejected apportionment plans because of population disparities, never has acted on the compactness issue.

If the Celler bill becomes law, the Supreme Court may be precluded from deciding a case on that basis, since the bill reserves this judgment to the state legislatures. It opens the door wide for abuse by declaring that each district is to be "in as reasonably a compact form *as the state finds practicable.*" Since Congress under the Constitution has the authority to define the appellate jurisdiction of the Federal courts, this language would probably block judicial review of the compactness of districts.

The bill is also confusing in its definition of the permissible variation in the population of districts. The common understanding is that the bill intends to permit—through the 1968 and 1970 elections—districts which are not more than 15 per cent larger or smaller than the arithmetical average. Under this interpretation, New York need not redistrict.

But that is not exactly what the bill states. As Representative Bingham of the Bronx pointed out in the House debate, the bill provides that "the district with the largest population . . . shall not exceed by more than 30 per cent the district with the smallest population." Strictly speaking, New York's largest district is 34.5 per cent larger than its smallest and therefore this bill's 30 per cent spread may not protect it from the court's decision. Representative Celler has himself offered contradictory explanations on this point.

Finally, would the 30 per cent rule be mandatory on the courts in future redistricting cases or merely advisory? Supporters of the bill in the House offered conflicting answers to this question.

There is serious doubt whether any legislation on this subject is now desirable; it might better be left entirely to the courts. But there is no doubt that this is a bad, sloppy way to legislate. The Senate has an obligation to hold hearings and consider this murky bill most carefully.

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1967]

HEARINGS NEEDED

The bill to reapportion Congressional districts looks worse the more it is examined.

In an effort to patch it up and extend its coverage to New York, the Senate Judiciary Committee has changed the formula to permit the largest district to exceed the smallest by as much as 35 per cent in population, rather than 30 per cent as in the House version. Since New York's variation is 34.5 per cent, this amendment just does the trick. Last week's decision by a three-judge Federal court throwing out New York's gerrymandered districts may now be reversed.

This amendment was taken in a brief closed meeting on Tuesday. There have been no hearings, and no public explanation as to why this arbitrary figure was picked out of the air. This is clearly not the way to draft legislation of such far-reaching significance.

The bill may make it impossible for the Supreme Court in the future to judge whether districts are reasonably compact. We stated yesterday inadvertently that the three-man court in the New York case had ruled on the compactness issue, but, in fact, the judges, although commenting adversely on the "bizarre" shape of several districts, did not reach that issue, since the populations disparities were a sufficient basis for deciding the case. However, it is important that the courts be left free to consider that question if necessary.

What effect do the authors of this bill intend it to have upon New York, Massachusetts and several other states that are now under Federal court orders to reapportion their Congressional districts? The legislative history in the House on this point is exceptionally confused. If the Senate is to act responsibly on this bill the Judiciary Committee has an obligation to seek answers to this and other questions before reporting it for floor action.

[From the Miami Herald, May 19, 1967]

ONCE AGAIN THEY PLAY OLD GERRYMANDER GAME

A peculiar situation arises in Washington as the House works to strike the word "representative" from our system of government. There is haste to legalize imbalances as much as 30 per cent among the congressional districts of a state.

This shady work on Capitol Hill would preserve the jobs of many congressmen who do not deserve a place on the public pay roll. It would also wreck the concept of equality for all citizens in the conduct of national affairs.

For the people of Florida, this would not be anything new because not in recent times has this state enjoyed congressional districts of equal voting weight. That is why the Florida question is now before the courts and why it is safe to assume that the federal judges will order equity in time for the congressional campaigns in 1968.

The move to sabotage representative government is tied to a three-judge verdict in federal court that knocked down a New York State congressional reapportioning for failure to maintain compact districts. There were too many districts strangely shaped by congressmen drawing in their known support and drawing out their weak spots.

There is a name for this game and it is "gerrymander," taken from Gov. Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts who in 1812 signed a bill that created a grotesquely shaped district for Essex County. It was not a new device in 1812, but Gov. Gerry will go down in history for his use of it.

The people of South Florida may soon have a gerrymander of their own as the state's congressmen worry over how to redraw district lines to their own benefit.

A start has been made with the suggestion that Republican Rep. J. Herbert Burke's Broward-North Dade district be increased by drawing in a north-south corridor through the unpopulated muck west of Miami and then ballooning it in an eastward arc around the GOP-minded residents of South Miami, Kendall and Homestead.

The ultimate shaping of such a district is not certain at this date, but it is possible to speculate that if Florida's governor signs such a congressional districting measure, the American political zoo would boast a new specie, the Kirkodile.

[From the Newark Sunday News, May 21, 1967]

NO WAY OUT

Uncertain in effect and of doubtful wisdom is the congressional redistricting bill passed by the House of Representatives and approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

By raising the permissible population variation among districts to 35 per cent until the election of 1972, the bill apparently would postpone the realignment of New York districts ordered by the federal court. But it is improbable the bill would extricate New Jersey Democrats from the embarrassing intraparty dispute that has blocked their efforts to amend a redistricting law declared unconstitutional by the State Supreme Court.

The bill before Congress would reduce the variation to 10 per cent beginning with the 1972 election. It apparently would also deny the federal courts power to require a closer adherence to the one man-one vote principle laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court. But students of the Constitution doubt that Congress could also limit the power of state courts to review the acts of state legislatures.

So it seems probable that the New Jersey Supreme Court's order that no more congressional elections can be held under the present law will stand, no matter what Congress does.

Congressional interference in redistricting is inexplicable at this point. Under firm judicial pressure, the legislatures are gradually complying with the constitutional requirement of equal representation, in their own houses and in the House of Representatives. It is in the public interest that this orderly process continue.

The pending bill serves no useful purpose. It is ineffectual in respect to a flagrant abuse on which Congress could helpfully take a firm stand, the gerrymander. The bill requires no more than that districts be as compact "as the state finds practicable." Which is like letting Ralph Houk umpire all the games in Yankee Stadium.

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 1967]

Emasculated Bill

What started out to be a congressional mandate for fair redistricting by the states has degenerated into a rather shabby compromise. As originally conceived on the House side, the bill laid down guidelines to which the states would have to conform in creating their congressional districts. Each district was to be compact, contiguous and nearly equal in population with permissible variations from the average of no more than 15 per cent. In the House and the Senate Judiciary Committee, however, the bill has been seriously weakened.

The House changed the allowable variations to 30 per cent between the largest and smallest districts in a state. Now the Senate Judiciary Committee has tentatively stretched this to 35 per cent, presumably to save New York from the necessity of redistricting before the 1968 elections. New York is under court order to remake its districts because of a variation of 34.5 per cent. The effect of the bill awaiting final action by the Judiciary Committee would be to relieve lawsuits for that purpose under the Supreme Court's fair-districting decision.

A bill originally designed to compel fair districting, therefore, has become in part a device for defeat of court redistricting orders. This is most unfortunate. In our view, this is an area in which Congress should act. It has a primary responsibility to put its own house in order. The decision as to how much leeway is to be given the states in shaping their congressional districts is chiefly a political one that should be made by Congress. But Congress should not leave its guidelines so loose that the courts may be tempted to upset them for want of equal protection of the laws.

The only excuse that may be offered for this laxity is that it would remain in effect for only the 1968 and 1970 elections. After the 1970 census figures are available, permissible variations would be reduced to 10 per cent. But the strictness of this standard designed to be permanent merely emphasizes the excessive leniency of the temporary requirement. It is unfortunate, too, that the Senate committee did not close the door to gerrymandering—a door which the House had foolishly left open.

Since no hearings have been held on the Senate side, it is especially important that this problem be aired thoroughly in the Judiciary Committee and on the floor, if necessary. Certainly every effort should be made to improve the bill before it is brought to a vote.

[From the St. Louis Post Dispatch, May 25, 1967]

Onward for Misrepresentation

The Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate has approved a congressional redistricting bill even weaker than one passed by the House.

Under the Senate bill, congressional districts could vary by no more than 35 per cent in population for the 1968 and 1970 elections, and by 10 per cent thereafter. The House measure limits the variations to 30 per cent until 1972 and 10 per cent afterwards. Representative Hungate of Missouri had already charged that the House bill represented carte blanche for continued misrepresentation; Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts found greater shortcomings in the Senate measure.

In many states the courts have obliged redistricting even under the 10 per cent limit. Why should Congress now try a departure from popular representation three times as great? No bill at all would be preferable to either of these.

[From the Detroit News, May 26, 1967]

Backward Reapportionment Step

Unless there is a substantial public outcry within the next few days, Congress probably will continue on its stealthy way to stall and undermine court-ordered moves to reapportion congressional districts.

This move is similar to Senator Dirksen's attempt to circumvent the Supreme Court's one man, one vote ruling on state legislatures. In brief, it would circumvent the high court's finding in Westbury vs. Sanders (1964) that congressional districts must be composed as nearly as practicable, of equal numbers of people.

Whereas the court set no standards to implement its decision, the bill which already has passed the House and which will be debated in the Senate June 5 seeks to do so.

And that is where the mischief lies, in the standards which Congress intends to establish.

The bill would permit any state with a deviation of less than 35 percent between its most populous district and its least populous one to ignore redistricting through 1972. After 1972 it would set a permanent 10 percent deviation figure.

In effect, this would mean that only four states would still have to act on reapportionment, at least until 1972. The unequal, unfair and discriminatory situations which prevail in many states (28 states have deviations of more than 20 percent) would be allowed to remain, or even become worse.

Michigan's situation exemplifies the badly drafted nature of this bill. Having just redistricted to a point where we have a maximum deviation of only 3.4 percent, Michigan would be prohibited from making any change. But any state with deviations between 6 and 34 percent could change—to create an even more unfair situation if it wanted.

To pick up an extra vote in the Senate, Hawaii would be required to redistrict immediately, a situation which is expected to benefit Senator Hiram Fong's Republicans back home. New Mexico, with precisely the same situation, but with Democrats in the Senate who do not want redistricting, has been exempted.

Most important, the bill gives back to the states—and to the selfish, local politicans who want to perpetuate their own power—the right to define what constitutes a compact, contiguous congressional district. This is an open invitation to gerrymandering and alone is good reason to oppose the bill.

It is no wonder Congress moved swiftly and silently to enact this legislation. No hearings have been held on the legislation in this or the last Congress. Debate in the House was limited to two hours and amendments were prohibited. (Where were the Republicans with their cries about Democratic railroading? They were there, voting for the bill.)

Having said all that, we agree there is justification for congressional action to set reasonable guidelines to help the states and the courts through the redistricting thicket.

But "reasonable" is the key word, and the bill being considered in the Senate does not meet that test.

DIANA ROSS, MARY WILSON, FLORENCE BALLARD—"THE SUPREMES"—OPEN AT THE SHOREHAM HOTEL ON THURSDAY NIGHT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to announce to my colleagues a very important event that will be taking place in Washington this coming Thursday night. Diana Ross, Mary Wilson, and Florence Ballard—collectively and most famously known as the Supremes—begin a 10-day engagement here in Washington at the Shoreham Hotel this Thursday night.

The talent and personalities of the Supremes have set them apart from all the other well-known popular singing groups and made them into an internationally famous group. Their talent is so great and varied that they are considered to be top performers not only in the rock and roll and rhythm and blues fields, but also on the nightclub and concert circuits, on nationwide TV, and as recording stars with many gold records to their credit. The Supremes are unique in the popular music field in their ability to appeal to music lovers of all ages, tastes and backgrounds.

There is certainly no doubt that these three beautiful and talented young women are the most famous residents of Michigan's First Congressional District. And I would stress that the very high regard we in Michigan have for the Supremes is completely bipartisan. Michigan's Governor George Romney, a well-known Republican, has aptly described the Supremes as "the most exportable Michigan product."

I am particularly proud to have the Supremes as my constituents because Flo, Mary, and Diana have consistently been concerned and diligent in seeing that their new-found fame and fortune has benefited not only themselves and their families but the entire community. They have often given freely of their time and talent to support many important public efforts.

Two recent articles regarding the Supremes tell much about their careers and their unique position in the popular music field in America. I insert these articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks:

[From the Washington Post, May 28, 1967]

Supremes Rolling In To Rock the Terrace

(By Carl Bernstein)

NEW YORK.—There is something wildly incongruous about the Supremes playing Manhattan's Copacabana.

Dressed in purple chiffon minishifts, belting out rhythm and blues numbers and doing the bugaloo while they sing, these three Detroit girls who hob-nob with the Beatles when they visit London, are in strange surroundings at the Copa.

The club is a musical mausoleum of another era, full of plastic pineapple trees and Fiberglas citrus gardens that could be either a giant Carmen Miranda hairpiece or Hawaiian Night at Grossingers. No place for a rock 'n' roll show, the Copacabana.

And there is the audience. Sure, there are plenty of leggy types who will probably stand in line at Arthur after the show, a few kids out for a big night after the prom, some East Villagers who haven't been uptown since the last Be-in.

But what about all the visiting firemen whose wives keep counting travelers' checks, the middle-aged couples from Long Island, the fathers who bring their 13-year-old daughters to see the Supremes, then come back with their wives the next night?

In New York, it is not the kids who have booked the Copa solid for 14 straight days, two shows week-nights, three on weekends.

When the Supremes leave the 45 rpm spindle, they also leave the teenage music business and become a sophisticated nightclub act.

There have been a few rock singers—Petula Clark comes to mind—who can bridge the gap between musical generations, but the Supremes probably represent the only group at the very top of the rhythm and blues business who establish complete rapport with adult audiences.

Part of this is due to the efforts of the girls—Diana Ross, Mary Wilson and Florence Ballard. But part of the credit goes to the Motown Record Co., for whom the Supremes record.

The girls, who grew up in the Motor City's slum ghetto and have been singing together since they were about 14, first came to Motown in the early '60s.

Even then, Motown had established itself as a unique organization in the pop record business, a Negro-owned corporation that was producing consistent hits. But it remained for the Supremes to put the label in its present position of outselling the rock and roll-rhythm and blues releases of any other label.

Berry Gordy Jr., Motown's president, first put Diane, Mary and Flo to work dubbing the background for the company's then better known properties like Marvin Gaye, the Four Tops and Smokey Robinson and the Miracles.

Then, in the summer of 1964, Gordy had the girls record "Where Did Our Love Go?" which became the first of a continuous streak of hits, nine of them gold records.

As the Supremes were perfecting their sound around almost Baroque counterpoint, close harmony, a big beat and Diana's throaty, Eartha Kitt-tones, the girls were also attending "the finishing school."

The finishing school, as it is called around Motown's Detroit headquarters, is the label's Artist Development Department, an institution where slum kids learn to play clubs like the Copacabana and the Shoreham, where the Supremes open Thursday.

Under Gordy's guidance, the Supremes learned how to overcome the restrictions of electronic gimmickry that plays so big a role in the record business and allows obscure, acne-generation stars to toss off hit records sight-unseen.

From the Supremes' considerable amount of raw talent there emerged a smooth, very capable, mature group of performers who—if things ever do hit bottom—could ride the Andrews Sisters circuit when they reach age 30, and do it with ability.

Becoming nightclub performers, however, was not without problems for the Supremes; off stage the girls are simple pleasant, friendly, average young ladies who are not easily given to singing Lerner and Loewe tunes, telling jokes and making 32d degree Masons aesthetically comfortable.

Happily for the Supremes, any reluctance to pay attention at the finishing school was offset by what one Motown official regards as the girls' "overwhelming desire to be on top."

This competitiveness, which colleagues say extends to the Supremes' dealings with other Motown artists as well as singers on other labels, got them through Gordy's Academy summa cum laude.

With the help of a retinue of veteran performers that Motown employs as teachers, Diana, Mary and Flo became schooled in the complex Motown choreography so evident in their club appearances.

And they paid strict attention in charm class, learning how to be little ladies, how to act when the public relations man takes you to lunch to meet the press, how to sit in Johnny Carson's low-slung chairs, how to be chic in the gowns selected by Motown's Special Projects Department.

Then, too, the Supremes learned to enlarge their repertory with standards, to tell a few jokes and began to gain stage presence.

Some of Motown's critics contend that there is artistic danger in the company's approach to training its performers; that they come out of the finishing school as though stamped on one of the Detroit auto assembly lines where Berry Gordy worked when he first ventured into the record business.

Although there are some evidences of this problem in both the "Motown Sound"—the generic term for the label's particular brand of Negro rhythm and blues—and in the live appearances of some of the company's performers, the Supremes have emerged as a distinctive group.

The first factor working in their favor is the personalities of the girls themselves. They are by nature rambunctious, happy, young and—despite three years of earning some of the highest salaries in show business—rather fetchingly naive. All of this comes through on stage.

Just as important, the Supremes are not nearly so bound by the Motown Sound as some of the label's other stars. "The reason," says one Motown aide, "is that the Supremes are more musical than most of the other groups."

Hence, they can work with the big, Basie-sized Motown band that travels with them as well as they do with the electronic mixmasters back in Detroit; their arrangements are freer and more inventive than those of most rock artists who try to raise the level of their work to serious music.

Finally, there is the "Supremes sound" itself, something related to but distinctly different from the parent Motown sound and probably the real reason for the group's ability to bridge the generation gap.

Even when the Supremes sing standards—as they will in perhaps a third or fourth of their numbers during the Shoreham engagement—this sound, to some extent, overshadows the songs themselves.

Roughly, it is a glossy yet soulful combination of hard rock, occasional funky blues, sensitive inflection, heavy bass and a big band style mixed with gospel vocal harmonies.

Such a conglomeration is, of course, difficult to master. But it includes enough forms from different types of music to generate wide appeal if handled freely and expertly.

That's why the Pepsi Generation and the Moxie Generation were able to coexist under the potted pineapples of the Copa.

[From Jet magazine, June 1, 1967]

Supremes in a New "Bag"—Fabulous Detroit Singing Group

(By Bobbie Barbee)

Already stars of records, concerts and television guest spots, The Supremes, at last, have been permitted to peek into a couple of brand new "bags." Although their faces didn't quite make it they are heard on the sound track singing the title tune of the new Columbia movie *The Happening,* which stars Anthony Quinn, and they've developed a "class" night club act that is regarded as "outta sight."

A continuous sell-out during their two-week stay at Copacabana—their third engagement at the New York nitery—The Supremes rocketed off to a rollicking start on opening night and reaped standing ovations from the clapping crowd that included TV's Ed Sullivan, singer Dionne Warwick, entertainer Bobby Short, grid star Tim Brown, etc.

"The Supremes have not simply changed over the years," beams publicist Paul Alderman, "but they have improved and diversified their show by adding new songs, quips, show tunes etc. to reach, satisfy and appeal to more people. Since you don't find too many young people attending night club shows—first because it's generally too expensive and secondly because they are barred by age—your audience is made up of adults. So The Supremes had to fill-in their repertoire to appeal to this group."

From evidence left in the wake of their Copa blast, the trio of comely Detroiters (Diana Ross, Mary Wilson, Florence Ballard) are quite appealing. In their night club shows The Supremes add a sprinkling of spontaneous gaiety in maintaining an ongoing rapport with the audience between medleys of their Gold Record tunes which include such love hits as *You Can't Hurry Love, Stop In The Name of Love, Baby Love, Love Is Here And Now You're Gone,* etc. interspersed with songs that have not been recorded as *Thoroughly Modern Millie, More, Second-Hand Rose, The Lady Is A Tramp, Michelle,* etc., to leave the fans in a state of delighted frenzy following their spell-binding performance.

But, even with the perfection of their club act, the dazzling Detroiters still remember the teen-agers and young adults, "fans from which cometh their original wealth," and, with hardly time off for rest and relaxation, maintain a grueling concert tour that takes them to such places as Dayton, Ohio; Minneapolis, Minn.; Newark, N.J.; Southern Illinois University and Yale along with a three-day stay (Aug. 21–23) at Expo 67 in Montreal, Canada.

The well-liked trio also have five shows to do on television for Ed Sullivan each year plus other TV shots on The Andy Williams Show, The Dean Martin Show, Hollywood Palace and Stage 67. While resting they'll record an album of Rodgers and Hart songs.

Like one enthusiastic fan sighingly gushed: "They may not be in a brand new bag, but that bag they're in is something else!"

C. RICHARD BARTALINI—AN OUTSTANDING YOUNG MAN

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, recently the California State Junior Chamber of Commerce selected Mr. Richard Bartalini, a resident of my district, as one of California's five outstanding young men of 1967. An article which appeared in the Alameda Times Star sets forth this young man's record of accomplishment and indicates his dedication to community service.

I am pleased, therefore, to insert this article in the Record in further well-deserved recognition of Mr. Bartalini's continuing contributions to his community:

Bartalini Among Top Young Men

C. Richard Bartalini of Alameda has been selected one of California's five outstanding young men of 1967.

Bartalini, a local attorney and member of the Alameda Board of Education, was selected "in recognition of his outstanding ability, accomplishments and services to his community, country, and profession."

The panel of judges making the selection included the Rt. Rev. Francis Eric Bloy, Bishop of Los Angeles; Marlane Bourns, president of Bourns Inc.; Norman Chandler, chairman of the board of the Times-Mirror Company; Frederick G. Larkin, Jr., president of Security First National Bank in Los Angeles; Stanley Mosk, justice of the California Supreme Court; John Wooden, head basketball coach at UCLA, and Dr. M. Morvel Young. president of Pepperdine College in Los Angeles.

The award will be presented in formal ceremonies Saturday, April 8, at the Mission Inn in Riverside.

ACTIVITIES

Bartalini is an active member of the Alameda Elks Club, B.P.O.E. No. 1015 and the Kiwanis Club of Alameda. He serves as a member of the board of directors of the Alameda Boys Club.

He is a member of the Citizens Advisory Committee to the City Council; was chairman of the Public Relations Division, United Crusade, 1960 through 1964; member of the executive committee, National Foundation, March of Dimes; has been president of the Good Government League since 1960.

Other activities include director of the California Hoop Club since 1959, chairman of the City of Alameda committee for formation of a junior college district, and membership on the executive committee of the Triangle Club, an association of policemen, firemen and citizens.

He has been active with the Alameda Jaycees since 1959, serving in various offices on the local, district, state and national level.

LOCAL SCHOOLS

Bartalini attended Alameda schools and graduated from the University of California and Hastings College of the Law.

His nomination was submitted by the board of directors of the Alameda Jaycees.

In 1966 Bartalini was selected as an outstanding young man of America to be included in the publication's "outstanding young men of America."

He and his wife, Anne, live at 405 Greenbriar Road with their two children, Robert, 11, a student at Will C. Wood School, and Denise, 6, a student at Donald C. Lum school.

THE SPACE PROGRAM IN PERSPECTIVE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman Joseph E. Karth, a valued member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics and chairman of one of its principal subcommittees, recently made a speech before the National Space Club.

Those of us who have the privilege of working with Congressman Karth know how dedicated he is and know the valuable contributions that he has made to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

I commend the reading of his speech to my colleagues:

The Space Program in Perspective

I accepted Greg's invitation to speak today for one main reason: we need to put the space program in proper perspective. It is my opinion that information and impressions conveyed to the public have been much too one-sided—we have zigged from the dismay following Sputnik to the euphoria induced by hundreds of hours of national television coverage of glamorous and highly successful manned space missions. In recent months we have zagged to where criticism of the space program and those who run it is "the name of the game."

Perhaps we in the Congress, the news media and the Administration could do a better job of smoothing out some of the zigs and zags. Seldom are things either as good or as bad as they are portrayed to the public. For example, just last week a headline in a major eastern newspaper read "NASA secrecy on its failures riles Congress." The story implied that the entire Congress was up in arms; it went on to state "NASA believes that Congress needs only to know of successes, that failures are an internal matter and are only for the eyes of NASA and its contractors."

The last thing I wish is to get into a battle with the news media—it's one you can't win—but I might suggest that this and many similar stories published since January 27 are overly simplified versions of some very complex situations and circumstances. Clearly I am making no charges—I am, however, stating some personal observations.

Most of us in the Congress have been deeply concerned—and properly so—about the Apollo accident. Many of us have spent days listening carefully and patiently to detailed summaries of many thousands of hours devoted to reports, reviews and plans for corrective action. Yet, much of the news coverage has been for those few who have conducted their own reviews by press con-conference or declared the Apollo review proceedings to be "whitewashes," "graywashes," and "cover-ups." I do not believe this kind of coverage gives the public a balanced accurate assessment.

I don't think I have to go into the details today about how I have been—on occasion—a critic of certain NASA programs. In fact, Congressman Mosher and I have been through a few investigations together—and we have had our differences of opinion with NASA and some contractors. And I expect that there will be similar differences of opinion in the future.

Yet along with my criticism I have always believed that creditable performance should be recognized and acknowledged. In so doing I have travelled all over this country selling the benefits of the space program and striving to give a balanced picture of its successes and failures. The objectives of the sub-committee I am privileged to chair have been to gather the facts, pinpoint responsibility, offer constructive criticism, make positive recommendations and then proceed to help in every way necessary to build a successful project.

Today I wish to congratulate Jim Webb and his associates for their response to the Apollo tragedy. They have presented an objective, constructive and very conclusive series of statements concerning their corrective actions, their future plans and the new NASA policies involving contractors operations. These steps will, in my opinion, reduce substantially the likelihood of a similar accident in the future.

Yet, while much can and will be done to reduce the chances of accident and failure, we must recognize more clearly that risk and danger are inherent in what we are doing. Risk and danger have been the constant companions of man since the beginning of time—and indeed—the beginning of this program. Freedom from risk coupled with perfect safety are impossible goals. Refusal to recognize this as a truism, is to substitute ignorance for fact.

This leads me to comment on a bill that was proposed late in the Apollo hearings. It calls for the establishment of an "Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel." This group would be an independent agency and would perform all phases of safety review on NASA programs.

While I don't necessarily oppose the establishment of such an independent panel, I do think that we in the Congress are better situated to evaluate NASA performance—including safety. Furthermore, we are the only ones directly responsible to the taxpayers; I believe that with some modifications in past arrangements Congress is better equipped to do a responsible job for the public.

One of the modifications I refer to deals with the difficult issue of "how much of what kinds of information" NASA can and will furnish the Congress. While it is very much of an over-simplification to say that NASA wants to tell us only about successes, it is true that in the past, the various Science and Astronautics Subcommittees have been, in varying extents, hampered by lack of complete information in reviewing NASA programs.

In all fairness, I must add that this information problem is neither new nor peculiar to our Committee; indeed the problem has been a central feature of the relationship between the Congress and Executive Departments for generations. New balances are continuously worked out pragmatically to meet changing times and situations.

Notwithstanding certain problems in the past which I noted above, I am convinced that in the future and as a result of the Apollo hearings we in the Congress will get a better flow of information—*in response to changing times and situations.*

Even so, we in the Congress must be careful about pushing our information requirements to the point where each executive in an agency begins to think about every decision mainly in terms of "how will this look if and when I have to appear before a Congressional Committee." I'll come back to this a little later.

Turning again to news media coverage of the space program, I would like to talk for a few moments about a meeting held two weeks ago in Dallas which some of you attended. Over 500 people met to discuss the commercial uses of space. In under 10 years we have progressed far enough from those first tentative probes of space to discuss seriously the prospects of billions of dollars worth of direct economic potential.

Yet, I would wager that the Phillips Report got more lines of newspaper space and minutes of television time in two weeks than the economic payoff subject has gotten in the past two years. In fact, I have been notably unsuccessful in trying to convince a major network to do a story along these lines. Just think of all the hours the networks have spent during the various manned missions hashing and re-hashing the same information—even when it was trite.

In talking to people everywhere in this country, it is clear to me that, in spite of the great advances, scientific and technological programs are among the least understood of government efforts. Tracing national growth and prosperity directly back to research and development is admittedly a tough job—particularly where it is basic as well as space research and development. But I agree with Dr. von Braun that space technology stimulates social and economic progress.

While the direct tracing is tough, one thing is clear: every nation in the world that is unable or fails to carry out an aggressive R & D program also fails to develop an economy that educates, feeds, houses and clothes its people. It's also one of the reasons underdeveloped countries are underdeveloped! Now, I recognize full well the simplicity of this statement and it is undoubtedly too simple for some. But nevertheless, it too, is a truism.

That the public does not more clearly understand this relationship must also rest at NASA's doorstep and that of the aerospace industry collectively. I think that some effort should be diverted from advancing the causes of specific programs and companies. These diverted resources should be spent on developing a greater public awareness of the benefits of the total space program—and driving home the point of how close we are to realizing magnificent achievements in bettering our lives.

I am sure that what I have just said about the benefits of the space program is "old hat" as far as you are concerned—but that is because we spend most of our "public affairs" time talking about space among ourselves at such gatherings as this luncheon today.

You've got to go where the people are—you've got to convince them that what we are doing is worthwhile—and you've got to show them that you're going to give them a "return with interest" for the tax dollars you are now absorbing. On top of that, you in industry must show the public that you have faith in what is to come and therefore, are willing to risk more and more of your own money for investment in space.

Turning now to another idea which has been on my mind for some time, I would like to suggest that the recent organizational changes in NASA involving the establishment of an Organization and Management Office should be viewed only as a step on the way to meeting the challenges of the 70's. Not quite a year ago I expressed some concern in a speech in New York before the AIAA that NASA's "future plans" presentations to the Congress were by and large plans for manned exploration. Several months later—in September—a tentative plan for unmanned exploration of the solar system was presented to the Congress. But NASA did not tie this plan with the earlier "future plans" submission.

Frankly, the point I make is this: in the early days a definite division between the manned and unmanned programs was the best organizational arrangement—but as we move toward the 70's this distinction is becoming less and less sharp—and less meaningful. I believe that this changing distinction should be reflected in NASA's program planning and its organizational planning.

I am not expert enough to tell Jim Webb how he should organize his planning activities, but I do think that we in Congress can expect more and better integration in future planning. Specifically, I think we should expect to get a total NASA plan which is the result of intensive trade-off analysis and a more definitive cataloging of priorities. And certainly it would not hurt if NASA occasionally—just occasionally—agreed to some policy direction from Congress without "crying wolf."

In concluding my remarks today I think that an assessment of the space program can be made so as to put it in proper perspective. Most surely, the Apollo accident has not been kept in perspective. As tragic as it was, it involved a very small part of the total space program—and even of the total Apollo program itself. Despite reports and statements to the contrary, neither the Apollo nor the rest of the space program is falling apart. Despite reports to the contrary, NASA has revealed and discussed its errors and those of the contractor to an unprecedented degree. In fact, I have never heard more candid admissions of failures and responsibilities. Yet, these errors must be weighed in the overall balance with the tremendous accomplishments of NASA and its contractors during the past nine years. It is unfair and super-bad-judgment to measure this present "low water" mark with any other yardstick.

It seems to me that the principal lesson of the terrible tragedy is to learn how to improve performance in the future. Thus, while we can and ought to demand greater emphasis on safety precautions, we must also keep in perspective that this is a dangerous business, and whether the program be manned or unmanned, we must allow adequate time and attention for preliminary design.

Finally, there is the attitude we take toward mistakes and disaster. In an editorial on April 19 the Washington Post had this to say: "But there will not be much bold venturing in a society that visits fury upon those unfortunate enough to preside over calamity. For in that kind of society, more and more men will discover that the way to avoid reproach is to avoid taking risks." Those are my sentiments exactly.

ISRAEL AGAIN FACED WITH AGGRESSION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish people, torn by tragedy and persecution through centuries of wanderings, emerged from World War II as the martyred survivors of their greatest terror under Nazi ruled Europe.

In 1948, just 19 years ago, the Jewish people achieved a homeland when they won their independence and created the State of Israel from ancient Palestine.

In 1948 and 1949, the infant Nation of Israel defeated aggressor armies of the Arab League.

Since then, Israel has survived as an island of democracy amidst a sea of hate from their neighboring Arab nations.

Today, Israel is again faced with armed aggression from her neighbors.

Armed Forces of the United States are now engaged in a war to prevent the Communist conquest of South Vietnam.

American fighting men are making the supreme sacrifice in the defense of a small, weak nation, which, standing alone, would have fallen. Our Nation made this same commitment when it halted aggression in South Korea.

If Israel, a showcase of democracy at work in the Middle East, is attacked, the United States has a commitment to come to its defense. Our commitment here is no less than our commitment in Vietnam or Korea.

Our political, cultural, and economic ties are deep and strong with the State of Israel.

It is my hope that the combined efforts of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union will be joined in a common cause for peace to restore coexistence between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

We must seek every avenue for peace through the efforts of our Nation, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union, either through the United Nations, or outside that international body, to uphold the freedom of the seas.

Closing the Gulf of Aqaba to Israel shipping and blocking Israel's Negev port of Eilat are acts of aggression on the part of the Government of Egypt. These acts of aggression must be reversed before they lead to an armed conflict that could plunge another section of the world into war.

As yet, we have had no indication from the Soviet Union that they will join in this effort to maintain peace in the Middle East. It is my fervent hope that the position of firmness taken by our Nation will remove any doubt from the minds of both the Communist world and the Arab world that we are committed to defend the victims of aggression.

NATIONAL CRIME COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION TO EASE OVERBURDENED COURT DOCKETS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, in making recommendations for improving the Nation's system of criminal justice, President Johnson's National Crime Commission has given careful attention to the courts. Some of its findings are shocking and should goad us into action.

The courts are dreadfully overburdened, and much of this load could easily be taken away. About one-third of all arrests are for public drunkenness, and this imposes a huge caseload on the lower courts. Is it not time, as the Commission suggests, to take public drunkenness out of the area of crime and consider it instead as a social and medical problem?

An astute discussion of this situation appeared recently in an editorial of the Boston Globe on May 9, 1967, and with unanimous consent, I include it in the Record as part of my remarks:

There Ought To Be a Law

The President's National Crime Commission reports that the nation's severely overcrowded lower courts, which handle 90 percent of all criminal business, are replete with "inequity, indignity and ineffectiveness."

This will scarcely come as a surprise to anyone familiar with the assembly-line justice meted out in so many of these courts. In some cases, as the commission noted, judges rush through trials in as little as five minutes, not even stopping to advise defendants of their rights; and in those courts not yet manned by public defenders, the few lawyers who appear on behalf of defendants often seem more interested in securing a fee from their clients than in defending them.

But neither judges nor lawyers can be blamed for the overcrowding, which is at the heart of the courts' problem and to a large extent is attributable to the existence of unwise laws.

Public drunkenness, almost universally treated as a crime, accounts for approximately a third of all arrests and imposes tremendous burdens on the lower courts. Yet public drunkenness, as the commission suggests, ought not to be considered a crime at all but rather "what it really is, a social problem of alcoholism and poverty." (Progressive legislation to take public drunkenness out of the area of crime is pending here in Massachusetts.)

In similar vein, the commission proposes that laws concerning gambling, prostitution, abortion, homosexuality and narcotics be modified "to bring the written law in closer conformity to the law as it in fact operates." Much of the law in these areas of "consensual crime" remains unenforced precisely because the public at large does not want it enforced.

The commission calls for the abandonment of the "common legislative premise that the criminal law is a sure panacea for all social ailments." For of course it is not. Those who say that "there ought to be a law" are often wrong. What is needed, here as elsewhere in the nation, is massive criminal law revision aimed at freeing the courts and police for the task of coping with serious crimes against person and property and making the treatment of criminal defendants rational and just.

THE AMERICAN COMMITMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the current crisis in the Middle East, I would like to include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times of May 28, by James Reston; and two articles which appeared in this morning's Washington Post—one by Joseph Alsop and the other by Joseph Kraft.

I think they would be of interest to my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, May 28, 1967]

WASHINGTON: EISENHOWER AND JOHNSON ON NASSER

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 27.—In his statement on the Arab-Israeli crisis the other day, President Johnson said he was following the policy laid down by all Presidents since Truman. This is generally true, but there is one important difference.

In 1957, when Egypt again asserted its sovereign right to keep ships from passing from the open sea through the narrow Strait of Tiran to the Israeli port of Elath in the Gulf of Aqaba, President Eisenhower not only insisted that this was illegal but undertook to prove his point by sending U.S. ships through the strait and protecting them if necessary.

It was this decision of the Eisenhower Administration to exercise what it regarded as its international right of free and innocent passage into the Gulf of Aqaba that broke the deadlock in 1957. But President Johnson has not yet gone this far.

THE MISSING ELEMENT

Mr. Johnson has stated the same principle as General Eisenhower, but has not followed with the same decision to act unilaterally, if necessary. "The United States," he said, "considers the Gulf [of Aqaba] to be an international waterway and feels that a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace. The right of free, innocent passage of the international waterway is a vital interest of the international community."

Having stated the principle so sharply, the President then weakened it by adding: "The Government of the United States is seeking clarification on this point. . . ." And this has been followed by a lot of advice from here to everybody to keep calm and not rock the boat, though Colonel Nasser has obviously rocked the boat all over the place.

NASSER'S ARGUMENT

Before this question gets hopelessly lost in a tangle of diplomatic obscurities, the key issue has to be clearly defined. Colonel Nasser has committed an aggressive illegality. His blockade amounts to a claim to strangle Israel's economy by cutting Israel off from the Red Sea.

His argument for doing so is that the Strait of Tiran, which connects the Gulf of Aqaba with the Red Sea, is only about three miles wide and therefore entirely within the territorial waters of Egypt, which can be opened or closed by Egypt alone on her own discretion.

The Internationl Convention on the Law of the Sea declared, in what came to be called the "Aqaba clause," that there should be a right of free passage from any open sea to the territory of another country. This was opposed at the time of the convention by the Arab states but the principle was adopted anyway.

LEGAL CLAIMS

Nevertheless, Egypt is claiming that she has the legal right to blockade the strait, and Israel and the United States are claiming that she has no such legal right. As a legal question, this could be debated for years.

Accordingly, the chances are that after all the diplomatic niceties have been honored, the same question that faced President Eisenhower will face President Johnson, only it will face Mr. Johnson under more difficult circumstances, with a war going on and U.S. casualties going up in Vietnam.

In the 1957 crisis, Secretary of State Dulles told the press that President Eisenhower had a constitutional right to protect United States ships passing through Egypt's blockade of the Strait of Tiran, but that the President did not have the constitutional authority to convoy the ships of other nations through the strait.

EBAN'S MISSION

This was a decisive point in the negotiations at that time, for Abba Eban, who was then the Israeli Ambassador in Washington, was able to report to his Government that the United States was not only prepared to convoy its own ships through the strait, but also that Washington recognized Israel's right to do the same.

Mr. Eban, who has just been in Washington as Foreign Minister of his country, knows this history very well, since he was deeply involved in the crisis. It can be taken for granted, therefore, that he is arguing now for sticking to the essential issue.

This is that an illegal and aggressive blockade has been imposed by Egypt, and must be withdrawn. Failing that, he will no doubt press for the Eisenhower-Dulles formula: that is to say, for a decision to exercise the right of free passage by sending ships through the strait under the protection of warships if necessary.

[From the Washington Post, May 29, 1967]

THE AMERICAN COMMITMENT

(By Joseph Alsop)

You should not make promises to escape from a present embarrassment, unless you are prepared to be asked to keep those promises at some time in the future. That was one of the lessons of Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban's visit to Washington. Foreign Minister Eban arrived with a basket-load of documentation of an American promise that had been three-quarters forgotten at the State Department. The promise arose from the fact that the trouncing the Israelis gave the Egyptians in 1956 left the Israeli army in control of the Gulf of Aqaba. More specifically, they controlled the position at Sharm el-Sheikh which the Egyptians are now using to blockade the Gulf.

The Eisenhower Administration wanted the Israelis to yield the Sharm el-Sheikh position to the U.N. "peacekeeping" force, whose total uselessness has now been demonstrated. For this purpose, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles firmly promised that if the Israelis evacuated the position, the United States would thereafter consider the Gulf of Aqaba an international waterway, and would therefore prevent free accesses to the Gulf being denied in any way.

Eban's documentation served to show the depth of this U.S. commitment made by Secretary Dulles and President Eisenhower. It included such things as a copy of the final Israeli statement to the U.N. saying that interference with ship traffic through the Gulf would be treated as an act of war, which Eban himself had prepared in partnership with Dulles.

This was corrected in Dulles' own hand, signifying the Secretary of State's full approval of every word. There was also a private letter from President Eisenhower to former Prime Minister Ben Gurion, giving thanks for the new arrangement when it had finally been completed, and underlining the U.S. commitment in fervent terms.

In the most practical sense, the Johnson Administration has also assumed a moral responsibility that strengthens the promise made by Dulles. When U.N. Secretary General U Thant rated a mere growl from Gamal Abdel Nasser, and the U.N. "peacekeeping" force vanished almost overnight, the American Government's first reaction was to beg the Israeli government to delay any direct action, until diplomatic and other expedients had been tested.

The Israelis assented, meanwhile reminding the U.S. Government of the Dulles commitment. Asking the Israelis to delay direct action, however, was really asking them to permit Nasser to build up and dig in with perfect impunity.

At the outset, the Egyptians were still weak enough on the ground to permit the Israelis to seize the Sharm el-Sheikh position by a swift thrust with a small force. But in the interval, the Egyptian buildup has been very big indeed. The Egyptians now have in Sinai no less than four infantry divisions, of which two are mechanized, plus two armored divisions and one more perhaps on the way.

Their arms include 1400 pieces of artillery and 800 tanks; and a considerable part of their air force has been moved forward to advance bases in the Sinai region. Egyptian forces are being redeployed from the Yemen to Sinai. Worst of all, there are clear indications that poison gas, including nerve gas, is in the Egyptian armory. And Nasser has already used gas in Arabia.

As these words are written, there are beginning to be serious indications that Nasser means to go far beyond the mere blockade of the Aqaba Gulf, which incidentally places another American friend, King Hussein of Jordan, wholly at Nasser's mercy. There are indications, in fact, that Nasser means to attack Israel on a wide front.

As these words are written, too, it is not clear just how or when the Johnson Administration means to keep the promise made by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles. But it is all but unthinkable that the promise will not be kept somehow, preferably by the kind of action by a broad group of the maritime powers that the British Under Secretary of State, George Thompson, came to Washington to propose.

If the councils of the illusionists had not prevailed during the Suez crisis in 1956, the present problem would never have arisen. Nasser was then treated as an innocent victim—which he was not—and we are now paying for it. The present problem would not have arisen, either, if the Soviets had not spent many hundreds of millions to strengthen Nasser militarily with arms, and to keep him afloat economically.

Furthermore, Nasser's abrupt change, from a posture of extreme caution to rapid movement toward confrontation with Israel, quite clearly dates from Andrei Gromyko's visit to Cairo in March. The Soviets have nothing to lose by using Nasser at this juncture. Whatever we do, we are bound to lose much in the Middle East. But the need to act—and act decisively—is nonetheless quite plain.

[From the Washington Post, May 29, 1967]

VIETNAM AND THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Joseph Kraft)

The troubles in Vietnam and the Middle East are connected in the way that beauty lies in the eye of the beholder.

But intrinsically they are as far apart in character as they are in distance. And since the polemically minded are using one case to argue the other, it is useful to get the difference straight.

The crisis in the Middle East represents a familiar diplomatic imbroglio. Relations among seven adjoining states are seriously strained. These states have well-defined boundaries. Within these bounds, the local governments have full control over affairs. In that sense, at least, they are all legitimate.

The international community is involved in no ambiguous way. Outside states have important economic interests at stake. The nations within the area are all members of the United Nations with common responsibilities to its Charter. That body has been continuously concerned with disputes in the area.

In these circumstances, the traditional tools of international law and order, clumsy as they may be, have at least some relevance. Concepts of "territorial integrity," and "aggression," backed up by limited application of force at precise points, have been applied in the past with useful results.

It makes sense to try again. Indeed, if a good try is not made, which is the present outlook, the Israelis will be fully justified in applying force unilaterally.

Vietnam presents a much more unusual case, murky, obscure and shot through with internal considerations. The present government of Saigon is a dubious proposition at best. A large fraction of the local population is hostile to the point of insurrection.

Neither is the international standing of the State of South Vietnam crystal clear. Its charter is the Geneva Agreement of 1954. But an implicit assumption of those who drew that agreement was that South Vietnam would not long exist as an independent sovereign entity.

In these circumstances, the concepts of territorial integrity and aggression are highly ambiguous. The chief requirement for Saigon is, and has long been, a government that can command local support. It is a question, to put it mildly, whether that goal is well served by a massive military effort steadily working to expand both the area and intensity of conflict.

There remains, in both cases, the common denominator of great power contention. The Soviet Union has commitments to other Communist countries, and to friends and clients around the world. Soviet leaders can renege on these commitments only at their peril—the more so now that Communist China is bidding for leadership of the bloc.

Thus the Soviet Union has been drawn to support North Vietnam because it cannot allow a Communist state to be submerged by American military action. And Soviet support for Egypt in the current Middle East crisis seems to be more of the same. The point evidently is to embarrass the United States in the Middle East, using it, in effect, as a second front.

But in the sense that the Soviet Union will survive no matter what happens in Southeast Asia or the Middle East, the Russian interest in both cases is less than vital. And all signs are that the Russians are handling both trouble spots in ways designed to avoid entanglement in war.

The American position seems to me parallel. The United States has commitments to allies, friends and clients. For a good political reason, namely that it is fatal to hand to the opposition the charge of "sell-out," no Administration can easily go back on these commitments.

But that does not mean that American vital interests are at stake. On the contrary, this country will also get along nicely no matter what happens in the Middle East or Southeast Asia.

By underlining these points, the present dual crisis can, I think, have the salutary effect of imparting more stability to American opinion. For it teaches both the difficulty of slipping commitments, and the peril of getting off balance on any one issue.

HENRY H. FOWLER

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot printed an editorial profile on one of Virginia's most distinguished citizens. The editorial discusses some of Secretary Henry H. Fowler's human characteristics which have contributed to his greatness in a wide variety of public service activity ranging from outspoken delegate to the Virginia Democratic Party convention to his superb performance as a member of the President's Cabinet and Secretary of the Treasury.

The editorial follows:

HENRY H. FOWLER: DEFIANT DELEGATE, CABINET SECRETARY

The most vivid event of the 1956 Virginia Democratic Convention—the most memorable moment in a decade of State conventions—was a white-maned, ruddy-faced man's arising in the gallery and shouting to the convention: "Go-to-hell!"

And in the astonished silence that fell over the cavernous Mosque in Richmond, he turned, laughing, to face his own applauding delegation, and took his seat, his face clearing like a summer sky after a thundershower.

Recently, Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler—Virginia's first Cabinet member in nearly half a century—and an outstanding one, according to all factions—recalled the defiance of Delegate Fowler.

"The Tenth District had been placed in the gallery where they always parked the Tenth, you know—and Northern Virginia was dissenting to some resolution that was being steamrollered. We had been humiliated in various ways all day, and, finally, some delegates in the Fifth District crowd started yelling, 'Go home, Yankees!' I wasn't about to listen to the likes of them telling a boy from Roanoke Valley what to do, so I just got up and told them where they could go."

The Secretary pondered a moment.

"I guess it was the North Carolina in me," he said, in his deep drawl.

The North Carolina in him was his father, a farm boy who left home at 16 to go on the railroad.

"He was a good Tar Heel. A powerful man.

"And independent as a hog on ice, as they say.

"Like a lot of parents who haven't had a formal education, he not only encouraged schooling but urged it on his son. I'd bring home a paper with a B or a B-plus, and he'd say, 'Why not an A?'

"My mother, who was born in Western Maryland, was a voracious reader and passed along her love of books by reading aloud to me. I remember, too, going down to my aunt's house a couple of blocks away and browsing in a set of many volumes, *Real America in Romance*. The series took a single family and followed its branches through major episodes in history.

"The public library was nearby in Elmwood Park, where I used to go and play tennis and read books.

"I don't see how any youngster growing up in that manner, reading history, practically in the backyard of Virginia history, wouldn't form an interest in public affairs.

"Colonial history was then, and always has been, my favorite period. The point of view of those early Virginians was a particularly broad-gauged one."

WITH AN INDEPENDENT STREAK

Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, who is known to hundreds in business, political, and government circles as "Joe," got the nickname while attending Jefferson High School in Roanoke.

"There was a restaurant, the Blue Ribbon, operated by two Greek brothers, Chris and Paul, where we'd go for hamburgers after dances. They had difficulty remembering our names and took to calling everybody Joe. We started addressing each other that way, and several of us who played basketball around the area called our team the Jefferson Joes. I carried the habit into college, and as I was one of the few Joes around, the name stuck."

He played, as well as read, furiously. He tried all sports, except football, which his father forbade. In college he was a boxer in the 129-pound—the featherweight—class.

"I didn't make any decision about a career until my senior year at Roanoke College. My father wanted me to be a lawyer. My mother, who was deeply religious—Momma sang in the choir in the Methodist Church—wanted me to be a minister.

"I like to write, I liked to speak, I liked working with people, and had a pretty strong competitive instinct. Law, as a general discipline and as a profession, combined all those factors. The next choice, the thing I sweated out, was being a newspaperman."

(In high school he edited the "Junior World-News" in the Roanoke *World-News*, and in college the campus weekly. "I'm a frustrated newspaperman," he said.)

He was fond of the University of Virginia—and therefore went to Yale for his law degree. "I knew I mightn't do as much work if I went where I knew so many people; and when I landed on the campus at New Haven, I didn't know a single human being."

He won a doctorate at Yale on a Sterling Fellowship, took the Virginia Bar exam, and, on the way to New York City for a job interview, stopped in Washington for a social weekend. He liked the brisk intellectual environment and stayed as a law clerk with the firm of Covington and Burling.

After a year he joined the Office of General Counsel to work on a major Constitutional case in defending the Tennessee Valley Authority, not so much because he was drawn by the issue of private v. public power as by his concern as a Southerner in seeing an opportunity for the region's economic development. "It was the first evidence of a delayed Marshall Plan," he said.

While he was with the TVA he met and married a pretty administrative assistant in the architects' office, Trudye Pamela Hathcote. They have two daughters and three grandchildren and live in an early 19th Century house in the old section of Alexandria.

He worked in several Government agencies, including the War Production Board, during World War II, and directed the Defense Production Administration during the Korean War.

"I've always been a liberal among conservatives and a conservative among liberals. Anybody who knows me gets very confused by the situation. It's that Independent North Carolina streak, that's all it is.

"That fellow up there—" he pointed to a portrait of Alexander Hamilton over his office mantel—"now I admire Jefferson as much as anybody, but the two of them—Jefferson and Hamilton—represent forces that are not so much conflicting as complementary.

"I always have admired the contribution Hamilton made to the creation of the national government, but I have a strong feeling for state and local rights.

"Looked at in the terms of Alexander Hamilton's contribution, I don't see how otherwise we can play the role of international leadership we didn't seek but which history and destiny placed upon us."

AND A DECEPTIVE CALM

Henry H. Fowler's call to leadership came one day early in 1965 when he, a lawyer of 56, was sitting in a board of directors meeting of the First and Citizens National Bank in Alexandria and received a call to come to a side door of the White House.

"I knew the President well, and I thought he planned to ask my opinion of various persons he had under consideration for the vacancy. Riding into Washington I organized my thoughts about what to say of their qualities and characteristics. We met in the Cabinet room and he put me in the Secretary of Treasury's chair to his left and said, 'Well, now if you were sitting in my chair, who would you want in that chair?'

"I began my spiel, and after about three minutes, he cut me short, and after he finished speaking, that was that."

Had he any hesitancy about accepting?

"I'm just like a private given a gun and told to get in there. I had no hesitation at all.

"Let me say I'm all out for him. Lyndon Johnson has more background and experience for the Presidency and inspires in me more confidence than any man I have ever known.

"From a personal standpoint, I find him a very warm and stimulating individual. He fascinates me, the skill with which he operates. Sometimes I get almost bemused watching him handle a situation, but I never had a better boss.

"He's a man who always surveys very carefully the alternatives or options the situation presents, but having deliberated, he is capable of prompt and decisive action."

How does the occupant of the Treasury's hot seat maintain what seems to be an easy, self-contained calm?

"A lot of it is natural. Being a Southerner and a Virginian, I don't like to hurry when it isn't necessary.

"Secondly, when I was about 36, I had something called a spastic colon—which turned out to be an ulcer—and I was told I ought to try to do things deliberately. I certainly haven't lived up to it."

Does he turn to any special reminder in moments of stress?

He pulled from his wallet a mimeographed poem a friend had given him. Entitled *Slow Me Down, Lord,* it asks for help to know the magical, restorative power of sleep, the art of taking minute vacations, of chatting with a friend, petting a dog, reading a few lines from a good book.

"Remind me each day of the fable of the hare and the tortoise that I may know there is more to life than increasing its speed; let me look upward into the branches of the towering trees and know that they grow tall because they grow slowly and well; slow me down, Lord."

James F. King, his executive assistant, observed that the Secretary practiced some of it: "When it comes to the magical, restorative power of sleep, he proves he doesn't need as much as anybody else."

He seldom plays tennis, attends international conference on government holidays, and devotes most of his reading to government documents.

About his only relaxation, noted Mr. King, is "just such an infrequent conversation as he has had with you."

During the interview, the Secretary had sat relaxed, slightly hunched in a big leather chair, as he spoke in a slow, reflective voice.

There was a final question.

Suppose Delegate Fowler had been carrying the slow-me-down plea in his wallet at the 1956 Virginia Democratic convention. What would he have done?

"The same."

CARDINAL-ELECT JOHN JOSEPH KROL, A NATIVE SON OF CLEVELAND

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. **FEIGHAN**. Mr. Speaker, Clevelanders are proud and elated over the announcement that His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, has named a native son, Archbishop John Joseph Krol, as one of 27 new cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church.

Cardinal-elect Krol was born in Cleveland October 26, 1910, graduated from Cathedral Latin High School, and attended St. Mary's Seminary in Cleveland. He was ordained at St. John's Cathedral in Cleveland on February 20, 1937. He studied in Rome and at the Catholic University of America here in Washington, where he received his doctor's degree in canon law in 1942. Cardinal-elect Krol then taught canon law at the seminary from which he was graduated. His superlative service to the church was recognized and he moved steadily through the various offices in the Cleveland diocese until he was appointed auxiliary archbishop. He was then elevated to archbishop and transferred to the Philadelphia diocese in 1961.

When Cardinal-elect Krol was elevated to auxiliary archbishop of Cleveland, his father was ill and confined to his bed. The new archbishop called upon his father and after a brief visit, was dismissed with the admonition, "Now don't linger here, you have much more important work to do." And his life has been dedicated to doing good for others—always stimulated by the noble and sacred purpose which animated every task he undertook. Cardinal-elect Krol is the son of Polish immigrant parents—both born in Poland, and now deceased.

Not only the Polish community of Cleveland, but all of Greater Cleveland is warm in its praise of Cardinal-elect Krol, whom we have held in high esteem for many years. He was always accessible to people of Polish descent and understood their problems. We are especially proud of the new cardinal-elect and deeply moved by his elevation.

Cardinal-elect Krol spoke out on many subjects, but favored a constant analysis and dialog on religious freedom, communism, the treatment of criminals, and international migration. On the latter subject he was dogmatic, saying:

> Migration is a national inalienable human right which the states are obligated to recognize, respect, and protect.

He also said:

> National interests should not be exaggerated much less used as a screen for discrimination on the basis of religion or racial prejudice.

He, more than once, gave hope to people locked in totalitarian societies, by broadcasting over the Vatican Radio to those behind the Iron Curtain, and he became internationally known for his sympathy for the oppressed.

The honor of being named to the College of Cardinals is indeed fitting recognition of the outstanding services which Cardinal-elect Krol has so ably and gloriously performed in the interest of the church, our country, and his fellow man.

To the new Cardinal-elect Krol, I join with his legion of friends and admirers in extending my congratulations. It is my hope that he will be blessed with vigorous health, that he may continue the noble work which has characterized his career and to which he has dedicated his life.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. Mink on May 31, June 1, and June 2, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Holifield, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Talcott (at the request of Mr. Mize), for 60 minutes, on June 6, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Feighan (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. McMillan and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Moorhead.

Mr. Dorn.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5357. An act to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89-487; and

H.R. 9481. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 26, 1967, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 399. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain real property to the city of Batavia, N.Y.;

H.R. 4374. An act to remove a cloud on the title of certain real property in the State of Oregon owned by John Johnson;

H.R. 5357. An act to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89-487;

H.R. 7965. An act to transfer title to tribal land on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9481. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned pursuant to its previous order until Wednesday, May 31, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

782. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of opportunities for reducing interest costs on refunds attributable to net operating loss deductions, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

783. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of inspection controls over concrete placements in building construction projects, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

784. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report listing certain required information with respect to contracts negotiated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period July 1, 1966, through December 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(e); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 1967, the following bill was reported on May 26, 1967:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 8718. A bill to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and the ceiling on the District of Columbia's borrowing authority; with amendment (Rept. No. 324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 29, 1967]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 536. A bill to provide that the United States shall hold certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Okla., in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment by the Cherokee Nation of $3.75 per acre to the Federal Government. (Rept. No. 325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 10406. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 10407. A bill to define and regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 10408. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN (by request):

H.R. 10409. A bill to amend the authorizing legislation of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 10411. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Res. 494. Resolution to amend rules X, XI, and XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 10412. A bill for the relief of Adolfo Q. Bengzon and his wife, Honorata Bengzon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10413. A bill for the relief of Dr. Dalisay San Agustin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 10414. A bill for the relief of Victor L. Ashley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10415. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio F. Frexes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 10416. A bill for the relief of Guido Fenu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 10417. A bill for the relief of Remco Industries, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

95. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to the creation of a U.S. Postal Corporation, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

New Era in Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to help promote high quality television and radio broadcasting over a noncommercial educational broadcasting system.

The city of Pittsburgh which has long been recognized as a world leader in industrial and scientific research also has first priority in communications. I am proud that America's first educational television station—WQED's channel 13—was born in Pittsburgh on April 1, 1954. It is my belief that this new legislation will permit the growth and development of our communications resources, bringing the best of public affairs programs to all of the people through maximum use of the creative leadership and facilities already available in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I envision a new era in communications where every American will have the opportunity to enjoy greater diversity and choice in public service programs, political issues and debates, as well as entertainment, music, and drama, and I hope that the recent passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 by the other body will spur early action on this legislation in the House.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, all peoples everywhere work and struggle for the attainment of certain goals; and among these goals national freedom has always held a leading place. Regardless of the degree of economic development of their countries, of their cultural and industrial level, or of their rare intellectual attainments, they all aim first for their national political independence. The Armenian people, having long lost their independence, and having lived under most oppressive alien regimes for centuries, are no exception.

From the time of the late Middle Ages historic Armenia was overrun by Asiatic conquerors and the Armenian people were subjected to the rule of their conquerors. The Ottoman Turks, as the last and the most oppressive of these overlords, held down the Armenians for more than four centuries, treating them as less than second-class citizens, and often massacring them by the thousands. No one can say how many hundreds of thousands have thus been done to death, but it is estimated that during the First World War more than 1,000,000 Armenians lost their likes in Turkish massacres. Fortunately many hundreds of thousands managed to survive, and these joined hands with their compatriots in the Caucasus and were enabled to proclaim their independence on May 28, 1918.

This was done in the northeastern part of historic Armenia, within sight of Mount Ararat. Thenceforth for a little more than 2 years they tried and struggled hard to be independent, hoping to make their state a safe home for refugee Armenians. But from the very beginning the newborn Armenian Republic was faced with insoluble problems—shortages of goods and of manpower, and in need of able-bodied men to carry on the fight against the then rising Bolshevism and also against their implacable foes, the Turks. After a precarious and agonizing existence of about 2 years the Armenian Republic was overwhelmed by the more powerful Turkish Army in December of 1920. Then most of its territory was lost to the Turks while the rest was reconstituted as the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic under the direct sovereignty of the Kremlin.

Since those distant days the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic has gone through a series of ordeals under the Stalinist regime of the Soviet Union, and has survived as a small, compact and relatively prosperous land. But there the Armenian people do not enjoy many of the freedoms which we consider our inalienable birthright. For this reason the old and defunct Armenian Republic looms large in the memory of many Armenians because they aim for political and real freedom. Let us all hope that the Armenians will attain these freedoms and live in peace in their homeland.

Recognition of Group of Foreign Naval Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor of hosting for the U.S. Department of the Navy a luncheon honoring a group of senior foreign naval officers who are currently in the United States as a part of a training and educational trip. Cohosting this luncheon with me was my distinguished colleague, Congressman GEORGE BUSH, of Texas. The group of naval officers had been at the naval shipyard in Philadelphia, Pa., for several weeks in a training program. Following their trip to Washington, the group split up to go to various naval centers throughout the country to receive specialized training.

I would like to commend the Navy Department of the United States for sponsoring such programs for our allies. As Congressman BUSH and I pointed out to them, we in the United States are sincerely appreciative for the help that they have given us in the past. We also asked for their continued support of our efforts in Vietnam in the coming months. We were genuinely impressed with their sincere interest in the United States, our Government, and our people and in their willingness to understand the problems that our country is facing at home and abroad. We were also impressed with their knowledge of the workings of the Government of the United States, and with their desire to learn more about it.

This should make each of us realize that it is our sacred duty as American citizens that we should have a strong working knowledge of our Government and a willingness to learn about the government of other nations. Only in this way can we have an effective basis for supporting our own governmental system and for making accurate and effective comparisons of our governmental system with the system of other countries.

I would like to point out to my colleagues that even our primary responsibility as Congressmen is to our constituents as the makers of the laws under which this country is governed, we are also charged with responsibility of bolstering the American image abroad and enhancing our country in the eyes of those foreigners who visit our country.

The naval officers present at the luncheon were Comdr. Mozart Padilha de Souza, Brazil; Comdr. Earl Wyllie Kimmerly, Canada; Lt. Jininu Eshetu and Lt. Comdr. Bekele Worku, Ethiopia; Capt. Satoru Nakahara, Japan; Commodore Su Kap Cha, Korea; Comdr. Armando Mazzotti Pretell, Peru; Lt. Comdr. Gregorio N. Abad, Philippines; Capt. Chinda Vuddhakanaka and Capt. Sahas Asavesana, Thailand; Capt. Ahmet Gazez and Capt. Hayri Tezcan, Turkey; Lt. Comdr. Le Kim Sa, Vietnam. The escort officer was Mr. Herbert Rash.

Address of Hon. Joel T. Broyhill at the Police and Fire Awards Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1967

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by my colleague, Hon. JOEL T. BROYHILL, at the police and fire awards luncheon here in Washington, May 23, 1967.

Congressman BROYHILL of Virginia has served with great distinction as a member of the House District Committee and has never failed to work long hours in an effort to improve conditions in the Nation's Capital.

He has always been a great supporter of the Police and Fire Departments, who must bear the burden of keeping our Nation's Capital a safe and decent place in which to live and for our constituents to visit.

I am certain that if the news media, the District Commissioners, and all the other agencies of the Government would get behind the Washington Police Department 100 percent, we could solve the crime problem here at an early date. Money alone will not solve this problem.

I hope every Member of Congress will take a few minutes of his valuable time to read the excellent speech made by my colleague, JOEL T. BROYHILL of Virginia, who is also one of the outstanding members of the House District Committee.

The speech follows:

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE JOEL T. BROYHILL, REPUBLICAN, OF VIRGINIA, AT POLICE AND FIRE AWARDS LUNCHEON, METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE, TUESDAY, MAY 23, 1967

My friends of the National Capital Police and Fire Departments; members of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade; and distinguished guests . . . the men who have earned the distinguished service awards to be presented today.

The recognition is long overdue.

I share along with every responsible citizen of this community the urgency of not only making amends but of pledging our service to your embattled ranks.

Throughout our long history a uniform was not only a badge of courage but a symbol of respect on the streets of America.

Today, from Viet Nam to Pennsylvania Avenue, in part because we as ordinary citizens have taken too much for granted, waited too long to fight back, a uniform is the target for filthy epithets, screeching abuse, and deadly target practice by howling hoodlums, armed with bottles, bricks and guns.

I am not amazed at your courage and dedication. I know too many of you too well to be surprised at any act of courage on your part.

I stand in awe, however, that you possess the will-power to put on those uniforms on arising each morning.

And I salute your wives and children, who witness your departure for duty each day. This is the segment of community admiration and courage I pay homage to today, for this is the real test of dedication to duty.

What does a policeman or a fireman say to his family when he returns home at night or at dawn, littered with the debris and abuse from his fellow citizens?

Does he say it will be better tomorrow?

Does he tell them his assailants did not mean to be abusive? . . . . that it was youthful exuberance or the result of instant anger or hot-tempered misunderstanding?

I doubt it. Because this is not all that confronts our police and firemen; our community and our nation today. And they know it far too well. And they must wonder, in fact, why it has taken the rest of us so long to know it, too.

What we are confronted with is a deadly, deliberate, planned and skillfully executed assault on authority, not just on our streets, not just against the man in uniform.

It is an assault against the very heartbeat of our civilized society.

Its purpose is to degrade those who govern us.

It is designed to create chaos, promote the pillaging of our property and to transgress on our freedom to live in decency . . . a freedom that is available to every American, including those who loudly protest today that it is being denied them.

Those protests are not confined to race, class or economic level.

They peal out in raw discontent from our campuses, our courts, community organizations, from some of our pulpits, and from far too many of our street corners.

And all together they generate an almost uncontrollable civic distemper in an element of our society whose actions borders on mental instability and moral degradation.

It is an organized voice; a disciplined voice; a well-financed voice; and it seeks to speak for law and justice while it rallies violators of that law to mayhem and riot.

I say it is time to answer it.

Today we are at the beginning of answering it—but only beginning.

The people of this community who obey the law and the members of our society who are charged with enforcing those laws are the conscience of our community . . . not the radicals, the thugs and the malcontents who thrive on chaos.

Yet, the only protests we hear come from those who threaten us.

The only anger comes from those who seek to destroy us.

The only action from those bent on disrupting our lives and endangering our people.

To deserve justice we must serve justice. To speak for the law we must obey the law.

And all of us who do so have been silent far too long.

Criminals emerge from jail cells to tell decent citizens how to behave.

They use prison records as diplomas of righteousness; arrest dockets for badges of civic leadership. They confer with left-wing, radical and Communist directed leaders. And when they emerge from confinement or board meetings of violence their cries for justice are accepted as gospel.

They no longer seek freedom of speech—but freedom from criticism.

They not only consider dissent a right—but demand immunity from the violence of their dissent.

They drown out criticism of their action with a chorus of meaningless slogans that dishonor the nation . . . desecrate the flag . . . and impugn the patriotism of those in Viet Nam who fight for the very peace and security they are destroying.

I think it is time to ask, who speaks for America?

I believe it is time to ask who serves America best, those who respect her institutions, her laws and her justice, or those who spit upon them with contempt?

I am certain it is time to ask our decent citizens for collective action; our public officials for more backbone; our courts for more reality.

I say with every ounce of conviction I can muster that it is time to stop this damned nonsense on our streets.

We must stop it now—not tomorrow or in July.

The time has come for us to begin to place more emphasis on the constitutional rights of the victims of their acts of violence . . . on the property rights of the merchants and businessmen . . . on the community rights of the decent and law abiding citizens . . . on the human rights of those who protect us.

Those receiving distinguished service awards here today, and the men they represent, do not call on anyone else but their own comrades and their own self-reliance in moments of peril.

They stand on their own feet at the firing line until knocked to the ground, not only by those who face them in violence, but by the long ranks of those of us in this city who have neglected to assist them in the months and years of their lonely vigils.

They did not ask for the awards being presented to them today.

They do not ask for more of them now. Although to me every member of both services earns one each morning he walks from his home for duty and a destiny he cannot foresee.

Gentlemen, we owe you much.

Your courage has earned you the right to our respect; your sacrifices an obligation on our part to stand beside you; your devotion to decency and order, our thanks.

I salute you for what you have done and what you will be called upon to do for your community in the days ahead.

You do not stand alone; you will not stand alone.

You must not stand alone if your America and mine is to fulfill the destiny for which it was created.

Together we can see that it does today and for whatever tomorrow may bring.

Thank you.

Chet Holifield's Address to Nuclear Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California, the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, made a superb address at the Conference on Nuclear Power Fuel Reprocessing at Augusta, Ga., May 11.

It was my privilege to hear Congressman HOLIFIELD on this great occasion and I commend his magnificent address not only to the Congress but to all those interested in atomic energy throughout this Nation and, indeed, the world:

NUCLEAR FUEL REPROCESSING: CRUX OF NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL POLICY

INTRODUCTION

Those who have planned and executed this conference deserve high commendation for their efforts, and I am glad to have this opportunity to share my thoughts with you.

The timing and location of the meeting are appropriate, I think, for a number of reasons. The sharp expansion in orders for nuclear powerplants over the past few years has resulted in a very substantial increase in the estimated reprocessing load during the 1970's and beyond. We already have one commercial facility in operation with others planned, and the AEC's heretofore dominant role in reprocessing is being adjusted to correspond with these developments. Increased attention is also being given both here and abroad to the practical problems of safeguarding reprocessing plants against diversion of fissionable material to unauthorized uses.

Of course, the Savannah River plant has played a key part in developing chemical reprocessing technology and will continue to do so in the future. In general, the manufacturing facilities at the Savannah River plant are highly versatile tools. It is a tribute to both the AEC and the DuPont Company that these facilities, intended originally for weapons material production, can also be used now for programs of great interest in the civilian application of atomic energy.

It has always been recognized that power reactor fuel reprocessing presents national and international policy problems of a high order. Tonight I would like to review a few of these problems with you, the progress we have made in resolving them, and something of the road ahead.

TRANSITION FROM EXCLUSIVELY GOVERNMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY TOWARD COMMERCIALIZATION

When the Atomic Energy Act was amended in 1954 to permit private ownership and operation of nuclear power reactors, it was obvious that isotope separation and chemical reprocessing were the two segments of the nuclear fuel cycle presenting the most severe obstacles to commercialization. Both of these operations required high capital investment; they were both of vital importance from a national security standpoint; and there were huge Government facilities already functioning.

Essentially the same conditions are present today, although we have taken major steps toward a competitive, self-sustaining commercial reprocessing industry. These steps were not easily taken by any means, and much remains to be accomplished before the goal is reached. It is instructive, however, to review the history of this transition, particularly as it may shed some light on the current review of possible private operation of isotope separation facilities.

To understand this history, one must consider the premise that has underlain Government-industry relationships in the atomic energy field—namely, that the unique circumstances surrounding the birth of this program should not prevent commercial participation to the fullest extent practicable in developing the new technology. A companion principle has also been followed—that the national interest in development and control of this energy source requires vigorous Governmental action.

In the middle 1950's, it was apparent that private industry was unprepared at that time to provide commercial reprocessing facilities. Accordingly, the AEC established the economic basis for this portion of the fuel cycle through its "conceptual plant" policy. Although this policy served adequately as a stop-gap measure, there were continued private efforts to develop a non-Governmental capability to provide the service.

In 1959, an industrial reprocessing group—composed of electrical utilities and a chemical company—was formed to study the technical and economic feasibility of a private plant. The AEC co-operated with this group in its studies, and later agreed to negotiate a base load contract with the first commercial reprocessing company. It took seven years for the first private plant to become operational, and a second such facility is not expected to start up until 1970.

In preparing the way for the first commercial plant many difficult questions arose. They included such matters as fostering competition; continued provision by the AEC of reprocessing services; the relationship of commercial reprocessing to the overall civilian power program; and international policies and commitments of the United States. However, these issues were resolved in one fashion or another and the project went forward.

There are some significant problems of transition yet to be faced. Notwithstanding the AEC's base load contract and the bright prospects for commercial reprocessing several years hence, the near-term power reactor fuel load is a lean one. Moreover, other U.S. companies have announced plans for entering the reprocessing business earlier than many had expected. These developments have led the AEC to announce that it no longer expects to offer another Government baseload as an inducement to industrial participation. The United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority has also indicated strong interest in reprocessing U.S. power reactor fuels. I think the changes that have occurred in the last few years demonstrate how important and difficult it is to keep abreast of developments in this field. Plans that seemed eminently reasonable a short time ago can quickly become outdated.

The emergence of a commercial capability for reprocessing power reactor fuels has not, however, eliminated the need for continued Governmental activity. For example, the AEC's research continues on advanced reprocessing techniques and means of reprocessing new types of fuel. The AEC's efforts to develop better means of radioactive waste management are going forward. The Government still is providing nuclear indemnity protection for reprocessing facilities, and the AEC has told the Joint Committee that the Commission may soon submit proposed legislation to extend this indemnity to ocean shipments involving these plants. Of course, the regulation of reprocessing facilities for safety and national security purposes is a continuing responsibility of the Government.

I have touched upon only a few highlights of the changes taking place in power reactor fuel reprocessing in the United States. However, I think these highlights show a mutual willingness by industry and Government to co-operate in good faith to provide for commercial entry, on a timely basis, into what was theretofore an exclusively Governmental endeavor. The development of atomic energy is a most complicated task. When differences of opinions arise as to the best means to proceed, it is sometimes easy to take a harsh view of the other person's motives. Nevertheless, I fully expect to see this same kind of co-operation continue in the future.

ISOTOPE SEPARATION FACILITIES

In this same vein, I would like to add a few words concerning private operation of isotope separation facilities. Notwithstanding the 1964 private ownership legislation which presently makes possible—and in the future mandatory—the private ownership of fissionable material in the civilian nuclear power program, the Federal Government still maintains ownership of uranium enrichment plants. Moreover, the overriding national security interests of the United States require that much of the technology of the gaseous diffusion process remain classified.

Although a study presently is underway looking toward the possible future private operation of gaseous diffusion plants, in my opinion this is something not to be realized in the near future.

An important matter which could pose a greater problem in the future is the possibility of developing a new method of isotope separation which, as we see it today, could require (a) less electrical power, and (b) less capital investment. Assuming such a process could be successfully developed, it could be attractive to some nations wishing to produce nuclear weapons material.

This area of development should not be judged on economic objectives alone. It is inevitably joined with important policy principles directly connected with our national security. Certainly the possibility of proliferation of weapon material through such technical developments cannot be divorced from our national and international security. As in other fields the national interest is and should be paramount over commercial profits or ambitions.

I speak, of course, about the possible development of the gas centrifuge method. Along with other Committee members, I strongly approve the Commission's recent decision to establish additional controls over classified information in this field. I would hope that the nuclear industry will fully cooperate with the AEC by not attempting prematurely to transfer into private industry the commercial development or operation of isotope separation facilities.

SAFEGUARDING REPROCESSING PLANTS

We have made major strides toward the objective of establishing a technically and economically sound basis for reprocessing power reactor fuels. However, there is a major piece of unfinished business which concerns both Government and industry. This is the need to establish additional criteria and detailed procedures for safeguarding power reactor fuel reprocessing facilities against diversion of fissionable material to unauthorized uses.

It is clear that a reprocessing facility is one of the most significant points in the nuclear fuel cycle from a safeguards standpoint. It is at this point in the cycle that the many tons of plutonium soon to be produced in power reactors around the world become easily accessible to diversion. Moreover, it is at this point that this material can be accurately measured for the first time. As the civilian nuclear industry expands, a larger number of these facilities will be built, and it is essential to have reasonable assurance that highly enriched uranium or plutonium used or produced in civilian nuclear power programs is not being diverted to military purposes.

To achieve this result, the United States has urged the adoption of an effective international safeguards system for these plants. I think it fair to say that no organization has more actively sought to achieve this goal than the Joint Committee. For example, we have consistently supported the application of international safeguards on power reactor fuel supplied to other nations. This requirement is of particular significance when such other nations possess independent reprocessing capability. The Committee has also urged the AEC to restrict the flow overseas of information concerning chemical reprocessing facilities unless the recipient country agrees to place any facility it builds under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) or equivalent safeguards.

However, to date international safeguards procedures have actually been applied at only one small reprocessing facility—the Eurochemic plant in Mol, Belgium. These safeguards were those of Euratom. Thus far, international safeguards procedures have never been applied to the reprocessing of power reactor fuels. I believe the first such instance will occur later this year when IAEA-safeguarded fuel from the Yankee reactor is scheduled to be reprocessed at the Nuclear Fuel Services, Inc. (NFS) plant. The U.S., in conjunction with the management of NFS, has also offered to allow the IAEA to use the NFS plant for developing and testing safeguards techniques, and to train the Agency's inspectors. With the strong encouragement of the Joint Committee, the AEC has arranged for a detailed safeguards procedures manual which has recently been completed for the NFS plant.

It is clear that we have much to learn about the manner in which international safeguards should be carried out at a reprocessing plant. This is not to say that we have to start from scratch in approaching this problem. In addition to the practical knowledge derived over the entire period of our nuclear program, the U.S. has sponsored studies of safeguards systems going back more than a decade. We have also worked closely with the IAEA and Euratom in developing their safeguards systems, and applying them to reprocessing of power reactor fuels.

In 1966, the IAEA for the first time extended the procedures of its safeguards system to chemical reprocessing plants. The AEC also reached agreement with Euratom last year whereby continuous inspection would be applied by Euratom's inspectors at the Eurochemic plant while U.S.-supplied material is being reprocessed. By continuing to work with these international organizations the U.S. should be able to contribute invaluable expertise in this field.

As I have indicated, we still have a long way to go in establishing an effective and acceptable international safeguards system. I am not going to attempt in a few minutes tonight to spell out all the provisions of such a system. To do so would require answers to difficult technical and policy questions, many of which are not yet available. However, I shall emphasize some of the matters which I believe warrant close attention.

DEGREE OF SAFEGUARDS CONTROL

No technical accounting system has been devised at this time which can account for all material. Therefore any safeguards system cannot be 100% foolproof. Recognizing these facts, a central issue that must be resolved is—How good must the safeguards system be? How much material, and of what kind, should the safeguards system be able to account for? It is not easy to answer these questions for a number of reasons.

Certainly there are powerful arguments in favor of a very intensive safeguards system. Tremendous quantities of U–235 and plutonium will be circulating throughout the world during the coming decades, as nuclear power acquires a sharply increased share of our energy economy. Defining the details of the military potential that could be represented by these amounts of fissionable material would necessitate a classified discussion. We have had many such discussions within the Joint Committee, and the facts are known to our members. However, enough reasonably reliable information is available in the public domain upon which to base an unclassified talk.

In 1963, a nuclear physicist by the name of Arnold Kramish pointed out in his book, "The Peaceful Atom in Foreign Policy," that 16 kilograms of U–235 (or 6 kilograms of plutonium) are required to manufacture an atomic bomb. This estimate was based upon unclassified information, but close enough to the facts to be utilized in general discussion.

The latest determination by the President of the amount of enriched uranium to be made available for peaceful uses at home and abroad is 550,000 kilograms of U–235 in enriched uranium. This estimate was made over a year ago, and undoubtedly is now subject to considerable upward revision. If we were prepared to accept the fact that 1% of this material could not be accounted for, we should recognize that this amount of U–235 (5500 kilograms) would represent over 340 crude atomic bombs based upon Kramish's estimate. The statistics concerning plutonium are perhaps even more significant. According to Kramish's book, a 150 megawatt nuclear reactor—a very modest size by today's standards—can produce enough plutonium for 30 bombs in one year.

There are many other factors to be considered, however. For example:

How much would it cost to improve accountability methods currently available, and how much improvement can reasonably be expected?

What would it mean—in terms of the dollars per kilogram of product from a reprocessing facility—to attempt to verify independently each step of the accountability system of a plant?

Would it be practicable to operate a plant in conjunction with so intensive a safeguards system?

How much extra degree of assurance would such a system provide over a less intensive safeguards procedure that placed greater reliance on alternative methods of control?

What would be the cost of less intensive efforts aimed at reducing the probability of diversion but accepting an increased uncertainty of its occurrence?

Until we have reached a decision on the relative degree of safeguards control we shall insist upon, it will not be possible to establish many other features of the safeguards system. We must therefore strive to establish our own position on this matter first, and then work to secure agreement by other nations.

SAFEGUARDS STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR U.S. CIVILIAN FACILITIES

This leads me to the next point I wish to discuss—the safeguards standards and procedures for civilian facilities within the U.S. At the outset, I wish to make clear that although I am addressing myself specifically to safeguards for reprocessing plants, much of what I say certainly concerns other facilities as well, such as conversion and fabrication plants.

At present, international safeguards—that is, IAEA safeguards—apply only to a few installations within the U.S. With the exception of the special arrangements covering the NFS plant, all of these facilities are reactors. However, regardless of whether safeguards on civilian facilities within the U.S. are supervised by the IAEA or the AEC, I believe the standards and procedures we apply to such facilities must be at least as strict as those we propose for other nations.

We must be prepared to accept this responsibility because it is in our national interest to do so. The potential dangers flowing from inadequate Governmental surveillance over the location of large quantities of plutonium and highly enriched uranium within our own country should be so obvious as to require no elaboration. Moreover, other countries will watch to see what controls we impose on our own civilian program, and surely we will be hard-put to demand more rigid safeguards for others than we assume for our own industry.

In the past I have been critical of the manner in which the AEC was administering the domestic safeguards system of the United States. Last June—at the annual convention of the Edison Electric Institute—I called attention to the need for improvement in a number of areas, including the possible stationing of resident inspectors at a few critical points in the nuclear fuel cycle. I am glad to see that during the past year or so the AEC has taken a number of steps to strengthen domestic safeguards. Some of these have been announced only within the past few weeks. The AEC has also clearly recognized the inadequacy of its past policy of placing such heavy reliance upon the financial responsibility of licensees for fissionable material to assure that proper safeguards control is maintained.

In particular, the AEC is moving closer to a system under which more detailed safeguards criteria, standards and guides will be established by the Commission, which will be applicable to all firms doing the same kind of work. This trend parallels the Commission's current efforts to develop criteria and standards for regulating nuclear facilities to protect the public health and safety. I strongly support the new approach to fulfilling the AEC's safeguards responsibilities. Moreover, I think it is particularly important that safeguards procedures be well established in advance, to avoid disputes and misunderstandings with plant management. I believe that private organizations in the atomic energy business will be better off under the newer systems than in the past, when the requirements for safeguards were more uncertain and a greater possibility existed of inconsistent treatment of AEC's licensees.

These are certainly steps in the right direction, but we have much more work to do in this area. The Joint Committee has held public and executive hearings on this subject. Last year we urged the appointment of an independent panel to review the AEC's safeguards procedures. Such a panel was appointed and submitted its report to the AEC recently. I believe this panel performed a valuable job by analyzing this complex situation and recommending actions to improve safeguards control. The Commission has told the Committee that AEC has already implemented some of the panel's recommendations and is continuing to study others. I look forward to early decisions on these important matters. I also am sure the Committee will wish to hold additional public hearings on this matter at an appropriate time.

Of course, we cannot overlook the fact that strengthened safeguards may impose some additional cost upon the civilian nuclear industry. As I have indicated, I believe the new procedures should also be helpful to commercial firms in a number of ways. In the past I have complimented industry concerning its statesmanlike attitude toward the safeguards problem, and I feel confident this attitude will continue to prevail.

In addition to the basic policy issues I have been discussing, there are a number of subsidiary matters that must be taken into account in establishing a safeguards system for reprocessing facilities.

RESIDENT INSPECTION

More attention should be given to the practical problems of resident inspection of reprocessing plants in the United States and elsewhere. Euratom has agreed to continuous inspection during the reprocessing of U.S.-supplied material, and the IAEA's safeguards system now recognizes the need for continuous inspection of large chemical reprocessing facilities. Here in the United States, the AEC has already stationed resident inspectors at the NFS plant for the purpose of ensuring compliance with the provisions of the AEC's base-load contract. The AEC has also instituted resident inspection for contractual purposes in certain "cold" uranium scrap recovery operations, for example.

I believe that resident inspectors are clearly required to assure proper safeguards control of chemical reprocessing plants. This position is supported by various studies that have been made on this subject. It is, of course, essential to develop inspection procedures for individual plants, and the recent review of the NFS facility should be helpful in this respect.

I think it is also necessary to devote additional thought to resident inspection of other key facilities in the nuclear fuel cycle. This procedure might be considered for application on an interim basis while additional experience is gained.

INSPECTION PERSONNEL

If we are to have an effective safeguards system, the inspection personnel must be intelligent, well-trained, dedicated people and there must be a sufficient number of them. Unless such a cadre can be developed and maintained, we will be lulling ourselves into a false sense of security when we talk of safeguarding nuclear facilities.

The problem of securing qualified inspectors—particularly resident inspectors—is a difficult one. Unless some imagination is exercised in defining the inspector's job, it could well become a monotonous, uninteresting task. If that is allowed to occur the safeguards agency will be unable to attract and retain the necessary people.

There are a number of steps that can be taken to attack this problem. However, I believe it is highly desirable that the inspectors have other duties to perform in addition to safeguards as such. Given their technical expertise, these persons might possibly serve in an advisory capacity to plant management on nuclear material accountability matters, or perhaps assume responsibility for performance of certain safety inspections as well.

These possibilities certainly warrant exploration. Since safeguards inspectors will become very familiar with the operation of a particular plant why could they not, for example, perform work related to compliance with safety regulations? I suggest there are substantial advantages to be gained from combining functions. This is particularly true if an intensive system of safeguards were instituted requiring a fairly large number of resident inspectors.

ADVANCE APPROVAL OF PLANT FEATURES

One of the essential features of an effective safeguards system is the advance inspection by the safeguards agency of designs for certain facilities. Conversion, fabrication and reprocessing plants built in this country have not to date been subjected to this requirement by the AEC, although the plans for such facilities may be reviewed for other purposes. In the case of chemical reprocessing plants a construction permit from the AEC already is specifically required. One of the matters I believe the AEC should look into closely concerns the possible need to review in advance the design of domestic reprocessing, fabrication, and conversion facilities to assure the feasibility of safeguards.

NEW SURVEILLANCE AND CONTAINMENT DEVICES

"Surveillance" and "containment" are two of the techniques that can be used in a safeguards system, along with accountability measures. The first two are designed to detect, and hence prevent, diversion as it is occurring. It has sometimes been suggested that electronic devices could be used to perform these functions, and to supplement the work of resident inspectors. Perhaps such devices could even reduce the need for resident inspection. I do not believe we know enough yet to form a judgment about the efficacy of these devices and believe that additional research and development work is called for here.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, I think that technical and economic decisions in fuel reprocessing are now being made in a new environment. The responsibility for many of these decisions has moved from the Government into the hands of private industry. This trend is consistent with the intent of our atomic energy program as a whole.

At the same time, the Government's obligations in certain areas continue, and often present complexities that are being faced squarely for the first time. Conferences such as this help both industry and Government to appreciate where each can make the best contribution to progress in this field.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

For their sake I consecrate myself, that they also may be consecrated in truth.—John 17: 19.

Eternal God, our Father, who hast guided us in ages past and who art our hope for years to come, in Thee do we put our trust for today. We recall once again our Nation's day of remembrance when we call to mind those who have given their lives for our country. For the ministry of memory, for the heritage of sacrificial deeds and for the hallowed thoughts which go through our mind as we think of those who gave themselves for freedom—we pause in gratitude before Thee.

Inspired by their devotion and challenged by their dedication may we now give ourselves afresh to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people may not perish from the earth. In the name of Him who died that men might live, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 29, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that May 29, 1967, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1587. An act for the relief of Richard L. Bass;

H.R. 1646. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. E. Housley; and

H.R. 9481. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I was not present on Thursday, May 25, during the vote on S. 1432 which amends the Universal Military Training and Service Act because of my daughter's graduation from high school. Had I been present, I would have answered "yea" to roll No. 108, which was taken on the passage of this legislation. I would like the RECORD to show my position on S. 1432.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I think we have reached a point in the Middle East crisis in which time is an important factor. I know that President Johnson has been seeking to mobilize the maritime powers and other stabilizing forces in the world to bring diplomatic pressure on Egypt to reopen the Gulf of Aqaba. I heartily approve of this Presidential endeavor, but I think it is unwise, Mr. Speaker, to let too much time elapse in the quest for diplomatic solutions.

We are dealing in the Middle East with countries that take procrastination for weakness. We have all noticed how Egypt's Nasser has become progressively more emboldened as the days have passed without action either from Israel or the Western Powers. Now we note in the morning papers that Russia is sending a fleet of warships through the Dardanelles as a show of its own strength in the Mediterranean.

I fear it will be a mistake, Mr. Speaker, if our country does not act with dispatch to back the rights of the only democratic, peaceful, Western-oriented state in the Middle East. Israel's principles are our own—not the least of which is the freedom of navigation in international waters. Further delay, I am convinced, will simply increase the chances of a major war. I call upon the President to consider quick and decisive action to uphold justice in the Middle East.

I would like to quote from this morning's New York Times column by James Reston in which he quotes the former British Foreign Secretary, Selwyn Lloyd:

> The proper course is for the United States and Britain . . . to declare boldly that they will assert the right of free passage of their ships into the Gulf of Aqaba, whatever their destination and whatever their cargo. If that right is disputed, military force will be used to sustain it. I believe a clear declaration of that sort is the best way to keep the peace.

THE THIRD-CLASS MAIL LOBBY

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, all Members received in their mail a large yellow card which attacked my bill to raise third-class postage rates, H.R. 99. This card very correctly quotes a statement I made on the televised "Town Meeting" program in Columbus, Ohio:

> I speak for millions of Americans who are irritated, indignant, and incensed. They are really fed up by all this junk mail that comes into their mail boxes every day.

The card also very correctly quotes the chief lobbyist for the third-class mailers, Harry Maginnis, as stating:

> Direct mail advertising is selling $40 billion worth of goods and services annually and providing $700 million in postal income while doing it.

My question is simply this: If the direct mail industry is doing a $40-billion-a-year business, should not this struggling, poor little industry be able to afford to pay the cost of delivery of third-class mail, which, after all, is all that my bill does? Why should the taxpayers of the Nation be forced to subsidize 40 percent of the cost of every piece of third-class mail?

I believe under our free enterprise system a business that produces $40 billion worth of goods and services should not have its hand out to the Government for subsidies. That is why I hope that the rates on third-class mail will be raised to 4.5 cents per piece of bulk mail, instead of 3.8 cents as recommended by the administration. Let us make third-class mail pay its way and help balance the postal budget.

THE TINY CRIME WAVE

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General says "there is no wave of crime in the country."

That he should say so is part of the crime problem in this country. The Attorney General of the United States is the chief law enforcement officer of the Nation. If he thinks, as he is quoted as saying, that "the level of crime has risen a little bit," then he is either misinformed about the statistics or badly mistaken about the size of a "bit."

Webster says that a "bit" is a "mite" or a "whit." Those who contend that the level of crime has risen only a mite are more than a little bit wrong. In the decade of the sixties, the growth rate of crime has outpaced the growth rate of the population by more than six times. To me, that sounds more like a wave than a whit.

The Attorney General was also quoted as saying that organized crime is only a "tiny part" of the picture. President Johnson last year, following a meeting with former Attorney General Katzenbach, said that organized crime "constitutes nothing less than a guerrilla war against society." The Katzenbach Crime Commission said that the estimates of illegal gambling profits alone, not counting profits from narcotics, prostitution, and racketeering, run as high as $50 billion a year. That may sound tiny to some; it sounds titanic to me.

The crime problem in American will never be solved by miniaturizing it with timid little words. The chief law enforcement officer must acknowledge it in its full dimensions and thereby set the atmosphere of urgency essential to its solution.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT ON SPECIAL INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the Wednesday message from the President, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 109]

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Battin
Bell
Blatnik
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Casey
Celler
Chamberlain
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Conyers
Derwinski
Diggs
Dorn
Dow
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Fascell
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gardner
Gathings
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gude
Gurney
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Heckler, Mass.
Hicks
Holifield
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
King, Calif.
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lloyd
Lukens
McClory
McDade
Madden
Mailliard
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Mink
Monagan
Mosher
Myers
Nix
O'Konski
Ottinger
Philbin
Pickle
Pollock
Purcell
Quie
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Roudebush
Ruppe
St. Onge
Smith, Iowa
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tiernan
Tuck
Waggonner
Watkins
Whalen
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Younger
Zwach

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 324 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT ON SPECIAL INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Fourth Annual Report on Special International Exhibitions conducted during fiscal year 1966 under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961.

The primary purpose of the program—in which the Nation's economic, social, and cultural achievements are exhibited in international fairs and expositions—is to build bridges of understanding between the United States and other countries of the world. Each exhibit is designed to show how our accomplishments relate to the capabilities and aspirations of the different countries. Because the exhibitions feature the products of American industries, they also contribute to mutually profitable trade relationships.

Since the program began in 1954, more than 100 million people—primarily in Eastern Europe and the developing countries—have witnessed 176 exhibits designed to help them understand, appreciate, and benefit from American progress and experience.

During fiscal year 1966, the United States participated in a broad range of international events:

Trade fair exhibitions in Algeria, Ethiopia, Hungary, Iraq, Poland, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia: These exhibitions dramatized our progress in mechanical equipment for farm and industry, educational techniques, electronics, and space.

Expo 67: During the year, plans were laid for our participation in the World's Fair which opened in Montreal, Canada, in April 1967. "Creative America" was chosen as the theme of this country's exhibit, which pictures American achievements in the arts and space technology.

Labor exhibits at trade fairs in Ethiopia, Hungary, Iraq, Poland, and Yugoslavia: The purpose of these exhibits was to project the true image of the American worker and the role he plays in the affairs of this Nation.

Special-purpose East-West exhibits in the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia: More than 2 million persons attended these exhibits, which featured the machinery of American industry, American architecture, and the graphic arts.

As in past years, the program's effectiveness was the result not only of Government efforts, but also of the contribution of materials, time, and talent by hundreds of private firms.

All Americans are indebted to them for their efforts to help carry America's message to the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 31, 1967.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board for fiscal year 1966.

For three decades the insurance system administered by the Board has been protecting railroad workers and their families against the economic hazards which accompany unemployment, sickness, old age, and death.

During the period covered by this report, more than 1 million individuals received $1.2 billion in retirement and survivor benefits—an increase of $82 million over the preceding year. These payments brought to $14.5 billion the total amount paid to retired employees, wives, and survivors of deceased employees since the program began in 1936.

In fiscal 1966 payments for unemployment and sickness dropped below the $100 million mark—to $88.1 million—for the first time in 13 years. This reduction reflects the unprecedented economic expansion which this country has enjoyed during the last 6 years. In each, unemployment among railroad workers showed a significant decline.

The increases in retirement and survivor benefits reported here represent increased comfort and security in the retirement years of many worthy citizens. But even greater comfort and protection would come with congressional enactment of the social security amendments which I have proposed this year. The proposed 20-percent increase would in the first year alone bring $65 million in added benefits to some 385,000 railroad workers and their families.

I again urge the Congress to take this vital step toward our goal of providing every elderly citizen an adequate income and a meaningful retirement.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 31, 1967.*

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1968

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10345, with Mr. HAYS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, H.R. 10345, makes appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Federal judiciary, and 12 related agencies for the fiscal year 1968.

The total recommended in this bill is $2,194,026,500, which would be an increase of $60,938,300 over appropriations for the current fiscal year. The bill I have referred to is $148,915,500 below the amounts requested in the budget estimates.

The following table indicates the committee's action:

Department or agency	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with— Appropriations, 1967	Bill compared with— Budget estimates, 1968
Department of State	$391,247,000	$404,543,000	[1] $382,327,400	−$8,919,600	−$22,215,600
Department of Justice	408,740,000	436,294,000	419,373,000	+10,633,000	−16,921,000
Department of Commerce	1,016,088,000	1,138,752,000	1,059,291,000	+43,203,000	−79,461,000
The Judiciary	89,850,700	96,379,000	93,997,100	+4,146,400	−2,381,900
Related agencies	227,162,500	266,974,000	239,038,000	+11,875,500	−27,936,000
Total	2,133,088,200	2,342,942,000	2,194,026,500	+60,938,300	−148,915,500

[1] Plus $15,606,000 to be derived by transfer.

The budget estimates for fiscal year 1968 for the Department of State total $404,543,000. The committee included in the bill $382,327,400 in new obligational authority plus a transfer of $15,606,000 from previously appropriated funds, making a total availability of $397,933,400, which is an actual reduction of $6,609,600 in the budget request and an increase of $6,686,400 over the 1967 comparable appropriation.

Under the general heading "Administration of Foreign Affairs," a total of $214,118,000 is recommended. For "International Organizations and Conferences," a sum of $99,448,400 is provided plus an additional $15,606,000 by way of transfer that I have just referred to. A total of $51,800,000 is provided for "Educational Exchange."

As to the salaries and expenses of the Department there were requested funds for "International Education Officers" to be stationed at various embassies throughout the world. We already have educational officers in the person of the cultural affairs officers of the U.S. Information Agency. The committee in toto denied any funds whatever for the start of this educational officers program. This was agreed upon with the other body in the supplemental appropriation bill recently passed at which time the House recommended no funds and the Senate concurred in language in their report likewise recommending no funds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman in his hearings at any point——

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course, the gentleman has not let me get far enough along to explain what is in this bill. I am afraid I will get into such an interesting colloquy with my distinquished friend from Iowa that I may forgo explaining what we have done with regard to the nuclear ship *Savannah*.

We have provided funds in this bill insisting that the Administration sail the *Savannah* for another year. It would cost $1,350,000, as I recall the figure, to lay up the ship. We have denied the lay-up money but have recommended $3.3 million in order to sail the ship. It has cost a lot of the taxpayers' money to train these men to run a nuclear ship. This ship has been a showpiece as far as the United States of America is concerned all over the world and it should continue to be sailed. In some ways it is better as a propaganda means than some of the activities that the U.S. Information Agency carries on.

Now I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I can readily agree with the gentleman as to the latter part of his statement that the operation of the *Savannah* is better promotion and publicity for the United States than a lot of the other things on which we are spending much more money.

I really arose to ask the gentleman if in the hearings there was a listing, as is usually the case, of the cultural experts that are stationed all over the world. Is such a list in the hearings this year?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Oh, of course; yes.

Mr. GROSS. I have not yet run across that listing in the hearings.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, there is also a list contained in here that becomes very interesting in connection with the educational exchange program, the so-called specialists list, where we use the money of the taxpayers—and when I say "we," I mean some misguided individuals down in the State Department to send abroad individuals who do not agree with the President on Vietnam and who say some very nasty things about him. We have taken this into consideration in arriving at the markup on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes, I yield further to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on page 716 of the hearings—and since the gentleman from New York has gone into the question of the "specialists"—page 716 of the hearings indicates the specialists by name and among those listed are Supreme Court Justice Earl Warren and his wife Nina P. Warren.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I was not sure whether that was the wife of the distinguished Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, or his daughter, because the Chief Justice has a daughter by the name of Nina. They are very fine people.

Mr. GROSS. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York will yield further, it seems to be fairly well confirmed that this is the wife of the Chief Justice, and she, apparently, is some kind of expert on social welfare. I do not know whether the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is an expert on social welfare or not. But it seems that the two of them collected about $946 of the taxpayers' money for a recent junket to three South American countries.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That cannot be the correct figure because 6 plus 2 makes 8. The total of the last two figures added together make 8.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman from New York will find that the figure is $586 and $362.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, the last figure would be 8, would it not?

Mr. GROSS. The figure would be nine hundred and some odd dollars—$586 plus $362 would be $948 for a junket for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and his wife to South America.

My next question is this: What did we get for the junket made by Antonio Taylor, brother-in-law of the President of the United States and his wife—the State Department's curio and souvenir shop specialist?

What did we receive from the junket that he and his wife made to South America? Does the gentleman from New York happen to know?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have wondered about many of these things myself. We asked for these lists of specialists which, incidentally, have not been published heretofore in these hearings. We just happened to think about it on this particular morning. Therefore, we have the list printed here in the hearings. However, the list was not furnished to the subcommittee until the witnesses had said, "Goodby." We would have been glad to inquire as to the trip of the Chief Justice and Mrs. Warren with reference to the success of their visit to South American countries, as well as the curio dealer to which the gentleman from Iowa has referred, or did the gentleman say "souvenir" dealer?

Mr. GROSS. The "souvenir specialist" dealer.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the hearings of the Committee on Armed Services relative to the enforcement of the Selective Service law revealed the frightening testimony on the part of the Department of Justice to prosecute only the "cinch"-type cases.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Justice is either afraid to prosecute most violations or it is seriously short handed in staff personnel and is, therefore, unable to initiate and carry through the prosecution of cases which exist in these areas.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my question is this: Are there sufficient funds contained in this appropriation bill with which to enable the Department of Justice to expeditiously and effectively prosecute every violation of the selective service law?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Every dollar requested by the Department of Justice for this purpose is included in the bill. So, the answer would be, "They have ample funds and should proceed with dispatch in the prosecution of such cases."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his response.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course, I do not know whether the gentleman's verbiage to prosecute only "cinch" type cases, and about the Department being afraid to prosecute these cases covers the situation, because I do not believe Attorney General Clark would be afraid to prosecute anybody if it became his duty to do so.

Mr. RIVERS. Let us hope so.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am quite confident of that.

Mr. RIVERS. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the committee is confident of that, but the testimony before our committee and the facts and figures before our committee indicate that there are over 12,000 to 14,000 violations a year, yet in 1962 the Department of Justice prosecuted only 321 cases, in 1933, 322 cases; in 1934, 301 cases; in 1965, 369 cases; and in fiscal year 1966, 642 cases.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman one other question:

Assistant Attorney General Vinson advised our committee on May 5, 1967, that substantial delays had occurred in the processing of conscientious objector cases under the Seeger case, because the Department of Justice had been "shorthanded until quite recently in both lawyers and secretarial personel relative to the increased caseload. We are adding personnel in an effort to minimize this kind of delay."

In the Defense Act, which we passed last week, we had a provision in there that they had to terminate these cases in 6 months, yet the testimony before our committee shows some cases have gone as high as 18, 25, and 30 months, and never been terminated.

The distinguished chairman has a great record in this area, and I just want to be sure that they have been given every dollar they have requested in carrying out prosecution of these violation cases. The American people are demanding that things be done to stop the draft card burners, the selective service evaders, and these so-called conscientious objectors.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that if it happens that the distinguished Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Fred Vinson, Jr., does not know how to recruit personnel, or to secure replacements of personnel; that that would be his responsibility.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman very much. I have no further questions.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Proceeding further, we come to a second item in the bill, representation allowances, and which is a favored subject of my dear friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

I believe Secretary Rusk is entitled to a great deal of credit for his moderation in his approach to this item of these spirituous beverages, and elegant dinners and lunches. The Secretary is asking exactly the same amount they have had for the last 3 years, and the committee has approved exactly that amount, to wit: $993,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I cannot think of a better time for the Secretary of State to join with the downtrodden taxpayers of this country by suggesting a cut in his $993,000 lemonade allowance.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. But did the distinguished gentleman from Iowa notice that I commended his approach to this subject?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I noted it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Because he has a far more moderate approach to this subject than they did during the Eisenhower administration, when I was also chairman of the committee.

During the course of the Eisenhower administration we had requests as high as $1.2 million, which we promptly cut to the proper amount.

Mr. GROSS. We are hearing these days, I will say to my friend from New York, that the deficit in the next fiscal year can go anywhere from $24 billion to $29 billion. And $993,000 for the tools of the trade, as my friend from New York calls them, will keep the "top of the mark" at the State Department really humming in the next year.

I tried to make a record of the number of booze allowances in this bill, but quit when I found so many.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It is not all for booze. They might want a nice cool lemonade or orangeade or some drink such as that in a place such as Ouagadongon, which might cost more than it does on the Riviera.

Mr. GROSS. That is possible.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This is a fact and the committee has studied this subject assiduously, as have the gentlemen and I.

Mr. GROSS. But can the gentleman tell me how much there is in this bill for liquor and entertainment? I got lost when I was taken from representation allowances to funds for hospitality I believe there is a $35,000 item for hospitality buried in the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not think you will find any money buried here for anything.

I am very pleased to advise the gentleman that in this bill now before the committee for its approval, the amount for representation and entertainment is $5,000 below the amount provided for the current fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. So it is $5,000 out of about $1,125,000 for booze—we are really doing business today.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It is only a token sort of thing, but it does show that we are going in the right direction.

Mr. GROSS. I suggest you could have gone further in the right direction in view of the deficit that confronts us and the $336 billion debt that we have.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I know, but you would not want these poor gentlemen who serve us so well abroad to be deprived of this. I am reminded of those Arabs on television yesterday in New York at the United Nations. I think any diplomat who goes through such a thing as that is entitled to go out in the lobby and have a drink for himself. Does not the gentleman from Iowa think so?

Mr. GROSS. They might try a little British tea.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUBSER. I do not ask the question I am about to ask facetiously, but do so in an honest search for information.

Did anything develop in the hearings that indicates any tendency on the part of the State Department in using this representation allowance to purchase wines from the great State of New York and the great State of California rather than purchasing foreign wines?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Oh, certainly.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. As a matter of fact, I think the New York State wine is far superior to the California wine.

Now, continuing with the items in the bill, we find that we had an increase in numerous items, which we do not like to see but we must be realists about this, in the request for contributions to the international organizations.

There is included in the bill for this item a total of $109,341,400.

As I have previously mentioned, $15,606,000 is to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Loan to the United Nations."

This is money that had been resting in the U.S. Treasury under this title "Loan to the United Nations" for a number of years past.

Continuing to the next item, "Missions to International Organizations," for which there is included in the bill the amount of $3,770,000. For international conferences and contingencies the amount of $1,943,000 is provided.

Going down to the Mexican border, we find the "International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico," consisting of a number of appropriation requests, all of which we feel have amply been taken care of. A total of $14,336,000 is included in the bill under this heading.

With regard to the item under "American Sections, International Commissions," there is included in the bill the same amount as was appropriated last year, $650,000, for payments of the U.S. share of expenses of the International Boundary Commission, the International Joint Commission, and the

Lake Ontario Claims Tribunal, which are all on the northern border.

Proceeding to the International Fisheries Commissions, the sum of $1,975,000 is provided in the bill to cover the U.S. share of expenses of eight International Fisheries Commissions in which it participates. We feel that this is ample money.

We previously mentioned the list of "specialists." The list of lecturers, research scholars and professors sent abroad under the educational and cultural exchange activities program is set forth on pages 634 through 687 of part 2 of the hearings. The list of "specialists" are set forth in pages 694 through 724 of the same volume. You might find some friends or acquaintances who have been sent abroad as "specialists" at the taxpayers' expense.

With regard to the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, in Honolulu, Hawaii, there is included the full amount of the budget estimate of $5,800,000, which is similar to the amount which was appropriated last year, except there was included an additional amount last year of $250,000 for plans for a library.

Getting to the Department of Justice, the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1968 for the Department of Justice total $436,294,000. The committee recommends in the accompanying bill $419,373,000, which is a reduction of $16,921,000 in the total requested, and an increase of $10,633,000 over the appropriations for the current fiscal year.

The Criminal Division, to which the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] made reference a while ago, is included under the item "General legal activities" for which the sum of $22,375,000 is provided for the operating expenses of the Office of Solicitor General, the Tax Division, the Criminal Division, the Civil Division, the Land and Natural Resources Division, and the Civil Rights Division. This is an increase of $394,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year and a decrease of $150,000 in the amount of the budget estimate.

Of the additional amount allowed, $100,000 is to increase efforts in the organized crime field and to meet new responsibilities as a result of the President's national anticrime program.

I might pause here to say that also included in the Department of Justice budget are funds for the Bureau of Prisons I am happy to advise that Mr. Valachi, that stoolpigeon, who did not, with all the talk and publicity engendered by him, assist in the successful prosecution of one criminal, is no longer in the D.C. jail. Nothing developed from all that nonsense, and they had him down here in the District jail with extra guards, which were costing $30,000 a year, as I remember the figure, just for Mr. Valachi. Mr. Valachi is back as a member of the population in Milan, Mich., and we are glad to note that.

We are also glad to note that the Department of Justice is opposing his lawsuit to write a book in which he is asking to name a lot of names which have already been mentioned and names which belong to one particular race here in America, a race that has been maligned too often by too many people.

I will go on now to the Alien Property activities. This has dwindled to practically nothing, the sum of $48,000, which will cover other activities in the coming year.

The Antitrust Division has been allowed the full amount, and we want them to effectively enforce the antitrust and kindred laws. We gave them an increase, and it is for within grade salary advancements.

Funds are included for the use of the U.S. attorneys and the U.S. Marshals all over the 50 States. There is included the sum of $3,100,000 for fees and expenses of necessary witnesses. Also included is the amount of $10 million, an increase of $2,750,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year, for law enforcement assistance.

No additional personnel have been furnished for this purpose.

These funds are for grants and contracts to provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel, and in improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in State and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime and for technical assistance as authorized by the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1962.

We have included the full amount requested, to wit, $186,574,000 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Incidentally, these increases in the funds for the Federal Bureau of Investigation are the result of additional burdens and duties put on them by the legislation passed by the Congress. During the year 1966, as pointed out in the report, the Bureau received 2,426,665 names for search through its files, which was up 43 percent over the prior year. It is expected that there will be a further substantial increase in the coming year.

With regard to immigration and naturalization, the committee has recommended the sum of $79,946,000 for enforcement of the laws relating to immigration and naturalization by this service. This is an increase of $1,111,000 over the total appropriated for the current fiscal year, and is $454,000 below the amount of the budget request.

There is included the sum of $61 million for salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Prisons. This is the area where they now let out a narcotics offender or a highway robber or a bank stickup man, to let him go back to work under the work release program and where he can even earn social security benefits—believe it or not.

In the old days, when I was a young fellow, I thought when a man was sent to prison, he stayed behind the bars, and anybody who let him out was guilty of jail delivery. I even thought that when I was a prosecutor in Brooklyn. Now, they let a man out on this work release program, and he is out working away from the prison in which he is supposed to be incarcerated by the sentence of the court.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, could we call that another "wild oat" of the Great Society?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not know whether it is the Great Society or the one before that. It could be. Of course, everything today is different. There is a statement in, I believe, this morning's New York Times with respect to a gentleman who has just been named the Director of Broadcasting for the Voice of America. He is already in the newspapers, although he has not even been sworn in as yet.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman referred to a statement by the new head of the Voice of America, Mr. John Charles Daly, Jr. It is a perplexing statement, and I would like to read it, if I might, into the Record, with the gentleman's permission.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Will the gentleman please do that. It is very interesting.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Daly says:

> All we can do is fully and fairly put down the divisions within the country and the divisions internationally. Honest people have honest opinions and we'll see to it that they get heard. I feel that our policy in Vietnam is right, but we have an obligation to give a hearing to those who don't.

If Mr. Daly were editing a private newspaper or heading a television or radio news department, he would have the responsibility of giving coverage to varying shades of opinion. However, we are now dealing with a man who is going to head an official agency of the Government of the United States of America which presents our Government's position abroad. As such, he must be willing to emphasize and promote the Government policy.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid Mr. John Charles Daly is going to have to realize he is not on "What's My Line?" if he takes this job.

The job he has undertaken to do has nothing whatever to do with making statements such as contained in that newspaper clipping. The job of Director of Broadcasting of the Voice of America is an administrative job. It has to do with contracts for the building of radio relay stations and the purchase of very expensive and highly technical radio equipment.

Surely it has something to do also with the content of the program, but I always thought that the purpose of the Voice of America was to cultivate the minds of men to our way of thinking.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I suspect Mr. Daly will find that he is on quite a different program when he appears before the Rooney subcommittee next year in behalf of the Voice of America.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Let us be fair about this. I understand Mr. Daly will not take over this job until September, so he will be fairly green when we hold the hearings about next January or February or whenever it may be. We might give him a brass ring the first time. But then we will watch him.

Mr. GROSS. At any rate, it will be a different line, would the gentleman not agree?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It will be an entirely different line, because he is now in the administrative line and not in one of those, "you give me a compliment and I will give you a compliment" groups. How does that go?

Mr. GROSS. You scratch my back and I will scratch yours.

The reason I asked the gentleman to yield was to inquire about the New York Times. Are the taxpayers still spending $300,000 to circulate the New York Times around the world?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. There was a time when we used to give 467 Members of the British House of Commons and 177 Members of the British House of Lords free subscriptions. We do not do that any more.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for the work he has done in cutting this down. The taxpayers still are paying for too many New York Times newspapers being circulated around the world.

Does not the gentleman agree with me it is quite a situation when the USIA apparently buys one subscription to the Chicago Tribune and the Lord knows how many hundreds of the New York Times.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I would imagine the USIA buys many, many more than the number the gentleman says when it comes to the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. GROSS. The record of the hearings does not show it, I say to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I would suspect there would be more around the shop than that.

We also took the same action with regard to the late New York Herald Tribune. The international edition of the Herald Tribune in Europe was sent all over the place, indiscriminately, also.

Mr. GROSS. It is unconscionable when we consider the amount of money today being spent upon newspapers for foreigners who can well afford their own subscriptions. Let them pay for these newspapers and magazines if they want them. Why should we load this on the backs of the American taxpayers?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I believe the analogy is that we have—and when I say "We" I mean the House of Representatives, with 435 Members—one copy of the New York Times, this morning, out in the Speaker's lobby, for any Member to read, as he waits his turn to do so.

However, to go to the extent that was done years ago with members of the British House of Commons and the British House of Lords is utterly ridiculous.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We are getting along pretty well today I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Not at all badly up to this point.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will now get to the Department of Commerce. Before doing that, I will say with regard to the Federal judiciary that there are sufficient funds in this bill to cover every court from the Supreme Court of the United States down to the district courts, their employees, books, and other expenses.

Now we proceed to the Department of Commerce. The amount requested for that Department was $1,138,752,000. The committee included $1,059,291,000 which is a reduction of $79,461,000 in the amount of the budget request but an increase of $43,203,000 over the comparable appropriation for the current fiscal year.

The largest increase here is for the Maritime Administration. Goodness knows they need an increase. I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, who unfortunately brought to this House a bill a week or so ago which would permit a Member to make a point of order if this committee saw fit to increase appropriations and do what we did today with regard to the *Savannah*.

Does the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. GARMATZ. No, sir.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and as a Member of Congress, I want to voice my approval of this bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Of special concern to me are those portions of the bill related to the Department of Commerce and—more specifically—maritime activities.

As you are all aware, our committee has just finished a series of hearings on the administration's proposal to lay up the nuclear ship *Savannah*. After hearing all the testimony from many industry and Government witnesses, we are convinced that the *Savannah*—the world's only nuclear-powered merchant vessel—should be retained in operation.

I do not intend at this time to review the many reasons for our convictions, except to say that we feel strongly that this technological lead in nuclear propulsion, which may well revolutionize the world's maritime industry, should not be relinquished by the United States.

It was, therefore, especially gratifying to me to see that the Committee on Appriations included in its bill an additional $1,950,000 to keep the *Savannah* in operation for another year. In its report, the committee noted that it did not feel it was "in the best interest of the United States to lay up the *Savannah* even temporarily."

I think this statement reflects the dominant feelings of Congress on this vital matter.

I would like to add one other thought: For some time now, there has been persistent talk about initiating a national maritime policy which would include a program of building American-flag ships abroad. Certainly, a constructive, forward-looking maritime program is badly needed; and it is also true that our declining American merchant marine must have more ships if it is to continue carrying even a small portion of America's commerce on the sea lanes of the world. But when ships are to be built for the American merchant marine they should be built in American yards.

I am happy to see that this feeling is also shared by the Appropriations Committee, which included a provision in the bill specifically prohibiting the use of any part of the maritime appropriation for "construction of any ship in any foreign country."

I think it is time for proponents of the pessimistic build abroad philosophy to accept the fact that this Congress will not turn its back upon American industry and the American workingman, and I am proud to voice my support of the bill reported by the distinguished chairman JOHN ROONEY and his Committee on House Appropriations.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. GARMATZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to point out that this committee took action with regard to the *Savannah* and furnished funds to the administration to proceed with its run. Under the language we put in the bill they will be required to continue operating the NS *Savannah*.

Mr. GARMATZ. I am not looking for credit. All I want to do is keep the *Savannah* afloat. Our committee held hearings several months ago, before the Committee on Appropriations started meeting on this particular subject. Nevertheless I do and I am sure many Members of the House appreciate the fact that you have specified money in your appropriation bill to keep the *Savannah* going.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak for the other members of the subcommittee on the subject of maritime appropriations and maritime activities. I am one who has always believed that it is unfortunate that our merchant marine has not been built up as it should have been after the Congress passed in 1936 one of the finest pieces of legislation and a piece of legislation designed to be of benefit to the maritime industry. Instead, we have lost the lead in this area and we have lost the operation of passenger ships such as the *America*.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee yielding to me at this time and I wish to compliment him also with reference to his statements, and the action of the committee on the use of the *Savannah*.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] knows, we in the Committee on Armed Services and on this floor have considered, only in recent weeks, legislation with reference to the fast deployment logistics ships in the Department of Defense. Rather than mothballing the *Savannah*, we should keep her in service inasmuch as she can at least keep up with our nuclear team of capital A.N.P. surface vessels of the Navy.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, why would it not be more appropriate, rather than to put the *Savannah* in mothballs even in another year, to use her as a demonstration unit manned if need be by defense forces for point-to-point delivery on some of these logistic runs, if necessary, rather than investing in these other new experiments. Our sealift must keep pace with our military and strategic airlift capability.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly make this as a further suggestion, rather than mothballing the *Savannah* even a year from now. This represents a part of the basic premise involved, and it is my opinion that it should be strongly considered by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for his contribution.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to continue on—and I promise to conclude in a minute or two so that others may express their views with reference to this bill—this bill does not include every amount to my satisfaction. I think in some instances we have appropriated too much money and I believe in other instances we have not appropriated enough. But, it represents the majority thinking of the members of the committee.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the "Related Agencies" there is a total of $239,038,000 in the accompanying bill for the 12 different agencies included under this title. This represents a reduction of $27,936,000 in the total amount of the budget estimate and represents an increase of $11,875,000 over the total amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, set forth in the report are the amounts for the American Battle Monuments Commission, the Commission on Civil Rights, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, civil rights educational activities, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Federal Maritime Commission, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, the Small Business Administration, the Federal Maritime Commission, as distinguished from the Federal Maritime Administration.

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Small Business Administration, Special Representative for Trade Negotiations—and I was certainly glad to learn that what we had feared would happen during the Kennedy round did not occur, and that we did get something out of the Kennedy round of negotiations at Geneva at the last moment.

The Subversive Activities Control Board, Tariff Commission, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, U.S. Information Agency.

In closing I want to thank all the members of our subcommittee who worked so hard on this bill. We have what we believe is a good bill. We believe we have cut as much as we could. Strangely, in some areas like the Department of State generally speaking they had a tight budget. The Department of Justice also had a tight budget. We did the best we could, and have succeeded in cutting it to the extent of $148 million.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I require.

Mr. Chairman, I am pinch-hitting today for my colleague, the ranking minority member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Just before I get on with a few comments—and I will try to make them as brief as possible regarding this legislation—I want to say that it is real great to see our distinguished chairman from New York feeling so well. We recall a year ago he had been under surgery and he was not up to par, but I am sure with the colloquy that has taken place today between my colleague from Iowa and the distinguished gentleman from New York we can see he is back fit as a fiddle and raring to go.

It is a distinct pleasure for me to be able to sit under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York.

I am also able to report that my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], although he has not been feeling so well lately, is coming along fine, and soon he will be back with the same feeling that our distinguished chairman has.

We met for some several months in hearings on this appropriation bill, hearing from the various agencies that are involved. We feel we have done a respectable job. I believe all of us would agree that there are some areas where we could have cut deeper. I really cannot think of any areas that I would like to increase. But I recognize that as we develop the programs for these departments and fund them, it becomes incumbent, in many instances, upon the Committee on Appropriations to go along with what some of the legislative committees do. We try our best to hold the line, but unless the legislative committees are going to take more jurisdiction on some of the activities in these departments, it places an additional burden upon the Committee on Appropriations to try to hold the line.

Take the Department of State. In looking over the Department of State's budget, especially in the area of salary expense, we find a pretty tight budget. As a matter of fact, most of the increases here are mandatory increases that have been proposed and passed by the Congress itself.

Another thing, some of the programs within the Department are adopted by the Congress. Many of these programs I believe could be cut and could be cut deeply. I am thinking of the educational and cultural exchange program. Here is an area that I believe has gotten way out of hand, from what was the original intention. And if you will look at the report you will find in all of these agency programs, in just this one area, we are spending something in the neighborhood of $449 million. And I am not convinced that we are getting that kind of a return in good will around the world. If you will look further in the hearings, you will find a list which has almost 100 pages of scholars, researchers, and lecturers, who have gone around the world spreading our doctrine, I hope, but in many instances I wonder if they are. And sometimes when we pass higher education bills under the pretext that we do not have enough professors to meet our present college needs, and then we find a 100-page list of lecturers, scholars, and professors running all over the world, I wonder how we take care of our own people here at home.

There is another thing that I think is dangerous or that can be dangerous about this program. I would have liked to have seen it cut substantially more and it is one that I think the Committee on Foreign Affairs ought to take a look at, because you have to look at it before we get to the appropriation and something could be done here.

But I think it is the kind of program that lends itself to possible abuse. It may lend itself to abuse regardless of the administration. I do not care whose administration it is. But it is awfully easy if you have a newsman here or a scholar here or a professor here to entice him to your way of thinking by sending him abroad to make a lecture in his specialty. I think you can probably see that this has been done in some of these areas. We have held it down quite well but I think it can be cut even more and I think the program has gone too far.

So far as the new employees of the State Department are concerned, we have held them to a minimum.

But take the Passport Office. There is a tremendous workload increase in the Passport Office. We are trying to expedite this increased workload and I think they are doing a pretty good job. But by and large I think the State Department budget is a pretty tight budget.

I would just like to say this. You know I think sometimes the employees of the State Department get a great deal of criticism which they do not deserve. I have had the opportunity to visit with many of them in many of our embassies around the world. I think by and large most of these people are dedicated to the jobs that they are assigned to do.

So I think so far as I am concerned, most of our Foreign Service people and those who work here in Washington are doing a good job.

So far as the Department of Justice is concerned, and the gentleman from New York has touched upon the details of this legislation, there are just a couple of areas that I would like to talk about briefly.

One of them is the Criminal Justice Act. This is the act under which an individual can receive counsel in cases coming before the Federal courts. This was adopted by this Congress some few years ago. As a matter of fact, the Federal judiciary and the Federal judges never heard about the program and were never consulted on the program at all, and as a matter of fact they would indicate that they are not very much interested in it.

But my concern is that here we have another duplication because under the poverty program, we have now what is known as judicare. So in the judicare program under the poverty program, you can get counsel. This counsel is available for courts of any jurisdiction while here in the Criminal Justice Act it is confined to the Federal district courts.

In my opinion, if we are going to continue to expend judicare funds under the poverty program, we ought to do away with the Criminal Justice Act because they are duplicating programs.

As to law enforcement assistance, and the gentleman from New York touched on this briefly, this legislation is designed to assist local police departments. You will find the overwhelming amount of money went to the District of Columbia Police Department for the purchase of cars and for the purchase of motor scooters and the changing of the paint on patrol cars and for everything that you could imagine. And this is outside the budget that we use for the District of Columbia.

It is my understanding that in the legislation presently pending in the Committee on the Judiciary, this act will be done away with and be carried in the crime bill that is being considered.

I just want to voice my own personal opinion while I have the opportunity, if we ever get ourselves in this country in the position where police departments in all jurisdictions within the United States are dependent upon the Federal Government for their operation, whether it be for the purchase of cars or the payment of salaries or the buying of uniforms or other equipment, I think we will have gone a long way down the wrong road. We can in the foreseeable future have all of our police departments dependent upon Washington and on Federal sources for their maintenance.

I think this goes a long way toward a Federal police force. I think those who are in charge of the Committee on the Judiciary and on writing this crime bill ought to take this possibility into consideration.

As I read these hearings and hear what has happened with law enforcement assistance, you will find that almost all of your police departments or some agencies within your States are receiving some assistance. You know I was thinking the other day, when I was going over some of this, that once you get a program of this kind you will find that they put these programs in almost all of the critical areas around the country.

Various foundations and universities become involved in the grants. Then when the Congress wants to review them and take a good hard look at them, they assemble all of these pressures from around the country and they descend on the Congress with the cries, "Don't touch it. Don't review it. Don't look at it. We are satisfied with it the way it is. We have become used to these Federal dollars and we don't want the program disturbed."

That happens with so many of our programs. But I think this is an area in which the Judiciary Committee ought to take a good hard look. I commend a reading of the hearings, because this program, taken to its ultimate conclusion, could cost many billions of dollars.

As far as the Immigration and Naturalization Service is concerned, I would just like to say that I think the hearings will indicate that agency has done an excellent job. They have had some new duties put on them. They have tried to hold the line. I want to commend the Immigration and Naturalization Service for the work that they have done. I have only one or two comments about the Department of Commerce. One is regarding the Bureau of the Census. You will note in this legislation that the administration requested—and, I might say, this was a last minute addition to the budget, I understand, by the Bureau of the Budget—$20 million to carry a spot check survey of housing throughout many areas in the country. There was a million dollars carried in the supplemental appropriation. We struck that out and the Senate agreed.

So this was not there. We have taken this out because we recognize that the regular census is going to be taken in 1970, and it seemed to the members of the committee that we could well wait for this kind of sampling to take place during the regular decennial census.

I believe, however, in listening to the testimony over the years from the Bureau of the Census that there are many special censuses required by law and that it might not be a bad idea to have, instead of a census every 10 years, to have a 5-year census. This matter, I believe, should be studied very carefully, because then if that were done, we could do away with a large part of the special censuses, and every five years get the kind of information that would be gotten in the special census, and also with the shifting population that is taking place in our country, I believe it would be better for Government planners, business, and every other segment of our economy if we could have this about every 5 years.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. In reference to the Universal Law Assistance Act, which the gentleman mentioned earlier, I believe I am correct that our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff] has placed an amendment on there which would eliminate the payment of compensation in the local police departments. I take it that that is the sort of amendment that you would favor in that act.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I certainly would favor that in the act. The only trouble is I notice, after having served here a few years, and I am sure the gentleman has noticed it in the time he has been here, that we start these programs, but then they have the habit of snowballing over the years, so we get into these things far deeper than we had originally intended. I agree that that is a good amendment.

Mr. HUNGATE. If the gentleman will yield further, I am certain he understands that part of the dilemma is among the members of the Judiciary Committee themselves. Court decisions on such subjects as alcoholism being a disease instead of a crime has resulted in some funds being provided for the hospitalization of alcoholics. I am sure that the gentleman is aware that we can no longer treat these cases as we usually have, for alcoholics have to be treated as hospital cases and funds become necessary in additional amounts.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am well aware of that. Frankly, I wish the Judiciary Committee was more aware of what has happened because of some of the Supreme Court decisions and would start taking a look at what the Congress can do as a result of these decisions, because I am not convinced that the crime bill you are considering in the Judiciary Committee will be very much about crime. I may be wrong.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Would it not help if each time the Judiciary Committee recommended these new laws that they would inquire as to the cost thereof?

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is exactly correct. As the gentleman well knows, we had testimony that this Criminal Justice Act would cost about $3 million. If I recall correctly, the first request was for about $7 million. Then it went up to $15 million.

I believe the legislative committees have a responsibility, when they consider legislation, to find out how much it is going to cost. This, I believe, has been neglected in many areas, because we now are faced then with funding it. Many of the members of the legislative committee come back and say they had no idea what the cost of this program was going to be.

Mr. HUNGATE. If the gentleman will yield further, I believe it is spelled out in the current proposed legislation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act that it is something like $50 million for this year.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I might say I had a little to do with the requesting of a sum by members of the judiciary, that they ask how much this is going to cost. So I believe the committee does have some figures in there. My prediction is it will be on the conservative side.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman for useful service in this regard.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, the economic development assistance is also in here. There has been some transfer of funds in this area. I am not completely clear on all that is involved, except I understand, with the reorganization downtown, Mr. Davis hopes to be able to do a better job in EDA than in the past.

I understand further, because of the tremendous backlog they had in EDA applications, they decided to go through the applications quickly and let those who filed applications know as soon as possible whether or not they were going to receive a grant. Too many of our communities have been relying on assistance when we know full well there is not enough money to take care of all the requests from around the country. So I understand EDA is going to write these communities whether or not they are going to be recipients of aid and the communities can plan more efficiently.

The distinguished chairman has stated well the committee's attitude on the Maritime Commission and maritime activities. We in the minority agree 100 percent. We think it is overdue.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the discussion the chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, I believe, complimented the committee on what they have done for the maritime industry. Certainly I would like to have my words on record complimenting the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], and the other members of the committee, because they have all given the administration the money it asked for in the budget for our merchant marine—and more.

I would like to point out that there is, I believe, on the horizon, some reason to hope. There are some private steamship operators who have proposals to build types of vessels which can compete in the world of shipping. I refer to the LASH-type ship—which stands for lighter aboard ship. These new types of ships will load entire barges. They will go at great speeds and load and unload very quickly. One of these new types of vessels will hold as much as three conventional ships. When we consider their speed and turnaround time, they will probably replace as many as 12 or 13 of the older type C-2 vessels. So I believe with the understanding of the Committee on Appropriations on these new proposals in future years, we will overcome this tremendous bloc obsolescence which is taking place, so that now we find ourselves something like 14th in the Nation's shipping and carrying only about 7 percent of our own cargoes.

I hope in expressing my commendation to the committee, they will continue their interest so we look forward to solving this problem of American shipping through private enterprise, without having to go to a defense type operation, such as recently was proposed for the FDL's—that is the fast deployment logistic vessels—which require 100-percent subsidy.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the distinguished gentleman. I believe we are all aware of the contributions he has made to being sure we have a strong maritime service in our country. He can be sure we in our committee will look with favor on anything that can be done logically in strengthening our merchant marine. We are all like minded in realizing the seriousness of the problem and wanting to do something about it.

The distinguished chairman of the committee did not mention the Travel Service. I know it is one of his favorite organizations. I might say I believe probably it is too bad the Travel Service did get off on a wrong foot. There is a job that it can do.

There is one thing I note they are going to try to do, which I hope will be successful. A large number of people from our own country go abroad to attend conventions. Businessmen, professional men, and others have conventions abroad. This is a real drain, I suppose, with respect to our gold flow.

The Travel Service, I understand, is going to try to convince those from abroad to hold some of their meetings in our country. I hope they will be successful in doing this. I believe it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Surely the distinguished gentleman from Michigan is not suggesting we increase the amount contained in the bill for the silly outfit known as the Travel Service.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am not doing that at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Is this not the outfit concerning which a survey was made about 2 years ago in certain capitals of the world where they had offices? The Ambassador in London, Ambassador Bruce; the Ambassador in Rome, Ambassador Reinhardt; the Ambassador in Tokyo, Ambassador Reischauer; and the Ambassador at Bogotá, Colombia, all recommended that the offices be taken out.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I wanted to mention that, because I noticed the gentleman was very comfortable for a few minutes.

I do want to say I hope their attempts in this area will be helpful. That is my own comment in this regard.

I do want to ask the distinguished chairman to listen again, because I know he would feel remiss if I did not call this to his attention. It has always been considered every year by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

I refer to the matter of bankruptcies taking place under the Great Society. We remember how a few years ago under the Eisenhower administration our distinguished friend would recall all the time how bankruptcies were increasing. I thought it might be not inappropriate to just say that under the Great Society they are continuing to increase, with greater numbers every year.

Frankly, I do not really blame this on anyone. Probably it is just because of too loose credit.

I know the distinguished gentleman is going to want to reply, and I am delighted to yield to him to respond.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. My distinguished friend evidently forgets exactly what I said, as shown on page 185 of the committee hearings.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have it right before me.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I said:

> It might be noted, Mr. Cederberg, the number of business bankruptcies in 1966 was almost 500 less than business bankruptcies the year before.

Mr. CEDERBERG. We do not have the time to go into my response, but it was that the business bankruptcies went down a little bit but the personal bankruptcies continued to go up, so that in the fiscal year 1966, the nonbusiness bankruptcy figure was 175,924, which is almost double what it was in the last year of the Eisenhower administration.

Everything is getting bigger under the Great Society, so I suppose bankruptcies ought to be able to go up, too.

We just want to be sure, for the record, that it is clear the bankruptcy situation has not improved and has probably gotten worse than it has ever been before.

There is another item in this legislation to which I should like to call attention; that is, the civil rights educational activities.

The administration asked for $30 million in this program. Last year they had $8 million plus. It was this year decided that we could make it $10 million.

If Members will read the hearings, I believe they will see that the money which has been used for these civil rights educational activities has not been used in accordance with what was intended when Congress passed the law.

Why do I say this? If I read the law correctly and if I understand the debate which took place, the purpose of this legislation was to assist those school districts that were having problems in going from a segregated school system to a desegregated school system. What has happened is that much of this money has been used in areas of the country where there is not any problem of segregation. Some of it has gone to my State in Michigan, with the idea of desegregation.

We have not had segregated schools in Michigan at all. The University of Michigan got a grant, as did the University of Detroit and the Wayne township schools. I admit that there are problems we get involved in in these areas, but I believe we had better put the money where the problem is. So rather than give $30 million, we put it at $10 million, and I hope the administrator will take some recognition of the intent of the use of this money. I am not convinced Mr. Howe will do that, though, because as far as I am concerned he continues to flout the intention of the Congress year after year after year.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I think the gentleman has made an excellent point. It would be wise for the House to take a look at the hearings on page 111, where, in response to my question, Harold Howe, Commissioner of Education, admitted that $100,921 is going to a school district in Las Vegas, Nev., which has never been segregated. Since its inception it has been desegregated. This certainly shows up the fact that many of these funds are being used in places where there is no problem in the field of segregation.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. I would like to point out that the House had a considerable discussion last week on the Green amendment and rather vigorously indicated to the administration that they expected the law to be applied across the country and not just in the South.

Mr. CEDERBERG. That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. CORMAN. So I assume that there are instances of racial discrimination in the North and, if there is a need for funds to help overcome this discrimination, that that would be consistent with the intent of the Congress. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. CEDERBERG. If the gentleman will read the exact law under which this was written, it says specifically that it should be used to assist schools in desegregating.

Mr. CORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is what it is for.

Mr. CORMAN. That is right.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not think you have in the State of California any schools that are segregated. Do you?

Mr. CORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CEDERBERG. You have some that are?

Mr. CORMAN. There are schools that have wound up with racial segregation based on neighborhood segregation and sometimes on gerrymandered school lines. There was considerable discussion on this floor last week about the fact that there is racial segregation of schools in the North. A number of the Members of this body spoke out vigorously against the administration for only enforcing the civil rights bill in the South.

Mr. CEDERBERG. What we are talking about here is the fact that the schools in some areas are segregated by law. This law has been declared unconstitutional. This legislation was written to be of assistance in the transition from a period of segregation to desegregation. If you want to apply other legislation or have legislation to assist schools such as you are talking about, I would not be opposed to that. As a matter of fact, I recognize that there are many school districts that have problems along the line that the gentleman is speaking about, but in my opinion this legislation as written should not be applied here to the problem you are addressing yourself to.

Mr. CORMAN. It seems to me—and I do not want to take up your time—if there is a case where the segregation is based on racial discrimination, these funds then ought to be available.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman.

In closing I just want to make one comment on the U.S. Information Agency. This is an Agency, of course, that is charged with doing something about our image abroad. We have tried to fund it and always fund the Voice of America for every dime they ask for. We try to do the best we can in being sure that this Agency is properly funded. I heard some criticism, however, about Expo 67 and the U.S. exhibit there. I have not had an opportunity to visit Expo 67, but from the reports I have had from those who visited it, we have a wonderful building. The architecture is fine. However, they tell me that the contents of the building leave something to be desired. I have always wondered why it is we cannot put our best foot forward in some of these expositions. At the New York World's Fair I think the U.S. Information Agency did a miserable job in our exhibition there. I hope if there are these things that have been done this way and they need to be corrected in Expo 67, they ought to be corrected. Personally, I would be interested in hearing from someone who has visited it in order to give us some idea as to what we are up to there.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I fully share your feeling about the U.S. pavilion at Expo 67. I was privileged some 2 weeks ago to visit the pavilion in the company of some members of the Canadian House of Commons.

Individual members of the Canadian Parliament came to me after they had gone through our exhibit and said that they did not think it could have been this bad. They said, individuals of their constituencies had contacted them and said, "Have you seen the U.S. pavilion? It is excellent on the outside, but it is very, very sad on the inside. It does not show American life as it exists. It shows a tinsel-bodied Hollywood-style type of America rather than the true type of our neighbor America that we know and love."

On my visit there I found that there was indeed a lot of pop art and mod art and, perhaps, art in line with the new "beat" generation or whatever one chooses to call it. But it certainly does not convey to those visiting the exposition the great story we have to tell, and I only hope that the USIA will change its approach and begin to tell that story.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I too had some constituents to visit in my office only this morning, constituents who had just come back from Montreal. They expressed the same feelings with reference to our exhibit there, that it was a Hollywood-type exhibition. They pointed out further how inferior it was to the Soviet Union's participation in that field.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from North Dakota that the gentleman certainly has a point to which we should have given a great deal more thought and attention.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Washington that this is a subject that I generally stay away from. I learned this many, many years ago. I believe it was last Thursday, I was invited by the President of the United States to accompany him to Montreal and to observe Expo 67 for which this committee has recommended the appropriation of moneys in support of our exhibit there. However, I have learned that for everyone who criticizes one of these exhibitions, there is usually someone who supports it.

Mr. Chairman, we had that situation with reference to the New York world fair. We had that situation with reference to the Brussels exposition. And, in fact, Mr. Chairman, there was a lady who wrote a book not too long ago, and in four chapters thereof she criticized quite severely what I had to say about the Brussels fair which was held in 1958.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I will have an opportunity to visit Expo 67 and I hope that an invitation will also be extended to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

And, further, Mr. Chairman, I hope that when we have had the opportunity to visit the exposition, we can get together and privately discuss our views.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I would not make that discussion too private. We might as well make it public. In other words, we might call some of those who are responsible for the exhibit to come in and discuss the matter with us.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will yield further, we might not want to do it that way. When they come back for more money, we would be able to grade their presentation based upon the merits or demerits of the exhibit.

Mr. CEDERBERG. However, the problem is that they always work around this couple of million dollars, rather than giving us the world exposition and exhibit to which we are entitled. We are going into another such exposition in San Antonio, Tex., next year.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will yield further, originally, the request for the world Expo 67 on the part of the United States was for $11,700,000. The House of Representatives recommended the appropriation of $8 million. The other body recommended $11,700,000. The conferees agreed on $9 million and that is how it came about.

Mr. CEDERBERG. It is my opinion that we have a good bill, generally speaking.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will yield further, I believe the people who are in charge of it are sincere. I talked with one of them just the other day. We had a very interesting conversation about the experts down there in the U.S. Information Agency, one of whom seems to be quite mixed up with everything with which he is concerned. Incidentally, he was put on the payroll during the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. CEDERBERG. He must be a good man, if the Great Society has still got him over there.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We could not get rid of him.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I might say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that I know the problem involved.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Our distinguished chairman from New York has pointed out very well that we do appropriate the funds, but then we lose control. True, there are those who think this exhibition is fine, and this handful are the very artists and stylists who create a stylistic version of America that is not really true. But we should direct these exhibitions to the 90 percent of the people who see them. And they are the 90 percent of the populace that I was talking about in talking with Members of the Canadian Parliament. We had a little straw vote taken among the 25 Members of the Canadian Parliament that I was with and the vast majority were disappointed with the internal arrangements of the American pavilion.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I might say to the distinguished gentleman that one day last week the Director of the agency, Mr. Leonard Marx, came to my office and had with him a considerable number of newspaper clippings which were highly laudatory of the content of the American exhibition in Montreal.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I understand his mayor even thinks it swings.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. You mean Fun City?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Sometimes these newspaper writers are a little more the swinger type than the average members of our population. I believe everyone realizes that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, with that I believe I will close, but may I end on a note of caution, and I hope the people in the departments downtown will take note of it also: that basically the legislation we are presenting to you today, in the overall not all are 100 percent satisfied with it, but by and large, in view of what we had to do and work with, it seems to me that this is the best we could do.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should just like to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan on his very fine statement and explanation of the various facets of this bill. Of course, I do not like some of the items, and I did not agree with the especially severe cut which was made to the educational items with regard to civil rights. I did my best in this regard, but I did not have the votes. So this being a democratic society, that is what we are bound by.

We were talking a while ago about the Bureau of Prisons releasing prisoners while serving their term in the prison under the so-called work release program and I am reminded of a clipping in the U.S. News & World Report of January 23, 1967, in which the Most Reverend Fulton J. Sheen, the bishop of Rochester, is quoted:

> Social slobberers who insist on compassion being shown to the junkies, to the dope fiends, the throat slashers, the beatniks, the prostitutes, the homosexuals and the punks. Today the decent man is practically off the reservation.

Then I thought of the printed hearings with respect to the judiciary and the Department of Justice, beginning at page 506 on what the situation was. The Bureau of Prisons officials picked a day at random, to wit: February 2, 1967. There were released by the Director of Prisons on work release, prisoners who had been sentenced for narcotics, burglary, counterfeiting, white slavery violation—transporting interstate—robbery, postal burglaries, manslaughter on Government reservations, bank robbery, kidnaping, et cetera. These are the kind of people who are being released from the prisons under this program, some of whom earn social security benefits or credit under civil service retirement.

Mr. CEDERBERG. May I say to the distinguished chairman that I agree with him 100 percent, and, of course, I agree with Bishop Sheen. It is tragic, I believe, when we see what is happening in our country, and where people do not pay attention to statements like that which the good bishop made. They do not pay attention to statements made by J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI, since they are trying to downgrade him because of his attitude on criminals—crime across the Nation which the FBI tries to do something about, and then some of the social do-gooders these days demoralizing what is going to have to be done if we are going to try to control crime.

You are going to have to have a lot more medicine than that.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLYNT. I would like to refer to page 24 of the bill and page 14 of the committee report under that section which relates to economic development assistance for the purpose of making some legislative history.

It is the intent of the committee, and indeed the intent of the House of Representatives, is it not, that the administrator of the economic development assistance program should pay special attention to applications which come in which would further depress an industry that is already in serious economic straits?

For example, several years ago, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan I am sure remembers, at a time when the broiler industry throughout the country, that is the broiler segment of the poultry industry, was in a very serious economic plight. Then the director of this program, the administrator, almost undertook to approve applications for both grants and loans, which if approved and put into operation would have had the effect of causing even more small operators and large operators alike in the broiler segment of the poultry industry to become further depressed—which would have had the exact opposite effect from that which was intended by the Congress.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I can only state so far as I am concerned that we should be very careful and the agencies should be very careful to be sure that it does not try to place in business those things that are going to be competitive to a business that is already trying to exist and probably having a difficult time now.

Mr. FLYNT. I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Michigan agrees with me that the purpose of this program is to create jobs and to create employment and not to kill employment and to further reduce it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Nor is it to place in jeopardy any business by any competitor by using these tax dollars to assist someone else in getting into a business, which may not be necessary, and that is my own personal opinion.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am sure that would be the sentiment of the Congress.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say we both almost forgot to say something about a subject that was uncovered in the hearings, and that is the fact that this covey of great experts out in the National Bureau of Standards, who have moved from the Connecticut Avenue, Reno Road property, to Gaithersburg, where they originally estimated that the cost of their buildings would be $62 million and they are now up to $107 million. But lo and behold, did we not find that they paid $45,000 for a flagpole, out in the middle of nowhere, in Gaithersburg—which amounts to $500 a foot for a flagpole.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Let the record speak for itself.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] has consumed 42 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, may I take just a few moments of the Committee's time on an important subject, the subject of JOHN ROONEY. Not many people know even remotely of the close scrutiny which he gives to this bill, of the effective results which he achieves in holding down costs of the many and varied activities which the bill covers. Our country owes JOHN ROONEY a great deal.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to tell first about the United Nations. The United States has a large listing of representatives at the United Nations. In fact, our staff at the U.N. and affiliate organizations totals 2,811 persons. That is nearly 3,000 people, and that does not include those who work for Public Law 480 and some foreign aid personnel associated with U.N. activities.

We pay $113 million annually to the United Nations and its affiliate organizations. This is, by far, the largest share of the cost of the U.N. paid by any nation. Actually we pay uncomfortably close to half the bills of that organization.

Mr. Chairman, it would appear that such a large group of capable representatives, backed by generous, even unstinting appropriations, would be able to exercise a major influence in the affairs of the U.N. That influence, it would be anticipated, could be reflected in vigorous action by the United Nations in dealing with peacekeeping problems and leadership problems throughout the world. It could be reflected in effective operations by peacekeeping forces, by sanctions against troublemakers, and by prompt recourse to the World Court when it becomes necessary to do so.

I find woefully little to support that thesis. Lengthy debates are carried on in the U.N., but they are largely meaningless in that nothing of significance really happens. The "have not" nations use the U.N. for a sounding board, and some of these "have not" nations are happy now to split themselves into smaller units, each calling itself a nation and sending the bill to the United States. Occasionally the U.N. does strike out against a responsible government like Rhodesia or South Africa, and regretfully I note that the United States usually tags along like a small boy trying to lead a large calf after the calf has found it can go where it wants.

Round 1 in the participation of the U.N. in the crisis in the Mideast must be chalked up as uninspiring—or blundering. Inexplicably, Secretary General U Thant withdrew the peacekeeping forces which had acted as a buffer between Arab and Israel forces, thus opening the way for direct confrontation by hostile units. U Thant himself has seemed to be floundering in his efforts to find appropriate channels through which to work. This is not the first instance.

The other major crisis affecting the U.N. is, of course, the war in Vietnam. In that situation the U.N. has carefully looked the other way while U Thant called for peace negotiations and an end to bombing. These gestures are of no earthly benefit to the United States. Instead they are quite harmful to a meaningful search for peace.

This brings us down to the fact that the United Nations is probably facing the greatest test of its existence. The organization which began 20 years ago with great hopes for an effective organization for the preservation of world peace has degenerated more and more into a debating society which costs much and produces little. It is a most disappointing situation. Unless the organization is able to realize its potentialities by facing up to crises in a responsible manner, the U.N. will have demonstrated that its usefulness as an international organization has come to an end. Many in Congress have for years felt that there was no justification for continuing to pay the lion's share of the cost of the U.N. We have urged with restraint that limitations be placed on these expenditures but these cries have fallen on deaf ears. I would think that the time may be near when this will no longer be the case.

Now let me get to the State Department. The problems of the Middle East focus with sharp clarity upon Moscow and the progress which Russia has made in that area. Whether there has been a breakdown in American diplomacy, or whether America's friendship with Israel through the years has soured on the Arab nations is not clear. What is clear is that the Russians have very definitely taken advantage of the situation and they are reaping the harvest. The situation need not be a lasting one, but for the time being the Arab nations are more solidly united against the small country of Israel than at any previous time. It places Moscow in the driver's seat in an area which has been troubled diplomatically for years, and the situation poses a direct counterthreat to America's actions in Vietnam. Even without consideration of Vietnam, the United States has a serious choice. We have a commitment to help preserve Israel, whose survival quite obviously is at stake. We have a very definite interest in the Arab-controlled oil, and in keeping open strategic routes to areas of major interest to the free world.

In Europe, France has kicked out the U.N.—lock, stock, and barrel. This has, of course, weakened the effectiveness of that organization and demonstrated a lack of unity on the part of the Western World. And not to be overlooked is the fact that France falls heir to very substantial U.S. military installations and to equipment which cannot readily be moved. For this she is obligated to pay, but the chances are that these obligations will simply be added to other billions which France owes to this Nation and which De Gaulle sublimely ignores.

There is an offset to the French defection. Spain would be very glad to become a part of the NATO Alliance, and Spain has effective forces and substantial manpower for producing still other forces. But some of the Socialist governments of northern Europe do not like the strongly anti-Communist government of Spain, and our diplomats are careful not to press the issue. After all, we must not offend anybody just to get allies with which to contain communism. That is not polite diplomacy.

I call attention also to the opportunity which now exists in Indonesia. Our relations with Indonesia were at a very low ebb for a long period while Sukarno courted the Communists. Now that period is past. The Communists have taken a fearful beating in Indonesia. There is a new order.

This presents a new opportunity for American diplomacy to move quickly and effectively to cement the anti-Communist posture of Indonesia's Government and to reestablish close and fruitful relations with that nation's government. Undoubtedly we are taking steps to achieve this but how positive are those steps and how effective have they been? There is very little to indicate any progress of moment in either respect. If this is another case of business as usual with no significant regard for time or opportunity, then American diplomacy is missing the boat very badly.

To me, it would appear that happier relations with Indonesia—the largest nation in Southeast Asia and a country of great potential and wealth—should be courted with all the ardor of a lovesick swain during full moon in June. This can be the most important nation in Southeast Asia in that area insofar as the future of democracy is concerned.

On the same side of the world, in Vietnam itself, pacification of liberated areas has had to be taken from State and related groups and placed in the hands of U.S. military forces. Poor progress, waste, and black marketing have forced a revision in the program. It is very clear that we will not have won the war in Vietnam until pacification is complete and effective and believed in by the people.

These are not cheering developments. They indicate a need for a very careful soul-searching in the higher levels of America's diplomatic agencies. It is high time for the elimination of deadwood. The dedicated, capable personnel, of whom there are many, should be given a freer hand to show positive accomplishment for the advancement of America's interests. But instead of careful pruning, there was much in the presentations to the committee of business as usual, with requests for a constantly mounting number of civilian employees. I am glad to state the committee has refused many of the requested additions but what is needed most is a coldly analytical facing up to the fact that they are not doing very well diplomatically in the hottest spots in the world. Neither this committee nor the Congress has the power to require more capable action. We can cut and scold but that is about all. The United States cannot fight everywhere. We have to be able to depend upon the diplomats in most parts of the world. I wonder if they realize that they have not been doing very well even though they have nearly all the money to do the job that they requested from Congress.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I join with others in congratulating the subcommittee for the generally fine job with this bill. I notice that some of the cuts made are in sensitive areas. It is never easy to cut or reduce appropriations requests in such areas.

I also notice that, according to my quick mathematics, there is a reduction of between 6 and 7 percent in this bill under the budget estimates. Fifteen million dollars of that, I believe, is involved in the use of previously appropriated funds, but, nevertheless, the total cuts range between 6 and 7 percent.

However, I would like to ask a question or two of my distinguished friend from New York, the chairman of the subcommittee, if I may have his attention. I notice the bill authorizes the sale of $150 million in participating certificates. I just wonder how the subcommittee justifies that, in view of the record which indicates that SBA already has authority to sell $850 million worth of participating certificates?

If they sell this additional $150 million that will give them a billion dollars of money for use next year.

I notice in the budget itself that if they get the billion dollars in receipts from the sale of participating certificates and from repayments on loans and revenues from loans unsold, they expect to go into fiscal year 1969 with a carryover balance of $476½ million.

I cannot understand why it would be necessary to incur the obligation for the insufficiencies which will amount to $1,350,000 next year and every year thereafter so long as the PC's are outstanding. For the entire $1 billion proposed for sale next year, the insufficiency, or subsidy if you prefer that word, will be about $7,000,000 a year.

I see no need to sell the $150 million, according to the budget estimates and, I might add, according to the record which was a very fine record, I thought, made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG], beginning on page 79 and running over through page 81 of part 4 of the hearings.

If the gentleman will enlighten me or discuss the need for this $150 million, he may be able to convince me I should not offer an amendment to strike that $150 million.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I shall be glad to discuss this with the distinguished gentleman, a fellow member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The page to which the gentleman referred in the printed hearings, to wit, page 79, contains testimony by Mr. Boutin, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. I believe it is universally considered, not only in the Congress but throughout the country, that one of the better run operations of the Federal Government is the Small Business Administration. It is one which is very important to the economic life of this country.

Mr. JONAS. May I interject to say I am not questioning the importance of the Small Business Administration or attacking the way it has operated. I am questioning whether they need the $150 million.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. As my lawyer colleague would say, this is just preliminary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. At page 79, the testimony of Mr. Boutin was:

> We would have sufficient money to meet our responsibilities for fiscal 1967 and fiscal 1968 at the level of $850 million in sales, with one caveat, Mr. Chairman, that the $150 million is all for the business loan and investment fund. Part of the balance, $125 million of the $850 million, is for the disaster loan fund. So we would be running at too tight a rate to be on safe ground going into fiscal 1969.

If I may conclude this thought, we had a situation—and have a situation each year—in which disasters occur and it becomes very important that the Small Business Administration have on hand sufficient money to cover the disaster loans as well as the business loans.

I can recall when, only a couple of years ago, another gentleman was the head of the Small Business Administration, and he did not ask the Appropriations Committee of the House for additional funds.

In every region throughout the country when loans were not made it was contended that this was all the fault of the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress. It was the thought of our subcommittee in dealing with this matter that we could not jeopardize such a situation. So we included not $850 million, as was included last year, as I recall it, but $150 million in these participation sales certificates.

Mr. JONAS. May I say that $150 million is all the administration asked for this year.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is true.

Mr. JONAS. And you give them every dollar that they asked for. May I state what follows in the quotation you read on page 79?

> Mr. ROONEY. Of course you will be here again a year from now for 1969, will you not?
>
> Mr. BOUTIN. Yes, indeed, Mr. Chairman.
>
> Mr. ROONEY. And this does not put you out at all coming up here to see us. We only see you once a year, generally speaking, and you have all of these fine-looking gentlemen with you.

Now, the question in my mind simply is, Do they need the $150 million or do they not?

May I add one other thing here? The reason I raise the question is because if you give them the $150 million, according to their own testimony and according to the budget, they will carry over into 1969 $476.5 million which they do not plan to spend or obligate in fiscal year 1968.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman's figures are correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We cannot be sure, I say to my distinguished friend from North Carolina, that they will not need this money. I approached the witnesses at that hearing with the idea of perhaps using the pruning shears. Subsequently, though, we became convinced we were not going to take that chance and possibly be responsible for their running out of funds for business loans and disaster loans. I have in my hand a letter from the Administrator, the Honorable Bernard L. Boutin in which he states he is grateful for including in our bill the authority to sell before June 30, 1969, an additional $150 million of participation certificates. This authority will assure that the Small Business Administration will have the funds available in our revolving funds to carry out without curtailment the various lending programs authorized to this agency.

So it is a matter of assurance.

Mr. JONAS. May I say that if they do not get the $150 million as provided in this bill, they will still have $325 million in carryover funds. That seems like a pretty big cushion to me. I am sure Mr. Boutin would like to have $476 million in carryover funds, but the question is, Do we need to give him all of that?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Further I am informed that there is presently pending or about to come up a bill which will increase the lending authority of the Small Business Administration.

In conclusion, the committee did not want to take the chance of being criticized for not having furnished enough money to meet these disaster and business loans as we were accused a couple of years ago when it was not our fault. If we refuse to approve this action of the committee, we will be placed in such a position.

Mr. JONAS. I am sorry to take so much time, but I think this is necessary.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman should take it. He always asks fair and sensible questions.

Mr. JONAS. Thank you.

I am not trying to be an obstructionist, but am trying to find some justification for this $150 million, and I have not had an opportunity to do so before.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, if he would not agree to write into page 48 $1,350,000, the estimated amount of the insufficiency, instead of leaving it wide open as a permanent and indefinite appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that there are several reasons why we should do this, the principal one being that two appropriation bills already passed this year have written in the exact amount of the subsidy.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it would be inconsistent if we adopted this bill and left it wide open, in the form of sort of a blank check, may I respectfully say to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina will yield further, may I respectfully reply to the gentleman, that if we were to include this amount at the place suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina, at page 48 of the bill as suggested by the gentleman, it could very well cost more money. Therefore, it is my opinion that we should not take that chance. We are approving the sale of participation certificates, to the extent of $150 million.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that I cannot see how it could possibly cost more than $150 million because the bill specifically limits the sales to $150 million and I would specifically limit the subsidy to $1,350,000—the exact amount Mr. Boutin estimated would be required.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. But, Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina will yield further, is it not a fact that it could cost less, if the amount is not set forth?

Mr. JONAS. In the other bills we said, "not in excess of."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. But what happened with regard to the other bills, I believe is incorrect. And, Mr. Chairman, insofar as the Small Business Administration is concerned, and I am sure it is concerned, I am not going to vote to interfere with the business and disaster loans.

Mr. JONAS. Again, I do not think anything I have suggested could be so construed.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, that is what we are afraid of.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time during which to discuss and to direct the Committee's attention to that portion of the report on the bill which deals with the Environmental Science Services Administration and, perhaps, to ask a question or two of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] with reference thereto.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Illinois will yield, I shall be glad to attempt to respond to the questions of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago we had an incident occur in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent, a tornado in which some 22 lives were lost and a great amount of property damage was done.

Mr. Chairman, I learned, to my consternation, that the station of the U.S. Weather Bureau at Rockford was operating only upon a 16-hour-a-day basis, due to a budgetary cutback in 1964 and that they only had one trained meteorologist on duty most of the time.

Mr. Chairman, this one man simply could not handle the many calls which would have gone out to the various public service agencies and public news media agencies, and so on, in order to provide advance warning of the impending storm.

Mr. Chairman, because of that most regrettable incident I addressed a letter to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on the 26th of April and asked for an additional $30,000 to be put into the bill so that we might have the three additional people needed to man this particular office on a 24-hour basis Of course, the subcommittee's hearings had already adjourned by that time and there was no opportunity to go into it further.

Mr. Chairman, I have read the language as contained on page 16 of the report on this bill, which states as follows:

> The full amounts requested for hurricane and tornado, agriculture weather and fire weather have been approved, as well as the funds for the nationwide natural disaster warning system.

Mr. Chairman, there was a meeting which was held on the day after the tornado at Rockford, Ill., at which time there was present, Mr. Paul Kutschenreuter, Director of User Affairs of the Environmental Sciences Services Administration, Department of Commerce, and Mr. S. Barton, from their public information office. It seemed to be the recommendation of the experts in this field that this is what is needed by way of additional authorization for fiscal year 1968, if our area is going to have adequate storm warning.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the substance of this meeting was to the effect that the Weather Bureau was so understaffed that during that time they could not have given the consideration necessary to warn the schools and other public institutions as well as individuals as to the impending danger.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that there is this language contained in the report. However, these people who attended this meeting indicated that there would have to be an additional authorization and appropriation for fiscal year 1968 in order to make these three additional positions available.

I would appreciate some assurances at this time from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, that what has been said at page 16 of the report is in fact so, and that there are moneys available now to the Environmental Science Services Administration that will make the personnel needed available because they are needed.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to say to the highly distinguished and capable gentleman from Illinois that I noted he has pursued this matter with the members of the subcommittee as well as myself, and I say now for the benefit of whoever hears my voice, or reads the RECORD, including the Weather Bureau, now known as the Environmental Science Services Administration, that we mean exactly what we say, that the full amounts requested for hurricane and tornado, agriculture weather, and fire weather have been approved, as well as the funds for the nationwide natural disaster warning system. I should further say that if the Weather Bureau feels there should be an around-the-clock, 24-hour service, that the funds are sufficient to do this, and we would expect them to do this if they think it should be done.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the distinguished gentleman for providing me with that information. I shall certainly pursue this matter with the Environmental Science Services Administration with the full expectation that they will staff the Rockford Weather Station on a 24-hour basis. I know the degree of importance that this agency will attach to the words just spoken by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I am also aware that officials of the Environmental Science Services Administration have already acknowledged in their conversations with Mr. Robert P. Selfridge, manager of the Greater Rockford Airport, that the need for 24-hour weather station operation at Rockford does exist.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my full support for H.R. 10345, the fiscal 1968 appropriations for the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments. I am pleased that the bill includes the full $5,800,000 budget estimate for the Center for Technical and Cultural Interchange Between East and West, the Honolulu East-West Center, created by Congress in 1960 and dedicated by then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1961.

The approval by the Appropriations Committee of the full budget request reflects the general recognition that the East-West Center is fulfilling the purpose for which it was established; namely, to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the peoples of Asia and the entire Pacific area. Americans and foreign students from more than 31 nations participate in the many and varied programs of the Center's Institute for Student Interchange, the Institute of Advanced Projects, and the Institute for Technical Interchange.

The East-West Center enables students from diverse cultures and backgrounds to gather and live in a cosmopolitan environment while pursuing intensive studies in their academic specialties. Senior scholars are enabled to meet in seminars and exchange ideas that eventually contribute materially to mutual understanding and respect, attitudes which hopefully will be carried back to many lands and will have ramifications for our international relations in the future.

Not only does the Center create an environment that fosters learning, but it has provided the means for intensive activity in the translation of foreign works, in the writing of books on subjects of cross-cultural concern, and the publication of many beautiful and valuable scholarly volumes through the facilities of the East-West Center Press.

The programs of the East-West Center have also made it possible for groups of scholars from Asian countries to attend summer sessions at mainland universities and to visit Washington, D.C., a trip which is a high spot of their stimulating experience in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot overestimate the implications of what is occurring at the East-West Center as a bridge to more meaningful relationships between the United States and our neighbors across the Pacific with whom our commercial and cultural interests are becoming increasingly involved. As the trade agreements and treaties we sign with Asian countries form a legalistic basis for our international policy in that area of the world, so do the intercultural activities made possible by the East-West Center provide the meaningful human element that will enhance the operative reality of such agreements. The foreign students at the Center are all of the highest caliber, rigidly selected from the most capable young people in their societies, and each year they return as cadres to assume leadership roles in their native countries. What they carry back with them from the East-West Center will expand and become more apparent as our relations with their nations continue to grow in every aspect.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the Committee on Appropriations for its vision in including the full budgetary request for the East-West Center in the 1968 appropriation and urge my colleagues today to approve this most significant legislation.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS ABROAD (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States, for the purposes authorized by section 104(b)(4) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), to be credited to and expended under the appropriation account for "Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad", to remain available until expended, $5,025,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and the members of his subcommittee, for the excellent hearings they conducted on the subject of this State, Justice, Commerce appropriations bill. It would be my hope the Members of the House would spend some time reading these hearings, because there is a wealth of information to be obtained from them.

Now, having said that, Mr. Chairman, I must add that I do not believe the committee, on the basis of the evidence the committee adduced with respect to a lot of the spending, cut deeply enough.

I do not know how notice is going to be served upon the departments represented in this bill as well as other departments covered by other appropriation bills, unless the Committee on Appropriations raps the knuckles of those who are misusing the public trust by extravagant spending on questionable projects.

The committee leveled all kinds of criticism in the use of various funds, but it will be of no avail unless effective notice is served that this situation cannot continue.

I recognize, of course, that the authorizing committees of Congress are to blame for much of this, but somehow or other we do not seem to be able to get it over to those committees that some of these things must be ended.

There is, for instance, the Chamizal deal with Mexico at El Paso, Tex. I suppose the answer will be that having been authorized in the amount that it was and in the way it was, Congress had to come along today and provide the money in this bill. This Chamizal deal could only happen in Texas, I do believe. I will not go into the details, for most of them are in these hearings.

Another illustration of what I am talking about is the east-west cultural center in Hawaii. From reading these hearings, you have to believe that there is terribly poor administration of this cultural center.

The fact that one of the students who is tapping the Federal Treasury for some $13,000 to $15,000 for an education, would lead an anti-Vietnam demonstration in Honolulu and commit a symbolic desecration of the U.S. flag, is beyond belief. Apparently the heads of that heavily subsidized institution gave him and others only a slap on the wrist.

Somehow or other we have to get it over that if we are going to support these cultural centers, that we will not tolerate this kind of business. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] suggested a little while ago that the United Nations and the State Department are failing in their missions in behalf of the American people and he is so right. We are spending millions upon millions of dollars in this and other bills on the State Department and its so-called foreign policy, and upon the United Nations and its specialized agencies, yet around the world we have fewer friends than we have ever had. It is time to quit spending so much on bankrupt policies and organizations.

So it goes up and down the line, including the judiciary and the Justice Department. It is my understanding that there are about 2,000 attorneys in the Department of Justice—somebody correct me if I am wrong. Yet, using just one illustration, a man by the name of Fred G. Black, former high-flying lobbyist for North American Aviation and an associate of Bobby Baker, was convicted on tax charges but the case was thrown out of court about a year ago on a technicality. Why has not the Department of Justice brought him to trial again—as the court instructed? Why not?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Are they afraid Black will talk? What is the story?

There is also the failure of the Supreme Court to do anything about the three Federal judges in Oklahoma who have been engaged for the last few years in calling each other names and accusing each other of corruption. Speaking of the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Warren finds time to load himself on the taxpayers' backs and take a junket to South America, along with his wife also on the payroll, yet he does not have time to dispose of the writ that was filed in the Court 2 or 3 years ago in the case of the three Oklahoma judges. Meanwhile, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives uses the weak-spined alibi that there is a legal action pending in the Supreme Court and therefore it cannot carry out an investigation of the three Oklahoma Federal judges who persist in denouncing each other and thus bringing the Federal court into disrepute.

It is about time the House and the Committee on Appropriations thereof, as well as the authorizing committees, rapped some knuckles around here. Let us cut down on the funds if that is the only way we can get decent performance and service out of some of these people.

Mr. Chairman, there is no possible way, based upon testimony given in the hearings, to justify many of the expenditures in this bill. Unless it is drastically reduced I have no alternative but to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the "Department of State Appropriation Act, 1968".

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last two words.

I take this time in order to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee or the ranking member or anyone who has the information available as to the employment levels currently of the Department of State and how many vacancies exist. I am moved to ask the question because recently I saw a news article which quoted a State Department official as saying that steps were being taken to reduce overseas employment by 2 percent or to eliminate 2 percent of the jobs. Was that statement in error?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am advised that there were no vacancies at that time.

Mr. JONAS. Was this a correct statement? Has the gentleman checked that statement to see whether action was taken?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Actually all that was being done by the new Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Mr. Rimestad, was to bring employment to the level that it should have been. Is that a satisfactory answer to the gentleman's question?

Mr. JONAS. It explains what happened. I was a little surprised and pleased, I might add, and complimented the people in State for taking that action. I just wondered if I was premature in doing so.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I suppose Mr. Rimestad should have been complimented for doing what you and I would call the right thing.

Mr. JONAS. At any rate, it is a plus for the taxpayers that he has done what he should have done.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is true.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States for necessary expenses for the promotion of foreign commerce, as authorized herein under the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses," $200,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF GEORGIA

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have a series of amendments beginning at this point. There are actually 10 amendments. I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The wording of the amendments is identical and basically the impact of the amendments is simply to put a time limitation on the funds that are appropriated, rather than having them remain available until expended at some indefinite period.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I understand the request is that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. That is the request.

Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia: On page 27, line 3, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 29, line 4, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 29, lines 11 and 12, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 30, line 5, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 31, line 7, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 33, line 14, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 35, line 10, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 54, line 7, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 54, line 13, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 54, line 23, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the reason I offer these amendments is simply that I have been appalled when reading various reports relating to the total dollars that have been appropriated by this Congress, only to find there are dollars which are lying around and have not been expended.

A few minutes ago, in the colloquy between the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from New York, I noticed the gentleman was taking objection to a $150 million appropriation request merely because there was—and I believe my figure is correct—$400 million which had been appropriated by prior Congresses not used by the particular agency involved.

It appears to me it would be only good business judgment to put a time certain expiration date on these appropriations and not let them carry over indefinitely if they are not used.

I have attempted, in offering these particular amendments, to exclude areas in which construction is involved. Actually, as one goes through the appropriation bill, one finds that the term "to remain available until expended" appears in approximately 25 different areas. I have selected 10 of these, and feel it is proper to put a 5-year limitation on this money. If the money is not spent within the 5-year period it should then revert to the Treasury.

What are the areas? They are such things as on page 35, under "State Marine Schools." There is $1,275,000 to be appropriated to the Maritime Academy, and it is to remain available until expended. Probably this money will be expended within a 5-year period, but if for some reason it is not I feel the appropriations should lapse and should then not be made available unless reappropriated by a future Congress.

On page 30, under "satellite operations" there is $28,100,000 to remain available, to observe the environmental conditions of space satellites. I support the space program, but at the same time I feel very definitely that we should have a time limit on the appropriations made. If they are not expended within a reasonable period of time for that purpose—and I have adopted basically 5 years—then they should lapse.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge the adoption of these amendments.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendments.

Mr. Chairman, over the years I have learned for this subcommittee particularly—and I imagine it is true for all of them—not to bring to the floor an appropriation bill providing that the funds shall be available until expended unless authorized by law.

First, if it were not authorized by law it would surely never get by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]. That is No. 1.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Not just now. I want to make my argument, please.

No. 2: This amendment would play havoc with many Government programs. If the gentleman had come to the committee during the course of the hearings and presented his thoughts on the subject, we would respectfully have listened. To come on the floor and without further ado to move to do away with the continued availability of funds for State marine schools—I just cannot see it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Not just now, please.

Mr. Chairman, the other items to which the gentleman offered an amendment have to do with the merchant marine. For instance, at the foot of page 32 and the top of page 33 of the bill there is the item "Operating-differential subsidies—liquidation of contract authorization." Does the gentleman want to do away with the availability until expended of funds which have already been contracted for? These funds are already entered into, in an agreement with the various companies and people concerned in connection with operating differential subsidies.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will yield to the gentleman, if he will be patient.

The gentleman's amendment would have to do with the item of $143 million for ship construction. We never fail to ask how much money they have available presently and how much money they had available last June 30 and how much money they will have available next June 30. The gentleman's amendments—and I believe there are 10 of them—would utterly play havoc with these items which are dealing with contract authority and have to be paid. There is nothing that can stand in front of their being paid.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. The gentleman is incorrect in that I have an amendment, as he stated, to the operating-differential subsidies. There is no such amendment. He is also incorrect in stating that I have an amendment to the maritime ship construction on page 32 and so forth.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am glad to learn that. Of course, the gentleman has 10 amendments. I do not think I have seen 10 amendments brought up all together once in all my years; but that is all right.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. My amendments are designed not to apply to construction for the simple reason that a contract cannot exceed a 5-year period.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The item at page 35 of the bill, State marine schools, is for the liquidation and obligation of contracts incurred by authority of the act. This is contract authority which would be interfered with by the amendment suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee vote down the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Thompson].

The amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Environmental Science Services Administration, including maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft; expenses of an authorized strength of three hundred commissioned officers on the active list; pay of commissioned officers retired in accordance with law; purchase of supplies for the upper-air weather measurements program for delivery through December 31 of the next fiscal year; $105,000,000 of which $1,013,000 shall be available for retirement pay of commissioned officers and payments under the retired serviceman's family protection plan: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be reimbursed for at least press costs and costs of paper for navigational charts furnished for official use of other Government departments and agencies.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from New York. I came in a few moments ago during general debate and heard some of the discussion about the Environmental Science Services. I would like to inquire of our subcommittee chairman when did this change take effect?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It took effect during the time that John Connor was Secretary of Commerce. I might say to the gentleman that John Connor, in my estimation, is one of the greatest Secretaries of Commerce we ever had during all of the years that I have had connection with their appropriations. At that time the proposal was brought up by Dr. Holloman, who is going to be the new president of the University of Oklahoma, to put together the U.S. Weather Bureau, the radio propagation laboratory of the National Bureau of Standards, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey. It was claimed that by amalgamating these three activities we would save the taxpayers' money. At that time—and this must be about 3 years ago—I warned them that we were going to look carefully at this whole business and if they did not save the taxpayers' money, that it might be necessary to unseparate them again, if I may use that expression.

Mr. RANDALL. How was the change from Weather Bureau to Environmental Science Services administration accomplished? Was it by Executive order?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is right.

Mr. RANDALL. I observe the report which refers to the change to the new name as a fancy enigmatic title. I wanted to be sure that all of our people out in our country would be clear about this, because they seem to associate Environmental Science Services with such things as water pollution and air pollution and things of that kind. What I must know, Will my constituents still be able to take a telephone book and look in it and find a listing for the Weather Bureau?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We say in this report that this fancy enigmatic title covers services which until last year were carried out under the names of the Weather Bureau and Coast and Geodetic Survey plus a portion of the National Bureau of Standards.

I do not know if the weather is getting any better in Missouri.

I would suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] has experienced some difficulty with reference as to the manner in which the Weather Bureau operates out in the State of Illinois and has so operated recently.

How is the weather with reference to the area which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] represents?

Mr. RANDALL. It is not improving. We have had some tornadoes this spring and are threatened quite frequently. We feel that we should be able to open a telephone book and there find in plain English the Weather Bureau's number listed and in a minimum of time to get a report in a hurry on an approaching tornado.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Missouri will yield further, if my memory serves me correctly, when we used to dial WE-6-1212, there was a short time during which the operator would say that "This is the latest report of the Environmental Services Administration," and then they got back to the Weather Bureau once again and its report thereon.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad I took this time to make it very clear that the Weather Bureau is still listed as such in the telephone directory. I am also pleased that the general public will be told that Environmental Science Services Administration is one and the same as the Weather Bureau.

I am glad to know that in the telephone directory listing of Environmental Science Services Administration or ESSA, there will be no doubt that is what was for so many years known as the Weather Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this time to ask the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], a question or two with respect to the amount of funds contained in this bill for the agricultural weather stations.

Could the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee give me that information?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman well knows the concern that the chairman and the subcommittee has for the weather conditions in his district in Nebraska. We have proved that upon a previous occasion. However, we have provided every dollar for the purpose about which the gentleman from Nebraska inquires.

Mr. MARTIN. Could the gentleman from New York tell me—and I appreciate the great interest that the gentleman and his subcommittee has shown in this subject—how much money is in this bill for the areawide teletypewriter circuit communications?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, I am sorry that I must say to the gentleman that under their reorganization plan it is almost impossible to find the total figure for a specific project.

However, Mr. Chairman, there is an item which appears on page 547 of the printed hearings, as contained in a chart listed thereon, entitled "Agricultural weather services," 173 positions in 1967, and the same number is provided for in 1968, and the amount of $2,747,000.

Mr. MARTIN. And, this is the amount that the agency or department requested of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes. I think that is all covered at page 16 of the report when we say as follows:

> The full amounts requested for hurricane and tornado, agriculture weather, and fire weather have been approved, as well as the funds for the nationwide natural disaster warning system.

Mr. MARTIN. I grant that, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to ask the distinguished chairman one more question.

Did the Department request any funds for setting up agriculture weather stations in phase 2?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska will yield further, we gave them the same amount as they had in the previous year for agriculture weather stations.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand from the Bureau that phase 1 has been appropriated for in the past and that we are now up to phase 2.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Nebraska will yield further, there is included, in toto, what they requested.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I notice in looking through the subcommittee report there is only one item that shows an increase over the budget request for fiscal year 1968, and that is for research and development under the Maritime Administration, $1,950,000.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It is not exactly for research and development. It comes under that title because it is there that the operation originated. This is to continue the maintenance and sailing of the ship, the NS *Savannah,* which carries cargo, incidentally, and does collect money for the carrying of such cargo.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It does that in keeping with the limitation which is set forth on page 26 of the report which reads as follows:

> of which $3,300,000 shall be for operation of the NS *Savannah*: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated herein are to be used for a lay up of the NS *Savannah*:

Mr. ROONEY of New York. If I may say to my friend, the distinguished minority leader, when they came to the committee they requested $1,350,000 as the expense to lay up the ship in fiscal year 1968. This would really only provide for the period from a date in August to June 30, 1968. The committee denied all of funds requested for the layup of the ship, but on the other hand appropriated $3,300,000 to continue to sail it with its specially trained crew.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, the committee took the $1,350,000 which was recommended for layup and added to it $1,950,000 to come to the total of $3,300,000 for the operation of the NS *Savannah* for fiscal year 1968.

These funds in this bill are applicable to fiscal year 1968. Is there any possibility that the Maritime Administration acting under direction of some higher authority might commit funds that are available in fiscal year 1967 for the purpose of laying up the NS *Savannah*.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No, that could not happen for this reason: The contract to operate the NS *Savannah* runs until the date I suggested, August, which is in fiscal year 1968.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. For the operations?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes.

If I may say so, I do not believe they can get out of it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am delighted to hear the gentleman say that inasmuch as I strongly favor the continued operation of the NS *Savannah*.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I believe they will have to continue to operate the ship. Very often we appropriate money that the executive branch never uses. We have been quite fortunate. Last year we built an extra ship for the Maritime Administration in which the Government's half, or the Government's share, was then $7 million-plus, and they did obligate that money. So we have been fortunate in this regard, and I am sure they will continue to sail the *Savannah*.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

To enable the Small Business Administration to pay the Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, such insufficiencies as may be required by the trustee on account of such outstanding beneficial interests or participations in obligations of the Small Business Administration, as may be authorized by this Act to be issued pursuant to section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, as amended, such sums as may be necessary, to be available without fiscal year limitation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONAS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 48, lines 17 and 18, strike out "such sums as may be necessary to be available without fiscal year limitation" and insert in lieu thereof "not to exceed $1,350,000".

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not restrict the amount of participating sales certificates that may be sold by the Small Business Administration. It would merely change a permanent and indefinite appropriation into a line item so that we will know the amount of subsidy the Government is going to have to pay in order to sell the $150 million worth of certificates. It is exactly the amount the committee listed in its report would have to be paid in subsidy. See page 40 of the report.

Actually, as has been brought out in debate on this subject on previous occasions, this is really not a sale. It is a new method of borrowing money and it is a more expensive way of borrowing money than Treasury borrowing.

If we leave the language in the bill as written, the result will be a permanent, indefinite appropriation in the form of a blank check. It will be a continuing payment so long as these certificates are outstanding.

It may run for 20 years, or so long as the certificates are outstanding. If it runs for 20 years, the amount of the insufficiency would be about $27 million, if it costs $1,350,000 a year. If it runs for 10 years, it would cost half that much, $13.5 million. But whatever it is going to cost, we ought to know, and as the language now stands, we have no control over this in the future. This is a recurring obligation, a continuing, permanent, indefinite appropriation of any amount that FNMA determines is necessary to enable it to sell these participating certificates.

We have had this matter on the floor twice before this year. On both occasions the House wrote into the bill as a line item the amount of the subsidy, so that we would know how much it is. If it is different next year, we can change it next year, but we cannot change it if the language remains indefinite and permanent in the appropriation bill which now says "such sums as may be necessary to be available without fiscal year limitation."

In the independent offices bill we had a teller vote, and the House wrote into that bill as a line item the amount of subsidy that could be paid.

The HEW bill contained such language. The committee itself wrote into that bill as a line item the amount of subsidy that could be paid.

I think the House should be consistent in its handling of this matter. We have already written line items into two bills. I think we ought to write it into this bill.

But even more than the importance of being consistent is the importance of being right. I submit to you that we ought not to give a blank check to any agency of the Government that will run indefinitely. This is absolutely the only way we can have any control over how much subsidy is going to be paid on these outstanding particular certificates.

I do not think it will hurt the Department to write this language in, because they estimate that that is the amount they will spend and they know on the basis of past experience what rate of interest or rate of subsidy they will have to pay in order to market these participating certificates. They have so testified and so justified the amount before the subcommittee. I think in all fairness and in all our efforts to protect the fiscal integrity of the Government, and in order to keep from defaulting on our own obligations to ourselves and to the taxpayers, we ought to write into this bill the exact amount of the subsidy so that we will all know what it is going to cost the taxpayers for the administration to engage in this method of financing.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have listened with great intent to the learned remarks by my distinguished colleague, fellow member of the Committee on Appropriations, from the great State of North Carolina [Mr. JONAS]. Of course, when he refers to the fact that this issue has been decided before on, I believe it is, two previous appropriation bills, that is not exactly the case, because we are not confronted with exactly the same situation that occurred on both of those prior occasions.

In this instance the gentleman would insert the amount $1,350,000, which is the same amount that the committee has inserted at the tables on page 41 of the committee report. By putting in a set amount such as he does, it could very well result in making the cost to the Government and the taxpayers more than otherwise it might be. The $1,350,000 carried in the committee tables to which I referred is the top figure, according to the witnesses before the subcommittee.

It could very well cost less. But by placing a figure in the bill, those who are empowered to sell these certificates claim that the very presence of a such a limitation will raise the interest rate that will have to be paid. So, in conclusion, it would appear that this may very well cost the taxpayer more money than if the language is left as suggested by the committee at page 48 of the bill.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why this amendment should not be adopted. I believe the language says, "not to exceed $1,350,000." I believe it clarifies the situation and lets the Department understand more clearly what we really had in mind. I understand that the Treasury Department has decided to put these participation sales under the debt limit. If that is the case, I would hope that this would have the effect of reducing the use of them, because I would certainly think they would not want to pay the higher interest rates which results from the selling of participation certificates.

I would believe it would be the better part of wisdom if we would accept the gentleman's amendment, because I believe it is much more clear than what we have in the language as we have presented it from the subcommittee report. We have it in the report, but I believe it is much better to have it in the method the gentleman from North Carolina has presented. I just cannot see any objection to this amedment at all. I urge its adoption.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe all of us are much concerned about the Small Business Administration. The Small Business Administration has not been a success in every detail, but its objectives are very laudatory and its accomplishments are considerable. I would regret to see us take any action which would make it more difficult for the Small Business Administration to operate in any way but the most efficient way possible. For that reason, I feel that we should oppose the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina.

It could be said, "Well, why do we not appropriate every year, in an annual appropriation bill, the interest on the public debt?"

This has been advocated from time to time. But the Treasury experts through the years have said—that whenever we introduce any element of uncertainty, we make the purchaser a little more skittish, and we create a condition which might make the interest rate a little higher. So the fear here is that by fixing this particular figure, there might be some element introduced which would tend to make the cost to the taxpayer greater.

Of course, there is a loss, and the loss as estimated here is at $1.3 million. There is nothing being swept under the rug or hidden in any way. But in the interest of trying to encourage this agency to do the best possible job for the least possible dollars, I am going to vote against this amendment now and if the amendment is approved, I shall vote against it again when and if a rollcall vote is ordered. I do not see why we should take action which might to some degree be injurious to the Small Business Administration and create more expense to the taxpayer.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that the Small Business Administration, generally speaking, has the confidence of the American public and that the small businessman is depending to a great degree upon it?

Chairman Boutin, in my opinion, is a very able and capable administrator.

They say that this could well result in an additional cost to the taxpayer, because it is going to make it more difficult to sell the certificates.

Mr. MAHON. If it is an additional cost to the taxpayer, then this will militate against a successful program.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I do not believe there is any question about the need of the Small Business Administration or any question about how it is being operated. I am sure that most of us, at least, on both sides of the aisle support the Small Business Administration.

There is nothing in this amendment which affects small business or the opportunity of the people in the districts to be able to get their loans.

Actually they will have a billion dollars in this fund—$850 million from existing law and $150 million from this bill. At the end of fiscal 1968, they will carry over $476 million into fiscal 1969. So, SBA has all the funds it needs.

It seems to me we are not talking about small business and whether they will get their loans. We are talking about how much of a subsidy is going to be allowed on participation certificates.

This is the question, whether we will issue them a blank check, an open end subsidy, or whether we will limit them as to the amount of subsidy they have testified they will need on the participation certificate sales.

This is not an attack on the Small Business Administration or on the good it does, nor is it a limitation upon the rights of small businessmen to be able to make their loans. It is simply writing into the law what the SBA says the subsidy will be.

Remember, in this fund there will be a billion dollars.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I want to make certain that the record is clear, because it has been injected in the debate that this amendment would curtail the functions or the administration of the SBA. It is my interpretation, as it is the interpretation, I believe, of the ranking minority Member, that this would in no way curtail the functions of the SBA, but would merely set down a line item on the amount of subsidy that can be paid for these participation certificates.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is quite correct.

I should like to yield to the author of the amendment, the gentleman from North Carolina, to let him further explain exactly what it will do.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman is quite correct. Absolutely the only thing the amendment will do is change an indefinite permanent appropriation to the amount of money the committee put in its report would be required, $1,350,000. It would make it a line item.

This is just exactly what we did on the independent offices bill. It is exactly what was done in the bill providing appropriations for HEW. It has nothing to do with the operations of the Small Business Administration.

It merely puts down, as a line item, the amount of subsidy that can be paid, instead of leaving it wide open. It is the exact amount the committee put in the table at the end of the report. You will find it listed on page 40 of the committee report on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONAS) there were—ayes 60, noes 57.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JONAS and Mr. SIKES.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 78, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for arms control and disarmament activities authorized by the Act of September 26, 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2589 (a)), $9,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped the subcommittee would cut deeply into this appropriation for the Disarmament Agency, in view of the fact that this country is peddling $2 billion worth of arms around the world each year and that is exclusive of Vietnam.

There was a time, only a few years ago, when this Government spent less than $1 million a year on the subject of disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt that there is another staff in any agency or department of the Government, on a per capita basis, more highly paid than the staff of this Disarmament Agency.

This business of spending $9 million a year on disarmament, when the U.S. Government is peddling arms through the Defense Department and around the world at the rate of $2 billion a year, is a contradiction beyond belief.

Mr. Chairman, it would be my hope that the subcommittee would give the most serious consideration hereafter to cutting this appropriation back to no more than a million dollars a year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: On page 57, immediately following line 7, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 704. Excluding the Federal Bureau of Investigation money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond 95 per centum of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15)."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that was offered five times last year, and has been offered twice in this year. It should not require any further explanation. I will explain it briefly, however, just so your recollection may be refreshed as to what it would accomplish.

Excluding the Federal Bureau of Investigation, it would limit the expenditure of funds appropriated in this bill so that expenditure thereof would not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all other agencies provided for in the bill beyond 95 percent of the amount which the President's January budget estimated would be spent by these agencies in fiscal 1968.

To the extent that there are 1-year appropriations in the bill, and a great body of appropriations are for 1 year, the effect of the amendment would be to reduce the funds in this bill, excluding the FBI, by 5 percent, and the President's proposed 1968 spending by about 5 percent.

To the extent that there are multiple year appropriations in the bill, the amounts of the reduction in the bill and in the President's planned spending would depend upon the availability of carryover funds which the President could use to finance activities of agencies provided for in the bill.

The amendment does not affect the spending of previously appropriated funds, and it does not cut any individual appropriation item in the bill. Simply put, it limits the President's total proposed spending in fiscal 1968 to 95 percent of the aggregate amount that would otherwise be spent by the agencies, excluding the FBI, provided for in the bill.

Since the amendment goes to the aggregate spending rather than for spending on individual programs, it would give the President substantial flexibility in determining where cuts could be made without any crippling effect upon the essential services of Government.

As a matter of fact, within the framework of the bill the President would have the same flexibility in determining where individual cuts should be made as he had last fall when he announced a budgetary cutback of $5.3 billion in Federal programs in an effort to save $3 billion from planned spending during the current fiscal year.

Of course, the expenditure limitation amendment would make the reductions mandatory, and the administration would not be in a position to rescind the cuts, as has been done recently with respect to the President's proposed $3 billion reduction in 1967 spending.

If Congress fails this year to curb Federal expenditures, then spending on nondefense programs, exclusive of interest, will have almost doubled, a 97 percent increase, in the 8 years since 1960, when the budget was last balanced.

We simply cannot escape the fact that necessary expenditures for the war in Vietnam are increasing, and they probably will continue to escalate for the foreseeable future. Never before in our Nation's history have we attempted to fight a war on the one hand and on the other continue business as usual with respect to nondefense spending. The continued pursuit of such a policy at this time can only result in further price inflation, either increased taxes or an unmanageable deficit, and the threat of debility in the economy's private sector should a recession develop from the present slowdown in economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, I do not offer this amendment in criticism of the great committee which has taken commendable steps toward cutting the budgets of the agencies and departments herein covered, nor do I take this step to single out any particular one of these agencies or departments, although I personally could perhaps raise some questions about the functions of several of them, but rather this action is taken on behalf of the forgotten man in our country; the man without whom none of these agencies could operate, the man without whom not one brick of one building of these agencies could stand upon the other, the American taxpayer. He is due for some consideration from the Congress. In the 89th Congress and 90th Congress also we have shown a great deal of proper concern for the poor, the old, the sick, and the young, but this is one group for which we have not yet shown enough consideration, the forgotten people who pay the bill for our Government spending. And this spending has been so great as to force and impose upon the old and the infirm of our country a burden of tax through inflation that is heavy to bear, so that their meager incomes will purchase little. We have also transferred the debt for what we are doing, the burden of what we are doing here and now, to a great degree to the shoulders of our children and their children, as we have built a pyramiding debt.

So it seems the reasonable thing to do is to cut spending at every place we can, and the time to do so is now.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Alabama has consulted with the minority members of this subcommittee who participated in the marking up of this bill. I wonder whether or not he knows it was marked up on the basis of there not being a 5-percent reduction at the conclusion of the bill.

This is not the kind of bill that this sort of thing should apply to. Do you realize there is only one Government agency exempted—the Federal Bureau of Investigation—which incidentally gets the largest number of additional employees under the terms of this bill.

I wonder if we realize some of the items that are in this bill such as the Department of Justice and all of its activities including the U.S. attorneys and the U.S. marshals; the courts all over the Nation; and the Small Business Administration, that everybody a while ago thought would not be hurt the least bit—the least bit—by the adoption of the last amendment.

What do you suppose this amendment—this 5-percent amendment would do?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We will probably need more FBI agents to watch the Russians who would be roaming around the country under the infamous consular treaty that the Great Society has put over.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thought the gentleman from Iowa was going to give me a better one than that.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate my distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York, yielding. I think perhaps we have a paradox here. Would the gentleman not agree with me that the reason we would be having to increase the number of FBI agents is because the judiciary is failing more and more to back up the constabulary?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, there is a bit of truth to that, but not too much. I think more so is the fact that we have too many social reformers around who would make some of the courts, and agencies that should not be social agencies, to make them social agencies.

To be perfectly frank with the gentleman——

Mr. HALL. I do appreciate the gentleman's frankness.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. To be perfectly frank with the gentleman, I ask—What sense is there, for any fairminded gentleman or lady on the other side, to go to a subcommittee on appropriations and to sit every day, 5 days a week from the end of the month of January until this time of the year, going over a budget such as this one which contains so many important items—and then along comes what I think is an outrageous attempt to cut 5 percent on expenditures.

Do you realize that this committee cut $148 million out of the funds requested in this bill? I think the gentleman from Alabama should more closely become allied with his fellow members on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the defeat of the pending amendment.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do not think I have ever been known as a big spender around here.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I want to explain exactly what we do. We are all gentlemen on this committee. We respect one another. We have great understanding in the subcommittee, and that is the reason we are able to save the taxpayers as much money as we do year after year for all the years we have been considering this legislation. When we approached markup of the bill, the question was asked, "Are we going to consider figures here with the view of a 5-percent amendment at the end of the consideration of the bill when we get to the floor of the House?" It was the consensus of opinion that such an amendment would not be offered.

We marked up the bill. I know the majority of the members of the subcommittee felt that way, and I am glad that my distinguished friend from Michigan, who in my estimation has increased 3 feet in stature today by making the statement he did, agrees with me.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Let me say to my distinguished chairman that we had this understanding in the subcommittee and I intend to honor my commitment.

I want to say one other thing. If I understand the amendment correctly, it could cost more because it says 95 percent of what the President said he would spend in the budget he submitted in January. Is that not correct?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Let me explain this, and then I shall be glad to yield. Ninety-five percent of what he was going to spend. In this budget over 90 percent of the money in here is in salaries. We have already cut it between 6 and 7 percent. I do not think the amendment would cut this bill 5 percent further. To do otherwise you will have to change the amendment. That is my opinion.

I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Michigan knows my great fondness, admiration, and respect for him.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I appreciate that.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I respectfully say to him that if the 7-percent cut which this subcommittee says is in effect——

Mr. CEDERBERG. Almost.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If that obligational authority, and only that, goes through and carries, and you are able to convince our friends at the other end of the Capitol, the fact that you have a 5-percent limitation on spending probably will not have any impact. But in my judgment it is healthy and salutary to have the 5-percent limitation on expenditures regardless of what you do in the way of an obligation recommendation.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to ask the distinguished minority leader, is it not a fact that this subcommittee has a pretty fair record of conferences with the other body? I think the distinguished gentleman from Iowa would agree to that.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I would say respectably well, although on some occasions the gentleman has capitulated.

I think it is the better part of wisdom to improve the bill with a 5-percent cut in spending, excluding, of course, the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I can only say, as one member of the subcommittee, that we labored long and hard to come up with this bill, which I think is a very good bill. It contains a substantial amount in salaries, about which you can do nothing.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCHANAN) there were—ayes 66, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and on the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 48, lines 17 and 18, strike out "such sums as may be necessary, to be available without fiscal year limitation" and insert in lieu thereof "not to exceed $1,350,000".

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 144, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—185

Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Biester
Blackburn
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Bush
Button
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Esch
Eshleman
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gettys
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hunt
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Nelsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Pelly
Pettis
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price, Tex.
Quillen
Railsback
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Rumsfeld
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Utt
Vander Jagt
Wampler
Watson
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Zion

NAYS—144

Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Ashley
Barrett
Bevill
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Casey
Celler
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hamilton
Hanley
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Holland
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Irwin
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kyros
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Randall
Rees
Rivers
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Shipley
Sikes
Slack
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Walker
Watts
White
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—103

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashmore
Aspinall
Battin
Boland
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Chamberlain
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Conyers
Dent
Diggs
Dow
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Fascell
Flood
Foley
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gardner
Gathings
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gurney
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Heckler, Mass.
Hicks
Holifield
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
King, Calif.
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lloyd
Lukens
McClory
Mailliard
May
Miller, Calif.
Mink
Monagan
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Nix
O'Konski
Patman
Philbin
Pickle
Pollock
Purcell
Quie
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Ruppe
St. Onge
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tiernan
Tuck
Waggonner
Watkins
Whalen
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Younger
Zwach

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs on this vote:

Mr. Riegle for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Zwach for, with Mr. Pickle against.

Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. Monagan against.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina for, with Mr. Stubblefield against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Wolff against.

Mr. Waggonner for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. Goodell for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Gurney for, with Mr. Foley against.

Mr. Erlenborn for, with Mr. Flood against.

Mr. Edwards of Alabama for, with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee against.

Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Battin for, with Mr. Boland against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Watkins for, with Mr. Jacobs against.

Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. King of California against.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. Whalley for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Mr. Ashmore for, with Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Pollock for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Mrs. May for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.

Mr. McClory for, with Mrs. Mink against.

Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Nix against.

Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. Winn for, with Mr. Tiernan against

Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Burton of California against.

Mr. Quie for, with Mr. Clark against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Cohelan against.

Mr. Reinecke for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Gardner for, with Mr. Fascell against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Friedel against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Lukens for, with Mr. Gray against.

Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts for, with Mrs. Hansen of Washington against.

Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mr. Myers for, with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee against.

Mr. Chamberlain for, with Mr. Hanna against.

Mr. Lloyd for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Hutchinson for, with Mr. Resnick against.

Mr. Ruppe for, with Mr. Reuss against.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi for, with Mr. Rosenthal against.

Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Brown of California against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Adams with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Tuck with Mr. Cabell.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Hardy with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Gathings.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. WRIGHT changed his vote from "yea to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrosment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HARRISON. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARRISON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 57, immediately following line 7, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 704. Excluding the Federal Bureau of Investigation money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond 95 per centum of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15)."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 156, not voting 107, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—171

Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Bolton
Bow
Brinkley
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Bush
Button
Byrnes, Wis.
Carter
Clancy
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Esch
Eshleman
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Henderson
Herlong
Hunt
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Long, La.
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Moore
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Pelly
Pettis
Poff
Pool
Price, Tex.
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rivers
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Rumsfeld
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Utt
Vander Jagt
Wampler
Watson
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zion

NAYS—156

Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Barrett
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Clausen, Don H.
Conte
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Hamilton
Hanley
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Irwin
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kyros
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Matsunaga
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Rees
Reifel
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Shipley
Sikes
Slack
Steed
Stephens
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Walker
Watts
White
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—107

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashmore
Aspinall
Battin
Bell
Bray
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Chamberlain
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Conyers
Dent
Diggs
Dow
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Fascell
Flood
Foley
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gardner
Gathings
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gurney
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Heckler, Mass.
Hicks
Holifield
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
King, Calif.
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lloyd
Lukens
McClory
Mailliard
May
Miller, Calif.
Mink
Monagan
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Nix
O'Konski
Patman
Philbin
Pickle
Pollock
Purcell
Quie
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Ruppe
St. Onge
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tiernan
Tuck
Waggonner
Watkins
Whalen
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Younger
Zwach

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Edwards of Alabama for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Zwach for, with Mr. Pickle against.

Mr. McClory for, with Mr. King of California against.

Mr. Riegle for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. Monagan against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Wynn for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.

Mr. Gardner for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Myers for, with Mr. Flood against.

Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Foley against.

Mr. Hutchinson for, with Mr. Stubblefield against.

Mr. Gurney for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Wolff against.

Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. Lloyd for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.

Mr. Watkins for, with Mr. Jacobs against.

Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee against.

Mr. Battin for, with Mr. Burton of California against.

Mr. Chamberlain for, with Mr. Fascell against.

Mr. Goodell for, with Mr. Friedel against.

Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee against.

Mr. Lukens for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. Quie for, with Mr. Clark against.

Mrs. May for, with Mr. Rosenthal against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Tuck with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Gathings with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Hardy with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Reuss.

Mr. Hicks with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Landrum with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Messrs. **KAZEN** and **TENZER** changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. **TEAGUE** of California and **HALPERN** changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. **ROONEY** of New York. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report back the bill H.R. 10345 with an amendment.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> On page 57, immediately following line 7, insert a new section as follows:
>
> "SEC. 704. Excluding the Federal Bureau of Investigation money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond 95 per centum of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15)."

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. **ROONEY** of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6950) entitled "An act to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

MIDDLE EAST AND/OR VIETNAM

Mr. **ROSENTHAL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ROSENTHAL**. Mr. Speaker, there appeared an article by the distinguished columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott entitled "Inside Washington" in the May 29 edition of the Long Island Star Journal. They reported that—

> Congressman Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D.-N.Y.), an outspoken Hawk on the Middle East crisis, got a blunt reminder of his dovish position on Vietnam.

They went on further with a rather gleeful commentary about what they indicated was a strange inconsistency.

I would like to suggest that Messrs. Allen and Scott, together with some of my colleagues who may have similar feeling, read an editorial that appears in today's New York Times. The editorial is as follows:

> [From the New York Times, May 31, 1967]
>
> ### MIDDLE EAST AND/OR VIETNAM
>
> The issues in the Middle Eastern conflict are being confused by some commentators and critics with the very different issues involved in Vietnam. Just as spokesmen for the Johnson Administration have drawn false parallels between appeasement of Hitler and what was described as appeasement of Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung, so now the terms "hawk" and "dove" are being loosely applied to the Middle East as if they had the same connotation as in Vietnam.
>
> It is neither accidental nor illogical that many of the same Americans who are calling for deescalation and unconditional negotiations in Southeast Asia also call for firmness on the part of the United States in insisting on freedom of passage to the Gulf of Aqaba and on honoring American commitments to defend the sovereignty and independence of Israel.
>
> The United States had no such commitments with regard to South Vietnam, least of all to fight a virtually unilateral and major war on behalf of Saigon. In 1954, when the SEATO treaty was signed, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles specifically ruled out "unilateral armed intervention." While SEATO's economic and defensive commitments were indeed extended in a protocol to South Vietnam, along with Cambodia and Laos, Saigon was not even a party to the SEATO treaty.
>
> The other major document sometimes cited by the Johnson Administration as a commitment to Saigon was a letter from President Eisenhower to President Diem of South Vietnam on Oct. 23, 1954. In it General Eisenhower wrote of aid to Saigon, the purpose of which would be "to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." However, this aid was made dependent of President Diem creating a Government "enlightened in purpose and effective in performance." Diem failed signally to do this, as virtually every Vietnamese from Premier Ky down now recognizes.
>
> President Kennedy just before his death and President Johnson as late as 1964 both insisted—in Mr. Johnson's words—that the war in Vietnam "ought to be fought by the boys of Asia," not by Americans. Israel is not asking the United States to fight for her. There is no commitment to do so, and in present circumstances no need to do so.
>
> But there are commitments, which can be documented precisely, by every American President since Truman to defend the sovereignty and independence of Israel, and there are also commitments by Presidents Eisenhower and Johnson in favor of upholding the right of free passage through the Strait of Tiran into the Gulf of Aqaba.
>
> In terms of American interest—as well as commitment—the Middle East is to be differentiated from Southeast Asia. The Middle East is the crossroads of the world, between Asia and Europe. It has been a strategic goal of Russia since Peter the Great. A reminder of this came only yesterday with the news that Russian warships are going to pass through the Black Sea Straits into the Eastern Mediterranean.
>
> In its great-power aspect the Middle Eastern crisis shapes up as a confrontation of the Soviet Union versus the United States. As the British and French were gradually forced out of the area following World War II, the United States took their place. The region is now of paramount strategic importance to this country, whereas until escalation of the Vietnam war, Southeast Asia was only a marginal power factor for the United States.
>
> The Persian Gulf area produces 27 per cent of the world's petroleum and has proved global reserves of 60 per cent. American firms have a gross investment in the region of more than $2,500,000,000. There is nothing comparable in American interests that can be said of the Southeast Asian peninsula.
>
> The American position has now reached the ironical stage where virtually every argument advanced for the Vietnam war—commitments, honor, security, interests, consistency, the self-determination of small nations—could be used in favor of helping Israel. However, it is not necessary nor is it valid to make such comparisons. These are two separate problems calling for different solutions, but they are alike in that they both require major policy decisions in 1967.
>
> If Washington now argues that it cannot afford to take on two crucial commitments at the same time, this would be another good reason to say it is time to deescalate the war in Vietnam.

I would also like to read one paragraph of that editorial, as follows:

> It is neither accidental nor illogical that many of the same Americans who are calling for deescalation and unconditional negotiations in Southeast Asia also call for firmness on the part of the United States in insisting on freedom of passage to the Gulf of Aqaba and on honoring American commitments to defend the sovereignty and independence of Israel.

A LONG, HOT SUMMER

Mr. **SIKES**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SIKES**. Mr. Speaker, there have been repeated warnings that our Nation is in for "a long, hot summer." There is growing apprehension about demonstrations which will lead to violence in the streets. Time is running out, and action is necessary. Yet it appears that efforts to be ready to cope with the problem when it arises have stalled on dead center. Strong leadership and positive action are needed.

I cannot believe that there is disinterest in curbing crime or preventing violence in the streets on the part of the Nation's leaders. I am seriously disturbed, however, by lack of forthright action, which is reflected by taking positive steps, in dealing with either. The Department of Justice has been extremely slow to take steps to cope with treasonable actions or to encourage steps against flag desecrators and the like. If State and municipal law enforcement agencies are left with the impression that Washington is looking the other way when crimes are committed, there is less incentive for them to take action.

Crime and violence in the streets go hand in hand. Usually one leads to the other, and indifference to either can be fatal to the future of this Nation. America cannot stand many more summers of violence and winters of discontent. Unfortunately, the press media, and particularly the television channels, are open to every troublemaker who preaches violence, race hatred, or even treason and this aggravates the problem. The spectacle of a sit-in by beatniks and antiwar demonstrators at the Pentagon is revolting, but the fact that it took 2 days for the authorities to muster sufficient courage to throw them out is equally disturbing. During the time they were in the Pentagon, they claim they had access to top secret areas. These are not harmless manifestations of excess spirit. There is a sinister thread of Communist influence which extends throughout the pattern of resentment of authority and indifference to citizenship responsibility which is being exhibited in the United States.

The problem is here, and it is serious. Two editorials of recent date in local publications spelled out the story very well indeed. One of them appeared in the Evening Star of Monday, May 22, and was entitled "Crime—What's That?" The situation was again pointed up with clarity in an editorial which appeared in Roll Call on May 25.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 22, 1967]

CRIME—WHAT'S THAT?

There is one thing to be said for our new Attorney General, Ramsey Clark. You never know what to expect when he takes off on the subject of crime.

In an interview the other day, the attorney general was reported as saying in effect that all the talk about a national crime wave is much ado about nothing. "The level of crime has risen a little bit," Clark said, "but there is no wave of crime in the country."

As an item in support of this thesis, the attorney general told of one city (unidentified) in which crime was up 1 percent from last year. But last year, he added cheerfully, crime in that city was down 1 percent from the year before. As for official statistics which indicate substantial yearly increases in crime throughout the country, Clark said: "We do ourselves a great disservice with statistics."

For our part, we do not quite know how to interpret this comment. It is true that crime statistics do a great disservice to the Clark suggestion that the crime wave talk is a case of making mountains out of molehills. But our attorney general, in all deference, is talking through his hat—at least as far as the crime statistics for Washington are concerned. Whatever the fact as to the statistics for his unidentified city—statistics, incidentally, which he seemed to think were quite useful—the figures for the Nation's Captial add up to a devastating rebuttal of the Clark crime thesis.

The most recent statistics for Washington show a dismaying crime rise here of 59.7 percent last month over the previous April. This included a 103.8 percent jump in robberies. The rise in serious crimes in March was 51 percent over March of 1966. The President's message on crime in Washington, promising safe streets and so on, went to Congress in January. The local crime statistics for that month revealed a jump of 42 percent over the same month a year ago. And to take a longer statistical journey into the past, the crime index in Washington 10 years ago was about one-fourth of its current level.

Yet our attorney general tells us that "we do ourselves a great disservice with statistics." It would be nice, we suppose, if the nasty figures could be thrown down the sewer. Then it might be possible for some people to believe that there really isn't any such thing as a crime wave. Possible for some people that is, but not for those who are the victims day in and day out of robberies, rapes, burglaries, assaults, and you name it.

[From Roll Call, May 25, 1967]

EDITORIAL

If the war in Vietnam is being conducted as badly and irresponsibly as the President's war on crime, then this nation is in bad shape. If the President's advisers on the Vietnam war are as unrealistic and as stubborn as his advisers on the war on crime, then the bloom of American youth is being sacrificed recklessly.

Since the average citizen is not privy to the myriad decisions and strategies of the military planners, we can only hope and pray that the professionals are providing sound advice, intelligent planning, and tough execution of plans to repel the enemy at every turn and to offer the utmost protection to our boys.

On the other hand, we know that the war on crime is a flop. Nowhere is that more apparent than in the District of Columbia—the Nation's Capital where crime figures have been rising fantastically despite the ostriches, who attempt to lull us into complacency by pointing out that we're not (yet) first in the nation, that crime is increasing because the population is increasing (that's a nice way to look at it) and that criminals are entitled to their uncivil rights (something new has been added to the Bill of Rights—the right to commit crime).

The President answers the growing wave of citizen protest against crime by vowing he is doing all he knows how and asking for suggestions. The Congress presented him with a bill, which, despite the compromises made to the ostriches, contained enough provisions with enough meat in them to make a start towards coping with the problem. On the advice of his District of Columbia advisor, he turned it down. His highly-touted Crime Commission spent months of study and came up with a load of the old fuzzy answers which only postpone needed action.

Readers may think it incongruous that this newspaper devote editorial space to a subject not ordinarily tackled by a Congressional-political newspaper. We admit that in this instance we have negated our long-standing policy. But when we decided to bring the crime problem to the attention of the Congress, no major newspaper in Washington recognized it. We predicted the rise in crime four years ago, while other newspapers were minimizing it. Week after week we editorialized forcefully, and other newspapers (the Knight chain, for instance) followed our lead. Our editorial drive succeeded in improving conditions in the Capitol area which was becoming a hotbed of muggings, stabbings, robberies and other crimes. With proper leadership, this could be accomplished throughout the District and eventually throughout the nation.

Parks, playgrounds and schools can help in the future. But right now there is an air of permissiveness in the District and in the nation which encourages crime. We predicted four years ago that following the prevailing drift, law and order would change into anarchy. With the unruly sit-ins (at the Pentagon, no less), marches, riots, demonstrations and crimes against citizens, our prediction, unfortunately could well materialize.

The apologists can minimize the problem all they want to. Which of them would attempt to explain their high-sounding theories to Mr. and Mrs. Mark Robeson, grieving in Kansas over the brutal slaying of their 25-year-old daughter?

We predict that the drift away from law enforcement and crime prevention will be a major issue in the coming campaigns for Congress.

Perhaps the voters, living in fear from day to day and disgusted with the permissiveness of their elected officials, will demand that this nation be returned to a land of laws—laws that are respected, obeyed and enforced; where civil rights again means not only the guarantee of rights for minorities, but also the right to the protection of the law, and the guarantee of security to the individual on the streets of his community or in what used to be referred to as the safety of his home.

We call upon the Congress to lead the way.

MIDDLE EASTERN CRISIS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the Middle Eastern crisis presents a severe test of our national will, our statesmanship, and the skill of our diplomacy. It also tests Israel's patience, Russia's sincerity, and the very workability of the United Nations.

The position in which it has placed us calls for our very best efforts and the total commitment and undivided attention of our national spokesmen. If indeed it is possible under the circumstances to follow the ancient Biblical injunction to be "as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves," this should be our aim.

There is no easy way out for anyone concerned. The precipitate withdrawal of United Nations forces and the overt provocation by President Nasser seem to have painted the world into a corner. But a solution must be found, if possible short of armed conflict. And whatever solution obtains must be one based upon principle rather than upon mere expediency. As we search for the elusive fragments of a solution, the following broad principles should guide our deliberations. Whatever we do must take into account these overriding facts.

First, we simply cannot and must not acquiesce to the bold and brazen closing of an international waterway. The Gulf of Aqaba has long been so recognized by solemn treaties to which this Nation is a signatory. Even apart from those treaties, this waterway would have to be so recognized in the basic concepts of international law. To permit the closing of this international artery of peaceful commerce would be to engage in a craven surrender of basic and fundamental principles to which this Nation has been irrevocably committed for generations.

Second, we cannot under any circumstances accept the premise on which President Nasser predicates his present posture, that he regards "the very existence of the State of Israel as an act of aggression" against him. There is absolutely no credible evidence whatever that the Government of Israel was contemplating any unprovoked attack upon Egypt. Whether or not any individual may have considered wise or unwise the creation of the Isael Republic, it is in fact a sovereign nation of the world. Its equal and unrestricted right to exist free from depredations has been fully and solemnly recognized by the world community and ratified by almost a generation of sacrifice on the part of its people. To abandon it to destruction by external forces would be unthinkable.

Third, the preservation of the Israel Republic and its full rights in the community of nations is not in any sense an act of favoritism. It proceeds from the same identical principle which motivated this Nation in asserting its influence more than a decade ago to prevent the destruction of the United Arab Republic of Egypt by external force. Surely none at that time could have interpreted our position in behalf of the rights of Egypt as favoritism. Certainly the world community, and indeed Egypt itself, must recognize that the scales of international justice cannot be tilted at Egypt's whim nor the rules of international behavior changed to permit that nation's doing to another what was expressly forbidden to be done to Egypt.

Fourth, this is rightly a problem for the United Nations. It is to be hoped that the Security Council will be able to act firmly to arrest this provocation, assert the clear rights of international shipping in international waters, and make clear to all that the territorial integrity of each nation in the area will be respected by all and no infringement tolerated on the part of any.

Fifth, if the Security Council should find itself paralyzed by the exercise of a veto on the part of any of its members, the problem should be brought speedily and forthwith to the General Assembly. The United Nations has in this matter a clear responsibility which cannot be evaded if the fabric of the world community is to remain intact. It is the United Nations whose presence has preserved the peace in that trouble-prone and volatile area. And it was the sudden and undeliberated withdrawal of United Nations forces upon the demand of Nasser which upset the delicate balance that has obtained for more than a decade and precipitated the present crisis. If the United Nations is to maintain its integrity, it cannot merely wash its hands of the problem.

Sixth, it seems apparent that a continued United Nations presence in the area may be indispensable to the preservation of order. Mr. U Thant's sudden unilateral decision to remove UNEF personnel at President Nasser's demand is, under the circumstances, analogous to the immediate withdrawal of police from a neighborhood upon notification that a bank is about to be robbed. The unpremeditated removal of peacekeeping forces was undoubtedly an error. It permitted and abetted the development of the present crisis. This fact in and of itself, therefore, commands the responsibility of the United Nations in bringing about an early and decisive solution based upon international law in order that the delicate fabric of peace shall not, through its overt action and subsequent delay, be irreparably torn asunder.

Seventh, in the tragic event that the United Nations should find itself incapable of acting, then the responsible nations of the world must form some concerted plan to assert and firmly establish the rights of all nations to the unrestrained and unrestricted use of the Gulf of Aqaba. It is important that this be done in concert rather than unilaterally. All nations have a stake in the preservation of the principles of peaceful international shipping. Obviously, the principle must apply to all. A law which applies only to some is no law. An international right which exists for all but one would be no legal right at all. Clearly, no single nation may capriciously and cavalierly deny to any other so profound a right. The right of peaceful international shipping must apply to Israel and to its port of Eilat, or it cannot be said securely to apply to any nation anywhere.

Eighth, the Soviet Union must collaborate in the recognition of this right or surrender its recently asserted claim to being a builder of bridges to peace. The single most important imponderable element in the present situation is that of Russian intent. The Soviet Union indeed has a greater stake than most in this basic right of international passage. Russia's commerce depends profoundly upon free and unfettered travel through the Bosporus and the Skagerrak. The creditability of recent Soviet overtures could be destroyed by Russia's failure or refusal to cooperate in preserving the lines of territorial demarkation secure from external expansionism and protecting untrammeled the right of peaceful passage through the international waters of the Gulf of Aqaba.

Ninth, the time for a solution is relatively short. The Israel Republic's great economic dependence upon the Port of Eilat renders its entire economy and national viability peculiarly sensitive to prolonged closure. We must not permit, through deliberate dilatory tactics or indecisive delay in face of an unlawful international act, the destruction of a nation by economic strangulation any more than we should permit the destruction of a nation by armed marauding aggression. Prudence, therefore, is not to be confused with procrastination. A clear policy must be enunciated and implemented soon.

Tenth, and finally, Israel—which in this instance is the offended party—must forbear with patience. It must have faith that the United States and the peaceful nations which respect international law will indeed act before it is too late. Israel must meanwhile preserve the innocence of its position by refraining assiduously from yielding to frustration and attacking its neighbors. It must have faith in the world community and preeminently in the United States to create a peaceful solution enforced by international sanction. In this, the injunction to be as "wise as serpents and as harmless as doves" falls with special force upon Israel. Its patience must be beyond provocation while the world community works speedily toward a settlement.

If this action comes soon and in concert, and as an expression of clear international intent, there can be little question that Nasser will pacifically if begrudgingly accommodate himself to it. Surely he does not wish to provoke a bloody conflict from which he will emerge again defeated and discredited. The way to avoid this is to leave no possibility of doubt in his mind that the world cannot and will not tolerate the brazen closing of this international waterway or other overt acts of hostility against his neighbors. While peace is served by the present detente, it will not be served by a prolonged sufferance of an illegal act.

INADEQUATE FUNDING OF TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of our major problems before the Committee on Education and Labor has been brought about by the inadequate funding of title I of ESEA. The formula for distribution of funds in the present law permits the poorer States to receive one-half the national average per pupil expenditure. The Bureau of the Budget recommended only $1.2 billion for fiscal year 1968. This brought about a situation where several of the major States in the country would receive less funds than they received in fiscal 1967. For this reason a provision was written into the 1967 amendments and later deleted by the House of Representatives that deferred the operation of the national average factor until title I was funded to the full extent of authorization. On the House floor I voted against permitting the formula to go into effect this year.

I am most hopeful that the Bureau of the Budget will recommend a supplemental appropriation in order that the formula, as written into the bill last year, may go into effect without interfering with any other section of the country.

It was the intent of the Congress last year that we provide a floor under the poorer States by guaranteeing that they would be permitted to go to the national average. It was never intended that the Congress take money away from any State. We well recognize that it will cost an additional $350 million when we permit the poorer States to come to one-half the national average per pupil expenditure.

If title I had been fully funded, this question would not have arisen. In other words, we gave all the States the option of either going to one-half the national average or one-half the State average per pupil expenditure, whichever is higher.

As chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, I wish to express my deep concern over the failure of the Appropriations Committee to approve increased funds for educational programs in fiscal year 1968. The number of children in our schools is increasing sharply, and yet we continue to cut and trim money from vitally needed programs. The effect is that each year we are spending less per pupil, at a time when improved instruction is essential for our continued growth as a nation.

I am particularly concerned about title III of NDEA, which suffered the most severe cut of all. During the current year appropriations for this title totaled $79.2 million. The amount recommended for 1968 is only $47 million, a reduction of 41 percent.

This, in spite of the fact that title III of NDEA has proved itself over the years. It originated as a bipartisan program in 1958, and over the intervening years it has had a tremendous effect on improving the quality of instruction in our schools. This has been amply demonstrated by testimony from educators in all parts of the country.

Title III is a going program, and its personnel and administration at local and State levels are efficient and well organized. Incidentally, many school districts have already completed plans and made financial commitments for next year's programs under this title, and if funds are not made available, serious damage will result.

It is often argued that title III of NDEA has been replaced by other newer programs. Actually, there is very little overlapping with any other program. Schools applying for title III funds are generally not eligible to receive money elsewhere. Funds under this program are aimed at strengthening the curriculum without regard to economic criteria.

Furthermore, it is significant that title III is a matching program, and that States are required to put up amounts equal to those obtained from the Federal Government. Nevertheless, moneys allocated have been fully utilized each year. This alone would seem to indicate that this is a program that is doing a good job, and that it is popular at local levels.

I should like to emphasize once again that title III of NDEA is a program that has proved itself; that it has had a great impact on raising the quality of instruction in our schools; and that it is strongly supported by schools everywhere.

I do not believe that a program such as this should be downgraded at the expense of newer programs, however promising they may be.

MEMORIAL DAY TALK AT NEBRASKA CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION BY GEN. BRUCE C. CLARKE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include pertinent material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, USA, retired, is well known to all and needs little introduction from this Missourian. He has journeyed to North Platte, Nebr., for the centennial celebration and Memorial Day talk, and uniquely tied commemoration in with history, challenge, heritage, and inspiration. One of the leading exponents of the volunteer program of the Boy Scouts of America, and a servant of that organization's national council, this retired general, who commanded all Army Forces in Europe in a most trying time, with headquarters in Heidelberg, is well worth reading for the sheer value of his thought, to say nothing of the timeliness of his challenge. His reverence in commemoration of those who have gone in defense of liberty and paid the supreme price with a role "infinitely more significant than speech" is stimulating and worth reflection and pondering by us all. The emphasis of responsibility, as well as knowledge of rights, is stimulating and should be made real in today's world. The concept that freedom is not free and must be rewon by each generation is beautifully reemphasized. The faith in youth of the United States of America, and demand for citizenship participation, is erstwhile. The simplicity of the message is elemental, and the timing is perfect. I commend it to all readers:

MEMORIAL DAY TALK GIVEN AT NEBRASKA CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION, NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.

(By Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, USA, retired, May 30, 1967)

Governor Tiemann, Comdr. Golbraith, Comdr. Smith, veterans, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, young men and young ladies, friends—

I am deeply conscious of the high honor that is mine in being here today. But I am, quite frankly, overwhelmed at the thought of finding words to fill this occasion, for it is always difficult to speak of those whose role was infinitely more significant than speech. It seems inappropriate to commemorate with lengthy tribute those whom the nation's love has long since made immortal. Yet, we can never fail to find renewed inspiration and dedication in their example. And it is important that we do so today, for never in our history has there been a greater need for inspired, dedicated Americans.

But today, Memorial Day, means much more to this great state of Nebraska. Many of you in this audience, many of your sons and daughters and your loved ones have served with distinction in the armed services of this great country. Your forefathers, beginning in the days when Nebraska was known as the Tree Planter's State and in the days of J. Sterling Morton, the originator of Arbor Day, contributed much to making Nebraska a great state.

Later, and today, known as the Cornhusker State, Nebraska is replete with historic achievements. Rather than discuss your state history, which is all too familiar with you, I think it is significant to mention that during President Johnson's term, President Andrew Johnson, Nebraska was admitted to the Union as the 37th state on March 1, 1867. So today, one hundred years later, during the term of another President by the name of Johnson, you are celebrating the centennial of the Cornhusker State. So I feel especially proud to be here today and to join with you in your celebration.

Memorial Day 1967 finds our young men answering a new call for courage and steadfastness in the age-old struggle against the forces that would suppress freedom or erect barriers against equality and justice for all men. Now we are confronted with dangers vastly greater than we or any other nation have before known, and we see no end or easy solutions to them. But you and I know that the great blessing of liberty is never secured without suffering. As Tom Paine, the American patriot, once said: "What we obtain too cheaply, we esteem too lightly."

And so in my remarks today, I intend to consider the meaning and the message that this Memorial Day brings to each of us.

For nearly a century, our citizens have set aside this day to honor those who served our Nation so well both in war and in peace. The real meaning of Memorial Day is found in the aftermath of the Civil War. Even after its end, the rumble of guns seemed to echo across the land—destruction and bitter memories marred the peace.

An inspiring symbol of unity and reconciliation was needed—a symbol from which the people could draw strength as they strove to become a united nation. That symbol was supplied in 1867 when a kind gesture by a small group of women in a little-known community in the South suddenly caught the imagination of the nation. As the women of Columbus, Mississippi, decorated the graves of their war dead, they saw nearby the graves of the Union soldiers—bare, cold and forgotten.

These women could not bring themselves to ignore the Union graves. Carefully they decorated them too, until there was nothing to distinguish Union graves from Confederate.

The story of the Mississippi women was printed in papers throughout the country, and their heart-warming performance was celebrated in sermons, speeches, poems, and songs.

The reaction was so great that in 1868, General John A. Logan, National Commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, the Union's veteran organization, ordered its members to observe May 30th as a special day. It was a day his order read, "for decorating the graves of the comrades who died in defense of their country and whose bodies now lie in almost every city, village, or hamlet churchyard in the land."

General Logan chose the date May 30th simply because of the abundance of beautiful flowers during this time of the year. But from then on, "Decoration Day" ceremonies were sponsored throughout the North, and similar rites were hold independently in the South. Gradually the legislatures of many states made the day a legal holiday.

In 1882, Decoration Day became Memorial Day to describe more fully the sentiment of the occasion. And with the passing years, Memorial Day has become a salute to the military dead, not only of the Civil War, but of all our wars.

Through the years, our soldiers have marched a tortuous road. It has taken them to frozen months at Valley Forge, to heavy fighting around Jackson's cotton bales at New Orleans, and to slaughter at Gettysburg. The road was wound from Monterrey to Mexico City; it has leaped the waters to Cuba and to the Philippines.

In the First World War, names previously unheard by the average American citizen took on new and terrible meanings; Argonne Forest, Chateau Thierry, the Marne River, Verdun—all became synonymous with the roar of gunfire and the struggle of men.

Then the Second World War came, and Americans fought on three continents—Europe, Africa, and Asia—and worldwide in the air and on the seas. They gave their lives at Anzio, at Normandy, and at Okinawa; they fought in sun-baked deserts, steaming jungles, and frozen fields. There were bad times—the Death March at Bataan, early reverses in North Africa, the Battle of the Bulge—but the American fighting man and our allies proved equal to the task. They retook the Philippines, held at "the Bulge," and forced the enemy to lay down his arms in Africa.

The road led on to Korea, where Heartbreak Ridge, Pork Chop Hill, and the Pusan Perimeter became new landmarks on our soldiers' map.

And today Americans are again serving in the cause of freedom throughout the world, opposing the Communist aggression that threatens the self-determination of our friends; and, ultimately, our own security. The road has carried thousands of America's fighting men to Vietnam, where with our allies we are engaged in a life and death struggle with a powerful Communist aggressor. Here strange sounding names—Chu Lai, Hill 881, Pleiku, the Mekong Delta, and Cu Chi—are rapidly becoming household words. And in the coming months as more and more of our young men give their "last full measure" in defense of liberty, we shall perhaps be called upon to steel ourselves for longer casualty lists from Vietnam.

Today, as we place flowers on their graves, we realize that we cannot discharge our solemn obligation to these men with mere words of homage. They did not die for wreaths and words. They died for the right of Americans to enjoy freedom. They died for future generations. They died for us. They died so we would be free to assemble here today in peace.

On this Memorial Day, we should remind ourselves that military obligations are an inseparable part of our heritage, that military service in time of the nation's need is a fundamental responsibility of citizenship. One of our great American philosophers, George Santayana, has reflected that "only the dead are safe; only the dead have seen the end of war." While we may hope that conclusion is wrong, we cannot afford to assume so. Certainly war has always been hellish—and the present war is especially so. Nevertheless, the idea that nothing is worse, that our proper purpose—individually and nationally—is mere survival, repudiates the heroism of all the men we honor today and represents a reversion to an animal view of life. If we lack the courage to stand firm for our beliefs, or if we lack beliefs we are determined to uphold, then we do not deserve the heritage which is ours, and we are unworthy of the sacrifices that these brave men have made for us.

Let me say a few words to you young men and women of Nebraska who are present with us today.

You are the benefactors and the inheritors of the Heritage I speak about:

You have health and long life expectancy.

You have luxuries and comparable affluence.

You have education and intelligence.

You have rights.

You have privileges.

You have opportunities.

You are destined to soon become the controlling generation in our relatively young country. You have our hopes and best wishes. You have our confidence.

I know that you have mine for I have been privileged to command many millions of young U.S. soldiers and marines in many countries of the world; I know how the youth of America "stack up" and I am proud of them.

They (the youth) are jealous of their rights, and should be for their rights are a part of their heritage that over a million Americans have died for in the last 190 years.

While mindful of their rights, they are also mindful of their responsibilities. They know they do not get something for nothing in a realistic, competitive society and world.

In spite of their great heritage they realize that each generation must prove itself.

The youth of America realize that in spite of the benefits and wealths they have as Americans, they were born in debt to many people and to many American institutions:

To their system of Government.

To their parents.

To their community.

To their state.

To their country.

To their schools.

To their church.

To their God.

And to those whom we honor today; they realize they must cope with these debts and at the end will pass many debts on to their children.

I am sure they realize that the now living and controlling generation wishes for them only the best as they take over.

I have been connected with the Boy Scouts of America for many years and, at present, I am a member of the National Executive Board. I think it especially fitting today to recall to the young members of this audience the thought that many Scout masters keep in mind in dealing with young Scouts:

Our Constitution and its Bill of Rights gives us, as Americans, certain Rights. However, we must understand and accept the responsibility attached to each Right. If we do not, we are trying to "get something for nothing" . . . which is not an "accepted" way of life.

Just what our responsibility is under each Right is a matter for each of us to determine for ourselves.

In making that determination, the "I care" test serves as a very good guide for the boy who is trying to become a good citizen of America.

"I care for: my self respect, my family, my community, my country and my God."

Hence, America has given you certain rights and you as an American must accept responsibilities, *you must care for* your own self respect, for your family, community, country, and God.

If our honored dead were alive today, they would probably let Captain John McCrae express it again so well when he said in France in World War I:

> "Take up our quarrel with the foe
> To you, from failing hands, we throw the torch
> Be it yours to hold it high,
> If ye break faith with us who die
> we shall not sleep though poppies grow in Flanders fields."

Friends, it has been a privilege for me to be here with you today and to have the pleasure of sharing in the ceremonies commemorating the centennial celebration of the 37th State of the United States.

DEDICATION OF NEW TRIER HIGH SCHOOL WEST, NORTHFIELD, ILL.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an address by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the 13th Congressional District of Illinois was honored to have the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, at the dedication of the New Trier High School West in Northfield, Ill., on May 7, 1967. Mr. Gardner spoke eloquently of the "themes of our national life" and urged students not to shun the problems of their day but to lend a hand, wherever they may be, to the betterment of their society. His words merit the attention of all who are concerned with the problems of our times.

Mr. Gardner's address follows:

REMARKS BY JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The name New Trier is known and honored in every school district in America. It stands for excellence in education.

Thanks to that tradition, one may be sure that the graduates of New Trier High School West will be well prepared. One may be sure that they will move smoothly into the colleges and graduate schools and complex specializations of modern life.

But I hope they will also be prepared in another vital dimension. I hope they will have a direct and personal concern for the problems racking this Nation, and be willing to exercise direct and personal leadership with respect to those problems in their own communities.

Far too many of our best educated people today are disinclined to provide such leadership.

The young people of this generation are perhaps more alert to the problems of the larger society than any preceding generation has been. But as they move on into their careers there is every likelihood that their concern will diminish. For all their activism, they show every indication of following the time-honored trend—a few years of indignant concern for social betterment, characterized by a demand for immediate solutions to all the world's problems, and then a trailing off into the apathy and disinterest of the young executive or professional.

If you want to avoid the toughest problems facing your generation, there are some classic forms of escape.

One is just to get so wrapped up in your personal life—job, family, bills, house repairs, bridge parties, office politics, neighborhood social competition, and the like that there just isn't any time for the larger problems of the day.

A more subtle exit from the grimy problems of the day is to immerse oneself so deeply in a specialized professional field that the larger community virtually ceases to exist.

This is a particularly good way out because the rewards of professional specialization are very great today, so you may become rich and famous while you are ignoring the nation's problems.

Still another and infinitely devious means of turning your back on the larger community is to assert that the whole society is so corrupt that nothing can save it. Such moral gamesmanship relieves the gamesman of all responsibility. With one shrug he shakes off the burden that serious men have carried from the beginning of time, the struggle to make an imperfect society work.

A variation on that theme is to tell yourself that the society has fallen into the hands of unworthy people, and that virtuous, clear-eyed spirits such as yourself haven't a chance. You can suck that lollipop of self-deceit all your life long and die secure in the belief that the world would have been different had they turned it over to you.

Unfortunately we can no longer afford such escapism on the part of our best people. We are facing social problems of unexampled gravity. I have observed the domestic problems of this Nation at first hand, and I can tell you that we have tasks of the utmost seriousness before us—tasks of alleviating poverty, of doing justice to Negro Americans, of redesigning our cities, of reshaping our governmental processes, of controlling the pollution of our natural environment, of learning how to educate deeply deprived children.

It has always been hard to stir our people to significant social action except in periods of great crisis. I would have no hope of changing that national attribute. I would simply say that another of our historic moments of crisis is upon us. If you can't sense it stirring under the surface of the news, then you don't understand the deeper currents of this Nation.

During the years ahead, our society will need the lifelong attenion and concern of its most highly educated young people. They must lend a hand. In doing so they will be committing themselves to an arduous assignment.

They will have to be willing to undergo the long, hard apprenticeship that is required to accomplish change in the modern world. It's a complex world. It can't be run by the untrained or changed by the untrained.

But education is only the beginning for those who hope to change the world for the better. After they're trained they have to have the fortitude and the staying power essential to the long, difficult task of accomplishing social change. Making a bad world better is tough, grinding, never-ending work. It's not for people whose chief interest is in posturing or striking an attitude or bandying words or venting the anger of youth.

I have little sympathy with those who have impossibly high hopes for social betterment and then the next day are wallowing in disillusionment and self-pity because their high hopes weren't realized. Social change isn't that easy. Creating a better world isn't that easy. Life isn't that easy.

Anyone who cares at all about improving the lot of mankind had better gird himself for a long struggle with lots of setbacks and defeats. That's the way it has always been and continues to be. It's backbreaking; but it's a man's work.

If enough of our young people are willing to commit themselves to a serious concern for the future of their society, then I have some hope for the years ahead. As some of your know, I have been keenly interested in what it is that makes nations decay. And as those of you who have read my book *Self-Renewal* know, the evidence convinces me that the decline of nations is not inevitable. As I said in the book if we go into a decline, we shall not be able to blame the inexorable forces of history. It will be an avoidable failure of the mind and heart and spirit of the American people. We now know beyond all doubt that nations die from within, and they are attacked less often by traitors within the gate than by traitors within the heart—complacency, apathy, cynicism, intolerance, self-deception and an unwillingness on the part of the individual to lend himself to any worthy common purpose.

Every morning and evening as I ride to and from work, I pass the Washington Monument, and the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, and I often think of the men and events they commemorate. But as I look at the perfection of the monuments, I try to remember—and I ask you young people to remember—that this great Nation was conceived and designed by human beings imperfect as you and I are imperfect; capable of mistakes, even as you and I; who were once young, as you are now; who were subject to weariness and doubt and confusion, as all of us are. But with all their human fallibility, they had the courage and heart to believe that man *might* create a free and just society. And that made all the difference.

It is easy to be cynical about that effort because no society anywhere or anytime has really been wholly free and just. But over the years and over the generations we have moved slowly and often plainfully toward those goals. And we have done so because some people had the vision and the steadfastness to try to make an imperfect world better.

That is hard and not always glamorous work and it is never finished.

A nation is never finished. It has to be built and rebuilt. It has to be recreated in each generation by believing, caring men and women.

That is what you are doing here at New Trier. This school is not a monument to the past. It is an affirmation of faith in what can be—an uncompromising commitment to excellence—an example of what people can create when they join that commitment to their most cherished values.

And what are those cherished values? I'd like to conclude this talk with a few comments on the things we value.

There isn't anything the American people believe in more deeply than individual fulfilment. Speaking of our forebears, President Johnson once said "They came here—the exile and the stranger—to find a place where a man can be his own man."

Opportunity and fulfilment. That's what education is about. At the base of our convictions as Americans is a concern that each individual have the opportunity to grow to his full stature and be what he has it in him to be.

When this Nation began, a good many people would have said that the chief requirement to achieve that goal was freedom from political oppression.

Now we know that there are other and more subtle tyrants than kings or dictators.

Ignorance is such a tyrant. Poverty is another. Racial discrimination another. Physical illness or incapacity another. Mental illness another.

We are now engaged in a great national effort—and I don't just mean we in the Johnson Administration, though we're working hard at it, I mean all the men and women in and out of government who care about these things—a national effort on a scale never before witnessed in this Nation to combat *all* the conditions that prevent individual fulfilment or stunt human growth. Teachers, social workers, citizens who do volunteer work, and all others who work with the handicapped and disadvantaged know the extraordinary scope of the task we have undertaken.

It is an effort of breathtaking magnitude, worthy of free men. It is an effort that is almost totally unrecognized by the press and the public. It is an effort that is sometimes mismanaged and always seems inadequate.

But it serves the deepest and truest goals to be conceived by the hearts and minds of the American people.

Study the line from the Declaration of Independence that is carved inside the Jefferson Memorial "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor." If we ask ourselves whether there is anything today to which we would pledge "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor," I like to believe that for most of us the answer would be "yes," because I like to believe that there is such a thing as an American commitment, not to affluence, not to power, but to the release of human potential, the enhancement of individual dignity, the liberation of the human spirit.

Those are the great themes of our national life. Everything else is a means to these ends. And it is to those ends that we dedicate this school.

ROHR CORP. TO BUILD SST ENGINE PODS

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the Rohr Corp. of Chula Vista, Calif., recently won a subcontract to construct the pods which will contain the huge jet engines powering our supersonic transport—SST.

This significant award is only the latest in a long line of accomplishments by the company. The selection of Rohr for the subcontract, which could be worth up to $500 million, is really not surprising. Rohr has virtually locked up the market for pods for our new jet transports. Among the aircraft that have been or will be fitted with Rohr pods are the Boeing 707, 727, 737, and 747; the Douglas DC–8 and DC–9; the Lockheed C–141, C5–A, and JetStar, and the Grumman Gulfstream II.

The ambitious SST program, designed to thrust the United States to the forefront in the intense international competition to build the absolute airliner—obviously will be good business for Boeing, General Electric, Rohr, and the other firms that are undertaking the project.

Rohr, for example, will use about 500 employees on its share of the construction of two prototype SST's. I have been reliably informed that when the actual production program reaches full swing—hopefully in the mid-1970's—as many as 2,000 workers will be needed by Rohr. The company currently employs more than 8,500 persons at the Chula Vista plant.

Rohr also contemplates spending $5.4 million for new equipment to be used in the SST work and the addition of about 100,000 square feet in plant space for manufacturing.

But far more important than the impact on any individual locale or company is the contribution the SST will make to our national economy and to our position in the international trade arena.

By 1990, a market will exist for at least 650 SST's but more likely for as many as 1,100. In a praiseworthy collaboration, the Federal Government, the airlines, and the manufacturers have agreed to share in the $1.14 billion prototype investment. In helping get this program started, our Government is doing no more than the Governments of Britain, France, and Russia—all of which are aggressively backing the efforts of their own manufacturers to develop and build a first-line supersonic aircraft.

The investment our taxpayers are being asked to make in the SST certainly will not be money lost. The Government, in fact, will recoup its entire investment with delivery of the 300th airplane. By the 500th delivery, the United States will have recovered 6 percent interest on top of the original investment. It should be pointed out, also, that the United States, as a partner in this great endeavor, will continue to share in the profits until at least 15 years after certification.

As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I intend to provide every bit of support I can for this splendid program to shrink the world by permitting travelers to fly at nearly three times the speed of sound.

Under unanimous consent, I would like to insert at this point articles from the San Diego Union and the Chula Vista Star-News that describe Rohr's part in the SST development program:

[From the San Diego Union, May 4, 1967]

$15 Million Job Given Rohr in Superjet Plane—Will Build Pods for Engines

(By Carl Plain)

Pods to contain the huge engines of the U.S. supersonic transport will be built by Rohr Corp. in Chula Vista under a $15 million program announced yesterday.

Company forecasts indicated that about 500 employes will be involved in Rohr's work on the pair of 300-seat, 1,800-mile-an-hour prototypes to be manufactured by Boeing Co., Seattle, under a go-ahead from President Johnson.

Eventually, the SST program could mean more than a half billion dollars of business to Rohr, said Burt F. Raynes, president.

"The large and complex pod assemblies to house the 60,000-pound-thrust General Electric engines include a variable-geometry engine inlet," Raynes said.

"They represent a technology and production challenge we will be most pleased to undertake."

Rohr engineers already are working with Boeing on design details of the engine pods. The assemblies will include streamlined nacelles, ducting, electrical wiring fuel lines and other devices built up around the four General Electric engines.

Specialized facilities for the new program are being developed at the Chula Vista plant where Rohr's SST operations will be centered.

Company engineers have been working several years on advancing manufacturing technology to meet the structural and material demands of supersonic flight.

High speeds and resulting heat from air passing over the plane's surfaces prohibit the use of ordinary materials, so much of the SST will be built of titanium alloys that resist heat better than aluminum but weigh less than steel.

Rohr has been producing titanium parts for other aircraft since the start of Boeing's B–52 bomber program in 1952. Titanium forming and sizing facilities in the Chula Vista plant are being expanded to handle added volume.

The SST's four engine pods will be mounted under the horizontal tail. As the plane approaches an airport, the variable-geometry air inlet will help reduce engine noise by choking out high-pitched sound from the compressors.

[From the Chula Vista Star-News, May 4, 1967]

Rohr Is Awarded Major Contract

A $15 million contract to manufacture propulsion pods for the U.S. supersonic transport has been awarded to Rohr Corp. of Chula Vista by Boeing Co. of Seattle it was learned yesterday.

News of the contract cames in a joint announcement by Rep. Lionel Van Deerlin (D-San Diego), and Burt F. Raynes, Rohr president.

The contract calls for manufacture of propulsion pods for two SST prototype aircraft.

The pods will house 60,000 pound thrust engines manufactured by General Electric, a prime contractor with Boeing on the SST.

On the basis of Boeing and Federal Aviation Agency sales forecasts, Rohr's participation in the SST program could mean more than a half-billion dollars in business for the company through the life of the program.

Rohr's SST operations will be centered at the Chula Vista plant, where specialized facilities are being developed for the program. Forecasts show that some 500 employees may be involved as the production phase of the SST program develops.

"We are very proud of this selection as a part of the Boeing team on the supersonic transport," Raynes said. "The large and complex pod assemblies to house the 60,000-pound-thrust engines include the variable geometry engine inlet. They represent a technology and production challenge we will be most pleased to undertake."

This is one of the largest aero-space contracts let in the county in recent years, Van Deerlin said.

Rohr is one of seven firms selected by Boeing to receive more than $165 million in subcontracts for work on the SST prototypes.

Rohr engineers have been working for several years on development of Rohr's manufacturing technology to meet the materials and structural requirements of supersonic flight.

Since the high speed and resulting skin friction temperatures of the SST prohibit use of conventional aircraft materials, much of the aircraft will be built of titanium alloys—material lighter than steel but offering substantially greater heat resistance than aluminum.

Rohr has been involved in production of titanium parts for other aircraft dating back to the start of the Boeing B–52 program in 1952 and is now expanding its titanium forming and sizing facilities to handle the additional volume created by the SST and other new programs.

Rohr engineers are already working with Boeing on the detailed design of the huge pods for the SST.

The four pods will be mounted under the horizontal tail and will be fitted with variable-geometry air inlets that will help reduce noise on airport approach by "choking" out high-pitched sound from the engine compressors.

The Boeing supersonic transport design features a variable-sweep integrated wing which combines with a large horizontal tail to form a single lifting surface for supersonic flight.

Aerodynamically, the wing will permit the Boeing SST to be three airplanes in one—a supersonic speedster capable of cruising at Mach 2.

SOUTH AFRICA'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the Republic of South Africa celebrates its sixth birthday and on behalf of the American people and my colleagues in the Congress, I extend best wishes to all the peoples of South Africa on the occasion of this anniversary. At the same time, in the spirit of brotherhood of all mankind, let me express my earnest hope that the "winds of change" which seem to be beginning to blow in that part of the great continent of Africa will continue in velocity. If so, a beneficial effect will be felt all over Africa.

Although Americans deplore South Africa's racial policy, and although as American delegates to the United Nations so often have declared we never in good conscience can condone her position on apartheid because it is degrading to a large portion of her population, these do not forbid the exchange of amenities on anniversary occasions. I am firm in my faith that dialog and the rule of law can achieve the objectives that we all desire.

South Africa has served as our loyal ally on past occasions and hopefully will be on our side in the future in the cause of peace or war. She is the natural repository of the large portion of the free world's gold, uranium, chromium, manganese, and diamonds. U.S. interests have invested well over $600 million in her mines and factories. In some instances I am advised that U.S. firms have been in the forefront in introducing progressive labor practices and employing nonwhite labor at high job and skill classification.

During the past year tragedy struck high in the Government of the Republic of South Africa with the brutal assassination of the Prime Minister. There were many who felt that the new Prime Minister would pursue even more ruthlessly his Government's policy of apartheid. This may not be the case. The world is watching the actions of Prime Minister Vorster and his seeming effort to improve his country's image.

We hear now that South Africa has agreed to allow multiracial teams in Olympic events and permit tours in South Africa of foreign teams that include some nonwhite players. We hear now that the Government has indicated that some white investment might be allowed in African institutions, another slight departure from total apartheid. Gestures like these, however modest, have received some response. Robert Gardiner, distinguished Ghanaian, has suggested that South Africa be readmitted to the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. He is executive secretary of the ECA, from which South Africa was expelled in 1964.

I look forward to the day, not many anniversaries away, when all Africa, including the Republic of South Africa, whose birthday we celebrate today, will work toward a common goal of making the continent truly a land of destiny and of racial equality.

MEMORIAL DAY IN THE SECOND DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I report to my colleagues in the House on the inspiring manner in which Memorial Day was observed in the community of Calumet Park in the district that I have the honor to represent.

From the bottom of my heart I congratulate, commend, and thank Commander Paul Luisi and all the 384 members of Calumet Park Post 1156 of the American Legion. I am not in position to state with proved accuracy that it was the best and finest community observance of Memorial Day in all the land, but I am sure that none could have surpassed it. It was truly a pattern for all the communities of our country. It was in the finest traditions of American patriotism.

The parade passed through business and residential sections, the lawns of homes alive with men, women, and children. Among those on the speaker's stand were Tony Pizza, mayor of the village of Calumet Park, Jack DePlanche, Bob Griffin, Roy Logan, Harry Murauski, Casey Drozdowski, and John Bedorcin, trustees of the village. Village Clerk Mary Hodgson, Municipal Judge James Sparing, Committeeman Lawrence Petta, Commander Dan Sullivan of Calumet Memorial Camp of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Irene Gipta, president of American Legion Auxiliary Unit 1156, Father Madden of Seven Holy Founders Church, Rev. Dr. Swenson of the Community Covenant Church, Attorney Michael Hinko, and Col. John P. Gibbons of the U.S. Army, orator of the day. Judges of the parade were Nancy Kapp, June Orlowski, Ida Hathaway, and Ev Shields.

The parade consisted of 68 units in five sections. The organization of a parade of this size and quality requires a tremendous amount of coordinated effort and hard, hard work. I am extending my remarks to include the order of the parade that my colleagues may have some idea of the truly wonderful accomplishment of a post of the American Legion, with a membership of 384, working under the creed of the American Legion "My God and Country."

MEMORIAL DAY PARADE LINEUP

LEAD SECTION

All fire units.
All police units.
Car with Congressman Barratt O'Hara.
Car with Mayor Tony Pizza.
Car with Col. John P. Gibbons, U.S. Army.
Cars with Gold Star Mothers and Blue Star Mothers.

FIRST SECTION

U.S. Marine Color Guard.
Calumet Park American Legion Color Guard Post #1156 (Blue Devils).
Calumet Park V.F.W. Color Guard Post #8774.
Calumet Park American Legion Post members Post #1156.
Calumet Park American Legion Auxiliary Unit #1156.
Calumet Park American Legion SAL Squadron #1156.
Calumet Park V.F.W. Post members Post #8774.
U.S. Navy Band from Great Lakes Training Center.
Commander Wm. "Clem" O'Brian of the 8th Dist. American Legion Dept. of Illinois and Officers.
Phillips Photo Float.
Majorette Judy Bond.
Thornridge Lassies Majorettes.
Calumet Park Rams A. C. Float.
Calumet Park Chamber of Commerce.
Peppermint Majorettes (with car).
U.S. Army Recruiting Van.
Community Covenant Church Float.
Calumet Park Hardware Float.
B.S.A. Troop #792 led by Mr. Walter Kaiser.

SECOND SECTION

Napleton Motors Horse Cart, Mr. Ed Napleton.
Southwest Shrine Club, horses and "pooper scooper."
Evergreen Park Rangerettes.
The Silhouettes from Lucella's School of Twirling.
Cub Scout Pack #3788 Jr.
Cub Scout Pack #3788 Float.
3rd Batt., 122nd Arty., 33rd Div. of the Ill. National Guard under Capt. Orsi.
Boy Scout Troop #744—Jr.
The Jr. Band from Dwight D. Eisenhower "Old Main" High School.
Lar Daly.
Color Guard from Roseland Post #49 American Legion.
Kosciuszcko Post #30 PLAV.
Kosciuszcko Post #30 PLAV Auxiliary.
Monarch Laundry Float.

THIRD SECTION

Calumet Memorial Post #330 of the American Legion, Color Guard.
Marching Sts. from Harvey American Legion Post #155 Color Guard.
Tinley Park American Legion Post #615 Color Guard.
Park Forest American Legion Post #1198 Color Guard.
Illiana Post #220 American Legion Jr. Band.
Stanley J. Sukta Post #5414 V.F.W. Jr. Color Guard.
Stanley J. Sukta Post #5414 V.F.W. Sr. Color Guard.
Calumet Park Little League Baseball Team.
Roseland Moose Lodge #1062 Float and Clowns.
Whirling Debs Majorettes.
Calumet Park Women's Civic Club.

FOURTH SECTION

Ko-Tam-Ta Campfire Girls led by Mrs. Flieth.
Civil Air Patrol.
Yvonne's Royal Lancers Majorettes (with sound car).
Calumet Park Drugs.
B.S.A. Troop #788 led by Mr. Eugene Ratysik.
Calumet Park Troublemakers A.C.
Bluebird Campfire Girls.
Pope John Council of K.C.
Indianapolis Pacesetter Car courtesy Tony Piet.
The Jesters Drum and Bugle Corps from Mt. Greenwood.
Lois Riney's Campfire Girls.
Ravae's Dynamics Majorettes.
Seven Holy Founders Church.

FIFTH SECTION

Imperial Majorettes.
U.S. Navy Recruiting Car.
J. & R. Bike Retanl, 6 bikes.
Calumet Park Teen Club.
Chicago Civil Defense Truck.
Cub Scout Pack #3792 led by Mr. Bob Riney.
Polish Womans Alliance Majorettes, "The Garlando".
Hegewish Raiders Jr. Color Guard.
The Shannon Rovers, Irish Pipe Band.
The U.S.A.F. "BOMARC" Missile.

ON BELIEVING THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that there is a great dissatisfaction in our Nation regarding the Vietnam war. Much of this frustration can be placed at the door of our President and Mr. McNamara who have not been honest with the American people. We all know that Mr. Johnson made a political football out of the Vietnam war during the 1964 presidential election. In his effort to deride and defeat Senator Goldwater he attacked the suggestion by the Republican nominee that the United States carry out escalated military operations to bring the war to a conclusion and minimize our losses. Mr. Johnson's chickens are coming home to roost.

The policies he is now carrying out are those that he ridiculed in 1964, although with indecision and bungling. The American people—both the left and the right—clearly do not trust our Commander in Chief. The major frustration in our country today over this war is due to President Johnson's deceptive and insincere statements. To repeat his past pronouncements of his intended policy and endeavor to square them to what he is now advocating brings sadness to all of us who believe that we should be able to respect and support our President. He clearly does not deserve to have us ratify his mistakes and offer excuses to fill his credibility gap.

The latest casualty reports indicate that over 300 men died in the last week of the war and more than 2,800 were listed as casualties. Our boys are being sacrificed as cannon fodder while the Johnson administration fiddles. President Johnson reminds me of the old line fireman who thought the way to put out the fire was to bring the water level above the fire. In this case he is escalating our troop commitments—something he said he would not do but has consistently gone back on his word. Possibly he and Mr. McNamara think that we can win by using our troops like the old fireman used the water but at any rate the American people are getting increasingly sick of such folly. Failure to use our superior military power and the subordination of the best interest of our troops to State Department political decisions are putting our boys in the position of sheer cannon fodder.

I cannot feel sorry for the American liberals and peace advocates who were misled by Mr. Johnson. They should have known better and they got what they deserved. Unfortunately, the rest of us got it with them. I feel sorry for the boys who are being sacrificed at the altar of expediency and while I support our basic commitment to Vietnam and believe we must check Communist aggression, I resent the deception of Mr. Johnson and Mr. McNamara and disassociate myself completely from their policy of putting our fighting men last in their considerations. They are far more worried about what India thinks, how the U.N. will react, how to placate the "peace" Senators and liberals at home, and 1968, than they are in basic decisions as to what is in the best military interest of our fighting men. Politics rates first, our boys last. At the root of the administration difficulty is the failure to clearly perceive the true nature of communism and to follow soft line policies.

In Sunday's New York Times, Judge Henry W. Edgerton wrote an interesting letter indicating the disaffection of those of Mr. Edgerton's liberal persuasion. To repeat, I cannot feel sorry for those who fell for Mr. Johnson's line in 1964 but it is at least meritorious to consider some of the statements Mr. Johnson made which misled considerable numbers of voters who, like Judge Edgerton, voted for him in 1964. The letter follows:

[From the New York Times, May 28, 1967]

"Commitment" in South Vietnam

To the Editor:

President Johnson has said "We are there because we have a promise to keep"; "we are committed"; "America keeps its word." Many Americans in and out of Congress share his illusion that he is America and "the country is committed." Only a declaration of war or an explicit treaty can commit America to an armed conflict. This war is not declared, justified by any treaty or consistent with the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Johnson seeks to use his two predecessors as examples. But President Eisenhower sent no fighting men and President Kennedy sent few. He said of the Vietnamese: "It is their war. They are the ones who have to win or lose it. We can help them, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it, the people of Vietnam." Only President Johnson has sent hundreds of thousands of men.

ELECTION PROMISE

During the election campaign Mr. Johnson promised not to enlarge the war and not to go north. He said: "I have had advice to load our planes with bombs and to drop them on certain areas that I think would enlarge the war. . . . I haven't chosen to enlarge the war"; "There are those that say you ought to go north and drop bombs. . . . We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys"; "We are not going north and we are not going south; we are going to continue to try to get them to save their own freedom with their own men, with our leadership and our officer direction, and such equipment as we can furnish them"; "We are not going to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves."

Many of us voted for him as a peace candidate. After the election he enlarged the war and went north.

In giving the Medal of Honor to a soldier's widow he implied that but for dissenters the man would not have been killed. As Walter Lippmann said, "The obvious rebuttal to the President's use of the heroes is that if Mr. Johnson had remained true to the policy on which he was elected . . . Sergeant Connor would be alive today."

WEAKNESS OF CASE

As Senator McGovern said, "In trying to imply that it is American dissent which is causing the Vietnamese to continue the war, the Administration is only confessing the weakness of its own case by trying to silence its critics and confuse the American people. It is not the impact of the dissent on Hanoi that worries the Administration; it is the fact that the dissenters have exposed the contradictions, the falsehoods, and the resulting credibility gap which surrounds Administration policy."

The Secretary of State said in Vietnam, "We are here because we made a promise. . . . If Moscow or Peking ever discovers that the promises of the United States do not mean what they say, then this world goes up in smoke." Any one who reads the public record with an open mind cannot fail to discover that the promises of President Johnson do not mean what they say.

Henry W. Edgerton.

Washington, *May 23 1967*.

(Note.—The writer is Senior Circuit Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia circuit.)

ADDRESS BY HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a speech by the Honorable Burt L. Talcott.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from the 12th District of California, Representative Burt L. Talcott, was recently honored by the American Teens Against Cancer—ATAC—a youth subdivision of the American Cancer Society, for his unusual and effective work in encouraging teenagers not to smoke.

We can all appreciate the special concern and extra effort of busy Members of Congress who take the time to work with students in the improvement of their health. Mr. Talcott is to be commended for his contribution in this area.

Representative Talcott was the principal speaker at the annual ATAC awards conference here in Washington, D.C. His speech to the assembled award winners and student workers is worth calling to the attention of all teenagers, their parents and the public generally, and to local, State, and Federal legislators.

I am therefore submitting his speech for inclusion at this point in the Record:

Address by Mr. Talcott

Young ladies and gentlemen, fellow citizens: I greatly appreciate this opportunity to talk with you. It is not often that I have an audience like you—one that is young, enthusiastic and openminded—but more importantly, one that is united by a single interest. I commend you for your dedication to the fight against cancer. It is encouraging to find teenagers not only aware of the gravity of the situation, but anxious to do something concrete about it.

Last year I noticed that the television networks were overlooking some excellent antismoking spot announcements prepared as a public service by the American Cancer Society. There were many reasons that prompted me to instigate a Congressional inquiry into the situation. To begin with, I have long been concerned with the medical, financial and social detriments of smoking. However, there is much more to consider than the individual smoker. The effect of smoke, and smokers, on *society* is a topic that must not be ignored. But I would like to address myself first to the effects upon the individual.

The amount of money spent each year on cigarettes, cigars and pipes is astronomical. Americans smoke 541 billion cigarettes a year—that's eight a day for *every* man, woman and child of every age. Computed one way, this is about 10 cents a day *each*, or $180.00 a year for a family of five—over a period of 40 years this is over $7,250.00 or the equivalent of three good automobiles or a good airplane. This staggering figure does not include cigar or pipe smoking. Money spent on tobacco products in 1966 exceeded $9,210,000,000. This is more than three and one-half times the projected federal budget for *education* during the coming fiscal year, and twice the budget for Space Research and Technology.

Other out-of-pocket costs of smoking—the expense of shopping and supplies, of cleaning clothes, homes and offices—the extra costs of mouthwashes and dental care—the enormous costs of damaged or ruined clothes—ties, sweaters, suits and party dresses—may *exceed* the costs of the tobacco. *No one* can estimate the loss of furniture, cars, homes, office buildings or forests destroyed by careless cigarette smoking. I challenge anyone to estimate this loss at less than *twice* the cost of tobacco.

One of the strongest arguments against smoking, I believe, is the danger it poses to your health. Cigarette smoking is regarded as the most important cause of chronic bronchitis and a significant factor in cancer of the larynx. Cigarette smoking, based on clinical and autopsy studies, animal experimentation and population surveys, *does* constitute a definite risk to health. A nation-wide survey indicates that *smokers* spend more than a *third* more time away from their work, because of illness, than *non*-smokers. What more evidence is needed? An overwhelming majority of physicians and researchers will admonish, "Don't smoke; if you don't smoke, don't start; if you must smoke, be moderate."—Smokers are suckers!

The dangers of smoking are recognized all over the world—the Royal College of Physicians in Great Britain, the World Health Organization, the United States Public Health Service, the American Medical Association—*all* conclude that cigarette smoking is a serious health hazard. *No* agency or organization has yet given evidence that smoking is salubrious or healthful.

Manufacturers may denicotinize, and filter the tars; but this can only reduce, not eliminate, the hazards. And the hazards include loss of life—not only from indirect internal diseases, but often from burns or asphyxiation from fires started by carelessly disposed cigarettes. I doubt that any adult is lucky enough *not to* know someone who was killed in this way. I have known four.

There is another aspect of smoking that is seldom considered by smokers—that is the *rudeness* of the habit. Smokers seem to believe their behavior is so common that consideration of another's sensitivities is unimportant. They suffer from the same syndrome that permits some people to believe that washing and bathing are not socially necessary.

I recently attended a high level seminar on the subject of *air* pollution. In this meeting, 8 of the 12 persons smoked something—the air in our meeting room became so polluted that a smoker became dizzy and finally asked permission to open the windows and door to let in some fresh air. I thought this was a strange twist—no one asked permission to foul the others' air, but one had to ask permission to let some fresh air in! The pollution index of our room would have triggered a major alert if it had been out on the street.

But what can *we*, as individuals, do? There are *two* powerful forces in America working against us—1) the government, at all levels, and 2) the mass advertising media. But public opinion and the truth are on our side.

During the last session of the Congress we passed a labeling bill which required the printing of "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health" on each cigarette package. Rather than a benefit to the smoker, the whole legislation is a boon to the tobacco interests—simply because it is so misleading. Most people believe that if smoking were truly "hazardous," their government would say so directly—and would prohibit the further use, sale or distribution of tobacco, like it does with other harmful products. So, because the Government did *not* come out with a *direct* denunciation, but simply a "maybe," the smoker is lulled into a false sense of security. The smoker's reaction is, "Well, it must not be too dangerous. I'll take my chances." So the smoker has not been deterred and the manufacturing of cigarettes and cigars increases. However, this is not the only result of the legislation. Tobacco manufacturers have not only retained their customers, but they were given *special protection* by the law.

Let me point out one example. Before the labeling legislation, law suits against tobacco manufacturers were being filed, *and won*, to recover money compensation for injuries and deaths caused by tobacco use. Now recovery is no longer legally possible. Every smoker has been technically warned of the hazards to his health. This is called "assumption of the risk"—a complete defense for the wrongdoer or tortfeasor. In law, if an injured party knows of a danger, and still proceeds, he is said to have assumed the risk and can recover nothing.

This warning label on cigarettes, not only aided the tobacco companies, but it put Congress in a rather ambiguous, if not duplicitous, position. Despite the labeling legislation, the Federal Government continues to *subsidize* the growing of tobacco. In 1966, $332,741 of your tax dollars were channeled into this industry. Now can you imagine a situation more incongruous than a government subsidizing an industry about which it feels compelled to warn its citizens?

When I started to discuss the role of our Government, I said that we are confronted by the Government *at all levels*. By this I meant that the Congress is not the only culprit—*local* and *state* governments were also involved, although in a less obvious and more indirect way.

When the Congress was considering the cigarette package labeling bill, local governments pleaded with Congress not to do anything which would jeopardize one of their principal sources of taxes—tobacco products. My state of California, for instance, received over $76,000,000 in cigarette revenues in 1966, and this figure does not even include revenue from cigar or other tobacco products. So local officials were culpable along with Federal officials in the passage of the mischievous legislation.

The second important force confronting us is the news and advertising media, which also have an interest in keeping tobacco on the market. In 1966 alone, newspapers, magazines, radio and TV stations, received over $276 million from the advertisement of this one product. 76.9 percent of this total was spent on television announcements. Regrettably, their social conscience and their concern for the public health does not yet equal their avarice for money. How much evidence or persuasion will be necessary to change their advertising morality (or lack of it) is not yet known. It is ironical how persistent the news media are in stressing a "morality" in areas of "civil rights" and Vietnam; yet where there is a pecuniary profit, the morality of the issue is ignored. It appears that where there are thoughts of money in coffers, there are few concerns for people in coffins.

All of these factors: the medical and financial costs of smoking to the smoker; the deleterious effects of smoking on society—what it does to our air, our forests and homes; the degrading effect of the legislation on the Congress—putting it in an ambiguous position; and the *special* favor done for the tobacco industry—giving it legal protection—all stimulated my concern on this issue.

Last summer I discovered that the American Cancer Society had some excellent public service films on the subject of smoking, and that the networks, out of fear of losing the patronage of the tobacco companies, were not using them. Following my Congressional inquiry, however, the networks began using the anti-smoking announcements more frequently. This was gratifying. I am now studying the policy of the "equal time" doctrine—which was once thought to apply only to opposing political candidates on controversial issues. I hope that equal time might be allowed as a matter of policy or regulation to opponents of liquor and tobacco advertising as well as political opponents.

This was one of my reactions to the problem of smoking; but the dilemma is far from solved. We have enormous obstacles ahead of us, and your enthusiasm and interest can help overcome them.

I have two *specific* suggestions for your *constructive* action—to complement the many good things you are already doing.

1) Become more active in your communities—your school, your town, your church. Don't *just* read, attend conferences and talk with other non-smokers. In this venture, you must convert others. Talking with like-minded people does not convert others—although it does bolster our own reasoning and our esprit.

Form a committee to accumulate new ideas, to formulate plans and to carry out your projects. Enlarge your group, include the respected and influential students. Set good examples. Work with your teachers, the sponsors of school organizations—PTA officials, the clergy, the medical society. It may surprise you how sympathetic and cooperative the influential people and leaders will be.

I would like to suggest that your committees call upon public officials or influential civic leaders, *who smoke*. Schedule a meeting with them, share with them some of the facts, explain the power of example, and urge them to stop smoking "as an example for our youth." Such flattery, attention, publicity and a sincere appeal to their concern for student and public health *can*, I believe, have considerable impact. If only *one* promised to quit, as a public service to youth, you would have achieved a great victory. His quitting would focus attention upon the hazards of smoking; it would cause some to reconsider the benefits of quitting, or of *not* starting. You would have another ally—maybe a *key* ally the next time the city council increases the cigarette taxes or when the newspaper of the Chamber of Commerce considers tobacco advertising. Some leaders may be unwilling, or unable, to stop smoking—yet they may willingly denounce smoking—and their denouncement can be helpful to your cause. Even if you *fail* to convert *one* smoker, you will have gained an invaluable experience in the art of persuasion and the science of community action. Every success will fire your committee to more effort and more successes. Other youth committees will take up your practices. You *can* be persuasive with *adult* leaders, if you will only *try*.

2) My next suggestion is similar—it is activist; it requires teamwork and it involves politics. Every teenager should become active in politics. Political campaigns afford good opportunities to raise issues. Smoking is an issue of public concern as well as of personal commitment. Youth may not have the expertise to get involved on issues like Vietnam, balance of payments, or Federal aid to education, but you *are* experts on smoking and you have the essential concern. Actually, if *you* don't raise the issue, few others will.

So your committee should support the non-smoker candidate; you should work actively for him and tell the others why. Don't treat the election, or the issue, as a gimmick—be serious, be professional, try to be politically effective. This is one of the best opportunities I know for you to "sell" your views and to obtain some very practical political *experience* which will stand you in good stead in future political campaigns. You might even discover your future professional career or your bent for public service.

In addition to effective gains for your *cause*, you will achieve many valuable fringe benefits for your *community* and for yourself. Just as importantly, your work in the political arena and your direct involvement with the leaders of your community, will be exciting and fun.

I also want to pass along *two* reminders: One is that anything an adult can do, *you* can do also. You should work with adults—it is good experience for you; it is encouragement for them. Their experience and knowledge will complement your zest and action. But, you don't have to wait until you are 21, or until you graduate, or until you can vote, to be effective. You need only a goal, a commitment, and a willingness to *work* for that goal—age, wealth, and background are not important.

A second reminder—education to discourage cigarette smoking must begin with children in *junior* high school, or younger. The scare of cancer and other health hazards which finally catch up and kill in middle age, do not impress youngsters.

The conduct of parents may be the greatest influence—but do not minimize the influence you teenagers have upon *pre*-teenagers; it is enormous, for both good and bad. When you have this opportunity, you have a commensurate responsibility. So, I repeat, set good examples.

We have many people to reach in this crusade to eliminate or reduce the health and social hazards of smoking—the pre-teenagers, your own peers, your parents and other adults, the leaders and opinion shapers! *Teenagers* can effectively influence these groups—if they will only apply their knowledge and talents.

You have two of the toughest and most powerful adversaries in this crusade—the governments and the news and advertising media. But don't despair; this should only intensify the challenge. You have two of the most powerful allies—the truth and public opinion.

All of the educational materials will go for naught if we cannot develop some example setters, who are concerned with the esthetic, social and moral grounds for not smoking. This is your role and you are performing it well. I wish you increasing success.

STUDENTS VOW VIOLENCE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to an article from the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader of May 16 entitled "Students Vow Violence," by Arthur C. Egan, Jr., which describes how some students plan to spend the coming long, hot summer. The second article in this series is unfortunately unavailable at this time and will be inserted later.

I think every law-abiding citizen will agree that this article is both anger-provoking and depressing. The account opens with this quote:

> We students are going to change the whole way of life in this country. We're going to do as we want, when we want and how we want. Let anyone try to stop us and they'll have a riot on their hands.

Of course the speaker quoted above was speaking only for a small but disruptive segment of our youth, but a whole system of permissive educational theories stands indicted as contributing to this present condition.

As for those planning this type of unlawful activity, it must be made clear that their long, hot summer might possibly be spent in a short, hot prison cell.

I insert the above-mentioned article in the Record at this point:

STUDENTS VOW VIOLENCE

(By Arthur C. Egan, Jr.)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—"We students are going to change the whole way of life in this country. We're going to do as we want, when we want and how we want. Let anyone try to stop us and they'll have a riot on their hands."

"Why man, we've got it made for sure this summer—we'll show the 'fuzz' just who the real boss is before it's over. Who is going to stop us, the police, the soldiers? Just you let them try it, we'll take over everything."

"We've got the people on the run. People quake with fear when they see demonstrations—the real honest 'johns' run for home. Yeah, we'll run things this year for sure."

"When you want something just take it; if you can't get it start a riot, but be sure there are 'blacks' in the mob. That'll keep the cops out; when a fuzz sees a black he just stands there and looks."

NOT A DAMN THING

"We are not going to do one damn thing we don't want to do—and no one is going to make us or we'll burn everything in sight."

These startling statements, these cold, matter-of-fact remarks, made in a callous manner with no pangs of conscience or remote thought of remorse, were not made by boys and girls from a ghetto. No indeed! They were made by students from three of Massachusetts' most respected institutions of learning, Harvard University and Radcliffe College, both in Cambridge and Smith College in Northampton.

Happily, not all the students in these famous institutions are sympathetic to the Vietniks, nor by any means are all students merely indifferent, or apathetic.

I was put in contact with leaders of a student group calling itself "Sons of Liberty." The name is taken from the historic pre-Revolutionary War followers of Sam Adams and other great Boston patriots who staged the Boston Tea Party and other events which led to the struggle for American independence.

The Sons of Liberty, 1967 version, is a Harvard-based group which says it is "the only 100 per cent pro-American organization on the Harvard campus."

AIMS EXPLAINED

The leader explained to me the aims of his group saying:

"We believe this country is in a fight for its life. Most of the faculty here are so liberal-minded they would see this nation destroyed just to gain their own ends. We intend to do all we can to prevent just such a thing from happening."

"On April 15 a group of students, both males and females, gathered in Freedom Square to attend the anti-war rally in New York City. Some students here expressed their views openly by playing a record of Kate Smith singing 'God Bless America'—they hung out a banner saying, 'American Overall' and unfurled a large American flag," said the spokesman.

"Believe it or not but the Harvard University police made the students stop playing the record, made them take in their banner and ordered them to take down the American flag," said the Sons of Liberty spokesman heatedly.

"We'll be damned if we will take down the American flag," Harvard police were told. The officers decided to not press the issue when they saw it would lead to a possible fight between the students and police.

"They didn't tell those damned anti-Americans to stop their music nor take down their banners saying things against the United States. So they (the police) must have had their orders from the university administration," said the spokesman.

TAKEN ON TOUR

The Sons of Liberty took this reporter on a tour of the Harvard campus pointing out the student activity undermining this nation's war effort in Vietnam. It was going on in the dining halls, the dormitories and the campus gathering spots. Everywhere there was anti-United States activity, literature against the Vietnam War, pamphlets on how to get to Canada and escape the draft, suggestions on how to organize and carry out demonstrations on a subject.

I asked and was shown college-patronized eating establishments in Cambridge where contact might be made with both male and female students from the Harvard area.

For three days and nights, I, dressed in old clothes, with a suede cap covering this fast-thinning hair, posed as a "recruiter of demonstrators against the Vietnam War."

For three days and nights I associated with a variety of students, the majority of whom were some of the most repulsive human beings he ever met—repulsive not only from the standpoint of personal hygiene but also from their views and opinions on life itself, and repulsive from their own personal aims in life.

As clearly as possible, without disclosing the names of the students involved, this reporter will relate some of the quotes gained from talks with these creatures.

HALPERN AMENDMENT TO GIVE WOMEN EQUAL RIGHTS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the worst of many forms of second-class citizenship imposed upon the women of America is discrimination against working women under the Social Security Act.

On March 2, 1967, I introduced a joint resolution in this House proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prevent the Nation, or any State, from denying equality of rights under law on account of sex.

That is an old debt we owe to the ladies, and one that should be paid promptly. But, without waiting for the long process of constitutional amendment, let us act at once now to end discrimination in our social security system.

The social security years are the most difficult time of life to bear such injustice. It is within our power to end it. Let us do so speedily.

Today, I have introduced an amendment to the Social Security Act, similar to the one introduced on May 8, 1967, by the distinguished Congresswoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths] to end some of the most callous discriminations against working women.

Under existing law, a working wife or widow must draw social security benefits either as a wife or a widow or as a worker, whichever is greater. Frequently, that works out so that a husband and wife who have worked, draw lower social security benefits together than do couples in which only the husband has worked.

What is even more unjust, if the salary base on which social security taxes are paid is increased, as the President has asked, the discrimination against such working couples will be even greater.

Under present law, a widow with two minor children, who receives the highest social security benefits, loses $1,296 in benefits if she works and earns the mean average wage for women in covered employment.

Further, her added costs for lunches, transportation to her job, and clothing come out of the meager $2,000 left to her, and this certainly adds up to a cruel and unjust tax against womanhood.

The amendment I propose today would provide these changes to correct these injustices:

First, it would permit working couples to pool their credits and draw higher social security benefits on the basis of such combined credits, if they wish to.

Second, widows with minor children could earn income without reducing monthly benefits.

And, third, husbands, widowers, and children of working women would be entitled to the same benefits now granted to wives, widows, and children of men workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in this House to do everything in their power to see that these just changes in an unjust law be enacted.

RESOLUTION BY THE OHIO REPUBLICAN DELEGATION IN THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 17 the Ohio Republican delegation in the House unanimously adopted a resolution calling attention to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's failure to enforce the Truth in Negotiating Act, which is so important to the taxpayers of our Nation. The Congress, the administration and the public should know about this resolution. It speaks for itself. Because this is a subject so vitally affecting all Americans, the Ohio Republican delegation has taken this unusual means of bringing it to public attention. As chairman of that delegation, I am reporting to all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Senator Proxmire, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, and our colleague, the Honorable Thomas Curtis, ranking minority member of that joint committee, have already examined this issue in recent public hearings. I would like to see their efforts continue, and I would hope that other committees—particularly those dealing with the Defense Department—see fit to pursue this matter as well so the executive branch becomes aware that it is the unalterable will of Congress that the law be enforced and enforced adequately.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that a news story from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of May 23, which prints our resolution in full, giving suitable backgroud material, be inserted in the Record. The story follows:

Nineteen Ohioans Call McNamara "Lax"

(By Sanford Watzman)

Washington.—In an unusual action, all 19 Republican congressmen from Ohio asserted yesterday Defense Secretary Robert S. Mc-

Namara "has been lax about protecting the taxpayers."

The lawmakers adopted a resolution urging Congress and the GOP leadership to check into overpricing of war contracts resulting from alleged failure to enforce the 1962 Truth in Negotiating Act.

Ohio's Republican delegation is the largest in the House. Though its members meet regularly to discuss legislative business, this is the first time they have spoken publicly as a group on a major controversy.

McNamara is not accustomed to such criticism. Frequently, he must defend his judgment on Vietnam and other issues, but his great strength has been his image as an economizer—which is seldom challenged.

Rep. Jackson F. Betts, R–8, Findley, presented the resolution to the caucus. He is the party's regional whip in 13 midwestern states, including Ohio.

Rep. William E. Minshall, R–23, Lakewood, explained the resolution and called for its adoption. At a meeting of the defense appropriations subcommittee recently, Minshall questioned a McNamara aide. He reported he was not satisfied with the answers.

Here is the complete text of the resolution:

"The Ohio Republican delegation in the House resolves that rampant waste and inefficiency in the Executive Department must be investigated and congressional action taken to curb this abuse of taxpayers' dollars.

"While examples of mishandling of public funds have been uncovered in nearly every department and agency, the most costly waste takes place in the Department of Defense.

"A recent series of articles in The Plain Dealer by Sanford Watzman disclosed startling facts about overpricing of military contracts.

"Millions of dollars are being wasted each week because Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has been lax about protecting his department and the taxpayers against procurement deficiencies.

"We recommend that the Republican leadership in the House give attention to the urgency of this problem and seek appropriate action in the 90th Congress."

After the caucus, Rep. Donald F. Lukens, R–24, Middletown circulated the resolution among members who were unable to attend. They concurred, and a copy of the resolution was posted in the House press gallery yesterday.

Betts will bring it to the attention of GOP Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford of Michigan.

In the Senate, two Democrats have been firing away at McNamara, Sen. Stephen M. Young of Ohio has inserted The Plain Dealer articles in the Congressional Record. Sen. William Proxmire of Wisconsin has made them a subject of inquiry by his economy-in-government subcommittee.

THE PANAMA CANAL: OUR DILEMMA

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **BOLTON**. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to insert in the Record a very fine, thought-provoking speech by our colleague, the Honorable Leonor K. Sullivan, made on May 25 before the St. Louis World Trade Seminar, an all-day conference sponsored by the World Trade Club of St. Louis, the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, and the U.S. Department of Commerce. The subject of Mrs. Sullivan's speech, "The Panama Canal: Our Dilemma," is extremely important. There are few persons, if any, in or out of Congress who are more qualified to speak on this subject than our colleague, Mrs. Sullivan. Since 1957 she has been chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, but her interest in the canal, the Canal Zone area and the problems connected with it goes back many years before she came to the Congress. She knows this area, its importance, and she has very sound advice as to the best policy our Government should take to protect our own interests and at the same time deal with complete fairness to the Panamanians. I hope her speech will be read by many people, especially all Members of the House and the Senate.

The Panama Canal: Our Dilemma

(By Congresswoman Leonor G. Sullivan, Democrat, of Missouri, Chairman, U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Panama Canal)

It is most appropriate that this meeting today is taking place on water—aboard a ship—for the locale lends some symbolic significance to my reasons for flying in from Washington on a day when the House is in Session. In the 14 years in which I have served in the House of Representatives, I have seldom been away from Washington when the House was in Session unless my absence was very directly related to the work I do on one or another of the two important committees on which I serve in the Congress. This is such an occasion.

Most people in Washington can understand why I serve on the Committee on Banking and Currency and on the Subcommittees on Consumer Affairs, on Housing, and on Small Business. These assignments obviously fit in with my role as Representative for a major urban center and industrial center of the United States. But there is usually some surprise expressed over the fact that I am also the Ranking Member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Chairman of its Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, and a Member of the Subcommittees on the Coast Guard and on the Merchant Marine. What have these things got to do with St. Louis? I am frequently asked that question.

In this gathering here today, I think there is general understanding of the reasons why I have retained during all of these years in the House my membership on the Merchant Marine Committee and my interest in maritime affairs. So far, no ocean shipping seems to be able to navigate its way up the Mississippi River to St. Louis, although recently there have been some suggestions and proposals for constructing shallow draft all-aluminum vessels which could negotiate our great river and which could also maintain a fairly steady keel in ocean traffic. I don't know what success these designs will have, but, of course, all of us here look forward to the day when St. Louis can indeed be considered a port for ocean shipping. In the meantime, however, we are quite aware of the tremendous amount of commercial cargo which originates in the St. Louis area for destinations all around the world, or which comes here from abroad. That is why you are having *your* world trade conference here today and why there are so many people in the industries of St. Louis who are vitally interested in all aspects of world trade. World trade, of necessity, entails shipping and shipping, therefore, definitely becomes of great concern to St. Louis. Of course, many of our exports from St. Louis go by air freight and, in this week which marks the 40th anniversary of the arrival of the Spirit of St. Louis in Paris, with Charles A. Lindbergh at the controls, I would certainly be quite willing to acknowledge that the airplane is a most important factor in foreign trade. Its role will expand as ever-larger aircraft come out of the factories, and as our trade expands, but I don't think the day will ever come when we no longer need a merchant marine on the theory that all the cargoes can go by air.

Actually, the ships which are being built today—the ore carriers and the tankers, particularly—are of such vast size that I think it is safe to say ship capacity has been expanding proportionately in the same degree as airplane capacity. This creates difficult problems, of course, when there are disasters such as the one off the coast of England which fouled the beaches with a thick scum of oil. Ever-greater increases in cargo capacity mean, also, that more ships will no longer be able to use the Panama Canal. That is one of the reasons—but by no means the major reason—why we are now engaged very actively—very seriously—in the development of a new sea level canal to transit ships between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans in Central America. The fact is that even among those ships which are of a size suitable for transit through the Panama Canal, the volume of traffic across the Isthmus of Panama has been growing at such a steady pace that in a few years the delays occasioned by the heavy traffic load will make it worth while for some ships to take a longer route. The larger the ship, the more likely it is that extended delays in transit would justify an alternate route, because of the very heavy tolls that large-capacity ships now pay for use of the Panama Canal.

This is a factor which the officials of the Republic of Panama tend to forget when they agitate for substantial increase in Panama Canal tolls, in the hope that the increased revenue could then be diverted to the Panamanians. The Canal has been a tremendous source of revenue for the treasury of the Republic of Panama and also for the few families which control the wealth of that small country. But, as is well known, there is a prevailing feeling in Panama that all you have to do to increase revenues from the Canal is to raise the tolls anywhere from 50 to 400 percent and the world's shipping would pay the increases without any significant decline in traffic volume.

Just last week I conducted a hearing of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal at which time we heard a very interesting report by a group of economists from the Stanford Research Institute, which has been making a comprehensive study of the relationship between tolls and traffic in the Canal. This study clearly establishes that there *is* a point of no return in any revision of the Canal toll structure. This point would be reached somewhere between a 25% and 50% increase in toll rates.

Of course, any increase in tolls by the Panama Canal would be reflected immediately in increased revenues, but the revenue increases would be short-lived. The shipping interests would have a choice of a number of counter measures which they could take in minimizing the impact of an increase in Panama Canal tolls on their operations.

So the idea now so widespread in Panama that the Canal can be "milked" at an ever-increasing tempo in order to provide more of the good things for the people of Panama—or, at least, and this is more likely, much higher profits for the few families which control the country's economy—turns out to be largely wishful thinking. I don't know how much success we are going to have in selling that idea to the responsible leaders of the Panamanian Government, but we must certainly do everything we can to get the point across.

Because the industries of St. Louis have a very great stake in the outcome of the negotiations now going forward for the revision of our Treaty of 1903 with Panama, I would like to use this opportunity this afternoon to discuss some of the terribly complex and terribly worrisome aspects of this important issue. I think everyone here who knows anything about my record in the Congress knows I am not an isolationist; quite the contrary. I am strongly in favor of expanded international trade, and I have always supported the efforts of our government through both Republican and Democratic Administrations to help underdeveloped nations to build up their economies so they can take a place in the world commerce which would enable them to bring more of the good things of life to their own people. In connection with the controversy which has been going on for many years now with the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal, I am sometimes pictured as a colonialist or imperialist or something of that nature. One of the Spanish-language newspapers in Panama recently accused me of trying to promote violence and revolution in Panama. Well, of course, that is just nonsense.

I have a responsibility to the Congress of the United States and to the people of the United States in connection with our administration of the Canal Zone and our operation of the Panama Canal that weighs heavily upon me, and I have tried *not* to shirk that responsibility. The facts as I have described them in Committee reports and in speeches in the House of Representatives are not popular with the Panamanians and they also inspire a good deal of skepticism among groups in the United States who feel we have somehow "taken advantage" of a poor little country to impose our own selfish interests upon the Panamanians.

Let us acknowledge the fact that if Teddy Roosevelt were President of the United States today, the chances are very remote that he could have sent a warship down to the Isthmus of Panama, and in effect, wrested that country's independence from Colombia. Things were a little different on the international scene in 1903. Let us acknowledge the fact that we exercised some national muscle in acquiring our present rights in the Canal Zone. We will never be able to obtain the same kind of favorable deal from any country in Central America for the construction of a new sea level canal that we obtained in 1903 for the present Canal. Much has been written about the one-sidedness of the American deal with Panama in 1903, but in the 64 years since that date the benefits and advantages of our action in building the Canal have been anything but one-sided. What we paid originally for the rights to the Canal Zone may not have been enough. What we have paid since then as an annual rental for the Canal Zone also may not have been enough. On the other hand, I think it is safe to say that from the standpoint of the Panamanians, no matter what we might have paid—and no matter how much we were to pay now—it would not be enough. Panama wants the Canal. Any concession which falls short of ownership and control over the Canal would be insufficient as far as the Panamanians are concerned. This is a fact we must live with and recognize.

Under those circumstances, how far do we go in trying to appease an unappeasable appetite? Do we walk out of the Canal Zone and surrender the Canal? That is the only way we would ever convince the Panamanians that we were treating them fairly. They have built all of their nationalistic hopes and aspirations around that 50-mile long engineering marvel.

As long as we are aware of the fact that Panamanian nationalist objectives will never be satisfied short of a complete take-over—a solution no responsible American could possibly tolerate—what alternatives do we have for avoiding continual friction and strife in our administration of the Canal? Must we give in to whatever is demanded short of a full surrender of the Canal? I don't think so.

The President has indicated his willingness to negotiate away our rights "in perpetuity" to the 10-mile-wide Canal Zone, and to give the Panamanian government or its representatives an increasingly larger voice in the operation of the Canal itself. I believe a Treaty based on such concessions would be a disaster for American commerce and a very serious threat to hemispheric defense. Members of the House of Representatives have *no* powers, under the Constitution, to block the ratification of Treaties—that is a power reserved to the Senate only. On the House side, we could block the legislation which would be needed to carry out a ratified Treaty, but this would be mischievous and perhaps dangerous to responsible government. We did not do that in 1955, even though the Treaty negotiated at that time was denounced by nearly all of us in the House as a major blunder which we predicted would reap the very harvest of additional pressures and demands and concessions which now confront us.

So we must now turn to public opinion, to explain the dilemma and to build up public opposition to the kind of treaty now being negotiated, in the hopes of stopping it before it is signed, or blocking its ratification in the Senate. Both are honorable courses.

What are the alternatives to the pending treaty's provisions which I have described as a disaster for American commerce and a threat to hemispheric defense? Well, first of all, of course, we could do nothing. That is not a very good solution—and it certainly is not what I counsel. Three years ago, when inspired riots broke out in Panama, climaxed by a march on the Canal Zone and a state of anarchy on the borders of the Zone, and there was shooting and bloodshed, we were fully within our rights to resist the rioters and to return the fire. The incident which set off the rioting was a clash of youngsters over a Panamanian flag flying over a Canal Zone school. This was no more worthy of an outbreak of shooting than the episode in New York's Central Park recently involving the burning of an American Flag by opponents of the war in Viet Nam. Both episodes were emotional excesses, of the kind which should be handled by firmness in dealing with juvenile irresponsibility.

Even though every objective investigation of the events which led to the rioting in Panama in 1964 cleared the United States Government and the Panama Canal Company of all charges made against us in that episode, we ended up offering to crown the rioters' efforts with some success, in the form of a new treaty which was supposed to satisfy Panamanian aspirations. We did not have to make such an offer, and it was a mistake to do so. But once the offer was made, and accepted by responsible leaders of Panama, we were then committed to the obligation to give *something*.

So we do not have the alternative—morally, that is—to do nothing and give nothing.

What can we give, and what can we do, then, which will resolve this dilemma, short of surrender of rights we dare not surrender?

It is now a principle of national policy that the present Canal must eventually be replaced by one more suited to expanding shipping requirements.

Any concessions we make to the Republic of Panama in connection with the operation of the present Canal should, in my opinion, be part of a multiple arrangement for solution of long-range Canal needs.

The most recent amendments in the treaty with Panama, negotiated in 1955, turned over to the Republic of Panama as a gift 25 millions of dollars worth of real estate and industrial facilities which had been in excellent condition and utilized with great effectiveness by the Panama Canal Company. But in the interval since that property was transferred, it was allowed, in most cases, to fall into ruin.

Each time I see the lovely little gem of a hotel which was built in Colon—(the Washington Hotel)—I could cry. Two years after we relinquished it to Panama in the 1955 deal, its swimming pool was no longer usable; now the building itself is practically falling down and rotting away.

Perhaps the last thing in the world which the impoverished slum-dwellers of Colon need today is a fancy hotel with a lovely swimming pool on a spectacular site overlooking the Atlantic Ocean. But wouldn't it have been nice if the neighborhood kids at least had been able to swim in the pool? Wouldn't it have been helpful if the hotel had been operated to provide jobs for the residents, and a pleasant place for tourists who would spend money in the Colon shops, once so prosperous and attractive?

What happened to Hotel Washington happened also to excellent hospitals, and schools, and beautiful ocean-front residences included in the 1955 gifts. So the transfer of more and more real estate solves very little for the Panamanian people and nothing for us.

An *alternative* to further appeasement of this nature would be to persuade Panama to work harder—with our enthusiastic help—to vitalize their own economy and to provide more jobs and incentives for their own people through the development of agriculture and their tourist attractions and other resources.

We have done as much in that direction as the Panamanian government has made it possible for us to do. We could do much, much more, if we had their full encouragement—if there were a willingness there to democratize their economy to a greater degree, to raise wage rates in the Panamanian economy more in line with the excellent wages now paid to those 11,000 Panamanians working for the U.S. Government in the Canal Zone, and help a painfully slowly emerging middle class to win a place within the economy now so completely dominated by a few extremely rich and callously unconcerned families which constitute the Panamanian Oligarchy.

The Minister who guides the Panamanian negotiations for the proposed new treaty identifies himself with that oligarchy and makes no apology for it. In fact, he is proud of it.

This is a group which controls every source of wealth in the Republic. It parcels out the concessions and the franchises and the charters and power bases with complete indifference to the grinding poverty of the mass of the people. Very little trickles down. There is no solid base of mass purchasing power.

The 3500 Americans living and working in the Canal Zone are constantly held up to attack in Panama because they and their families live very well compared to the average Panamanian. Actually, they live like American middle class skilled workers—which they are. The 11,000 Panamanian nationals who also work in the Zone and are able to live there also enjoy good living conditions, but they are extremely vulnerable now as a result of the directions the treaty negotiations are taking.

First of all, most of them are descendants of West Indian laborers brought to Panama to build the canal, and although they pay Panamanian income taxes they are not regarded by the Panamanian government as "real" Panamanians. About 10,000 of them are employed in the auxiliary services connected with the canal operations—the piers, the commissaries, and other service activities. The Panamanian negotiators are determined to have these Panama Canal Company service activities turned over to local businessmen to be operated as private enterprise. If they succeed, the Panamanian nationals now employed in the Zone will either lose their jobs to "real" Panamanians—and have to move out of their present attractive homes, or else they will have their present high wages reduced to the prevailing Panamanian wage scales, and will not be able to *afford* to live in their present homes. Either way, this large segment of Panamanian nationals would lose out as a result of their own government's policies, just as happened in 1955 when a number of other Panama Canal Company service operations were turned over to Panamanian private enterprise.

I have been unable to find out what would happen to the excellent housing which now exists in the Canal Zone if the Zone goes back to Panama. Would it, too, be turned over to Panamanian insiders to be rented or sold to businessmen, professional people, and other well-to-do local people, or would it just be allowed to deteriorate as happened to the properties turned over in 1955? No one involved in the negotiations has an answer to this question. I am convinced therefore that those Panamanians who need good housing will not get it.

Looking at the realities of the situation which confronts us, I feel that we must be prepared to swallow our pride and a little of our self-respect in the Canal Zone and give some substantial concessions to the leaders of the Republic of Panama. The current President of that country is probably the best, most responsible leader Panama has had in many, many years. As a political leader, he must produce some results in these critical negotiations, or else he will be overturned in a year by opposition elements capitalizing on discord and mass misery in that seething little Republic. We committed ourselves to some concessions in 1964 when we offered to renegotiate the existing treaty.

But unless the United States is prepared to say that it has brutally exploited and cruelly injured the Panamanian people for most of a century—and I certainly am not willing to concede any such thing—our concessions should be reasonable and rational and based on concessions of equal importance in return.

We need the rights in a new treaty to build a new sea level canal. Whether that canal should be built at the site of the present canal, or along the Costa Rica—Nicaragua border, or near Colombia, or elsewhere, is now being determined through test borings and surveys. But on the chance that it might well belong in Panama, we should couple our negotiations for a revision of the present treaty on the existing canal with concurrent negotiations and a concurrent treaty for rights for a new sea level canal.

We may not need those rights from Panama; we may decide to build elsewhere. But, just as we had treaty rights to several canal sites before proceeding with the present canal, we should have alternatives for a future canal. And Panama can give us such an alternative.

When, as and if a new canal is in construction, definite terms can be extended to turn over to Panama as much as, or all of, the Canal Zone not needed for a new canal operation.

We should insist on something for something. And, if we don't get that, or can't get it, then we should be in no hurry to make changes in the present treaty. This is my view, and I think it is shared by nearly every Member of the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, I do not know how many Senators—who will have the power to act on any new treaty—know or care very much about the situation.

That is why I have taken every possible opportunity to try to alert American business and industry to their stake in the resolution of this controversy.

Complicating the problem is the fact that we are also negotiating a third treaty with Panama, in addition to one for the existing canal and one for a new sea level canal. The third one would deal with the use of our military bases there for the defense not only of the canal and of Panama, but of the entire hemisphere. This is of vital importance to us, and to the rest of the Americas, of course. Panama has always been guaranteed the full protection of the United States armed forces, and has never had to maintain any army of its own. I suspect there is a strong tendency there to try to exact as high a price as possible for treaty rights intended to increase our ability to defend the rest of the hemisphere, and this could very well put pressures on our canal rights that would be difficult to resist. If we give in, we may find it only another installment on an unpayable obligation—an international equivalent of the "balloon note" in shady credit transactions.

If Panama can grab a controlling, or an equal, or even a very large minority interest, in the operation of the present canal before a new one is constructed and in operation, American businessmen—and their customers—all of us—will pay dearly for transportation of the goods we buy and sell in international trade. For Panama seeks the "quick buck" on the canal's tolls—raise them as high as the traffic will bear and divie up the money among the owners of the Panamanian economy.

In the short range, most ships using the canal would pay the higher tolls, but they would soon begin to take alternate routes, until canal revenues are less than they are now. We have studies to establish this pattern very clearly. True, they are only projections rather than certainties, but the projections are based on economic data which can stand critical scrutiny.

What can you do to forestall a drastic increase in your shipping costs through ever-higher Panama Canal tolls? Let me interject here that the toll structure has been virtually unchanged since the opening of the canal more than half a century ago. The present tolls are by no means low—some bulk carriers pay as much as $45,000 for the 13-hour trip through the locks; the average is about $5,100. Ever-increasing use of the canal has increased revenues, but the canal does not make money. Maintenance, which the Panamanians consider a waste of money, is constant and meticulous; after half a century the canal is bigger, better and more efficient than ever, and we are still putting new money back into its improvement. We have never gotten our investment out of it. We are not concerned over *making money* out of this wonder of engineering genius; instead our interest is in speeding the delivery of the world's raw materials and trade goods. And in that objective, the Panama Canal has been magnificently successful.

I asked what you could do to help in retaining the efficiency and effectiveness of this great canal, in which all of you as businessmen have such an important stake. The answer is a simple one: exercise your citizenship rights.

If what I have said persuades you we must not ratify a give-away treaty, then let as many Senators as you can reach know how you feel about it. And let the President know, too. He has many great problems bearing heavily upon him; he cannot devote endless hours to each one. But he is a great accumulator of information and he is interested in what businessmen think and say and feel. And he is, above all, a patriot.

Many of you have occasion to see him or people who are close to him. Many of you have occasion to see and talk to Senators from other states who are not nearly as aware of this problem as Stuart Symington and Ed Long. Talk to them—and to Symington and Long, too.

If enough citizens who have a stake in our international commerce will speak up and make their voices heard on this issue of the Panama Canal—knowing that 65% of all cargoes transiting the Canal are either to or from the United States—we can save this great resource for America and for world commerce. Otherwise, like a little surgical clamp shutting off a great artery, Panama could strangle the long-range usefulness of the Canal in a short-run grab for the fast dollar.

Don't let it happen!

REYNOLD BENNETT COMMENTS ON "THE CRISIS IN PATENTS"

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I know, are concerned with the preservation of the American patent system as guaranteed by the Constitution in article I, section 8, clause 8 thereof, and therefore, are following closely any comment on the recent report of the President's Commission on the Patent System.

In that connection, they will be interested in a recent article on the subject by my constituent and friend, Reynold Bennett.

Mr. Bennett is a lawyer, a vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers, and—together with Frederic O. Hess, president of the Selas Corp., and an engineer—he has written extensively in this area.

Their most recent article "The Crisis in Patents," appeared in Management Review for May 1967, and I commend it to my colleagues for a well-analyzed statement of the problem:

The Crisis in Patents

(By Reynold Bennett and Frederic O. Hess)

The patent systems of the world are currently in a state of crisis. Obtaining airtight patent rights is a complex and time consuming business: It is posing a serious threat to technological innovation and could lead to a drastic curtailment of foreign investment and trade.

The U.S. Patent Office is probably the most efficient in the world, but even so it takes at least two to three years to issue a patent. West German inventors cannot get a patent in less than five years, and the Japanese take at least seven years.

But that's not all. Today the world's inventors and their collaborators look for legal protection to over 80 different national patent systems, each with its own policies, procedures and pitfalls. A creative American innovator who wants to guard his product rights often has to file applications in at least a dozen national offices in almost as many different languages, and at an ultimate cost of thousands of dollars. Individual corporations, the chief patent pursuers, must often lay out as much as a million dollars a year to secure concomitant rights. All this effort, time and expense is necessary in order to obtain a limited 17-year patent monopoly in the United States, which is comparable to rights elsewhere.

Yet in these times of exploding technology and expanding world trade, patents are, and will continue to be, the main spur to invention. So in spite of the many requirements placed on inventors and their assignees, there is a vast and growing amount of patent paper filing going on in the world today—more than half a million applications annually. The mass of patent paperwork is only partly caused by the explosion of new technologies; much of it is a result of duplication. U.S. Patent Commissioner Edward J. Brenner reports that today "about 50 per cent of the applications filed annually throughout the world are simply duplicate or multiple filings of the same invention."

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION

Late in 1966 this situation prompted a specially appointed President's Commission on the Patent System to recommend that the U.S. and other nations "promote and direct interim steps toward the ultimate goal—a universal patent [including] international harmonization of patent practices." And the Soviet Union, eager to step up its invention output and technological position, has also expressed a willingness to meet patent problems on a multinational basis.

Since its inception in 1883, the so-called Paris Convention has been developing as the basic document for international patent order. Seventy-four countries now adhere to it, including the U.S.S.R., which joined in 1965. The primary value of the Convention is that inventors have 12 months in which to apply to other countries for the same patent sought in the initial country. During that period no one can encroach on the patent.

The trouble is that almost one-third of the 120 member countries of the U.N. do not belong to the Paris Convention—mainly because they have no internal facilities to administer any competent patent system. This poses a worldwide threat to anyone pouring money into research in the hope of maintaining general protection for resulting patent rights.

Steps are now being taken to improve patent protection in new nations; and at its Stockholm meeting in June 1967 the BIRPI (Bureau for the Protection of Intellectual Property), the Paris Convention's working arm, will probably move to create an International Intellectual Property Organization to bring into some kind of association those countries that do not now adhere to the Paris Convention.

For the past few years government officials, as well as research and patent experts throughout Europe and in other highly industrialized areas, have also been seeking solutions to the patent crisis on a regional basis. A prime example is the uniform approach proposed by the six Common Market countries. The Nordic Patent System, including Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland, is slated to take full effect this year. Also, the 12 nations comprising the African and Malagasy Industrial Property Organization have adopted a uniform patent law for themselves. During the latter part of 1966, Mr. Denis Ekani, Director General of the African group, spent a month in the U.S. with the object of assuring key American officials and business and investment organizations that patents and research know-how would be duly honored in the countries under his jurisdiction.

IMPETUS FROM THE UNITED STATES

But the biggest impetus for international patent reform undoubtedly comes from individuals and groups in the United States, because Americans account for almost one-third of the half million patent applications being filed every year around the world and the stakes are high. Billions of dollars are poured into research in the hope of pioneering and patenting the kind of breakthrough that gave rise to the light bulb and the telephone.

For the past few years J. Herbert Hollomon, the U.S. Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology, and Edward J. Brenner, the U.S. Commissioner of Patents, have been selling the idea of a world patent incentive system to private and official audiences in the United States, Europe, and developing nations.

Nor have efforts been confined to international solutions. U.S. Patent Office procedures have been streamlined and the bureau's corps of examiners has been strengthened. Microfilm, microform and other new techniques have been brought into bureau operations, along with computer and mechanical memory operations for registering and gleaning the information needed on many Patent Office questions.

ASKING THE QUESTIONS . . .

But streamlining of national patent systems is not enough. The examining patent offices of the world look at the application and try to answer such complex questions as "Was the result of the applicant's work 'unobvious' and an 'advance of the art'?" Today most of the answers can be reached only by skilled manpower using expanding information retrieval and documentation systems.

Mr. Brenner recently put it this way: "The task of translating a complicated 100-page electronic computer invention into a dozen or more languages or organizing these data into an equal number of special forms, and of separate processing, searching and examination of these cases by numerous staffs of highly trained personnel amounts to an incredible waste of creative talent in our generation."

. . . AND FINDING THE ANSWERS

Automated procedures can help. For almost a dozen years now, ICIREPAT (International Committee on Information Retrieval Among Examining Patent Offices) has been working to automate searching examination. But so far its activities have been limited to the chemical field, largely for technological reasons. It is estimated that about 5 or 10 per cent of the search files could be mechanized by 1972—but only if enough money is made available.

As an example of direct U.S. action, a series of bilateral exchanges of search results is being accomplished with a number of countries, notably West Germany. During the past year the U.S. Patent Office conducted an experimental exchange of information with the Munich "Patentamt" on 2,000 pairs of cross-filed cases. The ultimate ideal is that neither office will need to duplicate the other's complete search.

This search for true novelty and inventiveness is essential to the kind of examination that precedes the issuing of a strong patent in countries like the United States, West Germany, Japan and others. On the other hand, some important industrialized nations, such as France, Italy and Belgium, rely essentially on a relatively routine registration system for patent issuance. Still others, like Switzerland, have a mixed system. But a patent granted on the basis of examination almost always has the most immediate, and perhaps lasting, legal strength. The big problem confronting the examining patent offices is the almost prohibitive cost of maintaining search facilities.

The ultimate solution must come from the pooling of resources. Moves in this direction are already under way. For example, the existing International Patent Institute at The Hague is already carrying out searches and examinations for requesting nations and organizations. The U.N. is presently encouraging The Hague Institute to devise a system to conduct its search and examination work on a regional, and perhaps more available, basis.

Another front along which the United States and other nations can cooperate is in the blending of invention classification systems maintained by world patent offices. But progress along this line is complicated by the fact that there are different approaches to classification. For instance, one patent system will classify a new type of automobile clutch simply on the basis of its end use, while a system maintaining a structure viewpoint (like the U.S. Patent Office) will categorize the item according to whether a friction mechanism or hydraulic approach is utilized.

NEEDED: 700 MAN-YEARS

It has been almost ten years since an international patent classification (IPC) was recommended by a Council of Europe Convention, and still the work involved in developing subdivisions of this system is nowhere near completion. It has been estimated that even if the complete subdivisions were available, it would take the U.S. Patent Office 700 man-years of professional and clerical time, and cost more than $12 million to reclassify all U.S. and foreign patents into the IPC. It would take from 10 to 20 years to complete the job. Still, the work continues on a cooperative basis, inspiring confidence that someday a world patent classification system will become an operational reality.

David Sarnoff, Chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, described new electronic devices that might be joined to remote computers to carry out almost immediate patent information, creating ". . . a world patent center that could receive and process applications from inventors everywhere."

Hovering over the world of tomorrow will be high capacity satellites synchronized with large patent data processing and information storage systems. Through a desk instrument the inventor and his patent attorney will be able to submit their application to the international patent office. Within a matter of days—not years—the inventor might be informed that his patent has been filed and issued in Washington as well as in any other office adhering to the world system.

KEEP AQABA OPEN WHILE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE SETTLES ISSUE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent the following telegram to the President concerning the Near East crisis:

> The present crisis in the Middle East, including the blockade by the United Arab Republic of the Gulf of Aqaba, is a threat to the continued maintenance of international peace and security. The matters in issue are essentially legal.
>
> As such they should be submitted to the International Court of Justice at The Hague for adjudication along with other outstanding disputes between Israel and the Arab nations. Both Israel and the UAR are members of the Court. The United States, in joint effort with other great powers, should use its influence to persuade Israel and the UAR to submit the dispute to the Court for impartial third party adjudication.
>
> Pending Court decision, the great powers should preserve free passage through the gulf in accordance with the established rules of law. Should neither the UAR or Israel be

willing to refer the matter to the Court—and accept its decision as binding—the United States should request the Security Council or the General Assembly of The United Nations to seek an advisory opinion from the Court on the issue of free passage through the gulf for Israeli commerce and other outstanding disputes. The declaratory judgment could then be the basis for a settlement.

Acceptance of this proposal would demonstrate our determination to settle international conflicts under the rule of law instead of on the basis of armed force or political expediency. Military defeat is often the first ingredient to renewed aggression. The course I propose would involve no loss of sovereignty, power or prestige through the use of force.

Paul Findley,
Representative in Congress.

AMERICAN INDUSTRY'S BIG INVESTMENT IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a tremendous continuing effort is being made today by American industry to educate, train, and retrain employees and potential employees and to extend their programs to our least-educated and least-skilled workers.

Especially because of the attention paid to Federal Government programs in recent years, regrettably redundant, overfinanced, and ineffective, the huge investment by industry in training does not get the consideration in merits. It is almost inconceivable that the Federal governmental programs are administered from Washington, and certainly propagandized, without reference to these private programs. Fortunately at the local level those charged with carrying out the Federal programs are not quite as provincial as their chiefs isolated in Washington, D.C.

In a brief, but comprehensive, article by Sylvia Porter in the Washington Evening Star of May 24, these private efforts are described very well.

The article points out that $18 billion *is now being spent annually by business.* This dwarfs the $265 million the Federal Government will spend this year. It has long been clear that the private corporations is one of the Nation's best vocational educators and now this training is being opened up to more and more *workers. Chase Manhattan Bank, for example,* is training potential high school dropouts. Xerox is training unemployed men, many of whom have police records. The article provides other illustrations.

All of this points to two major legis*lative and administrative bottlenecks:* First, the Johnson administration obstructive tactics in sidetracking the Human Investment Act; second, the similar tactics which prevent the jobs available statistical series from being developed and utilized as required in the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article referred to in the Record at this point:

On-Job Training Increasing

(By Sylvia Porter)

A 19-year-old who spent most of his teens in and out of detention homes for youthful offenders and who was failing four out of five subjects in high school, this year signed up for a special part-time job-training program at New York's Chase Manhattan Bank. He now is learning to be a teller—and is planning to continue his education past high school under Chase's tuition refund plan.

A young Negro girl, victim of a broken home and getting poor grades in high school, is enrolled in another training program at J. I. Case & Co. in Racine, Wis. After high school graduation in June, she plans to attend a state college.

A 37-year-old prisoner in Danbury, Conn., is working days at the Dictograph Manufacturing Co. as a hearing aid repairman, after completing a job training course given by the company within the prison. He is supporting his family with his earnings, plans to continue working for Dictograph after his release.

These are success stories emerging from a stepped-up effort by private industry to provide education and training—and later full-time jobs—for school dropouts, unskilled, illiterate and other handicapped workers.

Industry is spending an estimated $18 billion a year to educate, to train and re-train employes and potential employes, and most significant, it is extending these programs to the least-educated, least-skilled workers.

This industry investment dwarfs the $265 million the Federal government will spend on vocational and technical training for 6.5 million students this year.

It long has been clear that the private corporation is among the nation's best-equipped vocational educators. To indicate how this field of on-the-job training is opening up:

has launched a training program for potential high school dropouts. Trainees receive individual counseling, attend lectures, take field trips to banking and investment institutions and work three hours a day at $1.86 an hour for as long as 21 months. Most of the students who have completed the course are now full-time employes.

In Chicago, Carson Pirie Scott, the big department store, is conducting another education-training program for actual or would-be dropouts. Two students fill a single job: while one works, the other attends school. Since 1961, when the program began, the work-study idea has spread to 31 Chicago companies.

In Racine the J. I. Case Co. is helping dozens of potential dropouts to finish high school by employing them as part-time trainees in a wide variety of fields.

In Rochester, N.Y., the Xerox Corp. last year launched a 19-week training program for unemployed men, many of whom had police records and were not more than "functionally literate." Trainees are given classroom instruction informal counseling, *remedial reading, arithmetic and job training.*

In Wilmington, Del., Du Pont has been training workers in 14 job categories from carpenter to chemical operator. Since 1959, 15,000 employes have completed more than 45,000 courses and Du Pont now is offering its series of 110 programmed courses to other companies as well.

The payoff for trainees, in steady employment, higher wages and increased self-respect is obvious. But the payoff to employers and to the U.S. economy may be even greater in increased productivity, in helping avert skill shortages, and in breaking the tragic cycle of poverty, illiteracy and joblessness.

In Manhattan, the Chase Manhattan Bank

WELL DONE, MR. PORTER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Keith] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, during the past week, the New Bedford Standard-Times carried an editorial praising the career of the Honorable William J. Porter, who has been nominated by President Johnson to be our Ambassador to the Republic of Korea.

Ambassador Porter, who is a resident of Westport, a lovely seacoast town in my congressional district, has worked tirelessly for 30 years in the Foreign Service of our country. I have the highest respect for his expertise and understanding, and I am sure he will be a credit to our country in his post in Korea as he has been in his many earlier assignments in years past. Now, when relations in Asia are particularly crucial, Mr. Porter will bring to his assignment the knowledge and experience which is so necessary if we are to acquit ourselves creditably on that troubled continent.

Mr. Speaker, the New Bedford Standard-Times, a large responsible and influential newspaper in my district, has editorialized:

Well Done, Mr. Porter

Greater New Bedford residents will feel justifiable personal pride in learning that William J. Porter of Westport has been nominated by President Johnson to be U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Korea.

This latest professional advancement for Mr. Porter climaxes a 30-year career in the U.S. foreign service, during which his assignments have taken him into numerous countries, from Algeria to South Vietnam. He has acquired an outstanding reputation for patience and competence, qualities highly necessary for successful diplomacy in today's delicate world balance.

The fact that Mr. Porter, recognized as a specialist in Arab affairs, was sent to Saigon and eventually placed in charge of the South Vietnam pacification program, is indicative of the confidence that the federal government places in him. It can be expected that he will represent this country ably in Seoul, another capital of the most critical importance to Washington.

It is an assignment most assuredly merited.

INTRODUCING BILL CALLING FOR RESTRICTIONS ON THE IMPORTS OF MINK

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unani*mous consent that the gentleman from* Wisconsin [Mr. Schadeberg] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from *Missouri?*

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from my district and from a meeting held with the mink ranchers in southeastern Wisconsin and a group from northern Illinois. These men spent over 2 hours telling me the seriousness of the problem they are facing. It is evident that, unless something is done immediately, irreparable damage can be done to this industry in the United States. The mink ranchers cannot wait even a few months for relief from cheap imports. Relief from such imports must be given now.

I was shocked to learn that the representatives of this Government have shown an utter lack of cooperation with the mink ranchers in their attempt to save this industry which they have built through their own efforts and promoted through their own funds. Here is an industry which does not receive 1 cent of public money in subsidy or support of any kind. Certainly, the least they could expect would be the active support of their Government representatives abroad who seem more interested in promoting the foreign mink industry than the U.S. mink industry. It is unconscionable to tax these men to support a government which seems intent upon destroying their economic future. Some 1,000 mink farms and 3,000 jobs in Wisconsin are at stake as well as $54,354,000 in capital investment and $46,323,000 in gross sales in my State.

I have today introduced a bill calling for restrictions on the imports of mink and I trust that my colleagues in this body will join me in assuring its early passage.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FOR PEACE THROUGH LAW SPONSORED SHOWINGS OF "THE WAR GAME," THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following letter, which has been sent to all Members of Congress, inviting them to attend special congressional showings of "The War Game" Thursday afternoon on the House and Senate sides of the Capitol:

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FOR
PEACE THROUGH LAW,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1967.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We write to invite you and your staff to attend a special Congressional showing of a unique film, *The War Game*—a work which raises issues of direct concern to those responsible for decisions regarding war and peace.

This forty-seven minute film was awarded the 1967 Academy Award as the most outstanding documentary of the year. Many who have seen *The War Game* feel it to be the most dramatic single film in their experience.

The movie depicts and explains the effects and consequences of nuclear war. As Life magazine remarked in praising the work, "*The War Game* is neither a pacifist document nor propaganda for better civil defense . . . the film is a work of truth."

We strongly believe *The War Game* should be seen by *all* Americans. Yet as the film discusses matters which bear directly on the business and policy of this nation, we believe it is particularly important that it be seen by members of Congress and government officials.

We urge you, therefore, to attend a free showing of the film on Thursday, June 1, 1967. For House members and their staffs, the film will be shown at the House Caucus Room, Room 346, Cannon Building, at 3:00 p.m. For Senate members and their staffs, the film will be shown at the Senate Auditorium, Room G 38 New Senate Office Building, at 4:30 p.m. A representative of the Atomic Energy Commission has been invited to offer comments and answer questions following each showing of the film.

The War Game is a remarkable, important film. We urge you and your staff to attend.

APOSTLE ISLANDS NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to establish an Apostle Islands National Lakeshore.

Located in northern Wisconsin, on the southern shore of Lake Superior, this is the only area of the Great Lakes that combines shorelines, islands, marshes, and highlands in one complex. This beautiful and unspoiled backyard of our great Midwest, only hours away from heavily populated areas, is readily accessible to millions of Midwesterners and offers the visitor a complete variety of recreational opportunities, such as hunting, fishing, boating, camping, hiking, and nature study.

The 57,511-acre project would include three sections:

First. Mainline section: Over 30 miles of winding shoreline, extending from Red Cliff Bay just north of Bayfield to near Cornucopia, Wis. A scenic road would wind through the approximately half-mile-wide area with turnover points from which to view the islands offshore. A hiking trail would follow the shore. The picturesque bays would provide various facilities for camping, nature study, beachcombing, and boating.

Second. The 21-island section: Including all but Madeline Island which is already substantially developed. The islands, to be kept as virtual wilderness, would provide minimum dock facilities, Adirondack-type shelters, and fireplaces.

Third. The Bad River-Kakagon Slough area: 10,000 acres of wild rice marsh just east of Ashland. It includes miles of navigable channels and abounds in deer, bear, beaver, otter, and 240 species of birds. Fishing is excellent. Facilities for hiking, fishing, hunting, and camping would be provided.

The natural beauty of this site, with its magnificent white sand beaches and wild islands, covered with luxurious growth of mixed hardwoods and conifers should be preserved as a great natural resource. In addition, the recreational activities of such a national park will also bolster the economy of northern Wisconsin which has been a tremendous decline in its principal industries. Senator GAYLORD NELSON, who has introduced a similar bill in the Senate, said:

> We have exhausted many of the resources of this area, but its natural beauty remains. Now it's up to us to save the last resource—natural beauty—and use it for the aesthetic and economic benefit of millions of people for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, here is a fine opportunity to preserve the precious assets of one of the most scenic areas of our country. The late President Kennedy, when he visited northern Wisconsin in September 1963, was moved by the striking wild beauty of the Apostle Islands and the lakeshore. He said:

> Lake Superior, the Apostle Islands, the Bad River area, are all unique. They are worth improving for the benefit of sportsmen and tourists. In an area of congestion and pollution, man-made noise, and dirt, Lake Superior has a beauty that millions can enjoy. These islands are part of our American heritage. In a very real sense they tell the story of the development of this country. The vast marshes of the Bad River are a rich resource providing a home for a tremendous number, and varied number, of wild animals. In fact, the entire northern Great Lakes area, with its vast inland sea, its 27,000 lakes, and thousands of streams, is a central and significant part of the fresh water assets of this country, and we must act to preserve these assets.

CHANGE THE COLOR OF OUR MONEY?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives an article entitled "Change the Color of our Money?" written by Mrs. Frances Spatz Leighton for the May 21, 1967, issue of This Week magazine.

For many years Mrs. Leighton was Washington correspondent for the American Weekly and now writes for This Week magazine. She is author and coauthor of a number of books about the Washington scene, including her highly entertaining book about "The Johnson Wit" which was published in 1965. Fran, as she is fondly known by her many friends, also writes for the Chicago's American, a leading newspaper in my own city of Chicago.

Her informative article indicates that from time to time suggestions have been made by both private citizens and officials in Government to change the color of our currency. Mrs. Leighton brings us up to date on current views on this proposal, and because of its significance to all of us who use U.S. currency daily, I would like the article to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article follows:

[From This Week magazine, May 21, 1967]

CHANGE THE COLOR OF OUR MONEY?

(By Frances Spatz Leighton)

"Please don't think I'm a nut," a man recently wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury, "but if you really want to help the economy of the country, just call in all the present green paper money and change it to different colors.

"There must be millions in safe deposit boxes or hidden in homes by people who haven't paid taxes and keep their assets in cash. Colored money would bring it out of hiding."

The Secretary did not think the man from Winchester was a "nut." In fact, he filed the letter respectfully alongside those of many other Americans—in high places and low, in politics and out—who have been campaigning for years for changes in the color of America's paper money. (Leave the current $1 bill green, say—but color the $5 bill yellow, the $10 bill red, the $20 bill blue, etc.)

For the letter hit upon only one of many valid reasons for a change in the color of the currency—as Canada, to cite just one example among many, many countries, has done since 1870.

1. *Colored money would make it easier to identify the different denominations at a glance.*

2. *It would help people with poor eyesight to identify the amount by the color.*

3. *It would help businessmen make change in a hurry.*

4. *It would save millions of tedious hours spent in sorting and re-sorting money in banks and other cashiers' cages.*

5. *It would save the public millions of dollars a year which are lost in incorrect change.*

It was just such a "wrong change" mistake, 20 years ago, that led Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers of Massachusetts to open the first crusade to change the color of money. A cab driver had given her change for $1 instead of for $10. She went to the Secretary of the Treasury—John W. Snyder—on August 22, 1947, and strongly urged him to use his authority to change the colors of the various denominations so they would be easier to distinguish. She reminded him that, in 1929, Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon had used the power vested in *him* to cut the size of paper money.

After waiting over a year and getting no action, Mrs. Rogers introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, "To provide . . . new and different colors for each denomination." Congress treated her bill lightly. Not only was she a woman but a Republican in a Democratic Administration. But undaunted, she re-introduced her bill on the first day of her next term. The following day a male colleague, August H. Andresen of Minnesota, rose to chide her from the floor, and an amusing exchange followed:

Mr. ANDRESEN: That is what they did in Russia and Germany and a great many other countries. Does the gentlewoman think we should do what they are doing

Mrs. ROGERS: The gentleman can get no Communistic tinge from this. As a matter of fact it would help the United States to find the Communists. In many instances their money is hidden money. This legislation would bring it out of hiding . . .

Mr. ANDRESEN: What color would the gentlewoman have for the new money?

Mrs. ROGERS: Different colors. It could follow the same system as our United States postage stamps so that it would be easier for those who are making change. . . One day I gave a $10 bill to a taxi driver for a $1 bill. He wanted to return it to me, but I told him to keep it. So I made a mistake. Others have made mistakes in making change.

Mr. ANDRESEN: I am sorry to hear that the gentlewoman has made a mistake.

OTHERS IN CONGRESS HAD THE SAME IDEA

That ended the matter until February of 1960 when Congressman James Roosevelt, son of the late President, advocated (but did not introduce) a bill to make two changes in paper money—one was to add tiny perforations or an embossment on each bill so the blind could identify money by touch. And second was a plan to color key the money.

Then the next year big things happened—or almost happened. A new woman Treasurer of the United States, Elizabeth Rudel Smith, called for a change from greenbacks to different-colored money for each denomination. She, too, had been victimized in getting change in a cab one dark night.

She said, " I do feel that it is easy to become confused where there is a single color used. People, of course, have the number to look at but under different lighting conditions and with failing eyesight many people have reported to me that they have given somebody a $20 bill and thought it was $10."

Five years ago, asked whether she felt the change-over to multicolored currency would slow down counterfeiting, Mrs. Smith replied:

"The Secret Service, 20 years ago when recommendations of this kind were first introduced, were very much in favor of the multicolored currency. But now, with the advance in equipment to reproduce almost anything, they are of the opinion it would not make any particular difference. I understand they feel it would slow down the do-it-yourself counterfeiter but not the professional counterfeiter."

COUNTERFEITING IS TOO RARE TO BE A FACTOR

A recent check shows the Secret Service still feels that way. A spokesman added that the total loss to the public in counterfeit notes in 1966 was only $933,000, compared with $40,000,000,000 circulating.

Mrs. Smith's mail ran 4-to-1 in favor of the change. Many of her letters came from cashiers in stores and restaurants, who had to make good on the big bills they gave away by mistake. Many newspaper editorials praised her. But alas, after she had been in office only 16 months, and before she had really had a chance to fight the matter to a conclusion, Mrs. Smith retired because of ill health.

Her successor, Kathryn O'Hay Granahan, did not share Mrs. Smith's enthusiasm—"I feel our money in its present form is a tradition and I would not like to see it changed."

Case dismissed.

But now Mrs. Granahan, too, is gone from the Treasury scene—she resigned last November. How will a new Treasurer feel about it?

Acting Treasurer W. T. Howell cites the reasoning of Henry J. Holtzclaw, Director of the Bureau of Engraving, as his own for opposing a change. He told THIS WEEK, "Mr. Holtzclaw feels people will tend to rely on color and not look at the denomination. This is a danger because various chemicals can be used by counterfeiters to change the color and enable a bill of a small denomination to assume the color of a larger denomination. The color now used is more difficult to counterfeit than other colors. However, if it is changed by law or by the decision of the Secretary of the Treasury, we will of course abide by the law."

YOU CAN TELL CONGRESS YOU WANT A CHANGE

And it may well be changed, according to three Administration leaders. Two are ranking members of the House Banking and Currency Committee which considers all legislative matters affecting banking and the legal tender—Frank Annunzio (D., Ill.), and Thomas L. Ashley (D., Ohio). The third, Senator Howard W. Cannon (D., Nev.), is a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, which is concerned with the business welfare of the nation.

In discussions with This Week, all three expressed great interest in the subject and willingness to sponsor legislation if the public wants it.

Congressman Annunzio said, "I like the idea. I will talk with Henry Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, about it and I will poll my Committee. I will also talk with bankers who must handle millions of dollars in currency every day to see how a change of this kind would improve their system."

Congressman Ashley went a step further and promised to introduce legislation based on the outcome of the ballot on this page. "I feel the circulation of This Week is great enough to provide an impressive sampling of the will of the American people," Ashley said. "If the results of This Week's poll warrant it, I plan to introduce a bill directing the Treasurer to print money in different colors for each denomination. The change need only be made in the $5, $10 and $20 bills. The $1 bill, most-used, could remain green. This would require development of only three new inks, and should not be very expensive."

The strongest statement came from Senator Cannon: "I don't believe there is anything sacred about the size or color of the American dollar," he said. "Certainly, if it can be established that there is a better way to serve the people, the Congress should look into it. I definitely would support such an inquiry—if there is substantial public demand for it—and I would support any legislation resulting from it that might increase public convenience."

An earlier This Week poll (January 15, 1967) has already resulted in the introduction of a bill to create more 3-Day Weekends. If any of you readers would now like to change the color of your money—or feel strongly against such a change—here's your chance to say so.

Clip and mark the ballot and send it to This Week. We cannot acknowledge letters but we will forward them, along with the tabulated results of the ballots, to the three interested members of Congress.

EDITOR, THIS WEEK MAGAZINE
P.O. Box 455
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11202

Concerning the idea of changing money to make each denomination a different color, I vote:

Yes— No—

Name

Address

City State ZIP Code

YES

"I don't believe there is anything sacred about the size or color of the American dollar. If it can be changed to better serve the public, Congress should look into it."

—Senator HOWARD W. CANNON (D., Nev.).

NO

"People will rely on color and not look at the denomination. Counterfeiters will try to color-change small bills into large ones—and the present green is more difficult to counterfeit."

—W. T. HOWELL,
Acting Treasurer of the United States.

MAYBE

"If the results of This Week's poll warrant it, I plan to introduce a bill directing the Treasurer to print money in different colors for each denomination."

—Representative THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
(D., Ohio).

ARCHBISHOP CODY ELEVATED TO RANK OF CARDINAL BY POPE PAUL VI

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, millions of Chicagoans are tremendously pleased and delighted with the announcement by Pope Paul VI that our own Archbishop John Patrick Cody is among the 27 new cardinals which he named yesterday.

Archbishop Cody came to Chicago in 1965 from New Orleans. During his tenure as archbishop of New Orleans, he became world renowned for his courageous support of racial integration in the New Orleans parochial schools.

On June 16, 1965, he was named to head the Chicago Archdiocese, and in the 21 months that he has been serving in this post, Archbishop Cody has won the hearts of millions of people in the Chicagoland area, non-Catholics as well as Catholics, for his keen insight and his humane and dedicated efforts to resolve the pressing social, moral, educational, and religious problems that confront us today.

As the Congressman of the Seventh District of Illinois, and as the general chairman of the Villa Scalabrini Development Fund which has raised over $2 million for the establishment of the Italian Old Peoples' Home owned by the Archdiocese of Chicago, I congratulate Cardinal-elect John P. Cody and wish him good health and long tenure as a prince of the church.

It is my pleasure also to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in yesterday's Chicago Tribune hailing the elevation of Archbishop Cody as a great honor both for Cody and the city of Chicago. The article follows:

APPOINTMENT CALLED HONOR TO CODY, CITY—CIVIC LEADERS HERE EXPRESS JOY

Chicago leaders in many fields termed the elevation of Archbishop John P. Cody to cardinal yesterday as an honor for Chicago and for a deserving man.

"His appointment is an honor not only to his flock but to all of the people of the metropolitan area," Mayor Daley said. "As Mayor of Chicago, and personally, I congratulate him and look forward to his great leadership in the future."

Mayor Daley said that Archbishop Cody, in his two years here, has "impressed everyone as a man of great courage, gentle kindness, resolute determination, and deep understanding."

A SOURCE OF JOY

Rabbi Seymour Cohen of Anshe Emet synagog, 3760 Pine Grove av., president of the Synagog Council of America, called the elevation "a source of joy" to all Chicagoans.

"He has been a tower of strength in improving interreligious cooperation and better understanding between the various racial and ethnic groups that make up our great city," he said.

The Rev. Raymond Goedert, a notary of the marriage tribunal at the chancery office, said the Association of Chicago Priests sent a congratulatory telegram to the Archbishop.

"I was thrilled to hear the news," said Morgan J. Murphy, chairman of the executive committee of Commonwealth Edison company and active in many civic affairs.

"I think it's a fine thing for Chicago. The archdiocese of Chicago, the largest archdiocese, is certainly a post that deserves a cardinal, and I believe Archbishop Cody personally has earned this high office."

GREETINGS FROM LABOR

William A. Lee, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, sent a congratulatory wire to the archbishop from the "500,000 families of the Chicago Federation of Labor and Industrial Union council." He said that people of all races and creeds are gratified by the elevation because of the archbishop's "dedicated work in behalf of our city and community."

Mrs. Lydon Wild, a school board member who is active in Catholic Charities work, said she was "delighted" and called Cody a "real doer."

"I'm exceedingly pleased not only for him but for the whole community," said School Supt. James F. Redmond. "Ours has been a most cordial and productive relationship. You're happy for your friends."

Dr. Edgar H. S. Chandler, executive director of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, also extended congratulations.

"The archdiocese is once again elevated in the status of the Vatican," he said. "The archbishop is to be congratulated on receiving the highest honor available to him in his church."

RECOGNITION OF WORK

Rabbi Robert J. Marx, director of the Chicago Federation of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, saw the appointment as recognition of the work Archbishop Cody has done in the community, coupled with an opportunity "to be even more effective in the days that lie ahead."

The archbishop was called a "capable administrator" by Methodist Bishop Thomas M. Pryor and a man of great ability by Bishop Gerald Francis Burrill, head of the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago.

The Rev. Comerford J. O'Malley, chancellor of De Paul university, said:

"The appointment of Archbishop Cody to the college of cardinals is a tribute to his many significant accomplishments thruout his priestly career. It is a tribute also to the clergy, religious, and laity of this great archdiocese."

Jan Berbers of Montevideo, Uruguay, president of Serra International, a laymen's organization to promote the priesthood, said "the organization is extremely pleased about the appointment."

Sister Mary Oliva, president of St. Xavier college, said.

"During his two years in Chicago, Archbishop Cody has consistently demonstrated his deep concern in many areas critical to our modern world—education, ecumenism, and human relations."

FLORIDA LEGISLATURE EXTENDS INVITATION TO NATIONAL COMMITTEES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi.

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, my State of Florida extends a cordial invitation to both the National Democratic Committee and the National Republican Committee to hold their next national conventions in Florida. I join in that invitation, and endorse the following concurrent resolution adopted by the State legislature:

S. CON. RES. 1096

A concurrent resolution urging the national Democratic and Republican committees to hold their next national conventions in Florida

Whereas, Florida is known throughout the nation as a hospitable and enjoyable convention state, and

Whereas, the accommodations in Dade county are more than adequate to provide all of the necessary housing and convention facilities needed for this purpose, and

Whereas, this Legislature and the people of Florida would heartily welcome both the Democratic and Republican National Conventions to our state, now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the Legislature does most cordially invite and urge the National Democratic committee and the National Republican committee to hold their next national conventions in Florida.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the chairmen of the National Democratic committee and the National Republican committee and to the Florida delegation in the Congress of the United States.

HOUSEBOATS MODIFIED FOR USE AS MEDICAL CLINICS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, my attention was recently called to a project sponsored by the Thomas A. Dooley Foundation, Inc., which envisages the provision of a fleet of houseboats, modified to serve as medical clinics for the Mekong River area in Laos.

In the thought that the membership of Congress would be interested in knowing more about this project, I wish to include in the RECORD the following background material supplied by the Dooley Foundation:

PROPOSAL

Project Showboat shall be a medical program on the Mekong River in the area of Laos and Thailand utilizing commercially available 38-foot houseboats modified as medical clinics. The program's primary purpose shall be to provide facilities for medical care to the people in the villages bordering the Mekong from as far north near the China border as security may allow to as far south to the Cambodian border as river navigability permits. Its purpose shall also be to provide educational and training opportunities for the local people as well as for the local health workers. The program shall further include culture exchange type activities with various forms of entertainment for the purpose of attracting and creating greater local interest.

Each 38-foot boat shall be equipped with surgical, laboratory, sterilization and x-ray facilities. Each boat shall uniformly be a distinctive bright orange for ease of identification, a practice that the Dooley Foundation has followed with all of its vehicles in Asia for the past four and one-half years. Each boat shall be based at one of the three hospitals in Laos now being assisted by the Dooley Foundation with American staff, supplies and equipment. American personnel on the boats will work in a counterpart relationship with Lao or Thai staff. Villages along the river shall be visited on a regular schedule.

Projected plans are to have three boats operational in six months and an additional three to seven boats in twelve months.

Financial support for the project will come only from private resources to permit the greatest program flexibility and local political acceptance. Industry and foundations shall initially be approached to provide the seed-funds to launch the program. Once operational, a public contributions campaign will be undertaken to provide sustained support.

Project Showboat shall be truly a *Showboat* of American concern and friendship for the people of Laos and Thailand as well as all of Southeast Asia. It shall be a *Showboat* of the warmth and love and humor of the American people. It shall be a *Showboat* of American medicine.

It shall be a *Showboat* to the world of the determination of the American people to resist Communist aggression wherever, and by whatever means, necessary.

PURPOSES

1. To provide medical care

The population of Laos is 2.3 million, 83 percent of whom are represented by the Thai-Lao and Lao-Thoung tribes, all of whom live along or in close proximity to the Mekong River. There are also large concentrations of people living on the Thai side of the Mekong, which for great lengths represents the international boundary between Laos and Thailand. These people suffer from those acute and chronic diseases usually associated with conditions of poor sanitation, inadequate nutrition and ignorance. Commonplace are malaria, yaws, leprosy, dysentery, tuberculosis, skin diseases and respiratory infection, not to mention a high incidence of traumatic conditions, much of which is the result of local Pathet Lao guerrilla activity.

Project Showboat shall provide the needed medical care to these people. Each vessel will represent a medical clinic with all the facilities needed for basic diagnosis and treatment. This shall include laboratory facilities for blood, urine and stool examinations. Diagnostic X-ray equipment will be available as well as facilities for minor surgery. Designated villages along the river will be visited on a regular schedule. American staff working with Lao or Thai staff will work out from the boat into the immediate surrounding villages providing treatment and public health measures. Such cases as may require major surgery or long-term hospitalization would be evacuated to the base hospitals of the Dooley Foundation or other adequate medical facilities. Medical continuity between visits of *Showboat* would be provided by local health workers trained, supervised and supplied by Dooley Foundation personnel.

The medical public health team will be prepared to handle the common medical problems at the village and district levels. Those cases which the Health Technician and his team are not qualified to treat would be evacuated to a larger center at a provincial level which would be attended by more advanced medical personnel.

Project Showboat will work in conjunction with the school in Pakse by acting as field training centers as well as by representing opportunities for employment after graduation. Such job opportunities would be either on the vessels themselves or in the village shore facilities serviced by the river boats. *Showboat* would work in cooperation with other teaching programs in Laos now sponsored by various national and international health agencies such as the Royal Lao Ministry of Health, the Lao Red Cross, WHO, UNICEF, AID and Operation Brotherhood.

Education and treatment represent the core of the purpose of *Project Showboat*.

2. To teach local health workers

Much of the practice of medicine in Laos today is carried out by the local village herb-doctors following those ancient practices and traditions of China and India handed down through many generations, as well as by the Shamans, or spirit doctors, and the elderly Buddhist bonzes.

Laos has but two western-trained M.D.'s. Other categories of physicians include the *medecins-indochinois* and the *infirmiers*. The former, having graduated from high school, were trained in Hanoi by the French for four years. The latter represent medical officers who have received a six-month course in medicine in Laos under French supervision. Neither of these categories of medical personnel is now being trained, although they represent the only reservoir of medical personnel available today in Laos.

The Dooley Foundation intends to establish in southern Laos, in the provincial capital city of Pakse, a Health Technician Training school at the local provincial hospital. This will be a category of medical officer similar to the *infirmiers* but with a longer training period of one to two years. These technicians will be trained to work as a part of a medical/public health team which will include a nurse/midwife and a sanitarian. The school will also provide a training program for these nurses and sanitarians. The Dooley Foundation currently has a nurse/midwife training school at its Khong hospital, near Pakse, which is being carried out as a cooperative effort with the Lao Ministry of Health, UNICEF and WHO.

3. To educate the villagers

The village people of Laos and Thailand have, over the years, come to *respect* western medical and public health practices—but not always to *accept* them. Ignorance, apathy and adherence to traditional customs are the main deterrents to such acceptance. These can be overcome only by time, example and education.

Utilizing the techniques of modern audio-visual teaching methods, education would be extended by *Project Showboat* to the villager and tribesman in such basic health areas as food handling, food preservation, eating habits, use of safe water, garbage and waste disposal, personal cleanliness, protection against insects and birth control.

The problem of good health is essentially a problem in education and economics rather than penicillin and surgery. *Project Showboat* must, however, fill both needs. Public health and education follow in the wake of therapeutic medicine. Therefore, in the course of treating patients, we must also educate them if any lasting results are to be attained.

4. To promote cultural exchange

In Southeast Asia the villages are numerous and small and the cities are few. The population is 90 percent rural.

To create interest, to attract people, and to promote awareness of American culture in the performing arts, entertainment will be a part of *Project Showboat*.

To show a Walt Disney cartoon, to play a guitar, to sing folk ballads, to teach an American dance—all contribute to a psychological climate conducive to acceptance of modern medicine, new teachings, better methods and, perhaps most of all, an awareness of the true meaning and intent of America.

5. To further understanding and friendship

As is true of most problems, of whatever nature, lack of communication is a basic deterrent to solution. In the world political mess, medicine has a unique and powerful role to play in promoting better understanding between people. It represents one of the best media of communications that America possesses. For whatever else, good or bad, the world may think of America, it is represented and admired most for its medicine.

A sick man knows no politics—he seeks the best care possible for himself and his family. A Pathet Lao or Viet Cong is no exception. Testimony to this is the freedom with which the Dooley legend has been allowed to operate in Southeast Asia for the past twelve years. *Project Showboat* will further promote that American legend and make its own contribution to the need for communication to promote friendship and world peace.

Such a program as *Project Showboat* will be successful, however, only to the extent of its caution in its own presentation to the national governments, the local officials and the village people. The effort must be directed toward the essential end of strengthening the national government at the local level to counter Communist subversive methods. It must be presented as a Lao or Thai program with the *assistance* of the Americans.

Project Showboat must not compete with local medical organizations, methods or customs. It must only supplement and assist them. On these terms, host country acceptance, cooperation and participation will continue at all government, political and social levels. The American presence will inevitably speak eloquently for itself.

Project Showboat then becomes very much in the combined interest of the Lao peasant, the Lao Government, the American people and the free world.

NASSAU COUNTY, N.Y., CONSUMER UNIT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in yesterday's New York Times an article of considerable interest to me, reporting the establishment in Nassau County, N.Y., of a department of consumer affairs.

As the author of legislation pending in the House of Representatives, to create a Federal Department of Consumer Affairs, I was most happy to see that some action, geared to benefit the consumer, has been initiated on the local level in my own State.

I am taking the liberty of including the news item in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, so that my colleagues can take note of the responsive voice now available to the consumer in Nassau County. Similar activities should be made available to the consuming public on the Federal level. The article follows:

NASSAU APPROVES A CONSUMER UNIT—NEW DEPARTMENT WILL ADVISE RESIDENTS ON PURCHASING—SUBPOENA POWER GIVEN

MINEOLA, L.I., May 29.—A County Department of Consumer Affairs was established today to give Nassau residents information on buying and to protect them from fraud.

The department is being formed through expansion of the county's Department of Weights and Measures, which is headed by John Occhiogrosso, the County Sealer. The new Commissioner of Consumer Affairs will be assisted by a nine-member advisory committee that would reflect a cross-section of consumer and business interests.

Mr. Occhiogrosso said that consumers would receive information about buying on credit and on the Federal truth-in-packaging law that goes into effect July 1.

He also said that his office contemplated a meat inspection program to insure that consumers have bought correctly labeled items. Consumers will also be warned about purchasing meats that are packaged in such a way as to misrepresent their true quality.

The department was formed by the Board of Supervisors after an eight-month study by an advisory committee, which reported a need for "positive consumer educational programs." The committee's study found inadequate coordination of existing public and private consumer programs, and the lack of a central point to which consumers might turn.

The Commissioner of the department approved today was given subpoena powers but no enforcement powers.

He will receive complaints and initiate investigations of fraud or unfair dealings against consumers. He will also represent the interests of consumers before administrative and regulatory agencies and legislative groups.

DR. WALTER BUCKINGHAM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with the very deepest regret that I call to the attention of the House the tragic death last week of Dr. Walter Buckingham, a member of the faculty of the Drexel Institute of Technology, and a former director of the Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation, of the House Education and Labor Committee. Dr. Buckingham was staff director of that subcommittee, while I was its chairman, and, as such, he played a major role in the birth of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. It was my hope, which I had discussed with him, to draw from his insight during the course of the study my subcommittee is holding this year on Federal manpower programs. His profession and all of us who knew him and worked with him, are deprived of a wise counselor and a good friend. I am sure that I speak for the other members of the subcommittee when I offer my deepest sympathy to Dr. Buckingham's wife and family.

CRISIS IN THE NEAR EAST

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Howard] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having the opportunity of bringing to the attention of my colleagues a wonderful statement by a distinguished American, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes, Governor of the State of New Jersey. I append a copy of his letter to me dated May 29, expressing his views on the Near East crisis and I am sure this will be of great interest to all Members of Congress, not only the New Jersey delegation.

State of New Jersey,
Office of the Governor,
Trenton, May 29, 1967.

Hon. James J. Howard,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Jim: I am taking the liberty of writing you concerning the current crisis in the Near East, a subject beyond the normal purview of any Governor, but yet one with such profound implications that all of us in positions of public leadership should speak out. The views I express herein are personal, but I believe they also reflect the thinking of a large majority of the people of New Jersey.

I have been gratified by the President's prompt and clear-cut affirmation on May 23 of the international nature of the waters of the Gulf of Aqaba—and of its involvement of international law and its relationship to the very survival of mankind. His noble appeal to the international community deserves the support of all who cherish freedom.

Today, when any threat of war strikes terror into the hearts of men, the continuing hope and the goal of humanity must be world peace. Now the tension which has arisen between Israel and the Arab States has faced the world with a new and very grave danger.

The President of the United States, like men of good will everywhere, has expressed his earnest support of "all efforts in and outside of the United Nations and through its appropriate organs, including the Secretary-General," to join in standing behind the President in this hour of crisis.

I am particularly concerned, as is President Johnson, with the serious threat to peace posed by the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping, for this is an international waterway, and a denial of the right of innocent shipping is a violation of international law. I share President Johnson's commitment—a commitment expressed also by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy before him—to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all Near Eastern nations. And I wish to add my voice to his in calling upon all concerned to bear in mind and act in accordance with their solemn responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations.

As a great President and former Governor of New Jersey, Woodrow Wilson, said more than half a century ago:

"Peace can be rebuilt only upon the ancient and accepted principles of international law, only upon those things which remind Nations of their duty to each other and, deeper than that, of their duties to mankind."

Never has the duty of nations to mankind, to keep the peace and maintain the sanctity of international law, been more clear or more urgent.

I know you will support the President at this critical time in our nation's history.

Sincerely yours,
Richard J. Hughes,
Governor.

NOTRE DAME SEMINARY HONORS REPRESENTATIVE HALE BOGGS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinguished leaders of the U.S. House of Representatives, the able majority whip, Hale Boggs, was honored by Notre Dame Seminary of New Orleans with an honorary doctor of laws degree, on May 25, 1967.

Nothing is more indicative of a man's worth than recognition by his peers, particularly by those whom he has dedicated his life to serve. In citing the reasons for the award of the degree to the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman Boggs, Notre Dame Seminary has so honored its representative in the House.

In glowing words the seminary has etched on parchment what many of us in the Halls of Congress have long known—that Hale Boggs is a leader among men, an exemplary Catholic, an able legislator, and above all, a great human being.

After receiving the degree, Congressman Boggs delivered a perceptive and visonary address to the seminary graduates. It was a typical Hale Boggs speech, expressing his faith in humanity and adding a new dimension to his belief in the future of America. The audience responded with a standing ovation.

The citation and the address bear reading by all of us:

To All Who View These Present Letters From the President and the Faculty of Notre Dame Seminary, Greetings in the Lord:

As an anxious world watched the lights of peace flickering in Europe during the summer of 1939, the newly elected Pope Pius XII wrote in his inaugural encyclical: "The human legislator must attain to that balance, that keen sense of moral responsibility, without which it is easy to mistake the boundary between the legitimate use and the abuse of power. Thus only will his decisions have internal consistency, noble dignity, and religious sanction, and be immune from selfishness and passion."

A few months after these words were read by a world in turmoil, an honor graduate of the Tulane School of Law, already showing traits of leadership in public service coupled with a keen appreciation for democratic processes, became the youngest legislator of his party elected to the 77th Congress of the United States. Before his two-year term had expired, his country was itself engaged in the Second World War. Sharing its commitment to human freedom and its abhorrence for dictatorship, the young legislator temporarily left political life to serve as an officer in the U. S. Naval Reserve and the U. S. Maritime Service. His nation at peace once again, he returned to Congress in 1946. Today, as the third ranking Democrat in the House of Representatives, he still displays that sense of balance, awareness of moral responsibility, internal consistency, noble dignity, and immunity for selfishness and passion which Pope Pius XII considered the chief characteristics of an effective and efficient lawmaker in a well-ordered society.

In promoting and supporting legislation which has run the gamut from education to urban affairs, from domestic housing to foreign trade expansion, from interstate highway finances to flood control and waterways development, from taxes and tariffs to narcotics control, he has been guided by the wise dictum of the poet Dante: "Just as the laws are made for the sake of the body politic rather than the body politic for the laws, likewise those living under the law do not exist for the sake of the legislator but he for them."

That his constituents are convinced of his embodiment of this democratic ideal is evident from their returning him to the halls of Congress each biennium of the past two decades. That his colleagues appreciate his legitimate use of power is crystal clear from the leadership they have entrusted to him. That the Presidents of the United States have respected his decisions and admired his noble dignity have been manifested by the confidence they consistently placed in him.

Numerous and notable as have been his achievements as legislator, perhaps none reflected so luminously his sense of moral responsibility and his deep compassion for his fellowmen as did his sponsorship of a special hurricane relief bill providing, for the first time in the history of the country, direct financial assistance from the national government to victims of a natural disaster. With parliamentary skill, relentless energy, and quiet persuasiveness, legislation was passed in record time providing $125 million in loans to persons affected by Hurricane Betsy in late 1965. Some 128,000 otherwise demoralized families were made aware that they existed not for the sake of the legislator but he for them.

Success as lawmaker, acclaim from constituents, honors at home and renown abroad, have not kept him from remaining a devoted husband, dutiful father, and loyal son of Mother Church. Internal consistency has marked his career as honor student and public servant, private citizen and Catholic layman, Phi Beta Kappa graduate and House Majority Whip, political reformer and member of Presidential Commissions.

Notre Dame Seminary is honored to bestow its own accolade on one who has been at once a human and humane legislator and has remained, in those other words of Pope Pius XII, "immune from selfishness and passion".

Therefore, Most Reverend Chancellor, We, the President and Faculty of this Seminary in view of the reasons adduced in these letters, have esteemed worthy of the doctorate, and present to you for the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws, the Honorable Hale Boggs, M.C., May 25, 1967.

WILLIAM J. RAFTERY,
President.
ROBERT J. STOHL,
Dean.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY HON. HALE BOGGS, DEMOCRAT OF LOUISIANA, NOTRE DAME SEMINARY, NEW ORLEANS, LA., MAY 26, 1967

Archbishop Hannan, very Reverend Father Rector, Reverend members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, and friends, it is my distinct honor to be honored by you today, for this occasion affords me the opportunity to salute Notre Dame Seminary, its faculty and student body, as it should be recognized. The honorary degree that you have so graciously conferred upon me is one that I especially treasure because it comes from an institution that is distinguished in many areas.

Notre Dame Seminary, we all know, can rightly be called the Alma Mater of the Catholic clergy of New Orleans. Many of the excellent priests that serve the Catholic body in this area are graduates of this institution. Notre Dame Seminary, as many of us also know, is a distinguished institution of the national scene. Its influence has filtered out into the entire life of the Catholic Church in our Nation. It has been recognized throughout our Nation for many years as a center of advanced Christian social thinking. It has produced many distinguished members of the Catholic clergy who have left a decided mark upon the Catholic body in our national life. I need not recall for you the names of but two of your many distinguished alumni. I refer to Monsignor Joseph Gremillion, who is presently secretary of the Vatican Secretariat for peace and world justice, and Monsignor Marvin Bordelon, who will assume the office of secretary of the American Secretariat for peace and world justice next month. Notre Dame Seminary has been a leader within the Catholic Church in the United States in the promotion and dissemination of the social teaching of the Catholic Church. For this reason, among many other personal reasons, it is my distinct honor to be honored by you today. I wish to assure you that I am both humbled and happy to be the recipient of your honorary degree.

Since we have just referred to the fine tradition of teaching the social doctrine of the Church that has distinguished Notre Dame Seminary these many years, I felt that a few words from me, as your elected representative on this subject might prove to be worthy of our consideration today. We all know that we are the enriched members of a Church that has for the past 75 years been among the leaders of a sound and sane social teaching. Our church has given to all of us a vast literature on the subject of the social teaching of the Gospel and has striven, from Pope Leo XIII down to our present Pontiff, Pope Paul VI, to make Catholic clergymen and laymen among the leaders of a rapidly changing and expanding social movement in our world today.

I need not recall, least of all to you, the teachings of Leo XIII's immortal *Rerum Novarum*. Nor need I review with you the reiteration of that teaching in Pius XI's classic *Quadragesimo Anno* and Pius XII's many papal messages concerning the social question. To all of us the teachings of the beloved Pope John's two masterpieces, *Mater Et Magistra* and *Pacem in Terris* are also milestones along the church's journey to serve the needs of modern man. Finally, Pope Paul's recent encyclical, *Progressio Populorum* is a document that we have all already read with great enthusiasm and will continue to study and strive to apply in the months and years that lie ahead.

These are the principal papal documents that have already shaped and will continue to shape, our Christian consciousness of the needs of a world in transition. To these we must immediately add that monumental document of the Second Vatican Council, the pastoral constitution on the church in the modern world, which has made all of us Christians more and more deeply aware of the witness that we must give, not only as Christians, but especially as truly human beings, to a world that in so many ways has become alienated not only from God but from reality itself. The opening words of this document should, I believe, in some way be the spirit of dedication shared by all men of goodwill everywhere. The opening words of this constitution are:

"The joys and the hopes, the griefs and the anxieties of the men of this age, especially those who are poor or in any way afflicted, these are the joys and hopes, the griefs and anxieties of the followers of Christ. Indeed, nothing genuinely human fails to raise an echo in their hearts. For theirs is a community composed of men. United in Christ, they are led by the Holy Spirit in their journey to the kingdom of their Father and they have welcomed the news of salvation which is meant for every man.[1]

Indeed, as I read the pastoral constitution on the church in the modern world, I see that our religious leaders are inviting all of us, as the people of God, to become involved in the real, and sometimes agonizing, issues of our times. I do not believe that you, as the priests of tomorrow, any more than I, as your civil representative today, can ignore the voices that come to us from the world in which we live. We know that we have many problems and we know too that we do not have all the answers to these international and national problems that weigh heavily upon us. Would to God that we had ready-made solutions! Would to God that we lived in a world where issues are clearly defined and we could all distinguish good and evil as Dick Tracy can separate the good guys from the bad guys. But we know that is not the situation and we must not only live, *but we must work* as Christians, in a world that is confusing and complex. I am trying to say that we are members of a pilgrim church and as such, be we clerics or politicians, we will always be in this life on the road. Heaven awaits us, it is not already upon us.

There is one aspect of the church's social teaching that I should like to elaborate upon for a few brief moments because I feel that the theology of secularity is one that deeply concerns and involves not only you as the priests of today and tomorrow, but also my colleagues and myself in the legislative halls of our Government. We are all dedicated to working for, what Pope Pius XII called "a better world willed by God" and we are, I believe, convinced that before that objective is achieved, "the whole world must be rebuilt from its foundations, transformed from savage to human, from human to divine, that is to say, to make it as God would have it."[2]

I believe that we are entering upon a new era of humanity. A man whom, I am sure, you are much better acquainted with than I am, has told us prophetically, that we are surely and steadily evolving into a creative perfection that we ourselves are not even aware of. "The human world of today," wrote de Chardin, "has not grown cold, but it is ardently searching for a God proportionate to the newly discovered immensities of a universe whose aspect exceeds the present compass of our power of worship."[3]

I believe that this is the vision we should grasp in our assessment of the future. Some of the old conflicts are resolved, but greater ones have arisen. By and large, these old conflicts between the employer and employee; between capitalism and socialism; between unions and corporations are already resolved.

On the other hand, I believe with De Chardin, that we are moving into a new cosmic understanding of man and how he must continually develop in a total evolutionary process. This process involves even more fundamental issues, such as, the problem of unbelief that is rampant in the world today; the problem of understanding and development of those basic truths that we have for so long accepted as the warp and woof of Christianity; the problem of making a transcendental god a reality in a world that is dedicated to secularity; the problem of war and peace, wealth and poverty, hatred and love, knowledge and ignorance. These problems, I submit for your consideration, are not purely religious problems, nor are they purely political problems. These problems, involving the very future of man himself, are the great issues of our society for the future of that society depends upon how we will measure up to them. This we must do, not simply as a cleric or a politician, housewife or scholar, but all together as witnesses of a Christian faith and a Christian message that we firmly believe does contain the germinal seeds of solution.

This same vision comes through in Pope Paul's encyclical, *Progressio Populorum*. In that magnificent document, our Holy Father invites all of us to look to the future. He tells us that the church wishes to offer mankind "a global vision of man and of the human race" (No. 13.) This vision, he says, is, "In brief, to seek to do more, know more and have more in order to be more: That is what men aspire to now when a greater number of them are condemned to live in conditions that make this lawful desire illusory." (No. 6)

In spite of obstacles, Pope Paul insists that man is more than his environment, that he is on the march to a rendezvous with a destiny that will make him more and more perfectible, both as a Christian and a human being. "By the unaided effort of his own intelligence and his will," writes Pope Paul, "Each man can grow in humanity, can enhance his personal worth, can become more a person." (No. 15). And, adding a Christian dimension to this vision, Pope Paul continues, "By reason of his union with Christ, the source of life, man attains to new fulfillment of himself, to a transcendent humanism which gives him his greatest possible perfection: This is the highest goal of personal development." (No. 16)

---

[1] Lumen Gentium, No. 1, *The Teachings of the Second Vatican Council*, Newman Press, Westminster, Md., 1966, pp. 439–40.

[2] Pius XII, Address to the People of Rome, Feb. 11, 1952.

[3] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Future of Man*, Harper & Row, Publishers New York, 1964, p. 268.

My friends, you are in a very real sense, the hope of the future. It is not only the Catholic people of our beloved state that look to you as the harbingers of that "second spring" and "new Pentecost" as a result of the Second Vatican Council. It is, as I intimated in the beginning of these remarks, the entire Nation that looks to you as the religious leaders of a new and reawakened South. Far be it from me to attach a moral to these remarks for far be it for a layman—even in these days of renewal—to preach to those who will be preachers. Permit me, however, to remind you of two quotations from those two remarkable men—both called John—who have shaped so much of our thinking today. The first is from an address of the late Pope John. Speaking on April 11, 1963, he said:

"There lies ahead an immense task for all men of good will, if the mutual relations of the human family are to be restored in truth, in justice, in love and in freedom. This is a most exalted task, for it is a task of bringing about true peace."

These words of good Pope John were echoed in words uttered by the late President John F. Kennedy, delivered on November 8, the same year. He said:

"And let the word go forth . . . to all who are concerned about the future of the human family . . . that we will not weary in well doing and we will faint not; and we shall, in due season, reap a harvest of peace and security for all the members of the family of man."

You must be prepared to face a world of ferment; a world boiling with resentments. Since history repeats itself, perhaps today is but a repetition of history, a repetition of past eras in which advocates of change and new ideas fought strenuously and with every weapon at their command against those who would not move forward.

It is possible that the troubles of today are even more pronounced. Now youth seems more involved. Some seem to confuse license with liberty, laissez-faire with democracy, legitimate and reasonable authority with authoritarianism, elimination of discrimination against them as giving them a right to discriminate against others, protection of their rights as giving them the right to trample on the rights of others.

Our job is to teach that responsibility goes with freedom, that liberty is not license.

The twentieth century has seen us go from horse and buggy to space ships that land on the moon in a matter of days; from diseases that took many lives and crippled or disfigured thousands to miracle drugs, to miraculous vaccines, to transplantation of vital organs. But, with all the advances of technology and medicine and knowledge have come a plethora of problems—problems to which our society must find a solution.

We are faced with a world in which a single word can produce a holocaust and destroy our civilization.

Yet you, the members of the class of 1967, are the ambassadors of the prince of peace. With the openness of Pope John, with the dedication of President John F. Kennedy, you can bring to your future charges the spirit of truth, justice, love and freedom that will, I sincerely believe, "reap a harvest of peace and security for all the members of the family of man" and contribute immeasurably to the answers of the problems of our times.

CONCENTRATED INTEREST ON THE POOR CAN BEST BE ACCOMPLISHED THROUGH OEO

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, our domestic war—the war on poverty—has been the target of much criticism, from those who want nothing done and those who contend that not enough is being done. The Republican leadership of the House, paying lipservice to the needs of this effort to raise the standard of and reason for living of so many people, proposes to kill the OEO and distribute its programs among other Federal departments and agencies. The effect of such action would be to dilute the effort to aid the poor and impoverished and lose them in the jungle of Federal bureaucracy.

The Philadelphia Inquirer this morning carried an excellent article on this very matter written by that eminent journalist Roscoe Drummond. I commend the article to my colleagues:

GOP ERRS IN ATTACK ON WAR ON POVERTY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The American people are making no mistake in giving their strong support to the war on poverty. Voters are 60 percent behind the war on poverty and want it continued or expanded, the Harris Survey shows.

Public support has been growing steadily for the last seven months.

The Nation as a whole has come to accept the war on poverty as one of the most compassionate, humane, and intelligent programs of the Johnson Administration.

And the Republican leadership in Congress, launching its own "Opportunity Crusade," avows that it favors all of the antipoverty programs and backs all the antipoverty goals—but would do the whole thing differently.

Surely all this should be sweet music to the White House and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Why, then, as he goes to Congress soon to defend his proposed budget, should Sargent Shriver, the coordinator-in-chief of the war on poverty, be the target of so much criticism for his administration of the program? Has he been a flop? Has he been incompetent? Has he been a dull-minded and routine administrator?

No one will argue, certainly not Shriver, that everything has come up roses in the Office of Economic Opportunity. But the volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on the OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled around the already over-burdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered. These facts ought to be borne in mind:

Much of the criticism comes from the extremists who pretty much cancel each other out—those who attack Shriver because they don't want the war on poverty to be doing anything and those who want Shriver to be asking for ten times as much as he is now doing. To each, Shriver is the enemy, though in fact Shriver is the best friend the war on poverty has.

The OEO has made mistakes. They should be recognized and corrected. The new antipoverty bill now before Congress greatly tightens the program.

But the OEO had to do things quickly in its early period and obviously it has not done them all well. But let's not forget that if there were no OEO there would be no war on poverty. There would be no Head Start. There would be no Job Corps. There would be no community action and, above all, there would be little recognition on the part of middle-class America that poverty in the United States acutely exists—32 million men, women, and children beneath the poverty line who must be relieved.

And without the OEO there would be no single strong voice raised in behalf of the poor, no single Government enterprise devoted solely to the multiple problems of the poor, no one place the poor can call their own when they want to protest an injustice or an inequality in the life of the community.

Finally, with public support for the war on poverty growing, it is politically tempting to play both sides of the street—praise the goals and attack their administration.

There is no doubt in my mind that the war on poverty continues to need innovative, pioneering, open-minded, let's-try leadership. It would be very unwise to bury these new and experimental programs in existing department which have more than they can do already and too many officials wedded to old programs.

These are the reasons I think it is a mistake for the Republicans—all of whom don't agree—to tie their support for the antipoverty programs to getting rid of coordinated control. Coordinated control ought to be strengthened, not weakened.

PHILADELPHIA CITY WATER DEPARTMENT EARNS NATIONAL HONOR

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that from time to time I am able to point out various departments and agencies of the government of the great city of Philadelphia which are the recipients of national honors. The receipt of these honors certainly points out that Philadelphia is one of the foremost cities in the country. It is therefore a pleasure for me to report that the Philadelphia Water Department will receive the John H. Murdoch Advancement Award from the American Water Works Association at the association's annual convention in Atlantic City on Monday. The award is a golden statuette of "Willing Water," symbolic water drop of the association.

The Philadelphia Inquirer this morning carried a news story regarding this award and the reason for the Philadelphia Water Department being so honored. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it in the RECORD at this point.

CITY WATER DEPARTMENT EARNS NATIONAL HONOR

The Philadelphia Water Department will receive the John H. Murdoch Advancement Award from the American Water Works Association at the association's national convention in Atlantic City on Monday.

A golden statuette of "Willing Water," symbolic water drop of the association will be presented to Water Commissioner Samuel Baxter at ceremonies in Convention Hall.

Philadelphia is being honored for its public information program, which started in 1959, its $528 million modernization program running from 1942 through 1972 and public acceptance of a 26 percent increase in water-sewer rates to help finance the city's water-sewer improvement projects.

The national award is presented annually to top water utility companies of public agencies in the United States and Canada with more than 25,000 customers. The association also will honor Alexandria, La., and Valley Center, Calif., utilities with fewer than 25,000 subscribers.

AWWA is comprised of 20,000 members, including engineers and management personnel in 4500 water utilities in this country and 91 other countries.

The Philadelphia Water Department won the AWWA's Pennsylvania award last year, placing the city in competition for the national award against State and regional winners.

The AWWA noted that Baxter's department made a successful and "comprehensive effort" to explain the need for water rate increases in the city through announcements in newspapers, brochures and talks before civic groups.

Some of the city's accomplishments noted by the AWWA were the completion of a $2.3 million intake at the Torresdale Plant on the Delaware River, modernization of a raw water pumping station, basins at Upper Roxborough for storage of purified water, two large storm water conduits for Mill Creek and main relief sewers and 60 miles of water and sanitary sewer mains.

RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL BY BROOKLYN COMMUNITY LEADERS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on Memorial Day, I attended a meeting of more than 150 community leaders of all faiths in my congressional district in Brooklyn to discuss the crisis created in the Middle East. The situation was discussed at length. Expression of support for our democractic ally in the Middle East, Israel, was unanimous. They commended our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, for his forthright and unequivocal stand in the crisis presently existing in the land held sacred by the three great faiths of the Western World.

Their desire that the United States do all within its power to maintain peace there and everywhere else in the world was strong and undeniable.

On that occasion it was my privilege to offer the following resolution urging that Israel be supplied with all necessary aid for her defense. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

The text follows:

Resolved, That we commend the President of the United States for his restrained but firm and unequivocal statement reaffirming that the Gulf of Agaba and the Straits of Tiran are international waterways that must be kept open to the traffic of all countries unimpaired and unimpeded by any country or countries and we commend the President for his continued and determined efforts to keep the peace and to restore it in the troubled areas of the world and urge him to use every avenue that may lead to restoration of peace everywhere and we further urge him to reaffirm the intention of the United States to do all in its power in and out of the United Nations and alone or together with such other nations as will join with us to prevent aggression everywhere and in that connection to supply to the State of Israel all the planes, tanks, missiles and other materiel she may require for her defense against aggression and infiltration and against interference with her peaceful pursuits, and to do everything within his power to maintain the territorial integrity of the State of Israel.

May 30, 1967.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO DENY FURTHER ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES IN MIDDLE EAST COMMITTING OR SUPPORTING AGGRESSIVE ACTS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any and all further grants, aid, assistance, loans, leases, and sales of any and all kinds by the United States or any of its agencies, departments, boards, or corporations, to the United Arab Republic, Lebanon, Syria, Saudi Arabia, or Jordan, be suspended until such time as the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran are opened to all international shipping, including that of the State of Israel, and until all threats to blockade the same by any and all of the countries named have been withdrawn.

The crisis in the Middle East is far from over, Mr. Speaker, and it will not be over until the Arab countries stop their threats and their aggressive acts toward Israel. Our President has made it quite clear as to our position on the Gulf of Aquaba and the Strait of Tiran; they are international waterways. This can only mean one thing, that the ships of Israel must also be permitted to continue to use that waterway, and we have pledged to keep it that way.

One of the ways that we can best bring President Nasser and his allies to their senses, perhaps, is to cut off all aid to those countries in the area who support the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba. Israel is not a warlike nation; since its founding 19 years ago it has tried to live in peace with its Arab neighbors. It cannot, however, meekly stand by and see its trade with the Far East cut off merely to benefit the political aspirations of pan-Arabism as dictated by Nasser.

To put the situation in focus, Mr. Speaker, we need only consider what this country would do if Panama tried to close the Panama Canal to our shipping.

I believe that the crisis in the Middle East can be solved peaceably. In the meantime, it is our responsibility to take affirmative action, such as the cutting off of aid, to accomplish that purpose.

The text of my resolution follows:

H. Con. Res. 367

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should take such steps as may be necessary to suspend forthwith all further grants, aid, assistance, loans, leases, and sales of any and all kinds by the United States or any of its agencies, departments, boards, or corporations, to the United Arab Republic, Lebanon, Syria, Saudi Arabia, or Jordan, until such time as the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran are opened to all international shipping, including that of the State of Israel, and until all threats to blockade the same by any and all of the countries named have been withdrawn.

SOME DOUBTS ABOUT LAWS TO CONTROL GUNS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Chicago Daily News by John M. Johnston regarding restrictive gun legislation has just come to my attention.

In this article Mr. Johnston expresses serious doubts about the reduction in accidents, crime, and violence that gun reform proposes to achieve.

Mr. Johnston's article, printed May 15, 1967, follows:

Some Doubts About Laws To Control Guns

(By John M. Johnston)

Manufacturers and distributors of firearms have a major stake in the outcome of current agitation for laws to restrict the sale of guns. An estimated 25,000,000 Americans engage in some form of recreational shooting, and the sale of ammunition runs around $100,000,000 a year.

The willingness of the industry to accept reasonable restrictions on sale and ownership is indicated by the support given by the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce to gun-control legislation at Springfield.

In view of the intense agitation for such laws sparked by the murder of President Kennedy, good public relations dictates this support. But I, for one, would forgive anybody who retained private doubts that this reform is going to accomplish the reduction in accidents, violence and crime that its sponsors promise.

These misgivings are based on long observation of crusades that failed to deliver as described in the prospectus. Such as national prohibition, that was going to banish Monday absenteeism, wife-beating, alcoholism, marital infidelity and five-eighths of the crime and disorder.

Such as the direct primary that was going to make the back-room politician obsolete.

Such as court reform in Illinois, which was going to clean up the six-year backlog of cases.

Such as the United Nations, that was going to bring the belligerents to amiable conference with tea and soft music, and so on and so on.

This recital may confirm the perspicacity of the sardonic Ambrose Bierce, who defined a conservative as one who accepts existing evils, in contrast to a liberal, who wishes to replace them with new ones.

There is some evidence, nevertheless, on what happens under tough gun laws. Philadelphia reacted promptly to a crime wave and after April, 1965, required permits even to buy shotguns and rifles. In 1966, homicides resulting from gunshots increased, although the total of homicides had declined.

The effect on the sale of guns was striking, however. Fourteen of 82 dealers in firearms had discontinued business entirely, and sales dropped to one-ninth of the former rate.

New York City has the toughest gun laws in the country. Still, 131 cities had lower homicide rates, and New York's rate of killings by pistols exceeds the national average. Such statistics prove nothing, of course, but neither does the emotional rhetoric unleashed upon each misuse of a gun.

Knives or other sharp instruments were used in 11 times as many New York homicides as long guns, but it seems acknowledged that it would be pointless to register bread knives.

It is simply not credible than an ex-con upon deciding to turn bank robber would hesitate to arm himself with a pistol before running the bigger risk. Nor that there would be a thriving bootleg market to supply him.

It ought to be apparent that without federal legislation to control interstate shipment there can be no effective check on sales to the mentally unbalanced or criminally inclined. The evils are plain enough, and an attack on them is overdue. But don't bet too much that by 1977 you will be able to tell the difference.

OUTLAW AGGRESSIVE WAR

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, excerpts from a speech delivered last month at Valparaiso University by Mr. Thurman Arnold, a former Assistant U.S. Attorney General of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, were brought to my attention by Mr. Louis Stulberg, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union. The excerpts of Mr. Arnold's address were published in the May 15, 1967, issue of "Justice," a publication of the ILGWU. At this point Mr. Speaker, I place in the Record this address because I feel it is so timely and noteworthy that it will be of benefit to all of my colleagues:

Outlaw Aggressive War!

(By Thurman Arnold)

It is in the field of international law where the greatest danger lies. We are living in a lawless world, a world where small and relatively impotent nations can nevertheless start brush fires which may spread to our own shores. We have seen it happen twice—the First World War and again in the Second.

But the world is even smaller today than it was in the Second World War. It has become a world so small that lawless aggressive action by any nation against another can threaten world peace. It is also a world where poverty and misery in the crowded nations which cannot feed themselves threaten revolutions which upset the balance of power.

In such a world we need some sort of a world constitution ever more desperately than the Thirteen Colonies needed the Constitution of the U.S. after the Revolutionary War. And the keystone of that world constitution is the principle that no nation must be permitted to expand its borders and its power through an aggressive attack upon its neighbors. We are today attempting to enforce that principle in Vietnam.

It was our feeling of desperate need for a principle of international law against aggression which led us to abandon our distaste for the League of Nations and become a leader in the formation of the United Nations. But this action we felt was not enough. We wanted some judicial sanction for that fundamental principle on which all international law must rest—the outlawing of aggressive war. And so, after Hitler's defeat, the U.S. joined with the victorious nations, including the Soviet Union, in the first Nuremberg trial to prosecute the national leaders of Hitler's empire.

The paramount purpose of that trial was to declare that an aggressive war was an international crime which justified imposing the death penalty on the leaders of the nation which started it. The trials for German atrocities represented no novel principle. The great principle of international law announced for the first time at Nuremberg was that an aggressive war is in itself an international crime regardless of the way it is conducted.

At the time of the Nuremberg trials those who write the think columns in our press, such as Walter Lippmann, and independent organizations of intellectuals, such as Americans for Democratic Action, and liberal professors on our college campuses, acclaimed the principle of the outlawing of aggressive war as a great step forward in international law.

Today they are bending every effort to prevent the enforcement of the principle that Nuremberg announced to the world. They are giving every aid and comfort to the enemy that they can in the light of their limited numbers. They are encouraging Hanoi to believe that if it will only hang on, the U.S. will abandon its attempt to enforce the Nuremberg principle in Asia. They proclaim that America cannot and must not be a world policeman.

On the principle of international law that it is the duty of the U.S. as the richest and most powerful country in the world to enforce the law against aggressive war, it is my belief that the majority of American citizens of both parties believe in that principle. I think they have learned the lesson that—in our present age—it is the function of a dominant world power to take the lead in establishing world order and enforcing international law, and that a disorderly consensus of bickering lesser powers such as the UN cannot now do the job. This role imposes a costly burden in lives and money.

I am one of those who believe that if we had not taken our stand in Vietnam, then Korea, which we have built up as one of the few strong economies in the Orient, would have become disillusioned and felt itself in danger. I believe we saved Malaya and Thailand. I believe that the present disorder in China and the growing weakness of the Chinese, heretofore aggressive, would not have taken place had China's onward march through Asia not been stopped in Vietnam.

There is no reason why we cannot carry our international burden and at the same time promote economic progress at home. We must do both. Today there is no safety at home in a lawless world. If we allocate the tremendous power of productive expansion with which the modern scientific revolution has endowed us to these two ends, the international law of the 20th century will be the gift of the U.S. to the world.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Long] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for its intent to revise regulations governing observances of the Sabbath and other religious holidays. These rules form part of the "Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Religion" issued pursuant to the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In the proposed regulation, the Commission interprets the ban against religious discrimination to include an obligation on the part of the employer to make reasonable accommodation to the religious needs of employees and prospective employees when this can be done without undue hardship to the employer's business. The burden of proving that accommodation to the employee's needs would be unreasonable would rest on the employer.

Revision of the guidelines became necessary because of numerous questions regarding the possibility of religious discrimination in cases where employers discharge or refuse to hire employees who observe Friday evening and Saturday, or some other day, as the Sabbath, or who observe certain special religious holidays during the year, and therefore do not work on such days.

The new regulations seem eminently reasonable and fair both to the employer and the employee. It assures the employer that his business will not suffer because of the special hours his worker must spend in the observance of his religious obligations, and it assures the employee or job applicant that his religious beliefs need not be a bar to employment.

Religious freedom is among the major cornerstones of our national heritage. A man's ability to have and hold a job is among his most vital possessions, and to abridge it because of his religion is a violation of that religious tolerance which so many of our citizens have sought on our shores since the days of the Pilgrims.

I have also introduced a bill today to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members. This bill would provide that Federal Government and District of Columbia employees would be given time off—without charge to any leave and without loss of pay—for their religious observances, provided that employees arrange with the agencies to make up the time on another day. Government flexibility would be retained by the provision that time off should be given to the extent compatible with the exigencies of the public business and the performance of essential services.

Government employees are now penalized for their religion through loss of vacation time for every special holiday they observe. This is practically a guarantee that Jewish employees, for example, will lose at least 3 days' vacation for Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur observances. Those required, but unable, to work on Saturday face an even more difficult situation. This seems neither reasonable nor necessary, and a change in the regulations along the flexible lines suggested would impose no undue hardship on the Government. I urge early consideration and passage of this legislation. Mr. Speaker, I insert at the close of my remarks the text of the equal employment opportunity's proposed guidelines, which originally appeared in the Federal Register:

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION—GUIDELINES ON DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF RELIGION

[29 CFR Part 1605]

OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH AND OTHER RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is considering amending Part 1605 of its regulations, Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Religion, issued pursuant to section 713(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000e–12(b). The proposed amendment would delete § 1605.1 and substitute the following revised § 1605.1:

§ 1605.1 Observance of the Sabbath and other religious holidays.

(a) Several complaints filed with the Commission have raised the question whether it is discrimination on account of religion to discharge or refuse to hire employees who regularly observe Friday evening and Saturday, or some other day of the week, as the Sabbath or who observe certain special religious holidays during the year and, as a consequence, do not work on such days.

(b) The Commission believes that the duty not to discriminate on religious grounds, required by section 703(a)(1) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, includes an obligation on the part of the employer to make reasonable accommodation to the religious needs of employees and prospective employees where such an accommodation can be made without undue hardship on the conduct of the employer's business. Such undue hardship, for example, may exist where the employee's needed work cannot be performed by another employee of substantially similar qualifications during the period of absence of the Sabbath observer.

(c) Because of the particularly sensitive nature of discharging or refusing to hire an employee or applicant on account of his religious beliefs, the employer has the burden of proving that an undue hardship renders the required accommodation to the religious needs of the employee unreasonable.

(d) The Commission will review each case on an individual basis in an effort to seek an equitable application of these guidelines to the variety of situations which arise due to the varied religious practices of the American people.

All persons who desire to submit written data, views, or arguments for consideration in connection with the proposed amendment should file the same in duplicate, not later than 30 days after publication hereof in the FEDERAL REGISTER, with the Employment Opportunity Commission, Room 1234, 1800 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20506.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 5th day of May 1967.

STEPHEN N. SHULMAN,
Chairman.

[F.R. Doc. 67–5222; Filed May 9, 1967; 8:48 a.m.]

COLUMBIA, S.C., VA HOSPITAL

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for modernization of the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Columbia, S.C. My bill for modernization includes the installation of air conditioning.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will carry out an agreement reached in Columbia, S.C., on November 17, 1960, at the annual South Carolina congressional delegation public hearing. This meeting was held in the senate chamber of the State capitol. The agreement reached on that date between officials of the Veterans' Administration and the South Carolina congressional delegation called for a new 500-bed VA hospital in Charleston and the modernization of the Columbia VA hospital with a 410-bed capacity.

South Carolina veterans at that time had fewer VA beds per capita available to them than any other State in the Union. The situation was urgent. As a member of the Veterans Affairs' Committee of the Congress I requested the Veterans' Administration to present a plan to our congressional delegation which would provide South Carolina with adequate VA hospital facilities. Veterans' Administration officials, the South Carolina delegation, and veterans' organizations all agreed that South Carolina needed 300 additional hospital beds to provide for modernization and the additional beds at the Columbia facility would cost approximately $15 to $17 million.

The availability of physicians and staffing for 900 beds at Columbia would be difficult; therefore, it was finally agreed that a $12 million VA hospital would be built at Charleston, near the South Carolina Medical College where staffing and the availability of research and physicians would greatly increase the efficiency and capacity of the new hospital. When the hospital at Charleston was completed and available to veterans, then the hospital in Columbia would be completely modernized with 410 beds making a grand total in the State of South Carolina of approximately 900 beds.

With modernization, the proposed 410 beds at Columbia could take care of as many veterans as the original 600-bed hospital without modernization. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is important to the veterans and to the people of South Carolina that we now proceed with the modernization in Columbia as originally agreed upon at the 410-bed level, with a Chapel, air conditioning, modern, up-to-date kitchen, dining facilities, and the most modern bath facilities.

The VA hospital in Charleston was dedicated last May 13 and is now in operation. All wards and beds at Charleston have not yet been activated and thus can be used while modernization at Columbia is in progress.

At no time was there any agreement or plan to have modernization and 500 beds at the Columbia hospital—the agreement was 410. Last year a 72-bed nursing care unit was established at the Columbia facility which also helped to prevent any crippling reduction in personnel.

The officials of the Veterans' Administration have been very cooperative. They want to see the Columbia Hospital completely modernized and updated.

The Honorable Bill Driver, Veterans Administrator, is rendering the veterans of our country outstanding service. He is completely dedicated to the service of our country and to our veterans. Mr. Driver is an expert on veterans affairs. Mr. Driver is returning tomorrow from Vietnam and will make further recommendations to the President and to the Congress on the needs of our men serving the cause of freedom throughout the world.

H.R. 10436

A bill to provide for the modernization of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Columbia, S.C.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall as expeditiously as possible undertake the modernization (including the installation of air conditioning) of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Columbia, South Carolina.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $7,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DEDICATION OF THE ALABAMA GREAT SEAL AT VALLEY FORGE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, May 28, the Alabama Great Seal in the Roof of the Republic at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania's Washington Memorial Chapel was dedicated. Our Governor, Hon. Lurleen Wallace, was unable to attend, but asked my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] to represent her and the people of Alabama. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. NICHOLS' remarks on this occasion in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY CONGRESSMAN BILL NICHOLS TO COMMEMORATE ALABAMA STATE SEAL IN ROOF OF REPUBLIC, WASHINGTON MEMORIAL CHAPEL, VALLEY FORGE, PA., MAY 28, 1967

It is a great pleasure for me to be here today to bring greetings from Governor Lurleen Wallace and the people of the Great State of Alabama. Governor Wallace would have liked to have been here herself, but the State legislature is just beginning its regular session for this year. On behalf of our Governor and each Alabamian, let me say that we are deeply honored to be a part of this chapel by way of our State seal which is imprinted in the Roof of the Republic.

This is my first visit to historic Valley Forge. It is indeed hallowed ground, and makes every American feel closer to the heritage given us by those Americans who so bravely fought for our country here.

This is a magnificent edifice memorializing the first President of our great country as well as the brave men of the Continental Army who faced that terible winter of 1777. Let us who daily enjoy the freedoms and privileges and riches of this country remember in deepest reverence the hardships, the sacrifices, the trials, and the tribulations of that determined group of men, 3,000 of whom paid the supreme sacrifice through malnutrition, exposure and disease.

It is General George Washington and those brave men that the people of my State of Alabama honor in dedicating our seal in this memorial chapel.

The Christian's duty to his country and his duty to God go hand in hand. It is with nations as with individuals "seek ye first the rule of God and all other matters shall take their proper places."

A brief panorama of American history reminds one that Christian patriotism has always led the way to the highest hopes of humanity. From the beginning, America was founded on the Christian faith, inspired by Christian hope, guided by Christian truth, and nurtured by prayer.

On such an occasion as this, it is good to look into the past and remind ourselves of what our forefathers went through to give us the America we have. You who live here in Valley Forge are reminded every day as you pass the landmarks which were left by those who lived and died here. Just a few miles from here in Philadelphia we are reminded of those daring men who affixed their names to a unique and a singular document which every true American cherishes as his own Declaration of Independence. To these men, their action was at best a daring venture, a courageous hope, a noble dream, a bold act of faith. They well knew the odds of success weighed heavily against them, but their hatred of tyranny and their love of liberty were so strong that they felt compelled, for the sake of mankind, to wager the risk. They were convinced of one thing: They were on the same side with Almighty God.

During those difficult days of the constitutional convention, when agreement was next to impossible, it was Benjamin Franklin who stressed the necessity for prayer. He was an old man, and he urged that if the new Nation did not place and keep its trust in God, it could not long endure.

We must always remind ourselves of the past, because in that glorious past lies the fulfillment of our present freedom and culture, and the hope of our future.

There are some things we need to remind ourselves of, however, in which the hope of America's future does not lie.

It does not lie in her illustrious past, as eloquent and outstanding as all past achievements in America and her greatness have been. These things do not guarantee future hopes. America has well been called "the paradise of liberty" but like the Garden of Eden of a yesteryear, America could very well become a paradise of fools if she depended solely upon her past. We must look forward to those things that safeguard the future, as we remember conceit could well darken wisdom.

It does not lie in her politicians. It should be remembered that there is a line in the holy book which says, "Woe unto thee, O land, when thy king is a child.". It may be said of any land, "Woe unto thee, when thy statesmen become mere politicians". May our petition be:

"Give us men to match our mountains,
Give us men to match our plains
Men with empires in their bosoms,
Men with eras in their brains."

Only the statesman who puts the good of his country first, who will sacrifice his own good if necessary for the advancement of his morrow's record with those whose heroic country can match today's history and tospirits and lives out of the yesteryears. Let us continue to pray:

"God give us men
Men whom the lust of office does not kill:
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy.

It is the "Tall men, sun crowned, who live above the fog" of petty politics who are needed for troubled times such as envelop our world in this our finest hour. The liberties purchased by the blood of our fathers are threatened by political plunderers, term servers, and seekers of selfish advantage.

But if the skies are dark their are stars of hope to light them. May we have vision to see them. If America's hope be hid, it is hid to them to whom Christian patriotism is a relic of past ages, and to whom Stars and Stripes have lost their significance.

Our country's future does not lie in her great wealth and culture. Witness Egypt, Babylon, Greece, and Rome. All faded glories of the past. History tells a tragic story of nations once great in wealth sunken into decay and their greatness only a memory. Despite their wealth and their culture, the envy of all the rest of the world in their time could not save them from the work of the pallbearers of their generation.

America's real wealth is not in material things, her banks and skyscrapers and real estate and commerce and oil and cattle. Material wealth is easily swept away. Rather her imperishable wealth is in her glorious traditions, and incomparable history in her Bunker Hills and Gettysburgs and Santiagos and Chateau Thierrys and right here in Valley Forge where you and I stand this day. It is in her Christian ideals. It is in her godly institutions. It is in her freedom of conscience. It is in her untrammeled liberty. It is in her untarnished name. It is in her patriotism. It is in her youth of today and generations to follow, if they be endowed with Christian culture and principles that make for peace among men and the continuation of civilization upon earth. By these things nations live—without these things nations perish.

The hope of America lies in her moral purity. America has been victimized in many areas of time and space by a false teaching that morality is merely a matter of standards: That which is immoral a generation ago may be moral now: That which is below standard today may top the standards tomorrow: That vice in one age is virtue in another. Today there is a belittling of the standards. "To love your enemies. Do good to those who hate you." Rather, the standard seems to be to do as you like and live as you please. We must never subscribe to such philosophy. There is but one rule of peace and prosperity. Whether it be for individuals, communities, or nations, and that is "Whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them".

The hope of America lies in her political sanity. This calls for the supremecy of a constitution. If the Constitution becomes no more than a playing of politicians, then our freedom would soon be a thing of the past, and our manner of life subjected to the whims of political pranksters who might be in power.

Political sanity waits upon sane laws and law enforcement. It deplores our insane desire for the making of laws, and our unconcern for enforcing them. The Stars and Stripes are broad enough to float over every American, and all Americans, no matter who their ancestors, or from what country they come.

Political sanity calls for American idealism with its free schools, with its separation of church and state, and with its adjusted differences between capital, and labor. That every man's home is his castle, and that every man is his own priest before God—free to call upon Him and to worship as conscience alone dictates.

I could not conclude without a brief mention of Memorial Day, which is Tuesday. It would seem appropriate, here in the Washington Memorial Chapel, to remember those who died at Valley Forge and at Yorktown, at Gettysburg and Vicksburg, in the trenches and hedgerows of France, and Hurtsgen Forest and the Battle of the Bulge. More recently on Pork Chop Hill in Korea, and today in the filthy, disease infested jungles of Viet Nam, American patriots are still giving their lives for the cause in which they believe so strongly.

On this Memorial Day weekend, 1967, every American should resolve, as did Abraham Lincoln over 100 years ago, "that these dead shall not have died in vain".

TO EXTEND THE PROVISIONS OF THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced into the House of Representatives a bill designed to extend the provisions of the Older Americans Act of 1965 and to increase the amount of Federal money available to plans both in progress and contemplated.

Too often in the past our Nation and its citizens have turned our backs on those productive and vital members of our society who have, merely through the passage of years, become regarded as unnecessary. Increased medical knowledge has stretched the life span; the Older Americans Act attempts to match this scientific advance with a corresponding social response. This act has already seen positive results and it is my hope that the extension and increased funding which I introduce today will carry forward and expand this exercise in fundamental human decency.

Specifically, my bill will extend the grant provisions of the act through 1972. In fiscal year 1968, $10,550,000 will be granted to the States for projects already begun and to allow for 240 to 300 new projects; $6,400,000 is authorized for research, demonstration, and training programs, with a particular emphasis on nutrition. Such sums as may prove necessary may be requested from the Congress for the next 4 years.

The provisions of my bill are in accordance with the bold and imaginative plans projected by President Johnson in his message on aid for the aged. I am pleased to associate myself with many distinguished specialists in the problems of longevity, whose knowledge and wisdom is only exceeded by their compassion. I feel that the extension of the Older Americans Act provided for by my bill, and the enlarging of its range and scope, is in keeping with the increased awareness that our social scientists have given us about aging and is a continuation of the noble tradition of allowing all Americans to enjoy the blessings of our unprecedented prosperity.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. REINECKE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. MEEDS), from May 31 through June 2, on account of official business.

Mr. Monagan (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. Friedel (at the request of Mr. Albert), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. Ruppe (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), on account of official business for Subcommittee on Coast Guard.

Mr. Wolff (at the request of Mr. Farbstein), for May 31 and June 1, on account of official business.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Cahill, for 60 minutes, on Monday, June 5; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Smith of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 30 minutes, on June 1; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Hall.

Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Rooney of New York to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole on the bill H.R. 10345, and to include tables and other extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hall) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Scherle.

Mr. Reid of Illinois.

Mr. Bray.

Mr. Latta.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Montgomery) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. St. Onge in two instances.

Mr. Celler in two instances.

Mr. Pucinski in three instances.

Mr. Vanik.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6950. An act to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 1, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

785. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of intention to donate certain surplus property to the East Carolina Chapter, Inc., National Railway Historical Society, Greenville, N.C., pursuant to the provisions of section 7545 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

786. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of an additional facility project proposed to be undertaken for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–188; to the Committee on Armed Services.

787. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of work registration under Federal-State aid to dependent children of unemployed parents in the State of Ohio, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

788. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of selected procurements and of costs of dedication ceremonies in the Pacific region, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

789. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of determination relating to deferment of the 1967 and 1968 construction payments due the United States from the Foss Reservoir Master Conservancy District, Washita River Basin project, Oklahoma, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86–308; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

790. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Council for Science and Technology, transmitting a copy of the annual progress report of the Committee on Water Resources Research, entitled "Federal Water Resources Research Program for Fiscal Year 1968," pursuant to the provisions of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (sec. 305); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

791. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Attorney General to admit to residential community treatment centers persons who are placed on probation, released on parole, or mandatorily released; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

792. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to authorize the collection of user charges, to permit any charges for customs services to be collected on a fixed rate of charge basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POOL: Committee on Un-American Activities. H.R. 8. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Rept. No. 326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 10418. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lend obsolete or condemned rifles to local units of certain national veterans' organizations for use for ceremonial purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 10419. A bill to provide the Coast Guard with authority to conduct research and development for the purpose of dealing with the release of harmful fluids carried in vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 10420. A bill to give the President authority to alleviate or to remove the threat to navigation, safety, marine resources, fish and wildlife, or the coastal economy posed by certain releases of fluids or other substances carried in oceangoing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 10421. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1924; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 10422. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 10423. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 10424. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 10425. A bill to provide for the free entry of limestone imported to be used in the manufacture of chemical and industrial lime; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10426. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record, to eliminate certain special requirements for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, to equalize the criteria for determining dependency of a child on his father or mother, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's or father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 10427. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 10428. A bill to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code for certain veterans holding national service life insurance who are totally disabled before their 71st birthday; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 10429. A bill relating to the conservation of natural resources upon lands of the United States and amending certain provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and the Mineral Leasing Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 10430. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 10431. A bill to provide for the return of unsolicited and personally offensive mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 10432. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 10433. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 to authorize Federal grants under the open-space land program for the development and redevelopment of existing open-space land and for the acquisition of outdoor and indoor recreational buildings, centers, facilities, and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 10434. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed 30 years of railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 10435. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 10436. A bill to provide for the modernization of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Columbia, S.C.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10437. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that no grant may be made thereunder for a code enforcement program which includes or permits the inspection of one- or two-family homes without the consent of the owners or occupants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 10438. A bill to create a commission to conduct a study with respect to cemeteries of the United States in which servicemen or veterans are or may be buried; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 10439. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 10440. A bill to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 10441. A bill to reduce crime and improve criminal procedures in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 10442. A bill to facilitate exchanges of land under the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), for use for public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL (by request):

H.R. 10443. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 with respect to the determination of project cost and the Federal and non-Federal share thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 10444. A bill to amend section 27, Merchant Marine Act of 1920, as amended (46 U.S.C. 883); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 10445. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 10446. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.J. Res. 596. Joint resolution concerning a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. Con. Res. 364. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to an investigation and study to determine the potential of railroad passenger and mail transportation in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 365. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to aggression in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 366. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the support of the Congress for United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 367. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the crisis in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. MIZE, Mr. WINN, Mr. SHRIVER, and Mr. SKUBITZ):

H. Res. 495. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that certain social security and railroad retirement benefits shall not be made subject to Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

208. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the installation of prescribed fireproofing materials under and behind the driver's compartment of cab-over-engine commercial vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

209. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the expansion of the commercial fishing training program for Micronesian fisherman in Hawaii; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

210. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the use of foreign constructed vessels in Hawaii State ferry system; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

211. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to funds to be used in the reconstruction and maintenance of freeway access roads in the city and county of Honolulu; to the Committee on Appropriations.

212. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the inclusion of funds in the harbors and rivers bill for the purpose of completing the plans and designs for the Waikiki Beach improvement project; to the Committee on Public Works.

213. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the unlawful burning and malicious damaging of the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

214. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to reducing the import of mink pelts into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

215. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, relative to the protection of interstate commuters from unfair multiple taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 10447. A bill for the relief of Michael Michalos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 10448. A bill for the relief of John M. Toy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H.R. 10449. A bill for the relief of Camille Anita Dobson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10450. A bill for the relief of Albert E. Jameson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 10451. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Tsouvales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 10452. A bill for the relief of Yehuda Ben Porat, Nehama Ben Porat, and Razya Ben Porat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 10453. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Riccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 10454. A bill for the relief of Andrea Caporrimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10455. A bill for the relief of Idalina Vieira da Silva Cavaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 10456. A bill for the relief of Dr. George S. Ioannides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10457. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angela Zabarte Fandino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10458. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose R. Zayas-Bazan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 10459. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Guiang Fabrigar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 10460. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amathine (Amentine) S. Hernandez and her children, Viviane Marie Nidaud and Jean Michel Arbonel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 10461. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Magdalena Widmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 10462. A bill for the relief of Comdr. John W. McCord; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 10463. A bill for the relief of Sabah Yagoub Atisha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

96. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to tax evasion, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

> (b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the fourth calendar quarter of 1966 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,041.06. E. (9) $6,041.06.

A. Herbert F. Alfrey, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $395. E. (9) $19.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,851.20.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,827.66. E. (9) $3,827.66.

A. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,135.52. E. (9) $1,135.52.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,798.37. E. (9) $4,798.37.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $333,254. E. (9) $5,444.79.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,395.73. E. (9) $10,395.73.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $330. E. (9) $15,211.52.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,272.26. E. (9) $1,272.26.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $37.47.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $64,052. E. (9) $500.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated International Trading Corp., 180 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $25.20.

A. George W. Apperson, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Transit Union, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Braniff Airways, Inc., Exchange Park, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $3,776.25. E. (9) $1.70.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $16,000. E. (9) $87.60.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Floor Covering Committee Affiliated with the National Council of American Importers, 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lever Brothers Co., 390 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Margaret Lee Weil, 33 West 67th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,249.99. E. (9) $503.08.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Rockwell-Standard Corp., 300 Sixth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $14.85.

A. The Arthritis Foundation, 1212 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,374.61.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $230.

A. Douglas B. Bagnell, Fairhope, Ala.
B. Maine Potato Council, Presque Isle, Maine.
D. (6) $300.

A. Vincent Gerrard Barnett, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.
D. (6) $8,555.39. E. (9) $12,272.91.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,359.68. E. (9) $944.11.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y.; and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert J. Bird, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. Joel D. Blackman, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,480. E. (9) $725.28.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $936.50. E. (9) $63.52.

A. Braniff Airways, Inc., Exchange Park, Dallas, Tex.
E. (9) $3,784.40.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,173.10.

A. Carl Bronn, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,250.01.

A. Robert J. Brown, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James E. Bryan, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,585.43.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, care of Mr. Chaco Chace, 2 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2.

A. Lowell A. Burkett, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. P. Burks, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562.50.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $105. E. (9) $105.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $584.50. E. (9) $512.43.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. George H. Buschmann, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Moog Industries, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. George H. Buschmann, World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Psychoanalytic Society, 4925 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Harold K. Howe, on behalf of the American Institute of Laundering, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $262.50.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Harold K. Howe, on behalf of the National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Harold K. Howe, on behalf of the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 996 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Ronald A. Capone, 505 The Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30-32 St. Mary Axe., London, E.C. 3, England.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $355.07.

A. Philip Carlip, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
B. Seafarers International Union.
D. (6) $2,222.22. E (9) $710.60.

A. Richard M. Carrigan, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,756.59. E. (9) $17.74.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. South African Sugar Association, Post Office Box 507, Durban, South Africa.
D. (6) $14,740. E. (9) $3,599.51.

A. Central Scientific Co., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,275.93.

A. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., care of Norris E. Phillips, 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,024.43. E. (9) $2,024.43.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. James E. Clark, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,030.42. E. (9) $522.65.

A. J. I. Collier, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $212.50.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $273. E. (9) $6.79.

A. Paul G. Collins, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $7,483.66.

A. Paul Conrad, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $110.25.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,531.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $292.41. E. (9) $292.41.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Linen Supply Association of America, 975 Arthur Godfrey Boulevard, Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers Federation, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,752.18. E. (9) $175.19.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States–Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 3129 Brereton Court, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $958. E. (9) $17.04.

A. Debevoise, Plimpton, Lyons & Gates, 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Edward G. Sparrow, 1 East 66th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.60.

A. Franklin W. Denius, Post Office Box 1148, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Electric Service Co., Post Office Box 970, Fort Worth, Tex.; Dallas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex., and Texas Power & Light Co., Post Office Box 6331, Dallas, Tex.

A. Horace J. DePodwin Associates, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., care of Norris E. Phillips, 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $242.08.

A. J. D. Durand, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $230.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $553.14.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $28.14.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Post Office Box 1776, Raleigh, N.C.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $989.82.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $237.50. E. (9) $50.93.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.,
D. (6) $395. E. (9) $22.70.

A. Lawrence E. Ernest, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,068.

A. John W. Fitzgerald, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $290.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,325. E. (9) $33.39.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7278, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,189.95. E. (9) $33.66.

A. Neal P. Gillen, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Gladwin, Fruit Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Massachusetts General Hospital, Fruit Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Glenn F. Glezen, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.

A. W. S. Goodkin, 112 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. George Gross, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $282.12.

A. Wilfred H. Hall, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Hamilton Associates, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., care of Norris E. Phillips, 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

D. (6) $416.25. E. (9) $437.95.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,000.02. E. (9) $230.69.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $143.05.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,917. E. (9) $126.58.

A. John T. Haughey, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,307.60. E. (9) $7.20.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW. Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $875. E. (9) $980.85.

A. Neel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Christopher O. Henderson, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $550. E. (9) $25.

A. Carey W. Hilliard, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C

B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $395. E. (9) $31.20.

A. John W. Holton, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Harold A. Hosier, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. David P. Houlihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas B. House.

B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., care of Norris E. Phillips, 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,285. E. (9) $1,344.40.

A. Humor Lobby of Humor Exchange Network, 5516 South Utah Street, Arlington, Va.

D. (6) $25. E. (9) $25.

A. Meryle V. Hutchison, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,424.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $787.85.

A. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. Chas. E. Jackson, 715 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3.

A. Ralph K. James, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $440. E. (9) $41.55.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Ponce Place, Fairfax, Va.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $18.70.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,125.

A. William F. Kenney, New York, N.Y.

B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.

B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, 1022 Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Thomas P. Kerester, 1120 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.

B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $2,200. E. (9) $250.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $270.83.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $350. E. (9) $31.31.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,752. E. (9) $930.99.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of ASCS County Office Employees, care of Clyde R. Payne, Jasper, Fla.

D. (6) $825. E (9) $125.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.

B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $125.

A. Richard M. Lauzier, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Oil Jobber Magazine, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $225.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $45.

A. E. Leitz, Inc., 468 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $6,587.95.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $12,200. E. (9) $1,519.66.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,924.88. E. (9) $2,924.88.

A. John J. Linnehan, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,249.99. E. (9) $837.22.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,241.98. E. (9) $685.43.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,625.00. E. (9) $16.80.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, State and Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $100.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,308.48. E. (9) $703.26.

A. W. F. McKenna, 427 West Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. California Savings & Loan League.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,362. E. (9) $13.73.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,375.25. E. (9) $213.07.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $155. E. (9) $16.86.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. Jos. R. MacLaren, 4 Linden Drive, Hudson Falls, N.Y.

B. Potlatch Forests, Inc., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $673.32.

A. Don Mahon, 1127 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,703.21.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

D. (6) $3,255. E. (9) $87.24.

A. Albert E. May, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $382. E. (9) $33.46.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $4,110. E. (9) $295.

A. Robert A. Means, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Melvin, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) $645.80. E. (9) $27.35.

A. Clinton R. Miller, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Health Federation, 211 West Colorado Boulevard, Monrovia, Calif.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $750.

A. Luther L. Miller, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,307.60. E. (9) $2.90.

A. Stephen A. Mitchell, Post Office Box 486, Taos, N. Mex.

E. (9) $887.97.

A. Thomas F. Mitchell, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Georgia-Pacific Corp., Box 311, Portland, Oreg.

E. (9) $27.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $1,712.68.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Murden & Co., Inc., 1616 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London E.C. 3, England, and Norwegian Shipowners Association, Post Office Box 1452, Oslo, Norway.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $539.76.

A. Murden & Co., Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Informal Committee of 18 European and Other Foreign Cruise Ship Lines, in care of Mr. Vincent Demo, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $10,500. E. (9) $987.91.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7278, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7278, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,585.43.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $45,117.93. E. (9) $1,331.25.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $13,671.79. E. (9) $19,033.04.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $467,357.81. E. (9) $16,238.70.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $32,621.46. E. (9) $20,386.81.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $800. E. (9) $800.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $9,325.35. E. (9) $9,325.35.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $588,026. E. (9) $5,896.45.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $4,928.17.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, care of Dr. A. B. Baker, Division of Neurology, University of Minnesota Hospital, Minneaplois, Minn.

E. (9) $3,000.

A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Association, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) $2,576.23.

A. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,023.75. E. (9) $5,578.36.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) $150.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Central Scientific Co., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $375.93.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $226.20.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $60,051.60. E. (9) $4,244.70.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $113,787.17. E. (9) $9,886.27.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $107.11.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,615.05. E. (9) $1,949.45.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $716.40.

A. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,680.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,492.29.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,539.10.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,700. E. (9) $973.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,936. E. (9) $15,557.

A. National Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,561.95. E. (9) $2,799.90.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $170.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $21,389. E. (9) $3,729.11.

A. Ivan A. Nestingen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $73.80.

A. Sarah H. Newman, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. Ben Paul Noble, Andrew McR. Barnes, and Allan M. Ephraim, 2022 R Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hallmark, Inc.; Westminster Time Corp.; Phoenix Industries, Inc.; Stratton Watch Co. (all watch assemblers of Agena, Guam).
D. (6) $3,090. E. (9) $288.60.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,225.02. E. (9) $363.42.

A. John B. O'Day, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,017.77.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $5,770.15.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,281. E. (9) $1,917.11.

A. John A. Overholt, 10400 Connecticut Avenue, Kensington, Md., and 1106 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,961.64.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1735 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $147.25.

A. Brig. Gen. J. L. Person, USA (Ret.), 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,249.99.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $3,313.38.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 100 Indiana Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N.J.
D. (6) $4,731. E. (9) $3,238.67.

A. Albert Pike, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y. et al.
D. (6) $17,550.01. E. (9) $7,895.53.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Bermuda Trade Development Board, Hamilton, Bermuda.
D. (6) $1,666. E. (9) $135.96.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bulk Food Carriers, Inc., 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 105, Elizabeth, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. South Atlantic & Caribbean Line, Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Stimson Lumber Co., Post Office Box 68, Forest Grove, Oreg.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $24.72.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Elisabeth von Oberndorff, 200 East 66th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5.50.

A. Edward M. Raymond, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,875.04. E. (9) $206.90.

A. Stanley Rector, 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Research to Prevent Blindness, Inc., 598 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $6,000.

A. Retired Officers Tax Credit Committee, Post Office Box 1965, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $304.80. E. (9) $551.31.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. $55.78.

A. John Rippey, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $226.38.

A. Stephen Philip Robin, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Public Relations Co., Ltd. (N.Y.) d/b/a Japan Steel Information Center, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $125.

A. James A. Rock, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $152.

A. Rockwell-Standard Corp., 300 Sixth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $14.85.

A. Nathaniel H. Rogg, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $119.80.

A. John F. Rolph III, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1555 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $385.52.

A. Mrs. Edward F. Ryan, 110 Bridge Street, Manchester, Mass.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $93.60.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Business Press, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,070.35.

A. Stanley W. Schroeder, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,253.31. E. (9) $486.51.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $97.64.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $398.74.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 6326 Southcrest Drive, Shreveport, La.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $575.

A. A. Z. Shows, 1800 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. WILMAC Corp., 1800 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $661.79.

A. Gerald A. Simmons, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,479. E. (9) $28.35.

A. Single Persons Tax Reform Lobby, 1629A Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $15. E. (9) $108.40.

A. Jack C. Skerrett, 717 19th Street South, Arlington, Va.
B. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 996 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. James E. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $185.

A. James E. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $225.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $225.

A. Milan D. Smith, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,575. E. (9) $137.68.

A. Lawrence Speiser, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. State and Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $20,989.63.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters Association and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers Association of Tokyo, Japan; Miscellaneous Goods Division, Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc., and Imported Footwear Group, National Council of American Importers, New York, N.Y.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip W. Stroupe, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $25.

A. Richard L. Studley, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Post Office Box 19128. Washington, D.C.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $79.29.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400.

A. Monroe Sweetland, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $335. E. (9) $50.

A. Russell A. Swindell, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $455.25. E. (9) $180.71.

A. C. M. Tarr, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,884.80. E. (9) $115.13.

A. Craig L. Thomas, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,754. E. (9) $29.35.

A. Evert S. Thomas, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $579. E. (9) $74.04.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,846.52.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John N. Thurman, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 635 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $703.49.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperative League of USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $7,880.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,021. E. (9) $15.18.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $263.20. E. (9) $1,655.91.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,194.04.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers Association, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $35,525. E. (9) $6,750.33.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $348.18. E. (9) $38.13.

A. E. Jerome Webster, Jr.
B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. John C. White, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth Williamson, One Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,561.53. E. (9) $439.76.

A. Morton M. Winston.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,153.86. E. (9) $337.40.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1967:

(NOTE.—The form used for report is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19........ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(*a*) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(*c*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $--------Dues and assessments
2. $--------Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $--------Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $--------Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $--------Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. $--------TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $--------Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. $--------TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $--------TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $--------Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $--------Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $--------"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": --------

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through ----------------, 19----)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(*a*) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $--------Public relations and advertising services
2. $--------Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $--------Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $--------Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $--------Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $--------Telephone and telegraph
7. $--------Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $--------All other expenditures

9. $--------TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $--------Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $--------TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $--------TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $--------Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $--------Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates*	*Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11:	Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15:	Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL	

PAGE 2

A. Charles D. Ablard, 1629 K Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $34.92.

A. Ad Hoc Committee of the Construction Industry Advancement Funds, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 404 Commerce Building, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,030. E. (9) $3,030.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5847.82. E. (9) $5,847.82.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., Suite 409, ARBA Building, 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,675.91. E. (9) $3,675.91.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, Post Office Box 5800, Washington, D.C.

A. Herbert F. Alfrey, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $394. E. (9) $19.50.

A. Mrs. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, 555 North Western Avenue, Room 2, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $1,040. E. (9) $1,677.45.

A. Kenneth D. Allen, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $62.50. E. (9) $10.58.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Class I railroads.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Americman Beekeeping Federation, Minco, Okla.

D. (6) $3,815.40. E. (9) $5,363.14.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $8,561.95.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc,, 3505 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $310. E. (9) $708.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $4,759.96. E. (9) $4,759.96.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, General Offices: Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.; Washington Offices: 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $30,531. E. (9) $30,531.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $43,796.79.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washingon, D.C.

D. (6) $4,539.60. E. (9) $4,489.72.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $344,810.80. E. (9) $5,497.86.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Humane Association, 5351 South Roslyn Street, Englewood, Colo.

E. (9) $1,500.

A. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $1,950.

A. American Israel Pulbic Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Suite 720, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,857.02. E. (9) $6,531.06.

A. American Justice Association, Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.

D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $83,989.67. E. (9) $36,686.22.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $3,153.51. E. (9) $15,932.39.

A. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $571.10. E. (9) $23.05.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $15,364.66.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $10,432.61. E. (9) $10,432.61.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.

D. (6) $6,712.49. E. (9) $6,712.49.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $318.20. E. (9) $782.35.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,315.13. E. (9) $662.86.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $14,719. E. (9) $8,151.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,490.34.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,493.80. E. (9) $1,493.80.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $900.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) $12,751.94. E. (9) $12,751.94.

A. American Transit Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,800. E. (9) $14,166.

A. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $17,825.31.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., Suite 502, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,256.60. E. (9) $3,256.60.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Spiegel, Inc., 2511 West 23d Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $150.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. William C. Anderson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,302. E. (9) $26.15.

A. Mrs. Erma Angevine, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George W. Apperson, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arkansas Railroad Association, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.

B. Class one railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,190.34.

A. The Arthritis Foundation, 1212 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y..

E. (9) $1,348.01.

A. The Associated General Contractors, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Railroad Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,468.18. E. (9) $3,469.18.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $525.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,997.04. E. (9) $4,997.04.

A. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $113.53. E. (9) $69.78.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW.. Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $215.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,005.50.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $10,075. E. (9) $8,092.32.

A. The Atlantic Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $300.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National AeroSpace Services Association, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $72.50.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,181.25. E. (9) $1,027.08.

A. Baker & McKenzie, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Clark Equipment Co., Buchanan, Mich.
D. (6) $3,244.

A. Baker & McKenzie, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Celia Margulis, 50 Belmont Avenue, Sutton Terrace, Bala Cynwyd, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $70,000.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Pacific Railway Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Great Northern Railway Co., St. Paul, Minn., and Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $300.

A. Ernest L. Barcella, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $12.96.

A. Vincent Gerrard Barnett, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.
D. (6) $10,629.62. E. (9) $12,536.81.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 2133 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Company of North America and Life Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $488.50. E. (9) $262.54.

A. Eugene T. Bartkowiak, 3829 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Polish Americans, Inc., 3829 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. James P. Bass, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ross Bass Associates, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Roy Battles, 917 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 917 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

A. (Mrs.) Dita Davis Beard, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $3,100.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,815.44. E. (9) $992.75.

A. John H. Beidler,
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,491. E. (9) $267.39.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $5.31.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Reed A. Benson, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,886.45.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,578. E. (9) $308.25.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenues of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $670.

A. Robert W. Blair.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
E. (9) $876.55.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,654.31.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,840. E. (9) $578.44.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross, Diamond & Gordon, 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $11.60.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Lyle M. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $238.56.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $34.88.

A. Samuel E. Boyle, 428 South Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $1,272.81. E. (9) $370.38.

A. Colonel A. A. Brackett, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 122 Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry.

E. (9) $465.50.

A. Thomas C. Brickle, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,000.

A. Fred T. Bridges Associates, 406–10 Southern Building NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Coopers International Union, 429 West Walnut Street, Louisville, Ky.

E. (9) $1,500.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Wally Briscoe.

B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $135. E. (9) $16.50.

A. David A. Brody, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $200.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $70.

A. Derek Brooks, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $729.45.

A. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $7,992.69. E. (9) $7,992.69.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,625.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,166.66. E. (9) $1,086,63.

A. Robert J. Brown, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $303.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $612. E. (9) $619.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, 2725 Avenue E, Riviera Beach, Fla.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, care of Chaco Chace, 2 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $30.53.

A. George S. Bullen.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $114.50.

A. George J. Burger.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Burger.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Burke, Finlen Hotel, Butte, Mont.

B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Drawer 1445, Spokane, Wash.

E. (9) $400.

A. C. P. Burks, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) $13,223.90. E. (9) $602.04.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

E. (9) $318.36.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $67.50.

A. Herbert H. Butler, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $50. E. (9) $68.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1514 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $95.81.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $80.

A. Donald L. Calvin, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Carl Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $83.08.

A. Jack C. Skerrett, 996 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $10.

A. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Roscelle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, AFL–CIO, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.

D. (6) $2,589.71. E. (9) $576.82.

A. Marvin Caplan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,704.50. E. (9) $94.20.

A. Ronald A. Capone, Kirlin, Campbell & Keating, Room 505, the Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,966.76.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Law Schools, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip Carlip, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.

B. Seafarers International Union.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,150.

A. Col. John T. Carlton, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. James R. Carnes, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,500.

A. Braxton B. Carr, Suite 502, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., Suite 502, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $192.15.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Richard M. Carrigan, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,816.88. E. (9) $230.28.

A. Blue A. Carstenson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,298.96. E. (9) $137.26.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $20.

A. Ralph E. Casey, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,380. E. (9) $155.30.

A. E. Michael Cassady, 225 South Meramec, Suite 1032T, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, Suite 1032T, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $25,040. E. (9) $21,893.84.

A. Col. Joseph L. Chabot, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Alaska Pipeline Co., Post Office Box 6554, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $20.86.

A. Chapman, DiSalle, and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.
E. (9) $1,078.10.

A. Chapman, DiSalle, and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139–141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7.10.

A. James W. Chapman, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $75.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Pennsylvania Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,429.09. E. (9) $3,850.26.

A. Edwin Christianson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $31,134.85.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10,557.90.

A. William F. Claire, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Allen C. K. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,294. E. (9) $45.

A. James E. Clark, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, P.O. Box 13125, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $187.50. E. (9) $272.77.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 917 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philip Morris, Inc.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. David Cohen, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,572. E. (9) $70.76.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for a Reasonable World Trade Center, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,150.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $13.80.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
(D. (6) $750.

A. Richard G. Cohen, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Universal Consolidated Industries, 1 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. J. I. Collier, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $231.25.

A. Paul G. Collins, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $579.26. E. (9) $579.26.

A. Harrison Combs, Jr., 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,289.98.

A. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,150.

A. Committee for a Free Cotton Market, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $232.15.

A. Committee for an Interstate Taxation Act, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Group consisting of New Process Company (Warren, Pa.) and Columbia Broadcasting Company (51 West 52d Street, New York, N.Y.).

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $66,225. E. (9) $1,818.85.

A. R. T. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $93.80.

A. Howard M. Conner, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $583.50. E. (9) $484.27.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $240.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Harry N. Cook, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $19.75.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $44.30.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 506, Portsmouth, N.H.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,332.90.

A. Darrell Coover, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $203.30.

A. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,595.47. E. (9) $18,679.86.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Lightweight Aggregate Percentage Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. P. Møller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mortgage Insurance Cos., Post Office Box 2976, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $1,962.50. E. (9) $81.75.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Wisconsin Corp., 500 Union Street, Seattle, Wash.
E. (9) $21.09.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. Steele Culbertson, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Fish Meal & Oil Association, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $41.50.

A. C. B. Culpepper, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,984.14. E. (9) $500.28.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $2,023.13.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railroads of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 3129 Bereton Court, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. F. Gibson Darrison, Jr., 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $34.56.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $343.75 E. (9) $282.04.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 901 West 22d Street, Oak Brook, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $5.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $127.62.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Union Tank Car Co., 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago Ill.
D. (6) $833.25. E. (9) $8.25.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
D. (6) $172.60. E. (9) $172.60.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Guild of Prescription Opticians, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Oceanic Properties, Inc., Post Office Box 2780, Honolulu, Hawaii.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Admiral Time, Inc., Belair Time Corp., and Unitime Corp., St. Croix, V.I., Bulti-Jewell Corp., St. Thomas, V.I.
D. (6) $13,125. E. (9) $72.03.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,200.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Nursing Home Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $12,928.50.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Export Agency Division, Calcutta, India.
D. (6) $20,000.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Peoples Life Insurance Co., Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., and Equitable Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,812.50. E. (9) $94.60.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Responsive Environments Corp., 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $198.75.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. John deLaittre, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,600. E. (9) $6,283.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 1003 Lancaster Drive, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Ronald W. DeLucien, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $100.

A. Max A. Denney, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Lloyd J. Derrickson, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. John M. Dickerman, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,100.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,762.50. E. (9) $215.15.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $62.28. E. (9) $7.50.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Post Office Box 388, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,169.22. E. (9) $144.22.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Post Office Box 15830, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $1,105.01. E. (9) $55.01.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Yuba County Water Agency, Marysville, Calif.
D. (6) $1,213,75. E. (9) $13.75.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Service Headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
D. (6) $11,375. E. (9) $1,767.47.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $462.50. E. (9) $7.50.

A. James F. Doherty, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,856.30. E. (9) $561.08.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $250.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $190.30.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,397.78.

A. Leonard K. Dowiak, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Mortimer B. Doyle, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Franklin B. Dryden, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,715.44. E. (9) $1,995.57.

A. William DuChessi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,597.50. E. (9) $160.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Durand, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $215.

A. Robert G. Dwyer, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8. E. (9) $26.73.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Post Office Box 1776, Raleigh, N.C.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,512.50. E. (9) $1,685.21.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $516.25. E. (9) $247.75.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md.
D. (6) $4,736.80. E. (9) $2,586.90.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $478.98. E. (9) $34.28.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $65.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,600.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centre, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,226.75.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $394. E. (9) $27.

A. Myles W. English, 202 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 202 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $672. E. (9) $69.60.

A. Ethyle Corp., 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $751.50.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $2,174. E. (9) $18.

A. William J. Fannin, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $89,049.49. E. (9) $19,821.77.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $600.

A. Arthur Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue., Chicago Ill.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

A. Joe G. Fender, 802 Houston First Savings Building, Houston, Tex.

B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

D. (6) $1,714.41.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

B. New England Footwear Association, Inc., 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) $400. E. (9) $28.59.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C.

D. (6) $7,125. E. (9) $135.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $2,835. E. (9) $300.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.

D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $80.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $24.29.

A. Floyd O. Flom, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.

E. (9) $1,200.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, 2725 Avenue E, Riviera Beach, Fla.

A. Gordon Forbes, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $27.33.

A. Frederick W. Ford.

B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $417. E. (9) $18.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago. Ill.

D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $128.44.

A. Charles E. Foster, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $187.75. E. (9) $250.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $70.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $172.64.

A. Morley E. Fox, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

D. (6) $120.53. E. (9) $98.60.

A. Charles A. Francik, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.

D. (6) $420.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph Freni, Jr., 1619 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $450.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $50,077. E. (9) $8,911.

A. Frank W. Frisk, Jr., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $240.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $611.

A. John Baxter Funderburk, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $500.

A. William B. Gardiner, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $80.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200.

A. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Aubrey D. Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $170. E. (9) $125.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,243.28. E. (9) $31.38.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

D. (6) $1,375.

A. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5. E. (9) $2.48.

A. Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $225. E. (9) $53.51.

A. Glenn F. Glezen, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Don A. Goodall, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $500.

A. Government Employees' Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $19,602.71. E. (9) $3,712.84.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $48.33.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 15401 Detroit Avenue, Lakewood, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) $16,961.94. E. (9) $16,961.94.

A. George Grant, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George O. Gray, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,600.66.

A. James A. Grey, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $38.25.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. J. S. Grigsby, Jr., 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. John G. Griner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,923.10. E. (9) $692.31.

A. George Gross, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $909.10. E. (9) $55.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association and American Zinc Co.
D. (6) $4,100. E. (9) $2,300.

A. Jerome R. Gulan.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert W. Haack, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $428.75.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,294. E. (9) $129.

A. Harlan V. Hadley, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Taxation Committee, Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $625.

A. Hal H. Hale, 421 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Randolph M. Hale, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,346.14.

A. Norman S. Halliday, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $5.04.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tejon Ranch Co., Post Office Box 1560, Bakersfield, Calif.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Student Aid Funds, Inc., 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $30. E. (9) $114.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dale W. Hardin, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $119.03.

A. William E. Hardman, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Proctor & Gamble Mfg. Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $28.

A. Mildred B. Harman, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $725. E. (9) $403.30.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 W Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $50.30.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperative, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,200. E. (9) $186.39.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. R. A. Harris, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 58 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Burr P. Harrison, Graichen Building, Winchester, Va.
B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., et al.
E. (9) $321.87.

A. John T. Haughey, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,692.20. E. (9) $8.60.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15. E. (9) $4.31.

A. Eugene B. Hayden, Jr., 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hays & Hays, Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $11.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $40.65.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $198.69. E. (9) $198.69.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $17.25.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,441.95.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Phil D. Helmig, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $150.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $466.90.

A. John K. Herbert, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,149.42.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., et al.
D. (6) $4,583.50. E. (9) 93.05.

A. Hester & Stone, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $69.45.

A. John W. Hight, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Carey W. Hilliard, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $394. E. (9) $45.

A. William Bentley Hitchcock II, 2413 Enfield Road, Austin, Tex.
B. International Public Relations, Inc., 315 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.

A. Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC (Ret.), 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $107.35.

A. Lawrence Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticue Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $61.80.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Fuller Holloway, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. John W. Holton, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. David P. Houlihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas B. House.
B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $1,607.47.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $352.50.

A. Robert R. Humphreys, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $320. E. (9) $96.30.

A. Meryle V. Hutchison, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,828.

A. Philip A. Hutchinson, Jr., 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $75.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
B. Miss Alice M. Hebing, Rochester, N.Y., et al.
D. (6) $1. E. (9) $414.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,227.50.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,545.45. E. (9) $8,545.45.

A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $3.50.

A. International Armament Corp., 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $6,695.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $21,243.24.

A. International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,474.98.

A. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $2,975. E. (9) $4.87.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1000 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $26,894.75. E. (9) $9,183.56.

A. Ives, Whitehead & Co., Inc., 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $314.

A. Rear Adm. Alexander Jackson, Jr., 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnson Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,375. E. (9) $264.95.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.51. E. (9) $43.10.

A. Chas. B. Jennings, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Stockyards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $423.80. E. (9) $2.20.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,461.38. E. (9) $126.07.

A. Spencer A. Johnson, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Stuart H. Johnson, Jr., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $22.

A. Ned Johnston, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $165.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $49.30.

A. Francis M. Judge, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Karelsen, Karelsen, Lawrence & Nathan, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $217.85.

A. Allan M. Kearney, 1001 Broad Street, Johnstown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Electric Co., 1001 Broad Street, Johnstown, Pa.
D. (6) $619.27. E. (9) $269.50.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. William J. Keating, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Howard B. Keck, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Eugene Adams Keeney, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation.

A. Thomas John Kehoe & Associates, 1904 Rookwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
E. (9) $675.

A. Robert H. Kellen, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mayonnaise & Salad Dressings Institute, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert H. Kellen, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Thomas A. Kelly, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,200.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180.

A. Cornelius B. Kennedy, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $77.80

A. James J. Kennedy, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $635.

A. William F. Kenney, New York, N.Y.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, 1022 Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Thomas P. Kerester, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $5,500. E. (9) $550.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $60.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Reuben H. Donnelley Corp., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $75.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Time, Inc., Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $150.

A. William J. Kerwin, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Edward W. Kiley, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $270.83.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $633.65. E. (9) $25.35.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors and Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
E. (9) $1,720.34.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. John M. Kinnaird, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $19.42.

A. Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz & Masters, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $690. E. (9) $72.56.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
D. (6) $158.03. E. (9) $154.65.

A. Ralph W. Kittle.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 430 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $11.50.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 430 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., West Higgins Road, Hoffman Estates, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $51.66.

A. James F. Kmets, 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,790.

A. George J. Knaly, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000.06.

A. George W. Koch, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert M. Koch, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $40.25.

A. William L. Kohler, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $213.20.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $5,124.83.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,872. E. (9) $1,001.72.

A. June Kysilko, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $9,397.63.

A. Laborers' Political Action League, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,672.21. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $8,292. E. (9) $6,866.

A. Julian J. Landau, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $55.50.

A. Richard H. Lane, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

A. Morton Langstaff, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $52.41.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. Edward Lashman, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

D. (6) $3,913. E. (9) $662.43.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $525.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $156.30.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $66.46.

A. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $472.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $36.25. E. (9) $108.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5. E. (9) $144.

A. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,600.66.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $58.

A. Nils A. Lennartson, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $9,249.96.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Edith M. Lesser, 2924 Rittenhouse Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington Home Rule Committee, 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,299.99.

A. Roy T. Lester, One Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $437.50. E. (9) $25.65.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Six Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $1,028.14.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $14,295. E. (9) $16,763.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,076.59. E. (9)$5,076.59.

A. Lightweight Aggregate Percentage Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.

D. (6) $8,094.82. E. (9) $5,361.34.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $8.

A. John J. Linnehan, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $738.60. E. (9) $188.75.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,511.74.

A. Zel E. Libsen, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America, AFL–CIO, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,575.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washintgon, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $375. E. (9) $17.33.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tennessee.

D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $70.

A. Paul H. Long, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Company (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $30.90.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $293.50.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.

B. Norfolk and Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va.

D. (6) $600.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Robert W. Johnson, Jr., Johnson & Johnson, New Brunswick, N.J.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobile Home Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. William R. Lucas, Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.

B. Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S.A., Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.

E. (9) $130.

A. Dr. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,388.10. E. (9) $527.84.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750.

A. John M. Lynham, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Charles and Katrushka J. Parsons, 310 Park Avenue, Pasay City, Manila, Philippines.

E. (9) $313.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,687. E. (9) $62.21.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., Eleventh & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, Eleventh & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) $3,437.49. E. (9) $810.28.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. William C. McCamant, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Robert C. McCandless.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $104.90.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employees' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,019.22.

A. E. L. McCulloch, Railway Labor Building, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L.E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $284.60. E. (9) $81.50.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington. D.C.
D. (6) $3,277.06. E. (9) $210.14.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $504.76.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,308.48. E. (9) $185.

A. Barbara D. McCarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington D.C. and its subcommittee, Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul J. McGowan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Virgin Islands Legislature, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, V.I.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $856.15.

A. Marshall C. McGrath.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $360. E. (9) $140.56.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,049.50.

A. Clarence H. McIntosh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,361.50. E. (9) $74.12.

A. William F. McKenna, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $226.02.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,387. E. (9) $60.25.

A. John S. McLees, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,375.25. E. (9) $125.66.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $224.15.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $361.93. E. (9) $25.76.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. John G. MacFarlan, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,290. E. (9) $315.50.

A. Joseph R. MacLaren, 4 Linden Drive, Hudson Falls, N.Y.
B. Mountain Fir Lumber Co., Independence, Oreg.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $247.98.

A. Joseph R. MacLaren, 4 Linden Drive, Hudson Falls, N.Y.
B. Potlatch Forests Inc., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $515.37.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $812.50. E. (9) $28.40.

A. Don Mahon, 1127 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,272.

A. Robert L. Maier, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $5.

A. Carter Manasco, 5932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,400. E. (9) $180.46.

A. Rufus W. Manderson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Olya Margolis, 924 Dupont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,296.20. E. (9) $136.21.

A. James Herk, Jr., 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,790.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. David M. Marsh, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $38.10.

A. Michael Marsh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.36.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $199.06. E. (9) $312.42.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $100.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mike M. Masaoko, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW. Washington, D.C.
B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,192.23. E. (9) $980.

A. J. M. Massey, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $908.01.

A. P. H. Mathews, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $541.24. E. (9) $855.81.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $137.61.

A. Charles E. Mattingly, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $2,820. E. (9) $132.06.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $4,120. E. (9) $225.

A. Robert A. Means, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mayonnaise and Salad Dressings Institute, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $3,291. E. (9) $32.50.

A. Carl J. Megel, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, 716 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $8,800.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,186. E. (9) $354.03.

A. Donald Melvin, 20 East Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) $702.14. E. (9) $265.81.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Apparel Manufacturers Association, Inc., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2,545.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $400. E. (9) $154.93.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis., Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $100. E. (9) $20.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Telephone Answering Exchange, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $90.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Music Publishers' Association, Inc., 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $368.31.

A. Clinton R. Miller, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Health Federation, 211 West Colorado Boulevard, Monrovia, Calif.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $750.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.

D. (6) $1,650.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1815 Capitol Plaza, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1815 Capitol Plaza, Omaha, Nebr.

D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $236.18.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $357.12.

A. Luman G. Miller, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.

B. Oregon Railroad Association, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.

E. (9) $588.89.

A. Luther L. Miller, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,692.20. E. (9) $12.45.

A. Jim M. Milligan, 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.

B. National Water Co. Conference, 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.

A. Othmer J. Mischo, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

E. (9) $116.43.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $2,004.12.

A. Carl A. Modecki, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 525 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $40.66. E. (9) $155.68.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,750.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Morison, Clapp, Abrams & Haddock, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Curtis Morris, Premier Building, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

E. (9) $900.

A. John J. Murphy, Wilelinor Estates, Route 2, Box 113–D, Edgewater, Md.

B. National Customs Service Association, Wilelinor Estates, Route 2, Box 113–D, Edgewater, Md.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,833.32. E. (9) $369.25.

A. Micah H. Naftalin, 1330 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ethyl Corp., 611 Madison Office Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,533.75. E. (9) $1,011.69.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $14.33.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $61,807.14. E. (9) $10,504.20.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $64,325.66. E. (9) $1,298.40.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $609,905.86. E. (9) $17,443.06.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,368.14. E. (9) $3,368.14.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $256.69. E. (9) $256.69.

A. The National Association of Polish Americans, Inc., 3829 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $30,000. E. (9) $6,957.41.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $42,111.82. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
E. (9) $845.56.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,180.01. E. (9) $10,180.01.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $387,153.32. E. (9) $10,220.88.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee to Abolish HUAC, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,677.45. E. (9) $1,677.45.

A. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $586.50. E. (9) $586.50.

A. National Conference of Nonprofit Shipping Associations, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $2,575.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,363.13. E. (9) $2,363.13.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4.838.75. E. (9) $8,860.60.

A. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $250.60.

A. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $578.66. E. (9) $651.71.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Cenco Instruments Co., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $126.24.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $112.01.

A. Federal Relations Division (NEA), National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $16,664.87.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Farmers Organization, 720 Davis Avenue, Corning, Iowa.
E. (9) $6,701.70.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23,785.51. E. (9) $23,785.51.

A. National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $815.23. E. (9) $955.84.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $52,356.46. E. (9) $31,158.14.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $240.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,615.05. E. (9) $1,924.45.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $418,204. E. (9) $577.17.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350.60. E. (9) $1,350.60.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,787.10. E (9) $4,787.10.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $698.68.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,866. E. (9) $1,034.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,587.25.

A. National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,262.34.

A. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $1,750.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $779. E. (9) $4,949.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $365,065. E. (9) $2,332.

A. National Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,980.69. E. (9) $38,730.04.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $972.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4.16.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,073.60.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,950. E. (9) $2,742.

A. George R. Nelson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $735.25.

A. Ivan A. Nestingen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $38.30.

A. New England Footwear Association, Inc., 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $428.59. E. (9) $428.59.

A. Sarah H. Newman, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,615.38. E. (9) $1,012.28.

A. Stanley D. Noble, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S.A., Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.
E. (9) $130.

A. Charles M. Noone, 410 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Cos., 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $190.60.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $5.62.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry E. Northam, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Graham T. Northup, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,450. E. (9) $3,508.

A. Michael J. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $249.15.

A. Ira H. Nunn, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $250.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $650.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,508.34. E. (9) $179.57.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Transit Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,166. E. (9) $55.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 7703 Normandale Road, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $53.16.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John B. O'Day, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economic Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $23,405.61.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Jane O'Grady, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,050. E. (9) $407.08.

A. Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Harness Tracks of America, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,490.72.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 501 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel Omasta, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.10.

A. Susanne Lois Orrin, 1126 16th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee on Africa, 211 East 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $432.86.

A. Morris E. Osborn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $185.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.
B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Walter Page, Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $81.14. E. (9) $39.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 200 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Michael Pasternak, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,474.98.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $197.75.

A. E. George Pazianos, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,316.38.

A. D. V. Pensabene, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $25.

A. J. Carter Perkins, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Brig. Gen. J. L. Person, USA (Ret.), 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,249.99.

A. Peter J. Pestillo, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $125.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $4,871.23.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $43.50.

A. Kenneth T. Peterson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hotel & Restaurant Employees & Bartenders International Union, 6 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Walter T. Phair, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $250.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph D. Phelan, 487 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Colorado River Association, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John P. Philbin, 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $167.91.

A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,462.50. E. (9) $145.11.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $80.14.

A. Albert Pike, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Bruce O. Pike, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $510.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $77.20.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $1,460.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $90,141.70. E. (9) $1,350.

A. J. Francis Pohlhause, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph M. Pollard, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County of Los Angeles, State of California, Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,050. E. (9) $1,050.

A. John W. Pompelli, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,462.50. E. (9) $263.17.

A. Robert R. Poston, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $212.37.

A. Ramsey D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Graydon R. Powers, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Saving & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $219.68.

A. William H. Press, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,000.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $187.50. E. (9) $2.

A. Earle W. Putman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $16.21. E. (9) $8.10.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., et al.
D. (6) $9,049.98. E. (9) $8,740.16.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $202.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Raleigh, Jr., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,125.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $73.03.

A. James A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co.

A. Edward M. Raymond, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,008.36. E. (9) $241.75.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas Railroads.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $799.98. E. (9) $154.71.

A. Robert E. Reiser, 6649 Holland Street, McLean, Va.
B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Reserve Officers Association of United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $158,405.19.

A. Retired Officers Tax Credit Committee, Post Office Box 1965, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $355. E. (9) $2,033.89.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $823.70. E. (9) $7,284.75.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,133.34. E. (9) $8.16.

A. Dorsey Richardson, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Co. Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana Railroads.
D. (6) $57.50. E. (9) $90.31.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $170.

A. William Neale Roach, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Armament Corp. (Interarmco), 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Austin L. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent National Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875.

A. Clyde F. Roberts, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Animal Health Institute, care of Robert Brouse, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Stephen Philip Robin, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Public Relations Co., Ltd. (N.Y.), d/b/a Japan Steel Information Center, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $146.96. E. (9) $125.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $183.

A. Howard O. Robinson, Jr., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $249.50.

A. James A. Rock, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $155. E. (9) $3.82.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562.50.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $526.

A. Royall, Koegel, Rogers & Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Realty & Petroleum Corp., 16 West 61st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Royall, Koegel, Rogers & Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Power Authority of the State of New York, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $47.41.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Harland J. Rue.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
E. (9) $348.22.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $171. E. (9) $165.83.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $469.16.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1555 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $384.87.

A. William H. Ryan, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $480.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, et al.

A. William H. Scheick, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Leslie J. Schmidt Associates, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Beer Wholesalers' Association of America, 6310 North Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $200.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for an Interstate Taxation Act, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th St. NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,308.48. E. (9) $214.12.

A. W. O. Senter, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leo Seybold, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $237.65.

A. Robert L. Shafer, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $310.

A. David C. Sharman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $1,187.50. E. (9) $684.09.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $879.33.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. Kenneth D. Shaw, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $474.99.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $950.46.

A. Ira Shesser, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Max Shine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $992.50. E. (9) $20.

A. Alvin V. Shoemaker, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $287.50

A. Robert L. Shortle, 1147 International Trade Mart Tower, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. George Shuff, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875.

A. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,416. E. (9) $1,951.66.

A. Gerald A. Simmons, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,042. E. (9) $43.87.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $16,350. E. (9) $4,226.25.

A. Jack C. Skerrett, 717 19th Street South, Arlington, Va.
B. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 996 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. Harold Slater, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,462.50. E. (9) $59.05.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $15.

A. Jonathan W. Sloat, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,021.84.

A. Donald E. Smiley, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $965.68.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $29.40.

A. Irvin A. Smith, 418 East Rosser Avenue, Bismarck, N. Dak.
E. (9) $13.50.

A. James E. Smith, 315 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $390.

A. Milan D. Smith, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Smith, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Robert William Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,975. E. (9) $278.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,430. E. (9) $305.50.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $95.51. E. (9) $52.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1726 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $227.04.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,160.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,816.50. E. (9) $3,303.72.

A. Stanley L. Sommer, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $30.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $129.12.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $61,344.40. E. (9) $5,781.11.

A. William W. Spear, 214 Fremont National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $729.17. E. (9) $1.53.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence Speiser, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Lynn E. Stalbaum, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Melvin L. Stark, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $250.

A. Newton I. Steers, Jr., 10400 Connecticut Avenue, Kensington, Md.

A. Mrs. Nell May F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hamilton Watch Co., Lancaster, Pa.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters Association and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers Association of Tokyo, Japan; Miscellaneous Goods Division, Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc., and Imported Footwear Group, National Council of American Importers, Inc., New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $75.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Unione Industriale Pratese, Prato, Italy; American Textile Importers Association, 200 West 34th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S.
D. (6) $4,350. E. (9) $195.35.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Box 168, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Box 907–X, Route 1, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, Box 231, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Tuscarora Reservation, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herald E. Stringer, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $4,675.98. E. (9) $803.72.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $41.47.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $750.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Monroe Sweetland, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $335. E. (9) $50.

A. Mr. Russell A. Swindell, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $57.69. E. (9) $9.78.

A. Gary Tabak, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Ralph L. Tabor, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence M. Tarr, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,365.60. E. (9) $517.33.

A. Warren G. Taylor, 604–605 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee, 604–605 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.

A. Craig L. Thomas, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,837. E. (9) $61.17.

A. Evert S. Thomas, 20 E. Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $962. E. (9) $196.17.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

A. William B. Thompson, Jr., Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $163.39. E. (9) $126.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John N. Thurman, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 635 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,236. E. (9) $730.08.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 2355 Alameda Street, Vallejo, Calif.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.
D. (6) $147.50. E. (9) $118.72.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,418.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $195.70.

A. Frank A. Todd, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $405.

A. David R. Toll, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $301.82.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $36.85.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington D.C.
E. (9) $144.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,062. E. (9) $39.20.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,375. E. (9) $87.

A. G. D. Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,383.53. E. (9) $1,681.87.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $150.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $86.95.

A. David G. Unger, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $1,129.61.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $497.79.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $569,186.33. E. (9) $60,635.73.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $178.04.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $30,466.31.

A. Lois W. Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $76.50. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $480.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $97. E. (9) $20.85.

A. Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., 44 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co., of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $150.

A. The Voice of the People in Action (The Society of the People, Inc.), 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Russell Forrest Egner, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
E. (9) $24.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers Association, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $8,318.21.

A. E. R. Wagner, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $161.55. E. (9) $16.88.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John S. Walker, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hanna Mining Co., 100 Erieview Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $712.50. E. (9) $46.69.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit. Mich.
D. (6) $3,525.01. E. (9) $785.06.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,848.08. E. (9) $898.25.

A. William A. Walton, Garlinghouse Building, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, Garlinghouse Building, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,159.50. E. (9) $2,790.77.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $420.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 1750 Brentwood Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,451.88.

A. E. Jerome Webster, Jr.
B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $8,000.

A. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Welch, 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Wellington Management Co., 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Don White, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $956.25. E. (9) $126.90.

A. Donald F. White, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $70.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $200.05.

A. John C. White, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Truck Council of America, Inc., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Douglas Whitlock III, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Whyte, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $8.95.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana.
E. (9) $14.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. KSL, Inc., 145 Social Hall Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $1.80.

A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.
B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 156 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $203.76.

A. E. Raybond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,440.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $529.61.

A. Robert Winter-Berger, 123 East 75th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,850.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $579.26. E. (9) $579.26.

A. Lawton B. Wolfe, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $4.50.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation-Communication Employees Union, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Hal J. Wright, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Football League, 280 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $10.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Holy Corp., 1111 West Foothill Boulevard, Azusa, Calif.; General Development Corp., 2828 Coral Way, Miami, Fla.; and Cherokee Village Development Corp., Cherokee Village, Ark.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $418.30.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Business Development Corp., 45 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $10.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $216.

A. Kenneth Young, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,001.20. E. (9) $370.05.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,049.56.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1967:

(Note.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the Record, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

File One Copy With the Secretary of the Senate and File Two Copies With the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

Place an "X" Below the Appropriate Letter or Figure in the Box at the Right of the "Report" Heading Below:

"Preliminary" Report ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"Quarterly" Report: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◄

REPORT

Pursuant to Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act

P	QUARTER			
	1st	**2d**	**3d**	**4th**

(Mark one square only)

Note on Item "A".—(a) In General. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) Separate Reports. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. Organization or Individual Filing:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

Note on Item "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. Employer.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

Note on Item "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. Legislative Interests, and Publications in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

A. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 404 Commerce Building, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William N. Albus, 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Life Underwriters, 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William C. Anderson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. The Atlantic Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. Blaine Bailey, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Ross Bass Associates, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Frank Blake, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rev. Eugene L. Boutilier, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Campaign for Agricultural Democracy, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred T. Bridges Associates, 406–10 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Coopers International Union, 401 Republic Building, Louisville, Ky.

A. Lydston D. C. Cady, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Central Scientific Co., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. David Cohen.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Howard M. Conner, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Thomas L. Copas, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Eugene Meyer III, Katharine Graham, Frederick S. Beebe, and American Security & Trust Co., as trustees under an agreement, dated April 25, 1963, between them and Agnes E. Meyer.

A. Louis R. Damiani, 4619 Conshohocken Avenue, Philadelphia Pa.
B. National Lodge, Fraternal Order of Police, Alms Hotel, Victory Parkway at Taft Road, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Larry C. Davenport, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago & North Western Railway Co., 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Horace J. DePodwin Associates, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

A. Lloyd J. Derrickson, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Mortimer B. Doyle, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William DuChessi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert G. Dwyer, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Elliott & Naftalin, 1330 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Business Schools Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Encyclopaedia Britannica Educational Corp., 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Verne H. Evans, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Encyclopaedia Britannica Educational Corp., 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Vernon LeRoy Ferwerda, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United World Federalists, Inc., 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Joint Committee of Printing and Publishing Industries of Canada, 117 Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto, Canada.

A. Walter L. Frankland, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gadsby, Maguire & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brazilian Embassy, 3007 Whitehaven Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ginsburg & Feldman, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George Grant, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Norman S. Halliday, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Hamilton Associates, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

A. F. Donald Hart, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John T. Haughey, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John Heiney, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Philip D. Helmig, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

A. Fred A. Hufnagel, Jr., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. E. Iisenburg, 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. Ives, Whitehead & Co., Inc., 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul Jennings, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gene Johnson, 720 Fleming Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. Francis M. Judge, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Kinnaird, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julian J. Landau, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Morton Langstaff, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Edward B. Lockett, 4407 Klingle Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Statehood Republican Party, Apartado 1207, San Juan, P.R.

A. Al Loewenthal, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Trinity Industries, Inc., 4001 Irving Boulevard, Dallas, Tex.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John S. McLees, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Luther L. Miller, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jack Mills, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. Charles B. Murray, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Automotive Service Industry Association, 168 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Campaign for Agricultural Democracy, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 202 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Retired Teachers Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Oliver, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Susanne Lois Orrin, in care of UAW, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Committee on Africa, 211 East 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David J. Pattison, 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Association of Life Underwriters, 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. George Pazianos, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Howard O. Robinson, Jr., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Royall, Koegel, Rogers & Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Realty & Petroleum Corp., 16 West 61st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington, D.C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. Jonathan W. Sloat, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert Wm. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Mr. Stanley L. Sommer, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 404 Commerce Building, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles L. Stewart, Jr., 231 South La-Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Encyclopaedia Britannica Educational Corp., 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 404 Commerce Building, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Union Industriale Prato, Prato, Italy; American Textile Importers Association, 200 West 34th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Sutherland, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. World Airways, Inc., Oakland International Airport, Oakland, Calif.

A. Evert S. Thomas, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Clark W. Thompson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Independent Telephone Association.

A. Phillip Tocker, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Tucker, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United Business Schools Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rein J. Vander Zee, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Installment Land Sales & Development Association of Florida, Inc., 420 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Robert H. Voight, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John S. Walker, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hanna Mining Co., 100 Erieview Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Charles A. Webb, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, Association of Intercity Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert P. Will, 487 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 1111 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert N. Winter-Berger, 123 East 75th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Lewis F. Wood, 1900 West 29th Street, Pine Bluff, Ark.

B. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Development Corp., 2828 Coral way, Miami, Fla., Holly Corp., 1111 West Foothill Boulevard, Azusa, Calif., Cherokee Village in care of John Mack Smith, Post Office Box 830, West Memphis, Ark.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O merciful God, whose law is truth and whose statutes stand forever, we beseech Thee to grant unto us, who in the morning seek Thy face, the benediction which a sense of Thy presence lends to each new day. Unite our hearts and minds to bear the burdens that are laid upon us.

To Thee we lift our hearts in prayer, bringing nothing but our need and the adoration of our contrite hearts.

Help us in all things to be masters of ourselves that we may be servants of all.

Wilt Thou crown our deliberations with Thy wisdom and with spacious thinking to fit these epic days.

As heralds of Thy love, send us forth across all barriers of race and creed, bearing to yearning hearts, as a holy sacrament, the bread of human kindness and the red wine of willing sacrifice.

Make real to us that kingdom whose radiant verities are its faith, its ideals, its visions which shine on the far horizons and its aspirations that lay hold of God and goodness without alloy.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday,

May 25, and Monday, May 29, 1967, was dispensed with.

REPORT ON SPECIAL INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Fourth Annual Report on Special International Exhibitions conducted during fiscal year 1966 under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961.

The primary purpose of the program—in which the Nation's economic, social, and cultural achievements are exhibited in international fairs and expositions—is to build bridges of understanding between the United States and other countries of the world. Each exhibit is designed to show how our accomplishments relate to the capabilities and aspirations of the different countries. Because the exhibitions feature the products of American industries, they also contribute to mutually profitable trade relationships.

Since the program began in 1954, more than 100 million people—primarily in Eastern Europe and the developing countries—have witnessed 176 exhibits designed to help them understand, appreciate, and benefit from American progress and experience.

During fiscal year 1966, the United States participated in a broad range of international events:

Trade fair exhibitions in Algeria, Ethiopia, Hungary, Iran, Poland, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia: These exhibitions dramatized our progress in mechanical equipment for farm and industry, educational techniques, electronics, and space.

Expo 67: During the year, plans were laid for our participation in the World's Fair which opened in Montreal, Canada, in April 1967. "Creative America" was chosen as the theme of this country's exhibit, which pictures American achievements in the arts and space technology.

Labor exhibits at trade fairs in Ethiopia, Hungary, Iraq, Poland, and Yugoslavia: The purpose of these exhibits was to project the true image of the American worker and the role he plays in the affairs of this Nation.

Special-purpose East-West exhibits in the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia: More than 2 million persons attended these exhibits, which featured the machinery of American industry, American architecture, and the graphic arts.

As in past years, the program's effectiveness was the result not only of Government efforts, but also of the contribution of materials, time, and talent by hundreds of private firms.

All Americans are indebted to them for their efforts to help carry America's message to the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 31, 1967.*

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board for fiscal year 1966.

For three decades the insurance system administered by the Board has been protecting railroad workers and their families against the economic hazards which accompany unemployment, sickness, old age, and death.

During the period covered by this report, more than 1 million individuals received $1.2 billion in retirement and survivor benefits—an increase of $82 million over the preceding year. These payments brought to $14.5 billion the total amount paid to retired employees, wives, and survivors of deceased employees since the program began in 1936.

In fiscal 1966 payments for unemployment and sickness dropped below the $100 million mark—to $88.1 million—for the first time in 13 years. This reduction reflects the unprecedented economic expansion which this country has enjoyed during the last 6 years. In each, unemployment among railroad workers showed a significant decline.

The increases in retirement and survivor benefits reported here represented increased comfort and security in the retirement years of many worthy citizens. But even greater comfort and protection would come with congressional enactment of the social security amendments which I have proposed this year. The proposed 20-percent increase would in the first year alone bring $65 million in added benefits to some 385,000 railroad workers and their families.

I again urge the Congress to take this vital step toward our goal of providing every elderly citizen an adequate income and a meaningful retirement.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 31, 1967.*

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

On May 26, 1967:

S. 1161. An act to establish the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On May 25, 1967:

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, and other laws relating to housing and urban development, to correct certain obsolete references.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 24, 1967,

The Secretary of the Senate, on May 26, 1967, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5357) to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89-487.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 399. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain real property to the city of Batavia, N.Y.;

H.R. 4374. An act to remove a cloud on the title of certain real property in the State of Oregon owned by John Johnson;

H.R. 5357. An act to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89-487;

H.R. 7965. An act to transfer title to tribal land on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9481. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, with an amendment; that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill and asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RIVERS, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. BATES, Mr. ARENDS, and Mr. O'KONSKI were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution

(S.J. Res. 26) designating February of each year as "American History Month," with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) to declare the week of June 18 "National Coal Week."

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7819. An act to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10196. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 204) marking the 175th anniversary of the admission of Kentucky to the Union, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 7819. An act to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 10196. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicate:

Report on Export-Import Bank Insurance and Guarantees Issued to Yugoslavia

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of April 1967, not previously reported, totaled $942; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Receipts for Medical Stockpile of Civil Defense Emergency Supplies and Equipment Purposes

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarterly period ended March 31, 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Department of Defense Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July 1966–March 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

H. Res. 230

Whereas, the following bills have been introduced in the 90th Congress:

1. Employee-management relations: H.R. 460, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ), and S. 341, introduced by Senator Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md). These bills seek to improve employee-management relations in the federal governmental structure.

2. Higher salary levels: H.R. 5407, introduced by Representative Arnold Olsen (D-Mont), and S. 854, introduced by Senator Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md). These bills seek to raise Levels 1–5 postal employees to Levels 2–6, with a "saved rate" factor for those persons in steps 11 and 12 of each level at the time of enactment.

3. Basic Monday–Friday workweeks: H.R. 5407, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ). This bill would establish a basic Monday through Friday workweek in the postal service with employees to be paid at the rate of time and one-half for work on Saturdays and double time on Sundays and Holidays.

4. Life insurance: S. 271, introduced by Senator Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md), and H.R. 464, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ). These bills would improve life insurance benefits for all federal employees.

5. Sick leave credits: S. 759, introduced by Senator Ralph Yarborough (D-Tex), and H.R. 464, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ). These bills would give an employee at the time of his retirement the option of being paid one-half the cash value of accumulated sick leave, or have the total number of days credited for retirement purposes.

6. Health benefits: S. 1065, introduced by Senator Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md) and H.R. 6351, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ). These bills would require the federal government to pay the entire cost of the employee Health Benefits Program.

7. 30-year optional retirement: S. 104, introduced by Senator Hiram L. Fong (R-Haw), and H.R. 1186, introduced by Representative Byron G. Rogers (D-Col). These bills would permit an employee to retire after 30 years of service, regardless of age and without reduction in annuity.

8. Prohibit work measurement: H.R. 766, introduced by Representative Edna F. Kelly (D-NY). This bill would prohibit the use of measuring devices or methods for determining the efficiency of postal clerks.

9. Postal substitute overtime: H.R. 1023, introduced by Representative Richard L. Ottinger (D-NY). This bill would provide overtime pay for substitute postal employees for hours worked in excess of eight hours in a single day.

10. Invasion of privacy: S. 1035, introduced by Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr. (D-NC), and sixty other Senators; H.R. 6390, introduced by Representative Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis). These bills would prevent unwarranted government invasions of the privacy of federal employees.

11. 35-hour workweek: H.R. 7346, introduced by Representative Arnold Olsen (D-Mont). This bill would establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for federal employees.

Whereas, these bills would materially improve the working conditions of federal employees, increase their employment benefits and increase their efficiency; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1967, that it request the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the above mentioned bills introduced in the 90th Congress; and

Be it further resolved that duly authenticated copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the members of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF IOWA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk two concurrent resolutions from the Iowa State Senate, Senate Concurrent Resolution 40 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 43 and ask that they be printed in the Record and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the Record.

The concurrent resolutions were referred to the appropriate committees, as follows:

To the Committee on Appropriations:

[From the General Assembly of the State of Iowa]

S. Con. Res. 40

Whereas, Iowans wish to honor Herbert Hoover, the 31st President of the United States, and the only Iowan ever to be elected President of the United States, and

Whereas, the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site at West Branch, Iowa, is of national interest, attracting more than 750,000 visitors since 1962, and

Whereas, this site includes the Presidential library and museum, and the grounds are the location of the former President's birthplace cottage and the gravesites of President and Mrs. Hoover, and

Whereas, the present site is incomplete and inadequate and part of it is in an unfinished and unsightly condition, Now Therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Iowa, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the General Assembly of the State of Iowa urges the Congress of the United States to approve the President's $470,000 appropriation request which was included in the Interior Department's appropriation bill for land and building acquisition and development at the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this

Resolution be forwarded to each of the members of the Iowa delegation in Congress.

ROBERT D. FULTON,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
AL MEACHAM,
Secretary of the Senate.
MAURICE E. BARINGER,
Speaker of the House.
WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

[From the General Assembly of the State of Iowa]

S. CON. RES. 43

Whereas, United States Department of Defense statistics for fiscal year 1966 reveal that 873 of the 4,873 servicemen killed in Vietnam fighting for freedom were interred in national cemeteries; and

Whereas, many more of the servicemen who have lost their lives would probably also have been buried in a national cemetery had there been space available near the home of the next of kin; and

Whereas, there are those in governmental authority who are against expanding the national cemetery system or providing additional space in those national cemeteries already existing; and

Whereas, the burial allowances of the Veterans Administration and those allowances provided under Federal Social Security are far too meager in many instances to provide for the last rites of many veterans and servicemen; and

Whereas, world unrest is again exposing and committing large numbers of persons to military service and battle; and

Whereas, this is not a proper time for limiting or closing the national cemetery system to those presently serving or expecting to serve in the uniform of our country; now therefore

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House concurring, that the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to take such action as is necessary to direct the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and other appropriate governmental agencies to establish and maintain an adequate and permanent national cemetery system to provide burial space for all United States military servicemen or women so entitled and who wish to be so interred; and

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of the Senate forward copies of this resolution to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, United States Secretary of Defense, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Iowa delegation serving in the United States Congress.

ROBERT D. FULTON,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
AL MEACHAM,
Secretary of the Senate.
MAURICE E. BARINGER,
Speaker of the House.
WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. MORTON):

S. 1882. A bill to provide for deductions of political contributions, to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and to prohibit solicitation of Federal employees by political committees; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1883. A bill to amend the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and myself, a bill designed to provide for deduction from taxable income of political contributions, to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and to prohibit solicitation of Federal employees by political committees.

Under this bill extra deductions of $100 would be allowed to each individual who contributes to the party or the candidate of his choice. The Corrupt Practices Act would be amended to provide full disclosure by all political committees, whether operating in a single State or otherwise. Second, the bill would provide that the Corrupt Practices Act be amended to cover primaries as well as general elections. Third, the law as amended would place a complete prohibition against any solicitation of Government employees, either by other Government employees or by any political committee on their behalf, for campaign contributions.

I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1882) to provide for deductions of political contributions, to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and to prohibit solicitation of Federal employees by political committees, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. MORTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SENATORS WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE AND RANDOLPH AGREE ELECTION CAMPAIGNS SHOULD BE SHORTENED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Surely.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I compliment the Senator from Delaware on his giving continuous close study to the problems connected with election of Members of the Congress and of the President and Vice President of the United States.

While I in no wise would wish to claim that I anticipated what the Senator was thinking and recently stated in reference to the compression of long political campaigns into a period of 5 or 6 weeks, the record will disclose—and it is not important for me to document it here today—that several years ago I advocated the shortening of presidential campaigns in this country, and also the campaigns for membership in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I was drawing, as the able Senator from Delaware perhaps has drawn, on the experience with shorter campaigns in Great Britain. The parallel between the situations in Great Britain and the United States is not perfect, of course, because of the greater population density and the smaller size of that country. But, with present-day improved methods of transportation and communication in this country, it seems to me to be highly important that the proposal now made by the Senator from Delaware for the shortening of election campaigns for the offices of President and Vice President be given very careful consideration. He bases his argument, in part, for shorter campaigns on the financial drain on the parties which the present lengthy campaigns entail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for such additional time as completion of the colloquy may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The drain on the treasuries of the parties is an important consideration. But certainly there is a drain also on the resources of the candidates themselves and, in many instances, those of their friends who wish to properly assist them in seeking public office.

I think it is important that we realize that the people of the United States will no longer suffer from a lack of information by reducing the length of campaigns to the shorter period contemplated by the proposal of the Senator from Delaware. With our present media of communication and methods and modes for exchange of opinions and information, the American people can and will be made aware of essential campaign facts and candidate positions and will be able to respond to them within the contemplated 5 or 6 weeks. It is no longer necessary that campaigns run 3 or 4 months.

I believe the proposal is very timely, and that we would do well to consider this matter of campaign limitations in connection with the other proposals presented by the Senator from Delaware and other Senators, having to do with expenditures, the filing of reports, and the general subject matter of election campaigns.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator, and I add that the shortening of campaign is an important part of the proposed program.

I understand that it would not require a change in the Federal law to shorten political campaigns but that it would require action by many of the State legislatures which have designated deadlines before which candidates must file. In my own State, for example, the deadline is early in September.

I have discussed this issue with various officials of the national committees of both major parties and have corresponded with the chairmen of the two committees. I shall ask them to present their views on the length of campaigns when this measure is before our committee on the question of financing.

I would say further that I have received much support from many people, not only those who have had experience in campaigns at the presidential level but also many Members of Congress who feel that the shortening of the campaigns would be a constructive step.

I have suggested that the national

committees get together and arrange for the national conventions to take place early in September after Labor Day to be followed automatically by the State conventions in September. By late September we could have all the conventions out of the way, and in the 5 or 6 weeks which follow there would be ample time for a concentrated campaign. There would be adequate time to place the issues before the American people and could be done in a far more intelligent manner than through the long-drawn-out campaign as at present, with so much repetition.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his support.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not feel that the prospective situations in any of the years just ahead, are in anywise similar to the situation in 1896 when William Jennings Bryan was running for the Presidency against William McKinley. There are those who say, whether correctly or not, that had Mr. Bryan had a few more weeks in which to campaign, he could have been elected.

I shall not discuss that point except to say that in those days the candidate in question had to carry on his campaign without the present comprehensive nationwide coverage in the daily press, entirely without the media of radio and television, and also without a mobile American population. People then were more or less confined to one area. But our modes and methods of transportation and communication today are another element which helps make unnecessary the long campaigns of the days of William Jennings Bryan and William McKinley.

I wish that Mr. Bryan might have been elected President of the United States, of course, but it is not the situation which prevailed in 1896. In that year there were campaigning handicaps which are not present in this era. It is the situation which prevails today that we are attempting to meet and campaigning ground rules might logically be modernized.

For that reason, I think the shortening of the presidential campaign is a timely and valid suggestion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. There is no question that extended campaigns were essential in the days prior to the television, radio, and the widespread distribution of our daily press. In recent years, however, general communication and travel have advanced. We are living in a new age, and certainly we should move our campaigns out of the horse and buggy stage.

I thank the Senator.

NOTICE OF CHANGE OF HEARINGS ON FEDERAL JURY SELECTION BILLS (S. 383, S. 384, S. 385, S. 386, S. 387, S. 989, S. 1319)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce a change in the Federal jury selection hearings for June.

It was previously announced the hearings would be held at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 6, Wednesday, June 14, and Wednesday, June 28, 1967, in the District of Columbia Committee hearing room, 6226, New Senate Office Building. I wish to announce one change: the hearing on June 14 will now be held on Tuesday, June 20, at the same time and in the same room as previously scheduled.

NOTICE OF NEW DATES FOR HEARINGS ON RETIREMENT AND THE INDIVIDUAL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last month I announced that the Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual of the Senate Special Committee on Aging would conduct its first hearings on May 22 and 23. However due to a conflict with other business of the Senate, these hearings had to be postponed. I am pleased today to announce that the hearings have now been rescheduled and will be held June 7 and 8. These will be general survey hearings and from all indications they will yield helpful testimony from many experts.

THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Federal Aviation Administration wants Congress to dip once more into the public coffers—this time for $198 million—so that it can carry on with the development of a gigantic, probably useless, and potentially menacing development: the supersonic transport.

Congress has already appropriated $531 million for the SST. If we approve this new request, the total will be $729 million. By the time the SST prototypes are built and tested, the Government will have poured nearly $1.3 billion into a venture of questionable value. And that is not likely to be the end of Government financial participation, despite FAA protests to the contrary. If the manufacturers get their way, the total Government investment could go as high as $4 billion.

What do we get for this huge investment of public money? We get a plane that cuts time in the air between New York and Paris from 6 hours to 2½. That is an important accomplishment. To perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the population—the high-powered international businessmen, the impatient jet set playboys and the like—it is pleasant and it is fun. But is it more important than finding a cure for air and water pollution? Is it more important than attacking the roots of poverty? Is it more important than eliminating unemployment by training the unskilled? Is it more important than building an educational system throughout the land that will provide every child, whatever his race or origin, with the opportunity to fully develop his potential?

These are the choices. We do not have the money to do everything. In a period of rapidly spiraling war costs and mounting budget deficits, deciding what stands at the top of our list of national priorities is more difficult than usual. The House made a choice the other day. It decided to kill the rent supplements program which would cost us a relatively small amount in the coming fiscal year and would do immeasurable good. Is this how we are going to order our priorities?

I am sure it will be of great interest to the young tradesman in Kenosha with a family of five to support, or to the struggling middle-aged businessman in Dubuque trying to put two children through college, or to the family of 10 in Harlem living on a subsistence income, to know how their Federal Government arranges its priorities. They are likely to wonder a bit—to put it mildly—about a standard of values that puts a gigantic frill like the SST ahead of a countless number of vitally necessary projects.

Speed is not the ultimate value. Even strong advocates of the SST do not dwell very long on the speed of this plane when they are defending it. Surely, they, too, have been struck by the irony of a world increasingly knotted and twisted in endless traffic jams, where terrific speed in the air is canceled out by long periods in holding patterns, waiting for clearance to land, and by long frustrating trips on the ground to and from the airport. Surely, they see that speed, too, is subject to the law of diminishing returns. I have no doubt that we may soon have the technical capacity to build a passenger missile that could travel at 10 and 20 times the speed of sound and shoot a man from New York to Sydney in an hour. A man, of course, would arrive at his destination in a condition roughly comparable to that of a jellyfish.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The comments of the Senator make it possible to draw the conclusion that because of the difficulty of landing, the plane might turn around and return to London before it could land.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator raises an excellent point. I believe that all of us who have flown in this country—the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Wisconsin have flown—know how frequently this kind of situation occurs.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

I agree with Bo K. O. Lundberg, Director General of the Aeronautical Research Institute of Sweden, who observed that most prospective missile passengers not specifically trained as astronauts would probably find it pointless to save even a whole day of travel if they then needed perhaps a week to recover from the excitement of having been shot as part of a bullet or meteor. But, it might be an efficient substitute for narcotics.

So we do not hear much about the need for tripling the speed of commercial air travel from the SST advocates. What we hear instead is this: We are told the SST will prevent our aircraft industry from losing its worldwide superiority to the Anglo-French consortium, which is 3 years ahead of us in the supersonic race. We are told it will provide work for thousands. We are assured the project will result in an immense technological fallout. And, finally, we are assured by FAA and the manufacturers that it will have a highly favorable effect on the balance-of-payments position of the United States.

These are important considerations. But prudent people do not buy an expensive car just to decorate the driveway in front of their house. They buy it so they can drive from point A to point B. If they do buy it solely for decoration, then most of us, I think, would agree that they are being wastful. But, if they can afford it, if it is not going to take food out of the mouths of their children, it is charged off to extravagance or eccentricity and forgotten. I think the analogy applies to the SST. This project is being sold to us not on the grounds that we have a vital need for a plane that would cut in half the length of the flight from New York to Paris. That is what we are paying for. But that is not the way it is being sold to us. Instead, we are told we need to build the SST to keep our aircraft industry in the peak of health. Does that mean the Government should take $4 billion out of the taxpayers' pockets to build a nuisance machine that would criss-cross the country with 50-mile-wide carpets of sonic booms, a machine that would transform the world into a huge drop-forge foundry?

The Federal Government is gearing up to do just that in order to protect an industry which does not need the protection at all, if it has the superiority it claims. The trouble is the SST may turn out to be the scourge of the industry rather than a boon to it. Karl M. Ruppenthal, director of the transportation management program at Stanford University, writing in the May 22, 1967, issue of the Nation, said:

> It is safe to predict that because of the sheer magnitude of the dollars involved, the advent of the supersonic transport will inevitably result in a much smaller number of airlines in the United States, and much greater consternation in the (aircraft) industry.

The SST gives Boeing and General Electric a supersonic monopoly and leaves other companies standing at the post.

The Government is preparing, in effect, to conduct a giant public works project to employ highly skilled workers who do not need the help.

And it is doing these things partly because of a claim—which has been disputed by the FAA's own economic consultants—that this venture will save us from a disastrous decline in our balance-of-payments position. The decline, we are told, would occur if the Anglo-French consortium produced a successful supersonic transport and our airlines bought a large number of them. But, the FAA consultants—the Institute for Defense Analyses—concluded that gains from foreign sales of an American SST could be more than offset by a big increase in American tourist spending abroad and also by a reduction in the sales of American subsonic aircraft. The so-called alleged gains in the balance of payments are not there, and competent, objective, and expert advice indicates that this is the case.

I am convinced that if the sonic boom problem is not solved and if a solution to airport congestion is not found, the supersonic transport—whether produced by the United States or by the consortium—will have little chance of being commercially successful. Switzerland, Sweden, and West Germany have already declared that they would prohibit overflights of supersonic planes if they produce disturbing sonic booms. The Swedes have said they would consider a boom disturbing if it could awaken a light sleeper—a pretty stringent limit. The West Germans have said the booms would be unacceptable if it were proven they damaged human health. Other countries are very likely to follow the Swedish, West German, and Swiss lead when they have been subjected to the booms and discover how disturbing they can be when they occur with maddening regularity.

Mr. President, we had a little experience with this problem in Wisconsin when the Air Force picked Milwaukee as a city over which they would fly B-58's. The avalanche of mail which I received from Wisconsin constituents during that period of time indicated that they were all critical and deeply concerned, and that they only accepted it because it was a military effort and in the interest of national defense. This shows how adverse the reaction would be if these were commercial flights.

The occasional super-booms of two and three times normal intensity that would inevitably be produced by nearly every SST flight might be enough to ban the SST's from flying over heavily traveled sealanes as well. If this happened, the SST would be so restricted it probably would not carry enough payload to buy the chewing gum stewardesses hand out before takeoff. SST advocates who admit the sonic boom effect would prevent flights over populated land areas have been arguing that SST ocean flights would be enough to make the plane a commercial success. The FAA has said that even with boom restrictions on overland flights, 500 SST's would be sold by 1990. They seem to discount any possibility of sealane restrictions. But, if the sonic boom can cause severe damage on land, then it can cause damage at sea, too. The shipping and fishing industry is not likely to accept incessant destructive booming without protest. And they by no means lack political clout.

Thus, far from representing a big gain, the SST could as easily spell economic disaster for the aviation industry, even with heavy Government participation. The sonic boom is only one of the countless technological dilemmas the SST developers must overcome, although it is the one for which prospects of finding a solution are dimmest. The other problems are almost as difficult because supersonic flight is really a completely different quantity from subsonic flight. As one writer has put it, flying beyond the speed of sound is like flying in a totally new medium. The difference between a subsonic plane and a supersonic plane is like the difference between a surface ship and a submarine. Building a successful SST demands a quantum jump in technology. The heat generated by air friction becomes a particularly critical problem at supersonic speeds. The high altitudes at which an SST must fly to reduce the sonic boom effect raises the problem of cosmic radiation and its effect on the crew after repeated exposures. Occasional solar flares would pose a threat to passengers as well because of the much higher intensity of radiation during such periods. The maneuverability and balance of a plane at supersonic speeds are less predictable. I have great respect for the capability of our scientists and engineers, however. They may find the answer to all of these problems in the laboratory tomorrow, or next week, or next month. But, until then we can not bury our heads in the sand. We have to recognize that the obstacles we are confonted with are enormous. We cannot base national policy on wishful thinking alone.

Mr. President, I might point out that the research is going to continue whether we invest this enormous amount of money or not. It is going to continue in the space program and in the defense effort. The Defense Department has said that it has no military value at all.

The SST, if we built it, would be the first commercial plane ever developed without substantial prior military experience. Of course, military planes have been flying at supersonic speeds for years. But almost all of them have been small planes compared to this flying football field we propose to build. There is almost no experience with planes the size of the SST at supersonic speeds. The SST would be a Mach 2.7 plane. And there is no experience whatever with flight beyond Mach 2 with any planes, small or large, for the sustained periods the SST would have to fly to turn a profit. In a report to President Johnson in December 1963, on the SST, Eugene R. Black and Stanley de J. Osborne observed that the experience of the Air Force in innovating new systems had been that if 25 percent of the vehicle was new, it would take up to 5 years of development. If as much as 50 percent was new, it would take 10 years. Almost all of the SST is new—radically new. Its airframe would be made of a new alloy—titanium. Perhaps the only component of the plane whose properties during supersonic flight we have some familiarity with is the pilot. And even he may act differently than we expect under the pressures of having to fly this golden goose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the SST advocates will answer that our lack of experience with this kind of plane is the most persuasive argument there is for building the prototypes so that we can gain that experience. But we all know that once the prototypes are built, there will be no turning back. After more than a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money had been poured into this boondoggle, the pressure would be immense to go into the production stage whether the sonic boom had been muffled or not, and whether or not the safety of the plane had been proven beyond doubt.

What I find most serious is that the FAA is already hedging its bets on the success of the SST, diluting standards—in short, selling the public down the river.

The Government contract with Boeing, the airframe contractor, made public only a few days ago provides for only 100 hours of flight testing of the two prototypes over a 6-month period. The Black-Osborne report recommended a full year of flight testing as a minimum and the tenor of the report suggested that far more than that would be desirable.

But, what is even worse, the FAA has apparently decided to forget about the sonic boom problem. They seem to have adopted the philosophy that if they cannot beat the boom, they will ignore it.

The contracts for phase II—the design stage—of the SST program specified that the sonic boom effect produced by the plane while cruising at 60,000 to 90,000 feet should not exceed an average intensity of 1.5 pounds per square foot. The top limit during the SST's acceleration and climb was set at 2 pounds per square foot. Even those limits were considered too high by a number of experts on the sonic boom—chief among them Bo Lundberg, who has been studying sonic boom effects for 7 years. The contract limits referred to the average boom intensity produced in the wake of an SST. But atmospheric conditions and deviations from a straight and steady course, Lundberg pointed out, could produce grossly magnified booms three and four times the average intensity in the 50-mile-wide carpet of sonic booms trailing every supersonic flight. These superbooms—as Lundberg labeled them—are the ones that can do severe damage to property and can even affect personal health. The reflection from walls of the boom shock wave can result in even further magnification—often by as much as 100 percent.

During the extensive sonic boom tests over Oklahoma City 3 years ago, the average boom intensity reached during any of the 1,253 supersonic flight runs over the city never exceeded 1.6 pounds per square foot, and most of the time not more than 1.2 pounds per square foot. Yet the FAA, which conducted the tests, received nearly 5,000 formal damage claims and a total of more than 15,000 complaints of all kinds. The FAA said that in an opinion survey it did at the time, 27 percent of the residents polled said the booms were intolerable and that they could never learn to live with them. That 27 percent should be compared with the fact that only 22 percent of our people on the basis of our estimates will use the SST.

But, now, I find that the FAA has had the audacity to draw up a contract with no sonic boom limits whatsoever. All the phase III contract requires is that Boeing "develop an airplane design to reduce the sonic boom effect." There is not a word about how far it should be reduced, or to what level. The contract requires Boeing to study boom characteristics but it does not require it to hit any target. It sets no meaningful goal. For all practical purposes, it leaves Boeing free to ignore the boom effect.

But that is not all. The FAA has admitted, I just learned, that the airframe design contracted for in phase II would produce an average sonic boom intensity above the limits set by the phase II contract. The sonic boom effect produced by the air frame design to which we are now committed would have an average intensity of 2.38 pounds per square foot during acceleration and climb, and 2 pounds per square foot during cruise—far more—in fact, almost double—the Oklahoma City experience where, as I said, more than one-quarter of the people there, at least, declared they could not live with the intolerable effects of the sonic boom.

So we have what amounts to a failure to meet specifications of the phase II contract. Yet the FAA insists on bulling ahead into phase III anyway.

The FAA has apparently concluded either, first, that the task of muffling the boom is impossible; or second, that it is content to build a plane that would be limited to ocean flights, which drastically reduces chances that the plane would be a commercial success—and I remind Senators that if it is not a commercial success, the Government could be out as much as $4 billion—or, third, that the public is just going to have to learn to live with the boom no matter how destructive or disturbing it may be.

I have a feeling, judging from past FAA pronouncements, that it is probably the latter. The following statement from a recent FAA brochure gives that feeling added credence:

> Individuals tend to accommodate themselves to an initially disturbing noise once it becomes a pattern of daily life. There are noises today in cities and in small towns that are taken for granted which, if they were introduced as new noises, would cause disturbances for an initial period of time.

The FAA refuses to recognize that there is just no parallel between the loud din of everyday life in the 20th century and the destructive menace of the sonic boom. Unsound buildings in every city would crumble to the ground like the "one-hoss shay" after repeated boomings. Ancient monuments and historic shrines like this honored building would be particularly susceptible. The west front of the Capitol, we have been told by the Architect, is so unstable that it could be demolished by the impact of a crash at National Airport. Imagine what the effort of 10 or 20 loud sonic booms every day, week in and week out, might be. This is not science fiction. Much damage has already been done by military supersonic flights, yet the planes involved were comparatively small and the areas subjected to the booms sparsely populated. The size and weight of the plane are the primary variables in determining the size of the boom. The prehistoric cliff dwellings in Mesa Verde National Park, as one example, have been seriously damaged by sonic booms, the Interior Department disclosed not long ago. To prevent this mass destruction of property, boom restrictions will inevitably be imposed, as I stated earlier; and if they are, we will be able to kiss our investment in the SST goodby.

The Institute for Defense Analyses, which conducted a demand analysis study for the FAA, predicted that only 279 SST's would be sold by 1990 in a boom-restricted market if the planes sold at $40 million apiece. That may even be an overestimate because the price per plane could run as high as $50 or $60 million. The Government, according to the financial plan in the phase III contract, would not recoup its investment until 300 planes have been sold.

The FAA, in its execution of the SST contract, has abdicated its responsibility to the public. It has failed to protect the interests of the Government.

The absence of sonic boom specifications is only one example. In another serious oversight, the definition of what will constitute a "royalty-bearing airframe" for purposes of recouping the Government investment when and if the SST's go on the market is so worded that the Government might have to write off most of its investment even if the SST is successful.

The SST airframe is defined for purposes of recoupment as one "principally of titanium structure and that achieves or is designed to achieve a maximum safe cruising speed of not less than mach 2.2 nor more than mach 3.1."

Remember, this section of the contract—entitled "Financial Plan for Future Phases of the SST Development Program"—is directed 10 and 15 years into the future. Suppose another metal is developed with properties making it superior to titanium. In fact, a better alloy may already have been found. The Air Force has been conducting extensive experiments with boron filament. What is to prevent Boeing from abandoning titanium in favor of boro filament, if that proves superior, 1 or 2 years after the production stage of the SST program had been launched? Similarly, what is to prevent them from trimming here or adding there in order to push the top safe cruising speed a hair above the mach 3.1 specified in the contract? The airframe definition represents an outrageous blunder on the part of the FAA. It can have nothing but unfortunate consequences. It will result in one of two things: preventing the contractor from adopting desirable major changes to improve the plane's performance, or bringing about the complete nullification of the royalty plan for repaying the Government investment because the production model airframe is not covered by the narrow definition in the contract.

The FAA's handling of the SST program so far is eloquent testimony to the wisdom of the Black-Osborne recommendation that a new independent authority be created to manage this venture.

The FAA has been exerting far too much of its energy selling the SST and too little protecting the public interest. As Fred L. Zimmerman of the Wall Street Journal wrote recently:

> If propaganda could power a plane, America's supersonic airliner probably would be flying by now.

We have all been subjected to a supersonic snow job. It is time for us now to take a hard look at the other side of the issue. We may be on the verge of building the brontosaurus of the air age—a mechanical monster with an immense capacity for speed that may well be irrelevant to the real needs of our day. I do not think the American people should be asked to finance the development of this monstrosity.

In subsequent speeches during the weeks ahead, Mr. President, I intend to deal in greater detail with some of the questions I have only touched on lightly here today. I will have more to say on the menace of the sonic boom, on the economic arguments being used to defend this venture and on some of the many technological obstacles, aside from the sonic boom, which must be hurdled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that articles published in the two most recent editions of the Nation by Karl M. Ruppenthal be printed in the Record, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues; also a recent New York Times editorial on the SST.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Nation, May 22, 1967]

The Supersonic Transport—Billion Dollar Dilemma

(Note.—This is the first of a series of three articles on the supersonic transport. Succeeding articles will deal with several of the technical problems involved in the design, manufacture and operation of the aircraft, and with some broad social and economic problems. Mr. Ruppenthal has been a contributor to The Nation for several years. An active airline pilot for twenty-five years, and an attorney, he is director of the Transportation Management Program at Stanford University.)

(By Karl M. Ruppenthal)

With a stroke of the pen in 1963, Juan Trippe declared war on the Boeing 707, the Douglas DC–8, and all other subsonic transports that now fill the air. Placing an order for six Concordes, the chairman of the board of Pan American World Airways relit the fuse on a bomb that had been quiescent since an Anglo-French combination, with the financial backing of their respective governments, announced that they would develop a plane to fly at Mach 2—or twice the speed of sound and appreciably more than twice the speed of presently operating commercial jets.

The first important reaction to Trippe's decision came from the President of the United States. Just one week after Pan American announced the placing of its order, John F. Kennedy authorized a major study of the supersonic transport (SST). And from this there followed a series of revolutionary events, the full effect of which will not be felt for years to come.

The SST will present all of the airlines with gigantic economic problems. In some cases the problems will be so severe that the airlines will forget their pride, together with their touted free-enterprise philosophy, and ask unabashedly for government subsidy. Other airlines will reluctantly merge or sell out; still others may simply go broke.

The revolution will force the Federal Aviation Agency to make new expenditures aggregating hundreds of millions of dollars, and the sheer volume of money required will increase the federal role in all phases of aviation. The government will be called upon to pay for most of the research and development required for the SST itself. It will also be required to develop and install new and complex navigation systems. It will be called upon to provide funds for new airports, new terminal facilities and for new safety devices. It may be asked to train pilots, to control traffic, to underwrite insurance, and to finance dozens of other ancillary projects. So great will be the demand for federal funds, and so great the government participation in all aspects of the supersonic project, that the aviation industry as a whole will need to develop some remarkable corporate agility if any aspect of private enterprise whatsoever is to be maintained.

The supersonic revolution will have an important impact on the United States in a host of other ways. It will add measurably to the balance of payments controversy; it will be a disquieting influence on living patterns; it will become the center of another controversy with Britain, France and many of the other nations of the world. It may be an important factor in determining whether there shall be continuing boom, widespread land speculation or large-scale unemployment in Los Angeles, Seattle and Hartford. Although the Federal Aviation Agency has indicated that Boeing will receive the prime contract for the air frame, and General Electric will build the engines, component parts will be made by subcontractors. Boeing's decision to subcontract certain systems and components will depend, in part, on its own ability to produce them. If the SST timetable indicates urgency, Boeing will be forced to subcontract large systems because of the shortage of labor and engineering talent in the Seattle area.

Should Johnson assign the program an urgent priority, he might well give Ronald Reagan the biggest boost he could possibly get. Boeing's subcontracting could add new jobs to an already swollen economy in Southern California. It could stimulate the real estate market, bringing higher prices, additional commissions and more sales. Reagan could claim credit for the increased level of business in the state, leaving post-boom problems for another administration to face.

The pending supersonic step in the evolution of aircraft is so large that physicists would term it a quantum jump. This leap through the sound barrier will shatter much of the aircraft industry, several of the airlines and the peace and quiet of much of the world.

Always before in the progress of aviation, measurable alternatives have been available to the airline industry. When the DC-3 was obsolescent, the manufacturers and the airline industry could make rational decisions concerning the planes that were proposed. A rather simple, basic issue was involved: would the airlines be justified in buying planes that were larger, faster and more productive? Was there a reasonable prospect that increased capital expenditures could be amortized through additional speed, additional lift and related economies? Could the greater capacity be absorbed? What new-plane problems could be anticipated, and what would be the probable cost of their solution? In short, the question was resolved by balancing the costs of designing, building and operating a projected new plane against the revenues that could reasonably be anticipated from improvements in comfort, economy and speed.

Thus the decision to graduate from the DC-3 to the DC-4 was relatively easy to make. While the later plane required a larger capital investment for each ship purchased, it offered considerably lower seat-mile costs. It was a more efficient plane. The same basic factors operated in the decision to drop the DC-4 in favor of the faster, more efficient DC-6 (and its competing plane, the Lockheed Constellation).

In the pre-jet days, the relationship between speed and initial cost was almost linear. Thus an airline could decide whether to increase its investment in aircraft, say, 10 per cent, in order to achieve a 5 per cent increase in speed. But when we enter the supersonic age, the old cost-speed equation will no longer apply. It will become entangled in a variety of complex physical laws and the airline industry will have much more difficult choices to make.

Basic to the problem is the fact that present jets now cruise at speeds slightly less than the speed of sound—usually in the range between Mach .80 and Mach .86. Because of the nature of the turbulene (and other phenomena) associated with flying at and near the speed of Mach 1, it is not practical to think in terms of small increases in speed. And since it is similarly impractical to think in terms of Mach 1.2 or Mach 1.5, the only real question is whether the next generation of jets should cruise at speeds on the order of Mach 2 or Mach 3—that is, at twice or three times the speed of sound.

In 1963 when it was first seriously proposed that the United States taxpayers might underwrite the cost of developing a supersonic transport, it was often stated that the development cost of the aircraft would approximate $1 billion. After some behind-the-scenes fencing, the SST project was taken from the Federal Aviation Agency and placed in the hands of the Defense Department. Subsequent meetings of the SST study committee were held in secret, and all that transpired is not a matter of public record. However, James P. Mitchell, vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, who had served on an earlier study committee, indicated in 1964 that the $1 billion research and development figure was about right. Another member of that committee was reported in *The New York Times* as saying that the development cost would be from $600 million to $1.2 billion.

In those days, spokesmen for the Kennedy administration suggested that the federal government might be willing to finance 75 per cent of the project, but that notion brought forth anguished cries from the aircraft manufacturers. They pointed out that if the industry were to invest all of its profits for a decade, it would still be unable to come up with that amount of cash. There was some public debate and a good bit of private maneuvering. Eventually the government proposed that the taxpayer finance 90 per cent of the preliminary costs (in practice, it would come to higher than this, since the aircraft industry, as long as it was making a profit in other areas, could deduct its 10 per cent share of the R&D costs from gross taxable income). The public was assured at the same time that the SST was certain to be a sound investment and that their tax money would be returned to them—with handsome interest to boot.

Evidently the financial community is not so sure. Although many investors eagerly seek situations in which a good bit of risk is coupled with quite high returns, no investment banker has yet suggested forming a consortium for the private financing of the supersonic plane. Indeed, one reputable investment banker has stated that without the underpinning of a government guarantee, such securities would have virtually no investment standing.

That judgment is supported by the fact that though development costs of earlier planes were minuscule compared with estimates for the SST, Lockheed was reported to have lost some $90 million on its executive jet, the Jet Star, in 1966 alone. It lost some $50 million on the Electra, although it is a very efficient craft and 188 of them were sold. And General Dynamics lost some $400 million on its 880s and 990s—the only commercial jets that company has yet produced.

Meanwhile the estimate for SST research and development costs has increased. The $1 billion figure most commonly quoted in 1963 (when the aircraft manufacturers indicated that they could not possibly finance 25 per cent of the costs) was soon doubled. In January, 1967, both *The Wall Street Journal* and the Transportation Association of America were talking of $4.5 billion. The magnitude of this figure can be appreciated when one considers that it is twice the New York Stock Exchange value of all the shares of Lockheed and Boeing combined. It is eighty times the highest net profit ever reported by any airline in a single year, and something like twenty times Boeing's total corporate debt.

While $2 billion or $3 billion or $4 billion may cover the research and development costs of the project it will not provide the airlines with planes. And some financial analysts question whether even the $4 billion R&D figure will really be enough. Government-financed projects are notorious for exceeding their estimates, and projects that venture into new and relatively unknown areas are subject to wider errors of estimate than are projects in more traveled fields.

But suppose, to be very optimistic, that the research and development costs of the supersonic transport can be held to about $2 billion, as some of its proponents now believe. Under one system of accounting it might be presumed that such costs should be spread over the total time span in which this particular plane may be produced—say the next ten years. That would mean that each supersonic transport built in the United States over the next decade would be charged with a portion of the costs of research and development. If, for instance, only 100 such transports were built, each of them would be charged with $20 million in research costs, in addition to the cost of manufacturing each plane. If 1,000 planes could be sold, the R&D costs assigned to each plane would be but $2 million. This means that to set a realistic price on the planes, one must know not only the probable cost of manufacture and the total cost of research and development but also the number of planes likely to be sold.

There is considerable variation of opinion about the potential market. One aircraft executive estimated that some 900 SSTs could be sold by 1985, but other estimates are much more pessimistic. An important—and as yet undecided—factor is whether or not supersonic flights will be permitted over land. If they are restricted to over-water routes, the market for the plane will be sharply reduced. Another aircraft executive indicated on a C.B.S. broadcast that if the plane were restricted to over-water routes, the market would be reduced to some 585 craft. That would almost double the amount of research and development costs to be allocated to each plane and, of course, there is no guarantee that even this estimate of the market is correct.

It is worth noting that the aircraft industry has on occasion been too enthusiastic in its sales forecasts and too conservative in its cost estimates. Probably the most spectacular example of this wishful tendency was demonstrated by General Dynamics. According to an article in *Fortune*, the company produced its 880 jets in the face of its own studies indicating that the market was too small to return a profit. The result was a staggering loss, a change of management and near bankruptcy.

Even the majestic Douglas Aircraft Company, once undisputed world leader in the field of transport aircraft, has had its problems. Although Douglas had a respectable backlog of orders for its DC–8 and DC–9 jets, the company recently faced severe financial problems, and there were alarming indications that it might be unable to make good on its delivery commitments to the armed forces without a substantial infusion of government money. For a time it appeared that it might be necessary for the government, in effect, to co-sign Douglas' note at the bank. Only the rescue operations performed by McDonnell Aircraft made that government guarantee unnecessary.

But that crisis made an effective point: once the government has invested billions of taxpayers' money in a given project, it is not likely to pull out merely because preliminary cost estimates were too low. Someone in Congress will always raise the cry that since so much money already has been invested, additional funds must be spent.

It is true that SST advocates forecast that the taxpayers will recover the funds invested on the research and development of the supersonic transport. Some propose that these costs be charged directly against the planes, the tag to be set accordingly. Others feel that since the cost of manufacture will in itself be exceedingly high, it might not be prudent to increase the selling price of each aircraft by such a substantial amount. Too high a price would surely shrink the total market for the planes and thus make them even more difficult to sell. These people would prefer that the government recover its research and development expenditures through a monthly royalty charged against the operations of the planes.

But slice it as you will, there is no doubt that the taxpayers would bear the financial risks of the project. They will be called upon to pick up the tab if the market estimates are overly optimistic, if an airline is unable to make its royalty payments, or if the aircraft manufacturer falls upon evil days. That is the history of government guarantees in almost every field of endeavor.

While a monthly royalty device for recouping the taxpayers' investment has certain appeal (after all, much of the U.S. economy is based on the idea of buy now, pay later), it raises the problem of the value of money itself. If the taxpayers invest a dollar in a project today, it cannot be fairly said that they have made a sound investment if but a single dollar is returned to them a decade hence. If that same dollar were deposited in a reputable savings and loan association, it would double in a decade. And if it were prudently invested in the electronics industry, the chemical industry—or, indeed, in airline stocks—there is a high probability that its value would be a good bit more.

Their economic studies challenged by a number of economists (allegedly including some from the Bureau of the Budget), most SST proponents will no longer say precisely how the taxpayers will be repaid. Recent statements indicate that the repayment may not be in dollars channeled directly from the project into the treasury, but that much of the repayment may come indirectly because the project will stimulate employment, and increased employment will increase the flow of income tax dollars.

Of course this economic argument is not new. It was made by Lord Keynes a good many years ago when he pointed out that government spending could stimulate economic activity. The real question to be decided is which vehicles for government spending are most efficient in this respect, and there is reason to believe that other government-financed projects could be used at least equally well to stimulate economic activity and thus the flow of tax dollars.

The magnitude of the cost of the SST program comes into better perspective when one considers costs from the viewpoint of the carriers. Just twenty-five years ago an airline could buy a DC–3 for $125,000; today, a single spare engine for a subsonic jet costs at least twice that amount. With the advent of the jet age less than a decade ago, the airlines fell under severe financial pressure. So great were the problems surrounding the introduction of the jets that it was not at all certain that several of the major airlines could afford the price. Virtually every one of the major European carriers incurred substantial losses. In more than one instance the prospect of recovering the losses was so slim that they were simply written off by the government that was the principal (or sole) stockholder in the line.

In the United States the financial picture was so bleak that four major airlines—American, Eastern, Pan American and TWA—publicly announced merger plans. Almost every other U.S. airline made serious merger studies, although many of these activities were never revealed to the press. It was not until the general level of business activity rose to new heights that the U.S. airlines moved out of real danger. Had the business boom been delayed for another year or two, several airlines would have ceased to exist—at least in their present form.

The stakes will be much higher, and the ante far greater, when the airlines begin to play the supersonic game. At the present time it is estimated that a single Supersonic plane may cost on the order of $45 million. This is just a little less than the entire after-tax profits that any airline has ever reported in its most profitable year. Of course airline revenues have been increasing at a rapid rate and are still rising. But even if the present growth rate continues, gigantic problems must be surmounted before an airline can equip itself with a fleet of supersonic transports. Any major U.S. airline will have to dedicate its entire net profits for at least a decade to the purchase of supersonic transports, unless profit margins can be improved, the tax burden reduced, or substantial funds made available from other sources. If total airline earnings are dedicated to SST purchases, the stockholders may become starved of dividends in order to provide the public with an exceedingly fast ride.

While the financing problems for the major airlines will be severe when the supersonic transports begin to arrive, they will seem trivial by comparison with what the smaller U.S. carriers will face. Consider an aggressive, highly profitable trunk line like Continental. Its growth rate has been spectacular, its profits increasing at a prodigious rate. But in the most profitable year in all its history, its after-tax profits were on the order of $10 million—about one-fourth the probable cost of a single supersonic transport.

Most of these smaller carriers compete with at least one of the Big Four over important route segments. If the big carriers do indeed operate supersonic transports over the highly competitive routes, the middle-sized subsonic carriers may well be left standing at the post. If the proponents of the SST are correct in their assumption that the public will flock to the faster planes, those lines that do not have an extensive route structure, or the requisite financial resources to purchase supersonic equipment, will have severe competitive problems the like of which they have not yet experienced.

For survival they may attempt to merge with other troubled carriers. Failing in that attempt, they may be swallowed up by the lines that have routes suitable for supersonic operations. If they do not merge and are not swallowed up, their financial situation may become so precarious they will begin to exist on government subsidy, or simply turn up their toes and go bankrupt.

The local service carriers, too, may well be caught up in the blast of the supersonic jet. Consider the affluent passenger who alights in Seattle from his two-hour cross-country flight from New York. Will he be content to spend a like amount of time getting from Seattle to his destination airport near Pocatello, Boise or Spokane? And how will the local service carriers respond?

While all of the effects upon the airlines themselves cannot be forecast completely at this time, it is safe to predict that because of the sheer magnitude of the dollars involved, the advent of the supersonic transport will inevitably result in a much smaller number of airlines in the United States, and much greater concentration in the industry.

As for the aircraft manufacturers, the forecast is even more bleak. If the supersonic transport should be commercially successful, it may well drive from the skies the slower, subsonic jets—and their manufacturers. The result would be even greater attrition in the ranks of the commercial plane producers, whose death rate has already been substantial. Now gone from the ranks of commercial aircraft builders are such once familiar names as Martin and Convair (General Dynamics). Douglas has had its problems, and it is not at all certain that relatively affluent Lockheed will attempt to build another commercial plane.

This tendency toward concentration would certainly be increased with the advent of a supersonic transport that is successful in an economic sense. It could even be that but one or two large aircraft complexes would remain: the prime contractors who design and manufacture the aircraft together with their respective (client) subcontractors. If a completely successful supersonic transport is actually built, there may be little demand for competing, subsonic planes.

The utility of the supersonic transport is indeed a two-edged sword: if the plane is suitable for a relatively small number of airline routes and can operate only from a limited number of airports, it may be an economic disaster for the manufacturers and for the taxpayers who put up most of the money. On the other hand, if the manufacturers are able to come up with a versatile craft, capable of operating quietly and efficiently over a large number of airline routes, and able to satisfy the demands of a large portion of the traveling and shipping public, then its effect may be to destroy much of the value of presently operating subsonic aircraft and to create another set of problems for the airlines and for their financial backers who hold substantial mortgages on the aircraft that are presently flying.

[From the Nation, May 29, 1967]

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT—II—HEAT, COLD, RADIATION AND THE BOOM

(NOTE.—This is the second of Mr. Ruppenthal's three articles on the supersonic transport. The first (The Nation, May 22) dealt with some of the economic aspects of the SST. The third will consider some of the political and social ramifications of the project.)

(By Karl Ruppenthal)

Before the proposed U.S. supersonic transport can get off the ground, some impressive technical problems must be solved. One of these concerns heat. When a plane travels through the air at three times the speed of sound, the heat generated on the skin of the craft will be on the order of 500° Fahrenheit—about the temperature that a French chef uses to broil a steak. Because aluminum loses much of its strength after prolonged exposure to such temperatures, neither aluminum nor any of its presently developed alloys can be used for the exterior surface of the SST. At present, the designers of the Mach 3 (three times the speed of sound) transport are working with titanium alloys and stainless steel. The disadvantage of steel is that it is heavy; titanium is much lighter, but it is relatively new on the industrial scene. It is also difficult to form and expensive to work. While it is entirely possible that new technologies for working this metal will be discovered, they are not yet at hand. Titanium offers promise to the aircraft designer and to the scientist, but to the banker it promises heavy costs. A great many research dollars will be spent in an effort to develop an air frame that will be sufficient to the task and still be light enough to carry a profitable payload.

The heat produced by flying through the air at high speeds produces other problems. How are the airlines to keep the passengers from being broiled alive as they speed about in their supersonic oven? While the task of air-conditioning the plane is not a momentous engineering feat, it requires the development of a system capable of dissipating large amounts of heat quickly and efficiently and without employing heavy or bulky machinery.

Paradoxically, flying at high altitudes where temperatures run as low as −100° centigrade, the plane's fuel (kerosene) may tend to freeze. The engineers are thus attracted to the idea of linking the two temperature problems together: heat created on the surface of the plane might be dissipated into the plane's fuel supply. To the man at the drafting table, this looks like a fairly straightforward solution to the problem, but to the pilot who is trained to think in terms of fire, the prospect is less inviting.

The spectrum of new engineering problems is challenging and wide. Windows and other openings on the SST must be able to withstand a wide range of temperatures and pressures. The problems associated with windows are so great that it is likely there will be no windows whatsoever in the cabin, and the pilot's windows may be functional only for take-off and landing. The plane may cruise entirely on instruments, depending upon radio, radar and other electronic devices to achieve separation from other planes.

Since the Mach 3 jet will cruise at 60,000 to 80,000 feet (10 to 15 miles)—its pressurization systems must not fail. The cabins of today's jets are pressurized to the equivalent of about 5,000 feet when they are at cruising altitude (normally between 24,000 feet and 41,000 feet mean sea level). The fail-safe features of the 707 and the DC–8 provide an oxygen mask that drops automatically in front of each passenger in the event the cabin loses pressure. But this will not be good enough for the Mach 3 craft. Should the cabin rupture at 60,000 feet, the passengers' blood would boil, and the oxygen mask would be of no avail. Only a space suit, or a system which cannot possibly fail, will suffice. This means fail-safe pressurization systems, doors that will not leak, windows that cannot be blown out. All of these features can be developed, but each development may add to the weight of the craft, and they will certainly add to the cost.

High-altitude flight creates another problem which aviation has not yet fully faced—the hazard of radiation. At the cruising altitudes of the SST, the primary cosmic radiation consists mainly of protons (the nuclei of hydrogen atoms). The energy of these particles can be extremely high. Nuclear scientists have stated that the shell of the aircraft will not protect the occupants from radiation; as a matter of fact, it will act to increase the dosage rate.

Flying at the new cruising altitudes, the occupant of an SST will be exposed to a radiation dose equivalent to about 2 millirem per flying hour. Since 500 millirem per year is the maximum specified for nonradiation workers by the International Commission on Radiological Protection, a passenger (or crew member) would receive the maximum permissible dosage in 250 hours—just one-fourth the amount of flying time plane crews are now allowed annually by the Civil Air Regulations.

Further, particular solar events greatly increase the radiation dosage. Anyone passing through such an event might receive the maximum permissible annual radiation dosage in a single flight. Because of the genetic implications of radiation, some biologists have suggested that crew members for the SST be selected entirely from people beyond the normal childbearing age.

Thus, all hostesses on supersonic transports would be at least 45—a breed of flying grandmothers who would contrast sharply with the image of the chic young thing the airlines have cultivated so assiduously these many years. Far more serious from an economic standpoint would be the effect upon the working life of pilots. The cost of training well-qualified DC–6 captains to fly the Boeing 707 was on the order of $30,000 per man. If training costs for the SST are but twice that amount, an airline will think twice before making such an investment in a pilot who has very few productive years ahead of him. The FAA requires all airline pilots to retire at 60.

Furthermore, one competent test pilot has stated that in today's jets a pilot can wait as long as fifteen seconds before reacting to a situation without risking irreparable harm. If he is correct in his estimate that only five seconds of reaction time will be available to the SST pilot, trouble may be in store. For it is well known that as a man becomes older, his judgment may improve but his reaction time becomes longer. In short, it looks now as though neither young men nor old men will be suitable as pilots for the SST.

Turbulence also will be a problem. As the airlines took to flying at altitudes used by subsonic jets, they began to experience clear air turbulence. Several of today's jets have encountered turbulence that has breached the aircraft structure or thrown it completely out of control. The supersonic transport must be designed to withstand the most severe conditions that can be encountered, and about these conditions relatively little is now known.

What is known is that the impact increases with speed, and the standard practice for subsonic jets is to reduce speed as soon as the condition is recognized. The worst problem of clear air turbulence arises principally from the fact that at present there is no accurate way to forecast its existence. Unless major advances are made in weather analysis, it may be impossible for the supersonic airliner to know of clear air turbulence far enough in advance to take precautionary measures.

But these problems of radiation, heat transfer and metal fatigue pale by comparison with the one great problem of supersonic flight, for which nothing approaching an answer has yet been found. That is the sonic boom, and indeed the problems of the boom are so important and so far from solution that they may wreck the nice economic calculations that have been made by proponents of the SST, and the SST timetable as well.

Many people are under the misapprehension that the sonic boom is a momentary phenomenon. In a movie made a decade or more ago, some Hollywood star flew through the theoretical "sound barrier." As his plane approached the speed of sound, he encountered many weird phenomena, but once the speed of sound was exceeded, all was smooth. There was no vibration, no problems—and no boom. How the aircraft industry wishes that the Hollywood version of the sonic boom were reality! The fact is that the sonic boom, a shock wave, is a continuing phenomenon, and it is created when a plane flies at any speed higher than Mach 1.

If a supersonic transport were to cruise at the speed of Mach 3 at altitudes used by present-day jets, it would leave in its wake a trail of destruction fifty miles wide. Although the Air Force has taken great pains to minimize the damage caused by its supersonic jets, the number of damage claims filed against the federal government has been steadily increasing. Some 3,000 were filed in 1962 alone. The Air Force no longer publishes the number of claims filed or the amount of reparations demanded, but it is known that the dollars paid, together with the cost of processing claims, has already run into the millions.

Sonic boom damage caused by military planes has been responsible for a wide variety of claims. In 1962 a farmer in North Dakota was paid $1,048 because his animal had to be shot after a boom caused it to bolt into a barbed-wire fence. Another farmer in Hallock, Minn., was paid $50 because booms caused his chickens to panic and suffocate against a wall. In Cedar City, Utah, a store owner was paid $1,900 to replace plate glass windows and stock damaged by a boom. A farmer in Northern California sued the Air Force for $1.25 million for boom damage to livestock and irrigation pipes.

Even when the claims are farfetched, they must be investigated, at a cost of about $100 per claim. The Air Force recently investigated (and denied) a claim from an elderly recluse who sought $19 million in damages because he alleged that a boom had turned his house upside down. Also denied was a claim from a Cleveland motorist who said that sonic booms had ruined his automobile's power steering.

Because of the rising number of claims the Air Force has in recent years run a public relations campaign. Hundreds of civic leaders along B–58 test corridors near Strategic Air Command Headquarters in Omaha and the General Dynamics plant in Fort Worth have been assured that sonic booms aren't much louder than thunder. "The flights are the by-product of training maneuvers to save lives," said an Air Force spokesman. "Americans will have to learn to live with sonic booms. There's going to more of them—a lot more."

This is a sobering background for the SST, particularly when one considers that most of the Air Force flights have been conducted with relatively small planes and over sparsely populated areas. The shock of the sonic boom varies with the size of the aircraft, and the damage created by the boom obviously varies with the value of the real estate that lies in its wake.

Uncertain about the effects of the sonic boom, the Federal Aviation Agency undertook experiments in Oklahoma City some time ago. After the residents had been carefully prepared, a series of runs was made. When there were claims of structural damage, the FAA made appropriate inspections. It also purchased structures in various parts of the city to record the vibrations and to note how much damage actually occurred.

At the outset, the residents of Oklahoma City were rather proud that their city had been selected for these important experiments. Many of them were eager to see them succeed. When the booms first began, most residents were mildly amused. But as they progressed, many of them became annoyed. At the conclusion of the test, many Oklahomans breathed a sigh of relief that the ordeal was at last finished.

In their official pronouncements the FAA has stated that the tests indicate that 73 per cent of the Oklahomans indicated that they could live wih the boom (at least, with a sonic boom such as they experienced during these particular tests). This means that some 27 per cent of the residents indicated that they would be unwilling to tolerate even that much sonic boom. That fact is significant for several reasons.

In the first place, the people were well conditioned. They knew when to expect the sonic booms, knew that they would occur only in daylight hours. They understood that the experiments were carefully monitored and controlled, and that they might well serve a useful scientific purpose. Add to that the fact that there are no historic shrines in Oklahoma City; no ancient castles that might be shattered by a sonic boom; no Revolutionary War structures; no great galleries; no sensitive seismographic instruments.

Consider also that much of the industry of Oklahoma City is based on and around aviation. The very large Air Force base, Tinker Field, together with the various installations of the Federal Aviation Agency, supply by far the largest payroll in the city. Within its metropolitan district are aviation schools, aircraft plants and other small industries with an aviation orientation. Much of the rest of the economy is based on petroleum, for which aviation is by far its largest single customer.

Important also is the fact that the residents of Oklahoma City knew that the sonic boom program was temporary. But despite all the factors, more than a quarter of the people affected found the boom intolerable. During the twenty-six weeks of carefully controlled sonic boom tests in Oklahoma City, the Federal Aviation Agency received 15,452 complaints from residents and 4,901 formal damage claims. However, a spokesman for that agency concluded that the fault was not with the sonic booms but with the public relations efforts of the agency. Said Maj. Gen. J. C. Maxwell, the FAA's director of the SST program: "We [shall] need to do a much better job in telling the SST story in the years ahead."

Speaking of the tests, B. O. K. Lundberg, the Swedish aviation expert, states that the number of people protesting the boom would be far larger than the number of people ever expected to enter a supersonic plane. He states that every flight across the United States would produce a "boom carpet" covering some 10 million people and terrifying millions more.

Although thousands of damage claims have been filed and millions of dollars paid for their satisfaction, no claims have as yet been filed for the most tragic effect of the sonic boom. It was not until last January 11 that the Interior Department revealed serious damage to the prehistoric cliff dwellings in Mesa Verde National Park. Some of the most scenic areas known to man have been defaced. A Navajo Indian, Guy Quazzie Teller, watched as the shock wave from a single military plane demolished a large portion of a magnificent overhanging cliff.

On October 4, 1966, Park Ranger Charles B. Supplee, "a qualified archaeologist," observed continuing damage by sonic boom between 12:27 and 12:31 P.M., and at 2:33 P.M. park rangers counted eighty-three sonic booms from August 11 through December 22, 1966. On October 12, 1966, after three short booms were reported, "approximately 10 to 15 tons of dirt and rock was found to have fallen from one of the formations near the bottom of the Navajo Loop Trail, in the park." Interior Secretary Stewart Udall said that the situation was disturbing because of the "intrusion of the sonic boom on the fragile masterpieces of nature."

According to *The New York Times*, Udall discussed the matter with the Air Force "which promised cooperation but suggested that the Federal Aviation Agency should be consulted. Air space is considered to be the province of the aviation agency."

George B. Hartzog, Jr., director of the National Park Service, reported that the number of sonic booms over the Canyon de Chelly (in Mesa Verde National Park) had increased sharply in 1966. "With extensive back country and side canyons, the total damage is impossible to assess; however, it is reasonable to assume that it is extensive in view of the on-site observation in Canyon del Muerto." There park service engineers estimated that about 80 tons of rock fell on the cliff dwellings.

Additional damage has been found in Bryce Canyon and Zion National Parks in southern Utah. There, amazing sandstone formations, the result of nature's forces conspiring together for millions of years, have been reduced to rubble in an instant by a single sonic boom. While the Interior Department presumably could ask monetary redress from the Defense Department, such a payment would be nothing more than an internal transfer of funds. Nothing can restore the damaged areas.

The severe wreckage already done in the U.S. by a handful of supersonic military planes increases the probability that such historic cities as Antwerp, Nuremberg and Vienna will never permit supersonic planes to approach within 100 miles. It goes without saying that the prohibition against overflight will be automatic for such jewels as Paris, Florence, Rome and Athens. The West German and Swiss Governments have already announced that they will forbid SST flights over their jurisdictions if their people find them annoying.

Even in the United States, where the historic shrines are much younger and less priceless, it seems improbable that even the flying public will be willing to risk boom damage to Mt. Vernon, Independence Hall or the White House. It seems more likely that the public will restrict the planes. That would mean that their utility would be severely reduced and the total cost per plane increased accordingly.

Some of the proponents of the SST seek to minimize the problem by saying that some inconvenience is the inevitable price of progress. They liken the process to the necessity for a prairie horse to become accustomed to the passing of an occasional railroad train. But obviously this is no realistic parallel. Given all that is presently known about the sonic boom, if regularly scheduled supersonic flights are permitted across the country, thousands of structures must be redesigned and rebuilt and their occupants fitted with sound suppressers, or a sonic boom right of way something like 100 miles wide must be cut from coast to coast.

Some people have suggested that since the force of the boom is a function of the size of the plane, a smaller version might be built for flights over land. Thus, they contend, the larger model (built by Boeing) could make the overwater hops while the smaller model (built by some other company) could fly over land. While this suggestion has the virtue of spreading the pie among several aircraft companies, it has the disadvantage of additional cost—perhaps $1 billion more. And much of the time that potentially would be saved flying a supersonic transport from Los Angeles to Vienna would be consumed in transferring from the little jets to the big jet at New York, again to the little jet in London or Paris. Furthermore, the size of the market for each type of aircraft would be so reduced that there would be virtually no chance that either could ever pay its way.

Speaking of the problems of the sonic boom, C.B.S. reporter Bill Stout suggests that if the SST is restricted to overwater hops, the SST could easily become a multi-billion-dollar bust. And while over-ocean sonic boom problems have been dismissed as insignificant by the SST promoters, it is not at all clear that this view is shared by the ocean shipping industry, by pleasure boatmen or by the fishing interests. If the sonic boom swamps a few yachts, damages the masts in merchant vessels, and rudely awakens sleeping passengers on ocean-going liners, an entirely new set of legal problems may be created. Who is to say that the aviation industry has the right to interfere with ocean-going commerce? Might the sonic boom be construed by the shipping nations as interference with the traditional freedom of the seas?

As small segments of the public have become aware of the destructive potential of the sonic boom, public apprehension has increased. Unless they have a clear economic interest in the project themselves, many people will seriously question whether the increased speed can possibly be worth the cost. They are not impressed by the statements of SST promoters that the public simply will have to get used to the boom. Nor are they convinced that overland operations should be permitted even if the earth-bound humans in sparsely populated areas are somehow compensated for the noise.

All of this raises serious questions concerning the feasibility of the supersonic transport itself and important questions also in a somewhat different realm. Should decisions critically affecting the living qualities of the earth be made only by the promoters, the bureaucrats and the technologists? Or should such decisions be shared by the people who must inevitably bear the brunt of them and who inevitably underwrite the cost?

[From the New York Times, May 21, 1967]

SUPERSONIC ECONOMICS

Supporters of Government subsidies for the supersonic passenger plane have continually stressed that it is needed to strengthen the nation's balance of payments. But a special report made for the Federal Aviation Agency and kept secret until now punctures this sales pitch. Far from helping to reduce the deficit in the balance of payments, the report by the Institute for Defense Analysis suggests that the SST may actually add to it.

The report states that the gains from foreign sales of an American SST will be more than offset by a big increase in American tourist spending abroad as well as by a reduction in sales of subsonic American planes. The F.A.A. disputes this analysis, insisting that if 500 SST's are sold, the balance of payments would benefit to the tune of $17 billion, while if 1,200 are sold, the gain would be $32 billion.

But given the high—and still unknown—cost of the SST and the problem of the sonic boom that threatens to limit its use, there is doubt that the manufacturers can sell 500 planes, to say nothing of more than twice that number. Some studies made for the Government estimate that only 200 to 300 will be sold by 1990.

The very fact that there can be no certainty about the sales prospects for the SST or its impact on the balance of payments argues for a deliberate and conservative approach in financing it. Statements based on hope and supersalesmanship are considerably less convincing than the hard facts of supersonic economics. The SST is supposed to be a commercial venture. It should meet commercial standards of investment.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. GRIFFIN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE, NOT STATE DEPARTMENT, MUST RATIFY HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—LXXX

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, I rise today to once again express my disappointment over the inactivity of this body with regard to the human rights conventions. There are those among us who say that the Department of State and the President have not done their share in convincing us to fulfill our constitutional responsibility of ratifying these treaties. I would hereby let it be known to each Member of the Senate that the time for "passing the buck" has terminated. We must step up to the challenge that the Founding Fathers of our great Nation created for this body. We must act upon the conventions.

The State Department is the oldest executive department of the U.S. Government. It originated with a resolution of the Continental Congress of January 10, 1781, as the Department of Foreign Affairs, and was reconstituted as the Department of State on September 15, 1789. Thomas Jefferson was our first Secretary of State from 1790 to 1793.

With the rise of the United States to a position of power and responsibility in world affairs, the American people have increasingly recognized the influence of foreign affairs on their daily lives and have taken a more active interest in foreign policy.

This relatively new position of the United State of America has greatly increased the responsibilities of the Department. Today State has 7,500 American employees in the United States and an equal number stationed abroad. In addition, it now employs approximately 10,000 foreign nationals at our overseas posts.

The Secretary of State is the President's agent and principal adviser on matters of foreign policy and is responsible for the operation of the Department of State and the U.S. Foreign Service. He, in turn, has four chief advisers. The daily work of the Department is carried on by specialized units, most of which are headed by Assistant Secretaries.

One of these, the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, is subdivided into five offices, including the Office of International Economic and Social Affairs. That office, as described in the Government Organization Manual, "coordinates and develops for the Department, U.S. positions on the international aspects of human rights."

The State Department has, throughout this decade, maintained a very realistic stance on the Human Rights Conventions. The Department has informed Members of the Senate that State favors ratification and intends to see that the President ratifies each convention at such time as we in the Senate have given our advice and consent.

Mr. President, we cannot ask for the State Department to do more. It is we, and not they, who have been granted the responsibility of consenting to the ratification of any treaties. Our Constitution states unequivocally that two-thirds of the Senate must consent before the Department of State or any other Department in the executive branch can play any further part in the treatymaking process. We have shirked this responsibility long enough. We, the Members of the Senate, during the 90th Congress, should accept the opportunity history has thrust upon us. We should ratify the Conventions on Slavery, the Political Rights of Women, Forced Labor, Genocide, and Freedom of Association.

PRESIDENT OF CHICAGO BANK SPEAKS OUT ON TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, recently Mr. Alvin F. Friedman sent me an excellent letter and statement endorsing the truth-in-lending bill. As the president of a Chicago bank with extensive experience in the installment lending field, Mr. Friedman is in a particular good position to judge the various arguments which have been raised against the truth-in-lending bill. Mr. Friedman concludes that all of these arguments are without merit and that it will be a simple matter for lenders or extenders of credit to provide full disclosure of credit costs to the consumer. Mr. Friedman points out the somewhat absurd position of banks who advertise that they pay 5 percent interest on savings but charge "4 percent" on loans. Obviously, few banks can stay in business on these terms. The truth-in-lending bill would require the banks to admit that their so-called 4-percent loans are really approximately 8 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD Mr. Friedman's excellent letter and statement.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMALGAMATED TRUST & SAVINGS BANK,
Chicago, April 27, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Congratulations on the good work you are doing in the Senate, re: your credit disclosure bill.

I certainly support the principle that retail merchants and lenders should be required by law to disclose to the consumer all credit charges, both as dollars and cents and as the approximate yearly percentage rate, before the transaction is completed. Some of my reasons for this position are per the enclosed.

Keep up the good work!

Cordially,

ALVIN F. FRIEDMAN,
Vice President.

RETAIL MERCHANTS* AND LENDERS SHOULD BE REQUIRED BY LAW TO DISCLOSE TO THE CONSUMER ALL CREDIT CHARGES EXPRESSED BOTH AS DOLLARS AND CENTS AND AS THE APPROXIMATE MAXIMUM YEARLY PERCENTAGE RATE BEFORE THE TRANSACTION IS COMPLETED

A free society demands that the consumer be given the facts by which to make an intelligent choice, whether he takes advantage of that knowledge or not.

The American competitive system of free enterprise cannot operate as it is supposed to operate unless the participants have available to them, before the time for decision, the maximum possible information on which to make a decision—that is, to compare the price and quality of one service supplied by one supplier with that offered by another. The long list of consumer credit abuses makes it clear that such is not the case in the area of consumer credit transactions.

The 3 per cent per month plan of small loan companies is really 36 per cent per year! The small service charge of 1½ per cent per *month* on department store charge accounts could be as high as 18 per cent per year, i.e., if monthly payments are made *after* the grace periods.

The 4½ per cent of new car financing of some commercial banks is actually a charge of $4.50 per year per $100 loaned and amounts to an annual interest rate of approximately 9 per cent.

The so-called 7 per cent rate for financing used cars offered by some dealers is at least

---

* Revolving charge accounts could be exempted.

13 per cent per year and sometimes very much higher—18 to 25 per cent per year or more.

The advertised 5 per cent rate on home improvement loans is not less than a 6 per cent first mortgage, as it would seem, but is nearly twice as much, or about 10 per cent per year.

The cost of teenage credit now being promoted by some retailers as only "pennies per week" is sometimes as high as 80 per cent per year.

The Federal Trade Commission states that the installment add-on or discount rates is untrue and misleading, and that the real rate is approximately twice the stated rates in these cases.

When the consumer is informed as to the true credit rate, it is significant to note that he pays much less than the *un*informed consumer. This conclusion was reached in a study conducted by Consumers Union in October of 1964.

The question obviously arises, therefore, why are not more consumers informed? The answer is that present credit practices are simply too complicated, complex, and confusing. For example, after four hours of instruction on credit rates with an excellent textbook and well-experienced teacher, only 38 per cent of a group of *college students* were able to figure out the annual rate of interest within six points. The average consumer remains uninformed, with results that are often socially destructive.

Now, if a disclosure bill became law, a consumer wishing to finance a used car for 18 months, with an unpaid balance of $700 and monthly payments of over $46, the car dealer would have to show the consumer, before he signed any papers, that his total finance charges were about $129, and that this is a *yearly* rate of 22 per cent. After the consumer has this useful information, he could more intelligently decide if he wanted to pay these charges, or if he might wish to "shop around" for less costly financing.

In the long run, the best interests of the business community will always be served if there is honest and effective competition. It is obvious that a competitive and effective pricing system cannot be successful in the presence of misleading or deceptive pricing practices.

President John F. Kennedy recognized the plight of the confused and often bewildered consumer when he stated, "Excessive and untimely use of credit arising out of ignorance of its true cost is harmful both to the stability of the economy and to the welfare of the public. Legislation should therefore be enacted requiring lenders and vendors to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amounts and rates which they will be paying for credit."

Recently, a vice chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Chairman of the Installment Credit Division of the New York Bankers Association, publicly urged that lenders be required to state, both in dollars and annual interest rate, the maximum cost of consumer loans.

To simplify the computation, rate charts have been worked out and printed which make it easy to determine the consumer's annual rate. For example, disks, slide rules and charts devised and perfected by the Credit Union Supply Association, Bowery Savings Bank, U.S. Department of Defense, and the Michigan Agricultural Extension Service, respectively, give to little-skilled clerks the ability to compute the *approximate* annual rates in a few seconds which are accurate to a tenth of a percentage point.

The United States Department of Defense requires that sellers and lenders dealing with our three million servicemen and their families disclose in advance the dollar amount and the *approximate* annual rate. This Defense Department action is implemented by the use of a prepared table of figures which shows the *approximate* annual percentage rates for level monthly payment plans, within ¼ per cent point at the lower rates and 1½ per cent at the higher rates.

In the states of Massachusetts and Washington, in 1966 and 1967, respectively, there are laws requiring retail merchants and lenders to disclose both dollar amount and *approximate* annual rate of credit costs. The Deputy Commissioner of Banks and General Council of Massachusetts has been quoted as saying:

"I am happy to report to you that the implementation of the legislative purpose expressed in the new Massachusetts statute on Truth in Lending has met with an unusual and unexpected measure of success. *The allegations made by those who opposed the principle of truth in lending, on the ground that it was completely unworkable, have been proved beyond doubt to have been in error. We are encountering no difficulty from the lending agencies of this Commonwealth. As a matter of fact, the reverse is true. I think it a fair statement to say that the banking interests at every level are cooperating in every possible way, and that as a result thereof, the public interest is being substantially served.*"

Our Canadian neighbors in Nova Scotia and Ontario have passed legislation requiring complete disclosure of credit costs both in dollars and cents and as an annual rate. Nebraska's installment Sales Act of 1965 required that full disclosure of the yearly rate must appear on one of the documents or written instruments.

In addition, savings institutions are giving and advertising the *effective* rather than the nominal rates of interest. This further demonstrates the fact that financial institutions are capable of disclosing annual rates, figuring interest daily, and allowing deferred and irregular payments. Furthermore, it is a general practice for real estate loans to be stated in terms of actual *yearly* interest. The Boston Federal Savings and Loan Association shows the *annual* interest rate on its application form. The Federal Housing Administration's Guide for Home Buyers and Owners quotes monthly payments, total costs, and interest rates.

Also, experience with laws requiring *some* disclosure of credit rates shows them, too, to be successful. For instance, some state statutes, including the Illinois Installment Sales Act, already require that the total financing charges in dollars and cents be disclosed. Under Section 42, Chapter 74, of the Illinois Installment Loan Act, the lender is required to state the rate "as the dollar interest charge per $100 per year of the original principal amount." Other state small loan acts require that the interest be stated as a simple annual percentage on the unpaid balance.

In addition to the consumer, the ethical and efficient lender or credit extender will also benefit if credit prices are made explicit in an accurate and uniform manner. Indeed, we cannot have a workable free enterprise system unless there is an adequate framework of rules which require sellers to accurately and honestly inform the buyers about their wares. Requiring full disclosure of credit costs will restore healthy competition to the consumer credit market. Although some business men complained about the Truth in Securities Act and various other labeling and full disclosure acts at the time of the enactment, they soon came to realize that such legislation was essential to the maintenance of a competitive free enterprise system.

Basically, the question is whether full and meaningful disclosure should prevail in transactions between dealers and lenders on the one hand and buyers and borrowers on the other. Full disclosure will reward the ethical businessman, deter the careless and less ethical, and generally benefit all but the determined and conscious wrongdoer.

A major benefit of requiring full disclosure could be a significant contribution to overall economic stability.

The need for the stabilizing effect on the economy which could result from disclosure of credit costs has been pointed out by Dr. James Tobin of the President's Council of Economic Advisors. "The cost of credit normally rises in periods of boom and inflation and falls in periods of recession. This natural cycle in credit charges, reinforced by monetary and credit policy, is a stabilizing force on the economy . . . However, the stabilizing effect of changes in credit costs depends on awareness by consumers that the changes have occurred. If buyers are ignorant of the true costs of credit, they are less subject to influence by cost changes. Increasing consumer awareness, . . . will help to make the cyclical fluctuations of credit costs a more stabilizing influence on the economy."

Moreover, Federal Reserve officials believe that economic growth is impaired when consumers are misled about the price of credit. The Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia in the April, 1960 issue of its *Business Review* pointed out that a real burden for the economy "occurs because consumers often buy on time in an uninformed way without knowing the cost of the money they are borrowing. When they do this, they not only hurt themselves, but they reduce the efficiency with which the economy provides goods and services in accordance with consumer taste."

ALVIN F. FRIEDMAN.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY HENRY H. FOWLER

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, one of the most delightful, and one of the ablest Virginians is the present Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler.

On May 25 the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot did an editorial profile on Mr. Fowler, which, at the appropriate time, I shall ask consent be made a part of my remarks; but before doing that, I should like to point out that Secretary Fowler is the fourth Virginian to hold a Cabinet position during the 20th century.

Carter Glass served as Secretary of the Treasury under Woodrow Wilson, and then, in 1919, came to the Senate, where he served from that time until his death in 1946.

Claude Augustus Swanson was elected to the Senate in 1910 and served until his resignation in 1933, at which time he became Secretary of the Navy. Then, during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., served as Secretary of State.

I might say, Mr. President, that Mr. Fowler ranks, in ability and competence, equal with those three great Virginians who served with such distinction in the President's Cabinet.

I am proud of my friendship with Henry Fowler and with Mrs. Fowler; and Virginia is proud of this native of Roanoke who now resides in Alexandria—

and who is serving with such distinction, as Secretary of the Treasury.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD pertinent portions of an editorial profile of Henry H. Fowler, published in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot of May 25, 1967.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH AN INDEPENDENT STREAK

Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, who is known to hundreds in business, political, and government circles as "Joe," got the nickname while attending Jefferson High School in Roanoke.

"There was a restaurant, the Blue Ribbon, operated by two Greek brothers, Chris and Paul, where we'd go for hamburgers after dances. They had difficulty remembering our names and took to calling everybody Joe. We started addressing each other that way, and several of us who played basketball around the area called our team the Jefferson Joes. I carried the habit into college, and as I was one of the few Joes around, the name stuck."

He played, as well as read, furiously. He tried all sports, except football, which his father forbade. In college he was a boxer in the 129-pound—the featherweight—class.

"I didn't make any decision about a career until my senior year at Roanoke College. My father wanted me to be a lawyer. My mother, who was deeply religious—Momma sang in the choir in the Methodist Church—wanted me to be a minister.

"I liked to write, I liked to speak, I liked working with people, and had a pretty strong competitive instinct. Law, as a general discipline and as a profession, combined all those factors. The next choice, the thing I sweated out, was being a newspaperman."

(In high school he edited the "Junior World-News" in the Roanoke *World-News*, and in college the campus weekly. "I'm a frustrated newspaperman," he said.)

He was fond of the University of Virginia—and therefore went to Yale for his law degree. "I knew I mightn't do as much work if I went where I knew so many people; and when I landed on the campus at New Haven, I didn't know a single human being."

He won a doctorate at Yale on a Sterling Fellowship, took the Virginia Bar exam, and, on the way to New York City for a job interview, stopped in Washington for a social weekend. He liked the brisk intellectual environment and stayed as a law clerk with the firm of Covington and Burling.

After a year he joined the Office of General Counsel to work on a major Constitutional case in defending the Tennessee Valley Authority, not so much because he was drawn by the issue of private v. public power as by his concern as a Southerner in seeing an opportunity for the region's economic development. "It was the first evidence of a delayed Marshall Plan," he said.

While he was with the TVA he met and married a pretty administrative assistant in the architects' office, Trudye Pamela Hathcote. They have two daughters and three grandchilden and live in an early 19th Century house in the old section of Alexandria.

He worked in several Government agencies, including the War Production Board, during World War II, and directed the Defense Production Administration during the Korean War.

"I've always been a liberal among conservatives and a conservative among liberals. Anybody who knows me gets very confused by the situation. It's that independent North Carolina streak, that's all it is.

"That fellow up there—" he pointed to a portrait of Alexander Hamilton over his office mantel—"now I admire Jefferson as much as anybody, but the two of them—Jefferson and Hamilton—represent forces that are not so much conflicting as complementary.

"I always have admired the contribution Hamilton made to the creation of the national government, but I have a strong feeling for state and local rights.

"Looked at in the terms of Alexander Hamilton's contribution, I don't see how otherwise we can play the role of international leadership we didn't seek but which history and destiny placed upon us."

AND A DECEPTIVE CALM

Henry H. Fowler's call to leadership came one day early in 1965 when he, a lawyer of 56, was sitting in a board of directors meeting of the First and Citizens National Bank in Alexandria and received a call to come to a side door of the White House.

"I knew the President well, and I thought he planned to ask my opinion of various persons he had under consideration for the vacancy. Riding into Washington I organized my thoughts about what to say of their qualities and characteristics. We met in the Cabinet room and he put me in the Secretary of Treasurer's chair to his left and said, 'Well, now if you were sitting in my chair, who would you want in that chair?'

"I began my spiel, and after about three minutes, he cut me short, and after he finished speaking, that was that."

Had he any hesitancy about accepting?

"I'm just like a private given a gun and told to get in there. I had no hesitation at all.

"Let me say I'm all out for him. Lyndon Johnson has more background and experience for the Presidency and inspires in me more confidence than any man I have ever known.

"From a personal standpoint, I find him a very warm and stimulating individual. He fascinates me, the skill with which he operates. Sometimes I get almost bemused watching him handle a situation, but I never had a better boss.

"He's a man who always surveys very carefully the alternatives or options the situation presents, but having deliberated, he is capable of prompt and decisive action."

How does the occupant of the Treasury's hot seat maintain what seems to be an easy, self-contained calm?

"A lot of it is natural. Being a Southerner and a Virginian, I don't like to hurry when it isn't necessary.

"Secondly, when I was about 36, I had something called a spastic colon—which turned out to be an ulcer—and I was told I ought to try to do things deliberately. I certainly haven't lived up to it."

Does he turn to any special reminder in moments of stress?

He pulled from his wallet a mimeographed poem a friend had given him. Entitled *Slow Me Down, Lord*, it asks for help to know the magical, restorative power of sleep, the art of taking minute vacations, of chatting with a friend, petting a dog, reading a few lines from a good book.

Remind me each day of the fable of the hare and the tortoise that I may know there is more to life than increasing its speed; let me look upward into the branches of the towering trees and know that they grow tall because they grow slowly and well; slow me down, Lord.—

James F. King, his executive assistant, observed that the Secretary practiced some of it: "When it comes to the magical, restorative power of sleep, he proves he doesn't need as much as anybody else."

He seldom plays tennis, attends international conferences on government holidays, and devotes most of his reading to government documents.

About his only relaxation, noted Mr. King, is "just such an infrequent conversation as he has had with you."

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR SPONG AT EMORY AND HENRY COLLEGE

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG] delivered the commencement address at Emory and Henry College, in Emory, Va., on Sunday, May 28, 1967. In his speech, Senator SPONG described the problems and turmoil of our time as "recurrent themes of an industrial and urban age." After telling the graduates that the purpose of their education had been to provide them with "the historical perspective necessary for an understanding of where we have been, and the intellectual skills necessary for making intelligent decisions about where we are going," Senator SPONG pointed out to them that—

> It will be your responsibility and your challenge to take the more advanced problems and issues of the technological and urban age out from under what Thomas Jefferson called the "regimen" of your ancestors. To acomplish this, you must add experience to your historical perspective and academic preparation.

I found Senator SPONG's speech provocative and thoughtful, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., AT EMORY AND HENRY COLLEGE, EMORY, VA., MAY 28, 1967

I want to talk for a few minutes today about your world—about the world you grew up in and about the world whose future you, now more than ever before, have a chance to determine.

You are among the first of a generation to live outside the immediate experience of two events which had significant materialistic and profound psychological implications for your elders. These events were the depression and a world war. At the same time you are among the first to have spent your entire life in a world alerted to the potentialities of atomic and nuclear power.

Your age has been characterized as one of skepticism, of unrest, of anxiety, of moral breakdown, of a disregard for law and order. Some supporting evidence can, of course, be found for all of this.

I believe, however, that the events and situations of our world can also be viewed as recurrent themes of an industrial and urban age.

In 1962 Michael Harrington published a book entitled *The Other America*. His subject was the poverty which exists in the ghettos of many of our large cities. Another author, Robert Hunter, wrote a book called *Poverty*, in which he defined the term as the condition in which persons "though using their best efforts, are failing to obtain sufficient necessities for maintaining physical efficiency." After studying all available statistics, Hunter concluded that "about 10 million Americans were living in poverty."

If the name of Robert Hunter is less familiar than that of Michael Harrington, it may be because Robert Hunter wrote in 1904.

People demonstrate—for civil rights, against the war in Vietnam, and for various other causes. But such activities are not without their antecedents. In the early years of our century, Susan Anthony waved picket signs for women's suffrage. The Women's Christian Temperance Union and the Anti-Saloon League carried their crusades into the bars and saloons themselves. The so-called "bonus army" of veterans marched on Washington in 1932 demanding cash bonuses and was dispersed only after regular troops had been called out.

And student involvement in such activities is not original with our decade. If today's anti-war signs say "Draft Beer, not Students" rather than "Schools, not Battleships," it may be because this is 1967 and not in the 1930's.

Today, some adults, including members of the academic community, encourage students to refuse to fight in Vietnam. Yet Charles Eliot Norton, Harvard professor emeritus at the time, advised students not to enlist for service in the Spanish-American War, because it was an "unrighteous war."

Pointing to antiwar demonstrators and draft card burners, some persons have concluded that the United States is losing its patriotic tradition. But it was in 1933 that the magazine, *The Nation*, after describing antiwar demonstrations, predicted, "It will take more than flag waving and bugle calls to empty the colleges for another war." Of course, only a few years later the colleges were emptied as Americans went to fight a "war to end all wars" and to try where they had failed before "to make the world safe for democracy."

Unfortunately, the world is still not so safe for democracy—as evidenced by Cuba, Berlin, the Middle East, some areas of the developing nations and the Southeast Asia country of Vietnam. And it is not so certain that the "war to end all wars" completely accomplished the purpose of its slogan. While a nuclear war has become widely recognized as the prelude to destruction, we find ourselves involved in the so-called "limited war."

Furthermore, we are told that our people are confused and uncertain about our current involvement in a particular "limited" conflict.

But that is not so novel either. *U. S. News and World Report* wrote "Down at the grass roots, what people want is peace, if they can get it. Failing that, they want to fight a war, when they must, that they have a real chance to win. They don't see this chance in an all-our war with Communist China." The same article quotes one person as saying "It's foolish to fight little fires until Russia is ready to launch an all-out attack," while another person suggests "pull all our men out, cut the losses short."

The article is 17 years old and refers, of course, to the Korean conflict.

Observers speak of a breakdown in respect for law and order and the President of the United States calls for a massive program to control crime. Organized crime is said to present a particular threat. If we refer to the problem today as organized crime rather than gangsterism or racketeering, it is perhaps because crime has become more subtle, more sophisticated, if you like. But to say that it is a recent threat is to ignore the Al Capone era and such things as the 500 gang murders which took place in Chicago alone between 1920 and 1929.

Likewise, to point to a moral breakdown among youth is to disregard much of what took place in the 1920's and to point to a Billie Sol Estes or other corruption in government is to forget a Tammany Hall, the teapot dome and a Boss Tweed.

This does not mean that our problems are the same as they were in previous years. In fact, the complexity and magnitude of these problems, and even their focus has changed drastically.

What I am suggesting is that many of our problems are in general the old industrial-age problems in the new wrappings of a further developed technological and urbanized nation. We have, for example, had the problem of war before, but not the same threat of destruction. We have had poverty before, but not on the same scale; war demonstrations, but not with the same implications; a previous relaxation of moral standards, but not with the same results. We have had urban problems but not the questions of air and water pollution, rapid transit, health and educational manpower on the same massive level.

Yet, despite this increase in the scope and intensity of our problems, advanced technology and expanding educational opportunities have offered a new insight into our problems and an increase in the capacity for solving them.

You have not been given all the answers to your problems here in the past four years. Hopefully, you have acquired the historical perspective necessary for an understanding of where we have been and the intellectual skills necessary for making intelligent decisions about where we are going.

It was Thomas Jefferson who noted that as the human mind "becomes more developed, more enlightened; as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered; and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times." "We might as well," he continued, "require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as (require) civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of our ancestors."

You can no longer wear a boy's coat. At the same time, the world into which you are going will not permit you to put on a man's coat all at once. In a way you will be required to start all over, at the beginning, as a freshman. You are likely to enter an office or company which has its procedures set and over whose control you will have little influence. It is probable that you will not begin earning quite as high a salary as you would like or doing the "interesting and creative" jobs that you want to do or holding the responsibility which you feel you are capable of handling. In some cases you may not be able to determine what time you go to lunch or how long you have to eat. You may be required to follow certain procedures, even on things as minor as answering the telephone, which you feel are ridiculous.

You may feel now that you know your particular field well. I trust that in many instances you do. But you will not always succeed and you will not always be right. You are likely to find that four years of studying does not match ten or fifteen years of direct experience and that there are aspects of your chosen profession which you never thought of. A doctor, for example, may be expert in his particular medical field, but if he cannot arrange the business part of his job, he is likely to find that bills do not go out, that the needed supplies are not maintained or that his record system is not complete. Or take the case of a teacher, a lawyer or a newspaperman. No matter how knowledgeable each might be in the area of his specialty, each will be truly forceful and influential only if he also has the understanding of human nature which comes with experience. These phases of a job may seem minor or peripheral to you, but they are essential for effectiveness and efficiency.

This is not intended to discourage you. Neither unbridled optimism nor undue pessimism is warranted. If you have the historical perspective and intellectual tools which I mentioned and the good fortune of finding a job with a capable and progressive company, this experience should be only a part of your continuing education, and additional preparation for the role you will later play. For, not only do those from whom you must now begin to learn have experience in their professions, but they also have experience in dealing with the problems and issues which are recurrent in our history. These persons have already wrestled—if on a lesser scale—with poverty, with disease, with finances, with war and peace. They have made progress, they have laid foundations on which to build. They may not have the answers to all the problems posed by the broadening scope and intensity of technological and urban development. They certainly cannot hand to you on a silver platter all the solutions you need in the upcoming decades. But you would not want that, for that would deny you the opportunity to develop your own potentialities and to meet your own problems. It will be your responsibility and your challenge to take the more advanced problems and issues of the technological and urban age out from under what Thomas Jefferson called the "regimen" of your ancestors. To accomplish this, you must add experience to your historical perspective and academic preparation. "Nothing ever becomes real," said Keats, "till it is experienced—even a proverb is no proverb to you till your life has illustrated it."

I hope your lives will be richly illustrated and I wish you well in all your endeavors.

WHAT'S NEW AT PATUXENT WILDLIFE REFUGE?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as Senators know, I have for many years been urging appropriations for a research project at the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge near Laurel, Md., designed to preserve American rare and endangered wildlife. The program is now beginning to provide positive results. There is increasing public awareness of the problem and interest in helping solve the problem.

On May 26, Burt Schorr, writing in the Wall Street Journal, provided us with a most interesting and informative article on the attempt to take whooping crane eggs from the nesting grounds at Wood Buffalo National Park and return them to the Patuxent Center for hatching. This project is underway right now and is a significant step in the preservation of whooping cranes and an eventual increase in their numbers. Mr. Schorr also discusses several other aspects of the rare and endangered wildlife program.

I ask unanimous consent that his story entitled "United States, Canadian Agents Plan an Urgent Joint Operation Next Week," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES, CANADIAN AGENTS PLAN AN URGENT JOINT OPERATION NEXT WEEK—HELICOPTERS WILL CARRY TRAINED TEAMS TO SEEK OUT ELUSIVE QUARRY IN THE NORTH COUNTRY

(By Burt Schorr)

WASHINGTON.—An urgent international operation starts next week. Here's the lowdown:

Two U.S. Government agents arrive by plane at Fort Smith in Canada's remote Northwest Territories to join their counterparts from Ottawa. A U.S.-Canadian team then speeds by helicopter over the almost-impassable lake-and-muskeg terrain to preselected destinations. Trained hands probe for the mission's precious quarry and place it in special insulated carriers warmed by hot-water bottles to 99 degrees. Back in Fort Smith, the U.S. operatives load their prize aboard a Canadian government aircraft and fly nonstop to their secluded Maryland countryside headquarters. There a tense wait begins.

Another CIA caper? Hardly. The operation is designed to aid survival of the nearly extinct whooping crane. What the U.S. Government men—actually two soft-spoken biologists from the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center outside Washington—aim to bring back from Canada is five or six giant beige and reddish-brown whooper eggs scooped from nests in the wild.

If the hopes of the Patuxent bird men are realized, some 10 days of artificial incubation will produce a number of tawny, fluffy-feathered whooping crane chicks. These birds, together with others hatched later from additional eggs, could in turn beget more whooping cranes. The potential result: A major victory in the 30-year struggle of naturalists to preserve the graceful whooper, North America's tallest bird (over four feet), from eradication by trigger-happy hunters and the intrusion of civilization on its shrunken habitat. A count of the species' present survivors turned up a meager 43.

STEPPED-UP EFFORT

The Canadian quest is only one of the signs that Uncle Sam, after decades of half-hearted effort, is now committed to preventing endangered North American, Caribbean and Pacific wildlife species from following the passenger pigeon and the penguin-like great auk into extinction.

In the fiscal year ended last June 30, Congress began providing significant infusions of cash for preservation projects. One result of this spending, a $145,000 wildlife propagation setup that will permanently house the whooping crane incubator and newly hatched birds, is nearing completion at the Patuxent center.

With more than a dozen wildlife specialists added to its staff, the Interior Department's Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife also has been able to begin essential studies of other endangered creatures. These range from the California condor, a giant vulture whose population is believed to total less than 100, to the black-footed ferret, a small and rarely seen Great Plains denizen that spends much of its time underground in prairie-dog burrows.

Naturalists, pleased by the Government's concern, say it reflects a surge of public support for preservation of the total natural environment.

THE ENVIRONMENT CRISIS

"There's a new awareness of pollution problems and the environment crisis that makes our job easier; people are beginning to recognize that diversity of species is the best index of an environment's worth," asserts Roland C. Clement, staff biologist and vice president of the National Audubon Society, which has pioneered in wildlife preservation efforts since its founding in 1905.

Businessmen, too, seem to sense a change in public attitudes. Some see wildlife protection as a way to earn good will.

Not long ago, Northern States Power Co. and Boise Cascade Corp., after conferring with Federal wildlife representatives, set aside a total of 330,000 woodland acres in northern Minnesota and Wisconsin as sanctuaries for the imperiled national symbol, the American bald eagle. Both companies adopted such safeguards as marking their land-management maps with eagle-nesting sites, establishing buffer zones 660 feet in radius around active nest trees and barring foot trails and other development that would make the nests more accessible to man.

"If corporate officials don't take such steps, they're going to face increasing Government encroachments," a Northern States spokesman predicts.

But Federal wildlife men still have much fact-finding to do before they can be sure what new protective moves to make. It was only last year that the Government got around to publishing its first comprehensive list of endangered species—some 300 birds, mammals, reptiles, amphibians and fish. Sample selection: Indiana bat, gray whale, Hawaiian monk seal, American alligator and shortnose sturgeon.

Collecting data on wildlife is a hard job. Some of its difficulties can be glimpsed in the work of the Craighead brothers, John and Frank Jr., two Montana ecologists. They have been studying the Yellowstone National Park grizzly bear since 1959, supported by Government and private funds.

The grizzly, or ursus horribilis, sometimes comes in half-ton sizes. It can turn without warning into a savage juggernaut of claws and teeth—a trait that used to discourage close scientific surveillance. But using hypodermic darts loaded with a muscle-paralyzing anesthetic and then administering shots of tranquilizer, the Craigheads immobilized more than 400 bears for examination.

RADIO-EQUIPPED BEARS

To learn more about life among the grizzlies, they affixed colored tags to the ears of 225 of them and fitted more than 30 with two-ounce battery-powered collar radios. (The radios were donated by Philco-Ford Corp., a Ford Motor Co. subsidiary, which also developed special tracking equipment able to pick up the radio "beeps" from as far as 20 miles away.) Thus, the minute-to-minute whereabouts of individual bears could be known.

As a result of their efforts, the brothers were able to make the first acurate generalizations about the Yellowstone region's diminished grizzly population (estimated at 850 in Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, and Colorado). One Craighead finding is that the average wild female grizzly doesn't breed until her fifth year and only produces one litter every 3 years. Another is that the average grizzly life-span in the wilds is only 5 or 6 years, with hunters outside the Yellowstone Park limits accounting for about 40% of the mortality. Reflecting the Craigheads' belief that a female might easily be killed before reproducing once, their final report will recommend tighter state game regulations to allow shooting of only a few "trophy" grizzlies each year, rather than the more general "meat" hunting now permitted outside the park.

The far smaller size of the whooping crane population has made whooper detective work every bit as exacting as grizzly tracking. One dedicated American ornithologist, Robert Porter Allen, spent a decade before finding some of the few remaining whooper nests in the 17,300-square-mile wilderness of Canada's Wood Buffalo National Park, which will be the target of next week's joint U.S.-Canadian expedition. Though the Canadian Wildlife Service suspects a dozen pairs of the birds are now mating there, it probably won't be able to pinpoint the location of more than half of them when time comes for the egg-napping, says David Murno, director.

PREDATOR PROBLEM

Robbing these nests won't imperil whooper survival as it might seem, U.S. and Canadian wildlife men argue. "Studies suggest that nearly half of the whooping crane nesting effort is wasted due to predators eating eggs and other factors," says Ray C. Erickson, the Patuxent biologist who will lead the mission to Canada. "In addition, there's a heavy loss of young birds."

Six years' successful experience in artificially hatching eggs removed from Florida and Oregon nests of the less rare sandhill crane raises hope for much improved survival of baby whoopers through use of an incubator. But a question remains as to whether the artifically incubated cranes will in turn produce offspring in captivity. Patuxent-reared female sandhills have produced over 30 eggs during the last two years. Yet none of these eggs have proved fertile; the male birds haven't done their part.

The Patuxent bird men now theorize that because all young animals seem to "imprint" or become mentally fixed on the first living individual seen, early exposure of the young sandhills to human beings has prevented them from accepting each other as mates.

So if whooping crane eggs are successfully hatched, Mr. Erickson plans to insist that any person approaching the birds be garbed in a white shroud—thus vaguely resembling a parent crane—or be concealed behind a screen. In addition, the young birds will be exposed to Canus, an adult whooping crane now in residence at Patuxent, as well as life-sized whooper silhouettes cut from plywood and painted white.

THE ALASKA CENTENNIAL OPENING IN FAIRBANKS: A GREAT SHOW

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, along with my colleague from Alaska, Senator BOB BARTLETT, I had the privilege of attending the opening of the Alaska Purchase Centennial in Fairbanks this past weekend. Representatives of our State and Federal Governments and of the Government of Canada participated in this event, which was an unqualified success and reflected great credit on those who brought it about.

A vast amount of highly intelligent planning, good taste, sound judgment, and dedicated effort produced a result which drew hearty and deserved praise from all who attended.

The days of 1898—the days of the gold rush—were brought to life vividly, entertainingly and charmingly. Past history and custom were entrancingly brought before a new generation of pioneering Alaskans. The tourists will love it. This achievement by the Centennial Commission was in itself an historic event and will remain for future generations to enjoy. There was much else—all of it very good.

An interesting article on the opening, written by its west coast correspondent, was published in the New York Times of Sunday, May 28. I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the news story by Lawrence E. Davies be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKANS OPEN AN EXPOSITION TO MARK THE CENTENNIAL OF "SEWARD'S FOLLY"

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, May 27.—Alaskans today commemorated the 100th anniversary of "Seward's Folly," one of the biggest real estate deals in American history.

DOGSLEDS TO SPACE

Ribbon cutting and speeches by American and Canadian officials opened the exposition, in which the transition of Alaska from the dogsled era to the space age is depicted.

Senators E. L. Bartlett and Ernest Gruening, Alaska Democrats, Representative Howard Pollock and Gov. Walter J. Hickel, Republicans who replaced Democrats in last November's election, and Arthur Laing, Canadian Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, had roles in the opening ceremonies.

President Johnson was represented by Ross D. Davis, Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Former Judge Vernon D. Forbes, chairman of the Alaska Purchase Centennial Commission, J. D. Vogwill, president of Alaska 67, and several others were on the program.

The centennial center was unveiled at the end of a week of mild temperatures, ranging during the day from 50 to 60 degrees, at a time of year when it is light here at midnight. A midnight baseball game is scheduled for June 21, between the Fairbanks Goldpanners and a team from Japan.

Humorous as well as serious references to the Russian-American land deal worked out by Seward with the Russian Minister, Baron Edouard Stoeckel in 1867, marked the celebration's start.

A celebration marking the sale of the land to the United States by Czarist Russia began at a 41-acre exposition center in this old Gold Rush town. State, Federal and local governments and individual contributors are spending on it more than the $7.2-million paid by a reluctant Congress in the original transaction.

"Seward's Folly," negotiated in 1867 by the then Secretary of State William H. Seward, gave the United States 586,400 acres of land at the price of a 5-cent postage stamp for every four acres.

The Alaska 67 Centennial Exposition is expected to draw about 400,000 visitors. But, like Canada's more ambitious Expo 67 in Montreal, it is accepted in advance by enthusiastic Alaskans as a money loser.

During the year, in 41 communities all over the state, the Purchase Centennial will be observed, but the officially designated focal point for the next 126 days, until Sept. 30, is the Fairbanks site on the Chena River here in the interior of the 49th state, 100 miles below the Arctic Circle.

A KOSYGIN "TELEGRAM"

The official program bore a series of fictitious telegrams, including one signed "A. Kosygin, Moscow," that had the Soviet leader giving this notice to Alaskans:

"Sirs: Have filed for injunction with International Court of Justice. Cease all activity at Alaska 67. Examination of grandfather rights indicates we still hold title to property you call Alaska."

The Fairbanks phase of the statewide observance packs in a mixture of education, the arts—ranging from handicraft of Eskimos, Aleuts, Athabascan and Tlingit Indians to musicals and drama on several stages, along with paintings by Alaskan artists—and a spectrum of amusements.

Visitors to the amusement park climbed aboard open cars drawn over a mile-long track by a little steam locomotive of the "Crooked Creek & Whiskey Island Railroad," a reproduction of an engine with a pot-bellied smokestack that operated over narrow-gauge tracks to the goldfields around 1885.

Others preferred to "mush" behind a dog team, with wheels substituting for sled runners in the absence of snow.

EMPHASIS ON CRAFTS

The exposition planners laid heavy emphasis on native arts and crafts. A village built on the site has brought Eskimos and Indians to Fairbanks for the summer to live in Eskimo sod houses and Indian log cabins. A house of stretched walrus skins illustrates the housing of King Islanders living off the state's western coast.

Dr. Erna Gunther, chairman of the anthropology department at the University of Alaska, set out to fill a small anthropological museum at the fair with art and artifacts to match the slogan, "Native arts of Alaska, come home."

"What I've tried to do is to find Alaskan art work all over the world and bring examples back for the exposition," she said. "Here is an ivory-decorated wooden sunshade from the museum of Rear Adm. Adolf Etolin of the Russian Navy in Finland. He spent 1820 to 1824 in southeast Alaska. I have a wooden figure six feet tall, not a totem pole but a figure memorializing a person, coming from Mexico City."

Her prizes include, she said, one of three known copper masks, inlaid with abalone shells, made by Tlingit Indians. She borrowed it from a museum in St. Joseph, Mo. A similar mask, she noted, is possessed by the Museum of Primitive Art in New York.

LOG CABINS SALVAGED

The exposition took advantage of Fairbanks's urban renewal projects to salvage 34 log cabins, which have been permanently installed to house exhibits at the fair site. In fact, all structures on the grounds, except the United States pavilion with its silver geodesic dome, are marked for retention as part of a lasting pioneer mark.

The old Palace Saloon at the corner of Gold Rush Street and Sourdough Way has been rebuilt. It boasts of a picturesque 22-foot bar found by its owner, Bob Guthrie, in the ghost town of Iditerod.

"Wiley Post," Mr. Guthrie said, "had a drink at this bar in 1934 when he made a forced landing at Iditerod on one of his attempted trips around the world."

The saloon and adjoining cafe, along with cancan dancers on a tiny stage, offers a menu of sourdough pancakes, raindeer sausages, reindeer miner's stew and Alaska king crab.

A Gold Rush era exhibit of immense popular potential is "The Big Stampede," housed in Pioneer Hall. An audience seated on a slowly revolving platform views a series of 15 murals by C. (Rusty) Heurlin, long a leading Alaskan artist, showing gold prospectors in the Klondike and Fairbanks rushes at the turn of the century. A taped narration of 45 minutes by Ruben Gaines, a Pacific Northwest radio commentator and storyteller, explains the murals.

Nearby the largest sternwheeler of its cargo-carrying type ever to operate on Alaskan inland waters—the 242-foot-long Nenana—has been reconditioned from her rotting stage into a modern restaurant for permanent use at the fair site.

While Anchorage and other cities and towns participate in their own centennial expositions during the year, Sitka, the headquarters of Russian America, takes the center of the stage on Oct. 18.

A century ago on that date the Russian flag was hauled down and the Stars and Stripes hoisted. Congress had not yet begun action to appropriate the purchase price for Alaska worked out six months earlier.

THE CITIZEN, THE CRIMINAL, AND THE CRIME

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the May 28 issue of the Washington Evening Star contains a lengthy feature article written by Ronald Sarro and Walter Gold, in which the frustration of being a Washington policeman is graphically depicted.

Coinciding with the publication of this article was the news of the release by Kemper Insurance of a 30-minute motion picture entitled "The Thin Blue Line," dealing with crime and police problems.

In a city which saw a 60-percent increase in crime from last April to this April, the lament of a policeman, as reported by the Star, is:

> We get absolutely no cooperation from people, and when you do, the courts defeat it. Sometimes you wonder if it's worth it, and maybe you look the other way.

In this context, Kemper publication asserts:

> A wave of frustration has swept over the entire field of law enforcement, adversely affecting police recruitment and the rate of resignation.

The writers of the Star article also quote an unnamed policeman as saying:

> I knew that if anyone challenged my arrest, I'd get no backing from the top—the officials, that is—they have no set policy. Sometimes if they think no one will raise a stink about it, they'll pat you on the back and tell you you're a good officer.

The increase in crime, together with the obstacles placed in the path of arrest by recent court rulings; congestion in our courts; and the attitude that somehow, collective society is to blame for the actions of criminals, hardly auger well for the permanence of the basic equation for the lessening of crime.

Few law enforcement officers would disagree that the prospects of prompt capture, speedy trial, and severe penalty are major deterrents to crime.

In all three respects, we as a nation, are failing.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Evening Star article and the publication by Kemper Insurance, which describes the crime problem in the Chicago area, be printed in the Record.

I ask also that two recent editorials from the Evening Star, entitled "Bad Day on the Crime Front" and "Crime: What's That?" be printed in the Record; also the text of a speech on Washington crime which I delivered on May 25 before the Political Study Club of the District of Columbia.

I further ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Wyoming State Tribune of May 17, 1967, be printed in the Record.

In this latter item, Tribune Editor James Flinchum, after describing the prospects of a brutal summer of civil unrest in America, asserts that—

> Before all of this occurs, the Johnson Administration, which is sitting back complacently and refusing to do anything against such lawless outbreaks, had better take action.

I thoroughly agree with that observation.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, May 28, 1967]

The Cops Tell Their Story: "You're Damned if You Do, You're Damned if You Don't"

(By Ronald Sarro and Walter Gold)

As you pound the pavement, you wonder whether you will make the arrest that will cause a riot.

Wheeling around in the white cruiser, you know that in this city the smallest incident can turn into a life-and-death situation.

Deep in the pit of your stomach, you feel you're damned if you do, and damned if you don't—and nobody else really knows how it is.

You are a policeman, but white or Negro, you're mocked, ridiculed, spat upon, stoned, taunted, enticed or jumped at the slightest provocation by militant youths.

President Johnson calls it a national trend towards lawlessness. You call it a powder keg of hostility and hate.

Most demoralizing of all, you feel the people you're doing it all for—the community—are not with you. Your morale is the lowest.

What once would have been a routine arrest becomes a federal case, an incident, a disturbance with dangerous racial overtones.

That split-second decision you'll have to make on whether to use your nightstick and gun quietly gnaws at you. And you wonder whether the man above you will back you up.

That about sums up how Washington's on-the-beat policemen say they feel today.

To find out what it's like to police Washington streets The Star went to the men who do it, interviewing dozens of policemen in the city's 14 precincts.

This was in the wake of recent shooting incidents involving policemen and youths.

The officers were breaking a department rule by talking to reporters, and Police Chief John B. Layton was opposed to the story. One reporter was asked to leave a precinct building for attempting to conduct interviews. But they talked anyway.

The National Crime Commission, in its report on police, observed that "the capability of a policeman, and particularly one who works in a high crime rate or slum neighborhood, to act in a restrained manner is constantly tested."

In doing his job, the commission said, "A policeman's authority is daily challenged by unruly juveniles anxious to detect any weakness or fear. In dangerous neighborhoods, he may be mocked, threatened or even spat upon.

"Even if an officer is of the highest quality, his work and the people with whom he must deal may cause him to become disillusioned or angry," it said.

So is it on Washington streets.

"It's the people's attitude about police work," said one veteran Negro officer. "It's a rotten job and you do it.

"You wonder if you'll make the arrest that will cause a riot. If you can see that far ahead, you don't make the arrest and avoid it.

"You put your job on the line every time you step out of this precinct," he said.

BAITING A POLICEMAN

The type of baiting a policeman is subjected to was seen last week just after two Negro youths were wounded by the Negro officer on the Northwest playground during a struggle which stemmed from a routine arrest.

The playground had been cleared for the investigation, and two white policemen guarded the entrance. A bearded Negro youth tried to push his way into the playground. He was told it was closed for the time being.

"What the hell do you mean I can't go out there, man, I pay my taxes," the youth said. As the policeman repeated his superior's instructions, the youth, taller and heavier, pressed toward the policeman's face, saying:

"Look, whitey, you guys have just murdered (they were wounded) two more of my brothers and I'm going out there to find out why."

There was another exchange, and then the agitator said, "If you want me to move back, whitey, then you're going to have to shoot me . . . you're going to have to murder me like you just did my two brothers."

The officer was then flanked by a racially mixed group of newsmen, and some youngsters broke the tension by laughing at the agitator. Whereupon he said, "All right, whitey, you've got me outnumbered but you just wait. You'll have to shoot me before the day is over."

As he left, he shouted over his shoulder, "This is the last straw. We're going to get even with all of you before sundown."

FORCE UNDER STRENGTH

Eight out of 10 Washington policemen are white. The city is more than 65 percent Negro. Eight out of 10 arrested persons are Negro; as are eight out of 10 victims of crimes.

The Metropolitan Police Force is more than 300 men short of its authorized strength of 3,100 men. Many of its men regularly work six-day weeks.

Both Negro and white officers emphasized that the color of the policeman's skin doesn't make much difference on tense Washington streets.

"If they have a riot, they are not going to pick out whites or Negroes. Just policemen, and we're all in the same boat," said an 11th Precinct Negro private.

A veteran of nine years on the force, he said, "I'm apprehensive out there. Some of these youths provoke police to arrest them just so they can yell police brutality."

"I've taken some verbal abuse myself, although not too much without acting. The kids know that to claim brutality is the one way to get back at police for exercising his authority no matter how justified," the officer said.

"DON'T TURN YOUR BACK"

Talking of his "apprehension" on the street, the Negro officer said, "It's don't turn your back or make a mistake, because it could be your last time.

"In 1959, I felt I had the community's support, the community with me. Now nobody's with us, not even the businessmen. All they say is they never see a cop."

He continued:

"They'll abuse you out there, the kids, calling names, struggle and put up a fight for no reason, same tactics as ever, just more of it. You very seldom get in trouble over major crime; it's always the petty things.

"An officer is afraid to use his gun, even if it's justified. Officials are constantly putting it in your head about the penalties. Some officers don't want to get involved under these conditions. The old time cops wouldn't have stood for it.

"Even in the most routine arrest, a crowd is going to gather . . . And you wonder, is the fellow going to complain; is the case going to be thrown out of court; are you going to be sued for false arrest?

"You are afraid to move out there and you gotta be careful. Some officers are afraid to do anything. Others are a little jumpy, because of the tension and may be quicker to use the stick.

"But a policeman has a gun, a nightstick, and a blackjack, and when someone attacks you, you have to assume he's trying to do you in, and act accordingly," he said.

UNDERSCORES DISRESPECT

A white 14th Precinct officer underscored the disrespect for police by youth. "It's police in general they don't like and it doesn't matter about the color of your skin," he said.

"We're enticed every day, mostly by name calling and rock throwing. They have a favorite obscene name they use—and they use it on officers of both races.

"A man will call you that and the policeman gets mad. He might tighten up on his hold on the man's belt some, but I've never seen a policeman hit one for it.

"It's funny about force. A colored policeman often can use force and get away with it. They (youths) can't charge discrimination."

A policeman for four years patrolling a high tension area in Northeast, the officer said, "These kids hate cops. They just hate the white ones more.

"The book says its a felony assaulting an officer, and you can use your gun. But no one can tell you what to do out there. You do what seems best and right for the moment," the officer said.

"We get absolutely no cooperation from people and when you do, the courts defeat it. Some times you wonder if it's worth it and maybe you'll look the other way."

The officer said that when responding to calls for certain crimes, like "man with a gun" or "robbery in progress," he "will have the gun ready, but not out, or I should say I'm ready to pull out the gun."

"You wonder about getting killed every day. You go into the projects, and everything you do is wrong, even if you're trying to help them," he said.

A 29-year-old Negro officer assigned to a mid-town precinct offered a poignant appraisal of the situation. He told it this way:

"A lot of us, especially the Negro officers, thought that things would be different once the city started hiring more colored men to be policemen here.

"We thought that, with a more balanced police force, there wouldn't be as many complaints from the people that the 'white cops' were picking on them. The white officers were glad . . . the colored people would stop squawking.

"But somehow, none of this happened. Instead our own people turn against us in many cases, calling us Uncle Toms, and 'the white man's slave.'

"To the nigger on the street—that's right, we call some of our own niggers; there's a difference, you know, between a Negro and a nigger— . . . to the nigger on the street we were traitors.

SCOUT CAR INTEGRATION

"The integrationists were yelling, 'integrate the scout cars,' so we integrated the scout cars and that didn't do much good either . . . A black officer and a white officer would make a joint arrest and, if it was a white man we locked up, we were picking on him. . . . He'd say, 'Your black partner tell you what to do?' . . . and the Negroes said just the opposite, so we still couldn't win.

"It used to be that every time a white officer shot a Negro suspect, the civil rights groups raised all kinds of hell. Now they do it every time any policeman shoots a criminal."

The Negro officer concluded:

"But whenever one of our men, white or black, gets attacked or even killed by a hood, you never hear the good citizens raise hell. I'd like to know what goes through their minds. Do they think that we're something less than human, something like discarded trash that isn't missed?

"As for me, man, when I police, I just play it cool. I'm no hero."

SEES "BACKPEDALING"

The young white lieutenant assigned to a downtown precinct said, "It's no secret that the police here are backpedaling. They let these bums get away with so darned much only because any type of crackdown brings screams of protest from the civil rights groups.

"I say the hell with these civil righters and the protesters. If a guy breaks the law, then lock him up and charge him with the offense. And if he gives you any lip, verbally or physically, use whatever force is necessary to maintain your arrest, or your name is mud.

"Because the word gets around that you backed down, and from then on you have to fight every punk in the precinct to keep law and order."

A 40-year-old white private from an uptown precinct observed, "We'll probably never get back to the old days when a policeman was a policeman and his word was law and, by God, you'd better not defy him or you'd go to the hospital before you went to jail.

"Perhaps we kicked around too many people too often and now the cycle has gone the other way. Neither way is really right. The only way to restore some sort of law and order is for more than half of the people who live here to rise up against the criminals who are less than 5 percent of the population."

ON A POWDER KEG

A policeman on the beat is "sitting on a powder keg," according to a 13th Precinct Negro private, a member of the force for four years.

"If you don't get a man off the street right away, there is a possible incident. A lot of times this is impossible. There are many times when the arrest is provoked.

"They know—the unruly ones—what our limitations are and take it upon themselves to cause a disturbance. You have to do something about it and if you don't, you're harassed by everyone," the officer said.

"You're caught between the devil and the deep blue sea. Juveniles know just how far they can go and they take you to the breaking point. It's the code of the street. To live in it, you have to be stronger than the next man," he said.

PERSONAL CONTACTS

"But the average policeman likes being a policeman," the private continued. "They train you to use your logic, but you don't know what you'll do in the heat of battle."

Many of the officers interviewed emphasized the need for personal contacts with members of the community in non-adversary settings. One suggested, "When they have community relations meetings, the privates who patrol and live with the people should be invited, not just the officials who are hardly ever out on the street."

A Negro sergeant, who has served on the force nine years in the 10th and 2nd Precincts, said some officers have taken the street difficulties personally and say "what's the use, and do just enough to satisfy their captain.

"They see a crime in progress and they turn the other way . . . A lot of men have the feeling they are not going to be backed up. They are constantly hounded by superiors. There are inequities in enforcing department policies. Police don't have the guidelines to help them in these tense situations.

"HAS BETTER CHANCE

"I have run into both Negroes and whites who are afraid of the people they have to police. I have seen one officer directing traffic while his partner was in a fight. That's ridiculous.

"A Negro officer has a better chance of getting to know the people in his precinct simply because of his race . . . We ought to get back to the ideal of all Negro precincts. . . . There are white officers in number 11 who won't go into Barry Farms (public housing project.) Negroes can."

The sergeant said one difficulty in developing better police-community relations is that "white officers have trouble telling one Negro kid from another. They can't be police in these areas.

"Police and city officials are catering too much to these so-called community leaders around here. These community leaders have got to stop talking about the long hot summer, and riots and these things. They are planting the idea with people. Trying to generate a riot. Trying to incite a riot. And I mean Stokely and Barry and the rest."

One Negro private, a 10-year veteran of Anacostia duty, said:

"I think Washington police take more abuse without retaliation than any other major police department. In other places, police would bash some heads in," he said.

"Here we are told to stay away from areas during disturbances, and in effect not protect the public, but leave it to community leaders and they end up with glory for preventing something they sometimes contributed to starting," the officer said.

He charged that "some poverty workers have a very hostile attitude toward police and transfer it to the people, and especially the youths."

A 25-year-old white former private, who has just quit the force out of disgust and disillusionment, said "I feel sorry for the guys I leave behind."

Bitterly, he said "I put in my time, did what I was told most of the time and managed to avoid a real blow up with one of those damn agitators.

"I knew that if anyone challenged my arrests, I'd get no backing from the top—the officials that is—they have no set policy. Sometimes, if they think no one will raise a stink about it . . . they'll pat you on the back and tell you you're a good officer."

One tough Negro private of 20 years on the force criticized the conduct of some of his fellow officers.

"Some white and Negro policemen feel you go out and shoot everybody down and that's the way you solve the problem," he said.

"In some of these crowd situations, some officers act like spectators. They don't know what to do or are afraid to do it.

"Putting on a uniform and swearing in does not make a cop. These rural men who come into the metropolitan area are not used to handling big city problems."

"In Anacostia, I went into a crowd of 200 people and pulled out a boy who threw a rock at a police car. They didn't bother me. They knew me and knew they couldn't beat me."

REFLECTS ON DIFFERENCES

A veteran white officer who served in both the 11th and 5th Precincts, reflected on the differences between policing in 1952, when he came on the force, and today.

"The men are jumpy," he said.

"Policing now is completely different than it was 10 years ago. I used to enjoy going to work," he said, adding:

"The biggest part of it is that these youths have no respect for any authority. In the past they normally would give police some backlip. But now they think nothing of jumping a policeman.

"They are looking to agitate a policeman into doing something to cause a scene. You are tense. It affects your working conditions, your home life, your marriage."

ALWAYS FEAR

This point was echoed by a Negro private from the 14th Precinct. A seven-year veteran, he said, "In the back of your head there's always fear.

"I do my job and don't think about it. If I didn't, I'd end up in the nut house like (a name). His wife kept on him, reminding him about the chances of getting killed."

This officer told his views on working the troubled far Northeast area. He said:

"No two officers are alike. We're people, too, you know. You take as much as you can and there must be flexibility. If you can see that far, don't make an arrest, and avoid a riot.

"The law says to make an arrest, but you have to use your own judgment. So you let the minor ones go. But in a major offense, I take my chances and make the arrest.

"The best thing to do with name calling is to ignore it. Some officers won't and get all excited about it.

"But I won't stand for it when they come right up to your face and cuss you out, or spit. I might even bash a head. But it takes years of knowing and experience, not what the department teaches you."

For example, he said, "In a crowd situation, when two policemen pull up, don't get out of the car. Back off and get all the men you can and then go back in there. Two men couldn't possibly handle it. They lose communications leaving the car, and could lose a life or get beat up."

A 14-year veteran Negro officer, assigned to the 14th Precinct, said: "When these crowds gather," he added, "put the loudest mouth there on the spot. If you're having trouble quieting down a drunk, challenge the loudmouth to help."

A white 14th Precinct officer had much the same idea: "I've got a favorite saying when a man's mouthing off in a crowd. I tell them, 'You know so much about it you tell me what to do.' That usually shuts them up."

He said that in disorderly crowd situations, "there just aren't enough arrests. The precinct is just content to break them up. At least we should bring them all in and call their parents and make them come down here, pull them away from their television sets if you can find them, and make them control their kids so the parents won't have to come down here again."

TELLS OF SUCCESS

A seasoned lieutenant from a precinct east of the Anacostia River told of success in handling a crowd of youths in the manner the 14th Precinct private advocated.

"About the first of the year, there was this group of youths throwing rocks at a police car with white and Negro officers in it. We arrested all 15 of them.

"A fellow from the human relations council and I sat here in the precinct and we brought in all the parents. It was encouraging. The parents were very cooperative. One whipped his kid right here. They really chewed these kids out."

A contrasting example was observed by a reporter in a precinct last week. The mother of a 9-year-old Negro boy blasted her child for telling police he saw two older youths stealing lawnmowers.

"You're nothing but a stool pigeon. Next time you don't know nothing, you didn't see nothing, and you walk the other way," the mother said, accenting her warning with a poke to the face.

IN NEW SOUTHWEST

And what of the policemen in the precincts where racial tensions are not so acute? Is their attitude about the job better?

Said a 25-year-old 4th Precinct white private:

"I'm glad that I'm in the new Southwest area, where most of our problems are housebreakings and noncontroversial crimes . . .

"I put in my eight hours a day and that's all. I have no desire to get out there and become a dead hero. . . . Sure, I'm looking for another job, isn't everyone?"

A 36-year-old white police private assigned to the 7th Precinct in Georgetown asserted, "If those officers who patrol the Negro sections of town think their hands are tied, they ought to come over to Georgetown for a while.

"We've got the kids and the beatniks to put up with along The Strip . . . and those little monsters, white or not, give us more headaches than a whole mob of colored kids.

"Sometimes we can't tell the boys from the girls the way they dress, until we get them to the precinct house . . . and then there is sometimes hell to pay for locking up some big shot's son or daughter who was dressed like a fag in the damnedest assortment of old clothes you've ever seen.

"White or black, you can't win as a policeman here," said the Georgetown area officer.

CHANGE IN HABITS

There were other views on the change in policing habits.

"It's for certain that we aren't policing like we used to, mainly because there just aren't enough of us to go around," said a 38-year-old white police detective.

"When I left the 2nd Precinct in 1965, there were 228 men assigned to just that precinct. I checked there yesterday and there now are only 112 men, counting officials. Now I ask you, how the hell can you patrol a precinct properly with less than half the manpower you had in 1965 and crime up nearly 100 percent?"

A huge Negro sergeant, crippled by a brick that a Negro youth hurled at his back last year, tapped his cane on the floor as he talked of returning to the job, if he ever can.

"You don't think much about the situation out in these street incidents at the time. You do what you think is right and use as much force as you think is necessary. A police officer's first duty is to uphold the law. I have been called all sorts of names, mocked, harassed, enticed. But you cannot inject your personal feelings into it."

Two discs were shattered by the brick, thrown from a group of angry youths protesting his arrest of seven unruly Negroes in Anacostia. Asked if he had any second thoughts about the handling of the incident, the sergeant said, "I wouldn't have done it any other way."

The Thin Blue Line: The Police/The Public

(By Fred E. Inbau, professor of criminal law, Northwestern University Law School)

(Note—Fred E. Inbau is a member of the Chicago Crime Commission. He is a former director of the Chicago Police Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory, a widely recognized authority on criminal law procedures, and author of several books, including a standard law text, Cases and Comments on Criminal Justice. He is also the Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science.)

In the early morning hours of a day in October 1963, three young hoodlums savagely assaulted Frank Perry, a uniformed police officer on duty with the Chicago Police Department. His assailants overpowered Officer Perry and seized his gun. He might have been killed except for the sudden appearance of two fellow officers in a cruising squad car.

The men who attacked Officer Perry were apprehended, tried and convicted. They had long police records; their offense was a serious threat to community law and order. Yet, the three convicted criminals, ages 23, 19 and 19, were granted probation. For reasons unknown, the trial judge expressed the opinion that Officer Perry was a "crybaby".

TRADITIONAL VIEW OF THE POLICE

During most of the 20th century, an American policeman seldom had to face a charge of "crybaby". Although a particular police force might sometimes serve as a target for rough humor or often as the excuse for public cynicism, most communities saw nothing wrong with their police that could not be corrected by a new chief or by the election of a local reform ticket.

For all their human imperfections, American policemen were regarded as courageous protectors of the innocent. In line of duty, they regularly faced the threat of physical harm or, if need be, the utlimate fact of death. It was no exaggeration to regard them as a thin line of men in blue striving to defend the peaceful members of society from its thugs, murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals.

HAVE WE CHANGED OUR MINDS?

Every casual reader of the newspapers knows that something has happened to this traditional view of the police. The scare-words "police brutality" regularly appear in the headlines. Too often holiday weekends produce stories of conflict between young pleasure-seekers and the police in resort areas. Motorists complain of improper enforcement of traffic laws. Newspaper reports of trials in court tell of repudiated confessions, alleged mistreatment of prisoners and charges of police bribery and incompetence.

From the slums to the suburbs, from the stories in daily papers to the decisions of the highest courts in the land, controversy rages over the conduct of policemen and the proper use of police powers. So widespread is the confusion and dissatisfaction that observers striving for impartiality must ask: Who has changed? The police? Or the public?

WHAT THE FACTS SHOW

If the widespread indictment of the modern policeman can be supported at all, surely it must be on the basis of some factual evidence. Is today's policeman less self-sacrificing in his traditional struggle with law-breakers? Available figures make a mockery of any such contention.

Instead, records prove it is becoming increasingly hazardous to serve the American public in the uniform of a police officer. During 1965 one in every ten policemen throughout the nation was the victim of an assault. In New York City during the same year, assaults on policemen increased 8% over 1964. From January through June, 1965, 264 Chicago police officers were injured on duty; during the same period of 1966 the number increased to 364. In July, 1966, excluding the detective division, 76 Chicago police officers were assaulted by persons resisting arrest; another 73 were injured as a result of mob action or fights between citizens. Over a recent five-year period, 406 Atlanta police officers incurred major injuries while making arrests. During the past six years, throughout the nation, 278 officers were killed.

In the area of professional skills, are the police of the '60's less accomplished than those of earlier days? It would, indeed, be difficult to show that they are, on the basis of any objective evaluation. Evidence indicates many fewer cases of physical abuse of suspects than formerly and far less intrusion on the constitutional rights and privileges of citizens. The so-called 3rd degree during the interrogation of criminal suspects—a fairly common practice twenty, or even ten, years ago—is a rare occurrence today. As for police procedure in general, it is an established fact that today's policemen are much more highly trained than ever before.

It seems certain that we must look elsewhere for the cause of the current wave of dissatisfaction with our police forces.

THE POLICEMAN AS A SYMBOL OF SOCIAL ILLS

Undoubtedly much of today's criticism of the police results from the fact that the policeman has come to be the uniformed symbol of many social ills. Unlike other representatives of local government—aldermen or members of the school board, for example—the policeman is on public view day in and day out. He therefore feels the brunt of much of the community's pent-up resentment over social conditions.

It is unreasonable to regard the policeman as responsible for the plight of minority groups. He did not create the slums or the Negro and Puerto Rican ghettos; nor have the police caused segregation and discrimination. Nevertheless, there is a widespread identification of the police with all these failures of society.

The psychology of this identification—the source of much basic resentment against the men in blue uniforms—is easy to understand. Most motorists have had the experience of being stopped or ticketed by a traffic policeman. Even when the driver knows that the action is justified, he is still likely to feel some humiliation and embarrassment. If the officer seems brusque or rude, or if the motorist can convince himself that he did not violate the law (perhaps, "only a little bit", his anger will burn hot. Psychologically, it is a short step from anger against a particular man in blue to transferred resentment of all police officers.

Perhaps most damaging of all to the image of the policeman has been the role he is forced to play when controversies over the civil rights of minority groups cause violence. With each passing summer it becomes more and more difficult to distinguish between legitimate social protest and flagrant violation of laws designed to protect persons and property. Puzzling and unpleasant though this choice may be for us all, for the police, who are professionally responsible for the maintenance of law and order, it is a cruel dilemma.

POLICE MORALE IN THE CRISIS

Men who accept hazardous public service as a way of life hope for the good will and good opinion of their fellow citizens. It is hard for the police to accept daily danger in the face of mounting public disrespect and outright hostility. A wave of frustration has swept over the entire field of law enforcement, adversely affecting police recruitment and the rate of resignation.

During the first six months of 1964, 1965 and 1966, Chicago's police resignations—without pension and for the purpose of accepting other employment—jumped from 20 in '64 to 37 in '65 and to 90 in '66. In July, 1966 alone there were 37 such resignations!

A breakdown in police tenure and recruitment would produce dire consequences for our society. As the false image of policemen as the defenders of inequities in our social system gains a greater and greater hold on the public's imagination, we tend to forget that we must depend on these same men to protect us from the criminal element in our society. Nothing less than a highly trained and soundly motivated body of men, replenished by effective recruitment and wholeheartedly devoting itself to career service, will protect the American people from violence and crime.

A CHANGE OF PUBLIC ATTITUDE IS CALLED FOR

If we are to arrest the obvious deterioration of police morale, a dramatic change in public attitude is called for. Our citizens must come to a more realistic appreciation of the awesomeness of a policeman's responsibility. Reasonable allowance must be made for inevitable errors of judgment in the performance of his duties.

When the public appraises the conduct of any other public employee or of any member of another profession, due allowance is made for the frailties of human nature. All too often, in the case of a policeman, we make no allowance for the normal human traits of impatience and anger. We forget or ignore the frustrations that confront him in his job every day.

We should never forget, in our dealings with a police officer, that he may have spent an eight-hour day confronting drunks, thieves and thugs. He may have suffered painful blows. He may have been attacked by knife or gun. A near psychotic may have spit in his face. At all times, nevertheless, he is expected to suppress any expressions of resentment or frustration. We expect him to show the composure of the surgeon, the patient understanding of the clergyman, and the learning of an appellate judge. And if he fails, he and his office may be condemned or scorned in a manner never inflicted on any other public servant.

All this is not to suggest that the public must condone whatever the police do, or that we should never hold the police accountable for mistakes. No responsible police officer asks for or expects any such special privilege. We must evaluate a police officer's conduct in any given situation within the context of all the facts and circumstances confronting him at the time of his decision-making.

THE COURTS AND THE POLICE OFFICER

Not only is the individual police officer frequently second-guessed in a particular case by the public or the press, but it has become highly fashionable lately for judges to formulate police policies and prescribe police procedures. A number of recent decisions severely limit the effectiveness of police officers in dealing with suspected criminals.

Even cases of physical assaults on officers —for example, the instance of the assault on Officer Perry, with which we began this discussion—seem in recent years to have been resolved in court with unusual leniency. Naturally this form of consideration for the proven guilty is the practice that the police find hardest to accept. Inevitably, it lessens their willingness to risk life and limb in scuffles with law-breakers.

It is the constitutional function of the courts to insure that no one is convicted except by "due process of law". In essence, this has always meant a "fair trial"—providing adequate safeguards to protect the innocent. For example, if the prosecutor seeks to use as evidence a confession that the police obtained by force, threats, or promises of leniency, the evidence should be rejected by the court. Under such circumstances an innocent person might make a false confession. But in the past few years, decisions of the Supreme Court have held that, regardless of the validity and reliability of the evidence against an accused person, it must be suppressed if the police deviated from the procedures prescribed by the courts.

This practice of turning the obviously guilty free—for considerations apart from the protection of the innocent—is a considerable factor in producing the present low morale of the police.

SOME KEY CASES AND DECISIONS

A few cases may help explain police resentment. Several years ago a housewife in Washington, D.C., was raped in a laundry room in the basement of her apartment building. Strong suspicion centered on one Andrew Mallory, a relative of the building's janitor. In fact, the suspect was the only one who could have been in the basement at the time, but the victim could not positively identify him as the rapist because he had used cloth to conceal his features.

Several days later the police located the suspect and held him in custody a few hours. After a short period of questioning—without the use of force, threats, or promises of leniency or any other conduct that might make an innocent man confess—the suspect admitted he was the rapist. His confession, together with other evidence, satisfied a jury, beyond a reasonable doubt, that he was guilty.

Nevertheless, upon appeal to the Supreme Court, the conviction was reversed on the ground that the confession was inadmissable as evidence because the police had violated a rule requiring arrested persons to be brought before a judicial magistrate "without unnecessary delay". It was futile to try the confessed rapist again because the confession was indispensable to proof of his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. He was therefore released.

Soon afterwards he assaulted another woman, and later was caught burglarizing a Philadelphia home in which he had attempted another rape. This time, with no technical out, he was sent to the penitentiary.

In another Washington, D.C. case, the Supreme Court rule laid down in the above case required a trial judge to release a man who had not only confessed to the murder of his wife, but had also led the police to the place where he had buried her body. In ordering the defendant's release the trial judge said: "I will direct a verdict of acquittal, but I do so with a heavy heart . . ."

Policemen experience a feeling of bitterness and frustration when they see a dangerous criminal set free. But Supreme Court decisions rendered on June 13, 1966, by a vote of five justices to four, seem to indicate that we have not seen the end of the practice.

The Supreme Court held that before any criminal suspect can be questioned by the police he must first be advised:

a. that he has the right to remain silent;

b. that anything he says can be used against him;

c. that he is entitled to consult with a lawyer; and to have him present during questioning; and

d. that if he cannot afford a lawyer, he is entitled to have one provided for him.

All of this was entirely new law. Over the years, at least thirty state supreme courts, and at one time the Supreme Court itself, held that the Constitution did not require the police to warn a suspect of a right to remain silent (although, this did not permit the police to force him to talk). Just a few years ago the Supreme Court specifically held that the police were entitled to question a suspect even though he asked for a lawyer and even though a lawyer was at the police station, trying to see him.

These earlier decisions were based upon the theory that the Constitution provides only that "in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right . . . to have the assistance of counsel for his defense." Nowhere in the Constitution is there any guarantee of the right to counsel before the start of a prosecution.

The warnings now required will be a considerable handicap to the police in producing evidence against guilty persons—especially the warning regarding the right to counsel because the standard advice of every lawyer to his client is: "Don't talk." The burden of this decision on the police results from the fact that many serious crimes can be solved only by the interrogation of criminal suspects. Fingerprints and other circumstantial evidence are rarely found in cases involving muggings, murders, or rapes committed on the streets and alleys of our cities.

CONCLUSION

In our efforts to preserve individual rights and civil liberties, we cannot impose so many restrictions on law enforcement agencies that they will be powerless to prevent crime and apprehend criminals. Our only practical course is to strive to improve the quality of our law enforcement agencies and to create an atmosphere in which the civil rights and liberties of all will be respected.

This must be done by selecting and promoting our police on a strict merit basis and by making certain that they are properly trained and adequately compensated. They must also be internally supervised with respect to abusive and corrupt practices and protected against politically inspired interference.

Further progress will result as the general public once more develops a sound and realistic attitude toward law enforcement agencies. As a guide toward our thinking on this point, the plea of Commissioner G. B. McClellan of the Royal Mounted Police deserves the consideration of all law-abiding citizens: "When the policeman exceeds his authority, bring him up short, but when he is doing a tough, thankless and frequently dangerous job for you and for all you hold dear, for God's sake get off his back."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 22, 1967]

CRIME—WHAT'S THAT?

There is one thing to be said for our new Attorney General, Ramsey Clark. You never know what to expect when he takes off on the subject of crime.

In an interview the other day, the attorney general was reported as saying in effect that all the talk about a national crime wave is much ado about nothing. "The level of crime has risen a little bit," Clark said, "but there is no wave of crime in the country."

As an item in support of this thesis, the attorney general told of one city (unidentified) in which crime was up 1 percent from last year. But last year, he added cheerfully, crime in that city was down 1 percent from the year before. As for official statistics which indicate substantial yearly increases in crime throughout the country, Clark said: "We do ourselves a great disservice with statistics."

For our part, we do not quite know how to interpret this comment. It is true that crime statistics do a great disservice to the Clark suggestion that the crime wave talk is a case of making mountains out of molehills. But our attorney general, in all deference, is talking through his hat—at least as far as the crime statistics for Washington are concerned. Whatever the fact as to the statistics for his unidentified city—statistics, incidentally, which he seemed to think were quite useful—the figures for the Nation's Capital add up to a devastating rebuttal of the Clark crime thesis.

The most recent statistics for Washington show a dismaying crime rise here of 59.7 percent last month over the previous April. This included a 103.8 percent jump in robberies. The rise in serious crimes in March was 51 percent over March of 1966. The President's message on crime in Washington, promising safe streets and so on, went to Congress in January. The local crime statistics for that month revealed a jump of 42 percent over the same month a year ago. And to take a longer statistical journey into the past, the crime index in Washington 10 years ago was about one-fourth of its current level.

Yet our attorney general tells us that "we do ourselves a great disservice with statistics." It would be nice, we suppose, if the nasty figures could be thrown down the sewer. Then it might be possible for some people to believe that there really isn't any such thing as a crime wave. Possible for some people that is, but not for those who are the victims day in and day out of robberies, rapes, burglaries, assaults, and you name it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 24, 1967]

BAD DAY ON THE CRIME FRONT

About half of the first page of the last edition of yesterday's Star was given over to the story of crime in Washington. And it couldn't have been otherwise—unless one believes that the way to deal with crime is to pretend it isn't there.

This latest chapter of our local crime story began Monday evening when a police officer was forced to shoot two hoodlums who attacked him on a school playground. Around noon yesterday a bank messenger was shot to death in a robbery at 10th and P Streets NW. At about the same time a young woman, Judith K. Robeson, who worked for Senator Carlson of Kansas, was found brutally murdered in her apartment at 800 Fourth St. SW. To top off the day, police had to battle a crowd of unruly youngsters trying to crash the city's annual Cadet Corps review at Eastern High School. After bottles and rocks began to fly, 19 arrests were made. All of this, of course, was over and above the daily run of "routine" crime in this city.

It seems to use that a day of this sort should be enough to shake up the most complacent, the most myopic, crime watcher. But maybe not.

Senator Carlson put his finger, perhaps unintentionally, on the root of the difficulty.

It fell to him to phone the bad news to Miss Robeson's parents in Kansas. "I tell you," he said, "it was rough. This kind of thing is just unbelievable until it happens (to someone) in your own office."

Well, "this kind of thing" is believable enough to thousands of people, generally "little" people, in Washington. All too often, they have seen members of their families murdered. They know what rape, robbery and assault mean. It is believable to the policeman whose daily stint is becoming more and more hazardous, while more and more fools or worse mouth the cry of "police brutality." And every indication is that the trend of crime is going up, not down. We hope that "this kind of thing" will not have to happen to someone in everyone's office before the threat of crime is taken seriously.

A new District crime bill—not a "tough" bill, but better than nothing—has started to move through the House. If it is passed, we hope the Attorney General, who seems to think that crime is something of a myth, will support it. And we also hope that the President, who makes fine speeches about safety in the city, but who unwisely vetoed last year's crime bill, will sign it into law.

Perhaps the message that is implicit in Senator Carlson's comment will get through to these protected gentlemen who have the power, if they will use it, to do something effective to curb crime in Washington.

TEXT OF REMARKS OF SENATOR CLIFFORD HANSEN AT NOON MEETING OF THE POLITICAL STUDY CLUB OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Each of us here today has at least two things in common. We are all interested in politics, and we live in a metropolitan area that has one of the highest crime rates in the nation.

And so I would like to speak with you for a few minutes about a war being fought right here at home—a war which we clearly are losing.

With all due respect to the Attorney General, statistics and our own newspapers tell the story of crime in the nation and in Washington.

Since 1960, the United States population has increased eight per cent. Crime of all types has increased 46 per cent. Much of this increase has been among juveniles. Indeed, it has been reported that of all criminals arrested by the police, the most frequent age is 15.

The Washingtonian soon learns, as have my wife Martha and I, that the streets of Washington are not a good place to be found when the sun goes down. Crime in Washington during the month of April increased 60 per cent from the level of April a year ago.

Our city seems to be caught in a double play that favors criminal activity. On one hand, crime is increasing; and on the other, it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain a fully-staffed police department.

Recently, the Washington police force had 310 vacancies.

One wonders if factors more than high risk and low pay haven't contributed to the disinclination of our young men to don the blue uniform of our most valuable public servant.

There's a line by an anonymous poet which goes, "God and the soldier we adore in time of trouble, and not before." This is equally true of our police. A motorist will look with disdain upon an officer who tickets her for speeding; five minutes later, that same officer may nab a mugger or purse snatcher who had made that motorist his victim.

It is a fact that in the United States today, combined spending to prevent or punish crime, carries an annual price tag of 27 billion dollars. This is 7 billion dollars more per year than we spend on education. Crimes of violence increase at an incredible rate.

Evidence of nationwide crime syndicates which form an invisible government in our major cities is more apparent every day. But paradoxically, our courts and our social philosophers seem constrained to weep, not for the murdered, but for the murderer . . . not for society's law-abiding majority, but for society's law-breaking minority.

Recently, when a New York court was forced to throw out the conviction of a confessed six-time murderer because of the so-called Miranda decision on voluntary confessions, District Attorney Aaron A. Koota had this to say:

"The United States Supreme Court has weighted the scales of justice heavily in favor of the criminal suspect. I am not a prophet, but the handwriting on the wall indicates a trend on the part of the court to outlaw all confessions made to police. If and when that meloncholy day comes, the death knell of effective criminal law enforcement will have been sounded."

I suggest to you that the criminal law exists to protect those who obey it from those who don't. When the courts distort this basis for the law to create from it a system of false equality that was never intended, the law ceases to become a shield for the society it is supposed to protect.

It becomes instead a pitiful instrument which feeds on trivia and technicality and serves neither to protect society nor punish society's offenders.

Sir Edward Coke wrote nearly four centuries ago that "reason is the life of law. The common law itself is nothing else but reason. The law," he said, "is the perfection of reason."

But how is reason served when by a one vote majority of the Supreme Court, the self-admitted guilty are turned upon society to wreak their havoc on the bodies and treasures of those who obey the law? When this occurs, the law and reason have parted company.

All of us are familiar with the Mallory decision. The U.S. Supreme Court turned loose a confessed rapist because a day had elapsed between his arrest and his arraignment. Mr. Mallory's response to the society which had gifted him again with his liberty was to again commit the crime of rape.

The history of man's efforts to create a framework of civilized law suggests that a debilitation in the system's appendages spreads rapidly through the trunk and to the heart.

We have today increases in crimes of violence on the streets; a system of organized crime throughout our nation; we have Stokely Carmichael threatening to "tear" our "cities apart."

Mr. Carmichael has told us in painfully graphic terms that he intends to take over Washington lock, stock and barrel. Given this young man's propensity to violence and his thirst for power, Washington might well indeed have a long, hot summer.

Law enforcement officials from J. Edgar Hoover down, agree that most positive remedy to crime—whether it be violence in the streets, systems in the cities, or sedition in the slums—is prompt capture, speedy trial and severe penalty.

In all three respects, we as a nation are failing.

The obstacles before our police negate prospects for prompt arrest and arraignment.

The congestion in our courts makes the speedy trial unlikely.

And a peculiar philosophy pervading our society is lessening the severe penalty.

It is highly unlikely that the Congress will take any action to vitiate recent Supreme Court decisions which I feel have contributed not only to the increase in crime, but the decrease in apprehension and conviction.

But there must be some things that we, as citizens, can do to protect ourselves, rather than simply double-bolt the door at night, and keep a shotgun at hand.

It seems to me that one of the most basic protective measures is to decrease the criminal element in our society by the rehabilitation of first offenders.

Studies show that we have a better than 50–50 chance of saving the first offender and keeping him from a career of crime.

Also, to keep criminals from society, we can demand much tighter control over parole and release of multiple offenders, particularly those with a record of crimes of violence.

Studies show that a life sentence for most prisoners runs only 12 years before parole. U.S. News and World Report stated early this month that of all criminals freed in 1963, from Federal prisons, 82 percent were rearrested for new crimes by June 30, 1966.

And so, I suggest that we not be so quick to turn loose the man with the long rap sheet. The parole and probation schools have pitted the classic school, with its emphasis on law, against the humanitarian school with its emphasis on man. The community protection role should take precedence over rehabilitation of the convicted multiple offender.

We have an obligation to offer freedom and aid only to those not likely to assault society again and that is the first offender—the one who goes to prison with the best chance of being rehabilitated.

I am thoroughly convinced—from watching the rehabilitation program at the Wyoming State Penitentiary, during my term as Governor, that we must not, in our penal system, throw the first offender into the environment of the hardened, habitual criminal.

The education of environment works to the detriment of those who might be saved from a life of crime. If it requires special prisons for first offenders only, then I think we ought to consider making that economic commitment. Or we could simply segregate our prisons now in existence.

But in any event, the importance of keeping first offenders from habitual criminal elements is a vital step in the diminution of the size and potency of society's criminal element.

Another measure that we could take—this applies to apprehension—is to enact a realistic wiretapping law which goes beyond the very limited national security authorization requested by the President.

I have helped author a bill that would create a search warrant-type procedure for the granting of electronic surveillance warrants by judges at the Federal, State and municipal levels.

To get authorization for a wiretap, an authority would have to show cause, establish need and deposit all of the information gleaned from wiretaps with the authorizing judicial authority.

The telephone wires which connect every town and city are an important factor in the organization of criminal networks. The ability to intercept these messages is of ever-increasing importance in law enforcement.

I am convinced also that we should reconsider our attitude toward juvenile offenders—and child raising.

This question goes to the very heart of the child-parent relationship; to the permissive school of child-raising that is invoked today. This philosophy, I might add, is largely of the same Doctor Spock who preaches Viet Cong supremacy in the company of civil rights leaders who ought to know better.

I think it is well to remember that children are young adults. What they will be in maturity, they are becoming as children.

As adults, they will reflect the moral judgments they see made in the home: both by example, and by loving but positive discipline.

They will be compassionate if their earlier lives reflect the therapy of compassion.

They will have a lively concern for others if their lives have been of concern to others.

A child needs to be involved in his family; not just fed and clothed by it. He needs to be guided by his family, not just shielded by it, and he needs at least as much Mom and Dad as Doc Spock and television.

When parents again take responsibility for the conduct of the lives they create, I think we will find fewer of our young people dragged into juvenile court.

But once they're in those courts, I firmly believe that they ought not to be clothed in a mantle of anonymity and freedom from exposure.

In the Rocky Mountain country which has been my home for more than 50 years, there is a splendid old judge in Helena, the capital of Montana.

He is Judge Lester Loble. His philosophy for controlling "juvenile crime" was outlined in a speech in Salt Lake City.

Said Judge Loble, "If they're tough enough and big enough to topple tombstones, steal cars and knock old men over, they're big enough to be tried in open court with their parents in the front row and with press coverage."

But more important than any of the foregoing, is the attitude of the common citizen toward the criminal, toward society of which he is a part, and toward the law enforcement officer whose job is his defense.

In commenting recently on the upcoming task force report on organized crime, former Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach blamed apathy for the flourishing of such crime. It could also be blamed for the flourishing of most of our crimes.

We need to involve ourselves in the problems which face our over-worked and underpaid law enforcement officers.

We need to take the demeaning term "cop" out of our prose.

We need to make the term "support your local Police" more than a bumper sticker.

We need to rise up in righteous indignation when a little band of hate mongers threatens to badger a police officer, who is doing his duty, offends one of their number.

We must signal the lawless minority that the law-abiding majority of us will stand behind the police whose excellence is our shield against rampaging crime.

If our cities have become jungles, we are partly to blame—not for any so-called "collective guilt of society," but for our apathy and our misguided sentimentality for those who prey on the persons and property of our citizens.

We are failing because we have lost sight of the importance of punishing crime, praising police, pitying victims, and protecting society.

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, May 17, 1967]

TROUBLE AHEAD

The echoes of the shooting in Houston had scarcely died away early this morning before the disclaimer went up that the rioting at Texas Southern University was organized. Many people, however, will find this hard to believe.

How can hundreds of students engage in such an event, employing firearms, molotov cocktails, chain lengths and other weapons, if it is not organized? The making of a molotov cocktail in itself is not a spontaneous act; nor is the collecting of firearms under the dormitory roofs of a large educational institution.

People hereabout would be a little horrified, we think, if a large cache of arms were discovered in the dormitories at the University of Wyoming. Yet in defense of the rioting at Texas Southern University last night and early today, it is described as a spontaneous occurrence. Presumably the collection of deadly weapons by the students body is a part of their academic efforts.

It is clear now that with the rioting that occurred last week at the Negro college at Jackson, Miss., and this latest outbreak at another Negro college in Houston, the long hot summer predicted by racial rabble-rousers has begun.

It is time that Congress cast aside its chariness, as reported in a column on this page today by Washington observer Holmes Alexander, and commence an intensive investigation into the circumstances of these grave breaches of the peace.

An article that appeared in the Sunday, May 7 issue of the New York Times and later inserted in the Congressional Record by Sen. Jack Miller, Iowa Republican, contains some grave warnings of the events to come.

It quotes the national secretary of the Students for a Democratic Society, one Gregory Calvert, 29, a former history teacher, as saying that group is "actively organizing sedition" and that is it working to organize a guerrilla force in urban areas.

It describes the dominant hero of the New Left movement as Ernesto Che Guevara, the onetime ranking Castroite official who disappeared under mysterious circumstances from Cuba several years ago, was believed at first to have been murdered, and now is reported in South America organizing guerrilla-type revolutions to break out all over this hemisphere.

The Times article reported that some of the young student followers of the New Left movement have gone so far that they now regard Communists as "squares" and have no use whatsoever for "establishment liberals."

It quoted a 24-year-old graduate teaching fellow at Michigan State University at Ann Arbor, identified as Michael Zweig, that he thinks violence is necessary and adds that the idea frightens him. Mr. Zweig adds somewhat as an afterthought: "There isn't a great deal of personal liberation in burning down a Cleveland store."

A student who succeeded Zweig as president of the Students for a Democratic Society at Ann Arbor expressed the belief, according to the Times article, that "Nicaragua and a lot of other countries" ought to organize to resist the United States.

Against what? It is not said; apparently just to "resist the United States," whatever that means.

Four persons were wounded in that rioting at Houston last night. Before the cries of "police brutality" go up, let it be noted that three of the wounded were policemen, one of them hurt so critically that he later died; and only one was a student.

Before this summer is over, a lot of policemen may be wounded and killed, battling to preserve the peace and to prevent a disintegration of our society through such anarchic acts as occurred last night in one of the country's largest cities. Yesterday afternoon the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. said the Negroes demanded their "freedom." Freedom for what? To riot, shoot at the police, throw molotov cocktails?

Before all of this occurs, the Johnson Administration, sitting back complacently and refusing to do anything against such lawless outbreaks, had better take action. Congress also holds a responsibility and the House Un-American Activities Committee should commence immediately an investigation into all of these acts and statements from New Left rabblerousers.

There is trouble ahead in this country. Big trouble.

THE LIVING AND THE DEAD OF HILL 881—WHAT PRICE THEIR SACRIFICE?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Mr. John G. McCullough, of the editorial page staff of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, is a man of great patriotism and great eloquence. He wrote an article on the meaning of war in Vietnam that, in its simple beauty, comes close to the meaning of war anywhere, at any time.

I will not describe it to this Chamber but offer it to the Senate for its own contemplation. I would say, however, that a public school in northeast Philadelphia plans to do a "choral speaking" arrangement of it.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO PLACE FOR FLAGS OR BUGLES—THE LIVING AND THE DEAD OF HILL 881—WHAT PRICE THEIR SACRIFICE?

(By John G. McCullough)

What do you tell them? What do you say to these quiet warriors in shrouded rest now on litters? How do you explain it all to this stilled file of the dead?

Hill 881 is a mark, a rough circle, on the military maps of South Vietnam. There are two 881s. They are 2,890 feet high and this makes them important to men who wear steel helmets and carry weapons. They are the high ground. So long as there have been wars men have fought and died for the high ground.

So men with the big whistles mark the map and speak into a field radio. Then the young warriors, many of them with boy faces under men's helmets, heed smaller whistles and move through the valley in this northwest corner of Vietnam.

WAR WITHOUT FANFARE

This is not a place of flags or bugles. The young men, as they lean forward against the now rising ground, wet their lips. Sometimes they breathe deeply. They put one foot in front of the other. They continue to move.

Morning sun slants through the windows of a fifth grade, parochial school classroom in Northeast Philadelphia. A girl is at the blackboard drawing lines to show the parts of a sentence. A woman, eyes wide in shock, suddenly is in the doorway. Her hair is in curlers. The nun at her desk is puzzled and starts to rise. "Some officers came in a car," the woman blurts out, "and said our Buddy was hurt bad in the war. I'll have to take Betty home." The nun tries to remember. Was it seven or eight years ago that Buddy was in this room—drawing lines around sentences?

In the living room of a house on a narrow street in West Philadelphia two Marine Corps officers sit with a Negro woman. They have told her her son has been killed in Vietnam. Now they explain that his body will be returned home and they offer to help with the arrangements. The mother nods. But she only half listens. She looks at a photograph of her son and she thinks that it was just this time last year that he posed for this picture in a high school cap and gown.

OTHER HILLS 881

Hill 881 has no name. The 881 tells only the height of the hills in meters. The others usually had names, although some were just numbers. There was Pork Chop Hill in Korea. There was Sugar Loaf and "The Draw" on Okinawa. Bloody Nose was Pelelieu. Iwo Jima's was "The Mountain." There were hills and bigger all along the line in Europe of the 1940s and back in the earlier 1900s, too. It is not the names that make them special. It is the men who climbed and crested them, the many who died, that makes them important. Millions of men go into uniform. Hundreds of thousands get into combat. The number of men who have climbed and fought their awesomely private and intensely personal wars on the 881s, the Pork Chops and the Sugar Loafs of history is far more limited.

FALLEN OF WORLD WAR II

There are prayers on these places, but not the prayer of organs and stained glass. "God, don't let the weapons jam," or "God, get the ammo and the water up." These are the prayers. Sometimes the prayer will be "God, don't let the mortars hit here." For on the 881s and the Sugar Loafs fate spins a wheel. A man you've never seen twists a knob an extra click and it is your turn. A rise of rock but inches high becomes a sanctuary. And the men who have climbed the slopes and come down again will for the rest of their lives be able to close their eyes and see each fold of ground, the brush, the debris of battle. They will see, too, their friends and the "others" in the grotesque sprawl of the fallen.

In a past war, after another 881, those who remained sought out those who had fallen. Then, too, there was a row of covered dead on litters. Those who lived paid tribute for the most part simply by standing close to those who were covered. For there is a closeness, one that others cannot know, between those who live and those who die on Hills 881.

From Okinawa's Sugar Loaf one of those who walked back was a warrior given to profanity. For days and nights he had fought alongside two friends. He watched them die. So he sought them out among the others who had fallen. And when he found them he sat on his heels near their covered heads and took from his pocket a harmonica. After he had knocked the tobacco shreds and dust from it he played softly, and over and over, the strains of "Silent Night, Holy Night." That it was the heat of summer made no difference to him or to the others who silently gathered around to join in this battlefield tribute. When someone later asked him why the music, he explained, with an oath that meant nothing, that this was "the only holy song I know."

COMRADES IN ARMS

So what do you say to those who fall on a Hill 881? Do you speak of duty and country? Not to these men. They were "on the Hill." That talk is for those who were not. Do you talk of democracy or of a threat to the world? No. They know of this, too. Nor would it achieve much to talk of pickets, flag burnings and draft defiance at home.

The men who fight to the crest of the hills in this war have in this something which sets them apart from those who climbed other hills in other wars. So they think, not of those at home who dissent, but of those who move beside them up the slopes and whose friendship and judgment is really all that matters on a Hill 881.

So all you can say with your thoughts to these men in shrouded sleep is: "I'm sorry for what happened to you." This is what the Marine said with his harmonica. His way was better.

MORE ACTION IS REQUIRED IN OUR MILITARY SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, every schoolboy knows the story of Robert Fulton and how he could not find anyone to invest in his submarine. Historians have said that had Napoleon put more money into this venture he would have won at Waterloo.

But we seem to have fallen prey to the same inaction syndrome that has previously condemned other great nations to downfall. Maginot Line mistakes are being committed by computers in the Pentagon in the name of "cost effectiveness." This is the excuse for not doing something new on the grounds that it will cost more than what it replaces. A century ago, I am sure, everyone was arguing that steamboats would be more expensive than sailboats, but in those days it did not matter. We could wait for the British to prove that that was wrong. But we cannot afford that luxury today, when the future of freedom rides on our ability to get there first with new discoveries. If the Russians beat us once in the race for weapon supremacy, that may be the end.

Two weeks ago, Gen. Bernard A. Schriever addressed himself to just this point in a speech before the Aviation/Space Writers Association at their meeting in Las Vegas, Nev. He is now retired, but his counsel deserves attention because of his great record in building a strategic missile system when we were faced with a possible missile gap in the late 1950's. In his speech he points out that we are incurring grave risks in deferring our investigation of space as a corridor of threat.

In the previous Congress, we appropriated $50 million more than was requested by the Secretary of Defense for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory research program. Those funds still have not been applied in spite of our anxiety that we were not proceeding at sufficient speed. When the Secretary of Defense submitted his new program for fiscal year 1968 he cut the Air Force proposed budget for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory again—this time by $80 million.

We have not fully completed a review of the new budget, but I, for one, intend to examine our military research program very closely. It may be that more support from Congress will be needed to override the inaction now prevailing in the Department of Defense.

Because this subject is of great consequence to the Nation, I ask unanimous consent that General Schriever's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LONG VIEW OF THE U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

(By Gen. B. A. Schriever, U.S. Air Force (retired), Aviation/Space Writers Association, Las Vegas, Nev., May 15, 1967)

First, I want to commend all of you in AWA on the occasion of your 29th annual meeting. You certainly know where to hold a convention. I believe it was the practice of writers and philosophers in the olden days to locate where they could meditate and concentrate without distractions. It is certainly being loyal to the traditions of your profession to meet here in the desert . . . in this atmosphere of austerity and privation.

Actually, I welcome this opportunity to come to Las Vegas, the gaming capital of the country. My game is golf, as some of you may know, and I generally shoot in the low 70s. If it gets any colder than that I quit.

Seriously, it's nice to be here and I am both honored and grateful to have a place on your program.

Mr. Haney and Mr. Johnston have talked about the Apollo program. This afternoon Dr. Adams and Dr. Pickering are going to outline the prospects for manned and unmanned space flight in the next ten years. I've agreed to speak at this time on "a long view of the U.S. space program" which I assume, by inference, extends beyond the moon and the next decade.

This isn't the easiest subject in the world. In fact, a lot of us have been trying to see beyond our noses in this space business for some time.

I'm convinced we can do all the forecasting, second-guessing and blueprinting we want, but we're really not going to come to grips with space until we change our thinking . . . or at least, expand it. Thus far, our explorations geographically have shown more imagination than our explorations intellectually.

We have to recognize, just as we gradually came to do with the airplane, that old standards, old criteria, and old ways of doing things may no longer pertain. I admit it's difficult *not* to be subjective about space when, as Emerson said, we find ourselves "sensitive to a thousand influences, instructed by the past, invited by the future . . ." Yet if we are to be constructive about its potentials we must come to know space not as a stranger but as an intimate friend. This means knowing its faults as well as its virtues—its possibilities both for us and against us.

Space *may* have no decisively unique military advantages, beyond these of observation, warning and communications identified in the Rand studies of 21 years ago. But we'd better be sure. And we can't be sure unless we keep an open mind and an open technology, with respect to military space applications. At present we still act as though we're not certain that space is here to stay or that defense in and from it is important.

I'm concerned because I believe that in the long run the value of the U.S. space program will be determined by our national *attitude* as much as by our *aptitude*.

By this I mean we must not only have the tools, the talents and the technologies to achieve difficult goals, but the desire and the determination as well.

Someone has said that the future cannot be predicted, but that futures can be invented. I would agree. The lunar landing program is nearing reality because we as a Nation invented the technologies necessary to it. All of the great developments of this century are the products of invention, not prediction. Wishful thinking has never produced an ounce of hardware or an iota of defense. Yet we spend a great deal of time and effort trying to predict the future of space and wish away the perils of its unknowns.

Amazingly enough, one of our problems today is the absence of incentive for invention and innovation in military aerospace systems. Considering the growth in research and development in recent years, both in funds and projects, it is remarkable that this should be so. Nevertheless, there is no space goal or space technology that I know of that is presently straining our capacity for inventiveness or ingenuity. But there are four factors that are working against any trend toward vigorous space progress.

In the first place, necessity is the mother of invention and few, if any, space goals are viewed as "necessary" today. The defense establishment has been hard pressed to justify military requirements in space according to the present ground rules of "see need, see solution."

Secondly, any significant invention is always preceded by an active curiosity. We are not very curious about space today. We would prefer to dismiss by logic any fears that an enemy may find a corridor to free world vulnerability through space. What, we ask, can an enemy do militarily by means of space that he cannot do as effectively by conventional means? The fact that we have no definitive answer doesn't mean there isn't one; it only means we ascribe to the enemy our own limitations of thought or technology. A nagging curiosity can be a useful national asset. Part of the research and development responsibility should be the task of keeping curiosity alive and healthy.

Third, there is the economic factor. War and welfare are making heavy demands on the treasury. And it's precisely when cash is short that cost-effectiveness becomes the way of life. Admittedly, decision-making is not nearly so difficult when there are no budget problems. But basing decisions on comparative costs can be risky. There's a circular dilemma here that leads nowhere. First, since inventions can't be predicted, neither can their costs, which makes them high risk projects. Second, without tangible cost figures, such "high-risk" proposals can't compete against proven systems, where costs and capabilities are known.

Fourth, there is the problem of national purpose. I suggest that this is an inhibiting factor rather than the positive influence it should be because our national objectives today seem clouded and uncertain.

Just about ten years ago, when I suggested that ballistic missiles might be springboards to space, I was admonished for making that "provocative" suggestion. Since then, many other proposals or alerts from military sources, some of them elementary to progress or productive to national security, have been rejected as provocative or destabilizing or escalating the arms race.

This is of great concern to me, for I am of the opinion that the competition between Communism and freedom still exists. I believe the threat to our security not only has not disappeared but actually has sprouted a few more hydra-like heads. I do not perceive where our cautions about innovative defense technologies or our strict subscription to the "peaceful" purposes of space have altered in any way the Communist campaign for, first, technical; second, economic; and, third, political superiority in the world. Space is one avenue toward the achievement of these goals.

Now please don't misunderstand me. I'm not trying to resurrect the space race or infer that the Soviets have better space capabilities than we have at present. I'm talking about the "long view" and from where I sit it seems to me that we're not as alert today as we should be to technological opportunities.

What can we do about this?

For one thing, we must try to give more encouragement to invention, innovation and creative thinking.

Some scientists, for example, have expressed concern over what effects certain space-applied forces might have on missile warheads. Or about the feasibility of satellites systems for missile defense. Or the consequences that improved orbital surveillance capabilities might have on the survivability of our sea-based ballistic missiles.

In the second place, scientific and technical curiosity not only needs to be stimulated, but properly compensated as well. Curiosity is expensive today. Few companies, particularly those operating on fixed-price or incentive contracts, can afford to do much free lance experimenting. Incentives are awarded today principally on performance—not the performance of the product, but the performance of the contractor in meeting schedules, staying within costs, and improving efficiency.

There also is little pronounced curiosity about space on the part of the public. As you in the editorial professions know, your space copy must be sensational, spectacular or controversial to attract attention outside of the "trade." In our self-satisfied technological affluence, we may have become blasé about space. Or, as I would prefer to think, we simply have not educated the public sufficiently to the significance of space . . . at least it's post-lunar significance.

We put a great deal of faith these days in surveys and public polls, which usually show that the majority favor the status quo, or have no opinion. As an example, I was amused by the 1776 political poll imagined by humor columnist Art Buchwald recently. His survey showed that "63 per cent of the colonists thought the British were doing a good job," "83 per cent thought the Minute Men at Lexington hurt our image," and only "12 per cent thought the Declaration of Independence was a good document." Mr. Buchwald reported that "on the basis of the results of this poll, the colonials decided they didn't have enough popular support for a revolution and gave up the idea of a United States of America."

Public opinion is vital, but progress depends on leading it, not following it.

Third; if we are going to overcome the present economic obstacles to space progress, we must prepare technologically to do several things. One: we must get on with the research and development necessary to reusable space boosters. I know this is no simple project. We looked into it many times while I was in the service. Here's another instance where justification becomes a brick wall. We can't actuarily justify the high costs of developing a reusable system until we have the necessary volume of space missions; at the same time we can't cost-effectively program any high utilization of space vehicles until the price comes down. Let me just add, incidentally, that the airplane was once in this very same predicament.

Still on the subject of economics, it is equally important to close the loop at the other end. The ballistic type of re-entry and return is at best primitive. The Soviets, as you know, recently had a sad lesson on the risks involved.

In addition to being an awkward and unsophisticated technique, the Gemini-type re-entry requires a very costly recovery force. We will gain a real operational as well as an economic advantage when we achieve a piloted re-entry and precision landing capability.

There is another aspect to the economic factor which inhibits our progress. Economic reasons are given frequently to explain why we *can't* pursue a certain proposal or develop a certain technology. With all our reputed scientific and technological resourcefulness and our reputation for technical breakthroughs, perhaps we should be actively exploiting technology in search of an *economic* breakthrough. Every step forward doesn't *have* to cost more than the last. First costs are not necessarily the minimum costs, and often prices can be reduced rather quickly as has been the case, for example, with boron fibre materials.

Fourth; if our long view of the U.S. space program is to be a positive and productive one, we must strive to see space included in the fabric of national policy, national posture, national progress and national purpose.

At present our attitude toward space, like our aptitude, is fragmented. Space is admissible to peaceful purposes but not to military, though the distinction is still indistinct, in my judgment. Space has broad support in its unmanned phases, but the value of manned space ventures is still being debated.

On the first of these points I have nothing to add. The arbitrary separation of space activities into peaceful and military is just that—arbitrary. It simply serves to emphasize, by comparison, the straightforwardness of the Soviet program. Their single-purpose program seeks only to attain a versatile technological superiority which, once attained, will serve the political purpose they choose regardless of what kind of a space program we have or how we categorize it.

Deliberation over the respective merits of manned and unmanned systems is, I believe, very serious to the long view of space. In the emphasis we have placed on technology, it is easy to relegate man to a subordinate position. Yet this goes against every experience of mankind over the ages.

We have made black boxes do a great deal for us, and the end of their potential is not yet in sight. But neither is man's potential exhausted.

Further, I am of the opinion that having man on board will eventually contribute to the economy of space missions. The "Six Rs" inherent in space operations—rendezvous, resupply, repair, replace, rescue and return—all demand human judgment, dexterity and ability. The life support systems necessary to safety and survival may well prove to be a cheap price to pay for such proven versatility. It may be cheap indeed once we have significantly improved present-day thrust to weight ratios.

As most of you know, I've talked a lot in praise of technology over the last dozen years or so. At the same time I've tried never to lose sight of the fact that people make technology possible; that the proper partnership of man and technology gives us the means to design our destiny.

We have elected to include space in that destiny. It's a wise choice. It would, perhaps, have shown greater wisdom if we had pioneered space voluntarily instead of waiting for a boost from sputnik.

The Soviets know our indecisiveness and consider it a weakness. As one Russian official observed: "The U.S. is a great and powerful country," he said, "but it has a hard time deciding what to do."

If we are not to be an after-the-fact nation forevermore, we must shift to an attitude of action rather than reaction, decision rather than deferral, in our space ventures and in other affairs of national and international significance.

Present technologies afford us the means and future technology the options to do whatever we want with our environment. Space is a part of that environment. We live on an orbiting planet which the dissensions of man have pockmarked with the afflictions of war and other inhumanities. These have been carried to the far reaches of the land, on and under the seas, and into the skies.

If we are to keep space free of the means or the implements of threat, we must take the long realistic look at history—and recognize that peace prevails only when those who would victimize others are denied the means to do so.

Technology today is by far the principal enabling instrument of national power. If we're out in front in technology—in space and across the board—let's keep the pace. If we're on a par with any other nation, then I suggest we're not doing enough.

We can't afford to fall behind the power curve at a time when technology is the overriding factor in the measurement, application and determination of power internationally.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION UNIT OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE CONCLUDES COMPREHENSIVE HEARINGS ON AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967—HAS TESTIMONY UNDER STUDY — ABATEMENT LEGISLATION WILL BE BOTH REALISTIC AND EFFECTIVE, SENATOR RANDOLPH FORECASTS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on May 18, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of our Committee on Public Works concluded hearings on S. 780, the Air Quality Act of 1967.

Under the informed and capable chairmanship of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the subcommittee conducted 6 days of hearings in the field, 2 of which were devoted to tours of industrial plants and research and testing facilities, and 12 days of hearing in Washington.

The subcommittee received testimony from approximately 124 witnesses representing a broad segment of public opinion and representing all levels of government. Industry, labor, conservation groups, and independent scientific, technical, medical, and other professional experts likewise were heard. In addition to statements by the witnesses, extensive supporting material was received. In all, the printed record of hearings will be in four volumes of approximately 2,600 pages.

This year's air pollution abatement legislation presents the Congress with one of the most involved and complicated subjects in the entire field of domestic affairs. And certainly it is the most complex pollution abatement legislation which has come before the Committee on Public Works during my more than 8 years of service on it, including the greater part of the past year as its chairman.

The task of abating air pollution on a national scale requires consideration of highly involved technological, meteorological, medical, physiochemical, and economic matters. It is, in short, a question that involves consideration of human ecology in its broadest sense, namely, the entire range of man in his urban environment. On this, as well as many other subjects before Congress, there is an oversupply of "instant experts" who are presuming to prejudge and even second-guess the subcommittee and the full committee before sessions are held by either to consider the basic legislation and amendments proposed or to be proposed. The "instant expert", in this frame of reference, is the individual who—without attending hearings and listening to testimony and questions and answers on many facets of the subject under consideration—alleges in advance prejudicial actions by members who will deliberate on the legislation and make recommendations to the Senate, and, indeed, to the whole Congress.

Mr. President, I have been a cosponsor and constant advocate of every pollution abatement measure which has been reported from the Committee on Public Works during my tenure in this body. My commitment to improving the quality of our environment has not been diminished by my proposal of amendments to S. 780. As I stated when introducing my first amendments on this subject, it is my conviction that they will enhance and make more effective the administration's efforts to solve the air pollution problem. These amendments were addressed to what I consider certain deficiencies in S. 780 as introduced. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has given me assurance that they will receive the same kind of consideration that is given to all responsible proposals in the field of pollution abatement, and I ask no more and no less.

Testimony presented to the subcommittee by administration's witnesses contained certain contradictions and inconsistencies on the subject of ambient air criteria, ambient air standards, and emission standards. Similar inconsistencies appeared in the testimony of other public and industry witnesses.

The subcommittee has an arduous task ahead of it in resolving these inconsistencies and in reporting a coherent, effective, and workable air pollution abatement bill. This task will not be lessened by the offer of simplistic solutions which present the problem in terms of "good guys" versus "bad guys." We must all work toward the same end of improving the quality of the human environment. There are honest differences of opinion in how best to achieve that end within the limits of present technological capabilities and without creating undue economic dislocations. I shall continue to work toward that end, and I am confident that the members of the Committee on Public Works will continue to maintain a record of achievement in this area.

It is my belief that we will report an improved version of S. 780 in the first session of the 90th Congress within time for Senate action and, I hope action also by the other body. This measure must be realistic and effective, and I predict it will fulfill these objectives.

CHRISTENING OF THE AIRCRAFT CARRIER U.S.S. "JOHN F. KENNEDY"

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, in Newport News, Va., on last Saturday, the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *John F. Kennedy* was christened. Present were members of the late President Kennedy's family including our distinguished colleagues, the Senators KENNEDY.

President Johnson, in a brief and moving tribute, spoke of John Kennedy, his ideals and the symbolism of the carrier *John F. Kennedy*.

Also in attendance were many thousands of Virginians, including those who had labored at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., to build the *John F. Kennedy*.

The simplicity and dignity of the launching touched all who were present, and its meaning was eloquently described by the editor of the Norfolk Virginian Pilot. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Norfolk Virginian Pilot, May 27, 1967]

CHRISTENING OF THE "KENNEDY"—LIEUTENANT'S NAMESAKE

John F. Kennedy once cited, as an example of the opportunities awaiting young people choosing careers in government, his rise from an obscure lieutenant to commander-in-chief of the armed forces. He might have applied the same subtle humor to today's launching in Newport News of the aircraft carrier bearing his name. For the lieutenant was in the PT flotilla, an element of the "dungaree navy," without much polish or much to polish: a collection of thin-hulled motorboats with a thin line of rank separating skipper from crew. A PT compares to a carrier as a mosquito compares to an eagle.

Yet there was style in the World War II PTs and in their dangerous work and, it follows, in the young men who manned their greasy parts and their torpedoes and their cockpits. The same sort of style distinguishes the carrier; it is in the pilot's eye and fingers, in the flightdeck sailor's graceful arms and nimble feet, in the controlled violence of the catapult and the arresting gear's functioning. Style and orderliness were innate in the lieutenant and the commander-in-chief. The USS *John F. Kennedy* is being well christened.

"The cost of freedom is always high," Mr. Kennedy said upon an occasion that invited no humor. The Cuban crisis was building up. "But Americans have always paid it," he added quickly. "And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender or submission. Our goal is not the victory of might, but the vindication of right—not peace at the expense of freedom, but both peace and freedom, here in this hemisphere, and, we hope around the world. God willing, that goal will be achieved."

John F. Kennedy led America toward that goal then. The *John F. Kennedy* on joining the United States Fleet will inherit a role in the mission, in this hemisphere and around the world.

STRONGER GUN LAWS NEEDED

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a band of armed men recently forced its way into the chamber of the California State Assembly. It was, as the Los Angeles Times asserted, a striking example of the need for effective gun control legislation.

As it turned out in the California case, no one was shot. But the elements for disaster certainly were there—for all of the rifles and pistols and shotguns were loaded.

The ironic factor is that the armed men who stormed the legislature were protesting a proposed gun control ordinance. Those armed men serve as a chilling reminder that legislation should be passed swiftly to keep firearms out of such irresponsible hands.

The editorial in the Times discussed the California incident at length and it certainly is worthy of serious attention. I respectfully ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 4, 1967]

STRONGER GUN LAWS NEEDED

The need for effective, comprehensive weapons control laws was never better illustrated than when a band of Negroes armed with loaded shotguns, pistols and rifles forced its way into the Assembly chamber at Sacramento.

The performance shocked not only those legislators and others in the Capitol who were supposed to be intimidated thereby but all law-abiding Californians who did not think such things possible in this enlightened day and age.

Ostensibly the so-called "Black Panther Party for Self Defense" was on the scene to protest a proposed law which would make it unlawful to carry a loaded weapon within a city.

The Black Panthers insisted the bill was "racist." But neither that view nor their actions found takers among Negro legislators. Assemblyman Leon Ralph (D-Los Angeles), felt the bill was aimed at other groups and that it should "be applied equally to all, black or white." Assemblyman Bill Greene, whose district includes the Watts area, branded the action "senseless" and added that "no person, black or white, can condone this."

As a result of the unseemly demonstration it is probable that the measure will be made even more restrictive or an even broader act passed.

That the Black Panthers should lay stress on the constitutional right to bear arms under the circumstances which obtained at Sacramento, makes their position completely farcical.

Certainly the authors of the Bill of Rights never had in mind such groups as the Black Panthers, the American Nazis, the Minute Men or the KKK when they wrote, in the Second Amendment:

"A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

On the other hand, perhaps they foresaw the need for a well-regulated militia to protect against the emergence of just such groups in the future.

Under existing California statutes it is a violation of the Fish and Game Code to carry a loaded weapon in an automobile. There is, however, absolutely no law which prohibits carrying loaded weapons in plain sight on the public streets or anywhere else including, obviously, the chambers of any state, county or city legislative body. There is, of course, a law against disrupting a legislative session. But that hardly meets the situation.

Several days before the Sacramento demonstration Atty. Gen. Thomas Lynch declared that there is no place in this day and age for "Wild West" exhibitions of firearms.

"The time has come," Lynch said, "when we have to legislate against carrying or exhibiting guns in public places."

The Times agrees. The present situation is ridiculous—and fraught with danger.

Even the National Rifle Assn., that most militant defender of the right to possess arms, should agree that incidents such as occurred in Sacramento and which may occur elsewhere, cannot be tolerated in modern society.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the war on poverty is one of the favorite whipping boys nowadays, perhaps second only to our efforts in Vietnam in the amount of vituperation and scorn that is heaped upon it, day in and day out, by certain vocal elements.

But fortunately the innate good sense of the American public has not been swayed by this continuing criticism of the poverty program, any more than it has been by the almost constant carping on the Vietnam issue.

A good, solid majority of Americans favor a continued or expanded war on poverty, just as a good solid majority of Americans favor our efforts to prevent the loss to the free world of South Vietnam.

Roscoe Drummond, in a very perceptive article in today's Washington Post, puts the complaints about Sargent Shriver and his Office of Economic Opportunity in their proper perspective.

Admittedly, there have been mistakes, perhaps many more mistakes than should have been made. But they can and should be corrected without doing so at the expense of the millions of Americans who live below the poverty line.

Mr. Drummond concludes his article with the following paragraph, a brief statement with which I heartily agree:

> There is no doubt in my mind that the war on poverty continues to need innovative, pioneering, open-minded, let's-try leadership. It would be very unwise to bury these new and experimental programs in existing departments which have more than they can do already and too many officials wedded to old programs.

Let us hope that Congress will show the same good sense as the general public, by rejecting the idea that OEO should be dismembered and its programs distributed among the various Government departments.

I ask unanimous consent that Roscoe Drummond's excellent column be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 1967]

The War on Shriver: Public Backs Fight on Poverty

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The American people are making no mistake in giving their strong support to the war on poverty.

Voters are 60 per cent behind the war on poverty and want it continued or expanded, the Harris Survey shows. Public support has been growing steadily for the last seven months.

The Nation as a whole has come to accept the war on poverty as one of the most compassionate, humane, and intelligent programs of the Johnson Administration.

And the Republican leadership in Congress, launching its own "opportunity crusade," avows that it favors all of the antipoverty programs and backs all of the antipoverty goals—but would do the whole thing differently.

Surely all this should be sweet music to the White House and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Why, then, as he goes to Congress soon to defend his proposed budget, should Sargent Shriver, the coordinator-in-chief of the war on poverty, be the target of so much criticism for his administration of the program? Has he been a flop? Has he been incompetent? Has he been a dull-minded and routine administrator?

No one will argue, certainly not Shriver, that everything has come up roses in the Office of Economic Opportunity. But the volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on the OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled around the already overburdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered.

These facts ought to be borne in mind:

1. Much of the criticism comes from the extremists who pretty much cancel each other out—those who attack Shriver because they don't want the war on poverty to be doing anything and those who want Shriver to be asking for ten times as much as he is now doing.

2. The OEO has made mistakes. They should be recognized and corrected. The new antipoverty bill now before Congress greatly tightens the program. But the OEO had to do things quickly in its early period and obviously it has not done them well. But let's not forget that if there were no OEO there would be no war on poverty. There would be no Headstart. There would be no Job Corps. There would be no Community Action and, above all, there would be little recognition on the part of middle-class American that poverty in the United States acutely exists—32 million men, women, and children beneath the poverty line who must be relieved.

There is no doubt in my mind that the war on poverty continues to need innovative, pioneering, open-minded, let's-try leadership. It would be very unwise to bury these new and experimental programs in existing departments which have more than they can do already and too many officials wedded to old programs.

THE GUN MEN'S POSSE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Chicago Sun Times recently discussed what it termed attempts by some interested and well organized groups to spur creation of civilian posses. Instead of curing civil disorders, the newspaper suggested, such posses might well lead to pitched gun battles in the streets.

> It'd be just your bad luck if you happened to get in the line of fire, as many would. The posse just might get you. Think of that, when you consider whether you want one in your home town or not—

The newspaper said in an editorial. Law enforcement obviously must be left to professional law enforcement agencies, not a bunch of amateurs. The editorial is a stern and timely reminder of some of the consequences of some of the people taking the law into their own hands. I respectfully ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun Times, May 10, 1967]

The Gun Men's Posse

The National Rifle Assn., which thinks that everybody who is anybody at all should be able to own guns in any quantity, has now come up with another hair-raising notion: It has urged its 800,000 or more members to form armed civilian posses as a "potential community stabilizer" against rioting in the cities.

Well, now. So no urban home would be complete without a gun, or several guns. The impulse is understandable: It is a romantic thing, harking back to the posses of the old West. Even in those days, the vigilante was a dubious character, and in today's crowded city would be an even greater threat to both lives and rights. Police work is better left to the police, and if the police are inadequate, there's the National Guard, and if that's not available, there're still sheriff's deputies and state police in large numbers. If a tense situation does not develop into a riot, it no doubt would if hot-headed amateurs go about brandishing and firing guns.

In its blindness the National Rifle Assn. ignores another flaw in its terrifying plan: If its members can get, own and use guns, so can the citizens who are members of mobs. If one side starts shooting, the other side can too. What the gun toters advocate, then, are pitched gun battles in the streets, and it'd be just your bad luck if you happened to get in the line of fire, as many would. The posse just might get you. Think of that, when you consider whether you want one in your home town or not.

NO VIGILANTES, PLEASE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, what this country needs is a substantial infusion of support for its law enforcement agencies. Those agencies need money to hire more men, to train them better, to equip them better. The point of this would be to win the war on crime and protect our citizens. All of these aims would be furthered by President Johnson's proposed Safe Streets and Crime Control Act.

What this country does not need is people taking the law into their own hands. That is just what the criminal tries to do and we have had enough of that. The Chicago Daily News suggested recently that certain well organized groups are urging a return to law by vigilante. The vigilante system was thoroughly discredited decades ago, and any attempt to revive it would surely be laughed out of town. The editorial in the Daily News is an enlightening one, and I respectfully ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, May 10, 1967]

No Vigilantes, Please

The National Rifle Assn. has urged its 800,000 members to constitute themselves as civilian posses to help "stabilize" things in case of urban rioting.

We suggest that Gov. Kerner and Mayor Daley put their respective police chiefs on the alert to break up any such attempts at vigilantism.

The organization that has led the fight against gun control laws goes even further, in the May issue of its magazine, and recommends that homeowners arm themselves against "savagery and pillaging." It recommends 12-gauge shotguns, but adds that "there is a good deal to be said for a sledge or ax handle."

What is obviously intended as propaganda to whip up support for the rifle association's position comes near to being incitement to terror.

While the association piously presents itself as abetting the regular authorities, it also suggests that these authorities may prove wholly inadequate to cope with large-scale rioting. In those circumstances, "the armed citizen represents a potential community stabilizer" whose "support of law and order" could prove essential. "What if the National Guard were overseas in a major war?" the magazine asks. "Who then supports the police?"

It can be assumed that the men in charge of law enforcement at the local, state and national levels have considered such contingencies and made plans to suit.

One trouble with vigilante groups is that they do not really work to protect society, but only one faction of it at the expense of another. Far from contributing to lasting order, that only incites the other side to lash out in its own behalf, making the police task far greater than it should have been.

The other trouble with vigilante groups is recalled ironically by the National Rifle Assn.'s self-description as the "foremost guardian of the American tradition."

Nothing could run more contrary to the American tradition than for private citizens to start fancying themselves policemen.

U.N. ALONE SHOULD DEFUSE MIDDLE EAST POWDER KEG

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column which appeared in the May 24 edition of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette. The editorial is entitled "U.N. Alone Should Defuse Middle East Powder Keg."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

U.N. ALONE SHOULD DEFUSE MIDDLE EAST POWDER KEG

The currently escalated war of nerves between Israel and the Arab states is one of deep confusion, except for one dreadfully clear fact: the Near East is a powder keg which with a single foolish move or miscalculation on the part of anyone from a chief of state to buck private, could set off fierce fighting and trigger World War III.

With U.N. Secretary-General U Thant in Cairo in a desperate effort to reach some solution, the one hope is evidence that neither the Arabs nor the Israelis are anxious for a fight at this time—but both sides have made such threats and such moves as to make armed clash almost inevitable.

And Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser put a large chunk of powder-saturated fat into the fire Monday when he announced that Egypt will block Israel's access to the Red Sea.

Fortunately, Israel's immediate reaction was to wait and see whether Egypt will carry out its threat to blockade the Gulf of Aqaba—but the situation was explosively precarious at best.

The developing storm in the Middle East is particularly crucial to the United States, which is already deeply involved in an interminable shooting war in Vietnam, and which has long standing commitments to maintain peace and security in the Arab-Israeli world.

The critical nature of the current crisis, as it relates to the possibility of World War III, was cited on the floor of the Senate recently by Sen. Joseph Clark, D-Pa., who pointed out that an understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States is absolutely essential if war in the Mideast is to be prevented.

"I would think it would be as obvious to the leaders of the Soviet Union as it is to our own government," said Sen. Clark, "that an outbreak of fighting between Israel and its neighbors could quickly spread and produce a highly dangerous confrontation between the Russians and ourselves.

"Our relations with the Soviet Union have already suffered greatly as a result of our involvement in Vietnam. If, on top of this, the Middle East flares up and becomes an area of controversy, all of the progress toward that most essential detente made since the death of Stalin could be quickly dissipated, and we could find ourselves again in two armed camps, moving progressively closer from cold to hot war."

Further complicating the crisis is the probability that it didn't really develop from the threat Israel and the Arabs feel for each other, but rather stems from inter-Arab rivalries, and especially the competition between Egypt and Syria for the leadership of the Arab "revolution."

This theory seems to gain support in Nasser's startling decision to demand withdrawal of the 3,400-man United Nations peacekeeping force that for 10 years had patrolled the 117-mile armistice line between Egypt and Israel.

Why had Nasser, with up to 50,000 troops tied down in civil war in Yemen, taken a move that left him directly exposed to Israeli forces?

The answer seems to be partly because his early posturing had not been taken seriously enough, partly to squash the irritating charges from monarchist Jordan and Saudi Arabia that he had been hiding behind the U.N. shield—a "pane of glass" neither side had dared shatter—and partly to outdo the firebrand Syrians and restore himself as the most militant and daring of the Arab leaders.

If this was the basis of Nasser's move, it is irresponsibility at its most dangerous worst—and he must somehow be persuaded to reconsider before the tensions spark an Arab-Israeli war, and possibly more.

Some U.N. diplomats think U Thant made a serious blunder in acting too hastily in acceding to Nasser's demand to remove the U.N. Emergency Forces without an effort to emphasize the folly of such a move. However, there is little doubt the secretary-general took the only action he could once the demand was made, for no U.N. operation has ever been imposed against the will of the host country.

But, with the crisis deepening and Russia making saber-rattling statements in the midst of belligerent attitudes in both Israel and the Arab nations, what can be done to avert catastrophe?

Clearly, this is a situation that calls for strong action on the part of the United Nations to bring the full weight of the organization to bear as a restraining influence.

Some way must be found to make the U.N. effective—perhaps by persuading Israel to let the U.N. forces patrol her side of the frontier from the Gaza Strip to Sharm el Sheikh on the Gulf of Aqaba, something she has not consented to before. Such action on the part of Israel not only would bring the U.N. Emergency Force back into the picture as a shield against provocative border incidents or invasion, but also should have a great impact on softening tensions.

At any rate, the United States should avoid any unilateral intervention, but insist upon working only through the United Nations.

A COAL-TO-GASOLINE CONVERSION PILOT PLANT IS DEDICATED AT CRESAP, W. VA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, last Saturday I participated, with Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, and others, in dedicating a coal-to-gasoline conversion pilot plant at Cresap, W. Va. The plant will be operated for the Office of Coal Research under a contract with the Consolidation Coal Co., a subsidiary of the Continental Oil Co.

This synthetic liquid fuels pilot plant will utilize the technology developed by the research division of the Consolidation Coal Co., at its laboratories in Library, Pa.

The coal used in the process is pulverized, dried, and then mixed with a solvent derived from the process. Part of it is dissolved, and the coal is then subjected to heat and pressure. Through a series of filtration steps a liquid extract is obtained, and the ash is removed.

It is further processed through reaction with hydrogen in the presence of a catalyst. This results in a synthetic liquid crude material that can be further refined into high octane gasoline through normal oil refining processes.

At this stage of the process development, natural gas is used in the manufacture of hydrogen which is then used in the reaction process. Eventually it is hoped that the hydrogen will be made from coal. Then the only raw materials will be coal, water, and air.

This pilot plant process is intended to verify the economic feasibility of making gasoline from coal at a competitive price. A successful end result will extend the Nation's liquid fuel energy reserves by hundred of years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the remarks made by me at the dedication ceremony.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, DEDICATION OF COAL-TO-GASOLINE CONVERSION PILOT PLANT, MAY 27, 1967, CRESAP, W. VA.

Fifty years ago a man named John Andrews was admitted to Navy Department offices in Washington when he promised that he could furnish a substitute for gasoline at a cost of two cents a gallon. Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels and his assistant, Franklin D. Roosevelt, listened intently and then agreed that the theory should be investigated, for America was going to need all the fuel she could get to see us through World War I.

A test was arranged at Brooklyn Navy Yard. John Andrews took a small can from his satchel, asked for a bucket of water, and poured the contents of both into the gasoline tank of a test engine. At least one-third of the mixture was water, but the engine started immediately and ran until the tank was dry. Other tests were equally successful, but nothing ever came of the project because Andrews, I am informed, wanted the Navy to give him a small fortune before he would disclose the contents of his magic potion.

The whole episode was described in Secretary Daniels' memoirs. What Andrews carried in the little can was never divulged, but it has been theorized that he used acetone to absorb acetylene and produce a liquid.

Now, what if John Andrews had carried a bucket of *coal* into the office of the Secretary? Well, that, figuratively, is what the director of the Office of Coal Research did when he came to my office with the concept of what we are here to dedicate.

But the groundwork for Cresap's Project Gasoline and all other projects coming out of OCR dates back to the time when our present Secretary of the Interior was still a Member of the House Committee that approved the bill for the Office of Coal Research program. We were colleagues in the House when the first OCR bill was passed by Congress.

I think we should also remember the efforts of my colleague, Senator Jennings Randolph, who, as a member of the House of Representatives, during the decades of the 1930's and 1940's, pioneered in urging Federal support of coal research. It was then Representative Randolph who, in 1944, joined with the late Senator Joseph O'Mahoney of Wyoming to press for research on synthetic liquid fuels. Those two men co-authored and co-sponsored the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of 1944, which became Public Law 290 of the 78th Congress.

Senator Randolph and I in the Senate, and Representative Moore and other members of the West Virginia Congressional Delegation in the House, joined in supporting legislation to establish the Office of Coal Research, and Senator Randolph's interest in research in two vital and critical areas continues—the production of liquid fuels from coal and oil shale.

In process at the present time is a miscellany of projects to provide more economical heat and power through use of coal; to abate air and water pollution; to provide building materials with a by-product of coal combustion that was once vented out into the atmosphere; and to filter sewage through beds of coal in the first step toward making contaminated water reusable.

A broad-scale attack on the problem of producing liquid fuels and pipeline-quality gas from coal has been largely carried through the laboratory development stage quite successfully.

The office of Coal Research program to develop improved methods of generating electricity from coal, while not yet as extensive as the liquid and gas conversion program, is equally vital to the coal industry and to the nation's energy base.

Two very promising new systems, the fuel cell and EGD (electro-gas-dynamics) are presently under development. Several other promising power systems are available for development.

To carry the presently contracted work to its ultimately necessary pilot plant stage, plus adding a few of the other promising power systems, will require funding considerably above the present level.

If the Office of Coal Research is to carry on to its originally planned objectives and return to our country maximum benefits in relation to its cost, the funds available to the Office must be greatly increased annually above that of fiscal 1967—which was really only the end of the preparatory period. This upward acceleration should be vigorously prepared for at least 10 years. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, this will be my purpose.

The Office of Coal Research has a substantial on-going program of major projects, and others available, which, I firmly believe, if carried to conclusion, will produce dramatic results not envisioned by even the more optimistic among us only a few short years ago.

We *did* foresee the potential, however, for coal and for all America in Project Gasoline. We know that it was possible to extract a high-grade motor fuel from the magic energy that is coal, but for too long it was assumed that the plentiful storehouse of petroleum reserves within the broad borders of this nation would be ample to see us through for generations to follow.

So, for too long the idea of a commercial coal-to-gasoline industry lay dormant in Files for the Future. Finally an imaginative plan was presented to the Office of Coal Research, and from that day we have been pursuing—painstakingly and patiently, but energetically and enthusiastically—the plan and the program that bring us today to this historic occasion.

As OCR Director George Fumich pointed out to members of the Independent Petroleum Association of America earlier this month, demand for petroleum products in this country will rise from 3½ billion barrels this year to 6 or 8 billion barrels in 1980, with perhaps double that amount by the year 2000. The 30 billion gallons of crude petroleum reserves are, to be sure, only a part of the total amount that lies beneath our soil, and I have every confidence that our great petroleum leaders will continually develop methods of drawing out the last drop that the Creator put there for our benefit. Yet, the stock is not inexhaustible, and to wait longer for inauguration of a program to provide substitute fuels would be sheer folly.

We may already have waited longer than good judgment—in retrospect—would dictate. Whether or not we like to think about the prospect, the supply lines for much of the foreign oil and products upon which we have come to depend could be severed tomorrow or on Monday or next month or next year. The danger is pointed out in every newspaper headline. It is not pleasant to comprehend.

An explosion in the Middle East could disrupt America's energy pattern and set our wells to pumping as they never worked before. If the crisis persisted, the petroleum industry could hardly be expected to keep up the pace of producing all the liquid fuels required. An industry developed at Cresap would be needed—and quickly. Let us pray that such exigency will never materialize.

In any event, peacetime requirements alone will justify the venture into this new energy field.

In not too many years, there will be another America placed right on top of the country we now know—twice as many people, twice as many cars, twice as many airplanes and homes and factories. But no more energy in the ground than God granted in his legacy to us. What we must do is to develop all the energy that is available, and we must do it without waiting for a shortage to develop.

Today we are on the threshold of another fuel industry in West Virginia. I congratulate the Consolidation Coal Company for its diligent undertaking. I thank Secretary Udall and Mr. Fumich for their belief in a dream which we are bringing to life through this intricate structure along the banks of the beautiful Ohio.

Besides creating a necessary new source of fuel for our tomorrow, this structure carries the hope of a more fruitful life for many West Virginians. Our miners have suffered the pangs of economic ills for many years. They have waited a long time for a Project Gasoline to open new opportunities to them. I believe that that day is dawning.

In closing, I wish to say that the bituminous coal industry has suffered far too long from a lack of genuine Government interest in its future welfare, or, more specifically, from a disproportionate financial support by the Federal government in the development of atomic power as coal's competitor in the electric utility fuel market. If coal, for a few years, could be assured of at least 25 per cent of the $200 million or more the Government is appropriating each year to the continuing development of atomic power, including development of the breeder reactor plant technology, the solutions to coal's present and future problems soon would be forthcoming.

The coal industry is strong today because of the wisdom and dedication of men in management and labor who refused to give up when coal markets declined following World War II. Such men can be relied upon to shape coal's future through research and development, but these efforts require increased support from the Government if one of the nation's most abundant sources of economical energy is to be safeguarded and most efficiently utilized for the future benefit of all Americans.

I regard coal research as the key to the energy future of the United States. I look for new efforts to increase the level of Government support for coal research, and I expect to be behind every project proposal which shows promise of making a significant contribution to the welfare of the industry and of future generations of Americans who will thus be able to rely on coal as a source of energy and new products in a wide range of modern forms.

Coal can be a cleaner fuel than ever, and a far more versatile one, through intelligently oriented research and development, fully supported by the Government. Research can and will unlock the door to a new age for mankind's oldest fuel.

DRUMMOND PRAISES L. B. J. WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when the war on poverty was launched by President Johnson a few short months after he took over the reins of Government, the hope and promise of the American dream gained a new dimension, a new depth. It made the job of our critics around the world a little harder.

But, for some time now both the war on poverty and particularly Sargent Shriver, the man who has so brilliantly organized and led this experiment in social justice, have been among the primary targets of an undeserved barrage of attacks from the Republicans, who are flailing about in search of issues upon which to stand in the next election.

Roscoe Drummond's column in the Washington Post for May 31, 1967, entitled "The War on Shriver," has put these attacks into the proper perspective. Said Drummond:

> The volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on the OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled around the already overburdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered.

Sargent Shriver's war on poverty has the support of the majority of voters, Drummond points out. And it deserves the full support of all Members of Congress and a vote in favor of OEO's budget request when it comes before us.

I commend Drummond's column to the attention of all my colleagues.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR ON SHRIVER: PUBLIC BACKS FIGHT ON POVERTY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The American people are making no mistake in giving their strong support to the war on poverty.

Voters are 60 per cent behind the war on poverty and want it continued or expanded, the Harris Survey shows. Public support has been growing steadily for the last seven months.

The Nation as a whole has come to accept the war on poverty as one of the most compassionate, humane, and intelligent programs of the Johnson Administration.

And the Republican leadership in Congress, launching its own "opportunity crusade," avows that it favors all of the antipoverty programs and backs all of the antipoverty goals—but would do the whole thing differently.

Surely all this should be sweet music to the White House and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Why, then, as he goes to Congress soon to defend his proposed budget, should Sargent Shriver, the coordinator-in-chief of the war on poverty, be the target of so much criticism for his administration of the program? Has he been a flop? Has he been incompetent? Has he been a dull-minded and routine administrator?

No one will argue, certainly not Shriver, that everything has come up roses in the Office of Economic Opportunity. But the volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on the OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled around the already overburdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered.

These facts ought to be borne in mind:

1. Much of the criticism comes from the extremists who pretty much cancel each other out—those who attack Shriver because they don't want the war on poverty to be doing anything and those who want Shriver to be asking for ten times as much as he is now doing.

2. The OEO has made mistakes. They should be recognized and corrected. The new

antipoverty bill now before Congress greatly tightens the program. But the OEO had to do things quickly in its early period and obviously it has not done them well. But let's not forget that if there were no OEO there would be no war on poverty. There would be no Headstart. There would be no Job Corps. There would be no Community Action and, above all, there would be little recognition on the part of middle-class Americans that poverty in the United States acutely exists—32 million men, women, and children beneath the poverty line who must be relieved.

There is no doubt in my mind that the war on poverty continues to need innovative, pioneering, open-minded, let's-try leadership. It would be very unwise to bury these new and experimental programs in existing departments which have more than they can do already and too many officials wedded to old programs.

DR. JAMES R. KILLIAN ON EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the establishment of a public television system is a matter of great concern to all Americans. A new proposal aimed at getting such a system started was set forth by the report of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television.

The heart of the Carnegie Commission proposal is public television and the leading architect for the commission's grand design for public television is James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television.

How to achieve the development and distribution of high-caliber programs under the supervision and direction of a nonprofit and nongovernmental corporation; and, the other reports and recommendations of the Commission were thoroughly explored recently on Theodore Granik's award-winning public affairs program "Youth Wants to Know."

James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, responded there to a panel of Yorktown High School students' penetrating and provocative questions. Dr. Killian's appearance on the program provided an opportunity for all Americans to discover, through the eyes of America's young people, a better understanding of the important issues of our time, as discussed by an outstanding authority in the field.

I ask unanimous consent that a partial transcript of that program may appear in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Youth Wants To Know

(Created and Produced by Theodore Granik; Associate Producer, Jay B. Cutler; Assistant to the Producer, Susan Gallagher)

Youth Wants to Know Presents Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., Chairman of the Corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television.

Announcer. Youth Wants to Know—the penetrating, provocative questions of America's young people.

Mr. Granik. Welcome to Youth Wants to Know. Our guest is James R. Killian, Jr., Chairman of the Corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television. Dr. Killian has had a distinguished career of dedicated public service. A report and recommendations of the Carnegie Commission, headed by Dr. Killian, heralded a new era for television. The Commission proposes the development and distribution of high caliber programs under the supervision and direction of a non-profit and nongovernmental corporation. How to achieve this grand design for public television will be the subject of many questions by our panel of Yorktown High School students. Let's begin with you, Peggy.

Question. Dr. Killian, is there really an untapped audience for public television?

Dr. Killian. I'm convinced that there is, that in our local communities there are many kinds of talent that have never been given an opportunity to display that talent and get a reaction to it on television. And I think if we have the proper media, we're going to have people coming forward with all kinds of gifts and special qualities that will be appealing on television.

Question. Even with the diversity in programing in educational television, how do you propose to attract those who are interested in mass media?

Dr. Killian. If the artist who wants to reach the largest possible audience feels that he has a better opportunity to do the kinds of things that to him represent integrity, in terms of his artistic talent, I think that he will find that public television, as we have proposed it, will give him an opportunity that he hasn't had before.

Question. Are you saying, Doctor, that educational television won't pay competitive salaries as commercial television?

Dr. Killian. We hope that eventually it will. Certainly educational television is not now paying competitive salaries. In fact, many of our representatives of the dramatic and artistic and musical communities have really been subsidizing educational television by contributing their services. And this is not right for the long pull.

Question. Dr. Killian, it seems that with the salaries being paid and considering where the talent is at this time in commercial television, it would seem to be that all the good talent is being utilized. How could educational television bring out that much more talent? It seems the best talent is there.

Dr. Killian. You've put your finger on a very important and difficult part of the whole television problem, because it is the kind of medium that uses talent up very fast. But it seems that we ought now to begin to plan to do the kind of recruiting, the kind of training, the kind of development of new talent that will enlarge this pool that television is going to require. But this is going to take time, and it is going to take a lot of doing. And at the present time we aren't training enough new talent for television. And one of the purposes of this proposed corporation is to provide ways for training new talent.

Mr. Granik. Then training will be a very vital part of this?

Dr. Killian. Oh absolutely, it must be.

Question. Dr. Killian, how do you think commercial television is failing to do its job?

Dr. Killian. Commercial television is geared to the demands of the marketplace, it serves the advertiser. This is an important function in our society, and the Carnegie Commission did not criticize commercial television for its concentration on economic objectives. But in meeting these economic objectives, and in serving the needs of the advertiser, they have to drive for the mass audience, to produce the largest number of listeners to a given program.

Mr. Granik. Aren't they also worried about that valley that might develop with a public affairs program?

Dr. Killian. And sometimes if they put on a program that doesn't reach a mass audience, it tends to affect all the programs that follow.

Mr. Granik. The commercial Nielsens.

Dr. Killian. That's right.

Question. Assuming that you do get the good talent and the new ways to present a program for public TV, what is going to make the people, the masses, want to watch it? I know, like if the President is on TV, or something, on all three channels, and I see that he is on, or maybe a moon shot or something. I immediately switch to the only channel, you know, that has something entertaining on it. And so this makes me wonder, are there all that many people really wanting to be educated and have the good stuff?

Dr. Killian. I hasten to emphasize that public television, or educational television or whatever we call it, must not be limited to the lecture or the panel discussion or what might be considered to be the dull parts of education. There's no reason why it can't provide excitement and entertainment and elegance of programing that would appeal to all kinds of people.

Mr. Granik. In other words, we must dramatize it.

Dr. Killian. That's right. We must.

Question. Dr. Killian, if Congress considers your Commission's plan for what you call public television, is there anything to prevent this from leading to perhaps a plan for public radio or even a plan for a public news paper?

Dr. Killian. In the President's message to Congress and in the Magnuson Bill, which was introduced into the Senate, and the other bill into the House, radio is provided for along with television, and this Corporation that has been proposed would also help to provide more adequately for educational radio. And I'm sure that radio has a very brilliant future too.

Mr. Granik. Well, they've shown their need at the hearings themselves by carrying them live.

Dr. Killian. Yes they have.

Question. Doctor, wasn't your Commission a little overly optimistic in expecting the excise tax proposal to pass Congress?

Dr. Killian. Well, we may have been optimistic, but we felt very strongly that we had to pose the issue of how in our system one can use federal funds for the support of free communications, and insulate the organization that is handling the communications, and we could find no better way than to recommend an excise tax which is a formula kind of approach, with a trust fund held by the Treasury. If someone else would invent another way to do this other than the excise tax, we would be very happy.

Question. But shouldn't some burden of the tax fall upon commercial television?

Dr. Killian. This is one approach and one recommendation that many people have made that some kind of tax—the profits of commercial television, a license on sets as they do in England and some other foreign countries, there are many different alternatives, but we could find nothing so simple and direct and to us workable as the excise tax. And I would hasten to say that I think that this can be a very equitable tax, because public television when it is going as we think it will, full force, is going to reach in and touch some member of every family right from the very youngest on up. And we are, therefore, going to get very broad coverage, and, therefore, everyone will be benefiting from it.

Question. Dr. Killian, do you think that satellite communications will have an effective impact on educational television?

Dr. Killian. Yes, I do, because I think the coming of satellite channels will make a veritable lower cost interconnection, more copious interconnection, will provide more channels for the distribution of television programs, so this is going to be profoundly important. However we may organize for public television by satellite, whether it is through a domestic satellite corporation as the Ford Foundation has proposed.

Mr. GRANIK. Will there be additional revenue from that?

Dr. KILLIAN. It depends on how Congress works this out. Whether there will be additional revenue, I think is still uncertain.

Question. Dr. Killian, wouldn't an excise tax be basically unfair to people who would not be interested in educational television?

Dr. KILLIAN. One can certainly argue this point, but I think the counter to that argument is what I've already stated that the comprehensiveness of the diversity of public television could be such that it touches everyone or every member of every family, so that there would be few people who would not benefit from it.

Question. Dr. Killian, I'm a little bit confused, this excise tax, I read something about it being for manufacturers and not for retail or vice versa or something like that, could you explain that? I mean, are there two possible excise taxes?

Dr. KILLIAN. No. We recommended a manufacturer's excise tax, so that under this arrangement, the company that manufactures the television set would pay an excise tax. The company would pay it. No, it would not be a tax on the individual. Now one can say that the company will pass along the excise tax in the retail price of the set, or they might, the excise tax being very low as we recommended it, they might find technological ways of reducing the cost of the set to offset the tax. One doesn't know just how this would operate.

Question. Dr. Killian, to change the subject just a little bit, if public television wants to have for one of its main goals better programing, who is going to define what better programing is?

Dr. KILLIAN. I think the American people again must define, the listeners must define what better programing is. But we have been very deeply convinced that a great body of American citizens who are not getting what they would like to get on television, because so much of the programing is directed at this mass audience, and let me use an analogy here, if I may. It is as though the book publishers of this country were concentrating only on the publication only of best sellers, and were forgetting about all the other kinds of books that we need, the text books, the need to know books, the small limited editions, and all these kinds of books that enrich our society and meet the needs of the individual. We want a television system that does that, too.

Mr. GRANIK. In other words, there may be 30 million listening to one program but there are 6 or 7 or 8 million others who would like to listen to others.

Dr. KILLIAN. This is right. We think that there are a great number of audiences in this country that are not now being reached at all, who are hungry for something, and if television can be designed to reach those people, and you add up all those different audiences, you're going to have still a very big audience.

Question. Dr. Killian, how would you be able to find out the public opinion? How would you be able to find out what kind of programing they want?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, there are many ways. Of course, the commercial people use the rating system. I would venture to hope that public television does not get encumbered with the kind of rating system that commercial television has to deal with now. But there are all kinds of ways of judging the audience response. People write in, people call in, you have different ways of polling to see what kind of audience you are getting. There have been many studies made of the audience of educational television.

Mr. GRANIK. The present rating system permits about 1300 in the whole United States to determine what the agencies buy.

Dr. KILLIAN. And, of course, the present rating systems, too, are giving some indication of how many people are listening to our educational television. So there's pretty good evidence, and the evidence shows that the audience for public television is steadily growing.

Question. Dr. Killian, if this audience is pleased by the results of the educational television, if you do accomplish a certain degree of excellence in the program which, as you say, reaches out and touches everyone, do you feel that commercial television will be released from its responsibility in this respect?

Dr. KILLIAN. I would hope not. I would hope that this would encourage commercial television to do a lot of things that it doesn't think it can do at the present time.

Mr. GRANIK. But it would still have to satisfy public interest, convenience and necessity.

Dr. KILLIAN. I think this is going to build very beneficial competition between these two. And I would also venture to suggest that public television, being freer to experiment, and not being under the pressures of the mass audience all the time, can invent new kinds of programs and new kinds of approaches to the way of reaching people that the commercial people then can pick up and enrich their own programs too. So I think these two things are going to feed into each other, and they are going to be mutually beneficial.

Question. Dr. Killian, Japan has five educational television networks, and two that are in color. Why couldn't we have more than two, more than one?

Dr. KILLIAN. Japan, I hasten to say, probably has in their educational television system probably the finest system in the world today. They are doing an extraordinary job of reaching their people, and they are spending, incidentally, something like $350 million a year on educational television. We're spending about $60 million a year on educational television in this country. And they are getting first rate results.

Mr. GRANIK. Does it frighten people when you say educational television?

Dr. KILLIAN. Yes it does.

Mr. GRANIK. You gave it a better name. That was always what we public affairs shows had to contend with, Dr. Killian.

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, happily, I'm an educator, and I come from an educational institution and I believe in education, but applied to television it does have a dampening effect, I'm afraid.

Question. Dr. Killian, why did your Commission decide instead of expanding the existing educational television network, why did they decide to establish a new corporation that will be much more expensive?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, our basic recommendation was that we should strengthen the local stations. We should have more of these local stations. We have 124 now. We think that ultimately to cover all the American people we should have about 380. And that those stations should be strong and independent, and they should determine what their programing should be. We don't want anyone to be telling the local station what its programing should be, or forcing on it any kind of programing. We did feel that in addition to the local stations we needed a national institution that could generate programs of national interest, to make these programs available by a system of distribution to the local stations, and that this national institution would exercise a sense of quality and build excellence and variety in the total system.

Question. Well isn't that what NET is doing now?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well NET is certainly contributing importantly to this objective. But we would like to see more diversity in the sources of programing in this country. We recommended, therefore, that there be at least two national production centers, of which NET would certainly be one. And it is my own personal view that NET might well be the proper instrument for handling news programs, political broadcasting, and so on. Now I have great confidence in NET and its role in this developing system.

Question. Dr. Killian, how can we prevent government control of public television?

Dr. KILLIAN. This is one of the key questions that we are confronted with at the present time, and that is being debated in Congress, and in our own proposals we tried to accomplish this, first of all by urging that this corporate entity, the Corporation for Public Television, be a private corporation, that it receive its funds through a trust fund and it also have private funds to supplement the federal funds and that it have a board of directors who could be free and independent. We must have freedom of communications as well as freedom of the press.

Question. Dr. Killian, do you think that the recent proposal by the Washington Post for changing how directors are chosen for the Commission, would that help prevent government control?

Dr. KILLIAN. I think it important that you look at alternative ways of appointing the directors of the corporation. But the Carnegie Commission itself reached the conclusion that in its judgment the most direct and simple way would be to have the President appoint these directors and have them—half of them confirmed by Congress, half of them appointed by the President, and half confirmed by Congress, by the Senate, and they in turn appoint six more. But we don't feel that this is the only way to do this, and that there may be alternative ways of doing it. But I hasten to point out that one of the best ways in this country of getting a first rate Commission, and a first rate Board is to have the President appoint them, because important people will respond to an invitation from the President when they may not respond to some other kind of appointive process.

Question. Dr. Killian, do you think that public television can be successful without the advantages of network telecasting?

Dr. KILLIAN. Without networking? Yes I do. In fact, again, it was the judgment of our Commission that we would not like to see a networking operation unduly prominent in the system of public television. There would be networking at times in the handling of certain kinds of programs, live, in which they would be broadcast simultaneously on all the stations.

Mr. GRANIK. Couldn't they serve also, these network programs, as a model for local programs?

Dr. KILLIAN. Yes, certainly. But we would like to see this distribution system operate so that every local station was feeding into it, and every station can look at all of these programs that are being fed into this distribution system and decide what it wants to use. But we would not like to see the system get the local stations always expecting to get the principal portion of their programing from Washington and New York.

Question. Much has been said about government control of this corporation, but I think there is another consideration. The United Auto Workers have pledged $25,000 in support of this corporation if it is formed. Do you see any danger in this contribution from pressure groups such as this?

Dr. KILLIAN. No I do not. In fact. I think we should welcome contributions from all sectors of our private—the private part of our society. And as you know, CBS, on the day that the Carnegie Commission report was released, said they would pledge $1 million toward the endowment for the corporation, and I am hopeful that many other corporations will provide funds toward the private endowment of the corporation, as well as foundations, and individuals. If this is dispersed and you have support from many different sources, along with federal support, then it seems to me you have the diversification that would insure freedom.

Question. Dr. Killian, to change the subject just a little, I'd like to know, the lack of communication between student and teacher now in many of the large colleges and universities, why—how would instructional—I mean, how would, you know, instructional television be a more communicative media?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, let me answer that this way. So far, I think, instructional television is not very much used in the universities. But I think we are going to see a growing use of it, and one of the ways it is going to be used is that teachers will use television to show things that the classroom doesn't permit students easily to see, and you can zero in and see something intimately on the television screen that you couldn't see. For example, scientific experiments and demonstrations done in the lecture room. But something else is coming very quickly and that is the stored kind of television in which you will have a tape or a record with an hour's television program on it, that you can go to the library and take out and play back, and have your own television program and look at it at your leasure and any time you want to do it, and I think this is going to have a very profound effect on helping students teach themselves, and this is one of the most important aspects of education.

Mr. GRANIK. Would these be programs that they could record and play later or programs already recorded for their convenience?

Dr. KILLIAN. Both.

Question. Doctor, is the university obligated to educate the surrounding community?

Dr. KILLIAN. I think the university has a very great opportunity today to make a great contribution to the improvement of its environment in its own community. Yes, the university does have an obligation to help its community. I think you will find all around this country university programs at the present time that are designed to contribute to the welfare of the people, the surrounding citizens. There is an institutional citizenship responsibility here invested in the universities, no less than an industrial corporation or individuals. And one of the great changes in education in the universities I predict in the next decade is the emphasis which we are going to see on urban affairs, and all of the different ways in which scholars and students can contribute to urban affairs. In my own institution, we have students that are tutoring disadvantaged young people in our community. We have a summer school run by students for young people who otherwise might not have these opportunities. There are a host of things that students themselves are doing in the universities that are very significant and to me they are moving to see what can be accomplished by young people working with young people.

Question. Dr. Killian, do you thus see public television dramatically changing the American way of life?

Dr. KILLIAN. I think that public television can contribute very greatly to the quality of American life. And one of the reasons that I think that led those of us on the Carnegie Commission to do so was a feeling that we must in this country address ourselves to all the many different ways in which we can contribute to the quality and richness of American life. And by improving television, we felt we could do this. May I add something else here. I come from a background in which there is great concern with science and technology. I have a very deep conviction that one of our major problems today is how we can make technology benign, how we can take the miraculous technology of television and make it serve the best and highest aspirations of our society, and not permitting it to be addressed to trivia too much of the time. We've got to do this all along the line. And television is one of the ways in which we can make technology benign rather than an incubus for our society, and individual people in it.

Question. Dr. Killian, have there been any studies made on the effect of the impersonal nature of educational TV? Sometimes I may be irrational, but I get the idea that it is a little bit like 1984, and you sit there and you watch the tube, and you know, it is frightening.

Dr. KILLIAN. There has been a great deal of discussion about this. But one of the things that I think is ahead in this field of television technology is a two-way interactive television. There is a chapter in our report that discusses some of these future developments in technology. And I think down the road we're going to see a person sitting in front of a television screen being able to respond to the person on the screen, to record his own effects, to ask questions, to give indications of dissent or agreement. In other words, there is going to be a feedback, an interaction here, and this would get at the problem in part that you're talking about.

Question. You mentioned earlier that commercial television as it is today has to more or less fight for the money that they get, and appeal to the mass audiences.

Dr. KILLIAN. The whole public television system is impoverished.

Question. And this is unlike what the proposed corporation would do. They would be assured of their income.

Dr. KILLIAN. They would be insured of better programing, and through HEW, we recommended that they would get grants for operations, and new equipment.

Question. And yet today's commercial TV networks still show educational shows occasionally, documentaries, news programs, and so on.

Dr. KILLIAN. Frequently with great brilliance.

Question. And if your corporation, the Corporation for Public Television, were to prove itself to be fairly successful, don't you think there is a possibility that the other three commercial networks, because they have to appeal to mass audiences, might abdicate all responsibility altogether for showing any educational programs?

Dr. KILLIAN. A number of people have voiced this concern, but my anticipation would be again, as I said before, that there is going to be a competitive factor here, and if commercial television sees that some of the programs are highly successful that appear on public television, they're going to want to do them too.

Mr. GRANIK. If they began to lose some of their ratings.

Dr. KILLIAN. And I think, too, that public television will tend to change the taste of the listeners in this country. And they will begin to look to commercial television for the kinds of programs that they have been finding only on public television.

Mr. GRANIK. Instead of re-runs of re-runs.

Dr. KILLIAN. This is right. And the Neilsen ratings will start going down if the kinds of first rate public television programs would be neglected by commercial television.

Question. Dr. Killian, when I found out that CBS, you know, gave that million dollars, I was sort of amazed. That seemed to me sort of like a shoe shop giving, you know, money to a little shoe shop that might hurt the big shoe shop's business. So why did they do it, besides being nice and humanitarian and all that?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, Dr. Stanton wrote a very eloquent letter about this saying that at CBS he and his associates had a conviction that an alternate system was needed in this country, that they would like to see the kind of system proposed by the Carnegie Commission, they thought it was sound, pluralistic, free of the controls that might otherwise encroach upon freedom of communication, and that they would like to give it a boost. And I think this is sound policy, and I think there was a very genuine conviction on the part of the people who made that decision that they would like to see a strong system of public television in the United States, and that this would be good for commercial television.

Question. Could it hurt them financially?

Dr. KILLIAN. I don't believe so. In fact, I think in the long run it may help them.

Mr. GRANIK. Dr. Stanton himself is an educator.

Dr. KILLIAN. That's right. He had his Ph. D. in psychology, as I recall.

Question. This conception of answering back the tube, though terribly exciting sounds rather frightening to me. Wouldn't this bring in the possibility of 1984 type view screens?

Dr. KILLIAN. No. Of course, 1984 is going to be a cliche in many respects, although I think the famous book was a very important event in our literary history. But I have a great conviction that we are finding ways of mastering technology so that we can turn it to humane uses, make it the servant of man and not in any way a dominating factor in our society. But we've got to constantly work at this. That's why we ought to be working at public television, because I think that we can master this miraculous inventiveness of mind, and put it to work for benign purposes.

Question. Would the Board of Directors of your proposed Corporation have the final say on political programs, say, produced by local stations?

Dr. KILLIAN. No, I would think not. They would have that final say on how the arrangements were made. For example, with NET to broadcast the speeches of political candidates. But I think that NET and the Corporation would probably want to turn panels of advisers or editorial committees that could make to them objective recommendations as to how they should handle this program.

Mr. GRANIK. I'm sorry to interrupt. I know there are many more questions. There just isn't time. Thank you, Dr. Killian for being our guest on Youth Wants To Know. Our thanks to you, panel, for your most interesting questions and to you, ladies and gentlemen, for being with us. Please join us again next week on Youth Wants To Know, where through the eyes of youth, we explore, we discover, we measure the important people, ideas and events of our time. Now this is Theodore Granik bidding you goodbye.

CONFRONTATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the explosive situation in the Middle East worries all responsible people. Not alone is there the potential of a confrontation between the two great nuclear powers of the world—the U.S.S.R. and the United States, but there are heavy overtones involving freedom of the seas. Additionally, a traditional Western-oriented ally of the United States faces threatened oblivion and American-supplied arms may once more be used against American-supplied arms.

Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz, one of Washington's most eloquent and learned clergymen, had something to say on this subject last weekend which I believe should be shared because of the erudite manner in which he explains his own ideas on this delicate situation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Twain Have Met

We have lived with crisis for so long that we have vulgarized the vocabulary of peril. Yet we must find words to define the horrifying meaning of the conflagration that threatens the peace of the world in Asia and now in the Middle East.

Those who believe in the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, who reject the use of military force, and who may deplore our country's military posture in Vietnam, are now brought face to face with still another challenge to principle. Is there any difference between the situation in Vietnam and that in Israel? Why should there be a question. If force is evil, it is as evil in the east as it is in the west. If the use of military power is immoral, its use must be deplored wherever it is invoked, whether in Israel or by Israel. And we must take care lest parochial bias confuse the moral issue.

It is the inescapable verdict of our religious tradition that the use of military power is an evil. But what defense is there against aggression by military power? The answer: greater military power. Power is evil because it is brutal, brutalizing and corrupting. But without the defense of power, we become its victims. Power, then, is a necessary evil. The pacifist denies that it is necessary. The militarist denies that it is evil.

Both are sincere, but both, I fear, are wrong. We are seldom called upon to choose between an evil and a good. We are frequently called upon to choose between a greater evil and a lesser one. And to stand by in pious neutrality while innocent blood is shed is the greatest evil of all. To abdicate in the face of a threat is not necessarily a good, for while my life may be no more sacred than that of my adversary, it is no less sacred. Nor is immortality to be achieved by walking humbly in the posture of the sheep led to slaughter. Power is a necessary evil which we must use with the wisdom of discretion, with self-control born of humility, and only in the just cause of survival. For no man need consider it immoral to defend his life.

No event in history springs forth, Minerva-like, full-grown, or without antecedents. The events of the past week recall the crisis of 1956 when, on October 29, Israel invaded the desert of Sinai. Israel's avowed purposes were to destroy threatening Egyptian military bases in Sinai, to eject the Egyptian invader from the Gaza Strip, to safeguard freedom of navigation through the Gulf of Aqaba, and to put an end to terrorist raids from the Egyptian border.

These objectives were achieved within 100 hours. For a brief moment, there was an opportunity to create a new era of peace in the Middle East and to eliminate Nasser as a political factor in the Arabian world. Nasser lost fully one-half of his magnificent Russian arsenal without having had the opportunity to use it. A pro-western regime would have emerged if hostilities were permitted to continue for another 48 hours. And had this happened, none would have benefited more than the Arab States.

Mr. Nasser was rescued from oblivion by the intercession of the United States. This will probably rate in history's pages as one of the greatest blunders of the century. The President of the United States demanded that Israel withdraw.

Israel had no choice but to withdraw from Suez, from Gaza, and from the Gulf of Aqaba, for she was then, as now, dependent upon the good will of the United States. But Israel made certain assumptions. There were: That the presence of Israeli troops in Egyptian territory would be replaced by United Nations Emergency Forces; that withdrawal would be followed by a peace settlement to be sought as quickly as possible; and that at no other time would she be denied use of the Suez Canal or any other waterway leading to Israel.

These assumptions were endorsed by Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, the U.S. representative, approved by the United Nations Assembly, and further confirmed by Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

This was an American commitment. The sanctity of commitment, we are told, is the root of our involvement in Vietnam where we are fighting to prove that we will stand by a pledge once given.

We must not fall into the trap of comparing Israel with South Vietnam, or even with comparing America's commitment to Israel with America's commitment to Vietnam, for no two situations are identical. Nor is any war ever a matter of one simple dimension. Like an iceberg, the war on the battlefield is only the apparent manifestation of the underlying struggle whose major bulk is not always visible to surface view.

There is more than one war being fought in Asia. First, there is an undeniable civil war between South Vietnam and the Viet Cong. This civil struggle has become intertwined with a second war between the United States and North Vietnam, whose capital is Hanoi. To prove that these are two separate, though intertwined struggles, Hanoi will not address the reality of the South Vietnamese government in Saigon any more than we will openly recognize the existence of an entity called the Viet Cong. There is yet a third struggle in Asia, in our confrontation with Red China. And still a fourth struggle is the enigmatic and ongoing cold confrontation with the Soviet Union, which we still call the cold war.

There are, then, at least four definable wars in Asia. By the same reasoning, there are no less than five wars swirling about the Middle East.

Most obvious is the conflict between Israel and the Arab states, which headlines our present concern. But if we were to resolve this war even to Israel's hurt, the other four wars would remain to plague our peace-seeking efforts.

Always beneath the surface of the struggles in the Middle East is the hatred in many Arab circles for the modern world which is western civilization. This struggle is clothed in the pious garb of anti-colonialism, but it is basically a rejection of western democracy, an alien ideology. Israel is not the cause of the Arab rejection of the west; Israel *is* the west. And its very presence in its midst is regarded as an affront to Arab dignity. Her very existence is termed "aggression". But if Israel did not exist, the fury of primitive wrath would be levelled against other western installations . . . from "library" to embassy.

Never too far beneath the surface is a second struggle, that between Arab and Arab, a war which goes underground in a ratio inverse to the intensity of the other struggles. Were it not for the existence of Israel, this war would come out in the full force of its bitterness. Its victims already number the assassinated heads of more than one Arab state. Its present manifestations are between Egypt and Yemen and between Nasser's Egypt and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The prize is the domination of the Arab world. Nasser may have one eye focused upon Israel, but the other eye is upon the lush oil fields of Saudi Arabia which will be easier to tap from a military posture astride the soon-to-be-evacuated British outpost in Aden. Nasser's thrust in the Yemen is so intense that he has used poison gas. And the world is silent. Israel dampens the inter-Arab struggle and even links Arabs together in league. Israel is hardly the cause of that dissension, only its excuse for seeking more arms. With Israel eliminated, the house of Arab unity will dissolve in a bath of blood.

There is still a fourth war whose existence was largely responsible for the fiasco of Suez in 1956. It disrupted the tri-partite alliance of England, France, and the United States. It, too, wears a pious garb, for it speaks in terms of the national interest. In truth, it has little to do with the national interest, for it is concerned primarily with corporate profit. It pays few taxes; yet it demands much. Its prize is concession to exploit the oil wealth of the Middle East. A truce has been declared in this struggle by economic armistice, but it is too soon to know the extent to which it remains a factor in the formation of American foreign policy or British foreign policy. Britain has retreated in this struggle, having conceded to United States corporations, but France has not forgotten the lesson. Here again, Israel is the mask, the pawn, and the victim, but not the cause.

The fifth war is the most insidious. It is the war between east and west, the struggle between the United States and the world of Communism, in its abstraction, and the Soviet Union in its representation.

These five wars are interrelated. One influences the other. Yet they are separate, for even if you were to solve one, the others would demand separate treatment. Some of the struggles in the Middle East are intertwined with those of Southeast Asia. The common element of the precipitate is the confrontation of the United States and the Soviet Union. It is at this point that east and west have met in bloody confrontation.

There is more and more evidence that mobilization in the Middle East was triggered not in Cairo, but in Moscow. For not one single tank could move for long in Egypt's Sinai desert without the spare parts from Russia. Not one bomber could take off from Egyptian airfields without instructions, guidance, and maintenance provided by Russia. Therefore, logical deduction should lead us to conclude that Nasser has been unleashed not only to attack Israel, but to embarrass the United States. It's the Cuba syndrome, the Berlin blockade test.

America's justification for being in Vietnam is that it has given a commitment to the government of South Vietnam to defend her against her attackers. Russia, then, has shifted the arena in which the American commitment is being tested, as if to allow the world to judge whether America is committed to safeguarding beleaguered nations as a sacred principle or whether America is simply concerned with expanding empire and arenas of influence. Whether this is Russia's intention or not, this will certainly be the result of this week of testing.

What we have in the Middle East is the explosive emergence of a marginal struggle that now shifts to center stage as part of the struggle in Vietnam. What we have in the Middle East is a conflict of world powers compounded by the rivalry of Arab states emulsified by private investment, in all of which Israel is either symptom, pawn, excuse, or mask.

Elimination of Israel, even if that could be accomplished, would not resolve any of the more basic rivalries. In this context, the familiar assertion that it is only the Arab-Israeli issue which prevents the western powers from inaugurating an era of peace and harmony in the Middle East, must take its place with other old myths which do not square with new reality.

Israel is the diversionary issue on which the Arabs have presently concentrated their fire and behind which they conduct their rivalry. By acting as the breakwater, Israel has unwittingly rendered service to the Arabs and the west.

Israel is the barometer of storms having their sources elsewhere. And just as the falling barometer warns of approaching storms, so the falling fortunes of a small democracy warns of the weakening of the democratic world.

Hawks and doves are in confusion and few show consistency in their postures. Those who are hawks in one war may be doves in another. But no one can remain uninvolved for long. Each of us must frame a judgment upon which he will base his actions.

In evaluating each struggle, we must put the test of key questions. In each separate struggle, we must ask: Who subverts his neighbor? Which side seeks to expand the arena of human dignity? Which nation turns to the ballot rather than the bullet? Which prefers tanks and rocket to economic development? Which nations clamor for war? The answers may be difficult to ascertain for the issues are complex but final judgment must be based on the answer to the key question, which nation has asked for negotiated settlement at the peace table? The answer to this question must determine the nature of our commitment and which commands our support.

Once again the handwriting is on the wall. We are being tested, weighed in the balance. We must not be found wanting.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1967;" the following: "not in excess of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; not in excess of $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970;".

Sec. 2. Section 16(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "This Act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, because of the necessary absence from the city of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] on account of a death in his family, he has requested me to handle the bill today, and I shall do so to the best of my ability.

I am not as familiar with this measure, which extends the Food Stamp Act, as is the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, the pending bill would extend the authority to appropriate funds for the food-stamp program for 3 additional years. It would authorize the appropriation of up to $200 million for fiscal 1968, $225 million for fiscal 1969, and $250 million for fiscal 1970.

We have now had considerable experience with food-stamp programs. During the years between 1939 and 1943 a program was operated under the authority of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress, which provides for diverting surplus commodities from the normal channels of trade. This program was suspended during World War II when our surplus stocks were used up. After the war there were many proposals for reinstitution of the program, and in 1961 a pilot operation was undertaken, again under section 32. The Food Stamp Act of 1964 was adopted in August 1964, providing authority for appropriation of up to $75 million for fiscal 1965, $100 million for fiscal 1966, $200 million for fiscal 1967, and such sums as Congress might thereafter authorize for subsequent years. The pending bill, as requested by the Department of Agriculture and introduced, would have provided permanent authority for the appropriation of such sums as might be necessary. The committee felt, however, that even with the experience accumulated to date, the program is still an expanding one, and some limits should be imposed to be sure that it is kept within bounds, while maintaining orderly growth. Appropriations for 1965, 1966, and 1967 have been, respectively, $60 million, $100 million, and $139.5 million. Provision of up to $200 million, $225 million, and $250 million for 1968, 1969, and 1970 should permit continued orderly development.

The program, which has been well received, provides low-income families with more adequate diets and expands our markets for farm products. It utilizes the existing channels of trade and commerce and existing welfare agencies to assure efficient and effective program administration. It is purely voluntary, operating under State-approved plans.

Whenever a State desires to participate in the program, the State agency which administers federally aided public assistance programs submits a plan of operation to the Secretary, specifying the political subdivisions to be covered, the effective dates, standards for approval of applicant households, and other details. When the plan is approved the State agency has responsibility for certification of the households eligible to participate in the program and for issuance of coupons.

Eligible households are restricted to those where income is a substantially limiting factor in the attainment of an adequate diet. After their eligibility is determined, they may purchase food coupons in the amount required to provide them with a more nearly adequate diet. They do not pay full face value for these coupons, but a lesser amount, equivalent to their normal expenditures for food. Thus, the purpose is to supplement, rather than substitute for, their normal expenditures, and to provide them with better, more healthful diets. The program does not free recipients' own funds for other purposes, nor does it transfer relief program responsibilities from the local governments to the Federal Government. Local governments are specifically prohibited from decreasing welfare grants because of program participation, and since the program requires participants to use their normal food expenditures for coupon purchase, it does not increase the feasibility of a reduction in welfare grants.

Coupons are redeemed for food by local merchants so that participants in the program are able to shop with convenience and dignity, obtaining those foods which they need and prefer. They are not restricted to a few commodities, such as cornmeal or other starches, but they may obtain some protein, vegetables, and other foods necessary to health and well-being. Coupons may not be used for tobacco, alcoholic beverages, imported meats, other products identified as imported, or any nonfood items.

Local food stores, in turn, cash the coupons at their banks. Use of the regular channels of trade strengthens those channels, as well as giving the program the advantage of the efficiency and experience of the regular distribution system.

Thus, the program involves the joint efforts of the Federal, State, and local governments, local stores and banks, and the participants themselves. By providing a better diet for low-income families in a manner which requires them to maintain their own efforts, the program contributes substantially to the health and welfare of the Nation.

In addition to controlling the growth of the program through the continuation of ceilings on appropriations, the committee amendment limits the use of funds for the program to those specifically appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that purpose. The budget for fiscal 1968 proposes that the act be carried out with funds appropriated under section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress. The committee felt that the use for this purpose of funds appropriated for another purpose is not advisable. Funds are appropriated by section 32 to be available when necessary for carrying out that section. Its purpose is to protect markets for perishable agricultural commodities and to protect the producers of those commodities. Perishable commodities cannot be held by producers until the market improves. They must be marketed when ready for market, and if the market is glutted, the producer may face financial ruin. There is not time then to appropriate funds. They should be there, available to the Secretary when needed, for the diversion of surplus stocks from the market as they are brought to the market.

Mr. President, at this point I depart from the text which had been prepared for the use of my distinguished chairman, Senator Ellender, to say that, inasmuch as I come from a State where the great majority of our agricultural products are perishable, I am particularly interested in the safeguarding of section 32 funds. Those funds, derived from 30 percent of the tariff receipts of the Nation, are earmarked particularly to take care of surplus production in perishable crops that are nonprice supported—for instance, beef, pork, poultry, fruit, vegetables, and other highly perishable crops.

I have felt that the Budget Bureau has been exceedingly unwise in repeatedly trying to raid section 32 funds for use in this food-stamp program. This year, it has actually recommended raiding section 32 funds to the extent of $195 million for the carrying on in fiscal year 1968 of the food-stamp program.

So the committee unanimously has urged the Senate, in the committee amendment, which I hope will be adopted, to require that the food-stamp program be carried out only with funds appropriated for that specific purpose. This section is consistent with the provision of the basic legislation which characterizes the program as a welfare or social program to be carried out with welfare funds, rather than an agricultural program to be carried out with agricultural funds.

The food-stamp program is a growing program. Where $60 million was appropriated for 1965, $139.5 million was appropriated for 1967, and the committee amendment contemplates the appropriation of as much as $250 million for 1970. When the program is fully operative, it is contemplated that it will take about $425 million. Whether Congress ever agrees to its going to that figure is, of course, a question for Congress to determine. The section 32 fund is similar to an insurance fund. If we begin to use some of it first for this purpose and then for that purpose, we may well find that we do not have it when it is needed.

I have one more comment about section 32 funds. At this time, when we all know that the tariff revenues are due to be diminished by reason of the going into effect of the so-called Kennedy plan figures for reduction of tariffs, we are particularly anxious that no further encroachment upon section 32 funds be inadvisedly made.

Mr. President, I now move that the committee amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have nothing further to say upon this matter. As I have already announced, I am simply handling it in the absence of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who could not be here. I shall be glad to yield to any Senator who wishes to discuss this program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting floor manager of the bill what amounts, as provided in the measure, are recommended by the committee for each of the 3 years over which the program is being extended.

Mr. HOLLAND. Those amounts are $200 million for fiscal 1968, $225 million for fiscal 1969, and $250 million for 1970.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. May I ask whether or not the committee, during its deliberations on this measure, considered authorizations of higher figures than these which have just been stated by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. I say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from West Virginia, that this bill was handled in committee by the chairman of the committee, himself. The Senator may recall that the Senator from Louisiana was the father of the original food stamp bill. He himself suggested and insisted upon the figures which were placed in the bill, in the committee amendment which is now before the Senate—that is, the $200 million, $225 million, and $250 million figures for the 3 years covered by this program. He was quite insistent upon that, and I know that is his conviction.

The Senator from West Virginia will see, from the list of States affected by this bill, that the State which the Senator from Florida represents in part is not affected at all. We have no food stamp program in our State.

But the Senator from Louisiana, by reason of his paternity of this bill, and for other reasons, has been very active in its furtherance; and I would not feel justified in departing from the figures which he insisted upon in the committee.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I had had some indication from the Department of Agriculture that higher authorizations might be justified for fiscal years 1969 and 1970. Perhaps I should ask this question: How will the authorizations of $225 million and $250 million for fiscal years 1969 and 1970, respectively, compare with the amounts that have been appropriated for the program in the past 2 fiscal years?

Mr. HOLLAND. They are much greater than the amounts appropriated for the last 2 fiscal years. I shall give the last 3 fiscal years, since that covers the entire period of the operation of the bill: $60 million in 1965, $100 million in 1966, and $139.5 million in 1967.

I might add that in no year was the Department able to commit and use the entire amount appropriated. For instance, in fiscal 1965, though $60 million was appropriated, the Department used only $35.6 million. In 1966, though $100 million was appropriated, the Department used only $70.5 million. We were told in committee that though $200 million was authorized and $139.5 million appropriated for 1967, it appeared that the total amount used this year would be somewhere between $120 million and $125 million.

So the amounts appropriated today are not only greatly under the amounts which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana requested be placed in the bill as limitations for 1968 and the 2 years to follow, but it also appears the Department has never been able to use the amounts actually appropriated.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is saying that the amounts authorized in this bill for the 3 fiscal years of fiscal year 1968, fiscal year 1969, and fiscal year 1970, are in excess not only of the appropriations that were made in each of the past 3 years, but also in excess of the expenditures and in excess of authorizations for those years.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. For the present fiscal year 1967, $200 million was authorized, $139.5 million was appropriated and between $120 million and $125 million, we are told by the Department, will be expended during this year. The making available in this authorization of $200 million for 1968, $225 million for 1969, and $250 million for 1970, in the opinion of the Senator from Louisiana, as stated to us with great conviction in the committee, was more than adequate, he thought, to cover the future growth of this program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Did the Department, during the hearings, attempt to justify any higher authorizations than are included in the bill before us?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Department attempted to justify appropriations without limit; in other words, an open-end authorization. I believe that the Department later talked to the Senator from Louisiana about some specific figures which were larger than these. But the Senator from Louisiana, who, as I say, has a very great interest in this program and naturally would, because he was the father of it, felt that these amounts were adequate and that they should be put in here to guarantee against growth that would be too quick a growth in the 3 years covered by the bill.

I will say to my distinguished friend that if we should find a need for greater appropriations we always have the possibility of amendment of the authorization bill, and if the Department has some new development not communicated to us, this bill has to go to the House of Representatives. I hope that the author of this bill, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], will accept the judgment of the Senator from Louisiana as to the soundness of this program and allow the bill, as included in the committee recommendations which have already been adopted, to be passed by the Senate today.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I understand that it is the judgment of the Senator from Florida, and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the committee, and the judgment of the committee that the authorizations provided in the bill before us will be ample to permit an efficient and judicious expansion of the food stamp program into areas not now participating in the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. That was certainly the statement and conviction of the Senator from Louisiana. I joined him in it. The committee unanimously approved it in the bill which is now recommended by the committee.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as the sponsor of S. 953, the bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for operations of the program for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending this June 30, I have been greatly encouraged by the well-nigh unanimous support of the extension of the Food Stamp Act beyond June 30. In reading records of testimony during hearings here in the Senate, and in the House on legislation of a similar nature, I have been impressed by the wide expression of views that the food stamp program is a vital, well-administered, and effectively designed Federal program.

I had previously made my own observations as to its effectiveness of operations in my own State of West Virginia, having been closely associated with its development from the inception of the pilot program in McDowell County in 1961 to its present coverage of 48 out of West Virginia's 55 counties.

From my personal observations of the program operations in my State, and from reports on its operations in other areas of the United States, I wish to concur with the estimate expressed by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman—the food-stamp program is a success.

The program has more than lived up to the expectations under which it was undertaken. It has provided a new channel for the wise and provident use of this country's great abundance of foods to improve the diets and health of our low-income families. It has not only expanded food markets for our farmers, contributing to an increase in farm income, but it has also stimulated local economies in the areas in which the program is operating.

As a special merit of the system used by the food-stamp program—through the issuance of bonus coupons—this program has not degenerated into a system of handouts. It requires participating families to use some of their own income to purchase food. It has served to provide those who most need improved diets with an opportunity to purchase more and better food for less money. And the program has proved the wisdom of its design, in that it has been singularly free of corruption at the varied levels of its administration, according to reports available in the Department of Agriculture.

I feel that action to provide the continuation of this program and to insure an increasing availability of funds for effective expansion over the next 3 fiscal years is well considered and timely.

With regard to the views of some people that there should be matching funds required of the participating States for bonus coupons, I am convinced that this suggestion, as a minimal disadvantage, would cause a totally needless complication in what has heretofore been a smooth operating program.

I had looked into this matter prior to introducing S. 953. And I had discussed it with responsible officials within West Virginia. I concluded that such a matching requirement—which would be in addition to the costs the States now bear—would put the program out of reach of many States.

I want to go on record as approving the committee's action in deferring any consideration of State matching requirements under the food stamp program.

I believe it is important to recognize the basic concept of the food stamp approach. We are putting a national resource to work to assist the States to improve food consumption levels among the needy. This national resource is our abundance of food. It is the Federal Government that has this national resource at its disposal—not the States.

The free food coupons that the recipients receive are but a means to put that food abundance within the reach of our low-income families. These coupons represent the added food purchasing power that moves our food surpluses into consumption rather than into Government ownership under price support and surplus removal programs.

Thus, if we were to require States to match part of the cost of the bonus coupons, we would be taxing nonexistent resources within the States—for our abundance of food is a national—not a State resource.

It is also important to remember that the States now share the cost of administering the program. The cost of carefully qualifying applicant families is a considerable one—but a necessary one to insure against waste and abuse. And the States finance the costs of safeguarding and issuing the coupons.

These State costs represent about 7 percent of the value of the Federal subsidy. So, the States are sharing in the costs.

Finally, I believe the record of the hearings clearly indicates that a State matching of the bonus coupons may likely kill the program. I know that it would pose an additional burden in West Virginia, and other Senators have testified that it would seriously threaten the program in their own States.

Many States are now hard pressed to finance basic welfare programs and the Congress is constantly called upon to consider legislation to raise the amounts provided for such programs. In the face of these facts, some States may likely, however reluctantly, decide to switch back to the surplus donation program because that program requires no State matching of the value of the surplus foods made available by the Department of Agriculture.

If we kill the food stamp program, now, with a State matching requirement, we are forcing a return to the less effective and less sufficient surplus donation program. We are forcing States and low-income people to give up a more dignified, self-help program for the poor—one that has won wide acceptance, approval, and support; the use of a program that operates through commercial channels rather than in competition with them; the economic stimulus the bonus coupons provide to the local economies of hundreds of communities throughout the country.

It is important to note that the administration has recommended that the Congress permanently extend the food stamp program.

As with any ongoing program, it is necessary for the agencies involved to plan ahead. The present provision for appropriations for the next 3 fiscal years would provide the assurance of orderly progression. It will protect and maintain the administrative organization necessary for effective action.

I urge that the Senate pass the bill before it now—S. 953—the extension of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, and I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for having patiently answered the questions I have propounded. I also express gratitude to Senator ELLENDER and the Committee on Agriculture, and to Senator JORDAN, of North Carolina, and his subcommittee, for the prompt and effective action in reporting this bill for Senate consideration in ample time to avoid a lapse of funding authority.

Mr. HOLLAND. The committee felt that the subject matter was sufficiently important to require the early action we took.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, first, let me compliment the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the work they have done in reporting S. 953, and on its predecessor, the Food Stamp Act of 1964. The present legislation represents the continuation of a giant step forward in raising the dietary standards among the poor in the Nation.

Food stamps have now proved themselves in 3 years of national use—during which, I might add, the results have been carefully studied and open to public scrutiny.

The facts are in. They demonstrate that this is an effective program and that it can be operated at an acceptable level of Federal expenditure.

States and localities must request participation. Costs to the States and localities are such that no new areas will come into the program unless there exists a clear need. Expansion to date has been gradual and orderly.

No county is permitted to operate the food stamp program simultaneously with the commodity distribution program. So, when an area shifts to the food stamp program, there is an offset in some of the Federal costs.

I am especially pleased to see that the committee provided for another 3-year extension. This will give the States and localities time for proper planning. At the same time, Congress will be in a position to review progress and determine if the additional 3 years of experience will then require any legislative modifications.

In summary, then, the program is attaining its objectives; it has enjoyed good administration; the expansion has been well planned and orderly. The passage of this bill will further that expansion to new areas of need. I favor passage to accomplish that purpose, and I urge all Senators to do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

So the bill (S. 953) was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is deeply indebted to the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], for so graciously agreeing to handle this measure, which extends the food stamp program over the next 3 fiscal years. In managing this bill, Senator HOLLAND stepped in for the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, whose absence today was occasioned regrettably by a death in his family. Though called upon at the last moment to handle this vitally important measure, Senator HOLLAND performed the task in the truly outstanding manner that has characterized his many years of public service to the Nation. His articulate explanation of the bill assured its overwhelming approval by the Senate. We are most grateful.

We are grateful also for the contribution of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. His penetrating analysis is a welcome addition to the discussion of any measure.

Finally, the Senate may be proud of another achievement, obtained with dispatch and with full consideration for the views of every Member.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

At 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m. the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. MANSFIELD].

AMENDMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT OF 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, President Johnson on May 25 submitted a highly important message for improving and strengthening our political process. I am very much pleased with the message. It is not only sound, thoughtful, and comprehensive, but will be significant, I am sure, in the ultimate resolution of the difficult and vexing problems in this area.

The President speaks not only as the Chief Executive, but also from a wellspring of knowledge acquired as a seasoned and experienced political campaigner, and from 30 years of distinguished public service as a Representative, Senator, majority leader of the Senate, Vice President, and President.

After the searching and sometimes spirited debate which was recently conducted in this Chamber, I think it can be fairly stated that all agree that the time for action is at hand. The President's thoughtful proposals will guide our way to the achievement of our common purpose.

Briefly, here is the substance of the President's message:

First, he makes basic and fundamental proposals to revise and give new life and meaning to the laws regulating the conduct of Federal election campaigns. These proposals would place meaningful limitations on the total amount of political contributions which any individual could make, and would put teeth into the rules relating to the disclosure of contributions received and expenditures made by Federal candidates and political committees supporting such candidates.

In substance and principle, the need for these reforms is uniformly recognized. The President has given the cause of honest elections new vigor and leadership. I am confident that this Congress will enact these vital measures. Our conscience and our constituencies demand no less.

Next, and of great concern and interest to me, are the recommendations involving campaign financing. The President has called two areas to our specific attention.

First, that public financing of presidential elections should be pursued as the best means of insuring the financial independence of presidential candidates and making certain the full and free flow of issues and ideas to the voters.

Second, that Federal action is needed at other levels of the election processes to sustain and make more viable these election campaigns.

I am gratified that after the thorough consideration which I know the President has given to this matter, he has concluded that the framework and philosophy of the Long Act should be retained. Modifications and improvements are, of course, suggested. I have suggested them myself. These are comprehensive, well reasoned, and thought provoking. I know that they will be earnestly considered in our deliberations.

Moreover, I find that this message charts a course which not only is in harmony with the general approach that I have advocated, but also lies within the boundaries of the recommendations made last week by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. My respected colleague would provide for the public funding of Federal election campaigns. I am encouraged to find increasing agreement from all quarters that a system of direct public financing of presidential election campaigns has a significant role to play in our political processes.

The area of agreement is large. We must now strive together, with the guidance of the President, to work out the details and mechanics of implementing the best system in the interests of all Americans. I look forward to working with all Senators in the days ahead, so that this problem can be resolved quickly though deliberately.

I wish to thank President Johnson for again demonstrating his deep concern for the integrity of our electoral process. I pledge myself to every effort in order that his inspired leadership and wise counsel will bear fruit before this session of Congress has completed its work.

I now introduce a bill which provides the guidelines and proposals on political campaign financing suggested by the President in his message. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] has already introduced two bills that implement other recommendations in that Presidential message. Quite rightly, those bills were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The bill I introduce today pertains only to the President's proposal for public financing of presidential elections. This bill and others already before the Committee on Finance were to be the subject of hearings by the committee which were scheduled to begin this afternoon. I understand that there has been objection, Mr. President, to holding hearings on political campaign financing this afternoon, so there will be no hearings for that purpose until tomorrow.

I ask that the bill be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1883) to amend the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESTORATION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT AND ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the further consideration of the conference report on the investment tax credit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the report by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes on the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, at the time that this bill was initially before us, we felt that there was a need for it in order to encourage investment and to fulfill a commitment, that when the need for the legislation had subsided, the President would recommend that the investment tax credit and the accelerated depreciation be reinstated, and that they should be placed into full operation in even a more favorable fashion for business than they had been before. That is what the conference report before us would do.

Senators know that I feel very strongly about the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act, and Senators know that I fought very strenuously against any weakening of that act. I believe that we should move forward rather than backward, and that we should not in any wise weaken that act unless we have something better to put on the books in its place.

It was not easy for me, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, to have to take to conference a Senate bill which contained the very type of provision I had fought so hard against.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT

I report to you now that while the conferees on the part of the Senate were not able to persuade the House conferees to accept all the Senate amendments, they did persuade the House conferees to recede on the Senate amendment regarding the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. In all candor, I must admit that I personally wish the House conferees had been more adamant or that I and my colleagues had been less persuasive.

The situation with regard to the Campaign Fund Act stands as it did at the conclusion of the lengthy Senate debate. The conferees agreed to the Mansfield motion as amended to include the Gore provision. Under the terms of the conference agreement, no funds can be appropriated and disbursed under the act until guidelines governing their distribution are adopted by law.

While I am on this matter, however, I want to point out that the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act has not been repealed. It remains on the statute books. The Finance Committee is ready to study guidelines under the instructions it received from the Senate. Hearings were to begin today in the committee. I have every confidence that they will lead to the development of guidelines which will satisfy a majority of the Senate. In the meantime, the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Advisory Board can be appointed, and with the Board's help the Comptroller General can begin—as I hope he will—to develop regulations for administering the act.

Now let me turn to the investment credit provisions of the bill. Three such provisions were considered by the conferees.

SUSPENSION PERIOD PROPERTY

The first investment credit provision dealt with the basic problem of defining the types of property which are to be denied the investment credit as a result of the suspension period. The conferees on the part of the House were adamant that the conference accept the definitions contained in the House version of the bill. In fact, I have never seen them more adamant on any provision. While we on our side tried hard to convince them to accept the Senate provision, the House conferees refused to yield. It was only after a difficult, long, and spirited discussion that any sort of compromise on this point was reached.

The Senators will recall that under the version of the bill approved by the Senate, the investment credit would not have been available with respect to property ordered during the suspension period or with respect to property whose construction was begun or ordered by the taxpayer during the suspension period. The only exceptions to this rule were cases in which the taxpayer had entered into a binding contract before the beginning of the suspension period.

The conferees on the part of the House felt strongly that the investment credit should be made available with respect to property acquired after the end of the suspension period regardless of the time when it was ordered. They argued that the administrative problems would be formidable if the Senate version were enacted. They argued that it would be impossible to distinguish between cases in which taxpayers canceled orders and reordered after the suspension period deliberately to evade the intent of the law and other cases in which a similar cancellation and reorder were unrelated to tax consequences. They also argued that some taxpayers were required by circumstances beyond their control to place orders or begin construction during the suspension period.

As the Senate well knows from the colloquy I had with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] last Thursday, I was not pleased with the agreement we reached on this particular provision in the conference, but after long discussion of the point, and after considering the attitude of the House conferees on this point, we concluded that we must, in large part, on this point accede to the wishes of the House if we were to obtain a conference agreement. The compromise we reached, which I will describe in just a moment, represents the most that we could obtain from the House conferees on this point. You will note that it picks up $150 million in revenue over the House version, and this, I believe, is at least one reason for favoring the conference agreement.

Under the terms of the compromise that was finally arrived at, the investment credit is denied property ordered during the suspension period—that is, before March 10—only if it was acquired before May 24, 1967. This compromise takes the House at least a short step toward the Senate provision. Property ordered during the suspension period, but delivered on or after May 24, will be eligible for the investment credit.

In connection with this basic rule, the investment credit—and in this case also, the accelerated depreciation provision—will only be denied in the case of property that is constructed if the construction was begun during the suspension period or if an order for the construction was placed during the suspension period and actual physical construction was begun before May 24. In these construction cases, the investment credit or accelerated depreciation will still be available with respect to the portion of the construction which takes place on or after May 24.

LIMITATION ON THE INVESTMENT CREDIT

Let me now turn to the remaining decisions of the conferees. Both the Senate and the House approved an increase in the existing limitation on the amount of investment credit which may be claimed by a taxpayer in any one year. Presently that limit is an amount equal to the first $25,000 of tax liability plus 25 percent of the remaining tax liability. Last year, at the time of the suspension of the investment credit, provision was made for increasing this limit to the first $25,000 of tax liability plus 50 percent of the remaining tax liability, as of the end of the suspension period. Both the House and Senate versions of this bill deal with the time when this 50-percent limit is to be put into effect.

Under the bill we approved in the Senate, the 50-percent limitation was to be available for taxable years ending after December 31, 1967. Under the House bill, the limitation was to be effective beginning March 10. The conferees on the part of the Senate receded on this matter of the effective date. The House conferees apparently felt that this earlier effective date for the 50-percent limitation was important because of concern over segments of the transportation industry, which are among the chief industries affected by the provision.

VIETNAM AIRLIFT

On the final amendment, the House conferees receded and agreed to the Senate provision which extends the investment credit to certain aircraft operating outside the United States. This is the so-called Vietnam airlift amendment. It will apply to certain aircraft operating under contract with the Defense Department to carry troops and supplies between Vietnam and foreign countries.

CONCLUSION

As for the revenue aspects of the conference report, the bill as agreed to by the conferees will involve a loss of revenue of $625 million in the 4 fiscal years 1967 through 1970 as compared to the bill as passed by the Senate. The decision regarding the definition of suspension period property reduces revenues over the 4 fiscal years by $420 million, while the change in the effective date of the 50-percent limitation will reduce revenues by $205 million. Of the total revenue loss as compared to the Senate bill, $175 million will occur in the fiscal year 1967 and $360 million will occur in the following fiscal year.

Mr. President, while the number of provisions at issue in this conference was small, the conference was one in which the issues were warmly debated—perhaps as much so as any I have participated in. Moreover, the Senate conferees acceded to the wishes of the House on the one point relating to orders and deliveries further than I wish had been necessary, but I am convinced that there was no other alternative if there were to be a conference agreement.

I urge the Senate to give its prompt approval to this report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not know whether the minority leader wishes to be here before the report is adopted, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has a statement he would like to make, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE UNITED STATES MUST PRESERVE THE PRINCIPLE OF FREE, UNHINDERED INTERNATIONAL SHIPPING THROUGH THE GULF OF AQABA

Mr. **GRUENING.** Mr. President, the ominous events in the Middle East during the past weeks, indicating a rapidly approaching crisis there, is of deep concern not only for the nations of the Middle East but for all the nations of the free world, especially the United States.

The Middle East has for far too long been under constant threat of violence instigated by dictator Nasser of Egypt, as well as the dictators of many other Arab countries.

For many years I have urged successive administrations of our Government to stop giving material aid to Nasser since such aid has enabled Egypt to carry out his openly proclaimed threat to destroy Israel, the only oasis of true democracy and civilization in the Middle East desert of backwardness and of ruthless dictatorships.

Heeding repeated congressional pleas both by myself and many of my colleagues, the Johnson administration has finally and properly cut off all aid to Egypt.

In this hour of crisis, I hope the United States will stand firm in resisting this latest Nasser threat and will not attempt to buy him off through a resumption of economic aid. There can be no compromise with blackmail or blackmailers.

The United States should insist that the international waters of the Gulf of Aqaba be kept truly free for all shipping, including ships flying the Israel flag.

When Egypt closed the straits leading into the Gulf of Aqaba except to shipping of which it approved, it committed an act of aggression not only against Israel but against the shipping of all maritime nations. The United States cannot stand idly by and permit its flagships to be searched by Egypt on the high seas.

Nor can the United States stand idly by and permit Egypt to starve Israel for the United States has definite commitments to Israel—commitments given repeatedly in no uncertain terms by Presidents from President Truman on.

I have for years on the Senate floor opposed the U.S. unilateral intervention in the civil war in Vietnam on behalf of a succession of inept, corrupt, and coup-imposed dictatorial governments of South Vietnam—governments enjoying no popular support and maintained in office only by the Armed Forces and lavish funds of the United States. On behalf of those governments the United States has unilaterally committed almost 500,000 ground troops to fight a ground war in an area which many who should know is not vital to the security of the United States, and which in his campaign pronouncements in 1964, President Johnson repeatedly indicated he would not do.

But, in recent weeks, when the security of Israel has been threatened by the aggressive actions of the Arab States, the United States, despite its many prior commitments to Israel to defend its territorial integrity, has been insistent that any action in the troubled Middle East be in concert with other nations.

That is a commendable spirit on the part of the United States. It is too bad that the United States did not exhibit a similar spirit before it escalated its involvement in Vietnam.

As the New York Times has put in its leading editorial this morning:

> In terms of American interest—as well as commitment—the Middle East is to be differentiated from Southeast Asia. The Middle East is the crossroads of the world, between Asia and Europe. It has been a strategic goal of Russia since Peter the Great. A reminder of this came only yesterday with the news that Russian warships are going to pass through the Black Sea Straits into the Eastern Mediterranean.

There can be no doubt that the United States stands overcommitted in Vietnam. But, as the New York Times states, if Washington "Now argues that it cannot afford to take on two crucial commitments at the same time, there would be another good reason to say it is time to deescalate the war in Vietnam."

There is not time for delay. The recent meetings of the Security Council of the United Nations show clearly that on a final vote—if it should come to that after days of futile debate—the sentiment will be for a breathing spell—which will give the Arab nations time to consolidate their positions while Israel starves.

As the noted historian Barbara Tuchman stated in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post on May 30, 1967:

> Meanwhile let us at least stop pretending; let us stop using the words Peace and Freedom as nice white verbal bandages to cover the gangrene underneath. I for one have had enough of hearing these words mouthed by administration spokesmen as an incantation to bewitch us into supposing that carnage in Vietnam is "freedom" and scuttle in the Middle East is "peace."

Therefore, if the other free nations should refuse or abstain from joining the United States, then the United States should not hesitate unilaterally to honor its pledges to guarantee the freedom and independence of Israel for the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba by Egypt can be viewed only as an act of aggression against that freedom and independence.

To fulfill its pledges to Israel, the United States should deploy at once the necessary units of its Armed Forces to protect all shipping desiring to pass through the Gulf of Aqaba en route to Israel, regardless of cargo and without inspection or harassment by Egypt or its allies.

As noted columnist James Reston stated in his column in the New York Times this morning entitled "Geneva: Europe's Second Thoughts on the Cold War":

> What the allies in Europe are watching now is whether the United States, which is commited to freedom of maritime commerce and the security of Israel, will apply these arguments to the Middle East crisis as Johnson has to the Southeast Asian crisis, and the paradox of it is that many of the Europeans who have been most critical of his use of force in Southeast Asia are now afraid he might not follow this line in the Middle East.

There is no other honorable course for the United States to follow than to use its forces not only to uphold the principle of freedom of the seas but also to honor its many commitments to preserve and protect the integrity of Israel.

It would be my hope that both Jordan and Saudi Arabia would immediately be warned by the United States that the military equipment which the United States gave them was for the purpose of fighting Communist aggression and not for the purpose of fighting an aggressive war against Israel.

In view of the belligerent attitudes expressed in recent days by both these Arab countries and their mobilization actions, the United States should immediately stop all military aid shipments to these countries. It was a tragic mistake for the United States to supply them with arms at all. The consequences of that folly were foreseeable.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks the editorial from the New York Times of May 31, 1967, entitled "Middle East and/or Vietnam," the column by James Reston in the New York Times for May 31, 1967, entitled "Geneva: Europe's Second Thoughts on the Cold War" and the letter to the editor of the Washington Post, printed on May 30, 1967, from Barbara W. Tuchman entitled "Guns of May?"

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 31, 1967]

MIDDLE EAST AND/OR VIETNAM

The issues in the Middle Eastern conflict are being confused by some commentators and critics with the very different issues involved in Vietnam. Just as spokesmen for the Johnson Administration have drawn false parallels between appeasement of Hitler and what was described as appeasement of Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung, so now the terms "hawk" and "dove" are being loosely applied to the Middle East as if they had the same connotation as in Vietnam.

It is neither accidental nor illogical that many of the same Americans who are calling for descalation and unconditional negotiations in Southeast Asia also call for firmness on the part of the United States in insisting on freedom of passage to the Gulf of Aqaba and on honoring American commitments to defend the sovereignty and independence of Israel.

The United States had no such commitments with regard to South Vietnam, least of all to fight a virtually unilateral and major war on behalf of Saigon. In 1954, when the SEATO treaty was signed, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles specifically ruled out "unilateral armed intervention." While SEATO's economic and defensive commitments were indeed extended in a protocol to South Vietnam, along with Cambodia and Laos, Saigon was not even a party to the SEATO treaty.

The other major document sometimes cited by the Johnson Administration as a commitment to Saigon was a letter from President Eisenhower to President Diem of South Vietnam on Oct. 23, 1954. In it General Eisenhower wrote of aid to Saigon, the purpose of which would be "to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." However, this aid was made dependent of President Diem creating a Government "enlightened in purpose and effective in performance." Diem failed signally to do this, as virtually every Vietnamese from Premier Ky down now recognizes.

President Kennedy just before his death and President Johnson as late as 1964 both insisted—in Mr. Johnson's words—that the war in Vietnam "ought to be fought by the boys of Asia," not by Americans. Israel is not asking the United States to fight for her. There is no commitment to do so, and in present circumstances no need to do so.

But there are commitments, which can be documented precisely, by every American President since Truman to defend the sovereignty and independence of Israel, and there are also commitments by Presidents Eisenhower and Johnson in favor of upholding the right of free passage through the Strait of Tiran into the Gulf of Aqaba.

In terms of American interest—as well as commitment—the Middle East is to be differentiated from Southeast Asia. The Middle East is the crossroads of the world, between Asia and Europe. It has been a strategic goal of Russia since Peter the Great. A reminder of this came only yesterday with the news that Russian warships are going to pass through the Black Sea Straits into the Eastern Mediterranean.

In its great-power aspect the Middle Eastern crisis shapes up as a confrontation of the Soviet Union versus the United States. As the British and French were gradually forced out of the area following World War II, the United States took their place. The region is now of paramount strategic importance to this country, whereas until escalation of the Vietnam war, Southeast Asia was only a marginal power factor for the United States.

The Persian Gulf area produces 27 percent of the world's petroleum and has proved global reserves of 60 per cent. American firms have a gross investment in the region of more than $2,500,000,000. There is nothing comparable in American interests that can be said of the Southeast Asian peninsula.

The American position has now reached the ironical stage where virtually every argument advanced for the Vietnam war—commitments, honor, security, interests, consistency, the self-determination of small nations—could be used in favor of helping Israel. However, it is not necessary nor is it valid to make such comparisons. These are two separate problems calling for different solutions, but they are alike in that they both require major policy decisions in 1967.

If Washington now argues that it cannot afford to take on two crucial commitments at the same time, this would be another good reason to say it is time to deescalate the war in Vietnam.

[From the New York Times, May 31, 1967]

GENEVA: EUROPE'S SECOND THOUGHTS ON THE COLD WAR

(By James Reston)

GENEVA, May 30.—The vicious Middle East controversy has startled our old friends and allies in Western Europe. They have been saying the cold war was over in this part of the world (blaming Washington for not knowing it), but now they are not so sure.

The Arab-Israeli crisis is a little nearer Europe than Vietnam. It is in an area where Britain and France still have important interests. Moscow is backing the Arabs and Washington is sort of backing Israel, and this has produced some interesting reactions.

All the Western European governments are playing for time. They are talking about Four-Power conferences, appeals to the World Court, and resolutions at the United Nations—all of which meet with objections from one side or the other—and they are waiting for a lead from President Johnson, who in turn, and not unnaturally, is waiting this time to see who will be with him if he challenges Nasser's blockade.

THE GATEKEEPERS

Europe has a special interest in the key issue in this Middle Eastern conflict. It is a sea-girt continent trading in the world. It is full of vast inland seas whose waters wash the shores of many lands but narrow down into gateways that could be controlled by other nations standing at the gate.

The nations of Europe, despite their ancient enmities, live too close together to accept Nasser's assertion that he has the right to close the gate to the Gulf of Aqaba just because he happens to dislike the Israelis who live inside. On that basis, Finland, Poland and even the Soviet Union couldn't get out of the Baltic, and the Black Sea powers, including the U.S.S.R., might not be able to enjoy "free and innocent passage" past the Turkish guns at the Dardanelles.

JOHNSON'S DILEMMAS

The legalities in the Arab-Israeli dispute at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba may be different, but the basic point is the same. Nasser is claiming not only the right to blockade Israel but to destroy her, and even Europe in her present mood of isolation and wishful thinking is not prepared to minimize Nasser's challenge.

Accordingly, the allies are turning to President Johnson, and he couldn't possibly be in a more difficult position, for all his arguments in defense of his Vietnam policy apply with even greater force in the Arab-Israeli dispute.

He has argued that he must keep his commitments in Vietnam or all his other commitments and hopes of world order are worthless. He has asserted that the United States must keep its international contracts even if the other parties to those contracts fail to do so. He has set out to block the expansion of Communist influence in areas vital to the interests of the United States. And he has said, in effect, that great risks and sacrifices must be taken in Vietnam in order to avoid greater risks and sacrifices elsewhere later on.

What the allies in Europe are watching now is whether the United States, which is committed to freedom of maritime commerce and the security of Israel, will apply these arguments to the Middle East crisis as Johnson has to the Southeast Asian crisis, and the paradox of it is that many of the Europeans who have been most critical of his use of force in Southeast Asia are now afraid he might not follow this line in the Middle East.

EUROPE'S MOOD

This is obviously a devilish dilemma for a President who has over half a million men engaged in a war in Southeast Asia and a quarter of a million standing guard in Europe, while France leads a campaign against American influence in Europe and American intervention in Asia.

"The United States," says The Telegraph in London, "is unequivocally committed to defending Israel against aggression, and Egypt, by closing the Gulf is equally clearly committing an act of aggression. Britain has only a secondary role to play in this drama. She can, in essence, only either help or hinder the United States. It is time the [British] Government made its intention clear. It would be only to compound the error of Suez to allow any sense of guilt about that operation to stand in the way of clear and decisive action now."

The former British Foreign Secretary, Selwyn Lloyd, has been more precise. "The proper course is for the United States and Britain . . . to declare boldly that they will assert the right of free passage of their ships into the Gulf of Aqaba, whatever their destination and whatever their cargo. If that right is disputed, military force will be used to sustain it. I believe a clear declaration of that sort is the best way to keep the peace. . . ."

The rest of Europe is less bold, but the mood in this part of the world is much sterner than it was a month ago. The Middle East crisis has not yet reunited the allies, but it has made them question their optimism of the past, and President Johnson is obviously waiting to see what action they intend to take to back up their bolder words.

[From the Washington Post, May 30, 1967]

GUNS OF MAY?

In the crisis in the Middle East we have come to a moment of truth for this country and for the community of Western democracies. Aqaba is the crux. If the President of the United States can state as a principle that the Gulf of Aqaba is an international waterway and that a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal, and thereafter not only do nothing to implement the principle but stand by while it is violated, then we have indeed reached the ultimate paralysis of power.

This is not a process new in history. It happened to the dinosaur, it happened to the Dreadnaught and it can happen to us.

With regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict it has been a creeping paralysis for the past 10 years. After Israel's withdrawal from the Sinai peninsula, under American pressure and on the promise that her maritime outlet through the Gulf was assured, President Eisenhower engaged to use American influence and best efforts for the reopening of the Suez Canal to Israel's ships. No such efforts were ever made or even attempted by his or by succeeding administrations. We can take no comfort in being a major power if we cannot exercise the will and the strength that goes with the status.

This is—or should be—an American, not a Jewish issue. It is the American reputation that is at stake. If the United States in this crisis fails to support its stated position, because of involvement in Vietnam, then the uneasy rationale—called "resistance to aggression"—of our battle over there collapses hollowly and publicly. While we claim to fight for it in the Far East, it is nullified in the Near East, closer to home.

Israel represents the land and the nation which were the source of the Judaeo-Christian tradition to which we and the other Western nations belong and which, presumably, we uphold. As such it seems to me obvious that its integrity and security, not to say its survival, is a closer concern of ours than that of South Vietnam. To sacrifice the land of our spiritual birth, the land as an Englishman said "to which we all turn our faces in the grave," while we fight for that great democrat, Premier Ky, is an extreme of absurdity.

Yet the crisis could be our opportunity—if we met it with the nerve and firmness of intent that served us in the Cuban missile crisis. It could be used to restore the prestige we have lost, not by futile fiddling in the U.N. but by straightforward independent action, the only kind that can be effective.

To wait for multilateral action by the so-called family of nations is useless; as far as concerns ability to act jointly and effectively for the maintenance of security, the family of nations is an illusion with which we comfort ourselves like a teething-ring. The meetings of the Security Council, as anyone knows who has attended or listened to them, have become a cynical farce.

Independent action in support of our stated policy is not intervention, nor is it something to be afraid of. Taken with courage and conviction it is what the world is waiting for—from us. It could win back the world's respect and, what is more important, self-respect.

Aqaba is the test from which the Arab nations, and behind them all the nations of Asia and Africa who are watching the performance, will take their cue. If we fail to act to confirm the principle of freedom of navigation, every person in every one of these countries will take note.

The sacrifice of Israel will not buy us time—and certainly not honor, though that is perhaps beside the point. Rather it will hasten the time that is closing in. If the Arabs, with Russia at their back, are successful in this challenge which U Thant's precipitous collapse so unexpectedly widened for them, then the period remaining to us, that is to the Western democracies, is shorter than I had supposed.

Meanwhile let us at least stop pretending; let us stop using the words Peace and Freedom as nice white verbal bandages to cover the gangrene underneath. I for one have had enough of hearing these words mouthed by administration spokesmen as an incantation to bewitch us into supposing that carnage in Vietnam is "freedom" and scuttle in the Middle East is "peace."

BARBARA W. TUCHMAN.

COS COB, CONN.

RESTORATION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT AND ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO MEET DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW — UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to sit and to conduct hearings, if need be, tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, let us wait and see what the business is tomorrow. Perhaps we can work it out. After all, we cannot be in both places. I think it will be all right tomorrow. I understand the committee is meeting tomorrow morning. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; it is intended that the committee will meet tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We can see what the business of the Senate is tomorrow.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana tell us when he thinks we will have hearings on the debt ceiling, which expires the end of this June? Will that be before taking up the question of the censure of the Senator from Connecticut or afterward?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am in no position to say at this moment when I will suggest hearings on the debt ceiling. It would be my thought that we would definitely conduct hearings and we will have completed our action well before the debt ceiling expires, if I have anything to say about it. This bill is not expected to be passed by the House of Representatives, however, until June 7 or 8. We could not meet before that time. It would be the thought of the junior Senator from Louisiana that we would conduct hearings sometime after the House has concluded its hearings and that we would attempt to bring the bill before the Senate with sufficient time for adequate debate.

I am well aware of the record Senators have made on the subject. I shall conduct myself in light of the views of Senators and in light of the statements which I have made on the floor concerning this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator insist on his request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, Mr. President, I believe it was objected to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING CONSIDERATION OF SENATE RESOLUTION 112 RELATING TO SENATOR DODD

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader further with respect to committee hearings beginning 2 weeks from yesterday; namely, the 13th of June, when we take up the resolution relating to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the time limitation on the bill now being considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare expires on the 19th of next month. It would be my hope—and this is in accord with the notice given to the Senate—that there would be no committee meetings of any kind beginning on June 13 for the duration of the consideration of the Dodd resolution. This would apply also to the Appropriations Committee.

It would be my further hope—and I assume that the Senate would agree with me—that we would stay with the resolution, S. 112, which would be the pending matter at that time, until it is disposed of, and that we will come in early and stay late.

I believe we already have an order for the Senate to come in at 10 o'clock on the morning of June 13.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN VETERANS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 16, for its disposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 16) to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967".

TITLE I—PENSION BENEFITS

ENLARGING WIDOWS' ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

SEC. 101. (a) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of sections 302(a), 404, 532(d), 534(c), 536(c), and 541(e), title 38, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(2) for one year or more; or

"(3) for any period of time if a child was born of the marriage, or was born to them before the marriage.".

(b) Subsection 103(a), title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "cohabitated with him for five or more years immediately before his death," and inserting in lieu thereof "cohabited with him for one year or more immediately before his death, or for any period of time if a child was born of the purported marriage or was born to them before such marriage,".

PERMANENT AND TOTAL DISABILITY AT AGE SIXTY-FIVE; AID AND ATTENDANCE ALLOWANCE FOR PERSONS IN NURSING HOMES

SEC. 102. (a) Subsection (a) of section 502 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "disabled if he is" the following: "sixty-five years of age or older or".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 502 is amended by inserting "(1) a patient in a nursing home or (2)" immediately after "if he is".

EXCLUSION FROM ANNUAL INCOME

SEC. 103. (a) Paragraph (7) of section 503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "amounts paid by" the following: "a wife of a veteran for the expenses of his last illness, and by".

(b) Paragraph (9) of such section 503 is amended by inserting "(A)" immediately after "amounts paid" and by inserting the following immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof: "or (B) by a widow or a wife of a deceased veteran for the last illness and burial of a child of such veteran".

(c)(1) Such section 503 is further amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(14) payments of annuities elected under chapter 73 of title 10."

(2) Section 415(g)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended (A) by inserting "and under the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959" immediately before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (C), (B) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and (C) by

adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(M) payments of annuities elected under chapter 73 of title 10."

(3) Section 1441 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "except section 415(g) and chapter 15 of title 38".

PENSION INCREASES FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT

SEC. 104. (a) The table in subsection (b) of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$600	$104
$600	1,200	79
1,200	1,800	45".

(b) The table in subsection (c) of such section 521 is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I		Column II	Column III	Column IV
Annual income				
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	One dependent	Two dependents	Three or more dependents
	$1,000	$109	$114	$119
$1,000	2,000	84	84	84
2,000	3,000	50	50	50".

(c) Subsection (e) of such section 521 is amended by striking out "$35" and inserting in lieu thereof "$40".

PENSION INCREASES FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF WARS BEFORE WORLD WAR I

SEC. 105. Sections 531, 532(a)(2), 534(a)(2), and 536(a) of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "$65" and inserting in lieu thereof in each such section "$70".

PENSION INCREASES FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT

SEC. 106. (a) The table in subsection (b) of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$600	$70
$600	1,200	51
1,200	1,800	29".

(b) The table in subsection (c) of such section 541 is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$86
$1,000	2,000	67
2,000	3,000	45".

(c) Subsection (d) of such section 541 is amended by striking out "$15" and inserting in lieu thereof "$16".

PENSION INCREASES FOR CHILDREN OF DECEASED VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT

SEC. 107. Subsection (a) of section 542 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$38" and "$15" and inserting in lieu thereof "$40" and "$16", respectively.

AID AND ATTENDANCE ALLOWANCE FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF ALL PERIODS OF WAR

SEC. 108. (a) Subchapter III of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF ALL PERIODS OF WAR

"§ 544. Aid and attendance allowance

"If any widow who is entitled to pension under this subchapter or the provisions of this title as in effect on June 30, 1960, is in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly rate of pension payable to her under this subchapter or such provisions, as the case may be, shall be increased by $50."

(b) The analysis of such subchapter III, after the heading of such chapter, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF ALL PERIODS OF WAR

"544. Aid and attendance allowance."

THERAPEUTIC AND REHABILITATIVE DEVICES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

SEC. 109. Subsection (b) of section 617 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "to any veteran" and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "to any veteran in receipt of pension under chapter 15 of this title based on need of regular aid and attendance."

PENSION FOR "OLD LAW" VETERANS WHO ARE HOUSEBOUND

SEC. 110. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay to a veteran who is entitled to pension under section 521 to title 38, United States Code, as in effect on June 30, 1960, and who—

(1) has, in addition to a disability rated as permanent and total, additional disability or disabilities independently ratable at 60 per centum or more, or

(2) by reason of his disability or disabilities, is permanently housebound but does not qualify for pension under such section 521 based on need of regular aid and attendance,

in lieu of the pension otherwise payable to him under such section 521, a pension at the monthly rate of $100.

AID AND ATTENDANCE ALLOWANCE—INDIAN AND SPANISH AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

SEC. 111. (a) Section 511(c) of the title 38, United States Code, is amended by (1) inserting "(1)" immediately before "Any"; (2) inserting ", except as provided in paragraph (2)" immediately before the period at the end thereof; and (3) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) The Administrator shall pay each month to each veteran of the Indian Wars who is receiving, or entitled to receive, pension based on a need of regular aid and attendance, whichever amount is greater (A) that provided by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section, or (B) that which is payable to the veteran under section 521 of this title if he has elected, or would be payable if he were to elect, to receive pension under such section pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection. Each change in the amount of pension payment required by this paragraph shall be effective as of the first day of the month during which the facts of the particular case warrant such change, and shall be made without specific application therefor."

(b) Section 512(a)(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by (1) inserting "(A)" immediately before "Any"; (2) inserting ", except as provided in subparagraph (B)" immediately before the period at the end thereof; and (3) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(B) The Administrator shall pay each month to each Spanish-American War veteran who is receiving, or entitled to receive, pension based on a need of regular aid and attendance, whichever amount is greater (i) that provided by subparagraph (B) of subsection (a)(1) of this section, or (ii) that which is payable to the veteran under section 521 of this title if he has elected, or would be payable if he were to elect, to receive pension under such section pursuant to subparagraph (A) of this paragraph. Each change in the amount of pension payment required by this subparagraph shall be effective as of the first day of the month during which the facts of the particular case warrant such change, and shall be made without specific application therefor."

TITLE II—ADDITIONAL READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS

COMPENSATION

SEC. 201. (a) Section 310 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "during a period of war" the following: "or on or after August 5, 1964".

(b) Section 312 of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "period of war" the following: "or on or after August 5, 1964,".

(c) Section 331 of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "during other than a period of war" the following: "or a period beginning on or after August 5, 1964".

PENSION

SEC. 202. (a) Section 501 of title 38, United State Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) The term 'Vietnam conflict' means the period beginning August 5, 1964, and ending on such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or the Korean conflict" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict".

(c) Such section 521 is further amended by—

(1) striking out "or the Korean conflict" in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (g), and inserting in lieu thereof "the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict",

(2) striking out "or the Korean conflict" in paragraph (3) of such subsection (g), and inserting in lieu thereof ", the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict", and

(3) inserting "(including the Vietnam conflict)" in paragraph (4) of such subsection (g) immediately before the period at the end thereof.

(d) The catchline of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict"

(e) Subsection (a) of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or the Korean conflict" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict".

(f) Paragraph (1) of subsection (e) of such section is amended by inserting immediately after "Korean conflict veteran" the following: ", or (D) before the expiration of ten years following termination of the Vietnam conflict in the case of a widow of a Vietnam conflict veteran".

(g) The catchline of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 541. Widows of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam conflict veterans"

(h) Subsection (a) of section 542 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or the Korean conflict" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict".

(i) The catchline of section 542 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 542. Children of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam conflict veterans"

(j) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "521. Veterans of World War I, World War II or the Korean conflict." and substituting in lieu thereof

"521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict ';

by striking out the subheading

"World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict"

and substituting in lieu thereof

"World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and the Vietnam conflict";

by striking out

"541. Widows of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans."

and substituting in lieu thereof

"541. Widows of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam conflict veterans.";

and by striking out

"542. Children of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans."

and substituting in lieu thereof

"542. Children of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam conflict veterans."

(k) Chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out the subheading "WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT" immediately preceding section 541 of such title, and substituting in lieu thereof "WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, THE KOREAN CONFLICT, AND THE VIETNAM CONFLICT".

HOSPITAL, DOMICILIARY, AND MEDICAL CARE

SEC. 203. (a) Section 602 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 602. Presumption relating to psychosis

"For the purposes of this chapter, any veteran of World War II, the Korean conflict, or of service after January 31, 1955, who developed an active psychosis (1) within two years after his discharge or release from the active military, naval, or air service, and (2) before July 26, 1949, in the case of a veteran of World War II, or February 1, 1957, in the case of a veteran of the Korean conflict, shall be deemed to have incurred such disability in the active military, naval, or air service.".

(b) Subsection (h) of section 612 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The Administrator shall furnish to each veteran who is receiving additional compensation or allowance under chapter 11, or increased pension as a veteran of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict, by reason of being in need of regular aid and attendance, such drugs and medicines as may be ordered on prescription of a duly licensed physician as specific therapy in the treatment of any illness or injury suffered by such veteran. As used in this subsection, the term 'Vietnam conflict' has the meaning given it by section 501(4) of this title."

(c)(1) Section 601(4)(C)(ii) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "veterans of any war" the following: "or of service after January 31, 1955".

(2) Section 601(4)(C)(iii) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "veterans of any war" the following: "or of service after January 31, 1955,".

(d) Section 624(c) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "veteran of any war" the following: "or of service after January 31, 1955,".

(e) Sections 641 and 643 of such title are each amended by inserting immediately after "veteran of any war" the following: "or of service after January 31, 1955,".

(f) Sections 5031(a) and 5034(1) of such title are each amended by striking "war veteran population" and inserting in lieu thereof "population of war veterans and veterans of service after January 31, 1955,".

(g) Sections 5032 and 5036 of such title 38 are each amended by inserting immediately after "war veterans" the following: "and veterans of service after January 31, 1955".

(h) Section 5034(1) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "war veterans" the following: "and veterans of service after January 31, 1955,".

(i) Section 5035(a)(4) of such title is amended by inserting "and veterans of service after January 31, 1955," immediately after "war veterans" the first time it appears therein, and by inserting "or veterans of service after January 31, 1955" immediately after "war veterans" the second time it appears therein.

(j) Section 5035(b)(4) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "war veterans" the following: "and veterans of service after January 31, 1955,".

SPECIALLY EQUIPPED AUTOMOBILES

SEC. 204. (a) Section 1901 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and by adding after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

"(b) The benefits of this chapter shall also be made available to each veteran who is suffering from any disability described in subsection (a), if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service after January 31, 1955, and if the injury was incurred or the disease was contracted in line of duty as a direct result of the performance of military duty."

(b) Section 1905 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by striking out at the beginning of the first sentence thereof "The benefits", and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the benefits", and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b)(1) In the case of any veteran who is eligible for the benefits provided in this chapter by reason of section 1901(b) and who was discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service before the effective date of this subsection, any applicable time limitation contained in subsection (a) of this section which otherwise would have begun to run before the effective date of this subsection shall not begin to run until that date.

"(2) In the case of any veteran whose entitlement to the benefits provided in this chapter first arose by reason of the enactment of Public Law 85–857, application for such benefits may, notwithstanding the time limitations contained in subsection (a) of this section, be made within one year from the effective date of the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967."

BURIAL ALLOWANCE

SEC. 205. (a) Section 902(a)(2)(A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "war" the following: "or of service on or after August 5, 1964".

(b) If the burial allowance authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, is payable solely by virtue of the enactment of this Act, the two-year period for filing applications, referred to in section 904 of such title 38, shall not end, with respect to an individual whose death occurred prior to the effective date of this Act, before the expiration of the two-year period which begins on the effective date of this Act, or, in any case involving the correction of a discharge after the effective date of this Act, before the expiration of two years from the date of such correction.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

STATUTORY AWARDS

SEC. 301. Section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(k) if the veteran, as the result of service-connected disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one or more creative organs, or one foot, or one hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, or has suffered complete organic aphonia with constant inability to communicate by speech, or deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction, the rate of compensation therefore shall be $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use independent of any other compensation provided in subsections (a) through (j) or subsection (s) of this section but in no event to exceed $400 per month; and in the event the veteran has suffered one or more of the disabilities heretofore specified in this subsection, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subsections (l) through (n) of this section, the rate of compensation shall be increased by $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed $600 per month;".

BURIAL FLAGS FOR CERTAIN IN-SERVICE DEATHS

SEC. 302. Section 901 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection "(d)" at the end thereof to read as follows:

"(d) In the case of any person who died while in the active military, naval, or air service after May 27, 1941, the Administrator shall furnish a flag to the next of kin, or to such other person as the Administrator deems most appropriate, if such next of kin or other person is not otherwise entitled to receive a flag under this section, or under section 1482(a) of title 10, United States Code."

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED

SEC. 303. (a) Subchapter III of chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1677. Special training for the educationally disadvantaged

"(a) In the case of any eligible veteran who—

"(1) has not received a secondary school diploma (or an equivalency certificate) at the time of his discharge from active duty, or

"(2) in order to pursue a program of education for which he would otherwise be eligible needs additional secondary school training, either refresher courses or deficiency courses, to qualify for admission to an appropriate educational institution,

the Administrator may, without regard to so much of the provisions of section 1671 as prohibit the enrollment of an eligible veteran in a program of education in which he is 'already qualified', approve the enrollment of such veteran in appropriate course or courses; except that no enrollment in adult evening secondary school courses shall be approved in excess of half-time training as defined pursuant to section 1683 of this title.

"(b) The Administrator shall pay to an eligible veteran pursuing a course or courses pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, an educational assistance allowance as provided in sections 1681 and 1682 of this chapter.

"(c) The educational assistance allowance authorized by this section shall be paid without charge to any period of entitlement the veteran may have earned pursuant to section 1661(a) of this chapter."

(b)(1) The analysis at the head of chapter 34, title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after "1676. Education outside the United States." the following:

"1677. Special training for the educationally disadvantaged."

(2) Section 1661(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "subsection (c)" the following: "and in section 1677 of this chapter".

(c) Where the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds that an eligible veteran has since June 1, 1966, and prior to the enactment of this section, received educational assistance while pursuing a course or courses of education to which he would have been entitled under section 1677, without charge to entitlement, he may restore to the veteran any period of entitlement expended in the pursuit of such course or courses.

INCREASE IN RATES OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ALLOWANCES

Sec. 304. (a) The table in section 1682 (a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I	Column II	Column III	Column IV
Type of program	No dependents	One dependent	Two or more dependents
Institutional:			
Full time	$130	$155	$175
Three-quarter time	95	115	135
Half time	60	75	85
Cooperative	105	125	145".

(b) Section 1682(b)(2)(B) of such title is amended by striking out "$100" and inserting in lieu thereof "$130".

PERIOD OF ELIGIBILITY, WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Sec. 305. (a) Section 1712(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "twenty-third birthday" each place where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-sixth birthday".

(b) In the case of any eligible person (within the meaning of section 1701(a)(1) or 1765 (a) of title 38, United States Code) who is made eligible for educational assistance under the provisions of chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, solely by virtue of the amendments made by subsection (a) of this section, and who on the effective date of this Act is below the age of twenty-six years, the period referred to in section 1712 of such title shall not end with respect to such person until the expiration of the five-year period which begins on the effective date of this Act, excluding from such five-year period any period of time which may elapse between the date on which application for benefits of such chapter 35 is filed on behalf of such person and the date of final approval of such application by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; but in no event shall educational assistance under such chapter 35 be afforded to any eligible person beyond his thirty-first birthday by reason of this section.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 306. This Act shall take effect on July 1, 1967.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the rates of pension payable to certain veterans and their widows, to provide additional readjustment assistance for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the message is before the Senate for its disposition.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 1, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 31, 1967:

TARIFF COMMISSION

Bruce E. Clubb, of Virginia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1971, vice Joseph E. Talbot, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Joe Hodson O43268, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general, Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3442, and 3447.

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Joseph Fuller, O22901, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as the Assistant Judge Advocate General, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general, Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3442, and 3447.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, having designated him for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of that section.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

District of Columbia Crime Reduction Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, recent, shocking crimes here in the Nation's Capital have made it apparent that new legislation is needed now. Washington plays host to millions of foreign and American visitors each year. It should be a model city.

I have today cosponsored with my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS], the District of Columbia Crime Reduction Act of 1967. This bill would reduce and improve criminal procedures in the District of Columbia.

It would embody the proposals of the President for combating crime in Washington and is the result of a recommendation by the President's Crime Commission that a sweeping attack be made on crime across the country, starting here in Washington.

According to the terms of the bill I have cosponsored today, the District of Columbia Police Department would be expanded and reorganized. The U.S. attorney's and corporation counsel's offices would be expanded. There would be expansion and procedural reorganization of criminal trial sections of the District and District of Columbia sessions courts. Criminal law would undergo reform both substantively and procedurally. Correctional institutions and probationary departments would be reorganized and expanded as would social rehabilitation programs.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the 90th Congress will realize the urgency involved in passing this bill.

Archbishop John J. Krol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the entire Cleveland community and the citizens of Ohio join in rejoicing at the nomination of Archbishop John J. Krol, of Philadelphia, as one of the new cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church.

Archbishop John Krol is a native of Cleveland, Ohio, and a longtime resident of my congressional district where he was born. His appointment as a cardinal comes as no surprise. We in the Cleveland area have long known of his dedication and devotion to his religious duties and his support of community endeavors. His career as a priest, a bishop, and an archbishop has been an inspiration to the entire community and to the vocations.

Archbishop Krol, since his ordination at St. John's Cathedral in 1937, has devoted his life to the cause of the common man. He has sought to promote religious freedom, tear down the source of tyranny and oppression, and develop a spirit of religious brotherhood. He has remained steadfast to these high purposes through his work as a teacher in canon law.

The people to whom he ministered in the Diocese of Cleveland found in Cardinal-elect Krol an extraordinary warmth and humility which exemplifies his dedication and his devotion to his religious calling and to the high principles for which he has stood throughout his career. These qualities have now been recognized by His Holiness Pope Paul VI.

The appointment of Archbishop Krol to cardinal comes at an early age and at a time when men of such understanding and vitality are needed to carry forth with fervor the changing role of the church in our troubled society.

On behalf of a grateful community, I want to express heartiest best wishes to Cardinal-elect John J. Krol on this memorable occasion.

Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, when the House considered the Elementary and Secondary Education Act my colleague from Iowa, Fred Schwengel, gave a speech which supported the Quie amendment.

Fred Schwengel's remarks were to the point. They constituted a formidable argument for the Quie amendment and the need to return control of education to State and local officials.

Fred Schwengel is well qualified to speak on the topic of education. He served in the Iowa House of Representatives for 10 years. His record on education while serving in the Iowa Legislature was remarkable. For 8 years he served as chairman of the schools and textbooks committee.

Under Fred Schwengel's leadership the principle of State aid to education was first established. He led the fight for both general and supplemental aid for the schools of Iowa.

He led the fight for teacher security in Iowa.

He began the fight which took the superintendent of public instruction out of politics.

He fought for a better retirement system for schoolteachers in Iowa.

He fought for minimum salaries for teachers in Iowa.

Fred Schwengel also fought for adequate funds for the State colleges and universities in Iowa.

The late Dr. Virgil Hancher, who served as president of the University of Iowa, has been quoted as saying, "Education in Iowa has had no better friend than Fred Schwengel."

As a former member of the Iowa Legislature I can attest to the fact that Fred Schwengel provided constructive and forward-looking leadership in education for Iowa. He has continued to provide that kind of leadership in the Congress.

Your Opinion, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, for several years it has been my custom to take samplings of public opinion in my congressional district.

For each Member of the Congress, keeping aware of the thoughts and beliefs of his constituents is his foremost duty, yet it is not an easy one.

In addition to the thousands of letters, telegrams, and telephone calls I receive, I appreciate the opportunity for personal contact with the voters. Obviously, we cannot contact them all as frequently as we would like and the opinion poll is a useful supplement.

I have found such questionnaires to be helpful to me in measuring public interest and attitudes on important matters before the Congress. This year I am again asking for "Your Opinion, Please."

The Vietnam war affects the life of every American, and debate on what we should do becomes more widespread daily. Is this a time to "build bridges" with the Communist bloc? Should we recognize Red China? How should the Federal Government pay its bills?

It is hard to select the right questions on foreign and domestic policy and phrase them so the answer is not influenced by the question. I have tried to pick the best possible questions and, in addition, have also asked what the individual feels is our major problem today.

The replies will be tabulated, the results inserted in the Congressional Record, and a copy of the results sent to those who have been polled. Following are the questions I am asking this year:

DO YOU FAVOR

1. In Vietnam: (check one)
   (*a*) doing whatever necessary to win.
   (*b*) continuing present course.
   (*c*) holding present position and trying to negotiate.
   (*d*) withdrawal.
2. Increased trade with European Communist countries?
3. Recognizing and trading with Red China?
4. Federal Government meeting its expenses by: (check one)
   (*a*) Increasing Federal taxes.
   (*b*) Cutting domestic spending.
   (*c*) Deficit financing.
5. Sharing Federal tax revenues with States?
6. Developing nation-wide anti-missile defense system?
7. Continuing space program to land a man on the moon by 1970?
8. Individual income tax credits for higher education?
9. U.S. policy in the Middle East should be: (check one)
   (*a*) Direct military intervention.
   (*b*) Economic and political measures only.
   (*c*) Refer the matter to the United Nations.
   (*d*) Strict "Hands Off" policy.
10. What do you think is our major problem today? (check one)
   (*a*) Vietnam.
   (*b*) Crime.
   (*c*) Inflation.
   (*d*) Other ______________________

Buckeye Sugars Seed-to-Market Agricultural Program for El Salvador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, in these days when the Congress is being asked to appropriate huge sums for foreign aid projects whose merits may not always be as clear as we could wish, the House will be pleased to hear of the imaginative new project developed by a company in my district for El Salvador called the seed-to-market program. The initial allocation for a positive program of agricultural development on behalf of our great Central American partner in the Alliance for Progress, El Salvador, is but $8,750 and deserving of attention and study. This self-help program could relieve us of the necessity for endless expenditures in this part of the world.

As conceived and presented by the management of Buckeye Sugars, Inc., of Ottwa, Ohio, I am told the seed-to-market project developed by the company in cooperation with our outstanding rural development officers in El Salvador and prepared for the U.S. AID mission there will:

First, train Central Americans in the complete spectrum of modern agricultural marketing; and

Second, demonstrate modern agricultural marketing processes to Salvadoran farmers.

I am advised the company plans to use a prototype plant already built with U.S. AID to help but never operated because of lack of competent supervision. It will also use lands owned by the school of agriculture of the Government of El Salvador to demonstrate methods of growing commodities for market, starting with the soil and carrying through the entire marketing process.

Technical personnel of Buckeye Sugars, Inc., will cover each phase of the program with specialists. International Vice President John B. Coke is already in El Salvador, prepared to act as liaison officer and project administrator. President James A. Yuenger has just returned from a 6-week tour of planning and preparation in Central America.

The initial allocation of $8,750 has been formally requested by Buckeye Sugars, and I am informed approved by the USDA rural development officers in El Salvador, with enthusiasm. The Minister of Agriculture and the superintendent of the school of agriculture have made their formal request for this project to U.S. AID/El Salvador. The initial sum is to be used to structure the entire 3-year program, prepare cost estimates, and provide preliminary estimates of project requirements for personnel and equipment. In order to meet budgetary deadlines of the Government of El Salvador, this initial fund will have to be allocated at an early date.

When Is a Drug Handbook Not a Handy Book?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a book entitled "The Handbook of Prescription Drugs," written by Dr. Richard Burack, has been referred to in connection with the current drug hearings being conducted by the Monopoly Subcommittee, Select Committee on Small Business. This "handbook" includes what purports to be a list of approved drug suppliers for the Armed Forces. Since this conflicts with my own understanding of the Defense Department's procurement program, I initiated an inquiry with the Defense Supply Agency. In response to my inquiry, the Defense Supply Agency suggests that "The Handbook of Prescription Drugs" is usually not a very handy book at all. Both letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1967.

Mr. HAROLD J. MARGULIS,
Acting Deputy Executive Director, Procurement and Production, Defense Supply Agency, Alexandria, Va.

DEAR MR. MARGULIS: A book intitled "The Handbook of Prescription Drugs" by a Dr. Richard Burack, has come to my attention. I understand it has been published during the past few days. In it, the author has provided what purports to be a list of *approved* drug suppliers for the Armed Forces. I am enclosing a copy of the pertinent pages.

It has been my understanding that your organization does not, in fact, have an "approved" drug bidders list, as such. From previous inquiries, I have learned that eligibility to enter bids for drug contracts is determined in each instance, in which bids are sought, I am, therefore, at a loss to understand the assertion by Dr. Burack, and the list which purports to be "official", and will appreciate your prompt clarification of the matter for me.

In addition, I would be grateful if you would, in looking over the enclosure, check to see whether the firms named have in fact been either qualified or disqualified, to bid on any Defense contracts in the past two years.

Sincerely,

DURWARD G. HALL,
Committee on Armed Services.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY,
Alexandria, Va., May 18, 1967.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALL: In reply to your letter of 2 May 1967, your understanding is correct, in that the Defense Personnel Support Center, which purchases medical material for the Armed Forces, does not maintain a list of approved drug suppliers. It is noted that the list of firms appearing in "The Handbook of Prescription Drugs" is similar to the bidders mailing list which was furnished to Senator Gaylord Nelson, Chairman, Subcommittee on Monopoly of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business in September 1966. It is noted that Dr. Burack states in his book that the list he used was supplied by a member of the staff of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

In furnishing the bidders list to Senator Nelson, it was clearly pointed out that the inclusion of a firm's name on the list denotes only that the company is a potential bidder for one or more items of drugs and medicines, and that in accordance with the provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation (ASPR) 1-902, responsibility of a firm with respect to any individual contract is established at the time the contract is placed. To further clarify this point, eligibility to bid does not constitute eligibility to receive a contract award.

Unless a firm has been debarred, suspended or determined ineligible in accordance with ASPR Section 1, Part 6, any drug firm may request inclusion on the bidders list and receive solicitations when they are published. A review of the firms listed in Dr. Burack's book does not indicate that any have been debarred, suspended or determined ineligible to bid.

Maj. Gen. EARL C. HEDLUND,
U.S. Air Force,
Deputy Director.

Fino Introduces Bill To Keep Lindsay From Harassing Small Homeowners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to amend the Federal housing law to block Mayor Lindsay and Buildings Commissioner Moerdler from implementing their gestapolike plans to inspect one- and two-family homes while slums fester.

Recently, the Lindsay administration has decided to revise the New York City housing and maintenance code to require inspection of one- and two-family homes. According to Lindsay and Moerdler, this action is necessary before New York City can continue to receive housing code enforcement grants from the Federal Government.

The amount in question is not $75,000,000, as the city claims, but at most a few million dollars. The $75 million figure is the Federal sum available for code enforcement throughout the entire United States. New York will only be able to qualify for a few million at best. As a matter of fact, New York City—under the Lindsay administration at least—has been so reckless with code enforcement and urban renewal funds that it has already used up its fiscal year 1967 allocation and is now tapping a safety-valve fund. Because of this extravagance, HUD—the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development—will not approve any more code enforcement or other New York urban renewal project applications until after July 1, 1967.

HUD Secretary Weaver, in construing the intent of Congress in enacting the appropriate Federal legislation, has recently—in a May 4 statement—denied any intent to have the code enforcement program applied to one- and two-family homes in New York. The Secretary's exact words are as follows:

> We would, therefore, expect that enforcement of a housing code in a city such as New York would be concentrated on the types of structures where violations are most frequent and detrimental to the health and safety of occupants. Normally, this would not be the single and two family structures.

Obviously, the Lindsay administration attempt to blame the Federal Government for Lindsay-planned household harassment is a phony. Only a few million dollars are involved, and besides which, HUD has indicated its flexibility interest in emphasizing multiple unit dwelling code enforcement. In line with Secretary Weaver's statement, I have drafted legislation to exclude one- and two-family homes from required inclusion in code enforcement programs receiving Federal subsidy. This way, Mayor Lindsay could no longer claim that he was taking his actions because of Federal requirements.

Of course the real reason for the Lindsay-Moerdler plan is the power hunger of the incumbent city administration, which revels in the idea of this new leverage over the small homeowners of our city. Besides which, Lindsay will no doubt want 27 new deputy commissioners to plan, guide, and enforce the program, just as in his hospitals department proposal. My bill, however, which I intend to try to add to the upcoming omnibus housing bill—H.R. 8068—would keep Lindsay from harassing New York City small homeowners.

Representative Reid Reports on Illinois Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I sent to the people of the 15th District of Illinois my third annual legislative questionnaire on issues facing the Congress. Once again, the enthusiastic response has been most gratifying; and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the results of this survey of my district, since I know these views will be of interest to other Members of Congress as well.

The following percentages are based on approximately 30,000 opinions of those responding. In summary, it will be noted that a large majority favored a more positive "win" policy in Vietnam, a tax-sharing plan to return certain revenues to the States without Federal controls, the rescinding of controversial Supreme Court rulings which limit police interrogation of suspects and the use of confessions in criminal trials, and 2 years of military or civilian service for all young men. On the other hand, a substantial majority did not approve of the President's proposal to expand trade with the Communist nations of East Europe, Federal restrictions prohibiting discrimination in the sale or rental of housing, an increase in Federal income taxes, and replacing the present draft system with a national lottery plan. Then, too, a large majority expressed concern that our foreign aid program has not been effective, and that the war on poverty has not been achieving expected results. The only question on which those responding seemed to be about evenly divided was regarding the placing of Federal restrictions on the sale of firearms.

The complete tabulation is as follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No answer
1. Vietnam: Listed below are some of the alternative courses of action being discussed. Which do you favor? [1]			
(a) Continue the administration's present policy	11.6	-------	1.8
(b) Expand efforts to win the war, including stepped-up bombing of strategic targets, supply routes, and quarantine of Haiphong Harbor	81.2		
(c) Stop bombing without prior commitment from North Vietnam that infiltration of men and weapons into South Vietnam will cease	3.3		
(d) Withdraw our military forces to small coastal enclaves for purely defensive action	3.4		
(e) Complete withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Vietnam	7.3		
2. Do you approve of the President's request for a further expansion of trade with Communist-bloc nations in East Europe?	25.2	70.4	4.4
3. Do you feel our foreign aid program has been effective?	13.1	78.8	8.1
4. Do you approve of the President's request for a Federal prohibition against racial discrimination in the sale and rental of housing?	24.8	69.5	5.7
5. Do you favor the administration's proposal to impose a 6 percent surtax on all Federal income taxes?	8.1	87.7	4.2
6. Do you think that the majority of the war on poverty programs have been effective?	10.0	84.0	6.0
7. The President has asked for an additional $25,600,000,000 to finance poverty programs. Do you feel this amount is:			
(a) About right?	8.4	-------	8.3
(b) Not enough?	3.4		
(c) Too much?	79.9		
8. Do you favor a tax-sharing plan which would return a certain percentage of Federal tax revenue to the States without Federal control?	69.4	23.1	7.5
9. Do you favor Federal restrictions on the sale of firearms?	50.4	46.1	3.5
10. Do you believe the Congress should take legislative action to counter Supreme Court rulings which limit police interrogation of suspects and the use of confessions in criminal trials?	80.1	16.0	3.9
11. Do you believe the present draft system should be replaced with a national lottery system?	32.2	57.1	10.7
12. Do you favor Secretary McNamara's proposal that all young men be drafted for 2 years of Federal military or civilian service?	54.0	40.1	5.9

[1] The total for this first question is more than 100 percent since some respondents selected more than 1 choice.

Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the committee on the Judiciary has been represented at every session of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration since that international organization came into existence in 1951.

ICEM was founded as a result of the initiative taken by members of this committee and ever since the operations and activities have been scrutinized and evaluated by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The 27th council session of ICEM was of particular significance inasmuch as the paramount item on the agenda was a resolution offered by the United States calling for a review of ICEM's scope of activities. In the course of the debate on the resolution, the leadership position of the United States was challenged. I am proud to say that the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., speaking for himself and for the Honorable CLARK MACGREGOR, representing the committee, responded to this challenge and joined with U.S. representative, Ambassador James Wine, in clarifying the leadership of the United States. I know that the House will be interested in the remarks of Congressman RODINO and I am pleased to insert them in the RECORD at this time:

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION

Mr. Chairman, it is always heartwarming for me to come here among you, the members of a Committee which I have learned to respect and admire for all the good it has been doing, and I thank you for the privilege of having been permitted to address this session of the Council and to make some pertinent observations.

Regretfully, the legislative schedule in Washington curtails my participation and that of my Congressional colleague, Representative Clark MacGregor, in this session's deliberations. However, we want to assure you that our limited visit here should not be construed in any way as a lessening of our interest in and dedication to the work of this fine Committee.

Within the framework of the United States Constitution, the Legislative branch of the Government shares with the Executive branch responsibility for United States participation in international organizations. Appropriate committees of the Congress have the power to recommend appropriations, authorize appropriations, and the obligation to see that they are enacted into law and spent in accordance with legislative intent. As a consequence of this responsibility, members of the committees on the Judiciary in both sides of the Congress have consistently attended ICEM sessions since this Committee was conceived over fifteen years ago. The visits to the Council sessions and the constant contact with ICEM activities, as well as consultations with United States delegations to ICEM form the basis for Congressional evaluation of Committee activities. The co-operative relationship between the Department of State and the Congressional Committees has resulted in a definite unity of purpose regarding the role of ICEM.

I come before you today to reaffirm first of all the interest of the Congressional delegation on behalf of all three of the basic, fully co-equal sectors of ICEM's activities: refugee resettlement, assistance for national migration, and development of Latin American programmes.

I am now as I have always been, convinced that there should be a *parity* and not a *priority* between the three authorized functions of ICEM. These functions must, in my judgment, be kept in proper balance.

Of course, recognizing that *within* each of the three basic sectors of ICEM's activities there are areas which may require urgent attention and thus receive a priority over another area which can be programmed over a longer period.

References were made last week to alleged, and I quote, "discrepancies" between the political support ICEM enjoys and financial contributions, often deemed to be inadequate. We personally have some difficulty in agreeing with that assessment or evaluation. One must discern between the political support which—as far as the United States is concerned—is *constant*, and I emphasize constant, and the financial support which may of necessity undergo fluctuations of a temporary nature. That constant support for reasons well determined inside and at the highest level of the United States' executive and legislative branches *is present* although exigencies of a *temporary* nature might cause temporary reductions in the financial support. The two elements, however, must not and should not be confused, but should, however, be recognized as facts which are subject to change, and hopefully I believe a change may come for the better in the not too distant future.

As one of my official duties I also serve as a member of the "Select Committee on Western Hemisphere Immigration", a committee which was established by the Immigration Act of 1965. This Committee, composed of members of the Senate, the House, and officials of the Executive branch, has great latitude within its mandate to review and study all aspects of migration relations between our good neighbours of Latin America and the United States. I intend to propose at the next meeting of this Commission that a liaison be developed with ICEM so that there can be an exchange of ideas and knowledge.

The notable results of ICEM's Selective Migration Programme of Latin America are already known and I commend the Committee wholeheartedly for the increasing success in recruiting, transporting, and helping in the adjustment of skilled workers. This *"Brain Gain"* to Latin America is a threshold for a new economic era.

Mr. Chairman, I now reiterate the words of our Ambassador, the Delegate to this Committee. We came to this session hoping that the Council would adopt a resolution calling for a review of the scope of ICEM's activities. The proposed resolution had been well received in the Congress and was a predicate for renewed support by the appropriate committees. The thought prevailed that a review would focus attention on new techniques, greater collaboration and coordination between governments and between programmes.

Notwithstanding the will of the Executive Committee to defer a review resolution, we will, however, leave this session knowing, since I see the tenor, that the Member Governments had an opportunity to express their respective positions on this question; and we are understandably grateful that the Administration of ICEM will undertake a "self-analysis", if you please, which when completed will be made available to all Member Governments. We feel that this analysis will certainly be the basis for future judgment and evaluations.

We shall return to Washington impressed with what we witnessed here and shall report accordingly to our colleagues in the Congress.

Connecticut Firm Marks 50th Anniversary With Plant Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Connecticut has long been distinguished by the originality and inventiveness of its artisans. It holds a proud position in the economic history of the United States, especially in the manufacturing of machinery and machine tools. The products of Connecticut factories craftsmen make a very significant contribution to our defense effort, as well as to the continuing economic growth of this country and other nations of the world. It is, therefore, always a pleasure to note the growth and development of a Connecticut company and join with it in celebrating a significant milestone.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the J. C. Barton Co., of East Hampton, Conn., which manufactures tools and dies and performs all manner of special machine work. The town of East Hampton is located in my congressional district and is about 20 miles south of our State capital at Hartford. It is in close proximity to the largest natural lake in Connecticut, and can rightfully be called a "typical New England town." East Hampton is an excellent place to live and work, and a most enjoyable area to visit.

For over two centuries several East Hampton factories have manufactured many types of bells and this has given the town the well-deserved nickname of the "Belltown of the World." In 1917, Mr. J. C. Barton organized a company to serve the tooling needs of the bell industry, specializing in precision tool work, job manufacturing and, more particularly, the design and manufacture of progressive dies. This industry has continued to grow and thrive under the leadership of its current president, Mr. Edwin A. Barton. Today the firm specializes in the design and building of precision tooling used in the manufacture of intricate contoured parts.

On its 50th anniversary and as an indication of the firm's growth and prosperity, the J. C. Barton Co. has begun construction of a 30,000-square-foot addition to its main plant. I believe that this company typifies the smaller but highly efficient machine and tool builders of this country who play such an essential part in the industrial development and vitality of our Nation. I am pleased to extend my best wishes to this firm, its officers and all its employees on their golden anniversary. I wish for them continuing expansion and success in the years to come.

Communications Workers of America Scholarship Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, several days ago it was my privilege to draw the names of the first winners in a new international scholarship program established by the Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO, to honor the late Ray Hackney, a vice president of that union.

It was entirely appropriate that the Communications Workers set up a scholarship program as a living memorial to Ray Hackney, because he and the union he served so faithfully have long been dedicated to the cause of education for all.

Ray Hackney, whose memory the scholarship program honors, took the lead in strengthening our Nation's ties with the people of Latin America. He worked on behalf of his union and from his own strong convictions to foster education and training for those at home and abroad who might have gone without that education had it not been for the valiant efforts of CWA and Ray Hackney.

It is eminently fitting, then, that one of the scholarships established by his union went to a young man from a Latin American nation. The other to a high school graduate in this country who is the son of a CWA member.

At the ceremonies to select the scholarship winners, Joseph A Beirne, the president of CWA, who is an ardent advocate of education for all, declared:

> The only real threat to our democracy is the possible failure of our people to understand how it works.

This is not only true, but needs saying again and again. Our form of government is the best in the world—but it is also complex—and its complexity demands understanding.

There were several hundred applicants for the first Ray Hackney scholarships including a substantial number from Latin American countries. On their application form the young men and women who applied were asked to define their goal upon completion of their college work.

It was heartening for me and all the others present at CWA's selection ceremony to learn that so many of these young people want to enter the field of service to their fellow human beings.

An overwhelming proportion of the applicants—almost one-fourth of the entire 700—named teaching as their No. 1 choice.

The field of medicine came next on the list of preferences; then, international affairs, the Peace Corps, social welfare work, religion, government, politics, the law, research, engineering, the space program, the Armed Forces, the computer field, photography, other forms of art, and library work.

While I cannot name each of the choices, several intrigued me.

Two applicants wanted to study archeology. Three wished to go into the field of atomic science. Nine chose home economics. Four would like to study marine biology. One prefers wild life management. And one ambitious young applicant defined his goal as "to work to become president of CWA."

I am deeply impressed by the evident desire of these young men and women to make the most of an opportunity to go to college. Of major significance is the fact that so many of these young people want to go abroad and to work in the interest of humanity. And we should view with special interest, and seriously question, why none of these youngsters express a clear-cut interest in going into business.

All of us know that many substantial scholarships are available. I single this one out for special mention today because it represents a major effort by a major union to provide educational opportunities for those who might otherwise have been deprived of a chance that might some day make a significant impact on our world and times.

For making this opportunity possible, I salute CWA, its officers and its membership. I wish fervently that more groups were as devoted so completely to the cause of democracy and equality of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the survey conducted by the CWA is tremendously interesting in that it gives us a good idea of what young Americans desire in the way of a career.

The list follows and indicates the number of youngsters who selected each category:

Teaching	137
Uncertain	90
Medicine	66

Travel	52
Peace Corps	28
Welfare (social)	20
Research engineer	20
Electric engineer	16
Business administration	14
Law	13
Armed Forces	11
Accounting	10
Home economics	9
Research chemist	8
Writing	8
Computers	8
Space program	7
Music	7
Veterinary medicine	7
Journalism	7
Medical missionary	6
Government	6
Telephone work	6
Secretarial	6
Architect	6
Politics	5
Airline stewardess	5
Artist	5
Airline pilot	4
Ministry	4
Merchandising	4
Marine biology	4
Television (broadcasting)	3
Atomic energy program	3
Languages	3
Archeology	2
Wild life management	2
FBI	2
Play sports	2
Advertising	2
Librarian	2
Public relations	1
Bell laboratories	1
Priesthood	1
Build golf courses	1
Fashion design	1
Repeal 14(b)	1
Construction	1
Ranching	1
Automotive design	1
Insurance	1
Photography	1
President of CWA	1
Crime research	1

Medicare Should Include the Cost of Medicines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. **ST. ONGE.** Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of the original Medicare Act, I have been extremely interested in following the development of the administration of this act. Medicare has enabled our older citizens to face their retirement years secure in the knowledge that if they should contract serious or prolonged illness their life savings will not be lost, that they will not become a burden to their friends and relatives, or become wards of the State.

This law offers incalculable peace of mind and security to those who have worked hard to make this country what it is today. Illness is never a pleasant occurrence, but when it strikes the aged and is combined with the prospect of creating financial obligations which can never be met, then it becomes unbearable.

The signing of the Medicare Act represented the culmination of years of hard work, determination, and frustrating debates. It was the realization of the dream of all those who had sought to eliminate the specter of financial destitution, because of medical expenses facing our older citizens. Medicare has been hailed by many as a declaration of independence for the aged against the threat of economic ruin from sickness.

In spite of the great promise which medicare offers, however, there remains one important area not covered by the original legislation. This is the inclusion of the cost of prescription drugs, which for many of the aged and chronically ill may represent a substantial portion of their medical expenses. Persons over 65 pay about $700 million for prescription drugs each year. Many times those who can least afford drugs often need them most. For instance, 86 percent of the elderly people living on annual incomes of $2,000 or less suffer from chronic illnesses. Thus, in the absence of assistance in the payment of drugs prescribed by physicians, the present Medicare Act may be inadequate to help those most in need.

In order to further extend and improve the medicare program, and allow it to fulfill the original purpose of protecting our aged from the anguish and financial ruin of illness, I am introducing a bill to include the cost of drugs requiring a doctor's prescription under the provisions of the Medicare Act. The need for congressional action has been widely recognized and endorsed. President George Meany of the AFL–CIO recently stated before the House Ways and Means Committee that labor union health centers dealing directly with retired workers, "express concern over the large number of the aged who have chronic diseases, requiring the continuous use of expensive prescription drugs, which they really cannot afford to buy."

Mr. Walter J. Sheerin, executive director of the New York Labor-Management Council of Health and Welfare Plans, Inc., speaking before the House Ways and Means Committee, said:

> Most of the aged have chronic ailments that do not require hospitalization, but require continuous use of expensive drugs. This financial burden is borne by the aged. Medicare should round out its program by filling this great need of providing drug prescription coverage.

In a statement before the same committee, Dr. Charles I. Schottland, president-elect of the National Association of Social Workers, pointed out as follows:

> Prescription drugs take about 18 cents out of every consumer dollar for medical care services. When one considers the serious limitations on incomes of the aged, it becomes evident that their health is being harmed by not having such a benefit as part of the program. Studies over the years have shown that very substantial numbers of physician prescriptions remain unfilled largely because of the costs involved. If it is the intent of Congress to approach comprehensiveness of health care for the elderly, as we believe it is, payment for prescription drugs cannot continue to be an exclusion.

The legislation which I have introduced will help stimulate the drug industry, as well as generate additional business for pharmacists. Our entire older population, which requires drugs in such large volume, will be able to purchase the medication they need. The pharmacist will be able to collect his professional fee, the drug industry will benefit from the larger demand, and most important of all, our older citizens will receive the medicines to ease their pain and suffering and allow them to spend their retired years in the best possible health.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the years to come the Medicare Act will prove to be one of the greatest legislative accomplishments in the history of Congress and of the Nation. The humanitarian goals that it will achieve and the mental well-being and security that it will give our older citizens, will provide our Nation with an even more durable foundation on which to go forward to meet the many challenges of the future. However, in order to secure these ideals, we must complete the job and bring the payment of prescription drugs for our older citizens under the provisions of the Medicare Act.

Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. **PUCINSKI.** Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the 25th anniversary observance of Zionist Day in Birmingham, Ala., this past weekend, and I am taking the privilege today of including in the RECORD my remarks to that fine organization.

I should like to point out that one seldom meets so thoroughly dedicated a group as it was my pleasure to associate with over the weekend in Birmingham. The officers of the Birmingham District, ZOA, are Charles Kimerling, president; Max Slaughter, vice president; Norman Niren, secretary; Morris Fisher, treasurer, and Mr. Harry Jaffe, who handled the arrangements for my visit to Birmingham.

My remarks follow:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN ROMAN C. PUCINSKI AT THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA DINNER IN BIRMINGHAM, ALA., SUNDAY, MAY 28, 1967

Not long ago, Reinhold Niebuhr spoke to each of us when he said, "Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible, but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy *necessary*."

We stand here tonight in the name of freedom.

We stand here tonight in a moment of great irony for the world. For as the world pays tribute to the 19th Anniversary of the Independence of Israel, her very sovereignty and existence are being more seriously threatened today than ever before in the past two decades.

For Israel today—despite 19 years of incessant and unyielding harassment by her warring neighbors is not only a free state—Israel is also an ideal.

Nothing is more irresistible than an idea whose time has come.

Ideas, toiling up throughout the centuries leave few milestones by the road.

History remembers, and gratefully, Pericles and the assembly at Athens which traced outlines of beauty.

History remembers Justinian and his code for the idea that law has majesty in itself. For law is the crystallized conscience of man.

History remembers the meadow at Runnymede; the birth of the Magna Carta which freed man from fear of the state.

History remembers the Constitutional Convention; The Bill of Rights—and for years to come, it must remember the rebirth of conscience 19 years ago when the world restored to the Jewish people their homeland and gave a new dimension to human dignity.

Today, as that rebirth of conscience is being seriously threatened in the attacks on Israel by the Arab states, we as Americans and, yes, the entire free world, must recall the firm commitments made toward the principle that an attack against Israel is an attack against freedom itself.

We must recall the words of President Johnson when on August 2, 1966, during the Washington visit of Israeli President Shazar, the President said, "We subscribe to the policy stated by President Kennedy on May 6, 1963, that we support the security of both Israel and her neighbors and we strongly oppose the use of force in the Near East."

We must resolutely recall this same principle enunciated by President Eisenhower in his message to Congress on January 5, 1957.

History demands that we also recall the administration of President Truman, when America joined Britain and France in the Tri-Partite Declaration of 1950 which said in part:

"The three governments take this opportunity of declaring their deep interest and their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the area and their unaltered opposition to the use of force or threat of force by any of the states in the area of the Middle East."

If justice and reason are to prevail, we must also recall and remind the nations of the world that in 1956 the United States joined with the other nations of the world in endorsing the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations to send a United Nations peacekeeping force to Egypt.

The whole rationale of that deep-rooted resolution to preserve peace in the Middle East has been demolished with U Thant's hasty agreement to meet Egypt's demand that those same peace-keeping troops must be removed.

If man has any respect for justice, he must recall the impassioned plea of only a few days ago by Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol to Egypt that she pull back her troops from the border of Israel and Eshkol's solemn pledge that Israel would do the same.

Today as Israel's freedom is again threatened, America and the entire free world must use all resources at our command to impress upon Egypt the inherent dangers embodied in Egypt's demand for withdrawal of United Nations troops.

We must, above all, remind our own people here in the United States that the problem in the Middle East today is not a problem involving Israel alone. It would be a tragic mistake to treat this as a "Jewish problem" for, indeed, Israel today stands alone as the bastion in the Middle East against the Soviet Union's bold design to use the Middle East as the gateway for ultimate conquest by the communists of the entire continent of Africa.

It would be even a more tragic mistake to let Israel alone suffer the full brunt of her determination to check Soviet expansion. This is a task for the entire free world and not Israel alone.

We must firmly support President Johnson's unequivocal statement that the Gulf of Aqaba and the straits of Tiran are international water, open to all shipping, including Israeli, and that we shall never agree to any limitations on such shipping for, indeed, America's own national interest is vitally involved in preserving these troubled waters as international waters.

We must support whatever measures are necessary by the United States to impress upon the Egyptian government the dangers of miscalculating America's unyielding and unbending determination to preserve the sovereignty of Israel, which we helped to establish 19 years ago.

There is no more indisputable fact in the annals of civilization than the fact that every single major conflict started by man since the birth of civilization has been started by a miscalculation.

The most tragic miscalculation in the history of man was perpetuated by Hitler when he failed to understand that sooner or later America would come to the defense of freedom against this tyranny.

The lives of 6 million Jews tragically murdered for no other reason than their religious beliefs could have been spared; the great tragedy of World War II and the massive loss of lives on all sides; the destruction beyond a thousand hurricanes could have been spared if Hitler had not engaged in this monstrous miscalculation of the world's stubborn refusal to yield to tyranny.

Finally we must support the use of the full influence and leadership of the United States to halt continuous attacks on Israel and permit that Nation as well as all the nations in the Middle East to develop their resources in an atmosphere of peace and mutual understanding.

If freedom is to survive, the Middle East must not be permitted to become a holocaust of man's inhumanity to his fellow man.

For, at the heart of that freedom is the belief that the individual man, the child of God, is the hallmark of value, and all society, all groups, the state itself, exist for his benefit.

The world's population now stands at more than 3.3 billion, double the figure of 1900.

At the present rate of growth, the human race will number 7 billion souls by the year 2,000.

Half of today's world population has been born since the end of World War II.

Of the children entering this life, 85% are born in the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The population of Latin America is tripling every 35 years.

Occupying 6% of the land area of the world and with less than 6% of the population, the United States accounts for one-third of the world's gross national product. Our future is inescapable and burdensome.

Of the world's children under 6 years of age, 70% suffer from malnutrition.

Currently, the world's population is receiving an average diet of 2,100 calories per person per day. By the year 2,000, this will drop to an average of 1,340 calories per person per day. Experts say the absolute starvation level is 1,350 calories per day.

Starvation in May of 1967 is killing an estimated 12,000 people each and every day—four million each year.

Two-thirds of the world's population lives in areas where the per capita income is $160 a year or less.

Forty-five per cent of the population of the world's poorest nations is under 15 years of age.

Horrifying statistics, you think, incredible. Unbelievable, perhaps. But chilling realities to men who have seen The Apocalypse.

Each of us here in this room is confronted with the vision of global problems on a scale so vast no man can hope to ignore them or hide from them.

Our right to express and communicate ideas; to set ourselves apart from the animals in the field and forest; to call governments to their duties and obligations; above all, our right to affirm our membership in society and to the man with whom we share the land and our children's future—all these constitute the very soul of freedom.

This distinguishing freedom of speech goes hand in hand with the power to be heard—to share in the decisions of government which shape men's lives.

The essential *humanity* of men can be protected and preserved only where government must answer, not just to those of a particular religion or a particular race, but to all its people.

Government and law are the armour and sword of individual rights. In our world at this moment, there are forces raging which can destroy forever the hopes of man for perpetuating life on this planet.

"To feed on the past is to bite the dust," Victor Hugo said. The world no longer has the space or the time for dreams of conquest and destruction, for old hatreds and ancient animosities.

Unless we begin anew to work with one another and for one another toward the common goal of survival, we face an extinction of our own making—all of us—poor, wealthy, overfed, underfed, philosopher, philanderer, beggar, and bureaucrat.

In our quest for stability and a lasting, genuine peace on this earth, we must reaffirm our need of idealism, high aspirations and deep convictions.

Honor cannot be a misplaced commodity in our world of modern technology.

There is no inconsistency between ideals and realistic possibilities. There is no separation between the deepest desires of heart and mind and the rational application of human effort in the solution of human problems.

Surely, one of the great examples of man's infinite capacity for growth is Israel itself.

In the 19 brief years since independence, Israel has confounded the cynics, amazed the nonbelievers, and captured the imagination and hearts of men of peace the world over.

Refusing to acknowledge the danger of futility—the belief there is nothing one man or woman can do against the enormous arsenal of the world's ills—the Israelis have set 2 goals for themselves; first of all, to survive; secondly, to insure the survival of Israel.

Each time a human being stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of another, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope to the farthest reaches of our planet.

For the past 2 decades, Israel's reverence for life, for freedom, for the infinite worth of all God's creations has blazed out across the world in waves of hope and light.

Today, this tiny nation is threatened by countries whose long tradition of grinding human souls to powder and sand has been documented through all the centuries of man's existence.

The leaders of what is known as the United Arab Republic, unable and unwilling to face the outrageous deprivation and poverty that characterize the Middle East today, have resorted to violence and threats of violence directed against Israel.

Armies have been mobilized, equipment moved, men and machines placed on alert along the border awaiting the signal.

And all of this to hide the futility of purpose, the total disregard for the impoverished millions who have suffered the unending vanities of conquerors.

Israel is *too* bright a hope, *too* significant an achievement to perish in the flames of war.

The people of Israel *care* too deeply for one another and for the land.

Their lives, however individually poverty-stricken or difficult, have meaning and attainable goals.

In contrast, the nations of the United Arab Republic have been festering sores on the body of human progress for centuries.

Rather than face their responsibilities to their people, initiate meaningful improvements, and work with one another to harness the resources available to them to improve their conditions, they have chosen to destroy and to trample and to pillage the dreams of dignity which have become a triumphant reality in Israel.

In the current issue of Jewish Frontier, Abba Eban wrote:

"Our eyes are wide open to the barrenness of the Arab policy of enmity. So we offer neighboring peoples an alternative vision: a Middle East distinguished for its diversity, for its many centers of freedom, for a free and separate existence of different sovereignties, a region in which there will be a free ferment of disparate policies, a region whose varying vistas will, together, present a diversified mosaic and not a monolith . . .

"This stretch of earth in which the State of Israel dwells is limited in size, but it is graced by the wonderful attribute of centrality; it is the crossroads of continental communication.

"Israel can open up access to the Mediterranean for Jordan, develop joint resources with it, make a flow of men and goods possible all along the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, from the river of Egypt to the north of Syria.

"In a word: In conditions of *hostility*, the Arab mind conceives of Israel as a barrier. In conditions of *peace*, Israel at once becomes a bridge."

My friends, I ask you to consider the wisdom and depth of humanity that would impel a man to reach out with such compassion and offer once more, in this dark hour, the open hand of friendship across thousands of years of bitterest prejudice and persecution, as Abba Eban did in this historic pronouncement.

No one who knows the tenacious heart of the Israeli can doubt he will defend to his last breath his right to stand on his own soil.

His courage is legendary; his skill as a soldier unsurpassed in all the armies of the world.

That is why Nasser and his fellow conspirators have so cruelly abdicated their responsibility to their own wretchedly-deprived countrymen, trusting that a war will unite their people.

Aesop said, "Any excuse will serve a tyrant." And Nasser has proved him correct.

For every 10 men who are willing to face the guns of an adversary, there is only one willing to brave the censure of his colleagues, the wrath of his society. Moral courage is a rarer commodity than bravery in battle or great intelligence.

Yet it is the one essential, vital quality for those who seek to change a world which yields most painfully to change.

For the fractional fortunate among us there is comfort. There is a temptation to follow the easy and familiar paths of personal ambition and financial success so grandly spread before those who have the privilege of education.

But that is not the only road beckoning to us and it is not the only course marked for our nation.

There is a Chinese *curse* which says, "May he live in interesting times."

Like it or not, we live in interesting times—times of danger, uncertainty, threats of holocaust and pain.

But they are also times more open to the creative energy of men than any other time in history.

And everyone on this planet will ultimately be judged on the effort he has contributed toward building a more human world society—one which is less dependent on terror, more dependent on the gift of self.

I ask you to ponder just a moment. No one quite like you has ever lived before, nor will again. No one who looks just like you, who has exactly the same dreams, talents and aspirations. No one with quite your potential for making a particular mark in a particular field of endeavor.

Understand this great gift of life which is yours to use so freely, with so few restrictions. Understand it, be grateful for it, and *use* it. For you will never have another and your world has great need of you.

Each of us will be judged by the extent to which our ideals and goals have shaped the vision of man free of hunger, free of crippling ailments and death in childhood, free of ignorance and cruelty.

Man has that vision constantly before him. We *can* be what we aspire to be. The charisma of mind, heart and soul that is Israel today has instilled life to that shining miraculous vision.

Only the truly brave know how to forgive. When a man says of the affairs of state, "What does it matter to me?", the state may be given up for lost.

In these "interesting" times, we must strive, seek, find and never yield in our pursuit of the freedom which is each man's right.

I am unalterably opposed to Communism because it exalts the state over the individual and the family, and because of the lack of freedom of speech, of protest, of religion and of the press which is so characteristic of totalitarian states.

But the way of opposition to Communism is not to imitate its dictatorship. Rather it is to enlarge human freedom everywhere on the globe.

There are privileged minorities in every land who believe they serve the cause of that freedom by labeling as "communist" every threat to their privilege. But the denial of freedom only strengthens the very Communism it claims to oppose.

The United States, with its great wealth, great technology, has been called to exercise its influence and strength in Vietnam, in Cuba, in the Dominican Republic, in Korea—wherever the encroachments against self-determination threaten the security of those who desire to choose their own destiny.

We have not hesitated to use our measured strength in defense of liberty. We are fully prepared to assist in bringing stability and peace to the Middle East. We will never abandon Israel.

The rights of the small nations to survive unfettered shall not be forsaken by the United States—surely the most powerful nation in the history of the world.

And what *are* the United States and Israel but people—people who share a vision of what human existence could be. So long as that vision is bright for us, any sacrifice to obtain it for our brothers on this earth is a sacrifice well made.

Many years ago, a wise man wrote to his son: "Let me exhort you to do your utmost to think outside and beyond our present circle of ideas. For every idea gained is a hundred years of slavery remitted."

He might well have addressed each of us. Some time ago, I said our future was inescapable and burdensome. It needs the best of each man and woman and our response must be soon.

Down through our western peaks runs an invisible boundary known as the Great Divide. And down through the range of centuries, an invisible boundary has marred the progress and elevation of man.

Throughout these centuries working together, and believing fervently in their high ideals, the Jewish people have elevated man. In their stubborn defense of human dignity, they have helped mankind cross the Great Divide; they have charted man.

In order to understand why America is determined to defend our noble ally, Israel, we must understand the Jewish people themselves.

There may be some truth to the idea that Jews are like other people—only more so.

The tradition is that every Jewish generation worries and frets—with clucking affection—about the next one.

This deep concern of one Jewish generation over the next one is the mortar which has held these gallant people together.

In more than 4,000 years of unbroken continuity of a magnificent people have been constructed out of that affectionate worry by one Jewish generation over the next Jewish generation.

What a monumental source of pride it must be to a young Jew to know that in his veins flows the blood of a people who have endured and stubbornly survived 4,000 years of the most outrageous attempt to destroy their abiding faith in the glory of man.

Sooner or later every human being must ask himself: "Who am I?"

We didn't grow on a tree; we weren't carved from rock, we were born from man and as each generation of Jews looks upon his background he finds a glorious litany of forefathers who against odds which have destroyed weaker men, have withstood and survived in their tenacious belief in the dignity of man.

No race of human beings has written a prouder record of sacrifice that freedom may find its rich fulfillment in the human community.

The Zionist Organization of America, since its inception has been the catalyst which has brought this fantastic cultural wealth of the Jews into a meaningful form and today the ZOA continues to guide these resources into ever more meaningful service to humanity.

The ZOA has been the chief interpreter of the magnificence of Jewish culture and tradition which has given us these 4,000 years of unbroken continuity of the Jewish people.

Today more than ever before the ZOA needs your help for never before in its existence has this magnificent tradition of Jewish dignity been threatened.

Just as in Israel, where every man is a builder and every man is a defender of the land so throughout our land the ZOA has tried to impress upon not only the Jewish people but all Americans the brotherhood of men.

If the Jews are able today to make a significant contribution to our future generations and keep alive the rich tradition of their past, it is only because the ZOA lights the way.

It has been argued that the social freedom of American life is separating the Jewish youngster from the tradition of his people.

Those who would seek to blame this change on the American environment are, in truth, indicting the spirit of American freedom. For, in a free society, the Jewish community is free to do nothing. Free to wither. Free to disappear.

And the magnificence of a Jewish community in a free society is that it is free to be as vibrantly and creatively Jewish as it wants to be. Free to invest in its future. Free to encourage its youth to a mature awareness of the relevancy of the Jewish tradition in the modern world.

The very freedom of the choice poses the challenge.

There are a great number of Jews in this world who do not have the advantage of making this choice. I am speaking now of the Jews of the Soviet Union.

For the past several years, I have sponsored a resolution in the House of Representatives expressing the sense of Congress that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.

The Jewish youngster in our American society who is groping for some understanding of his Judaism is also, in a sense, cast into a bewildering world.

There is a Jewish consciousness in the Soviet Union today struggling to stay alive. There is a Jewish consciousness among our youth today, eager to be vibrant and alive, as well.

Against the onslaught of intransigent Communism, our task of preserving this rich Judaic cultural and philosophical inheritance becomes a matter of personal choice, a family decision, a community decision.

Perhaps the special satisfaction that is ours in America is the knowledge that we are seeking in some measure to be active participants in a great enterprise—that which Malachi defined as "turning the heart of the fathers to the children and the heart of the children to their fathers."

We are responding to a generation of questioning youth, of troubled youth, who are not blind to the great social and moral issues of our times.

We are also responding to a generation of sophisticated youth who want to determine for themselves just what are the modern values of Judaic tradition.

The depth of our response will determine the quality of the next generation.

Today as the whole world wonders can mankind survive; can a free Israel survive, can our rich tradition of freedom survive, yes, can we ourselves survive—let us remember an ancient Jewish philospher who wrote:

"When you have shut your doors, and darkened your room, remember never to say that you are alone, for you are not alone. God is within and your genius is within—and what need have *they* of light to see what you are doing?"

Congressman Horton's Stand on the Mideast Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with the House the remarks of our colleague, Congressman FRANK HORTON, concerning the current confrontation in the Middle East. Monday evening, May 29, Congressman HORTON addressed an emergency meeting of the Rochester, N.Y., Jewish Community Council. In a strong demonstration of concern for the situation, over 3,000 persons attended the Rochester meeting, which Mr. HORTON addressed via an amplified telephone hookup from Washington.

The text of his address follows:

I am grateful for the opportunity to address this gathering. Even from Washington, I can sense the urgency and uneasiness which pervades your meeting tonight. Since 10 days ago when I dispatched my wire to Ambassador Goldberg, I have shared your uneasiness about the explosive confrontation in the Mid-East.

I attended a noon State Department briefing on this situation in the Capitol this morning. To further arm myself for this report to you tonight, I had a special briefing this afternoon with a representative of Secretary Rusk, just as I have been briefed each day since the crisis began.

Let me begin by reviewing the background of this situation. During the past year, Israel's prestige has risen as the result of its punishing retaliation to Syrian and Jordanian terrorist raids. In the first encounter, an Israeli armored column leveled a Jordanian village which has been harboring terrorists who had harassed and killed residents of several Kibbutzim near the border. When the raids continued near the Sea of Galilee, the Israeli air force demonstrated its superiority by knocking out a large proportion of the Syrian jet-fighter force. In all of these actions, you will recall, Egypt's Nasser was conspicuously silent and inactive. With every Israeli triumph, Nasser's falling star in the Arab world fell lower. With serious economic troubles at home, and a vast army hopelessly engaged in Yemen, Mr. Nasser was a long way from accomplishing the leadership of the Arab world he had once envisioned for himself. Even his influence in Syria, once his staunch partner, was in serious question.

Then, in what appeared to be almost a last-ditch effort to renew his campaign for Arab leadership, Nasser precipitated the present crisis. He started innocently enough, maneuvering his own troops across the Sinai peninsula, within Egyptian territory. He followed this sabre-rattling move with what appeared to seasoned diplomats to be a propaganda-seeking demand for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force, which had been deployed along the Israel-Egyptian border since 1956.

To the shock and chagrin of every western, and many eastern capitals, Secretary-General U Thant responded to Nasser's bold demand by ordering the withdrawal of the once-effective peacemaking force, without so much as convening a meeting of the Security Council. Probably equally shocked at this spineless stand of the Secretary-General was Nasser himself. Suddenly he found himself with an unexpected and undeserved victory. At once he took control of Sharm el Sheikh, overlooking the Tiran Strait, and announced that he was closing the Gulf of Aqaba, calling it, in effect, an Egyptian lake. From near extinction as an Arab leader, Nasser had again propelled himself to the top of the heap.

His latest move yesterday was a more or less conciliatory statement in which he so generously offered to seek a non-military solution to the crisis he himself began—a solution which, of course, would leave his 2 strategic victories at the Gaza border and at the Gulf intact. In effect, the little boy has stolen the cookies, and he now generously offers to eat them without a fight.

The seizure and closing of the Gulf of Aqaba is clearly in violation of international waters, and as such, is a clear-cut act of aggression. The world is most fortunate that Israel's government has had the presence of mind to restrain any immediate military response to Nasser's aggression. But Israel will not and cannot long restrain itself if Nasser's moves become accepted as a desirable status quo. While President Johnson warned last week that our country views with seriousness this illegal seizure of international waters, it is important that Nasser's action be immediately and internationally branded as being what it is—out and out aggression. The time to save the Middle East from being engulfed by the flames of aggression is now, not after Arab aggressors light the torch.

After my briefing this afternoon, I dispatched a telegram to U Thant, urging that he lead the United Nations in placing full responsibility for this aggressive act on Egypt's shoulders. Further, I urged him to seek a settlement which would reinstate the status quo which existed prior to the departure of the United Nations Emergency Force—including the unconditional opening of the Gulf.

You and I know that Israel and other nations who stand by her can and will accept nothing less. The United Nations will not succeed in bringing peace to the Near East unless it firmly establishes as its goal the restoration of that status quo. I closed my telegram to U Thant with a plea that he establish a negotiating team composed of representatives of the great powers to achieve this settlement.

Each and every man and woman in this auditorium knows that I have left no stone unturned in my steadfast support for the United Nations in the Congress. I have repeatedly supported plans to beef-up the U.N.'s peacekeeping capabilities, and I have urged U.N. involvement in Southeast Asia. I watched with great interest reports of this afternoon's Security Council meeting on the Near East crisis. All of us hope for the rapid evolvement of an international solution to this crisis. But I could not support any so-called solution which left Mr. Nasser with carte blanche to control the Gulf of Aqaba and to terrorize Israel's south-western border, as he did prior to 1956.

Thus, while I hope for a U.N. solution to the problem, I in no sense favor "passing the buck" on this confrontation to the U.N., if it becomes obvious that U.N. efforts are doomed to failure.

So far, the performance of the United Nations in this crisis has been unpromising—the action by the Secretary General in pulling out the U.N. Emergency Force put the prestige and effectiveness of the U.N. at a new low.

But we cannot abandon the United Nations and the hope we have placed in it because of a single blunder by the Secretary General. Especially now that we are assured of at least some pause in the explosive crisis atmosphere, we must seek from the United Nations a meaningful route to settlement. We must give every chance to this international body to find a solution, at the same time that we make clear our opposition to any solution which would violate the territorial or political integrity of Israel.

You are all aware of the place Israel has in human history. She is a nation whose rate of growth and development—much of it aided by your own efforts and contributions—is unequalled in history. But even more than Israel's significance for Jewish people throughout the world is her significance to all of the world's underdeveloped nations. When I was in Jerusalem for the dedication of the Knesset last August, I was most impressed by the considerable representation of African nations at the dedication. These nations have seen in Israel the antithesis to the teachings of communist revolutionism. They have seen a nation with limited natural resources prosper through planned freedom and democracy. I would venture to say that Israel is one of the principal influences which has turned much of Africa against communist subversion.

The United States, much less the world, cannot afford to allow the sacrifice of this little country to the very forces she has helped to defeat on other continents.

Israel is also to be admired for the determination and strong patriotism of her people. Facing a situation where the blood of countrymen may be spilled, the Israeli's are not deserting the stand of their government. Even those who found themselves out of the country when the crisis began have flocked back to bolster the homeland. This is indeed a lesson in patriotism which other nations might do well to follow.

Let me end this telephone message just as I ended my telegram to Ambassador Goldberg last week:

"Our government has a dual responsibility in this crisis: The protection of Israel and its people through the United Nations from aggression, and the protection of American lives and vital U.S. and free world interests in the Middle East."

Your own Rabbi Bernstein, a frequent visitor to Israel, will tell you that she is the best representative of freedom in that sector of the world. Our government so far has played a major role in preventing the crushing of Israel in this crisis. A few days ago, I joined 109 other Congressmen in signing a declaration of support for Israel in this situation. With this kind of determination, and with people like yourselves showing concern for the safety of Israel, I think we can look for continued American guarantees of the political and territorial integrity of that nation.

Freedom Sanctuaries in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my privilege to address a gathering of my constituents who assembled in the Union Ridge Cemetery in my district, which is one of the burial grounds for Civil War soldiers.

I took the opportunity on this solemn occasion to review with my constituents the situation that confronts the United States at a time when the world is experiencing one of its most serious crises.

I had proposed during my remarks at the cemetery that the United States must make a very hard reappraisal of our military strategy in Vietnam because of America's widespread other commitments throughout the world.

All of us want to see the day when peace with justice and honor will be established in Vietnam.

But the question that we Americans have to ask ourselves at this time is: Can we follow the basic strategy that we have laid out in Vietnam and still meet our other commitments in the world, or is there a more effective way of achieving our basic mission in Vietnam and still be able to maintain our position of leadership throughout the world?

One of the problems that has disturbed me enormously is the fact that our American soldiers are suffering increasing casualties in their seek-and-destory mission into the jungles and swamps of South Vietnam and every time they have the enemy on the run, our enemy slips across the border into either Cambodia or Laos.

These are the conditions under which we are trying to win the war in Vietnam, while our problems all over the world continue to escalate.

There is no question in my mind that while we continue our effort in Vietnam the Communists are starting a series of provocations in other parts of the world and there is no question the Communists are counting on the fact that because of America's involvement in Vietnam we will not be able to effectively stop Communist aggression in other parts of the world.

Thus, it appears to me, that we could continue our present tactics in South Vietnam if, indeed, South Vietnam was our only problem. But with the fantastic proliferation of problems throughout the world, I have suggested a series of new concepts to give America greater flexibility in dealing with these global problems instead of permitting ourselves to be totally bogged down in Vietnam.

I regret that some of the press has interpreted my remarks as changing from my hawklike position in strong support of the President, to a dovelike position.

I have made it very clear that I continue to stand firmly behind the President's determination to bring freedom to the people of South Vietnam, and I strongly support the President in his decisions.

Those who would suggest that my proposals are a shift to a dove position would find little comfort in reading my remarks to sustain their erroneous conclusion. On the contrary, if men are to be labeled, I would say that in proposing alternative solutions to win in Vietnam, I have now become a falcon which is, after all, the most courageous and the most noble of the hawk family.

While I am mindful, Mr. Speaker, that the seek-and-destroy missions do develop a great deal of intelligence for our forces in Vietnam, we, as Americans, must weigh the relativity of all these factors in terms of global needs for American assistance instead of judging them only in terms of what such missions mean in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks delivered in Chicago at Memorial Day services at Union Ridge Cemetery follow:

FREEDOM SANCTUARIES IN SOUTH VIETNAM

I can't think of anything more tragic than to withdraw our troops from Vietnam.

If we were to falter in South Vietnam and fail that little nation's plea for help to retain freedom, the Communists would stage similar "South Vietnam's" in 73 nations of Asia, Africa and South America.

But our commitment to the elusive doctrine of total victory in South Vietnam has cost us 10,000 American lives and has kept all of our resources bogged down in Southeast Asia while the Communists play their options to the fullest in the Middle East; in Cuba, in Korea, in the Sea of Japan and other places where American leadership has suffered because of our total involvement in South Vietnam.

Our forces today securely control the most essential urban and agricultural areas of South Vietnam.

Our basic mission in South Vietnam can now be considered overwhelmingly successful.

When the South Vietnamese first asked us for help, their country was on the verge of total collapse to the Communists.

No village was safe; the government was impotent as a democratic institution and had to rely on the discipline of a dictatorship; her economy was on the brink of total collapse and the Communists were confidently counting the days when the key to Southeast Asia would be totally theirs.

Contrast those bitter days of defeat with the South Vietnam of today when 455,000 American soldiers have helped turn South Vietnam into a land of confident hope for freedom in our time.

South Vietnam, even though it is engaged in a bitter war, has been able to hold elections in which 86% of the population participated to elect a constitutional assembly which has written a doctrine of freedom for its people.

This September a constitutionally elected government will govern this tiny war-torn country; her economy is sound and thriving; her educational system has been restored; two weeks ago free elections for local officials have been held in 1600 villages, and finally, in village after village, the U.S. pacification program is instilling principles of democracy among her people.

I believe the time has come for us to declare ourselves the victor in South Vietnam and use all of our resources—including more American troops if necessary—to establish these hard-won territories as freedom sanctuaries.

There is still a great deal of trouble ahead and one would be naive to fail to recognize the continuing threat to South Vietnam's new won freedom in village after village.

But I would like to suggest that our administration seriously consider using our 455,000 troops in Vietnam along with South Vietnam's 600,000 troops to secure those areas now solidly in allied hands and concentrate on the pacification program in those areas leaving the rest of South Vietnam to the throes of normal attrition among the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops.

I was in Vietnam twenty months ago and already then it seemed to me that allied troops had possession of the best parts of South Vietnam.

I found a great deal of irony in the fact that in some parts of Vietnam our troops were defending huge French rubber plantations whose owners were secure in the comforts of Paris supporting Charles de Gaulle in his attacks on the United States.

I seriously question whether much more can be gained by using our troops and suffering losses in the jungles of Vietnam which are of little strategic or military use to our side serving only as regrouping areas for the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops.

I would suggest we concentrate our troops in a perimeter of defense around the cities and those fertile rural areas now in our possession, then to use our huge resources at great losses to chase the Communists through the jungle.

In other words, I believe we should force the Communists to come to our areas where we can see them and destroy them instead of wasting vast American resources on seek and destroy missions in the hopeless jungles and swamp of South Vietnam.

By firmly securing those areas in our possession and developing their resources, I believe we can afford the risk of suspending the bombing raids over North Vietnam and put the full burden of finding peace in that troubled country on the back of Secretary General U Thant and the United Nations. He has said repeatedly he can find peace if we stop the bombings. Let's test his ability by giving him that chance.

Watching the fiasco of the United Nations in relationship to its withdrawal of peacekeeping troops in the Middle East, I believe the United States should serve notice on the United Nations that if it fails to find a just peace in Vietnam after we have ceased the bombings, the United States should seriously consider withdrawing from the U.N.

We should not fear that by protecting selected "freedom sanctuaries" in South Vietnam—we will somehow lessen our stature and prestige throughout the world.

On the contrary, history throughout the 20th century shows that partial victory has been achieved more often than total military victory in 10 out of 14 major wars in our time.

Since the turn of the century, the following wars have been resolved by partial victory rather than through total victory by one side or the other:

1. Russo-Japanese War, 1904–1905.
2. The First Balkan War, 1912–1913.

3. The Second Balkan War, June 29–July 30, 1913.
4. Soviet-Polish War, April 25, 1920–October 12, 1920.
5. Kashmir War, October, 1947–January 1949.
6. War in Indochina, 1948–1954.
7. Korean War, 1950–1953.
8. Laos, (Intermittent civil war since c. 1953).
9. Somalia-Ethiopian War, 1964.
10. India-Pakistani War, 1965.

In the Russo-Japanese war both sides could have continued fighting, but the war had reached a point of diminishing returns for both sides. The same could probably be said for virtually all the wars cited above; the disputants could have fought to a point of exhaustion of one side, of the other, or of both; but for reasons of national interest opted for other solutions.

I firmly believe that by securing "freedom sanctuaries" and developing democratic principles in those areas of South Vietnam which are now actually holding elections, we can show the Viet Cong the futility of their cause and more important, we can address ourselves to the role of leadership in the many other trouble spots in the world which can become the seeds of World War III if they are not checked through effective American leadership.

Man has never suffered a greater waste of human resources than war.

We as a free people owe it to the men and women we honor today to us all of our resources, all of our ingenuity, all of our military strength, and yes, all of our belief in the nobility and dignity of freedom to find effective alternatives to armed conflict.

Ho Chi Minh once said that Americans do not like long wars. He said he intends to make the war in Vietnam a long one and thus win it.

I submit we must *not* give him this opportunity.

While I am fully mindful that tyranny and subversion continue in many parts of South Vietnam, I believe we have won enough of the important territory to force Ho Chi Minh into a stalemate in South Vietnam on our terms and those terms are to secure those areas we now hold and let them flourish under freedom while we demonstrate to the rest of the country that Communism has no more to offer in South Vietnam than it has offered the rest of the Communist world.

We might as well recognize that in Vietnam, just as in Korea, there will be no ticker tape parade down Wall Street or La Salle Street marking the end of the war.

Hereafter, man's conflicts will not end in formal total surrenders and the sooner we recognize this the sooner we can win partial but important victories in defense of freedom.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Thou has been our dwelling place in all generations.

For a thousand years, in Thy sight, are but as yesterday, when it is past and as a watch in the night, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

Let Thy work appear unto Thy servants and Thy glory unto Thy children.

And let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us: Yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it.

In spite of all the evil that stalks the earth, we thank Thee for human kindness, for hope that shines undimmed, for faith that is dauntless, and for all the qualities of high personality that cannot be bought.

Steel our wills and steady our hands with power, and wisdom, that with eager joy we may dedicate the Nation's strength to throw open the gates of a new life for Thy children everywhere.

As here we face the questions which confront us, and almost confound us, give us to know clearly the things that belong to our peace and to the peace of the world in righteousness and justice.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 31, 1967, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONTRACTS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON DONATION OF CERTAIN SURPLUS PROPERTY TO THE NATIONAL RAILWAY HISTORICAL SOCIETY, GREENVILLE, N.C.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed donation of certain surplus property to the East Carolina Chapter, Inc., National Railway Historical Society, Greenville, N.C.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROJECT TO BE UNDERTAKEN FOR NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVES

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on a project to be undertaken for the Naval Reserve Training Center, Ft. McHenry, Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLICATION OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "Hydroelectric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1965" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Implied Consent Law for the District of Columbia" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930, RELATING TO COLLECTION OF USER CHARGES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to authorize the collection of user charges, to permit any charges for customs services to be collected on a fixed rate of charge basis, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on opportunities for reducing interest costs on refunds attributable to net operating loss deductions, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department, dated May 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of inspection controls over concrete placements in building construction projects, Public Building Service, General Services Administration, dated May 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of selected procurements and of costs of dedication ceremonies in the Pacific region, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, dated May 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of subsurface exploration for and design and construction of foundations of public buildings, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, dated May 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of work registration under Federal-State aid to dependent children of unemployed parents in the State of Ohio, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated May 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DETERMINATIONS RELATING TO DEFERMENT OF CONSTRUCTION PAYMENTS DUE FROM THE FOSS RESERVOIR MASTER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the deferment of the 1967 and 1968 construction payments due the United States from the Foss Reservoir Master Conservancy District, Washita River Basin project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Attorney General to admit to residential community treatment centers persons who are placed on probation, released on parole, or mandatorily released (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO VOTING IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the Federal election laws and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 6

"Relative to the installation of prescribed fireproofing materials in cab-over-engine commercial vehicles

"WHEREAS, Fires in the engine compartments of cab-over-engine commercial vehicles create a serious hazard to the lives and safety of persons who are employed to drive commercial vehicles; and

"WHEREAS, The danger to employees driving cab-over-engine vehicles may be substantially reduced by the simple and inexpensive installations of prescribing fireproofing materials under and behind the driver's compartment; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to require employers to install prescribed fireproofing materials under and behind the driver's compartment of cab-over-engine commercial vehicles in order to protect employees from an outbreak of fire; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION No. 2113

"A resolution memorializing the President, Congress, and the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the import of mink pelts into the United States

"Whereas, there are 5,000 mink ranchers in the United States with a capital in their operations of $171,000,000; and

"Whereas, this American industry is highly efficient and competitive; and

"Whereas, the American mink growing industry has suddenly been severely affected by the import of mink pelts, in recent years totaling more than 40 percent of the mink pelts used in the United States; and

"Whereas, as a consequence of these imports the valuation of the American mink business has declined 42 percent; and

"Whereas, the American mink industry is faced with extinction because of the enormous imports of mink pelts; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota that Congress speedily enact legislation to reduce the import of mink pelts, and the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture establish import limits on mink pelts under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

"Be it further resolved that the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the United States Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the Minnesota Representatives and Senators in Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 25

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation protecting interstate commuters from unfair multiple taxation

"Whereas, More than 210,000 residents of this State commute to work in New York City, contributing thereby a great deal to the commercial activity and economic prosperity of the State and city of New York; and

"Whereas, In addition to their aforesaid contributions to the commerce and economy of the State and city of New York, such commuters (as well as many thousands more from other neighboring States) are subjected to the same income taxes imposed by the State and city upon their own residents, while at the same time paying all the taxes upon their property and their consumption of goods and services which are levied by this State and its governmental subdivisions; and

"Whereas, The city of New York in the past year imposed a new tax which had as one of its avowed objects the extracting of further revenue from commuters, justifying the said tax by exaggerating the benefits conferred upon commuters by the city and minimizing the degree of support and benefit conferred upon the city by commuters and by those industries which rely heavily upon commuter work forces; and

"Whereas, The city of New York appears likely to attempt further and more burdensome taxes upon commuters in its continuing desperate search for sources of revenue; and

"Whereas, Commuters actually receive only minimal government services from the State and city of New York, and are excluded, as nonresidents, from most of the particular educational and welfare benefits which have created the demand for new revenues for that State and city; and

"Whereas, The imposition of taxes deliberately designed to mulct commuters is discriminatory and in effect levies a tribute upon them for the privilege of crossing State lines to earn a living, contrary to the letter and spirit of the United States Constitution, Article IV, section 2, Amendment XIV, section 1; and

"Whereas, A Committee of the United States House of Representatives has already called attention to the "threat to the 'American Common Market' of new magnitude" in the similar growth of interstate taxation of business, and has called for "national guidelines which will allow interstate business to pay its share of State and local taxes, with assurance as to what its obligations are, and with confidence that it will not be subject to multiple and unfair taxation;" and these observations are equally true as applied to the taxation of individuals; now, therefore,

"BE IT RESOLVED *by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the General Assembly concurring)*:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized to give full consideration to the study, preparation and passage of legislation which will end and prevent the imposition of unfair multiple taxation upon persons whose place of work and of residence are in different States;

"2. That in considering such legislation the Congress be, and it is hereby, requested to give due consideration to the discriminatory aspects of taxation levied by any State or municipality upon persons to whom it denies benefits which are to be paid for by such taxation;

"3. That an authenticated copy of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives;

"4. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the members of Congress elected from the State of New Jersey."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 200

"A concurrent resolution to memorialize Congress to enact legislation to make the unlawful burning and malicious damaging of the American flag a Federal crime

"Whereas, the valiant defenders of Freedom are now engaged in a life and death struggle in the jungles, swamps and mountains of Viet Nam with the insidious hordes of atheistic communism, and

"Whereas, from the birth of our nation, the American flag has been a symbol of our country and the freedoms for which it stands as proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States of America, and

"Whereas, whenever the American flag is

displayed all believers in freedom and democracy honor it with pride, dignity and reverence, and

"Whereas, certain seditious elements who have overstepped the boundaries of legitimate dissent have had the audacity to besmirch and attempt to destroy this sacred symbol of freedom, and

"Whereas, such actions are reprehensible, loathsome and disgusting to every loyal American citizen, and

"Whereas, such actions give aid and comfort to the enemy by attempting to subvert the morale of the armed forces of the United States, and

"Whereas, such actions are an attempt to create the false opinion abroad that the climate of opinion in this country is opposed to the American defense of Freedom in Viet Nam, and

"Whereas, legal sanctions should be imposed to prevent these despicable actions, and

"Whereas, legislation has been introduced in the First Session of the 90th Congress to outlaw the malicious destruction of the American flag.

"Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the state of Louisiana, the Senate concurring herein, that the Legislature of the state of Louisiana hereby urges and requests the members of the Congress of the United States, and especially the members from the state of Louisiana, to act promptly and favorably and enact into law the proposed "flag burning" legislation.

"Be It Further Resolved that the Legislature extends its thanks, congratulations and commendation to the members of the Louisiana delegation for their efforts in favor of said legislation.

"Be It Further Resolved that copies of this Resolution shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the House to the President of the United States, to each member of the Louisiana Delegation in Congress, to the chairmen of the respective Congressional Committees before whom this proposed legislation will be heard, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and the President of the United States Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"SENATE RESOLUTION No. 257

"Senate resolution requesting the Congress of the United States for funds to be used in the reconstruction and maintenance of freeway access roads in the city and county of Honolulu

"Whereas, the construction of Federal Aid freeways is making a tremendous impact on Honolulu's traffic, and the addition of the Interstate Defense Highway System has added congestion to affected streets; and

"Whereas, streets which connect directly to the freeways carry heavy volumes of traffic; and

"Whereas, to handle the added traffic loads resulting therefrom, the provision of adequate traffic-carrying streets connecting to or extending from these freeways is of prime importance for the general welfare of the State; and

"Whereas, the costs of widening, reconstructing and maintaining these streets runs high and the City and County of Honolulu has the responsibility of improvement and maintenance of these access roads which places an unusual heavy burden on the City and County of Honolulu; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session 1967, that the Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to appropriate the necessary funds to be used for the reconstruction and maintenance of freeway access roads in the City and County of Honolulu; and

"Be it further resolved, that duly certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to Hawaii's Congressional delegation."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

"Senate concurrent resolution requesting Congress of the United States for passage of legislation to enable use of foreign constructed vessels in Hawaii State ferry system

"Whereas, Act 204, Session Laws of Hawaii 1965, provides for the establishment and operation of an inter-island ferry system in the State of Hawaii; and

"Whereas, among the impediments to the implementation of the Hawaii State Ferry System are the high costs connected with the lease, charter, contract or purchase of suitable vessels to be utilized in the ferry system; and

"Whereas, a review and study of the costs of the various domestically constructed vessels as compared with the costs of comparable foreign constructed vessels reveal that the utilization of the foreign made vessels may prove far more economically feasible; and

"Whereas, under the existing Federal law, the use of foreign constructed vessels in any ferry system in the United States is prohibited; and

"Whereas, there is now pending in the Congress of the United States legislation to permit the use of foreign constructed vessels in the State of Hawaii for a 3-year period; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1967, the House of Representatives concurring, that the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to give favorable consideration to the pending legislation to permit the use of foreign constructed vessels in Hawaii to initiate the Hawaii State Ferry System; and

"Be it further resolved that Hawaii's Congressional delegation be respectfully urged to strongly promote the passage of the said pending legislation; and

"Be it further resolved that certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, the Honorable Hiram L. Fong, the Honorable Spark Matsunaga and the Honorable Patsy T. Mink."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35

"Senate concurrent resolution relating to the expansion of the commercial training program for Micronesian fishermen

"Whereas, a program for the training of foreign fishermen has been established in Hawaii; and

"Whereas, this training program has been highly successful and beneficial to both the local commercial fishing industry by providing the needed manpower to alleviate the shortage of trained fishermen, and to the trainees by providing them with valuable experience as members of the regular crew on local fishing boats; and

"Whereas, twenty-five Micronesian trainees were originally enrolled under arrangements made by the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and under the sponsorship of the Tuna Boat Owners Association; and

"Whereas, of the original twenty-five Micronesians, nine have since returned to their homes, leaving sixteen trainees to complete the training program; and

"Whereas, trainees who complete the program will be able to return to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to provide invaluable assistance in the development of a Micronesian commercial fishing industry; and

"Whereas, a study prepared by the Hawaii State Department of Labor and Industrial Relations in February of 1965, ascertained that the presence of foreign fishermen trainees apparently has had no adverse effect on the local labor force but rather has proven to be beneficial in meeting the labor requirements of the local fishing industry; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1967, the House of Representatives concurring, that the Congress of the United States, Hawaii's Congressional delegation, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the members of the Tuna Boat Owners Association be and they are respectfully requested to support and provide all necessary assistance to expand the commercial fishing training program for Micronesian fishermen in Hawaii; and

"Be it further resolved that duly certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson; the President of the Senate, Hubert H. Humphrey; the Speaker of the House of Representatives, John W. McCormack; Senator Daniel K. Inouye; Senator Hiram L. Fong; Congresswoman Patsy T. Mink; Congressman Spark M. Matsunaga; Secretary of the Department of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall; and the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, William R. Norwood."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works:

"S.R. 143

"Senate resolution requesting the United States Congress to include $56,000 in the harbors and rivers bill for the purpose of completing the plans and designs for the Waikiki Beach improvement project

"Whereas, Hawaii is known throughout the world for its white sandy beaches and excellent climate which allows the newest of the fifty States to favorably compete in the worldwide tourist market; and

"Whereas, Hawaii is a Rest and Recuperation Center for armed services personnel fighting in Vietnam and the recreational beach areas are greatly enjoyed by our fighting men; and

"Whereas, one of the most widely used beaches in Hawaii is located in the District of Waikiki on the Island of Oahu which presently enjoys the distinction of being the major tourist resort area for the entire State; and

"Whereas, there is an urgent need to widen the beach at Waikiki for two miles extending from the present site of the Waikiki Elks Club to the Ala Wai Yacht Basin which would eliminate some rocky shoreline areas and provide an average width of 180 feet of sandy beach along the entire two miles; and

"Whereas, Congress and the Public Works Committee of the United States Senate have approved the Waikiki Beach Improvement Project having an estimated total cost of $4.3 million with the federal government sharing in $2.8 million of its estimated cost; and

"Whereas, none of the federal appropriation will be available until the plans and design studies are completed and approved by the United States Army Corps of Engineers which will require $56,000 to complete; and

"Whereas, all of Hawaii is anxious to see this project move as swiftly as possible since it will greatly benefit the entire State which depends heavily on its beaches to compete in the worldwide tourist industry; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1967, that the United States Congress be and is hereby respectfully requested to include $56,000 in the Harbors and Rivers Bill for the purpose of providing the necessary funds to the United States Army Corps of Engineers to complete the plans and designs for the Waikiki Beach Improvement Project; and

"Be it further resolved that duly certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each member of the Congressional Delegation from the State of Hawaii."

The petition of Florence B. Crane, of New York, N.Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase social security payments; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Kiwanis Club of Sheridan, Mont., endorsing the policy of the United States in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Texas Water Development Board, Austin, Tex., praying for the enactment of legislation to remove from the Federal reclamation laws the 160-acre limitation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

UAW SUPPORTS PENSION PROTECTION

Mr. **HARTKE**. Mr. President, on April 19 the United Auto Workers held a National Independents Parts and Supplier Conference in Detroit, comprised of its locals representing that portion of the automotive industry. In the course of its deliberations, the group adopted a resolution in support of the Hartke pension protection bill, S. 1635, which was introduced in this session on April 26, and on which an earlier version received 1 day of hearings in the Finance Committee last August.

As the resolution notes, the proposed legislation is intended to deal with the problem of pension plan terminations due to plant closings and similar causes, which has often caused hardship when this occurrence has left insufficient funds to meet expected retirement costs. Workers thus left without the retirement income they had counted on deserve protection of the kind the bill proposes. The principle has been endorsed by the Department of Labor and the Department of the Treasury. But there are still many questions to be resolved in the matter of details, questions which I hope will be further explored in more hearings. At least the serious problem deserves serious study and the most practical action possible—and I hope the expressed concern of this group may help further both study and action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may appear in the Record and may be appropriately referred.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Spong in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Pension Reinsurance Resolution

Whereas: The UAW now has over 1000 pension plans with employers in the Automotive, Aerospace, Agriculture Implement and related industries. These plans cover over 1¼ million active workers and are currently paying monthly benefits to more than 180,000 retired UAW members.

The available governmental statistics have indicated that over 7,000 retirement plans in the United States were terminated between 1953 and 1965.

The UAW has had direct experience with 113 of these pension plan terminations, involving companies ranging in size from Studebaker, which employed 7,000 workers in South Bend, Indiana, at the time it discontinued operations in that community in December of 1963, to an independent parts supplier with less than 20 employees.

The UAW has through collective bargaining, made sure that these plans are actuarially sound, however, collective bargaining, by itself, cannot guarantee pension security if a company goes broke before the pension plan is fully funded.

An establishment of a national mechanism to insure a portion of the risk of inadequacy of plan assets to meet benefit obligations in event of termination is vitally needed to alleviate the pain and suffering that accompanies the closing of plants and the termination of pension funds.

The U.S. Senator Vance Hartke (D., Ind.) had submitted a bill in the last congress to cover this pressing problem and is re-submitting a bill in this congress on pension reinsurance, which would require modest contribution from each pension fund to a federal pension reinsurance fund that would finance pensions for workers of closed plants. His plan would create a self-supporting federal agency to insure the pension plans against bankruptcy—the same way the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insures our bank deposits and the Federal Housing administration protects some mortgages.

In this way every company that adopts a retirement plan would pay this new agency a very small premium to insure its plan against failure.

Now therefore be it resolved: That the delegates to this National Parts Conference go on record of supporting this resolution and the passage of this bill when presented, and

Be it further resolved: That an all-out educational drive be conducted in each and every region in the United States so as to let all of the people know and understand what this bill means to them. Every means available should be used; at our local union membership meetings, at the AFL–CIO council meetings, in our labor newspapers, ads in every local newspaper, spots on television and radio, handbills, anyway. It is only when the populace is made aware and aroused that we can expect action, and

Be it finally resolved: That when this Council meets again this year in Washington, D.C. to meet and talk with our Congressmen, that these legislators have been fully informed by their citizens at home of the vital need for this particular Pension Reinsurance Legislation.

We cannot expect passage of this bill if Congress is not made fully aware of the problem and its need.

AUTHORITY FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. **McCLELLAN**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to have until June 30, 1967, to file certain reports of its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. These reports are entitled "Investigations Into Small Business Investment Companies," and "Investigation Into FHA Multiple Dwelling Projects."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT ON H.R. 2508—AUTHORITY TO FILE MINORITY AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 2508.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with the authority obtained previously regarding filing the report on H.R. 2508 by midnight tonight, I ask unanimous consent that the minority and individual views may be filed therewith.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1884. A bill for the relief of Michael A. Jennings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1885. A bill for the relief of Seymattin Kahraman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 1886. A bill for the relief of Angela Liotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERCY:

S. 1887. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Howard M. Tomme, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 1888. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Rita Rohr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 1889. A bill to provide for the modernization of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Columbia, S.C.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1890. A bill to amend the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCarthy when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH (for herself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Scott, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 1891. A bill to amend title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to establish more effective criteria for a finding of serious injury to domestic industry as a result of concessions granted under trade agreements, to make mandatory the findings of the Tariff Commission with respect to the necessity for tariff adjustment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Smith when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1892. A bill for the relief of Leo Walker; and

S. 1893. A bill to amend sections 40c(1) and 52a of the Bankruptcy Act so as to reallocate part of the filing fee from the clerk's earnings to the referees' salary and expense fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 1894. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGovern when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

INVESTIGATION TO DETERMINE THE POTENTIAL OF RAILROAD PASSENGER AND MAIL TRANSPORTATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURDICK submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31); which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

S. Con. Res. 31

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, for the purpose of relieving the ever-increasing congestion on the Nation's highways, promoting the spread of population throughout the Nation, and providing relief to an overburdened mail service, it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Transportation should make a full and complete investigation and study of the potential of rail transportation, particularly over existing lines and rights-of-way, for passenger and mail transportation in the United States. Such investigation and study should include—

(1) a determination of the possible future use of high-speed passenger trains in the various corridor cities or megalopolis areas of the Nation;

(2) a determination of the possible future use of auto carrier passenger trains for long-distance, high-speed rail transportation.

(3) a determination of the possibilities of developing economical means to continue and provide additional rail service to small communities not located in areas of dense population;

(4) a determination of the possible use of electricity for high-speed rail transportation;

(5) in consultation with the Postmaster General, a determination of the possible use of high-speed rail transportation for post office operation;

(6) a review of all existing research and development in rail transportation and a determination of areas where future research and development should be concentrated; and

(7) such other matters as would promote such purpose.

Sec. 2. It is also the sense of the Congress that pending the completion of such investigation and study by the Secretary of Transportation—

(1) the Interstate Commerce Commission should exercise such authority as it has under law to prevent any further discontinuance or abandonment of railroad passenger service; and

(2) the Postmaster General should continue all existing arrangements for railroad mail transportation.

AMENDMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT OF 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Presidential Election Campaign Act of 1966.

The procedure provided by this bill, I believe, is a sound approach to the problem of financing presidential elections. It represents a moderate and reasonable transition by which a greater number of citizens could participate in financing campaigns. It provides an equitable method for determining which political parties will receive Federal funds and for determining how much they will receive.

The bill also includes safeguards to insure the Federal payments received by political parties are used only for those campaign expenses which are directly related to bringing the candidates and their views before the public.

We have not had experience with public financing of political campaigns in this country. I believe that the first attempts to provide such financing should meet several tests:

First. It should be voluntary;

Second. It should be simple in operation;

Third. It should be fair to all parties;

Fourth. It should be limited in scope, taking into account the traditional methods of financing campaigns.

In my judgment the law we enacted last year did meet the first two tests. Many questions were raised as to whether it would be fair and also about abuses which might develop under it. I believe that everyone agreed that amendments were needed to limit its scope and to provide safeguards against possible abuses.

The bill I am introducing would continue the provisions of the present law which allow taxpayers to designate $1 of their Federal income taxes be paid into the fund. In addition the designated amounts would be automatically appropriated to the fund. I believe it is important that the funds be raised by the voluntary decision of citizens rather than have them appropriated from the general revenue. The income tax checkoff system retains the voluntary feature.

In my opinion, provisions for tax credits or tax deductions for contributions will not be effective. We will provide some tax relief for those who have been making contributions in the past, but I doubt that we will greatly increase the number of contributors. On the other hand, the income tax checkoff system has the great merit of simplicity and of providing a broad base of support.

The bill I am introducing today amends existing law to provide an equitable distribution of funds and to limit the scope for which such funds can be used. It ties the amount any political party could receive to the amount the party is able to raise by voluntary contributions from citizens and to the number of votes the party's candidates receive in the general election.

Generally, the maximum amount a political party would be entitled to under the bill is 50 cents multiplied by the number of votes the party's candidate for President receives in the election. The amount actually paid, however, will be limited to the amount of contributions from private persons which the party receives for use in conducting the presidential election campaign. In other words, each dollar a political party receives from the presidential election campaign fund will have to be matched with a dollar of private contributions.

The payments a political party receives from the fund may only be used for certain types of expenses which are closely associated with the most important aspect of a political campaign, that is, to bring the views of the candidates before the people. Federal payments will only be used for radio and television expenses, advertising expenses, and the expenses of preparing and distributing campaign literature.

The bill provides a further limitation on the amount of Federal payments a political party may receive which is a combination of the two points just mentioned: the dollar-for-dollar matching with private contributions and the limited types of expenses for which the Federal payments could be used. The Federal payments a party receives could not exceed 50 percent of the qualified expenses incurred by the party in carrying on the presidential election campaign. In other words, the largest Federal payment a political party could receive is an amount equal to one-half of its qualified campaign expenses and then only if the party has received private contributions in that amount.

The payment I have been discussing would not be available to a political party until after the presidential election has occurred, the amount a party may receive is to be determined on the basis of the number of votes its presidential candidate received in the election. Many of the expenses for a presidential campaign must, of course, be incurred and paid before the time of the election. In recognition of this, the bill provides for advance payments to political parties of approximately 25 percent of the amount the party would be otherwise entitled to. The amount of the advance payment is to be determined on the basis of the number of votes the party's presidential candidate received in the past presidential election. In other respects, the amount of the advance payments will be determined on the basis of one-fourth of what the regular payment would be. Thus, advance payments will be limited to 25 percent of the amount of private contributions received by the party for use in the presidential campaign, or, if it is smaller, 25 percent of one-half of the qualified expenses incurred by the party. If it is determined after a presidential election that a party's candidate for President received fewer votes in the election than the party's candidate received in the preceding election, and, accordingly, the regular payment to which the party is entitled is smaller than the advance payments the party has actually received, the bill provides that the party may retain the advance payments. It would be unreasonable to require a party in these circumstances to return amounts to the fund, especially in view of the fact that advance payments from the fund cannot exceed one-eighth of the party's qualified presidential election campaign expenses.

The bill also provides criminal penalties for misusing Federal campaign funds and for falsifying information or records in connection with obtaining amounts from the presidential election campaign fund. These penalties are necessary to insure that amounts received by political parties will be properly determined and will be used only for the allowable types of campaign expenses.

The method I am proposing represents, I believe, a sound approach to the problem of financing presidential election campaigns. The American people will be able, through the tax return checkoff, to participate in providing moneys to political parties for the purpose of bringing the presidential candidates' views before the public. Any political party, not just the major parties, will be entitled to receive presidential campaign funds. The amounts a party could receive from the presidential election campaign fund would be limited by the 50-cent-a-vote provision and also by the dollar-for-dollar matching with private contributions requirement. Finally, Federal campaign funds could only be used for those campaign expenses directly connected with bringing the candidates' views before the people.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1890) to amend the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966, introduced by Mr. McCarthy, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REMOVE SOCIAL SECURITY OUTSIDE EARNINGS LIMITATION

Mr. **McGOVERN.** Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would remove the $1,500 limitation on outside earnings that is presently imposed upon retired people if they are to receive full benefits under the Social Security Act.

From discussions with many people who are presently covered by the program and from a careful reexamination of its provisions, I am convinced that this legislation is based on economic realities, justice, and the needs of retired Americans.

Social security benefits are not adequate to provide an adequate standard of living for retired people. In mid-1966 the average single social security recipient received only $82 per month or $984 a year, and the average couple received $144 per month or $1,728 annually. They obviously cannot live in dignity or comfort without supplemental income, and I can see no good reason for forbidding them to get it from honest work.

The $1,500 limitation on outside earnings actually forces many people into a less-than-respectable standard of living. It serves as an effective lid on total income for people who want to receive the full retirement income they have earned.

The prospect of a cut in benefits is a strong deterrent to a retired individual who otherwise has the physical capacity and the desire to work to meet his own needs or those of his family during retirement years. It goes without saying that the desire to work and the feeling of responsibility and pride should be encouraged rather than penalized.

It is also significant that existing law does not limit rent, interest, or dividend income as it does wages and salaries. It thus discriminates against retired people who depend on their labor rather than on land or capital. Certainly they should have the same rights as those who depend on stocks or bonds.

The basic premise under which I continue to view the social security program is that it is insurance, not welfare. People who are covered pay premiums through payroll or self-employment taxes to protect retirement income. They are not recipients of a Government dole in any sense of the word.

Viewed in this light, it is basically unfair to penalize retired people who have paid the premiums merely because they have the initiative and the ability to earn income from other sources.

I am most hopeful that this legislation will be favorably considered by the appropriate committee, and that Members of the Senate will endorse its objectives and its terms.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1894) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder, introduced by Mr. McGovern, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADJUSTMENTS IN THE AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING SILVER CERTIFICATES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 203, 204, AND 205

Mr. **DOMINICK** submitted three amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1352) to authorize adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 16) to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] be added as a cosponsor.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1642, the Rural Recreation and Industrial Development Loan Act of 1967.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **JAVITS.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1741) to provide certain Federal controls over foreign banking corporations operating within the United States.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **GRUENING.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 1676, my bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and calling for a White House Conference on Population, that the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hansen], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] be added as cosponsors.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **HOLLINGS.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 1796) to impose quotas on the importation of certain textile articles, the names of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] be added as cosponsors.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 836

Mr. **HARRIS.** Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Government Research will reopen hearings, Friday, June 2, at 10 a.m., in room 3302 to consider S. 836, a bill to create a National Foundation for the Social Sciences.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1299, MARGIN REQUIREMENTS FOR SECURITIES TRANSACTIONS

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on Thursday, July 13, 1967, on S. 1299, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to permit regulation of the amount of credit that may be extended and maintained with respect to securities that are not registered on a national securities exchange. The hearing will commence at 10 a.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements in connection with the bill should notify Mr. Stephen J. Paradise, assistant counsel, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510; telephone 225-3921.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF PAUL X. WILLIAMS, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

Mr. **BURDICK.** Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 8, 1967, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Paul X. Williams, of Arkansas, to be U.S. district judge, western district of Arkansas, vice John E. Miller, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], as chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROBERT D. MORGAN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 8, 1967, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Robert D. Morgan, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge, southern district of Illinois, vice Frederick O. Mercer, deceased.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], as chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN E. HORNE, OF ALABAMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on Monday, June 5, 1967, on the nomination of John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term expiring June 30, 1971.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Persons desiring to testify or to submit statements in connection with this nomination should notify Mr. Lewis G. Odom, Jr., Staff Director, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-3921.

SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on April 21, 1967, the National School Boards Association held its 27th annual conference in Portland, Oreg. Dr. Joseph Ackerman, immediate past president of the association, delivered a speech before this group entitled "School Boards: A Creative Force in Public Education." Dr. Ackerman is a constituent of mine and is a member of the Elmhurst, Ill., School Board.

His address is very timely and constructive in connection with the problems of education which we face today, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL BOARDS: A CREATIVE FORCE IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

Distinguished platform guests, board members from across the nation, ladies and gentlemen: On behalf of our school board leadership throughout the country, it is my pleasure and privilege as President of the NSBA to welcome you to our 27th annual convention.

This year we will again have a record attendance, I am sure that those of you who sit in on the sessions will find that the program is concerned with the fundamental and vital issues of today. This growing attendance reflects the awareness of our board members of the opportunities and the challenges that they face in making our boards of education a creative force in education.

I wish it were possible to report to you about each of the meetings that I as your President have had the privilege to attend. It has been an exciting year and an encouraging one. We are living in an age of rapid change—in our economy, in the tools and methods employed, and in the people who manage and operate the economy. We have witnessed a recommitment to education, because there is wide recognition of the important role of education in adjusting to this change.

There is no question in my mind but that education and the orderly process of responsible self-government are the two indispensable elements that have led to the progress of our nation. The two elements are interrelated. Certainly the power of the people to govern themselves can be used with intelligence and wisdom and can be a vital force for progress only if people are well educated. The goals of our public education arise from the meaning and the values of our democratic society. They are often expressed in terms of productive, competent, ethical citizenship. Education in the United States is intended to develop the capacities of individuals to provide for richness in personal living on the one hand and to contribute to society and enrich the lives of others through the sharing of talents on the other hand, whether this sharing be through the economic, social, cultural, or other aspects of life.

During the early years of our history changes in our economy came relatively slowly, and our people were unprepared for the revolutionary changes that were to follow. The far-reaching changes that we have experienced during the last fifteen years have found us often unprepared and left us somewhat bewildered, always lagging a little behind the times.

We can say that whatever its faults, our educational system has functioned fairly well in the past. However, American education is in an uneasy state today because it, too, is lagging.

Boards of education have been assigned by the state legislatures the task of translating into reality the American dream of universal public elementary and secondary education at public expense. The education needed by today's children to compete successfully in tomorrow's world is vastly different from that received yesterday by the typical member of a local school board in a small community. Boards of education need to provide every opportunity for education to arrive at a level of maturity and a quality of service that a few years ago seemed impossible of attainment. This calls for vision, imagination, resourcefulness, courage. It requires all the talents and abilities the board can muster. If a sound educational system is to be developed, boards of education must remove education from the wraps and bounds of parochialism. Boards of education often realize the need to change the structural pattern of education and yet at the same time hesitate to break with tradition and experiment with the unfamiliar or adopt the revolutionary.

On the other hand, there is danger that we will become excited and make sweeping revisions in response to much publicized experiments, or in answer to the demands of pressure groups, which do not take into consideration the student's total educational needs. If our public schools are to advance, changes cannot be made impulsively or haphazardly.

The attitude of the public can be a strong restraining force in the development of education. Many people are suspicious of change and look upon any departure from the so-called fundamentals with a great deal of skepticism and suspicion. One of the main responsibilities of a board of education is to create the proper educational environment and to exert a wholesome influence on the community. The board needs to improve the level of public understanding about the goals and processes of public education. The people should help determine the kind of educational program they want. However, if they are confused, uncertain, indifferent, or inarticulate about the schooling they wish for their children, then others with little interest in the school may make the decisions.

Board members must know intimately, and must understand the educational aims and philosophies, not only of their fellow citizens, but of the state and of the nation. They must have a knowledge of the educational needs of the community and how these needs can best be met. Professional educators are trained to design and to operate a school system that fits a pattern, provided the board of education supplies the blueprint and the direction.

In a predominantly rural nation it was sufficient for farm children to have a working knowledge of the fundamentals of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Much more is demanded of education in today's urbanizing complex society. Education today is expected to be a powerful force in effecting social change, and it is likewise expected to be a partner with defense in preserving our way of life. It is being called upon to provide the leadership to prevent the growing scourge of crime in our streets. It is difficult for school administrators, and especially school board members, to keep pace with the changes needed and the reasons for the need.

Certainly one of the prime concerns of boards of education is what our schools should teach. Today a variety of forces are pressing relentlessly on education to intensify the learning process. These forces include the revolution of science and technology, the new frontiers in outer space, the changing patterns of economic life, the expanding role of government in an increasingly interdependent society, the sharpening conflicts concerning values, and the new international role which we are playing. In order to deal with these dramatic changes in American life and culture, college learning is being pushed back to high school and high school subject matter to the elementary curriculum.

Many people say that soft subjects dominate the curriculum and are calling for a return to solid subjects, by which they mean those related to college preparatory courses of the nineteenth century. There are also those who think that the curriculum of today lags behind available knowledge. There are differences of opinion concerning the priority that should be established among the subjects taught in the school and the levels at which they should be taught. We need to make wise decisions in these areas based upon research and careful evaluation.

Certainly the educational needs of all

youth cannot be met by a single uniform program of instruction. Equal educational opportunity does not, and should not, mean identical education. A varied curriculum must be provided to give pupils, who have individual differences, opportunity to develop their potentialities. Too often in the past we have rewarded conformity and have discouraged creativity.

Another major concern is the teaching method. Should we use team teaching? Should we have one teacher per classroom? Do we need to share the talents of our most gifted teachers? Can a variety of educational experiences be provided through large group instruction seminars? Is individual instruction required to meet peculiar special needs? Are there any other opportunities we need to examine closely?

We need to adapt teaching methods to the needs of pupils rather than to mold students into predetermined educational activities. We need to provide sufficient classroom space and opportunities for divergence, and teachers should be encouraged to discover and nurture talent. We need to know much more about educational TV programs, teaching machines, and many more teaching innovations being developed around the world.

The third concern is what changes are needed in our school organization. Many of the areas in need of reorganization are still in the Midwest. In 1962 the seven states, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska with 42 percent of the nation's school districts, still had 53 percent of the nation's one-teacher schools and over 48 percent of all districts providing only elementary education. Kansas has taken the leadership recently in requiring a uniform system of free public schools throughout the state, with all areas of the state included in school districts which maintain grades one through twelve and kindergarten where desired. In this plan all school districts will be unit districts operating under one board of education for each district.[1] We still have a long way to go in enlarging the size of districts to increase financial support and pupil enrollment sufficiently for the development of a sound educational system.

The fourth area of concern is strengthening state departments of education. They are the catalytic agents as well as the administrative and regulatory agencies for local boards of education. For too long, too many state departments of education have remained the forgotten step-children. They have been inadequately staffed and inadequately financed so that they are often unable to provide the dynamic leadership required of them today.

State boards of education can provide leadership in formulating educational objectives and philosophies, in reorganizing districts, in developing a basic curriculum, in conducting pilot programs and research studies, in recommending legislative programs, and in developing a well informed electorate. They can do much to prevent duplication of effort and to express a third party judgment over parochial decisions. They can serve as a clearing house not only between local boards of education but also between states. With increasing federal aid we need better communication between all the federal agencies and the local boards of education. This can come and should come through a strong state board of education if we are to retain any degree of local control.

Another important concern is financing for education. Although money itself is not a guarantee of high quality education, the best schools are often found in the areas that have the most money. We are one of the wealthiest nations in the world, but we have not tapped much of this wealth on an equitable basis to provide the funds needed to meet the increased cost of education.

Part of the problem related to school finances is that we have relied too heavily on property taxes to support our schools. Assessment in relation to true values varies from less than 20 percent in some counties to as high as 80 percent in other counties in the United States. Because of differences of the location of commercial interests the value of assessed properties in relation to each child varies from a low of less than $3,000 to a high of over $600,000. We need to take steps to eliminate such large variations in the financial resources behind schools. In most cases more state aid is required. The growing pressures on property taxes for the support of education are leading to efforts to shift the financial burden to other sources.

Money is necessary for adequate facilities. The architecturally obsolete building is not as common as many people think, but the educationally obsolete building is fairly common. With the changing of educational ideas we have a new concept of building needs. Classrooms need to be something more than a collection of chairs and desks bolted to the floor. New concepts of class size, teacher-pupil ratio, curriculum, and teaching techniques call for facilities that are adaptable.

Another problem of concern is teacher training. Due to the great demand for teachers, quite frequently it has been necessary to retain unqualified personnel, particularly those who did not meet all of the requirements of certification. The lack of adequately trained teachers is related to the dropout problem. There is a question whether existing teacher certification laws and standards are really in line with current thinking. Many educational people feel that certification should be based upon the competence of the individual rather than courses, that the existence of equivalents and compensatory qualities should be recognized, that procedures for certification should respect the professional judgment of those who can judge competency on the job, and that periodically certification procedures should be re-evaluated objectively.

Beginning teachers need to have better preparation. It has been said that teachers need a better background in liberal arts and that they need to have a clear insight into the social and psychological aspects of learning. Above all, they need to have greater skill in the art and techniques of teaching. A student can no longer take some courses in education as a part of his college program, spend some time in the school as a student teacher, and then be expected to deal singlehandedly with the problems that confront a new teacher.

An area of increasing concern is urbanization and the many educational problems growing out of this trend. Many thousands of pupils enroll from outside the city each year. It has been said that more than one-fourth of the school population within a large city originates elsewhere. This urban growth is partly the result of our technological development which has reduced the need for labor in rural areas. Many people leave rural areas in search of better opportunities in the city, hoping to have the comforts and conveniences that so often have been pictured as part of city life. They frequently arrive ill-equipped and ill-prepared to compete successfully for the available jobs. They have little money, a poor credit rating, slum housing, and find many other unexpected conditions associated with urban growth and development. They bring to the city many of their own problems and encounter other new ones which often overwhelm them. The schools, therefore, are immediately confronted with problems which are not particularly educational.

It is evident that a child's response to learning is related to his physical, mental, and spiritual condition at the time of instruction. Therefore, the school needs to be concerned with whether he eats regularly, whether he has a good place to sleep and has someone to turn to for love and protection. Environmental factors are tremendously important in the achievement of children in elementary schools. We need to reach down to establish earlier contact with the children and also need to reach up to help families provide a better environment for their children.

There is some evidence that school performance has been low in low-income areas although many of the economic situations are not the result of the individual's ability or lack of ability. We, therefore, need to develop a more effective teaching method to reach children in our low-income areas. Many pilot projects are under way, and we need to assess them properly and then make improvements to meet this greatly expanded need.

Many people are suggesting that school boards are outmoded. Some say that our professional staff should be given a much larger role in policy making. The increasing size and complexity of our school systems have made it impossible to continue the informality of operation that has characterized many of our school systems in the past. Thus, it has become necessary to formalize school policy and to clarify roles and responsibilities in order to maintain good employer-employee relationships and effective administration.

There is certainly no more important element in the quality of the school system than the caliber, the enthusiasm, and the professional dedication of its teaching corps. Good employer-employee relationships depend upon the existence of a dedicated group of professional educators. It has been said repeatedly at our meetings that recommendations of classroom teachers, administrators, and other professional personnel should be given every consideration in the formulation of school board policies. Effective school boards have for years operated in ways that have recognized the unique roles that professional educators can play in the total school program. Adequate personnel policies, employment practices, working conditions, grievance procedures, and the obvious import of two-way communication are not altogether new to such school boards.

Of vital concern to school boards is the growth of collection bargaining, professional negotiations, and sanctions, that are a product of our changing times. We cannot make them disappear by ignoring them, and we need to recognize that few things in the world remain static. While we continue to talk about and think about the policies that we should have, we find that across the country policies with respect to negotiations are being established in the several states. Some of these policies are shaped by our national organization. But most of the positions reached reflect the views and pressures of many other parties—local, regional, and national. It is a fact that what is happening locally and in the states in the aggregate is becoming a national public policy on this issue. Certainly our uppermost concern should be that professional negotiation policies serve the needs of public education. We need to see that there is adequate opportunity for two-way communication between the board and the teachers. We must make available to all groups the information needed to understand the total situation and the total needs of the school system. We need to be aware of the concerns of all groups, and need to study them objectively. Then we can move forward provided all parties work together in good faith and follow sound operational procedures.

---

[1] L. R. Simpson, *Outline and Guide for Board of Education*, State Department of Public Instruction, Topeka, Kansas, revised 1965.

Another significant matter which can have far-reaching implications for education is a nation-wide assessment of education. Education, like any other important social endeavor, needs to be objectively evaluated. Such an evaluation would give us a better understanding of our achievements and the strengths and weaknesses of our educational system and would provide a basis for making decisions affecting education. The concerns which board members should have are: who will administer this evaluation, and what uses will be made of the results?

We must always keep foremost the thought that the strength of the nation lies in the hearts, the minds, the spirit, and the conscience of the people. The nation's welfare lies not in the laws of government but in the honesty and the moral responsibility of its citizens, which are acquired through an effective educational program. Board members must be aware of their creative role, their service role, and their leadership role if we are to see the full realization of our nation's democratic ideals.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business?

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE BLIND

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the eminent columnist, Bob Considine, has written a warm article about the very able director of the Iowa Commission for the Blind, Kenneth Jernigan. The article appeared in the Cedar Rapids Gazette of May 23, and in other newspapers around the Nation.

The headline of the column, "The Blind: 'So Loved and Discriminated Against,'" sums up the content. The article merits the attention of everyone.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, May 23, 1967]

THE BLIND: "SO LOVED AND DISCRIMINATED AGAINST"

(By Bob Considine)

NEW YORK.—Kenneth Jernigan, director of the Iowa Commission for the Blind, directs his crusade in the eternal night of his sightlessness. But his vision of a new day for the blind is strictly 20-20.

"The blind have a serious complication: Nobody hates us," the educator said. "We are discriminated against, like the Negroes and other minority groups. We can't go here, we can't go there. Jobs we could handle are not available to us. But it is difficult to rebel, to stand up for our rights as citizens and human beings, because we are so loved. And pitied.

"Aside from cancer, blindness is the trouble people fear the most. But at Des Moines we teach the newly-blinded what we feel is a new outlook on sightlessness. We think of it as a characteristic, one of perhaps 500 each human being has. Each characteristic, in a sense, is a limitation, but it does not destroy the whole man. Nor should he permit it to destroy him.

"For example, I can never own a car driver's license. Is that sad?" It might be for you but not for me. I don't want to drive a car. Years ago I thought it might be nice to be a jockey. But I was cut off from pursuing that kind of life not by blindness alone but by another characteristic: I weigh too much.

"I would not have hired Albert Einstein to teach at our place in Des Moines. He had two characteristics which would have made him a poor member of the facility: He was too intellectual for us, and was easily bored.

"The Negro has reacted strongly to the discrimination against him. Some of the reaction to the hostility against him has resulted in his going in for riotous disorders—which have only short-term value. Progress lies beyond that, one hopes. But hostility is a sign of progress. Every ethnic group that progressed in this coutry went through a period of hostility—the Irish, Italians, Germans, Scandinavians, Jews. They rebelled against that hostility and won equality. The blind tend to be smothered in kindness."

Sometimes, sympathy can rile a blind person. Jernigan said:

"We get a lot of people who mean well, God bless them, and when they are attracted by something we say or do they in turn will say in a most surprised way, 'I'd hardly know you were blind.' It's like saying to a Negro with a doctor or philosophy degree, 'say, you're pretty smart.' What they mean in that case, of course, is 'you're pretty smart even though you're a Negro.'

"We've got to be kind to good souls with sight, too," the good man said. "Not long ago at the end of an especially long and hard day at the office I was tapping my way home and came to a particularly busy intersection. I knew it well. As I started to cross it I felt a hand on my hand. It was the hand and voice of an old man. I felt he might be eighty. He said he would help me across the street. I pulled away from him, stepped out ahead of him, and made my own way. And then when I reached the curb I examined my conscience and found myself grievously at fault. I wish I could find him to apologize to him.

"There are so many little things that can get under your skin, if you let them. A hotel clerk permitted me to check into his place on a business trip not long ago—sometimes they won't take me, of course. I was taken to my room by a bell-hop who gave me the layout of the place: Bed, table, bathroom, so forth. I extended my hand with a tip and he refused to take it. He said an odd thing. He said, 'I'm a gentleman. I wouldn't think of taking a tip from a blind man.'

"And my Lions club. God knows the Lions have done more for the blind man than almost any other organization. But last Christmas it didn't ask me to join the volunteers who rang bells beside the Salvation Army collection pots. As if a blind man couldn't ring a bell just as well . . ."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 10 minutes so that I may make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT SAFETY STANDARDS AND NEW CAR PRICES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, within the past 2 weeks three of the four major American automobile manufacturers have announced that the price of 1968 model cars will be "substantially" increased over 1967 car prices.

These announcements of forthcoming substantial increases in car prices are most disturbing, Mr. President, for while declining to specify how much of an increase to expect, it is claimed in each instance that the cost of complying with the initial Federal motor vehicle safety standards and air pollution requirements will necessitate a substantial increase in the price of 1968 model cars.

SAFETY BLAMED

These announcements are also disturbing in light of last year's experience when the industry increased the price of 1967 model cars. Those increases were also blamed on safety and now the industry is again talking about increasing car prices and again blaming safety improvements for the bulk of the increase.

These announcements of another price increase because of safety are disturbing because many of the safety standards being required on 1968 model cars were met or exceeded by many 1967 model American cars—and presumably were paid for by the 1967 increases which averaged from $54 to $66. In fact, experts in the automotive safety field claim that 1967 model cars met most of the safety standards being required on 1968 automobiles.

PUBLICITY CAMPAIGN

And they are disturbing, Mr. President, because these statements about skyrocketing costs requiring substantial price increases have all the earmarks of a publicity campaign to gain advance acceptance of higher car prices, and at the same time, to create the impression that any price increase—regardless of how substantial—is a result of Government action in attempting to reduce the tragic toll of death and injury on our streets and highways by requiring that motor vehicles meet certain minimum safety standards.

From the outset, the American auto industry opposed enactment of effective legislation to make automobiles safer. When Congress enacted this long-overdue legislation, the industry transferred the fight to the newly created National Traffic Safety Bureau which was required by law to promulgate the first nationwide vehicle safety standards for 1968 automobiles.

INDUSTRY OPPOSITION

Despite the modest nature of these initial standards and despite compromises by the National Traffic Safety Bureau on many of its proposed standards, the auto industry has fought them all the way. The traffic safety agency has been attacked as being uncooperative and unresponsive to industry problems and the proposed standards have been attacked as being unreasonable, arbitrary and technically unfeasible. Six months ago the president of one auto company even claimed that imposition of the proposed minimum safety standards would be detrimental to the national economy and might force production lines to be shut down.

DIRE PREDICTIONS

And throughout there have been dire predictions about how much the new standards would cost. For several months now, unidentified industry sources have been floating predictions that the new safety standards alone would add between $100 and $200 to the price of 1968 model cars and that the antismog requirement would add another $40 to $50. Thus the recent announcements of forthcoming substantial price increase for 1968 cars are simply the latest variations on an old theme. But they are significant, nonetheless, because in each case it was the president of the company who made the statement.

Mr. President, no one questions the fact that some of the new vehicle safety standards will cost money—but we should also keep in mind that there are others which can be implemented at little or no cost, that a few will even result in a cost savings, and most important of all, that many if not most of the standards are already included on 1967 American automobiles.

EXCISE TAX CUT IN 1968

Mr. President, I wonder if instead of a price increase whether a price decrease on 1968 models might not be more appropriate—especially in view of the fact that on April 1, 1968—in the middle of 1968 model years sales—the excise tax on automobiles will be cut 5 percent—from the present rate of 7 percent to 2 percent. For a $3,000 automobile, a 5-percent reduction will amount to $150. In enacting the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, Congress intended that these tax savings be passed on to the consumer, not just the 3-percent reduction which took effect in mid-1965 but the subsequent reductions as well. I have yet to hear this forthcoming 5-percent tax reduction mentioned by automobile company spokesmen in their statements about the necessity of increasing 1968 prices because of the high cost of complying with safety standards. However, this is hardly surprising in view of the fact that the 3-percent cut in 1965 was not passed on to the consumer until a public issue was made of Congress' intent in authorizing the reduction.

NO INCREASE FOR STYLING CHANGES

In addition, I think it is most strange that an industry which is so experienced and expert at making expensive annual styling changes in automobiles without increasing prices, finds it necessary to substantially increase prices to meet the modest safety standards being required this year. I can not recall ever hearing an industry spokesman say "prices will have to be increased this year because of the costly styling changes in our new cars." But let anyone mention the most trivial safety requirement and immediately we hear that it will be terribly costly and that the consumer will have to pay extra for it.

President Johnson referred to this practice when he signed the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act into law last September with the comment that: "Safety is no luxury item, no optional extra. It must be a normal cost of doing business"—just, I might add, as the industry considers annual styling changes a normal cost of doing business.

BUILT-IN PROFITS

In 1958 the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly conducted extensive hearings on "Administered Prices—Automobiles," in an attempt to determine if the pricing practices in the American automobile industry were monopolistic. While no specific legislative action resulted, the hearings identified for the first time some of the pricing policies in the industry. At the conclusion of my remarks I will ask to include in the Record the introduction to the November 1, 1958, committee report which provides an excellent summary of these policies.

One of the pertinent facts brought out by the hearings is that, in setting prices, the major automotive companies include a net profit of about 20 percent as part of the cost of producing automobiles. This practice virtually guarantees a profit return, after taxes, of more than 20 percent of net worth each year, depending on the variance between sales estimates—which are generally conservative—and actual sales.

But last year was an exception. As reported in last Sunday's Washington Post, the industry's profits after taxes dropped from about 23 percent in 1965, the highest in American industry, to about 18 percent in 1966—still one of the highest profit returns in American business. So the question arises whether the industry is trying to make up for last year's slippage with a higher rate of return on 1968 cars.

IS SAFETY AN EXCUSE FOR INCREASES

Thus when the auto industry says that substantial price increases are necessary, one begins to wonder just how necessary. And when the bulk of these substantial increases are blamed on safety standards, one begins to wonder whether safety is being used as an excuse to raise prices or whether price increases are being used to promote opposition to future vehicle safety standards—or perhaps both.

I do not think it necessary to detail the detrimental impact on future vehicle safety efforts which would result from creation of the impression in the public mind that the minimal safety standards laid down this year required major price increases.

And whether intentional or not, such an impression is being created by the constant flow of statements from Detroit claiming that the cost of complying with the safety standards is so high that major price increases will be required.

A typical example is a story which appeared in the Cleveland Press on January 4 of this year—a month prior to issuance of the safety standards for 1968 cars. This article, which I shall ask to be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks, was entitled: "Safety Items Will Increase Car Prices." And it concluded with these words:

> In summary: Look for higher price tags pasted on rear windows next fall and thank Uncle Sam for them.

And the possibility of using safety as an excuse for price increases has long been a concern. Last August, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee—Senator Magnuson, who played such a key role in bringing the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act into being—commented in this Chamber that:

> It would be tragic indeed to permit this significant legislation—which is designed solely to protect the lives and safety of each of the millions of Americans who drive a car—to serve as a license for automobile makers to increase prices.

Senator Magnuson also questioned the justification for increasing 1967 car prices and Senator Ribicoff urged the auto companies to "utilize the fruits of their mass production techniques and increases in productivity to keep the cost of safety down." A month later, when an average increase of over $100 was announced by one company, Senator Ribicoff noted that—

> It seems clear that at least one manufacturer is trying to make an unfair profit out of safety.

This increase and others were later cut back to about the same level as increases announced by General Motors. Nonetheless, United Auto Workers President Walter Reuther, in a news article I shall ask to be included in the Record, stated that rather than raising prices the industry "could well afford a substantial price cut on its 1967 models" and that the industry could have cut the price of all 1966 cars by $251 at wholesale and still earn the average rate of profits for all manufacturers.

DISCLOSURE OF SAFETY COSTS

Senator Magnuson also noted last August, that during the hearings before his committee, there was considerable discussion regarding the cost of mandatory minimum safety standards, that much concern was expressed that manufacturers would be able to attribute any price increase to implementation of safety standards, and that suggestions were made that the law require public disclosure of the actual cost of required safety changes "so that the buyer would know what part, if any, of a price increase he was paying to protect himself and his family and what part might be due to other factors."

This proposal was not incorporated in the law, and rightly so, I believe, because of concern that it might involve infringement of manufacturers' trade secrets.

Nonetheless, Mr. President, if prices for 1968 cars are going to be substantially increased, and if these increases are going to be blamed on safety, I think the public has a right to a precise accounting of exactly what it is paying for.

INDUSTRY ASKED TO SPELL OUT INCREASES

Thus, I am pleased to announce that Senator Magnuson, who is unable to be here today, and I have written the four major American automobile manufacturers requesting that they voluntarily spell out any price increases in their 1968 model cars which will be "directly attributable to compliance with the initial Federal motor vehicle safety standards."

Our letter to them, which I shall ask to be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks, asks for a model-by-model breakdown specifying the amount of increase attributable to each safety standard. In addition, we have asked that they answer several related questions raised by the Federal Highway Administrator, Lowell K. Bridwell, in a letter to me following the recent announcements of forthcoming substantial price increases.

These questions include: First, whether the price increase would include the total cost of features affected by safety standards or only the additional cost required by implementation; second, whether the price increase would include the cost of safety features which were included on 1967 models and which are now mandatory; third, whether savings which accrue from implementation of safety standards—for example, elimination of dangerous or unnecessary ornamental metal—are being deducted from the cost increase attributed to safety; fourth, whether the cost of mandatory antismog devices is being included in the cost of complying with safety standards; and fifth, whether the cost of defect notification and recall campaigns is being included in the cost of complying with the new safety standards.

SUBSTANTIAL INCREASES NOT JUSTIFIED

As Mr. Bridwell notes in his letter, the National Traffic Safety Bureau does not have sufficient information available to make factual evaluations of manufacturers' assertions that the cost of compliance with safety standards necessitates significant price increases. However, he also comments that in his opinion, "any substantial price increase based on compliance with the safety standards is not justified."

And I am pleased to note that the safety agency is undertaking to establish an in-depth engineering and economic analysis system in order to identify the specific cost factors of future safety standards.

Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the Record at this point the letter which Senator Magnuson and I have sent to American automobile manufacturers, along with Administrator Bridwell's letter which was enclosed. I also ask permission to insert a news article from the January 4, 1967, issue of the Cleveland Press, entitled "Safety Items Will Increase Car Prices"; a news article from the September 23, 1966, issue of the Washington Star, entitled "Reuther Hits Car Price Rise"; and the introduction to a November 1, 1958, report of the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly entitled "Administered Prices—Automobiles."

I also ask consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record the following news dispatches regarding car price increases: New York Times, May 19, 1967, "New Safety Devices To Lift Car Prices, Henry Ford Warns"; Dow Jones News Service, May 20, 1967, "AMC Planning Price Increases on 1968 Lines"; UPI, May 20, 1967, "AMC Predicts Car Price Hike"; Automotive News, May 29, 1967, "Roche Says GM Prices Will Rise"; and Detroit News, February 25, 1967, "GM Hints Safety Items Will Boost 1968 Car Prices."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Commerce,
May 29, 1967.

Mr. William V. Luneberg,
President, American Motor Corp.,
Detroit, Mich.

Dear Mr. Luneberg: We are naturally concerned by recent statements that compliance with the Initial Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards will necessitate substantial increases in the prices of the 1968 model automobiles.

Congress has the responsibility to assess the impact of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act on the economy as well as on public safety. However, as the Federal Highway Administrator indicates in the attached letter to Senator Mondale, the National Traffc Safety Bureau does not now have access to sufficient cost and price data to assess this impact objectively. We would therefore very much appreciate receiving from you a breakdown by model and standard of the increase in your prices which will be directly attributable to compliance with the Initial Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards.

In addition, we would appreciate receiving your answers to the several related questions raised by Administrator Bridwell in his letter.

Sincerely yours,
Warren G. Magnuson,
U.S. Senator.
Walter F. Mondale,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1967.

Hon. Walter F. Mondale,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale: This is to confirm our May 19 telephone conversation about our views on automotive prices for 1968 models.

In my opinion any substantial price increase based on compliance with the initial Federal motor vehicle safety standards issued January 31 of this year is not justified. However, at this time we do not have sufficient information available to evaluate the validity of manufacturers' assertion that the cost of compliance with the standards necessitates significant price increases.

For example, we do not know whether each company's figures include the total cost of features affected by the safety standards or only the additional cost which implementation of the safety standards requires. In addition, various 1967 models already meet different parts of the 1968 standards, and therefore new expenditures should not be required in a number of instances. Furthermore, we do not know whether any savings which accrue from the implementation of the safety standards, for instance, elimination of dangerous or unnecessary ornamental metal, have been deducted from the total cost increase attributed to safety improvements. It should be mentioned that, in determining 1968 model prices, the cost of our safety standards apparently has been lumped with the cost of the anti-smog devices required under the Clean Air Act administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Finally, we do not know whether the increased cost of defect recall campaigns has been included or to what extent. Prior to enactment of the law last fall, some recall campaigns were conducted. However, your Fair Warning Amendment requires more extensive and efficient campaigns. The increased cost of these campaigns should not be attributed to the cost of complying with the new safety standards.

In order to identify specific cost factors in the future, we are starting an in-depth engineering and economic analysis of the entire automotive industrial engineering process and product cycle.

A major part of our present contracting program is designed to develop industrial engineering and economic data concerning the industrial automotive process that will provide a technically sound, definitive framework within which the reasonableness and practicability of every proposed motor vehicle safety standard and its effective date can be evaluated. An important part of this effort will deal with the development of methodology for analyzing the impact of safety standards, both on market sales and price to the consumer.

I am enclosing a copy of a request for proposal on this subject that has already been mailed to prospective contractors. The bidders' conference is tentatively scheduled for May 24 and we hope to have the study funded and under way by the end of this fiscal year.

Thank you for your continuing interest and help.

Sincerely,
Lowell K. Bridwell,
Federal Highway Administrator.

[From the Cleveland, Ohio, Press, Jan. 4, 1967]

Safety Items Will Increase Car Prices

(By Roger Rowand)

Predictions and just plain guessing about the economy are filling the air these days. Much attention is being focused on what the auto industry will do this year.

There's one thing you can bet on:

Car prices are going up. The car shopper who's hoping to buy a new 1968 car for what he could buy a 1967 model for had better forget it.

Reasons for the upward movement include the usual "more costly labor and materials" but this year will have two important added companions.

Those price boosters are safety and smog control.

The Federal Government at the end of this month will publish 23 safety standards that will range from the distance above the road that parking lights must be to the distance between seat belt anchor bolts.

Other standards will be more dramatic, and all will cost money. Any design change in the auto industry is an expensive proposition.

The costs arise from such factors as engineering, tooling expenses, retraining workers and jiggling of production procedures.

The industry is expert at adapting to change but will be reluctant this year to absorb the cost. Profits, while still hefty at the manufacturing end, are declining.

That means, of course, the added expense will be passed on to the retail buyer.

Detroit sources are predicting the safety features will add between $100 and $200 to the price of a car.

Most estimates range around $100.

As for smog control, as things stand now you'll be paying $45 on the average.

Prices of smoke control devices run from the $18 to $25 for the Chrysler package to much higher for others.

You will have to have one no matter where you live or drive. Uncle Sam says you have to have the equipment on any new car starting with the 1968 models.

In addition to the initial cost, you will have to maintain the device. Auto companies came up with ridiculously low figures—under $5 a year—on maintenance.

We all know it will cost that much just to ask a bonafide mechanic to look at the thing to see if it's functioning properly.

In summary: Look for higher price tags pasted on rear windows next fall and thank Uncle Sam for them.

[From the Star, Sept. 23, 1966]

REUTHER HITS CAR PRICE RISE

DETROIT.—The Big Three auto firms have increased 1967 car prices well beyond the cost of added equipment, the United Auto Workers Union said today.

"All of the companies are charging their customers the full cost of the added equipment plus a substantial amount more which can only be interpreted as direct price boost," said Walter P. Reuther, UAW president.

Reuther said, "The auto industry will give the U.S. economy a painful, perilous and entirely unjustified push up the threatening spiral of inflation if the price increases . . . are put into effect."

He said the industry "could well afford a substantial price cut on its 1967 models." Reuther said profits of the industry in the first half of this year "represented a phenomenal annual rate of return on stockholders' investment of 20.9 percent—the highest of any U.S. manufacturing industry, and one and a half times as much as the average of all manufacturers."

He said the industry could have cut the price of every 1966 car by $251 at wholesale and still have earned the average rate of profits for all manufacturers.

General Motors Corp., Ford Motor Co. and Chrysler Corp. announced increases in 1967 car prices this week. GM's new prices averaged $56 more than for its 1966 models. Ford's increase averaged $113 per car. Chrysler reported a $92 average increase, although other sources figured Chrysler's boost at $103.

All three firms said the price increases covered costs of equipment changes, mostly safety devices.

The firms also said the price increases did not include any provisions to cover increased costs for wages, fringe benefits and materials.

ADMINISTERED PRICES—AUTOMOBILES

INTRODUCTION

In making its inquiry into administered prices in the automobile industry, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly has been examining an industry which, perhaps more than any other, occupies a pivotal position in the economy. Its trade association claims that 1 out of every 7 workers in this country is dependent directly or indirectly on the automobile industry.[1] Analysis of interindustry relationships suggests that for each worker employed in the automobile industry itself, one other worker is employed in supplying industries. The industry consumes nearly one-fifth of the Nation's steel, 1 out of every 14 tons of copper, more than 2 of every 5 tons of lead, more than 1 of 4 tons of zinc, 1 pound in 7 of nickel, half the reclaimed rubber, nearly two-thirds of the natural and three-fifths of the synthetic rubber, almost three-fourths of the upholstery leather, nearly all the tire cord, and substantial proportions of the Nation's output of glass, machine tools, general industrial equipment, forgings, and other industries. The degree to which autos are purchased and used obviously determines the level of activity in the petroleum industry, filling stations, automobile supply stores, etc.

Over a long-term period there have occurred fundamental changes in the automobile industry's structure, principal among which have been (*a*) a persistent and continuing decline in the number of enterprises and (*b*) a long-term increase in the relative importance of the leading producers. The rise in the position of General Motors has been particularly striking. From 20 percent of the new-car registrations in 1925, General Motors' share rose to 45 percent in 1957 and to 50 percent in the first quarter of 1958. General Motors has derived its strength from a number of sources. It has long been regarded as an efficient, well-organized company. It has been active in putting on the market a number of important technological innovations, such as the Hydra-Matic drive. It has a strong dealer organization which is by far the largest in the country. It has ready access to sources of capital and credit. But General Motors derives its strength from a number of other and less well-recognized sources. To a much greater extent than any of its competitors, it operates in a variety of industries other than automobiles, such as railroad locomotives, household appliances, buses, earth-moving equipment and others. The defense contracts which it has received have, by their very nature, been an important source of strength. The manner in which trade-in values on used cars are determined may also have contributed to General Motors' growth.

Regardless of the causes, however, the paramount structural characteristic of the automobile industry since the late 1920's has been the increasing dominance of General Motors. During this period the share held by the other major producers has declined and the proporton accounted for by the independents has all but vanished. As independent producers have one by one fallen by the wayside, the number of alternatives available to the consumer in the form of different makes and models has diminished. The nature of the rivalry among the remaining producers represents a classic example of the change in the nature of competition which would be expected to accompany the change that has taken place in the industry's structure. Broadly speaking, competition in price has been largely altered and deemphasized, being replaced in large part by various forms of nonprice competition—principally advertising and model and design changes. The two most outstanding characteristics of the price rivalry which does exist are (*a*) substantial identity of prices among the Big Three at each price level and (*b*) the exercise by General Motors of leadership in prices, on some occasions in a simple form but on others in a complicated and subtle manner. With each of the Big Three charging about the same price for a given type of car, they have turned increasingly in their efforts to attract customers to various forms of nonprice competition. Between 1950 and 1957 advertising expenditures (for space and time only, not counting radio and TV talent) by the Big Three rose more than threefold—from $61.6 million in 1950 to $195.7 million in 1957. Models have been changed with increasing frequency until today General Motors appears to be bringing out a new model every year. Since 1950 the amount expended by the Big Three on the amortization of special tools, which are used largely in model and style changes, has also increased more than threefold—from $182.3 million in 1950 to $762 million in 1957.

Because of its increasingly dominant position, the level of automobile prices has come to be largely determined by the pricing methods and policies of General Motors. In setting its prices, General Motors seeks to attain a target goal of 20 percent rate of return on net worth after taxes at a predetermined level of production, or standard volume. The amount of profit per car needed to yield the desired rate of return at the standard volume is incorporated as a cost in arriving at the price level. When actual production exceeds standard volume, as has been true during most of the postwar period, the actual rate of return exceeds the target. As compared to its target of 20 percent, General Motors' actual rate of return after taxes on net worth during the period 1948–57 averaged 25 percent.

But while prices are based on costs (including profits) aggregated in this manner, the level at which prices are established has an important effect upon costs. This results in part from the fact that overhead costs form an important element in the cost structure of the automobile industry. These costs, principal among which are advertising, selling, general and administrative expense, maintenance, repair and rearrangement, amortization of special commercial tools, and depreciation and obsolescence, remain virtually the same in toto regardless of the level of output. Thus the smaller the number of cars produced, the fewer the number of units over which these overhead costs are spread and the higher the overhead costs per car. Because of the importance of overhead costs to total costs, amounting to approximately $550 per car in 1957 and perhaps $800 in 1958, anything which changes significantly the level of automobile production thereby changes the cost per car.

The principal determinants of the level of automobile sales have been found to be changes in per capita income and in price. Over the former the automobile producers have virtually no control. But because demand for automobiles is responsive to changes in price, the automobile producers can affect the level of sales by changing their prices. And because of the importance of overhead costs, the changes in output brought about by changes in price will significantly affect the level of costs. Thus in this industry the two-way relationship between costs and prices is quite distinct.

That changes in price do have an important influence on changes in automobile sales is the finding reached by the studies that have been made of the elasticity of demand for automobiles. Generally speaking, these studies show that with every 10-percent increase in price, sales tend to fall by 12 to 15 percent. Moreover, there is reason to believe that during an economic downswing the adverse effect of a price increase is even greater.

It has also been shown that price reductions are capable of stimulating automobile sales. The elasticity of consumers' demand (i.e., the sensitivity of consumers to price changes) admittedly is not high enough to preserve the present level of profits in the face of price cuts, given the current level of costs in the industry. As stated above, however, a large share of these costs are optional outlays which serve only to promote nonprice competition and which could readily be reduced. If annual expenditures for styling, advertising and tooling associated with increasingly frequent model changes by the major firms were compressed to their pre-1955 levels, substantial price reductions could be made with no sacrifice of passenger car profits by the manufacturers.

The full effect of price increases is now for the first time in several years coming home to the average automobile buyer. In the preceding 4 years the price increases made by the manufacturers were more or less camouflaged by the granting of more liberal financing terms, principally the extension of the maturity period. To those buyers whose principal interest is the amount of the monthly payment (considered by some authorities to represent the majority of all credit purchasers), the increase in price was to a very considerable extent offset by the increase in the number of months in which payments could be made. But now, according to what seems to be the consensus in the trade, the maturity period can no longer be extended.

---

[1] Automobile Facts and Figures, Automobile Manufacturers Association, 37th edition, 1957, p. 44.

For the first 10 to 15 months of a 36-month finance period (depending on the size of the downpayment) the resale value of a car remains below the amount still owed by the purchaser. Extending the finance period to 42 months, with a 25-percent downpayment, would leave the buyer owing more than resale value for as much as 21 months. Under such circumstances it may well be more to the buyer's self-interest to let his car be repossessed and use the amount still owed for the purchase of a newer used car. As a consequence any further increase in automobile prices can be expected to be immediately reflected in the average monthly payment. The full influence of price changes upon sales will be manifest.

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1967]

New Safety Devices To Lift Car Prices, Henry Ford Warns

(By Jerry M. Flint)

Detroit, May 18.—Henry Ford 2d warned today that "substantial price increases" on new cars would be coming next fall because of the cost of new safety and anti-smog equipment.

The Ford Motor Company chairman told stockholders at the company's annual meeting here that "research, development and manufacturing costs to reduce emissions and improve safety are adding up very rapidly. We shall have to look to substantial price increases next fall to cover the added costs."

Mr. Ford said the safety and anti-smog effort had "skyrocketed" costs that would have to be recovered by higher prices. He also said labor and material costs were climbing substantially, but refused to estimate how much car prices might climb next fall.

Arjay Miller, Ford's president, pointed out to the stockholders that profit margins have been squeezed between level car prices and rapidly rising costs.

"It should be all too evident that prices of cars will have to go up. As companies in practically every other industry have already done, we are going to have to face economic realities," Mr. Miller said.

In 1966, Ford's sales were $12.2-billion, up 6 per cent from the 1965 volume, while net income was $621-million, or $5.63 a share, down 12 per cent. In the first quarter of this year Ford's sales were $2.9-billion, off 10 per cent from the 1966 level, and net income was $120.6-million or $1.10 a share, down 42 per cent from the total the year before.

Last fall, Ford raised its new 1967 car prices more than $100 a car. The General Motors Corporation then increased its prices by $56 a car. Ford then backed down on part of its increase. All car companies said the increases for the 1967 models did not cover the added cost.

Mr. Ford's warning of a "substantial" rise apparently was a hint that the 1968 price increase could be a big one.

New anti-smog devices, shoulder harnesses and added seat belts will become standard equipment on the 1968 models. These items now cost $75 to $100 when installed as optional equipment. Automobile stock analysts in Detroit have been talking about price increases of $100 to $150 per car on the 1968 models.

New anti-smog devices, shoulder harnesses and seat belts will become standard equipment on the 1968 models. These items now cost $75 to $100 when installed as optional equipment. Industry analysts here have been talking about price increases of $100 to $150 a car on the 1968's.

They are concerned about troubles with the Government on auto safety standards set by the new National Traffic Safety Agency.

They believe Ford is well on the way to winning the battle against auto-caused air pollution.

Ford is expected to take a strong stand against "unreasonably high" union demands in new contract bargaining later this year.

Mr. Ford called the last 12 months "a time of trial" for the company and the industry.

Although relations with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which makes rules covering auto fumes, seem to "be excellent," he said, "I wish I could be equally encouraging about our experience with the vehicle safety standards."

"Unfortunately," he added, "we have had serious difficulties establishing meaningful communication with the Government. As a result we have incurred extraordinary costs."

Car makers have been forced to oppose the imposition of some safety rules "that would be totally unreasonable are unreasonable and unrealistic or impossible to meet in the time available to us," he said.

This has forced the industry "into a position of appearing uncooperative and seeming to resist actions that presumably would improve the safety of our product," Mr. Ford said.

The Ford company chairman said Ford wants to build more safety into cars quickly and cheaply. "But to accomplish these goals we need better communication with the Government, faster decisions from the Government, and a standards-making procedure that follows an orderly and reasonable timetable and accepts the car manufacturers as partners and sources of useful technical information."

Mr. Ford said part of the troubles are "the natural birth pains" of a new relationship with the Government and of a new Government bureau, but added, "in part, they reflect intense political pressures upon the industry and upon the safety bureau itself to come up with some kind of vigorous and dramatic action, even if it is in some ways ill-considered."

Mr. Ford also criticized an experimental safety automobile being built for New York State. "It just isn't an appropriate automobile," he said, asserting that it adds safety equipment without regard to cost. "We could all ride around in tanks," he said.

[From the Dow Jones News Service]

AMC Planning Price Increases on 1968 Lines

Los Angeles, Calif.—Asked Friday about the announcement by Ford Motor Co. that it will raise prices on next year's auto lines, Roy Chapin, president of American Motors Corp., said his company "will have some increases in price across the board."

"The styling stability on our Rambler American won't preclude price changes in that line either, but our relative competitive position should be the same," he said.

He added that some of the price increases, most of which are attributed to safety improvements, will be substantial.

(Meanwhile, in Detroit, General Motors Corp. president James M. Roche agreed that 1968 prices will be substantially higher, but refused to set a dollar figure.)

Chapin said American Motors is "right on target in reducing our inventories. In January we had a 150-day supply of automobiles. That figure is down to 80 days. We plan to have half as many cars at the end of September as a year ago."

[From the Detroit News, Feb. 25, 1967]

GM Hints Safety Items Will Boost 1968 Car Prices

(By Robert W. Irvin)

Chicago.—General Motors President James M. Roche has indicated that new safety items required by the federal government may force an increase in 1968 car prices.

"Anything you add to a car increases the cost of it," Roche replied to a question yesterday.

"It's too early to say," whether 1968 prices will go up, he commented, but added:

"Additional equipment costs money and everything that goes into a car is reflected in its overall price."

Under the new safety standards, all cars next year will require two more lap-type safety belts and two shoulder belts. These items now sold as optional equipment for around $40.

In addition, all cars next year must have exhaust emission control devices. These anti-smog systems can add anywhere from $20 to $50 to the price of cars, depending on the model and type of unit installed.

Roche said he believed GM "can comply with virtually all of the standards as currently written—based on our best interpretation of the requirements."

All of the companies, it was learned are worried about exact government requirements for interior crash protection.

Because of the procedure for testing, the executives aren't sure the instrument panels can meet the U.S. standard. They will ask for clarification when they submit their formal comments to the national safety agency late next week.

The auto executives were here for the opening of the 59th Chicago Automobile Show.

[From the Detroit News, Feb. 25, 1967]

AMC Predicts Car Price Hike

Los Angeles.—Roy D. Chapin Jr., board chairman of American Motors Corp., said Friday at a news conference that 1968 AMC cars will have "substantial" price increases, mostly due to safety improvements.

Chapin's predictions of price hikes echoed similar statements made by Henry Ford II, board chairman of Ford Motor Co., during a Ford stockholders meeting Thursday in Detroit.

[From the Automotive News, May 29, 1967]

Donner Promises Firm Stand in Labor Talks—Roche Says GM Prices Will Rise

(By John K. Teahen, Jr.)

Labor negotiations, the boss's retirement and a variety of other matters were paraded before General Motors shareholders at the corporation's protracted and often yawn-filled annual meeting at Detroit's Cobo Hall.

There was talk of car prices, too (they'll be up for '68), although no shareholder raised the question during the meeting itself. The price discussion was part of an impromptu news conference staged by President James M. Roche at the end of the long afternoon.

The meeting droned on for four hours and eight minutes, and the official transcript of the proceedings covered 126 pages. It was five minutes longer than last year's marathon. Some 1,100 shareholders were on hand for the start, but there were plenty of empty seats at the finish.

Chairman Frederic G. Donner served notice that GM will be no patsy in this summer's contract negotiations with the UAW.

"We will bargain hard to reach a fair and equitable settlement," Donner said. "We hope to accomplish this without interruption of production."

On the price issue, Roche acknowledged that "there has to be an increase," but he wouldn't comment on how it will compare with last year's. On the '67 models, GM's sticker prices went up an average of $54.13 per car.

In explaining the '68-model price hike, Roche mentioned the rising costs of labor and materials, the upcoming labor settlement and the addition of such standard equipment as shoulder harnesses, a third set of belts for front and rear seats and the antismog device.

It's quite possible that the labor negotiations will still be in progress when the '68s reach the showrooms. How will this affect pricing?

Roche said that by introduction time, GM should have a good idea of what the settlement is going to be. If negotiations are still going on, he said, "we'll just have to take the bit in our teeth."

As expected, Donner's retirement was discussed. The GM chairman will observe his 65th birthday next Oct. 4.

In his prepared remarks, Donner spoke at some length of the changes in the industry and at GM during his 41 years with the company. To some observers, it sounded like a farewell address.

Later, a shareholder asked Donner about his retirement. Donner replied: "I retire the first of November."

That's certainly a definite statement, but the picture became a little less clear a moment before the meeting adjourned.

A shareholder asked: "If you are retiring as chairman in November, you will not preside at our next annual meeting. Isn't that correct?"

Donner answered: "If the 'if' goes, the other goes."

Earlier in the meeting, Donner turned aside a question about dollar sales by individual GM divisions, but he assured another shareholder that every division operated at a profit last year.

Said the shareholder: "I'm happy to hear that."

Replied Donner: "So am I."

Executive compensation came before the meeting when "professional stockholder" Wilma Soss recalled her year-ago recommendation that no bonus be awarded to anyone involved in the shadowing of Ralph Nader. She wanted to know if her suggestion had been followed; for instance, how about the legal department.

Donner said these matters were considered by the Bonus Committee, and that he feels they were properly dealt with. But he declared that he would not discuss individual bonus awards.

Sol A. Dann, Detroit attorney and Chrysler Corp. critic of several years ago, delivered a vigorous protest against one of the proposals in the GM proxy statement. The proposal concerned the revision of a 1945 bylaw by broadening the indemnifications provisions for officers and directors involved in lawsuits.

Dann called it a "vicious resolution" and asked, "Why revise this bylaw, if not to protect corrupt officials for misfeasance or malfeasance in office?"

He asked that the vote on the resolution be tabled, but the chair ruled that his motion was out of order. The resolution was approved, as Dann acknowledged that it would be, with some 99 percent of the shares voted supporting the company's stand.

In answer to a question, Donner said that the pending litigation brought by Nader had nothing to do with revising this bylaw. He also explained that it does not apply to the Nader suit since Nader is suing the corporation, not individuals.

Donner told another shareholder that GM spent $251 million on advertising last year, compared with $234 million in 1965.

Asked whether the Corvair is still profitable, Donner said: "I think it is still carrying its weight."

Three speakers criticized GM's operations in South Africa. They accused the corporation of racial discrimination in its wage policy there and asked the company to discontinue its investments in the country.

Donner said GM has been in South Africa 40 years, that 50 percent of its employment there is non-white and that GM trains these workers and provides job opportunities. He said he felt GM is operating there in a way it can be proud of.

Arthur Hughes, 23, a New York painter, told the meeting that he had transferred ownership of 953 shares of GM stock (about $80,000 worth), which he had inherited to the African Aid and Legal Defense Committee in protest against GM's actions in South Africa.

In his address to the stockholders, Donner spoke of industry changes during the last 41 years and recalled that in 1927, a "nationally known economist" had predicted that the 22 million cars and trucks on the road represented a saturation point for motor vehicles in this country.

"It's a wonder I didn't leave General Motors," Donner observed.

Today, he noted, the vehicle total in the U.S. has passed 88 million and a growing demand continues to push the figure higher.

Donner declared that today's vehicles are the safest in history and that the industry is working on further improvements. But, he said, the industry has a communications problem with the federal government in the safety area.

He added, "There is good reason to believe that closer and more constructive working relationship will be established between the industry and government so that progress is achieved as quickly and effectively as possible."

Roche sketched GM's advances in the last 10 years in terms of unit sales, production capacity, dollar sales, net income and dividends paid.

He noted that an important part of progress is the job that GM and its dealers do in providing good service to car and truck owners. This, he said requires more skilled mechanics and service personnel.

He said that GM is training about 100,000 dealer-mechanic enrollees a year in its 30 service training centers across the nation and that 7,000 GM dealers added to 180 million square feet to their dealerships between 1962 and 1966 to meet the expanding needs of their customers.

"What I have just said about service," Roche continued, "underscores the importance of the franchise system of distribution in our industry. This unique system was in fact brought into being in order to provide the best possible basis for customer satisfaction—service satisfaction in particular."

He noted that competition in the auto industry is stiffer than ever before, and he said that this demands innovations in technology and "aggressive selling effort at every level—in national advertising sales promotion, product merchandising and direct selling at the dealer level."

Roche added, "Our GM dealers are the finest in the industry. We are proud of the stability and business continuity represented in our dealer body. One-third of our dealers have been with us for 20 years or more and 65 percent for at least 10 years."

THREE AMERICAN MEDICAL WOMEN STRUGGLE VALIANTLY TO KEEP THEIR VIETNAMESE HOSPITAL OPEN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would again like to call the attention of the Senate to the truly outstanding work of three courageous American women in Vietnam. A doctor from Seattle, Pat Smith, and two nurses from Milwaukee, Jean Platz and Joan Blonien, have persevered selflessly to keep their 40-bed hospital in Kontum, a central highland city, open and operating.

The Montagnard tribesmen whom they serve prefer a mat on the floor to a bed. Because of this, these gallant ladies are able to care for 120 inpatients instead of 40.

Unfortunately, official regulations for Government aid limit assistance to hospitals with a one-bed to one-patient ratio. Therefore, these three women, who are trying to do and who are doing more, are penalized. They are forced to make do without any form of regular aid.

The 120 patients are all serious cases. As Dr. Smith has said:

> We take it for granted that the patient is malnourished, that he has intestinal parasites and also malaria. After that we ask what's wrong with him.

Working under these conditions, these women merit our highest praise.

The American people who have aided this outstanding effort must also be mentioned: Joan's mother, Mrs. Clem Blonien, of Wauwatosa, Wis.; the parishioners of St. Jude's parish; and the ladies auxiliary of the Knights of Columbus, also of Wauwatosa, have continued to extend a helping hand. Mrs. Kay Duer, of Atlanta, Sgt. Henry G. Logsdon, of the U.S. Army, who is stationed in Vietnam, and many other groups and individuals have joined them.

Mrs. Kay Duer, of Atlanta, Ga., who learned of the problems faced by these three women from my previous comments in the RECORD, made an appeal for aid for the hospital. On her own initiative she organized a drive which gathered 25 tons of supplies for the hospital.

Through the most welcome assistance of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Navy agreed to airlift the supplies gathered by Mrs. Duer to the hospital by a program aptly entitled "Operation Handclasp."

Mrs. Duer had a great deal of help in gathering the supplies. Among those who qualify for special mention are Mrs. S. D. Williams of Douglasville, Ga.; Mrs. Clare Bozeman of Cliburn, Ga.; and radio station WTOF of Mobile, Ala.—all pitched in to make the drive a success. This type of response is inspiring.

Sgt. Henry Logsdon is an ammunition specialist serving in South Vietnam. He heard of the women's efforts and hitched a ride up to their hospital. Shortly after his arrival in Kontum, Sergeant Logsdon donated some of his rare B-type blood to save the life of a dying Vietnamese woman.

The sergeant was quickly and thoroughly impressed by the job the woman doctor and two nurses were doing. Through his successful campaign to round up thousands of bars of soap for the hospital, Sergeant Logsdon earned a fitting nickname, the "Soap King." With an assist from my office, Sergeant Logsdon was able to acquire a generator to provide the hospital with continuous electricity.

These three courageous American women and all those who help them are in the frontlines of our "other war." It is person-to-person assistance such as this which proves the real concern and deep commitment we hold.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize that these women are not receiving regular aid. All those who have helped so far are to be praised. However, this aid must continue. They need many pieces of basic equipment—medicine cabinets, a water heater, in addition to medical supplies. But even safety pins will be appreciated. Those who want to help should write Kontum Hospital Fund, Post Office Box 5125, Seattle, Wash. 98107; or Mrs. Clem Blonien, 6722 West Wisconsin Avenue, Wauwatosa, Wis., 53213.

I hope the American people will respond to this need. Support for these women will really help the Vietnamese people and help win the very crucial "other war."

RECORD OF COUNTRIES WHICH HAVE RATIFIED HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS SHOWS UNITED STATES INEXCUSABLY LOW—LXXXI

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise today to reemphasize my concern for this body's inaction with regard to the human rights conventions. I have given the figures to this body stating how many countries of the world have ratified the conventions. I am also sure that most of you are aware of the diversity and respectability of those governments which have become parties to these human rights treaties.

I recently came across a most visible and most distressing chart listing the countries of the world and their record on human rights conventions. Mr. President, I am compelled to reiterate that the United States of America is in a class with Spain and the Union of South Africa in having ratified none of these.

We in the Senate have a very special responsibility under our Constitution. It is our task to complement the President in our Nation's treatymaking process. It is inherent in our system of checks and balances that two-thirds of those present and voting in the Senate must advise and consent to all treaties before the President can ratify them on behalf of our country. Let us not shirk that responsibility. Let us no longer ignore these human rights conventions on forced labor, freedom of participation, genocide, political rights of women, and slavery.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the aforementioned chart be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ratification of Human Rights Conventions—Parties as of Nov. 1, 1966

1. ILO Convention on Freedom of Association.
2. United Nations Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery.
3. United Nations Convention on the Political Rights of Women.
4. ILO Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labor.
5. International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

	(1) Freedom of Association	(2) Slavery	(3) Political Rights of Women	(4) Forced Labor	(5) Genocide
UNITED NATIONS MEMBERS					
Afghanistan				X	X
Albania	X	X	X		X
Algeria	X	X			X
Argentina	X	X	X	X	X
Australia		X		X	X
Austria	X	X		X	X
Belgium	X	X	X	X	X
Bolivia	X				
Brazil		X	X	X	X
Bulgaria	X	X	X		X
Burma	X				X
Burundi				X	
Byelorussian S.S.R	X	X	X		X
Cambodia		X			X
Cameroon	X			X	
Canada		X	X	X	X
Central African Republic	X		X	X	
Ceylon		X			X
Chad	X			X	
Chile					X
China		X	X	X	X
Colombia				X	X
Congo (Brazzaville)	X		X		
Congo (Leopoldville)					X
Costa Rica	X			X	X
Cuba	X	X	X	X	X
Cyprus	X	X		X	
Czechoslovakia	X	X	X		X
Dahomey	X			X	
Denmark	X	X	X	X	X
Dominican Republic	X	X	X	X	
Ecuador		X	X	X	X
El Salvador				X	X
Ethiopia	X				X
Finland	X	X	X	X	X
France	X	X	X		X
Gabon	X			X	
Ghana	X	X	X	X	X
Greece	X		X	X	X
Guatemala	X		X	X	X
Guinea	X			X	
Haiti		X	X	X	X
Honduras	X			X	X
Hungary	X	X	X		X
Iceland	X	X	X	X	X
India		X	X		X
Iran		X		X	X
Iraq		X		X	X
Ireland	X	X		X	
Israel	X	X	X	X	X
Italy	X	X			X
Ivory Coast	X			X	X
Jamaica	X	X	X	X	
Japan	X		X		
Jordan		X		X	X
Kenya				X	
Kuwait	X	X		X	
Laos		X			X
Lebanon			X		X
Liberia	X			X	X
Libya				X	
Luxembourg	X			X	
Malagasy			X		
Malawi		X	X		
Malaysia		X		X	
Maldives					
Mali Republic	X			X	
Malta	X	X		X	
Mauritania	X				
Mexico	X	X		X	X
Morocco		X			X
Nepal		X	X		
Netherlands	X	X		X	X
New Zealand		X			
Nicaragua			X		X
Niger	X	X	X	X	
Nigeria	X	X		X	
Norway	X	X	X	X	X
Outer Mongolia			X		
Pakistan	X	X	X	X	X
Panama	X			X	X
Paraguay	X				
Peru	X			X	X
Philippines	X	X	X	X	X
Poland	X	X	X	X	X
Portugal		X		X	
Rumania	X	X	X		X
Rwanda				X	
Saudi Arabia					X
Senegal	X		X	X	
Sierra Leone	X	X	X	X	
Singapore				X	
Somalia				X	
Spain					
Sudan		X			
Sweden	X	X	X	X	X
Syria	X	X		X	X
Tanzania		X		X	
Thailand			X		
Togo	X				
Trinidad and Tobago	X	X	X	X	
Tunisia	X	X		X	X
Turkey		X	X	X	X
Uganda		X		X	
Ukrainian S.S.	X	X	X		X
Union of South Africa					
Upper Volta	X				X
U.S.S.R	X	X	X		X
United Arab Republic	X	X		X	X
United Kingdom	X	X		X	
United States					
Uruguay	X				
Venezuela				X	X
Yemen					
Yugoslavia	X	X	X		X
Zambia				X	
Guyana				X	
OTHER COUNTRIES					
Monaco					X
Federal Republic of Germany	X	X		X	X
Indonesia			X		
Korea, Republic of			X		X
Switzerland		X		X	
Vietnam, Republic of					X
Total	71	67	50	75	69

REPORT ON 55TH ANNUAL MEETING OF U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I recently was delighted to receive an excellent report on the 55th annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce from Peter Weidenbruch, who represented the Food and Dairy Industries Supply Association at the meeting. I was particularly pleased to have an opportunity to read this concise summary because a last minute rollcall on this floor made it impossible for me to speak before the chamber, although I was scheduled to appear.

Perhaps the single most impressive aspect of the annual meeting was the wide range of speakers and viewpoints. The speakers ranged from Secretary of State Rusk and J. Wilson Newman, chairman of the board of Dun & Bradstreet, to Andrew Biemiller, director of the department of legislation for the AFL–CIO, and columnist Victor Riesel. All viewpoints were represented with great ability and candor.

Mr. President, so that my colleagues can share this concise, informative report, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON THE 55TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, APRIL 30, MAY 1, 2, 3, 1967

The time is here again when I must submit my annual report to the members of Dairy and Food Industries Supply Association.

In the past, I have reported on specific selected subjects, which, in my opinion, were of general interest to the majority of our members. I will do so again this year. Space does not permit to cover all of the proceedings of the four-day meeting and, therefore, many of the important discussions will not be covered.

Some of the significant statements made in respect to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce could be equally applied to our own Association. Membership is a two-way street. It must be mutually beneficial. Leadership in solving individual problems is most important. Hanging a membership certificate on our wall is not a free ticket to better profits. The continued success of our Association has been due principally because we have concentrated on the election of the most capable members to represent us, and to a very great extent, to the capable and experienced staff in our Washington office. We must let nothing happen to interfere with this long established and adhered to policy.

In this report I will refrain from making comments in respect to political discussions and also as far as the Viet-Nam war is concerned. To intelligently analyze and interpret the talks in this respect, would require individuals, better equipped than I am, to express opinions on such controversial matters.

One of the outstanding features of the Meeting was a talk by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State. Mr. Rusk expressed his respect and appreciation to the United States Chamber of Commerce for having the opportunity to speak at its Fifty-Fifth Annual Meeting.

He said that we should not sell the United States short with respect to its purposes and its motivations and the aspirations of its people.

Mr. Rusk stated that we came out of World War II with incredible power to carry out purposes. Those purposes are relatively simple—to have peace in the world, so as to give individuals a chance to live out their lives in accordance with their own sense of destiny; to give them an opportunity to raise a family with some sort of security; to have cooperative relations across national frontiers, free institutions that do not permit that ugly knock on the door at midnight. These are the simple purposes for which the United States has borne many burdens since 1945—military burdens, economic burdens and psychological burdens.

The speaker pointed out that we are entering in a period when there is great prudence in the world, and that we did not get there by giving away one little country after another. It has been a long and difficult and, on occasions, a bloody path, but the processes of peace are at work.

The speaker concluded his talk by saying that the understanding of the requirements of a durable peace are becoming more widespread, and that we should stay steady on the course and not be too concerned too soon.

Mr. Maurice H. Stans, President, Glore Forgan, Wm. R. Staats, Inc., New York, New York, Former Director of the Budget, said that current discussion of government fiscal policy seems to center mostly on the question of whether a tax increase or less spending would provide the better prescription for the economy for 1967.

He pointed out that this is an important decision, of course, and its consequences will definitely be felt by business and labor, and all of us, in one way or another.

Mr. Stans stated that the world of business has a big job on its hands. And that all boils down to the task of teaching a vast number of people some elementary principles and some facts of American history:

(1) That it is only by increasing production that living standards can be advanced for all the people.

(2) That it is only by increasing productivity that real wages can be increased.

(3) That the accumulation of capital is necessary to provide the tools of production.

(4) That the best efforts of people are generated under a system of competitive rewards.

The speaker continued by saying that the reasonable growth of government spending under orderly programs to meet real needs of the people cannot be questioned. But government spending for the purpose of inhibiting the competitive system is destructive. American business should take heed of the dangers of this philosophy.

Mr. J. Wilson Newman, chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., New York, New York, spoke on the subject of: "Does Business have a Future?"

"Can business, with its great experience and ability to get things done, respond to the new desires and hopes of our fellow men in an environment rapidly changing through its own creative technology? Does business have a future?"

"Social progress requires material achievements. And these achievements require the very type of management of new technologies and human resources that business has developed."

"Who has more experience and talent for the kind of cost-benefit analysis required to solve problems such as pollution, than the private corporations who developed such techniques?"

"The purpose of business has always been to answer human wants. Whether these wants are for candy-striped toothpaste and wrinkle-free dresses, or traffic systems and pollution control equipment, nine times out of ten, business can do the job more efficiently than government or any other institution."

The Honorable Melvin R. Laird, U.S. Representative from Wisconsin, spoke on a very important subject titled: "Sharing Federal Dollars with the States."

The speaker said that revenue-sharing would eliminate the red tape and the confusion that is often at the heart of long delays in getting on with the business of solving our problems. It would permit states and localities to establish their own priorities rather than force them to follow federally dictated priorities which may be applicable in one area of our country but not another.

Mr. Laird said that revenue-sharing would allow a much more efficient use of federal tax dollars than is presently the case.

Congressman Laird indicated revenue-sharing is an idea whose time has come and its eventual implementation is only a matter of time.

Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, Director, Department of Legislation, AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C., spoke on the same subject as Congressman Laird. He agreed with Mr. Laird that state and local governments need more money. They need more money than they are now raising through their own tax systems.

However, the speaker indicated that the solutions will not be found by leaving these problems to the states. He said that national problems demand national solutions.

Mr. Biemiller stated that, "The tax-sharing proposition is a form of anarchy which no national corporation would tolerate, and one which strikes at the very principle of federalism."

The new President of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Mr. Allan Shivers, expressed his appreciation for the honor of being elected President of this important Association.

The speaker called attention to the fact that everything around us is what we, as individuals make it: our community life, our businesses, our government, our moral standards and social concerns, our progress and our plans for a better future. Each of us contributes a little of his own, and shares in the contributions of other individuals.

Mr. Shivers said that our failures are individual ones, too. Society doesn't cause inflation. Individuals and governments do, and there is no mass mind or conscience. Only through individuals can goodness and freedom be spread, and the individual, each one of us should start with, is himself.

He pointed out that we can make a contribution by developing ever better communications with government—local, state and national. Our contribution will come from a positive attitude in dealing with government—in which we work constructively together and at the same time use positively our right to express criticism or concern or recommendations as the situation may call for.

The speaker urged us: "To move ahead on the course we know is right."

The new President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce stated that the average businessman should become more interested in the problems of his community and state and more active in the political party of his choice.

"To meet the crisis of our cities there must be strong leadership at the local level of both business and government and the two forces must work together constructively. It seems to me that the average businessman is the key to this situation."

"Business leadership is strong when it is well supported by those with an economic interest in the community and with practical experience in dealing with the people."

"Local government benefits when more businessmen bother to become politically active; when they help pick good candidates and get out and work for their election."

"More businessmen should learn to take a broad, unselfish view of national issues as a means of increasing their political effectiveness, and that the business position should be more unified, the way that labor's is."

Mr. Shivers concluded his excellent speech with the statement: "There is a serious need, for citizens to increase their contacts with local and state governments, for unless democracy is strengthened at those levels, individuality and freedom of choice eventually will be swallowed up by expanding centralized authority."

I am sure that all of us agree with Mr. Shivers, and that we will put forth our very best efforts in order to work more closely with local, state and federal governments.

It is always interesting and worth-while to listen to men who are open-minded when they talk about labor's place in today's economy. Their comments are important to the business community.

Mr. Victor Riesel, the Columnist who was blinded many years ago, and who is well known to most of us, stated that our reputable labor leaders are hard working, honest men, who are statesmen with an honest conviction of the rightness of their goals. He pointed out that the labor leaders in other countries have become the political leaders, mentioning Wilson in England, and counterparts in Germany and the Scandinavian countries, as examples.

In explaining the division between Walter Reuther and George Meany, the speaker stated that Mr. Reuther sees time slipping by without his acquiring the mantle of overall labor leadership, and that he wants to bring into existence the kind of national leadership that does exist in the other countries.

Mr. Meany, on the other hand, does not feel that his age is any deterrent. He looks at the late Chancellor Adenauer as an example of a man who began his career in his 70's.

Mr. Riesel advises not to take too much consolation from the election returns in 1966, and that it was not a set back for labor. There were so many congressmen swept in on the 1964 presidential election, that some replacements were inevitable.

The speaker said that labor is still strong and a potent power to be reckoned with. Reagan, Rockefeller and Romney, all had labor support and would not have won otherwise.

Mr. Riesel indicated that President Johnson knows the value of labor and will listen to labor very carefully. By implication, it was pointed out that the business community still fails to work together properly and that it does not have the political know-how of the labor movement.

The speaker also mentioned that businesses too often have the top men on the golf course, and that they send the third Vice President to the labor conferences, whereas the unions are working with their top men all the time.

Mr. Riesel also implied that the business community is too much concerned with issues like 14–b and situs picketing. As for turning the labor tide, it was stated that it was already too late, that the battle had been lost.

Another speaker, Mr. L. B. Maytag, Jr., President, National Airlines, Miami, Florida, and Chairman of the Membership Committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States had this to say: "The position of leadership in our community or trade or profession is not automatic. It has to be earned—and re-earned each day of the year. This is the price of voluntarism which we must gladly pay—or prepare for the death of our voluntary organizations and our freedom of enterprise."

We were sorry to hear that Senator Proxmire was unable to attend and speak to us because he was held on the Senate floor by a roll-call.

So, another annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce is history. A new President has been elected. Under the capable leadership of Mr. Allan Shivers, the membership is assured that its very best interests will be served in a conscientious and efficient manner.

It was a pleasure for me to have the privilege again to write this annual report and I trust that its contents will be helpful to our membership.

MARYLAND BANK OFFICIAL COMES OUT STRONG FOR TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I recently received a statement from Mr. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., bank commissioner of Maryland, regarding the truth-in-lending bill. As a State official most familiar with the problems of consumer credit and the credit industry, Mr. O'Conor is in a particularly good position to judge the impact of this bill both on the credit industry and the consumer. As a State official, he is also in a good position to assess the impact of Federal legislation in an area where there is already extensive State legislation.

It is, therefore, highly significant that Mr. O'Conor sees no problem with the truth-in-lending bill, but, on the contrary, recommends that it be speedily enacted by the Congress.

Some opponents of the bill argue that the truth-in-lending bill might have a disruptive effect on State consumer credit legislation. Mr. O'Conor comments on this charge are most significant. He says that such a theory "would hardly be consonant with the theory of dual sovereignty." Certainly, the logic of the position of the critics of truth in lending would lead to the belief that our entire dual-banking system rests upon an untenable jurisdictional foundation. Obviously, this is absurd and so is the argument that Federal action on consumer credit would preempt existing State legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. O'Conor's statement be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE TRUTH IN LENDING ACT

I am Herbert R. O'Conor, Bank Commissioner of Maryland. This statement is submitted as a private citizen and member of the bar, and not as an official spokesman for the State.

From the evidence presented before you and the studies conducted by public and private bodies, it has been clearly established that a substantial portion of the American public is not aware of the true cost of borrowing money or obtaining credit in the purchase of goods and services. Some of this lack of knowledge is due to sharp practices, but much of it is attributable to lack of meaningful and standard information about the myriad species of legitimate transactions.

S–5 addresses itself to this problem—the disclosure of finance charges in connection with the lending of money and extension of credit. It does not attempt to regulate the amount of these finance charges or otherwise establish a pervasive federal system for regulating lending of credit.

I wholeheartedly endorse that principle. Following the able presentations made to your Subcommittee, some amendments to S–5 may be deemed desirable by the Congress. Whatever these may be, the principle of the bill—that meaningful, uniform basic borrowing and credit information be given to the consumer—is meritorious and provides a remedy to a felt national public need.

In order to be able to make effective comparisons of alternative opportunities, consumers need to know five things:

1. The selling price of the commodity if they pay cash or if they buy on credit,
2. The dollar amount of all charges additional to the selling price but not incident to the extension of credit,
3. The dollar amount of all charges for or incident to the extension of credit,
4. The effective annual percentage rate of credit costs and charges incident to the extension of credit, and
5. The size and number and frequency of payments.

In a particular transaction it may not be necessary for the consumer to have all of these criteria available in order to make a knowledgeable comparison of alternatives, but none is effective as a single standard for all varieties of money-borrowing and time-credit transactions.

If the Congress can agree on a formula which provides these five essentials for the consumer, it will have performed a tremendous service to the public. In particular, any charge for or incident to the extension of credit which the lender or seller retains and which is therefore a part of the true cost of money should be included when the percentage rate is computed and stated. Only those items such as recording fees which are paid, directly or indirectly, to a court or governmental agency should be excluded in arriving at the percentage cost.

Specifically, I do not agree with the Reserve Board's recommendation that the cost of insurance should not be regarded as part of the finance charge. The Board arrives at this point in its testimony after realistically noting that where "the insurance is required, the borrower bears a cost which probably would not have been incurred if no credit were obtained." Since the individual must incur this expense to obtain the credit it is obviously part of his cost and it would be inconsistent with the fundamental principle of truth in lending to allow its exclusion when that individual is told how much he will pay.

More often than not there is an intercorporate relationship between the lender and the insurer. If the cost of insurance were allowed to be excluded from the statement of rate with which the borrower is furnished, it is inevitable that the keen business minds behind business would bring about a rise in that cost. Where there is no relationship between the lender and the insurer and where the insurance premium is subject to some control, it might be assumed that insurance premiums would not skyrocket. Even in that situation, however, the minimum that should be required is the inclusion of the commission which the lender receives.

On the question of possible exemptions from the bill, experience supports the contention that the area of first-mortgage lending need not and probably should not be further regulated in this regard, as the Federal Reserve Board pointed out in its testimony. Rate disclosure is already the standard practice in this industry, and there is no need to subject it to further regulation.

I cannot agree, however, with those who argue that loans or sales under $100 should be excluded. The argument that disclosure in this area might cut off credit to lower income people is not only specious but shortsighted. These are the very people whom society owes the most protection; they are not the one group whom we should allow to dig their own graves.

On another point, I feel that the exception of the FRB is well taken when it observes that Congress itself should prescribe what constitutes reasonable tolerance in stating annual rates. We would suggest that section 4(a)(7) be amended by adding at the end thereof: ", within a maximum tolerance for error of one percent per annum."

The Committee may also wish to obviate the problems posed by irregular payments, skipped payments, etc., by adding to this section some language such as the following, which is similar to suggestions made to me by bankers in Maryland, who inform me that such a provision would solve their problems in this regard:

"If such a rate cannot be readily computed from tables promulgated by the Board, a statement in the form "The rate of financing charge under this agreement does not exceed ——%", where the blank is filled by a percentage not less than the true annual percentage computed as set forth in section 3(5), shall be deemed sufficient compliance with this subsection."

Such a concession may lead to an unwritten gentlemen's agreement among creditors to state the same not exceeded rate, with a lessening of the spur to competition. But since such agreements are equally possible with respect to the actual rate to be charged anyway, I am not convinced that such a provision would substantially weaken the bill. Rather, by eliminating a potential source of problems for the honest businessman, it should enhance the chances of passing this much needed bill.

The claim has been made that S–5 invades state sovereignty in the fields of private lending and credit. I do not believe that this view is correct. Any regulation entails a limitation on absolute freedom of action. The principal question is whether it is in the public interest to do so in order to remedy a genuine and prevailing ill. The answer involves the balancing of a number of considerations. The ultimate and transcendent issue is the welfare of the American people in the context of the problem and its proposed solution.

I am adamantly opposed to federal preemption of the overall regulation of the economics of the lending and credit businesses, and I urge that you do not in any sense try to set charges of any type. It is the States which have and should have the right and duty to enact usury laws to protect unsophisticated and impecunious borrowers not equipped to shop for credit and therefore unprotected by the competition of the marketplace. The complexities that would arise from tinkering with the free marketplaces of the country by national legislation in this area are an enormous Pandora's box of unknowns and imponderables that almost defy the imagination.

It has traditionally been a part of the federal role, however, to ensure the freedom of the marketplace and the openness of competition. In this regard it is my judgment that a national law requiring the disclosure of the real cost of money and credit to the non-business consumer is desirable and outweighs in benefits any additional burdens it might impose.

However, the FRB has properly pointed out in its testimony the inadvisability of having an administrative agency of the federal government sit in judgment on the effectiveness of state regulation in this area. That would hardly be consonant with the theory of dual sovereignty. At the very least, the idea arms opponents of truth in lending with an argument that will appeal to substantial numbers of Americans. The Board is to be commended for its appreciation of the philosophy on which the government of this country was founded and because of which it remains strong. Furthermore, the willingness to accept the responsibility of implementing the bill if Congress wishes, is characteristic of the sense of duty manifested by the numbers of the Board since its creation.

I propose, therefore, that subsection (b) of Section 6 of S–5 be amended as recommended by the FRB, to exempt transactions that are determined to be "subject to state law that requires disclosure substantially similar" to that required under S–5. Further, I recommend that a new subsection (c) be added to provide an affirmative statement that "it is not the intent of Congress to divest the States of either equal responsibility or concurrent authority" in this critical area.

With these amendments, S–5 should be secure against any charges of interference with the prerogatives of the states. To me, the philosophy of a true cost disclosure standard is neither an incursion upon state prerogatives nor antagonstic to free enterprise. A well informed consumer is hardly a foe of either. Despite the burden of such disclosure, which experience shows is more fear than reality, the average American who borrows money or buys on credit will be vastly better equipped to understand what he is doing under a Truth in Lending law. I am confident that the incorporation into law of a basic cost disclosure standard in borrowing and credit extension transactions to apply on a national basis will prove to be a benefit to the body politic as a whole and foster legitimate business without doing violence to the federal-state relationship.

EIGHTEEN YEARS OF ARAB AGGRESSION AGAINST ISRAEL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as the crisis in the Middle East intensifies, one thing should be made abundantly clear: Israel has been the victim of unremitting Arab aggression for 18 years.

The state of war which the Arab nations assert exists between them and Israel results from a declaration of war by the Arab nations. It was declared unilaterally by them from the day of Israel's birth as an independent nation. As I have repeatedly stated, tensions in the Middle East could be decreased, and peace made far more likely, if the Arab nations would now rescind that one-sided declaration of war. It has constituted aggression without precedent or parallel by many nations against one small country.

In this current crisis the word "aggressor" should be carefully used. By its blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, Egypt has already committed a further act of aggression against Israel. If now Israel should militarily move to remove that blockade—as it must do if it is not to be strangled to death—then it would be moving in self-defense. There can be various types of aggression and a blockade of a vital lifeline of supply can be one form of such aggression just as surely as though Arab troops were moved onto Israel territory.

For the Arab nations to contend—as they are now contending in the Security Council of the United Nations—that tiny Israel is seeking to conquer the Arab States, with a population 50 times as large as its own and an area 100 times greater, is, even on its face, a ridiculous charge.

The facts are clear. The warmongering has come from the Arab States. The 18 years of aggression in the Middle East has been aggression by the Arab States against Israel, which for that many years has been literally living under the gun. It is time for the United States—preferably in concert with other freedom-loving nations, but alone if necessary—to move decisively to remove that threat and to stand firmly behind the principle of freedom of the seas—a principle for which the United States has fought since the days of the Barbary pirates, and in accord with the administration's oft-repeated declarations of our national purpose to repel aggression wherever it appears.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a speech I made at the meeting of the San Francisco Area World Trade Association on May 25, entitled "The Western Pacific, Perspective and Prospective," and a commencement address which I delivered at Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., on May 30 entitled "In the Shadow of Vietnam."

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Western Pacific: Perspective and Prospective

(Remarks of Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, at the San Francisco Area World Trade Association, a Council of the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco, Calif., May 25, 1967)

It is my understanding that at any given time up to 75 ocean-going vessels can be counted in San Francisco Bay. Within a 24-hour period, 50 planes on international schedule will pass through the gateways of this city. In a year, the Bay region moves 13 million tons of cargo in and out of the nation. Over the same period, 400 to 500 thousand travelers enter or leave by way of its portals.

These are figures which add to the cosmopolitan luster of this magnificent city and I know they are a delight to the Chamber. They are also figures, may I say, which are not calculated to grate on the ears of this distinguished group of world traders.

As a Senator of the United States, I share your pleasure in an immense volume of international trade. Since Montana lacks ocean ports, moreover, it is quite agreeable that a lion's share move through the waters which lie within the jurisdiction of the sponsoring Chamber. In view of the entrepot which San Francisco provides for this great two-way flow, the name "Old Gold Mountain," which is what I understand the Chinese call the city, seems most appropriate.

There is great value in a thriving intercourse with countries beyond our borders. The exchange of goods and peoples is a contribution to the nation's peace and well-being. It is a source of enrichment of our national life.

In these times, however, any pleasure which comes from international interchange is not unalloyed. Rather, it is tinged with a profound concern because Viet Nam figures in the figure with which I opened my remarks. You and I know that a part of the 13 million tons of cargo is military cargo; it is headed for a brutal struggle in distant jungles and rice paddies. You and I know that the travelers using the facilities of this city are not all bent on commerce or pleasure. The travelers include tens of thousands of Americans outward bound for war or homecoming from war, many bearing the scars of conflict and some in the stillness of death. The latest casualty figures show more than 10,000 Americans killed and 55,000 wounded in Viet Nam.

So the satisfaction which comes from a flourishing international exchange, I repeat, is diluted by the implications of Viet Nam. Viet Nam casts a shadow not only over your commercial preoccupations; in the same way, it also dims other aspects of our national life. As Majority Leader of the Senate, for example, I have had some association with the enactment of the legislative programs of the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. These programs, in my judgment, make exceptional contributions to the nation's approach to the problems of older citizens, public health, education, conservation of natural resources, recreational facilities, taxation and economic growth, international trade, transportation, communications, power supply, and many other long-neglected public needs of the American people.

Some of you may regard these programs in a different light. However they may be judged, I can assure you that from the point of view of a professional legislator, the enactment of the Kennedy and Johnson programs represents, in terms of volume and scope, a unique legislative achievement.

The satisfaction which might be found in the achievement, however, is dulled by the deepening concern with Viet Nam. And whatever contribution the enactment of the Kennedy and Johnson programs may have made to the public life of the nation lies largely in the engulfing shadow of Viet Nam.

The Vietnamese conflict has something of the same effect on the nation's foreign relations. It throws into doubt, for example, the fragile beginning in the improvement of relations with the Eastern European nations. It introduces a note of diffidence into our associations with the Western Europeans who are unwilling—to say the least—to immerse themselves in the question of Viet Nam. It obscures the unfolding of events in Latin America, the Middle East, Africa, and even in other parts of Asia which may have great significance for this nation.

That American interest should be concentrated on Viet Nam is as inevitable as it is understandable. The implications of Viet Nam are stark and immediate. More and more the war involves the young man next door. Already it touches directly a great number of American hearts. It demands much from many in the way of tangible personal sacrifice. Millions of Americans have been in Viet Nam or know someone who has been in Viet Nam. Millions more can expect to be exposed to a similar experience.

Viet Nam is war and war takes precedence over other affairs of the nation. On that point there ought to be no ground for confusion or doubt. The support which the American forces in Viet Nam have received has been unstinting. They are the best equipped and supplied military organization in the history of warfare. Whatever has been sought by the President for the conduct of operations in Viet Nam has been granted by the Congress and by overwhelming votes. Congress is on record by a resolution, which I myself happen to have introduced, assuring to the men in Viet Nam the unequivocal support of the nation.

That will continue to be the case for as long as necessary. Let neither friend nor foe be under any misapprehension on that score. Americans in Viet Nam shall receive whatever they may require to carry out their assignments. They did not choose to go to Viet Nam; they were sent there by the policies of the United States government. To differ with the policies in no way inhibits a sense of obligation to the servicemen in Viet Nam. Nor, may I add, does full support of these men require rote endorsement of the policies which sent them there. To insist that the two are inseparable is to equate the open heart of patriotism with the closed mind of political conformity.

President Johnson, may I say, was among the first to reject any suggestion that the two are linked. I know from personal knowledge that he welcomes responsible discussion of the question of Viet Nam and that he is prepared to listen to all reasonable suggestions on how the conflict may be terminated in honor.

It must be faced frankly, however, that the end is not in sight in Viet Nam. It is not in sight, by military action or negotiations, or any visible combination. The question of Viet Nam has taken on ever increasing significance to Americans as the massive buildup of forces in Southeast Asia has proceeded. That buildup gives to the matter another dimension by underscoring the depth of the commitment of the United States to help the people of South Viet Nam preserve a choice over their political future.

In view of the sacrifices which already have been made, Viet Nam is now embedded in the feelings of the nation. That is all the more reason for responsible public discussion of the issues which are posed by this situation. Unless it ensues, the conflict in Viet Nam cannot be placed in accurate perspective in terms of the domestic needs and other problems abroad which confront the United States.

I would emphasize that Viet Nam is not the sum of our national difficulties. Notwithstanding Viet Nam, smog will still settle over the cities of the nation. There will be no letup in the pollution of rivers, streams, and tidewaters. Viet Nam will not spare us a long summer of racial and other tension in the smoldering cities. Viet Nam will not reduce the pressure of population on the police, transport, educational, housing, and other facilities of the great urban centers. What is required to maintain a prosperous and inflation-free economy and a flourishing international exchange—as you well know—will not be lessened by Viet Nam.

Problems of this sort have been the preoccupation of the Congress for the past several years. I believe the legislation which has been enacted goes to the heart of many of them. But this legal machinery must be used energetically and it must be used wisely. If it is neglected, if it grinds to a halt because of the preoccupation with Viet Nam, the nation will suffer the consequences in the years ahead. A concentration on Viet Nam may obscure the public needs of the nation but it will not alleviate them. On the contrary, Viet Nam will complicate and exacerbate all of them.

In a similar vein, it should be noted that the flow of events throughout the world will not wait upon a disposal of the problem of Viet Nam. There are questions of foreign relations elsewhere in which the stake of the nation is also very great, but which tend to be overlooked in present circumstances. One has only to note, for example, the current turn of developments in the Middle East. We may well ask ourselves is the change in that situation as sudden as it now appears? Or did the crisis gather while our preoccupations were elsewhere?

I would stress, therefore, that it is vital to consider Viet Nam in the context of the nation's worldwide interests. In particular, we need to see this conflict in Southeast Asia in the perspective of the nation's over-all position in the Western Pacific.

Certain similarities between Korea and Viet Nam are relevant to that perspective. Both, for example, lie at extremities of an antagonistic mainland China and both are on the Asian littoral of the Pacific Ocean. Both are former colonial dependencies. Both were set free but were divided in the wake of the collapse, respectively, of Japanese and French power.

Our military involvements in the two conflicts developed as a response to aggressive incursions from a Communist-linked north into an American-linked south. These incursions were launched, however, not in the name of Communism but under the banner of nationalism—of national liberation and unity.

Both the conflict in Korea and in Viet Nam have pitted us in brutal struggle against peoples for whom we have had no tradition of hostility. Both conflicts have exacted a heavy toll of suffering and destruction amongst those people and a large price in American lives and resources. Our direct military involvement in each instance began as a limited effort, on top of a prolonged period of economic and military aid to a weak indigenous government. With U.N. sanction and support, we sought to assist the South Koreans to repel an invasion from North Korea. This initial and successful campaign was then pushed beyond its original purpose and led, against expectations, into a massive and indecisive clash with mainland Chinese forces.

In Viet Nam we have had the support of certain allied Asian and other Western Pacific nations but, to date, the United Nations has maintained a formal silence. It has not sanctioned the U.S. action. Indeed, the U.N. has not yet even taken formal note of the existence of the conflict. That is, may I say, an immense understatement of a massive oversight.

If I may digress for a moment, I would express the hope that steps will be taken to bring the U.N. into this question in the near future. At the very least, the U.N. Security Council should recognize the existence of the struggle and seek to bring all the disputants into a cards-on-the-table confrontation.

As in Korea, our military involvement in Viet Nam began as a limited support undertaking. By air and sea, however, the military effort has now been expanded into North Viet Nam. At the same time, the war in the south has become, increasingly, an American military operation which pits our forces against both North Vietnamese regulars and Viet Cong guerrillas.

The expansion of this conflict in Viet Nam, in my judgment, carries the strong possibilities of another massive clash between China and the United States and even the seeds of World War III. It is not that all concerned do not remember the Korean experience. It is not that this nation would deliberately enlarge the Vietnamese conflict into a provocative challenge to China. It is simply that military actions once launched tend to establish their own momentum in which one step leads inexorably to the next. We may well ask ourselves before we go much further in this process how many steps have already been taken in this fashion since the first American bomb fell on North Viet Nam scarcely three years ago?

The successive steps have drawn U.S. military power deeply into Viet Nam. In this involvement, as with the Korean conflict a decade and a half ago, we have made an immense military commitment in a region in which our national interests were minimal before World War II. A quarter of a century ago, Viet Nam and Korea scarcely piqued our national curiosity.

American foreign policy found little of relevance to our national security and welfare in Korea. The same was true of Viet Nam or, for that matter, of Indo-China as a whole, except perhaps as that region came under the control of the Japanese war machine after 1940. Pre-World War II trade with these two Asian peninsulas was almost non-existent. Americans did not travel to either of them in any great numbers. In fact, in 1953, when I visited Laos with an associate, the two of doubled the American population there. Even at that late date, there only two young American vice-consuls living in the entire country. And in Viet Nam, that year, the total of Americans certainly did not exceed two hundred, almost all government officials and including several in an American consular establishment in Hanoi.

The contrast, today, is staggering. We have mobilized in and around Viet Nam in Southeast Asia an American military force well in excess of half-a-million men. We have thrown into this conflict an enormous quantity and assortment of military materiel. We have consigned great air and naval power to the struggle. Expenditures for military operations in Viet Nam have now reached an annual rate which is estimated at $25 billion and is still rising.

As I have noted, this great commitment has been undertaken in a region which, a few years ago, was scarcely visible on the spectrum of the nation's interests in the Western Pacific and of even less significance in terms of the world-wide position of the United States. The precipitous increase to the present level of concern with Viet Nam raises certain fundamental questions. We must ask ourselves whether the Vietnamese involvement (and, for that matter, the Korean involvement) signifies a new concept of American interests in the Western Pacific? Do these incursions into the Asian mainland signal a permanent recasting of our policies?

Before trying to answer these questions, let me refer briefly to the pattern of American policy in the Far Pacific prior to World War II. To put it succinctly, U.S. policy traditionally resisted the commitment of substantial American military power anywhere on Asian soil and, particularly, anywhere much beyond the reach of naval support and supply. Even during World War II, the number of Americans who fought on the Asian mainland was but a fraction of the forces which we have at the present time in Viet Nam.

In setting the Philippines free in 1946, moreover, this nation turned its back on a colonial role in Asia. To put it another way, we rejected once and for all a dominant responsibility for the affairs or future of any Asian people. Rather than chase the illusions of imperialism, this nation saw its interests in the Far East as lying precisely in the activities which many in this group pursue for a living. We saw those interests in commercial and other exchange with an Asia of peaceful, independent and developing nations. To that end, we were prepared to join with others in a judicious transfer of the skills, knowledge and capital of modernization.

In my judgment, the present involvement in Viet Nam in no way, shape, or form signals a substantial recasting of our position in the Far East. The Vietnamese conflict, as the Korean conflict before it, is a consequence of the collapse of Japanese and French imperial power. It is a consequence of the understandable weakness of the successor states. Above all else, it is a consequence of the Chinese revolutionary sweep of the mainland and the ideological fears and other uncertainties which were engendered by this cataclysmic change.

However, neither the involvement in Viet Nam nor in Korea, I would reiterate, reflects a permanent change in our position. The role of American power on the Asian mainland was and will one day, again, be limited. We did not shake loose of the costly responsibilities in the Philippines only to assume them in Viet Nam by a new name. Our extraordinary military incursion into the Asian mainland will end as soon as the extraordinary circumstances which have evoked it have also ended.

In the second half of the 20th century, this nation is a world power, not a colonial power. The global scope of our current interests requires us to exercise the responsibilities of the former even as it compels us to reject the trappings of the latter. In a similar vein, I would suggest to you that the United States occupies the position of a Pacific power, not that of an Asian power. The difference is more than semantic.

Every significant development in, on, and over the Pacific Ocean has direct relevance to the security and well-being of the United States and we have a substantial capacity to exercise a rational influence over the course of these developments. We do not live, however, on the mainland of Asia and the practical reach of our influence in the Far Pacific does not extend very far inland from littorals. We do not have a unique or unilateral interest in what transpires on the Asian mainland. To the extent that we have an interest at all, it is an interest which is shared with other nations, in the peace, stability, and progress of one of the great regions of the world.

In this context, our involvement in Viet Nam will be seen to be a temporary phenomenon. Indeed, the President has made this point over and over again. He has emphasized that we shall not pursue the course of a bankrupt and bankrupting colonialism in Asia. He has emphasized that as soon as an honorable settlement can be negotiated we will reverse the extraordinary deployment of our military power into Southeast Asia. He has said time after time that we seek neither territory nor permanent bases in that region.

Once peace is restored in Viet Nam, there could emerge the conditions which will allow us to resume fully the pursuit of our traditional interests in the Western Pacific. In particular, it is to be anticipated that the prime international events of the Western Pacific will once again revolve around the triad of Japan, the Soviet Union, and China. Indeed, there are signs that this restoration is already underway.

I would note, for example, that the clash of historic border claims and other differences between China and the Soviet Union has shattered the abnormal monolithic pattern of relations between these two nations. Yet only a few years ago it was commonly thought that through Communism, Russia could fasten a permanent yoke on China. Indeed, we find, today, that there is not even a common Communist ideology within China, much less one which binds the Chinese in inseparable subservience to the Russians.

To be sure, a mutual interest in the conflict in Viet Nam has restrained differences to some degree between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic and additional extensions of the war, moreover, could act to strengthen the temporary bridge between them. If, as, and when the Vietnamese conflict is settled, however, the normal difficulties between China and Russia may be expected once again to come into full play.

Japan's relations with mainland China—a China against which we alone of all the major powers impose and enforce both a primary and secondary boycott—have also developed from the total alienation two decades ago in the direction of a reassertion of natural cultural and economic affinities. It might be noted, for example, that mainland China's trade with Japan now surpasses that of Taiwan. The total reached $600 million in 1966, almost evenly divided between exports and imports. In that year, China also became Japan's fourth largest trading partner.

Similar tendencies towards normalization are to be found in relations between Japan and the Soviet Union. Under a five-year trade agreement which was initiated in 1965, total trade between the two nations will approach half-a-billion dollars for the year 1967, a large increase over last year. There is also under discussion at high levels in the Japanese and Soviet governments plans for the joint development of Siberia. These involve the exploitation of gas resources on Soviet Sakhalin, the building of an immense pipeline in Siberia, and, possibly, the exploitation of Soviet timber and copper resources.

International developments of this kind, as I noted at the outset of my remarks, tend to be overlooked in our concern with Viet Nam. Yet, we cannot afford to ignore them, particularly when they indicate changing situations which are of great significance to our national interests.

In my judgment, the re-emergence of a free interplay among Japan, China, and the Soviet Union is a welcome development. It tends to restore the normal core of relations in the Western Pacific. It tends also to bring closer the day when this nation may rechannel its energies fully into the pursuit of our traditional interests in that region. President Johnson, in fact, has already begun to put emphasis on these interests. He has been, for example, a prime mover in taking the multi-nation Mekong River Development Project from the drafting boards where it had rested for many years to the construction sites of Southeast Asia. He has given strong but appropriate U.S. support to the creation of the Asian Development Bank. He has pledged our contribution to the enormous tasks of reconstruction and development in all of Southeast Asia which must surely follow the conflict in Viet Nam. In these and other ways, he has made it abundantly clear that what we seek are the lasting achievements of peace and not the fleeting triumphs of war.

Peace in Viet Nam will pave the way for a reduction and return of our military forces from the Southeast Asian peninsula. One would hope that it might also pave the way for a reduction and return of our forces from the Korean peninsula. These pull-backs of American power, of course, cannot and will not occur in a vacuum. As a prerequisite, they will require satisfactory political settlements of the problems of the Korean partition and the Vietnamese division. They will require assurances of stability in the Formosan Straits which, in effect, would involve a settlement of the questions of the Chinese partition. They will require the establishment of effective international guarantees of the peace and security of nations both large and small throughout Eastern and Southeast Asia. In short, they will require the liquidation of the problems left over form World War II and the Chinese Revolution.

I do not know when all involved will be prepared for the face-to-face negotiations which are necessary to restore and maintain a durable peace in the Western Pacific. I do know that the sooner there can be a rendezvous with realities in Asia on the part of all involved, the better for this nation, for the Asian nations and for the world.

IN THE SHADOW OF VIET NAM

(Commencement address by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, Haverford, Pa., May 30, 1937)

It is doubtful that there has ever been a good time to graduate from college. There is only an inevitable time and you have arrived at it. If you have a sense of concern as to the future, it may be somewhat reassuring to note that it is a feeling which has been shared by graduating classes as far back as anyone can remember.

And, yet, this class of 1967 is entitled to an uncommon concern about the future. You graduate in uncommon circumstances. You walk out directly into the shadow of Viet Nam.

Since that is the case, you are not likely to have much interest in what I might say about the job opportunities "out there". Nor do I believe that you would be especially enthralled by comments on medicare, highway beautification, antipoverty programs, the peace corps or a dozen or more other creative and useful legislative enterprises which have been initiated in recent years by the federal government.

I expect that what you expect from me is to make some sense on the question of Viet Nam—on the war and its prospects and your prospects in the light of it. I do not know that I can live up to those expectations if what you seek is a punchcard computation of satisfying answers. I do not have that sort of information and I do not know how to run the computers. As one Senator, I have only the personal estimates and attitudes which come from a long effort to try to understand what is involved in the problems of Viet Nam and Asia. I have only the concerns which I share with young people as to their personal future in the light of this persisting difficulty. I have only an awareness of the curtain of uncertainty which Viet Nam has drawn across the pursuit of happiness in this nation and the prospects for continued civilized survival everywhere in the world.

On the part of the United States, the eventual resolution of the conflict in Viet Nam will depend greatly on the President and the Executive Branch of the government. It will, also, depend in part on Senators and Congressmen. In the last analysis, however, it will depend heavily on the people of the nation and, in particular, on the reaction of young persons such as yourselves to this situation. Your opinions on Viet Nam are relevant and you have not only a right but, if you are so inclined, a public duty to express them. You also have, however, an obligation to ask; you have a responsibility to listen and these are antecedent to the responsible exercise of your right and duty to speak. In short, you owe it to yourselves, to your country and to the vitality of the institutions in which you have matured to make your opinions as informed as possible. In the hope of contributing something to that end, I make these remarks today.

The Viet Nam war has been so often in the news that at times it seems that for several years nothing else of note has happened in the world. We have had an incessant bombardment from the communications media. We have been exposed to the horrors and the heroics and to the destruction and the dedication of this war. We have had almost a surfeit of facts as well as a torrent of irrelevances. Yet the pattern of the conflict is illusive and its purposes remain obscure. We have known the frustration which comes from an ever more intensely sought peace in an ever more intensely fought war.

It is difficult in these circumstances to maintain a balanced view of the conflict or our role in it. Indeed, the Vietnamese conflict is as a powerful drug which has been administered to the American body politic. The effect on some individuals has been that of a heady stimulant; they would go all out to get out. For them the solution to this grim conflict is "to pull out the stopper and let's have a whopper." I respect the right of those, who are so inclined, to express dissent from policies of restraint, even to the extent of calling for a return to the Stone-Age, but I also most respectfully disagree with them. The honorable road out of Viet Nam is not one which leads ever more deeply into Asia. A desirable end to the war in Viet Nam is not to be found by extending the battlefields to the rest of Southeast Asia and to China. It is, or ought to be, crystal clear to all by this late date, that it is very easy to expand this involvement on the Asian mainland, but that it is immensely difficult to contract it.

I do not believe that the circumstances of this conflict have generated any great enthusiasm for expansion of the war. Rather they have induced a deep concern as to its extent and the elusiveness of its conclusion. It is no less a concern because it is accompanied by a silent acceptance of its great costs. The fact is that the war bewilders. The sensitivities of our society are changed. Figures totaling billions of dollars tend to be regarded now with the non-comprehension of scores in a sport in which we are not interested. Unless affected directly by personal considerations, the grisly casualty counts are accepted with the same non-thought as the regular morning cup of coffee. In the growing demands of war there is a tendency to consign to a limbo pressing domestic problems and other issues of foreign policy.

An educated guess of the monetary costs of Viet Nam runs from $2 billion a month, or $24 billion annually, to $2.7 billion per month or more than $32 billion annually. Certainly a figure of $25 billion for a year gives some reasonable indication of the current rate of spending for the war. It is a figure, moreover, that is not going down; it is going up. Keep in mind, moreover, that I am speaking only of the cost of our military effort in Viet Nam. That represents only about a third of our annual defense expenditures of over $70 billion.

It might be possible to appreciate what $25 billion a year for war in Viet Nam means if the figure is compared with the annual cost of certain other federal programs. On the basis of the President's budget requests in January for the coming fiscal year, for example:

Fourteen weeks of war expenditures in Viet Nam would fund all federal transportation proposals, including our huge highway construction program and the development of such items as high-speed railroad and commuter services and the supersonic passenger airplane;

A year's cost of veterans' benefits and services growing out of all past wars could be met with 12 weeks of current war expenditures in Viet Nam;

Eight weeks of military expenses in Viet Nam equal all of the federal monies sought for education—elementary, secondary, higher, vocational and international—and the special funds for improving education in city slums and depressed rural areas;

The costs of all housing and urban affairs programs of the federal government, including slum clearance and other efforts to make the nation's cities safer and more satisfying places for human habitation represent 6 weeks of the cost of the Vietnamese war;

The entire Food for Peace program which feeds millions of hungry people abroad is supported on the equivalent of less than 4 weeks of war costs in Viet Nam.

The international activities in which we participate for the purposes of humanitarian and economic goals and above all, a more stable peace, can be expressed in similar stark contrasts. The annual level of U.S. appropriations, for example, for the inter-American Alliance for Progress—much of which is repayable, represents only about 6 weeks of war-costs in Viet Nam. One economist has estimated that a needed redistribution of farm land to peasants throughout India, Pakistan, the coastal areas of Asia, and all of Latin America, could be brought about equitably and without confiscation, for about $5 billion of total cost. That would be the equivalent of 10 weeks of war expenditures in Viet Nam. Finally a look at United Nations costs suggests that the entire annual U.S. contribution to the regular budget and to all other programs of that organization, such as the peace keeping missions in the Middle East, Cyprus and elsewhere comes to 80 hours or 3 days of war expenditures in Viet Nam.

That the great burden of Viet Nam has been met without shifting the economy to a wartime footing and with surprisingly little inflation is a commentary on the vitality of the nation's productive facilities. It is also a tribute to the skill with which the President and his Administration have conducted the federal government's role in the nation's economic and fiscal affairs.

Nevertheless, it would be pointless to ignore the prospect of a convergence of factors which may require us to accept controls and higher taxes or alternatively, to suffer a serious and, in the end, destructive inflation. We are approaching the point where growing needs in Viet Nam are beginning to draw significant numbers of skilled workers out of civilian production into military service and defense industries. At the same time, there is no corresponding decrease in the demand for consumer goods. To fill the gap in part, we import in greater and greater quantities and this process, in turn, leads to growing complications and difficulties in the balance of payments.

Whatever the economic implications, however, the fundamental tragedy of Viet Nam lies not so much in those considerations as in the toll of human life and hope. Already the over-all casualties are more than one-third that of the Korean war.

It is grim to speak of human suffering by way of statistics, yet some numerical comparisons are necessary if we are to understand the dimensions of Viet Nam. In the first three weeks of April, for example, 518 Americans were killed in action. These young men joined over 10,000 others who have lost their lives since U.S. troops were committed to Viet Nam. So far the number of young Pennsylvanians alone who have been killed in Viet Nam is about equal to the entire student body of Haverford College.

In addition to the dead, there have been over 60,000 Americans wounded in Viet Nam. To give this figure of 60,000 some sense of the pain it has entailed, note that it would be the equivalent if every man, woman and child in the city suffered an injury in some sudden and appalling disaster in Haverford.

The civilian analogy is apt because in addition to the military casualties which have occurred, the war in Viet Nam inflicts great pain on those who are caught up in its crossfires and in the incredibly brutal fury which characterizes intra-Vietnamese political rivalries and hatreds. Major General James Humphreys, director of our public health efforts in Viet Nam, recently estimated that 50,000 civilians would be treated for war-related injuries in government hospitals in South Viet Nam this year. Of course, this figure says nothing of the countless deaths, accidental and unreported which are induced by military action. It says nothing of the political murders and mutilations. It says nothing of the countless injured who go untreated in a land of limited and, in many areas, non-existent medical services.

The hostile military forces against whom we are pitted have also been hard hit. Official sources list the combined total of North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong killed in action in South Viet Nam as 149,000 for 1966, with weekly totals at times this year in excess of 2,000. These figures are indicative of the great destructiveness of the repertoire of modern weapons which has been drawn upon for use in Viet Nam. Yet, enemy forces continue the struggle and actually are growing in numbers. The latest Pentagon figures show enemy strength at record levels—287,000 today as compared to 239,000 a year ago. This increase is in the face of an estimated loss of half-million in the war to date.

What was, scarcely two years ago, preponderantly a war among Vietnamese has now become preponderantly war between hostile Vietnamese and U.S. forces. The total number of American ground forces in Viet Nam went from 45,000 in 1965 to 400,000 by the end of 1966. It is in the neighborhood of 450,000 today and there is talk, even now, of the need for an additional Marine division and one or two additional army divisions. The prospect of an increase well beyond 500,000 by the end of this year is not to be dismissed. This prospect, in fact, is enhanced by the recent consignment of new responsibilities to the U.S. military command in the work of pacification and the possibilities of the expansion of the U.S. military effort into the delta regions of the Mekong. United States forces having replaced the Saigon armies as the principal combatant on the front lines in the North and West of South Viet Nam may now be on the way to becoming the major military element in the Southern sector and the rear areas. This delta region and the work of pacification have heretofore been consigned to the South Vietnamese authorities working in concert with a few American civilian and military advisors.

There is currently, coincident with these changes, some expression of views from "anonymous" but "official sources" that a military victory is just around the corner and that it can finally be achieved by another new input of American forces and effort. The same feeling, however, it should be noted, has been present in the past, prior to significant new inputs or usages of U.S. military power. And after each added military step, I regret to note the forecasts of an imminent resolution of the conflict have ceased.

I think it is to be anticipated that the process of increasing the U.S. military role in installments will go on, but in my judgment the search for a decision by force of arms will be as elusive as the quest for a just solution by diplomatic negotiations has so far proved to be.

In short, the prospects for a restoration of peace in the near future are not at all encouraging. We will do well to face, now, the fact that enormous risks lie ahead on the present military course. The prospect of a direct military conflict with China obviously is somewhere along the path of an expanding war in Viet Nam and Southeast Asia. It is not important that, as a matter of policy, we do not wish to threaten Chinese interests on the Asian mainland and have so stated many times. What is important are the implications of our growing military effort in Viet Nam as seen through the spectacles of Chinese xenophobia. The cosmic gyrations of the Chinese "cultural revolution" are indicative of the immense enigma which China poses for our policies. It is not safe to assume, with any degree of assurance, what may be the eventual result of this great political upheaval in China. It may mean a more militant China; it by no means guarantees a less militant China. Insofar as we are concerned, there is no reason to expect as a consequence of the inner struggle any reduction in Chinese suspicion of us or any remission in the hostility with which they have regarded our course in Viet Nam from the beginning. This response to us, in Viet Nam, it should be noted, has its roots at least as much in Chinese history and tradition as in Chinese ideological theory.

To reiterate, the Chinese response to us in Viet Nam will be little affected by current developments in China, in the absence of other changes in the situation. In any event, there are signs that the ideological fury within that immense nation has begun to abate. Chinese foreign trade has not been cut by the action of the Red Guards although it may suffer from the current Hong Kong unrest. So far as anyone is aware the nuclear project in Lop Nor continues to operate at full blast in the deserts of Sinkiang. Most important in its implications for Viet Nam, the Chinese-Soviet conflict has been put aside at least sufficiently to permit Soviet military supplies for Hanoi to flow unimpeded overland through China.

There is some tendency to dismiss the Chinese as a significant factor in the considerations which should be given our course in Viet Nam. A preoccupation with the possibilities of a U.S.-Chinese clash is regarded in some quarters as unwarranted, to say the least. The view is that the Chinese dragon, out of preoccupation or prudence, will bellow but not bite. It would be well to recall that similar sentiments were expressed in connection with Korea. Indeed, they were expressed in a kind of whistling in the dark even after the initial reports began to come in that the Chinese had crossed the Yalu and clashed with U.S. forces in the far North.

Since my memory goes back that far, I hope you will forgive me if I reiterate that the prospect of war with China emerging from the Vietnamese conflict cannot be dismissed. And I hope you' will forgive me if I reiterate, too, what I reported on returning from Viet Nam 1½ years ago. I said then and I repeat now: the war in Viet Nam could become open-ended and the end is not in sight. One of the most significant statements of General Westmoreland, the able soldier who commands the U.S. forces in Viet Nam, on his visit in this country a few weeks ago, was that an end of the war in Viet Nam is not in sight. Presumably he meant a military termination of the war. That was the sober opinion of a soldier on a matter in which his professional competence gives his opinion a special significance.

In the light of General Westmoreland's estimate, it would seem to me to be prudent, as I have stated, to anticipate an enlargement of the war in Viet Nam. Yet I do not wish to suggest that the war will inevitably escalate towards a grim infinity. I have suggested on occasion the possibility of limiting the military conflict, so long as it must persist, to South Viet Nam. Indeed, the rationale for the bombing of the North can be eliminated on the basis of a defensive military barrier on the ground, south of the 17th parallel. That could do what aerial bombing of the North was expected to do but has not done, namely, interdict the lines of supply and communication between north and south Viet Nam. Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, recently asked that the bombing in the North be limited to these supply routes and that, too, is a step towards limiting the war.

In the end, however, negotiations alone can supply a sure and permanent limitation or termination of the conflict. In the end, a way must be found to negotiate an honorable peace. That would be a peace which is not sought on the basis of an elusive military triumph. Rather it would be a peace grounded in the principle that the rights of the Vietnamese people are paramount in this situation. It is their country and their future which are at stake. Indeed, that is the principle which President Johnson, Ho Chi Minh and all others concerned have contended is the basis for the current military efforts. The problem is how to initiate negotiations which might lead to a common concept of the principle and agreement on means by which it is to be put into practice.

The effort to open negotiations to end the war has been so far an exercise in complete frustration. Countless proposals have been advanced and they have come to naught. I have long felt, along with many others, for example, that the proper vehicle for peace talks is the Geneva Conferences. These conferences brought the war in Indo-China to an end in 1954 and in 1962, produced a treaty which, whatever its shortcomings, did return a measure of peace to a Laos on the verge of collapse. The Geneva Conference has the merit of being recognized not only by North Viet Nam, but by China. Getting the Conference participants to face up to their responsibilities, however, is another matter.

I have also sought to have greater attention given to the views General de Gaulle and Cambodia's Prince Norodom Sihanouk and U Thant and I have advocated a meeting between Secretary of State Dean Rusk and China's foreign minister, Chen Yi. An all-Asian conference of friend and foe alike has also been proposed as an elaboration of last year's Manila meeting. I have urged that the brief cease-fires which we have seen during holiday periods in Viet Nam be extended and coupled with a military "standfast" on land, sea and air as a prelude to negotiations. I have suggested that South Viet Nam's borders be inspected and patrolled by the three-nation International Control Commission.

When it became apparent that traditional secret diplomacy had failed to open up a road to negotiations, I began to urge last fall a formal and open U.N. contribution to the effort to restore peace should be sought. With all due respect to U Thant, the dedicated Secretary-General, the U.N. as an organization has yet to face up to the responsibilities which are imposed by this situation.

I do not think anyone expcts miracles from that organization but I do think that all members of the U.N. have an obligation to make a concerted contribution through its machinery to the search for peace. It would appear to me to be most appropriate, for example, for the Security Council to issue a call by formal resolution to all who are directly or indirectly engaged in Viet Nam—member and non-member of the U.N. alike—to confer in New York or Geneva. A confrontation of positions and a consideration of ways and means to restore peace in Viet Nam in this fashion is in order and it is urgent. I do not know whether it would be effective but I see no reason why it should not be attempted or why this nation should not take a strong initiative in connection therewith. I will state, on my own responsibility, that the President would not look with disfavor on such a proposal.

In view of the grim estimate of the Viet Nam war, which I have just given you, you may be asking at this moment: "Where do I come in or, perhaps, where do I get out, or, perhaps, when does he get out?" As I told you at the outset, I do not have punch-card answers, either for the war in Viet Nam or in terms of its personal implications. For you, the concern is direct. The draft is already an important consideration in your life. But concern for ending the conflict needs to go beyond the immediate problems of the draft, important as that may be to each individual. The implications of a run-away war, with full Chinese involvement and even Russia at a later stage are staggering to contemplate.

Even without a great expansion, the lives of additional thousands of Americans and Asians, both military and civilian, are forfeit, if we do not achieve an end to this conflict in the near future. The well-being of the U.S. economy, which is, after all the underpinning of our international position, is at stake. The survival of humanism, if not of humanity itself, is increasingly thrown into doubt as the persistence of the war induces the removal of restraints and an even greater callousness to human suffering.

As graduates, you have a special responsibility as well as a special concern. It is larger than protest. It is a responsibility to try to understand and to contribute to the understanding of others so that no stone may be left unturned in the search for peace. Much has happened since Dien Bien Phu. Many persons have been involved—Communists and non-Communists, Americans and foreigners, Democrats and Republicans. Mistakes have been made. Good intentions have been distorted. At this late date, the question is not "who got us here and why?" but "where do we go from here and how?"

In connection therewith, I hope that I have at least made the point that as one American, as one Senator, I believe without reservation that it is in the interests of the United States and all others involved in Viet Nam and the world to scale down these hostilities as quickly as possible. I believe it is in the common interest to get to the conference table without delay, to bring this war to an honorable end and to begin using the immense energy and resources which are now preempted by the conflict for the constructive works of peace.

OUTER SPACE TREATY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was extremely pleased to note that on May 18, the Soviet Union ratified the treaty on principles governing the activities of states in the exploration and use of outer space. I understand that talks are currently underway to set a date for the deposit of instruments of ratification in Moscow, London, and Washington.

The action of the U.S.S.R. thus paralleled the earlier action of the United States, taken in this very Chamber on April 25. The Senate will recall that on that date it unanimously voted to ratify the Treaty on Outer Space, a landmark agreement, and the first dealing with this critical subject. The vote marked the culmination of a long campaign which drew upon wide consultation and collaboration and broad consensus. For the achievement and senatorial approval of a treaty had required full cooperation not only between political parties, but between the branches of governments and among the discrete departments of the executive branch.

The first steps toward international agreement in the area of outer space were taken in 1957 and 1958 by President Eisenhower and Lyndon B. Johnson, the then majority leader of the Senate and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. Interest in the possibility of a treaty grew all through the remainder of the Eisenhower term and under the Kennedy administration. President Johnson, who remained one of the principal supporters of such an agreement, contributed the final impetus for negotiations, with an announcement in May of 1966 drawing world attention to the increasing need for a treaty. The President indicated that the United States was eager to forestall potential conflict stemming from space activity and to insure freedom of scientific investigations by astronauts. He proposed six specific elements which should be covered in a treaty satisfactory to the United States: Freedom of exploration; prohibition of claims of sovereignty, freedom of scientific investigation and international cooperation, studies to avoid harmful contamination, mutual assistance among astronauts in the case of need, and a ban on the stationing of weapons of mass destruction, weapons tests, and military maneuvers on celestial bodies. All of these elements are present in the final treaty.

For an agreement of such monumental significance, negotiations proceeded with extraordinary rapidity. The desires of the United States, as expressed by President Johnson, were immediately communicated by Ambassador Arthur Goldberg to the Chairman of the 28-member United Nations Outer Space Committee and to the Soviet Union and other members of the Legal Subcommittee. By the end of the month of May the United Nations had received an encouraging response from the Soviet Union, indicating that the U.S.S.R. was contemplating a treaty of the very same nature as that proposed by President Johnson. Indeed, the Soviets proposed that the treaty deal not only with celestial bodies—as the United States had suggested—but with all of outer space. Needless to say, this proposal was welcome as indicative of the Soviet desire to take a constructive approach.

Treaty texts of the United States and Soviet Union were published on June 16 and negotiations opened on July 12 at the European headquarters of the United Nations in Geneva. Discussions proceeded through August 4 and, after a short recess, resumed in the fall in New York. Throughout this period the U.S. delegation held lengthy private talks with all of the more than 25 participating members of the Legal Subcommittee. The aim at all times was to eschew polemics and to surmount the relatively few differences of principle that existed among the various states involved.

The fruit of these consultations, an agreed treaty text, was harvested in early December. Quickly approved in a resolution passed by the Political Committee of the General Assembly, the treaty was then endorsed by acclamation in a plenary meeting of Assembly. On January 27 the treaty was opened for signature in Washington, London, and Moscow, simultaneously. There are, as of the current date, more than 75 nations signatories.

I need not go into great detail in order to underscore the enormous step forward which the treaty represents. Suffice it to point out only that in at least four critical aspects—arms control, prevention of sovereignty claims, peaceful cooperation, and protection of astronauts—the agreement stands as a major achievement, not only of the United States, but of the whole world community. In regard to arms control, the treaty forbids the orbiting or stationing of weapons of mass destruction in outer space or on celestial bodies; it declares that the Moon and other celestial bodies are to be used only for peaceful purposes; it insures freedom of movement anywhere in outer space and on celestial bodies; and it guarantees access by each state party to the installations and vehicles of other parties on celestial bodies.

Equally as important, in prohibiting claims of sovereignty the treaty proclaims outer space to be the "province of all mankind," and it explicitly extends the rule of international law into the boundless realm of space.

In furtherance of the aim of peaceful cooperation, the treaty assures freedom of scientific investigation in outer space, and requires the fullest practicable reporting by all states on the nature and results of their space activities; it guarantees freedom of access to all parts of celestial bodies and forbids harmful interference with the space activities of another state; it calls for avoidance of space activities that would contaminate celestial bodies or do harm to the Earth's environment; and it declares as a general principle that the exploration and use of outer space "shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries."

Finally, the treaty provisions regarding the safety of astronauts are of considerable importance. These "envoys of mankind" are to be given all possible assistance in the event of an emergency landing on foreign territory; they are to be returned home safely and promptly. While in outer space, astronauts of different nations are required to assist one another. And any hazard to astronauts must be reported immediately by the state that discovers it.

These are some of the major provisions of the treaty. Just as significant, however, are some of the less concrete considerations involved in the reaching of such an agreement. In regard to the area of arms control, for example, the treaty is not only—in President Johnson's words—"the most important arms control development since the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963." It is also an augury of much that can and that must come. The accomplishment of such a significant agreement lends great hope to a nation that actively seeks more and better arms control measures—for example, to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons, or to limit the prospective race in offensive and defensive missiles.

Then, the treaty constitutes a significant advance in international law—not only in the specific achievement of a rule of law in outer space, but also in following the same general line of historical development as the many treaties and conventions that are now governing so many aspects of modern life; this growing body of shared principles binds nations together in their practical common interests, and comes more and more to pose a powerful discouragement to war.

Finally, the treaty represents a grand step forward in United States-Soviet relations. In this respect the agreement follows upon other, similar agreements—the Antarctic Treaty of 1959 and the Limited Test Ban of 1963. All of these pacts tend to contribute to the growth of tolerance and understanding in Soviet-United States relations. The fact that the U.S.S.R. is prepared to cast differences aside and to sit down to discuss interests shared with the United States can only bode well for the cause of world peace.

In transmitting this treaty to the Senate for ratification, President Johnson noted that—

> Space exploration has become an intimate part of our lives. The exploits of men and machines in outer space excite and thrill us all. The valiant young men who have become symbolic of our national effort as astronauts are close to every American family. Yet—

The President continued—

> we must remember that these are only primitive years in the epoch of space exploration and utilization—an epoch that will run to the end of time. In the next decade and in all the decades to come, the capabilities of nations in space will multiply far beyond our comprehension today.

Efforts to explore outer space are bound to continue and to increase—not only because man is rapidly coming to tax the resources of this planet but because space, like the highest mountain, is there to be explored. I believe we all must agree wholeheartedly with the President when he says that "the future leaves no option. Responsible men must push forward in the exploration of space, near and far. Their voyages must be made in peace for purposes of peace on earth. This treaty is a step—a first step, but a long step—toward assuring the peace essential for the long journey."

I am sure we are united today, Mr. President, in congratulating President Johnson upon the taking of this step—which must rank as one of the outstanding contributions of his administration.

THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF KENTUCKY TO THE UNION (H. CON. RES. 204)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will report.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (H. Con. Res. 204) marking the 175th anniversary of the admission of Kentucky to the Union.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the pending House concurrent resolution expresses the congratulations and felicitations of Congress to the State of Kentucky on the 175 anniversary of its admission to the Union.

Today, June 1, marks the day on which the Commonwealth of Kentucky proudly entered the Federal Union as the 15th State in 1792, so it is very appropriate that this resolution be considered at this time.

On March 3, 1967, for myself and Senator MORTON, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 15. It was passed by the Senate on May 17 of this year.

This concurrent resolution would extend the greetings and felicitations of the Congress to the citizens of Kentucky upon the occasion of the celebration of the 175th anniversary of statehood of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Several days before the introduction of our Senate concurrent resolution, my good friend, Congressman William H. Natcher, of the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, had introduced a resolution with similar purpose in the House of Representatives.

Last week, the House of Representatives passed House Concurrent Resolution 204, the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. Natcher, and it has come to the Senate today.

Because these resolutions are directed to the same expression of greetings and felicitations by the Congress, and as many observances of this anniversary are planned this summer in Kentucky, Senator Morton and I have joined with our colleagues from Kentucky in the House of Representatives in a joint desire that the concurrent resolution be enacted in advance of the local celebrations.

I want to pay tribute to the work and the interest of Congressman Natcher, and all of the members of the Kentucky delegation in the House of Representatives. The resolution (H. Con. Res. 204) does honor to them and to our entire State.

I also want to thank the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] for his interest in Senate Concurrent Resolution 15, which he reported from the Senate Judiciary Committee without delay. He is a neighbor who has always been concerned with the history and the development of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

I hope that the Senate will accept the concurrent resolution passed by the House to complete action on this legislation. I again express my appreciation to my colleagues in the Senate for the prompt passage of our concurrent resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky states the case. The Senate concurrent resolution is in the House and will die there without any further action. Insofar as I know, it does not have to be recalled.

I do not have the slightest objection to the House concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 204) was agreed to as follows:

H. Con. Res. 204

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States extends its greetings and felicitations to the Commonwealth of Kentucky upon the occasion of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the admission of Kentucky into the Union and joins with the people of the Commonwealth of Kentucky in commemorating this anniversary.

Sec. 2. A copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

CELEBRATION OF THE PRELUDE TO INDEPENDENCE—AN ADDRESS BY JAMES E. WEBB

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, last Saturday, May 27, a celebration of the prelude to independence was held in Williamsburg, Va. The occasion honored the great American patriots of Virginia who worked so diligently to give real meaning and substance to the concepts of individual liberty and self-government in those historic days from May 15 to July 4, 1776.

Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautic and Space Administration, delivered a notable address to mark the occasion, recalling eloquently the great contributions made to America and the entire free world by the efforts of these distinguished fathers of freedom.

Entitled "From Runnymede to Ganymede," Mr. Webb's address captures the hopes and aspirations of our 18th-century leaders at Williamsburg, and traces them through the pages of history to today's exploration of space.

Calling man's probing of space an epoch of vast significance, Mr. Webb notes that it is a "prelude to a new age in our endless quest for enlarging and applying understanding of ourselves and our environment." He describes this gigantic space undertaking as "uniquely our quest—our unique destiny, and our unlimited adventure."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Webb's address printed in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

From Runnymede to Ganymede

(Address by James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, on the occasion of the celebration of the prelude to independence, Williamsburg, Va.)

Governor Rockefeller, Governor Godwin, Mayor Stryker, Dr. Strassner, Mr. Humelsine, Distinguished Guests, Friends, It is a great honor to share with you the privilege of meeting here in Williamsburg to recall the concepts of individual liberty, self-government, responsible leadership, and public service breathed into life by the great American patriots who did their work here in the fifty days from May 15 to July 4, 1776. Time and again on these occasions Governor Rockefeller and his distinguished guests have pointed out that independence for the United States was accomplished because the leaders of Virginia based their work on a deep understanding of man as an individual and as a collection of individuals making up society.

While the main events which we commemorate here today took place in fifty days, there was a long period in which, to use Woodrow Wilson's words, "the great continent lay 'a veiled and virgin shore' in flaming desires that could not be gratified, stirring dreams that only enticed brave men to their death, exciting to enterprise and adventure, but never to substantial or lasting achievement."

Then came a colonial development prelude that lasted more than fifty years. Even the Byrds of Virginia had to submit to its rigors. In fact, in 1717, having lost his first wife, William Byrd of Westover was in London paying ardent suit to a young lady named Mary Smith whose father required that he set down an analysis of his property and income. He did this, adding a statement of his honorable descent from the Byrds of Cheshire. But Mr. Smith replied coldly that property on the moon was as acceptable as an estate in Virginia. So Byrd lost Mary Smith.

Tonight the moon seems much nearer and samples of it are eagerly awaited by scientists all over the world. It is nearer, because over 400,000 men and women have worked hard to develop every scientific discipline, every major area of technology and every engineering and management requirement to succeed in the largest and most complex non-military undertaking of all time. Our Nation has mobilized for this project within a decade the number of people who were required to build our transcontinental railroads. As independent individuals they have cooperated to use gravity, inertia, thermodynamics and celestial mechanics in extraordinary new ways. They have constructed a rocket-powered transportation system that is already being used again and again, not only to the moon, but to almost any place in the solar system. And we have passed the peak. Five thousand men and women are leaving this space work every month to use their new skills to serve our economy in other fields.

Property from the moon will soon become a more acceptable asset than even an estate in Virginia. Today communications satellites and weather satellites are serving to tie the peoples of Europe, Asia, North America, and Australia together and to provide to the entire world useful weather information.

On June 25, the people of 24 nations, completely girdling the earth, will simultaneously watch the same television program—which will tell millions of men what other men are doing at many points around the world. United States and Soviet Union communications satellites will both be used to make this possible.

Thirty-nine nations currently receive cloud cover pictures on a routine basis from our weather satellites.

During the period from last February to April, a combination of surface-based, airborne, seaborne, and satellite observations were taken in the Pacific which will be used for many years to study fundamental meteorological problems.

Observing the earth from satellites will soon provide a powerful means for us and other nations to locate potential areas of mineral and oil resources.

And man is not only looking toward how space can serve him here on earth, but is also continuing to look further outward into space, eagerly awaiting the time when he can travel to the moons of other planets than his own earth. One such moon revolves around Jupiter, that distant and still little-known planet. Its name is Ganymede, and it was discovered by Galileo 150 years before the famous fifty days we celebrate today.

The capability man now has to project himself or his instruments to our own near-by moon or a distant moon of Jupiter is, of course, dependent on that developed intellectuality which flourishes on man's independence, nourished by individual liberty, and freedom of choice. This is less well stated in our history books than is the story of that great turning point in man's struggle for independence and liberty that occurred at Runnymede in the 13th Century. Runnymede means, to most of us, an epoch in man's struggle for his natural rights and for self-fulfillment. Ganymede means an intellectual concept and an object so distant we can hardly reach it in this century. But both are symbolic. Therefore, I have chosen for my topic today *"From Runnymede to Ganymede."*

The men who labored here in 1776 took the long view of man, man in space, if you will, since to the best of their knowledge and ours, man has always been in space and always will be. He was in space with King John at Runnymede when he made his giant step toward guaranteed human rights; he was in space with Galileo Galilei at Padua in the 17th Century, when he made his giant step toward understanding his place in space with the aid of free scientific thought; and he will be in space at Ganymede in the 21st Century if he chooses to stop there to do a detailed spectro-analysis of Jupiter to see if life exists. No one has yet figured out a way to land on Jupiter itself.

Already, here on earth, we are performing experiments which show the possibility that some life could evolve even on that hostile planet.

Thus, while this century will bring us the capability to travel to our moon and the nearby planets Venus and Mars, man already begins to dream of going on to the distant planets in the next century. If Jefferson were alive today, he would without doubt be an enthusiastic participant in this thought process. In Jefferson there was a happy marriage of physical science and political science. Through him, both were joined for good at Williamsburg in 1776.

Jefferson knew about Runnymede. He was deeply committed to extend the progress man had made in the intervening five centuries. Interestingly enough, Jefferson also knew about Ganymede. More than this, he understood the profound importance of interaction between the physical and the social sciences. He knew the sequence that plays itself out as man's attention is drawn to a phenomenon of nature and he begins to think about it, refine his observations and analyze them in depth. He understood that given enough motivation, enough intelligence, and enough time, man would then begin to identify the important elements to perceive their relationships one to another. He recognized that through this scientific method, there would come some understanding, and that with sufficient understanding, man could achieve the power to make predictions about the phenomenon to which his attention had been drawn.

Many who explain science and interpret the scientific method today stop at this point, but Jefferson was a close student of Bacon, and recognized that with a deeper and more profound understanding, man discovers the basic principles that enable him to predict related phenomena, and that he will discover he can control some of these and put them to work.

The term we used today for man's ability to capture and put to work the forces of nature is technology, and since technology frequently gives birth to better means for making new scientific observations, it continually provides the beginning of a whole new cycle of discovery, understanding, and practical use of knowledge.

As Jefferson thought deeply on the lessons of history in the spring of 1776, it is hardly possible that he did not reflect on the fact that the most dramatic examples of man's scientific success had derived from his centuries-old interest in the vast regions outward from the earth. He was aware, for example, that almost two hundred years before, the famous Danish astronomer, Tycho Brahe, and his collaborators perfected the quadrant and made a long and especially accurate series of observations of the motions of the stars and planets. He was aware that a short time later, Galileo Galilei applied the telescope to the more detailed study of our moon and the planets of our solar system. He knew that the observations of Brahe and Galileo cast great doubt on the then current theory which placed the earth at the center of the solar system and which had been man's egocentric view since the time of the ancient Greeks. Jefferson knew that Johannes Kepler, a student of Brahe's, achieved greatness by analyzing Brahe's data and deducing his famous laws of planetary motion. Jefferson knew well that Newton, who was described as "he who in genius surpassed human kind," had surveyed the work of Kepler on planetary motions and Galileo on falling bodies and had concluded that the dynamics of these phenomena were really but manifestations of a universal principle which became his law of gravitation. He knew that Newton had gone on to enunciate his three famous laws of motion and had become thereby, apart from relativistic considerations, the architect of dynamics and celestial mechanics as we know them even today.

Here in Williamsburg two hundred years ago Jefferson undoubtedly pondered the massive impact on man and society of this sequence of events. What did it mean, what could it mean to the new nation being born, that those literary and religious positions which had rallied around the fallacious earth-centered universe of Ptolemy, and were made vivid in the epic poems of Milton and Dante, had been so recently and so sorely shaken by advancing intellectual processes?

Could Jefferson have foreseen that man's lesson in humility and in objectivity in the face of such a vast unfolding physical universe had only begun, and that the forces of a free-thinking science would shortly bring man to conceive that the solar system itself was nowhere near the center of the universe? Indeed, that the universe itself is an immense space-time continuum in which energy and mass are interchanging on a grand scale?

We know today that if knowledge is to be of benefit to mankind, it must be put to work through organized society. Jefferson knew this too. He had read John Locke and had placed his picture in his home. Indeed he had made Locke's "Essay Concerning Human Understanding" a subject of careful study. He knew what Galileo's great accomplishment had contributed to Newton's work, and that it had also provided an inspirational basis for Newton's friend, John Locke, in the fields of philosophy and government. The effect of Locke's works defining and defending human rights were strongly reflected in the Declaration of Independence and in much that came thereafter.

And so, it is today, hard to imagine a grander consequence of the cross-fertilization of ideas in the history of man than that represented by Locke and Newton as seen by Jefferson.

In our early days, Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, and Franklin built in concert on the knowledge of each other, and they did this with all the effectiveness that characterized the work of Brahe, Galileo, Kepler, and Newton. This was no small feat. Washington, the soldier, had to know government like he knew war; Hamilton, the lawyer, had to know banking like he knew jurisprudence; Jefferson, the philosopher, had to know men like he knew logic; and Franklin, the scientist, had to know diplomacy like he knew electricity. There was no assumption underlying their work more important than that individually free men would become collectively responsible men. They set a pattern of collective action and governmental framework that has enabled a growing society of free men to effectively exercise initiative in exploiting new knowledge through new technology on a scale never before attained. Our free society has become a select haven for free-thinking science and advanced technology, with the result that its search for, and application of, new knowledge has been successful on a scale which challenges all the rest of mankind.

But let us return to Newton and recall that his third law of motion, equating action and reaction, is especially suited for providing vehicles that move in the vacuum outside our atmosphere. This possibility was recognized by Robert Goddard, who conceived and developed the first small liquid rocket, over thirty years ago. He laid the foundation for the large space boosters of today that have already succeeded in taking man far away from the earth where he may make even more revealing observations and find new ways to make use of his environment.

Truly, then we are witnessing the full measure of John Wesley Powell's penetrating observation in 1888 when, as President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, he stated, "In man's progress from savagery to enlightenment, he has transferred the laws of beast evolution from himself to his inventions, and relieved of the load, he has soared away to the goal of his destiny on the wings of higher law."

It is instructive to mentally blast off from earth and look at ourselves as an *entity in the totality of this space region which we can now traverse*. Either individually or collectively as an element of mass or energy, man's presence in space can easily be calculated to be of trivial significance. On the grand scale of space, man appears to be a physical triviality.

As an intellectual entity, however, he is as uniquely significant in the totality of space as he is in the locality of earth. By all odds, his destiny appears to be the destiny of his intellect. He appears to have no recourse but to engage by all means available in the endless search for new food for thought—new information which he digests to form the new knowledge that enables him to continue the search for better understanding of himself in his environment. This search, then, is the greatest continuing adventure known to man and it is uniquely his in the physical universe. It is uniquely suited to constructively consuming all of his resources, mental and physical; thus, if man so chooses, he does indeed have an outlet for all the effort now expended in conflict or wars, an outlet vastly more noble and rewarding.

But the events of the day make it clear that the existence of conflict and war still provides dramatic evidence of the animal that remains in man; that man himself is the one animal that man has far from fully mastered.

George Mason penned in Article XV of the Virginia Declaration of Rights, "That no free Government, or blessing of Liberty can be preserved to any people but by . . . frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."

What then are these principles as they apply today? To get at this question, let us take another view of ourselves paying special attention to the impact of science and technology. It is important to note first that we have become a nation composed largely of specialists, both as individuals and professional groups. This has been necessary to cope with the increasing number and complexity of the functions which must be performed, each of which must be tractable for the individual, for his professional or associated group, and for those who must fit them together to provide an effective total operation of society. In a very real sense, then, we have evolved into a highly complex, interconnected, and interdependent system of people, groups, functions, and interests. This is in contradistinction to our early period when the advancing frontier provided opportunity and fluidity, and the pattern of settlement consisted of a relatively small number of loosely connected groups which could enjoy a quasi-independent existence.

Now perhaps the most remarkable thing about this evolution is that our fundamental principles, and rules of law and order have been able to adjust and evolve at more or less the same rate. Within our constitutional frame of government, this has served to preserve the essential independence and freedom of the individual, and to maintain a balance of forces and positions between existing and new groups.

Increasingly science and technology have been important forcing functions of this evolution. It is the prime purpose of science to enlarge our understanding of known phenomena and to begin our understanding of new phenomena. The output of this effort is new knowledge which is put to work in improving the way we do things we already know how to do, and in developing ways of doing things we never knew how to do before. Accordingly, science and technology facilitate the development of new and improved functions in our society, and the most effective management techniques for exploiting these functions have largely involved the specializing of people and groups. More generally, however, the essential product of science and technology is *change*—that is, *change in the attitudes and interests of people* through the acquisition of new knowledge, and *change in the methods of action and interaction of people* through the application of this knowledge. It follows too, that the larger the effort in science and technology, the larger those changes will be and the more rapidly they will occur.

Is this sufficient background against which to ask if we today are participating in a prelude to the independence or loss of it in the 21st Century? Can we now grasp the basic problem posed for the individual by big science and big technology as major continuing elements in the same way the problems of 1776 were grasped by the men we honor today?

We know that the effect of science and technology is to upset the dynamic equilibrium of society. The bigger the effort on science and technology, the bigger and more rapid these perturbations are likely to be.

The hard fact of life for organized society and its leaders today is that if dynamic equilibrium is achieved at any one time it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain. This is especially true when it is upset by a number of large innovations not introduced with the most careful consideration of their second and third order effects.

There is significant evidence that new and improved methods must be brought into play to analyze and prepare for the introduction of major innovations. These methods must include not only consideration of the direct benefits which the innovations are primarily intended to provide, but also the intellectual response time of humans, the inertia of human systems, and the interaction of human endeavors with their supporting physical and social environment.

In the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, our experience to date indicates that for success we must make the most careful analysis of all factors at the start, and still be prepared to adjust to meet reality when conditions turn out to differ from those foreseen. When we proceed this way the "integrated systems" approach developed for defense systems and for space exploration is vastly more effective for specific purposes than the "independent components" approach to the solution of problems in complex dynamic systems.

We all know that goals for society and the projects to achieve them are realistic only as they are achievable with existing systems or desirable modifications of such systems.

This means that goals, projects, and systems must, in the last analysis, be viewed as inter-dependent elements, and goals that depend on undesirable systems are undesirable goals. Cooperation is desirable; loss of independence or individuality is not. The classic and continuing goal of our society is to preserve those basic freedoms and rights that have been won for responsible individuals, and the essential bases for cooperation between responsible groups within the framework of representative government.

The problem of choosing goals in our society depends on both our capabilities and our desires. From a capability point of view, we have long since passed the stage of surviving in our natural environment. To be sure, we are creating problems of environmental pollution, but these are in no sense intractable to scientific and technological solution. We are in the process of pulling up the rearward displaced elements of our society, and we are extending assistance to provide security and opportunity to many other peoples throughout the world. All of this we are doing, and yet there is still capability left over. There is some desire left over, too, and we are satisfying this desire by applying some of our remaining capability to the enlargement of our science and technology effort, on earth and out in space. There are many important factors that contribute to this, but there is one that stands out. This is the *fact that the carefully conceived methods of science and technology provide the only proven means known to man for consistently enlarging and applying his understanding of himself and his environment.* Moreover, *man alone of all creatures has learned to develop and use these methods for these means.*

In this setting, the opening of the space regions to man's exploration and use is an epoch of vast significance. It is a prelude to a new age in our endless quest for enlarging and applying understanding of ourselves and our environment. It is uniquely our quest—our unique destiny, and our unlimited adventure.

And so we have arrived back at the starting point of the evolution of our free society from 18th Century Williamsburg toward an unknown but beckoning 21st Century. The challenge at Williamsburg was to establish an independent order of free and responsible men whose physical frontier would then move North, South, and West, and whose intellectual frontiers would be bounded solely by their individual capacities and their ability to cooperate. This challenge was met so magnificently that the physical frontier is not now measured by the horizontal but by the vertical—it is out in space away from earth. We are exploring this frontier with Mariner and Surveyor, and also with Glenn and Schirra, like Jefferson probed North and West with Lewis and Clark. Today's frontier is limited only by our ability to maintain individual freedom and yet join many minds and hands in concerted action. Independence must continue to find a way to include interdependence in spite of complexity. Interdependence is the root of the nonlinearity which marks the safe limits of our overall system, and of our individual lives.

Can we as individuals be *essentially free and yet interdependent?* Can we remain free and still put a governor on society that will stop us short of war? Can we remain independent and still go to Ganymede? This is Zeno's paradox of the 20th Century and may continue into the 21st. How we answer it today and tomorrow will make up the character of any prelude to independence for man in the 21st Century. Much of what we can contribute to the answer lies in a fact that is obvious. This fact is the essential requirement for each of us to do what we can as individuals and as groups to make our system of representative government work, and then work better. More and more this means that each of us must find a way to reach through complexity and organized prejudice to trusted sources of information and organized facts. We must not do less than to make sure we understand the *fundamentals, in the many important disciplines* of human activity. Without this understanding of at least the fundamentals, from the golden rule to the laws of gravity and natural selection, today's citizen will not play the role only he can play in representative society; cannot bridge the gap from one discipline to another, from the old to the new. Without this a citizen today cannot be a fully effective participant in a free society. Indeed, without this basic understanding on a large scale at all levels, our Nation is likely to forfeit the capability of collectively responsible action and thus for an effective free society. This is the heritage of the tremendous intellectual and cooperative effort made here in Williamsburg in the fifty days that were the prelude to independence in 1776. If we can now build on this heritage to achieve the same kind of success in the face of the massive complexities of our times, I am confident that free men of the 21st Century will look as well upon us as we do upon the men whom we honor here today.

Thank you.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in October 1956, at the same time the Soviet Union was crushing the nation of Hungary, the United States forced the Governments of Great Britain, France, and Israel to cease hostilities they were conducting against the United Arab Republic.

At that time I asked whether the foreign policy of the United States was one of strength against the weak and weakness against the strong.

After these hostilities were terminated at the direction of the United States, I visited the Mideast and became convinced that the Israelis would have been successful in these hostilities without either British or French support.

Three years later, in 1959, I talked to the man who had been commanding general of the Israel forces in the field. He stated:

> Whereas the plans for the British and French to reach Cairo were, in each case, three weeks, our plan was three days.

When I questioned this he replied:

> As a matter of fact, I let quite a few of my men have a swim in the Nile.

The purpose of presenting this latter story is to present also the dominance of the Israel position at the time the United States forced that country and its other two allies to cease hostilities.

As a result of this action on our part, the stock of Nasser and the United Arab Republic soared, the effectiveness of Sir Anthony Eden was destroyed, and the prestige of the United States damaged substantially in that part of the world.

During 1957, when I pointed out what the problems in this rise of Nasser's military position would ultimately present to the United States, I was criticized by certain interests as being guilty of "political hooliganism."

Apparently the U.S. Government later at least partially recognized the danger in the policy they had taken, danger not only to the position of Israel, a state, in effect, created by this country in 1948, but also to the prestige of the United States, because in 1957 the Secretary of State made the following statement:

> It is our intention to . . . (establish the principle of free or innocent passage through the Gulf of Aqaba). That intention was made clear I think by the aide memoire which we gave to the Government of Israel and published last February. Now the question of how it takes place is not yet determined. I think that it is the fact that a certain amount of shipping is or shortly will be in fact passing through the straits, although I also think that it is important to get a decision by the International Court of Justice as to what the legal rights of the parties are. We indicated, indeed, in that aide memoire that that would be a factor; that we felt that the preponderance of legal authority was so strong in favor of the right of passage unless and until there was a contrary decision by the World Court. And you may recall that the report of the Secretary-General said that he did not think that

> belligerent rights should be exercised in relation to the Sharm el-Sheikh area and the Straits of Tiran, because he also shared the view that the preponderance of legal authority was that there was no right to exercise belligerent rights and to stop innocent passage through there.

In addition, during that year the President of the United States also stated:

> I believe that Israel will have no cause to regret having conformed to the strong sentiment of the world community as expressed in the various United Nations resolutions relating to the withdrawal. It has always been the view of this Government that after the withdrawal there should be a united effort by all the nations to bring about conditions in the area more stable, more concrete and more conducive to the general welfare than those reached heretofore. Already the U.N. General Assembly has adopted resolutions which presage such a better future. Hopes and expectations based thereon were voiced by your Foreign Minister and others. I believe that it is reasonable to entertain such hopes and expectations, and I want you to know that the U.S., as a friend of all the countries of the area and as a loyal member of the U.N., will seek that such hopes prove not to be in vain.

Some 9 years later—January 1966—upon returning from Vietnam, I pointed out that the continuing failure of the United States to achieve any real accomplishment in the Vietnam theater was hurting badly the prestige of the United States, all over the world.

I presented that few people could understand why a nation with 200 million people, and a gross national product approaching three-quarters of a trillion dollars, was having so little real success in its war effort against a country of 17 million people with a gross national product considerably less than one-half of 1 percent of our own.

In 1966, I came back from the Far East through the Middle East, and thereupon reported also my deep apprehensions about not only the size, but also the quality, of the United Arab Republic military strength supplied them primarily by the Soviet Union.

It was at this time also that I stated we should either move forward or move out of the Vietnam picture, that we should not be trapped into any silly "enclave" theory, especially because, with our some 40 military commitments, worldwide, we were overcommitted; and that this was especially true because we were receiving little help from any other nations of the free world, and none except from countries in that general area.

After a trip to Europe, on May 4, 1966, in an open letter to the chairmen of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, I reported in part as follows:

> It may be difficult to decide whether or not the United States is over-committed politically, or over-extended from a fiscal and monetary standpoint. But if military commitments are an important part of political and economic commitments, then this nation is over-extended, in all three categories.
>
> Rich and powerful though we are, the United States cannot continue indefinitely to both finance and defend the so-called "Free World" with such little support from our friends and allies. They should live up to their commitments, as we have to ours.
>
> In addition, unless we change the "normalcy" approach now characteristic of our domestic policies and programs incident to handling these worldwide commitments, there should be a reduction in the nature and scope of these commitments; and even so, some reduction would be desirable.
>
> Under current plans and programs, there is little chance of maintaining adequately trained personnel necessary to handle our present worldwide commitments, even if those commitments do not involve us in further trouble in some other country.

Upon returning from Vietnam in January 1967, I again visited the Middle East, and talked to various people, including Ambassador Battle in Cairo; Ambassador Burns and others in Jordan; Ambassador Barbour, Prime Minister and Defense Minister Eshkol, Foreign Minister Eban, and General Dayan in Israel; and Ambassador Talbot in Greece.

Again, I was astonished at the further increased quality as well as quantity of the United Arab Republic Air Force, along with other developments in their military strength, which should not be developed any further on the floor of the Senate. I so stated in my report, much of which was classified before release.

After my visit to Jordan, I also became apprehensive about the future relationship of Jordan with the United States, because of the necessity for that country to, in effect, rely on the United States and its allies of the free world in order to survive in the Arab world.

A comment made at that time by one of our able people in the area was:

> The story is around southern Europe and the Middle East that the Israelis wanted to attack the Syrians, whom they knew were responsible for the border incidents; but they were afraid to because they knew the Syrians were the friends of the Soviet Union. Accordingly, they attacked the Jordanians because they knew the Jordanians were the friends of the United States.

The American representative who gave me this information added:

> A story of this kind in this area is just plain murder so far as we are concerned.

What this country does now is not up to any member of the legislative branch. But under the constitutional theory of advice, and for the consideration of my colleagues, it is my considered opinion that if the United States and its allies, on the basis of any syllogistic reasoning, now allow the State of Israel to be beaten back, if not destroyed at this time, the prestige of the United States and the free world will drop to the point where no country will believe their commitments are worth the paper on which they are written.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am happy to yield to my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first, I compliment the Senator upon the admirable statement he has made. He knows my love and affection for him, so I need not protest that.

What the Senator has discussed is critically important, but a further fact should be added. We are not taking over or Americanizing Israel's struggle of self-defense. We are dealing with a valorous small nation, which we relied on very heavily to protect our flank when we sent Marines into Lebanon some years ago. It is a nation whose prestige in military terms has risen very markedly with our own Pentagon in recent years.

I wish to ask the Senator this question: Does he not believe, in making the declaration he has made—with which I wish to associate myself—that to acquiesce in Mr. Nasser's aggression not only would damage the prestige of the United States but also would very likely open the door to such miscalculation in the Middle East, and by the Soviet Union itself, as to make measurably more dangerous the possibility of another world war?

In addition, there is the question of the interdiction of the enormous resources of the Near East which still supply Europe's industrial machine with over 50 percent of the fuel it requires. These resources could be cut off even in a wanton way, considering the emotionalism, and almost the passion for self-destruction, which one sees at this time in the Arab world.

I should, therefore, like to ask my colleague whether he would not consider it a fitting corollary to the proposition which he has announced to note that we are not dealing in this situation with the Americanization of a conflict. On the contrary, are we not dealing with a small nation which is determined to secure its own survival, which has enormous respect from our military authorities in terms of its own military capacity, and which has proven its reliability as an ally?

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, let me reciprocate with respect to my feelings about the distinguished Senator from New York. Every one in this body knows that he is one of its ablest and most dedicated Members.

As chairman of the Mideast South Asian Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have done my best to follow the problems of the various countries in that part of the world.

There is little of what the able Senator characterizes as Americanization involved in this present crisis. The Senator from New York is correct. We have the position which was taken in the Tripartite Agreement of 1950, not only by the United States, but also by the British and French. In 1951, commitments were also made by the United Nations. I have already stated that this matter is one that should be handled with our allies. If it is right for us to be in Vietnam, the war we are waging out there is just as important to all countries of the free world as it is to the security of the United States.

In addition to France and Great Britain—the countries we also forced to stop hostilities in 1956—it would be better if we could handle this latest Mideast flareup through the United Nations. But, if we cannot—and in all candor I was not overimpressed with the recent sessions on the subject in the United Nations—all countries should realize what the precedent of allowing the closing of the Gulf of Aqaba could mean to them.

As I see it there are three basic legs to the platform of the security and well-being of this country and all countries.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. Mr. President, the first leg has much glamour and therefore interest; the political-diplomatic leg. The second has glamour and equal interest, and is a component part of the political—the military leg. The third leg of the platform of our security and well-being has little interest and no glamour, but when it becomes important at all it becomes vitaly important. A man does not realize the importance of adequate resources, at times, until he reaches into his pocket and cannot pay the bill. Then he is either trusted, or taken away. In the Middle East, what worries me as much as the political and military aspect, are the economic implications, especially to one of the closer allies this country has today, Great Britain.

Great Britain lost its Far East holdings of rubber, tin, and so forth—and it is common knowledge as to the extent it currently depends on its oil position in the Middle East.

As a result of the Bretton Woods Conference, which resulted in the creation of the international monetary system, it could be serious to all free world countries and very serious indeed for Great Britain to have that oil controlled by satellites of the Soviet Union. Today the value of the dollar is synonymous with the value of gold, but according to this same Bretton Woods agreement, so also is the pound. Therefore, unless we and our allies, best of all, the United Nations, can stop this latest act of aggression on the part of the United Arab Republic, it could be serious indeed to that third leg of our platform of security, the economic leg.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further, if I am not taxing him too much?

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. I am glad to yield.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. I will yield the floor to the able Senator from New York, if he so wishes.

Mr. **JAVITS**. No. I wish to ask the Senator a question, and give the Senator an opportunity to reply.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, the Senator used the word "aggression" to describe the situation in the Strait of Tiran. I wish to amplify this because I have listened to, and read with great interest, the statements made in the United Nations by the Arab representatives, and the representatives of the Soviet Union.

The question of who is the aggressor may turn out to be the key question in this situation. It is constantly being asserted that if Israel acts to insure its survival by launching hostilities, it would be the aggressor. No account whatever is taken of the closing of the Strait of Tiran, which could strangle Israel.

I wish to ask the Senator the following question, which may be rhetorical: Is it aggression to strangle a nation, or is it aggression only if you fire a shot?

Mr **SYMINGTON**. The Senator is correct. We went through a comparable situation at the time of the seizure of the Suez Canal. We went through much of it again when we notified the French, the British, and the Israelis to cease retaliating against the economic aggression of the United Arab Republic in 1957.

There was additional aggression on the part of that nation a few days ago, the arbitrary closing of a port which eliminates much, if not most of the economic position of southern Israel.

The longer this latest move is allowed to continue, the greater the possibility of Nasser achieving his goal through the establishment of a status quo; and if this status quo continues hour after hour, day after day, possibly week after week, then he will be able to portray any resistance to this closing as aggression on the part of the State of Israel.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Is it not also aggression to say to a country: I am about to liquidate you, and then to mobilize upon its frontiers fighting forces infinitely greater than required for border forces, with every paraphernalia for aggression? The other nation is required to mobilize and Nasser knows that this is also a way to strangle Israel. The strain of mobilization on the economy, with its diversion of men and resources, could as effectively strangle a nation as overt attack. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. I do, because this would be closing the one port they have in that part of the Middle East.

The Senator now speaks of the third leg which I mentioned a few moments ago, the economic aspect of the security and well-being of any country.

Many people will say we should not take sides in this matter. I have sympathy with that desire, but it was Secretary James Forrestal who many years ago pointed out what control of the Mediterranean by countries behind the Iron Curtain could mean to the future security of the United States.

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, I have one other question.

As I listened to the debates, a great deal is made of the possibility of restoring the situation to pre-1956 or pre-1949. Will the Senator bear with me in one element of history, which I am sure he will wish to consider as a part of his presentation, because it is an important fact? Prior to the time when Nasser took over the Suez Canal, it is a fact that Israel shipping, or cargoes, were able to traverse the canal under the armistice agreement of 1949. Once Nasser took over the canal, and in defiance of promises to President Eisenhower, he closed the canal to Israel shipping. Because of this, Israel had to establish the port of Eilat in order to engage in commerce with nations that could not be reached through the Mediterranean, except by a circuitous route which was prohibitively expensive.

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. I do not have the expertise as to that part of this problem as does the able Senator from New York. However, I do know that, if this one port is closed, it could result in the ultimate elimination of the economic prosperity of Israel.

Let us consider what it means to all countries of the free world if the Middle East falls into the political, military, and economic hands of satellites of the greatest nation behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. **JAVITS**. I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Missouri for his patience and kindness.

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. Let me first say to the able Senator from New York that it is always a privilege to discuss any matter with him.

Mr. **JAVITS**. I thank the Senator.

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. I am glad now to yield to the able Senator from Alaska.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Who yields time?

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **GRUENING**. I want to commend the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for his forthright statement. Earlier today, I discussed this very question of what constitutes aggression. It seems clear not only that the closing of the Gulf of Aqaba, which is Israel's only access to the rest of the world since the Suez Canal was closed to it by the same dictator who is now responsible for mining the Gulf of Aqaba is an act of aggression but also that Israel has been the victim of aggression from the surrounding Arab states for the 18 years of its national existence.

From the very beginning, the Arab nations have, unilaterally, declared war on Israel and missed no opportunity to boycott it, to raid it, to trespass across its borders to kill its citizens, and thus compel it to arm itself to the teeth when it needs those funds for its own economic development.

Thus, what we have today is aggression piled upon aggression. I think we should be clear on that point.

The very worthwhile and interesting colloquy between the senior Senator from Missouri and the senior Senator from New York has brought out, I think clearly, that the attempt to break a stranglehold which will throttle and destroy the life of a nation by taking the necessary measures to break it is not an act of aggression but an act of self-defense.

I fully agree with the Senator from Missouri that the United States has the imperative duty—along with its repeated proclamations over the years in opposing aggression wherever it lifts its ugly head—to do likewise in this situation, with the help and assistance of other nations—through the United Nations if possible—but if all else fails, then to carry out this duty and commitment alone.

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. May I say again to my friend from Alaska that I would earnestly hope this does not become a unilateral matter for the United States rather a matter for all countries.

This Nation is overcommitted around the world. No country—not even the United States—can continue to defend indefinitely and finance indefinitely the percentage of the free world the United States defends and finances today.

As things are now going, it is inevitable that not too long from today we will come to the moment of truth.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, let me close this interesting debate by saying to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri, that I agree with him completely that the United States is overcommitted. In my view, it has needlessly accepted unilaterally the role of global policeman.

We are, regrettably, following the example of ancient Rome whose legions were everywhere. It ultimately brought the Roman Empire's downfall. We have troops all over the world. One reason, perhaps, why our so-called allies are not with us is that we have moved in these fields unilaterally, and have not insisted that they be with us whenever we felt our cause was good.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to add a brief comment to this fascinating debate, and to compliment my colleagues, the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Alaska, on their part in it.

Let me point out that what needs to be constantly evaluated in this matter is the national interest of the United States, which is so heavily linked with the interests of world peace. This is the element of evaluation which is the most critically important to the people of our country.

I am deeply convinced that the national interests of the United States—as a maritime nation, as the leading power on earth in terms of productivity, and in keeping peace in the world—are heavily and directly involved.

Mr. President, there are times when we cannot shrink from our duty. Now is such a time. The fate of a nation has been placed in jeopardy by the sheer willfulness and the overweaning ambition of a dictator in the Middle East, emboldened by the mischievous and irresponsible conduct of the Soviet Union in furnishing $3 billion worth of arms.

I am sad to have to say that I warned about this months and months ago in speeches on the floor, and all over the country; but that is neither here nor there right now. The fact is, we are all in it. The exercise of statemanship which the President has shown, in his statement and declaration of U.S. policy, and which Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara and others are pursuing, require, certainly, the devoted interest, attention and support of Senators and the people of this country.

But all this must be done with a very clear understanding that the crisis is at fever pitch—it is not by any means over—and of the fact that Israel has made a historic decision entirely of its own discretion, a decision which has excluded at this time—Israel has put no time limit on it—any preemptive strike or other military action. Israel has created an opportunity for world statesmanship. This should not lull us into any false sense of security that the crisis is by any means ended, or that there has been no aggression. There has been a blatant aggression, supported, in effect, by the Soviet Union, not only against Israel, but—and this is critically important—against the whole world, including the United States, which has been defied and placed in a situation which cannot be tolerated.

I hope that as we pursue this debate, the American people will realize the enormity of this crisis. In many ways, it is like the 1962 crisis in Cuba. Now is a critical moment, as Russian warships are moving into the Mediterranean. It is widely claimed that that is merely a routine movement of forces. I hope so.

The very straits through which Russian warships are moving were themselves the subject of a great international crisis which intelligence and resolution settled, just as Cuba involved a great international crisis which intelligence and resolution settled.

I am much pleased thus far to see these qualities being displayed by the President and by the members of his Cabinet who are officially charged with these responsibilities.

WATER UNLIMITED FOR ONONDAGA COUNTY, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today marks the completion of the initial phase of a gigantic project to bring much-needed water out of Lake Ontario into Onondaga County, N.Y. The new system will provide an immediate 35-percent increase in the county's water supply. The huge facilities which have been built will provide a 25-million-gallon average daily increase in the area's water supply. This accomplishment is a tribute to the perseverance and leadership of two late members of the community after whom two of the major facilities are named. The citizens committee was headed by Alexander F. "Casey" Jones, former executive editor of the Syracuse Herald-American. The vice chairman of the committee was the late John J. Farrell, a General Electric Co. official who headed the metropolitan water board.

The fact that the original June 1, 1967, completion date remained unchanged since the project was begun in June of 1964 attests to the unswerving dedication of the entire community headed by County Executive John Mulroy.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on this subject, which was published in the Syracuse Herald-American of Sunday, May 14, 1967, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ontario Water Heading Toward Onondaga Area

(Note.—A salute to two of the leaders in the campaign for the Ontario water project did not live to see its completion. This article is dedicated to them: Alexander F. (Casey) Jones, former executive editor of the Herald-Journal, Herald-American; and John J. Farrell, former executive of General Electric Co.)

(By Gene Goshorn)

Lake Ontario water will start flowing into Onondaga County June 1, marking completion of the initial phase of a gigantic project to provide "Water Unlimited" for the county's future needs.

The much-heralded system will provide an immediate 35 per cent increase in the county's public water supply.

And, unlike most projects of its type, the Ontario supply system so far has cost 15 per cent less than expected.

The basic 50-mile system which will suck up lake water offshore at Oswego and distribute it to western, central and eastern parts of the county has cost $29.7 million of the $45 million authorized by county residents in a referendum July 10, 1962.

The basic distribution system originally was estimated to cost $35.2 million, leaving $9.8 million for later additions as exact water needs became apparent.

With the basic system costing $5.5 million less than estimated, $15.3 million was left—of which $3.6 million already has been committed.

The drive for the Ontario project was based on the slogan of "Water Unlimited" for future needs. Since then, estimated local water needs by the year 2000 have already jumped 30 million gallons beyond the 1962 estimate of 140 million.

The basic system to be turned on with appropriate fanfare June 1 will increase the average capacity of public water supply systems in the county from 72 to 97 million gallons a day—a 35 per cent increase.

With a 25 million gallon average daily capacity, the system designed by O'Brien & Gere engineers will have a peak daily capacity of 36 million gallons, a 1.44 to 1 ratio.

Syracuse and the Onondaga County Water Authority will be the first customers of the Ontario supply system and their average daily draw at first will be 4.5 to 5 million gallons. Their peak demand has been estimated at 9 million.

As promised in 1962, the basic price for the water will be 26 cents a thousand gallons. But a demand charge, based on how much of the system's capacity must be reserved for peak demands, brings the full price to 40 cents a thousand.

The basic system is expected to be adequate until the mid 1970s, when an investment estimated today at $6 million, will double the system's capacity to 50–72 million gallons a day.

One 54-inch diameter pipeline is in place. A twin pipeline built beside the first will double the capacity.

The Ontario water system is the concrete and steel result of the work of a group of public minded men. Two leaders of that group, editor Alexander F. (Casey) Jones and industrialist John J. Farrell, did not live to see their handicraft.

The system's administration building at Clay has been named in honor of Jones, who as executive editor of this newspaper headed a citizens committee which recommended the Ontario program and won public support.

The system's terminal reservoir and pumping station (pictured on Empire's cover) has been named for Farrell, a General Electric Co. official who was vice chairman of the committee Jones headed and who was vice chairman of the program's administrative agency, the Metropolitan Water Board, until his death last July at age 69.

The system is truly an engineering marvel. Water will be raised 354 feet in a series of pumping and storage operations. Two rivers, eight railroads and 77 roads have been crossed. The system will produce enough water in one day to cover 12 football fields to a 10-foot depth.

County Executive John H. Mulroy looks on the system as a key achievement of his administration.

Construction began June 17, 1964, with a 30-million-gallon storage reservoir in the Town of Manlius. The original June 1, 1967 completion date was unchanged from the beginning as the water board kept work on schedule.

With the past history, O'Brien & Gere and the water board now are studying future needs—what they will be and how they will be met.

Projections show the county will need 170 million gallons of water a day from public systems by the year 2000 for a population conservatively estimated at 700,000.

Twenty years later the county's needs are estimated at 213 million gallons a day for 750,000 people.

Fabius, Lafayette and Pompey are expected to need a public water system in 2020 in addition to Syracuse and the 14 towns which presently are supplied by public water and whose needs will grow.

Syracuse, whose daily needs are pegged at 35.5 million gallons today, is expected to need 50 million in 2020. Salina, whose needs were put at 9.3 last year, is estimated at 20.9 in 2020. DeWitt, whose 1966 use was 8.3 million gallons, is expected to nearly triple by 2020 to 22.1 million gallons a day.

The townships as a whole, whose 1966 needs were 36.5 million, are expected to need 163 million gallons a day in 2020—an increase of more than 350 per cent.

"Water Unlimited" has a job cut out for it . . . and the initial efforts will be a reality in less than two weeks.

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS AT GRAFTON, W. VA., BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Tuesday, I observed the most impressive Memorial Day ceremony I have ever had the privilege to see. It took place in Grafton, W. Va., where, since 1869, the schoolchildren of Grafton, dressed in white and each carrying a small bouquet of flowers and an American flag, have participated in the annual Memorial Day parade and observance at the national cemetery in Grafton. This year, some 2,000 schoolchildren participated in the 100th anniversary of the founding of the only national cemetery in West Virginia. It was truly a moving and never-to-be-forgotten sight to witness as the little children marched through the streets of Grafton to the national cemetery. Upon arriving at the national cemetery, each child placed its bouquet of flowers upon the grave of a fallen veteran.

There are 2,067 graves in the cemetery, 1,251 of which contain the bodies of Union and Confederate troops of the Civil War. More than 664 unknown dead are buried in the cemetery, most of them Civil War veterans. These unknown graves are marked only by number, and the records in the cemetery office show merely from what State the bodies came. Each grave received its eloquent message of respect in the form of the fragrant flowers placed thereon by the little children.

This is probably the only observance of this kind in the Nation, and I shall never forget it. More than a score of excellent high school bands marched in the parade. Thousands of people lined the streets. The spirit of patriotism was everywhere felt, and as the little children came, marching in evenly formed and properly spaced lines, even a stranger would feel that the humble tribute being paid to the Nation's honored dead was something that was very personal to himself.

I was accorded the honor of delivering the Memorial Day address, for which I thank Mr. Ronald Knotts, secretary of the Memorial Day Committee, and I wish also to thank all of the members of that committee. I should like to express appreciation to the Gold Star Mothers, Inc., the Sons of the Confederate Soldiers, Veterans of World War I, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the various ladies auxiliaries. Additionally, I wish to thank Mr. Cass Collier, director, West Virginia Department of Veterans' Affairs, for his kind introduction of me.

I salute the fine people of Grafton for their patriotism and for their continued reverence of the memory of our country's fallen heroes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the speech which I made at the U.S. National Cemetery in Grafton, W. Va., on the 100th annual Memorial Day observance.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Remarks at Grafton National Cemetery, Grafton, W. Va., May 30, 1967

(By U.S. Senator Robert C. Byrd)

One hundred years ago, this National Cemetery was established by the United States Government.

Here the men who wore the Blue of the Union were buried with those who wore the Gray of the Confederacy, and fitting this was.

For this State gave her sons to both sides of that cause, in which brother fought against brother and father against son.

But in the silent halls of the dead, there is no North, no South, and those who fought under the banner of the Stars and Stripes have slept these 100 years with those who marched beneath the banner of the Stars and Bars.

1251 of them, and here they will rest forever.

The dead of other wars have since been gathered here—816 in number—making a total of 2067 graves.

Of this total, 664 are known but to God and only to His call will they ever again answer to their names.

But known or unknown, it can never be said, in the words of Scott, that these men went down "to the vile dust from which they sprung—unwept, unhonored, and unsung", for every year in this Memorial City, the grateful living men and women of our country have met to pay them tribute while little children—and Jesus would have us remember them, for "as such is the Kingdom of Heaven"—little children have placed bouquets of flowers upon the graves of these dead heroes.

So, on this 100th Anniversary, we gather to pay our solemn and grateful respect to our Nation's honored dead—the men who have given their lives in our country's wars—at Seven Pines, at King's Mountain, at Manassas, Antietam, and Gettysburg. In Cuba, at Verdun, at the Battle of the Marne, at Anzio, in Normandy, Guam, Midway, the Philippines, at Pusan.

Airman, Soldier, Sailor, and Marine. In the air, in the trenches, on the seas. Whether on the fields of Northern Virginia or on foreign fields.

These were the men who left the firesides of home to "march proudly away, under the flaunting flags," keeping time to the grand and inspiring music of martial bands, "marching down the streets of the great cities, through the towns," across the hills, "down to the fields of glory, to do and to die for the eternal right."

Human speech can never pay just tribute to these brave men who fell upon the gory fields. There between contending hosts, in ravines running with blood, "unable to move, wild with thirst, . . . pierced by balls and torn with shells. The life ebbing away among the withered leaves."

Human speech can never tell what they endured. Nor can human speech ever portray the awful anguish at home when the news came that they were dead.

To the maiden in the shadow of her first sorrow—to the silvered head of the old man bowed with the last grief—no earthly words could ever give recompense for that which they had given.

These graves we look upon today constitute a "silent city"—the price which a Nation pays for greatness; the price which a Nation pays for peace.

Yet, peace in the world depends largely on the sure conviction, honestly founded, that when our country makes a solemn covenant, it will be fulfilled.

And at this hour, the spectre of military involvement elsewhere hangs over our heads so long as Communist objectives remain the same—to foment trouble, subvert governments, and achieve military victories whenever and wherever possible.

The past week saw the highest American casualty rate in the record of the Vietnam hostilities. And may I say here that our purpose in Vietnam, as in other wars, is to win peace. Unlimited escalation is not the answer to the future conduct of this undeclared war. On the other hand, as much as I regret our ever having become involved in that far-off country, a sudden withdrawal of our forces under present circumstances, and without a reciprocal withdrawal by the enemy, would be to invite a holocaust in Asia, the Middle East, or wherever the Communists may choose to strike next.

Today it is the highest duty of all of us to preserve our Nation's honor by keeping inviolate our unity of purpose. We must take care that our enemies do not believe that we are divided.

This does not mean that dissent, if properly exercised, should be stifled. Honest dissent will always have its rightful place in our way of life.

But dissent merely for the sake of dissent becomes dissension, and there is a vast distinction between honest dissent and dissension.

A House divided against itself cannot stand.

Let every American, though he may disagree with the policy that brought us to Vietnam, stand behind our fighting men who are there. They did not ask to go, and I, for one, want to do everything I can to see that they come back alive to their homes and loved ones. And the surest way is, by our conduct, to convince the enemy that we stand united.

On this Memorial Day let the flag desecraters the draft card burners, the Pentagon sit-iners, the May-Day demonstrators, and those who advocate refusal to serve this nation's call in her hour of need—let these individuals pause to count the American lives their actions may have cost. Let those who make tape recordings for the Viet Cong and those who advocate the giving of blood to the North Vietnamese contemplate the aid and encouragement their actions have given to the enemies of American fighting men.

Let those who are bold and defiant in the street marches come here to see our Nation's honored dead and take care that they do not serve our enemies through their thoughtless actions.

We *all* have a duty—both to the dead and to those who, even now, fight to preserve our nation's honor—to these glorious dead—to our fighting men who today carry our country's flag on weary marches and on fields of battle.

Though oceans may separate us, we must stand guard with them "in the wild storm and under the quiet stars."

Let us thank again and again every man who has fought to make and keep our country free. Everyone living, and everyone who has gone down to the "tongueless silence of the dreamless dust."

They died for liberty.
They died for us.
They are at rest.

Many of them sleep here "in the land they made free, under the flag they rendered stainless, "under the solemn pines, the sad hemlocks, the tearful willows, and the embracing vines

"They sleep beneath the shadows of the clouds, careless alike of sunshine or of storm, each in the windowless Palace of Rest . . . In the midst of battle, in the roar of conflict, they found the serenity of death."

So, let us share today Ingersoll's sentiment for soldiers, living and dead:

"Cheers for the living;
Tears for the dead."

But let this be not only a Memorial Day—a day of sacred memory honoring our Nation's fallen herces. Let it also be a day of sacred rededication to the principles and ideals which constitute the cornerstone of this Free Republic: respect for law and order, thirst for wisdom and understanding, devotion to our flag and loyalty to our country, love of Constitutional liberty, and reverence for the Creator.

These are the ideals that fired the torch that has been passed from other hands to our hands to keep the star of this Republic burning ever brightest in the constellation of Nations. We shall not fail. For we know that we are links in a vital chain, both to the dead and to the unborn—to the heroic dead who sleep in calm assurance that we will not betray the trust they confided to our hands, and to future generations who wait, confident that we will not cheat them of their birthright.

Let us then act in the spirit of Kipling's immortal lines:

"Our fathers in a wondrous age,
Ere yet the earth was small,
Insured to us an heritage
And doubted not at all,
That we the children of their hearts
Which then did beat so high
In later time would play like part
For our posterity.

Then, fretful, murmur not they gave
So great a charge to keep
Nor dream that awestruck time shall save
Their labors while we sleep.

Dear bought and clear, a thousand year,
Our father's title runs;
Make we likewise their sacrifice
Defrauding not our sons."

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES AND TAX POLICY: A RECENT ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE WILBUR D. MILLS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, prior to the Memorial Day recess, the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Hon. Wilbur D. Mills, delivered, on May 22, an address in Rochester, N.Y., on the subject of "Expenditure Control and Tax Policy."

In the course of his remarks, Mr. Mills offered a realistic and sobering appraisal of the very serious budgetary situation that confronts the Federal Government today. After analyzing the revised estimated tax revenues for fiscal 1967 and 1968 and certain assumptions made concerning these estimates in light of the projected increase in Federal expenditures, he concluded that the budget deficit for fiscal 1968 could go as high as $29.2 billion. He said:

> The task is overwhelming. Secretary Fowler last week projected a budget deficit for the fiscal year 1968 of $11 billion. We are undertaking to determine how realistic that figure is and to what extent it can be used in our determinations. We have found thus far that it assumes the passage of the President's proposal for a 6-percent surcharge and acceleration of corporate tax payments, effective July 1, 1967. This would be $5.5 billion. We have also found a variation in the revenue estimates between the Treasury and our own staff involving a shortfall of $2.7 billion in the Treasury figures. If we pass no tax increase, these are added to the $11 billion and we have a figure of $19.2 billion. We also have to figure on certain contingencies, such as the possibility of a range of some $5 billion additional spending for defense purposes connected with Vietnam, which I believe Senator Stennis of the Senate Armed Services Committee has mentioned. In addition, if participation certificates are not sold as anticipated there is a contingency of possibly another shortfall of $5 billion. If these contingencies should all develop adversely—which is unlikely but still possible—then the budget deficit for fiscal year 1968 *could* go as high as $29.2 billion.

Mr. Mills aptly points out the increased need for Congress to "continually reevaluate existing expenditure programs in the light of a very objective measurement of the benefits which they convey and the cost which they will impose. Every new program should be viewed not in terms of its first year cost alone, but in terms of what its cost will be 5 years from now, 10 years from now, or perhaps 15 years from now. It is only by this process that the full impact of spending programs can be objectively evaluated in terms of their demands upon the entire economy."

If Congress is not going to make this restudy and reevaluation of programs as to their cost benefit ratio and to determine their priority on demands of public funds, Mr. Mills proposes the establishment of a Presidential Commission along the lines of the Hoover Commission to make such a study of Government programs and to report the results to Congress, so that "with these findings and recommendations the Congress would then have the materials and the basis for making determinations between programs and establishing priorities among them."

In my view, this address by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means is most timely and merits the close attention and study by Members of Congress, the executive branch, and the public at large.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mills' address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Expenditure Control and Tax Policy

(Remarks of Wilbur D. Mills, Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, at 75th Anniversary Celebration, Security Trust Co., Rochester, N.Y., May 22, 1967)

I am delighted to have the opportunity to participate in this 75th anniversary celebration of the Security Trust Company of Rochester on the invitation of my good friend, Barber Conable. Your institution's importance to the progress and the economic welfare of this area of New York is best attested to by the fact that you have been a part of this community for 75 years and the attendance here of this "blue ribbon" group of business leaders you have invited to participate in this occasion.

Congressman Conable, while still a relatively new member of the Committee on Ways and Means, has already made substantial contributions to the Committee's output. His impact on its legislation will grow in the coming years. He is a young man with objective and critical but constructive outlooks. He is very conscientious and is willing to work. He is making a real contribution in the Congress. He is the type of member who would be an asset to any district or state. I am very pleased to have him on our Committee.

As businessmen in the Rochester area interested in the economic welfare of your community, I know you are also interested in the nation's fiscal policy, the problems which we face and the alternatives which appear to be open to us.

THE ROLE OF EXPENDITURE CONTROL IN TAX POLICY

In the last several years, and particularly in the last three or four years, we have heard a great deal said about the role of tax policy in the economic affairs of the nation. Several different points of view have been expressed. The use of tax policy as an economic "tool" to shape the economy in this direction or that direction has become a favorite topic for many economists both in and out of government. It is not my purpose tonight to further belabor the already loaded literature as to the role which tax policy does or should play in the economic affairs of the nation, because I have expressed myself on this subject at length on a number of occasions.

My purpose tonight is to talk about the role which expenditure control plays in the shaping of tax policy. All too little has been said about expenditure control and in my judgment, insufficient attention has been paid to it. It is, in fact, one of the most influential factors of all in the shaping of tax policy, whether many like to admit it or not.

I am prompted to talk about this matter tonight because of some very real decisions which have to be made by those of us in the Committee on Ways and Means, including my good friend, Barber Conable.

We have at the present moment a very serious budgetary situation confronting us. The Administration is proposing an increase in the debt ceiling from its temporary limit of $336-billion—$51-billion temporary on top of the permanent ceiling of $285-billion—to a permanent ceiling of $365-billion. As a result of the testimony developed in the Committee during the week, it is now apparent that we are in the very unenviable position of making a decision on the Administration's request in the face of the following circumstances:

1. A nation at war with all of its attendant contingencies.

2. An economy in a state of transition—with some indicators pointing up, some down.

3. A budget deficit for fiscal year 1968 that could, if certain contingencies occur, burst all bounds and become the largest since World War II.

We are presently attempting to evaluate a series of possible developments within the next fiscal year or so in order to set a reasonable and workable ceiling. This obviously involves some examination of projected expenditures based upon existing law and proposed new programs. In addition, it involves projected revenues. Finally, it requires examination of a series of contingencies which might or might not develop.

The task is overwhelming. Secretary Fowler last week projected a budget deficit for the fiscal year 1968 of $11-billion. We are undertaking to determine how realistic that figure is and to what extent it can be used in our determinations. We have found thus far that it assumes the passage of the President's proposal for a 6% surcharge and acceleration of corporate tax payments, effective July 1, 1967. This would be $5.5-billion. We have also found a variation in the revenue estimates between the Treasury and our own staff involving a shortfall of $2.7-billion in the Treasury figures. If we pass no tax increase, these are added to the $11-billion and we have a figure of $19.2-billion. We also have to figure on certain contingencies such as the possibility of a range of some $5-billion additional spending for defense purposes connected with Vietnam, which I believe Senator Stennis of the Senate Armed Services Committee has mentioned. In addition, if participation certificates are not sold as anticipated there is a contingency of possibly another shortfall of $5-billion. If these contingencies should all develop adversely—which is unlikely but still possible—then the budget deficit for fiscal year 1968 *could* go as high as $29.2-billion.

This unhappy possibility causes us to ask: Where is it anticipated that all these expenditures in fiscal 1968 will be made? What programs are involved? We know that approximately $76.2-billion will be for defense. Some $13.7-billion will be for interest on the public debt, $15.9-billion will go for payments on prior contracts and obligations. Some $6.1-billion is for veterans' benefits (including pensions, the new G.I. bill benefits, hospital care, etc.), and another $4.6-billion is for public assistance grants. The anticipated postal deficit will account for $1.1-billion—which does not take into account a proposed rate increase of $700-million. Farm price supports, etc., will take $1.5-billion. One billion will go for health insurance payments to trust funds. An additional $2.2-billion is accounted for by other noncontrollable items, such as vocational rehabilitation $302-million, conservation reserve payments $125-million, military service credits $105-million, etc. All this totals some $122.3-billion. The current total projected budget expenditure is $141.5-billion, in the event that the proposed sale of $5-billion of participation certificates is not consummated. When we subtract this $122.3-billion, we have remaining just over $19-billion. Of this $19-billion another $7-billion is the estimated amount of wages and salaries and fringe benefits of Federal employees not included in the Departments and agencies already mentioned. This leaves approximately $12-billion as the area for possible controllable reductions by the Appropriations Committees. We are told that substantive law would have to be changed to make reductions in expenditures on most of the other items.

Thus, all budget items are not "uncontrollable" expenditures, but many are. Some involve programs which are bound to grow to considerable dimensions in the future. It is the future ramifications of spending for some of these programs which cause me even greater concern than their present rate of expenditure, because of the effect which this will have in confining the areas of our choice in tax policy and because of the possible long-range effect on the trend of revenues. Clearly, then, all this will have an influence, and a very profound influence, on the series of decisions which must be made in the future by the Committee on Ways and Means since uncontrollable expenditures severely limit the area within which we can exercise options to develop sound tax policy.

THE EFFECT OF EXPENDITURE PROGRAMS

In a speech some weeks ago, I pointed out that every government purchase involves limiting the availability of production capability for carrying out the plans and meeting the demands of private economic entities. Over the years, I have expressed concern for proper limit on governmental programs and in doing so, I have not joined the so-called "doctrinaire" group which simply indicts government spending in general without a bill of particulars. On the contrary, I have recognized that government spending arises out of the demands of our citizens, that as the society grows and becomes more complex the extent and scope of demands for public services, and hence, public expenditures, very naturally increases. This, however, does not justify the perpetuation of programs that have already proved to be unsound or have outlived their former usefulness, and it does not mean that any and every new program must be accepted lock, stock and barrel no matter how worthy or high sounding its objective may be. It does not mean that we must tolerate ill-conceived experiments which could pass a rudimentary cost-benefit test only if the benefits are measured in such ambiguous terms as "prestige". I again emphasize tonight that we must continually re-evaluate existing expenditure programs in the light of a very objective measurement of the benefits which they convey and the costs which they will impose. Every new program should be viewed not in terms of its first year cost alone, but in terms of what its cost will be five years from now, ten years from now, or perhaps fifteen years from now. It is only by this process that the full impact of spending programs can be objectively evaluated in terms of their demands upon the entire economy.

The point is simply this: the level of projected expenditures can impose such a straitjacket on tax policy as to prevent needed adjustments in that policy in order that it may serve a desired long-range purpose. Great importance should be attached to regular, frequent and significant reductions in tax rates. Stable economic growth is produced by a long-range program of periodic tax reduction. Attention has frequently been called to the growth in our tax system's revenue productivity which accompanies the growth of the economy. There will always be competition for this potential increment in revenues between those who would spend and those who would reduce taxes. I have expressed the view that tax reduction should have a preferred position.

A few years ago, it appeared that we were committed to this course. As some of you may recall, in connection with the tax reduction act of 1964, I stated that: "There are two roads the Government could follow toward a larger, more prosperous economy—the tax reduction road or the Government expenditure increase road. There is a difference—a vitally important difference—between them. The increase in Government expenditure road gets us to a higher level of economic activity with larger and larger shares of that activity initiating in Government—with more labor and capital being used directly by the Government in its activities and with more labor and capital in the private sector of the economy being used to produce goods and services on Government orders. The tax reduction road, on the other hand, gets us to a higher level of economic activity—to a bigger, more prosperous, more efficient economy—with a larger and larger share of that enlarged activity initiating in the private sector of the economy—in the decision of individuals to increase and diversify ther private consumption and in the decisions of business concerns to increase their productive capacity—to acquire more plants and machines, to hire more labor, to expand their inventories—and to diversify and increase the efficiency of their production.

"Section I of the bill is a firm, positive assertion of the preference of the United States for the tax reduction road to a bigger, more progressive economy. When we, as a Nation, choose this road we are at the same time rejecting the other road, and we want it understood that we do not intend to try to go along both roads at the same time."

Following the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1964, for a period of time I was encouraged to believe that the rate of Federal expenditures had moderated, but this very encouraging development did not last long. Some time around September 1965, the rate of Federal spending began to ascend quite rapidly and there has been no discernible or substantial abatement in the rate since then. Defense costs due to Vietnam, of course, account for a part of expanding Federal expenditures, but another part of the increase is due to non-defense spending. This latter is what discourages me.

We know it is not possible to completely turn back the clock in many of these areas, but I do feel that the rapid rate of increase of non-defense spending must be brought under control. We know that we have only limited control with respect to defense spending because defense is a matter of the foremost urgency. We, therefore, have little leeway as to that area, but we do have in the non-defense area.

THE OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

Looking ahead, we should continue to seek a tax policy which provides a stable framework within which taxpayers can make individual and business decisions. When the special requirements of Vietnam subside, we hope once again to be faced with the choice between the two main alternative routes for government action—that of increasing Federal spending or the path of tax reduction and expenditure control, placing our emphasis on freeing the private economy of excessive restraints.

If the Congress itself is not going to make a restudy and a reevaluation of programs as to their cost-benefit ratio and determine their priority of demand on public funds as I have thought should be the case in order to establish the degree of expenditure control which I think is needed, then I am beginning to think in terms of the establishment of another Presidential commission to make a study of Government programs and report to the Congress. With these findings and recommendations the Congress would then have the materials and the basis for making determinations between programs and establishing priorities among them. Such action is required by some group in my opinion if effective controls are again to be established over Federal spending.

For the basic question which we must all ask ourselves is this: Where are we going? It appears obvious to me that there is a limit to the size and the number of Federal programs which our economy can support in the future without ever-increasing public debt. balance of payments problems and possible loss of confidence in the dollar by holders abroad. On the other hand, with reduced rates of taxation, our free enterprise system can be depended upon more and more to help solve many of the problems which many people are urging that the Government solve directly. A key to the efforts of the private enterprise system in these endeavors and under these conditions lies with the banking community and with institutions such as the Security Trust Company.

THE EFFORTS TO END POVERTY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, jobs for all who need them must be a number one objective in our continuing efforts to end poverty. The U.S. Employment Service, administered through the States, has a major responsibility in matching jobs and people, particularly in the semiskilled and unskilled categories. But State employment services face a serious administrative problem in metropolitan areas that include parts of two or more States. Some 32 such areas now exist, containing over 23 percent of the Nation's population.

A metropolitan area is essentially a single labor market, even though it may be an interstate area. Both the jobseeker and the employer range throughout the area: they are not bound by State lines. Yet the fact that employment services are administered on a State basis can raise real obstacles to a free flow of job information and job services when the area embraces parts of two or more States. These difficulties can have their most serious impact with respect to nonwhites, particularly where nonwhite unemployed are concentrated in the central city, part or all of the suburbs are in another State or States, and job opportunities are in the suburbs.

In 1965 the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in a report on "Metropolitan Social and Economic Disparities: Implications for Intergovernmental Relations in Central Cities and Suburbs," called attention to this problem and recommended that Governors and the Secretary of Labor take steps to assure that employment services are provided to all job applicants and employees within metropolitan area labor markets regardless of State lines. They recommended that these steps include interstate agreements and action by the Secretary to assure himself that such arrangements are being effectively carried out as a condition to Federal grants for employment security administration.

The Committee on State-Local Relations of the National Governors' Conference endorsed the Commission's recommendations in July 1965 and urged that Governors maintain close followup to assure that State employment service agencies take necessary action to carry out the interstate agreements.

I am happy to report now, Mr. President, recent action by the Federal Government in response to the Commission's recommendations. The Administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security in the Department of Labor has amended Federal regulations to require State employment service agencies in interstate labor areas to establish and maintain adequate arrangements and procedures to assure that workers and employers have full access to job opportunities and the available labor supply within the area, without regard to State boundaries. By these regulations we will be getting machinery and procedures to remove one more of the invisible, but nonetheless real, barriers to better use of public employment services in our metropolitan areas, and thereby help provide the more effective matching of job-seekers and jobs that is so urgently needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amended regulations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the regulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Employment Security Manual, Part I, Organization and General Administration, 0204–0206]

OBJECTIVES, REGULATIONS, STANDARDS, AND POLICIES

D. *Section 602.2(d) Multistate labor areas.*[1] With respect to any single labor area covering parts of two or more States, the State agencies involved shall establish and maintain adequate arrangements and procedures to assure that workers and employers have full access to job opportunities and the available labor supply within the area, without regard to State boundaries.

These arrangements are to include written agreements between the State agencies involved setting forth procedures to be followed by local employment service offices in the area in serving applicants and employers. Each written agreement should provide for one office in the area to be designated as the order-holding office responsible for control and distribution of job openings. This designation should be based on such factors as staff resources, physical facilities, geographical location, and density of applicant supply and employer location. Each agreement should also provide for periodic (at least monthly) meetings of appropriate State agency staff (including area and local office managers and appropriate local office staff) to review the effectiveness of procedures and to recommend necessary changes. USES regional directors are responsible for certifying the adequacy of such agreements to the Director of the United States Employment Service. Copies of these agreements are to be furnished to the Governors of the States involved and to the Secretary of Labor as part of the material to be submitted with the plans of operations.

NONPROFIT BLOOD AND HUMAN TISSUE BANKS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on January 24, I introduced S. 628, a bill to exempt from the antitrust laws nonprofit blood banks and other nonprofit human tissue banks. The bill is pending before the Antitrust Subcommittee, and I anticipate hearings will be held in July.

The Wall Street Journal on Friday, May 12, 1967, published an article which explains quite clearly with a minimum of words why the enactment of the bill is so important to the people of our Nation and their health.

Also, on May 12, 1967, Medical World News carried an article relating to blood banking. This article discusses a Florida court decision which would allow a doctor to be found negligent if he knew or should have known that a blood bank from which he obtained blood did not meet adequate standards. This presents another reason why doctors should be allowed to exercise their own judgment in selecting blood and should not be liable for antitrust violations because they limit procurement to nonprofit blood banks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 12, 1967]

FTC'S BLOOD DECISION: PRACTICING MEDICINE WITHOUT A LICENSE?

(By Richard D. James)

KANSAS CITY.—By most measures the nonprofit Community Blood Bank here is hardly remarkable. Serving about 50 hospitals and dispensing around 32,000 pints of blood annually, it is neither the biggest nor smallest. And having opened its doors in April 1958, it certainly isn't the oldest or newest.

Nevertheless, it's attracting considerable attention, for it stands at the heart of a controversy set swirling by a recent Federal Trade Commission ruling. That decision holds that the blood bank, as well as the hospitals here and their pathologists, violated Federal antitrust laws by combining illegally to restrain trade in human blood. The combination, it said, unduly restricted two commercial blood banks.

The implications of the action stretch well beyond Kansas City and the field of blood banking. As one result Congress is considering legislation to exempt blood banks from the antitrust laws.

THE IMPLICATIONS

The FTC's ruling is being appealed to the courts. If the decision survives, it could well broaden Federal influence over the practice of medicine. It threatens to put an immediate crimp in the volunteer blood banking system—at a time when blood shortages are growing—and most important, it will probably open vast new territories to the commission's already considerable authority.

The respondents vigorously deny the FTC's allegations, saying they acted on independent, professional medical judgments. They contend the FTC has no jurisdiction in the matter and that blood, or any other part of the human body for that matter, should not be considered a commodity, subject to the laws of the marketplace.

The FTC itself apparently isn't entirely sure of its footing. Two of the five commissioners dissented sharply, raising doubts about the commission's authority over nonprofit groups, as well as the wisdom of sitting as a board of review over physicians' judgments.

The details are simple enough. Mr. and Mrs. Francis H. Bass opened commercial blood banks here in 1955 and 1958, buying blood at $4 and $5 a pint and offering it to the hospitals at $25 and $35 a pint. Before 1955 blood bank operations in the area were carried on by hospital blood banks and an American Red Cross defense blood bank. With the closing of the Red Cross facility in 1953, efforts were begun to consolidate the area's blood resources in a community bank, which began operation with a broad base of hospital, physician and public participation.

Unlike its commercial rivals, the community bank does not sell blood. The bank is compensated by a service fee, currently $13, charged each person requiring a transfusion. The fee covers storage and drawing costs, grouping and typing, plus a number of other tests.

In addition the bank assesses the patient a "responsibility fee" of $25 for each pint of blood. When the patient or one of his friends or relatives donates blood to replace that used, the fee is canceled. If the blood is not replaced the patient forfeits the deposit.

The FTC concedes it has no direct proof of a conspiracy by the doctors and hospitals. But on several occasions, some area hospitals declined to accept blood from the two commercial banks. The community bank, after 1958, refused to accept direct shipments from the commercial banks. The commission cites these instances as evidence pointing to an illegal agreement.

---

[1] Revises section 0204D.

It also reasons that the doctors had ample opportunity to hatch the scheme when they met at professional gatherings. Finally, the commission concludes, the formation of Community itself was evidence of a plot since the bank was controlled by the hospitals and doctors and constituted a means of carrying out the conspiracy.

The respondents' main line of defense, and the one that raises the broadest question in the case, is that the FTC doesn't have jurisdiction over nonprofit organizations. Indeed, the act creating the agency in 1914 seems clear: It gives the commission authority over any group that is "organized to carry on business for its profit or that of its members."

There's little doubt the hospitals and blood bank were legitimate nonprofit organizations in the usual sense. They were exempt under the Federal Internal Revenue Code. The doctors served without pay in supervising the blood bank's operations. And Community's receipts after five years still were insufficient to meet expenses and repay loans; it was $41,000 in debt.

But the Commission argues that FTC authority isn't limited by these considerations, that the term "profit" must be understood in the broadest sense. It then proceeds to interpret the act in such a way that any organization using income after expenses to maintain its existence can be considered "in business for its own profit."

The FTC's jurisdiction would certainly extend to new lengths if the ruling survived. Churches, fraternal groups, charities of all types, as well as hospitals, would be within the commission's reach for the first time. In fact, no organization would be exempt. Commissioner Philip Elman, for one, doubts Congress ever intended to give the FTC such power. In his dissent he says: "Neither the language nor the legislative history of the Federal Trade Commission Act leaves room for such a broad interpretation. The words are plain and unambiguous."

The FTC's position also raises a question about whether blood is a commercial product. The commission claims it is, but there are grounds for arguing otherwise. For instance, blood can't be manufactured in the sense other products can. And doctors agree blood differs in that it constitutes living human tissue. Since 1865 (when the Constitution's Thirteenth Amendment took effect) it has been illegal to buy or sell human beings and presumably living human tissue as well. Whether blood qualifies as human tissue in that sense hasn't been settled, but the doctors say it is and they are pressing the issue in their court appeal.

A WARRANTY WORRY

The commission's ruling on this point particularly worries the medical profession, for blood would presumably fall under the doctrine of implied warranty, as do other products. This means that by offering blood for sale, a blood bank implies it's safe for use. If it isn't, the bank could be sued.

As a result, blood banks might be subjected to increased lawsuits from patients contending they caught, for a notable example, hepatitis from a transfusion. Hepatitis, a serious liver infection, can be transmitted through the blood. There is no known laboratory test to detect the virus. So far, blood banks have successfully fought most such suits by citing this fact and by arguing that in any event blood, not being a product, isn't covered by an implied warranty.

Doctors believe if the FTC had its way with blood it would logically follow that all transplantable human tissues, such as the cornea of the eye, kidney, bones and arteries, would be considered commodities subject to FTC regulation.

Still other ramifications emerge. In maintaining they didn't join in any conspiracy, the doctors explained that because of several strongly held professional opinions each doctor was merely behaving naturally under the circumstances, wholly apart from what any other doctor was doing.

For one thing, they questioned whether the Basses, or those they hired, were qualified to run a blood bank. Before coming to Kansas City to start the venture Mr. Bass earned his living at various times as a commercial photographer, used-car salesman and banjo instructor.

Too, the medical professionals considered it unethical and immoral to traffic in human blood. In refusing to use blood from the two commercial banks the Kansas City doctors say they were only following the separate dictates of their consciences—dictates that were strengthened when the Basses promoted their blood banks in radio and newspaper advertising.

Finally, there were the doctors' individual medical judgments—widely supported by the profession as a whole—that blood from commerical banks, which rely primarily on so-called paid donors, is generally less safe and more apt to endanger a patient's health.

The question of commerical blood's safety isn't entirely settled, but doctors contend, with some justification, that paid donors often are alcoholics, drug addicts or other debilitated persons who are more apt to carry hepatitis. All blood banks try to screen out such persons by questioning prospective donors about their medical history, but doctors doubt that those who need the money will tell the truth. One study showed an 11-fold increase in the rate of hepatitis cases resulting from transfusions when a group of Chicago hospitals went from buying none of their blood to 40% from commercial sources.

NOT IMPRESSED

The commission doesn't seem impressed. It goes to some length to refute these opinions, seeking to prove that the blood from the commercial banks was perfectly good and safe because, for instance, the banks met Federal standards set by the National Institutes of Health. Moreover, the FTC argues that far from showing how or why the physicians could have acted separately, their judgments provided the very motive for a conspiracy.

As things stand now, physicians, at least those here, will not be free to exercise their own professional medical judgments in accepting or rejecting blood from commercial banks. They will not be free to meet, discuss and recommend the use or non-use of such blood. If there should be any such meetings and if any doctor should refuse to accept commercial blood, he will be subject to $5,000-a-day fines for violating the FTC order.

Physicians here believe the FTC should stick to its own job: Eliminating unfair methods of competition in interstate commerce. They heartily concur with Commissioner Elman's view: "Regulating the professional conduct of doctors is not (the commission's) business."

[From Medical World News, May 12, 1967]

Court Broadens Liability of Doctor

The current tendency of courts to hold a doctor liable for the actions of all the members of his health team has been pointed up once again. The District Court of Appeal of Florida has ruled that a physician may be found guilty of negligence if he obtains human blood from a bank that fails to meet adequate standards. According to the decision, actual knowledge by the doctor of the blood bank's inadequacy need not be proved: He is liable if he "should have known."

The decision resulted from a suit by Marilyn L. Hoder against Dr. Maxwell M. Sayet, the Atlantic Clinical Lab (a commercial blood bank), and North Miami General Hospital. Mrs. Hoder's husband died in the hospital after a transfusion that, her attorney claimed, caused him to contract homologous serum hepatitis. Dr. Sayet was sued both as the hospital pathologist and as owner of the laboratory. According to the complaint, it was his duty to evaluate and select a source of blood for the hospital that would not be likely to supply a product that was contaminated.

A lower court had dismissed the suit, holding among other things that the hospital and Dr. Sayet had discharged their proper responsibilities by selecting blood from a licensed blood bank.

DECISION SEEN AS WARNING

But in remanding the case for trial, the appellate court ruled that the mere fact the blood bank was licensed did not bar a suit against the hospital and its pathologist. A hospital and its agents, the tribunal noted, have a duty to use reasonable care to ensure that its suppliers exercise minimal caution in selecting blood donors—a blood bank's license, by itself, is irrelevant. If they fail to check into the actual practices of the supplier, the court declared, a jury can hold them liable on a finding of negligence.

The Hoder decision offers fresh warning to physicians to assure themselves that all persons and agencies dealing with their patients—however tangentially—are properly trained, equipped, and accustomed to meeting adequate standards of performance. They warn, for example, that any physician on a hospital staff could be charged with negligence if he failed to determine the adequacy of the hospital's facilities. Moreover, the physician could be found liable if he saw substandard practices in operation and did not take appropriate steps to eliminate or correct them.

Doctors are also accountable for hospital formulary systems. Unless an attending physician assures himself that the medications are purchased from reliable sources, lawyers say, he could be held responsible for a patient's injury. Since complete information about the formulary is available in all accredited hospitals, any doctor who fails to check on the source might be hard put to defend himself against a charge that he "should have known."

Members of operating teams are also considered mutually responsible. A surgeon who operates with a resident physician whom he knows or should know to be of substandard competence can be held liable for any injury that occurs. The same rule of liability pertains to the anesthesiologist who participates in an operation with a negligent surgeon.

Vaccines and prepackaged injectables are another area of vulnerability for doctors. Most attorneys believe that physicians who purchase such items from established, reputable sources would not be liable for defects caused in manufacturing. But if the instrument or injectable causing harm came from a questionable source, the doctor who selected the source could be sued for negligence.

WINNING ESSAYS ON THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Nebraska Rural Electric Association has sponsored a youth tour to Washington for a number of years. The group is made up of those boys and girls who have been the winners of essay contests sponsored by their individual Nebraska rural power systems in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

I am privileged to include six of these winning essays in my remarks.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Elaine Oellermann, Perkins County High School, Grant, Nebr.)

(NOTE.—Contestant sponsored by the Midwest Electric Membership Corp., Grant, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

What would farm life in our rural Midwest community be like without electrical power? For our generation it is hard to imagine.

I, for one, didn't realize the great value of electricity until the blizzard and ice-storm in mid-March of last year. My parents have often told me of the days of reading by the light of kerosene lamps, cooking on wood stoves, and carrying water from the wind mill. But all at once we had slipped back to the days before REA had brought emancipation from these inconveniences.

When the electrical power was restored, I felt the same joy my parents must have felt the first time they flipped the switch and light illuminated their home twenty-one years ago. At that time electricity was used primarily for lighting, refrigeration, and operating small appliances.

But by my generation, because of its versatility, electricity provides our farm people with all the conveniences of urban living, while they enjoy the privacy and freedom of country life. Those tall poles along our country roads, equipped with transformers and power lines, have made possible lighting, electrically controlled heating systems, and the use of a myriad of devices and appliances to make our homes a pleasurable place in which to live. Thanks to REA, our rural population enjoys television, radio, and stereo. Just as our city cousins, we depend on these media for entertainment and for keeping us informed of the latest happenings in the world around us. As for the future, our imaginations cannot foresee all the uses of electricity that are being proposed for electronically-controlled devices for cooking and doing other household chores.

REA though not only brings us more comfortable living, but also provides a means of more profitable farming. Electricity is the farmer's "hired man." But this "hired man" doesn't stop at the end of an eight-hour day to rest, nor insist on three square meals a day. Even on our farm, which is not highly mechanized, this "hired man" silently works day and night. My dad especially enjoys the energy that is available to him in the outlets in his farm shop for use of power tools and auxiliary lights.

I feel that the use of electricity in this rural area is at the dawn of even greater possibilities. The demand for agricultural products will continue to increase as the population of the world rises. Each year more electrically powered irrigation wells will be established. Livestock production will be accelerated, and there will be greater demand for power in controlled-environment livestock production.

In this centennial year the theme, "Beautify Nebraska," is being emphasized. Without additional water, beautiful gardens and yards could not be grown in this part of Nebraska. This water, Nebraska's greatest natural resource, would not be as readily available if it were not for REA supplying the power which pumps the water and forces it where it is needed.

Our gratitude goes out to those men who worked so diligently to bring rural electrification to Southwest Nebraska and who helped to establish the Midwest Electric Membership Corporation. In turn, we ought to keep informed about pending legislation and be ready to defend the position of REA, for we truly know what it's like to live better and farm better—electrically.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Jerry Lynn Zitterkopf, Lyman Public Schools, Lyman, Nebr.)

(NOTE.—Contestant sponsored by the Roosevelt Public Power District, Mitchell, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

Agricultural products are becoming an increasingly essential commodity to the United States as our population increases by the thousands. In order to meet the agricultural needs of our nation better and more efficient methods of livestock and crop production are being incorporated. Rural electrification is one of the leading factors contributing to the agricultural revolution for better farming methods.

Times were when fifteen head of cattle and sixty acres of land could support an average family of four, but the farmer has found it necessary to increase both acreage and livestock production to meet the higher cost of living. When neither of these were successful, what else could he do. Ways had to be found to reap a greater profit from the same land.

There was an answer, better farming methods and more important yet the use of electricity to increase livestock production and keep farm machinery on the go. Today one man can feed triple or more the amount of livestock he could before rural electrification. By pushing one button the electric farmer can feed almost any practical number of cattle. The dairyman can milk a much larger herd of dairy cattle with the electric milker. The swine grower can save a larger portion of his pig litters by raising them under electrically controlled environmental conditions. Many poultry farms are now using electrically operated conveyors to feed their flocks and even to transfer eggs to a central gathering point. An abundance of fresh water is supplied for all of these using the electric pump.

Seldom does the farmer have to take broken equipment into town. The electric arc welder, drill, and grinder usually can handle the fixing job.

Electricity doesn't cease to aid the farmer when the day's work is done. Come evening time he is welcomed into a house, cool and fresh, thanks to the electric air conditioner. Mom has cooked a meal, fit for a king, thanks to the electric range and oven. Many electric appliances aid in making her housework easier. After supper the kids are busy doing their homework. They probably don't realize how lucky they are for they haven't ever done their studies under candle light. During the winter everyone is thankful for their fumeless, flameless, electric heating.

In the future electricity will even take some of the thinking out of farming. Electric computers will be used to calculate such things as: pounds of fertilizer per acre, crop rotations, pounds fed per pounds gained, rations, etc.

There is hardly a phase of farming or farm life that is not somehow dependent upon rural electrification. Great, indeed, is the debt of the farmer to rural electrification.

DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN MY AREA

(By Jean Kloepper, Elgin Public School, Elgin, Nebr.)

(NOTE.—Contestant sponsored by the Elkhorn Rural Public Power District, Battle Creek, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

Electricity. This is a big word with an even more important meaning. Without electricity, neither rural nor urban areas would be as modern and as advanced as they are. It can truthfully be said that electricity has revolutionized rural living in the whole United States.

Has Nebraska's rural area always had an abundance of electricity? No. The bill creating REA was signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1935. Nebraska's Senator, George W. Norris, was a co-sponsor of this bill to lend money annually to have rural electricity permanently.

There were many difficulties trying to get REA, but the Elkhorn Rural Public Power District came into being in 1938. The really big day came for rural people on April 29, 1949, when 116 lines were energized with 148 consumers receiving electricity. Twenty-seven years later the Elkhorn District has had considerable growth with over 1,915 miles of line and 8 substations serving over 3,550 consumers in 6 counties.

Yes, thanks to the dreams and the sweat and hard work of many men, electricity is no longer considered a luxury in the rural areas, but it plays a very important part in our everyday needs.

The farm wife of today thinks nothing of sticking a load of clothes in her electric washing machine, then prepare dinner on her electric stove while listening to the radio. With the use of many modern electrical appliances, the modern housewife of today doesn't have to work so hard.

The farm man used to have to use mostly manual labor, but that has changed with the use of electricity. A man can now raise a large herd of livestock and farm a lot of land besides. Thanks to the use of electric tools, a man's repair jobs around the farm are almost made enjoyable.

As I look around our farm, I can truthfully say that without electricity we would not have expanded and grown as we have.

Rural electric systems are old hands at fighting down the cost of power. While the cost of practically everything has gone up, the average cost of power per kilowatt-hour to consumers in rural areas has actually gone down. Statistics show that farmers paid 2.20 cents per kilowatt-hour in June 1966, compared with 2.27 cents per kilowatt-hour in June 1965. This proves that the cost of electricity get cheaper to use each year.

If electricity has had a glowing past, its future is brilliant. Electricity is the cleanest, practical, and one of the most economical powers for the use of man. Electricity has been a blessing to Mankind, helping us to grow and expand in this modern day and age.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

(By Patricia Majerus, Petersburg Public High School, Albion, Nebr.)

(NOTE.—Contestant sponsored by the Cornhusker Public Power District, Columbus, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

"The biggest lift that farmers ever had," is how Texas Representative Sam Rayburn and Nebraska Senator George Norris described Rural Electrification. It was largely through their support of the R.E.A. bill that Congress passed it and Franklin Roosevelt signed it in 1936. This bill provided for government loans for building consumer owned power districts.

This was the era of the 20th century industrial revolution. However, to the farmer and his family, life was closely related to that of the early colonists. For the farmer, the twentieth century didn't begin until the early 40's and then only because cooperative and progressive members of a community wanted a better life than what they had known during the depression. They realized that only electrification could give it to them. Fortunately, most people were far-sighted enough to realize the value of electrification, for percentages jumped from 11% to the present figure of 98%.

Since farmers are a minority group, it's necessary for them to produce their crops and livestock to the fullest extent. This is true in my community for electricity is surely put to an economical test on the farm. Dairying on a large scale becomes possible with electricity through the use of milking machines and bulk tank coolers. The expansion of cattle-feeding becomes time-saving and profitable by the use of augers. Electric wells dependably provide water for livestock and irrigation. All of this has helped to preserve Nebraska's proud title "The Beef State."

The average farmer can save on maintenance bills by repairing with welding equipment; and if the need demands, he can turn amateur carpenter with construction conveniences such as electric saws, sanders, and drills.

Likewise, the farmer's wife has found that electricity plays an immense part in the poultry business that constitutes her "egg money." Electricity keeps chicks warm in their first crucial moments and soothes laying pullets at night.

Look inside the average farmhouse. You'll find electricity used for the betterment of human environment. Probably the biggest improvement is in food and meal practices. Freezers, refrigerators, and electric ranges have made meals nutritious and interesting. Because of running water and modern appliances made possible by electricity, the weekly laundry is no longer a tedious task. Electric toothbrushes and electric hairdryers, conveniences employed for the sole purpose of personal appearance and health, are found in the rural home.

Electricity has benefited both economical and social aspects. It has also benefited the future. The installation of electricity in Rural Schools promotes a better attitude toward education and has increased the yearning for higher education.

In short, this is what electricity means to me; a modern home to be proud of, a healthy state of hygiene, more leisure time, improved educational facilities, and a profitable occupation in farming.

This year Nebraska is celebrating 100 years of progress. The modern farmer has come a long way since the early pioneer farmers. In the last 30 years, he has made considerable progress. Most of this was due to electricity—your best buy.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

(By Irene Gardine, Loomis High School, Loomis, Nebr.)

(NOTE.—Contestant sponsored by the Southern Nebraska Rural Public Power District, Grand Island, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

When electricity is mentioned, I do not think of Benjamin Franklin flying his kite in a storm. I think of electricity as the scientific marvel that has advanced my community, my state and my country.

Electricity has made my community a part of the world we live in by the use of television and radio. A flip of the switch or a turn of the dial and we can learn what is happening here and abroad.

What would we do for entertainment without electricity? We couldn't watch the space capsule in orbit on television or hear the latest weather report on the radio. We couldn't listen to our favorite tunes on a record player. We couldn't even go to a movie because electricity is needed to run the projector!

It has been stated that a nation's might can be measured by the amount of leisure time enjoyed by its citizens. Electricity has provided us with an abundance of leisure time and thus we have a mighty nation.

On the farm, electricity is fast replacing the dog as man's best friend. "He" is always there to run the drill, the saw, and the welder. "He" powers the machines that lift the heavy burden of labor off of the farmers' shoulders. Machines that milk the cows, heat the pig and chicken brooders, and on some farms feed and water the livestock are all inventions powered by electricity. Farming is a gamble but electricity helps to even the odds.

"Man may work from dawn to setting sun but a woman's work is never done." It is true that a woman's work is never done but electricity has certainly made housework easier. Can you picture your mother throwing a log into the old wood stove to cook your oatmeal on and churning the butter by hand or taking a pitcher of milk out of the ice box? Electric mixers, electric blenders, electric refrigerators, and electric vacuum cleaners are a far cry from the laborious appliances of the past.

A well-lighted and comfortably heated home is the desire of all families. When you have flameless electric heating, there are no fuel lines to worry about. You get cleaner heat with less worry and less expense. Electric lighting is less dangerous than oil lamps or candles, and it can even add quite a decorative touch to your home.

Electricity has also made "night life" possible. We no longer have to retire when the sun sets. Every farm has a yard light so work can be done at night and street lights in towns have made walking much safer. Flashing lights and neon signs add a sparkle to Saturday night in town. Can you imagine Christmas without its bright tribute to the infant King? Without electricity our world would be very dull.

Electricity gives hope and progress to the future. Engineers to build dams, repairmen for electric appliances, linemen to keep the power coming—these are all jobs that electricity will provide for the unemployed. Electric instruments will help medical research find cures for many diseases. Electric cars can help end the air pollution problem by eliminating exhaust fumes. Electricity will help NASA in her exploration of outer space. Electricity does all this for us, yet the government is reducing funds for such projects as rural electrification to support the war cause. Is this right? I think not!

What does rural electrification mean to me and my community? It means less work, beauty, hope, and progress. It gives us the opportunity to advance, improve, and prosper. Rural electrification is my community's best friend.

WHAT RURAL ELECTIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

(By G. Peter Konen, Roseland Public Schools, Roseland, Nebr.)

(NOTE.—Contestant sponsored by the Southern Nebraska Rural Public Power District, Grand Island, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

Successful ventures consume much time, effort, and hard work, and rural electrification was no exception.

To us, the younger generation, it is difficult to imagine a rural community entirely void of electricity and the countless advantages made possible through its great magnetic power. But a look into the past can be most revealing.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, America showed a landscape dotted with small farms. The American farmer, at the dawn of this century, was making his living much as the people of the Middle Ages had done. His tools were simple and ancient. For most tasks, the only power available was the strength of his own back or that of his mule. His children did their homework in front of the kerosene lamp, while his wife slaved away at the wood range and washboard.

By the end of World War I, the gasoline engine was well established. This form of power, however, was much too expensive for the average small farmer.

Therefore, in 1923, a committee was organized to see just what could be done for the American farmer. Various experiments dealing with the practical use of rural electrification, were directed by this committee, and it was found that it could be used very successfully by the farmer. However, the high cost of delivering the electricity was a big setback in the rural program.

On May 11, 1935, the Rural Electrification Administration was created by Order of the President. The Order granted powers to an REA administrator to "initiate, formulate, administer, and supervise a program of approved projects with the respect to the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy in rural areas."

After much debating and solving of problems, REA went into full swing. Now farmers could get the power they needed to run their operations more economically and efficiently.

Today, as a result of REA work and study, along with developments in the electrical industry, farmers are no longer becoming old before their time. Labor-saving devices and home appliances are within the range of nearly every family. Entertainment and education is now possible through radio, television, and records, to even the poorest of families.

With the advent of REA, the Nebraska rancher and farmer can do much more work with less effort than was ever thought possible. Feeding cattle has become an easy and profitable business with the use of electricity. Thousands of livestock can be fed by pushing a simple button. Electric motors convey the feed to a large wagon which is mounted on a track. The wagon is pushed across the feed bunks, distributing the grain evenly to the herd.

Farmers of yesterday had to go to the blacksmith's shop for repair of tools. Here the blacksmith worked over a hot fire with a sledge and forge, pounding out steel to meet the requirements of the farmer. Many times the farmer had to travel several miles on horseback or wagon to get his work done.

In our community today, the farmer need only go to his own small shop to repair or sharpen his machinery. Electric drills, tool sharpeners, welders, saws, and hundreds of other machines, help the farmer do his job easier and more efficiently.

All these improvements in living, ranching, and farming may well have been a pioneer's dream, and certainly would not have materialized had it not been for the efforts of Rural Electrification. Bringing electricity to the farm was one of the greatest achievements of all times. As a teenager in a rural community, I salute the REA.

MY CONTRIBUTION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Miss Dianne Craft, 529 West Main Street, Grafton, W. Va., recently won an essay-writing contest. Her essay was entitled "My Contribution," and this young lady, who attends Grafton High School, read the essay at the 100th annual Memorial Day observance, which was held on May 30, at Grafton, W. Va.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Craft's prize-winning essay be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY CONTRIBUTION

(By Dianne Craft)

Other holidays may be festive occasions but Memorial Day is observed with dignity and reverence. The flag is flown at half staff until noon as a symbol of the nation's mourning for its dead. At noon it is raised to full staff, symbolizing new hope for the future.

In still other ways Memorial Day is a brief rendezvous of the living with the dead—a meeting of conscience with memory.

Man's memory is short. It is too easy to forget the dead and that is why this day is set apart for remembering. What might they have been like had they lived?

They were young men those soldiers, sailors, flyers and Marines who died in past wars and who are dying today in Vietnam. They were proud to be Americans, so when the call came to serve their country, they folded up their dreams and ambitions and tucked them away in a corner of their minds until they could be taken up again when the war was over.

Many died for democracy and freedom, so it is up to you to make your democracy flourish. You can do this in your daily lives by acting upon the principles of freedom and justice in your dealings with your fellow man.

I used to wonder what I could contribute, for this is my country, too. What could I do to help? If I had been a person I could have fought, but I was only a worthless piece of ground. Then one day my hopes and dreams came true.

I remember that day back in 1867 when I was chosen by an act of Congress to become the final resting place of those who had died for their country. I became the only National Cemetery in West Virginia. My name is the Grafton National Cemetery.

On Memorial Day, May 30th, each year since 1869, school children from kindergarten to high school seniors, dress in white and each carrying a small bouquet of flowers and an American Flag along with other marching units, take part in the line of march and assist in decorating my graves.

Any citizen of Taylor County who attended Taylor County Schools can proudly boast that he or she has marched in the Memorial Day Parade in past years and has helped honor the nation's sleeping heroes. This is probably the only observance of its kind in the nation; an unique and humble tribute to the honored dead.

Since 1867, many individuals have passed through my gates. There have been those, who by accident, have discovered the grave of an old friend or relative. There have been those who came to mourn at the grave of a loved one, and school children who, after placing their flowers on a grave, wondered why their eyes were suddenly filled with tears.

Approximately 1,251 bodies of both Union and Confederate Troops of the Civil War lie within my walls. Since the burials of the Civil War Veterans in and around 1867, there have been, to date, 816 additional burials of veterans of all wars.

I now occupy three terraces and the ranks of the "Silent Army" have grown to about 2,067 graves of men of all wars including the Korean Conflict. Of this total, there are 664 known but to God.

I remember vividly the Civil War, since part of it took place in Grafton, I have the distinction of having entered the first casualty of that war, Pvt. T. Bailey Brown of the 2nd West Virginia Infantry. Pvt. Brown was shot by a sniper while on picket duty May 22, 1861, on the west side of Grafton. A monument to his memory stands where his life was taken and another stands here at the head of his grave.

May 30 has become "Homecoming Day" for many former citizens of Taylor County who come from all sections of the country and meet on my grounds to honor the war dead and renew old acquaintances. Visitors make an annual pilgrimage to visit the graves of friends and relatives at rest in the "Bivouac of the Dead" beneath the azure skies and peaceful atmosphere of my domain.

Since November of 1962, I have been unable to receive new honored dead. I am full! No longer can I serve my country. In a way, I, too, have died, but I can rest in peace, with my colleagues, knowing I have done my part to keep my nation "one undivided".

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an article published in the April 20, 1967, issue of the Portland, Maine, Evening Express, which describes the education and training achieved by Raymond C. Gilliam, of Portland, Maine, while enrolled in a manpower development and training program.

It is most gratifying to me to find that the opportunities offered by MDTA have helped this young man broaden his horizons. I am confident that Raymond Gilliam's experience will be an incentive to other enrollees in the MDTA programs throughout Maine and the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

He Jumped From Job to Job; Now He'll Try for College

A former school dropout has become the first student at Portland's Manpower Training Center to pass his high school equivalency test.

He also hopes to be the center's first student to go on to college.

"I'll take the college boards May 6, and with any luck I'll get into the University of Maine in Portland," said Raymond C. Gilliam, 19, of 149 Cumberland Ave.

Gilliam said the idea of getting ahead through education came to him only after drifting from one job to another.

Before entering the basic education program at the Manpower center at Oakdale School, Gilliam was making hot dogs for a local packing firm.

"I just couldn't see myself doing that for the rest of my life," he added.

Gilliam dropped out of the general course at Brunswick High School at the end of his junior year mainly because his father was ill and he had to take over and haul lobster traps.

He said because he had been missing so much school, officials didn't make any particular effort to get him to stay.

He then served in the Navy for about four months, but was forced to leave submarine training school for medical reasons. Since then he has had a variety of jobs which has built up an interest in business administration.

Gilliam praised the Manpower Training Center's education program because of the small classes, the informal atmosphere, the tutoring help and ability grouping.

He said because teachers helped him with mathematics he was able to get a good score on the high school equivalency test. "Sixty-nine per cent of those who took the test got lower scores than I did," he added.

He said he is trying to build up his vocabulary to prepare for the college boards.

In addition to going on to college, Gilliam has one other desire—to get his 16-year-old sister to finish high school too. She has had no high school and is working in a supermarket.

"In my parents' time, a diploma wasn't so important, but it is now," he added.

PROSPECTS AND PROBLEMS IN ALASKA MINING

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, between May 24 and 26, a mineral conference, celebrating and coinciding with the opening of the celebration of the centennial of Alaska's purchase, was held at the University of Alaska, near Fairbanks.

I ask unanimous consent that the address which I delivered on that occasion be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I bring what I believe to be cheering news to my fellow Alaskans interested in mining. This once great and still potentially great industry in Alaska is due for a new lease on life. I hope to develop the nature and extent of these good tidings.

I am not prepared to say just when this impulse began, but I have reason to suspect it was initiated, or at least intensified last summer, when I persuaded the top three federal officials entrusted with responsibility in the mineral and mining fields—and highly qualified—to accompany me to Alaska. They were all newly appointed to their important posts. They were J. Cordell Moore, just named Assistant Secretary of the Interior in charge of mineral resources; Dr. Walter Hibbard, for whose confirmation as Director of the Bureau of Mines I had voted for a few weeks previously in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and William T. Pecora, newly appointed Director of the Geological Survey.

Of these three neither of the first two—Secretary Moore and Director Hibbard—had ever been to Alaska. Dr. Pecora had been in Alaska, but not for 25 years. It seemed to me essential that all be initiated, and in the case of Bill Pecora reinitiated, into Alaska's needs and potentials and that we all come together and become acquainted with what was being done and not being done in the field of mining—and what needed to be done.

Finally, I felt that I should accompany them, not especially in my capacity as United States Senator but particularly as, also, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the committee which above all others has more interests and responsibilities in Alaska than any other Senate committee. That was, indeed, why I sought membership on it when I was first elected to the Senate nine years ago.

The special motivation for this visit was the knowledge that much more could and should be done in Alaska in the field of mining.

This was pointed up by a map drafted by Chuck Herbert, whom you all know, a graduate of the University of Alaska, a miner by profession, a former member of the Territorial Legislature, indeed in the 1941 session, the first session after I became Governor and where I got to know Chuck, and subsequently the assistant Commissioner in the State Department of Natural Resources. This map appeared in the first report of the Alaska Field Committee, whose purpose and objective it is to help plan Alaska development and is headed by Joe FitzGerald, who has had substantial experience in Alaska in diverse fields. This map pictured Alaska, the neighboring Yukon Territory in Canada and the upper third of British Columbia, the part of British Columbia that lies east of the Alaska Panhandle.

On this map the major active mining projects in these areas were indicated by crosses. In Alaska they numbered 7; in neighboring Yukon Territory they numbered 19, and in the upper third of British Columbia 30. So we could see that in an area adjacent to Alaska, smaller in extent than Alaska and presumably with similar geology, the active mining projects in our neighbor were seven times as numerous as those in Alaska—49 to 7.

It seemed to me the appropriate time to try and ascertain what accounted for this difference. So we first visited the active mining projects in Alaska. We also conferred on the potentials, for concomitantly with our visit a search for heavy minerals was being undertaken and a group of knowledgeable geologists were exploring various areas in Alaska to try and ascertain where some of the heavy minerals, especially gold, might be found. We flew over these areas and talked with the geologists, some of whose findings are already marked on maps. We visited the copper prospect at Bornite in the Kobuk Basin. We conferred with representatives of the federal government and state in Alaska, and indeed were accompanied variously on this trip by Phil Holdsworth, Commissioner of Natural Resources for the State; by Chuck Herbert, then assistant commissioner, by James Williams, Director of the Division of Mines in the Department of Natural Resources, and J. A. Herdlick, Area Director of the Bureau of Mines.

After we had seen much of what Alaska was doing and had in prospect, although by no means all, we went to Whitehorse, where a meeting had been arranged with both Canadian mining executives and government officials in the field of mines. We knew in a general way how their governmental policies differed from ours and how their policies were in a large measure responsible for the greater mining activity across the border. We found that there were two things that were being done there that we were not doing:

First, when a good mining development was in prospect the government—Dominion Government in the case of Yukon Territory, Provincial Government in the case of British Columbia—would pay two-thirds of the cost of the infrastructure; that is would pay two-thirds of the cost of such transportation as would be needed to bring the ore out to tidewater, whether by highway or railway, and also what airfield might be needed, as well as the power development. You can all see what great encouragement that would be to a mining enterprise inevitably destined before long to be investing and expanding before any returns were visible.

Second, when the prospect reached the development stage and was producing ore it was relieved of all taxes for three years, thus enabling it to get a good start and encourage its development.

Also in Canada prospecting is subsidized. That in itself was not peculiar to our neighbor. We have at times done it in Alaska, but I would say that it was done across the border more knowledgeably and more expertly. Someone coming in and merely claiming to be a prospector and asking for a handout would not receive it until he had demonstrated his knowledgeability in the field of prospecting and could convince the appropriate government official that he knew how to look and would be able to know what he saw. Having thus demonstrated his expertness, he would be subsidized for one, two or three years, depending on the circumstance. And if his prospecting produced results and a mining development resulted, he would be expected to repay the sums advanced him as a prospector; but if he were less fortunate the costs would merely be written off. Of course, we also have federal programs of loans run by the Geological Survey, but it needs to be expanded to encourage more exploration.

To what extent these various sound provisions may be applied under the American flag remains to be seen. Such changes in our approach would require some joint federal and state cooperation.

But, meanwhile we have moved to a certain extent with the passage of P.L. 89–570, which, for the first time, allows full deduction of exploration expenses of mining enterprises—a tax benefit not allowed prior to enactment of this law.

Four years ago when I became Chairman of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels, I undertook a general survey of the state of the mining industry. The Subcommittee heard witnesses from many branches of the industry, and from officials of the government agencies, principally those of the Interior Department having concern with the strength of the mining industry in the United States.

After this very instructive series of meetings it seemed to me one particular area of legislation was presented which deserved special attention.

For the industry as a whole it became apparent a major obstacle to growth and prosperity of the mining industry was the income tax treatment of exploration expenses. At that time the law imposed an absolute ceiling on the amount of deductions that could be taken for exploration expenditures of $100,000 annually and $400,000 over the life of the property. The large mining companies that are equipped to invest large amounts of money in the search for valuable mineral deposits worthy of development were reluctant to make the enormous investment required because no tax deduction could be taken even where no discovery resulted, thus severely limiting the potential return of investment from any venture undertaken. As representatives of the industry pointed out, this was particularly frustrating for such regions as Alaska where vast exploratory efforts are required to reveal the riches beneath the surface of the earth. The exploration investment, without tax relief, is often too great to encourage serious searches for minerals here.

Soon after the hearings were concluded, I introduced legislation to allow full deduction of exploration expenditures for the mining industry. In an effort to achieve enactment I also introduced the measure as an amendment to internal revenue legislation then pending before the Senate Finance Committee which had already passed the House. I was abruptly apprised of the difficulties with which the industry was faced in attempting this reform.

The Treasury Department was adamantly opposed to the proposal on the grounds it represented a double deduction from gross profits. The reasoning of the Treasury was that exploration expenditures represent capital investment and are, therefore, subject to recapture in the form of depletion deductions. The industry and I argued against this theory strongly. However, the opposition of the Executive Branch was sufficient to frustrate passage of the legislation.

Again at the next—the 89th—Congress I reintroduced legislation to allow full deduction of exploration expenditures. This time, in order to mollify opposition of the Treasury Department, I incorporated changes in the bill to permit recapture of deductions the bill would allow when a mine reaches productive status. Similar legislation was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative Al Ullman of Oregon, a member of the House Ways and Means Committee and in a strategic position to boost the bill over the first hurdle—the Ways and Means Committee. As all tax legislation must, by Constitutional requirement, originate in the House of Representatives, it must first be approved by the House Committee.

All through the 89th Congress we worked to obtain passage of the tax liberalization law. At every step of the way we were opposed by the Treasury Department, and, even at the last minute, the President threatened a veto. Finally, however, at the end of the session we were successful and the President signed into law Public Law 89–570. It is my belief this will stimulate exploration in Alaska for mineral deposits and that, following exploration, will come greater development. The effect of the law was described in a recent publication of the Division of Mines and Mining of the State Department of Natural Resources, as follows:

"Because most of the larger mining companies have already spent the maximum of $400,000 in exploration allowed under the old law, the new law will encourage them to spend more money than previously planned on exploration. This money is most likely to be spent in areas which have not yet been thoroughly investigated. This will be especially applicable to Alaska because (1) Alaska's geology is favorable for the deposition of mineral deposits, (2) huge areas of Alaska have not been well prospected, and (3) Alaska is adjacent to British Columbia and Yukon where many recent important discoveries have been made and new mines developed by prospectors and companies alike. The new Act places Alaska is closer competition for the great amount of mineral activity in Canada by giving an incentive that helps overcome the talking point of the Canadian three-year exemption of new producing properties.

"Under either law, prospecting or developing a mining property may be cheaper than many people realize. The savings in taxes and resultant actual cost of exploration are interesting. . . . For instance, . . . an Alaskan corporation with $35,000 in taxable profits can save $1,392 in taxes if it spends $10,000 for prospecting, thereby doing its prospecting at an actual cost of only about 86¢ for every dollar so spent. A single taxpayer of $50,000 taxable income can prospect for only about 65¢ for each dollar spent prospecting or developing a mine. The savings are less for smaller incomes, but even a single man with a $12,000 taxable income will find he can make bona fide prospecting expeditions for around 75¢ on the dollar."

We are watching the effects of this legislation with great interest. We have reason to think it will result in greater opportunity than ever before for the mining industry.

But since that time there is more good news. There will be new activity by the Bureau of Mines in its laboratory on an island in the Juneau-Douglas area.

Its first project will be to test a new approach to mining problems caused by permafrost. Costs of mining in this permanently frozen ground average 16 cents more per ton of ore. Bureau engineers believe these costs can be cut substantially with a recently developed device called a sonic drill. Dr. Hibbard, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, believes that successful application of the sonic drill could improve both the speed and economy of mining in permafrost, and might even permit the development of mineral deposits that are now considered unprofitable.

The laboratory will begin operating in July with a small initial complement of scientists and engineers, plus supporting personnel.

Perhaps even more dramatic and more important is the commissioning of a fleet of three vessels which will explore and prospect for heavy minerals in the waters adjacent to our coast. I was present last Saturday at Tiburon, a suburb of San Francisco, when the largest of these three vessels, a former Navy vessel which served gallantly in World War II, was commissioned for its new role. It has been completely reconditioned and equipped for its mission of undersea mining and has been rechristened "Virginia City."

This is the largest of three vessels and may be called the flagship of the mining fleet, and at the commissioning ceremony at Tiburon last Saturday I conferred upon Walter Hibbard the title of "Admiral," which in this case does not require confirmation by the Senate. The vessel now appropriately bears the name of a town that grew up around the richest deposits of gold and silver ever discovered in the United States. Virginia City was settled as a mining camp in 1859, when the famous Comstock lode was struck. The camp soon became a boom town as miners flocked to it. Before long its flow of gold and silver was to amaze the world. In the next two decades, the region produced more than $300 million worth of precious metals. Much of San Francisco was built with the metallic wealth extracted from Virginia City, especially after the discovery of the major ore body—the "Big Bonanza"—in 1873.

This in a sense was all the more remarkable because little was known at the time of ore geology or efficient mining methods. The research vessel "Virginia City" hopes for similar good luck, but it will also be able to rely on the ship's well equipped laboratories, special instruments for probing ocean bed depths, and cumulated knowledge and skill of the scientists aboard. Let's hope that we will strike more such lodes as made the original Virginia City celebrated in mining lore. The other two vessels are also appropriately named for communities that have a place in mining history—"Grass Valley" and "Cripple Creek."

The "Virginia City" will sail from California early in June up the Inside Passage and hopefully will stop at Juneau to give the men a little shore leave and to be hailed as a new type of pioneer at our capital. She then will proceed across the Gulf of Alaska, through Unimak Pass into the Bering Sea and begin boring the ocean depths off Nome.

The reconditioning of the "Virginia City" cost approximately three-quarters of a million dollars, and this cost was reduced by the cooperation of the Navy, which was glad to see this vessel removed from its mothball status and put to valuable use in the strengthening of our nation's economy.

Admiral Taylor, who carried out the formal ceremony of transferring this vessel with its fine war record to the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior for civilian use, must have been comforted in his justifiable violation of Captain Lawrence's immortal slogan "Don't give up the ship" by turning it over to a man by the name of Nelson, Research Director of the Marine Technological Center. The name of Nelson ranks high in Naval annals as that of a man who acquired the vessels of others as part of his career. To give up the ship to a Nelson must have softened the sorrow of surrender. (For the record, this latter-day Nelson is named Arthur, not Horatio.)

The reconditioned "Virginia City" will be equipped with a variety of experimental instruments and two specially-designed seabed sampling drills. The samples recovered will be analyzed on board the ship's own laboratories.

This initial cruise of the "Virginia City" to the scene of one of the great historic gold-bearing areas of Alaska is perhaps the most important single constructive step taken by the federal government in our time in the field of mining. Its aim is as far as possible to try to make our nation more self-sufficient, not merely in gold, the domestic supply of which is dwindling while the demand increases, but also for tin and other metals, the supply of which hitherto has largely come from abroad.

The vessel is over 200 feet long and with its geologists, mining engineers, mineralogists and crew will have a total complement of 43 persons. It is to be assumed that more of the gold, first discovered on Anvil Creek back of Nome and then on the beach, will be found, let us hope in large quantities, in the waters just offshore.

Meanwhile we are getting closer to other legislation beneficial to the gold mining industry. The story of the frustration of this once great American and Alaskan industry is familiar to all those here present. It has been a rather depressing story, beginning with War Production Order L–208 during World War II, which closed all our gold mines with the mistaken idea that these miners would find employment in the mining of strategic minerals. And with the subsequent freeze on the price of gold established 33 years ago, we know that gold mining in the United States has been headed for extinction.

During the past eight years while in the Senate I have tried, with the collaboration of other colleagues from western states, to produce legislation which would somehow rectify the one outstanding basic injustice under our free enterprise system levied against a single once great industry. Various approaches have been tried. Now for the third time a bill has been reported favorably by unanimous vote first by the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels and then by the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and hopefully is awaiting floor action in the Senate. That floor action has not taken place in the past because of the unwavering opposition of the Treasury Department, meekly followed by the Interior Department. The Treasury-led opposition has been based on the fanciful idea that any effort to assist the gold mining industry will somehow cause a panic in international monetary circles and cause a raid on the dollar. No one in the Senate who has supported this legislation and the present bill which I have introduced, S. 49, which has 21 cosponsors, shares this view.

REACTIVATION OF THE BATTLESHIP "NEW JERSEY"

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the Pentagon announced last night that the Secretary of Defense has authorized the Navy to begin reactivation of the battleship *New Jersey* for possible use in Vietnam.

This decision is welcome news to all of us who have urged the Pentagon to approve the use of powerful 16-inch guns off the North Vietnamese coast and have advocated an increased role for naval gunfire in the war against the north.

Yesterday's action by the Secretary of Defense is an encouraging first step toward what I hope will be eventual deployment of the battleship *New Jersey* in Vietnam.

I am pleased that this decision has been made and I am hopeful that, before long, the *New Jersey* and possibly one other battleship can be on station off the coast of Vietnam, ready to bring their awesome firepower, to bear on strategic targets in the north. The battleship played a proud role in the Korean conflict, providing an all-weather offensive against the enemy.

It is the hope of those of us who advocate deployment of battleships in Vietnam that their earlier successes can be repeated and that, in some way, the battleship can help to persuade the Hanoi regime that her cause is futile.

NASA SAFETY STANDARDS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the June copy of the American Engineer which was issued today carries a most timely article coauthored by my esteemed and distinguished colleague, Congressman Donald Rumsfeld, entitled "How To Close NASA's Hazard Evaluation Gap." Because I am sure that all who are concerned with sound, remedial action by NASA in the wake of the tragic Apollo disaster will want to compare Congressman Rumsfeld's proposal with the steps announced by NASA to solve this problem, I ask unanimous consent that the article appear in its entirety in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How To Close NASA's Hazard Evaluation Gap

(By Hon. Donald Rumsfeld, Republican, of Illinois, U.S. House of Representatives, and William E. Kriegsman, American Political Science Association congressional fellow on leave of absence from the AEC)

(Note.—The tragic Apollo fire has turned the spotlight of public attention on many of the space agency's engineering/management policies. Here's a proposal to establish an aerospace safety advisory panel for NASA.)

Since its creation in 1958, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) has aggressively and imaginatively pioneered in the development of new space technology and disciplines. The trademark has been success; the result, an unprecedented space capability and exciting and meaningful prospects for the future.

The tragic Apollo spacecraft fire which claimed the lives of three astronauts during a "routine" ground test in January, 1967, dealt NASA its severest setback thus far and, in the process, has focused national attention on NASA's safety practices. The findings of NASA's Apollo 204 Review Board's formal investigation of the accident lead to the conclusion that neither NASA nor contractor management had established adequate safety programs.

Let us first consider what the Apollo 204 Review Board and its 21 panels found and recommended with respect to the identification of hazards.

The Apollo 204 Review Board's panel 13 was charged with the responsibility of considering ground emergency procedures. In outlining the standard NASA procedures in this area, the panel reported that the contractor's safety officer reviews a test outline which defines "in outline form, all of the tests planned for the vehicle" and "establishes a list of the operations considered hazardous." The criteria employed are contained in an instruction which, according to the Review Panel, offers "a certain amount of specific instructions, but very little in the form of an overall plan for insuring adequate safety considerations and emergency procedures in the test documents."

The panel's report noted that this "list of hazardous operational checks and procedures (OCP) and all of the test outlines are reviewed by the Kennedy Space Center (KSC) and the Air Force Eastern Test Range (AFETR) safety offices." These offices, in turn "release a letter establishing the official KSC and AFETR safety review requirements list designating the OCP's for that spacecraft which must be reviewed and approved by those offices." When the OCP report is prepared, the OCP writers, who are "contractor operations support personnel," are "*responsible for including all references to safety*, hazardous situations, and emergency instructions." The panel concluded, however, that "the instructions defining the scope of this responsibility are completely general and in many instances vague. As a result, the specific test procedures reflect a lack of definitive instructions in these areas." Most significantly, the panel then noted:

"Copies of the draft release of procedures identified as hazardous are reviewed by the contractor safety office and the systems engineers. Significant comments or inputs from the contractor safety office are incorporated in the master-draft copy which is then approved by KSC–SCO, and published as the release document.

"Copies of released test procedures are forwarded to the KSC safety office. Those procedures specified [as hazardous by KSC and AFETR] require review and approval by KSC safety. Procedures involving hazardous operations at AFETR are forwarded by KSC safety to AFETR safety for comments and approval. Approval by KSC safety is made in writing to the contractor after AFETR safety has signified their formal approval."

Finally, the panel observed that there is "no formal review requirement in the area of spacecraft safety for emergency procedures" between the Kennedy and Houston Centers.

The panel made four "findings and determinations" concerning identification of spacecraft hazards:

1. FINDING

During the preparation of S/C test procedures at KSC, safety considerations for hazardous operations and documentation of applicable emergency procedures are limited in most cases to routine safety reference notations and emergency power-down instructions.

Determination

Insufficient emphasis is applied by the test procedure originator upon documenting emergency procedures and identifying specific hazards and applicable safety requirements.

2. FINDING

Under the existing method of test procedure processing at KSC, the cognizant safety offices review only those procedures which are noted in the OCP outline as involving hazards. Official approval by KSC and AFETR safety is accomplished after the procedure is published and released.

Determination

The scope of contractor and KSC Safety Office participation in test procedure development is loosely defined and poorly documented. Post-procedure-release approval by the KSC Safety Office does not insure positive and timely coordination of all safety considerations.

3. FINDING

Criteria for defining hazardous test operations are not complete.

Determination

A positive method does not exist for insuring identification and documentation of all possible hazards involved in test operations.

4. FINDING

Requirements for the review and concurrence of KSC S/C test procedures by MSC are not well-defined.

Determination

The present review system does not insure that MSC concurs with released KSC test procedures.

Thus, at the time of the Apollo accident—

(1) Unless the contractor's safety officer found a prospective test to be hazardous, little or no further evaluation was made;

(2) The contractor's evaluation was not guided by written instructions from NASA management; and

(3) The final review authority for NASA rested with the safety staff at the space center level with no provision or mechanism for meaningful review by higher NASA management.

The Apollo 204 Review Board, in considering the reports of the 21 panels which served as the basis for the Board's recommendations to the administrator, determined that "adequate safety precautions were neither established nor observed for this test." The Board found that "those organizations responsible for the planning, conduct, and safety of this test failed to identify it as being hazardous." The sole recommendation for remedial action in this respect was that "management continually monitor the safety of all test operations and assure the adequacy of emergency procedures." One would wish that the Board's recommendations had not been so general on this subject in view of the seriousness of the findings and determinations made by panel 13.

It is apparent from the Report that the Review Board adopted a restrictive view of their responsibility to examine the hazard identification system which failed to recognize that fire was a potentially lethal hazard. While doing an outstanding job from a technical standpoint, it would have been helpful if the Board had attempted to identify the points of weakness in the NASA/contractor management systems of hazard identification and had made recommendations for strengthening them. As one of the astronauts told the House Science and Astronautics Committee, "none of us really placed any stock or gave any serious concern to a fire in a spacecraft. This is the real crux of the problem." In view of the weaknesses in the management systems which permitted this situation to exist undetected, one might ask, what other possible hazards "are not causing concern" today?

As all now agree, with the benefit of 20/20 hindsight, freshman engineering students would be expected to be aware of the potential fire hazard involved in working with pure oxygen under pressure, whether in "ground tests" or in "flight." Many technical studies and reports exist identifying the potential problem of a pure oxygen atmosphere in a spacecraft. In fact, a NASA study (NASA–SP 48) published long before the accident observed that two accidents which occurred in 1962 "illustrate in concrete fashion the potential dangers of 100 percent oxygen atmospheres."

NASA did, in fact, have a research program aimed at reducing or eliminating the potential fire hazard. Laboratory experiments had been conducted to determine the flammability of spacecraft materials in oxygen atmospheres of varying pressures. NASA also conducted other programs which were designed to eliminate sources of ignition in the spacecraft.

With this background knowledge of the potential hazard of fire and with NASA's vast engineering and scientific organization, one wonders not how an accident could occur—they are inevitable. Rather, one wonders with that knowledge of the danger and the extensive resources available, how there could have been such a complete breakdown in the ability to recognize the danger of fire on that ground test and to identify the test as hazardous.

The evidence as to the management system's inability to identify hazards in ground tests is now reasonably clear. The next obvious question is what is the evidence with respect to flight tests. Knowledge here is less complete, but last year the staff of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics undertook a study of space flight safety and emergencies. The staff's purpose in conducting the study was to obtain information as to whether a space rescue capability should be established at this time. The report prepared by the staff showed that nearly all of the companies and agencies having an interest in space activities felt that insufficient information was known about the possible emergencies which might occur in space, i.e., that NASA has thus far not sufficiently identified the potential hazards.

NASA in its reply to the staff study described its safety review program in general terms and made no mention of any formal hazard evaluation effort:

". . . Prior mention has been made of the review process which each program has employed to insure the flight worthiness of the space vehicle and the capability of the mission support facilities. On Apollo this process has matured and currently includes the following formal reviews on the space vehicle.

1. Preliminary design review (PDR): The PDR is a formal technical review of the basic design approach for a contract end item. It is conducted early in the detail design phase to establish system compatibility with planned functional and reliability requirements.

2. Critical design review (CDR): A CDR is conducted for each contract end item when the detail design is essentially complete, to review and approve specific engineerng documentation which defines the design of the item.

3. First article configuration inspection (FACI): FACI is conducted on the first item of operational configuration to assure that its design and manufacture are in accordance with the specifications and documentation defined at the CDR.

4. Flight readiness review (FRR): Immediately prior to each Apollo mission, a formal review is jointly conducted by the Apollo program director and the Apollo mission director to insure the operational readiness of the space vehicle and mission support.

5. Design certification review (DCR): A DCR is a formal review of each manned mission of new configuration which is conducted by the management council to examine the design of the total mission complex for proof of design maturity. The objectives of the DCR are assessment and certification of the design of the space vehicle for flight worthiness and manned safety and the certification of the capability of the mission support to support a manned mission. In the review of crew safety, particular attention is paid to equipment reliability and the identification of single failure points."

As a result of this staff study, the Committee recommended a complete overhaul of NASA and U.S. Air Force flight safety programs:

"That, in addition to the space flight safety efforts that are integral to specific programs of the two government agencies established and maintained in each agency, a *separate* and unique flight safety group which would be responsible for, among other tasks, providing separate inputs, on an overall system basis and keyed specifically to the problems of space flight safety, into the design of systems for specific missions; . . . the preparation and organizing, in advance, of procedures and investigating boards of experts for the handling of accidents; and the development of an organizational philosophy for space flight safety (similar to the approach which has evolved in aviation flight safety) which would ultimately provide for an independent review and audit of safety provisions and procedures in specific manned space flight programs."

Finally, one additional factor contributes to the conclusion regarding the inadequacy of NASA's safety program. The most recent NASA headquarters organization chart identifies various line officials having responsibility for NASA's program and also such staff officers as the general counsel, the director of public affairs, and the director of legislative affairs.

Nowhere is there listed an individual whose sole concern is safety. If safety is a function of the program managers, one could expect to find a senior individual in the program office with safety as his sole responsibility. An examination of a recent organization chart of NASA's Office of Manned Space Flight identifies many positions, both line and staff, but nowhere can there be found a "safety officer." Looking further one finally finds that the organization chart for the Houston Manned Spaceflight Center shows a Flight Safety Office, but no similar office or individual is shown on the Kennedy Space Center organization chart. Investigation shows that no direct counterpart exists at the KSC. There, the Chief Safety Office reports to the director of support operations at the third level of management. It seems possible to conclude that top NASA management does not, under this structure, receive sufficient safety advice uncolored by budgetary considerations and/or schedule commitments.

What are reasonable standards for an adequate aerospace safety program?

First, the program must provide a positive system for the identification of all potential hazards affecting the safety of astronauts, NASA and contractor employees, and the public.

Second, the safety program must include a comprehensive review of each potential hazard to assure that the hazard is eliminated or minimized.

Third, where "tradeoffs" (to use NASA's term) are necessary between safety factors and mission goals, budgets, and schedule commitments, then top management must be fully apprised so it is aware of the consequences of any safety compromise.

Finally, there must be assurance that deviations in procedures, production, or operations affecting safety are made known.

Information made available to the U.S. Congress and to the public as a result of the Apollo tragedy indicates serious weaknesses in both NASA and contractor management in these crucial areas.

First, as the Apollo 204 Review Board recommended, NASA top management obviously must start thinking more about the safety of its operations—and we are confident that they are. Second, the now apparent structural weakness in NASA's management must be corrected.

One possible step toward the goal of strengthening NASA's ability to identify, evaluate, and minimize potential hazards in both ground and flight tests would be to establish a mechanism for top level "independent" safety review. Rep. Rumsfeld has introduced legislation (H.R. 8145) calling for the establishment of an "aerospace safety advisory panel" to perform this needed function. Such a panel, patterned after the Atomic Energy Commission's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, could provide for the independent safety review of all NASA's operations by a group of non-NASA experts participating on a part-time basis. The panel's role would be to ask the hard questions concerning safety—which obviously were not being asked—and thus to provide the administrator with additional assurance, free of budget or schedule considerations and employee fear of "rocking the boat," that the potential hazards of the space program have been identified and either removed or their ramifications understood and controlled.

Another legislative proposal pending is a bill (H.R. 4473), introduced by Rep. Fulton (R-Pa.), to create in NASA the position of "inspector general." The inspector general concept has been successfully used by several key government agencies, including AEC, as well as all branches of the Armed Services. Clearly, an inspector general could help to provide management with greater assurance that NASA's staff and contractors are performing properly from a safety standpoint.

The U.S. space effort has a truly significant role ahead. Successes of previous years must be matched and surpassed. Now that the need for a greater emphasis on safety within NASA is known as a result of the accident, our task is to continue the development of a well-balanced U.S. space program. NASA should be in the forefront in urging passage of H.R. 8145 to establish an aerospace safety advisory panel and H.R. 4473 to provide for an inspector general.

Problems are not solved by pretending they do not exist. The "hazard evaluation gap" within NASA can and must be closed. The Congress and NASA have the means to achieve that goal if they will act promptly and responsibly.

THE WAR GAME

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a letter which the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law sent to all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FOR PEACE
THROUGH LAW,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1967.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We write to invite you and your staff to attend a special Congressional showing of a unique film, *The War Game*—a work which raises issues of direct concern to those responsible for decisions regarding war and peace.

This forty-seven minute film was awarded the 1967 Academy Award as the most outstanding documentary of the year. Many who have seen *The War Game* feel it to be the most dramatic single film in their experience.

The movie depicts and explains the effects and consequences of nuclear war. As Life magazine remarked in praising the work, "*The War Game* is neither a pacifist document nor propaganda for better civil defense . . . the film is a work of truth."

We strongly believe *The War Game* should be seen by *all* Americans. Yet as the film discusses matters which bear directly on the business and policy of this nation, we believe it is particularly important that it be seen by members of Congress and government officials.

We urge you, therefore, to attend a free showing of the film on Thursday, June 1, 1967. For House members and their staffs, the film will be shown at the House Caucus Room, Room 346 Cannon Building, at 3:00 p.m. For Senate members and their staffs, the film will be shown at the Senate Auditorium, Room G308 New Senate Office Building, at 4:30 p.m. A representative of the Atomic Energy Commission has been invited to offer comments and answer questions following each showing of the film.

The War Game is a remarkable, important film. We urge you and your staff to attend.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH S. CLARK,
Chairman.
F. BRADFORD MORSE,
Vice-Chairman.
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

BENEFITS WHICH FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION HAS CONFERRED ON ALASKA SCHOOLS

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is having a positive and heartening impact. I was happy to support it enthusiastically. In Alaska, for example, Public Law 89–10 has been used, in part, to provide library facilities for schoolchildren in the Anchorage Borough School District.

A few days ago I received a letter from Miss Frances A. Jones, librarian of the Fairview Elementary School, in the Anchorage Borough School District, written on behalf of the Alaska Library Association, in which Miss Jones described how Public Law 89–10 has strengthened library facilities at Fairview Elementary School.

She writes, in part:

> The children have developed a real pride in the library . . .

I am pleased to share Miss Jones' remarks with Senators and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of her letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIRVIEW ELEMENTARY LIBRARY,
Anchorage, Alaska, May 25, 1967.
Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRUENING: I have been asked by the legislative committee of the Alaska Library Association to write to you concerning the effect of recent library legislation on our instructional program.

I am the librarian at Fairview Elementary School in Anchorage. Fairview School was the first school in Alaska to receive Federal monies for their library under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This program has now been in effect at Fairview for slightly over a year and at Mountain View and Denali Schools for slightly less than a year. We have been happy to learn that three other elementary schools in the Anchorage Borough School District will be the recipients of Title I Library funds beginning this summer.

It was my privilege to join the Fairview staff last July. Although the project was very new and very few of the new books had yet arrived, it was rewarding to see the number of children who used the facilities of the library during the summer months. Over 100 families were registered as users during this period. Storyhours were held, particularly in connection with the city's summer recreation program and the summer kindergarten program. There were many pre-school children among the summer users. These children definitely had a "headstart" in their acquaintance with books, the library, and the librarian.

As school got underway our library became an "instructional materials center" in every sense of the word. We had received, by this time, many of the new books purchased with Title I funds as well as audio-visual equipment such as record players, tape recorder, and headsets for listening, a sound filmstrip projector, and an 8mm single concept film projector and films.

Prior to the opening of school an orientation to the library was planned for both new and returning faculty members. They were an enthusiastic group who began the year by really promoting library usage, and who continued to encourage the boys and girls to use the library throughout the year.

Because of Title I funds, books and materials are now readily available for use by our boys and girls, and our faculty members that, in many instances, were not accessible at all previously. Since books, records, and in some cases magazines are not to be found in the homes of many of our students, this ready availability of books and materials is of immeasurable value.

The services of a full-time librarian, a full-time library aide, and a half-time community helper made possible through Title I funds, make it possible for us to provide extended library hours—before and after school, one evening a week, and Saturday mornings. This makes it possible for junior high school students, senior high school students, and adults to make use of the library facilities too.

It would be difficult at this time to make a valid objective evaluation of the Title I library program. We are attempting some measure of objective evaluation through the administration of standardized tests. Of course, we hope that we will find evidence of increased achievement overall. However, we realize that such factors as background and extreme mobility of population will affect the validity of any testing program.

Therefore, much of our evaluation must, of necessity, be subjective. Evidences of the value of the library are to be found in changing attitudes. The children have developed a real pride in the library. Most of them have developed a sense of responsibility in the care and handling of books and non-book materials. Many of the children have developed excellent study habits. Others have laid a good foundation. Given the opportunity, they will build upon this foundation in the ensuing years. For some of these children the library has become a veritable refuge. Who knows—who can possibly predict the influence this library program will have on the future of these youngsters?

We can only say "thank you" for your support of library legislation in the past and urge your continued support of the kind of library legislation which has made this type of library program possible.

Sincerely,

Miss Frances A. Jones,
Librarian, Fairview Elementary School.

TUITION TAX CREDIT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, a statement by President H. Edwin Young, of the University of Maine, presents a clear and concise picture of the tuition tax credit proposal. President Young's statement reflects the views of the majority of professional educators in Maine, and I believe will be of interest to Senators. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Young's statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An Argument Against Tax Credits in Higher Education

(By H. Edwin Young)

As I discuss tax credits and higher education, I want to convey some of my concerns and some of the goals that I want to see satisfied, as educators continue to evolve the American system of higher education.

First, I'm a strong believer in a pluralistic higher education system. America must continue to have both publicly and privately controlled colleges and universities; there is a need for some institutions of traditional excellence, to which only students of great promise are admitted, and there must be other institutions, in which students who have not demonstrated high achievement will have a chance to prove themselves.

Efforts must also be continued to bring an increasing percentage of the children of low-income families into schools until people are convinced that family economic status is not an important determinant of college attendance. (Some educators are quite aware that there are other factors than ability to finance an education; however, there is no evidence that raising the price of tuition will encourage more applicants to attend institutions of higher education.) The American system should encourage scholarships for students who demonstrate high promise, but there must also be opportunities for students who are poor, whose backgrounds did not make them good competitors, to make their way.

Because of increasing numbers of students, competition for faculty (often a by-product of numbers), alternative opportunities, and improved quality of instruction, costs continue to rise, and particularly for those institutions which are trying to spread a relatively fixed endowment over a large number of students the problem becomes very real.

There has been the suggestion of a scheme of tax credits that would allow people buying tuition to deduct a part of the cost of that tuition from their federal taxes. Another way of saying it is to say that if one's income were large enough he could appropriate from the United States Treasury part of the cost of tuition, if he were paying tuition. Approximately $1 billion a year would either be pocketed by those who qualified, or transferred by higher tuition rates to the colleges, or used in some combination of these ways. If tuition rates are not raised, it is hard to see how colleges would benefit from this plan. The plan might become a program for the relief of middle-income families with students in college—a peculiar way to write tax legislation.

If the tuitions rise, one can foresee the result that students whose families do not pay enough taxes will find the economic barriers to college raised. To say that such people all get scholarships is certainly not true. In fact, the good scholarships do not go to the lowest economic groups. Perhaps private institutions of higher education could have a scholarship system under which tuition would be calculated at a flat price plus tax saving to the family. But I don't think this idea is feasible.

I foresee another result of the tax credit plan for education. Publicly controlled schools in which tuition is kept low by legislative appropriation would undoubtedly be under great pressure to take advantage of the tax credit by raising tuition and thus creating a further barrier to students whose parents have low incomes. I view the raising of tuition in the public colleges and universities as a very serious matter, for I believe that low tuition is the best possible form of scholarship. Low tuition requires so little administration, so few invidious comparisons, so little concern about family status, advantages, or disadvantages, that in a way it helps to make up for the nature of some of the nation's scholarship competition.

My negative approach to the tax credit idea does not solve the problem of the school that does not have access to legislative appropriations. Increasingly, ways have been found to help institutions with research support, facilities, equipment, and so forth. More recently, assistance to students has allowed private schools to raise their fees rather substantially. In the period 1956–57 to 1964–65, tuition and required fees at private institutions of higher education rose from 28 percent to 37 percent of the per capita disposable income, which was rising from $1,743 to $2,268—a rise from $495 to $831.

Loans under the National Defense Student Loan Program have been important aids to students, and now there are grants, work-study programs, and interest-free loans. It has been estimated that families who could benefit most from the tax credit proposal can benefit more from the loan program. These families can benefit, and so can the student who cannot get benefits himself, or through his family, under the tax credit program.

It seems to me that the recent enactments of the Congress in the form of student aids are more beneficial to students and to the schools than the tax credit scheme, and educators ought to be glad to forget a scheme that as a national fiscal policy seems unwise and unfair, a scheme that could set precedents for the distortion of the American tax system, and a scheme that would invite expansion into areas other than education. The scheme has a very dubious relationship to the American principle of ability to pay. It provides for a method of bypassing the appropriating authority of Congress and yet may in the long run cause Congress to look closely at the way in which privately controlled institutions of higher education set their fees.

REHABILITATION OF SUBSTANDARD HOUSING

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, Mr. Whitney Young is one of our Nation's great leaders. As executive director of the National Urban League, Mr. Young has pioneered in helping to close the racial gap in jobs, in education, and in housing. By helping disadvantaged minorities get into the mainstream of American life, he has, in fact, narrowed the gap in the fullness of living. He was in the forefront of concern about the crises in our cities long before the "urban problem" was even acknowledged by most Americans.

Mr. Young is also well known for his work in encouraging American businessmen to cooperate and work with other groups in our society to help solve many of our difficult public problems. In this regard, he has written an article which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record.

Mr. Young points out in his column, "To Be Equal," that a great opportunity exists in the slum areas for the American businessman. The nationwide market for rehabilitating America's substandard housing is estimated at over $30 billion. Mr. Young states,

> This is an enormous market, one which few companies can afford not to enter.

Mr. Young and I agree completely on this matter. This is clearly an example of how the private and the public sector can work together for the benefit of all.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chicago Defender, Aug. 20, 1966]

To Be Equal—Business' Role in Slums

(By Whitney M. Young, Jr.)

American business has a well earned reputation for efficiency and ability to turn a profit out of the most unlikely enterprise. It is also beginning to realize that with wealth comes responsibility and many companies are doing well in opening up expanded opportunities for Negro workers.

But industry has a long way to go yet before it fully lives up to its social responsibilities. Ideally American business would like to make a profit and perform a social service at the same time. Such an opportunity exists in rehabilitating slum housing.

At a time when business finds that the billions it has pumped into foreign ventures are slow in earning a fair return as start-up costs and the costs of entering a new market abroad eat into earnings, many companies might look with profit at the housing in their own back yards.

Every city in the nation has its share of dilapidated buildings, decayed with age and neglect, which house the poorest people in the city who cannot afford better. Often these slums house Negroes who can afford better but are cut off from the open market by discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. New York City alone has more than 330,000 apartments in buildings which were erected before 1901 and another 825,000 apartments almost that obsolete.

The nation wide market for rehabilitating these substandard structures could run to over $30 billion. This is an enormous market, one which few companies can afford not to enter. One major company has already done so in a well publicized project.

The U.S. Gypsum Company bought several buildings on East 102nd Street in New York's East Harlem. Using refined construction techniques, they stripped the building down to its outer walls and then rebuilt the interior—clean, modern apartments. When one building was finished, they moved on to the next, thus avoiding large-scale disruption of the neighborhood. Three-fourths of the new apartments were rented to the tenants who lived there before.

Of course rents went up, but the tenants were certainly getting more for their $80 than they were for $40. The new owners also hired a project manager who made it clear that repairs would be made and that the buildings would not be allowed to lapse into their original state.

This concern was transmitted to the tenants who take great pride in their new homes, thus proving that it is neglect by slum landlords that breeds neglect on the part of tenants. The company expects to turn an 8 per cent profit on the program, and the benefit to the city is that at least one slum block is on the upgrade.

Similar projects run by non-profit groups backed by federal mortgage insurance are also under way. One such, on 114th Street in Harlem, helped explode the myth that such rehabilitation projects are useless because slum tenants will destroy the new improvements. After eight months of occupancy they are as fresh as the day they were first occupied.

When landlords demonstrate concern for their property and provide tenants with the services for which they pay rent, tenants will keep buildings in their original state. It is when people pay hard earned dollars for rat infested dwellings that despair reigns and they no longer care about anything other than sheer survival.

When the potential profits of slum rehabilitation begin to sink in and companies take advantage of this new opportunity a new face will be put on the nation's slums. This is clearly a case where the self-interest of profit seeking can combine with the social responsibilities of corporate citizens to upgrade the communities from which they earn their livelihood, for the benefit of all.

This is of course, no panacea for the nation's housing ills. But expanded business interest in housing rehabilitation, a national fair housing policy which forbids discrimination in the sale or rental of homes and apartments, a determined program of building offices, cultural centers, and other huge civic developments in the ghetto, the rent subsidy program, large-scale building of low-income housing, and other devices must be used in tandem to change the shameless housing situation afflicting our cities.

TAX CREDIT FOR EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on February 6, 1967, I introduced a bill (S. 835) to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education. I requested the Library of Congress to prepare a table showing the dollar benefit of the credit at certain State universities and land-grant colleges. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dollar benefit of Ribicoff tax credit bill on tuition, fees, and books at State universities and land-grant colleges, 1966–67

	Resident			Nonresident		
	Tuition, fees, and books	Dollar benefit of tax credit	Percent benefit of tax credit	Tuition, fees, and books	Dollar benefit of tax credit	Percent benefit of tax credit
Alabama A. & M. College	$410	$203	49.5	$560	$231	41.3
Auburn University	450	213	47.3	750	250	33.3
University of Alabama	500	225	45.0	850	260	30.6
University of Alaska	387	197	50.9	522	227	43.5
Arizona State University	436	209	47.9	1,651	340	20.6
University of Arizona	419	205	48.9	1,234	298	24.1
Arkansas A. & M. College	350	188	53.7	620	237	38.2
University of Arkansas	350	188	53.7	620	237	38.2
University of California	370	193	52.2	1,350	310	23.0
Colorado State University	486	222	45.7	1,161	291	25.1
University of Colorado	522	227	43.5	1,270	302	23.8
University of Connecticut	340	185	54.4	740	249	33.6
Delaware State College	388	197	50.8	738	249	33.7
Florida A. & M. University	350	188	53.7	750	250	33.3
University of Florida	410	203	49.5	810	256	31.6
Florida State University	410	203	49.5	810	256	31.6
Fort Valley State College	471	218	46.3	801	255	31.8
Georgia Institute of Technology	525	228	43.4	1,215	297	24.4
University of Georgia	483	221	45.8	903	265	29.3
University of Hawaii	383	196	51.2	383	196	51.2
University of Idaho	360	190	52.8	860	261	30.3
Southern Illinois University	392	198	50.5	782	253	32.4
University of Illinois	420	205	48.8	1,000	275	27.5
Indiana University	480	220	45.8	1,110	286	25.8
Purdue University	480	220	45.8	1,100	285	25.9
Iowa State	495	224	45.3	1,080	283	26.2
University of Iowa	490	223	45.5	1,080	283	26.2
Kansas State University	438	210	47.9	838	259	30.9
University of Kansas	442	211	47.7	842	259	30.8
Kentucky State College	390	198	50.8	730	248	34.0
University of Kentucky	430	208	48.4	970	272	28.0
Louisiana State University	370	193	52.2	770	252	32.7
University of Maine	550	230	41.8	1,150	290	25.2
University of Maryland	516	227	44.0	916	267	29.1
Maryland State College	355	189	53.2	505	226	44.8
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	2,050	325	15.9	2,050	325	15.9
University of Massachusetts	486	222	45.7	886	264	29.8
Michigan State University	504	225	44.6	1,170	292	25.0
University of Michigan	498	225	45.2	1,150	290	25.2
University of Minnesota	525	228	43.4	1,071	282	26.3
Alcorn A. & M. College (Mississippi)	341	185	54.3	541	229	42.3
Mississippi State University	492	223	45.3	942	269	28.6
University of Mississippi	500	225	45.0	940	269	28.6
Lincoln University (Missouri)	300	175	58.3	500	225	45.0
University of Missouri	500	225	45.0	1,000	275	27.5
Montana State College	516	227	44.0	1,123	287	25.6
Montana State University	525	228	43.4	1,133	288	25.4
University of Nebraska	484	221	45.7	1,010	276	27.3
University of Nevada	506	226	44.7	1,100	285	25.9
University of New Hampshire	686	244	35.6	1,331	308	23.1
Rutgers (New Jersey)	678	243	35.8	914	266	29.1
New Mexico State University	486	222	45.7	936	269	28.7
University of New Mexico	486	222	45.7	942	269	28.6
Cornell University	1,950–2,100	325	15.5–16.7	1,950–2,100	325	15.5–16.7
State University of New York	575	233	40.5	775	253	32.6
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College	500	225	45.0	752	250	33.2
University of North Carolina	459	215	46.8	884	263	29.8
North Carolina State University	507	226	44.6	932	268	28.8
North Dakota State University	510	226	44.3	954	270	28.3
University of North Dakota	510	226	44.3	954	270	28.3
Kent State (Ohio)	660	241	36.5	1,110	286	25.8

Dollar benefit of Ribicoff tax credit bill on tuition, fees, and books at State universities and land-grant colleges, 1966–67—Con.

	Resident			Nonresident		
	Tuition, fees, and books	Dollar benefit of tax credit	Percent benefit of tax credit	Tuition, fees, and books	Dollar benefit of tax credit	Percent benefit of tax credit
Miami University (Ohio)	$670	$242	36. 1	$1, 170	$292	25. 0
Ohio State University	600	235	39. 2	1, 158	291	25. 1
Wayne State University	462	216	46. 8	900	265	29. 4
Ohio University	650	240	36. 9	1, 150	290	25. 2
Langston University (Oklahoma)	401	200	49. 9	732	248	33. 9
Oklahoma State University	438	210	47. 9	886	264	29. 8
University of Oklahoma	438	210	47. 9	886	264	29. 8
Oregon State University	480	220	45. 8	1, 050	280	26. 7
University of Oregon	480	220	45. 8	1, 050	280	26. 7
Pennsylvania State University	600	235	39. 2	1, 200	295	24. 6
University of Puerto Rico	309	177	57. 3	309	177	57. 3
University of Rhode Island	503	225	44. 7	1, 103	285	25. 8
Clemson University (South Carolina)	636	239	37. 6	1, 136	289	25. 4
South Carolina State College	470	218	46. 4	950	270	28. 4
South Dakota State College	537	229	42. 6	893	264	29. 6
State University of South Dakota	529	228	43. 1	865	262	30. 3
University of Tennessee	420	205	48. 8	870	262	30. 1
Prairie View A. & M. College (Texas)	304	176	57. 9	604	235	38. 9
Texas A. & M. University	374	194	51. 9	674	242	35. 9
Texas Technical College	300	175	58. 3	594	234	39. 4
University of Texas	294	174	59. 2	594	234	39. 4
Utah State University	432	208	48. 1	789	254	32. 2
University of Utah	525	228	43. 4	840	259	30. 8
University of Vermont	725	248	34. 2	1, 725	348	20. 2
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	570	232	40. 7	990	274	27. 7
Virginia State College	597	235	39. 4	777	253	32. 6
University of Virginia	602	235	39. 0	1, 187	294	24. 8
University of Washington	495	224	45. 3	975	273	28. 0
Washington State University	495	224	45. 3	975	273	28. 0
West Virginia University	404	201	49. 8	1, 034	278	26. 9
University of Wisconsin	475	219	46. 1	1, 200	295	24. 6
University of Wyoming	495	224	45. 3	1, 111	286	25. 7

JOHN DAVIS LODGE ISSUES REPLY TO TOM WICKER ON TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my office has been supplied a copy of the highly effective and persuasive reply which John Davis Lodge has written to a recent article written by Tom Wicker and published in the New York Times. I have been authorized to have printed in the RECORD the reply written by the former Governor of Connecticut and American Ambassador to Spain. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the reply, written by John Davis Lodge, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 30, 1967.

Mr. TOM WICKER,
New York Times Bureau,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WICKER: Recalling our pleasant meeting a few short years ago, I am writing to you with respect to your skillfully written "In the Nation" column of last Sunday, May 28th, entitled "Bridges or Betrayals". I read it with interest and some dismay.

I wish that I could share your assumption that East-West trade at this time of mortal conflict is a sign of progressivism. Surely, had we helped Germany with such trade during World War II, that would not have been regarded as a liberal gesture on our part. It may be contended that Russian military forces are not engaged in combat against us as was the German military machine. Yet that is hardly a reason why we should give them the added advantage of receiving aid in the form of trade from the United States while they are supplying 80% of the arms to Hanoi, i.e: all the petroleum, all the MIGS, all the SAM missiles, all the anti-aircraft weapons and all the sophisticated weapons. The fact that the Russians are not losing blood in Vietnam as we are does not, I would suppose, constitute a reason why we should help them to convert a large segment of their economy to supplying North Vietnam with arms with which to kill Americans. In time of war it becomes fanciful to endeavor to distinguish between strategic and non-strategic items.

Is Communism really less deadly than Nazism? David Ben Gurion, the retired Premier of Israel, doesn't seem to think so. Upon arriving in the U.S. earlier this year he said, if I remember correctly, that the Russians have been doing to the Jews spiritually what the Germans did physically . . . This is a strong statement and I gather that it comes from personal experience.

Surely the Russian Communist support of Nasser in his declared desire to destroy the State of Israel hardly gives evidence of a sincere wish for "peaceful coexistence." The United Nations, with our help and backing, created the State of Israel. My late grandfather, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, introduced the resolution in 1922 which underscored our support of the Balfour Declaration that Palestine should become a National Home Land for the Jews.

In 1948 when my brother, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., was a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and I was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, we had the happy joint opportunity of helping to bring to fruition our grandfather's statesman-like vision. Israel celebrated its 19th anniversary this May.

Why is it "moderate" for the U.S. to help Russia with East-West trade at this time of great danger for our gallant friends in Israel, essentially an outpost of the Western Alliance? Why, Mr. Wicker?

If the war in Vietnam were a declared war, surely we would not be helping Hanoi by credits to Russia and by trade. Doesn't it really seem rather quixotic to penalize ourselves in this fashion for not declaring war while young Americans are drafted to fight the war?

There is, as far as I know, no reliable evidence that the Russians have altered their original objective of world domination. For them the concept "peaceful coexistence" seems to be a tactic, not an objective. If they really desire a detente, they can achieve it by stopping military assistance to Hanoi, to Cairo, and to Havana. Since North Vietnam has very limited industrial capacity, this would measurably shorten the war and thereby reduce the tragedy of American casualties.

The thought of a nuclear halocaust is so dreadful to contemplate that it is tempting to indulge in the wishful thought that the Russians must feel about it as we do and therefore we must build bridges to lessen the tension. Winston Churchill reminded us repeatedly that it was only our nuclear superiority which held the Russians at bay. He described the Russians as our "self-styled enemies". Our nuclear superiority has been steadily declining. It is not nearly as great as it was in 1962 at the time of the Cuban missile crisis. Many responsible and knowledgeable Americans are in great doubt as to whether our nuclear threat will be effective when the next missile crisis occurs.

While Secretary of Defense McNamara and General Wheeler, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, are in open disagreement about the need for an anti-ballistic missile system, the Russians have an ABM system around Moscow and 26 Russian cities. They have an ever-increasing family of offensive nuclear weapons. Our nuclear superiority has descended from a ratio of 8 to 1 when President Eisenhower left office to a ratio of 2 to 1 today. It is estimated that at this time next year parity will have been achieved. Perhaps the Russians are counting on our fear of nuclear destruction to enable them to prevail in the world struggle by non-nuclear means. Their ambition is conquest; ours is peace. In that way, we Americans would have a kind of peace under Russian conquest.

In the grim light of Russian advances in supersonic aircraft and in nuclear potential against the background of the war in Vietnam and the crisis in the Middle East, I venture the thought that they have won a great victory in the so-called battle for men's minds. They have somehow persuaded the New York Times and others that it is the sign of an evolved and sophisticated intellect to believe, in spite of all the mass of evidence to the contrary, that the Russians' real objective, like that of the U.S., is not conflict—not victory—not conquest, but peace.

I hope that you will request the editor of the New York Times to publish this letter.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN DAVIS LODGE.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, while I have not had an opportunity to read the

Wicker article entitled "Bridges or Betrayals," I can positively and emphatically state that I fully agree with Mr. Lodge when he states:

> It may be contended that Russian military forces are not engaged in combat against us as was the German military machine. Yet that hardly is a reason why we should give them the added advantage of receiving aid in the form of trade from the United States while they are supplying 80% of the arms to Hanoi; i.e., all the petroleum, all of the MIGS, all of the SAM missiles, all of the anti-aircraft weapons, and all of the sophisticated weapons. The fact that the Russians are not losing blood in Vietnam as we are does not, I would suppose, constitute a reason why we should help them to convert a large segment of their economy to supplying North Vietnam with arms with which to kill Americans.

In addition, Mr. President, I certainly concur with Mr. Lodge when he says:

> In time of war it becomes fanciful to endeavor to distinguish between strategic and non-strategic items.

In my opinion, the most incredible and indefensible factor in the entire approach of the Johnson administration to the conduct of this war and the selection of the various options open to it in endeavoring to bring it to a successful and early conclusion, is its stubborn insistence on encouraging even additional programs of trading with the enemy in this time of war. Surely, by making additional war weaponry available to the Communists of North Vietnam, we are not moving in the direction of either peace or victory in Vietnam.

Consequently, Mr. President, it is encouraging to witness the formation and rapid growth of CEASE—the Committee To End Aid to the Soviet Enemy—which was recently organized and of which John Davis Lodge is the National Chairman. CEASE reports that it is now in the process of procuring more than two million signatures to petitions urging the Johnson administration to prevent all shipments of American supplies to Russia so long as that fountainhead of communism continues to supply the weapons of war which are prolonging the conflict in Vietnam and expanding the lists of American casualties which are already escalating so alarmingly.

CEASE has its national headquarters at 1061 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. Voluntary contributions from those desiring to assist CEASE with its effective crusade should be sent to that Washington address, as should all correspondence offering to assist with the circulation of these nationwide petitions.

Among the sponsors and directors of CEASE are such renowned and highly regarded Americans as Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy, retired; former U.S. Senator William F. Knowland, of Oakland, Calif.; former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Arthur Radford, U.S. Navy, retired; Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, U.S. Army, retired; and a growing list of many other distinguished citizens and military authorities.

Citizens frequently write in to ask, "What can I, a private citizen, do to help promote peace and to help bring the Vietnam war to an early and successful conclusion?" CEASE offers an answer to those earnest citizens who want to have a part in ending this senseless and suicidal policy of selling and shipping supplies to the enemy which serve to help Russia step up its already substantial shipments of war weapons to be used to kill and maim our American troops in Vietnam.

Those seeking a fat profit from wartime trade with the enemy have their lobbyists working feverishly in Washington to continue this bizarre business of supplying the Russian industrial complex with what it needs so it can concentrate on stepping up shipments of weapons to be used against us in Hanoi but once the people of America fully understand the cruel results of such traffic in blood, I am confident that through CEASE and other avenues of expression they will insist that the Johnson administration reverse its policies in this connection. When that happens, we shall be well along the path of finding means to bring the Communists in Hanoi to the negotiating table.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA—A HALF CENTURY'S RETROSPECT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Alaska, the centennial of whose purchase we are celebrating this year, has come a long way since that historic occurrence, 100 years ago, which was due to the great vision of William Henry Seward, Secretary of State in President Lincoln's and President Johnson's Cabinets.

But for the first 92 years under the American flag Alaska was a stepchild in the national family, the victim of discrimination and neglect by a distant Federal Government without precedent or parallel in our history. That is why the people of Alaska began a quarter of a century ago to engage actively in the struggle for statehood. Since this was achieved 9 years ago, Alaska has taken on a new lease in life.

In particular, the University of Alaska is on its way to becoming an institution of higher learning of national and indeed, prospectively, of international importance. It is serving not only the people of Alaska in its undergraduate courses, but is becoming the foremost national institution for the study of arctic and subarctic conditions, needs and problems. In this role, which in America it alone can, because of its location, adequately fulfill, it will assume responsibilities vital to our Nation's future. It is already doing much in this field.

How far this northernmost American institution of higher learning has progressed since its arduous beginnings may be deduced from an interesting address concerning the university's founding half a century ago, delivered recently by William R. Cashen, professor of mathematics at the university.

I ask unanimous consent that the address entitled "50 Years Ago Today," delivered by Professor Cashen, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY YEARS AGO TODAY

(By William R. Cashen)

President Wood, Governor Hickel, Members of the Board of Regents, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

Delegate James Wickersham's role in securing Congressional legislation extending provisions of the Land-Grant College Act to Alaska in March of 1914, and the subsequent laying of the Cornerstone on the Fourth of July of that year is well and fully told by Wickersham himself in his Cornerstone Address and in his diary, as well as by the local press.

The Dedication and opening of the College in September 1922 is equally well recorded in issues of the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner of that time and in early issues of the Farthest-North Collegian.

Less well-known is the story of the actual birth of the University—May 3, 1917—the 50th Anniversary of which we are observing today. Let us turn back the pages of history those fifty years and see what was happening at that time.

With Congress willing to grant Alaska both a building site and additional lands and monies for the support of a land-grant college, the next step was up to the Third Territorial Legislature, meeting in March, 1917 in Juneau. On March 17, Dan Sutherland, a senator from the Fourth Division who listed Poorman as his residence, introduced a bill to accept the land granted in the Act of March 4, 1915, and create a corporation under the name of the Alaska Agricultural College and School of Mines in the Tanana Valley.

The bill also provided that the Governor appoint a Board of Trustees to organize the College, and appropriated $60,000 for the purpose of constructing necessary buildings and for the purchase of necessary equipment.

The man who sponsored this Senate Bill 15, Dan Sutherland, has been somewhat of a forgotten man in University history, although he worked closely with Andrew Nerland, Luther C. Hess, and E. B. Collins in the early legislative struggles for appropriations. A Nova-Scotian by birth, Sutherland was a commercial fisherman in Salem, Massachusetts, before joining the Gold Rush of 1898. He mined on the Koyukuk and at Nome, Council, Ophir, Cleary Creek and the Iditerod before running as a Republican candidate for the Senate of the First Territorial Legislature in 1912. He was re-elected in 1916 for a second four-year term. When Wickersham announced he would not seek re-election as Delegate to Congress in 1920, Sutherland filed for that office and was elected. He served ten years in the Congress and then retired, taking up residence in Pennsylvania. The Office of Delegate, incidentally, passed back to James Wickersham, who served until 1932. It seems probable that Senator Sutherland introduced Senate Bill 15 at the request of his good friend, Delegate Wickersham.

The Legislature in early territorial days consisted of four Representatives and two Senators from each of the four Judicial Divisions, thus giving the House 16 members and the Senate eight.

The Senate in 1917 had trouble in selecting a president; several roll calls each day failed to resolve a 4 to 4 deadlock. Finally on the tenth day, O. P. Hubbard, a lawyer from Valdez, was elected.

Internal organization was only one of many vexing problems confronting the Legislature of 1917. On April 6, the United States Congress and President Wilson declared war on Germany and the Central Powers. In Juneau the local Elks held a patriotic parade through the business district, Douglas staged a patriotic rally, the call went out for volunteers, and home guards started to organize. On April 13 Edward Krause, a convicted murderer, sawed through the bars of the Federal Jail and escaped—throwing the towns of Gastineau Channel into panic until he was shot by a rancher on Admirality Island three days later. Then on April 23 another major disaster struck. The famous Treadwell Mine across the channel on Douglas Island—at the moment the second greatest gold mine in the world—and employing a thousand men (among them my father, Thomas Cashen, a mine blacksmith and my grandfather, Nicholas King, a mill foreman)—caved in. Mining at extreme depths under the floor of the channel, a miscalculation in what ore could safely be removed, resulted in a major flood; so severe in fact that not only the underground operations, but many of the surface structures collapsed as the ground underneath caved in.

With the nation at war and the Territory's largest gold producer in complete ruin, it is small wonder that the House Ways and Means Committee had misgivings about starting a college.

Senate Bill 15 had come to the floor of the Senate on April 13 with a "do pass" recommendation from the Committee on Finance, and the Senate passed the bill six to one. President Hubbard sent it on to the House, where it was referred to the Ways and Means Committee. This committee recommended to the House that the question of establishing a college be placed as a referendum to the voters in the general election of 1918. There was much debate, but finallly on April 26 the House decided not to accept the Committee's recommendation and to vote on Senate Bill 15. It passed by a one vote margin, nine to seven. On the "ayes" side, and strongly supporting the bill throughout the debate, were Andrew Nerland and the Speaker of the House, Luther C. Hess, both of Fairbanks.

Having passed both the Senate and the House, the bill went to the Governor, J. F. A. Strong, for his signature or veto. On May 3, 1917, he signed Senate Bill 15 creating the Alaska Agricultural College and School of Mines, which eighteen years later became the University of Alaska.

But Governor Strong was less than enthusiastic about Senate Bill 15. In a statement accompanying the bill as it was transmitted back to the secretary of the Senate, he wrote:

"I desire, however, to say that I have approved this bill solely because it provides a means of insuring higher education for the youth of Alaska, and is therefore a progressive educational measure. But on the other hand, I feel that the measure is immature, in that the time is not opportune for the construction of suitable buildings for an institution of that kind. The bill proposes an expenditure of $30,000 during the present calendar year, presumably in the construction of buildings, etc., but it is submitted that in view of the lack of ample transportation facilities of the Interior and the added fact that the building should be substantial and permanent in character, and the further lack of suitable building material such as cement and brick, it would be advisable to defer such construction until building material and supplies of various kinds can be secured at fair prices—something impossible at this time. . . ."

The Governor went on to say that the appropriation appeared inadequate for the job intended and that few students could be expected until the Alaska Railroad, then under construction, was completed. He closed by saying,

"Although I have pointed out the above objections, I do not believe they would justify me in vetoing this bill, in view of the fact that it is a measure of potential importance to the people of the Territory and that it has been approved by a majority of the elected representatives of the people, to whose judgment I feel that I should bow in these circumstances; and for the added fact that I have always been a consistent advocate of the policy of giving to the children of Alaska, who are growing up in the Territory and upon whom the future government of the Territory will devolve, the best educational facilities that can be reasonably provided for them."

That was the way it was, fifty years ago today.

A LIFE OF SERVICE LEADS TO RED CAP

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is with the greatest of pleasure and pride for my Commonwealth that I call to the attention of the Senate the elevation of three Pennsylvanians to cardinal in the Roman Catholic Church.

Those so honored by Pope Paul VI are Cardinal Patrick A. O'Boyle, of Washington, a native of Scranton, Pa.; Cardinal Francis J. Brennan, who was born in Shenandoah, Pa.; and Cardinal John J. Krol, of Philadelphia.

I ask consent of the Senate to insert into the Record an article by John M. Cummings which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Thursday, June 1, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Life of Service Leads to Red Hat

(By John M. Cummings)

Since his arrival in Philadelphia from Cleveland in 1961 Archbishop John J. Krol's popularity and personality have penetrated every section of his vast arch-diocese. Now, as one of 27 Cardinals recently appointed by Pope Paul VI, his fame as a churchman has spread throughout the country and in fact the world at large.

The son of Polish-born parents, the Cardinal-designate is not only revered by the thousands of Catholics in his immediate jurisdiction, but prelates and laity of other faiths have come to honor him for his interest in the public welfare.

John J. Krol came to Philadelphia from Cleveland where he was Auxiliary Bishop at the time of his promotion and transfer to the largest city in Pennsylvania. Indeed, he was one of three from this State named to receive the Red Hat and thus qualify to sit in the inner councils of the Roman Catholic Church. Designated for the Cardinalate, along with Krol, were Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle, of Washington, a native of Scranton, and the Most Rev. Msgr. Francis J. Brennan, who is stationed in Rome. His birthplace is Shenandoah. Thus the church claims two for elevation to Cardinal who were born in the anthracite section of Pennsylvania. Krol, although a native of Ohio, qualifies as a Pennsylvanian.

It is to be noted that one of Cardinal Krol's friends and admirers in Philadelphia is Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, of the Methodist Church. Krol has also worked in close union with Rabbi Harold B. Waintrup, president of the Board of Rabbis of the Greater Philadelphia area.

Cardinal Krol will be the third to serve in the Cardinalate in the Philadelphia diocese. His immediate predecessor was John Cardinal O'Hara, who succeeded on the death of Dennis Cardinal Dougherty.

The Red Hat which the newly named Cardinals will receive from the Pope at ceremonies in Rome is not intended for ordinary wear. On his arrival home with this, the signet of his office, the new Cardinal will place the Red Hat on the high altar in his church.

To rise to Cardinal in the Roman Catholic Church is no ordinary feat. Years of education and work go into the preparations that lead to the Red Hat.

Gratitude and humility are characteristic of Philadelphia's new Prince of the Church. He said so in his humble way in his first interview, in the Barclay Hotel, after his elevation to Cardinal had been announced.

"My nomination by his Holiness Pope VI to the rank of Cardinal is a humbling experience." As he said this he looked back over the long years of study and work that have gone into the designation. He was grateful not only to Pope Paul, but "I am grateful," he continued "for the many acts of kindness to me by the non-Catholic community. I ask all for prayers that this new honor may redound to the spiritual welfare of all for whom I have pastoral responsibility."

Service is a word frequently uttered by the new Cardinal. He has devoted a life-time to the service of his church and the people under his pastoral direction.

If you would know what it takes to become a Cardinal look over the milestones in the life of John J. Krol as listed in Tuesday's Inquirer. There you will find as the rungs of a ladder—work, study, study, work. Over and over you discover the young priest bent on reaching the top. Even eligibility for the office of Pope is not denied him. But there can be only one Pope. There can be many Cardinals.

DEATH OF CARL ESTES, LONGVIEW, TEX.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], who is necessarily absent, I have been asked to make the following statement, which he has prepared:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER, READ BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I was deeply shocked and saddened to learn of the death late Monday of Carl Estes, of Longview, Tex. He was a newspaper publisher of great conviction, ability, and dedication who did more for east Texas than any of us ever will be able to repay.

I have long admired his courage and shall be eternally grateful for his friendship.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record brief remarks about his life and death, as published in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Carl Estes, Publisher

Longview, Tex.—May 30.—Carl Lewis Estes, 70, publisher of the Longview Daily News and Longview Journal and one of the Nation's foremost newspapermen and industrial developers, died at 10:30 p.m. yesterday.

He suffered a heart attack at his vacation home in La Jolla, Calif.

The publisher and his wife left Longview April 18 on a business and vacation trip to California.

One of the most colorful and dynamic personalities to emerge on the Texas scene in many decades, Mr. Estes was known throughout the Nation because of his work in the newspaper, industrial and political fields.

He gained prominence by championing the cause of the independent oil operator. After discovery of the East Texas oil field, he kept the trail hot between his East Texas headquarters and the State capital at Austin and Washington.

Mr. Estes also led the movement to have the Federal Government turn over the Army's big Harmon General Hospital at Longview to R. G. Letourneau for the establishment of the Letourneau Institute, a school to train war veterans and others for various jobs.

HANDLING OF ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], who is necessarily absent, I have been asked to make the following statement, which he has prepared:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER, READ BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Technology Week magazine's editor, Mr. William J. Coughlin, has written an editorial in his May 15 edition which, I believe, gives voice to many of the worries and uncertainties that many Americans feel about the Defense Secretary's handling of the antiballistic missile development program.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record and commend it to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On Walking Softly

It isn't quite unanimous.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff believe this nation should have an anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system. Committees of both the Senate and House believe this nation should have an ABM system. The Secretary of the Army agrees. The Secretary of the Air Force agrees. The Secretary of the Navy agrees.

The Secretary of Defense disagrees. His stand is one of commitment to talks with the Soviets in hope of heading off an arms race by convincing the Russians they should dismantle the ABM system they are building.

There are so many fallacies in Mr. McNamara's position it is little wonder everyone around him is disagreeing with him.

Perhaps the foremost and most dangerous, because of the implications it holds for our nation's entire defensive posture vis-a-vis the Soviets, is the Secretary's belief that the power of his logic will force the Russians to cease and desist. He is so convinced that the building of ABM systems by both nations is ill-advised that he is certain he can make the Soviets see this if they will just talk to him.

We don't know how many Russians Mr. McNamara knows, but we have some news for him. The Russians don't trust him. Since he is head of the American military establishment, they are inclined to regard his statements as something less than the word of Marx. When he tells them something is good for them, they are less than overwhelmed by his generosity in making the news available.

That is a major stumbling block. But it is far from the only one. Much more dangerous is Mr. McNamara's hope that he can talk the Russians out of doing something they already are doing by promising that the U.S. will continue to do nothing.

The Soviets must be smiling slyly at the naivete of suggesting that kind of horse trade.

Even worse is the fact that the Soviet willingness to discuss the matter is billed as a great victory for the McNamara viewpoint. What else would the Soviets do? They are busily engaged in the building of an ABM system to protect their nation and to readjust the balance of power in their favor. If a series of protracted conferences with Mr. McNamara can delay initiation of the *Nike-X* system while deployment of the Soviet ABM continues, it is hardly surprising that the Russians are willing to talk.

We are rapidly nearing the end of a six-month period since President Johnson and Secretary McNamara revealed that they were postponing initiation of *Nike-X* production in an effort to engage the Russians in an ABM detente. We suggest that setting of a deadline to Mr. McNamara's nonsense is a must.

The very inactivity of the U.S. program will encourage the Soviets to continue discussions while stepping up their own ABM deployment. Every week that goes by widens the gap.

If Mr. McNamara expects the Russians ever to give serious consideration to his arguments, he should pass the word immediately to start deployment of a U.S. ABM. Only when such work is underway will the Soviets begin to think seriously about what he is proposing. And while they are considering it, they will not have the advantage of improving their military position by taking part in the discussions.

The need for an early and public deadline was made apparent by the qualifications of each of the service secretaries in voicing their support for *Nike-X* deployment. Air Force Secretary Brown referred to deployment if the talks "do not succeed." Army Secretary Resor used the phrase, "if these negotiations do not lead to a satisfactory settlement." Navy Secretary Nitze made his support "subject to the results of the negotiations with the Soviet Union."

Another argument by the Secretary of Defense that leaves us cold is his belief that allowing the Russians to redress the balance of power will ease tensions in the world. He has made it apparent he feels the world will be much better off if the Soviet Union is permitted to bring its offensive ICBM strength up to a level more equitable with that of the U.S. Attainment of such a position of offensive parity can also be achieved, of course, by alteration of the defense positions of the two nations.

Our worry stems from the fact that the Soviets have shown themselves to be much more sensible in pursuit of national interest than Mr. McNamara has. He is going so far in the opposite direction, as a matter of fact, that we anticipate his whole attitude on this topic one day becoming the subject of a Congressional investigation.

The difficulty lies in the fact that the Russians have shown no intention of stopping when they reach parity nor is there any reason for believing they will do so. They may, in fact, already have passed that point. You may recall that Mr. McNamara was basing his actions of several years ago on the belief that he could convince the Soviets that inferior ICBM strength was good for them and the world.

Now that he has failed to get that word across, he is pressing for an equal balance of power. If he stays around long enough, we expect to hear Mr. McNamara someday patiently explaining at a Pentagon backgrounder why the world is better off if the U.S. is in an inferior military position to the Soviets.

We sympathize with Mr. McNamara's thesis that a nuclear holocaust is so horrible to contemplate that the nations capable of bringing it about must take steps to prevent it. But this opens a trap for the internationalist into which Mr. McNamara has fallen. National interest still is a major force in the world.

Walk softly and carry a big stick is still good advice. It should also carry the reminder that on occasion national interest requires doing something other than walking softly. If there is then no big stick, all the U.S. will be able to do on such occasions is to continue walking softly—into subjugation.

If President Johnson wants Mr. McNamara to work on the problem of easing international tensions, he should name him Secretary of State. Then he should name a Secretary of Defense who will protect the national interest against the mistakes of the Secretary of State.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], who is necessarily absent, I have been asked to make the following statement, which he has prepared:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER, READ BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Mr. Seth Kantor, whom I regard as among the most talented and professional newsmen covering Washington, has recently written a penetrating, skillful series of three articles about the Federal Housing Administration.

These articles appeared concurrently in the El Paso Herald-Post, the Albuquerque Tribune, and the Fort Worth Press. Similar shorter articles were published by other Scripps-Howard newspapers across the country, such as the Washington Daily News.

I commend these articles to the attention of the Senate, particularly Senators who are charged, as I am, with special responsibilities in the field of housing and urban affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the three articles be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Herald-Post, May 16, 1967]

FHA Has Modern Front, Dilapidated Operation

(This is an exclusive three-part series on FHA problems in general and Texas and New Mexico in particular.—The Editor.)

(By Seth Kantor)

Washington, May 16.—The Federal Housing Administration puts up a modern front and behind it is a dilapidated collection of 19th Century operating procedures.

Robert N. Jones, the FHA's deputy assistant commissioner for multifamily housing, puts it this way:

"We have a system which takes us 12 months to process a case. It takes us three months just to say 'no' to somebody. We desperately need a system to reduce losses—to avoid the large claims we've experienced in the past couple of years."

The case of Campus Associates of San Bernardino, Calif., thrown out this year as operators of the high-rise Birkley apartments in downtown Fort Worth, is a classic example of the bureaucratic gumbo that the FHA walks around in.

Nov. 5, 1965, the FHA "sold" the 233-unit building to Campus Associates for $750,000. The property had been worth $2 million.

Under terms of the deal, Campus Associates put up $22,500, signed a note for $727,500 and was allowed to wait nine months to make its tax payment on the Birkley.

As it turned out, Campus Associates never made a payment and the FHA foreclosed this year, buying the property back from itself for $675,000.

How did the California group, a holding organization formed in 1965 for Campus Crusaders for Christ, happen to get the Fort Worth property?

"I steered them to it," J. Guy Arrington, an FHA official, said yesterday. In 1965 he was head of the FHA's property disposition committee. "We usually always sell properties on a competitive basis, but we can negotiate with non-profit organizations."

Arrington says he is "fuzzy" about the details, but Campus Associates "came to us," looking for a deal. "There was a soft market in Fort Worth. There was a surplus of properties in the area. We felt we could take the Birkley off the market."

Made up of seven top FHA officials, the property disposition committee approved Campus Associates without taking another bid because the religious group "held properties in other states and other nations," said Arrington, adding:

"We had never heard of them before, so I guess they were more thoroughly checked out than any other organization we ever dealt with."

But when one asks questions about what states and what countries have successful properties held by Campus Associates, Arrington shrugs.

"Once the property disposition committee made its decision," he said, "the Campus Associates file moved on to the multifamily division. We don't have access to that file any more."

But the multifamily people at FHA can't tell you anything about Campus Associates because once foreclosure proceedings were begun, the file moved on to the legal department. The legal department refers you to the Justice Department.

The FHA doesn't even have so much as an index card to show other Campus Associates properties. Things can only be looked up by case number. Never by name.

It is common information at FHA—that Campus Associates got hold of the Birkley in Fort Worth because it had a couple of successful projects in Arizona.

But records show that the California organization took over the Arizona properties—the 183-unit Sierra Catalina Vista and the 124-unit Imperial Gardens, both in Tucson—in September, 1965, only two months before it took over the Birkley there was no record of successful management in Tucson.

Records further show that Campus Associates couldn't make a go of it in Tucson, either, losing money there, the group unloaded the two apartment houses last fall, selling them to Turtle Creek properties of Tucson, Inc., which operates out of Indianapolis. Both properties are thriving now.

Earlier this year the Justice Department said it would sue Campus Associates in Texas. Then the suit was withdrawn because the organization was not incorporated in Texas.

But federal lawyers have had third thoughts. The attorney general's office said yesterday the U.S. will file suit against Campus Associates after all, for money owed and damages.—Seth Kantor.

[From the Albuquerque Tribune, May 17, 1967]

THE FHA EXPERIENCE WITH PARK PLAZA IN ALBUQUERQUE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Seth Kantor, Tribune Washington Correspondent, has made a study of FHA activities in the apartment house field. Today's story is the second on a three-part series. Yesterday's story dealt with the experiences of FHA in handling an apartment house project in Fort Worth. Today's discusses an Albuquerque project.)

(By Seth Kantor)

WASHINGTON, May 17.—The way has been cleared by the Federal Housing Administration for M. M. Hardin of Albuquerque temporarily to keep operating his high-rise apartment house—even though foreclosure proceedings have been begun against him for failure to pay his creditors.

Hardin built the 151-unit Park Plaza Apartments near Downtown Albuquerque in 1963, along with a pair of bigtime El Paso builders, Charles H. Leavell and Dan Ponder.

FHA INSURED

The El Pasoans owned 55 per cent of the new landmark on the New Mexico skyline. The New Mexico State Investment Council loaned the trio $2.8 million to put up the building and the FHA insured the deal.

Subsequently, Ponder died. Hardin later became full owner of the Park Plaza.

By Feb. 24, 1967, Hardin's mortgage was declared in default by the State Investment Council. He still owed the state agency $2.8 million. He had paid $14,747 on the principal.

GRANTED DEFERRALS

Hardin had been granted 18 months of deferrals, amounting to $53,000, on interest payments.

Without checking with the State Investment Council Hardin had transferred ownership of the Park Plaza last Dec. 22 from himself as an individual to himself as a corporation, and was applying for another six-month deferral in interest payments. That automatically caused the default, the investment council ruled.

In a private letter to State Instrument Officer Robert G. Mead on May 4, the FHA said it is treating the date of Hardin's default as last Sept. 1, which was more than two-and-a-half months before Hardin's "automatic default."

Private negotiations are under way now by the FHA and the investment council to settle the FHA's pay-off in debentures to the state agency, in exchange for the mortgage.

The investment council now can transfer the Park Plaza deed to the FHA, in lieu of foreclosure, and Hardin could be designated by the FHA as operator of the apartment house, with the FHA serving as lender.

NO PERSONAL LOSS

Under that arrangement, Hardin wouldn't lose any of the money he has invested.

So far, the FHA here reports that "there has been nothing irregular" in Hardin's conduct of Park Plaza financial affairs. But the Justice Department is expected to move in to investigate, when and if foreclosure action becomes final, "in order to protect the government's interests."

Ordinarily, there is no federal agency in Washington more aloof from the government than the FHA—when it wants to be.

OWN RESERVE FUND

Salaries and operating expenses of the FHA, a division of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) come from the FHA's own pool of reserve money.

The reserve now totals about $1.1 billion, according to an FHA spokesman, and it initially comes from the half-per cent interest rate charged to millions of FHA-insured individuals and groups in the nation. The reserve is invested in government bonds.

When losses are sustained by the FHA—such as when mismanagement causes a foreclosure—the money comes from the reserve pool and is not paid for out of the federal budget.

TRANSACTIONS PRIVATE

FHA officials tell you that with privately gathered funds to operate on, the agency doesn't have to make public its transactions with clients.

But the FHA invokes Title 18, Sec. 1905 of the U.S. Code, which forbids release of information that could adversely affect a person or corporation doing business with a federal agency.

The FHA denies that politics ever plays a part in its decisions.

[From the Fort Worth Press, May 18, 1967]

FHA IMPROVES PLAN FOR ELDERLY HOUSING

(By Seth Kantor)

WASHINGTON.—When an employee of the Federal Housing Admn. commits a blunder, the running gag inside the agency is that the offender will be banished to "Title Seven."

Title Seven of the federal act setting up the FHA 33 years ago calls for establishment of investment yield insurance—and is so complicated that it hasn't been brought into existence even yet.

It typifies the pace at FHA, where an intensive, internal study has been under way—a "critical review," they call it—for the past three years on the FHA's housing for the elderly program.

What's been learned so far?

As one FHA expert answered it:

"Rents have been too high in this program because building costs are high. The risks of the program are high because the average age of the renter is 72.

"When you get into a market study of the elderly, you find they buy one pork chop instead of five. We have learned a lot."

They have done that in just three years.

But, through trial and error in the field, the FHA has been developing a far more substantial program for the elderly than it had five years ago when Christian Homes Inc., was put up on the edge of Fort Worth.

The 343-unit, $3.4-million Christian Homes spread was the "most spectacular of all flops" in the housing for the elderly program, an FHA official shuddered. "We use it as our prime example of failure.

"We were misled at Fort Worth. We didn't check out enough of the facts. It was typical of our attempts to service the elderly market in an all-too-optimistic manner."

Another $3.4 million housing for the elderly project on the edge of Fort Worth, St. Francis Village, has become controversial now, behind scenes at the FHA.

The Third Order of St. Francis, sponsor of the project, hasn't made a payment on the principal yet. Some interest payments have been made. The project was opened in 1965.

Two months ago, regional FHA director Adrian Henderson denied one public report that St. Francis Village was facing foreclosure procedures.

"They're doing marvelously out there," Henderson insisted to a newspaper reporter, about the progress at St. Francis. But at FHA headquarters here, Henderson encountered stone faces.

Privately, April 27, a toughly worded letter was sent to Henderson from headquarters, setting up May 10 as the absolute deadline for a final "firm, acceptable proposal" for the Third Order of St. Francis to run its project in a business-like way or get out.

May 10 came and went, of course.

Henderson scheduled yesterday, a week after the dire deadline, for the showdown. That was all right with FHA officials here. They are not exactly in a hurry to come to grips with mistakes.

One of the most classic sleepy-time approaches to business by the FHA occurred during the Kennedy administration at old Cape Canaveral, Fla.

It was a military-impacted area. Servicemen came and went. FHA analysts couldn't bring themselves to approve a request for a 1000-unit project.

Finally, when the space launching site was clearly, visibly booming, the experts saw the need. They okayed the project. But by then private builders were jumping into the same market with 5000 units.

As a result, everybody lost. But that's not a new story with the FHA.

LAKE ERIE CANAL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the administration has included in its fiscal year 1968 budget request an item of $2 million for the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal. In order for this canal to ever be built, Public Law 89–72 requires that local cooperation and financial participation be assured.

The following letter from Gov. Raymond P. Shafer, Pennsylvania, and two editorials make it abundantly clear that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania does not now intend to support authorization, construction, maintenance, or operation of the canal. It would therefore be a waste of the taxpayers' money to appropriate another $2 million for this project.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and two editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER FROM GOV. RAYMOND P. SHAFER TO LT. GEN. WILLIAM F. CASSIDY

In accordance with your letter of March 15, 1967, we have reviewed the proposed Report of the Chief of Engineers together with the pertinent papers on the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, Pennsylvania and Ohio.

In your letter you infer that since Congress appropriated $500,000 in Fiscal Year 1967 to initiate preconstruction planning of the project in accordance with the Report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated September 7, 1966, that the project authorization requirements as set forth in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1935, have been met. We take issue with any statement concerning the authorization of the project which was recommended by the District Engineer in January 1965 and concurred in with certain changes by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on September 7, 1966. We feel that there is no Congressional authorization for the canal, the only thing approaching a Congressional authorization is embodied in the Act of August 30, 1935, C. 831, 49 Stat. 1028, 1035. In an opinion dated May 25, 1940, Robert H. Jackson, then Attorney General of the United States, advised the President of the United States that the Act of 1935 was no longer effective to permit the Corps of Engineers to proceed with any work on the project because of substantial changes in the plans on which the provisional approval contained in the Act of 1935 was based. Consequently, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania strenuously objects to the premise that the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, as now proposed, has been approved by Congress.

It is alleged that the canal will open a new passage from the Ohio River to Lake Erie. Proponents of the canal system foresee a revitalization of industry along the canal. However, we do not concur with these views. At the present time, and for the foreseeable future, we have adequate transportation facilities to haul all types of commodities between the Ohio River and Lake Erie. This vast and diversified transportation system has never been taxed to the limits of its capabilities and readily provides facilities for transporting all the commodities considered for water transportation in the report. Since these existing traffic systems can provide the necessary facilities for transportation of all commodities, we cannot see any justification for the expenditure of over One Billion Dollars in order to provide additional water transportation facilities which are not needed. The plan requires that local interests assume approximately $95,000,000 of the first costs for the project. In addition to the original capital costs for the project, the expenditures by the local governments for operation and maintenance will be considerable and continuous. We are not in a position to assume any of these costs.

Our analysis of the cost data indicates that the costs for construction and operation and maintenance of the canal system have been under-estimated, whereas the benefits of the system have been over-estimated. In view of the geological formations to be encountered along the proposed route of the canal, it would appear that construction costs would be in excess of those which have been indicated in the report. During operation of the project, considerable funds will have to be expended for maintenance of channel banks and removal of depositions from the channel. Operation and maintenance costs for these items appear under-estimated. While we do not agree with the costs estimates for construction, operation and maintenance, or with the figures presented for benefits to be derived from the project, such objections may indeed be more academic than real since the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is unwilling to provide any of the local cooperation required for the project.

Whether or not the project has been or may hereafter be authorized by the Congress, we are convinced that the project is so wholly devoid of merit that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will not provide any of the local cooperation required for the project. So that there is no misunderstanding concerning our views on the project, you are advised that we will not furnish the following listed assurances:

a. The Commonwealth will not provide to the United States any lands, easements or rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent operation and maintenance of the project.

b. The Commonwealth will not hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction, operation and maintenance of the project.

c. The Commonwealth will not bear any costs associated with the bridge alterations over the existing channels of the Beaver, Mahoning and Grand Rivers.

d. The Commonwealth will not assume any obligations for operation and maintenance or for replacing any railroad or highway bridges required to be altered or constructed as a part of the multipurpose project.

e. The Commonwealth will not provide any assurances for the construction and maintenance of terminal and transfer facilities along the waterway and at the Lake Erie terminus.

f. The Commonwealth will not accomplish any utility relocations and alterations occasioned by the project.

g. The Commonwealth will not agree to any restrictions concerning the withdrawal of water for consumptive use.

h. The Commonwealth will not provide any funds required for construction or operation and maintenance of the facilities which are subject to cost sharing under Public Law 89–72.

Since the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania does not and will not support authorization, construction, maintenance or operation of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, we feel that all planning on the project should be suspended, and we urge that funds which were included in the President's 1968 Fiscal Year Civil Works Budget for advanced engineering and design should not be appropriated.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, May 31, 1967]

BILLION-DOLLAR DITCH DOOMED

No one can possibly misunderstand either the meaning or the inevitable result of Gov. Raymond P. Shafer's official refusal of Pennsylvania support for the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal.

The "Billion-Dollar Ditch" simply cannot be built without Pennsylvania's participation in the interstate project.

Gov. Shafer has made it clear that this State not only declines to co-operate in the canal program but actively opposes it. The only question remaining is whether the Federal Government will continue to squander time and money on the doomed project.

The Johnson Administration's proposed budget for the next fiscal year contains $2 million for planning the canal, but Gov. Shafer's blunt statement leaves no doubt that this money would be wasted if Congress approves the appropriation.

"The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will not provide any of the local co-operation required for the project," Mr. Shafer declared. "Pennsylvania will do absolutely nothing to help build the canal."

Although the Governor's statement of policy is the most crushing blow, previous developments already had indicated the plan was beyond hope for everyone except the most avid—and unrealistic—promoters of the costly boondoggle.

In response to an inquiry, U.S. Steel Corp. declared it would continue to use railroads, rather than the canal, to ship its ore. Consolidation Coal Co. reported that "we do not anticipate that any significant amount of our coal would move through the proposed canal." Thus, two of the largest shippers are not prospective customers of the canal.

Also previously, in a poll answered by 21,336 people, 62 per cent of Ohioans who live near the northernmost portion of the proposed route reported they opposed the canal. Only 28 per cent favored it. It is clear that opposition to the canal is not confined to Pennsylvania.

In debating the Administration's request for $2 million to plan the canal, Congress may take into consideration a recent statement by Chairman Wilbur D. Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee. Instead of the $8.1 billion deficit planned by President Johnson for next year, the deficit might run as high as $29.2 billion, Rep. Mills said.

Rejection of the canal appropriation will indicate that Congress is truly concerned about the Government's alarming budget crisis and the growing burdens of U.S. taxpayers.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, May 30, 1967]

BLOW TO BIG DITCH

Governor Shafer is to be commended for his categorical refusal to have anything to do with construction of that scandalous boondoggle, the proposed billion-dollar Lake Erie-Ohio River canal.

The Federal Bureau of the Budget announced recently that it will not recommend funds for construction of the canal until affected local interests give firm assurances of cooperation. After review by the Bureau, a report by the Army Engineers and the views of the states and agencies will be sent to Congress.

Pennsylvania's views, as expressed by Governor Shafer, should do much to discourage further action on this project. He has assured the Army Engineers that Pennsylvania, in which much of the canal would be built, will do everything in its considerable power to block construction.

This is saying a great deal. It means that the Commonwealth will contribute nothing in money, right-of-way, bridge alterations, water rights or anything else it might do to advance the canal.

In view of this opposition by one of the two states most heavily involved, we do not see how Congress can in good conscience spend more planning funds. The funds should be cut off. Far too much money has already been wasted on this pork-barrel scheme promoted by Rep. Michael Kirwan, of Youngstown. Governor Shafer's strong and timely condemnation of the canal should help prevent further waste of tax dollars.

THE PRESIDENT'S DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PLAN FOR PROGRESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, President Johnson has taken a major step toward creating progressive and effective government for the 800,000 residents of the District of Columbia. The President's reorganization plan for the District of Columbia government is a historic step forward in bringing the District into the mainstream of modern urban government.

I warmly endorse this reorganization plan. I believe that short of home rule itself, this plan offers District of Columbia residents their best hope of having a government responsive to the needs of a growing, dynamic city.

The President has wisely recomended replacing the current three-man Board of Commissioners with a single Commissioner. The need for such a change is self-evident in a democratic society where clear-cut responsibilities are vested in popularly elected officials.

Rule by committee is alien to our way of life. And although true representative democracy will be missing in the District of Columbia until home rule becomes a reality, the President's plan provides the best possible alternative.

It is important to note that the administration will insist that the Commissioner reside in the District, and that members of the nine-man Council, serving as a quasi-legislative body, must be residents of the District for at least 3 years prior to their appointment.

These requirements will insure District of Columbia residents of a government that is both familiar and sympathetic to their needs.

This Congress knows well that modern America is urban America. Nearly 70 percent of all Americans now live in our urban centers. Most of our problems with housing, traffic congestion, unemployment, pollution, and social unrest are found in our sprawling urban centers. And the District of Columbia is America's fastest growing urban center.

We must do everything possible to insure that the District has a governmental framework that is best suited to meeting the needs of modern city life. I believe the President has developed such a framework. Short of home rule itself—the best of all possible solutions—this reorganization plan will be a great step forward in the development of a democratic District government.

I urge my colleagues of the 90th Congress to support the President's reorganization plan to bring a new era of progress to the Nation's Capital City.

SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA RECEIVES APPROPRIATE COMMENDATION FOR COAL AND SULFUR OXIDES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDING

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a deserved editorial of commendation was published in the May 26, 1967, editions of the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser centering on the diligent efforts and the success of our colleague from West Virginia, Senator Robert C. Byrd, with respect to the funding of Federal programs for coal research—especially coal to gasoline—and for research on the removal of sulfur oxides from the fumes of coal and oil combustion as part of the air pollution abatement activities authorized under the Clean Air Act.

In both of these vital areas of activity, our colleague's interests and goals parallel mine and it is a pleasure and a privilege to join the able editor of the Advertiser, Wendell Reynolds, in commending the zeal and perseverance applied by Senator Byrd in his advocacy of adequate appropriations to forward the project to produce gasoline from coal on a commercial scale and to speed research on sulfur oxides in the interest of reducing air pollution.

Yesterday, our colleague placed in the Record, by unanimous consent, his cogent remarks at Cresap, W. Va., May 27, on the occasion of the dedication of the coal-to-gasoline conversion plant there. That plant is operated for the Office of Coal Research of the Department of the Interior under a contract with Consolidation Coal Co., a subsidiary of the Continental Oil Co., under funding principally and successfully sponsored during the past few years by Senator Byrd. The editorial in the Huntington Advertiser was in the issue published on the eve of the plant dedication.

I am grateful to my colleague for having pointed out in his speech that when a Member of the House of Representatives in the 1930's and 1940's, I had been a pioneer sponsor with the late Senator Joseph O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, of legislation authorizing and directing research programs for the development of synthetic liquid fuels from coal and oil shale. These early wartime activities provided some basis for the modern research and development moving along so well at Cresap, with Senator Byrd so helpful to its progress.

It is pleasing to note also that the Huntington Advertiser editorial made timely reference to the $4.5 million included in the fiscal 1967 supplemental appropriation measure agreed on in Senate-House conference 2 days earlier. The record is clear that Senator Byrd was the prime mover in our Appropriations Committee and in the Senate for augmentation of the $3.6 million originally provided in the fiscal 1967 supplemental bill for air pollution abatement research to center on the removal of sulfur oxides from combustion and stack processes in the burning of coal and oil in power-generating plants and others.

In this same connection, both as a Senator from the coal-producing State of West Virginia and as chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, I have been dedicated to the acceleration of research in order to improve the abatement technology as we strive for air pollution control. In a letter to the President of the United States on January 16, 1967, I wrote, in part, as follows:

> Dear Mr. President: In the State of the Union message to the 90th Congress, you admonished that "We should vastly expand the fight for clean air with a total attack on pollution at its sources. . . ." I agree, and I recommend the purposefulness of that statement. It is my hope that we resort to the same definition "sources" on which to center pollution abatement attention.
>
> I feel that we must avoid economy-destroying actions while seeking to develop technology at the maximum rate of capability.
>
> There should be emphasis on developing new fuel burning methods and equipment, as well as stepped up efforts to find ways to screen out or trap or absorb the harmful and offensive smoke stack gasses and particulate emissions as means to the end of materially minimizing air pollution and eliminating it in every possible area. These are the affirmative types of activities on which government and industry should be centering much attention because, without such actions, regulations and criteria for air pollution control will be virtually unaccomplishable and relatively unrealistic.
>
> We know that there is much being done in research to improve technology bearing on air pollution. Sulfur oxide problems are being attacked—but not enough. The automotive manufacturers and the petroleum industries obviously are centering more attention on efforts to achieve low emission vehicles—but is the effort being expended at the maximum rate of capability? Our Senate Public Works Committee has a specific schedule of inquiries in this particular field, and I hope we will find more progress and more reason for optimism than is publicly apparent.
>
> There seems to be a substantial emphasis by the air pollution control policy-makers and administrators on limiting sulfur oxide emissions—even more so than on other gasses and on particulates. And there appears to be a tendency to rush regulation proposals and criteria development and dissemination faster than technology can be brought to bear on possible solutions to problems which perhaps bar compliance with the proposed regulations and standards (criteria). Fuel supply and energy distribution chaos, as well as sharp upward thrusts in the cost of living index due to consumer fuel and energy cost increases, could be direct results of precipitous programs to outlaw all but very low sulfur fuels or all but those not emitting sulfur oxides. Hasty restrictions might even create severe fuel and energy shortages and safety hazards in some areas.
>
> So, Mr. President, I urge that there be the earliest possible emphasis placed on research and development directed toward achieving substantial break-throughs in the technology or entrapment and possible recovery of sulfur in the stacks, especially those of the coal or oil burning electric generating plants. In the interest of expediting such a course of action, I suggest that a larger role be assigned to the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior and that the Bureau be funded for such purpose as promptly as possible to proceed on a full capacity basis.
>
> I am an advocate of air pollution control, but I believe it must be a progressive movement accomplished in an orderly and realistic manner. We must not inflict dislocation and chaos on substantial elements of our economy if they demonstrate cooperativeness but are held back by technology gaps. I know that clean air will be expensive to achieve but we must be careful not to make inordinate increases in the cost of living index. The real answers to air pollution abatement will be found in regulations and criteria kept in balance with technology and supply.
>
> It is recommended, Mr. President, that we make an inventory of technological shortcomings which inhibit in substantial degree the accomplishment of a condition of clean air and that we make vigorous efforts to advance more rapidly in the field of technology bearing on air pollution control. It is my feeling, based on information available, that there is a capability in the Bureau of Mines to accelerate the research and development of methods to trap sulfur oxids emissions in stacks and possibly to capture usable sulfur—which is in short supply. This is doubtless only one of numerous areas on which technological emphasis should be placed in the interest of abating air pollution—but it is a critical area and a sensitive pressure point at which to begin a more adequately

financed and more aggressive effort to achieve clean air.

Mr. President, in later conversations with the President of the United States, with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as with U.S. Public Health Service authorities, and during hearings last month by our Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, I have been convinced of their cooperative attitudes and of their sincerity of purpose in moving for acceleration of research to improve the state of the art as relates to air pollution abatement—especially regarding the sulfur oxides on which so much criteria and regulatory attention are being focused.

In fact, I understand that as a direct result of the increased funds for this research provided in the fiscal 1967 Supplemental Appropriations Act, officials of the U.S. Public Health Service administering the air pollution control research program are currently in pertinent and timely conversations and possible negotiations with officials of the U.S. Bureau of Mines looking toward some of the actions I suggested in my letter of January 16 to President Johnson in commenting on his state of the Union message to the 90th Congress. I am gratified and encouraged.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the editorial to which I have been making reference in commendation of Senator BYRD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Huntington Advertiser, May 26, 1967]

BYRD'S COAL RESEARCH FUNDS OPENING DOORS TO PROGRESS

Continuing efforts of Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D-WVa) to provide more federal funds for needed coal research programs are brightening prospects for progress in at least two important directions.

In one field new developments promise success of efforts to produce gasoline from coal on a commercial scale. The door to this development is expected to open with the dedication of the new research facility at Cresap, W. Va., Saturday.

Sen. Byrd sponsored this project and obtained appropriations for it. He will deliver the dedicatory address. Secretary of the Interior Udall also will speak on a program that can mark an epochal step in opening a vast new market for coal and in revolutionizing the gasoline production industry.

In another field—that of air pollution abatement—Sen. Byrd was successful Wednesday in winning conference committee approval of a $4.5-million supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1967 to finance coal research under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Although this was substantially below the $6.775 million additional incorporated into the Senate bill on Sen. Byrd's amendment, it was almost a million dollars more than the $3.6 million originally provided in the appropriation bill. Sen. Byrd was a member of the conference committee and led the fight for the larger amount.

These funds for HEW research on the removal of sulphur dioxide from the fumes of coal combustion are expected to be supplemented by an additional $450,000 that Sen. Byrd was able to insert in the Interior Department appropriations bill.

This money would be used to expand research by the Bureau of Mines on removing sulphur from coal.

Sen. Byrd has also announced that he will seek an appropriation for the full amount of the previous authorization for such research under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare during fiscal 1968.

The importance of finding means of reducing air pollution from coal combustion has been emphasized by the announcement of sulphur dioxide emission limits under the Public Health Service of the HEW Department.

Without accelerated research programs to enable coal to meet the requirements, not only will the mining industry suffer loss of markets. The electric generating facilities will be unable to obtain sufficient fuel for their needs.

The critical national condition that could result was pointed out by Sen. Byrd in an address on the Senate floor the other day.

"Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, the director of the Bureau of Mines," he declared, "has recently warned that the low-sulphur coal required to meet the recommendations of HEW of New York, Chicago and Philadelphia are just not available."

Sen. Byrd also quoted from a recent presidential message emphasizing the need of speeding research to reduce air pollution and announcing that additional funds would be requested for the work.

He underscored the urgency of the need of additional funds when he declared:

"I believe that this nation can have clean air without destroying the nation's coal and petroleum industries, but this accomplishment can only be achieved if we engage upon a crash program now to remove sulphur from coal and oil prior to combustion of the fuels and also to remove sulphur oxides from stacks prior to emission into the atmosphere."

While these problems were holding official attention, "Project Gasoline" at Cresap took on high new significance from the zinc chloride development that will reduce the cost of producing gasoline from coal by one to one and a half cents a gallon.

Provision has not yet been made to include the zinc chloride work in the pilot plant at Cresap, but it is expected to be.

Alterations necessary for the work will require about six million dollars spread over two or three years. Sen. Byrd sought an additional $1.5 million on top of $2.5 million in this year's allocation, but the amount was over the budget estimate, and the committee did not accept the amendment.

The government has filed an application for a patent on the zinc chloride development, and ultimately all the results will be in the public domain.

This is expected to hasten the acceptance of the process by private industry and the construction of commercial plants.

The pilot plant is expected to convert 24 tons of coal a day into gasoline. It will determine the process and the equipment alternatives which could enable a full-scale plant to be designed and built as a commercial venture.

"If the coal-to-liquid conversion program is successful, as it promises to be," Sen. Byrd said, "it would supplement for years to come our liquid hydrocarbon reserves and should reduce the refinery rack price of gasoline in time under what it might otherwise be.

"If the savings are as slight as one cent a gallon, the liquid fuels program would by 1980 save the American public approximately $2.5 billion annually, and the benefits would continue to increase with expanding fuel demand."

Location of the plant in West Virginia through the efforts of Sen. Byrd should encourage the development of commercial operations within the state.

This not only would greatly increase the demand for coal but would further stimulate the economy by creating new jobs in the plants themselves.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 2:03 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair).

READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN VETERANS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, is the House message on S. 16 reported to the Senate at this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, it is not.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask that it be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 16 for its disposition. The clerk will report.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 16) to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

SENATE VERSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senate will recall that in February, it unanimously passed S. 16 as approved by the Committee on Finance. This bill, sponsored by 73 Senators, would extend wartime benefits to Vietnam veterans who serve during the "Vietnam era"—the period commencing on August 5, 1964, the Gulf of Tonkin incident, and ending on a date to be determined by Presidential proclamation. It would insure that boys serving their country during this "hot" wartime period would receive, among other benefits, full compensation for any service-connected injuries or illness, pensions for non-service-connected disabilities and death, a $250 burial allowance and, if severely disabled, a $1,600 automobile allowance. The total first year cost of this measure was a modest $9.7 million. An identical bill, S. 3580 was passed by the Senate in the 89th Congress but failed to receive final consideration in the House.

HOUSE VERSION

Subsequently, in March, when the House had occasion to consider and pass S. 16 in amended form, they not only enlarged upon the basic Vietnam benefits, but broadened the scope of the bill to include, among other items, general pension benefits and educational allowance increases. The House also added a number of miscellaneous matters, one of which they have sent to the Senate during each of the last six Congresses.

VIETNAM BENEFITS ENLARGED

In its action, the House adopted August 5, 1964, as a service date qualifying veterans for three wartime benefits—namely, wartime rate of compensation for service-connected disabilities, $250 burial allowance, and pension for nonservice-connected disabilities and death. The remaining benefits, heretofore reserved to those serving their country during war, were extended to those veterans serving after January 31, 1955.

Thus, so-called cold-war veterans would be eligible for drugs and medications, certain medical benefits, a service-connection presumption for psychotic conditions, as well as a $1,600 automobile allowance, if badly disabled. The House also deleted the termination provision for "Vietnam era" benefits except for pension. Thus, for the future, no distinction remains in these benefits for wartime and peacetime service and a precedent is established for possible pension payments to any service personnel—not just those risking their lives and future in a "hot and shooting" war. These House amendments increase the cost of S. 16 $4.7 million over the Senate version.

PENSION BENEFITS

The House added amendments to S. 16 which provide an overall 5.4 percent cost-of-living increase for 1.4 million veterans, widows, and children receiving pensions under the "new" pension law. The other pension amendments would provide $5 monthly increases in Spanish-American War widows and prior war widows benefits from $65 to $70 and in the "housebound" rate from $35 to $40; and would establish a new $100 "housebound" allowance for old-law pensioners, together with a new $50 widows aid and attendance allowance. Other additional provisions would provide presumption of disability at age 65, certain income exclusions, additional aid and attendance assistance in furnishing therapeutic devices, authority to pay higher pensions to elderly aid and attendance veterans, and reduction of 5-year alternative marriage requirement to 1 year. The total first year cost of these pension provisions of the House is $107 million.

PRIOR HOUSE ACTION, H.R. 17488

With the exception of the provisions dealing with discretionary authority for payment of higher pensions, and income exclusion for military retired pay, the additional House amendments are identical to House provisions of H.R. 17488, which was passed by the House last year during the 89th Congress. The Committee on Finance approved H.R. 17488 after deleting those provisions which broadened the old pension program, since it was the intention of Congress to phase out this old program. The first year cost of the Senate version of H.R. 17488 was $98 million. However, because of the lateness of the session, H.R. 17488 died on the Senate Calendar.

EDUCATIONAL ALLOWANCE INCREASES

The House also added amendments to S. 16 which would increase the present GI monthly educational allowance under the "GI bill of rights" from $100 to $130 for a single veteran, from $125 to $155 for a veteran with one dependent, and from $150 to $175 for a veteran with two or more dependents. The House amendments would also authorize full educational payments to educationally disadvantaged veterans, so that they may complete high school without losing their eligibility for full college benefits. These additional House provisions increase the first year cost by $110 million.

MISCELLANEOUS HOUSE AMENDMENTS

Finally, completing its omnibus veterans bill, the House added, first, an anatomical loss provision which would provide $47 a month for each loss of a member or organ in addition to the basic rate of compensation; second, a burial flag provision which assures survivors of a deceased veteran that a flag would be furnished when the deceased is buried at sea or his remains are not located; and third, a war orphans training provision which would extend the present age limit of 23 to 26 for such individuals to receive educational assistance.

These additional House features will cost $4.6 million during the first year.

OVERALL COST OF HOUSE VERSION OF S. 16

Thus the aggregate total first year cost of the House bill for its pension, Vietnam, educational allowance, and miscellaneous benefits is $236.4 million, that is, S. 16, as amended, and presently pending before the Senate.

S. 9, THE COLD WAR GI BILL AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Just last week the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported S. 9 which improves and broadens the present GI bill.

SIMILAR TO S. 16, AS AMENDED

S. 9, in line with the House version of S. 16, provides the same increases in the monthly educational allowances. It goes further, however, and provides an additional $10 per month for each dependent in excess of two. Hence, a veteran, who is pursuing a full-time course of college instruction and who has four dependents, would receive the basic rate of $175, plus $10 each for his additional two dependents for a total monthly benefit of $195. S. 9, as S. 16 amended, also contains high school education benefits for the educationally disadvantaged veteran.

BROADER PROVISIONS OF S. 9

S. 9 would broaden the present GI program to include education benefits for on-the-job, on-the-farm and flight training. It would also increase a veterans entitlement benefit from 1 to 1½ months of schooling for every month of service. In addition, S. 9 authorizes a $1 reporting payment to be made for each enrolled veteran to educational institutions required to submit reports.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO S. 16

Mr. President, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, has expressed the hope of his subcommittee as well as his own personal wish, that the provisions of S. 9, as approved, be made part of the pending bill, S. 16.

In line with this request, and that of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, I have prepared an amendment which not only incorporates the provisions of S. 9 but also the provisions of H.R. 17488, as approved by the Senate Finance Committee last year. Further, my proposed amendment restores the original version of S. 16 as passed by the Senate this year.

Mr. President, I send to the desk this amendment and ask that it be read.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the House to the text of the bill, insert the following:

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967'.

"TITLE I—PENSION BENEFITS

"ENLARGING WIDOW'S ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

"SEC. 101. (a) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of sections 302(a), 404, 532(d), 534(c), 536(c), and 541(e), title 38, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

" '(2) for one year or more; or

" '(3) for any period of time if a child was born of the marriage, or was born to them before the marriage.'.

"(b) Subsection 103(a), title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'cohabitated with him for five or more years immediately before his death,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'cohabited with him for one year or more immediately before his death, or for any period of time if a child was born of the purported marriage or was born to them before such marriage,'.

"PERMANENT AND TOTAL DISABILITY AT AGE SIXTY-FIVE; AID AND ATTENDANCE ALLOWANCE FOR PERSONS IN NURSING HOMES

"SEC. 102. (a) Subsection (a) of section 502 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after 'disabled if he is' the following: 'sixty-five years of age or older or'.

"(b) Subsection (b) of such section 502 is amended by inserting '(1) a patient in a nursing home or (2)' immediately after 'if he is'.

"EXCLUSIONS FROM ANNUAL INCOME

"SEC. 103. (a) Section 415 (g) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

" '(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, in determining the annual income of any person for any year there shall not be included in such income the amount of any increase in monthly insurance benefits payable to such person for such year under section 202 or 223 of the Social Security Act, if—

" '(A) such increase resulted from provisions of law enacted after July 1, 1965, providing increases in the schedule of benefits under either such section with respect to one or more categories of beneficiaries under title II of such Act, and

" '(B) for the month (or any portion thereof) in which the Act containing such provisions of law was enacted, such person was entitled to (i) a monthly insurance benefit under section 202 or 223 of the Social Security Act, and (ii) dependency and indemnity compensation under the provisions of this section.'

"(b)(1) Paragraph (7) of section 503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after 'amounts paid by' the following: 'a wife of a veteran for the expenses of his last illness, and by'.

"(2) Paragraph (9) of such section 503 is amended by inserting '(A)' immediately after 'amounts paid' and by inserting the following immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof: 'or (B) by a widow or a wife of a deceased veteran for the last illness and burial of a child of such veteran'.

"(c) Section 503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'In' at the beginning of such section and inserting in lieu thereof '(a) In'; and by adding a new subsection as follows:

" '(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, in determining the annual income of any person for any year there shall not be included in such income the amount of any increase in monthly insurance benefits payable to such person for such year under section 202 or 223 of the Social Security Act, if—

" '(1) such increase resulted from provisions of law enacted after July 1, 1965, providing increases in the schedule of benefits under either such section with respect to one or more categories of beneficiaries under title II of such Act, and

" '(2) for the month (or any portion thereof) in which the Act containing such provisions of law was enacted, such person was entitled to (A) a monthly insurance benefit under section 202 or 223 of the Social Security Act, and (B) pension under the provisions of this chapter, or under the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959.'

"PENSION INCREASES FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT

"SEC. 104. (a) The table in subsection (b) of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

" 'Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than—	but Equal to or less than—	
	$600	$104
$600	1,200	79
1,200	1,800	45'.

"(b) The table in subsection (c) of such section 521 is amended to appear as follows:

" 'Column I		Column II	Column III	Column IV
Annual income		One dependent	Two dependents	Three or more dependents
More than—	but Equal to or less than—			
	$1,000	$109	$114	$119
$1,000	2,000	84	84	84
2,000	3,000	50	50	50'.

"(c) Subsection (e) of such section 521 is amended by striking out '$35' and inserting in lieu thereof '$40'.

"PENSION INCREASES FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF WARS BEFORE WORLD WAR I

"SEC. 105. Sections 531, 532(a)(2), 534(a)(2), and 536(a) of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by striking out '$65' and inserting in lieu thereof in each such section '$70'.

"PENSION INCREASES FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT

"SEC. 106. (a) The table in subsection (b) of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

" 'Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than—	but Equal to or less than—	
	$600	$70
$600	1,200	51
1,200	1,800	29'.

"(b) The table in subsection (c) of such section 541 is amended to appear as follows:

" 'Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than—	but Equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$86
$1,000	2,000	67
2,000	3,000	45'

"(c) Subsection (d) of such section 541 is amended by striking out '$15' and inserting in lieu thereof '$16'.

"PENSION INCREASES FOR CHILDREN OF DECEASED VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT

"SEC. 107. Subsection (a) of section 542 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out '$38' and '$15' and inserting in lieu thereof '$40' and '$16', respectively.

"AID AND ATTENDANCE ALLOWANCE FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF ALL PERIODS OF WAR

"SEC. 108. (a) Subchapter III of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" 'WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF ALL PERIODS OF WAR

" '§ 544. Aid and attendance allowance

" 'If any widow who is entitled to pension under this subchapter is in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly rate of pension payable to her under this subchapter shall be increased by $50.'

"(b) The analysis of such subchapter III, after the heading of such chapter, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" 'WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF ALL PERIODS OF WAR

" '544. Aid and attendance allowance.'

"THERAPEUTIC AND REHABILITATIVE DEVICES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

"SEC. 109. Subsection (b) of section 617 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'to any veteran' and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'to any veteran in receipt of pension under chapter 15 of this title based on need of regular aid and attendance.'

"TITLE II—ADDITIONAL READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 201. (a) Paragraph (11) of section 101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(11) The term "period of war" means the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, the Vietnam era, and the period beginning on the date of any future declaration of war by the Congress and ending on the date prescribed by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.'

"(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" '(29) The term "Vietnam era" means the period beginning August 5, 1964, and ending on such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.'

"ELIGIBILITY FOR PENSION

"SEC. 202. (a) Subsection (a) of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(a) The Administrator shall pay to each veteran of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era, who meets the service requirements of this section, and who is permanently and totally disabled from non-service-connected disability not the result of the veteran's willful misconduct or vicious habits, pension at the rate prescribed by this section.'

"(b) Such section is further amended by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

" '(g) A veteran meets the service requirements of this section if he served in the active military, naval, or air service—

" '(1) for ninety days or more during either World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era;

" '(2) during World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era, and was discharged or released from such service for a service-connected disability;

" '(3) for a period of ninety consecutive days or more and such period ended during World War I, or began or ended during World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era; or

" '(4) for an aggregate of ninety days or more in two or more separate periods of service during more than one period of war.'

"(c) The catchline of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '§ 521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era'.

"(d) Subsection (a) of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(a) The Administrator shall pay to the widow of each veteran of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era who met the service requirements of section 521 of this title, or who at the time of his death was receiving (or entitled to receive) compensation or retirement pay for a service-connected disability, pension at the rate prescribed by this section.'

"(e) Paragraph (1) of subsection (e) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) before (A) December 14, 1944, in the case of a widow of a World War I veteran, or (B) January 1, 1957, in the case of a widow of a World War II veteran, or (C) February 1, 1965, in the case of a widow of a Korean conflict veteran, or (D) before the expiration of ten years following termination of the Vietnam era in the case of a widow of a Vietnam era veteran; or'.

"(f) The catchline of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 541. Widows of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam era veterans'.

"(g) Subsection (a) of section 542 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'or the Korean conflict' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era'.

"(h) The catchline of section 542 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 542. Children of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam era veterans'.

"(i) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"'521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict.'

and substituting in lieu thereof

"'521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era.';

by striking out the subheading

"'World War I, World War II and the Korean conflict'

and substituting in lieu thereof

"'World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and the Vietnam era';

by striking out

"'541. Widows of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans."

and substituting in lieu thereof

"'541. Widows of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam era veterans.';

and by striking out

"'542. Children of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans.'

and substituting in lieu thereof

"'542. Children of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam era veterans.'

"(j) Chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code is amended by striking out the subheading 'WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT' immediately preceding section 541 of such title, and substituting in lieu thereof 'WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, THE KOREAN CONFLICT, AND THE VIETNAM ERA'.

"PRESUMPTION; DRUGS AND MEDICINES

"SEC. 203. (a) Section 602 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 602. Presumption relating to psychosis

"'For the purposes of this chapter, any veteran of World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era who developed an active psychosis (1) within two years after his discharge or release from the active military, naval, or air service, and (2) before July 26, 1949, in the case of a veteran of World War II, or February 1, 1957, in the case of a veteran of the Korean conflict, or before the expiration of two years following termination of the Vietnam era in the case of a Vietnam era veteran, shall be deemed to have incurred such disability in the active military, naval, or air service.'

"(b) Subsection (h) of section 612 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(h) Any veteran who as a veteran of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era is receiving increased pension under section 521(d) of this title based on need of regular aid and attendance may be furnished drugs or medicines ordered on prescription of a duly licensed physician as specific therapy in the treatment of an illness or injury suffered by the veteran.'

"SPECIALLY EQUIPPED AUTOMOBILES

"SEC. 204. (a) Section 1901(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'World War II or the Korean conflict' and inserting in lieu thereof 'World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era.'

"(b) Section 1905 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 1905. Applications

"'The benefits of this chapter shall be made available to any veteran who meets the eligibility requirements of this chapter and who makes application for such benefits in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator.'

"TITLE III—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

"ENTITLEMENT

"SEC. 301. Section 1661(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), each eligible veteran shall be entitled to educational assistance under this chapter for a period equal to one and a half times the duration of his service on active duty after January 31, 1955 (or the equivalent thereof in part-time educational assistance).'

"ON THE JOB, ON THE FARM, AND FLIGHT TRAINING

"SEC. 302. Section 1673 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by repealing subsection (b) thereof and striking out in subsection (c) 'of apprentice or other training on the job, any course of institutional on-farm training, or any course', and by redesignating subsection (c) as amended by this section) and subsection (d) as subsection (b) and subsection (c), respectively.

"EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ALLOWANCES

"SEC. 303. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 1682(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'Except as provided in subsection (b) or (c)(1)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Except as provided in subsection (b), (c)(1), (d), (e), or (f)', and by striking out 'column II, III, or IV' where it first appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'column II, III, IV, or V'.

"(b) The table contained in paragraph (1) of section 1682(a) of title 38, United States Code, relating to educational assistance allowances, is amended to read as follows:

" 'Column I	Column II	Column III	Column IV	Column V
Type of program	No dependents	One dependent	Twodependents	More than two dependents
				The amount in Column IV, plus the following for each dependent in excess of two:
Institutional:				
Full time	$130	$155	$175	$10
Three-quarters time	95	115	135	7
Half time	60	75	85	5
Cooperative	105	125	145	7'

"(c) Section 1682(b) of such title is amended by striking out '$100' in clause (2)(B), and inserting in lieu thereof '$130'.

"(d) Section 1682 of such title is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(d) Any eligible veteran may receive the benefits of this chapter while pursuing a full-time program of institutional on-farm training approved under the provisions of section 1777 of this title. The training assistance allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing such an approved full-time program shall be computed at the rate of (1) $110 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $125 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $145 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his training assistance allowance shall be reduced at the end of the third, and each subsequent, four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to $65 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or $80 per month, if he has one dependent, or $100 per month, if he has more than one dependent, as four months bears to the total duration of such veteran's institutional on-farm training reduced by eight months. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive a training assistance allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of such months of such training a multiple of four. The terms "program of institutional on-farm training" and "training assistance allowance" used in this subsection and section 1777 shall, for the purposes of the other provisions of this chapter and chapter 36, have the same meaning as "program of education" and "educational assistance allowance", respectively.

"'(e) Any eligible veteran may receive the benefits of this chapter while pursuing a full-time program of apprenticeship or other training on the job approved under the provisions of section 1778 of this title. The training on the job approved under the proveteran pursuing such an approved program shall be computed at the rate of (1) $80 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $95 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $115 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his training assistance allowance shall be reduced at the end of each four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to the basic training assistance allowance as four months bears to the total duration of his apprentice or other training on the job; but in no case shall the Administrator pay a training assistance allowance under this subsection in an amount which, when added to the compensation to be paid to the veteran, in accordance with his approved training program, for productive labor performed as a part of his course, would exceed the rate of $450 per month. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive a training assistance allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of months of such training a multiple of four. The terms "program of apprenticeship" and "training assistance allowance" used in this subsection and section 1778 shall, for the purposes of the other provisions of this chapter and chapter 36, have the same meaning as "program of education" and "educational assistance allowance", respectively.

" '(f) Each eligible veteran who is pursuing an approved course of flight training shall be paid a training assistance allowance to be computed at the rate of 75 per centum of the established charge which similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same flight course are required to pay for tuition for the course. If such veteran's program of education of training consists exclusively of flight training, he shall not be paid an educational or training assistance allowance under one of the preceding subsections of this section; if his program of education or training consists of flight training and other education or training, the allowance payable under this subsection shall be in addition to any education or training assistance allowance payable to him under one of the preceding subsections of this section for education or training other than flight training. Such allowance shall be paid monthly upon receipt of certification from the eligible veteran and the institution as to the actual flight training received by the veteran. In each such case the eligible veteran's period of entitlement shall be charged (in addition to any charge made against his entitlement by reason of education or training other than flight training) with one day for each $1.25 which is paid to the veteran as an education and training allowance for such course.'

"APPROVAL OF ON-THE-FARM AND ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

"SEC. 304. (a) Subchapter I of chapter 36 is amended by redesignating sections 1777 and 1778 as sections 1779 and 1780, respectively, and by inserting immediately after section 1776 thereof the following new sections:

" '§ 1777. Approval of institutional on-farm training

" 'The State approving agency may approve a course of institutional on-farm training when it satisfies the following requirements:

" '(1) The course combines organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least two hundred hours per year (and of at least eight hours each month) at an educational institution, with supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment.

" '(2) The eligible veteran will perform a part of such course on a farm or other agricultural establishment under his control.

" '(3) The course is developed with due consideration to the size and character of the farm or other agricultural establishment on which the eligible veteran will receive his supervised work experience and to the need of such eligible veteran, in the type of farming for which he is training, for proficiency in planning, producing, marketing, farm mechanics, conservation of resources, food conservation, farm financing, farming management, and the keeping of farm and home accounts.

" '(4) The eligible veteran will receive not less than one hundred hours of individual instruction per year, not less than fifty hours of which shall be on such farm or other agricultural establishment (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home-study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products.

" '(5) The eligible veteran will be assured of control of such farm or other agricultural establishments (whether by ownership, lease, management agreement, or other tenure arrangement) until the completion of his course.

" '(6) Such farm or other agricultural establishment shall be of a size and character which (A) will, together with the group-instruction part of the course, occupy the full time of the eligible veteran, (B) will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of the farm or other agricultural establishment of the type for which the eligible veteran is being trained, and will provide the eligible veteran an opportunity to apply to the operation of his farm or other agricultural establishment the major portion of the farm practices taught in the group-instruction part of the course, and (C) will assure him a satisfactory income for a reasonable living under normal conditions at least by the end of his course.

" '(7) Provision is made for certification by the institution and the veteran that the training offered does not repeat or duplicate training previously received by the veterans.

" '(8) The institutional on-farm training meets such other fair and reasonable standards as may be established by the State approving agency.

" '§ 1778. Apprenticeship or other training on the job

" '(a) Any State approving agency may approve a course of apprenticeship or other training on the job if the training establishment offering such training is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

" '(1) The training content of the course is adequate to qualify the eligible veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

" '(2) There is reasonable certainly that the job for which the eligible veteran is to be trained will be available to him at the end of the training period.

" '(3) The job is one in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon skills learned through organized training on the job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turnover.

" '(4) The wages to be paid the eligible veteran for each successive period of training are not less than those customarily paid in the training establishment and in the community to a learner in the same job who is not a veteran.

" '(5) The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than three months and not more than two years of full-time training, except that this provision shall not apply to apprentice training.

" '(6) The length of the training period is no longer than that customarily requested by the training establishment and other training establishments in the community to provide an eligible veteran with the required skills, arrange for the acquiring of job knowledge, technical information, and other facts which the eligible veteran will need to learn in order to become competent on the job for which he is being trained.

" '(7) Provision is made for related instruction for the individual eligible veteran who may need it.

" '(8) There is in the training establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training on the job.

" '(9) Adequate records are kept to show the progress made by each eligible veteran toward his job objective.

" '(10) Appropriate credit is given the eligible veteran for previous training and job experience, whether in the military service or elsewhere, his beginning wage adjusted to the level to which such credit advances him, and his training period shortened accordingly, and provision is made for certification by the training establishment that such credit has been granted and the beginning wage adjusted accordingly. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to an eligible veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the job objective.

" '(11) A signed copy of the training agreement for each eligible veteran, including the training program and wage scale as approved by the State approving agency, is provided to the veteran and to the Administrator and the State approving agency by the employer.

" '(12) Upon completion of the course of training furnished by the training establishment the eligible veteran is given a certificate by the employer indicating the length and type of training provided and that the eligible veteran has completed the course of training on the job satisfactorily.

" '(13) That the course meets such other criteria as may be established by the State approving agency.

" '(b) For the purposes of this section, the term "training establishment" means any business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under the supervision of a college or university or any State department of education, or any State apprenticeship agency, or any State board of vocational education, or any joint apprentice committee, or the Bureau of Apprenticeship established in accordance with chapter 4C of title 29, United States Code, or any agency of the Federal Government authorized to supervise such training.'

"(b) The analysis of subchapter I of chapter 36 is amended by striking out '1777' and all that follows down through 'courses.' and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '1777. Approval of institutional on-farm training.
" '1778. Apprenticeship or other training on the job.
" '1779. Notice of approval of courses.
" '1780. Disapproval of courses.'

"DELIMITING PERIOD

"SEC. 305. Subsection (c) of section 1662 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In the case of any eligible veteran who was discharged or released from active duty before the date of enactment of this sentence and who pursues a course of institutional on-farm training, apprentice or other training on the job, or flight training within the provisions of section 1682(f) of this chapter, the eight-year delimiting period shall run from the date of enactment of this sentence, if it is later than the date which would otherwise be applicable.'

"SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED

"SEC. 306. (a) Subchapter III of chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" '§ 1677. Special training for the educationally disadvantaged

" '(a) In the case of any eligible veteran who—

" '(1) has not received a secondary school diploma (or an equivalency certificate) at the time of his discharge from active duty, or

" '(2) in order to pursue a program of education for which he would otherwise be eligible needs additional secondary school training, either refresher courses or deficiency courses, to qualify for admission to an appropriate educational institution,

the Administrator may, without regard to so much of the provisions of section 1671 as prohibit the enrollment of an eligible veteran in a program of education in which he is 'already qualified', approve the enrollment of such veteran in appropriate course or courses; except that no enrollment in adult evening secondary school courses shall be approved in excess of half-time training as defined pursuant to section 1683 of this title.

"'(b) The Administrator shall pay to an eligible veteran pursuing a course or courses pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, an educational assistance allowance as provided in sections 1681 and 1682 of this chapter.

"'(c) The educational assistance allowance authorized by this section shall be paid without charge to any period of entitlement the veteran may have earned pursuant to section 1661(a) of this chapter.'

"(b)(1) The analysis at the head of chapter 34, title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after

"'1676. Education outside the United States.'

the following:

"'1677. Special training for the educationally disadvantaged.'

"(2) Section 1661(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after 'subsection (c)' the following: 'and in section 1677 of this chapter'.

"(c) Where the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds that an eligible veteran has since June 1, 1966, and prior to the enactment of this section, received educational assistance while pursuing a course or courses of education to which he would have been entitled under section 1677, without charge to entitlement, he may restore to the veteran any period of entitlement expended in the pursuit of such course or courses.

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"BURIAL FLAGS FOR CERTAIN IN-SERVICE DEATHS

"SEC. 401. Section 901 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection '(d)' at the end thereof to read as follows:

"'(d) In the case of any person who died while in the active military, naval, or air service during the Vietnam era, the Administrator shall furnish a flag to the next of kin, or to such other person as the Administrator deems most appropriate, if such next of kin or other person is not otherwise entitled to receive a flag under this section, or under section 1482(a) of title 10, United States Code.'

"SEC. 402. (a) The second sentence of section 1802(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'July 26, 1967' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 26, 1970'.

"(b) Clauses (i) and (ii) of section 1803 (a)(3)(A) of such title are each amended by striking out 'July 25, 1967' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 25, 1970'.

"SEC. 403. Section 1811(d) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding after the numerals '$17,500' wherever it appears therein the following: '*Provided*, That the Administrator may increase such amounts to not to exceed $30,000 where he finds that cost levels so require'.

"REPORTING FEE

"SEC. 404. Section 1784 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by (1) striking out 'Educational' at the beginning of such section and inserting in lieu thereof '(a) Educational'; (2) adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(b) The Administrator shall pay to each educational institution which is required to submit reports and certifications to the Administrator under chapter 34 of this title, an allowance at the rate of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution under the provisions of such chapter to assist the educational institution in defraying the expense of preparing and submitting such reports and certifications. Such allowances shall be paid in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by the Administrator, except that if any institution fails to submit reports or certifications to the Administrator as required by this section, no allowance shall be paid to such institution for the month or months during which such reports or certifications were not submitted as required by the Administrator.'

"EFFECTIVE DATES

"SEC. 405. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than ten days after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(b) The amendments made by section 203 of this Act shall become effective upon enactment.

"(c) The amendments made by title II of this Act relating to the payment of burial benefits in the case of veterans of the Vietnam era shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act. If the burial allowance authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, is payable solely by virtue of the enactment of this Act, the two-year period for filing applications, referred to in section 904 of such title 38, shall not end, with respect to an individual whose death occurred prior to the enactment of this Act, before the expiration of the two-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, or, in any case involving the correction of a discharge after the date of enactment of this Act, before the expiration of two years from the date of such correction."

PROVISIONS OF LONG AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, my amendment would:

First. Restore the original Senate version of S. 16 which provides wartime benefits to Vietnam era veterans only; the House provision authorizing flags is adopted for the Vietnam period. The total first year cost would be the same as before—$9.7 million;

Second. Incorporates the pension provisions of H.R. 17488, which provide a much-needed cost-of-living increase to pensioners under the new pension law together with additional monthly increase to certain widows and disabled veterans as well as necessary improvements in the overall pension program. All of these provisions as incorporated were reviewed and unanimously approved by the Finance Committee last fall but failed to pass because the session ended before consideration could be given to the bill. The additional first year cost of these pension provisions comes to $98 million;

Third. Incorporates the provisions of S. 9, as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and as requested by the distinguished chairman of its Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. These increased and broadened educational provisions total a first year cost of $161 million. Thus, the estimated total cost of the Long veterans amendment is $268.7 million.

Mr. President, I have also included an amendment to the bill which provides that increases under the Social Security Amendments of 1965—Public Law 89-97—or under future social security legislation will not be counted in determining the annual income of persons entitled to both VA payments and social security benefits for the month in which the legislation authorizing the increase is enacted. This provision will prevent the continued loss or reduction of dependency and indemnity compensation or pension payment which would otherwise result from the social security increase.

Congress in approving the 7-percent social security increase in 1965, recognized the increased need of beneficiaries due to the changes in wages, prices, and other economic factors since the last general social security increase in 1959. Thus, the benefit increase was designed to provide social security recipients with additional necessary funds to meet everyday needs. It was certainly not designed to deny veterans and their surviving widows and parents from continuing to receive their VA benefits. However, many such persons had their VA payments cut back or terminated as a result of the social security increase. This action has nullified the overall effectiveness and purpose of the increase not only by failing to add to their overall purchasing power but also by cutting back on what they were receiving before the social security increase was enacted. My amendment prevents this adverse effect on future VA payments as a result of the 1965 increase as well as all future social security increases.

It is identical to the Curtis amendment which was added in the Senate to H.R. 14347 and thereafter deleted by the House when it considered H.R. 14347.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is presently considering in executive session an overall 15 percent increase in social security. We will have to face the problem once again—so we should act before drastic results similar to the 1965 social security increase are once again experienced by VA beneficiaries.

Mr. President, I have spent considerable time detailing the House and Senate action on these various measures, so that some understanding might be reached regarding what the House and Senate positions have been.

It is my thought, that the amendment which I have proposed to S. 16 would place the bill in the position that the Senate has indicated it should be, either by its votes or by its committees' recommendations. My amendment represents the expressed Senate thinking on veterans' benefits and improvements in these veterans' programs—in effect, my amendment substitutes prior Senate action for present House recommendations. It should, thus, be adopted.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment with the amendment that I have submitted in the nature of a substitute for the language of the House amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is a privilege to associate myself with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, Senator RUSSELL LONG, in support of S. 16, the measure now pending before the Senate.

This bill, which was passed by the Senate early in the life of the 90th Congress, and which has been amended by the House, had as its original purpose the providing of deserved war-period benefits for our veterans of the Vietnam conflict. As my able friend from Louisiana has pointed out, the Senate passed a similar bill in the closing days of the 89th Congress, but the measure failed to receive consideration in the House of Representatives.

It is gratifying and appropriate that consideration is now given to amending S. 16 so as to add the provisions of S. 9, the Cold War GI Bill Amendments of 1967. The Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, which it is my responsibility to chair, conducted hearings on S. 9 on March 20 and 21 of this year. Testimony was solicited from a wide range of knowledgeable witnesses, including veterans' groups, business and professional organizations, spokesmen of labor and management, educators and educational groups, the administration, private citizens and others.

On April 12, 1967, the subcommittee considered S. 9, in executive session, amended it in several particulars, and reported it to the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. During an executive session May 17, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare ordered this measure reported to the Senate and the report was filed May 24, 1967.

It is encouraging to me personally to see the Senate move toward enactment of the provisions of S. 9 in an expeditious manner, for I believe that there is definite need for the benefits contained in the bill. Moreover, I point out that the majority of the provisions of S. 9 had gained Senate approval in the 89th Congress since they were embodied in the original cold war GI bill which has been so ably championed by my cherished friend from Texas, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH. Unfortunately, the provisions of which I now speak were not included in the final version of that legislation as signed by President Johnson, due to objections arising in the other body. I am pleased that the Senate is again expressing its belief that the provisions of S. 9 are vital to the best interests of our veterans, and to the continued growth and strength of this Nation.

Mr. President, S. 9 would bring about a number of important improvements in veterans' benefits. It would permit a veteran to obtain one and a half months of training for each month of active service during the cold war period; it would make meaningful increases in educational assistance allowances; it would add new categories of training, such as on-the-job, on-the-farm, and certain flight training, for which a veteran would be able to receive assistance; it would aid institutions in defraying costs of submitting required reports to the Veterans' Administration; and, it would permit a veteran to complete necessary high school courses so that he might go on to college, without using up his entitlement. I believe that these are constructive and important improvements in a law—the cold war GI bill—which has already had significant impact in readjusting our returning veterans.

Acting in recognition of the sacrifices being made by these young Americans, the 89th Congress enacted the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Act, which became Public Law 89–358. Hitherto, similar concern has been expressed through the enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—Public Law 78–346—and the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952—Public Law 82–550—popularly and respectively known as the World War II GI bill, and the Korean GI bill. Like its predecessors, the cold war GI bill has been extremely effective in making available opportunities for self-improvement and educational advancement among our servicemen who are seeking to resume the normal pursuits of civilian living. The bill S. 9, 90th Congress, is designed to constructively amend the cold war GI bill, Public Law 89–358, so as to provide a more meaningful level of wider range of needed benefits. The aim of the committee has been to make the cold war GI bill essentially similar to the Korean conflict GI bill in the amount and scope of benefits for the veteran.

Let us examine the provisions of S. 9 which would be incorporated as a part of the substitute measure proposed by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee.

As reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, S. 9 would change the formula for computing an eligible veteran's entitlement to education and training from one month educational benefits for each month or fraction thereof of active duty service performed by the veteran after January 31, 1955, to 1½ times the duration of service on active duty after such date. The latter formula is the same as the one which was used to compute the educational entitlement of veterans of World War II and of veterans of the Korean conflict. The committee believes that the veterans of the cold war period are entitled to comparable educational benefits.

The bill would make important adjustments in the rates of educational assistance allowances which are payable to veterans in order to assist in defraying the costs of higher education. The current rates are as follows:

Column I	Column II	Column III	Column IV
Type of program	No dependent	One dependent	Two or more dependents
Institutional:			
Full time	$100	$125	$150
Three-quarter time	75	95	115
Half time	50	65	75
Cooperative	80	100	120

If the student is enrolled for one-half time or is on active duty, the educational assistance allowance is computed at the rate of the established charges for tuition and fees, or at the rate of $100 a month for full-time education, whichever is the lesser.

The new rates would be as follows:

Column I	Column II	Column III	Column IV	Column V
Type of program	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	More than two dependents
				The amount in column IV, plus the following for each dependent in excess of two:
Institutional:				
Full time	$130	$155	$175	$10
Three-quarter time	95	115	135	7
Half time	60	75	85	5
Cooperative	105	125	145	7

For individuals pursuing a program of education while on active duty or on a less-than-half-time basis, the maximum monthly rate would be increased from $100 to $130.

It would appear that these liberalizations of educational assistance allowances are justified in view of increases in the cost of education which have come about since enactment of the Korean GI bill.

The provision in S. 9 to set the educational assistance allowance for a veteran with two dependents at $175 per month, and to provide an additional $10 per month for each dependent in excess of two is designed as additional aid for veterans with larger families.

S. 9 would permit eligible veterans to make use of educational allowances for a full-time program of institutional on-farm training. Training assistance allowance for such a program would be computed at the rate of $110 per month for a veteran with no dependent, $125 per month for a veteran with one dependent, and $145 per month for a veteran with two or more dependents. Payments are reduced after 1 year, and every 4 months thereafter.

The bill permits eligible veterans to make use of educational allowances for a full-time program of apprenticeship or other training on the job. Training assistance allowance for such a program would be computed at the rate of $80 per month for a veteran with no dependent, $95 per month for a veteran with one dependent, and $115 per month for a veteran with two or more dependents. Payments are reduced every 4 months. In no case shall the training allowance and the veteran-trainee's pay total more than $450 per month.

S. 9 allows the eligible veteran to enroll in a course of flight training, for which 75 percent of the established charge would be paid by the Veterans' Administration.

The bill would authorize the Veterans' Administration to pay $1 per month per enrolled veteran to educational institutions in order to defray the administrative costs of submitting reports and certifications to the VA.

Under this measure the eligible veteran may receive educational assistance allowances while pursuing high school training needed in order to qualify for higher education. Time spent in pursuit of such courses would not be charged against basic entitlement.

I request unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a letter received from the Veterans' Administration setting forth the VA estimate of costs of S. 9 as reported by the committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed, as follows:

Veterans Administration,
Office of the Administrator of
Veterans Affairs,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1967.

Hon. Jennings Randolph,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In accordance with your request I submit herewith the estimated first year cost to the Government of each section of S. 9, 90th Congress, as amended by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, as follows:

Section 1. New formula for increased entitlement—No increased cost the first year; $75 million cost for the second year.

Section 2. Repeals prohibition against on-farm, on-job and flight training—No direct cost.

Section 3. Increases educational assistance rates, and provides rates for on-job, on-farm, and flight training—

Educational assistance rates increase—$104 million first year cost;

On-job training—$27 million first year cost;

On-farm training—$5 million first year cost;

Flight training—$10 million first year cost.

Section 4. Approval provisions—No direct cost.

Section 5. Savings clause—No direct cost.

Section 6. Reporting allowance—$1.6 million first year cost.

Section 7. Educationally disadvantaged—$15 million first year cost.

No allowance is made in these estimates for additional persons who may be induced to enter school training because of the higher educational assistance rates, but allowance is made for the additional job trainees who may be expected to train under the $450 ceiling as compared to the $310 ceiling originally provided in S. 9.

In summary, the following chart indicates the estimated number of trainee years and the direct benefits cost for each of the next five years for each provision of S. 9, 90th Congress, as reported by the Subcommittee:

Trainee-years

[In thousands]

Fiscal year	New estimate	Current estimate	Increase	Disabled veterans	Training			Entitlement
					On the farm	On the job	Flight	
1968	321	286	35	9	2	18	6	----------
1969	445	336	109	15	5	36	9	44
1970	482	370	112	15	6	33	11	47
1971	484	368	116	17	6	33	10	50
1972	489	373	116	17	5	33	10	51

Direct benefits cost

[In millions]

Fiscal year	New cost	89-358 cost	Increase	Rate change	Disabled veterans	Training			Entitlement	Reporting allowance
						On the farm	On the job	Flight		
1968	$547	$386	$161	$104	$15	$5	$27	$10	----------	$1.6
1969	752	449	303	126	26	10	51	15	$75	2.3
1970	807	497	310	136	26	10	39	19	80	2.4
1971	811	494	317	136	29	10	39	17	86	2.4
1972	819	501	318	138	29	8	39	17	87	2.4
5-year total	3,736	2,327	1,409	640	125	43	195	78	328	11.1

Sincerely,
Cyril F. Brickfield,
Deputy Administrator
(For and in the absence of
W. J. Driver, Administrator).

Mr. **RANDOLPH**. Mr. President, I emphasize that I am gratified that the Senate is considering prompt action on the provisions contained in S. 9. I commend my energetic colleague, the senior Senator from Texas, the Honorable Ralph Yarborough, for his vigorous efforts to bring forth effective legislation to benefit veterans of the cold war period. Without his leadership and energy we could not have made such heartening progress.

Likewise I express commendations to the knowledgeable and cooperative Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] for his efforts to facilitate Senate consideration of the provisions of S. 9. His record of service in the Congress is replete with instances of positive actions to assist the veterans of our Armed Forces.

It is also appropriate to give recognition to the senior Senator from Alabama, Senator Lister Hill, for his constructive efforts in moving S. 9 through the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which he so effectively chairs.

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. President, I wish to express appreciation for the fact that in the motion the Senator from Louisiana has offered he has included a proposal relating to social security benefits which, if necessary, I would have offered in my behalf and in behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller].

This particular item has already passed the Senate three or four times. It meets an important need. We found that when social security payments were increased the last time Congress discriminated against veterans, their widows, and orphans receiving VA pensions. That situation came about in this manner.

The 1965 social security increases placed a veteran's total income for pension purposes in a higher bracket and, in turn, in many instances, the social security increase resulted in a reduction in the total income for persons substantially dependent on veterans pensions—for in many cases the person's VA pensions were reduced or terminated.

My proposal, which I introduced and which has been passed by the Senate, and which is incorporated in the substitute amendment the chairman of the Finance Committee has offered, not only would take care of the problem of social security increases on pensions for veterans but also relates to social security increases received by survivors of veterans, widows and orphans, as well as parents under the so-called dependency and indemnity program.

This proposal would exclude not only the past 1965 social security increase but future social security increases from the determination of income for pension and DIC purposes; namely, in determining what amounts are payable to a veteran or to his survivors in pension, or to his parents in DIC benefits, where there is an income limitation.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has labored long in this area and I must express my dismay that the Senate has not been more effective in obtaining House agreement for that which the Senator had worked. In my judgment the Senator is right in what he is seeking to do. We have passed a measure of this sort a number of times, four to be exact, and we had no luck in getting the House of Representatives to agree. However, I would be happy to try again on this matter and I am sure that eventually something of this sort will be worked out because it is right. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] has been interested in this matter and has worked diligently in this area. I hope that eventually we will reach the right answer. The present situation is not the adequate answer. What the Senator is trying to do is basically right.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield to me I wish to call up an amendment which I have discussed with him. I would hope that he thinks well enough of the amendment to take it as a part of his amendment, which would be most desirable. I would like to have the clerk state the amendment. I submit the amendment for myself, as well as the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough]. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] has been the author of the original GI bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The pending question is concurrence in the House amendment with the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, substituting language.

Does the Senator from New York offer his amendment?

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, I offer my amendment as a modification to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

After section 401 insert the following:

"(a) the second sentence of section 1802(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'July 26, 1967' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 26, 1970'.

"(b) Clauses (i) and (ii) of section 1803(a) (3)(A) of such title are each amended by striking out 'July 25, 1967' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 25, 1970'."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if we might have the attention of the Senator from Texas, it is my understanding that he has been consulted with respect to this matter and he would like to see it agreed to. Is that correct?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator is correct. Had we had S. 9 here originally that would have been my purpose.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in view of that statement I modify my amendment to include the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, eligibility for home and small business loans to veterans of World War II will expire on July 25 of this year. In effect, this termination will deprive 4,683,000 World War II veterans of opportunities provided by such loans.

Although the number of veterans taking advantage of these loans has decreased in recent years, last year 166,000 persons did utilize the program, and already this year 37,500 persons have participated. This certainly is not an insubstantial number. I feel that as long as a reasonably large number of veterans are taking advantage of this loan program, the program should be available for their benefit.

I would point out that similar benefits for veterans of the Korean war have been extended by the Congress until 1975—25 years after their inception. The amendment which I propose today would extend the termination date for World War II veterans for home and small business loans from July 25, 1967, to July 25, 1970—25 years after the end of World War II. It should be noted that the FHA veterans loan program has no termination dates—any veteran is eligible at any time.

Insofar as defaults are concerned, the veterans home and small business loan program boasts of only a 3-percent default figure over a 20-year period. This represents almost 7 million loans amounting to $66 billion as of March 31, 1967.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I desire to bring up my amendment No. 201, which I have checked with the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. Long], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and understand is acceptable as an amendment to the pending amendment. This is an amendment to section 7, section 1811(d) of title 38, United States Code which simply provides that after the numerals "$17,500," wherever they appear, will be the following, "provided that the Administrator may increase such amounts to not to exceed $30,000 where he finds the cost level so requires." This amendment is offered, due to the fact that both in Alaska and Hawaii the cost of housing is much higher than it is elsewhere, that because loans extend only to $17,500, they will not satisfy conditions in Alaska and Hawaii. In the case of Alaska, we have many applications, but few takers because many houses cost more than $17,500. This is within the discretion of the Administrator. He need not do it unless he finds it necessary, but he will find it necessary in most Alaskan communities. I would ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the modification.

The Legislative Clerk. After section 402 insert:

Sec. 403. Section 1811(d) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding after the numerals "$17,500" wherever it appears therein the following: "*Provided*, That the Administrator may increase such amounts to not to exceed $30,000 where he finds that cost levels so require".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I understand that this amendment has been discussed with the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Texas and that they are in favor of the amendment. With that understanding, I so modify my amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. This amendment would correct an existing inequity in the Veterans' Administration's home loan guaranty program which adversely affects the ability of veterans in Alaska and Hawaii to take advantage of this program. In both these States the present $17,500 limit on the amount which can be insured by the Veterans' Administration under its program is entirely inadequate. Both States experience high labor costs, increased costs in shipping homebuilding materials, high supply costs, and in Alaska, a very short building season.

In keeping with the authority already contained in the Federal Housing Administration's basic legislation, the amendment which I am introducing would give to the Veterans' Administrator discretionary authority to increase the insurable amount to not to exceed $30,000 "where he finds that cost levels so require."

Because of the $17,500 limitation in the amount which can be insured under the present veterans home loan guaranty program, the program is in very little use in Alaska. Thus, through April 30, 1967, not a single home loan guarantee had been approved for a post-Korean veteran and the total number of home loans under the program of the Veterans' Administration is only 294, with the amount of the loans totaling $2,660.485 with a guarantee of $1,250,832.

I greatly appreciate the efforts of my good friend, Joseph M. Briones, the very able department service officer of the American Legion for the Department of Alaska, who called this inequity to my attention. Joe Briones has served the veterans of Alaska ably and conscientiously for many years and this is but one more example of the very fine work which he has consistently performed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, these amendments are offered as amendments to the basic legislation. Originally, the principal sponsor was the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya]. He is unable to be here today but has provided me with a statement of his views and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Montoya

We have the opportunity today to rectify a situation which is grossly inequitable to many millions of our veterans who have made great sacrifices to serve this nation. I urge that this body give speedy approval to S. 16, the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967, in order that we may correct these inequities. By this action, we will create legislation proving that the United States Government is anxious to fulfill its obligations to those gallant men who have borne the brunt of battle that this nation might continue in freedom.

I am happy to say that this bill which we have before us today is an outgrowth of a bill which became our concern last year when 56 members of this body joined me in sponsoring S. 3580 the Vietnam Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act. That measure was passed unanimously by the Senate and reported out by the House Veterans Affairs Committee but time did not permit its enactment into law before Congress adjourned last October.

Again this Session, 73 of you joined me in sponsoring S. 16, legislation similar to S. 3580 of last Session. My bill would equate the benefits to be received by Veterans of the Vietnam Conflict with those being received by Veterans of other wars and as you will remember was again passed by the Senate unanimously.

President Johnson in his message of January 31, recognized the need for enactment of S. 16 and proposed additional benefits for all Veterans and their dependents. These increased and well-deserved benefits proposed by the President have subsequently been incorporated by the House into the original S. 16 and it is this House-amended version of S. 16 which we are considering here today.

I would like to make one important distinction, however, between the provisions of S. 16 as I originally introduced it and the provisions of the House-amended bill as they pertain to Veterans of the Vietnam Conflict. When I introduced S. 16, I urged the Senate, and my colleagues unanimously concurred with me, to accept August 5, 1964 as the beginning date of the "Vietnam Era". The House, however, has provided that certain of these benefits to Vietnam Veterans become effective as early as January 31, 1955.

The date of August 5, 1964, was selected as the beginning of the "Vietnam Era" for obvious reasons. It was on this date that the "Gulf of Tonkin" incident occurred which incident was the beginning of our increased involvement in this conflict. I strongly believe that it is only proper to equate service since the Gulf of Tonkin incident with service during previously recognized war periods. Thus, I believe, that the proposed extension of pension benefits to those who served during this period and their dependents is assuredly warranted as well as timely. Any period of service prior to that would not be truly representative of "wartime" conditions as we know them.

Arguments could be made, as I am sure they will be, that we should make the effective date in 1955, or 1957, or 1961, or some other year to give additional benefits to other Veterans. However, the real purpose of my original bill was to provide these benefits to "wartime" veterans and that period which can be considered as "wartime" in my opinion began on August 5, 1964.

For that reason I would urge my colleagues to reject the effective date of 1955 as provided by the House for certain of those provisions that pertain only to Vietnam Era Veterans and to retain the original effective date of August 5, 1964.

This legislation we have before us serves a two-fold purpose. It will equate the present pensions being allotted to our older and disabled veterans and their dependents, with the current cost of living expense. Further it will acknowledge the fact that those men who are now defending the South Vietnam nation from Communist aggression, are indeed involved in a conflict no less important than our other struggles against tyranny.

It is inconceivable to me that the brave men who search out the enemy in the deltas of South Vietnam, or who face death each second in a battle like the recent incident at Hill 881, are not acknowledged as full-fledged representatives of this nation. We have been faced with draft card burners and despoilers of the flag of the United States here at home. In contrast, patriotic young men carry on a battle which fulfills our commitments to free people throughout the world, and in turn, assures our nation that no such communistic aggression will attack our shores.

We can do much to assure that these men are recognized for the outstanding valor and devotion they are exhibiting each day we wage this war against the invaders from the north. One way in which we can fulfill our duty is to pass legislation which will provide them benefits which every veteran since World War II has received. This proposed legislation will take this step toward that goal.

We can never repay them for their sacrifices. We can never give them anything—for in reality whatever we provide in the way of benefits, is but a payment on the debt which we owe the veterans of this nation. But we should pass this legislation which will at least begin payment on this debt, and express the gratitude of our people for their actions in our behalf.

I believe that we have a mandate from the people of this nation to give our approval to this legislation. Not only will we provide the benefits which these men deserve, but we will have pointed out to the world that this government is not divided in its concern for its present day fighting men. We will have assured our veterans, as the President pointed out in his message that they will never become second class citizens.

We have long talked about pension increases for our older veterans from previous conflicts, but we have not acted. Now is the time to act on this long over-due increase. They need the Assistance of this nation, and we will be remiss in our obligation if we do not heed their needs.

While fulfilling the needs of our veterans of all conflicts, it will bring the veterans of this era into full cognizance. I support this legislation and ask that you join me in giving your speedy approval to these much needed proposals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] to concur in the House amendment with an amendment by the Senator from Louisiana, as modified, in the nature of a substitute for the language of the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the vote on the motion be reconsidered.

Mr. JAVITS and Mr. RANDOLPH moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as the sponsor of the cold war GI bill of 1966, S. 9, I am delighted to support these amendments. I rise to express my appreciation to the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] for his kindness in accepting these amendments. My thanks, above all, go to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] who, as chairman of the Veterans' Subcommittee, and through his cooperation, made it possible for the bill—cosponsored by 55 Senators of both parties, as well as the effective leadership and views of the subcommittee chaired by the Senator from West Virginia—to contain provisions which will restore to all veterans of the cold war period from February 1, 1955, the benefits which Korean veterans obtained.

The Senate has already approved the substance of these benefits. When the cold war GI bill passed the Senate in June of 1965, the Senate approved a bill that sought to provide all the readjustment benefits available to Korean veterans. Unfortunately, the final bill enacted in 1966 was cut back below the level passed by the Senate, and did not attain the equity that we had sought.

The bill, S. 9 of the 90th Congress, as unanimously reported by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, will provide for the present-day veteran the same range of educational and other readjustment benefits as was granted Korean conflict veterans, with adjustments in the allowances which attempt to offset some of the increase in the cost of living since enactment of the earlier program.

These amendments to the cold war GI bill were the subject of hearings before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on March 20 and 21, 1967. The bill that has been reported incorporates the recommendations of substantially all of the private individuals and groups presenting testimony. Fifty-five Senators have joined in cosponsoring it.

The bill increases the monthly educational allowance payable to the veteran to amounts more nearly reflecting the increased cost of today's tuition and subsistence. These increases in benefits will go directly to the 545,000 veterans expected to be in school next fall. In addition, I expect that many more veterans will find it possible to enter college through the increased allowance.

A recommendation of the administration was gladly adopted to increase further the allowance for veterans with more than two dependents, so as to encourage veterans with large families to advance their educational level.

On-the-job, on-the-farm, and flight training as offered under the Korean GI bill are authorized by our bill. Perhaps 50,000 or more veterans each year will thus be added to those receiving training under the cold war GI bill by adoption of these provisions. These provisions are very important to make this something other than a college-only program; they recognize that many veterans will find other goals and careers.

Veterans who have not completed high school especially will be helped by the bill. Following the recommendation of the President, the committee has provided that a veteran's basic period of entitlement would not be reduced for the period in which he completes his high school training. He receives the regular monthly training allowances while finishing high school.

The bill restores the formula for computation of the duration of the benefits a veteran will receive to that of the Korean GI bill: 1½ months of training for every month of service. There is no reason why a veteran of Vietnam should receive a lesser period of training than a veteran of Korea.

Finally, the bill provides a $1 per veteran per month fee to educational institutions in payment of their costs in providing necessary documentation to the Veterans' Administration. The equity of restoring this payment is obvious.

This is a sound bill and a prudent bill; it does not attempt to do all that perhaps should be done to compensate our returning veterans for the time they have lost away from civilian pursuits. No law can compensate many of these men for what they have endured in our behalf. Rather, this bill attempts to ratify only what has been done by previous Congresses. If certain benefits were appropriate for World War II veterans, and were found appropriate for Korean veterans in 1952, they are appropriate in 1967 for veterans of Vietnam and the cold war. By this bill, we can make the half million men finishing military service each year the best educated group of veterans in our history. These men deserve no less.

Through the effective leadership of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and the full cooperation of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], chairman of the full committee, we were enabled to complete hearings on the bill and get it reported to the floor. I am grateful for the cooperation of the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Louisiana, in getting it incorporated into S. 16, so that when the bill passes and is agreed to in conference, it will give the veterans of the cold war period and those of the Vietnam conflict these well-merited benefits.

Two recommendations of the administration were incorporated. One, if a veteran had more than two dependents, he would get $10 each for each extra dependent. This was never provided for in past laws. This means that veterans in college who have five, six, or seven children, veterans who go to college because they know that they must get an education in order to get a fair chance in life, for each of those children over two, he will get an extra $10. Many veterans have told me that this extra $10 a month will help them very much to secure a college education.

Another benefit recommended by the VA and incorporated in this amendment is one that if the veteran has not finished high school, he can finish high school at the Government allowance and then begin his entitlement—that is, at the rate of a month and a half of training for each month in service. In the past, if he had not finished high school and had used up his entitlement, he had nothing to go to college with; but under the amendment he can now finish high school and then use his entitlement for a college education.

There are many other benefits included here. I want to thank the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who has been much interested in this subject. He has helped us all the way, as has the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], not only on this bill but also on the GI bill of last year. All Senators whose names I have mentioned helped us greatly on the original GI bill last year. By incorporating all these amendments in S. 16, we now bring to full justice the relative benefits for all veterans of the cold war period now enjoyed only by Korean war veterans.

I hope that the Senator from Louisiana can hold these amendments in conference, because it will mean so much to millions of men under arms. The 5 million veterans of the cold war already discharged and out now are eligible to go to school. Before, many of them could not go because the monthly allowances were too low.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to take this occasion to commend unqualifiedly the magnificent work on behalf of our veterans that the Senator from Texas has been carrying on ever since he came to the Senate.

No man has shown more determination, more devotion, or more dedication to a good cause—that of our veterans—than he. It is more to his credit than that of any other Member of this body, although many Senators have assisted, notably the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOPLH] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], that this splendid legislation has been passed—as well as previous legislation in favor of veterans.

It is my hope that this bill, which I think is a climax to the legislation passed on this subject, will be adopted by the House and become law—as a matter of justice to all veterans whether in active service or not—which the distinguished Senator from Texas has sought to obtain for so long.

I hope that the veterans of this war and past wars will appreciate the unflagging concern, dedication, and efforts of the Senator from Texas, to whom we all largely owe this great success.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr JAVITS. I should like to say about the Senator from Texas that I have rarely seen a man fight a battle for so long a time and so well as he. He has fought it almost alone. Of course, he had some cosponsors such as the Senator from West Virginia, myself, and others; but, generally speaking, he did it pretty much alone. But, he did fight it through.

Now that the bill has been accepted as part of the law dealing with veterans, I think that the Senator from Texas is entitled to great credit from the people of this country for what he has done.

I join the Senator from Texas in thanking the chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], for bringing the bill to the point that we could join him in cosponsoring it.

I also thank the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] for actually bringing it to the floor of this Chamber and bringing it to consummation. This is a really fine piece of legislation which has just been passed. I do not believe that any of us will ever forget the fine work of the Senator from Texas in carrying on the battle. His work has finally been crowned with success.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I want to express my gratitude to this body as a body, because this is a legislative body. We know that in the 7 long years, every time the bill was up, it passed. The Senator from Louisiana was in the forefront, back in 1955, in having it passed without any opposition from the Veterans' Administration, Defense Department, and the Bureau of the Budget. We had no help, only opposition from the executive department. This is a legislative victory for Congress in seeing that our veterans get well-deserved justice.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to express my appreciation also to the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], as well as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], for accepting my amendment, which does justice to the veterans of our last two States admitted to the Union, where housing construction costs are higher than elsewhere, and which will enable them to share the benefits of the legislation in the matter of housing loans with the veterans of the other 48 States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment to the House amendment and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. DOMINICK conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJUSTMENTS IN OUTSTANDING SILVER CERTIFICATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1352, relating to silver certificates, be laid before the Senate. I do this so that the bill will be the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1352) to authorize adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, on page 2, line 12, after the words "United States," to insert "(other than silver transferred to the stockpiles established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act)"; after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. From and after the date of enactment of this Act, and until transferred to the stockpiles established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act in accordance with this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall hold as a reserve for purposes of the common defense not less than one hundred and sixty-five million fine troy ounces of silver. Upon the expiration of one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer not less than one hundred and sixty-five million fine troy ounces of silver to the stockpiles established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act. For the purposes of that Act, the silver shall be deemed to have been transferred pursuant to that Act.

And, on page 3, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. The last sentence of section 3517 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 324) is repealed.

So as to make the bill read:

S. 1352

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to determine from time to time the amount of silver certificates, issued after June 30, 1929, which in his judgment have been destroyed or irretrievably lost, or are held in collections, and will never be presented for redemption. In the case of each determination he shall credit the appropriate receipt account with an equivalent amount, and shall reduce accordingly the amount of silver certificates outstanding on the books of the Treasury.

Sec. 2. Silver certificates shall be exchangeable for silver bullion for one year following the enactment of this Act. Thereafter they shall no longer be redeemable in silver but shall be redeemable from any moneys in the general fund of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Sec. 3. Effective upon the expiration of one year after the date of enactment of this Act, section 2 of the Act of June 4, 1963, as amended (31 U.S.C. 405a–1), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use for coinage, or to sell on such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, any silver of the United States (other than silver transferred to the stockpiles established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act) at a price not less than the monetary value of $1.292929292 per fine troy ounce."

Sec. 4. From and after the date of enactment of this Act, and until transferred to the stockpiles established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act in accordance with this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall hold as a reserve for purposes of the common defense not less than one hundred and sixty-five million fine troy ounces of silver. Upon the expiration of one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer not less than one hundred and sixty-five million fine troy ounces of silver to the stockpiles established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act. For the purposes of that Act, the silver shall be deemed to have been transferred pursuant to that Act.

Sec. 5. The last sentence of section 3517 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 324) is repealed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that will be the pending business when we return Monday, and there will be no further legislative action this afternoon.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader about the program for next week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, following disposition of S. 1352, it is the intention to call up Senate Joint Resolution 33, to establish a National Commission on Product Safety on Tuesday. It is hoped that following that it will be possible to take up S. 1030, the information media guarantee bill, and on Wednesday, S. 450, a bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands.

I would point out to the Senate that it is hoped that on Thursday or Friday of next week we will be able to get the railway legislation out of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. We would like to get that out of the way before we turn to the consideration of Senate Resolution 112 on the following Tuesday. If we can get it before us next week, we should be prepared to meet on Saturday if conditions call for it.

INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR DIRKSEN ON A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in the June 5, 1967, issue of the U.S. News & World Report, there appears an interview with the senior Senator from Illinois, Senator Dirksen, concerning the calling of a constitutional convention. With so much mistaken and erroneous information being circulated, Senator Dirksen's answers to pertinent questions will enable the issues to be placed in true perspective. As Senator Dirksen states:

> I want such an amendment so that once again the people in each state can exercise this most vital function of government, deciding for themselves how one house of their legislature will be apportioned.

With many so-called sophisticated arguments of more for the people, it is amazing that the opponents of such a convention seem to trust the people less. However, as the distinguished minority leader points out:

> This is a government of and for and by the people, and my faith in the people has not diminished.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the interview be printed in the Record.

In the same issue of the U.S. News & World Report, there appears an article entitled "How Chief Justice Warren Changed His Mind." During Mr. Warren's tenure as Governor of California, he spoke in opposition to a proposal to apportion California's Senate on the basis of population. As Governor, he stated:

> It is the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the states of the Union—equal representation in one house and proportionate representation based on population in the other.

Later he states:

> Any weakening of the laws would invite a return to boss rule which we are now happily rid of.

And that California "has made almost unbelievable progress under our present system of legislative representation."

However, Mr. Warren did change his mind on June 15, 1964, when he wrote the opinion in which the Supreme Court decided that both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned on a population basis.

Senator Dirksen, upon being asked why Mr. Warren changed his mind replied:

> I haven't the slightest idea. He has never indicated why he changed his mind.

Mr. President, I believe the Chief Justice was right the first time, and request unanimous consent that the article concerning his statement be printed in the Congressional Record.

Mr. President, the U.S. News & World Report has also printed an article entitled "A Constitutional Convention—The Facts." I request unanimous consent that this article be placed in the Congressional Record, and I recommend to my colleagues the reading of all three of the foregoing articles for a better understanding of the important issues involved.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rewrite the U.S. Constitution? Interview With Senator Everett Dirksen

(Note.—If a constitutional convention is called: Will it stop at one amendment—or seek many changes? In this interview, Senator Dirksen, of Illinois, sizes up the outlook. The Republican Leader tells why he hopes for a convention and what he thinks it would—and would not—try to do.)

Question. Senator Dirksen, you have been urging States to call a constitutional convention to amend the U.S. Constitution. Do you think we are going to have such a convention?

Answer. Yes, I think so. We now have 32 States whose legislatures have passed resolutions calling for a constitutional convention—and only 34 States are required.

Of course, the Congress could obviate the necessity for calling a convention by submitting an amendment to the States. These petitions make provision for such action.

Question. Do you expect action by two more States this year?

Answer. We're hoping to get them within the next few weeks. We have an effort going on in some six States at the present time. And to show you our efforts in this field, I've gone so far as to give testimony by telephone to committees of some legislatures that wanted me to do so. It was done at their invitation. They wanted my argument on this issue, and, since I couldn't go out there because of my chores and burdens here in Congress, I just had to do it by telephone.

Question. Do you have an idea as to which two States will act soon to complete the calling of a convention?

Answer. Well, I do have an idea. But I prefer not to disclose it at the moment because I think, if I did, it would probably invite a countereffort on the part of those who are in opposition to calling a convention.

In fact, when they learned of our efforts in the past, they promptly moved in. I won't name the organizations that tried to do it, but efforts were made in at least five States to get legislatures to rescind their action. Every one of those efforts failed.

Question. What is your purpose in seeking a constitutional convention? What do you want such a convention to do?

Answer. I see a convention as the sure means of securing an amendment to the Constitution that will restore to the people of each State their right of self-determination in respect to the apportionment of one house of their legislature. We have tried twice in the Senate to obtain approval of such an amendment and, even though we received a very substantial majority, we fell short of the necessary two thirds. Now we can use the other amending process provided in Article V, that of calling a constitutional convention, as a means of securing this amendment.

Question. Why do you want such an amendment?

Answer. I want such an amendment so that once again the people in each State can exercise this most vital function of government, deciding for themselves how one house of their legislature will be apportioned.

For over 175 years, the people in each State had and exercised this power. During this period some States had "one man, one vote" legislatures; in other States different systems were selected, but in each instance it was a decision of the people that determined what system would be used.

The Supreme Court took away this right of the people by its decision in Reynolds v. Sims and related cases, decided in June of 1964. No longer do the people have this right of decision. The Court has said that each body of every State legislature must be apportioned solely on the basis of population. They are bound to this one standard no matter what the people want.

It makes no difference to me what system the people select. They may want "one man, one vote," or they may decide that the federal system more nearly meets their needs. Whatever is decided upon should be by a decision of the people and should not be made by the Supreme Court. That is why I want this amendment—so that this right of determination will be restored to the people, where it belongs.

Question. What is wrong with this "one man, one vote" rule?

Answer. There are all too many people who have somehow failed to realize the full implications of that ruling. It goes much further than "one man, one vote." Actually, it is a question of whether or not the people of the States shall have the power of deciding the composition of at least one branch of their own legislature.

It is conceivable that the people of a State may like the idea of "one man, one vote"—and if they so desire, they can adopt that idea for their own State. On the other hand, the people in many States have rejected this type of apportionment when it was presented to them for approval. Colorado is a good example; there the people were given a clear choice: "one man, one vote" or a little federal system. In every county, metropolitan and rural, they rejected "one man, one vote" and overwhelmingly approved the other system. However, the Supreme Court threw this choice out and required a "one man, one vote" system of apportionment—the very kind the people had rejected.

But the essential point is that it should be up to the States to determine this quesion.

The Supreme Court has taken it to itself to determine this, and that is exactly where the controversy joins. I am persuaded that the Court's basic decision must be modified to the extent that we go back to that power that was set forth in the Constitution.

Under the Tenth Amendment, the reservation was made that all the powers not delegated expressly to the central Government were reserved to the States and to the people, respectively. That is the language of the Constitution today, and it ought to be observed. In my considered and very humble judgment, the Supreme Court has not observed it.

Question. What has been the effect of the Supreme Court ruling in its application to State legislatures—good or bad?

Answer. I don't pass judgment on it particularly. In the first place, there are some States where they already had "one man, one vote"—but that was by their own choice, not by Supreme Court order. Wisconsin is an example.

But, on the other hand, you have States with huge metropolitan centers which contain virtually half the population of the State. Illinois is an example. Michigan could well be an example, or Pennsylvania, if you combine the populations of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. You have the same situation in California, and in Arizona because of the growth of Phoenix and its area. You'll probably have the same thing in New Mexico because of the growth around Albuquerque.

When this situation exists, and you apply the "one man, one vote" rule to both houses of a legislature, you have the likelihood of a legislature dominated by people representing only a very small area of the State—the metropolitan areas—and very specialized interests.

Now, as one fellow from a rural area put it: "Those from the city couldn't care less about our interests or about our needs." And you see the problem that they are up against.

Now, that will be true wherever you have diverse interests in a State—agriculture in one end of the State, or maybe fruit growing or coal mining, while at the other end of the State is a great metropolitan center that is a consuming center, and that is its principal interest. So it can hit on economic lines.

Question. What is the significance of the Supreme Court's ruling on May 22 about the application of the "one man, one vote" doctrine to local units of government?

Answer. The Court in its decisions on May 22 didn't really meet the "one man, one vote" question. Two cases were sent back to the lower courts. In the other two cases, the precise question was not decided. We still don't know if the Court intends to apply this doctrine to local units of government. That will be determined by subsequent decisions when the issue is squarely before the Court.

Question. A constitutional convention is such a rare method of amending the Constitution that a lot of people don't understand it. Just what is a constitutional convention?

Answer. A constitutional convention is provided for by Article V of the Constitution. It contains two substantive provisions:

The first is that amendments to the Constitution can be initiated by the Congress and then submitted to the States for ratification. That is the commonly used method.

But the Constitution also provides another way of going about the amending of the Constitution, and that is for two thirds of the States to submit a resolution to the Congress mandating that body to call a constitutional convention.

Now, there's a very good reason why that second provision was placed in the Constitution.

In the 85th paper in "The Federalist," which is that compendium of papers setting forth what James Madison and John Jay and Alexander Hamilton said in their campaign to secure ratification, they encountered the fact that people were afraid there might be a hostile Congress that would not use this amending provision, and therefore they wanted some assurances on that point. That's the reason they put in a provision that the States could mandate the Congress to call a convention. The convention would then consider proposed amendments to the Constitution.

By either method, the amendments that are proposed must be submitted for ratification by at least three fourths of the States.

Question. Is it possible for Congress to ignore the States' call for a constitutional convention? Can Congress refuse to call a convention even though two thirds of the States request it?

Answer. Hamilton dealt with that matter in this "Federalist" paper and indicated what the Constitution's framers had in mind. He said: "Nothing in this particular is left to the discretion of that body," meaning the Congress. He said: "The words of this article are peremptory," meaning that it is mandatory. So it is a mandate to Congress—an order.

Question. Hasn't there been talk of challenging the validity of the resolutions passed by the State legislatures?

Answer. Yes. There are some who would undertake to impeach the validity of two or three of these petitions from the States on the ground that their phraseology is not identical. But the Constitution says nothing about this and in my considered judgment, all you need is to establish the clear intent of the legislature. That's all that is required, and I believe there is enough case law on that point to sustain my judgment.

Question. What about the argument that the action of some State legislatures in calling for a convention is unconstitutional because the legislatures had not been reapportioned in line with Supreme Court ruling?

Answer. I think we have ample law on that subject, because such a question has been raised a number of times. It was raised in connection with an act of the Texas legislature during the War Between the States, and the Court ruled that a State could not be left without a legislative body and therefore whatever that body was, it had to be considered as the *de facto* legislature of the State and, therefore, what it did was valid, except such acts as were treasonable or contributed to the rebellion. And I have yet to hear anyone make that contention in connection with these petitions.

If you took any other position, then you would have to say that everything done by a malapportioned legislature would be illegal. And just think of the problems that would raise.

Question. If you don't get enough States this year, how long a time do you have in which to complete action? In other words, how long will a State resolution remain in effect?

Answer. That question has been raised, and I have to answer it a bit indirectly, but I think this is a sufficiently substantial answer: In connection with one proposed amendment, Congress provided that the amendment should remain before the States for a period of seven years for ratification. That seven-year period was contested, but the Supreme Court finally came to the conclusion that a seven-year period was not an unreasonable period to leave an amendment before the country for action.

Now, the first State resolutions to call for this constitutional convention were enacted only four years ago, in 1963, so petitions received up through 1970 would be valid.

Question. Suppose Congress chose to ignore or defy this order by the States for a constitutional convention. Could the Supreme Court step in and call the convention?

Answer. This is a delicate question on which the Constitution is silent. But I presume that, if the Congress failed to observe what I regard as a mandate in the Constitution, then you could go to the Supreme Court with a petition.

Now, the question is whether the Court would issue an order to Congress.

Question. If a constitutional convention is called, how will the delegates to the convention be chosen?

Answer. They will be chosen under State laws. And the States can determine how few or how many delegates they might want.

Question. Would all areas of the State be represented?

Answer. The States would vote as a unit, you see, regardless of the number of delegates that they would have. But all parts of the State would obviously be represented in a constitutional convention.

Question. Would each State have the same weight in the convention?

Answer. No. Each State would have a vote equal to its total representation in Congress.

Question. Is a constitutional convention limited in its scope?

Answer. No.

Question. In calling the convention, is it set out precisely what the convention is to do—what kind of amendments it is to consider?

Answer. In reality, it is not. The Congress might try to limit it somewhat by the language used in calling the convention.

Now, our whole purpose in seeking a constitutional convention was limited. It was directed only to one item, and that was this question of the apportionment of our State legislatures.

However, I must be frank to say that in my considered judgment there is no restriction or inhibition in the Constitution, and if such a convention undertook to entertain other proposals, it could very well do so. But I point out that the delegates would be coming here for that one purpose, and I doubt very much that they would go far afield.

I'd point out, secondly, that I've never had any fear about delegates chosen by the people. This is a Government of and for and by the people, and my faith in the people has not diminished.

The third factor is that, regardless of what a convention might propose, its proposals still must be submitted to ratification by three fourths of all the States. And that is probably your greatest safeguard.

Question. Do you see any danger that a convention of this kind might take the bit in its teeth and propose extensive changes—or even try to write a new Constitution, like the original convention of 1787, which was supposed only to make changes in the original Articles of Confederation but produced a completely new Constitution instead?

Answer. No. I go on the theory that the people who would come to a convention would be reasonable, rational people, and they would know why they were called into session. I can't imagine that they would take liberties with the Constitution, because no generation ever has.

Also, I point out these facts: The Articles of Confederation contained a provision that nothing could be done by the central Government if there was so much as one objection or one veto by a single State. Something had to be done about that.

Here is another factor: At the time the 1787 convention was meeting there was very considerable dissident sentiment in the colonies. Today you have a unified country in support of a central Government and a federal-State system.

Question. If the convention should go beyond the subject of the "one man, one vote" ruling, what subjects do you think are most likely to be considered?

Answer. Oh, I haven't the slightest idea. A lot of subjects have been bandied about at one time or another, such as limiting the tenure of the justices and judges of our federal courts. There has been a good deal of grousing on that matter over a period of years, and I think there's probably more now than there has been in a long time.

People get rather unhappy about the orders and decisions of the Supreme Court in certain fields, and they place the onus on those who compose the Court.

Question. Do you think it likely a constitutional convention might seek to clarify or limit the extent to which a person can use the Fifth Amendment to avoid self-incrimination?

Answer. It is within the domain of possibility, I would say. But I have grave doubts that they would take any action in that field, even though I think they could if they wanted to.

Question. Have you heard of any move to amend the Constitution so as to limit the effect of recent Court decisions on criminal confessions and police interrogations?

Answer. No, I haven't, although those rulings have commanded a great deal of attention. There is a subcommittee of the Senate which has been holding hearings for the purpose of seeing what might be done about the Miranda decision, for example. [The so-called Miranda decision, handed down by the Supreme Court on June 13, 1966, established strict new rules for police to follow in questioning criminal suspects.] And there could be other decisions to which they might want to give attention.

Question. In recent years there have been demands for repeal of the income tax amendment. Do you see any possibility that the convention might seek to alter the nation's tax structure?

Answer. It could, but I doubt that it would, for this reason: In the first place, the Government has to have revenue, and this revenue has to be obtained from some source, and long ago we determined that probably the income tax was the very best and most equitable source from which to derive those revenues.

Question. What about the possibility of the convention's proposing that Congress have power to overrule a Supreme Court decision that was reached by a 5-to-4 vote?

Answer. I doubt very much whether anything like that would be undertaken because, after all, the Congress can initiate the procedure by which a decision of the Court can be overruled, and that is by proposing a constitutional amendment. That was the reason for the Sixteenth Amendment.

We proceed on the basis of a majority vote in nearly all parts of our government. We do that in Congress, our State legislatures, county boards and city councils. So a split vote in the Supreme Court is not actually a wide deviation from the practice of all our elective bodies today. Only recently, here in the Senate, we had two tie votes that had to be broken by the Vice President. So a division of opinion is not an unusual phenomenon in our public life.

Question. In the case of the Senate, the House has to agree and the President has to approve the action. But in the case of a 5-to-4 Supreme Court decision, is there any appeal?

Answer. No, there isn't, unless the Court itself at some subsequent time re-examines and modifies its decision. Now, that isn't too unusual. The Court has not reversed itself, exactly, but it has reversed the decisions of prior Courts a good many times.

It is interesting to note that the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court [Earl Warren], when he was Governor of California, took exactly the opposite position on the "one man, one vote" rule from the position that he later took as a member of the Supreme Court.

As Governor he argued that, considering the diversity of interests in the State of California, it should be a matter for California to decide the composition of its legislature, and he urged the voters to support the federal system, which they did. Yet, as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, he voted to impose the "one man, one vote" rule not only on California but on all other States as well.

Question. What caused Mr. Warren to change his mind?

Answer. I haven't the slightest idea. He has never indicated why he changed his mind.

How Chief Justice Warren Changed His Mind

When Earl Warren was Governor of California, he opposed a proposal to apportion his State's senate on the basis of population. Speaking at Merced, Calif., on Oct. 20, 1948, Mr. Warren said:

"Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting the representation in the senate to a strictly population basis.

"It is the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the States of the union—equal representation in one house and proportionate representation based on population in the other.

"Moves have been made to upset the balanced representation in our State, even though it has served us well and is strictly in accord with American tradition and the pattern of our National Government.

"There was a time when California was completely dominated by boss rule. The liberal election laws and legislative reapportionment of the system have liberated us from such domination. Any weakening of the laws would invite a return to boss rule which we are now happily rid of.

"Our State has made almost unbelievable progress under our present system of legislative representation. I believe we should keep it."

As Chief Justice of the United States, on June 15, 1964, Mr. Warren wrote the opinion in which the Court held that both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned on a population basis—a ruling that applied not only to California but to all the 50 States.

A Constitutional Convention—The Facts

This country may soon have its first nationwide constitutional convention since the present U.S. Constitution was drafted in 1787.

By late May, the legislatures of 32 States had passed petitions asking Congress to call such a convention.

Action by only two more States is required to bring into play a provision of the Constitution which says:

"The Congress . . . on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments. . . ."

Why, after 180 years, is this unusual method of amending the Constitution now being tried?

The answer is found in a long story of dispute over decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Backers of a constitutional convention want particularly to override a 1964 decision of the Court which said that both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned on the sole basis of population.

"One person, one vote" was the rule laid down by the Court.

Until that ruling, more than 40 of the States gave some weight to various other factors—such as area or local divisions of government—in apportioning the membership of at least one legislative branch.

The 1964 ruling met widespread opposition—especially in rural and smalltown areas where people saw control of their State legislatures shifting to residents of big cities and suburbs.

Now there is speculation that the Court may extend its "one person, one vote" rule to local units of government—such as city councils, county commissions and school boards—as well as to the State legislatures. In four actions on May 22, the Court stopped short of ruling decisively on this specific question.

A leading figure in opposing the Court's 1964 decision is Senator Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois, the Minority Leader in the Senate.

Senator Dirksen tried first to overcome the ruling by getting Congress to propose a constitutional amendment.

The amendment that the Senator proposed would expressly permit a State to apportion one house on factors other than population "in order to insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate."

If passed by two-thirds vote in each house of Congress, the Dirksen amendment would have been submitted to the States and, if ratified by three fourths of the States, would then become a part of the Constitution.

The congressional approach failed, however. The Senate, in 1965, voted 57 to 39 in favor of the amendment—but that was seven votes short of the two-thirds vote required.

Backers of the Dirksen amendment then shifted to the other method of submitting such a measure—through a constitutional convention. There have been attempts to call such a convention in the past, but no attempt has succeeded.

The idea is to get around the congressional roadblock. But any amendment agreed upon by the convention would still have to be ratified by the States.

Once the movement to call a constitutional convention got under way, State after State joined it.

Senator Dirksen predicts that the last two States needed will act within the next few weeks.

AN UNSETTLED SITUATION

Even if that should come to pass, however, a constitutional convention still may not be a certainty.

There are disputes, challenges and questions still to be settled.

Are all the State petitions valid? Will the fact that some petitions are worded differently than others cast a legal cloud on their intent?

Is a petition valid if it was passed by a State legislature that had not yet been reapportioned according to the Supreme Court's standards? Some members of Congress have argued that a petition from such a legislature would not be constitutionally valid.

Will Congress actually call a constitutional convention, even if 34 or more States present valid petitions? There have been expressions of doubt about this.

What if Congress should ignore or defy the States' petitions? Would the Supreme Court order Congress to act?

And if the Court should so order, how could the Court enforce that order on a supposedly coequal branch of the Federal Government?

Yet another question widely discussed is this: Supposing a constitutional convention were called, would its work be limited to this one proposed amendment? Or could the convention propose other changes—perhaps even undertake a large-scale rewriting of the Constitution?

Senator William Proxmire (Dem.), of Wisconsin, recently predicted that a constitutional convention would be a "Pandora's-box nightmare." He said:

"Frankly, if the Congress should call a constitutional convention, I would expect a number of extreme amendments to be offered and adopted by three quarters of our State legislatures."

MORE THAN IS EXPECTED?

Historians recall that this nation's first constitutional convention, in 1787, was called only to amend the Articles of Confederation. Yet that convention wrote an entire new Constitution. Could this happen again?

To get answers to such questions that people are asking about the prospect of a constitutional convention, members of the staff of "U.S. News & World Report" interviewed Mr. Dirksen.

KENNEDY ROUND IS BAD NEWS FOR THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the news about the international tariff agreement recently concluded at Geneva, Switzerland—the so-called Kennedy round—is bitterly disappointing to the American farmer.

This was the agreement that was supposed to safeguard and expand the foreign markets for our agricultural surpluses, particularly in the European Common Market countries—Germany, Italy, France, and the Low Countries. For a good many years we have heard the administration give promise after promise that by tariff bargaining with other countries these markets would be opened up. We were specifically promised that in this Kennedy round no agreement would be made in which agriculture did not share fully with industry.

Now it is clear that these promises have been simply forgotten or ignored. For major agriculture export items there is hardly even a pretense that this agreement will be helpful. The agreement amounts to abandonment of the American farmer by the U.S. State Department.

The great barrier to our agricultural sales to the Common Market has been their system of variable import levies, which they apply to wheat, rice, all feed grains, poultry, dairy products, and several others. By this system they have imposed on our produce a levy or tax at a rate varying from day to day, which has been kept always high enough to force the price of our products above the price of their own—in other words, to price us out of the market.

Even Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has told us again and again that this system was the greatest single barrier to the expansion of our exports.

The application of this system to our trade has been simply ruinous. At times the rates of variable import levy imposed by the Europeans have been fantastically high. For example, on one recent day the rate of levy per bushel of wheat imposed by Germany was $1.77, by France, $1.22, by Italy, $1.53 and so on. That represents, in the case of Germany, a tax of more than 100 percent of the original value of the wheat.

On the same date the rate of variable levy on our corn imposed by Germany was $1.07 per bushel, a tax of nearly 100 percent on the base value of the product.

Getting rid of this variable levy system was originally the No. 1 objective of the U.S. negotiators in their tariff bargaining at Geneva. But the Common Market negotiators turned thumbs down on that proposal. They would not even talk about it.

Then the U.S. negotiators asked that at least there be a limit put on the height of the levy that could be imposed. They did not get anywhere on that request either.

Then they asked for a guarantee that the Common Market continue to import a certain percentage of its grain consumption from the surplus-producing countries. This approach, asking for a guaranteed "access" for a certain quantity of grain, was also unsuccessful. This Nation asked for a guarantee that European countries would take 13 percent of their grain needs from abroad. That figure did not represent an increase in our sales, merely a promise to maintain the same level of purchases. That request likewise was refused.

At that point it might have been a good idea to tell France and the others that there would not be any agreement unless they were willing to give agriculture equal treatment with industry. If this had been done, I do not think the Common Market would have been happy at the idea of losing all the tariff concessions this country had made and the markets in this country that we were offering them. However, our negotiators apparently lacked the gumption to demand a real quid pro quo.

As a result, on our grain we received no concessions at all except two face-saving gestures. First, the Common Market has agreed to make a contribution toward a wheat pool to be provided to the underdeveloped countries. This contribution will amount to only about 1 million tons. Last year we gave India alone about 10 million tons. Obviously, this token contribution by the Common Market will do little to reduce the world wheat surplus. Second, it was agreed that the minimum price for world wheat prices would be raised by about 28 cents per bushel, but it will still be below the level at which world wheat has been selling recently.

Possibly these two supposed concessions will be widely advertised and paraded by administration spokesmen as great gains for our grain exports. In fact, they have little practical meaning to our farmers or our grain trade.

The important fact is this: The agreement contains not a word limiting the use of the variable levy system. It contains nothing at all in the way of a guarantee of access for any of the grains. Yet wheat and feed grains are the key products whose outlets in the Common Market are in jeopardy.

We are really worse off under this agreement that we were before without it. At the 1961–62 tariff negotiations at Geneva—the so-called Dillon round—the same question came up, but at least at that time we got a promise that the Common Market would continue the same level of wheat imports as in the past. This year, we did not even get that.

We have been reducing our tariff levels almost continuously ever since 1934 when the original Trade Agreements Act was passed under President Roosevelt. We have made concession after concession to other countries on the promise that they would open up markets for our products including our farm surpluses. It is a sad commentary on the skill and will of our negotiators that after all these years, the barriers by other countries against our exports of wheat, feed grains, and other farm products are higher than ever.

The June issue of the Farm Journal contains a particularly penetrating analysis of the manner in which this tariff agreement was negotiated. This article points out that for the last 4 or 5 years, administration publicists and spokesmen have been talking up this proposed agreement, advertising its virtues and the benefits it would bring us, tagging it with the name of the late President Kennedy, and generally building up the image of the agreement in the public mind even before any agreements had been made. As a result they find themselves prisoners of their own propaganda. They dare not now confess failure. They dare not reveal how destructive the agreement will be in actuality. They must make any concession, accept any rebuff, grant any request demanded, in order to get some kind of agreement which it can then be pretended is some sort of a triumph.

Thus, we have an agreement which represents a total failure to carry through on the promises that were made to the farmer. Once again, as the Farm Journal notes, the farmer has been sold down the river.

Unanimous consent is requested to insert in the RECORD at this point an article from the Farm Journal for June 1967 entitled "Farmers and the Kennedy Round."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS AND THE KENNEDY ROUND

Ever since the writer was in Geneva and the Common Market countries last winter we've been highly skeptical that American farmers were going to win anything of consequence in the much-advertised Kennedy Round. The United States had given the negotiations so much publicity (with the former President's name on the whole affair) that FARM JOURNAL predicted then that we'd fix up some kind of face-saving deal on agriculture so we could come home with an agreement of some sort, almost any sort. We wouldn't want to admit that after four years of hassling around, all this had come to nothing. It appeared plain that the Common Market negotiators, knowing this, would just sit tight until we caved in.

Which apparently is exactly what happened. Little by little we gave in until at the end the rout, so far as U.S. agriculture was concerned, was almost complete.

Come July 1 farmers are going to discover how they were abandoned by their government in Geneva. On that date the Common Market's tariffs against most of our major farm products are going *up*—not down. Don't forget that as you read about the great "success" of the Kennedy Round! We could have done something about it by threatening to raise tariffs against European industrial goods imported here. We had a club, all right, a big one, but didn't have the guts to use it. Instead we meekly accepted the higher tariffs against our farm stuff, thereby tacitly putting our stamp of approval on Europe's vicious "variable levy" system. Right then and there we had lost the Kennedy Round so far as American farmers were concerned.

After that we did a lot of hollering about "access" to the Common Market, quibbling over whether we and other non-member nations should be allowed 13% (our historic share) or 10% (as the Common Market offered). We rather pathetically tried to assure "access" by means of an international grains agreement. In the end we gave up even on that and in the final agreement you won't find a word about "access."

The real way to get "access," of course, is to lower tariffs as the Kennedy Round was intended to do, not argue over an "agreement" which, judging by all past experience, wouldn't have been enforced anyway. But, as pointed out, U.S. farmers were sold out by this administration months ago on this. For fear of endangering the whole round of talks their interests were quietly dropped down the well.

In the Geneva talks the minimum price in the range of world wheat prices was raised 28c a bushel, to $1.73. This is about a dime under what wheat has been selling for in world markets recently. So it neither costs the Common Market anything nor brings American farmers anything, although it does increase the floor under world prices. Anyhow, we don't sell much wheat to the Common Market and the amount is declining. She has a surplus of soft wheat of her own and the hard wheat she buys she gets largely from Canada and Australia.

Finally, on food aid for the hungry world the Common Market pledged about 1 million tons, a mere token. We alone gave just one country, India, 10 million tons last year. Our give-away and soft-currency "sales" under PL 480 will amount to $1.5 billion to $2 billion this year.

Probably in the over-all sense the Kennedy Round did some good. Doubtless it will reduce industrial tariffs generally and stimulate more world trade. But don't let anybody tell you American farm products won anything much. In fact anything accomplished at the Kennedy Round was bought at their expense. The much-advertised fight that the Administration was going to put up for U.S. farmers ended in almost complete capitulation. Which is usual for our State Department when it deals with the interests of U.S. farmers.

The best thing that resulted, aside from a minor concession here and there (on such products as tobacco, fruit and some smaller-volume items) was that we escaped getting entangled in an international grains agreement which could have shaped American farm policy in Geneva. We can thank the Common Market negotiations for this. Our own team tried hard enough to get one, but in spite of ourselves we were spared. Otherwise American farmers got a thorough selling down the river.

NEBRASKA RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ESSAY CONTEST WINNERS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, each spring the winners of the Nebraska Rural Electrification Association essay contest come to Washington as a part of their prize. Thirty of these youngsters will be guests of the association this year. Their essays were selected as the best from among hundreds on the subject, "The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community."

A highlight of the trip is the Nebraska congressional breakfast at which these youngsters are presented with copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which appear their winning essays.

Printing the essays in the RECORD serves a dual purpose, to honor the winners of the contest, but more importantly, to call to the attention of the Congress the importance of rural electrification.

As Nebraskans observe their State centennial this year, it is significant to point out the role played by rural electrification in the development of Nebraska. For over two-thirds of Nebraska's first hundred years its rural areas were largely without electricity. Only 7 percent of the farms in Nebraska had electric power in 1920. Today, 98 percent of the farms have electricity.

Many of us can remember the days when the farmer had to rely on an oil or kerosene lantern and a wood-burning stove, the days when there was no radio, television, milking machines, and a host of other electric-powered items now common to the farm.

Even so, some of us who do remember the inconveniences of being without electricity sometimes tend to take this marvelous force for granted. We often fail to consider how electricity has improved our economy, provided safety, and given us the extra hours to devote to our home and community.

This year's essay winners have had the benefits of electricity for most of their lives and would not be expected to appreciate its importance. Yet the excellence of the essays shows the writers do indeed have a deep appreciation of the benefits of rural electrification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, essays written by the following:

Jim Carse, 17, a junior at Palisade High School; the son of Mr. and Mrs. Leon Carse of Palisade, Nebr. Sponsor: Southwest Public Power District, Palisade, Nebr.

Janice Kloepper, 15, a junior at Elgin Public School; the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ivan Kloepper of Elgin, Nebr. Sponsor: Elkhorn Rural Public Power District, Battle Creek, Nebr.

Vickie Maska, 17, a junior at Franklin High School; the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Wayne Maska of Franklin, Nebr. Sponsor: Franklin County Rural Public Power District, Franklin, Nebr.

Dennis Pelster, 16, a sophomore at Dalton Public School; the son of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Pelster of Dalton, Nebr. Sponsor: Wheatbelt Public Power District, Sidney, Nebr.

Stanley R. Rabbe, 17, a junior at Sutton High School; the son of Mr. and Mrs. Cleo H. Rabbe of Sutton, Nebr. Sponsor: South Central Public Power District, Nelson, Nebr.

Elaine Waggoner, 17, a junior at Huntley High School; the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Calvin Waggoner of Republican City, Nebr. Sponsor: Twin Valleys Public Power District, Cambridge, Nebr.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND THE VALUE OF ELECTRICITY IN THE HOME AND ON THE FARM

(By Jim Carse, Palisade High School, Palisade, Nebr.)

Mankind found electricity, the mighty force behind the thunderstorm, two hundred years ago. This power was of no value until man learned to control it.

The first step toward finding controlled electricity came by accident in the middle of the eighteenth century. It began when an Italian anatomist, Galvani, left the legs of some freshly killed frogs in contact with two wires, one of brass and one of iron. He noticed that the frog's legs began to twitch, and thought it was because some kind of animal energy still remained in them. But another Italian scientist, Volta, proved that the twitching was caused by the fact that the two different metals played a part in producing electricity. Soon Volta made the first electric battery. From this idea controlled electricity became possible.

Batteries produce electricity by chemical changes yet do not produce current enough for the modern man's needs. Today's large scale generators produce electricity by means of rapidly rotating magnets.

The notion of electricity generated from a central station and distributed to farms in the United States took hold of men's minds slowly. Engineers knew how to do the job as early as 1915 when they learned to transmit power as far as one hundred miles from a generating station. Large scale rural electrification, for lighting, at least, was technically possible from that time on.

The Rural Electrification Act of 1935 put "fuel to the fire" by authorizing loans to bring electric service to rural areas at a reasonable rate and to the remote and low density area residents on a non-profit basis. George Norris of McCook, Nebraska was Senatorial leader toward passage of this act.

Local co-ops or power systems now provide the rural power lines and certain related electric expenditures.

On May 11, Nebraska will be celebrating the 32nd anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration. It will not get the publicity the Nebraska Centennial is attracting; yet just as the Model T heralded a new era in transportation, R.E.A. has provided a better standard of living for rural Nebraska and improved farm production.

Nebraska's Centennial displays have made me more conscious than ever how fortunate I am to be of this generation. I enjoy electricity in many medias.

Rural Electrification on farms has increased the efficiency of the farmer, both in his home and about his farmstead. It has "lifted the load from their tired backs."

In the form of heat, electricity provides a comfortable temperature, and a supply of hot water. It provides the right temperatures for processing farm produce as found in bulk milk coolers.

Through the medium of light it increases efficiency and promotes safety. Plant and animal production may be stimulated as found in modern poultry and greenhouses.

Electricity has its widest applications in the form of power. On farms electric motors drive grain elevators and conveyors, grind feed, air-cure grain and hay, and powers shop tools. It can remove manure from dairy barns or poultry houses as well as insure an automatic water supply or control a ventilating system. It accurately cools the milk, refrigerates storage, or even mows the lawn. Electric power has made the farm gas engine and hand crank obsolete.

Farm homemakers are delighted to enjoy the conveniences of the city homemaker. Heating, lighting, cooling, and all the many power driven appliances free her from house work drudgery.

I believe R.E.A. will continue to improve the rural economic condition of Nebraska by utilizing local resources and attracting new industry. What a future!

Development of Rural Electrification in My Area

(By Janice Kloepper, Elgin Public School, Elgin, Nebr.)

The time is a period between 1882 and 1935. As we look at the rural Nebraska, we see only scattered farmhouses about the country. Looking into one of these houses the first modern conveniences we notice are a wood burning stove, and a lantern. Now the time is 1967 and looking in the same house we see an electric range; instead of the lantern we find on the wall a switch for the electric light.

How did this change come to be? This is where the story of how the REA came into being starts.

The first big step occurred on May 11, 1935, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt created by Executive Order, the Rural Electrification Administration. However, there was little interest at first because private power companies did not believe that farmers could afford electric service.

This did not stop the determined Nebraskans though. Farmers held countless meetings making plans to organize their own power district. Then came the first problems. In 1934 and 1936 Nebraska was faced by a dry period in which crops were poor and they were faced by a serious fund shortage. Senator George W. Norris noticing the plight of the Nebraskans if they did not receive aid introduced about in 1936 a bill which would enable REA to receive $40,000,000 annually. His co-sponsor was Representative Sam Rayburn of Texas.

With this new crutch to aid them, they completed final plans to surge on to the big day in April 29, 1940, when 116 miles were completed of energized line serving 148 customers.

At this time 18.9 per cent of Nebraska farms had electric service. By 1950 72.2 per cent had service, and in 1965 98.0 per cent of the farms had it.

But does it all stop here? No, in order to keep all services up rural electric systems borrow money from the REA to build the latest electric facilities to serve their customers. These loans are repaid with a two per cent interest rate set by the passage of the Pace Act in 1944. The system has enabled Nebraska rural electric systems to operate about 59,307 miles of line and operate this service for 102,315 customers.

Although this was only a small part of how rural electrification got its start in my area, it was the beginning of a more modern life. Today it is still expanding and improving as Senator John Sherman of Kentucky stated; quote—". . . Much yet remains to be done, for the increasing use of electric energy calls for heavier equipment and enlarged facilities, to provide and carry the power which modern rural life demands today."

The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community

(By Vickie Maska, Franklin High School, Franklin, Nebr.)

What is electricity? According to Noah Webster, it is an imponderable and invisible agent producing light, heat, chemical decomposition, and other physical phenomena. But to the rural inhabitant it is much more than this. To him electricity is a way of life.

In 1920 only 7 per cent of the farms had electric power; but by the middle of the century three fourths of all farms in the United States were electrified. Rural electrification is so widespread, in contrast to what it was several years ago, that many take it for granted. It is only when one finds himself without it that one realizes its great value.

The value of this is proven inside the home. For example, light and water, two of the most important assets, are provided by electricity. Electric heat provides many homes with warmth so vital in the Nebraska blizzarding winter months, as electricity also makes air conditioning possible in the blistering summers. Household tasks are lightened immensely and time-consuming jobs are shortened by the use of many electric appliances such as washers, dryers, vacuum cleaners, dishwashers, and irons. The kitchen, sometimes considered the heart of the home, is the center of numerous electric devices, the range, the refrigerator, mixers, skillets, and others which help make it the heart. When one speaks of comforts and conveniences of the home he also speaks of electricity, for many of these are made possible by it. Illustrating this is electric blankets and deep freezers. Where would people be without the news transmitted to them by the popular radio and television which also offers entertainment?

Moving to the outside, electricity is found equally important. The back-breaking task of scooping grain is eliminated by the electric auger and elevator. An outstanding aid to the farmer is irrigation. The milking machine and electric separator are indispensable items of the dairy farmer. Water, a must to the farmer, is available whenever needed. Mechanical tools, essential in farm labor, are operated by electricity. Kerosene lanterns can now be stored on the shelf because of the yard lights which illumine the darkness. The development and use of these electric devices has led to increased livestock and crop production and provided the farm laborers with more leisure time.

The coming of rural public power put rural areas on an equal basis with urban areas. Opportunities and comforts once only available to city inhabitants are now enjoyed and used to advantage by people living in rural areas. A country home can be as beautiful, modern, and convenient as one in any area.

Through these things it is evident that rural public power is one of the greatest developments and achievements of this modernized world. By saving time, lessening burdens, providing more comforts, conveniences, and opportunities, and modernizing his home in general, rural electrification has revolutionized and improved the living standard of the rural inhabitant. This has taken place not only in my home and community, but nationwide, thus making for a more prosperous and progressive country.

The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community

(By Dennis Pelster, Dalton Public School, Dalton, Nebr.)

Rural electrification has brought the people of our community out of the darkness into a bright future. It has made it possible to eliminate early "conveniences" and substitute modern electrical appliances for them, thus, aiding our rural people in keeping step with their city counterparts. Ice boxes, kerosene lamps, coal stoves, scrub boards, hand pumps and water dippers are no longer commonplace articles of today. Now for your Saturday night bath, you can bask in a tub of hot water supplied from a nearby faucet instead of huddling in a tin tub placed in the middle of the kitchen floor filled with water provided from a kettle heated on the kitchen stove. Plumbing facilities do not consist of the Sears and Roebuck catalogue in a shack at the end of a worn path; instead, we have an electric pressure system and modern indoor plumbing.

Freezers, automatic washers and dryers, self-defrosting refrigerators, and many more modern electrical conveniences have emancipated the farmer's wife from many tedious jobs and allow her more free time for the activities that she would like, such as playing an occasional game of golf or sponsoring a group of Girl Scouts. Now she may devote more of her time to her family. Almost everything a housewife does during the day, from the time she shuts off the electric alarm clock in the morning until she flips the last light switch at night, is dependent in some way on electricity.

Consider the farmer who conserves much time and energy when he can just push a button and have his cattle fed by an electrical feeding system. Many a farmer has saved his golden harvest from a devastating hail storm by reaping wet grain and drying it in an electric grain dryer. The advent of electric grain augers has practically discontinued the need for a scoop shovel. When time is at a premium, costly machinery repairs may be made hastily with an electric welder.

Even the mighty United States Government needed rural electrification when the National Defense Minuteman Program was carried out in Western Nebraska when the missile silos and sites were established. Wealthy oil companies need electricity to power the huge pumps they have on the oil wells which dot our countryside. Due to ample low cost electric power, several industries have located in our vicinity in the last five years. These things all help to bring additional income to our locality.

In 1936, a group of foresighted men, seeking a better way of life, formed co-ops who borrowed money from the Rural Electrification Administration which was a division of the United States Department of Agriculture in order to finance rural electrical systems.

There still remains an abundance of things to be done. More electrical conveniences will be developed in the future. Many giant steps will be taken in progress for the rural population due to electric power. Rural electrification—what would we do without it!

The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community

(By Stanley R. Rabbe, Sutton High School, Sutton, Nebr.)

Electricity came to our home November 1, 1949. Preparation was made for this event by a qualified electrician. Preparations for a new baby in the household were also being made. Excitement and anticipation filled the air.

So it was that I was born November 15, 1949, the year our home and farm became electrified. Let me tell you of the value it has been. The barn was wired as soon as the house wiring was completed. Milking cows at regular hours required additional hours of light over winter months. Before rural electrification, it was furnished by a kerosene lantern. To increase production of eggs, the chickens had to have additional hours to eat and drink. This had been accomplished with a gasoline lantern.

The farrowing house for pigs was also

wired. This gave an immediate increase in the baby pig crop. Heat bulbs installed in divided pens gave baby pigs heat they needed, plus safety away from mother.

The increased income helped us provide improvements for the home. The iron and washing machine were the first purchases. Soon after, there was refrigeration. With a growing boy in the family, groceries were very important. Larger portions of food could be purchased on special sales and stored safely. Thus electricity was saving for us again.

Mother really had a helpmate in the kitchen when the new electric range was installed. It cooks to perfection, large or small portions. Timed cooking, pre-set by mother, freed her for other duties. The mess of flame and soot from grandmother's day are gone. Pretty curtains and clean walls remain bright.

In seventeen years, we have learned to make electricity work for us. I thoroughly enjoy helping dad work with the drying of grain, augering it into bins for storage and feeding purposes, plus all the other farm work made easier and faster with electricity.

From these examples, you can see how our income has increased, and how we have been given additional hours for our home and community.

Our yard light, as well as our neighbors', is also among the welcome conveniences. Many are the times dad and I have made the necessary repairs to machinery, broken down in harvest time, by this yard light after dark. The yard light welcomes neighbors and friends for a friendly evening of visiting and cards. It waits patiently to show us the way home after school activities. Neighbors' lights over this wide prairie country gives a feeling of fellowship and friendliness to our community. The spiderwork of millions of miles of electric wire connect us closely.

Electric cooperatives have *improved* our *economy*.

Electricity has given us *safety* in many dark corners.

Electricity has given us *convenience* to do our jobs better.

We have been given *extra time* to devote to our home and community.

We are seventeen years old, electricity and I, and we are growing and looking toward a wonderful future.

The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community

(By Elaine Waggoner, Huntley High School, Republican City, Nebr.)

The REA is a way of life in my community. It provides many of the basic essentials so that we can be more comfortable.

The farmer especially needs electricity to do his job well and if it were not for the REA, he would have none. On the farm electricity is used for lighting, of course, but this is only one of its minor functions. It also pumps water for people, livestock, and crops. Electricity gives heat to homes and to animals such as baby pigs whose lives depend upon it. The REA also provides us with a link to the outside world by giving us a chance to learn through television, radio, and records. Our food is cooled and cooked by electricity and our clothes are washed and dried by it.

These, of course, were just obvious uses of electricity. There are many we hardly notice such as our dependence on the light bulb to help us find things and even to read. There are many more we never even think about since electricity is so completely woven into the fiber of our daily lives.

To different people electricity means many different things. To a small child it is the security of knowing a light switch is always near to keep back darkness. Teenagers practically subsist on electricity since it plays their record players, radios, and television sets. Without it for "burning the midnight oil" homework would never be completed. To adults the REA means an economical way of getting hard work done. In our lives today machines do ninety per cent of our work and electricity runs many of these machines. With the REA as a helper farmers can finish their work quickly and have time for recreation which also is often provided by electricity. To older people electricity helps cut loneliness by bringing entertainment into their home.

Besides these important functions, our REA has another advantage. It is owned by the people who use it so they have a say in the business matters of the company. This helps to keep the prices low. In recent years instead of prices raising per kilowatt hour they have gone down which is an exact opposite of almost everything else in the country.

But what does Rural Electrification mean to me? The REA for me has always been a constant friend. I have never had to be without it for more than a few hours at any one time. For this reason I probably do not appreciate it as much as my parents since they spent their childhoods without it. But I do realize that without it I would not be as well informed, I would have to work harder and I would not be as healthy as I am now. But most important of all: the REA means a company that is always near and ready to serve cheaply and efficiently.

The REA is a silent servant that improves our farming community and my family each day it serves us.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE III OF TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of introducing a bill on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The bill amends title III of the Tariff Trade Expansion Act of 1962 so as to substitute for the required finding of serious injury or threat thereof to domestic industry, a requirement that the Tariff Commission find "whether, as a result, in whole or in part, of concessions granted under trade agreements, an article is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause, or threaten to cause, serious injury to the domestic industry producing an article which is like or directly competitive with the imported article."

The bill provides that increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered to cause, or threaten to cause, serious injury to the domestic industry concerned when the Tariff Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed in any substantial degree toward causing, or threatening to cause, serious injury to such industry.

Under the bill, the Tariff Commission is directed to make a finding of serious injury to the domestic industry when it finds that increased imports have contributed or are contributing in any substantial degree to a declining volume of domestic production, regardless of other influencing factors.

The bill substitutes similar findings by the Tariff Commission for a firm to seek adjustment assistance under chapter 2, or for a group of workers to seek adjustment under chapter 3, of title III.

Under the bill, if the Tariff Commission makes the necessary finding of serious injury or threat thereof, it is mandatory upon the President to provide tariff adjustment for the affected domestic industry and to authorize firms in such industry and groups of workers in such industry to apply for adjustment assistance under chapters 2 and 3 of title III.

In addition, the bill makes the Tariff Commission's finding as to the amount of increase, in, or imposition, of, any duty or other import restriction which is necessary to prevent or remedy the serious injury or threat thereof to the domestic industry binding upon the President. That is, the President would have to provide the tariff adjustment which the Tariff Commission finds necessary to prevent or remedy the serious injury or threat thereof.

Under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, a domestic article is considered "directly competitive with" an imported article at an earlier or later stage of processing, if the importation of the imported article has an economic effect on producers of the domestic article comparable to the effect of importation of articles in the same stage of processing as the domestic article. For this purpose, an unprocessed article is considered to be at an earlier stage of processing.

The bill adds a provision to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to provide that, in determining whether an unprocessed article—that is, a raw material—is directly competitive with an imported article at a later stage of processing—that is, a finished or semifinished imported article—the Tariff Commission shall weigh carefully, among other factors, the relationship of the unprocessed article and the imported article, the number of processes involved, and the number and volume of secondary materials required.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for a period of 1 week or until the close of business on Tuesday, June 8, to allow Senators who may desire to cosponsor the measure to do so.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the Senator from Maine will permit me, it is my understanding that a general objection was lodged some time ago to having bills lie on the table. My personal feeling is not to object to any such request, myself; but in view of that program laid down by the leadership on this side, I have agreed to object. Therefore, I object.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I understand completely. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. SMITH. Since this legislation is actually an updating of S. 2176 that the late Styles Bridges, then senior Senator from New Hampshire and ranking minority Member of the Senate, introduced on June 29, 1961, I shall liberally use many of the same observations that he did on that date.

As he said at the outset of his speech that day, I am not certain, Mr. President, whether this bill had its beginning in the sincere appeals of an unemployed shoeworker in Maine or New Hampshire, in the entreaties of a desperate textile manufacturer, or, indeed, in my own deep-rooted belief that we invite disaster when we close our eyes to ailing domestic industry.

Six years ago Senator Bridges said:

> In any case, the basis for this bill is valid. And, I might add, the need for this legislation is overpowering. Industry, the lifeblood of our Nation's free enterprise system, is in trouble. The American giant which produces the weapons of wartime and the labor-saving, time-saving devices of peacetime is facing a serious and unfair challenge from abroad. The same seemingly indestructible giant which provides necessary employment to keep this country economically strong has been very seriously wounded by the sharp knife of low-cost imports from foreign countries. Thus far, despite significant losses, it has managed to survive, but even a giant can bleed to death. I respectfully introduce this bill as a tourniquet to stop the bleeding.

What Senator Bridges said 6 years ago is even more applicable now. Five years ago, many of us went along with, and voted for, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 for two basic reasons. The first reason was that we did not want to be obstructionists against reciprocal trade agreements. No one has consistently supported reciprocal trade agreements legislation more than I have.

But we did not want to blindly and "carte blanc" support reciprocal trade agreements legislation to the detriment of domestic producers. We were not asking for special and restrictive protectionism; but we were asking that the trade agreements be truly reciprocal.

So we were offered what was called the orderly marketing agreement approach, which was incorporated in sections 352 and 301(b) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. These provisions were represented to be saviors for domestic producers. They were particularly hailed as saviors by the shoe manufacturers. They were represented as providing the way out for those who did not want to be tagged as obstructionists to reciprocal trade, but who still wanted to obtain equitable treatment for their domestic producers. This was the second basic reason why many of us ultimately supported the trade expansion bill back in 1962.

Yet, some of us did express skepticism as to whether the Orderly Marketing Agreement approach would really produce the happy solution that it was promised that it would. Five years of the operation of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 have proved that our worst fears and skepticism were, unfortunately, justified.

Under the provisions of section 352 and section 301(b)—the provisions that provide for the orderly marketing agreement approach—section 352 authorizes the President to negotiate an international orderly marketing agreement only after receiving an affirmative finding of the Tariff Commission under section 301(b) with respect to an industry. After such an affirmative finding is received, the President may—and I repeat the word "may" for clarification and emphasis—under section 352 negotiate such an agreement in lieu of exercising the authority contained in section 351(a)(1).

Now what have these originally greatly heralded orderly marketing agreement provisions produced in results for the equitable treatment of domestic producers during the 5 years of the operation of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962? Exactly nothing—I repeat, exactly nothing. So much promised 5 years ago; and absolutely nothing delivered by the orderly marketing agreement approach in the past 5 years.

For the General Counsel of the U.S. Tariff Commission, in a memorandum dated February 15, 1967, reported that—

> There have been no affirmative findings by the Tariff Commission under section 301(b). In the circumstances, it would appear that there would have been no occasion for the President to exercise the authority granted under section 352.

Section 352 being the orderly marketing agreement section of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Nothing delivered from so much promise.

I have inquired more specifically on the operational record of the Tariff Commission with respect to section 301 and 352 that established the so-called orderly marketing agreement machinery. The information furnished me is a summary, as of today, compiled by the Secretary of the U.S. Tariff Commission through the entire 5-year period of the Trade Expansion Act to this very day.

That summary compiled by the Office of the Secretary of the U.S. Tariff Commission revealed that there had been only 20 investigations completed by the Tariff Commission under section 301 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 during the period covered. It further showed that on these 20 investigations, not once did the Tariff Commission render an affirmative finding in favor of domestic producers. More than that, it revealed that in all but two of these investigations—in 18 out of 20—the negative findings were unanimous. One negative finding was a 3-to-2 split decision—the other, a 2-to-2 split decision. One investigation, started in April of this year, is still underway.

But what is even more shocking to me, is the fact that domestic producers thought so little of, and had so little faith in, the orderly marketing agreement approach to equitable solution of their problems of the low-cost import competition, that only 21 times have they petitioned for an investigation.

After the manner in which the shoe manufacturers 5 years ago heralded the orderly marketing agreement approach as the salvation of their industry against the competition of low-cost imports, I am particularly shocked to find that no one in the shoe industry—no shoe industry association, no shoe manufacturer, no shoeworkers union—no one, but no one—filed a petition to invoke the orderly marketing agreement machinery. Such a complete absence of petitioning devastatingly reveals how little faith the shoe industry and workers actually have had in the orderly marketing agreement approach on which they originally lavished so much praise.

Almost equal in the original praise of the orderly marketing agreement approach was the textile industry—yet in the past 5 years there has been only one petition for its invocation by anyone in the textile industry. That petition was filed by the Textile Workers Union of America, of Cordova, Ala., over 3 years ago in 1963.

Added to this overwhelmingly negative 5-year record of the orderly marketing agreement approach are disturbing indications from the recently completed Kennedy round of the GATT negotiations. I quote from a recent statement of a person who lives with this problem, and obviously has a greater depth of knowledge on it than I have.

On May 17, 1967, William J. Erwin, president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, released the following statement regarding textile tariff reductions made during the Kennedy round of GATT negotiations:

> Although specific details are not available, we understand that textile tariff cuts which average approximately 20 per cent on cotton products, 13 per cent on man-made fiber products, and something substantially more on man-made fibers and yarn have been made at Geneva. We understand further that there are no cuts on woolen products, other than the so-called hand-loomed items.
>
> It is tragic that our government has reduced tariffs in view of the enormous volume and increasing rate of textile products imports already entering the U.S. market. Some representatives of government and many interested members of Congress have been diligent in their efforts to avoid further damage to the U.S. textile industry by tariff cuts. We regret that their efforts were not more successful.
>
> The fact remains that any level of tariff cuts increases the vulnerability of our textile industry to low-wage foreign imports.
>
> During the life of the Trade Expansion Act we have seen textile imports build up from 926 million square yards in 1961 to a current rate of 2.8 billion, a three-fold increase. What has happened at Geneva can only make the situation worse.
>
> The Trade Expansion Act was to be a vehicle for expanding trade between the United States and the Common Market. In the case of textile products, it is clear that the prime beneficiary will be Japan and other low-wage textile producing nations. These are the countries that already are siphoning off American jobs.
>
> Apparently nothing was done in Geneva about the non-tariff barriers which stand in the way of U.S. textile exports to many coun-

tries of the world; neither did it eliminate the barriers with which other countries keep out imports from Japan and other low-wage countries, thereby giving further encouragement to these countries to focus on the American market.

As a result of the new textile tariff cuts, it is all the more clear that the only solution for the survival of a healthy, efficient, expanding textile industry in America is a system of quantitative controls for man-made fiber, man-made fiber products, and woolen textile products, together with effective administration of the GATT Cotton Textile Control Arrangement, which we definitely have not had in recent years. These objectives will continue to be the prime concern of the U.S. textile industry, and will be pursued with all the vigor and resourcefulness it can muster.

The March 18, 1967, editorial of Leather and Shoes stated that the "footwear industry is now teetering on the brink of major disaster, due more to the rapidly expanding influx of imported footwear. We are faced with a Government trade policy which appears willing to sacrifice one of the Nation's most important industries in the interest of so-called political necessity." I will not read the entire editorial, but rather ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UP FOR GRABS—A $5 BILLION INDUSTRY

Few people, especially in Government circles, realize that the $5 billion plus footwear industry, generally regarded as one of the more stable standbys in U.S. manufacturing circles, is now teetering on the brink of major disaster.

Rather than looking forward to projected growth in 1967 and ensuing years, some 800 odd domestic footwear manufacturers and their hundreds of suppliers may soon find themselves facing a long period of attrition and decline.

The footwear industry's bright future seen for the 1970's and beyond, its hitherto moderate but assured growth rate, is almost sure to prove but a dim memory. Even the 665 million pairs of conventional shoes expected to roll off our production lines this year may turn out to be more shadow than substance.

This astonishing turn of events can only be attributed to a fact we can no longer ignore: the U.S. shoe manufacturing industry is up for grabs. In more than 300 years of contributing to the nation's progress and well-being, it has never been threatened as it is today.

Apparently Congress or the State Department—we haven't been able to pin down the individuals or groups responsible—regards the American footwear industry as expendable.

Otherwise, how could cheap labor, low-cost imported footwear be allowed to reach close to 17 percent of domestic production in 1966?

How, we ask, could our State Department consider reducing imported footwear tariffs by as much as 50 percent (at the Kennedy Rounds) while reciprocity remains a figment of somebody's imagination? And while foreign governments continue to encourage footwear exports to the U.S. through export subsidies?

How could Congress consider opening our gates wide to a flood of cheap shoes from Iron Curtain countries via the projected East-West Trade Bill?

We submit that the current log in domestic shoe production, which has manufacturers and suppliers concerned over a severe drop in new orders, is due more to the rapidly expanding influx of imported footwear than to any decline in consumer demand. Witness the 24 percent increase in footwear imports during January, lifting imports to an unprecedented 23 percent of U.S. footwear production for that month.

Witness the fact that while American manufacturers went begging for orders at the recent New York and Boston shoe shows, importers at the same shows were busily writing a record volume of orders for low-cost, foreign-made footwear of all types.

As matters stand now, the situation will soon become intolerable. We are on the verge of a record invasion of imported footwear and leathers with which our domestic industries cannot possibly compete solely because of price. We are faced with a government trade policy which appears willing to sacrifice one of the nation's most important industries in the interests of so-called "political necessity".

Thus we can only look forward to a declining share of the American footwear market and closed doors overseas. The inevitable result is a growing mortality rate among U.S. footwear producers, among the highest employers of labor in relation to dollar volume, as well as severe attrition among tanners and suppliers—and thousands of workers thrown out of jobs.

The issue is no longer one of outmoded political expediency. Today—right now—it concerns the survival of an industry!

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, as I stated previously, I have been an advocate of international trade throughout my 27 years in Congress—an advocate of reciprocal trade agreements as long as they were reciprocal. But as the Daily Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Maine, stated in its May 25, 1967, editorial:

> The liberalization of international trade is always a goal worth pursuing—but never at the expense of American domestic industries and American workers' jobs.

Rather than read that entire editorial, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

GENEVA: WERE TEXTILES HURT?

The textile industry in New England and the South now looks somewhat apprehensively to President Johnson for a helping hand. The industry hopes for protection against lower-cost foreign competition, in the wake of the so-called "Kennedy round" trade negotiations recently concluded in Geneva.

Kennebec Journal Washington Bureau reporter Don Larrabee says it will be late next next month before details are published on every item negotiated at Geneva, but that "enough is known about the textile agreements to make the industry apprehensive.

Southern congressmen, representing states with heavy concentrations of textile manufacturing, had a closed-door meeting last week with Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Larrabee reports, on the "damage" to domestic textiles at Geneva.

One participant quoted anonymously by the Washington reporter, commented: 'What we learned from Mr. Rusk offers little or no encouragement for the textile industry. It is clear that the industry is in a worse position than it was when the negotiations were started in 1962. We did get a three-year extension of the long-term agreement. But this agreement in the past has not been administered in the manner originally contemplated."

The reciprocal trade agreement program which involved 53 of the world's most important trading nations in the Geneva "Kennedy round" negotiations is a program which gives extensive tariff-cutting power to the Executive Branch of the U.S. government. That power, in theory, is in President Johnson's hands; in actuality, it is wielded for him by more or less anonymous employes of the Department of State. Larrabee reports, in this connnection:

"Apparently Secretary Rusk and his aides reported that the United States agreed to (tariff) cuts of about 15 to 20 per cent on average for all cotton textile items . . . There were no changes in tariffs on wool products . . . The failure to obtain any restrictions on woolen textiles is a special blow to New England textile interests . . ."

The industry must keep its fingers crossed, at least until late in June when details on the Geneva negotiations are published in full, before the worst—or the best—can be known. On May 19, the Kennebec Journal called the known results of the "Kennedy round" agreements impressive. But, the KJ added:

"In the United States today a strong case can be made for keeping the barriers up against a rising tide of imported steel, dairy products, chemicals, textiles, shoes and some other lines competing with American products in the American domestic market."

The liberalization of international trade is always a goal worth pursuing—but never at the expense of American domestic industries and American workers' jobs. If Mr. Rusk and his aides have been over-generous to foreign textile exporters, at the expense of New England and Southern workers, the congressional delegations from both regions should loudly demand to know why.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in my concluding remarks on this bill, I would observe that I am trying to do basically the same thing the late Senator Bridges proposed 6 years ago—to spell out the intent of Congress as clearly as possible to avoid continued misinterpretation by those individuals responsible for carrying out the provisions of the act.

Although his words are not completely applicable today, I cannot improve on his own words of 6 years ago when he stated:

> Now, how is this to be accomplished?
>
> First, through a redefinition of the term, "interested parties," it is my intention to halt the practice of the Tariff Commission refusing to hear some cases because of some strange, unrealistic idea of the term. That has been one of the outs, one of the tragic abuses.
>
> Secondly, by singling out increased imports vis-a-vis domestic production decline as the paramount consideration in a Commission investigation, I hope to end the custom of hiding behind remote side issues as excuses for decisions adverse to petitioning industry. And,
>
> Thirdly, by making the recommendations of the Commission mandatory on the President, my purpose is to provide a guaranteed follow through on suggested modifications and to relieve the President of the pressure which he must now endure when a decision is submitted to him by the Commission.

Like the late Senator from New Hampshire, I am not suggesting that imports be unnecessarily curtailed or that a high tariff wall be erected. I am merely asking for a reasonable regulation of imports to stimulate fair competition in this country's marketplace.

We have given the orderly marketing agreement approach 5 years in which to prove its worth or workability. Without any reflection on anyone, the true facts speak for themselves, and they record that the orderly marketing agreement approach has been a failure and produced absolutely nothing.

As the late Senator Bridges said, my bill is not designed as a weapon against world trade, but rather as a lifeline to save it. It offers something more specific and with real teeth in it as compared to the orderly marketing agreement approach, which has already been given 5 years trial and failed. I hope the passage of this bill will assist in the promotion of truly reciprocal and beneficial world trade.

Obviously, this type of legislation must originate in the House of Representatives. I hope someone in the House will introduce a companion measure and that it will be adopted by the House as an amendment to trade expansion legislation acted on in this Congress. If not, it is my intention to offer it as an amendment to a House-passed bill.

For a long time we have been talking about doing something for the suffering domestic industry, but we actually have done little more than talk. It is time to stop mere talk and replace talk with real action. This is what this bill proposes to do.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1891) to amend title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to establish more effective criteria for a finding of serious injury to domestic industry as a result of concessions granted under trade agreements, to make mandatory the findings of the Tariff Commission with respect to the necessity for tariff adjustment, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. SMITH (for herself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

RUSSIA'S ROLE IN THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, more is involved in the current Middle East crisis than the fate of Israel, whose political independence and territorial integrity I support.

Standing firmly behind Egypt's President Nasser's asserted right to close the gate to the Gulf of Aqaba is the Soviet Union. It is the Soviet Union which armed Nasser, and now backs to the hilt his aspirations.

On this first day of June, I should like to read several paragraphs from a speech which I made on the floor of the Senate on February 15:

> During recent weeks, talks with high government officials, including the American Ambassador to the United Nations, lead me to the conclusion that our Government is misjudging the intent of the Soviet Union and its threat to world peace.
>
> I do not question the motives of our policymakers, nor their conscientious desire to do what is best for the United States.
>
> I do question their judgment.
>
> In seeking to bring about a lessing in East-West tension, which all of us wish, American officials are downgrading the Soviet threat to peace.
>
> Too often do we hear from top officials that were it not for Red China, peace could be attained in Vietnam.
>
> Mr. President, I do not buy the argument being peddled around Washington and in the United Nations that the Soviet Union desires peace in Vietnam. If this were indeed a fact, peace could come quickly. Russia, not China, is the main supplier of arms.
>
> I am convinced, Mr. President, that the Vietnam war is dragging along to the advantage of both the Soviet Union and Communist China.
>
> I submit, Mr. President, that a long war is playing directly into the hands of the Soviet Union.
>
> I feel, Mr. President, that too many high officials are misjudging the intentions of the Soviet Union. If in fact, we do make an error in this regard, it would be an error that we could not later correct.

Three and a half months ago, when the above statements were made, the intent of the Soviet Union perhaps was not as clear, but the current Middle East controversy and Russia's determined backing of the Egyptian blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba should emphasize that the Soviet Union is determined to put pressure on the free world wherever it can.

The Soviet Union obviously stands to gain a great deal in the Middle East as a result of this crisis, and is not likely to permit an easy settlement of the problem.

Just as in Vietnam, the Soviets have found a way at very little cost to themselves to bring pressure on the free world.

Both of these situations emphasize what I have been pointing out for some time. The Soviet Union has not become our friend overnight, nor does it share the same desire for world peace.

Because of weapons being supplied by the Soviet Union, the United States suffered a record number of casualties in Vietnam during the past 2 weeks—more than 5,500 battle casualties during a period of 14 days.

Because of fear of the Soviet Union, a quarter million American troops are stationed on European soil.

Now, a new crisis backed and stimulated by the Soviet Union threatens the Middle East and all of Europe.

The Middle East provides 55 percent of Europe's oil; 80 percent of known world deposits are under Arab control. Petroleum is the fuel of a modern industrial society—and Russia is self-sufficient.

Just as a long war in Vietnam is playing directly into the hands of the Soviet Union, so, too, is it to Moscow's advantage to stimulate turmoil in the Middle East.

So, as I see it, the crisis facing Israel is much broader in its implications than the fate of that small nation of two and a half million persons.

It may serve one purpose, however. It may cause Washington policymakers to view the Soviet Union in a different light.

Several months ago high Washington officials were depending upon the Soviet Union to obtain peace in Vietnam, curtailing America's military efforts there in order to encourage Russian Premier Kosygin.

Then our Government sought further appeasement of the Russians by having the Senate ratify a Consular Convention between the United States and the Soviet Union, giving to the Russians special privileges not now held by any other nation.

Now, Washington seemingly thinks Moscow can be persuaded to restrain Nasser.

The Socialist Government of Great Britain, which likewise has been cozying up to the Soviet Union, now finds herself in a position to get badly pinched, as is France, where General de Gaulle has made a pass at the Soviets. The Arab-Israel crisis is a bit nearer Europe than is Vietnam. It is an area where Britain and France still have important interests.

So while the Middle East crisis seems to have united the Arab world, it possibly could have the effect of reuniting the Western Allies. Certainly it should cause Washington and London and Paris, to name only the more important ones, to reappraise their thinking and their judgment concerning the long-range intentions of the Soviet Union.

In the meanwhile, President Johnson has issued a clear call to all nations concerned to observe the spirit of restraint and solemn responsibility in order that peace can be maintained. I hope this call will be heeded and that the United Nations can fulfill its responsibilities.

The ramifications of Egypt's recent action against Israel extend far beyond the borders of either nation.

COLUMBIA'S "RSVP" PROGRAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, at times I have criticized the Nation's press for overstressing the actions of demonstrators and agitators who do not truly represent the feelings of the people. Today I would like to call attention to an action which I think is truly representative of the people, but which somehow has failed to get the attention which it deserves.

I would like to point today to the RSVP campaign which has been undertaken by the citizens of Columbia, S.C., to boost the morale of our boys in Vietnam. This program is not just another march or meeting. "RSVP" stands for Rally Support for Vietnam Personnel. It is a unique program whereby sponsoring civic and church clubs and organizations have agreed to "adopt" a particular unit of the 1st Cavalry Division—Air Mobile—now fighting in Vietnam and supply those soldiers with special materials they cannot find in that beleaguered country.

Some 100 different civic clubs, church groups, business firms, professional organizations, schools, and other groups have joined in adopting some 25 units of the 1st Cavalry Division. Each sponsor sends over on a continuing basis packages and letters to its adopted unit. Items sent include such homely articles as ball point pens, unaddressed self-sealing envelopes, pocketbook novels, magazines, chess, and other game sets, playing cards, tape recordings of short messages and popular songs, and presweetened Kool-aid.

But not all these supplies are for the soldier's own use. Today's American soldiers are humanitarians and much of the work is winning the hearts of the Vietnamese people and helping them to rebuild their wartorn country. The sponsors are also sending children's size summer clothes, pencils, crayons, notebooks, and other school supplies; they are sending soap, toothpaste, home building supplies, and medical supplies. They have even sent over three cement mixers for the soldiers to use in their spare time good works.

Mr. President, I think that this program is indicative of the real sentiment of the American people, anxious to support our men in their work, instead of trying to destroy their morale. The response this program has received has been amazing. Originally organized by the Columbia Chamber of Commerce, it has been actively supported and propagated statewide by the South Carolina Jaycees and the American Legion. Clemson, Myrtle Beach, Blackville, St. Andrews, and East Columbia have already organized chapters, and enthusiasm is still spreading.

I have before me a copy of the RSVP Honor Roll, listing the units of the 1st Cavalry Division—Air Mobile—and their sponsors in Columbia. It gives a clear idea of the extensive support the citizens of South Carolina are giving to our men in Vietnam, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the Honor Roll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, **as follows:**

HONOR ROLL OF COLUMBIA "RSVP" UNITS OF 1ST CAVALRY DIVISION (AIR MOBILE) AND SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS (96490)

HQ & HQ Company: Republican Women's Club.

15th Administration Company: VA Regional Office; Small Business Administration; Columbia Jaycees.

545th Military Police Company: Cardinal Newman High School.

13th Signal Battalion: Columbia & Cayce Kiwanis.

8th Engineer Battalion: Columbia High School; Seibels-Bruce Co.

1st Squadron, 9th Cavalry: Dreher High School; Brookland-Cayce High School.

191st Military Intelligence Detatchment: Columbia Optimist Club; Cayce-West Columbia Optimist Club; Breakfast Optimist Club; North Trenholm Optimist Club; Dutch Fork Optimist Club.

1st Battalion, 5th Cavalry: Nat'l Assn. Internal Rev. Employees; Federal Housing Administration.

2nd Battalion, 12th Cavalry: Columbia Commercial College; St. John's Episcopal Church; Kathwood Baptist Church; Trinity Episcopal Church.

1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry: S.C. Empl. Comm., Bus. Mach. Center; Veterans Administration Hospital; Clemson Jaycees, Zonta Club.

1st Battalion, 77th Artillery: Lexington County Methodist Youth Council; Olympia High School.

1st Battalion, 21st Artillery: Carolina Vagabonds; Dentsville High School; Richland City Young Republicans.

2nd Battalion, 19th Artillery: Pilot Club; Columbia Business & Prof. Women's Club.

85th Evacuation Hospital (96238): S.C. Tax Commission; C.C.I. Jaycees; East Columbia Lions.

An Khe Army Command: Capital Sertoma; Dentsville Lions Club.

27th Maintenance Battalion: U.S. Post Office; Park Street Baptist Church; East Columbia Jaycees.

2nd Battalion, 20th Artillery: Social Security Adm., Bur. Pub. Roads; Reg. Sub. Hqrs., Columbia; U.S. Forest Service.

11th Aviation Group: Richland County Dental Assoc.; Washington St. Methodist Church; U.S.C. Student Body; Winnsboro, S.C. Girl Scouts; Centennial Associate Reform Presby. Church; Ft. Jackson Civilian Personnel; Columbia Rotary Club; Va. Wingard Methodist Church.

227th Aviation Battalion: Traveler's Protective Association; Irmo High School; Eau Claire Station Post Office; Tree of Life Temple; Edgewood Station Post Office.

229th Aviation Battalion: Richland Sertoma; Columbia College.

15th Supply & Service Battalion: YWCA; Blue Triangle Business Women's Club; St. Andrews Women's Club; Cayce Women's Club.

15th Medical Battalion: Alcorn Junior High School; Eau Claire High School; Jr. Women's Club of Columbia; Crane Creek Elementary School.

Battery E (Aviation), 82d Artillery: Cayce Rotary Club; Cayce Civinettes.

2d Battalion, 7th Cavalry: Medical Society of Columbia; Richland County Pharmaceutical Assn.

2d Battalion, 5th Cavalry: Amer. Bus. & Prof. Women's Assn.; A. C. Flora High School.

213th Aviation Battalion: Exchange Club; Painted Desert Garden Club; Civitan Club of Columbia.

2d Surgical Hospital: Morale Booster Columbia; District Office of Independent Life Ins. Company; Morning Glory Garden Club; Meadowgold Garden Club; Poinsettia Garden Club.

228th Aviation Battalion: Boy Scouts of America (Capital District); Girl Scouts of Congaree Area; Luther League of Columbia—Incarnation, Christ The King, Resurrection, St. David's, Mt. Herman, Christ, Ascension, Good Shepherd, Gethsemane, St. Luke's, Mt. Tabor, Transfiguration, Redeemer, St. Andrews, Faith, Emmanuel, Our Saviour, Ebenezer, St. Paul's, Reformation.

THE DEDICATION OF THE FAITH OF OUR FATHERS CHAPEL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recently I was privileged to attend the dedication of the beautiful new Faith of Our Fathers Chapel at the Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge, Pa. This was truly an inspiring occasion, comprising an acknowledgement of our patriotic obligations, and an expression of all the major faiths of our Nation. Believing that all of my colleagues who were unable to attend this occasion will be interested in the memorable proceedings of this event, I ask unanimous consent that the description of the chapel and transcripts of the sermons and prayers delivered at the 2-day dedication ceremonies be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the description and transcripts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITH OF OUR FATHERS CHAPEL, FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AT VALLEY FORGE, VALLEY FORGE, PA.

Formal programs and solemn services highlighted two special dedicatory ceremonies focusing important significance on the new Faith of Our Fathers Chapel of Freedoms Foundation at historic Valley Forge, Valley Forge, Pa., on the afternoons of Saturday, April 29, and Sunday, April 30, 1967.

The Faith of Our Fathers Chapel is the fifth major building constructed on Freedoms Foundation's 100-acre American Freedoms Center campus on the western edge of Valley Forge State Park, only a short distance from General George Washington's Revolutionary War Headquarters.

The chancel and stained glass window of the Faith of Our Fathers Chapel are exact replicas of those in the Prayer Room in the United States Capitol used exclusively by Senators and Representatives. Its design and appointments were established by approval of an advisory panel including the Chaplains of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, the Assistant Chancellor of the Catholic Archdiocese of Washington and the Rabbi of Washington Hebrew Congregation.

The exterior of the chapel is red brick of colonial design matching the other buildings on the campus of the American Freedom Center of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

The interior furnishings exhibit reverent simplicity. Flanking the altar are two menorahs, each with the traditional seven lights. Fronting each menorah is a plain prie-dieu or prayer bench. Standing at the extreme right of the altar is the American flag. Facing the Central window are twenty deacon's benches matching the altar and chapel trim and the organ.

This lovely new edifice provides a place for meditation, prayer and worship for all peoples. May it forever be a wellspring of the spiritual resources essential to the strengthening and preserving of our Republic under God.

The lovely stained glass window in the "Faith of Our Fathers" chapel at Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge symbolizes our nation at prayer. The central medallion shows George Washington kneeling in prayer at Valley Forge. "This Nation Under God," and the text from Psalms 16:1, "Preserve me, O God: for in thee do I put my trust" are the central themes.

The reverse side of the Great Seal of the United States with pyramid and eye and the Latin phrase "Annuit Coeptis" (God has favored our undertakings) and "Novus Ordo Seclorum" (A new order of the ages in born) appears at the top of the stained glass.

The obverse side showing the Eagle and the United States Motto, "E Pluribus Unum" (One from many) is at the bottom.

Directly above the central figure is the phrase from Lincoln's immortal Gettysburg Address, "this Nation Under God."

The names of the thirteen original States are on scrolls in the central portion, each with its star nearby. The names of the other States as they were admitted in the Union are on the laurel leaf border. Displayed on the lower corners of the window are Holy Scriptures, an open book and a candle.

SUNDAY DEDICATION, APRIL 30, 1967

An impressive dedication drew religious dignitaries of the three major faiths and other religious bodies from throughout the nation and members of the Foundation's board of directors and trustees composed of national leaders in business and industry, the judiciary, government, education and the arts.

The unique ceremony is believed to be the first ever of its kind in the United States.

FREEDOMS FOUNDATIONS EVENT—3000 GUESTS INSPIRED BY FAITH OF OUR FATHERS CHAPEL DEDICATION

More than 3000 invited guests were inspired with a greater appreciation and understanding for the ideals of American principles based on spiritual values at the official dedicatory ceremonies of Freedoms Foundation's new Faith of Our Fathers Chapel, Sunday, April 30.

Representing the three major faiths were a Roman Catholic Cardinal, a Rabbi, and a Protestant Bishop who had leading roles in the impressive dedication of the Faith of

Our Fathers Chapel located only a short distance from General George Washington's Revolutionary War Headquarters.

Francis Cardinal Spellman of New York, Bishop Fred Pierce Corson of Philadelphia, and Rabbi Charles E. Shulman of New York, along with Freedoms Foundation co-founders Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, president, and Mr. Don Belding, chairman of the board of directors, led clergymen and laymen of various denominations in a procession which opened the dedication ceremonies.

The Hon. Albert W. Hawkes of New Jersey, former U.S. Senator and a Foundation trustee, served as marshal.

Twelve holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor and outstanding leaders of government, industry, military and service organizations, and members of Freedoms Foundation's directors and trustees took part in the colorful ceremonies held under a sunlit sky.

Hundreds of patriotic Americans filled row on row of seats on Eisenhower Mall and the Patriots Circle before the new chapel.

Mr. Belding of Los Angeles presided at the reverent occasion which opened with the advancement of colors by servicemen stationed at the Valley Forge General Hospital.

Under the patriotic beauty and splendor of the Star-Spangled Banner moved by an April wind, Congressional Medal of Honor recipient Gino Merli of Peckville, Pa., led the pledge of allegiance, and the United States Army Chorus with Commanding Officer Lt. Col. Samuel R. Loboda, USA, directing, sang the national anthem.

Rabbi Shulman gave the call to worship, and the Rev. Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, chaplain of the U.S. Senate and national chaplain of Freedoms Foundation, the invocation. The Rev. Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., welcomed the throng of dignitaries and their families.

Bishop Corson and the Rt. Rev. Henry Irving Louttit, Episcopal Bishop of South Florida Diocese, each gave a scripture lesson.

Cardinal Spellman provided the prayer of dedication and Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, D.D., of Washington Hebrew Congregation, in Washington, D.C., offered a prayer of gratitude.

Maj. Gen. Edwin R. Chess, USAF, Chief of Air Force Chaplains, gave the benediction.

Former U.S. Representative Howard H. Callaway of Georgia, chairman of the Foundation's trustees, introduced scores of special platform guests.

A gold-trimmed white leather book of gifts, listing the principal benefactors was presented by Mr. Kenneth D. Wells II, senior vice president, and accepted for the Foundation's directors and trustees by Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, USA (Ret.), Freedoms Foundation vice chairman.

President Wells accepted the key to the Faith of Our Fathers Chapel from Mr. Frank H. Wilson, chapel builder.

In his acceptance, Dr. Wells issued a clarion call to all Americans "to win the faith that made us free—the faith of our fathers." He spoke of the fundamental belief in God as the only source of political, economic and spiritual rights of the individual under a Constitutional government designed to serve the people.

Choral selections by the United States Army Chorus included: "God of Our Fathers", "Faith of Our Fathers", "Hymns of All Faiths", "The God Who Gave Us Life", and a choral benediction, "The Lord Bless and Keep You".

About twenty prominent clerics and laymen joined hands to form a circle with the Cornerstone as the central object. Each offered a brief prayer.

Following the ribbon cutting ceremony, Dr. Wells invited all those present "to walk through the chapel, each to dedicate this House of Worship in his own way and with his own prayers."

The Faith of Our Fathers Chapel will be open on Sundays to all visitors and friends of Freedoms Foundation, and to all Americans who may want to renew faith in God, express loyalty to country and families, and sense anew the value and significance of our American Credo.

CALL TO WORSHIP BY RABBI CHARLES E. SHULMAN, D.D., RIVERDALE TEMPLE, RIVERDALE, N.Y.

God of our Fathers, here on this historic spot where Washington led his weary soldiers in the struggle to win American freedom, we gather together today to dedicate a house of worship, testifying to the faith of our fathers. We are deeply mindful of the inspiration, the wisdom and the great heartedness of the founding fathers of this nation who brought forth on our continent a government under which men could worship their God according to the dictates of their conscience; where Catholic, Protestant and Jew might find sanctuary under a constitution and the laws of the land which, in the words of the first president of this country, "happily gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance" and requires only that those who dwell under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens and giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

We gather together in difficult days, days of turmoil and suffering and war. We are confronted with nations in the midst of upheaval, with peoples anxious concerning their future lot, with citizens in our own beloved nation at times forgetful of the fact that rights carry obligations and freedom carries responsibilities in their train. But we are also mindful in this hour what it means to be an American as we contemplate the examples set before us by our illustrious forebears of another day who on these shores demonstrated not only their will to live as free people, but their capacities to build as free people a nation destined to grow in blessings conferred by Thee as great among the nations of the earth, in wealth and power and influence among the communities of the world.

Behind this steady growth in the short span of our national history, we recall on this day the idealism to sustain this power, the faith to sustain its institutions, and the humility to balance its strength. Here we cleared virgin forests and built our towns and cities from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Here we established our educational institutions to make us keep an informed people informed. Here we created a standard of living unparalleled in the world. But here we also performed great deeds in spiritual prowess. We opened our doors to the world and welcomed the immigrant from all lands to help make us a great nation. We guarded jealously our freedom as we developed from strength to strength. We did not forget God. We did not become full of overweening pride. Our material capabilities were balanced by our spiritual fulfillment. We helped make the world more comfortable, more knowledgeable, more aware of the cleaner and saner life, but we also stood as an example to the world of the guardians of freedom. We fought and we died in wars that freedom might live, that men might again have the chance to complete their days with dignity as children of God.

With such qualities we surmounted our doubts and our fears, our challenges and our handicaps of yesterday. With these qualities bequeathed to us by Washington and Jefferson, by Franklin and Lincoln, we can overcome again our present day difficulties and rise to levels undreamed of in past days. Here on this spot where Washington and his soldiers of the American Revolution bled so that America might be the home of all men and that America might be the inspiration of the whole world of a noble and better society, we pray now as we dedicate a house of worship in Thy Name. Do Thou, O God, give us the vision to chart our goals for a new tomorrow so that from this chapel dedicated today might come a new birth of freedom. Help us to rededicate ourselves on this day to the sacred ideals which annimated those who gave us our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution.

INVOCATION BY THE REVEREND FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, D.D., CHAPLAIN, U.S. SENATE

Our Father God, at this sacramental hour, we reverently open the door at this faith of our Fathers Altar, dedicated to thy worship and to Thy service.

As we thus enter this sacred pavilion of meditation of prayer and quietness, we acknowledge our utter dependence upon Thee who hath made us in Thy image and for Thyself.

Our needs are many, but our greatest need is of Thee. Unless we find Thee, and are found of Thee, we begin at no beginning and come to no ending. Thou hast made us to be Thy temples. Grant that this holy place of our inner lives may harbor nothing unworthy of our high calling in Thee.

The ruins of our souls repair and make our hearts a house of prayer!

And so we come to the cloistered walls of this shrine of faith, this shrine of freedom, this shrine of the written word. Here on the waiting altar of prayer we find the golden prongs of the seven candlesticks, lighting the book of ages, the book which is a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path.

Mid all the traffic of the day, turmoil, without, within, make in my heart a quiet place and come and dwell within.

Thus, on this altar of beatitude, we would fall on our knees with the prayer upon our penitent lips.

Father of our faith, we will strive to win all nations unto Thee, and through the truth that comes from God, mankind shall be truly free.

In Thy holy name we ask it.

Amen.

WELCOME BY THE REVEREND EDWARD L. R. ELSON, D.D., NATIONAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Belding, Reverend Clergy, Distinguished Guests, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

The United States of America began where the Bible begins. As the first words of that sacred book are "in the beginning, God," so faith in God was the public philosophy and the theistic proposition, the consensus among our earliest people.

America has become great and strong not simply because of vast national resources, secured behind wide ocean frontiers and by friendly neighbors, but America has become utterly unique, has become great and strong because of a creative spirit which has been mediated to its life to a variety of religious denominations. In some, this faith has been intimate and personal, in others it has been an attitude of life derived from the social climate and the public atmosphere created by vital religious faith.

And so, this afternoon, we have foregathered from various areas of the country as clergymen representing many religious expressions, and as laymen, or patriots to renew and reaffirm again our faith in the transcendental God to whom both men and nations are accountable.

A nation lives when it has a clearly defined national purpose, when it always has respect for its national heroes and when it steadfastly maintains its patriotic and religious rituals and ceremonies.

That noble army of the street—God's Army of the Street, the Salvation Army, has an apt phrase for this occasion. Their devotions they call "knee drill."

The symbol which this chapel becomes in

this hour represents America at its "knee drill." Let us, therefore, come to this hour to reaffirm the theistic propositives on which our life has been founded, which has been written into our institutions and which is the motivating force of our daily life and our ultimate destiny.

On behalf of the Board of Trustees I welcome you most heartedly to this occasion.

SCRIPTURE LESSON BY THE REVEREND BISHOP FRED PIERCE CORSON, D.D., RESIDENT BISHOP, PHILADELPHIA AREA OF THE METHODIST CHURCH

Let us listen to the word of God as it is recorded in the second book of Chronicles, parts of the Seventh Chapter.

When Solomon had ended his prayer, fire came down from heaven and consumed the burnt offerings and sacrifices, and the Glory of the Lord filled the Temple. And the priests could not enter the House of the Lord because the Glory of the Lord filled the Lord's House. When all the children of Israel saw the fire come down, and the Glory of the Lord upon the Temple, they bowed down with their faces to the earth on the pavement and worshipped and gave thanks to the Lord saying, "For He is good, for His steadfast love endures forever." Then the King and all the people offered sacrifice before the Lord; King Solomon offered a sacrifice of 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep, so the King and all the people dedicated the House of God. The priests stood at their posts, the Levites also with the instruments for music to the Lord which King David had made for giving thanks to the Lord, for his steadfast love which endures forever, and whenever David offered praises by their ministry, opposite them the priests sounded their trumpets and all Israel stood. Thus Solomon finished the House of the Lord and the King's House, all that Solomon had planned to do in the House of the Lord and in his own house he successfully accomplished. Then the Lord appeared to Solomon in the night and said to him, "I have heard your prayer and have chosen this place for myself as a House of Sacrifice, for now I have chosen and consecrated this House that My Name may be there forever, Mine eyes and My heart will be there all the time." Amen.

SCRIPTURE LESSON BY RT. REV. HENRY IRVING LOUTTIT, EPISCOPAL BISHOP OF THE SOUTH FLORIDA DIOCESE

The words of Scripture from St. Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians, the Third Chapter, beginning at the Tenth Verse.

According to the commission of God given to me like a skilled master builder, I laid a foundation and another man is building upon it that every man take care how he builds upon it. For no other foundation can anyone lay than that which is layed which is Jesus Christ. Now if anyone builds on the foundation with gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, each man's work will become manifest for the day will disclose it, because it will be revealed with fire and the fire will test what sort of work each one has done. If the work which any man has built on the foundation survives, he will receive a reward. If any man's work is burnt up, he will suffer loss, though he himself will be saved but only as through fire. Do you not know that you are God's Temple and that God's spirit dwells in you? If anyone destroys God's Temple, God will destroy him, for God's Temple is holy and that temple, you are. Let no one deceive you or himself. If anyone among you think that he is wise in this age, let him become a fool that he may become wise, for the wisdom of this world is folly with God, for it is written that He catches the wise in their craftiness and again the Lord knows that the thoughts of the wise are futile. So let no one boast of them, for all things are yours, whether Paul or Apollus or Cephas, or the world or life or death, or the present or the future. All are yours and you are Christ and Christ is God.

Here ended the Lesson.

PRAYER OF DEDICATION BY HIS EMINENCE FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN, ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK

In the name of the Father, and the Son and of the Holy Spirit. O Lord God, whom the heavens and the earth cannot contain, but who dost condescend to have a dwelling here on earth, where Thy Name can be continually invoked, we beseech Thee, visit this Faith of Our Father's Chapel with Thy kindly countenance and protect it from all evil. And as Thou didst cause the vow of Thy beloved David to be fulfilled in the work of Solomon his son, grant us in this work the realization of our desires. O God, Who dost sanctify the places dedicated to Thy Name, pour forth Thy grace upon this house of prayer so that all here who may invoke Thee, may experience Thy gracious assistance. O God, our Father Who dost wish us to dedicate ourselves to the great task of securing the blessings of freedom for all Thy children, inspire and strengthen us. May this Faith of Our Fathers Chapel be for each one of us an enduring symbol of our abiding faith in Thee and of our profound prayers that all men may soon learn to live in justice, freedom and peace under Thy all powerful protection. And may we conclude in the words of the father of our country, "Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou will keep the United States in Thy holy protection, that Thou wilt incline the hearts of its citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government, to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another, and for their fellow citizens in the United States at large." Amen.

PRAYER OF GRATITUDE BY RABBI NORMAN GERSTENFELD, D.D., WASHINGTON HEBREW CONGREGATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

We bow our heads.

Thou Who art the shield of our hopes, the tower of strength of our souls, the guide of our hands, the vision of our courage, and the love in our hearts, we thank Thee for a new age of promise into which we have come, out of the tragedy of the old world, America was born, with a burden of hope and of challenge.

We thank Thee for the spiritual strength of our blessed heritage. . . . Out of the religious freedom of the 17th century arose the political democracy of our 18th century that has made America the homeland of the old world's oppressed in the 19th century, and the arsenal and the guardian and the promise of the world's freedom in the 20th century, we pray that we may be true to that vision in our own age. We thank Thee for our tradition of a free church and a free state, the holy of holies of all our freedoms.

We thank Thee for the noble souls, Christian and Jew, who labor to fortify the foundations of this blessed land, to preserve the moral disciplines that give us spiritual power to face new trials and the generation still to come. In this festival time of the ancient Passover, we remember that brave men are not alone. When they aspire towards freedom they will find a way across new Red Seas, they will triumph over new pharoahs, new miracles of history will come through the witness of the faithful. We thank Thee, great God of our fathers, who ever reneweth the hearts of the faithful, O Thou Who art from everlasting to everlasting. Amen.

BENEDICTION BY CHAPLAIN (MAJ. GEN.) EDWIN R. CHESS, USAF, CHIEF OF AIR FORCE CHAPLAINS

Let us pray. Our Heavenly Father, in whose name our nation is dedicated and entrusted, we humbly ask Thy benign benediction for those who gather here today, for those who come in days ahead. This chapel now stands dedicated in Thy honor and for Thy service. May all who come find it a place of prayer, a house of worship, where those who use this chapel merit Thy bountiful blessings for self, for neighbor, for friend and for stranger, for our beloved country, its leaders and its people, for all who serve in the Armed Forces in the cause of freedom, for an universal and lasting peace, grant that all who come in search of blessings, grace, consolation, mercy, courage, know Thy heavenly benediction. Amen.

CORNERSTONE PRAYER BY REAR ADM. JAMES W. KELLY, CHC, USN CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS, U.S. NAVY

On this stone now laid with prayer
Stands this temple strong and fair
Freedom's cost, this spot has known
Where we lay this cornerstone.
Bloody footprints in the snow
Huddled forms round campfire's glow
Courageous, selfless men alone
Could fashion such a cornerstone.
Here were men who found no rest
Here were men with hope obsessed
And here were seeds of greatness sown
Where we lay this cornerstone.
Here were dreams by faith preserved
Inalienable rights—by men deserved
Ordained by God to be man's own
And *freedom*—is the cornerstone.

Let us pray: Eternal Father, Thou the Creator and foundation of man's being; make firm this stone which is laid in Your name. May this chapel which rests upon it fittingly bespeak Your praise and glory. May it bring to recollection that sacrifice and courage upon which our Nation was founded; call to mind its proud and noble past and be an inspiration for its long and glorious future. We ask this of You who lives and reigns forever. Amen.

"The Chapel is to the glory of God. It will be open to all visitors and friends of Freedoms Foundation, regardless of race, color or creed, and to all Americans who may want to renew faith in God, express loyalty to country and families, and sense anew the value and significance of our American Credo," Dr. Wells said.

The Faith of Our Fathers Chapel is the latest addition to the planned eleven-building American Freedom Center complex. The other four buildings on the campus include: the Martha Washington Building, which serves as the national headquarters, two residence halls named for Alexander Hamilton and Benjamin Franklin, and the Henry Knox Building devoted to the patriotism of the recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

When completed the American Freedom Center will include four additional residence halls, a dining hall, and the George Washington Building which will become the operations keystone for the entire complex. The nonprofit, nonpolitical and nonsectarian Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge established in 1949 with headquarters in an old dairy barn has advanced steadily through private support of many contributors interested in the perpetuation of the American Credo.

Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge is a nonprofit, nonpolitical, nonsectarian and nonpartisan educational organization dedicated to the preservation of the American Way of Life.

The leadership of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge includes: General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, honorary chairman; The Honorable James A. Farley, honorary president and senior vice chairman; General Bruce C. Clarke, vice chairman; Frank Gard Jameson, vice chairman; Wallace D. Hall, treasurer. The Honorable Howard H. Callaway of Pine Mountain, Ga., is chairman of trustees. Members of the Board of Directors include: Don Belding, Los Angeles, Calif., Chairman; Clifford J. Backstrand, Lancaster, Pa.; Walker L. Cisler, Detroit, Mich.; James S. Copley, La Jolla, Calif.; Roger S. Firestone, Pottstown, Pa.; Thomas F. Patton, Cleveland, Ohio; Admiral Arthur W. Radford, Washington, D.C.; and Dr. Wells, Foundation president, Valley Forge, Pa.

SUPREME COURT'S DECISION IN CALIFORNIA "PROPOSITION 14" CASE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, by a five to four margin the Supreme Court of the United States on Monday of this week handed down a decision which has a most serious impact upon relations between the State and the Central Government. The Court's decision in the case of Reitman against Mulkey, in which they ruled part of the California State constitution unconstitutional, is destructive of the necessary balance of power which exists between the States and the people of the States and the authority of the Central Government. This decision continues the steady erosion of the powers residing in the States and the people of the States and makes a mockery of government by, for, and of the people.

To recount the factual circumstances leading to this decision, the State Legislature of California adopted a series of so-called fair housing laws which were vigorously opposed by many citizens in the State. As a direct result of the actions of the State legislature, a requisite number of the voters of the State initiated, in conformity with the California constitutional provisions relating thereto, a proposition to be presented to the voters for a constitutional amendment. Proposition 14 was thus brought before the electorate in the general election of 1964 and was adopted by the overwhelming margin of 4,526,460 for, to 2,395,747 against. The constitutional amendment, which subsequently became article 1, section 26 of the State constitution, reads in pertinent part as follows:

> Neither the State nor any subdivision or agency thereof shall deny, limit or abridge, directly or indirectly, the right of any person, who is willing or desires to sell, lease or rent any part or all of his real property, to decline to sell, lease or rent such property to such person or persons as he, in his absolute discretion, chooses.

In my judgment, the language of this provision is clear and unmistakable, and I fail to see how it can be misconstrued to the extent that the Supreme Court has misconstrued it in order to hold it in violation of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Indeed, Mr. Justice Harlan experienced the same difficulty as I, and expressed it in his dissent in which he was joined by Mr. Justice Black, Mr. Justice Clark, and Mr. Justice Stewart. To quote from the dissent, Mr. Justice Harlan said:

> I am wholly at a loss to understand how this straight-forward effectuation of a change in the California constitution can be deemed a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The U.S. Supreme Court, aided and abetted by the California Supreme Court, is in reality guilty of denying the people of that State a portion of their sovereign authority to determine the framework and content of legislation by which they govern themselves.

Through a process of judicial legerdemain, the Supreme Court has reached a subjective, factual determination and attempted to apply it to what is in reality given only to a legal determination. It is difficult to follow the exact line of reasoning pursued by the majority since a number of cases are cited, but then they are virtually dismissed in the sentence beginning the last paragraph of the majority decision which says:

> None of these cases squarely controls the case we now have before us.

It seems apparent that the sole reason for finding this section of the California State constitution unconstitutional is a sort of superhuman sixth sense which leads the majority members to believe that this section of the California constitution will have the effect of encouraging private discriminations. In this way some State involvement is presumed. This is illusory and raises a specter which is nowhere supported by factual testimony. To arrive at this conclusion the U.S. Supreme Court has resorted to the intellectually and judicially dishonest practice of cloaking legal conclusions of the California State Supreme Court with the authority normally accorded only to findings of fact by a lower court empowered to make such findings of fact.

The provision adopted by the people of the State of California in the most democratic process available—that is, by popular referendum—has placed that State in a position of neutrality as regards private action. This is what the 14th amendment requires. Mr. Justice Harlan stated the proposition accurately when he said:

> I believe the state action required to bring the Fourteenth Amendment into operation must be affirmative and purposeful, actively fostering discrimination.

The summation by Mr. Justice Harlan expresses in clear terms the total impact of this decision:

> Here the electorate itself overwhelmingly wishes to overrule and check its own Legislature on a matter left open by the Federal Constitution. By refusing to accept the decision of the people of California, and by contriving a new and ill-defined constitutional concept to allow federal judicial interference, I think the Court has taken to itself powers and responsibilities left elsewhere by the Constitution.

In the same connection, this morning's edition of The Washington Post contains a story concerning efforts of Maryland to prevent their recently enacted "open occupancy" law from going into effect. This is being done by filing a petition signed by the necessary number of registered voters. If this move is successful the law will have to be approved at the next general election.

It will be interesting to see the U.S. Supreme Court's reaction to any case which may be brought before it on the basis of the Maryland law and the petition to prevent its going into effect. If the logic by which the majority reached its decision in the Reitman case from California prevails, then the mere action of preventing the Maryland law from going into effect may be characterized as tending, in some way, to encourage private acts of discrimination. This would result in an illogical absurdity, but it is not at all out of the realm of reason considering the precedent by which the Court will be guided.

If this line of reasoning is extended even further, a State may be held guilty of encouraging discrimination if it fails to take affirmative action to prevent such discrimination by enacting some form of open occupancy or fair-housing law. More than a little judicial restraint is in order, and I, for one, wish that the Court would, in the future, confine itself to judicial interpretations and not to subjective, sociological, and philosophical conclusions. The seat of all wisdom does not necessarily reside in the Supreme Court chamber.

COALWORKERS AND PNEUMOCONIOSIS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on May 18, 1967, Dr. Lorin E. Kerr, assistant to the medical officer of the United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund, spoke at the West Virginia University School of Medicine centennial symposium on the subject "Coalworkers' Pneumoconiosis." I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Kerr's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COALWORKERS AND PNEUMOCONIOSIS

(By Lorin E. Kerr, M.D.[*])

Coal miners live with coal dust and far too many die from coal dust. That this needless suffering and shameful waste of human life continues into the second half of the twentieth century is ironic as well as tragic. The "black lungs" of autopsied coal miners clearly directed attention to coal dust fifty years before the founding of this University, whose Centennial we salute in one of the Nation's largest coal producing states. A few years later the condition was first identified as a disease associated with coal mining. From then until the end of the nineteenth century, physicians generally accepted coal dust as the primary cause of respiratory disability and morbid pulmonary changes observed in coal miners.

Conditions outside of the coal industry dramatically turned the spotlight of medical and public interest on silica. By 1915 silicosis gained the dubious distinction of being labeled the only important occupational dust disease. To this day, as far as many American physicians and lawyers are concerned, silicosis remains the only important occupational dust disease.

This symposium, devoted to the role of coal dust in the lung diseases of miners, signifies a fresh awareness that medical research and clinical medicine go forward only when we have inquiring minds and take nothing for granted. Exploration of the causal relationship between coal dust and miners' lung diseases—using techniques and resources unavailable to our predecessors a century, or even 30 years ago—is long overdue. A clear-eyed look at what we know and what we ought to know is most appropriate on this occasion in this place.

Unlike their American counterparts, the

---

[*] Assistant to the Executive Medical Officer, United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund, Washington, D.C.

British continued their concern for diseases associated with coal dust. By 1930, British investigators were reporting radiographic differences between silica and coal dust exposures and a respiratory disability which could not be attributed to silicosis. The British Medical Research Council, in 1937, initiated comprehensive studies of chronic pulmonary disease among coal miners with particular reference to conditions in the South Wales coal field.

The first report, issued in 1942, identified a new type of dust disease as "coal workers' pneumoconiosis". The following year this disease, as distinct from, and in addition to, classical silicosis, became compensable. In Britain, coal workers' pneumoconiosis is now generally considered to be a diagnosable occupational dust disease separable into two distinct forms, simple and complicated. It is reported to have characteristic pulmonary radiological changes which have been observed in workers exposed to hard or soft coal and some other carbon dusts both in Britain and the United States. Pathological studies have demonstrated lesions which are specifically characteristic.

The American coal miner may not know the medical technicalities but he does know that the location of the Atlantic Ocean has nothing to do with the occurrence of coal workers' pneumoconiosis. It occurs on both sides of the ocean. The pathology is comparable, the x-rays are indistinguishable, the respiratory function tests give the same results and the symptomatology is no different. exertional dyspnea develops at the same rate and afflicts about the same number of men—and it is just as disabling in West Virginia as it is in Wales. Recent reports confirm earlier estimates that about 70,000 American coal miners who are working or have worked in anthracite or bituminous coal mines are afflicted with some stage of coal workers' pneumoconiosis. The American coal miner can not understand why, in Britain, coal workers' pneumoconiosis has been recognized as a clinical entity since 1942, and been compensable since 1943, but in the United States many still use such terms as "anthracosilicosis", "anthracosis", or "miners' asthma". And why, the American miner wants to know, do only two states pay workmen's compensation benefits for coal workers' pneumoconiosis—one of these only for the last 15 months? He strongly suspects that employer oriented physicians, company lawyers, state legislators and workmen's compensation officials avoid facing known facts about the ravages of coal dust in human lungs because, to do otherwise, would cost money.

The coal miner welcomes recent efforts to overcome this oppressive time lag. The research potential heralded by the Appalachian Laboratories for Occupational Respiratory Diseases here at the West Virginia University School of Medicine promises to hasten relief for the long-suffering dyspneac coal miner. The Pneumoconiosis Research Unit at Beckley, West Virginia, initiated a short time ago by the U. S. Public Health Service, marked the beginning of a national medical concern with the frightening pulmonary disability always confronting the coal miner. Provision of workmen's compensation benefits for coal workers' pneumoconiosis by the Pennsylvania amendments in December 1965, following close upon the Governor's Conference on Pneumoconiosis, represented (at long last) political recognition by that state of the enormity of the disability inflicted by coal dust.

Recognition by the U. S. medical profession of coal workers' pneumoconiosis, however, is the first order of business. More than anything right now, coal workers need doctors who, regardless of past assumptions, know how to make a correct diagnosis of this man made disease.

Radiographic examination of the lungs is essential for determining the earliest changes, severity, progression and prevalence of coal workers' pneumoconiosis. This requires, first of all, an acceptable method of radiological diagnosis and classification of the disease. Such a classification is also necessary because those frequently used are concerned principally with silicosis and usually include some reference to the disability of the worker. Moreover, there is a need to correlate post-mortem findings with ante-mortem radiography which can only be resolved by using an acceptable classification.

A standardized method of describing and classifying the radiographic changes, developed by the British investigators, was accepted with minor modifications by the International Labor Office Conference of Experts on Pneumoconiosis in 1950. This International Classification has been further refined and is now utilized successfully by an increasing number of physicians in Brittain and elsewhere. The Classification is purely radiological and does not imply a relationship between categories of abnormality and "suffering from pneumoconiosis", the presence of compensable disease or a particular degree of disability. Two major types of changes, simple and complicated pneumoconiosis, are defined and the "dust opacity" is described as the basic abnormality. These opacities are less striking than those observed in silicosi. Thus, it is maintained that some radiologists in Britain and elsewhere who are unfamiliar with the characteristic appearance of coal workers' pneumoconiosis are inclined to regard the radiographic changes as trivial and not necessarily diagnostic of disease. The significance of the radiographs should be apparent when they are compared with the autopsied lung. We should be mindful of the fact that 30 years ago the radiological appearances of asbestosis were considered by leading radiologists as being with normal limits.

The experience elsewhere with the ILO Classification and the standard films and photographs illustrating the Classification is reported to be sufficiently helpful to warrant an intensive American evaluation of the system. A limited evaluation has been conducted by the U. S. Public Health Service but it needs to be broadened to include many physicians. It should be designed to clarify any differences and thereby hasten the early detection and control of coal workers' pneumoconiosis among U. S. coal miners.

The lack of agreement in the United States on the etiology of coal workers' pneumoconiosis has probably been the most important single deterrent to the medical acceptance of this disease as a clinical entity. The danger of inhaling coal dust was accepted a century ago. Later this was discountenanced but today the dyspneac coal miner is again a serious concern.

While complacency about the danger of coal dust has been a factor, silicosis has been the outstanding obstacle. Mass X-ray studies of industries using silica were initiated in 1912 and very soon silica was labeled in scientific journals as the most harmful industrial dust and silicosis as the only important dust disease. There was little public discussion, however, until 1932 when silicosis jumped from obscurity as a scarcely recognized disease hidden for centuries in the chests of workers to the headlines and wide technical discussion in the United States and other countries. This was not the sudden realization of an unsuspected health hazard, but a rude awakening to an economic hazard which might bankrupt some industries. Workers were glad to get a job in 1930 when construction was started on the Hawk's nest tunnel near Gauley Bridge, West Virginia, but some never returned to their homes. One witness testifying at the 1936 Congressional investigation of these deaths, told of three sons dead with silicosis within thirteen months after starting to work in the tunnel. Efforts to secure compensation benefits for any of the Gauley Bridge workers, living or dead, were notoriously unsuccessful.

In an effort to allay fears and apprehensions and bring some order out of chaos, the late Frances Perkins, then Secretary of Labor, called the First National Silicosis Conference in 1936. The experts worked in five committees for ten months and submitted their report to Madam Perkins early in 1937. Today—thirty years later—silicosis still remains as a major occupational health disease of relatively unknown proportions in the United States.

The relationship of tuberculosis and silicosis is now well known but it was at one time an important factor in the increasing attention given to silicosis. The passage of legislation making silicosis compensable also played a large role in centering attention on this disease. Complicating this development, however, was the definition of silicosis which came into usage in 1933 and has since been adopted by most of the states providing workmen's compensation for silicosis. By intent, it excludes all other dusts and is thought by some investigators to be so lacking in clarity that it denies compensation to many unfortunate workers. Scientific dissatisfaction with this definition was apparent with terms such as "so-called silicosis", "pseudo-silicosis" and "modified silicosis" which began to appear in literature. This search for labels, plus the conviction that silica was the only dangerous dust, probably accounts in a large measure for the coinage of the misleading term "anthracosilicosis" used to describe the pneumoconiosis commonly called "miners' asthma".

A further complication involved the attempts to classify various dusts. One such classification which had many adherents and is still seen in some texts, referred to coal dust as "inert". The proponents of this classification seemed to feel that an "inert" dust *per se* produced little, if any, lung pathology. Other investigators have indicated that an "inert" dust may produce no animal reaction but when inhaled by a worker some pathology does ensue. Even though the dusts may be "inert" it would seem obvious that the lung cannot become a physiological dust trap and still retain its normal structure and function.

Silicosis does develop among a relatively small number of coal miners, especially those who are engaged extensively in rock drilling. Silicosis and coal workers' pneumoconiosis may occur in the same worker but usually proper differentiation at autopsy is possible. Because of the extensive use of sand for traction on the rails in the haulage ways in the United States and the recent increase in "roof-bolting" where the drilling may be very dusty, it is possible that the silicotic element may be greater in U.S. coal miners than realized.

The higher carbon content (rank of coal) of anthracite as contrasted with bituminous coal is also thought to be a possible cause of coal workers' pneumoconiosis. This is unlikely because the characteristic morbid pathological changes are the same in workers exposed to either bituminous or anthracite coal dust and coal workers' pneumoconiosis occurs in workers exposed to the fine dust of either hard or soft coal.

The long cold journeys underground and fumes from explosives and cable fires have also been suggested as etiological factors. The reports, however, of coal workers' pneumoconiosis among men with none of these exposures, particularly men loading coal in ships, have negated these theories. At the most these are thought to be only contributing factors.

The essential cause of simple pneumoconiosis is reported to be the gradual pulmonary accumulation of fine particles (less than 5–7 microns in diameter) of coal dust. The genesis is thus the simple mechanical overloading of the lungs with coal dust rather than the activity of free silica. Related factors are the concentration of respirable dust in the air, duration of exposure to dust, and the workers' respiratory rate. Individual susceptibility is thought to play a minor role.

The foregoing discussion seeks to give some of the background on both silicosis and coal workers' pneumoconiosis. What is the present situation with respect to these diseases? What courses of action are open to us?

At the present time it is impossible to provide completely accurate figures on the number of U.S. coal miners with some stage of coal workers' pneumoconiosis or the number of miners needing vocational rehabilitation or retraining because of disablement from this disease. It is conservatively estimated, on the basis of available reports, however, that about 60,000 active and ex-bituminous coal miners have developed one stage or another of coal workers' pneumoconiosis. There are probably an additional 10,000 men from the anthracite mines with the same diagnosis. Of these 70,000 miners it is estimated that about 11,000 bituminous and 2,500 anthracite miners are disabled to the point of inability to continue working in the industry and probably many are in need of vocational rehabilitation or retraining. Possibly nearly 3,000 bituminous and about 1,000 anthracite miners would require "sheltered" work; the remainder could work elsewhere in other industries. These are appalling figures!

Medical rehabilitation using clinical and physiological methods requires, first and foremost, a medical determination of the extent of disability. This provides a real opportunity to appropriately reassure and encourage those men with only slight disability that they individually may not be suffering from a progressive and rapidly disabling disease. The psychological aspects of rehabilitation are quite important; there is a special need for clarity in explaining to the miner the true nature of his disease. The provision of adequate diagnostic services associated with rehabilitation practically demonstrates to the community and prospective miner a sincere interest on the part of all concerned in the health of the miner. A system which protects the young miner from injury to his health by this serious occupational hazard will reap a great dividend not only in human contentment but also in productivity. Rehabilitation also involves resettlement or reemployment in a suitable job. Of necessity this involves such items as the age and extent of disability of the miner, as well as his mental capabilities and previous occupational experience and training. Despite these and other problems, such as the need to avoid heavy physical exertion and the bronchial spasm often provoked by dusts and fumes, it has been amply demonstrated that many men with extreme disablement can, in fact, continue to be employed. If the work available is appropriate to the man's degree of physical disablement, he will give satisfactory service.

Unfortunately, disability determinations of both silicosis and coal workers' pneumoconiosis have not been just a physiological problem. They are also of considerable legal interest. The question of assessing the part played by either of these diseases in a miner's disability has often been purely political. It has had nothing to do with medicine—in fact, in workmen's compensation cases the U.S. physicians have largely abdicated to the lawyers. Today there are only two states, Alabama and Pennsylvania, that provide workmen's compensation for coal workers' pneumoconiosis.

The Alabama legislation was passed in 1950, Pennsylvania in 1965. In the 13 months between December 1965 when the Pennsylvania amendment became effective and January 7, 1967, 24,432 miners had applied for benefits under the new coal workers' pneumoconiosis provisions. In all other states any coal miner who cannot meet the legal definitions of silicosis has no recourse, regardless of the severity of his disability. This opposition to including workmen's compensation coverage for coal workers' pneumoconiosis is best typified by a state medical director of workmen's compensation who recently stated he would resign before he would countenance certifying miners with this disease for compensation awards. The benefits paid for silicosis by this state are even more meager than most states.

It is conservatively estimated that in addition to the 70,000 men with coal workers' pneumoconiosis there are about 20,000 more coal miners with some stage of silicosis and another 5,000 with a mixed dust pneumoconiosis—while most of these men live in states with workmen's compensation coverage for silicosis, the qualifying requirements are a legal nightmare. In one state the miner himself must notify his employer and the State Health Department within ninety days of first being informed by a physician that he has silicosis. If he does not take this action he automatically excludes himself from workmen's compensation when he later submits such a claim. And if he does notify his employer as required by law, he knows with great certainty that he will shortly lose his job regardless of the absence or presence of disability. The coal miner, under these circumstances, continues to work as long as humanly possible. Even when work becomes impossible, he needs a good lawyer more than a physician. Moreover, in most states, any miner who does qualify for silicosis benefits is immediately black-listed for future employment in the coal mines with the exception of Pennsylvania which has a second injury proviso, the costs of which are borne by the taxpayer and not the industry. Furthermore, the benefits in most states are determined by the stage of silicosis apparent in the x-ray. There is almost a total disregard of symptoms and clinical evaluation. When this was recently explained to a visiting Mexican physician, he expostulated, "What do they want, a blackboard in his chest?" At no time does the pulmonary disability *per se* determine the benefits and there is rarely any effort to coordinate rehabilitation with the workmen's compensation award.

The American coal miner rightly envies the British system, which I feel is worth reviewing in some detail.

An assessment is made of percentage disability and the man is paid a pension proportionate to the estimated disability. He may continue to work in dust approved conditions and is examined periodically. He is advised by the Pneumoconiosis Medical Panel whether he should leave the mines; if he is advised to stay, he is told what work would be suitable for him. The Panels, appointed by the Government of the United Kingdom, are responsible for the diagnosis of pneumoconiosis and assessment of the degree of disability.

If the miner thinks he has pneumoconiosis, he applies for examination at the local office of the Ministry of National Health. Usually the radiographic examination is made at the office of the nearest government Pneumoconiosis Medical Panel.

If the miner is too ill to travel that distance, the x-rays are taken at the nearest hospital. A miner travelling to obtain an x-ray has his fare paid, receives an allowance for meals and compensation for loss of a day's pay. A member of the Panel reads the x-ray; if there is no evidence of pneumoconiosis, the miner is notified. The miner can reapply as often as he likes, but the Miners' Union discourages unreasonable reapplications following a recent rejection.

If the x-ray shows evidence of pneumoconiosis, the miner is instructed to attend the Panel for examination. If he is too ill to attend, the Panel visits the miner at his home. The two questions to be answered are: (1) Is the miner dyspneac?; and (2) Is the dyspnea due to dust?

The miner diagnosed as having pneumoconiosis is then paid a pension, the percentage of which corresponds to the percentage of disability. The miner with 100% disability can qualify for a supplemental pension if unable to secure a light job or if confined to bed. This extra allowance is to pay for an attendant when the miner is bedridden and the care of children in the household.

All British miners receiving workmen's compensation for coal miners' pneumoconiosis are re-examined annually and permitted to continue to work in accordance with the Panel recommendations if they care to. Disability is reassessed at each annual examination.

Any miner with active pulmonary tuberculosis is forbidden to work in any dusty occupation.

Several important factors should be remembered. First, coal workers' pneumoconiosis is a preventable disease which, with the application of adequate control measures, could be eliminated. This would require effective suppression of coal dust at its source, whether below or above ground. Dust suppression is primarily an engineering problem, but to be effective, it is essential that the engineers, physicians, and coal miners operate as a team.

Second, a further preventive measure would be the limitation of the total period of dust exposure. This can be accomplished by: limiting the working period on a dusty job; placing an upper age limit on hazardous dust exposure; and advising employment in less dusty jobs when indicated.

Third, improving workmen's compensation legislation and enforcing existing occupational health laws and regulations would encourage the application and improvement of known preventive measures.

Fourth, an expanded research effort would help to solve some fundamental problems, such as the precise etiological role of coal dust, the cause and correct assessment of the respiratory disabilities, efficacy of various therapeutic measures and the safe limit of total dust exposure.

It is a sorry, worrisome reality that the silicosis control program advocated in 1937 by the First National Conference on Silicosis was in the main never implemented. Many words were spoken and some good concepts were developed but little action has ensued. Today, the coal miner is disturbed and fearful that these patterns of the past will continue for another thirty years. He can also ask what kind of medicine do we have in the United States that is unwilling to recognize all the ills that afflict mankind, including coal workers' pneumoconiosis.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess pending the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

(At 3 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m. the Senate reconvened when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3—BETTER GOVERNMENT FOR CITIZENS OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL (H. DOC. NO. 132)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on Reorganization Plan No. 3, relative to better government for the citizens of the Nation's Capital.

Without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and appropriately referred.

The message from the President of the United States was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967 to provide a better government for the citizens of the Nation's Capital.

The explosive growth of the District of Columbia challenges the city on every front—from schools and hospitals, courts and police, to housing and transportation, recreation and job opportunities. If the District is to meet these tests and fulfill the needs of its citizens, it must, as I said in my message on the National Capital, "have the most responsible and efficient government we are capable of providing."

The plan I submit today is more than a matter of routine reorganization. Its vital purpose is to bring 20th century government to the Capital of this Nation: to strengthen and modernize the government of the District of Columbia; to make it as efficient and effective as possible.

The present form of District government was designed almost a century ago for a community of 150,000 people. The District government then employed less than 500 persons, and administered a budget of less than $4 million.

Today Washington has a population of 800,000. It is the center of the country's fastest growing metropolitan area with a population of 2.5 million. The District's government now employs some 30,000 people, and the proposed 1968 budget is more than half a billion dollars.

The machinery designed more than 90 years ago to govern a small community is now obsolete. The commission form of government—unorthodox when the Congress accepted it as a temporary measure in 1874—provides neither effective nor efficient government for the Nation's Capital. That form of government has long since been abandoned by the few cities which adopted it around the turn of the century. Today none of the Nation's 27 largest cities and only two of the country's 47 cities with populations exceeding 300,000 have a government of divided authority.

The District of Columbia is governed by three Commissioners. Each Commissioner is the chief executive—the mayor—but for only a part of the government. Yet, the problems of the District of Columbia, like those of any major city, cannot be neatly broken into three parts. Any effort to control crime, for example, cuts across virtually every function of government—from police and corrections to housing, education, health, and employment. An effective attack on the problem requires action by two or more Commissioners and the departments for which they are separately responsible—a time-consuming and often costly process.

The District has been fortunate in the caliber and dedication of the men who have served as Commissioners, but it can no longer afford divided executive authority. Its government must be able to respond promptly and effectively to new demands and new conditions. This requires clear-cut executive authority and flexible government machinery—not divided authority which too often results in prolonged negotiations and inaction.

The problem of divided executive authority in the District is aggravated by the additional nonexecutive responsibilities now borne by the Commissioners. As a member of the Board of Commissioners, each must now make rules and regulations on matters with which he is not otherwise concerned as an executive. Some of these quasi-legislative responsibilities—such as police regulations and property taxation—are of great importance to the city. Many—such as the naming of streets and the labeling of potato packages—are merely time consuming. None should require a substantial portion of the time of the chief executive of a major city.

The reorganization plan I propose would remedy these deficiencies in the present form of government. It would—

Unify executive and administrative authority.

Eliminate competing and sometimes conflicting assignments of responsibility.

Provide for the informed exercise of quasi-legislative functions through a Council which would be bipartisan and representative of the community.

Permit the single Commissioner to organize the District government to provide effective day-to-day administration.

Under the plan, subject to Senate confirmation, the President would appoint a single Commissioner as chief executive and a bipartisan Council of nine members. The Commissioner would serve a 4-year term, corresponding to that of the President. Council members would serve 3-year terms, with three members to be appointed each year. The staggered terms would insure continuity of experience on the Council.

The plan would abolish the present Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Its powers and responsibilities would be apportioned between the single Commissioner and the Council.

The Commissioner would be assigned the executive functions now vested in the Board of Commissioners. He would be given responsibility and authority to organize and manage the District government, to administer its programs and to prepare its budget. The plan also provides for an Assistant to the Commissioner to help him carry out these responsibilities.

The Council would be assigned the quasi-legislative functions now performed by the Board of Commissioners. The plan describes more than 430 functions which would be transferred to the Council. These include major responsibilities such as the approval of boundaries and plans for urban renewal, establishment of rules governing the licensing of professions, and setting of rates for property taxation. The Council would also be empowered to review and revise the Commissioner's budget before submission to the President.

Since the plan was announced in my message on the Nation's Capital, we have been working to strengthen the Office of Commissioner and the Council. Out of this process of refinement four key changes have emerged, and have been incorporated into the plan.

First, the plan would authorize the Commissioner to veto actions of the Council with which he disagrees. The Council, in turn, could override such a veto by a three-fourths vote of its members. This provides due recognition for the responsibilities of the chief executive, while at the same time preserving the right of the Council to act on matters of overriding importance.

Second, the terms of Council members would be set at 3 years instead of 2. The reduction in turnover and increase in experience would add strength to the Council.

Third, the salaries of the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Council members would be increased to reflect their important responsibilities.

Finally, the plan recognizes that the machinery of the District's government, no matter how modern, cannot realize its highest purpose unless it is infused with the most experienced, informed and able leadership.

The 800,000 citizens of the District of Columbia deserve nothing less than such leadership, not only as a matter of fundamental right but because the District occupies a special and central role in the affairs of the Nation.

The best talent available must be found for the key posts of Commissioner and Assistant to the Commissioner. The Commissioner is the chief executive of the District of Columbia. The Assistant to the Commissioner will be his chief aide, his deputy, and will perform such duties as the Commissioner may prescribe.

In the search for leadership necessary in these crucial posts, the President and the Congress must balance the need to draw from the best talent in the Nation with the need for local experience and local involvement that are such valuable assets to enlightened municipal government. The plan therefore provides for the Presidential appointment of both these men, subject to Senate confirmation, with the requirement that at least one of them be a resident of the District for 3 years prior to appointment.

We would be indifferent to the cause of good government if the search and selection of the Commissioner and his Assistant were confined only to those who reside within the geographic boundaries of the District. This plan does not take that course. It provides a wide range of choice—opening the field not only to those who reside in the District, but to those who live in other parts of the Nation. At the same time, the plan assures that local experience will be well represented in the highest councils of the District government.

Not only must either of the top executive positions be filled with a District resident, but each member of the nine-man Council must have been a resident of the District for at least 3 years prior to appointment.

Moreover, in selecting the Commissioner, I will look first to the residents of the District and I hope that he can be found here.

Of all the benefits of the plan, one stands out in particular—the strong leadership it provides as the cornerstone of support for any effective attack against crime. With that leadership and with the continued commitment and devotion of its police, the District can move with a greater sense of sureness and purpose against the spectre of crime that haunts the streets and shops of the Nation's Capital.

Of all the duties of the new single Commissioner none will be more important than his leadership in a renewed community effort to stem the rising tide of crime in the District.

The reorganization plan has been prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code. At my direction, it has been discussed with each member of the interested committees of Congress or with their staff assistants. I have found, after investigation, that each reorganization included in the plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901 (a) of title 5 of the United States Code.

I have also found that it is necessary to include in the plan, by reason of the reorganization made, provisions for the appointment and compensation of the new officers specified in sections 201, 203, and 301–303 of the plan. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are comparable to those fixed for officers in the executive branch of the Government having similar responsibilities.

The functions which would be abolished by the provisions of section 503(c) of the reorganization plan are provided for in subsection (e) of section 6 of the act of March 3, 1925, 43 Stat. 1121, as amended—District of Columbia Code, section 40–603(e).

The plan would not impair the corporate status of the District of Columbia government. Nor would it in any way detract from the powers which the Congress exercises with respect to the District.

This reorganization plan would provide improved management of the municipal responsibilities vested by Congress in the government of the District of Columbia. It would bring savings to the District taxpayers and the Federal Government, although overall costs will not be less because of the increasing scale and complexity of municipal government. The precise amount of such savings cannot be itemized at this time.

The proposed reorganization is in no way a substitute for home rule. As I stated in my message on the Nation's Capital:

> The plan will give the District a better organized and more efficient government . . . but only home rule will provide the District with a democratic government—of, by and for its citizens.

I remain convinced more strongly than ever that home rule is still the truest course. We must continue to work toward that day—when the citizens of the District will have the right to frame their own laws, manage their own affairs, and choose their own leaders. Only then can we redeem that historic pledge to give the District of Columbia full membership in the American Union.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 1, 1967*.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 5, 1967, at 12 o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Leo Heim, Congregation B'nai Zion, El Paso, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father: We, citizens of this free haven, rise to acknowledge our cherished privileges and to affirm our faith in Thee as we beseech Thy benign guidance in the deliberations of this distinguished assemblage.

Charged with the affairs of our Nation, these our Representatives seek Thy beneficence. Imbue them with wisdom and loving kindness that their efforts emerge into a beacon of light and hope to a bewildered humanity.

In these perilous times cause Thy spirit to enter the hearts of the brazen and the bigoted. Cleanse their hands of aggressive designs; their spirits of iniquitous schemes.

Look down with favor upon this our blessed land. Unite our pursuit for peace; empower our minds that we may not falter. Make our lives a contribution to the symphony of a freedom-loving humanity. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 953. An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

RABBI LEO HEIM

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Leo Heim, who delivered the prayer this morning, today celebrates a significant anniversary. Just 18 years ago today, he entered the United States from Czechoslovakia to become one of our finest citizens.

We, of El Paso, Tex., are fortunate indeed to have in our community this gentleman of highest integrity, and we are grateful to him for his spiritual guidance and leadership.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968 UNTIL MIDNIGHT JUNE 2, 1967

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tomorrow, Friday, June 2, to file a privileged report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1968.

Mr. TALCOTT reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

FAILURE OF THE M–16 RIFLE

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I should like to read a letter from a constituent in relation to the M–16 rifle:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: Enclosed is an excerpt from my son's letter, concerning the inefficiency and failure of the M–16 rifle. He is a Marine in Vietnam, and was wounded in the operation, he mentioned.
>
> Congressman Long, please do all you can, to have the M–16 rifle investigated thoroughly. The controversy about it has been going on for several months.
>
> I am aware that Gen. Wallace Greene has commented "that the M–16 rifle is the weapon to do the job in Vietnam. Also that the parents of Marines and all Troops that are armed with this rifle, to know it has proved to be a reliable, hard-hitting weapon." Yet, so many boys in Vietnam, are complaining about it.
>
> I understand the members of the House Armed Services Subcommittee are to leave this week for Vietnam to investigate the M–16. Not only should they check the rifle, but they should question the wounded boys in Da Nang and Chu Lai Hospitals, to get some of the answers to it.
>
> I sincerely thank you for your help.
>
> I request that my name be withheld.

This is the excerpt from the letter sent by the son:

> These new M-16 rifles aren't worth a damn. On Operation ———, we had about 10 rifles in our platoon that would fire. They had better do something soon, as it is costing lives. We were pinned down for 5 or 6 hours, because we couldn't put out enough fire power, plus all the wounded. Our company had 18 killed and 34 wounded. There were only 23 men left in our platoon.

PERMISSION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE THIS AFTERNOON

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE SUPREME COURT—WRONG AGAIN—CITIZENSHIP DOES HAVE ITS REQUIREMENTS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Supreme Court by a 5-to-4 vote held that this Congress lacks the constitutional authority to strip Americans of their citizenship without their consent, however grave the offense may be.

The Court went beyond the simple facts of the case before it, one involving voting by a U.S. citizen in a foreign election, and said that the 14th amendment makes a citizen's nationality inviolate unless he voluntarily gives it up.

Under this reasoning it appears that a U.S. citizen, whether by birth or naturalization, can take an oath of allegiance to a foreign power, join the military service of a foreign power, serve as an official of a foreign government, and even be guilty of treason yet not be subject to loss of U.S. citizenship—since he can only lose it by his own voluntary renunciation by this decision.

What sort of sovereignty is it that has no right to exercise normal expatriation powers? What point is there in providing a naturalization process under which an individual can acquire U.S. citizenship, perhaps only motivated by prospects of economic gain, and then go to the far corners of the world, vote in foreign elections, avoid and evade service in the American armed services, perhaps even hold foreign office while wrapping himself in the American flag and looking for the protection of Uncle Sam at every threat to his property and his own safety?

U.S. citizenship is not a one-way street—all privileges and rights and protection but no duties, responsibilities, and obligations of loyalty and service.

The Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee of the Judiciary is deeply disturbed as a result of this decision. It is our firm resolve to see that the full sovereign power of expatriation is asserted and again made effective for the United States of America. If it requires a constitutional amendment, then that we must provide.

THE EAGLE'S TALONS

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, those who feel today that the Gulf of Aqaba is a remote and distant waterway in which we have little interest and no business should remember how remote and distant the Gulf of Tonkin seemed just 3 short years ago. There is now a challenge to world peace at Aqaba that is far more dangerous and deliberate than at Tonkin. While we are not yet physically involved at Aqaba, there is no doubt that part of the spirit of belligerency in the Mideast is a conscious desire to pluck the eagle's feathers, if not to actually debeak the bird.

We are told that the U.S.S. *Intrepid* is transiting the Suez Canal from West to East today. The significance attached to this event underscores two naval recommendations that have been largely ignored, but ignored at a cost that we today are about to fully appreciate.

The first of these naval proposals is that we should maintain a naval presence in the Indian Ocean area—east of, and free of the passage through Suez.

The second recommendation is closely related to the logistical problem presented by the first. A naval force in the Indian Ocean area in order to maintain the highest degree of independence should be composed of nuclear-powered units.

While there has been some Pentagon recognition of the value of these recommendations, the acceptance of them has been painfully slow. Had we not delayed, there is a possibility that we might have discouraged the showdown at Aqaba.

The eagle's talons, although sheathed, are the best insurance for its feathers.

EVENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST SHOW THE VIETNAM WAR NOW IN ITS TRUE PERSPECTIVE

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, events in the Middle East show the Vietnam war now in its true perspective as an ill-conceived and ill-advised venture, which has accomplished nothing except to waste the substance of the United States with our young men dying and billions of dollars going down the drain, and for what?

Those who have supported the domino theory should by now know that it is actually a chess game, and we have become the pawns.

In January 1966, during my campaign for Congress in the special election to fill the Lindsay vacancy in the 17th District, Manhattan, I stated, with respect to the war in Vietnam, that "you do not take a firm stand in quicksand."

Are we not now bogged down in that debilitating conflict? Is not the Soviet Union now free to move in any direction at a fraction of the sacrifice, which our people have been asked to assume? Do we any longer have a leading place in helping to determine world destiny?

We now have the situation of a true democracy, Israel, a bastion in the Middle East, that needs not only our support, but will fight for its own preservation, and we are seemingly impotent to take real action.

The New York Times editorial of Wednesday May 31, 1967, has a direct bearing on this question, and I set it forth herein at length:

MIDDLE EAST AND/OR VIETNAM

> The issues in the Middle Eastern conflict are being confused by some commentators and critics with the very different issues involved in Vietnam. Just as spokesmen for the Johnson Administration have drawn false parallels between appeasement of Hitler and what was described as appeasement of Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung, so now the terms "hawk" and "dove" are being loosely applied to the Middle East as if they had the same connotations as in Vietnam.
>
> It is neither accidental nor illogical that many of the same Americans who are calling for deescalation and unconditional negotiations in Southeast Asia also call for firmness on the part of the United States in insisting on freedom of passage to the Gulf of Aqaba and on honoring American commitments to defend the sovereignty and independence of Israel.
>
> The United States had no such commitments with regard to South Vietnam, least of all to fight a virtually unilateral and major war on behalf of Saigon. In 1954, when the SEATO treaty was signed, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles specifically ruled out "unilateral armed intervention." While SEATO's economic and defensive commitments were indeed extended in a protocol to South Vietnam, along with Cambodia and Laos, Saigon was not even a party to the SEATO treaty.
>
> The other major document sometimes cited by the Johnson Administration as a commitment to Saigon was a letter from President Eisenhower to President Diem of South Vietnam on Oct. 23, 1954. In it General Eisenhower wrote of aid to Saigon, the purpose of which would be "to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." However, this aid was made dependent on President Diem creating a Government "enlightened in purpose and effective in performance." Diem failed signally to do this, as virtually every Vietnamese from Premier Ky down now recognizes.
>
> President Kennedy just before his death and President Johnson as late as 1964 both insisted—in Mr. Johnson's words—that the war in Vietnam "ought to be fought by the boys of Asia," not by Americans. Israel is not asking the United States to fight for her.

There is no commitment to do so, and in present circumstances no need to do so.

But there are commitments, which can be documented precisely, by every American President since Truman to defend the sovereignty and independence of Israel, and there are also commitments by Presidents Eisenhower and Johnson in favor of upholding the right of free passage through the Strait of Tiran into the Gulf of Aqaba.

In terms of American interest—as well as commitment—the Middle East is to be differentiated from Southeast Asia. The Middle East is the crossroads of the world, between Asia and Europe. It has been a strategic goal of Russia since Peter the Great. A reminder of this came only yesterday with the news that Russian warships are going to pass through the Black Sea Straits into the Eastern Mediterranean.

In its great-power aspect the Middle Eastern crisis shapes up as a confrontation of the Soviet Union versus the United States. As the British and French were gradually forced out of the area following World War II, the United States took their place. The region is now of paramount strategic importance to this country, whereas until escalation of the Vietnam war, Southeast Asia was only a marginal power factor for the United States.

The Persian Gulf area produces 27 per cent of the world's petroleum and has proved global reserves of 60 per cent. American firms have a gross investment in the region of more than $2.5 billion. There is nothing comparable in American interests that can be said of the Southeast Asian peninsula.

The American position has now reached the ironical stage where virtually every argument advanced for the Vietnam war—commitments, honor, security, interests, consistency, the self-determination of small nations—could be used in favor of helping Israel. However, it is not necessary nor is it valid to make such comparison. These are two separate problems calling for different solutions, but they are alike in that they both require major policy decisions in 1967.

If Washington now argues that it cannot afford to take on two crucial commitments at the same time, this would be another good reason to say it is time to deescalate the war in Vietnam.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I was not present on Thursday, May 25, during the vote on S. 1432, which amends the Universal Military and Service Act. Had I been present I would have answered "yea." To roll No. 108 which was taken on the passage of this legislation, I would like the RECORD to show my position on S. 1432.

THE CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST VERSUS OUR SUPPORT OF SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with amazement and amusement to the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN].

Mr. Speaker, I do not see that there is all that great difference between the war in Vietnam and the potential war in Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be one of those who thinks the United States ought to stand up to dictatorships any place in the world. I understand, of course, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] has a constituency which is much less interested in South Vietnam but much more interested in Israel. However, I would think that even so, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] ought to have the courage to at least be consistent.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERAL PAYMENT AND BORROWING AUTHORITY

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 8718) to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and the ceiling on the District of Columbia's borrowing authority, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 112]

Abbitt
Abernethy
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Ashmore
Battin
Bell
Blatnik
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Conyers
Dawson
Dent
Dingell
Dow
Eckhardt
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Foley
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gardner
Gathings
Gray
Gurney
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Hawkins
Heckler, Mass.
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Hosmer
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
King, Calif.
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, La.
Lukens
McClory
Mailliard
Miller, Calif.
Mink
Monagan
Nichols
Nix
O'Konski
Philbin
Pickle
Pollock
Pool
Pryor
Quie
Rees
Reinecke
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roudebush
Ruppe
St. Onge
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tiernan
Tunney
Waggonner
Watkins
Whalen
Whalley
Whitten
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Younger
Zion
Zwach

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERAL PAYMENT AND BORROWING AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8718

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Section 1 of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2501a) is amended (1) by striking out "June 30, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1968", and (2) by striking out "$60.000.000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$70,000,000".

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act of June 6, 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 9-220(b)), is amended by striking out "$250,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$275,000,000".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'District of Columbia Federal Payment Authorization and Borrowing Authority Act of 1967'.

"TITLE I—FEDERAL PAYMENT AUTHORIZATION

"SECTION 101. Section 1 of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2501a) is amended (1) by striking out 'June 30, 1967' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1968', and and (2) by striking out '$60,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$70,000,000'.

"TITLE II—AUTHORIZATION FOR LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FROM THE UNITED STATES TREASURY

"SEC. 201. Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act approved June 6, 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 9-220(b)), is amended to read as follows:

" '(b)(1) To assist in financing the cost of constructing facilities required for activities financed by the general fund of the District, the Commissioners are hereby authorized to accept loans for the District from the United States Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to lend to the Commissioners such sums as may hereafter be appropriated for such purpose, except that no loan made under this subsection after June 30, 1967, shall cause the amount which is required to be paid in any fiscal year out of the general fund of the District as principal and interest on the aggregate indebtedness of the District to exceed—

" '(A) in the case of an amount required to be paid in a fiscal year ending in 1968, 1969, or 1970, 6 per centum of the general revenue of the District which the Commissioners estimate will be credited to the general fund of the District during such fiscal year; or

" '(B) in the case of an amount required to be paid in a fiscal year ending after June 30, 1970, 6 per centum of the general revenue of the District credited to the general fund of the District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

" '(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term "general revenue of the District" means the sum of—

" '(A) the tax revenues of the District, including but not limited to the revenues (including penalties and interest) derived from the following taxes: (i) taxes imposed on real and tangible personal property, (ii) sales and gross receipts taxes, (iii) taxes on the incomes of individuals, corporations, and unincorporated businesses, (iv) real estate deed recordation taxes, and (v) inheritance and estate taxes;

"'(B) proceeds from the motor vehicle registration fees collected under section 3 of title IV of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 (D.C. Code, sec. 40-103); and

"'(C) the amount of the appropriation authorized by section 1 of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947. The appropriation of any loan shall not be construed to alter or to eliminate the procedures for consultation, advice, and recommendation provided in the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1001 et seq.). $50,000,000 of the principal amount of the loans authorized to be made to the Commissioners under this subsection shall be utilized to carry out the purposes of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (D.C. Code, secs. 1-1404, 1-1421—1-1426); and $40,000,000 of the principal amount of such loans shall be utilized to carry out the purposes of the District of Columbia Public Education Act (Public Law 89-791). Such loans shall be in addition to any other loans heretofore or hereafter made to the Commissioners for any other purpose, and when advanced shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the general fund of the District.'

"SEC. 202. Subsection (f) of the first section of the Act approved June 6, 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 9-220(f)), is repealed."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 8718 after a great number of conferences and discussions with other members of the House District Committee. We have appropriated more money during the past 10 years for schools and especially new school buildings in the District of Columbia than any other city of comparable size in the United States. I think all the members of the House District Committee are of the opinion that the cost of erecting these buildings is out of line, as the cost of erecting a school building in the city of Washington as stated by the District Commissioners ranges from $50,000 to $73,000 per classroom, which seems to me to be a great deal more than the cost of any classroom in any other State in the Union.

My bill increases the authorizing Federal payment for contributions made annually to the District of Columbia from $60 to $70 million per annum. When I first became a member of the House District Committee the Federal payment was only $9 million per annum and we had almost the same number of people residing in the Nation's Capital that we have today.

I realize the number of students in the local schools has greatly increased during the past 10 years. In my original bill I called for the borrowing authority to be increased by $25 million. However, some members of my committee were of the opinion that the borrowing authority should be greater than $25 million so the committee agreed to accept an amendment suggested by Congressman NELSON and Congressman ADAMS which will increase the borrowing authority ceiling during the next 3 calendar years as follows: $333.8 million for fiscal year 1968; $363.9 million for fiscal year 1969; and $392.3 million for fiscal year 1970.

The Congress at that time will have an opportunity to review the financial situation in the District of Columbia and see if the conditions in the Nation's Capital will permit the borrowing authority to come to an end.

I respectfully suggest that this increase in revenue provided in this bill together with the deficiencies in Federal payment which have accumulated since 1955 are more than ample to meet the requirements for any necessary projects in the District of Columbia.

It is the sincere hope of the members of my committee that the Appropriations Committee will closely scrutinize the cost of every project in the Nation's Capital and see how the more than $100 million dollars per annum in grants is spent and also be certain that any request for funds has been properly authorized by the Legislative Committee for the District of Columbia.

I want to congratulate both Congressman NATCHER and Senator BYRD for their continued efforts to hold down expenses in the Nation's Capital. We have people residing in the District of Columbia that pay very little taxes that are continuously harassing the Congress for additional funds. We all know that some additional schools should be erected in the Nation's Capital and some of the old schools be replaced; however it is difficult to understand why some of the officials in the District of Columbia think that all these buildings can be erected in 1 year.

The cost of operating the District government has doubled several times during the past 10 years and the number of personnel required to operate the government has doubled during the past 5 or 6 years.

When the Reorganization Act was passed in 1952, the District Committee was assured that its enactment would provide a more efficient government for the District and expenses would decrease by at least $5 million dollars in 5 years. The gross payroll for District employees has increased from $82.5 million in 1954 to $201.5 million in 1966, an increase of 143.8 percent.

Expenditures in the Nation's Capital are at the top of expenditures in comparison with the following 17 major cities of comparable size:

Expenditure items

General expenditures (all functions excluding capital outlay):	*Rank of District of Columbia*
Police	1
Fire protection	3
Health and hospitals	1
Public welfare	4
Public education operating expenses	2

The record shows that the Committee on the District of Columbia has authorized adequate funds for the needs of the local government and the pending bill makes adequate provisions for the immediate future. The record shows that the District government has received generous appropriations and ranks essentially at the top among other comparable cities in per capita expenditures. It is my feeling that the Congress and the Appropriations Committees need to take a more critical look at the District budget and the justification for proposed expenditures.

EXAMPLES SHOWING THAT CONGRESS HAS WELL DISCHARGED ITS FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Reckless and unfounded statements have appeared in the press from time to time, charging the Congress with a lack of proper concern for the fiscal well-being of the District of Columbia, and with making wholly inadequate provisions for the District of Columbia as to availability of funds and services within the Nation's Capital.

The following exhibits are submitted for the purpose of showing the degree to which the Congress has discharged its fiscal responsibility toward the District of Columbia, in acceptance of the Federal Government's stewardship over the Nation's Capital as spelled out in section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

Exhibit No. 1 lists Federal grants to the city of Washington, in addition to the Federal payment referred to above.

Thus, in addition to the annual Federal contribution or payment to the District of Columbia, the District for fiscal 1968 will receive, it is estimated, a total of over $167 million under the Federal grant programs.

This represents an increase of $38.2 million over 1967 grants to the District.

These grants, plus the Federal payment, add up to a total Federal expenditure to the District that belies any allegation of neglect of the District on the part of the Congress.

Summary of the Federal grants for 1967 and 1968 follows:

Agency	Estimated, 1967	Estimated, 1968
Executive Office	$21,000	$35,064
General Administration	215,599	309,827
Public Service Commission	1,562	5,897
Planning and Zoning	2,162	2,162
Commissioners' Youth Council	15,500	50,050
Urban Renewal and Redevelopment Land Agency	3,500,000	3,780,000
Council on Human Relations	2,991	2,961
Public Library	496,480	496,480
Office of the Surveyor	6,814	6,814
Police Department	1,177,353	272,075
Fire Department	10,800	10,800
Office of Civil Defense	312,724	198,316
Juvenile Court	11,030	11,030
Corrections	128,792	89,810
Licenses and Inspections	29,207	41,279
Public Schools	18,464,639	17,872,579
Recreation	2,180,608	1,255,274
Vocational Rehabilitation	1,902,124	1,735,302
Public Health	9,416,002	7,949,860
Public Welfare	16,627,422	20,141,620
Highways and Traffic	72,221,379	111,328,088
Sanitary Engineering	1,542,502	1,661,575
Grand total	128,347,780	167,211,893

Exhibit No. 2 is a presentation of expenditures in the District in certain major categories directly benefiting the public, with an indication also of the relative rank of the District of Columbia with respect to these expenditures, in comparison with those in the other U.S. cities of comparable size which enjoy local or home rule. These figures show the Nation's Capital to rank first among these cities in per capita expenditures in three of the six categories, and second, third, and fourth, respectively, in the three remaining ones.

EXHIBIT 2

Rank of the District of Columbia among the 17 U.S. cities of population between 500,000 and 1,000,000 in certain major expenditures, fiscal year 1963

Item of expenditure	Expenditure	Rank of District of Columbia
General expenditures (all functions, excluding capital outlay)	[1] 455.51	1
Police	[1] 30.95	1
Fire protection	[1] 13.83	3
Health and hospitals [2]	[1] 64.14	1
Public welfare	[1] 34.66	4
Operating costs, public education [3]	[4] 459.00	2

[1] Per capita.

[2] This is in addition to more than $42,000,000 spent by the Federal Government for hospital construction in the District in recent years. This has no parallel in any State, and is solely a result of the status of the District of Columbia as the Federal City.

[3] This item does not include more than $83,000,000 spent in the past 10 years for construction of new classrooms in the District, which as far as we can learn is the highest such expenditure among the 17 comparable cities.

[4] Per pupil in average daily membership.

Note.—Fiscal year 1963 is the latest year for which these data are available.

Source: "Compendium of City Government Finances in 1963," U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Exhibit No. 3 shows, in detail, the expenditures for personal services in each of the 17 U.S. cities referred to above, in fiscal years 1951 and in 1963, together with the increase in this expenditure in each city during this interval of 12 years. These figures show the District to rank first among these cities in this expenditure by a very large margin, and highest by far also in the increase in this expenditure. This latter figure is highly significant, for while it is true that the District of Columbia, because of its peculiar status as the Federal City, has certain functions and responsibilities which are assumed elsewhere by the State governments and which would account for a higher expenditure for personal services in the District than in these other cities, it is true also that Washington has always had these extra responsibilities. They have not increased in number, and thus this fact does not account in any way for the great increase in such expenditure over a period of years. All salaried positions in the District of Columbia government must be authorized and the salaries appropriated, by congressional action. Thus, little justification may be found in these facts for any implication of "stinginess" on the part of the Congress toward the District.

EXHIBIT 3

Expenditures for personal services in U.S. cities of population between 500,000 and 1,000,000 in either the 1950 or the 1960 census, fiscal years 1951 and 1963

[In thousands of dollars]

City	Fiscal year 1951	Fiscal year 1963	Increase
Milwaukee	28,097	57,750	29,653
Baltimore	58,322	137,500	79,178
Pittsburgh	23,758	37,250	13,492
Boston	75,131	118,500	43,369
Cincinnati	22,843	54,650	31,807
Cleveland	55,012	75,650	20,638
Buffalo	31,629	57,950	26,301
San Francisco	51,811	115,500	63,689
Houston	13,531	42,350	28,819
St. Louis	33,968	66,050	32,082
Minneapolis	21,048	34,250	13,202
New Orleans	18,997	32,750	19,753
Dallas	13,852	37,350	23,498
San Antonio	10,557	31,150	20,593
San Diego	9,400	28,950	19,550
Seattle	27,059	51,750	24,691
District of Columbia	65,387	166,500	101,113

Note.—Fiscal year 1963 is the latest year for which these data are available.

Source: "Compendium of City Government Finances" (1951 and 1963 editions), U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Exhibits Nos. 4, 5, 6, and 7, pertain to the District of Columbia public school system, the area in which the Congress has been subjected to the greatest amount of unfounded criticism. An item in exhibit No. 2 indicates that the District of Columbia ranked second, in 1963, among the 17 comparable U.S. cities, with respect to operating expenditures per pupil in average daily membership in its public school system.

Exhibit No. 4 presents this picture in detail, showing the actual amount of this highly significant expenditure in each of these cities during school year 1964–65, and also for school year 1956–57. These figures show that the District rose from sixth to second place in this expenditure during this period of 8 years, and ranked first among these cities in the increase in this figure. These statistics, together with the item of $83 million spent in the past decade for new school construction, completely belie the frequent allegation that Congress is in any way indifferent to the quality of public education in the Nation's Capital. It should be pointed out that in these exhibits, fiscal year 1963 is the most recent year for which the figures involving the 17 U.S. cities of populations comparable to the District are presently available.

EXHIBIT 4

Current (operating) expenditures per pupil in average daily membership for school years 1956–57 and 1964–65, in public school systems of U.S. cities whose populations in the 1960 census were between 500,000 and 1,000,000; and relative rank of District of Columbia in each

City	1956–57	1964–65	Increase
District of Columbia	$328 (6)	$514 (2)	$186 (2)
Baltimore	281	410	129
Cleveland	311	434	123
Houston	228	315	87
San Francisco	410	608	198
New Orleans	242	315	73
Boston	326	511	185
St. Louis	332	425	93
Milwaukee	321	447	126
Cincinnati	320	444	124
Pittsburgh	358	428	70
Buffalo	364	513	149
Dallas	324	357	33
Seattle	(1)	476	----------
San Diego	307	469	162
San Antonio	205	(1)	----------

[1] Not available.

Note.—These figures do not include expenditures for capital outlay or for debt retirement, neither of which is considered by any recognized authority as reliable for purposes of comparison.

Sources: "Current Expenditures Per Pupil in Public School Systems," by U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. "Selected Statistics of Local School Systems, 1964–65," by Research Division, National Education Association.

Exhibit 5 shows the total school appropriations for the District of Columbia for the years 1955 through 1967, number of pupils in attendance, and operating expenses per pupil. It will be noted that such expenses per pupil have increased from $283 in 1955 to $650 in 1967, and according to the recent testimony of the Superintendent of Schools to your committee, it is hoped that within the next few years the expenditure per pupil will approximate $1,000.

EXHIBIT 5

Total appropriation, number of pupils in average daily membership, and operating expenditures per pupil in average daily membership, fiscal years 1955–67

Fiscal year	Total school appropriation	Pupils in average daily membership	Operating expenses per pupil in average daily membership [1]
1955	$35,001,570	104,412	$283
1956	35,928,326	105,796	312
1957	39,093,326	106,427	328
1958	50,072,772	109,248	352
1959	52,963,968	112,358	382
1960	54,095,500	116,500	388
1961	58,674,700	120,917	413
1962	63,092,110	126,646	412
1963	67,197,750	132,698	432
1964	81,922,943	137,858	452
1965	86,443,377	140,366	514
1966	93,210,450	142,494	594
1967 [2]	108,045,100	145,700	650

[1] See separate exhibit comparing these per pupil expenditures in the District of Columbia with those in other U.S. cities of comparable size.

[2] Estimated.

Sources: District of Columbia Budget Office; Statistical and Finance Office, District of Columbia Board of Education.

Exhibit No. 6 shows the expenditure of $83 million for 1,816 classrooms to accommodate 50,469 additional students in the past 12 years.

EXHIBIT 6

Expenditure for new schoolroom construction, District of Columbia public school system, fiscal years 1955–67

Total number of new schoolrooms completed or under construction	Seating capacity (pupils)	Cost of construction
1,816	[1] 50,469	[2] $83,000,000

[1] During this 12-year period, while new schoolrooms have been constructed to accommodate 50,469 additional pupils, the enrollment in the District of Columbia public school system has increased by only 42,655. Thus, new space has been provided for 7,814 pupils in excess of the increase in enrollment.

[2] The cost figure shown does not include expenditures for site acquisition nor for equipment for the new schoolrooms.

Source: Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Buildings and Grounds, Public Schools of the District of Columbia.

Exhibit No. 7 shows by years the incredible cost of broken window panes in the District of Columbia schools, over $1 million since 1955:

EXHIBIT 7

Window breakage—District of Columbia public schools, 1955–66

Fiscal year	Number of panes	Cost of replacement
1955	19,693	$58,062.11
1956	19,635	59,267.47
1957	21,418	65,279.50
1958	21,346	64,427.36
1959	20,555	75,705.29
1960	21,356	72,281.65
1961	23,610	85,946.08
1962	23,648	90,907.00
1963	19,307	91,451.52
1964	27,689	112,868.10
1965	26,518	118,220.00
1966	30,037	143,470.15
Total	274,814	1,037,986.23

Mr. **BROYHILL** of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the committee report accompanying this bill is a very fine report and explains in great detail the purposes and objectives of this legislation.

Unfortunately, however, the committee felt it necessary to take what seems to be a defensive position in some of the language contained in the report, in that they use various charts and statistics with which to prove that the District of Columbia Committee has met its responsibility in legislating for the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, these charts show that the District of Columbia compares most favorably financially with 17 to 21 comparable cities in the United States with populations of between 500,000 and 1 million people.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the District of Columbia has time and again acknowledged this responsibility in legislating for the Nation's Capital—the responsibility that the Congress of the United States has a financial obligation, and that this obligation could not be lightly discharged and delegated to someone else to manage.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is no magic formula that can be applied which will solve the District problems. We cannot permit appointed officials to assess Federal property and to tax Federal property in order to obtain a Federal payment. The Committee on the District of Columbia must carefully review every proposal and every authorization, in order to determine what are the true and proper needs of our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of all this effort and concern that has been put forth by our Committee on the District of Columbia—both the legislative committee and the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Committee on Appropriations—we have been criticized, maligned, and blamed for all of the ills that we have existing here in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that both of the committees of this House and the Congress are due an apology. I say this as the representative of an area which makes up a large part of this metropolitan area of which the Nation's Capital is a part.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been interested in the welfare of the Nation's Capital. Many of our people from the 10th Congressional District of Virginia work here and do business here.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I should like to express a word of gratitude and appreciation to the Committee on the District of Columbia for its support in the past of what I felt was and has been worthwhile legislation, legislation in the best interest of the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, on page 7 of the report, in the next to the last paragraph on the page, there is pointed out some of the factors which cause some of these serious problems with which we are confronted. The makeup, and the characteristics as well as capabilities of the population of the District of Columbia during the past decade has undergone quite a change. This includes the elderly citizens that we now have—the large number of elderly citizens—broken families, dependent children, low-income residents who are handicapped with lack of skills, education, and family background. This, of course, causes a great deal of additional financial problems.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the Committee on the District of Columbia has done an excellent job in its effort to find proper solutions to the problems which exist here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware of the problems of needed educational facilities, poverty, and other facets of deprivation which exist here in the Nation's Capital. These problems have too often been exaggerated.

Mr. Speaker, I have visited some of the schools of the District of Columbia and will certainly acknowledge that some of them are in somewhat of a rundown condition. However, there are older buildings which exist at some of the best universities throughout this country, buildings which are much older than we have in use here in the District of Columbia. Yet, on the other hand, we have some of the finest schools that can be found anywhere in the United States. We have an excellent program upon which we are working now to further enhance the educational system of the District of Columbia. We have one of the finest school superintendents in the country, Dr. Carl Hansen.

Of course, we have some poverty here. Yet, we found that one of the greatest causes for poverty in the Capital is that the population is made up of a large percentage of people who will not work, even if they were offered good jobs. I do not believe we can make that problem dry up and go away just by appropriating additional money.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my endorsement of H.R. 8718, a bill to provide increased revenues to the District of Columbia.

Title I of this bill increases the authorized Federal payment to the District from $60 million to $70 million per year. This is in keeping with the policy of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of increasing this authorization whenever the financial needs of the city indicate that the Federal Government should contribute a larger sum as its fair share toward meeting the expense of operating and maintaining the Capital City.

Title II pertains to the authority of the District of Columbia Commissioners to borrow money from the U.S. Treasury for deposit in the District of Columbia General Fund, from which it may be appropriated by the Congress for expenditure in connection with the city's program of capital improvement. This proposed legislation stipulates that the total amount of money so borrowed shall not during any fiscal year exceed that amount on which the cost of debt service, including payment of interest and amortization, shall require 6 percent of the District's total revenues to the general fund for that fiscal year, including the Federal payment.

This is a departure from previous policy, as heretofore the limit on the city's borrowing authority has been set at a fixed dollar amount by the Congress, though of course this maximum limit has been increased several times as the need and justification were indicated. The present limit on this borrowing for capital outlay is $290 million, and it is estimated that the authorization provided in H.R. 8718 will increase this ceiling to $333.8 million in fiscal year 1968, and to $392.3 million in fiscal year 1970.

I favor this formula as the basis for the ceiling on the borrowing authority, as it will unquestionably provide the District of Columbia Commissioners a far more predictable basis for planning in connection with the program of capital improvement, while at the same time the limit of 6 percent of the city's revenues usable for debt servicing is certainly conservative and within safe fiscal bounds.

I support this bill because I recognize the real need for additional revenues to the District of Columbia over the next several years, above and beyond the amount which can possibly accrue from the city's various tax levies. At the same time, however, I strongly resent the repeated and widely publicized accusations against the Congress and the Committee on the District of Columbia in particular, blaming them for neglecting to provide funds adequate for the proper operation of the District of Columbia government and particularly the District of Columbia public school system.

The utter fallacy of these allegations is evident from a number of exhibits in the committee's report on this bill. These factual data, from unimpeachable sources, show clearly that the District of Columbia has in fact consistently enjoyed a degree of financial prosperity shared by no other U.S. city of comparable size. The District enjoys the highest per capita income of all such cities, the highest tax revenues, and by far the greatest amount of Federal funds, in addition to the annual Federal payment, spent each year solely for its benefit. In the face of these facts, it is my earnest opinion that some real attempts at economy and efficiency in the operation of the District of Columbia government are long overdue.

It is my understanding that the greater part of the additional funds which will become available for capital outlay if this legislation is enacted will be used for the purpose of school construction. As I have stated on previous occasions, I realize that a considerable amount will have to be spent for this purpose in the District of Columbia in the next several years, and I endorse this plan. Again, however, I deeply resent the repeated accusations that the Congress has been negligent in this regard, to the detriment of the city's school system. Over the past 12 years, the District of Columbia has spent some $83 million in the construction of 1,816 new schoolrooms, with a capacity for 50,469 additional pupils, while the city's school population has increased by only 42,655 students during this time. I doubt that any other city of comparable size has made greater strides during this time toward the goal of adequate school buildings for all its pupils. Of course it is true that some dilapidated and obsolete school buildings still are in use in the Nation's capital—just as is the case in every other city in the United States. But this is by no means an indication of "neglect" on the part of the Congress. Steady progress has been made in the District in the area of school construction, and will continue to be made as rapidly as is possible.

In this connection, I should like to point out that in my opinion, the cost estimates for this school construction program as presented to the Committee on the District of Columbia are extremely high. I cannot believe that it will be necessary to spend from $63,000 to $72,000 per classroom. Also, it is difficult for me to appreciate the necessity for elementary school construction in the District of Columbia costing $20.26 per square foot, while in Fairfax County, Va., the cost is only $13.69 per square foot. Many of the new schools being built in Fairfax County are in my district, and I know that they are substantial and well constructed. I urge that careful study be made to determine means of reducing these costs.

In the matter of financing of public school operating costs, the Congress has certainly met its obligation to the Nation's Capital in full measure. An exhibit in the committee's report on H.R. 8717 shows that in the school year 1964–65 the District of Columbia ranked second only to San Francisco, among the U.S. cities of comparable size, in the amount spent per pupil in average daily membership for school operating costs. And during the 2 years which have elapsed since that time, this per-pupil operating expenditure in the District has increased from $514 to $650.

Despite these indisputable facts, we Members of Congress, and of the Committee on the District of Columbia in particular, are the constant targets of false and misleading criticism and accusations, as the shortcomings of the District school system in all areas are blamed upon our failure to provide adequate funds. The plain and uncomfortable fact is that the District of Columbia school system has serious shortcomings which cannot be remedied by the expenditure of any amount of money. The main one of these is the lack of discipline which pervades the city's school system, and which inevitably hampers the learning process for those students who seriously are trying to acquire an education, and also is the direct cause of the incredible cost of vandalism which wastes so much of the city's money each year. This grave problem is not improving, and until the school administration faces the fact that self-improvement is the greatest need in the District of Columbia public schools, and stops deluding the public into believing that all that is needed is more money, the deterioration of the school system in its real mission, to educate the city's children into responsible, productive adult citizens, will continue at a rapid pace.

Mr. Speaker, again I wish to recommend this bill H.R. 8717 to my colleagues as being in the public interest, while at the same time I urge a more realistic spending policy on the part of the District of Columbia government.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of the authorization bill for the District of Columbia, I believe that compliments should be paid to the chairman of this committee [Mr. McMillan]. As we both know, our committee has been criticized; but many times things that should be complimented are overlooked.

Working on this committee from the minority side, Mr. Speaker, I want to say Mr. McMillan and I have had a wonderful relationship. There has been an atmosphere of cooperation for the best interests of our Nation's Capital that has been most excellent.

I would call attention to the fact that in working on this bill, neither our side of the aisle nor the majority side of the aisle were wedded to any particular plan, but we did hope when a plan did come up it would be fully justified. We feel we have worked out a plan that will meet the needs of the District of Columbia, and is fully justified on every score.

At the present time Mr. McMillan and I have been working also on other pieces of legislation, including that involving vocational rehabilitation. We are seeking to qualify the District of Columbia for the same Federal payment as our States would receive.

We are working on the medicaid proposition which would also give the District of Columbia the same advantages our States have. We have been working together on the vocational school and on the liberal arts college. All of these things are on the plus side. Mr. McMillan deserves a great amount of credit for the work he has done in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that serving on the Committee on the District of Columbia is a political liability for a Member of Congress. But I also do wish to say that we have been asked by the Congress to assume this responsibility, and we accept it.

We also need to have in mind this is our Nation's Capital. A great deal of effort is constantly put forth to make it the prestige center of the United States of America.

I will remember the time of the launching of the sputnik, when many people were disappointed that the United States of America came in second in that race. Right now we are trying to be the first on the moon. By the same token, we should be very sure that the Nation's Capital be the No. 1 model city in the United States of America, a city of which we can be proud. I fear at the present time we cannot so feel. However, I would also want to be sure that everything we do is fully justified.

As to the authorization bill itself, I would like to point out that in our Nation's Capital we have a tremendous need in the area of our schools. For example, in the age group up to 4 years, there is a terrific increase in population, a plus-15-percent increase from 1950 to 1964. In the age group from 5 to 10 there is a 47.6-percent increase from 1950 to 1964. All this means there will be a tremendous need in our Nation's Capital for additional schools in the future.

As has been pointed out in the hearings, $46 million was cut from the school budget because of the fact that a little more elbow room was not available under the authorization by the District of Columbia Committee.

As to the authorization proposal that is before us, it is based on sound principles. It provides a fixed payment of $70 million by our Nation's Treasury to the District of Columbia.

It provides for a formula for borrowing based on tax revenues, and this is sound. This formula is 6 percent of the sum of the estimated annual general fund revenues from local taxes and the annual Federal payment.

It is also provided in this bill that the formula will apply only for a 3-year period, which will automatically terminate at that point. The reason for this is we want to have an opportunity to see how it works and if it does not work, it will expire. If it does work, the Congress can act to extend it.

I do feel that the compromise version is a sound one, that it is fully justified, and that it will meet the needs of our Nation's Capital.

As to the further justifications involving our school system and other points already discussed in the committee report, in the interest of saving time I will make no reference to them. They appear in the committee report.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman who is the ranking minority member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

In addition to associating myself with the sentiments the gentleman has expressed, I would like to congratulate him and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan], for the objective, constructive, and positive way in which they have approached this problem which has resulted in this reasonable bill coming to the House for our consideration.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Rostenkowski.) The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The gentleman will recall that the former director of the budget of the District of Columbia, Mr. Schuyler Lowe, who retired yesterday, did state that the amount authorized in this legislation, both as to the Federal payment and in the borrowing authority, would provide all the funds that would be needed to finance properly the District of Columbia for the next 3 years; is that correct?

Mr. NELSEN. That is exactly correct.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. So this should pretty much be an answer and an effective answer to those criticisms that have been coming from those sources that have no economic responsibility to the Nation's Capital—who make the criticism that the Congress is not meeting its financial responsibility.

Mr. NELSEN. I think it is an answer to such criticism.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to say before this debate closes that I want to thank the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN], as well as every member of our Committee on the District of Columbia for the fine cooperation they have given to me in the preparation of this revenue bill.

This bill was written by every member of the committee and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] was a great stalwart in preparing the main section of the bill. I am satisfied that these additional funds are required.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. M'MILLAN

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer several committee amendments to the committee amendment and ask unanimous consent they be considered en bloc.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments to the Committee amendment offered by Mr. McMILLAN: On page 3, line 18, insert "paragraph (1) of" immediately after "For purposes".

On page 4, strike out line 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) The appropriation of any loan made under this subsection shall not be construed to".

On page 4, strike out lines 20 and 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"the District of Columbia Public Education Act (Public Law 89-791).

"(4) Any loan made under this subsection shall be in addition to any other loans".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard this afternoon that the District of Columbia compares favorably with other cities of 500,000 to 1,000,000 population. In some respects it compares much more than favorably with cities of that size. I note in recent publications that personal income in the Washington metropolitan area between 1929 and 1962 showed an increase of 759 percent, which, according to this publication, far outpaces the 413-percent gain for the Nation.

Per capita personal income in the Washington area was estimated at $3,043 in 1962 compared with $1,131 in 1929, while national per capita income in 1962 rose to $2,368 against $705 in 1929. To repeat, personal per capita income in the District of Columbia in 1962, the latest year for which figures are available, averaged $3,043 as compared with the national per capita average of $2,368.

When do they propose in the District of Columbia to start financing their own government on the basis of potential income? Not only that, but in the matter of income there is no more substantial payroll anywhere in the United States than there is in the District of Columbia. There is no more constant, and no more substantial income, per capita, anywhere in the United States. I do not understand why we have to increase the take from the Federal taxpayers of the Nation by $10 million, or to a total of $70 million a year, to support the District of Columbia, especially in view of the fact that only recently we were told that property taxes in the District of Columbia are half those collected in the city of Baltimore.

When is it proposed to start taxing the people in the District of Columbia to pay the costs that they ought to bear?

On page 16 of the report I note the startling item that it cost no less than $143,470 to replace the window glass in the school buildings of the District of Columbia in the last year alone—$143,470. I doubt, without having facts at hand, that it cost that much to replace the window glass in the school buildings in the city of New York in any 1 year, and that city has a population of about 7 million. The $143,000 would buy a lot of textbooks for the schoolchildren of the District of Columbia. It would buy a lot of equipment. This is incredible.

If the people of the District of Columbia have no more interest in the schools of this city than to permit the rocking-out of $143,000 worth of windows in their school buildings each year, they do not have the proper interest in education and in the maintenance of their school facilities. I am not about to tax the people of the district that I have the honor to represent in the State of Iowa to pay for $143,000 worth of window glass for school buildings or to take any other burden off the taxpayers of the District of Columbia that they ought to bear.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, to the committee amendment.

The amendments to the committee amendment were agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. M'MILLAN

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. McMILLAN: On page 5, after line 3, insert the following new title:

"TITLE III—ELIGIBILITY FOR EMPLOYMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

"SEC. 301. In any program of recruitment or hiring of individuals to fill positions in the government of the District of Columbia, no officer or employee of the government of the District of Columbia shall exclude or give preference to the residents of the District of Columbia or any State of the United States on the basis of residence, religion, race, color, or national origin."

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the full 5 minutes, but I do want to indicate my support of this revenue measure. I compliment the chairman for his support of this measure and for the willingness on his part to have the committee move forward with it in a timely fashion.

I also would like to add, Mr. Speaker, my genuine and very sincere appreciation for the work of the ranking minority member [Mr. NELSEN], for his energy and interest and concern with respect to this measure. I have had the pleasure of working with Mr. NELSEN on a variety of matters, and I have found that his interest in the District of Columbia, and particularly his interest in the problems of public education, is not exceeded by anyone. This is indicated by his interest in seeing that the schools are given an opportunity to move forward, not only at the elementary and secondary education level—which will be more adequately provided for under this measure—but also, as expressed in his support for the 4-year college and vocational training institute, which he helped to shepherd through the last Congress.

This measure will give the Subcommittee on Appropriations the needed flexibility to meet the needs of the city as they find them. I have been impressed with the dedication of the chairman of that subcommittee [Mr. NATCHER]. I believe he has shown good judgment and concern for the welfare of the city. I am hopeful that, under this added flexibility, he will continue to scrutinize these needs carefully and help us to carry out our responsibilities to the District of Columbia.

Another point needs to be made about these comparisons with various cities throughout the Nation. In the District of Columbia we have, in effect, expenditures which are found in other States at the State, county, school district, and municipal levels.

There are no such separations or levels of government in the District of Columbia. The expenditures which are recorded in any of the District activities have to be compared to those made by at least four levels of government in the typical State in the United States.

Finally, I do believe this action is timely. We are moving ahead on the first of June. This will permit the Appropriations Subcommittees in their final resolution of the appropriations for the District to have the flexibility which they need.

I only add that we ought to continue to strive for more flexibility on the question of Federal payment. What we are doing today is wholesome, constructive, and forward looking. We might, however, explore the ways in which we could provide added flexibility, so that the appropriations subcommittee could continue to work without restraint with respect to the authority under which they have to operate.

The committee report notes that there has been an accumulation of authority, and why the Subcommittee on Appropriations does not choose to act under this, I do not know. It may well be they feel they should stay within current levels, rather than going back and using unappropriated authorizations. But, in any event, if we can move to give them more flexibility on the question of Federal payment, to match the flexibility we are writing here in the borrowing authority, then I believe we will have, indeed, provided well for the District.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the amounts of money we are making in the Federal payment are excessive. This would still be, under this measure, less than 25 percent of the total revenues of the District.

In years past, the Federal Government has contributed a far higher proportion of the budget of the District of Columbia

We know that the principal industry in Washington, D.C., is government. It is tax exempt. It pays no corporate income tax, no personal property tax, no real estate tax. It is incumbent on the Federal Government to contribute something to take the place of revenues which would be derived in a normal community from the industrial activities generally present in the urban areas of the Nation.

In closing, I renew my sincere appreciation and compliments to the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee for what I believe is a tremendously constructive step forward for the District of Columbia.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I join my other colleagues in complimenting the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan], the distinguished chairman of our committee, and also the ranking minority member, Ancher Nelsen, and all the members on both sides for what I believe is really dedicated service to the District of Columbia.

As indicated, I know that at times this committee is rather severely criticized. The chairman particularly has to take his share of what I consider to be very unjustified criticism from time to time. I do believe he is worthy of the support of this House for the dedicated work he does in an area which is certainly not very politically popular at times because, as I say, of some of the unfounded criticisms that go on.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to impose upon the House, but I want to take this opportunity to comment briefly on the funds which will be made available for the school system in the District of Columbia.

I am for schools. This committee has indicated strong support for additional funds to improve educational opportunities in the District of Columbia, to provide better facilities, better buildings, better teachers, and to do everything possible to give to the boys and girls of the District of Columbia the finest education possible and the finest advantages.

But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but bring to the attention of the House some concern which I feel with reference to apparent desires on the part of some individuals in the District to use this as a ground for experimentation, for innovation, which I do not believe to be in the best interest in our school system in this city.

It is unfortunate that there are those—unfortunately, I understand, represented by some members of the present Board of Education—who are attempting and have attempted in the past to gerrymander the school district lines and so on to make it very inconvenient, frankly, for a great many of our children to get to school. I have in mind a specific instance, where attempts are being made and have been made in the past to gerrymander district lines on some elementary schools and junior high schools, which requires children to go double the distance they otherwise would have to go if they were permitted to attend their normal neighborhood schools. In many cases they have to change buses.

As one who has always supported additional funds for schools, who believes strongly in education and in doing everything possible for it, I shall not now, nor will I in the future, support funds to be used for so-called innovations which I believe are tending to tear down the neighborhood school.

This Congress has spoken a number of times with reference to its attitude regarding the so-called busing of students, the two-way busing, dealing with the so-called matter of de facto segregation.

I might say that the complaints I have received have come from parents of varying races because of the inconvenience of getting their children to some school because of the whims of some individual on the school board. At this point I want to say that I have a great deal of confidence and respect for Dr. Hansen and the job he has done for the District of Columbia schools. I for one have a great deal of confidence in him, I want to say. However, there are those who do have some rather far-fetched ideas about changing the methods and manner of the school districts dealing with innovations which I do not believe and I also believe a great many other people do not believe are in the best interests of the educational system. This is to serve notice that I for one will look with a very jaundiced eye at any appropriations that will be dissipated in this type or kind of action which I believe in essense will break down our neighborhood schools.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to say to the gentleman that I would enter a mild dissent to some of the concern he expresses. My children attend school in an area where one of these so-called innovations was carried out. I am thinking particularly of the tri-school arrangement in Southwest Washington. It is my judgment that probably the right role for Congress is to see that the schools are made a matter of local responsibility. We do not want our Federal Legislators to tell the local community what to do. Some of these innovations have been useful and they should be looked at more carefully before they are criticized.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Sisk was granted permission to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SISK. Let me say to my good friend from Minnesota that I agree with him that innovations sometimes can be helpful and in some instances they may be beneficial. However, I happen to know of a very specific situation and, in fact, of two or three in the District, one particularly in the Northwest section, where I do not think it is in the best interest. I agree that we should have local control, and I for one, support an elected School Board for the District of Columbia, but the type and kind of local control we now have is such that in view of our responsibility I am going to assert my responsibility in passing upon appropriations. I feel I have this responsibility as a member of this committee and this Congress under the present setup in the District. I am serving notice as far as I am concerned that I will not support some of the wild ideas of some of these individuals. I recognize there may be differences of opinion, but this is my reason for taking the time now.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there is need for more money for District schools.

Last year, the Congress authorized two public colleges in the District, and provided for an additional $40 million in the city's borrowing authority for their planning and construction. These institutions, the Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute, are scheduled to open in September of 1968, and while they represent a project of real merit and with widespread public support, their operation will of course add an appreciable amount to the city's future budget requests.

The public schools construction program, as projected through fiscal year 1973, calls for the replacement of 578 obsolete classrooms presently in use, and for the construction of 2,762 new classrooms.

It is estimated that this program, which will increase the total number of classrooms from the present 4,726 to 7,488, will cost some $286 million. This is in addition to $31 million which will be needed over this same 6-year period for other permanent improvements to existing school buildings. Thus, the 6-year school plan calls for a total expenditure of $317 million for capital outlay.

The public schools construction program provides for elimination of overcrowding, replacement of old schools, and modernization of existing schools.

There are two reasons given in justification for expanding the number of usable classrooms in the District from the present 4,726 to a total of 7,488. First, it is estimated that the school population, which this year totals approximately 148,000 pupils, will increase to nearly 160,000 by 1973. And secondly, the school administration feels strongly that there must be a reduction in class size in both the elementary and the secondary schools. Their objective is the establishment of a maximum size of 25 pupils per regular class in the elementary schools, and classes of 25 pupils also in high school academic subjects. At the present time, while there are some schools in the District of Columbia in which the pupil-teacher ratio is within these limits, there are also a great many classrooms with considerably larger numbers of pupils. This overcrowding exists mostly in the poorer neighborhoods, where the pupils come from less favorable home environments. And these, of course, are precisely the students who are in the greatest need of small classes, in order that they may receive a maximum degree of individual attention and instruction.

Your committee is told that many of the children in the District of Columbia start school almost unable to speak, or in some cases they speak a language which is almost wholly unrecognizable. A pupil in this situation, who comes to school with either no language at all or with a garbled form of American English, not only must be brought to the ordinary standard of speech expression, but must first be taught to "unlearn" much of what he has already acquired at home or in the streets.

There are also other problems, your committee is informed, more difficult to overcome than lack of language skills. These include adverse attitudes, lack of motivation, and moral and social handicaps, which are prevalent among children in Washington as in other large urban centers.

The District of Columbia public school administration is of the firm opinion that a building program to provide these smaller class sizes is the most important and badly needed project to improve schools in the Nation's Capital so that they may work effectively for reduction in delinquency, crime, and dependency.

Your committee recognizes the valid need for a considerable capital expenditure in connection with the city's school system over the next few years. At the same time, however, the committee is strongly of the opinion that all feasible means of reducing the estimated costs of this construction program should be thoroughly reexamined and explored. The figures submitted at the hearings, indicating estimated costs per classroom ranging from $63,000 in the elementary schools to $72,000 in senior high schools, as well as costs per square foot materially in excess of those in the other jurisdictions of the metropolitan area, seem to this committee to indicate a need for serious efforts to reduce these costs.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. Davis of Wisconsin: On page 3, line 12, after "during" strike out "such" and insert "the preceding".

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is a very minor change and I offer it in the interest of certainty in order to replace uncertainty and to ease a bit the position that the appropriations subcommittee does have with respect to handling the funding of the programs for the District of Columbia each year.

Before I attempt to discuss this particular point I think a few corrective comments are in order. Three times I have heard this measure referred to as a revenue bill. I defy anyone to say where one dime of revenue is raised under this legislation. What it is is a two-fisted authorization to dip into the Treasury of the United States. One fist is in the increase in the direct Federal payments to the District of Columbia. The other fist is the authority for direct borrowing which comes from the General Treasury in order that the District of Columbia have these funds available on a "pay tomorrow" basis. So this should not be confused in the press or on the floor of the House or anywhere else as a revenue measure. It is an authorization to spend measure. It is not in any sense a revenue bill.

Some criticism, at least by implication, could be found in this report reciting that each year there has not been authorized or appropriated the full amount of borrowing authority or the full amount of Federal payment. I think that the chairman of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee, who is here with us this afternoon, at this time will concur in the statement that heaven help us if in recent years at least we had not exercised restraint and held back something in both of those categories.

Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what we would do with pay raises and other demands that come upon us on a contingency basis, if something had not been held back in all three of the last years.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this measure places two difficulties in the lap of the Committee on Appropriations.

One problem is this: We have tried to tell these people that if they want some of this additional spending, they ought to at least help pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not tell them that they have to help pay any more. This bill in its import tells them to get it from Uncle Sam in one way or the other and they do not have any responsibility to help pay for these additional items for which our subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations said we could not appropriate, because the money simply was not there.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would counsel and advise the Members of this body to not ever refer to this legislation as a revenue bill, because it is not that.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this bill creates a second difficulty for our subcommittee, the difficulty of uncertainty.

The purpose of my amendment is an attempt to correct that uncertainty by inserting the "preceding" rather than "such" fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, on page 3 of the report it indicates that these repayments are to be determined or limited to the sum of the estimated annual general fund revenues from local taxes and annual Federal payment for the year involved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, obviously, what is going to be submitted to our subcommittee every year in the form of estimates, is going to be the highest possible estimate, based upon the maximum Federal payment, because that is a portion of the basis upon which the estimate is to be made.

Mr. Speaker, I note with approval that the fiscal year 1970 loan authorizations are to be based upon the previous fiscal year, or at least a fixed figure so that there cannot be this flexibility, this self-service of overestimating the amount of the Federal payment and the revenues that are to be brought into the Treasury from local sources. This, I consider to be a necessary item.

In my opinion the amendment which I have offered is a simple amendment and it is my opinion that I can see no cause of possible hardship. However, it is my further opinion that it will ease the position of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan], that if there are objections to it about which I am not aware, I would like to know what those objections could be and if there are such objections, I would be pleased to hear from the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina what those objections are.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Davis] with reference to the use of the language "preceding years" as opposed to "during such fiscal year," the purpose of this amendment to the Revenue Act is to make more current the moneys that are available to the District of Columbia, based upon the revenues that are raised during that year; as, for example, each current fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, as shown in the report, there is a considerable increase each year in the amount of revenues that are available in bonding capacity. Now, there is a limitation in here to the effect that the Committee on Appropriations must appropriate each year such amount as will be available insofar as a loan is concerned. And if we do not leave it as to use "during such fiscal year," it will mean that actually we are a year behind each time in terms of trying to match the district bonding capacity to that available in revenues.

Mr. Speaker, this concept of Government bonding is to base it upon the same system that is used by local entities throughout the United States to create bonding capacity for their schools which is either a constitutional provision or it may be a statutory limitation. However, basically, it says that we must have resources and be sure that the revenues are available with which to pay the bonds that are issued.

It was to make it current, otherwise it would reduce the amount available in a particular year when compared to what was really raised in revenue during that year. That is the reason for the provision using the current as opposed to going back to a prior year.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman's comments in relation to this, yet if we are to use the analogy which the gentleman used I am sure in the handling of any school bond issue that I have ever seen that in the interest of certainty it is on a percentage of the assessed valuation of that district, not on what the estimates on assessments for the next year are going to be, but what the fixed assessment shows on the record book.

Mr. ADAMS. I would say to the gentleman that is correct, but our problem is that it was suggested to establish an assessed valuation for the District, and use that as a formula, but we run into the problem of a large portion of the Federal facilities being in the area and there is a question as to who would assess them. Would this be done by a local group, or by the Congress, and so on?

So this was picked as an alternative method in tying bonding capacity to capacity of the District of Columbia to pay for a particular year.

All I am pointing out to the gentleman is that we are trying through this measure to keep the bonding capability up to date with the realities of the District of Columbia rather than falling a year behind, which it would be, and actually, as I think the gentleman would agree, in the accounting system we sometimes fall behind as long as a year and a half, which could mean a reduction of $5 to $10 million in the bonding capacity available for the committee the gentleman sits on to have available for use for the benefit of the District of Columbia.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I believe the problem that is concerning me the most here is that, for I do not know how many years now, the gentleman from Kentucky, as the chairman of this subcommittee, has been insisting we ought to have a balanced budget to work with, and I am afraid if we are going to let them use estimates, which in every case because of there being no good reason for restraint, would be the highest estimates, including the highest estimated Federal burden, the highest estimated real estate revenues and the highest estimated income taxes, in order that the amount could be large, the committee nine times out of 10 would have to look at this thing and view those estimates in the light of what is going to happen, so I think there is an element of uncertainty plus an element of difficulty, which will confuse if you rely on projections rather than facts.

Mr. ADAMS. We were just leaving it to the good judgment of the Committee on Appropriations to determine if there had been an improper estimate the first year, and they can look back on the estimates as compared to what was actually the revenue. The committee within its control has the ability to compare the estimates with revenues in the succeeding years and say "you misestimated the revenue capacity of that year and its effects on the bonding capacity, and we made appropriations based on it, we will make certain adjustments for that."

There we had the feeling that there was no danger that this could run away for any sustained period of time. I believe the Committee on the District of Columbia and the entire House would be very interested in the report of the Committee on Appropriations after a year's operation of this system and if what the gentleman states is true, that there has been either a misrepresentation or overinflation of revenues, and we can see then about correcting it.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to reenforce the comments of the gentleman from Washington. The Subcommittee on Appropriations each year is faced with appropriating within the limits of the estimated revenue for the following year. When they appropriated this year they had to take into account what the proper estimates would be in fiscal 1968. It would seem to me that there is no difference in having to work with those kinds of estimates, and in taking a 6 percent figure of that estimate in determining the borrowing ceiling. There are uncertainties in either event, but this does not compound or add to the uncertainties because it all stems from the problem of making up the estimate as far ahead as a year and a half.

I do not think the amendment is really going to be helpful. Even if the amendment were adopted, there would still have to be an estimate because we still do not know for the fiscal year 1967 what the actual revenues will be until we come to June 30, 1967. Even then the problem would be that the accounting procedures might not be current. In any event, we are dealing with estimates, and it would simply set us back a year.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Does not the Committee on Appropriations have the same problem of estimating revenues in all areas?

Mr. FRASER. Exactly so.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. When they set their appropriation for the following fiscal year, in this case fiscal year 1968, they have to estimate what the revenues of the District of Columbia will be and set the appropriation.

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman is correct. I think the gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. I would like to point out that in the language of this authorization bill—and previously I referred to it as a revenue bill and I apologize, it is an authorization bill—this formula terminates at the end of 3 years. If it is abused, it terminates at the end of 3 years. I do feel that it was our intention to use all previous historic methods and I think the plan we did provide is the best one we could possibly arrive at. For that reason, I hope the amendment is not adopted.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In answer to the comment made by the gentleman from Minnesota, all I am suggesting is that we do have the 3 intervening years, and what this bill says we shall do after June 30, 1970, and that is to use the previous fiscal year in the interest of certainty.

Mr. McMILLAN. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin concerning taxation of the people of the District of Columbia, I would like to state that we increased taxes on almost everything in the District of Columbia last year and we almost doubled taxes on income. Just this year the assessed value of property uptown in the Northwest section of Washington has been increased almost 400 percent. I believe we have gone as far as we can in the taxing business unless we want to run all the taxpayers out of the District of Columbia.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman.

I only want to point out again to the gentleman from Wisconsin that as the gentleman from Minnesota said, this is a 3-year provision and if there are problems, we will revise the formula at the end of 3 years because at the end of 3 years it does stabilize.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Davis].

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTION FROM LICENSING REQUIREMENTS FOR PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS EMPLOYED BY THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by directions of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 3973) to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, as amended, and the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, as amended, to exempt from licensing thereunder physicians and dentists employed by the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3973

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 42 of the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, approved February 27, 1929 (45 Stat. 1339), as amended (sec. 2–133, D.C. Code), is amended by inserting the following immediately preceding the colon and proviso contained therein: "; nor (d) to any practitioner duly licensed to practice his calling in a State or other jurisdiction forming a part of the United States and employed by the government of the District of Columbia in the discharge of his official duties".

SEC. 2. Section 8 of "An Act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto" approved June 6, 1892 (27 Stat. 43), as amended (sec. 2–317, D.C. Code), is amended by inserting the following immediately after "duties": "; to any practitioner duly licensed to practice his calling in a State or other jurisdiction forming a part of the United States and employed by the government of the District of Columbia in the discharge of his official duties".

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 42 of the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928 (D.C. Code, sec. 2–133), is amended by striking out ': *Provided*, That all' and inserting in lieu thereof '; nor (d) to any practitioner, duly licensed to practice his calling in a State or other jurisdiction forming a part of the United States, in the discharge of his official duties as an employee of the government of the District of Columbia. All'.

"SEC. 2. Section 17 of 'An Act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto', approved June 6, 1892 (D.C. Code, sec. 2–317), is amended by striking out 'official duties, nor to' and inserting the following: 'official duties; to any practitioner, duly licensed to practice his calling in a State or other jurisdiction forming a part of the United States, in the discharge of his official duties as an employee of the government of the District of Columbia; or to'."

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOWDY

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment, offered by Mr. DOWDY: On page 2, strike out line 16 and all that follows down through and including line 8 on page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 42 of the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928 (D.C. Code, sec. 2–133), is amended by striking out ": *Provided*, That all" and inserting in lieu thereof "; nor (d) to any practitioner in the discharge of his official duties as an employee of the government of the District of Columbia if such practitioner—

" '(1) is not less than twenty-one years of age and is of good moral character,

" '(2) has studied the healing art through not less than four graded courses of not less than nine months each in a professional school or schools approved by the Commissioners,

" '(3) has had not less than one year of training in a hospital approved by the Commissioners, and

" '(4) is duly licensed to practice his calling in a State or other jurisdiction forming a part of the United States.

All'.

"SEC. 2. The Act entitled 'An Act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto', approved June 6, 1892, is amended—

"(1) by inserting in section 8 (D.C. Code, sec. 2–308 '(a)' immediately after 'Sec. 8.';

"(2) by striking out in section 9 (D.C. Code, sec. 2–308) 'Sec. 9.' and inserting in lieu thereof '(b)'; and

"(3) by inserting immediately after section 8 the following new section:

" 'SEC. 9. (a) (1) The Commissioners may issue to qualified applicants a special license to practice dentistry in the District of Columbia under such limitations as the Commissioners shall set forth in the license.

" '(2) For purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the term "qualified applicant" means a person—

" '(A) who holds a license to practice dentistry in a State or other jurisdiction forming a part of the United States which license has been lawfully issued;

" '(B) who has not had any license to practice dentistry revoked or suspended in any jurisdiction;

" '(C) who is a graduate of a reputable dental college, approved by the Commissioners; and

" '(D) who has successfully completed any practical or theoretical examination which the Commissioners may require.

" '(b) The provisions of the following sections of this Act shall apply with respect to a license issued under this section: section 11 (relating to revocation or suspension of license), section 12 (relating to procedure in suspending or revoking license), section 13 (relating to fees), and section 14 (annual registration of dentists).' "

Mr. DOWDY (during the reading of the amendment.) Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to the unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have reserved the right only to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of the House of Representatives Committee on the District of Columbia if this is the proposed amendment of the committee amendment that has been worked out in conference with the District of Columbia physicians, dentists, and the groups that had some opposition at the time the gentleman so very generously withdrew the bill from the program some weeks ago, until such time as the compromise could be arranged?

Mr. DOWDY. I will state to the gentleman that I want to thank him and compliment him for his efforts in aiding and working out the amendment that has just been proposed. The Medical Association, the Dental Association, and the District Department of Public Health and Commissioners have all agreed that this will accomplish the intent of the bill, and I am glad to report that, as far as I know, it is agreeable to everyone.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I in turn wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the chairman and members of the full committee for their forbearance and the help of the staff in working out this compromise. There was recognition on the part of the societies that the physicians in the District of Columbia and the Director of the Department of Health needed help and assistance; that is, legislative relief in this particular area. They did cooperate. The compromise has been worked out, and it is an exemplary item of how cooperation in this area can help. The needs have been met, and quality service has not suffered. I certainly thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to take one moment to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]. It is my opinion that if we had continued to hold hearings on the original bill that was introduced at the instigation of the Public Health Service, we would never have been able to get a bill reported from the House committee. Through the fine service that Dr. HALL has rendered, in contacting both dental and medical associations here, we were able to get together on a bill which I think is satisfactory to all parties concerned. I certainly thank Dr. HALL.

Mr. DOWDY. I also wish to express my appreciation to both the Medical Society and the Dental Society for their cooperation in working out this bill.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 3973 is to authorize the District of Columbia government to employ qualified physicians and dentists who are licensed in a State or other jurisdiction of the United States, but who are not licensed to practice in the District of Columbia.

These physicians and dentists are to be employed to perform medical and dental duties solely under the administration of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health.

BACKGROUND

The District of Columbia Healing Arts Practice Act and the act to regulate the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia presently forbid the practice of medicine and dentistry in the District of Columbia by persons not licensed to practice by the District of Columbia Department of Occupations and Professions. Exceptions to these licensing requirements do exist, however, in the case of medical officers of the Federal Government practicing in Washington in the discharge of their official duties, and of dentists in the employ of the Federal Government also in performance of their official duties here. These exceptions provide also a means by which physicians or dentists may visit the District of Columbia in the capacity of consultants.

Thus, qualified physicians not licensed by the District of Columbia are now permitted to practice in the District in facilities of the Veterans' Administration, the U.S. Armed Forces, and Public Health

Service, and St. Elizabeths Hospital; and dentists not licensed by the District may practice in facilities of the Armed Forces, U.S. Public Health Service, and the Veterans' Administration. However, in all cases these practices are limited to the performance of official duties.

Your committee is informed that the District of Columbia Department of Public Health frequently receives applications from qualified medical specialists and dentists who are licensed in other States, and that in many instances these applicants are trained and skilled in special medical fields in which the District of Columbia Health Department is desperately shorthanded. However, before any such applicant may be employed by the Department he must be licensed by the District of Columbia. In some cases, these physicians and dentists are not eligible for a license under existing District of Columbia law. In other instances, such an applicant may be required under District of Columbia law to take an examination in order to secure licensure, even though he may have been in practice for many years and have achieved national recognition in a specialty field. In these circumstances, a physician or dentist would be handicapped in such an examination by reason of having been out of school for some years, and would naturally be extremely reluctant to take refresher courses for the purpose. And even in those cases where there is no impediment to District of Columbia licensure by reciprocity, the time interval for this procedure is such that many physicians will prefer to accept other positions rather than to wait for the reciprocity to be accomplished.

Thus, the District of Columbia, in addition to being beset by problems in the recruitment of a sufficient number of qualified physicians and dentists to fulfill its functions properly, by reason of a serious nationwide shortage of dentists and of physicians in such specialties as radiology, pathology, psychiatry, public health, obstetrics, ophthalmology, and anesthesiology, is prevented because of this licensure problem from recruiting and employing many well-qualified physicians and dentists who are available and who would like to come to the District of Columbia.

Your committee is informed that many States now have authority to employ physicians within the State government without their possessing a license in that State. This is true particularly in the case of the employment of physicians employed to work in State institutions where there are difficulties in recruiting qualified physicians. There are also instances in which States may employ a physician pending his acquisition of a license in that State, which procedure also is not permitted in the District of Columbia. Further, some States have authorization to grant limited or temporary licenses, under which they may employ physicians without a State license. In some such cases, the temporary license can be renewed for a period of years, or even be made indefinite. None of these procedures is presently permitted in the District of Columbia.

PROCEDURE IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

With respect to this problem, your committee feels that the situation in the District is more comparable to that of the Federal Government than to any of the States, for the following several reasons.

First, the Nation's Capital is the center of a metropolitan area containing a relatively large number of Federal institutions employing many physicians and dentists. This puts the District of Columbia Health Department in direct competition with these Federal agencies in the matter of recruiting these vitally needed personnel. For example, St. Elizabeths Hospital, which is actually the State mental institution for the District of Columbia with nearly 5,000 District patients, employs physicians and dentists who are not required to be licensed in the District of Columbia. Having a license in any State, they can treat these District of Columbia patients. Should any of these doctors and dentists wish to become employed by the District of Columbia Department of Public Health, however, and thus treat perhaps these same patients, he must obtain a District of Columbia license.

Second, other States are able to employ physicians and dentists who are retired from Federal service, and this is a very important source of recruitment. This is not feasible in the District of Columbia, because the District of Columbia government is in fact a part of the Federal civil service system, for which reason a retired Federal employee stands to lose most of his retirement benefits during any time of employment with the District of Columbia government.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

This situation poses a very real problem for the District of Columbia Department of Public Health in its function of supplying a wide range of medical and dental services to thousands of residents of the Nation's Capital.

At a public hearing on this proposed legislation, conducted on March 14, 1967, the Director of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health testified that the Department at that time had budgeted positions for 371 physicians and 31 dentists. Of these 402 positions, 200 are for interns or residents, who of course are not required to possess District of Columbia licenses. Your committee was advised further that as of February 2 of this year, the Department had 63 vacancies for physicians and four vacancies for dentists; and that positions for medical and dental specialists frequently remain vacant for more than a year.

In the face of this situation, the District of Columbia Health Department has had applications for employment from physicians and dentists, well qualified in their specialty field, from numerous other States including New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Florida, California, and Pennsylvania. There certainly is no reason to believe that the standards these professional men had to meet for licensure in these States were in any way less rigid or less demanding that those provided for licensing in the District of Columbia. And yet, because these requirements may differ in some detail, these physicians and dentists often are required to stand a local examination.

One such case occurred recently, when the District of Columbia Department of Public Health was forced to reject the application of a psychiatrist licensed in the State of Maryland, well-qualified and badly needed to participate in the District's mental health program, but who could not obtain a license in the District of Columbia for the sole reason that he is a graduate of a foreign medical school.

As another illustration of the problem, the District of Columbia Health Department has had a vital position vacant for more than 4 years, for a highly qualified dental officer with supervisory and administrative experience. At recent meetings of the American Dental Association in San Francisco and Dallas, several well-qualified dentists were interviewed and expressed interest in this position. However, when they learned that licensure in the District is a requirement, they promptly declined.

This situation, in the opinion of your committee, militates against the physical and mental well-being of the thousands of citizens of the District of Columbia to whom the ever-expanding services of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health are essential.

CONCLUSION

We see no reason why the District of Columbia government should not have the same authority which is currently extended to Federal agencies such as the Armed Forces, the Veterans' Administration, the U.S. Public Health Service, and St. Elizabeths Hospital, operating in the District of Columbia, to employ physicians and dentists who have been duly licensed in other States and who are otherwise fully accredited on the basis of specialty training, quality experience, and high professional recommendations. These physicians and dentists, of course, will be required to confine their practice to facilities of the District of Columbia government. They could not under any circumstances engage in private practice without obtaining the usual District of Columbia license.

The District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, under date of January 10, 1967, requested this vitally needed legislation, and they approve the bill as amended.

It is necessary for this bill to be enacted in order that the necessary number of doctors and dentists might be available for employment by the Public Health Department in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Does the amendment which is now being offered include section 309 entitled "Special License"?

Mr. DOWDY. Yes, it does.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. For the purpose of establishing legislative history, I would like to ask a few questions, if I may. First, under section 9(a)(1), it is stated that—

> The Commissioners may issue to qualified applicants a special license to practice dentistry in the District of Columbia under such limitations as the Commissioners shall set forth in the license.

Just what limitations specifically did the committee have in mind?

Mr. DOWDY. I think they are set out in section (2) that—

> "Qualified applicant" means a person who holds a license to practice dentistry in the State or other jurisdiction forming a part of the United States, which license has been lawfully issued, and who has not had any license to practice in his career revoked or suspended in any jurisdiction, and who is a graduate of a reputable dental college approved by the Commissioners, and who has successfully completed any practical or theoretical examination which the Commissioners may require.

I believe, in addition to that, any such practitioner—it is our intent at least—should only be permitted under his special license to discharge whatever his official duties happen to be as an employee of the government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Then, do I understand the gentleman correctly, this special license will not permit the special licensee to engage in private practice?

Mr. DOWDY. It is not our intention at all that he should engage in private practice. It is purely, as I say, in discharge of his duties as an employee of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Not even on a part-time basis?

Mr. DOWDY. That is correct.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that this had been agreed to by the medical practitioners and dentists in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DOWDY. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy. I thought the original version was causing a little difficulty.

Mr. DOWDY. The original version was not what any of us wanted, and it was our intention all along to get these people together and work out something that would be satisfactory to all parties.

Mr. DOWNING. I am most happy that all got together. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the bill as presently written would permit those physicians or students who come to the United States under the educational and cultural exchange program to be employed in the District of Columbia?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Dowdy was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CAHILL. If the gentleman will yield further, I wonder whether or not a foreign educated doctor, for example, who comes to the United States under the educational and cultural exchange program, would qualify for practicing in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, the amendment says that the person should have studied the healing arts for not less than four graded courses at a school approved by the Commissioners and should have had not less than 1 year in a hospital approved by the Commissioners.

I believe that will take care of the question the gentleman has.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of the gentleman, they may be permitted to practice in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, if the school and hospital in which he was trained were approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, yes.

Now, wait a minute. The person also has to be duly licensed to practice his calling in a State or a jurisdiction formally a part of the United States.

Mr. CAHILL. That is the question I wanted to ask. In other words, to practice in the District of Columbia, he must have taken some State medical examination and have successfully passed it?

Mr. DOWDY. That is true.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, while I realize that this is irrelevant to this particular bill, I would like to say that the reading of the report calls to the attention of all the House the acute shortage of doctors, not only in the District of Columbia, but throughout the United States.

Secondly, I have the pleasure of serving on the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Judiciary Committee, which is now making a study of this problem as it is affected by the foreign students coming here. It seems to me that the report should be read with interest by everyone, because it is a problem confronting the United States generally and something we must face up to. We must face our responsibilities in this respect in any event in the very near future. Later in the Record I intend to make a complete statement on this entire matter. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. There are small communities all over the country in need of doctors. There are many in my district crying for doctors. They are unable to find any doctor to take care of them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy].

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the Act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such Acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 113]

Abernethy
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Ashmore
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Blanton
Blatnik
Bolling
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Conyers
Dawson
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Dow
Eckhardt
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Everett
Fascell
Feighan
Foley
Ford, William D.
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gardner
Gathings
Gray
Gurney
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Hawkins
Heckler, Mass.
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Hosmer
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
King, Calif.
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, La.
Lukens
McClory
McEwen
Mailliard
Miller, Calif.
Mink
Monagan
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Philbin
Pickle
Pollock
Pool
Purcell
Quie
Reinecke
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roudebush
Ruppe
St. Onge
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Tiernan
Tunney
Waggonner
Watkins
Whalen
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Younger
Zion
Zwach

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Rostenkowski). On this rollcall 330 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10368) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10368, with Mr. KARSTEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the usual annual bill for the legislative branch for fiscal 1968 which begins this July 1. It thus provides for one of the three branches of Government.

There is not a great deal unusual about the bill this year. Conforming to the long practice, it provides for all activities except the appropriations for the other body; it is the custom to leave those for the decision of the Senate. It includes the House of Representatives, the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, the Architect of the Capitol, the Government Printing Office, and a number of items of a joint character between the two Houses such as joint committees, and so forth. And this year, the General Accounting Office appropriation is in this bill—which incidentally raises the total of the bill about $53 million above what it otherwise would be; and, in fact, the way the figures work out, leaving out the GAO, the bill total, in figures, would be roughly $3 million below the corresponding fiscal 1967 total.

The GAO was formerly carried in the independent offices bill, but it is of course an agency of Congress within the legislative branch.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE BILL

The bill as reported for 1968—again, excluding items for the Senate—totals $228,089,952. That total includes $52,800,000 for the General Accounting Office.

The bill as reported is $586,959, net, above comparable appropriations for the current fiscal year 1967 of $227,502,993.

The bill as reported is $3,221,180 below the budget estimates of $231,311,132 considered by the committee. We cut the budget requests by that much.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take much time of the Committee but there are a few highlight items that I might touch on. The printed committee hearings have been available for some time and the committee report elaborates in a good deal of detail. I might just say that the explanation for a good many of the line item increases above last year's appropriation, or portions of them as the case may be, represent the effects of mandatory-type costs; such as, wage board and within-grade salary increases; general pay raise legislation; new positions specifically created by the Committee on House Administration since submission of the previous budget under delegated authority in the House Employees Position Classification Act; and specific resolutions of the House authorizing additional allowances.

Mr. Chairman, for the second year in a row there are no major construction or remodeling appropriations recommended by the committee.

There is nothing in the bill for extending the west-central front of the Capitol. In excess of $400,000 has already been appropriated for engineering and architectural studies and services. The special joint Commission has approved an extension plan—so-called plan 2—a scale model of which has been on display in Statuary Hall since last November. Every Member ought to take the time to look at the model. The proposal is—for the time being at least—on the back burner and in my opinion does not clamor for urgent and instant attention, but eventually, something must be done.

There is nothing in the bill for the Madison Memorial Library Building—although one is greatly needed. The committee has been recommending rental money as a stopgap to help alleviate ever-increasing crowding in the present two buildings, but that is certainly nothing more than a temporary measure. If we are to have a satisfactory Library operation, more permanent accommodations near at hand are probably the much better answer.

Mr. Chairman, as with the national budget generally, the budget for the legislative branch has also grown over the years. The committee report, on pages 4 and 5, illuminates some of the general reasons for this growth. And if Members would turn to pages 6 and 7 of the committee report, they can see just on those two pages, a simple capsule listing of the principal increases and decreases from the current year appropriations and what they are for. I will not repeat all of them here; they are readily listed in the report.

But taking the bill by its major subdivisions as we show on page 3 of the report of the committee, there is a total of $80,368,670 for the House of Representatives; $11,271,282 for various items of a joint character involving both Houses; $12,045,100 for the Architect of the Capitol; $584,500 for the Botanic Garden; $36,961,400 under the Library of Congress; $34,059,000 under the Government Printing Office, $26,700,000 of which is for congressional printing and binding; and $52,800,000 for the General Accounting Office which, as I mentioned, was heretofore carried in the independent offices bill.

HOUSE ITEMS

As to items under the "House of Representatives" heading, there is virtually nothing new in the way of services, and nothing that has not previously been authorized. For many items, the amounts are merely statutory where the requirements recur, often with little or no change from year to year. Some objects are not subject to precise estimating in advance; they are, at best, educated guesses.

Mr. Chairman, the general budget presentation for House items was made to the committee this year by the new Clerk of the House, who quite obviously has tackled his duties with industry and diligence and a questioning frame of mind. He told the committee of many of the things he is doing and looking into and some of the things that have occurred to him. He is questioning the need. He is questioning the way. He is taking a hard look. I believe I can say that all members of the subcommittee were quite impressed with the presentation. And speaking for myself, I predict he will make a great Clerk.

I might call attention to the report, on page 9, where we explain the recommendation that the Office of Coordinator of Information be phased out this fall. The committee did not, in all the circumstances, feel justified in suggesting continuation of that office.

JOINT ITEMS

As to the various items falling under the joint section of the bill, there is nothing to be added to what the report says.

Members may recall that at one time, some turbulence surrounded the budget for the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy. Conforming to the suggestion of the chairman, there are no funds in the bill for that purpose this year.

Certain expenses of the Capitol Police are in the joint section of the bill. May I just point out that the currently authorized strength is about 450 officers and men, and that this does not include 40 or so men generally on detail from the District of Columbia Police Department during the sessions of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, in response to a suggestion of the other body, and to conform to the realities of the situation, the committee has included under the "Joint item" section of the bill an item for the office of the attending physician heretofore carried in the House section.

Mr. Chairman, may I just briefly make public note of the fact, as many Members of course know, that we now have a new attending physician, Dr. Rufus Judson Pearson, Jr. I have heard nothing but favorable comments about Dr. Pearson and his work. A native of Atlanta, Ga., and a graduate of Emory University medical school, Dr. Pearson is a cardiologist with wide experience. Already he has introduced several changes in the services and procedures of the office. He has updated the pharmacy and laboratory services and improved the records system. He is intensifying the preventive medicine work. He plans to install an X-ray unit if space can be found. All these procedures are designed to save valuable time of Members of Congress and to afford the necessary immediate medical service near both Chambers. May I say also that many visitors to the Capitol find their way to the doctor's office for emergency service.

Speaking for myself, and so far as I know, for every other Member who has had occasion to visit with Dr. Pearson, we are happy to have him with us, and hope he will be with us for many years to come.

THE ARCHITECT

As to the Architect of the Capitol, there is nothing in the bill in the way of major remodeling or construction. There are, however, as there have been for some years, a number of minor repair and improvement items necessary to keep the physical plant on Capitol Hill in reasonably good order. We have made some reductions in the requests of the Architect. The details are in the report.

We have allowed funds for attending and cleaning the two new underground garages just south of the office buildings. We are told that at least beneficial occupancy of the garages may be taken this month or next.

We have allowed funds to permit the air conditioning to be operative earlier in the morning for the comfort of those Members and employees who arrive unusually early, or who work during the night hours. There is some question whether it will, in fact, cost anything extra in the aggregate; it may require less electricity to keep the water at the lower temperature than to have to lower it in the early morning as is now done.

I might say that from all we have learned, the program of keeping the Capitol Building open to 10 p.m. during the heavy visitor season seems to be popular and to be working well.

THE LIBRARY

Mr. Chairman, in the Library of Congress, a great national institution, the work situation is fairly characteristic and not entirely unpredictable. Established in 1800, the Library is the Nation's largest research library. In the nature of the case, a library has only one way to go—to get bigger all the time. It has been said that the Library needs roughly 44,000 additional square feet of space each year. There is growing need for a third building. Money is in the bill for more rental space as a stopgap solution.

But the housing, the servicing, and the managing of an evergrowing collection of the magnitude of what this one is apt to be, say, 25 years from now compels the need of finding ways to automate. Otherwise, there is cause to wonder whether it would be practical to supply space enough to house the collections and employees enough to service them.

So we have enlarged the funds for the automation study program, which will require several more years. It is a complex undertaking and it will be expensive. But it is expected to provide information on techniques and procedures that will be of value to other libraries as well.

Some of the increases allowed for the Library relate to growing workloads in the Copyright Office and in the catalog card sales work. Both of these activities turn a profit for the Government.

We have tried to make reasonable provision for the valuable services rendered by the Legislative Reference Service. But we did not go as far as they proposed.

We have tried to maintain current levels.

We provided the full budget request for the wonderful program of books for the blind, which, as Members will recall, was enlarged last session to extend to others so physically handicapped that they cannot enjoy normal reading.

Mr. Chairman, we should keep in mind as we look at this section of the bill that a significant part of the increase over 1967 is for activities not of the conventional research library character. $1.5 million, approximately, is for additional "talking books" in the program of supplying materials to the blind and others physically handicapped; $1.8 million additional over 1967 is allocated to the profitmaking card catalog sales program; $185,000 of the increase over 1967 is for the Copyright Office.

What I am saying is that while these are important expenditures, they are for functions that would not normally be found in a Library budget.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. Chairman, for the section of the bill covering the Government Printing Office, there is little to add to what the report says. It includes printing and binding for Congress. There is an increase recommended. Congress is talking more; holding more hearings; printing more bills, and so on. And wages are up. Much of congressional work is overnight printing—or short deadline in any event—and that costs money. But it is a vital item of expense. And quick service is important.

This section of the bill includes the Superintendent of Documents activity, which turns a profit. In other words, they recover more to the Treasury through sales of publications.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned previously, the GAO is new to this bill. But it is old to the Congress. And it is a highly essential instrument of legislative oversight in checking the efficiency of Government operations and procedures and the propriety of Government expenditures, and in assistance to Congress and its committees otherwise.

We have allowed nearly all of the request. The war is putting an added load on them in such matters as central audit of transportation charges of the Government. They are strengthening their ability of their auditors to get about for more on-the-spot checks of the operations of the Government.

NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL POSITIONS

Mr. Chairman, I might also say a word about new employees. In all phases of the bill, a total of 619 additional positions were requested. We cut 115 from that list. But in addition, we cut 33 positions from the "basic" position structure by eliminating the 10 positions in the Office of the Coordinator of Information; by striking funds for 21 telephone positions that continue to remain vacant; and by eliminating, after 6 months, funds for two positions assigned by the House to the Capitol law library. Thus, we made a total cut of 148 positions.

Most of the additional employees allowed are in the Library and in the General Accounting Office, and mostly to cope with rising workloads. A sizable number of those are in profitmaking catalog card sales activity. Then, there are the additional employees for the underground garages. Some relate to the profitmaking GPO publication sales program. And some represent new positions created by the Committee on House Administration for various phases of work under the Clerk, the Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster—positions currently chargeable to the contingent fund.

Mr. Chairman, there are many details to this bill even though it is a relatively small bill. I will be glad to try to answer any questions. I might say in closing that so far as I am aware, the committee is either unanimous, or perhaps I should say, about as unanimous as it is reasonable to expect in a bill dealing with a multiplicity of items.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. I have three or four questions for the gentleman and I shall try to be brief.

First of all, may I take it from the gentleman's statement that there is no money whatever contained in this bill for the west front of the Capitol?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The gentleman from Iowa is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Alabama will yield further, is there any money contained in this bill to place operators on the automatic elevators in the Rayburn House Office Building?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that we took the money out of the bill, that was in last year's bill for those automatic elevator operators. It was not used, I may say.

That money has been taken out, so therefore those jobs have been eliminated.

Mr. GROSS. I want to thank the gentleman and his committee for taking those funds out of the bill. The gentleman well knows when those elevators were first put in operation an attempt was made, and I opposed it, to man them with operators. I am pleased to hear the taxpayers are spared that expense.

With respect to the restaurant operations in the Capitol, I know the House committee does not have anything to do with the operation of those beyond this area.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The gentleman is referring to the restaurants in the other body?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am referring to the restaurants in the other body. We have been reading in the newspapers of how a couple of Members of the other body—and I know nothing as to the veracity of this story—have together accumulated some $5,000 in unpaid food bills at the other end of the Capitol. Does the gentleman know whether such a situation as that exists on the House side?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. First of all, I can speak only for myself, and I have to pay cash when I eat in the House dining facilities.

Mr. GROSS. So do I, but did the committee hearings this year develop any substantial number or any number of unpaid food bills in the House restaurants, cafeterias, or any of the facilities for serving food?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. There are none that I know of.

Mr. GROSS. My final question is this: With respect to the parking garage that has been a building for several years, the gentleman has just said that it is expected to be completed and the use of it is expected to begin in the next month or so. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Why has it taken all this time to build what amounts to a poured concrete underground garage?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman that I have wondered perhaps more about it than the gentleman has, but I will also say to the gentleman that the contractor has a so-called lock and key job, a fixed-price contract, and as such there is a penalty of $250 per day for every day that he goes beyond the expiration date fixed pursuant to the contract, and that will be done as far as I know. I am certain the Architect will see that the contractor gets no more money than the contract calls for. I can assure the gentleman that the Architect is very much disturbed about that contract, and is keeping his finger on the project every day.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, in the light of other settlements that have been made for failure to perform according to contract, I have my doubts as to whether the $250 per day penalty is going to be inflicted upon this particular contractor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] is recognized.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee has performed his usually eloquent and precise description of the bill, and outlined for you in quite some detail the items that are covered in this appropriation bill.

It might be said this is one of the more important appropriation bills that comes before the House, because it does concern all of the activities of the House of Representatives. I should add hastily that the committee has done its best to provide sufficient moneys to meet the needs of the legislative activities that must necessarily be performed by the House of Representatives. I should also add in all sincerity, however, that this bill as an appropriation bill probably brings closer to the membership the realities of some of the problems confronting the Committee on Appropriations, and some of the problems confronting the budgeting and funding of the activities of this Nation at this time. For here is where we learn firsthand that as we expand Government services, as we add new programs, or salary increases, obviously it takes more money and it takes more people to operate government in general.

These are reflected throughout the bill. I should call your attention, as the chairman has done, to the extent to which such needed services have grown throughout the years. As we have added these new programs and these new services, obviously it means more work for every Member and it means that larger staffs are required. It means the use of the telephone and telegraph and all of the conveniences that are available to us today become a necessity in the general operation of the Congress.

So in that connection, it emphasizes to us that when we have a serious budget situation such as we do have confronting us these days, we need to recognize the full cost of operation of these new programs and new services as they are enacted by Congress.

I should also relate to you that the bill covers something more than just the needs of the legislative branch. There are a lot of services to the public that are included in this appropriation bill.

The chairman has referred to a program for the blind. Last year, as you will recall, we expanded this program substantially so that it should also include the physically handicapped—those who are handicapped in such a manner that they may have difficulty in reading. We have provided these services for them and in so doing it required an estimated additional appropriation of almost $1,500,000. This provides services to a group and class of people who do have a real need. It is now just being put into operation and the committee has done its best in providing moneys for the demands of the coming year.

We have gone over in quite some detail all of the requirements of the House of Representatives and its legislative activities. In so doing we have attempted to be as prudent as possible to ferret out, if we could, where there are duplications.

As the chairman mentioned, this is one of the reasons why we have recommended the gradual phasing out of the Office of Coordinator of Information because there was an overlapping of duties here with the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress that does provide very much the same service and is in a position to respond to the demands of the Members which incidentally grows as the activities of Government grow, and obviously makes it necessary to carry on more research. We need more background material, which the research service provides for us very well.

So in that connection we have attempted, as best we could, to provide adequately for these needs.

I should also add that we have included moneys which provide for services that reach all around the Nation through the Library of Congress. Many of these services are self-sustaining and actually produce money for the Government by the charges that are made for these services, such as indexing and cataloging of material available to the depositories, libraries, and so on.

In this connection, we have attempted to add new employees in those instances where this kind of service is provided, and that are paid for by those who receive the services.

I have already mentioned the fact that we have a difficult budget situation. It therefore behooves every department of Government to practice prudence in all expenditures. Certainly the legislative branch is no exception, and ought to set the example. We are at war, and the economic strain is such that we ought to recognize this fact and tighten our belts wherever possible. There are more savings that can be made and should be thoroughly explored for another year, eliminating all duplications that have been referred to in the report. This is only in keeping with the most necessary and desired budget practices. Many Members of the House are to be commended for their prudence in not spending all of the allowances provided or allowed. Many of the expenditures are not under the control of this committee, in that once the increase has been authorized, if the Members of the House respond, we are obligated to provide the money. We would do well to watch the authorizations and approve only those absolutely necessary.

So in view of the recognition that the committee has given to all these various phases of legislative service, I can heartily recommend the bill to the House for its favorable approval.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I think most of us in the House are very keenly aware of high taxes and the high cost of government. We applaud any sensible effort to reduce appropriations and expenditures.

I have been looking at the so-called 5-percent expenditure reduction amendment adopted by the House on yesterday in the motion to recommit the State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary appropriation bill. I have analyzed it. I find upon further examination of the amendment that there may be some Members of the House who are unsure as to just what the effect of the House action was in the motion to recommit. I have found that some Members thought they had voted for a cut in the appropriations carried in the bill. But, Mr. Chairman, it is now crystal clear that the House on yesterday did not cut one dime from the appropriations in the bill.

The object of the 5-percent amendment was not to cut the appropriations. The object—the sole object, as near as I can now determine—was to affect the rate of expenditure of the appropriations in the bill only during the fiscal year 1968.

Let me recall a few facts about the bill that was before us on yesterday. The House Committee on Appropriations reduced the budget requests for appropriations in the bill which was before us yesterday by $148,915,700, a cut of between 6 and 7 percent in the requests. The House knows—all Members know—that not all money appropriated for a given year is usually expended—disbursed—in that same year. Even if it is obligated and committed 100 percent during the first year, it will, usually, not all be paid out by the end of the year. There will be some unpaid, unexpended balances. The amount of the appropriations in the bill that we passed yesterday totaled $2,194,000,000.

The motion to recommit did not reduce that appropriation total by a single penny. All it did, as I now see it, was to say that in expending money available to the agencies in the bill during fiscal 1968, those agencies—except the FBI—could not expend—disburse—during fiscal 1968, more than 95 percent of the total amount that had been estimated by the President to be expended by such agencies in the 1968 budget submitted on January 24 of this year.

In other words, it dealt not with appropriations, but with expenditures.

The 6- to 7-percent cut made by the committee and accepted by the House of Representatives would to some extent, of course, affect the expenditures estimated for fiscal 1968. It is not possible, at this time, to predict precisely how much it would reduce the expenditures in a given period. Nevertheless, those reductions in appropriations do result in economies. As to the motion to recommit, however, it would be wide of the mark for the press or for Members of the House to think or say that we had taken any steps toward economy. We should take economy steps at every sensible opportunity. I am not speaking in a partisan manner at this time.

But the best way we can take economy steps is to vote against appropriations wherever that seems the right course. If the amendment on yesterday had been to slice 5 percent off the appropriations in the bill that was pending yesterday, it would have presented a real economy issue and, if adopted, would have saved some money. But that was not the issue at all. That was not what the 5-percent amendment did.

We had the identical issue—the very wording of the amendment was virtually identical—before us on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for fiscal 1968 in March of this year. In that instance, the amendment was offered by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas]. Mr. Jonas, in an effort to make crystal clear what his 5-percent expenditure reduction amendment would have done had it been adopted, went to great lengths to make very clear what I am undertaking to say now. I quote from the Congressional Record of April 4, 1967, at pages 8214–8215. Speaking of the 5-percent expenditure reduction amendment which he offered to the earlier bill—and, I repeat, in substance it is identical in its import and virtually identical in its phraseology to the 5-percent expenditure reduction which was adopted in the motion to recommit on yesterday—Mr. Jonas said:

> The amendment did not, as has been charged, provide for any cut at all in the appropriations. *Let me explain what* the amendment contemplated in language I hope will be clear enough to eliminate all misunderstandings. *The amendment did not touch a single appropriation item in the bill.*

Further, Mr. Jonas explained:

> It would not have denied the administration the power to obligate all of the funds provided in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, those are the words of the author of the 5-percent amendment to the bill last March, which as I say, is to all intents and purposes identical to the one before us on yesterday.

So, Mr. Chairman, neither did the 5-percent amendment of yesterday cut—or touch—a single appropriation amount in the bill to which it was offered and adopted.

But after the fiscal year 1968 ended, they could expend all the money that was appropriated in the bill, because according to the crystal clear wording, and the explanation of the gentleman from North Carolina, there would be no limitation on the money that could be obligated and which would be available for expenditure for 2 additional years.

Of course, the executive branch can withhold appropriations and thus postpone the expenditure of appropriations, and they might decide to apply the postponement to just one activity. For example, under the 5-percent amendment of yesterday—if it should become law—all of the withholding of expenditures during fiscal year 1968 could be applied to the Maritime Commission—and more. They would not have to go beyond the Maritime Commission in order to live within the limitation. The limitation applies only to fiscal year 1968. It does not deal with expenditure of funds in yesterday's bill that would be made after the fiscal year 1968.

So I believe it should be made very clear that if we think we voted for economy on yesterday, the word "economy" is not the word. The word "postponement" is the word.

It does seem to me we ought to make our own reductions, and do it by reducing the appropriations in the bills. The amendment did not say that we must prune all accounts equally. No, not at all. It did not cut any appropriation, by any amount. It did not deny the right to obligate all—100 percent, not 95 percent—of the appropriations in the bill. All it said was that they must withhold from the total aggregate amount in such a way that they do not spend more than 95 percent of what was predicted would be expended in the fiscal year 1968. But on the very next day after the close of fiscal year 1968, the agencies can pay off contractors, or whomever money is due.

Repeating what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas] said on April 4, when he discussed this matter—and he was right in what he said:

> It would not have denied the administration the power to obligate all of the funds provided in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, note the word "all". Not 95 percent, but "all"—which means 100 percent. It is unassailable that if 100 percent of the funds in the bill are obligated, 100 percent of the funds in the bill would eventually be expended.

We provided the full appropriations as recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. We provided full authority to obligate the funds in the bill.

I would say, let us cut appropriations on the one pending here, if we feel we should, but let us cut the money and do the work, as difficult as it may be, in our own shop in the House of Representatives.

I do believe some Members may have felt they were voting to reduce appropriations yesterday at the time, and I believe all Members voting were utterly sincere in that respect, but I would say if we want to reduce the bill before us today let us reduce the appropriations that are in it. That is where we have the power to act. That is the effective way. That is the traditional way.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, to reply at least in part to my distinguished chairman.

I do think he is right, that the amendment needs explanation. I find there are many Members who do not realize just what it does, and, much to my surprise, among those is the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

What we did yesterday was a very simple thing, but a very constructive thing, I believe.

There is a difference between appropriations and expenditures. What we did yesterday, simply stated, was that we limited the amount of money the President may spend in fiscal 1968 out of the funds appropriated in the bill. Spending plans must be differentiated from his appropriation requests, in the bill to which we offered the motion to recommit yesterday. A spending program is offered in the budget. That is not his appropriation request, but what he says he is going to spend.

Excluding the FBI, that was $1,936,371,000. The motion to recommit limited him to spending only 95 percent of that amount from the funds appropriated in the bill yesterday.

So, if we take that figure, we find that we reduce the spending—which, after all, is what we are interested in—the amount he can spend, under the motion to recommit, by $96 million.

Gentlemen, that is economy; $96 million is a tidy sum in that particular bill.

The gentleman said that perhaps the President could not spend it now, but later after 1968. Many of these items are 1-year funds and would lapse, so they would not be spent in years following 1968.

I want to get the record clear, because we have had some confusion on this so-called Bow limitation amendment.

If there were carryovers from previous years, they could be used. I point this out. We can consider small business as an example. As I recall, the Small Business Administration will have $1 billion of lending authority in 1967 and 1968 and plans to carry over $476 million into fiscal 1969. This could be expended. But to meet his spending estimate for the agencies in the bill, he would be limited to 95 percent of what he planned to spend, which would be a reduction of $96 million.

It is just that simple.

I should like to take more time and go into it in much more detail, but I hesitate to do so at this time.

I should like to say that I offered this, I believe, on five or six bills last year.

This year it has been offered on three bills. Yesterday was the first day it carried. I intend to offer it on this bill today, and we will offer it on other bills.

If we really believe in economy, if we believe in the things we have been talking about, the amendment will carry today.

The gentleman from Texas said we should pick out the items up here, and we should cut off their foolishness and spending here in the House. What he is suggesting is a line item budget, which we do not have.

He said probably we would have to take this money out of maritime. That is a popular program, and a good one for him to use.

May I suggest some other places we might take some of this money out.

I refer to yesterday. We could not do anything about this yesterday on a line item basis.

Here is a fund to send a boxing coach to Santo Domingo. Did we do anything about it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BOW. Here is another item of appropriated funds, for which they spent funds the year before. This is the type of thing we are doing, where we can really save some money: This is to train Mexican athletes who will participate in the 1968 Olympic games.

We are going to train athletes to compete against Americans who go down to Mexico. Nothing was done about these line items they talk about.

Instructional work with basketball coaches and intensive training of national junior selection and basketball clinics. We are doing that down in Chile. Lecture on musical education in the Center for Advanced Studies in the Argentine. Here is one which is a voluntary social welfare program. I will not discuss that any more because there was a little discussion of that in the newspapers. However, there are many items that are not line items but which the administration sends up here and we do not cut. After we appropriate these funds they go down to the President and they freeze them there and do what they want to with the funds when it comes to that.

I say that when we put this limitation on them, they have to find the programs to cut and they will not cut popular programs like the maritime program but will cut some of the programs that I just pointed out here and others. For instance, I saw one the other day where we sent somebody over to London to study how to play the kettle drums. My goodness. I wonder if the taxpayers of this country know about the great New York symphony and the great Cleveland symphony and other symphonies. Do you not suppose that we have anybody in this country who can teach people how to play kettle drums? So when we are talking about economy in this House and talking about the situation in Vietnam and what we are faced with now in the Middle East, it seems to me we just cannot be criticized for any effort we make to bring about reduction like this.

We know it may do some good if we accomplish this. We know there is a possibility here of a saving of $96 million. Then, if the gentleman from Texas or the gentleman from New Jersey, who want to protect the integrity of the House, have some amendments they want to offer to cut appropriation bills further, I will go along with them. But I have been racking my brain on this subject. The gentleman from New Jersey, to whom I will yield in just a minute, has criticized us time and time again saying that it is a prerogative of the House to make these cuts. Do not let the President do it, he says. I have been searching my mind for any amendment he has ever offered to reduce any figure in any bill which would bring about economy in this House. I do not remember a single amendment.

I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey now to tell us what amendment he has ever offered to reduce bills and get us some economy here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOELSON. Yes. I am glad you asked. If I believe an appropriation is wrong, I vote against it. I voted against a public works appropriation because I thought it was too fat. I voted against the NASA appropriation because I thought it was too fat. However, you have proven the truth of what the chairman said when he said we are abdicating our responsibility. You said, and I quote you, "They"—and I assume when you use that word you mean the executive branch—"They will have to determine what they are going to cut out."

I say to you by so doing you are giving the function of the legislative branch to the executive branch in derogation of the separation of powers, which is the theory on which this Government is based.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is completely wrong. No money can be spent without an appropriation by the House. So we do have that responsibility to make the appropriations. The executive cannot spend a dime except some back-door spending that we have authorized at times. Except for that, no funds shall be spent unless appropriated by the House, which gives us that responsibility. You must remember that they can freeze the funds downtown at any time. They did last year and almost followed the amendments which were offered by the gentleman from Ohio last year with regard to these reductions. That is one point I want to make.

However, the gentleman said he has voted against this. The gentleman is a persuasive Member of Congress.

Mr. JOELSON. I thank you.

Mr. BOW. Have you offered any amendments on those bills that you thought were too high, or did you just vote against the whole thing?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BOW. I am going to ask you a couple of more questions: When the gentleman thought the appropriations for NASA were too high, did the gentleman from New Jersey just vote against the whole thing? Is the gentleman against the NASA program? In other words, does the gentleman believe we ought not to be engaged in that program at all?

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, I believe at the present time, with our other commitments, we can defer going to the moon and, first, emphasize solving our problems here at home.

Mr. BOW. Did the gentleman from New Jersey offer any amendments to the bill to stop that?

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think that in the past I have offered an amendment to the agricultural bill.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Ohio can understand why the gentleman from New Jersey might pick the Department of Agriculture bill on which to offer amendments.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, I am not being personal with the gentleman from Ohio and I do not know whether the gentleman wants to be personal with me. The gentleman from Ohio is asking questions but when the gentleman receives an answer from me the gentleman is unhappy.

Mr. BOW. No; I am not unhappy with the response of the gentleman from New Jersey. However, I do not recall the amendments that the gentleman from New Jersey offered to the agricultural appropriation bill—whether the gentleman wanted to increase the appropriations or decrease them.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, I am sure that, being economy-minded, I would have wanted to decrease them.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Ohio yields further to the gentleman from New Jersey, if the gentleman desires more time.

Mr. JOELSON. No; thank you.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I was not present when the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations commenced his comment with reference to some remarks I made in the House on April 4, 1967. I came in as the gentleman was talking. However, I heard enough to feel complimented that he should approve one comment which I have made in recent debate. Recently we have had mild differences of opinion on certain issues.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I do not construe what I said on April 4 in the same manner as it has been construed by the gentleman from Texas. However, that is not hard or difficult to understand, because both of us reserve to ourselves the right to construe or interpret statements the way we think they should be construed.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] construed what I said the way I would construe what I said. I do not mean that statement to be taken in any critical manner. However, I feel that the gentleman's construction of what I said is not what I intended to say, and it is not my interpretation of what I said.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JONAS. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. I do not believe there is any difference in the opinion of the gentleman from North Carolina and in the opinion of the gentleman from Texas as to what the gentleman said on April 4. The gentleman said that the amendment "would not have denied the administration the power to obligate all of the funds provided in the bill."

Mr. JONAS. But not in 1968. The gentleman from Texas must remember the last sentence of my statement.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from North Carolina will yield further. Yes, I must and it is quite clear. Reduction was sought in spending by 5 percent during fiscal 1968. I agreed with that interpretation completely—it is absolutely correct—but, of course, the money could be obligated for later expenditure. As the gentleman from Ohio said, the amendment did not provide for any cut at all in any appropriation.

Can the gentleman from North Carolina and I agree on that?

Mr. JONAS. No; I said that the amendment imposes a limit upon the amount of money that could be expended.

Mr. MAHON. In a given fiscal year?

Mr. JONAS. In a given fiscal year. And, further, it was not directed to any specific item contained in the bill or to any particular title of the bill. It was directed to the entire bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this: I offered the amendment on that occasion because the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], who is the author of the amendment, was not here and was unable to offer it himself. I offered it as a substitute for the gentleman from Ohio and because he could not be here to offer it himself.

But, I do say this to my colleagues here today: You must understand that there is a great deal of difference between appropriations and expenditures.

I can make that clear by reference to the bill that is under consideration this afternoon. The budget proposes appropriations of $231,311,132 but proposes to spend next year only $229,602,000. It can be shown also by reference to the bill that passed yesterday. The budget request for appropriations in that bill was $2.156 billion, but called for expenditures on those programs next year of only $1.9 billion.

Members speak about abdicating our authority. I insist that if we are going to try to exercise any control over spending in any specific year, we have to do it by limiting the amount of money the executive agencies can spend that year. At the end of 1968 the executive branch of the Government will have $130 billion of previously appropriated money unspent. If we appropriate the full amount requested in the bill today the executive branch will carry over funds into 1969 because the budget does not contemplate spending next year all of the money the President is requesting Congress to appropriate in the legislative appropriation bill before the House today.

The budget does not call for spending next year all of the money we were requested to appropriate yesterday. The difference, as I have already stated, was that we were requested to appropriate $2.156 billion but the amount budgeted to be spent is only $1.936 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. Langen), Mr. Jonas was permitted to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.)

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how Congress can exercise any control over spending without doing it this way.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has said he cannot see how Congress can influence spending unless we do it this way.

Let me give this very simple answer: Just reduce appropriations, and it cannot be spent. That is the way to do it. I challenge the gentleman or any Member of the House on either side of the aisle to offer amendments to make reductions in the appropriation bill today which they feel should be made, not in the spending, but in the appropriations, and then we know it cannot be spent because we did not authorize or make it available for expenditure.

So I hope the motion to recommit today will not be one to delay spending; we do not want to see our salaries go until after the end of the fiscal year. Rather, we would like to see the appropriations reduced if the gentleman would like to tailor them in such a manner.

Mr. JONAS. I would say there is another way to limit spending, and that is, if we made all appropriations on a 1-year basis. In that way unspent funds would lapse at the end of the fiscal year if they had not been spent. We do not do that because we know many programs have long leadtimes. I have already said $130 billion of previously appropriated funds are on hand in the executive branch of the Government and they will be spent in future years.

The President himself last fall announced budget cuts or budget reductions of $5.3 billion, and said that if he reduced the program levels by $5.3 billion it would result in an expenditure savings of $3 billion that year.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I will yield to the gentleman in just 1 second.

But the President rescinded some of those reductions before the year was out. Now we are saying in the only way we can that we approve spending cuts in the fiscal year ahead as well as reductions in appropriations. This is the way for Congress to exercise some control over spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas] has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Casey], a member of our committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I will be pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the very interesting, and I think positive and objective discussion we have had, I believe it would be well to have printed in the Record here just what the amendment was that was approved yesterday, and I assume the one offered today will be identical.

It clearly shows there is no reduction in the authority to obligate funds and it will not save any money. It could slow down and postpone expenditures to some extent.

Let me just read the amendment which was adopted:

> Excluding the Federal Bureau of Investigation—

And that is $186.5 million—

> Excluding the Federal Bureau of Investigation money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond 95 per centum of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for the fiscal year 1968.

The January budget expenditure estimates and the appropriation budget request, to some extent, are now out of date because the Committee on Appropriations has already cut about $148 million from the various requests.

It is very important to remember that the source of spending is Congress, through its authorizations and its appropriations. To try to control the rate of expenditure after we appropriate the money to the executive branch could be wasteful.

So I would say, Mr. Chairman, taking action on line items for specific purposes is the way to save money—we know where those items are in the bill. It seems to me that on yesterday if the Committee on Appropriations had not already cut the bill deeply enough in order to eliminate things we were opposed to that we ought to have offered amendments on the floor to cut them further and thus achieve the objective of really saving money and not just postponing the expenditures.

Mr. CASEY. I appreciate the further discussion of this by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas and chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Back to the bill at hand. Of course, it is not a bill that the executive department has anything to say that I know of. These really are not housekeeping bills. The fact is that the Members' own salaries are in this bill. I think even the page boys will tell you that this is a pretty important bill to them because their pay is in here.

This has been a difficult bill for this committee to consider. It has been my privilege to serve for the first time on this particular subcommittee. I was amazed at how the chairman and other members of the committee who have served for a good while on this committee have been able to tackle the complexities of our business—which we have made complex by authorizations and through the administration committee bills that we have approved on this floor.

I will say this: I detected a glimmer of light—I believe this is probably the first time we have ever eliminated an office that had been established in the past, such as the Coordinator of Information. The job was created for a specific purpose at some time in the past and then when the purpose or the need passes, the job has been staying on.

I call your attention to page 8 of the report which has a title "Potential Areas of Study." That is a very brief statement about potential areas of study. It is a very brief statement of what I think this committee in conjunction with other committees of this body are going to do with reference to studying overlaps and positions and jobs or branches or functions that we created in the past which continue to live on because no one has taken a close look at it.

I feel confident that when this committee comes back next year, we will have some recommendations that will probably jar some of you because you know every time you try to eliminate a job around here, no one is friendless—especially some of those who have had positions here in conjunction with the operation of the Congress, and when you start to eliminate a job someone's toes get stepped on and you may be one of the ones who next year will say, "Well, now wait a minute, you have gone to meddling instead of really tending to business."

But if we are really going to tighten up on our functions, I trust that you will back us in this committee and eliminate this Office of Coordinator of Information now. I trust when we come back next year with further recommendations, I hope you will support us on these recommendations, too. It has been a pleasure to serve as a member of this distinguished committee, and I look forward to further service on the committee. Frankly, I have learned a little more about the operation of our own body by serving on this committee.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, as one who has expressed some opposition for the past several years to the expenditure of $34 million for an unnecessary and a rather dangerous and harmful extension of the west front of the Capitol, I am glad that no funds are included in this bill, as the distinguished gentleman from Alabama has already pointed out, for this purpose. This is, in fact, the second year that funds for this west front extension project have been excluded from this legislation, and I think it is quite clear that those of us who have felt that this project would be unfortunate and who have worked so hard to try to get the facts about it to the American people, have clearly scored another victory.

While it is true that the Architect has not abandoned his plans to try to get the money, I think that as long as we can continue to delete these funds from these individual appropriations bills year after year, we will have succeeded in a de facto victory, if nothing else.

Clearly, as the information about the west front extension has gotten out to the public, they now realize that the project is too expensive, that it would be very harmful to an historic shrine, and that certainly we can get along spending our money on other things that are more urgently needed at this particular time. In fact, since last year's legislative appropriations bill, Mr. Chairman, the American Institute of Architects has studied the west front, which the Architect of the Capitol had originally told us is collapsing, and has found not only that it is not collapsing, but that for less money than the Architect of the Capitol wants to spend to put in restaurants and movie theaters, we could restore that west front of the Capitol, paint it up, touch up the mortar a little bit so it will not keep falling off in pieces through neglect—a neglect which has continued since 1961—and I think we ought to do that job.

I appeared before the subcommittee and urged them to put in $50,000 to make a full survey of just what would have to be done to restore the west front instead of extending it, and how much it would cost. However, the subcommittee in its wisdom and trying to save money—and we are all sympathetic with that—decided not to include that additional sum.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the Architect of the Capitol has had almost $400,000 appropriated to him, nearly a half million dollars, for various studies on the west front of the Capitol. Some $20,000 or $30,000 of that amount, for example, was expended for that model over in Statuary Hall which interferes so much with the orderly flow of tourists through one of the historic shrines of this building. Certainly if that amount of money is available to the Architect, and if he can spend $20,000 to impede the flow of tourists through the Capitol, why can we not spend $20,000, $30,000, or $40,000 to get a thorough scientific and engineering study of exactly what would be required, how much it would cost to repair and restore this building, and let us forget once and for all about the costly, needless $34 million project that would permanently deface the historic Capitol Building.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BROTZMAN. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding. I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman. Recently a group of Colorado citizens visited the Capitol. They were members of the homebuilding trade and profession. In viewing this national shrine, they were appalled at the state of the west front. Accordingly, as was quite proper, they called it to my attention.

I likewise am appalled at the condition of the west front. In fact, I believe it is tantamount to a national disgrace. Accordingly, I am writing today to the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. Stewart, requesting, among other things, a study with the money that I understand is available, as to how much this might cost to restore it, as distinguished from extending it.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the Appropriations Committee did not include any funds in the legislative branch appropriation bill for extending the west front of the Capitol. In view of the estimated cost of $34 or $35 million for extending the west front, the committee should be commended for disallowing this request. I think it is particularly so when we consider that the Architect of the Capitol was given in excess of $400,000 for engineering and architectural studies and surveys on the west front and has produced nothing much except a scale model of the Capitol with the west front extension shown, which is now on display in Statuary Hall.

However, Mr. Chairman, I want it understood that I am not opposed to doing something about the west front. While I am pleased that the committee did not appropriate more funds for the extension plan, I was somewhat dismayed to learn that they did equally little about restoring the west front or at least assuring that something would be done to correct the appalling condition of the west front.

It is my understanding that there never has been a study undertaken to determine the cost of restoring the west front. We did give the Architect of the Capitol the $400,000 which I mentioned earlier and all he has given us is a handsome model of the Capitol and the suggestion that the west front be extended. I recently wrote to the Architect of the Capitol and asked him to request the necessary funds to undertake a study of the cost of restoring the west front. I do not think the extension is necessary, and before we move any further, we should investigate the possibility of simply restoring the building to its original condition.

Mr. Chairman, I include in my remarks a copy of the letter I addressed to the Architect of the Capitol:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. May 31, 1967.

Mr. J. GEORGE STEWART,
Architect of the Capitol, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEWART: In late April, a constituent of mine, Mr. Keith Neville of Boulder, Colorado, visited me in the Capitol. I had occasion to escort Mr. Neville through the building and we happened to step out onto the West Terrace where we saw the appalling condition of the West Front of the Capitol. Mr. Neville was horrified by what he saw and found it hard to believe that the United States Capitol had been allowed to deteriorate into such a state of decay.

He was so shocked by what he saw that upon his return to Colorado he resolved to do something about it. He had pictures taken of the West Front and showed them to his friends and associates. He took it upon himself to investigate the situation regarding the West Front and concluded that the building should be restored to its original state and condition.

To this end, he was instrumental in offering a resolution at the April 27, 1967, general meeting of the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Denver, of which he is a national director, calling upon the Congress to take action necessary to correct the condition of the West Front. You will find a copy of the resolution enclosed for your information. I might also add that this resolution was accompanied by more than 250 signatures of concerned Coloradans who favor the position stated in the resolution.

As you know, the House Appropriations Committee did not include any funds in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill of 1967 for either extending or restoring the West Front. It is my understanding that you, as Architect of the Capitol, were given funds to undertake an engineering and architectural survey of the West Front and concluded that the building should be extended. It is my further understanding that there never has been a study undertaken to determine how much it would cost to simply restore the building to its original state.

It is my belief that before we move any further on the extension plan—a plan which evidently does not have the full support of the Appropriations Committee since they refused to fund it in the latest bill—it is important to investigate the possibility of simply restoring the building.

I am asking you to request the necessary funds to undertake a study to determine the cost of restoring the West Front to its original state and condition in the Fiscal Year 1969 Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill. In the meantime, it is hoped that you will be able to at least renovate the West Front within the present maintenance and construction budget in order to present a more pleasant view of this great National Shrine to the thousands of tourists who will be viewing the Capitol during the coming months.

Sincerely,

Donald G. Brotzman,
Member of Congress.

Not too long ago, I was showing a visiting constituent—Mr. Keith Neville, of Boulder, Colo.—through the Capitol Building. We happened to step out onto the west terrace and there we saw the timbering and jerry-rigging on the west front. We were horrified at what we saw—cracked stones, buckled building blocks, broken cornices, and all the rest of it.

It is nothing short of a national disgrace.

Mr. Neville is a national director of the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Denver, so you can understand his interest in construction and sound workmanship. He was so shocked by what he saw, that upon his return to Colorado, he resolved to do something about it. He had pictures taken of the west front and showed them to friends and associates.

When the Home Builders Association held a general meeting in Denver on April 27, 1967, they adopted a resolution calling upon the Congress to take action necessary to correct the condition of the west front. They further called upon Congress to specifically allocate funds for the restoration of the west front of the Capitol to its original state and condition. Mr. Chairman, I include a copy of the resolution in my remarks:

Resolution to the Congress of the United States of America

Whereas the Capitol Building of the United States of America is the home of legislative representation for our Great Republic, and

Whereas the said Capitol Building is even more in the hearts of the American people as a National Monument & Shrine, and

Whereas the West face of the National Capitol Building has for years received no maintenance or repair, and

Whereas the West face & Portico area is no longer accessible to the citizens of this country and is, in fact, condemned with jerry-rigged supports to save total collapse of the pillared Portico area, and

Whereas the entire West face of the Nations Capitol Building is witness to obvious neglect and waste, and

Whereas the said neglect of our Nations Capitol Building is a discredit to our Country and to our citizens and therefore be it

Resolved, That the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Denver, its officers and members, expect the Congress of the United States of America to take immediate action necessary to remove and correct the aforestated National disgrace, and further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America specifically allocate funds for the said purpose, and expedite complete restoration of the West face of our Nations Capitol Building to its original state and condition.

Attest:

Ray G. Parker,
President.
Johnny Green,
Keith B. Neville,
Douglas Schauer,
National Directors.
Charles H. Sanford,
Secretary.

Sam Primack,
National Director at Large.
Ed Northway,
National Representative.

This resolution was forwarded to me by Mr. Lauren H. Cahill, executive vice president of the Home Builders Association. Mr. Chairman, I want to include a portion of Mr. Cahill's letter in my remarks. In writing about the pictures which he saw of the west front, he said:

> The people who have seen the pictures are amazed that we have let our nation's capitol building get into such a condition. They can hardly believe their eyes.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution was accompanied by the signatures of more than 250 concerned Coloradans who believe that the west front should be restored.

It is hoped that the Architect of the Capitol will ask for the necessary funds to undertake a study of the cost of restoring the west front, and I sincerely hope that the Appropriations Committee will see fit, in the fiscal year 1969 legislative branch appropriation bill, to include funds to undertake such a study. Certainly we cannot put off action on the west front indefinitely.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado. I might point out the Architect of the Capitol has already spent approximately $100,000 for an engineering study of what could be done to correct the difficulties that he saw in the west front. But in that $100,000 study there is not a single thing analyzing in any detail what might be done by way of restoring and repairing that front, without going into a vast, grandiose enlargement that would cost a total of $34 million. I believe we ought to get our $100,000 worth and get the restoration side of the story analyzed in that engineering study in as much detail and with as much attention as was given to the extension proposal.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Sixty-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 114]

Abbitt
Abernethy
Anderson,
Tenn.
Ashley
Ashmore
Battin
Bell
Blanton
Bolling
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Button
Cabell
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Dent
Dingell
Dow
Eckhardt
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Everett
Fascell
Feighan
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gardner
Gathings
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gurney
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Heckler, Mass.
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Hosmer
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
King, Calif.
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, La.
Lukens
McClory
McMillan
Mailliard
Miller, Calif.
Mink
Monagan
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Philbin
Pickle
Pollock
Pool
Quie
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roudebush
Ruppe
St. Onge
Staggers
Steiger, Wis.
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Tiernan
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Watkins
Whalen
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolff
Younger
Zion
Zwach

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Karsten, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 10368, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 329 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. One of the great satisfactions in serving in this body these past 6 years has been the desire on the part of everyone, from the Speaker and the majority leader right down to the newest Member of this body, to be ultimately fair with not only the Members, but the staff and every one of its constituents.

We have had under consideration this bill that includes the responsibilities of the Architect of the Capitol. He has been mentioned in the newspapers and by Members of both bodies as though he were completely responsible for whatever takes place on the Capitol grounds. I would like to direct the attention of all Members of this Committee that he is really nothing more or less than an agent. In the instance of the extension of the west front of the Capitol, the Architect is the agent of the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol.

That Commission is made up of the

Speaker of the House, the Vice President of the United States, the minority leader of the House, the minority leader of the Senate, and the Capitol Architect himself. I think that when we are addressing suggestions or hopes that changes may be made or improvements built around the Capitol, that they be directed to the proper source and not hold the Architect of the Capitol responsible, because he is merely again, I add, the agent of this Commission.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, if the Architect of the Capitol is indeed an agent, then I wish to address my words to my distinguished colleagues serving on the Commission, as well as the other members of the Commission. We have heard on repeated occasions that the west front of the Capitol is in the process of disintegration, that it is a hazard for Members of the Congress and members of the public, alike.

I would like to urge the members of this Commission to stop the needless wanton abandonment of the Capitol, by taking the selfsame simple elementary precautionary measures to repair and maintain the Capitol that any private owner of a valuable structure would be not only legally but morally obliged to take.

The Capitol Building is disintegrating under our eyes. Yet not the simplest measures have been taken to point up the bricks, to fill the spaces between the bricks which during the winter permit water to get in, which freezes, and eventually destroys the structure.

If the Members of this body and of the public are in peril, why can we not get on with the work of proper maintenance and restoration of this building? It ought to bring a sense of outrage and shame to every one of us that we are sitting by and negligently permitting the west front to disintegrate day by day, hour by hour, and minute by minute.

Why can we not get on with the job that any civilized community would insist on—doing whatever is necessary to preserve and maintain this national heritage, to make sure it does not constitute a menace to the safety of all of us?

I would like to turn for one fleeting moment to the question of the Madison Memorial Library. The committee report states that there is nothing in the bill for the Madison Memorial Library, but that the Architect of the Capitol should facilitate, as much as he can the expedition of final approvals of plans for the building.

In legislation providing for the planning and construction of this building, consultation with the American Institute of Architects is provided for, and the American Institute of Architects has submitted its report, dated May 18, 1967.

To put it charitably, Mr. Chairman, it is a very negative report. First of all, they suggest, in developing the plans and the specifications for this building, the architects did not follow a direction of the Public Works Committee to set the building in a proper parklike setting. Indeed, it is suggested that the proposed design would place the building close to the sidewalk line on three sides, much as is the Cannon Building.

In the report of the American Institute of Architects, the proposed building is variously referred to as "aesthetically and psychologically unsatisfactory as a place to work," and as "inhuman and overpowering." Let me read one sentence:

> The AIA Committee believes that the proposed building would neither qualify as a compatible and meaningful addition to the Capitol Hill scene, nor would it provide working conditions conducive to high morale and maximum productivity.

I would like to ask the chairman of this committee, since the Architect of the Capitol admittedly is only an agent, what impact will this report—of a distinguished group of nationally recognized architects, designated by the AIA to confer on the Madison Memorial Library, in conformity with the law—have on the development of plans and specifications? Will this report enter into the decisionmaking process? Will we reverse the trend toward creating another ugly, monolithic, awesome, deadly monotonous building that will embarass us for decades to come?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Of course, the gentleman knows well, I cannot answer that question.

Mr. SCHEUER. Is there anybody who can answer that question?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I would think the Architect of the Capitol can answer that, and the members of the building commission.

Mr. SCHEUER. Is it the membership of the building commission, then, that will act on this highly critical report of the AIA?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. When the report is submitted for consideration, I would think it would be the members of the building commission. Certainly it is not our committee.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, the report I have previously referred to is as follows:

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS, MADISON MEMORIAL LIBRARY COMMITTEE, MAY 18, 1967

A. INTRODUCTION

Public Law 89–260 directs the Architect of the Capitol to construct the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building after consultation with a committee designated by The American Institute of Architects.

The House Public Works Committee report on the legislation which became Public Law 89–260 further states that "the AIA Committee should consist of from five to seven outstanding architects who would present a national viewpoint on the type of building to be constructed."

Accordingly, in July 1966, Charles M. Nes, Jr., of Baltimore, President of the AIA, appointed the following architects to serve as an advisory committee under his chairmanship:

George Kassabaum, St. Louis, Missouri; Vincent G. Kling, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Llewellyn W. Pitts, Beaumont, Texas; Harry Weese, Chicago, Illinois; David N. Yerkes, Washington, D.C.

Members of the AIA Committee have held a series of meetings with the Architect and Assistant Architect of the Capitol and the Associated Architects of the Madison Memorial Library project to discuss the building and the Architects' preliminary studies for its design. The first of these meetings was devoted to a general discussion of the project, the role of the AIA Committee, and the question of how the Committee could be most helpful to the Associated Architects. At the second meeting, the Associated Architects showed the Committee a graphic presentation of the program requirements, indicating the size of the lot, the maximum height limitation of the building, the floor area proposed in the legislative history, and the resulting cubage or "envelope" of the building. At the four subsequent meetings the AIA Committee reviewed and discussed with the Associated Architects various sketches, renderings, plans and models of the proposed building.

Before the first meeting the Committee members were provided with copies of the first volume of the program prepared by the Library Consultant who had been retained by the Library. This document explained very clearly and completely the nature of the activities which will take place in the new building, the areas required for each, and the desired relationships between these spaces.

In approaching our task of consulting with the Architect of the Capitol and the Associated Architects, we assumed that the Congress called for the AIA advisory committee because neither the Fine Arts Commission nor any comparable organization engages in critical review of Capitol Hill projects. Furthermore, Congress may have turned to the AIA because the Institute, as a professional society representing about 80% of the Nation's registered architects, has taken a keen interest in the master planning and design of buildings on the Hill. For some time the AIA has urged preparation of a long range master plan for all construction on Capitol Hill, and the creation of a Capitol Hill design review commission whose functions would be comparable to, but more extensive than, those of the Commission of Fine Arts. The Institute supported H.R. 16100 and similar bills in the 89th Congress which would provide a permanent architectural review body, consisting of architects and other qualified persons, authorized to advise the Congress on the construction of new buildings on the Capitol grounds.

Since the AIA Committee was written into the legislation as a review body, this Committee has obligations and responsibilities somewhat similar to those of the permanent review commission which it advocates. One of these obligations is to comment on the requirements of the legislation under which the Architect of the Capitol and the Associated Architects have been working.

More specifically, the Committee feels that it has a responsibility to evaluate the following aspects of the building design and the program on which it is based:

1. Urban Design Considerations: the relationship of the building to adjacent buildings and open spaces with respect to material, height, area of site occupancy, and form.
2. Functional Considerations: the building as a place for books and people, giving consideration both to library technology and human requirements.
3. Aesthetic and Philosophical Considerations: the appropriateness of the proposed building as an important statement of this country's approach to architectural design in the mid nineteen-sixties.

B. THE LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND OF THE MADISON MEMORIAL LIBRARY PROJECT

Before discussing the Committee's comments in more detail, it seems desirable to review the history of this project in so far as the Committee has direct knowledge of it.

At the time that the Committee held its first meeting with the Associated Architects and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol, the following directives had been incorporated in the Madison Library Authorization Act or in the legislative history:

1. The site (Square 732).
2. The surroundings ("a proper parklike setting").
3. The budget ($75,000,000 total cost).
4. The approximate floor area (2,000,000 gross square feet, 1,700,000 net square feet).
5. The design philosophy (a building "in keeping with the prevailing architecture of the Federal buildings on Capitol Hill").
6. The schedule for submission of schematic designs.

It is apparent that these requirements go a long way toward determining the building design. They give the architects a directive which, in advance, pre-determines the answers to many questions of basic architectural importance.

The Committee suggests that some of the limitations listed above are incompatible with each other and with such desirable objectives as the following:

1. To produce a building which is responsive to its urban environment, enhancing the quality of the adjacent buildings and open spaces, and enhanced by them.
2. To provide a structure where books can be stored and used safely and conveniently, where people can work in surroundings which are physically and psychologically beneficial, and which is sufficiently adaptable to meet changing conditions for many years to come.
3. To create a work of architecture which is compatible with other structures on Capitol Hill, but which is also a vigorous product of its time, achieving both dignity and vitality.

C. URBAN DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

One basic urban design aspect of the Madison Library project is the relationship of the building to its site and to the buildings, streets and other open spaces around it. From this point of view one must consider such questions as the following:

1. The height of the building in relation to the height of other buildings in the area.
2. The alignment of the building on all sides relative to the adjacent structures and open spaces.
3. The mass, form and scale of the Library as related to its surroundings.

At one of its first meetings with the Associated Architects the Committee discussed the need for a model of the Capitol Hill area so that these relationships could be clearly seen and tested. Such a model need not show much detail, but should indicate the main masses of all buildings within several blocks of the Library site.

Unfortunately, the only model which was made shows only the original Library of Congress building and the Cannon Office Building in three dimensions. Other existing buildings in the immediate area of the Library are shown in plan only. The Committee believes that the absence of a more complete model handicaps both the Associated Architects and the AIA panel in judging the urban design aspects of the Library project.

At their third meeting, on January 19, 1967, the Associated Architects first showed the Committee drawings and models of various proposals for the Library. In general, these schemes showed a rectangular building approximately 500 feet by 400 feet in plan.

At each meeting there was discussion about the bulk of the Library, both as a separate entity and in relation to the adjoining buildings. Most of the members of the Committee expressed their opinion that a simple rectangle of such vast dimensions would be *inhuman and overpowering*. They pointed to the way this effect has been avoided in some of the other buildings in the area, such as the Capitol building itself.

The Associated Architects indicated that, to meet the legislative requirements for a floor area of approximately 1,700,000 net square feet, the building must be built almost out to the property line on at least three sides without any major recesses or penetrations, and up to the maximum height permitted by the prevailing cornice line on Capitol Hill.

The Committee suggested that the bulk of the building above the ground might be reduced by adding one or more additional floors below the level of the ground. The Associated Architects claimed that this would increase the cost of the building above the limits provided by the legislation because it would carry the building below the water level.

The Associated Architects and Dr. Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, also stated that the Library officials were opposed to increasing the amount of office space below the ground level.

Commenting further on the Library's size in relation to the limited site, the AIA Committee pointed to the references in the House Public Works Committee Report to "a parklike setting." The Report states:

"The Committee intends that the building be placed in a proper parklike setting which will enhance not only the beauty of the proposed new building but also the surrounding areas."

The proposed design would place the building close to the sidewalk line on three sides.

D. FUNCTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

The second aspect of the proposed building considered by the Committee deals with the quality of the working conditions provided by a building with approximately three acres of space on each floor.

In this connection the Committee was much concerned about the following:

1) People would be working throughout the entire area of each floor, not just near the perimeter where there would be natural light and a view of the outdoors.

2) *No interior courtyards are included* in the plan except for a covered court running through three floors. The only contact with the outside world would be in the perimeter offices, and because of the simple rectangular form of the building these would occupy only a small percentage of the total floor area. A more open plan, with deep recesses and projections or internal courts, would obviously provide much more outside wall and potential window area in proportion to the floor space.

3) Not only do the plans include *no enclosed* or *partly enclosed courts*, they also do not provide any *lofty spaces* such as a *great hall, lobby*, or light wells running through the building so as to relate the various floors to each other. Except for the covered three story court already referred to, the few high rooms are only two stories high. In a very large building such as this one, without any open courts, the Committee holds that generous vertical and horizontal spaces of some sort are essential for orientation, and to provide spatial variety and relief.

4) *The ceiling height* throughout, except in the lobby and a few other spaces, would be only *nine and one-half feet*. This is a very low ceiling for such a vast space.

For all these reasons the Committee believes that the present design would produce an environment which would be aesthetically and psychologically unsatisfactory as a place to work. The tremendous floor spaces with low ceilings and no outside light or view would provide undesirable working conditions—certainly not the conditions which should prevail in an important modern building designed for the Federal Government.

E. AESTHETIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Finally, considering the building from the point of view of its validity as architecture, the Committee noted the following statement in the enabling legislation:

"The design of such building . . . shall be in keeping with the prevailing architecture of the Federal buildings on Capitol Hill."

There can be no argument that the Library must be compatible with other buildings on Capitol Hill, although no two architects would interpret this in exactly the same way. But the Committee believes that the phraseology used in the Joint Resolution implies a degree of literal adherence to the classicism of Capitol Hill which is unnecessary and unfortunate. It should be possible to design a building which is respectful to the adjoining structures but which still has its own distinctive character; in short, a vital and imaginative architectural creation rather than a "modernized" imitation of more vigorous precedents. In this respect, it is worth noting that in the Western world, the United States is the only nation which imposes such official eclecticism on its public architecture.

The Committee hopes that this will be the last time that Congress feels it necessary to write this restrictive wording into the authorization for a new building.

In view of the basic criticisms which have been made, comment on the detailed aspects of the design seems superfluous.

F. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Beginning with its inspection of the first sketches and continuing throughout its meetings with the Associated Architects, *the Committee felt that the concept which produced the designs has a basic flaw: it requires too large a volume enclosed by the walls above ground when considered in relation to all the other given conditions.* The Committee believes *the proposed building would neither qualify as a compatible and meaningful addition to the Capitol Hill scene, nor would it provide working conditions conducive to high morale and* maximum productivity.

The various suggestions which the Committee offers for dealing with this problem are not acceptable to the Associated Architects because they feel they are prevented from following them by budgetary restrictions, legislative requirements, or the specifications of the Library of Congress.

The Committee agrees that severe—and perhaps contradictory—limitations have been imposed on the Architects. These requirements should be considered. In the Committee's opinion reconsideration of the requirements would be preferable to the construction of a building on Capitol Hill which would be visually unsatisfying and functionally inadequate.

The Committee believes that the lesson to be learned from the Madison Memorial Library project is clear: there is an immediate need for legislation through which situations of this sort may be avoided in the future. The advice of a permanent body of professional consultants, working within the framework of a master plan, could be of inestimable value to the Congress, the Architect of the Capitol, and architects commissioned to design buildings on Capitol Hill.

With the help of such a group, mistakes which are damaging and costly might be avoided. Certain decisions must be made prior to passage of legislation which authorizes the construction of a building. As has been pointed out in this report, this legislation sometimes includes requirements which may seriously handicap the architects. Such difficulties could be prevented if a permanent review commission could study the program requirements for any project as a prerequisite to preparation of legislation.

In conclusion, we would like to mention that on several occasions, the Associated Architects arranged meetings on very short notice to accommodate the AIA Committee. The Committee wishes to express its appreciation to the Associated Architects and to the representatives of the Architect of the Capitol and the Library of Congress, for their patience, courtesy, and cooperation when faced with this unavoidable inconvenience. The Committee also wishes to thank the Associated Architects for the complete and clear presentation of their designs, and for their unfailing helpfulness.

Charles M. Nes, Jr., FAIA.
George E. Kassabaum, FAIA.
David N. Yerkes, FAIA.
Llewellyn W. Pitts, FAIA.
Vincent G. Kling, FAIA.
Harry M. Weese, FAIA.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Speaker [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is about time that some evidence be given to the Members of the House, because all we have been hearing is a one-sided story about an "ugly, monolithic building."

What kind of language is that?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished Speaker yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Has the distinguished Speaker looked at some of the apartment buildings down in Southwest, which might fit that description?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will let the gentleman from New York answer that.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished Speaker yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. I would never have brought up this subject and never have referred to any of my prior activities, prior to coming to the House, but I can say, not only with respect to a project with which I was associated in Southwest, but also regarding many other apartment buildings in the Southwest, that these are internationally famous for their elegance, beauty, and grace, and for the excellence of their architecture, planning, and design. Projects in the Southwest have won architecture and planning awards, prizes, and citations by the bushel basket.

Our State Department and our Department of Housing and Urban Development bring a constant stream of visitors to view the great work that our great free enterprise sector accomplishes in partnership with the Federal Government. Visitors from Asia, Europe, Africa, and Latin America wonder at the handsome style of the splendid developments in Southwest wherein almost 10 percent of this House, and our Vice President, live.

It is that kind of beauty, that kind of splendid architecture and planning that I should like to see drawn into Capitol Hill.

I might say that every single sponsor of every single portion of that Southwest development was designated a sponsor by an architectural competition. It was not their dollars. It was not their connections. It was the beauty and artistry of their plans, in a competition with the greatest architects in our Nation which was the determining factor in the designation of who was going to build what in the Southwest.

It will be a great day when the door is thrown open to competition among the great architects of America for the planning and design of future development on Capitol Hill. Hopefully, one day, development on our own Capitol Hill will match—and hopefully outdo—the splendid examples of great architecture and planning in Southwest Washington.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished Speaker yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield for an answer to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would say, of course, everything is objective and relative. To the Africans and Asians who might live in mud huts, they look pretty good.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, there are several vital reasons why the Congress should not consider any so-called restoration of the old deteriorated central west front of the Capitol and should proceed with the proposed extension as soon as our situation permits.

The extension of the west front is not new. One would think it was new, to listen to my friend from New York.

It was recommended almost 100 years ago by Architect Thomas U. Walter, the gentleman who designed and supervised the construction of the present large dome over the Capitol, and the Senate and House wings, which includes this very Chamber in which we sit today.

One of his plans was very similar to the one the Commission, of which I am Chairman, has considered and approved.

Incidentally, this great man of yesterday, architect Walter, was one of the founders of the American Institute of Architects. Furthermore, he was the second president of the organization.

Such an extension would complete the composition of the Capitol made necessary by these additions of approximately 100 years ago. The extension, planned by eminent professional architects, will improve the esthetic quality of the west side, while at the same time preserving its essential characteristics.

The outstanding engineering firm retained by the Extension Commission to study the condition of the west central front and to recommend remedial action, advised against the so-called restoration and recommended a buttressing extension such as constructed in 1958–62 on the east side.

The president of this firm testified in a public hearing we held on this matter as follows:

> What is needed here is to, in my opinion, protect this whole wall, enclose it just as you did on the east side by another structure.

These recommendations were made after a thorough analysis and considering several alternatives.

Even the members of the AIA hierarchy—that is what it is, not the members; and I refer to "hierarchy" in a most refined manner, and just to describe—testified and admitted this was an outstanding firm that we retained.

This same engineering firm estimated that the restoration cost would run from $10 million to $50 million. The extension has been estimated at $34 million.

There are so many unknowns about the old section of the Capitol, I am advised, that it would be impossible to obtain a competitive bid price on any restoration program. They do not know what they are going to get into there. They will take it on a cost-plus basis, but you cannot get a competitive bid from contractors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the distinguished Speaker an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Thank you very much.

Such work would have to be done on a cost-plus basis, just as in 1949–51 the House and Senate Chambers were reconstructed on a cost-plus basis. On the other hand, a firm price bid could be obtained on the approved extension.

A restoration or reconstruction would provide no additional space for the vital operations of the Congress in this building. Do we wish forever to seal the walls of the building from expansion to meet the needs of Congress, and thereby turn the building into an empty monumental shell? I do not think so. This is the home of Congress. This is the symbol of the legislative arm of the Government, and I, for one, hope that we can deliberate and work here for many, many years to come—you and I and our successors.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have become somewhat of an expert on the needs of the House for space. Many of you constantly are asking me where you can find additional space for your necessary work in the Capitol and elsewhere, and also with regard to committees. As a matter of fact, I was thinking humorously of having a resolution introduced to give me an employee to assist me in connection with space. I was wondering what title I would give him if I got him. I will not ask you for one, but I decided that if it did happen, I would call him my "space" man. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the space that will be gained on the west side will be most helpful to the Congress and, I might say, to the public who have great difficulty in being accommodated in their own Capitol. The people coming up here tremendously increased in number; from less than 1 million, 10 years ago, they are over 6 million now. I love to see them visit this Capitol, but by 1970 there will be 10 million or 11 million visitors coming to this building. The more I see the better I like it, because it means that they are interested in our Government. I want them to come up here from all over the country.

Now, we have heard much of late about the position of an organization of architects, who have their headquarters here in the Capital City. I refer to the American Institute of Architects. I respect the organization; I respect the members of it. The members have never been canvassed on this particular question, that is, the individual members. They are said to oppose the extension. Their primary reason for opposition now appears to be that they want one old wall of the Capitol retained as a "textbook of architecture." Mark you, this is a historic building, but it is a servicing and functioning building, also. These "textbook of architecture" are nice words, but the issue is simply, should the Capitol serve as some kind of a course in architecture or should it remain, as it was originally intended, as the workshop of the Congress? While we preserve the architecture of the Capitol by putting it in a sound, permanent-type construction, the building must of necessity continue to be dedicated to its first and continuing high purpose—an edifice in which the Congress considers legislation day after day affecting the lives of 198 million Americans and many more than that in the decades ahead.

Now let me call this to your attention. Although the management of the American Institute of Architects now appears to oppose the planned extension to the west side, it has not always been so. Members will recall too well that my great and esteemed predecessor, Speaker Sam Rayburn, also ran up against the opposition of this same group in 1958 when he was leading the fight for the extension of the east front.

At that time, this very same group was violently opposing the east front extension. And, what did they do? They recommended instead, "developing a proposed scheme for expansion on the west side of the building."

Mr. Chairman, in 1957 and 1958, they were for the west side extension. Now they are opposed to it. What kind of consistency is that?

Now, Mr. Chairman, they have changed courses and are opposing the very move which they recommended in 1958.

And, Mr. Chairman, there are other groups which have come out in favor of the west front extension. For example, there is the American Registered Architects who heartily endorsed the plan, after study by a committee.

The Philadelphia chapter of the American Institute of Architects recommended the extension. The American Society of Landscape Architects examined the extension plans and made suggestions which were accepted. That organization then agreed to take no position on the extension project, "in view of the fact that it has been in preparation for years with private and public knowledge and approval, and it is in the hands of eminently qualified professional persons of high standing in their own organization."

Mr. Chairman, restoration—and now, mark you—restoration, if undertaken, would require the entire west central section to be vacated—that whole west front will be torn down and vacated—from the basement to the attic—for a period of 5 to 10 years, and will go practically through the middle of the building to the rotunda.

Mr. Chairman, all of the space now occupied by the Committee on Appropriations and its many subcommittees, and that entire west front will have to be vacated for a period of 5 to 10 years in the event of restoration. They do not know the cost of this proposed restoration and competitive bids thereon are not available.

Mr. Chairman, this procedure was recommended 100 years ago. I am a layman, but I have listened to them, however, and the Committee on the Extension of the Capitol was unanimous in voting in favor of this procedure.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose today is simply to let the Members know, so that they will not let this small group of my dear friends whom I like very much, penetrate too much in their minds.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this 3 minutes during which to give the Members of the Committee a little dissertation on the AIA and some of its activities.

You know, Mr. Chairman, I happen to be chairman of the Subcommitte on Foreign Affairs that deals with the authorization for foreign buildings. They have an architectural advisory committee on this question, of course, which committee really runs the show. They pick out one of their own members to be the architect for the various places involved, and when these structures are built, we get some very peculiar reasons sometimes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have the time during which to mention all of them, but I will tell the Members of the Committee about a couple.

Mr. Chairman, we have an Embassy in London on which this architect advisory panel put a $57,000 metal eagle on the roof, an eagle which initially cost not only $57,000, but he has to be cleaned up every once in awhile, because he oxidizes, and the last time they cleaned him, that cost the taxpayers of the United States of America another $57,000.

But, Mr. Chairman, then there is a modern-day Taj Mahal out in India which is very beautiful from their point of view—and I think it looks nice too—but it has some serious defects. I say this, Mr. Chairman, because if they have a party there and if the ambassador is a little late getting ready for the occasion and is in the bathroom, you can hear the scrape of his razor during his shaving down in the main ballroom, let alone what else you can hear.

Mr. Chairman, further, over in Ireland they built one—they already had it designed in the form of a circle, but President Kennedy hated to waste the expenditure of that $60,000 in the form of a circle.

It is a similar building, and it is not very functional. In fact, I quizzed the architect about it, and he did not have any very good reason for it except he said it was in line with ancient Irish defensive towers. Then I asked some of the people over there what that had to do with an embassy. They said "Well, since all the offices were circular nobody could corner a secretary in any of them."

If these are some of the things that the AIA and their advisory committees do, I would just as soon for my part leave the extension of the west front of the Capitol in the hands of the Speaker and the Congress of the United States.

You know, we catch all kinds of criticism, and the newspapers write about how wasteful we are with the money, but I have never heard any mention in the newspapers about the AID and some of their ideas, and how much some of them cost.

Since I have a half a minute remaining, I will tell you about the airport out at Dulles, which is out in the country some miles, and sometimes people go out there. I have been out there once or twice myself. One of these great architects who designed our Embassy in London—and incidentally, I forgot to tell you about the fountain they have in the lobby there which, if it is not functioning and is not running, people do not see it, and they fall in it, and when it is running it sprays all the passersby, no matter how they go, and the water runs down the front steps on the outside.

Well, you ought to take a look at it some time.

The architect who designed this airport out at Dulles out in the country, instead of having ramps where passengers can walk and get on the plane without costing anybody anything, he designed it so that they have these—what do you call them?—these mobile lounges. Well, the mobile lounges cost the taxpayers $300,000 per copy. I do not know exactly how many they have out there, but the last time I was out there I saw between 20 and 30, and I suppose they have some spares, and it takes a crew to run them. They are pretty expensive.

This is what these architects will do when you turn them loose and they really put on a lot of gadgets, but I notice when they are working for private builders they do not put on quite so many gadgets.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, with the threat of another increase in the debt limit and another increase in taxes looming before us, I think this Congress should take every step possible to eliminate unnecessary spending and to keep a tight rein on the purse strings of the Nation.

As one who strongly supports the theory of frugality in government, I feel that if we must begin by cutting our own salaries to show our sincerity, then let us do it.

I do not see how we can, on one hand, continue to fight a war in Vietnam, keep the lid on things in the Middle East and in Latin America, while on the other hand permit domestic spending to run rampant. To even hope to do this is sheer folly.

I for one stand for slashing to the bone any expenditure that is not imperative to the existence of this Nation.

Fiscal responsibility as well as charity must begin at home.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 26, immediately following line 10, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 105. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond ninety-five percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15)."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this is the usual amendment known as the "Bow limitation."

We have discussed this here today with the gentleman from Texas and others and I think the Members of the House are familiar with it so I am not going to take the time of the Committee to discuss it. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment be approved.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman, how does he propose to have the cuts applied? The gentleman knows that probably 90 percent or more of the amounts contained in this bill are for salaries; salaries of Members fixed by the Congress; salaries of employees fixed by the Members of Congress and also by legislation; mileage and telephone calls fixed by resolution and law; the office of the Chaplain; and so on. Does the gentleman propose that this would be an across-the-board reduction?

Mr. BOW. I think the amendment speaks for itself. As the gentleman knows, it is not an across-the-board proposition. It is a limitation on estimated spending.

I will say to the gentleman that the salaries of Members are fixed by law—and others by resolution—and I would say to the gentleman, if the House accepts this and if we lead the way to economy in Government and if the salaries are not reduced, I am sure a bill will be introduced to reduce salaries by 5 percent.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. In a very old book it is said that "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." My point is this: This committee has used mathematics to determine the amounts involved in this bill. There are so many Members of Congress at such and such a salary and when that is multiplied you come up with a certain amount. For instance, for compensation of Members you come up with a figure of $14,160,700.

Pretty much the same thing is true of the employees, mileage and telephone allowances and the Chaplain and so on. We would be reducing our salaries.

I think this committee has been just about as frugal as a committee could be. We have eliminated some 148 jobs. We have eliminated an agency of Government lock, stock, and barrel that has been in existence for years and years.

Now I would like to know, if the amendment is adopted, who would apply the expenditure cuts—the postponements—and where would they be made?

I guess—I can only guess—that the man who has the money—for example, the Clerk would apply the postponements so far as his office is concerned.

There are funds included in this bill for the great program that the Library of Congress has providing books for the blind and the physically handicapped. Is that to be deferred, or postponed?

I would say to the gentleman, I have voted for some of these 5 percent expenditure deferment propositions. But I say this bill has come nearer to meeting the actual requirements than any bill that has come before this Congress.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. We have always fixed the salaries of the Members of Congress on both sides by law and we have always insisted on preserving the rule of comity. We should never do anything to force the other body to break the rule. This, I fear, would break the tradition and I hope the amendment will not be adopted. If you want to do this, it should be done by law and not by this amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman, that so far as I can recall, there is not a salary that is allowed here for Members, employees, staff members, or what not that has not been approved and recommended by or pursuant to resolutions or law passed by this House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Let me say that this amendment does not reduce appropriations one nickel. What it does say is that during the fiscal year 1968 you cannot spend more than so much. But all of the money carried in the bill can be obligated. To stay within the expenditure limitation it would be necessary, perhaps, for Members to wait until the beginning of the next fiscal year, which would be 1 day after June 30, 1968, in order to get their pay for the last part of the year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I yield to no Member of this House when it comes to being educated in a little matter called comity between the two bodies of the Congress. I think most of you know that I have had a little experience in that field. For 12 years now I have fought the battles of the House to maintain this law of comity when the other body has tried to impose its will upon us, and we have always been successful in seeing that that did not happen.

Today, if we adopt this amendment, we shall be doing the very thing that we have been fussing all these years with the other body for trying to do, and I do not know how the conferees on the part of the House could any longer make a case for the rule of comity when we go to conference with the other body if we adopt this amendment, which in effect provides that we reserve the right to impose our will upon the other body.

We should practice what we preach. I think every Member should think about this before voting for any such amendment as this, because there is a very serious violation of the law of comity involved.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like particularly to call attention to the Books for the Blind. Last year the item of Books for the Blind was $4,303,000. Even with the cut in expenditures that amount this year would be $5,371,000, if the amendment is adopted. So there would be over a $1 million increase. We would not be cutting that program; we would still be increasing that program by $1 million.

May I also point out that if the amendment is adopted today—and I hope it will be—limiting the spending of funds provided in this bill to about $218 million, or $11 million less than the $229 million that was proposed in the January budget; spending in the current year by the agencies provided in the bill is estimated at $209 million.

If the amendment is adopted, spending in fiscal 1968 would be limited to $218 million, or $8,200,000 more than we are spending this year on the same items. Since the amendment goes to the total spending in the bill, I am sure such a cut would be apportioned in such a way as to avoid any cuts in necessary expenditures.

The gentleman from Texas has referred to the possibility of having to wait until the end of the next fiscal year to pick up the money. This does not lapse at the end of the year. It would not be obligated. You would not have to pay that on the day after the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that a Member's annual salary rate is specifically fixed by law, and that a Member could go into court to collect the salary due, if that were necessary?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is correct. Salaries are fixed by law, and the amendment would not reduce the salaries fixed by law. This amendment would take care of those items which are not fixed by law, and there are many. Some are fixed by resolution.

In all honesty I say to the gentleman that I am assured that if the House adopts the amendment today, although salaries will not be cut by this, there will be a bill introduced in legislative form to reduce salaries by 5 percent.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

No one could challenge the fact that the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, my colleague from Alabama and dean of our delegation, is one of the finest fiscal conservatives in this House.

I believe this committee is to be commended for what they have already done toward assuming a position of fiscal responsibility in this matter. However, I rise in support of this amendment. It seems to me that economy, like charity, should begin at home. Confronted with the possibility of a $25 or $29 billion deficit, this House could take no finer action than to demonstrate we mean business by starting with ourselves.

I cannot think of a finer thing we could do—not that any Member of this House is overpaid; indeed, the opposite is the case. It seems to me by the time the average Member spends what he has to spend in conducting his office, he receives no more than a living wage, and he suffers a worse comparability gap than anybody else in the Federal Government. Yet we can here graphically demonstrate that we are determined to protect the interests of the taxpayers of this country and to meet the fiscal crisis.

We have a serious fiscal emergency on our hands. It seems to me now is the time to act responsibly, and this is the place to begin, so that no one can say to this Congress: "Physician, heal thyself."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, through the years we have had similar amendments, and always they are offered on the floor and never in the committee, that I can recall. In my opinion, this type of amendment is completely unworkable and I could show will not necessarily save money. With regard to the average department of the Government, an amendment like this would give to the Bureau of the Budget and the President the right of item veto. There is no question but that, with respect to the average department, this would be surrendering to the Executive the right to veto anything he wished to.

Judging from the past—and I am not referring particularly to the present administration, but to all—I have seen many times where such cuts were applied at the worst possible place.

The point I am making is that I believe this whole approach is unsound. I ask the gentleman from Ohio a question. This is not a department of the Government we are dealing with. This is a conglomeration of various and sundry services. Would the gentleman tell me who in the world has the authority, insofar as this legislative branch is concerned, to make determinations that would be required if we adopt this amendment? I cannot see where anyone would have the right to make this determination in this particular situation.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer the gentleman's question, but I can throw out a little suggestion. A Member does not need to wait for a bill to be introduced to cut salaries. Some Members who think they are overpaid can just turn back 5 percent or 10 percent, or, if they like, the whole works.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, proceeding further, this is serious. Think about it. This amendment might read as though we are voting for economy, but are we not showing irresponsibility if we adopt this amendment in the peculiar place where it is offered, where there is no head, where there is no departmental authority in any individual to make these determinations?

I ask the gentleman in all sincerity: Who would have the power under existing law to decide where there should be a salary cut, or the elimination of minority employees, or eliminate the Chaplain.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman frightens me for this reason. Who makes up the budget? Somebody certainly does. Somebody certainly has that responsibility. Then he would have the same responsibility for allocating these funds.

I just wonder whether we are blindly going ahead with a budget that nobody has responsibility for. We had better do something about it, if that is true.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very fond of the gentleman from Ohio, but I am as wholly without an answer to his question as he is without one to mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we were all amused—as we always are—a moment ago by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] and the remarks he made a few moments ago, but the question with regard to the west front is really not whether professional architects are wise or foolish. But we can be sure of one thing about the members of the American Institute of Architects, and that is that they are more architects than is the so-called Architect of the Capitol.

What we are discussing here is whether this House is going to have something to say about what happens to the west front of our Nation's Capitol, rather than have that decision be made indirectly, either through an appropriation bill or simply by the action of an employee of this House, the Architect of the Capitol.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel] said a moment ago that the Architect is only an agent. But when the gentleman from New York [Mr. Scheuer] asked the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. Andrews] what would happen to the report of the architects' committee regarding the Madison Library building the chairman said, "You will have to ask the Architect." The fact of the matter is that the Architect of the Capitol is not an agent at all; he has long been the moving force of the Commission on the Extension of the Capitol, and the members of that Commission, occupied with many other responsibilities, have largely gone along with his ideas, although they certainly do have the final say over them if they want to veto them.

The distinguished Speaker indicated a moment ago that the proposal for extending the west front was nothing new. It is, indeed, true that it was suggested many years ago, but the fact is that Congress has gone on record twice or three times officially against that old Walter proposal. And it is also true that the present extension proposal has never been officially authorized by Congress except as a rider on an appropriation bill many Congresses ago; a rider that would, in fact, have been subject to a point of order had someone elected to make it. Indeed, the whole legislative authority for the west front is very vague and shaky.

The House has never had an opportunity to vote on the west front itself, and if it were not for the opposition which has developed in the past two Congresses and across the country funds for constructing the west front would have already slipped through as a minor item on some appropriation bill, either a supplemental appropriation bill or a legislative appropriation bill like this one before us today.

So what is wrong with getting the whole idea out where we can debate it and vote it either up or down? Do we want to spend $34 million for such a project? The chairman of the subcommittee says we are not going to spend a nickel on it while the Vietnam war goes on. Then why do we not see that at least a few dollars of the half-million dollars already given to the Architect of the Capitol for his studies are used at least to paint the west front and to do a little pointing up of the mortar and so on? Let us do something at least to make this great shrine of democracy at least respectable for the time it is going to remain, and while the Vietnam war continues.

Despite what the distinguished Speaker said a moment ago, there has never been any study made of exactly what would be involved in repairing and restoring the west front, or what it would cost. If the Architect can spend $100,000 for a study of what is needed to extend the west front, certainly he ought to be able to spend a few dollars to tell the Members of the House in detail exactly what would be needed and how much it would cost simply to repair it. It should be cheaper and simpler.

That is the only point I am arguing, and I believe it is an issue on which we fairly ought to be allowed to debate and make a decision.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am glad to yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not wish to discuss what the gentleman said, because I have already discussed it, but I do not want the record to show that I said nothing would be done on the west wall while the Vietnam conflict is on, because we do not know what is going to happen on the west wall. If it should cave in, we might have to move. I do not wish to be misquoted on that.

Mr. STRATTON. I was quoting the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama. He said that nothing was going to be done on the west front, or any appropriation made, during the duration of the Vietnam war.

The American Institute of Architects has pointed out that the Capitol is not collapsing, it is not shifting laterally. It may be sinking slightly into the ground, but all those fearsome buttresses out there are not really needed at all. They are just part of the propaganda campaign for extending the west front.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KARSTEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10368) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that Committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 26, immediately following line 10, insert a new section as follows:
>
> "SEC. 105. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond 95 per centum of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15)."

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. (After counting.) Two hundred and nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and to include tables and tabulations during my remarks while in the Committee of the Whole on the bill H.R. 10368, and I further ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

> H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution marking the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the admission of Kentucky to the Union.

THE OTEPKA CASE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the publication, Government Employees' Exchange, deals with the State Department's handling of the case of Mr. Otto Otepka, former security officer in the Department.

The State Department is now trying to drop 10 of the 13 charges it brought against Otepka, and is insisting on a closed-door hearing on the three remaining charges. This latest action is a new and foul injustice piled on the many injustices that have been a part of this case from the outset.

First, the harassment of Otepka by wiretapping, eavesdropping, and other police-state methods came only after he proved that one of his superiors was a liar.

Second, for more than 3 years the State Department has been smearing Otepka on the basis of the 13 charges that had been drummed up against him.

Third, now that Otepka says he is prepared to prove that 10 of the charges were a willful frameup, the State Department is protecting itself by trying to drop those charges.

Fourth, the State Department is insisting on a secret hearing before a State Department official. This secret hearing is scheduled to go forward over the protests of Otepka and his lawyer. They say they have nothing to hide. This was after a promise to Otepka that a Federal judge would preside over his hearing.

If there is any justification for secret personnel hearings it is to protect the individual employee, and not to protect the bureaucracy or the bureaucrats. In this instance the whole idea is perverted. Secrecy is being used to bar Otepka from getting his full story before the public, and to protect the State Department hierarchy from embarrassment.

The inaction of the Civil Service Commission is shocking. It is an abdication to the political expediency of the State Department.

Following is the article from the May 31 issue of the Government Employees' Exchange:

> A serious, internal crisis has developed within the State Department regarding the handling of the Otto Otepka appeal hearings now scheduled to begin on June 5, following the return of Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach from his African tour, an authoritative source within the Department told this newspaper last week. Mr. Otepka, a GS–15 with an annual salary of $20,585 employed as a Personnel Security Specialist in the Department, is appealing his "firing" which was to have taken effect 43 months ago, on November 5, 1963, on 13 charges, including the allegation that he "mutilated" confidential documents before giving them to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee which had been investigating security practices at the State Department.
>
> The hearing will be conducted by a Special Hearing Officer, Edward Dragon, with Irving Jaffe, of the Department of Justice, pressing the Department's charges, and Roger Robb, an Attorney, defending Mr. Otepka.
>
> Through Mr. Robb, Mr. Otepka has asked for an open, public hearing. The State Department has ruled that secrecy must be employed in the proceedings to "protect" Mr. Otepka's privacy and to "safeguard the classified documents" which might be involved in the evidence.
>
> Mr. Robb objects. He has insisted that "both arguments are invalid," and adds that "the employee in this case doesn't want to be protected. And there are no classified documents involved; every one of them has been published in the report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on the case," he concluded.
>
> Besides the controversy over the question of an "open" or a "secret" hearing, *The Exchange* has been authoritatively informed by a source close to Under Secretary of State Katzenbach that, on the advice of Mr. Jaffe, who formerly worked for Mr. Katzenbach at the Justice Department, the Under Secretary has recommended that the State Department drop 10 charges at the outset of the hearings. These 10 revolve around the issue

of the alleged "mutilation" of classified documents.

The informant added that the reason for the recommendation is Mr. Jaffe's fear that Mr. Otepka obtained positive information regarding the identity of the persons actually involved in the "mutilations" and, in the event the charges are maintained in their present form, he will be able to expose the persons at the hearings. In this event, the Department of Justice will have no choice but to bring criminal proceedings against the persons so exposed. In turn, these persons have already indicated they will reveal the identities of the "top persons" in the Department of State who had instructed them to "mutilate" the documents and to "plant them" in Mr. Otepka's burn bags in such a way as to make it appear that Mr. Otepka had carried out the mutilations.

Another reason for Mr. Katzenbach's support for Mr. Jaffe's recommendation, *The Exchange* was informed, is the consideration that "selected out" Foreign Service Officer Stephen A. Koczak, has charged three of his former superiors not only with "mutilating" but with actually "destroying" original pages of his 1961 efficiency report forging substitute pages and inserting these into his record as if they had been in the original. Mr. Koczak has repeatedly asked the Department of State to prepare a chronology of these events and to hold a hearing on the results. Up to the present, the Department has evaded answering Mr. Koczak's request and has omitted discussing this issue of the "destruction of the original pages" in its correspondence with Senators. Mr. Katzenbach is reported to feel that in the event the "mutilation of documents" charges are pressed against Mr. Otepka, such a strong precedent would have been created that the State Department could no longer deny a hearing to Mr. Koczak on the similar charge Mr. Koczak raised regarding the "destruction" by Foreign Service Officers of the original pages of his 1961 efficiency report. By dropping the "mutilation of documents" charges now against Mr. Otepka, Mr. Katzenbach is reported to feel the State Department can continue to prolong delaying answering Mr. Koczak's charges.

The Exchange's informant stated further that Secretary of State Dean Rusk appears to have been impressed by Mr. Katzenbach's and Mr. Jaffe's views and that there is a very good prospect that the "mutilation of documents" charges will be dropped when the Otepka hearings are opened.

Besides embarrassment to the State Department, the Otepka case is now also becoming an embarrassment to the Civil Service Commission, *The Exchange* learned from a State Department source close both to Jules Bassin and to Robert T. Hennemeyer, Mr. Bassin's successor, in the Office of Functional Personnel Programs, which supervises all civil service employees at the State Department. Mr. Bassin, previously in charge of Mr. Otepka's personal files, was named by Mr. Koczak as one of three Foreign Service Officers who "manipulated" his own efficiency record before sending it to the 1964 Selection Board which recommended Mr. Koczak's "firing" by "selection out" without a hearing and without confrontation.

According to this source close to Mr. Hennemeyer, one of the main problems for the Civil Service Commission is that Mr. Otepka, a Civil Service Classified Employee, GS–15, has not had a performance rating for six years, beginning with 1962 when Foreign Service Officer Class One, William Boswell, refused to write Mr. Otepka's performance rating unless William J. Crockett, then the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration issued a direct, explicit order in writing that he do so. Mr. Crockett did not and the Civil Service Commission since then has taken no action against the State Department's violation of the civil service regulations on the grounds that both Mr. Crockett and Mr. Boswell were Foreign Service Officers and therefore not subject to the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. Mr. Otepka's current nominal supervisor is FSO–1 Marvin Gentile, formerly with the CIA; his actual "supervisor" is domestic Foreign Service Reserve Officer, Maximum U.S. Duty, George W. French, Jr., a "protege" of Mr. Crockett commissioned in the "domestic" Foreign Service Reserve so as not to be subject to civil service regulations. Neither has given Mr. Otepka a performance rating, yet the Civil Service Commission has not proceeded against either Mr. Gentile or against Mr. French on the same grounds that it did not take action against Mr. Crockett or Mr. Boswell, namely that they themselves are not subject to the Civil Service Commission's supervision.

Another "headache" for the Civil Service Commission, according to the same source, is the question whether Mr. Otepka's present duties on "detail" to a position entitled "Personnel Security Specialist" are commensurate with his GS–15, Step 6 salary of $20,585.00. The most recent DS–1032 Form on Mr. Otepka, effective December 25, 1966, detailing him for the seventh time to this position states that his duties are "to compile materials obtained during the previous details pertaining to the Congressional Record and other publications emanating from the Congressional Committee on various phases of the Security/Loyalty Programs of the Department of State and other Governmental Agencies relative to Congressional interpretation of E.O. 10450 and related procedures and to render a status report."

Classifiers at the Civil Service Commission concede that the identical functions performed at the Library of Congress are done by workers at the GS–5 to GS–7 level. The top step in GS–7 is $8,368, or $12,000 less than Mr. Otepka's current pay. Thus, *The Exchange's* source revealed, the Civil Service Commission is coming under increasing criticism for having failed to conduct a desk audit of the position to which Mr. Otepka has been "detailed" for the last thirty-nine months. A further criticism, related to this, is that Mr. Otepka's seven details, each for six months, violates the statutes and the civil service regulations that allow only one such "detail" for six months and, thereafter, the position must be filled by a civil service employee "assigned" to it.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1967 TO PROVIDE A BETTER GOVERNMENT FOR THE CITIZENS OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the established custom, and in view of the hour, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, in order to honor the President's message.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri insist upon his point of order?

Mr. HALL. I do, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the President's message contains an embargo until delivered to the Congress on June 1, 1967, which includes any and all references to any material in this message.

Mr. HAYS. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALL. Mr Speaker, I insist upon my point of order

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri insists upon his point of order that a quorum is not present.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 115]

Abbitt
Abernethy
Ashmore
Baring
Bates
Battin
Bell
Blanton
Brademas
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Celler
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Conyers
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Feighan
Foley
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gardner
Gathings
Gray
Gurney
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Heckler, Mass.
Hicks
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
King, Calif.
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, La.
Lukens
McClory
Mailliard
Miller, Calif.
Mink
Monagan
Nichols
Nix
O'Konski
Passman
Philbin
Pickle
Pollock
Quie
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roudebush
Ruppe
St. Onge
Staggers
Steiger, Wis.
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Tiernan
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Watkins
Whalen
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Younger
Zion
Zwach

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the schedule for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of my distinguished friend the minority leader, we have completed the legislative business for this week, and we will ask that after the conclusion of proceedings for today the House adjourn over until Monday next.

In response to the inquiry regarding the program for next week, Mr. Speaker, Monday is Consent Calendar day.

There will be three suspensions:

H.R. 9682, extending authority for loans to certain officers of Federal Reserve banks and Federal credit unions;

H.R. 10226, providing additional mailing privileges for the U.S. Armed Forces; and

H.R. 4241, extending period for in lieu

payments on real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

Also on Tuesday we will consider the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1968.

Wednesday the House will consider H.R. 10328, to increase the public debt limit.

For Thursday and the balance of the week the House will continue consideration of H.R. 1318, the Food Stamp Act Amendments of 1967.

I should like to add that I know of no additions to the program at this time, but we always make the reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further business may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 5, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RESIDENCY VOTING ACT OF 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in a nation which prides itself on the free mobility of its citizens to all parts of the country, it seems strange that we have allowed the voting rights of these persons to be lost due to State residence requirements that must be met in order to vote for the President of the United States. Freedom of opportunity often means that an individual must move from one location to another in order to advance in his career, and it seems inequitable that he must do so at the price of his right to vote.

In his message to Congress on "The Political Process in America," the President has made several concrete suggestions for improving our election procedures. I am particularly interested in the one entitled "Residency Voting Act of 1967" wherein he proposes:

> A citizen, otherwise qualified to vote under the laws of a State, may not be denied his vote in a Presidential election if he becomes a resident of the State by the first day of September preceding the election.

In response to numerous complaints from new residents, my own State of Colorado several years ago took steps to rectify this palpable inequity. It reduced the residency requirement—in voting for President and Vice President only—from 1 year to 6 months. That was a step in the right direction, but I do not think it went far enough.

In voting for State and local candidates there is some justification for more lengthy residence requirements, inasmuch as the newcomer may not be sufficiently informed on the candidates involved and the issues at stake. That argument does not apply to a national contest.

The right to vote in a presidential election should never be curtailed by unreasonable residence requirements. The insertion of criminal penalties would seem to foreclose multiple voting by one individual and the reasonable residence requirements set out in the proposed legislation would also foreclose the footloose wanderer from asserting his right to vote when there is no way to determine if he qualifies.

To deprive five to eight million persons from exercising a constitutional right is cause enough to initiate immediate action to stop these abuses. I favor prompt enactment of the President's proposal so that this problem will be alleviated by the next presidential election.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in a recent message to the leaders of the Middle East countries, President Johnson reaffirmed the United States commitment to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all the nations of the area. This policy has been proclaimed by our last three Presidents and is one which I strongly support.

A peaceful solution to the flareup in the Middle East is possible, but will come about only when those nations which continue to fan the fire realize that a serious violation of the territorial integrity of an independent state will not be permitted.

During this critical period, the Israel Government has exercised remarkable restraint. It is my belief that this conduct is evidence of good faith on the part of a struggling democracy which seeks to have international disputes resolved through diplomatic, rather than military action. If the other principals to this dispute act in a similar manner, the threat of war can be eliminated.

In view of an existing international agreement, I fail to see how any nation can support Egypt's position of denying to Israel shipping access to its port of Elath, through the Strait of Tiran.

It is especially ironic that the Soviets have given so much encouragement to President Nasser and continue to support his action while the U.S.S.R. is so dependent upon the cooperation of other countries for access to Western waters.

While the Russians are maintaining the United Arab Republic has every right to prohibit the passage of Israel ships through the Strait of Tiran, they are sending their own vessels through the territorial waters of Turkey.

I have been following closely the developments in this matter and am greatly disappointed that the sincere efforts by the United States and others to bring about an Arab-Israel entente have been rejected by President Nasser without any apparent concern over the dangerous alternative.

It is my hope that the United Nations Security Council will be successful in its effort to satisfactorily resolve the dispute at an early date.

In addition to opening the Gulf of Aqaba for Israel shipping, a United Nations settlement should also contain provision for the prompt redeployment of U.N. peacekeeping forces along the Arab-Israeli borders. Such action can have a stabilizing effect on the Middle East situation.

In the absence of prompt and decisive action on the part of the United Nations, the maritime nations, including the United States, Great Britain, and France, should give immediate consideration to collective action, the purpose of which would be to assure the free passage of Israel ships through the Strait of Tiran.

STRICTER CONTROLS ON DAIRY IMPORTS NEEDED

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the unfavorable economic position of the American farmer and more specifically the impact of increasing dairy imports on our half million dairy farmers.

Cash receipts in the farming industry reached $5.51 billion in 1966—an all time high. However, USDA estimates indicate farm income in 1967 will be down 5 percent from 1966. Also there was a 13-percent decline in the number of dairy herds last year. Farmers are discouraged because current prices are below the level needed to provide a fair return for their labor and investment. Last month the farm parity ratio went to an all time low of 72—a depression level. The dairy industry is much too important a segment of our economy to be sacrificed without serious effects on the welfare of the Nation.

Increased dairy imports have had considerable impact on the dairy farmer, the dairy industry, and our national economy. Dairy imports began to rise sharply in 1964 and have increased every year since. Dairy imports totaled 0.9 billion pounds in 1965. They rose sharply to 2.7

billion pounds in 1966 and are expected to reach an all time high of 3½ billion pounds of milk equivalent in 1967. Much of the increase in imports has been from evasive-type products—those of butterfat-sugar mixtures alone displaced a market for U.S. mixtures equal to 10 percent of our domestic production. This is a sizable slice and comes out of the profitmaking end of domestic production.

It is interesting to note a comparison between the estimated volume of dairy imports in 1967 with production in my State of Kansas. The 3½ billion pounds would be equal to 2 years' production of all dairy cows in Kansas and an estimated 12 years' production from the 52 counties in my congressional district.

I sincerely hope that the recent hearings on dairy imports held by the U.S. Tariff Commission will prompt the administration to act under their emergency authority of the Dairy Import Act. We need more sensible restrictions on dairy imports, including controls on the importation of the evasive-type products.

I believe the Congress has already voiced its concern in this matter. Over 150 House Members, myself included, have introduced dairy import bills; and over half of the Senators have coauthored similar legislation.

This is a most urgent matter and one which we should correct as quickly as possible. Our experience over the past few years is that existing laws have not provided adequate and effective controls on dairy imports. Also, adequate supplies of milk and milk products are vital to our national security. We cannot rely on overseas sources of these essential foods in case of world crisis, and even now the situation is not one of peace and quiet.

If we fail to place reasonable controls on dairy imports now, we may face a real crisis in case of national emergency at some future date. Also the Nation's 500,000 dairy farmers, already hurt by a cost-price squeeze, should not have to take the brunt of still lower prices caused by increased imports of dairy products.

McNAMARA MUST GO

Mr. **DEVINE.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DEVINE.** Mr. Speaker, this morning the Defense Department made their weekly announcement of casualties in Vietnam. There were 313 American boys killed last week and well over 2,000 wounded. The previous week 337 Americans were killed and thousands wounded. Total: over 10,000 killed, over 63,000 wounded.

We expect, Mr. Speaker, to have growing casualty lists when there is a period of escalation, but unless the escalation is designed to win and bring this conflict to a prompt, honorable and responsible conclusion, it is not possible to justify this gross and criminal waste of our young men.

Secretary Robert S. McNamara has been in charge of the Department of Defense since before our active participation in Vietnam. Congress has provided him with billions and billions of dollars. Indeed, in some instances, more than requested. However, wrong decisions, gross errors, miscalculations and an arrogant disregard of the military facts of life, have caused the American people to lose confidence in Secretary McNamara. His mishandling of the Reserve-National Guard components, his one-basket missile concept, his refusal to recognize maritime shortages, his calculator, pushbutton, statistical answers to our problems, his poor judgment in his declarations concerning deadlines, and predictions of winning or losing leads to but one reluctant conclusion: McNamara must be replaced.

I fully recognize it is a most serious step during these critical times, to replace a leader in our defense complex; and the other powers in the world may question the stability of our Government. Yet, can we afford to worry about image when the lives of American fighting men are being drained away at a rate of about 50 a day, with no indication or evidence whatsoever that we are winning or planning to conclude the conflict?

It is useless to try to pin the blame on Mr. McNamara alone, or anyone else at this time, but a record of failures, wrong guesses, miscalculations and lack of official candor requires a change.

Accordingly, I am today directing a letter to the President of the United States requesting him to seriously consider replacing Mr. McNamara as Secretary of Defense, as a step designed to restore the confidence of the American people in the operation of our Defense Department, and as evidence of good faith to the youth of our country that they are not being sacrificed in an endless conflict due to miscalculation and cloudy objectives.

THE 100TH ANNUAL MEMORIAL DAY SERVICE AT ANTIETAM

Mr. **MATHIAS** of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MATHIAS** of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, when Americans throughout the world paused to observe Memorial Day, a ceremony of special significance was held at Sharpsburg, Md.

Just 100 years ago, on May 30, 1867, the veterans of the Grand Army of the Republic gathered at Sharpsburg, at the site of the bitter and bloody Battle of Antietam, for ceremonies commemorating the sacrifices made by men on both sides of that conflict. This May 30, at the 100th Annual Memorial Day Service at the Antietam National Cemetery, I was privileged to join many of my constituents in paying tribute to the courage and commitment of the brave Americans who have fought in all of our Nation's wars.

At a time when young Americans are dying for their country's principles every day in Vietnam, halfway around the world, it was especially appropriate for us to meet for this observance at Antietam, the site of the bloodiest major engagement ever fought on American soil. Through this service, we were reminded again not only of the tragedies of war, but of the continuity of our struggle to advance the basic tenets of liberty and justice upon which our Nation was built.

It was a particular honor to have as the major speaker on Tuesday, Maj. Gen. Charles E. Johnson, Chief of Staff of the 1st U.S. Army. In his remarks, General Johnson invoked the faith in America, and the will to defend her freedoms, which he described as "the foundation of individual responsibility to our Nation in her dedication to the defense of freedom in our troubled world.

Summarizing the ideological competition of the cold war, General Johnson called on all Americans to maintain perspective, to recall the price paid in the past to protect our national integrity, and to renew our obligations to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the officers and members of the Maryland Department of the American Legion deserve our thanks for their continuing sponsorship of these Memorial Day services at Antietam. Special thanks should go to Comdr. Woodrow F. Robertson and the men of Antietam Post No. 236, who have served our heritage so well by planning and directing this impressive commemorative ceremony.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues General Johnson's remarks, and also to include in the Record a summary of the first Memorial Day service, held at Sharpsburg just a century ago.

The 100th Anniversary: 1867–1967

One hundred years ago the Grand Army of Republic converged on the little town of Sharpsburg, Maryland on the 30th of May to hold very solemn services to commemorate the many from among them who had lost their lives in a very bitter conflict just passed. Most pressing in their thoughts was the war of many names but rightly a war of brother against brother. They came into the town by every kind of conveyance of the day. The main force came by rail and the N & W Railway and Antietam Station became headquarters for the occasion and the present day event.

History tells us of the many achievements they recorded for posterity. We see part of this today. The beautiful trees lining our western approach to this town were planted. We are told that the participants would have shade and be able to rest here, that some comfort would be given on their long march to Cemetery Hill. This occasion in those days took weeks of the participants' time as some sought and searched the fields of Antietam for knowledge of loved ones buried or lost here. Stories were exchanged leading sometimes to recovery of things very dear to them.

The state of Maryland recognizing the need for a burial place for Union dead at Antietam bought the site of the present day Antietam National Battlefield Cemetery and later gave this site to the Federal Government. Arrangements were made in nearby Hagerstown, Maryland to intern the Confederate dead in Rose Hill Cemetery. Feelings between the two groups still ran high at this period.

During later years the present day Battlefield was secured, but many years later real effort was put forth by many groups, of which the American Legion was outstanding, to enlarge, renovate and generally improve the Antietam National Battlefield site. Today among many other improvements the Burnside Bridge area stands apart from modern day living.

The 100th Annual Memorial Day Service as will be presented here this May 30th will be very much like the original services with the various bands playing prior to The Memorial Service, combined with a mammoth parade with participants from many places. The theme and purpose always remains the same—to memorialize the dead of all our country's war.

Address by Maj. Gen. Charles E. Johnson, Chief of Staff, First U.S. Army, at the Memorial Day Exercises, Antietam National Cemetery, Sharpsburg, Md., May 30, 1967

Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to share with Antietam Post 236 of the American Legion, and my fellow Americans, these Memorial Day exercises on this hallowed ground.

There is obviously nothing that my words can add to the record of valor that was written on this Antietam battlefield in the bitter fighting of September 1862.

This centennial monument and the other memorials here stand as the tribute of the American people to those who fought and died in the bloodiest single day of battle during the four long years of that war.

The men in gray under General Lee and those in blue under General McClellan—Americans all—fought each other well and bravely for what all believed to be right. Neither side won a victory that day, but the tide of war moved on until the nation was united once again—geographically and in spirit.

It was in this unity of spirit that the tradition of Memorial Day was born just one hundred years ago. With the passing of the years, this holiday has become a salute to the military dead, not only of the Civil War, but of all the conflicts in which our nation has been involved.

So, today, in ceremonies throughout our country, the American people are honoring our warrior dead of the past as well as those who are dying in combat even now in Southeast Asia, half-way around the world from this peaceful scene.

All of those we honor today have paid the highest possible price for freedom.

All were united in *faith* and *will*—*faith* in the worth of freedom and the *will* to defend it at the cost of life itself.

This *faith* and this *will* are the foundation of individual responsibility to our nation in her dedication to the defense of freedom in our troubled world.

Individual responsibility is inherent in defense of freedom from both external threats and internal dangers. Individual responsibility also is essential to our country's defense of other nations whose freedoms are in peril.

The need for armed strength to defend freedom is imperative in the race of the Communist threat that has confronted our country and her free world allies for the last twenty years. That challenge has not diminished in gravity since there is no let-up in the Communist tactics and drive to incite turbulence, exploit minorities, plot coups, falsify aims, exploit under-developed countries, and ignite and support so-called wars of national liberation.

Even as Hitler warned the world of his evil designs in "Mein Kampf," just as clearly have the Chinese Communists revealed their plans for global conquest in a militant eighteen-thousand-word document published on the 2nd of September 1965. In this manifesto they establish the precept that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun" and outline in detail their intent to eventually take over North America and Western Europe via continuing wars of liberation based, as a springboard, on the so-called rural areas of the world identified as being Asia, Africa and South America.

Possibly even more insidious and just as clear is the threat of international communism as promulgated and directed by the Soviet Union—a threat which has not really diminished in capability in spite of what some may think. It is *their* design to impose *their* brand of government on the world and follow that by installing *their* way of life—Socialist communism. As much as we in the free world mistrust and dislike communism as a thesis—that is, complete subordination of the individual to the state as a requisite for making a livelihood as specified by the state—I do not think we as a people or nation could object to communism simply as a social system that happens to be different from free enterprise. No, that is not the point! The thing that we object to is the *method* by which the Communists go about establishing the required conditions to enable them to *impose* their social system. The keystone credo of all Communists *is* that "the end justifies the means." No nation in history has freely and willingly embraced communism, including Russia. Each and every nation practicing communism has first had a totalitarian political system imposed upon it and *then* has been forced to accept Marxist-Leninist socialism or some facsimile thereof, whether they liked it or not! The pattern repeats itself through subversion, insurgency and outright aggression as we are experiencing now in Vietnam. Call that a war of liberation if you like, as the Communists do. But from *what* are free men being liberated?—the right to earn a living as they please or can? The right to vote? The right of protection by law?—the right of free speech? The option of a religion?—the right of freedom itself? Remember, the *chains* come only *after* a war of liberation, *or* insurgency, *or* a Communist coup, not before.

Our forefathers won our American heritage by two hundred years of blood, sweat, tears, cooperation and vision, culminating in a war amongst themselves—exemplified by the dead of this battlefield—to decide whether they would remain one nation under God or disintegrate—this war was one of the final acts which forced and unified our great country. Do we want to be liberated from all that we have won—from all this? It can happen. We have established *our* way of life—we have protected our system against every threat and at great cost. Within the framework of this ideal we have not hesitated in the past to help other countries in their pursuit of freedom or in resisting aggression as a prelude to oppression and the loss of freedom. No country has operated on such a plane of unselfishness. Certainly some self-interest was involved, but no country within the recorded history of this world has ever picked up the defeated enemy—freed him—fed him—clothed him—protected him, yes and even paid him. Few countries in modern times have offered the blood of their sons to protect the freedom and rights of other lesser countries. Ridiculous? Idealistic? Maybe. But if we want to preserve ourselves and our world from the Communist menace then someone has to do it. At this point in history it appears that this country is about the only one with the will, the guts, and the vision to do the job. Although it would seem that the United States has clearly presented its true character to the world, nevertheless we are being accused as imperialists, warmongers and worse, from without and from within. Why are our aims and intentions so misunderstood and maligned? Partly it is because the Communists have been successful in solidifying and propagandizing their lies against us. Partly it is because we are divided from within and the Communists are supporting and sometimes directing this divisiveness. Also, we have begun to question those eternal truths that we have always held as immutable and dear while at the same time not substituting anything of substance to fill the vacuum so created! And lastly we are *not* speaking out for our country.

Who will speak for the United States of America? By the Eternal God, I will!

Let us pay serious attention to the lessons of history. Great and wealthy nations of the past have fallen with almost mechanical regularity because their peoples lost their perspective. In each, the individual desire for self-gratification undermined the basic obligations of citizenship. Their indifference and their selfishness weakened the fiber of their nations so that they fell before nations less wealthy and less secure but which were willing to sacrific to achieve their goals. Who are *we* to suppose that we are different?

The freedom we enjoy today came to many of us on a silver platter. What we *have* of liberty was purchased by someone-else's blood in earlier times. A long line of fallen Americans beginning in 1776 and continuing to this very minute have paid the supreme price—*so* we could be free—*so* we could say what we want to say and *do* what we want to *do*. And all of *this so* that a small minority of misguided people could strike their country in the name of freedom—could dissent in the name of freedom—could even refuse the call to our nation's colors in the name of freedom—

I wonder what *these* honored dead would say to such dissenters. Would *they* say this is freedom of speech?

Would *they* say—this is freedom of assembly?

Would *they* say—these acts are consistent with safeguarding life and liberty?

Would *they* say—these acts are consistent with our great heritage?

I think not.

Freedom does not live simply because someone proclaims it through the land. It lives because of our collective efforts and collective sacrifices. It could not live long based on the pathetic, misinformed rantings of this minority of pathetic souls who challenge everything and anything just for the sake of dissent, or for a foreign power, or for their own self-indulgence.

Each of these dead in his own way, I think, would speak the thoughts that a brave American in South Vietnam expressed to his wife in these words:

"Please don't let *them* back *there* where *you* are sell me down the river with talk of despair and defeat. Talk instead of steadfastness, loyalty and victory—for we *must* and *can* win here. There is no backing out of Vietnam, for it will follow us wherever we go. We have drawn the line here and the America we all know and love best is not one to back away."

Therefore I say, let us go forth from this place with these thoughts and renew our obligations to our nation. By steadfastness and loyalty, let us show our gratitude to all the noble men who *have* died and *are* dying for our American heritage. *And above all*, let us speak out for America!

THREAT TO PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I join with millions of Americans in their alarm at the threat to the peace which exists today in the Middle East between the Arab nations and the State of Israel.

Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, and their Secretaries of State have publicly affirmed that we will protect the sovereignty of all Middle East nations.

Last week President Johnson reaffirmed the U.S. commitment to the territorial integrity of all nations of the area. He also stated that the United States considers the Gulf of Aqaba an international waterway. The President declared that "a blockade of Israel shipping is illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace."

It is proper that the United States should be committed to freedom of the seas, to its friends and to peace. Our position is sound, and we should abide by it.

As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I have been dismayed to review the record of U.S. foreign assistance to the United Arab Republic whose President Nasser threatens to destroy Israel and roars defiance at the United States.

Since 1946 American taxpayers have contributed over $1.1 billion in foreign aid to Nasser's Egypt. I well recall our efforts in the House in the recent past to cut off grain shipments to Egypt in the face of administration opposition.

For our assistance the Egyptian president has, on occasion, told us to go "drink sea water." Our Embassy has been stoned and U.S. libraries burned.

This week we have learned of the mutual defense pact signed by President Nasser with King Hussein of Jordan which has added to the explosiveness of the crisis.

Our Government also has been generous in its assistance to Jordan over the past 20 years contributing nearly $573 million including military assistance. The record also shows our Government has provided assistance to Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia totaling $473 million.

American assistance to these countries should be reevaluated, reviewed, and terminated if they are intent upon pursuing warlike policies against their neighbors or other nations.

The aggressive attitude of the Arab nations is being encouraged and fostered by the Soviet Union. On May 23, 1967, my distinguished minority leader [Mr. FORD] pinpointed the Soviet role in this crisis. He stated:

> During Moscow's May Day celebration only a few weeks ago, the Soviet Defense Minister, Marshal Andrei Grechko, issued an order of the day accusing the United States of "hatching sinister plots to spread aggression" in other parts of the world beyond Vietnam.
>
> Anyone who has studied Soviet tactics should have been forewarned that Moscow might be doing exactly what it was accusing its adversary of plotting. In my judgment this may be a bold and reckless move on the part of the Soviet communist leaders to divert the attention of the United States and Western Europe from the struggle in Southeast Asia.
>
> Since the Russian military chief's May Day order, trouble instigated by Communists has erupted in widely scattered areas of the globe—in the Sea of Japan, in Korea, in Hong Kong, and now in the Middle East—with the most serious consequences to the free world and to world peace.

Mr. Speaker, in these perilous days we hope and pray that the United Nations can successfully cope with this crisis. It must restore calm to the area, and work toward lasting solutions to the complex problems that have precipitated prolonged strife and struggle in this vital part of the world. Time is running out on the U.N. efforts, however.

The life of a young and free nation is at stake in the Middle East. Indeed the peace of the world may be at stake there. The best guarantee of keeping the peace in this explosive situation is to let the aggressors know that the free nations will not permit the success of aggression.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967 AS PROPOSED BY THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future this House will be called upon to pass judgment on the Social Security Amendments of 1967 as proposed by the administration. One of these amendments relates to the amount of outside earnings that people over 65 may have without losing any of their social security benefits.

The administration's proposal, as embodied in H.R. 5710, would increase the limit on outside earnings to $1,680—which is $180 higher than the present maximum.

Mr. Speaker, this increase amounts to under 50 cents a day—less than the price of a quart of milk and a loaf of bread. It is perhaps the understatement of the hour to say that this increase is far from adequate.

It is more appropriate, I believe, to term such a ceiling on the outside earnings of the elderly as absolutely unjust and inhumane. By condoning the continuation of ceilings on the earnings of the elderly, we are condemning many of them to poverty.

The way the law now operates, the social security retirement test is, in fact, an earnings test. It restricts the amount of income a person may earn without forfeiting part or all of his social security benefits.

It is probable—no, I shall say it is certain—that a sizable number of senior citizens are now forced to limit their earnings because the retirement test would make the losses in their social security benefits excessive. Seven years ago, in 1960, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimated that one-third of a million workers 65 or older could "be assumed to be deliberately holding their earnings to $1,200"—the limit then in effect—in order to receive full benefits.

Just 5 years ago, employment was the largest single source of income for the aged population. There is every reason to believe that, in 1967, gainful employment will be an even more important source of income for the older worker. I want to help make it so.

Mr. Speaker, we have every good reason to declare in this Congress that to continue to limit the amount of income persons over 65 can earn without reducing or eliminating their social security benefits can no longer be justified.

The most recent figures available show that one-third of the families over 65 took in less than $2,500 in 1965. Two-thirds had to live on less than $5,000. For single people, the picture was even worse. More than 71 percent of those living alone had incomes of under $2,000.

This situation exists among the Nation's elderly at a time when it is established Government policy that a person living on less than $3,000 is poverty stricken.

Mr. Speaker, this situation ought not to exist—not when we have hundreds of thousands of older citizens still able and wanting to work full time or part time to supplement their retirement incomes. Last year the Social Security Administration estimated that some 1.4 million persons over 65 years of age were engaged in full-time employment and another 900,000 held part-time employment.

These people ought not to be penalized because of their willingness and ability to continue earning. The policy of this Congress and this Federal Government of ours ought to be to encourage productivity, rather than discourage it. It ought to be designed to stimulate our citizens, both young and old, to earn as much as their talents and their opportunities will allow.

And a worker who has contributed to social security during most of his productive years should be entitled to all his benefits without any penalty because of his willingness and ability to continue earning.

It is for these reasons that I am today offering a bill which I believe will strike away the financial shackles from the senior citizens of America. This bill simply removes the ceiling on the amount of money retired people can earn and still enjoy full social security benefits.

I believe this is the most just thing we can do for the senior citizens of this country. I ask for your support.

AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY INSURANCE—OUTSTANDING PRESENTATION BY HERB JAFFE OF THE NEWARK STAR LEDGER

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege in recent weeks to discuss with the House my concern regarding automobile liability insurance. In continuation of the subject I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this body a series of articles recently published in the Newark Star Ledger written by Mr. Herb Jaffe. I would like to summarize in Mr. Jaffe's words the main grievances in this timely series.

Mr. Jaffe has pointed out the problem generally is that motorists are caught in an auto liability insurance squeeze, with skyrocketing premiums on one side, arbitrary cancellations on the other, and a tightening insurance market that has resulted in an unprecedented percentage of high-rate assigned risks.

It seems apparent that of the numerous complaints against the auto insurance industry, discriminatory cancellation by profession and age is the greatest concern to the people with skyrocketing prices not far behind.

New Jersey is faced with complaints in spite of its reputation as one of the most progressive States in the area of watchdog insurance legislation.

A law went into effect in New Jersey in 1965, which defines as unfair, methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts or practices in the business of insurance: "Making or permitting any unfair discrimination solely because of age in the issuance, withholding, extension or renewal of any policy or contract of automobile liability insurance or in the fixing of rates, terms or condition therefore."

Yet, various classes and categories of drivers exist in "agent guides" relative to age, sex, and marital status.

One major problem in this particular area is that racial and age discrimination cannot always be proven, although some form of discrimination is the very basis of all insurance for, as it has been put, there is simply "no other way to compute insurance."

Last year more drivers were canceled for lesser claims and violations while the assigned risk plan grew in membership. From all areas it seems evident that the assigned risk philosophy has become the bane of the controversial squeeze which surrounds the insurance industry. The plan includes anything from drivers who are surcharged because of their age to drivers and agents with records so bad that the motor vehicle department often steps in and revokes their license. But one of the more frequent complaints among drivers and agents is the industry's condemnation of motorists with one or two minor violations against an otherwise excellent record. These are the people who are forced to pay heavily for their one or two minor violations.

To concentrate on the main discontent of the auto insurance industry, indiscriminate cancellations and skyrocketing premiums, it is generally agreed that when one reaches the golden era age 65, he is accustomed to full social security, medicare, and pension benefits, and time for leisure and relaxation, along with higher premiums, assigned risk category, minimum coverage, and in many cases cancellation or nonrenewal of their auto liability policies, as indicated by statistics.

Obviously, the auto insurance industry is faced with many problems. What are the answers? Compulsory insurance or perhaps Federal intervention? The case for Federal intervention has produced the bills introduced in both Houses to create a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation.

As Mr. Jaffe cited:

> Automobile insurers cannot go on raising premiums to cover soaring garage and court awards; the public will not go along with these increases forever. The automobile is a social problem and together with traffic and safety problems should be treated just as industrial accidents were 40 to 50 years ago. That attitude gave rise to Workmen's Compensation laws, and something along this line is needed to cover the automobile.

An insurance official has stated himself that—

> Federal regulations may be the answer unless state commissioners use all the enforcement that they have now, or obtain new legislation with power to clean up areas detrimental to the public interest.

In conclusion, industry leaders have recognized the problem and have called for a study involving the appraising of present and alternate systems of indemnifying automobile accident victims with the objective of establishing in this country a method that will satisfy the real needs of society. In such an undertaking, there is the prospect of solving—the industry's—problems and of performing an important service for society as well.

I should like to congratulate Mr. Jaffe on an outstanding summary of the entire automobile liability insurance problem. I strongly recommend these articles to the Members of the House as a ready reference in evaluating this great social dilemma.

LETTER URGING ECONOMIC AID FOR ISRAEL IN THIS MOMENT OF PERIL

Mr. **BINGHAM**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BINGHAM**. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD of a letter which I have written to the President urging economic aid for Israel in this moment of peril. This would be a supplement to other actions which should be taken to secure peace in that area and to guarantee the international character of the Straits of Tiran. I insert a copy of my letter at this point:

MAY 31, 1967.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Few beneficiaries of U.S. economic aid have so justified our faith and confidence as has Israel. She has preserved and perfected her democratic character and has raised the living standards of her people. She has extended the hand of friendship to neighbors whose avowed hostility pre-dates the present crisis. Even at this moment of peril, Israel has resisted the impulse to break the illegal blockade which has stopped all trade through the Gulf of Aqaba—her only outlet to the East. The loss of use of this port is particularly grave in view of the fact that the UAR prevents use of the Suez canal to ships calling at Israel's Mediterranean Ports.

The current military crisis confronting Israel, and the impact of the blockade, threaten her economic stability and the well-being of her citizens. I think that this is a time when we must demonstrate our friendship for Israel and our confidence in her. Your restatement of our commitment to her territorial integrity and her right to free and innocent passage through the Straits of Tiran has been heartening. I suggest additional action.

I urge that the United States offer such economic aid to Israel as may be required under the circumstances to regain the momentum she has achieved in recent years. This economic aid should be prompt and adequate to tide Israel over a difficult period. It is justified on many grounds, not the least of which is that it goes to a democratic nation in need at a moment of peril.

Respectfully,
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

JUNE 2, 1946, A GREAT DAY IN ITALIAN HISTORY

Mr. **ANNUNZIO**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ANNUNZIO**. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, June 2, marks a thrilling and stirring event in the rich history of Italy. For on that day in 1946, the great Italian people gave a resounding vote of confidence for political democracy.

The beautiful land of Italy, washed by the blue waves of the Mediterranean and cradled within the Alps, has boasted of an advanced civilization for thousands upon thousands of years. Italy may be truly said to constitute a mosaic of human history. She is the font of Western culture—her legal system is a model for the West, her language is the tongue of music, and her Renaissance stands as one of man's greatest achievements. Yet throughout her glorious history, few more stirring events have occurred than the day, 21 years ago, when the Italian people chose a republican form of government.

Let us recall those early postwar years. In the devastation and destruction of World War II, Italy had suffered more heavily than any Western nation except Germany. Her civilian population had endured privations and suffering even more severe than the German citizens, and they had suffered more than two decades of oppressive Fascist rule under the dictator Mussolini.

In the immediate aftermath of the war, the most urgent political problem facing Italy was the need to establish a framework for effective democratic government. The task was a difficult one because of the multiplicity of political parties and because of disagreement over whether the monarchy should be abandoned or retained. In a nationwide referendum, held on June 2, 1946, the Italian people elected delegates to a constituent assembly to draw up a new constitution. In the same referendum the Italians were called upon to decide whether to keep the monarchy or turn to a republic with a president. By a margin of 2 million votes the Italian people voted for a republican form of government, an outstanding victory for political democracy.

Eleven days after the referendum, King Umberto II left Italy. In July the new Italian Government was established, based on the first free elections since 1921. In December 1947, the Constituent Assembly completed framing the new Italian Constitution, and on January 1, 1948, that historic document came into force. The way had been paved for the momentous task of rebuilding Italy. With the aid of the Marshall plan, the determined and ingenious Italian people launched upon a great period of economic, political, and social progress. In addition to outstanding postwar achievements on the domestic scene, Italy has also placed herself in the vanguard of European integration. Moreover, in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Italy has been and continues to be a stalwart, loyal Western ally.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we commemorate June 2, 1946, a proud day in Italian history, and, indeed, in the entire history of man's eternal striving for freedom. On this glad occasion, may I extend warmest best wishes to the people of that great Republic and to our many friends of Italian descent in my own Seventh District of Illinois, throughout the United States, and all over the world.

PUERTO RICAN PLEBISCITE

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, I introduced legislation to provide statehood for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico should citizens of that island indicate such a desire.

Identical bills have been sponsored by colleagues from both parties, and I solicit further pledges of support to assure the people of Puerto Rico that this matter will be acted upon when those people express their views. Repeated expression of our intent will remove whatever doubt may be created by the forces of communism now at work in an attempt to dissuade Puerto Ricans from choosing to move into our family of States.

The strategy of the Red conspirators in trying to preclude a closer link to this Nation is obvious enough: they foresee not only a stronger Union through the bond of statehood, but also greater difficulty for them to operate in an area that has become a prime target of Moscow's agents. Within easy reach of the Soviet base in Cuba and even closer to other Communist objectives, Puerto Rico as a State would present a new challenge to Russia's blueprint for revolution and encroachment.

Though small in area, Puerto Rico is nevertheless larger than Delaware and Rhode Island combined. She would rank 27th in population among the States. Her income from manufacturing exceeds that of a dozen other States and her great agricultural industry provides such commodities as coffee, pineapples, coconuts, and tobacco as well as vegetables and assorted other fruits.

Puerto Rico can become an important component of a Union that is the symbol of freedom and the major impediment to further Soviet conquest. So Red interference with plans for the July 23 plebiscite, as described in a recent article by Victor Riesel, is understandable. In order that my colleagues may familiarize themselves with what is taking place as the day of the referendum approaches, I insert in the Record the article, "Communists Plan Puerto Rico Terrorism," which appeared in the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat. It follows:

Communists Plan Puerto Rico Terrorism

(By Victor Riesel)

It may be Puerto Rico and not the big mainland cities which will have a long hot summer. The Vietnamese front may simply move thousands of miles eastward.

A network of dedicated revolutionists, devoted to Peking and Hanoi and somewhat disdainful of Moscow, are believed by federal authorities to be preparing to give the sunny island a dose of terror.

"You've been to Caracas," said one official. "You've had a machine gun poked into your car. You've heard the fusillades. You've noted the damage at U.S.-owned plants and stores. We believe the same type of wild ones are ready to repeat Venezuela in Puerto Rico early this summer to make a mockery of the plebiscite. They're calling for a civil war. They won't get it from the Puerto Ricans. But they'll try to embarrass us and discourage investments and keep people from working."

This plebiscite on Puerto Rico's future is set for July 23, which gives the network of interlocked Marxist-Leninist parties enough time to shake the cool from the Commonwealth.

Their target is obvious: Disrupt the people's vote on three propositions—the retention of Commonwealth status, statehood, or an independent nation, which would have to be voted by the Congress here.

Some of the network reaches into the mainland; so there might well be some explosive sounds in some of the megalopolises as far west as Chicago.

Biggest of the so-called independence movements is one with a representative in Czechoslovakia at the International Union of Students. This headquarters is in Prague, and it takes no deep analysis to know of its orientation.

It also has a permanent representative at the Cuban headquarters of the Tricontinental Congress. This was set up in January 1966 to coordinate with what the revolutionists agilely refer to as "wars of liberation in Asia, Africa and Latin America."

This alleged independence movement has its allies. One is the Federation of University Students for Independence—whose leaders have scurried as far as Mongolia (a costly trip) to participate in anti-U.S. global gatherings of students.

There is, too, the Puerto Rican Socialist League—no relation to the American brand advocated for so many decades by Norman Thomas. It is led by Juan Corretjer who believes the traditional Communist party has gotten too moldy. He teaches Marxism and Leninism. He champions Castro's Cuba. He is in close touch with the tiny cells of the New York based pro-Peking Progressive Labor party, a violent group of young, young people who were right in the midst of the '64 Harlem riots.

The party's chairman that year, William Epton, soon after was convicted of conspiring to riot and advocating criminal anarchy. After being sentenced to a year's imprisonment, he was released last Jan. 4. His was the first indictment in New York on criminal anarchy charges since 1919.

Senor Corretjer is socially and politically close with the Independence party of Puerto Rico and with the explosive Nationalist party of Puerto Rico. Some will recall its raw terrorism and its members' efforts to kill President Truman. Some will even recall how they did a wild west from the public balcony in the House of Representatives in '54 when they gunned down five congressmen.

This by no means insinuates that all those for the independence of Puerto Rico are allied with the terrorists. The political scientists expect the island to move slowly from Commonwealth status to statehood. Nor does the trigger-happy network have much strength on the mainland. But they are neo-revolutionists. And that's where the action is.

They can't stop the plebiscite. But they can embarrass such efforts as the cooperative venture of the Rockefellers' International Basic Economy Corp. (IBEC) and the proletarian, New York City-based International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

Under the leadership of the now honorary president David Dubinsky and the current president Louis Stulberg, the union put up $25 million in mortgage money for the IBEC to build individual homes for some 2,000 families. So here is America today—a union puts up millions for a billion-dollar family subsidiary so that low-income Puerto Rican workers can be housed in their own homes amid gardens and modern plumbing.

No revolutionist can tolerate this. So they plan to make a mockery of the free elections to prove that the long arm of the U.S., its industry and its labor, is too short to protect them from the new way-out radicalism.

It will be a short hot summer—fireworks and all.

BIRTHDAY SALUTE TO TUNISIA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today is Tunisia's 11th national holiday. Although these 11 years are not many in terms of the life of nations, they have been full and highly significant for the friendly people of Tunisia. The United States has enjoyed particularly close relations with Tunisia since its independence, and, indeed, even before that historic date. We have cooperated with Tunisia to help her to become a model of economic growth. We have seen with satisfaction how the Tunisians demonstrated that even a country poor in natural resources can give its people the promise of a better life it they want it enough and if they follow wise policies.

These wise, moderate policies are the work of a great man who has been the architect of Tunisian independence, and is now leading his country in its national effort of peaceful development. I refer to

President Habib Bourguiba. We rejoice with the people of Tunisia that this good friend of ours has made such a good recovery from the heart attack which he suffered last March, and we hope that he will soon be restored to perfect health.

It is, therefore, an honor and a pleasure to mark this notable milestone in the life of our Tunisian friends. We would hope that Tunisia's distinguished representative to Washington, Ambassador Driss, will convey to his illustrious President and to all of our Tunisian friends this message of sincere best wishes from the Congress and the people of the United States.

PRESIDENT'S PLAN FOR REORGANIZING GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has today received a plan for reorganization of the government of the District of Columbia. The purpose of the plan, as stated in the President's message, is to give the Nation's Capital "the most responsive and efficient government we are capable of providing.

I believe that the city of Washington has been extremely fortunate in the high caliber of the men who have served it as Commissioners. In addition, it is my judgment that this city has had as honest and dedicated a government as any city in the Nation. Nonetheless, I recognize that the problems of all cities are increasingly complex. Their solution demands that each city continually review its municipal government to find ways in which it can be improved. Washington is not an exception.

Accordingly, I welcome the proposal of a reorganization which is aimed at strengthening and improving a government which, like all city governments, can be strengthened and improved.

As I understand the proposed reorganization—and I intend to continue to study it closely—it will accomplish several things.

First, it will end divided executive authority. It will consolidate responsibility for running the District government in a single administrator to whom the Congress may look for enforcement of the laws we enact. In addition, the consolidation of authority in the single executive will bring more direct leadership for the employees of the government. I would hope that this would be an opportunity for infusion of a new and healthy espirit in the municipal government.

The plan will also lift from the executive the time-consuming responsibilities of hearings and decision with respect to the making of rules. Congress has, I know, in some 430 separate Code provisions, delegated rulemaking responsibilities to the District government. Today the Commissioners' time is taken with hearings and decisions necessary to the fulfillment of this responsibility. The plan would assign this to a new nine-man council which is to be bipartisan and broadly representative of the community.

The plan, however, keeps in mind its central objective—the strengthening of administrative leadership in the District. It provides the executive with authority to veto actions of the council which he disapproves, but recognizes that a broad community consensus represented by a three-fourths vote of the council members should be sufficient to override the executive's disapproval.

The proposed reorganization also draws strength from the experience of other cities which have tried and now given up the commission form of government. Only two other cities over 300,000 population retain the commission form.

I am making a particular study of the reorganization plan. I intend to give it very careful consideration and I urge other Members of Congress to do the same. We want to be sure we are taking the right step and also to be sure that this plan will improve the city of Washington. Washington merits the best government we can provide.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The gentleman will recall it was our understanding that an official representative from the White House would meet with and consult with our Committee on the District of Columbia, in order for us to learn more about this legislation before it was sent up. Unfortunately, that meeting is scheduled for next Tuesday.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes. I say that I am deeply sorry that has not taken place. I expressed myself yesterday and again today to the White House, that I felt it was a mistake to bring this up here without having done that.

On the other hand, it is here, and I do believe the plan ought to be given very serious consideration. I am sure the gentleman from Virginia, who has been deeply interested in the District of Columbia, will be happy to give it consideration if he feels it will improve the government of the District of Columbia.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state on the legislative reorganization bill for the District of Columbia that there has been consultation with a number of members of the committees, all of the committees involved, and we do have a period of time under the usual statutory provisions by which a bill is brought to the House under the reorganization plan in which to consider this. So there is an ample opportunity after the meeting on June 2 for us to go ahead. I would like to say I believe this is a step forward in trying to bring a single head and provide a legislative group for the District of Columbia. Those of us who sit on the District Committee are well aware a number of functions could well be carried out by a city council type of government such as is proposed in this plan, and we hope that the House will give it careful consideration. I know none of us on the committee have any feeling that we are being bypassed or in any other way are being avoided in this process, because I personally have had a number of contacts from members of the White House staff who worked on this. I know other members of the committee also have. So I will be very hopeful the House will give this matter its close consideration. Further I want to say that the committee will consider many legislative changes after this bill has been discussed if we feel they are necessary.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the other members of the District Committee who commented on this matter. Particularly I want to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to the President of the United States for the great concern that he has shown on this subject. Some of us have had some different ideas. Some of us have felt that the legislative route would have been, let us say, the better way to proceed. I am sympathetic to the position my good friend from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] expressed, but I do want to say that the President has spent a great deal of time and effort in this. I know to my own knowledge—and I am sure my colleagues who were at the meeting recently will join with me in this, because they know to their own knowledge—that he spent an hour and a half or better with a group discussing this subject. I am sure they will join me in commending him for this. I simply want to express on my own behalf my deep appreciation for the very sincere manner the President has approached this and the great amount of effort he has spent on a subject of a serious nature to the people of the District of Columbia.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my commendation to the President for the way in which he has approached the problem of reorganizing the District of Columbia government. I know representatives of the executive branch have offered for some time now to meet with members of the District Committee. The fact that a meeting is not going to be held until next Tuesday does not reflect any delay on the part of the executive branch but perhaps a difficulty on the part of the committee in arriving at a suitable date. I do believe that the President is deeply sincere in his desire to improve the District government. I think this was shown by his efforts last year to secure home rule for the District. I believe that he made a greater effort and spent more time and used the great prestige of his office more fully than it has ever been used before in order to secure for the District of Columbia the right to choose its own government.

Mr. Speaker, having failed in that—and those of us with him having failed in that effort and having recognized that failure—it does seem wise that the President should now seek to put the government of the District of Columbia under an improved form of administration.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House of Representatives will give sympathetic consideration to this proposal which has been carefully worked out by the President of the United States.

Briefly, the plan provides for a nine-member council, a commissioner and an assistant commissioner. These officials will be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the other body.

The members of the council must be citizens and residents of the District for 3 years preceding their appointments. The council membership is to be nonpartisan, and no more than six members shall be adherents of one political party. The council will have the rulemaking and other quasi-legislative functions which are now the responsibility of the Board of Commissioners. Their actions are subject to veto by the commissioner, unless the council overrides the veto by a three-fourths vote.

The commissioner will be responsible for the executive and administrative functions of the District government. He will have the help of the assistant commissioner. The commissioner or the assistant commissioner must be a resident and citizen of the District for 3 years prior to appointment by the President. The President has stated that he will look to the District first in selecting the commissioner. I think this is a wise decision; one of the problems of the government of the District of Columbia is that it is aloof from the residents, and I hope that the commissioner chosen by the President will be a citizen of the District who is familiar with its problems and people.

The chief benefit of this reorganization will be to make the District government more efficient. A number of newspaper stories in recent weeks have told of the drift and indecision in the District government which has prevented an energetic attack upon the problems facing the city. The District of Columbia is the only large American city which retains a commission form of government. Other cities have found it useful to adopt a mayor-council form of government, and I think it would be wise for the District to follow their example.

The plan will now be referred to the Government Operations Committee. I am sure the committee members will scrutinize the plan very carefully under the leadership of their distinguished chairman, who is also a longtime and highly regarded member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia. I hope the House will pay careful attention to the recommendations of the Committee on Government Operations.

In connection with my remarks, I would like to include an editorial which was broadcast on WTOP radio and television on February 27 and 28:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PLAN FOR THE DISTRICT GOVERNMENT

President Johnson's plan for improving District government deserves full support from Washington residents. It also merits prompt and favorable attention from Congress.

The President's idea is simply to make the city government of Washington more capable and more responsive. He wants to give it the benefit of vigorous one-man executive management by putting a mayor in place of the present three commissioners. At the same time he wants to broaden public participation in policy-making by turning the Commissioners' legislative work over to a 9-member city council. The mayor and council would be appointed by the President subject to approval by the Senate. This change would be made by a reorganization plan that the President will send Congress later. A Presidential reorganization plan takes effect unless Congress rejects it within 60 days. The approach makes possible a reform that Congress might not want to initiate by its own legislation.

Mr. Johnson also wants the District to be granted home rule. Hopefully Congress might some day be more willing to take the plunge into home rule if the municipal government had become more effective through reorganization. The mayor-council setup could provide a logical transition to an elected local government. The Presidential reform package also calls for giving the District a non-voting delegate in the House. This would be followed, hopefully, by a Constitutional amendment to give the District actual voting representation in Congress.

Approval of the Johnson proposals, in part or in full, would begin to put the District at last in a better position to deal with its many problems. The alternative is to go on accumulating problems faster than they can be handled by a Congress trying to function as a part-time city council for Washington.

This was a WTOP Editorial, James Hudgens speaking for WTOP.

PROPOSED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the other members of the Committee on the District of Columbia in asking the House to give very serious consideration to this proposal of the Executive.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia is the core city for a great metropolis which has all the problems—the social, crime, welfare, and health problems—the same complex problems which are comparable to those of the core cities of other metropolitan areas of the country. Yet, the District has a commission form of government which is hardly capable to seriously cope with these problems.

Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal is an attempt to create a single executive administrative head and a legislative branch, which I believe can better deal with the challenges just as the mayor-council form of government is presently utilized in most American cities.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that we will want to scrutinize the proposed plan with care and give it the serious consideration it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, while speaking upon District affairs, I would like to make one further comment. Mr. Speaker, I did not have the opportunity to comment during today's debate on the District revenue bill. I would like to commend the ranking Republican member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] for his diligent and untiring work to see that the Appropriations Committee has the necessary authorization to provide the funds needed so that the District of Columbia government can adequately serve the citizens of this city. I would like also to commend the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] for the efforts and interest which he also has invested in this legislation, so that the District of Columbia government can adequately serve the citizens of the city.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing appreciation to the President of the United States for his interest and concern in the welfare of our Nation's Capital.

I do regret, however, Mr. Speaker, that the President has chosen the Reorganization Act route in order to propose a change in the organizational structure of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on the District of Columbia is very much concerned about this problem. If the President of the United States had chosen the legislative route we would have been able to hold hearings on this matter by considering and making whatever changes in it which we felt were necessary as a result of the testimony presented at those hearings.

Mr. Speaker, by choosing this route of

approach he has cut off many changes that any Member of the House might want to make in this plan. In other words, the only alternative is to vote it down.

Mr. Speaker, the formulation and submission of this plan has been made in the smoke-filled rooms, under the guns over at the White House and here on Capitol Hill. We have no alternative to debate this measure and to make effective changes in it and to bring about what the majority wants to have done in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that in the absence of having the opportunity to fully debate this proposition and to amend it and to take advantage of the wisdom and pertinent ideas that we may receive from other Members of the House, I feel that a disapproval resolution should be filed and that this reorganization plan should be turned down.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia yield to me at that point?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Virginia not agree that there is nothing to prevent any of us who are on the Committee on the District of Columbia from holding hearings on legislative matters as to possible changes that would be appropriate to this reorganization plan? And, if we find, for example, that there were changes needed in it, after it goes into effect, which we do not believe are correct, there is nothing to prevent us from holding hearings thereafter and pass some legislation to make those changes as we believe are necessary.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. This approach would be somewhat ridiculous for us to proceed with hearings upon the legislation when the President has his gun pointed at our heads by having this reorganization plan pending before the Committee on Government Operations, which automatically becomes law if there is not a disapproving resolution by both bodies of the Congress within a period of 60 days, and it goes into effect.

Mr. ADAMS. No. No. I am talking, if the gentleman would pause for a moment, on the period of time, assuming that it becomes law, the 60-day period, we have the rest of this session, which is a year and a half basically, after that period of time to make any changes we may wish to make in that law that our committee deems appropriate. We could hold hearings on them and pass measures on them.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I fully agree with the gentleman. That is the reason I feel we should vote down this reorganization plan, and get into hearings on a new form of government for the District.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that with the serious crisis we have in the Middle East and the serious crisis we have in Vietnam, plus the $29 billion deficit which we are confronted with at this moment, we should be at this time obliged to get into a complicated reorganizational plan of the District of Columbia. I believe we should take time to study this matter, and to go into it when we do not have the other emergencies with which we are now confronted.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REORGANIZATIONAL PLAN

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, for many weeks the reorganization plan for the District of Columbia has been discussed, and I believe a lot of us would agree that some reorganization in the District of Columbia Government would be in order.

I have pleaded for weeks with representatives of the White House that a rough draft proposal be brought before our Committee on the District of Columbia so that we might review in detail such a plan, but only Monday of this week did I receive a copy that we here have today to examine it.

It is a pretty broad measure. I cannot honestly say whether I am for or against this proposal, because I am not familiar with the details on how it would be applied and what changes would be made. I had hoped that our Committee on the District of Columbia that has made such tremendous progress in our city could have had a chance to review it with the idea of making recommendations relative to the proposal if recommendations were in order, and would be found to an advantage, but we have not had that chance.

I do not take a position in opposition to the reorganization plan because I do not really know what it will do. Perhaps it is good and perhaps it is not good, but I believe in view of how our Committee on the District of Columbia has been working we should have had a chance to go into it carefully with the idea of making suggested changes, but here it is—take it or leave it. I believe the finesse of this whole operation has been very, very badly handled.

I do hope, however, that we will have a chance to review it in our committee. Beginning, I guess, next Tuesday, we are going to have hearings on it. I believe we should have had a chance to look this over in rough draft form before it was submitted.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REORGANIZATION PLAN

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if memory serves me correctly, when the President was a Member and majority leader of the other body, he opposed home rule for the District of Columbia. This message today is a most interesting development in the light of that position of other days.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1967 TO PROVIDE A BETTER GOVERNMENT FOR THE CITIZENS OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 132)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967 to provide a better government for the citizens of the Nation's Capital.

The explosive growth of the District of Columbia challenges the city on every front—from schools and hospitals, courts and police, to housing and transportation, recreation and job opportunities. If the District is to meet these tests and fulfill the needs of its citizens, it must, as I said in my message on the National Capital, "have the most responsive and efficient government we are capable of providing."

The plan I submit today is more than a matter of routine reorganization. Its vital purpose is to bring 20th century government to the Capital of this Nation: to strengthen and modernize the government of the District of Columbia; to make it as efficient and effective as possible.

The present form of District government was designed almost a century ago for a community of 150,000 people. The District government then employed less than 500 persons and administered a budget of less than $4 million.

Today Washington has a population of 800,000. It is the center of the country's fastest growing metropolitan area with a population of 2.5 million. The District's government now employs some 30,000 people and the proposed 1968 budget is more than half a billion dollars.

The machinery designed more than 90 years ago to govern a small community is now obsolete. The commission form of government—unorthodox when the Congress accepted it as a temporary measure in 1874—provides neither effective nor efficient government for the Nation's Capital. That form of government has long since been abandoned by the few cities which adopted it around the turn of the century. Today none of the Nation's 27 largest cities and only two of the country's 47 cities with populations exceeding 300,000 have a government of divided authority.

The District of Columbia is governed by three Commissioners. Each Commissioner is the chief executive—the mayor—but for only a part of the government. Yet, the problems of the District of Columbia, like those of any major city, cannot be neatly broken into three parts. Any effort to control crime, for example, cuts across virtually every function of government—from police and corrections to housing, education, health, and employment. An effective attack on the problem requires action by two or more Commissioners and the departments for which they are separately responsible—a time-consuming and often costly process.

The District has been fortunate in the caliber and dedication of the men who have served as Commissioners, but it can no longer afford divided executive authority. Its government must be able to respond promptly and effectively to new demands and new conditions. This requires clear-cut executive authority and flexible government machinery—not divided authority which too often results in prolonged negotiations and inaction.

The problem of divided executive authority in the District is aggravated by the additional nonexecutive responsibilities now borne by the Commissioners. As a member of the Board of Commissioners, each must now make rules and regulations on matters with which he is not otherwise concerned as an executive. Some of these quasi-legislative responsibilities—such as police regulations and property taxation—are of great importance to the city. Many—such as the naming the streets and the labeling of potato packages—are merely time consuming. None should require a substantial portion of the time of the chief executive of a major city.

The reorganization plan I propose would remedy these deficiencies in the present form of government. It would:

Unify executive and administrative authority.

Eliminate competing and sometimes conflicting assignments of responsibility.

Provide for the informed exercise of quasi-legislative functions through a Council which would be bipartisan and representative of the community.

Permit the single Commissioner to organize the District government to provide effective day-to-day administration.

Under the plan, subject to Senate confirmation, the President would appoint a single Commissioner as chief executive and a bipartisan Council of nine members. The Commissioner would serve a 4-year term, corresponding to that of the President. Council members would serve 3-year terms, with three members to be appointed each year. The staggered terms would insure continuity of experience on the Council.

The plan would abolish the present Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Its powers and responsibilities would be apportioned between the single Commissioner and the Council.

The Commissioner would be assigned the executive functions now vested in the Board of Commissioners. He would be given responsibility and authority to organize and manage the District government, to administer its programs, and to prepare its budget. The plan also provides for an assistant to the Commissioner to help him carry out these responsibilities.

The Council would be assigned the quasi-legislative functions now performed by the Board of Commissioners. The plan describes more than 430 functions which would be transferred to the Council. These include major responsibilities such as the approval of boundaries and plans for urban renewal, establishment of rules governing the licensing of professions, and setting of rates for property taxation. The Council would also be empowered to review and revise the Commissioner's budget before submission to the President.

Since the plan was announced in my message on the Nation's Capital, we have been working to strengthen the Office of Commissioner and the Council. Out of this process of refinement four key changes have emerged, and have been incorporated into the plan.

First, the plan would authorize the Commissioner to veto actions of the Council with which he disagrees. The Council, in turn, could override such a veto by a three-fourths vote of its members. This provides due recognition for the responsibilities of the chief executive, while at the same time preserving the right of the Council to act on matters of overriding importance.

Second, the terms of Council members would be set at 3 years instead of 2. The reduction in turnover and increase in experience would add strength to the Council.

Third, the salaries of the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Council members would be increased to reflect their important responsibilities.

Finally, the plan recognizes that the machinery of the District's government, no matter how modern, cannot realize its highest purpose unless it is infused with the most experienced, informed, and able leadership.

The 800,000 citizens of the District of Columbia deserve nothing less than such leadership, not only as a matter of fundamental right but because the District occupies a special and central role in the affairs of the Nation.

The best talent available must be found for the key posts of Commissioner and assistant to the Commissioner. The Commissioner is the chief executive of the District of Columbia. The assistant to the Commissioner will be his chief aide, his deputy, and will perform such duties as the Commissioner may prescribe.

In the search for leadership necessary in these crucial posts, the President and the Congress must balance the need to draw from the best talent in the Nation with the need for local experience and local involvement that are such valuable assets to enlightened municipal government. The plan therefore provides for the Presidential appointment of both these men, subject to Senate confirmation, with the requirement that at least one of them be a resident of the District for 3 years prior to appointment.

We would be indifferent to the cause of good government if the search and selection of the Commissioner and his assistant were confined only to those who reside within the geographic boundaries of the District. This plan does not take that course. It provides a wide range of choice—opening the field not only to those who reside in the District, but to those who live in other parts of the Nation. At the same time, the plan assures that local experience will be well represented in the highest councils of the District government.

Not only must either of the top executive positions be filled with a District resident, but each member of the nine-man Council must have been a resident of the District for at least 3 years prior to appointment.

Moreover, in selecting the Commissioner, I will look first to the residents of the District and I hope that he can be found here.

Of all the benefits of the plan, one stands out in particular—the strong leadership it provides as the cornerstone of support for any effective attack against crime. With that leadership and with the continued commitment and devotion of its police, the District can move with a greater sense of sureness and purpose against the specter of crime that haunts the streets and shops of the Nation's Capital.

Of all the duties of the new single Commissioner none will be more important than his leadership in a renewed community effort to stem the rising tide of crime in the District.

The reorganization plan has been prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code. At my direction, it has been discussed with each member of the interested committees of Congress or with their staff assistants. I have found, after investigation, that each reorganization included in the plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of title 5 of the United States Code.

I have also found that it is necessary to include in the plan, by reason of the reorganization made, provisions for the appointment and compensation of the new officers specified in sections 201, 203, and 301–303 of the plan. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are comparable to those fixed for officers in the executive branch of the Government having similar responsibilities.

The functions which would be abolished by the provisions of section 503(c) of the reorganization plan are provided for in subsection (e) of section 6 of the act of March 3, 1925, 43 Stat. 1121, as amended—District of Columbia Code, section 40–603(e).

The plan would not impair the corporate status of the District of Columbia government. Nor would it any way detract from the powers which the Congress exercises with respect to the District.

This reorganization plan would provide improved management of the municipal responsibilities vested by Congress in the government of the District of Columbia. It would bring savings to the District taxpayers and the Federal Government, although overall costs will not be less because of the increasing scale and complexity of municipal government. The precise amount of such savings cannot be itemized at this time.

The proposed reorganization is in no way a substitute for home rule. As I stated in my message on the Nation's Capital, the plan "will give the District a better organized and more efficient government . . . but only home rule will provide the District with a democratic government—of, by, and for its citizens."

I remain convinced more strongly than ever that home rule is still the truest course. We must continue to work toward that day—when the citizens of the District will have the right to frame their own laws, manage their own affairs, and choose their own leaders. Only then can we redeem that historic pledge to give the District of Columbia full membership in the American Union.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 1, 1967*.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S BLUEPRINT FOR MODERN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has given District of Columbia residents something to cheer about. The President's reorganization plan will provide the District with the kind of government it desperately needs to meet its obligations to 800,000 District of Columbia residents.

The President has come to grips with the most controversial aspect of District of Columbia government—the present three-man Board of Commissioners. He recommends instead a single Commissioner who will govern in concert with a nine-man Council. The single Commissioner will possess the authority and responsibilities now vested in the three-man body. And the Council will be assigned quasi-legislative functions now vested in the Board of Commissioners.

The President has provided the framework for a modern, urban government that will surely be more effective in handling the burdens and problems of the District than the present Board of Commissioners.

President Johnson's plan calls for clear-cut executive authority and flexible governmental machinery in administering the needs of the District. While the President notes that home rule is still the best and most meaningful course for the District, I believe his reorganization plan will be an effective tool for progress until home rule can be achieved.

I warmly endorse this reorganization plan. And I urge the Members of the 90th Congress to act promptly and positively to support this plan to bring District of Columbia government into the 20th century.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, as one Member who has long supported meaningful home rule for the District, and realizing the present climate of the Congress, I rise to support the President's plan to reorganize the government of the District of Columbia.

The plan meets a long-felt need to bring effective and efficient organization to the government of the large metropolitan area now concentrated in the District of Columbia. Under the plan a single Commissioner would preside as chief executive, in place of the present three-headed body which governs the District. He would have the necessary authority to organize and manage the District government. He would be responsible to the Congress for execution of the laws. He would prepare the budget and would have authority to veto actions of the council with which he disagreed subject to being overridden by a three-fourths vote of the council members.

The Commissioner of the District of Columbia appointed under the plan would be subject to Senate confirmation. He would serve a 4-year term. There would be an Assistant Commissioner to assist him in carrying out his executive responsibilities in running one of the country's largest and fastest growing metropolitan areas.

The single-executive type of government has proved to be the most efficient management tool in cities of comparable size to Washington.

Along with the Commissioner the plan proposes the establishment of a nine-man Council which will be responsible for making the local rules for the District of Columbia. Congress has delegated such authority to the District government in some 430 different code sections. The making of these rules now consumes valuable time of the Commissioners. Reassignment of the responsibility to the Council will afford broader representation for the community as well as significant savings in time of the city's executive officer.

In addition to its responsibility for the making of rules, the council would be empowered to propose revisions to the Commissioner's budget of expenses and revenues. Where the Commissioner does not concur in a proposed revision the council may insist upon the revision by a three-fourths vote.

As the President stated in his message on the Nation's Capital, the proposed reorganization would "bring urgently needed improvements to make the present unwieldy structure into an efficient and effective instrument of municipal government."

I commend the plan for favorable consideration.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I endorse strongly the President's reorganization plan for the District of Columbia. Under this plan, the District will for the first time be able to organize its government to meet the challenges of modern America.

The problems which today face our local governments have become increasingly evident both to the Congress and to the executive branch. During the 20th century America has emerged as an urban society. At the same time, however, our central cities have been under siege from the stresses of age, congestion, pollution, inadequate tax resources, and a host of other urban ills. In this respect, Washington has shared a common experience with other large cities of the Nation.

In recent years, however, Congress has come to recognize these problems and has authorized many new programs to help make our cities more livable. In all of the programs—demonstration cities, community renewal, mass transportation, et cetera—local government plays a key role. In fact, unless local government is responsive, flexible, and imaginative such Federal programs cannot meet their objectives.

While many American cities are organizing to meet these challenges, we find that the District of Columbia is shackled by an outmoded, restrictive form of city government. The President's reorganization plan is designed to remedy this defect. Under the terms of the plan, the District government will be restructured so as to provide effective administrative leadership under a single Commissioner.

Today the District is headed by three Commissioners. The first Hoover Commission stressed a fundamental point of administrative management—a plural executive is a notoriously inefficient choice to administer executive functions. It is evident that this is true in the case of the District of Columbia.

Many of today's programs do not fit easily into simple categories of Government administration. A wide-ranging program, such as that for the "model cities" involves a host of District agencies and services if it is to be carried out effectively. In Washington, however, because there are three Commissioners, each assigned responsibility for certain of the city's administrative agencies, a city department head cannot look to a single individual for guidance in carrying out such a program. Rather, some agency heads look to one Commissioner, others to a second, and still others to a third. It is no wonder that in this welter of extended communication lines and confused responsibilities the programs designed to serve District residents are not as effective and efficient as they should be.

Under the provisions of the reorganization plan, all District agency heads will be responsible to one Commissioner for direction; a single responsible official will be able to insure that District programs operate without cross purposes and overlapping. Jurisdictional issues, staffing problems, and other administrative conflicts will not be lost in the maze of a multiheaded executive, as is the case today. Rather, the residents of the District, the President, and the Congress will be able to hold a single individual responsible for effective administration within the District.

As the nature of our urban problems changes and new responses are called for, city government must be reorganized to promote these responses. The plan will allow the Commissioner, with authority similar to that accorded Cabinet officers in Federal departments, to make internal changes in District government organization in order to reflect current needs. Programs now carried out by scattered and diffused agencies can be brought together for concentrated action. A much greater consolidation of the District's housing and manpower activities, for example, could lead to substantial progress in these areas of great concern to the citizens of the District.

Another feature of the plan, which

establishes a nine-member council, is also a significant step forward. While it is in no way a substitute for home rule, careful selection of the council's membership will allow a degree of representation for the city's varied community interests. Freed from the existing mixture of administrative and legislative type duties, the council members will be able to devote more time to the regulating and rulemaking function than the commissioners find possible today. More thoughtful and effective rules and regulations should be forthcoming.

Hopefully, the more representative character of the council will be reflected in decisions on the District's annual budget. The budget, after all, represents an ordering of priorities for improving the nature and character of life in a great city. The nonpartisan council, in reflecting the needs and desires of the District's residents, will have a significant impact on these priorities. The budget, as a result, should more truly represent the wishes of the citizens than is now possible.

I believe that the reorganization plan is an important move toward achieving the goal set forth by the President earlier in this year, that of making Washington "a city in which all Americans can take pride." The plan will allow the District to move up in the ranks of American cities with a responsive, efficient, and streamlined government organization structure. I urge that the Congress support this plan.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, The President has presented a workable and efficient plan for reorganizing the government of the District of Columbia. Its effect would be to make the District of Columbia government more responsive to the needs of the community. At the same time it would provide wider representation of community interests than can be afforded at present. Under present arrangements executive authority is divided among the three members of the Board of Commissioners. This means deliberation and inevitable delay in arriving at decisions. There is, moreover, no official body reflecting to the Board the views of the community at large. Under the plan executive authority would be vested in one Commissioner, who would provide a single source of direction and have authority for prompt action. All agency heads would be accountable to the Commissioner, who would appoint and remove them and set the limits of their authority and responsibility.

In the nine-member council the community would have the wider representation which is lacking in the present three-member Board. Council members would serve 2-year staggered terms, thus insuring continuity of experience and providing the opportunity for replacement when circumstances justified a change.

I support approval of the plan.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the President's plan to reorganize the government of the District of Columbia is a good one. The Nation's Capital requires, and the citizens of the District of Columbia deserve, a government so organized and equipped that it can deal effectively with the problems of the 1960's and the years ahead, not those of almost a century ago. A dynamic and changing society cannot be well governed by stagnant institutions. The Nation can no more afford obsolescence in its governmental machinery than in its industry, its science, or its medicine. Old routines and outdated organizational structures are poor engines of progress.

The single Commissioner and nine-man council will give the District a better organized, more streamlined, and efficient government; but the Commissioner and councilmen will have no functions beyond those the three Commissioners now possess. In large measure, what the plan does is place in a single Commissioner those functions which the three Commissioners now perform as individuals—thus substituting one executive for three executives—and places in a collective body those functions which the present Commissioners perform as a Board. The new structure, closely approximating the distribution of functions under a mayor-council form of government, will make the transition to self-government easier. But only home rule will provide the District with a democratic government fully responsive to the needs and wishes of its citizens.

The basic structure of the District government has remained unchanged for almost 100 years. When the commission form of organization was established, the District was a community of 150,000, with a government employing less than 500 persons. Today the District has 800,000 residents, and some 30,000 people work for the District government. Given the size and complexity of the District government and the urgency of the problems facing the District, as one of the Nation's fastest growing metropolitan areas, we cannot hope to provide the best and the most efficient municipal government unless we apply the techniques of modern management and adapt the government structure to present-day needs.

Each Commissioner is today the chief executive within specified program areas. One acts as Commissioner of Public Works, another as Commissioner of Public Safety, and the third as Commissioner of Health and Welfare. This makes it difficult to deal effectively with problems which cut across the areas of two or more Commissioners—as is increasingly required to develop and administer programs to solve the most urgent current municipal problems, such as juvenile delinquency, poverty, and law enforcement.

As a member of the full Board, each Commissioner makes rules and regulations on matters with which he is not otherwise concerned as an executive. Inevitably, each tends to be the dominant legislator on those programs which he administers.

The present Commissioners are dedicated and conscientious men. But compelled as they are to function in multiple and sometimes conflicting roles, they do not have adequate time to devote to any one of them.

By separating responsibility for the performance of executive duties and the responsibility for the performance of quasi-legislative and regulatory functions, the reorganization plan conforms to modern management theory and practice within the Federal Establishment and in major cities. The first Hoover Commission amply documented the deficiencies of plural executives. The Commission stated in its report on "Regulatory Commissions":

> Purely executive duties—those that can be performed far better by a single administrative official—have been imposed upon these commissions with the result that these duties have been sometimes performed badly. The necessity for performing them has interfered with the performance of the strictly regulatory functions of the Commissions.

Experience with the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia completely supports the Hoover Commission's findings.

While the plan properly calls for separation of exclusively executive functions from those which are concerned primarily with making rules and regulations affecting private rights and interests, it provides also certain essential checks and balances. The mayors of most of our major cities, including New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Detroit, Denver, and Honolulu, have the power to veto ordinances passed by the city council. If the Commissioner is to function effectively it is necessary that he also have the power to veto actions of the District of Columbia Council with respect to rules and regulations, penalties and taxes, except for matters related to the internal organization and functioning of the council. Under the plan the Commissioner will have the right to veto. The council, of course, retains the power to override any veto by a three-fourths vote of the council members present and voting.

Today only three of the Nation's 47 cities of over 300,000 population have a commission form of government, and the largest of these, Memphis, has voted to go to a mayor-council form of government in 1968. The rollcall of cities which have abandoned the commission form of municipal government since 1940 includes Birmingham, Houston, Jersey City, Newark, Camden, Duluth, Erie, Trenton, El Paso, San Antonio, Des Moines, Spokane, Tacoma, Fresno, New Orleans, and Omaha. I urge that we add the District of Columbia to this distinguished roster.

Centralization of authorities for performance of executive duties in a single Commissioner will make for more efficient administration of the laws enacted by the Congress and the regulations adopted by the council. Centralization of authority for quasi-legislative functions in a nine-member bipartisan council appointed by the President will permit a broader and more effective participation of community interests in the formulation of basic rules and policies.

Good government in the Nation's Capital is not a partisan matter. The reorganization plan is complex in detail but simple in purpose—to provide a government structure capable of meeting efficiently the needs of the country and the citizens of the District of Columbia. I am confident that it will have the support of the Congress.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Mark Twain once noted that loyalty to a petrified opinion never broke a chain or freed a human soul.

That conviction is the real meaning of President Johnson's message to us this morning on the reorganization of the District of Columbia government. For whatever else you might say about the District, its form of government is petrified. It is a historical anachronism.

As the President points out, the present form of government was designed nearly a century ago for a community of 150,000 people. The government at that time employed less than 500 individuals and administered a budget of less than $4,000,000.

The President notes:

> Today, Washington has a population of 2.5 million. The District Government now employs some 30,000 people and the proposed 1968 budget is nearly one-half billion dollars.

Now we know that the District of Columbia can continue to limp along under its present form of government, with its divided authority and with its inefficiency. There is still room for further deterioration.

The schools can become more crowded; we can even stack the desks in tiers.

Crime can become worse—although we probably would have to turn some of our hotels into jails if it did.

Our slums can continue to deteriorate—although not much.

Our health problems have not actually reached epidemic proportions yet.

And our traffic jams do not even begin to compare with those of Los Angeles.

Yes, we still have a little way to go before the District reaches rock bottom. And we have a long, long way to go before the District reaches the point where it can be the model city for the freest and richest nation on earth.

The question now before us is this: Do we want to continue the short slide down to the bottom, or do we want to begin the long journey to the top? President Johnson has clearly chosen the latter course, and I support him.

He has called for a complete reorganization of the District of Columbia government.

Specifically, he has asked that the present three-man Board of Commissioners be replaced with a single Commissioner and a nine-man council. This plan would replace administrative confusion with a clear and efficient chain of authority. It would make the District government more responsive to the needs of the citizens and to the desires of the Congress.

I endorse this plan. And I urge my colleagues to give it their fullest support.

This is not a partisan matter; this is a practical matter—and a very urgent one at that.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the reorganization plan for the government of the District of Columbia which the President has presented to us today represents a recognition and an attempt to solve the need for more effective management of governmental affairs in Washington, D.C.

The President has found, after extensive study of the present governmental setup in our Nation's Capital, that governmental responsibility can best be served by a mayor-council form of government—a single executive in tandem with a quasi-legislative body of nine members. The resulting executive-legislative arrangement follows the doctrine of separation of powers on which the Federal, State, and most municipal governments rest.

Mr. Speaker, as the President so well points out, the problems of a city, and particularly a city of 800,000 citizens, do not respect jurisdictional lines nor can they be solved by a commission form of government where responsibility is divided and overlapping discouraged. The President's message points to only one example:

Any effort to control crime, as an example, cuts across virtually every function of government.

To paraphrase President Truman, the District of Columbia needs somewhere for the "buck" to stop. The present three-member Commission does not adequately provide for an overall responsibility for actions by the city government. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Commissioner and nine-member council would give Washington a council responsive to the needs and wishes of the citizens combined with a Commissioner with whom would rest the authority and responsibility to carry out the executive functions of city government.

Mr. Speaker, the President has given us a workable and worthwhile plan for reorganizing what was meant 90 years ago to be a temporary solution. I believe the Congress should signify its approval of the President's reorganization plan.

THE NATIONAL GUARD

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the speculation in the press recently concerning alleged plans by the Secretary of Defense to reorganize the Reserve components of the Army. According to the press accounts I have seen, Secretary McNamara intends—among other things—to inactivate 15 combat divisions of the National Guard, including the famed 45th Infantry Division from Oklahoma. I need not take up your valuable time citing the outstanding combat record this Oklahoma division has compiled through World War II and Korea. The division has the unique distinction of being involved in four D-day landings during World War II—Sicily, Salerno, Anzio, and southern France. Sicily, of course, was the first major amphibious landing on the European continent in that conflict. It was one of two divisions—along with the 42d Infantry Division, another National Guard division—which liberated the prisoners who survived the hell at Dachau. During World War II, the division spent 496 days in actual combat duty in the line. Five of its members received the Medal of Honor. Casualties ran to more than 20,000 men.

In Korea, it was one of the first four National Guard divisions mobilized. And it was the first National Guard division to blast the Communist enemy in Korea. It won recognition as one of the toughest fighting units in our superb 8th Army, which has never been surpassed in its ability to fight—by any Army in the history of the world.

Under Mr. McNamara's alleged proposal, this division—and many other divisions of the National Guard—would fade into the dusk of history, the victim of a man who has virtually thumbed his nose, not only at the Congress, but also at long-cherished prerogatives given it under the Constitution. I should think that the honorable Secretary of Defense would have concluded long ago that while he might have fooled some people into believing he is omnipotent, he certainly has not blinded the Congress, particularly men like the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS.

I think evidence of that fact can be found in many of the actions taken by the Congress since the first day the current Secretary of Defense came to Washington. Certainly, Mr. McNamara could find little sense of victory in his ill-fated attempt of 2 years ago to merge the Reserve components of the Army. He was thwarted in that effort just as he's been thwarted in his attempts over the past 2 years to eliminate valuable Air National Guard air transport units. We have the 137th Military Airlift Wing and the 137th and 138th Military Airlift Groups in Oklahoma, and I know firsthand what a contribution they have been making to the Nation's war effort. Each of those Air Guard units, for example, has been averaging three flights a month to Vietnam. And so have the other 23 Air Guard airlift units in the United States. Mr. McNamara does not recognize this performance any more than he has ever recognized the contributions of the National Guard. I have the feeling at times that he holds the same respect for the National Guard as he held for Chevrolet when he was trying to peddle the ill-conceived Edsel.

Mr. Speaker, I do not care to characterize myself—a freshman Congressman out of the wheatfields of Oklahoma—as a military expert. But I did not leave the commonsense so characteristic of a farmer back there in the wheatfields when I came to Washington, either.

I do not believe I would represent the attitude of my constituents if I remained silent on this issue, because to them—and to me—the elimination of the 45th Division just does not make good sense. The mere suggestion that the 45th would be eliminated cuts deeply—and its retirement would represent a deep personal loss to me and to my fellow Oklahomans.

Now this reported proposal of Mr. McNamara concerns me because it seems that he is steering a rather perilous course. To me, it does not take a military genius to recognize that a reduction in our National Guard and Reserve forces at a time when our Armed Forces are stretched to what must be near their elastic limit just is not the wise and prudent road to a solution.

I am aware, of course, that the realities of military power and defense posture have changed over the years. War, itself, has changed drastically from what it was just a few short years ago. I am aware, also, that we cannot build military forces today without looking into the future—to the demands of the 1970's and the 1980's. But as every day passes, it becomes more evident than ever to me that we must not build for our own safety and survival alone, but for the safety and survival of the entire free world as well.

For that reason, I believe that a reduction of our combat divisions is a risky and shaky business. I would like to point out that in recent years, 14 divisions already have been eliminated from the Army's Guard and Reserve structure. And I say to you today—at a time when we might very well be standing on the precipice of world war III in the Near East—that this Nation has never gone into a conflict with enough organized, trained, and equipped divisions to carry it through the first few crucial months of battle.

Now, if what we read in the newspapers is correct, Mr. McNamara would reduce the current number of 23 National Guard divisions by 15 divisions—leaving a mere eight divisions as the backup to our Active Forces. That seems about as reasonable as allowing a professional football team to have only eight substitutes on the bench. Under those circumstances, the coach would have to quit halfway through the game or end up playing out his 60 minutes with about half of his team sidelined with injuries.

Now, we have already lost 10,000 dedicated, patriotic and brave Americans in Vietnam. Thousands more have been wounded. Mr. McNamara paints a rosy picture of our Active Forces and maintains there is no need to mobilize the Guard or the Reserve. But he has raised serious doubts about our intentions with our friends—if we have any left—in Europe when he proposed to reduce our forces there. Now, he says, too, that there is no pilot shortage, but I noticed that 3,700 Air Force men who had planned to retire had their plans suddenly and unwillingly changed the other day, when they were told they might have to remain on active duty another year.

I am not a poker player—and I know very little about the game. But I would say that if Mr. McNamara's actions in the field of diplomacy were translated into a few bluffs in a poker game, he would soon be writing I O U's. His "credibility gap" would be so broad that the rest of the players would be laughing all the way to their banks. And they would be standing in line the next time around, eagerly awaiting their chance at the fellow who was gullible enough to believe he was fooling everyone.

What are Mr. McNamara's motives in this alleged proposal of his? Is he trying to "streamline" the Reserve components as the press reports? Or does he really have something else in mind? What are his long-range plans? Certainly, none of us could be expected to answer that question. But would it be beyond comprehension to think that Mr. McNamara really sees the elimination of the entire National Guard in the future? Would it be beyond comprehension to think that this step is merely one of many to come in the future that would eventually eliminate these forces for which he holds so little respect?

I believe that his track record demands that his motives not only be questioned, but be questioned seriously and in depth.

Let me say that I think National Guard divisions provide the best command framework on which to build and maintain a responsive reserve of combat power for the Army. They are organized and trained in consonance with current Active Army concepts. They are commanded and staffed by experienced and well-trained combat officers. They have developed a solid chain of command, a facility for effecting operational coordination, and a healthy esprit de corps. These divisions have attained a high degree of mobilization readiness; they would become combat deployable when given a proper fill of individually trained soldiers, serviceable equipment, and a few months of postmobilization time to integrate new resources and to complete advanced level training. Newly organized divisions would require an extended period of time to attain a combat readiness posture.

It seems to me that Mr. McNamara is not asking for reorganization of the National Guard, but for disorganization of that splendid military force. It seems highly irrational to me for a Secretary of Defense to seek a reorganization at a time when the world situation is so tense and unpredictable. It would appear to be highly dangerous to tear apart an organization that is so well organized at a time when the Nation might well need its services at any moment.

I believe that a more proper course for this Nation to follow would be one of strengthening or even expanding the National Guard. Mr. McNamara—instead of pulling the fangs from our National Guard tiger—should seek ways of making it a more meaningful and powerful tiger, give it a growl and a bite that we could all recognize, including any prospective enemy who might be looking very closely at what we have in our Reserve forces stockpile.

Any careful analysis of the defense responsibilities being performed by the National Guard reveals that Mr. McNamara is seriously lacking in his analysis of information of military and economic realities of life. Every year he comes over here bragging about how much money he has saved the American taxpayer. And in spite of all these savings, I note that we are never able to find any reductions in the overall Defense Department budget.

Be that as it may. However, I say that Mr. McNamara has not investigated the possibilities of really saving the American taxpayers money. He has not seriously reviewed an expansion of the National Guard that would allow it to assume many of the missions now being performed by the active services. It is not inconceivable that the National Guard could take over many of the responsibilities now being performed by the active military forces, just as it has many of the responsibilities for the Nation's air defenses and military airlift. I do not think too many people are aware of the facts, but the Army National Guard maintains 43 percent of the Nike Hercules missile sites guarding the continental United States. The Air National Guard provides 52 percent of the fighter interceptors defending our shores. The Army Guard and the Air Guard, working together, provide 100 percent of the air defenses for Hawaii. The Air Guard is flying 200 overseas missions a month for the Military Airlift Command, 75 of them in support of Southeast Asia. And there is seldom an exercise carried out today that does not find a major share of the participating forces units of the National Guard.

It is obvious to anyone who reviews these performances without bias that they are being performed by the Guard at a fraction of the cost that accrues when they are performed by the active establishment. This fact should not be too difficult to understand. It is easy to see that the National Guard does not require the investment of PX's, commissaries, hospitals, barracks, and many other items demanded by an active duty operation. The guardsmen live at home. They shop in their communities. Their States and communities support their operation by providing many of the services that would be required of the Federal Government were it an active service operation.

Now I do not think Mr. McNamara—or anyone else, for that matter—can argue about the professional capabilities of the guardsmen. If he does, I suggest that he review the firing records of the National Guard Nike units with those of the Active Army units. If he does, I suggest he review the achievements of the Air Guard in the worldwide missile meets, known as William Tell. If he does, I suggest that he look at the safety record of the Guard's air transport units. I can assure you, gentlemen, that Guard performance not only measures up to the quality of the active establishment, but quite often even surpasses it.

Mr. McNamara and his cohorts who attempt to control the press over there have not seen fit to emphasize these very important facts about the National Guard. I cannot recall—except for a statement that he made during the Berlin crisis of 1961 when the Army and Air National Guard were mobilized—that Mr. McNamara has ever expressed publicly any confidence in the National Guard whatsoever.

As a matter of fact, statements issued by the Department of Defense in recent months have tended to undermine both public confidence and national pride in the National Guard. As a result, we find many Americans believing that the National Guard is a haven to escape eligibility from the draft. We find many Americans believing that the National Guard is composed primarily of professional football players and political incompetents. We have many Americans believing that the National Guard has not been mobilized for Vietnam because the Department of Defense does not have any confidence in it. There is even a distinguished Member of the other body who has stated that the Guard "neither guards nor trains."

Well, I say these conclusions are as preposterous and as ill founded as those which held that Mr. McNamara might make a good President of the United States.

The Guard is composed of dedicated, patriotic, capable, and hard-working Americans whose record over 300 years speaks for itself. The National Guard has nothing to be ashamed of when it comes to battle streamers. And there are thousands of communities in this Nation of ours who found the National Guard a pretty comforting sight during a local emergency or disorder. It has not been mobilized for Vietnam not because it could not perform its mission, but because it has not been politically or diplomatically expedient to mobilize—at least, as yet it has not been politically or diplomatically expedient. I am sure that my Democratic friends might not think too callously of this Republican if I were to suggest that this situation might take on a different character with a presidential election looming ahead in 1968.

Now, I have gone on for some time here. But I think it is high time someone came to the defense of the National Guard. In conclusion, just let me say that I think Mr. McNamara's suggested reorganization is improper, imprudent, and illogical. I believe that he could not have found a more hazardous time in which to tear up an organized and trained military force. And I believe that if Mr. McNamara is really interested in saving the American taxpayers' money he should take another look at the Guard and find a way to expand and strengthen rather than reduce and weaken its capabilities.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I should like to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for his splendid remarks. I believe they were outstanding. I certainly agree with about everything he has said today.

I had the honor of serving beside the 45th Division in World War II. It was a splendid outfit. They did a wonderful job fighting across Europe.

I am saddened, too, that 15 National Guard divisions will be eliminated in the near future. We have been told that.

I visited the Under Secretary of the Army today, to speak in behalf of my division, the 31st Dixie Division of Mississippi and Alabama. I received no encouragement from the Under Secretary of the Army, and I feel that these divisions will be eliminated.

There is a great deal of tradition with these divisions. In regard to my 31st Division, Jefferson Davis, a former U.S. Senator, the head of the Confederate States, was commander of the 155th Infantry Regiment, which is a part of the 31st Division. They fought at the battle of Buena Vista, where the motto came, "Stand fast, Mississippi."

I believe the gentleman's remarks have been splendid. I commend him for working up this talk. Certainly more of us should have done this.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for joining in these remarks.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Committee on Armed Services, for taking time in the well today to alert the Members of the whole House on this situation. Indeed, I concur in everything he has said. I have listened to every word thereof.

I have been through this once before, when the present Secretary of Defense threatened to emasculate the Guard and Reserve divisions. I hope that the Congress will stand fast and again prevent this, as it has in the past, as indeed in respect to another error of McNamara's judgment it prevented the elimination of the Reserve Officers Training Corps, both junior and senior divisions.

It is indeed difficult to understand the errors in judgment of a man with this much power, whom other Members today have called upon the President to remove in these critical times, when he is obsessed with errors of judgment, repeatedly demonstrated and pointed out on this floor—on the one hand, with egocentricity supreme, and on the other with a consuming belief we must have a posse comitatus of regular forces of the United States under his control alone.

This is in direct violation of the Constitution, of course. Therefore, even more than ever, I commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for bringing this to our attention. It is true to say in removing some of the Governors of the States of the Union in their control over the Guard forces, which are used and tested in time of riot as well as natural disaster, to say nothing of being mobilized or federalized into the Army of the United States in time of peril, is a wrong procedure. I could not agree with the gentleman more that this is no time for a reorganization. With his help and with the help of other Members of Congress plus the known attitude of the Committee on Armed Services, I think we can prevent this additional error of judgment on the part of Robert Strange McNamara.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman from Missouri, the honorable DURWARD HALL, who serves on the Committee on Armed Services with me.

CONGRESSMAN WENDELL WYATT LAUDS SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN ED REINECKE, POINTING OUT BUREAUCRATIC MISMANAGEMENT OF FEDERAL MEDICAL PROGRAMS

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the problem of an increasing Federal bureaucracy and centralized control of medical and health programs is becoming more and more acute.

In a recent speech, my colleague, Hon. ED REINECKE, of California, pointed out this alarming situation with great clarity. I would like, at this time, to present this address for the attention of the entire Congress. I believe it is not only timely, factual, and interesting, but also of great importance to the Congress and every American.

The address follows:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN ED REINECKE, OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE GENERAL MEETING OF THE CONGRESS OF COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETIES, KANSAS CITY, MO., MAY 20, 1967

It is indeed a pleasure for me to visit with you tonight at this General Meeting of your organization, here in Kansas City. Just a few weeks ago I had the opportunity to visit with some of the leading medical men in my home county and State—Los Angeles, California.

And I must say that I am encouraged by what I hear, and see. I am encouraged by the increased interest which you as professional men, and as leaders in your communities, are showing in public affairs and government. I want to commend you for that. We need your help, your thinking, your leadership to help make America a better place to live for every citizen.

You are equipped for community leadership by the fact of your education, your professional competence, and the trust which people place in your good judgment. That is a great responsibility to live up to.

The medical profession also carries a greater responsibility for sound community leadership because your skills and technical knowledge are related and involved in so much that affects the public. The good health of the people, and your pledge to keep it good, get you involved in problems of your community. Such problems as—

Air and water pollution, hospital facilities;

The sale and distribution of drugs, either legally or illegally;

Health insurance and the costs of medical care;

Preventive medicine: public sanitation and waste disposal;

Control of communicable diseases; the sanitation of public facilities;

The problems of poverty, mental health care;

The psychiatry of criminal rehabilitation;

The employment of the handicapped;

The care of the aged;

Traffic safety and accident prevention;

Family planning and the population explosion; and the list could go on and on.

Your involvement in these problems stems from your professional dedication to the health of the individual man and woman, of each boy and girl. These are your patients: the citizens, rich and poor, of the cities and towns in which you live.

There is another major reason why you must be concerned about the total needs of your community. That is the extent to which the Federal Government has expressed its interest in these problems of your community. The Federal agencies are now spending over $12 billion a year on health and medical activities. This includes the programs of Medicare.

The growth in this Federal involvement in health has been dramatic. A generation ago, in 1939 total health and medical programs, including school health programs, facilities construction, research, maternal care, and direct hospital care cost only $681,700,000. In 1964, these same programs cost $6,078,000,000. Total Federal Government programs dealing with the sick, the disabled, and the aged (including welfare programs) in 1939 cost $1,535,900,000. In 1964, the same programs, not including Medicare, cost $30,122,800,000. Medicare will cost about $6 billion more.

The health and medical programs of just the Federal Government alone cover every condition of human life from birth to death.

Research is being conducted under federal grants, and by federally employed physicians and researchers, into every known disease, and some that are not so well known. I might add at this point, that I personally support programs of grants in aid to private researchers and medical centers and schools for the purposes of research. The costs of this type of research are very great. And private resources cannot always support it. Because the public will ultimately benefit from these medical advances, it is only fitting that they should bear some of the costs of the research. Here is one area in which there is a creative partnership between government and private enterprise. And this has benefitted society at large.

The other direct Federal programs of health touch you as a school child, as a military man, as a veterans, as an independent businessman, as an industrialist, as a property owner, as a traveler, as a medical student and doctor, and as consumers and patients.

The Federal bureaucracy, unfortunately, is not well known for its efficiency, and expertise in administering programs. And health programs are no exception. The problems are compounded, I believe, because of the delicacy of dealing with personal health care. The Federal bureaucracy just does not have the same "bedside manner" as the family physician; nor the same skill as the competent private medical specialist and practioner.

There are many dedicated medical personnel serving in the federal government. But it stands to reason that we cannot gather together in one office building in Washington, D.C. all the best medical minds in the nation. And if we are going to operate nation-wide, federally controlled health programs which affect every American then they ought to be operated by the best medical minds in the country.

Well, that will never happen.

So the alternative is to return control and organization of medical care and medical regulation to local health agencies and to private physicians and institutions. The best medical minds, the experts are all across the country. They are men and women with community concerns and responsibilities, like all of you here.

Let me give you an example of what I mean. This involves a piece of legislation which I introduced just a few months ago in the House of Representatives.

We have in this country the excellent challenge of a rapidly advancing technology in the field of medical devices. The President has proposed legislation for establishing standards and regulations for the design, manufacture, and use of medical devices. He is approaching the matter from the standpoint of consumer protection. He wants to require pre-marketing clearance for medical devices before you as physicians can use them to treat patients. The Food and Drug Administration in implementing the President's program has discussed simply extending the present food and drug laws to include the words "medical devices."

I find this a glaring example of the insensitivity of the Federal Government to medical science. Government regulation would definitely stifle advanced research in medical device technology. Government regulation would prevent adequate private development of devices and instruments before they were made available to doctors. The Administration proposes to set out in the law the standards for all medical devices.

But my question is this: Who in the Federal bureaucracy is qualified to set standards for medical devices? Who could set standards for such an advanced device as the booster heart pump? There are only a hand full of men in the whole country who even know how to surgically install one.

There are hundreds and hundreds of medical devices. And it would require that many government experts to adequately set standards for them. But this Administration has proposed to do the job with the same people who are already employed by the Food and Drug Administration. It will not work.

I am proposing, as an alternative, in my bill, H.R. 6165, to create the National Medical Devices Standards Commission.

The purpose of this Commission would be to bring together the genuine experts in the medical devices field to first determine the need for and the extent of Federal regulation of such medical devices as surgical instruments, artificial organs and limbs, therapeutic instruments, and other medical and hospital equipment. We must first find out from the experts whether there is a genuine need for such legislation.

And only the experts know. The Commission will be composed of equal representation from the medical devices manufacturing field; from the private practice of medicine; from the research centers and laboratories engaged in work on medical devices; from the public health agencies; and from the Congress.

The Commission will make its recommendations for the need for this legislation. It will outline its ideas for determining constructive minimum performance standards, and also set feasible standards. These will be sent to the President and to the Congress for action.

We have beat the Administration to the punch on this. They have not yet introduced their bill. They cannot get a consensus on what the details of the bill should be. And I think we have them on the run.

I have received many expressions of support for my bill. It has been endorsed by the American Heart Association, the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, the American College of Cardiology, the California Association of Clinical Laboratories, the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, and the American Dental Trade Association. Many letters have come from medical schools and researchers who support this proposal. My bill has also been co-sponsored by a Democratic Congressman, and by Senator Smathers of Florida.

I am confident that hearings will be scheduled as soon as the Administration puts its bill in. But we have seized the initiative.

It is significant, I think, that in our experience of working out this bill, we beat the Administration with a bill that is finding much more broad acceptance than their own proposals.

It is better to propose positive alternatives to undesirable legislation, rather than simply criticizing it. We could not ignore the fact that the medical devices area was going to be legislated. It simply became a question of how and when. In our proposal we have developed a procedure which is receiving wide support throughout the very industry and profession that will be affected. In fact, we are inviting them to participate in the formulating of the device standards. This is in the best American tradition of citizen leadership and participation.

It will never do for us to stick our heads in the sands, and say that a problem does not exist. That is not realistic. The problem will not go away if it is simply ignored by the responsible leaders of the community and the nation. If we do not like the way the Government is handling health programs, then we must make constructive suggestions to better them. If we do not approve of proposals by the Administration for new health programs, then we must propose better ways to solve the same problems.

Let me give you another example: One of the major proposals made by this Administration has been the expansion of federally controlled health programs for the poor, the disabled, and the aged. Americans in 1964, before Medicare, spent, both privately and through government taxes, about $65 billion on meeting the health and retirement problems of the sick, the disabled, and the aged.

We cannot, you see, say that there is no problem. What are the alternatives? Contributions by private philanthropy for health purposes have been estimated at about $1 billion annually. Care and treatment provided without charge by doctors and others is estimated to range from $350 million to $650 million each year. Private philanthropy so far cannot do all the job. More needs to be done in this area.

Government programs should be used to help the sick, the disabled, and the aged only if voluntary and private means—truly tried and tested—cannot adequately meet society's needs. And this seems to be the case.

I want to propose a positive alternative to what the Administration has in mind. They say: expand the federally controlled health programs. I say: adopt a tax sharing concept for federal health programs. Return to the States, and ultimately to local agencies, federal tax funds which can be used to support locally controlled and directed health programs. Return these programs to the people who know how to run them, who know what their own health needs are in their own communities.

The tax sharing concept would operate this way: The Federal government would return to each State federal tax dollars without specific restrictions. These funds would be appropriated by the Congress for general areas, like health. Then each State would use this money to carry out its own programs.

This would eliminate the complex red-tape of categorical programs now administered by the Federal government. It would give to the heavily taxed local citizen the necessary additional help he could get from the superior and broader tax base of the federal government. But without the federal controls and interference.

Local health authorities could still draw upon the research experience and technology available through the National Institutes of Health, and the U.S. Public Health Service.

A similar tax-sharing, block grant concept is now being debated in the Congress for the field of education. And it is receiving considerable support from both sides of the aisle.

The Administration says about health: We'll run the programs from our offices and bureaus in Washington. I say: put the policy-making and planning authority in the hands of local health officials and in advisory boards composed of local medical leaders who can determine the policies and priorities for their own communities.

The proliferation of federal medical programs continues to be a problem. There is duplication, overlapping, and inefficiency. I would like to propose that we explore alternative ways to bring together the various health agencies of the government. One suggestion has been to create a separate Cabinet-level Department of Health. Another is to form a Federal Council of Health, within the Executive Office of the President. Your views and suggestions of this matter would be of value.

In the matter of Medicare, I am proposing some initial steps to re-establish the traditional patient-physician relationship by removing of the receipted bill requirement under Public Law 89–97. This removes the patient from the pinch he often found himself in when he could not pay the bill, but needed a receipted bill in order to be reimbursed by Medicare. This legislation was suggested by the medical profession.

Other steps will be taken to alter the Medicare program to make it more workable, more responsive to the people and to the profession, and to reduce and minimize federal control. Your creative suggestions, drawn from your own experiences will be very valuable in this. I would invite you to write to me, and to your own Congressman with your ideas.

It is very important that you make your voice heard. Make your views known to your own Congressman. It doesn't matter what party he is. He will listen to the people back home, especially if they are responsible leaders in the community, and make constructive suggestions.

You have a strong voice in Washington, in the American Medical Association. They can help you keep informed of health legislation that is being proposed, and they can make your thoughts known.

But the job, basically, is still up to you. You must make your ideas known to your own Congressmen and Senators. You have to come up with new ideas. The Congress wants them and needs them. An informed Congress will not pass legislation contrary to the physicians' wishes if the information at hand has been communicated in a positive, and constructive way.

There are many areas in which you can take the leadership. You can fill the initiative gap by being first to propose the best solution to a given problem. You are on the frontier—you must recognize and communicate the problems.

Take, for instance, the matter of the effective use of computers and other sophisticated hardware in the diagnosis of illness. This is a field in which there is interest on the part of some members of Congress and will be the direction of a thrust for legislative activity, possibly in the next Congress. The volume of data being gathered on this subject, in my estimation, will result in legislation. This is where you in the medical profession could be providing meaningful research activities and studies.

Another problem in which you could make a significant contribution is to recommend ways to improve the delivery of medical care to help make up for shortages of physicians in certain geographical areas. This subject is on the minds of some of the Congressmen. Your ideas could lead the way. The problem must be solved. Help to solve it the way you want to.

The problems of the shortage of medical personnel, of trained doctors and nurses is becoming increasingly critical. The Congress is greatly concerned about this. What do you suggest we do about it? Give us your ideas and suggestions. We need your help.

The problems are as vast as the breadth of human life; and as complex as our society. But they are real problems, and they call for solutions. Congress can help you by considering your suggestions.

My friends, gentlemen, doctors—you have the dedication, you have the professional skills, the judgment, the leadership capacity, the creative ideas. I am encouraged by what I see and hear from medical men. You have a great responsibility. The challenge of mankind's needs calls you to action.

KEEP AQABA OPEN WHILE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE SETTLES ISSUE

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the serious nature of the present situation in the Middle East requires that some definite steps be taken to resolve the legal aspects of the issue, before any meaningful solution is possible. As a nation which has always promoted the rule of law—ahead of the passions of men—it should be in our interest to urge recognition of this fact. It may prevent resort to the force of arms and avoid a serious conflict.

To help promote such rational action, I have sent the following telegram to the President:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The present crisis in the Middle East, including the blockade by the United Arab Republic of the Gulf of Aqaba, is a threat to the continued maintenance of international peace and security. The matters in issue are essentially legal.

As such they should be submitted to the International Court of Justice at The Hague for adjudication along with other outstanding disputes between Israel and the Arab nations. Both Israel and the UAR are members of the Court. The United States, in joint effort with other great powers, should use its influence to persuade Israel and the UAR to submit the dispute to the Court for impartial third party adjudication.

Pending Court decision, the great powers should preserve free passage through the gulf in accordance with the established rules of law. Should neither the UAR or Israel be willing to refer the matter to the Court—and accept its decision as binding—the United States should request the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations to seek an advisory opinion from the Court on the issue of free passage through the gulf for Israeli commerce and other outstanding disputes. The declaratory judgment could then be the basis for a settlement.

Acceptance of this proposal would demonstrate our determination to settle international conflicts under the rule of law instead of on the basis of armed force or political expediency. Military defeat is often the first ingredient to renewed aggression. The course I propose would involve no loss of sovereignty, power or prestige through the use of force.

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

WOOL INDUSTRY IN DANGER

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the policy of this administration toward wool imports raises serious questions of national security and threatens both wool producers and textile workers.

Sixty percent of all our wool is now imported which gives reason to believe that in an all-out national emergency the U.S. textile industry could not meet all the minimum civilian and military requirements.

Wool imports have increased 125 percent in the last 5 years. As one of the authors of the National Wool Act, I am deeply disturbed at the inflow of imports which have virtually erased the value of the act which was passed in the early 1950's.

In the past 5 years, as well, more than 50 textile woolen mills have disappeared as a result of our failure to keep low-wage foreign competition in check.

And yet, incredibly, the United States has now agreed to cut its tariffs on textiles even further in trade negotiations in Geneva. This policy casts the shadow of bankruptcy and danger over the entire wool industry.

This is a crisis point which the administration must address at once.

Without objection, I would like to insert into the RECORD at this point, a chart showing the growth of wool imports over the last 5 years by country of origin and their percentage of domestic consumption.

Wool: U.S. imports by country of origin, duty free and dutiable, actual weight, 1961-66

[In thousands of pounds]

Country	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	5-year average	1966
Australia	39,930	72,527	58,684	58,968	99,751	65,972	93,176
New Zealand	84,547	83,871	105,584	80,031	86,871	88,181	98,717
South Africa, Republic of	42,477	49,080	33,568	31,328	37,367	38,764	36,199
Argentina	72,140	77,098	76,136	48,289	62,269	67,186	71,775
Uruguay	20,662	19,212	17,966	3,820	32,985	18,929	28,590
United Kingdom	9,378	8,542	14,365	9,015	12,295	10,719	11,737
EEC countries	9,989	8,890	13,485	10,891	7,899	10,231	6,027
Others	56,913	43,526	48,736	40,781	29,753	43,942	29,737
Total	336,036	362,746	368,524	283,123	369,190	343,924	375,958

[In thousands of pounds]

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	5-year average	1966
Wool consumption	----------	711.7	705.7	624.9	668.0	----------	630.7
Imports as a percent of consumption	----------	51.0	52.0	45.0	55.0	----------	60.0

Source: Bureau of the Census.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KLEPPE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House resolution which would amend rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives by adding this language:

> (b) Whenever a committee reports a bill or joint resolution (other than a private bill or resolution, or an appropriations bill), it shall include in its report an estimate of the cost (if any) to the United States of carrying out such bill or resolution. Insofar as practicable, such estimate shall be made on a fiscal year basis. If such bill or resolution is reported with one or more amendments, the estimate included in the report shall be an estimate of the cost of carrying out the bill or resolution as so amended.

It seems to me that this would provide both the public and the membership of the House with more cost information than is now readily available in connection with many bills and resolutions. I believe it could produce substantial savings over a period of time. I believe it would tend to put the brakes on some long-term, open-end commitments the Congress might otherwise make.

As an example, programs such as rent supplements may commit the credit of the United States for a period of 40 or 50 years. When we obligate future Members of Congress, many of whom may be yet unborn, to tax citizens not yet arrived on this earth, it seems to me that we should act with great restraint. After all, there is the possibility that tomorrow's Americans would want a greater voice in determining what is best for them and their country in their own lifetime.

IN GENEVA, A TRIUMPH OF ARDUOUS EFFORT AND COMMON CONCERN FOR THE COMMON WELFARE—ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH EDITORIAL

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 17, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in an editorial titled "Triumph in Geneva," expressed its opinion on the substantial results of the Kennedy round in cutting deeply tariffs on a large volume of world trade. The Post-Dispatch noted that though the Kennedy round of trade negotiations "was oversold at the outset as a panacea which it never could be," the negotiations have been successful through "arduous effort," and they demonstrate a continuing awareness in Europe and the United States of continuing "common concern for the common welfare."

The Post-Dispatch is, in my view, correct in treating the Kennedy round as a portal opening the way to the solution of other international economic problems. It recognizes that one of the most fundamental developments of the Kennedy round negotiations was its intensive study of international trade problems. This has a meaning for future—for other difficulties which are bound to have a braking effect. For these, the Post-Dispatch concludes the Kennedy round's "closer acquaintance with ramified problems has enhanced the prospects of progress," providing a "mustering ground for new advances," particularly in the areas of nontariff barriers, developing countries trade problems, and international agricultural trade.

With unanimous consent, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial referred to follows:

TRIUMPH IN GENEVA

Those who expect "big ideas" to work miracles overnight may have lost interest in the Kennedy Round of tariff-cutting long ago. They may not recognize as a triumph the less than universally satisfying agreement achieved after four years of hard bargaining and narrow escape from failure in a last-minute crunch.

The more discerning, however, will be impressed by the perseverance which has introduced a new measure of rationality into a world all too prone to bungling and blundering. And they also will be grateful for the avoidance of a new rash of nationalistic rivalries which would have been the cost of failure.

If some are disappointed that Geneva has not met all desires, this may be because this round of negotiations by the signatories of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was over-sold at the outset as a panacea which it never could be. Yet its success does make other successes more likely. For example, Gen. De Gaulle almost surely had it in his thoughts when he said that this time he "notes with sympathy" the British application for Common Market membership. For him and for all others, the Geneva achievement must be a demonstration of the strength of the trend toward common concern for the common welfare.

We hope this point will not be lost on those American interests which are sure to protest against one provision or another of the new agreement. Certainly adjustments will be necessitated by the new rates. Yet who can say that, over-all and in the not too long run, tariff reductions averaging between 33 and 35 per cent and affecting 40 billion dollars of world trade—eight times more than covered by any previous agreement—will not stimulate the global economy?

The best of all possible worlds will not dawn as soon as the new schedules come into effect. Other difficulties are bound to have a braking effect. There is, for example, the matter of introducing a substitute for gold to permit the enlargement of the monetary reserves essential to the enlargement of world trade. There also are import quotas and other non-tariff barriers raised most often by governments, like that of Britain, when in economic trouble. There is the tough job of putting the less developed nations more nearly on the same footing as the advanced. And there are the complexities arising from agricultural prices and support policies. Yet for the latter at least, the Geneva negotiators were able to work out a formula which should lead to still more satisfactory arrangements.

Closer acquaintance with ramified problems has enhanced the prospects of progress. Above all, the negotiators have demonstrated—as the builders of the Common Market did before them in a narrower circle—that while "big ideas" may open splendid new vistas, the brambles can be cut away only by frank, patient and sometimes disillusioning work. This arduous, effort, however, also proves the value of even a partial success as the mustering ground for new advances.

THE KENNEDY ROUND, ST. LOUIS EXPORTS, AND FREER WORLD TRADE—ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT ARTICLES

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an editorial and a news article from the May 17 edition of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat regarding the Kennedy round. The editorial article, titled "Freer World Trade," concludes, I believe correctly, that "the last minute give and take which rescued the Kennedy round talks proved the common ideals that bind free nations are still much stronger than forces dividing them."

The Globe-Democrat also gave its judgment that the historic Kennedy round accord will mean greatly expanded trade among participating countries as thousands and thousands of new markets are opened for new products. Nonetheless, noting that a number of U.S. industries may be hurt by foreign imports under the new tariff schedules negotiated at Geneva, the St. Louis paper concludes that our country stands to gain far more than it stands to lose because of vast new markets opened.

The effect, it judges, will be to promote prosperous and peaceful relations in the long run. All kinds of new cultural exchanges, as well as commercial exchanges, are made possible by the new agreement.

The news article of the same day, titled "Cuts in Tariffs Should Boost St. Louis Exports," reports some St. Louis reactions to the news of the Kennedy round's completion.

Noting that there are opinions that the general bargaining package agreed on at Geneva would not bring expanded exports and a more prosperous American economy, the news article said that "Made in St. Louis, U.S.A." labels seen abroad would increase as a result of the prospective tariff cuts on world trade. and noted that Missourians can expect greater industrial and farm exports as a result of the negotiations.

With unanimous consent, the two articles referred to follow:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat,
May 17, 1967]

FREER WORLD TRADE

Success of the crucial Kennedy Round trade negotiations, just when they seemed hopelessly deadlocked, can prove an inspiring victory for free world trade and for free people everywhere.

Tariffs were slashed an astonishing 33 per cent and more on the average in the agreement affecting 80 nations. This historic accord will mean greatly expanded trade among participating countries as thousands and thousands of new markets are opened for new products.

Tariff reductions were so sharp that many of those remaining are only of nuisance value, incapable of impeding the flow of goods from one country to another.

It is true the new agreement isn't an unmixed blessing. There is little doubt that a number of United States industries may be hurt by foreign imports under the new tariff schedules.

But our country stands to gain far more than it stands to lose because of vast new markets opened.

The United States still exports far more than it imports. It is now exporting about $27,000,000,000 in goods a year as compared to $19,000,000,000 in imports.

The world should applaud the international food aid program hammered out in Geneva. It should move some 4,500,000 tons of food from major industrial countries each year to the have-not nations.

The United States, heavily committed to relieving hunger in India and other agriculturally backward nations, has long sought participation of other industrial countries in the food-for-peace program.

In voting to remove tariff barriers, the signatory nations will be promoting better relations and peace in a meaningful way. For in fostering improved trade relations, they are, in effect, renouncing isolationism and protectionism in favor of internationalism and common understanding.

Nothing could do more to promote prosperous and peaceful relations in the long run. All kinds of new cultural exchanges, as well as commercial exchanges, are made possible by the new agreement.

There will be those who take a negative view and stress the shortcomings of the conference—the fact that it didn't break down farm trade restrictions, failed to deal with many non-tariff barriers that block trade and didn't do enough for underdeveloped nations.

But on balance this was an agreement of which its sponsors can be justly proud. It came at a time when there were fears that a new isolationism was about to grip free nations of the world.

The last minute give-and-take which rescued the Kennedy Round talks proved the common ideals that bind free nations are still much stronger than forces dividing them.

Cuts in Tariff Should Boost St. Louis Exports

"Made in St. Louis, U.S.A." labels seen abroad should increase as a result of prospective tariff cuts on world trade agreed to in Geneva, Switzerland, an international banking expert here said Tuesday.

Already foreign exports are an important economic factor, added H. R. Dominguez, vice president of the international division of the First National Bank in St. Louis, pointing out that the Missouri portion of the St. Louis area alone exported some $450 million worth of products last year.

MOST SHOULD GAIN

Most St. Louis area industries should gain at least in a small way and some in a much larger fashion, because of the tariff cuts, he predicted.

However, a New York-based executive of Monsanto Co., whose world headquarters are here, predicted "shock waves" in the chemical industry and charged that the "economic interests of our industry have been sacrificed at the altar of political expediency."

Speaking as president of Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturer's Association, a trade group, Mr. Mahoney called proposed changes in chemical duties "one of the most blatantly one-sided bargains in the history of American trade negotiations."

The U.S. reportedly agreed to cut its chemical tariffs 50 per cent, but received reductions of "less than half that amount" from European exporting nations, he charged. Mr. Mahoney is a Monsanto vice president and manager of the huge firm's New York-based textile division.

KENNEDY ROUND

The Kennedy Round accord, so called because the late President Kennedy pushed through legislation enabling the bargaining, was reached by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, an 86-nation trade booster group—though only 53 nations took part in sessions.

An average of 33 to 35 per cent cut in tariffs on 6300 industrial and farm items was agreed to. Some $40 billion yearly in world trade would be affected, including U.S. exports totaling $27 billion annually and imports adding up to $19 billion a year.

Among the most optimistic initial reactions came from American farm leader Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, who predicted U.S. farm exports would rise from the present $7 billion to $10 billion annually in three years.

Mr. Dominguez also forecast a benefit for Missouri farm products, including live animals, used for food, and processed foods.

SHOES NOT COVERED

Shoes, not mentioned, are probably not covered in the cuts, he said, pointing out that U.S. shoe exports amounted to only about $9 million last year.

In a recent article, the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis listed four local companies—Ralston Purina Co., Monsanto Co., Wagner-Electric Corp. and McDonnell Douglas Co.—which are known throughout the world. Other firms which ship products abroad on a large scale, it said, are Nooter Corp., Mallinckrodt Chemical Works, Carboline Co., Indeeco, UMC Industries Inc., and John Fabick Tractor Co.

In a less-than-jubilant statement, President Johnson said the tariff cuts clear the way for billions of trade, but cautioned that "much hard work remains for the weeks ahead" in translating the accord into concrete terms.

DIRKSEN'S VIEW

Cautious Congressional reaction was summed up in the comments of Sen. Everett M. Dirksen (Rep.) of Illinois, the Senate minority leader, who said that while Administration spokesman reported the U.S. came out "reasonably well, others may have different ideas.

"Actually, they had no details, no precise figures," he said of Vice President Humphrey and others who gave Congressional briefings Tuesday.

AMVET AWARDS

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 it was my pleasure to serve as master of ceremonies for a luncheon where AMVETS of America citations were presented to House Speaker John W. McCormack; Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler; entertainer Martha Raye; Veterans' Administrator William J. Driver; and president of the Freedom Foundation, Dr. Kenneth D. Wells.

I include the citations for each of these awards in the Record:

Citation

(The 22d annual National Convention of AMVETS, assembled in Columbus, Ohio, on August 21, 1966, did unanimously resolve that its Congressional Award be presented to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, in recognition of his 38 years of continuous distinguished Congressional Service and his outstanding National legislative leadership in an era of unending challenge to our national security, our domestic institutions and our national ideals of Human Rights, Justice, Freedom and Peace for all)

John William McCormack of Massachusetts, legislator, statesman, and debater without peer, has, during his long and distinguished service to his fellow Americans, through three critical wars and the present conflict, profoundly influenced the entire course of government through his personal impact in the consideration of literally thousands of bills, resolutions, and subjects passed upon or enacted into law by the Congress.

Speaker McCormack's understanding and insight of the problems affecting America's veterans comes from his own personal knowledge and experience as a World War One Army enlistee, who interrupted his own legal and political career to serve until war's end. In the early days of the Pension Bureau and of his own Congressional service, Congressman McCormack was ever generous with his personal time and services, in pressing the meritorious claims of veterans before the Bureau. His abiding interest and the effective support he has given throughout the years to every piece of veteran's benefits legislation has earned him the title of "All-American Veterans Member" in the Congress.

AMVETS wishes also to recognize Speaker McCormack's unequalled legislative accomplishments in the field of National Security, represented by his chairmanship of the original Special Committee Investigating Un-American Activities, which gave our country the protection of the Smith Act, and the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The original National Selective Service Act of World War Two, through his efforts, carried by a one vote margin. The Atomic Bomb "Manhattan Project" funding arrangements, which he guided, was the best kept secret of World War Two. In defense procurement activities Speaker McCormack was responsible, in the "Sage" Arctic early-warning radar net program, for a billion dollars in savings through corrective contract procedures.

As the strong champion of the working man, the underprivileged and the Nation's ever growing population of older citizens, Speaker McCormack, has been in the forefront in creating and perfecting sound labor laws, and foresighted health, education and welfare legislation.

Every man who served in the Congress in the last four decades, has been inspired by the example, guided by the counsel or warmed by the humanity, friendship, and unfailing consideration of John W. McCormack.

AMVETS of America, are honored and privileged to express their appreciation and gratitude to John W. McCormack for his lifelong service to the highest legislative goals of Justice, Freedom, and Peace for all, with the presentation of our Congressional Award.

CITATION

(The 22d annual National Convention of AMVETS, assembled in Columbus, Ohio, on August 21, 1966, did unanimously resolve that its Defense Award be presented to the Armed Forces of the United States of America, and accepted by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Earle G. Wheeler)

Recorded history has no precedent for the awesome responsibility for the very existence of mankind which bears so heavily upon the United States of America today.

The peace, security and freedom of the earth's millions, to develop their individual talents and initiative for the creation of a better world is dependent upon the success with which our country's leaders cope with the vast problems of our nuclear and space age.

The Armed Forces of the United States of America, comprised of the individual services, Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and Coast Guard, each with its own crucial mission, provide the shield and deterrent which affords the time for men of good will to seek solutions which will permit man to live at peace with himself and his neighbor.

Never before has such awesome military force and capacity been used with such restraint and patience. The Armed Forces have been organized and are capable of flexible and varied responses to provide adequate defense and security for free men all over the globe, and are the only and absolute deterrent to nuclear conflict.

The price our Nation and its Armed Forces are called upon to pay for this limited, restrained and patient response to the communist onslaught in South East Asia and elsewhere in the world, testifies more clearly than words, to American maturity, insight and dedicated perseverance to the real ideals of peace, not only for ourselves but for all mankind in every part of the world.

Never in history have the Military Forces of any nation while engaged in war with an implacable and merciless enemy, ever simultaneously devoted themselves with equal strength, skill and determination to alleviating the suffering of a civil population. Our Armed Forces through these organized activities and as individuals, today are alleviating the horrors of war for millions of defenseless people, without reducing the military effectiveness of their defense action against the aggressors.

For their untiring effort, their sacrifice of life and limb, their hardships and suffering in the front line defense of freedom with dignity and honor, AMVETS is proud to salute the brave and dedicated men of the Armed Forces of the United States who faithfully serve America's defense.

AMVETS is honored to present its Defense Award to all the members of the Armed Forces of the United States, through the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Earle G. Wheeler.

CITATION

(The 22d Annual National Convention of AMVETS, assembled in Columbus, Ohio, on August 21, 1966, did unanimously resolve that its Special Silver Helmet Award be presented to Miss Martha Raye, in recognition of her never failing devotion and service to American fighting men in every part of the world, in three wars to lift their hearts, bring laughter, renew courage and share the toil and anguish of combat in the field, in the air and on the sea)

Martha Raye is a woman whose attainments in the world of entertainment and the performing arts have earned for her a truly world-wide recognition as the First Lady of American Comedy. In this make-believe world, there are Oscars and Emmies and a host of other awards for outstanding "STAR" performances and accomplishments.

AMVETS, not unmindful of her well merited and recognized stature in this entertainment world, wish today to recognize another Martha Raye, the compassionate woman, the untiring morale booster, the impromptu but skilled nurse, of Vietnam, Korea and World War II. AMVETS is proud to recognize the truly unsurpassed record of "Colonel Maggie's" twenty-five years of devoted service to American fighting men, with the presentation of a Special Silver Helmet Award.

Martha Raye in the current conflict, has entertained 273 of the 275 United States Installations in Vietnam. At Soc Trang in the Mekong Delta, the show did not "go on"—BUT—NURSE RAYE DID—in Army fatigues, as a blood donor, surgical aide, assisting the field hospital team of doctors and medical corpsmen, until the job was done, two days later. Then, she again "Put the Show on the Road" at Vinh Long. General William C. Westmoreland, however, cited Nurse Raye's assistance with official appreciation, the first of its kind.

Martha Raye's is a lifelong record of affection, unselfish devotion and service to American fighting men. In turn, she holds a place in their hearts and fond recollections, which no one else can ever take. In World War II, before the U.S.O. was organized, she volunteered to entertain and serve in England and North Africa—and stayed until yellow fever forced her to come home.

The names of World War II and Korea have faded from most minds and hearts—but Martha Raye's incredible roster of 14 morale boosting months in Vietnam show that she remembers the past and brings the priceless gift of laughter, and a link with home to a new generation of fighting men, in new far away places with even stranger sounding names.

Lest Martha Raye, for even one moment consider herself an "unsung Heroine," We, AMVETS of three wars, with whom she has served, lifting our hearts, bringing laughter to our lips, renewing courage and sharing the toil and anguish of combat in the field, in the air and on the sea, take honor and pleasure in bestowing upon her This Special Silver Helmet Award.

CITATION

(The 22d annual National Convention of AMVETS, assembled in Columbus, Ohio, August 18–21, 1966, did unanimously resolve that its Rehabilitation Award be presented to Hon. William J. Driver, in recognition of his outstanding and effective administration of the greatest rehabilitation accomplishments in the history of mankind)

The quest of man for knowledge has been paralleled by his desire for longer life and excellent health. From before the days of recorded history, devoted men have taken the lead toward this accomplishment, not only for themselves but for their fellowman. Carrying on in this tradition, William J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans Affairs, has accomplished an outstanding record in the annals of history in promotion of programs aimed at rehabilitating the sick and disabled.

Through Administrator Driver's leadership, the 165 hospitals of the Veterans Administration with its 125,000 beds have treated almost three-quarters of a million veterans during the past year. The devotion of Mr. Driver to this tremendous task is embodied in the results of his efforts. His concern for the welfare of the individual veteran is reflected in the hundreds of projects instituted by him not only to treat, but cure, these defenders of freedom from all disease.

Through his efforts and ideas new and revolutionary methods have been employed that return a disabled veteran to a full life of activity. The old concepts of disability have been disregarded by Administrator Driver and at his instigation the disabled are taught new methods and new techniques which qualify them for full employment. The full rehabilitation cycle is completed by his leadership in helping the rehabilitated veteran to return to a society that is willing to accept him as an equal partner in our social and economic complexities.

The bright beacon of leadership has focused on great men in this field. This light now shines on Mr. Driver as the leader of the cause that will enhance the beauty and dignity that belongs to man alone.

Administrator Driver has years of service in helping mankind even before he came to lead this nation's organization designated to aid America's veterans. As a veteran of World War II and the Korean Conflict, he was the recipient of the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, the Order of the British Empire and the French Croix de Guerre. This outstanding service to our nation was but the beginning of his career to show compassion and a desire to help mankind. It was his devotion to duty and concern for others that labeled him as a man of outstanding qualities. It was this life-long ambition that resulted in Mr. Driver's appointment by President Johnson as the first career Administrator of the Veterans Administration. The dramatic stature of the Veterans Administration in the accomplishment in healing the sick, curing the mentally ill and restoring veterans to normal lives is heralded throughout the world. Periods of hospitalization have been reduced; programs that aid in rehabilitation outside of actual hospitalization have been instituted, and a new era of health has been opened up through his devotion. Research has been given new emphasis and 6,600 separate studies are now being carried on that will continue to improve the health of all men throughout the world.

Administrator Driver has excelled in the missions of the Veterans Administration. Rehabilitation has become a paramount concern, and the posture of this nation has been enhanced through his superior contributions to the struggle against disease and infirmity.

CITATION

(The 22d annual National Convention of AMVETS, assembled in Columbus, Ohio, on August 21, 1966, did unanimously resolve that its Americanism Award be presented to Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, president of the Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge, Pa., in recognition of his distinguished service and contribution in advancing the cause of thorough understanding and renewed dedication to our American heritage)

Dr. Kenneth D. Wells exemplifies the living, ringing, reply to the late President Kennedy's challenge to every American "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

Long ago, as our forefathers before him, Dr. Wells with true personal patriotism and sincere love of country, dedicated his life to the preservation and advancement of the American way of life.

The Credo of the American Way of Life of Freedoms Foundation is an inspiration for every American: "to personally understand and maintain the American Way of Life, to honor it by his own exemplary conduct, and to pass it intact to succeeding generations, is the responsibility of every true American."

In 1949, Dr. Wells began Freedoms Foundation, selecting for its site, that Historic Shrine of our American Freedom, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania. The Continental Army's winter quarters and General Washington's Headquarters seemed a fitting place from which to re-awaken and remind all Americans of their individual duty and responsibility for helping to safeguard our American heritage and to preserve it for future generations.

Since that time, Freedoms Foundation has steadily grown to include the Campus of American Freedom Center, the Congressional Medal of Honor Grove, The Faith of Our Fathers Chapel at the Valley Forge site and a variety of living, action programs. Sixty patriotic, civic and veteran organizations, the National Judiciary and outstanding Americans from all walks of life embrace the activities of Freedoms Foundation.

In all of these untiring efforts, Dr. Wells is a truly contemporary "Paul Revere," traveling the length and breadth of our great Country, arousing his fellow Americans to the never-ending need for safeguarding and preserving Liberty, Freedom and Justice for all.

A truly unselfish patriot, he offers unstintingly his understanding, experience and leadership to his fellow Americans in the important work of assuring that America will take from the best of its past to insure the realization of a future, true to the ideals of American freedom.

AMVETS of America, as citizens and veterans who have made their own contribution and sacrifice defending the American Way of Life, with conviction, honor and valor, are privileged to recognize the continuing and outstanding record of Dr. Kenneth D. Wells in the service of his fellow Americans and our beloved country, with the presentation of AMVETS Americanism Award.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BURKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Egyptian blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba has superimposed a serious crisis on top of an already high level of international tension in the Middle East. Ever since the British mandate over Palestine expired on May 15, 1948, and the State of Israel proclaimed its independence, the Arab-Israel dispute has kept the entire region in a chronic state of turmoil. There has been a continuous series of border incidents, raids, retaliatory measures, charges, and countercharges even in the relatively calm periods when there was not open warfare.

Now the fever has been pushed to the critical point by the withdrawal of the United Nations emergency force from Gaza and Sinai and the United Arab Republic's imposition of a blockade against Israel in the Gulf of Aqaba. Without the United Nations emergency force to prevent border incursions and separate the two sides, with Israel's only access to the Red Sea blockaded, there is a grave danger that the war so long prepared for in the Middle East may be beginning.

While it is important that we maintain an attitude of calmness and restraint, we must not allow the frequency of world crises and the continuous tension in the Middle East to dull our senses to the danger of this situation. In this politically divided and highly armed world there is the danger in every local conflict that events will get out of control and lead to a third world war that nobody wants. In the case of an Arab-Israel war it could be particularly difficult to keep the hostilities confined, because the Soviet Union has completely sided with the Arabs and laid all blame for the situation on Israel.

Firm action now is the best way to prevent tragedy later. As it has been required to do many times in the years since the end of the Second World War, the United States must make clear its position and its intention of honoring its commitments. Then it must continue to exercise its leadership in the United Nations until the international organization has found a way to restore and maintain peace in the area.

The commitments of the United States are clear and long standing. For example, on April 9, 1956, the principles guiding President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles in the Middle East included:

> The United States, in accordance with its responsibilities under the charter of the United Nations, will observe its commitments within constitutional means to oppose any aggression in the area.
>
> The United States is likewise determined to support and assist any nation which might be subjected to such aggression.

On February 1, 1957, Secretary of State Dulles said in an aide memoire to Israel:

> With respect to the Gulf of Aqaba and access thereto, the United States believes that the gulf comprehends international waters and that no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage in the gulf and through the straits giving access thereto. . . .
>
> In the absence of some overriding decision to the contrary, as by the International Court of Justice, the United States, on behalf of vessels of United States registry, is prepared to exercise the right of free and innocent passage and to join with others to secure general recognition of this right.

President Johnson restated these positions in his message of May 23, 1967. In addition, if the situation reveals itself to be part of the attempt of international communism to expand its holdings by force, our commitments are more explicit. The Middle East resolution, passed by Congress at the request of President Eisenhower and approved by him on March 9, 1957, states:

> . . . the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of such nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism.

It is my hope that both President Nasser and the Soviet Union will see the folly of intertwining the many basic problems of the area with the continuing ambitions of the Communist world to expand and the free world to prevent that expansion. To bring the great powers into the situation on opposite sides would not accomplish anything, but would only bring devastation to the entire region and, possibly, the whole world.

The best hope of peace lies in collective action with the great powers all on the side of preventing aggression and insuring justice. Accordingly, after making it clear that the United States will not stand idly by and permit aggression to succeed, the United States must exercise its leadership to promote United Nations action to keep the peace.

However discouraging and difficult, the United States must persevere in its efforts to keep the United Nations an effective agency for collective action in the Middle East. This is a region in which the international organization has played an important role from the beginning. From 1947 until 1949 it worked to bring about a solution to the problem of Palestine and an end to the hostilities which accompanied the establishment of Israel in 1948. After the armistices, the presence of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization helped to maintain peace despite the continued enmity. For the past 10 years the United Nations emergency force, established following the Suez crisis, has been an important element in keeping peace.

If the members of the United Nations fail to utilize its machinery now, they will weaken both the organization itself and the fabric of security in the Middle East.

Furthermore, should the U.N. fail to act in this crisis, it seems clear to me that we should immediately initiate a total and critical review of U.S. participation in that organization and our position of leadership in the world.

I deeply and sincerely hope that the Security Council, backed by all member nations, will be successful in restoring peace in the Middle East. But if, in this threatening situation, the United Nations fails to show significant signs of fulfilling its intended role of maintaining international harmony, I feel strongly that the President of the United States should immediately call for, first, reevaluation of our commitments to other nations and a reexamination of our position of world leadership; second, critical examination of total U.S. contributions to the U.N. and the failure of other nations to give their full share; and third, redetermination of the extent to which we should continue to support an ineffective and impotent international organization.

If, on the other hand, the United Nations can succeed in keeping the peace in the Middle East now and in the indefinite future, eventually this organization may find a way to bring about a reconciliation or a solution to the underlying political problems of the area.

For the United States, the present crisis is part of the continuing challenge of maintaining peace without sacrificing justice. By demonstrating firm determination to meet that challenge, we can contribute to building a world in which all the nations of the Middle East will find greater security.

BURKE URGES CRACKDOWN ON STOLEN CREDIT CARD RACKET

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BURKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BURKE** of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there has long been a great need for more effective law enforcement aimed specifically at criminal syndicates in this country which engage in the profitable traffic of stolen, lost, and counterfeit credit cards. This organized racket is responsible for losses to card-issuing industries and organizations estimated to be as high as $40 million annually. In order to help put the necessary tools into the hands of our law enforcement agencies to fight this racket, I have joined several of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation to make the unlawful use of credit cards a Federal crime.

The means of facilitating travel and domestic exchange are constantly being developed and extended and improved. The traveler and retail buyer are no longer limited to the paper currency they may carry in their wallets, or even to the money that may be on deposit in their bank account. Now they have instant credit, acceptable without discount at many thousands of service establishments and retailers, not merely in their own neighborhood or State or country, but throughout the world. The specialized credit cards for use at service stations, and the American Express, Diners Club, and Carte Blanche travel and entertainment credit cards, among others, are now being extended and supplemented by regional and national credit cards issued by banks, either by arrangement with the major travel card issuers or by arrangements among banks.

The credit card can be safer and more convenient than bank notes, and they enable the owner and user to spend before he has accumulated money. They are nearly as good as money, and they add the power of credit to the consumer who owns or has access to them. But their ready acceptability and the ease of getting them create great possibilities for misuse.

The possessor of a credit card is limited in his spending only by the terms of the agreement with the company which issued the card, or by the sales that will be made in reliance on the card by hotels, motels, department stores, liquor stores, restaurants, theaters, car rental agencies, airlines, service stations, and other retailers in the United States and in foreign countries. The major bank issuer of credit cards, Bank of America of California, has over 3 million cardholders, and is extending its coverage through 15 major banks in 13 other States; the American Express travel card, with about 1.8 million outstanding, is being supplemented through a bank credit card, on which 139 banks in 24 States have signed; Midwest Bank Cards, Bancardcheck of First Financial Marketing Group of Boston, Marine Midland Bank, and others, are developing bank credit cards for travel and entertainment, retail purchases, and loans, on regional, national, or international range. Over 1,200 banks are participating in credit card plans, and many thousands of retailers sell to holders of credit cards.

The "universal" credit cards and bank credit cards are issued primarily to persons of above average income, and are used for many transactions of substantial dollar value.

Part of the convenience of the credit card is in its original issuance, characteristically by mail.

The ready acceptability of the credit card where the owner is unknown, the size of purchase which may be charged with it, and the issuance of the card by mail, create possibilities of very serious misuse by a holder who is not the owner of the card, misuse which is costly to the issuer, and may be disastrous to the owner. The newspapers report, and the courts decide, cases in which stolen cards are used to charge thousands of dollars of purchases and travel.

Leaving such criminal misuse of another's credit to be settled between the card issuer and the card owner by negotiation or in the courts, would be a failure to recognize the problems arising from improved methods of conducting business transactions. The billions of dollars of business now conducted with credit cards, and the many more billions which will be transacted in future years, require that such protection be assured. Both the issuer and the owner of the credit card should be provided protection under the Federal statutes, as it now is given to issuers and users of older credit instruments such as drafts, letters of credit, and travelers checks.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee will give early and favorable consideration to H.R. 10374, a bill to amend chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, which establishes penalties for crimes involving securities, to include the credit card, so that it will be a Federal crime to make unlawful or fraudulent use, or to transport or receive, credit cards for such uses. And I urge all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to give their full attention to this greatly needed legislation.

BETTS TAX CREDIT BILL FOR EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES

Mr. **WINN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Betts] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BETTS**. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced a bill, H.R. 10257, to provide tax incentives for increased educational endeavors by individuals and by State and local governments. My bill was specifically designed to avoid the heavy hand of the bureaucratic Federal Government in educational affairs. The bill would enhance individual efforts and State and local government activity toward improved educational opportunities through the encouragement of tax incentives.

My bill proposes four basic tax changes in existing law to provide incentives for educational activity and endeavors. Perhaps the most important provision of the bill would be a credit to individual taxpayers for amounts paid as real property taxes which are imposed for the support of public elementary and secondary education up to a maximum of $100 of such real property taxes.

The bill would also exempt earnings of college students from income tax. The exemption would be limited to a maximum of $200 per month and could only apply during months in which the individual was enrolled as a student.

Another provision of my bill would clarify the tax-exempt status of certain scholarships, fellowship grants, and student assistantships. Under the modification, an individual who is not a candidate for a degree would be able to receive up to $300 a month in such an award without having it subject to tax liability even though the award may in part be in the nature of compensation. Persons who are candidates for degrees may receive such awards without a maximum limit.

The final substantive change under my bill would allow as a tax credit an amount equal to 30 percent of expenditures for tuition or other fees expended for full-time training at institutions of higher education or at institutions providing occupational training or retraining. The bill would also make the credit available to schoolteachers who may not be pursuing a full-time course of higher education but who are taking special courses on a more limited basis.

Mr. Speaker, I have given very careful study to the problems besetting our American educational institutions. My investigation clearly indicates that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction with the present Federal involvement in primary and secondary education, and is one reason that I propose this alternative to massive Federal grant programs. Under my bill, the growing bureaucracy administering educational assistance programs in Washington would not be needed. This approach would also help local school boards and the State boards of education which are constantly beseiged by groups promoting Federal intervention programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that ever-increasing amounts of Federal aid are not going to solve our educational problems. I believe that my proposal offers a new approach and that it merits serious consideration in the Congress.

PANAMA CANAL ISSUES AND TREATY TALKS; REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD TO ADDRESS HOUSE ON THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1967

Mr. **WINN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BOW**. Mr. Speaker, in many notable addresses before this body, our most distinguished and scholarly colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] has made contributions in the way of clarifications of the interoceanic canal problems that are unique and outstanding, reflecting patriotism and courage of the highest quality. No Member of the Congress has studied this complicated and vital subject more deeply or has a more profound understanding of it than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

A collection of his selected addresses, 1958–66, published as House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, under the title of "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions," contains a wealth of authentic and carefully documented information that is invaluable as a reference work on most key phases of the canal problem, and is commended for study by all seeking reliable information.

On Thursday, June 8, 1967, Representative FLOOD will again address the House and appraise the recent booklet on "Panama Canal Issues and Treaty Talks," published by the Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, and widely distributed in the Congress. I am sure he will speak in his usual able and convincing manner, and supply many new insights into the canal problem as well as revealing the defects and validities of the indicated booklet.

Mr. Speaker, because of the vital importance of his subject to hemispheric security and interoceanic commerce and the need for every Member of the Congress to be informed on it, I trust that as many as possible, especially those on appropriations, cognizant legislative, and investigatory committees will be present and participate in discussions on the floor.

SOUTH CAROLINA ADOPTS AMERICAN FIGHTING MEN

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam has produced many paradoxes, but the most glaring example is seen right here on the homefront where life goes on at a pace not indicative of a nation at war. Despite the fact that billions of dollars are being poured into the war effort, the civilian population has not felt the pinch of rationing and other emergency wartime restrictions that were in effect during World Wars I and II and, to an extent, the Korean war.

It almost seems that a concentrated effort is underfoot to purposely not remind Americans that over 10,000 young men have been killed and another 60,000 wounded in Vietnam. In fact, with the exception of the academic debate on the merit of our involvement in Vietnam, and demonstrations for and against that involvement, life goes on pretty much as usual among the civilian population in the United States.

In my opinion, this unawareness of the Nation at war is dangerous since the American people, through their apathy, could lose sight of just why we are fighting in Vietnam. It appears to me that, when a nation has committed a half million of its military personnel in an armed conflict, the nation is indeed at war, and it is time for civilian participation. Our fighting men are going to win this war, but it is absolutely imperative that they have support from the folks back home.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding examples of civilian support for our brave troops is taking place in my native State of South Carolina. This is being done through the efforts of an unique idea entitled "R.S.V.P. Vietnam Adoption Program."

Founded and nursed into maturity by a far sighted and concerned University of South Carolina professor, Dr. Dave Palmer, this effort has involved the State capital of Columbia, of which I am proud to represent in Congress, in a program of civic support for American troops in Vietnam. Community organizations have joined in adopting 25 military units of the 1st Cavalry Airmobile Division, two military hospitals, and the 213th Aviation Company, which are located in South Vietnam. Adoption of a unit means that community groups such as churches, civic clubs, business organizations, and so forth, are sending the unit various materials and supplies unobtainable in Vietnam. These items are for the personal use of the servicemen but, in addition, much-needed goods are sent to the units to be used by the Vietnamese people to rebuild their war-torn country.

This meritorious program is growing by leaps and bounds, and now other cities in South Carolina are following the example of Columbia by instituting their own program of R.S.V.P.

Of course, the initials R.S.V.P. generally apply to an invitation, but the South Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce has come up with a novel meaning for R.S.V.P.—"Rally Support for Vietnam Personnel."

And, "rallying" is the key word for this program. Its amazing growth was recognized by the General Assembly of South Carolina on April 26, as that great legislative body unanimously passed a resolution calling for its support. Maj. Gen. John Tolson III, who commands the 1st Cavalry, has expressed his appreciation for the program, and the men under his command have done likewise. At present, thousands of packages have been dispatched to Vietnam. In fact, everything from three cement mixers to 10,400 plastic utility bags have gone so far. A partial list reads something like this: school and medical supplies, clothing, homebuilding supplies, and soap for the Vietnamese, and tape recordings, books, magazines, and ballpoint pens for American servicemen.

The success of this program was summed up recently in a letter by Lt. Col. James H. Mapp, who commands the 1st Battalion, 5th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division. Colonel Mapp wrote to Mr. John Wharton of Columbia, a U.S. civil service representative, who is doing an outstanding job with R.S.V.P., and I quote:

> . . . I will tell you of an incident that occurred only recently in which one of my men was wounded in the thigh by a VC booby trap. In cutting away his trouser leg to tend the wound, a medic removed a folded magazine from the young man's pocket, the magazine having a jagged hole torn through the center. The wounded man immediately rallied and said, 'wait a minute, I ain't finished with that yet.' The medic returned the magazine to the wounded man. The subscription tape on the magazine read 'Mrs. Hugh L. Fellers, 401 W. Durst Lane, Greenwood, S.C.' Mrs. Fellers can rest assured that her 7 April issue of "Time" has gone to a good purpose.

Mr. Speaker, our fighting men are writing new chapters in heroism and bravery this very hour in Vietnam. But, additionally, their humanitarian work among the Vietnamese people during time of war stands as a monumental tribute to this Nation's dedication to peace and compassion. These men are receiving support from civilians on the homefront, but now is the time to increase this support one hundredfold. I sincerely hope that communities throughout the Nation will form their own R.S.V.P. programs. I know of no greater refutation to the flag burners and peace creeps than this noble concept.

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to command to the attention of my countrymen a wise and penetrating editorial on the crises that now face us, that appeared in the Washington Post, this Memorial Day. And along with it, I should like to include a 2-minute address, also on the significance of Memorial Day, delivered by my friend, William A. Coblenz, before a patriotic audience at the Memorial Day exercises on the Battle Ground National Cemetery in Brightwood, D.C.

The Post editorial is rich in erudition and the knowledge of history with its lessons for the challenge that confronts us today. In it one can more clearly recognize the prodigious burden that rests upon the President. I especially emphasize these thoughtful words from this lead editorial:

> We know well . . . that meeting issues involves present calamity. And present calamity is harder to face that predicted calamity that may not mature. So the impulse is to shrink from present hardships.

This is an important observation that needs to be pondered. The hawks or hard-liners will see this as some kind of endorsement. The doves will demur or perhaps see themselves as heroes, but it may well be that from our experiences in Vietnam, other and better answers to the problems can be presented.

It could be that the other and better answers are yet to be found, that there is a hard position which can be taken somewhere between what the doves and the hawks want. This will take some reevaluation of the present programs, some consideration of new programs, some things we can do in addition to what we are now doing, or some bold, new program that will serve to fire the freedom spirit that may be too latent in the hearts and minds of the people of Vietnam, who will be the ultimate principle beneficiaries of a newly oriented and coordinated system that will bring liberty and progress for all of Vietnam, both North and South.

Mr. Coblenz is vice president of the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, formerly with the Department of Justice, the Library of Congress, and a veteran of World War I and World War II. He spoke with deep conviction about present-day problems, and our involvements and the challenge that is ours as we deal with our commitment in Vietnam. He called on the observation by paraphrasing a great American, Abraham Lincoln, as he reminded us of the crisis in the freedom of mankind and that now threatens us in the menace of communism. Here is the Post editorial followed by the magnificent address of Mr. Coblenz:

Memorial Day 1967

Memorial Day, before World War I, was a day for the remembrance of war sacrifices long past, hardships long over and heroes of combats already dim in memory. Its close conjunction with school commencements and its near relation to spring gave it an aura of seasonal gaiety in some conflict with its reverent and patriotic connotations. But this served to make it a time rich in sentiment and tinged both with sadness and joy.

Now, as we are all too aware, it is a time for the remembrance of present as well as past sacrifices by those who fight and die in defense of their country's causes. Americans are more keenly conscious now, than they were then, that the future will mirror the past; that those we honor for giving their lives to the country's causes will be joined, tomorrow and on into all the tomorrows, by comrades in arms who, in their turn, will offer up the "last full measure of their devotion."

It is not likely that Americans now living ever will see a day when men in the uniform of this country will not be dying on some field, to defend its far flung interests around the whole world. Or such days, at least, will be rare and will furnish abnormal interludes in a world of conflict from which we cannot escape.

This Memorial Day we know there is no peace; but we are not always courageous enough to face the hard fact that there is not likely to be any peace for decades and for generations. We ought to face this cruel fact because the failure to face it may keep alive the illusion that peace is an alternative to hard tasks that confront us.

Many years ago, a distinguished American soldier, in a Memorial Day Address at Longmeadow, Mass., spoke of these dangers. General Omar Bradley warned that "if we cringe from the necessity of meeting issues boldly with principle, resolution and strength, then we shall simply hurtle along from crisis to crisis, improvising with expedients, seeking inoffensive solutions, drugging the Nation with an illusion of security which under those conditions cannot exist."

We know well, however, that meeting issues involves present calamity. And present calamity is harder to face than predicted calamity that may not mature. So the impulse is to shrink from present hardships. And only long after the fact, if ever, can we discern the point at which present calamity was averted at the cost of future peril.

Statesmen themselves cannot often perceive the right side of this nice and awful choice. Much less can soldiers discern the relation of every mission and every battle to the survival of the Nation. Many men go to their deaths not having fully resolved in their minds a full measure of the cause in which they die. Were there none willing to do so, there would be no heroes to remember on this Memorial Day, and no Nation to remember them.

Memorial Day Exercises at the Battleground National Cemetery, Brightwood, D.C.

(Address delivered by William A. Coblenz)

You will be pleased to know that my function today is very brief. I am here solely to represent President Robert J. Havlik of the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia. We are proud to join with the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, with the GAR Memorial Day Corporation, with the Brightwood-Manor Park Citizens Association and with the Wheaton-Silver Spring Civil Air Patrol, Cadet Squadron, in this always inspiring moment of rededication to the faith of our fathers.

For this ceremony means what thousands of ceremonies like it have meant down through the decades since the founding of this country. It means now what it meant a century ago here at Battle Ground National Cemetery and at Gettysburg. For we are engaged today in dangerous and costly international crises that involve us deeply. These involvements test whether the integrity of American commitments in Vietnam, in the Middle East or anywhere on this earth, have prestige, validity, and the impact and power of meaningfulness. These crises also subtly probe the conscience of the American people in the quality of their support of the President and their freely elected government within the orbit of democratic debate.

The world may little note nor long remember what we say but history will never forget the men fighting our battles today in Vietnam. Nor the character and vigour with which we confront the enemies of freedom.

So that our purpose today in this solemn moment of remembrance is—what?

It is that from the honored dead beneath these headstones, and from the honored dead in all our struggles since Valley Forge, we take increased devotion to the great tasks remaining before us. It is that we here highly resolve that these dead—who gave their last full measure of devotion—and all our fighting dead—shall not have died in vain; that this nation under God shall not lose heart in the face of powerful, determined and arrogant evil, and that governments—free governments—unshackled from tyranny and dictatorship, shall have freedom, independence and self-determination under the aegis of the concerted strength of all free peoples, jointly sharing the responsibility.

It is our resolve further that duly elected governments everywhere—however weak—shall feel safe and secure in their freedom and shall not perish from the earth, so long as the greater might of the rich and powerful free nations, acting together, respect their own honor and in unity support freedom wherever it seeks expression on this earth.

This is the crisis in the freedom of mankind that now threatens us under the menace of communism and the inflammatory pronouncements of slapstick dictators. It is these crises over which we and our associated free nations shall win the ascendancy—so help us God!

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE RECLASSIFICATION

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am, today, cosponsoring the introduction of a bill to upgrade levels 1 through 5 in the postal field service and to reclassify certain other positions in the postal field service.

I feel that passage of this legislation is long overdue. Immediate action must be taken to enable our postal employees to meet the rising costs of living.

These employees must be afforded the same benefits that are available to employees in comparable positions in Government and private industry. I believe it is imperative that this situation be altered, not only for the benefit of present postal employees, but also to enable the Post Office Department to attract capable, efficient personnel who can maintain the standard of postal service essential to the business of our expanding Nation.

I urge the members of the Post Office Committees to take action to insure passage of this legislation by both Houses of the Congress.

WTIC–TV CHOOSES A BALANCED APPROACH

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Paul W. Morency, president of WTIC–TV, Hartford, Conn., has written a letter to the station's viewers concerning the decision to omit "Saigon" from their programing. He states:

> "Saigon" was not a newscast. It was a film documentary, completely subjective in approach, dwelling entirely on the misery and ugliness of the war and how Americans helped make it that way.

The letter is neither an apology nor an attempt to regain viewers who were disturbed by the action. It is, rather a straightforward statement of the reasons behind the station's decision and reflects an excellent example of responsible action.

Mr. Morency's letter explains that objectivity was lacking, totally lacking, in the documentary. He also documents the station's efforts to bring to its viewers a balanced compilation of news coverage of the war in Vietnam. To show the film would have been a corruption of the objectivity which the station has obviously worked to achieve through the mass of programing which was presented prior to the scheduling of "Saigon" and, in addition, a tacit approval of this, nonnews, subjective approach.

It is evident that the decision not to show the program was not made from a position of agreement or disagreement with "Saigon," but from a position of objectivity, concern, duty, and responsibility. As he states:

> It is because we are acutely aware of our duties and responsibilities as licensees, that we will not, we cannot, permit this station, your station, to become a compliant and passive pipeline for biased programming, no matter its source.

At the time the letter was written, the station had received 91 letters of complaint and 41 of commendation. I would add my name to the list of 41.

For the benefit of the other Members who might not have seen this letter, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

WTIC–TV3,
Hartford, Conn., March 22, 1967.

DEAR VIEWER: This is in reply to all who have written to us on the subject of the CBS documentary "Saigon." We do not resent those who attacked us, neither do we console ourselves because others agreed with our position. We are concerned and deeply regret the circumstances which forced us to take the stand which provoked this incident and produced a strain in our relationship with some of our viewers.

As of this date we have received 91 letters of complaint and 41 of commendation. The total of the 132 letters represents the gamut of American beliefs and philosophies.

Understandable to us is the reaction of the letter writer who feels he has the right to decide for himself whether or not he should view a scheduled network program. We ask for equal understanding and appreciation of our obligations as a broadcast licensee.

We have been accused of "censoring" a network newscast. A newscast consists of factual and objective reporting of news, a la Cronkite at 6:30 PM. "Saigon" was *not* a newscast. It was a film documentary, completely subjective in approach, dwelling entirely on the misery and ugliness of the war and how Americans helped make it that way.

When we first began to preview the film, we were not disturbed since we were convinced that one portion of the film would be devoted to footage, which though not perhaps complimentary, at least might be sympathetic to our presence in Viet Nam. Then the film ended. We were deeply perturbed. For the first time in all the years that we have carried CBS programming, this film was absolutely and completely one-sided.

By not devoting even one minute of footage towards a semblance of balance, the documentary evolved as nothing more than a visual accusation and distortion of the issues, the motives and the action of American forces in Viet Nam. There simply was no attempt to achieve balance.

Jack Gould of the New York Times said of it, "The hour's tone was anything but sympathetic to the American presence and did not include a bare reference to the existence of even one soldier in Saigon who might have a modicum of compassion and sensitivity for the plight of the Vietnamese."

WTIC–TV has been deeply concerned about the war in Viet Nam since the time Americans became involved there. To gain first-hand knowledge of the war and its issues, we dispatched a WTIC news team to Viet Nam. As an important by-product of that trip, through the generosity of listeners and viewers and of the WTIC Staff, we have been able to build and equip a sixty-bed wing to the hospital at An Khe.

As all our viewers know WTIC–TV has presented hundreds of hours of news and documentary programming on Viet Nam, of both local and network origin, in order to provide as much information and insight as possible. In addition to daily reports of combat operations, such programming has included the complete Fulbright Committee hearings, news features on the Saigon black market, and the accidental killing of civilians by Americans.

The simple, the easy, the comfortable solution would have been to just carry the program. Some have suggested we should have done so and then followed "Saigon" with a local discussion program. There is no need to dwell, I'm sure, on the pallid ineffectiveness of such a program, in contrast with the realism and power of the camera on the scene, shooting only those subjects needed to support a preconceived effect.

Mr. William Ray, chief of the FCC complaint and compliance division, says in the March 21, edition of the New York Times, "Each station has the right to choose its own program material. We have always held that stations should exercise this right and not take everything a network pumps out."

The management of WTIC today is the same management which we trust has earned your respect and confidence over the past 37 years. It is because we are acutely aware of our duties and responsibilities as licensees, that we will not, we cannot, permit this station, your station, to become a complaint and passive pipeline for biased programming, no matter its source.

Sincerely yours

PAUL MORENCY.

NEW ENGLAND'S PROPOSED HOT SUMMER

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I inserted an article from the Manchester Union Leader entitled "Students Vow Violence," by Arthur C. Egan, Jr., which described the type of "hot summer" being prepared for New England by a certain segment of the student populace. The first article of this two-part series recounted how Reporter Egan was put in touch with some of the individuals who will participate in the crusade against the Vietnam war.

From this series of articles one can appreciate how increasingly difficult it is becoming for parents to select a school for their offspring. In addition to the academic excellence of the institution it would be wise for parents to ask of the institution just how wholesome is the atmosphere to which their children will be exposed. Have any Government officials been nearly assaulted on campus recently? Is there an unsavory element on campus which advocates civil disobedience to the extent of violence? What is the possibility of drug addiction and promiscuity as extracurricular activities? In view of recent developments on some campuses, these are valid questions to which parents, in all fairness to their children and to themselves, should give serious consideration.

I include the article "Recruits Push Plans for 'Hot' Summer 'Crusade' " by Arthur C. Egan, Jr., from the Manchester Union Leader of May 17, 1967, in the RECORD at this point:

"RECRUITS" PUSH PLANS FOR "HOT" SUMMER "CRUSADE"—STUDENTS MOUNT CAMPAIGN FOR NORTHEAST PROTESTS

(NOTE.—An amalgam of the forces of Dr. Martin Luther King and U.S. Sen. Robert F. Kennedy is being marshaled behind a plan to foment a New England "hot summer" of violent protests against the Vietnamese war. Yesterday Reporter Arthur Egan told how "The Sons of Liberty," a patriotic group of Harvard University students, agreed to put him in touch with some of the Cambridge campus types regarded as ideal "recruits" for the big "crusade." In this account Egan describes his talks with some of the group.)

(By Arthur C. Egan, Jr.)

CAMBRIDGE, Mass.—In a Brattle Street self-service cafeteria I sat beside a table waiting for what I thought would be a "college-type couple" and it wasn't too long before one arrived.

Going over and introducing myself and showing a blank petition for signing up for "Vietnam Summer" I struck up a conversation with this young man and woman.

He, complete with long-hair, longer than his girl friend's, was a junior at Harvard; she was a drop-out from Radcliffe after her sophomore year. Both were from New York City but had not known each other until meeting at a college civil rights function.

They both indicated they came from college-graduate parents of middle income bracket, his father being a lawyer, hers an electronics engineer in New Jersey.

They were living together, and had been for some time but hadn't bothered to get married.

"No need of it. Then if we ever get tired of each other we just walk away from it," was their explanation.

Asked if they ever took part in civil rights demonstrations both said they were in Selma, Ala., and took part in that march. When asked why, they answered, "We just are sick and tired of being told what to do. What we do is our business and no one else's. The —— with people. We only took part in the march to show people they can't lead us around like cattle."

During the rest of the first day's checking I was able to talk with two other couples, one of whom accused me of being a "government undercover man."

I was told, "You won't get anything around here—if you stick your nose into Harvard's business you'll get the word from Washington. Our faculty members have connections in high places, mister."

The second day I again saw my first contact and invited them for coffee. In doing so, I was introduced to two other couples in the cafeteria.

This trio of couples was something to behold. The girls had long straight hair hanging into their faces, dirty feet and legs and skirts so short they left practically nothing to the imagination.

The women were from Smith College, the men, complete with girlish curls, were from Harvard.

The Harvard students were both seniors, and they admittedly had taken part in many demonstrations, marches and other civil disobedience affairs.

"Hell man, the cops can't do a thing. We just tell the judge we are students and we really didn't mean it and we can get away with it," said one from Wisconsin.

FLORIDA LOOTING

The new group related how they took part in looting in Ft. Lauderdale, Fla., during the last spring vacation, how they pulled various ruses on motel owners to get out of paying their bills, how they stole furniture and sold it. And it was all just one big joke to them.

I was invited up to the "arena" as they called it, the apartment where the two new couples all lived together in three rooms. It was shabbily furnished, no rugs on the floor, discarded whisky bottles and beer cans around, only food to make sandwiches and the bathroom! I should live so long to see another one so dirty.

When I asked how the Smith students

could be down at Harvard so much of the time it was explained, "We only stay here three nights a week and Linda has a car so we can come down anytime we want during the day."

Of course, since I mentioned I had the price of two six-packs of beer I was "in like Flynn" as the saying goes. As the evening progressed more students, male and female dropped in to talk about the coming summer and plans for their off-time.

LOOKING FOR TROUBLE

From the nature of the conversation I concluded these so-called educated students were looking for nothing more than a way or cause to demonstrate. It didn't matter for what, just as long as they were creating trouble.

"We're going to be back in the days of old Rome—just like it was in Nero's day. Only the students are going to be the Roman legions and sweep everything before them. No one is going to stop us, they are afraid of our strength," said one girl.

"To hell with everything, the law especially. We are going to do as we want, take what we want, when we want. We'll decide what laws we will obey and to hell with the rest. If we get grabbed by the fuzz (police) we'll just get a good old Harvard grad and he will use that 'academic freedom' bit and away we go, scot free. Ask the Supreme Court—they've set it all up," exclaimed one Harvard senior who said he was going into the U.S. State Department upon graduation.

This man, who claimed he has already been accepted by a government interviewer who visited the college recently, went on to say this was the general attitude of most college students these days.

The third day however was a different story, and it restored my faith in college students somewhat, when I barely escaped a beating at the hands of three Harvard men and their two dates.

BEATING THREATENED

"Why you commie so and so, we'll beat the hell out of you," was the response I received when I requested them to sign a petition to work as a "demonstrator" this summer.

When the college men began to get real nasty about the subject I was forced to confess my real identity and purpose but they were not going to accept my word for it. They made me produce my press credentials to prove it.

In quizzing the trio, I discovered that although not impressed by the conflict, it was more from the standpoint of the "actual conduct of operation" and not from the "principle" of the war effort. They summed up their views by saying, "Let's fight it and get it over with—hit them with everything we got and end it once and for all."

"If they really wanted to end it they could do so in a month. I believe Washington wants to continue it from the economy standpoint. There would be a tremendous depression if it was to end," said one youth.

"I wouldn't mind going in, I don't want to go to Vietnam, but then if my father and millions like him didn't stop Hitler I wouldn't be here now and certainly these damn agitators would not be getting away with this stuff under Hitler, so why don't they wise up," said the second youth, a senior from Virginia whose father was a major in the Air Force during World War II.

The women, one from Boston, working for a year before going on for her master's degree, the other from Vassar, voiced the same sentiments of their escorts.

"My sister goes to Smith and that place is a real rabble-rousing school. Most of the faculty there have questionable morals or else are engaged in that "Silent Vietnam Vigil" they have there and in Amherst on the town common," said the Vassar girl. Her father is a Cornell graduate and her mother a "Smithie" and reside in Denver, Colo.

CLASSIC EXAMPLE

A classic example of how students enforce their demands was illustrated just yesterday when Radcliffe College officials capitulated to the demands of 21 students staging a "hunger strike" to gain more liberal "off-campus living privileges."

One of the female students I talked to last week was one of those involved in the five-day "self-enforced diet" in a dispute with the college administration.

Mrs. Deane Lord, college news director said yesterday, "We have granted 36 students the privilege of living off the campus. These girls involved in the strike wanted an increase in the number of seniors allowed to live in a city apartment rather than to reside in a dormitory."

Mrs. Lord admitted it was the first such "strike" in the history of Radcliffe but added, "The college has allowed the students to have a voice in the administration for some time."

"When they get an apartment in town they usually team up with someone to share the expenses," said Mrs. Lord.

The woman involved in the strike, whom I talked to at length in a Brattle Street eating spot had told me, "When we want something we start a demonstration. That'll get us what we want. The good people can't stand the pressure of organized opposition.

SHORTAGE OF U.S. MEDICAL SCHOOLS—THE IMPACT OF THE FOREIGN TRAINED PHYSICIAN

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, the deplorable shortage in U.S. medical schools and training facilities has been underscored by hearings now in progress before the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee of the Judiciary. The subcommittee is presently holding hearings to ascertain if the objectives of the exchange visitor program are being circumvented.

The educational and cultural exchange program was first set up under the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to regularize the admission of foreign students to the United States and to oversee the educational opportunities available to them. In 1961 the program was modified by the Fulbright-Hays Act, Public Law 87–256, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961.

It has been alleged by some that the exchange visitor program has been used as a back door immigration route. Others charge that it is contributing to the "brain drain," robbing the underdeveloped countries of their sorely needed medical, scientific, and technical skills. Still others claim that the exchange visitor program is nothing but a recruitment device by which hospitals and medical institutions obtain low pay staff members thus releasing U.S. doctors and nurses for lucrative private practice.

The subcommittee hearings are not yet complete; we have reached some tentative conclusions, but further investigation will be required before we are ready to implement our decisions with specific recommendations.

For me, however, one thing has been made crystal clear. One startling, disturbing fact has been brought home to me with shocking force. The richest country in the world is woefully deficient in medical and nursing schools. Without the foreign medical and nursing graduates now serving in our hospitals our medical service could not possibly meet present-day demands.

The failure of the United States to train enough American doctors to meet our own needs has become glaringly obvious only in the last few years. As recently as 1950 only 308 of the licensees that year were foreign medical graduates. In the year 1950-51 only 9 percent of hospital residencies were filled by foreign graduates. Now the percentage has multiplied three times to approximately 27 percent.

The President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke in February 1965 reported as follows:

> For years we have been importing physicians from other countries. The Bane report (in 1959) anticipated that we would continue to do so at a rate of 750 per year, although the consultants questioned then whether or not this should be done when physicians were needed so badly in other parts of the world. Despite these qualms, we are parasitizing other countries at an increased rate (1,651 in 1963). Approximately one-third of the medical graduates in Canada each year migrate to the United States—296 in 1961.
>
> This drain upon other nations is neither to their best interest or ours; the 'brain drain' is resented by the countries suffering from it; the inability of the United States to provide for its own needs ill fits our posture as a world leader; offers by the U.S.S.R. to provide medical personnel for the emerging African nations and for international efforts against disease have counted heavily on the propaganda front; in short, our national interest requires us to provide the manpower necessary for our obligations as a world leader in medicine.

Charles Frankel, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, testifying before the Immigration Subcommittee reported that there are now 13,559 foreign exchange participants in U.S. hospital and related programs. His testimony was that Government-sponsored exchange training programs have apparently not contributed significantly to the "brain drain" and that remedial steps—for the exchange program—to be recommended by the Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs do not include proposals for changes in immigration policies.

However, the testimony of Dr. John C. Nunemaker, director of graduate medical education for the AMA, indicated that nongovernmental sponsored programs apparently are abusing the exchange visitor program flagrantly. Dr. Nunemaker testified:

> It is believed that the greatest detriment to fulfillment of the intent of the educational exchange program as it applied to medicine is the lack of effective selection, guidance, orientation and placement for the vast majority of foreign medical graduates serving as interns and residents in exchange visitor programs sponsored by private agencies.

In 1964–65, out of 10,097 interns in U.S. hospitals, 2,821 were graduates of foreign medical schools. Of the 31,005 hospital residents, 8,151 were foreign trained. Thus 10,974 out of the total of 41,102 internships and residencies in our hospitals were filled by foreign medical graduates. When one-fourth of the hospital staff positions are filled by so-called temporary foreign trainees, some U.S. medical graduates are obviously released for private practice. This may be economically advantageous for U.S. doctors but reliance upon foreign graduates to staff hospitals minimizes the demand for new medical schools and additional graduate training facilities.

Dr. Kelley M. West, M.D., professor of continuing education, University of Oklahoma School of Medicine, has written:

> The immigration of foreign graduates now accounts for a substantial percentage (18 percent) of the annual additions to the U.S. medical profession. We would have to build and operate about 12 medical schools to produce the manpower being derived through immigration (approximately 1,200 per year). The dollar value of this "foreign aid" to the United States approximately equals the total cost of all of our medical aid, private and public, to foreign nations.

The failure of the United States to train enough doctors to meet our own needs is graphically shown by the following table which not only highlights our increasing dependence upon foreign graduates but, worse, shows that even with the help of foreign graduates, we are not filling our internship and residency needs. How can we expect to meet the increasing demands of medicine when we have for a number of years been failing to find either U.S. or foreign graduates to fill all our hospital staff positions? The following table shows how far short we have been since 1960 in filling needed internships and residencies:

INTERNSHIPS

Year	Total offered	Total filled	Filled (U.S. graduates)	Filled (foreign graduates)	Vacant
1960–61	12,547	9,115	7,362	1,753	3,432
1961–62	12,074	8,173	6,900	1,273	3,901
1962–63	12,024	8,805	7,136	1,669	3,219
1963–64	12,229	9,636	7,070	2,566	2,593
1964–65	12,728	10,097	7,276	2,821	2,631

RESIDENCIES

Year	Total offered	Total filled	Filled (U.S. graduates)	Filled (foreign graduates)	Vacant
1960–61	32,786	28,447	20,265	8,182	4,339
1961–62	35,403	29,637	21,914	7,723	5,766
1962–63	36,502	29,239	22,177	7,062	7,263
1963–64	37,357	29,485	22,433	7,052	7,728
1964–65	38,750	31,005	22,852	8,153	7,749

The medical profession itself is finally beginning to admit the shortage in medical schools and training facilities. In an article published in the April 1966 issue of Federation Bulletin, Dr. G. Halsey Hunt, of the Educational Council for Foreign Medical Graduates, wrote:

> It is a depressing and humbling experience for an American doctor to visit a medical school in one of the under-industrialized countries of Asia, to have his host open the conversation with a bland statement that "You people in the United States, and your hospitals, couldn't get along without our doctors," and to realize that at the present time this is indeed a fact.
>
> If the 11,000 foreign graduates who are now occupying internships and residencies in United States hospitals were to be suddenly withdrawn, many United States hospitals would be forced to curtail sharply their services to patients. I submit that for the long run this is a completely untenable situation. By almost any standard of measurement, the United States is the richest country in the world. American standards of medical education and medical research and hospital practices are among the highest in the world. It ill becomes us to depend permanently on other countries for the production of medical manpower to provide services to American patients.

The only answer is that more U.S. medical schools and hospital training facilities must be built. We cannot allow this deplorable situation to continue, or rather to snowball at increasing speed as it has recently from year to year. This is not merely a problem of a possible "brain drain" from undeveloped nations—it is a simple matter of self-preservation. We must produce in the United States a sufficient supply of U.S. citizen medical graduates to meet all future needs under all possible circumstances.

H.R. 8718—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERAL PAYMENT AND BORROWING AUTHORITY

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 8718. The legislation represents an important effort to meet the problems of the District of Columbia—and I look forward to further efforts by the Congress to improve conditions in our Nation's Capital.

I agree with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia who stated before the committee that although additional revenues alone will not supply the complete answer to the problems of the District, there can be no solution without them.

My particular interest, Mr. Speaker, is the improvement of the public schools and public education for the District of Columbia. I am personally aware of the conditions in our schools, and I know that the needs are great. The report of the committee points out that the educational needs of the majority of the children living in the District are unique and require a prompt reduction in class size. For example, my daughters attend public schools in the District. Each is in an oversized combined class—one in a room of 34 first- and second-grade students, and the other in a room of 32 fifth- and sixth-grade students. The report also justifies the need for additional, up-to-date classrooms to take care of the increasing school population.

This bill represents an investment in human resources. The development of the young is a measure of the progress of our society—and this is one investment, I submit, that will not fail to bring future profits and benefits.

A PARENT SPEAKS TO THE PRESIDENT IN BEHALF OF A SON KILLED IN VIETNAM

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a recent exchange of poignant correspondence between the President, a member of his staff, and the father of a young soldier killed in Vietnam was published as a paid advertisement in the Washington Post on May 30, 1967. The policy of the Post would not permit the exchange of correspondence to be carried as a news item of general public interest. Yet all of the letters are of great public interest today.

The letter of the President seemed to lack sincerity and personal warmth—a form letter which has now been written 10,000 times. I believe that the letter is overwhelmingly appreciated, but many who are intimately involved strongly disagree. Some contend that the routine official condolence of the President merely accentuates the small value of life in war—as if a form note from the office of the President would be in some way compensate or alleviate the grievous loss.

The father's letter very accurately represents the purport of mail and other communications I receive from families of soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen in Vietnam.

The letter of the President's aide was also typical. It missed the father's point. It confused our mission in Vietnam. It used the possible destruction of Hanoi as an example of our military might. Who ever thought of destroying Hanoi? What a misleading and unresponsive rejoinder.

The President's aide said we are bombing North Vietnam to make clear to the leaders of North Vietnam that, if they want to continue to support the aggression in the south, they must pay a price for this action.

Again this was not responsive to the father.

The father was, in effect, asking why should we pay a higher price than the Vietcong and North Vietnamese? We value life more highly, but our allied casualties probably exceed the enemy's. We certainly expend more on armament than the cost of the military targets we destroy.

Our Government asked First Lieutenant Hunter and 500,000 other men to fight a frustrating, if not futile, war under great restrictions to accomplish the limited objective of deterring aggression. Lieutenant Hunter's father asked why do we not apply our full force to destroy the supply lines of the aggressor at its source. Neither the President nor his aide answered this fundamental question satisfactorily.

Mr. Hunter seems to agree that our objectives in Vietnam are limited. Being limited should not be the same as undefined or confusing or variable. And even with limited objectives, Mr. Hunter and other fathers of servicemen in combat wonder why the war should be limited short of stopping the aggression. These questions were not answered.

As honorable as our mission in Vietnam may be, our citizens, our servicemen in combat and their families, are entitled to know why there is a limitation on waging the war when there is no limitation on the dollars or lives we are squandering.

If we are fighting for "political objectives in the South"—as the President's aide proclaimed—we are entitled to know what these political objectives are, no matter how limited they may be.

I have supported the U.S. commitment in Vietnam—often with great misgivings about the manner in which the war was being waged—but I never understood our objective—limited or otherwise—to be political. We have no business fighting a political or religious war in Vietnam or elsewhere. Our effort should be to deter physical aggression and to insure physical stability in South Vietnam regardless of the political situation or objectives.

The correspondence which was published as a paid advertisement in the Post is of such great significance and so enlightening of the positions of the three parties that I believe every Member of Congress and every citizen should have the opportunity to read and to study each letter. I therefore include the four letters in their chronological order:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1967.

MR. AND MRS. WILLIAM J. HUNTER,
3311 North Glebe Road,
Arlington, Virginia.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. HUNTER: It was with deep personal regret that I learned of the death of your son, First Lieutenant James D. Hunter, in Vietnam.

As I go about my daily tasks, I often stop and think of our servicemen who are fighting and dying to defend freedom in Vietnam. The burden is a heavy one and I share your sorrow and grief in this difficult time.

May God, in His infinite wisdom, strengthen you in the days ahead. Mrs. Johnson and I extend our heartfelt condolences to you in your tragic loss.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

ARLINGTON, VA.,
March 7, 1967.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: Mrs. Hunter and I thank you and Mrs. Johnson for your expression of condolence to us in the death of our son, 1st Lieut. James D. Hunter in Vietnam.

Our son, Jim, was proud to be a soldier in the United States Army. His principal complaint and the one that he referred to most was the fact that he and his men were being asked to fight "a no-win war."

You spoke in your letter of "our servicemen who are fighting and dying to defend freedom in Vietnam." If this is, in truth, what they are fighting and dying for, certainly they should be given the unrestricted opportunity to do so.

Every day, we read a lot of gobbledygook in the newspapers about what we can and cannot do, because of our many so-called commitments to not only our questionable friends but to our known enemies. Today, we have at least 500,000 young men in Vietnam, and these men are the cream of the crop, who have been sent to a faraway land to fight a war, and to lay down their lives for what they are told is the defense of freedom in Vietnam.

It is high time that we gave them every opportunity to fight to win this war, so that they can come home where they belong.

Our first and primary commitment should be to our boys. Let's give them everything that they need to win. Let's effectively close every supply route being used by the enemy. Haiphong harbor is a good place to start, and from there we can go to all the other strategic targets in North Vietnam.

Announce to the world that we are going in to win this war and that our purpose is to destroy only strategic areas of North Vietnam, that our bombing may not always be on target and that those who do not want to get hurt should get out of the way. Stop apologizing for accidents which are bound to occur in any aggressive action.

Stop begging the enemy to come to the conference table on any terms. With a little bit of effort on our part, I am sure the enemy would quickly understand that to survive at all, he must meet us at the conference table.

Anything short of a real victory will only mean to Mrs. Hunter and myself and to thousands of other fathers, mothers, wives, brothers and sisters that their loved ones are being sacrificed on an altar of political intrigue.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM JAMES D. HUNTER.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1967.

DEAR MR. HUNTER: President Johnson has asked me to reply to your letter to him in which you thanked him for his and Mrs. Johnson's expression of condolence in the death of your son, 1st Lieut. James D. Hunter, and urge that all steps possible be taken to insure victory in Vietnam.

The President appreciates your thoughtful letter. While we know there are no words that will assuage your grief, we of the Department of Defense also wish to express our deepest sympathy in the loss you and Mrs. Hunter have suffered.

You may be assured that American servicemen in Vietnam are fighting for victory. President Johnson has said that the national interest requires that we persist in our present policy. "The policy," he said, "is to bring to bear the ground, naval and air strength required to achieve our objective."

It is important, however, to define that objective. We are engaged in a limited war for limited objectives Our military actions must be weighed against those limited objectives. Our bombing operations in the North are conducted within certain constraints because they are tied to our limited political objectives in the South.

United States military might could, for example, destroy the city of Hanoi. No one questions this. But do we gain our limited objectives more quickly by the destruction of Hanoi? If we were to raise the level of our bombing to that necessary to destroy North Vietnam as a political entity, or to impose a high degree of damage to major cities, we would inevitably run the risk of increasing the scope of the conflict. Were that to happen, the casualty lists of today would grow longer, not shorter. Additionally, we would be out of phase with our objectives in South Vietnam, where the war must be won.

As you know, we are not seeking to destroy the Government of North Vietnam, nor its people. The basic objective of our selective-bombing operations in North Vietnam is to reduce the level of infiltration of men and material into the South and/or to increase the cost of infiltration. We believe our bombing of military targets makes clear to the leaders of North Vietnam that, if they want to continue to support the aggression in the South, they must pay a price for this action.

The primary emphasis of military pressure must be applied against the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese units in the South. Bombing of the North is supplementary to our military operations in the South, and thus we do not consider the bombing as an end in itself. All-out bombing of North Vietnam would not achieve the ends we seek. It would not serve peace, but only serve to enlarge the limits and participants in the conflict.

I need not tell you that we share the longing of you and Mrs. Hunter, who have suffered the loss of a son, for an end to this war. We share your desire for a real victory. But the "victory" must be won in South Vietnam; destruction of the North will in no way guarantee achievement of our objectives in the South. And if we do not achieve those objectives, then the sacrifices of our people will truly have been without meaning.

On behalf of the President, I would like to express our appreciation for your thoughtful and expressive letter.

Sincerely,

PHIL G. GOULDING.

ARLINGTON, VA.,
April 6, 1967.

DEAR MR. GOULDING: Thank you for your letter of March 24 in reply to my letter of March 7, addressed to President Johnson.

I have given your letter careful study and consideration and can only conclude that, like it or not, my son, along with thousands of other men, has been sacrificed on an altar of political intrigue and thousands more apparently will be so sacrificed.

You, speaking for President Johnson, tell me: "We are engaged in a limited war for limited objectives," that, "Our bombing operations in the North are conducted within certain constraints because they are tied to our limited political objectives in the South."

My son often told me that he and his men were being called upon to fight a "no-win war." How right he was! The inference in your letter is clear that, because of our "limited political objectives" in Vietnam, our soldiers will be allowed only to fight "a no-win war" with one hand tied behind their backs. What a miserable way to fight a war! You say we are not seeking to destroy the Government of North Vietnam. If the North Vietnam Government and its stooges are not our real enemy in South Vietnam, pray tell me, who is?

Even an uninformed layman like myself knows that the best and quickest way to destroy an enemy is to destroy his supply lines. All of our enemy's sources of supply originate in the North. Cut off the supplies at the point of origin. Eliminate all the strategic targets and stop wasting a lot of bombs on targets that cost less than the bomb. We can do this without destroying the large or small cities of North Vietnam, but there will be civilian casualties—there always are in any war. You, for some strange reason, seem to be more concerned with civilian casualties in the North than you are with civilian casualties in the South.

If what I read in the papers is true, the civilian casualties in the South far exceed those in the North. Yet we hear very few expressions of concern because of this. The sooner this undeclared war is over, the sooner we will bring an end to all casualties. Destroy the supply lines at their source and the enemy will have to sue for peace.

I gather from your letter that our leaders are seeking a "victory" in Vietnam akin to the one that we had in Korea. If this is so, then the word "victory" certainly has a hollow meaning. I cannot believe that this country will accept such an ignominious end to the war.

Mrs. Hunter and I are not ungrateful to you for your expression of sympathy. We have received many letters from those closely connected with the war, beginning with the President and ending with our son's captain at the battlefront, and some of these letters have helped sustain us. However, at this point, we must be concerned with the living, and nothing would cheer us more than being informed by those who are running this miserable show that the boys who are now putting their lives on the line are going to be allowed to fight a war to win a real victory, and not just hold on until some limited political objective has been reached.

The very least our leaders should do for our fighting men who are forced to put their lives on the line, and for those Americans who are forced to furnish the billions of dollars needed to carry on this "no-win war," is to be completely honest with them. Tell them all that this is only a limited war with limited objectives, and that this is what we are now squandering our priceless lives and hard-earned dollars on.

I, of course, know that this will never be done. To do so would place the altar of political intrigue in grave danger. We can't do that, can we?

I only hope that the American public wakes up before we win all the battles in Vietnam and lose the war.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM JAMES D. HUNTER.

MINK IMPORT PROBLEM REQUIRES PRESIDENTIAL ACTION

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the crisis facing American mink ranchers will grow even worse unless price-depressing mink imports are curtailed immediately. That is why I have urged the President to use the emergency authority under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, to negotiate agreements with foreign countries that would restrict foreign mink permitted to enter the United States.

We should call a halt to unwarranted mink imports now, before our mink ranchers are completely forced out of business by foreign imports that usurp their market.

At present prices, Minnesota's mink ranchers stand to lose over $3.4 million on their 1966 production. This is a conservative figure based on the tenuous assumption that they can find a market for their large carryover of unsold pelts. An alarming number of mink ranchers, however, are still first, unable to find buyers for most of last year's crop, and second, unable, in the meantime, to borrow enough money to purchase the required feed for the newly born kits—young mink.

Since the average national price ranchers receive per pelt has skidded from $19.48 to $15, the need for Executive and congressional action is all the more imperative.

Last April I introduced a bill to permanently curtail mink imports that are in competition with domestic producers, and I am pleased that several of my colleagues have introduced similar mink import control legislation in the past month. While these bills are pending action by the House Ways and Means Committee, I strongly urge the President to secure agreements with foreign countries to stop the mink import deluge.

The American mink-raising industry has seen its domestic market shrink drastically due to increased imports, which account for more than two-fifths of this essential market. Unless the President and Congress respond with appropriate action to restrict imports of foreign mink, the domestic producer will soon find his entire investment lost, never to be recovered again.

A WARNING AGAINST MUNICH-TYPE "SELLOUT" IN ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I must underscore the danger of a Munich-type sellout of Israel, in the current crisis in the Middle East.

Despite all the talk about commitments that we have heard from the administration, about defending small nations against Communist-armed and Communist-supported aggression; despite all the verbiage about "aggression unchecked is aggression unleashed"; I fear that Israel finds herself in the position of Czechoslovakia in 1938.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept any premise or rationalization that attempts to prove, in effect, that Saigon is more sacred than Jerusalem.

I reject any notion that we must fight aggression in the Far East, but appease aggression in the Near East.

Let us be consistent. Let us honor our commitments. Let us be true to all the Americans who have sacrificed their lives to stop aggression and totalitarianism in World War II and subsequently.

The terrible danger confronting Israel, America's only real friend in the Near East, is known to all of us.

The United Nations failed miserably to promote peace, and then betrayed even the shaky armistice by arbitrary removal of the United Nations emergency forces. Communist China backed the Arabs. North Vietnam backed the Arabs. Russia backed the Arabs. India backed the Arabs. Pakistan backed the Arabs. Morocco backed the Arabs. Algeria backed the Arabs. East Germany backed the Arabs—and so forth.

Israel turned to Washington, recalling the many assurances we have heard by so many administration spokesmen, of both political parties.

What about the tripartite guarantees? France and England backed out. The situation in Europe had changed, with France out of NATO and England no longer the power she was. Neither wanted to face a showdown with Russia over the Near East. The tripartite guarantee was not worth the paper it was written on. Now, even the United States is backing out.

The administration has failed to effectively stand by Israel against the Egyptian aggression in the Gulf of Aqaba. The United States has failed to warn Egypt that we will not stand by idly in face of the massive Arab preparations for war.

The administration has indicated to the press that we do not want a unilateral involvement on the side of Israel. Explanations include the excuse that we are involved in a commitment in Vietnam and do not want to get involved in the Middle East at this time.

According to reports some of our State Department strategists say this is not the time nor place to fight the Egyptian Dictator Nasser. The same men argued so compellingly that we had to fight in Vietnam or forfeit the faith of all people menaced by aggression.

Israel today is not only the target of aggression, but has been victimized to the extent that American commitments should clearly be in effect. However, we have had words, not action.

Do the spokesmen for our Government not realize that the only way to prevent war is for the United States to stand firm, and to reaffirm its often-expressed commitments?

To side with Israel, according to some of our policymakers, would undermine the American position in every Moslemland, from Morocco to Indonesia. It would help Moscow, they say, to bracket America with Israel, and thus to facilitate Communist penetration of the Near East and other areas.

Another excuse is that American military forces are so heavily involved in Vietnam that reserves are needed there.

This is exactly what Nasser wants to hear. This is exactly what he knows he will hear, and because of this, he has made his aggressive moves, confident of the U.S. position.

All this is hypocrisy and spurious rationalization to sneak away from a commitment. It smells of appeasement.

How can we tell Israel to seek a solution through the United Nations, when it was the U.N. that made it possible for Nasser to blockade Israel's vital port of Elath?

It was the U.N., by hasty removal of its emergency forces, that made it possible for the Egyptian Army to mass on Israel's southern borders where tanks, divisions of troops, and even Soviet-made rockets are poised to strike at the heart of Israel?

We have passed the buck to the United Nations, and so many of our leaders have emphasized that this is the forum where this problem must be resolved.

Commendable as the recommendations for U.N. action may be, and laudable as Senator KENNEDY's proposed U.N. naval patrol may be, the feasibility of this is questionable at this point, because of the realities of the U.N.

Let us face the fact that the history of the U.N. in recent years has been anything but fair in regard to Israel. The Russian-Arab combination has predominated, and this was only too blatantly illustrated by the immediate acceptance of Nasser's demands to pull out the United Nations emergency force.

I am afraid that we cannot count on the U.N. to save Israel, nor to deter Arab aggression. It has not done so in the past. Why should Washington now assume that the Arabs and Communists will have a change of heart?

Persistence in this attitude will betray not only Israel, but vital American interests. If Nasser is permitted to get away with his blockade and belligerence against Israel, it will strengthen the Arab revolutionists and their Communist supporters.

Jordan has already yielded to Nasser. Saudi Arabian oil will next be seized by Nasserite forces. Kuwait, Aden, Lebanon, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, Libya, Tunisia, Morocco—the whole works will go. Then what point will there be to fighting in Vietnam when the Communists will control the Near East and north Africa, when they will dominate the eastern Mediterranean, will have undermined NATO and neutralized the U.S. 6th Fleet? How long will the Western democracies of Europe last, thus outflanked from the south? Communism and revolution will gain great and dangerous momentum and impetus.

Aside from our legal and moral commitments, let us look at it from the viewpoint of our own national security: Israel's defense is more important to our security than the defense of Vietnam.

Our Nation must consider today not only Israel's survival, but the survival of freedom, and the fate of democracy everywhere.

President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson have all voiced assurances to Israel. Now Israel calls to her American friends in Washington. Where is their response in terms of really telling the Arabs that America is on the side of Israel?

The hour calls for action. We must demand that our Nation honor its commitments. We must be consistent in meeting aggression in the Middle East if there is to be any validity in our commitments elsewhere.

If our President does not make this clear in forthright language, the U.S. prestige and influence in the entire Middle East will be dead, and Nasserism—the front for communism—will win by default, while elsewhere, American guarantees to small countries menaced by aggression will have no meaning whatsoever.

Of course, we can still hope for a miracle in the United Nations. Certainly, we should take bold, relentless leadership in the U.N., using it as a world forum to focus attention on Nasser's tyranny, and fighting for firm, effective action. But we must face realities and be fully cognizant that we cannot, at this time, rely on a solution there.

And indeed, Mr. Speaker, the President should ask Congress for a Gulf of Aqaba resolution, just as he asked for a Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

Israel must not become another Warsaw ghetto, nor another Buchenwald. We must not permit it. We must not permit those valiant people, standing guard for our freedoms, standing guard for the interests of the United States, for the interest of democracy, to stand alone.

The Communists and their Arab stooges have begun what the Nazi S.S. troops used to call an "action." It is an action to encircle the Jews, cut them off from the outside, and then to destroy them methodically.

If we are to avert a Nazi-type "action" in Israel, we must organize American action at once. All Americans—Republicans and Democrats, Jews and non-Jews—must make it clear to the President that appeasement will not be tolerated.

The President must speak in strong terms to the Arabs and to Moscow. He has not yet done so. There is still time, but the sands of time are running out.

AN ANALYSIS OF VIEWS ADVOCATED BY ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, because the ideas of Arnold J. Toynbee are provocative and controversial, recent congressional mail which quotes this distinguished scholar has increased markedly.

Professor Toynbee has been giving a course of lectures at Stanford University in my congressional district, and in April delivered two public lectures in the McClatchy series entitled "The Challenge of Our Time: Conservative Social Habits Versus Revolutionary Technological Change." This has stimulated much correspondence, but an even greater amount has resulted from his frequent writings in the San Francisco Chronicle. These articles give opinions on American manners and mores and American foreign policy.

While I admit that Mr. Toynbee's writings are intellectually stimulating and are therefore worthy of being read, I have been dismayed by his constant downgrading of our American society and his praise of those who seek to dilute and erode it. It was therefore a great satisfaction for me to receive an excellent article from the March–April issue of the Intercollegiate Review, a journal of scholarship and opinion. This article, written by Dr. William C. Bark, professor of history at Stanford University, was a rebuttal of some of Professor Toynbee's theories and took the form of a critical review of his book, "Change and Habit, the Challenge of Our Time."

Dr. Bark specializes in medieval studies and for some years has been director of Stanford's general course in the history of western civilization. He is a frequent contributor to scholarly journals, including the American Historical Review, the Harvard Theological Review, and History and Theory. His most recent book is "Origins of the Medieval World."

I shall include the complete article at the conclusion of my remarks for those with the time and the inclination to read it in its entirety. I strongly urge that every Member of the House take the time to read every line of it, but for those who cannot, I shall summarize Dr. Bark's article entitled "Mystery, Ancient and Modern."

Though Dr. Bark's analysis is sharply critical, it is scholarly and sportsmanlike and expresses admiration for the British historian's "broad learning and felicitous style."

Dr. Bark describes Toynbee as "a haughty historian and peremptory 'prophet' whose tendency is not to inquire 'Whither, mankind?' but to command 'Tither.' "

According to a press release issued by the Stanford University News Service, Professor Bark "takes particular issue with the Oxford University scholar's attachment to the 'world-state' as a desirable aim of human endeavor and with his concomitant scorn for an allegedly declining Western civilization whose chief fruit has been an unworthy 'political disunity.' "

The press release continues as follows:

> Underlying these two objections to the British historian's work are what Bark calls his "distrust" of Toynbee's "sense of satisfaction with his own predictions, his absolute certainty that he is infallable . . ."
>
> Though Bark finds Toynbee's general "absorption with the future" somewhat overweening for a student of the past, he is even more concerned with what he calls the Britisher's attempt to "use history to persuade, in a way to coerce, the present."
>
> "This would amount not simply to trying to discern the form of the future but actually to shaping it in accordance with an historian's, or a group of historians', ideological views as to what the future ought to be."
>
> The Stanford professor pays tribute to Toynbee's healthy fear of a monumentally destructive war and to his earnest desire for a peaceful world. But he questions the baldness of Toynbee's assertion that, in the atomic age, " 'mankind has to choose between political unification and mass-suicide.' "
>
> Among other reactions to Toynbee's views on the world-state and the decline of the West, Bark writes:
>
> "Why have men resisted being incorporated in world-states against their will? Toynbee seems to have no awareness whatever of the importance of the question. There is no real comprehension of the cost of the enforced unification he so deeply admires, that cost being, above all, the loss of freedom."
>
> "The absurdity of Toynbee's position lies chiefly in this: he sees no fallacy in desiring so eagerly to give man peace that he would give it by means of violence, in short by war, at the price of degradation and slavery."
>
> "Toynbee says that 'Better dead than Red' is a value judgment that we of the 20th century are not entitled to make for any other human being . . . Presumably he would reject even such a slogan as 'Better dead than slave' on the ground that slavery is one of those habits or institutions mankind can outlive.
>
> "Those who have experienced or witnessed the horrors of death camps, incinerations, mass liquidations . . . or more recently the tender ministrations of the Red Guards might have doubts, to express it mildly, about Toynbee's pretense to omniscience."

A statement by Professor Bark which accompanied the press release quoted above is especially interesting as an example of true academic tolerance. In my opinion, the academician who can criticize sternly and sharply, but still retain his respect for the views of a fellow scholar, is a true liberal—a faculty which

I fail to note in the writings of Professor Toynbee. Dr. Bark says:

Unfortunately it seems difficult for historians and other students to differ in their views and interpretations without suggesting to some observers that they are engaging in violent controversy. In reality the apparatus of books, articles, lectures, and reviews—controversy, if you will—provides a forum for the exchange of ideas. It is a marketplace in which the prospective buyer can examine and compare analyses, theories, and interpretations. It certainly is true that in the review essay, "Mystery, Ancient and Modern," I have criticized many of Professor Toynbee's views, views that for the most part he has been advancing over a long period of years. I have pointed out his penchant for advocating enthusiastically and only too often quite uncritically such vaguely defined notions as the "world-state." I believe he hopes it could be achieved peacefully, by a reasonable process, and that it would provide a desirable world to live in. I suspect it could only be achieved by a gigantic war, waged by ruthlessly totalitarian methods, resulting in a groveling conformity established and maintained by the violent suppression of the freedoms we now enjoy and hope to extend. He apparently prefers the "ideology" of Communism to that of Individualism but his faith in its "worldmindedness" and peaceful intentions seems to me pathetically naive. He refers happily to a "wave of the future," apparently forgetting that "wave of the future" supposed thirty years ago to denote the coming of the great new world-state of Adolf Hitler. He sincerely means to defend liberal views, I believe, but would countenance methods that, as I point out, could only take the "liberty" out of liberalism. I refer also to his biased views of the West, or Red China, of Christianity, and his inadequate understanding of historical change as contrasted with what Marc Block might have called "routine-mindedness." Strangest of all is his warm devotion to change, which he betrays by advocating a world in which the powers-to-be might well succumb to an insuperable temptation to maintain the *status quo*—forever, if possible.

One thing at least Toynbee may like about my review of his last book and that is the title, which comes from *Alice in Wonderland*. As a matter of fact, I suggest that Toynbee lives in a kind of Wonderland of the future in which there is constant change, things appearing and disappearing, like the Cheshire cat's grin, and in which everything of course turns out just fine. I am not so sure about all that. You remember that at school the Mock Turtle studied along with "Mystery, ancient and modern" such other strange but somewhat familiar-sounding subjects as Reeling and Writhing, Distraction and Derision, and even Laughing and Brief.

Mr. Speaker, there is much food for thought in this delightful clash of opinion between two of the world's great scholars. Though I have described Dr. Bark's article in brief, I still urge each reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to study "Mystery, Ancient and Modern" in its entirety. The article follows:

MYSTERY, ANCIENT AND MODERN

(By Dr. William C. Bark, professor of history, Stanford University)

Mankind has been looking to history for answers to its questions ever since the Greeks first displayed their willingness to give the answers. During most of that very long period of time this has meant looking to historians, for, as the late Sir Maurice Powicke observed, the historian was greater than history in the days of Thucydides and no less so only a century ago. Historians were indeed giants and wrote with the greatest confidence in the world. Since they were so sure they had the answers, it is not surprising that they wrote in this way. A qualification is required, however: although they often had the answers to the questions they asked, they did not always ask the right questions. And they did not do this because historical criticism was not yet sufficiently advanced to stir those questions. It is perhaps sad but nonetheless true that as historians have improved the quality of their work, in the process informing others more intelligently about those questions, they have lessened their own stature. It is of course true that actual developments in recent decades, many of them due to the natural sciences, have had much to do with the new and sharper questioning, but it should not be forgotten that historians themselves contributed to the process by which their former prestige has been so markedly diminished. I should also venture to say in defense of historians that they continue to add to their problems, and rightly so, by deliberately attempting to use more vigorously in their own research and interpretation the new findings in the humanities and social sciences.

The best way to understand the new status of historians is to consider the reasons for it. No one, I believe, has treated the matter more effectively than the distinguished medieval historian just cited. Powicke contrasts vividly the "deliberate and disciplined pursuit of historical generalizations" found in the great Italians, Voltaire, and Gibbon with what he calls "the discomfort of the historic generalization" as it is met with now. One reason, he says, why the older variety gave and gives pleasure is its confidence. It seems both "to open the door to secrecies" and "to assure the reader that no more need be said." And then comes the pithy remark, "It suggests that history is written by scholars to be read by gentlemen." Alas, it is so no longer. The old comfort and confidence are gone, vanished is the aura of infallibility, and the smooth old generalizations no longer serve. Instead we have sharp and bitter questions which, we are convinced, history *ought* to be able to answer but somehow cannot seem to answer adequately. The result is impatience, certainly among students of history as well as the reading public, and as Powicke has it, a loss of confidence and a feeling of discomfort and inadequacy. "The spacious and cultivated ease of our predecessors" is indeed denied to today's historian and in the words of the grand Dutch historian, the late Pieter Geyl, history is "an argument without end."

What has the plight of historians today to do with the project at hand? The two are as a matter of fact more closely related than they at first sight appear to be. We live in an age when *exact* knowledge, *exact* data, and the capacity to bring about tremendous alterations in the old way of doing things have been multiplied beyond anything that would have been considered possible a century ago. It is this vast growth in the exact, I suspect, that has led to the inclination—indeed the demand—that history give "exact," unqualified answers, whether the evidence for them exists or not. Those who write history are very much aware of this pressure to give forthright replies to great and stirring questions. What this may mean in terms of written history I attempt to explain in the pages that follow.

The title of the most recent of Professor Toynbee's books is in itself both challenging and timely. It would not be easy to find two more richly human and promising subjects for study than change and habit and, presumably, their relationship to each other. If they are related to each other in the manner suggested by Toynbee's title, we certainly ought to be aware of the fact and give it all due consideration. Actually an examination of the book reveals that it deals with a number of subjects that, at least at first sight, seem not to bear very closely on the title, but this may perhaps be explained by the origin of the book. The author observes in a brief preface that most of the topics were the subjects of lectures given at Denver University, at New College (Florida), and at the University of the South in the last quarter of 1964 and the first quarter of 1965. The notes for the lectures provided his starting point, but the lectures do not make up the chapters of the book, for in the course of writing he rearranged the contents. Thus it is that we find, among others, chapters on "Light from the Past: Its Value and Limitations," "The Significance of the Would-be World-States," "Is a World-Wide World-State Feasible?" "Mechanization, Regimentation, Boredom," and "Affluence and Leisure."

To all those familiar, even in a superficial way, with the noted author's earlier writings, these sweeping subjects, these massive questions, and these resounding hyphenated words will have a familiar ring, and for some will also raise a question. Is it possible that a Toynbee cannot change his habit, in this respect resembling the leopard who has the same trouble with spots? Having asked that question, without attempting to answer it at this point I shall go on to another topic, for reasons that, I believe, will in due course become apparent.

That other topic with its implied question concerns the value, indeed the validity, of the type of history represented in a general way by this book. Professional historians, not to mention philosophers and social scientists, have had much to say about the subject in the last few years and, unless I err badly in reading the heavenly portents, they will have much more to say about it in the next few. Toynbee is not the only to concern himself with the kind of history that in the opinion of some professional historians attempts to do more than history can be expected legitimately to do. One thinks of Spengler, and more recently Barraclough and others; but Toynbee, following Spengler and on his own, has done it so much more extensively and so much more vividly than the others that he is generally considered the liveliest proponent of this variety of historical writing. It was a foregone conclusion that it would be asked whether Toynbee is any kind of historian at all. Some years ago Pieter Geyl, in a now famous article, suggested that Toynbee was a prophet while Edward Fiess in an accompanying essay suggested that he was a poet. In a rather lame reply Toynbee declared that he would rather be called minor poet than minor prophet and added that he would not mind being called minor historian so long as it is understood he has not renounced the right to study history and to write some if he chooses. He had already pointed out, in a way reminiscent of his earlier debating style, that he had entitled the work that brought on the query as to his status not a "History" but *A Study of History*. In the droll manner of which he is a master, he observed that if one were to write *A Study of Shakespeare*, it would clearly not mean . . . and so on.

Now leaving aside for the moment Toynbee as "minor prophet," "minor poet," or "minor historian," I should like to go back to the question concerning the validity of history that is aimed at the present or future. A good many of today's historians take the view that concern with the future is not *verboten* to historians but indeed a reasonable and proper part of their job. These historians mean by this no more and no less than that it is possible we may learn something from history that could be helpful and useful to us in the present or the future. It was a generation ago that Carl Becker in his famous Presidential Address to the American Historical Association, "Everyman His Own Historian," made certain pertinent allusions to history and memory, equating the two in the life of Everyman as well as in the studies of professional historians. Perhaps it will be asked what good this collective memory of the past called history can do us if we cannot use it either now or in the future. The problem is not quite so simple. It is a question not merely of the value of history but of what is done with it and who does it, thus entailing the further questions of how and why he does it.

In a more recent Presidential Address delivered to the American Historical Association on December 29, 1963 by Crane Brinton and entitled "Many Mansions," Professor Brinton presented a plea for some broadening and loosening of what he regards as the excessively narrow and inflexible boundaries of the historical craft. He suggested that greater variety in historical writing ought to be encouraged by extending a more generous welcome to the newer forms, and he further stated that comparative, nomothetic and "even" philosophical history ought to be cultivated more than they are at present. Brinton generously, in my opinion too generously, asserted that "we" meaning the professional or traditionalistic historians, drummed Toynbee "out of our ranks," when he went into the philosophy of history. I regard this description as excessive on two grounds, first that "the philosophy of history" no longer arouses the blood lust of traditional historians and second, that Toynbee met sharp rebuffs from other historians not because he ventured into the philosophy of history but for other reasons. In reality many of the historians who have criticized him have, while doing so, engaged in philosophical considerations of history much more deeply than has he. It was not exactly, certainly not exclusively, the philosophy of history Toynbee went into and as I write this, I bear in mind the point he himself made, namely, that he titled his greatest work *A Study of History*.

The point I have been aiming at is that a goodly number of professional historians no longer fear to make generalizations, to speculate, though carefully, to ask what they are doing and how and why, and recognize that they are doing so. Thus, Brinton, though he prefaced this advice with the caution that he does not "mean to urge we imitate Toynbee, let alone Croce-Hegel," suggested that "very tentatively, very professionally," historians might try their hands at "something close to philosophical history." It is indicative of a growing interest on the part of historians in reaching a wider group of readers that he further suggested that we try to show the educated public how far history—and he means the traditional variety—can answer and how far it cannot answer "that impossible and unavoidable question: *Whither Mankind*." He shortly afterward repeated that historians "ought not to imitate Toynbee in his role of prophet," adding that there is no reason for not occasionally making "fairly long-term guesses" as to how far and in what direction "the human group" is likely to change or be changed. So Toynbee is not alone in his great interest in the idea of change. As a matter of fact, this is by no means the first time Brinton has shown his concern with the need for historians to face the great questions and to tell the educated public candidly where they stand. It was indeed not much before he delivered his presidential address that, in reviewing another of Toynbee's books, he had used this same expression, "Whither Mankind?," and expressed plainly his concern with the way Toynbee succeeds in reaching the public and giving them something the professional historian does not. In that review he also referred specifically to the Toynbeean practices other historians find "irritating." Toynbee was indeed reaching a wider group. To the major matter of concern, however, i.e. what he was reaching this group with, Brinton perhaps paid too little attention in his presidential address. He was, to be sure, chiefly concerned with an opportunity that he thought historians ought not to miss and it was very much to the point to refer to Toynbee's keen assessment of the kind of questions the public would like historians to answer. He makes it very clear, with his usual tact, that professional historians have not always been fully aware of the magnitude of the challenge the world puts to them and that they have not always distinguished themselves for their boldness. As already observed, the risks faced by historians have increased very considerably indeed in the last few decades and it may be added that the experience of some of the "neighbors" of history in attempting vast interpretations without adequate historical background has not encouraged historians to take on tasks for which they have not felt themselves prepared.

There are, clearly enough, many reasons in addition to those mentioned why historians should not rush to compete with Toynbee for a wider public. It might be remarked, for example, that writing history is not a popularity contest and that serious historians should insist upon maintaining certain standards not conducive to winning the field. There are, moreover, historians who maintain that some of the questions the public would like answered simply cannot be answered, at least not by historians or philosophers or even social scientists. Meanwhile, Crane Brinton's insistent question "Whither Mankind?" remains. Could the answer be, finally, that none but prophets can or would try to cope with queries of the vastness of *Quo vadis*? Or if it is reasonable for professional historians to learn from history, in what significant way do they differ from Toynbee?

I repeat that it is quite conceivable to me that a great many, perhaps most, contemporary historians would grant that it is appropriate for them to attempt to perceive, on the basis of their knowledge of the past, the way things are going to go in the future. Even R. G. Collingwood, well known as a man strongly opposed to "historical" attempts to prophesy or foretell the future, concedes that "the only clue to what man can do is what man has done." To agree on so much is one thing. It is quite another, however, to make use of the past to "serve the needs of the present" and it is just at this point that many historians who would go along with the attempt, as historians, to try to discern the shape of things to come would begin to experience that familiar feeling of discomfort mentioned by Powicke. For, as I observed above, it is important who reads the entrails and how and, above all, why he does it. Are the Soviet historians merely serving the needs of the present when they write history as they think it ought to be? There are so many needs that might be served, needs for peace, or war, or national or religious or racial pride, for controversial ideologies, for all manner of schemes and theories. And when historians have a large public demanding to be given great answers, preferably from high Olympus without those scholarly reservations and qualifications and hesitations, the temptation to supply what is wanted is, for some at least, irresistible. The risk is not simply that historians may write on themes that are popular but that they may feel compelled to influence opinion in ways not properly historical. Though they may not resort to propaganda in the flagrant manner of the Nazi or Soviet historians, they may still become propagandists for a favored ideology, using rhetoric artfully as they pretend to pay homage to established critical standards. It is even possible that they may sometimes yield in this way without being fully aware of it. The danger of writing propaganda under the delusion that it is history is greatest for those of strong reformist tendencies, those with burning zeal and kindly intentions. Most of us are familiar with the human proclivity to believe that we know what is good for others better than they do themselves—but most resist giving in to it.

Let me remind the reader that I raised a question about what Toynbee is reaching that public with. Both Geyl and Fiess were right, Geyl in insisting that in *A Study of History* Toynbee was prophet rather than historian and Fiess in describing the *Study* as a "huge theological poem in prose." In *Change and Habit* Toynbee remains true to his calling; he is still prophet and he still writes in that grand, sweeping manner from a point of view still much more prophetically and theologically poetic than historical. He is still the high priest interpreting the omens and doing it so effectively, in the manner of those eighteenth-century historians Powicke described as seeming to open the door to secrecies while assuring the reader that no more need be said. Yet perhaps the air of confidence, the assurance behind the ready and eloquent answers to a public "eager to know what it is all about" are bought at too dear a price.

Toynbee in this book soon makes it clear that he has a message to deliver. Change is good and Habit is bad in this particular sermon, though an innocent reader who recalls that not all change can be good since Toynbee himself mentions certain changes that have not worked out well, might be confused by this simple dichotomy. The fact is that this opposing of Change and Habit is only a convenient device, for Toynbee is quite aware that some traits of human character are constructive and some destructive and that the same may be said of some human practices that are virtually changeless. I do not believe, however, that he would agree with Crane Brinton when the latter says that historians' awareness of change can drive them into neglecting "not-change, or permanence," adding "Yet what endures is surely at least as 'real' as what changes." I do not believe it, because to oppose Change and Habit to each other, as Toynbee does, reveals a monumentally inflexible state of mind. The innocent and confused reader just mentioned might point out specifically, for example that technology, one of the leading devils in Toynbee's hell, is an example of change and not all bad by any means, and that other changes, such as atomic energy, mechanization, and urbanization at least raise questions. Yet they too represent Change. As for Habit, he has in mind such Habits as going to war, "the divisive movement" in human affairs, and harboring feelings of devotion for causes Toynbee does not approve of, above all the "post-Christian ideologies," especially Nationalism and Individualism. Yet one might ask about the habit of religion, or rather "the higher religions," which he sometimes ridicules (especially in the case of Christianity), but which turn out finally to be the most hopeful means of mankind's possible salvation. They must, to be sure, first undergo certain changes (p. 177).

The familiar fire and brimstone are resorted to, sometimes rather strangely, in the course of charming warnings about the imminence of human self-destruction, unless the Toynbee prescription for survival is followed. This comes out most vividly in his solemn advice on the need to adopt a world-state, something that seems very similar to the imperialism that in recent decades we have been moving away from in the apparently mistaken belief that it is bad. An especially interesting aspect of Toynbee on the world-state is his concomitant anti-Western attitude, which Geyl so thoroughly dissected and explained in comments on the *Study of History*.

Special pleading in favor of the world-state emerges most dramatically at the beginning of Chapter VIII, "Is a World-Wide World-State Feasible?". Toynbee begins by contending that in the Atomic Age "mankind has to choose between political unification and mass-suicide" (p. 138). It is pointed out that we are free. We can (and the implication is that we can, if we are foolish enough) refuse the way out that our historian has found for us. Finally, with thunder and lightning in the background, Toynbee puts it to us that to refuse "would mean choosing death," adding, as consolation no doubt, that "human beings seldom do choose death when it comes to the point" (p. 139). He then proceeds to set up and knock down a series of obstacles to the world-state, proving to his own satisfaction that these obstacles are not really very serious after all, be they technological, psychological, or physiological. Under this last heading he refers to "acute racial strife" in South Africa, Rhodesia, "the Old South" of the United States, Britain, and India and to the lack of racial strife in such regions as Hawaii, and "many" Latin American and Muslim countries. Racial antipathy is declared to be peculiar to three sections of the human race, the "higher-caste" Hindus, the Jews, and the English-, Dutch-, and German-speaking minority of the Western peoples (p. 143).

Toynbee's views on the world-state do not really become clear, however, without some understanding of his attitude toward Nationalism. This he describes as being, in the Atomic Age, a "death-wish," the antidote to which is "world-mindedness." And this, in turn, has found expression in two "historic institutions," the "would-be" world-states and world-religions (p 112). Then in a sort of historical sketch of earlier world-states and the opposition to them Toynbee gives a startling demonstration of his inability to grasp the nature of the problem.

He begins this review with a little disquisition on a certain failure on the part of two of the would-be world-states, China and Russia. Since their ideology is Communism and Communism as a "missionary ideology" is devoted to the conversion of the whole of mankind, Toynbee felt justified in assuming that they would proceed toward the world-state. That is implied, not asserted, but the implication is quite clear, for Toynbee finds himself faced by the reality that they did not do so and he unquestionably regards this as quite regrettable. It seems to me that it is with a mixture of sorrow and impatience that he announces the undeniable fact that both of these promising would-be world-states capitulated to an ideology—Nationalism—that is the "antithesis of worldmindedness." And why did they do it? It was the "price of survival" and somehow one concludes that Toynbee regards this as unworthy of them, for he observes, with some asperity, that their overriding commitment to Nationalism is "incompatible with the universalism that both states still profess." The admission follows, "but it is consonant with present facts" (pp. 115–116). I need not add that it is not explained how the two might have gone about the smooth advance toward the unity Toynbee so strongly feels they should have attained. I can only describe this kind of browbeating of history as indicative of confusion of the "present facts," which are one set of facts reluctantly recognized in part, with the facts as Toynbee believes they ought to be, which constitute a second set just as real, if not more so, to him.

More light is thrown on this peculiar lack of sure contact with reality in the course of an attack on two of those confident historians of an earlier era, Gibbon and Hume. Toynbee scolds them, because, in contrasting "the dynamism" of the divided Western world of their day with "the torpor" that in their opinion is induced by the establishment of a world-religion or a world-state, "each opts for disunity unreservedly" (p. 91). He then actually goes over the case for the view that in history neighboring but independent communities have stimulated each other to creativity and that periods of "social agony" have also been periods of intellectual vigor, In doing this, he cites illustration after illustration, and he also maintains that where as in the southern two-thirds of Africa, a region has been blocked off from stimulating contacts, there has been a "5,000-years time-lag" in the coming of civilization. So there is "truth" in the observations of Gibbon and Hume but Toynbee hastily shows that there was not much truth, for they did not probe far enough to discover two important reservations. Yet he himself neglected to apply these same reservations to his rather careless citation concerning Africa (pp. 95–96). In following up this indictment, Toynbee makes one sweeping assumption after another, vaguely drawn from "the history of the last 5,000 years," about "fractured" societies and the cost of political disunity. The only defense of this hodge-podge of arguments in which the Sumero-Akkadians, the Egyptians, the Chinese, the French Revolution, and the Roman Empire are made to serve their master's thesis is Toynbee's natural and reasonable fear of war. This fear, however, does not excuse his blindness to the reasons for mankind's age-old resistance to empires or world-states.

Nothing could be clearer than the fact that the desire, indeed the need, for peace is very great throughout the world. This need will not be answered, however, by a frantic, imperceptive, and one-sided clamor for a world-state. Why have men resisted being incorporated in world-states against their will? Toynbee seems to have no awareness whatever of the importance of the question. There is no real comprehension of the cost of the enforced unification he so deeply admires, that cost being, above all, the loss of freedom. There is, however, scarcely concealed irritation at the perverse and obstinate insistence of "forcibly united peoples" to revolt at their earliest opportunity (p. 117). Nor is there any reference to the fact that the unification into his world-state has sometimes been undertaken by slave states, e.g. the Oriental mass-state of Persia, against peoples, such as the Athenians, who had thrown off the yoke of domestic tyranny and had no intention of bowing to a foreign potentate. Yet this same author of ours deplores the institution of slavery (pp. 148 and 184, though on p. 184 he hedges). One can only wonder if he would have consoled Negro slaves brought to America against their will by pointing out to them the good fortune of their escape from a life of incessant inter-tribal warfare. Nowhere does he express curiosity at the conditions against which conquered peoples have revolted. It is enough that they were unappreciative of the undescribed beauties of world-statism-by-force.

Further examples might be given—Toynbee provides page after page crammed with the venerable names, e.g. Sumero-Akkadian, of experiments in world-states (pp. 126ff.)—but I shall make only two more specific references on this subject. First, there is his astounding failure to understand how the Greeks so long retained their resentment against their Roman conquerors. He mentions the fact that the Romans owed the Greeks "whatever culture they had managed to acquire" (p. 120) but that is all. Second, I refer to his citation of Dostoyevski's Grand Inquisitor. Unless I read him wholly incorrectly, he has utterly failed to grasp the sense of even the brief passage he quotes. He does not understand, so low apparently is his opinion of man, that peace cannot be thrust upon him, that man will not attain peace until he understands himself and consequently seeks peace. The absurdity of Toynbee's position lies chiefly in this: he sees no fallacy in desiring so eagerly to give man peace that he would give it by means of violence, in short by war, at the price of degradation and slavery.

Another facet of Toynbee's crusade for the world-state, as familiar and interesting as ever because it plays with that question "Whither Mankind?", concerns his anti-Western bias. As a serious departure from even minimal standards of objectively it brings his critical judgment into question and it is another illustration of his inclination, when the realities do not conform with his preconceived ideas of what they ought to be, to twist them until they do. There are numerous examples to cite but again I must restrict myself to just a few. One occurs in the course of a contrast of the organization of the Ottoman Empire, which may have been a "preview" of the future world-state, with the West's prevalent political ideology, which is described as backward. There are accompanying scornful references to the "temporary ascendancy" of the West and the "regression" it has caused (p. 85). Another example is to be found in the comparison of Christian and Communist missionary activities and the West's "indignant" reaction to the Communist efforts, which Toynbee finds comic (p. 190). Still another discusses the matter of the introduction of the world-state. Will it be done by the United States and the Soviet Union or by China? Toynbee seems to think the two Western powers will miss the boat and give China her chance. But he appears to welcome the prospect (China rarely receives any of his needles), for China would have a better chance to do the job—having on her side unity, numbers, and above all, history (pp. 157–158). And the West is scolded again for its dislike of political unity. True this is only a habit, so we may not be lost. It is not a built-in trait of nature "even in the West;" it could therefore be *changed* and thus readily turned from bad to good (p. 138).

The most shocking example of Toynbee's anti-Western prejudice, however, occurs fairly early in the book (pp. 48 ff.) and it most effectively betrays the principles in accordance with which Toynbee studies and interprets history. It also provides one of the more impressive demonstrations of his great powers as an arranger of "facts" and of the considerable subtlety with which he can advance his ideology. This particular piece of pressurized historical special-pleading is introduced by portentous references, accompanied by vast figures, to the innumerable host of human beings still unborn, but still to be born in the course of the next 2,000,000,000 years. It is of course quite a large number. This unborn host has a plea to make—and Toynbee has appointed himself spokesman for this huge constituency—to the tiny minority of us alive today who by the chance of living now hold "posterity's destiny" in our hands. It is pointed out that since these unborn successors cannot plead for themselves, their plea to us has to be put to us by ourselves, since we alone out of all the departed and all those yet to come, we alone, being alive, bear the responsibility. It will be understood that by "ourselves" Toynbee means Toynbee, who again is not dealing with historical realities but making an emotional presentation of his own conception of what ought to be done.

It would be, he goes on, a "monstrously arbitrary and arrogant abuse of power" by the living minority to decide to prevent that tremendous potential majority from being born. In my opinion that admonition should read "decide not to do as Toynbee thinks we should do." But it is precisely at this point that our evangelical student of history makes an amazing revelation that will unquestionably raise questions as to just what he has in mind. He refers to the "wave of the future" more than once in this book and it is a term that for me at least has an ominous connotation. Naturally, therefore, I am intensely interested, when, after warning us not to condemn future generations to remain unborn, Toynbee says that "Better dead than red" is a value judgment that we of the twentieth century are not entitled to make for any other human being (p. 49). This is the man who a few lines before mentioned "an arbitrary and arrogant abuse of power." After his first reference to "Better dead than red" he proceeds to tell those who disagree with him what they can do: *viz.*, commit suicide. He then supports his position by some of the strangest and most inappropriate comparisons I have ever encountered. One is "a piece of historical fiction" in which the fourth-century Roman would-be Emperor Eugenius opposes the forcible imposition of Christianity on the non-Christian majority. Suppose Eugenius to have the atomic weapons. Suppose further that he decided it would be better for mankind to be dead than Christian. Suppose finally that he used the bomb. Toynbee spares us the frightening thought, knowing that it will occur to us, that we, including Toynbee, should then never have been born. He proceeds rather to some dubious speculations about the "lesson" involved, e.g. Christianity did not ruin mankind, so Eugenius would have been wrong. The argument that it is evil to impose ideologies by force is disposed of by noting that Christianity was imposed by force. A few lines below he says "this monstrous régime of Christian totalitarianism" lasted for 1,300 years, thus being longer by three centuries than the "Thousand Years' Reich" Hitler promised for his "totalitarian German nationalism" (p. 5). The disintegration of Western Christendom in the Reformation only made the evil worse, for then "Western Christians" took to persecuting each other as well as Muslims and Jews.

Let those who can do so accept this as history. It not only attempts to perceive the shape of the future, it foretells that shape in minute detail and would use history to persuade, in a way to coerce, the present. This would amount not simply to trying to discern the form of the future but actually to shaping it in accordance with an historian's, or a group of historians', ideological views as to what the future ought to be. If this is history, the word has become synonymous with propaganda and Crane Brinton's question "Whither Mankind?" has become a command "Thither, Mankind!"

In considering the "Better dead than red" argument as Toynbee employs it, it may not be useless to ask why in his omniscience he gave the world and all those teeming billions yet to be born no other choices. Is that the only one there is? Or is it his intention to use this argument only to attempt to coerce the non-Communist world? Why does he never change the alternative to, say, "Better dead than capitalist" or "Better dead than democratic," thus allowing the Communists, especially his beloved Chinese Communists, an opportunity to save the innumerable host of the future? He has told us that so long as the human race allows itself to stay alive, it will be able to outlive any habits or institutions," and of course he has given us the example of the West's survival of 1,300 years of the "monstrous régime" of Christian totalitarianism. It is, I believe, an extremely significant revelation that Toynbee chose to put the onus only on the Western World for which he expresses such contempt. In his view, if he were consistent, surely mankind would outlive capitalism or democracy or individualism as well as Communism.

Toynbee's exposure of his views in the course of his attack on "Better dead than red" is borne out by his spirited defense of the world-state even at the cost of enslavement. Presumably he would reject even such a slogan as "Better dead than slave" on the ground that slavery is one of those habits or institutions mankind can outlive. Those who have experienced or witnessed the horrors of death camps, incinerations, mass liquidations in Poland, the Ukraine, and elsewhere, or more recently the tender ministrations of the Red Guard might have doubts, to express it mildly, about Toynbee's pretense to omniscience. They might also ask about that reference (p. 51) to Hitler's "Thousand Years' Reich." Again if Toynbee were consistent, he would have to admit that monstrosity, too, as a world-state that the human race could outlive, and he has not rejected it in his scheme of world-states. Indeed the full malignity of his ideology comes out most forcefully in what amounts almost to reverence for the world-state and in the repeated suggestion that there is something much worse than the dehumanization wrought by the world empire.

I am inclined to believe, on the basis of a consideration of Toynbee's arguments, that Toynbee worships the *fait accompli* and has no little admiration for the use of force to attain ends he regards as in themselves worthy. I do not see how otherwise we are to explain his obtuseness with respect to the cost of unification. This is brought out most clearly in his aforementioned impatience with the "forcibly united peoples" who did not appreciate the "peace and order" es-established for them but seized the first opportunity to revolt (p. 117). The meaning of the combination of "peace" and "order" "established" by the imposition of political unity cannot be missed. Granted that all sane men hope for peace, would they have it on any terms, even on those of a Hitler or Stalin? Light is thrown on this problem (helpful to illuminate the predicament Toynbee has written himself into) by a remarkable essay written by Dr. L. J. Rather on the subject of Faustian man and the Western world today.

It will be remembered that Faust, now the possessor of great power, conceived vast utopian-social aspirations which he was determined to implement regardless of cost. He did so with great brutality, because of a metaphysical error committed early in his career. This was the substitution of the *Deed* for the *Word* and, as Dr. Rather expresses it, it work itself out in pure activism and in the replacement of genuine knowledge and understanding by applied technique (p. 61). Faust had access to an abundant supply of the latter through his contract with Mephistopheles. For the Faustian man it was perfectly satisfactory to proceed toward his noble goals with no regard for individual members oft he human race—after all, he had their welfare at heart—but as he used his enormous power, he became progressively alienated from the natural world and his fellow men. It is not surprising that Hitler is said to have taken special pleasure in the Philemon and Baucis incident and that at the time of the first World War Oswald Spengler expressed his admiration for facts and deeds and his hope that *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* might turn young men from poetry to technology and from philosophy to politics (p. 64). Nor is it surprising that Albert Schweitzer in 1932 recognized that men of his time, like Faust, were making a terrible mistake and that he pleaded for "the ideal of human personality in hostile circumstances" as against the rising idea which ordained that man must change and achieve a "differently ordered fulfillment of his nature" submissive to organized society (p. 64).

That early error of Faust's arose from his perversion of the Johannine Gospel. He began by rejecting the "Word" (*Wort*) as inadequate. He passed then to "Thought" (*Sinn*), decided next it must be "Power" (*Kraft*), but finally saw, with the help of Mephistopheles, that "In the beginning was the *Deed*" (*"Im Anfang war die Tat"*). Man in this philosophy becomes only a scientific object (*Husserl*), a puppet to be moved about as the Fausts of the world see fit. Faust, as he became older and more estranged, manipulated his people not as human beings but as objects. It did them little good that he wanted them to be happy. They were of course not consulted about their happiness, possibly because, like the individuals Toynbee manipulates so placidly, they might have given the wrong answers. To quote Rather once more, "Nothing remained in the end except the brute irrational fact and its counterpart, the 'Deed,'" and he recounts that Hitler once said to Rauschning that he had no love for Goethe but could overlook much for the sake of one phrase, *"Im Anfang war die Tat"* (p. 67). We can, I hope, recognize the danger in a philosophy of action for the sake of action, deeds for the sake of deeds, power for the sake of power, as opposed to the union of the universal and the particular, i.e. the Christian version of the Logos Doctrine, and we can see with Dr. Rather that several centuries of devotion to technique and worship of the naked Deed have helped bring Western man to "his current mood of despair." I also hope we can see that Toynbee with his adulation of the world-state and his unconvincing attempts to discover some kind of salvation in the world-religions cannot tell us where mankind is going. It is quite clear to me, however, that he is prepared to rearrange humanity, to manipulate men like puppets, and that he hopes, like Faust, to make them happy in spite of themselves. His concept of change is excessively simple and renders meaningless his idea of "change" and "habit" as opposing forces which constitute the challenge of our time.

There are many other points I should like to take up but I must confine myself to a few more brief remarks about Toynbee's ideology. One of the more astonishing of his pronouncements declares that the symbol of the "ideology" of Individualism is commercial advertising. It is also a Christian heresy, he says, which erred not in insisting on the "sacrosanctity of human personalities" but in sacrificing social justice. It is at the same time, strangely enough, a "reversion to the Greek deification of the self-sufficient individual human being." He also taxes it with being too closely bound up with freedom of economic enterprise (pp. 170 ff.). There is in these somewhat contradictory definitions a not uncommon mixture of fact and fiction which would baffle anyone who first encountered them without any previous knowledge of Tonynbee's method. I present the definitions here, however, not because of this confusion but as an example of Toynbee's fondness for denigrating anything he does not approve of or understand. There is a danger in this course, a risk of falling into arrogance and the overwhelming and blinding conviction of one's own righteousness. Very few of us can afford to be condescending about the opinions of all who disagree with us. We may, and often must, oppose them but we cannot simply dismiss them either by banishing them to the gas oven or garbling their views. We have had too much of that form of skepticism accompanied by overweening pride in contrived solutions, and, as I have already suggested, there is a danger. If most historians now experience the "discomfort which oppresses the thoughtful study of history" (Powicke, p. 229), it seems to me quite sensible that they should. I do not mean that I think it is good for them to suffer for the sake of suffering but rather that it has become almost impossible for a conscientious man to study history with ease and comfort. Few of us have many of the answers and most, though not all, of us know it.

It is in part because of Toynbee's sense of satisfaction with his own predictions, his absolute certainty that he is infallible, that I distrust his interpretations. The reason behind my doubts goes back to his guiding ideology. He never names this, as far as I know, but I believe he may be regarded as an exponent of one of a number of varieties of "liberalism" now rather widely accepted. As with certain other "ideologies," such as

Communism, his particular "liberal" variety starts with good intentions, but being the product of fallible human beings, it does not succeed in fully carrying out its intentions. Something sometimes happens to exponents of ideologies along the way and those who, to begin with, believed in truth—for they had discovered it—end up dealing in sophistries. They become impatient with human beings as they are and feel that they must, like Faust, hurry up the natural process. If men are too backward to learn quickly enough by themselves, the enlightened reformer will tell them, i.e. give them the answers. But what happens if men prove to be so "weak," "foolish," and "backward" as to refuse to accept the answers? That is the dilemma of this new reformer. As does the old liberal, whom Toynbee calls an "individualist" and who is often called a "conservative" today, the new liberal of Toynbee's type believes in freedom, in fact in many freedoms, or at least professes to do so. It is true that the old liberal lost a magnificent opportunity but he did at least remain faithful to the spirit of freedom. It would be interesting to inquire into the reasons for his failure and to ask if he may possibly have a second chance, but that is another story and much too long to examine here. The new type, believing in freedom, or assumed to believe in freedom, and faced with obstinate, independent man, has had to make a choice. He has, like Toynbee in his manipulating of the puppets, chosen expediency. From this decision come, in Toynbee's case, the scornful attacks on all who find different answers, the absurdities such as the mocking definitions of "Individualism," of the "backward" Western World, of Western Christianity, of Communism as a Christian heresy (Toynbee got double duty from the gibe). Thence also comes the hasty new solutions, the shortcuts, the betrayals of original principles. Apparently it becomes necessary for the exponent of the new "liberalism" to hedge a little, to recognize that man is not yet quite ready for freedom.

There continues to be talk about freedom of course, but this is primarily lip-service. The doctrine that the end justifies the means begins to look better and better, just as it did for Faust. Thus the contradictions pile up and the absurdities become more sickening, as enslavement is justified in the name of peace, lawlessness, including violation of the rights of others, in the name of social justice, compulsion in many forms in the name of freedom. It is no wonder that scepticism with respect to human beings turns into cynicism cloaked by an appearance of righteousness that becomes eventually no more than sanctimonious hypocrisy. Thus the problem of the new "liberal" reformer is how to attain good ends by expedient means. This accounts for the error of Faustian man, who with all his good intentions, has so little faith in human beings that he feels he must give them by any means available what is worth having only if achieved with justice, with respect for the rights of others, and without the loss of freedom. It might be asked, before dropping the subject, where today's hasty "liberals" tend to go astray. It is, as it appears to me, first of all by allowing their strong and, in themselves, benign intentions to blind them to the reality that in their haste to do good they permit their principles to become blunted so that they end up too eager for power and too careless about how they obtain and use it.

"Liberal" is really not a good term for the kind of eager, would-be saviors of mankind I have been describing, and I am reluctant to use the word in writing of them. Their conception of "liberal" exaggerates the aspect of liberality in giving things away with an open hand and it under-emphasizes the more important meaning of liberty as a state of freedom from restriction or compulsion. They sometimes carry this so far in their sincere enthusiasm to help others, that they lose perspective. They hope by giving "things" (the issue between Christ and Satan and later the Grand Inquisitor) to attain noble ends but they exaggerate the value of "things" as contrasted with values of another kind. Bread alone is still not enough. The distortion of perspective is plainly exposed when we finally see self-appointed "liberal" donors giving away not only things but the spirit itself, i.e. liberty, human dignity, and the moral and ethical values without which bread, and peace, have no value to man. It is by some such process as this, I believe, that "liberals" of Toynbee's persuasion find themselves advocating a world-state and submission to a wave of the future that mean in effect compulsion, conformity, and ultimately slavery. It is a strange kind of "liberalism" that can defend and advocate in the name of peace surrender to imperialism imposed by violence, and that can look forward calmly to the crushing of the individual freedom of men and the destruction of their integrity in the very name of liberty. As for the speculations about Nationalism *vis à vis* "worldmindedness," I have already referred to Toynbee's own demonstration that the latter gave way to the former when the chips were down and I then asked how "world-minded" states such as Russia and China can be expected to give up their Nationalism. Can any assurances be given that the world-state Toynbee hopes for would be free of nationalistic feeling on the part of its rulers, such as would create a master-slave relationship with respect to the rest of the world?

Toynbee is right in saying that change is the essence of life and that the rate of change in human life is being speeded up as never before by the accelerating advance of technology (p. 199). He fears, however, that "Two thousand million years of life in megalopolis" may bring some problems (p. 207). He is aware, for example, that extending a privilege to everyone amounts in effect to taking it away from everyone (pp. 218–219). So he sees that the affluent and leisured society he would give us in megalopolis would require, if life there were to be even half-way worth living, freedom to change constantly, quickly, and wisely. Yet he is the man whose ideology leads him to advocate creation of a world-state that must be viable and fool-proof and that must protect the freedom of the individuals who live in it from the very moment of its introduction. On the basis of a growing mass of evidence gained in man's recent efforts to contend with world problems, the prospects for working out a world-state government of this kind do not seem bright. Something would have to go in the process of organizing the world-state and I am afraid that, as in the past, freedom would prove to be the most expendable item.

Toynbee is right also in his fear of individualism and for reasons closely connected with his willingness to make "liberal" concessions at the cost of freedom, contradictory though that may appear to be. By "concessions" I mean that he puts survival above freedom, for he is asking the free world to give up its freedom in exchange for an undescribed world-state about which he is unable to give any guarantees. I find it difficult to believe that in spite of all he says about change and individualism, Toynbee does not know that the rapid and intelligent change he recognizes as vital can be made only in a free society based on the principles of the individual freedom he ridicules. The fatal contradiction in his scheme lies in his failure to see that *the opportunity for the rapid change and adjustment he recognizes as essential could not exist in his world-state.* It is the individualist who sees that continuity and change are inseparable, that unless we make the neecssary changes, we cannot preserve the values of the past, and that these changes can be made only in an atmosphere of freedom. It is the "liberal" of Toynbee's views who talks about human life, rights, opportunities to change and improve and yet does not see that these have no meaning without freedom. He perhaps sincerely believes that he opposes enforced conformity, materialism, and the cipherization of mankind. What freedom as against conformity, what spiritual and cultural values as against materialism, and what individualism as against cipherization could there be in Toynbee's world-state? Even the opportunity to exist for two thousand million years in megalopolis would not justify condemning mankind to that drab and featureless life. I must confess that Toynbee seems at times to have qualms in his final chapters, as he writes of a "preview of this impending world-wide dearth of amenities" to be obtained by visiting New Zealand or Australia today (pp. 219 ff.). But even as he speculates about the problems of leisure in megalopolis, he does not retreat; there may be a solution in religion (pp. 226–227). Still, when it is remembered that death is to be avoided by choosing Communism, one must wonder what kind of religion Toynbee is thinking of.

I repeat that personal honesty, sincerity, and benignity do not justify the attempt to twist history in order to support an ideology. If we truly wish to achieve peace, it behooves us to observe when and in what conditions unification has proved, in history, workable and when it has not. The *Pax Romana* cost too much. Many of us feared that Hitler's *Pax Teutonica* would also be too expensive. And as I said above, it disturbs me to find Toynbee blithely talking about a "wave of the future," a phrase well remembered as a plea for the view that Communism, Fascism, and Nazism might be some new, perhaps ultimately good conception of humanity trying to come into existence and thus causing some disturbance. Mrs. Lindbergh also felt that in these new ideologies constituting "the wave of the future" this new conception of humanity had to force its way through the heavy crust of custom by violence because we were blind and slow to change (p. 16). She asked if we were afraid not only of the Germans but of change, of responsibility, of growing up, and finally if we were afraid of paying the price of peace (p. 38)! It is not difficult to see why Toynbee fancies the phrase; he also has a wave of the future in mind.

Toynbee suffers from an absorption with the future strange to find in one who concerns himself in any way with the "study of history." Possibly if he had studied history with more concern for accuracy and objectivity and with less devotion to his preconceived opinions, he might have learned more about the question "Whence Mankind?" Thereby he might have prepared himself better to take up the other question "Wither Mankind?" This second question, though a perfectly legitimate one for historians to consider, must always remain secondary to the first in that the historians, only claim to competence with respect to the second is based on what they have learned of the first. That is what R. G. Collingwood had in mind and his approach to history is likely to be much more helpful to humanity than Toynbee's essentially unhistorical solution of the great problems of mankind.

For the benefit of any who wonder how doubt may thus be cast on the accuracy and objectivity of so famous an historian as our author, I must add a few brief words. The matter of objectivity of interpretation, the major problem in this review of *Change and Habit, the Challenge of Our Time,* has already been examined at some length. Factual accuracy concerns us less here but derelictions in this area are relevant to the historian's general soundness and deserve brief mention. One example is the illustration of what is called the Roman imperial government's concern for stability, which is demonstrated by an admittedly fictitious story concerning a Roman emperor and the invention of unbreakable glass (p. 124). It would have been more to the point to note that both Greeks and Romans played with power machinery more than they used it and that it was not a simple matter of unemployment that held up the practical use of technical inventions but the existence of large numbers of slaves and the general backwardness in economic development. Later Toynbee explains the efficient organization of the Kingdom of Sicily under Frederick II by saying it was a successor-state of the East Roman Empire and had inherited some of that state's administrative traditions (p. 131). Not a word is said of the extremely valuable Norman contribution of administrative machinery, nor of the relative failure of the Muslim-Byzantine system to work effectively in the era before the Norman invasion of Southern Italy. For many a long year, to mention a third example, historians have debated in vain Constantine's conversion to Christianity, but that problem has now been solved to Toynbee's satisfaction (p. 123f.). One can take comfort in the thought that Ferdinand Lot was spared this particular effort, which displays a shocking ignorance of the question. Of repetition and style I shall say only that there is some repetition and that the noted writer still retains that irritating trick of abruptly moving himself into the future when it suits him, and pretending, by employing the past tense about the present, to look back on the present. The device has a certain eerieness, which may recommend it to some readers. At any rate Toynbee may be said not to recoil from attempting to generalize about history. The difficulty is that he sometimes fails to base his generalizations on sound knowledge and frequently departs, in the most flagrant manner, from standards of objectivity that have for good reason long been accepted.

Finally, what is Toynbee in this new book: "prophet," "poet," or "historian"? Perhaps the best term is Henri-Irenée Marrou's "culturologist." The same writer declares in another essay that too many historians act as if they were gods, in the ancient Greek sense, or to speak as a Christian theologian, as if they were angelic species, autonomous and immortal. I concede that it is difficult in a sense to think of Toynbee as autonomous—immortal perhaps but not autonomous. But perhaps I worry too much about the matter and Powicke was correct in saying that "After all has been said, we are still quite safe. Nobody can abolish the past" (p. 237). This reminds me of a quotation attributed to Samuel Butler that one of my colleagues called to my attention not long ago. It is in the *Dictionary of Humorous Quotations* edited by Evan Esar and it says that God cannot alter the past and that is why he is obliged to connive at the existence of historians. I have not thus far found the exact source of the observation but it does not much matter—*se non è vero è ben trovato.* To answer the question asked early in this essay, Toynbee has not changed his habit in writing history, even though he rearranges some of his views on religion. It still must be said of his work that in reading it we get pretty much what the Mock Turtle got at school, "Mystery, ancient and modern."

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE REORGANIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on the President's message on the reorganization of the District of Columbia government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OLSEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR TV NETWORK REGULATION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for regulation of television networks. This bill is intended to fill a vast void in the existing legislation relating to regulation of broadcast communications. It is intended to assure that the operations of television networks are conducted in the public interest.

A great paradox in present law is that sole responsibility for broadcasting in the public interest is placed upon individual licensees—our local television stations—while the great bulk of national broadcasting originates with the networks, which are wholly unregulated.

Extensive hearings have been held by the Federal Communications Commission and by committees of Congress showing that more than 90 percent of the television programs broadcast during the prime hours of viewing are owned or controlled by the originating networks.

Previous bills have been introduced in the House for the purpose of subjecting networks to regulation in the public interest. House Commerce Committee Chairman Harris in the 87th Congress, first session, introduced H.R. 1164 to provide for the regulation of national networks and other purposes. In the 86th Congress, the late Mr. Bennett of Michigan, ranking minority member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, introduced H.R. 5042, likewise providing for network regulation. In the other body, in the 87th Congress, Senator PASTORE introduced S. 2400, a bill to amend the Communications Act in order to provide for the regulation of networks.

For one reason or another, the proposals were never enacted and the networks were permitted, in effect, to proceed along a path of so-called self-regulation.

Recently, however, serious questions have been raised about the performance of the networks in matters of important public interest. The questions relate to network control of program fare, of the increasing dominance of program decisions based on purely commercial reasons, the presentation of controversial public issues in a fair manner, limited access to the public airwaves, and others. Never before has control of so much of the broadcasting fare rested in so few hands.

In an American system dedicated to diversity, innovation, and social responsibility, the networks have displayed an increased tendency toward the repressive, restrictive, and restraining.

In 1963, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce issued to the Congress a report prepared by the Federal Communications Commission on television network program procurement practices. At that time, the Commission report stated:

> The American pattern for the regulation of broadcasting—adapted over the years to the needs of a free society by competitive give and take and trial and error—places the primary responsibility for broadcast service on free, competitive industry. That system relegates the Commission to the role of assuring that free channels of commercial, social and cultural competition shall be maintained so that broadcasting, not only in theory, but in reality, may perform its function to the public interest of our open society. Within the limits of authority, it is the duty of the Commission to use its full powers to assure that the concourse of ideas in a free market shall be expanded and fostered, rather than restricted or stultified, by commerce.

Now, years later, the obvious fact is that commercial considerations have, in fact, restricted and stultified rather than expanded and fostered the concourse of ideas in a free market.

If the system which now prevails is inadequate to meet the public interest—and I think such is the case—then it is imperative that we act to restore to the American people the benefits of the public airwaves which they own. Since the networks have the strength and the power to dominate our airwaves, they must be brought within the areas of legal responsibility to stand an accounting for their practices in the public interest.

With that in mind, I submit this bill.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS FOR WORKING WIVES AND WIDOWS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing three amendments to the Social Security Act in order to remedy certain existing provisions which discriminate against working wives and widows.

Under the present law, a retired wife or widow who has worked must choose between drawing her social security benefits on the basis of her marital status or her employment status. Thus, in many situations, where both a husband and wife have worked and have made their separate contributions to the social security fund, they receive lower social security benefits than if only the husband had worked. In order to remedy this, one of the amendments I am submitting today would allow working couples to pool their social security credits and thus draw higher benefits on the basis of their combined earned credits.

Another hardship imposed on widows

exists because the social security benefits received for support of their minor children are reduced if the head of household earns more than $1,500 in wages to supplement the Federal benefits. Since the social security benefits are not sufficient to support a growing family, the remaining parent is sharply limited in the amount that can be earned for minor children without being penalized by the loss in social security benefits. My amendment would permit both widows and widowers with minor children to earn outside income without any reduction in monthly benefits for their minor children.

Finally, current legislation denies to the families of workingwomen many benefits paid to families of male workers, even though the social security taxes paid in each case are the same. I am introducing legislation to erase this distinction and equalize the benefits paid to spouses and minor children of working wives and husbands.

I am optimistic that during this session of Congress we will see a major revision of the social security system enacted. I have already submitted proposals to raise the level of benefits, provide for cost-of-living increases, and include prescription drugs under medicare. The same three amendments I am proposing today, which have also been sponsored by the distinguished gentle lady from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], will correct some serious inequities in the present social security system, and I hope they will win the approval of the Ways and Means Committee and the House.

THE 21ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks a historic occasion for the Republic of Italy, for it is the 21st anniversary of the founding of the Republic. Its birth coincided with the end of the last war and marked the beginning of a new era not only in Europe but also in many parts of the world.

Since the birth of the Republic of Italy, the people of Italy have experienced something rather new in their modern history. Having become masters of their own fate, they have chosen their own form of government and have lived under its democratic and benevolent rule happily. Today, on the 21st anniversary of their Republic, they view their work with just pride, for they have made war-ravaged Italy not only a prosperous and peaceful country, but also a vital bastion of democracy against despotism and totalitarianism.

The highly gifted and gallant people of Italy had the misfortune to suffer under Fascist tyranny during the interwar years, and also during most of the war. Toward the end of World War II they were effectively aided in their effort to overthrow the Fascist regime and eventually established the republican form of government.

During the postwar years they were materially aided by the Government and the people of this country, thereby making the task of rebuilding Italy easier. We rendered such aid gladly, knowing that it was badly needed and fully appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Italy has now come of age, and is a loyal ally of the democracies of the West. On this 21st anniversary it is a pleasure and privilege to pay tribute, to the people of Italy and wish them continued peace and prosperity.

LETTER FROM AN AFL-CIO SCHOLAR

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Judy Armstrong, former high school student at McLain High School in Tulsa, Okla., is now finishing her college education at Oklahoma State University. Miss Armstrong who won an AFL-CIO National Merit Scholarship in 1963, recently wrote to express her appreciation to the union members who made her education possible.

Miss Armstrong's letter appears in the May issue of the American Federationist, official monthly magazine of the AFL-CIO. Since it is most interesting and may encourage other scholarships for our talented young people who might not otherwise develop their abilities for the benefit of this country, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the letter appear in the RECORD.

A LETTER FROM AN AFL-CIO SCHOLAR

DEAR UNION MEMBER: We've never met and probably never will. Yet, during the last four years your money has bought me approximately 3,000 meals, 150 pounds of textbooks and supplies and a chance for a college education and a career as a teacher.

I am one of the more than 50 students who have attended or are attending colleges across the nation on National Merit Scholarships sponsored by funds from the AFL-CIO.

Six scholarships are awarded each year on a regional basis to graduating high school seniors who are among the approximately 14,000 annually who qualify as finalists in the NMSC testing program. Three are unrestricted and three are limited to sons or daughters of members of AFL-CIO affiliated unions.

The maximum award is $1,500 a year for four years, with the exact amount determined on the basis of need. The student's family is expected to contribute and the student is expected to work during the summer to pay part of the cost of his education.

My story is only one of many, but I'd like to give you a glance behind the statistics to show you what your money has accomplished in terms of specific people and experiences—or, more exactly, whatever happened to your $4,250.

In the spring of 1963, I was a senior at McLain High School in Tulsa, Oklahoma. After I had qualified as a National Merit finalist, I had an interview with Jack Sessions, Washington representative of the education department of the AFL-CIO and C. E. Wilson from the Tulsa Labor Council. Although my father had been a member of Operating Engineers' Local 948 for 16 years, my knowledge of unions was limited to the vague notion that Samuel Gompers had something to do with starting unions in the United States. Thus, I'm sure that my answer to Mr. Sessions' question concerning the difficulties that a European Common Market might create for the European laborer was less than he'd hoped for. Despite my answer, I was soon notified that I had been selected as the first winner from Oklahoma.

The following fall, I entered the Liberal Arts College of Oklahoma State University. Despite the rigors of dormitory life, a 7:30 a.m. German class and final exams, I managed to maintain a 3.9 grade average.

The summer following my freshman year I had a chance to learn about labor firsthand.

I went to work in the wrapping department of a large bakery in which "union" was a forbidden word. I soon found out the truth of the dry textbook statement that the individual worker has no bargaining power. Employes were fired on whim. One newcomer was told to "clock out" before she had even found the place to "clock in." At the end of three months, I was the most experienced worker on my crew.

Racial segregation was practiced with regard to restrooms and lounges. Employes were required to work overtime, but instead of recording this on their time cards, it was held over until a short week and paid for as straight time. Work periods sometimes extended for eight hours without a break.

Health standards were very low; any food which fell on the floor but could still be scraped or swept up was reused. A few of my customary jobs were sweeping up flour, adding spoiled applesauce to the fresh to extend it and picking flies off the tops of french cocoanut pies as they went down the conveyor to be boxed.

No longer is my idea of exploitation of labor limited to accounts of miserable conditions of workers in English textile mills of the 1870s. I have a very vivid picture of similar situations in America in the 1960s.

When the summer finally ended, I was only too glad to return to school.

During the summers after my sophomore and junior years, I worked as a teacher aide in Project Head Start, the government program designed to provide disadvantaged children with learning experiences which the average child has had before he enters school. The program provided a wonderful opportunity for me to begin repaying the help given me by helping others. It was also the deciding factor in my decision to become a teacher.

It was exciting teaching the kids and learning from them. They were so eager to experience—to taste, to sniff, to pinch. I wish I could make them real to you.

Peggy, a blue-eyed blonde whose right leg was four inches shorter than the left, could still, with the aid of what the others called her "big shoe," run faster and climb higher than anyone else in class. Becky, the youngest of 11 children of a disabled veteran, did not even speak for the first six weeks. Finally, lots of individual attention brought forth a smile and a few shy questions. And then there was Tommy, a skinny little Negro boy, who paid me the supreme compliment when I overheard him say to one of the others, "Miss White and me—we're friends. We play ball together every day."

I am now in the final semester of my senior year at the University of Tulsa and doing another type of teaching, my practice teaching in English at Gilcrease Junior High School. Next year I will begin work as a full-time teacher and your investment, I hope, will begin to pay off.

Many people and groups say grand, high-sounding things about helping others and making the world a better place, but the AFL–CIO is doing something about it. It is actively involved in studying and attempting to gain effective legislation in such vital problem areas as civil rights, unemployment, the poverty program and education at all levels.

The AFL–CIO is, bluntly, willing to put its money where its mouth is. This year alone, the AFL–CIO and its affiliates are picking up a $1.4 million price tag for the belief that higher education should not be limited to the very rich or the very bright but should be available to all who desire it and are able to profit from it.

It's hard to judge the results of this huge expenditure of your money. The results are in intangible terms—in people, but the results are far-reaching.

The influence of the AFL–CIO extends not only to direct recipients of scholarships and enables them to become doctors, teachers, union representatives and Peace Corps workers but, in turn, through the people they come in contact with, the discoveries they make and the services they perform.

Thank you very much for the opportunity you have given to me and to so many others.

Sincerely,

Judy Armstrong.

A BILL TO ELIMINATE CERTAIN ACTIVE DUTY REQUIREMENTS FOR RETIREMENT FOR RESERVISTS AND MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to eliminate certain active duty requirements for retirement for reservists and National Guard members under chapter 67 of that title.

Present law provides that anyone who served in a National Guard or Reserve unit prior to August 16, 1945, but who did not serve in an active duty status before or after that date is not eligible for retirement. Anyone, however, who served in a National Guard or Reserve unit after August 16, 1945, is entitled to retirement after 20 years and attainment of the age of 60, even though no active duty was performed.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this provision of the law is unfair. The rationale for it is that at no time since World War I have all National Guard and Reserve units been called to active duty except during World War II and, therefore, members of the Reserve or National Guard units during World War II who were not called to active duty should not receive retirement benefits.

If these people have served our country honorably in a Reserve or National Guard unit for 20 years then, in my opinion, they deserve the same retirement benefits when they reach age 60 as any other reservist or guardsman who has served the same 20 years after August 16, 1945, without any active duty service.

The bill that I have introduced today will cover that situation and I hope that it can be enacted during the current session.

THE RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize too strongly my disappointment with the defeat last week of the rent supplement program. It is, I submit, a sad day when we find the opposition successful in destroying what promised to be a really good program, a program which was beginning to give dignity and a sense of responsibility to the poor.

Opposition for the sake of opposing, Mr. Speaker, has always been anathema to me. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made some distinguished contributions to our society and sometimes this makes us forget the reason why most Americans are Democrats. But they remind us at the polls every election day.

Unfortunately opposition to the rent supplement program is an example of why our colleagues of the opposition usually lose elections; they just do not seem to have the vision required to create and maintain the Great Society.

The following editorial from the May 22, 1967, edition of the Washington Evening Star, puts the story of the defeat of rent supplements into focus. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

Empty Victory

On its third annual try, the House Republican leadership has finally managed to shoot down the administration's rent supplement program—and it is a victory in which no one has gained anything.

The rent supplement program's goal is to encourage a wholly new approach to subsidized public housing—a sounder, healthier and possibly cheaper approach than the huge institutionalized public housing projects which too often in the past have proved to be dead-ends for the poor. It does not broaden the scope of public responsibility for the housing needs of the poor. It does not, as Representative Scott of Virginia foolishly charged during the House debate, constitute a threat to "home ownership" or to "family life." And it surely does not, as Representative Ford, the minority leader, implied, impose an oppressive additional burden on the national economy.

The full extent of the "burden," as curtailed by the House Appropriations Committee, would have been a $10-million bequest for all of next year. Ironically, this modest sum was part of a multibillion-dollar appropriation bill that provided no less than $275 million in new dollars to finance traditional forms of public housing—and the larger amount was never so much as questioned.

During its three-year life, however, rent supplementation has been a constant source of confusion and controversy in the House. The basis of opposition, in our view, is entirely invalid. But the fact is that the dissension was sufficient to make this element of the Great Society program singularly vulnerable to attack. And the Republican leadership, with a coalition of solid southern support, could hardly wait to cut it down.

This is a strange way to build an image of Republican interest in urban problems, and to break the party's coalition with southern Democrats in Congress. Both goals were loudly proclaimed by Gerald Ford no less than a week ago.

The victims of the House action that concern us are not politicians, however, but the cities which have counted on the rent supplement program's continuation. New applications for participation are pouring into Washington at the rate of 5,000 a week, and the small sums made available previously to get the program started are all committed. The only hope of salvage rests now with the Senate.

TESTIMONY OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, IN SUPPORT OF ESTABLISHING A COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT, APRIL 20, 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that steps be taken at this time to safeguard the position of small business in Government procurement. In this era of mounting conglomerate mergers on the one hand and increasing Government requirements for good and services on the other, we see an emergence of and dominance by modern industrial giants in the procurement markets.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement and Economic Concentration of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I am particularly concerned, as is each and every member of my subcommittee, with these trends which create problems for small business and endanger our free competitive enterprise system.

I invite the attention of our colleagues to my recent testimony before the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations in support of my bill, H.R. 8785, which would establish a Commission to conduct an overall study of Government procurement policies, procedures, and practices, as follows:

Statement of Hon. Abraham J. Multer, a Representative in Congress From the State of New York, April 20, 1967

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement introduced by our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. Chet Holifield. The gentleman from California, like the chairman, my good friend John Blatnik, has served many years in this body with great distinction. I have always admired them and I cherish their personal friendship.

I am pleased to join Congressman Holifield in sponsoring this legislation, although my bill, H.R. 8785, is slightly different in that it would broaden the scope of the Commission's studies and increase the membership from 14 to 18.

There has been no overall full-scale study of the Government procurement system since 1949. In my opinion, a commission such as envisaged in this bill is long overdue and will fill an urgent need.

The need for the Procurement Commission today is even greater than it was 18 years ago. We now have greatly increased Government requirements for goods and services, increased dollar values of procurements, and high dollar programs. In 1949, prime awards to all U.S. firms, large and small, totaled $9 billion. In fiscal 1966, 10 large companies alone received that much in Defense contracts. Total procurements in 1966 were five times the 1949 amount. With this we see an emergence of modern industrial giants in the procurement markets.

The stake of small business in the study we propose is much greater today than it was in 1949 in view of mounting conglomerate mergers and economic concentration everywhere, including those in the field of procurement.

Our Government is the largest purchaser of goods and services in the American market, if not in the world. The manner in which the agencies of our Government exercise this vast procurement function profoundly affects our economy and our people. We must carefully examine the buying habits of the various procuring agencies of Government. We must be certain that their policies and practices accurately and effectively carry out the congressional intention to preserve and strengthen our economic system of free enterprise.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement and Economic Concentration of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I have a special interest in this legislation, as does each and every member of my subcommittee.

To begin with, let us view this proposed legislation against the background of congressional small business policy and enactments.

The Congress has repeatedly declared small business to be essential to our free enterprise economic system. It is clearly enunciated in the Small Business Act that:

1. Free competition is the essence of the American economic system of free enterprise.

2. The preservation of such competition is basic to the economic well-being and security of our Nation.

3. Such security and well-being cannot be realized unless small business capacity is encouraged and developed.

Government procurement is specifically identified by the Congress as a major area in which small business is to be assisted in order to preserve our free competitive enterprise system. Congress has repeatedly declared that a fair proportion of Government contracts is to be placed with small business. This applies to subcontracts as well as prime contracts. This policy has been written into the Armed Services Procurement Act, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, and into many other laws involving procurement by Government agencies.

Additionally, Congress enacted laws to effectuate the fair proportion policy at prime level through a joint set-aside program and at subcontract level by establishing a small business subcontracting program.

The purpose of this legislation is to enable small business to secure and maintain an effective competitive position in our economy, to preclude an undesirable concentration of Government contracts and subcontracts in the hands of large companies, and to preserve and strengthen the economic well-being and security of our Nation.

It would be a serious mistake for a Procurement Commission such as we propose here to be established without due recognition of this congressional intent. More than this, if any person appointed to the Commission is one who would ignore or oppose this congressional intent, such person would not be qualified to identify and evaluate the many-faceted problems to be studied by the Commission. Nor could we expect such an individual to be able to reach appropriate conclusions and to make appropriate recommendations regarding procurement programs.

I did not include in my bill a statement of the qualifications for membership on the Commission because I felt that it would be more appropriate to leave the full selection process in the hands of our President, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. I do think, however, that it is most important that we spell out in the legislative history of this bill certain guidelines with which I am sure the members of the committee will agree. That the prospective members of the Commission must have high competence and probity goes without saving.

They should have something more. They must be strong supporters of national policies and at least some of those chosen should be persons known to be familiar and sympathetic with small business needs and problems.

While the intent of the Congress regarding procurement is clearly expressed in our statute books, regulations adopted by some agencies do not always follow that intent. In too many instances, the application of regulation tends to defeat the purpose of the statute.

Because of the major impact that Federal procurement has upon the Nation's economy, one would assume that these policies, rules, regulations, practices, and procedures would be formulated at the highest levels of Government. Regrettably this is not the case.

These functions are performed principally by two bodies: The Armed Services Procurement Regulation Committee, the ASPR Committee, governing military procurement, and the Interagency Procurement Policy Committee for the civilian agencies. These committees write nearly all basic Government procurement regulations.

Since the regulations must necessarily reflect economic policies of the Congress and the President, the committees interpret these policies as they see them and to the best of their ability.

I doubt that the ASPR and Interagency Procurement Policy Committees are the appropriate places for this important task. This does not mean that I lack regard for these committees. To the contrary, I believe they are composed of competent and well-intentioned individuals. More, however, is necessary. Specialized knowledge and expertise in socioeconomic areas are required to properly determine policies which govern the Nation and affect its total economy. The primary function of these committees is to safeguard the integrity of contracts and the efficient and speedy procurement of goods and services. I do not believe that they can be as effective in achieving the objectives intended by the Congress and the President.

At this time, I have no recommendation as to where this regulation-making authority should be lodged. This function could be performed by the Executive Office of the President, but there are other alternatives. This problem should be one of the subjects of the Commission's study.

I invite your attention to another area which I propose in my bill to be included in the Commission's mandate. Various nonappropriated fund activities are conducted by the exchange systems of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Their purchases with nonappropriated funds are not regulated by the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

The volume of their purchases run $1.5 billion annually, a figure which is higher than the amount of fiscal 1966 purchases from U.S. firms by General Services Administration. Nevertheless, their accounts are not usually subject to audit by the U.S. General Accounting Office even though, I am told, they utilize appropriated funds in connection with their operating costs.

The procurement policies, practices, and procedures of the exchange services have a significant impact upon our national economy and should come under the Commission's scrutiny.

You will note, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that the substantive changes added in my bill are the following:

1. Specific reference to the procurement problems of small business;

2. Specific inclusion of post exchanges and nonappropriated fund activities.

3. Increase in the number of Commission members.

The reasons for the inclusion of the first two changes I have already outlined to you. The reason for suggesting a larger Commission by calling for five members to be appointed by the President of the Senate and seven by the Speaker of the House is to include majority and minority representation from the Small Business Committees of both bodies.

I urge, Mr. Chairman, that in reporting a bill you include these changes. I have no pride of authorship and I will support whatever bill this committee reports.

I am confident that with the passage of this legislation our Nation's small business community will be able to look forward to the Procurement Commission's effort to safeguard the integrity of Government procurement and to strengthen our free enterprise economic system.

May I add to my prepared statement these further comments:

Since 1961 and in each of the Congresses beginning that year, I have introduced a bill which, incidentally, had cosponsorship in the Senate by as many as eight members of that body. This bill sought to take away from the Defense Department its finality of determination in making awards, particularly in negotiations of contracts where they ignore the bidding process and pick out the one whom they believe to be the most responsible and most competent supplier. Then they go ahead and negotiate the contract.

Now, strange as it may seem, the General Accounting Office has recommended not only the enactment of the principle of that bill, but has said that the bill does not go far enough because unless the Defense Department or any other department that may have the authority to negotiate contracts is subject to review there is nothing anyone can do about it. They give no reasons for resorting to negotiation and ignoring the competitive bid procedure. They use the language of the statute which gives them the right to do it as their excuse. Every time there is a negotiated contract awarded which should not be awarded, the General Accounting Office may come in and review the matter. But all it can do after having reviewed the matter is to give the Defense Department a slap on the wrist and say, "You should not have done it."

Now, unless we take away that finality of determination in the negotiation of awards—unless we set up a review of this process to determine that they should not do this except when they can state facts which will support their conclusion—unless we let the General Accounting Office review that procedure—we can never correct this situation and eliminate the tremendous waste of money in the cost-plus contracts and in the negotiation process which goes on in the Government procurement offices of the DOD.

I think this is one of the important things that this Commission must review. I am sure if they review it, they will come up with appropriate recommendations that will come close to the recommendations of the General Accounting Office.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear hear. I will be very happy to answer any questions that may occur to the chairman or any of the members of the committee.

Chairman BLATNIK (presiding). We certainly thank our colleague and friend. He has had years of experience and an excellent record in this field.

Mr. Multer, on page 6, would you elaborate a little on a sentence that attracts my attention, an area in which I am very interested?

At the top of the page, you say: "More, however, is necessary. Specialized knowledge"—the third line down from the top—"and expertise in socioeconomic areas are required to properly determine policies which govern the Nation and affect its total economy."

Mr. MULTER. Well, take for instance our set-aside program. As you know, by statute, we require that a fair proportion of Government contracts shall be placed with small business. The various procurement agencies are required to set aside certain procurements for small business. In setting aside for small business any of these procurement items, they first must determine that small business is competent and able to do the job. After having done that, they then must determine that there is a sufficient number of small business concerns who will bid so that awards will be made at reasonable prices.

So you do not just give it to small business at any price. The matter is reviewed to make sure that it is not going to be costing the Government more money by letting small business come in.

Very frequently, and this enters specifically into the socioeconomic implications, we find instances of unfair competition by big business concerns in bidding for procurement. Where the actual cost to them may be, taking arbitrary figures, $1 million, they will bid $900,000 in order to eliminate other bidders. They can afford to take that $100,000 loss because they know that the procurement is just a pilot program. Not even a pilot program. The procurement agencies know in the first instance that they need $10 million worth of this item. But yet they let the first contract for only a portion. And having awarded this to the one contractor for $900,000—$100,000 below cost—eliminating others from participation, once having placed that one piece of business with their friend, they will almost automatically give the balance of the procurement to the same friend. And the balance will be given away at a much higher price.

Now, we know from experience in the various hearings which have been conducted by my subcommittee and by the full Small Business Committee, that actually the set-aside program has been saving money for the Government.

Now, these are the things that I had in mind when I made the reference to the socioeconomic areas. It is not just a matter of saying, "We need this item and these are the specifications." We need people who are familiar with the operation of these small business plants. We need people who are familiar with the big business operation.

For instance, the big business firm can have a man come down here to Washington and scour the procurement agencies and in advance know what the specifications are and what the Government will need. They can be prepared, then, on 24 to 48 hours' notice to get their bid in for that item. The small businessman cannot afford that kind of a lobbyist or that kind of representation.

Chairman BLATNIK. He does not even know where to start, does he?

Mr. MULTER. He does not know where to start. He must wait until the specification and the bid comes to him. And then he must sit down with his estimators and figure out whether he can do this job and how much it will cost. It will take him 2 weeks or more, maybe, taking a simple specification, to analyze it and get his bid in. And all he may be given is 4 or 5 days' notice.

The big fellow already has the advance notice because he had his people down here and knows what the Government is looking for. He gets the bid in within 48 hours. The little fellow is still trying to figure out how much it will cost, and the time has elapsed within which to bid.

Chairman BLATNIK. And there is no centralized place at all where this information would be available to the small businessman, is there?

Mr. MULTER. There is not.

Chairman BLATNIK. There might be a depot in Detroit. There might be another one in Chicago, Kansas City, or San Francisco. He has no idea where to apply to. We have had great difficulty trying to find out here ourselves for Congressional offices that are trying to help small businessmen.

All they want to know is: "Where do I find out?" or, "What is the office from which I can find out the exact specification and where I can submit a bid and get more details on it?"

Mr. MULTER. The small businessman is too frequently lost when it comes to that. We try through the Small Business Administration offices throughout the country to make this information available. But there, too, the best we can do is tell them, "This is the place where you must go for this particular procurement."

He may be inquiring in New York City for the procurement and find that the only place he can bid or get the specifications is down in Texas.

The Army and Air Force Exchange Service has just moved its procurement offices out of New York to Texas. Now New York is their biggest market. What is the excuse for it? This is one of the things this Commission will have to inquire into. Why should these people who would ordinarily go to Chicago or Boston have to chase down to Texas to find out what it is that the Government agency wants and then determine whether or not they can supply it?

Now it does not matter to the big businessman. It does not matter to him whether he is in Chicago or Boston and is going to send his representative down to Texas or to Washington. But the small businessman does not have the ability to do that. He does not have the finances with which to do it.

Chairman BLATNIK. In short, I found this, Congressman, With very, very limited experience with procurement, trying to help small businessmen—and on a check to see what your experience has been—I have found that in so many cases, almost uniformly and consistently, responsible procurement officers, especially in Defense, are just so busy racing against time that their motto is—and I have been told this by Secretary McNamara, directly, clearly, and precisely—"We just have not got time to fool around with anything else. All we want is to get the item to meet the specification, get it in quantity to meet the price and time. And we have not got time to worry about the economic impact of this simply enormous expenditure of public funds."

Have you run into that type of thing?

Mr. MULTER. I think that Secretary McNamara is one of the first Secretaries of Defense who has been frank enough and honest enough to tell you that is precisely what they do in the Defense Department, both Army and Navy and Air Force. Air Force less than the other two.

And if you go, as our committees have gone, all over the country, holding field hearings for the small businessman to tell us his problems and bring in the man in charge of procurement at the particular Defense Department installation, invariably, if you can get the man to open up and be frank with you, he will tell you he cannot afford to do business with 10 small businessmen. He says: "I get one big company. If anything goes wrong, they have the money and finances to make good. Even if it is not their fault, they will assume the responsibility. I cannot afford the time and annoyance of chasing around among 10 different people to get my procurement when I can get it in one spot."

Chairman BLATNIK. In short, you would be in an area, a very complicated and important area, where you would need real experts and knowledgeable people on a commission——

Mr. MULTER. There is no question about that.

Chairman BLATNIK (continuing). To do a job on this that needs doing badly that procurement people down in Defense, particularly, primarily, either cannot or will not and do not have the time or are not inclined to get into that area or do not have the expertise, as you indicate. And neither does the legislative committee such as yours have the time to really get into it in depth, is that not true?

Mr. MULTER. You are quite right. If we spent every week in the year in the field conducting hearings, we could not do the whole job. As our colleagues know, we just do not have the time to do that. We cannot be all over the country and at the same time be here doing the legislative job that is required of us.

Chairman BLATNIK. Thank you, Mr. Multer, for a most helpful statement.

Mr. Holifield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I also want to thank our colleague for his statement. And I want to pay respects to him for the long and devoted work that he has done in the Small Business Committee.

I think he finds probably in every member of this committee a sympathetic attitude toward the sentiments that he has expressed because we have all had the same experience in trying to help small business in our various districts. And we recognize the trend of business generally is against the small businessman. This is true in all fields of manufacturing and retailing.

In my own experience as a small businessman, and I still operate a small business in my district, I have seen the big chains and the big discount houses displace the small retailers and the chain banks, for instance, the small independent banks.

And we have seen in the last few years the tremendous trend toward mergers of companies. It has been alarming to me to see this happening. There is talk about centralization of power in Government, but we see the centralization of power in business and in finance which has called forth the need for some centralization of power in Government to offset the abuses that sometimes occur.

And this is not to indict big business as an entity, because I think it has to do with the complete economic trend in our country toward more and more size in all of our functions in our society. I think that is almost inevitable and many people have accepted it as inevitable. But we do have to do what we can to see that the small business sector does get fair treatment. And your testimony is very valuable.

There are one or two points in it that I would like to comment on. You speak of the various nonappropriated fund activities which are conducted by the post exchanges and the commissaries of the Defense Department and say that "their purchases with nonappropriated funds are not regulated by the Armed Services Procurement Act," and I was surprised to find that the purchases run $1.5 billion annually.

Mr. MULTER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is tremendous.

Mr. MULTER. It is as much as the General Services Administration buys for the entire Government.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And there is no control on that, you say, at all?

Mr. MULTER. No, sir.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In other words, they can place their contracts anywhere they want to, and they operate free except for such control as the services themselves put over them in their camps and stations, is that correct?

Mr. MULTER. That is correct, sir. That is absolutely correct.

You and I can walk in with two identical items made by the same manufacturer, you being a wholesaler and I being a wholesaler. Mr. Blatnik, for instance, as the manufacturer of the identical item, will make it for you under your trade name and for me under my trade name. Your price will be lower than mine to the PX or the commissary.

Because the man who is doing the buying for the exchanges likes the way I talk to him, he will give me the order and not you. There is no review of that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In other words, you say there are all kinds of opportunity for favoritism and for unusual arrangements, let us say.

Mr. MULTER. That is putting it very mildly. I can document that for you, sir.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Without any review on the part of anyone above to really scrutinize. There is no audit by the General Accounting Office——

Mr. MULTER. None.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (continuing). On those activities.

Mr. MULTER. It is worse than that, sir. If you go to the commanding officer who is theoretically in charge of that and complain about the procurement officer, he replies: "I am just too busy to get into this. I must rely on him and his judgment. I am not going to review his judgment."

I am talking from actual experience, and can document this with instances—not one, but many.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Now I think you have brought to the attention of the committee something that is quite important. And I agree with you that this is one of those areas of procurement which, while not exactly Government procurement, yet it is done ostensibly for Government employees, to give Government employees either more convenience or better prices, which is pretty well established because it is considered generally as fringe benefits. And in some of the outlying posts and camps and stations, it is almost necessary particularly in foreign countries, to have post exchanges and commissaries for the benefit of the military and civilian people who are employees of the Government. But, of course, this is another one of the areas that I think ought to be looked into.

I am glad you are showing an interest in this matter, and I know that you have introduced an additional bill. And I want to talk with you a little bit as a practical Member of Congress.

As you know, the two Hoover Commissions were mixed commissions the same as provided for in my bill. The Hoover Commission membership was 12. We have 14. We have increased it by two.

Now this has concerned me somewhat because, having served on the second Hoover Commission, I found that, to put it mildly, it was a little bit difficult to function because of the numbers that were on it. And, also, of course, each commissioner is entitled to the necessary staff, an administrative assistant, and one or two secretaries. When you start adding up the salaries and so forth, you get into a considerable amount of money to operate the Commission.

I am sympathetic toward the intent of your bill, but I can foresee from a practical standpoint, in handling a bill like this on the floor, that there would be other committees that are interested—the Joint Economic Committee, the Armed Services Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, probably, that you serve on, each committee wanting representation.

And we are trying to keep this on a bipartisan basis. So it would not only mean just adding one, it would mean adding two. And suddenly, I think, if you open the door to any more than we have in this—and maybe we have too many in it now, I am not sure—why, there is no stopping the people that are interested that want to be on it.

And, therefore, I would hope that you would give some thought to achieving the purpose of being absolutely sure by our legislative history and even by words in our report and so forth that the small business problems would be given—there would be a direct mandate that they be given special attention in the overall consideration of procurement. I would hope that you would give some thought to that, and I only say this from the standpoint of the practical multiplication effect of people who would want to serve on this Commission.

Mr. MULTER. I share your concern about having an unwieldy committee because of the size. I am not at all wedded to the idea that there must be 18 rather than 12 or 14 as recommended in your bill.

I think I have made the point and emphasized the point when I presented it this way. I am quite in agreement with you. If the legislative history shows the intent and the desire that the Commission shall do this full job, not overlooking small business, not overlooking the exchange problem and the nonappropriated fund problem, I think I have made my point, and that would satisfy me.

I also have in mind that when any of these commissions write in their recommendations after they have done their full and intensive work, we in Congress do not accept it just because they recommend it. They will still have to come to the Congress, and there will still have to be hearings before the bill is enacted on the floor.

So if the legislative history shows the intent of the Congress when establishing this Commission, and also indicates that it will be an appropriate task force that will do the underlying job as they always do for these commissions, I think I have accomplished my purpose.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Personally, I would be very favorable towards having our staff confer with your staff on this point and work out something definite, words for the report, which would accent this concern of all of us and handle it in some practical way which would not jeopardize the passage of the bill.

Mr. MULTER. I am again in complete agreement with you. I think the principle is so important that we should get the bill enacted and not add anything to it that may impair its speedy enactment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, I thank you very much for your very fair attitude toward it and also your contributions today.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman BLATNIK. Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Congressman Multer, I want to also thank you for your testimony and for calling to our attention a couple of areas that I think it would be very important for this Commission to study. One is the plight of the small businessman which I think is one of the greater contributions that this Commission may be able to make.

I would like to note just for a moment the comment that you made about the transfer of the procurement office from New York to Texas and ask you if there was any significance to the fact that it went to Texas. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Multer did not have anything to do with it. He is from New York.

Chairman BLATNIK. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. ERLENBORN. I do not really expect an answer to that question.

Mr. MULTER. I think I am known as one of the strong supporters of President Johnson. I think that if President Johnson had been living in Illinois, this particular procurement agency might have been moved to Texas anyway.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I see. [Laughter.]

Mr. MULTER. I think the idea was not to put it into Texas because it was the President's State, but to get it away from New York, Chicago, and Boston, which are the big centers of procurement, and make it more difficult for the small businessman to get in and do his job and to make it easier for these fellows who, as we say, using the most mild language, do not like the cut of your hair today and, therefore, prefer me because they like my crewcut.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I would like to also ask you about the area that you touched on concerning the finality of contracts, the lack of supporting data, and the fact that the General Accounting Office can do little more than slap the wrist of the procurement officer.

You made reference to a General Accounting Office report that Congressman Brown and I have been interested in which pointed out that the Truth in Negotiations Act is apparently not being fully implemented by the Defense Department and often is circumvented in that there is a failure by contractors to furnish supporting data. Is that what you had reference to?

Mr. MULTER. Precisely. This is precisely what the General Accounting Office finds. Whenever they make the determination, whatever supporting data there is, no one ever gets to see it. It is highly confidential. They always hide behind the business of this being classified, top secret. And even the General Accounting Office cannot get any data.

The least we should do is to require them to give the General Accounting Office the supporting data. If it is a matter of confidence, the General Accounting Office says, "We do not want to get into it, but if it is erroneous facts you are basing your conclusion upon, then we should have the right to say 'you should not do this' and not after it is all over merely say, 'you made a mistake.' "

Mr. ERLENBORN. As a matter of fact, the General Accounting Office has issued a number of reports along this line, one as recently as January of this year. And I have the impression—I wonder if you have the same impression—that the Department of Defense has not cooperated with the General Accounting Office in changing their practices.

They still do not have the supporting data and do not seem to intend to have the supporting data in their files.

Mr. MULTER. Again, calling on the experience we have had in our Small Business Committee—and it goes back over many years—I think these men in the Defense Department are highly motivated and with the best intentions. But they are so steeped in tradition that they will not make a change because they have been doing it for the last 50 years. We have had this fight with them over the years in connection with the set-aside and in connection with getting specifications more precise and in connection with getting the bids out in time so that small business would have enough time to bid.

"This is the way we have done it all the time. There is no reason to change." And this has been their attitude, unfortunately, in too many of these matters and particularly in the procurement field where small business is involved.

Mr. Erlenborn. Do you have evidence of the fact that the great detail in the regulations makes it difficult or impossible for many small businessmen to participate in this procurement?

Mr. Multer. There is no question but that is so. In our hearings throughout the country, time after time, we found that procurement specifications are in many cases unduly burdensome upon the small businessman who just has not the facilities or finances with which to study those specifications and try to analyze them. If he just looked at the wrapping specifications, it is enough to scare the small businessman away. He meets the specifications and can deliver the product which may be a simple glass or a pitcher, but when he starts to read those wrapping specifications and the labeling, he runs away from it. I think they can be simplified.

Mr. Erlenborn. I want to also thank you for raising the point about the post exchanges. This is something I was not aware of. And I think it is an area that certainly deserves attention, particularly in view of the fact that you surprised all of us with the figures as to the total amount that is being spent in procurement in this field, approximating or exceeding the amount procured through GSA. And I presume what you are talking about here is what I would call the armed services discount houses, the post exchange.

Mr. Multer. The commissaries where they are selling foods and items of that kind to the servicemen and the post exchanges where they are selling the so-called luxury items.

Now, as Congressman Holifield indicated, some of the fringe benefits are held out to these men, particularly the enlisted men. We say to them: "True, your salary is small, but look at the advantages you get. You can buy all these things at low prices, much lower than in the retail store." And we get complaints regularly from the retail stores in the vicinity of these post exchanges that we are taking their business away.

The answer is: We have got to take this business away. You cannot afford to sell this item at less than your cost. We are able to buy it at less than your cost. And there is no cost of overhead to pass on to these men and women in the services who can't otherwise afford to buy it.

But we are frustrating them, and we are defeating the purpose of these exchanges and commissaries when you increase the cost to the servicemen because you buy from me at a higher price rather than from you at a lower price. The frustrating thing to our committee is that time after time, there is hardly a week goes by, we do not get a complaint from some small merchant about his having offered the same kind of goods, the same specifications, and everything else, and somebody else got the order for more money. We go in with the complaint and are told: "We are running this agency; we are very happy to have your complaint. We will look into it."

And that is the last of it. It is just filed away and nothing done about it. We have no means of going in and saying anything to these people to make them abide by the law that applies to everybody else.

Mr. Erlenborn. I think there is another area that you also touched on, either in your direct testimony or in answer to some questions by Congressman Holifield, which I had a complaint about. And that is small items that are procured by agencies that are not subject to bid or negotiation, just ordered through mail order, for instance.

I had a scientist from the Argonne National Lab come in to complain to me that before the end of the year they always ran out of their funds for the purchase of these small items. And yet he could point out to me any number of cases where one particular mail order catalog house was getting the business from the local procurement officer for small items like step stools or centrifuges. Items like this were not subject to bid. And he could point out case after case, as he did, where other mail order houses could furnish the same item at much less or in many cases where even the Sears catalog had the item at about half what they were paying to the one favored order house.

That happened, in this case, to be in Ohio. I hope it was not in your district Congressman Brown.

Mr. Brown. I am sure it was not.

Mr. Erlenborn. And I think there probably is a vast area here that we could get into through this Commission.

Mr. Multer. Again, what you say is in accordance with the experiences as related to my subcommittee.

Mr. Erlenborn. I want to thank you very much.

Chairman Blatnik. Any other questions? Mr. Brown.

Mr. Brown. Congressman Multer, as a recognized authority on small business, I appreciate your testimony this morning, too, in that connection. And I would like to ask you if small business can compete more economically in providing many of these items than big business can.

Mr. Multer. The evidence before our committee, submitted to our committee, both my subcommittee and the full committee, bears out that small business can compete effectively price-wise as well as quality-wise with big business.

Mr. Brown. So the problems are not in either price or quality or in the lowest item cost of production, but rather in some of these collateral things, as you suggest, like wrapping, and so forth, that maybe are unnecessary regulations that have just grown up. We have got a problem in hacking away some of the redtape, or rather, this Commission would have that problem.

Mr. Multer. I think you put your finger on one of the important problems.

Mr. Brown. I am interested in another area that you went into where you suggest that big business often has a continual gleaner at work in the Government contract field who knows the Government procurement officers on such a personal basis that they develop a relationship that may preclude the consideration of the infrequent small business bidder.

And you suggest in your colloquy with one of the other members of the committee that the Secretary of Defense is aware of this. Can you suggest any action he may have taken to forestall this kind of relationship?

Mr. Multer. Yes, there are directives upon directives that have been issued and been sent out to the various procurement agencies. They get them and read them and file them in their big book, and that is the last attention they pay to them.

Mr. Brown. In other words, it would be your suggestion that while there may be some awareness of this, there has not been particularly effective implementation.

Mr. Multer. That is the fact.

Mr. Brown. And maybe this would also be an area for the Commission to look into.

Mr. Multer. I agree completely.

Mr. Brown. Would you agree that the small businessman, as a taxpayer, is usually pretty much worried about the cost of Government and whether or not the Government is getting the most for its money?

Mr. Multer. Well, I would not put it on the basis of worry. I think he has a legitimate concern about the high cost of Government. But I think you will find that the man who is looking for Government procurement is not concerned with the overall tax implications. He would like to get the business and get his little profit, too.

Mr. Brown. You do not think, then, that we ought to have a taxpayer representative on this Commission who provides the money for these contracts?

Mr. Multer. Well, let us not overlook the fact that not only the wage earner, but every businessman is a taxpayer.

Mr. Brown. Absolutely. And I wondered if I should be represented as a taxpayer on this Commission.

Mr. Multer. Well, this is like asking should not the consumer be represented. I think we are all consumers. I think we are all taxpayers. I do not think you can separate the tax implications from the procurement implications or from the other. I think this is part of the socio-economic underlying principles.

I think if you can get someone on the Commission who is a tax expert, I do not know that he would contribute very much to the overall problem. I think anybody who is going to serve on this Gommission consequently is going to have in mind that one of the things he wants to accomplish is lower cost to the Government.

Mr. Brown. Which is also a taxpayer interest.

Mr. Multer. Which is protecting the taxpayer.

Mr. Brown. So I guess we are on common ground on this, are we not?

Mr. Multer. Oh, yes.

Mr. Brown. Would you compare the volume of purchases—you mentioned $1.5 billion from nonappropriated funds—by the Federal Government to the purchases, say, of Sears or Federated Department Stores? Is it high, low, comparable?

Mr. Multer. I do not have those figures at the moment, but I can get them for you and submit them to you for the record.

Mr. Brown. Would you have any idea what percentage of purchases of an outfit like Sears or Montgomery Ward or Federated Department Stores comes from what you would classify as small business and how that compares with Government purchases?

Mr. Multer I think that—and again, this is just from the top of my head as ideas rather than based on fact—these large companies, in order to be able to compete pricewise and be able to indicate—as they do—that you can buy cheaper from them, do a good shopping job. They will buy wherever they can get the best price and be sure, of course, that the quality is there and delivery can be made in accordance with their time schedules.

I think that the small businessman has an easier approach to these large companies that you mentioned than they have to most Government procurement agencies.

Mr. Brown. Has an easier approach?

Mr. Multer. Yes.

Mr. Brown. It might be well, then, that we get somebody from one of these private industries who is purchasing from the competitive market to serve on this Commission.

Mr. Multer. I would hope we would have a top purchasing agent on this Commission who has had all this experience. He could then bring to bear his own experience in the private segment of our economy as against the Government procurement. I think a lot of good could come from that.

Mr. Brown. One final question.

On page 7 of your testimony, where you suggest that consideration be given to placing representatives of the Small Business Committee on the Commission, you said that such representation should "include majority and minority representation." You mean in the politically partisan sense majority and minority?

Mr. Multer. Yes.

Mr. Brown. Do you think that this Commission should take into consideration the majority and minority representation generally?

Mr. Multer. I think if this Commission is to do the full job, it must be bipartisan.

Mr. Brown. That is not included, as I

understand, in the legislation. And I just wondered if you would agree.

Mr. MULTER. Yes. I think there are no political inferences here, but it must have the bipartisan approach because whether we like it or not, we have in both parties men of conservative leaning and so-called progressive or liberal leaning. I think if this Commission is going to do its full job, every segment of our country must have a voice in it.

I do not mean by that that you have got to go in and take a retailer and a manufacturer and distributor. But I do think in the broader sense, the thinking of the country must be taken into account, the majority view and the minority view.

And I am not now talking about political differences.

Mr. BROWN. And I gather from your colloquy with Mr. Erlenborn that you feel that the quality of Defense Department procurement, at least with reference to observance of the Truth in Negotiations Act, is not very good.

Mr. MULTER. It can stand much improvement.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you.

Chairman BLATNIK. Mr. Edwards.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Multer, I want to thank you for coming. I believe you put in much better perspective in my own mind the fact there is a lot more to procurement than just tanks and planes and ships. There are many other small items that perhaps we do not think enough about.

Second, I want to ask—putting partisanship aside for the moment—are there too many Members of the House and the Senate and the executive branch proposed in this bill?

We have been talking here the last several days about the need for this type of expert from civilian life and that type of expert. And as I try to absorb the need for all of these different fields, I wonder if we are not overly weighted in people like us on this Commission. I do not know whether we have any particular business on there or not.

What do you think?

Mr. MULTER. Well, I have serious reservations as to whether or not Members of Congress should serve on these commissions except to this extent: I think there should be some congressional representation on these commissions at least to be able to guide these men as to the practical implication of legislating. Usually, the lay persons do not begin to understand the practical methods of getting a bill through the Congress. I think this is important in connection with their recommendations that they have the guidance of Members of the Congress as to what is likely to be enacted and what is not.

Now, there were many good things that the Hoover Commission recommended. But it took years to get them through because they did not take into account the practical legislative approach. I think we should have some representation if for no other reason but to give them that view.

As I said to Mr. Holifield earlier, no commission's recommendations are ever enacted into law unless we have full and complete committee hearings. A lot of this ground will have to be gone over again. But they can do a lot of the legwork and detail and digging that we do not have the time to do. That is the good that will come from this Commission.

I am sure we are not going to take their recommendations just because they recommend them. That is why in my bill I asked for 18. But as I also said, I have made the point now that there should be small business representation, if not on the Commission itself, at least on its task force. We must get people who will take all these things into account.

I do not know whether 12 or 14 is the right number or whether we should cut down on the congressional representation. I do think there must be some congressional representation.

Mr. EDWARDS. You are suggesting the Commission, then, has got to temper its idealistic approaches with some practical politics.

Mr. MULTER. Exactly.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman from Alabama will yield.

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think I can testify to two things on this point.

I think the tradition that has been set up was necessary from the standpoint of getting the acceptance of Congress to the formation of a Commission of this type. It gave them, I think, more confidence that there would be congressional advice given to the Commission along the practical line of what is attainable. And I can remember many, many times when the advice of the four Members of Congress on the Commission was accepted by the full Commission along the line of whether a proposed recommendation would receive any kind of consideration or not on Capitol Hill.

And many, many times, the Commission dropped recommendations on advice from Mr. Brown and myself and Senator McClellan and Senator Bridges who served from the Senate side, that while their recommendation might be idealistic, it was just simply beyond the scope of practicality.

And this was a bipartisan piece of advice. We both agreed that you just could not do some of the things that the outsiders thought should be done. And maybe they should be done, but you have to weigh the possibilities.

I just do not think you could get the Congress to pass a bill, have the confidence to set up a completely outside Commission appointed by the President, let us say, unless they felt that there was some congressional participation in the formulating of the recommendations that come back to the congressional committees.

Mr. EDWARDS. I think your point and Mr. Multer's point are both very sound. It may mean we need to increase the number of outside people if we are going to bring in all of the areas we have been talking about.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We have six of the 14, you see, from the outside. Of the four appointed by the Senate, of course, two are restricted to the Senate and two outside. The four appointed by the Speaker would be two from the House of Representatives and two outside. Of the six appointed by the President of the United States, four would come from the executive branch. And that was to take in those areas of the executive branch that have the most experience and the most responsibility in procurement.

Mr. EDWARDS. For example, Defense, GSA, and so forth.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Without pinning it down to that, I would say yes. The four largest procurement agencies, I believe, at this time would be Defense, Space, Atomic Energy, GSA, and I am sure that DOT, Department of Transportation, will probably come in above NASA even. As I understand their operation, it will be around $6 billion. So it will probably rank in the top group.

That is without pinning it down as being definitely where these representatives come from. Because I think the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House and the President would have to make judgments on that. But this gives a pretty good distribution when you consider the bipartisan nature of the House and the Senate and the people from the executive branch and then the ones appointed outside, the six of the 14 appointed from outside.

And we have already discussed this. They would be, in my opinion, people that have great expertise in private industry and professional organization along the line of procurement. You just would not pick a name.

Mr. MULTER. I hope not.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But certainly, if you are going to have an effective Commission, you pick people that had a background of experience and yet were maybe remote enough not to be too much involved in self-interest on the matter.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have one more question, Mr. Chairman, and I will be through.

Mr. Multer, of course, the procurement process starts with specifications and so forth and goes all the way through until payment is made. It seems that many small business people who either do business or would like to do business with the Government either have problems or are fearful of problems regarding final payment on contracts. There is the necessary settlement procedure concerning how much is owed and that sort of thing. And you know from your experience, I think, that many times these settlement negotiations can drag out a long time.

I wonder if you would agree that that end of the procurement process is a valid subject for this Commission to consider.

Mr. MULTER. It is a very important subject for them to consider because many a small businessman has gone in and obtained his first award, and was then practically put out of business because of the delays in payment and because of the frustrations that he ran up against when it came to getting payment and because of the constant and dragged out negotiations about extras and whether or not he did actually perform on time.

This is an important subject, too, for inquiry by this Commission.

Mr. EDWARDS. May I ask you, then, to turn to section 1, No. 9, both in your bill and in Mr. Holifield's bill, and ask you if that section is sufficient to trigger a Commission investigation into this subject, or should it be broadened?

Mr. MULTER. I think the language is sufficiently all-inclusive when read together with No. 10 which says: "Otherwise promoting economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in Government procurement operations."

I think together, that covers that subject and also covers the matter of assignment of payments. You know, one of the difficult problems here with the small businessman is getting financing. And if he could assign the moneys due or to become due on his contracts or subcontracts, he would have a better opportunity to obtain financing and to help him pay his bills.

This also, I think, requires attention. I think it comes under Nos. 9 and 10. But if there is any doubt, please spell it out.

Mr. EDWARDS. But it is very important, is it not?

Mr. MULTER. Oh, yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Not only should we look for economy and efficiency in the Government, but we should bend over backward to be fair with those who deal with the Government.

Mr. MULTER. That is right. Part of getting the economy and efficiency in Government is to keep these men as bidders and willing to supply the Government. Too many of these small businessmen run away from it after their first experience because of these very things you referred to.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman BLATNIK. Thank you very, very much, Congressman. It has been most helpful and most enlightening.

ITALIAN REPUBLIC DAY—21ST ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Italy had its birth at the end of the last war. At the time of its birth Italy was a war-ravaged and ruined country, while its gallant people were in desperate need of help for their survival. With the effective and very generous aid from Western democracies, especially from the United States, the Italian people joined hands, worked hard in rebuilding their country, and enjoyed freedom under their chosen form of democratic government. They had their ups and downs, and anxious moments, during the two decades of work and struggle, but today they, as well as their friends everywhere, joyfully witness the coming of age of their Republic.

Italians are among the most gifted and gallant peoples of the world. Western civilization owes much to them, and their significant contribution to our culture is well known, especially in the arts. Our debt to the genius of Italy is very great and that for many obvious reasons. The discovery of America was made by a son of Italy—Columbus—while the very name "America" is taken from the name of another Italian explorer, Amerigo Vespucci. From that early beginning to our own day, Italian immigrants have been very active in our midst, and have been among major contributors to our way of life in this great Republic.

They came here by the millions, in search of economic opportunities and for better livelihood. And here they have given a good account of themselves in every walk of life—in artistic and literary fields, in educational and social work, in trade and commerce, and also in banking. It is worth noting that the largest banking establishment in the country—and of the world—the Bank of America, was founded by Amadeo Giannini, and the largest foundry for casting fine art work was founded by Ricardo Bertelli. In the performing arts Americans of Italian ancestry have few serious rivals, while in the other fields of art, such as sculpture and painting, they are unsurpassed. Scientists of Italian origin are most prominent, and Enrico Fermi was one of the true pioneers in the development of atomic energy.

The mere mentioning of these few names does not give an adequate idea of the immense contribution made to America by immigrants from Italy, but it should remind us of the debt we owe to these sons of Italy.

PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM TO MINIMIZE OIL SPILLAGE DISASTERS COMMENDED

Mr. **MONTGOMERY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. KYROS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has taken swift and meaningful action in directing Secretary of Transportation Alan Boyd and Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall to determine methods of preventing and correcting a pollution problem of demanding importance to the people of my State. I speak of oil pollution caused by spillages at sea.

I highly commend the proposed work of these men. It will be their responsibility to marshal the governmental resources and industrial expertise needed to come up with an action program.

Coming from a coastal State, and in view of the recent SS *Torrey Canyon* disaster off the coast of England, I can well appreciate the significance and urgency of the work this task force has been directed to do.

The *Torrey Canyon* incident brings the demand for such a study clearly into focus. This one disaster—the largest oil spillage in history—serves as a red flag to the problems and dangers inherent in bulk oil shipping.

I'm sure all of us saw the television pictures of ducks immobilized on the shores of Cornwall, England, after being immersed in the giant oilslick that floated to those beaches. We did not see the fish and other biotic resources of all description which undoubtedly perished.

British estimates of the beach cleaning costs range as high as $36 million. But just as costly are the individual hardships suffered due to the losses of income from tourism and fishing. I know what the impact would be on my State if the beaches and harbors were suddenly covered with oil. It is a picture I do not care to contemplate—especially as we are about to enter the summer season.

An estimated 700 million tons of petroleum and petroleum products a year move by sea. About 420 million tons of this total consists of crude oil. The rest is refined products. Surely, this amount of oil movement warrants the best safety prevention measures we can adopt. While the *Torrey Canyon* disaster is the largest we have ever experienced, the ship itself was of infantile proportions compared to other ships now operating, under construction or planned for the future.

The possibility of a similar accident that involves an even larger amount of oil can never be entirely prevented. For this reason, Secretaries Boyd and Udall will also be concerned with postaccident emergency measures. Such measures were sadly lacking in the *Torrey Canyon* accident.

In London the British Government was widely criticized on the grounds that it acted too late in bombing the *Torrey Canyon* in order to destroy the continually leaking oil. But London had good reason for caution and, in some future case, another government might have even more. The reasons are these:

The *Torrey Canyon* was a Liberian-flag ship technically in international waters.

At the time when she might have been effectively destroyed by bombing, shelling, or torpedoing, it was not all certain that she was beyond salvage.

Destruction of her by naval or air forces without consent of the owners or underwriters could have precipitated a very hot international condition.

Also, the bombing came only after detergents and other unsuccessful means of dissipating the oil were found to be useless. Adequate study could have indicated the proper methods of dealing with these problems—both legally and physically.

Much work has already been done by the U.S. Coast Guard and several other Government agencies in surveying the entire oil pollution situation. Their findings will become a part of this special study.

I am pleased to note that the President directed the Secretary to concern themselves with all phases of the pollution-at-sea problem. It will suggest regulations to minimize spillages from pipelines, offshore towers, and other appurtenances that might leak pollutants as the result of earthquake damage, hurricanes, tidal waves, or other natural causes.

Legislative proposals will be made to enable Federal agencies to take immediate action in the event of any type of oil spillage accident.

The President has given Secretaries Boyd and Udall a large assignment, but it is one most vital to the shipping industry, our oceanic resources, and our coastal citizens. I commend the President for taking a positive lead in this most important aspect of preserving our national environment.

NETWORK REGULATION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for regulation of television networks. This bill is intended to fill a vast void in the existing legislation relating to regulation of communications. It is intended to assure that the operations of television networks are conducted in the public interest.

A great paradox in present law is that sole responsibility for broadcasting in the public interest is placed upon individual licensees—our local television stations—while the bulk of national broadcasting originates with the vast networks that span the country and which are wholly unregulated. Responsible persons have been concerned with this problem for many years.

In 1959 in the "Report to the President by the Attorney General on Deceptive Practices in the Broadcast Media," Attorney General Rogers stated that Congress could enact legislation which would place direct regulatory authority over the networks in the Federal Communications Commission. In this connection, his report contains the following statement:

> The networks, as such, are not regulated by the Federal Communications Commission. This is so even though the individual broadcasters rely upon the networks so heavily for matter broadcast, and the networks are ordinarily in a far better position than the individual licensee to select and control the presentation of that matter. Legislation could be enacted which would place direct regulatory authority over the networks in the FCC.

Under present law, only the individual station licensees are accountable for observing the various requirements providing for equal time, the fairness doctrine, and the presentation of various public issues, and the other basic ground rules established to create a fair and healthy use of the public airwaves. Apart from the chain broadcasting rules promulgated in 1941 to regulate certain aspects between networks and licenses who are affiliated with them contractually, the networks operate with no congressional injunction to serve the public interest.

In 1959 we were in the midst of the revelations concerning the network-originated TV rigged quiz shows. Pursuant to a recommendation of the then Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, bills were introduced in the House for the purpose of subjecting networks to regulation in the public interest. In this connection, Chairman Harris, in the 87th Congress, first session, introduced H.R. 1164 to provide for the regulation of national networks and other purposes. Earlier in the 86th Congress, the late Mr. Bennett, of Michigan, the ranking minority member of the House Commerce Committee, introduced H.R. 5042, likewise providing for the regulation of networks. In the other body, in the 87th Congress, Senator PASTORE introduced S. 2400, a bill to amend the Communications Act in order to provide for the regulation of networks.

Extensive hearings have been held by the FCC and by committees of Congress showing that more than 90 percent of the television programs broadcast during prime hours of viewing are owned or controlled by the originating networks. Independent producers have been met with a situation whereby they cannot have their programs telecast unless they agree to give an interest of 50 percent or more to the network. This is certainly not in the public interest and is contrary to the policy laid down in the Communications Act of 1934 that the airwaves shall be used for the public interest of the people.

What kind of a system is it that depends on financial payoffs instead of the needs and requirements of the viewing public as to what shall be shown on the public airwaves? The networks apparently look upon the public airwaves as a giant money tree to be shaken until all but a few barren leaves are left as a token.

The bill I am introducing today provides that a network may not own more than 50 percent of the programs telecast during prime time.

This would provide a unique opportunity to permit the kind of innovation which historically has characterized our enterprise system. The entertainment fare on network television has failed to display a comparable innovation.

Previous bills designed to regulate networks and the one I am introducing today, are based on the compelling need for placing the same degree of legal responsibility for broadcasting upon a network that is now placed upon the individual station licensee.

Although today the networks dominate the national distribution of information relating to issues and controversies concerned with our national interest, over the years there have been incidents wherein networks have been charged with refusal to abide by the requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act, which provides that if any licensee permits a candidate for public office to use a broadcasting station, it shall afford equal time to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station. Similarly, there have been complaints that the provisions of that section of the act requiring a broadcast licensee to afford reasonable opportunity for the presentation of conflicting views on issues of public importance have not been honored.

On Tuesday, May 23, 1967, Representative QUIE appeared on the NBC early morning "Today" show and presented his arguments in favor of the House adopting his amendments to the education bill. A vote on such amendment was scheduled for the same day. A Congressman who opposed the Quie amendments immediately requested time on the "Today" program to respond to Representative QUIE's views. This request was first refused by the network. Late on the evening of May 23, apparently higher officials of the NBC Network had a change of heart about their refusal. The opposing Congressman was informed that he would have the privilege of appearing on the "Today" show on the morning of May 24, at which time he could offer rebuttal.

The significance of this episode cannot be exaggerated. If a network on the morning of a day scheduled for a vote on a measure of extreme national importance can furnish a national platform for a proponent of proposed legislation and try to deny it to an opponent, there is no meaning whatsoever to the fairness doctrine now embodied in the Communications Act of 1934.

My bill would correct this situation and place an obligation upon a network to observe the equal-time and fairness requirements in the same manner that is now required of the individual station licensee.

Recently we have witnessed a series of arrogant maneuvers in the broadcasting of sports events.

A system of "selective blackouts" of important sports events by makeshift network operations seems to be emerging.

The mayor of Chandler, Ariz., complained that the Clay-Folley bout at Madison Square Garden not long ago was blacked out in the Arizona hometown area of the challenger, Folley. In Folley's hometown area, the people had to pay box-office prices for a closed-circuit presentation. According to the mayor, this precipitated considerable local unrest and protests against having to pay to see what viewers elsewhere were getting free.

Few of us would argue that it is unreasonable to provide a blackout of a sports contest at the point of origin in order to protect local gate receipts, but is it in the public interest to permit the use of publicly owned airwaves in such a fashion as to checkerboard the country with areas of blackouts dictated solely for the purpose of obtaining revenues from the sale of tickets to closed-circuit presentations? The bill I am introducing today will put a stop to this growing practice of selective blackouts.

Many thoughtful persons throughout the Nation are now concerned with the extent to which network control of professional sporting events is undermining the spirit of honest participation by the players and teams in those events.

As everyone here probably knows, not long ago the referee in a professional soccer game was reported in various press accounts as having called phoney halts in the sports event so that the network might work in its advertising commercials. The referee stated that he carried electronic devices so that he could be signaled by the television staff with instruction to stop the game for commercials.

Shortly after the accounts were published, the referee proved unavailable for further interviews by newspapermen and network officials expressed dismay that anyone could possibly charge them with such a practice. The network's claims of innocence were almost as loud as when they professed ignorance of the rigging of television quiz programs some years back.

When the continuity of a sports event is subjected to artificial interruptions, there is bound to be a deterioration of the genuineness of the event. Practices such as this would soon lead professional baseball, football, or basketball to the status of a wrestling performance.

Carried to the extreme, this kind of activity by anyone—networks, licensees or others—can reduce all our national sporting events to rigged entertainment spectacles. I need not remind this body of the extremes engaged in by various persons not many years ago when contests of intellectual skill were similarly reduced to rigged entertainment spectaculars.

Furthermore, it would not be reasonable to expect that if the networks become owners of major professional sports teams that they objectively would provide network facilities for the telecasting of sports contests between teams which they do not own or control.

I do not believe that it is in the public interest that networks should be permitted to make use of publicly licensed facilities to promote profitable operations of professional sports teams which they own or control. The competitive disadvantage to a non-network-owned team is obvious.

In order to insure that the conduct of professional sports contests are bona fide and free from the domination of commercialism, my bill prohibits any television network from owning any professional football, baseball, basketball, hockey, or soccer team.

The fantastic cost of technological advance coupled with the understandable economic exploitation of commercial advantages by network operators have reduced local-station licensees to very limited opportunities to program according to the specific needs of their local communities. As a result, virtually all local television stations must be affiliated with a network in order to survive economically. Moreover, television viewers throughout the Nation are subjected to a bland diet of sameness day in and day out in every region of the country.

We are now on the threshold of the season when the magic of the ratings and the convenience of the networks will treat us with an opportunity to view in prime time third, fourth and fifth generation reruns.

Unless the Congress lays down basic ground rules which will create a healthy atmosphere to encourage diversity within the networks and competition between the networks, and opportunity for nonnetwork producers to have reasonable access to local broadcasting facilities, it will be derelict in its responsibility to promote the public interest.

MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Karth] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, because of the Middle East crisis, the world stands at this moment at the awesome crossroads between total war and peace.

This is a time for rational men to reason together before the gates of madness and destruction snap forever shut. A recent editorial—May 24—in the Washington Post plainly articulates the need of the Arabic forces to come to their senses before it is too late.

Certainly it must be clear to everyone that the Near East—Israeli-Arabic—conflict is markedly different from the Vietnam situation. There is no doubt about who our friends are in this instance. There is no doubt about our commitment or the necessity for our involvement. There is no doubt that communism versus democracy are the clearly defined combatants. There is no question about revolutionary forces being involved.

I again reiterate my strong support of President Johnson and his firm stand to defend freedom, justice, and democracy in the Near East.

I think it appropriate that the Post editorial be printed in the Record, as follows:

This Gun Is Loaded

Only a man insanely bent on starting a war and prepared to suffer the awful consequences could misunderstand President Johnson's forceful and timely statement on the crisis in the Middle East. President Nasser is now on notice, if new notice was needed, that this country will support Israel, as indeed it would any other country in the area, against aggression "in any form."

More specifically, Mr. Nasser is on notice that this country will not acquiesce to the blockade imposed by the United Arab Republic against Israel shipping and Israeli-bound, "strategic" cargo carried by ships of any flag through the Tiran Straits to the port of Eilat. President Johnson made plain beyond question his view that Mr. Nasser's claim to control this waterway is "illegal and potentially disastrous" to peace.

If Mr. Nasser has any doubts on this score, he had better be as "ready for war" as he claims, in his reckless and bombastic way, to be. For if he presses this outrageous claim, it is hard to foresee any other eventuality.

The world, or that part of it still guided by elemental reason and the rule of law, cannot countenance so brazen a piece of aggression, no matter how tangled and tormented the history of the conflict between Israel and the Arab States. International law, as solemnly laid down in a Conference on the Sea in Geneva in 1958, is against Nasser. The vital interests of a free and independent state run directly against Nasser. And the interests of the United States, as President Johnson has freshly reaffirmed them, are also against Nasser.

Taken together, the law, and Israeli interests, and American interests can leave no doubt that President Nasser is staring down the barrel of a loaded gun. The Israelis have made it clear they have no choice. The blockade is tantamount to a declaration of war; its enforcement, which could come at any moment, would be an act of war. There is no reason whatever to doubt that, given this provocation, the Israelis will fight, and scant reason to doubt that the fighting will lead to a general Arab-Israeli war. It is hard to see how a war, begun in this fashion, would not sooner or later bring the big powers to the brink of conflict—and perhaps beyond, into conflict itself.

And it is hard to believe that Mr. Nasser does not realize this. Yet, if he does, it is just as hard to understand how he could have overplayed his hand so dangerously. It is not quite too late for him to draw back. It is still not too much to hope that the United Nations, or some responsible segment of the world community, may yet devise a diplomatic solution to forestall the first, fatal act of war.

But there is not much ground for hope unless Mr. Nasser comes to realize, quickly, that he is looking down the barrel of a loaded gun.

FRANK MANFREDI INVENTS GAS-SAVING DEVICE FOR AUTOMOBILES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Annunzio] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frank Manfredi, of Cleveland, Ohio, has recently invented a fuel booster, which not only saves gasoline in operating an automobile, but also eliminates pollution from the exhaust system.

With air pollution reaching unprecedented levels, particularly in our crowded metropolitan areas, Manfredi's device could prove to be a great step forward in the fight to cut down air pollution.

His device increases miles per gallon, deters carbon from forming, and improves combustion, which in turn reduces exhaust emission considered to be a major cause of air pollution.

Mr. Speaker, an article describing Mr. Manfredi's invention appeared in the June 1967 issue of Science and Mechanics magazine. I read this article with keen interest and feel that it merits the attention of my colleagues, who I know are seriously concerned with finding a simple and inexpensive solution to the critical problem of air pollution. The article follows:

New Fuel Booster Hikes MPG!

(By Gene Hersh)

Since 1887, when William Maxwell of Middlesex, England, developed a rotary exhaust pump, men have been trying to use moisture to get better performance from engines. In Maxwell's case, it was a gadget for condensing water vapor for use in steam engines. But even in the early days of the development of the internal combustion engine, it was felt that they would operate more efficiently if moisture could be injected.

Some 36 different inventions and 80 years later, a Cleveland, Ohio, man seems to have created a device that can put moisture to good use in an automobile engine.

It was a late-night ride through moist Pennsylvania air that inspired Frank Manfredi, who runs an automation line at the suburban Brook Park Chevrolet plant, to invent a gizmo which may be a blessing to car owners the world over. Manfredi made the drive about six years ago and noticed his car performed much better in the high-humidity air. He determined to create this ideal condition in his car. The result is a gas-saving device for which a patent is pending. If a manufacturer is found, it could be on the market within two or three months.

The contrivance consists of a valve, mixing chamber and fluid container. It should retail for approximately $20 when mass-produced, according to Manfredi. He says his invention breaks up the gas molecules and burns the gas more thoroughly than in a normal engine. He further claims it also eliminates pollution from the exhaust system. "It's less complicated and just as effective as the pollution reducer being produced by General Motors," Manfredi reports.

Manfredi says his device has been thoroughly tested over the past several months by a large U.S. electronic-automotive equipment firm, which, he hopes, will eventually mass-produce the fuel booster.

Under precision computer tests, dynamometer performance ratings showed that revolutions per minute increased by 50 when the instrument was attached to the motor of Manfredi's 1963 six-cylinder Chevrolet. Also, between speeds of 45 and 75 mph, the horsepower increased by five.

With the gas-saving device attached, Manfredi's car ran with the carburetor needle valve set one-tenth of a turn. Without the device the needle must be set at 1½ turns. The less the needle is turned, the more gas is saved. A mechanical check immediately after the tests on the inventor's car revealed there was much less carbon accumulation than in a normal engine.

To attach the device, the valve is connected to the manifold and a line from the valve is connected to the mixing chamber which in turn is attached to the fluid container. Water is put in the fluid container. The water is pumped into the chamber, where it mixes with air. The mixture then goes through the valve into the manifold.

The inventor's original device was 18 inches in diameter. It has now been refined to a two-inch diameter valve and a four-inch long mixing chamber with a diameter of four inches.

Manfredi feels his invention is worth "millions of dollars." He does have several letters from large American companies that have expressed interest in his invention but refuses to let the firms be mentioned. He willingly demonstrates his gas saver—except for revealing what's in the aluminum vapor chamber.

"How this is constructed is the secret of the invention's success," he stated.

Manfredi says the prototype device he uses on his car cost around $700 to produce. All parts except the vapor chamber were manufactured by a tool and die shop. The confidential components were put together in the basement of his west side Cleveland home.

The function of this vapor chamber is to break up the molecules of gasoline more thoroughly by creating for the fuel system the same environment as exists on a rainy day. The device causes moisture to play a part in separating the gas molecules.

"Besides affording smoother and pleasanter operation, the invention increases the miles per gallon, deters carbon from forming on the valves, improves combustion and thus reduces exhaust pollution," Manfredi explains.

Here is how Manfredi made one test on his invention:

"My car was driven with and without the invention. In preparation for the test, the line to the gas tank was disconnected and in its place a gas line was connected to an empty gallon can attached to the car under the hood. Gas remaining in the carburetor was burned off and a quart of fuel poured into the gallon can.

"The car was driven at a steady 40 mph until the quart of gasoline was used up. A before-and-after check of the mileage revealed that the vehicle traveled exactly five miles on the quart. Then my invention was attached (a task that takes less than five minutes) to the manifold and the same procedure was followed.

"This time the car traveled 6.4 miles on one quart. Converting these figures to miles per gallon, the car would get 20 miles to the gallon without the invention and 25.6 miles to the gallon with the device."

A great number of devices have been invented aimed at increasing the efficiency of the internal combustion engine. Some of these have been widely promoted both as "gas savers" and for allegedly reducing engine wear. None seem to have gained universal acceptance, perhaps because not all of them seem effective in all types and models of cars—old and new, compacts and luxury models, economy six-cylinder jobs and high-performance V–8s. But if the claims made for Frank Manfredi's "fuel booster" prove out in actual performance, it would seem his invention is headed for success.

OUR NATIONAL MARITIME POLICY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I was much impressed by an address given by Mr. Frank Nemec, president of Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., New Orleans, La., before the Rotary Club of Baltimore, Md., on May 23, 1967, entitled "National Maritime Policy—Now or Never."

The speech of Mr. Nemec demonstrates his imaginative and sensible approach to the problems of the American merchant marine. Mr. Nemec is a man of keen intellect and great capacity, and I feel that his remarks deserve the attention of every thoughful American.

I am also enclosing an editorial from the Baltimore Sun dated May 27, 1967, as well as a news story about Mr. Nemec's speech by Helen Delich Bentley, carried in the Baltimore Sun on May 24, 1967.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun., May 24, 1967]

MARITIME FUNDS CALLED ENDANGERED—NEMEC ASKS ACTION BEFORE U.S. DEFICIT GROWS TOO BIG

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

The mounting deficit spending of the United States Government could cost the maritime industry all hope of any improvement in appropriations unless a policy is firmed up in the near future, a leading steamship company executive pointed out yesterday.

In an address to the Rotary Club of Baltimore, Frank A. Nemec, president of Lykes Brothers Steamship Corporation, warned that the American merchant marine once again could find itself in a dismal abyss unless a definite commitment can be obtained from the Administration before the deficit actually amounts to the predicted $29,200,000,000.

BUDGET REDUCTION

"Should any one of the growing crises in the Middle East, Hong Kong, India-Pakistan or Cuba entangle the United States in any way, the Government undoubtedly would look to reduce all expenditures sharply and the maritime industry would be included," the speaker said.

"As desperate as the merchant marine picture is today, and it is, unless remedial action is taken now to firm up a program there is reason to believe that the maritime budget not only will not be increased, but will be reduced."

DOUBLING FUNDS

Nemec's sense of urgency stemmed from the bleak financial picture painted Monday by Representative Mills (D., Ark.), chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

In recent weeks the Administration has indicated that it is interested in putting a new policy through for the American merchant marine, but tied into that program would be the construction of some merchant ships in foreign yards.

Although the tentative plans would call for doubling the appropriations for new construction for the first five years and widening the scope of the subsidy coverage on merchant vessels, two major segments of labor and management have held fast in their opposition to the Administration line because of the foreign building aspect.

On Monday night at a National Maritime Day dinner in Baltimore, Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation, who has been charged with the responsibility of putting a maritime program together, declared flatly that this could be the last chance to restore the viability of the merchant marine.

SUFFICIENT SUPPORT

Boyd also has made it clear that until he has sufficient support to get a program through Congress, he will not ask the President to introduce one, because of the present impasse which is tying up the whole package.

On one side of the impasse sit Boyd and some segments of the maritime industry; on the other is a labor group headed by Paul Hall, president of the AFL–CIO Maritime Trades Department, and the management group led by the Shipbuilders Council of America.

NATIONAL MARITIME POLICY: NOW OR NEVER

(An address by Frank A. Nemec, President, Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., before the Rotary Club of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., May 23, 1967)

Let there be another decade of national neglect under our present patchwork maritime policy and the United States will be courting international economic and military disaster. The United States has no choice—it must secure the seas for its defense and its commerce—and new national maritime policy for a rejuvenated merchant marine is essential to both.

Today, the United States, involved in an expanding military commitment in all of Southeast Asia and with war clouds gathering in other areas should recognize that *its maritime resources are strained to the breaking point*. Despite the exaggerated claims of the peacetime proponents of airpower, ocean transportation moves more than 97% of all military cargo and almost 100% of vital economic supplies to Vietnam and the rest of Southeast Asia. Why, even 80% of all Vietnam cargo required by our Air Force moves by sea.

The magnificent armada of merchant ships constructed to help win World War II—now more than twenty years of age—has reached the end of its useful life. Under present conditions, it is increasingly difficult to find suitable ships and crews to carry necessary military cargoes without damage to our international trade and balance of payments.

A substantial enlargement of the present conflict or need for significant military intervention in some other area of the world *probably would require mobilization of many or perhaps even most of our vital cargo-liner ships in the military sea-lift*. A few years from now the situation will be even more critical. Unless remedial action is taken soon, our nation will be face to face with the unpleasant truth that during the 1970's it will be without the support of an effective United States merchant fleet even for limited conflicts such as the Korean or Vietnam conflicts.

Let me illustrate this! During 1967–1968, military requirements of *dry-cargo sea-lift* to *all* areas of the world will aggregate about 30,000,000 tons. This requirement will be met in the following manner:

MSTS—Nucleus fleet	3, 500, 000
National defense reserve fleet	6, 000, 000
Total	9, 500, 000
Merchant marine	20, 500, 000
Total	30, 000, 000

But—and mark this well—neither NDRF or MSTS have much more sea-lift capability in reserve. The inactive NDRF consists of about 1,100 ships—of which only a handful are suitable for use in the present emergency.

As a practical matter, any further military sea-lift requirements during the balance of this year of crises must be satisfied by the ready ships in the American merchant marine.

But—and this is often overlooked—we are not fighting a conventional war. In a military-political-economic form of warfare it is abundantly plain that cargoes necessary to support the civilian economy of the Republic of Vietnam are as important to the overall requirements of the United States effort as are direct military cargoes. The hazards and risks undertaken by the commercial cargoliners in carrying this vital cargo to RVN have not been adequately appreciated either by the Department of Defense or by the public at large. These cargoes were carried at costs to the Government which were substantially less than the commercial tariffs, and these tariffs were not increased when a tight market developed by reason of the Vietnam conflict.

Looking into the '70's, the situation is frightful. With the exception of the subsidized fleet, most segments of the American merchant marine are now obsolete. Specifically, the MSTS nucleus fleet, the NDRF, the so-called tramp or contract carriers, and most unsubsidized liner ships have limited remaining life. In the future the United States defense establishment must become increasingly reliant* upon the subsidized cargoliner segment of the United States merchant marine for sea-lift availability even in cases of limited emergency.

The increasing per-capita consumption of military supplies obsoletes the importance of the C-5A airplane as a significant factor in cargo-lift—even before a proto-type is produced. Only sea-lift is capable of supplying the massive military-economic needs of operations such as those now conducted in Southeast Asia.

As a nation we seem to have forgotten that sea power is not a single element but a very complex structure—with built-in time delays—the essential elements of which must include:

1. A formidable naval fleet made up of surface, underwater and air units;

2. A military auxiliary which in time of need must consist largely of a merchant fleet capable of maintaining adequate logistic support for our armed forces overseas.

While part of the present maritime situation arises from the fact that we are trying to maintain a highly geared civilian economy hand in hand with supporting a large-scale military action, it is likely that as a nation we will face recurring situations of this type. Guns and butter—with a good part of our merchant fleet being retained in the foreign trade so as to earn and conserve badly needed foreign exchange.

More than any other single factor, the future state and size of the merchant marine can limit our ability to apply effectively the full measure of our military and economic strength as rapidly and as forcefully as may be required by future events. Herein lie the seeds of national disaster! We stand as a military and economic Goliath—with feet of clay!

Yet this need not be so. At a *time when the Soviet Union is rapidly expanding its maritime capability*, building ships both at home and abroad and in the process expending large amounts of badly needed foreign exchange—*the U.S. fumbles with indecision* and seems to hope that like a bad dream its maritime problems will disappear with the dawn.

The United States cannot long remain the greatest military power on earth with an overage and inadequate maritime fleet. Cost effectiveness seems to have become a goal—rather than a tool; short-term expedients have been dignified as long-term policies; and as a consequence our national security and a vital segment of our total economic strength are in jeopardy.

Perhaps at the heart of this indecision lies the unwillingness of successive national administrations to face the reality that an enlarged, modernized and more efficient merchant marine is going to *require the long-range dedication of a larger portion of our national economic resources.*

During recent years even relatively small shipbuilding programs have been pared to the point where the scheduled replacement program of the subsidized cargoliner fleet is about 50 ships behind schedule—and 50 additional fine, new ships could make a real difference in our maritime capability today.

While the American Merchant Marine is on the verge of *a technological explosion of impressive magnitude*, maintenance of the American standard of living in a citizen-manned merchant marine is going to require more government support—not less. While foreign officers and seamen have obtained substantial increases in wage and fringe benefits in the last decade, the American merchant fleet cannot compete in the commercial foreign trades at wage levels that are three or four times as high as competing foreign flag ships.

Yet, while our merchant marine programs have faltered, the subsidized common carrier companies have built ships to the limit of the available shipyard subsidies. As a consequence, *today the United States has the finest cargoliner* fleet on the high seas and the 155 new ships built or building are the envy of the entire world.

With heavy emphasis on construction and design which improve endurance and reliability, the speeds of these new ships, cargo-handling abilities, and crew conditions have all been substantially improved. Their heavy-lift cargo gear, cargo-handling flexibility, special features such as strengthened decks, quick-opening hatches and many other specialized capabilities make these ships *the finest group of military auxiliaries in the entire world today—bar none.*

Consider just this one fact—today, the United States has in operation three times as many twenty-knot cargoliners as the rest of the world *combined.*

Presently, in the absence of full mobilization and because of our need to earn and conserve badly needed foreign exchange, many of these ships have been retained in their commercial trades—but they are ready and available to the defense establishment whenever required by our national interests. *But—and mark this carefully*—since 1957 the 155 new ships which the subsidized lines have built or now have building have released an equal number of excellent C-2 and C-3 type ships—most of which are now serving in the Southeast Asia sea-lift. *Without this shipbuilding program which represents an expenditure of corporate funds aggregating more than $1 billion, the United States would be in dire straits today.*

THE NEW MILITARY AUXILIARIES

While this accomplishment is gratifying, the 13 companies presently associated in the Committee of American Steamship Lines are on the verge of exciting technological breakthroughs of unprecedented magnitude.

For example, Lykes has conceived and developed at its own expense its new Seabee Class, which ships—while designed as commercial carriers—are destined to become the finest military auxiliaries on the high seas. Other new concepts—including container-ships and lash type ships—will immeasurably strengthen our economic and military sealift capability.

These new types of military auxiliaries which will be invaluable to the defense establishment can, and in the future must, be made available to the Armed Forces. Even assuming that future national interest requires continued commercial cargoliner services, the newest, the finest and the most useful of these ships can be turned to military service *almost instantly*, provided the Defense Department joins in implementing the so-called *respond* program which CASL developed and presented to the Navy and Defense Departments this year.

This proposal, now under active study by the Navy, D.O.D. and D.O.T., will make sea-lift capability available to the military on a pre-programmed basis.

Let me make this perfectly plain—the military establishment will have increased need of the common carrier cargoliners in the near future—and the CASL lines are willing to cooperate completely with the national interest. *But* this must be based on recognition by D.O.D. of the *basic long-term importance of this cargoliner fleet* to the United States *coupled* with *constructive changes* in *the handling of military sealift cargo.*

OUR PATCHWORK POLICIES

While in general terms our national cargoliner policy and its results have been constructive, the United States has muddled along with other segments of our merchant fleet—patching here and there—but always reluctant to fix firmly its maritime objectives, unable to develop a logical cohesive over-all maritime policy and unwilling to dedicate the economic resources necessary to implement it.

The three decades which have intervened since enactment of the Merchant Marine Act have seen many changes in the world-wide role of the United States in its foreign trade and in the relative standing of its merchant marine on the sea-lanes of the world. Thus, today:

We are the strongest economic and military power in the world and a nation which has assumed vast international commitments.

As a consequence of World War II, we built and still possess some usable remnants of a war-built fleet.

In the two decades after World War II the United States became the bread-basket of the world. Cargo preference legislation enabled the creation of a U.S. tramp fleet using war-built ships and engaged largely in the carriage of agricultural aid cargoes at subsidized rates.

The United States has become the world's major importer of ores and petroleum products and U.S. citizens and citizen corporations own and operate many ships of foreign registry to supply some of the capability necessary to meet these rapidly expanding demands.

In the field of international shipping a major revolution has taken place in the size and capability of bulk carriers—but with minor exception no such ships have been built for operation under the U.S. flag. (Whereas cargo tonnage of war-built ships was of 10/15,000 capacity, today carriers built or building range up to 250,000 tons.)

The domestic fleet went to war, and on its return found that it could not meet the rate and the competition of other modes of transportation.

Budgetary limitations and other factors have severely restricted the construction of an adequate fleet of new ships—and only the subsidized cargoliners have been able to replace significant portions of their fleet.

Only about 20% of the active U.S. merchant fleet is modern—the rest consists of World War II ships rapidly approaching the end of their useful lives.

In the face of sweeping changes in our world responsibilities in our foreign trade, in the international shipping community and in the modes of ocean transportation, the United States has failed to come to grips with its maritime problems, to redefine its maritime objectives, and to do something about them.

During the two decades since World War II, this industry has been studied to death. The classical excuse for inaction by each successive national administration has been the commissioning of still yet another study.

Probably the most unpleasant aspect of this problem to our national administration is that if the United States wants a rejuvenated and effective merchant marine, increased appropriations for operating as well as shipyard support will be required. *However, compared to the billions of dollars we are expending in space and in other support of the aerospace industry, the increases are relatively modest.*

Failures of the past years, our national indecision and shortsighted policies have created an era of ill-feeling and in some instances have tempered the co-operation of labor to technological innovation. Given a new climate, given a progressive program, given common sense and realistic administration in national policy, the United States can count on the full co-operation of industry and labor—both of which have tendered support to such a program.

On May 1 of this year, after months of consultation with all segments of industry, Secretary of Transportation Boyd submitted to the Congress his proposals for revitalizing the American merchant marine. Regretfully, he reported that he was unable to submit his program to the President because of deep divisions in the industry. He summarized the situation by saying:

"The truly tragic realization is that the demands confronting us will produce the very thing that everyone fears the most—continuation of the present financial and administrative patchwork—fewer maritime jobs—a shrinking fleet—less work for American shipyards—continuing deterioration of our competitive position."

Plainly, the major opposition was generated by shipyards, shipyard labor, and by some elements of seagoing labor—despite the fact that Boyd committed the administration to about 30 domestic ships a year, about twice the present level. The *direct* increase in shipyard work force was estimated at about 10,500 new shipyard jobs with about an equal increase in the supplier industries.

I say to you, that because of decades of neglect, the United States is woefully short of modern ships and the private interest of American shipyards and shipbuilding labor must not stand in the way of rapidly curing this mortal danger.

Basically, the Boyd plan is sound and is supported by a substantial majority of American shipowners and their seagoing officers and men. It provides a sound approach to a comprehensive program benefitting all segments of our merchant fleet. The hour is late, the challenge is great, but the future is golden. I say to you, the Boyd plan is constructive and deserves the support of Congress.

With forebearance and some submergence of private interest to national need, we can win for ourselves and children, the security and the economic opportunity inherent in a strong and vigorous American merchant marine.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, May 24, 1967]

American-Flag Fleet

There has long been general agreement that the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is outdated; that the policies called for under that measure cannot provide the country with an adequate American-flag fleet. Succeeding Presidents have called for an updating of the act. President Johnson has pressed and is still pressing for appropriate action. From the start the question has been: What should be done?

The job of preparing proposed new maritime policies was assigned some time ago to Alan S. Boyd, who has since become Secretary of Transportation. He has finished the job and controversy has followed, particularly over his proposals for the construction of some American ships in low-cost foreign yards and the placing of Federal maritime agencies in the Transportation Department.

In his National Maritime Day address here Monday Mr. Boyd suggested that his proposals could be the country's last chance to move from the policies adopted 30 years ago to new policies that would assure an adequate fleet in the present-day, highly competitive ship-building and ship-operating fields. His warning obviously must be taken seriously by the various ship interests from labor to management, from building to operation.

WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Meeds] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty has come under continuous attack in our Nation. The attacks have been launched at a time and in a manner designed to still a battle for the people.

I have long believed that the war on poverty is a good war. It is an attempt, the first in our history, to cut across the lines of bureaucracy and to meet the problem of poverty on all levels. Poverty is not simply to be solved by approval of welfare payments from one agency nor by authorization for low-rent housing by another agency. Poverty must be recognized as a national evil with many facets.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has tackled the problem that way.

The OEO's work rightfully should be under constant critical review. It should be improved as ways to improve it are discovered. But the program does not deserve the continuing carping of those whose sole purpose is to kill it.

One of the Nation's distinguished journalists, Roscoe Drummond, has skillfully and accurately written of the need for going ahead with the war on poverty. He has clearly pointed out that although this war needs innovation, it also needs continued congressional support. It has the support, Mr. Drummond writes, of a majority of the American voters.

Mr. Drummond's words should be read by all Americans and particularly by those in Congress who face the primary responsibility of making the first judgment of the OEO program.

I commend Mr. Drummond for his astute observations and respectfully request permission to enter his newspaper column of May 31 in today's proceedings.

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 1967]

The War on Shriver—Public Backs Fight on Poverty

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The American people are making no mistake in giving their strong support to the war on poverty.

Voters are 60 per cent behind the war on poverty and want it continued or expanded, the Harris Survey shows. Public support has been growing steadily for the last seven months.

The Nation as a whole has come to accept the war on poverty as one of the most compassionate, humane, and intelligent programs of the Johnson Administration.

And the Republican leadership in Congress, launching its own "opportunity crusade," avows that it favors all of the antipoverty programs and backs all of the antipoverty goals—but would do the whole thing differently.

Surely all this should be sweet music to the White House and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Why, then, as he goes to Congress soon to defend his proposed budget, should Sargent Shriver, the coordinator-in-chief of the war on poverty, be the target of so much criticism for his administration of the program? Has he been a flop? Has he been incompetent? Has he been a dull-minded and routine administrator?

No one will argue, certainly not Shriver, that everything has come up roses in the Office of Economic Opportunity. But the volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on the OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled around the already overburdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered.

These facts ought to be borne in mind:

1. Much of the criticism comes from the extremists who pretty much cancel each other out—those who attack Shriver because they don't want the war on poverty to be doing anything and those who want Shriver to be asking for ten times as much as he is now doing.

2. The OEO has made mistakes. They should be recognized and corrected. The new antipoverty bill now before Congress greatly tightens the program. But the OEO had to do things quickly in its early period and obviously it has not done them well. But let's not forget that if there were no OEO there would be no war on poverty. There would be no Headstart. There would be no Job Corps. There would be no Community Action and, above all, there would be little recognition on the part of middle-class Americans that poverty in the United States acutely exists—32 million men, women, and children beneath the poverty line who must be relieved.

There is no doubt in my mind that the war on poverty continues to need innovative, pioneering, open-minded, let's-try leadership. It would be very unwise to bury these new and experimental programs in existing departments which have more than they can do already and too many officials wedded to old programs.

PRESIDENT AUTHORIZES SPECIAL EFFORT TO COPE WITH POLLUTION OF SEAS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Meeds] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson last week authorized a special effort to study methods of strengthening this Nation's ability to prevent and cope with oil and other pollutant spillages at sea. I applaud his most timely action in the interest of preserving our oceanic and costal resources. I do so particularly as a Congressman from Washington State which has a long coastline and hundreds of miles of inland, saltwater beachline subject to such potential pollutant damages.

The Secretaries of Interior and Transportation were directed to head the effort and to provide recommendations to the President within 90 days. The expediency attached to this work by the President is well taken.

Americans were awakened by the *Torrey Canyon* accident off the coast of England to what has long been accepted as routine destruction of our coastal vegetation and biotic life.

The ship broke open after hitting a reef and released several thousand tons of crude oil into the ocean. The black film blotted out nearly 100 miles of the Cornish coast, covering waterfowl, killing biotic life, and closing many fishing harbors.

This accident brought to light the many oil spillages of a smaller nature which continually blight the coastlines of the world. Some are caused by ships during their tank cleaning operations. Others are said to be caused by oil leaking from tankers which were sunk during World War II.

Residents of the Puget Sound area in Washington State are fortunate in that so far no major oil slicks nor shipwrecks have occurred. However, not many years ago a vessel did go aground in upper Puget Sound. There was oil leakage which did cover much of the adjacent waters and beaches. The damage, luckily, was not nearly as heavy as it might have been.

In my own Second Congressional District, bordering on Puget Sound, there are oil refineries and oil docks, all serviced by ocean-going vessels. As we all know, ship sizes are increasing and ship traffic in Puget Sound is growing. The damage to marine life and to property would be immense if any of these huge oil-carrying vessels were to be involved in a major collision or to sink in the protected waters of Puget Sound.

Secretaries Boyd and Udall have, within their respective Departments, the existing authority and talent to develop a significant program of pollution abatement. Their directives from the President were specific. "Among the areas which you should consider," he said, "are these":

The prevention of spillage accidents through the design of vessels and through control of the movement of vessels carrying hazardous material;

Techniques for detection, recovery and neutralization of spilled pollutants;

Preventive measures relating to offshore production of oil and other minerals;

Opportunities for broad international cooperation in the program;

And development of contingency plans to deal with spillage emergencies.

These areas of study point out the vast ramifications of pollutant spillages at sea. And I speak of ramifications well documented by the aftermath of the *Torrey Canyon* disaster. Waterfowl could not fly or protect themselves from the cold because their feathers were coated with oil, beaches were void of the tourists so necessary to the local economy, and a nation was restrained from protecting itself due to the legal implications of destroying a foreign ship in international waters.

Clearly, the task facing Secretaries Boyd and Udall is broad in scope and urgent in need. Not only oil pollution but other waste discharges are a threat of irreparable damage to wildlife, recreational resources and valuable fisheries. I await with great anticipation the recommendations that the President will receive.

INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY REQUESTED

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Paul D'Ortona, president of the Philadelphia City Council, has brought to my attention Resolution 315, which was adopted unanimously by the council at a meeting on May 18. An increase in social security is of vital concern to many of my constituents in the Third District of Pennsylvania, and I am therefore bringing this resolution to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION 315

A resolution memorializing the members and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States to support the proposed increase of twenty per cent in Social Security payments

Whereas, The Senior Citizens of our Nation include a great majority of elderly men and women who rely solely upon the Social Security payments they receive for their subsistence, care and shelter; and

Whereas, Living costs under present conditions make it difficult for these elder citizens to meet their financial needs without a realistic increase in Social Security payments; and

Whereas, President Johnson's proposal that Social Security payments be increased to not less than twenty per cent is unanimously endorsed by the members of the Senior Citizens' Central Association of Philadelphia; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States to favor and support the proposed increase of twenty per cent in Social Security payments.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to Chairman Wilbur Mills and the members of the House Ways and Means Committee as evidence of the sincere sentiments of this legislative body.

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President of City Council.

Attest:

NATHAN WOLFMAN,
Chief Clerk of the Council.

NO THIRD CHANCE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last year after my return as an observer for the Organization of American States during the elections in Santo Domingo. I stated that we had been lucky and had been afforded a second chance in the Dominican Republic. I said at the time that things would work out provided we manifested a genuine interest and concern, a disinterested concern in aiding and helping this indomitable people. I stated that President Balaguer had won fair and square and that he was a good man, that the Dominican people had shown the world they were orderly, law abiding, and wanted nothing more than to develop in peace. I also said that completely surrounding this country was trouble; too close to Cuba and also sharing the island with another troubled country.

I firmly believe in the ability of the Dominican citizens to seek out their own destiny, in a competent, civilized, and orderly fashion. But we must not wait for emergencies to develop in order to show concern and then react out of emergency or crisis. Now is the time. There is evidence that President Balaguer is confronted by a serious, indeed an insidious, threat.

The New York Spanish language daily El Diario La Prensa, had an apt and well-written editorial on this subject matter. I ask unanimous consent to print it at this point:

DOMINICAN REALITY

Six years ago, Tuesday, Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo was shot to death by assassins.

The end of the dictatorship failed to bring peace or prosperity to the Dominican Republic. After 31 years of dictatorship the people were ill-prepared for democracy and in the last six years the nation has had six governments and a bloody civil war, checked only by the intervention of American troops with the belated acquiescence of the Organization of American States.

This Republic of four-million people which the late President John F. Kennedy tried to make a show-case for democracy in the Caribbean, still seethes with plots and schemes which are not contributing to the stability of its government.

At the helm of the nation now is President Joaquin Balaguer whose efforts to keep political peace, distract him from the pressing need of getting the country out of its severe economic dilemma.

Dr. Balaguer, now 59, served Trujillo as a diplomat, cabinet minister and makeshift president. There is no doubt, however, that he is entitled to run his country. He won, by overwhelming majority, last year's elections, running against former President Juan Bosch, and he controls both Houses of Congress.

President Balaguer has tried to shy away from the ostentation of the Trujillo era and he lives simply in a two-story villa on one of the capital's most pleasant avenues. He is credited with being honest and sincere in his struggle to maintain political peace, but terrorism, intolerance and vendettas are still rampant. To this we have to add the unavoidable fact that the military, even though not actually ruling, are still a very powerful force. In fact many believe that the President could not last long if he clashes with the armed forces as President Bosch did.

Our hope is that President Balaguer would be able to keep internal peace in his country in such a way that he would be free to devote all his energies to the solution of the pressing economic problems of the Dominican Republic.

We know that peace and prosperity are his aims and we wish he will be able to attain them in a democratic way, for the good of the Dominican Republic.

ZION BESIEGED

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, every person in the world who has thrilled at the birth—or renewal—of Israel—Zion—feels deep concern and foreboding in the light of recent developments in the Near East. Dictator Nasser, like a Philistine of old, proclaims undying enmity toward Israel and couples it with a death threat. For those of us who believe in democracy and the creative forces in this human existence in this dark hour abide in the secure faith that the star of David will shine as ever and guide this infant, yet ancient, country and deliver it in liberty and freedom.

In today's Washington News, a very well written and timely article was written by John Herling. I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the Record at this point:

Hate in the World

(By John Herling)

Maybe—just maybe—the present Arab-Israeli crisis will abate. Whether it slackens or escalates, many Americans find themselves emotionally involved, fearful for the future of Israel, a nation whose development is one of the wonders of our time.

When will there be peace between Arabs and Jews? Mrs. Golda Meir, formerly Israel's foreign secretary, once answered: "When the Arabs love their children more than they hate the Jews."

For 19 years now, the Jews of Israel, thru their government, their cultural endeavors and thru their trade unions have sought to find ways, direct and indirect, to bring about a formula of understanding with their Arab neighbors. To no avail.

The more the Israelis strive in this direction, the angrier the Arabs get.

When the Israelis made their Africa-Asia Institute a great center for the technical training for people of other nations, Cairo's fury mounted. From many African and Asian countries came men and women to learn from the Israelis how best to organize themselves into effective instruments of social change in their developing countries.

They had gathered courage and knowledge from the example of Israel. If Israel could make the desert bloom, they too with their more fertile land should be able to go and do likewise. So for several years Tel Aviv had become a Mecca—if you'll excuse the expression—for builders of co-operatives, for the training of teachers, for trade union organizers. Again, this kind of activity drove the Nasserian Arabs wild.

When the Israelis said to the neighboring countries—"Come, let us harness the waters of the Jordan and bring power and prosperity—and peace—to all people," the Arabs answered, in effect: "Drop dead."

A terribly irony grins up wickedly in the fact that Egypt and Syria, which call themselves socialist countries, have trained their guns at the heart and brain of what is surely one of the most effective social democracies in the world. What makes it even more terrible is that Nasser openly flaunts their intention to murder Israel. He is the author of a literature of assassination.

The enthusiasm and admiration of visitors to Israel often embarrass the Israelis, who say: "We're not that good. Nobody can be."

But, despite such disclaimers, the Israelis value especially the support of the free trade union movement of the world. The Israeli trade union movement—the Histadrut—is a many-faceted thing. It created the economy of the nation, it educated the people, and it transformed a haven of refuge from persecution into a beautiful land. Perhaps if the Israelis had been less successful, the Arabs would be less envious.

While quite obviously the Arab neurosis must some day yield to massive therapy, the present crisis requires handling now.

In this country, the maritime unions have warned that they would boycott Egypt-bound ships if the United Arab Republic moves to implement the threat to shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba which would cut off the Israeli port of Eilat. The calling of an emergency meeting of the Maritime Division of the International Transport Workers Federation is being urged by Joseph Curran of the National Maritime Union. In addition, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the Trade Union Secretariat of the Common Market, ORIT—the Inter-American Federation of Labor, the British Trades Union Congress, and the Dutch Labor Federation already have pledged their backing.

LET'S MAKE WAR ON POVERTY, NOT ON SHRIVER

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the time is rapidly approaching when the Congress must come to grips again with the poverty program. The administration's proposals for amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act are before us, and they will soon, I hope, be the subject of hearings and action by the Committee on Education and Labor. When the poverty bill comes to the House floor, I have no doubt, the administration of the program as well as the basic concept underlying it, will be subjected to violent and massive attack. We are already on notice that our friends on the minority side intend to offer amendments dismantling the program, similar in spirit to those they offered to scuttle the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This is, of course, their unquestioned privilege, but I think they ought not to take too much comfort from the proposition that the people of this country are with them in their plans.

The American people are sometimes impatient, but they have never, in the history of the Republic, been accurately accused of lacking in compassion and a sense of justice. The poverty program, as the Harris survey shows, appeals strongly to the people of this country for just these reasons.

Roscoe Drummond, a distinguished columnist, but one who has never been thought of as a "knee-jerk liberal," has recently written an excellent piece on public support for the poverty program, and for the superb job Sargent Shriver has done as Director of OEO. Mr. Drummond points out that Mr. Shriver is the last person in the world to assert that OEO is perfect. But he also points out that the "volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled about the already overburdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered."

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will not have a repetition of what happened with the education bill when we take up poverty. I hope that we can have a reasoned debate on the weaknesses of the program and a concerted effort to improve it. I hope, in short, that we will respond to the public faith in this program by strengthening it, not by using it as a sacrificial lamb on the altar of the 1968 elections.

Under unanimous consent I place the Drummond column, from the Washington Post of May 31, at this point in the Record:

The War on Shriver—Public Backs Fight on Poverty

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The American people are making no mistake in giving their strong support to the war on poverty.

Voters are 60 per cent behind the war on poverty and want it continued or expanded, the Harris Survey shows. Public support has been growing steadily for the last seven months.

The Nation as a whole has come to accept the war on poverty as one of the most compassionate, humane, and intelligent programs of the Johnson Administration.

And the Republican leadership in Congress, launching its own "opportunity crusade," avows that it favors all of the antipoverty programs and backs all of the antipoverty goals—but would do the whole thing differently.

Surely all this should be sweet music to the White House and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Why, then, as he goes to Congress soon to defend his proposed budget, should Sargent Shriver, the coordinator-in-chief of the war on poverty, be the target of so much criticism for his administration of the program? Has he been a flop? Has he been incompetent? Has he been a dull-minded and routine administrator?

No one will argue, certainly not Shriver, that everything has come up roses in the Office of Economic Opportunity. But the volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on the OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled around the already overburdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered.

These facts ought to be borne in mind:

1. Much of the criticism comes from the extremists who pretty much cancel each other out—those who attack Shriver because they don't want the war on poverty to be doing anything and those who want Shriver to be asking for ten times as much as he is now doing.

2. The OEO has made mistakes. They should be recognized and corrected. The new antipoverty bill now before Congress greatly tightens the program. But the OEO had to do things quickly in its early period and obviously it has not done them well. But let's not forget that if there were no OEO there would be no war on poverty. There would be no Headstart. There would be no Job Corps. There would be no Community Action and, above all, there would be little recognition on the part of middle-class America that poverty in the United States acutely exists—32 million men, women, and children beneath the poverty line who must be relieved.

There is no doubt in my mind that the war on poverty continues to need innovative, pioneering, open-minded, let's-try leadership. It would be very unwise to bury these new and experimental programs in existing departments which have more than they can do already and too many officials wedded to old programs.

MAYOR TATE EXPRESSES THE PRIDE OF PHILADELPHIA IN THE ELEVATION OF JOHN J. KROL TO CARDINAL-ARCHBISHOP

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the mayor of the great city of Philadelphia, James H. J. Tate, who is now out of the country, has requested, through his office, that I express the honor felt and pride taken in the appointment of John J. Krol as cardinal-archbishop of the Philadelphia archdiocese. This same feeling is shared by the entire Philadelphia delegation to the House of Representatives. He is the third cardinal for Philadelphia since it was designated an archdiocese in 1875.

Cardinal Krol is a native of Cleveland. The fourth of eight children born to his immigrant Polish parents, John and Anna Krol. As a boy, Cardinal Krol sold newspapers and worked in a grocery and box factory to help support his family.

Cardinal Krol received his schooling in Cleveland, was ordained to the priesthood there on February 20, 1937, named a monsignor in 1951, and elevated to the episcopacy in 1953 to serve as auxiliary bishop of the Cleveland diocese. He came to Philadelphia on February 15, 1961, as archbishop and spiritual leader of the 1,300,000 Roman Catholics in the Philadelphia and five-county area comprising the archdiocese.

At the time of his Philadelphia appointment, Cardinal Krol was in Rome helping to prepare for the second Vatican Council, one of the few Americans engaged for 2 years in laying the groundwork for the historic session. He served on one of the 10 major commissions in preparation for the council and after the council opened he served as one of the six under secretaries, helping to record the voluminous proceedings and votes.

Following the Vatican Council, Cardinal Krol was one of two American members of a new central commission at the Vatican which was given the assignment of furthering the Vatican Council's work and interpreting its decrees and declarations. This past weekend, he was accorded a new honor when it was announced that he was one of four American prelates named by the National Conference of Bishops to represent the church in this country at the Worldwide Synod of Bishops to be held at the Vatican beginning September 29.

Several years ago, Cardinal Krol created a Commission on Human Relations for the archdiocese, headed by Auxiliary Bishop John J. Graham, with six priests and four laymen as its members. He said that the commission would direct both the ecumenical movement and the apostolate for racial harmony.

For years Cardinal Krol led the fight for liberalization of the Nation's immigration law, calling the quota system restrictive and selfish.

Last September, Cardinal Krol addressed the annual dinner of the Church Club of Philadelphia, an Episcopal laymen's group, at the Union League, the first Roman Catholic leader to do so. On April 22, 1967, he addressed the Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches at their annual meeting. This was the first time in 28 years that a Roman Catholic clergyman addressed the group.

Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, of the Philadelphia Area Methodist Church, said of the elevation to cardinal "all faiths in the Philadelphia area will rejoice in Archbishop Krol's elevation to the cardinalate."

> His service in his archdiocese and Second Vatican Council, as well as his leadership in the ecumenical movement, have all pointed to his selection to this high honor and responsibility—

Bishop Corson said—

> It is our hope that Cardinal Krol may remain in Philadelphia where his influence transcends denominational lines and is felt in every aspect of our community life.

The Evening Bulletin of Tuesday, May 30, carried the following editorial:

PHILADELPHIA HONORED

> Not only the 1,300,000 Catholics in the five county Archdiocese, but all residents of the Philadelphia area, can take pride in the appointment of John J. Krol as Cardinal-Archbishop.
>
> Since he succeeded the late Cardinal O'Hara little more than six years ago, Cardinal Krol has made himself a part of Philadelphia. He assumed a prominent role in the deliberations of Vatican II, and demonstrated leadership in promoting liturgical reform and good racial relations in his jurisdiction.
>
> An able administrator, and a devout churchmen, whose genial personality has done much to advance the cause of ecumenical brotherhood among all religions, the Cardinal will have the best wishes of Philadelphians for his continued success in his chosen apostolate.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, as a proponent for building for the future, that the President has made the decision to proceed with the supersonic transport. New Mexico, like aviation, has made gigantic progress during the past 60 years and it is my belief that the advent of the SST will carry with it even greater progress for New Mexico and the Southwest. There has been considerable mention by the media, the Government, the manufacturers of the SST and the user airlines of the great advantages to the world of bringing overseas continents and their peoples closer in time. This is also true for distant places within our shores. It is just as important to the southwest and New Mexico that its people will be closer in time to other major cities of the world. The advent of the SST will mean even greater accessibility for business to come to New Mexico and New Mexicans to pursue business ventures with the rest of the United States and overseas. In the wake of faster transportation has always been rapid growth and economic advances. The commercial exchange of people and ideas will have a vast economic impact on our State. No longer will sound business ventures and untapped resources of an area be stymied by the limitations of time to our leaders of commerce and industry.

I would like to insert into the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Albuquerque Journal, a newspaper that serves the State I am proud to represent. In addition to endorsing the President's decision to proceed, the editorial warns that when the SST appears on the aviation scene in the seventies, the communities and areas that have the most to gain from the SST must ber eady to handle this type of aircraft. I have no doubt that when the SST flies, New Mexico, in the spirit of the progress it has exhibited during its parallel growth with aviation, will have met the challenge and will be ready to take full advantage of far-reaching benefits this magnificent airplane will bring to the State and the great Southwest.

The editorial follows:

BUILDING FOR FUTURE

> President Johnson's decision to proceed with the development of a commercial supersonic transport (SST) is a commendable if tardy one.
>
> It comes some eight years after the Federal Aviation Agency first considered the project and puts the U.S. far behind two foreign competitors in the supersonic transport race. A French-British combine is expected to have its SST—the Concorde—in commercial service by 1971 and the Soviet Union's version, the TU-144, may be flying passengers even before that.
>
> Johnson's decision aims at having our SST in the air by 1970 and in commercial service by 1974.
>
> The advantage of the American SST, as planned is that it will be bigger and much faster than either of the foreign competitors. It will travel 1800 miles per hour and carry 300 passengers. The Concorde and TU-144, which closely resemble each other, will be about 20 per cent slower and have 50 per cent less passenger capacity.
>
> Johnson noted that, "Although the promise of the supersonic transport is great, the program still carries high technical and financial risks."
>
> Secretary of Transportation Alan Boyd claims airlines already have ordered 113 of our supersonic transports and expects 300 to be built and sold, a figure he said was based on the most pessimistic projections.
>
> If Boyd is correct, the financial risks will be minimal. In any event, the SST race was one we couldn't afford to stay out of. It will provide a great stimulant not only to our national pride but to our economy as well.
>
> Johnson's decision also serves notice on a number of cities, including Albuquerque, that they too must start building for the supersonic age. Albuquerque's Sunport obviously isn't suited for SSTs and there has been criticism that it is not even safe for present commercial planes. The city should begin action immediately toward the acquisi-

tion of land and the financing of an airport adequate to handle the planes that will be flying in a few short years.

SHE'S OURS BY CHOICE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Bevill] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, every Alabamian is justly proud of our Miss Sylvia Hitchcock. Miss Hitchcock, a student at the University of Alabama, was recently chosen Miss U.S.A.

With the consent of the House, I place in the Record at this time an editorial from the Gadsden Times, Gadsden, Ala., which I believe appropriately describes the feeling of every Alabamian toward our Miss U.S.A.:

She's Ours by Choice

Dear Sylvia Hitchcock: Thank you for choosing Alabama!

We greatly admire your taste.

We also admire the 20–20 vision of judges who decided in the Saturday night Miss USA contest that of all the dazzling beautiful girls who competed, it was you who deserved the title.

It is our understanding that you were born in Massachusetts and that during vacation "home" is now Miami.

But for the core of these crucial years—your education, the founding of lifelong friendships—you have chosen the University of Alabama.

Good for you.

This makes you one of us.

We hope you will stay.

It is our firm conviction that our state has much to offer to the young and beautiful, the young and talented, the young and ambitious.

But not so much, perhaps, as you have to offer us.

The nation will watch with pride as you represent the United States in the Miss Universe contest later this summer.

And when it is all over we will welcome you "home" to Alabama.

ALBERT RAINS SPEECH CONTEST WINNERS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Bevill] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, several years ago a former Member of this body, a great gentleman, a distinguished lawmaker, a prominent Alabamian, and a good friend of mine, the Honorable Albert Rains, of Gadsden, Ala., suggested an annual speech contest to be held at Snead College, in Boaz, Ala. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, this school has held this annual contest. Speech subjects deal with current problems, as suggested by Congressman Rains.

This year's subject was: "Air Pollution, a National Problem." Michael Neighbors, Route 3, Albertville, Ala., won first place; Miss Brenda Heard, Route 4, Boaz, Ala., won second place; and Miss Marsha Garner, Albertville, Ala., won third place.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that since the beginning of this contest, it has been the custom to have the winning speeches placed in the Record. With the consent of my colleagues, I would like to continue this fine tradition, and place the winning speeches in the Record at this time. They are as follows:

Air Pollution

(By Michael Neighbors)

Honorable Judges, faculty, fellow students and friends.

An analysis of polluted air today indicates one part oxygen, four parts nitrogen and ten parts greed, public apathy, neglect, and mismanagement.

Already a world wide problem, air pollution is the result of our trend toward urban living. From such diverse sources as automobiles, apartment buildings, steel mills and even our homes come pollutants in every conceivable form. Primarily an urban problem, air pollution today afflicts more than 7,000 urban areas inhibited by 115,000,000 Americans.

There was a time when air was free—but not so today. Conservative estimates show the average family of four unknowingly pays from 300 to 800 dollars annually to undo the damage and clean away dirt left by air pollution.

Ozone, one of the chemicals in smog, triples the rate at which asphalt deteriorates. Ozone also causes automobile tire sidewalls to crack and also deteriorates rubber-grommets, gaskets and insulation.

The citizen in a community whose air is polluted is affected in a variety of ways, most of which hit him in the pocketbook far more seriously than he realizes. Food is a typical example, in California's San Joaquin valley 11,000 square miles of farm land are affected by this air blight which is spreading every year. Unfortunately Californians are not alone. Serious loss in crops has been reported in eighteen other states. Air pollution also costs you more in the form of new clothes. The soil and grime that falls from the air has to be washed out, and cleaning shortens the life of clothes far more than wear.

Corrosion is a particularly costly consequence of air pollution. Sulfur dioxide, a by-product of coal burning, reacts chemically with moisture to form sulfuric acid, which eats away metal roofs, eaves down-spouts, and other exposed metals: even attacking building stone and masonry.

Most important of all however, is the tie between air pollution and your health. All of us breathe in part of the millions of tons of noxious gases that pollute our atmosphere as well as the tons of soot and dust that fall about us every day.

Probably the most clear-cut evidence linking air pollution with health is a recent mortality study sponsored by Vanderbilt University. The place was Nashville, Tennessee whose residents are exposed to concentration of benzphrere, a by-product of coal burning, equivalent to smoking two packages of cigarettes a day. Researchers discovered that death rates from respiratory diseases, notably tuberculosis, influenza, and pneumonia were 64% higher in industrial areas than in outlying residential areas.

According to surgeon Ernest Rockey, some 10 million Americans suffer from pulmonary emphysema. Although less fatal than lung cancer, this disease accounted for 16,000 deaths in 1960.

The complexities of the pollution problem leave it particularly vulnerable to the opposition of those resolved to do nothing until it is too late.

Especially opposed are the heavy industries using large quantities of coal and oil.

Although pollution from all sources tends to increase with population, the automobile appears to be the nation's chief polluter, contributing perhaps half of our problems. Afterburners have been designed which could eliminate 80% of the hydrocarbon emission and 60% of the carbon monoxide, but state and local governments are slow to pass laws which would make use of such devices compulsory. One state, California, has passed laws restricting individual and industrial contamination. Air masses conveying pollutants do not recognize political boundaries. California's lead in stopping pollution will help little if surrounding states continue to pump noxious gases and dirt into the air about her. Clearly our drive toward cleaner air must begin on a national level with equal clean up requirements from all states.

The question of how to finance pollution control has yielded several proposals. One answer is to tax polluters for use of the public air supply as an atmospheric sewer. Such a tax of about 25 dollars a ton was recommended at the national conference on smog control. If used to finance control programs these taxes would have several advantages, apart from making polluters pay for their damage. In addition the tax would prod offenders into cleaning up and as pollution grows so would the funds to combat it. Few control programs now in use incorporate these principles. Fines are either set too low or imposed too sparingly. Though the situation is somewhat improving most judges still do not recognize the seriousness of air pollution. The maximum 100 dollar a day fine established in the federal Clean Air Act, encourages big polluters to delay corrective action. Since the cost of control equipment is about one quarter that of production equipment, an industry with over two million dollars invested might find it more economical to pay the 100 dollars a day indefinitely than invest in control equipment.

Motorists should also pay for their contribution to pollution. Since the pollutants emitted by automobiles increase in proportion to gasoline consumed, a surtax on gasoline would conform with the principles of taxing polluters as a fair way of financing state and local control programs.

Though the methods of financing pollution control are still open for debate, the need for more drastic control is not. Profections of present growth rate indicate a 50% increase in pollution by 1980. In regard to this appalling increase in pollution noted meterologist Morris Neiburger observed, "All civilization will pass away not from a sudden catastrophe like nuclear war, but rather from gradual suffocation in its own waste."

Time for Decision

(By Brenda Heard)

The air we breathe and the water we drink has become an international crisis. It is widely misunderstood and because of the confusion and growing urgency of the problem, I would like to offer some ideas on how serious pollution is, who causes it, and what should be done.

Contamination of the air and water dates back from the beginning of time. Even before the spread of civilization, forest fires, dust storms, and volcanic eruptions poured vast quantities of contaminants into the air.

Untold generations of mankind have dumped trash and wastes into our streams; smoke has contaminated the air since Stone Age man first began building fires in caves. London in 1660 was described as having "her stately head in clouds of smoke and sulphur."

The industrial revolution created new problems and stepped up the contamination process. While industrialization raised man's standard of living, it lowered the quality of his most vital resources—air and water.

It is plain to see that with America's pollution problem, we have a very serious matter on our hands.

Man's potential for damaging his environment is continually increasing. The U.S. Public Health Service estimated that we Americans, in performing normal activities, release some 360,000 tons of principal pollutants into the atmosphere each day. We also produce nearly 400,000 tons of waste material each day. Some of this flows into our lakes and rivers and jeopardizes their usefulness for recreation or consumption purposes. Secretary of the Interior Udall recently warned that parts of the Great Lakes were threatened with an unnatural death and according to New York's Governor Rockefeller, sections of the Hudson River are so contaminated that fish are unable to live in them.

In simple terms, pollution results from the daily activities of an increasing number of people. In 1900 the approximate 3 million square miles of the United States accommodated the daily activities of less than 80 million people. Today, that same area—and the same amount of air and water—must accommodate the activities of nearly 200 million people.

In 1900, less than one person in three lived in a major metropolitan area. Today two-thirds of our population live in urban areas, and according to one source, 85 percent of the people live on less than 2 percent of the land.

One hundred years ago, isolation of the sources of air and water pollution was a simpler matter. A person could just point to an industrial smokestack or trace the scum on the water to a manufacturing plant's waste outlet and the question was answered. There was the prime polluter—industry. Today it is not that simple. In recent years Industry has become less and less the main offender. A recent report by the National Academy of Sciences said that less than one-third of the principal atmospheric pollutants released in the U.S. comes from manufacturing plants or electricity generating devices. The remaining two-thirds comes from other sources, mainly individuals and municipalities.

The fact is that the problem of air and water contamination involves all of modern society. Pollutants are released whenever backyard leaves are burned, whenever an automobile is used, whenever apartment or municipal trash is incinerated, wherever inadequate city sewage treatment facilities discharge wastes into rivers. One study revealed that in New York alone several hundred thousand tons per day of sewage remains untreated, and the city's 11 municipal incinerators contribute more than 35 tons of objectionable matter to the atmosphere each day.

The best solution to the problem of restoring and maintaining the quality of our air and water lies in a well-coordinated, community-wide effort. No single segment of society is capable of accomplishing the job that lies ahead.

In the last 10 years the electric power industry has spent some $750 million on air and water conservation. Over the same period, the chemical and petroleum industries have spent a similar amount on pollution control equipment, and are now spending additional millions of dollars a year to operate, improve, and expand this equipment.

A chief reason citizens do not insist that local governments and industries shoulder the cost of cleaning up waste water before putting it back into the streams is that damages and costs from polluted discharges are "off-site."

There is increasing discussion about who should pay for water-quality control, including lost opportunity costs. Local governments and industries question whether they can and should afford the expense of cleaning their waste water. Citizens realize that in the end they will pay for a cleaner stream, but they wonder how these costs can most fairly be distributed.

How large a share of the cost of municipal pollution abatement should be borne by local taxpayers?

How much should states and the federal government contribute to help localities pay for cleanup?

Should the expense of industrial pollution prevention be a cost of doing business, or should the public help industries finance improved waste treatment because of the social benefits of clean streams?

These questions have yet to be answered.

If the pollution problem is to be solved, and it must be, it is demanding that more state and local governments play an active role. In most cases, the problem is a local responsibility, and we should see that it remains such. But if effective local programs are not implemented, we may be assured that federal action will be forthcoming.

The average citizen would have to buy add-on exhaust controls for his car. He would have to pay for at least annual testing to insure their efficient operation. He would be required to pay additional taxes so the city could purchase smoke-free incinerators and improved facilities for the treatment of sewage. He would be forced to collect the leaves in his yard and pay for an inspection system which assures that he doesn't burn them.

The public must realize, that the problem of air and water pollution is closely linked to economics. The purity of our air and the water depends upon how much we are willing to pay.

The blight of polluted air will spread as population and production rise.

Annual loss to the U.S. as a result of air pollution is 11 billion dollars.

The cost of dealing with air and water pollution over the next 10 to 20 years will be 100 billion dollars.

More than half of U.S. cities of 2,500 or more people do not have good sewage-disposal systems. Present systems were devised for conditions that existed 40 years ago.

U.S. cities discharge 65 billion gallons of sewage a year directly into streams and rivers.

To meet demands for sewage-treatment; plants in the U.S. in the next six years will require 20 billion dollars.

These are only a few facts telling how air and water pollution problems have grown.

No reasonable person would suggest that man not use his environment, or that he revert to his primitive past. But at the same time no reasonable person can condone the misuse of two resources needed to sustain life.

Society must come to grips with the problem of air and water conservation. However, we must not do so in a mood of panic. We must develop a reasoned and effective response to the challenge. To be specific, industry must act responsibly—government must act fairly—the public must act with understanding. The time for decision is here.

Air Pollution—A Threat to Mankind

(By Marsha Garner)

Honorable judges, members of the faculty, fellow students, and guest; the subject of my speech is "Air Pollution—A Threat to Mankind."

First, I would like for you to visualize yourself in thickly populated industrial city and picture the following accounts, which could become true in your own city, large or small.

An uneasy quiet hung over the deserted streets of the city. No people, cars, or buses moved between the tall, soot-streaked buildings. The sun could scarcely be seen, and the air had a faint odor of sulfur.

During that night the city council met behind closed doors. At 7 a.m. a radio broadcaster interrupted his regular program to announce the passing of an emergency ordinance by the council. It prohibited the use of automobiles, buses, trucks, or tractors and the burning of coal, oil, leaves, and other carbonaceous materials until further notice.

Hospital wards were filled with people coughing and choking.

The emergency had been caused by power plants, automobiles, houses and leaf burning. After rainless and windless days, the atmosphere contained more dust and gases than people could take. The air of this city had become dangerously polluted.

This dramatized situation is more real to life than you may think and illustrates how destructive air pollution can and will be unless proper action is taken immediately.

During a twenty-four hour period, the human body uses thirty pounds of air. Oxygen is the most essential element to life, therefore, it cannot be wasted. Air pollution is a very serious problem not only from the standpoint of health but also for agriculture and economic reasons.

A scientist at the New York Botanical Gardens has complained that the fumes from buses, trucks, and cars have caused withering of leaves and forces many trees to an early death.

New York is not the only city with the problem of air pollution. One of the most unusual air pollution problems occurred in Donora, Pennsylvania. In October, 1948, Donora was covered with a motionless clot of smoke which lasted four days. The air was so thickly polluted that many businessmen had difficulty finding their offices. People had problems driving; and many coughed constantly. One doctor stated that he lit a cigar, but disposed of it quickly when he started a chain of coughing. Four days later rain washed the air clean of most of the impurities, but this terrible situation will not soon be forgotten.

One of the most disastrous incidents of pollution occurred in London, England in 1952. During a five day period over four thousand people died of possible smog siege. The death toll continued high for several days after the smog had cleared.

Many cities throughout the United States have air pollution problems, such as; Los Angeles, Chicago, St. Louis, Denver, Birmingham and others.

There have been several suggestions on how to control and rid cities of this destructive pollution of air. In Los Angeles a popular suggestion is to dig a tunnel through the mountains surrounding the city, thus allowing the smog to be sucked out through the tunnel. The tunnel is supposed to create a natural draft that would draw air out of the local basin, but control authorities say it would never work.

Many have suggested making boilers in sewer systems to lead smog out to sea. A large part of the smog problem is from exhaust from automobiles. This has also had many control proposals, such as; highways with plastic roofs, and control devices on cars.

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania had a very bad problem of air pollution until the county finally realized the necessity of an attack on pollution. The county spent approximately 250 million dollars between the years of 1947 and 1960, and may spend another 100 million dollars before the program is completed. The citizens of Pittsburgh have eliminated coal heating and back-yard incinerators, and have turned to the use of electricity. Steel and power plants have helped by installing improved devices for trapping the ash and soot coming out of their smokestacks. Still the problem in Pittsburgh is not completely solved.

Air pollution has been known to kill, sicken, and destroy. Doctors, who are doing research on pollution, say it may cause eye, nose and throat irritations.

Clothes, metals, public buildings, vegetables and plants are effected by pollution. Doctors are finding more and more reasons to believe that air pollution (especially in older people and people with respiratory diseases) may make a number of sicknesses worse. These sicknesses include: hardening of the arteries, heart trouble, chronic bronchitis, asthma, and cancer of the lungs.

Specialists are looking for more and better ways to prevent and control air pollution economically.

We live in an amazing age filled with wonders and accompanying dangers. The automobile that carries us swiftly from city to city also kills thousands of people each year. The split atom that provides bountiful energy, when not controlled, emits deadly rays. Pesticides and detergents help us in our daily lives, but they sometimes can linger in our fields and water, and endanger our food and water supplies.

Our complex way of living demands that we take precautions everyday. In the years ahead we are going to have to retain our natural resources. We are going to have to exist on clear, clean air, in order to continue life for future generations.

Air pollution can and will destroy America and her citizens unless proper action is taken now. Humanity must be saved, and you—the people—are the only ones that can save it.

MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hanley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, I rose on the floor of this body in support of President Johnson's position on the Middle East situation. Today, I want to reiterate my support.

We all want to see harmonious relations established in the Middle East, but we cannot see them established at the cost of Israel's freedom and sovereignty.

President Johnson is using every channel at his command to preserve the peace, but he has told Mr. Nasser in no uncertain terms that the United States intends to honor its commitment to Israel.

Since 1948, when the State of Israel was established out of the old Palestine mandate territory, Arab-Israel relations have been strained, at best. The Jews who resettled to their ancient homeland have had to withstand concentrated attempts at incursion. In the year of its recognition as a sovereign entity—1948—Israel was forced to go to war to protect its land. Again in 1956, the Israelis had to fight to preserve the integrity of the very area in question today.

It was in 1956 that the Israel Government, under then Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, agreed to cede its right to the gulf and border area to an international peacekeeping mission under the control of the United Nations. The object of that agreement was to guarantee that the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba would forever be considered an international waterway, open to the trade of all sovereign nations.

After 11 years of peacekeeping by the United Nations, President Nasser has asserted the right of Egypt to control the gulf, the straits, and the border area. The United States, however, still considers the Gulf of Aqaba as an international waterway, whose access must be guaranteed to all the nations of the world. Nasser has no more right, either politically or morally, to close off the straits than, say, the Scandinavians have to blockade the ports of the Baltic. Israel's economic development depends in large measure on its access to the Red Sea. This access must be preserved.

We have longstanding ties to Israel—political, economic, cultural, and familial. We are not going to see these ties severed by an Egyptian sword.

Mr. Speaker, if the United Nations is to survive as a viable entity and if the United States is to maintain its international integrity, Israel must be protected against encroachment and the gulf must be kept free to unimpeded international trade.

CONGRESS AND THE RAILROADS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is again asked to intervene in the railroad dispute.

Before taking this decisive step, the House must consider several possible objections. First, has the legislation been carefully considered, or has it been formulated in haste and without exploration of other possible solutions. Second, would intervention at this time stifle incentives for labor and management to proceed with serious negotiations. Third, will Congress be called more and more often from its legislative responsibilities to become unnecessarily involved in labor-management disputes.

The Minneapolis Labor Review had an excellent editorial on the dangerous position the principle of free collective bargaining now finds itself. I offer it for insertion in the Record:

Postponement No Way To Settle Rail Problem

It may be convenient for Congress to postpone railroad strikes by legislation, but it serves no useful purpose in achieving the goals of collective bargaining.

The Railway Labor Act provides sufficient time for management and labor to iron out its problems. And it certainly should not be necessary for Congress to adopt special legislation in 2 instances—barring a strike first for 20 days, and then for 47 additional days—because the railroads find it serves their purposes better to avoid serious bargaining.

To extend the strike even further would completely destroy the area for bargaining and would result in no less than compulsory labor for members of the 6 unions involved in the dispute.

Following the latest extension of the no-strike ban, Michael Fox, president of the AFL–CIO Railway Employes Department said "if Congress will only affirm our members' right to strike, the railroads will quickly settle with us and no strike will take place."

It is apparent that delay is the modern strategy employed by railroad management to avoid sincere contract negotiations with employes. Why should they bargain in seriousness when Congress can be relied on to come to the rescue?

No better example of management procrastination exists than that exhibited by the railroads in stalling negotiations with the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen for 4 years. Congress entered the scene in 1963 and passed the first compulsory arbitration law in peacetime history.

The net result was that sweeping decisions were made by that board to destroy the jobs of thousands of workers when railroads seized the opportunity to ride roughshod over the rights of employes who were under compulsion and legal restraint.

It was discovered by the union that railroads could not be forced to live up to decisions of the arbitration board without court action; and recourse in the courts was slow and disappointing.

The halls of Congress are too sanctified to be used for strikebreaking. Anything that smacks of compulsory labor surely should not have such a hallowed site for a springboard.

POLITICAL PROCESS IN AMERICA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the President is to be applauded and the Congress is urged to act promptly on the five-point program transmitted to us recently to improve the political process in America.

Our present system of campaign financing obviously needs mending. Omissions, loopholes, and shortcomings in the existing law were highlighted in House hearings during the last Congress on legislation similar to the proposed Election Reform Act of 1967. The Committee on House Administration explored the need thoroughly last year; this year we should act.

As you know, the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 provides for public financing of presidential campaigns. In enacting it, the Congress recognized this would serve the public interest. This is a matter of great concern to me and I am particularly pleased to see the President submitting 11 recommendations to improve and strengthen the act.

The third major facet of the political process to which the President addressed himself is a strengthening of the Lobbying Act. The Senate decisively acted in this area about 2 months ago in passing the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Finally, the President has recognized the mobility of present-day society. He has recommended that a citizen, otherwise qualified to vote under the laws of a State, may not be denied his vote in a presidential election if he becomes a resident of the State before the first day of September preceding the election. This is a most important measure which should receive the wholehearted support of the Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Ichord (at the request of Mr. Albert) on account of official business, departed at exactly 3:55 p.m., June 1, 1967, for Vietnam.

Mr. GARDNER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for Wednesday, May 31, and Thursday, June 1, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, for 60 minutes, on June 5, 1967.

Mr. FLOOD, for 60 minutes, on June 8, 1967.

To the following Members (at the request of Mr. WINN) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. HALPERN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. GUBSER, for 40 minutes, today.

Mr. CAHILL, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. BROTZMAN to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter during debate on the legislative appropriation bill today.

Mr. SCHEUER, his own remarks in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 10368 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL and to include the results of a study, immediately following the remarks of Mr. MCCORMACK in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 10368.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. WINN), and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. WYLIE in two instances.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY), and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. KEE.

Mr. BROOKS.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6950. An act to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 5, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

793. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the Peace Corps for the fiscal year 1968 (H. Doc. No. 130); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

794. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements fiscal year 1965, Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development (H. Doc. No. 131); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

795. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of savings possible by consolidating management of acquired residential properties, Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

796. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 7, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations on a survey of streams at, and in vicinity of, San Mateo, San Mateo County, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved July 3, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

797. A letter from the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of medical devices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on the Government Employees Training Act (Rept. No. 329). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1724. A bill for the relief of Hwang Duk Hwa; with amendment (Rept. No. 327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE. Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4952. A bill for the relief of Annunciata Di Carluccio; with amendment (Rept. No. 328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 10464. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 10465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a farmer (or fisherman) shall have until March 15, instead of only until February 15 as at present, to file an income tax return which also satisfies the requirements relating to declarations of estimated tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 10466. A bill to authorize regulations requiring certain vessels to use bridge-to-bridge radiotelephone communications while operating in certain areas of the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 10467. A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child-day-care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10468. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10469. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to permit retirement of employees with 30 years of service on full annuities without regard to age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 10470. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to lease airspace above and below freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 10471. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 10472. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to eliminate certain active duty requirements for retirement for nonregular service under chapter 67 of that title; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 10473. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in regard to real property held for investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 10474. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to improve and expand the authority to conduct or assist research relating to air pollutants, to assist in the establishment of regional air quality commissions, to authorize establishment of standards applicable to emissions from establishments engaged in certain types of industry, to assist in establishment and maintenance of State programs for annual inspections of automobile emission control devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 10475. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs requiring a doctor's prescription among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the voluntary program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 10476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the leasing by local governmental units of certain industrial and commercial facilities for private profitmaking purposes at rentals below their fair rental value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 10477. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the amount of home loan guarantee entitlement from $7,500 to $10,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 10478. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's benefits shall not be subject to deductions on account of outside earnings after the beginning of the year in which he (or the primary beneficiary) attains age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 10479. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado (for himself, Mr. WHITENER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. POFF, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ROUDEBUSH, Mr. RIVERS, and Mr. SELDEN):

H.R. 10480. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. OTTINGER):

H.R. 10481. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for regulation of television networks to assure that their operations are in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 10482. A bill to amend section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the application of local law in determining the effect of claimant's contributory negligence, to clarify the procedure for appeal from certain claims determinations, and to limit the amount of attorney fees thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 10483. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record, to eliminate certain special requirements for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, to equalize the criteria for determining dependency of a child on his father or mother, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's or father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 10484. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10485. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10486. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow under retirement age may continue to receive mother's insurance benefits (but at a reduced rate) even though none of the children of her deceased husband are any longer entitled to child's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10487. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10488. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit certain exclusions from gross income for full-time law enforcement officers employed by State and local governmental instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10489. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that pensions paid to retired law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 10490. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 10491. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital in the District of Columbia as the Melvin J. Maas Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 10492. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 10493. A bill to authorize the Legislative Reference Service to make use of automatic data processing techniques and equipment in the performance of its functions; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 10494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R.10495. A bill to establish the Capital National Park in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 10496. A bill to incorporate the International Aerospace Hall of Fame; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 599. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H. Res. 496. Resolution to amend rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. Res. 497. Resolution providing for the printing as a House document of the bibliographical list entitled "Hungarians in Rumania and Transylvania," prepared by the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 10497. A bill for the relief of Loo Bing Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 10498. A bill for the relief of Joseph Charles Mechaly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 10499. A bill for the relief of Hong Sing Cheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 10500. A bill for the relief of Mahlon G. Hubbard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 10501. A bill for the relief of Mabel Mollineau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 10502. A bill for the relief of Kim Kap Rai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 10503. A bill to authorize and direct the President to award the Medal for Merit to Charles H. Payne in recognition of his services in the development of the "jeep"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 10504. A bill to authorize and direct the President to award the Medal for Merit to Charles H. Payne in recognition of his services in the development of the "jeep"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 10505. A bill for the relief of Della B. Perdue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 10506. A bill for the relief of Fidel B. Seneris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 10507. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Manzella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 10508. A bill for the relief of Eugene P. Horton, Remilda Horton, and James Horton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Salute to Mae Morgan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, an old friend of mine, Mary C. Morgan, of Randolph, Mass., who is a constituent of my colleague, Congressman JAMES BURKE, has recently retired after 27 years of loyal service to the U.S. Army and the Boston Army Base. During the trying years of World War II, Mae Morgan was a loyal and devoted secretary in the office of the Army base's commanding general. From 1947 until 1954 she was personal secretary to the commanding generals of that base. In 1954 the Army decided that Boston no longer needed a commanding general, and Mae Morgan moved to the public information office.

The public relations work she did there was a labor of love. Meeting the public, dealing with the press, and keeping the Army's best foot forward were both challenging and satisfying. In August 1964, when the Boston Army Base's commander, Col. Philip B. Melody, was retiring, he presented Miss Morgan with an "outstanding sustained superior performance award."

The Defense Department is now hiring thousands of civilians to free military men for military tasks. If these employees match Mae's record of loyal and devoted service, they shall have served their country well.

The Fine Work of the Chatsworth, Calif., Business & Professional Women's Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House the generous and patriotic efforts of the Business & Professional Women's Club of Chatsworth, Calif., in behalf of our servicemen overseas.

Every month these ladies have sent gift boxes to Chatsworth servicemen on tours of duty outside the United States. Approximately 60 of the 76 Chatsworth boys are now stationed in South Vietnam—and they are all, wherever they are, grateful to be remembered by their home community. I would like to quote a letter of May 13, from one serviceman:

> Dear Ladies: It is 7 a.m. and I just got off a 12 hour shift at the hangar. We're working 12 hours on—12 hours off now.
>
> I received your latest package and once again I think you. The thoughtfulness of your organization surpasses that of any other that I have heard of. The foot powder that is in this box is very welcome. It's hard to keep things dry in this climate. There is a lot of mildew and everything rots or rusts if not constantly taken care of.
>
> I'll have to make it a point to visit and thank you in person when I return home. I'll write more later. I'm dead beat right now.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> John Johnston.

I am told by the past president of the organization that—and I quote from a recent letter:

> Next weekend (May 27), we shall be packing boxes for our boys overseas . . . and thanks to the Chatsworth American Legion, we do not have to worry about the postage this month, for they are sending us a $25 check. In April, we mailed 45 boxes to our servicemen . . . the most we have ever sent in one month . . . and we hope to be able to top that amount this month.
>
> We have begun a new type of service to our servicemen . . . keeping them posted on other Chatsworth boys stationed in or around their camp. We have personally written nine of our boys stationed in various small towns in Germany; notifying them of the other eight boys who are there also . . . and now comes the waiting time to find out if they were able to get together for a weekend reunion. This new service will perhaps in some small way help them to realize their community does care about them all year long.

I extend to the officers and members of the Chatsworth Business & Professional Women's Club my best wishes for its continued success. Its efforts in the community have always been notable and worthwhile. It is now graced with the knowledge that by this added service to the boys overseas, it is serving its community and its Nation extraordinarily well.

The Attorney General Sets the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in a Washington newspaper May 22 left the false impression that Attorney General Ramsey Clark does not recognize crime as a major challenge in America.

Members of the Congress, the press, and the public who have even superficially followed the public statements of the Attorney General know of his recognition of, and deep concern about the rising crime rate.

For example, I note that he discussed crime in two Law Day, 1967, appearances.

In a television interview on April 30 he said:

> We have to be very much concerned about the rise of crime in the United States . . . I think we know now, that there is an increase that exceeds the population growth rate several fold, at least, and that we are compelled to take strong action to arrest and reverse the trend toward lawlessness that we see among us.

The following day he stated in a speech at Los Angeles that:

> We cannot define with precision the extent of crime's increase. We can only be sure that crime is increasing . . . the rate of increase is a cause for real concern.

Since the editorial contradicted the views often expressed by the Attorney General, I inquired of him and today received the following reply:

May 31, 1967.

Hon. Ramsey Clark,
The Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Attorney General: Knowing of your commitment to explore every possible avenue to deal with the increase in crime throughout our Nation, I was astonished to note the editorial in the May 22 edition of the Evening Star indicating you are of the view that crime is not a major problem in this country.

Having spent hours with you before our Subcommittee urging enactment of the legislation submitted by the President to deal with the crime problem, I cannot believe the editorial correctly reflects your views.

For this reason, I would appreciate having the gist of your remarks in the interview to which the editorial referred.

Sincerely,

Emanuel Celler,
Chairman.

Office of the Attorney General,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1967.

Hon. Emanuel Celler,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: You have asked for my comments on an editorial entitled "Crime—What's That" which quotes me as saying there is no crime wave. The editorial apparently was based on a single news story appearing in one New York newspaper which resulted from a conversation with a reporter while en route to La Guardia Airport in a taxi.

During that conversation, I was asked whether I thought we are experiencing a crime wave. I said I wish it were a crime wave because waves rise and fall, but unfortunately crime has increased steadily over the years without any signs of a recession.

Why the editorial writer chose to assume from this one news story that I do not believe crime to be a serious problem, I cannot say.

Considerably more than half my time, indeed more than half the resources of this entire Department are devoted to crime reduction.

In the less than three months since I became Attorney General, I have made speeches from coast to coast urging greater effort in the war on crime. In numerous press conferences I have consistently urged action to reduce crime. I have testified more than 20 hours before committees of the House and Senate seeking legislation to vastly increase the crime fighting resources of the nation. I have convened two conferences of national leaders in law and law enforcement to consider implementation of a national strategy against crime.

I am, as you know, personally deeply concerned about the incidence of crime in America and committed to do everything within my power to arrest and then reverse the trend toward lawlessness which prevails.

For these reasons I deeply regret that the public might be led to believe that I do not think crime is a problem. It is a grave national problem.

Sincerely,

Ramsey Clark,
Attorney General.

Postal Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is the postal deficit.

The report follows:

> This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.
>
> President Johnson recently recommended that Congress authorize substantial increases in the four main classes of postal rates. This additional revenue would help reduce the annual postal deficits which now amount to more than a billion dollars annually.
>
> Just before the President made his recommendation, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien suggested that the Post Office Department should be reduced from its present cabinet status and converted into a Government corporation organized on a business basis. This Corporation would have authority to fix postal rates—instead of Congress—and the authority to issue bonds for new postal construction. The general purpose would be to convert the Department from a chronic money loser into a well-run business establishment.
>
> While everyone wants to reduce the deficit, it is unlikely that the Postmaster General's

suggestion will be adopted in the near future by the Congress. It is reasonable that the Congress will reduce the annual deficit.

However, this is a good time to review what the postal system has meant in the life of our nation. The postal system is usually referred to as a public service—which it is. But the founding fathers looked upon it as something more than that. They wanted a postal system which would help weld this new nation into a unified whole and they succeeded in doing just that.

The Constitution itself authorized Congress to establish post offices and post roads. Shortly after the Federal Government started functioning, Congress created what is known as second class mail with special rates for the transportation of newspapers, magazines, and other publications. In doing this, Congress recognized that the spread of ideas on the widest possible basis was urgently needed to keep our nation both united and prosperous.

The privilege of second class mailing is no longer of much importance to the big metropolitan dailies. But this mailing privilege is still highly important to the small-town dailies and weeklies which play such an important part in the nation's rural life. And it is still very important to the national magazines which depend for their existence on mass circulation in all of the fifty States.

Over the years, Congress has created two other classes of mail for the convenience of those who use the postal system. The third *class authorizes bulk mailing and this is* often attacked for promoting the growth of so-called junk mail—meaning advertising matter unwanted by those who receive it. Yet without this class, the large mail order houses would be severely handicapped. Fourth class is used mainly for the carrying of books and records and this is very important to public libraries and educational institutions.

Thanks to the encouragement given by Congress, the U.S. postal system now handles nearly as much mail as all the other postal systems in the world combined. It has played a notable part in promoting national unity. The devotion of a loyal corps of postal workers has made it into a model of dependability.

In cutting down the deficit, we should avoid injuring one of the finest public service organizations in the world.

Thank you for listening.

Try To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the observance of Memorial Day at Hilliard, Ohio, on May 30, 1967, I was privileged to express some thoughts which I respectfully insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TRY TO REMEMBER

It is a great honor for me to have the privilege of giving this Memorial Day address. This is the type of occasion when one feels hardly adequate. I wish we could hear from the one we came to honor. He would be a more fitting speaker. But he is unable to be here because of a more important commitment. I hope that my words may be essentially the thoughts he would express were he able to talk with you this day. The "he" I mention, who is best qualified to speak, is the one we came to honor—one of the brave men lying nearby. His commitment to America was so strong that he gave his life because he chose to defend our way of life. If I may, for the moment "represent" him and these other noble men, I should like to ask you, on their behalf, to "try to remember":

Try to remember that Memorial Day isn't entirely a sad occasion. It would be a very sad occasion indeed if these brave men who gave their lives for what they believed died in vain. The country and the democracy they so nobly defended lives on so they did not die in vain. While Memorial Day is primarily a day of reverence, reminiscence and respect, it is, also, a day to be grateful. That is one of the things to try to remember today: to be grateful—grateful that we live in a country such as ours and that the basic principle on which this Nation was founded—Freedom—still lives. At this very moment while we are here honoring those who have died for Freedom, a terrible war is claiming still more lives on Freedom's altar.

Try to remember that these men who lie here as well as those who today are lying in fox-holes in Vietnam, all had a choice: They could have chosen not to fight. Others have taken devious ways out of service—ranging the gamut from deliberately failing physical or mental tests to announcing simply that they refuse to be inducted and will choose jail as an alternative. But these men chose instead to go out and defend that freedom of choice—that same freedom of choice that permits some of their fellow citizens to refuse to fight even though they may not deserve this choice.

To paraphrase Voltaire: "We do not agree with your decision not to help in our struggle for freedom but we will risk our lives in that war to defend your decision—right or wrong."

The majority of our boys today do accept this responsibility of defending our freedom, for a successful democracy is predicated upon the majority of its citizens shouldering their share (and sometimes somebody else's share) of responsibility.

Citizens of countries that are not democracies have another kind of freedom: they have freedom from responsibility. But they have no freedom of choice.

In Vietnam we have another kind of responsibility. We have given our word—made a commitment—and now find ourselves faced with a responsibility to go through with what we said we'd do. An individual or nation cannot go back on a promise once given. That's another thing we must *try to remember* today, and I'm afraid all too many people are inclined to forget it.

We are fretting over proceeding with a decision we actually have already made. It wasn't a pleasant choice. Nobody wants war. But there are somethings that are more intolerable than war. Once having decided that there was a situation in Vietnam that could not be tolerated—that war was necessary to correct that situation, we find ourselves in the awkward position of indecision as to how, how soon, and even *if* we should completely implement our promise.

What should we do? Today is a day to respect and venerate the war dead—and so I think it appropriate to listen to the wishes of the dead of another war—World War One, whose wishes were in a poem articulated by John McCrae. Now John McCrae was not a poet by trade. He was a surgeon serving with the Canadian Artillery in Europe, during the hottest phase of the Second Battle of Ypres. In the dressing station right on the battlefield. Dr. McCrae tended the wounded soldiers, and heard the last words of those whose wounds he could not mend. In this same dressing station he wrote a most moving poem, in which he speaks for the dead soldiers being buried within his view. No doubt, Dr. McCrae had many occasions in those hectic and terrible days to hear the last wishes of many a dying soldier. I would like you to listen carefully to the words of those soldiers as expressed in the last stanza of his now famous poem "In Flanders Fields":

> Take up our quarrel with the foe:
> To you from failing hands we throw
> The torch; be yours to hold it high.
> If you break faith with us who die
> We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
> In Flanders fields.

The men whom we have come here to honor today sacrificed their lives to keep that torch alight. Do not we whose lives have been illuminated by that thus far eternal flame have a duty to keep the light of freedom burning? The sacrifice these men have made for us should be inspiration enough to overcome the sorrow we feel in their loss. But let us ask ourselves: Why are we grieving? Does not much of our grief stem from the fact that these loved ones are no longer around to enrich our lives? If so, are we not grieving in vain? These men died so that we could continue to live our lives in the manner that each of us finds most enriching—in other words, so that we could continue freely to choose the type of life we live. Thus they continue to enrich our lives, and will so long as we guard that freedom they defended for us. Thus their very loss has enriched our lives. Try to remember that: "without a hurt the heart is hollow."

There is a bittersweet quality to Memorial Day. This is so because memory itself is bittersweet. Yet memory is one of the things that makes us human. In fact, memory is perhaps the most significant difference between mankind and the animal kingdom. Memory permits the development of reasoning power, another extremely important difference between the human and animal kingdoms. How very sad indeed when humans are denied the very highest realization of their humanity—free choice that is made possible by the power of reasoning and the ability to remember. Try to remember—try very hard to remember that mankind was never to be ruled by any earthly master. Rather, man was given dominion over all the creatures of the earth, and instructed to know no other master than God himself. No matter how each of us individually defines God, we can surely agree that God intended us to be free—else he would have planned things so our behavior was automatic—as automatic as the instinct of the animal world. I think we can further agree that God would want us to use all the power He has given us to keep all men on earth free.

The Civil War that originally occasioned our Memorial Day was fought for that very principle of human freedom. "Now we are engaged in (another) Great Civil War, testing whether (our) nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure (the ravages of Communism that would shackle the free world)." It is altogether fitting and proper that we should close this Memorial Day address with the words of one of the greatest men ever to die in the name of freedom. He was a man who exhibited the qualities of forgiveness and concern for all mankind, with the courage to proceed with a grievous war in order to grant freedom to a people who were not then in a position to champion their own cause. His words should identify him to each of you:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, *with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right*, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

I hope these words today have evoked some meaningful memories in you. *Try to remember* just one more thing: actions speak louder than words. These men you have come here today to honor have clearly spoken with the bravest of all actions. They have given their lives in action. *Try always to remember* why they bequeathed the ultimate gift.

Sea Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Ninth District of Texas, which I represent, encompasses several great ports. Many million gallons of oil and petroleum products are exported each year through these ports. For this reason we are acutely aware of the possibility of a situation occurring on our own coasts such as was caused by the tragic accident involving the merchant ship *Torrey Canyon.*

That accident which despoiled the beaches along England's Cornish coast by inundating them with oil had dramatized a serious pollution problem. But it is a problem which President Johnson has wasted little time in directing governmental effort toward finding a solution. Last week he announced that Secretary of Transportation Alan Boyd and Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall would conduct a special study for this very purpose.

For years we have had our best brains studying ways and means of reducing pollution of the air. Thousands of dollars have been spent researching the best ways of cleaning up our rivers and streams. Now we are presented with a new dilemma—pollution at sea. This problem has existed for some time, but it took the *Torrey Canyon* to focus national and international attention on the dangers inherent in pollutant spillages at sea.

The President, deeply concerned over this problem, directed Secretaries Boyd and Udall to make their recommendations to him within 90 days.

The President has asked them to look for a method of transporting large quantities of oil securely; to find a way of containing vast oil spillages if such an accident should occur again; to develop legislative proposals to enable Federal agencies to take immediate action in the event of an accident; and to suggest regulations to minimize spillage from pipelines, offshore towers and other appurtenances as the result of earthquake damage, hurricanes, tidal waves and other natural causes.

Secretaries Boyd and Udall do not have an easy task. Investigations to date have provided no explanation of the *Torrey Canyon's* grounding on a well-marked reef. None of the experts who tried everything in the book to contain the oil and keep it from destroying Britain's beaches were at all successful. Over 40,000 tons of oil coated the sea for thousands of miles causing untold damage to bird and marine life, before the vast pool was finally destroyed.

International maritime officials have called for strict regulations to govern ocean ship movement through well-defined, specified seaplanes in order to restrict the possibility of a recurrent disaster.

However, as it is not humanly possible to absolutely prevent the future occurrence of oil spillages, we need to find immediate methods of containing and destroying oilslicks before they reach disastrous proportions.

I am confident that these men, with the assistance and expertise of their respective Departments, will be able to solve these knotty problems. I look forward to their recommendations.

It Can Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, C.M. Sgt. John H. Hatcher will make Air Force history this month when he is presented a doctor of philosophy degree in American history from the University of Cincinnati. The 42-year-old airman, currently assigned to the headquarters, U.S. European Command, Stuttgart-Vaihingen, Germany, is the first Air Force airman to achieve a doctorate while serving on active duty.

LONG ARDUOUS JOURNEY

The road leading to this outstanding honor has been long and arduous. Sergeant Hatcher entered the Air Force in January 1943 after completion of only one semester of college work. During the next 20 years, he diligently applied himself by earning semester hours whenever time away from official duties would permit. His efforts were first rewarded in 1962 when he received a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Omaha under the Air Force Operation Bootstrap program.

Sergeant Hatcher completed requirements for a master of arts degree with both a major and minor in American History at Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Tex., during 1963–64. His master's thesis was titled "Dyess in Its First Decade; a Study in Base Community Relations."

DEDICATION BRINGS RESULTS

In March 1964, Sergeant Hatcher accepted a full tuition scholarship offered by the University of Cincinnati to commence advanced studies in American history leading to conferral of a doctor of philosophy degree. While engaging in advanced studies, Sergeant Hatcher was placed under the general supervision of the Air Force Institute of Technology.

At the University of Cincinnati, Sergeant Hatcher completed 104 hours of formal classroom work plus the dissertation, maintaining a 3.86 grade average on a four-point scale. One of his seminar papers has been published, with four more scheduled during the next 1½ years.

John Henry Hatcher, son of Mr. and Mrs. William B. Hatcher, 178 Devonshire Avenue, Dayton, Ohio, was born December 10, 1924, in West Prestonburg, Ky. His wife, Hildegard, is from Munich; his daughter Eva, was born in Frankfurt, where Sergeant Hatcher was stationed during one of his three different tours of Europe. A son, John Henry III, arrived at Dyess Air Force Base in 1962.

M. Sgt. John H. Hatcher has proved that whatever the difficulties, whatever the barriers, the desire for higher education can be fulfilled. Sgt. John Henry Hatcher has proved that it can be done.

Italy: A Democratic Republic Founded on Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1946, the citizens of Italy ended, by direct vote, their constitutional monarchy, and established from that time forth the sovereign Republic of Italy. More than 50 million Italian citizens, together with the millions of Italian-Americans in this country, and friends all over the world, will salute the 21st anniversary of the republic in a spirit of jubilance.

The installation of a new system of government in Italy signaled an unprecedented era of reconstruction, remolding, growth, and progress. Four years after the republic was established, the economy of Italy had regained the level it had attained prior to World War II. Since 1950, it has surged ahead with such furious activity that today, Italy is heralded as the leader among the Mediterranean countries and one of the fastest growing in the world. The nation is enjoying a pulsating, spirited life, and the people, far from relaxing on their laurels, are working endlessly to make their country greater. Intelligent economic planning has remodeled Italy from a land where agriculture predominates to a fast-moving, modern industrial nation. Today, industry is responsible for twice as much of the economic wealth as is agriculture. Today, the average worker earns twice what he has in years past. The annual growth rate in GNP is one of the highest in the world. Italy's foreign trade is booming and the tourist business is increasing yearly at a phenomenal rate. The economy maintains a large reserve placing Italy in the market for a multiude of foreign products. A generation of jet-age industrialists have taken the reins of the Italian economy and their fast-thinking, shrewd business manner is enabling Italian enterprises to hold their own in the world market.

The unprecedented progress made by the Italian Republic since its birth fills the Italian people with a swelling pride and a deep sense of satisfaction—and well it should. For although the western powers contributed much to aid this crippled nation following the terrible years of World War II, the credit for Italy's phenomenal rise to economic power is wholly due to the diligent, hard-working spirit of the Italian people. Our American experience has taught us only too well that no gains are made without years of strenuous toil and dedicated effort. It is this industrious quality which today we honor most in the Italian people. They have demonstrated to all the world that order can come from chaos, that a nation can rise from almost total devastation to unequaled success—in a remarkably short period. Indeed, the people of Italy have evidenced an energetic force, a will to build and to grow which few peoples can claim in our time.

Perhaps the greatest example of the strength and spirit of the Italian character occurred last November after the devastating floods which hit Florence and other areas of the north. Twenty years ago, this tragedy would have dealt a death blow to the Italian economy and sorely shattered the morale of the people. Instead, in the Italy to today, the Government has managed to absorb much of the cost of the flood damage, and Italians have steeled themselves to the task of rebuilding their homes and businesses, and restoring their precious Renaissance art treasures.

Italy's luminous future is being carved today through the diligent activity of all of the Italian people. On this anniversary of the Italian Republic, we in the United States extend our heartiest congratulations to the citizens of that beautiful country on a job well done. It has been said that Italy is a democratic republic founded on work. It should also be said that Italy is a 20th-century success story authored by the love and dedication of her people.

Tribute to Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 159th anniversary of the birth of Jefferson Davis, I would like to pay tribute to this great leader of our country as well as of the South. Jefferson Davis, born on June 3, 1808, should be remembered as a statesman, soldier, patriot.

Jefferson Davis, a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, distinguished himself in the Black Hawk war. It might be noted as a sidelight that at the beginning of the Black Hawk war, Davis was sent to Illinois to accept and muster into the U.S. services any volunteers. One of the young men who volunteered and was mustered into service by Jefferson Davis was Abraham Lincoln. Thus, Jefferson Davis administered to Lincoln the first oath of allegiance to the U.S. Government that Lincoln took.

He again served in a military capacity during the war with Mexico as the colonel in command of the Mississippi Rifles, the regiment that was a major force in the winning of the Battle of Buena Vista. It was at this battle that Davis, while urging his soldiers forward, spoke the famous phrase, "stand fast, Mississippians." Following the secession of Mississippi at the beginning of the War Between the States, he was offered and accepted a commission as major general to command the military forces of Mississippi, a post he had to resign when he was chosen President of the Confederacy.

Jefferson Davis, the statesman, served his State and country in many ways. He served as a U.S. Representative, and following the war with Mexico, Davis was appointed a U.S. Senator from Mississippi. He ranks among the greats in the Senate. He served as Secretary of War in the Cabinet of President Pierce, and took to that position brilliant leadership. He selected workers on the basis of competency, adapted and updated many modes of warfare, introduced improved weapons, established forts for the protection of western settlers, and was influential in bringing about the Gadsden Purchase. He made himself a conspicuous figure in Pierce's Cabinet, and made vast improvements in the organization of the Department.

Davis was returned to the U.S. Senate and was a leader and defender of States' rights. He resigned to return to Mississippi when his State seceded. I quote from his speech of resignation concerning the secession:

> This is done not in hostility to others, not to injure any section of the country, not even for our own pecuniary benefit, but from the high and solemn motive of defending and protecting the rights we inherited and which it is our duty to transmit unshorn to our children.

On February 18, 1861, Davis assumed the reins of leadership of the Confederate States of America. He was the first and only President of the Confederacy.

Davis was a patriot and sincere lover of the whole country. He did not advocate secession, but he firmly believed in the right of secession and of States' rights. His loyalty to his State and this principle compelled him to join his State at the time of secession.

In addition, Jefferson Davis was a deeply religious man and a good Christian. He was an author, an outstanding orator, and he was a man who was beloved by many.

In closing, I would like to quote from remarks that he made in March 1888, to a group of young men who were holding a convention at Mississippi City, Miss., which was near Davis' home, Beauvoir, on the Mississippi gulf coast. In his remarks, Davis foresaw the future of the United States and the glory and potential that the country had. These words should be an inspiration to all people. They truly indicate the great man that he was, a man who deserves the honor and respect of the people of our entire country as well as the South. After beginning his speech with the words, "Friends and fellow citizens," he paused and said:

> Ah, pardon me, the laws of the United States no longer permit me to designate you as fellow citizens, but I am thankful that I may address you as friends. I feel no regret that I stand before you a man without a country, for my ambition lies buried in the grave of the Confederacy.

He further continued:

> The faces I see before me are those of young men; had I not known this I would not have appeared before you. Men in whose hands the destinies of our Southland lie, for love of her I break my silence, to speak to you a few words of respectful admonition. The past is dead; let it bury its dead, its hopes and its aspirations. Before you lies the future—a future full of golden promise; a future of expanding national glory, before which all the world shall stand amazed. Let me beseech you to lay aside all rancor, all bitter sectional feeling, and to take your places in the ranks of those who will bring about a consummation devoutly to be wished—a reunited country."

Cigarette Smuggling—Federal Action Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker on March 30, 1966, in the 89th Congress, I introduced legislation (H.R. 14153) to amend the Jenkins Act to assist States to collect cigarette taxes and curb the illicit practice of cigarette bootlegging.

I have again introduced this legislation in the 90th Congress—H.R. 2153.

The problem of cigarette bootlegging, according to New York State and city officials has caused a revenue loss of approximately $60 million annually—more than $40 million to New York State and about $20 million to New York City.

Mr. Speaker, when I addressed the House on the subject of cigarette bootlegging, last year, I pointed out that many of our youth were being misled by unscrupulous persons, who encourage them to sell unstamped cigarettes to their families and neighbors to "make a few dollars."

That is why I initiated and have led the fight for enactment of Federal legislation in this field. See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 6, page 7307.

In April of 1966, the Honorable Louis L. Goldstein, Comptroller of the State of Maryland called a meeting of east coast cigarette tax administrators to discuss methods to curtail the illegal traffic in contraband cigarettes. I was subsequently advised by Comptroller Goldstein that the following jurisdictions unanimously endorsed the passage of my bill at the Baltimore conference: Connecticut, Delaware, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, New York City, and the District of Columbia.

Tax authorities from these jurisdictions have been working together in an effort to curb cigarette bootlegging, but they and other States faced with similar problems need the assistance of the Federal Government.

As a result of the revenue loss to New York State and New York City and the alarming increase in bootlegging activity, both Gov. Nelson Rockefeller and Mayor John Lindsay have endorsed my bill, H.R. 2153, to bring relief to States and local governments in dealing with this problem. See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 7, page 8654.

Governor Rockefeller has announced plans to convene a conference of Governors from 16 States this summer to discuss this problem with particular emphasis on cooperation among the States in policing shipments of smuggled cigarettes and the need for Federal legislation to assist the States.

Since 1966, Mr. Speaker, the activity has taken on new dimensions. Cigarettes are now being shipped in interstate commerce not only by private car "trunkload" but in carload and trailer load lots.

To escape detection, it was recently revealed that two station wagons loaded with unstamped cigarettes were being transported piggy-back style in a large interstate trailer.

As the city and State taxing authorities increase their surveillance, other and more devious means are being employed. The distinguished and courageous district attorney of Kings County, N.Y., Aaron Koota, now has before the grand jury a case involving an arrest made last week "involving over 11,000 cartons of untaxed cigarettes." The district attorney stated to me that "indications are that the vendor of these cigarettes in North Carolina actively participated in concealing these cigarettes through a form of camouflage so as to prevent detection by law enforcement officials."

The full text of the district attorney's letter is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
Kings County, May 24, 1967.

Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERBERT: Please forgive my delay in replying to your letter of May 3rd.

I had asked Irving Seidman, who is in charge of my Rackets Bureau and of the cigarette investigation, to prepare the necessary documentation. He, in turn, has been in touch with Inspector Cottell, Chief of the Police Department Central Confidential Investigation unit and working closely with us in this inquiry. Documentation is being prepared and when ready I will write directly to the Attorney General and send you a copy of the letter.

I have also your letter of May 22nd which I read with a great deal of interest. I am asking Mr. Seidman to get me details and will advise you as quickly as I can.

Mr. Golden, my Chief Assistant, told me about the conversation he had with you while I was in Albany as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention. He told me that he advised you that in an arrest we made the other day involving over eleven thousand cartons of untaxed cigarettes, indications are that the vendor of these cigarettes in North Carolina actively participated in concealing these cigarettes through a form of camouflage so as to prevent detection by law enforcement officials.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,
AARON.

Recent grand jury proceedings in New York City have raised speculation that the illicit practice of cigarette smuggling has become such a big business that underground elements have taken over this field. Because of my concern that organized crime syndicates may be involved and in light of my request for a Justice Department investigation into cigarette bootlegging, I also contacted New York State and city officials as well as district attorneys in the five counties of New York City and Nassau and Westchester Counties asking them to cooperate by turning over any pertinent evidence to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I have been told that in order to facilitate distribution of bootlegged cigarettes, counterfeit State tax stamps are affixed to each cigarette pack. Since these cigarettes are shipped in interstate commerce, I contacted the Attorney General of the United States to request a review of existing Federal statutes to ascertain whether there was Federal jurisdiction in such cases.

I place in the RECORD at this point a letter which I received from Assistant Attorney General Fred M. Vinson, Jr., confirming that Federal statutes are being violated:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington,, May 18, 1967.

HON. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This responds to your letter of May 3, 1967, to the Attorney General in which you referred to the growing practice of cigarette smuggling and asked whether the use of counterfeit State tax stamps constitutes a violation of any Federal criminal statute.

The mere affixing of a counterfeit stamp or making of a false meter impression is not a Federal criminal violation unless the package on which it is affixed or imprinted is transported in interstate commerce. The third paragraph of Section 2314, Title 18, United States Code, proscribes the transportation, in interstate commerce, of "any falsely made, forged, altered, or counterfeited securities or tax stamps. . . ." The fourth paragraph proscribes the transportation, in interstate commerce, of any tool or thing used in the making of such false security or tax stamp. The legislative history of Section 2314 reveals that it was amended in 1961 to cover state tax stamps and meter impressions after state officials had testified before the House Committee on the Judiciary about the large revenue losses suffered by states affected by the use of false stamps and impressions, especially when they had been made in another state.

Violations of this statute are investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Investigations of offenses involving "underworld elements" are given special attention in the Criminal Division.

It is a pleasure to serve you in this matter.
Sincerely,
FRED M. VINSON, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General.

The fourth paragraph of District Attorney Koota's letter illustrates the need for Federal legislation and Federal action in curbing cigarette smuggling. On May 24, 1967 I wrote to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover requesting an FBI investigation into cigarette bootlegging and the possible violation of the Federal statute referred to in Assistant Attorney General Vinson's opinion of May 18, 1967.

Following my letter to Mr. Hoover, I met with FBI officials and presented the case for Federal action to them. I was assured that the FBI would undertake an investigation with particular attention to possible underworld involvement and the violation of Federal law.

I have also kept the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee informed of the facts set forth above and I urge my colleagues to follow the situation in their own States and advise the chairman and the Attorney General accordingly.

I urge my colleagues in the House to contact their State officials and district attorneys to ascertain the scope of this problem in their areas and to encourage them to turn over all pertinent evidence to the FBI. I also call upon my colleagues to support efforts to achieve Federal action and to pass effective Federal legislation to curb this illicit practice.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the observance of Memorial Day at Ridgeview Junior High School, Columbus, Ohio, I was privileged to express some thoughts which I respectfully insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. Tilton, teachers, and students of Ridgeview Junior High School, it is a great privilege and honor for me to appear before you today and share some thoughts reflecting on this solemn occasion. At the outset, I should like to commend Mr. Robison and his very fine band for their excellent participation in this Memorial Observance. As the young man played the drum solo, I was reminded of a very special moment of a very special day—the Sunrise ceremonies last Easter at the Tomb of the Unknowns at Arlington National Cemetery.

The Marine Band was playing as only that band could on such an occasion. Now the Marine Band is selected from the top musicians in the land, according to the same standards musically that the marines set physically for the selection of their fighting units. Just to be selected presupposes a musician is excellent. His selection seems to give him a further pride and inspire him to greater excellence. There came a time in the ceremony—just at dawn, when the drama of the moment was to be emphasized by a drum solo. Now a drum solo, while seemingly the simplest of instrumental solos, is anything but that. There is no melody to distract from any slight deviation in precision. The Marine Band drummer chosen to execute this solo stepped forth. He was short of stature—not particularly handsome—and he wore thick-lensed glasses, all of which would not lead to the conclusion that he is a Marine.

As the first stroke of his drumstick broke the awesome silence, I thought—here is a Marine. He outperformed any other drummer I have ever heard. His superior performance did more than emphasize the symbolic occasion. He was, to me at that moment, a symbol of this age of opportunity—in which what you are born with, or without, is of less importance than your own ability to achieve excellence in your chosen field. What this young man lacked in physical attributes, he made up for in achievement. It was pretty obvious that a lot of determination, discipline, and perseverance had gone into achieving the degree of skill he had mastered, no doubt through hours of dedication and practice. You, too, can make your contribution to our way of life—doing what you do best—in the best way you know how.

I thought it appropriate to discuss the history of Memorial Day—a little lesson in civics—and something of the true meaning of Memorial Day.

Memorial Day is the day when we pay tribute (as Lincoln once put it) "to those who gave their lives that this nation might live." No one gave more in the defense of the freedoms we enjoy. We are again engaged in a patriotic struggle in Vietnam because of a conflict—on great issues of political philosophy. We went into Vietnam to prevent a Communist take-over at the request of the South Vietnamese people—we are told. And there is no question but that Communism is a threat to our way of life. It is a threat to the freedoms we enjoy and love. Can you imagine this news dispatch from Washington? "The Commissar has found positive proof that George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Betsy Ross, and Patrick Henry were all traitors, and appropriate action will be taken at once. The city's name will be changed so that it will no longer be referred to as Washington, D.C. The stars and stripes will be replaced with a new flag. All old flags and old patriotic books in America must be burned immediately. Benjamin Franklin will be replaced by Benedict Arnold in all literature. All postage stamps picturing Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, and Lincoln will be burned. Any crank citizen who protests will be executed."

Preposterous? Don't be too sure! Russia accomplished just such a "repatriotization" in barely five years by eliminating freedom of speech, freedom of press and other freedoms which we enjoy.

The point I make is that these freedoms we have are not so obvious except in comparison with the lack thereof in other nations. We must remember them and be thankful for them this day, and do whatever is necessary to preserve them.

We are gathered here to honor our dead who so courageously have given their lives on the battlefields of distant lands so that our great democracy might be preserved. National recognition of their bravery and sacrifice is the only fitting way to show our gratitude.

In this Memorial Day talk, it is altogether fitting and proper that I refer to Lincoln because this great and good man is, in my opinion, responsible more than anyone else for the other reason for this day—a time of rededication to God and country.

Shortly after Lincoln's death on April 14, 1865, the Grand Army of the Republic was formed. General John Logan, who had served with Lincoln's Union Army, became its Commander-in-Chief in January of 1868. The G.A.R. was an organization of Union Soldiers.

Many persons have laid claims as having originated Memorial Day, commonly called "Decoration Day." One claim originated when, on May 5, 1868, General John Logan issued an order designating May 30th as a day for all members of the G.A.R. to strew with flowers the "graves of comrades who had died in defense of their country during the late rebellion." Probably, most historians credit General Logan with initiating Memorial Day and set its beginning as May 30, 1868. In his order, Logan expressed the desire that the ceremonies would be kept from year to year, and that the Republic "would garland the passionless mounds with the choicest flowers of Springtime."

Many of the departments and posts of the government seized on the idea with skepticism. Debate raged about the idea of a Memorial Day. Some said: "A national observance of such a holiday would unnecessarily keep alive war-time bitterness and foster animosities that should be buried in oblivion." These objections were lost in the tremendous outpouring of people when May 30, 1868 dawned.

Excursions piled crowds of people into the larger cities who formed into parades, decorated graves and made speeches to commemorate the occasion.

A national holiday had been born, even if the government of the United States was never to *declare it so*. The States in the north rapidly made it a day of legal observance with the Southern States joining, differing only in the date. North and South Carolina named the 10th of May, which is the anniversary of Stonewall Jackson's death. All of the rest of the Dixie States named April 26th.

Some say that Logan got the idea from the Confederate Soldiers who made an occasional decoration of a comrade's grave. Others say that General John J. Murray of New York had told of his leadership of ex-soldiers to Union graves on Sunday, May 22, 1866, two years before. Adj. General Chipman of the G.A.R. insisted that he had given the idea to Logan around May 1, 1868 in a letter by which he had suggested that they adopt the old German Custom of scattering flowers on the graves of the dead each Springtime. Comrade T. C. Campbell of Cincinnati claimed that he had headed a delegation of veterans taking flowers to the cemetery in the Spring of '67 and that the idea originated for propagation at that instant.

General Logan's wife got in on the act and declared that it was she who had prompted her husband to issue the order, having borrowed the thought from the memorial services which she had witnessed in Richmond, Virginia earlier in the Spring of 1868.

Through the South lived still more numerous claims to the inauguration of the custom. Each state claimed that it was the originator. The Richmond Times-Dispatch claimed that it was responsible for the custom in an article on July 15, 1906. On May 10, 1866, the Oakwood Cemetery Memorial Association adorned the graves of Confederate dead and hung flags in the city. On April 26, 1866, the anniversary of General Joseph E. Johnson's surrender to General Sherman, the people of the City of Columbus, Georgia, put flowers on soldiers' graves with an appropriate observance. A woman by the name of Miss Lizzie Rutherford claims that she made the suggestion to a group of Ladies' Aid Society. And so the numerous claims persisted.

Always this dispute will go on because the date itself came from nowhere—everywhere. The greater the number of claimants for its birthplace, the plainer the proof that the Republic was aching vaguely with eagerness to speak its grief after four years of killing. The funeral of the war's greatest figure pointed that way.

Each little fugitive decoration of graves across the land, each little individual call to action, was a spontaneous outburst of the sentiment that had been crystallized at the burial-drama of Lincoln. It was at his funeral that flowers were strewn on his grave and marked the way of the funeral parade while veterans and their families spoke—fired salutes and sang their old favorite war songs.

By 1869, thirty-one states had adopted the custom. Some of the earlier memorial days were marked by strife and by demonstrations of anti-southern wrath in the north and anti-northern wrath in the south. Hatred still burned bright and at the National Cemetery in Arlington, Marines were stationed at Confederate graves to prevent southerners from placing roses thereon. It was quite obvious that General Grant was ignorant of these episodes in the graveyard and the antics were never repeated. On the same day, Union Soldiers helped decorate the graves of Confederate Soldiers who had been buried at Alexandria, another suburb of the Capital.

Since then, Memorial Day has become a day of rededication—a day of patriotism all over the nation and has aided in the healing of ancient wounds and has made us ever mindful of our responsibility to our country which was so torn by strife in its inception.

A Memorial Day celebration recalls many memories of our national beginning. Patriotism is of many inspirations and receives refreshments from many springs. None are more powerful than our traditions of service, of suffering, of accomplishment and memorial dedication to our heroes.

These memories are indeed the imponderable force which builds and cements our national life.

We have another reason today for remembering. At this very moment mothers, fathers, wives and sweethearts are anxious about their loved ones in Vietnam. As we honor our dead from past wars this Memorial Day, let us also salute our valiant men in Vietnam—and pray for an honorable and speedy end to hostilities over there.

Remember, too, that the future is in your hands. The future is important to you because you will spend the rest of your lives in it—which according to life expectancy tables could be over 50 years. More than 50 percent of the people now living in the United States are 26 years old and under. We'll try to leave a legacy which you will be proud to defend by your best effort whatever form it might take. I'm sure you'll do your part.

Congressman Robert L. Leggett Presents Penetrating Analysis of American Maritime Program in Propeller Club Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, 1967, in an observance of National Maritime Day, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Robert L. Leggett, of California, delivered an address to the Propellor Club of Los Angeles.

Congressman Leggett's speech is a penetrating analysis of the dangerous level to which we have permitted the American maritime program to fall, and he made clear that the revival of American shipbuilding capabilities is imperative to our national security and well-being.

I commend Congressman Leggett's timely remarks to the attention of the Members and other readers of the Congressional Record:

Address by Honorable Robert L. Leggett to the Propeller Club of Los Angeles, May 24, 1967

President Wright and gentlemen of the Pacific Coast Maritime industry. I want to thank you for inviting me to come from

Washington to Los Angeles to help celebrate National Maritime Day with you—May 22. The day might also be known as the *Rise and Fall of the Savannah* in 155 years.

It would be well if we could say that we have come a long way since the first Savannah steamed across the Atlantic to Europe in 1812. Instead we must report that the N.S. Savannah after visiting 40 ports and sailing but 130,000 miles, the world's most modern ship, has more or less been in mothballs since last August.

In a way this action is par for the course with today's American maritime program. Labor, management and the administration in Washington are all jointly responsible. The industry, maritime labor and the Federal Maritime Administration have probably been damned and praised by more great speakers over the past few years than any other facet of American life by Ed Hood, Ralph Dewey and from the Navy Department's Admiral David L. McDonald to Department of Transportation's Secretary, Alan Boyd.

My concern with this industry is partly provincial. I represent in the Congress of the United States the 4th Congressional District which contains the Mare Island Division of the San Francisco Bay Naval Shipyard. To those who say our American shipbuilding know-how has deteriorated I would say look over the SSBNs *Stonewall Jackson, Woodrow Wilson* and the latest, *Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo,* SSBN 658—all built at Vallejo. These are true precise accurate and durable instruments of American foreign policy—and their quietness and capability have no peer in the free or Communist world.

The secret of these ships, however, is money—$35 to $55 million for the shipyard work and nearly $100 million of government provided equipment.

My Mare Island yard was the yard that constructed 392 ships and repaired and overhauled a total of 4,560 ships during World War II—the yard that launched the World War I destroyer *Ward* in 16½ days.

When I came to Congress 5 years ago I quickly discovered, however, in the 65–35 battles with Ed Hood and Representative Jerry Ford that it just was not in the cards that we would long have a thriving Naval shipyard industry if we were perennially scrapping with private industry over the same Navy dollar. In a word we couldn't be healthy in public yards if the private yards were not prospering. As a practical matter the whole issue of 65–35 was the eventual distribution of $100 million of Naval and repair work—less than 3% of the total ship work being performed in the country. We are now beyond the 65–35 encounters in Washington and not merely because of Vietnam but because my House Committee on Armed Services under the inspired leadership of my colleague, Chairman Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, intends to upgrade not only the Naval shipyards but private yards as well.

At the insistence of our committee, Secretary Nitze announced a few weeks ago that Kaiser Industries would shortly complete a 5–7 year $600 to $700 million Naval ship modernization program. 8 or 9 Naval shipyards will each achieve a 20th Century capability.

Moving forward simultaneously with this improvement I hope and I know will be a *Modern Merchant Program* for which the Congress has waited well over two years. Nearly every Member of Congress I know has got a gut feeling that we should be moving ahead with a radically new Merchant Ship Program. How do you do it. There has been so much written by so many people—some enlightening—some confusing—we have had Task Force Reports and Maritime Committee Reports and all of these thoughts have been capsulated so many times it is difficult to expound a new idea to resolve the problems of building foreign or forming an independent Maritime Administration.

I frankly believe that we have enough steam or nuclear propulsion in the maritime industry to insist on and stimulate the creation of a new American Maritime industry—*of space program proportion*. We've been thinking large but we are budget programmed small at the federal level. The Maritime Administration received a total support of $303 million for '66, $280 million for '67 and $305 million is scheduled for '68. We announced recently that the '68 funds were up $25 million from '67 and that amounts were included for 13 new vessels as part of our subsidized fleet. *This kind of a replacement program begins no place, ends no place and will do little to abate block obsolescence.*

For ship construction "to provide for National Defense features in the form of construction subsidy this year" is the monumental sum of $106 million and I am sure someone will claim that the $143 million included in the '68 budget may break the bank. Certainly these kind of budgets are exactly in line with testimony of Secretary Robert McNamara before our House Merchant Marine Committee in 1962 and recently when he said:

"From a purely military point of view the Reserve Fleet, plus vessels in service, plus the construction program previously outlined appear adequate to our needs . . . I do not wish to overstate the military requirement thereby providing an umbrella under which a huge shipbuilding program for the Merchant Marine can be justified . . ."

I personally think Secretary McNamara is the best we've had and the best in the business but on this issue he's dead wrong.

We all considered it rather ironic that the Secretary then should decide to move full steam ahead this year with a $2 billion Fast Deployment Logistics Shipbuilding Program. The Secretary said:

"Not only does it cost twice as much to build a ship in this country, it also takes twice as long." He said the reason is not higher labor costs or less skilled workers so much as the fact that American shipyards are "generally technically obsolete compared to those of Northern Europe and Japan."

I dispute what the Secretary says but if he is accurate I think he and the Department of Defense are to blame for compressing our American shipbuilding industry from a better than 1,000 ship per year capacity at the end of World War II to the 13 Merchant ships delivered and 16 ships ordered by and in American yards last year. This policy has allowed our skilled Naval shipbuilding levels to degenerate at one point to 75,000 and private shipbuilding levels was near 100,000 men. We have had in years past a true *'survival of the fittest'* in American shipbuilding with the government forcing companies to bid at cost and under cost to both harpoon each other and Naval shipyards in the competition. Needless to say, except in exceptional contracts there have not been fat profits for modernization programs and with the government spending 85% of the shipbuilding dollars it is no wonder that there has been a degree of status quo in the industry.

How ironic for the Secretary to make statements that he does and then propose a $2 billion shipbuilding program which includes $100 million in the contract for a new shipyard. This program has rightfully been indicated by Stewart Cort of Bethlesem, Ralph Dewey of your Pacific Association and by our House Merchant Marine Committee almost unanimously. To many of us in Washington when we saw the Secretary of Defense, Navy, Army and all the Joint Chiefs of Staff unite simultaneously before our hearing for a program, we thought there must be something wrong with it.

My personal indictment in letters to the President and on the House floor went something like this:

". . . Over the past year and before I have concerned myself about the need for and manner of construction of the projected $2 billion Fast Deployment Logistics Shipbuilding Program. I am concerned likewise with this Nation's critical need for a nuclear Navy and the needs of this Nation for a crash program to revitalize out rapidly depleting Merchant Marine Fleet.

"It is obvious that as a result of our Southeast Asia involvement our Nation has become critically aware of our Nation's current deficit in ability to commandeer on short notice a surface fleet capability to deliver logistic material support on underdeveloped having participated as a member of the Armed Services Committee on a South Asia inspection tour last year, however, I am satisfied that this deficit was overcome by our Department of the Army and Navy at Chu Lai and Cam Ranh Bay by alternative means. I am personally also satisfied that though we moved troops to the shore before supplies, the overall delay has not seriously affected our total overall effort.

"The FDL program could overcome the referenced deficiency. You could speculate that perhaps the program could also assist in providing the United States with a continuing capability with the C5A aircraft that would allow us to retract troops from overseas positions and still allow us to involve ourselves very quickly in a police action or war overseas. I am satisfied that the United States needs more of a capability to get out of encounters easily rather than get in. The nuclear Navy which I support has a 'defensive' world image. A patrolling FDL fleet, I am sure, would be considered as 'offensive.'

Secretary McNamara said last year in Montreal that during the past 8 years there were 150 encounters around the world, one-third of which were affected by communism—some intracountry and some between nations in all of which the United States could have involved itself.

"The idea of maintaining a $2 billion fleet—an amount equal to the shipyard cost of our Polaris fleet, I think is preposterous.

"I personally believe that the purpose of the FDL program and its manner of procurement have been confounded.

"My reasons for opposing this program can be summarized as follows:

"First. The timing is wrong. Our current year deficit of $9.7 billion should be limited in every way possible.

"Second. The FDL program would be mutually exclusive to a nuclear Navy program which program I know carries paramount priority by the Navy Department. In the 1960's we have averaged $1½ billion annual Navy expenditure for new construction. The FDL program while perhaps only 6 percent of the total U.S. shipbuilding program would comprire nearly 25 percent of all Navy construction procurement for the next 6 years.

"Third. The FDL program I believe to be the most cost ineffective to ever receive the stamp of approval of the Secretary of Defense. The ships constructed will not be operational because they will have no place to go. To tie up $2 billion of a merchant fleet we do not have dockside, loaded with progressively obsolete military equipment is not sound.

"First, the Army and Marines would have to buy two of everything, one-half of which would be hermetically sealed for perhaps a 5-year period when it must be replaced without ever going in service—hopefully. If the ships were used once capriciously or ill timed, thereafter our fleet would be persona non grata all over the world.

"The ships also would be manned 24 hours a day with military crews or civilians claiming overtime, hazard, and special-duty pay.

"Far better it would be to build a fleet with a function; that is, a true, modern fast merchant fleet that would be available on priority call to the Department of Defense.

It is my information that such a fleet could be constructed for private merchant marine operation in private shipyards and could be available on call to the Department of Defense. The Department would pay an annual rental for the preemptive rights which financial guarantee I am informed would be adequate for private financing and construction.

"The proposed pending FDL submission could be used to develop the required merchant fleet with the full FDL capability. This type of program has real merit. The work would be spread to all private shipyards or to one on a competitive bid. The United States would not get into the merchant shipping business. The ships would be in full operation and operated under the regulations of the Military Sea Transportation Service or Navy Department maintaining perhaps a partial FDL capability at all times. Taxpayers money would be involved at a minimum. The base could be laid for a new modern merchant fleet and the fleet operation would not be construed as a hostile act.

"Fourth. It would seem that if we must preposition logistics hardware, that we could do it much cheaper at the many American bases overseas. If the FDL have a quick offloading capability, they must also have a quick onloading capability of containerized material. There should be no need, therefore, to maintain idle a complete fleet of floating warehouses . . ."

I further stated to my Chairman:

". . . I, personally, believe that this is the chance of a lifetime for our Committee to lay the groundwork for a Merchant Marine as a national defense requirement." I don't think the Secretary has discharged his obligations in this respect and at all. I believe that if it is worthwhile for us to spend $20 billion to meet the Russians on the moon, for which purpose we are not really sure, it is certainly worth our while to meet the Russians on the high seas, which constitute four-fifths of the earth's surface.

"I would like to see the United States undertake a sealift program of a billion dollar magnitude with the same enthusiasm that we undertake the Space Program based primarily on a national defense requirement. Certainly, the intelligence which we would acquire by means of having large numbers of American ships plying the international trade routes would be invaluable and could not be satisfied by foreign crews manning 'flag ships of convenience . . .'"

Our committee heard witnesses from all over the country and decided on the FDL to go slow and, specifically, we found in our report as follows:

"The committee, therefore, in approving two of the five FDLs requested in this year's budget does not commit itself to approval of the 30 ship program . . . before considering any further expansion of the FDL program beyond that recommended in the proposed legislation, the committee will want to see an approved program submitted by DOD with respect to

"(a) Modernization of naval shipyards.

"(b) A strengthened American Merchant Marine.

"(c) A continued assurance that none of the ships previously authorized will be used in competition with the American Merchant Marine.

"It is also possible that other shipbuilding companies who have not submitted proposals on the FDL program may find themselves qualified to bid on the design of one of the aerospace companies. If the proposal permits such a possibility the DOD would be remiss in not taking advantage . . ."

The importance to the Maritime industry of the FDL program is the fact that Secretary McNamara for the first time is talking about a sealift requirement being worth $2 billion. This was the first time that Defense talked of space magnitude dollars in a Merchant shipping program.

I say if the Soviets can do it so can the United States—it's all a question of postulating a program. The United States with a $760 billion G.N.P. has twice the economic power of the Soviet Union by any measure of comparison. California alone with a $90 billion G.N.P. is equal to France, 10% ahead of Japan and by 1975 our state will be leading the United Kingdom and West Germany. Yet since 1962 the Great Society has built but 87 ships averaging about $100 million annual federal cost, whereas the Soviets built 502 Merchant ships during the period at nearly $1 billion cost per year. As a result 80% of the Soviet fleet is less than 10 years old and 80% of the United States fleet is more than 20 years old. The Soviets carry 75 to 85% of their commerce. The United States, which accounts for 25% of all of the world's ocean commerce, carries but 7.7% of that trade in her own American flag bottoms. The Soviets employ 9,000 in oceanography—we employ 3,700. The Soviets last year caught 6.5 million tons of fish in near American waters. We caught 2.3 million tons, while the Soviets have gone from 1.8 million tons of ocean shipping in 1950 to 9.8 million tons last year and have a projected 15 million tons by 1970—all pursuant to a massive Russian 1958 seven year shipbuilding plan. While the Soviets have presently on order 556 ships, the United States is building 48. While the Soviet Fleet expanded catastrophically, the United States fleet slumped from 22 million tons to 14 million tons with many second class ships.

If DOD has been derelict respecting our Merchant Marine, it has likewise neglected our Navy. In our Armed Services Committee report on Defense procurement we also addressed ourselves to block obsolescence of our Naval Fleet. We recited that according to Navy studies but 490 of our existing fleet would still be in commission in 1973. That even if we continued to build at the current 43 ship per year standard that the Navy would still lose 306 ships net over the next 5 year period. We stated "there has been a stunning indifference in the Pentagon to the inevitable declination in the size of our fleet—a resolute incuriosity about it." Our Armed Services Committee is charged under the Constitution with the duty of "providing and maintaining a Navy." If my Chairman has anything to say about it, we will perform our function.

To rehabilitate our American Merchant Marine and to change the trend of our time it's going to take more than 30 Merchant ships per year to do the job—more than a simple "Respond" program to marshal the forces of our existing Merchant fleet. We must think big. If we wait for a tranquil year in the post Vietnam era it won't happen. Our Defense budget escalated from $41 billion in 1960 to $76 billion next year and they say that it is still $5 billion light. In addition, the Secretary of Defense has withheld approval of hardware and construction totaling $23 billion additional requested by his departments.

I say if we can afford to spend $3 billion a month for Vietnam, we can spent $1 billion a year for a ship program for better than a half a million man industry to *insure our world commerce in that area.*

Wait for a year of surplus to start a program? Get ready for a long wait. We raised the national debt $2 billion last summer, $6 billion in February and plan to try for $8 billion next month. We have sold off $2 billion stockpiles, $5 billion of Mortgage Participation Certificate paper and sales of $5 billion of the same paper is projected for next year. We've held back spending $4½ billion in our domestic authorized appropriated programs and we still have a $9.7 billion deficit planned—and next year looks worse.

The point is that there are tremendous claims for funds around Capitol Hill. Obviously not enough to go around. *But if the Administration doesn't request an adequate program, nothing happens.* Congress has nothing to act on.

We recently enacted legislation in the House to change this in the form of H.R. 158. This bill vests the function in the Congress every year to authorize an adequate Merchant program in compliance with the Jones Act. I supported this bill on the floor.

I have saved to the last a commentary on the proposal submitted recently by Secretary Boyd for a new Maritime policy. To begin with his suggestion although it talks of a 100% increase in program is not of Space Program proportions. As I understand it, the President asked for a program that would achieve the full support of *all segments* of industry and would allow the United States to recapture a substantial amount of her foreign commerce cartage. The Boyd Plan, I believe, much like the Task Force recommendation, is conceived in defeat from the outset. According to Ed Hood's latest shipbuilding report, Japan last year completed 6.4 million tons (46.1% of the world's new ships), West Germany 1.1 million tons (8.2%), Sweden 1.1 million tons (8%) Great Britain 1 million tons (7.5%), Italy 3.7% and the United States ranked 13th at 191,000 tons (1.3%). In other words Japan completed last year more total tonnage than the United States completed during the whole of World War II.

Stated another way total export and import ocean cargo of the United States while escalating from 64 million tons in 1936 to 404 million tons last year, the United States share of this cargo in U.S. bottoms has slipped from 29.7% to 7.2%. In other words, while our commerce has expanded nearly 700%, our ship capability has remained static. As a practical matter under existing law over the past 20 years, 1,229 ships totaling 35 million tons have been built by American companies in foreign yards.

If we're trying to equalize these figures I don't think you start off with the Boyd Plan of *building foreign* in any respect. We have as an objective not merely recapturing our foreign operating Flags of Convenience, but we also want to recapture the building industry for new construction and repairs. Last year the Secretary of Defense negotiated a deal to trade among other things $50 million Naval ship construction business for $1½ billion in F 111 contracts. Last week the English bids came in only 5% below American tax paying shipbuilding industries offers. Nick Johnson's whole theory of foreign building last year was conditioned on his idea that $330 million was the sky top limit of U.S. support to our Merchant Marine—the $800 million recommended by the Maritime Committee we couldn't afford. Similarly, Secretary Boyd said at the Maritime Trades Convention last year that as far as he was concerned "government assistance should be a *minimum* to accomplish the purpose and to provide for the defense requirements of the nation." He said he *could not* be an advocate of land, sea or air. He pointed out that he was charged with unsnarling downtown traffic under the Mass Transit Act and building a multi-billion U.S. highway network."

I say the purpose in establishing a Department of Transportation was to stimulate all industries as required not to checkmate our ocean commerce by explaining that a particular offer is the last one and that there is a breaking point where the interests of the public and shipping industry necessarily separate. I am one who believes firmly that the interests of our American shipping industry and the public interest and our national defense have much more in common than the Secretary would believe. Far better it would be to have a Secretary who would, in fact, do what the President has asked—postulate a multi-billion dollar shipbuilding program over a 5 year period to tie into sea science, fishing and oceanography and then let the Congress decide whether the program is larger than the American public will sustain and support.

If a Secretary has vision it would matter little then as I see it whether he headed a Cabinet Department or an independent Maritime Agency which has been supported in the Congress by a 3 to 1 vote.

It's the purpose not the form that counts.

I personally have been assured by responsible leaders of industry and organized labor that they would both contemplate making sacrifices for an adequate program.

This, then, is the challenge of our time. I know that my Democratic Party is equal to meeting this challenge by proposing a program. I also know that the Congress of the United States will bi-partisanly enact such a program by a strong majority.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 5, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Be of good courage, and He shall strengthen your heart, all ye that hope in the Lord.—Psalm 31: 24.

O God, our Father, whose law is truth and whose life is love, as we enter the gates of a new week we would pause in reverence before Thee to acknowledge our dependence upon Thee and to pray for strength as we face the demanding responsibilities of this day.

Give us courage and faith for the tasks before us. May we now and always do our best to preserve liberty, to prevent tyranny from spreading, to promote peace in our world, and to proclaim the good news of freedom to all mankind.

May we live worthily as Thy children and be faithful and true in every experience. Help us to rise above fear and hatred and to maintain our integrity in this free land of our birth. We do not pray for easy tasks but for power to meet them; not for easy burdens but for strength to carry them; not for less dangerous times in which to live but to keep loyal to our ideals in an all too unideal world.

So may we go forward conscious of Thy presence, eager to do Thy will and to live in good will with all Thy children. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 1, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill S. 16, an act to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendment to the House amendment to the bill S. 16 entitled "An act to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and appoints Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RETIREMENT OF HOUSE CHAPLAIN, DR. EDWARD G. LATCH, AS MINISTER OF THE METROPOLITAN MEMORIAL CHURCH

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of this body will share in a feeling of congratulations to our very beloved Chaplain of the House on the news that yesterday he completed his 26th consecutive year of ministry with the Metropolitan Memorial Church, long known as the National Methodist Church here in Washington, D.C., and preached the final sermon of his ministry with that church. He will be devoting full time to his services to the House of Representatives as Chaplain in the future.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I wish to join the gentleman in saluting our beloved Chaplain. Dr. Latch's ministry in Washington has been a very important element in the life of this community, and his ministry here as Chaplain of the House of Representatives will continue to be a very important element in the lives of all of us and all the people of our Nation. I congratulate my colleague from Oklahoma for taking the floor for this purpose.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I appreciate very much the gentleman making such complimentary remarks about our present Chaplain. I, too, wish to express my congratulations to Dr. Latch for his long and wonderful service of many years as pastor of Metropolitan Methodist Church and in building up one of the finest and most dedicated congregations in our Nation's Capital. My family and I have been privileged to attend Dr. Latch's church almost every Sunday. I have regretted when I have been prevented from being present to listen to his outstanding sermons. I am glad today Dr. Latch is the "Shepherd" of this House, so to speak, serving in his capacity as our Chaplain. I know we will all continue to be benefited by the fine service he renders us in so many ways. I join all others in congratulating Dr. Latch on his outstanding service at Metropolitan for 26 years. His truly has been a life of dedicated service.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] and the distinguished majority leader and the minority whip.

We, the Members of the House of Representatives, are very fortunate indeed in having this distinguished Chaplain who each day does a very magnificent job and who is an inspiration to all of us.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma and those who have spoken concerning the ability and capabilities and kindnesses of the Chaplain.

I was one who was privileged to be present yesterday when Dr. Latch gave his final sermon after 26 years of service as pastor in the Metropolitan Memorial Church. I can only say that those who were present heard one of the finest sermons and farewell addresses ever made by a minister to his congregation. Dr. Latch possesses the talents which he so graciously and effectively uses in his services to man that he is destined to be one of the great House Chaplains of all time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman from Oklahoma took the well of the House this morning to make these remarks and accord to the rest of us the privilege of commenting on the services of Dr. Latch throughout his ministry with the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church.

I have been worshiping at Metropolitan for a goodly many years. Dr. Latch has been an inspiration in my life as well as in the lives of thousands of people in this area and in this country. He is a man of God. As a dedicated servant of the Lord, he has been of great ministerial service to the people of this area.

I regret to see Dr. Latch retire from Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church; but I am very happy that we will continue to benefit from his able and good work as Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the remarks which I made concerning the great sermon which our Chaplain, Edward G. Latch, D.D., gave

when he finished his outstanding service at Metropolitan Memorial Church, I include for the benefit of all, the sermon itself, with the hope that it will be enjoyed by the readers as much as we who heard it given:

In the Name of the Lord

(The farewell sermon of Edward G. Latch, D.D., on the occasion of his retirement after 26 years of ministry at the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Nebraska and New Mexico Avenues NW., Washington, D.C., June 4, 1967)

Well, at last it has come—my retirement after preaching in this pulpit for 26 years. I preached that first Sunday in June of 1941, with fear and trepidation. Today, I have no fear but a lot of trepidation.

I want to thank you for these years of fellowship and fun, of loyalty and love. You have been wonderfully good to us. If my heart speaks too loudly this hour, please forgive me.

Well, I've said that—now I want to preach.

When I was a young man—seventeen years of age—I delivered my first sermon in a little church in Hummelstown, Pennsylvania. My college roommate asked me to preach while he went somewhere else. I recall that day as though it were yesterday. I took for my text: *"Then David said to the Philistine—'you come unto me with a sword and with a spear and with a javelin; but I come unto you in the name of the lord of hosts'"*—I Samuel 17: 45).

That is all I remember about that sermon.

This story is one of the best known and most popular in the Bible. Since our early days we have heard about David and Goliath, and it is one of the favorite tales of the Old Testament. The Army of the Philistines was encamped on one hilltop, and across the valley was the Army of the Israelites. The Philistines had a mightly man of valor who came out every day and taunted the Israelites to send the champion against him. Whoever won the personal combat would decide the national issue, but Israel had no champion who could stand against this mighty giant encased in armor and carrying a spear.

Day followed day and the morale of the Israelites had an all-time low. Into this situation came the shepherd boy, David. His father sent him down from Bethlehem with food for three of his brothers who were fighting in the Army of Israel, and a gift to present to the Commander. He was to bring back news of the battle to his father. When David heard Goliath's taunt, he volunteered to go against him, but King Saul was reluctant to send him. Since there was no one else, the king agreed finally that he should go and outfitted him with his armor. The armor did not fit and David cast it aside. Picking up five stones from the brook he took his sling and went forth to meet the arrogant enemy.

Goliath was more amused than angry and cursed the shepherd lad. Then David replied:

"You come unto me with a sword and with a spear and with a javelin; but I come unto you in the name of the Lord of hosts."

Fitting a stone into his sling, he threw it at Goliath, pierced his forehead and killed him.

What I want you to think about for a little while is the great affirmation of David—"I come unto you in the name of the Lord."

This has been the keynote of my ministry. In the four churches that I have served, I have endeavored—all too imperfectly, to be sure—to make my people conscious of the presence of God. In other words: *I came in the name of the Lord.*

Four men were sitting in the locker room of a country club. They had just finished a game of golf to the delight of one and the disappointment of three. One man was especially despondent, and he had reason to be. He had met with business reversals, was confronting failure, and the outlook was altogether black. His friends, realizing the depth of his depression, had arranged this game to attempt to get his mind off his difficult situation. They hoped a few hours on the golf course might give him some relief. Now, he began to talk about his difficulty, and various suggestions were offered him. Finally, one of the men arose to leave. He, too, knew about difficulties and reversals because he had had many of them himself, but he had found an answer to his problem. He laid his hand on the shoulder of his friend and said:

"John, I hope you will not think I am preaching to you—really, I am not, but I would like to suggest something. It is the way I got through my difficulty. It really works if you work it. Why don't you try letting God have his way with you? Give yourself to Him and day by day endeavor to live with Him and let Him live with you. In this faith I found my way out, and by this same faith you can find your way out."

He patted his friend affectionately on the back and then left the room. The other three men sat mulling this over. Finally, the discouraged man said:

"I think I know what he means, and I wonder if he does not have something. I have tried everything else, and now I am going to try this. I am going to let God have His way with me. I will endeavor to live with His Presence in my heart."

This he did, and with the help of his friend and his minister, his own life was changed, and he became a happy and a most useful person. The secret was in his learning to live with God—to live in the name of the Lord.

This suggestion was very wise. There are many people today who are despondent and depressed, just not getting anywhere with themselves or with other people or with their work. They do not need to remain the way they are—really they do not. The secret of life—the secret of abundant living—the secret of a creative faith is to live with God. If they—and we—would only learn to do this, how much better and brighter life would become and how much better and brighter life would be for others.

There is a sense in which we cannot live without God. Although we may never think of him, we are nevertheless absolutely dependent upon Him. Who provides the air we breathe and without which we cannot exist? Who produces the conditions upon which life progresses upon this earth? Who causes the crops to grow, the sun to shine, the rain to fall? Who keeps the planets in their courses? Who creates and sustains this universe of law and order? It is not man but God—God the Father Almighty.

Politically, there may be two worlds—the East and West; actually there is but one world—God's world, and he is at work in every part of it—in the hearts of all people of all Nations. To those who have eyes that see, minds that think, and ears that hear, it is obvious that "someone is at work behind the scene." The universal desire for peace, the growing concern for backward people of the world, the awakening of conscience concerning man's relationship with men are evidences that God is at work.

And He is at work in every one of us. Every twinge of conscience, every feeling of shame and remose, every conviction of wrong within us is God at work in our hearts. Every pure and noble thought, every desire to do a good turn, every victory over evil is God at work within us.

Try as we will we cannot get away from God. The cry of the Psalmist can be echoed by many a man:

"Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? Whither shall I flee from Thy Presence? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold Thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea: even there shall Thy hand meet me and Thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, surely the darkness shall cover me: even the night shall be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from Thee; but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to Thee."

God is with us, and we are absolutely dependent upon Him: We cannot live without God.

But there is a sense in which it is possible for us to live without God. It is possible to believe in the existence of a supreme being and not to make Him supreme in our own being. To live without prayer or worship or Bible reading or Holy Communion is to ignore God.

It is possible for a man to live his life from beginning to end without any conscious reference to the Almighty. All too many do. They go through life, from the cradle to the grave, with scarcely a thought about God. They have longings, yearnings, hopes and fears, but they battle their way through, never looking for the comfort and the strength and the insight which a living faith in the Almighty gives.

Sometimes when things are tough, they may try to pray, but at ordinary times they do not feel the need of prayer. They have never formed the habit of turning to God for help and guidance along the way. They never confess their sins and accept His forgiveness.

Sometimes they wish they were stronger and better, but they never relate themselves to God to become stronger and better. They are just living their lives without the sense of His Presence.

Why do we have so many differences and disagreements in the family circle? Why are men beaten down by alcohol? Why has gambling a fever-hold upon so many? Why do men and women play fast and loose with sex? Why are people proud, jealous, filled with resentment and hatred and ill-will? Is it not because men are living without the sense of the Presence of God? They are adrift from Him, and this is the reason why the world is in such a sorry plight today. If we keep on going as many people are now going, only doom and destruction await us. Well might we fear the atomic and the hydrogen bombs when we do not live with God.

God comes into our world, but our world neglects him and rejects Him, and if we keep on neglecting Him and rejecting Him, we shall suffer the consequences. We need to know that we belong to God and that life will not work without His guidance. We are made for Him and we cannot live our true lives apart from Him. *"Thou hast made us for Thyself and our hearts are restless until they find rest in Thee."* All the discontent and dissatisfaction we feel within us is God calling us home to Himself, and He will go on disturbing us until we come back to Him.

So there is a sense in which we cannot live without God; there is a sense in which we can live without Him. But there is also a sense in which it is possible for us to live consciously and confidentially with Him.

There is no more joyful experience in all the world than to know that you are at home with God, and that each day you are deliberately and definitely letting Him come into every part of your life. There is no more satisfying experience than to know Him personally—not as an idea, but as a person, as the Companion of your way. You may not always be conscious of "someone standing there," but you will be aware of something taking place in your life which lifts you up to higher levels of living.

There is a story of a little boy named Davy, who lived in Scotland. He could not see the trees and the flowers and the birds because he was blind. But he loved fun and he had a kite. One day two men from the city were walking past the home where Davy lived. As they were walking by, they saw, in a distance, a boy's kite, and there was Davy holding it at the other end. "But, why Lad," said one, "what's the good of your having a kite you cannot see." Then Davy, his face wreathed with happiness, gave you a very good answer: "No, sir, but I like to feel the pull."

Like Davy, you and I may not be able to see God, but we can so live with Him that we can know by the wonderful, warm tug in our hearts that He is real. There is all the difference in the world between people who try to live without God and those who strive to live with Him. That difference is quality—a quality of life.

For one thing, there is a new sense of purpose. It was H. G. Wells who said: "Religion is the first thing and the last thing. And if a man has no religion, he begins nowhere and ends nowhere."

There are too many people who are wandering aimlessly through life. They have no goal, no cause to which they give themselves completely, no dominating ideal which lifts them up. They give no reason for their being here on earth. As J. B. Phillips says: "So often they are waiting for something—waiting for the children to grow up, waiting until their ship comes in, waiting until they get more money, waiting until they can buy a cadillac, waiting for the time when they can retire. Waiting, waiting, waiting—but so often doing little good now." They do not have the sense of a purpose bigger and greater than themselves. Many of them are nice people, but if you ask them, "What are you living for?" They wonder and usually give you rather hazy answers. They can tell you where they live, whom they live with, but they cannot tell you what they live for. When people have nothing to live for, they become bored with life and boredom is a deadly disease. God has a plan for our lives and the real adventure of being alive is to find that plan and to achieve it.

A woman who had a vital experience of the Presence of God which sustains and strengthens her, told of a time when life went to pieces. She lost her husband and was left with a young child. One trouble followed another and she went down, down, down; and under the strain of it all suffered a nervous collapse. Looking back over that time, she said: "I do not know that I lost my faith, but I did lose my way." Then she turned to God and giving her whole attention to Him, she found a new life and a new purpose.

Living with God, we also have a new sense of power. Something greater than ourselves holds us up and keeps us up. A minister tells this story about himself—and what I am saying this morning is as true for ministers as it is for laymen. He was called to a large church in a university community. He wanted to justify the confidence placed in him and he worked very hard and began to feel the results of strain and stress. One day he called on one of the professors, a real friend of his. When this friend was not teaching, he would be out on a lake fishing—so the two went fishing. "But, what's the matter, son?" he asked with understanding, and the minister told him how hard he was trying and that it was getting him down. "I have no feeling of lift or power." The professor chuckled, "Maybe you're trying too hard." When they came ashore he invited him back to his house. Then he said: "Lie down on the couch. I want to read you something. Shut your eyes and relax while I find the quotation." The minister did as directed and thought he was going to hear some philosophical treatise, but instead his friend said: "Here it is—listen quietly while I read it to you and let these words sink in: 'Hast thou not known? Hast thou not heard that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? There is no searching of his understanding. He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might he increaseth strength. Even the youth shall faint and be weary and the young men shall utterly fall. But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength, etc. Do you know what I'm reading?" The minister replied: "The 40th chapter of Isaiah." "I am glad you know your Bible," his friend said, "why don't you practice it? Now, relax, take three deep breaths, in and out slowly. Practice resting yourself in God, practice depending upon Him for your support and power, believe He is giving it to you now and do not get out of touch with the power. Yield yourself to Him and let His power flow through you." Then he repeated the passage: "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength."

The minister said he never forgot the experience nor did he ever forget the experience of the new sense of power which came to him as he lived with the sense of the Presence of God in his heart.

So can we. We, too can live with power, power to triumph over our troubles; power to conquer our temptations: power to comfort us in sorrow. When a man lives with God, it may not make him exempt from sickness or accidents or pain or bereavement, but it does mean that when trouble comes, he has an altogether adequate resource with which to meet it.

A student said he always liked to be at chapel when a certain man was preaching. Said he: "He stands up there with quiet confidence like a man who holds four aces in his hand. He is unconquerable." As Paul says: "We are more than conquerors through Him." And when we finally face death itself, we can say: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me." The man who lives with God—in the name of the Lord—has not only a real purpose for living, he also has a real power for life.

A man living with God also takes a positive and constructive attitude toward his problems and toward people. In a world filled with suspicion and hatred and fear, the man who lives with God is confident that God is here working for good in the hearts of those who believe in Him. He believes that this is God's world and he is sure that though God's purposes may sometimes be delayed because of man's folly and wickedness, they can never be finally defeated. He has a message of hope for a world without hope. His message brings confidence to men and women who despair of themselves, for he says to them: "I know someone, someone greater than you and me, someone who has helped me to conquer trouble and temptation, and I know He can help you."

A man and his wife, in real trouble, came to see their minister. The man had had two heart attacks and his wife seemed to be in a steady decline. The question put to the minister was this—"Can I get hold of some power that can help us recover ourselves and give us new hope?" The minister said it could be done and he gave them a simple prescription: They were to read the New Testament and the Psalms until their minds were saturated with the spirit there found. They were to commit certain affirmations to memory. Above all, they were to put their lives completely in the hands of God, believing that God was with them, that God was filling them with power and that He was guiding them even in the most commonplace details of everyday life. They were to picture the healing power of the great physician making them well.

And next spring the wife said: "I have never experienced a more wonderful springtime. The flowers this year are lovelier than ever. The leaves seem greener and I have never heard the birds sing with such melody. She gradually improved and regained much of her old-time strength.

As for the husband—there has been no more heart trouble. Physical, mental and spiritual vigor mark him as being extraordinarily vital. They moved into a new community and have become the center of its life and wherever they touch people they do it with a strange, uplifting force. What was the secret? To live with God and to let God have his way with them—in other words, to live in the name of the Lord.

How can we live confidentially with God? First, take out of your life everything that meets with God's disapproval. Face up to yourself—deliberately, thoughtfully, unflinchingly. This will be the hardest thing that you have ever done because not one of us wants to be fully known, even to ourselves. Ask yourself—is there any dishonesty in my life? Any impurity? any hatred? any bitterness? any evil? If so, remove it by saying in place of dishonesty there will be honesty; in place of impurity, purity; in place of hatred, love; in place of bitterness, sweetness; in place of evil, good.

Change the center of your life from self to God. Then yield yourself to God. Give yourself, surrender yourself to Him and let Him fill your life with health and happiness, peace and power. Toscanini was once preparing the New York Symphony Orchestra for a concert. They were playing Beethoven's Eighth Symphony. The conductor was not at all pleased with their performance and made them play it over and over and over again. Finally, he silenced them and after a long pause said: "Who am I? I am nothing. Who are you? You are nothing, but Beethoven; he is everything."

Likewise, in the presence of God, a man may say—"Who am I? I am nothing. Who are you? You are nothing. But Almighty God? He is everything."

Yield yourself to Him and finally go out to live with Him. You and God together, partners in the glorious adventure of remaking the world. Every minute of every hour of every day, learn to live with Him and henceforth be one of the glorious companions of those who live with God. And a new sense of purpose and power and a new positive attitude toward life will be yours. You will have discovered the secret of creative happiness.

One of the young girls of the church asked me last Sunday what I was going to say in my farewell sermon. When I replied I did not know, she said: "Say something that will last me the rest of my life."

This then is my closing word to you: Live with God. Let God live in your life. May God bless every one of you and keep you always.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members wishing to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EQUAL TIME TO ANTISMOKERS

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to read over the weekend that the Federal Communications Commission has held that radio and television stations which carry cigarette advertising must now provide significant "equal time" to antismokers. This can only be construed to mean they must provide free public service time if necessary.

This ruling constitutes a shocking abuse of power which strikes at the very heart of the advertising industry, the tobacco industry, and our free enterprise system.

It is difficult indeed to comprehend how the fairness doctrine, which has always been questionable at best, can be construed as it has been here, as applicable to paid advertising.

MEMBERS JOURNEY TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish the Record of today's proceedings to show that Mr. Ichord, of Missouri; Mr. Speedy Long, of Louisiana; and Mr. Bray, of Indiana, will be out of the city on official business for the Committee on Armed Services until June 16.

At the specific direction of the chairman of the committee they have journeyed to South Vietnam to conduct an investigation of the M-16 rifle.

THE NEAR EAST SITUATION

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, we stand at a decisive moment in history as the very existence of the democracy of Israel is threatened by her enemies.

It should be unmistakably clear that today's fighting did not arise from any misunderstanding but is part and parcel of a continuing pattern of aggression which has persisted throughout Israel's 20-year history.

Nasser's determination to destroy Israel has brought us to the critical situation which confronts us today in the Middle East.

Not only is Israel under attack, but the United Nations is under attack; for Israel was created by the United Nations. Egypt's demand for the withdrawal of U.N. troops from the border in the Sinai Peninsula and from Sharm El Sheik at the Strait of Tiran raises a very serious challenge as to the purpose and the future of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has reaffirmed our commitment to Israel and to stand by her in this crisis. Today, I understand, the President is supporting a cease-fire through the United Nations. This is urgent. It will require the support of the Soviet Union, which has dangerously encouraged Nasser to embark upon this very precarious path of aggression.

Every effort must be made to achieve a cease-fire.

I also want to give strong support to the idea of a four-power conference between the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and France, to guarantee the territorial integrity of Israel and also to guarantee the right of free and innocent passage through international waterways, specifically through the Strait of Tiran.

British Prime Minister Harold Wilson said, "Time is emphatically not on our side."

Mr. Speaker, if diplomacy does not work, if the cease-fire is not achieved, and promptly, it is incumbent upon the United States to honor its commitment embodied in the Tripartite Declaration and in the statements of four Presidents and to do whatever is necessary to protect Israel in this hour of crisis.

WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, It was with a heavy heart that I heard on the air this morning that war had broken out in the Middle East. I do not think it matters very much whether a column of Egyptians were seen approaching Israel in the desert or whether Israel fired the first shot. To me it seemed that war was inevitable when the Strait of Tiran was closed and the status quo was being permitted to harden, depriving Israel of its lifeline to the Red Sea, Asia, and Africa.

The U.N., I fear, is at this time handcuffed by the Soviet veto.

It should be remembered that Israel represents the American presence in the Middle East. The question now presents itself whether domination is to be taken over the area by an outside power that has made a career of causing difficulty to the Western world.

I am certain that the commitments to this little nation of 2½ million people will not be forgotten; that this little nation built from the ashes of 6 million people whose only crime it was that they were born Jewish will not find itself friendless at the moment of its travail. I fully believe that this great Nation will at this difficult time, remember Israel which was born while the American flag was waving overhead.

REVIVALTIME CHOIR FROM SPRINGFIELD, MO.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in these troublous times, it is indeed a privilege to invite all Members and guests to appear on the House steps, through courtesy of arrangements properly made through the Speaker, to hear the Revivaltime Choir at 1:30 p.m. this afternoon. I would hope the Members can step out and hear this a capella group which emanates from the Assemblies of God denomination, which has its international headquarters in my hometown of Springfield. Mr. Lee Shultz is the national secretary of radio. This program is heard weekly on the "Revivaltime" broadcast produced in Missouri. This appearance heralds the beginning of many stops on a 30-day tour this summer. The Reverend Jack Risner is the field representative, and Mr. Cyril McLellan is the choir director. I hope that as many of my colleagues as can be spared from their duties will step out and hear this a capella choir this afternoon.

DISTRICT COMMITTEE IS LOGICAL FORUM FOR REORGANIZATION

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the President sent to Congress his plan for the reorganization of the District of Columbia government. In doing so he has chosen to follow the procedure of the Reorganization Act of 1949 which gives limited authority to the President for the reorganization of executive agencies of the Government. Under the Reorganization Act procedure, proposals submitted by the President are referred to the jurisdiction of the House and Senate Government Operations Committees and so the President's District reorganization plan would not be referred to the District of Columbia Committees for consideration.

Today, I am introducing as a bill the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967 for one reason and one reason alone—for the specific purpose of bringing before the District of Columbia Committee the recommendations of the executive branch. The District Committees of the House and Senate are the logical forums for reviewing any such substantial proposals affecting the government of our Nation's Capital.

Moreover, unless the President's proposal is considered as legislation, Congress will have no opportunity to amend or improve the plan. Congress is left in the position of swallowing the plan whole or rejecting it entirely.

I have served on the House District of Columbia Committee for 8 years and at no time during that period has the Executive presented our committee with any proposal for the reorganization of the District government. Had any been submitted, I can say that the committee would have given it every consideration in an effort to contribute to the efficiency of the administration of government in the District of Columbia.

No one will question the need for reorganization of the District government looking toward more centralized planning, the fixing of executive responsibility and the avoidance of needless and wasteful duplication. I am in no position to judge whether the President's proposed reorganization plan will necessarily accomplish these objectives in the best possible manner. That question can be resolved only after a study in depth by the committee which is charged with the responsibility of advising the House on matters pertaining to the government of the District of Columbia.

We might well question the advisability of using the Reorganization Act procedure to effect such a substantial change in the structure of the District of Columbia government, and we might even question the legality of such an approach under the Reorganization Act itself. In the past I have been critical of the manner in which this entire matter was handled by the White House. But all I am seeking to do today by the introduction of this proposal is to give our Committee on the District of Columbia the opportunity to study at first hand the provisions and implications of the President's proposal.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the tragic conflict now underway in the Middle East proceeds, it is essential that we keep two basic facts in mind.

First, for all these years Israel wanted nothing more than to be left alone. The Arab States, as they have constantly stated, wanted the destruction of Israel. The Arab States are thus self-proclaimed aggressors.

Second, Nasser brought on the present crisis by his demand for the withdrawal of U.N. troops and by his proclamation of an illegal blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, an international waterway.

It would be a mistake for us now to get caught up in an argument about who started the shooting this morning. If a bandit openly threatens to destroy your family and your home, you may not want to wait for the bandit to fire the first shot.

Israel was our protege and is our friend. Israel is the victim of clear aggression. The United States must act accordingly.

I trust that the President will extend to Israel whatever assistance may be necessary and that the Congress will fully support the President in so doing.

Some of us may want to do something immediate and tangible to express our support for Israel; for example, by giving blood.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the House physician be asked to make arrangements for this as soon as possible, to accommodate Members and staff who may be so inclined.

TO REVISE THE QUOTA CONTROL SYSTEM ON THE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a little over 2 months ago, many Members of this body, myself included, raised a protest over the treatment of America's dairymen by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It would appear that, by painfully slow steps, the desperate situation faced by our dairymen because of prejudiced administration of import controls is beginning to ease.

But the farmer in this great Nation is still a long way from enjoying the traditional American right of unencumbered participation in the free enterprise system. We should not and cannot expect an overnight transition from heavy-handed Government control to complete free-swinging independence from restrictions. Some Federal participation may be necessary in the national interest.

But another example of inequitable treatment of farmers by the present administration has become boldly apparent. I refer to the handling of import controls on meat and meat products.

At a time when the American farmer faces serious economic challenges, the Meat Import Act of 1964—Public Law 88-482—is entirely ineffective in any real relief for meat producers in this country.

When net beef imports in the year 1966 are totaled, including those which are not covered in the law, they amount to almost 10 percent of the total U.S. commercial beef production. And for the first 3 months of 1967, beef imports were 23 percent greater than the comparable period for 1966. There has been a steady increase in canned, cooked, and cured beef imports in this same period.

I have today introduced a bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products. This is the same measure that has attracted wide support in both Houses of Congress because it is a step in the direction of strength for the meat-producing sector of our economy.

I urge the House Ways and Means Committee, whose esteemed chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, WILBUR MILLS, is one of many sponsors of this legislation, to place consideration of this problem high on its agenda, and I urge the support of all Members of Congress for an equitable policy on the importation of meat and meat products.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

RATES OF TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL BY VESSEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3979) to amend section 6409(b)(1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3979

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (1) of section 6409(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "may pay compensation not to exceed 80 cents a pound for letters, post cards and postal cards, and 8 cents a pound for other articles" and inserting in lieu thereof "may be compensated at rates fixed by the Postmaster General".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That paragraph (1) of section 6409(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'may pay compensation not to exceed eighty cents a pound for letters, post cards and postal cards, and eight cents a pound for other articles' and inserting in lieu thereof 'may pay compensation at rates fixed by him'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge a unanimous vote in favor of H.R. 3979, a bill which I introduced to correct an inequitable situation relating to the rates of compensation that may be paid for transportation of mail on vessels of U.S. registry.

It is somewhat surprising, but true, that for 40 years there has been no change in the ceiling placed by statute upon what the Post Office Department may pay U.S.-flag vessels for the transportation of international mail. The law provides a limit of 80 cents a pound for letter mail and 8 cents a pound for other mail. This statute recognized the two classes of mail which existed in the Universal Postal Union at the time of its enactment.

The statutory maximum was most generous, being based upon the concept of paying U.S.-flag vessels up to the entire amount collected for postage, and it was a common practice of many postal administrations to authorize payment of the maximum.

However, the statute was made obsolete in 1954 when the Universal Postal Union created a single class of mail for the settlement of accounts for maritime transit. The immediate effect of a single classification was to lower the statutory maximum from 80 cents to 8 cents a pound, the limit for mail other than letters, as such mail now was included in the single classification. What had once been an extremely generous law had therefore become restrictively unfair.

Moreover, this reduction in payments to vessels of U.S. registry has never been adjusted to help meet the rising costs in the shipping industry.

The situation now borders on the intolerable as a result of the most recent Universal Postal Union Convention which made effective on January 1, 1966, a much higher scale of rates for the settlement of maritime postal transportation accounts. These rates exceed by as much as 37 percent those which are paid by our Post Office Department to U.S.-flag vessels.

The measure on the floor is intended to correct the inequitable situation under which U.S.-flag vessels are presently carrying mail. It is my understanding that many American vessels, particularly those which ply along the extensive routes in the Pacific, are carrying mail at a loss.

H.R. 3979 does not purport to establish a mandatory rate schedule of compensation for transportation of mail by vessels of U.S. registry. The bill merely provides that U.S. vessels may be compensated at rates fixed by the Postmaster General, leaving the matter of determining mail rates for maritime services to his sound judgment. It is my understanding that the Post Office Department has no objection to the elimination of the present statutory rate ceilings and the substitution therefor of the language which is found in the proposed legislation.

During the hearings, the Post Office Department witnesses testified that they were hopeful that the overall cost of transporting mail by U.S. vessels would not be increased by the enactment of this measure. They pointed out that, while it is reasonable to anticipate that some long-haul rates would be increased, it is their view that there would be an offsetting reduction in some short-haul rates.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is deserving of our full support. I urge a unanimous vote for its passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE REAPPOINTMENT OF JEROME C. HUNSAKER AS CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 58) to provide for the reappointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 58

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by the expiration of the term of Jerome C. Hunsaker, of Boston, Massachusetts, on March 29, 1967, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 58 reappoints Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution is composed of the Vice President, the Chief Justice, three Senators, three Members of the House, and six other persons other than Members of Congress. The law provides that appointments of the six citizen regents shall be by joint resolution to serve a 6-year term. Regents receive no salary or compensation, but are paid actual expenses in attending Board meetings.

Dr. Hunsaker was first appointed to the Board of Regents in 1949 and has served three consecutive terms. His appointment expired on March 29, 1967. His reappointment for a fourth term is unopposed and has the support of both the Senate and House Members of the Board of Regents, and officials of the Smithsonian Institution.

Dr. Hunsaker's background eminently qualifies him for membership on the Board of Regents. He has been associated with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; a director of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.; former chief of aircraft design in the U.S. Navy; former vice president of Bell Telephone Laboratories and Goodyear-Zeppelin Corp.; founder and first president of the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences; chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and a participant in numerous other noteworthy and meritorious activities as set forth in the report No. 264 accompanying this joint resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the resolution will be unanimously approved.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VILLAGE OF BROOKLYN CENTER, MINN.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4496) for the relief of the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4496

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the village of Brooklyn Center, Minnesota, the sum of $2,036.62. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the village of Brooklyn Center, Minnesota, against the United States for reimbursement for one-half of the cost of certain civil defense alerting monitors and tone signaling equipment which were purchased by the village during the year 1963 in reliance on an assurance by civil defense officials that such reimbursement would be made. No part of this amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL PROPERTY CLAIMS BY EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8140) to provide for the settlement of claims against the District of Columbia by officers and employees of the District of Columbia for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8140

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of the Act entitled "Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964", approved August 31, 1964 (18 Stat. 767; 31 U.S.C.A. 240–242), including amendments thereof made before, on, or after the effective date of this Act, shall apply in respect to the damage to, or loss of, personal property occurring on or after the effective date of this Act and incident to service of any officer or employee in or under the government of the District of Columbia, irrespective of whether the damage or loss occurs within or outside the District of Columbia, except that in applying such provisions the terms "agency" and "United States" shall be held to mean the government of the District of Columbia, and the term "head of agency" shall be held to mean the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 3 of the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, as amended (78 Stat. 767; 31 U.S.C. 240–242, as amended) is amended by the addition of the following subsection: '(f) The provisions of this Act apply in respect to the damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to service of any officer or employee of the government of the District of Columbia, irrespective of whether the damage or loss occurs within or outside the District of Columbia, except that in applying such provisions in connection with the damage or loss of personal property of an officer or employee of the government of the District of Columbia, the term 'agency' and 'United States' shall be held to mean the government of the District of Columbia, and the term 'head of agency' shall be held to mean the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING LONG-TERM LEASING FOR THE GILA RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2154) to provide long-term leasing for the Gila River Indian Reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask someone the question of whether this will in any way change the term of the grazing leases?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. It is a change in the term of leases authorizing long-term leasing of land.

Mr. GROSS. This would provide for 99-year leases?

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Under those circumstances, why is the 10-year grazing lease provision not increased? I am curious. I make no issue of it.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. This would permit, if it is so desired, for any contract or any lease agreement to be changed in accordance with the demands of the present period. What this legislation is supposed to take care of, however, is an industrial complex or business undertaking that may be possible on an Indian reservation. If it would be to the advantage of the Indians to enter into longer leases, they could do so, but a 40- or 50- or 25-year grazing lease, for that matter, is usually the extent that anybody would want to enter into a lease of that kind.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2154, introduced by our colleague from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], is a bill to authorize long-term leasing of lands of the Gila River Indian Reservation.

Present law permits Indian reservation lands to be leased for various purposes for terms of 25 years with an option to renew for not to exceed an additional 25 years. In many instances, this leasing authority is adequate; however, in some cases the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have been persuaded to recommend enactment of legislation authorizing leases for a term of 99 years. To date, the Congress has enacted legislation extending such authority to nine reservations.

The Gila River Indian Reservation is located just south of the city of Phoenix. Because of its proximity to this rapidly expanding city and because the reservation will be crossed by a new interstate highway, its lands are a substantial tribal asset. For the benefit of the members of the tribe, every effort should be made to encourage development of reservation lands. Under existing authority substantial developments are unlikely because of current minimum legal requirements for construction and development loans for lessees. Authority for longer term leases would permit flexibility to meet these circumstances when they arise.

Mr. Speaker, the testimony before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs indicated that the Gila River Indians are making every effort to improve their economic well-being. The tribe has developed a challenging self-improvement program which, it is hoped, will be advanced if legislation authorizing 99-year leases is enacted. In all likelihood, in this location, substantial developments could result which should provide new employment opportunities and a better standard of living for the members of the tribe. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to recommend H.R. 2154 to the Members of the House and I urge its enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2154

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539), as amended, is hereby amended as follows: After the words "Pyramid Lake Reservation," insert the words "the Gila River Reservation,".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN LANDS ON THE HUALAPAI RESERVATION, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4919) to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Hualapai Reservation in Arizona.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4919

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 1 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539), as amended (25 U.S.C. 415), is hereby further amended by inserting the words "the Hualapai Reservation," after the words "the Fort Mojave Reservation,".

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill which we now have before us (H.R. 4919) is not controversial. It is simply a bill which would add the Hualapai Indian Reservation of Arizona to the list of Indian reservations authorized to negotiate leases for terms up to 99 years.

H.R. 4919 was introduced by our colleague from Arizona [Mr. STEIGER] who represents the people of this area. He advised the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs that there are pending lease proposals which would be beneficial to the Hualapai Tribe; however, final arrangements are contingent upon leasing authority for a term longer than the present maximum term of 50 years.

There are several reasons why longer term leases are sometimes necessary. It is understandable that a person making a substantial investment in development of lands would want a lease of reasonable duration to protect his investment. It is, also, understandable why a tribe would desire to have a reasonable degree of flexibility in negotiating long-term leases for reservation lands, because such flexibility provides the tribe with a means to compete for developments with non-Indian lands for which fee title is generally available. But the most important reason for 99-year leasing authority is that the 50-year term is generally inadequate because necessary financing is often unavailable under current minimum legal requirements.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4919 will do for the Hualapai Reservation what the Congress has already done for nine other tribal reservations. The rate of unemployment on this particular reservation is extremely high and the average annual per capita income is desperately low. Hopefully, the authority to negotiate leases up to 99 years will attract developments which will afford the residents of this reservation an opportunity to upgrade their economy. I want to recommend H.R. 4919 to my colleagues and I urge its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, YORKTOWN, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7362) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain properties within the Colonial National Historical Park, in Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 7362

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to permit acquisition of the Thomas Nelson House, the Edmund Smith House, the John Ballard House, and the Thomas Pate House, all of which are located within the boundaries of the Colonial National Historical Park on lots numbered 42A, 44 through 55, 84, 85, and 120 through 129, and known as the George Waller Blow Estate, the appropriation authorization in section 4 of the Act of July 3, 1930, as amended (46 Stat. 1490), is amended by deleting "$2,000,000" and substituting "$2,777,000".

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7362 is a bill to amend existing legislation with regard to the Colonial National Historical Park. The bill would have the effect of raising the amount authorized to be appropriated from $2 million to $2,777,000.

This area, which was originally authorized in 1930 as Colonial National Monument, has received congressional attention on previous occasions. The first, in 1931, increased the amount authorized to be appropriated from $500,000 to $2,000,000. Another one, in 1936, redesignated the area as a national historic park.

Of the $2 million authorized to be appropriated at the present time, we are advised that $1,551,188 has been appropriated and that the remaining $448,812 is programed for acquisition of certain inholdings.

Over the years, considerable progress has been made toward acquiring Yorktown lands for the historical park. Enactment of H.R. 7362, which would increase the existing appropriation ceiling by $777,000, would enable the Park Service to acquire the George Waller Blow Estate. With this acquisition, all of the 1,452-foot frontage on the east side of Main Street would be publicly owned and over 50 percent of the frontage on the west side would be in public ownership. Only one small lot on the waterfront would remain unacquired.

The Blow property is recognized as "one of the most historically significant holdings" relating to the historic park. It includes nine buildings—four of which are of considerable historic value. They are:

First. The "Scotch Tom" Nelson House, which was built in the 1730's, is the only remaining grand townhouse of the period in Yorktown. Built by "Scotch Tom" Nelson, it was the home of his son, Thomas Nelson, who was the wartime Governor of Virginia, the commander of the Virginia militia, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence. The house, it is believed, was used by Cornwallis as his headquarters in the closing days of the siege of 1781.

Second. The Edmund Smith House, known to have been built in 1750, is adjacent to the Nelson House and was the home of Nelson's Lieutenant Governor, David Jameson.

Third. The John Ballard House is one of two remaining colonial frame houses in Yorktown. In 1744, it was the home of a prominent merchant, Captain John Ballard.

Fourth. The Thomas Pate House, a small brick cottage mentioned as early as 1703 in correspondence, was the home of Cole Diggs, another merchant.

These properties, which were acquired by George Waller Blow around 1900 and restored under the direction of noted Philadelphia architects, are in excellent condition. Failure to include them as an integral part of the national historical park would seriously impair the preservation effort being made by the Park Service. As Mr. Carlisle H. Humelsine, chairman of the American Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission stated:

> Without this purchase I don't believe it will be possible ever to have a really outstanding historical park. The Blow properties represent the heart of Yorktown, and commercial development of this area would be a body blow to the entire Yorktown effort.

The owners of these properties are willing sellers, Mr. Speaker. They have given the United States an option, which expires on August 31, 1967, to purchase these historical properties at the Government-appraised price. The Nation owes this family a debt of gratitude for preserving these invaluable, irreplaceable monuments of our heritage and for unselfishly affording us this opportunity to acquire them.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the siege of Yorktown in 1781 was one of the most important battles of the Revolutionary War. It was here that the allied armies, commanded by General Washington, inflicted such severe damages on the British forces that their commander was forced to surrender. This decisive victory settled the question of our national independence. It is highly fitting and proper that we should seize upon this opportunity to preserve these properties associated with our Revolutionary War history for the benefit of this and future generations.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUNDS OF THE UPPER AND LOWER CHEHALIS TRIBES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 678) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 678

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a roll of all persons who meet the following requirements for eligibility: (a) They were alive on the date of this Act, and (b) they are descendants of members of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes as they existed in 1855. Applications for enrollment must be filed with the area director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Portland, Oregon, on forms prescribed for that purpose. The determination of the Secretary regarding the utilization of available rolls or records and the eligibility for enrollment of an applicant shall be final.

SEC. 2. After the deduction of attorney fees, litigation expenses, the costs of roll preparation, and such sums as may be required to distribute individual shares, the funds, including interest, remaining to the credit of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes, which were appropriated by the Act of June 9, 1964 (78 Stat. 213), shall be distributed in equal shares to those persons whose names appear on the roll prepared in accordance with section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 3. Sums payable to enrollees or to their heirs or legatees who are less than twenty-one years of age or who are under a legal disability shall be paid to the persons whom the Secretary determines will best protect their interests. Proportional shares of heirs or legatees amounting to $5 or less shall not be distributed, and shall escheat to the United States. In the event that the sum of money reserved by the Secretary to pay the costs of distributing the individual shares exceeds the amount actually necessary to accomplish this purpose, the money remaining shall also be distributed per capita unless individual shares would have a value of less than $5. In this event the total sum remaining after initial distribution shall escheat to the United States.

SEC. 4. The funds distributed under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out "area director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Portland, Oregon," and insert "Superintendent, Western Washington Agency, Everett, Washington,".

On page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "shall be paid to the persons whom the Secretary determines will best protect their interests." and insert "shall be held in trust by the Superintendent, Western Washington Agency, until such minor becomes of age or disability ceases.".

On page 2, lines 23 and 24, strike out "In this event the total sum remaining after initial distribution shall escheat to the United States." and insert "individual shares or proportional shares of heirs or legatees amounting to $5 or less shall not be distributed, but shall escheat to the United States.".

On page 3, line 5, strike out "this Act." and insert "this Act, including appropriate deadline for filing enrollment applications.".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGE IN NAME OF CERTAIN WATER RESOURCE PROJECTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1649) authorizing the change in name of certain water resource projects under jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1649

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the names of the following locks and dams, reservoirs, and other navigation and flood control facilities under jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, are hereby changed as follows:

the Bluestone Dam and Reservoir, New River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938, to the "Bluestone Lake";

the Sutton Dam and Reservoir, Elk Creek, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, to the "Sutton Lake";

the Tygart Dam and Reservoir, Tygart River, West Virginia, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1935, to the "Tygart Lake";

the East Lynn Dam and Reservoir, East Fork of Twelvepole Creek, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, to the "East Lynn Lake";

the Summersville Dam and Reservoir, Gauley River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, to the "Summersville Lake";

the Burnsville Dam and Reservoir, Little Kanawha River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, to the "Burnsville Lake";

the Birch Dam and Reservoir, Elk River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, to the "Birch Lake";

Steer Creek Dam and Reservoir, Steer Creek, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, to the "Steer Creek Lake";

the West Fork Dam and Reservoir, Little Kanawha River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, to the "West Fork Lake";

the Beech Fork Dam and Reservoir, Twelvepole Creek, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, to the "Beech Fork Lake";

the R. D. Bailey Dam and Reservoir, Guyandot River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, to the "R. D. Bailey Lake";

the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood

Control Act of 1965, to the "Rowlesburg Lake";

the Panther Creek Dam and Reservoir, Panther Creek, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1965, to the "Panther Creek Lake";

the Stonewall Jackson Dam and Reservoir, West Fork River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1966, to the "Stonewall Jackson Lake";

the pumping plant authorized to be constructed by the Flood Control Act of 1950 on the Saint Francis River, Arkansas, southeast of Marianna, Arkansas, to the "W. G. Huxtable Pumping Plant";

the ship channel from the San Francisco Bar Channel through the San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun Bays to the downstream terminus of the Stockton Deep Water Channel, to the "John F. Baldwin Ship Channel";

the navigation lock and water control structure known as structure 79 of the central and southern Florida flood control project located on the Caloosahatchee River in the State of Florida, to the "W. P. Franklin Lock and Control Structure";

the dam, commonly referred to as Garrison Dam, located on the Missouri River in North Dakota, is hereby officially designated as "Garrison Dam"; and

the reservoir, known as Garrison Reservoir or Garrison Lake, located above Garrison Dam to "Lake Sakakawea."

SEC. 2. Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which any such lock and dam, reservoir, or other navigation and flood control facility is referred to by its former name shall be held to refer to such lock and dam, reservoir, or other navigation and flood control facility by the name designated herein.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 4, line 7, strike out "and".

On page 4, strike out line 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Sakakawea";

"the Dam B and Reservoir on Neches River, Texas, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1945, to the 'Town Bluff Dam' and 'B. A. Steinhagen Lake', respectively;

"the Blanchard Dam on Bald Eagle Creek, Pennsylvania, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1954, to the 'Foster Joseph Sayers Dam";

"the Port Hueneme Small Craft Harbor, California, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954, to the 'Channel Islands Harbor';

"the Buck Creek Dam and Reservoir, Springfield, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, to the 'Clarence J. Brown Dam and Reservoir'; and

"the Lock and Dam 14, Arkansas River, Oklahoma, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1946, to the 'W. D. Mayo Lock and Dam'."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am highly pleased that the House has amended S. 1649 to add to that bill the designation of lock and dam No. 14, on the Arkansas River in Oklahoma, to be known in the future as "W. D. Mayo lock and dam."

This action, if accepted by the other body and signed by the President, will give Federal agreement to the name placed on this great structure by the Oklahoma Legislature last February, when it unanimously approved Senate Concurrent Resolution 6.

It also gives much deserved recognition to a great pioneering Oklahoma civic leader who was one of the early champions of Arkansas River development and navigation.

I believe it is especially appropriate that the first lock and dam on the Arkansas channel as you enter Oklahoma from Arkansas should be named for a gallant pioneer who shared the early dream of full river development, and worked to make that dream a reality.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOANS TO CERTAIN OFFICERS OF MEMBER BANKS AND FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9682) to amend section 22(g) of the Federal Reserve Act relating to loans to executive officers by member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the loan provisions relating to directors, members of the supervisory committee, and members of the credit committee of Federal credit unions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to remind the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. PATMAN] that the report that accompanies this bill does not indicate the views of the various departments. The departmental views are not printed in the report on the bill. It gives a list of various people who testified on the bill, but it does not indicate how they expressed themselves nor does it give the views of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, it would be helpful to the official objectors and to those who are trying to evaluate legislation if committees would furnish to us in the committee reports on the various bills, printed in full the letters from the various departments and agencies affected by the legislation in question.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I am sorry that they left that out of this report on this particular piece of legislation. However, I have them here and shall be happy to make them available to all Members. They, unfortunately, were received after the report was filed.

Mr. PELLY. I feel it would be helpful from the standpoint of consideration of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Texas if these reports are all favorable.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Washington will yield further, the reports are available and I can assure the gentleman from Washington that the Bureau of the Budget has endorsed this legislation. The reports from the Federal Reserve Board and Federal Bureau of Credit Unions are favorable.

Mr. Speaker, there are no funds authorized to be expended on the part of the Federal Government on this legislation at all. There is no cost involved. It was passed unanimously by the other body and was reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency by a unanimous vote.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Washington yield to me at this point?

Mr. PELLY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] for bringing this to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and to the attention of all the chairmen of the standing committees of the House.

Mr. Speaker, everyone should have read the letter of instructions that was placed in the RECORD at the beginning of our session insofar as the operation of the Consent Calendar is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, one of the demands, and one of the requests, pursuant to the procedures which were set forth in that letter of instruction, was to the effect that all of the letters from the departments and agencies involved would be printed in the committee reports and would be available thus to all of the Members.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the second time that we have had to defer to the requests of chairmen who have failed to pay attention to those rules which we have previously laid down. In this instance, in view of the fact that the House has been assured that these favorable reports will be placed in the RECORD upon this legislation, I have no objection. However, from here on out, it seems to me that all reports should be inserted in the committee reports.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, in view of the foregoing statements and further in view of the fact that this legislation is scheduled for consideration under a suspension of the rules, I feel it should be debated, and I now ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN CHILOCCO INDIAN SCHOOL LANDS, CHILOCCO, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 536) to provide that the United States shall hold certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Okla., in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment by the Cherokee Nation of $3.75 per acre to the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire if this meets the procedure of the objectors insofar as the requisite number of days of filing is concerned?

Mr. Speaker, I notice that this bill was filed on the Consent Calendar on the 29th of May. Today being the 5th of June, I would inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee of objectors, if this meets the filing requirements and the consideration thereof?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have checked on this measure and the 3-day period does permit this to be considered at this time, as I understand it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further question with reference to the bill per se, and inasmuch as it is eligible for consideration today, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 536

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in 2,667.94 acres, more or less, of the following described land, which has been determined to be surplus to the needs of the Chilocco Indian School, will be held by the United States in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment therefor at the rate of $3.75 per acre, the original cost of the land:

INDIAN MERIDIAN

TOWNSHIP 29 NORTH, RANGE 2 EAST

Section 13, lots 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7, southwest quarter northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter; and the parts of lot 3, southeast quarter northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter lying east of the east right-of-way line of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad, 339.53 acres.

Section 16, lots 3 and 4, south half northwest quarter, and southwest quarter, 313.85 acres.

Section 17, lots 1 and 2 (except that part described as "Beginning at a point 39 rods south of the northeast corner of the northeast quarter section 17; township 29 north, range 2 east, Indian meridian; thence 24 rods south, thence 33⅓ rods west, thence 24 rods north, thence 33⅓ rods east to point of beginning, containing 5 acres"), lots 5 to 7, inclusive, southeast quarter northeast quarther, and east half southeast quarter, 313.62 acres.

Section 20, lots 1 and 2 and east half northeast quarter (except that part described as "Beginning at a point 67 rods north of southeast corner of the northeast quarter section 20, township 29 north, range 2 east, Indian meridian, thence north 20 rods, thence west 50 rods, thence south 10 rods, thence east 20 rods, thence south 10 rods, thence east 30 rods to point of beginning, containing 5 acres"), lots 3 and 4, and east half southeast quarter, 316.36 acres.

Section 21, those parts of the northwest quarter and southwest quarter lying west of the west right-of-way line of the S.L. & S.F. Railroad, 150.26 acres.

Section 24, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, west half northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter, and those parts of the east half northwest quarter and southwest quarter lying east of the east right-of-way line of Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad, 398.39 acres.

Section 25, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, west half northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter, and those parts of the northwest quarter and north half southwest quarter lying east of the east right-of-way line of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad, 583.25 acres.

Section 26, that part of lot 1 lying east of the east right-of-way line of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad, 12.68 acres.

Section 29, north half southeast quarter and northeast quarter, 240.00 acres.

SEC. 2. All of the mineral interests of the United States in lots 1 and 2 (south half southeast quarter), section 29, township 29 north, range 2 east, Indian meridian, Oklahoma, comprising 77.84 acres more or less, are hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States for the Cherokee Nation. If title to the surface of any of this land should revert to the United States, the land shall become subject to the provisions of section 1 of this Act.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the favorable action of the House on this bill to permit the Cherokee Indians to reacquire lands surplus to the Chilocco Indian School in Oklahoma.

I am also deeply grateful to the members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to that committee's able chairman, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, and the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, the Honorable JAMES HALEY.

The committee has recognized the equity and justice on which this bill is solidly based, and has twice reported this bill to the House.

I hope and trust we will be successful in securing favorable action in the other body, where this measure is strongly supported by Oklahoma's able Senators.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

LOANS TO CERTAIN OFFICERS OF MEMBER BANKS AND FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9682) to amend section 22(g) of the Federal Reserve Act relating to loans to executive officers by member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the loan provisions relating to directors, members of the supervisory committee, and members of the credit committee of Federal credit unions, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9682

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Section 22(g) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 375a) is amended to read:

"(g)(1) Except as authorized under this subsection, no member bank may extend credit in any manner to any of its own executive officers. No executive officer of any member bank may become indebted to that member bank except by means of an extension of credit which the bank is authorized to make under this subsection. Any extension of credit under this subsection shall be promptly reported to the board of directors of the bank, and may be made only if—

"(A) the bank would be authorized to make it to borrowers other than its officers;

"(B) it is on terms not more favorable than those afforded other borrowers;

"(C) the officer has submitted a detailed current financial statement; and

"(D) it is on condition that it shall become due and payable on demand of the bank at any time when the officer is indebted to any other bank or banks on account of extensions of credit of any one of the three categories respectively referred to in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) in an aggregate amount greater than the amount of credit of the same category that could be extended to him by the bank of which he is an officer.

"(2) With the specific prior approval of its board of directors, a member bank may make a loan not exceeding $30,000 to any executive officer of the bank if, at the time the loan is made—

"(A) it is secured by a first lien on a dwelling which is expected, after the making of a loan, to be owned by the officer and used by him as his residence, and

"(B) no other loan by the bank to the officer under authority of this paragraph is outstanding.

"(3) A member bank may make extensions of credit to any executive officer of the bank, not exceeding the aggregate amount of $10,000 outstanding at any one time, to finance the education of the children of the officer.

"(4) A member bank may make extensions of credit not otherwise specifically authorized under this subsection to any executive officer of the bank, not exceeding the aggregate amount of $5,000 outstanding at any one time.

"(5) Except to the extent permitted under paragraph (4), a member bank may not extend credit to a partnership in which one or more of its executive officers are partners having either individually or together a majority interest. For the purposes of paragraph (4), the full amount of any credit so extended shall be considered to have been extended to each officer of the bank who is a member of the partnership.

"(6) Whenever an executive officer of a member bank becomes indebted to any bank or banks (other than the one of which he is an officer) on account of extensions of credit of any one of the three categories respectively referred to in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) in an aggregate amount greater than the aggregate amount of credit of the same category that could lawfully be extended to him by the bank, he shall make a written report to the board of directors of the bank, stating the date and amount of each such extension of credit, the security therefor, and the purposes for which the proceeds have been or are to be used.

"(7) This subsection does not prohibit any executive officer of a member bank from endorsing or guaranteeing for the protection of the bank any loan or other asset previously acquired by the bank in good faith or from incurring any indebtedness to the bank for the purpose of protecting the bank against loss or giving financial assistance to it.

"(8) Each day that any extension of credit in violation of this subsection exists is a continuation of the violation for the purposes of section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

"(9) Each member bank shall include with (but not as part of) each report of condition and copy thereof filed under section 7(a)(3) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act a report of all loans under authority of this subsection made by the bank since its previous report of condition.

"(10) The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may prescribe such rules and regulations, including definitions of terms, as it deems necessary to effectuate the purposes and to prevent evasions of this subsection."

Sec. 2. Section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757) is amended—

(1) by changing, in paragraph (5) thereof, "shall exceed the amount of his holdings in the Federal Credit Union as represented by shares thereof plus the total unencumbered and unpledged shareholdings in the Federal Credit Union of any member pledged as security for the obligation of such director or committee member" to read "may be made except as authorized under paragraph (6) of this section";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (6) through (13) of that section as paragraphs (7) through (14), respectively; and

(3) by inserting, immediately after paragraph (5), the following new paragraph:

"(6) to make loans to its own directors and to members of its own supervisory or credit committee, but all such loans shall be reported to the Director at least annually, and such a loan may be made only if—

"(A) the loan complies with all lawful requirements under this Act with respect to loans to other borrowers and is not on terms more favorable than those extended to other borrowers;

"(B) upon the making of the loan, the aggregate amount of loans outstanding to the borrower will not exceed the total amount of shareholdings in the credit union, not otherwise encumbered or pledged, which are pledged as security for loans to the borrower, or $5,000, whichever is greater;

"(C) upon the making of the loan, the aggregate amount of loans outstanding under authority of this paragraph will not exceed 20 per centum of the unimpaired capital and surplus of the credit union;

"(D) the loan is approved by the credit committee and by the board of directors after the submission to them of a detailed current financial statement by the borrower; and

"(E) the borrower takes no part in the consideration of his application and does not attend any committee or board meeting while his application is under consideration;".

Sec. 3. Paragraph (D) of section 8(8) of the Federal Credit Union Act is amended to read: "(D) in shares or accounts of savings and loan associations or mutual savings banks, the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9682 is noncontroversial legislation that would correct a deficiency in the financial laws of our country.

Although this deficiency does not on the surface appear to be of major significance, it nevertheless is highly important to those individuals who have been unable to obtain loans from financial institutions simply because they are employed by those financial institutions.

H.R. 9682 would, first, allow executive officers of member banks of the Federal Reserve System to borrow from the banks at which they are employed in amounts up to $5,000. In addition, it would authorize loans to these officers in an amount up to $10,000 to finance the education of such officers' children. A first mortgage loan on an officer's home could also be obtained in an amount not greater than $30,000. All of these loans could only be made on terms not more favorable than those extended to other borrowers and would, of course, be subject to all other banking laws.

This legislation would also allow directors, and members of the supervisory or credit committee of Federal credit unions to obtain loans up to $5,000, or in amounts equal to the unencumbered shares pledged for such loans, whichever is greater.

Under existing law, which was enacted in 1933, officers of Federal Reserve member banks are limited to loans from their own banks in a maximum amount of $2,500, regardless of the reason for the loan.

The President's Committee on Financial Institutions in 1963 recommended that the ceiling be increased. Although the increases appear to be substantial, it was felt that the length of time that had expired since the $2,500 ceiling was placed in the act and the numerous safeguards contained in H.R. 9682 were such that increases were clearly justified.

Under existing law directors of Federal credit unions and members of the credit and supervisory committees can obtain loans from their credit unions only in the amount of shares which they have in their credit union, or shares pledged on their behalf for a loan. Thus, a credit union officer with $500 in shares could borrow only $500 from his credit union, unless another member were willing to pledge shares on the officer's behalf. This has worked an extreme hardship on credit union officers, who, it must be remembered are all volunteers, serving without any compensation whatsoever. In a number of cases, credit union officers have had to resign because they needed loans in amounts greater than their share holdings.

This legislation does not in any way change the unsecured loan limit of Federal credit unions, which remains at $750.

There are a vast number of safeguards in H.R. 9682 to make certain that individuals covered under the legislation do not gain advantages solely because of the positions they hold.

Detailed financial statements must be submitted by the borrowers and periodical reports must be made of all loans to the respective supervisory agency. Bank-officer borrowers must report to their bank any loans which they receive from other banks which are in amounts greater than they could receive from their own bank.

Only 20 percent of the Federal credit union's unimpaired capital and surplus will be available for borrowing by directors and members of the credit and supervisory committee.

There has been sent to the Clerk's desk a committee amendment, which was adopted unanimously, to H.R. 9682 after the report on the legislation had been written. It is an amendment that simply clarifies an oversight in previous legislation, making it clear that credit unions may make deposits in any mutual savings bank, if the bank is insured by an agency of the Federal Government. Under present law credit unions may make deposits only in mutual savings banks in the State where the credit union does business. At the appropriate time the amendment will be offered.

Supervision for this legislation is placed in the Federal Reserve Board and the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions advises that there will be no additional cost in handling the supervision of this legislation, and the Federal Reserve Board concludes that the expenses of administering the bill would be negligible. I ask unanimous consent that letters from these two agencies on this subject be placed in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

Bureau of Federal Credit Unions,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1967.

Hon. Wright Patman,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: H.R. 9682 as reported by your committee would amend section 22(g) of the Federal Reserve Act relating to loans to executive officers by member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the loan provisions relating to directors, members of the supervisory committee, and members of the credit committee of Federal credit unions.

With respect to Federal credit unions the changes enacted in Section 2 would allow a Federal credit union to make loans to its own directors and to members of its own supervisory or credit committee, and would require all such loans to be reported to the Director at least annually. Such loans may be made only if—

(A) The loan complies with all lawful requirements under this Act with respect to loans to other borrowers and is not on terms more favorable than those extended to other borrowers;

(B) Upon the making of the loan, the aggregate amount of loans outstanding to the borrower will not exceed the total amount of shareholdings in the credit union, not otherwise encumbered or pledged, which are pledged as security for loans to the borrower, or $5,000, whichever is greater;

(C) Upon the making of the loan, the aggregate amount of loans outstanding under authority of this paragraph will not exceed 20 per centum of the unimpaired capital and surplus of the credit union;

(D) The loan is approved by the credit committee and by the board of directors after the submission to them of a detailed current financial statement by the borrower; and

(E) The borrower takes no part in the consideration of his application and does not attend any committee or board meeting while his application is under consideration.

Enactment of this bill as it relates to Federal credit unions would result in no additional expenditure at all by the Federal Government.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it interposes no objection to the presentation of this statement from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
J. Deane Gannon,
Director.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1967.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have asked for the Board's views as to whether enactment of H.R. 9682 as reported by your Committee would result in additional administrative expenses. The first section of the bill would revise provisions of existing law governing the conditions under which banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System may make loans to their executive officers. The only provision in this section that could have any appreciable impact on administrative expenses, in our judgment, is paragraph (9) on page 4, which requires each member bank to file a report of all such loans with the appropriate Federal supervisory agency. The committee report on the bill states that the Board of Governors is to include in its annual report to the Congress an analysis of these reports received from member banks, including the number of loans, total amount, and the interest rate charged on the loans.

The committee report also states that the Board will be expected to review these reports to make certain that the loans involved are on terms not more favorable than those granted to other borrowers. We do not see how this could be done without requiring reports so elaborate that the expense of preparing and analyzing the reports would be prohibitive. We believe that the effective and economical way to enforce the prohibition against a bank's making more favorable loans to its own officers is through the examination process, rather than through reports to be filed with the Board.

On the basis of conversations in which the Board's staff has explored these questions with your committee's staff, we now understand that the reporting requirements will be satisfied if each member bank simply reports the total number and total amount of loans it makes under the legislation and the range of interest rates involved, and the Board reports to the Congress the total number and total amount of loans made by all member banks under the legislation and the range of interest rates involved in the total. We assume that that is your intent and we accordingly advise that expenses of administering the bill would be negligible.

Our comments are limiting to the first section of the bill because section 2, relating to Federal credit unions, is outside the area of the Board's responsibility.

Sincerely,

J. L. ROBERTSON.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman from Texas has consumed 6 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of this esteemed Committee on Banking and Currency.

We gave this bill tremendously great consideration and I want to say on behalf of the minority that we have supported this bill and we support it here today on the floor of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE].

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Is it not correct that this bill was passed unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency and that it has already been passed by the other body by a unanimous vote?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9682, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 714) to amend section 22(g) of the Federal Reserve Act relating to loans to executive officers by member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the loan provisions relating to directors, members of the supervisory committee, and members of the credit committee of the Federal credit unions.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 714

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (g) of section 22 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 375a) is amended by striking out the first two sentences thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(g) No executive officer of any member bank shall borrow from or otherwise become indebted to any member bank of which he is an executive officer, and no member bank shall make any loan or extend credit in any other manner to any of its own executive officers: *Provided,* That any member bank may extend credit otherwise authorized under applicable law or regulations, on terms not more favorable than those extended to other borrowers, to any executive officer thereof, and such officer may become indebted thereto, in an amount not exceeding $5,000, and in the case of credit extended to finance the education of such officer's children, in an amount not exceeding $10,000, and, in the case of a first mortgage loan on a home owned and occupied or to be owned and occupied by such officer, in an amount not exceeding $30,000, but any such indebtedness shall be promptly reported by such officer to the board of directors of the bank of which he is an officer. If any executive officer of any member bank borrows from or if he be or become indebted to any other bank or banks in an aggregate amount exceeding that which he could lawfully borrow from the member bank of which he is an executive officer under this section, he shall make a written report to the board of directors of such member bank, stating the date and amount of such loan or loans or indebtedness, the security therefor, and the purpose for which the proceeds have been or are to be used."

SEC. 2. Subsection (5) of section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757) is amended by striking out the following: "except that no loans to a director or member of the supervisory or credit committee shall exceed the amount of his holdings in the Federal credit union as represented by shares thereof plus the total unencumbered and unpledged shareholdings in the Federal credit union of any member pledged as security for the obligation of such director or committee member." and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "except that loans otherwise authorized under applicable law and regulations made to a director or a member of the supervisory or credit committee shall not exceed $5,000, and any such loans shall be approved by the credit committee and by the board of directors. The member of the board of directors, supervisory committee, or credit committee applying for such loan shall not take part in the consideration of his application and shall not attend any committee or board meeting while such application is under consideration."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PATMAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 714 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill, H.R. 9682, as passed, as follows:

"SECTION 1. Section 22(g) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 375a) is amended to read:

" '(g) (1) Except as authorized under this subsection, no member bank may extend credit in any manner to any of its own executive officers. No executive officer of any member bank may become indebted to that member bank except by means of an extension of credit which the bank is authorized to make under this subsection. Any extension of credit under this subsection shall be promptly reported to the board of directors of the bank, and may be made only if—

" '(A) the bank would be authorized to make it to borrowers other than its officers;

" '(B) it is on terms not more favorable than those afforded other borrowers;

" '(C) the officer has submitted a detailed current financial statement; and

" '(D) it is on condition that it shall become due and payable on demand of the bank at any time when the officer is indebted to any other bank or banks on account of extensions of credit of any one of the three categories respectively referred to in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) in an aggregate amount greater than the amount of credit of the same category that could be extended to him by the bank of which he is an officer.

" '(2) With the specific prior approval of its board of directors, a member bank may make a loan not exceeding $30,000 to any executive officer of the bank if, at the time the loan is made—

" '(A) it is secured by a first lien on a dwelling which is expected, after the making of the loan, to be owned by the officer and used by him as his residence, and

" '(B) no other loan by the bank to the officer under authority of this paragraph is outstanding.

" '(3) A member bank may make extensions of credit to any executive officer of the bank, not exceeding the aggregate amount of $10,000 outstanding at any one time, to finance the education of the children of the officer.

" '(4) A member bank may make extensions of credit not otherwise specifically authorized under this subsection to any executive officer of the bank, not exceeding the aggregate amount of $5,000 outstanding at any one time.

" '(5) Except to the extent permitted under paragraph (4), a member bank may not extend credit to a partnership in which one or more of its executive officers are partners having either individually or together a majority interest. For the purposes of paragraph (4), the full amount of any credit so extended shall be considered to have been extended to each officer of the bank who is a member of the partnership.

"'(6) Whenever an executive officer of a member bank becomes indebted to any bank or banks (other than the one of which he is an officer) on account of extensions of credit of any one of the three categories respectively referred to in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) in an aggregate amount greater than the aggregate amount of credit of the same category that could lawfully be extended to him by the bank, he shall make a written report to the board of directors of the bank, stating the date and amount of each such extension of credit, the security therefor, and the purposes for which the proceeds have been or are to be used.

"'(7) This subsection does not prohibit any executive officer of a member bank from endorsing or guaranteeing for the protection of the bank any loan or other asset previously acquired by the bank in good faith or from incurring any indebtedness to the bank for the purpose of protecting the bank against loss or giving financial assistance to it.

"'(8) Each day that any extension of credit in violation of this subsection exists is a continuation of the violation for the purposes of section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

"'(9) Each member bank shall include with (but not as part of) each report of condition and copy thereof filed under section 7(a)(3) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act as a report of all loans under authority of this subsection made by the bank since its previous report of condition.

"'(10) The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may prescribe such rules and regulations, including definitions of terms, as it deems necessary to effectuate the purposes and to prevent evasions of this subsection.'

"Sec. 2. Section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757) is amended—

"(1) by changing, in paragraph (5) thereof, 'shall exceed the amount of his holdings in the Federal Credit Union as represented by shares thereof plus the total unencumbered and unpledged shareholdings in the Federal Credit Union of any member pledged as security for the obligation of such director or committee member' to read 'may be made except as authorized under paragraph (6) of this section';

"(2) by redesignating paragraphs (6) through (13) of that section as paragraphs (7) through (14), respectively; and

"(3) by inserting, immediately after paragraph (5), the following new paragraph:

"'(6) to make loans to its own directors and to members of its own supervisory or credit committee, but all such loans shall be reported to the Director at least annually, and such a loan may be made only if—

"'(A) the loan complies with all lawful requirements under this Act with respect to loans to other borrowers and is not on terms more favorable than those extended to other borrowers;

"'(B) upon the making of loan, the aggregate amount of loans outstanding to the borrower will not exceed the total amount of shareholdings in the credit union, not otherwise encumbered or pledged, which are pledged as security for loans to the borrower, or $5,000, whichever is greater;

"'(C) upon the making of the loan, the aggregate amount of loans outstanding under authority of this paragraph will not exceed 20 per centum of the unimpaired capital and surplus of the credit union;

"'(D) the loan is approved by the credit committee and by the board of directors after the submission to them of a detailed current financial statement by the borrower; and

"'(E) the borrower takes no part in the consideration of his application and does not attend any committee or board meeting while his application is under consideration;'.

"Sec. 3. Paragraph (D) of section 8(8) of the Federal Credit Union Act is amended to read: '(D) in shares or amounts of savings and loan associations or mutual savings banks, the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;'".

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 9682) was laid on the table.

MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR U.S. ARMED FORCES

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10226) to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10226

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 4169 (a)(1) of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(A) the letter or sound-recorded communication is mailed by the member at an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title which is located at a place outside the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States; or

"(B) the member is hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty; or".

(b) Subparagraph (D) of paragraph (2) of section 4169(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(D) the letter or sound-recorded communication is mailed by the member—

"(i) at an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title which is located at a place outside the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States; or

"(ii) while hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of disease or injury incurred while in the services with, or in, a unit under operational control of a command of the Armed Forces of the United States; and".

Sec. 2. Chapter 67 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 4560. Air transportation of parcels mailed at or adressed to Armed Forces post offices

"Any parcel, other than a parcel mailed airmail or as air parcel post, not exceeding thirty pounds in weight and sixty inches in length and girth combined which is mailed at or addressed to any Armed Forces post office established under section 750(d) of this title shall be transported by air on a space-available basis, on scheduled United States air carriers at rates fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board in accordance with section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376), upon payment, in addition to the regular surface rate of postage, of a special fee to be prescribed by the Postmaster General for such transportation by air. Whenever adequate service by schedule United States air carriers is not available to provide transportation of mail matter by air in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, the transportation of such mail matter may be authorized by aircraft other than scheduled United States air carriers.".

(b) The table of contents of such chapter 67 is amended by inserting at the end thereof—

"4560. Air transportation of parcels mailed at or addressed to Armed Forces post offices.".

Sec. 3. Section 4303(d)(5) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A)(i) first-class letter mail (including postal cards and post cards),

"(ii) sound-recorded communications having the character of personal correspondence,

"(iii) parcels of any class of mail not exceeding five pounds in weight and sixty inches in length and girth combined, and

"(iv) second-class publications published once each week or more frequently and featuring principally current news of interest to members of the Armed Forces and the general public,

which are mailed at or addressed to any such Armed Forces post office; and

"(B) parcels of any class of mail exceeding five pounds but not exceeding seventy pounds in weight and not exceeding one hundred inches in length and girth combined, including surface-type official mail, which are mailed at or addressed to any such Armed Forces post office where adequate surface transportation is not available.".

Sec. 4. (a) Chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 4170. Mailing privilege of members of United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations in the Canal Zone

"(a) For the purposes of sections 4169(a), 4303(d)(5), and 4560 of this title, each post office in the Canal Zone postal service, to the extent that it provides mail service for members of the United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations, shall be considered to be an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title.

"(b) The Department of Defense shall reimburse the postal service of the Canal Zone, out of any appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense, as a necessary expense of the appropriations or funds and of the activities concerned, the equivalent amount of postage due, and sums equal to the expenses incurred by, the postal service of the Canal Zone, as determined by the Governor of the Canal Zone, for matter sent in the mails, and in providing air transportation of mail, under such sections.".

(b) The table of contents of chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding—

"4170. Mailing privilege of members of United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations in the Canal Zone."

immediately below—

"4169. Mailing privilege of members of United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations.".

(c) Section 4303(f) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "the Virgin Islands or the Canal Zone" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "or the Virgin Islands".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I sponsored H.R. 10226 to round out our efforts to give servicemen the benefit of fast, efficient, and less expensive mail service.

This bill had the bipartisan support of the members of our committee, and is cosponsored by 25 of our committee members.

First. H.R. 10226 will extend free mailing privileges on letters, cards, and sound-recorded personal communications to all members of the Armed Forces overseas, and to all members hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty.

Under Public Law 89-315 only servicemen in combat areas as designated by the President, and those who are hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred as a result of service in a overseas combat area, qualify for the free mailing privilege.

Second. This legislation will establish a new category of airlift mail for a member of the Armed Forces between the point of mailing and the point of delivery for parcels not in excess of 30 pounds of weight and 60 inches in length and girth combined, mailed at or addressed to any Armed Forces post office.

The parcels would be transported by air on a space-available basis upon payment of the regular surface rate of postage plus a special uniform airlift fee to be fixed by the Postmaster General. It is anticipated that this fee will be in the neighborhood of $1 per package, regardless of the weight of the package or the distance to be mailed.

This provision provides a solution to the undesirable requirement for the payment of relatively high rates of postage charged for priority air parcel post. To illustrate, it costs $8.08 to mail a 10-pound package in my district in Buffalo, N.Y., to Vietnam by preferred air parcel post service. This legislation would permit the same 10-pound package to be mailed for approximately $3.40.

Mr. Speaker, I will include, at the end of my comments, a table showing examples of the high air parcel post fees now required on a 10-pound package mailed to an APO San Francisco and an APO New York address, as compared with the rates that will be authorized under this legislation.

Third. This legislation will extend the airlift for second class news publications to all members of the Armed Forces overseas.

Last year's military mail law, Public Law 89-725, provided, among other things, an airlift from the United States to designated combat areas for news value publications, particularly news magazines and hometown newspapers. This legislation will extend this privilege to all members of the Armed Forces overseas.

Fourth. This legislation will clarify the application of the Armed Forces mailing privileges for servicemen stationed in the Canal Zone. The Canal Zone currently does not have any Armed Forces post offices, but operates an independent postal service under the jurisdiction of the Canal Zone government. This legislation will remove any doubt as to the intention of the Congress to extend the special mailing privileges to members of the Armed Forces stationed in the Canal Zone.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the third legislative proposal from the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee designed to improve mail service for members of the Armed Forces overseas. I will include in the RECORD a comparative analysis of the provisions of the existing laws—Public Law 89-315 approved November 1, 1965, Public Law 89-725 approved November 2, 1966, and under the new bill, H.R. 10226.

This bill addresses itself to several problem areas that were not covered in the earlier two enactments. All of these problems areas, which are the subjects of these three pieces of legislation, are highlighted in the recommendations made in three reports of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee of on-site studies and investigations, which I and other members of our committee have made in Europe and in the Far East. Each time we have considered legislation involving mailing privileges for military personnel, we realized that it would be a considerable time before we were able to present a complete and well-rounded program.

For example, we found during our deliberations last year that it was impracticable to include provisions in last year's law for the domestic airlift such as will be provided in section 2 of H.R. 10226.

Immediately following completion of last year's legislation our ranking minority member, Mr. CORBETT, and several other members of our committee, joined with me in sponsoring identical bills containing provisions now contained in section 2 of H.R. 10226. We were not able to consider those bills during the 89th Congress.

Early this year, during the 90th Congress, identical bills were introduced and early consideration was scheduled. We had 16 bills pending before our committee on this subject and, as I have indicated, 25 of our committee members cosponsored H.R. 10226, which is pending before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation does not have the blessing of the administration, which reported to our committee that action on the bill should be delayed on the basis that the special mailing privileges are a form of personnel benefits and as such any adjustments in these privileges should be considered in the context of the results of the comprehensive review of pay allowances and fringe benefits now underway.

Our committee gave extensive consideration to the position of the administration, but we felt that there is no justification to delay consideration solely on such a basis. It is estimated that the cost of this proposal will be approximately $6½ million annually.

As chairman of our committee, I am convinced that this is a small price for us to pay in order to provide fast, efficient mail service at reasonable rates of postage for our servicemen.

Our first bill in 1965 passed the House under unanimous-consent procedure. In 1966 the bill passed on a record vote of 303 to 0.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members here today to approve H.R. 10226 by a unanimous vote, as we have approved similar legislation during each of the past 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to the Honorable ARNOLD OLSEN of Montana, chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, and to each member of his subcommittee, who have pursued this matter so diligently in holding extensive hearings on this legislation, and in reporting the bill to the full committee for our consideration. Mr. OLSEN, who is unavoidably absent from the House today, asked that I tell you today that this legislation has his 100-percent support.

Examples of postal rates for 10-pound parcel mailed to servicemen at APO

Origin	Air parcel post		Airlift under sec. 2, H.R. 10226 (surface rates plus $1 fee [1])	
	San Francisco	New York	San Francisco	New York
New Orleans	$8.08	$6.59	$3.40	$2.75
Buffalo	8.08	5.00	3.40	1.95
Pittsburgh	8.08	5.23	3.40	2.20
Oklahoma City	6.59	6.59	2.75	2.75
Topeka	7.31	6.59	3.10	2.75
Dallas	7.31	6.59	3.10	2.75
Cheyenne	5.82	7.31	2.50	3.10

[1] Estimated, actual fee to be fixed by the Postmaster General.

Mailing privileges for U.S. Armed Forces, 89th and 90th Congresses

FREE MAIL

Morrison bill (Public Law 89-315, Nov. 1, 1965)	Dulski bill (Public Law 89-725, Nov. 2, 1966)	Dulski bill (H.R. 10226, 1967)
Letters mailed from combat areas.	Letters and sound recorded communications from combat areas.	Letters and sound recorded communications from all servicemen overseas.
AIRLIFT (SPACE AVAILABLE BASIS)		
Letters carried as airmail from combat area to address in United States.	For all servicemen overseas between APO and point of embarkation, upon payment of surface rates for— 1. Letters. 2. Sound recordings. 2. Parcels up to 5 lbs.	Adds new category for parcels up to 30 lbs. mailed to or from any APO, including airlift within United States upon payment of surface rates plus airlift fee to be fixed by the Postmaster General.
AIRLIFT OF NEWSPAPERS AND NEWS PUBLICATIONS		
No provision.	Airlift to combat area.	Airlift extended to all overseas APO's.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the Post Office Subcommittee for his work on this particular bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOHNSON] who is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee handling this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, not only to be a cosponsor of this bill, but also, as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, to have taken part in the extensive deliberations that are being culminated here today.

As our chairman indicated to you, this is the third proposal in as many years that our committee has brought to the House floor designed to give military personnel, particularly those overseas, the best possible mail service. In this bill we now round out our efforts, and upon its enactment the Congress can be proud of the full program that will be operating to provide fast and efficient communications between servicemen and their families and friends.

Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing is moving the postal service for our Armed Forces overseas into the 20th century. We are, in effect, saying to our servicemen that when we separate them from their homes, families, and friends by great distances in defense of their country, we will give them the means of communicating with their homes swiftly, efficiently, and less expensively. We are saying to servicemen overseas that we are trying to give them mail service as good as we are providing for all the rest of the people back home. We are also telling the mothers, wives and sweethearts back home that they will no longer have to pay exorbitant sums of money to get fast delivery of a package to their servicemen.

The specific provisions of this bill have already been detailed by the gentleman from New York, so I will only comment briefly.

The privilege of sending letters free that is being extended to all servicemen overseas certainly is not going to save any one serviceman an appreciable amount of money. This is really not its intent. The free mailing privilege is more a convenience than anything else. I think all Members who served during World War II, when the free mailing privilege was enjoyed by servicemen everywhere, will agree that being able to send a letter home without a stamp did not save much money but certainly did eliminate the worry about always having stamps available. As our report on this bill states, we are establishing the principle that the free mail privilege is being given to a serviceman in recognition of the fact that he has been separated from his home in an overseas area—great distances from home. The fact that he may or may not be in combat is incidental to this principle.

Section 2 of the bill is most important and, in my opinion, its enactment is long overdue. It affords the family of a serviceman the means of sending him a parcel weighing up to 30 pounds by air at a reasonable postage charge. Air parcel post charges are so high that the average family is financially inconvenienced when airmailing a parcel of any appreciable weight, and most often postage charges exceed the value of the parcel's contents. It costs $12.08 postage to airmail a 15-pound parcel from anywhere in Eastern United States to a serviceman in Vietnam. The alternative to paying $12.08 is sending it by surface, knowing that it can take up to 2 months for delivery. The new category of airlift mail established in section 2 takes advantage of space on our Nation's airlines that is not now used. By paying airlines lower rates for this space as it becomes available, we are able to transport parcels by air at much cheaper postage rates. For example, that same 15-pound parcel that costs $12.08 when airmailed from Washington, D.C., to Vietnam would only cost $4.30 under the airlift provided for in section 2.

Mr. Speaker, the cost in this bill of giving our servicemen the best possible mail service does not nearly approach the cost of one space shot or one jet bomber.

I suggest we pass this bill promptly and unanimously.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wish to commend the gentleman for his statement and to say I join with him in support of this measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I join in supporting our chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], and urge favorable consideration of H.R. 10226.

I, too, cosponsored this bill, and previously had joined with our chairman in introducing a similar bill late during the 89th Congress, and introduced H.R. 4707 early in this session of the 90th Congress.

The bill, as finally revised by our committee and pending before us for consideration here today, has the major feature of authorizing parcels mailed to or from an APO address, to be transported by air at an economical rate of postage.

The greatest volume of correspondence received by the members of our committee has been addressed to the problem of affording an economical and speedy means of mailing packages which are sent from or to an APO address. My constituency consistently has raised objection to the necessity of paying the higher parcel post rates on the packages in order to obtain transportation by air across the United States.

This legislation will require airlift for parcels weighing up to 30 pounds when mailed by a member of the family, or a friend, in the United States to a serviceman who has an Armed Forces post office address. The parcel will be mailed upon payment of the regular surface rate of postage, plus an airlift fee to be fixed by the Postmaster General, which is expected to be not more than $1.

Our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was instrumental in obtaining legislation in 1965—(Public Law 89-315)—authorizing airlift for parcels up to 5 pounds when mailed between Vietnam and San Francisco or Seattle, and legislation in 1966—Public Law 89-725—extending the airlift for parcels not in excess of 5 pounds, mailed between any APO office overseas and the point of embarkation in the United States.

However, there still is no legislative authority for airlifting the parcels across the United States unless the mailer pays the premium air parcel post rates.

Mr. Speaker, I believe H. R. 10226, which I was happy to cosponsor, will close the airlift gap for APO parcel mailings by providing an economical means of obtaining airlift from the point of mailing to the point of delivery on a worldwide basis.

I will be most happy to report to the constituents in my district in New Jersey when this legislation is finally approved, that they no longer will be required to pay over $8 to mail a 10-pound package having a $2 value to Vietnam by preferred airmail service. Under this legislation, the same 10-pound package can be mailed for approximately $3.40, depending on the amount of the airlift fee to be fixed by the Postmaster General.

Mr. Speaker, as our chairman has pointed out, I am convinced that this is the major feature of this legislation. However, I believe that the extension of the free mail privilege to all servicemen overseas is just as much of a morale building factor for the servicemen as is the additional airlift provision.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that H.R. 10226 will receive favorable consideration by the House here today, and I urge all Members to support our proposal to improve mail service for our servicemen.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from New Jersey for the work he has done on this legislation and for his outstanding service on this committee. I would also like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], the ranking minority member of the committee, and say that I support the legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of our full committee [Mr. DULSKI], and the ranking member of the committee [Mr. CORBETT], for their great leadership in developing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation being considered by the House today.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide fast, efficient, and inexpensive mail service to all servicemen stationed in an overseas area. The provisions of this bill resulted from onsite studies conducted by members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The reports of these investigations, House Report 1226, "Postal System of U.S. Armed

Forces and Certain Countries in Europe," and House Report 2198, "Postal Systems of U.S. Armed Forces—Vietnam and Thailand," set forth the recommendations of the members, and I would urge my colleagues to give careful attention to these recommendations.

The legislation before us today is designed to enact into law certain of the recommendations of those reports.

The Members, by acting favorably on H.R. 10226, will give recognition to the hardships a young man suffers by serving his country in a distant land. The great distances separating American troops from their families is certainly hardship enough, without the addition of slow and costly mail service.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain my colleagues share my concern for the morale of our troops overseas. This bill will provide a great boost to the morale of those troops, and I have no doubt this will far outweigh the relatively minor cost of implementing the provisions of this bill.

The Congress has a responsibility to provide all American servicemen with whatever is necessary, and this duty does not cease with the necessities of life, nor with the weapons of war. It extends to providing mail service as rapidly as our facilities will permit.

I believe the Congress has done a commendable job in enacting Public Law 89–315 and Public Law 89–725, but the task is not yet complete. The Members can be justly proud of their accomplishments in the 89th Congress, in providing better and faster mail service to American troops.

The bill before us today will expand and improve communications between our servicemen and their families in this country. These improvements are warranted, and even necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to approve the legislation before them today.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE].

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress today is taking a splendid and forward-looking action in its consideration of H.R. 10226. The major portion of this bill is identical with my own bill, H.R. 7635. It is good legislation. It is legislation which has been needed for some time.

For the past several years, principally since our involvement in the conflict in Vietnam, the inadequacies of our mail service for the Armed Forces have become painfully evident. Like many of my colleagues, I had this called to my attention, and I have had a constant stream of communications with the Postmaster General, in the hope that administrative action on his part might bring about an improvement in that mail service. In the meantime I prepared legislation which would greatly extend mailing privileges.

I am now delighted to see the Congress assert itself in bringing this legislation to the floor in H.R. 10226.

The broadening of the free mailing privileges to all members of the Armed Forces stationed overseas, and covering both letters and sound recordings, will certainly do much to bring our overseas military personnel closer to their own families.

The extension of these privileges to those who are rotated out of combat zones is another fine feature of the bill. It is, as the committee report notes, a simple matter of equity and fair treatment.

The newly created air parcel service is particularly significant. The rapid dispatch of parcels from the families of servicemen overseas to the military personnel is most important in the whole morale picture of our Armed Forces. I might remark in passing, by the way, that it is my hope that the Postmaster General will fix a very modest minimal fee for this mailing.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, this is a fine piece of legislation which all Americans will rejoice to see passed. It is my hope that the House will quickly pass this bill today, that the other body will take rapid action, and that it will be signed into law. On that day, Mr. Speaker, we will all be able to look with particular pride on a law which will make such a significant difference to our splendid men in the armed services.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL], a member of the committee.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my pleasure to join with my distinguished colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in introducing H.R. 10226, a bill to improve the mail service for members of our Armed Forces serving overseas. The laws passed in 1965 and 1966—Public Law 89–315 and Public Law 89–725—certainly went a long way toward providing the finest mail service available to our service personnel. However, even with this legislation, a few problems still remained. Our new bill, H.R. 10226, corrects these problems.

The earlier legislation had limited the free mailing privileges to men serving in combat areas. However, this draws an arbitrary line between those men serving in the combat areas of Vietnam and those serving in support activities in neighboring countries. The committee felt that this distinction was unfair, and I agree, for no one will question the vital need for or importance of an effective logistics operation as well as an effective fighting force.

Our new bill removes this distinction by extending free mailing privileges for letters, cards, and sound-recorded personal communications to all members of the Armed Forces serving overseas. Similarly, the bill removes the line between combat and noncombat areas as it relates to hospitalized servicemen by extending this airlift privilege to all personnel hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty, instead of only those whose disease or injury was incurred in a combat area.

In addition, I feel that servicemen stationed overseas, separated from their homes by many miles, deserve to receive news from their hometowns as quickly as those in combat areas. Our bill extends the airlift privilege for second class news publications, as was initiated by Public Law 89–275 of November 1966, to all Armed Forces personnel overseas.

Another major area in which we are providing better mail service involves packages. The law passed in 1966 limited the airlift to packages under 5 pounds and between the point of embarkation in the United States and any overseas APO. However, this does not cover the distance from the serviceman's home to the point of embarkation. In addition, the high cost of air parcel post is often prohibitive. To meet these objections, I am glad that we have recommended airlift from the point of mailing to the final destination for parcels weighing no more than 30 pounds.

Our service personnel serving in the Canal Zone have presented a special problem because the zone has no APO offices, but has an independent postal service under the jurisdiction of the Canal Zone Government. In my opinion, it is only fair that the benefits of our new bill, as well as those of our earlier legislation, be extended to these men, and section 4 of H.R. 10226 does this.

Our servicemen and women stationed overseas deserve the finest mail service possible, and it is my earnest hope that the Members of the House can show their support for these men and women by approving the passage of this important legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE].

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join with my colleagues in complimenting the chairman of this committee [Mr. DULSKI] and the other members of the committee for the very fine job they did in bringing this bill to the House floor.

I visited Thailand and Vietnam in March and April. The only gripes I heard were from the boys in Thailand who were not getting an equal break. People sending packages to them were being charged a certain amount of postage and they, too, had to pay postage to mail a letter home. I think this is a very good morale builder.

Mr. Speaker, I have been convinced for quite some time that we should furnish our servicemen overseas with mail service by the fastest means of transportation available.

I am convinced that the legislation we have before us today will accomplish the objectives the members of the committee have been trying to accomplish for the past 3 years. These objectives are fully explained in the reports issued as a result of onsite investigations in Europe and in the Far East.

My rationale for supporting this legislation is very simple. It is based upon a policy that I have given careful thought to, and that I would most seriously urge the Congress to adopt. The policy is simply this. We, as a Congress, should adopt the proposition that when a member of the Armed Forces is separated from his family and friends in an overseas area in service to his country, his Government should endeavor to provide him and his family with the means for fast, efficient, and economical communication.

This benefit should be provided to all servicemen overseas and to those members of their families who wish to communicate with them, regardless of the servicemen's duty assignments. It should be extended in recognition of the fact that the serviceman is separated by distance, rather than in recognition of the fact that he may be in a combat area.

I believe that, if you will consider this matter for a moment, you will agree with me that what we are trying to do by this legislation is to recognize the need for improving communications between a serviceman separated from home and his loved ones. I, for one, cannot adopt the policy that a serviceman stationed in a remote area of the Arctic, manning an early warning station, or a serviceman stationed in Thailand, Pakistan, or India, or in any other overseas area of the world, should be denied the right to have the benefits of air transportation of all of his mail. I know of no logical reason for denying air transportation of mail to servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Members here today will agree with me and be favorably disposed to approve H.R. 10226 today.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Congress, in deliberate steps, is gradually meeting the need for modern and inexpensive mail service to our military personnel in all areas of the world.

In the 89th Congress, we accomplished a great deal toward providing swift and efficient postal service to American service men and women assigned to oversea posts. The legislation before the House today is designed to fulfill the military mail program which the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service embarked on 2 years ago.

This legislation contains three features which are desirable if we wish to bring our military personnel in closer touch with their families and friends at home.

First, it extends the free mailing privilege for letters and sound recorded personal communications to all servicemen in oversea areas and to all who are hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty.

This, in my estimation, is a convenience which we can provide at a minimum cost. I think it is only fair that all servicemen overseas be accorded equal privileges, and I think we can ill afford to discriminate against a serviceman because of his particular geographic duty assignment.

Every service man and woman under the American flag in whatever part of the world is a defender of our freedom, and I suggest that this free mailing privilege is among the least of tributes we can pay.

Two other provisions of this legislation would help shorten the distance between the serviceman and his hometown.

One creates a new category of airlift mail for parcels weighing up to 30 pounds, mailed at or addressed to any Armed Forces post office. A special uniform fee, in addition to the regular surface rate of postage, would enable the parcel to be transported by air on a space-available basis.

The last provision of the legislation provides for the airlift of hometown newspapers to all Armed Forces post offices in any oversea area. I can foresee this as an important morale boost to our military personnel who are anxious to keep in close touch with the affairs of their home communities.

The emphasis of this whole military mail program is speed and efficiency, and I suggest our Nation is fully capable of providing modern and undelayed postal service to oversea military establishments.

I join our good chairman in urging that we pass H.R. 10226 unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor this piece of legislation. I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the whole Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for the well-thought-out bill they have brought to the floor of the House.

In my opinion, the proposal is most worthwhile, is economically feasible, and certainly is in the best interests of the United States.

I want to express my complete support for H.R. 10226, which will provide certain additional mailing privileges for our armed services stationed abroad.

The bill is a more or less natural result of the concern and earnest desire on the part of the American people to express our deep and abiding gratitude and our respect for our young men and women in uniform. It is the outgrowth of our desire to make life in the service—especially during times of great stress and uncertainty such as today—to make that life more pleasant and rewarding.

H.R. 10226 is similar in concept and philosophy, if not in detail, to legislation which I had introduced earlier this year. My bill is H.R. 5134, and would establish certain postal rate benefits on mail going to, as well as coming from, military personnel in combat zones. In some respects, the legislation before the House today goes a step further than my bill, and I am gratified that it does. In other respects, it does not go as far as my bill and I look hopefully to possible future amendment of this program which might incorporate some of the additional provisions.

In any event, I support the bill before us today and I hope it will prevail. Certainly, enlightened thinking along these lines is long overdue and seems of basic value and importance toward maintaining a high morale among our men in uniform.

Anyone, and I know there are a great many in this body, who has ever worn a uniform in service to this country; who has ever pulled duty in any of the thousands of remote, unfamiliar outposts strung around the world; who has ever known the loneliness of prolonged assignment out of touch with family and loved ones; anyone who has known these things knows also the priceless value of a letter or a package from home.

The thing we sometimes take for granted in everyday life—indeed, the thing that has been something of an economic controversy here in the Congress on more than one occasion—is also a godsend to our GI's in service overseas.

This legislation recognizes these facts and attempts, in a feasible and realistic way, to do something about them. This bill will permit our GI's all over the world at any APO address to send their mail home postage free. More importantly, it liberalizes airlift rules and rates on packages sent to GI's overseas.

The committee has done an outstanding job in organizing the facts and figures pertinent to this legislation. Their report is persuasive and enlightening. It leaves little doubt that here is an innovation we can well afford to make in behalf of the morale and the welfare of our men in uniform and to their loved ones who wait anxiously and solicitously at home.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill and again, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania as ranking Republican on the committee and all the members of the committee for reporting out this very important and necessary bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], a member of the committee.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise as one of the cosponsors of this legislation in support thereof.

As a cosponsor of this bill, I rise in support of it. We need this legislation to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for other members of the U.S. Armed Forces as well as those combat forces to whom these privileges already extend.

The changes which the bill proposes seem to me necessary to provide a simple, logical, and fair system of handling Armed Forces mail.

The proposed legislation would eliminate complications in the present law, which grants free letter mail for letters mailed by a serviceman in the combat areas. Under current law, that serviceman loses his free mail privilege when he is rotated out of a combat area for rest and relaxation. Arbitrary distinctions exist between the forces serving in Vietnam, who have free mail privileges, and those stationed in Thailand or other noncombat areas, who do not. The free mail privilege now extends to a serviceman hospitalized as the result of injury or disease sustained in combat zones, but not to patients who were hurt or became sick outside those areas.

I believe that a citizen who enters the Armed Forces of the United States makes the same commitment no matter where he is sent by his country. My opinion is that the proposed legislation will reflect our understanding of that fact. I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask

unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Nix] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to have the privilege of being a cosponsor of H.R. 10226, and am glad to rise here today in support of this bill.

This legislation is designed to further improve mail service for members of the Armed Forces in three significant respects. Generally speaking, this legislation:

Extends the free mail privilege for letters and sound-recorded communications to all servicemen in all overseas areas;

Extends to a worldwide basis the privilege of airlift for news value publications; and

Establishes a new category of airlift mail parcels weighing up to 30 pounds and not exceeding 60 inches in length and girth combined, which are mailed at or addressed to any Armed Forces post office, in order to provide an airlift for this type of mail within the United States at a reasonable rate of postage.

All of these matters have been discussed in detail by the Honorable Thaddeus J. Dulski, chairman of our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates that considered this legislation this year. We on the subcommittee were unanimous in our support of the bill approved by the subcommittee and now pending before us here today.

There were 16 bills referred to our subcommittee, which may be divided into two groups. The bills in the one group are representative of H.R. 10226, reported by our committee. The other group, in addition to providing the basic benefits approved by the committee, would have extended the free mail privilege to include a sender in the United States when the letter was mailed to the serviceman in a combat area, and would have amplified the category of mail entitled to the free mail privilege from letters, post cards, and sound recorded communications, to include the news publications and parcels of any class of mail not over 5 pounds.

Our subcommittee rejected these proposals primarily on the basis that the estimated additional $30 million cost would be excessive under the existing circumstances. Also, such a privilege would extend far beyond any similar mailing privileges afforded members of the armed services in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good bill. It is something that is vitally needed in order to afford our people an economical means of utilizing the modern means of air travel to speed the mail between our servicemen and the folks at home. I urge favorable consideration for this legislation here today.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate my strong support for the bill under consideration which would greatly improve the mail service for the members of our armed services and, especially, for our fighting men in Vietnam.

I agree with General Westmoreland that next to "bullets, beans, and bandages," mail from home is the most important commodity for American troops in Vietnam. Free mailing privileges for letters and tape recordings provided by this bill, will encourage a more constant flow of mail to Vietnam, thereby providing for many the needed reassurance that we are thinking about them every day. Our men in Vietnam are fighting a tough and dirty war, and their performance on the battlefield is greatly influenced by morale. Greater access to parcels, papers, letters, and recordings from home will help to sustain the high morale American troops have demonstrated to date.

I am particularly pleased that this bill would significantly reduce the cost of mailing packages and newspapers to members of the armed services. Too often prohibitive mailing costs have prevented an American soldier from receiving a package from home. I have heard of cases where a present worth $5 cost $10 or $20 to send to a soldier overseas. Only greatly reduced mailing costs will make it possible for literally thousands of American soldiers to receive packages. Of similar importance is the provision of the bill which would extend the airlift of news magazines and hometown newspapers to all Armed Forces post offices overseas. Presently, our soldiers who subscribe to news publications either get them late or pay exorbitant prices to have them air mailed.

Mr. Speaker, by passing this bill, we have a chance to make the long days for our men in Vietnam and other parts of the world a little more bearable. I urge my colleagues to give it their support.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress are well aware of the many sacrifices of our servicemen overseas, not only those serving in combat areas, but those serving in areas separated by great distances from their families and loved ones. The oceans separating these American boys need not be a barrier to prompt, efficient, and inexpensive communications.

Many times in this country we take for granted the day-to-day delivery of our mail, we assume that any mail sent will be delivered within a reasonable period of time. What many people do not realize is the time it takes for a letter mailed overseas to reach this country. The people who do realize this are the servicemen stationed overseas and their families in this country.

Excluding the necessities of life, mail from home is probably the most important single factor in the life of a serviceman overseas. The mail call is an oasis in an otherwise dreary desert. The "letter from home to the serviceman provides him with not only the latest news about his family and friends, but many times gives him an understanding of why he is called upon to serve his country, and gives him the drive he needs to continue doing a good job.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important aspects of life in the Armed Forces is establishing and maintaining high morale. A letter or parcel from home produces a very positive reaction in the serviceman receiving the communication. All the high ranking military people recognize this, and do all they can to improve troop morale. I believe, by passing the legislation before the House today, the Members will do their part in maintaining the morale of our troops.

I believe, as I am certain my colleagues believe, America's Armed Forces personnel are entitled to share in the life they are defending for others. I reject any theory that prompt mail communications are not to be extended to servicemen overseas, or that this service cannot be provided. The Congress must do all within its power to assure that those who defend this Nation have at least the standards enjoyed by people living within the continental United States. The passage of the legislation before the House today will provide some small measure of that standard.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of equity and fair treatment, I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill being considered by the House.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions the Congress has recognized the pressing need to provide fast and efficient mail service for our service men and women serving overseas. In 1965 and again in 1966, the Congress liberalized the amount of mail and packages that could be sent at a reduced charge to members of the Armed Forces serving in various combat zones.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today insures that friends and family of those members of the armed services stationed overseas are not put to any undue hardship or expenses in sending letters and packages.

The bill we passed last year allowed a person in the United States to send a letter, sound recording, or package under 5 pounds by mailing to the point of embarkation within the United States and then the Armed Forces provided airlift for the letter or parcel to the APO overseas. This legislation has proved extremely successful and helpful, even though hampered by what many of us considered an unrealistic weight limit on parcel post packages.

The bill before us today increases that weight limit to 30 pounds, providing that the width and length of the package is within 60 inches. This increase in the size of packages represents to me a realistic estimate of the needs of our servicemen and the desires of their families and friends.

As General Westmoreland has said, he rates a good mail service in Vietnam only after "bullets, beans, and ballots." To keep the morale of our fighting men throughout the world at a peak we must give them an efficient and relatively speedy method of receiving mail from home and at a reasonable cost. I think this bill provides for this.

At the present time, to send a 10-pound package from Washington, D.C., to Vietnam by surface transportation costs about $2.40. As you can imagine, this method takes quite a long time. If the sender wants reasonably fast service, he must send the package air mail which for the same distance costs $8.08, and this is sometimes more than the cost of the package itself. The bill we are considering today would allow that same package to go to Vietnam by air for the cost of $2.40 plus a charge to be established by the Postmaster General which we expect will not exceed $1. This means that a parcel could be sent airlift to Vietnam for about $3.40 as compared to the present cost of $8.08. I think most Members will agree that the former figure is much more reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Armed Forces serving overseas, and particularly those serving in combat areas, are giving a great measure of sacrifice to their country in being away from their loved ones, family and friends for extended periods of time. The one thing that gives a small comfort is receiving a letter or package from home. As a former GI, who served overseas during World War II, I can give firsthand testimony to the very great need for these letters and packages.

I would hope that today's vote would be unanimous in favor of this legislation to show our men and women serving in foreign lands the support and gratitude of this Congress and the people we are all privileged to represent. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the City Council of Elizabeth, N.J., which I am proud to represent, recently adopted a resolution introduced by Council President Michael J. DeMartino urging the Congress to enact legislation liberalizing the mailing privileges for members of the Armed Forces overseas. I think it would be appropriate for this resolution to appear at this point in the Record.

Whereas, our nation is contributing its heroic fighting men and women, who face death for the cause of freedom and peace while defending this nation against the Communist aggression in Vietnam; and

Whereas, said American fighting men and women require encouragement and support from the home front from the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States as well as from their families and friends; and

Whereas, parents, families and loved ones in support of our fighting men and women send to them packages from home; and

Whereas, the mailing cost for said packages are overburdening so as to restrict the number of packages which would be sent; and

Whereas, it is the intention of the City Council of the City of Elizabeth to request the proper Federal Officials for relief in postal rates for packages sent to our servicemen and women in Vietnam; now, therefore, be it

Resolved that the City Council of the City of Elizabeth requests the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, through his Postmaster General, Lawrence O'Brien, to initiate and support suitable legislation in the Congress of the United States permitting free postage for packages sent to all servicemen and women serving in Vietnam; and be it

Further resolved that the City Clerk is hereby directed to forward a certified copy of this Resolution to the Office of the President of the United States, the Postmaster General of the United States, the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would urge all Members of this House to support H.R. 10226 which will provide faster, better, more equitable postal service for all members of our Armed Forces who serve in overseas assignments.

The bill we are considering today would make three major changes in existing law:

First. Free mailing privileges for letters and personal voice recordings would be extended to all servicemen in overseas assignments and for all servicemen who are hospitalized while serving on active duty.

The present law gives these free mailing privileges only for servicemen on duty in designated combat zones or who are hospitalized while serving in combat zones.

Second. The second provision would extend air parcel post service for military personnel serving abroad. This would provide air parcel post service for packages weighing up to 30 pounds, with a combined length and girth of up to 60 inches, upon payment by the mailer of regular surface parcel post rates plus a special airlift fee which would be established by the Postmaster General.

We have already provided parcel post airlift to overseas bases and stations from New York, San Francisco, and Seattle.

But to get air service between these three points and post offices within the United States, mailers must now pay regular air parcel post rates. This often results in charges greater than the monetary value of the package—although not greater than the morale value.

The tentative estimate by the Post Office Department is that the special airlift fee would be $1. This would mean that a 10-pound parcel could be mailed to a serviceman anywhere overseas by air for $3.40. The present cost, at regular air parcel post rates, would be $8.08.

Third. The third change would provide air transportation for second-class news publications to any overseas Armed Forces post office.

The present law provides this airlift privilege only for newspapers and periodicals mailed into designated combat areas.

The estimated cost of these changes, including the revenues that would be lost from the extended free mailing privileges, is about $6.5 million.

I believe that this is a very small investment to make for substantial improvements in mail service for the young Americans who serve their Nation everywhere in the world.

We cannot calculate the value of morale, but we know that its value is great, and we cannot calculate the value of mail from home, but we know that this, too, is great.

I believe that the costs of the service which this bill would extend are a small price to pay for the morale of our servicemen and their families.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the morale of the Armed Forces of the United States is one of the most important factors involved in the protection of our country's vital interests throughout the world. And few, if any, bills which the Congress considers this year will contribute more to good morale among American fighting men than the legislation now before us.

For this reason, I wholeheartedly support the bill to expand mailing privileges for members of the Armed Forces and to improve mail service between them and their families and friends at home.

As the committee report points out, this is the third time in 3 years that the House has acted to bolster mail service for members of the Armed Forces serving overseas. The present bill is a natural and reasonable extension of the earlier legislation—improving it, correcting certain inequities, and devoting to the goal of fast, efficient, and inexpensive mail service for Americans on military duty abroad the high priority it deserves.

The bill seeks to accomplish this purpose in four major areas:

First, by extending to all servicemen stationed overseas, and to all servicemen hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty the privilege of mailing cards, letters, and sound-recorded communications free of charge;

Second, by establishing a new category of airlift mail for parcel post which will cover parcels of up to 30 pounds in weight and 60 inches in combined length and girth and will reduce significantly the high cost of sending packages to servicemen overseas;

Third, by broadening the present airlift for publications of news value to include those addressed to any overseas Armed Forces post office; and

Fourth, by applying the benefits in the present and earlier legislation to servicemen stationed in the Canal Zone which does not have an Armed Forces post office.

Expert witnesses, Mr. Speaker, have assured us that adequate airlift capacity now exists to handle the additional categories of mail covered by the present bill. The additional cost of the improved service will be moderate. It will not interfere with the transportation of vital military cargo.

In light of these considerations, I hope the House will give to this bill the overwhelming approval it should have. It is one small way in which we can express the concern and the commitment we all share for the welfare of those men who are risking their lives in the defense of our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10226.

The question was taken.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 316, nays 0, not voting 117, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—316

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bow
Brademas
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Carter
Casey
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Esch
Eshleman
Everett
Farbstein
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neal, Ga.
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, Pa.
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watson
Watts
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams, Pa.
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING 117

Abbitt
Barrett
Battin
Bell
Blanton
Bolling
Bolton
Brasco
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Button
Cabell
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Collier
Dent
Devine
Diggs
Donohue
Dow
Eckhardt
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Gathings
Goodell
Gray
Gurney
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jones, Mo.
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Lukens
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Miller, Calif.
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Railsback
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Ruppe
Sandman
St. Onge
Scheuer
Shriver
Slack
Steiger, Wis.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Watkins
Whalen
Whalley
Wiggins
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Younger
Zion
Zwach

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Button.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Pettis.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

Mr. Wolff with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. King of California with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Younger.

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Feighan with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.

Mr. Fascell with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Holifield with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Olsen with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Kupferman.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Zwach.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Zion.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Whalen.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Myers.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Rosenthal.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Irwin.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Dow.

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Gathings.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Ottinger.

Mr. HICKS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on H.R. 10226.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING FOR 2 YEARS THE PERIOD FOR WHICH PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES MAY BE MADE WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TRANSFERRED BY THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND ITS SUBSIDIARIES TO OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4241) to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4241

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 703 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (69 Stat. 722) is amended by striking out the figures "1967", and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "1969".

(b) Section 704 of such Act (69 Stat. 723) is amended by striking out the figures "1966", and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "1968".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The

Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4241 is to extend for a further 2-year period the authority to make payments in lieu of taxes on certain former Reconstruction Finance Corporation properties now being held by other Government agencies. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Government Operations.

The authority provided here expired on December 31, 1966, due to the fact that in the last Congress the Senate failed to act on a bill we reported and which passed the House. We are informed that there was no known opposition to the bill in the other body and only the press of business prevented its passage over there.

The former RFC properties involved are industrial-type facilities and were all at one time or another on the tax rolls of the communities in which they are located. The Congress has long considered that even though title is now in the U.S. Government, an alternative to real estate taxes should be provided. Legislation was therefore enacted in 1955 permitting payments in lieu of taxes to be made by the Federal agency having custody of the properties. This legislation was extended for 2-year periods until the last Congress.

The Department of Defense has custody over 29 of the properties and favors the extension. In fiscal year 1966, DOD made payments of $2.5 million. The other three properties are held by the General Services Administration and in that year it paid out $585,000. GSA feels the purposes of the act have been accomplished and an extension is not necessary.

The Bureau of the Budget, however, approves the extension for 2 years but questions whether the payments should continue beyond that period inasmuch as the purpose of providing temporary relief to the local taxing authorities has been accomplished.

The committee felt that it would only be fair to give some warning to the communities that these payments would terminate rather than have the sudden cutoff that has resulted. Such a warning is contained in our report so that taxing authorities may prepare for this eventuality.

H.R. 4241 will be retroactive to January 1, 1967. A list of the properties and the amounts of the payments made on each in fiscal years 1965 and 1966 is contained in the report. Agency comments on the extension will also be found in the report.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I might point out that the minority on the subcommittee and on the full committee had no objection to this legislation. The legislation passed the committee, as I recall it, unanimously. This bill supports a theory we already have in operation, namely, the impacted school district program where we recognize the existence of a need for funds in lieu of taxes from the Federal Government because of the utilization of certain Federal properties in specific ways.

I just want to associate myself with the comments made by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the committee [Mr. Reuss].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Ohio has certain requests for time on his side, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I do have requests for time. I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Clancy].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of legislation identical to the bill before us to reinstate the law providing for payments in lieu of taxes, I would strongly urge that we pass this bill today without delay.

As you know, the original law enacted in 1955 was designed to furnish temporary relief for local taxing authorities which were under an undue and unexpected burden as the result of the transfer of taxable real property from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to another Federal agency or department, which transfer operated to remove such property from the tax rolls.

Although we voted last year to extend the law authorizing these payments for 2 additional years, the Senate failed to act prior to adjournment. As a result of the expiration of the law, a number of communities are faced with unanticipated financial hardship.

Among these are taxing districts in Hamilton County in Ohio. Two school districts in the village of Evendale, which I am privileged to represent, have been particularly hard hit because the Comptroller General has ruled that the payment of $58,855.32 which the two taxing districts in Hamilton County anticipated for the second half of 1966 is barred because it did not become due until after the expiration date of the statute. This sum was due on properties owned by the Department of the Air Force in the vicinity of the General Electric plant in Evendale. The nonpayment, of course, places undue hardship on the village of Evendale and the affected school districts because it reduces available funds anticipated to meet current operating expenses and the obligations of their bonded indebtedness.

Fairness to the fiscal situations of the communities involved, not only in our community of Evendale, but across the country, justifies a continuation of temporary relief. The impact upon the financial resources of the communities affected is considerable. They have relied on the anticipated payments and have not had sufficient notice to make alternative arrangements.

I am hopeful that the other body will recognize the predicament facing these communities and will take up this important legislation as soon as possible.

I also hope that during this session we can work toward the development of a comprehensive program to afford permanent relief to all State and local taxing authorities which are being deprived of tax revenues as the result of Federal ownership of property which would be subject to taxation if privately owned.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Ohio yielding to me at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks which the gentleman has just made with reference to this subject. In reading the committee report, I notice that the Bureau of the Budget states that, if this bill is not enacted, "possible" hardship could occur in the various communities which are affected by this problem throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, for local government officials and the taxpayers of that community in my congressional district in which one of these plants is located, it is my opinion that the word "possible" should be replaced by the word "probable" or "certain."

I say this as one who knows what the problems are with reference to the local communities which have located therein such governmental facilities and the particular community in my district which has such a plant located therein.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this community would have a great problem in adjusting, if such legislation as this were not enacted at this time, and I would join with the gentleman in expressing the hope that this bill passes here, today, and that the other body gives it its early consideration.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that I could not agree more with the gentleman and I am very grateful for his contribution.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, my personal interest in this legislation stems from the fact that Air Force Plant No. 59—which is mentioned in the committee's report—is situated at Johnson City, N.Y., within my congressional district.

This plant is now occupied—as it has been for a considerable number of years—by the General Electric Co., as tenant, the U.S. Air Force acting as landlord. To all intents and purposes, it is a commercial manufacturing plant and engineering laboratory, even though the Federal Government is General Electric's principal customer by virtue of the use to which the plant is put and the items it produces. Like any other commercial plant situated in the area, it receives certain services at the hands of local government which, but for the fact that the plant is federally owned, would be paid for through the normal processes of local taxation.

To get around this problem, as the committee report shows, Congress enacted legislation in 1955 that permitted payments by the Federal Government to the affected local taxing authorities—such payments to be in lieu of normal taxes on the real properties in question which, under the Constitution, are exempt therefrom.

There is no question but that this arrangement was intended to be temporary in nature, only, presumably to allow the passage of sufficient time after the date when these former Reconstruction Finance Corporation properties were transferred to other Federal agencies, and thus stricken from local tax rolls, for those various Federal agencies to dispose of the same, getting them into private hands and so back on those tax rolls, all without causing undue hardship on the affected local municipalities.

But, Mr. Speaker, like so many other plans around here, matters have not worked out quite as hoped for. Even at this late date, as the report shows, the Air Force still owns 11 such facilities besides the one in my district; the Navy still owns eight such facilities, and the Army an additional nine, all scattered at various points across the Nation. I am not aware of the status of the other such facilities, nor do I know why they have not been disposed of. As for Air Force Plant No. 59, however, the Air Force declared it "surplus" to its needs some years back, the General Services Administration accordingly offered it for sale, the General Electric Co., according to my understanding, was the only bidder and things then progressed to the point where General Electric's offer, following some negotiations, came before the Department of Justice for review. The then Attorney General—or the Department of Justice—apparently influenced by some difficulties the company was having at the time under the antitrust laws, thereupon rejected GSA's request for an antitrust clearance, and General Electric's bid of $2,610,000 was turned down. Thereafter, matters reverted to the status quo, and there they still rest.

As has already been pointed out, the Congress has been extending Public Law 388 of the 84th Congress for 2-year intervals since its original expiration date, as the House in the 89th Congress sought to do only to have the other body fail to act. As a result, the abrupt ending of this program for payments in lieu of taxation on December 31, last, has caused not only some uncertainty but threatens to cause real hardships on the local governments affected by this situation and the other taxpayers thereof. According to my information, the county of Broome, the town of Union and the Johnson City Central School District—to all of which local municipal entities the General Electric Co., if it were the owner of Air Force Plant No. 59, would pay taxes—stand to lose approximately $136,500 in anticipated Federal revenues in this tax year if this bill is not enacted into law.

To my mind, this would be manifestly unfair because, up until the other body's failure to act at the end of the previous session, no such local municipality as far as I know had any reason to doubt the extension of this program. The committee, this time, has given clear warning that even if this extension is enacted, it may be the final such extension, and all of us who are concerned are, I am sure, grateful for this advance notice. But, Mr. Speaker, it does certainly seem to me that Congress should not merely permit the matter to rest there, and I hope that, in the intervening 2-year period that this bill may give us, an effort is made to discover how these federally owned facilities can be disposed of, especially where they are commercially occupied by private corporations such as is the case with Air Force Plant No. 59. I therefore welcome the concluding sentence in the committee's report, in which it states its intention to "make a careful study of this matter," and I hope that study will be undertaken as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time not only to support this bill, but to point out that in my judgment this is the prototype that should be used in relation to all Federal property real estate holdings. This, probably, would do more in the area of providing a proper tax-sharing setup that many have been advocating with the Federal Government and the local communities.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is necessary, as has other legislation along this line been necessary, because under the Constitution, the States and local communities cannot directly tax the Federal Government or its instrumentalities without its consent. This is analogous to the practice which has been established in the Court of Claims. Through this court Congress has permitted citizens to sue the Federal Government in certain areas, a privilege which they do not have the authority otherwise to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, this permits a system to be established whereby the Federal Government pays in lieu of taxes—the local taxes—for the benefits that it receives which are derived from the community services that are performed. An example is a Federal installation in St. Louis, Mo., which derives all the benefits from the sewers, the streets, the fire department, the police protection, and the educational system. Yet, the Federal Government moves in and withdraws this property from the tax rolls and, in effect, is not contributing to the cost of the services from which it derives those benefits.

Of course as all of us who were in the Congress when we first considered the impacted school area bill know, the whole theory behind the impacted area school bill was that when the Federal Government came into a community, withdrew from the real estate rolls assessable property, it created a burden on the school district to provide for the education of the children in the community. Many of these children in many instances would be those associated with the operation of the Federal Establishment.

I hope the committee is correct in their statement that they think this might phase out this particular small area of property held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I would also hope that, as I said, this would be a basis of a prototype to cover all Federal properties with very few exceptions, I might state. Incidentally, I have in being a comprehensive bill of this nature that I have been working on for several years, and it is now in proper technical language, and it has just been a matter of time that has prevented me from introducing it, along with the remarks discussing it. In developing this bill I had thought possibly one of the types of properties that would be not subject to the in-lieu-of-tax payments would be land held by the Forest Service, only to find that many people in the Forest Service have said to me they would welcome this kind of a bill and to some extent do pay funds in the nature of "in lieu" of taxes. As they put it, in this way we would be welcomed into communities where we go to develop and take forest land if the local people knew we were not going to impose a burden on them by taking this land from the tax rolls.

Finally, and equally important, though, is the other side of the coin which I believe attracted me to this area the most in the first instance. The other side is the discipline that it imposes on the Federal agencies not to go into a community and take up the very best land in the community merely for the reason that it does not make any difference to them whether it was the most valuable piece of property or the least valuable. But if we enacted this in-lieu-of-taxes principle then those people would know that every year in their budget they would have this item for in lieu of taxes, and it would be a great discipline and incentive to use cheaper land if it served the Federal purpose.

In St. Louis one of the most valuable pieces of downtown real estate is held in the old customhouse. They do not need that kind of property in order build a Federal building. Actually, property one-fifth the value would serve their purpose better.

There is a second part of this discipline, and that is the Federal agencies would then not hang on to real estate beyond the time they needed it because again there would be a regular discipline if they had to account for in-lieu-of-tax payments in the budget. Questions are asked—in fact, Federal personnel have asked them themselves—can we not get rid of this real estate and let it get back into the tax base of our local community.

This is essentially good cost accounting, and that is what I am deeply interested in seeing developed in this area. It would bring in, roughly estimated, about $1 billion in additional revenue to the local communities on a right cost-accounting basis.

I commend the committee for this extension. I hope I can get some help from the committee in promoting this concept to include all Federal properties.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and to ask the gentleman if this would not also have the effect, if we apply this program to public works projects such as dams and reservoirs where the Federal Government would be kept from taking more land than is necessary.

I have in mind a situation in my own congressional district now where a small community is going to be destroyed by a reservoir project and there is no way by which that community can be compensated.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is so right. This imposes cost accounting principles on our Federal bureaus in a proper way and I think it is an exceedingly healthy thing.

Those who know that our local communities are having a problem in meeting their local bills for police, fire protection and sewerage services, streets and so forth, recognize the value here and, of course, Uncle Sam, just like any beneficiary of these local services, ought to be paying a pro rata share.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, H.R. 4241, on the simple premise that it is admittedly unconstitutional and that nothing is as perpetual as death and taxes.

The committee report, all speakers, and the departmental reports have all said that this started originally as a temporary measure in 1955, and it has been continued in the wisdom of this body by 2-year spurts, ever since that time.

I am not unfamiliar with the impacted area school funds which has been stated to be analagous to the intent of this bill. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with the income from the Corps of Engineers and reclamation impoundments paid back to the various States on the 75-percent income bases for the use of the various counties.

The trouble is that once these temporary measures on taxation and arrogation of power related thereunto by the Federal Government are imposed, they are seldom removed.

I think further that in this time of a planned national deficit of over $29 billion and in a time of turmoil and of defense expenses and in a time of undeclared wars that perhaps instead of considering this surtax increase or reimposing, as was said in the well of this House this same day, the excise taxes that are being eliminated according to the will of the Congress, that we should consider ending this temporary legislation here and now.

In the landmark case of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, 4 Wheat. 316 (1819), Mr. Chief Justice Marshall laid down the constitutional principle that a State may not tax an instrumentality of the Federal Government. Subsequently, in *Clallam County* v. *U.S.* 263 U.S. 341 (1923) and in *Cleveland* v. *U.S.* 323, U.S. 329 (1945), the Court held that property owned by the United States is wholly immune to State taxation.

These cases uphold the broad rule of law mentioned in the committee report.

I think that this legislation is segmental and it is discriminatory tax legislation, regardless of how it evolved.

Mr. Speaker, I just refuse to believe that we are not collectively smart enough to correct any inequity of Federal centralized Government taxation overpowering or overcoming State taxation, including property taxes.

These block grants, these impacted area grants, these other devices may be well and good, but I submit that the Constitution should be changed if it is not correct rather than having temporary legislation perpetuated in this regard.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4241 and also to compliment and associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CURTIS.

The principle contained in this legislation is one of prudence and certainly realistic in its approach.

As written in the report:

> The law provides . . . the Government department having custody and control of the property shall pay to the appropriate State and local taxing authorities an amount equal to the real property tax which would be payable if the property were in the hands of a private citizen.

Under the Constitution, property owned by a Federal department or agency cannot be taxed by the States. This, in my judgment, has created one of the more serious problems facing our State and local political subdivisions, particularly in our Western States where 45 to 60 percent of the land is federally owned.

It has permitted Federal agencies and departments to actually acquire or hold on to unneeded lands without concern for the same tax liability that a private landowner must pay.

The Federal Government can provide a substitute for this restriction by special legislation such as H.R. 4241, whenever the Congress deems it desirable.

The major point I would like to make to my colleagues is that the principle contained in this bill should be considered on a more permanent basis.

We have been discussing the tax-sharing concept in great detail this year, which I have supported.

I sincerely believe legislation, containing this principle, should be passed by the Congress, where all federally owned properties were subjected to a payment in lieu of taxes, payable to the appropriate State and local taxing authorities. This would greatly assist these local political subdivisions in broadening their tax base, with the subsequent relief to the private property taxpayer whose burden has become intolerable.

I have been working on this type of legislation and intend to introduce it when the language is perfected.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4241 which extends for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments.

Congress has seen fit to extend this legislation for 2-year intervals since its enactment in 1955. Under the Constitution, property owned by a Federal department or agency cannot be taxed by the States. However, the Federal Government may provide a substitute for the tax where the Congress deems it desirable.

These in-lieu-of-taxes payments provide important and necessary assistance to schools. In my congressional district, for example, the payments made by the Federal Government represent a substantial portion of the budget of the Derby, Kans., Unified District No. 260. Distributions also are made to other Sedgwick County schools in my district and those of my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] who represents the Fourth Congressional District.

In fiscal year 1966 a total of $783,107 was paid under this law to Sedgwick County, Kans. Derby public schools received $457,440 to augment its annual budget; $297,868 was distributed to other Sedgwick County schools; $16,005 to Riverside Township schools; and $17,674 to the State of Kansas.

These payments are made by the Department of Defense, under provisions of Public Law 388 of the 84th Congress, on Air Force Plant No. 13 in Sedgwick County, Kans., Air Force plant No. 13, leased to Boeing Aircraft Co., in 1966–67 taxable year made up $11,782,780 or a good one-third of the Derby district's ad valorem taxable base. The total district ad valorem taxable valuation was $33,474,974, Public Law 388—H.R. 4241—has paid the total mills levied on the Aire Force plant. The Derby Unified School District has received from these mills levied the following totals over the past 5 years:

Year:	
1962–63	$390,501
1963–64	454,876
1964–65	573,343
1965–66	457,440
1966–67	423,498

The Derby district's ad valorem taxation for schools is 36.718 mills on a one-third of actual property value tax base. The city of Derby with a population of 7,000 is a resident city. Ninety percent of the homes have been built within the last 10 years. No industry other than a very small manufacturing plant is in the city. Homes are carrying a heavy tax load. The total mill levy is now running in the 90-plus-mill category. Homes in the $18,000 actual value classification are now paying $560 per year ad valorem taxes. The elimination of Public Law 388—H.R. 4241—revenue to the Derby USD No. 260 would increase total ad valorem tax mill levy for schools an approximate 25 mills or to a total of 63 mills. To the average homeowner with homes valued from $15,000 to $18,000, an additional ad valorem tax load of $120 to $150, or to totals as high as $710 per year would be the rule.

For the average skilled worker, schoolteacher, or Air Force personnel who make up 90 percent of the Derby City population, such taxation would be prohibitive. The heavy tax level is now a deterrent for the location of industry in Derby.

The House passed an extension of this law during the second session of the 89th Congress. The law expired on December 31, 1966, and unless we take affirmative action now, further payments cannot be made to these school districts. We should remember that school budgets were developed and adopted for this year and even next year on the basis of these payments being made.

We must keep faith with the local taxpayers and school districts affected by this legislation. If in-lieu-of-taxes payments are to be discontinued, it should be done only after careful study which the distinguished chairman of the Government Operations Committee has pledged. The affected school districts should have time to find new revenues or to make necessary budgetary adjustments. In view of the considerable emphasis with the Congress and the administration have placed upon education programs, it is imperative that we fulfill this commitment to the children enrolled in schools in these areas.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this additional time because in talking to the Forestry Service I discovered—and I did not make it clear—that in effect they do pay funds in the nature of "in lieu of taxes." There are various forms in which it is done. So do some of our other governmental agencies. It is not quite as clear cut as in connection with the impacted school area bill or in this bill now before the House. But there are various devices that are tantamount to this payment in lieu of real estate taxes. I wanted to make that clarification.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, last year the House of Representatives voted approval of a 2-year extension of Public Law 388 of the 84th Congress which provides in lieu of taxes payments to State and local taxing authorities on federally owned properties. However, the Senate did not take action on this legislation and it was allowed to expire on December 31, 1966.

Today we have an opportunity to extend the law for another 2 years which would permit further payments. On January 10, 1967, I introduced H.R. 1277 an identical bill to H.R. 4241 to provide for extension of the law for 2 years.

The Bureau of the Budget in a report dated March 10, 1967, forwarded its views on both my bill and H.R. 4241. It stated:

> Since failure to enact an extension would work possible hardship on the taxing jurisdictions, the Bureau of the Budget would not object to the enactment of either of these bills. However, we question whether the special payments for this limited group of properties should be continued beyond the end of 1968 since it would appear that the basic purpose of Public Law 84–388 of furnishing temporary relief to the local taxing authorities from an undue and unexpected burden has been accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported extension of this law since coming to Congress. Air Force Plant No. 13, which is used by the Boeing Co., is in my congressional district. In fiscal 1966, in lieu of taxes payments amounted to over $783,000 on this federally owned property.

Derby Unified School District No. 260, now located in the Fifth Congressional District, is heavily dependent upon this assistance to meet its present budgetary commitments. Last year this district received over $451,000 in in-lieu-of-taxes payments. Other distributions were made to the Sedgwick County High School fund and elementary school fund. Distributions also were made to the city of Wichita for elementary and high schools.

We should honor our commitment to these school districts and pass this 2-year extension. This 2-year period then could be utilized to conduct a careful study of further need for this program by the Committee on Government Operations. It also would permit local school districts, affected by the legislation, to consider in an orderly manner alternative revenue measures or adjustments in their budgets.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 4241.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 4241.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

RECENTLY ANNOUNCED FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD INTERPRETATION PERMITS UNDERWRITING OF "REVENUE" BONDS BY COMMERCIAL BANK SECURITIES "SATELLITES"—OUR FINANCIAL STRUCTURE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent legal controversy over the underwriting of "revenue" bonds by national banks and State member banks, the Federal Reserve Board consistently took the position that the exemption for general obligation bonds from the prohibition against securities underwriting by banks contained in title 12 U.S.C. 24(7) did not extend to "revenue bonds."

While this section of our banking laws is not part of the Federal Reserve Act, nevertheless, the Board undertook to loudly voice its opposition to former Comptroller Saxon's more permissive attitude. The reason for the Board's willingness to interpret a provision applicable to national banks which would normally be the exclusive domain of the Comptroller of the Currency is apparently because the Federal Reserve Act itself provides that the limitations on securities underwriting by national banks shall apply also to State member banks.

As it turned out, a Federal court ruled last December that the exemption from the underwriting prohibition referred to above does not in fact extend to "revenue bonds" and that national banks and State member banks may not underwrite these securities.

It is most ironic, Mr. Speaker, perhaps downright astounding is a better term, that a recent legal interpretation by the Federal Reserve Board opens the door wide to unrestricted securities underwriting by banks through "satellites." Pursuant to a legal interpretation rendered with respect to First National City Bank's application to operate a mutual fund-type investment company, the Board announced at your Banking and Currency Committee hearings on March 15 that the prohibition against member bank affiliations with securities underwriters is no legal impediment to 60 percent of an underwriter's directors being officials of that bank. This precedent-shattering interpretation of section 20 of the Banking Act of 1933—12 U.S.C. 377—clearly implies that if member banks, including national banks, desire to engage in general underwriting of common stocks, preferred stocks, corporate bonds, as well as revenue bonds, then the Federal Reserve Act is no bar, provided it is done through a "satellite" setup. In fact, First National City Bank, through its satellite investment company operations, has already sold to the public several million dollars worth of shares. The Board claims that this investment operation by First National City Bank is actually part of the bank itself and therefore in no way conflicts with section 20, or section 32 of that same act which prohibits formal management interlocks between member banks and securities underwriters.

Personally, I strongly disagree with these interpretations. But even assuming that the Federal Reserve Board is correct in its interpretation that its "single entity" theory that the securities company is an arm of the bank and not in violation of sections 20 and 21, I do not see how it is earthly possible to avoid a clear violation of title 12 U.S.C. 24(7) which states in pertinent part that national banks—and State member banks—"shall not underwrite any issue of securities or stock." It would seem that if the Federal Reserve deemed it illegal under this section for member banks to underwrite revenue bonds directly, then the Board should likewise deem it illegal for member banks to underwrite equity securities directly as First National City Bank is now doing. Apparently, the Board considers the First National City Bank securities operation as part of the bank itself with respect to the prohibitions in sections 20 and 32, but as an indirect, affiliated relationship with respect to section 24(7) of title 12.

Mr. Speaker, what I have just described is an extreme example of bureaucratic confusion and self-contradiction, completely oblivious to and in disregard of the clear expression in the laws of congressional intent that commercial banking and investment banking be kept separated except to the extremely narrow and limited extent set forth in the celebrated revenue bond decision of last December.

We shall simply have to wait and let the courts unravel this extremely complicated legal tangle created by the Federal Reserve Board. The case is now pending. And while I strongly disagree with the Board's legal conclusions, if in fact they are correct, then all national banks and State member banks may immediately proceed to set up satellite securities operations in the manner of First National City Bank and engage in the unrestricted underwriting of revenue bonds and all other types of securities. I would not be surprised to see a few banks jump in right now rather than wait for a final Supreme Court decision in the First National City Bank case which may be a year or more away.

ADM. THOMAS H. MOORER NAMED NATION'S TOP NAVAL OFFICER

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn over the weekend of the President's announcement of the future appointment of Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, U.S. Navy, to the highest military office of the Navy, that of Chief of Naval Operations.

One of the most distinguished officers in our Armed Forces, Admiral Moorer was born in Mount Willing, Ala., a small rural town in the south-central portion of the State on February 9, 1912. The son of the late Mrs.—Hulda Hill Hinson—Moorer and the late Dr. R. R. Moorer, he was graduated valedictorian of the class of 1927 from Cloverdale High School in nearby Montgomery at the age of 15. With an early interest in a technical career, he secured an appointment to Annapolis and, at the age of 17, entered the U.S. Naval Academy where he was graduated as ensign in June 1933.

His first assignments were aboard the cruisers U.S.S. *Salt Lake City* and U.S.S. *New Orleans*. Fascinated with the rapid development of naval aviation, Thomas Moorer became an aviation cadet at the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., one of the birthplaces of naval aviation, and in July 1936 won the gold wings of a naval aviator.

Appropriately, his first duty station as an aviator was aboard the Navy's first aircraft carrier, the U.S.S. *Langley*. Later he was assigned to fly from another almost equally famous ship, the U.S.S. *Lexington*, and, before the beginning of World War II, served aboard the famous *Big E*, the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Enterprise*. As a patrol plane pilot based at Ford Island, Pearl Harbor, he was one of the few Navy pilots who managed to get his aircraft skyward to search for the attacking Japanese fleet.

Later in the war, during the 1942 Battle of the Java Sea, his patrol plane was shot down by a Japanese plane, and Lieutenant Moorer managed to land his blazing aircraft on the water, despite serious wounds to himself and his copilot. Lieutenant Moorer and his crew were rescued by a passing Philippine ship which was attacked and sunk later that same day by more Japanese aircraft. For his actions during these two engagements, Lieutenant Moorer won the Silver Star.

As the war continued, he won the Distinguished Flying Cross for organizing and flying a rescue mission evacuating wounded American soldiers from a Pacific island. Having flown his unarmed seaplane under the very shadow of Japanese guns, he landed near the island and took off with an extremely heavy load of wounded passengers.

Also during the war, the admiral contributed significantly to aerial antisubmarine warfare. As gunnery and tactical officer on the staff of the Commander Air Force Atlantic, he planned and supervised the development of tactics and doctrines for aircraft in antisubmarine warfare. For his efforts in this endeavor, he received the Legion of Merit.

Admiral Moorer was the first of his Academy class to attain the two-star rank—then three-star rank—and significantly, he was the first in his class and the youngest admiral ever to achieve four stars in peacetime.

In October 1962 Admiral Moorer took command of the U.S. 7th Fleet in the volatile Far East and 2 years later moved up to head the U.S. Pacific Fleet. As commander in chief of all Navy forces in the Pacific, he gained a reputation for a computerlike mind, great leadership, and dedication. Fellow officers said he knew where everything was and how it was working.

In contrast, he has a warmth of personality that one does not associate with the computer image. One officer said of Moorer:

> He'd be sitting on the bridge waiting for one of his pilots to come back who was late from a strike, and a sailor would bring him a cup of coffee. He never failed to smile, thank him, and even call him by name.

In April 1965 Admiral Moorer moved to the Atlantic as commander in chief of the Unified Atlantic Command, commander in chief of all Naval forces in the Atlantic, and Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic, becoming NATO's top Navy man.

When Admiral Moorer took over the Atlantic Command, it meant moving from one crisis to another. While in the Pacific, he headed the Navy's Vietnam buildup and Tonkin Gulf action, and, moving to the Atlantic, he arrived just in time for the Dominican Republic crisis of 2 years ago. Admiral Moorer directed all U.S. military operations in the Dominican Republic.

With this assignment, Admiral Moorer became the only Navy admiral ever to command both the Pacific and Atlantic Fleets. Now the Navy's fourth-ranking admiral, he will become No. 1 upon assuming the duties of the Chief of Naval Operations. He will become the second youngest man ever to become Chief of Naval Operations during peacetime.

Perhaps one of the most interesting facets of Admiral Moorer's character is his unique ability to blend his "southern gentleman" diplomacy with leadership and military competence. This has been illustrated by his position as Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic, where he has been internationally involved in the affairs of the 15 NATO nations. His ancestry is Dutch, and his manner obviously blends not only with his international associates but also with his U.S. Navy associates as well.

He has been primarily responsible for the smooth transfer of scores of Atlantic Fleet ships to the Pacific Fleet.

Admiral Moorer comes to the Navy's top position extremely well qualified. He has proven himself capable of performing the complicated tasks of coordinating vast military efforts between the Pentagon, U.S. Army, Air Force, and Marine leaders, European military leaders, and military and political leaders from the Caribbean to Asia.

Mr. Speaker, as a native son of Alabama, Admiral Moorer brings great honor to his State and Nation. All Alabamians are proud of this outstanding naval leader.

ON SUSPENSION OF EXCISE TAX REDUCTIONS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, by legislation adopted by Congress in 1965 and revised in 1966, the excise tax on passenger automobiles will be reduced from 7 percent to 2 percent on April 1, 1968, and then to 1 percent on January 1, 1969. The excise tax on general and toll telephone service presently at the rate of 10 percent is scheduled to be reduced to 1 percent on April 1, 1968, and repealed completely on January 1, 1969.

At the time these excise taxes were reduced, the principal argument for their elimination was premised on the fact that these were wartime excise taxes and no war condition existed. Since this action by the Congress, the situation has been entirely reversed and the Nation is now confronted with the problem of conducting a major struggle in Southeast Asia in addition to preserving and maintaining our defenses throughout the world. From all indications, these obligations will entail deficit spending possibly in the area of $29 billion in the current fiscal year.

In view of this unprecedented deficit, it is unthinkable that the Congress of the United States should permit tax reductions to take place and increase the size of the deficit.

The reduction of the telephone tax scheduled for April 1, 1968, will result in a Treasury loss of almost $1 billion per year on an annual basis. The reduction of the automobile excise tax will involve a Treasury loss at an annual rate of $1 billion per year which will rise to $1½ billion per year after January 1, 1969.

In view of the deficit it seems extremely ridiculous for the Congress of the United States to permit a $2 to $2½ billion Treasury loss at this time. These excise taxes were originally imposed as wartime necessities. The conditions of that justification are reinstated today. The abatement of these excise taxes can certainly be deferred until world tensions ease and the reduction of military expenditures make it again a feasible action.

It seems to me that too much of the obligation of the war in Vietnam rests upon the military personnel who have been dispacted to action in this theater. At home, we are making no obvious sacrifice. While we postpone the burden of debt repayment upon future generations and those military men in Vietnam who survive the conflict, we deny ourselves nothing.

It seems to me that prudence at this moment dictates that we in Congress, charged with the responsibility of allocating the burden of our worldwide commitments, recognize the need at this hour for bringing Treasury receipts more in line with the expenditures of our Government. The suspension of the contemplated tax reduction in the telephone tax and the automobile excise tax is a good place to begin.

I am, therefore, introducing legislation toward this goal and hope for its early consideration by the Congress.

BUSINESS FAVORS HECHLER POSTAL RATE BILL

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain tables.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that the National Federation of Independent Business has just completed a nationwide poll of its members indicating that 82 percent of the Nation's independent business proprietors support H.R. 99, my bill to provide a steep increase in postal rates on third-class mail. In its official statement announcing the results of this poll, which is being released today, the National Federation of Independent Business indicated that the support for my bill was by a "surprising majority."

The statement went on to indicate:

> It has long been held that third-class mail is a mainstay of the advertising activities of smaller business firms, thus the heavy support for raising the rates on this class is considered to be somewhat of a surprise.

The following pro and con arguments for H.R. 99 were listed in making the poll:

> 1. Argument for H.R. 99: Proponents note that the Post Office will operate at a $1.2 billion loss for fiscal 1967. Much third-class mail is really "junk mail", unwanted, unread, and unpaid for. The current rates are so low that only 60 percent of the cost of delivery is covered by the current rates. The cost of first-class mail is covered over 100 percent of the 5-cent stamp. Why should the small businessman and every other taxpayer pay 40 percent of the cost of third-class mail? When an advertiser places an ad in the newspaper, radio, TV, etc., he pays the full cost. Why not here? Besides, the rate hike will unburden the post office from the avalanche of mail.
>
> 2. Argument against H.R. 99: Opponents of the proposal note that it could have a very disastrous effect of some small businesses. Most bulk rate third-class mail is now mailed at 2⅞ cents a piece. Under this bill, if enacted, third-class rates would be raised over 50 percent. This would mean a 50 percent increase in overhead for all business using third-class mail . . . and some necessarily use quite a lot. Direct mail outlets, service outlets, non-profit organizations, etc., will be adversely affected by this bill. Opponents claim that 4,000,000 people who make their livelihood through the direct mail industry will be in danger of losing their jobs if this bill becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the full text of the press release of the National Federation of Independent Business:

THE BRIEF FACTS

There is before the Congress bill H.R. 99 by Rep. Ken Hechler, West Virginia, to raise postal rates on third-class mail slightly more than 50 per cent, which is now 2⅞ cents per piece when mailed in bulk. This proposal, submitted to a nationwide vote by the Federation finds 82 per cent in favor, 15 per cent opposed, with 3 per cent undecided.

By a rather surprising majority, 82 per cent of the nation's independent business proprietors favor increasing the rates for third-class mail.

This is shown in a nationwide vote just completed by the National Federation of Independent business on a bill pending in the Congress by Representative Ken Hechler, West Virginia, which would increase present rates on third-class mail by slightly more than 50 per cent. Currently, the rate on bulk mailing of third-class is 2⅞ cents per piece.

The vote shows only 15 per cent opposed, with 3 per cent undecided.

Proponents of the measure argue that while the costs of first-class mail are met completely by the present 5 cent rate, third-class mail is handled at rates which cover only 60 per cent of the cost of delivery.

It has long been held that third-class mail is the mainstay of the advertising activities of smaller business firms, thus the heavy support for raising the rates on this class is considered to be somewhat of a surprise.

State tabulation follows:

State breakdown figures

[This bill would increase postal rates on 3d-class mail]

State	Percent in favor	Percent against	Percent Undecided
Alabama	78	16	6
Alaska	93	7	
Arizona	81	14	5
Arkansas	79	19	2
California	85	13	2
Colorado	86	9	5
Connecticut	82	11	7
Delaware	83	15	2
Florida	82	13	5
Georgia	76	19	5
Hawaii	70	23	7
Idaho	83	13	4
Illinois	80	16	4
Indiana	84	14	4
Iowa	80	16	2
Kansas	79	19	2
Kentucky	81	15	4
Louisiana	78	17	5
Maine	70	26	4
Maryland	83	13	4
Massachusetts	82	15	3
Michigan	81	14	5
Minnesota	79	18	3
Mississippi	84	15	1
Missouri	79	18	3
Montana	83	14	3
Nebraska	80	18	2
Nevada	88	9	3
New Hampshire	84	16	
New Jersey	80	15	5
New Mexico	82	17	1
New York	80	16	4
North Carolina	83	13	4
North Dakota	73	23	4
Ohio	83	15	2
Oklahoma	79	18	3
Oregon	83	13	4
Pennsylvania	79	17	4
Rhode Island	100		
South Carolina	77	15	8
South Dakota	80	20	
Tennessee	80	17	3
Texas	83	15	2
Utah	83	13	4
Vermont	81	19	
Virginia	79	18	3
Washington	83	15	2
Washington, D.C.	93	7	
West Virginia	92	8	
Wisconsin	82	15	3
Wyoming	82	18	

Mr. Speaker, I am really gratified by the unusually large percentage of support for my third-class postal rate bill from many people in all walks of life. The lobbyists for low rates on "junk mail" have simply misread the temper of the American people. The lobbyists have tried to convey the impression that I am wrecking business, and throwing people on the welfare rolls, simply by asking that these advertisers-by-mail pay their way like everybody else does. The results of the National Federation of Independent Business Poll show conclusively that the American businessman, who is and should be the strongest defender of the free enterprise system, does not fall for this propaganda. Business men have voted solidly in favor of requiring third-class mailers to pay what it costs the Post Office Department to deliver their advertising. They have shown that they don't believe in forcing the American taxpayer to subsidize a big profitmaking business by helping to pay 40 percent of its postage rates.

I am particularly pleased that West Virginia businessmen have voted in such overwhelming numbers in support of my bill. The fact that West Virginians are 92 percent in favor of my bill, as against 82 percent throughout the Nation, clearly means that West Virginia business men are 10 percent smarter than the national average.

IMMEDIATE UNITED STATES-SOVIET SUMMIT ON MIDEAST; RESOLUTION FOR FRONTIER GUARANTEES AS A PLAN OF NEGOTIATION

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, of this year I spoke to my colleagues in the House on the impending danger of flareup in the Middle East. On that day, nearly 5 months ago, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 64 urging immediate steps toward a joint guarantee of frontiers in that area by the United States and the Soviet Union.

I want briefly to recall, for my colleagues, the key thought of my address on the floor on that day.

> We cannot wait until the day that bullets replace the blistering charges and countercharges which have been regularly exchanged across frontiers. It is time that our Nation took affirmative action to soften the tensions in this area. . . . It is important that we not allow Israel to be pushed into a war of face-saving or a war to defend her territory against intermittent slaughter. One way we can ease this pressure is to put world opinion squarely behind maintaining the territorial status-quo in the Middle-East. A frontier guarantee agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union would have this effect; but we must act quickly if we are to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, the horrible eventuality I feared would happen 5 months ago occurred early this morning. While, in the interim period, our Ambassador to the United Nations and our President have taken steps in the course of normal diplomatic channels to attempt prevention of what has occurred, normal channels are no longer adequate to prevent a real disaster, perhaps of worldwide scope.

As I urged in House Concurrent Resolution 64, I again urge today that we seek immediate agreement with Russia and other great powers, establishing and enforcing peace and territorial integrity for all Mideast countries.

But at this late and unhappy hour, extraordinary steps must be taken to accomplish even a cease-fire in the eastern Mediterranean. I urge all of my colleagues in this House and in the Senate to join me in calling on our President to personally and immediately offer to meet with the highest officials of the Soviet Union and the other great powers, to begin working out a solution to this tragedy from the highest level.

NATIONAL FLAG WEEK

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the 7 days beginning next Sunday, June 11, will mark the second annual commemoration of National Flag Week. I am most grateful to this body, to the Senate, and to the President for their actions last year in approving my joint resolution establishing the week in which Flag Day, June 14, occurs as National Flag Week.

This, of course, is a relatively new commemoration in the history of our beloved country, but its roots are secured in a long-ago date. June 14, 1967, will mark the 190th anniversary of the adoption by the Continental Congress of the Stars and Stripes as the official flag of the United States of America—June 14, 1777.

The principal reason Congress and the President approved my proposal to extend Flag Day into Flag Week was, in fact, a rather practical one. It often happens, of course, that June 14 falls on a Saturday or Sunday, when most businesses, offices, and industrial plants are not open and therefore not able to display Old Glory, as they would like to. The same was true of service clubs, which meet only once a week and which, by tradition, like to observe Flag Day with a club program.

Now all these establishments and organizations may observe Flag Day on any day of Flag Week or, for that matter, can display our national banner throughout that week, which was one hoped-for development that I had in mind in submitting my joint resolution to the 89th Congress.

But Flag Week has a far greater meaning and significance than any justification based on such purely practical reasons. This is so because of all our flag's symbolism in the American heritage. Our flag is the Declaration of Independence. It is the Constitution, and all the freedom and liberty embodied therein. Our flag is the Star Spangled Banner of Francis Scott Key and Fort McHenry. It is the Union itself, held together at Vicksburg, Gettysburg, and Appomattox. It is Admiral Dewey at Manila Bay and Teddy Roosevelt on San Juan Hill. It is the doughboys in the muddy trenches of France in 1917–18. It is Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Iwo Jima, Anzio, and the Normandy beaches. It is Korea and today it is Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that now, as perhaps never before, Americans have occasion to demonstrate their solid support of our fighting men by displaying the Stars and Stripes—by the millions, throughout the length and breadth of this land, during this second annual National Flag Week. Nothing, in my opinion, could demonstrate more eloquently or forcibly the unity of the American people in their resistance to the threat to their security and freedom that is posed by the forces of aggression in this critical time of battlefield strife.

Let there be such a display of the red, white, and blue next week as to dispel for all the world to see, all talk of any lack of resolve on the part of the American people to see the present struggle through to an honorable and successful conclusion.

THE EXPLOSIVE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this morning the thing we have dreaded most in the Middle East became a fearful reality. Open fighting has broken out between armed forces of Egypt and Israel. Thus, the long feared and postponed inevitability in the Middle East has occurred, and the peace of the world is once again placed in jeopardy.

The responsibility immediately thrust upon the world and certainly upon the United States is to bring the situation between Israel and the Arab Republic quickly and permanently under control. I join in the fervent prayer and fond hope that the United Nations can and will assume the necessary leadership and will devise the means to head off another downward plunge for civilization.

I will, of course, support every effort of the United Nations toward this end, as indeed I have throughout its history.

I have been to the Middle East and to other parts of the world where the U.N., from time to time, has stood as the only barrier between hostile interests and has prevented the two from clashing and setting off the inevitable explosion. I have seen the effectiveness of the U.N. peacekeeping in the Middle East; have seen the tremendous respect with which it has been held by both the Arab Republic and the Israel Government.

And I was deeply disappointed and filled with a sense of grave foreboding when that force was summarily withdrawn from the frontiers of Egypt and Israel a week or two ago. The barrier was thus removed. The two forces were permitted to mix, and the inevitable result is now at hand.

I can only deplore the naive optimism of the Secretary General who so quickly withdrew the only effective deterrent to a Middle East war in the apparent belief that Egypt and Israel could resolve their differences peacefully without the influence of a third party. It behooves him now to move with even greater swiftness and determination to prevent the conflagration from engulfing the entire world.

The commitments of the United States to uphold and safeguard the national and territorial integrity of Israel are clear. We are the moral and legal ally of Israel in defense against territorial aggressors. We must and do stand ready with unilateral military assistance in behalf of the Israelis.

However, the Middle East crisis cannot and must not be considered a unilateral crusade by the United States. Peace and stability in the Middle East are essential to world peace, therefore it is a world problem.

The United States should make every effort to mount an effective multilateral drive toward a quick and permanent end to the fighting. If we cannot secure it through the U.N., then we should certainly turn to our other allies such as Great Britain and France. Their stake is fully as great as ours. Moreover, their unilateral commitments in behalf of Israel are just as binding as ours. Unilateral action by any world power must be considered only as an absolute last resort. Military and diplomatic action should be mounted in concert with other nations if an effective and lasting solution to the Arab-Israel dispute is to be implemented.

LACK OF ADEQUATE LAWS TO COVER TREASONOUS AND SEDITIOUS UTTERANCES?

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have had many occasions in the past to pay tribute to Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, a former chief of Army Intelligence. I am proud to have him as a friend.

In uniform he was one of our great Americans. In mufti he remains a great American. I was interested recently when I read an Associated Press dispatch quoting General Trudeau as raising the question of lack of adequate laws to cover treasonous and seditious utterances by some people, as well as demonstrations which incite to riot in violation of the law.

If the general's observations were not so tragic, it would be amusing.

Has the general not gotten the word yet from the Department of Justice, who says it is most difficult to write adequate laws to protect this country? And if the general has not gotten the word, I am directing his attention to the following colloquy:

(From raw hearings on the draft before House Armed Services Committee, May 5, 1967, and a part of an exchange between the distinguished chairman from South Carolina and Fred Vinson, Jr., Assistant Attorney General of the United States. The emphasis is mine. P. 880, lines 11–25; p. 881, lines 1–11.)

The Chairman. Have you any advice to give the committee whereby we can strengthen the law in this area as it affects the faithful performance of the carrying out of the Selective Service Act? Because if carried to its logical conclusion, if one were persuasive enough he could dissuade all young men not to register. Then where would you be?

Mr. Vinson. Well, I am convinced it would take a more persuasive man than now walks the earth, because actually—and I think our Selective Service figures demonstrate that the vast bulk of our young men are not only ready but willing to serve their country.

The Chairman. That is beside the point. That goes down to motivation, their training on their mother's knee and in schools and communities. I am talking about the actions of any one individual. *What you are telling us, under the decisions of the Supreme Court now there is no way you can indict any individual who counsels against registering for service to his country under the provisions of this or any other law on the statute books of the United States? Is this what you are telling us?*

Mr. Vinson. *Well, basically I suppose what I am saying is that no legislation can override the First Amendment*. The First Amendment rights, however are not absolute. This again gets back to the idea expressed by Holmes in the area of proximity.

Now I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the article quoting General Trudeau:

Ex-Army Spy Boss Testifies: "U.S. War Protest Chiefs Get Orders From Moscow"

Washington.—Retired Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, a former chief of Army intelligence, said today the leaders of anti-Vietnam war demonstrations in this country are taking orders from Moscow.

And he told the Senate internal security subcommittee that a Soviet announcement last week that Yurd Andropov has been put at the head of the KGB, the Soviet secret police, bodes more trouble for the United States.

"This is not a change which affects the U.S.S.R. internally only but is of extreme importance to the Communists' main target, the United States," said Trudeau.

"The KGB has been upgraded," he testified. "We can expect more espionage, more sabotage, more demonstrations and bolder actions by Communist agents, directed centrally from Moscow and aimed primarily at Washington."

Trudeau, who now makes his home in Pittsburgh, is president of the Gulf Research and Deveopment Co. He retired from the Army in 1962 and was chief of intelligence in 1953–55.

He warned that "the Communists and other subversive elements are well aware that our society cannot survive if we continue to tolerate increasing disorders."

"Present events have gone far beyond the right to dissent of a traditional display in order to right a grievance," Trudeau said.

"Stopping of troop trains, sitins, burning of draft cards, burning the American flag, displaying the Viet Cong flag and other so-called fight-for-peace demonstrations are acts at least bordering on treason," he said.

The retired general said Congress should pass tighter laws declaring such acts as flag-burning a federal crime.

And he said that "if, in fact, a gap does exist between treason and giving aid and comfort to the enemy, such as the Viet Cong, then this should be filled with a new federal law just below treason."

He said he could state on the basis of his military assignments that "nearly all of the radical student organizations, the so-called pacifist organizations, and civil rights groups are honeycombed with Communists."

Trudeau also testified that he could state unequivocally that "the demonstrators in the streets of the cities of the United States are a force in direct support of the Viet Cong killing our troops in Vietnam."

And further, he said, "the leaders are taking orders and being supplied from the identical high command—the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R." He said he was sure many demonstrators were unaware of this.

In the ultimate, it all boils down to one simple fact. The Department of Justice refuses to discharge its responsibility and duty in this area.

ADDRESS OF UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE KATZENBACH AT ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I announce to the House the conclusion of a visit to Africa by Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach that was most helpful in deepening the ties of interest and understanding of our country and the countries of Africa. By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the text of Secretary Katzenbach's address at Haile Selassie I University in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, on May 26, 1967, as follows:

America and Africa: The New World and the Newer World

President Kassa, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In the Congo, there is a wise proverb: "Let him speak who has seen with his eyes."

It is so with this great continent. In the United States, one can imagine Africa from the stereotypes generated by films and zoos and masks in museums. One can hear about Africa from a growing number of Americans with ties here. One can read about Africa from a swelling number of books. But none of this data can produce more than a Mercator projection. None of it can convey the vitality of Africa—the equal vitality of old villages and new cities. None of it can convey the diversity and spirit of your people. I can say this because, heeding the proverb, I have come to see with my own eyes.

I cannot now pretend to speak with great insight. A tour of 12 countries in 17 days can provide no more than a taste, a suggestion. But I do wish to share with you a few observations as this full and moving experience draws to a close.

It is fitting that I do so at this time, in this city, and in this place. It is a fitting time for yesterday was the fourth anniversary of the creation of the Organization of African Unity—a date whose importance is already plain and which will, I believe, become even clearer in coming years. And today is the first anniversary of President Johnson's memorable address on Africa, an expression of congratulation and confidence which he has asked me to renew to the officers and member nations of the OAU.

Equally, this is a fitting place. As one who was closely involved for five years in America's great effort to make law the instrument of full equality, I can have only the warmest feelings for your law school and for its seminal effect on legal education throughout Africa.

I expressed the hope that it would be possible to come here to offer some reflections on Africa because to talk of Africa is to talk of change and to talk of youth. My words may have some interest in the United States. They may have some significance to political leaders in Africa. But it is the young people of Africa—you and the generation immediately to follow—who will determine the outcome. It is you who are the most important audience of all.

It has been observed that travelers are justified in describing what they have seen and need not rise to generalization. I might be greatly tempted to take that observation to heart, for we have seen magnificent things. Yet it is impossible to settle for mere description. The contrasts are still more startling than the sights.

In West Africa, we saw the sun set on an uninhabited rain forest beach just as it might have ten centuries ago. But only a few miles away, in Dakar, we saw a spectacular urban renewal project housing 60,000.

In Zambia, we saw men pulling wooden carts to market. But only a few miles away, we saw giant cargo planes unloading barrels of oil and taking on tons of copper ingots, all within 12 minutes.

In Ghana, we saw a village woman in a red loincloth cooking over an open fire. But only a few yards away, we saw energy pouring out of the giant orange penstocks of the Volta River Dam.

We have seen, in short, the old Africa and the new.

If the changes that are taking place are far-reaching, they are not unique to this continent. The whole world feels the power of revolutionary change. One level is external: the change in international relations impelled by the headlong technological advances of the past few decades. A second level is internal: the attempts by new nations to find appropriate institutions and responses to meet the needs of their peoples.

Change is all about us and yet we are only dimly aware of the forces that it unleashes. The giant Volta River Dam at Akosombo means power, industry, and economic strength. But consider the problems that have come with it:

The vast reservoir behind the dam has displaced thousands of families.

After generations of fishing in a swift river, those who remain must now learn to catch lake fish.

Medical specialists brood about which new diseases will be bred in the now still water.

On a larger scale, we send men into space. We communicate instantaneously with the most distant nations by satellites. His Imperial Majesty this year has twice flown to North America more easily than he traveled to the provinces not many years ago. Yet we are still trying to find a way to bring something so fundamental as human dignity and self-determination to the Africans in the southern part of this continent.

This is a cause in which we stand with you, conscience to conscience. Not for economic gain, not for political advantage, not for cosmetic appearance, but because we share the certainty once expressed by President Kaunda: "We shall win because we are right."

As striking as these contrasts in change may be, I find myself impressed by some striking parallels between the new world of America and the newer world of Africa.

I do not mean America of the moment, for that is a deceptive model. First, America may be wealthy, America may be advanced, America may be a world power, but America also is troubled by internal problems. Like Africa, like other parts of the world, my country encompasses a great underdeveloped country, an underdeveloped America of citizens who are poor, who often are ignorant, and who for too long have been ignored. President Johnson and his administration have made the uplifting of these people a prime domestic goal, but that goal cannot soon be achieved.

Second, America of today is a deceptive model precisely because it is the developed America of today. Our concern, our devoted concern here, is the Africa of tomorrow.

What do I mean, then, by striking parallels between America and Africa? I mean parallels in development—the factors in the growth of my country which have relevance to the growth of the new nations of your continent.

Let me focus on three of these factors.

The first is education, and I would like to begin by reading you a passage I find unusually descriptive: ". . . What sphere of patriotic exertion is left open for the lover of his country, but the sphere of improving the rising generation through the instrumentality of a more perfect and efficient system for their education?

"We call our fathers patriots because they loved their country and made sacrifices for its welfare, but what was their country? A vast tract of wilderness did not constitute it. It was not unconscious, sentient plains, or rivers, or mountains, however majestically they might spread or flow or shine beneath the canopy of heaven. Their country was chiefly their descendants, the human beings who roam these vast domains, the sentient, conscious natures which were to live here—and living, to enjoy or suffer."

These words were written in 1842 by Horace Mann, an American, and a leading exponent of public education. They have relevance to Africa now. Efforts like his were successful. The United States initiated widespread free public education. Was it merely coincidence that my country's mushrooming rush to industrial power began approximately 15 years later?

The importance Africa places on education is evident from statistics. Of 53 African universities, 30 have been created since 1952 and 11 since 1961. The number of all students on this continent has nearly tripled in 15 years, from 9 million in 1950 to 27,000,000 today. The number of university students has gone from 70,000 in 1950 to more than 250,000.

Yet it is impossible to take too much cheer from such statistics, for there are other figures which suggest the enormity of the job ahead. University enrollment may be 180,000 greater than it was fifteen years ago. Yet at the same time, the number of university-aged Africans has increased by three million in just the past five years.

A second parallel between developing Africa and America when it was developing is transportation.

America began as a nation of 4,000,000, largely settled, like many of your countries, on the coastal fringe of a vast land, and containing vast mineral and agricultural treasure.

Unlocking that wilderness was an immediate goal. Even before the steam engine had been invented, we had completed what was then a national road. When the railroad did come, it became an object of high priority.

In 1830, America had 23 miles of railroads. Twenty-five years later, there were 18,000 miles of railroads. Five years after that, in 1860, there were 30,000 miles.

I believe it is fair to say that from 1840 until the turn of the century, transportation—the railroad—was the key to American success.

In 1869 came an historic date that symbolizes much of our past and your future—the completion of a trans-continental railroad line—a line that tied a vast nation together; a line that allowed ore, wheat, and timber to be taken out; a line that allowed men to come in.

"The railroad," an American historian has written, "tied the North and West into one massive free economy. It did much more. It tied business to politics and both to the life of the individual in a way unknown in America before."

What these words say about America seem to me to have great force on this continent.

The parallel with present-day Africa is indeed striking. The new nations of this continent require circulatory lifeblood, allowing the transport of your natural wealth and the ready infusion of human resources to help develop it.

In the Africa of the late 20th century, transportation might well center on highways or even air routes rather than railroads. But the principle—and the potential—are the same. Finally, let me turn to agriculture and natural resources. When America was settled, there were vast expanses of fertile but inaccessible land. There were hidden treasures in minerals. It was the railroad that opened up those riches to development. As transportation improved, young America could go beyond farming for subsistence and become a source of food for others; our Midwest was built on a foundation of wheat for the world.

The fertility provided by nature and the accessibility provided by technology were supported by another factor: extensive government-private cooperation to improve both the production and the lives of our farm population.

One great advance was an act of Congress of 1862 providing for colleges to promote knowledge of "agricultural and mechanical arts." In short order, such institutions were established in almost every eligible state.

These did more than train young men and women in needed skills. Through extension centers, they went out to the people. Ultimately, through resident agents in each county, they reached out to virtually every part of our agricultural areas. These county agents brought practical advice as well as technical and scientific information—not only to farmers but also to their wives and families.

The parallels of mineral and agricultural potential in this continent are plain. There is great need for information, tutelage and advice at the village level. There is a need at least as great for instruction and assistance in marketing and distribution. Here in Ethiopia, the Agricultural High School at Jimma and the College of Agricultural at Alemaya are pioneering efforts on a fruitful frontier. For Africa could become an agricultural heartland for the world, given your unlimited potential for production. That is a potential for more than one-crop economies, for a wide diversity of crops, some with industrial applicability. And it is a potential for more than agricultural production, for it could readily lead to the development of the food-processing industry.

However appropriate these parallels may be, there is a basic defect in each of them: America was able to devise these answers to development alone and at its own pace for two reasons—reasons which make it possible for Americans to be thankful that our thirteen colonies won their independence in a simpler day.

One of these reasons is that we came to independence at a time when it was possible for us to be truly independent—to hold ourselves aloof from the rest of the world.

Though we were impoverished, we were left alone to build a nation and find our destiny. For decades, we found a watchword in Washington's farewell address: "It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances, with any portion of the foreign world."

For us, non-alignment was an easy task.

The second reason is that, unlike some thirty new African nations, we became independent in a time when technological change was slow and slight.

Our arms were rudimentary, but they fired as well—sometimes better—than the Naval cannon and muskets of imperial Britain.

Our economy was simple, but then so was that of every country, in a time when concepts like gross national product were a century away from definition.

And our industry was primitive—for there was no other sort of industry. It was conducted on spinning wheels and blacksmiths' anvils. The world had not yet even dreamed of megatons or megawatts, aluminum smelters of titanium airplanes.

In short, newly independent America had time—time to explore itself, time to educate itself, time to learn new vocabularies and new technologies as they were devised.

By contrast, the new nations of Africa have been called to the main stage immediately—to go from the spear to the slide rule, from disunited tribes to the United Nations virtually in months.

Can this transition be made with the speed which the influential young men and women of Africa believe necessary?

That is not a question for an outsider to answer. It is a central question in virtually every new African nation. Their answers undoubtedly will vary. I would suggest, however, that there are two irreducible factors to which we must reconcile ourselves, factors which must limit the telescoping of time on this continent.

The first of these factors is human capabilities. The education of intelligent men and women in complex skills can be improved in quality. It can be enlarged in quantity. But no amount of good motives, nor wealth, nor wisdom can, without the passage of time, produce the pool of skilled and educated African men and women who are required to manage the affairs and fuel the spirit of a modern nation.

You here in this eminent institution will be frontiersmen in that effort. But not until your numbers swell-as surely they will—can this country and your sister countries on this continent find the manpower with which to generate widespread growth.

The second factor to which I believe we must reconcile ourselves follows the first. It is suggested occasionally that the development time gap could be overcome if only developed nations like the United States would more fully meet responsibilities of assistance to the underdeveloped world.

As a son of a free country and as a friend of Africa, I am unable to accept this case. It is theoretically possible for major industrial powers to send huge sums and corps of technicians to build and operate factories, or transportation systems, or railroads. And by doing so, they would help build nations in Africa. But they would not be African nations in Africa. As we oppose neo-colonialism, so should we oppose such a false solution.

President Johnson has observed accurately that development cannot be exported. And President Nyerere has said of his people, they "recognize that the task of economic development is a long and heavy one . . . our people do not believe that it is better to be a wealthy slave than a poor free man."

By no means do I wish to suggest that African nations can avoid losing their independence only by refusing outside assistance. Nor do I wish to suggest that already-developed nations should not assist those parts of humanity who are coming late to political manhood. What I do believe is that, in the interests both of developed and developing nations, developmental assistance must be carefully offered—and it must be carefully received.

In his speech on Africa a year ago, President Johnson outlined a policy for such assistance, noting that "The world has now reached a stage where some of the most effective means of economic growth can best be achieved in large units commanding large resources and large markets. Most nation-states are too small, when acting alone, to assure the welfare of all of their people."

This is the principle which underlies our present policy of aid for Africa—cooperation among donors and cooperation among recipients.

This is not a new philosophy for us. Nearly a third of the aid we have provided in the past has been for projects benefitting not merely one country but several.

We are assisting river development in the Senegal River, Niger River and Lake Chad basins. We are working with an organization of 14 Central African nations to combat measles, smallpox, rinderpest and bovine pneumonia. In this decade, Ethiopia and four other African countries have combined with American and British support, to form the Desert Locust Control Authority, whose efforts have been completely successful. We have helped to establish advanced education institutions, like the regional heavy equipment training center in Togo.

Neither is such a cooperative policy new in the relations of other countries. The nations of Western Europe have made striking progress in the past decade toward a common market. The leaders of Latin America have just pledged themselves to work toward a similar goal.

The aim of our cooperative policy is simple: maximum benefit for all the new nations of Africa. We do not seek to dictate development priorities to recipient countries. The fact is that virtually every nation has the same developmental priorities to begin with—the same sort of priorities which I described as paralleling the experience of my country—education, transportation, and agricultural and natural resource development.

Nor is it our aim to require rigid cooperative groupings. The new nations of Africa have varying links to each other. River development may run North and South; a railroad may benefit two nations; a public health program may involve 14.

We shall look with particular interest for programs organized by existing multilateral organizations—the World Bank, the African Development Bank, ECA, and the OAU. At the same time, we will welcome project proposals devised directly by the participating countries. Indeed, the competition among them may well serve as a spur and thus itself help bring the economies of scale to African development.

Even beyond flexibility, beyond economies of scale, beyond the more beneficial use of developmental assistance, our new emphasis on cooperation among donors and cooperation among recipients can have another result, a result which may, in the end, be the most important of all. It can serve as an additional impulse toward African unity.

In my various conversations across this continent I have found unity a goal that is widely shared, and a goal that is particularly prized by young people. They see their young countries struggling against the arbitrary divisions inflicted by the colonial period—divisions created by inherited boundaries; divisions created by the imposition of different Western languages; divisions created by different levels of colonial development.

It is this aspect of cooperative development that is to me the most hopeful and the most exciting. For if it is conducted among groupings established by the recipient countries themselves, it seems to me that it can be an important force toward the eventual conquest of those arbitrary divisions.

We believe, in short, that this policy of coordination among donors and cooperation among recipients is sound. We hope it will be successful. But even if it succeeds beyond our wildest expectations it can only hasten—and not bring about—the emergence of Africa as a community of strong and confident nations, able and willing to make their contribution to the welfare of their people and of the world.

And that work, that very difficult and patient and inspired and patriotic work must be yours. The present leaders of Africa have begun that work with wisdom and courage. It will be in your lifetimes—and indeed because of your lifetimes—that this work will come to fruition, that the land, and the people who animate the land, and the spirit that animates your people will make their mighty contribution to the world.

I think of the words of President Senghor, describing the spirit Africa can give to the world:

"For who would teach rhythm to a dead world of machines and guns?

"Who would give the cry of joy to wake the dead and the bereaved at the dawn?

"Say, who would give back the memory of life to the man whose hopes are smashed?"

I see, much more clearly now, what he means, Africa will not be easily mastered. One has only to see the struggle of wresting crops from difficult soil and hostile climate to know that it has taken people of character to make something of the land. It has taken courage, tenacity, humor, creativity—in short, spirit.

What has impressed me, then, about Africa is not so much its vastness, nor its resource potential, nor its beauty, but its people.

The foundation of Africa is the spirit of its people.

Africa is on the move. I knew that before I came, now I believe it.

INTEROCEANIC CANAL PROBLEM IN THE AMERICAS

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress from Louisiana, a State with large shipping activities and vital connections with the Panama Canal, I have watched with the greatest interest and increasing concern the succession of crises in recent years at Panama, which have serious implications for interoceanic commerce and the security of the Western Hemisphere.

During this time, in both the House and Senate, distinguished Members of the Congress have made many addresses dealing with these matters. Among the subjects covered have been the Monroe Doctrine, our Caribbean policies, the Panama Canal, and the question of interoceanic canals generally.

The principal purposes of these efforts have been clarification of our foreign policies with Latin America and the fostering of harmonious relations between the United States and the nations to the south as matters of the highest importance.

Results have been evidenced by articles in various periodicals, seminars in institutions of learning, thoughtful resolutions by veterans' and other patriotic organizations, and a growing interest and understanding over the Nation of some of the grave policy questions involved.

The magnitude of the source material thus made available is shown by a comprehensive bibliography prepared by Representative Clark W. Thompson, of Texas, former chairman in 1949–50 of the Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Operation of the Panama Canal. This list of references was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 2, 1964, under the title of "Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Documentation, 1955–64."

In these connections, one of the most significant developments was a colloquium on "The Strategic Importance of Latin America" held during July 17 to 21, 1964, at Georgetown University under the auspices of its Center for Strategic Studies, of which Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy, retired, a former Chief of Naval Operations, is director.

This occasion was a memorable proceeding attended by notable personages from Latin America. Those present included:

Former President Miguel Alemán of Mexico.

Mr. Paulo Ayres Filho of the Instituto Pinheiros, Sâo Paulo, Brazil.

Dr. Pedro Beltrán, former Prime Minister of Peru.

Mr. Alberto Benegas Lynch, President of the Centro de Estudios Sobre La Libertad, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Mr. Alvaro Fernándes Escalante of the Movimiento Costa Rica Libre, San José, Costa Rica.

Mr. Fernando Guillén Martińez of the Comité de Accion Ciudadana, Bogotá, Colombia.

Mr. Patrico Lasso Carrión, former Minister of Defense of Ecuador.

Mr. Eudocio Ravines, editor of Vanguardia, Lima, Peru.

Monseñor José Joaquín Salcedo of Acción Cultural Popular, Bogotá, Colombia.

His Excellency, Enrique Tejera-París, Ambassador of Venezuela to the United States.

Adm. Alberto Pablo Vago of the Argentine Navy.

Dr. Carlos Urrutia Aparicio, former Ambassador of Guatemala to the Organization of American States.

The colloquium included a like number of U.S. officials, business leaders, and academic experts of comparable stature in the Latin American field.

The director of the colloquium was Prof. Norman A. Bailey, of Queens College, New York. Its coordinator was Dr. Donald M. Dozer, distinguished author and professor of history at the University of California, Santa Barbara, formerly historian in the Department of State.

The papers discussed dealt with the military, strategic, economic, social, and cultural factors in Inter-American relations. Edited by Dr. Bailey, these contributions were published in 1965 for the Center of Strategic Studies by Frederick A. Praeger of New York in the book, "Latin America: Politics, Economics and Hemispheric Security," as part of the Praeger Special Studies in International Policies and Public Affairs.

Chapter 3 of this book is a carefully researched paper by Dr. Dozer on "The Interoceanic Canal Problem in the Americas." In it, the author cuts through the clouds of confusion that have so often featured writings about canal problems, brings the key issues into sharp focus, including the question of our indispensable sovereignty over the Canal Zone, and urges the creation of an independent, broadly based Interoceanic Canals Commission to consider the entire canal subject, including its diplomatic aspects, with the view of securing basic legislation.

In connection with Dr. Dozer's paper, the attention of the Congress is invited to an address by Capt. C. H. Schildhauer, U.S. Navy Reserve, retired, on "The Problem of a New Canal: The Best Solution," published in a statement to the Senate on July 13, 1966, by Senator JOHN G. TOWER, of Texas; also to a collection of authoritative addresses on "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions" by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, published as House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, and containing a vast store of authoritative and revealing information.

The latest major development in the growing public movement as regards the canal question, which has resulted from informed congressional leadership, was the adoption on September 1, 1966, by the American Legion's 48th Annual Convention, after mature consideration, of a resolution calling for the following:

First. The continuation by the United States of its indispensable sovereign control over the Canal Zone;

Second. The enactment by the Congress of legislation to create an independent, broadly based Interoceanic Canal Commission, with a mandate to consider all tangible solutions for improvement of transisthmian operating conditions and increasing traffic capacity; and

Third. The deferment of all further diplomatic negotiations between the United States and Panama about the canal problem until after such Commission is created and makes its studies and recommendations.

This American Legion resolution closely follows the views and reasoning set forth in Dr. Dozer's paper, which reflects scholarship, well-digested knowledge and vast experience in the Department of State. The long delay and complexities in the current treaty negotiations with Panama makes his paper both timely and useful.

During the present Congress, Representatives WILLIAM R. ANDERSON of Tennessee, BOW, of Ohio, FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, HOSMER and SISK, of California, and I have introduced identical bills to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission.

To make Dr. Dozer's paper, the correlated American Legion resolution, and the text of my bill to create the indicated Commission readily available to the responsible officials and citizens of our Nation, I quote the documents memtioned as part of my remarks:

LATIN AMERICA—POLITICS, ECONOMICS, AND HEMISPHERIC SECURITY*—THE INTEROCEANIC CANAL PROBLEM IN THE AMERICAS

(By Donald M. Dozer)

In the nomenclature of geopolitics the Western Hemisphere consists of two continental land masses each of which possesses its own heartland and rimland areas. The two continents are connected by a narrow isthmus which, from the arrival of the first white conquistadores in the American hemisphere, served as a strategic crossroad for the conquest of lands both to the south and to the north—Perú controlling the heartland of South America and Louisiana controlling the great Mississippi River valley, the heartland of North America. Only slightly less vital as strategic bases are the Caribbean Islands commanding the maritime approaches to the isthmus from the east.

The position of the United States in the Panama Canal Zone is due directly to the long-range commitment undertaken by this government to construct, maintain, operate, sanitate, and protect an isthmian canal in pursuance of the Hay Pauncefote Treaty with Great Britain in 1901 and the Spooner Act of 1902 authorizing the securing of a canal route by treaty with Colombia, which at that time was sovereign of the isthmus. The construction of the Panama Canal, located at the strategic center of the Americas, revolutionized the political geography of half the world. The severing of the isthmus by the construction of the canal between 1904 and 1914 enormously enhanced the importance of the isthmus by enabling the transit between the oceans of vessels of war and commerce. Even before arrangements were made for the construction of the canal, the United States had foresightedly provided for a naval base at Guantanamo on the south coast of Cuba to guard the eastward approach to the isthmus.

As the canal was constructed by the United States the foreign policy of our nation after 1903 *vis-à-vis* the countries of Central America was formulated more explicitly than ever before in terms of the protection of its interests in that area, requiring that it stabilize the countries of Central America and reinterpret the Monroe Doctrine to produce and maintain stability there. One major motive—probably the most important single motive—for the policy of fiscal control and interventions supported by our Naval forces and the Marine Corps, which the United States followed in the Caribbean and Central America after 1905, was the protection of the canal. For the United States, the canal, because of its shortening of maritime trade routes, became the decisive focus of policy formulation toward the countries to the south. In both respects its value and indeed its indispensability to the United States were later proved during both world wars and the Korean War.

The Panama Canal is one of the greatest transportation facilities in the Americas. It is primarily a commercial operation, one of the largest in which the United States is engaged. As such, it is required by law "to be self-supporting, to reimburse the United States Treasury annually for the net cost of operation of the Canal Zone Government and the basic annuity payment to the Republic of Panama, and to pay interest to the Treasury on the net investment of the United States Government in the corporation." The present annuity of $1,930,000 consists of $430,000, which was an adjustment of the $250,000 annuity caused by devaluation of the gold dollar, and the additional $1,500,000 borne by the State Department budget. The Panama Canal enterprise is not a part of the Department of Defense. It is an independent agency under the President but is currently assigned for supervision to the Secretary of the Army. It is not, however, a part of either the Army or the Defense Department. The Bureau of the Budget in 1950 recommended its transfer by Executive Order to the Secretary of Commerce.

For the United States the canal has been characterized as the lifeline of national defense and the backbone of its ocean commerce. In 1962 almost 60 per cent of the cargo carried through the canal involved the commerce of the United States. The prime function of the canal is the safe and expeditious transport of vessels from one ocean to the other. Its importance in this respect is shown by the fact that in 1963 it furnished transit for 11,999 vessels of commerce and war of various nations on terms of equality. Before and during its construction great danger to the canal was apprehended from naval gunfire, but the canal has been so adequately protected that in wartime it has suffered no damage from either direct hits or sabotage.

Reservations have been expressed since World War II as to the strategic significance of the Panama Canal in an age of nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles, which have altered the nature of modern warfare and allegedly increased the vulnerability of such stationary installations as the canal. The canal, it is argued, will have to be defended by large navies stationed far out in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans or from land bases in the continental United States. In 1957, Hanson Baldwin pronounced the canal indefensible in total war and in conflicts less than total war less defensible and less strategic than ever before. Navy planning is based on a two-ocean navy without reference to any movement of naval vessels through the canal. Further, it is alleged, the usefulness of the canal to the United States is limited by the inability of the major United States aircraft carriers to transit it. In all, 24 United States naval vessels are unable to squeeze through it, and many commercial vessels either are too big to transit it or cannot go through fully loaded. Since World War II these and other developments, particularly the intensified anti-United States demonstrations in Panama, have focused world attention anew upon alternate canal possibilities and have also revived proposals for a sea-level canal which, it is argued, would be less likely to be put out of service by sabotage or a nuclear explosion than the present lock canal.

---

*Edited by Norman A. Bailey.

The steps in the procedure by which the United States undertook the construction of the canal across the isthmus connecting the continents of North and South America are well known. The obstacles presented by the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850 with Great Britain had first to be removed. The abrogation of that treaty was accomplished in the second Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901, giving the United States a free hand, as far as Britain was concerned, to construct a canal across the isthmus of Central America. Thereafter a decision had to be made by the United States as to the most feasible route for a canal among four major possibilities: (1) the Tehuantepec route through Mexico, the rights to which the United States had acquired in the Gadsden Treaty of 1853, (2) the route following the San Juan River between Nicaragua and Costa Rica, (3) the route through the Colombian department of Panama, and (4) the route through Colombia from the Gulf of Darién following the Atrato River, thence across the Continental Divide and down the valley of the Truando into the Pacific. Studies and surveys made by the Isthmian Canal Commission, headed by Rear Admiral John G. Walker, initially gave preference to the Nicaragua route, but the Commission's recommendation to this effect was subsequently altered because of the clearly demonstrated advantages of the Panama route and the pressures exerted by the reorganized New Panama Canal Company, which was eager to sell to the United States its concession to the Panama route. As a result Congress passed the Spooner Act in 1902 which authorized the President to construct the canal through Panama if he could make satisfactory arrangements with the New Panama Canal Company and with Colombia, of which Panama was then a department. The arrangements with the Company were made, the Company agreeing to sell all its canal rights and equipment to the United States for $40 million.

But when Secretary of State John Hay negotiated a treaty with Colombia for a concession to build the canal through Panama, he ran into difficulties. Colombia was jealous of its sovereign prerogatives, it was torn by civil war, and the Colombian Senate unanimously rejected the treaty, as it clearly was entitled to do under the Colombian Constitution. The Roosevelt Administration then diplomatically intervened in a successful revolution in Panama and hastily concluded with the new government, on November 18, 1903, a "Convention for the Construction of a Ship Canal."

This Convention made the United States the guarantor of the independence of the Republic of Panama and granted to the United States "in perpetuity the use, occupation and control of a zone" ten miles wide across the isthmus "for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection" of the canal, excepting the cities of Panama and Colón at the Pacific and Caribbean ends of the zone respectively. In its key Article III, which has since been variously interpreted and remains a subject of controversy, it gave the United States "all the rights, power and authority within the zone . . . which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory . . . to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority." In addition the treaty gave the United States full rights to the water runoff in the Chagres River valley lying outside the zone for navigation, water-power, and other purposes.

As compensation for these sovereign rights, power, and authority the United States agreed to pay Panama $10 million in gold coin at the time of the ratification of the treaty in full satisfaction of Panama's claims of sovereignty in the Canal Zone, and $250,000 annually in like gold coin beginning nine years after ratification of the treaty. This latter amount was to be paid to Panama by the United States as the new owner of the Panama Railroad Company which under its concession from Colombia had been liable for annual payments in this amount.

Subsequently, the United States acquired, pursuant to the treaty of 1903, outright ownership of all land and other property in the Canal Zone by purchase from the individual owners. When the canal was completed it became possible to fix the boundary line between the Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama paralleling the canal axis five miles from it on each side. In pursuance of the treaty of 1903 these lines were fixed in a Boundary Convention dated September 2, 1914, and cannot be altered except by the negotiation of a new treaty. The Panama Canal Zone consists of a ten-mile strip of land and water across the isthmus extending five miles on each side of the center line of the canal, the arms of Gatún Lake up to the 100 foot contour, and Madden Lake up to the 260 foot contour. The seaward limits are three marine miles from mean low water. The total Canal Zone area is 647.29 square miles, including 89.45 square miles of water within the 3-mile limits and 185.52 square miles of fresh water. The claims of the United States to it are derived from the grant from the government of Panama and purchase from the individual property owners.

The sovereign rights, power, and authority which the United States received from Panama in the treaty and has always exercised were the conditions deemed minimally necessary to warrant its undertaking the construction of the canal through Panama rather than through Nicaragua, for the United States could turn to Nicaragua if it could not make suitable arrangements with Panama. The Isthmian Canal Commission, headed by Rear Admiral John G. Walker, had stipulated in its report of January 18, 1902, that, as a *sine qua non* of any canal negotiations, "the grant [of the Canal Zone] must be not for a term of years, but in perpetuity, and a strip of territory from ocean to ocean of sufficient width must be placed under the control of the United States. In this strip the United States must have the right to enforce police regulations, preserve order, protect property rights, and exercise such other powers as are appropriate and necessary."[1]

In conformity with these stipulations the Spooner Act was passed and the treaties with both Colombia and later Panama were negotiated. In consideration of the assumption by the United States of the obligation for the perpetual maintenance, operation, and protection of both the canal and the Panama Railroad, Panama granted to the United States the right in perpetuity to exercise sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Panama gave this right in perpetuity because of the obligation of the United States to operate the Panama Canal in perpetuity.

The United States, therefore, should not feel "guilty" for taking undue advantage of Panama in the 1903 treaty. Its action responded to Panamanian popular will, and its favorable terms were the inducement to construct the canal in Panama rather than in Nicaragua, which alternative was authorized under the 1902 Spooner Act. Nor should it be overlooked that the Republic of Panama grew out of the movement for an Isthmian Canal. It could never have gained its independence except for the guaranty of the United States, and if the United States should withdraw from the isthmus, Panama might again be absorbed by Colombia, especially since the United States abandoned its guaranty of Panama's independence in 1936. This contingency was anticipated in Article XXIV of the treaty of 1903, which specifically provides that in the event that Panama should enter any union or confederation of states the rights of the United States shall not be "lessened or impaired."

A grant by one nation to another such as the grant by Panama to the United States in 1903, of the right to exercise sovereignty "in perpetuity" over a part of a nation's territory, is anomalous in international law; the treaty of 1903 is probably unique. Almost from the beginning the treaty with Panama has been criticized on this ground and also on the ground that it allegedly had its origin in a kind of conspiratorial action which was responsible for establishing Panama as an independent nation. Panama's claim to the right to dispose of a Canal Zone to the United States was clouded by the dubious nature of the circumstances under which she had achieved her independence and gained control over the zone. In international law her claim was inferior to that of Colombia, as the United States itself recognized by concluding the Thomson-Urrutia Treaty with Colombia in 1914 giving Colombia special canal privileges and a grant of $25 million.

The precise nature of the Canal Zone grant made by Panama to the United States has been the subject of acute controversy on many occasions, especially since the 1930s. Some of the provisions (but not Article III) of the treaty of 1903 have been modified in new treaties between the United States and Panama concluded in 1936 and 1955. In the treaty of 1936, the United States renounced its guaranty of the independence of the Republic of Panama, but neither in the treaty of 1936 nor in the treaty of 1955 has it agreed to any redefinition of its fundamental rights, powers, and privileges in the Canal Zone different from those set forth in the treaty of 1903—Article III of which therefore remains the basis for the United States position in the Panama Canal Zone.

One interpretation of Article III is based on the legal distinction between the historic term "sovereignty" and the concept of the exercise of sovereignty, which is synonymous only with jurisdiction. By that article, so the argument runs, the United States was not granted sovereignty over the Canal Zone; it was granted only jurisdiction, but a jurisdiction which continues "in perpetuity" and which, under the treaty, includes the right to exercise all the rights, power, and authority within the zone "which it would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign . . . to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority."

At the time when the treaty was negotiated between Secretary Hay and the Panamanian envoy, Philippe Bunau-Varilla, the United States could probably have bought the Canal Zone outright so eager were the agents of the new Panama Canal Company and the Panamanian revolutionists to have a canal constructed by the United States across the isthmus. That the United States was not granted sovereignty in Article III is shown, it is alleged, by the argument that it would not have obligated itself to pay to Panama an annuity on the zone beginning nine years after the ratification of the treaty. In other words, it was granted jurisdiction or the right to act in a sovereign capacity in perpetuity in the zone, but not sovereignty in the full sense of the word as understood in international law. Presumably the sovereignty of Panama continued, but it continued in abeyance in perpetuity, Panama meanwhile collecting an annual "rental" for the perpetual alienation of its jurisdiction over the zone. By the treaty of 1903, Panama in full exercise of her sovereign authority forfeited forever her right to exercise sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

The claim of Panama to the retention of sovereignty over the zone is undoubtedly strengthened by the requirement of an annuity and also by the increase in the annual payments which the United States has subsequently made—to $430,000 in 1930 and $1,930,000 in 1955, thus apparently recognizing that it does not possess legal sovereignty over the zone. Panama has insisted since 1904 that in the treaty of 1903 it granted to the United States only a delegated and revocable jurisdiction limited to matters pertaining exclusively to "the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of said canal." As early as 1904 Panama claimed the right to control all ports, including ports in the Canal Zone, and denied the right of the United States to establish customs houses and postal service on the ground that such agencies were not connected with "the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection" of the canal. Then and subsequently Panama has insisted that the treaty, by using the phrase "as if it were sovereign," plainly did not intend to grant sovereign rights to the United States in the Canal Zone. If Panama had intended to cede sovereignty of the Canal Zone, only two articles, according to the Panamanian argument, would have been necessary in the treaty: "one specifying the thing sold and the other expressing the price of the sale."

---

[1] U.S., Congress, Senate Document 123, 57th Cong., p. 9.

Panama has never demanded mere "titular sovereignty" in the Canal Zone but rather full and unconditional sovereignty. When the phrase titular sovereignty was first used, it was seemingly accepted by the Theodore Roosevelt Administration, but only informally and temporarily in order to abate Panamanian grievances and facilitate the completion of the canal; it was simply understood to exclude all Panamanian jurisdiction in the Canal Zone and to mean only sovereignty of a reversionary character that could never come into effect unless the United States should abandon the canal. But in 1924, a decade after the canal was completed, Panama was explicitly told by Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes that the United States would not limit "its full right to deal with the Canal Zone under Article III of the treaty of 1903 as if it were sovereign of the Canal Zone and to the exclusion of any sovereign rights or authority on the part of Panama." The Panamanian drafter of the treaty of 1903, Bunau-Varilla, concerned about the continuing controversy over the question of technical sovereignty, wrote in 1913: "After mature thought I recognized that if I enumerated in succession the various attributes of sovereignty granted, I ran the risk of seeing in the Senate some other attributes asked for. To cut short any possible debate I decided to grant a concession of sovereignty en bloc."

But this "concession of sovereignty en bloc," as Bunau-Varilla described it, only started the debate, which continues to the present. When the United States negotiated the new treaties in 1936 and 1955 it made no change in the original Article III of the treaty of 1903, but rather confirmed it, and as these treaties were duly ratified by the Panamanian government the continuing force of this article can be considered to be acceptable to Panama. The conclusion must be reached that in the matter of juridical status the Canal Zone is a territorial possession of the United States, constitutionality acquired pursuant to law, treaty, and purchase from individual propery owners.

But whether the United States is technically sovereign over the Canal Zone in the legal sense, it is clearly entitled under the treaty of 1903 to exercise all sovereign rights in the zone "to the entire exclusion" of the exercise of those rights by the Republic of Panama forever or until the United States itself relinquishes the exercise of those sovereign rights, in which case they will revert to Panama and to no other nation, for Colombia's claims to the exercise of such rights were extinguished in the Thomson-Urrutia treaty of 1914, ratified in 1922. The exercise of complete sovereignty over the zone, to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority, is essential to the successful discharge of the obligations of the United States in the Canal Zone.

The United States therefore is entitled to exercise full control over the Canal Zone and is accountable to no other nation and to no international entity for its exercise of that control. The report that was submitted by Secretary of State George Marshall to the United Nations on the administration of the Canal Zone as a "non-self-governing" or "occupied" territory represented an egregious if not a willful misinterpretation of the status of the United States in the Canal Zone and weakened the position of the United States there.

The value of the Canal can of course be weakened or destroyed by hostile action against it based in the Republic of Panama. In the years since the negotiation of the treaty of 1903, Panamanian nationalist politicians have repeatedly used the United States and its position in the Canal Zone as targets against which they could direct public resentment for their own political ends. The United States appears to be able to do little to counter this resentment by pointing to the countervailing advantages which Panama derives from the Canal. The Panama Canal is the largest single source of income and employment for Panama. The outflow of money from United States agencies in the Canal Zone to Panama in 1963 amounted to approximately $92 million, paid directly in salaries, retirement and disability payments, and purchases of goods and services in addition to many indirect benefits to the economy of the nation. In 1963 approximately 11,000 Panamanians were employed in the zone as compared with 4,000 Americans. The expenditures by the United States in Panama exceed the entire budget of Panama by about $14 million. Because of these and other benefits which Panama receives from the canal, the economy of Panama is one of the strongest in Latin America. The income from Canal Zone agencies has given Panama the highest per capita income in Latin America, and, if the United States continues to operate the canal, this will undoubtedly increase.

The question of sovereignty can be used as a profitable political slogan and has been made to embody all the frustrations of the Panamanian people. One such frustration arose out of the distinction which the United States began to make, for valid reasons, during the construction of the canal, between the gold and silver employees—the former being the white United States employees who were paid in gold, and the latter the Panamanians or black West Indian laborers who were paid in silver. This distinction followed the traditional pattern of United States treatment of local employees in its embassies, consulates, and other installations in countries around the world. It was particularly resented by the Panamanians as having overtones of racial discrimination. General McSherry, who was sent to Panama to investigate this complaint after World War II, recommended the abolition of the dual-rate system, and in 1948 the silver and gold roll designations were replaced by two new categories: "United States rate" and "local rate." In October 1953 the Presidents of the United States and of Panama in a joint statement recognized the principle of equality of job opportunity and treatment for Panamanians in the Canal Zone, and this principle was embodied in a memorandum accompanying the treaty of 1955, which, however, for security reasons reserved certain positions to United States citizens. Panama has continued to charge discrimination against Panamanians under this reservation.

So far as the United States annuity payment to Panama is concerned, the treaty of 1936 increasing the payment from $250,000 to $430,000 simply took cognizance that the United States had gone off the gold standard and undertook to continue the payment at a value equivalent to gold. The treaty of 1955, which raised the annual payment to $1,930,000, legally inhibited any further demand on Panama's part for an increase in the annuity. The net proceeds of the canal during the fiscal year 1963 amounted to only $2.4 million; Panama's annuity of $1,930,000 represented more than two-thirds of the net proceeds of the canal. But this amount has not satisfied the Panamanians. They are demanding at least one-half the gross revenue from the canal, which in 1959 amounted to $87 million. Panama is thus claiming at least equal partnership with the United States in the canal.

A turning point in the Panama controversy came with the Suez crisis which resulted in the nationalization of the Suez Canal by Egypt and which stirred up agitation for the nationalization of the Panama Canal. Charges that the United States was playing the role of imperialistic power in the Canal Zone and exploiting a Panamanian resource for its own benefit were intensified. The Panamanians clamored for recognition of the sovereignty of their government over the Canal Zone. For this reason their demand for the privilege of raising the Panamanian flag alongside the United States flag in the Canal Zone assumed considerable importance for them and became a rallying point for nationalist and anti-United States elements in Panama. In November 1959 some of them tried to force their way into the Canal Zone in order to plant the Panamanian flag there as a symbol of Panama's sovereignty. Under Secretary of State Livingston Merchant, on a visit to Panama, stated officially that "the United States recognizes that titular sovereignty over the Canal Zone remains in the Government of Panama." This announcement was followed immediately by the invasion of the Canal Zone by a second mob and the presentation of an official request by the Panamanian government to be allowed to fly its flag in the zone. President Eisenhower in a press conference soon afterward expressed a willingness to allow "visual evidence that Panama does have titular sovereignty over the region." The House of Representatives in Washington passed a resolution (by vote of 381 to 12) objecting to the proposal to allow the Panamanian flag to be flown, but the Eisenhower Administration proceeded nevertheless to announce by Executive authority (September 17, 1960) that it would allow the Panamanian flag to be flown alongside the United States flag at a designated place in the Canal Zone.

The national flag is the symbol of sovereignty. Under the 1903 treaty, sovereign rights were vested in the United States to the entire exclusion of any exercise of sovereignty by Panama. The official display of the Panamanian flag in the zone is therefore contrary to direct treaty provisions, and the display of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone has inevitably produced confusion, disorder, and insistent claims by Panama that it confirms recognition of Panamanian sovereignty to the exclusion of the exercise of sovereignty by the United States.

Panama has never claimed only titular sovereignty in the zone and the Panamanians and their government have taken maximum advantage of recognition of their titular sovereignty by the United States to claim the full sovereignty to which they feel they are entitled. The action of the Eisenhower Administration was interpreted in Panama as a complete reversal of the United States' position on the question of sovereignty, for the flying of the flag is obviously one of the sovereign rights which Panama agreed in the treaty of 1903 never again to exercise. This action was regarded as a formal recognition of Panama's sovereignty over the Canal

Zone and it has since been used as a lever to extract further concessions from the United States, including the concession of authority to fly their flag at other places in the Canal Zone where the United States flag is flown. It has also made it necessary for the United States to defend its position in the Canal Zone and the lives of its citizens there by means of force.

President Kennedy met with President Roberto Chiari of Panama in June 1962 and agreed that arrangements would be made "for the flying of Panamanian flags in an appropriate way in the Canal Zone." Subsequently the Joint Commission created by the two governments reached an agreement that both flags would be flown in the Canal Zone wherever the United States flag was flown by civilian authorities. In pursuance of this agreement, the Governor of the Canal Zone, Robert J. Fleming, Jr., opened a new hornets' nest when, on December 30, 1963, he authorized the Panamanian flag to be flown alongside the United States flag at seventeen selected sites in the zone. Already both flags were flying at eleven different sites in the zone. The Governor announced that six additional sites would be selected and that the United States flag would thereafter not be flown at certain designated sites, one of which was the Balboa High School. This action did not satisfy the Panamanians because they wanted their flag flown at all the places where the United States flag had previously been flown in the zone by civilian authorities, and it was resented by the North Americans in the zone who did not like to have the United States flag removed from places where it had formerly flown. The students at the Balboa High School hoisted the flag, and violence ensued on January 9 when Panamanian students invaded the Canal Zone and tried to mount their flag in front of the high school. They had already informed the Ministry of External Affairs of their intention to demonstrate in the zone, and immediately after they returned from the zone they were received by the President of Panama. For more than three days while the rioting continued the Panamanian authorities made no attempt to control the violence. It resulted in more than 100 United States casualties, both civilian and military, including four killed.

At the height of the rioting, the United States Secretary of the Army, Cyrus Vance, announced that the Canal Zone authorities would continue to fly the United States flag outside the public schools of the Canal Zone and that in accordance with the agreement between the United States and Panama the Panamanian flag would be flown along with that of the United States at these places. The Inter-American Peace Committee immediately went to Panama and initiated efforts to harmonize the difficulties between the United States and Panama, making, among others, the recommendation (1) that the barricades that the United States had raised to block traffic across the Bridge of the Americas (The Thatcher Ferry Bridge) crossing the Canal should be removed, and (2) that diplomatic relations between the United States and Panama, which Panama had broken, should be re-established. But Panama, on January 31, preferred charges before the Council of the Organization of American States that the United States had committed an "unprovoked armed attack against the territory" and the people of Panama, invoked Articles 6 and 9 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and called for a meeting of the Organ of Consultation in order to agree on the measures that must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression.

The anti-United States agitation has been inspired in part by the resentment of Panamanian business interests toward the competition offered by the commissaries and industrial establishments operating in the Canal Zone. Several concessions to Panama on this point, limiting the operations of their competitive business enterprises in the zone, were made in the treaty of 1955, but they proved unsatisfactory to Panama. Finally, in 1959, in order to give maximum benefit to Panama's economy, the Panama Canal Company and the United States Department of Defense agreed to purchase either in Panama or in the United States all their supplies, except gasoline, required for their operations in the Canal Zone, thus requiring them to pass through either Panamanian or United States customs.

The assaults upon the position of the United States in Panama serve well the Communist objectives of breaking lines of communication and enlarging the area of world conflict. The nationalist agitation in Panama, aggravated by Castroites and by representatives of the Arab nations, against the position of the United States in the Canal Zone has directed attention afresh to alternative canal routes, particularly (1) the Nicaraguan route through the San Juan River and Lake Nicaragua and (2) the Atrato River route through Colombia.

In the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty with Nicaragua in 1914 the United States acquired "in perpetuity" exclusive rights to construct, operate, maintain, and defend an interoceanic canal by a Nicaraguan route in exchange for three million dollars. A new survey of this route made under the auspices of a Congressional Committee in 1960 reported the cost of a Nicaraguan lock-canal at over four billion dollars and a Nicaraguan sea-level canal completely impracticable. Nicaragua, as one of the two places on the American isthmus where the elevation is lowest, has been the historic rival of Panama for a canal route. Competent engineers who have studied the construction of a Nicaragua canal have always contemplated the use of Lake Nicaragua as part of the canal. This lake is about 105 feet above sea level and has an area of approximately 3,000 square miles. A canal utilizing the natural features of the Nicaragua site would have to make use of this lake and the valley of the San Juan River flowing from it, and this would be a high-level lake and lock type with a summit level of 110 feet. The idea of a canal at sea level at Nicaragua is not realistic; it would have to ignore Lake Nicaragua and pass around the southern end of the lake at sea level and be protected from inundation from the lake by high levees. A new isthmian canal wherever located, if properly designed, would have greater capacity and might divert traffic from the Panama Canal, making final liquidation of the latter inevitable. Moreover, the United States would have to defend both canals, thus doubling the defenses for protection of two weak points.

New surveys of the Atrato River route have just been begun, although several such surveys have previously been made, the last as recently as 1948. But before a canal can be constructed through either Nicaragua or Colombia, new treaties not only with these countries but also with Costa Rica and possibly El Salvador and Honduras will have to be negotiated. The Bryan-Chamorro Treaty with Nicaragua for a canal at that location is a general agreement that would have to be supplemented by one or more additional treaties. Conventions would also have to be concluded, certainly with Costa Rica, probably also with El Salvador and Honduras, concerning defense. If the United States should give serious consideration to the Tehuantepec route, as Senator Mansfield is proposing, it would also have to negotiate a new treaty with Mexico, for it abandoned its rights to the Tehuantepec route in 1937.

The construction of a new canal of sea-level design in Central America, or the construction of a new transisthmian canal wherever it may be located, would require new treaties negotiated at a time when the United States, because of the concessions which it has already made to Panama since 1936, is in an extremely weak negotiating position. Under existing circumstances any treaty concluded between the United States and another country will provide only a minimum of United States control, greatly impairing the authority essential for efficient maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of a canal. Moreover, if the vital interests of the United States in Panama are not fully protected, it is doubtful that Congress and the people of our country will invest the vast sums required in a project certain to be lost.

Besides the renewed interest in alternate canal routes to rival the Panama Canal, other suggestions that have been either revived or newly presented to solve the United States-Panama problem include (1) the internationalization of the canal, (2) the admission of Panama as a new state in the Union, and (3) outright purchase of the "entire Central American half of the Republic from the zone's present eastern border to the Costa Rican frontier." The internationalization of the Panama Canal has been urged by such different individuals as Victor Raúl Haya de la Torre and President Harry Truman. Senator Morse of Oregon insists that the United States cannot favor "the internationalization of the waterways in other parts of the world and then take the position that we have some kind of Monroe Doctrine in the United States that prevents any internationalization of waters in the Western Hemisphere." With reference to the old idea of admitting Panama as a state, Congressmen who have made this proposal acknowledge that the principal obstacle would be nationalism in Panama, which has a long history going far back into the nineteenth century and which has become particularly strong since World War II.

The success of Egypt in nationalizing the Suez Canal, with the consent of the United States, stimulated the demands among Panamanian students, nationalists, and Communists for the nationalization of the Panama Canal. But only the most irrational Panamanian nationalist can believe that Panama herself should own and is capable of operating the canal. The most conservative estimate of the cost of needed improvements of the canal to meet the demands of international commerce by the year 2000 amounts to $61 million, which is clearly beyond the financial resources of Panama.[2]

Alternative suggestions, calculated to divest the United States of its unilateral exercise of sovereignty over the canal, would provide for the internationalization of the canal under the auspices of either the Organization of American States or the United Nations. But past experience in international control does not presage success for such control over the canal whether under the inter-American or United Nations organization. Besides, international control would forfeit the large financial investment and the considerable security interest which the United States has in the canal. The United States has paid more for the Panama Canal Zone, both initially and subsequently, than for any other territory over which it exercises or has exercised sovereign control. Including the purchase price, the annual payments, and the liquidation of the claims of all private property owners in the Canal Zone, the Canal Zone has cost the United States more than $144.5 million, as compared with only $7,200,000 for Alaska, $6,674,057 for Florida, $15,000,000 for Louisiana, $15,000,000 for the Mexican Cession, and $10,000,000 for the Gadsden Purchase. The total cost of the acquisition of the Canal Zone as reported by the Deputy Secretary of the Army, Harry C. McPherson, Jr., on March 31, 1964 is as follows:

---

[2] U.S., Congress, *Report on a Long-Range Program for Isthmian Canal Transits*, 86th Cong., 2d Sess., 1960, Rept. 1960, p. 32.

Original payment, 1904 (treaty of 1903)	$10,000,000
Annuity, 1913–63 (treaties of 1903, 1936, and 1955)	30,150,000
Property transfers:	
In Panama City and Colón, 1943	11,759,956
Water system in Panama City and Colón	669,226
Under treaty of 1955	22,260,500
Colombia (1922)	25,000,000
Compagnie Nouvelle du Canal de Panama (1904)	40,000,000
Private titles, stocks, and claims	4,728,889
Total	144,568,571

The total investment of the United States in the canal and defense installations there is estimated at $2 billion. International control and operation of the canal would make its defense dependent upon the consent of other powers having only a minimal or possibly even a destructive interest in the canal. United Nations control, for example, would entrust its defense in part to Communist-bloc countries and would give them an incomparable leverage to use against the security and stability of the Western Hemisphere, thus violating the Monroe Doctrine as well as inter-American agreements for the defense of the hemisphere. The evidence is conclusive that Soviet strategy aims at control over international waterways, particularly, the Suez Canal, the Danube, the Dardanelles, the straits of southeast Asia, and the Panama Canal. The Panama Canal is a strategic artery of international trade and inter-American defense and in the interest of both must continue to be controlled, maintained, operated, sanitated, and protected by the United States. Ex-President Theodore Roosevelt wrote in December 1918:

"The Panama Canal must not be internationalized. It is our canal; we built it; we fortified it, and we will protect it, and we will not permit our enemies to use it in war. In time of peace, all nations shall use it alike, but in time of war our interest at once becomes dominant."

The United States cannot discharge its responsibilities for the Panama Canal with less control and jurisdiction than that to which it is entitled under the treaty of 1903. The Panama Canal is no ordinary enterprise but a vast economic and strategic agency that can in nowise serve two masters or operate under divided authority. Moreover, it is bounded on both sides by a country afflicted with revolutions and must not be allowed to become a pawn of Panamanian politicians.

Ominous conclusions can be and are being drawn from Caribbean developments centering in the Panama Canal: In December 1958 Panama extended its coastal waters to a twelve-mile limit, partly, it was alleged, in order to be able to close the seaward ends of the Canal Zone which under the treaty of 1903 extend only three nautical miles beyond the ends of the canal. In 1959 and again in January 1964 Panamanian mobs instigated by Communist agents have invaded the Canal Zone, jeopardized the security of the canal, and caused destruction of United States lives and property. In Cuba a Communist regime has been established dependent upon Moscow and subservient to it threatening the northern flank of the Atlantic approach to the canal. Communist influences are strong in British Guiana on the southern flank. Taken together these developments show a consistent pattern with vast geopolitical significance, threatening not only the position of the United States in the Caribbean but also the security of the Americas.

The Panama Canal has a major strategic importance to the United States—politically throughout the Caribbean and Latin America, economically to United States commerce, and militarily in limited war. If it is lost to the United States our country will suffer irreparable damage throughout Latin America. It will lose whatever support and sympathy it still retains in this hemisphere. The erosion of the United States position in Panama, besides seriously handicapping this nation for wartime operations and interrupting vital supply lines, produces worldwide repercussions and, in particular, adverse effects throughout the Caribbean and Latin America generally.

The over-all interoceanic canal question has been complicated by the recent exhumation of the corpse of the 1945–48 issue over type of canal, with advocates of a canal at sea level contending for this predetermined design regardless of the costs or consequences and despite the rigorous clarifications in 1947–50 of the fallacies in the security hypothesis upon which it is based. Many leading experts in nuclear warfare and canal problems have repeatedly asserted that the atomic bomb is irrelevant in the planning of navigational projects; that such projects cannot be defended by passive defense measures embodied in design; and that their defense against enemy attack, like the defense of the seaports, airports, railroads, highways, and other productive facilities of our country, depends upon the combined military, naval, air, and industrial might of the United States. Protection of the canal against sabotage, which is largely an administrative matter, involved effective fences, floodlights, guards, and identification precautions.

In the broadest sense, however, the Panama Canal, like every other defense installation and industrial center of the United States, has become more vulnerable since the development of long-range ballistic missiles. The canal presents few defense problems different from those of other transportation and industrial centers of the nation. Any type of canal can be destroyed by nuclear weapons, if the latter are allowed to strike. These facts do not make the canal any less important to the United States but highlight the point that the defense of the canal is a function of the over-all defense responsibility of the United States and cannot be assured merely by modifying its design features under pretext of security.

The paramount function of the Panama Canal is to serve as an aid to commerce and navigation and to provide the tolls which give it economic justification. The effective operation of the canal for these purposes requires that the approaches to the canal, particularly the Guantanamo naval base, must be maintained. Challenges by the Castro regime in Cuba to the United States position in Guantanamo appear to be directly related to anti-United States demonstrations in Panama.

The position of the United States in Panama has been sometimes compromised by divided counsels. The fact has been ignored that the Panama Canal is the key to most problems affecting relations of the United States with Panama and the principal reason for the presence of so many United States agencies on the Isthmus. In the Canal Zone the Governor outranks all other officials, including the Commander-in-Chief, Southern Command at Quarry Heights, who is an army officer, and the Commandant of the 15th Naval District at Balboa, who is a naval officer. The United States Ambassador to Panama in Panama City is the diplomatic representative of the United States accredited to the Republic of Panama. In time of peace the Panama Canal is headed by a Governor of the Canal Zone under provisions of the Panama Canal Reorganization Act of 1950; in time of war or other emergency the President may designate an officer of the Army to assume exclusive authority over the Canal Zone Government. Seldom is an ambassador, concerned with problems of diplomatic relations with a truculent Panamanian government and with his own official security, qualified to speak on basic Panama Canal questions, nor can a Governor, on the other hand, be expected to know all the minute questions faced by an ambassador. The problems of the Commander-in-Chief and naval Commandant are military and naval.

If these representatives are unable to agree, and one voice on Panama Canal questions is necessary, that voice should be the Governor's—as illustrated in 1905–06 when Governor Charles E. Magoon also served as Minister to Panama. Certainly no ambassador should be permitted to commit the United States to any policy affecting the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal until he has received instructions on these matters from higher, responsible authorities.

The attention that is currently being given to alternative canal routes, though it may be diplomatically useful in applying pressure on Panama, should not be allowed to detract from the importance of maintaining and modernizing the Panama Canal as indispensable to the safety and the economy of the United States. It is calculated that the Panama Canal will reach the limit of its capacity by the year 2000. Attention must therefore be given to meeting the ever-increasing demands for the use of interoceanic transit facilities across the Central American isthmus. The fallacy of constructing a sea-level isthmian canal, of converting the canal into the "Straits of Panama," has been repeatedly exposed—the major difficulties being the differential in tidewater level as betwen the Caribbean and the Pacific waters and the enormous earth-moving operation which would be required.

The term sea-level canal is a misnomer, for it would require tidal locks as well as flood-control reservoirs and dikes. The alternating currents through such a canal, attaining a maximum velocity of approximately four and one-half knots, would make necessary massive lateral dikes on both sides for flood control. Besides, there are the problems caused by the instability of the banks, possible slides of the first magnitude, and the danger of prolonged interruption of traffic.

In the opinion of competent nuclear warfare experts and physicists, any type of canal can be destroyed by military bombs regardless of inherent design characteristics. Some physicists consider that the longer restricted channels and lateral dams make a sea-level canal more vulnerable in some ways than the high-level.

In 1943 the General Board of the Navy, studying canal problems before the advent of the atomic bomb and the injection of the confusing issues of "security" and "national defense," urged abandonment of the idea of a sea-level canal. When the idea was nevertheless pressed after World War II by some contractors, engineers, and Congressmen, it was again clarified by the Department of Defense under Secretary James Forrestal. It failed to receive Presidential approval, and the report was sent to the Congress without comment or recommendation, and the Congress took no action.

It was estimated at that time that a sea-level canal would cost $2,500 million; it would now probably cost double or triple that amount. Construction, it is estimated, would require ten years. The use of nuclear explosions for excavation is limited by the nuclear test ban treaty and is, in any case, still in the experimental stage. Besides, since a sea-level canal is not provided for in the treaty with Panama it opens up diplomatic problems of an explosive nature and would require the negotiation of a new treaty which under existing conditions would be extremely difficult and which would almost certainly involve a huge indemnity to Panama, increased annuity payments by the United States, a limitation of the duration of United States control to a period less than perpetuity, and possibly recognition of full Panamanian sovereignty. Nevertheless at the instigation of the Department of State and the Department of Defense, the 88th Congress considered a bill [S. 2701] to determine the most suitable site and means for construction of a sea-level interoceanic canal across the isthmus as a successor to the Panama Canal.

An alternate and practical proposal which would expand the capacity of the canal to meet its growing requirements into the twenty-first century is the terminal lake-third locks plan. This plan, which was the original conception of French engineers associated with Ferdinand de Lesseps, calls for the construction of a fresh-water lake at the Pacific side of the canal similar to the Gatún Lake on the Caribbean side. This plan has been endorsed by many experts as providing the best operational canal at minimal cost without involvement in new treaty negotiations. As described, it "provides for removing all lock structures from Pedro Miguel and for regrouping of all Pacific locks at or near Miraflores, thus enabling uninterrupted navigation at the Gatún Lake level between the Atlantic and Pacific locks, with a greatly needed terminal-lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal. Thus improved, the modified third-locks project could be completed at relatively low cost—estimated at around one billion dollars. The soundness of this proposal has been established by forty years of a similar arrangement at Gatún."

Under the terminal-lake plan, the major increase of capacity of the existing canal would not be a new canal different from the present one but merely an expansion covered by treaty and hence would not involve a new treaty, which is a paramount factor in the whole modernization process. If the total cost of constructing and operating a sea-level canal were charged against the traffic passing through the canal it would increase the toll rates twenty times, but the terminal lake-third locks plan would only triple the toll rate.

The levy of tolls in the canal is subject to three treaties: (1) the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with Great Britain, 1901, (2) the Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty with Panama, 1903, and (3) the Thomson-Urrutia treaty with Colombia, 1914–22. Any change in the tolls would involve these three treaties. The United States has treaty obligations with Britain, Colombia, and Panama requiring adequate maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal with tolls that are just and equitable.

In summary the principal proposals for increase of interoceanic canal facilities include: (1) The modernization and major increase of capacity of the existing Panama Canal by the terminal lake-third locks solution in which all Pacific locks would be consolidated in three lifts near Agua Dulce south of Miraflores to form a Pacific high-level anchorage which would correspond with that at Gatún and which would necessitate the elimination of all locks at Pedro Miguel. This plan would not require a new treaty with Panama and is recognized as providing the best operational canal practicable of achievement. (2) The construction of a new Panama Canal at sea level near the present canal. This proposal would cost much more, and would pose the risk of slides of the first magnitude and resulting prolonged closure. Moreover, it would require a new treaty with Panama. (3) Construction of a new canal at a more remote site, which would be costly and fraught with grave diplomatic uncertainties.

To conciliate Panama and avert dangerous anti-United States demonstrations, the United States has yielded concession after concession to Panama in the treaties of 1936 and 1955 and other agreements, saving, however, the treaty basis justifying its exercise of complete sovereignty over the Canal Zone "to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority." It has abandoned its treaty right to maintain public order and to supervise sanitation in the terminal cities Panama and Colón, with the result that these cities were used as bases for invasion of the zone and loss of life and property by United States citizens in 1959 and again in 1964. In the 1955 treaty the United States gave to Panama, without consideration, the terminal yards and passenger stations of the Panama Railroad in Panama City and Colón, and only the intervention of Congress prevented the negotiating authorities of the United States from giving away the main line. The railroad now is forced to operate without its two designed terminals. The United States made these concessions without regard for the rights of Colombia with respect to the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad, as these rights are set forth in the Thomson-Urrutia treaty of 1914–22. They are comparable to those of the United States and Panama. Among the privileges enjoyed by Colombia under that treaty is the use of the Panama Railroad, but those privileges were curtailed by the treaty of 1955.

The United States has yielded to Panama's claims relating to the flying of the Panamanian flag, operation of the zone commissaries, importations into the zone from third countries, the amount of the annuity, the construction of a $20 million bridge across the canal for the special use of the Republic of Panama, return of real estate in Panama City and Colón (market value, $40 million), and many others, without even requesting any reciprocal concessions from Panama. But Panama's demands go far beyond the concessions already made and include the following as stated in a report dated September 20, 1960 to President Chiari by his Committee on International Politics: a guaranteed minimum annuity of $5 million, mixed courts in the Canal Zone, a Panamanian monopoly of supplies needed in the Canal Zone, cessation of all production activities in the zone, use of Panamanian postage in the zone, liquidation of the Panama Railroad, establishment of Spanish as the official language of the zone, corridors under Panamanian jurisdiction across the zone, and acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court over controversies between Panama and the United States. This Panamanian program was further clarified—and expanded—in a report of the Planning Department of President Roberto F. Chiari's Executive Office made public on July 15, 1964, with an intimation that it may be presented by Panama in any future negotiations with the United States involving the position of the United States in the Canal Zone. It includes demands for the removal of all residents—both Panamanian and non-Panamanian—from the zone, the imposition of Panama's taxes upon non-Panamanian employees of the canal, the return to Panama's control of all lands in the zone not directly used in the operation of the canal, the transfer to Panama of industrial sites on the canal and control over port areas at both ends of the canal, and the concession to Panama of a voice in setting toll rates.[3]

An announcement by Governor Robert J. Fleming, Jr. of the Canal Zone in March 1964 offers employment to Panamanian nationals as members of the Canal Zone police, thus further compromising the security of the canal and rendering it more susceptible to sabotage. The Canal Zone police are an important force in protecting the canal. To use alien Panamanians in this police force would make it difficult to prevent communist infiltration into the zone. Moreover, it would be a major step toward a "coalition" Canal Zone Government with all the hazards that such would involve. During the disorders last January a Panamanian security guard joined rioters and was photographed while shooting into the Canal Zone. Recently four Panamanians were arrested at an army post in the Canal Zone for making bombs. Certainly, employment of Panamanians on the police force of the zone would be a serious breach in security and should not be permitted.

More than twenty-five years of piecemeal surrenders to Panama of the rights, power, and authority granted to the United States in the 1903 treaty have not placated but merely served to increase Panamanian appetites. For each Panamanian demand our diplomats have failed to make counterclaims, with the result that the United States has withdrawn to the boundaries of the Canal Zone and has been thrown into a defensive position even there, subject to rioting, violence, and loss of life and property. It is submitted that the most practical and urgent thing that should be done to improve relations between the United States and Panama is to clarify and reaffirm our historic canal policy at Panama in favor of the United States ownership and operation of the canal and the removal of the Panama flag from the zone. The United States, having acknowledged Panama's titular sovereignty in the zone, should make unmistakably clear that this acknowledgment does not involve the slightest reduction in its treaty right to exercise full sovereign control over the zone to the entire exclusion of its exercise by Panama.

In conclusion, therefore, continued sovereign control of the Panama Canal Zone by the United States pursuant to treaty commitments is absolutely necessary in the interest of our own and of world commerce and the security of the Western Hemisphere, and should be reaffirmed by positive actions including the removal of any flag from the zone except the flag of the United States. As long as two flags fly in the zone there will be chaos and violence. The first obligation of the United States in the exercise of its complete sovereignty over the zone is to maintain uninterrupted transit through the canal. In fulfilling this obligation it must take a strong stand against any reduction of its sovereign authority there, must prevent all acts of sabotage against the canal, and must receive the full cooperation of the Panamanian authorities to accomplish these objectives.

The Panama problem seems to be boiling up into a crisis situation. Under these circumstances it is imperative that Congress should create an independent commission of highly qualified citizens, comparable in ability to the members of the Walker Commission at the beginning of this century, to consider the entire problem of transisthmian canals, including the diplomatic aspects of the problem, with a view to the adoption of basic legislation which will clarify the position of the United States in relation to these matters.

Resolution No. 547 of the 48th Annual National Convention of the American Legion

Committee: Foreign Relations.

Subject: Panama Canal.

Whereas, in a joint statement on September 24, 1965, Presidents Johnson of the United States and Robles of Panama announced that the two countries were negotiating new treaties with respect to the existing Panama Canal and a new "sea-level" canal which might be constructed across Panama; and

Whereas, that statement made clear that the 1903 treaty "will be abrogated" and that its replacement "will terminate after a specified number of years or on the date of the opening of the sea-level canal whichever occurs first;" and

---

[3] *New York Times,* July 16, 1964.

Whereas, there is no assurance at this time that the construction of a sea-level canal will be determined to be feasible, either in Panama or elsewhere in the area, or that a satisfactory treaty respecting such new canal can be secured so as to provide the United States with the necessary rights for its effective operation and protection; and

Whereas, in the interim, this situation places in serious jeopardy the rights of the United States respecting the existing canal; and

Whereas, the Congressionally authorized Commission currently studying the feasibility of constructing a new interoceanic canal is restricted to studies relative to a "sea-level" canal; and

Whereas, various proposals, such as one known as the "Terminal Lakes Plan," have been advanced for the modernization of the existing Panama Canal, based upon study by competent students of many years experience in maintaining and operating the Canal; and

Whereas, such proposals would not require a new treaty with the Republic of Panama and would not jeopardize the U.S. rights in the Canal Zone; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Washington, D.C., August 30, 31–September 1, 1966, That The American Legion (1) reaffirms its support of the basic and still existing provisions of the 1903 treaty, and the continued, indispensable sovereign control by the United States over the Canal Zone; (2) urges the enactment of legislation (similar to the Anderson-Flood-Bow bills of the 89th Congress) to establish an independent, broadly-based "Interoceanic Canals Commission," having as its mandate the examination of *all* tangible possibilities for improving and increasing trans-Isthmian transit capacity, followed by appropriate recommendation, and (3) urges that, until such a commission is duly created and makes its report, all further negotiations with the Republic of Panama be deferred.

H.R. 9981

A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission Act of 1967".

Sec. 2. (a) A commission is hereby created, to be known as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), and to be composed of eleven members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows: One member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Army; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Navy; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Air Force; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers (retired) of the United States Army; and seven members from civil life, four of whom shall be persons learned and skilled in the science of engineering. The President shall designate one of the members from civil life as Chairman, and shall fill all vacancies on the Commission in the same manner as original appointments are made. The Commission shall cease to exist upon the completion of its work hereunder.

(b) The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $30,000 per annum, and the other members shall receive compensation at the rate of $28,500 per annum, each; but the members appointed from the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall receive only such compensation, in addition to their pay and allowances as will make their total compensation from the United States $28,500 each.

Sec. 3. The Commission is authorized and directed to make and conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of all problems involved or arising in connection with plans or proposals for—

(1) an increase in the capacity and operational efficiency of the present Panama Canal through the adaptation of the third locks projects (53 Stat. 1409) to provide a summit-level terminal lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with that in the Atlantic end, or by other modification or design of the existing facilities;

(2) the construction of a new Panama Canal of sea-level design, or any modification thereof;

(3) the construction and ownership, by the United States, of another canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans;

(4) the operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal, and of any other canal or canals which may be recommended by the Commission;

(5) treaty and territorial rights which may be deemed essential hereunder; and

(6) estimates of the respective costs of the undertakings herein enumerated.

Sec. 4. For the purpose of conducting all inquiries and investigations deemed necessary by the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Commission is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Commission is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other officer, of the Commission, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Commission may deem relevant or material for the purposes herein named. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

Sec. 5. The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress, not later than two years after the date of the enactment hereof, a final report containing the results and conclusions of its investigations and studies hereunder, with recommendations; and may, in its discretion, submit interim reports to the President and the Congress concerning the progress of its work. Such final report shall contain—

(1) the recommendations of the Commission with respect to the Panama Canal, and to any new interoceanic canal or canals which the Commission may consider feasible or desirable for the United States to construct, own, maintain, and operate;

(2) the estimates of the Commission as regards the approximate cost of carrying out its recommendations; and like estimates of cost as to the respective proposals and plans considered by the Commission and embraced in its final report; and

(3) such information as the Commission may have been able to obtain with respect to the necessity for the acquisition, by the United States, of new, or additional, rights, privileges, and concessions, by means of treaties or agreements with foreign nations, before there may be made the execution of any plans or projects recommended by the Commission.

Sec. 6. The Commission shall, without regard to the civil service laws, appoint a secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission and shall receive compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Sec. 7. The Commission is hereby authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such engineers, surveyors, experts, or advisers deemed by the Commission necessary hereunder, as limited by the provisions in title 5, United States Code, section 55a; and may make expenditures, in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, for travel and subsistence expenses of members of the Commission and its employees while away from their homes or regular places of business; for rent of quarters at the seat of government, or elsewhere; for personal services at the seat of government, or elsewhere; and for printing and binding necessary for the efficient and adequate functions of the Commission hereunder. All expenses of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Commission, or such other official of the Commission as the Commission may designate.

Sec. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

Sec. 9. The Act entitled "An Act to provide for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans" (Public Law 88-609, 78 Stat. 990), is hereby repealed.

UNITED STATES AND NORTHEAST AFRICA

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the present African conflict involving Israel and the Arab nations has gained banner headlines around the Nation and world.

So that our colleagues may have some background information, I insert the May 24 release of William Ryan, and an article from the New York Times of May 22, 1967, plus the official U.S. policy in this area from the U.S. State Department bulletin.

The latter bulletin includes remarks of the official "Tripartite Declaration" of May 25, 1950; President Truman's statement of the same date; President Eisenhower's statement of November 9, 1955; Secretary Dulles' statement of February 6, 1956; President Kennedy's statement on May 8, 1963; and Ambassador Goldberg's statements of October 28, 1966.

The material follows:

JEWISH-ARAB HATE STIRS SERIES OF WORLD CRISES

(By William L. Ryan)

The fierce hatred between Jews and Arabs in the Middle East dates back exactly 50 years, and there is no prospect that it will abate while Israel remains an independent state.

That hatred has been responsible for years of turmoil and a succession of world crises. Now the world looks at another which could involve the great powers.

What seems an eternally insoluble problem had its beginnings in World War I. Before America lent a hand in 1917, the Allies' backs were to the wall. Russia was collapsing in revolution. England looked everywhere for straws to grasp. The search led to negotiations with Zionist and world Jewish leaders in what Winston Churchill called a "practical measure" seeking world Jewry's aid in the war effort.

The result was the Balfour Declaration, promising Britain's "best endeavors" to realize what Zionist leaders dreamt of—a Jewish nation in the ancient Biblical "Promised Land" of Israel—Palestine.

When the war ended, Britain received a League of Nations mandate in Palestine. Zionists began working and planning for their national home. Jews flowed in from Europe. And Arabs claimed they had been betrayed.

World War II hastened the pace of history. Nazi Germany's brutal treatment of Jews aroused world sympathy and, after the war, applied steam behind the Zionist cause. Jewish immigration increased sharply.

The British attempted to limit the flow of immigrants and the Jews reacted sharply with an anti-British campaign.

In Palestine, Jews organized underground terror units to push their aims—Irgun Zvai Leumi, the Stern Gang and Haganah, the latter the nucleus of what would be the Israeli army. The critical moment came in November, 1947.

ADOPT PARTITION PLAN

The United Nations, trying to apply reason to growing chaos, adopted a partition plan. It would give 56 percent of Palestine to a proposed Israel, 44 percent to a proposed Arab state. Jerusalem would be internationalized, accessible to all three great faiths, Jewish, Christian and Moslem.

Again the Arabs cried "betrayal." Though the resolution purported to protect the rights of inhabitants, Arabs said Jews owned less than 10 percent of land which would be given them, and Jews were by far the minority.

The Zionist underground mounted a campaign of terror, against the British to end the mandate, and against Arab villages and towns, driving out the inhabitants. Before the British mandate ended May 14, 1948, Zionist forces occupied much of what had been set apart for Arabs and most of Jerusalem's proposed international zone.

As the British withdrew, the Jews proclaimed the state of Israel and Jerusalem became a divided city.

Armies from surrounding Arab nations attacked but fared badly agains the well-equipped, modern-minded Jews.

The wily Emir Abdullah, head of the unlikely little British-created state of Transjordan, moved in with his British-trained Arab Legion and seized all Palestine east of the Jordan River. He proclaimed a kingdom of the Jordan.

A U.N.-sponsored truce ended the fight in mid-1949. Arabs withdrew in defeat. In Jordan, a Moslem tailor in 1951 assassinated Abdullah, whom many Arabs called traitor. After a brief interim young Hussein, Abdullah's grandson, mounted the throne.

In Egypt in 1952, a young officer named Gamal Abdel Nasser overthrew a corrupt monarch and Egypt became a Socialist-leaning republic.

The Arabs nursed resentment of the United States and Britain for the creation of Israel and denounced the power bloc Baghdad Pact, linking Arab Iraq to the West, as an instrument of "imperialism." Little Jordan found the presence of its British uncle embarrassing, sent him packing, and has experienced turmoil ever since.

SUEZ CANAL NATIONALIZED

The Arab east picture changed abruptly in 1955 with a sudden intrusion of Soviet and Communist-bloc influence in the form of arms to Egypt. With new strength Nasser in 1956 announced nationalization of the Suez Canal. Britain and France conspired with Israel to attack Egypt that fall, and Israelis drove all the way to the canal as Egypt's army collapsed. U.S. and Soviet pressure brought the ill-starred adventure to an end.

The crisis subsided, but not Arab hatred.

For two years thereafter, the Arab east was almost in permanent crisis. The climax came in 1958 with a rebellion in Lebanon, which brought a landing of U.S. Marines, and a bloody revolution in Iraq, ending the monarchy and the Baghdad Pact. Jordan's throne almost collapsed along with Iraq's.

Again the area simmered down.

Egypt turned inward to internal economic difficulties. Syria seceded from Nasser's United Arab Republic after a brief and restless union. Arab nations were too weak and too disunited to face up to Israel's military power.

Then internal pressures, food problems and other woes, possibly combined with an urge to rebuild his image as an all-Arab leader, appeared to impel Nasser to support Syria in a quarrel with Israel over border clashes. The crisis mounted slowly but steadily since last fall, as if by it own momentum.

Now, once again, the Middle East looks at the unwelcome prospect of general war.

[From the New York Times, May 22, 1967]

U.S. Pledge on Israel-Arab Borders Dates to 1950—Truman and Successors Have Stressed Opposition To Use of Force in the Region

Washington, May 21.—The United States has a commitment dating from 1950, when Harry S. Truman was President, to preserve the frontiers of Israel and the adjacent Arab countries.

The commitment has not been emphasized by Administration officials during the current period of acute tension in the Middle East. But, in the absence of any statement to the contrary, it stands.

The underlying United States policy has been restated, in varying degrees of precision, by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson. The commitment to oppose armed aggression applies to an Israeli attack on any Arab country as well as to an Arab attack on Israel.

The most formal statement of the commitment was in a declaration by Britain, France and the United States May 25, 1950.

OPPOSE "USE OF FORCE"

The statement said:

"The three governments take this opportunity of declaring their deep interest in and their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the area and their unalterable opposition to the use of force or threat of force between any of the states in that area.

"The three governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation."

Subsequently, on June 1, 1953, after the Republicans had assumed power, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles recalled the declaration in a radio address and said, "The present U.S. Administration stands fully behind that declaration."

He had preceded this remark by saying, "that declaration when made, did not reassure the Arabs."

ECHOED BY EISENHOWER

In his State of the Union Message to Congress on Jan. 5, 1957, President Eisenhower said: "We have shown, so that none can doubt, our dedication to the principle that force shall not be used internationally for any aggressive purposes and that the integrity and independence of the nations of the Middle East should be inviolate."

Speaking of the Middle East in a press conference on May 8, 1963, President Kennedy said:

"In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations, adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or to put a stop to such aggression; which, of course, has been the policy which the United States has followed for some time."

President Johnson has twice reiterated the basic pledge. On June 2, 1964, a joint communiqué with Israel's Premier, Levi Eshkol, stated:

"He [Mr. Johnson] reiterated to Prime Minister Eshkol U.S. support for the territorial integrity and political independence for all countries in the Near East and emphasized the firm opposition of the U.S. to aggression and the use of force or the threat of force against any country."

KENNEDY STAND RECALLED

More than two years later, on Aug. 2, 1966, when President Zalman Shazar of Israel visited Washington, President Johnson said:

"As our beloved, great late President, John F. Kennedy, said on May 8, 1963, as a declaration of the leader of this country and as a spokesman for this land: 'We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors. We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East.' We subscribe to that policy."

In addition, the United States has a special commitment to free access to Israel's southern port of Elath, on the Gulf of Aqaba. On Feb. 1, 1957, Secretary of State Dulles said in an aide memoire to Israel's Foreign Minister, Abba Eban:

"With respect to the Gulf of Aqaba and access thereto, the United States believes that the gulf comprehends international waters and that no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage in the gulf and through the straits giving access thereto. We have in mind not only commercial usage, but the passage of pilgrims on religious missions, which should be fully respected.

"In the absence of some overriding decision to the contrary, as by the International Court of Justice, the United States, on behalf of vessels of United States registry, is prepared to exercise the right of free and innocent passage and to join with others to secure general recognition of this right."

U.S. DECLARATION URGED

Two American Jewish groups urged yesterday that the United States reaffirm its commitment to Israel.

The American Jewish Committee, ending its 61st annual meeting at the Waldorf-Astoria approved a resolution calling for "the immediate and unequivocal reaffirmation" of what it termed "the fundamental United States commitment to Israel."

The National Governing Council of the American Jewish Congress, meanwhile, urged President Johnson to make an "unequivocal declaration that the United States will not tolerate attempts by Arab states to act out their repeated threats to overwhelm Israel by force of arms."

The council acted at a meeting at the Stephen Wise Congress House, 15 East 84th Street.

[From the Department of State Bulletin No. 5, June 1950]

Tripartite Declaration Regarding Security in the Near East

THREE-POWER STATEMENT

The Governments of the United Kingdom, France, and the United States, having had occasion during the recent Foreign Ministers meeting in London to review certain questions affecting the peace and stability of the Arab states and of Israel, and particularly that of the supply of arms and war materials to these states, have resolved to make the following statements:

1. The three Governments recognize that the Arab states and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purposes of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole. All applications for arms or war material for these countries will be considered in the light of these principles. In this connection the three Governments wish to recall and reaffirm the terms of the statements made by their representatives on the Security Council on August 4, 1949, in which they declared their opposition to the development of an arms race between the Arab states and Israel.

2. The three Governments declare that assurances have been received from all the states in question, to which they permit arms to be supplied from their countries, that the purchasing state does not intend to undertake any act of aggression against any other state. Similar assurances will be requested from any other state in the area to which they permit arms to be supplied in the future.

3. The three Governments take this opportunity of declaring their deep interest in and their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the area and their unalterable opposition to the use of force or threat of force between any of the states in that area. The three Governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

During the recent meeting in London, the Foreign Ministers of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France had an opportunity to review the security and armaments situation in the Near East and to consider what action their Governments might take to provide greater stability in the area. As a result of this consultation, a 3-power declaration is being issued. This is another of the many valuable results of the London meeting.

The participation of the United States Government in the declaration emphasizes this country's desire to promote the maintenance of peace in the Near East. It is the belief of the United States Government that the declaration will stimulate, in the Arab states and Israel, increased confidence in future security, thus accelerating the progress now being made in the Near East and contributing toward the well-being of the people there.

[From Department of State Bulletin]

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE NEAR EAST

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

All Americans have been following with deep concern the latest developments in the Near East. The recent outbreak of hostilities has led to a sharp increase in tensions. These events inevitably retard our search for world peace. Insecurity in one region is bound to affect the world as a whole.

While we continue willing to consider requests for arms needed for legitimate self-defense, we do not intend to contribute to an arms competition in the Near East because we do not think such a race would be in the true interest of any of the participants. The policy which we believed would best promote the interests and the security of the peoples of the area was expressed in the Tripartite Declaration of May 25, 1950.[1] This still remains our policy.

I stated last year that our goal in the Near East as elsewhere is a just peace. Nothing has taken place since which invalidates our fundamental policies, policies based on friendship for all of the peoples of the area.

We believe that true security must be based upon a just and reasonable settlement. The Secretary of State outlined on August 26th[2] the economic and security contributions which this country was prepared to make toward such a solution. On that occasion I authorized Mr. Dulles to state that, given a solution of the other related problems, I would recommend that the United States join in formal treaty engagement to prevent or thwart any effort by either side to alter by force the boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

Recent developments have made it all the more imperative that a settlement be found. The United States will continue to play its full part and will support firmly the United Nations, which has already contributed so markedly to minimize violence in the area. I hope that other nations of the world will cooperate in this endeavor, thereby contributing significantly to world peace.

U.S. Policy in the Middle East

(Note.—Following is an exchange of correspondence between Secretary Dulles and a group of 40 members of the House of Representatives:)

SECRETARY DULLES TO MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

February 6, 1956.

Gentlemen: I have your letter of February 3. I share your concern at the continuing tense situation in the Near East, and at the persistent threat it represents to the peace. Let me say that the foreign policy of the United States embraces the preservation of the State of Israel. It also embraces the principle of maintaining our friendship with Israel and the Arab States.

The Government of Israel, feeling that its peaceful existence is threatened by the large amount of arms now made available to certain Arab countries by the Soviet bloc, desires to purchase from the United States and other countries additional armament to balance what it considers to be the increased threat against it.

The United States recognizes that current developments would create a disparity in armed force between Israel and its Arab neighbors. However, we are not convinced that that disparity can be adequately offset by additional purchases of arms by the State of Israel. Israel has a population of under two million, whereas the Arab population amounts to tens of millions, and they apparently have been offered access to huge stores of Soviet block material. Under this circumstance the security of Israel can perhaps better be assured by means other than an arms race.

The having in hand, by Israel, of equal or superior arms is not the only deterrent to aggression. Israel is a creation of, and member of, the United Nations; the Arab States are also members, and all are solemnly bound by that Charter to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force. The United Nations organization is capable of providing many forms of protection. Furthermore, the United States in 1950 joined with the United Kingdom and France to declare a policy of action within and without the United Nations to deter aggresssion by either side against the other. United States policy in that respect has recently been reemphasized in the statement issued on February 1, 1956, by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Eden.[1] The combined influence of the nations which would, under the United Nations Charter and the Tripartite Declaration, be against any armed aggression is a far more effective deterrent to any potential aggressor than any amount of arms which could be obtained by either side.

We do not exclude the possibility of arms sales to Israel. But it is our belief that the security of states in the Near East cannot rest upon arms alone but rather upon the international rule of law and upon the establishment of friendly relations among neighbors. We are actively working toward the establishment of such relations.

In my speech of August 26, 1955,[2] made with President Eisenhower's concurrence, I referred to the fear and tension rising in the area from the lack of fixed permanent boundaries and indicated U.S. willingness to assist the parties in substituting agreed frontiers for armistice lines. To encourage the parties to work toward such agreement and to assure them that the United States would be prepared to make its contribution to the maintenance of international respect for such boundaries, I stated that the President would recommend that the United States participate in an international guarantee of agreed frontiers. That statement still stands.

You inquire about economic aid. United States policy in the extension of economic aid is based upon the desire to strengthen other free nations. In the case of each aid program we take into account the nature of the project in question and the purpose for which it was intended. I can assure you that United States aid would not be extended for purposes or under circumstances which we judged would undermine peace in any part of the world.

The Arab refugees remain perhaps the most important single source of bitterness existing between the Arab States and Israel. In my speech of August 26, 1955, I proposed that the problem of the Arab refugees be attacked in several ways. I suggested United States participation in an international loan to Israel to assist her in funding her obligation to pay compensation for property left in Israel by the refugees and which is now being utilized by Israel. I recommended assistance to Israel and the Arab States in the rehabilitation of the refugees both by repatriation to Israel to such extent as may be feasible and resettlement in adjoining Arab States. In this connection the Arab States and Israel have accepted, on a technical basis, the Jordan Valley plan which would provide new economic opportunities for several hundred thousand refugees. But final political approval remains to be achieved. Thus, some progress has been realized, but much remains to be done.

I know that you all understand that it is not practical, or in the interest of the goals we seek to discuss publicly all of the factors involved in this complicated situation. I know you also recognize that the problems of this area must be studied in the larger context of the free world's unceasing struggle against international communism. I have, however, no hesitation in declaring that the United States, seeking for itself to avoid involvement in war, is earnestly striving as a friend of both Israel and its Arab neighbors to relieve the present tension in the area. If the political and economic developments should subsequently become such as to make Congressional action desirable or necessary, the President would, of course, promptly communicate with the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

John Foster Dulles.

Tripartite Meeting on Situation in Middle East

Representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France met on February 8 to consider the situation in the Middle East. As members of the United Nations, the three Governments share in the responsibility of all members to be alert and vigilant to threats to international peace and security.

---

[1] For text of declaration, see Bulletin of June 15, 1953, p. 834, footnote 2.

[2] *Ibid.*, Sept. 5, 1955, p. 378.

[1] Bulletin of Feb. 13, 1956, p. 232.

[2] *Ibid.*, Sept. 5, 1955, p. 378.

In light of the increased tension in the Middle East and in accordance with their undertakings in the Tripartite Declaration of May 25, 1950, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France believed it would be useful to discuss their responsibilities under that declaration.

This was a preliminary exchange of views, and further consultations will take place.

Excerpt From President Kennedy's Press Conference, May 8, 1963

Q. Mr. President, do you consider the situation in the Middle East, the balance of power there, to have been changed as a result of recent developments, and what is the U.S. policy towards the security of Israel and Jordan in case they are threatened?

A. I don't think that the balance of military power has been changed in the Middle East in recent days. Obviously there are political changes in the Middle East which still do not show a precise pattern and on which we are unable to make any final judgments. The United States supports social and economic and political progress in the Middle East. We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors. We seek to limit the Near East arms race which obviously takes resources from an area already poor, and puts them into an increasing race which does not really bring any great security.

We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East, and we also seek to limit the spread of communism in the Middle East which would, of course, destroy the independence of the people. This Government has been and remains as strongly opposed to the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East. In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations, adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or to put a stop to such aggression, which, of course, has been the policy which the United States has followed for some time.

United States and Israel Reaffirm Ties of Friendship

(NOTE.—President Zalman Shazar of Israel visited Washington August 2-3 and met informally with President Johnson on August 2. Following is an exchange of toasts between the two Presidents at a state dinner at the White House on August 2:)

President JOHNSON. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen: In the traditional Hebrew greeting we welcome our esteemed guest: *Baruch ha-ba*—blessed is he who comes to our shores as the leader of a people for whom we hold the greatest admiration.

Mr. President, as a renowned scholar and educator, and as a pioneer in the new Israel, you are deeply versed in the teachings of the Bible.

And you know that our Republic, like yours, was nurtured by the philosophy of the ancient Hebrew teachers who taught mankind the principles of morality, of social justice, and of universal peace.

This is our heritage, and it is yours.

The message inscribed on the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia is the clarion call of Leviticus: "Proclaim Liberty throughout all the Land unto all the Inhabitants Thereof." It is a message not only for America, or for Israel, but for the whole world.

We cannot proclaim tonight that all men have liberty, that all men are moral, that all men are just. We do not have universal peace.

But those of good will continue their work, to liberate the human spirit from the degradation of poverty and pestilence, of hunger, and oppression. As spiritual heirs of the Biblical tradition we recognize that no society anywhere can be more secure unless it is also just.

Israel today carries forward its pursuit of spiritual values. It is sharing those values and those experiences with other countries in the world.

We in America, as we meet here with all of our blessings tonight, are keenly aware that God has showered our land with abundance. The sharing of our blessings with others is a value we hold in common with Israel.

Above all, Mr. President, we share in common the vision of peace you call *shalom*.

The prophet Micah described it in this way: that every man sit under his vine and fig tree and "none shall make him afraid."

As our beloved, great, late President, John F. Kennedy, said on May 8, 1963, as a declaration of the leader of this country and as spokesman for this land: "We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors. . . . We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East. . . ."

We subscribe to that policy.

This I say in friendship for all the peoples of that region. We extend to all the hand of friendship and offer to help all in meeting the challenges of fear and pestilence and poverty.

We look toward the happy and peaceful pursuits that can bring tranquillity and the blessings of knowledge and understanding to all peoples, without fear of war.

We welcome you tonight, Mr. President, in friendship and in deep respect for you and the people of your country.

I should like to ask all gathered here to join me in the traditional Hebrew toast in honor of our distinguished guest—to life, to peace, to blessing for all mankind.

Ambassador Goldberg—Statement of October 28

As stated on many other occasions before the Security Council, in dealing with various aspects of this matter, United States policy respects the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries in the Middle East, member states of the United Nations, as the United States is required to do under the charter. United States policy firmly supports maintenance of a peaceful situation in the Middle East and seeks to prevent and to bring to an end all acts of violence across existing frontiers, regardless of the direction in which they accur. In the unfortunate instances where violence does occur, the United States has consistently called for utilization of United Nations machinery on the spot and for recourse to the Security Council as the proper forum of prevention and redress.

Implicit in this policy is the concept that when resort is made to the United Nations machinery and to the Security Council, the United Nations must take strong and effective action to bring to an end the use of violence across these frontiers in any form.

U.N. Security Council Censures Israel for Raid Against Jordan

(NOTE.—Following is a statement made in the U.N. Security Council by Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, on November 16 during debate on a Jordan complaint against Israel, together with the text of a resolution adopted by the Council on November 25:)

Statement by Ambassador Goldberg

Immediately after learning of the incident now before the Council, on Sunday morning, I issued a statement on behalf of my Government expressing our strong disapproval of the large-scale Israeli military action on Jordanian territory on November 13.[1] As far as I am aware, the statement of my Government condemning this attack was the first and most prompt statement made by any Government represented on this Council, at least here in New York. The United States then condemned this raid and condemns it now, deeming it in clear violation of the solemn obligations undertaken by Israel in the General Armistice Agreements. And what makes it of course most deplorable is the tragic toll in human lives of this inexcusable action.

On October 14 I stated before the Council my Government's policy of seeking to promote conditions of peace and stability in the Middle East and our opposition to the use of force across Middle East boundaries regardless of the direction from which it came.[2] This was the purpose of our statement on Sunday. This was our objective in the recently concluded Security Council action when Israel was the complainant. It continues to be our objective in the present consideration of this deplorable violation of the General Armistice Agreements.

I said in our last debate—I now repeat—that violence breeds violence, and indeed, it should be and must be the function of this Council to assure conditions of peace and stability in the area.

At the end of our last debate over Syrian responsibility for incursions into Israel, I stated:

"Despite the Soviet veto, it is nevertheless a matter of high import, not to be ignored, that the resolution received such widespread support by members on a broadly geographical basis."

I urged the implementation of the essential features of the resolution in the interests of peace and stability in the area. That urging was addressed to all countries concerned, including the Government of Israel.

I made that statement on November 4. Nine days later, as the Secretary-General has told us in his report[3] and as confirmed by reports of our ambassadors in the area, the Government of Israel carried out, with the support of tanks, armored vehicles, heavy weapons and aircraft, a raid into Jordan the nature of which and whose consequences in human lives and in destruction far surpass the cumulative total of the various acts of terrorism conducted against the frontiers of Israel. Although we do not have the full details which have been promised us by the Secretary-General, nevertheless, from his report and from what we have been advised, the basic nature of this destructive raid is sufficiently known in outline.

Now we are dealing with the complaint of Jordan here before us. And on behalf of my Government, I wish to make it absolutely clear that this large-scale military action cannot be justified, explained away, or excused by the incidents which preceded it, in which the Government of Jordan has not been implicated. This is not a new attitude by my Government. My Government has expressed itself about retaliatory raids in the past. Deplorable as these preceding incidents were—and they were deplorable, as we said on Sunday—this deliberate, governmental decision must be judged as the conscious act of responsible leaders of a member state and therefore on an entirely different level from the earlier incidents, which we continue to deplore.

It was undertaken without proper utilization of United Nations machinery in the area, notably the Mixed Armistice Commission, which in this situation, unlike some others we have had to consider, is fully functioning between Israel and Jordan. It was also undertaken without any effort to use again, and again if necessary, the good offices of the Security Council, a failure made even more inexplicable by the fact that the Council had just completed extended discussion of an Israeli complaint against Syria for similar incidents during which over two-thirds of the members had spoken out against such terroristic activities. I am aware that that resolution was vetoed. But, nevertheless, the

---

[1] For text, see U.S./U.N. press release 4975 dated Nov. 13.

[2] See p. 969.

[3] U.N. doc. S/7593 and Corr. 1 and Add. 1.

> forum of this Council is still available to members, as it is available today, and it is our view that it should always be restored to and we feel it is the duty of member states to resort to the Council for its consideration of the matter.

MEN OF CONSCIENCE MUST NOT REMAIN SILENT AT THIS TIME

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, "Men of conscience must not remain silent at this time." This, my colleagues, was the opening sentence in a statement by religious leaders of all the major faiths in America that appeared in yesterday's New York Times which called "on the administration to support the independence, integrity, and freedom of Israel."

That statement was written before the outbreak of actual war in the Middle East, but certainly this morning's developments give that statement the greatest urgency. The continued existence of Israel is vital for political stability in the Middle East and therefore vital for the maintenance of world peace. The United States, which had so much to do with the establishment of Israel in 1948 and which has so repeatedly and strongly pledged to Israel its continued support, has the clearest legal and moral obligation to defend Israel against those apparently committed to its destruction.

On May 23, I joined with the distinguished dean of the House of Representatives, Congressman Emanuel Celler, and more than a hundred of my colleagues in pledging our mutual support to "measures which must be taken by the administration to make our position unmistakably clear that we are now prepared to take whatever action may be necessary to resist aggression against Israel and to preserve the peace."

I want to again urge the President to take strong, effective and immediate action to "resist aggression against Israel and to preserve the peace." If we wait any longer, the hourly changing situation in the Middle East could result in the destruction of Israel.

Under unanimous consent I place the May 23 statement at this point in my remarks:

> Egypt and Syria are now threatening Israel and we fear that war in the Near East is inevitable unless the United States acts firmly and vigorously to prevent it. President Nasser's speech to his troops in Sinai yesterday was in effect a declaration of war. We note with dismay that the Soviet Union is encouraging and arming Egypt and Syria in a bold move to win influence and power in the Middle East. Once again the Soviet Union appears to be testing American resolve to defend the peace.
>
> The United States Government, speaking through Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, and through the Congress of the United States has repeatedly declared its determination to act against aggression in the Middle East. And we note with appreciation the declaration of a White House spokesman that—
>
> "This country is of course, committed to the principle of maintaining peace in the Middle East. This has been our position over the years. It is still our position."
>
> Consistent with that declaration, we pledge the fullest support to measures which must be taken by the Administration to make our position unmistakably clear to those who are now bent on the destruction of Israel, that we are now prepared to take whatever action may be necessary to resist aggression against Israel and to preserve the peace.
>
> We are confident that the people of the United States will support such a policy.

The statement by religious leaders of all the major faiths in America demonstrates the maintenance of the State of Israel, including the vital question of freedom of passage at the Straits of Tiran, is a matter of deep concern to Americans of all faiths and backgrounds. I place that statement at this point in my remarks:

The Moral Responsibility in the Middle East

> In the current crisis in the Middle East, men of good faith must recognize their moral responsibility to maintain freedom of passage at the Straits of Tiran. The following statement by a cross section of prominent Christian clergymen and religious editors reflects the views of thousands of church leaders throughout the United States. It eloquently clarifies the full meaning of the moral responsibility in the Middle East, where Israel has worked so hard to achieve the right to live in peace.
>
> "Pray For The Peace of Jerusalem" Psalms, 122: 6.
>
> Men of conscience must not remain silent at this time. The Middle East is on the brink of war. President Nasser of Egypt has initiated a blockade of an international waterway: the Straits of Tiran, Israel's sea-lane to Africa and Asia. This blockade may lead to a major conflagration.
>
> The Middle East has been an arena of tension due to the threat of continued terrorist attacks, as well as the recent Arab military mobilization along Israel's borders. Let us recall that Israel is a new nation whose people are still recovering from the horror and decimation of the European holocaust.
>
> President Johnson has called the blockade "illegal and potentially disastrous" to world peace.
>
> We therefore call on the United States government steadfastly to honor its commitments to the freedom of international waterways. We call on our fellow Americans of all persuasions and groupings and on the administration to support the independence, integrity and freedom of Israel.
>
> Men of conscience all over the world bear a moral responsibility to support Israel's right of passage through the Straits of Tiran.
>
> The people of Israel have the right to live and develop in tranquility and without fear. The Middle East requires respite and peace.
>
> "Seek peace and pursue it." (Psalms, 34: 15)
>
> The Rev. John C. Bennett, President Union Theological Seminary.
>
> The Rev. Robert McAfee Brown, Professor of Religion, Stanford University.
>
> The Rev. Thurston N. Davis, S. J., Editor, *America*.
>
> The Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., President, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.
>
> Dr. Franklin H. Littell, President, Iowa Wesleyan College.
>
> Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Professor Emeritus of Christian Ethics, Union Theological Seminary.
>
> James O'Gara, Editor, *Commonweal*.
>
> Dr. Daniel Poling, Chaplain, Interfaith Memorial of the Four Chaplains.
>
> The Rev. Alexander Schmemann, Dean, St. Vladamir's Russian Orthodox Seminary.
>
> The Rev. John B. Sheerin, C.S.P., Editor, *The Catholic World*.
>
> Bishop Stephen Gill Spottswood, Washington, D.C., Chairman, National Board of Directors, NAACP.
>
> Bishop Lloyd C. Wicke, Bishop, New York Area, Methodist Church; Former President, Methodist Council of Bishops.
>
> (Affiliations listed for identification only.)
>
> Sponsored as a public service by Americans for Democracy in the Middle East, Charles E. Silberman, Chairman.

My colleagues, I cannot end my remarks on the crisis in the Middle East without discussing Israel's role in the Middle East and throughout the developing areas of the world.

Israel has been a force for stability and progress in the Middle East, even during these troubled years when the Arab governments have so consistently and unalterably worked to maintain animosities against Israel.

In addition, Israel has had a miraculous record for rapid economic development, political stability and social integration of the people of many different national backgrounds who have come to Israel. This example has been of great importance and value to all the developing countries. And Israel has done more than just be an example. Israel has an incredibly large, effective, and tactful technical assistance program for underdeveloped countries all over the world. I am particularly familiar with Israel's great and effective help to the newly independent countries of Africa.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the United States has an obligation to quickly come to the aid of Israel in the interests of world peace, in its own national interest, for maintenance of stability in the Middle East, and, most unmistakably of all, for moral reasons.

A MODERN TALE OF THE PRODIGAL SON?

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, while some economists are pushing their "new economics" theories at home with limited success, it would appear that nations abroad are looking askance at the deficit-spending policies of the Federal Government. A column by the nationally syndicated columnist, Henry J. Taylor, appearing in the Columbus Dispatch of June 5, sums up this reaction nicely:

> What we face is a crisis in confidence. The majority of bankers and dollar holders around the world apparently do not believe Washington will whip either the inflation or the over-spending from which so much of it springs.

Apparently, those abroad are not as concerned about our Government's burgeoning spending programs as are some here at home, although these programs in recent years should be cause for concern. Although the U.S. population has grown 10 percent since 1960, the civilian personnel in the Federal Government has jumped by 25 percent, and the cost of Government payrolls, including military, has grown by 75 percent. Not many will quarrel with the increase for national defense expenditures—including the $22 billion for Vietnam in the 1968 budget—of 68 percent. But how explain the increase since 1960 of 97 percent for nondefense spending? One cannot conveniently blame the Vietnam war for our financial predicament; it is evident that the increases in spending are due to the civilian nondefense activities of the Government.

I include the above-mentioned column by Henry J. Taylor, entitled "Gold Market Dips in Confidence Crisis," in the RECORD at this point.

OUTFLOW, DEFICIT FACTORS—GOLD MARKET DIPS IN CONFIDENCE CRISIS

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Immense volume, highest in history, has hit the London Gold Exchange. The big American budget deficit, and the sight of a softer and softer dollar, sparked it off.

Our balance-of-payments problem is only part of the story. At best, it can only reduce the means by which foreign creditors gain the right to convert dollars into gold. They would not exercise that right on an endangering scale and threaten the dollar if they trusted our financial trend.

What we face is a crisis in confidence. The majority of bankers and other dollar holders around the world apparently do not believe Washington will whip either the inflation or the over-spending from which so much of it springs.

In the world's cold, slow-motion appraisal of what is happening here the unchanging record is governing their views:

The last and fleeting balanced budget was in 1960—before the New Frontier and Great Society took over. President Kennedy inherited a federal debt of $283 billion. We now owe $331 billion. This means that the New Frontier-Great Society has run in the red at the rate of about $8 billion a year—with the Vietnam War now superimposed on top of this.

The last Congress before President Kennedy's Administration appropriated $83.8 billion of the people's money. In the last session President Johnson's congress voted $141 billion for all purposes. The difference is an incredible $57.2 billion.

Our creditors abroad see even in the face of the Vietnam War Washington's nondefense spending has also increased by leaps and bounds. Washington's spending needs priorities and President Johnson and Congress have failed to apply priorities.

Creditor nations and individuals abroad have gradually come to own America's entire gold stock (and billions besides), including the reserve legally required behind our dollar. In fact, our obligations payable in gold have reached about twice our entire gold supply.

Our gold stock is now lower than Europe's Common Market countries. It has gone down every year for 10 years while the Common Market countries' reserves have gone up. So have the rest of the major countries of the world climbed the gold pole while the United States has fallen off it.

When the New Frontier-Great Society took over we held $21 billion in gold—about 54 per cent of the world's monetary supply. Today we hold $13.1 billion—less than 30 per cent. In this period other nations' gold reserves climbed to $27.3 billion by the latest Federal Reserve Board figures. And their additional dollar balances subject to conversion climbed from $13.8 billion to $28.2 billion. The outside world now holds about $55 billion in gold and dollars—nearly twice as much as 10 years ago—while our gold supply has just hit another new low.

Thus we have suffered not only an absolute loss of gold but also an alarming prorata share of the world's gold. Both these losses are larger than those of any other nation. Most others have achieved both an absolute and proportionate increase.

As a result, the United States simply does not command the same pre-eminence in world finance that it formerly did. And which meant so much to Britain in the pound sterling. When we own more and own less and the Washington Robin Hoods of the Red Ink keep operating in the red we can only decline, as Britain did, while other nations advance.

The pressure is further complicated by an added factor. For the first time in a century no gold was added last year to international monetary supplies. Production has fallen as mining costs have mounted. World output has reversed a 16-year trend.

Last year a record 30.9 million ounces, valued at $1.1 billion, was mined. But most of it went to industries or into speculators' or hoarders' hands. Thus the phenomenon: While gold is being bought in unprecedented volume, gold-mining shares on the London Stock Exchange have fallen to the lowest level in 12 years.

The New Frontier-Great Society inherited a gold problem and changed it into a gold crisis that has grown so damaging that it makes President Johnson's monetary responsibility now nearly as consequential as the Chinese-Soviet menace itself.

EXTEND MAILING PRIVILEGES TO SERVICEMEN OVERSEAS

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10226, a bill to provide cheaper mailing privileges to our servicemen overseas.

I commend the distinguished members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for their prompt action in bringing this bill to the floor of the House of Representatives.

I have already turned over to the committee some 3,900 letters, cards, and petitions from residents of my congressional district and the surrounding Detroit metropolitan area urging favorable action on this legislation. The mail came in response to a campaign conducted by Mr. Dale C. Burley, a councilman in Hazel Park, Mich., a community in my congressional district.

Most of the mail came from families with loved ones in Vietnam or other U.S. military stations around the world. I am sure that many of you have received similar letters or telephone calls from your congressional districts.

I doubt that we could devote ourselves to a finer cause than the improvement of mail services to our boys overseas, whether in Vietnam or any other part of the world.

Under this legislation, packages weighing up to 30 pounds would be airlifted on a space-available basis upon payment of the regular surface rate plus a small uniform airlift fee to be established by the Postmaster General.

It would mean that packages could be sent overseas for less than half the present rate. In addition, the proposed legislation would improve on the fine work done by the committee a year ago extending the free mailing privileges for letters and sound recordings to all servicemen overseas—not just those in combat zones.

Another major provision of the proposed legislation would eliminate the same distinction in regard to hometown newspapers and magazines. While they may now be mailed free to combat zones only, the bill under consideration today would extend the privilege to all overseas military stations.

I believe that passage of this legislation will round out our efforts to see that all servicemen serving in remote parts of the world have the benefits of fast, efficient, and inexpensive mail service.

CRISIS TO CRISIS

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow our House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will resume hearings on House Joint Resolution 559, which is to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees. It is my understanding that the committee will commence executive sessions on the measure on Thursday, following testimony by the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, and the Association of American Railroads, tomorrow and Wednesday.

The current railroad dispute is just another in a series of labor disputes which has rocked our Nation's economy. On the horizon is the danger of a most serious impasse in contract renewals in the automotive industry later this year.

For some time, the administration has promised new legislation to deal with strikes that cripple the economy. As has been pointed out, the administration has failed to produce.

As an editorial in the May 31, 1967, Wall Street Journal mentioned, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has stated that the need for Congress' intervention in three national strike emergencies in the past 4 years is not "enough to warrant a permanent intrusion on collective bargaining."

The editorial continued:

> In other words the nation should go on improvising from crisis to crisis, hoping that in time the trouble will just go away.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with Secretary Wirtz, and I am further convinced that our Nation, because of commitments abroad and at home, can ill afford to go along its merry way improvising.

The recent strike in the trucking industry was extremely damaging in the Midwest. The so-called 3.2-percent wage guideline has long been discarded.

It is because of recent disputes, current developments, and an uneasy future in labor-management matters that I have today introduced legislation which would establish a joint bipartisan congressional committee on industrywide bargaining in the Congress to review and recommend revisions of existing laws relating to collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts.

This resolution is not new. Our former House colleague, now U.S. Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, presented such legislation in the House of Representatives in 1963 and 1965. He did so last year in the Senate, and for the fourth time just a few weeks ago. Other Members of the House have called for such congressional action.

At this time, with a host of major collective-bargaining agreements to be settled this year—32 of them—it is time that Congress face up to its responsibility and at least seriously consider possible means of improving methods of resolving industrywide bargaining and strikes.

Why must Congress continue to react to a labor-management crisis? Let us act now in an effort to avoid damaging hardships in the future of labor-management negotiations.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF WEST CENTRAL FRONT OF U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, no one has a greater interest in the Capitol building than myself. It has been my hobby ever since I have been here as a Congressman. I have had strong feelings about improving the Capitol—not only improving it, but preserving it. Until now, we have not fulfilled our commitment to properly preserve and improve the Capitol, nor have we responded to the needs it could serve as we should. There may be some quarrel as to how these decisions should be made, but based on research, studies, and observations, I am convinced what is being planned now for the west front is not only right, but urgent, and we ought to get on with the business of extension and the resulting preservation. It is unfortunate there has been some apparent biased discussion that has proven to be an unnecessary hurdle. I have followed with interest the observations of the American Institute of Architects. To say the least, they have been inconsistent and, I believe, have made not always correct judgments.

As proof, I point out the AIA has recently submitted its own task force report indicating an apparent reverse of its position on the proposed extension of the west central front of the U.S. Capitol. The now-recommended restoration, even though such an operation, if feasible, would be hazardous, costly, and time consuming; it would require the vacating of much-needed space along the west half of the Capitol between the Senate and the House wings for a period of 5 to 10 years. They have made this recommendation in spite of the fact that the proposed restoration would not, according to knowledgeable engineers, offer a permanent solution for correcting the deteriorated condition of this portion of the building.

There is dependable evidence that many of the existing cracks would recur in any restored walls. This is because of the expansion joints, sandstone material of good quality and of character to match the material originally used, is no longer available. Also, removing the paint would show up a patchy stone job, the majority of stones would have to be removed and replaced, resulting in a reproduction and not the original work, the vaulted ceilings of the interior rooms along the west side would have to be shored, and congressional work would be seriously disrupted due to vacating of offices along the west walls.

All of the expense of so-called restoration would result in a product of questionable stability and integrity, would, in my opinion, contribute nothing to the aesthetic improvement of the least architecturally successful side of the Capitol. In addition, it would provide no opportunity to complete the revised composition made necessary by the addition of the Senate and the House wings and the enlarged dome over a hundred years ago, and would provide no additional space.

It is interesting to note that Thomas U. Walter, fourth Architect of the Capitol, 1851–65, one of the founders of the AIA and its second president, made studies while Architect of the Capitol, and after his return to private practice recommending such extension in order to complete the architectural composition made necessary by the extensions and changes made under his direction. One of the plans made by him is similar to the plan approved last fall by the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol project.

To say the least, the AIA's present position is in direct contradiction to their position taken in 1957 when they actually recommended the extension of the west central front. For instance, at the AIA National Convention in Cleveland, in July 1958, the architects who led the fight for the AIA against the east front extension were Ralph Walker, FAIA; Lorimer Rich, FAIA; and Douglas Haskell, AIA. They circulated a paper at the convention saying the practical space needs to be gained from the east front extension: "Could be achieved in better measure by extending the west front, and without the threatened architectural sentimental damage. . . ." And from the AIA Journal, January 1958, Architect Ralph Walker stated:

> . . . everything that would be obtained by the predetermined plan . . . that of moving the east front and also extending the wings, would be accomplished much more pleasantly, esthetically and efficiently by the reconstruction of the west front which has no great historic significance.

And from the Washington Post, August 13, 1958, page A–15:

> The AIA has a plan for providing much extra space by extending the West Front.

The Joint Committee on Landmarks of the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts prepared a list of National Capital landmarks a few years ago comprising some 292 structures. The Chairman of this Committee is Architect Francis D. Lethbridge. He is the same person who has been leading in recent years to opposition to the extension of the west central front for the AIA. This list shows the following buildings at the head of the landmarks list as copied from their list:

STRUCTURE, ARCHITECT(S) AND DATE(S)

1. The White House: Hoban, Latrobe 1792–1807; McKim, Mead & White (renovated), 1902; renovated, 1948–52.
2. The Capitol: Thornton, Latrobe, Bulfinch, Walter, 1793–1863; West Terrace and Steps Olmsted, 1874–75; East Front reconstructed, 1960.
3. The Octagon (Tayloe House), 1741 New York Avenue, NW.: Thornton, 1800.
4. Arlington (Custis-Lee Mansion), Arlington National Cemetery: Custis, Hadfield, 1802–20.
5. Tudor Place, 1644 31st St., NW.: Thornton 1815.
6. St. John's Church, 16th and H Sts., NW.: Latrobe, c.1816.
7. Decatur House, 748 Jackson Place NW.: Latrobe, 1818.
8. Old City Hall, 451 Indiana Avenue NW.: Hadfield, 1820–50.

The inconsistency of the present AIA is noted in their recommendations to remove and alter the Octagon area.

You will note that the Octagon building follows immediately on the heels of the U.S. Capitol in importance. Notwithstanding their recommendation to restore the Capitol, the AIA, as recently reported to the press, sees no need for preserving the historic setting of the Octagon House, and under the guise of a proposed restoration of the interior of the house, they now would plan to destroy its pleasant old garden setting, demolish the old stable, which was fitted some years ago to house its library, destroy its present Headquarters Building which was designed in keeping with the Octagon and its dependencies, and destroy the adjacent Lemon Building with its ornate brick facade, even though opposition to such destruction has been expressed by eminent persons, namely Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall; Conrad L. Wirth and Horace M. Albright, both former Directors of the National Park Service; Alexander Hamilton, president, American Scenic & Historic Preservation Society; Oliver O. Jensen, editor, American Heritage magazine, but to mention a few. I join this group. In place of these destroyed structures, they intend to erect a seven-story ultramodern, nonconforming, huge brick structure which almost completely envelopes the Octagon like the whale about ready to swallow Jonah.

Well then, how does all this affect the

proposed extension of the Capitol. Wolf von Eckardt, Washington Post staff writer, who, incidentally, is opposed to the extension of the Capitol, put it aptly if I may quote from the May 20, 1967, article entitled "New AIA Headquarters Plan Called Exciting, Unsuitable:"

> But what is good for the Capitol ought to be good for the Octagon. You either believe in historic preservation or you don't . . .

From this, one must conclude that the present AIA management deals in double standards, depending on which serves their purpose at the moment. In these instances, they have one standard for the Capitol and another for their own historic building, the Octagon. If they are genuinely dedicated to preserving historic buildings, such as the Octagon and its dependencies, why do they not go elsewhere to provide their additional required space, as they recommend that the Congress do? How can they justify constructing such an avant garde building as Mr. von Eckardt calls it, almost completely surrounding and dominating the Octagon, and at the same time say to the Congress leave the Capitol alone?

The Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, has just recently completed its hearings and has heard from both proponents and opponents of the Capitol controversy. It is obvious the condition of the old sandstone walls is serious as reported in depth by the independent engineering firm employed by the Congress to investigate its condition, that the cost of the proposed so-called restoration recommended by the AIA will be as much or more than the extension without any gain of any much needed space, that the composition of the Capitol, if extended, will finally be completed as dictated by the additions of a hundred or more years ago, that for the same or less money than restoration, we will gain much needed space as a byproduct, that we, therefore, should proceed without further delay with the work of extension in order to have, in the next 4 or 5 years once again, a beautiful, dignified looking, and structurally sound Capitol, of which all Americans can be proud, without the disruption to the work of the Congress that would result if the so-called restoration were carried out.

CRISIS POINT IN AFRICA

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gene Sherman, Pulitzer Prize winning chief of the London bureau for Copley News Service, wrote an article entitled "Crisis Point in Africa." He made the report to the 38th annual Copley conference and his remarks were reprinted in the Copley News Service of June. In my opinion, this is a very realistic article on Rhodesia, and is worthy of attention by all those interested in this subject. His article follows:

CRISIS POINT IN AFRICA

(By Gene Sherman)

English-speaking Africa is a crisis point in today's world.

Coverage of the dark continent has come a long way since Stanley presumed he had found Dr. Livingston. The responsibility of informing the public on Africa can scarcely be exaggerated. The complexity of its problems and America's relationship to them is simply not understood.

It is essential that the American public is kept aware of the awakening continent and the growing importance it has on this country's security and economy.

Not so long ago Africa could virtually be ignored. It was too far away to matter much. To have much bearing on the rest of the world. But today it is only a few hours from anywhere by jet. Its leaders have seen what is happening in the rest of the world. Communications have brought it into the world community.

Not so long ago people would have laughed at the thought of Britain's Prime Minister discussing a rebellion with the leader of Rhodesia by telephone. But that's exactly what happened a year ago last November. Harold Smith phoned Ian Smith to discourage him from declaring unilateral independence.

My first trip to Salisbury for Copley News Service re-emphasized to me the ultimate responsibility of the written word. I didn't know what to expect. There was talk of troops in the streets—guerrillas murdering white settlers. Hard words in a crisis atmosphere. It sounded like the Mau Mau all over again.

I remember scanning the airport from the window of my South African Airlines 707 for signs of armed guards and barricades. I guess I'd been reading the British papers too thoroughly.

Instead I was treated with the greatest courtesy by customs and immigration people. When I checked into Meikles Hotel I was completely disarmed when the man behind the desk said, "Welcome to rebellious Rhodesia." He grinned broadly. Rhodesians like to call sardonic attention to the tranquility that prevails.

Salisbury itself was the epitome of a quiet, clean city going about its multiracial business with a minimum of sweat or fret. To all outward appearance, Rhodesia is a peaceful country intent on advancing its economy under the present trying circumstances. I found much the same atmosphere prevailing when I visited Salisbury again last November, despite the additional worry of the UN's mandatory sanctions.

But outward appearances are deceiving. If you go no further you're likely to be lulled into believing it's business as usual. It isn't, of course. There's plenty wrong, but it's not all with Rhodesia.

The Rhodesia story is the most significant in Africa today. It is much more far-reaching than the *coups* in Ghana, Nigeria, Uganda and elsewhere. It involves not only essential constitutional issues but basic social and moral issues that pertain directly to the plight of the whole question of black nationalism.

These days an ideology often is considered more important than a fact. It is not popular to weigh both sides of a question as volatile and controversial as Rhodesia.

That is one reason, I think, that Prime Minister Harold Wilson lost control of the situation that led to Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence (UDI). He was pushed heavily by the left-wing of the British Labor Party which was concerned with one factor above all—instant majority rule for Africans.

The operative word there is "instant."

Majority rule certainly is consistent with the democratic process. No one can quarrel with that premise. It is the keynote of our democratic system.

But Rhodesia, and indeed all of Africa south of the Sahara, presents problems of democracy that are absolutely unique. And I qualify the superlative for emphasis.

The acceptance of majority rule is not exclusive to the Labor Party. The Conservative Party is equally concerned that the majority should be represented. Sir Alec Douglas-Home when he was Prime Minister was adamant on that point. But he dealt with it and with Ian Smith in a much different manner. His fist was just as iron, but his glove was softer velvet.

I do not believe that if the Tories had remained in office Rhodesia would have broken away from Britain before the issue of majority representation had been worked out to everyone's satisfaction. The air of crisis created by the Labor government did much to precipitate Smith's drastic action.

Whether he was justified or not is a matter of opinion. Rhodesians themselves are widely split on that question, although, now the die is cast, they are determined to make it work.

One Rhodesian business man I asked about that replied that UDI may be *legally* wrong, but it is *morally* right. I found that attitude to be prevalent among the white residents.

The big question now is whether Rhodesia can survive economically under mandatory sanctions. Almost everybody believes it will, even some of the most vehement anti-Smith Laborites in London.

Although Rhodesia's economy is being affected, it also is being bolstered by trade with South Africa, Portuguese Africa and nations abstaining from the Security Council decree—France and Switzerland among them.

Britain's close trade links with South Africa, her fourth largest export customer, prevents her from pressing sanctions to the point of involving the Pretoria government.

The use of military force to topple the Smith regime is inconceivable. The Labor government would fall if Wilson moved seriously in that direction. He continues to say force is not ruled out if troops are necessary to maintain law and order. But the Smith regime is playing it very cool. It has put itself in the position of a fighter willing to take anything the opposition can dish out and still win on the opponent's terms.

Disruptive nationalist leaders are in detention. Minor guerrilla sorties across the Zambesi River from neighboring Zambia are dealt with by Rhodesian troops on a local basis.

Every precaution is taken to keep the atmosphere cool and calm. Rhodesia is determined not to give Britain or the UN any overt reason to employ force.

How will the present stalemate be broken, then?

The most likely probability is that Rhodesia will declare itself a republic, like South Africa, adopt a revised constitution and begin a long campaign for recognition.

It is less likely that some basis for reopening negotiations with Britain develops, although some functions in Rhodesia and Britain are urging that course.

In one dispatch from Salisbury I compared Rhodesia to an outcast who cannot understand why he has been banished. This I think is an underlying tragedy of Rhodesia. It emphasizes the need for more and wider understanding of Africa's problems.

Nowhere in Rhodesia are you conscious of any sense of guilt. On the contrary, the whites feel sincerely they are treating Africans better than they are treated in other multi-racial countries and better than many Africans treat one another.

The vast majority of white Rhodesians concede that African majority rule is inevitable. They admit they don't like the idea. But they also admit that they cannot prevent it indefinitely. Meanwhile they don't want to see what they have built fall into inexperienced or incapable hands.

They consider that wise, well-earned self-interest—not villainy.

For an impartial observer there is a good deal of evidence to support that point of view. In education, one of the requirements for African franchise, for example, pupil enrollment in ratio to school age is the highest in Africa—60 per cent. Most schools are segregated, but a number are multi-racial—including the university.

The government is building middle class housing for Africans that can be financed for thirty years. Little publicized projects such as African Farming Development train Africans to raise cash crops and free themselves from subsistence farming. AFD is underwritten by white farmers with the objective of creating an African market for consumer goods and raising the Africans' standard of living.

This is not to imply that Africans in Rhodesia have no cause for complaint by American civil rights standards.

But—and this is an unpopular fact I'd like to discuss in a moment—the average African is an entirely different type of person from the average American Negro. Nevertheless, I would venture to say that the black Rhodesian generally is better off on a comparative basis than his American counterpart in Mississippi.

The sad crux of the situation lies in the failure of Rhodesia and other colonial governments during the past 50 or 75 years to provide adequate opportunity for Africans to prepare themselves for the inevitable day when they are ready to assume the responsibilities of government. The sad, nagging fact is that independence caught Africans unprepared to cope with it. The dozen or so *coups* on the continent during the last year and a half, many of them bloody, constitute a damaging indictment not only of their unreadiness but of colonial failure to prepare them.

But problems are faced and solved in the present, not in the past. That is why the illumination of Africa's dilemma is so important, especially for Americans.

There are three ways in which I think Africa has been misrepresented: By being compared with other under-developed areas by people who never set foot on the continent. By equating African's problems with those of American Negroes. And by reporting colored by personal ideology, opinions and wishful thinking.

Rhodesia is a prime example of this. I was asked constantly to explain America's attitude to UDI. And, as are all Americans, reminded repeatedly of how we treated the Indians and how the 13 colonies of New England broke away from the crown.

Let me give you two examples of the kind of reporting that makes everybody look bad.

Shortly after UDI a photographer took a picture of Cecil Rhodes Square in the middle of Salisbury showing Africans taking their customary noon siestas on the grass. The picture was published with a caption indicating the snoozing Africans were corpses.

Another photographer tossed candy into a trash can and snapped a picture of small African children eagerly reaching into the cans for the goodies. The implication of the photograph was as obvious as the ruse was disgusting.

Rhodesia crystallizes the African story today because it has suddenly deflected the wind of change that swept 35 countries into uneasy nationalism during the last decade. Whether that in itself is an achievement is beside the point. What matters is that Rhodesia has made the world look again at the deep-rooted problems of African independence.

It has forced the world to separate idealism from practicality. To weigh again the wisdom of the precipitate plunge to power that left Africa an unsettled continent.

Rhodesia is only 150,000 square miles of Africa's 11½-million square miles. It has only 4¼-million of the continent's 250-million population. But the rest of Africa hangs over it like a mushroom cloud.

Extremists of both colors focus its predicament on the confrontation of the races. It is more than that. It is linked just as much with the desire of the people who built the country to keep what they built and in time share more of it with the Africans who helped them build it.

Against that, it is interesting to watch the leftwingers who so bitterly condemn the bombing in Vietnam cry with equal bitterness for the forceful overthrow of the Smith regime.

The comparison of Africa's racial differences with those of the United States is one of those easy but dangerous blunders.

It takes very little observation on the scene to realize there is no similarity whatever between the political, social or economic problems of the African and the American Negro. Yet the fact they are both black provided a great deal of the American impetus in favor of granting speedy independence to African states.

It is only during the last decade that American official and public interest in Africa has developed. Before then we sat on the fence unwilling to antagonize Africa or Europe. For Americans, Africa was a mysterious exotic zoo.

In his scholarly assessment of Africa in world politics, Vernon McKay, a professor of African studies, notes that we tended to forget that the direct responsibility for governing Africa belonged to the European democracies.

He goes on to say, "Believing in democratic values and sincere in the conviction that their costly new postwar policy of gradual development towards self-government was right, they (the European democracies) found they could not maintain this policy without resorting to the undemocratic practice of suppressing African nationalists. When they were no longer willing or able to do this, they had to abandon the policy even though unconvinced it was right to do so."

It was this policy of the European democracies that involved American liberals in Africa. The involvement almost immediately centered inferentially on the question of race, which was not the main concern of the European governments.

They were agreed for quite different reasons that African independence was a just goal and a desirable one.

Race has figured to a large extent ever since in the attitude of Americans toward Africa. This inevitably led to the equating of African nationalism with American civil rights.

The fallacy of this was brought home to me most poignantly.

In Zambia, Ghana and Nigeria I met a number of American Negroes atached to the U.S. Foreign Service. The policy of sending American Negroes to Africa to represent America seems entirely sensible. The immediate inference is of Africans welcoming American Negroes as kinsmen of a sort. It seems logical to expect people of the same race and color to understand one another better.

Curiously enough, it hasn't worked out that way at all. To a man, the American officals I talked with expressed reservations.

Africans look upon them not as members of a brotherhood of color, but as Americans. That they were the same color made no difference to the Africans.

Some of the American Negroes were from the South. They were amazed to find themselves resented in varying degrees because of their superior education, their cultivated tastes and their affluence. The points of irritation were the same as between Africans and whites.

The Americans for their part were disappointed in the Africans. They experience the same difficulty in establishing a rapport as whites do. The Americans arrive full of dedication for what they think of as their people. Their disappointment is sometimes a stunning psychological blow.

One young Negro from the Middle West joined the Peace Corps in Ghana convinced that the empathy gap would be bridged by the color of his skin. He became so frustrated after a few months that he had a breakdown and requested a transfer.

A big, affable outgoing Negro from Georgia told me sadly that he had been invited to only two African homes during his two years of duty in Zambia.

The winds of change have fanned racial antagonism. But that is only one of the many problems that beset the continent.

Belatedly African leaders themselves are beginning to realize this. They are beginning to realize that the effort expended against whites in Africa is needed more urgently to put their own houses in order.

The experience of American Negroes in Africa highlights the need to think of Africans as Africans—with their own peculiar characteristics and sensitivities. They are not just another segment of the world's colored population. They most certainly are not an extension of America's civil rights movement.

Those who lump Africa's woes under one heading—race—glibly encourage the Communist line. The far left divides Africa into black and white. African poverty, lack of education and initiative, tribal fragmentation and all the obvious problems are blamed on the African's color.

Yet more and more leaders like Kenyatta, Banda and Gowon of Nigeria are telling their people they have only themselves to blame if their countries falter.

In this respect, Africa would seem to be a fertile ground for Communist advancement. All the elements are there—poverty and the shadow of white domination. Yet I was equally surprised at the answers I got when I asked American, British and African diplomats how successful Communist infiltration really is.

Ghana last summer was deeply involved in stabilizing itself after the overthrow of Kwama Nkrumah, who salted away millions of dollars in graft while currying favor in Moscow and Peking. Twenty-four hours after Nkrumah's overthrow Communist diplomats were on their way home. The attitude toward American and British diplomats warmed instantly.

Naturally they were delighted. But when I asked the American political officer whether I should accept an invitation to appear on television in Accra, he hesitated. He assured me nobody would tell me what to do. But he explained that since the *coup* the American and the British were being careful not to repeat the Communists' mistake.

The Communists were in evidence everywhere. They were too apparent and too overbearing. We wanted to stay more in the background. I took the hint and declined the invitation.

Everywhere I went I got the same assessment. The threat and bribery of Communism meets a natural resistance in Africa. By the very nature of their traditional, family-oriented tribal society Africans find Communism undesirable.

This is not to say Moscow and Peking will quit trying to corrupt susceptible leaders to further their aims and gain a foothold on the continent. But every qualified source I talked with in Africa and elsewhere believed they won't get very far.

I heard the same opinion so many times that I began to doubt it. I particularly began to wonder if I should write it, but I did. Some time later I was glad to see the opinions substantiated by the last vote in the United Nations on whether to seat Communist China. As you recall, the African bloc increased its vote against seating the Peking government.

The struggle for African loyalties continues, however—although the basis for pan-Africanism is a rejection of both Communism and capitalism in favor of total independence.

Coincidentally, the expressed basis for American relations with the new nations is our respect for their desire to remain non-aligned.

That sounds good to American ears. But to most Africans non-alignment means a position flexible enough to accept assistance from anybody.

Kenya and Tanzania are "non-aligned." But in fact Kenya is flagrantly pro-West and Tanzania is flagrantly pro-Communist. Yet I think it would be a mistake to say that Kenyatta is anything but a Kenya nationalist or that Nyerere wants anything but Tanzanian socialism.

Kenyatta's effective elimination of Oginga Odinga and his Kenya People's Union can be taken as ample evidence of his anti-Communism. Odinga had—still has, in fact—outright Communist support. Against Kenyatta's lofty influence, however, he is powerless.

Yet Odinga's banishment is not simply a matter of anti-Communism. It goes even deeper—something that escapes those who do not understand Africa. Kenyatta is leader of the Kikuyu tribe from which he gets his support and power. Odinga is leader of the Luo tribe, the great rival of the Kikuyu for power and political spoils.

In the African mind this is uppermost, not whether one leader is pro-Communist or pro-West. The vast influence of tribalism is little understood outside the continent. Yet it is the cause of most of the instability in Africa.

Tribal loyalties transcend all other political ties. They color every decision and influence all public reaction. The massive influence of tribalism and the Balkanized colonial borders that disrupted it is one of the most important factors in the riddle of Africa.

Some idea of the difficulties it presents becomes apparent when you consider there are some 1,000 tribal languages spoken on the continent. And nearly half of the continent's 250-million population cannot read or write in *any* language.

There is constant pressure on African politicians to balance tribal representation on a strictly tribal basis. In Kenya, for example, where there are 34 different tribes, the Luos are demanding that more of their members be admitted to the Army. Dr. Mungai, the Stanford-educated minister of defense, warned them of the danger of allowing tribalism to disrupt organizations devoted to the national interest.

Education—or lack of it—is the second monumental obstacle to African progress. The education gap is discouraging, and widening with each year's climbing birth rate. From 60 to 90 per cent of African children who are old enough to be in elementary school are not enrolled.

Ninety per cent of those old enough to be in secondary school, aren't. The number of Africans in universities on an age and population ratio is nil.

This has created an educated elite—a thin top layer of college-trained Africans from whom leaders emerge. They are the ones who are seen abroad and give an impression of African advancement that falls short of reality.

A disturbing aspect of the educated elite is the tendency for Africans to study liberal arts rather than acquire technical training so necessary in their countries.

In many—but, of course, not all—education is more a status symbol than an opportunity to contribute. Conscientious Africans recognize that this has led to a lessening of effort rather than the reverse.

Just recently Dr. Banda vehemently castigated Malawans for their laziness. The Nigeria *Daily Sketch* editorialized strongly against laziness while I was there. The editorial said in part:

> "Laziness is a tragedy which deserves to be met seriously by all African independent states if the continent is to take its rightful place in the comity of nations."

It may seem elemental to condemn laziness and praise work. But it is one of the elementary problems that has a great deal of bearing on Africa's backwardness.

On the wave of independence Africa has gained an aura of instant sophistication that really is barely a glimmer. Independence and freedom does not necessarily presuppose democracy and freedom as we know it.

While I was in Kenya a British journalist was deported for criticizing the government's censorship of films. An American correspondent before him was ousted for writing about witchcraft, although the subject is discussed frequently in Parliament.

African politicians all the way to the top tend to take things personally and deal with them personally.

An American embassy official tried to set me on the right track. The simple truth, he said, is that Africans respect power and force. If a government falls it is because it is weak and therefore no good. We don't like to acknowledge that because our idealism gets in the way. Criticism is equated with troublesome opposition, which is equated with disloyalty, which is equated with treason—which means death.

It seems paradoxical, incidentally, that Rhodesia is criticized so strongly for domestic censorship while African nationalist states escape crticism for the same thing.

But Africa is a continent of paradoxes—and in the word of Tanzania's President Nyerere, a mess. The rosy bloom of independence with its dreams of power and riches has faded somewhat and Africa today is taking stock of itself.

Men like Ian Smith and the pioneer farmers of Rhodesia are in the crucible today. Much of the future of Africa rests on their future. They built cities like Salisbury. They want to keep it as peaceful as it is now.

What right have they to that wish? Do they have as much right or more to this than their African neighbors? The agony of white Rhodesians is their desire to hold on to what they believe is rightfully theirs and still fly the British Union Jack. They feel they can operate a multiracial society with due concern for Africans, who outnumber them 20 to 1.

Whether they have the chance depends on how they survive economically under mandatory sanctions—on whether they can sell the tobacco crop so vital to the economy of the country.

Smith remains strong and popular with the people, although opposition has developed from both the left and the right. The betting is he'll ride it out.

The 37 independent countries of Africa have custody of one of the world's greatest untapped sources of wealth.

With one quarter of the earth's land surface and eight per cent of its population it produces one-seventh of the world's mineral output; contains 40 per cent of the world's potential hydro-electric power and has three times as much land under cultivation as Western Europe. Yet the whole continent's share of the world output is only two per cent.

In every way it is a land of contrast, from the snows of Kilimanjaro to the modern streets of Ndola in the copper country and the bright new structures of Nairobi.

All this has long been recognized. Now it is being recognized *even* in *Africa* itself that something is wrong—that potential is not enough—that progress depends on more than racial antagonism and greed for power.

Africans themselves are just beginning to realize that the blame for Africa's turmoil must be shared by them as well as by history.

Meanwhile America's economic and political stake in the continent becomes increasingly important. For that reason the African story needs consistent telling if we are not to be surprised by the future.

LET THE U.N. ACT ON THE MIDEAST CRISIS

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at this time few people predicted war in the Mideast. This is no time for unilateral action by the United States. Last week, the President came close to committing the U.S. military might throughout the world to guarantee the integrity of national borders from all aggression. This was at a time when the Arabs were threatening, when Arab troops were moved in to fill a void left by the withdrawal of U.N. troops along the Israel-United Arab Republic border, when Nasser had announced the closing of the Bay of Aqaba—"constructive aggression" in some international law texts.

Now with aggression by air and land by Israel, it may be difficult to ascertain who the first aggressor really was.

Unilateral action by the United States in support or defense of the United Arab Republic or Israel would be premature and ill advised for several reasons.

Unless we intend to sabotage the United Nations now, we should give it an opportunity to function as a true peacekeeping organization.

If the U.N. is not effective in this situation, it may be so severely disgraced that it will never regain a stature or dependability to permit it to function even in social, health, and welfare fields.

Our Government should encourage the U.N. to cope with this incident. All combatants are U.N. members—a perfect case for the U.N.

A U.N. solution would bolster the prospects of an effective peacekeeping function.

I propose that the President instruct U.N. Ambassador Goldberg to give notice to the U.N. that if the U.N. does not take immediate action in the Mideast to stabilize the outbreaks and to restore the pre-June 1967 national boundaries and to introduce a sufficient force to keep the peace, that the United States will withdraw its financial support. If the Security Council fails to act promptly, then I recommend that the President direct Ambassador Goldberg to summon the General Assembly, under the terms of a decision of the General Assembly of November 1950, which provided that if the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, the Assembly may consider it and recommend collective measures, including, in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression, the use of armed forces to maintain or restore peace. In such case, the General Assembly may be convened within 24 hours to take up the matter in an emergency special session.

On an important question such as this, a two-thirds majority of members present and voting is required.

We have contributed almost $3 billion to the U.N. If we are not to obtain any peacekeeping value for our large contributions; if, in spite of our heavy contributions to the U.N., we must still "go it alone" or, in more sophisticated terms, resort to unilateral action—then we should forewarn the U.N. of our disappointments and of the need to make better use of our taxpayers' money.

Unilateral action in the Mideast now would be precipitous; it would rob the U.N. of an opportunity to perform its basic objectives; it would deprive the U.N. of an opportunity to prove itself; it would duplicate the expenditure of large sums of U.S. money and risk the lives of American men in a U.N. war.

Mistakes and blunders, timidity and fears of the U.N. have precipitated this war. The U.N., for its own survival and for the peace in the world, should assume the responsibility and management of resolving the peace in the Middle East.

HOOVER INSTITUTION ON WAR, REVOLUTION, AND PEACE

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable and unique organizations in the world is the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace located on the campus of Stanford University and founded in 1919 by former President Herbert C. Hoover. Its unparalleled service to mankind is only hinted at in the following article which appeared in the June 22 issue of the Wall Street Journal:

Hoover Library Gathers Material To Shed Light on Events Overseas—It Collects Documents From Russia, China, Aids CIA; Network of Agents Helps—A Haven for Goldwater Men?

(By Ronald Buel)

PALO ALTO, CALIF.—The 14-story tower on the Stanford University campus houses some startling goings-on. Messages go out to smugglers in Hong Kong and to other agents in trouble spots around the world. Documents arrive directly from the Kremlin and Peking. CIA agents browse in the cluttered halls and rooms.

It's a pretty spooky place—for a library. But this is no ordinary library. It's the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace. The Hoover tower (Hootow, in campus slang) has become one of the world's major repositories for documents dealing with 20th century political and economic developments.

When the Soviet Union discovered that a copy of the first issue of Izvestia, the government newspaper, was missing from its archives, Russian officials got a copy from Hoover. The institution has the first published documents of the Chinese Communist Party and the files of the Okhrana, the Czarist secret police for the years 1883 to 1917. Within the past year, the institution was able to provide the Central Intelligence Agency with a purloined photocopy of a seven-year-plan drawn up by a Hungarian Communist economist for the government of Ghana. When opposition leaders are arrested by South Africa's government, their papers and files are swiftly spirited out of the country to Hoover.

ATTRACTING SCHOLARS

In one recent year, 1,000 scholars from 36 states and 27 foreign countries came to dig into the institution's vast collection. Douglast W. Bryant, Harvard University librarian, calls Hoover "one of the great libraries of the world in the fields in which it specializes."

Hoover is more than just a collection of documents, however. The institution supports about two dozen full-time research fellows. It is publishing 32 books this year based on research in its collections. And it currently is financing more than 120 research projects by its own staff and outsiders.

Much of this work is of interest to the Government and its diplomatic and intelligence agencies. A recent 2,000-page work called The Politics of the Chinese Red Army brought Government orders for 250 copies. That Hoover has links with the CIA is undisputed, though it appears to get little if any money from the intelligence agency ($500 was given Hoover last year by American Friends of the Middle East Inc., a known recipient of CIA funds).

Some scholars believe that the institution—or, at least, some of its staffers—has moved beyond objective research into the realm of politics. "Some of the members of the senior staff are propagandists, not scholars," asserts Oli Holsti, a Stanford faculty member whose father, a Finnish diplomat, left his papers to Hoover. Mr. Holsti adds: "Certainly not everything that goes on there is unscholarly, but much of it is highly disreputable." A Hoover spokesman replies that the charge is too baseless to warrant further comment.

PROTECTING "THE AMERICAN WAY"

The institution was founded by Herbert Hoover in 1919 with a grant of $150,000. Mr. Hoover helped sustain it through his years as President and up until his death in 1964. He once said: "The purpose of this institution must be, by its research and publications, to demonstrate the evils of the doctrines of Karl Marx . . . thus to protect the American way of life."

Hoover now has an endowment of about $3 million, and its annual income is fattened by donations from such sources as Standard Oil Co. of Calif., Gulf Oil Corp., Monsanto Co. and the Ford Foundation. Allen-Bradley Co., Milwaukee, Wis., is another donor. "One of our basic policies is to support anti-Communist and conservative organizations," the company says. "The institution falls right in with this policy."

Glenn Campbell, 42-year-old director of Hoover, took a leave of absence to work on Barry Goldwater's Presidential campaign. Stephan Possony, a research fellow, was a major Goldwater foreign affairs adviser. James Hobson, information director, also worked in the Goldwater campaign. Some of Hoover's critics claim that Mr. Campbell uses institution funds to support conservative speech writers between campaigns. Research fellow Roger Freeman, for example, is chairman of a Republican committee refining a key GOP proposal for the 1968 campaign—tax-sharing between the Federal Government and the states.

OBJECTIVITY DEFENDED

Notwithstanding the close identification of some staffers with aggressive anticommunism, the institution's leaders vigorously defend its objectivity. A spokesman says several staff members have a tolerant view of communism. He says the institution remains free from political domination, though not aloof from the Government. Associate director Witold S. Sworakowski says: "Any U.S. Government agency has first priority on our materials. We owe them that much for our tax-exempt status without which we just couldn't exist."

Edward J. Rozek, a visiting fellow from the University of Colorado, thinks the institution faculty is Republican-oriented—and he thinks it is a good thing. "This may be the nation's only academic body viewed as Republican, and we need more like it to establish an equilibrium," he says. Mr. Rozek, who is writing a book with Presidential foreign affairs adviser Walter Rostow, adds: "The institution didn't ask me for my political views before they brought me here."

Controversial or not, Hoover often is called on for research in sensitive areas. The United Nations recently asked it to search for some record of an eight-part proposal for peace in French Indochina supposedly made public in 1918 by Nguyen Al Quoc, now known as Ho Chi Minh. In this case the institution was unsuccessful.

In 1951, the State Department asked Hoover to search for documentary evidence that the Soviet Union had drafted deported Polish families into Russian forced labor camps in World War II. The question was at issue in the United Nations at the time. Hoover came up with "transfer certificates" for Poles at 360 forced labor camps. Confronted with the certificates, Soviet UN ambassador Andrei Gromyko threw them on the floor and stomped on them.

Like some of the institution's other sensitive documents, the certificates were probably obtained by theft at some point. The institution says one of its curators had persuaded the anti-Communist Polish underground to part with them several years earlier. It's assumed the underground stole them from Communist authorities.

In a 1963 project for the Army, Hoover detailed China's steel industry and energy resources to the point of producing growth figures and plant locations. Yuan-li Wu, a research fellow, used Chinese government bulletins and other documents—some of them smuggled from China—to piece together the report.

STUDYING DISARMAMENT

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, an independent agency established under President Kennedy, paid the institution $200,000 to study the long-term reduction of weapons and resolution of conflict in the Far East. Turning to documents, pamphlets and newspapers it receives from Asia, Hoover scholars in April came up with a number of recommendations. These include establishment of a regional police to enforce border armistices, the promotion of regional economic and scientific programs to start a "habit of cooperation" and negotiations aimed at limited arms control as a prelude to eventual disarmament in the Far East.

"Much of the institution's information used in a study like this just isn't available elsewhere outside of Government sources," says Dennis Doolin, research curator of the East Asian collection, consisting mainly of material on China, Japan and Korea. Mr. Doolin, a paid consultant for the CIA, goes to work full-time for the agency next month.

Mr. Doolin's East Asian collection is one of Hoover's more extensive ones. Hoover houses 120,000 volumes written in Asian languages. Last year it regularly received 262 Chinese and 235 Japanese periodicals. It also has 30,000 volumes on East Asia in Western languages.

It takes 18 full-time and 6 part-time librarians, or about 15% of the institution's staff, to collect and maintain East Asian materials. John T. Ma, chief librarian of the East Asian collection, corresponds with 60 dealers in Hong Kong, 15 in Formosa and 30 in Japan. Typically, his letters order books or documents the dealers have told him they have; one recent buy of this sort was a tourist map of Red China that cost $50. Or Mr. Ma may ask dealers to "find" a certain document for him in the hope they will be able to smuggle it out of China through agents.

On one of the three crowded library floors given over to East Asia, Mr. Ma points to a corner filled with pocket-sized blue, red and green pamphlets, some with misleading covers. They are early pamphlets of the Chinese Communist Party, including its first document, and were published in small size and with deceptive titles so they could be carried unobtrusively.

The pamphlets, considered by scholars as key sources on modern Chinese history, were gathered mainly by Mrs. Mary Wright, now a history professor at Yale. Mr. Hoover personally sent her to China with $100,000 for two years right after World War II to collect as many important documents as she could find. One discovery came while she browsed in a Peking market. She noticed that a shopkeeper was wrapping pottery in rare newspapers published by the Route Army, the army that Mao Tse-tung took on the 6,000-mile Long March of 1934–35 to escape from superior Nationalist forces.

Hoover has a network of friendly agents around the world who supply documents. The papers of arrested South Africa government opponents come from a newspaper reporter who gathers them and mails them out of the country under pretenses Hoover chooses not to disclose. The reporter gets no fee or salary, but he is reimbursed for his expenses.

Hoover paid nearly $100,000 for its most costly collection, that of Boris Nicolaevsky, a pre-1917 Russian scholar and collector of political documents. Some valuable material has come in unsolicited, though. In 1936, a young man walked into the library, turned over a package marked "Do Not Open Until Jan. 1, 1950" and left without giving his name. Opened in 1950, the package held evidence that, contrary to legend, Anastasia, daughter of deposed Czar Nicholas II, was executed by Communists with the rest of the royal family.

Considering its anti-Communist reputation, the institution has maintained surprisingly amicable relations with Communist governments. For years Moscow's export agency shipped Russian publications directly to a number of U.S. libraries. Then the agency's U.S. representative complained that he was losing out on commissions. The Russians stopped direct shipments except to the Library of Congress—and Hoover.

Karol Majchel, Hoover's curator for Eastern Europe, believes that the Russians "are well aware of the completeness of our collection on them and undoubtedly like the idea of it being in one place." He thinks that if it were possible, leading Russians someday might wish to send their own collections to Hoover rather than risk having them suppressed by their own government.

An exchange agreement between Hoover and Communist China, however, apparently has been damaged by political disorders this year. Last year Peking sent 125 periodicals regularly to Hoover. But fewer have come this year, and those that have continued have arrived irregularly. In return for the Chinese publications, Hoover sends books and periodicals published by itself or by Stanford—for example, a book called Territorial Claims in the Sino-Soviet Conflict, by Dennis Doolin, which could provide the Chinese the benefit of some outside thinking on their Russian border disputes.

Many Red Chinese documents come through Nationalist sources on Taiwan. Mr. Ma, well-known to many mainland and Nationalist leaders, worked in the ministry of information in Peking from 1944 to 1947.

COLLECTOR HOOVER

Mr. Hoover himself started the institution's collecting tradition. He used his influence with the Government after World War I to commission civil and military officials stationed in Europe to track down as many important historical documents as they could. Documents dealing with the Russian Revolution alone filled several rail cars.

A former Czarist ambassador to France later got in touch with Mr. Hoover when he decided to dispose of 16 large trunks of papers, including the secret-police files. Mr. Hoover arranged for the late Christian Herter, then a Commerce Department official, to take them into the United States as personal luggage. The Soviet Union currently is pressing for copies of the files, but Hoover wants in return some documents the Russians aren't yet willing to provide.

Hoover, in theory, is accountable to the Stanford board of trustees, who provide just under 20% of the annual budget of some $1.5 million. In practice, the institution is autonomous. Mr. Campbell, a Harvard-educated Canadian, runs the institution with a strong hand. He selects research fellows, hires librarians and makes spending decisions.

JACK KELLY

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that for all of us, the formative years of our lives were most profoundly influenced by our teachers. I know that this was true in my own life, and certainly one of the outstanding influences in my high school days was Mr. Jack Kelly, my basketball coach at Scranton Preparatory School.

It would be delightful to recount how Jack was given a school full of Latin and Greek scholars, and somehow came up with championship basketball teams. There is great amusement in the story of the only football game he ever coached at Scranton Prep. But what is memorable about Jack Kelly is not his work as a coach; rather it is his stature as a man.

Through all of my years at Scranton Prep, Jack Kelly seemed to me to be the very essence of manliness. For all of us who came under his tutelage, there was something we took from him that will be with us for all of our lives.

Last week the friends of Jack Kelly gathered to pay tribute to this splendid man. Tragically, an illness has deprived him of his sight. I could not put into words our feelings as we learned this. I can only say that for as long as any of us shall live, we will see life better and clearer because of a vision we took from him.

Mr. Speaker, I will append an article on this testimonial dinner, taken from the pages of the Scranton Tribune.

550 HONOR KELLY AT TESTIMONIAL

More than 550 friends of Jack Kelly honored the former Scranton Prep coach at a testimonial dinner Monday night at the Jermyn Motor Inn.

First full-time teacher-coach at Prep where he developed many championship teams, Kelly recently lost his sight and was forced to give up his position with the Pennsylvania Highway Department. He is the father of four teen-aged youngsters.

Kelly, who received several gifts, was deeply grateful to everyone for the fine tribute. He was surrounded by his family, his brother, Lodi, and his aunt and uncle.

The speakers included two of Kelly's most famous graduates, Congressman Joe McDade and Atty. Bob Casey.

John Gallagher, who succeeded Kelly as Prep coach, served as the toastmaster.

The speakers included J. Donald Kelly, general chairman; Warren C. Smith, executive director of the Scranton Boys Club, Mayor James J. Walsh, Msgr. Andrew J. McGowan, director of the Catholic Youth Center; Congressman McDade, Msgr. Michael J. Kennedy, Atty. Casey, the Rev. John F. Lennymm, S.J., former headmaster at Scranton Prep; Thomas J. Harrington, district supervisor of the State Highway Department; Jim Crowley, ex-Notre Dame great who now serves as the industrial commissioner for Lackawanna County; Daniel Donovan, Cathedral coach, the Rev. Michael J. Quinn, pastor of Christ the King Church; and the Rev. John J. Duggan, S.J., moderator of the Scranton Prep Alumni Society.

Msgr. Kennedy spoke for everyone when he said "We are not here in sympathy, we are here to honor a fine Christian gentleman." He compared Kelly with Brother Mathias, who sent the immortal Babe Ruth on his way to baseball fame.

Msgr. McGowan said "we are here to say thanks for what he has done for a lot of people."

Congressman McDade said "Jack Kelly revolutionized basketball in Northeastern Pennsylvania" and went on to relate how the Prep team had played in a Vandling swimming pool. He cited his former Prep teammate, the Rev. Joseph Hawley, as the greatest guard that ever lived.

In closing the congressman said, "We are here to honor you tonight and tomorrow and all the tomorrows after."

Many letters and telegrams of congratulations came in from all sections of the world.

One from a Jesuit mission in India came from the Rev. Dick McHugh, S.J., one of Kelly's first pupils to reach stardom. The telegram read, "You are the greatest of them all. I wish I could be with you."

OSTRICH IN FOGGY BOTTOM

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this morning, in their column "Inside Report" which appears in the Washington Post, Rowland Evans and Robert Novak highlight the apathy over the past several months of the administration to the obviously deepening crisis in the Middle East. While our Department of State apparently paid little heed to the clear warnings of impending disaster coming from the field, a number of Republican leaders have called for greater U.S. attention to the persistent conflicts in that troubled area. Senate Majority Leader Everett Dirksen suggested a reaffirmation of the tripartite agreement of 1950 in his Republican state of the Union address. In January, Senator Jacob Javits of New York urged a big-power conference to discuss these issues before violence took place.

The failure of the administration to act points up the dangers of preoccupation with one crisis, at a time when others with perhaps more far-reaching implications lie just over the horizon. More than a year ago, speaking before the Massachusetts Junior Chamber of Commerce I asked:

> Can we afford the luxury of preoccupation? If we have learned anything from our twenty years as a global power, we should have learned that our role demands flexibility of response. . . . Can it be said that our policymakers have become so absorbed in the crisis of the moment that they have lost perspective on the forces and the problems that will confront us for years to come?

The Middle East is certainly in that category.

The Evans-Novak column this morning suggests that this question still has relevance, both for the Middle East and for other impending world problems. I include the column in the Congressional Record, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

Ostrich in Foggy Bottom

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

It is now clear that the Johnson Administration allowed precious months to pass last fall and winter without reacting to repeated alarms of impending disaster in the Middle East.

Moreover, the presumably crucial spot of Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Mideast Affairs was allowed to remain vacant from Oct. 19, when Raymond A. Hare resigned, to April 5, when he was replaced by the highly regarded Lucius D. Battle.

It was precisely within this time span that secret warnings of utmost gravity were relayed to Secretary of State Dean Rusk from well-informed non-diplomats with close contacts to the Israeli government.

These warnings specifically documented the growing intimacy between Egypt and the Soviet Union and their "frequent consultations" in Cairo. They also documented a subtle change in the tone of Egyptian President Nasser after the United Nations Security Council resolution of last Nov. 25, which Nasser regarded as a public slap at Israel. Nasser's truculence increased from that time on.

But the State Department, preoccupied with Vietnam, seemed frozen in the posture of an ostrich. If only the status quo could be preserved, Foggy Bottom hoped, all the hobgoblins would melt away and peace would be assured.

Thus, in a Feb. 11 letter to Sen. Jacob K. Javits, the New York Republican whose close relationship to the American Jewish community provides special insights into Middle Eastern affairs, Rusk said:

"I am not aware of any change in the positions of either the British or French governments which would cast doubt on their adherence to these principles" (the principles embodied in the tri-partite declaration of May, 1950, by the U.S., France and England guaranteeing the integrity of the Middle Eastern states).

Rusk was apparently unaware that the French were ready to scuttle the 1950 declaration, as they have now done, thus shredding the fabric of Western unity in the Middle East. Or, if Rusk suspected what Javits did—that the tri-partite declaration by then was virtually meaningless—he was not prepared to admit it for the simple reason that he had no solution.

Actually, the State Department's inability to face the true dimensions of the Middle East crisis goes back far beyond last fall. During President Kennedy's Administration, the White House formally asked the Department to develop contingency plans, bringing up to date the U.S. response to a variety of possible crises in the Middle East. The plans never were developed.

In the Johnson Administration, moreover, the White House has lacked the services of a top-level trouble-shooter on Middle Eastern affairs, a kind of unofficial ambassador between the President and the American Jewish community.

When New Frontiersman Myer Feldman left the White House in March, 1965, that behind-the-scenes job simply vanished. Instead, Walt Rostow, White House national security adviser charged with being Mr. Johnson's eyes and ears in the Vietnam war, inherited Feldman's role. Rostow has been too busy with Vietnam to act as the President's confidential agent on the Middle East.

At the heart of the Administration's failure to anticipate the current crisis lies a basic miscalculation. Generally speaking, this miscalculation placed both Nasser's Egypt and Syria in the third world—the uncommitted developing nations, tied neither to Moscow nor to Washington. In fact, the tremendous arms buildup in Egypt and Syria, courtesy of Moscow, was a stark warning that they were in fact going into the Soviet orbit.

It was precisely these concerns that Javits had in mind when he first wrote Rusk complaining about the State Department's inaction.

This correspondence makes unhappy reading in the light of recent events, Javits' first letter, written Nov. 26, was brushed off by Rusk. Javits pressed his point with a second letter, dated Jan. 6, pleading for the U.S. to call a big-power conference "before we face a conflagration" in the Middle East.

It was in reply to that letter that Rusk saw no change in the tri-partite declaration of 1950. Now, however, it may be too late to avert the "conflagration" warned against by Javits—and other experts on the Middle East—during the long months when Washington's head was in the sand.

AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY INSURANCE POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill] for 1 hour.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of bringing the membership up to date on the very important subject of automobile liability insurance policies, their cost to the public, and what I conceive to be a very grave social problem facing the country as the result of the activities and actions—indiscriminate, in my judgment—by a great many of the companies, that is either pricing the liability insurance out of reach of the average man, or making it impossible because of discriminatory practices for the average man to get policies of liability insurance.

On previous occasions the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Green], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Snyder], and I have pointed out some of the abuses that have been going on in this field in this country.

For example, we have brought out the facts that certain age groups just cannot get liability insurance unless they pay what are, we believe, unusually high rates. Any young man under 21 years of age and any male or female over 65 years of age finds it almost impossible to get liability insurance. Those who live in certain States and those who live in certain sections of certain States, and those who follow certain occupations also find it difficult. I have even been informed by my friend from Kentucky that the name by which one is referred to as a nickname may have some part in the determination of whether he can qualify.

All in all, we have tried to point out these abuses. Today we would like to discuss, I hope, some of the remedies, with the thought in mind that we will be able to point out a course of action that this Congress can follow to an intelligent and reasonable and objective and fair solution to this problem.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again, with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, to join with him in calling for a congressional investigation into this entire area of automobile insurance in our country. We rose together, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill], and I, several weeks ago to bring this matter to the attention of the House. We consider this to be a very important matter.

Since that time I have received complaints from all over the country from automobile owners who do not feel they are getting a fair shake in automobile insurance. They have watched their rates climb. They have seen insurance departments in their States raise the rates from 30 to 40 percent at a time, so that car owners in many States now pay double what they paid about 11 years ago for protection.

They complain, too, about the nature of the policy. The big print makes them believe they are covered against all possible accidental situations, and then it is the small print which exempts the company from liability.

Even more than this, they are all too familiar with the claims that insurance companies practice discrimination, as has been indicated by the gentleman in the well, against whole classes of citizens.

Insurance documents and guidebooks that they put out for their salesmen reveal that the following groups are considered high risk drivers who should be avoided by their salesmen and agents: the young, that is, those under 25; the elderly; residents of our big cities; the Negroes; people whose occupations make them undesirable in the eyes of the insurance world; people with nicknames like "Shorty" and "Butch"; people whose neighbors question their morals; and a whole host of other arbitrary categories, which have nothing to do with the way these people may perform behind the wheel of an automobile.

The courts, the insurance companies claim, present them with their greatest test, with their greatest crisis. They claim that it is the courts and not the roads that present them with the problem of rising rates.

For their part, the insurance companies complain that they pay out more than $4 billion in claims, which puts them in the red, even though they write a total of more than $8 billion in premiums annually.

The increase of accidents and claims, they say, is forcing them continually to seek rate rises.

The companies further blame the pyramiding of costs on a number of interrelated factors. They claim that the pileup of claims is padded by both their insurance agents and by garages in an attempt to seek an increase in the payments in accident cases.

They claim the high fees demanded by lawyers in negligence suits have the same tendency.

The lawyers claim that because of the backlog in the courts they are forced to spend such an inordinate amount of time on these cases that consequently their fees are necessarily high.

I believe we have an instance here where the insurance companies want to point to the bad drivers, point to the lawyers, and point to the courts, and the lawyers want to point to other lawyers. It is a situation where everybody is pointing the finger of blame at everyone else, and in the meantime the ordinary insurance policyholder, the fellow who must buy insurance today if he can be secure at all when he ventures out to drive his car, is getting stuck, in the end.

As a result of all these conditions—the higher rate of accidents, the increasing number of automobiles, the large court calendar of claims—the rates the insurance companies have charged have caused the companies to come consistently again and again to badger the States for increases in their rates.

The public pays the bill for the protection that this gives in the case of an accident.

The public gets only $1 for every $2.50 that is paid in in automobile insurance premiums.

As this whole problem has developed and festered, I believe we are beginning to hear the public complain. The public is complaining that the States are in control and that the State insurance departments are all too frequently acting as though they were the proprietary guardians of the insurance interest.

The public has had little opportunity to present its grievances to an open hearing. I understand, for example, in Maryland the last two commissioners opened their doors to the public and that the complaints have poured in. While one of these gentlemen admits that half of the complaints are unjustified, at least there is an opportunity to air these problems.

In other cases, he says, he has prevented arbitrary cancellations and has headed off considerable hardship to drivers.

I believe we will find, if we open up this whole area to investigation, that we will have many unjustified complaints, but all we are attempting to do is to create an atmosphere where the whole system can be questioned and where it can be given a good, hard look.

One of the troubles is that in most States there is no complaint department, and very little regulation. The Federal Government is prevented from entering this field because it has specifically, in the McCarran-Ferguson Act of 1945, exempted itself from doing so. The result is that these powerful companies enjoy immense privileges with little fear of regulation.

Our purpose is not to punish the companies. Our purpose is not to embarrass them or injure them.

Many of the proposals for reducing the cost of insurance for everyone in this country and making it available to all are proposals that are in fact favored by the insurance companies.

They are in such a competitive situation with each other that many of them are afraid to begin to initiate what would be moves toward reform. With the States in control, insurance companies and lobbies are in a position now to pick off reform wherever it starts. I think eventually what we are going to have to do—and that is why the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, the gentleman from Kentucky, and I rise occasionally to discuss this subject—is we are going to have a Federal investigation where complainants from all over the country can come in and have their cause heard. I have had requests from many other Members to join us today. Some of them just could not make it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of this special order the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Brinkley], who submitted a statement to me, and all other Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding to me.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman in the well [Mr. Cahill], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Green], should be commended for taking this special order today. I rise in support of the position they have been taking here today. Back on March 8 of this year I introduced House Resolution 375, which would authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce acting as a full committee or as a subcommittee to investigate the underwriting practices of the Nation's automobile liability insurance carriers. Since the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Pennsylvania have, during the ensuing days, done such a good job in bringing to light many of the inequities taking place across the country, my only reservation in regard to my own resolution is whether or not it goes far enough and whether or not such an investigation should be limited to the extent I would have had it limited in my resolution as I introduced it.

It think it is very noteworthy to draw your attention today to an article that appeared in the Washington Post on last Friday headlined "Auto Liability Firm Cancels Policies of 3,500 in Virginia." This article points out the fact that a company known as the American Fidelity Fire Insurance Co., of Westbury, N.Y., is notifying 3,500 of its policyholders, which they class as substandard, that their liability insurance coverage will be canceled. While they cannot go back and cancel those beyond March 15, under some of the Virginia rules and regulations, it is understood that many more policies will not be renewed when they come up for renewal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this article appear in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. I think it is significant for us to consider in connection with this company and in connection with any company—the question of what are substandard risks and how do they get to be classed as such.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned the fact that many people who live in wrong neighborhoods or happen to be the wrong color or have the wrong occupation are rated as substandard risks without any examination of their own particular driving record. I have had some insurance people come around to talk to me about this. They say, "We have to black out whole areas." All of Appalachia, in my own State of Kentucky, for instance. "Or we have to black out all recent divorcees or this, that, or the other. We do not have the time or the staff to underwrite these people individually," they say. Well, the truth of the matter is, if you happen to live in the right neighborhood and have the right occupation and be the right color but you have a bad driving record, they have the staff and the time to underwrite you as an individual.

That is what I think is perhaps the crux of the situation insofar as underwriting is concerned. People who have good driving records and want automobile liability insurance should be judged for what they as individuals are and for what liability they might reflect on the company insuring them rather than all of the particular categories or classes that the companies establish.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting and noteworthy to point out the fact that the gentleman in the well [Mr. Cahill] inserted an article in the Congressional Record back on April 13, an article which made reference to a recent divorcee domiciled in my own home State, the State of Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, she was married to a drunk and she had liability insurance at standard rates. I suppose being a rather sober character herself, and being of the right color and coming from the right neighborhood and working at the right job, she was able to get standard rates. However, she divorced the drunk. And, when she did that, they raised the rates because she became a "recent divorcee." The premise was that she "might" be going out with a boy friend who "might" be driving the car and they did not know the driving propensity of the boy friend. I would suggest that they had better reason to know the driving propensity of the drunk to whom she was earlier married.

Mr. Speaker, this matter goes further than this when they write off entire categories either by residence or age or for being in the military—and this is a category that has not been mentioned heretofore today—which I think and I believe is a category which needs to be mentioned. A boy who goes into service to defend his country and defend the right of the insurance companies to remain in business in a free America—and because of the fact that he is in the military service, he has to pay a higher premium on his insurance than do others. I think that is deplorable. I do not think that he should be penalized because of his military service, if his driving record is good.

But, Mr. Speaker, it even goes beyond this. The truth of the matter is that many of these policies which are canceled or not renewed because of the fact that the policyholders fit into one of these "forbidden" categories are people who fall into an economic category in which they cannot afford to pay 150 percent or 200 percent of the standard rate for their insurance coverage. As a consequence, this practice is increasing the number of uninsured drivers upon our highways.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed a statement just recently by Commissioner Woodall of my own State of Kentucky wherein he pointed out the fact that Kentucky ranks third in the number of uninsured drivers, with only the States of Georgia and New Mexico ranking above it.

I think, certainly, Mr. Speaker, the problems that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] and myself are attempting to alleviate and the legislation that we are supporting is most reasonable in that we only ask the Congress to conduct an investigation into these practices to ascertain just what the problem is.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this effort is meritorious and deserves the support of the entire membership of this House.

Mr. Speaker, just as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] has received a number of letters on this subject, I have received a number of letters since I spoke on the issue previously and introduced legislation designed to in some way help correct this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not undertake to introduce all of this correspondence into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—all of the letters that I have received on this subject, because it would be too voluminous and most of the correspondence would be repetitious—however, I have received two letters, one of which comes to me from Knoxville, Tenn., from a Mrs. E. H. Fabian, in which she tells of her experience with the liability insurance carriers.

Mr. Speaker, she had insured their car with the same automobile insurer—the State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.—so she says, for at least 14 years. Likewise, her son has had coverage with this company for 14 years. Both Mrs. Fabian and her son have had their policies canceled without a reason. The only claim which was filed under her policy was as the result of a hailstorm in which there was some damage to the automobile in 1963, an occurrence which had nothing to do with the driving on the part of anyone. They paid that claim.

This lady who never had an accident, never had any claims, except the hailstorm loss, has her insurance and her son's canceled without a reason. She cannot find out why. I believe anyone who has been paying the price as these people have, and who for many, many years have not had any losses other than the one from the hailstones—for which certainly, if anyone were to be penalized, it would be the Almighty, and I do not think they want to try that—certainly are entitled to know why it is that their insurance is being canceled.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that that letter from the lady, and the letter from her insurance company, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, another letter which I believe is symbolic of the situation is one I received from a fellow at Ludlow, Ky., which happens to be within my own congressional district. He had been insured with the Commonwealth Fire & Casualty Insurance Co., for several years. The only claim he ever had was 2 years ago when someone threw a rock through his window when his car was parked, which they promptly paid, and which had nothing to do with his driving record. He has now received a letter from his agent in Covington, Ky., that his insurance is being canceled. He called his agent and asked him why it was being canceled but did not find out why. He has had no claims other than the glass breakage which had nothing to do with his driving propensity. He has been carrying insurance with this company for several years, paying $178 per year. His agent did call him up the other night and said he could get him another insurance policy, but it would cost $418. Here again something is wrong and apparently this youngster is being "rated" for some reasons that has nothing to do with his driving record.

Mr. Speaker, in that connection I would ask unanimous consent that this letter and the letter of the insurance company be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we should mention in the debate is the fellow who finally does have a claim that is for something he is not really responsible for, or does not reflect on his driving record at all, yet all of us—and I certainly have—have run into the situation where people have had legitimate claims, be they accidents or not, who have been afraid to put the claims in, although they have paid for insurance for years and years, for fear their policy will either be canceled or their rate would rise.

Mr. SNYDER. I would say some people are doing that at their own volition. On the other hand, as a lawyer I have had many people tell me just that and not only have they done this on their own volition, but some have indicated that the insurance agent himself has suggested to them, well, now, that is a small claim costing $25, $30, $50, or $100, you know if you put that claim in now that is going to be on your record, and that is going to be held against you in the future. What the gentleman has pointed up certainly is another area which is in dire need of investigation.

I am concerned about why the underwriting practices have been as they are, and I do not know the reasons for it. That is why we are asking for the investigation. I am sure that neither of the other two gentlemen know the reasons. They may have their own ideas, as I have mine.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. In the interest of costs, since the three of us rose the last time on the floor and discussed this, I was invited by a large number of insurance executives of mutual companies in the State of Pennsylvania to address a luncheon. Prior to the luncheon I was talking to several of the executives. I said to them, "What is the problem on automobile insurance as you see it?" Some of them said the only reason they have automobile insurance is to satisfy their other customers, to provide a service for them, because automobile insurance is hard to get, and they said in fact, some of them said, they were losing money on it anyway.

So I suggested to them that perhaps what the Government should do was to create some sort of social insurance system so that all people in the country could be covered with insurance.

Mr. SNYDER. I am sure that suggestion met with resistance, as well it should.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. And immediately they rejected the idea. It is hard for me to believe they are losing money, and yet they do not want to give the business up, either.

Mr. CAHILL. I might just state to the gentleman that I intend to discuss with them in a few minutes the very questions which have been raised here, but I believe there are a couple of different things we could do here, today. We can suggest something about the manner in which these rates are determined, and what if anything can be done to make a constructive contribution to the reduction of those rates.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I have one or two other comments to make that I had in mind and which I would like to develop and I will try to hurry as I, too, must leave for a meeting on the Senate side of the Capitol.

As I was saying before this colloquy developed, I do not know the reason and none of us do as to why they will not underwrite these people individually and why so many people are classed substandard when they have good driving records.

But I was very interested in a letter that I received from a fellow by the name of Paul N. Frazier, from Knoxville, Tenn., who happens to be in the insurance business. I would submit to you what he says—and not representing at all that I agree that it is or is not true—I do not know—but this is just one theory.

Mr. Frazier says in part:

> The reasons that people are rejected for insurance is due to the inspection companies writing false reports on people. The head of the Inspection Companies tell their agents that 25% of the risks should be rejected. They employ 18 year boys to make these reports, and do not pay them a decent salary. Several years ago, the inspection company sent an 18 year boy out to Fountain City to make an inspection on an automobile for me, and Junior kissed my clients 38 year wife and 18 year old daughter. Junior was fired. I lost the business as my client thought Junior was an agent of my company.
>
> We will take a 35 year old school teacher, if she is the finest example of Southern Womanhood, and the best driver in the state, and the biggest Church Worker in the State if the 18 year old boy with the inspection company should file a false moral report on her. She would be rejected by a standard company, and then she do in hard lines which would charge her three times the Standard Rate.

What he is attempting to say there, of course, is that she will be rated as a substandard risk because of a false report.

Whether or not the inspection companies are responsible for the problem, I do not know. Whether they are instructed that in order to justify their own pay with the insurance companies on their own business that they have to write out a given quantity of them as being unacceptable, I do not know. But here is a thought by an insurance man that needs to be looked into.

I would say, I think the ramifications that we have developed in the few times that we have talked about this here certainly should point out that beyond any doubt at all that an investigation by the Congress certainly is in order.

Whether or not legislation would be in order is something that we do not know. I would say, as I said before on this subject, I would hope not. I would hope any investigation pointing out the facts would prompt the companies to clean their own house.

I yield to no one insofar as standing up for the freedom of the companies to operate so long as they do so legitimately and fairly with the American public and without government control and regulation. But when they get beyond what apparently is fair and proper and good ethics, then it may become necessary for the Government to step in. I would hope that this would not be the case in the instant situation. It may be, but certainly an investigation would bring to light the problems and inequities and perhaps the companies would see fit to correct and clean up their own house.

Mr. Speaker, the matter previously referred to follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 2, 1967]

AUTO LIABILITY FIRM CANCELS POLICIES OF 3,500 IN VIRGINIA

(By Richard Corrigan)

About 3500 Virginians who bought automobile liability insurance policies this spring have been notified that their policies are being canceled.

The mass cancellation was ordered by the American Fidelity Fire Insurance Co. of Westbury, N.Y., which says the risks are too high and the rates are too low in Virginia for the company to maintain this type of policy.

To the policyholders, the action means they must arrange new policies within 30 days after receiving notice of cancellation by the company. If they are not insured after that time they must pay a State uninsured motorist fee of $50, and will be personally liable for any claims brought against them.

ASKS REFUNDS IMMEDIATELY

The State Corporation Commission has told the company and its Virginia agent, Parham General Agency of Norfolk, to refund the unused premiums to the motorists involved "immediately."

Mark M. Hart, chairman of the company's parent holding company, American Plan Corp., said the aggregate refunds will total about $700,000, an average of $200 per policyholder. Hart pledged that all refunds will be paid and all other obligations will be met.

All of the canceled policies are in the "substandard" category, which covers motorists who are considered poor risks and who must pay at least 35 per cent more for their liability policies than most drivers are charged. Hart said the rates still are too low.

American Fidelity has been losing $1.57 for every $1 it collects since it started issuing this type of policy in Virginia in January, 1966, he said.

The cancellations affect policies dated March 15 or later this year.

BEFORE MARCH NOT AFFECTED

Hart said policies written before March 15 cannot be canceled under State regulations. But his comments indicated those policies will not be renewable.

"We intend to stay in Virginia, but we're not going to stay in this field (substandard liability policies)," Hart said. The company has issued between 15,000 and 20,000 liability and physical damage automobile insurance policies in the State, he said.

In addition to saying that high-risk rates are too low, Hart said the company had to cancel the 3500 policies because a Pennsylvania insurance firm that was backing Americal Fidelity's losses has gone into receivership and now owes American Fidelity nearly $1 million.

Hart said the American Plan Corp. bought American Fidelity Fire Insurance Co. on Nov. 1, 1963, from American Fidelity and Casualty Co. of Richmond. American Fidelity Fire and American Fidelity and Casualty were headed by T. Coleman Andrews, former U.S. Internal Revenue Commissioner and now a Virginia Conservative Party leader. American Fidelity and Casualty was dissolved in 1965.

KNOXVILLE, TENN.,
March 18, 1967.

Representative GENE SNYDER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a clipping that appeared in our daily paper, The Knoxville News-Sentinel, March 9, 1967.

I am delighted to know that the auto insurance racket has come to someone's attention, and I truly hope something can be done about it. I'm also sending you a photostatic copy of a letter I received from the company that I had a car insurance policy with. My husband had a policy with them for years and as far as I know they never had to pay one penny on his car. When our son became sixteen years old, he is now thirty, my husband got a policy from the same company for him. True, they did pay several hundred dollars for damage done to our son's car due to a severe *hail storm in 1963*. That was paid without question. Why not?

Two weeks before I received cancellation, my son had a letter from them cancelling his policy without stating a reason. As a matter of fact, the letters were alike, almost word for word, and you see they gave me no reason. I asked our agent for a reason and he refused to give me one. I had had no accidents and no damage had been done to my car.

I have heard numerous complaints from friends about the same company as well as other companies.

I think this unfair practice is being carried out, not only on car insurance policies, but by home owner's policies as well. I have just cancelled a home owner's policy because they flatly refused to pay any part on smoke damage done in our home, which they should have taken care of.

Respectfully yours,
MRS. E. A. FABIAN.

STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE
INSURANCE CO.,
October 21, 1964.

Expiration of Policy Number 1345 559-FO8-42, 62 Cvair 4 Dr.

ADELAIDE FABIAN,
Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR MR. FABIAN: We regret to tell you that we do not wish to continue your policy beyond 12:01 A.M. Standard Time December 8, 1964, the expiration of the present policy period. On that date our obligation to protect you under this policy will terminate.

You are given this advance notice so that you may have reasonable time to make other arrangements for your insurance protection.

Very truly yours,
TROY PHILLIPS,
Underwriting Superintendent.

MAY 3, 1967.

Congressman EUGENE SNYDER,
Longworth Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a letter I received on April 28, 1967 from the Commonwealth Fire & Casualty Insurance Company of Louisville, Kentucky notifying me of cancellation of my automobile insurance.

I have been insured by this company for approximately two years with the *only claim being replacement of a side window when an unknown party threw a rock through it about two years ago.*

As you can see, there is no reason given in the enclosed letter for cancellation of my insurance. While it is true that I am but 22 years of age, this of and in itself is, to me, insufficient reason for cancellation especially in view of the fact that I have been acceptable to this insurer for the past two years.

When I received this letter, I called my agent, Mr. Gaskins, of Covington, Kentucky, who did not, according to his statements to me over the telephone, know why my insurance was cancelled. A few hours later my agent called me to say that he could obtain coverage for me at an annual premium of $418 as opposed to the the $178.00, that I have been paying annually. Obviously an increase of approximately 125% in premium annually is more than can, as far as I can see, be justified under the circumstances.

Therefore, the purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention, sir, the apparently unwarranted and apparently illegal activities of the above named insurer domiciled in the Commonwealth of Kentucky and therefore, directly under your jurisdiction. It would appear to me that it would be your duty to not only me as an individual citizen of this State, but to the public at large that a thorough investigation into the above insurer's practices with an eye to prosecution under the insurance laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, would be in order.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL PEGG.

COMMONWEALTH FIRE & CASUALTY INSURANCE CO.,
Louisville, Ky., April 27, 1967.

Type of Insurance: Automobile.
Policy Number: A042817.
Cancellation date and time: May 8, 1967, 12:01 A.M. standard time.

MICHAEL PEGG,
Ludlow, Ky.

DEAR MR. PEGG: This is to inform you that the policy indicated above is being cancelled as of the date and time indicated.

We are sorry that this action is necessary and thank you for your interest in our company.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM R. SWANSON,
Underwriting Manager, Underwriting Department.

P.S.—Enclosed is our unearned premium refund check for $14.41.

PAUL N. FRAZIER & CO., INC.,
Knoxville, Tenn., April 1, 1967.

Hon. GENE SNYDER,
Kentucky U.S. Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: I was reading the News-Sentinel on March 10th, and I noticed a dispatch from Washington, dated March 9th, where you introduced a resolution in Congress calling for a congressional investigation of the underwriting policies of the Nation's liability Firms.

This is the best thing that ever happen since the invention of the wheel. We insurance agents ask that you please investigate this matter from every angle. I have been in the insurance business for 32 years, and it is a mell of a hess. The worst that I have ever seen it.

The reasons that people are rejected for insurance is due to the inspection companies writing false reports on people. The head of The Inspection Companies tell their agents that 25% of the risks should be rejected. They employ 18 year boys to make these reports, and do not pay them a decent salary. Several years ago, the inspection company send an 18 year boy out to Fountain City to make an inspection on an automobile for me, and Junior kissed my clients 38 year wife and 18 year old daughter. Junior was fired. I lost the business as my client thought Junior was an agent of my company.

We will take a 35 year old school teacher, if she is the finest example of Southern Womanhood, and the best driver in the state, and the biggest Church Worker in the State if the 18 year old boy with the inspection company should file a false moral report on her. She would be rejected by a standard company, and then she do in hard lines which would charge her three times the Standard Rate. This is the most unfair thing in the world. She should have the right to face her Accuser, but there is no way by law to make the insurance company tell her what the inspection company said.

Please let me hear you in regard to this matter. Please do not show this letter to Anyone. I have more information that will give you at a later date, which will be helpful.

Yours very truly

PAUL N. FRAZIER.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. In reference to the remarks of the gentleman about free enterprise, I would like to make a comment and I would like to point out to the gentleman in the well that I was an insurance agent before coming to the Congress. I was chairman of the insurance committee of the State Senate of the State of Mississippi for 8 years. I feel that I know a little something about the insurance business.

Certainly the remarks that have been made by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey and the gentlemen from Pennsylvania and Kentucky are well stated. But I would like to say this. Certainly, there are two sides to this situation. As an insurance agent I have always tried to represent the people to whom I sold insurance. I had my problems with the insurance companies. I would lose some business and the underwriting was especially hard.

I am glad that the gentleman mentioned the military. I do think the situation there is unfair. The insurance companies have had their problems also in this country. Like everything else that has gone up in this country—the cost of living has gone up—surely the cost of insurance has doubled and the cost of almost everything you buy in your own home has doubled.

As to the question of rates, it should be mentioned that rates are controlled by individual States. The States have their insurance commissions and so far as I know all States do have commissions. In my State they have given the privilege to the insurance companies to make a 5- or a 6-percent profit.

We try to watch this. I think my friend from Pennsylvania said that we need a complaint department. Well, we have a complaint department. If the people want to complain about the insurance rates, in most States, I believe, there is an insurance commissioner who is elected by the people to whom complaints can be made.

Mr. CAHILL. May I just address myself to that point, because I think it is a valid and good point. I do not believe that any of the American people would object to any insurance company making a 5-percent profit. That is not the problem. But I want to ask the gentleman this question. I have in my hand a series of advertisements that have appeared in full page in every daily newspaper in the State of New Jersey on five separate occasions immediately before a hearing was scheduled before the Commissioner on Banking and Insurance of the State of New Jersey to get an increase in rates. These are five big ads, all paid for by an organization called "The Insurance Information Institute, 110 Williams Street, New York," which is headed by a man by the name of J. Carroll Bateman, general manager, who is accredited by the Public Relations Society of America.

I would assume that the cost of these ads and the cost of this public relations firm are all being paid out of the administrative expenses of the various insurance companies who are contributing to this agency.

The problem is that none of us object to a company making a fair profit. And we do not object to the amount of money that is being paid out of the premium dollar to the accident victim, because that is why we have insurance, to take care of the disabled and the injured. But what we say is that there has not been on a State level a sufficient examination in depth into the administration expenses that the insurance companies charge off to their expenses.

Secondly, and I would like to have the gentleman's comment on this phase of it, where a company takes in millions of dollars in premiums, and they take that premium when it is paid in at the first of the year and invest it in stocks, they often buy goods securities; they buy common stocks that appreciate. At the end of the year, when they come for an appraisal to determine whether they made a profit or a loss, does not the gentleman think that they ought to take into consideration income that they have developed from the investment portfolio, especially when that investment portfolio has been the product, to some degree at least, of the premiums that have bene paid in by the very policyholders that they now seek to charge extra money?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The problem has been that any profits the insurance companies have made have not been made in underwriting. They have been made on their investments on that stock which holds steady at a level keel.

As to their profits, I believe they go into their financial statement because when an insurance commissioner and the commission looks at a financial statement they use it to determine whether that company can even come into the State and write insurance.

I will agree with you on your first thoughts that sometimes it is the tendency of all companies to cover up some of their profit by operational expenses, and it is up to a good insurance commissioner to dig it out and see where they are padding the operations.

I believe the figures that were used indicate they take in $2 and pay out only $1 in claims. This is possibly true. But most companies, as I understand it, to make a decent 5- or 6-percent profit will have to have the underwriting loss of about 50 percent.

Mr. CAHILL. I do not believe any of us object to that, but would the gentleman not say, in summary, that what we are recommending here would not be harmful to any insurance company, and perhaps we are all suffering from a lack of adequate knowledge?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Certainly the debate is good.

Mr. CAHILL. All right. Would the gentleman not agree that investigation of this overall problem, because it now seems to affect every State in the Union, should be an investigation by an appropriate committee, well-funded, with objective investigators, giving all insurance companies an opportunity to come here and discuss these very problems, so the American people may have a better understanding of the problem? That is exactly what we are trying to do. We feel this whole situation has gotten out of all proportion. We feel the rates are getting to the point now—and this is the danger—that they are so high today, especially for young people under 25 or under 21, that a boy who is a sophomore or junior in college has to pay $350 or $400 for the minimal exposure, $10,000 to $20,000 liability. The temptation is going to be very great for that boy to drive without insurance. This is what causes the social problem.

We have to find some way to make sure every man who takes that dangerous instrumentality known as the automobile, and puts it on the highways, and drives it at the speeds we drive today, is able to protect the public. This is what we are trying to do. The gentleman can make a very valuable contribution.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Let me make this final comment. I appreciate the gentleman yielding this time. After this comment, I will sit down.

Two things worry me about the discussion and the debate that I have heard today. The first thing is that I am worried about bypassing the State insurance commissioner and the commissions. They are mostly and mainly elected by the people of this country in the different States. We are getting ready to have a Federal investigation. I have confidence in my insurance commissioner. Where we have a good commissioner, we usually have good laws. I really think it is unnecessary.

Mr. CAHILL. I might say respectfully, however, the gentleman is speaking only for one State and one commissioner. I would say to the gentleman respectfully that our investigation does not indicate that the other 49 commissioners measure up to the same stature as the gentleman attributes to the commissioner for Mississippi.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE].

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the question I want to ask is pretty much in line with the one just asked. Would the purpose of the Federal inquiry, the congressional investigation the gentleman is seeking, be to devise Federal legislation relative to rates or relative to the manner by which people would be placed in assigned risk categories?

Mr. CAHILL. No. My purpose in inviting a Federal investigation in the first instance would be to determine just what State regulatory bodies are doing along the lines that the gentleman discusses. My opinion is that they are not acting adequately.

Secondly, I am beginning to believe, let me say reluctantly, that since the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Southeastern Underwriters Association in 1944—and as the gentleman knows, under that case it was held that the Federal Government had full regulatory powers over the insurance industry—since that time, in 1945, immediately after that decision, the 79th Congress passed the McCarran-Ferguson Act, which delegated primary regulatory responsibility to the States. What I am concerned about here—and I say this with some reluctance, but I have to answer the gentleman's question frankly—is whether we should not take a look at this overall insurance situation from the possibility of antitrust violations.

I am beginning to believe that perhaps we should look at it from the standpoint of restraint of trade. I am beginning to believe perhaps we should look at it from the standpoint of some of the Federal statutes on the books.

I can see, from my limited investigation—and I am just now beginning to get interested in this problem, for I am beginning to see a lot of things I never suspected existed until I started my investigation—that much needs to be done.

I say to the gentleman, I believe we should look into it in depth. That is my view.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WALDIE. If the in-depth investigation should result in a conclusion, as I believe the gentleman suspects to be the case, that the States are not in fact sufficiently interested in regulating insurance companies that do business within their borders, in terms of the amount of profits they are entitled to make or in terms of the methods of determining insurability risks, would the gentleman then believe it proper to advocate Federal regulation of these factors?

Mr. CAHILL. Yes, I would.

Mr. WALDIE. In closing, so that the record not misconstrue my particular questions, I would not agree with the gentleman that that would be a desirable course of action to take.

Mr. CAHILL. I hope to be able to supply Congress with some more facts in this regard.

I say to the gentleman, my preliminary investigation indicates to me that there is one State in the Union where almost 20 representatives of the State legislature are actively engaged either as officers or directors or principal stockholders of insurance companies.

I will also say to the gentleman that in most of the States the insurance commissioner is appointed by the political power.

I will say to the gentleman that in most of the States the independent insurance agents, as properly they have a right to do, do a great deal of lobbying.

I will say to the gentleman that it is very difficult even for the most honest, the most knowledgeable, the most dedicated commissioner on a State level to do what he should know has to be done.

I will say to the gentleman that I would regret the necessity for the day to come when the Federal Government would have to renew its interest in this field, but I say to the gentleman very frankly and very seriously, I believe that day is coming.

If the gentleman will involve himself also with us in this, he probably could make a valuable contribution. This is not a one-sided situation. This is an effort by all of us, regardless of party, regardless of politics, regardless of where we come from, to try to get a job done.

I believe the gentleman will agree that there are indeed abuses, and if the State commissioner cannot correct them or will not correct them, then action needs to be taken.

Mr. WALDIE. I certainly concur that there are abuses, and I certainly agree that those abuses need correcting. I am not at all personally convinced of the solution the gentleman recommends, of Federal control and regulation of insurance. I am not convinced that will provide a satisfactory solution to the problem.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

If I may, I should like to make a statement, which perhaps will clear up some of the points I have, and then I will yield further.

I believe the high cost of insurance and the rating of companies can be attributed to many reasons.

Certainly we all realize that there are more cars and there are more accidents. I am an attorney, and I do this type of work. We realize that in many instances the attorneys' fees are excessive and should be reduced, perhaps subject to court approval.

I understand and believe that at times garages in certain areas charge excessive fees to insurance companies.

It is reported that hospital bills and doctor bills have gone up so high that the companies have to make these additional charges.

I understand that all of these play a part.

I hope the membership will interest themselves sufficiently to investigate all of these facets. For myself and for today, I should like to limit my observation to what I feel is the contribution of the insurance companies to the high cost of policies.

It is my conviction that the insurance companies themselves are responsible for most of the problems mentioned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] and by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER].

Nor has State regulation of the industry been effective to protect the public interest in reasonable rates and a competive market and a solvent and responsible insurance industry.

I have already mentioned the Supreme Court case in 1944 and the act of the 79th Congress that placed responsibility for regulatory action on the States. However, in the absence of Federal Sherman antitrust jurisdiction, State regulatory schemes permit the insurance companies to gain premium rate increases through rating bureaus. Ultimately these rating bureaus are no more than a collaborative group of companies. Such fraternities of common interest supply State insurance commissions with slanted and often misleading statistics upon which rate determinations are made and permit inefficient companies to operate under the protection of rate formulae based on average loss experience, average overhead expenses, and average premiums earned.

State commissions, frequently underfunded and understaffed, have been ill equipped to detect the fallacy contained in statistics and data provided by rating bureaus and individual companies. In general, rate increases are allowed without scrutinization of requests. The ultimate extension of this inability of the State commissions effectively to regulate insurance has occurred in California where free and open competition is left to limit insurance prices. The results of this lack of effective regulation have been chaotic. Rates in California, as in most States, skyrocketed. The ratemaking formulae of most States provides for a loss ratio of approximately 65 percent, operating expenses of 30 percent, and a 5-percent profit. In other words, where over 65 cents of every premium dollar is devoted to the payment of claims, the company is entitled to a rate increase. State formulae thus assume 30 cents will pay overhead costs and 5 cents will provide a fair margin of profit. Despite this built-in profit factor, the insurance industry maintains it is losing money. In effect they claim an allowance of approximately 30 percent of the final premiums for overhead expenses is insufficient. Yet the insurance industry is characterized by a complete lack of imagination to cut costs. I would recommend the insurance companies seriously consider the following suggestions:

At the present time the marketing system of autombile liability insurance does not provide group policies. Lower commissions on group contracts plus savings in paperwork could reduce premiums for members by some 10 to 15 percent. The UAW, employees of General Electric, and the University of Pennsylvania have had to supply their own initiative in attempting to negotiate group insurance. Their attempts have met with small success. Few companies attempted to cut costs by direct marketing methods. Rather, in general, the industry prefers to use independent agencies rather than their own salesmen. The success of some of the more aggressive companies, such as All State and State Farm Mutual, indicates a substantial saving might be passed on to policyholders. However, since most States ratemaking formulas allow 5 cents net profit on final premiums, fees of independent agents are charged not to the company but to the public. The automobile insurance industry spends millions of dollars in advertising designed to brainwash the public into believing it is losing money.

I just mention here for anyone's examination what I would consider to be a $100,000 to $200,000 program in a 5-week period immediately preceding public hearings scheduled in the State of New Jersey. I would certainly be interested to know who is paying for that. I would certainly be willing to venture that it is coming out of the premium dollar. While the companies are complaining about these costs, they persist in training agents to go out and secure releases for claim from unwary traffic victims who are receiving inadequate settlements which in and of themselves bring about litigation for the purpose of attacking and negating the effect of releases. And, Mr. Speaker, the books are replete with these cases where lawyers have had to go into court and bring action in order to compel the cancellation of a release that was obtained, especially in cases where they fail to settle cases promptly where they think it can outwait a justified claim of a traffic victim who does not have the financial resources to await his full and merited compensation.

Mr. Speaker, they use vague and deceptive small type in policies, as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] pointed out which, again, crowds dockets with litigation to determine the precise nature of coverage.

Mr. Speaker, the industry, in its "spare no expense" operations has spent millions of dollars in establishing powerful lobbies to influence legislation and administration at all levels of government, yet the Nation's drivers have no lobby. This has been true at all levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, in short, the sole evidences of competition in the automobile insurance industry do not indicate a constructive competition that accords with public industry. The industry has not competed on costs, but has engaged in a destructive attempt to maximize profits by "skimming off the cream" of the preferred risk market.

Mr. Speaker, in an inane competition for the "accident free, perfect driver," insurance companies have "weeded out" the average driver by selective risk classifications. This has led to arbitrary cancellation and nonrenewal of policies, or rejection of applicants for policies.

Mr. Speaker, such arbitrary cancellations are made on the basis of irresponsible investigations into the personal life, ancestry, and social status.

Mr. Speaker, such practices have forced many "average" drivers into assigned risk programs with minimal coverage, into "excess" polices at exorbitant rates, into insurance companies, poorly or fraudulently managed, which frequently go insolvent, or victims of such industry practices have simply remained uninsured.

Mr. Speaker, the industry defends such practices on the grounds that, first, the public demands selective risk classifications and, second, that it cannot afford to insure everyone at a reasonable rate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the first argument in my opinion misses the point.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the public do not want to subsidize a careless driver. They want to pay premiums based upon groupings of drivers of their own ability and loss experience. They demand that they be grouped into risk classifications based on their driving ability and skill. But they do not demand that they be classified according to race, occupation, neighborhood or other spurious factors. Failure to insure, except on the basis of substantial loss experience, is wrong. And, Mr. Speaker, the public realizes this.

Mr. Speaker, the second argument is at best unjustified and misleading. It will take something more persuasive, more reliable and more objective than the lamentations and hand wringing of insurance companies to convince me that they are suffering any underwriting loss. I seriously question the slanted and often misleading bookkeeping procedures by which insurance companies attempt to show they are operating in the red.

Now, Mr. Speaker, based upon some of the observations along these lines, I am compelled to point out additional factors although I shall do so upon another day, because I think I have already trespassed too much upon the time of the House and our friends of the House, during this particular period.

But I want to discuss at length, and I hope I can get my friend from Mississippi and some of the others to discuss with me, this question of using not only the ratio of losses to premiums, but the ratio of losses to overall income for the purpose of making a determination before the commissioners of the various States.

I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi it is my understanding that the commissioner in Kentucky has already made this determination. I believe he has broken ground, and he may be setting a precedent which hopefully will be considered by other commissioners. That part of it I will save for another day and another hour. But I do believe—if I may close my remarks, and then I will be glad to yield—and I am very grateful to the gentleman from California, the gentleman from Mississippi, and all the others who have participated in this discussion—that this is a matter that all of our States are interested in. Hopefully, with this type of dialog we can develop perhaps a reasonable, logical, sensible, and fair method of solving some of these problems.

I want to repeat for all Members of the House that we who are interested in this are interested in it because it has had such an effect upon either our own constituency or our own State. In my case it is the State. The insurance companies in my State are now appearing before the commissioner later this month for the purpose of seeking a tremendous increase in rates—rates that are already, in my judgment, much too high. I as a practicing lawyer have found—and I have had personal experience to prove it—that they are arbitrarily canceling policies, they are refusing to insure, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out. I must have had in the course of the last year 25 calls asking "Why should we not put in this claim for $25? That is why we pay our premiums." But they have been told by their insurance agents not to—and I believe again that the insurance agent is not the one who is responsible; he is the one who is being victimized also because he cannot write all the insurance he would like to write or that he could write because he cannot get the companies to take the coverage, but I find all of these things are happening.

The gentleman from Virginia referred to it, and we have heard it referred to in California and we have heard it referred to in Texas and we have heard from

Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and I believe you will find that as of today perhaps 20 or 30 of the 50 States in the Union are having the same type of problem that we are experiencing in New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlemen who participated and say that I believe it was a good dialog, and I hope we can continue it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—PERMISSION TO SIT TODAY WHILE THE HOUSE IS IN SESSION

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me, and I ask him to excuse my intruding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit today while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to comment to the gentleman in reference to what he said as to the powerful lobbyists who are paid by the insurance companies, that I certainly am not involved in this situation. I do not believe they would pick a freshman Congressman to get up here. Certainly they would not pick me to get up and argue the question. I am sincere when I say I am worried about the Federal Government maybe getting more into the insurance business. I think the State insurance commissioners can do the job. I know our insurance commissioner can. The experience I have had with him has been good. And there are certainly some capable insurance commissioners. So I did not think the gentleman meant that.

Mr. CAHILL. I will say to the gentleman, "No." I hope the gentleman understands that I of course had no reference directly or indirectly to the gentleman from Mississippi, for whom I have—as I have for all Members of this House—the highest respect and regard. I was referring to the paid publicity men, the paid lobbyists who are working, as I know, and I think the gentleman knows, properly at the Federal level and at the State level for the purposes of developing programs that are to the best interests of the insurance companies, but I had no reference to the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman once again.

I would like to close by saying I think it is the gentleman's belief, and it is my belief, that there is a crisis in automobile insurance. I would point out to the gentleman from Mississippi that in my own State 15 companies have gone insolvent in the last 2 years, and left over 4,000 claimants in Pennsylvania with less than one penny of every dollar they claimed in claims.

So that there is concrete proof that some States have not done the job. Of course, it does not mean that every State has not done what is necessary. Likewise, it does not mean that some States that have been negligent in the past have not also worked on this problem to try to improve the situation and to look at the situation and take a fresh look at these problems and try to do something about them.

The simple fact is that we have had about 85 insurance companies in this country in the last few years that have become insolvent and have left claimants all over the country without any recourse or compensation for injuries that they have sustained as a result of the negligence of others. This is not just a question or problem of insolvency but it involves all these problems to which we have been addressing ourselves to here today.

For my part I am sure, and I know the gentleman from New Jersey feels the same way, the Congress of the United States cannot remain aloof while this situation exists.

It is incumbent upon us as Members of the Congress to appraise this situation and look into it to see if we cannot find some way to protect the public.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill] for yielding to me and again I want to say that once again I have enjoyed participating with the gentleman in this endeavor to bring to the attention of the Congress the problems with reference to automobile insurance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill] may, with the permission of Members having special orders at this time, proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to accede to the gentleman's request.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those waiting to be recognized but I would be delighted for the gentleman to have the additional time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill] is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, although I received advance notice about this special order by the gentleman from New Jersey we have been tied up and I was unable to come to the floor of the House earlier. I would have been glad to participate in this important discussion. I am grateful to the gentleman for yielding to me at this time.

I know that every Member of this House receives some mail from constituents on this problem of liability insurance. So frequently do we have to send back an answer that this is a field in which we are not able to be very helpful. That is why I wanted to take a moment to commend the gentleman from New Jersey and our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and others, because by your presence here this afternoon you have indicated you are going to try to do something about the problem.

I am not sure whether there is any particular bill pending. I am not sure what committee would proceed with this matter. Would it be the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. CAHILL. I will say to the gentleman that we thought it best, first, to have a dialog and to have some discussion on this and develop some participation in this matter before we recommended any legislation to the House of Representatives. The only thing we recommended was that an appropriate committee, and it might be the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, hold hearings so that there could be a forum in which this important subject could be discussed with the hope that the committee in its wisdom would recommend appropriate legislation.

Mr. RANDALL. I think that is an additional reason why the gentleman deserves the commendation of his fellow Members. The gentleman is seeking to pinpoint this problem.

As I remarked earlier, I was not able to get to the House floor in time. I just heard a few of the words spoken by our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, and I do not know what colloquy preceded that. But while we are concerned about the high cost of insurance and the fact that some people are denied insurance, because of the prohibitive cost and otherwise, it seems to me that you are on the right track when you hope to give a full airing to this problem. One of the most truly pitiful and deplorable sights is to see a family whose members have been in a horrible motor car crash. They thought or believed they were covered by insurance and then to their dismay discover that they have no insurance because the company cannot meet its obligations. There is nothing any sadder and nothing more pitiful. This sort of thing most unfortunately happens again and again.

I do not know what we may be able to contribute or be helpful in this effort. I want to assure you that we are ready to be called upon and are ready to help you in any way that we can. Again let me say you and the gentlemen from Pennsylvania deserve the commendation of all Members for your effort to focus attention on this problem.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to join with my distinguished colleagues, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Snyder, and Mr. Green of Pennsylvania, in discussing the problem of automobile insurance.

I have been very disturbed by the

growing complaints from policyholders about unwarranted cancellations and rising premium costs and I am also most concerned about the financial difficulties of many insurance companies which stem from increasing numbers of auto accidents and the larger settlements which are being made for accidents.

The Interstate Highway System now under construction gives new emphasis to the interstate nature of motor vehicle travel and the related insurance problem. We must remember that when it is completed in the early 1970's, the interstate network will carry at least 20 percent of all vehicular traffic.

There is mounting evidence that no one is wholly satisfied with the present approach to auto insurance. There is constant pressure for higher premiums from those who sell insurance and at the same time increasing complaints from consumers who buy the policies.

Among the specific questions which need airing are:

First. The widespread practice of canceling policies without sufficient justification, and often on the basis of whim or flimsy excuse;

Second. The practice of setting rates on the basis of the lump-sum performance of many companies, which makes it possible for efficient companies to make excessive profits while inefficient companies continue to lose money no matter how high premium rates are set;

Third. The discriminatory nature of present rate practices, which penalize motorists because of their age, sex, and place of residence, irrespective of the individual's driving record;

Fourth. The need for a government reinsurance program similar to the ones that now protect depositors at banks and savings and loan associations;

Fifth. The fair and equitable treatment of investment income—the money an insurance company makes by investing premium payments and which presently is excluded from the rate structure in most States;

Sixth. The added costs of settling claims that arise from the need to establish negligence in an accident claim;

Seventh. The length of time it takes to settle claims;

Eighth. The problems, if any, of settling claims that involve motorists from two or more States; and

Ninth. The problems arising from mail-order sale of insurance across State lines.

Mr. Speaker, we must determine whether insurance companies are providing the kind of insurance protection to which the public is entitled and which the public needs; and if not, we should look further into the question to decide on action required to assure adequate protection.

Mr. **BRINKLEY**. Mr. Speaker, an aroused and bewildered public, those who have seen their auto insurance rates more than double and those who have received notice of cancellation of automobile insurance with no reason indicated, have contacted their congressional Representatives for relief. In Georgia, our very able insurance commissioner, the Honorable James Bentley, states that some companies cancel a man's insurance when he goes into the Army, or when his children go to college, or when he reaches age 65. Mr. Bentley also reports that companies have a legal right to do this, but says insurance companies have a moral obligation to meet the needs of the public and that some companies are being grossly unfair in selecting their insureds. Fortunately, such insurance companies seem to be in the small minority.

I feel our best contribution at the Federal level, is to respond directly to the insurance commissioners of the States to act as a factfinding body, not a policymaking organization. States have departments designed to develop rules and regulations governing insurance companies and the enforcement power necessary for implementation.

As an example of State supervision, in Georgia, insurance companies will soon be required to submit lists of canceled policyholders to the State insurance department. The State of Georgia insurance commissioner receives 500 complaints a month from persons whose insurance was canceled, drastically reduced, or not renewed. To quote Mr. Bentley:

> We are determined to eliminate arbitrary treatment of Georgia policyholders. Insurance is not a luxury, but in the modern world has become a necessity.

With States taking such action, our best service can be to encourage such diligence on the part of those charged with these responsibilities within the several States.

Mr. **FARBSTEIN**. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, I joined four other Members of the House in introducing legislation creating a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, to protect policyholders and injured parties against automobile insurance company failures. This measure is designed to solve one specific insurance problem; but other more fundamental insurance practices such as soaring insurance rates, arbitrary cancellations, and nonrenewals continue to plague insurance policyholders, particularly the youthful driver and elder citizen.

As we are all aware, every year auto accidents keep increasing regardless of substantial safety programs by both public and private organizations. A recent national magazine estimated auto insurance settlements for 1966 approaching $4 billion. This rising level of claims has resulted in a policy-writing loss for many insurance companies. This serves as their justification for seeking substantial increases in the premiums charged citizens. I can understand the concern of these insurance executives for maintaining a profit margin, but quite frankly, I am not convinced that the size of insurance premium increases requested by insurance companies are necessary. As was recently noted, many insurance companies earn a healthy income from the investments they make during a year on the premiums collected from customers. Therefore, many companies, although possibly losing money on premiums, more than make up for it from the investment incomes earned. I believe investment incomes should be included in computing policyholders' auto rates.

I have received a number of letters from citizens from all parts of the country as a result of my support for the Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation. These letters have listed a wide range of complaints about insurance companies; but a large number of them dealt with the questions of arbitrary cancellations and nonrenewal of policies. Many of these cancellations involved young people but others included experienced drivers who have driven for years without an accident, but who in a brief period were involved in one or two accidents. All of a sudden, these citizens have been notified by companies, often ones with which they have done business for years, that their policy had been canceled. It is not uncommon for such cancellations to be made without clearly stating the cause.

Mr. Speaker, the automobile has become a part of every American's leisure life, but it also plays a vital role in the working day. To cancel a driver's insurance without just cause can work an economic hardship on many responsible citizens.

The non-renewal of a policy seems to be a practice particularly pertaining to elder citizens who, because of age, are no longer considered preferred risks. Again, I believe insurance companies must be responsible for showing just cause for non-renewal and, in addition, provide a means through which citizens can appeal such action. I do not consider age as showing just cause.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress in 1945, gave the power to regulate insurance to the individual States. It seems evident to me that present regulation is not adequate and that it is time the Congress reviewed the present practice of these insurance companies. The many complaints of our citizens cannot continue to be ignored. We have a responsibility to them to assure that they are receiving both responsible and responsive auto insurance service. I know many of my colleagues share this concern.

Mr. **CAHILL**. I hope that if the representatives of the insurance companies read the remarks in the RECORD, they will hopefully look to the following items for reform:

First. Reform in the marketing place with emphasis upon some imaginative merchandising at lower costs.

Second. A more rapid payoff so that the method of adjusting claims and the time can be shortened between injury and receipt of payment.

Third. That more premium dollars be paid for the victims of accidents and less premium dollars be expended in administration.

I believe that if the insurance companies would correct those three matters they would be taking a giant step forward in performing a great public service to their policyholders.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Kentucky, and all who participated in the debate.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE COULD HELP TO AVOID ANOTHER HOUSING CRISIS BY SHIFTING ITS $45 BILLION PORTFOLIO TOWARD LONGER TERM SECURITIES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Members will remember the financial fiasco of last August and September. Interest rates reached record levels, the liquidity of our financial institutions approached the vanishing point, and the housing market was starved for funds and utterly demoralized.

I call upon the Federal Reserve System to do its part in averting another such fiasco within the next few months.

In recent months the Federal Reserve has properly added to the money supply by purchases of Government securities in the open market. Unfortunately, until the last few days, those purchases have been almost entirely confined to the short end of the spectrum of Government securities. As a result of these massive purchases by the Federal Reserve of Government short-term securities—accompanied by similar widespread corporate purchases—the yield on Treasury bills has declined from 5.6 percent last August to a current rate of 3.4 percent. But the interest yield on long-term U.S. securities, such as Treasury 1992 bonds, has declined hardly at all—from 5.08 percent to the current 4.91 percent. Rates on long-term corporate bonds and on housing mortgages are even higher.

HIGH LONG-TERM RATES HURT THE HOMEOWNER

This is a ridiculous state of affairs. Short-term rates can afford to be reasonably high without appreciably harming business. More than that, short-term rates that are reasonably high are actually a help to our balance of payments, to at least some extent keeping down our payments deficit by preventing a flight of capital from this country.

But the unreasonably high long-term rates we are now suffering are acutely harmful. They hurt the homebuilder. They hurt the businessman, including the small businessman, who needs to borrow for plant or equipment. They hurt State and local governments who want to build schools and hospitals.

The Federal Reserve bears some responsibility for creating this perverse situation. It has actually been selling long terms and buying short terms in recent years—just the opposite of what it should have been doing.

THE FED IS INFATUATED WITH BILLS-ONLY

Why has the Federal Reserve been so perverse? Mainly, I suggest, because of its infatuation with the bills-only policy which it has been following off and on since March 1953. While theoretically the policy was abandoned in February 1961, one has only to look at the Federal Reserve's portfolio today to see that bills-only still reigns.

The record shows that the Federal Reserve has, since 1961, steadily been returning to bills-only. In 1960, the last year of the unallowed bills-only policy, the Fed's net open market purchases of U.S. Government securities of up-to-1-year maturity was $1.8 billion; of over-1-year maturity, zero. Then in February 1961 came *the famous recantation: the Fed was promising to dump bills-only.* And for that year, 1961, it did, purchasing $434 million in 1-year-and-under securities, and a whopping $2.6 billion in over-1-year securities.

But thereafter the backsliding began. More 1-year-and-under securities were purchased each successive year, and fewer over-1-year securities. Thus, in 1962, the Fed purchased $1.2 billion in 1-year, and $1.8 in over-1-year; in 1963, $2.8 in 1-year, and $1.4 in over-1-year; in 1964, $4 billion in 1-year, and $1 billion in over-1-year; in 1965, $3.6 billion in 1-year, and only $302 million in over-1-year; in 1966, $4.9 billion in 1-year and only $374 million in over-1-year; and in the first 4 months of 1967, $3.1 billion in 1-year, and only $208 million in over-1-year.

THE FED'S PORTFOLIO HAS BEEN SHORTENED

This backsliding becomes clearly evident in the increasing percentage of short terms in the Fed's portfolio, and the diminishing percentage of long terms. As of December 31, 1960, the Fed's $27.3 billion total portfolio consisted of 55.7 percent 1-year-and-under securities, and 44.3 percent over-1-year securities—with 5.29 percent over-5-year; as of December 31, 1964, the Fed's $37 billion total portfolio consisted of 57.9 percent 1-year-and-under securities, and 42.1 percent over-1-year securities—with 5.64 percent over 5-year; and as of May 24, 1967, the Fed's $45.5 billion total portfolio consisted of 68.2 percent 1-year-and-under securities, and 31.8 percent over-1-year securities—with 3.07 percent over 5-year.

Plainly, the Fed's doctrinaire adherence to bills only is in large part responsible for the fact that excessively high long-term interest rates have not declined. All the decline has come in short-term interest rates.

THE FED'S RATIONALE WILL NOT HOLD WATER

What is the justification of the Fed's bills-only policy? From the Board's own tortured rationale over the years, one gathers that by dealing mainly at the short term, the Federal Reserve thinks it will really be helping the whole economy, because changes in short-term interest rates will be transmitted rapidly to long-term interest rates as well.

The only trouble with this rationale is that it is not so. Take the situation today. Short-term rates are down to 3.4 percent, yet long-term rates are still around 5 percent.

There have been hints in recent days that the Federal Reserve has seen the error of its ways, and is now purchasing some long-term Treasury securities. But this is very late and very little. If the Federal Reserve is to do its part in averting another housing crisis, it must steadily shift its portfolio away from the short term and in the direction of the long term. It need do nothing rash or precipitate. Particularly, it should not create one penny more of the increment to the money supply than is needed for full employment without inflation.

But the Federal Reserve should move. And its movement should be recorded *in a steadily increasing portfolio emphasis on the long end of the spectrum.* The doctrine of bills only should be consigned to the dustbin, and quickly.

REPAIRING THE REVENUES BY PLUGGING TAX LOOPHOLES

Let me emphasize again that even if the Fed should thus appropriately lengthen the maturity of its portfolio, this would not by itself be sufficient to produce the reasonably low long-term interest rates which are essential for continued economic growth. Confronted with a fiscal 1968 budget deficit in excess of $20 billion, we need some method of putting more revenues into the Treasury in a way that will not slow economic growth. Additional Treasury revenues will mean just that much less necessity for the Treasury to borrow, and just that much lower interest rates. The place to get these additional revenues, I believe, is by plugging some of the more outrageous loopholes in the Federal tax structure. I have set forth my views on this in an article in Commonweal magazine for May 26, 1967:

EXORCISING THE DEFICIT DEMON: OUR RUBE GOLDBERG TAX SYSTEM

During the hearings early this year before the Joint Economic Committee on the President's Economic Report, I kept raising this point: "The economic philosophy of the Administration for some years has been based upon the so-called full employment fiscal dividend theory. The Administration said, in effect, 'Bear with us, gentlemen, while we run deficits for a few years because, when we get to full employment, so carefully have we calibrated economic policy that we will have a nice fiscal dividend.' We now have, in the words of the Council of Economic Advisers, 'essentially full employment.' We also have, in this first half of 1967, a $5 billion deficit on the national income accounts basis. Why is the scenario not unfolding as planned? Has our income-price-profit pattern got out of whack? This is what Karl Marx always used to say about capitalism, and I am anxious to prove him wrong. Isn't the best way to prove him wrong to make sure that we have enough purchasing power and investment in the economy to take off the market the product that we can produce?"

I failed to get a definite answer to my question during the hearings and, regrettably, I have none myself. But here is my guess why the economy seems to need constant stimulus from federal deficits, even with the CEA's "essentially full employment": our loophole-filled tax system is at fault.

I first ask: have the before-tax shares in the national income of the income groups in our society—poorest, poor, middle, better-off, wealthiest—altered appreciably in the last 20 years? I cannot find that they have. Taking the years 1947, 1954, 1960 and 1965 (the most recent for which we have data), the lowest and second lowest fifths of our families received 5 percent and 12 percent of the total family income in all four periods; the middle fifth received 17 percent in 1947, and 18 percent in the other three periods; the fourth fifth received 23 percent in 1947 and 1960, and 24 percent in 1954 and 1965; and the upper fifth received 43 percent in 1947, 42 percent in 1954, 42 percent in 1960, and 41 percent in 1965. Before taxes, then, the shares of the national pie reveal about the same proportions for the rich and poor in 1965 as in 1947.

So far so good—or so bad for someone who, like myself, has a hunch that things are not so rosy as they seem. But two additional questions need to be asked: *(1)* have things happened since 1965 which may have altered this stable pattern; and (2) what about *after-tax* incomes?

Two things *have* happened since 1965. From December, 1965, to December, 1966, the cost of living went up 3.3 percent (the sharpest increase in the last 15 years except for the 3.5 percent increase for a twelve-month period in 1956–57). While we lack definitive data on just how much this inflation has diminished real consumer income, it has undoubtedly had some effect

Two things *have* happened since 1965. in skewing real income away from the poor and toward the not-so-poor. Particularly this seems to be true of factory workers. Manufacturing workers' real spendable earnings actually declined in 1966, the first time they have done so since 1960. Meanwhile, the after-tax profit margins of manufacturing corporations in 1965 and 1966 were the highest since 1950.

A second post-1965 development has been the rapid increase in interest rates, only recently checked, caused by the stringent monetary policies of the Federal Reserve system. While the effect of higher interest rates on income distribution has also been most inadequately researched, my guess is that people who pay interest on home mortgages, on automobile and other consumer installment paper, and on personal loans, tend to be a shade poorer than the people who receive interest. If so, this could be a further case of recent skewed income distribution.

But the primary cause of income maldistribution—the thing that may be ruining the dream of the full employment surplus—is our tax system. Fifteen years ago we had all the classical tax loopholes—the oil and mineral depletion allowance, the escaping of capital gains tax if the taxpayer will have the wit to hold his appreciated securities until he dies, the beginnings of the abuse of the income tax-free state and local bonds issued for private industrial plant purposes, the ability of a wealthy taxpayer to buy U.S. bonds at 85 and have his estate turn them in a few weeks later at 100, and so on. After 15 years, these loopholes, plus some new ones, still remain.

Perhaps more important, general federal tax reduction in the last 15 years (with rare exceptions) has been overwhelmingly weighted in favor of the higher-bracket taxpayer, who saves a large part of his income, and against the lower-bracket taxpayer, who tends to spend what he gets. The tax revisions and depreciation reductions of 1954, the accelerated depreciation and investment tax credit of 1962, and the tax revisions and reductions of 1964, all tended to promote higher savings more vigorously than they did higher consumption. Moreover, the successive increases in the social security payroll tax took large bites out of lower-income people who would otherwise have been spending that money. And meanwhile, regressive state and local real property and sales taxes were hitting harder the very same pocketbooks. Only the excise tax decreases of 1965, and the provision of the 1964 Act dividing the first $2000 income tax bracket into four steps with much lower rates, did much to promote consumption.

Nobody knows what a real tax reform, with emphasis on loophole-plugging as well as on more equity for the low and middle income groups, could mean. But I have a hunch that the private economy—consumers with money in their pockets and investors anxious to build plants and equipment in order to take advantage of that market—would stand a much better chance of making the full employment surplus dream come true with such a redistribution of after-tax income.

If my hunch is correct, our tax system is encouraging individuals and businesses to try to divert a larger proportion of the total income steam into savings than they are willing to put to work in productive private investment. The result is that consumption plus investment does not take up the whole income stream, leaving excess savings that flow abroad or into speculation in the stock market or in real estate. Then the economy can stay at high level only as long as government (federal, state and local combined) runs a deficit large enough to offset excess private savings. When government does not do this, the excess of planned savings over desired investment leads to a decline in private activity, with its hardships in the form of idle men and idle machines.

The original scenario of the full employment surplus rested on the implicit assumption that we would get to full employment with a correct balance among consumption, savings and investment. Shouldn't we return to that scenario by reforming the tax structure, so that the private economy can generate a balance among consumption, savings and investment, and hence the growth of income that will produce the very budget surplus we were originally promised?

It may not take very much. It could be that the billions which now leak through the joints of our Rube Goldberg tax system could be surprisingly like the $5 billion budget deficit the Government currently is running. Recovering some of those billions for the Federal Treasury from those who neither consume nor invest could make possible easier money, since the Federal Reserve would no longer have to fight the deficit demon. And easier money would encourage the economic growth that a balanced economy needs.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman is making. Certainly this House should be well acquainted with the many contributions which the gentleman from Wisconsin has made as a well-informed and concerned Member of this House in a very difficult field of the involved financial structure of the United States.

However, I would ask the gentleman, in addition to the comments he has made, if he would not believe that this Federal tilt of the portfolio to short-term bills might not have some relevance to the bill we will have before us on Wednesday, in which we will seek to increase the debt ceiling, but also will consider power to penetrate the interest ceiling on some of the long-term debt of the Treasury?

Would the gentleman comment on this?

Mr. REUSS. Yes. In my opinion the reasons I have advanced for the Federal Reserve's getting rid of its "bills only" policy become even stronger in the light of what I am informed is contained in that debt ceiling bill which will be before this House next Wednesday.

I am informed—and the gentleman will correct me if my information is not in accord with his own—that the bill contains a provision which pierces the 50-year-old, 4¼-percent ceiling on Federal securities of more than 5 years, and allows the 4¼-percent ceiling to be pierced on issues, I believe, up to 7 years.

Mr. HANNA. Yes; it is 7½ years.

Mr. REUSS. It may be said that this is only a small baby, but as far as I am concerned, it represents a departure from a principle which, by and large, has been a healthy principle for the Nation's taxpayers, the Nation's homeowners, and the Nation's small businessmen in the last 50 years, in that it has tended to keep excessive increases in long-term interest rates from occurring.

I would hope that when we consider that phase of the debt ceiling bill next Wednesday, we may do something to temper the propensity of the Federal Reserve System to make bad matters worse by seeking to raise long-term interest rates.

If the "Fed" does what it has already done, I would be very much afraid that they would do everything in their power to see that Uncle Sam had to pay the highest possible rates in those new 7-year securities on which the ceiling is now proposed to be removed.

So I believe the gentleman makes a very pertinent point indeed.

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman, because I believe he is exactly on target on this matter. Probably a part of the whole problem which we are now asked to direct attention to, in regard to permitting this opening, this first breaching of a 50-year-old policy, is created by the very fact that there has been such a mass movement into short terms that it has affected Government debt substantially over the past few years.

It is also true, is it not, that we perhaps are being a bit myopic again, as the gentleman and I suggested in early 1966, by not bearing down on a fiscal policy to go in tandem with a monetary approach, which is our responsibility?

They may not be doing what they are doing right; but we are not doing anything at all about what we should be doing our part in; that is, establishing the fiscal policy to go along in the traces side by side.

I believe the gentleman will agree that the housing market, and the small businessmen, and so on, would be much better off with a policy that was fiscally oriented to this situation, than one which is singularly monetary in its solution.

Mr. REUSS. I believe the gentleman is entirely correct.

While I have not been sparing in my criticism of the Federal Reserve this afternoon, I believe it is only fair to recognize that there are other actors on the stage who have not fulfilled their roles. Included therein should be we who serve in the Congress who, after all, are in ultimate charge of tax policy, and also those in the administration, who should have been concerned months and months ago with bringing to the Congress a loophole-plugging tax bill, so that the burden would not be so exclusively on the monetary authorities and on the Federal Reserve as it has been.

If what I have said makes this look a little like the last act of Hamlet, so be it, because I believe many are responsible, and perhaps many who should now be instructed to get on with our full employment without inflation economic goal.

Mr. HANNA. I commend the gentleman for seeking this kind of balance. I see in this picture something that has not been emphasized very clearly.

We are used to having problems in the economy of price push or wage pull, or this kind of thing talked of in terms of ordinary inflation, but not very many people have seen the influence of capital shortage in the light of such tremendous, almost massive, capital requirements. It seems to me what the gentleman is pointing out in the light of this tremendous massive capital requirement is that we must have a balance in monetary policy between short and long term, and we also must have a balance between the Government's spending its money through its fiscal policy as well as going to the market at a time when there is such a massive incursion into the market for capital for all requirements as today.

Is that not the gentleman's position?

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman has said it very well.

I would reiterate one point, that neither the gentleman from California nor I in any way advocates that the monetary authorities should create new money at one nickel's worth faster rate than is necessary for a full employment without inflation economy.

All we are saying is, why be sadistic? If the monetary authorities have determined that *x* rate of monetary increment is necessary for the good and welfare of the economy, why achieve it all by purchasing at the short end of the spectrum and hurt our balance of payments in the process, when one could do a little good for the homeowner, for the small businessman, and for the local school district by purchasing at least a fair modicum in the long end?

Mr. HANNA. I believe the gentleman is precisely correct. As I say, I certainly will be with him in making his presentation and in many other efforts, by which we can bring our policy back into an effective process.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

BLAME FOR MIDDLE EAST CRISIS FALLS ON U THANT AND THE U.N.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Pollock] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, the news this morning carries the tragic word of the outbreak of another war. The crisis of the last few days has erupted into the inevitable conflict. I believe it is the time to place the blame for these events precisely where it really belongs—in the lap of the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant.

It is ironic that on the first day of this new conflict the New York Times carries U Thant's excuses for his role in it on page 1. Yet there can be no conceivable justification for the precipitous withdrawal of the U.N. troops from the Egyptian-Israeli border in the face of the deliberate, provocative acts of Egypt. It was this act ordered by U Thant that brought on the crisis and the obvious rush toward its inevitable end—war. I will not detail all the arguments pro and con over the Secretary General's actions. It is sufficient to say that he acted without consultation with anyone with or without time for reflection. The advice of the great powers was not sought, nor did he bother to bring the matter before the Security Council. Certainly the Secretary General should at the very least, have flown to Cairo to explore the entire situation with President Nasser and should have advised him there would be no withdrawing of the troops. Without the withdrawal, there would have been no crisis and no new war. There are reports that even Nasser himself was surprised at the acquiescence and fast U.N. withdrawal. The Arabs have made many demands in the past without any real intention of carrying through. The U.N. retreat put Egypt in the obvious position of carrying out their threats or losing face.

One of the reasons for the United Nations' existence has been its peacekeeping efforts in conflicts between small powers. Apparently, by U Thant's own admissions and by the inconclusive fumblings of the Security Council, the U.N. can no longer perform this role. The world organization in this crisis has gone a long way towards contributing to its own demise. It is very possible the United Nations itself will be the chief casualty of the Middle East war. Should this be the case, much of the responsibility must lie squarely on the head of the Secretary General.

I do not know the real reasons for U Thant's action. It may have been sheer stupidity or it may have been a calculated move designed to bring the matter to a head, which is worse than stupidity. In any case it could mean the end of a dream. Perhaps the dream of a united peaceful world is impractical. I don't think so. Nevertheless, men must keep trying. The real tragedy is that one of the best attempts has been scuttled by the incredible mistake of the very man sworn to make it work.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLLOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman for his excellent statement and associate myself with his remarks to the extent that if indeed there is war in the Middle East, the Secretary General of the United Nations cannot absolve himself from the responsibility for it. I certainly agree with the gentleman that the United Nations is at the crossroads of its continued existence or collapse. We are all deeply concerned about what is going on in the Middle East. President Johnson is exercising great restraint in not inflaming the situation any more than it has to be but I believe the United States must tell the world we shall not abandon Israel if her sovereignty is threatened. I certainly agree that if the United Nations is incapable at this crucial juncture in world history of resolving this problem in the Middle East, it may very well be the end of the United Nations. I hate to speculate what will come in its place, but I think that the delegates to the United Nations, particularly those in the Security Council, ought to at this moment weigh very carefully what they are doing and how they are doing it, because we have seen the United Nations previously fail to respond to major crises.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has too often had to act unilaterally in an attempt to try to resolve similar problems.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the time has come when the United Nations and all parties concerned with the United Nations ought to recognize one thing—that American patience is not inexhaustible. We have in the past given the United Nations every opportunity to grow and develop and to find ways and means of resolving conflicts. We have tried to explain and to repeatedly justify some of its failures, because we recognize that the United Nations is dealing in the most difficult arena of human emotions and historical clashes.

But, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Pollock] and it is my opinion that the gentleman performed a noteworthy public service by calling attention to the fact today that the very existence and the survival of the United Nations is at stake. I wish that every delegate to that organization will ponder very carefully the consequences if the United Nations fails right now to find an effective means with which to resolve this situation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the suggestion to dispatch a peacekeeping force to that troubled zone right now with which to restore order is a good one.

If the United Nations should falter, if it fails to respond to this most urgent need, then, indeed, I believe there will be a great deal of clamor in this country as to the future of the United Nations.

It has been our hope that the United Nations would have found some workable suggestions to protect Israel from her warring neighbors. But the United Nations obviously has failed and we see the tragic attack on Israel today. There is no time to waste.

I would hope some way can be found to establish peace in the Middle East, but, Mr. Speaker, if the U.N. cannot do it, then the United States must firmly state it will stand ready to help Israel immediately in the event she should ask for such help. We cannot leave Israel carry the full brunt alone of checking Arab and Soviet expansion in the Middle East.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] for his very excellent statement and for the contribution which he has made to this discussion.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLLOCK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said today about the current crisis in the Middle East which, we learned this morning, erupted into a major military clash between Egyptian and Israel forces in the Sinai Desert.

My mail of the past few weeks, Mr. Speaker, indicates deep concern and confusion over our position in the Middle East crisis and I must say, with all candor, that I share their concern and confusion.

The questions being raised, in my judgment, are valid. Are we or are we not committed to support Israel by the tripartite agreements of 1950 and 1956? Should we or should we not take unilateral action in the Mideast if the United Nations continues to vacillate much longer? Can we or can we not oppose a blockade in one area of the world and impose one in another? Were we or were we not maneuvered into a corner by Russia and the United Arab Republic in this Middle East crisis?

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, anyone who understands the situation intimately is very concerned about the problem, particularly the unexplained action by the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant, in withdrawing U.N. troops from the contested Egyptian-Israel border. This he did apparently without even consulting the major powers of the world or obtaining the concurrence of at least those countries that have been carrying the major burden of international security obligations and commitments.

In light of this action, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is incumbent upon this administration, the Congress, and those who have been supporting the efforts of the United States within the framework of the United Nations to demand a detailed explanation of this action on the part of the Secretary General.

And further, Mr. Speaker, we, in turn, are certainly going to have to weigh, very carefully, our future course of action and support of the United Nations. If it cannot serve its basic purpose or even uphold its own charter, I doubt very much whether the American people will have confidence in its future ability to serve as the "peacekeeping" organization of the world.

If the conflict that is now underway in the Middle East ultimately results in a major war, I believe the blood is going to be on the hands of the Secretary General for what, in my judgment, has been unwise and untimely action on his part.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as urging this administration, the United Nations, and all responsible authorities to take whatever action is necessary to bring about a cease-fire as soon as possible in this Middle East conflict.

EAST-WEST TRADE—REMARKS OF ARCHIE E. ALBRIGHT TO THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, JUNE 2, 1967

Mr. **REUSS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. **OTTINGER**. Mr. Speaker, one of the major issues facing us today is the subject of expanding our trade with the East. For over a decade we held the official attitude that doing business with the Communist countries would merely help them continue and spread their way of life. However, this attitude is changing. We have come to the realization that Soviet bloc countries will find Western nations with which to trade whether we engage in such trade or not. If we shut ourselves off completely from economic exchange with the nations of Eastern Europe, we will be the losers, not they. We have a very real economic stake in expanding trade with other nations of the world and I believe history has proved to us that withholding our trade is not likely to retard the growth of the Soviet bloc nations.

This is being realized more each day, not only by our policymakers but by American industry as well, as demonstrated by the address delivered last Friday by Mr. Archie E. Albright, executive vice president of the Stauffer Chemical Co. of New York, to the Foreign Policy Association. Mr. Albright, a trustee of the Foreign Policy Association, notes that in trading with the East "our own national self-interest and the interest of world peace will be served best." I read Mr. Albright's remarks with great interest and believe that they deserve our careful consideration. Therefore, I am pleased to present Mr. Albright's remarks herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF ARCHIE E. ALBRIGHT TO THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, JUNE 2, 1967

I am particularly glad to have the opportunity to share some personal observations with you today on the subject of East-West trade—a subject which I believe is of considerable urgency, not only to the American business community, but to the future well-being of the nation.

For the past twenty years there has been an economic freeze, in varying degrees of coldness between the United States and the Eastern European countries. In my view, this freeze has not always served the best interests of either the United States or the communist oriented countries.

The situation has been studied and restudied over the years by governmental agencies, foundations, professional associations and business groups, as well.

The conclusions and recommendations which have resulted from these studies generally indicate that a liberalized trade policy between the United States and the Eastern European countries is one potential road over which we might travel toward a thaw in East-West relations.

The policy of our government has gradually shifted from a posture of economic nationalism with respect to Eastern Europe, to provide substantial leadership in moving toward the objective of peaceful engagement through increased trade.

The President and many leaders of Congress have affirmed the wisdom of this approach. In May of 1966 the administration sponsored an East-West Trade Relations Act designed in part to help achieve a more liberal trade policy. While the bill did not pass and its future is problematical in the 90th Congress, its very introduction was an important step forward in our trade policy attitude toward the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries.

In October of 1966 the President authorized the Export-Import Bank to provide normal commercial credit guarantees on industrial exports to Poland, Czechoslavakia, Hungary and Bulgaria. This practice had been in effect since 1964 with respect to Rumania, and there are indications that the Eximbank, Agency for International Development, and World Bank will consider a more flexible approach to supporting long-term U. S. trade development.

Still another liberalization in U. S. government policy was the recent removal of more than 400 nonstrategic items from the Commerce Department's Commodity Control List. These products can now be shipped without specific export licenses. This list of 400 was expanded in mid-May and it is reasonable to anticipate that other products, presently requiring a specific export license, will be dropped from the Commerce Department's list in the future.

In short, there have been a number of positive governmental steps forward toward a thaw in our trade relations policies with Communist-bloc countries. This progress is, I submit, of vital importance in the continuing search for a viable peace—providing a point of departure from which we can improve our trade relationships with Russia and Eastern Europe and add strength to the underpinnings of so-called "bridges of understanding," between the East and West.

I do not suggest that increased trade and commercial communications between ourselves and the Communists will resolve the basic social and political conflicts between Communism and our free society.

But a hard-headed, *quid pro quo* trade policy between America and the producing countries of Eastern Europe can go a long way to foster the type of peaceful engagement which hopefully will moderate the suspicions and tensions which divide us. And, at the same time it can provide new and expanding markets for American goods and services.

On balance, it would seem that United States business has much to offer the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries, particularly in the sale of technology. Developments in the U.S. in process technology for the production of non-strategic items has been much faster than in Russia and Eastern Europe because our economy has been consumer oriented to a much greater degree for a much longer period of time. Communist countries have indicated an increasing interest in U.S. products and technology and a willingness to pay—not only by way of reasonable prices or royalties, but also by protection of technology, protection of patents and trademarks.

It is encouraging to note incidentally, that the Soviet Union has already become a member of the Paris Convention for the protection of foreign-owned patent rights and many companies, including my own, have taken a much more liberal view with respect to filing patent applications in Russia. To the best of my knowledge, the Soviets have scrupulously observed the rights of foreign companies arising from these patent rights. Admittedly, copyrights have faired less well to date.

What is the present dimension of U.S. trade with the Soviet Union and the nations of Eastern Europe? In 1966 trade reached its highest level in twenty years, excepting 1964 when large volume wheat shipments ballooned the total by some 180 million dollars.

Two way trade between the United States, the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries exceeded $375 million in 1966 as compared with $277 million in 1965. The balance of trade was slightly in favor of the United States, with U.S. exports approaching $200 million while total imports were about $180 million.

The overall increase between 1965 and 1966 is an impressive 35%. But the increase loses much of its significance when we consider the relatively low base on which it is computed, and absolutely palls when you consider what our friends and allies in Western Europe and Japan are doing in volume of trade.

Consider these statistics. Preliminary figures from the Department of Commerce indicate that in 1966 trade between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Eastern European countries including East Germany and Russia exceed $2 billion—more than five times that of the United States. The United Kingdom reached about $1 billion and Japan, France, and Italy fall in the range between $600 million and $1 billion.

The figures speak for themselves. Suffice it to say that the United States, as compared to the other leading manufacturing countries of the world, is not getting a competitive share of the fast growing Eastern European market.

Admittedly, even if the value of technical data, services and exports by subsidiaries or licensees of U.S. firms were added to the United States trade figures—and these values would be difficult to come by—it is clear that the comparison with other trading nations would still be unfavorable. The reason for the unfavorable balance cannot be attributed solely to a lack of U.S. interest in competing for Eastern European business. The economic facts of life—market proximity, labor costs, raw material sources—have given our friends a head start. But there are ways in which we can make ourselves more competitive in these markets.

I have touched on what has been done by the Administration in an effort to stimulate our overall long term trade policy toward Eastern Europe and Soviet Russia:

The introduction of the East-West Trade Relations Act of 1966;

The liberalization of export controls;

The extension of commercial credit facilities.

These steps are obviously based on the premise that a trade "boycott" of Russia and the Eastern European countries is not in our own self-interest, particularly when the same commodities, goods, services and sophisticated technology are available from third country sources.

It is impossible for us to persuade our allies to join in an effort to foreclose trade with the Communist oriented countries—nor, in my own judgment, would this be at all desirable.

If one accepts this general premise—and I suspect that there may be many here today who do not—I should like to consider briefly what additional steps might be taken both by the Administration and by business leaders to effectively expand East-West Trade and American participation in it.

The availability of credit on reasonable commercial terms is an essential element in the conduct of an expanding trade picture with Eastern Europe. For many years most of the Western industrialized countries have provided credit arrangements to their nationals to assist in increasing exports to Eastern European countries.

Extensive use of credit, credit guarantees and insurance facilities have without doubt been of substantial aid in maintaining a high level of trade. This is particularly true when considering major plant installations which run to many millions of dollars. Some of these major credit arrangements have been granted for ten years or more.

United States firms, on the other hand, are at a disadvantage in this respect, since U.S. credit facilities in support of trade to the Eastern European countries have been quite limited. Two principal obstacles to the extension of such credits have been the Johnson Act of 1934, and legislation which permits Export-Import Bank guarantees on private credit financing of exports of commercial products to communist countries only after a determination by the President that such action is in the national interest.

The Johnson Act provides that loans may not be extended to any government which is in default in its obligations to the United States. Since the Act is applicable to most of the Eastern European countries, it has been the principal obstacle.

Several years ago the rigid application of the Johnson Act was modified by the Attorney General. He ruled then that the Act did not prohibit extensions of credit within the normal range found in commercial sales of a like nature to other countries.

Nonetheless, even though most Eastern European countries enjoy good credit reputations, lending institutions have been slow to show interest in extending such credit unless the U.S. government would supply substantial guarantees or insurance of the private credit being extended.

Since the Johnson Act does not apply to the actions of the Eximbank, the focus of attention naturally shifted to the Eximbank's willingness and ability to guarantee commercial credits.

Recently the Eximbank has been authorized to guarantee appropriate short and medium term commercial credits on those products which are not restricted from export to Eastern European destinations.

These actions have enabled the U.S. exporter to become more competitive with other industrialized countries in obtaining orders from most Eastern European countries for those goods, services and technology which the Commerce Department is willing to approve for export. Notwithstanding the help that Eximbank can provide, it remains clear that the competitive advantage of the other industrialized nations, by way of medium and long term credit extension, remains a problem for U.S. exporters.

A note here about indirect credit assistance; the President recently announced that the Eximbank has been authorized to extend a multi-million dollar loan to an Italian bank for the purchases of U.S. goods destined for installation by Fiat in a Russian automotive plant. While the Administration action has met with mixed reactions, including severe criticism, there is good reason to expect that there will be future instances of the need of such supplemental financing—particularly in exceptionally large transactions—and there is hope that these requirements will be carefully considered in the light of their benefits to U.S. industry.

The conclusion to be drawn from this brief discussion of the credit situation is, of course, that government policy makers should take another look at our credit policies with a view—either through new legislation or through presently existing means—to making those policies more responsive to the needs of the American business community. Nor is this conclusion limited exclusively to improving trade with the Eastern European countries. Its application extends as well to the emerging nations of the world, where, because of lack of credit availability, a significant market is inaccessible to United States exporters.

Along with a liberalization of credit policies, there are other actions which we can take to improve the climate for increased world trade. In April of this year the National Export Expansion Council issued a penetrating report entitled "Trade and Investment in Developing Countries." The report made a series of far-reaching recommendations which are too numerous and detailed to examine in this short time. However, I would like to highlight several of the more important conclusions which the study group reached.

In calling for government actions which would bring about significant increases in the attention U.S. business pays to the Eastern European countries and the lesser developed world, the Action Committee of NEEC focused on those steps which would bring about substantial improvements in profit/risk ratios. Among other points, the recommendations called for:

1. Major new U.S. tax incentives for American firms doing business abroad;

2. Increased efforts to help developing countries increase their own export earnings, including consideration of preferential U.S. tariff arrangements;

3. Expansion, rationalization and improvement of existing government information, guarantee, loan and other supporting services for such business activities; and,

4. A shift in emphasis in government trade development programs to give more recognition to foreign investments and other methods of international business, rather than focusing so heavily on exports.

In a related report entitled "Export Promotion" the Action Committee of NEEC made still further recommendations, one of the more important of which was the enactment of legislation similar to the East-West Trade Relations Act of 1966. The Committee favors a nondiscriminatory tariff approach, or most favored nation treatment, and urged the removal of obstructions now blocking trade expansion in this area.

I subscribe to these recommendations. If you conclude—as I have—that an expanding trade picture with the communist oriented countries is in fact in our *national interest*, as well as that of U.S. industry, I urge you to join in the effort to achieve that end.

One final word before I conclude:

Going beyond the problems of increasing the two way import-export flow between the United States, Russia and the Eastern European countries is the question of possible direct United States investment in the Communist oriented countries. An unthinkable postulate a few years ago, the concept of direct investment today, based on economic history since the end of World War II, could be the next logical step to getting a stronger competitive position in these fast growing markets.

At first blush investment in the socialist countries where production facilities are state-owned and state-controlled appears to be basic economic contradiction. But is it really?

In recent years there has been a continuing shift away from the economic rigidities which were imposed by the Soviet Union. There is a marked tendency by most Eastern European countries toward a reassertion of their national identities. There is ample evidence that there has been a turning away from economic centralization to a greater use of the profit incentive.

Yugoslavia is the classic example. After its break with the Cominform in 1948, Yugoslavia embarked on a program of economic decentralization and allowed considerable autonomy to individual enterprises. The results are that today Yugoslavia enjoys full membership in the more important international economic institutions such as the World Bank, GATT and the International Monetary Fund.

Yugoslavia does not represent an isolated change. At the beginning of 1967 Czechoslovakia took steps to free itself from the Soviet economic prison of central planning and adopted a near-capitalistic credo which calls for an individual enterprise to be measured by profits arising from actual sales to customers.

In short, almost all of the Eastern European countries are working to overcome the clumsiness and inherent inefficiencies which come from over-centralized economic direction. With the exception of Russia, I suggest that it is possible that the Eastern European countries may well turn in the future to the free world for direct investment on some equitable basis just as they have for our products and technology. I also suggest that we be alert to any indications of this trend and be prepared to take advantage of them where they serve our interests.

There is much that is controversial in what we have discussed today. The sacrifices of the Viet Nam war lead many wise and sincere Americans to a very different view of our relations with Russia and Eastern Europe. I respect their wisdom and sincerity. But I firmly believe the strength of our free society is such that we can take these steps with confidence that our own national self-interest and the interests of world peace will be served best.

REFORMS ARE NECESSARY IN THE ELECTORAL PROCESS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bingham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last week the President sent to the Congress a major message on the political process which took a forthright approach to the realities of modern political campaigning and financing. The President pointed out that existing statutes dealing with election campaigning are more shadow than substance and really do not remedy the abuses which they were aimed at.

The details of campaign financing have long been deliberately obscured with resulting suspicion and cynicism on the part of much of the public. As the President noted:

> The heart of basic reform is full disclosure.

During the last Congress, I introduced a comprehensive bill to reform our election procedures and to require complete disclosure of all sources of income, gifts, and assets.

I think that the proposed Election Reform Act of 1967 with its requirement of full disclosure of every contribution, loan, and expense item over $100 for every candidate for Federal office, will go a long way toward clearing the fog from this subject and restoring public confidence in the electoral process. Moreover the new ceiling of $5,000 which any individual, or his wife or minor children, can contribute to any one candidate will close some of the loopholes in existing law which have been grossly abused.

An outstanding example of legislation which has failed to correct the abuses for which it was designed is the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act passed more than 20 years ago. The act was designed to require lobbyists to register with the Federal Government. Some of the most influential and best financed groups have avoided registration by means of the loophole in this law known as the "principal purpose test," under which only those whose principal purpose is the influencing of passage or defeat of legislation must register. The President has supported S. 355 which has already passed the Senate and which recognizes the need for closing this loophole to protect the public interest by providing for registration by any individual or group which has as a substantial purpose the influencing of legislative action.

The President's proposed legislation also recognizes the irony of the existing situation in this country where—in a time when the right to vote has been secured for all citizens through Federal legislation—the increased mobility of our citizens has disenfranchised millions of otherwise eligible voters due to the varying State residence requirements. Any local interest in such requirements would seem to be far outweighed by the national interest in having all eligible voters cast their ballots for President and Vice President.

I have mentioned only a few of the far-reaching reform measures proposed by the President, but these areas seem to me to be indicative of the entire tenor of the election reform proposals, which seek to cope with present realities in the field of political campaigning and financing with realistic and effective legislative solutions.

ORGANIZED LABOR RESPONDS TO CHANGE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bingham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Gus Tyler, assistant president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, made some interesting observations about the labor movement the other day which I believe should be called to the attention of all my colleagues.

Mr. Tyler, a most thoughtful observer of the trade union situation, has written a book called "The Labor Revolution." He was interviewed about it on the AFL-CIO public service radio program, "Labor News Conference," on the Mutual Broadcasting System. He predicted a surge of union organization among white collar, government, service trades, and professional workers that will greatly increase the membership and affect the character of the labor movement.

So that we may all know what Mr. Tyler said, Mr. Speaker, I am including the transcript of the program with my remarks at this point in the Record.

"Labor News Conference," May 16, 1967

Subject: "Organized Labor Responds to Change."

Guest: Gus Tyler, assistant president, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, AFL–CIO.

Panel: Stanley Levey, labor correspondent, Scripps-Howard Newspapers, Alan Adams, Washington correspondent, Business Week Magazine.

Moderator: Harry W. Flannery.

Flannery. "Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of "Labor News Conference," a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL–CIO. "Labor News Conference" brings together leading AFL–CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Gus Tyler, assistant president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, AFL–CIO, author of "The Labor Revolution," the recently-published analysis of the development of trade unions in the United States and their future in an ever-changing world.

Throughout its history, organized labor in America has been evaluated, criticized and often attacked from all areas of social, economic and political life in this country. Here to question Mr. Tyler about the conclusions he comes to in his book are Stanley Levey, labor correspondent for the Scripps-Howard Newspapers, and Alan Adams, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine. Your moderator, Harry W. Flannery.

And now, Mr. Adams, I believe you have the first question?

Adams. Mr. Tyler, in your book, you describe how labor has undergone two revolutions and now is in the stages of a third. Will you explain to us what you mean by that? What is a "labor revolution?"

Tyler. It is a quiet revolution, like the others have been—so don't expect any mass panics or riots in the streets. But the revolution is significant in terms of economic and political impact.

The first great revolution was the breakthrough about 1900, when the American Federation of Labor really took on size, and strength and meaning in the United States. This was the organization of workers in craft unions—mainly skilled.

The second quiet revolution took place in the mid-1930's, when the industrial workers in the United States were organized, first by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and then by the AFL unions. That just about doubled the size of the trade union movement in the United States and once more changed both the character and political impact of American trade unionism.

We are now, it seems to me, on the threshold of a new kind of quiet revolution in the United States, in which we will see the organization of an entirely new sector of the American labor force that is now the dominant sector in American labor. It too, will change the size of American labor—I expect it may well double, as a percentage the labor force in the United States. It will also change the character of the American trade union movement.

And finally, it will increase the political impact of American trade unionism on the American scene.

Levey. Mr. Tyler, I gather from what you have been saying and from reading your book, that you would agree with Mark Twain that the reports of the death of the American labor movement are grossly exaggerated.

Tyler. You are quite right, Mr. Levey. I don't write unless I am angry, because I have other things to do. But so many people were writing about the death of American labor that I thought somebody ought to indicate that the obituary notices were unfounded and exaggerated.

It was a general thought that as automation moved into the American scene, the labor force itself would become obsolete, and, of necessity, since there wouldn't be working men, therefore, there wouldn't be organizations of working people. I read one piece after another that said there would be no trade unionism—or, if there is trade unionism, it will have no significant impact and certainly no political importance in the United States.

Upon examination of the facts—and I live with this thing from day to day—quite the reverse has been happening. Automation has not wiped out the American labor force—we now have more people in the American labor force every single year. Nor has automation, by itself, caused mass unemployment. We are rather low in unemployment in the United States—the lowest in 13 years. This is due to the fact that social measures have been taken—many of them at the spur of the American trade unions—that have created a demand in the United States to offset the impact of automation.

So we do have a labor force. It is being organized. But, another thing was happening in the midst of this. Blue collar workers were becoming a smaller part of the total labor force. The white collar and service workers were becoming an ever larger part of the labor force. Since the traditional trade union movement in the United States is based on the blue collar worker, that traditional section was not growing at the usual rate. In some sectors, it was actually falling back. So it was at a standstill.

What these observers and commentators failed to see was this new huge factor coming up in the American labor force—the factor that can be defined as the people engaged in service trades—in white collar, government employment and professional work.

They are now the majority. And they are just beginning to organize. As they organize, a new kind of vitality must inevitably be imparted to the total labor movement, and we are seeing this in progress now—at least for the last two years. I think it is picking up momentum, and by the end of the 1960's, we will see a kind of revolution in the American trade union movement that is the equivalent of the revolution in the CIO in the mid-1930's, and of the AFL in the 1900's.

ADAMS. What you are saying, Mr. Tyler, rather, what the critics are saying, is that the labor movement, in balance, is not growing as a percentage of the work force. Now I think that is probably true today. Your projection of a revolution is that it is coming—it is not here. Indeed, is it even starting, would you say?

TYLER. I am moving over 25 years—that was the framework of reference that I took for the book—and I would not say that it is going to happen if I had no factual evidence.

I could proceed from theory alone and say that if the craftsmen organized, and the semi-skilled and unskilled workers organized, why shouldn't the white collar, professional and governmental employee organize? That would be a theoretical statement, and I think there is validity to that kind of theoretical approach.

But we also have evidence at the present time. Four years ago, the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, appeared to be just a talkie-talkie little sect that would never go any place—and might be lucky if it survived. Within the last four years, two major developments have taken place in the educational world. The American Federation of Teachers, at the present time, counts some 140,000 members—it has more than doubled its membership in a very small span of time. In terms of rate of growth, this is really the parallel of the old CIO.

But more than that, in a very recent election in the District of Columbia, the American Federation of Teachers went in and challenged the National Education Association—the traditional nonunion representative of teachers in the United States—on the NEA's home base and won, rather overwhelmingly.

There is also a parallel development that is equally significant. If you look at the American Federation of Teachers, you can actually see the growth and you can count the growth—by numbers. But the union idea has caught on far beyond the boundaries of the American Federation of Teachers. The National Education Association has looked upon itself, traditionally, not only as non-union, but, if you please, as anti-union—a professional association that would not act like a union. But once an idea begins to spread, it becomes infectious—in the same way that company unions in the early days of the CIO switched over, broke away from the companies and became legitimate unions.

So the NEA today is entering elections and asking to be certified as a bargaining agent—which makes them a union. They are entering into collective negotiations and signing contracts—which makes them a union. They are calling for boycotts of school systems. They strike—but they don't call a strike a strike, they call a strike a sanction. The difference is that they refuse to strike during the life of an agreement. They do as the miners used to do—no contract, no work.

So this union idea has penetrated the entire teaching community. And, in effect, insofar as I can see, if you just forget about labels and semantic snobbery, in effect, you have more than 1¼ million teachers in the United States who are involved in collective bargaining through certified agencies.

LEVEY. Mr. Tyler, why are these people who traditionally shunned the unions—people like teachers, librarians, welfare workers, city doctors and architects, nurses and all that group of public employees—why are they, who have traditionally cast their lot not with the unions, but with the professionals—why are they joining unions?

TYLER. Well, let me take a simple case. Take the case of the little teacher who ran a school, and it was one class. She was teacher, mother, principal—in effect, the school system, and looked upon this as her property.

Time has now gone by. America has become urbanized. And at the top of the heap stands the school board. It is really the ultimate boss, in a sense, and is political—not involved with the teaching process.

Then you have the school managers—the managerial level of principals, superintendents and the rest. By the time you get down to the teacher, the teacher feels that he or she, today, is an employee.

You can no longer make the appeal—"but you are the school system." The teacher says, "No, I am not the school system." That's point number one.

Point number two. Our society has become remarkably affluent. The teacher looks around and says, "I have been sitting on my professionalism, surrendering money income and gathering psychic income—and here is this person around the school who is a maintenance man, who has not been gathering psychic income, but is making more money than I am—I had better look into this." And so the teacher says, "I think maybe the union does make a difference."

Now I use teachers only as an example. But actually, you can take the total society and extend that concept. People who looked upon themselves as part of the managerial group do not, at the present time. The white collar person who came into a plant where they ran many computers said, "Well, this is something new and I am somebody important." Now you go into one of these large buildings and there is no real difference between one of these women sitting there punching cards and running monotonously through some kind of process—there is no difference between that kind of white collar worker and one of the members of my union who is sitting at a sewing machine. They say, "I am a worker and I belong to a union." There is this problem of semantic snobbery, but it is gradually being broken down. There has been a great move to break down that semantic snobbery. The press has missed on this story, terribly. Since we have two very able reporters here, may I just turn loose on it.

There is a new organization—a council of the AFL-CIO, called "SPACE." Labor has now entered the "space age." SPACE stands for the Council of Scientific, Professional and Cultural Employees. This is, in effect, your new CIO, for the 1960's and 1970's.

LEVEY. I am glad you raised that point, Mr. Tyler, because that leads into the next question I want to ask you. And that is, are the existing labor organizations—the traditional unions—competent to deal with this revolution you are talking about, and what are they doing to fit themselves to deal with it? Incidentally, by the traditional labor organizations, I would mean the AFL-CIO as well.

TYLER. Mr. Levey, the answer is yes and no. Some of the unions have thus far already proven their competence, and far more, regrettably, than they are willing to admit. Let me take a typical blue collar union, the United Automobile Workers, AFL-CIO. At the 1962 convention of the UAW, a council of delegates got together and said, "We want to have a separate section of the United Automobile Workers known as 'TOP.'" "TOP" stands for Technical, Office and Professional Employees. There was some hesitancy about creating this new kind of highly professionalized and skilled craft council inside the UAW. But finally, it was granted. I became curious about it and discovered that when the charter was granted to this council, they counted—in 1962—50,000 members. Now, we think of UAW as blue collar. But there were at least 50,000—and they have grown since then—I don't know what the number is, but my guess is that some 75,000 members of the United Automobile Workers are not blue collar workers at all—they are technical, office and professional.

Take the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO. They have affiliated with SPACE. Now, we think of electrical workers as electrical workers—somebody who is handling wires or digging holes in walls and the rest of it. Well, they have signed up with 25,000 of their members. And without pointing a finger at a fellow trade union, I would think they are cheating SPACE out of some dues, because they probably have three or four times that number of people who are technicians—highly skilled programmers of electrical machines, and mechanics on these machines, and designers and supervisors of these machines, and men who work for cities and counties—and office workers. But they are all in the Electrical Workers union. So, many, many of the unions have already organized these people.

But take the other unions that don't come out of the blue collar area. Take the Musicians—the American Federation of Musicians, AFL-CIO. Their membership has grown and it is growing constantly.

The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO. They are leaping ahead.

The American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO. The last time I spoke to them, they were adding 5,000 members per month—AFGE.

And the American Federation of Teachers is another.

But you are quite right. I believe one of the reasons that we always find trade unionism lagging behind the appearance of some sizeable economic group in society, is that it is very, very difficult, normally, to organize any group in society from the outside. Mass organization, in the final analysis, has to develop its own leadership from the inside.

This was true of the AFL in 1900 and 1904. It was true of the CIO, which developed some two decades after the industrial worker was already a majority of the labor force in the United States. It's true of this new group. It takes time to develop an awareness of your own importance—of what you can accomplish through organization—and it takes time to develop your own leadership.

And, if it's true that the leadership has to come from within to be effective for mass organization, then one understands the inevitability of delay in organization. I do not believe that these new sectors like the nurses can be organized like automobile workers or by electricians. The nurses are going to organize the nurses. They have a Nurses Association—tens of thousands of members in the Nurses Association. And now the nurses have begun to move. At their last constitutional convention, they dropped the ban on strikes and picketing. The Wall Street Journal, if I may mention it, commented that "Florence Nightingale is now beginning to talk like Samuel Gompers."

ADAMS. Mr. Tyler, the thesis of your book, The Labor Revolution, as I understand it, is that the existing labor movement can carry on this revolution. But at the same time, you say really two other things: one, that there is a need for new leadership among labor;

and two, that the labor movement really doesn't yet have its own philosophy. Now I was curious on that point. You say that the critics have expressed a philosophy for labor, indeed, in denying that labor is achieving its proper goals, but the labor movement itself—does it not have a philosophy on which it can base its new program?

Tyler. The American trade unions really do not have a written philosophy. I tried to write a philosophy for the American trade unions in a little publication for the Fund for the Republic, but that is my philosophy. The American trade unions don't begin with a philosophy. The American trade unions begin the way most Americans begin. They are terribly pragmatic people—Americans are—and American trade unions are terribly pragmatic. That does not mean that they do not have a kind of philosophy.

Selig Perlman, who was a thinking man, a professor of economics at Wisconsin. I remember, some 15 years ago, becoming involved with him in this kind of a conversation and Selig Perlman said, "Gus, of course, American trade unions have a philosophy. The fact that nobody figured out the philosophy doesn't mean it isn't there." He said, "Now take a primitive people who speak a language. These primitive people know nothing about grammar, but that doesn't mean that their language does not have a grammar."

So you have to derive the philosophy of the American trade unions from the behavior of the American trade unions.

And fundamentally, the philosophy is Samuel Gomper's philosophy of "more," which is also the philosophy of the American people. We begin with an assumption that it must be dynamic in our lives—that tomorrow will be better than today—and you go about that pragmatically. You try to act as individuals in voluntary groups of a nongovernmental character. And subsequently you discover that a great deal can be accomplished through governmental action, so you enter into politics.

Now, in connection with that, you raise another point. That is the problem of changing trade union leadership. The leadership of the trade union movement will change. It has to change. First of all, life is not eternal. Secondly, the American trade union movement is changing in character. The leadership of the AFL–CIO in the year of 1967, is not the same as the leadership of the American Federation of Labor was in 1937.

But there was this difference between the relationship of the AFL–CIO to the coming labor movement and the relationship of the AFL to the CIO. The AFL leadership of the 1930's resisted the organization of workers into industrial unions. And they said if anybody begins to make a move in that direction we are going to block it. Finally there were suspensions and expulsions.

Now we have SPACE that is organized—this new council. And the AFL–CIO is not behaving as the old AFL did. It says, "Fine. If you organize, you are accepted, and we give you our blessing, and we give you aid—go ahead and add these new contingents."

Now, as these new contingents come in, it means that the whole mix inside the American labor movement will change, and as the mix changes at the bottom, the mix changes at the top, and you obviously change the personality of the organization, since it reflects a new constituency at the bottom.

There is a third factor that I feel one has to add, although I only touch on it lightly in the book. There is a generational change that is taking place in American society at the present time. I wasn't fully aware, when I wrote the book, of how great that generational change is, although I do speak about the growing youth contingent that is coming into the labor force and into the trade union movement. But the UAW recently told me of developments. Within the last three years, they lost 200,000 retirees. Within the same three years, they picked up 547,000 new members—42 percent of the members of the Auto Workers Union are only members for three years. When you look at that new membership, you will find a large contingent that is under the age of 21. Now this means that the trade unions are no more immune to the impact of this vast horde of youth moving into our society—than is the campus and American politics.

Levey. Mr. Tyler, what leader of American labor bespeaks this new revolution best? Is it George Meany? Is it Joe Beirne? Is it Walter Reuther? Is it Roy Siemiller? Who is it?

Tyler. You will find at the end of Chapter I, a very long and erudite paragraph, Mr. Levey, that I wrote on this particular subject in which I said the rather remarkable thing about American trade unionism is that at no point in its history was its philosophy really shaped by a person. There were individuals who came along and expressed ideas.

The American trade union movement is like a woman at a shopping counter who has remarkable and discreet taste. The American trade union movement listened to this leader, and this ism, and that ism, and the other leader, and picked, and chose—and finally came out with its own sort of eclectic philosophy. If you ask me who, at this moment, bespeaks the philosophy, not only of the past AFL and the CIO, which is the more current past—but also of the future, namely, when these new contingents come in--I do not know. If I knew I would have said in the book.

Adams. In your book, Mr. Tyler, you raise the point, I think, that labor's future, and the future of this revolution, lie in the political arena—that labor will become more and more deeply involved in politics. Do you mean they will do less collective bargaining—less of the traditional labor role?

Tyler. No. I have two distinct chapters, one, I think, is called the Resurgence of Collective Bargaining, in which I point up why trade unions will do even more collective bargaining. One of the reasons for this is the following: A, that the reorganization of the work process attendant upon the coming in of new methods of production, rescrambles the plans, and therefore, you have to rethink your contracts, almost from scratch.

Secondly, the movement of the public employee creates a whole new sector of collective bargaining and therefore, that is inevitable. But parallel with that, I see added political impact. And for these reasons, your public employee is terribly articulate. And your white collar person in the United States is more likely to vote than your blue collar person. This is traditionally so and will continue to be so. Therefore, the addition of this legion is an additional legion of active voters. The employer, for the public employee, is the government. Therefore, one of the great weapons of the public employee is not simply the union, but also the vote, because in that way he can pick the employer, by election, with whom he will then carry on his collective bargaining.

Levey. Mr. Tyler, is the American Negro going to buy the labor revolution, or is he going to regard labor as just another phase of the establishment?

Tyler. I think the American Negroes who are members of the American trade unions will unquestionably buy it. And from what I have seen of elections in the United States where Negroes are employees, they have been voting overwhelmingly for trade unions.

Flannery. Thank you, gentlemen. Today's Labor News Conference guest was Gus Tyler, assistant president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, AFL–CIO, author of "The Labor Revolution," published by Viking Press. Representing the press were Alan Adams, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine, and Stanley Levey, labor correspondent for the Scripps-Howard Newspapers. This is your moderator, Harry W. Flannery, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL–CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Radio Network.

THE APPROPRIATIONS BUSINESS, 90TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include tables and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, including the reported version of the agriculture bill scheduled for floor consideration in the House tomorrow, the House has considered at this session budget requests for appropriations of about $55,304,000,000 in connection with bills for both fiscal years 1967 and 1968. Including the agriculture bill as reported from committee, these requests for appropriations have been reduced by $1,750,000,000.

The $55.3 billion of requests represents about one-third of the total appropriations which it is now tentatively indicated will be submitted. It is of course subject to change as circumstances may demand, but it is now indicated that Congress will be asked to appropriate, at this session, largely for fiscal years 1967 and 1968, something on the order of $163,000,000,000, more or less, for administrative budget purposes, counting roughly $15.2 billion of so-called permanent appropriations such as interest on the debt that must be reckoned in the totals even though such appropriations do not come before us for a vote in the annual bills.

In other words, roughly $93 billion in requests are still pending in the Committee on Appropriations: $71,584,000,000 of that relates to the main defense bill scheduled to be taken up on the House floor next week; $4,867,000,000 pertains to the public works bill; $2,937,000,000 is involved in military construction projects. A total of $3,818,000,000 applies to the foreign assistance bill; $1,718,000,000 relates to the transportation appropriation bill. And perhaps 7 to 8 billions of dollars—it is too early to be too precise—would relate to the customary closing supplemental bill including NASA, the anti-poverty program, and several other items that have had to be deferred for lack of the necessary legislative authorizations.

The Senate has adopted four appropriation bills this year—the two supplementals for 1967 and two regular bills for 1968, involving $23.6 billions in requests for appropriations. They made net reductions of $195 million in those requests. The two bills for 1968 are awaiting conference action.

Mr. Speaker, thus far this session there has been no significant impact on the outgo side of the budget in actions on legislative authorization bills outside the appropriations process.

I include a supporting summary table on the appropriation bills of the session:

Summary of action on budget estimates of "appropriations" in appropriation bills, 90th Cong., 1st sess., as of June 5, 1967

[Does not include any "back door" type appropriations, or permanent appropriations[1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

	Budget estimates considered by House	Passed House	Budget estimates considered by Senate	Passed Senate	Enacted	(+) or (−), latest action compared to budget
Bills for fiscal 1968:						
Treasury-Post Office	$7,613,787,000	$7,499,230,000	$7,615,148,000	$7,555 167,000		−$59,981,000
District of Columbia:						
Federal payments	63,499,000	59,499,000				−4,000,000
Federal loan appropriation	49,600,000	48,100,000				−1,500,000
Interior	1,443,793,000	1,365,310,150	1,458,218,000	1,399,359,550		−58,858,450
Loan and contract authorizations	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)		(−14,500,000)
Independent offices-HUD	[2] [3] 10,804,642,700	[2] [3] 10,013,178,782				−791,463,918
Contract authorization	(40,000,000)					(−40,000,000)
Labor-HEW	[3] 13,322,603,000	[3] 13,137,488,000				−185,115,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	[3] 2,342,942,000	[3] 2,194,026,500				−148,915,500
Legislative	231,311,132	228,089,952				−3,221,180
Agriculture	[3] 5,021,097,400	[3] [4] 4,770,580,950				[4] −250,516,450
Loan authorization	(859,600,000)	[4] (859,600,000)				
Defense	[5] (71,584,000,000)					
Public works	[5] (4,867,813,000)					
Military construction	[5] (2,937,000,000)					
Foreign assistance	[5] (3,818,736,000)					
Transportation	[5] (1,718,618,772)					
Supplemental (NASA, poverty, other deferred items; usual supplementals)	([5] [6])					
Subtotal, 1968 bills	40,893,275,232	39,315,503,334	9,073,366,000	8,954,526,550		−1,503,571,498
Supplementals for fiscal 1967:						
Defense supplemental (Vietnam)	12,275,870,000	12,196,520,000	12,275,870,000	12,196,520,000	$12,196,520,000	−79,350,000
2d supplemental	2,134,932,833	2,041,826,133	2,257,604,652	2,260,246,933	2,197,931,417	−59,673,235
Subtotal, 1967 bills	14,410,802,833	14,238,346,133	14,533,474,652	14,456,766,933	14,394,451,417	−139,023,235
Cumulative "appropriation" totals for the session:						
House	55,304,078,065	53,553,849,467				−1,750,228,598
Senate			23,606,840,652	23,411,293,483		−195,547,169
Enacted			14,533,474,652		14,394,451,417	−139,023,235

---

[1] Permanent "appropriations" were tentatively estimated in January budget at about $15,212,066,000 for fiscal year 1968. (All forms of permanent "new obligational authority" for 1968 were tentatively estimated in the January budget at $17,452,899,000.)

[2] Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for urban renewal and mass transit grants (budget, $980,000,000; House bill, $925,000,000).

[3] And participation sales authorizations as follows: Independent offices-HUD, $3,235,000,000 in budget estimates and $881,000,000 in House bill; Labor-HEW, $115,000,000 in budget estimates and House bill; State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary, $150,000,000 in budget estimates and House bill; Agriculture, $800,000,000 in budget estimates and House bill as reported. Total authorizations requested in budget, $4,300,000,000; total in House bills or in bills as reported, $1,946,000,000.

[4] As reported from committee.

[5] These are the amounts presently pending consideration in the committee.

[6] Several billions.

REMARKS ON H.R. 9682

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 9682 which would increase the maximum amounts which member banks may lend to their executive officers and which Federal credit unions may lend to their directors and members of their supervisors and credit committees.

I think it is particularly important that we take note here of amendments adopted in the Banking and Currency Committee—some of which I proposed—and which impose important restrictions.

H.R. 9682 as reported provides that any loan made under its provisions to a member bank officer must be accompanied by a detailed current financial statement to the bank which shall include any obligations for which the officer is personally liable—not only the officer's own obligations but obligations entered into by him as a comaker or guarantor. The same provision is contained in section 2 of H.R. 9682 which is applicable to officers or directors of Federal credit unions.

Similarly all loans to bank officers must be reported to the board of directors of the bank and each bank must include in its report of condition a statement of all loans made under the act.

If an executive officer of a bank borrows from other banks in an amount in excess of what he would be permitted to borrow from his own bank he must report this borrowing to his board of directors and if he has loans outstanding at his bank they shall be subject to call.

Similar safeguards in section 2 with respect to Federal credit unions requires that only 20 percent of credit unions' unimpaired capital and surplus can be outstanding at any one time in the form of loans to directors and members of the supervisory and credit committee despite the $5,000 limitation. It is the committee's position, as stated in the report and with which I fully concur, that it is the responsibility of the board of directors of each Federal credit union to make certain that a few officer-borrowers do not use for themselves the 20 percent permitted to all officers.

The committee considered, at my suggestion, that the bill be amended to protect the member bank or Federal credit unions from officer self-dealing when the possibility of liquidation of the financial institution arose. In lieu of any amendment the committee decided that proper supervision of the institutions by their respective regulatory agencies would be sufficient to prevent officers and committee members of Federal credit unions from profiting by advance knowledge of possible liquidation proceedings. We would like to make it crystal clear at this point that we expect the most careful and thorough supervision of such activities by the supervisory authorities.

The reporting procedures and other safeguards against self-dealing contained in H.R. 9682 will only be as effective as these agencies make them. If they do not do the job then we will have to write more specific prohibitions into the law.

I am pleased to join with my colleagues of the Committee on Banking and Currency in support of the committee amendment to H.R. 9682 which will give Federal credit unions the right to make deposits in mutual savings banks, provided the accounts of such institutions are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

I must confess that I was rather surprised by the recent ruling of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions requiring Federal credit unions to withdraw deposits which they might have in out-of-State mutual savings banks, even though such banks were federally insured.

The law permits Federal credit unions to make deposits in national banks, wherever located, and in savings and loan associations whose accounts are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

It was not intended that the law should exclude federally insured mutual savings banks as depositories for Federal credit unions. The purpose of the present amendment is to permit these credit unions to carry accounts in insured mutual savings banks.

The amendment is a simple one and I urge the House to adopt it. There can be no good reason for opposing it and it will eliminate an unintended discrimination in the law.

MR. OTTO CANDIES

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most enterprising and energetic businessmen in my district is Mr. Otto Candies of Des Allemands, St. Charles Parish, La.

In the past 30 years, Otto Candies has built a fledgling one-boat transport business in the bayous of St. Charles and Jefferson Parishes into a terrific $8 million a year transportation service, particularly for the oil companies operating in the Gulf of Mexico. One of the principal benefactors of this splendid transportation service by way of Candies' fleet of barges, inland tugs, and other boats is the Humble Oil & Refining Co. which gave Mr. Candies his first regular job to transport equipment and supplies for the company.

Through energy, enterprise, hard work, and intelligence, Otto Candies developed this transport service to the point that today he and his able sons direct the operations of a fleet of more than 100 boats. These vessels carry equipment and supplies from New Orleans and nearby communities to the many offshore oil rigs which lie many miles out in the Gulf. Mr. Candies' company is rendering an invaluable service to Humble and other oil companies in my State, and I am proud to salute him for the extensive contribution he is making to the economic growth and prosperity of south Louisiana.

Another significant factor about Mr. Candies' flourishing business is that it is an example, as the Humble company editors wrote in an enlightening article in the 1967 first quarter issue of the Humble Way, "of small businessmen with uncommon enterprise who have used their talents profitably to support some phase of the petroleum industry." This is the kind of quality which forged the United States into the great Nation it is today, and Otto Candies can be proud of the good works he has done, not only for his State, but for his country.

I am happy to commend to my fellow colleagues this article on Mr. Candies which was featured in the Humble Way, published by the Humble Oil & Refining Co. in Houston, Tex. The article follows:

OIL HELPS SMALL BUSINESS

No one thinks of Otto Candies as an oil man. Rather, he is considered a marine transportation specialist.

Yet, in many ways this soft-spoken native of the Louisiana bayou country is typical of thousands of small, independent U.S. business men who attained success because they had courage and foresight and were able to supply needed services to the oil industry in their town or area.

From his offices in Des Allemands, Louisiana, 30 miles west of New Orleans, Captain Candies oversees the operation of a fleet of more than 100 work boats. Some are leased but most are owned. His red and white vessels, as modern and powerful as any in the world, range the Gulf as far as Mexico. Most of the fleet, however, sails out of Grande Isle, Louisiana, supplying the offshore operations of Humble and other oil companies with marine power and transportation.

Candies managed vessels carry men and supplies—drilling equipment, pipe, mud, cable, and drill bits, and staples, food, water, and fuel—seaward in the wake of the Gulf's leap frogging oil production.

Powerful tugs with overlayed "O C" stack markings frequently move the towering mobile drilling rigs to Gulf locations. And other, smaller, red and white Candies vessels perform similar services for companies active in the continuing search for, and production of, crude oil and natural gas in the bayou backwaters of South Louisiana.

In all, the fleet operated by Captain Candies represents an investment of $7 million. He expects his firm to gross $8 million in 1966.

Thirty years ago, both Otto Candies and the sleepy fishing village of Des Allemands seemed to lack the necessary resources for such heady business success. The community had sprouted along the banks of one of Louisiana's interminable bayous. There was some agricultural activity in the area, sugar cane and corn, and most of the able-bodied men worked in the fields, when work was available, or hunted and fished for a living.

Like most local boys of 14 or 15, Otto Candies, after finishing the seven grades of schooling locally available, found his first job in the nearby cane and corn fields. After several years of such employment he married and established a household on the bayou, literally within a stone's throw of the family home. Up to this point he was much like every other bayou country youth: He spoke the sometimes awkwardly phrased but very expressive English common to South Louisiana; the farthest reaches of his world seemed to be the thick moss-draped oaks to the north and the cypress-dotted marshes to the south; and he demonstrated a consuming passion for duck hunting.

But close acquaintances of young Candies early detected personal traits which set him apart from his peers: an unerring sense of orderliness, and a flair for accepting challenges.

By the late 1930's, a number of companies began to search in earnest for oil in South Louisiana. This new activity, destined to bring lasting changes to the economy of the area and create undreamed of opportunities for a generation of farmers and fishermen, stirred an irresistible personal challenge in young Candies.

Learning that a small exploration company planned to drill a shallow wildcat well on the bayou, the enterprising youth took what he still looks back on as "a desperate chance." He arranged to transport men and supplies to the wellsite by boat. And, on the strength of a verbal contract, he managed to borrow $500—a significant feat of salesmanship, considering the times and his as yet unproven ability. Candies became a captain; he bought an aged, leak prone 30-foot boat powered by an engine salvaged from a wrecked automobile.

The boat operator's first job lasted less than a week. Captain Candies and his unimaginatively named "V–8" were laid off when drilling was completed.

"About then I heard that a contractor was digging a canal nearby that would serve as a 'road' to a wellsite picked by another oil company," Captain Candies recalls. He talked to the foreman on the job and agreed to keep the canal clear of water lilies until the oil company was ready to use it. But the contractor was cautious; he was willing to pay for performance only.

"So I told him, 'Don't pay me anything now. Come back when you're ready. If the canal's clear, I want my money; if it's not, you don't owe me a thing'.

"That's the way we left it. He came back 83 days later, looked at the canal, and wrote me out a check. Better yet, he recommended me to the oil company, Humble, and my boat and I were hired for $12.50 a day plus fuel, oil, and rope," Captain Candies says.

Following a long succession of assignments, by the early 1950's, Captain Candies was the owner-operator of a small fleet of inland tugs, crew boats and barges.

"My equipment was all paid for. I owned my home, and I was making a good living," he says. "But changes seemed to be in the wind because several companies were already drilling in the Gulf. I felt certain that there would be a big move to offshore operations and that my business was fast approaching a crossroads: I could stay smaller or I could gather the equipment I would need to operate out in the Gulf."

Two months of continuous discussions with his wife and his two older sons, all three of whom are parties to most major decisions, ended with an agreement to accept the new challenge. Captain Candies borrowed heavily against his holdings and sent the oldest son out in search of four big tugs for the firm, an investment of about $2 million. It was a big step for a businessman who had been refused a $2,000 loan not many years earlier. Moreover, it was yet another "desperate chance." None of the oil companies had announced plans to extend their operations out farther offshore.

The move proved to be well timed. When the new boats were delivered, there *was* work for them. A number of companies had moved offshore and the Des Allemands firm was almost alone in its ability to provide the equipment and service sorely needed by the industry.

Major offshore finds over the past decade brought on increased activity so that now more than 90 drilling rigs are in operation off Louisiana. As a whole, the oil industry is currently spending $1 million a day searching for and developing oil production in the area. And, during the past 15 years the industry has invested more than $5 billion in offshore Louisiana waters.

The Candies firm grew proportionately with this development. In marked contrast with the leaking "V–8," today's fleet is made up of steel vessels such as the 160-foot supply boat "Agnes Candies," and the "Ben Candies," a 132-foot sea-going tug, one of the most powerful vessels of its kind operating in the Gulf.

Captain Candies credits his 177 employees with making significant contributions to his continuing success. Most of them are natives of the area and share a common heritage with the captain. They all learned their basic seamanship piloting pirogues on the bayous. And once hired, few ever leave Candies. He is both an understanding and a demanding taskmaster. His boats must be perfectly maintained, ("If I go aboard and find a dirty galley or unmade bunks, it makes me *real* mad," he says,) and ready to work at a moment's notice. By contrast, the captain often makes personal loans to employees faced with an emergency.

The two Candies sons, Otto, Jr., 28, and Paul, 26, are gradually assuming management of the firm. The Captain, now in his mid–50s, is devoting increasing amounts of time to other interests: as a director of two banks (one of which, ironically, once turned him down on a $2,000 loan); as a member of the state highway commission, and the Mississippi River Bridge Authority. Captain Candies is also a trustee of Nicholls State College, at Thibodaux, and, along with his wife, is active in a host of church-related and civic pursuits.

While the degree of Captain Candies' success is unusual, it's far from unprecedented.

There are outstanding examples all across the country of small businessmen with uncommon enterprise who have used their talents profitably to support some phase of the petroleum industry.

The Arrow Transportation Company, in Portland, Oregon, for example, traces its origins back to the 1920's. Following a change in management in the mid-1940's, Arrow began to specialize as a transporter of petroleum products in the Pacific Northwest. Under the direction of James M. Cutler, Arrow has become one of the nation's largest operators of over-the-road petroleum transports. More than 100 units service customers out of Arrow terminals in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

On the broad plains of West Texas, George Bentley of Monahans, has built a thriving business with the aid of bulldozers and a handful of skilled employees. The Bentley firm prepares wellsites, clears land, digs disposal pits and grades roads for companies searching for oil.

Another example, the family firm, Buckley Powder Company, formerly of Silver Plume, Colorado, adjusted its pace to the times by re-tailoring its activities to serve the petroleum industry. J. D. Buckley and his sons once were the principal source of explosives for hard rock mining in the Rocky Mountains. Faced with a declining market, the firm began to stock and sell the especially compounded explosives and other materials needed by seismic crews working for petroleum companies. The firm later moved its headquarters to Denver to better serve its oilman customers.

It would be impossible to develop an all-inclusive list of such oilmen-once-removed, small business men who have found opportunity to expand established businesses by serving one or more oil companies. Nor is there any systematic way to count the other thousands who, under the happy influence of time, place, and circumstance, have found it possible to carve significant places for themselves in the business world by supplying needed equipment or services to the petroleum industry.

The Otto Candieses, the J. M. Cutlers, the J. D. Buckleys, and the George Bentleys are legion.

ARAB-ISRAEL CRISIS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Murphy] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, when Secretary General Thant removed the United Nations Emergency Force—UNEF—from the Middle East 2 weeks ago, I predicted that the result of such action would be the beginning of a hot war. This morning that hot war began.

For 10 years the U.N. force had been, in Mr. Thant's own words, "an important factor in maintaining relative quiet in the area of its deployment." By occupying the sensitive Gaza/Sinai area it had established a buffer zone and had prevented armed conflict between Israel and Egypt.

The day after the U.N. force was removed, the Arab troops moved in to fill the vacuum. They began to take over the U.N. installations and guard posts on the Israel border. In less than a week Egypt had moved more than a division of troops into the area. Israel also moved troops into the area to protect her border. And now the war is raging.

This war threatens the peace of the entire world. It is being fought by nations armed with modern weapons capable of inflicting enormous destruction; its result will be catastrophic for the entire Middle East. Even more serious, it may eventually involve the entire world, for there are few nations not tied to the Middle East in some way. There is a very real danger of involvement of other powers in a much larger war.

For this reason, it must be stopped now by collective action on the part of all nations. All nations must realize their responsibility, and they must realize that there can be no neutrality when the only alternatives are war or peace. Failure to act will mean a larger and more destructive war, in which all nations will suffer.

The United Nations is the only existing means for such collective action. The very reason for its existence, as stated in its Charter, is "to maintain international peace and security—to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breeches of the peace.

Therefore, if the United Nations is to live up to its responsibility, it must return its peacekeeping forces to the Middle East. Failure to do so will not only further weaken its own effectiveness, but it may result in a wider and more violent conflict.

I urge all Members to join with me in calling for the return of the U.N. peacekeeping forces to the Middle East, and I urge all of the nations of the world to join together to secure peace in that area.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1967, it was necessary for me to leave the floor of the House of Representatives in order to catch an oversea flight to undertake an assignment for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

For this reason, I was not present when the vote was recorded on S. 1432, which amends the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Had I been present, I would have answered "yea" to roll No. 108, which was taken on the passage of this legislation.

MAJ. ROBERT N. KATAYAMA PAYS TRIBUTE TO NATION'S FALLEN HEROES AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY CEREMONIES

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, there has never been a time in our Nation's history when the proper observance of Memorial Day was more needed than Memorial Day 1967 where a grateful Nation could pause to express tribute to the brave men who have made the supreme sacrifice defending the freedom of our country.

On May 28, 1967, the Japanese-American Citizens League sponsored a very fitting ceremony in observance of this historic holiday at Arlington National Cemetery, and selected a distinguished young Army officer, Maj. Robert N. Katayama, to speak at the memorial services, which I had the honor to attend. Major Katayama is a highly decorated veteran of the 442d Infantry Combat Team of World War II fame. He wears the Bronze Star Medal, the Purple Heart Medal with an Oak Leaf Cluster, the Army Commendation Medal with an Oak Leaf Cluster, the Combat Infantry Badge, four campaign battle stars and the Presidential Unit Citation Ribbon with Oak Leaf Cluster. He presently serves in the Judge Advocate General's Corps at the Pentagon.

Major Katayama delivered a solemn and meaningful tribute to the valor and dedication of those young men who are called upon to serve their country, and a genuine understanding of and respect for our Nation's inspiring heritage of freedom—and of the serious concern for the individual responsibilities of free men—are reflected in his observation that—

> Although we pay tribute on this day as a Nation and share this occasion as a group, our rededication is also a personal matter. We—each of us—need to act—need to be committed . . . need to be involved . . . in the preservation of our heritage.

I listened to this stirring speech with a sense of deep appreciation for the spirit of responsibility and patriotism personified in this splendid young officer—who honored us as he paid honor to his fallen comrades—and I submit for insertion in the Congressional Record for the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the speech delivered by Maj. Robert N. Katayama, at 1967 Memorial Day ceremonies at Arlington National Cemetery:

Speech by Maj. Robert N. Katayama at Memorial Services Held at Arlington National Cemetery Under Sponsorship of Japanese-American Citizens League, May 28, 1967

We gather here today in tribute to those who have made the supreme sacrifice in defense of our Nation. On Tuesday our flags will be flying at half staff throughout the forenoon hours to express our deep gratitude for the deeds of these brave men. In a short time we will place flowers on their graves. At this moment we speak words in their praise.

But, is this enough?

We cannot discharge our solemn obligation to these men with mere words or gestures. They did not die for words and flowers alone.

They died that we might be free men and

women today . . . that we might enjoy the fruits of freedom . . . that our Nation might endure.

And so it is fitting that on this Memorial Day observance that we should turn our thoughts to renewing our dedication to the cause of freedom.

Although we pay tribute on this day as a Nation and share this occasion as a group, our rededication is also a personal matter. We—each one of us—need to act . . . need to be committed . . . need to be involved . . . in the preservation of our heritage.

Today, the greatest U.S. fighting machine assembled since World War II is engaged in battle in Southeast Asia. There, men are also paying the highest possible price of freedom. In return, each one of us must pay the price of responsibility . . . individual responsibility.

Of the many individual responsibilities of free men, three stand out: First, defending our freedom from outside threats; second, helping to defend nations that are free; and third, defending our freedom from within.

Defense against an outside threat is basically provided by our Armed Forces. This is a form of insurance . . . insurance which provides for protection against any aggressor.

National defense, as with insurance, presumes a risk, a threat. The risk is there—the threat has never been greater. For the last twenty years, the United States and her Free World allies have faced one of the gravest challenges ever to face freedom—Communism. Today, in spite of nuclear-test ban treaties and increasing detente between East and West, that challenge remains grave.

Now, it is quite possible to agree with the need for national defense, but not to see it as an individual responsibility. After all, the days are gone when a man picked up his musket and went out to defend his home against the Indians or the British. The job of defense, you may say, is a responsibility of Government. Yet, national defense is an individual responsibility . . . for both the soldier and the civilian.

The soldier's role in national defense is direct. Money cannot be dedicated; equipment cannot be courageous. But the soldier can and does provide these qualities.

Although the soldier's contribution to national defense is more direct, the contribution of the individual citizen not in uniform is no less important. The individual citizen, of course, helps to pay for defense through taxes—as does the soldier—and, when necessary, has willingly served his country in uniform. But the citizen's responsibility must go far beyond this. For he must be both knowledgeable and interested in his country's defense.

In addition to defending our own freedom, we should respond to calls for assistance from other free nations. It is not only right, but necessary that we defend our allies in freedom, for as their freedom is diminished so is our own; as their peace is broken, so also is ours.

Our success in helping other nations maintain their freedom can only be proportionate to the degree of freedom that we as individuals and as a nation give our own citizens.

Thus, perhaps the responsibility that looms largest is defense of our own freedom at home, for as we painfully know freedom can be destroyed from within as well as from without. It is here that the individual is so important.

As individuals we must speak out "loud and clear" as we say in the military, in defense of our freedom or we could be silenced forever. It is not dissent or protest that could destroy our freedom. Rather, it is indifference which can do the greatest harm. If the majority of Americans are too apathetic, too timid to stand up and speak out for America—we could one day have little left to praise, or for that matter, little left to criticize. We could lose our freedom—the freedom that these men have died for—by mere default.

We have an inspiring heritage of freedom that has been shaped with the muscles and blood of the men who died defending it. They gave their lives that we might live. They denied themselves a future that we might have ours. They have given us the gift of freedom; and if we would keep that gift, we must use it wisely—defending it, cherishing it, and sharing it.

On Memorial Day 1967, then, let us as individuals remember that we each have a stake in the future of this country. So it is written in the Preamble to the Constitution which states:

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

"We the people . . ." established these ideals. And "We the people . . ." must carry on this work. Let us not forget our heritage for noble men have given their lives in its defense. Let it not be said that they have died in vain.

GEORGE STEVENS, JR., NAMED TO HEAD A NEW AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to be present today, June 5, 1967, in Washington, D.C., to hear an announcement by Roger L. Stevens, on behalf of the National Council on the Arts of which he is Chairman, that an American film institute has been established as a nonprofit, nongovernment corporation with administrative headquarters here in Washington.

At the same time, Gregory Peck, film actor and producer, who is acting chairman of the film institute board, announced that George Stevens, Jr., has been named director and chief executive officer of the institute which will be guided by a 22-member board of trustees.

Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon B. Johnson, in a letter to Roger Stevens, said of the film institute:

> It is heartening that this new organization will be dedicated to stimulating progress and excellence in the film art. I think your organizational approach is a sound one—

Which will provide—

> the necessary support as well as the essential freedom of action which a creative venture of this kind requires.

President Johnson also praised the selection of George Stevens, Jr., as the institute director.

> In 5 years of public service—

Said the President—

> George Stevens, Jr., gave a new vision and excellence to government filmmaking as director of the Motion Picture and Television Service at USIA. I am confident that he will provide distinguished leadership for this new venture.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many Members of Congress, both of the House and Senate, who know George Stevens, Jr., and his gifted and imaginative leadership in filmmaking at the USIA will share the President's view and will join in wishing Mr. Stevens well in this new position of both responsibility and opportunity.

Mr. Peck, a former member of the National Council on the Arts, said today that the institute will serve as a catalyst and point of focus for the many individuals and institutions dedicated to progress in the film arts. He added that the institute will concentrate essentially in five areas—filmmaker training, film education, film production, archival activities, and publications.

Mr. Speaker, the American Film Institute begins its operations with grants and commitments in hand totaling $3.9 million—$2.6 million made available by the National Endowment for the Arts and the Ford Foundation, and $1.3 million in commitments over a 3-year period from the member companies of the Motion Picture Association of America. The initial 3-year budget is $5.2 million, with the remaining funds to be raised by the board from private, foundation, and corporate sources.

STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD, a letter from President Johnson as well as statements made today by Roger L. Stevens, Gregory Peck, George Stevens, Jr., and McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation. I also include certain background information concerning the American Film Institute:

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON TO ROGER STEVENS

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 24, 1967.

MR. ROGER STEVENS,
Chairman, National Council of the Arts,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROGER: I am glad to learn that plans are now complete for the estbalishment of the American Film Institute.

The motion picture—whether it be projected in the theatre, the classroom, or on the livingroom television set—has the power to move the mind and spirit. Therefore, it is heartening that this new organization will be dedicated to stimulating progress and excellence in the film art.

I think your organizational approach is a sound one. Operating as a private nonprofit, nongovernmental corporation supported by funds from the National Endowment for the Arts, and private monies, the American Film Institute will have the necessary support as well as the essential freedom of action which a creative venture of this kind requires.

I also compliment your choice of a Director for the American Film Institute. In five years of public service, George Stevens, Jr. gave a new vision and excellence to government filmmaking as director of the Motion Picture and Television Service at USIA. I am confident that he will provide distinguished leadership for this new venture.

Sincerely yours,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Statement by Roger L. Stevens, Chairman, National Council on the Arts, at the American Film Institute Luncheon, Washington, D.C., June 5, 1967

We are very pleased to announce that today, in the largest single grant ever made by the National Council on the Arts, the American Film Institute has been formally established as a non-profit, non-government corporation with administrative headquarters in Washington, D.C. We now have a director, a 22 member Board of Trustees, and an estimated budget for the first three years of $5.2 million, $3.9 million of which is already in hand or committed to the operations of the Institute.

Most of you will remember that President Johnson, when he signed the bill at the White House on September 29, 1965, establishing the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, announced our intention to establish such an organization. At that time, the President said:

"We will create an American Film Institute, bringing together leading artists of the film industry, outstanding educators, and young men and women who wish to pursue this 20th Century art form as their life's work."

When the Arts Council met in November of 1965, plans were made for a study leading to the establishment of this Institute, and $100,000 was set aside for this purpose. Early in 1966, the Stanford Research Institute was retained to assist the Council in defining the functions and programs of the proposed American Film Institute. That study has been completed and will be formally presented to the American Film Institute Board at their next meeting.

In the fall of 1966, we appointed a Film Advisory Council to assist us with final plans for the Institute. Mr. Gregory Peck, whose term as a member of the National Council on the Arts expired in September of 1966, agreed to serve as chairman of this advisory group.

During all of this time, we were attempting to raise the large sums of money required to establish such an ambitious national Institute. It was determined that the minimum initial three-year budget would have to be over $5 million. Approximately half of that sum, $2.6 million, is now being granted to the Institute by funds made available from the National Endowment for the Arts and the Ford Foundation. An additional $1.3 million has been committed to the American Film Institute, without condition or restriction, by the seven major member companies of the Motion Picture Association of American whose President, Jack Valenti, is here with us today, and without whose efforts this grant would not have been possible.

The remaining funds are still to be raised by the American Film Institute Board of Trustees from private, foundation and corporate sources. And I might add that the Institute will have to begin almost immediately its campaign to acquire funds for its future operations. The National Council on the Arts hopes to be able to provide additional financial assistance to the Film Institute in coming years, but if this is to be a truly national effort, then we must achieve full support from the private sector as well.

The American Film community has been anticipating this day for many years. We hope this Institute will become the world leader in its field, as it certainly should. The United States has the talent and the skills and the technical expertise to bring about a great new era of filmmaking in this nation, and we believe the American Film Institute will make a significant contribution to this potential creative revolution in the art of the film.

Finally, we should pay tribute to all those people whose efforts over the past few years have made this day possible, especially those members of the Arts Council who worked so closely with the project, the Film Advisory Council, and many others from the film community who volunteered their time and services most generously.

At this time, I am pleased to announce the following appointments to the Board of Trustees of the American Film Institute:

AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Miss Elizabeth Ashley, Actress.

Charles Benton, Educational Film Producer.

Francis Ford Coppola, Screen Writer-Director.

Sherrill Corwin, President, National Association of Theatre Owners.

Rev. John Culkin, S.J., Director, Center for Communications, Fordham University.

Bruce Herschensohn, Documentary Filmmaker.

Francis Keppel, Chairman of the Board, General Learning Corporation and former U.S. Commissioner of Education (Mr. Keppel will join the AFI Board in January, 1968).

Arthur Knight, Film Critic-Historian-Teacher.

Richard Leacock, Filmmaker.

Donald H. McGannon, President, Westinghouse Broadcasting Company.

David Mallery, Director of Studies, National Association of Independent Schools.

Gregory Peck, Actor-Producer (Acting Chairman).

William L. Pereira, Architect, Member, National Council on the Arts.

Arnold Picker, Executive Vice President, United Artists Corporation.

Sidney Poitier, Actor, Member, National Council on the Arts.

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Historian.

George Seaton, Director-Producer-Writer.

Dan Taradash, Screen Writer.

Jack Valenti, President, Motion Picture Association of America.

Richard F. Walsh, President, International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees.

Fred Zinneman, Film Director-Producer.

George Stevens, Jr., Director and Chief Executive Officer, American Film Institute (ex officio).

Before turning the conference over to the Acting Chairman of the Institute Board, Gregory Peck, I would like to pay him a special tribute on behalf of the National Council on the Arts. Greg has devoted most of the past year and a half to this effort, traveling all over the country, meeting with with groups and individuals, no matter where they might have been located, seeking their advice and counsel on the establishment of this Institute. He has become a familiar figure around our offices, and he will be greatly missed when he resumes his full-time filmmaking career later this month. I, personally, have known few men in my life for whom I have higher respect and admiration.

It is my pleasure to introduce Mr. Gregory Peck.

Statement by Gregory Peck, Acting Chairman, Board of Trustees, American Film Institute

Responsive to the President's directive to create an American Film Institute, the following purposes and objectives applicable to the concept of an American Film Institute were derived from Congressional legislation enacted in 1964 and 1965 to provide greater recognition of the arts in the national interest:

(1) To recognize, assist, encourage and promote elements of progress and scholarship in film arts and humanities.

(2) To encourage and support the growth of creative activities and creative talent in film in a climate of freedom of thought, inquiry, imagination and individual initiative.

(3) To mantain, develop, disseminate and coordinate the nation's artistic and cultural resources in film.

(4) To foster and support film, film scholarship and teacher training for film study in general education.

(5) To encourage and promote greater public understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of film.

(6) To encourage and promote increased opportunities in film and to provide or support productions and projects that will assist and encourage film artists to achieve, demonstrate and maintain high standards of professional excellence.

(7) To facilitate the exchange of information and to support the publication of scholarly works pertaining to the history, theory and practice of film art.

(8) To initiate and support research in the history, criticism, theory and practice of film art and to provide or support other relevant projects including surveys, research and planning in film.

(9) To award fellowships and grants for training and workshops in the history, criticism, theory and practice of film.

During the early weeks of our research efforts, late in 1965, a committee of members of the National Council on the Arts, under the direction of Roger Stevens, was given the responsibility of taking the initial steps in carrying out the President's directive. The committee members began to gather information, to conduct interviews and to familiarize themselves with the views of professional film critics and scholars on the subject of an American Film Institute, what it ought to be and ought not to be, as expressed in their writings.

Films from the universities, "underground" films, experimental and educational films were viewed. Archives were inspected. Our purpose was explained to the labor guilds, to the university cinema departments, to film creators, technicians and administrators in the theatrical and non-theatrical field.

Early in 1966 it became apparent that we were only scratching the surface and that we would require the services of a professional research organization staffed with trained personnel capable of assembling a comprehensive body of information from many sources in this country and abroad.

We wanted everyone to be heard, or at least advocates of every point of view ranging from the purveyors of mass entertainment to the youngest and newest advocates of the film revolution. We wanted to understand the needs of young people interested in experiment with content and form, of archivists, and scholars and historians of film.

We also wanted the thinking of writers and directors of theatrical films who shared our concern with excessive commercialism, which, except for a handful of theatrical films each year, and some examples of the fresh and innovative in the non-theatrical field, has become so unfortunately identified with the American film.

THE STANFORD REPORT

Accordingly we recommended to the National Council on the Arts a grant to the Stanford Research Institute. A $91,000 grant was approved and the work began in February of 1966. An advisory council of 16 members was appointed to provide the SRI a resource list of individuals and organizations to meet periodically with the Stanford research group, to evaluate the findings and to advise on the organization and funding of the Institute.

The Stanford report has been completed. It is essentially a summary based on an extensive background of investigation. The project working files which supplement the report are considered to be an integral part of the formal results of the study. In the files are copies of interviews conducted with over 100 individuals with the broadest possible range of interest in film. Studies were made of teaching methods and various kinds of film activity in eight American universities. The archival holding, the functions, the programming of film showings at the Museum of Modern Art, Eastman House in Rochester, and the Library of Congress were reported in detail.

Foreign film institutions, 18 in all, were visited by consultants. Among them were the British Film Institute, the Centro Sperimentale in Rome, the Cinematheque Francaise, Czechoslovakian Film Institute, the Swedish Film Institute, the Polish State Academy for Theatre and Film, the Danish Film Foundation, and the Cinematheque Royale de Belgique.

A typical report on these foreign institutions includes details on administration, financing, physical facilities, film library, professional training curricula, film history and film aesthetics. Finally a qualitative judgment was submitted. All of this material is ready to be turned over to the newly formed Institute. We believe this to be the most comprehensive study ever undertaken in the field.

The report and the files were not intended for publication, nor is the report intended to be a blue print for the establishment of an American Film Institute. As source material we believe that it will serve as an invaluable guide to the Director and the Board of Trustees. The report and the files, in whole or in part, will be made available to students, teachers, historians, journalists and others, following its acceptance by the full Board of Trustees after its first meeting in July.

PROGRAMS TO BE CONSIDERED

At this meeting a Chairman will be elected and an Executive Committee will be appointed. The Board will consider a priority list of action programs to be undertaken during the first three years of the Institute's existence. Among those programs to be considered by the Board are the following:

(1) A series of fellowships, enabling graduates of film schools, as well as other qualified young filmmakers, to become closely associated with accomplished directors throughout the making of a film—from the conceptual stage to the final editing. Fellowships and scholarships for foreign study, for thesis films and for research study and publication will also be considered.

(2) Commissioning of textbooks. There is a need for comprehensive, imaginative and intelligently written textbooks and guides in the field of professional training. Leading filmmakers in the theatrical and non-theatrical field will be asked to contribute to a detailed formulation of cinematic principles and techniques.

(3) There is a need for a national catalogue of all existing film resources in this country. This would be a major program involving the location and identification of important collections of film and related materials. Inspection of much of this film will be necessary. Valuable film in a state of deterioration, or in danger of deterioration, must be restored. The Institute does not plan to establish its own film archives. Rather it expects to coordinate available holdings and to support the leaders in this field—the Museum of Modern Art, the Library of Congress, Eastman House, the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences and others.

(4) Establishment of a system of film libraries or cinematheques. The objective will be greatly increased by the availability of historic and classic films for training and education. The Institute recognizes the urgency of this need as expressed in many quarters by scholars, students, historians and practicing professionals.

(5) Establishment of one or more Advanced Study Centers to enlarge the opportunities for young filmmakers to master their craft. It should be noted that the Ford Foundation, in joining in this effort with the National Endowment for the Arts and the Motion Picture Association of America, has expressed its strong interest in the prospect of an advanced conservatory program. W. McNeil Lowry, a Vice President of the Ford Foundation, said today: "Our activities in the creative and performing arts have emphasized both the provision of opportunities for development of artists and artistic directors and outlets for their careers. The American Film Institute under the leadership announced today has a chance to make a major contribution to professional training in the art of film."

Film education and pre-professional training for filmmakers will continue to be carried out by colleges and universities. To bridge the gap between the academic and professional realms, the AFI would include at least one Advanced Study Center to offer specialized training and experience in all types of films. The Advanced Study Center would provide facilities and staff for intensive professional training courses, exercises in filmmaking under professional conditions and tutelage, and initial creative ventures by new filmmakers.

(6) New filmmakers production program. Plans will be submitted to the Board for development. At this stage it can be said that the Institute expects to engage in the production of documentary films, experimental short films and feature films. An unprecedented method of financing is under discussion for producting films free of conventional commercial restrictions but in an atmosphere of professional and artistic discipline.

WASHINGTON, D.C., TO BE SITE OF NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Washington, D.C. will be the site of the national headquarters for central administration, fiscal planning, research, educational and international liaison. It is intended that services and programs in professional training, new filmmakers production, archival and film library services will eventually be established in Los Angeles, New York and other American cities.

We are proud of the Board of Trustees which has been brought together to govern the Institute. We are grateful to these accomplished people for agreeing to serve, for lending their talents, their time and their judgment to the work of the Institute. I feel that I may speak for all of the Trustees today, and simply say—"We intend to carry out the President's directive and we regard the creation of the American Fim Institute as a public trust."

We are grateful to Roger Stevens, a theatre man who has fathered a film institute.

We acknowledge and are appreciative of the significant grant from the Ford Foundation, and we pay tribute to the Motion Picture Association of America. Under the leadership of its talented and vigorous President, Jack Valenti, the Association's member companies have committed $1.3 million over a three year period to development of the Institute and the launching of its initial action programs.

Finally, we wish to announce the appointment of George Stevens, Jr., as the Director, the Chief Executive Officer of the American Film Institute.

By attracting to the USIA productions a mixture of previously unknown young filmmaking talents and recognized leaders in the documentary field, George Stevens, Jr., created a climate for a new forward movement in the American documentary tradition.

Edward R. Murrow said that "the stamp of Stevens' creative imagination and vigor has revolutionized the character and quality of motion pictures produced by the USIA."

The Trustees of the AFI are confident that the same qualities of youth, vigor and creative imagination will characterize the leadership Mr. Stevens will bring to the AFI, and indeed will characterize the Institute itself.

In a letter to Roger Stevens, President Johnson had this to say about George Stevens, Jr., as the Director of the Institute: "In five years of public service, George Stevens, Jr., gave a new vision and excellence to government filmmaking as Director of the Motion Picture and Television Service at the USIA. I am confident that he will provide distinguished leadership for this new venture."

Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. George Stevens, Jr.

REMARKS OF GEORGE STEVENS, JR., ON HIS APPOINTMENT AS DIRECTOR OF THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

I am honored and grateful for the opportunity and the challenge of undertaking this venture.

Asked why I chose to get involved in this kind of enterprise, the best answer I could supply was—"because it isn't there."

You have heard it said that the projected image is central to American lives today. And there are those who can supply the figures. A high school graduate in the United States has seen 500 films and 15,000 hours of television. This compares with the 10,800 hours he has spent in the classroom. No doubt this is why Marshall McCluhan describes school as—just an interruption of a child's education.

There is little question that today this "projected image" is central to the quality of American life, or lack of it. At the heart of the American Film Institute's purpose is a concern for the substance and style of those thousands of hours which are devoted to the witness of moving images.

It is becoming more difficult to be casual about the training of the men and women who will create those combinations of sight and sound which will preoccupy children more than schools and adults far more than books. Neither can we continue to be casual about giving the young, who will form tomorrows audiences, an opportunity to develop appreciation and taste for what is good in cinema, as we do in painting, literature and music.

And central to the education of filmmakers and film audiences is access to the great works, most of which are presently unavailable to teachers and students, and much of which—America's precious film heritage—is slowly turning to dust in vaults and cupboards across the country. We will address ourselves to overcoming the problems which make these works unavailable.

And, let's face it, the art of motion picture in America has seen better times. The American Film Institute will be concerned with assuring the continuity of the proud tradition of the films which was born in this country in this century.

And I have no doubt that more access to training and a greater opportunity to experiment will confirm what we all know—that the United States has the human and economic resources to provide world leadership in the art of filmmaking.

I would like the American Film Institute to be a harbor for many points of view, and a rallying point for people with new ideas and the energy and determination to see them achieved. And, I would like this corporation to be a source of hope—sorely needed hope which can inspire young people to pursue this incredibly difficult art knowing that there is someplace where the name of the game is taking chances, and there is one place where the balance sheet is read in terms of art, not commerce, by a board of directors whose accomplishment will be measured in terms of progress, not profits.

So, we begin today with a signal of hope to those who would join us in our purpose. And it is our own hope that when it grows up, America's Film Institute will be, as it should be, the best in the world.

BIOGRAPHY OF GEORGE STEVENS, JR.

George Stevens, Jr. was born in Los Angeles, California on April 3, 1932. He graduated from Harvard School in North Hollywood in 1949 and received a Bachelor of Arts Degree from Occidental College in 1953. In 1954 Mr. Stevens was assigned to active duty as an officer in the United States Air Force. He left the service in 1956 as a First Lieutenant.

Mr. Stevens began his career in films during college as an assistant to his father, George Stevens, on "A Place in the Sun" and "Shane". Following service in the military he worked as an assistant to Jack Webb who gave him his first directing opportunity in 1957. During the next few years Mr. Stevens directed a number of television shows including *Alfred Hitchcock Presents* and *Peter Gunn.*

In 1958 he worked at Twentieth Century-Fox as Associate Producer of "The Diary of Anne Frank" and also directed the location segments of that film.

In 1962 the late Edward R. Murrow selected Mr. Stevens to head the motion picture division of the United States Information Agency. He served in this position (which in 1965 was reorganized to include USIA's television operations) until 1967.

In this job he was responsible for USIA's worldwide film program which included annual production of some 300 documentary motion pictures and 105 hours of television programing for distribution in 106 foreign countries. Murrow cited Mr. Stevens for having "revolutionized the character and quality of motion pictures produced by USIA." Many young filmmakers were attracted to the Agency's activities and USIA's filmmaking was widely credited with a new excellence and effectiveness.

Mr. Stevens' office served as the government's point of contact for international film activities. He also served as Chairman of the United States delegations to the 1963 and 1965 Moscow Film Festivals.

In 1965 he married Elizabeth Guest Condon. They have two children—her daughter Caroline aged 8, and their son Michael Murrow Stevens, six months.

ORGANIZATIONS

Directors Guild of America, Inc.

Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.

Board of Governors of Film Industry Workshops, Inc.

Society of Cinematologists.

National Student Association Student Film Advisory Board.

Program Committee—John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts.

Vice Chairman—Friends of the Kennedy Center.

Federal City Club, Washington, D.C.

HONORS

Selected as One of the Ten Outstanding Young Men in the United States by National Junior Chamber of Commerce—1964.

Arthur S. Flemming Award as One of the Ten Outstanding Young Men in the Federal Government—1963.

AWARDS TO USIA FILMS

1964: Academy Award for Best Documentary *Nine From Little Rock* (director, Charles Guggenheim).

1966: IFIDA Award Best Documentary Feature *John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums* (director, Bruce Herschensohn).

1966: One of the Ten Best Films of the Year—National Board of Review *John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums.*

1963: Academy Award Nomination Best Documentary *The Five Cities of June* (director, Bruce Herschensohn).

1966: Academy Award Nomination Best Documentary *Cowboy* (directors, Michael Ahnemann, Gary Schlosser).

1964: First Prize Documentary Festival Bilbao, Spain *The March* (director, James Blue).

1966: First Prize Cannes Youth Festival *The March.*

1966: First Prize Netherlands Film Festival *The March.*

1963: First Prize for Human Relations Venice Documentary Festival *The School at Rincon Santo* (director, James Blue).

1963: Lion of St. Mark Venice Documentary Festival *Letter from Colombia* (director, James Blue).

1966: Second Prize Berlin Agricultural Festival *Beyond This Winter's Wheat* (director, Carroll Ballard).

1965: First Prize American Film Festival *Night of the Dragon* (director, Richard Heffron).

1965: Grand Prize Paris Festival of Architecture *Architecture USA* (director, Tibor Hirsch).

1966: Special Jury Award Mannheim Festival *Destination Man* (director, Morton Heilig).

1966: Golden Gate Award San Francisco Festival *Nine From Little Rock.*

STATEMENT BY MCGEORGE BUNDY, PRESIDENT, THE FORD FOUNDATION, UPON ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE FORMATION OF THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

The Ford Foundation is glad to make the support of the American Film Institute a part of its extensive activities in the creative and performing arts. In other countries national film institutes are generally agencies of government. In the United States it is fitting that such an institute is launched with the support of both public and private funds—foundation, corporate, and individual. It is also fitting that the American Film Institute is a private, non-profit corporation even though relying in such significant part on government funds. The Ford Foundation is confident that the leadership of Mr. Peck and his group and of Mr. Stevens will make the American Film Institute of real significance in the continuing development of film as an art.

BACKGROUND ON THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

At the time of the signing (September 29) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, President Johnson said: "We will create an American Film Institute, bringing together leading artists of the film industry, outstanding educators, and young men and women who wish to pursue this 20th Century art form as their life's work."

The National Council on the Arts retained Stanford Research Institute (SRI) to assist in defining the functions of the proposed Institute. Approximately 100 organizations and individuals with a wide variety of knowledge of film production, education and archives were interviewed in the United States by SRI. Surveys were made of film activities at 11 American universities and SRI consultants visited 18 foreign film institutions.

The National Council on the Arts appointed a film Advisory Council of 16 members with Gregory Peck as Chairman to assist in evaluating the SRI findings and to advise on the funding and final plans for establishment of the American Film Institute.

ORGANIZATION

The American Film Institute has been established as a non-profit, non-government corporation with administrative headquarters in Washington, D.C. Created to serve the public interest, it will derive its resources from both private and public funds. It will be governed by a Board of Trustees of 22 members including a Director appointed by the Board.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Institute will be to stimulate and encourage progress in the film art.

The creation of the American Film Institute is based on the awareness that film in all its forms is central to American life today, and that there is a clear and pressing need for encouragement, assistance and leadership in many facets of this nation's pursuit of excellence in film. The founders of the American Film Institute have considered the motion picture in the broadest sense of that term—the moving image and its associated sound, whether it is projected in a theatre, classroom, museum or transmitted electronically on television.

The American Film Institute intends to serve as a catalyst and point of focus and coordination for the many institutions and individuals who are anxious to share its purpose.

PROGRAM

Initial funding will permit the American Film Institute to chart its path and take the first necessary steps. The Institute will be able to support only a few, and those only in part, of the many worthwhile and urgent needs which came to the attention of the Film Advisory Council during their extensive investigations. The Institute will concentrate essentially in the following areas of endeavor:

(1) Filmmaker training
(2) Film education
(3) Film production
(4) Preservation and cataloging of films
(5) Publications

(1) The training of filmmakers will focus on the establishment of one or more Centers of Advanced Film Study. The Center is intended to bridge the gap between scholarship and practice. It will appeal primarily to the college or university graduate who has excelled in filmmaking study, but has not found a ready avenue into the type of filmmaking he wishes to pursue as a career.

At the same time, the American Film Institute will act as an ally and supporting arm for existing filmmaker training activities. The Advisory Council concluded that diversity is of prime importance, and the continued development of independent and varied film schools at universities throughout the country is considered essential, since only in this way will prospective film students be offered the widest choice.

Detailed plans for the first Center for Advanced Film Studies will be developed by the Institute staff.

(2) Film Education refers to the study, on the part of students and teachers, of film as an art form, with its own aesthetics, history and techniques. The American Film Institute will explore ways in which it will be able to assist the development and improvement of this activity throughout the United States.

(3) Production. Emphasis of the Institute's production will be on the development of new American filmmakers. This will include documentary production, experimental short films and projects undertaken at the Advanced Study Centers. The Institute also expects to engage in feature production with the emphasis on films by filmmakers of ability who have not found an opportunity to make feature films within the existing commercial and financial structure.

(4) Preservation and cataloguing of films is a task which lies at the heart of the Film Institute's purpose. It is as important to conserve as to create, and the founders wish emphatically to bring attention, as others have before, to the necessity of preserving this Nation's film heritage. This is a complex task and the American Film Institute expects to serve as a focal point for coordination and leadership, and will work with several organizations which are already involved in the field and will seek the cooperation of America's eminent archivists. The American Film Institute does not expect to create its own archives; rather, it will be prepared to coordinate and stimulate the activities of regional and private institutions.

The work in this area will have a most important bearing on Filmmaker Training and Film Education, both of which depend upon the study of great works of the past for the learning process.

(5) In concert with the four major categories listed above, the American Film Institute will be prepared to undertake related research and publication activities.

FUNDING

The American Film Institute is being funded by public and private monies. It will operate on an initial three-year budget of $5.2 million. Three-quarters of that amount ($3.9 million) is already in hand or committed to the Institute. The remaining funds are to be raised by the Board from private, foundation and corporate sources.

$2.6 million is being made available to the Institute by the National Endowment for the Arts and the Ford Foundation.

Statement By W. McNeil Lowry, of The Ford Foundation

The Ford Foundation, joining in this effort with the National Endowment, is providing $1.3 million to the American Film Institute as partial support of tis operations over a three-year period. The Ford Foundation's funds will help support the training activities of the Institute and thus enlarge the opportunities of potentially talented young filmmakers to master their craft.

"Since its first activity in the art of the film represented by awards to young filmmakers in 1964, the Ford Foundation has been interested in the prospect of an advanced conservatory training program," W. McNeil Lowry, a vice president of the Ford Foundation, said stoday. "Our activities in the creative and performing arts have emphasized both the provision of opportunities for development of artists and artistic directors and outlets for their careers. The American Film Institute under the leadership announced today has a chance to make a major contribution to professional training in the art of film."

An additional $1.3 million has been committed to the Institute by the seven member companies of the Motion Picture Association of America (Columbia, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Paramount, Twentieth Century Fox, United Artists, Universal and Warner Bros.).

Statement of Jack Valenti

Jack Valenti, President of the Association, issued the following statement on behalf of the MPAA:

"The member companies of the Association believe it is in the urgent long range interest of the motion picture for the Institute to be born. It is important to encourage and train talented young filmmakers, upgrade and aid the educational work in film being carried out by American colleges and universities, and to focus attention on important film archival work. The endurance of excellence in motion pictures will be the prime objective of the American Film Institute. In this aim, the entire motion picture industry is eager to join."

WELCOME POSTAL SUPERVISORS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the burdens and responsibilities placed upon public servants and especially the postal supervisor, have increased enormously in recent years, and with them, the need to revest the classification system and salary scale.

I am, therefore, pleased and honored to welcome the postal supervisors from many of the States who are convening here in Washington this week. They, of course, are here to press for more adequate legislation in the postal field service. I am in complete accord with the objectives encompassed in both H.R. 3383 and H.R. 4531. I have introduced a similar bill, H.R. 6992, in recognition of that need. It includes a redefinition of positions in various salary levels including functions, duties, and responsibilities, and organizational relationships, as well as a revision of basic compensation for positions in the postal field service, rural carrier, and fourth-class office schedules. Provision is also made for the determination of the basic compensation of each employee subject to the above schedules as of the date of enactment of the legislation.

The postal service performs a vital function, and this legislation recognizes the need to update classifications and salaries to fit new conditions and to reward postal employees for their faithful service.

Mr. Speaker, I, therefore, welcome my friends and wish them well in their objective for more adequate legislation. I also urge my colleagues on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to enact this needed legislation at an early date.

WATER DISTRIBUTION PROBLEM IN NORTH JERSEY

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to note that last week 3 months of negotiations to resolve the problem of distribution of water to 11 north Jersey communities was successfully concluded. This was an exhaustive and complex task, and it is a genuine tribute to the capability and dedication of the participants that a solution was found. A fine editorial in the Nutley Sun of June 1, 1967, discusses the role of New Jersey's outstanding commissioner of conservation and economic development, Robert A. Roe, and I place the editorial in the Record following these remarks. I was pleased that it also notes the fine and effective effort of Newark's corporation counsel, Normal Schiff. The successful resolution of this difficult problem is an excellent example of how conflicting interests can be brought into harmony when there is knowledge, perseverance, and a genuine desire to seek a solution.

The editorial follows:

Bob Roe—A-1 Negotiator

For the past three months Commissioner Robert Roe, chief of New Jersey's Department of Conservation and Economic Development, has been engaged in an endless effort to negotiate differences between eleven New Jersey communities and the North Jersey District Water Supply Commission. The dispute arose over the Water Commission's proposed construction of a 32-mile pipe line necessary to deliver water to northern Jersey from the Hunterdon County-based Round Valley-Spruce Run reservoirs. The chief objector to the Water Commission's project was the City of Newark, whose city-wide water distribution system must be utilized in order to distribute the water to suburban Essex County communities, once it was brought to Newark's southwest boundaries.

There were problems all over the lot. Virtually all of the seven Essex communities had different conflicts with Newark. Elizabeth and Bayonne had their ideas as to how water should be delivered to their communities. The Water Commission, working under legislative edict, was unable to argue Newark out of its objections. As a result, legal action was instituted by the Water Commission against Newark.

Fearing that a legal dispute would unnecessarily prolong the construction of a vitally needed public project, Governor Richard J. Hughes requested the New Jersey Water Resources Council (the state agency empowered to allocate water supplies) to hold public hearings so that the underlying facts of the dispute would be placed on the public record, and from such an airing a negotiated settlement might result.

Under the able leadership of its chairman, Mrs. Lillian Schwartz, the Water Resources Council opened public hearings three months ago. Participating in the hearings as co-chairman, was Commissioner Robert Roe. As a result of the joint efforts of Mrs. Schwartz and Bob Roe, the parties of interest conferred day after day with some sessions terminating at 3 o'clock in the morning.

At times almost everyone associated with the negotiating endeavor hopelessly looked to the inevitable court clash. Largely due to the adroit and skillful negotiating talent of Bob Roe, the pieces fell into place.

Last week Governor Hughes put the final touch to a happy ending by assuring the Water Commission and the eleven communities involved that the State of New Jersey will guarantee the $260,000 engineering cost of a feasibility study currently under way.

In reviewing the history of the foregoing negotiations it is only fair to place on the public record the substantial contributions of the attorneys involved. In its corner the City of Newark had Norman Schiff, one of New Jersey's ablest attorneys. The Water Commission had in its corner one of New Jersey's most knowledgeable water attorneys, Oscar Wilensky, its chief counsel.

Schiff proved to be a real champion, fighting for the interests of the city he represents. Wilensky's encyclopedical knowledge of New Jersey's water problems and resources benefited not only the commission he served, but all the participating communities as well.

We knew Bob Roe was a talented, dedicated, public servant. Just how deep his dedication is—how keen and ingenious he is—we didn't know until now.

When future state historians write the history of the successful solutions to New Jersey's water shortage problems in the last half of the Twentieth Century, a major share of the credit must go to Bob Roe.

As a member of the state's North Jersey District Water Supply Commission the undersigned is able to make the above observations from personal participation in the negotiations.

F. A. O.

THE VISTA VOLUNTEERS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as the principal speaker at a recent VISTA graduation program at Jackson's Mill, W. Va., the Honorable Hulett C. Smith, Governor of West Virginia, offered advice that should have meaning not only to the volunteers in service to America but to us all.

Governor Smith stressed that those involved in the Nation's strategy against poverty must demonstrate leadership, understanding, patience, a willingness to work with others and, above all perhaps, a recognition of the circumstances and customs of those who are poor.

Governor Smith was speaking specifically to the VISTA's completing their training at Jackson's Mill but his words have importance for us all—for each of us has a responsibility to fulfill in combating poverty.

For that reason I include his thoughtful remarks at this point in the Record:

Six weeks ago, you began your training to prepare for your work in Appalachia.

You have already begun to experience some of the deprivations peculiar to this tedious work.

But don't be misled into thinking that these weeks of training in the field and elsewhere have initiated you into *every* problem that you will encounter.

In your field work, you have only witnessed *some* of the substandard conditions of poverty.

You will witness more.

The more you witness, the more disappointed you will become.

But this much is certain: the degree of your success will be proportionate to the degree that you *listen* to the people with whom you're working—the people you're trying to help.

To *discuss* with them—from *their* point of view—is the keynote to this inter-personal relationship.

If you have not already, you will begin to discover that the deprived person of Appalachia is a *secluded* person—secluded from the *mainstream* of America, secluded from the *urban* sprawl, secluded from middle-class accomplishments. This person is a living reality of an American *paradox* where wealth has produced poverty.

Each of you is confronted with producing a climate in which a person may realize his capabilities . . . whatever they may be.

Each of you is faced with the challenge of helping this person secure an education where he can learn a skill.

And each of you must face your *own* inadequacies before you can even begin to understand the other person in his isolation, in his poor education, in his inadequate nutrition, and in his poor housing.

All of these depressing circumstances are inter-related with that which makes poverty persist.

Above all, however, I urge you to learn the *laws of the land* in which you work, and the *customs* of the people.

You should be aware of local ordinances, before you attempt to change something that would get you an uncomfortable position with the law.

And this has happened in the past.

The people in the communities in which you work must be viewed as your *friends*.

Too often, the assumption is automatically made that local government officals are always *against* you.

If you take the time to talk with them, I think you will find this is *not* the case, because remember—*their* job is to make the area progress, too.

And I call on you to set an *example*—in *your habits*, in your *attitudes* and in your *grooming* . . . because the people will be looking to you for just that—*an example*.

They anticipate that you will be a *leader*.

And if you fail to set the right example, then you're bound to encounter a great deal of opposition, springing from *personal* faults, against a program that is really worthwhile.

These are some of the challenges which confront you and they need radical new concepts and approaches.

If you bring to this challenge your energies and efforts, then many of these distressing problems can begin to be solved.

In so doing, take into account that *local* initiative and *local* resources should be utilized in dealing with these problems.

We on the State level pledge you our cooperation in dealing with these problems, in conjunction with federal and county governments.

But even *with* all these efforts, be also aware that progress will be *slow* and that you are dealing with a social disease for which no one has yet devised the ultimate cure.

DESERVES UNANIMOUS SUPPORT

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10226 which provides additional mailing privileges for members of the U.S. Armed Forces and provides surface rates on airlift mail for certain parcels that are mailed at or addressed to any Armed Forces post office within the United States or overseas.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee report estimated that the cost of this legislation would be approximately $6.5 million annually. This is a small price to pay for the beneficial impact free mailing privileges will have on the morale of overseas or hospitalized GI's.

Furthermore, this legislation will go a long way toward alleviating the financial burden faced by parents who want to send parcels to their sons in the military as rapidly as possible.

In this time of conflict all over the world, when American boys are carrying the burden of trying to preserve peace, anything we can do to lighten this burden we have a moral obligation to do. The liberalization of mailing privileges of members of U.S. Armed Forces overseas is no more than a token illustration of our confidence in them, our respect for their commitment, and our appreciation for their sacrifices.

THERE MUST BE A BETTER WAY

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Schadeberg] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, one of the fine newspapers in my district, the Elkhorn Independent, carried an editorial recently which points up a much-debated dilemma facing this Nation, the problem of finding an equitable solution to the disputes between management and labor without infringing upon the rights of either.

At the request of Mr. Walt Sands, of Elkhorn, Wis., who very kindly brought this editorial to my attention, I respectfully place this editorial in the Record at this point:

There Must Be a Better Way

There must be a better way of settling labor-management disputes than by the present methods which bring suffering and hardship to innocent people as well as those directly involved.

If organized tradesmen could put the pressure on the employer without affecting other trades, businesses and the public, it would be fine, but life is so complicated these days that almost any work stoppage shuts down plants which use the product in their manufacturing, and are forced to close and lay off employees. Once the chain reaction has set in, everyone is eventually affected. Work stoppage that affects war production is especially disastrous because the man at the end of the line, the American serviceman in Vietnam, cannot stand a shortage in what he needs.

The right to strike is fundamental and unquestioned. Yet the fact remains that sometimes each strike will be settled. It is unfortunate that it is necessary to cause all this hardship while reaching a decision. There must be a better way that would be welcomed by labor, management and the public. The best minds in America should be at work on a solution to this problem.

IF THIS BE HERESY

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Schadeberg] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished president of Beloit College, Dr. Miller Upton, recently addressed an honors convocation at Ripon College in Wisconsin. His thought-provoking comments on this occasion are well worth the attention of the Members of this body.

I submit Dr. Upton's remarks to be included in the Record at this point:

If This Be Heresy

(By Miller Upton)

I am truly honored to have been asked to speak to you on your Honors Day. But to honor you, I must first honor myself by being honest with you. To honor you fully, I feel I must say things to you which much of our society today, apparently, would indict as dishonorable. To honor you properly, I feel I must say things which are seldom said these days—the "unmentionables" within a framework of thinking that has become so deeply established and pervasive that they resound with the tremor of heresy.

For, you see, I have just about reached

the end of my tolerance for the way our society at the present time sems to have sympathetic concern only for the misfit, the pervert, the drug addict, the drifter, the ne'er-do-well, the maladjusted, the chronic criminal, the underachiever, the loser—in general, the underdog. It seems to me we have lost touch with reality and become warped in our attachments, if not in fact psychotic.

In short, I feel it is time for someone like me to stand up and say, "I'm for the upperdog!" I'm for the achiever—the one who sets out to do something and does it; the one who recognizes the problems and opportunities at hand and endeavors to deal with them; the one who is successful at his immediate task because he is not worrying about someone else's failings; the one who doesn't consider it "square" to be constantly looking for more to do, who isn't always rationalizing why he shouldn't be doing what he is doing; the one, in short, who carries the work of his part of the world squarely on his shoulders. Not the wealthy, necessarily, not the ones in authority, necessarily, not the gifted, necessarily—just the doer, the achiever—regardless of his status, his opulence, his native endowment.

We are not born equal; we are born unequal. And the talented are no more responsible for their talents than the underprivileged for their plight. The measure of each should be by what he does with his inherited position. No one should be damned by the environmental condition of his life—whether it be privileged or underprivileged.

I trust it is sufficiently clear by this time why I am so honored and so pleased to be invited to speak at this honors convocation. This is one of the few remaining ceremonies where the achiever is honored. It is a dying fashion to pay respect to those who achieve—who really "have it"—to use the vernacular. This is the day when the fashion is to be for the underdog. The attitude is being developed that if you really want people to care for you (and who doesn't), don't be successful, be a misfit, a loser, a victim of one's environment.

Right here and right now it's different, though. This is an occasion to honor the successful—to say it is better to win than to lose, better to receive an *A* than a *C*, that class rank *is* meaningful, that those who have developed the pattern of achieving in college will go on achieving out of college, and because of their achievement the rest of us will live richer and easier lives.

I'm not entirely sure of the reason for what appears to me to be a general social psychological aberration, but I suspect it springs from a massive social guilt. Each of us individually is so aware of our personal limitations that we have developed a form of masochistic reaction to problems of the day. Instead of attempting to deal with the problems in a forthright way, we berate ourselves, we martyr ourselves, we pillory ourselves. Or if the problems seem too much for us to handle, we mitigate our sense of guilt by heaping all blame on convenient scapegoats or by concerning ourselves with the problems of others at a conveniently remote distance.

Let me illustrate my point by specific reference. I have become increasingly bored and resentful of the ridicule and snide references made of the WASPS. (The white, anglo-saxon, protestant suburbanites.) I wouldn't feel the point so strongly were the criticisms leveled by those outside of the circle. Such could be looked upon as healthy social criticism and competition. But when it mainly comes from those who are part of the circle—WASPS stinging themselves—it assumes the nature of sick self-immolation.

Our society's treatment of the negro over the years is deplorable. In fact, that's too mild a term for it. The word "sinful" in its full theological sense is more accurate. But this fact does not justify us in our sense of guilt condemning a particular segment of society which in many ways constitutes the backbone of American social existence. If damning by association is wrong, as I would maintain strongly it is, then how horribly wrong it is to level our guns of hostility, envy and ridicule in this fashion on the successful white man who more often than not struggled financially to get a college education, who more often than not works at his job more than 60 hours a week, who buys a comfortable home in the suburbs with the welfare of his family in mind, who is active in his church and community affairs, who gives his time to service on boards of education and social welfare agencies, and in some cases is shortening his life span through overwork and anxiety resulting from the basic social responsibilities he must carry.

These are among the chief doers and achievers of today. And where would our society be without them? For one thing, we would not have Ripon College or Beloit College or the University of Wisconsin as we know them today were it not for the likes of these people. Nor could we afford to have a major portion of the population going to school for 12–20 years. Nor would we enjoy the leisure time, recreational activities and cultural advantages which are a direct product of our material welfare. However, there would be one by-product advantage: We would have to be so concerned individually with eking out our own meager existence that there would be no time to be wasted on such irrelevant and dishonest name-calling and buck-passing.

Or, just as we point an accusing finger at those who succeed within our economic system, so we accuse the system itself of faults which are not of its creation. In short, we tend to blame the economic system for the faults of individuals who operate within it. It is important to recognize that the quality of any society is directly related to the quality of the individuals who make it up. Therefore, let us stop referring naively to creating a "great" society. It is enough at this stage of our development to aspire to create a decent society. And to do so our first task is to help each individual be decent unto himself and in his relationship with other individuals. A decent society cannot be created out of a vacuum and imposed. It can only evolve out of the lives of constituent members. In this regard, our economic system has become the scapegoat for the failures of our educational, religious and family institutions to develop decent and responsible individuals.

Whenever one blames another or group of individuals for one or more of the ills of mankind—beware! He is expressing personal hostility and offering no solution. There is no single scapegoat for the world's ills, unless it be our own personal limitations as finite beings.

Also, the Puritan ethic and religious morality in general have come in for some heavy-handed humor and disdain. I can support that criticism which focuses on arbitrary value judgments. But we seem to be in the process of developing a much more perverse kind of moralism—a moralism which says that since love is the one absolute virtue of man, the one way we will solve the problems of poverty, crime, racial discrimination and the like is by forcing everyone to love everybody else—we must love the white man because he is white, or the black man because he is black, or the poor because he is poor, or the enemy because he is the enemy, or the perverse because he is perverse, or the afflicted because he is afflicted! Rather than because he is a human being, any human being who just happens to be white or black; poor or rich; enemy or friend.

This is a hideous abuse of the notion of love that avoids the hard fact that love is a uniquely personal experience. If it is idle to attempt to legislate individual morality, it is even more idle, and even arrogant, to attempt to force individual love. There can be no love unless it is genuine and authentic. To love, or go through the pretense of loving, without truly feeling that way is one of the lowest forms of hypocrisy. It is dishonesty at its worst. And the fruits of such dishonesty, as with all forms of dishonesty, is distrust, degradation, chaos. We should respect all people so much that we would not dare demean one by pretending to love him when we don't.

Here is the evil I see about us so much at the present time: Love is expressed in a masochistic way—as a duty to be performed rather than a blessing to be received. The notion is current that to love is to sacrifice, that the Good Samaritan was good because he put himself out. We should sacrifice ourselves for the poor because we feel sorry for them, we should sacrifice ourselves for the dispossessed because we feel sorry for them, we should sacrifice ourselves for the retarded because we feel sorry for them, etc.

What a tragic confusion of motives! This is not love; this is a sick desire to be loved. It is a perverse and futile attempt to escape the pain of guilt. If you would put my claim to a test, just make a date sometime with a girl who doesn't go out very often and then tell her you did it because you felt sorry for her.

We need to start being honest with ourselves in more ways than one. It is too bad that we have failed to heed the charge that Polonius made to his son: "This above all, to thine own self be true." For were we to do so we would have to admit honestly and joyously that love in its very essence is selfish. Were it not so, there would be none—not real love, only a martyred imitation.

Our loving should not be restricted to the poor and dispossessed but should be offered to all. It is in the act of loving that we are redeemed—not in loving the poor alone. And it is in the personal redemption of each individual that the hope of the world exists, not in the changing of the other person.

To love is to give. But it is in giving that the giver receives his reward—his sense of belonging, of being accepted, of being needed. To give because you think you are expected to or because you hope for something in return is not true giving—it is hope for receiving, and therefore frustrating.

In other words, it is in the act of giving that one feels rewarded. And by the same token, it is in the act of loving that one feels loved. There is no time sequence involved. One should not act benevolently in order to receive reward in the future. If the reward is not experienced simultaneously with the act it will never be realized. Loving is its own reward! This is the true message of the Good Samaritan: He made no sacrifice, he experienced a greater peace and joy than those who had passed by, and in this sense he was more selfish. More humanly and intelligently selfish! How else can we interpret the promise that he who would be master must first be servant? Or that it is better to give than to receive?

A sense of compassion is a stimulus to love, but for authentic love to be experienced the compassion itself must be authentic and not manipulated. If a man is truly the product of his environment, then shouldn't we feel just as sorry for those who are cursed by affluence as those who are cursed by poverty? If I had to choose between being a product of a very wealthy family whose father is never around and whose parents are always involved in social or public obligations, or of a poor, struggling family whose parents are ever-present and loving, I would choose the latter every time. The only trouble is I would probably end up being the "successful" first kind because of the sense of security I would enjoy, and then my own children would in turn be deprived.

The only people I feel sorry for are those who feel sorry for themselves. And this state of mind has nothing to do with wealth or poverty, intelligence or ignorance, prestige or ignominy. I am impressed with the large number of well-to-do people who commit suicide each year, probably a higher proportion than among any other group. This act to me is the ultimate evidence of poverty of spirit, and this is the basic poverty we should be concerned about. In the final analysis our compassion should be expressed for people—whether they be white, black or yellow; rich, poor or middle class; genius, average or moron—any who suffer a poverty of spirit.

And to be authentic, this compassion must spring from real contact with a situation which our love can affect and not with a figment of our imagination. How dare we be so insolent as to speak of creating a great society when we aren't even capable individually of creating a healthy home environment?

What I am insisting, in other words, is that we take care of Ripon and Beloit before we concern ourselves with Selma and Saigon. It's not a matter of charity beginning at home. The point of the matter is that there can be no charity anywhere if it does not exist at home. And it is not unconcern for Selma and Saigon. It is a matter of the fact that authenticity, *auto-hentes*, means "that which is at hand."

The hardest task in the world is to love the person at hand—your roommate, your brother or sister, your wife or husband, your parent, the man across the counter, or the desk, It is so much easier to love in your imagination the Saigon waif than it is actually to pick up in your arms and hold firmly and lovingly the emaciated, sore-covered body of the unwanted child that can be found in any American city or town.

This kind of ersatz compassion is not humanitarianism; it is escapism. It is the mental process by which we try to kid ourselves into thinking we are better than we really are. It is the psychological process by which man hides from the realities of the here and now by caressing his ego through *imagined* concern for the there and later. It takes no personal courage or sacrifice to bleed and die in one's mind for the remote victim of oppression, poverty or disease. But it requires supreme courage and compassion and understanding—true love—to turn to your neighbor, extend your hand, look him in the eye and tell him why you like him or don't, as the case may be.

We have serious problems and issues facing our society at the present time. Let there be no doubt about it. But they can be solved over time if we will attack them directly and honestly, that is, if we will be willing to pay the price in time and persistent personal effort. They will never be subject to instant solution—to wishing it so. Nor will they be solved by blaming others for their existence, or by making certain segments of society the scapegoat for the general ills of society. Nor will they will be solved by running away from them by concerning ourselves with remote situations rather than those at hand. Nor will they be solved by application of the perverse notion that to love means only to sacrifice one's self.

The one most certain point is that they will be solved by doers, not people with good intentions but individuals with good deeds. Not those who talk a good game but those who play a good game—the achiever. We will never create a good society, much less a great one, until individual excellence and achievement is not only respected but encouraged. That is why I'm for the upperdog—the achiever—the succeeder: I'm for building an ever better society and this will only be done by those who take seriously their responsibility for achievement, for making the most of their native ability, for getting done the job *at hand*.

Alfred North Whitehead once said, "The present contains all that there is. It is holy ground; for it is the past, and it is the future." In this very wonderful sense we stand on holy ground right here and now. We honor those we see about us who have been faithful to their trust in their past pursuits. And in thus honoring individual achievement *for its own sake* we face the future with greater hope.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION IN STRIKE SETTLEMENTS

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, more than 2 years ago, the President promised to come up with a sound and workable plan for the settlement of strikes that threaten to cause severe disruptions in our economy and great inconvenience to our people. I must assume that he had—or certainly could have had—help from some of the best minds in the field of labor and management relations. Yet, after all this time, the President comes to Congress with a plan that has been rejected time and time again—a plan which amounts, purely and simply, to compulsory arbitration.

I cannot buy this approach. Such compulsion would reduce greatly the area of economic freedom for both labor and management. In spite of all the disclaimers already being trumpeted by the administration, the plain truth is that the adoption of the President's bill would be the first step along a path that would lead to a progressively greater Government role in fixing wages and working conditions, and, ultimately, would wipe out free collective bargaining.

I also cannot agree with those who say that this type of approach is the only one left open to us. There is an answer to this problem short of general seizure or compulsory arbitration. There is an answer to this problem that is consistent with our system of free enterprise and economic freedom.

The administration's answer is simple—simple compulsion. The answer which I propose today is not quite so simple, but it does preserve collective bargaining. It is consistent with our principles of economic freedom.

Step by step—here is how my plan would work. It would apply only to those common carriers who are named in the Railway Labor Act—that is, the railroads, the airlines, water transport, and certain terminal facilities. These are, by-and-large, the people who provide an essential service for which there is no available substitute. It would not come into effect until all other existing procedures—that is, mediation, "cooling off" periods, injunctions—have been exhausted or have expired.

No agreement being reached, my plan would then require a "fractionalization"—a breaking down—of bargaining units. That is, an employer would be allowed to bargain only with his employees; employees would be allowed to bargain only with their employer. No union or management association would be allowed to represent more than one group of employees or one employer.

Take for example a strike against the airline industry. At the point where my plan would become effective, pilots who worked for a certain line—say United—would deal only with United, and United would have to deal exclusively with its pilots. If they reached a settlement, then they could go back to work—regardless of what the other lines were doing. In other words, there would not have to be an industrywide agreement—one that would satisfy all employers and all employees in the particular industry.

Another important requirement of my plan would be a secret polling of employees—conducted by the Mediation Board—to determine, first, whether a strike would be called, and, then, every 21 days thereafter, to determine if the strike would be continued. If the majority of a company's employees were satisfied with an offer, then they could vote to go back to work—again, regardless of what employees of other companies might choose to do.

This represents, I think, a practical approach. It would preserve collective bargaining. It would encourage prompt settlement of disputes. It would prevent oppressive concentrations of power in the hands of either industry or labor. It would allow all of the influences of a free and competitive economy to come into play in the settlement of strikes that might otherwise drag on to a severe disruption of our economy.

I ask that the Members of this House, especially those sitting on the Education and Labor Committee, give this proposal their very serious consideration.

ON NAVIGATIONAL SAFETY AND BRIDGE-TO-BRIDGE COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, I introduced a bill, H.R. 10466, to authorize regulations requiring certain vessels to use bridge-to-bridge radiotelephone communications while operating in certain areas of the navigable waters of the United States.

In view of the importance I attach to this legislation, I should like to bring it to the attention of our colleagues and explain why I believe it warrants the interest and support of the House.

The weight of expert opinion indicates that for the relatively modest expenditure of $700, vessels using the harbors, bays, and inland waterways of our country can equip themselves with a bridge-to-bridge radiotelephone system which will greatly increase the margin of safety for their passengers, crews, and cargoes.

Given the high cost of collisions while underway, in terms of lives that are lost and property damaged, this kind of inexpensive and effective safety insurance should be required in the public interest. We need only remember last year's tragic collision of the tankers *Alva Cape* and *Texaco Massachusetts* in the Newark Bay area of the New York-New Jersey Port, which cost 33 lives, and the 1956 collision of the passenger liners *Stockholm* and *Andrea Doria* which caused 50 deaths, to appreciate the urgency of taking all reasonable precautions against their recurrence. Maritime experts agree that both these collisions may well have been averted had the ships involved been in bridge-to-bridge radio communication.

The Case-Dwyer bill, Mr. Speaker, which is titled "The Navigational Safety Radio Act of 1967," would apply to self-propelled passenger ships of 100 gross tons or more, to other motorized vessels of 300 gross tons or more, and to special-purpose craft such as dredges when their operations might hinder regular shipping traffic. While every ship of significant size would be covered, the tonnage standards in the bill would exempt most tugs, barges, and pleasure craft, though committee hearings may develop the need to include heavier barges or strings of barges under the requirement of using bridge-type radiotelephone systems.

The rising rate of shipping accidents—a rate which has doubled on an annual basis, for example, in the Newark Bay area during the past 3 years—makes it evident that existing safety precautions are inadequate. This is further confirmed by the fact that where bridge-to-bridge radio communication is used, even on a voluntary basis, it has been highly effective. The Coast Guard reports, for instance, that the use of the system in Port Philadelphia has resulted in "a dramatic reduction in collision frequency."

Our proposal, in large measure, is the result of extensive experience and study on the part of the Coast Guard, the American Association of Port Authorities, and other public and private groups. The regulations our bill would authorize would be reasonable and effective, and I hope the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee will begin active consideration of the legislation at an early date.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, from June 5, 1967, through June 30, on account of official business.

Mr. Long of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. Waggonner), from June 2, 1967, through June 15, 1967, on account of official business.

Mr. Fountain (at the request of Mr. Taylor), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Button (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Wolff (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for Monday, June 5, 1967, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Reuss for 40 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

To the following Members (at the request of Mr. Wylie), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Pelly, for 10 minutes, on June 6.

Mr. Talcott, for 10 minutes, on June 7.

Mr. Pollock, for 10 minutes, on today, June 5.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Hanna in three instances.

Mr. McCormack (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Matsunaga.

Mr. Tenzer.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Wylie) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Mathias of California.

Mr. Widnall.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Reuss) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. Walker.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, June 6, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

798. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting proposed changes in S. 1126 and H.R. 6232 to incorporate proposals of the administration and related simplifying and clarifying amendments; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

799. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

800. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Eighth Annual Report of the Federal Aviation Agency, covering fiscal year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 313(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

801. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copy of an order entered in a certain case, pursuant to the provisions of section 13(c) of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

802. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in a certain case, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

803. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

804. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases together with a list of the aliens covered, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

805. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports of visa petitions approved according the beneficiaries third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

806. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reduce from 5 to 4, the ratio of career substitutes to regular employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

807. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 31, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a letter report on Lafayette River, Norfolk, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted March 2, 1939; no authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 1, 1967, the following bill was reported on June 2, 1967:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 10509. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 330). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 1967, the following bill was reported on June 2, 1967:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means H.R. 10328. A bill to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1564. A bill for the relief of Antonina Rondinelli Asci; with amendment (Rept. No. 332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1818. A bill for the relief of Marina Panagiotis Restos; with amendment (Rept. No. 333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2036. A bill for the relief of Carlos Rogelio Flores-Vasquez (Rept. No. 334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aranka Mlinko; with amendment (Rept. No. 335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3471. A bill for the relief of Francesco Corigliano; with amendment (Rept. No. 336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6096. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inge Hemmersbach Hilton; with amendment (Rept. No. 337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 1, 1967, the following bill was introduced on June 2, 1967:

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 10509. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

[*Submitted June 5, 1967*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 10510. A bill to revise the quota control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10511. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Attorney General to admit to residential community treatment centers persons who are placed on probation, released on parole, or mandatorily released; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 10512. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 10513. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the U.S. Labor Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 10514. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit payment to the recipient of medical assistance, for physician services furnished under the program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10515. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 10516. A bill to provide for the sharing with the States of one-half of the revenues derived from Federal excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 10517. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended to extend its protection to employees employed in certain forestry or lumbering operations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 10518. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 10519. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for an income tax deduction for political contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 10520. A bill to establish the Government Program Evaluation Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 10521. A bill providing for the reorganization of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District on Columbia.

By Mr. PRYOR:

H.R. 10522. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 10523. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 10524. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 10525. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to continue after March 31, 1968, the existing 7-percent manufacturers excise tax on automobiles and the existing 10-percent excise tax on communication services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYLIE:

H.R. 10526. A bill to prohibit certain financial institutions from participating in gambling activities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 10527. A bill to repeal the authority for the current wheat and feed grain programs and to authorize programs that will permit the market system to work more effectively for wheat and feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10528. A bill to authorize the U.S. District Court for the District of New Hampshire to hold court at Manchester; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10529. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 10530. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act with respect to the settlement of emergency labor disputes in industries subject to that act and to require that strikes by railway and airline employees must be authorized by a secret ballot of the employees in the bargaining unit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 10531. A bill providing for the use of money received by the United States for oil shale; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 10532. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 10533. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide an allowance based on living costs and conditions of environment for Federal employees in Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands whose pay is fixed in accordance with prevailing rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 10534. A bill to authorize and direct the General Services Administration to make payment in lieu of taxes to the city of Sacramento, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 10535. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in order to authorize quality grants for schools of veterinary medicine and scholarships for students of veterinary medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 10536. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.J. Res. 600. Joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to review, and recommend revisions in, the laws relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. BARRETT):

H.J. Res. 601. Resolution extending for 4 months the emergency provisions of the urban mass transportation program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. Res. 498. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that certain social security and railroad retirement benefits shall not be made subject to Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

216. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to the Breckenridge and Call land grants in Santa Rosa County, Fla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

217. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to legislation imposing unreasonable and unwarranted restrictions on the sale, possession, and use of firearms by sportsmen and other reputable citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

218. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the reduction of the Federal tax load or to rebate to the States on an equitable basis a portion of the Federal taxes collected; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

219. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, relative to the combat divisions of the Army National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 10537. A bill for the relief of Yee Sik Quoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 10538. A bill for the relief of Angelo Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10539. A bill for the relief of Celia S. and Dominador Calderon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 10540. A bill for the relief of Mark Edward Associates, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

97. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to different colors for different denominations of U.S. paper money, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

Monday, June 5, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Dr. John Maxwell Adams, chaplain, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, creator, sustainer, and redeemer of life—we give Thee thanks for all the blessings Thou has showered upon this Nation; and again we remind ourselves of our dependence upon Thee for every good. As we face the momentous decisions that we must make this day, we confess that "our goodness is not good enough; our wisdom is not wise." Therefore, we ask for the blessing of Thy goodness and the guidance of Thy wisdom in every thought, word, and act. Forgive our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

We have been told that "unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it," and so we pray that Thou wilt clearly reveal to us Thy will for our world, that we may work with Thee in the doing of it.

For all who are in distress this day we pray, and for all who seek to relieve their suffering. For those in every nation who bear political responsibility we ask that Thou wilt lead us all, enemies and friends alike, in the ways of justice and brotherhood that make for peace—especially today in Asia and in the land that for centuries men have called holy. May Thy kingdom come and Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven, to the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 1, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of June 1, 1967,

Mr. McCLELLAN (for Mr. Ervin), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably, with amendments, on June 1, 1967, the bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 291) thereon, which was printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 8718. An act to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 10368. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 8718. An act to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 10368. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1965, Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated May 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings possible by consolidating management of acquired residential properties, Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Veterans' Administration dated May 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Federal Water Resources Research Program for Fiscal Year 1968

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Council for Science and Technology, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report on the Federal water resources research program for fiscal year 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Adjustment of Status of an Alien

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an order in the case of Shams Ol Shoara, Ali Reza, relating to an adjustment of status of said alien (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Third Preference and Sixth Preference Classification for Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to third preference and sixth preference classification for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of National Academy of Sciences

A letter from the President, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Academy, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

Medical Device Safety Act of 1967

A letter from the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of medical devices with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to change the method of dividing funds allotted under the Federal cropland adjustment program

Whereas, the Federal Cropland Adjustment Program, which pays farmers not to produce certain crops, in its present form appropriates funds which are distributed to eligible farmers on a first come, first serve basis; and

Whereas, this system is inequitable and works a terrific hardship on all farmers participating whether or not they are successful in obtaining funds; and

Whereas, in Anderson County several farmers, eager to be among the first filing requests for the 1967 Cropland Adjustment Program, spent the night in the Agricultural Building parking lot on the night prior to the first day for filing; and

Whereas, eighty Anderson County farmers filed requests for funds but because of the unfair first come, first serve rule only a few of them will receive money; and

Whereas, in Williamsburg County the first two applicants for funds under the 1967 program applied for the entire twelve thousand dollar county quota after they had camped out for several days outside the Kingstree Agricultural, Stabilization and Conservation Office; and

Whereas, some eligible farmers, because of physical infirmities or old age are not able to undergo the rigorous ordeal necessary in order to be one of the first applicants for funds; and

Whereas, it is believed that the Congress of the United States should take appropriate legislative action to correct the numerous inequities in the program to insure a fairer distribution of the funds under the Federal Cropland Adjustment Program. Now, therefore,

of the members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina, to the Clerk of

That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to take legislative action to correct the inequities in the Cropland Adjustment Program so as to insure a fairer distribution of funds administered thereunder.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the United States Senators from South Carolina, to each of the members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina, to the Clerk of the United States Senate and to the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, and ask unanimous consent that it be appropriately referred and printed in full in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION

An assembly resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation prohibiting the mutilation or defilement of the flag of the United States

Whereas, There have recently occurred throughout the United States several incidents of mutilation or defilement of the flag of the United States; and

Whereas, Such incidents of mutilation or defilement of the flag of the United States give encouragement to those forces with which the United States is engaged in combat; and

Whereas, The mutilation or defilement of the flag of the United States is an act against the public order peace and tranquility of the United States as well as the several States thereof; and

Whereas, The State of New Jersey has already provided, by Section 2A:107-2 of the New Jersey Statutes, that "Any person who publicly mutilates, tramples upon or otherwise defaces or defiles any flag, standard, color or ensign of the United States or State flag of this State, whether the same be public or private property, is guilty of a misdemeanor"; and

Whereas, The Congress of the United States has not yet enacted legislation prohibiting the mutilation or defilement of the flag of the United States; now, therefore

Be it Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized to consider and enact legislation prohibiting the mutilation or defilement of the flag of the United States.

2. That the President be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to consider and formulate, for submission to the Congress of the United States, proposals for legislation which would prohibit the mutilation or defilement of the flag of the United States.

3. That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded forthwith to the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States and the Members of the Congress of the United States elected from the State of New Jersey.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], I send to the desk a concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina memorializing Congress to change the method of dividing funds allotted under the Federal cropland adjustment program. I ask that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Memorializing Congress to change the method of dividing funds allotted under the Federal cropland adjustment program

Whereas, the Federal Cropland Adjustment Program, which pays farmers not to produce certain crops, in its present form appropriates funds which are distributed to eligible farmers on a first come, first serve basis; and

Whereas, this system is inequitable and works a terrific hardship on all farmers participating whether or not they are successful in obtaining funds; and

Whereas, in Anderson County several farmers, eager to be among the first filing requests for the 1967 Cropland Adjustment Program, spent the night in the Agricultural Building parking lot on the night prior to the first day for filing; and

Whereas, eighty Anderson County farmers filed requests for funds but because of the unfair first come, first serve rule only a few of them will receive money; and

Whereas, in Williamsburg County the first two applicants for funds under the 1967 program applied for the entire twelve thousand dollar county quota after they had camped out for several days outside the Kingstree Agricultural, Stabilization and Conservation Office; and

Whereas, some eligible farmers, because of physical infirmities or old age are not able to undergo the rigorous ordeal necessary in order to be one of the first applicants for funds; and

Whereas, it is believed that the Congress of the United States should take appropriate legislative action to correct the numerous inequities in the program to insure a fairer distribution of the funds under the Federal Cropland Adjustment Program. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to take legislative action to correct the inequities in the Cropland Adjustment Program so as to insure a fairer distribution of funds administered thereunder.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the United States Senators from South Carolina, to each of the members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina, to the Clerk of the United States Senate and to the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. HOLLINGS], I send to the desk a concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary in order to reestablish in Columbia, S.C., a permanent office to purchase all items which were formerly purchased in Columbia by the U.S. Subsistence Regional Headquarters, Defense Personnel Support Center. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary in order to reestablish in Columbia, South Carolina, a permanent office to purchase all items which were formerly purchased in Columbia by the United States Subsistence Regional Headquarters, Defense Personnel Support Center

Whereas, the United States Subsistence Regional Headquarters, Defense Personnel Support Center of Columbia, South Carolina, has recently been transferred to New Orleans, Louisiana, and only one purchaser will remain in Columbia to purchase fresh fruits and vegetables; and

Whereas, this transfer creates a tremendous hardship and undue burden on the numerous farmers, producers and suppliers of meats, dairy products and all other items which were formerly purchased by this Columbia office: Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take such action as may be necessary in order that a permanent office of the United States Defense Supply Agency be re-established in Columbia, South Carolina, to purchase all items which were formerly purchased by the United States Subsistence Regional Headquarters Defense Personnel Support Center which was recently located in Columbia.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to each member of Congress from South Carolina and to Major General Earl C. Hedlund, USAF, Deputy Director, Defense Supply Agency, Headquarters, Alexandria, Virginia.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1895. A bill to authorize and direct the General Services Administration to make payment in lieu of taxes to the city of Sacramento, Calif.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1896. A bill for the relief of Dr. Paul S. Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1897. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1898. A bill for the relief of John Anthony Bacsalmassy; and

S. 1899. A bill for the relief of Ritva Butrum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. Brewster):

S. 1900. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Grimaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 1901. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1902. A bill for the relief of Greene County, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE EQUITY FOR THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce, today, legislation to rectify a grave inequity created by the General Services Administration of the United States against the city of Sacramento, Calif.

Briefly stated, in June of 1966, the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Sacramento issued $6,700,000 of tax-allocation bonds for certain municipal purposes. The bonds were issued to the public on the representation that future bondholders would be repaid, in part, from tax receipts obtained from the Federal Government on a lease-purchase agreement involving the Sacramento Federal Office Building. These representations were based on firm information made available to the redevelopment agency by GSA that the lease-purchase contract would remain in effect until fiscal year 1972–73.

In September of 1966, GSA, contrary to its former representations, purchased the property and wiped out the tax receipts that were so essential to the issuance of the bonds. This turn of events has created a severe hardship upon the city of Sacramento, the redevelopment agency, and the bondholders.

I believe that it is totally in the public interest that GSA make payment in lieu of taxes to the city of Sacramento in an amount equal to the tax receipts that would have been received had GSA stood by its original representations.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposal which would authorize this repayment by the GSA. I am pleased to say that the distinguished Congressman, John E. Moss, of Sacramento, is today introducing a similar bill in the House of Representatives. It is our hope that this legislation will be enacted by the Congress in order to undo this severe inequity to a fine American community.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1895) to authorize and direct the General Services Administration to make payment in lieu of taxes to the city of Sacramento, Calif., introduced by Mr. Kuchel, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1217) to provide for uniform annual observances of certain legal public holidays on Mondays, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1598) to create a national commission to study quality controls and manufacturing procedures of medical devices, surgical instruments, artificial organs and limbs, therapeutic instruments and devices, and other medical and hospital equipment; to determine the need for and the extent of Federal regulation of such medical devices; to recommend to the President and to the Congress methods for determining constructive minimum performance standards, and feasible methods for Federal regulation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 23, which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to establish a memorial museum at Las Vegas, N. Mex., to commemorate the Rough Riders and related history of the Southwest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Monday, June 12, 1967, beginning at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Thomas A. Masterson, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372 approved March 18, 1966.

E. Mac Troutman, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372 approved March 18, 1966.

Charles R. Weiner, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372 approved March 18, 1966.

Milton Pollack, of New York, to be U.S. district judge, southern district of New York, vice Wilfred Feinberg, elevated.

Newell Edenfield, of Georgia, to be U.S. district judge, northern district of Georgia, vice Frank A. Hooper, retiring.

Joe Eaton, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge, southern district of Florida, vice David W. Dyer, elevated.

Ben Krentzman, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge, middle district of Florida, vice Bryan Simpson, elevated.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Walter Dunbar, of California, to be a member of the Board of Parole, for term expiring September 30, 1972, vice Richard A. Chappel, retired.

Lawrence A. McSoud, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney, northern district of Oklahoma, for term of 4 years, vice John M. Imel, resigned.

Robert M. Morgenthau, of New York, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of New York, for term of 4 years—reappointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing.

or before Monday, June 12, 1967, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the following nomination:

Benigno C. Hernandez, of New Mexico, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay, vice William P. Snow.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

RESCHEDULING OF HEARINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee has rescheduled its hearings on its study of mortgage credit.

The hearings, which were scheduled for the week of June 12 through June 16 have been rescheduled as follows: Monday, June 12; and Monday, June 26, through Thursday, June 29.

I ask unanimous consent that a revised schedule of the hearings be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the new schedule was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS, MORTGAGE CREDIT HEARINGS

MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1967

Panel A. Housing & Urban Development Dept., Veterans Administration, Farmers Home Administration.

Panel A-1. Federal Reserve Board, Department of the Treasury, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

MONDAY, JUNE 26, 1967

Panel B. Mortgage Bankers Association; Life Insurance Association; Professor Jack M. Guttentag, Wharton School of Finance, Univ. of Penn.; Mr. Julian Zimmerman, Lumbermen's Investment Corp., Austin, Texas; Mr. Raymond T. O'Keefe, Chase Manhattan Bank; Mr. Walter A. Hoadley, Bank of America.

TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 1967

Panel C. U.S. Savings and Loan League; National League of Insured Savings Associations; Dr. Arthur Weimer, University of Indiana; Professor Robert Bartell, Jr., Northwestern University; Professor Eugene F. Brigham, University of California, Los Angeles; Mr. Robinson Newcomb, Washington, D.C.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 1967

Panel D. National Farmers Union; National Housing Conference; National Association of Housing & Redevelopment Officials; International Association of Credit Unions, AFL-CIO; Home Manufacturers Association.

THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 1967

Panel E. National Association of Home Builders; American Bankers Association; National Association of Mutual Savings Banks; National Association of Real Estate Boards; Mr. Arthur W. Viner, Investors Central Management Corp., New York; Mr. John Heimann, V. P., Warburg & Co., New York.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 951, BILL TO AMEND AND EXTEND THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to announce that on next Monday, June 12, the Special Subcommittee on Aging of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will hold a hearing on S. 951, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Special Committee on Aging, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey. S. 951 would extend the Older Americans Act of 1965 for an additional 2 years, and provide a modest increase in its authorizations for program benefiting our senior citizens. The bill has 11 cosponsors, who are Senators CHURCH, LONG of Missouri, MILLER, MORSE, MOSS, MUSKIE, RANDOLPH, SMATHERS, YARBOROUGH, YOUNG of Ohio, and myself.

S. 951 is an administration bill, having been recommended in the President's special message to Congress of January 23 of this year, entitled "Aid for the Aged." In it, the President spoke of the need for "enriching the later years," and recommended legislation along the lines of S. 951 as a means to that desirable end.

Mr. President, soon after I entered the Senate, I became interested in the series of proposals which later were enacted into the Older Americans Act of 1965. In 1964, after I had been appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Services of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, that subcommittee conducted a series of hearings on services for senior citizens and issued a report on that subject. Our first three recommendations in that report were implemented the next year by the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965.

From all indications, the modest authorizations in that act have been wisely and fruitfully used since 1965 to enrich the later years of our senior citizens. This program has been as free of criticism as any new Federal program of which I have knowledge.

In enacting the 1965 act, the 89th Congress left it to the 90th Congress to determine how much should be authorized for carrying out the Older Americans Act during fiscal 1968 and subsequent years. Since the new fiscal year begins less than 1 month hence, it is important that Congress consider legislation providing the needed authorization, in order that there may be no pause in the implementation of the act at the beginning of the fiscal year.

The Special Subcommittee on Aging, of which I am chairman, has invited a group of witnesses who have a wealth of experience in the field of aging, generally, and with the administration of the Older Americans Act in particular. With their assistance, we will make a thorough study of what has been done for older Americans under the provisions of the act, and what we can expect for the future if S. 951 is enacted.

Mr. President, later this week I will release a list of the witnesses who will appear before our subcommittee.

DESECRATION OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, even before the hostilities and tenseness of the present crisis, we were all conscious of the waning American prestige throughout the world. The most blatant evidence was the many instances in which our embassies, consulates, and libraries have been mobbed and destroyed, and particularly those cases when the American flag has been desecrated and burned. It is a sad fact that flag burning has more recently taken place in our own country. We can hardly hope to command respect abroad if we do not command it at home.

Within 10 days, on June 14, we shall be observing our 190th Flag Day. I note in the press that a movement is afoot in the other body to make that observance more real by reporting and acting upon a bill making desecration of the American flag a Federal offense. We have a similar bill in the Senate, sponsored by the distinguished minority leader, which is now in the Committee on the Judiciary.

I have never been one to call for precipitous action. However, Senator DIRKSEN's bill is a simple one, carrying reasonable penalties. It is true that most, if not all, States have laws to enforce respect for the flag. Nevertheless, it is our national flag, and under present circumstances, I can think of no better way of commemorating the day dedicated to it than by making intentional disrespect to it a Federal offense. It would have a good effect on Americans, old and young, if the Senate joined the House in enacting this bill on June 14.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, twice that flag desecration bill has passed the Senate. Each time it failed in the House. Accordingly, we have waited to see whether the House would act on the bill; and if they will act, certainly, the Senate will take immediate action.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the distinguished Senator, my leader. But, with patriotism at a premium these days, I wonder if it would not be highly fitting for the Senate once more to take the lead in this matter and pass the distinguished Senator's very commendable bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We can do so. The celebrated Subcommittee on Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, if it does have jurisdiction, can operate at a moment's notice, and all we need is a full meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary. I assure the Senator that the matter will receive immediate attention.

Mr. COTTON. One reason why I urge this action—I am sure the Senator will agree with me—is that the psychological effect of enacting this legislation on the 190th Flag Day of our country's history would be something well worth while.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a proper incentive, indeed.

THE NEAR EAST CRISIS: WORLD POWERS MUST SHOW RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the world awakened this morning to the stunning reality that a broad conflict has now erupted in the Near East between Arab and Israel armed forces. For 20 years, since the creation of the State of Israel, the United States through the United Nations has sought to work in concert for stability, harmony, and peace in this, the homeland of our civilization.

The war which preceded the creation of the State of Israel ended with an armistice. In the succeeding years, we have learned that this meant neither peace nor war, but an uneasy suspension of hostilities. The policing of that truce has from the very first been the job of the United Nations—in terms of supervising it, of preventing a resumption of the fighting, and of attempting to sustain and resettle hundreds of thousands of refugees.

The present crisis, I regret to say, followed a retreat from the careful arrangements prepared by the United Nations 10 years ago with the patient but firm assistance of President Eisenhower. The highly regrettable withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force from positions in Gaza and Sharm el-Sheikh left an opening for provocation and terrorism and for a full confrontation of opposing forces.

Mr. President, in this crisis, we must insist that the U.N. reassert its jurisdiction, if necessary, enlarge its role in this area to prevent a giant step toward the darkness of worldwide conflict. I have said earlier that the U.N. is on trial in the Near East. I add today that all nations who have any sense of world responsibility are also on trial.

All of us who fought against tyranny in World War II recognized the need for a homeland for the Jewish people after their unspeakable ordeal in Europe. The Soviet Union agreed in this design, equally with the United States, as did the United Kingdom and France. We are all morally committed to the continued existence and safety of the people of Israel. This is not inconsistent with a full measure of compassion for the peoples of the Arab world who, after decades of some highly irresponsible leadership, are now plunged into the abyss of war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished minority whip be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

The task of the United States, Mr. President, is to assure that the United Nations accepts the very responsibility for which it was created, and seeks to prevent a polarization of the major powers in Europe and Asia. All nations of the earth know that at the final reckoning, the United States will stand by Israel. The Arabs have always known this. But this is no reason for us to advocate or to acquiescence in the polarizing of the family of nations in this tragedy.

In recent months the United States has been trying to work toward a reorientation of world politics, away from the black and white differences of the cold war. The irresponsible actions of the Soviet Union in avoiding its duty in the present crisis suggests strongly that the Near East may now at last become a major cold war battlefield—with Arabs on one side and the Israelis on the other, supported by their respective sponsors. That is precisely what we must seek to avoid. We have long had friends among the leaders of the Arab world. We can continue to have them, but only so long as we are able to keep this crisis within the venue of the United Nations, and prevent it from falling into two world camps.

This is not merely a crisis in the homeland of civilization. It is a severe test of leadership of all nations in this strife-torn world to use the available machinery of peaceful settlement. It is time for the Soviet Union to demonstrate that it wants peace, as its propagandists have insisted. It is time for all of us to prove up on our own deep belief that diplomacy must be substituted for armed conflict.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to compliment and commend the distinguished Senator from California and assistant minority floor leader for a statement which is careful, reasoned, restrained, logical, and definite. He has rendered a real service in voicing a position on this extremely critical matter, which the Senator from New Hampshire shares and which approximates the statement he prepared and had intended to make.

Mr. KUCHEL. I express my deep thanks to the able Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CIVIL RIGHTS—SUMMER DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, an exceedingly timely editorial recently appeared in the Florida Times Union of Jacksonville, Fla., under date of June 1, 1967, entitled "Violence Will Ruin Dearly Bought Gains."

The editorial calls forceful attention to the manifest unwisdom of the programs of summer demonstrations recently announced by Dr. Martin Luther King and Stokely Carmichael which, if carried out, cannot help but do great harm nationwide to the cause of improving race relations.

I ask unanimous consent to have this thoughtful editorial printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, for I believe it reflects the feeling of a vast majority of Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIOLENCE WILL RUIN DEARLY BOUGHT GAINS

Stokely Carmichael and Martin Luther King, Jr., moved into trouble spots in Cleveland, Ohio, and Washington, D.C., today, and it seems that Americans are to be doomed to another long, hot summer of useless street riots, looting and other disorders as some hot heads make trouble in the name of "civil rights."

This summer, however, there will be a marked difference, for both the agitation leaders are seeking to combine opposition to the war in Vietnam with the struggle to gain equality of opportunity in this country. The attempt will undoubtedly lose support for civil rights programs and negate the good efforts of Negroes now serving in the Armed Forces in Vietnam.

Americans have traditionally tried to present a solid front whenever our men have been engaged in armed combat overseas, but King and Carmichael, in company with some white sob sisters and soft-headed liberals, have taken it upon themselves to malign maliciously the intentions of the President and people of these United States and to attempt to reduce our defense of freedom abroad.

The only persons being hurt by the agitation against the war and the attempts to create anarchy in American streets, are the disadvantaged minority groups and the Negro servicemen who, more than anyone else, have done so much to negate arguments against equality of opportunity in this country.

During World Wars I and II, Negro troops did not gain a distinguished reputation in defense of their country. The same is generally true of the Korean War. Sociologists blamed the poor performance on a lack of personal motivation created by the belief among Negroes that they had nothing to gain from the conflict.

In Vietnam, however, the Negro serviceman has distinguished himself by gallantry under fire and heroic efforts in the rear areas. In doing so, he has wiped out the concept of race among the troops. "We're all just khaki out here," said one soldier. Khaki is the color of the Army uniform.

General William Westmoreland praised the valiant efforts of Negro troops in a speech to the South Carolina legislature and earned the men a thundering ovation. He repeated his words in a talk to the Congress.

Most opponents of proposed civil rights legislation have opposed it on the dual grounds that the acts are unconstitutional and that equality must be earned and not legislated. The Negro serviceman in Vietnam has and is earning unquestioned rights of equal opportunity for himself and his people in this country.

Anyone who doubts that his efforts are being recognized need look no further than recent elections in Duval County where qualified Negro candidates were given general support by citizens who voted their convictions in the secret freedom of the polling places.

No one supposes that all opposition to Negroes will vanish overnight, but it is clear that old stereotypes are being broken and people are beginning to judge each other as individuals more often. The process can be reversed, however, by violence and mayhem in the streets and this is why a long, hot summer would be particularly disastrous for the Negro and this nation.

Unfortunately, King and Carmichael seem unwilling or unable to judge the true mood of the people and have embarked upon a program that must result in violence and a reinforcement of old stereotypes. Their efforts will serve no one but themselves, for only the two racist leaders are gaining wealth or status as a result of the violent and unhappy anarchy in the streets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1(a) (50 App. U.S.C. 451(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) This Act may be cited as the 'Military Selective Service Act of 1967'."

(2) Section 1(c) (50 App. U.S.C. 451(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations of serving in the armed forces should be enforced through the provisions of this Act only when necessary to insure the security of this Nation, and the opportunities and privileges of serving in the armed forces and the reserve components thereof should be shared generally, in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy."

(3) Section 4 (50 App. U.S.C. 454) is amended by:

(a) Inserting after the first proviso of subsection (a) the following: "Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any registrant who has failed or refused to report for induction shall continue to remain liable for induction and when available shall be immediately inducted.", and

(b) Adding the following new subsection (g) to read as follows:

"(g) The President shall establish a National Manpower Resources Board, which, after consultation with the National Security Council, shall periodically advise the Director of the Selective Service System and coordinate with him the work of such State and local volunteer advisory committees which the Director of Selective Service may establish, with respect to the identification, selection, and deferment of needed professional and scientific personnel and those engaged in, and preparing for, critical skills and other essential occupations. The members of the National Manpower Resources Board on professional, scientific, and critical skills shall be selected from among individuals outside the Federal Government who are outstanding in such fields and shall include, but not limited to, representatives in the fields of health resources, agriculture, industry, science, engineering, public administration, law, skilled trades, education, and transportation. In the performance of their function, the National Manpower Resources Board on the selection of professional, scientific, and critical skills and such other voluntary advisory committees as may be appointed by the Director of Selective Service shall give appropriate consideration to the respective needs of both the Armed Forces and the civilian economy."

(4) Section 5(a) (50 App. U.S.C. 455(a)) is amended as follows:

(a) Designate the existing section 5(a) as subsection 5(a)(1).

(b) Add a new subsection 5(a)(2) to read as follows:

"(a)(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding subsection, the President in establishing the order of induction for registrants within the various age groups found qualified for induction shall not effect any change in the method of determining the relative order of induction for such registrants within such age groups as has been heretofore established. However, if in the discretion of the President such a change in priority of induction is deemed necessary in the national interest, such a change may be effected provided that a determination to this effect is reported to the Congress by the President together with information justifying the proposed change. The proposed modification or change in the order of induction will then become effective on the first day after the expiration of a period of sixty days from the time such a report had been received by the Congress while in continuous session during that period: *Provided,* That Congress has not, during that period, adopted a resolution rejecting the proposed change. For the purposes of this subsection a session may be considered as not continuous only if broken by an adjournment of Congress sine die. However, in computing the period that Congress is in continuous session, days that the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are not counted."

(5) Section 6(c)(2)(A) (50 App. U.S.C. 456(c)(2)(A)), is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) Any person, other than a person referred to in subsection (d) of this section, who—

"(i) prior to the issuance of orders for him to report for induction; or

"(ii) prior to the date scheduled for his induction and pursuant to a proclamation by the Governor of a State to the effect that the authorized strength of any organized unit of the National Guard of that State cannot be maintained by the enlistment or appointment of persons who have not been issued orders to report for induction under this title; or

"(iii) prior to the date scheduled for his induction and pursuant to a determination by the President that the strength of the Ready Reserve of the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve cannot be maintained by the enlistment or appointment of persons who have not been issued orders to report for induction under this title:

enlists or accepts appointment, before attaining the age of 26 years, in the Ready Reserve of any Reserve component of the Armed Forces, the Army National Guard, or the Air National Guard, shall be deferred from training and service under this title so long as he serves satisfactorily as a member of an organized unit of such Reserve or National Guard in accordance with section 270 of title 10 or section 502 of title 32, United States Code, as the case may be, or satisfactorily performs such other Ready Reserve service as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. Enlistments or appointments under subparagraphs (ii) and (iii) of this clause may be accepted notwithstanding the provisions of section 15(d) of this title. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (h) of this section, no person deferred under this clause who has completed six years of such satisfactory service as a member of the Ready Reserve or National Guard, and who during such service has performed active duty for training with an armed force for not less than four consecutive months, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this Act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress after August 9, 1955. In no event shall the number of enlistments or appointments made under authority of this paragraph in any fiscal year in any Reserve component of the Armed Forces or in the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard cause the personnel strength of such Reserve component or the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, to exceed the personnel strength for which funds have been made available by the Congress for such fiscal year."

(6) Section 6(a) (50 App. U.S.C. 456(a)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. (a) EXEMPTIONS FROM REGISTRATION AND SERVICE.—

"(1) Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Naval Academy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserves; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense; members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and the Coast Guard, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President who are not citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4, except that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall not be so exempted. Any person who subsequent to June 24, 1948, serves on active duty for a period of not less than eighteen months in the armed forces of a nation with which the United States is associated in mutual defense activities as defined by the President, may be exempted from training and service, but not from registration, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, except that no such exemption shall be granted to any person who is a national of a country which does not grant reciprocal privileges to citizens of the United States: Provided, That any active duty performed prior to June 24, 1948, by a person in the armed forces of a country allied with the United States during World War II and with which the United States is associated in such mutual defense activities, shall be credited in the computation of such eighteen-month period: Provided further, that any person who is in a medical, dental, or allied specialist category not otherwise deferred or exempted under this subsection shall be liable for registration and training and service until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of his birth.

"(2) Commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and members of the Reserve of the Public Health Service while on active duty, and assigned to staff the various offices and bureaus of the Public Health Service including the National Institutes of Health and the Coast Guard, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4. Commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and members of the Reserve of the Public Health Service, who prior to the enactment of this subsection had been detailed or assigned to duty other than that specified in the preceding sentence, notwithstanding the preceding sentence, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4."

(7) Section 6(h) (50 App. U.S.C. 456(h)) is amended to read as follows:

"(h) Occupations: Dependency: Fitness: Extension of Age of Liability: Authority of Selective Service Board.—Except when the President finds that the needs of the Armed Forces require substantial restriction or termination of student deferments provided for by this subsection, the President shall under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of persons satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of learning and who request such deferment: *Provided*, That unless such person is deferred for graduate study under the provisions of this subsection such deferment shall terminate on completion of requirements for his baccalaureate or first professional degree, failure to pursue satisfactorily a full-time course of instruction or on attainment of the twenty-fourth anniversary of the date of his birth, whichever first occurs: *Provided further*, That no person deferred under the provisions of this paragraph shall thereafter be deferred under this subsection except for extreme hardship to dependents under regulations governing such deferment: *Provided further*, That any person who requests and receives a student deferment under this paragraph shall upon the termination of such deferment if not otherwise deferred under one of the two preceding provisos, and if qualified, be liable for induction as a registrant within the prime age group irrespective of his actual age.

"Except as otherwise provided in this subsection the President is authorized under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other *occupations or employment, or whose* continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in graduate study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropatric, chiropodial, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: *Provided further*, That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces under the provisions of section 4(a) of this Act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferrable under any other provisions of this Act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the President shall, in carrying out the provisions of this title, establish, whenever practicable, national criteria for the classification of persons subject to induction under this title, and to the extent that such action is determined by the President to be consistent with the national interest, require such criteria to be administered uniformly throughout the United States."

(8) Section 6(j) (50 App. U.S.C. 456(j)) is amended to read as follows:

"Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections whose claim is sustained by the local board *shall, if he is inducted into the Armed Forces* under this title, be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or shall, if he is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, in lieu of such induction, be ordered by his local board, subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe, to perform for a period equal to the period prescribed in section 4(b) such civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest as the local board pursuant to Presidential regulations may deem appropriate and any such person who knowingly fails or neglects to obey any such order from his local board shall be deemed, for the purposes of section 12 of this title, to have knowingly failed or neglected to perform a duty required of him under this title."

(9) Section 10(a)(3) (50 App. U.S.C. 460 (a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Director shall also appoint a Deputy Director who shall serve under the direction of the Director and be responsible for public affairs and such other matters as may be assigned to him by the Director."

(10) Section 10(b)(3) (50 App. U.S.C. 460(b)(3)) is amended by:

(a) Inserting the following new proviso at the end of the first sentence thereof: "*Provided*, That no person shall be disqualified from serving as a counselor to registrants, including service as Government appeal agent, because of his membership in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces."

(b) Deleting the colon immediately preceding the first proviso, substituting a period therefor and inserting the following: "No member shall serve on any local board or appeal board for more than twenty-five years, or after he has attained the age of seventy-five. No citizen shall be denied membership on any local board or appeal board on account of her sex. The requirements outlined in the preceding two sentences shall be fully implemented and effective not later than January 1, 1968."

(c) Inserting before the last sentence of the subsection the following: "No judicial review shall be made of the classification or processing of any registrant by local boards, appeal boards, or the President, except as a defense to a criminal prosecution instituted under section 12 of this title, after the registrant has responded either affirmatively or negatively to an order to report for induction, or for civilian work in the case of a registrant determined to be opposed to participation in war in any form: *Provided*, That such review shall go to the question of the jurisdiction herein reserved to local boards, appeal boards, and the President only when there is no basis in fact for the classification assigned to such registrant."

(11) Section 10(b)(4) (50 App. U.S.C. 460(b)(4)) is amended by deleting the semicolon at the end of the subsection, substituting a colon therefor, and adding the following: "*Provided further*, That an employee of a local board having supervisory duties with respect to other employees of one or more local boards shall be designated as the 'executive secretary' of the local board or boards: And provided further, That the term of employment of such 'executive secretary' in such position shall in no case exceed ten years except when reappointed."

(12) Section 10(g) (50 App. U.S.C. 460(g)) is amended by deleting the period at the end, inserting a colon in place, thereof, and adding the following: "*Provided*, That the Director of Selective Service shall report, *to the Congress, at least quarterly on the* operations of Selective Service including such specific kinds of information as may be requested by the Congress."

(13) Section 12 (50 App. U.S.C. 462) is amended by:

(a) Deleting the last sentence of sub*section (a) and substituting the following* in lieu thereof: "Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this title, and such cases shall be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing, and an appeal from the decision or decree of any district court or circuit court of appeals shall take precedence over all other cases pending before the court to which the case has been referred."

(b) Adding a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) The Department of Justice shall proceed as expeditiously as possible with a prosecution under this section, or with an appeal, upon the request of the Director of Selective Service System or shall advise the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing the reasons for its failure to do so."

(14) Section 17(c) (50 App. U.S.C. 467(c)) is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

Sec. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter 537, as amended (77 Stat. 4), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

Sec. 3. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2216), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

Sec. 4. Section 9 of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public Law 85–62, as amended (77 Stat. 4), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

Sec. 5. Sections 302 and 303 of title 37, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" whenever that date appears and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the bill S. 1432 and agree to a conference with the House, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Russell, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Symington, Mr. Jackson, Mrs. Smith, and Mr. Thurmond conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOSTILITIES BETWEEN ISRAEL AND UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise today with a heavy heart. As we all know, fighting has erupted in the Middle East. The breathing spell which was sought by the United States and other nations—especially by us—apparently did not produce a United Nations solution, or even an indicated hope of one. Certainly none of us here in this country desired that the breathing spell would be ended or knew when it would be ended. But we knew that the situation was extremely tense. However one may view the conflict, no American can speak of it with anything but the heaviest of hearts.

We may never know who fired the first shot in the early hours of this fateful day, but I rise today to point out that, for practical purposes, this is not the relevant question. Aggression was committed some 2 weeks ago, when President Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, evicted the United Nations Emergency Forces. And again I deplore, as our President has deplored, the precipitate—unnecessarily precipitate—decision by the Secretary General. Nasser evicted the UNEF; closed, or at least declared the closing of, the Strait of Tiran; and mobilized his own and other Arab forces along Israel's border.

Any pretense that these actions were anything but naked aggression was belied by the statements of President Nasser himself. He declared that he was at war with Israel and determined to obliterate its existence.

I think we have a right to ask, in this situation, when the world will learn to listen to these dictators and take what they say at face value, instead of putting fancy interpretations on their statements to avoid their evil intent.

Three points must be made clear.

One, the repeated warnings that war was imminent are warnings no longer. War is here. United States policy must now be crystallized——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. To repeat, three points must be made clear.

First. The repeated warnings that war was imminent are warnings no longer. War is here. United States policy must be crystallized and implemented in light of the existing situation.

Second. The aggressor is the United Arab Republic, under President Nasser. I have already described the aggression. To supplement the description of the aggression, I will, in a moment or two, specifically quote some of the declarations on this subject * * * not only by our Government, but by the Government of Egypt itself.

Third. It is the duty of the United States and of other major powers, as loyal members of the United Nations, to seek through the Security Council, now in emergency session, every immediate means to achieve a cease-fire. But this time, let us be mindful of the broken pledges of 1956 and 1957 regarding access to the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

Let us be mindful also of the policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to foment a new arms race in the Near East, notwithstanding its earlier direct participation in assurances leading to the pullback of the forces of Israel, the United Kingdom, and France, in 1956 and 1957.

If we hold fast to those ideas, the path of the United States will become clear. I do not think it is necessary for the United States to spell out in detail precisely what it is going to do, except to repeat, as the President has repeated, the pledge and the responsibility of the United States, and the vindication of our Nation's honor. I do not think any blank checks are needed here from Congress. This is one conflict in which the people are defending themselves, and know how to defend themselves with such valor as to compel the respect, perhaps even the admiration, of the people of the United States.

Under these circumstances it seems to me our Government must proceed with dignity and propriety.

I have little doubt—and I speak only as one Senator—that when the right time comes for something to be done, it will be done, and it will be done with the support of the great majority of the Members of the Congress of the United States.

Let us make no mistake about it. This is not just another brush-fire war in the desert. The major powers have made pledges, based on their national interest, and their pledges have involved them deeply.

Let us not forget the declarations made 10 years ago, when we faced a similar situation. If carried out at that time, these pledges would have prevented the present situation. I would like to refer to them specifically.

On February 20, 1957, President Eisenhower, the most important single individual responsible for the withdrawal of the three powers at that time, said, with respect to the armistice agreement which included both the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba:

> If, unhappily, Egypt does violate the Armistice Agreement or other international obligations, then this should be dealt with firmly by the society of nations.

The "society of nations," Mr. President, means every single nation, including this Nation.

This statement was made by Secretary of State Dulles to Ambassador Eban on February 11, 1957:

> With respect to the Gulf of Aqaba, and access thereto—the United States believes that the Gulf comprehends international waters and that no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage in the Gulf and through the Straits giving access thereto.

Then in a news conference on March 26, 1957, Secretary Dulles said:

> You may recall that the report of the Secretary-General said that he did not think that belligerent rights should be exercised in relation to the Sharm el-Sheikh area and the Straits of Tiran, because he also shared the view that the preponderance of legal authority was that there was no right to exercise belligerent rights and to stop innocent passage through there.

On the first of March 1957, in the United Nations, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, speaking for the United States, said:

> Once Israel has completed its withdrawal in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly, and in view of the measures taken by the United Nations to deal with the situation, there is no basis for either party to the Armistice Agreement to assert or exercise any belligerent rights.

These statements must be read in the light of the statement of the Government of Egypt on February 27, 1957, regarding the Suez Canal, in which it was stated:

> The Government of Egypt are more particularly determined: (a) To afford and maintain free and uninterrupted navigation for all nations within the limits of and in accordance with the provisions of the Constantinople Convention of 1888;

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? How much additional time does the Senator desire?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York be given whatever additional time he deems necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator kindly set a maximum limitation on the time requested?

Mr. JAVITS. Ten minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it seems to me, taking these declarations together, that it is the clearly considered policy of our Government that there should be free transit, not only through the Gulf of Aqaba, but through the Suez Canal, and that the invocation of "belligerent rights" to justify Nasser's denying such freedom to Israel represents specific illegality, according to the policy of the United States, and as it construes the declaration of the Government of Egypt of 1957 which I have just quoted.

Let us remember, therefore, the actions of that great man, Dwight Eisenhower, in 1956–57 to end what could have become a world conflagration. Let us not forget that Khrushchev then threatened to send rockets to the area if the action did not cease; no one has ever argued what would have been the reaction of the United States under those circumstances. But the actions of that great man in ending that conflict have been defied and nullified by the actions which have taken place since. Time has finally caught up with President Nasser, Mr. President.

The point that must be left in the minds of the American people at this historic hour is not as to what we are going to do. We Americans have a great historic disposition as to what we do when justice is imperiled and our means allow us to something about it. The important point, Mr. President, is to clearly designate the aggressor. The aggressor is the United Arab Republic. Nasser is the aggressor, having sought to perpetrate on the world an illegal act. About Israel we need only ask the question: Is the nation which is the victim of aggression supposed to sit still and let itself be shot off the face of the earth and strangled as a nation, or must it be permitted to exercise elementary measures to assure its own survival?

Israel's Prime Minister has declared that his nation has no territorial ambitions. He did not have to make that declaration. We all know that. It is all threatened with being driven into the sea, and having its people liquidated. Mr. President, I cannot believe, no matter what are the other responsibilities and obligations of our Nation, that we will fail to meet this one squarely. We are a great and powerful nation, Mr. President, and this is the test.

There is a connection, Mr. President, between Vietnam and this Arab-Israel struggle. It is a mischievous and unhappy connection. One of the great things about matters of this kind in the world is that they come out, as it is coming out now.

We do not have to threaten anybody, or promise anything more than we have already promised. I am confident, Mr. President, of the good faith of the Government of the United States. I am a U.S. Senator, and I speak for the interests of our Nation. I am confident of the good faith of the Government of the United States in honoring the pledges of four Presidents—pledges which have received, and which I believe will continue to merit, the support of every American.

That, in my judgment, Mr. President, is enough for today.

EXTENDING THE VOTING FRANCHISE TO 18-YEAR-OLDS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to two young citizens of my home State of Wyoming, Miss Karen E. Greenfield, of Sheridan High School, and Mr. Bruce Patrick Almich, of Cheyenne Central High School. They are the winners of the annual McGee Senate internship contest. In this essay contest, the winners get the opportunity to spend a week in Washington, viewing and participating in democracy in action. They learn the ropes, so to speak, and observe at first hand the democratic processes by which our Nation is governed.

It is the kind of exeprience that most students in Eastern schools take for granted because they can easily get to Washington, the laboratory of self-government, whereas those of us from the Far West find it more difficult to send substantial numbers of young boys and girls this far. Thus, the contest is a small effort to make these advantages available to youngsters from the West.

Miss Greenfield and Mr. Almich are excellent representatives of today's younger generation. The fact that they are here as winners of the contest speaks for itself, for the competition was tough, indeed, with scholastic achievement, extracurricular activity, and an essay all entering into the judging.

The subject of this year's essay was the extension of the voting franchise to 18-year-old Americans. Both winners, Miss Greenfield among the girls and Mr. Almich among the boys, favored lowering the voting age to 18, as I do myself.

Mr. President, both Miss Greenfield and Mr. Almich were especially distinguished this year because of what I consider to be the fairminded way in which they dealt with a subject that otherwise might be viewed as a conflict of interest; namely, whether 18-year-olds should have the right to vote.

Their approach to this question seemed to me to be straightforward. Karen, for example, stressed that this age of change, of which we are all a part, requires more and more, and sooner and sooner, the necessity to reach decisions, and that therefore her generation was ready.

Bruce stressed that the Members of this body have placed emphasis upon providing the finest possible education for the youth of America, but that, even though we are providing that kind of education, we are somehow dragging our feet in permitting them to put this education to work in a responsible way. These are both excellent points to consider. I suggest that, in my judgment, the 18-year-olds of today know more, have a far better background, and are more stable and responsible at the age of 18 than my generation was at the age of 21. For these reasons, I am hopeful that we can get the voting age lowered to 18, and that others, like both Karen and Bruce, will have an early opportunity to shoulder some of the responsibilities of a younger political citizenship than we have known.

Their essays on the subject are worthy of note by all Senators. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOWERING THE MINIMUM VOTING AGE TO 18, A NECESSARY CHANGE

(By Bruce Almich)

In January of 1967, the Wyoming State Legislature, following a national trend, allowed the controversial minimum age for voting bill to die, without hearings, debate, or a vote. This outdated and archaic practice of not allowing ten per cent of our nation's voting potential to exercise the right of franchise has been continued by our lawmaking bodies, including Congress, for many years. I allude to the history of this measure, along with reasons favoring a long needed change.

First, let us consider the actual origin of the antiquated twenty-one year old voting concept, in addition to a brief history of the legislation associated with this problem. It all began with the Greek-Romanic concept of "seven-seven-seven." This school of thought divided life into three periods before maturity: Infancy, childhood, and manhood, each considered as having a seven year duration. In *The History of English Common Law*, by Pollock and Maitland, we find that there were several ages at which an English youth was considered to be mature. These ages varied from fifteen to twenty-one years and were combined with requirements ranging from the ability to count money and measure cloth, to the strength necessary for the carrying and wearing armor. The age of twenty-one, being the most prevalent was transferred to the thirteen American colonies, with minor exception of militia elections in which the minimum voting age fell to seventeen and below. Little conflict regarding a general voting age of less than twenty-one years was noted in this period.

The first American legislation for a lowered voting age was introduced in the New York Legislature in 1867, by Marcus Brickford. This early attempt to correct the problem was defeated. To date, the eighteen-year-old voting issue has been introduced in the legislatures of thirty-seven states. Ultimately, the measure was allowed to die in all of the 37 states except Georgia (1943) and Kentucky (1955). Both of these states utilized public referendum for deciding the outcome which was a lowered voting age. The action of Georgia and Kentucky indicates that the public, on the state level, is in favor of lowering the voting age.

Legislation on the Congressional level relative to the voting age issue began in 1941, with the introduction of a Constitutional amendment by Senator H. M. Kilgore. Since then, similar amendments have been brought up in virtually every session of Congress, with considerable support from both major parties, but without positive Congressional support.

Having completed a brief history of the

voting age issue, we can now logically identify the significant reasons for lowering the minimum age to eighteen years.

First, we should realize that we are Americans, a rapidly progressing, intelligent, foresighted, and free civilization which thrives on the healthy concept of democracy. We are proud of our free elections, Government representation, education, technical advancements, and our willingness to fight in order to allow less fortunate peoples to choose a democratic method of Government. Why, then, do we forbid ten per cent of our voting potential from assisting in the choice of the leaders and the policies of our country? This eighteen to twenty-one age group has full responsibilities as citizens.

Eighteen year olds are considered to be adults under the following typical conditions: Courts cease to recognize them as juveniles, they may marry without parental consent, state and federal penal codes are in full effect for them, school attendance is no longer compulsory, they may make legal and binding contracts, federal relief for them, as dependent children, is suspended, the military draft is fully exercised, and finally, many members of this age group are married, supporting a family, working, and paying full taxes. These citizens have obviously advanced beyond the age necessary to count money, measure cloth or carry armor! Many of them are carrying the adult burden and joys of a home, job, and a family, with full supporting responsibilities.

Secondy, the change of the voting age is a most logical move in recognition to two centuries of the world's finest education, which we as Americans have enjoyed. Our system of education has advanced so rapidly, that today's students often hear their parents say, "We never studied this subject . . . even in college." American History, a case in point, is taught from the lowest elementary grades through high school and college. The *Statistical Abstract* for 1966 tells us that only forty-nine per cent of our high school graduates attend college. We can, therefore, conclude that high school constitutes the termination of studies in the realm of political sciences for half of our potential voters. If we continue the practice of forbidding eighteen year olds the right to vote, the result will be disinterest and a feeling of rejection. The Honorable Edward T. Breathitt, Governor of Kentucky, supports the preceding statement by the following quote from his recent letter to me: "By permitting eighteen-year-olds to vote in Kentucky, we find a much larger proportion of young people participating in politics in our state. They attend rallies, assume leadership posts in campaigns, work in precincts, participate in class and group debates. They are less prejudiced than their parents, less swayed by special interests in their voting. Through their participation in politics and Government at a young age, I think they become better citizens."

Thirdly, it is significant to note that, according to the *Statistical Abstract* for 1966, a total of 104,300 aliens, having successfully passed a Constitutional examination, were permitted to exercise full voting rights in 1965. Yet, our eighteen to twenty-one age group must wait for the "magic age", regardless of their thorough education in the political structure of our society.

Finally, we should note an interesting group of statistics concerning the public, student, teacher, and parent opinion involving the chances of success of the lowered voting age. In a recent correspondence between the Honorable Lester Maddox, Governor of Georgia, and myself, I learned that Georgia has operated its political system successfully in respect to eighteen year old voting, for twenty-four years. Secondly, from poll results and statistics, taken by experienced pollsters, such as Gallup, we note the following: The majority of the eighteen to twenty-one group polled are in favor of a voting age change, an average of all age groups polled showed that approximately fifty-four per cent are in favor of the lowered voting age, and finally, fifty-two per cent of the members of the eighteen to twenty-one group hold political beliefs independent of their parents. This last statistic is of great importance, since it illustrates the fact that children are not likely to become "mirrors" of their parents' political beliefs.

In conclusion, we have investigated the history and several significant supporting contentions in favor of lowering the minimum voting age in the United States is eighteen years. Although I personally believe that it is difficult to set an arbitrary calendar age for voting, I strongly believe that a change from the present status quo in lowering the voting age is not only tardy, but necessary in order to preserve our dynamic, progressive, youthful, Democratic way of life.

SHOULD THE VOTING AGE BE LOWERED TO THE AGE OF 18?

I am an American. I pay taxes, I obey the laws, and I speak English. I am literate, responsible, and free. I am a member of a generation which will soon represent the majority of the United States' population, a generation which is a major contributor to the nation's economy. We have jobs, we raise families, and we serve in the military. We are old enough to die for the rights of citizenship and democracy, but we don't share in those rights. I and the rest of the age group between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one are not citizens. We are not allowed to vote. We are denied the most basic right of a democracy because of an age-old belief that the search for knowledge and the quest for maturity both end simultaneously at the age of twenty-one, an age of magic, intrigue, and, most important of all, citizenship.

Ironically, our Government has increased its spending four-fold in the past decade to completely renovate and re-vitalize the national educational system in order that we can absorb even more of the information explosion and stretch our education beyond high school—past the age of twenty-one. And yet the very group which has favored better education and an increased momentum of learning are the ones now denying that we, the products of such intensive training, have the intelligence to vote. We are better prepared at the age of eighteen than our parents were at the age of twenty-one. We have reaped the benefits of a massive communications media which links our nation with the entire world. The fact remains, however, that we are taught the facts of civil government and international relations and told to think for ourselves; but we cannot express our views at the polls, and our knowledge must lie dormant because the status quo of the voting age is so adamantly maintained.

The knowledge that we have attained can be tested, but the maturity that every voter must possess is infinitely more difficult to divine. One thing is certain: maturity cannot be measured with a yardstick or a calendar. Maturity does not "arrive" with the age of twenty-one or any other age. Such a deep and personal process is not only gradual, but secreted in the minds and hearts of each of us. Regrettably, the age of twenty-one has become synonymous with maturity, and this stigma of voting and the associated maturity to be attained at that age cannot be easily removed. If voting stands as a guide to maturity, however, then voting participation must be a partial indication of that quality. The disheartening fact is that a third of America's citizens failed to register their maturity and their rights by voting in the last Presidenial election. Teen-agers would certainly seem more mature in comparison to adults if we were allowed to vote. Armed with a greater knowledge of civil government and world affairs and backed by enthusiasm and free expression, we would be more anxious to exert our rights and would more actively participate.

In search of quick answers and concrete proof of our maturity, however, some adults single our juvenile delinquency and say that our entire generation is immature. In so doing, they fail to see that our delinquencies are too often an integral part of their daily lives. We are surrounded by adult vices, but we are expected to be more mature than our elders and abstain. With this paradox must come the realization that maturity is not attained by everyone at any one time nor can it be reached by all. We teen-agers should be judged in view of what we, as a majority, stand for, what we have done for the betterment of our neighborhoods and our communities.

The fact that we American youth are the most civicly active of any preceding generation is the most ample evidence of responsibility and maturity. Silently, the volunteers working on Project Head Start, in special education classrooms, in VISTA, in civil rights, or in merely obeying the laws of the land show what kind of a generation we are. Dying in Vietnam or working in the Peace Corps shows the mettle of which we are made. Acts of irresponsibility may make more sensational news, but knowledgeable adults can easily testify to the uprightness of character, the determination for success, and the willingness to serve of today's youth. The immorality, irresponsibility, and listlessness of some youth should not stain the record of all of us, any more than these same traits in many adults should cause us not to lose respect for our elders.

Teen-agers are also attributed with not being "independent" enough in thoughts and deeds. Political philosophy is usually a part of parental influence, but parents themselves, as a majority, also concur with their own parents' ideas on the subject. Keeping the voting age at twenty-one did not change their outlook nor will it help to change ours. Attaining the age of twenty-one does not immediately free us from parental bonds, teachings, or pocketbooks, but the greatly increased amount of free discussion allowed and fostered in homes of today is helping to loosen the strings attached to our parents' ways of thought. We are becoming more independent, financially and politically, a trend to be welcomed, not abhorred, as a safeguard against extremism.

The most pressing issue concerning the eighteen-year-old vote is that of the conflict in Vietnam. Why should a high school graduate be drafted to fight for a government which denies him any representation? This condition of dying without voting has existed since our country's inception, but perpetuating the abuse will not rectify the wrong. If a young man is old enough to kill on the battlefield, he is old enough and independently-minded enough to cast a ballot. Military discipline will not follow him inside the voting booth.

I sincerely believe that the voting age should be lowered to the age of eighteen. This should, however, be accomplished by a Constitutional amendment and not by individual states' laws as is defined in the Constitution. Confusion and inequality are the results from such laws. The basis of our Government is equality, and the voting age should be uniform just as woman suffrage was made universal in the United States in 1920 by the Nineteenth Amendment. One state's youth should not have the right to vote when another's is denied that same right: a condition which causes a disruption of equality before the law and on the battlefield.

Let our generation stand for equality and citizenship: give us the right to vote. We are the eighteen-year-olds emerging from the Age of Change, a swift-moving, enthusiastic change. We are the generation suffering from an ignominy faced by millions of our predecessors: that of helping shape the outcome of a war without the right to cast a ballot in support or denial of that cause. Our tax money is filling public coffers, and we cannot guide the fiscal policies of our government. We are well-educated, informed, and responsible Americans. We ask our Government to grant us our Constitutional right of expression through the vote. We call upon the nation's citizenry to recognize our plight and aid us in our cause. We are Americans. We seek to become citizens.

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS IN WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, was to be the keynote speaker at the annual banquet of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Thursday, June 1, 1967. Unfortunately, the death of his beloved brother, Willard Ellender, prevented him from giving this address, and I was asked to substitute for him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ELLENDER's prepared talk, entitled "The Role of Congress in Water Resources Development," be printed at this point in the RECORD, for I am sure that all who are interested in water resources will be most interested in the provocative remarks of our colleague, whom we know to be an authority on and dedicated to the development of the Nation's water resources.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS IN WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

I am honored to be your keynote speaker at the 54th Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Looking around, I note faces that I frequently see at "that other" Congress across town on Capitol Hill. Four Members of the United States Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives proudly serve as national vice presidents of this Congress here assembled. The importance which so many Members of the United States Congress attach to the recommendations of your organization is indicative of your significance in our legislative deliberations and the shaping of our national life. The work of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has, through many years, helped "that other" Congress do a better job in water resources planning and in the implementation of those plans.

When I first became a U.S. Senator from Louisiana, I was already very well acquainted with water and what it could do for, and against man and his works. Louisiana is a maritime State. Its 7500 miles of navigable waterways constitute one of its most valuable assets. Most of these waterways traverse the marshes and lowlands where the State's mineral wealth lies, and as a result we have been able to develop the resources of otherwise inaccessible areas. There are three great deep-water ports in my State, and it contains more miles of navigable streams than any other State in the Nation. Is it any wonder, then, that I have given my primary efforts in the United States Senate to an orderly and prudent development of the use, control, and conservation of the land and water resources of ALL the States of this great land?

I have concerned myself with all endeavors related to the wise and prudent development of our land and water heritage. Your interests and mine in that respect are parallel.

As Chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I have fostered programs to protect and preserve our precious topsoil, including the strengthening of our soil conservation programs. I am particularly interested in the development of small watershed projects designed to hold the rain where it falls for beneficial use, instead of letting it run off to erode our topsoil and become mere sediment in the downstream flood control reservoirs.

Serving as I do as Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works, I could not imagine myself in a more satisfying position in the Congress.

Ever since the early days of our Nation's history, Congress has had to cross swords with the executive branch to get water resources developments undertaken with Federal funds. The struggle began with some early statesmen asserting that the Constitution did not invest in Congress the power to develop commerce.

All of you here tonight are familiar with the history of American rivers and harbors and related water resources legislation. I am somewhat in the position of the preacher sermonizing to the converted, yet I think Congress' long and redoubtable role in America's water history is worthy of review at this time.

That history begins with the first Congress of the United States, which was convened on March 4, 1789. On August 7 of that same year, Congress enacted the first water resource act, providing for the establishment and support of lighthouses, beacons, buoys, and public piers which were "erected, placed, or sunk" at the entrance of, or within, any bay, inlet, harbor or port of the United States.

When the 9th Congress convened in early December of 1805—Mr. Jefferson, who made the Louisiana Purchase, was President—the House and the Senate were concerned with laying out and making a National Road from Cumberland, Maryland, to the State of Ohio, a Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, and a canal around the Falls of the Ohio (in the vicinity of Louisville, Kentucky). Many Members of Congress favored Federal backing of these projects, and in 1806 the Cumberland Road was authorized for Federal construction.

In 1807, two proposals for the aforementioned canals were before the Congress. It was proposed that grants of western lands would be exchanged for stock in private canal companies, thus making their construction a joint Federal-private project. Senator John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts, a consistent opponent of Federal participation in internal improvements during the years before he became President, opposed them on the grounds that fraud and collusion could result among the States getting Federal aid for "local projects." His arguments prevailed and the legislation was not passed. However, proponents of the projects set out to get a resolution passed that would call for studies and reports on the two projects by Federal commissions. The resolution was agreed to by the Senate on March 2, 1807, and became the authorization for the Secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin, to prepare his "Report on Roads and Canals," which the Senate received on April 4, 1808.

The Gallatin Report consisted of a detailed survey of the existing arteries of transportation in the United States and suggested an overall plan for improving the means of transportation between the several sections of the country. Unfortunately, the Gallatin Report was laid aside—possibly because its cost figures ($20,000,000) were too astronomical for the times and Gallatin's concept too broad. Someone has remarked that it was presented 100 years too soon.

John C. Calhoun in mid-December of 1816 introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution "to inquire into the expediency of setting apart the bonus, and the net annual proceeds of the National Bank, as a permanent fund for internal improvement." Calhoun argued vigorously that Congress had the constitutional right—and duty—to look into all domestic affairs, and he said that "internal improvements was not exceeded in importance by any." The resolution was adopted, but President Madison vetoed it with the argument of "constitutionality." Madison told the Congress that he recognized the great importance of canals and improved navigation but he felt that an amendment to the Constitution specifically ascribing such powers to the Congress was a prerequisite to the enactment and approval of such legislation.

Congress did not retreat. When President Monroe succeeded Madison and sent up his message to the 15th Congress, Monroe also recommended that Congress work out a constitutional amendment that would specifically give the Congress power to provide for navigation legislation. Henry Clay responded by saying that Congress already *had* such power. A bill almost identical to the one vetoed by Madison was narrowly defeated of passage after ten full days of debate in March of 1818. By this time, the "constitutional issue" had become such a battle-royal for supremacy in this area between the legislative and executive branches that it was felt wiser to await a judicial ruling.

The steamboat had arrived on the American scene about this time, and efforts toward monopoly of State waters for navigation developed. In New York State, for example, the legislature enacted statutes granting to Livingston and Fulton, the steamboat inventors and business partners, the exclusive right of navigation by steamboat of all waters within that State. Other coastal States passed similar laws. Then Chief Justice John Marshall handed down the most famous of all decisions on the "Commerce Clause" of the United States Constitution. Justice Marshall said:

"The power of Congress . . . comprehends navigation within the limits of every State in the Union so far as that navigation may be, in any manner, connected with 'commerce with foreign nations, or among the several States, or with the Indian Tribes'. . ."

The "constitutional" right and power of Congress to legislate on navigation anywhere in the Nation was therein recognized by the Supreme Court. In 1824, $115,000 was voted by the national legislature for navigation work, and regular appropriations have been made annually ever since.

The struggle about Congress' right to legislate in water resources development was not over, however. Andrew Jackson as President (1827–1834) believed, as did his predecessors in the White House, that a constitutional amendment was necessary before Congress could pass legislation to construct a *national* system of improvements. Jackson vetoed several "internal improvements" acts, calling them "local enterprises."

President Van Buren, following Jackson in the Presidency, was an even stricter "constructionist" on internal improvements, and for all practical purposes, internal improvements came to a halt during his administration.

But it took more than a Jackson and a Van Buren combined to silence the din and debate in Congress. When President Tyler succeeded Van Buren, Tyler recommended in his 1843 message to the Congress that appropriations for harbors *should* be made, but *only* for *western* harbors. Promptly and defiantly, Congress passed appropriations bills for both western *and* eastern harbors. Tyler vetoed the eastern harbors bill and accepted the western harbors bill.

Congress likewise "went to war" with President Polk, who consistently vetoed internal improvements bills that Congress sent to him in 1846 and 1847. Finally, in 1854, a river and harbor bill was enacted over the veto of President Pierce.

In 1865, after nearly a hundred years of infighting between the Executive and Congress about who had the right to provide for national water transportation and related projects, the Supreme Court ruled once again that only Congress had the power to regulate commerce and control and improve navigable waters. In 1866, Congress ultimately succeeded in getting President Andrew Johnson to sign a rivers and harbors bill. And so the "constitutional" debate was closed.

Throughout our history, Congress has had to fight to carry out its Constitutional authority. Nowhere has this been more apparent than in the area of water resources. The struggle for flood control began much later than that for navigation. But it, too, has been a long and difficult task. The chief opposition to Federal flood control has centered around the "local" character of flood protection.

However, under the Swamp Lands Acts of 1849 and 1850, Congress granted unsold swamp and overflowed lands to Louisiana, Arkansas, and other flood-prone States. The idea was that the state legislatures could sell the grants and use the proceeds for drainage, reclamation, and flood control. In 1850 the Congress also moved successfully to authorize comprehensive studies of the Mississippi River. The Humphreys and Abbot report, filed in 1861, is still useful for a knowledge of the Mississippi and its tributaries.

When the Civil War came, a lot of comprehensive work for flood control was under way, but many levees were destroyed in the military conflict. At the conclusion of the War, there was a clamor in the Congress and throughout the country for flood control legislation. In 1867, the Senate Finance Committee recommended the expenditure of $3 million in Federal aid to build levees along the lower Mississippi River. It was approved.

In 1874, the first substantial and constructive flood control measure passed Congress. It was an act that provided for a commission of engineers to investigate and report on a permanent plan for the areas of the Mississippi that were flood-prone. This particular legislation grew out of the terrible suffering and damage which spring flooding brought that year.

By 1874, Congress had so firmly established its hard-won right to legislate on *navigation* improvements that, until 1890, most flood control levees received appropriations that were described as being for "navigation improvements and incidentally for flood protection." By 1917, flood control was *called* "flood control" and dealt with as such.

On March 1, 1917, Congress authorized $50 million for flood control on the Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers. Then came the Flood Control Act of 1917, wherein Federal-local cost sharing made its debut.

As often happens in many areas of national and personal life, disaster such as that suffered in the 1927 and 1928 floods brought the acceptance of full national responsibility for future flood control. The resulting "omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control" bills are now recognized as prudent investments of Federal funds in the development and use of our God-given natural resources.

In connection with flood control, I should mention the small watershed protection program carried out by the Department of Agriculture. It is concerned with controlling runoff and soil erosion in small watersheds all over the country. The Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938, and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, with its subsequent amendments, set up a most useful Federal-local corollary program to the flood control work of the Corps of Engineers. I am hopeful that this small watershed program will be more comprehensive and more fast-moving in the future than it has sometimes seemed in the past.

I shall not go into the other major historical areas of Congressional interest in water resources development, except to mention such milestones as the acts authorizing reclamation of arid lands, the generation of hydropower, Tennessee Valley Authority, the control of water quality and water supply, and, most recently, recreation and saline water conversion.

Congress has "carried the ball" on all of these water resources programs. The Executive Branch reacted adversely to practically all of them when they were first proposed. In the early years of the Republic, the Executive objected on "constitutional" grounds. In more recent years, the voice of the Bureau of the Budget has raised objections to Congressional initiative in more subtle ways. The Budget Bureau, acting for and through the Executive, seems to me to be continually trying to take more authority unto itself. Out of fiscal 1968 Federal budget totals of $135 billion, Congress will have *some* control over only $30 billion, or 22 percent of total Federal expenditures. I might interject here that less than two percent of the total Federal Budget is allocated to water resources development. The Budget Bureau has a large degree of control over the expenditure of funds for water programs expressly authorized by Congress, but not recommended by the President. Increasingly, the Budget Bureau seeks to inject itself into the realm of national policy, including water resources policy, and this is clearly the domain of the Congress. It is a trend that I have said time and again I hope to see altered.

Charles L. Schultze, the present Director of the Bureau of the Budget, regards the entire budgetary process as an exercise in "making choices" about which programs will move ahead, which ones will be deferred, and which ones will be left to stagnate. Of course, choices *do* have to be made, but the appointed bureaucrats in the Budget Bureau are not the ones who should make them. I strongly believe that Congress should vigorously reassert itself in the budgetary process and assume greater control over all Federal spending programs. As chairman of the Senate subcommittee on public works appropriations, I assure you that I work toward this goal.

For example, in the most recent hearings on proposed Corps of Engineers projects, I found that tremendous recreation benefits were included in some of the projects to make them appear economically feasible—to get the benefit-cost ratio up to where it would look like a sound and sensible project to construct out of public funds. I am still of the opinion that public works projects should be directed primarily toward navigation and flood control of such scope that the local governmental bodies do not have the means to carry them out. I do not believe we should authorize a great big Federal program of public works projects wherein as much as 90 percent of the benefits on individual projects are for recreation.

If projects are constructed primarily for recreation, local people should pay a good deal of the cost. If local people cannot, or will not, pay a large part of the costs of a project where the primary objective is to provide recreation—like swimming, fishing, and hunting—then I think such projects should be deferred, and projects that protect the land and the homes and lives of people should have priority.

When a public works appropriation bill is reported and brought up for action on the floor of the Senate, I endeavor to "balance" the bill between the Administration requests and taking care of worthy areas not included in the Budget Bureau's estimates. Public works appropriations, in my judgment, should reflect the indispensable water resources needs and problems of the country. A reasonable number of new construction starts should be included in the Budget each year to meet the growing and dynamic needs of the country.

The story of water resources development in the early years, as in the present day, is one in which the Congress has had to carry on a long and stubborn struggle to implement its *right* to make determinations and to give sound direction to programs. It has consistently been the Congress that has had primary responsibility—and determination—to provide for a general, national development of water transportation, flood control, hydropower, and other benefits. The American water development story is full of instances of fierce opposition from the Executive Branch, as I have pointed out tonight. Only through the tenacity, idealism, conviction, and courage of the Congress, who are *elected* representatives of the people, has it been possible to secure authority to act in this area of national interest. Speaking for myself, I have supported the fight for this inviolable authority of Congress through all my years in the Senate—and I intend to continue to resist any attempt at usurpation by the Executive Branch through artifice or subterfuge. On many occasions, I have asserted my duty as a member of the United States Senate to express my views with respect to trivial and insubstantial schemes to weaken the basic and historical purposes of water resources programs.

Without the courageous persistence and foresight of the Congress, there might not be today our abundant supply of hydroelectric power; there might not be any water for the irrigated lands in the seventeen western States; there might not be effective control of floods in the alluvial valleys of great American rivers such as the Mississippi and Missouri. The Columbia, the Tennessee, the Colorado, and the Rio Grande Rivers might never have been harnessed for the benefit and profit of the American people. Our extensive and efficient water transportation routes might not be available to use in war and in peace.

The United States Congress, in its myriad water resources enactments, has helped to guide this Nation to a noble destiny, unmatched in history. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has given us invaluable assistance, and we thank you. May our common interest continue to commit us to a future of even more notable accomplishments in developing sound water resources policies, programs, and projects for America.

TRIBUTE TO VICE ADM. HOMER NORMAN WALLIN

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, North Dakotans have always been very proud of their native-born sons who have made good in all walks of life. On May 27 a fine example of this occurred at the annual commencement of Jamestown College which is located in Jamestown, N. Dak.

During the commencement exercises an honorary degree of doctor of science was awarded to Vice Adm. Homer Norman Wallin, retired, who was born in North Dakota and received his secondary education at Jamestown College Academy. A citation prepared by Dr. Alex C. Burr, past president of the Jamestown College Alumni Association, describes many of the achievements of Admiral Wallin. His most notable accomplishments include the raising of the fleet at Pearl Harbor, the maintenance of the fleet in the South Pacific during World War II, and the refloating of the great battleship *Missouri* when it grounded in Chesapeake Bay. Admiral Wallin has had a distinguished career and the people of North Dakota take pride in claiming him as a native-born son.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this citation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Citation for Vice Adm. Homer Norman Wallin

Mr. President, by independent action of the board of trustees and of the faculty of Jamestown College, a son of this institution is being honored today, and by his presence on this platform is, in turn, honoring us.

Eighty years ago instruction began on this campus. Over that period of almost a century a continuous flow of graduates and former students have served the Nation and our Government. They have served with distinction in all branches, including the armed services. We have been honorably represented in the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, the Mexican border incident, World Wars I and II, the Korean conflict, and now in Viet Nam. Jamestown College is honoring today one of this group, not only as a representative of that distinguished body, but also because of his outstanding personal contribution, over half a century, to the Navy and of the United States.

Fifty five years ago this very season, a youth born and reared in Washburn, North Dakota, completed his secondary education in Jamestown College Academy. As was the custom in those days, he participated in the commencement exercises, speaking on the topic: "Despotism and Democracy." With unerring insight, he put his finger on one of the continuing problems of this world, and in the half century following his initial analysis he has devoted his efforts to converting this early estimate of the future into the history of our day. Few men have held as tenaciously to an ideal.

Appointed to the United States Naval Academy he was graduated in 1917 from a shortened course to serve in World War I. His initial record brought him the Navy Cross—the first of many major awards. Following this service he was ordered to Massachusetts Institute of Technology for graduate work in naval architecture, receiving his master of science degree in 1921.

His record from this time on is one of wide experience, increasing responsibility, and continuing recognition. He has served at six of our Navy yards, and has served as commandant of four of them—two on each coast.

His various tours of duty in Washington culminated in his being the sixth and last chief of the Bureau of Ships. Upon the creation of the Department of Defense, he was appointed Coordinator of Shipbuilding, Conversion, and Repair.

At the time of our entrance into World War II, he was serving as material officer on the staff of the commander of the battle force of the Pacific fleet. For the salvage of the fleet at Pearl Harbor he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. The citation read in part: "Through his tireless and energetic devotion to duty, and benefiting by past experience, he accomplished the reclamation of damaged naval units expeditiously and with success beyond expectation, thereby sustaining the highest traditions of the United States naval service."

For later service as force maintenance officer of the South Pacific Force, he was awarded the Legion of Merit "For exceptionally meritorious service", when, "with unerring judgment and excellent foresight" he "directed the salvage and repair of numerous battled—damaged ships"—"his skill, resourcefulness and courageous leadership were an inspiration to the men under his command and contributed in a major degree to the accomplishment of an extremely vital and hazardous undertaking."

Time does not permit of the recounting of other services and other honors. There are many, suffice it to say that a career begun on this campus fifty-five years ago reaches a new peak today. Trained in three of the outstanding institutions of the country, his career forged in the preparations of peacetime and tempered in the fire of combat, and honored by a grateful nation, he returns to us today as the first and only North Dakotan to hold his present rank.

Mr. President, it is a privilege to present to you Vice Admiral Homer Norman Wallin, retired, as a candidate for the degree of doctor of science—an honorary degree from our point of view, and yet truly earned by a half century of devotion to participation in the continuing conflict between "depotism and democracy."

A SMALL, SIGNIFICANT VICTORY

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, in the war against poverty, total victory may not be achieved in 5 years or 10 years or even in our lifetime. But it is already being won in individual cases throughout the country.

One such case is that of an 18-year-old Albuquerque youth, Johnny Padilla, who had just about everything stacked against him before getting a new lease on life through the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Deaf, unable to speak since birth, a seventh-grade dropout, Johnny is now a "very good" maintenance worker for the city of Albuquerque. He is working hard to prepare for a more productive life.

And that is what the federally funded Neighborhood Youth Corps is all about. It gives young people an opportunity to get a new start on life as they contribute to community betterment.

Johnny Padilla represents one of hundreds of thousands of heartwarming success stories being unfolded wherever the Neighborhood Youth Corps is operated across the country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Albuquerque, N. Mex., Journal that recounts the story of Johnny Padilla.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Excellent Performer as Meter Repairman—Neighborhood Youth Corps Finds Right Spot for Deaf Boy

(By Pat Lamb)

Johnny Padilla, 18, who found employment with the City of Albuquerque through the Neighborhood Youth Corps has turned out to be one of the most capable and hardworking youths in the program.

But Johnny's excellent rating means even more because he has been deaf and unable to speak since birth.

Johnny, son of Mrs. Ernest Ortega, 1417 Adams NE, and Johnny Padilla, 2443 Black Mesa Loop SW, works as a water meter repairman in the city's shop adjacent to the Albuquerque Police Academy. He cleans up the meters and performs general maintenance work around the shop.

Through the help of the Neighborhood Youth Corps here (not associated with the Job Corps), Johnny was given a job with the city two months ago. The corps helps to place high school drop-outs and other needy youth in positions where they may gain work experience so they may continue their education.

PLACING WASN'T EASY

But placing Johnny wasn't easy, said Orlando Sedillo, assistant project director of the NYC.

Afflicted with a nerve deafness which also affected his speech since birth, Johnny attended the New Mexico School for the Deaf in Santa Fe. He dropped out of school when he was 16, however, with a seventh grade education.

His mother said Johnny first worked as a cook, but didn't like the job. A friend and his brother, who also works for the city, suggested he inquire about the NYC program.

When the boy applied, said Sedillo, "We didn't know just what to do with him." He obviously couldn't work outside where he would be in danger from not hearing something which could injure him, Sedillo pointed out.

RETIREMENT OPENED DOOR

The NYC office finally got an idea when they heard of the retirement of an employee, also deaf and unable to speak, who worked at the meter repair shop.

After NYC contacted shop manager John Nieto, he said he'd give him a try—and evidently it was a lucky move for Nieto.

Nieto said the youth is a "very good" worker, who learns quickly at the shop.

"Sometimes he even knows what I'm going to tell him," Nieto related, "before I start to show him."

GETS ALONG WELL

Bright-eyed and intelligent looking, Johnny gets along nicely with his fellow employees, is neat and clean, and has never been late to work.

Communication at work is carried on in several ways, Nieto said. The boy knows the sign language (there is a poster on the bulletin board at the shop showing hand positions for letters, which Johnny brought). He can read lips fairly well, he can read notes written him, "and sometimes I just show him," Nieto added.

Perhaps the best indication of the successful work the youth has done is Nieto's desire to have Johnny work with him full time when he completes the NYC program in about four months.

Johnny is just one of many Albuquerque youths who have been helped by the federally-funded, City of Albuquerque-sponsored program.

The NYC launched about two years ago, provides a part time work experience program and an incentive to improve the education of the participants. Applicants enroll in the program for six-month periods.

In addition to the placement of youths in jobs, the NYC also holds special group training sessions every payday.

Anthony G. Mance, training co-ordinator for the NYC, said Johnny is always on hand for the sessions.

"He doesn't always know what's going on," Mance explained, "but he is always attentive, well-mannered and gets something out of the sessions."

Johnny's mother said he is happy with his new job and he hopes he will be able to start work full time there when he finishes the part-time program with the NYC.

Johnny has overcome his handicap, and by doing so has helped not only himself, but others too. He is a model participant in the NYC program, Mance said, and will provide an incentive for other youths.

"The NYC has an excellent program," Mance said, "and this boy epitomizes the whole thing."

PRESERVATION OF PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the serious crisis in the Near East has caused serious concern throughout this country and the world. The Council of the City of Philadelphia on May 25 unanimously adopted a resolution memorializing the President of the United States to use his good offices to preserve peace in that area of the world and to insure the security of Israel.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 319

A resolution memorializing the President of the United States to use his good offices within the Government and the United Nations to preserve peace in the Middle East and insure the security of Israel

Whereas, the current crisis in the Middle East occasioned by the massing of troops and military armor along the Arab-Israeli border is fraught with the imminent danger of war; and

Whereas, the withdrawal of the United Nations peacekeeping force from the Israeli-Egyptian border heightens the danger of open conflict resulting from some provocative incident and aggressive action; and

Whereas, the mounting tensions in this area of the Middle East pose a serious threat to world peace, making the presence of a United Nations Emergency Force more necessary now than ever before; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the President of the United States to take all possible steps within the Government and the United Nations, to stabilize and preserve the peace in the Middle East.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Senators from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Congressmen representing Philadelphia in the House of Representatives.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY AT CUMMINS ENGINE CO.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, it is gratifying to realize that the concept of equal employment opportunity once alien to a large part of our business community, has become in our time an American standard. Businesses throughout the country proudly advertise themselves as "equal opportunity employers," and members of minority groups are finding it increasingly easier to find work that suits their ambitions and abilities.

Some employers, however, have given little more than lipservice to the essential elements of equal opportunity. In these cases equal opportunity remains a mere facade or even an outright hoax. I am pleased to report that Indiana's Cummins Engine Co. taking the opposite approach, has instituted a positive and constructive policy of equal opportunity employment which goes far beyond tokenism.

In a recent issue of the Labor Department's Employment Service Review, Henry W. Abts, vice president of Cummins, discusses his company's philosophy and approach to this problem. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "A Positive Policy," which clearly describes the experiences of this company in attracting and hiring Negroes, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. I especially call the attention of Senators to the seven conclusions Mr. Abts formulates at the end of the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Employment Service Review March–April 1967]

A Positive Policy

(By Henry W. Abts, vice president, Personnel, Cummins Engine Company, Inc., of Columbus, Indiana, manufacturers of high speed diesel engines)

In 1965, Cummins became the first business corporation to hold recruiting interviews on the Tougaloo campus. We had made a substantial financial contribution to the institution for the long-range planning necessary to upgrade the facilities, the faculty, and the curriculum. The Vice President of Personnel became a member of the Board of Trustees and a member of his staff joined the Planning Committee.

Almost immediately after these activities were made public, our Jackson, Miss., distributor informed us of a cancellation of an order for 35 engines from a local customer. He feared a general boycott of Cummins engines. The response of our Board Chairman, J. Irwin Miller, was: "Cummins has worked to improve the atmosphere of human relations throughout the country for many years . . . and the aid to Tougaloo is a part of this commitment . . . we are firmly convinced that such efforts help the Company in the long run."

To attract Negroes from outside the company, we made a special effort to alert college placement offices and employment agencies that we wanted to have a look at all qualified candidates available, regardless of race, religion, or nationality. We also informed various Negro leaders and organizations of our desire to hire qualified Negroes. In 1963, we were able to recruit a college graduate for our Public Relations staff, the first such direct Negro recruit at this level.

During the 1964–65 school year, we held interviews on the campuses of three predominantly Negro colleges in the South. As a result, in June of 1965 we added three more young Negroes to our management training program, one of whom was placed in our foundry operation in South Bend.

Hiring Negroes for management positions has created some difficulties for us in Columbus. In 1963, when we hired our first Negro management trainee, there was only one sizable apartment development in town. Since we referred many of our newly hired personnel to this development, we decided to treat our new man just as if he were any other newly hired Cummins employee.

When he went to the development office to sign his lease and pick up the apartment keys, it was apparent that his color was something of a surprise. He was treated cordially, but told that the person who had to sign the lease was "not in the office."

The Vice President of Personnel and a member of his staff went immediately to the development office to talk with the manager, who informed them that he and his associates were disappointed that Cummins had not said that the prospective tenant was a Negro. He insisted his opposition was based solely on economic grounds, because he was likely to lose many tenants if he rented to a Negro. We replied that we were most interested in this man's receiving an apartment and that if he were admitted, we would continue to refer our employees to his development. He reluctantly agreed and signed the lease. As it turned out, there were no problems of any kind.

Our interest in Equal Employment Opportunity is complete. As a result of our experiences we have drawn the following conclusions:

Equal Employment Opportunity is based on managerial attitude. We must want to hire Negroes, not just because it is the law, but because we feel it is the right thing to do.

We must keep in mind that the decision to hire Negroes, or to upgrade them is not based on employees' views, or the views of customers, suppliers, or competitors. The decision is ours.

If we proceed into the program with firm conviction, our people will probably go along. We must assume their consent, rather than ask for it.

We need to be persistent in seeking qualified Negro employees.

In hiring, we must look ahead to the time when this man is to be upgraded. He will expect to be upgraded to the level of his ability. By the same token, if he does not work out, we have a responsibility to discharge him. To fail in this is also discrimination, although of an opposite nature.

We must give our Negro employees something meaningful and necessary to do; we cannot just locate them conspicuously for display purposes.

We must be willing to go the extra mile at the outset—can our new Negro employee locate housing, can he eat at the restaurants where we eat, stay at the motels we use; and so forth. We must help in these areas.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR LOOKS AT PROBLEMS OF OLDER AMERICANS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, writers for the Christian Science Monitor have contributed many thoughtful and influential articles dealing with social problems of our times. I am proud that this great newspaper has its headquarters in Massachusetts.

On April 27, the Monitor published the second of three articles dealing with problems of older Americans. The author, Mr. David Holmstrom, described the help that senior centers give to older Americans who might otherwise endure bitter isolation. Mr. Holmstrom also defines the differences between happiness and unhappiness in old age: Mr. Halpert, he writes, "thinks the differences between being old and unhappy and being 'a senior citizen' and unhappy is a receptivity to the possibilities in the world."

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal, State, and Local Services of the Special Committee on Aging, I find that statement very helpful in my thinking about the purposes of programs for older Americans. I believe that—in the words of an article in a recent edition of the Boston Center Topics—

> It is more and more realized how much ability, knowledge, and wisdom is being wasted in older people retired from their occupations who have so much free time. . . . What they need is the opportunity to do something that will attract their interest, give them an aim to strive at, a purpose to accomplish.

Mr. President, I think that Mr. Holmstrom's article should receive widespread attention. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 27, 1967]

ROLE TO PLAY—A SENIOR CENTER IS RENEWAL

(By David Holmstrom)

Boston.—Richard Halpert hasn't been to a movie in 20 years. Nor does he own a television set. But he reads a lot, and now and then a movie could be inviting, or a comfortable chair to watch a good documentary on educational TV.

But living on $132.65 a month doesn't encourage extravagance. It cuts daily life down to the essentials.

Under the circumstances Mr. Halpert outdoes most other men his age (76) in surmounting the problems of retirement, old age, and loneliness. His attitude could well serve as a model to other elderly citizens because he has always been active and alert.

His large apartment, up three flights of stairs in an old red-brick building in Boston, is spartan and quiet. He moves through his home carefully and deliberately. He is a small, thin man with sparkling gray eyes.

MARKET WATCHED

When he came to this country 44 years ago from Germany, as a young World War I veteran, he went to work in a chocolate factory near Boston. After several years of "working at chocolate" he eventually became the manager of a grocery store owned by a large company. He retired in 1955 with a few thousand dollars in savings. His wife passed away in 1965 after several years of illness.

He receives a pension of $24.45 a month from his former employer and $108.10 a month in benefits from social security. Occasionally he makes a small profit from buying and selling shares on the stock market by using his savings carefully. But he has no other income.

SOYBEAN MEAL USED

Rent is $72 a month. Usually he allows himself $7 a week for food "but prices are too high now," he says, and calls eating "a bad, expensive habit. I'm not fond of meat and I don't have too much interest in cooking." He speaks with a noticeable German accent and now and then searches for just the right word.

Several years ago he learned of a firm in Chicago which processes a nutritious soybean meal for consumption in underdeveloped countries.

Every few months now he orders two large cans of the meal and uses the mixture in his evening meals. It is granular, nearly tasteless, but something like eating starch and old bread. Mixed with a creamed soup or other ingredients he says it makes a substantial, if not appealing, meal.

He is usually up by 5:30 every morning and has a breakfast consisting of cereal, a banana, one slice of bread, a boiled egg, crackers with jam, and cocoa. "I go for the expensive kind," he says and holds up a can of imported cocoa.

READING ENJOYED

His apartment is well furnished with old but clean furniture and he does the household work himself. Just recently he spent money on some new winter clothes, the first clothes he had purchased in years. At the same time be bought a pair of shoes for $6.60—a "real bargain," he says.

Most of his enjoyment comes from reading magazines and books and he has done some writing. "I like to write," he says. "I get in print very seldom." Eagerly he shows his clippings and tells of his interest in languages and Biblical archaeology.

Last year after taking a walk through the Boston Fenway, he wrote a firsthand account, submitted it to a local magazine and was pleased to see it published. He subscribes to National Geographic and Forbes magazines and listens to the radio.

"I have no time to sit around on park benches and talk about illnesses with other men," he says waving his hand toward the window and street below. Every day he tries to spend two hours outside walking. Often he goes to the Boston Museum of Fine Arts to pursue his interest in archaeology.

CENTER DISCOVERED

For lunch he has two slices of bread with cheese, a beverage and a piece of cake. He never eats out. "I can't afford it," he says. In the afternoon he likes to snack on macaroons and a piece of chocolate. "I'm very much for chocolate," he says smiling.

Recently, through contact with a newly formed Boston Center for Senior Citizens, his life has taken a new turn. The center, within walking distance of his apartment, is funded by a $90,000 grant under the Older Americans Act of 1965. It is a trial project which, if successful, will serve as a model for other centers.

Through its permanent and volunteer staff it encourages older people to come together for friendly, meaningful activity. Local contributors include the Episcopal Diocese, First Baptist Church, The First Church of Christ, Scientist, Permanent Charity Fund, Inc., Saint Ann's Paulist Fathers, Church of the Advent, and Trinity Church.

NEWSPAPER PRODUCED

Mr. Halpert was asked to write the center's first edition of the "Boston Center Topics." On the front page of the mimeographed newspaper he outlined the general purpose of the center:

". . . it is more and more realized how much ability, knowledge, and wisdom is being wasted in older people retired from their occupations who have so much free time on hand with which they don't know what to do. What they need is the opportunity to do something that will attract their interest, give them an aim to strive at, a purpose to accomplish. Leisure time, which is one of recreation, to look forward to when one is usefully occupied, hangs heavy on them, a burden from which to escape is a hopeless wish."

Perhaps more important to Mr. Halpert than the chance for increased activity is the pay he will receive for the work he will do for the center.

"In a way," he says, "I am glad to be busier, but in a way, no. I have so many interests on my own. But I want to do something for the common good, so I have involved myself."

For attending a two-week training course on how to more effectively approach other older people and introduce them to the possibilities of the center or offer other aid, he earned $28 a week. Once the center is in full swing he will earn $80 a month for doing 30 hours of work a week.

But for others, less independent than Mr. Halpert, a center is a vital meeting place where friendship and activity replace the loneliness and wasted days of living in large cities. It also serves as a middleman when personal needs or problems have to be solved through community or government agencies.

RECEPTIVITY CITED

"One man," said Mr. Halpert, "a former railroad man, didn't know what to do with himself until the center opened. Now he is a new man, much happier, and he looks forward to anything he can do for the center.

"One time I went to a restaurant with a young woman, a social worker from the center. She approached a lonely looking older woman sitting at a table and introduced herself. It came out that the woman had no friends and no relatives and was so glad to be spoken to. We told her about the center and all shook hands. That woman needs to go to our center very much."

Mr. Halpert thinks the differences between being old and unhappy and being "a senior citizen" and happy is a receptivity to the possibilities in the world. "When I was a young boy of 16 in Germany I read a book which said the best medicine was cheerfulness. I have always tried to be cheerful no matter what I was doing. It appears to have worked all these years," he says with a sly grin.

DWAYNE L. WALLACE—A LEADER IN AVIATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the citizens of Kansas are proud that our State has contributed as it has to the growth of the aviation industry. Wichita, Kans., has, for many years, carried the title of "Air Capital of the World."

One of the Nation's leaders in making the aviation industry what it is today is Mr. Dwayne L. Wallace, former president and now chairman of the board of Cessna Aircraft Co., in Wichita. Mr. Wallace, a native of Belmont, Kans., gained his bachelor's degree in aeronautical engineering at the University of Wichita, and became president of Cessna at age 25.

Cessna, at that time, was producing fewer than 20 airplanes a year. Many longtime employees have stated that the company survived because Dwyane Wallace did not know how to quit. Today Cessna employs more than 11,000 persons and has sales in excess of $200,000,000 annually. This success is due largely to the abilities and hard work of Dwayne Wallace and his belief in the future of aviation. Dwayne has always believed that "the sun is just beginning to shine on the aviation industry." Even in view of the tremendous growth which has already taken place, he still maintains that it is only a beginning.

Mr. President, the June 1967 issue of National Aeronautics magazine carries an article on Dwayne L. Wallace and the Cessna Aircraft Co. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"From the first day I joined Cessna, we've been going by forks in the road. There have been dozens of them in our history, and we're still coming up to them all the time."

That his company has usually taken the right fork in the road is a tribute to the leadership of Dwane L. Wallace, Cessna chairman of the board, who at only 55 is the youngest of the men who have pioneered general aviation.

Wallace quickly downgrades his personal contributions, pointing instead to the "team" which over the years has molded Cessna into the world's largest producer of general aviation aircraft.

There's no denying the influence of this team, but those who know the company best are equally quick to point out that Wallace's personality runs so deeply into the organization that his company is basically an extension of himself.

A profile of Cessna Aircraft Company comes remarkably close to a profile of Dwane Wallace.

Both are staunchly conservative, yet willing to make a bold move when the occasion is right and the odds are favorable; both live only for the future, content to draw on lessons from the past but refusing to indulge in nostalgia; both firmly believe that aircraft serve "God's purpose" by providing people with more abundant living; both refuse to recognize the meaning of "failure," measuring instead in degrees of success toward known objectives.

One of Wallace's favorite expressions is that "nothing real, nothing constructive, nothing worthwhile is ever accomplished without plenty of hard work." And indeed his whole life could serve as the framework for a morality play in which the protagonist finds success through hard work, integrity, faith, and confidence.

Wallace was born in Belmont, Kansas, in October, 1911, just a few months after his uncle, Clyde V. Cessna, made his first successful flight in a Bleriot-like monoplane.

Cessna's dedication to airplanes eventually became the inspiration for Wallace's entire life. At a Sunday afternoon family reunion in 1921, Uncle Clyde asked who wanted to go for a ride in his OX-5 Swallow. "I knew I wanted to go," Wallace recalls, "and I was right up there at the head of the line. It was decided that I and my brothers, Dwight and Deane, would all ride together in the front cockpit. One of my aunts was beside herself; she couldn't understand how my mother could let all of the boys risk our lives in the same plane."

But his mother had faith in Clyde and his airplane, and soon the three boys were roaring over the Kansas fields, standing in the cockpit so they could see out.

From that moment on, Wallace was convinced that his future was in aviation.

His first hurdle was overcoming the doubts of his father, a country doctor, and Wallace well remembers the talk in which he convinced his father that he knew exactly what he wanted to do.

In 1929, Wallace enrolled in the University of Wichita, one of only three universities in the country which offered a bachelor's degree in aeronautical engineering. In college, he resumed his flying career, checking out first in gliders built by his engineering class and finally soloing in a powered aircraft—the first production model OX-5 Travel Air—in March 1932.

Wallace recalls the last years of college as the toughest in his life. "I kept telling myself that I'd quit if I only could, but it just wasn't in me to quit." He and three others made up the entire aeronautical engineering graduating class at Wichita U. in 1933, and the same year he joined the late Walter Beech as an engineer.

His Uncle Clyde's aircraft company, which had shown great promise during the late 1920s, was closed at the time because of the depression. In 1934, Wallace persuaded "C.V."—as he still refers to Clyde—to reorganize the Cessna Aircraft Company, and two years later, upon Clyde Cessna's retirement the 25-year-old engineer became president of the company.

The new title carried with it an odd assortment of duties. One long-time employee recalls that "Dwane is probably the only man who ever served a company as president and water boy at the same time. Our factory was not hooked up to city water, so we had no drinking water. Dwane would regularly bring water out in five-gallon bottles." In addition, he swept floors, served as chief test pilot, sold airplanes, participated in air races, and pitched for the lunch-hour softball team.

Wallace also did a lot of traveling, either on business or to participate in the air races which dominated aviation in those days. Another employee remembers that "we could always tell when Dwane was returning from a trip. He used the plant's water tower as a pylon, and before landing he would do a turn around the tower, so close that it looked as if his wing tip would touch it."

Asked about these incidents, Wallace smiles broadly and says, "Well you see our flying conduct in those days wasn't always exemplary. Besides, we couldn't work all the time, and being able to fly like that was one of the compensations we had."

The "air race period," one of the most interesting in Cessna's history, was a product of necessity rather than design. Still another employee recalls, "The air races Dwane took part in were the big things in the mid-thirties. He had no interest in gaining personal glory by entering the races. He went because the future of the company depended on the money he won and the publicity Cessna got. The purses Dwane brought back often determined whether or not there would be be a full paycheck for everyone." The employee could also add that Wallace often went without a paycheck himself so that others could be paid.

Many of the trophies earned during this period are still displayed in the Cessna lobby. The lineup is dominated by the huge Detroit News Air Transport Trophy. Eldon Cessna, Clyde's son, won the trophy in a Cessna model in 1931. There were no races from 1932 through 1934, but George Harte won again for Cessna in 1935. The following year, Wallace won permanent possession of the trophy for Cessna by winning the race in a C-34 Airmaster.

To say that Cessna was a struggling young company would be a vast understatement. Production of the C-34, C-37 and C-38 Airmaster averaged less than 20 units a year, and Wallace remembers that "dollars in those days were as big as cartwheels."

The company survived primarily because Dwane Wallace didn't know how to quit, and his attitude permeated the company. An employee remembers when he became dissatisfied with his pay and went to talk with Wallace: "I told him I just couldn't live on fifteen dollars a week. He took me into his confidence and showed me just what the profit was on a single sale of an Airmaster. He showed me that wages depend on sales. He promised to do better when he could. Let me tell you, the company had only a handful of employees, but we all had confidence in Dwane. We liked that guy well enough so that none of us quit our jobs."

The coming aircraft production demands of World War II signaled an abrupt change in Cessna's fortunes. The company's first twin-engine plane, the T-50, was being considered for purchase as a trainer for the Royal Canadian Air Force. Wallace went to New York to discuss details with the British Purchasing Commission, which was handling the sale. Before the British were willing to hand down a contract, they wanted to know something of Cessna's ability to produce and were especially interested in the company's financial condition. Wallace called back to Wichita and asked for a financial report. It showed that Cessna had a cash balance of less than five dollars.

Knowing that such a report would kill any chances of landing the contract, Wallace contacted a Wichita banker, who agreed to extend a credit line of $500,000 to Cessna. The British were satisfied, and Wallace came home with a contract for 180 T-50s.

Many people view this as the major turning point in Cessna's history, but Wallace regards it as only one of the many forks in the road. He is firmly convinced the company would have survived and eventually prospered even without this contract.

"Turning point" or "fork in the road," the T-50 put Cessna in the black to stay. Before the war's end, the company built more than 5,400 of the aircraft. Officially, the variations were known as the Crane, AT-8, AT-17, and and UC-78, but the airplane will long be remembered less glamorously as the "Bamboo Bomber" or "Rhapsody in Glue."

Although it was wartime production that finally brought Cessna the recognition it had long sought, Wallace and others in the company anxiously looked forward to returning to their first love—the production of aircraft for business and pleasure.

The immediate post-war period proved to be one of falsely grounded optimism. It was widely believed that this was to be the era of the family car of the air, an airplane in every back yard, and boundless horizons for general aviation. Indeed, a score of companies produced a staggering 35,000 aircraft, mostly two-placers, in the gay days of 1946. When the bubble burst a short while later, Cessna was one of a handful of companies, which survived, and Wallace candidly admits it wasn't primarily because of product or sales superiority but because "we worked hard and hung on."

The intervening 20 years have seen Cessna slowly but steadily climbing to the top rung of the industry—consolidating its gains, building better sales and service capability, fighting for public acceptance of flying, and taking the right turns at the major forks in the road.

Through it all, the company has shown a faith and singleness of purpose which is summed up in a comment by Wallace: "I admit wondering occasionally when we would ever amount to anything, but since the day one, I've always believed deep down that it was just a matter of time and hard work."

One of Wallace's greatest pleasures has been to watch the company and its people grow into new responsibilities and bigger jobs. Before he was elevated from president to chairman of the board in 1964, he often quipped that he was "the only man in the company who hadn't received a promotion in 28 years."

Wallace's responsibilities now include the highest executive and long-range policy decisions of a company with 11,000-plus employees and sales in excess of $200,000,000 a year, more than 1,000 times greater than when he became president. A single year's production of aircraft is now greater than combined production during the first 35 years after Clyde Cessna's first flight.

But in his own mind, Wallace's job today is basically the same as when he was personally putting the finishing touches on engineering drawings, test-flying every airplane off the line, and hauling drinking water for fellow employees.

Though he admits he now has to "spend more time doing some things and less doing others," he keeps a close watch on all phases of operation and often amazes associates with his detailed knowledge of people, plans, and policies at all levels of the company.

Expressions which appear over and over in Wallace's conversations are "teamwork" and "the Cessna team." Though such expressions may easily become trite, this is overcome by Wallace's obvious sincerity and his pride in the people around him.

He sees as his greatest responsibility the development of competent management for the company. "Personalities are the key to growth," he says. "Men with know-how and the ability to apply it will always be vital to our company. The greatest responsibility of management is to spot these people and place them in the right jobs. These men may be recognized by their judgment, dedication, integrity, and ability to work hard."

Not far beneath the surface of Wallace-the-executive, is Wallace-the-pilot, and he still retains the love of flying which 45 years ago launched him on his career. He does his own business flying, currently using a twin-engine Skyknight, and often flies just for relaxation in the evenings or on weekends.

More than one "wind-in-the-wires" airplane buff has been chagrined to learn that Wallace has little nostalgia for the airplanes of yesteryear. With unromantic candor, he points out that they were cold, windy, uncomfortable, and difficult to fly.

He is known to have a certain amount of sentiment, especially toward the Airmaster, the first Cessna on which he played a major design role and still one of the most famous the company has ever built. About fifteen years ago, he came upon an old Airmaster shoved into a corner of the plant. Turning to an old-time employee, he said, "You look after this old fellow. He's the only one left in the plant. Take him to the experimental department, and whatever happens don't let anybody scrap him. This plane has done a lot for us." The airplane still lies crated in a Cessna warehouse.

Sentiment aside, however, Wallace says that "my favorite airplane is always the one I'm flying today. But the planes I like best are the ones we'll have tomorrow. I can't wait to fly them."

Visitors often ask what these airplanes will look like, but the closest Wallace will come to a description of them is that "they will each have a wing and an engine." Instead, he speaks of the vast improvements that have been made in aircraft and electronics over the years and points out that there will continue to be evolutionary developments which will make tomorrow's airplanes even better.

Looking at some of the upcoming forks in the road for Cessna and general aviation, Wallace speaks particularly of the needs to tackle the growing airport problem, continue the progress that has been made in creating public acceptance of flying, improve marketing techniques, design better and more useful products and develop more "honest-to-goodness service capability."

"Above all," he says, "our success in the future, as it has in the past, will be built on the most fragile of structures—on the confidence the customer has when he buys our product. Confidence in the way the product is built and operates—confidence resulting from the way it is sold—and confidence in the way it is serviced. The customer will make his purchase based on the confidence that he is doing business with men of good faith and good judgment."

U.S. MISSION TO U.N. FAVORS HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I congratulate our representatives at the United Nations Headquarters, in New York City. It is largely a reflection on those individuals who carry out our Government's day-to-day business at the U.N. that the present administration has taken a positive view of the conventions on various human rights, conventions which have been pending in these Senate Chambers for too many years.

The U.S. mission to the United Nations was officially created in 1947 "to assist the President and the Department of State in conducting U.S. participation in the United Nations." The mission carries out the instructions of the President as transmitted by the Secretary of State, in the various organs of the postwar world organization. This involves: First, representing the United States in meetings of the United Nations councils, commissions, and so forth; second, stating the case for the United States on issues under debate; third, negotiating and consulting with the 121 other national delegations in order to find common ground with them and thus to gain majority votes for resolutions which the United States can support; fourth, reporting to Washington on all of these activities, especially on views and intentions of other delegations; and fifth, making recommendations to Washington to help in the making of U.S. policy decisions involving the United Nations.

Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, the chief of the mission, is certainly no stranger to the problems inherent in protecting human rights. As special counsel for the AFL–CIO and as Secretary of Labor, he played a leading role in the formulation and recommendation of the convention concerning the abolition of forced labor. While an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Goldberg declared:

> There is no sovereign right of any state large or small to deny the fundamental rights of man—rights which belong to him because as a child of God he is endowed with human dignity.

The President's respect for Ambassador Goldberg's prowess in the field of international human rights has been manifested on numerous occasions. The most recent of these was the selection of Arthur Goldberg as the chief spokesman for the administration at the recent hearings on the human rights conventions.

I reiterate my gratitude to those members of the U.S. Mission to the United Nations who have done much to see their dream of Senate ratification of the human rights conventions implemented. They have done more than their share. The rest is up to us. There is no reason, constitutional or moral, that the United States should not join the members of the United Nations who have become parties to human rights treaties. The Senate must act on these agreements, quickly and favorably.

USE OF DOMESTIC ANIMALS FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last year Congress enacted Public Law 89–544 to regulate the sale, transportation, and handling of domestic animals—dogs and cats—for research purposes. It was a badly needed law, as was demonstrated at the time by the spotlight of publicity being thrown on numerous instances of stolen family pets, maltreatment of animals, and cruelty.

Still, it would appear, dogs do get stolen and do show up in perfectly reputable medical facilities, even in veterans' hospitals, undergoing experimental operations. One such case has come to light in recent days. It concerns Thunder, the 3-year-old pet of the Jim Shorter family, of Pontiac, Mich. It is not an isolated case, I am told, and points up the need for full funding, in the amount of $1.5 million, to permit the Department of Agriculture to carry out its inspection program under Public Law 89–544. The story of Thunder, incidentally, ends happily, for he was found by a representative of the animal welfare institute in the experimental laboratory of the veterans' hospital in Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that articles published in the Pontiac Press and the Detroit Free Press, concerning the discovery of Thunder, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pontiac (Mich.) Press, May 27, 1967]

PONTIAC FAMILY'S DOG FOUND AT ANN ARBOR RESEARCH LAB

(By Dave Cook)

Thunder nearly split his stitches, but after a three-month absence from home and a bout of major surgery, no one could blame him.

His return was so unexpected, in fact, that his owners—Mr. and Mrs. Jim Shorter of 280 Bondale—were unable to restrain from indulging in a few antics themselves.

"Can you blame us? We thought he was dead," exclaimed Mrs. Shorter, a nurse's aid at Pontiac Osteopathic Hospital.

"Even when the Humane Society called and said they had our dog, I didn't believe them," her husband admitted.

Thunder, 55 pounds of German shepherd-collie, was driven to the Shorter home late yesterday by Mrs. Dorothy Dyce, a field investigator for the Animal Welfare Institute.

It was through the efforts of Mrs. Dyce that the 3-year-old dog—missing since February—was located in a research laboratory at Veterans Hospital in Ann Arbor.

On a routine visit to the lab, one of her activities as an investigator, Mrs. Dyce noticed one of the four-legged patients still bearing a license chain—nearly buried under heavy hair, but still there.

She jotted down the number, put in a call to the Oakland County Animal Shelter, and with the assistance of Pontiac's dog-license records, finally succeeded in tracing Thunder to the Shorters.

Thursday night Mrs. Shorter received a call from Mrs. Dyce and agreed to go to Ann Arbor in order to identify Thunder.

SQUEALING, WHINING

"It was him all right," she said. "He started squealing and whining as soon as he saw me."

A large patch of bare skin on Thunder's left side, however, immediately caught Mrs. Shorter's attention.

Hospital authorities explained the dog had undergone an operation in which one lung was removed and then restored to its original position.

"They told me it was for research purposes," Mrs. Shorter said.

WHY THE OPERATION

"What I can't understand is how Thunder got there and why he was operated on when he still had identification tags.

"He's strictly a stay-at-home dog—can't imagine him even trying to get out of the back yard."

Mrs. Dyce, whose work brings her into contact with both laboratory personnel and humane societies, said she had determined that Veterans Hospital had purchased Thunder from a "reputable" Ann Arbor dog-dealer.

"They assured me the dealer would have nothing to do with a stolen dog or a dog that was cared for and a family pet," she said.

"We are definitely going to press an investigation into this, however."

[From the Detroit Free Press, May 28, 1967]

STOLEN THUNDER IS SAVED FROM EXPERIMENTERS' KNIVES

(By Gary Blonston)

Dinner was a delicacy; warmed-over hash only two days old. The welcoming committee was the giddiest group of scratchers and patters a three-year-old collie could hope for.

Thunder was back from the medical men, still in one piece, though stitched up here and there.

Jim Shorter and his family lost Thunder in

February, when the dog who never left his own backyard, who insisted on coming inside when it rained, who whined like a baby even when he wasn't one any more, disappeared.

The Shorters checked the Pontiac dog pound again and again, but Thunder didn't show up. Eventually, they gave up looking, convinced he had been stolen.

Thunder was found last week after he had already gone through one operation in the experimental laboratory of the Veterans Hospital in Ann Arbor.

The lady who discovered him was Mrs. Dorothy Dyce, Detroit representative of the national Animal Welfare Institute, who happened to stop at one pen in the hospital as she checked on the condition of the guinea-pig animals.

Thunder was still wearing his dog tags.

A phone call, a happy "Oh, yes!" and Thunder was on his way home.

He had been sold to the hospital for $6 on May 12. Where he had been before that, no one was prepared to say. The hospital called the dog dealer who sold him "very reputable."

By the time Mrs. Dyce happened by, Thunder had already undergone an operation to prepare him for an eventual, and experimental, lung transplant.

The Shorters remember well the night Thunder disappeared.

"The kids cried like mad when that dog turned up missing," Mrs. Shorter says. "My husband always said: 'Honey, I don't feel like Thunder is dead. I think someone has taken him, and when he gets loose, he'll come home.' "

The day Mrs. Dyce found the dog, the Shorters put some beef hash on to warm and hurried to the hospital to make sure it was Thunder.

"I walked down the hall," Mrs. Shorter said, "and a dog started barking. I couldn't help but cry. They brought Thunder in and he just ran and jumped up on Jim. He just whined like a baby. It was just a miracle."

Thunder didn't come home that night, because doctors wanted to make sure he was sufficiently recovered from his operation. They cleared him in time for the weekend.

"I'm still crying, believe it or not," Mrs. Dyce said. "That dog was so delighted to see those people . . . and they to see him. It's awfully hard to find a dog like this. I was just lucky. Somebody was remiss in not contacting the owners of the dog. I don't know who's guilty, but someone is."

"We're very sorry when something like this happens," a hospital spokesman said. "We would never buy a dog that we thought belonged to somebody else."

A system started last year provides for identifying dogs with National Registry numerical tatoos, the spokesman said, and reputable dog-buyers now check for the numbers at time of sale.

TRADE LIBERALIZATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Kennedy round of trade negotiations was substantially concluded on May 15, although much detail is still being worked out in preparation for the formal ending on June 30. The success of these negotiations has been the subject of much editorial comment, with a number of writers and journals already looking to the future. I share their view that while the Kennedy round is an important step toward trade liberalization, the vital continued expansion of world commerce demands sustained effort.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record views of particular significance on this subject from the Wall Street Journal and the Journal of Commerce, together with a thoughtful appraisal of the meaning for the United States of the Kennedy round agreement that appeared in the first issue of the new International Herald Tribune, published in Paris.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 17, 1967]

After the Kennedy Round, What?

(By Ray Vicker)

Geneva, Switzerland.—The free trade-protectionist battle, long a part of America's history, is entering a new phase as a result of the successful Kennedy Round.

Tariffs are dropping so drastically that, in the future, rate cuts alone can no longer be used as a trade stimulating device, except in specific areas. So say trade authorities in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the international agency that conducted the so-called Kennedy Round, and officials of some of the 70 nations associated with GATT.

The next era in trade liberalization promises to focus on reducing nontariff trade barriers, establishing preferences for underdeveloped countries, developing free trade regional blocs (while seeking to reduce friction between different blocs), launching free trade schemes to cover specific products only and eliminating nuisance tariffs (those with rates of 5% or less).

It was at a nightclub on Geneva's Place du Cirque that one articulate trade authority voiced his thoughts about post Kennedy Round liberalization. The blonde strip teaser on stage had reached the climax of her act when this official asked, "How can you strip any more from a tariff when it reaches zero?"

This is not to say that the world's tariffs are coming down to zero. The U.S. has zero rates on only 576 of the more than 6,000 items listed in its tariff schedule of about 650 pages. But hundreds of other rates are dropping to below 5% under the Kennedy Round, and the same thing can be said about tariff rates of other major industrial powers.

These nuisance tariffs require more paperwork and other formalities than they are worth, and few countries will have any incentive to preserve them once all Kennedy Round concession become effective. Numerous trade officials believe such tariffs should be marked for early elimination, perhaps through mutilateral negotiations among interested nations.

Sector tariff negotiation is also becoming a topic for discussion. The goal would be to initiate free trade for specific products, probably those encompassing a high degree of technology and international interest. The computer industry is frequently cited as an example. Machine tools, chemicals, electronic equipment and farm equipment might also lend themselves to package negotiations of this type.

The U.S.-Canadian agreement establishing a free trade area for autos and auto parts is a small-scale version of sector tariff negotiations. Here in Geneva, though, trade authorities would like to see any such negotiation concluded under GATT. Since the most-favored-nation clause applies for members, benefits of any sector negotiations would extend to other GATT countries.

Tariff preference is another matter that promises to become more important. Sitting in his pine paneled office facing a sweeping view of Mont Blanc, Raul Prebisch, secretary-general of the UN Conference on Trade and Development, insists, "Developing countries must have tariff preferences to stimulate sales of their manufactured and semi-processed goods to industrial countries."

The U.S. has opposed preferences of any kind until recently, arguing that GATT's most-favored-nation principle is the best way to stimulate world trade. Recently, however, there have been signs of a shift in the Johnson Administration.

"Now the U.S. appears willing to study the question," said Dr. Prebisch.

Trade blocs seem to be a permanent part of the world scene. The European Economic Community, or Common Market, has thrived. The seven-nation European Free Trade Association, with affiliated Finland, has achieved its goal of reducing industrial tariffs to zero among member nations. A Latin American common market is being considered.

These blocs could restrict world trade if they became devices for protectionism. But they also offer considerable scope for future negotiations aimed at reducing economic frictions between different blocs.

Nontariff trade barriers were barely touched in the Kennedy Round. Many countries, including the U.S., discriminate against foreigners in placement of government contracts. Sanitary and health regulations are sometimes restrictions in disguise.

America has quite a collection of these trade barriers, the aftermath of nearly a century of a protectionism that has been steadily whittled away in the last few decades.

In 1934 the Franklin Roosevelt Administration started the trade liberalization trend being climaxed now by the Kennedy Round. In that year the first reciprocal trade act was passed, allowing the U.S. to cut certain tariffs if reciprocal benefits were obtained from its major trading partners.

From that time, tariffs have been tumbling as a result of successive tariff negotiations. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, one of the immediate post World War II international cooperative agencies, has stimulated the trend. The Kennedy Round is the 6th negotiation this group has conducted.

In the early 1930s the average U.S. tariff on the value of the merchandise was 50%. By 1961 this average had been cut to 12%. The Dillon Round of tariff negotiations then lopped off a point or more from that figure, leaving U.S. tariffs at under 11% computed arithmetically as the Kennedy Round started.

Weighted by imports, U.S. tariffs averaged only 7% at start of the Kennedy Round, which means that the average will slip below the nuisance point level when all concessions from the round are obtained.

But one U.S. trade negotiations backgrounding paper warns: "Because of the complexity of tariff structure, such calculations are at best a measure of relative levels."

They do indicate, though, that the U.S. is dropping its tariff walls on industrial products to such a low level that in only a few areas do tariffs form any wall against imports. Thus, in the future, the U.S. can not depend very heavily on tariff cutting to win reciprocal trade benefits from trading partners.

To negotiate again, however, new legislation will be required from Congress. This legislation may not be on the books until after the 1968 election.

Other countries won't be sitting back, waiting for the U.S. to act. The EEC commission is already studying preferences for underdeveloped nations. Britain is seeking to enter the Common Market, a situation that could lead to lowering of trade barriers between the EEC and countries now forming EFTA. Here in Geneva the UN Conference on Trade and Development is already seeking to carve a place for itself in the area of trade stimulation for underdeveloped nations.

So a new tariff liberalization phase is starting, even as Kennedy Round histrionics echo in the halls of this lakeside city.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, May 17, 1967]

The Tumult and the Shouting

The Kennedy round—probably the last big multi-national effort at tariff cutting we shall see in our lifetime—is over. It will certainly be weeks yet before any definitive judgment can be pronounced upon its results, but on balance they appear much more substantial than they could have been and much better than it seemed as though they might be during the wrangling of last fall and winter.

It is true that the 50 per cent reductions on industrial products offered by President Kennedy when he launched this round were not actually achieved. It is just as true that the United States did not get all the accommodations it wanted for its agriculture exports in the Common Market. But in the latter case it did get a compromise it can live with, especially in terms of food aid.

Whether upon examination it turns out that the slash in industrial tariffs approved in Geneva works out to 33 per cent, 35 per cent or even more, it still rates as the biggest round of tariff cutting yet to be held under the auspices of General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). It offers good prospects for further increases in world trade over the coming years and in that respect provides grounds for satisfaction all the way around.

During the last frantic hours of negotiations between the U.S. and Common Market representatives, when tempers were flaring and the tension rising visibly, it became more obvious than ever what a collapse of these negotiations would have meant. It would have meant a regrouping of the world's major mercantile states into large and (in all probability mutually antagonistic) trading blocs. It would have necessitated a whole new American approach to such institutions as GATT itself, of multilateral trading under the Trade Agreements Act and very possibly the unconditional most-favored-nation system.

Now, at least, the trading nations know one thing they could not be sure of last fall. They know that the GATT system is still alive and kicking, even though it may not produce any more general tariff cuts.

After all, further tariff reductions on this scale will not be necessary for some time to come. In this connection it is important to remember what the Kennedy Round was supposed to accomplish. Its real purpose—often forgotten—was to complete the stage-by-stage dismantling of the protective devices adopted by the United States (via the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act) and a large number of other countries in the black depression years of the early 1930s.

Some vestiges of these tariff barriers still remain. Some were erased years ago. The extent of the changes varies from one product to another and from one country to another. But the over-all result of the Kennedy Round should be that of a world-wide tariff system returning to normal—or to what was considered normal prior to 1930–31.

This does not mean, however, that the United States can now consider that its policy toward international trade is something that has been settled for years to come. Aside from the advantages outlined above, what we mainly got out of the Kennedy Round, in the company of our trading partners, was a respite.

There are many other problems yet to be settled. One big one is that posed by the multiplicity of nontariff barriers to trade via special taxes and the like regulations of various kinds. Another big one is the treatment the more successful mercantile states should accord the less developed countries which are dismayed to see the terms of trade turning against them and which are demanding more and more insistently some kind of special treatment for their products—whether through compensatory financing, more favorable tariffs in the big industrial markets or through some other means.

It is hardly to be expected that Britain and the Common Market will do much intensive planning along these lines over the next half year or so. Both are likely to be too preoccupied with Britain's bid to enter Europe (they are likely to, that is, unless General de Gaulle once again vetoes the British bid, in which case the situation will be entirely different).

The United States, however, has about a year to consider its future approach to international trading in the light of the results (as they become clearer) of the Kennedy Round. Such a study ought to be wide-ranging, thorough and started quite soon—no later than this coming fall. It ought also to be carried out at the highest levels and carried on by individuals representing all major points of view on the subject at hand.

Some moves have already been made in this direction, even though quite tentative at this point. We shall have more to say about this shortly. We shall also have more to say about what subjects especially commend themselves to the attentions of such a group and of what the alternatives confronting it are likely to be.

[From the International Herald Tribune, May 22, 1967]

Kennedy Round—What It Will Mean for United States

(By Edwin Dale, Jr.)

Washington.—Not long ago there was a member of Congress whose district included Staten Island and the Brooklyn waterfront. Through the port there passed several billion dollars worth of foreign trade each year, but on Staten Island there was a bird cage factory employing about two dozen workers that was suffering from import competition.

On every recorded vote, the member supported high tariffs and opposed laws to enable the President to negotiate them downward.

Things have changed, and the successful conclusion of the Kennedy Round negotiations last week in Geneva is perhaps the culminating demonstration of the change. Not only did Congress in 1962 give the President, through the Trade Expansion Act, the most extensive tariff negotiating authority ever, but the other leading nations demonstrated, in the end, their conviction that ever-freer trade is in the interest of all.

Allan Shivers, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, said unequivocally: There is widespread approval among American businesmen of the results of the Kennedy Round. . . . The typical American business economy will benefit from easier access to foreign markets."

Things have not, of course, changed completely. Thomas P. Turchan, vice-president of the American Cyanamid Co. and a representative of a traditionally protectionist industry, said it was "a bad deal, a very bad deal for the American chemical industry." And a protectionist group called the Nationwide Committee for Export-Import Policy said that "this country lost heavily in the Kennedy Round" and predicted that "the need for protective devices will not be reduced but will grow."

ALL HAVE PROBLEMS

In Europe, the French aluminum industry apparently headed off a tariff cut for that important industry, and every major bargaining nation had its problems. Despite the unmistakable liberalizing effect of the sweeping tariff reductions—50 percent in thousands of cases and an average of 33–35 percent—some annoying non-tariff barriers to trade remain, particularly in agriculture.

Still, the sweep of the tide was clear. What, then, will the Kennedy Round results mean to the United States?

Most of the details, product by product, are still not known. But enough information is available to permit some general conclusions.

First, on the import side, the record of the past suggests that genuinely acute damage to American industry and its workers from the tariff cuts will be limited and scattered. Over the previous five rounds of negotiations this country's tariffs have been cut an average of 75 percent and, despite constant warnings of disaster, the United States has full employment and thriving industry.

The fact is that United States imports have remained a remarkably steady 3 percent of gross national product, suggesting strongly that they rise in line with general prosperity more than with reductions of tariffs. What tariff cuts do accomplish, however, is a spur to American competitiveness in the area where imports constitute a challenge. This nation has cheap transistor radios in part because of Japanese competition.

CONSUMER GOODS

This time tariffs were reduced on imports of about $8 billion, and the effects might be more keenly felt. Some consumer products such as cameras and watches (though again, details are still not known) may actually come down in price. But consumer goods constitute only one-fifth of the United States' $25 billion of annual imports. And it is worth recalling, too, that one-third of U.S. imports are already duty-free—mainly items such as coffee that cannot be produced domestically.

Thus the effect on Americans as workers or consumers will not be dramatic. What about the export side?

The United States exports considerably more than it imports—fairly good evidence that America's overall competitiveness must be pretty good despite high wages. The chief accomplishment of the Kennedy Round was to assure that American exports will not be seriously damaged by the creation of privileged trading blocs, above all the European Common Market.

CIVIL RIGHTS LAWYERS IN THE SOUTH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the summer of 1964, when civil rights litigation in the South accelerated at a rapid pace, it became apparent that local lawyers were unable—and in some cases, unwilling—to handle the volume of work. A group of civil rights and civil liberties organizations, including the legal defense fund of NAACP, CORE, the ACLU, the American Jewish Committee, and the National Council of Churches, then organized the Lawyers Constitutional Defense Committee. This group of lawyers provided legal services for those trying to exercise their constitutional rights—services which would not have been available without these volunteers. LCDC has now sent about 250 lawyers to the deep South—many at their own expense—and is now concentrating efforts in Jackson, Miss., New Orleans, La., and Birmingham, Ala.

These efforts have been met with obstruction from many sides, the most damaging of which is a challenge to their right to practice in State courts. It is a matter which Congress should explore—together with other court reforms proposed in the administration's civil rights bill—since without these volunteer lawyers, many persons in the South would be without the right to effective counsel. A perceptive article written by George B. Driesen, a Washington lawyer, who was himself a volunteer in Louisiana, was published recently in the Reporter. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CIVIL RIGHTS SETBACK IN SOUTHERN COURTS

(By George B. Driesen)

Like several of the attorneys handling civil-rights cases in the Deep South, Donald A. Jelinek, staff counsel for the Lawyers Constitutional Defense Committee (LCDC) in Selma, Alabama, is from out of state, is not a member of the local bar, and receives no fees from his locally unpopular clients.

Although most states bar lawyers not licensed locally from setting up practices, Jelinek and other out-of state lawyers hurdled this obstacle by associating themselves with licensed Negro attorneys in Deep South states. This procedure was rarely questioned. But last November, after an unidentified attorney challenged Jelinek's right to appear in Demopolis Circuit Court on the ground that he was not a member of the Alabama bar, Judge E. F. Hildreth barred him from trying any case in the circuit. When Jelinek stepped outside the courtroom to consult with a client, he was arrested for illegal practice of law. Taken to jail, he was held there for six hours until he obtained a $300 cash bond.

In the face of this criminal charge, Jelinek and his clients asked an Alabama Federal court to enjoin state officials from preventing him from practicing law. The suit charged that without Jelinek, his clients—Negroes and rights workers—could not obtain counsel who would zealously and capably represent them in asserting their legal rights.

While the proceedings were pending the LCDC counsel was unable to appear in Alabama courts on behalf of his clients. But Jelinek, for personal reasons, already had decided to leave his position in Selma after more than a year's service, and his leaving probably will mean that the criminal charge and Jelinek's countersuit will be dropped. Neither side seems anxious at this time for a court showdown over the right of Alabama Negroes to out-of-state counsel. Nevertheless, there is still no assurance that the state will not try to prevent Jelinek's successor from practicing.

THE VOLUNTEER DEFENDERS

The Lawyers Constitutional Defense Committee is one of three national groups working on civil-rights cases in Southern courts. The others are the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (LDF). The latter group had been on the scene many years before LCDC and the Lawyers' Committee were formed. It has been sending lawyers into the South since the late 1930's and led in the development of the country's civil-rights law, including the school-desegregation cases decided by the Supreme Court in 1954.

When civil-rights organizations were about to intensify their activities in the summer of 1964, the chief legal officers of a number of civil-rights and civil-liberties groups (including LDF, NAACP, the Congress of Racial Equality, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Committee, and the National Council of Churches) organized LCDC to send volunteer lawyers South. That summer, LCDC sent about 125 volunteers to Jackson, Shreveport, New Orleans, Birmingham, St. Augustine, Memphis, and Tallahassee. Working in relays of two to four per office, most of the volunteers remained for only a short time.

The next summer, recognizing the need for some continuity, LCDC began to hire a small staff to supplement the volunteers and slashed the number of cities in which it operated to three: Jackson, New Orleans, and Montgomery. Currently, LCDC has four full-time staff counsel, two in Jackson and one each in New Orleans and Selma. Between May and October, LCDC sends four or five volunteers at a time to Jackson, one or two to New Orleans, and two to Selma. During the rest of the year, volunteers are few. In all, LCDC has sent about 250 attorneys to the Deep South. Right now, it has nearly four hundred cases on its docket, involving three thousand plaintiffs and defendants.

The Lawyers' Committee was formed at the invitation of President Kennedy and with the approval of Vice President Johnson as a result of a June, 1963, White House conference called in response to the desperate need of civil-rights workers and Southern Negroes for counsel. Several past presidents of the American Bar Association are members of the Lawyers' Committee, and so are the presidents or past presidents of more than half of the state bar associations. The Committee had the official sanction of the Mississippi Bar Association, which formally recognized the necessity of providing counsel "on behalf of all persons accused of crime or who seek legal redress of their grievances, whether they be indigent, unpopular, residents, or non-residents and regardless of race."

Like LCDC, the Lawyers' Committee began operating in the summer of 1964, when it sponsored a group of volunteers working out of a Jackson office supported by the Legal Defense Fund. The Committee now has five full-time attorneys in its own Jackson office and three or four volunteers, most of whom stay for thirty-day periods. Its attorneys handled about fifteen hundred matters last year.

The Legal Defense Fund maintains three lawyers in Jackson, only one of whom is a member of the state bar. In Mississippi, as in other Southern states, LDF co-operates with locally licensed Negro lawyers. Supporting them and the Jackson staff are LDF's twenty New York attorneys, who work on poverty and civil-rights problems across the country. More than the other two groups LDF tends to emphasize Federal suits involving school, welfare, and employment problems likely to have a broad impact upon Negroes. Thus far, none of its out-of-state attorneys have been challenged in Southern courts.

The case load of the lawyers' organizations runs the gamut of civil-rights problems in the South. Principally they supply lawyers to represent Negroes and rights workers arrested in retaliation for demonstrating, registering to vote, demanding access to public places, or holding meetings to organize the Negro community. Through Federal suits the lawyers have wiped off the statute books numerous local ordinances violating the free speech and assembly provisions of the Federal Constitution, thus freeing Negroes to organize and to engage in peaceful protest. In other suits, they have sought to desegregate public facilities and to stop whites who tried to prevent Negroes from using them. While challenging discriminatory elections and election procedures, the rights lawyers have also helped Negro candidates through the maze of technical barriers put up by state registrars to keep them off the ballot. And the lawyers' groups represent Negroes who because of their race have been denied a fair trial by Southern courts or have been subjected to outrageous treatment by police or prison officials.

BLOCKING AND HOLDING

The recent harassment of civil-rights lawyers has not been limited to Jelinek and Alabama. Last August, L. W. (Woody) Davis, who doubles as mayor and judge in Ferriday, Louisiana, refused to let an LCDC volunteer attorney try a case and warned that he would jail the next out-of-state lawyer who attempted to practice law in Ferriday. In September he stopped two LCDC volunteers from investigating a mass arrest and threatened to jail them.

In Mississippi, an "Unauthorized Practice of Law Committee" was formed by the Bar Association last October. The bar committee announced that it would "investigate charges arising from legal matters involving people who might not be licensed to practice law in Mississippi." So far it has met no public meetings, but it has met privately with a Lawyers' Committee representative. The outcome of that meeting has not been revealed.

A few weeks after the Unauthorized Practice Committee was formed, the city and county attorneys in Grenada, Mississippi, the scene of school disorders last fall, decreed that thereafter no non-Mississippi lawyers would be permitted to appear in local courts. (Both men, thanks to the rights lawyers, were under a Federal court order to stop intimidating rights workers.) Later, Marshall Perry, judge of the circuit court with jurisdiction over Grenada, forbade a Lawyers' Committee attorney to consult with a Mississippi lawyer when the two appeared as co-council. And after two hundred youngsters were arrested for peacefully protesting the mistreatment of Negroes at newly desegregated schools, Grenada police refused to let Lawyers' Committee attorneys interview their clients in the city and county jails.

The Grenada counterattack has now hit the Lawyers' Committee's only Mississippi-licensed staff lawyer, Lackley Rowe, Jr. Late last month Rowe was jailed for contempt in connection with his attempt to represent Robert Johnson, a locally prominent Negro rights worker who was arrested during a peaceful attempt to integrate a Grenada church. Before Johnson got to court on the day of his trial, Judge Perry announced a court rule forbidding any person from walking in front of the jurors seated on one side of the courtroom. When Johnson arrived, he unwittingly violated the rule and was hustled out of court by the sheriff and constable.

Rowe, seated in front of the courtroom, saw his client being removed and went to the lobby to ask the officers why they were arresting him. "You'll find out later," they said. When Rowe repeated his question, the constable grabbed his arm, took him before Judge Perry, and accused him of interfering with an arrest. Judge Perry told Rowe that he was in contempt of court and ordered him taken to jail, where he was held for an hour and a half before being released on his own recognizance pending a later trial. (After Rowe's arrest, several white men walked in front of the jurors without incident.)

To represent Rowe, a white law firm in Greenville—Keady, Campbell & DeLong, Sr.—was retained. William Keady, who took the case because he believed that no Mississippi bar member should be treated as Rowe was, got a temporary Federal court order halting Rowe's trial.

ON UNCERTAIN GROUND

Considering the traditional rule that an attorney must be licensed in a state to practice there, one wonders why the Southern bar has tolerated out-of-state civil-rights lawyers thus far. One reason may be that if lawyers from other states did not defend Negroes and civil-rights workers in criminal cases, local lawyers might have to do so: convictions where the defendant had not been represented by counsel would face invalidation by higher courts. Then, too, Southern lawyers—especially those with ties to the national bar—are professionally concerned about the quality of justice meted by Southern courts and share the professional view that neither poverty nor unpopularity should deprive an individual of his legal rights. And legal rights can't be obtained without lawyers.

Another reason for tolerating the lawyers' groups is that there are legal restraints against barring out-of-state lawyers. A Louisiana statute expressly permits "visiting" attorneys to practice "in association" with Louisiana-licensed attorneys, although no Louisiana case spells out the meaning of "in association." Mississippi law permits out-of-state lawyers to practice unless challenged. Only Alabama has a law that seems flatly to restrict its courts to locally licensed lawyers. It is possible that such laws are unconstitutional if locally licensed attorneys will not vigorously defend Negroes and civil-rights workers in criminal cases. Even in civil suits, barring out-of-state counsel may violate the Constitution's equal-protection clause if the consequence is that the clients cannot obtain the same Federal and state remedies against state officials that are available to local whites.

If these considerations led the Southern bar to tolerate lawyers from other states in the past, why the pressure against them now? One reason may be white backlash, which has affected even the Southern moderates and produced a resurgence of hostility to rights activity and to the Negro movement in the North as well as in the South. Some persons familiar with the situation have suggested that Jelinek's troubles stemmed from a personal antipathy he aroused unnecessarily, and it is probable that Rowe's harassment was due partly to Grenada officials' resentment against a white Southerner defending Negroes. But the best explanation seems to be that LCDC and the Lawyers' Committee are no longer content simply to defend clients. They have recently begun bringing suits in Federal courts to obtain economic justice for the Negroes and to curb Southern officials who victimize them. So long as the cases righted isolated wrongs and modified some outrageous practices, they posed no real threat to the Southern way of life. The other kinds of suits do, and civil-rights lawyers thus have become targets.

Jelinek, for example, was first challenged in Alabama's courts upon his return from trying a suit in Washington that was part of a sustained effort to improve the lot of Alabama's poor Negro farmers. The purpose of the suit was to force changes in Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service elections to assure Negroes a fair chance to vote. In those elections farmers choose ASCS community committeemen who in turn select ASCS county committeemen to administer the Federal crop subsidy program. Last year that program poured $15 million into the hands of Alabama cotton farmers alone. But no Alabama Negro has ever served on a county committee, despite the clear Negro majority in ten of Alabama's sixty-seven counties. In fact, prior to 1964, when the Rev. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee began organizing Negro farmers and were met with threats, economic coercion, violence, and bombings, no Negro had ever *voted* in an Alabama ASCS election.

In 1965, Alabama ASCS officials nominated so many Negroes (some of them with the same names as the Negro community's candidates) that the Negroes were unable to elect any county committeemen. Indeed, conditions in that election were so bad that the Secretary of Agriculture set the Lowndes County tally aside. Last summer, the Alabama ASCS elections were scheduled on a mere thirty-five days' notice and in August—in the past they had been conducted in the winter. The short notice made it impossible for the Negroes to organize an election campaign. So Jelinek went to court on behalf of a group of poor Negro farmers, SNCC, and SCLC.

In the complaint, Jelinek alleged that ASCS committeemen and employees (picked by the committeemen) had conspired with large landowners to control elections and that fraud, violence, economic sanctions, and deliberate efforts to confuse Negro voters had been used to keep Negroes off the ASCS committees in the past. The complaint quoted extensively from a 1965 Civil Rights Commission report on the problem, and one of Jelinek's witnesses swore at the trial that he had been warned he would be killed if he testified. He was later shot at.

Jelinek was partly successful: with court approval he obtained an agreement from the Secretary of Agriculture to postpone the Alabama elections for thirty days. Since his return, Jelinek says, he has never had a moment's peace, for it was then that he began facing challenges to his right to practice in Alabama courts. One judge, who had always treated Jelinek cordially, told him that barring him from court was not the judge's idea; he was under orders from the Alabama Bar Commissioners. Jelinek says that some of the Bar Commissioners represent wealthy Alabama plantation owners who receive substantial crop-support payments and that Negro farmers could double their income throughout the South if they were represented on the ASCS committees. Jelinek has brought a suit against a plantation owner, represented by one of the Bar Commissioners, who allegedly forced tenant farmers to assign Federal crop-diversion payments to him in exchange for permitting them to continue using his land. The suit asks that the Department of Agriculture be required to forbid such assignments in the future.

THE WAGES OF BRUTALITY

Jelinek's battle with powerful agricultural interests parallels the struggle that other civil-rights lawyers are waging through Federal suits against state and local officials who use or sanction the use of violence to prevent Negroes from exercising Constitutional rights. Suits like an LDF-Lawyers' Committee action to end the terror in Grenada, a similar suit that LCDC brought and won in 1965 to stop police brutality against peaceful demonstrators in Bogalusa, Louisiana, and another against Ferriday's Mayor Davis have forced Southern officials to operate in the shadow of Federal injunctions. These court orders amount to a Federal presence in the South—though not the one some civil-rights leaders have sought.

Court orders have not been the only form of relief that the lawyers have asked for. Southern police are being forced to face the prospect of compensating the victims of their brutality and disregard of rights. For example, Lawyers' Committee attorneys are pressing a Federal suit (the Parchman Penitentiary case) on behalf of almost two hundred plaintiffs, each claiming damages of more than $6,000 against Natchez and Mississippi state officials. The officials, the suit charges, arrested plaintiffs for participating in a peaceful demonstration and, without the preliminary hearing required by state law, transported them to the state penitentiary two hundred miles away, where many were stripped, beaten, and forced to take laxatives.

Another Federal suit, brought by LCDC's chief staff counsel in Mississippi, Alvin Bronstein, and settled out of court, sought damages from a Mississippi lawman for unlawfully arresting a Negro woman and beating her in jail. Her $1,500 recovery was the first of its kind by a Mississippi Negro. Similar cases in the Federal courts are pending in Louisiana and Alabama, where law-enforcement officers are charged with beating white and Negro rights workers either in jail or on the way.

Southern law-enforcement officials do not like being subjected to the restraints of Federal law, and they may be responding by trying to drive out the lawyers who are making that law a reality. It is no secret that the Mississippi bar's Unauthorized Practice Committee was formed in response to the threat to the previously unbridled power of Mississippi lawmen. A few weeks before the bar announced its "investigation," the state's Attorney General, Joe T. Patterson, blasted LCDC and the Lawyers' Committee for what he called "violations of legal ethics and intimidating law enforcement officers." Patterson objected to the group's giving "free rides to persons unable to pay for counsel and court charges by representing them for nothing." And the intimidation of law-enforcement officials to which he referred means the bringing of suits for damages and other relief from unlawful arrest, prosecution, and jailhouse brutality that the civil-rights lawyers are pressing.

Efforts to make Southern police observe the law prompted former Governor Ross Barnett, who achieved national notoriety by defying a court order to admit James Meredith to the University of Mississippi, to issue a press release in Jackson urging that "public-spirited attorneys" in Mississippi and other Southern states offer free legal services to law-enforcement officials. "Our public officials and our law-enforcement officers should be free to perform their assigned duties to the best of their ability," Barnett proclaimed, "without having to worry about the expense of defending themselves against bothersome and frivolous law suits." Barnett's interest in the problem may not be unrelated to next fall's Mississippi election, in which Barnett will again seek the governorship.

A DEARTH OF ALTERNATIVES

Whether the out-of-state civil-rights lawyers will be forced to leave Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana is not yet clear. Some of the recent incidents may reflect the racist proclivities of local court officials rather than a co-ordinated effort. But the investigation launched by the Mississippi bar's Unauthorized Practice Committee is ominous in view of the bar's formerly tolerant and even helpful attitude toward the Lawyers' Committee. And in Alabama, the Bar Commissioners participated in the action brought by Jelinek to establish his right to practice there—and not on Jelinek's side.

If LCDC and the Lawyers' Committee were run out of the South, LCDC Executive Director Henry Schwarzschild points out, Negroes and civil-rights workers would be deprived of much essential, day-to-day legal representation in both criminal and civil suits. The result, he says, would be to subject Negroes to the virtually unrestrained power of the law-enforcement officials. Aaron Henry, president of the Mississippi NAACP, described the effect of depriving Mississippi Negroes of out-of-state lawyers as "tremendous." Marian Wright, chief Legal Defense Fund lawyer in Mississippi—who would not be directly affected because she is licensed there—says the work to be done is so heavy that all three groups cannot handle it. And LDF lawyers in New York agree that their group is not in a position to provide all the services of the other groups.

Southern white lawyers are not likely to take over the job either. Hardly any of them can afford to jeopardize their livelihood that way. Even when appointed to defend an arrested Negro "agitator," a lawyer may present only a perfunctory and inadequate defense if he fears or shares a white community's racist attitudes and its hostility to Federal statutes and Supreme Court decisions that might help his unwelcome client. And counsel is almost never appointed in misdemeanor cases tried before Southern mayors and justices of the peace.

Neither are the Negro lawyers equipped to take over the work of LCDC and the Lawyers' Committee. In Mississippi there are six Negro lawyers—and one million Negroes. Civil-rights cases often crop up in sparsely populated areas where there are few Negro attorneys or where representing civil-rights advocates could be dangerous. In northern Louisiana, for example, where Negro communities are in the early stages of organization, there are only three Negro lawyers.

Furthermore, becoming too closely identified with the rights movement could cost the Negro lawyer the cooperation of local officials, which he must have to effectively represent his other clients. And Negro lawyers cannot devote full time to rights cases; their clients have other problems.

State-sponsored public defender systems and the Office of Economic Opportunity's Legal Services Program offices are not likely to fill the gap either. Alabama and Louisiana do not have public-defender offices, while Mississippi's one office (in Gulfport) has never represented anyone arrested in the course of civil-rights activity. The Legal Services Program, where it exists, provides legal aid to the poor, mainly in landlord-tenant, sales, contract, and domestic-relations matters. The program is in the hands of the local bar, and its lawyers would not be anxious to bring suits seriously challenging the Southern establishment. In any event, in the Deep South only Mississippi has a Legal Services Program, and none of the attorneys affiliated with it has ever handled a civil-rights case.

In light of all this, participants in a Twentieth Century Fund conference last October 6 and the administration of justice in the South agreed that "The need for outside lawyers might last for 5 to 10 years, and more in some areas." In that time, the conference hoped, progressive elements in some Southern states—including the younger lawyers—might be encouraged to undertake civil-rights work. But the real solution probably lies within the Negro community itself. As more Negroes in the Deep South states become lawyers and achieve a measure of financial independence, they can take over the bulk of civil-rights litigation now handled by outsiders. In New Orleans, for example, a few Negro lawyers, including the prominent firm of Collins, Douglas & Elie, have been doing this work for years. In fact LCDC's New Orleans operation began in the firm's library, and LCDC still works closely with it.

But New Orleans is hardly a typical Southern city. The growth of the Negro bar elsewhere will take time and can occur only if the climate in the South improves to the point where more Negroes will want to practice there and are able to get high-quality legal training. The Legal Defense Fund is tackling this problem by providing money to help Negroes through law school (twelve are attending the University of Mississippi with such aid) and to start practicing in the South.

The out-of-state lawyers were probably never more important than now. The civil-rights movement in the South is being carried on almost entirely by local Negroes. Indeed the national rights groups, their attention turned elsewhere and their treasuries depleted by the disenchantment of once-generous supporters, have all but stopped supplying money and organizers. Throughout the struggle, having lawyers who could effectively challenge Southern officials and who had the confidence of Southern Negroes has helped the Negroes find the courage to organize and to claim their rights. With most of the organizers gone, in some communities only the civil-rights lawyers now stand between local Negroes and the attempt to reassert the old patterns of white dominance. A serious reduction in the lawyers' ranks at this critical moment could be harmful beyond measure.

COSPONSORSHIP OF NELSON MINK IMPORT BILL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, Minnesota is one of the most productive agricultural States in the Nation. It is also one of the leading States in the production of animal furs as it has been since the pre-Northwest Territory period of our national life.

Minnesotans are deeply troubled today by the economic squeeze which is being placed on American farmers by an increasing deluge of foreign agricultural commodities. The tightening economic vise, long a reality for the Minnesota dairy and livestock farmer, now has begun to affect the hundreds of Minnesota families who have dedicated a lifetime to the production and marketing of mink pelts. The following statistics, compiled by the Business and Defense Services Administration of the U.S. Commerce Department, graphically depict the accelerated dumping of inexpensive mink pelts in recent years:

Annual total of imported mink furs

[Quantity in thousands of pelts]

Year:	*Number*
1960	2, 846
1961	4, 131
1962	3, 825
1963	4, 459
1964	4, 357
1965	4, 856
1966	5, 651

Mr. President, the trend accentuated by the jump in figures for 1965 and 1966 requires little amplification. The statistics do not, however, tell the full tragedy which domestic markets glutted by inexpensive foreign pelts bring to the thousands of mink farmers across the Nation and in Minnesota who have, through industrious work and intelligent promotion, created an expanding domestic market for the product of their labor and investment.

On May 24, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] introduced a bill to impose reasonable controls on imported mink pelts. The proposal offered by Senator NELSON, S. 1856, offers simple justice to the thousands of persons connected with the production of American mink pelts, and I am pleased to join with Senator NELSON in the sponsorship of this legislation and to join in his request for hearings on S. 1856 at the earliest date.

The proposed legislation is not designed to close the American market to foreign pelt producers. On the contrary, the volume of the foreign share of the American market under S. 1856 will grow. The purpose of this proposal is to assure the American mink farmers that 60 percent of the domestic market will be his and that he will be able to freely compete for a share of that market without encountering competitors whose production is subsidized by a foreign government and rendered inexpensive because of lower labor costs.

Mr. President, imports in the first 6 months of this year have doubled over the average monthly figures for 1966. For the mink farmer and his family and the entire agribusiness community the hour is growing late. I commend Senator NELSON for his leadership in this area and join in the support of S. 1856.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a selection of the dozens of letters I have received on this issue be printed in their entirety in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA FUR BREEDERS ASSOCIATION,
May 21, 1967.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
Senator from Minnesota,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I am writing to you in regards to the bill that Congressman James Burke of Massachusetts introduced, Bill H.R. 6694.

My name is Howard Brechtel and I am a mink rancher in Austin, Minnesota. I also am the Secretary of the Minnesota Fur Breeders Association. I am writing for myself as well as for the Minnesota Fur Breeders Association.

The mink ranchers of Minnesota need this bill. Foreign countries are literally dumping cheap commercial mink in this country. They are taking 42% of our market right now. These mink are coming in duty free and promotion free. They pay no taxes, elected no public officials, command no votes, take no local responsibilities, support no agricultural markets, and cause the United States a serious loss of gold in the amount of 173 million dollars annually.

I said that they are taking 42% of our market right now. This market was built by the mink ranchers of our country by assessing ourselves from our own sales receipts for market development. In the last several years this amounted to more than a million dollars annually.

We are willing to give them 40% of our market duty free. With out this bill and if the present trend continues it is estimated that over 50% of the American mink ranchers will be forced out of business from selling below cost of production.

There are 428 mink ranchers in the State of Minnesota. This is what these 428 ranchers are doing for the State.

Total investment in ranch production	$20, 640, 000
Total pelts produced	903, 000
Ranches	428
Breeder females	258, 000
Gross sales at $17.57 national average	$15, 866, 000

Production costs

Selling costs	$1, 586, 000
Feed	7, 224, 000
Labor payroll	3, 612, 000
Interest, depreciation, taxes	1, 586, 000
Management	793, 000

As a mink rancher and one of your constituents I ask you to support the Burke Bill H.R. 6694.

In concluding I would like to hear your thoughts and comments on this bill.

Thank you very much for your time and trouble.

Yours truly,
HOWARD BRECHTEL
AUSTIN, MINN.

SPRING GROVE, MINN.,
May 25, 1967.

Senator MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.:

As an American Mink rancher, I come to you with one thing in mind—Help. For many years our product has been troubled, but not until now is it desperate. I would like to make you aware of the situation the American Mink rancher is in today, and how he got that way.

As mink ranching was perfected in the United States, and as the rancher developed the market, foreigners got into the act with the United States market, as a proven target, riding free of charge on the market development of the American rancher. Imports, on a duty-free basis, began with little or no share in the American market and have expanded until, in 1966, they had seized nearly 42 percent, a threatening "bite" out of the

American consumption of mink pelts. Auction company officials estimate that if this trend continues, over 50% of the American producers will be forced out of business from selling BELOW COST OF PRODUCTION. Imported mink pelts ride in on the American rancher's market duty-free, promotion free, pay no taxes, elect no public officials, command no votes, take no local responsibilities, support no agricultural markets, and cause the United States a serious LOSS OF GOLD in the amount of $73 million annually.

A bill, H.R. 6694, has been introduced by Congressman James Burke of Massachusetts. It would put a duty on raw or dressed mink when the Secretary of Agriculture determines that in any given year 40 percent of the domestic market has been taken by foreign mink. This, in effect, limits the duty-free imports to the ratio of our market currently held by foreigners. It does not roll back nor impose quotas, but merely provides that when the foreigners have taken 40 percent of our market each year, they will pay a duty on each additional mink brought into this country.

I would be very interested in knowing what your feelings are on this bill, and what is being done about it.

Sincerely,

THOMAS A. JONES.

NOLTIMIER MINK RANCH,
SOUTH ST. PAUL, MINN.,
May 31, 1967.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been a mink rancher for 21 years and have always managed to make a good profit from our year's work, but so far this year I haven't disposed of a single pelt. I have had many reports as to the market conditions but was still skeptical so I went to New York to see for myself and found the fur market was loaded with mink with hardly any buyers because the American buyers went to the Scandinavian Countries and loaded up with duty-free mink.

Statistics show that it costs from $17.00 to $18.00 to produce a pelt. I was led to believe that I couldn't expect much more than $10.00 per pelt, which would be about the price of feed to produce a pelt. I have always been a conservative operator, but will not be able to hold out too long under these prices. Reports are that 50% of the U.S. ranchers will go broke if the present tax-free imports are allowed to continue.

I surely hope you will see fit to support the bill H.R. 6694 and would greatly appreciate receiving a reply as to how you feel on this bill.

Sincerely,

C. A. NOLTIMIER.

BORDER MINK FARM,
Ranier, Minn. May 26, 1967.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
Washington D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: This letter is more of a call for help than a request. It is in regard to the present situation the mink ranching industry is in.

I am a family type mink rancher and have been in this business since 1956 when I got out of the service. I bought it from my folks who had been in it since 1937. Up until this year they did it on a smaller scale but were forced to quit by the low prices received. In my situation I have everything put into the mink business and am deeply concerned about my future, with the Scandinavian and other furs pouring into our market duty free and with no import quota. It seems they can produce and sell these mink at prices below our costs of production. If this trend continues and nothing is done to help us, a great many of us will be forced out of business.

The Scandinavians are increasing their production each year and have the U.S. market to aim for. If we are forced out, much will be lost over here in monies invested in our ranches annually, taxes paid, etc. Imported pelts come into our markets duty free, pay no taxes, elect no public officials, command no votes, and cost the U.S. a loss of gold in the amount of 73 million dollars annually.

Of all the various agricultural commodities mink alone received no price support and no government protection in any way shape or form.

We ask for help at this time in the form of a quota and a high duty on any mink imported over this quota. This is being asked for in a bill introduced by Congressman James Burke and his bill H.R. 6694. I sincerely ask for your support of this bill as it will decide greatly on the future of thousands of mink ranchers, like myself.

If possible I would appreciate hearing from you on your views of this and any further action that could be taken.

Yours truly,

DUANE OVESON.

REIMERS' MINK RANCH,
Montevideo, Minn., May 20, 1967.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
Senator for Minnesota,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I am a mink rancher and director of the Minnesota Fur Breeders Association. We mink ranchers are in drastic need for help! I wish you could have been to our last state of Minnesota Fur Breeders annual meeting, held at the Curtis Hotel in Minneapolis on April 15th. There were ranchers there that had not been able to sell a skin, worried—who wouldn't be? It is hard to believe that a country like ours can afford to let their own market slip away from them. That's exactly what is and has taken place right here in our own country. What are we to do? Join the Poverty Plan?

A Chevrolet which sells for $2500 in the United States would sell for $6500 in Norway. The extra $4000 is mostly import tax. Meanwhile, Norway's mink come untaxed into the United States.

What are the results of this? The American rancher is going out of business at the rate of 500 per year. If the crop this year cannot be consumed or even sold, the number will really soar high. In 1966 imports increased 16 percent over 1965, imports from Scandinavia by 23 percent, from Denmark, as an illustration of excessive expansion, over 28 percent! This was in just one year!! That's not all, Norwegians recently reported that their 1967 production would exceed 1966 by 20%. With the United States as their market!!! They will drive the American rancher right out of his own market. Sweden dumps her skins every year and floods the market, dropping prices. They can raise the mink much cheaper than we can.

Now we are asking Mr. Mondale, to help the mink rancher by supporting a bill, H.R. 6694, which has been introduced by Congressman James Burke of Massachusetts. It would put a duty on raw or dressed mink when the Secretary of Agr. determines that in any given year 40 percent of the domestic market has been taken by foreign mink. This, in effect limits the duty-free imports to the ratio of our market currently held by foreigners.

This passage of the bill is very important for Minnesota as we rank second in United States in the production of mink. At the meeting the ranchers were very concerned who was representing them at Washington and I would like a reply to this letter in regards of how you stand on this bill. Of all the various agricultural commodities, mink alone receives no government protection in any way shape or form, no price supports, not even sympathy. If we loose our market, we'll get a big group on the poverty list. This letter is meant in the best of purpose but it does spell out help!

Yours truly,

HARRY and GLADYS REIMERS.

RICHARDS MINK FARM,
Buffalo Lake, Minn., May 20, 1967.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
Senator from Minnesota,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I, and hundreds of other mink farmers like myself earnestly need your help. We are being overrun by the unlimited quantities of Scandinavian mink being brought into this country. No Restrictions. Our trouble is simply, too many foreign mink being allowed into our fur markets here in the States. The mink business has grown into a sizeable industry. Millions of dollars are spent on feed for the animals, labor to operate the ranches, and income taxes on the profits. Wisconsin leads in total mink production, next comes our state of Minnesota.

Pelts imported into this country last year reached 40% of domestic consumption. Denmark led the import supply nations with 1,200,000 skins. We are facing a market this year that will put many ranchers out of business. Present market conditions are such that the cost of feed and labor can not be met. Will you help us? Any influence you can lend us will be most appreciated.

A bill, H.R. 6694, has been introduced by Congressman James Burke of Massachusetts. This bill would put a duty on raw or dressed mink when the Sec. of Agriculture determines that in any given year 40 per cent of the domestic market has been taken by foreign mink.

Will you help us in protecting our domestic market, by limiting imports? Please we need your influence and help.

Sincerely Yours,

LOREN J. RICHARDS.

PROPOSED REALINEMENT OF THE ARMY RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on last Friday, June 2, the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense announced a plan calling for the realinement of the Army Reserve and National Guard forces.

Immediately upon being informed of this plan I issued a statement giving my views on the proposal. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed following these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR THURMOND

The proposed realinement of the Army Reserve and National Guard announced today by the Department of Defense will require the most searching inquiry by the Congress. The Senate Armed Services Committee and the Preparedness Subcommittee will both want to study the plan and determine its impact on the capabilities of our reserve forces to meet any contingencies which may arise.

Both the Reserves and the National Guard have proved their worth to our country on more occasions than it is necessary to mention. Particularly at this point in history, when we are faced with crisis after crisis, which arise virtually overnight, it would be disastrous to take any step to impair the combat readiness of our reserve forces. With world conditions as they are and considering the tremendous responsibility resting upon our country, it would be asinine to consider reducing the strength and thereby the fighting capabilities of either the Reserve or the National Guard.

It is on this basis that the Congress should evaluate the proposed realinement.

MRS. G. H. A. CLOWES, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in the death of Mrs. G. H. A. Clowes, Indianapolis recently lost one of its most distinguished citizens. Mrs. Clowes helped establish and shape a number of important institutions and worthwhile activities in that city.

Some of the distinctive characteristics of Mrs. Clowes' personality and achievements are well summarized in an editorial published in a recent issue of the Indianapolis Star.

As a tribute to one who contributed much to the welfare of her community and, indeed, to the whole State of Indiana, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mrs. G. H. A. Clowes

There may be new memorials to Mrs. G. H. A. Clowes. But it would be hard to surpass the set of living memorials which exist now because of the things she did.

She was an innovator. She may or may not have been more alert than most persons in perceiving things that needed to be done. But she did something about them.

There are Clowes Hall, the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra, Orchard School, the annual Park School Garden Tour, the law which permits city and school contributions to the Symphony operations, the tower of Trinity Episcopal Church and the Clowes art collection, to name the more noteworthy ones. In the creation of all of these—some with others and some by herself—she was a prime mover.

Hers was a forceful and decisive personality. She shunned no controversy and she had a habit of being right. When she moved, she did it with vigor and purpose.

In contrast to her belief that tax money should help keep the orchestra going, she opposed the use of tax money to help build an auditorium on the Butler University campus. The taxpayers, she opined, had burdens enough. She and her family backed that opinion with some $2.5 million, and in addition picked up the first year's operating losses of Clowes Hall.

Those were things indicative of the character of a noble woman. She worked in many other civic enterprises. She didn't just send her money to do things; she put herself into them.

She will be remembered with joy and pride.

FLORIDA ACTUARY BLASTS REVOLVING CREDIT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most complicated subjects known to man is a revolving credit account. There are very few housewives who understand the complicated bookkeeping system employed by department stores who commonly extend revolving credit.

I do not mean to imply that the revolving portion of the credit is complicated. Once the credit charge begins, it is a simple matter of multiplying an unpaid balance by a fixed percentage, usually 1½ percent to obtain a finance charge. The truth-in-lending bill would require that this monthly percentage be translated into an annual rate of 18 percent per year so that such credit is directly comparable with other forms of credit.

The determination of the unpaid balance, however, is another matter. Some stores charge on an adjusted balance method. This means that the store will charge 1½ percent per month on the opening balance less any payments or returns during the month. Thus, under this system the consumer receives credit for any partial payment he may make during the month.

However, under the opening balance method, which is used by 60 percent of all department stores, a charge is made on the basis of 1½ percent of the opening balance unless the entire balance is paid in full within 30 days. Thus, if a consumer had an opening balance of $100 and repaid $99 during the month, the store would still charge 1½ percent of the $100 opening balance.

Mr. John S. Ripandelli, a Florida actuary, has attacked the opening balance method and claims it is unfair to consumers.

The truth-in-lending bill, which I introduced last January, would not prescribe any particular method of billing. It would, however, require the stores to disclose in clear and simple language the exact way in which their billing systems are operated. As it stands now, most stores simply say they charge 1½ percent per month "on the unpaid balance." No definition is provided for the term "unpaid balance." It might either be the opening balance or the adjusted balance. It makes a substantial difference in dollars and cents which opening balance the store is talking about. The bill I have introduced would require the store to disclose this important fact to the consumer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article published in the St. Petersburg Times, concerning Mr. Ripandelli's attack on the opening balance system.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ripandelli Versus the System

John S. Ripandelli has been fighting the system. Like most men who set out to do battle with windmills, he has had quite an exercise in the American right to question things that no one seems to understand.

But that doesn't mean he's making any progress toward getting the answer he wants.

His fight concerns the way department stores figure carrying charges. He doesn't think their method of accounting is "right."

Ripandelli, a Tallahassee actuary and consultant, brought the whole matter to the attention of the State Comptroller's office, and they've been going "round and round" ever since.

He puts it this way:

"For example, take an extreme case," he wrote to Harold Lewis, state deputy commissioner of mortgages . . . "I purchase $300 worth of merchandise the day before the 'billing date'. A few days later, I receive the bill, and pay $299 immediately. My unpaid balance is $1."

But, said Ripandelli, his next month's bill would show a service charge based on the entire $300. It would come to $4.60.

"This," said Ripandelli, "is hard to understand."

The commission answered with a letter telling him it was all legal according to Florida statutes.

Ripandelli didn't question the legality of the practice. But he did write back, pointing out that as he saw it, it resulted in a service charge based on $300 when the amount owed for the month was only $1.

Lewis says the situation is perfectly natural.

"Practicality," says Lewis, "dictates that the charges be computed on the account balance as of some arbitrary date during the billing period." Any date, he adds, could have been chosen. It would have resulted in the same problem for the bookkeeper.

"The drafters of the Florida Retail Installment Sales Act realized that it is not feasible to calculate a separate charge for each item purchased during the month," says Lewis.

"A practical reason," he says, "for computing the charge on beginning balances is to eliminate complaints that would develop in cases where the customer makes a payment, say, on the 29th day after billing, and this is not picked up in time to appear on his next statement, which may be already in the mail."

"And," points out Lewis, "I might add that if, in the case suggested by Mr. Ripandelli, the customer had paid the entire $300 due, he would not have been billed for the service charge the following month—even though there was an opening balance at the beginning of the billing period." This means he would have received credit for free.

The law makes no stipulation whether the computing of charges will be based on either the beginning or the end of the billing period. Most of the large stores, however, figure it on the opening date, according to Lewis.

And, he adds, most contracts work out so the customer pays no added charges if the bill is paid within 30 days of the billing statement.

This means, says Lewis assuredly, "a customer can obtain credit for 60 days with no service charge."

He gives an example: An account is opened on Jan. 15 with a $100 purchase. A statement is sent to the customer on Feb. 15 showing an unpaid balance of $100 with no carrying charges. If the customer pays the account in full within 30 days from the date he was billed—by March 15—he will pay no service charge.

"If he pays an installment (instead of paying in full), he will be assessed a carrying charge on March 15 for the full Jan. 15 purchase. The customer may then wait until April 14 before paying this carrying charge."

This, indicates Ripandelli, who has had a similar explanation given to him, is fine but it still doesn't help him understand whether this practice, legal or not, is "right." He wonders whether or not the charge should be based on the unpaid balance, instead of the opening balance.

It's all the same says Lewis.

"The opening balance of a period is the closing balance of the preceding period," he says, referring to his example. (But it is not the unpaid balance.)

"Personally," says Ripandelli, "I think the Legislature ought to define what is meant by 'unpaid balance' and how to charge a fractional part of a month."

Nevertheless, the charges are still appearing on bills from department stores. And Ripandelli doesn't seem to be any closer to winning his battle than he was in the beginning. But he's trying a new approach.

"I gave up with them," he says, referring to the mortgage commissioner's office.

He says he might ask the Legislature to "define" the problem, and he hints there might be a possibility of bringing the matter before a U.S. Senate Committee investigating installment credit charges.

In the meantime, he'll be billed just like everyone else who buys on credit from a department store. The system doesn't flinch.

WATER CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the 23d annual meeting of the Texas Water Conservation Association in Austin, in March 1967, was the occasion for three very informative addresses summarizing the work of three Federal agencies toward conservation and beneficial use of our precious Texas water.

The current work of the Army Corps of Engineers was presented in a fine address by Brig. Gen. William T. Bradley, division engineer, U.S. Army Engineer Division, Southwestern, Dallas.

The activities of the Bureau of Reclamation were outlined by Mr. Lon W. Hill, regional director, Bureau of Reclamation, Amarillo.

The very fine program of the Soil Conservation Service in Texas was described by Mr. H. N. Smith, State conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, Temple.

These three speeches provide a comprehensive picture of the water development work being carried out in Texas by these Federal agencies. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

[From Texas Water, April 1967]

The Corps of Engineers' Role in Texas Water Development

(By Brig. Gen. William T. Bradley)

(Editor's Note.—Following is text of remarks by Brig. Gen. William T. Bradley, Division Engineer, U.S. Army Engineer Division, Southwestern, Dallas, to the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Texas Water Conservation Association in Austin March 12-13, 1967.)

Being perhaps one of the newest Texans in the room, I was pleased to have this opportunity to meet with such a distinguished gathering of leaders in the water resources development field in Texas.

Texas is fortunate to have an organization such as the Texas Water Conservation Association, which can bring the diverse water interests of the state into one body for the purpose of considering and trying to create better understanding of one another's water problems.

The topic I have been asked to speak on today is, "The Corps of Engineers' Role in Texas Water Resources Development." Basically, we in the Corps of Engineers consider our role to be one of partnership with the states and local governments and the various Federal agencies concerned in this field of water resources development. Functionally, we play several roles. We are here to help in planning, and, where appropriate, to construct facilities to meet water needs inherent with the state's growing population.

The Corps of Engineers' civil works program in the Southwest today comprises about three-fourths of our overall mission, the other one-fourth being devoted to construction of military installations and facilities for the Army and the Air Force. We have recently phased-out our mission at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, which we built for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This two-fold military and civil works mission of the Corps dates back to George Washington, himself an engineer, and the founding of the U.S. Army. Later it was determined that the government should have an engineering segment, which would alternate its emphasis between military and civil functions as the country moved between peacetime and wartime status. The basic thesis of this arrangement is that by using military men in civil works in peacetime we keep them sharpened for military engineering duties when needed. The feasibility of this theory is evidenced by the fact that Major General Carroll H. Dunn, who stood before this organization five years ago in the same capacity in which I am here today, is now Assistant Chief of Staff for Logistics for American forces in Viet Nam; and, as such, has jurisdiction over all engineering and construction forces in the encounter over there.

Since World War Two the Corps has completed construction of 21 dams and reservoir projects in Texas. Seven of these—Proctor, Navarro Mills, Canyon, Sam Rayburn, Bardwell, Waco and Somerville—have been completed in the past four years. These 21 projects provide 12.8-million acre-feet of flood storage space and nearly 5.6-million acre-feet of conservation storage capacity. This represents approximately 40% of the total capacity of all surface reservoirs in the state today and about 15% of the conservation storage capacity. Three more dams are under construction now—Stillhouse Hollow, in the Brazos River Basin; Pat Mayse, in the Red River Basin; and Wallisville, on the Trinity. They will add nearly one-half million acre-feet of flood control storage and over 370,000 acre-feet of conservation storage to the present totals.

Significant changes in water development concepts have come about since the early- and mid-forties when Lake Texoma was built as the first Corps of Engineers reservoir in Texas. Projects formerly were considered largely in terms of individual reservoirs or floodways to meet specific local needs for flood protection. In some of the early projects Congress included conservation storage for municipalities and industry, or hydro-electric power, as specific project purposes. In three basins—the Trinity, the Brazos, and the Neches-Angelina—the flood control concept was broadened to the creation of entire systems of reservoirs and floodways which can work in concert during periods of extensive flooding.

Federal agencies have always considered the full impact of proposed Federal activites within river basins. Their studies were comprehensive in that sense. However, many potential needs and uses of water resources were not thoroughly searched out, because under the law they could not be incorporated into Federal programs.

Since the passage of the Flood Control Act of 1958, all new Corps projects in Texas have been planned under the concept of developing available dam sites for the most feasible utilization for *all* purposes. Under the direction of Congress, we have broadened our basic flood control and navigation programs, to permit the facilities that we build for those purposes to be adapted to other purposes, such as water supply for municipalities and industries, irrigation, hydro-electric power, water quality control, recreation and others.

Today we still build on an individual project basis where such an approach fills special local needs. But we are concentrating more and more on comprehensive development of *entire river basins* as the most effective solutions to water needs. In Texas, comprehensive studies are now being made on the Red River, the Guadalupe, the San Antonio, the Sabine, the Neches, the Colorado, and the Brazos Rivers. An interim report on a study of navigation and bank stabilization on the Red River below Denison Dam has been submitted to Washington by the Lower Mississippi Valley Division, which has cognizance in that area. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has approved a project for bank stabilization from the mouth of the Red River to Denison Dam and for navigation from the Mississippi River to Daingerfield, Texas, with recommendation that the reach from Shreveport to Daingerfield be made the subject of further study.

The Trinity River Plan, authorized by Congress in the River and Harbor Act of 1965, is a product of the most comprehensive basin-wide study completed in the United States up to that time. We are now in the first phases of implementing this plan. In its authorization of the Trinity program, Congress provided that the Corps of Engineers should make a re-evaluation study of the navigation economics phase. The original study was made on the basis of traffic potentials existing in 1958, when a traffic survey was made, and on a 100-year amortization basis, which Congress was encouraging us to use at that time. The new study will be based on current traffic potentials and a 50-year amortization period. Our Galveston District has largely completed a survey of shippers in the Houston area and is now working in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. The restudy will include an analysis of the feasibility for increasing the minimum width of the navigation channel from the presently-authorized minimum width of 150 feet to 200 feet, and for enlarging the size of navigation locks recommended in the original report. We are endeavoring to recomplete the re-evaluation at field level this summer.

An item in the President's fiscal year 1968 budget is an appropriation for advance Federal participation with the state in construction of five bridges required for new highways crossing the Trinity River. The total Federal share in the bridge construction work would be $12.3-million. The 1968 budget includes $4-million for the first year's work on bridges for State Highway 105, U.S. 190, State Highway 31, Interstate 635 and Interstate Highway 45. It is estimated that participation in building these bridges now to a height sufficient for navigation could save the Federal government several million dollars over the cost of raising them later.

Another Trinity River item of interest in the President's fiscal year 1968 budget is a suggested appropriation of $100,000 for beginning a pre-construction planning on the Lakeview Dam and Reservoir. This multiple-purpose project, to be located southeast of Grand Prairie on Mountain Creek, is one of the four new reservoirs included in the comprehensive plan. Construction is continuing on Wallisville Dam, near the mouth of the Trinity River, which is a part of the comprehensive plan but was authorized by Congress earlier. This salt water intrusion barrier and conservation storage reservoir includes a navigation lock to service the existing channel to Liberty.

Start of construction on four new dam and reservoir projects, in the portion of Texas within the Southwestern Division, is expected between now and the middle of next year. One of these is the enlargement of Lake Lavon, on the East Fork of the Trinity northeast of Dallas. The enlargement will raise the height of the dam eleven and one-half feet and increase the reservoir's conservation storage capacity by 280,000 acre-feet. The North Texas Municipal Water District has contracted for storage in the reservoir, to serve water needs of several North Texas communities. In another type of reservoir modification, early next year our Tulsa District plans to start the reconstruction of Lake Kemp at Wichita Falls, which was built by local interests. At about the same time the Fort Worth District expects to start construction of the Laneport and North Fork Dams and Reservoirs on the San Gabriel River near Georgetown.

The Corps has 12 other authorized dam and reservoir projects in various stages of planning. These include three reservoirs authorized as parts of the Trinity River comprehensive plan and the Lower Mississippi Valley Division's authorized Cooper Dam and Reservoir on the Sulphur River.

Though our usual water resources role is the more commonplace one of designing and building projects, Congress in recent years has given the Corps some assignments which have entailed considerable pioneering and scientific research. Two of these studies, by our Tulsa and Fort Worth Districts, have introduced new approaches to problems of obtaining good, useable water for Texas municipalities, industries and irrigation. A study of natural chloride pollutions in the Red and Arkansas River Basins was conducted jointly with the U.S. Public Health Service. The Public Health Service located sources of natural chloride pollution in the Red and Arkansas River Basins, which materially limit the use of water from these basins. Over 60% of the Red River's chloride load was found to come from ten primary sources in the headwaters of the river. The studies have convinced us that the chloride sources in the two basins can be controlled in varying degrees. Findings indicate that impoundment of brine close to the source and diversion of fresh water around the salt source area, or a combination of the two, are the best control plans. In the Wichita River Basin, collection of low flows, which carry about 85% of the brine load, and pumping the brine to off-stream impoundment sites are expected to make Lake Kemp a much more dependable source of fresh water supply for Wichita Falls and vastly improve the quality of water flowing into Lake Texoma. Congress, in its last session, authorized construction of the recommended water quality measures on the Wichita River. In other areas of the basins, our recommendations have been for subsurface cutoff and collection of brines in a conduit for pumping to a disposal site. On main streams, where there are salvageable quantities of fresh water, we believe control can be accomplished best by impoundment of brines in the stream bed and diverison of the fresh water in a by-pass channel around the brine impoundment. Through these and other innovations, we anticipate a break-through toward solving the salt problems of the Arkansas and Red River Basins. Our Fort Worth District also has been conducting some salt studies in the Brazos River Basin, which has somewhat similar problems.

The second unique search for development of a source of potable water was made in the Edwards Underground Aquifer near San Antonio. The purpose of this study was to determine the feasibility of capturing surface water for recharging the underground reservoir. The aquifer is a water-bearing layer of limestone 350 to 500 feet thick, several miles wide, and about 175 miles long, underlying portions of the Guadalupe, San Antonio and Nueces River Basins. In floodtime, water moves down the river channels faster than the aquifer can absorb it. This not only wastes the water but also causes flood damage downstream. Our plan is to build four reservoirs, which would retain flood flows and increase the rate of recharge of the aquifer. The plan is now being reviewed by interested Federal and State agencies.

At the request of state interests, Congress has approved a study by Federal agencies, including our Fort Worth District, to determine the feasibility and possible extent of Federal participation with the state in implementing provisions of the Texas Water Plan. The District is working on the study now and expects to have it completed by the summer of 1968. We are encouraged to see that those in authority in the state government are willing to tackle the complex problems of Texas water needs and trying to develop a workable approach to meeting them.

In today's world of water resources development, environmental considerations and problems are becoming increasingly prominent. The Corps of Engineers and other builders of civil works projects find themselves more and more in the role of environmental planners. Urban dwellers want to be able to emerge from their high-rise apartments, get off their paved streets, and find green fields, wooded hillsides, and clear, free-running streams somewhere nearby. They deplore what has happened to the air they breathe, the landscapes of yesterday, the woodlands and rivers. Although wholesome outdoor environments may be available in remote parts of the country, that does not satisfy them. They want these things within easy reach of a weekend outing, if not an afternoon picnic.

Therefore, the enhancement of esthetic values, the preservation of natural beauty, the provision of recreational opportunities, and the conservation of fish and wildlife have become factors of increasing prominence in the water resources field. Due allowance must be made for the effect of future development on the entire natural environment.

The Corps of Engineers has employed wildlife, park, outdoor recreation, and other specialists on its staffs for many years, and sought the expertise of other agencies. We are now strengthening our capability to respond to the growing need to preserve environmental resources while meeting the essential needs of development in our expanding economy. In the Southwestern Division and the other Divisions of the Corps we have established Environmental Resources Branches within our planning organization. It is their responsibility to see that environmental considerations are included from the start in all of our planning and program formulating activities. We are seeking and securing improved working relationships with the conservation groups and organizations. Our purpose is not just to explain our activities to them, but also to acquire a better understanding of their needs and views.

A natural progression in the building of water resources projects is that from construction to operation. In recent years the Corps of Engineers has become a major operator and custodian of completed reservoirs. We now have 48 of these in the Southwestern Division, all but four of which have been completed since World War Two. As I mentioned earlier, 21 of these are in Texas. Last year our Texas reservoirs, including the portion of Lake Texoma this side of the Oklahoma state line, recorded over 29 million visitors. This is nearly twice the *national* total of visitors to Corps of Engineers reservoirs in 1950. This explosive expansion of the public's use of our reservoirs for recreation purposes has made the provision of facilities to accommodate the crowds a major consideration not only in our operations but also in construction and planning of new projects. In plan formulation, economic evaluation, and cost allocation, recreation is now treated as a full partner with other purposes of water resources development.

Another subject to which renewed interest is being applied is the Corps Flood Plain Management Services program. One important element of this program is the preparation, on request, of detailed flood plain information reports delineating the flood hazard in any given area. It also provides technical service and guidance to state and local governments to assist them in developing appropriate flood plain management procedures. I want to point out that flood plain regulation is not considered a substitute for the construction of flood control facilities wherever they are most suitable. However, the management of flood plain utilization can be used as a valuable adjunct to the established flood control program.

The new challenges and changes which are transforming our water resource development programs underscore the fact that we must all work together, and act together, with full cooperation among all levels of government, as well as private interests, if we are to solve all of the difficult problems involved in meeting the broad demands of the public of the future.

I appreciate this opportunity to be with you. This association is in an advantageous position to keep the people of Texas informed about water-related problems affecting their present lives and their future hopes. I am confident that you will continue to carry on with foresight and enthusiasm.

[From Texas Water, April 1967]

THE RECLAMATION PROGRAM IN TEXAS

(By Leon W. Hill, Regional Director)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is text of remarks of Leon W. Hill, Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation, Amarillo, to the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Texas Water Conservation Association in Austin, March 12–13, 1967.)

It is a real pleasure to meet with my Board of Director to report on the Reclamation program in Texas. My report will cover three phases; namely, construction, activities under the small projects loan program and the general investigation program.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM IN TEXAS

For all practical purposes all authorized construction work in the State of Texas will be completed this year.

Canadian river project

The Canadian River Project is now 95% complete. The remaining work consists of completion of recreation facilities at Lake Meredith, general cleanup, and testing the pumping plants and aqueduct. During the testing period this summer water will be made available on a limited basis to project cities where needed to meet their summer peaks. The system will be ready for full operation January 1, 1968; and it is expected that the Authority will assume responsibility for operation and maintenance of the project at that time.

Mercedes division, lower Rio Grande project

The Mercedes Division rehabilitation work is 96% complete. However, it is expected that some pipeline construction and drainage work will continue into next year. All remaining work is being performed by District forces and the entire construction program was closely coordinated with the District's operation and maintenance activities.

Pecos River Basin water salvage project, New Mexico-Texas

For the Pecos River Basin Water Salvage Project in New Mexico and Texas a total of $2,500,000 has been authorized to initiate the first clearing of salt cedars and other phreatophytic growth in the Pecos River Basin. A portion of this work is in Texas, from the state line to Mentone, Texas. The result of this work in water salvage, improved land, and quality water will be beneficial to Texas. The first contract will be awarded this month.

To summarize the construction phase of my report, approximately $164 million in constructed works has been invested in the State of Texas in the last 60 years. This compares to a total of about $8 billion of Reclamation works in the 17 western states. In other words, Texas to date has had only 2% of the Reclamation construction work.

SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT

We currently have an active program in the State under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956. At the present time this work is being carried on principally in the Lower Rio Grande Valley. The Hidalgo County Water Irrigation District No. 1 (Donna Division) has completed rehabilitation of its distribution and drainage system and the Cameron County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 (Harlingen Division) has substantially completed rehabilitation of its irrigation system under this program.

The loan application for Cameron County Water Control and Improvement District No. 5 (El Jardin District) has been approved, and funds to start construction have been included in the FY 1968 budget.

Loan applications have been received from the following Districts:

Cameron County Water Control and Improvement District No. 4 (Santa Maria District).

Cameron County Water Control and Improvement District No. 13 (Arroyo Gardens District).

Loan application reports are now being reviewed in my office for the following Districts:

Cameron County Water Irrigation District No. 2 (San Benito).

Cameron County Water Control and Irrigation District No. 19 (Adams Gardens).

Hidalgo and Willacy Counties Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 (Willacy).

The Zavala-Dimmit Water Improvement District No. 1 at Crystal City has submitted a Notice of Intent to apply for a small projects loan.

PROJECTS SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS

I want to report to you briefly on the projects that have been submitted to Congress.

Columbus Bend project

The plan of development for the Columbus Bend Project provides for construction of the Columbus Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Colorado River between Columbus and La Grange. The reservoir would be operated by the Lower Colorado River Authority as an addition to its system of existing reservoirs on the Colorado River above Austin. The project report was transmitted to the Congress in 1961, and hearings have been held before subcommittees of the Senate and House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. No further action is contemplated on this project.

Palmetto Bend project

The Palmetto Bend Project would be located in the Lavaca-Navidad River Basin in Jackson County, Texas. The project plan provides for construction of the Palmetto Bend Dam and Reservoir and associated recreation facilities on the Lavaca and Navidad Rivers about four miles north of their confluence. The project report was submitted to Congress in 1965 and bills to authorize construction of the project have been introduced in the current session of Congress.

Red Bluff project

Legislation has been introduced in the Congress seeking authorization of the Red Bluff Project. The Bureau furnished the District an engineering report which was used as a basis for the legislation. The plan proposed construction of a diversion dam on the Pecos River and 110 miles of concrete-lined main canal to project lands. The plan contemplates that the District would rehabilitate existing systems of the seven irrigation districts to permit the delivery of water from the main canal to project lands and would construct any drainage works that may be needed.

American Canal extension (Chamizal)

Legislation has been introduced to authorize the American Canal extension as a supplement to the Chamizal Treaty. Work would be located along the Rio Grande near El Paso. It would consist of enlarging about 1.1 miles of existing canal and construction of about 13 miles of new canal located on the American side of the Rio Grande. The canal would supply irrigation water to the Rio Grande Project.

PROJECTS IN TEXAS UNDER INVESTIGATION

In rounding out this report on our Reclamation program in Texas, I want to call your attention to the projects that are under investigation in the state.

Cuero project

The Cuero Project would be located in the Guadalupe River Basin in DeWitt and Gonzales Counties, Texas, and would consist of the construction of Cuero Dam and Reservoir and associated recreation facilities on the Guadalupe River and Sandys Creek, a tributary, a short distance upstream from their confluence. Completion of the Secretary of the Interior's report on this project is being withheld pending receipt of the review comments from the State of Texas. Submittal of the Governor's views and recommendations on this report is awaiting completion of the State Water Plan by the Texas Water Development Board.

Nueces River project (Choke Canyon)

The project would be located in the Nueces River Basin in Live Oak and McMullen Counties, Texas. It would consist of the construction of Choke Canyon Dam and Reservoir and associated recreation facilities on the Frio River, a tributary of the Nueces. A draft of the proposed report on this project has been prepared and is currently being reviewed at field level by interested state and federal agencies.

Cibolo project

This project would be located in the San Antonio River Basin in Wilson and Bexar Counties, Texas, and would consist of the construction of Cibolo Dam and Reservoir and associated recreation facilities on Cibolo Creek, a tributary of the San Antonio River. The proposed report on this project is scheduled for completion this year.

Texas basins project

Our report on the Texas Basins Project known as "Burleigh's Big Ditch" was completed in 1965 and submitted to the Commissioner of Reclamation. Further processing of the report has been held in abeyance pending completion of the state's water plan. The report has been submitted informally to the Governor of Texas by the Secretary of Interior for consideration by the Texas Water Development Board in formulating the statewide water plan.

The Texas Basins investigation included reconnaissance studies of the Baffin Bay, Sinton, and Lower Rio Grande Irrigation Units. We are currently updating the studies on these units and preparing a feasibility grade designs and cost estimates.

Also under investigation are two units which are not considered in the Texas Basins Report and for which reconnaissance studies are needed. These are the West Texas Water Supply Unit and the Winter Garden Unit. The West Texas Water Supply Unit comprises the western part of the state, excluding the Panhandle and that portion lying in the Red River Basin. The West Texas Unit would involve works on the Colorado River through construction of new dams and pumping plants that together with existing dams would provide a continuous series of reservoirs on the river from the coastal area to the upper end of the basin. The Winter Garden Unit consists of the potential irrigation unit suggested by the Texas Water Development Board in its recently published proposed Texas Water Plan. The potential plan for this unit includes diversion of the major water supply from the Rio Grande downstream from Amistad Dam to supply existing and potential new irrigation in the Winter Garden area in the upper Nueces River Basin. However, this unit would depend on exchange of water which would be supplied through the Texas Basins Intercoastal Canal.

West Texas and eastern New Mexico import projects

Funds for the study of the West Texas and Eastern New Mexico Import Project were included in the 1967 appropriations bill and were made available to the Bureau of Reclamation to begin studies in January 1967. This study will consist of a broad investigation of the potentialities of importing water to West Texas and Eastern New Mexico from the Mississippi River system. It will take about a year to define the possibilities and select the most promising ones. Following completion of an interim report, a reconnaissance study of the plans that appear to have the greatest potential will be initiated.

PROJECT FEASIBILITY

To qualify for development under the Reclamation program, a project must (1) have a favorable cost benefit ratio and (2) be capable of repaying the reimbursable costs within 50 years. Costs allocated to irrigation may be repaid without interest. Costs allocated to municipal and industrial water are repaid with interest at rates equal to those the United States pays on its long-term obligations.

Finding irrigation projects that meet the repayment requirements is an increasingly difficult task. As you know, power is referred to as the paying partner in many Reclamation projects of the West. For example, Glen Canyon Dam on the Colorado River is the cash register for the Colorado River Storage Project and all participating projects. The San Juan-Chama Project in Region 5 is one of those participating projects. In this project, all irrigation costs in excess of the irrigators' ability to repay are to be repaid from New Mexico's share of the power revenues.

We have no such cash registers in Texas. With the exception of the San Juan-Chama Project in New Mexico there are no such cash registers in Region 5. Thus, our planning efforts have been directed toward projects which combine irrigation and municipal and industrial water that can meet repayment requirements. The Texas Basins Project is an example of this type of combination. In addition, we in Region 5 have pioneered the field of water supply development for municipal and industrial purposes where no irrigation is involved. The Canadian River Project is one of the largest such projects undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation.

As we investigate the possibilities of large-scale water movements to the West Texas area, we must bear in mind the feasibility tests which I have heretofore discussed. I think we can expect that costs of moving water to West Texas will likely be more than irrigators can repay. Thus, it may be helpful to cite a few examples of how the differences between costs and repayment ability have been handled in this Region. In the San Angelo Project in order to meet repayment requirements, the city of San Angelo agreed to repay costs allocated to irrigation that were in excess of what the irrigators could be expected to repay. By this means, the San Angelo Project met the test of repayment feasibility. Another example is the Washita project in the State of Oklahoma. This project combined municipal and industrial water with irrigation development. To meet repayment requirements, the municipal and industrial water users agreed to continue annual payments at the same rate until all costs allocated to irrigation have been repaid.

Another means of meeting the repayment problem is what we refer to as conservancy district repayment. This type of organization has been used in three instances in New Mexico. Briefly, a conservancy district with powers to tax assumes the obligation to repay all costs. Irrigated lands of the district are assessed costs up to their repayment ability, and the remaining costs are assessed against all other properties of the district. In two cases in New Mexico nonirrigated properties of the district are responsible for repaying 20% of the project costs. In the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District with headquarters in Albuquerque, the nonirrigated properties pay 75% of both capital costs and annual operation and maintenance costs. In the latter case, the repayment assignment is justified partially on drainage and flood protection.

[From Texas Water, April 1967]

THE SCS ROLE IN TEXAS WATER RESOURCES PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

(By H. N. Smith)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is text of remarks of H. N. Smith, State Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, Temple, to the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Texas Water Conservation Association in Austin, March 12–13, 1967.)

The current role of the Soil Conservation Service in water resource planning and development is authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 and by Public Law 566, 83rd Congress, as amended. The 1944 Act applies in Texas only to the upper 8,250,000 acres of the Trinity River Watershed, a 5,000,000-acre segment of the Colorado River watershed and the portion of the Washita River Watershed in the Texas Panhandle. P.L. 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, is applicable to the remainder of Texas.

There is no limitation on the size of a subwatershed for which a plan can be developed under the 1944 Act. P.L. 566 limits the size of an individual watershed project to not more than 250,000 acres. However, a number of subwatersheds, when they are component parts of a larger watershed, may be planned together when the local sponsoring organizations desire.

No single structure under either Act currently may be planned with more than 12,500 acre-feet of floodwater detention capacity or with more than 25,000 acre-feet of total capacity for all purposes.

Before the SCS may assist in any watershed development program, an application for such assistance must be submitted to and approved by the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board, as designated by the Governor. Only combinations of subdivisions of State Government can sponsor such watershed projects. The SCS follows the recommendations of the SSWCB in regard to priority of assistance to applicants.

The purposes which may be included in a watershed program under both Acts are:

1. Land use and treatment.
2. Flood damage prevention, including channel improvement.
3. Sedimentation prevention.
4. Municipal and industrial water.
5. Irrigation—from supplemental storage or sediment pools and by stream diversion.
6. Drainage.
7. Recreation.
8. Fish and wildlife habitat.
9. Prevention of land destruction by streambank cutting and gullying.
10. Groundwater control and use; a. Recharge; b. Level control and correction; c. Use.
11. Pollution abatement.
12. Augmentation of low flows for livestock water and other purposes.
13. Natural salt water source control and intrusion prevention.

Land use and treatment and flood damage prevention must be included as purposes in all watershed plans. Others are included in accordance with need and the availability of local sponsors for each purpose.

Federal cost-sharing under these Acts varies by purposes. Local sponsors must furnish all needed land rights without cost to the Federal Government for all purposes other than public fish and wildlife or recreation developments. They must also operate and maintain all structural measures. They must obtain all needed water rights under State laws. The Federal Government bears 100% of all costs attributable to flood and sedimentation damage prevention. For fish and wildlife or recreation developments, the SCS is authorized to bear not to exceed one-half of the cost of land rights of the additional storage capacity and minimum basic facilities needed for public health and safety and access to and use of such reservoir for these purposes.

The SCS may cost-share also in works of improvement which are applicable to the agricultural phases of the conservation, development, utilization and disposal of water and underground water recharge.

Other than Federal funds must bear all costs associated with providing additional capacity for municipal or industrial water in floodwater retarding structures and for pollution abatement, streambank erosion and low flow augmentation.

The SCS "may pay for any storage of water for anticipated future demand or needs for municipal or industrial water included in any reservoir structure constructed or modified under the provisions of these Acts not to exceed 30% of the total estimated cost of such reservoir structure where the local organization gives reasonable assurance, and there is evidence, that such demands for the use of such storage will be made within a period of time which will permit repayment of the cost of such water supply storage within the life of the reservoir structure." The repayment period may not exceed 50 years. No repayment need be made until the water supply is first used but in no case shall the interest-free period exceed 10 years. These provisions of these Acts are comparable, essentially, to those under which other Federal Departments may provide storage capacity for municipal and industrial water for anticipated future demand.

It is my belief that the State of Texas and many small communities of the State need to make use of these provisions of these Acts in providing for future municipal water needs. Many opportunities for providing additional water supplies of from a few hundred to a few thousand acre-feet are being passed due to lack of State or local sponsorship.

The Secretary of Agriculture, through the Farmers Home Administration, may make loans to local organizations to finance the local share of costs of carrying out works of improvement provided for in these Acts. The interest rate on these loans is the same as paid by the Federal Government on its marketable public obligations at the beginning of the year in which the loan is made. The repayment period of these loans may not exceed 50 years. No loan may exceed five million dollars.

As of March 1, 1967, the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board had approved 146 applications for assistance under P.L. 566 and had seven additional applications pending consideration. Seventy-nine of these have been approved for planning by the Administrator of the SCS. Fifty-two have been approved by the Congress or by the State Conservationist for operations. About 12 more will be ready for approval by the Congress this year. In addition, 51 subwatersheds have been approved for operations by the Service under the Flood Control Act of 1944. Applications under P.L. 566 are being received faster than they can be serviced. Planning had not started by March 1, 1967, in 72 watersheds approved by the SSWCB. On the same date last year this figure was 63. The number of watersheds awaiting planning assistance would be much larger except for trust funds made available to SCS by the State of Texas and local subdivisions of State Government. For example last fiscal year the State provided $125,000 and local sponsors over $80,000. This represents 57% of our total P.L. 566 planning funds. Planning under the Flood Control Act of 1944 is done exclusively with Federal funds.

As of January 1, 1967, 2,142 floodwater retarding and multipurpose structures had been planned in Texas by the SCS and 1,181 had been completed or were under construction. Planned also were 1,008 miles of stream channel improvement and drainage ditches, with 143 miles completed.

Some of the multipurpose structures on which agreements have been entered into with subdivisions of State Government are:

For *flood prevention* and *municipal water* with Kaufman, Coolidge, Alvarado, Brady, Sherman (2), Howe, Bells, Clarksville and Alice. With the exception of the Brady reservoir (24,000 a.-f.), the municipal water capacity in these structures has ranged from 400 to 7,000 acre-feet.

For *flood prevention, municipal water* and *recreation* with Decatur, Mansfield Clyde, Sherman and Canton. In these reservoirs, municipal water capacity has ranged from 1,000 to 6,400 acre-feet and recreation capacity from 1,000 to 4,500 acre-feet.

For *flood prevention* and *recreation* with Bartlett, Denison, Grayson, Madisonville and the Attoyac Bayou Watershed Authority. Recreation capacity in these reservoirs ranges from 314 to 6,600 acre-feet.

Water stored in multipurpose structures for recreation with cost-sharing by the SCS and under a water right from the Texas Water Rights Commission could be used temporarily under severe drought conditions for municipal water purposes without infringement on the project agreement between the local sponsor and the SCS. Permanent planned use of water in the recreation capacity of a reservoir for municipal and industrial purposes could be made with the approval of the Texas Water Rights Commission and by refunding to the SCS its cost shares for recreation capacity, basic facilities and land rights.

The SCS, on request and as resources permit, makes sedimentation surveys of publicly owned water supply reservoirs. These surveys are to determine loss of capacity and projected useful life and to indicate measures to reduce sedimentation rates. Some of the reservoirs for which such surveys have been made in recent years include: Lake Kemp, Lake Brownwood, Lake Cherokee, Mountain Creek Lake (Robert Lee), Dawson City Lake, Century Lake (Sulphur Springs) and Lake Stamford. One is pending on Lake Amon Carter for Bowie.

P. L. 566 has been amended several times to broaden its purposes. Such amendments are made to apply, generally, to the watersheds included in the Flood Control Act of 1944. Several bills to further amend P. L. 566 have been introduced into the 90th Congress. In H. R. 1451, our own Representative James C. Wright has recommended that (1) water quality management be included among the purposes for which Federal cost-sharing is available in upstream watershed projects, (2) the USDA be empowered to enter into agreements, based on conservation plans, with landowners in watersheds to cost-share on land treatment measures over a period not to exceed 10 years, and (3) that Federal funds, other than P.L. 566 funds, be authorized for use in purchasing needed easements and rights-of-ways. In my opinion, these are very desirable additions to the Act to meet the needs of broader watershed programs in Texas.

Streambank erosion control and erosion control on county and local roads have been proposed in other amendments as cost-sharing purposes for pollution and sedimentation prevention. It is true that the most common pollutant of streams is sediment—"mud" if you prefer that term. You cannot have "clean, clear water" in streams of watersheds with significant erosion of agricultural land, urban areas, streambanks or roads and highways.

The SCS continuously studies the effect of planned floodwater retarding structures on water yield of major water supply reservoirs. Funds are provided also by SCS to the U.S. Geological Survey for studies through instrumentation of floodwater retarding structures.

A recently published report of a 1966 study of the effect of 87 planned structures on Denton Creek watershed on Grapevine Reservoir is typical of such studies. The 87 floodwater retarding structures will control potential flood flows from 239 square miles of the drainage area of Grapevine Reservoir.

Reservoir operation studies for the period 1941 through 1957 were made to determine the effect of floodwater retarding structures on the water yield of Grapevine Reservoir. These studies include reservoir operations with and without floodwater retarding structures of the drainage basin for reservoir conditions that existed in 1958 and those expected 50 and 100 years after floodwater retarding structures are built.

The results of the study are presented to show the effects of floodwater retarding structures on water yield for Grapeville Reservoir for conditions existing at the time of installation of the structures and for conditions 50 and 100 years after their installation.

The study results show the following effects on Grapevine Reservoir:

1. A reduction in dependable yield at the time of installation of the upstream structures of 2,500 acre-feet annually or 7%.

2. An increase in dependable yield 50 years after upstream project installation of 1,300 acre-feet or 4%.

3. An increase in dependable yield 100 years after upstream installation of 2,300 acre-feet or 8%

4. Annual sediment accumulation in Grapevine Reservoir reduced from 470 to 270 acre-feet.

5. After 100 years Grapevine Reservoir would have about 20,000 acre-feet more capacity with the upstream project than without.

6. The average annual inflow to Grapevine Reservoir will be reduced from 153,860 to 150,655 acre-feet (2.08%) after the floodwater retarding structures are installed. This reduction also will decrease as the sediment storage capacity of these structures becomes depleted.

I think you know that the only capacity designed into a floodwater retarding structure is for sediment storage and the temporary detention and automatic release of floodwaters. Thus no capacity is included for water storage for any beneficial use under Texas law unless the local sponsors have obtained a permit from the Texas Water Rights Commission.

Similar studies were made of the effects of planned works of improvement above Lake Brownwood in 1962 and above Lake Tawakoni in 1966–67. In both of these studies the results in general were the same as in the Grapevine Reservoir study. In each study it is noted that reservoir yields will be decreased at the time floodwater retarding structures are installed. It is significant, however, that in the future, when demands are expected to be higher, yields will be increased. Copies of these reports are available upon request.

The SCS is participating in comprehensive river basin investigations with other Federal and State agencies. Currently, such investigations are underway in the Red River basin below Denison Dam, the Sabine River basin and the Lower Rio Grande basin and adjacent areas in Cameron, Willacy and Hidalgo Counties. The Sabine investigation is due for completion in June 1967. The others should be finished in June 1968. Additional basin investigations scheduled include the Rio Grande Region and the Texas Gulf Region to start in fiscal years 1969 and 1970, respectively, and to be completed in 1972.

Texas water resource planning and development must include consideration of many factors, conditions and projections. Consumptive use for all purposes, whether economically productive or not, must be a major consideration. The effect of land use and treatment, kinds and amount of vegetative cover by economic and noneconomic plants are conditions that must be evaluated because they influence water and sediment yields and are changing.

One of these conditions which is continuing an insidious change is under constant study by the SCS. A survey by the SCS of the extent and density of undesirable woody plants (brush) on Texas grasslands in 1963 revealed that 82% (88½ million acres) have significant infestations. Fifty percent of these grasslands were classified as having dense stands (20% or more canopy.) Such plants are "water-hogs" as compared to grass. Texas A&M University has estimated that approximately 40% of the water that falls on Texas is used by uneconomical plants. Studies underway by the SCS indicate the possibilities of increasing the water yield of Texas streams by five to ten million acre-feet per year by programs resulting in effective reduction and control of present brush infestations on 50% to 80% of the acres involved. We will issue soon a report on these studies.

In spite of efforts by landowners and cost-share programs of the USDA, total brush infestation has increased. Surveys by the SCS in 1948 and 1963 indicate an increase of 3½ million acres of cedar and 1¼ million acres of mesquite. Comparable increases in many other species have occurred.

Water resource planning and development have many aspects requiring the best thoughts, efforts, research and complete "togetherness" in spirit and in fact by all State and Federal agencies, with the State providing ever-increasing leadership.

THE CRISIS IN THE NEAR EAST

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the situation in the Near East has developed into the gravest of possible eventualities.

At a meeting with General Eisenhower in Gettysburg early this morning, he and I discussed with the gravest concern the crisis which developed just hours before our meeting.

Since the U.N. Secretary General precipitately removed the U.N. peacekeeping force, there has been a steady buildup of troops along the Israeli borders. Full military mobilization on both sides was accompanied by near-hysterial threats by the Arab leaders, who were egged on by the Soviet Union.

With masses of troops facing one another, it was almost inevitable that a spark would set off full-scale fighting.

The war in the Near East today is not only a tragedy for those who are engaged in the battles, but also poses the most serious threat of developing into a general world conflagration.

This is a responsibility of the whole international community, and we must pray that men of good will everywhere will deal with it promptly and intelligently.

The United Nations or a concordance of world nations, led by the great powers, should move immediately to stop the fighting and to insure the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of all participants in the fighting.

We should strive to put back on the scene an international peacekeeping force and keep it there regardless of the bluff and bluster of one of the combatants. Such a force should be subject to the control of the Security Council or the General Assembly and not of the Secretary alone.

If the fighting can be halted, however, we must not stop short of a full and fair solution, one that has been avoided for the past 19 years. We must strive to bring all the contending parties to a peace table so that they can live, grow, and develop for their mutual benefit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements on the Near East situation, which I made on May 30 and June 4, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of May 30, 1967

In the explosive situation in the Near East, I hope that the nations of the world do not lose sight of certain fundamentals.

The United States is deeply committed to the preservation of free institutions and the sovereignty of free nations. Recent history demonstrates that the United States meets its commitments.

The present crisis in the Near East developed when the Secretary General of the United Nations made a serious mistake in judgment when he withdrew the U.N. peacekeeping force from the buffer zone between Israel and Egypt. That action should make us examine again the frequent statements by the Secretary General about the maintenance of peace in many parts of the world. I am concerned that the Secretary General is missing the point—in both the Southeast Asia and the Near East—about who is the aggressor.

The action by Egypt's dictator in attempting to close the Gulf of Aqaba is a threat not only to Israel shipping but to the right of free passage for all nations.

The free world nations must not permit an international waterway to be blockaded on the whim of a dictator who is trying to restore his sagging political fortunes at home.

As President Johnson said, "The United States considers the gulf to be an international waterway and feels that a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace. The right of free, innocent passage of the international waterway is a vital interest of the international community."

I commend the people of Israel for showing remarkable restraint under the most difficult of provocations. I commend the international community for its efforts to remedy an extremely dangerous situation.

We in the free world must reassert our determination—stated long ago—to assure the safety and integrity of the State of Israel and we must do everything within our power to assure the rights of free passage in the Gulf of Aqaba.

Statement of June 4, 1967

I have been concerned about the existence of the State of Israel since before there was a State of Israel.

I believed then, and I believe now, that it is in the interest of the United States to have free representative government in the Near East.

It is further in the interest of the United States to have as its ally a country that shares our views on the major issues facing the world and is willing to fight for the beliefs which we share.

The threat to the existence of Israel is not new, but it has now become very much more severe. The threat is not alone the element of trigger-happy Arab countries, but the situation of a posturing dictator in Cairo who is being egged on by the Soviet Union.

What are the potentialities of that situation?

There is no question in my mind that the United States fully intends to keep its commitment to Israel, as it has kept its commitment to other freedom-loving countries in the world. If anyone was ever in doubt about the United States honoring its pledges, he need only look at the terrible price we are paying in Vietnam.

Just how do we go about keeping our commitment? That is a decision that must be made by the President, who is our Commander-in-Chief.

At the risk of offering him unsolicited advice, I would say I disagree with some of the things he is doing, while I agree with other moves currently underway.

I do not think anything will be accomplished by working through the United Nations.

The present crisis in the Near East developed when the Secretary General of the United Nations made a serious mistake in judgment by withdrawing the U.N. peacekeeping force from the buffer zone between Israel and Egypt.

By his action, he pushed the United Nations to the level of an impotent debating society. I do not think anything is ever going to be accomplished in an international crisis of this sort by delaying decisions until we have heard all the consecutive translations.

On the other hand, I think the President is wise in seeking a multilateral approach through direct dealing with Great Britain and other maritime nations, 14 of whom asserted the freedom of these waters in 1957. They have as much at stake as we do in the right of free, innocent passage of an international waterway.

A multilateral statement should be pressed for now in asserting maritime rights and should not await long U.N. debates.

This Senator believes that the U.S. meets its commitments.

I will bring to bear whatever influence I have to make sure that my views and yours are brought to the attention of the man in the White House who has the lonely job of making the ultimate decisions on how we go about it.

DEATH OF LLOYD V. BERKNER

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, we were all terribly saddened by the untimely passing of Lloyd V. Berkner, one of our Nation's most outstanding scientists.

His pioneering work in radio and atmospheric physics has secured for him a well-deserved reputation among his scientific colleagues. His military efforts led to the development of the early warning system, an immeasureable contribution to this country's security.

He will probably best be known, however, as the father of the IGY—International Geophysical Year—in 1957–58, probably the most successful large-scale cooperative scientific enterprise in history.

As Chairman of the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences, his contributions to our space program have been of tremendous importance. For these contributions he received the NASA Public Service Medal last October. He also testified and has given valuable council to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences on many occasions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of achievements of Dr. Berkner be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ACHIEVEMENTS OF LLOYD V. BERKNER

Father of the International Geophysical Year, champion of the North American distant early warning system, author of "Science and Foreign Relations," advocate and sponsor of the first national radio astronomy observatory, past president of the International Council of Scientific Unions, and for 10 years responsible for the destiny of the Brookhaven National Laboratory, Lloyd V. Berkner has worked tirelessly for the progress of science on both the national and international scenes. At the same time he has sought to ensure that the advances of science would be used wherever needed to strengthen the United States and its alliance with the Free World.

It was Berkner's personal philosophy, somewhat ruefully expressed, that active participation in scientific research is for young men who can bring to their work the fresh imagination and physical vigor of youth. The years of maturity, he felt, should be devoted to the important areas of science administration and policy. Certainly Berkner's own career has exemplified this. Combining a keen intellect with extraordinary physical stamina, he pursued his scientific interests around the world.

His early work included a major role in the installation and operation of the communications system for the first Byrd Antarctic expedition. He utilized this unique occasion to make studies of long-range radio propagation.

Many of Berkner's contributions to ionospheric research and related fields coincided with his association with the Department of Terrestrial Magnetism of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. One of his first accomplishments was the design and construction of the first sweep frequency ionospheric sounder. This provided a major tool for his own subsequent research investigations as well as those of his colleagues.

His early investigations lead him to discoveries of the F_1 and F_2 layer separation, the elucidation of Dellinger fade-outs, the specification of ionization density with sunspot variation, and the inter-relationship between ion density and geomagnetic variations, including the phenomena of ion layer disappearance during intense geomagnetic activity (storms).

During his tour of active duty with the Navy in World War II, he is credited with a large share of responsibility for the success of naval airborne radar, communication, and identification equipment. He also introduced the "systems" aspect of dealing with electronic installations. This became a "must" as electronic devices in aircraft proliferated and became more sophisticated. His support of research, his organizing skills, and his ability to expedite the engineering for production of innovations all contributed materially to the U.S. war effort.

In government Berkner has made important and continuing contributions to both military and civilian scientific programs. As first Executive Secretary of the Research and Development Board of the Department of Defense, he exerted a strong influence on the coordination of the research and development programs of the three branches of the armed services. For the first time each of the three services became aware of what the other was doing in the field of research and development, and this knowledge made it possible to eliminate unnecessary duplication and to fill important gaps. He was one of the first to become aware of the seriousness of the air navigation and traffic problem and, under his leadership, an important report was issued by the Board—"Navigation and National Security" (March, 1948). At the request of Secretary of Defense Forrestal and Vannevar Bush, Chairman of the Research and Development Board, he instituted an inquiry into the problem of evaluating the relative importance of weapons systems to national security. The report of this Committee led to the establishment, in January 1949, the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, which Secretary Forrestal described as "one of the most interesting and significant accomplishment in the work of unification of the military services." Despite numerous departmental reorganizations, weapons system evaluation has remained a continuing function of the Department of Defense and currently rests with the Institute for Defense Analyses.

Berkner was one of the strongest and most outspoken advocates of the feasibility of distant early warning at a time when the military were not convinced that the northern approaches to the United States could be protected by a radar network. Through his intimate association with Project Charles and his own knowledge of new breakthroughs in the field of electronics he was convinced that the North American Continent could and should be protected by a chain of radar stations stretched across the Arctic wastes. In a series of public addresses and magazine articles he consistently urged this position.

In company with a number of his distinguished colleagues, Berkner postulated making use of certain upper atmospheric anomalous ionization characteristics to permit "scatter" propagation of electronic signals. This has developed into a very useful and effective means of communication where normal systems are frequently inoperative due to disturbed conditions in the ionosphere.

In 1949 he was made Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for the purpose of organizing the military assistance program for members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Greece and Turkey. Berkner effectively headed a committee composed of top-level representatives of the State Department, Department of Defense, and the Economic Cooperation Administration, which set out to prepare a plan and formulate objectives for meeting the needs of our allies for weapons and equipment. He played a leading role in successfully pleading the need for such a program before Congress at a time when foreign aid was a relatively new concept and there was little precedence for the type of aid represented in the military assistance program.

Following the completion of this assignment, he was asked by the Secretary of State to stay on to conduct a study on the relationships of science and foreign policy. Again surrounding himself with a committee of experts, Berkner made an extensive six-months study of the many ramifications of science in United States relations with other nations. The result was a definitive study, *Science and Foreign Relations,* released by the Department of State in June 1950. The report was described by the *New York Times* as "a document of first-rate political and scientific importance." In it, Berkner recommended the establishment of the post of Science Adviser to the Secretary of State, and he also recommended the appointment of science attachés in the principal capitals of the world—recommendations that have since been implemented.

In 1951 Berkner accepted the presidency of Associated Universities, Inc., a corporation composed of 9 eastern universities which operates the Brookhaven National Observatory for the Atomic Energy Commission. When Berkner assumed the presidency he gave the Corporation an identity of its own, establishing its business offices in Manhattan and drawing a strict line between administrative and fiscal management of the Laboratory and its scientific direction, which he wisely felt should properly reside in the director of the laboratory at Brookhaven.

Up to the time of Berkner's appointment AUI had been solely concerned with the operation of Brookhaven. Under his leadership the Corporation turned to a consideration of other scientific problems, including notably, radio astronomy. Although this new field was discovered by an American scientist, Karl Jansky, in 1932, progress in the field had lagged in the United States through lack of instrumentation and organization. At the request of a group of astronomers, speaking through the National Science Foundation, AUI undertook an intensive study of what would be needed to put radio astronomy on a firm footing in the United States. The work of AUI was reviewed for the Foundation by a special panel on radio astronomy. AUI recommended and the National Science Foundation approved and supported the construction and operation of the first National Radio Astronomy Observatory, located at Green Bank, West Virginia.

Another significant project of AUI was an exhaustive study of the whole problem of civil defense undertaken at the request of the Department of the Army and the Federal Civil Defense Administration. This was known as Project East River and was headed by Major General Otto L. Nelson (Ret.). The study, which resulted in a multivolume report, was conducted by panels of experts and constituted an exhaustive review of every phase of civil defense—military and civilian. In addition to having responsibility for the general management of the project. Berkner also participated actively in the studies and in the preparation of the final report.

One of Berkner's outstanding achievements is unquestionably his relationship to the International Geophysical Year, the largest cooperative international scientific activity ever undertaken. Berkner is generally credited with having conceived the idea of the IGY. He first put forth the idea at an informal gathering of scientists who met on April 5, 1950 in the home of James Van Allen to greet the distinguished British geophysicist, Sidney Chapman. Two earlier attempts had been made at worldwide synoptic observations of geophysical data—the First Polar Year in 1882, and, 50 years later the Second Polar Year in 1932. Berkner proposed that the rapid advance of modern technology, the availability of new instrumentation, and the need for new and more comprehensive data made the time right for a new Polar Year. The proposal was eagerly taken up by geophysicists and the project became known as the International Geophysical Year. It was scheduled for an 18-month period in 1957–58, which would coincide with the period of maximum sunspot activity.

Not only did Berkner propose the IGY but he worked tirelessly for its realization. He was made Vice Chairman of the Special Committee on the International Geophysical Year appointed by the International Council of Scientific Unions. Later, as President of ICSU Berkner pressed for continued international cooperation in science in the newly developing field of space, in oceanography, and in Antarctic research.

As Chairman of the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences, he has played an active role in the formulation of the United States space program.

A keen observer of the political and military scene as well as scientific affairs, Dr. Berkner has frequently given expression to his views in national periodicals. In his column of January 2, 1958, Walter Lippmann commented:

"The true nature of the challenge has been defined with brilliant insight in an article in the current 'Foreign Affairs,' written by Lloyd V. Berkner of the President's Scientific Advisory Committee. I hope I am not distorting Mr. Berkner's article in the following summary of his central thesis."

In 1960 Dr. Berkner turned his talents in a new direction. Responding to the concern of a group of Southwestern businessmen over the lack of graduate research facilities in the Southwestern United States, he accepted their invitation to organize the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest. With headquarters and facilities in Texas, the Center is designed as a cooperative effort involving the major universities in the states comprising the Southwest.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, an editorial in this morning's Washington Post very properly evaluates Dr. Lloyd V. Berkner's contribution in the scientific world. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LLOYD VIEL BERKNER

In every generation there are a few men whose personal careers reflect with precision the great changes that have come over the country in their lifetime. Lloyd Viel Berkner built his first radio transmitter as a schoolboy in Sleepy Eye, Minnesota, and in 1928 he joined an expedition to the South Pole. Three decades later he emerged as one of the most effective advocates of American exploration in space.

In those years American science had become a vast interwoven fabric of academic and Federal laboratories, foundations and private corporations, civilian operations and military operations. Mr. Berkner moved in this world, which he had signally helped to create, not only as a scientist of distinction but as an organizer and manager of extraordinary force and capacity.

Mr. Berkner was also a notable educator; his pupils were congressional committees and public opinion, and he labored arduously to explain to them the nature of scientific research and its requirements. During the 1950's the Government attempted, for a time, to protect its scientific advantages by a blind and excessive application of traditional military secrecy. Mr. Berkner was among the most influential of the scientists who, eloquently and at length successfully, persuaded the Nation that, in the field of science, secrecy did not mean security. Beyond clear and narrow limits, he repeatedly warned, secrecy would only damage American scientific advancement. To give further substance to this belief, he pushed the International Geophysical Year to a brilliant conclusion despite an otherwise bleak atmosphere in world politics.

His last great undertaking was the establishment of the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest in Dallas: he intended it to offset the migration of the Nation's scientific talent to the East and West Coasts. Although he had had the warning of an earlier heart attack, he deliberately chose not to abandon his strenuous preoccupations. He died yesterday, in the midst of this immensely promising new enterprise.

REPORT BY SENATOR CASE ON HIS FACTFINDING MISSION TO SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], reporting on his study mission to Vietnam and Southeast Asia. The statement is concise and expresses the good judgment that we always expect and receive from the Senator. I know that it will be of value and interest to the Senate and to all others who read it.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE ON HIS RETURN FROM A 3-WEEK STUDY MISSION TO SOUTHEAST ASIA AS A MEMBER OF SENATE APPROPRIATIONS AND FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEES

I went to Viet Nam, not to probe the rights or wrongs of how we got where we are, but to try to assess for myself the situation as it now is and the alternatives that may be open to us.

I return with a view of the war that, I regret to say, can only be described as somber.

The scope and intensity of the conflict in South Viet Nam show no sign of diminishing. On the contrary, the most realistic assessment of the current military situation appears to be that allied forces—American, South Vietnamese, South Korean and others—are not losing the war but also are not winning it, at least as yet.

I regret to report that I saw and heard nothing to indicate any possibility of a negotiated peace in the foreseeable future, short of a willingness on our part to abandon our objectives.

Those objectives are limited: to help prevent the forcible takeover of South Viet Nam by Communist forces waging a "war of national liberation," and to assist the people of South Viet Nam to establish an independent and viable nation.

Whether or not we should have interceded as we have in order to attain these objectives is not the question. We did intercede, and in consequence our choices are now limited and, as our former Ambassador to Japan has put it, "all are unsatisfactory."

Ambassador Reischauer's analysis of our predicament was, in fact, substantiated by my talks with leaders and experienced newsmen in Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines, Indonesia and Thailand, as well as South Viet-Nam, and therefore bears quoting:

"If we escalate the fighting, we run the risk of paying a much higher price, with little increased prospect that this will end the original guerrilla war in South Viet Nam.

"If we withdraw to cut our immediate costs, we are likely to have to pay a much greater price in the long run, since this could encourage more guerrilla 'wars of national liberation' and discourage those who would withstand them.

"The least unsatisfactory course would seem to be our present one of limited warfare to pacify South Viet Nam, and economic and political development to build up a government and a society more resistant to internal subversion. But this will be at best a long, slow and painful process."

The risks of escalation are increasingly apparent, and it would be wise at this time, I believe, to confine the bombing of targets in North Viet Nam to those having a direct bearing on the infiltration of men and supplies into South Viet Nam. In this connection, I was glad to learn on my return of the proposal of Senator John Sherman Cooper along these lines.

If, as I believe, neither escalation nor withdrawal makes sense, we are left with that "long, slow and painful process" of helping the Government of South Viet Nam to bring security and stability to the countryside and to win the confidence and support of its people.

Estimates by knowledgeable persons of the time and resources that will be required to achieve these goals vary widely. In the light of past experience, however, I am persuaded that we are in for a long pull—measured in years—if we are to see the job through.

Over-optimism and misleadingly cheerful reports of progress, of which we have had an over-abundance, serve not only to deceive the American people but to deepen the cynicism of the war-weary people of South Viet Nam and to hamper the development of a viable political system there.

From both military and political points of view, the essential—and still missing—ingredient of success is security for the villages and hamlets in which most of the people live. The security that is lacking is no less psychological than physical in kind; to provide security is, therefore, no less a political than a military challenge. The current Revolutionary Development program has been tailored to meet this dual task, and it has been given high priority by the United States and Vietnamese Governments.

Beyond this, we can draw some encouragement from the movement toward constitutional government that is now underway. The election of the Constituent Assembly last fall, the drafting of a constitution now completed, and the Presidential and legislative elections to be held this fall can mark the beginnings of political reform and rejuvenation in a society that has never known social justice.

At the same time, we cannot and must not ignore the extent to which corruption permeates public and private life in South Viet Nam and threatens to nullify all other efforts to mobilize popular support for the Government and for the war effort. Indeed, we should be prepared to make clear to the country's present leaders that a determined and effective attack on corruption is an essential precondition to our continued support, as indeed it is to the attainment of our mutual objectives.

We must, at the same time, remain alert to the dangers of pressing too far, too fast for quick results that may be more apparent than real. We are in for a long, slow and painful involvement in Viet Nam, and any effort to mislead the American people on this score can only have disastrous consequences.

In the longer run, of course, the independent nations of Asia must provide for their own collective security. While the emergence of any regional grouping that would constitute an Asian counterweight to China remains well over the horizon, there is substantial evidence that China's neighbors have taken heart from our commitment to help preserve the independence of South Viet Nam.

FORDHAM PROJECT TO COMBAT ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the March 1967 issue of Fordham, the magazine of Fordham University, a great institution of learning in New York City, contains an article entitled, "Judaism and Justice," which describes a most significant project of the university's John XXIII Center, undertaken in cooperation with the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. The aim of the project is to implement and foster within the Catholic community at the grassroots level the spirit of the Vatican II decree on Catholic-Jewish relations.

In the brief period since their first appearance, the booklets described in the article, published and distributed under the center's auspices, have been enthusiastically received by people of all faiths. I believe that the work of the John XXIII Center is a most constructive endeavor which merits the attention of all Americans. It is because I want to share this article with Senators that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDAISM AND JUSTICE

Six small, brightly colored pamphlets entitled *"Our Spiritual Heritage, The Outline of Truth, The Anguish of A People, The Face of Sin, To Talk Together and The Declaration on Non-Christian Religions"* constitute the external evidence of one of the more important projects ever launched by any Catholic body in the United States. They are a series produced by the John XXIII Center at Fordham University and have as their purpose the instruction of Catholics everywhere in the United States, at the grass roots level, about the Vatican's attitude towards anti-Semitism. Their purpose further is to destroy this great bias. The pamphlets beautifully illustrated cost only a matter of 25¢ a set (bulk price), yet they contain enough material to foster the spirit of Vatican II with relation to the harmony that should exist between Catholics and Jews.

Each pamphlet has a specific purpose. *"Our Spiritual Heritage"* shows that the heritage of Christianity did not suddenly appear or explode on earth but rather that it came to us from the people of Israel. It proves that Christianity does not depend on temples, buildings, outer organizations; that it is a personal response of a people in whom God acts whenever they gather together in His name. This is a heritage of the Synagogue.

The booklet entitled *"The Declaration on Non-Christian Religions"* contains a number of quotes from Vatican II. It says for example "Here the church recognized the unreasoning, inflammatory poison of the mind and spirit which is anti-Semitism, a poison which can turn differences into dislikes, misunderstanding into mistreatment. The church attacks the evil of anti-Semitism as a thought as well as an act."

"The Outline of Truth" describes what the church feels about the death of Christ and the charge of deicide which for nearly 2,000 years has been a source of so much hate, bloodshed and violence directed against the Jewish people. This pamphlet further makes clear what we all should know: that love, mercy and forgiveness constitute Christ's outline for our lives and for the world.

Much is heard these days of "Dialogue." That is to talk together in openness and respect and friendship, and in the pamphlet *"To Talk Together"* it is made clear that the church urges and offers dialogue to the world. Vatican Council II was itself a form of the church's dialogue with the world and now the church is in dialogue with other churches and with non-Christian religions.

"The Face of Sin" asks the readers to listen to the church as a "Mother and Teacher." These words were used in the John XXIII encyclical. The pamphlet further makes it absolutely clear that anti-Semitism must be considered a grave sin, a matter for confession.

And in the last of the six pamphlets *"The Anguish of A People"* the pamphlet tells of the depth and extent of persecution suffered by the Jewish people down through the ages. It is a page that should be imprinted upon the hearts of every Christian. It is interesting to note that for the first time ever in a council document the term "Anti-Semitism" was used and it was used because the church recognizes that if the teachings were used to quote hate instead of love, pain instead of joy, then she must speak to tell all men everywhere that she stands in love, mercy and justice.

Fortunately, Christianity has recognized the grievous injustice of the painful and shameful things we have done against our Jewish neighbors, and in order to give official sanctions both to the wrongs and to the need for redress, Vatican Council II made its clear and unequivocal statement on the Jews. It said: "In our time when day by day mankind is being drawn closer together . . . the Church examines more carefully her relationship to non-Christian religions. In her task of promoting unity and love among men . . . she considers above all . . . what men have in common, and what draws them to fellowship." And further on, Vatican II goes on to say: "What happened in his Passion cannot be charged against all the Jews, without distinction, then alive, nor against the Jews of today. Although the Church is the new people of God, as if this followed from the Holy Scriptures."

History has shown us that many years can elapse before doctrine enunciated by the Vatican is fully implemented. The pronouncements of the Council of Trent present a good example. This has been due to difficulties of interpretation rather than implementation. On the question of the Pontiff's and Vatican II's intent towards the Jews there is no room for mis-interpretation; it is already clear. Consequently, there is no excuse for delay in implementation.

Spurred by this conviction, the John XXIII Center at Fordham University enlisted the aid and advice of Dr. Joseph Lichten, Director of Intercultural Affairs of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the American Bishops Committee for Ecumenism and Inter-Religious Affairs and the Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations, launched a project aimed at the immediate implementation of the Vatican II decree on Jewish-Catholic relations in the spirit of interreligious harmony.

Dr. Lichten is the initiator and pioneer of the Christian-Jewish Dialogue in the United States. The first Institute on the Person and the Common Good at Assumption College in Worcester, Massachusetts was established in close cooperation with Bishop John J. Wright, then Bishop at Worcester. Since that time, Dr. Lichten has organized more than 60 Christian-Jewish conferences with a special accent on Catholic-Jewish cooperation. He has an extensive knowledge of Catholic thought and activities all over the world. Throughout his life he has not only studied the Catholic world, but has established a close friendship with a great number of church leaders. His personal and professional contacts in connection with all the segments of the Catholic community are exceptionally warm and close.

The Fordham project is one of the more fascinating plans made in the United States today for the purpose of bringing the decisions of the rarefied atmosphere of St. Peter's to the ordinary parishioner making his spiritual way to salvation far from the madding crowd of neo-intellectualism.

When it was decided to publish a series of pamphlets to be distributed throughout the country, Fr. Edward H. Flannery, formerly an editor of a Catholic paper in Rhode Island, the *Providence Visitor*, was selected as editor. His book, *The Anguish of the Jews*, is already recognized as a valuable source of information on the subject. The need to prepare the material for consumption at the grass roots level was a special problem, since the real need was to make a serious effort to destroy anti-Semitism among the less informed. Unhappily, as any historian knows, the three great biases in the world, the bias against colored people, the bias against Catholicism, and the bias against Jews, are sustained and nurtured on lack of knowledge.

In their study of the ways and means to really reach the man-in-the-parish, the committees sought the aid of John Messmann, who is the Episcopalian president of an organization known as Eric Jon Associates. This group has been very successful in the past as specialists in taking complex subjects and making them palatable for the average man. Their specialized experience included the promulgation of material on vocations, the liturgy, and various other religious projects. In fact, the pamphlet idea originated in a discussion in Father Flannery's office in Rhode Island.

The John XXIII organization at Fordham is well fitted to sponsor the whole project. For some time, it has been working on the reconciliation of the Eastern and Western Catholic Churches. It fully understands the problems of eradicating age-old bias and realizes only too well the need for further harmony and understanding among Christians of all denominations and Jews.

The fact that Fordham University is situated in New York is another important element in the John XXIII project. As Father

Feodor Wilcock, S.J., superior of the Center, says: "New York City is the core of the ecumenical movement in the world." The University has made public its dedication to the interests of the city; this gives point to the location for the new venture; any project that will draw the University closer to the city is important. This does not mean that the present project is limited to the Metropolis. Already numerous archbishops and bishops throughout the country have agreed to distribute the pamphlets throughout their dioceses. It is anticipated that many more will follow suit.

The John XXIII Center is also particularly well equipped for its task because its staff of priests have had considerable international experience, realize more fully than most clerics the close relationship between the Hebraic and Catholic liturgy. They are totally dedicated to their work. In their effort to unite the Eastern and Western Catholic churches they are deeply involved in a study of the liturgical and theological group differences. This is important in an ecumenistic age when the practice of religious tolerance and understanding could lead to an unbiased approach to external religion.

The present staff of the John XXIII Center is comprised of eleven Jesuit Fathers and one diocesan priest, all of whom have had many years of study and educational experience in Europe. Their varied personal backgrounds and special training contribute to a variety of valuable projects that the Center has been continually involved in throughout its fifteen years of existence. To complement the already existing staff, three young American priests are now engaged in European study for doctorates in the fields of Oriental Liturgies, patristics and Byzantine History. One doctor recently returned to begin teaching Oriental theology and Eastern Christian Spirituality. Other doctors in Byzantine and Slavic history, art, literature, spirituality, theology, languages and patristic studies are drawn from the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome to assist the staff of the Center when needed.

The Fordham project, in short, is dedicated to the increase of both understanding and love between our two major faiths and among Christians and Jews from all walks of life—for the scholar as well as the man-in-the-parish. Its down-to-earth approach is expressed in the "Outline of Truth": "Vatican Council II has set forth the true outline of Jewish-Christian relations for all to see. The scriptures, the Gospels, Christ's own words tell us the truth about His death, the truth which some men could not, some did not and some would not see clearly. The Church has not given this to you as a history lesson. It is given you for today, so that here and now, in your every daily action, you may sweep aside old wrongs and mistrust, worn half-truths and misconceptions. It is given you so that you may see more clearly your Jewish neighbors—and yourself."

All orders for bulk sales of the booklet should be sent to the John XXIII Center.

DALLAS WAGES THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in Dallas, Tex., success after success is being recorded in the city's antipoverty program.

On March 26 and again on April 9, 1967, the Dallas Morning News published articles surveying the work of two very effective programs in the city's war on poverty, the Upward Bound and Neighborhood Organization programs. These articles were ably written by Dennis Hoover, News staff writer.

Executive Director Allan L. Maley, of the Dallas County Community Action Committee, pointed out a major reason for the success of Neighborhood Organization:

> If you believe in the concept of allowing the people to frame programs to satisfy what they consider their needs are, then you have to involve them.

In Dallas, the people are very much involved.

One great step forward noted as a result of organizing communities was "a new willingness by witnesses to crimes to sign complaints for police, even at risk of being beaten, stabbed, or shot by the lawless element." In Dallas, the poverty program has proved to be, as many hoped, a real and effective weapon against crime.

Of Upward Bound, which seeks to keep youths from dropping out of high school, it was noted that—

> The crucial change . . . is that the students are beginning to realize they can succeed if they try. Their sagging self-images are being repaired; a lifetime of defeat is becoming unthinkable.
>
> "These kids have had no one to inspire them and fire them with ambition," said Miss Helen Butler, a speech teacher at Washington (High School) who worked with the group in the summer program.

In Dallas, and throughout Texas, the war on poverty has brought new hope, and new ways of realizing those hopes, to the poverty stricken.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Mar. 26, 1967]

Upward Bound Offers Chance for Maturity, Purpose

(By Dennis Hoover)

Some teenagers need an exceptionally lucky break to get a foothold on life's ladder. Before "it" happened to them the outlooks of 65 Dallas high school pupils were, for the most part, not very bright.

Teachers knew the boys and girls had good minds. But the minds weren't fully "turned on." Poverty, with its cultural and educational deprivations, was dulling the youths' hopes and potential for learning beyond high school that would enable them to "be somebody."

Then "it" came—their big chance, called Project Upward Bound.

For eight weeks last summer the 65 pupils who had just finished their sophomore year in high school lived on the campus of Southern Methodist University. There, under creative teachers, counselors and tutors they underwent an intensive program of academic instruction and of cultural and social experiences that altered their lives forever.

Upward Bound is a pre-college program for able but disadvantaged secondary students, a front of the national War on Poverty that seeks to save brains and ability that might otherwise be lost to society.

Changes in the youngsters when they returned to regular high school classes last fall were "truly amazing," recalled Mrs. Ruby N. Herd, guidance counselor at Crozier Tech, which is contributing 26 students to the project.

"They just came back in bouncing," she said. "Many who had been taking the minimum requirements for graduation switched to college preparatory.

"Their academic grades improved, but their personalities even more so. You can pick the Upward Bound students out of a crowd of their classmates. They're the ones with the most poise, maturity and purpose."

Similar appraisals of Upward Bound's success come from other high school counselors and from Dr. Glen C. Hoskins, professor of education at S.M.U. who directs the project.

The 65 pupils attend high schools in low-income areas: Crozier Tech, Washington, Lincoln, Madison and Pinkston. They will remain in Upward Bound until they graduate, a total of two years.

On Saturdays during the regular school term they return to S.M.U. for follow-up programs. Next summer they will spend another eight weeks in residence at S.M.U., and in the fall resume Saturday instruction and mind-awaking experiences to keep them "upward bound."

A 16-year-old Negro girl enrollee echoed the bubbling esprit de corps of the whole Upward Bound group, saying: "It is helping me to become a better person. I feel real big about it, real special."

The battery of educators working with the S.M.U. project includes nine teachers and teacher assistants, supported by graduate and undergraduate tutor-counselors. Four of the teachers are from the Dallas school system, five from the university.

First aim of the project is to help the youngsters do well in high school and not drop out. Then it is hoped they will go on to some sort of post-high school education.

Dr. Hoskins said it seemed like a formidable task at the outset.

Despite having good brains, 90 per cent of the pupils had been making only fair or poor grades in school. The group's average reading level at the start of the summer term was just below seventh grade. Vocabularies tended to be stunted, diction unacceptable.

About 56 per cent of the group is Negro, 29 per cent Latin American, 13 per cent Anglo and 2 per cent Indian. Their families, averaging six members in size, have average annual incomes of $3,000. Some are on relief; many live in public housing projects.

Almost half the Upward Bound students come from broken homes, most of them headed by a mother.

Dr. Hoskins said each of the pupils had problems growing out of his family situation that threatened to cripple and thwart his learning. The youths tended to feel insecure. Some were shy or withdrawn. Some were under parental pressure to quit school and take a job.

Counseling parents on the value of education has been a major aspect of the project. The enrollees come from high schools where fewer than one-third of the graduates seek further education.

"The one thing shared by many if not most of our students was a low level of aspiration," said Dr. Hoskins.

Enrollees were selected on the basis of nominations by high school teachers and counselors and Dr. Hoskins' interviews with each student and family. Those chosen, in addition to being of low-income families, were judged to have talents that should not be wasted—abilities that if stimulated would blossom into ambition and achievement.

Intuitive feelings had to be relied on to a large extent.

"We went through the tortures of the damned when deciding who should go and who should not," related a high school counselor.

About 1,400 other pupils in the sophomore class of the Dallas schools met Upward Bound's income criterion.

Fate is indeed partial.

After one summer session and 14 Saturdays of working with Upward Bound students, here is Dr. Hoskins' prediction for them:

Half will enter traditional college programs.

The other half will enter vocational or technical programs.

That will be quite an accomplishment.

"The great majority of these kids were losers," said the director. "Without the help of Upward Bound not more than eight of them would have seen the inside of a post-high school institution."

How is the miracle of turning underachievers into promising students being accomplished?

The prescription is advanced and complex.

One ingredient is a new environment: suddenly the underprivileged youths found themselves living in air-conditioned dormitories on a beautiful university campus, with a $10-a-week spending allowance.

This alone transmitted vital messages to the youths—that somebody cares about them, that they are important people, worthy of mingling with the regular students of a major university.

"Deprived youngsters," noted Dr. Hoskins, "tend to have deep doubts about their self-worth."

From 8 a.m. until noon, Monday through Friday, the Upward Bound group attended classes in the Student Union. Instruction was geared to meet their special needs in reading and literature, discourse and composition, social studies and science-mathematics.

Classes were small, allowing close student-teacher relationships. The teachers were persuasive, patient and challenging types who dared try new instructional approaches and unusual course materials in efforts to crash through apathy.

The literature course plan, for example, contained this sentence: "It is intended that the resemblance between this course and a typical literature course will approximate zero."

"We were trying to motivate them, to create in them a desire to learn that matches their abilities, and to back this up with solid knowledge," said Dr. Hoskins.

After lunch at the campus cafeteria every day came an hour's free reading in the university libraries, then workshop in which the students explored types of dancing and music, art forms, drama, creative writing and the art of conversation.

Some afternoons there were field trips—to county and city government centers, scientific research laboratories, art galleries, museums and industries. Once the students went to Fort Worth to hear an address by Vice-President Hubert Humphrey.

The field trips related to the social studies and the science-mathematics courses. The varied exposures also broadened vistas, stirred ambitions and gave the students ideas to write about in composition.

Learning and development continued at nightly "bull" sessions in the dormitories, where the counselor-tutors lived with the students.

Also in the mix of academic, cultural and social experiences were workouts in a special reading laboratory, a night at the summer musical "West Side Story," swims in the university pool and close association with members of different races.

The enrollees wrote and published their own weekly newspaper, took part in debates, heard guest speakers representing a wide spectrum of interests, and had self-government in their dorms.

Saturdays were devoted to outings at lakes and other leisure activities. Sundays were free time for church and visiting families.

Youths in the lower socioeconomic group tend to regard the agents of government with suspicion and fear. These feelings were allayed during the course in social studies, which brought the youths face-to-face with city managers, police officials, judges and other government figures.

"It wasn't long until the students began to speak with concern about the multiple problems of cities and their government," Dr. Hoskins recalled.

Out of the busy and exciting eight weeks came many other results. Speech and writing improved. The average reading level rose to eighth grade, fifth month, with one student reading at freshman college level.

"One boy had an I.Q. of about 130 and a desire to continue his education to the Ph. D. level in mathematics," Dr. Hoskins related. "However, his family's annual income was less than $2,000 and he had been advised to substitute vocational courses for one year of high school English and two years of science.

"This would penalize him severely. The staff discussed with him the opportunities for scholarships, work-study and other financial aids. He later revised his class schedule to include as many solid subjects as possible."

Since the summer program 58 of the Upward Bound students, on an average, have reported for Saturday work on the S.M.U. campus.

"It takes guts to give up your Saturdays in order to undertake additional study," Dr. Hoskins noted. "These kids are doing it, and doing it enthusiastically."

To pay their bus fare, buy lunches and partially compensate them for money they might earn at Saturday jobs, the enrollees receive a $3.75 weekly allowance during the school year.

The Saturday program, in general design, continues that of the summer. Mornings are devoted to academic classes, aided by specialists in counseling, speech, reading, music and other areas. Instruction remains anything but the usual textbook, lecture-and-listen approach.

For instance, classes studied the "Goals for Dallas" essays, which discuss some of the community's problems. Instructors believed analysis of the essays would help teach composition, language, logic, reading and listening.

The students were visibly awed one morning when Mayor Erik Jonsson popped in as a guest speaker. His Honor reminded the group of his own very humble beginnings. When he said goodbye to rush to another meeting the students gave him a standing ovation.

Saturday afternoon, the students pursue such activities as art, dance, music, journalism, debate, swimming, tennis and bowling. One memorable evening the enrollees were guests of S.M.U. students at the State Fair of Texas.

Project staff members work closely with principals, counselors and teachers in the high schools in trying to solve the enrollees' problems of learning, emotional health and future plans. There's general agreement the Upward Bound kids have come a long way.

High school counselors report greater motivation; changes in goals, with many students turning to college-preparatory courses; greater participation in classwork, and more personal refinement in speech and general appearance.

Despite electing harder courses, most grades are above those earned the previous year.

"More important," said Mrs. Mabel Chandler, a counselor at Washington, "these kids care about themselves and their future. They feel 'I'm Somebody.' "

Before Upward Bound, said Mrs. Chandler, it appeared only three of the pupils would go to college. Now she believes almost all will seek at least some kind of education beyond high school "and do well in later life."

Mrs. Betty Wehrle, pupil personnel counselor at Crozier Tech, made this report: "There has been a vast improvement in the Upward Bound students' general attitudes. They are very enthusiastic and involved in their schoolwork. In every respect, scholastically, attendance-wise and with regard to discipline, these students have shown marked improvement."

The most powerful element of the prescription at S.M.U. may be as simple as the right word at the right time by a sensitive teacher; an exposure to a new experience, or finding a particular book.

The crucial change, say observers, is that the students are beginning to realize they can succeed if they try. Their sagging self-images are being repaired; a lifetime of defeat is becoming unthinkable.

"These kids have had no one to inspire them and fire them with ambition," said Miss Helen Butler, a speech teacher at Washington who worked with the group in the summer program.

"Many of them really are college material and they hadn't given college a second thought until Upward Bound came along."

The Dallas project will cost almost $200,000 over the two-years—$160,000 of it from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, the remainder supplied by S.M.U. and the Hogg Foundation. That averages about $3,077 per student.

"If only a few of the students complete college, the taxes they pay on their larger incomes will repay the cost of the whole program," said Dr. Hoskins. "Those who take post-high school technical and vocational training will also boost their earning capacities."

Dr. Hoskins said he prefers, however, to think of the program in terms of preserving human values.

S.M.U. has been a delegate agency of the local War on Poverty (Dallas County Community Action Committee) in carrying out the program. Next year the university will operate Upward Bound as a prime contractor directly under the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

Across the nation, 220 other Upward Bound projects for about 20,000 students are in progress at colleges and universities.

Dr. Hoskins and others say it's a tragedy that only a relative few of the "less chance" youngsters who need Upward Bound's redirection can find berths in the program.

But Upward Bound is calculated to have many "ripple effects" beyond switching on the potentials of its enrollees:

—Teachers in the program are inventing media and methods for educating children from deprived backgrounds that will blaze new trails in the public schools. "I will never return to the rote, stereotyped method of teaching again," vowed one Upward bound instructor.

—Many of the tutors in these programs have decided that they want to teach, and probably in disadvantaged areas, Dr. Hoskins said.

—Upward Bound enrollees are envied by many of their classmates. "Being in the program has given me status," commented one girl. Her improving grades and personality may spur her friends to strive harder.

—It isn't unusual for an eager Upward Bound student to encourage his parents to enroll in adult literacy classes.

—Some ex-Upward Bound students may become leaders for community advances that will help rescue untold numbers of children from educational failure.

After the next summer session, the 65 Dallas youths will be offered two-week jobs in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, to enable them to save the $100 or so they needed to buy school clothes and supplies for their senior year.

When the students conclude the program in May, 1968, they will step onto another "bridge" leading to college in the fall. For some, the bridge will be enrollment in S.M.U.'s regular summer term. For others it will be placement in summer jobs, maybe on the S.M.U. campus, to keep them heading toward advanced education.

"We are committed to enable each youth to appraise his potential realistically," said Dr. Hoskins. "We are also committed to assist him in getting the financial aid he needs to get into the post-secondary program of his choice.

"These students have become our concern and our pride, their progress has been rewarding; their futures are our responsibilities."

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 23, 1967]

Recruited From Poverty—Homemaking Counselors Doing Well

(By Ruth Eyre)

For the first time last year, a struggling Dallas mother was able to buy each of her seven children food and a whole apple and orange for Christmas.

The year before, the children had to share four apples and four oranges from the Salvation Army.

The reason the woman could buy food for her family last Christmas was because of a $1.75-an-hour job as a homemaker for the local War on Poverty Homemaker Services.

In the past she worked for $20 a week cooking 8 to 10 hours a day for 85 children in a nursery. Half her salary went to pay the rent.

Today she is one of 107 homemakers from Dallas poverty areas trained to teach people in the city's blighted areas how to work out a budget, make balanced meals and use government surplus foods such as powdered milk.

All the homemakers were making less than $1.75 an hour when they were hired. Some as little as $20 a week.

The Homemaker Service asked only that the Homemakers be literate and meet Office of Economic Opportunity poverty qualifications. There were no educational requirements—in fact 12 of the women had college degrees—and no age limit.

Fifteen of the women hired were able to move their families out of welfare housing projects and more than 20 were able to get off welfare and old age assistance rolls.

Nine homemakers went back to school taking college courses at night. Eight of their children were able to enroll in college because of the added income. Another mother was able to keep her daughter from dropping out of college.

Before the project was started last September its critics said it would never work according to Mrs. Lillian Williams, director of Dallas Homemaker Services.

"They told us we would never find enough women to fill the positions and that even if we did they would not be the kind of people who would stay long."

She received 700 applications.

So far only one has quit and she did so to take a better job with the encouragement of Mrs. Williams.

"We also had one trainee leave after a few days of training. She had been working for a department store doing technical alterations for $1 an hour," Mrs. Williams said. "When they realized what a valuable employe they had lost, they hired her back at $1.75 an hour."

These are the only two cases of homemakers leaving.

The homemakers teach hygiene, child growth and development, nutrition and care of the sick to people living in the areas where they themselves live.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 9, 1967]

Poverty Victims Glimpse Way Out of Misery—New Hope Stirs in Ugly Areas of County

(By Dennis Hoover)

Lumps in the throat and the blur of tears came to a class of Southern Methodist University students when they toured West Dallas recently.

The sight of lean, ragged children and poverty-gutted homes saddens even experienced social workers.

"When the students' chartered bus pulled away from the area there was hardly a dry eye on it," recalled Randolph R. Ratliff, a field commander of the local War on Poverty.

One scene may live long in the students' memories—that of a man scraping a freshly killed hog he had strung up to a tree in his front yard. The hog, Ratliff remembers, was silhouetted against the beautiful skyline of Dallas.

The pathos of poverty may blemish the land of plenty for years. But today new hope is stirring in the ugly areas of Dallas County.

Thanks largely to a front of the local War on Poverty called Neighborhood Organization, which Ratliff directs, hundreds of poverty victims are glimpsing a way out of their misery.

The way is through self-help, by the poor banding together in neighborhood councils to discuss their mutual problems, then pressing en masse for the means of improving themselves and their communities.

That is the system used by neighborhood improvement leagues and other organizations of the middle and upper classes.

The poor of Dallas County, once inarticulate, fearful and politically unknowing, are learning to work the system.

They are bringing change.

Nudged by Ratliff and a corps of neighborhood workers and aides, low-income area residents have organized 53 neighborhood councils over Dallas County in recent months. The groups go by such names as South Central Action Organization, and Latino Progreso Para West Dallas (Latin Progress for West Dallas).

Often racially mixed, the councils meet weekly or twice a month to talk, hear reports of their committees, and form plans of action.

The results in some neighborhoods, said Ratliff, have been fantastic.

By petitioning local government officials and sending delegations to approach them personally, councils here and there have secured regular garbage pickup service, more police protection, street lights and stop signs.

With new-found pride, the councils have sponsored cleanup campaigns to rid many streets, alleys and vacant lots of debris that had been stacking up for years. They have launched typing classes to give their young people a job skill; organized consumer education forums to learn how to stretch their dollars; created sewing circles that produce low-cost school clothing, and established clubs to occupy teen-agers usefully. The teen-agers are forming basketball and baseball teams, organizing to provide baby-sitting service and tutoring for younger children.

"You don't know what such accomplishments do for the people's self-confidence," said Ratliff, full of enthusiasm for his program.

With a determination new to them, the poor in their councils are shooting for bigger gains: city water and sewage service, street paving, improved transit service, multi-purpose community centers, park playground equipment and swimming pools, and day care centers where working mothers may park their children and invalid old folks.

The Councils are meeting with police and juvenile authorities to offer their help in combating such problems as glue-sniffing; contacting poverty-area grocers to protest low-quality produce sold at standard prices; meeting with school principals and visiting teachers to question such practices as sending children home without their parents' knowledge; attending P-TA meetings to make their influence felt, and asking industries to help solve flood drainage problems.

The local War on Poverty is co-ordinated by the Dallas County Community Action Committee (DCCAC). It embraces a variety of programs, ranging from homemaker and legal services to remedial education at Bishop College and buying school supplies for Dallas school children in deprived areas.

But Neighborhood Organization is the heart of the whole anti-poverty effort, says Allan L. Maley Jr., executive director of the DCCAC.

From inception of the War on Poverty here about 18 months ago, Maley and the DCCAC board of directors regarded neighborhood organization as vital to the entire program.

"In most places," Maley said, "the community action groups jumped right off drafting programs without having established contact with the people to be served.

"If you believe in the concept of allowing the people to frame programs to satisfy what they consider their needs are, then you have to involve them."

The neighborhood councils are vehicles of communication between the poor, the DCCAC and the rest of the community.

By attending council meetings hundreds of the poor are learning about the health, welfare and education services already available to them through government and volunteer agencies. They are voicing opinions about what additional anti-poverty services are needed in each neighborhood. And by their own efforts they are helping to see that the additional services come into being.

A major example, said Maley, will be the six multi-purpose neighborhood centers that the DCCAC hopes to establish beginning Aug. 1. These will be focal points of the anti-poverty program, providing a variety of services such as job information, recreation, child care and perhaps medical and dental care.

Whatever the centers offer, Maley said, has been recommended in depth by the poor themselves.

Encouraging the poor to organize for self-help is a process of subtlety and hard work, both by the DCCAC staff and leaders among the poor themselves.

The spark that flamed into today's network of neighborhood councils was struck in October, 1965, when 10 poverty-area residents met with Maley at a church center on South Harwood.

Maley told the group: "We're supposed to develop programs that will help you to help yourself. Now, tell us what your problems are."

Afterwards, several of the people there agreed to invite a few of their neighbors to meet in their living rooms. At these meetings Maley and his assistants explained the other War on Poverty programs and offered to aid the people with efforts to help themselves.

"Then it kind of snowballed into a whole series of small neighborhood meetings," Maley related.

These meetings grew into larger meetings in churches, community centers, housing project auditoriums and schools. The larger meetings led to the formal organization of councils.

Ratliff, a former juvenile probation officer and detached worker for the YMCA, became co-ordinator of neighborhood organization early last year—and learned his job from the bottom up.

"I'd just pick out a poverty street and start knocking on doors and giving my speech," he related. "I'd say, 'We are not a giveaway organization. We don't pay rent, buy food or clothing. But we do give you an opportunity to help yourself.' "

Invited into homes, Ratliff would listen to problems, then tell the people that he was hearing similar stories everywhere he visited.

"You are going to have to get together with your neighbors and come up with solutions," he'd say. "Why don't you have some friends in and let me come back and talk to them."

They bought it.

When the neighbors were assemled, Ratliff would ask them to air their troubles. They'd say their children have no place to play, that the neighborhood didn't have streetlights, that the garbage pickup was slow, that the police weren't coping with juvenile delinquents in their area.

"To get an organization established, we'd encourage the groups to tackle a problem they could do something about," Ratliff continued. "So maybe they'd petition the city to put up a streetlight. They'd gain strength, then ask the sanitation department to improve the garbage service."

Then came the more ambitious efforts, such as seeing what had to be done to tie into city water and sewage lines.

Already rolling, the Neighborhood Organization program was given separate funding last July by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

Ratliff's staff now includes five neighborhood organizers, each having five aides recruited from among leaders in the poverty areas. The organizers are paid $625 a month by the DCCAC, the aides $435.

Daily these anti-poverty troops fan over the county to work among the poor in "target areas" of the War on Poverty. More than 60,000 families, nearly 200,000, live in these poverty pockets where the median family income is $3,000 a year or less.

Ratliff and his assistant, Billy Medina, a former West Dallas resident, direct the organizers via citizens band automobile radios. The organizers direct their aides by walkie-talkies.

The workers and aides do basically what Ratliff did: knock on doors, listen, try to bring neighbors together to seek solutions to some of their woes. They talk at neighborhood meetings, inspire and help organize councils, and perform such other services as referring people to health and welfare agencies and explaining how to get a plumbing permit at City Hall.

On a recent afternoon, aide Ann Browning, a former waitress, was working in a Mexican-American area of North-Central Dallas.

"I'm calling at homes to tell people about a neighborhood meeting tonight," she related. "They'll be discussing such problems as street lighting, police protection and garbage pickup."

Not far away another aide was trying to organize a youth group. "Mainly to get them off the streets," explained organizer Dan Hale. "We're trying to reach delinquent kids, dropouts, narcotics addicts. One aide meets with about 60 of them. The aide is an ex-hard core man himself. He can really relate to them."

In West Dallas, aides were about such tasks as inviting more women to join sewing circles, helping to form a new council and getting residents to sign up for a cleanup campaign. Directing these efforts was organizer Domingo Cisneros, a former automobile mechanic in the area.

"We're trying to get total involvement—teaching people how to help themselves," said Cisneros.

Aid Alice Lowery had just come from a home meeting in a public housing project. What problems did the people raise?

"School clothing and food," Mrs. Lowery replied.

One man, she said, had the idea of "salvaging" food that is left over from big dinners at downtown hotels, when many expected guests fail to show up and distributing the left-overs among families.

In an oak cliff neighborhood, aides under organizer Kenneth McGaughey spent the afternoon helping volunteers of a council gather signatures on petitions calling for a child care center.

"The people here are also interested in the truancy problem and in trying to beautify the community," related aide Betty Guy, who has a bachelor's degree in economics from Southern University. "They have set up committees to see what can be done."

In March 200 home meetings, larger gatherings and council meetings were held in the city's poverty clusters. Such brisk activity will multiply the number of councils to 75 or 80 in the next six months, Ratliff predicts.

One night recently, a meeting of the Frazier Courts Miracle Workers council drew over 200 people in the auditorium of a South Dallas public housing project. It was mostly a Negro gathering.

Council President Mrs. Ophia Morring called for committee reports. One report concerned the number of signatures that had been gathered on a petition for a day-care center. Another noted that 500 children, ages 1–6, live at Frazier Courts and are potential users of the day care center.

Mrs. Mildred Wright, council secretary, reported that the council was asking for four services to be included in a hoped-for multi-purpose neighborhood center: an emergency clinic for minor illnesses; a Parkland Hospital drug sub-station; a federal foods substation, and a day care center.

Later in the meeting, juvenile delinquency became a topic of general discussion.

"The Bible says to train a child in the way he shall go and he will never depart therefrom," offered one woman in the audience. "Parents should sit down and counsel with their children."

President Morring agreed, saying: "We (parents) are the delinquents, not our children. We work all the time and don't pay enough attention to our children."

Other business included a report by neighborhood organizer Bill Lewis on a free legal aid station recently set up in South Dallas as part of the War on Poverty.

"Offices are open 9 to 5 weekdays, and until 9 p.m. Wednesdays," Lewis informed the group. "The attorney there is willing and able to handle your legal problems if you aren't able to hire an attorney."

As often happens, this council meeting was attended by representatives of some other councils. Cross-visitation helps exchange ideas and information.

An Oak Cliff woman reported that her council is forming a teen-age group to give them "something to do" on weekends. A man from the East Side Community Workers Movement told the assemblage. "We are presently attacking the sanitary and street light problems in our neighborhood."

"We have a lot of children out of school," reported another visitor. "They haven't ever been to school. We might be able to work out something to get a law to make them go to school."

And so it went.

Out of such deliberations by poverty-area residents now intent on bringing change have come:

—A citizens protective association to help with the policing of school crossings.

—A new willingness by witnesses to crimes to sign complaints for police, even at risk of being beaten, stabbed or shot by the lawless element.

—A Christmas gift-wrapping service at an Oak Cliff store which netted several unemployed women $1,000.

—An arrangement by which eight funeral homes use their vehicles each month to pick up free commodities at the County Welfare Department for 70 families that lack other means of getting to and from the federal foods center.

—The easing of public housing regulations which tenants thought unreasonable.

—Neighbors pitching in to help neighbors put new roofs on houses.

—The registering of 4,500 citizens to vote.

In a semi-rural area of Seagoville, residents are through with griping about their lack of piped water. Their neighborhood council is in process of forming its own water district, with each homeowner subscribing $50. The council president is happily proclaiming: "The taps will soon be turned on!"

"It has been a beautiful thing," said Ratliff. "They haven't asked for charity, but have gone about this in a businesslike way. They would have been forever without water had they not organized."

Another means of involving the poor in their own salvation has been the election of DCCAC directors from target areas of the War on Poverty. But now 49 of the DCCAC's 150 directors are representatives of the poor themselves.

Campaigning for poverty-area directorships is spirited. More than 300 people turned out for an election in a West Dallas housing project—an area in which only a handful of people bother to vote in political elections.

Directors from poverty areas, in addition to working with some of the community's top business, civic and professional leaders in hammering out DCCAC policies, do a heavy share of volunteer work in their neighborhoods.

One day recently, Director Mrs. Willie Mae Hampton was busy gathering signatures on a petition for a multi-purpose center in West Dallas. She was also signing up people to take part in a cleanup drive "so the kids will have a better place to play."

Why was Mrs. Hampton working so hard? "Because," she replied, "I live out here. I want to be somebody myself, and to be somebody I've got to get others to help themselves."

Last August Mrs. Ruth Henry, a store inventory clerk, was elected to the DCCAC board to represent the Wahoo Park section of South Dallas. She has done much to organize and guide her neighborhood council, which has scored several gains.

"For example," Mrs. Henry related "the Frazier School had only one police patrolman to help the kids cross the street. This wasn't enough and the parents knew it, but no one had ever talked to the Police Department about it before.

"Our neighborhood council voted to send a delegation to talk to the police about the problem.

"At first, the police wouldn't agree to an extra policeman at the school. We returned a few days later with a petition signed by many of the families in the neighborhood and a list of schools in other parts of town which had two patrolmen assigned to them.

"We got our additional policeman."

Mrs. Henry said she feels this kind of neighborhood cooperation is the most important way for people to lift themselves out of poverty.

"What the War on Poverty can do through Neighborhood Organization is open doors that the poor either didn't know exist or were afraid to try," she said.

"There have always been ways for the poor to help themselves, but they didn't know about them. What we can do is show the poor how to do things for themselves."

Unquestionably, the organized poor are irritating some officials as, with growing knowledge about how to work the system, they present requests for additional services.

"But we think," said Maley, "this method of allowing them to express themselves is much more desirable than the demonstrations that have taken place elsewhere."

An agitator could come to Dallas, rub resentments raw, and organize the poor quickly, said the DCCAC executive.

"Our method is harder," he continued. "It takes longer. But it is a more desirable way to correct problems. In the process you bring the whole community with you in realizing what the needs of the poor are. The long range results for the poor will, in my opinion, be much greater and more lasting."

Federal funding of all War on Poverty programs financed directly via the DCCAC this fiscal year totals $1,900,000. About $223,000 of this is allocated to Neighborhood Organization.

For Neighborhood Organization activities next year the DCCAC has requested $448,000. Plans call for expanding into poverty clusters as yet untouched by the program, and for digging down to the worst-off of the poor—the hard-core individuals who utterly lack the motivation to help themselves.

How long the Neighborhood Organization will continue to be funded nobody knows. But it has already poisoned the roots of poverty at many geographic points.

"If we were to fold tomorrow," said Medina, "these people would be left with something. They have the feeling that they have been listened to. They have self-confidence and self-respect. They have found a way to express themselves. They know how to get things done. They are individuals, not just part of a helpless mass."

IMPROVEMENTS TO THE TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on June 8 and June 9 a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency will meet to consider the truth-in-lending bill. We have gone over the bill with a fine tooth comb, after taking into account many of the constructive suggestions by members of the credit industry. We have made a total of 50 changes in the bill, all of which, I believe, increase the bill's workability, flexibility, fairness, while still retaining the consumer protections for which we have fought so long.

I believe the improved version of the bill should go a long way toward removing all of the objections which have been raised in the past. For example, the bill now spells out a specific tolerance, thus giving specific meaning to the concept of an approximate annual rate. If lenders used a rate chart and charged 12 percent for credit, the chart could have a tolerance of up to 1 percentage point. If the lender charged 24 percent, the chart would have a tolerance of 2 percentage points, and so on. In other words, the tolerance would increase the larger the rate of finance charge.

I believe this change is in accord with commonsense. Most consumers do not make decisions on credit on the basis of a 1 or 2 decimal point difference in the finance charge. By providing the tolerance, we vastly simplified compliance with the bill and have permitted the use of simple rate charts.

We have also increased the effective rate to 1 year in accordance with the Federal Reserve Board's recommendations. This should give them the time to make a complete study of the problem and issue appropriate regulations.

We have also clarified the definition of "finance charge" and have indicated items such as official fees or taxes will not be included. This again will vastly simplify the compliance with the bill and make it much easier to publish rate charts.

Also, we have provided specific authority to grant even more tolerance on irregular payment situations, and we have provided authority to disregard slight irregularities in the contract. These slight irregularities, such as deferring the first payment, could slightly change the rate if we were to insist upon absolute accuracy. By ignoring these irregularities we once again simplified the job of the creditor while still giving the consumer the basic facts. I have said all along that I believed we could draft a bill that is fair to the consumer and workable to the credit industry. I believe the committee print on S. 5 achieves both of these objectives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the committee print of S. 5 together with a summary of the changes made.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[NOTE.—Roman printing is original matter, new matter printed in italic.]

[Committee Print]

S. 5

A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Truth in Lending Act".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that economic stabilization would be enhanced and that competition among the various financial institutions and other firms engaged in lending or the extension of credit would be strengthened by the informed use of credit for the acquisition of property and services. The informed use of credit results from an awareness of the cost thereof to the user. It is the purpose of this Act to assure a full disclosure of such cost with a view to promoting the informed use of credit to the benefit of the national economy.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Board" means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(2) "Credit" means any loan, mortgage, deed of trust, advance, or discount; any conditional sales contract; any contract to sell or sale, or contract of sale of property or services, either for present or future delivery, under which part or all of the price is payable subsequent to the making of such sale or contract; any rental purchase contract; any contract or arrangement for the hire, bailment, or leasing of property; any option, demand, lien, pledge, or other claim against, or for the delivery of, property or money; any purchase, or other acquisition of, or any credit upon the security of, any obligation or claim arising out of any of the foregoing; and any transaction or series of transactions having a similar purpose or effect.

(3) "Finance charge" means the sum of all the charges incurred by the borrower for the extension or use of credit and shall include, but not by way of limitation, loan fees, service and carrying charges, discounts, interest, time price differentials, and investigators' fees.

(4) "Total amount to be financed" means the total credit extended, excluding the finance charge.

(5) "Annual percentage rate" means the percentage rate per period expressed as a per centum per annum. It shall be computed by multiplying the percentage rate per period by the number of periods per year.

(6) "Percentage rate per period" means the percentage ratio of the finance charge for the period for which the charge is made to the unpaid balance of the total amount to be financed.

(7) "Period" means the time interval between the payments specified in the credit agreement for repayment of the total amount to be financed.

(8) "Creditor" means any person engaged in the business of extending credit (including any person who as a regular business practice makes loans or sells or rents property or services on a time, credit, or installment basis, either as principal or as agent) who requires, as an incident to the extension of credit, the payment of a finance charge.

(9) "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, association, or other organized group of persons, or the legal successor or representative of the foregoing, and includes the United States or any agency thereof, or any other government, or any of its political subdivisions, or any agency of the foregoing.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCE CHARGES

SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), any creditor shall furnish to each person to whom credit is extended, prior to the consummation of the transaction, a clear statement in writing setting forth, to the extent applicable and ascertainable and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Board, the following information—

(1) the cash price or delivered price of the property or service to be acquired;

(2) the amounts, if any, to be credited as downpayment and, or trade-in;

(3) the difference between the amounts set forth under clauses (1) and (2);

(4) the charges, individually itemized, which are paid or to be paid by such person in connection with the transaction but which are not incident to the extension of credit;

(5) the total amount to be financed (the sum of the amounts set forth under (3) and (4), above);

(6) the finance charge in dollars and cents;

(7) the finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate to be computed as set forth in section 3(5);

(8) the time and amount of payments scheduled to repay the indebtedness; and

(9) the terms applicable in the event of advanced or delayed payments from those specified in (8) above.

(b) Any creditor agreeing to extend credit to any person pursuant to a revolving or open-end credit plan shall, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Board—

(1) furnish to such person, prior to agreeing to extend credit under such plan, a clear statement in writing setting forth the following information:

(i) the periodic dates of the balances against which a finance charge will be imposed;

(ii) the percentage rate per period of the finance charge to be imposed; and

(iii) the periodic rate of finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate.

(2) furnish to such person, as of the end of each period following the entering into of any such agreement, a clear statement in writing setting forth to the extent applicable and ascertainable—

(A) the outstanding balance in the account of such person as of the beginning of such period;

(B) the amount of each extension of credit to such person (including the cash price or delivered price of any property or service acquired by such person) during such period and, unless previously furnished, the date thereof and a brief identification of any property or services so acquired;

(C) the total amount received from, or credited to the account of, such person during such period;

(D) the outstanding unpaid balance in the account of such person as of the end of such period;

(E) the annual percentage rate used to compute the finance charge for such period;

(F) the balance on which the periodic finance charge was computed; and

(G) the finance charge (in dollars and cents) imposed for such period.

As used in this subsection, the term "revolving or open-end credit plan" means a credit plan describing the terms of credit transactions which may be made thereunder from time to time and under the terms of which a finance charge may be computed on the outstanding unpaid balance from time to time thereunder.

(c) If information disclosed in accordance with this section and any regulations prescribed by the Board is subsequently rendered inaccurate as the result of a prepayment, late payment, or other adjustment in the credit agreement through mutual consent of the parties, the inaccurracy resulting therefrom shall not constitute a violation of this section.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this Act. Such rules and regulations shall (1) include a description of (A) the methods which may be used in determining the annual percentage rate for the purpose of section 4, and (B) the size of type or lettering which shall be used in setting forth information required by such section, (2) prescribe reasonable tolerances of accuracy with respect to disclosing information under such section, and (3) require that such information be set forth in bold type and with sufficient prominence to insure that it will not be overlooked by the person to whom credit is extended. Any rule or regulation prescribed hereunder may contain such classifications and differentiations, and may provide for such adjustments and exceptions as in the judgment of the Board are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this Act or to prevent circumvention or evasion, or to facilitate the enforcement of this Act, or any rule or regulation issued thereunder. In prescribing any exceptions hereunder with respect to any particular type of credit transaction, the Board shall consider whether in such transactions compliance with the disclosure requirements of this Act is being achieved under any other Act of Congress.

(b) In the exercise of its powers under this section, the Board shall request the views of other Federal agencies exercising regulatory functions with respect to creditors, or any class of creditors, which are subject to the provisions of this Act, and such agencies shall furnish such views upon request of the Board.

(c) The Board shall establish an advisory committee, consisting of not more than nine members, to advise and consult with it in the exercise of its powers under this section. In appointing members to such committee the Board shall seek to achieve a fair representation of the interest of sellers of merchandise on credit, lenders, and the public. Such committee shall meet from time to time at the call of the Board, and members thereof shall be paid transportation expenses and not to exceed $25 per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b 2).

EFFECT ON STATE LAWS

SEC. 6. (a) This Act shall not be construed to annul, or to exempt any creditor from complying with, the laws of any State relating to the disclosure of information in connection with credit transactions, except to the extent that such laws are directly inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or regulations issued thereunder.

(b) The Board shall by regulation exempt from the requirements of this Act any credit transactions or class of transactions which it determines are effectively regulated under the laws of any State so as to require the disclosure by the creditor of the same information as is required under section 4 of this Act.

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES

Civil Penalties

SEC. 7. (a) Any creditor who in connection with any credit transactions fails to disclose to any person any information in violation of this Act or any regulation issued thereunder shall be liable to such person in the amount of $100, or in any amount equal to twice the finance charge required by such creditor in connection with such transaction, which ever is the greater, except that such liability shall not exceed $2,000 on any credit transaction. Action to recover such penalty may be brought by such person within one year from the date of the occurrence of the violation, in any court of competent jurisdiction. In any such action, no person shall be entitled to recover such penalty solely as the result of the erroneous computation of any percentage required by section 4(a) (7), 4(b) (1), or 4(b) (2) (E) of this Act to be disclosed to such person, if the percentage disclosed to such person pursuant to this Act was in fact greater than the percentage required by such section, or by the regulations prescribed by the Board, to be disclosed. In any action under this subsection in which any person is entitled to a recovery, the creditor shall be liable for reasonable attorneys' fees and court costs as determined by the court. As used in this subsection, the term "court of competent jurisdiction" means either any Federal court of competent jurisdiction regardless of the amount in controversy or any State court of competent jurisdiction.

Criminal Penalties

(b) Any person who gives false or inaccurate information or fails to provide information required to be disclosed under the provisions of this Act or any regulation issued thereunder or who otherwise willfully violates any provision of this Act or any regulation issued thereunder shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(c) Except as specified in subsection (a) of this section, nothing contained in this Act or any regulation thereunder shall affect the validity or enforcibility of any contract or transaction.

(d) No punishment or penalty provided by this Act shall apply to the United States, or any agency thereof, or to any State, any political subdivision thereof, or any agency of any State or political subdivision.

EXCEPTIONS

SEC. 8. The provisions of this Act shall not apply to—

(1) credit transactions involving extensions of credit to business firms as such, governments, or governmental agencies or instrumentalities; and

(2) transactions in securities or commodities in accounts by a broker-dealer registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 9. The provisions of this Act shall effect upon the expiration of one hundred and eighty days after the date of its enactment; except that section 5 shall take effect immediately.

That this Act may be cited as the "Truth in Lending Act".

Declaration of purpose

Sec. 2. The Congress finds and declares that economic stabilization would be enhanced and that competition among the various financial institutions and other firms engaged in the extension of consumer credit would be strengthened by the informed use of credit. The informed use of credit results from an awareness of the costs thereof by consumers. It is the purpose of this Act to assure a full disclosure of such costs with a view to promoting the informed use of consumer credit to the benefit of the national economy.

Definitions

Sec. 3. For the purpose of this Act—

(a) "Board" means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(b) "Credit" means the right granted by a creditor to defer payment of debt or to incur debt and defer its payment, where the debt is contracted by the obligor primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.

(c) "Consumer Credit Sale" means a transaction in which credit is granted by a seller in connection with the sale of goods or services, if such seller regularly engages in credit transactions as a seller, and such goods or services are purchased primarily for a personal, family, or household purpose. The term does not include any contract in the form of a bailment or lease unless the obligor contracts to pay as compensation for use a sum substantially equivalent to or in excess of the value of the goods and unless it is agreed that the obligor is bound to become, or for no other or a merely nominal consideration, has the option of becoming the owner of the goods upon full compliance with the provisions of the contract.

(d) (1) "Finance charge" means, except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (2) or (3), the sum of all the charges incurred by the obligor incident to the extension of credit such as loan fees, service and carrying charges, discounts, interest, time price differentials, and investigators' fees.

(2) With respect to credit secured in whole or in part by an interest in real property, the term includes, but shall not be limited to, the following items incident to the extension of credit: interest; lender's fees; the cost of any guaranty or insurance protecting the creditor against the obligor's default or other credit loss; credit reports; and any amount paid by an obligor under a point, discount, or other system of additional charges. Charges not embraced within the term, in the case of such transactions, include (without being limited to) any amounts charged for, or in connection with, the following: title examination or corresponding procedures; title insurance; preparation of the deed and other documents; preparation of the settlement statement and related services; recording deed and other documents; taxes and assessments; fire and casualty insurance; escrows for future payments of taxes and insurance; appraisal fees; notarizing deed and other documents; revenue stamps; and maintenance and repairs.

(3) The term does not include amounts individually itemized and disclosed under section 4, which are collected by a creditor or are included in the credit for: (A) fees and charges prescribed by law which actually are or will be paid to public officials for perfecting or releasing or satisfying any security related to a credit transaction; (B) taxes; (C) casualty or physical damage insurance; (D) if a clear and specific statement is furnished the debtor that such insurance is optional and is not required as a condition for obtaining the credit, for credit life or health and accident insurance. In all other cases, charges for such insurance shall be included in the finance charge.

(e) "Creditor" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, cooperative, or any other entity, including the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, or any other government or political subdivision or agency or instrumentality thereof, if such individual or entity regularly engages in credit transactions, whether in connection with the sale of goods and services or otherwise, and extends credit for which the payment of a finance charge is required.

(f) "Annual percentage rate" means, for the purposes of sections 4(b) and 4(c), the nominal annual rate determined by the actuarial method (United States rule). For purposes of this calculation the following shall be assumed:

(1) the total time for repayment of the total amount to be financed shall be the time from the date of the transaction to the date of the final scheduled payment. A period of

time equal to one-half or more of a payment period may be considered one full period.

(2) all payments are considered equal provided every scheduled payment in the series of payments is equal except one which may not be more than double any other scheduled payment in the series; and

(3) all payments are considered to be scheduled at equal intervals provided all payments are scheduled at equal intervals except the first payment, which may be scheduled to be paid before, on, or after one period from the date of the transaction; except that the Board may prescribe methods other than the actuarial method where other irregular payments are involved and the Board determines that the use of such other methods will materially simplify computation while retaining reasonable accuracy as compared with the rate determined under the actuarial method. For the purposes of section 4(d), the "equivalent annual percentage rate" means the rate or rates computed by multiplying the rate or rates used to compute the finance charge for any period by the number of periods in a year. Where a creditor imposes the same finance charge for all balances within a specified range, the annual percentage rate or equivalent annual percentage rate shall be computed on the medium balance within the range for the purposes of section 4(b), 4(c), and 4(d).

(7) "Open-end credit plan" means a plan prescribing the terms of credit transactions which may be made thereunder from time to time and under the terms of which a finance charge may be computed on the outstanding unpaid balance from time to time thereunder.

Disclosure of finance charges

SEC. 4. (a) Each creditor shall furnish to each person to whom credit is extended and upon whom a financed charge is or may be imposed, the information required by this section in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Board.

(b) This subsection applies to consumer credit sales other than sales under an open-end credit plan. For each such sale, the creditor shall disclose, to the extent applicable:

(1) the cash price of the property or service purchased;

(2) the sum of any amounts credited as downpayment (including any trade-in);

(3) the difference between the amounts set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2);

(4) all other charges, individually itemized, which are included in the amount of the credit extended but which are not part of the finance charge;

(5) the total amount to be financed (the sum of the amounts disclosed under (3) and (4) above);

(6) the amount of the finance charge (such charge, or a portion of such charge, may be designated as a time-price differential or as a similar term to the extent applicable);

(7) the finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate;

(8) the number, amount, and due dates or periods of payments scheduled to repay the indebtedness; and

(9) the default, delinquency, or similar charges payable in the event of late payments.

Except as otherwise provided, the disclosure required by this subsection shall be made before the credit is extended. Compliance may be attained by disclosing such information in the contract or other evidence of indebtedness to be signed by the obligor. Where a seller receives a purchase order by mail or telephone without personal solicitation by a representative of the seller and the cash price and deferred payment price and the terms of financing, including the annual percentage rate, are set forth in the seller's catalog or other printed material distributed to the public, the disclosure shall be made on or before the date the first payment is due.

(c) This subsection applies to extensions of credit other than consumer credit sales or transactions under an open-end credit plan. Any creditor making a loan or otherwise extending credit under this subsection shall disclose, to the extent applicable—

(1) the amount of credit of which the obligor will have the actual use, or which is or will be paid to him or for his account or to another person on his behalf;

(2) all other charges, individually itemized, which are included in the amount of the credit extended but which are not part of the finance charge;

(3) the total amount to be financed (the sum of items (1) and (2) above);

(4) the amount of the finance charge;

(5) the finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate;

(6) the number, amount, and due dates or periods of payments scheduled to repay the indebtedness; and

(7) the default, delinquency, or similar charges payable in the event of late payments.

Except as otherwise provided, the disclosure required by this subsection shall be made before the credit is extended. Compliance may be attained by disclosing such information in the note or other evidence of indebtedness to be signed by the obligor. Where a creditor receives a request for an extension of credit by mail or telephone without personal solicitation by a representative of the creditor and the terms of financing, including the annual percentage rate for representative amounts of credit, are set forth in the creditor's printed material distributed to the public, the disclosure shall be made on or before the date the first payment is due.

(d)(1) This subsection applies to open-end credit plans.

(2) Before opening any account under an open-end credit plan, the creditor shall disclose to the person who seeks to open the account—

(A) the conditions under which a finance charge may be imposed, including the time period, if any, within which any credit extended may be repaid without incurring a finance charge;

(B) the method of determining the balance upon which a finance charge will be imposed;

(C) the method of determining the amount of the finance charge including any minimum or fixed amount imposed as a finance charge and, where a rate is used to compute the finance charge or portion thereof, the equivalent annual percentage rate; and

(D) the conditions under which any other charges may be imposed, and the method by which they will be determined.

(3) For each billing cycle at the end of which there is an outstanding balance under any such account, the creditor shall disclose—

(A) the outstanding balance in the account at the beginning of the billing period;

(B) the amount and date of each extension of credit during the period and, if a purchase was involved, a brief identification (unless previously furnished) of the goods or services purchased;

(C) the total amount credited to the account during the period;

(D) the amount of any finance charge added to the account during the period, itemized to show the amount, if any, due to the application of a percentage rate and the amount, if any, imposed as a minimum or fixed charge;

(E) the balance on which the finance charge was computed and a statement of how the balance was determined;

(F) the rate, if any, used in computing the finance charge and the equivalent annual percentage rate;

(G) the outstanding balance in the account at the end of the period; and

(H) the date by which or the period, if any, within which payment must be made to avoid additional finance charges.

(e) Written acknowledgment of receipt by a person to whom a statement is required to be given pursuant to this section shall be conclusive proof of the delivery thereof and, unless the violation is apparent on the face of the statement, of compliance with this section in any action or proceeding by or against an assignee of the original creditor without knowledge to the contrary by such assignee when he acquires the obligation. Such acknowledgment shall not affect the rights of the obligor in any action against the original creditor.

(f) If there is more than one obligor, a creditor may furnish a statement of required information to only one of them. Required information need not be given in the sequence or order set forth in this section. Additional information or explanations may be included. So long as it conveys substantially the same meaning, a creditor may use language or terminology in any required statement different from that prescribed by this Act.

(g) If applicable State requires disclosure of items of information substantially similar to those required by this Act, then a creditor who complies with such State law may comply with this Act by disclosing only the additional items of information required by this Act.

(h) If information disclosed in accordance with this section and any regulations prescribed by the Board is subsequently rendered inaccurate as the result of a prepayment, late payment, adjustment, or amendment of the credit agreement through mutual consent of the parties or as permitted by law, or as the result of any act or occurrence subsequent to the delivery of the required disclosures, the inaccuracy resulting therefrom shall not constitute a violation of this section.

Regulations

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall prescribe regulations to carry out this Act, including provisions—

(1) describing the methods which may be used in determining annual percentage rates under section 4, including, but not limited to, the use of any rules, charts, tables, or devices by creditors to convert to an annual percentage rate any add-on, discount or other method of computing a finance charge;

(2) prescribing procedures to ensure that the information required to be disclosed under section 4 is set forth clearly and conspicuously;

(3) prescribing reasonable tolerances of accuracy with respect to disclosing information under section 4.

(b) In prescribing regulations with respect to reasonable tolerances of accuracy as required by subsection (a)(3), the Board shall observe the following limitations:

(1) The annual percentage rate may be rounded to the nearest quarter of 1 per centum for credit transactions payable in substantially equal installments when a creditor determines the total finance charge on the basis of a single add-on, discount, periodic, or other rate, and such rates are converted into an annual percentage rate under procedures prescribed by the Board.

(2) The use of rate tables or charts may be authorized in cases where the total finance charge is determined in a manner other than that specified in subparagraph (1). Such tables or charts may provide for the disclosure of annual percentage rates which vary up to 8 per centum of the rate as defined by section 3(f). However, any creditor who willfully and knowingly uses such tables or charts in such a manner so as to consistently

understate the annual percentage rate as defined by section 3(f) shall be liable for criminal penalties under section 7(b) of this Act.

(3) *In the case of creditors determining the annual percentage rate in a manner other than as described in subparagraph (1) or (2), the Board may authorize other reasonable tolerances.*

(4) *In order to simplify compliance where irregular payments are involved, the Board may authorize tolerances greater than those specified in subparagraph (2).*

(c) *Any regulation prescribed hereunder may contain such classifications and differentiations and may provide for such adjustments and exceptions from this Act or the regulations thereunder for any class of transactions, as in the judgment of the Board are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this Act or to prevent circumvention or evasion of, or to facilitate compliance by creditors with, this Act or any regulation issued hereunder. In prescribing exceptions, the Board may consider, among other things, whether substantial compliance with the disclosure requirements of this Act is being achieved under any other Act of Congress or any State law or regulations under either.*

(d) *In the exercise of its powers under this Act, the Board shall request the views of other Federal agencies which in its judgment exercise regulatory functions with respect to any class of creditors, and such agencies shall furnish such views upon request of the Board.*

(e) *The Board shall establish an advisory committee, to advise and consult with it in the exercise of its powers under this Act. In appointing such members to such committee the Board shall seek to achieve a fair representation of the interest of sellers of merchandise on credit, lenders, and the public. Such committee shall meet from time to time at the call of the Board, and members thereof shall be paid transportation expenses and not to exceed $100 per diem.*

Effect on State laws

Sec. 6. (a) *This Act shall not be construed to annul, alter, or affect or to exempt any creditor from complying with, the laws of any State relating to the disclosure of information in connection with credit transactions, except to the extent that such laws are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or regulations issued thereunder and then only to the extent of the inconsistency. This Act shall not otherwise be construed to annul, alter or affect in any manner the meaning, scope or applicability of the laws of any State, including, but not limited to, laws relating to the types, amounts or rates of charges, or any element or elements of charges, permissible under such laws in connection with the extension or use of credit, nor to extend the applicability of such laws to any class of persons or transactions to which such laws would not otherwise apply, nor shall the disclosure of the annual percentage rate in connection with any consumer credit sale as required by this Act be evidence in any action or proceeding that such sale was a loan or any transaction other than a credit sale.*

(b) *The Board shall by regulation exempt from the requirements of this Act any class of credit transactions which it determines are subject to any State law or resolutions which require disclosures substantially similar to those required by section 4.*

(c) *Except as specified in section 7, nothing contained in this Act or any regulations issued thereunder shall affect the validity or enforcibility of any contract or obligation under State or Federal law.*

Civil and criminal penalties

Sec. 7. (a) *Any creditor who, in connection with any credit transaction, fails in violation of this Act or any regulation issued thereunder to disclose any information to any person to whom such information is required to be given shall be liable to such person in the amount of $100, or in any amount equal to twice the finance charge required by such creditor in connection with such transaction, whichever is the greater, except that such liability shall not exceed $2,000 on any credit transaction. Action to recover such penalty may be brought by such person within one year from the date of the occurrence of the violation, in any court of competent jurisdiction. In any such action, no person shall be entitled to recover such penalty solely as the result of the erroneous computation of any percentage required by section 4 to be disclosed to such person, if the percentage disclosed to such person pursuant to this Act was in fact greater than the percentage required to be disclosed by such section, or by regulations prescribed by the Board. In any action under this subsection in which any person is entitled to a recovery, the creditor shall be liable for reasonable attorneys' fees and court costs as determined by the court. As used in this subsection, the term "court of competent jurisdiction" means either any Federal court of competent jurisdiction regardless of the amount in controversy or any State court of competent jurisdiction.*

(b) *Any person who knowingly and willfully gives false or inaccurate information or fails to provide information required to be disclosed under the provisions of this Act or any regulation issued thereunder, or who otherwise knowingly and willfully violates any provision of this Act or any regulation issued thereunder, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. The responsibility for enforcing this subsection is hereby assigned to the Attorney General.*

(c) *No punishment or penalty provided by this Act shall apply to the United States, or any agency thereof, or to any State, any political subdivision thereof, or any agency of any State or political subdivision.*

Exceptions

Sec. 8. The provisions of this Act shall not apply to—

(1) *credit transactions involving extensions of credit for business, agricultural, or commercial purposes, or to governments, or to governmental agencies or instrumentalities; or*

(2) *transactions in securities or commodities in accounts by a broker-dealer registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission; or*

(3) *credit transactions, other than real property transactions, in which the total amount to be financed exceeds $25,000.*

Effective date

Sec. 9. The provisions of this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of one year after the date of its enactment; except that section 5 shall take effect immediately upon enactment.

[Committee Print, Committee on Banking and Currency, June 2, 1967]

S. 5—EXPLANATION OF CHANGES IN COMMITTEE PRINT

1. Section 2. Declaration of purpose: "Consumer credit" is substituted for "credit" and "consumer" is substituted for "user" of credit to make the intent clear that the bill applies to consumer credit and not to all forms of credit.

2. Definition of "Board" 3(a): No change.

3. Definition of "credit" 3(b): The original definition was deleted because it was somewhat sweeping and referred to various types of lease situations which might not be true extensions of credit. This language was based on the Federal Reserve's old regulation W which dealt with selective controls over consumer credit and whose purpose was quite different than S. 5. In its place, fairly simple language from the proposed Consumer Credit Code was substituted.

4. Definition of "consumer credit sale" 3 (c): This is a new definition made necessary by the revised structure of section 4 which treats lender credit and retail credit separately. The new definition defines credit sales whose disclosure provisions come under section 4(b) as opposed to direct loans which come under section 4(c). The definition makes it clear that the act covers only those creditors who regularly extend credit in accordance with Senator McIntyre's comments during the hearings.

The definition of credit sale is also limited only to those leases which are, in essence, disguised sale arrangements. The definition has been so limited because there is no way to disclose a finance charge or rate in connection with a conventional lease as Governor Robertson pointed out on page 8 of his testimony. The language covering disguised leases is nearly identical to the language used in the Uniform Conditional Sales Act and in many State retail installment sales acts to distinguish between "true" leases and other leases.

5. Definition of "finance charge" 3(d): The term has been expanded to make its meaning clearer. With respect to real estate transactions, the definition indicates which of the typical closing costs are to be included in the finance charge and which ones are not. The rule followed was to include only those charges clearly incident to credit. Where there was doubt, the charge was excluded from the definition.

With respect to other credit, the definition makes it clear that taxes, official fees, and property or casualty insurance are not part of the finance charge. Exclusion of official fees and taxes meets a major objection raised by bankers and others who argued that inclusion would vastly complicate compliance with the rate disclosure provisions of S. 6.

The original bill was silent on whether credit life insurance should be counted in the finance charge or not. Under Secretary Barr recommended it be counted only if required by the creditor as a condition for obtaining credit. Governor Robertson recommended it not be counted regardless. The new definition adopts Under Secretary Barr's suggestion.

6. Definition of "creditor" 3(e): Essentially the same language is used, but Senator McIntyre's suggestion is reemphasized by restricting the definition only to those who regularly engage in credit transactions. Thus a small retailer who extended credit and charged for it in an isolated instance to accommodate a particular customer would not be covered.

7. Definition of "annual percentage rate" 3(f): This definition has been rewritten to achieve greater clarity. The old definition described what was essentially the actuarial method for determining an annual rate, but it did not use the term actuarial method. Many had difficulty in determining the interest. The new definition, rather than describing the actuarial method, merely indicates it is the method to be followed. This is a well recognized term in the mathematics of finance and has also a long judicial history under the U.S. rule (*Story* v. *Livingston* (38 U.S. 359) 1839).

The annual percentage rate for closed-end credit would thus be the actuarial rate. For open-end or revolving credit, it is defined as the periodic rate times the number of periods in a year which is exactly equivalent to the actuarial rate.

The definition also permits a creditor to simplify the computation by ignoring slight irregularities in the payment schedule, such as a deferred first payment, or one odd-sized payment. This will greatly simplify compliance while maintaining reasonable accuracy.

The Board is also given the power to prescribe other methods for determining the annual percentage rate on irregular payment contracts. For example, the constant-ratio method, which is in the Massachusetts law, could be used for highly irregular contracts. It is possible to develop formulas or other shortcut procedures based on the constant-ratio method which would be much simpler than the actuarial method.

Finally, the definition makes it clear that creditors who determine their finance charges on the basis of a bracketed amount of credit can compute the annual percentage rate on the basis of the midpoint of the bracket. For example, assume a mail-order house charges a flat $20 for purchases ranging between $140 and $150. Under the new language, a creditor could compute the rate for $145 and disclose it for all transactions within the bracket, whether they were $140.01 or $149.99.

8. Definition of "open-end credit plan" 3 (g): This retains the original language of S. 5 but incorporates it under the definitions section rather than in the disclosure section.

SECTION 4. DISCLOSURE OF FINANCE CHARGES

9. Section 4(a): This is a prefatory section setting forth the basic requirement to disclose. It is similar to the original S. 5, except that it is made clear that disclosure need only be made to persons "upon whom a finance charge is or may be imposed." Thus, the disclosure requirement would not apply to transactions which are not commonly thought of as credit transactions, including trade credit, open account credit, 30-, 60-, or 90-day credit, etc., for which a charge is not made.

10. Disclosure on retail credit, section 4(b): The original S. 5 covered retail and lender credit under subsection 4(a). The new version splits retail and lender credit into two subsections—4(b) and 4(c). The reason for this change is to emphasize the fact that Congress recognizes the difference between these two forms of credit and does not deny the validity of the time-price doctrine upon which most retail credit is legally justified. This should prevent the act from being used as ammunition in any litigation challenging the time-price doctrine. Many retailers had expressed concern over this possibility.

11. Disclosure of other charges, section 4(b)(4): The new version clarifies S. 5 by restricting disclosure to these charges "which are included in the amount of the credit extended." The original S. 5 was ambiguous on this point and could have been interpreted as requiring charges not included in the credit to be listed in the total amount to be financed, which is a logical contradiction.

12. Disclosure of finance charge, section 4(b)(6): Reference is made to labeling the finance charge as a "time-price differential" to avoid any implication that Congress sees no validity in the time-price doctrine.

13. Disclosure of repayment schedule, section 4(b)(7): The original S. 5 required disclosure of the "time and amount of payments." The new version requires the "number, amount, and due dates or periods." This makes it clear that a creditor can disclose "36 monthly payments of $20 due on the first of each month begining in July" without actually listing the date of each individual payment.

14. Disclosing penalties for late payment, section 4(b)(9): This language is similar to the original S. 5 except that the requirement to indicate the terms applicable in the event of advanced payment has been deleted. Most creditors will rebate an unearned finance charge if the debt is paid early in accordance with the "rule of 78's". This is a complicated formula which would require at least a three-paragraph explanation to be intelligible to the average consumer.

15. Time of disclosure (first two sentences of last paragraph of sec. 4(b)): The original of S. 5 required disclosure "prior to the consummation of the transaction." The present version substitutes "before the credit is extended" with a stipulation that the disclosure can be made on the contract or other document to be signed by the consumer. This obviates the need for a separate piece of paper showing the disclosure items.

16. Disclosure for mail order or telephone sales (last sentence of last paragraph of sec. 4(b)): This permits mail order houses to comply with the act by disclosing prior to the first payment providing the general terms of financing are set forth in the catalog. A similar provision contained in the Massachusetts law. No such provision was in the original S. 5.

17. Disclosure on lender credit, section 4(c): This is a new subsection written to distinguish between lender and retail credit. It is a residual category encompassing all credit other than retail credit or open-end credit which are defined elsewhere in section 3. Hence, no definition of loan is provided as it would fall within the general definition of credit. Financial institutions such as banks, credit unions, savings banks, savings and loan associations, industrial banks, and consumer finance companies would fall under this subsection. Similar changes, described under section 4(b) for retail credit, have also been incorporated in the lender section.

18. Disclosure on open-end credit, section 4(d): This replaces section 4(b) in the original S. 5. It applies to retail open-end credit plans such as department store revolving credit and to lender open-end credit such as a bank's check credit plan. The section has been rewritten in accordance with Governor Robertson's recommendations in his testimony on page 6. Subsection 4(d)(2) applies to disclosure when the account is opened, while 4(d)(3) refers to disclosure on the periodic (monthly) statements.

19. Disclosing the period of free credit, section 4(d)(2)(A): This clarifies the original S. 5 to indicate the creditor must disclose the time period, if any, within which a finance charge may be avoided.

20. Disclosing the billing system, section 4(d)(2)(B): This is a new requirement not in the original S. 5 and is in accordance with Mr. Batten's recommendations when he testified for J. C. Penney's. As Mr. Batten pointed out, there is a substantial difference in dollar cost between the opening balance method and the adjusted balance method. This paragraph would require the disclosure of whatever method was followed.

21. Disclosure of method of determining finance charge, section 4(d)(2)(C): This paragraph is comparable to the original S. 5 in that it requires disclosure of the periodic rate expressed as an annual rate. However, it also requires disclosure of the complete method for determining the finance charge including the imposition of any fixed or minimum fees. Many department stores have minimum fees while bank credit plans often have a 25-cent per check charge. By requiring separate disclosure of these charges, the new version also recognizes such charges cannot be included in the rate.

22. Disclosure of method of determining other charges, section 4(d)(2)(D): This is also a new provision. It has been included in the event the Board determines the 25-cents-a-check charge on bank check credit plans or similar charges are not finance charges. In any event, they would be required to be disclosed.

23. Disclosure on periodic or monthly statements, section 4(d)(3): This subsection outlines the disclosure which must be made on the periodic statements. It differs from the original S. 5 by explicitly not requiring a statement if there is no balance in the account.

24. Disclosure of the amount of finance charge, section 4(d)(3)(D): This requires a statement of the finance charge similar to the original S. 5; however, it also requires that this charge be broken down to specify how much is due to a percentage rate and how much is due to a fixed or minimum fee. For example, the monthly charge on a revolving check credit plan would have to show how much was due to the 25-cents-per-check charge and how much due to the 1-percent monthly (12-percent annual) rate. This will insure direct comparability between the finance charge and the rate.

25. Disclosure of the balance for computing the finance charge, section 4(d)(3)(E): This paragraph is similar to the original S. 5 but it adds the requirement to state the method for determining the balance. For example, stores which use the adjusted balance methods might have a statement along the following lines: "You will be charged 1½ percent of your opening balance less any payments and returns during the month." Stores which use the opening balance method might indicate: "You will be charged 1½ percent of your opening balance unless paid in full within the month." This is also in line with Mr. Batten's recommendations and reinforces the distinction between the different billing systems.

26. Disclosure of equivalent annual percentage rate, section 4(d)(3)(F): This is similar to the original S. 5 except for the word "equivalent." This reinforces the notion that the annual rate is merely an equivalent statement of the monthly rate and does not purport to measure all the credit in use from the time of purchase to the time of payment. This is in line with Governor Robertson's recommendations on page 7 of his testimony.

27. Disclosure of the time for avoiding a finance charge, section 4(d)(3)(H): This is a new provision. The creditor would indicate, for example: "If you pay your bill within 30 days you will not be charged." It reinforces the idea of a "free ride" period for which there is no charge. This is also in line with Governor Robertson's testimony.

28. Acknowledgment of receipt of disclosure information, section 4(e): This is a new provision designed to facilitate the free flow of credit paper. It provides a bank or finance company with assurance that the original dealer has made the required disclosure and that the bank or finance company will not be liable for any failure, on the dealer's part, to make disclosure.

29. Disclosure to only one obligor, section 4(f): This provision is new and is designed to reduce needless paperwork. A creditor need furnish only one copy of a contract with the required disclosure information if two people (e.g., a husband and wife) are the obligors. A similar provision is contained in the Massachusetts General Laws (ch. 140A, sec. 4).

30. Information need not be given in the order outlined in the act, section 4(f): This is a new provision designed to afford flexibility. It is common in State retail installment sales acts.

31. Identical terms need not be used, section 4(f): This is a new provision. The authorization for the use of language different from that used in the act, so long as it conveys substantially the same meaning, is designed to avoid conflicts in terminology and to facilitate compliance with both State and Federal law in a single disclosure statement.

32. Additional explanations, section 4(f): Additional information or explanations are expressly permitted. This would permit J. C. Penney's to disclose the type of information which they felt they had no legal authority to disclose in Massachusetts.

33. Compliance with comparable State laws is compliance with Federal law, section 4(g): This is a new provision. It is intended to avoid duplication of Federal and State requirements, to leave State requirements untouched as much as possible, and to permit a creditor to avoid double paperwork. If he complies with the applicable State disclosure law, he need supply only the additional in-

formation required by the Federal act to comply with such Federal act. It also makes it clear that Congress does not intend to preempt consistent State law but merely to build upon it.

34. Adjustments after the contract do not violate the disclosure made, section 4(h): This is similar to the original S. 5; however, the original version only applied to adjustments through "mutual consent of the parties." The present version adds: "or as permitted by law, or as the result of any act or occurrence subsequent to the delivery of the required disclosures." A repossession permitted by State law but not mutually agreed to by both parties would affect the rate. The new language makes it clear that such a change would not violate the act. This meets the criticisms on this point raised during the hearing.

SECTION 5. RESOLUTIONS

35. Prescribing methods for determining the annual rate, section 5(a)(1): This expands upon the original S. 5 by specifically authorizing the use of rules, charts, tables, or other devices. Such express authority was recommended by the Commerce Department.

36. Prescribing tolerances, section 5(b): This is a considerable expansion of the original S. 5 which merely provided the Board authority to establish "reasonable" tolerances. Governor Robertson, in his testimony, requested a quantitative definition of "reasonable."

37. Tolerance on single rate situations, section 5(b)(1): This paragraph covers simple situations where a creditor uses a single add-on, discount, or periodic rate to determine the finance charge. For example, a bank which uses a 6-percent, add-on rate would know immediately that the actuarial equivalent was 10.90 percent on a 12-month contract. A credit union would instantly know that 1 percent per month was 12 percent a year. In such cases a tolerance to the nearest quarter of 1 percent is prescribed.

38. Tolerance for tables, section 5(b)2: This paragraph covers more complex situations where the creditor determines the finance charge in a more complicated manner such as a combination of monthly rates (e.g. 3 percent on the first $300; 2 percent on the next $200; and 1½ percent on the excess); or perhaps he determines the charge by an add-on rate of 10 percent plus a fixed charge of $10. In such cases the answer would be provided by a rate table. The bill authorizes a tolerance of 8 percent to be built into the table. This does not refer to 8 percentage points, but to 8 percent of the rate. For example, if the actual rate were 12 percent, the tolerance would be 0.96 percent (8 percent times 12 percent) or almost 1 percentage point. Thus, the tolerance would vary depending upon the size of the rate. For credit at 6 percent, the tolerance would be roughly one-half of a percentage point. At 12 percent it would be 1 percentage point. At 24 percent it would be 2 points and so on. A provision is added to penalize any creditor who willfully uses these tolerances so as to always understate the rate. The purpose of the tolerance is to simplify the construction of tables so that they do not have to be overly detailed. With such tolerances, the disclosed rate should, on the average, be slightly over the actual rate half the time and slightly under the actual rate half the time. If a creditor is always under the actual rate, he is obviously misusing the tables and would be subject to criminal penalties.

39. Tolerance for other situations, section 5(b)(3): This paragraph authorizes the Board to prescribe other reasonable tolerances for creditors who do not wish to use tables in computing the rate.

40. Tolerances for irregular payment situations, section 5(b)(4): This paragraph would permit the Board to prescribe even greater tolerances for irregular payment situations. It is expected, for example, that the Board will permit creditors to disregard a certain number of skip payments in computing the rate. In such a case, the rate computed as though the contract were a level payment contract might vary 2 or 3 percentage points from the actual rate. These irregular situations would be in excess of the slight irregularities already recognized under section 3(f)(1), 3(f)(2), and 3(f)(3) for which authority is provided to disregard.

41. Authority to prescribe adjustments and exemptions, section 5(c): This is similar to the original S. 5 except that the phrase "to facilitate compliance by creditors with this Act or any regulations issued hereunder" has been added as an additional authority for prescribing such adjustments or exceptions. Also "the Board may consider, *among other things*, whether substantial compliance with the disclosure requirements of this Act is being achieved under any Act of Congress *or any State law or regulations under either*" the words "among other things" were added at Governor Robertson's suggestion to make it clear these are not the only things the Board will consider. The phrase "or any State law or regulations under either" has also been added.

42. Consultation with other agencies, section 5(d): This provision is similar to the original S. 5 except that the determination of who should be consulted is up to the Board. This is designed to overcome Governor Robertson's concern that the Board's regulations might be challenged because it hadn't consulted a particular agency. Obviously the Board is going to consult other agencies with or without the language. However the section was not deleted, as Governor Robertson suggested, in order to convey the high importance the Congress attaches to consultation with other agencies.

43. Establishment of advisory committee, section 5(e): This differs from the original S. 5 in that the limitation of nine members has been removed and the per diem allowance is increased from $25 to $100 per day. The latter change is in line with Governor Robertson's observation that few members would be available at the lower figure. However, the section was not deleted as Governor Robertson recommended again largely to emphasize the high importance Congress attaches to consultation with industry. The limitation of nine has been removed to overcome the objection that this might deny adequate representation to some specialized segment of the industry.

SECTION 6. EFFECT ON STATE LAWS

44. Relationship to State law, section 6(a): The original version of S. 5 said the act did not annul State law unless the State law was "directly inconsistent." The present version drops the word "directly" and adds the further stipulation that inconsistent State laws are annulled "only to the extent of the inconsistency." The word "directly" was dropped because there is no apparent difference between inconsistent or directly inconsistent. The added phrase makes clear that S. 5 does not preempt an entire body of State law should an inconsistency arise in one case.

45. Effect on usury laws and time price doctrine, section 6(a): A new sentence was added at the end of the section 6(a) to make the intent of Congress clear that it does not regard the annual percentage rate as an interest rate within the meaning of the usuary statutes or the judicial interpretations of the time price doctrine. This language should make it difficult for anyone to cite S. 5 as evidence in any legal proceeding challenging a credit transaction under the usury statutes or challenging the interpretation of the time price doctrine. The language was supplied by the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce who recommended such a provision in the Department's report on the bill. This meets one of the major objections raised by the American Banking Association.

46. Exemption when covered by State law, section 6(b): This section is similar to the original S. 5 except that the Board can exempt creditors covered by a State law which is "substantially similar" to the Federal law. The original version of S. 5 only authorized exemptions if the State law required the "same information." Also the provision was reworded to make it clear the Board is only responsible for reviewing the law and not the effectiveness of the administration of the law. These changes are in line with Governor Robertson's suggestions.

47. Criminal penalties, section 7(b): The words "willfully and knowingly" were added as a condition for giving false or inaccurate information. Also, the section now makes it clear that the Attorney General will enforce the criminal penalties section. This is in keeping with Governor Robertson's testimony that the Board did not have any trained investigators or law enforcement officials.

SECTION 8. EXCEPTIONS

48. Business credit exemption, section 8(1): The original S. 5 provided an exemption to "business firms as such." This left an element of doubt with respect to farmers or proprietorships or independent professionals. The present version would exempt credit for "business, agricultural, or commercial purposes." This is basically a clarification of the meaning of the words "as such."

49. Exemption for transactions over $25,000, section 8(3): This is a new provision included on the recommendation of Governor Robertson. The exemption would not apply to real estate credit transactions. The purpose is to provide an objective test between consumer credit and business credit so as not to require the creditor to inquire continuously as to the purpose of the credit. If a credit transaction is under $25,000 and the creditor is uncertain if it is a business or consumer transaction, he will tend to assume it to be a consumer transaction to avoid violation. If it is over $25,000 he can safely assume it to be a business transaction without worrying about violation.

50. Effective date, section 9: As recommended by the Board the effective date has been changed from 6 months to 1 year to permit the Board to develop adequate regulations.

PUBLIC AND NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS—ALLIES OR ADVERSARIES?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, recently at its 27th annual conference in Portland, Oreg., the National School Boards Association reelected as its secretary-treasurer, Dr. George E. Ewan.

Dr. Ewan, a member of the District 7 Board of Education in Sheridan, Wyo., is a practicing orthodontist who has over the years found time, despite his busy practice, for a broad range of activities, many of them centering on education and on the youth of Sheridan. He is a past president of the Wyoming School Boards Association and, with his recent election at Portland, is serving his second term of office with the national association. We in Wyoming are proud of his service.

At that same meeting of the National School Boards Association, in Portland, another distinguished Wyomingite, Superintendent Maurice F. Griffith, of School District No. 2 in Casper, delivered a paper on the subject, "Public and Nonpublic Schools—Allies or Adversaries?" This, of course, is a question of continued interest among educators, lawmakers, and, in fact, among people all over our land who share an interest in the quest for a higher quality of education for all of America's youth. He cites the example of his city, Casper, where a high degree of cooperation exists between the public schools and the parochial schools, and sums up by saying he cannot think of problems that might arise that could not be easily resolved.

The problems are resolved, in Casper as elsewhere, Mr. Griffith says, when people of good will working together for the benefit of children work at it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Griffith's paper be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Public and Nonpublic Schools—Allies or Adversaries?

(By Maurice F. Griffith)

The opportunity to address you on this topic means several things to me. One, I am attending my first meeting of the NSBA because of the invitation to appear at this clinic session. This is my first such attendance not because of a lack of desire to see what board members do when assembled in national meeting as compared with what school administrators do under similar circumstances but because I have believed we were adequately represented by our board members who have faithfully attended over the years.

Two, I find myself speaking in an area where strong opinions exist and where I am certainly not an expert even though I am hundreds of miles from home.

Three, whatever I say in connection with this topic is inevitably related, and closely, to the whole topic of Federal Aid to Education, an area where I have strong opinions that have recently been completely reversed.

As in any other contentious situation related to American education one finds rather firm and fixed opinions regarding public aid to private schools. We may as well recognize immediately that most of the conflict is related to aid to parochial schools with comparatively little attention being paid to the funds that flow into private colleges and private, nonparochial elementary and secondary schools.

Comments such as:

"Federal aid provided for parochial schools means the end, of the public school system in America."

"If they wish to have public funds let them send their children to the public schools."

"We support the public schools without choice: We also, through our church pledges and tuitions support our own system of education. Who is better qualified to receive Federal assistance than our parochial schools."

"Some competition for the public schools of America would be a good thing."

are not unusual and the person who is without opinions on this controversial subject is quite rare.

All elements of the educational enterprise have been more than willing to go to court over the issue of public aid for use in parochial education. No sooner is a precedent set than it meets a legal challenge on the constitutional principle of separation between church and state. In December of 1966 the predictable reaction to the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 came on the authorization of use of Federal funds in parochial schools to help deprived children.

Four organizations—the American Jewish Congress, the New York Civil Liberties Union, the United Parents Association and the United Federation of Teachers—filed suits in Federal and New York courts challenging the constitutionality of such aid. Both suits asked for injunctions to halt the use of public funds in parochial schools pending a final decision—probably from the United States Supreme Court. Leo Pfeffer, attorney for the plaintiffs, predicted that the cases were likely to reach the nation's highest court around October 1968.

Although the question of separation of church and state has been with with us a long time its recent blooming has been caused by the sharp increase in Federal aid to schools in the past two or three years.

We find local school districts compelled to provide assistance to the children of parochial schools if they are to participate in the Federal funding. Such arrangements as public owned and operated buses serving the children of church related schools, textbooks provided for the children of such schools while owned by the public school, teachers under contract to the public school but teaching in the religious institution and shared time whereby the children of the private school attend the public school on a part-time basis.

All of these arrangements have been attacked from several sources as violating the intent of the Constitution on the separation of Church and State and as one might expect arrangements are forthcoming to make such things possible without great amount of dissent and discord.

One of the more startling arrangements is the plan being developed for Swanton, Vermont where planners have a distinctly different approach to public-private cooperation. They look at it this way: Since the chief obstacle to solving the educational church-state problem is the fact that public and parochial schools are kept apart, let's bring them together, physically and administratively. Administrators are hatching plans there to build a new school that will offer vocational, academic, and private religious instruction—in the same plant—to students who, today, are attending separate public and parochial schools. The project has been awarded a $59,000 Title III (ESEA) planning grant. Preliminary designs for the school—a comprehensive junior-senior high school—have already been prepared.

Father John LaBrake states "The parochial school as we know it today is an anacronism. It's on its way out. It simply can't operate effectively in this day and age." LaBrake is principal of Saint Anne's Academy which is headed for the linkup with the public schools.

What about the constitutional decree on public and private schools operating independently?

"Fine," say the area schoolmen. "But there's no reason why public and parochial functions can't operate independently . . . under one roof."

This then is shared time with a capital "S".

Another trend in parochial education, brought on in part by Federal aid, is that toward lay boards in place of the board of priests. Let me quote from a news release of last February—

"An end to parish control of Catholic grade schools was urged to save them from slow and agonizing strangulation." The "traditional structure is failing," said the Rt. Reverend William M. Roche, superintendent of Catholic schools in Rochester, N.Y. He called for a radically different administration taking church schools out of the hands of pastors and turning them over to parents to reorganize them under various school boards generally paralleling public school districts.

Catholic education "is on a grand downhill slide at the present moment," Msgr. Roche told the National Catholic Education Association. There is not enough Catholic money to support them on the present basis, he said.

"The shackles of archaic diocesan and parish administration must be broken," Msgr. Roche said, adding:

"To insure that the school is separated from the church structure, it must be incorporated as a legal and separate entity."

His proposal came as some do-or-die issues were put before the convention by the Most Reverend Ernest J. Primeau of Manchester, N.H. including these questions:

"Why should the church be operating schools at all?"

"Should we concentrate on one level of education or should we instead seek to promote education across the board on all levels?"

The movement of colleges in changing from close ties with a church to situations more closely resembling public controlled institutions is another example of the change in religious control to accommodate the availability for public funds for all educational enterprises. This movement has been precipitated by the historic case of Horace Mann versus Maryland Board of Public Works. This case denied construction grants of public funds to Western Maryland College (Methodist), Westminster and Notre Dame of Maryland in Baltimore and St. Joseph's at Emmitsburg, Md. both Roman Catholic. These grants were declared as in violation of the First Amendment which forbids acts respecting establishment of religion.

Of equal importance in the current situation is the fact that the court approved a state construction grant for Hood College in Frederick, an institution sponsored by the United Church of Christ. Why the preferential treatment for Hood? Because, said the court, the ties between Hood and its church were so vague and nondefinitive that Hood was, in effect, a nonsectarian institution. As such it could receive public funds with no constitutional problem.

Thus church related institutions of learning are finding it expedient to change their organizations to become eligible for Federal dollars. Federal control? Perhaps.

With the rapid modification of religious institutions to meet the demands of the Federal government in qualifying for grants we find less significance in the idea that the government could aid students in a school without aiding the school. This concept used to help with the passage of the ESEA of 1965 seems to have lost its place of importance because of the willingness of institutions to change their administrative structures in order to comply with the requirements of ESEA.

A new element in the relationships between private and public schools has been introduced, not by a religious order, but by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. This body contends that change in education and indeed the whole process of upgrading public education can be most effectively brought about through the creation of competition among schools.

With this proposal we would find the public schools competing with private schools which would also be financed with public funds. Hence the law of the marketplace would be established and schools would change more rapidly than is now possible because of the necessity of keeping up with the competition.

This idea appeals to me as it would to any thoughtful public school educator who has been so frequently thwarted in his attempts to improve his program of education. The normal resistance to change of people particularly as regards change in schools is the element most often responsible for the continuation of the program of education of the 1880's in most areas.

Who wouldn't welcome competition if it

would mean the ready acceptance of change in order to keep up with the competition?

If this concept receives recognition it would certainly remove the pressure from religious orders to change their school to meet the demands of a Federal government.

As a more than somewhat prejudiced public school man embittered by the snail's pace of change in our schools I believe it highly unlikely that the people of America would "buy" the concept of generous aid to private schools in order to create a competitive situation.

One needs only to read the report emanating from the National Education Association to understand the reaction of the education fraternity to such a proposal.

Most schoolmen, and I was one of them until recently, contend that general aid to education from the Federal government would be much more desirable than the categorical aid we have had so far.

Two events of recent months have caused me to join those, if there are others, who might wish to have a continuation of categorical aid.

The first is the almost certainty of reduction in aid if presented in general form to the private schools. It is only because of the necessity of assisting the local parochial schools with special programs that we are now cooperating with them.

The second event is that well known, new institution on the American scene of teacher militancy and negotiations. We have gone through this for the first time this year and it was interesting to observe that all the money that was not absolutely required for other purposes went into salaries of teachers. This in itself is not bad for a good salary structure helps to make a strong school system.

I know, however, that most of the changes and improvements in our schools have been wrought with Federal funds. If we were to receive the same number of dollars now provided by the Federal government in the form of general aid it would join the other dollars going into teacher salaries with the minimal resulting change.

I present this in explanation of my earlier statement regarding my attitude toward general aid to education.

What then can be done to keep alive the important services rendered by our private schools in America? I consider them important because even though most such schools are poorly financed and non competitive with public education their loss to the American scene would only mean more entrenchment of the concept of regeneration of American public education every few years with only minor changes.

Our experience in a community with 14,000 public children and two parochial schools may show the way for cooperation without creating the mythical monster of a strong religious system of schools that will engulf the public schools.

In many years of administrative work in our community I had never met the teachers and administrators of our parochial schools until Federal fund availability made it desirable for me to do so.

Our meetings around the conference table quickly convinced me that the Catholic educators had the same ideals and desires for their children as we had for ours. They displayed a willingness to cooperate that was pleasant to behold. Our similar attitude made possible a system that is working and will continue to do so.

We have shared time. We are paid our share of state funds for the time that Catholic students spend in our schools. We offer them science and physical education courses that are beyond the financing possibilities of the parish.

We have established portable buildings at another parochial school where we offer special reading classes for the Catholic children who are not progressing satisfactorily in this skill. We employ the teacher and provide textbooks and supplies. I would hasten to add that we do this in a portable building not from fear of contamination of the religious atmosphere of the parochial building but only because there is not room for our class in it.

A new and lovely grade school erected by another Catholic parish in our community has been leased to us for public school use for several years because of the inability of the parish to staff the building for a religious operation. We permit the Church to hold catechism classes, youth meetings and other religious oriented meetings in the building when we are not using it.

We have transported Catholic children for years in our buses to their schools. This has been done without establishing special trips or routes and no one has challenged us so far.

The children and teachers of the Catholic schools attend special performances of various kinds held in our schools and make use of televised programs that go into our classrooms.

How can all of these things be done and I am confident that we are not the only community in America now doing them? They can be accomplished by people of good will working together for the benefit of children. I cannot, now, think of problems that might arise that could not be easily resolved between the religious representatives and our public school people.

Here then is a way to keep healthy competition alive and to, perhaps, keep the public schools from becoming worse than they are because of a complete monopoly.

Thank you.

BULK POWER SUPPLY FOR SMALL SYSTEMS

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the American Public Power Association recently held its 24th annual conference in Denver. Members of the association gathered to discuss the problems and progress of public power systems in the United States.

Commissioner Charles R. Ross of the Federal Power Commission, addressed the conference on May 9, 1967, on the subject of bulk power supply for small systems. Commissioner Ross suggests a number of steps that should be taken by small public power systems to insure that they share the economic benefits of power pooling and generation of power by large nuclear plants.

Commissioner Ross' remarks deserve the attention of everyone interested in lowering the cost of electricity for consumers. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BULK POWER SUPPLY FOR SMALL SYSTEMS

(An address by Charles R. Ross, Commissioner, Federal Power Commission)

Recently, in a series of articles on the New England Power controversy by the Providence *Sunday Journal*, it was stated,

"Where does this controversy, the promises and estimates leave the homeowner? Whether power is public, private or something in between does not matter. What does matter is that, in this battle between power interests, it may be the consumer who loses."

As far as I am concerned, this concern for the consumer should be the overriding consideration by the managers of the publicly-owned systems, by the executives of the investor-owned systems, and by government officials whether regulatory or operating. However, much too frequently, I have sensed that the power industry still wants to carry on a public vs. private feud at the expense of their consumers. I also have the feeling sometimes that investor-owned companies don't want to pool and take advantage of the economies inherent therein because of their desire to maintain their own corporate empires where the executive is still the big fish in a small pond. Sometimes, too, the investor-owned utility seems unwilling to pool for fear that this will bring federal regulations which can mean someone looking over its shoulder to see if the consumer is getting what he is entitled to.

The publicly-owned utilities, for their part, sometimes forget their special role. One would normally think that, being publicly-owned, the consumer always is the beneficiary. This may not always be the case. A traditional feeling of distrust towards the investor-owned utilities permeates the thinking of some municipal systems. In the past, this feeling may have had some grounds for justification. However, as we pointed out in the *National Power Survey*, the Federal Power Commission is hopeful and we are encouraged that we can provide a forum where your rights may be protected. We are confident that in the years ahead you will not be forced to provide your own generation at a higher cost as contrasted to entering into contractual relationships for purchased power on more reasonable terms. Just as in the case of private systems, there also exists a natural human tendency to empire-build by the public systems. Let us be sure that every proposal can stand on its own two feet.

I might add here a remark about one tendency of the public systems to fail to distinguish between tax payers and citizen users of the electricity. Don't ever forget your primary obligation is to furnish energy to your customers at the lowest reasonable rate. It is not the obligation of the electric light department to finance every other department in the city so as to hold down the property tax rate. When a municipal fails to charge the lowest rate possible, consistent with a sound, up-to-date system, it will be sounding its death knell.

In discussing the public vs. private power relationship, I do want to emphasize one important valuable by-product which has and I hope will continue to benefit the consumer and that is, the American tradition of competition. I applaud your efforts to show up the executives of the investor-owned systems and I applaud the efforts of the private sector in constantly seeking ways to lower rates which offset some of the tax benefits you may have. Because the nation likes competition, we have been blessed with a pluralistic power system. As I have said many times before, I would hate to see it otherwise. Furthermore, I believe that, generally speaking, the present relationship is good. In other words, I would be distressed to see very many "take overs" by either side since it might well disrupt what seems to be a more and more harmonious relationship. In fact, the longer the existing status can be retained and the more vested the interests become, the more likely ultimately we will have an unofficial territorial recognition of the areas of each group. Let me hasten to add that territorial recognition must be accompanied by effective regulation. This is to assure the consumer that he gets all the benefits that can flow from such recognition with none of the detriments likely to result from an unregulated, single utility within a legally-protected service area.

Before going into greater detail as to the problems and possible solutions for the publicly owned systems in securing low cost power which will enable them to compete with the private systems, let me digress for a moment about the rights and future demands of the consumers who are often caught in the cross-fire between these two large and important groups. These same consumers are also often times the civilian casualties of the war for lower and lower rates. As I have said before, in commenting on certificate legislation for EHV, the general public, in my opinion, will force public and private groups to accept a joint use of wheeling concept for EHV since the indiscriminate taking of duplicate rights of way is a luxury our nation cannot afford. Furthermore, the public is also trying to tell the power industry, both public and private, that low rates in and of themselves, are not necessarily the sole criterion in utility operation. The public, through their representatives in Congress and the Executive Branch, are trying to convey a message, which seems to fall on deaf ears, that the quality of their environment really is important to them. To breathe clean air, to swim in clean, cool water, to be stimulated visually by the beauty of our environment, to enjoy freedom from a never-ceasing pounding on our ear drums are freedoms which we must possess if as citizens we want to maintain our sanity. If you think or believe that it is only the rich who feel this and can afford such a luxury, you are way behind the times. As a taxi driver in Chicago said to me recently as we were driving along Lake Michigan through a haze, "Can't we do better than this? What's so hot about low rates if I'm not around to benefit from them?"

To get back to the primary reason for my visit here, let me explore for a moment some of the problems that I see facing you, the managers of public systems, in securing a low-cost power supply to enable you to maintain your existence as an integral part of the power systems of our country. Incidentally, some of the problems are also bothering the private systems since an abundant supply of low-cost power is essential to them in their increasingly hot competitive struggle with the natural gas industry for heating and air-conditioning loads.

As I visualize the future for your systems. I foresee the absolute necessity for small municipal systems to join the parade and become participants of the newly forming bulk power supply pools in order to take advantage of the economies of scale and the technological progress which these pools make possible. Even if you dispute the contention that reliability of service can be best maintained by stronger and stronger interconnections, you will not be able to produce low-cost power with the small units inherent in separate, isolated systems. The huge units which pools are making possible give the private sector the chance for the first time in their history to produce power at such low prices that they may be able to outsell you at the meter despite your tax advantages. Needless to say, this has ramifications for you. Undoubtedly, some of you are already visualizing the next take over campaign. This need not happen, however, although it may require some changing of the rules.

The first rule or guideline which needs acceptance is the requirement that membership to all pools be nondiscriminatory. This should be your Civil Rights Act of 1967. The mere fact that you are a public body should not bar your entry. Nor should the membership rules encourage you to build inefficient generation. The primary criterion of a pool should be the lowest cost generation and transmission for the benefit of all consumers, public and private. The planning undertaken by such pools should be open and above board. Uncertainty as to the plans of the large pools in the region is a real handicap to the manager of the small system in knowing what his best alternatives are. The general public, as well as industry, has a "Right to Know." With the plans and criteria subject to public scrutiny, you will know where and how to proceed.

I would be remiss, however, if I failed to point out that the basic principles of economics will have to be recognized in setting the ground rules of the pool agreements. In other words, some of the more well-endowed participants may be able to do better because of their contributions to the pool, such as lower-cost units, better types of load, etc. While this may be the case and a free ride is prohibited, nevertheless, the same general rules should apply to every one. If marginal pricing is fair in one situation, then it should be used in a like situation. If transmission charges are based upon displacement in one situation, it should be used for similar situations.

Because admission to a pool may in years ahead be the most vital factor in the life of a small municipal, I feel that Justice Department overnight is necessary. I frankly am pleased to know that Justice has been and is interested. Furthermore, the interest Justice has shown in the past has been helpful. I can't really foresee the Justice Department prohibiting pools *per se* unless (1) they are discriminatory, (2) the results of such pools are to drastically change the nature of our existing pluralistic system or (3) the concentration of economic power by such pools violates some aspect of the national interest. I am sure that no sincere member of a pool really seeks these objectives. If that's the case, they have nothing to fear.

In addition to becoming members of a pool, the small municipals must have a chance to buy into some of the organizations being formed to construct large nuclear plants. It is my understanding that the taxpayers in this nation have invested over $40 billion in nuclear development; of the nearly $1 billion that is being expended annually for R&D in the electric industry, roughly 5% was contributed by the major utility companies.[1] Under these circumstances it would be ironic if the only consumers in the nation that will benefit from the nuclear revolution are those of private systems. With the acceptance of the fact that the larger the nuclear unit, the more economic it becomes and with the anticipation of greater economies inherent in the breeder reactor which I hope comes faster than some would will, it becomes harder than ever for a municipal to construct a nuclear plant for itself. In addition, to the extent local or state law requires you to locate a plant within your municipal boundaries, you may be prohibited because of safety rules. Furthermore, probably one of the most critical factors in the location of a nuclear plant, namely an adequate supply of cool water, will usually prohibit the location of a plant within your municipal boundaries.

Senator Aiken of my native State of Vermont, I am proud to say, has already indicated his awareness of these types of problems which face the municipal utility. In a recent hearing on the Licensing and Regulation of Reactors, he stated,

"One thing I wanted to ask about, following your discussion, is that in granting a license I don't see that you give any weighting to the possible creation of a monopoly in the power supply for an entire region. What I mean is this: suppose there are 20 or 25 utility companies of varying size servicing an entire region. Five of them are what we call big boys; the other companies vary in size from pretty good size down to rather small, local distribution systems. Suppose the five big ones get together and say, 'We will apply for a 750,000 or a one million kilowatt nuclear plant. When we get it, we will squeeze these little nuisances right out of business'.

"How do you handle that situation? How do you act to prevent establishing a monopoly in the hands of a very few people?"[2]

* * * * *

"Up in New England, I presume you know that the larger companies which have applied for a license have now offered to sell stock to the smaller ones who originally were excluded from their plans. Of course, that is an ideal way, I think, of handling the situation if it works, although their application for a license, I believe, states that the entire amount of power will be used by the companies that are applying for it. That, however, could be changed.

"I think it is serious, because we have used a lot of public funds in developing low-cost nuclear power. That would be low-cost in the area I come from; it might not be in some other parts of the country."[3]

In reply to these queries by Senator Aiken, A.E.C. indicated that if there were competing applications and a question were raised, they would refer it to the Justice Department.

That progress is being made is evident by the fact noted by Senator Aiken, namely, that the Vermont State Public Service Board under the Chairmanship of Ernest Gibson, Jr., has entered an order providing for Vermont Yankee Nuclear Corp. to allow participation by the municipals and coops. This is really a truly significant step by Vermont and as Senator Aiken noted, the participants in this project have authorized an offer to the Vermont municipals and coops. While some negotiation still remains as to the offer, it is encouraging that the concern reflected by Senator Aiken and the Vermont State Public Service Board is being taken into account.

In my opinion, unless all segments of the industry can avail themselves of the economies of nuclear generation through voluntary efforts, it may become necessary to provide legal means to achieve a fair share for the municipals and coops. Simply put, it has been the taxpayers of the whole nation, private and public, who financed the research and development of the nuclear power industry. Living as we are under the shadow of the nuclear bomb, let's make sure that the one major peaceful use of the atom is available to all at the lowest possible price so that we can at least fool ourselves a little into believing that "it" isn't so bad after all.

In participating in these nuclear pools or organizations, I see no reason why a municipal, if local or state laws allow it and they should, should not be able to secure its revenue requirements to buy-in through its normal municipal channels. This certainly is a matter of local discretion and if the tax laws allow the municipal to raise funds on such a basis to build and operate plants of their own, then they should be allowed to do so here. In addition, conditions for buying-in should not be onerous for small buyers in comparison to the large systems. By this, I mean that municipals and coops shouldn't be required to put all their eggs in one basket any more than a private system would. Along these lines, then, I would suggest that municipals and cooperatives not be obligated to buy-in a share greater than the ratio of the private company's interest in the new plant to its total system supply. In this way, the small system will still be flexible enough to buy from new, more efficient plants as they come on the line. Moreover, municipals and cooperatives should have the right to buy into a new plant at least at that same ratio. This would assure the small systems that their shares in the new plant would be more than token recognition.

In conclusion, I want to reemphasize a few factors which in my opinion are essential to an adequate low-cost source of power to your customers.

---

[1] Milton F. Kent, Forum Magazine, Jan.-Mar. 1967, p. 21.

[2] *Hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the Licensing and Regulation of Reactors,* April, 1967, Transcript, pp. 327–8.

[3] *Id.*, at 329.

First of all, your consumers can't afford to allow any "escalation" of the public vs. private feud. For reliability reasons and economic reasons, the power industry must operate as one but preserving the unique contributions of both public and private sectors.

Secondly, we must continue to explore and meet the limiting factors on large scale generations. One of these factors is the scarcity of good sites for large-scale power generation whether thermal or even more difficult, nuclear. The tremendous amounts of water needed to adequately cool the large nuclear units effectively restrict their location because of thermal pollution. In the earlier portion of this century, hydro sites were considered so valuable that we instituted a policy of withdrawing the lands where such sites were located. In my opinion, the scarcity of sites for nuclear plants of the scale on the drawing boards requires an immediate national inventory of them. If long-range considerations require, such sites should be acquired or withdrawn as soon as possible. At the same time, it may be appropriate to coordinate future EHV rights-of-way from the plant sites to population centers and if necessary, to reserve such rights-of-way as well.

Another factor that limits the development of large scale nuclear generation is our inability to date to come up with an economical, safe, large-scale breeder reactor. We know that we must have it since presently known sources of uranium in the United States cannot fuel the expanding conventional nuclear development for too many years in the future. You, in the municipal systems, should on behalf of your customers support and urge continued progress in this exciting prospect. Maybe, the New York Power Authority or some similar publicly-owned group with the advantage of low-cost money could lead the way here.

Third, the municipal power systems must continue to support, support for which I am grateful and acknowledge, the most economic joint use of large-scale transmission systems. This must be done under federal regulation. Without this, I am afraid your hopes of low-cost power will be day dreams only.

Fourth, we need your help in maintaining a vigorous and fair scrutiny of wholesale power contracts. In 1964, in discussing the future of small power systems, we indicated that we were attempting to eliminate the legal and psychological barriers "by effective and impartial regulation of wholesale electric rates and terms and conditions of service for transactions in interstate commerce." We further stated, "Where economic strength alone determines bargaining power, the small systems may be at a disadvantage, but where regulation is effective, long-term wholesale relationships can be built firmly on a foundation of legally enforced rights and responsibilities. With such foundation, the parties are enabled to reach the most economic solution to the problem of power supply under the particular circumstances of each case." The *Shrewsbury* case, as you know, has been one of the landmark wholesale rate cases in the history of the Commission. The *Gainesville* and *Crisp County* cases indicate the thoroughness with which the Staff explores the possibility of coordination. Since these cases are before us, I cannot comment further. They do indicate, however, the Staff's interest in your problems. The New England power study, the Kansas study, the Wisconsin study and our interest in the upper Middle West have contributed directly, I believe, to the welfare of your customers. We promise you knowledgeable, vigorous and fair regulation. We won't be able to make that promise, however, if certain proposals to limit our jurisdiction are successful. Here again, we need your help.

Fifth, I ask you, on behalf of your customers to study carefully and support if you can, a bill which we hope to propose to Congress shortly. I feel that such a bill will provide all the customers of this nation a reliable, low-cost source of power. Undoubtedly, there may be areas of disagreement over particular terms of this bill. In fact, the Executive Department may have its own variation. Also, without question, any bill probably will be improved during the careful consideration it will receive before appropriate committees of Congress and during passage therein if it gets that far. Let us all use the most imaginative and resourceful approach possible in trying to achieve something constructive from the now infamous Northeast Blackout of 1965.

PROTECTING THE HEALTH OF URANIUM MINERS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, there has been a deluge of oratory and printed opinion about the tragic effects on the health and lives of those men who have been working in our Western uranium mines. Too much of the debate has centered on economic consideration as opposed to the real concern for human life.

The record is graphic enough. There can be no conjecture on this score: 98 men are already dead, and apparently, 10 times that number may be doomed.

Even today, men are still working in unprotected uranium mines, betting that they can beat the odds against them. Their chances, however, are not good, and they become worse with each working day.

In the meantime, Secretary of Labor Wirtz has taken positive action to remedy the situation. Using his authority under the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, he has acted drastically to put a stop to this chaos. There is no dilemma here, for surely no consideration can be more important than the lives that may yet be saved.

His directive was studied and sound. Since the concentration of radon can be measured scientifically, Mr. Wirtz acted to remove men from the kind of risk no reasonable man could support.

I commend the Secretary of Labor for proceeding according to his conscience and believe that the Nation will support his move.

CALIFORNIA MEXICAN-AMERICAN EDUCATORS ENDORSE BILINGUAL EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at their 1967 State convention, the California Association of Mexican-American Educators passed a resolution which specifically endorsed legislation for bilingual education, such as that proposed by Senate bill 428. This active and aware organization, headed by President Edward Moreno, is familiar with the problems faced by our non-English speaking Mexican children in the Southwest. This qualification makes the endorsement of this association extremely important.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution passed by the State convention, in San Francisco, on May 28, 1967, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 1

Whereas: This nation is actively engaged in promoting peace and understanding among non-English countries throughout the world, and

Whereas: This nation's people are finding it an economic necessity to become bilingual, and

Whereas: This nation possesses a considerable reservoir of natural bilingual peoples, and

Whereas: Guidelines under ESEA, NDEA and Higher Education Titles are not cognizant of the specific needs of non-English speaking children, and

Whereas: The immensity and complexity of the needs of non-English speaking children—especially Mexican-American children in the Southwest have not been met, and

Whereas: Specific funds for non-English speaking children would reflect a concern to perceive him, his language and his culture as an asset to society, and

Whereas: The goals of this nation are to prepare functioning citizens in this democratic society

Be it resolved: That the Association of Mexican-American Educators go on record in support of bilingual education—especially Bill S. 428 introduced by Senator Yarborough and HR 8000 introduced by Congressman Roybal.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am privileged to be a member, has concluded hearings on S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill, which has been endorsed by the administration.

The hearings on this proposed legislation for the benefit of the American consumer have been completed and I followed them with interest. My reason for doing so has been the belief that we should help in every possible way to safeguard the interests of the American consumer.

While the American consumer today enjoys the highest standard of living ever, he is also particularly faced with a great deal of misinformation and confusion when he borrows money or makes purchases on credit. S. 5 will help us to attain this desired goal—eliminate misinformation and confusion on the part of the consumer, and in so doing, make the credit industry truly a competitive industry by enabling the consumer to make an intelligent choice.

The truth-in-lending bill is very much like another important piece of consumer legislation which the 89th Congress saw fit to pass—namely, the Truth in Packaging Act to tell the buyer what he is purchasing, how much it weighs, and who made it. I am convinced S. 5 is as necessary and worthwhile a measure as the Truth in Packaging Act. It will make a significant contribution toward assisting and safeguarding the American consumer in the credit field.

Consumer credit has become a huge and complicated business. It is now more than a $100 billion industry and is growing fast in both size and complexity. For many average consumers, it is a bewildering jungle of rates, terms, and payments—one that often eludes comprehension and precludes the making of accurate buying decisions. There is a vast array of practices—add-ons, discounts, percent of original balance, monthly payment amount, term price differential, sales price versus cash price, rule of 78's, and so on—all of which can be understood only by an expert.

Take the case of a consumer who wants to obtain credit for a $100 purchase to be repaid in monthly installments. Confronting him are some of these alternatives:

First. The consumer is told that the charges will be $10 down and $10 a month, but he is not told either the finance charge or finance rate.

Second. The consumer is told that the finance charge will be $6 on the $100 12-month installment loan. The lender usually represents this as a 6-percent annual rate. Actually, the annual rate is about 12 percent or nearly twice the stated rate because the borrower, over a period of a year, only has the use of about an average of $50, rather than the $100 face amount. In other words, at the end of 6 months the borrower will have only about $50, having already repaid approximately one-half of the loan. This is known as the add-on rate.

A variation of the add-on rate is the discount rate. In the add-on, the borrower receives $100 in cash or goods and must pay back $106. Under the discount technique, the consumer receives $94 but repays $100. The finance charge is paid in advance. But, again, the actual rate is approximately 12 percent because the borrower is periodically repaying the loan and, unlike the add-on situation, he had the use of a maximum of $94 and not $100.

With respect to add-on and discount loans, the consumer is often quoted a rate based on the original amount of the debt, not on the declining or unpaid balance as is the custom in business credit, mortgage transactions, and Government loans.

Third. Another alternative is the simple monthly rate. This is usually quoted by lenders and retailers using revolving credit plans. The rate stated is usually from 1 to 4 percent per month. The annual rate is generally not computed, but could easily be given. For example, the annual rate for credit now stated as 1½ percent per month is simply 18 percent, or 12 times the monthly rate.

One can only wonder how many consumers are actually aware of the costs involved in these type of transactions. What it comes down to in many such cases is this:

The 4.5-percent new financing plan of some banks is really an approximate annual rate of 9 percent.

The 3-percent-per-month plan of some loan companies is really an approximate annual rate of 36 percent.

The service charge of 1.5 percent per month on revolving charge accounts at department stores is 18 percent per annum.

Confusion in the credit field can be further illustrated by a study by Juster and Shay, entitled "Consumer Sensitivity to Finance Rates." A sample of 800 families were asked in the study to estimate the rate they were paying on their debts. Their average estimate was 8.3 percent. But actually, it was much, much higher—some 23.2 percent. Misunderstanding and confusion of this nature is not uncommon among Americans who use and need credit. Frequently, they are documented in the long lists of bankruptcy proceedings in the Nation's courts.

Many industry leaders and Government officials have admitted publicly to being confused by the practices now used by lenders and vendors in stating their finance charges on consumer credit. One can only wonder what is the rhyme and reason for this bewildering and often incomprehensible variety of methods for stating the costs of credit that exists today. Whatever it may be, the situation has become a very unhappy and unfortunate one.

A solution to this problem must be found. The consumer has to be informed of the cost of credit fully, accurately, and in an understandable way to shop wisely and prudently. S. 5 can accomplish this objective. The bill's most important feature, the requirement to state the finance charge as an approximate annual percentage rate, in addition to its statement in dollars and cents, will provide for uniform disclosure of finance charges in a manner that is fully responsive to the American consumer's needs. With uniform disclosure, consumers will be able to compare the many alternative forms of credit available to him. He will even be able to compute whether it would be preferable to withdraw from his 4.5 percent savings account rather than borrow at a higher annual rate.

As for the lender, I have found no substantiated evidence that S. 5 will be significantly burdensome for him. In fact, I believe the hearings held by the subcommittee have shown the bill's workability, with the presentations of standardized tables that have been developed for relatively simple computations of any kind of finance charges, with no significant burden placed on the businessman.

In the past, critics of truth-in-lending legislation have argued that the complexity of credit transactions makes disclosure of finance charges very difficult, if not impossible. After the recent hearings, I am convinced that this concern is groundless.

I conclude my remarks by saying that truth in lending has proven successful in the instances where it has been adopted. I refer, for instance, to the States of Massachusetts and Wisconsin, where such laws have been passed, and to the directive of the Department of Defense on truth in lending, issued last year. The experience of Massachusetts and the Department of Defense, as related in the hearings, is conclusive proof of the acceptability and workability of annual rate disclosure.

Mr. President, for the benefit of the entire Nation, I urge the prompt passage of S. 5, the Truth-in-Lending Act of 1967.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ADJUSTMENTS IN OUTSTANDING SILVER CERTIFICATES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, S. 1352.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A bill (S. 1352) to authorize adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I urge that the Senate act promptly on S. 1352, the administration bill relating to silver certificates.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the committee report be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 1.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a letter addressed to me by Mr. J. Allen Overton, Jr., executive vice president of the American Mining Congress under date of May 16, 1967.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 2.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a letter addressed to me by the Honorable Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, under date of June 5, 1967.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 3.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, S. 1352 would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to write off lost or destroyed silver certificates and free for other use the silver now held against the certificates.

S. 1352 would require holders of silver certificates who wish to convert them to silver to do so within 1 year. Thereafter the certificates would continue to be legal tender, but would not be convertible to silver.

S. 1352, under the Bennett amendment, would require the Treasury to hold for 1 year, and then turn over to the critical and strategic materials stockpile, 165 million ounces of silver.

Another amendment, submitted by me and cosponsored by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] would permit the mint to reintroduce mint marks on the coins.

The rapidly increasing demands for silver for industrial uses have made it necessary to convert from silver subsidiary coins to the new clad coins made out of copper and nickel in the case of 10-cent and 25-cent pieces and with a silver content in the 50-cent pieces reduced to 40 percent.

Demands for silver are increasing even more now than in recent years, and, if they continue much longer, it will not be possible for the Treasury to maintain the price of silver at $1.29 an ounce. A substantial increase in the price of silver might lead to the withdrawal of silver subsidiary coins from circulation before they have been completely replaced by the new clad coins, which might cause very great problems for all persons and industries which use coins.

The situation is sufficiently serious so that, after consultation with the Joint Commission on the Coinage at its first meeting May 18, 1967, the Treasury Department has issued an order to prohibit the minting, treatment, and export of silver coins, and it has adopted the policy of refusing the sale of silver to any buyer other than a legitimate domestic concern which uses silver in its business, and then only up to a 2-month inventory. The silver markets in this country and abroad are in confusion and turmoil, and speculation is rampant.

I would like to assure the Senate that by the passage of this bill, plus the action taken by the Treasury on May 18, 1967, in discontinuing sales of silver to any buyers other than legitimate domestic concerns which use silver in its business and invoking its legal authority to prohibit the melting, treatment, and export of silver coins, we will not have a shortage of silver. Our legitimate domestic users of silver will be able to have their normal needs supplied, and we will have sufficient silver for our coinage needs.

In my judgment the Congress should act promptly and decisively on S. 1352 which, as amended, was unanimously reported. I am advised that the Silver Users Association is also in favor of prompt approval of this bill.

A fact sheet has been supplied to us by Adm. Donald J. Ramsey, who is the legislative counsel of the Silver Users Association of the United States, in which he supports the bill as it has been reported, without further amendments.

I ask unanimous consent that this fact sheet be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 4.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair.] The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that the bill, as thus amended, be regarded for purposes of amendment as original text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPTS FROM COMMITTEE REPORT NO. 232

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO

As introduced, S. 1352 contained two provisions, which are included in the bill as reported:

(1) It would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to write off silver certificates he determines have been destroyed or irretrievably lost or are held in collections, and will never be presented for redemption, thereby freeing for other use the silver now held against those certificates.

(2) It would require holders of silver certificates who wish to take advantage of the Government's commitment to convert them to silver, to do so within 1 year. Thereafter, these certificates would continue to be legal tender, but not convertible to silver.

The committee added two amendments to S. 1352:

(1) The first amendment—the Bennett amendment—would require the Treasury to hold for 1 year, and then to turn over to the stockpiles established under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 165 million ounces of silver—the amount of the reserve for defense purposes established by the Office of Emergency Planning under that act.

(2) The second amendment—the Sparkman amendment based on the chairman's bill, S. 1008—would repeal the prohibition against the use of mint marks contained in the Coinage Act of 1965, and would permit the mint, at its discretion, to reintroduce mint marks.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The basic purpose of the legislation is to assure an adequate supply of coins to meet the needs of the economy during the remaining stages of the transition from silver coins to the new clad coins. It would do this by increasing the supply of free silver available to the Treasury to prevent a rise in the market price of silver which would bring about the withdrawal of silver coins from circulation, and by providing a reasonable period—1 year—for holders of silver certificates to get silver from the Treasury.

In addition by virtue of the Bennett amendment, the bill would assure maintenance of an adequate supply of silver for defense purposes—165 million ounces—in the Treasury during the year following enactment, and would require transfer of this reserve to the stockpiles established under the Critical and Strategic Materials Stock Piling Act at the end of the year.

By permitting the reintroduction of mint marks on our coins under the Sparkman amendment, the bill would also permit the mint to exercise greater security and manufacturing controls over our coinage, and it would satisfy the requests of coin collectors who have expressed an interest in knowing which of our mints have made the coins they collect.

BACKGROUND OF THE LEGISLATION

S. 1352 is one more step in the transition from a coinage system based on silver, where the coins themselves are made of precious metals and have value in and of themselves, to a functional system of coinage, where the coins are made of base metals and have no value except as legal tender.

This change has been made necessary by the technological demands of the Nation's industry and commerce. Silver, once used almost exclusively for tableware, jewelry, and coinage, is now one of the most highly prized industrial metals. For example, in 1966 the industrial consumption of silver amounted to 150 million ounces, distributed as follows:

	Million ounces
Photographic film and paper	46.5
Electrical and electronics	36.0
Silverware and jewelry	25.5
Brazing alloys and solders	18.0
Batteries	10.5
Dental and medical	4.5
Mirror	3.0
Miscellaneous	6.0
Total	150.0

The following Treasury Department table shows what has happened to silver over the past 15 years:

Estimated free world silver consumption and production, 1949–66

[In millions of fine troy ounces]

Calendar year	Industry and the arts (1)	Coinage: United States	Coinage: Coinage foreign (2)	Coinage: Total coinage	Total consumption (3)	New production (4)	Indicated deficit (−) (5)	Deficit excluding all coinage demand (−) (6)
1949–53 average	153.1	36.5	48.2	84.7	237.8	173.9	−63.9	20.8
1953–57 average	190.1	37.5	36.0	73.5	263.6	191.0	−72.6	.9
1958	190.5	38.2	41.3	79.5	270.0	205.8	−64.2	15.3
1959	212.9	41.4	45.0	86.4	299.3	188.4	−110.9	−24.5
1960	224.6	46.0	57.9	103.9	328.5	206.9	−121.9	−17.7
1961 (revised)	239.5	55.9	81.2	137.1	376.6	203.2	−173.4	−36.3
1962 (revised)	258.5	77.4	50.2	127.6	386.1	209.0	−177.1	−49.5
1963 (revised)	260.7	111.5	54.9	166.4	427.1	214.6	−212.5	−46.1
1964 (revised)	304.2	203.0	64.1	267.1	571.3	210.7	−360.6	−93.5
1965	346.6	320.3	55.3	375.6	722.2	215.3	−506.9	−131.3
1966	356.5	53.9	53.8	107.7	464.2	231.0	−233.2	−125.5

Source: Cols. (1) and (2) are from Handy & Harman, annual reviews. Col. (4) is derived from the world totals published in the annual reports of the Director of the Mint and compiled by the Bureau of Mines, except for 1966 which is from Handy & Harman's 1966 Annual Review. Production for the following countries has been subtracted from the world totals: Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Rumania, Poland, U.S.S.R., China, and North Korea (hearings on S. 1352, p. 72).

Because of the essential nature of many of the uses of silver, the Office of Emergency Planning has established stockpile goals for silver under the Critical and Strategic Materials Stock Piling Act. The objectives are 165 million ounces on the assumption of a conventional war, and 9,975,000 ounces on the basis of a nuclear war (hearings on S. 1352, pp. 35, 103, 105).

In the light of the greatly increased demands for silver, and the slowly increasing supply, it is not surprising that the price of silver has risen. From a depression low of about 25 cents an ounce (at which point the silver in a silver dollar—0.77⅓ ounce—was worth about 19 cents), the price of silver has increased to $1.29+ an ounce, the monetary value of the silver in a dollar (i.e., the silver in a silver dollar is now worth 100 cents).

The price of silver has been substantially affected over these years by governmental policies. From 1934 through 1958, the Treasury bought 3 billion ounces of silver at an average price of 58.7 cents an ounce. The purchase price for newly mined domestic silver was 50 cents an ounce from 1934 to 1939; 71 cents from 1939 to 1946; and 90½ cents an ounce from 1946 to 1963.

Beginning in 1959 the Treasury silver stocks have served as a source of supply for industrial users. Nonmonetized silver was sold by the mint at 90.5 cents an ounce up to November 28, 1961, when the President directed that sales should be stopped. Silver was then available to the public from the mint only through the redemption of silver certificates for silver dollars.

By 1963 the demands for silver and the increasing prices of silver made it necessary to pass Public Law 88–36, repealing the Silver Purchase Acts. This law authorized the issuance of $1 Federal Reserve notes, replacing the old $1 silver certificates, and it authorized the Treasury to redeem silver certificates in bullion instead of in silver dollars.

The Coinage Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–81) removed all silver from the 10-cent and 25-cent pieces and reduced the silver content of the 50-cent piece to 40 percent. This greatly reduced the demand for silver for coinage—from 320.3 million ounces in 1965 to 53.9 million ounces in 1966.

Since that time, the mint has produced 7.8 billion of the new clad coins, and present production plans call for a total production of the new clad coins by June 30, 1968, or more than 12 billion pieces ($1.1 billion of 25-cent pieces, $700 million of 10-cent pieces; $250 million of 50-cent pieces—or approximately $2 billion in value (hearings on S. 1352, p. 94; hearings on S. 1008, p. 11)).

In spite of this tremendous output of the new clad coins, and in spite of the very substantial inventories of coins now in the hands of the mint and the Federal Reserve Banks,[1] it is not yet clear that the new clad coins have replaced the old subsidiary silver coins to such an extent as to make it possible to permit the price of silver to rise to a point where subsidiary silver coins, containing 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper, might be melted down.

At the present time the Treasury has on hand total stocks of silver of about 510 million ounces. Of this amount, almost 425 million ounces are required to be held as reserves against the 550 million of silver certificates outstanding, leaving only about 85 million ounces of free silver available for coinage or for sale to meet the needs of industry, thereby maintaining the current market price of $1.29+. Continuation of the present rate of coinage and sales of silver to industry would soon reduce the free silver to a point where it would no longer be possible to satisfy these demands.

Since, however, it is clear that a large proportion of the outstanding silver certificates will never be presented for redemption, and since it is undesirable to permit indefinite continuation of the holding of silver certificates for the purpose of redemption for silver, the Secretary of the Treasury on March 14, 1967, transmitted to the Congress a bill which was introduced as S. 1352 on March 21, 1967. Hearings were held on the bill on May 4, 1967. The committee considered the administration proposals and recommendations from the affected industries at an executive session on May 12, 1967, and voted to report the bill, with amendments.

EXHIBIT 2

AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1967.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Following an executive session on May 12, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee is expected to favorably report S. 1352, a measure which, if enacted, would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to declare a certain number of silver certificates to be lost or destroyed and thus free for immediate sale the silver backing these certificates. The measure would also provide that, one year from the date of enactment of the Act, silver certificates could no longer be redeemed for silver.

The Senate Banking Committee has adopted an amendment to S. 1352 which would require the Secretary of the Treasury, from and after the date of enactment of the Act, to hold not less than 165 million fine troy ounces of silver for transfer to the National Stockpile.

As stated in our letter to you of April 28, Congressional action is needed directing the Secretary of the Treasury to fulfill the stockpile objective in order to assure by law that Treasury silver bullion stocks will not be exhausted before this objective is met. We, therefore, urge your support of this amendment.

Were the Treasury permitted to sell all of its present silver bullion at the bargain price of $1.29+ per ounce, it would then be forced to fulfill the stockpile objective at a considerably higher cost. The American Mining Congress believes that the silver remaining in the Treasury's possession at this time is a national asset and should not be disposed of in its entirety at the monetary value.

Your interest in this important matter is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. ALLEN OVERTON, Jr.,
Executive Vice President.

EXHIBIT 3

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, June 5, 1967.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Chairman,
Banking and Currency Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is understood that several amendments have been proposed to S. 1352, a bill, "To authorize adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates, and for other purposes."

These amendments are:

1. An amendment to require the immediate transfer to the national stockpile of 165 million ounces of silver.

2. An amendment providing that silver certificates shall be redeemable in silver for 3 years from the date of enactment of the legislation.

3. An amendment which would limit to $200 million the amount of silver certificates which the Secretary of the Treasury may determine have been destroyed or irretrievably lost, or are held in collections, and will never be presented for redemption.

The Treasury Department is strongly opposed to each of these amendments.

Any requirement for an immediate transfer of silver to the stockpile would be totally inconsistent with the basic purpose of the legislation which is to free an additional amount of silver. Our present stocks of free silver are less than 50 million ounces. It is contemplated that enactment of the proposed legislation in the form reported by your Committee would free an additional 116 million ounces. The combination of this 116 million ounces and the free silver which we can reasonably expect to hold when S. 1352 is enacted into law will be less than 165 million ounces. Therefore, it would be impossible for us to comply with a Congressional mandate to transfer immediately 165 million ounces to the stockpile. We will, of course, be in a position to do so at the expiration of one year after enactment of S. 1352, for at that time the Treasury silver stocks now required by law to be held as backing for silver certificates will be free.

S. 1352, as amended by your Committee, would require that we keep on hand during the next year 165 million ounces of silver and that we transfer it to the stockpile at the end of one year. These provisions will assure that this quantity is on hand available for use for military or essential civilian needs in case of war.

The amendment which would extend to 3 years the period in which silver certificates may be redeemed in silver is also objectionable. Another of the basic purposes of the legislation is to free for other purposes the remaining stocks of silver backing silver certificates. At the same time it is recognized that this should not be done without first affording the holders of silver certificates an opportunity to redeem them in silver if they desire to do so. One year is an entirely adequate period of time to allow for this purpose. There would be no logic in, and no justification for, extending the one year period to three years. This is particularly true now since silver certificates are likely to be traded at a premium.

A limitation of $200 million of the amount of silver certificates which could be written off by the Secretary of the Treasury would serve no useful purpose, but would anticipate without basis the experience which the Treasury Department might expect to have on the rate of redemption of silver certificates.

We strongly recommend that the Senate reject these amendments.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. BARR.

EXHIBIT 4

FACT SHEET ON S. 1352 BY THE SILVER USERS ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

S. 1352 authorizes adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates, and for other purposes. As introduced, it would:

1. Authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to write-off silver certificates he determines will never be presented for redemption (lost, destroyed, in collections), thereby freeing for productive uses the silver now held against those certificates; and,

2. Require holders of silver certificates who wish to take advantage of the Government's commitment to convert them to silver, to do so within one year. Thereafter, these certificates would continue to be legal tender, but not convertible to silver.

The Committee added two amendments:

1. *The Bennett Amendment*, which would require the Treasury to hold for one year, and then to turn over to the stockpiles established under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 165 million ounces of silver—the amount of the reserve for de-

---

[1] The coin report, week ending Apr. 28, 1967, follows:

COMBINED COIN INVENTORIES AT FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS AND MINTS

[Millions of pieces]

	As of Apr. 28, 1967	Corresponding week		
		1964	1965	1966
Halves	17.9	12.1	5.5	7.4
Quarters	1,798.9	44.1	41.1	352.0
Dimes	3,995.1	78.6	129.4	757.6
Nickels	1,127.9	20.5	182.5	1,147.7
Cents	574.4	78.6	784.5	792.0
Total	7,514.2	233.9	1,143.0	3,056.7

Source: Hearings on § 1008, p. 31.

fense purposes established by the Office of Emergency Planning under that Act; and,

2. *The Sparkman Amendment,* which would repeal the prohibition against the use of mint marks on coins.

The proposed legislation is one more step in the clearly defined policy of the Government to demonetize silver by eliminating its use as a reserve against paper money and in coinage. This change has been made necessary by the increasing shortage of silver and increasing requirements for silver as a commodity.

Failure to enact this legislation would lock up most of the Treasury's silver in the sterile form of currency reserves and would also impair the Treasury's flexibility in handling the transition to new coins. The Treasury must sell silver in order to keep the U.S. market price below the point where old coins will be withdrawn from circulation because of the value of their silver content.

Treasury stocks of May 26, 1967, were as follows:

	Million ounces
Silver backing silver certificates	428
Silver not required as backing (free)	56
Total	484

There is ample precedent for this legislation. Public Law 87-66, enacted on June 30, 1961, authorized similar adjustments in accounts of certain outstanding old series currency including silver certificates issued prior to July 1929.

The proposed legislation would not abrogate a contract with the American public and all holders of silver certificates. If silver certificates are destroyed or lost, there is no contract. If holders of certificates do not wish silver in exchange for certificates, there is no breach of contract.

Holders of silver certificates should not be able to speculate on the price of silver merely by holding these certificates indefinitely as warehouse receipts. It was never contemplated that the silver in our monetary system would be worth more as a commodity than the face value of a silver certificate or a silver coin.

Silver released by this legislation becomes a windfall profit to the Treasury, and it should be sold at its monetary value of $1.29 per ounce for the benefit of the consuming public and not at a higher price for the benefit of a special interest group.

Recent Treasury action in restricting sales of silver to domestic users, though necessary, has caused uncertainty about our gold policy. Cessation of silver sales to domestic users at the traditional price of $1.29 would intensify this uncertainty.

The world silver markets are now controlled by speculative pressures which have driven up the London price from $1.30 to $1.65 in two weeks. Producers and speculators are the beneficiaries.

Enactment of S. 1352 is urgently required in order to reduce the chaos now prevailing.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I wish to express my support for S. 1352, which should have been enacted weeks ago. Because it was not enacted earlier, the Treasury has been required to take other measures which have triggered speculation and disrupted the silver market throughout the world. On May 18, at 3:30 p.m., the Treasury suspended its sales of silver to buyers other than legitimate domestic firms using silver in their business. The Treasury also used the authority granted in the Coinage Act of 1965 to prohibit melting, treating, and exporting of silver bearing coins.

In my view, it is unfortunate that the Treasury was forced to take this action. It was unfortunate, because it was unexpected, and in such instances there are always some who are hurt. It was unfortunate because it did not result in an orderly movement from the controlled price to a world market price. It was unfortunate, because I doubt that the Treasury wanted to invoke these restrictions. On May 4, Under Secretary Barr said that the Treasury had not invoked export controls because it would have triggered "speculation that we have been trying so assiduously to avoid." In an answer to a prepared question, the Treasury added that such controls have not been considered necessary and that they would not be necessary so long as the price of silver can be expected to be below the melting point of silver coins. It was expected that the legislation before us today would be enacted in time to provide sufficient silver to avoid the direct controls that are difficult at best to administer and burdensome both to buyers and sellers.

Unfortunately, this was not the case. At the first meeting of the Coinage Commission on May 18, we were shown figures of orders for silver received by Federal Reserve banks. These are very revealing. Let me preface these figures with the fact that silver withdrawal from the Treasury for purposes other than coinage has averaged just under 13 million ounces a month during the period from January 1966 until April of this year. Orders received by the Federal Reserve banks for Treasury silver during the days immediately preceding the Treasury order of the 18th were as follows:

	Ounces
May 1	200, 000
May 2	610, 000
May 3	647, 000
May 4	4, 000
May 5	1, 942, 000
May 8	1, 969, 000
May 9	3, 411, 000
May 10	2, 723, 000
May 11	3, 598, 000
May 12	5, 767, 000
May 15	504, 000
May 16	4, 064, 000
May 17	5, 088, 000

On May 18, orders were received for 18 million ounces. Now let us see what the situation was that confronted the Treasury.

On the last day of April, free Treasury silver totaled 87,828,653.4 ounces. I do not know how many ounces had been ordered that did not show up on the daily statement since it takes a few days for orders to be completed. Even if there had been no orders on hand at that time, if those received up to and including May 18 are subtracted, we find that the Treasury would have had only 39.3 million ounces of free silver on that date, and at the rate of withdrawal during the first part of the month, that would not have been sufficient to maintain the price of silver even through the month of May. In fact, I suspect that the Treasury silver would not have even lasted another week. The Treasury would have been forced to stop selling silver and our silver coins would have disappeared. As was pointed out clearly in our recent hearings, the Treasury does not feel that it is ready for such possibility until the end of this year.

As has been pointed out by the chairman, the legislation has four major provisions, which are:

First. Authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to write off silver certificates which he determines will never be presented for redemption and thus free the silver now held against those certificates for other uses.

Second. Place a limit of 1 year on the period during which the Treasury will redeem silver certificates with silver. After that period, they will continue to be legal tender but not convertible to silver.

Third. Require the Treasury to maintain a stock of not less than 165 million ounces of silver for 1 year to be used if necessary for defense purposes. At the end of that period, the 165 million ounces would be turned over to the stockpiles established by the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

Fourth. Repeal the prohibition against mint marks on our coins and allow the mint to reintroduce the mint marks on our coins.

I approve all four of these provisions.

The major purpose of this legislation is to provide the Treasury with enough silver to permit it to assure an adequate supply of coins to meet the needs of commerce during the remainder of the coin transition. The additional silver would make it possible for the Treasury to maintain the price of silver at a level which would discourage the immediate withdrawal of silver coins.

This is another necessary step in the coinage transition and the removal of the Treasury from the dominant role in silver price determination. This process began on June 4, 1963, when Public Law 88–36 provided for the issuance of $1 and $2 Federal Reserve notes. There was opposition to that enactment, but let me point out that it was necessary. Since the 1963 act, over $1.4 billion in Federal Reserve notes provided for in the act have been issued, and this would have required over 1 billion ounces in silver backing if it had been necessary to provide this currency increase needed in commerce with silver certificates.

Just 2 years ago, we embarked upon a program to produce a new type of coinage. It was determined that our new dimes and quarters would not contain silver and that the silver content in the half dollar would be reduced to 40 percent. That change was necessary because of the great demand for silver for industrial uses and coinage uses, and the resulting rapid outflow of silver from the Treasury stocks presented us with a real crisis. It became evident that it would only be 2 or 3 years until the Treasury would no longer be able to hold the price of silver at $1.29 plus per ounce. While this in itself might not result in too much concern, the fact was that our subsidiary coinage contained an amount of silver which would make its intrinsic value as metal equal to a monetary value of $1.38 an ounce. If the Treasury had continued to mint only silver coins, in the numbers minted in the last 2 years, it would have required over 1 billion ounces of silver and we would have had no silver in the Treasury today, either "free" or that backing silver certificates, and all our coins would have been withdrawn from circulation. That we could not permit, and we were able to avoid it by the Coinage Act of 1965.

Since that time, the silver supply of the Treasury has continued to decline. The Treasury now has a balance of some 465 million ounces of silver in addition to that contained in the nearly 3 million silver dollars still held. There are, according to Treasury records, 550 million silver certificates outstanding which require about 425 million ounces of silver as a reserve. This leaves about 40 million ounces of "free" silver which can be used to maintain the price.

At rates of withdrawal just prior to the Treasury action of May 18, discontinuing sales to other than bona fide domestic users, we would have been completely out of free Treasury silver more than a week ago. Even with the restrictions on withdrawals, when sales already committed and the rates of new orders are considered, the 40 million ounces of silver remaining will only last for a very short period as users request silver to fill a 2-month inventory, and unless this legislation providing additional silver is enacted quickly, we will find ourselves in another crisis.

While the Treasury silver supply has been declining, the mint has been producing coins at an unprecedented rate in order to establish an inventory sufficient to meet foreseeable demands. In the past 2 years, nearly 8 billion coins have been produced, and present production schedules call for this to reach a total of 12 billion by the end of this year. In our recent hearings on this bill, the Treasury provided us with figures showing that there were about 7.5 billion coins on hand at Federal Reserve banks and mints. The coinage transition has developed very well thus far. Contrary to predictions, with which I did not agree when they were made, the new clad coins with far less intrinsic value than the silver-bearing coins have not driven the latter out of circulation. I should add, however, that the real test lies ahead. Under Secretary Barr testified before our Banking and Currency Committee that it may be that we now have enough coins in inventory to meet the need to replace silver coins in the event that the price is allowed to rise to a point at which they are removed from circulation for their metal content. He said that he could be certain that we would have enough, however, to meet any possible withdrawal that could be anticipated if we get through the forthcoming Christmas season demand.

I strongly feel that with the situation facing us today, the Treasury should be given the time which the Under Secretary testified is necessary to be sure that the coin inventory is sufficient to meet our needs. That would be made possible by the legislation before us today, which would allow the Secretary of the Treasury to determine and write off the number of silver certificates which in his judgment have been destroyed, lost, or held in collections or for some other reason would never be presented for redemption. Once this is done, the Treasury could reduce by an equivalent amount, the silver which is required by law as a reserve for such redemption. In other words, for every 1 dollar silver certificate which the Secretary determines will never be presented for redemption, .7734 of an ounce of silver would be freed for the Treasury to use as the Secretary may deem appropriate or dispose of at a price of not less than $1.29 an ounce.

The Under Secretary has said that the Treasury intends to write off 150 million certificates immediately. This would free 116 million ounces of silver for other use and bring to a total of 156 million ounces of free silver. The Under Secretary also testified that experience under this legislation would provide them with information on which to write off additional certificates if necessary, but he could see no rational basis for writing off more than an additional 100 million certificates. This would provide another 77 million ounces for a total of 233 million of free silver. This would leave 300 million outstanding silver certificates with a reserve of 230 million ounces of silver. The Under Secretary suggests that this silver would be available at the end of the year. During the year, however, some of the silver certificates will be brought in for redemption, and, in fact, it is my view that a large proportion of them may be brought in for redemption as the end of the year approaches beyond which they cannot be redeemed.

The Treasury has said that while no one knows the rate at which they will be presented, if we assume the present rate of 3 million ounces a month, it would require about 36 million ounces during the year.

To summarize, if 250 million certificates are written off leaving 300 million in certificates remaining together with the 230 million ounces of silver backing them and then another 36 million ounces are withdrawn for redemptions, that would leave approximately 194 million ounces of silver at the end of the year. I am of the strong opinion that these projected rates of redemption will prove unrealistically low. In other words, I am not at all convinced that without a specific requirement, there would be enough silver left at the end of 1 year to meet the stockpile objective set by the Office of Emergency Planning which requires 165 million ounces.

It was for this reason that I introduced an amendment to the bill which would require the Treasury to keep on hand at all times a minimum of 165 million ounces of silver and to transfer that amount to the national stockpile at the end of the year.

The amendment does not require the Treasury to transfer the 165 million ounces to a stockpile immediately when the bill goes into effect or to hold it in addition to any other legal requirements, because to do so, on the assumption that the Treasury will write off 150 million certificates upon enactment which is clearly their intent, would be impossible.

Let me explain why that is true. I have already shown that there is now only 40 million ounces of free silver in the Treasury. I may add that some of this is committed, but excluding any commitments, if we add the 40 million to 116 million ounces that would be freed by writing off 150 million silver certificates, we get a total of 156 million ounces of free silver. It is not difficult to see that one cannot set aside 165 million ounces if he has only 156 million at his disposal. Even if the Treasury were to write off 200 million certificates immediately, which they do not want to do until they have some experience under this legislation, the total free silver would amount to only 194 million ounces. If 165 million ounces were transferred immediately to a stockpile, that would leave only 29 million ounces of silver which the Treasury could use to maintain the price, and that is a worse situation than we are in at the present time. In other words, the whole purpose of this legislation would not only have been negated, but we would have 11 million fewer ounces of free silver than we have right now.

There is no doubt in my mind that 29 million ounces would not allow the Treasury the time needed to assure a reasonable tolerance of coin inventories necessary to meet the withdrawal that could occur when the price of silver is allowed to seek its own level in the marketplace.

I have disagreed with Treasury action in the past. I could not agree with past Treasury estimates for silver use, and time has proven my figures to be far more nearly correct, as the record shows. We must remember, however, that we are not talking about past mistakes or differences, and no useful purpose can come from such a discussion. We must face the problem that is now facing us regardless of what action has brought it about, and I, for one, am not in favor of measures which would make it difficult, if not impossible, for the Treasury to carry out its chief coinage responsibility.

The amendment which I introduced and which was accepted without a dissenting vote by the Banking and Currency Committee, would provide that at no time will the Treasury allow its silver supply to drop below 165 million ounces—the estimate of our defense needs established by the Office of Emergency Planning. I do not know anyone in this body who wants to jeopardize the security of this Nation through failure to assure the availability of silver that could be needed for defense purposes. This bill, as reported unanimously by the Senate Banking Committee, completely assures that such a supply will be available at all times. Not only was this method of providing for defense contingencies accepted by the Committee, but it also has the endorsement of the Treasury Department, the Silver Users Association, and the American Mining Congress. One could hardly ask for more than endorsement by all major groups concerned.

It has been suggested that this legislation is not in the best interest of silver producers. As the senior Senator from a State which has been second or third among the silver producing States of this Nation for the last 10 years, and one who has taken an active part in silver legislation during the nearly 17 years I have been representing the State of Utah, I do not feel that I need to yield to anyone in my efforts to assist the mining industry in its desire to be properly compensated for its production.

I have been in constant consultation with representatives of the silver producing industry, and let me repeat that this bill is endorsed by the American Mining Congress. Producers know very well that this legislation will not bring about a price rise as swiftly as could some other legislative proposals, but the responsible producers realize that they must look to a long term solution that is both in their interests and the interest of the country as a whole. They are to be commended for this approach. I am firmly convinced that this bill will operate in that spirit.

Now let me just briefly comment on the silver certificate redemption provision in this bill. One year is a reasonable period for us to set on redemption of silver certificates. This does not unduly restrict redemption privileges. The committee members considered both lengthening and shortening the period. There is some merit in even shortening the period as far as the Treasury is concerned. These certificates were never intended as warehouse receipts. Since the Treasury is obviously going to have to get out of the silver market soon, and the price will then rise, I see no real advantage in prolonging the time. Anyone holding silver certificates who desires silver will have the facts on which to base his hold or redeem decision long before the end of a year. He can either hold silver for its intrinsic value or retain silver certificates for their face value as a medium of exchange, but he cannot after the end of a year hold silver certificates for their silver redemption value.

I do not feel that the mint mark provision of the bill needs additional comment.

While this legislation allows the Treasury flexibility and is a necessary step, it leaves unanswered many problems regarding silver, coinage, and the Treasury's participation in the silver market. It is unfortunate, in my view, that the Joint Commission on the Coinage, provided for 2 years ago, was not set up and activated at that time because helpful recommendations could have been forthcoming by this time, which might have helped us through this current problem. As it was, the first meeting of the Commission was held on May 18—the very day on which the Treasury Department had to institute its rather drastic controls over the marketing of silver.

At our first meeting, some of the remaining problems were discussed.

Among the many other matters that face the Commission, I feel that perhaps most important is the charge given in the 1965 act to study and make recommendations concerning "the time when and circumstances under which the United States should cease to maintain the price of silver." That time has already come, so far as a world price is concerned.

I am sure that we are rapidly approaching that time for the price of silver in this country. Everyone admits that the Treasury outflow is the only factor holding the price of silver at its present low level. The Wall Street Journal of May 18, 1967, reported that the Mexican Government has asked the United States to end its restriction on the world price of silver. That was done by the May 18 Treasury action. The ceiling price remaining within this country can be justified only if it is necessary to allow the Treasury to fulfill other responsibilities which outweigh the cost. Treasury silver represents an investment by the American people, and it should not be unnecessarily dissipated. I, therefore, feel that it is the responsibility of the Treasury to maintain a ceiling for domestic users only so long as is necessary for coin production, and at the earliest possible moment, plans should be put into effect which would conserve any remaining silver and bring about an orderly transition from the present controlled market to a market in which price will be determined by supply and demand.

In a major speech on the subject nearly 2 years ago, I suggested that the transition to a free market could occur in 1968. Many of the facts we have today were, of course, unknown then. The Under Secretary has suggested that so far as coinage requirements are concerned, this could begin at the first of next year.

In conclusion, let me state that I supported this legislation when it was before the committee. I support it now, because it is necessary; but, at the same time, I still urge the Treasury to take every possible step to remove itself from the silver market as soon as possible.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am glad that the bill before us now, S. 1352, reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, requires that the Treasury Department has to hold for 1 year, and then turn over to the stockpiles established under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 165 million ounces of silver, before more silver is released.

The amendment which requires that this be done was offered in committee by my senior colleague from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and I commend him for this action. It is absolutely essential that our silver stockpiles be preserved.

Some weeks ago I appeared before the committee to urge that action be taken, and today I support it strongly.

The bill, as introduced, provided that the silver freed by the provisions of the bill be sold to industry at $1.29 an ounce. But then, when the inevitable day arrives when the U.S. Treasury runs out of its silver reserve, and the price of silver goes up, the country will be left without sufficient silver to mint half dollars and meet our defense stockpile objectives. Then we would be forced to buy silver in the market at substantially higher prices than we are selling it for now. The difference, of course, would come out of the taxpayer's pocket. This I oppose, so I gladly support the Bennett amendment.

I prefer that the 165 million ounces be transferred immediately to the defense stockpile, rather than a year from now.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am going to give the Senator that chance. I am going to offer an amendment for that very purpose.

Mr. MOSS. I shall support such an amendment.

If it is a desirable objective to stockpile silver, I see no reason why it should not be reserved now rather than a year from now.

I also will gladly support the amendment which I understand the Senator from Colorado will offer which provides that the Treasury Department shall transfer not less than 165 million ounces of silver. We must make sure that at least this amount of silver is transferred.

I am convinced that as soon as the silver is put in the stockpile, the price of silver will jump to seek the market level.

I support the bill today with the proposed amendments.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I take the floor to make some basic statements about the bill as a whole and also about the silver situation in particular. In order that my colleagues may know what I have in mind, I intend to call up my amendment No. 203 after my speech. I will then ask for a live quorum, and then the yeas and nays. Depending on the outcome of the vote on amendment No. 203, I may or may not offer amendment No. 204. I am hopeful that the committee will accept that amendment without having to carry it through to a rollcall vote.

Mr. President, as Senators well know, I have stated my concern over the present silver crisis on numerous occasions during the past 8 months. I have delivered three speeches on the floor of the Senate since February 8, and I appeared before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency last month to again express my concern and alarm over the silver dilemma now confronting this Nation.

I have a deep conviction concerning this issue, and while undoubtedly the bill will pass the Senate, more or less as reported, I would like to once again point out a few of the critical problems which have caused some of us such great concern.

Three extremely significant things have happened since my last speech on the silver situation.

First, there has been a fantastic reduction in our free silver reserves. Consumers and speculators have been purchasing our Treasury reserves as a hedge against a sharp price increase, which was certainly predictable under our present silver policy. Our yearend free reserve of silver for 1966 was 154,960,777 ounces. By January 27 of this year, it had dropped to 135,153,027 ounces, by March 10 to 112,979,825 ounces, and by April 28 to approximately 89.8 million ounces. From April 28 through May 17, counting pending orders, the total had dropped to only 54.5 million ounces. Today it is estimated the Treasury has only between 40 and 45 million ounces of free silver.

This is a fantastic drop, and it has occurred because of the unwillingness of the Treasury to take steps to face up to the crisis which was apparent as long ago as early 1965.

Second, the Treasury on May 18, issued

a set of regulations which were necessary as a crisis measure, but which should have been issued 2 years earlier. The Treasury Department on that date issued regulations discontinuing sales of silver to any buyers other than legitimate domestic concerns which use silver in their business, and prohibiting the melting, treatment, and export of silver coins.

At this point I should like to cite a statement made by Under Secretary of Treasury Barr, testifying before the committee, which can be found on page 66 of the hearing, which dealt with this very subject. It occurred on May 4, 1967. Mr. Barr was asked what would happen if it appeared that the Treasury reserve would go below the 165 million ounces which admittedly we need for defense.

Mr. Barr said, on May 4:

> I would say, sir, that if it looks as though we were going below 165 million ounces, we would use some of the extraordinary authority that is granted to us in the Coinage Act of 1965. We have the authority to prohibit melting, treating, or export of coins, and we would certainly consider using this authority, although we are reluctant, extremely reluctant to get in this area of controls unless it is absolutely necessary. If it appeared that we were going to fall below 165 million ounces as of the target date, we would certainly consider seriously using some of these extraordinary measures.

It is interesting that, after emphasizing his reluctance to issue regulations on May 4, the Treasury only 2 weeks later issued the regulations. As we have pointed out previously, we think the Treasury should have done it 2 years ago, in order to try to maintain some fluid balance in our Treasury reserve.

Finally, the President announced the appointment of the eight public members of the Joint Commission on the Coinage.

I will comment further on these three developments in the course of my remarks.

The most critical problem confronting us is that this Government may not have enough silver to meet its legal, moral, and defense obligations to the people. This Government clearly has at least three specific obligations which it must in good faith fulfill:

First. It must provide at least 165 million ounces of silver for the defense stockpile;

Second. It must make certain there is enough silver to redeem outstanding silver certificates during the period allowed for redemption;

Third. It must continue to provide silver for coinage.

On May 4, a month ago, Under Secretary Barr, in presenting testimony on this bill, stated that we had $555 million in silver certificates outstanding, backed by 430 million ounces of silver. The bill as written provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time, at his option, "write off" the amount of silver certificates which he feels in his judgment have been destroyed or unretrievably lost or held in collections. The Secretary of the Treasury has stated that he intends to immediately write off $150 million in certificates which is backed by approximately 116 million ounces of silver.

This will free the 116 million ounces of silver and as the bill is now written, it is safe to assume that all or most of this silver will be sold to domestic consumers at $1.29 per ounce. I might say parenthetically that if we add the 116 million ounces that will be free to the 40 million or 45 million ounces of free silver we have now, we will have not quite enough to establish the stockpile that we need at this point in history.

This would then leave approximately $400 million worth of silver certificates backed by only 314 million ounces of silver. However, under the bill, 165 million ounces of silver must be retained for the national defense stockpile, leaving only 149 million ounces of monetized silver which could in fact be used for redeeming silver certificates. This would standing silver certificates are redeemed mean that if only one-half of the outduring the year allowed for redemption under the bill, the Treasury simply will not have adequate silver to honor the redemption. Presumably, the Treasury would have to refuse to redeem certificates contrary to law, or buy silver on the open market at a premium price.

However, it does not stop there. Should the Secretary of the Treasury decide arbitrarily to write off additional certificates, he may do so at his own discretion.

The fallacy here is, of course, that the Secretary of the Treasury is only guessing at the number of certificates lost or destroyed and there is no definitive measure for assessing the number of certificates that will be redeemed once a deadline for redemption is established.

The third obligation—coinage—has been totally ignored by this bill and by the Treasury. In the first quarter of this year, 14,368,000 ounces of silver was used in coinage. If the present rate of usage were to continue, by the end of the year the Treasury would have consumed over 57 million ounces for coinage—only slightly more than consumed for that purpose last year. The Treasury has an obligation under existing law to produce half dollars with 40 percent silver—but where is the silver to come from? The fact is that our last prestige coin may well be on its way to elimination, and we might as well be prepared to face that fact right now. Predictably, the Treasury will let the current silver crisis worsen, and then make its case for the total elimination of all silver from all coins.

The Treasury feels confident that there will be few redemptions of certificates during the year. As I have said, this is based totally on an assumption. In my judgment they are wrong. But right or wrong, the Treasury is embarking on a dangerous gamble.

With all due respect, this administration has an amazingly accurate record of being totally wrong in forecasting developments in silver and coinage. In 1963, the Treasury told us that if we would pass H.R. 5389, and I was sitting on the committee during that period, we would be assured of an adequate supply of silver for coinage for at least 10 to 15 years. They only missed their guess by 8 to 13 years. The silver crisis averted by the 1963 act had come back to haunt us by 1965. The administration then promised that, if we passed the Coinage Act of 1965, we would have an adequate supply of silver to get through the transition period from silver to clad coins. President Johnson stated in his message relative to coinage—

> We believe our present stocks of silver to be adequate once the large present drains from coinage are greatly reduced, to meet any foreseeable requirements for an indefinite period.

So the Coinage Act of 1965 was passed and our coins were debased, with assurances that the silver crisis of 1965 was the crisis to end all crises.

To make a long story short we are now face to face with our usual and predictable biannual June silver crisis. The administration is, as usual, optimistic and full of promise. Under Secretary Barr speaking for the administration states at page 63 of the hearings:

> I think that the specter that Senator Dominick is raising that we will end up without enough silver to transfer to the stockpile, is, in my candid opinion, sir, unrealistic. In my best judgment we will end up with something between 230 and 270 million ounces of silver.

This statement was, of course, made prior to the Bennett amendment, but I would submit that with or without the Bennett amendment, the amount of silver left in our reserves will very likely be considerably less than this year's biannual "guess" made by the administration, if in fact we have any silver left at all, which I doubt.

The present silver crisis has unfortunately been precipitated by a series of omissions by the administration. These omissions have resulted from what I consider, in a charitable mood, an incredible amount of bad judgment. After stumbling from silver crisis to silver crisis, the administration was given an opportunity with the passage of the Coinage Act of 1965 to extricate itself from its embarrassing position. Unfortunately, the administration failed to take advantage of the opportunity given it by the act.

First, the President failed to appoint the eight public members of the Commission though he was given this authority in the Coinage Act of 1965 signed into law in July 1965. This, in my judgment, was the most crucial of the series of omissions committed by the administration. Had the Commission been promptly appointed, the legislation now before us may well have been completely unnecessary. The Commission could have at once commenced a study of our coinage supply, the time when and under what circumstances the United States should cease to maintain the price of silver and other appropriate matters. Instead, our silver policy has been allowed to drift along into another crisis.

The President's failure to appoint the Commission represents, I might add, a broken pledge, because in his 1965 message on coinage, the President stated:

> The Commission will be appointed soon after the new coinage is issued.

The appointments were not made until May of 1967.

Second, the Treasury was given the authority in the 1965 act to promulgate the regulations they finally issued May 18, 1967. The earlier promulgation of these regulations would have eliminated the fear of the melting of our silver coinage 2 years ago, and, might I say, have at least minimized our present crisis.

Third, the administration has done little to encourage new silver production in the United States, though this is admittedly tied in with the controlled price.

I would submit that the fourth serious omission has been the failure to maintain the peak production of our clad coins during the transition period, if we assume for the moment, as the Treasury does, that we are still in the transition period. Congress was told that until the transition period was complete, the mints would operate on a crash basis of 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. But last November, 7 months ago, the Mint eliminated the crash program and went from a 7-day week to a 5-day week. Under Secretary Barr stated when testifying on this bill that on June 30 the Mint will further reduce its production from a 5-day, three-shift basis to a 5-day, two-shift basis. Yet, it is the shortage of these coins which the Treasury is using as an excuse for pointing out that we need this legislation and cannot afford at the present time to allow the price of silver to go up.

Despite this, the Treasury now says that we must still protect our silver coinage with this legislation because they are not certain whether we have enough clad coins. To cut production of clad coins on the one hand and to ask for legislation on the other hand to protect our silver coinage is patently inconsistent and borders on the ridiculous.

In fact, whether the legislation is necessary is predicated on the fact that we need to further protect our silver coinage. I would emphasize that the fact that the mint has reduced production can only be considered as evidence of an adequate coin supply or, at least, some evidence of an inconsistency in viewpoint.

I submitted other evidence in my earlier speeches which lead me to the conclusion that we have an adequate clad coin supply. Under Secretary Barr gave some very interesting testimony on this point at the hearings. I read from page 61:

> Senator BENNETT. The way I read these figures—and I may be wrong—is that the coin crisis has largely been met and that your crash production of 7.8 billion of coins has very largely gone into inventory?
>
> Mr. BARR. That is correct, sir. That is correct.
>
> Senator BENNETT. How long has it been since you started to circulate these new coins? When did you start circulating them?
>
> Mr. BARR. In November 1965, Senator Bennett.
>
> Senator BENNETT. So we have gone 17 months and no crisis has developed which has effectively pulled on your manufacturing since that time?
>
> Mr. BARR. That is correct, sir. And because we realize this fact, as Miss Adams has testified, we shifted from a 7-day week to a 5-day week, and starting on June 30, Senator Bennett, we will shift from a 3-shift to a 2-shift operation in the production of our coins.
>
> Senator BENNETT. The thing I am getting at is that, according to your estimate, you have got to go 7 months more before you think you are safely through the crisis, so maybe your figure represents an unwarranted concern.
>
> Mr. BARR. That might be correct, Senator Bennett, and I will only admit that I am being supercautious and superconservative. However, I will submit, sir, that I had the traumatic experience of living through the holiday season of 1965 when we simply did not know whether there were going to be enough quarters to keep the commerce of the United States flowing.

I point out here that the holiday season of 1965 was before we started putting the new clad coins into any kind of real production. We now have them in production and have an inventory. Yet, we are trying to say that we need still further production in order to justify the position of the Treasury.

Despite the way in which we have blundered into our present dilemma, I finally see some reason for optimism on the part of our silver producers. The Government will unquestionably soon be out of the silver business and presumably silver will be allowed to seek its own level in the marketplace. Unfortunately, this will have resulted out of necessity rather than through an affirmative, well reasoned silver policy.

In my judgment the bill still has at least three serious deficiencies.

First, the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], which is certainly far better than anything submitted by the Treasury, is still inadequate. The Bennett amendment provides for the setting aside of 165 million ounces at the end of the year.

If we are going to do it at the end of the year, we might as well do it now. If we have retained 165 million ounces, regardless of whether the certificates are open for redemption alone, we have in effect set them aside and might as well go through with it.

Second, the limitation on the number of silver certificates that can be written off is entirely at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

I do not feel that we should give the Secretary of the Treasury such unlimited power, without review by Congress or anybody else, involving $555 million in silver certificates still outstanding in the hands of the public. To give any man in any agency or party the right to say: "We are not going to live up to our obligations on this," is the wrong method, as far as I am concerned, by which to go forward in an orderly governmental process.

The third thing that I think is wrong with this is the short term that is provided for redemption. The period of redemption should be extended from 1 to 3 years. If we do that, we will not have the intense desire of people who hold silver certificates to bring them in for redemption.

We will have a real rush on the redemption of silver certificates the minute this bill is passed. If we have a little longer time, we can space this out to a considerable degree.

Mr. President, I do not know whether any other Senator is going to speak on the pending bill. However, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and shall then offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 124 Leg.]

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Clark
Cotton
Dominick
Griffin
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Hollings
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
Metcalf
Miller
Montoya
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Prouty
Scott
Sparkman
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Brooke
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
McIntyre
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell
Smathers
Smith
Spong
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Yarborough

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 58) to provide for the reappointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 3973) to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the Act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 3973) to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADJUSTMENTS IN OUTSTANDING SILVER CERTIFICATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1352) to authorize adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 203

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 203 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment offered by Mr. DOMINICK is as follows:

On page 2, beginning with line 17, strike out all through line 2, on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer not less than one hundred and sixty-five million fine troy ounces of silver from the Department of the Treasury's silver holdings to the stockpiles established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY A GROUP OF PARLIAMENTARIANS FROM THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, we have the honor and great pleasure today to have visiting us a group of parliamentarians from the Dominican Republic. They are with us now in the Chamber. They took office about a year and a half ago in the Dominican Republic. They are representatives of our sister State in the Western Hemisphere.

It is my great privilege at this time to present this group of parliamentarians, as well as the Ambassador from the Dominican Republic, to Senators now in attendance here.

I ask this distinguished group of parliamentarians to rise and step forward.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess for 5 minutes, in order that Senators may greet our friends from the Dominican Republic.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.

At 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m., on the expiration of the recess, the Senate reconvened, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair).

ADJUSTMENTS IN OUTSTANDING SILVER CERTIFICATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1352) to authorize adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators now in the Chamber, let me say that I shall not take very long to speak on the amendment, because it is a relatively simple one. I shall take perhaps 5 to 10 minutes to explain it. Perhaps other Senators may wish to talk on it, including members of the committee. I shall be as brief as I can.

Mr. President, although I congratulate the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] on the amendment which he included in the bill, it seems to me that it does not go far enough.

Some time ago, when we had a previous discussion on the need for doing something about silver, the distinguished majority leader and myself, together with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and my colleague [Mr. ALLOTT] discussed at that point the need to set aside a stockpile reserve of silver for defense purposes.

At that very moment, while we were discussing it on the floor, the Treasury Department sent a letter to the distinguished majority leader in which it indicated it would hold aside for defense purposes, the necessary amount of 165 million ounces, which is a 3-year stockpile of silver.

This was subject to ifs, ands, and buts and, as a result, they said it was simply a policy and not any kind of real commitment.

In October of last year, former Governor Bryant, head of the Office of Emergency Planning, sent a letter to the Treasury Department saying, "Your free silver reserves are getting very low. We would like to have some indication from you that you are in fact going to keep 165 million ounces of silver for defense purposes." Again, another if, and, and but letter, complete with assurances.

We have only 40 million to 45 million ounces of free silver available for any kind of use at the present minute. We do not have nearly enough in terms of free silver to be able to supply the needs of this country for defense purposes at a time when we are already engaged in one war in Southeast Asia and are faced with this cataclysmic eruption in the Middle East besides.

Let me say to all Senators that it is a mistake when we have an opportunity to do something about it, not to grasp that opportunity in our hands, as nettlesome as it may be.

The present proposal of the committee, as proposed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], is that we keep in the Treasury stock 165 million ounces, and set it aside next year. What for? Why hold it in the Treasury when we need it right now for defense stockpile purposes? Why hold it 1 year and then say we will go forward and add it to the stockpile?

What will happen if the Treasury finds itself faced with a situation where it is going to have to use the silver for redemption of silver certificates or violate this law? That is what the law says and the Treasury will be in a position where it will have to break one or the other commitment. If there is a drain from the silver certificates, which most of us anticipate, the result will be that we may find ourselves in a position where we do not have enough silver to set up the stockpile reserve at the end of the year or go out on the open market and buy silver to redeem certificates. I do not want to place myself in that position.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand the position of the Senator from Colorado, who comes from a mining State, but I come from a consuming and user State, where thousands of people are engaged in industry which has need for this silver. I am suggesting that our defense needs should come first, but, on the other hand, if the Senator is wrong in his assumption, we run the risk that we may deprive thousands of people of the opportunity for employment.

We must keep in mind that the silver will be transferred a year from today. One of the pressures involved is that it must be held to $1.29 an ounce. If it is transferred a year from now, is that not a requirement to transfer it at $1.29?

Mr. DOMINICK. In reply to the distinguished Senator, there are several comments I wish to make. First, with respect to the statement that the Senator comes from a user State, and not from a producing State, as I come from—incidentally, our State is fourth in line in production—the question is whether we are going to have enough silver available for defense. This is more important that the State from which we come.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that.

Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. It is more important to have it for defense of the country than to determine whether we are going to have a certain amount of increase in the price.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I will yield as soon as I am through. If we find ourselves engaged in an all-out struggle in the Middle East, which I hope we will not—that is, I hope we will find some method of preserving peace—we may find ourselves in a position where we will need the silver immediately, and not a year from today.

Now I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. No one disagrees with the Senator. All of us know that the administration is also interested in that question. All I am saying is that if the Senator from Colorado is wrong in his assumption, and it means many people are thrown out of jobs, then we have done nothing to insure the defense needs of our country, and at the same time we will have put a lot of people out of employment. We have a duty to think about them.

Mr. DOMINICK. If I am wrong, we would simply be carrying out what the committee has said we should have done for some time. If I am wrong, we would be carrying out a plan which it has urged for years. If I am wrong, we will not have done any harm; we would merely have withdrawn silver which the taxpayers have paid for and set it aside for defense needs of the country, and not require the Treasury to buy silver at much higher prices, at the expense of the taxpayer, and still find ourselves short of silver.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield. I am always happy to engage in colloquies with the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Was not that argument made before the committee?

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not true that the committee reported the bill unanimously?

Mr. DOMINICK. Absolutely.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not possible the Senator from Colorado could be wrong?

Mr. DOMINICK. Absolutely. There is also a chance that the Senator from Rhode Island is wrong.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, but I had the unanimous action of the committee behind me, and I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. DOMINICK. All I can say is that the Treasury was wrong in 1963. It was again wrong in 1965. I do not feel that the Treasury Department was right in recognizing that we have a defense need, but leaving it up in the air and not dealing with the problem in a positive way in order to safeguard the best interests of our country. This is the reason why I brought this issue before the Senate. All I say is, if we can do it a year from now, why not do it now? If we are in a period of crisis, there is nothing wrong with acting now. If we set aside this amount, we have taken care of our primary need, which is the defense of the country.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. First, I want to commend the Senator for a position which I think is a sound one. I would suggest the Treasury has been wrong on every single estimate it has given us, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. It seems to me at the time we argued this problem in 1961, 1963, and 1965, the Treasury said we had sufficient silver stocks to run for something like 10 or 12 years. Is that correct?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. Was that a correct prediction of things to come?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Treasury was incorrect from 8 to 13 years, depending on which position one takes.

Mr. BIBLE. I am willing to give the Department the benefit of the doubt by saying it said we had enough for 10 years. I know the Treasury officials said that, somewhere along the way.

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes.

Mr. BIBLE. We now have from 45 million to 50 million ounces of free silver and less than 500 million ounces back of the silver certificates. Is that correct?

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes.

Mr. BIBLE. That drains down at what rate per month?

Mr. DOMINICK. It is draining at such an increased extent that it is hard to forecast accurately, but at the beginning of the year, in terms of free silver, we had 155 million ounces, and we have lost 100 million ounces of silver since then.

Mr. BIBLE. In the last 5 months we have lost 100 million ounces of silver?

Mr. DOMINICK. Of free silver.

Mr. BIBLE. Of free silver. Where did that go?

Mr. DOMINICK. It went to the users; it went to the very people the Senator from Rhode Island was talking about.

I have no objection to that, but I object to having them get it from the Treasury when they could buy it on the open market, while we could be setting it aside as a defense stockpile.

Mr. BIBLE. Is it not correct that in May of this year the Treasury Department put into effect export regulations which were provided for in an amendment that we lost here on the floor in 1965.

Mr. DOMINICK. It was the Senator from Nevada who offered that amendment. Now, on May 28, the Treasury put those provisions in effect by regulation.

Mr. BIBLE. I think the Treasury followed by regulation many of the provisions we offered to place in the statute, but unsuccessfully. Had that amendment been passed, we would have at least protected some of the exportation of silver overseas.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. Many million ounces have been exported overseas. I am happy to see some of the free silver go to Rhode Island and Connecticut to keep employment up there, but I cannot envision the catastrophe which the very distinguished Senator from Rhode Island envisions. I do not think this is going to wipe out the silver users and fabricators, even if the price goes up a bit? Would it?

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not see how it could. The price of silver on the London market was at approximately $1.55 last week. If our domestic price goes up, we shall probably still not have a price high enough to increase production substantially, but it will be more in keeping with the world market and international trade.

I would assume that silver users could buy silver like anybody else, instead of having the taxpayers pay for their silver.

Mr. BIBLE. I agree with that observation. It seems to me that the era of bargain prices of silver may well be over, and they may have to go to the free market for their raw product, just as others must depend on the free market for raw materials.

I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Colorado. I support his amendment. I think it is a good amendment. I thought it was a good amendment 2 years ago, and, if anything, I think it is even a better amendment now, because it has been graphically illustrated that what we were predicting 2 years ago has been accelerated even beyond our expectations, and, if anything, the situation is more critical now than it was then.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his support.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If this silver is released, is it to be released over a gradual period of time, or does the authority lie with those in control to dispose of it when their discretion dictates?

Mr. DOMINICK. We have several different types of situations. The so-called free silver, which is the amount of silver not needed to back silver certificates, can be sold by the Treasury to anybody at any time they feel like it. Therefore, it can go out the window very rapidly.

Now they are placing a limit on the time during which silver certificates may be redeemed. They are saying that since some of them will not be redeemed, there is available additional silver which can be sold at $1.29, to prevent coins from being melted down. But now they have passed regulations prohibiting that, in any event, so there is no danger; at least violation is subject to a criminal penalty. But we still have no reserve. That is the problem.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much do we have in the defense reserve?

Mr. DOMINICK. We do not have any at the present time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much has been calculated to be needed?

Mr. DOMINICK. One hundred and sixty-five million ounces.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the argument of the Senator from Colorado that unless we impound, at this time, silver to meet our defense needs, we may at a later date have to begin buying it at a price far in excess of what we pay for it now?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is exactly correct. I thank the Senator from Ohio for putting it so succinctly and clearly.

I might add, at that point, that there is some question as to whether or not we could even find the silver on the market to buy at such time, because consumption is far greater than production.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us assume that we do not earmark silver for defense purposes at this time, and the defense need later becomes acute. The Government then would have to go out and buy it.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is the present situation. That is correct. That is what I am trying to cure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us assume that we impound it now, and it becomes available but is not needed for defense purposes. What, if any, prejudice will the Government suffer?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Government would suffer no prejudice at all, because we could then declare it surplus to our defense needs, and it would be issued on the market.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that the Senator from Colorado takes the position that the danger of loss to the Government is greater through failure to impound than it would be through impounding?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is absolutely correct. In addition, I feel——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there a scarcity of silver today?

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes, very definitely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is that why the release of silver has been urged?

Mr. DOMINICK. Silver consumption is many times production at the present time. A part of the reason for such condition is the releases out of the Treasury into the open market, which prevent the price from going up. The silver being released is from the stockpile we have acquired over a period of time under the Silver Purchase Act. They keep releasing it on the open market, on the ostensible ground that it is to prevent coins from being melted down for their silver content.

We do not have any coins with silver content now except the 50-cent pieces, under the 1965 Coinage Act; and under the prohibitions just adopted on May 15, they have eliminated that argument, because now it is a felony to melt down or do anything with coins.

Therefore, it seems to me that the justification given for such action has long since passed, and we are now in a position to take 165 million ounces of silver and set it aside for emergency needs, as the Office of Emergency Planning has stated that we should.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we release silver periodically for the purpose of keeping the price of silver down, and in the end we release all of our silver, will there not arise a situation where the cost, because of the scarcity of silver, will fall heavily upon the U.S. Government, and therefore upon the taxpayers?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is absolutely correct, to whatever extent the Government finds itself under the need to buy new silver in the market. It would then be at a very highly increased price to the taxpayers and to the country. That is another reason why I think the 165 million ounces should be set aside right now, to avoid that risk.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now, to put the opposite side of the question, is it advisable, at present, to release the silver so as to keep the price stable? If it is not advisable, why is it not?

Mr. DOMINICK. The purpose of the bill is to try to have an orderly release of Government interference in the silver market. The bill, in general, along that line, envisages, as I see it, two or three things. First, it envisages cutting off the ability to redeem silver certificates with silver. Those certificates are already outstanding, in the hands of people all over this country, and have been since 1920. Such action, therefore, would permit more silver to be released into the market at a later date.

But no matter what we do here, within a year and a half the Treasury will have no silver, and at that point, no matter what we do, the silver price will go up. So we are talking in terms of a matter of timing, more than anything else. My purpose in this amendment is to make sure that we set aside and hold for defense the amount of silver we have obtained at relatively low cost, when we need that stockpile for defense, and when we do not know whether, at the end of a year, we will have enough silver available to set it aside.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. First of all, Mr. President, I congratulate my colleague upon the statement he has made, and also upon the introduction of this amendment. He has been farsighted in this area.

The amendment which he has offered today is not a sudden inspiration as the result of the consideration of this bill on the floor, because he has advocated exactly this step for several years, and he foresaw what almost everybody eventually acknowledged was coming.

I do not think we can emphasize too greatly the fact that unless we set aside, in this very critical time, some silver for our national defense and our national needs, we may be in grave danger.

If the silver had not, in effect, been controlled by the Treasury Department—will the Senator not agree with me—the price of silver would have risen a long time before now?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. And if the price of silver had risen a long time before now, we would not have such a shameful and crying need for silver at this time.

Mr. DOMINICK. That statement is also correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. In the past few years the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have met with representatives of nearly every department of the Government, including the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget. We have been able to arouse no interest in the production of 2 commodities so important to our monetary system—gold and silver. I will not go into the gold question.

I recall that 2 years ago the present Secretary of the Treasury testified that we were in no danger whatever of having Gresham's law operate after the introduction of phony coinage. I call it phony because that is what it is.

The present Secretary of the Treasury also testified this spring that instead of approximately $4 billion in seigniorage by way of the silver that came back in the coins, the seigniorage to the Government would amount to $2 billion.

It merely illustrates again how wrong the Treasury Department can be and has been in dealing with our valuable metals in this country because people keep the silver coins.

While we still pick one up occasionally—I picked one up yesterday and have it in my pocket—the bogus and phony coinage that we now have is driving the silver out of the market.

It seems to me that, while they anticipate a great rush of redemptions on the silver certificates, I would not be surprised in the least if Gresham's law were to come into operation in a secondary sense and people would not rush to redeem them but rather would continue to retain them as they have in the past.

It is impossible to get the silver certificates today. I think that people who have them will keep them as collector's items.

We would, therefore, get an effect opposite to that which was expected.

Getting down to the basics of this matter, it seems to me that the approach my colleague has taken—and in which he has taken the leadership again and again ever since he has been in the Senate—is the only sound one.

I am not unsympathetic with my friend, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. I know his people have to eat. However, the fact is that if the silver fabricators do have to pay a little more for their silver, the people who buy sterling in the marketplace—knives, forks, spoons, and so forth—are simply going to have to pay a higher price for it.

If I felt that we would completely debilitate the industry, I would feel differently about this matter.

I do not think there is any question that unless we do have a set-aside here, within a year or a year and a half—and this will depend a lot upon our national situation—the United States will have to go into the open market and pay a much higher price for silver.

I think the Senator has really performed a great service to the Senate and to the country. I believe that it would be a most unfortunate thing if we were not to take advantage of this opportunity to agree to the amendment of my colleague.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the support of the Senator. I know that the Senator has been helpful all the way through.

I think it is of interest, and I do want to repeat this, that if as many as one-half of the outstanding silver certificates should be submitted for redemption, we would not have enough silver on hand at the end of the year to be able to set aside 165 million ounces of silver. That is why we should do it now and then see what happens to the redemption problem.

I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Colorado where the 165 million troy ounces would come from. I understand there are only 50 million ounces of free silver available to the Treasury. Where would the balance come from?

Mr. DOMINICK. The balance would come from the amount of silver that we would free up by declaring that a certain number of certificates have been lost or mutilated or would never be submitted for redemption.

Mr. MILLER. What would that action do as far as the price is concerned?

Mr. DOMINICK. That amount would be freed up and under my amendment, if it is agreed to, it would be immediately set aside as a reserve for stockpile purposes. Also, the silver would be needed for the redemption of certificates.

This is the crux of the point I am trying to make. The problem is that we do not have enough silver.

Mr. MILLER. I understand that some people have a problem on price and that within the last couple of weeks the price has gone up about 35 cents an ounce in the world market.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLER. This is of concern to some of the silver users in my State.

Mr. DOMINICK. It will go up more than that because we do not have enough silver under production to establish and take care of the demand for it.

The only way in which it has been held down at the moment is by the distribution of silver which the taxpayers have paid for and which the Treasury Department has been shooting out into the market as though it were from the private silver users' mine. I do not know how long they have been doing this, but they have been doing it for at least 4 years to my personal knowledge.

Mr. MILLER. If the price is going to go up, will it not go up even more if we take the silver that is freed and put it in a stockpile, isolated from the market, rather than let the silver be available for market needs.

Mr. DOMINICK. It probably will tighten down the screws on the price situation some because it will take 165 million ounces out of the total we presently have and provide that it would be used for defense.

This is what the Office of Emergency Planning has said we need. This is exactly what everybody has indicated we need. In the interest of keeping the price down for the silver users, I am not disposed—and I know the Senator from Iowa is not disposed—to say that we will not take care of the defense needs of this country.

To enlarge on the statement a little, by the middle of next year it will not make any difference what we do here. The price is bound to go up.

Mr. MILLER. Can the Senator tell us how many troy ounces of silver are now in stockpile?

Mr. DOMINICK. There is none in the stockpile. That is the problem. There is no stockpile of silver for defense purposes at the present time.

Mr. MILLER. How long has that been the case?

Mr. DOMINICK. That has been the case to my personal knowledge since 1964. I do not know how long that was true prior to that time.

It was at that time that we started talking about this. I brought the matter up with the distinguished majority leader. The Office of Emergency Planning established an objective of 165 million ounces in 1965.

Mr. MILLER. Do I correctly understand that the pending bill, without any amendment, does provide for some transfer to the stockpile?

Mr. DOMINICK. The pending bill does not provide for any transfer until the end of the year.

It exercises a restriction on the Treasury and provides that they have to hold in the Treasury 165 million ounces.

So, it does the same thing. However, it does not transfer it to Defense until the end of the year. That is the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. MILLER. If we got along without any silver in reserve in 1965, another 4 or 5 months will not make any critical difference.

Mr. DOMINICK. That may be the opinion of the Senator from Iowa. I do not feel that is true in view of the needs for Defense and in view of the fact that we are faced with an explosive situation in the Near East and already have the situation in Vietnam.

I would say that it is not 4 or 5 months we are talking about. We are talking about 12 months.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator, when he says "the end of the year," means the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. DOMINICK. The end of the year after the bill is passed. So it is 12 months after the bill is passed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I do not express an opinion. I was asking a question. However, it would seem to me that if there had been a critical need for stockpiling some of the silver, Congress would have been called upon long before now, especially with the war in Vietnam, to do something about it. I am wondering why, at this particular time, there has suddenly become such a need on the part of some of these agencies that the Senator from Colorado believes that this is a critical time to do it.

Mr. DOMINICK. This is nothing new. The figure was established in 1965 as the objective that we should have. The Treasury Department has failed to provide the necessary silver for the objective established by the Office of Emergency Planning.

Mr. MILLER. Is there any reason why the Defense Department or one of the Federal Government agencies could not go out and buy and say that this amount is mined to satisfy the stockpile requirements?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Defense Department could certainly go out on the open market and pay more for the silver. But this silver has already been paid for by the taxpayers. So long as we have the stockpile on hand, it seems very peculiar to me to say that the Defense Department, in order to get the silver they need, should have to buy it on the open market.

Mr. MILLER. It seems to me that perhaps we are getting into a balancing of the equities between the producers and the users. If the users need silver in order to meet defense commitments, they will get that silver somehow, and the Defense Department will have to pay an increased price for what it buys; and that means the taxpayers will have to pay for it indirectly, anyway.

Mr. DOMINICK. I did not understand that. The users are not buying it for defense purposes. They are buying it to make some ornaments and some photographic equipment. Most of the big users have large supplies. We are talking about silver for Polaris submarine batteries, for complicated electronic equipment used by the Defense Department.

Mr. MILLER. That is also my understanding. But where have these people been getting silver for the defense need during the last 3 years?

Mr. DOMINICK. Out of the Treasury silver. The Defense Department has said, "This is what we need," and it is transferred to them at that price.

Mr. MILLER. It has not come from a stockpile?

Mr. DOMINICK. It has come from the Treasury.

Within a year, we may be out of silver and not have enough to do this. This is why I want to set it aside now.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I direct the Senator's attention to section 4 of the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is the Bennett amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The purpose of my inquiry is to ascertain whether or not the bill makes mandatory the retention, in one form or another, of 165 million fine troy ounces of silver.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is my hope that it does.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I now read section 4:

> From and after the date of enactment of this Act, and until transferred to the stockpiles established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act in accordance with this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall hold as a reserve for purposes of the common defense not less than one hundred and sixty-five million fine troy ounces of silver.

I construe that to mean that he shall hold at least 165 million fine troy ounces of silver for defense purposes. Does the Senator agree with my interpretation?

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe the Senator is correct. The Secretary of the Treasury is holding it on the monetized side. He is holding it in the Treasury and not as a defense stockpile. If the Senator will read the next sentence, he will see that the Secretary is directed to transfer it to the Stockpiling Act at the end of the year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. For 1 year he is required to hold it in the Treasury, earmarked for defense purposes.

I now read the second sentence:

> Upon the expiration of one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer not less than one hundred and sixty-five million fine troy ounces of silver to the stockpiles established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

Does not that again say that at the end of the year, the 165 million ounces of silver that are in the Treasury Department shall be transferred to the stockpile?

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes. But the point I wish to make to the Senator from Ohio is that this provision says that the Secretary shall hold 165 million ounces free of anything, and presumably to be transferred at the end of the year.

The difficulty with that provision is that if we have 50 percent of the outstanding silver certificates offered for redemption for silver, the Treasury will then be placed in a position, in that year, of saying, "We are either going to have to violate this law, which says for us to hold it, or we are going to have to break our promise with those people to whom we promised to pay silver for the silver certificate."

This is why I want to set it aside now and get it out of the way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand the position of the Senator from Colorado. While this language does indicate that 165 million ounces shall be earmarked, the Senator from Colorado is afraid that 165 million ounces of silver will not be available for earmarking.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, of course, the silver argument is an old chestnut. This is not the first time we have talked about silver in this Chamber. The idea that some people are interested in their States and not in the national welfare is another specious argument. The underlying argument is price—whether we are going to gouge the consumers of America and take it out of the brides of America when they go to buy silverware, so that some people can collect more than $1.29 an ounce. That is all it amounts to.

As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has pointed out, the 165 million ounces are frozen; but they are frozen in the Treasury Department. At this price, they want to take it out of the Treasury Department and put it in the stockpile. Alternatively, because of the paucity of silver, the demand will then become much greater than the supply. Already, the demand for silver is much more than the supply of silver. We all know that.

If it is necessary to forfeit the silver for the national defense, I am all for that. But the idea that today we must dramatize the need of silver for defense in order to jockey up the price does not fit right with the Senator from Rhode Island. That has been the underlying argument of this amendment. If the proponents of the amendment are allowed to talk long enough, they will reveal their real purpose. The only question is, "How soon will we break the ceiling of $1.29." If we break it immediately, we will break the market. If we wait for a year, we will give industry a chance to acclimate itself to a change in price. That is all this amounts to.

Mr. President, this is an anticonsumer amendment. The minute this amendment shall be adopted, it will mean that the cost of silver will be greater; that the price will be higher to people who have to buy silver. They are the people who work in the factories of the country which produce silver. Either they will lose their jobs, or the consumers will have to pay more money for silver. That is all the amendment amounts to. I simply say that when the time comes that the Department of Defense must appear before Congress and say, "We need all the silver for defense," I shall be willing to see the factories in Rhode Island shut down. I shall be willing to see the brides of America buy stainless steel. But if that is not the case, and the only reason for the amendment is to jockey up the price, then I say the amendment is ill timed.

This subject has been considered by the whole committee. The committee is representative of the whole country. The committee has submitted a unanimous report. But we are being told this afternoon that unless we adopt this amendment, the defense of the Nation will be jeopardized. I disagree most emphatically.

The amendment seeks to break the ceiling of $1.29 and raise the price of silver. We know who will pay for that: the brides of America; and this afternoon I am for the brides of America. I shall vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 125 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Allott
Baker
Bartlett
Bible
Burdick
Carlson
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Fannin
Gruening
Hatfield
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Mansfield
McGee
Metcalf
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Pearson
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—45

Anderson
Bennett
Boggs
Brooke
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Clark
Cotton
Eastland
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Harris
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Lausche
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClellan
McIntyre
Miller
Monroney
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—29

Aiken
Bayh
Brewster
Cannon
Case
Church
Cooper
Ellender
Ervin
Gore
Hansen
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McGovern
Mondale
Mundt
Nelson
Percy
Ribicoff
Talmadge
Tower
Young, Ohio

So Mr. DOMINICK's amendment (No. 203) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 204

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 204 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 4, after "certificates" insert "(not exceeding $200,000,000 in aggregate face value)".

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I am going to be very brief. I have already discussed the amendment with the chairman of the committee. For the benefit of Senators, I point out that what the amendment would do would set a limitation on the discretion of the Secretary as to the amount of silver certificates which he can determine will or will not be redeemed, or turned in for redemption. It does not try to say how much. It merely sets a limitation on the discretion. I understand that the distinguished chairman is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have discussed this with the Senator from Colorado. I told him—and this is in agreement also with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]—that I would be willing to accept the amendment provided he did not insist on the other amendment which he has pending. That is the understanding, is it not?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is the understanding.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on that basis, I am willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 204 of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask for third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the final vote is taken, I should like to ask the majority leader about the schedule for the remainder of the day, and also on tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished majority leader as to the schedule for the rest of today and on tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, when we get through with the pending legislation, it is the intention of the leadership to call up Calendar No. 216, Senate Joint Resolution 33, establishing a National Commission on Product Safety. Then, immediately following that tomorrow, it is the intention of the leadership to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 281, H.R. 2508, an act to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes.

Following the disposition of that measure, the leadership intends to call up the railway labor legislation, which may be reported out of committee tomorrow. As of now, that is the anticipated order of the legislative program. There are several other bills of a minor nature which also may be called up at appropriate times this week.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe the Senator mentioned Calendar No. 224, dealing with the U.S. Information Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

ADJUSTMENTS IN OUTSTANDING SILVER CERTIFICATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1352) to authorize adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, before proceeding to a vote—and I shall not ask for a rollcall on it—I have a few remarks to make. I am informed the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] does not intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. President, I am sure that most Members of this body know my position with respect to this Nation's silver policies.

Ever since the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act, I have from time to time made remarks on the floor, warning that the Treasury would soon be out of silver and that the policies as requested from the Treasury Department and adopted by the Congress were responsible for this situation.

Today we are requested to give the Secretary of the Treasury authority to free silver now backing our silver certificates after 1 year from the date of enactment of S. 1352. This request is on the assumption that many of our outstanding silver certificates are lost and that this action will permit the Secretary to add additional silver to our free stocks.

The bill also provides that 165 million troy ounces of silver shall be turned over to the Office of Emergency Planning for a reserve for defense purposes. The Treasury Department expects that those silver certificates now lost or destroyed will enable the Secretary to recoup at least this amount of silver or more.

Members of the Senate will recall that at the time of the passage of the Coinage Act in 1965 I submitted an amendment at that time to preserve silver for our defense. We were told that there were ample silver stocks and that the Treasury would recognize this need, and my amendment was defeated. We were also told that we needed the Coinage Act to preserve ample stocks of silver for our coinage.

At that time, we had nearly 1 billion ounces of silver in the Treasury.

I opposed the Coinage Act as I was of the belief that the Treasury Department should adopt measures which would protect our Nation's supply of silver and that we could still have a coin with intrinsic value. We would, of course, have had to stop exporting silver to foreign nations and we would have found it necessary to stop making the Treasury stocks of silver a source of supply for the users.

I introduced an amendment, which was joined by other Senators here today, that would have put on export controls at that time. This amendment was also defeated.

Now, from 1 billion ounces of silver, in just 2 years, we find ourselves as of May 26 with only 55 million ounces of free silver and slightly less than 500 million ounces of silver still backing our silver certificates.

We have just about made the full circle, and with passage of this bill, we shall have erased silver as a factor in our monetary policies.

This is being done after 175 years of honoring this precious metal and giving our citizens coins and silver certificates backed by intrinsic value.

Some in this body do not feel that we need gold or silver to back our money. I happen to believe otherwise and I note that most nations of the world are doing everything they can to secure as much gold and silver as they can possibly acquire.

Perhaps there is some magic way that we can convince our foreign friends that our paper and copper-nickel alloyed coins are just as valuable as gold and silver, but I seriously doubt it.

Late in May of this year, the Treasury Department was experiencing such a drain on its silver stocks that it was necessary for the Department to adopt several measures by regulation which I and others had attempted in 1965 to secure by statute. The Treasury placed export controls in effect. It limited the sale of silver to domestic users and then only by the end-use certificate method which sharply curtailed users from speculating in silver and now permits them to only purchase the equivalent of the amount of silver used in the preceding 2 months of their respective operation.

I welcomed this action by the Treasury; however, the action was at least 2 years too late to forestall a world silver crisis.

The London silver market immediately made sharp gains. Other nations starting selling their supplies of silver at increased prices over what our own Government sells for at $1.29-plus per troy ounce. We now have a two-priced market in silver. The U.S. Treasury has the same price of $1.29 while the rest of the world is operating in a free market.

I approve of a free market theory, and this bill gives the Secretary of the Treasury authority to advance the price of silver beyond $1.29 plus. As I read the language, it states the Secretary of the Treasury can dispose of silver stocks at not less than the monetary value of $1.29 plus per ounce.

It is my position that the taxpayers of this Nation should not be penalized. The Secretary, in other words, should not sell silver at $1.29-plus per troy ounce when the London market price is around $1.55 per ounce, with futures even higher.

With the world situation as it is today, it is my opinion that even further efforts must be made to protect our defense needs. I recognize the Treasury's attempt to set aside in the neighborhood of 165 million ounces of silver. I do not think it was nailed down as tightly as it would have been under the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. I am not sure that even the figure of 165 million ounces is realistic.

The Treasury Department in its May order also adopted controls making it a penalty to melt silver coins. This was also the subject of an amendment which I offered 2 years ago.

This action will admittedly be difficult for the Treasury Department to police. Nevertheless, it will stop individuals from blatantly advertising for coins to melt, as they were doing with the World War II nickels just 2 years ago. It will, in my opinion, be a deterrent.

We all know that when the price of silver exceeds $1.39 per ounce our dimes, quarters, and half dollars of silver content can then be melted at a profit.

I do not believe that it is necessary for the Secretary of the Treasury to advance the silver price to that extreme; but I do feel that there is no good argument for selling our free stocks of silver at bargain basement prices.

We should preserve as much silver as necessary to continue the minting of the clad silver half dollars even though it only contains 40 percent silver fineness.

With the world situation as it is today, it is my opinion that a second look at our defense needs is in order. In World War II, we used approximately 950 million ounces of silver for defense, and some of the governmental agencies perhaps still have stocks on hand; nevertheless, we should take a second look to see if 165 million ounces is sufficient to meet our war needs.

If we do not follow this course, we will wind up buying back our $1.29 silver, which we have sold all comers at a higher price, which in the end will cost the good old taxpayer.

I submit that no business in the United States would sell its raw products at a price when, within a short time, it would have to rebuy this same material at prices from 25 to 50 percent higher.

At this point, I submit for the RECORD, and ask unanimous consent to have printed, an article from the June 2 Wall Street Journal which sets out in detail the dual market price of silver as now exists.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEXICO ALLOWS SILVER SALES AT LONDON RATE, ACCELERATING TREND TO A DUAL-PRICE MARKET

MEXICO CITY.—The Bank of Mexico, the nation's central bank, began authorizing sales of silver to foreign customers at prices based on quotes in London, rather than those of the cheaper New York market.

The major significance of the move, according to industry officials, was to add further impetus to the establishment of a two-price world silver situation. The movement began after the U.S. Treasury banned exports of its stocks on May 18. Until then, Mexico and all other countries had been held to a price of $1.29 an ounce since September 1965, when the U.S. effectively set a world level by unlimited sales at that price.

However, prices began to rise outside the U.S. immediately after the Treasury's mid-May action. U.S. businesses still obtain Government stocks at $1.29 an ounce, but the metal is in extremely short supply and has risen recently to around $1.55 an ounce in London.

In a parallel development yesterday, Handy & Harman of Canada Ltd., the Canadian subsidiary of the leading New York fabricator and supplier of silver and other metals, raised its quote for silver to Canadian customers by 4.9 cents an ounce, to $1.589.

Mexican industry officials said the country's new pricing system will substantially boost the nation's income, noting that each cent-an-ounce rise in the silver price results in an increase of about $400,000 in Mexico's intake. However, they noted that the country's output of the metal hasn't been rising very swiftly in recent years and that it may be overtaken as the Free World's largest supplier by the U.S. this year.

Since 1962, Mexico's production has grown only to 43 million ounces last year from 41.2 million ounces. The U.S. has boosted production in the same period to 42 million ounces from 36.3 million. Discovery of the famous Comstock Lode in Nevada in 1858 enabled the U.S. to top the world in silver output until about 1900. Mexico has held the lead in most succeeding years.

Mexico last year shipped about one third of its output into the U.S., but it's expected that practically all of its exports will now be drawn to the higher prices outside the U.S.

Added income to Mexico from the higher silver prices will help offset declining profit from the country's exports of lead and zinc, both of which have fallen in price since early 1966. It's estimated that a decline of 2 cents a pound in world lead prices has cost Mexico about $7.5 million and a cent-a-pound drop in the zinc price about $3.7 million, officials say.

The two-price system for silver is analogous to a similar situation which developed for copper a year ago after the U.S. acted to protect its dwindling supplies by banning all exports. U.S. producers were forced by the Government to a price below 40 cents a pound, but foreign suppliers began basing their charges on the London market level and received upwards of 85 cents a pound at times.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, though I am not asking for a rollcall vote on final passage, I want the RECORD to show that I am not supporting the bill. I cannot support any measure which debases and cheapens our money, which in my opinion this bill will do.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that I am in general accord with the very perceptive remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. On many pieces of legislation, we find ourselves on the horns of a dilemma, in that we find some provisions that are somewhat advisable, and we find other provisions that we simply cannot swallow.

Personally, I am taking the same position on this bill that I took on the bill that authorized the "phony" coinage in 1965. I said then I could never vote "yea" on a bill which debased our coinage; and I cannot vote for this bill for the same reason. Section 2 of the bill shuts down the redemption of silver certificates after a year, so that people will not be able to procure coinage or silver for those certificates, despite the fact that the certificates clearly state that they are redeemable.

At the same time, another interesting comment appears in the report. On page 4, in the last paragraph, except for the tabulation that appears, the committee said this:

> Since, however, it is clear that a large proportion of the outstanding silver certificates will never be presented for redemption, and since it is undesirable to permit indefinite continuation of the holding of silver certificates for the purpose of redemption for silver, the Secretary of the Treasury on March 14, 1967, transmitted to the Congress a bill which was introduced as S. 1352 on March 21, 1967.

As I understand it, this bill was voted out unanimously by the committee. If this is so, then it is the unanimous opinion of the committee that the Treasury Department is, in effect, working a shenanigan on the American people. After a year, those who hold certificates will not be permitted to redeem them. So the certificates will contain money that is the equivalent of any other certificate the Government issues, which are getting to be worth less and less every day.

Since this, in effect, abrogates the promises of the Government, and since it is fruitless to try to convert a $1 silver certificate into coinage, I think it abrogates the promise of the Government, and I would therefore never vote for it, even, Mr. President, if it meant my defeat for election to this august body.

The bill, with the Bennett amendment, does go somewhat along the way of trying to meet some of our problems. But, as the distinguished Senator from Nevada pointed out, this problem has been with us a long time, and I have not seen one concrete step taken by the Treasury Department nor by the administration to meet the decreasing supply of silver which we knew was coming.

When we consider the grave situation that this country faces today, if we should, God forbid, become involved in a war on another front, or the support of a war on another front, we would indeed be hard put to find silver to meet our defense needs. That is why the Dominick amendment was such a great and valuable asset and addition to this bill. I am sorry that the majority of the Senate did not see it that way. Of course, every Senator votes in accordance with how he sees the situation.

But, considering the defeat of the Dominick amendment, together with these other factors, of the total amount in the hands of the Treasury of approximately 470 million ounces, 425 million would be required to be held against the reserve for the $550 million silver certificates outstanding, and there would remain only about 45 million ounces of free silver available for coinage or to meet the needs of industry. It seems very peculiar to me, Mr. President, at this late time, when the country is in such a grave situation, that it has taken our Treasury Department all of these years to turn around and at least partially, in a meager, pauperish way, face the problem of the silver shortage, which every financial journal, every business magazine, and every metals journal in the country has been talking about for the past several years.

While the language in the bill is somewhat garbled, if I may say so, I presume that after a year has elapsed, what is left will end up in the strategic and critical materials stockpile. I cannot, in all conscience, vote for the bill, and I want the Record to show, in the event there is not a rollcall, that I certainly oppose the bill and would vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 1352) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United Sates of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to determine from time to time the amount of silver certificates (not exceeding $200,000,000 in aggregate face value), issued after June 30, 1929, which in his judgment have been destroyed or irretrievably lost, or are held in collections, and will never be presented for redemption. In the case of each determination he shall credit the appropriate receipt account with an equivalent amount, and shall reduce accordingly the amount of silver certificates outstanding on the books of the Treasury.

Sec. 2. Silver certificates shall be exchangeable for silver bullion for one year following the enactment of this Act. Thereafter they shall no longer be redeemable in silver but shall be redeemable from any moneys in the general fund of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Sec. 3. Effective upon the expiration of one year after the date of enactment of this Act, section 2 of the Act of June 4, 1963, as amended (31 U.S.C. 405a-1), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use for coinage, or to sell on such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, any silver of the United States (other than silver transferred to the stockpiles established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act) at a price not less than the monetary value of $1.292929292 per fine troy ounce."

Sec. 4. From and after the date of enactment of this Act, and until transferred to the stockpiles established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act in accordance with this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall hold as a reserve for purposes of the common defense not less than one hundred and sixty-five million fine troy ounces of silver. Upon the expiration of one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer not less than one hundred and sixty-five million fine troy ounces of silver to the stockpiles established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act. For the purposes of that Act, the silver shall be deemed to have been transferred pursuant to that Act.

Sec. 5. The last sentence of section 3517 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 324) is repealed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] handled this measure with the outstanding competence that has characterized his many achievements over the years. In this instance the measure concerned silver certificates, a vitally important legislative proposal. Joined by the able senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], their combined presentation to the Senate was thoughtful and articulate. The overwhelming success of the measure may be attributed directly to their high abilities.

In disposing of this measure so efficiently, the Senate is indebted to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], who, while urging his own strong and sincere views on the matter, in no way inhibited prompt and orderly action. Other Senators are also to be commended for joining the debate. The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] offered their views which are always valued highly by the Senate. Noteworthy, too, was the eloquent statement of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], who again demonstrated his broad knowledge of the issues involved.

Finally, the Senate may be proud of another accomplishment obtained swiftly and with full recognition for the views of all Members.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on a nomination favorably reported earlier today by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term expiring June 30, 1971.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Sparkman, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 216, Senate Joint Resolution 33, a joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Product Safety. I do this so that the joint resolution will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) to establish a National Commission on Product Safety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 3, line 12, after the word "identity", to insert "of categories"; in line 13, after the word "which", to strike out "are determined to" and insert "may"; in line 22, after the word "against", to insert "categories of"; and, on page 4, line 15, after the word "study.", to insert "The Commission shall publish notice of any proposed hearing in the Federal Register and shall afford a reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present relevant testimony and data."; so as to make the joint resolution read:

S.J. Res. 33

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a National Commission on Product Safety (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members appointed by the President from among persons who are specially qualified to serve on such Commission by virtue of their education, training, or experience.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers.

(d) The President shall designate one of the members to serve as Chairman and one to serve as Vice Chairman of the Commission.

(e) Four members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 2. (a) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the scope and adequacy of measures now employed to protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injuries which may be caused by hazardous household products. Such study and investigation shall include consideration of the following:

(1) the identity of categories of household products, except such products excluded in section 6, which may present an unreasonable hazard to the health and safety of the consuming public;

(2) the extent to which self-regulation by industry affords such protection;

(3) the protection against such hazardous products afforded at common law in the States, including the relationship of product warranty to such protection; and

(4) a review of Federal, State, and local laws relating to the protection of consumers against categories of such hazardous products, including the scope of coverage, the effectiveness of sanctions, the adequacy of investigatory powers, the uniformity of application, and the quality of enforcement.

(b) The Commission may transmit to the President and to the Congress such interim reports as it deems advisable and shall transmit its final report to the President and to the Congress not later than January 1, 1969. Such final report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems appropriate.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) The Commission, or any two members thereof as authorized by the Commission, may conduct hearings anywhere in the United States or otherwise secure data and expressions of opinions pertinent to the study. The Commission shall publish notice of any proposed hearing in the Federal Register and shall afford a reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present relevant testimony and data. In connection therewith the Commission is authorized by majority vote—

(1) to require, by special or general orders, corporations, business firms, and individuals to submit in writing such reports and answers to questions as the Commission may prescribe; such submission shall be made within such reasonable period and under oath or otherwise as the Commission may determine;

(2) to administer oaths;

(3) to require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all documentary evidence relating to the execution of its duties;

(4) in the case of disobedience to a subpena or order issued under paragraph (a) of this section, to invoke the aid of any district court of the United States in requiring compliance with such subpena or order;

(5) in any proceeding or investigation to order testimony to be taken by deposition before any person who is designated by the Commission and has the power to administer oaths, and in such instances to compel testimony and the production of evidence in the same manner as authorized under paragraphs (3) and (4) of this subsection; and

(6) to pay witnesses the same fees and mileage as are paid in like circumstances in the courts of the United States.

(b) Any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which an inquiry is carried on may, in case of refusal to obey a subpena or order of the Commission issued under subsection (a) of this section, issue an order requiring compliance therewith; and any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(c) The Commission is authorized to require directly from the head of any Federal agency available information deemed useful in the discharge of its duties. Each Federal agency is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission and to furnish all information requested by the Commission to the extent permitted by law.

(d) The Commission is authorized to enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of its duties.

(e) When the Commission finds that publication of any information obtained by it is in the public interest and would not give an unfair competitive advantage to any person, it is authorized to publish such information in the form and manner deemed best adapted for public use, except that data and information which would separately disclose the business transactions of any person, trade secrets, or names of customers shall be held confidential and shall not be disclosed by the Commission or its staff: *Provided, however,* That the Commission shall permit business firms or individuals reasonable access to documents furnished by them for the purpose of obtaining or copying such documents as need may arise.

(f) The Commission is authorized to delegate any of its functions to individual members of the Commission or to designate individuals on its staff and to make such rules and regulations as are necessary for the conduct of its business, except as herein otherwise provided.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 4. Each member of the Commission may receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each day such member is engaged upon work of the Commission, and shall be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 5. (a) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, to appoint and fix the compensation of an Executive Director and the Executive Director, with the approval of the Commission, may employ and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission, but no individual so appointed shall receive compensation in excess of the rate authorized for GS–18 by section 5332 of such title.

(b) The Executive Director, with the approval of the Commission, is authorized to obtain services in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem.

(c) The head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of its personnel to assist in carrying out the duties of the Commission under this Act.

(d) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting and accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) shall be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of the General Services. Regulations of the General Services Administration for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Administrator for the administrative control of funds shall apply to appropriations of the Commission, but the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

(e) Ninety days after submission of its final report, as provided in section 2(b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

DEFINITION

Sec. 6. The term "household products" means products customarily produced or distributed for sale through retail sales agencies or instrumentalities for use by a consumer or any member of his family. Such term does not include products regulated under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.), the Flammable Fabrics Act (15 U.S.C. 1191 et seq.), the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act (15 U.S.C. 1261 et seq.), the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 135 et seq.).

AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $2,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The preamble was amended so as to read:

Whereas the American consumer has a right to be protected against unreasonable risk of bodily harm from products purchased on the open market for the use of himself and his family;

Whereas manufacturers whose products are marketed substantially in interstate commerce are entitled to a reasonable degree of uniformity in the application of safety regulations to such products;

Whereas it is desirable to establish a commission to review the scope, adequacy, and uniformity of existing voluntary self-regulation and Federal, State, and local law relating to consumer protection against such hazardous products; and

Whereas it is desirable for such commission to make recommendations as it deems appropriate for remedial action by the President, the Congress, the States, and private industry: Now, therefore, be it

---

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I reiterate that following the disposition of the legislation seeking to establish a National Commission on Product Safety, the order of business will be Calendar No. 281, H.R. 2508, which concerns congressional redistricting.

COAL TO GASOLINE AT COMPETITIVE PRICES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, very great potential benefits for our Nation lie in the hands of researchers and technicians in the coal industry. Among the very stirring accomplishments being made through coal research is the prospect of commercially profitable production of gasoline from coal which is beginning to be realized through operations at the pilot plant at Cresap, W. Va.

As one who has strongly supported

this research, including long efforts to fund the costs of plant construction, I found it greatly satisfying to attend the dedication of the plant on May 27.

As a booster of "Project Gasoline," through which this coal-to-gasoline process is being researched, I have provided a summary of the project and its potentials which was published recently in the form of an article, "Coal-to-Gasoline at Competitive Prices," which appeared in the May issue of the Mining Congress Journal. I believe that my colleagues here in the Senate, who supported the funds for this research through their votes, will be interested in the progress being made and the great future promise for economic benefits to our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the magazine article to which I have referred be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Coal-to-Gasoline at Competitive Prices

(By U.S. Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia)

Engineers have long known that it is possible to produce gasoline from coal; in fact, the Europeans made good use of the practice during World War II when petroleum could only be had at a premium. But for many people it will be a source of wonder to realize that coal will soon be the source of automobile gasoline obtained at costs that will make it competitive with fuels produced by traditional methods.

The major breakthrough on this cost barrier—which will mean a new field of development for coal—was accomplished chiefly with the assistance of federally-sponsored research entitled "Project Gasoline." The first pilot plant operation of this process will be conducted in the State of West Virginia—the heartland of power-from-coal.

The $5.5 million plant nearing completion at Cresap, W. Va. will enable Consolidation Coal Co. to set the wheels in motion on the operation that may revolutionize customary fuel supplies.

RESEARCH CONTRACT LET IN 1963

In addition to the promises it holds for the coal industry, engineers and research technicians believe the most encouraging aspect of the work is the possibility of producing gasoline at a refinery cost of 11 cents a gallon. At such a cost it will become economically competitive with other types of refinery fuels—and thereby justifies the experiment.

There are many reasons why I am interested in this project and why I, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee which provides funds for the Office of Coal Research, took the lead in endorsing a $10 million research contract for the project in 1963. It was under this basic research contract that the process was perfected, which led to establishing the pilot plant.

Our need for additional sources of petroleum becomes apparent with the knowledge that the total United States demand for petroleum products is currently about 3½ billion bbl a year, and by 1980 it is expected to be six to eight billion bbl. Twenty years beyond that, in 2000, it could possibly be 12 to 15 billion bbl a year.

PETROLEUM INDUSTRY COULD ACTUALLY BE HELPED

These figures indicate that the availability of gasoline from coal should not greatly upset the petroleum industry as we know it todav. Rather, it should be the other way around. Coal could be useful to the industry in helping it to supply the ever-increasing demand for gasoline, diesel fuel, and similar traditional petroleum products. George Fumich, Jr., director of the Office of Coal Research, believes there are signs that this is recognized, and says that many petroleum companies are extending their bases so as to have other sources of raw materials.

Closer to home is the knowledge that this pilot plant will use from 20 to 25 tons of bituminous coal daily. This represents a new economic horizon for West Virginia, where there exists an estimated seven billion tons of coal in underground reserves. The employment and income which could result from an increasing demand for this coal would be a healthy stimulant for the economy of affected coal producing areas.

COMMERCIAL PLANT WOULD NEED 17,000 TPD OF COAL

Projections indicate that an average commercial plant would require 17,350 tons of coal each day, or 5.75 million tons annually. The yield would be 18 million bbl of gasoline and the equivalent of about 1.5 million tons of boiler fuel in the form of char each year.

It is realistic to assume that, for a long time to come, most fuels will be produced from petroleum. On the other hand, "Project Gasoline" promises to produce competitively priced gasoline in some locations, and that, consequently, it can be a favored source of liquid fuel where suitable reserves of coal are available. If a small percentage of the growing liquid fuel demand is satisfied by coal, it will result in very large increases in coal consumption.

For the most part, the technique does not attempt to convert all of the coal to gasoline. Instead, the most amenable fraction of the coal is converted, hopefully at lower costs, and the remainder, a low-volatile char, becomes, boiler fuel or other product.

MAIN PRODUCTS ARE GASOLINE AND CHAR

The method used is to dissolve the coal in a liquid which itself is produced in the process. Ash and the less reactive parts of the coal are filtered out, and the remaining extract is catalytically hydrocracked to produce a refinery feed stock. This stock is then processed in a more or less standard manner to produce high-octane gasoline and char as the end-products.

The operation will work this way; prepared coal goes to the extraction step where it is partially dissolved and then filtered to separate the liquid extract from the undissolved coal and coal ash. Any gases produced in this step will be purified to manufacture hydrogen for the hydrogenation needs of the process. Recovery and reprocessing of off-gases throughout the plant are a vital part of the overall process. The solid fraction from the filter will go to the low temperature carbonization unit for the production of char, but primarily for recovery of the solvent. Recovery of the solvent, which takes places at several steps, is necessary to make the process self-sustaining.

Liquids from the filtration step are washed with water to remove minute quantities of ash and then distilled into three streams. In the first stream, recovered solvent is recycled to the extraction step; in the second, crude feed is sent directly to the final gasoline-making step; and the third stream is treated with hydrogen to produce additional crude for hydrocracking.

Before the plans for a pilot plant could be approved, there had to be convincing evidence of its practicality. It came in the form of a report on bench scale research that pinpointed the conversion of coal to gasoline at 80 percent! The economic potential was then detailed by Ralph M. Parsons Co.

REFINERY WILL HAVE TO BE LARGE

It is believed that to be commercially practical, the coal-gasoline refineries must be large—in the size range of 30,000 to 100,000-bbl a day output. This would compare favorably with many oil refineries. It means that when the pilot plant has brought this process to the level of normal commercial risks, large long-term coal reserves must be assembled to serve one plant and substantial amounts of capital must be accumulated to build the plant.

Taking shape at the 15-acre site at Cresap are several buildings including administration and control buildings, the warehouse, shops and utility centers. There are hoppers to receive coal from the railroad cars, and a three-story open-air extraction and filtration center where coal will be washed and prepared for the next process. Surrounded by concrete walls are the areas where coal will undergo hydrogenation under pressures of 5000 psi. The hydrogenation center is easily recognizable from the tall columns to house the liquid for the distillation process, in which the synthetic crude material is separated for a later refining into gasoline.

A tank farm will store the crude liquid for shipment to a refinery.

SUCCESS OF PILOT PLANT WILL GIVE FINAL ANSWER

The pilot plant will employ about 100 persons and produce about 60 bbl of synthetic crude material from the 20 to 25 tons of coal to be used. This is equivalent to some 2500 gal of gasoline a day.

It is interesting to note that this is the first step in a lengthy process. Neal P. Cochran, who, as chief of the Utilization Division of the Office of Coal Research, has supervised "Project Gasoline," believes that the final answer to the conversion of coal to gasoline must still await the success of the pilot plant operation. But Cochran states, "We have made every reasonable effort to make the best possible engineering pre-evaluations and they give us good reasons to be optimistic."

If gasoline is produced commercially from coal, it is inevitable that kerosene, a light fuel oil or diesel fuel, and other fuels can probably be produced in some quantity. That, I believe, is the opening of a door to a major change in the supply and availability of petroleum fuels and paints a beautiful future for mining and miners.

UDALL SPEAKS ON PROJECT GASOLINE AT CRESAP, W. VA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on May 27, the pilot research plant for converting coal into gasoline at Cresap, W. Va., was dedicated. A number of Federal and industry officials were present, in addition to State dignitaries.

In discussing the tremendous potentials to be derived from successful founding of an economically profitable commercial refinery for production of gasoline from coal, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, a principal speaker, pointed out that the $5.6 million plant could be the first of many to emerge in coal-producing regions, elsewhere in Appalachia, the Midwest, the northern Great Plains, and the Intermountain West.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech by Secretary Udall be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall at the Dedication of the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Pilot Plant, Cresap, W. Va., May 27, 1967

The dedication today of this pilot plant in Cresap, West Virginia, indicates that a significant phase has been reached in research directed toward the conversion of coal to competitively-priced gasoline. The presence here of responsible Federal, State and business executives suggests that this is no ordinary event and that the results of this testing will be followed carefully by many people.

The Department of the Interior is supporting various approaches to the conversion of coal to liquids and gases. The program is closely interrelated and interdependent. In point of time, this is the first OCR pilot plant to be activated. The decision to move to pilot plant came after successful benchwork and process development, and after very careful independent analysis.

The development of this specific process stems from earlier private research undertaken by the Consolidation Coal Company, now a part of the Continental Oil Company.

Shortly after the Office of Coal Research was staffed, the Department was visited by representatives of the Consolidation Coal Company and the Standard Oil Company of Ohio, who wished to discuss their process for converting coal into gasoline. Their data and information was reviewed carefully and the process was evaluated by an independent engineering company. This evaluation revealed that the process appeared marginally competitive or noncompetitive. As such, it was felt that commercial enterprises would probably avoid this type of operation. We believed, however, that this type of risk-taking was what the Congress intended when the Office of Coal Research was established. Government support of this program is in keeping with its position regarding assistance of research which promises to return to society many times the cost of the original research.

We are meeting today in the largest coal-producing State of the Nation—West Virginia. In this same region are other States which mine coal and are part of what is generally known as Appalachia.

There are, it may be reasoned, various ways of raising the income level of Appalachia. One way is through the mining of the coals of which the area is richly endowed and another is through industrialization. These possibilities are not mutually exclusive.

The mining of coal pays for labor and materials, and studies have shown that the benefits flow out throughout the community. A commercial coal refinery based on successful results from this pilot plant would of necessity be large with a production capacity of 30,000 to 100,000 barrels per day—similar to many present oil refineries. This would involve the opening of large mines dedicated to this purpose.

As we develop methods for converting coal into synthetic fuels, we can expect to reap other benefits from our program. Creation of a synthetic fuel industry will create mining jobs, it will create jobs in the synthetic fuel industry itself, it will create jobs in satellite industries that we expect to grow around large-scale coal processing plants, and it will create prosperity and wealth in many regions of our country that require a lift. We firmly believe that these manufacturing plants will emerge in our coal-producing regions, such as Appalachia, the Mid-West, the Northern Great Plains, and the Intermountain West. Skillful exploitation of the techniques we develop here and at other locations will make energy available to our economy and insure that coal will continue to play an important part in development of our Nation.

These possibilities have been recognized from the beginning by Senator Robert C. Byrd, who has been a strong supporter of the Office of Coal Research. As a member of the Department of the Interior Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator Byrd, who shares this platform with me today, has played an important role in helping us secure the funds for the Project Gasoline pilot plant that we are dedicating here today.

Energy, in all its forms, is a vital key to man's progress. As President Johnson said earlier this year in citing the need for a coordinated energy policy: "We must better understand our future energy needs and resources. We must make certain our policies are directed toward achieving these needs and developing these resources."

It is in this context that the Department of the Interior is working for intelligent use of our energy resources for the benefit of our Nation—both today and in the future. In the area of energy, coal has been, and will continue to be, important. Our national reserves of coal constitute upwards of 80 percent of our recoverable fossil fuel reserves. We believe these reserves can be converted into synthetic fuels, both liquids and gases, as well as into electricity. Both in the Office of Coal Research and the Bureau of Mines, we are vigorously pursuing research and development along all these lines, along with many others.

In particular, the Office of Coal Research has sought out processes for converting coal into crude oil, gasoline, jet fuel, pipeline gas, fuel gases, and into electric power. Much of this work, along with other work of the Department, can potentially benefit the process used in this pilot plant. This process can, in turn, materially assist a number of the other projects.

I would like to describe for you one such instance. If we look upriver, we can see stacks from a coal-fired, mine-mouth powerplant. Downriver, we can view similar stacks. The process we expect to prove out in this plant will produce high quality, low cost boiler fuel as a byproduct. This boiler fuel will leave the process in the form of a char with a substantially lower sulfur content than the coal from which it came. In all our departmental evaluations, we have calculated a price for this fuel at a lower cost than the coal raw material fed to the plant. Being deficient in hydrogen, this material is an ideal fuel for an MHD powerplant. The potential high efficiency of MHD powerplants, coupled with this low sulfur char, will lead to an elimination of air pollution, with drastically reduced thermal pollution and produce electric power at very low cost. In one step, then, we will have converted coal into a high quality liquid fuel and into electricity to the mutual benefit of both industries, with a significant move toward elimination of air and thermal pollution. As our Nation's population grows, our people will require increasing quantities of electric power, as well as increasing quantities of liquid fuel. To this extent, at this dedication, we are standing in the doorway to tomorrow.

In a gross sense it is possible to describe the process in simple terms. The scientists and engineers who have been working to perfect the process are here today and can fill you in on the details.

Coal is ground and dried and partially dissolved in a solvent. The solvent is a liquid produced in the process itself. The dissolved coal, containing the fraction most useful in producing the end product, is separated from the undissolved solids including the ash. The solid fraction thus removed is not wasted but can be a useful boiler fuel.

The liquid fraction is then combined with hydrogen to produce a refinery feed stock. This is then refined, following more-or-less standard petroleum refining methods, to produce high octane gasoline fuel oil and liquid petroleum gases. I said "more-or-less standard methods" of refining purposely. Just as crude petroleum varies widely according to source, the feed stock from this process will be different in some particulars from petroleum, and undoubtedly will vary with the source of raw coal feed.

We mention this so that no one is led to believe that the output of this process is undistinguishable and absolutely interchangeable with some standard specification petroleum. Nevertheless, we do believe that it can be refined to high grade standard products within the range of raw material variation normal to the petroleum industry.

In this pilot plant the necessary hydrogen is made by reforming natural gas. While this is the economical and expedient thing to do for the time being we do regard it as a temporary measure. All of the processes under development by OCR to make liquid and gaseous fuels from coal require some source of hydrogen. The Office of Coal Research is attacking this problem and the Consolidation Coal Company and other contractors are developing coal to hydrogen processes so that eventually all conversion processes should use only coal, water, and air as raw materials.

What is our outlook for the future? As indicated earlier, this process appeared to be marginally competitive or noncompetitive. Today, as a result of hard, conscientious work on the part of all concerned, the plant has been built and will now begin operating. We believe that this process, projected to commercial scale, can be competitive. During the period this plant operates potential manufacturing costs should be reduced still further. This would indicate that we will have all the data needed for design of a commercial plant by the early 1970's. We can look forward to operation of a commercial plant by industry prior to 1975. This dedication is, then, a giant step forward in our effort to properly utilize the coal with which our Nation has been blessed.

Thank you for being with us today.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 6, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 5, 1967:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Benigno C. Hernandez, of New Mexico, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay, vice William P. Snow.

THE JUDICIARY

Thomas D. Lambros, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Stephen H. Sachs, of Maryland, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Maryland for the term of 4 years, vice Thomas J. Kenney, resigned.

Veryl L. Riddle, of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Missouri for the term of 4 years, vice Richard D. FitzGibbon, Jr., resigned.

John C. Begovich, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of California for the term of 4 years to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, effective September 18, 1966.

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy for a term of 2 years pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5081.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 5, 1967:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term expiring June 30, 1971.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Glen Rock Student Wins Honors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, we often read and hear about young people who have come into conflict with the established standards of behavior of our society. I am convinced, however, that the only reason that we are informed of such news is precisely because of the fact that it is news. Only a small minority of the Nation's young people experience such difficulties. The vast majority matures and takes its place in our society as responsible citizens without incident. I wish to give particular credit to this latter group by bringing to the attention of my colleagues the fine accomplishments of one of my young constituents, Neil Calman of Glen Rock, N.J.

Neil is a senior at Glen Rock High School who has distinguished himself both in school and in his community. Besides being a top student in his class, Neil has participated in such varied activities as the Glen Rock High School Band, stage crew, Explorer Scouting, horseback riding, scuba diving, and leadership in the United Synagogue Youth chapter of the Glen Rock Jewish Center. But Neil's greatest interest lies not in these activities, but in his laboratory work in leukemia research.

It is Neil's research paper entitled "Respiratory Alterations Due to Drug Resistance in L1210 Ascites Tumor" that has won him national recognition with the recent honor of being one of 150 students invited to attend the National Junior Science and Humanities Symposium at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y. The paper was the result of a tremendous amount of work at the Marcia Slater Leukemia Research Laboratory of the Jewish Memorial Hospital in Manhattan. After a summer of volunteer work at the laboratory in 1965 in which he learned the use of the lab equipment, Neil became an actual employee of the lab last summer. He was placed in charge of his own project, the procedure for which he devised himself, including the necessary library research.

Neil describes his research project as "a study of the oxygen consumption of mouse leukemia cells. The untreated cells were compared to cells that were resistant to either 6-mercaptopurine or methotrexate, both of which are antileukemia drugs. It was concluded that the 6-mercaptopurine mutation is associated with a change in the respiratory mechanisms."

Neil plans to continue his research project after his graduation from high school because of his awareness of the importance of repeating each experiment over and over to prove that the results are not mere coincidence. Significantly, Neil feels that the most important thing he has learned in his 2 years of research is "not only the responsibility to yourself, but the responsibility to other people."

Neil's abilities and interests will undoubtedly take him far in the career he plans to pursue in research after several years of study at the University of Chicago. I am certain that my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating Neil on his achievements and in wishing him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

Crisis in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. S. JOHNNY WALKER

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to put myself on record as favoring any action the administration takes to preserve the territorial integrity of Israel.

In my opinion, the United States has a much bigger stake in the affairs of the Middle East than it does in Southeast Asia. I already have informed the administration of my feelings on this matter.

I do not, in any way, mean to imply that I will support any action that would jeopardize our military operations or the lives of our men in Vietnam.

The Arab nations, despite untold riches, have stultified, while Israel, with only a tiny foothold on the African continent, has forged ahead in social and material progress, proving, if nothing else, that it is people, not things, that make for greatness in nations. The first reports from the Middle East battlefields indicate that Israel, although surrounded on three sides by its enemy is making a heroic stand.

The imagination is hard put to envision the spectacle of the United States standing idly by while the Middle East becomes a slaughterhouse.

Essentially, the question which precipitated the crisis is a legal one. The suggestion that the International Court of Justice at The Hague be given jurisdiction still has merit, despite the fighting now going on. Both Israel and the United Arab Republic are members of the Court.

If both sides in the Middle East conflict would cease hostilities and accept a decision of the Court, it would be a tremendous victory for reason over emotion. It is still not too late to take this course.

If either side in the dispute refused to accept the International Court's jurisdiction, then the United States or the United Nations should seek an advisory opinion from the Court on the issue of free passage through the Gulf of Aqaba.

I believe the United States should reaffirm its desire to settle international disputes by the rules of reason and law, rather than by the irrational use of armed might.

America's Challenge to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an outstanding youth group in the congressional district I represent, in Delano, Calif.

Established on February 24, 1963, the Father Garces Circle No. 1625, of the Columbia Squires, is an example to the entire community of Delano.

A good friend of mine, Bob Brooks, founded the organization and still remains active in all its programs. Certainly, his leadership and dedication to these young boys has meant a great deal to the continuing success of this group.

Briefly, the Columbian Squires are sponsored by the Knights of Columbus, and serve boys aged 13 to 18. They center their activities in four general areas: spiritual, social, civic-cultural and physical. All programs have as their underlying theme the advancement and betterment of the individual.

Some of their more notable volunteer activities have included work on behalf of the American Red Cross and the Kern County retarded children.

I also want to direct particular attention to a recent achievement of the Delano Circle of the Columbian Squires. In competition with more than 900 circles throughout the world and a membership in excess of 30,000, the Delano Circle was recognized as the "No. 1 International Circle of the Year."

Last April, I had the pleasure of addressing a dinner meeting sponsored by the Squires, and at this time I would like to share with my colleagues some of the remarks in my speech. While these ideas were directed to the Columbian Squires, I hope that other young people may also benefit from the message therein.

AMERICA'S CHALLENGE TO YOUTH

A British author once commented that "Youth was so wonderful that it was a shame to waste it on the young." . . . But his attention to the condition of the younger generation of his day was hardly new. As long ago as ancient Greece the philosophers were lamenting that the young people of their day had lost all respect for the elders, and that the world would surely suffer because they were so irresponsible.

But we're here today, not to join in these laments, but to recognize the talents that this particular young generation possess. Perhaps as no other generation before, you are involved and aware of the world around you. Current morality, the bomb, Vietnam, the draft—all these and many other crucial issues find their way into your magazines, your class rooms, and your discussions. You are, without a doubt, the aware generation.

And few times in history have demanded awareness that this era does today. There was a time when America was isolated from the affairs of other nations by the physical barriers of the two oceans. But with the advent of the airplane, and particularly the jet, the most remote areas of the world are just a few hours away. And, as this nation has assumed a position of leadership in the free world, we can no longer be self-centered.

What does this all mean to you? I think, a great deal, not only because, as you have heard so often, today's youth are the leaders of tomorrow, but also because you have a definite and constructive role to play right now. The idea gets around that 21 is some sort of magic age—that citizenship and participation begin then, and only then. Nothing could be further from the truth. The fate of a nation rests upon the opinions of its young people. This means that the demands and challenges of the twentieth century must be met by you, not only in your future role as leaders, but in your present opportunities and roles as young people.

The first role you have is one of you share with all those who live in a democracy—to be well-informed of current events. A dictatorship is actually more efficient if the people who are ruled are NOT aware of what is going on. Then the tyrant can get away with all he wants, with little fear of discovery. But a democracy rests on the premise that the citizens are intelligent enough to choose their own government . . . A good representative government, if the citizens do not even know what is going on around them. What a farce that premise becomes. In other words, this democracy can continue to be a democracy only if the people who live in this country are informed on the crucial issues that confront us. Only through knowledge of the conditions around us can we prevent the erosion of our freedoms that can only take place in the shadows of ignorance and complacency.

People who are informed can exert their influence.

Let me give you an example.

A housewife in one of the Western States read in the papers that hunters and ranchers were killing and raiding herds of wild ponies, and that these beautiful animals were slowly being wiped out. This informed citizen wasn't content to read about it and sit home and do nothing. She began action that finally resulted in legislation enacted by Congress providing protection for those wild ponies by the National Park Service.

The story about the housewife points out the importance of participation. If that woman had read the papers, thought how bad it was that the ponies were being wiped out, and then did nothing, those animals would be gone by now. But she coupled her knowledge with action, and out of that combination came constructive results. Participation, however, doesn't require that you start a national campaign. There are many things that you, as young people, can do to become involved in politics.

Really, one of the best ways can be found in your school, and in its student government. Student government, or student council, or whatever you call it, is an excellent place to learn the workings of our system of government. First, it's Representative. All the students select a few students to decide upon their rules, plan their activities and determine other matters. Second, it's democratic in that all vote for the few who finally represent them. But valuable experience does not limit itself merely to those who get elected. Those who run for office will learn about campaigning, with all its trials and sometime triumphs. You learn the art of building a platform, of making speeches, and see just how much is really involved. Those of you who are elected will learn the responsibility for making decisions for many others than just yourselves. And those who vote will learn to evaluate a campaign, and to try to pick the best candidate based on his merits. Thus, student government is the essence of the workings of a democratic republic such as ours, as well as being an excellent method of becoming involved in politics.

To the man on the street, politics is likely to be directly connected and limited to the major political parties. But there is a place for you here also. Both parties are eager to have young people working with them, and they have organizations designed specifically with you in mind. Whether you are a Young Democrat or a Young Republican, the experience is as invaluable as well as fun. Political parties need workers to pass out literature, to work in headquarters, and to perform a hundred other essential tasks.

Such activities as these can prepare you for an even fuller participation in politics in the years to come. The Congressional elections of this last year saw the election of many young Representatives, despite their young age, most of them had extensive preparation in politics.

Challenge awaits each and every one of you young adults here this evening. It's not only a challenge to make something of yourself, to become a success. It's the challenge to make something of this Nation, and of this world. Only through your initiative, your courage, and your determination, can America continue on the road to continued prosperity and freedom. No matter how trite it may sound, and no matter how many times you may have heard it, it's still true, that you are the leaders upon whom this country will rely for her future success.

This is the challenge of America. A challege of high ideas fostered since its birth, a challenge of vast potential yet to be tapped. It must be met by each of us, separately and together. We must all be informed, all be dedicated, all be involved in the crucial affairs of state. It's been said that a chain is no stronger than it's weakest link. That's especially true of a democracy, where all of us rely on each of us to do our part in bearing both the rights and the responsibilities of citizenship.

This is the challenge before you, it's yours to accept or reject. Our future rests with you.

Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I reintroduced my bill to provide that disabled widows may receive full social security benefits at 50 rather than have to wait until age 62—reduced benefits are payable at age 60.

Under the present law, a disabled widow must wait until she is 62 in order to collect full social security benefits, unless she is the mother of a disabled child or one under 18.

This is totally unfair. A disabled widow is, beyond doubt, a very hard person to place in a job. The interim between the time she either becomes a widow or her child becomes 18, and the time she reaches 62, has aptly been described as the "valley of despair." She may have no means of support. The age requirement of 62, in this circumstance, is unrealistic and cruel. I strongly urge humanization of this law so that disabled widows can receive social security benefits at age 50.

Dr. Edward Lee Russell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to give recognition to one of the outstanding citizens of my district, Dr. Edward Lee Russell. "Doc" Russell as he is affectionately known, will retire this year after almost 40 years of public service in the healing arts. He came to Orange County, Calif., in 1930. At that time it was a relatively sparsely settled farming area. In his 37 years of service to Orange County, first as chief of the county's division of maternal and child health, later as child psychiatrist for the county's juvenile courts, and for the last 28 years as county health officer, he has seen many changes take place. He has seen the county grow at an almost unparalleled pace. This great growth placed demands upon the county health department, demands which were met by "Doc" Russell and the able organization he was responsible for building and leading.

"Doc" Russell, in addition to taking an active leadership in Orange County, played a prominent role in State Public Health Affairs. He served as president of the health officers section, League of California Cities in 1946. In 1954 he was elected President of the Southern California Public Health Association. In 1955–56 he served as president of the California Conference of Local Health Officers. In 1960–61 he assumed the presidency of the important western branch of the American Public Health Association.

Today "Doc" Russell serves as both the senior attending physician and member of the board of trustees of Children's Hospital of Orange County. He also holds membership in the Los Angeles Academy of Physicians.

During his long career, "Doc" Russell has contributed a score of important articles in the fields of public health. The development of these articles represents an extraordinary accomplishment when viewed in light of the fact that "Doc" Russell was at this same time shouldering important burdens of leadership noted above.

It would be a serious oversight to fail to recognize "Doc" Russell for his community services outside the medical profession. He has provided leadership in countless civic projects. In recognition of his civic leadership, the Edward Lee Russell Elementary School was dedicated in his name some 5 years ago.

I consider it a privilege to take this opportunity to express my personal respect for this outstanding individual. He has served his county and State with great distinction.

Hanna Hails Anniversary of Consumer Credit Counselors of Orange County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I note with a great deal of pleasure the passing of the first anniversary of the Consumer Credit Counselors of Orange County. This fine group, whose headquarters are located in Santa Ana, Calif., is a nonprofit corporation made up of business, labor, and county service groups. Its purpose is to provide a free credit counseling service to the community.

The Consumer Credit Counselors of Orange County first opened its doors on June 1, 1966. Under the leadership of Carl F. Lindquist, the manager and executive director; Mike Booth, the president; Wendell K. Johnston, treasurer, as well as a board of directors of public-minded citizens, the group has grown and expanded. During the course of its initial year of operation, it has aided numerous families in Orange County.

In large measure, credit for the success of this service can be claimed by three broad groups: the consumer finance industry, banks, and retailers in Orange County. Representatives of each of these industries have given a great deal of financial assistance to the counseling group.

While the vast majority of American families can and do handle their credit obligations without difficulty in this era of installment credit, there unfortunately do exist some families which become so enmeshed in financial difficulties, either through accident, ill health, and so forth, that they are unable to meet their obligations when due. This results in loss for the creditors, and often acute family disruption, inefficiency, garnishment, job loss, and other problems for the debtor. If debt problems are permitted to become acute, they can become social problems which affect the entire community. They can also generate criticism of the whole consumer credit system which has become such a vital part of the postwar economic growth of our Nation.

Unfortunately, I must point out that California with about 9½ percent of the Nation's population records more than 18 percent of all U.S. personal bankruptcies. This is despite a per capita income that places California fifth among all States.

The consumer credit counselors have established educational and publicity programs on the economics of sound credit, the wide use of credit, and family income management. They have included educational seminars, family counseling, and assistance to social workers in the various agencies in the field of credit counseling.

It has been my distinct privilege to serve on the board of directors of this fine organization. On the occasion of their first anniversary, I congratulate them and wish them every success in the future.

Hebrew Academy of Nassau County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, June 4, 1967, I attended the 14th annual dinner of the Hebrew Academy of Nassau County, honoring District Attorney William Cahn of Nassau County.

The Hebrew Academy of Nassau County has grown from an enrollment of 30 students 14 years ago to a student body of 600 from 30 communities throughout Nassau County and beyond. The academy has met the highest educational standards of New York State while at the same time providing a program of intensive Hebraic teaching. In its religious studies, covering the breadth of Biblical instruction, taught in Hebrew, the original language of the Old Testament, the academy has placed special emphasis on the development of ethical values of Judaism as applied to our American democracy.

The Hebrew Academy has also excelled in the field of Jewish day camping in Nassau County. The success of the HANC day camp program resulted in the construction of an additional modern campsite at the Mitchel Field Center.

Mr. Speaker, the invocation at the dinner was delivered by Rabbi Meyer Fendel, principal of the Hebrew Academy of Nassau County. He invoked the blessings of Almighty God, Creator of all men, in a prayer for peace for all mankind.

INVOCATION

As we meet in commemoration of our 14th year, to pay tribute to a faithful servant of our cause, our honored guest, William Cahn, the hearts and thoughts of all of us throb to the terrifying events of the past few days and we pray in the agony of our souls. For in this critical hour, the very fabric of all that is precious to our people stands threatened by overcast skies, darkened by clouds of war hovering over Thy holy land—the tiny State of Israel. Together with Israeli pioneers, those who were snatched from the embers of the inferno which raged no more than two score years ago transformed a desert into a blossoming garden and a wilderness into a home for the homeless. For the weary survivors of the gehinom of Europe, the only ray of hope beckoned from this ancient hallowed territory. Now the fury of aggression threatens this land and our people there . . . casting fear unto all mankind. As Israel stands menaced by those who cry out—

"Come let us cut them off from being a nation that the name Israel shall no longer be remembered," we echo the words of Thy psalmist: "Our earnest desire is for peace . . . while they seek war. Peace is Thy most precious gift and an embattled people fresh from the wounds of holocaust and decimation beseech thee from the depths of their being that this gift be vouchsafed unto them."

Grant that we who are assembled here, loyal proud citizens of a great nation, whose sacred task it is to illumine the darkened world with the reflected splendor of Thy teachings, and to strengthen the loyalties of Thy people everywhere, be equal to the hour of challenge and opportunity—that our solidarity with the people of that beleaguered land remain firm and steadfast, and that we be ever ready to respond in whatever manner necessary for the welfare of their just and peaceful future.

Strengthen the defenders of the Holy Land; grant them salvation and crown them with victory. Establish peace in the land and everlasting joy for its inhabitants.

Imbue the leaders of our great country and the representatives assembled at the United Nations with wisdom, moral rectitude and courage so that justice may prevail.

Guardian of Israel—preserve the remanent of Israel: Let not Israel perish who proclaims for all the world the eternal verity of Thy Being in the words Hear O Israel.

At the dinner the following petition was circulated to the guests and was signed by more than 740 guests of all faiths and all political affiliations:

PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, TO ACT IN SUPPORT OF ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE AND INTEGRITY

We, the undersigned, Jews and Christians residing in Nassau County commend your forthright reiteration of America's commitment to the independence and integrity of the State of Israel and her rights to navigation through the Straits of Tiran.

It is on the basis of this solemn and unequivocal commitment that Israel voluntarily withdrew her forces in 1957 from Sinai and from Sharm el Sheikh. It is the creditability of this solemn commitment that is being challenged.

We therefore join with fellow Americans of all persuasions in urging you, Mr. President, to take immediate steps inside the United Nations and outside of it, to restore the freedom of innocent passage through the Gulf of Aqaba to all nations including Israel.

The peace of the world in the Middle East as elsewhere requires that America honors her commitments.

Mr. Speaker, the petition with these signatures was presented to me for delivery to the President of the United States which, accordingly I have dispatched to the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I join in this petition to the President and urge all Members of Congress and Americans of all faiths to endorse the President's forthright statement of May 23, 1967. We must in addition, urge our Government to give Israel all possible material assistance and political support to bring to an end once and for all, Nasser's policies of aggression and expansionism, designed to destroy the State of Israel, in a holy war.

Israel, an oasis in a desert of medieval feudalism, is the only bastion of democracy in the Middle East. The defense of Israel is in America's national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to my colleagues in the Congress to urge the United Nations to push for direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab nations. This is so essential to the restoration of peace—for just as a skirmish can light the spark which starts a confrontation—the conflict can light the spark for a world war. Diplomatic channels which have not been successful of late in maintaining or in restoring peace in the troubled areas of the world must be made effective and the hands of our President must be strengthened to implement our Nation's commitment to the independence and integrity of the State of Israel and her rights to navigation through the Straits of Tiran.

We pray that diplomacy will succeed in the Middle East crisis—if it fails—we must not fail Israel.

The Fire Marshal Plan, a Program of Sustained Classroom Sixth Grade Education, as Conducted in Boston and Other Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for almost two decades I have followed with great interest a program that originated in my district in Boston and which, I am proud to say, has become known and adopted in many communities in the United States, and even adopted by other nations, such as Sweden.

It is known as the fire marshal plan, and is a sustained program of fire prevention by education conducted at the sixth-grade level. It is usually conducted by the local fire department in cooperation with the local schools. It is often sponsored by a local organization. In Boston the fire marshal plan has been sponsored by the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters.

However, many communities have the fire marshal plan so beneficial, not only for preventing fires but as an outstanding youth program, that the local fire and school departments have incorporated the slight cost of the program in their budgets. My information is that the cost averages out to approximately 30 cents per sixth-grade pupil, boys and girls, and a rule of thumb is that there is an average of 100 sixth-grade pupils for every 8,000 in population.

In other words, the cost for an average size community of 50,000 would be about $150. This is an extremely small cost in view of the proven reduction in loss of life and property where the fire marshal plan has been conducted.

Let me just refer to some sample reports from communities that adopted the fire marshal plan:

Watertown, Mass.: The Watertown Press in a full page feature story cited the following fire loss figures:

> The year before adopting the Fire Marshal Plan Watertown fire losses were $235,483. The first year under the program they dropped to $38,789. The second year they dropped to an all-time low of $19,332.

Warren, Ohio: The chamber of commerce reported in a survey of the results following the first year of the fire marshal plan a drop of 10 percent in fire losses and a 20-percent drop in number of dwelling fires.

Woonsocket, R.I., reported a 40-percent drop in fire losses the first year of the fire marshal plan.

Flint, Mich., has conducted the fire marshal plan for many years with outstanding success. I am sure my fellow Congressmen who have represented Michigan recall the visits to Washington, under the leadership of Deputy Fire Marshal Dennis Sullivan of the Flint Fire Department, of the boys and girls who performed so faithfully in this fire marshal plan.

Johnstown, Pa., reported that not only had the fire marshal plan reduced fires and losses from fire, but that it had so many beneficial effects as a youth program that it has been renamed "A Fire Prevention and Juvenile Delinquency Program." For years it has been conducted and paid for by the school department.

This factor of being an outstanding youth program has become the source of praise from many communities and from church and youth leaders. I would like to quote from an article written by Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, in the diocesan paper, The Pilot, in 1964. Aware for many years of the effectiveness of the fire marshal plan, he has praised the program for its collateral values in teaching children respect for property and instilling at the most impressionable age a lasting sense of civic responsibility and participation.

In his article, he was praising in particular the achievements of "two Negro boys who organized their neighbors and for a period of several weeks succeeded in turning in, respectively, 3,492 and 2,974 credit slips for corrected fire hazards certified by fire department instructors."

Cardinal Cushing added—

> These are only two of almost 15,000 Sixth Grade Boston boys and girls who each year so enthusiastically win the cooperation of parents and other adults in eliminating fire hazards.

The significance of all this has become apparent because of the success of what is known throughout the United States as the Boston plan.

One of the most sensitive and gravest urban problems in recent years has been that of fairly and nondiscriminatorily providing fire insurance in substandard areas and which, unfortunately, have have been referred to as "tension areas."

The Boston plan was a means whereby fire insurance for these areas would not be denied merely because of being in such areas and would not be rejected at standard rates without prior inspection.

The program began on October 1, 1960. For almost 7 years it has been possible to provide fire insurance at standard rates—that is, avoiding any surcharge because of area—to over 95 percent of the risks that have requested inspection.

I wish to quote from testimony given to the Massachusetts Legislature as recently as April 1967:

> From Oct. 1960, when the program got underway, to the year-end 1966, the plan has inspected 22,131 properties, issued 28,274 fire policies for a total value of $184,983,000.

It was further pointed out that the plan had resulted in fewer fires and loss of life and property in these areas than would normally be expected, and that the Boston fire department had supported this conclusion. Credit was given to the residents for their cooperation. The point is that the fire marshal plan instructors devoted extra attention to these areas. The attitude built up by years of instruction to sixth-grade children, and through them to their parents, as Cardinal Cushing pointed out, had greatly reduced the number of fires.

As a result, the Boston plan has been cited by the insurance industry as the model plan for other troubled cities, and has been adopted by several cities. This is one more reason why we urge the adoption of a sustained education program at the best age, such as the fire marshal plan.

We need only to look at Sweden to appreciate the value and success of this type of program. One of the earliest enthusiastic advocates of the fire marshal plan was a longtime Boston Swedish consul, Arthur J. Anderson, who died a few years ago. He was noted for his many civic activities. In his visits to Sweden, and with other contacts, he supplied information about the fire marshal plan.

It may well be that Swedish officials developed the idea separately, but their success provides further evidence of its value. At the 93d International Association of Fire Chiefs Convention, attended by over 5,000, from all over the world, the feature address was given by Chief Sven Sonnerberg, president of the Swedish Fire Chiefs Association. In his address, entitled "A Modern Scandinavian Fire Department of Our Time," he credited this program for a remarkable reduction in fires and an almost complete elimination of false alarms.

False alarms have long been held to be an evidence of vandalism and improper respect for property. Sweden has adopted this program universally at the seventh-grade level. In America, the sixth-grade level has been the choice of most school officials, but otherwise the program and, more important, the results have been the same in demonstrating the great value and need of this sustained classroom education by uniformed fire department instructors.

It is true that in many communities firefighters visit schools, especially during Fire Prevention Week, and often they distribute material in the hope that it will be brought home and read by parents. But more than 20 years of successful operation of the fire marshal plan proves that to be most effective any effort to educate schoolchildren must follow the well-established methods of our educational system.

This means that education must be directed at a certain grade. Our schools do not attempt to teach multiplication tables and algebra to the same age groups. Also, an effective fire prevention program must be taught in the classroom rather than in a school assembly of all grades. It must be sustained and taught by uniformed firefighters.

This places no extra burden on schoolteachers. On the contrary, to be effective the program must be the pupils' own program. It is centered around a key pupil designated as the room fire marshal. Hence the name of the program. Moreover, teachers have found that the interest generated by the visit of the uniformed firefighters can be directed most advantageously into general school work. This has happened so often that teachers have become the best advocates of the fire marshal plan.

I have brought this program up to date because the times and conditions in which we now find ourselves, such as the unrest, the tensions and, yes, the vandalism and wanton destruction of property, have given new value to this fire marshal plan which teaches at the best age a lasting sense of respect for property and a sense of civic participation.

It is for such reasons that in my State the Massachusetts State Chamber of Commerce has made the increased adoption of the fire marshal plan a major project. It has the support of such organizations as the New England Kiwanis, local chambers of commerce, local insurance groups, and many others.

I urge all to give serious thought to the adoption of this type of program in their own communities.

Why Our Nation Must Explore the Possibility of Adopting the Metric System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last week, after years of agonizing discussions, frequently punctuated by periods when it appeared that unbridgeable chasms existed between our Nation and the other countries participating in the GATT talks, an agreement was reached providing for the substantial reduction of tariffs between the world's developed nations.

Although there has been a general reluctance to impute too much to this monumental agreement, it is surely safe to suggest that even the most conservative isolationist would concede that the significant reductions achieved will eventually spell sizable increase in world trade. How substantial? No one knows and few dare estimate. Nonetheless, it is clear that marked progress has been made in facilitating international commerce.

As President Johnson pointed out:

> The barriers that fell at Geneva clear the way for great advances in trade.

Yet the great success at Geneva makes ironical the fact that our Nation has been so slow in taking the concomitant steps needed to assure it an increasing share of the world markets which will be opened. I make specific reference to a small yet very important study for which my able colleague, Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER, has called. This investigation is embodied in H.R. 3136, which is now pending action by the Rules Committee. H.R. 3136 would "authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States."

"What," you might ask, "has a bill to authorize a study to determine the feasibility of increased use of the metric system to do with increased trade?" Over 90 percent of the world's nations have in use or are in the process of adopting the metric system as their official standard of measurement. Many of these same countries have made the use of the inch-pound, the English system, illegal. More directly related to the query is the fact that in nearly all of the world's developed nations—France, Italy, Japan, Germany, and England, yes, even the nation which originated our current system—have adopted or are in the process of adopting the metric system. If our Nation's industries are to compete effectively in world markets, if our goods are to be serviced overseas, if, in short, we are to take full advantage of the favorable trade climate made possible by the successful Kennedy round discussions, we must begin moving toward the adoption of the metric system.

The economic benefits which would accrue to our Nation should we adopt this system are so significant that we cannot consider further delay in acting favorably on this piece of legislation. It was estimated, over a year ago, that the acceptance by our Nation of the metric system would increase by $10 billion the amount of our annual foreign sales. Exports last year totaled less than $30 billion. The extent to which this amount would be multiplied by the reduction of tariff barriers has not been estimated. However, there can be little doubt that the increase would be significantly in excess of the earlier estimate. This potential increase, in exports of over one-third, and the substantial benefits accruing therefrom are highly significant. The value of this increased activity would benefit American business, industry, and labor. In addition, it could be an important contributing factor to the amelioration of our increasingly critical balance-of-payments problem. These substantial benefits would warrant a sizable expenditure of funds should this be necessary. However, no such significant expenditure of funds is called for by H.R. 3136. The bill authorizes a first-year appropriation of only a half million dollars. In my view, these funds and the underpining that they will provide for the possible adoption of the metric system may well represent the best investment that this Congress can make in the future growth and development of our country's economic vitality.

There have been many charges that the conversion to the metric system would be so vastly expensive that it should not be considered. I counter on two fronts. First, by asking the rhetorical question: Can we afford not to consider adopting the system? In this vein, I would only point to the great potential markets that we exclude from ourselves by using the incompatible "English" system. Second, I submit that no convincing evidence has been prepared to document the cost of the transition. No one has established, to my knowledge, that machines have a "preference" for making parts only on the "English" system. The record is clear that the study proposed in H.R. 3136 would explore this dimension of the problem. Surely the existing evidence, sketchy as it is, is not sufficient to support a conclusive finding, especially when the benefits appear so great and for less money than our Government spends annually for measuring devices, we can fully explore the potential costs and benefits arising from the implementation of the metric system.

In concluding, I wish to reemphasize my view that this important bill, H.R. 3136, should be enacted promptly so that progress can be made in fully exploring the implications of adopting the metric system.

Immediate Cease-Fire in Middle East a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the fuse has been lit. Who lit it is not the question with which we ought to be primarily concerned. Every effort should be first exerted to put the fuse out before it is too late.

Unless an early settlement is reached, the situation in the Middle East is more likely to explode into world war III than the conflict in Vietnam. It is my fervent hope that the United Nations Security Council will act with wisdom and dispatch to effect a cease-fire. If it fails to do so the usefulness of the United Nations as a peacekeeping organization will have ebbed to zero.

As responsible leaders of the most powerful member of that organization let us give full support to President Johnson's plea for immediate cease-fire action by the United Nations.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia.

Rev. William E. Smith, Waialae Baptist Church, Honolulu, Hawaii, offered the following prayer:

Father, these are not ordinary days; these are not ordinary men, and You are not an ordinary God. With the crises of the hour weighing heavily upon these men, give them wisdom that they need to know and the strength to do Your will.

Lord, we need Your help and blessing. Make us to realize that without Your guidance, we cannot really know the right direction to go as a nation.

Bless these men today and lead them by Your Holy Spirit to agree upon that which America needs and to reject the rest. Regardless of party or geographical location, unite all of their hearts and minds to courageously stand for what is right.

Let there be no bitterness or selfishness. O Lord, through them do great things. By their actions may all of the world know that they are not only powerful, but also compassionate and fair.

Increase our faith and dependence on You. Forgive our sins. Draw us close and inspire our hearts. We ask these things in Jesus' name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1967.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 5, 1967, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

TRAINING PROGRAMS—BILL ORDERED TO LIE ON THE TABLE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 280, S. 9, to authorize on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and certain flight training under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the educational assistance allowances paid under such chapter, and for other purposes, be ordered to lie on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 5, 1967, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 666) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 714) to amend section 22(g) of the Federal Reserve Act relating to loans to executive officers by member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the loan provisions relating to directors, members of the supervisory committee, and members of the credit committee of Federal credit unions, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1649) authorizing the change in name of certain water resource projects under jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 678. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2154. An act to provide long-term leasing for the Gila River Indian Reservation;

H.R. 3979. An act to amend section 6409 (b) (1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General;

H.R. 4241. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H.R. 4496. An act for the relief of the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.;

H.R. 4919. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Hualapai Reservation in Arizona;

H.R. 7362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain properties within the Colonial National Historical Park, in Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes;

H.R. 8140. An act to provide for the settlement of claims against the District of Columbia by officers and employees of the District of Columbia for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10226. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 678. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2154. An act to provide long-term leasing for the Gila River Indian Reservation;

H.R. 4919. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Hualapai Reservation in Arizona; and

H.R. 7362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain properties within the Colonial National Historical Park, in Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3979. An act to amend section 6409 (b) (1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General; and

H.R. 10226. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4241. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4496. An act for the relief of the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.; and

H.R. 8140. An act to provide for the settlement of claims against the District of Columbia by officers and employees of the District of Columbia for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Amendments to the Budget, 1968, for Legislative, Judiciary, and Executive Branches (S. Doc. No. 32)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1968, in the amounts of $278,850 for the legislative branch, $101,195 for the judiciary, and $1,560,000 for agencies of the executive branch (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Report on Title I Agreements Under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the months of April and May 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report of Federal Aviation Agency

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Aviation Agency, for the fiscal year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need for improvements in supply and maintenance support for F-4 aircraft, Department of the Navy, dated June 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Improvement of Programs of Insured Loans to Students

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to strengthen and improve the programs of insured loans to students (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Reduction of Ratio of Career Substitutes to Regular Employees in Postal Field Service

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reduce from five to four, the ratio of career substitutes to regular employees in the Postal Field Service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. Monroney and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Ohio Senate Resolution

"Memorializing the 90th Congress of the United States to do whatever is necessary to insure there is no reduction in the combat divisions of the Army National Guard

"Whereas, The national policy of the United States is to bring peace to southeast Asia; and

"Whereas, The maintennace of peace in the middle east and the Caribbean may require the commitment of military forces; and

"Whereas, The National Guard, historically has been raised and trained by the sovereign states, and has been immediately responsive to support the regular military establishment in three major wars and one international incident in recent memory; and

"Whereas, The citizen-soldier now stands ready to answer the call to duty; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the members of the Senate of the 107th General Assembly of Ohio do hereby respectfully memorialize the 90th Congress to insure that the combat responsiveness of the reserve components is not decimated by the elimination of any combat divisions of the National Guard; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be spread upon the pages of the Journal, and that the Clerk of the Senate transmit properly authenticated copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice-President of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the two United States senators from Ohio, and to each member of the House of Representatives in Congress from Ohio."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 15

"Assembly joint resolution relative to fish and wildlife resources

"Whereas, Federal and state agencies have proposed a series of major water projects in the north coast area of California; and

"Whereas, The construction of these projects will have a major impact on fish and wildlife resources in the area, particularly affecting the anadromus fish and the winter deer range; and

"Whereas, The saving of fish and wildlife is of great importance to the people of California, as fish and wildlife are a vital economic resource as well as an important source of pleasure and recreation in this state; and

"Whereas, Detailed planning prior to the construction of projects is extremely important in regard to the savings of fish, being essential to effective preservation at the lowest possible cost; and

"Whereas, Many general problems such as the effect of turbidity and temperature on fish are of critical importance in connection with the construction of these projects; and

"Whereas, The State of California under provisions governing state constructed projects is making substantial appropriations of money for the study of fish and wildlife resources preservation and enhancement on the north coast; and

"Whereas, The federal government is not spending a proportionate amount of funds for such studies; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the funds available to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for basic biological investigation in connection with water projects on the north coast of California in order to determine the impact of such projects on fish and wildlife resources; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 791

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to ensure and provide a sound and healthy domestic trawl fishery through tariff or quota protection on imported groundfish

"Whereas, The importance and nutritional value of fish and shellfish in the world (F.P.C.) and the American diet are becoming increasingly more important as a protein resource; and

"Whereas, our federal agencies involved have found on three occasions since 1953-1954 that our domestic trawl fish industry was being hurt or injured by importations, and yet executive administrative action has not been forthcoming to provide this needed protection; and

"Whereas, the United States domestic fishery production has decreased and diminished consistently since 1954 to the point of having dropped in world production from second place to fifth place (1964) with Norway overtaking the United States in 1966; and

"Whereas, the domestic fishing industry, having been severely criticized for not having up-graded itself, has found so doing impossible as long as any and all foreign nations can so conveniently ship fishery products into the United States; and

"Whereas, the United States production of these species in 1966 was only 19.2% of the total United States supply and that from imports was 80.8% (U.S.D.I. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries Annual Summary, 'Packaged Fishery Products—1966', C.F.S. No. 4343); and

"Whereas, foreign fishing on our coasts and importations are one and the same problem, and are destroying the domestic trawl industry; and

"Whereas, some processing plants in the United States are limiting the landings of other trawled seafoods due to the heavy and steadily increasing imports of similar species; now, therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States take appropriate action to ensure and provide a sound and healthy domestic trawl fishery through tariff or quota protection on imported groundfish, and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the vice-president of the United States, to the speaker of the house of representatives of the United States, and to each of the senators and representatives from the state of Rhode Island in the congress of the United States, earnestly request-

ing that each use his best efforts to enact legislation which would carry out the purposes of this resolution."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 46

"A concurrent resolution to memorialize the U.S. Congress to take adequate steps to reduce the Federal tax load or to rebate to the States on an equitable basis a portion of the Federal taxes collected

"Whereas, the State, parish and local governments are unable to tax at a sufficient rate to maintain the increasing tax load for state, parish and local governments, and

"Whereas, the federal tax load is so great that the state, parish and local governments do not feel that they can further increase this tax load in order to gain much needed additional revenue, and

"Whereas, the state, parish and local governments are not able to maintain a balance in tax receipts with tax receipts of the federal government, and

"Whereas, many of the ever increasing federal grants-in-aid programs require the states to match federal funds, thus diverting monies from older and equally essential state, parish and local programs, and

"Whereas, the federal government is able to raise a substantially greater amount of revenue than state, parish and local governments, and

"Whereas, several bills to provide for sharing of federal tax revenues with the states have been introduced in the 90th Congress.

"Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Louisiana Legislature, the Senate concurring herein, that the Congress of the United States is hereby urged and requested to take adequate steps and to enact needed legislation to reduce the federal tax load or to rebate to the states on an equitable basis a portion of the federal taxes collected.

"Be It Further Resolved that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the two houses of the United States Congress and to each member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States."

A committee substitute for a House Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Committee Substitute for House Memorial 645

"A memorial to Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will permit the settlement of a controversy over the ownership and use of the Breckenridge and Call grants in Santa Rosa County, Fla., so as to make available approximately 1,049 acres of land now owned by individuals for use by the University of West Florida, Florida Board of Parks and Historic Memorials, and other governmental agencies, the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts of America

"Whereas, the Honorable Robert L. F. Sikes, Member of Congress, introduced H.R. 13883 on March 22, 1966; in the House of Representatives of the 89th Congress of the United States, Second Session, which contained the following statements:

" 'Whereas it is the intent of this Act to end a controversy which has existed for more than twenty years; to promote the development of Santa Rosa County and the State of Florida; to remove the impediment to such development caused by said controversy; to restore to the State of Florida approximately one thousand forty-nine acres to be devoted to public purposes; to permit the State to actively develop this major portion of the land for the purposes for which it was conveyed to the State of Florida in 1947; to permit the private development of approximately two hundred thirty-four acres by persons adjudged by the Courts of Florida to be the owners thereon and to place such lands on the tax rolls of said county; and

" 'Whereas a portion of the properties is required by the University of West Florida, a State institution, for educational purposes and the remainder for the development of a waterfront live oak park of incomparable beauty, and for the preservation of one of the last remaining portions of the trail traversed by the armies of General Andrew Jackson, known as the Jackson Trail, the Indian artifacts thereon and the historical heritage of the area for posterity; and

" 'Whereas certain of the lands presently occupied by the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of America and the lands herein described, to be administered by the Florida Board of Parks and Historic Memorials, contain sufficient area to make provisions for such organizations; and

" 'Whereas it is recommended and understood that the State shall permit the above organizations, consistent with its obligations to operate a public park, the use of a reasonable portion of the lands adequate for the requirements of such organizations; and

" 'Whereas, the United States Government having previously sold and transferred the property in its entirety to the State of Florida, will incur only a nominal expense in implementing the provisions of this Act and no expense in the development of the land for public purposes;' and

"Whereas, the body of the proposed law set forth that the title to the 1,283 acres, in the final decree of the Circuit Court of the First Judicial Circuit of Florida, in and for Santa Rosa County, Florida, dated September 19, 1955, recorded in Chancery Order Book 16 at page 493 to 501, both inclusive, was determined not to be vested in the State of Florida but to be vested in certain individuals subject only to a restrictive covenant that the property be used for park purposes, and

"Whereas, since June 20, 1947, the said lands have been used in their natural state for park purposes and recreation of the public as well as by the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of America, and

"Whereas, the said H.R. 13883 provided that it was 'deemed appropriate, in resolving the various equities and interests, that (1) full ownership, control, and management of that portion of the reservation situated north of the north right-of-way line of United States Highway 98 and comprising approximately 1,049 acres (referred to as the "north portion") shall be vested in the State of Florida; and (2) that the interests of the private landowners shall be consolidated and vested exclusively in that portion of the reservation that is situated south of the north right-of-way line of said United States Highway 98 and which portion (hereinafter referred to as the "south portion") contains approximately 234 acres', and

"Whereas, that at the hearing before a subcommittee of the House of Representatives it was agreed by supporters of the bill and the agencies and organizations concerned, that approximately 200 acres would be utilized by the University of West Florida for educational purposes and that the remainder of the 1,049 acres would be administered by the Florida Board of Parks and Historic Memorials, allowing the Boy Scouts of America and Girl Scouts of America to utilize a portion thereof, which was satisfactory to those organizations, and

"Whereas, the said H.R. 13883 was not acted upon during the Second Session of the 89th Congress of the United States and therefore died on the calendar, and

"Whereas, the said Honorable Robert L. F. Sikes has indicated that he proposes to create a Gulf National Seashore and Historic Site extending from Destin, Florida to Louisiana and to include therein the Breckenridge and Call Grants in Santa Rosa County, Florida, under a settlement similar to that contained in H.R. 13883, and

"Whereas, the State of Florida paid to the United States of America One Hundred Thousand Dollars ($100,000.00) for said grants but as a result of litigation which terminated adversely to the State, the State of Florida acquired no title and has received no benefit from said expenditure, and

"Whereas, under the terms of H.R. 13883 the State of Florida will be enabled to acquire a valid title to 1049 acres by the Federal Government releasing the restrictive covenant relating to the 234 acres South of U.S. Highway 98, and

"Whereas, said 1049 acres will be devoted to public purposes for the benefit of the citizens of the State of Florida and of the other states of the union, and 234 acres of land will be returned to the tax rolls of Santa Rosa County, Florida, and the development thereof will make a major contribution to the economy of Santa Rosa County, Florida, and of West Florida, and

"Whereas, the United States has parted with its interest in said property except to retain a right of reversion if the said lands are not used for park purposes, and

"Whereas, immediate action is urgently needed so as to proceed with the development of the property for educational and other purposes, Now therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

"That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to enact into law H.R. 13883 introduced in the House of Representatives in the 89th Congress of the United States, Second Session, or a similar bill which will (1) permit the utilization of 1049 acres of the Breckenridge and Call Grants North of U.S. Highway 98 in Santa Rosa County, for public purposes, including educational and park purposes, providing the western 200 acres for the University of West Florida, an adjoining 75 acres for the use of the Boy Scouts of America and a 75 acre parcel adjoining the last described parcel for the use of the Girl Scouts of America, and (2) authorize the release, subject to the condition in the H.R. 13883, of the 234 acres south of U.S. Highway 98 from the terms and provisions of the restrictive covenants contained in the conveyance from the United States to the State of Florida, dated June 20, 1947; and

"Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives representing the State of Florida in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 127

"A concurrent resolution to place the Louisiana Legislature on record as opposing passage by the Congress of the United States of Senate bill No. 1, as amended, and House Resolution No. 5384, and all similiar legislation, imposing unreasonable and unwarranted restrictions on the sale, possession and use of firearms by sportsmen and other reputable citizens

"Whereas, certain legislation has been introduced in the United States Congress, in particular Senate Bill 1, as amended, and House of Representatives Bill 5384, which would prohibit all mail order sales of firearms to individuals, and all interstate sales of handguns, and would permit such sales only between licensed importers, manufacturers and dealers, thereby placing severe, unreasonable and burdensome restrictions upon reputable citizens who desire or need to purchase any firearm by mail or handgun in interstate commerce, and

"Whereas, the issuance of a federal firearms license after proper application had been made would be discretionary with the Secretary of the Treasury, and

"Whereas, the 'Findings and Declaration' of Senate Bill 1 and House of Representatives Bill 5384 are conflicting and in part erroneous, and

"Whereas, the founders of the United States of America provided guarantees of freedom of religion, of speech, of the press and of assembly in the first amendment to the Constitution, and specifically granted to the people the right to defend these freedoms in the second amendment by providing that the right of the people to keep and bear arms should not be infringed, and

"Whereas, the proposed firearms legislation as expressed in Senate Bill 1 and House of Representatives Bill 5384, and in bills of similar import introduced in the United States Congress, place severe restrictions and harassments upon the purchase, use and ownership of firearms by responsible citizens and constitute serious infringement of the Articles of the Bill of Rights, in particular the second, ninth and tenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and

"Whereas, by their terms and through administrative control, Senate Bill 1 and House of Representatives 5384 and similar legislation discourage and complicate the private acquisition and use of firearms to the extent that the private ownership of firearms might eventually cease, and

"Whereas, such restrictive regulations as are contained in the Dodd Bill (S. 1) and the Celler Bill (H.R. 5384) and similar legislation against firearms sales could have a crippling effect on the economy of the multi-million-dollar-a-year sales and services business associated with recreational use of firearms in the state of Louisiana, and would only result in the further loss of American liberty, add to the workload and responsibility of our law enforcement agencies and personnel, and inconvenience and penalize law-abiding citizens, and

"Whereas, the accessibility of firearms to all citizens does not contribute significantly to greater crime in the United States, but in fact the ownership of firearms by citizens trained in their use provides a deterrent to crime and to the lawless elements of our society, and

"Whereas, the target for preventative legislation should be the crime and the criminal, not the tools used by the perpetrators of crimes, and severe penalties should be imposed on the criminal use of firearms, and

"Whereas, Federal excise taxes on sales of firearms and other forms of revenue from special licenses and stamps for recreational hunting provide many millions of dollars annually for the conservation and preservation of wildlife of all kinds, and

"Whereas, the passage of Senate Bill 1 and House of Representatives 5384 and similar legislation would greatly curtail the use of firearms by the youth of our Nation for recreational and sporting purposes, and thus prevent many of the young people of the Nation from learning the use of firearms under supervision and control, thereby creating a dangerous situation in later years whereby there would be a great number of inexperienced adults using firearms, and

"Whereas, it is in the great interest of the national defense against enemy invasion that the people of the United States be familiar with, accustomed to using, and the owners of, firearms, and

"Whereas, the training of all citizens, especially the young people of our Nation, in the safe and proper use of firearms constitutes the best method of reducing the misuse of firearms, by instilling responsibility, self-discipline and safety, and

"Whereas, history has shown that in some countries it was partially through registration or exorbitant taxation of weapons and the control of all such weapons by a small percentage of the populace that the democratic form of government of the people, by the people, and for the people was lost, and

"Whereas, the proposed legislation contained in Senate Bill 1 and House of Representatives 5384 and similar legislation if passed would in fact place many burdensome restrictions upon all states, local governments and their citizens, and would encroach upon the lawful activities of the states' legislatures and law enforcement bodies, usurping the power of the states to make and enforce laws reasonably regulating the use of firearms and ownership thereof by the citizens of each State, and

"Whereas, House of Representatives 5384 is so worded as to place the Congress in the position of establishing a policy of preempting state firearms control if there is any direct and positive conflict between Federal law and state law concerning firearms ownership, acquisition and possession.

"Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, the Senate concurring herein, that the Louisiana Legislature does hereby go on record as opposing the passage of Senate Bill 1 as amended, known as the Dodd Bill, and as opposing the passage of House of Representatives 5384, known as the Celler Bill, and all similar legislation, and urges and requests that each and every member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States actively oppose and vote against the passage of said Senate Bill 1 and House of Representatives 5384 and similar legislation, and

"Be it further resolved that the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States is hereby urged and requested to support legislation providing for the imposition of mandatory imprisonment of all persons who use a firearm in the perpetration or attempted perpetration of a crime in interstate commerce, and

"Be it further resolved that the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit, without delay, copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each of the two Houses in Congress, the chairmen of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, and to each Member of the Louisiana delegation in Congress."

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works:

Fred B. Burke, of Michigan, to be alternate Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1903. A bill for the relief of Hamilton Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 1904. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide an additional 1,726 miles to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to provide for the designation of a highway from Brownsville, Tex., to the North Dakota-Canadian border as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1905. A bill to amend provisions of the Shipping Act, 1916, to authorize the Federal Maritime Commission to permit a carrier to refund a portion of the freight charges;

S. 1906. A bill to amend section 510(a)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936;

S. 1907. A bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws; and

S. 1908. A bill to permit tacking of citizen ownership of vessels for trade-in purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1909. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the completion of the first transcontinental railroad to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. MOSS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of New York):

S. 1910. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to landlords and tenants; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. BOGGS):

S. 1911. A bill providing for a study of serious interruptions of certain essential services; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1912. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, by adding section 245, to prohibit the knowingly making of false statements pertaining to any alleged deprivation of constitutional rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 1913. A bill to provide authority to increase the effectiveness of the Truth in Negotiations Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO CONTINUE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CASE, and Mr. BOGGS) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 32

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, established by Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to March 11, 1965, is hereby continued through December 31, 1967.

SEC. 2. The joint committee is hereby authorized to make expenditures from July 1, 1967, through December 31, 1967, not to exceed $50,000.00, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT "A PRELIMINARY PRESENTATION OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR PLANNING A CONTINUING FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM"

Mr. RANDOLPH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 132); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the preliminary presentation of the American Association of State Highway Officials Special Committee for Planning a Continuing Federal-Aid Highway Program be printed as a Senate document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed twenty-five hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CASE, and Mr. BOGGS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 133); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the first sentence of Senate Resolution 293, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session, agreed to August 26, 1966 (relating to the establishment of the Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967", and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1967".

REFUND OF FREIGHT CHARGES UNDER SHIPPING ACT, 1916

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request of the Federal Maritime Commission, a bill for appropriate reference, to amend provisions of the Shipping Act, 1916, to authorize the Federal Maritime Commission to permit a carrier to refund a portion of the freight charges.

The bill would empower the Commission to authorize carriers to make voluntary refunds to shippers and waive the collection of a portion of their freight charges for good cause such as a bona fide mistake.

Section 18(b) appears to prohibit the Commission from authorizing relief where, through a bona fide mistake on the part of the carrier, the shipper is charged more than he understood the rate to be. For example, a carrier after advising a shipper that he intends to file a reduced rate and thereafter fails to file the reduced rate with the Federal Maritime Commission, must charge the shipper under the aforementioned circumstances the higher rates.

Another example would be where a reissued tariff page contains a typographical error changing a rate, for example, republishing a rate in error as $73 per ton rather than continuing it on the page as $37 per ton. In such a situation, under section 18(b)(3) of the Shipping Act, a carrier can charge only the published rate, and the Commission cannot permit an adjustment to the intended rate.

This amendment is necessary because the Shipping Act, 1916, unlike the Interstate Commerce Act, contains no statutory authority which empowers the Commission to direct the enforcement of a reasonable rate. The Interstate Commerce Act, which applies to domestic rail carriers, motor carriers, water carriers, and freight forwarders, specifically provides, as to each form of transportation, authority to fix and enforce reasonable rates—sections 15(1), 216(e), 307(b), and 406(b). Therefore, even though the Interstate Commerce Act contains a provision similar to section 18(b)(3) of the Shipping Act, providing that carriers can only charge rates specified in tariffs on file with the Commission, a different rate can be directed and enforced when that Commission makes a finding that the published rate is "unreasonable" and directs the enforcement of a "reasonable rate." Since no such reasonable rate fixing authority is contained in the Shipping Act applicable to ocean carriers engaged in our foreign commerce, the Commission feels it necessary to obtain the statutory authority contained in this proposed legislation. Only in this manner can rate relief be granted by the Commission where a bona fide mistaken rate filing has resulted in a clearly inequitable and unreasonable rate being charged to a shipper.

The Federal Maritime Commission has not been able to afford relief in certain instances in which equity calls for granting of refunds. On January 13, 1965, the Federal Maritime Commission in its report on special docket Nos. 377 and 378 stated as follows:

> Strikingly absent from the authority upon us over rates in the foreign trades is any power to set a "reasonable" rate.

Under the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, the Commission may prescribe a just and reasonable maximum or minimum rate, fare, or charge, thereby affording relief for persons subject to that act. The absence of such authority from the Shipping Act, 1916, has resulted in the Commission being unable to afford equitable relief thereunder. If the Commission is granted authority to permit deviation from a filed tariff, hardship could be avoided.

The amendment contains, in the second and third paragraphs, the necessary safeguards to insure that there is not any favoritism or discrimination among shippers. They provide that before refund may be made or waiver of collection of a portion of their charges may be granted, a carrier must file a new tariff rate and the resulting rate is both retroactive and prospective from the date of shipment, thereby insuring the effective rate will be enforced for a sufficient period of time to discourage any attempt at discrimination among shippers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1905) to amend provisions of the Shipping Act, 1916, to authorize the Federal Maritime Commission to permit a carrier to refund a portion of the freight charges, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

TRADE-INS OF WAR-BUILT MERCHANT SHIPS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request of the Department of Commerce, a bill to amend section 510 (a)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

When section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, was enacted it defined an "obsolete vessel" for the purposes of the trade-in provisions of that section as a vessel which, first, is of not less than 1,350 gross tons; second, is not less than 17 years old and, in the judgment of the Commission—now the Secretary of Commerce—is obsolete or inadequate for successful operation in the domestic or foreign trade of the United States; and, third, is owned by a citizen or citizens of the United States and has been owned by such citizen or citizens for at least 3 years immediately prior to the date of acquisition under the section.

In 1952, however, a proviso was added to this definition which provided that until June 30, 1958, the term "obsolete vessel" shall mean a vessel which, first, is not less than 1,350 gross tons; second, is not less than 12 years old; and, third, is owned by a citizen or citizens of the United States and has been owned by such citizen or citizens for at least 3 years immediately prior to the date of acquisition under this section.

This proviso was extended by subsequent legislation to June 30, 1964, at which time it expired.

The difference between the original definition and the proviso is in subdivision (B) of both of them. Subdivision (B) of the original definition requires that the vessel to be traded in be not less than 17 years old and in the judgment of the Secretary obsolete or inadequate for successful operation in the domestic or foreign trade of the United States. Subdivision (B) of the proviso merely required that the vessel be not less than 12 years old.

The reason for enactment of the proviso was to permit an orderly replacement program for war-built ships all of which were built between 1941 and 1946 and would reach the end of their statutory 20-year lives between 1961 and 1966. The purpose was to avoid such block obsolescence by permitting the trade-in of some of these vessels before they become 20 years of age and some after they reach that age. For that reason the minimum age required for trade-in by the proviso was 12 years and there was no requirement for a finding that the traded-in ship is obsolete or inadequate for successful operation in the domestic or foreign trade of the United States.

Upon expiration of the proviso on June 30, 1964, the original definition again became applicable. The 17-year minimum age is not a problem, because all of the war-built ships were at least 17 years old on the date the proviso expired. The required finding, however, is not clearly consistent with other actions which the Maritime Administration must take in connection with its replacement program.

Under the replacement program for subsidized operators, some of the war-built ships will be operated with the aid of operating-differential subsidy until they are about 30 years of age. Section 605(b) of the act provides that operating-differential subsidy shall not be paid for the operation of vessels built before January 1, 1946, which are more than 20 years old—or for the operation of vessels built after that date which are more than 25 years old—unless the Secretary of Commerce finds that it is to the public interest to do so. A finding that a ship, say a C–3, is obsolete or inadequate for successful operation in the domestic or foreign trade of the United States at its age of 17 years is not clearly consistent with a finding that it is to the public interest to pay operating-differential subsidy for the operation of other ships of the same type until they are 30 years of age.

This bill would amend section 510(a)(1) to eliminate this inconsistency by striking out the required finding and substituting therefor a finding that the vessel should be replaced in the public interest. This would relate the required finding to the requirements of the replacement program.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1906) to amend section 510 (a)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

COLLECTION OF FEES BY THE BUREAU OF CUSTOMS UNDER THE NAVIGATION LAWS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request of the Department of the Treasury, a bill for appropriate reference, to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws.

In addition it would abolish certain fees which are prescribed by statute for entry and clearance of vessels, post entry, granting permits to proceed, receiving manifest, change of name of vessel, recording bills of sale, mortgages, hypothecations or other instruments, issuing certificates of ownership and issuing abstracts of title.

The repeal or amendment of these statutes is necessary in order that the Secretary of the Treasury, with regard to the Bureau of Customs, and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, with regard to the Coast Guard, may in their discretion set fees under the provisions of section 501 of the act of August 31, 1951, 65 Stat. 210.

It is contemplated that fees will be established for, but not necessarily limited to, admeasurement of vessels; registry of vessels; issuance of special certificates to vessels; authorization for changes of names of vessels; furnishing and recording abstracts of title of vessels; recording of evidence of title to, and encumbrances upon, vessels and the discharge of the latter; entry and clearance of vessels; furnishing certificates of ownership of vessels; furnishing copies of documents, records, or other papers filed in customs offices, and certifying such copies; furnishing certificates of inspection, seaworthiness, and stability of vessels; approval of vessel plans; inspection of equipment; furnishing officers' licenses and seamen's documents; shipment and discharge of seamen; certification or acceptance of equipment or material; and the issuance of certain vessel permits.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1907) to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

TACKING OF CITIZEN OWNERSHIP FOR TRADE-IN VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request of the Department of Commerce, a bill for appropriate reference, to permit tacking of citizen ownership of vessels for trade-in purposes under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended.

To be eligible for trade-in under the provisions of section 510, a vessel must meet the requirements of the definition of an "obsolete vessel" contained in that section.

One of the requirements of that definition is that the vessel must be owned by a citizen or citizens of the United States and must have been owned by such citizen or citizens for at least 3 years before the date the vessel is traded in. This required that the vessel must be owned by the same citizen owner for the 3 years prior to trade-in.

Because of this requirement, if an operator sells his vessel to a citizen instead of trading it in to the United States but must repossess the vessel for nonpayment of the purchase price the vessel is ineligible for trade-in until 3 years after the repossession.

This bill would remedy this situation by permitting the tacking of citizen ownership to meet the 3-year requirement. This will encourage operators to sell their vessels in the commercial market instead of trading them in to the United States.

This bill also deletes a proviso in the section which by its terms expired on June 30, 1964.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1908) to permit tacking of citizen ownership of vessels for trade-in purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

GOLDEN SPIKE MEMORIAL MEDAL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the striking of a medal to commemorate the centennial of the driving of the golden spike at Promontory, Utah, in 1869.

The State of Utah is making extensive plans to commemorate this occasion on its hundredth anniversary on May 10, 1969—just 2 years hence. The Utah Golden Spike Centennial Commission, which is headed by Mr. George Christensen, of Salt Lake City, and the National Golden Spike Society, Box Elder County, of which Mrs. Bernice Anderson, of Corinne, Utah, is president, are cooperating on plans.

My bill provides that the Treasury Department may strike medals, up to 500,000 in number, in two sizes and two medals, and that the medals must be designed in cooperation with the Utah Centennial Commission, which will bear the costs of the dies and the design. The Utah Historical Association will place the order for the medals, and supervise their sale.

The Utah Centennial Commission already has in hand the funds to pay for the design and dies, and the medals will be paid for as ordered. So, as in the case of commemorative medal bills generally, this measure will not cost the Federal Government any money.

Utah is putting forth a mighty effort to make the centennial a splendid and exciting event. It was at Promontory that the lines of steel finally linked the country from coast to coast, and united the east and west coasts of the United States. The completion of the transcontinental railroad tracks signaled the opening of the West, and the beginning of a new era. It was a milestone in our history—a milestone whose centenary is well worthy of a memorial medal.

I hope that the Congress will give favorable consideration to this measure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1909) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the completion of the first transcontinental railroad, introduced by Mr. MOSS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF ACT TO ESTABLISH A CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], for appropriate reference, a bill to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the District of Columbia Housing Code. In broad outlines this bill is similar to legislation I introduced at the end of the last Congress, and on which the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce, of which I am chairman, of the Senate District of Columbia Committee conducted 6 days of hearings. The bill provides for a court remedy of rent trusteeships, so that where landlords do not remedy housing code violations, tenants can go to court and pay their rents into a court fund which is then used to have the violations corrected. The bill also provides protection against retaliatory evictions or rent increases being used by unscrupulous landlords against tenants who exercise their rights under the housing code. In addition, the bill strengthens the authority of the District government to make repairs in houses which are manifestly unsafe, and to charge the cost of those repairs to the landlord. This provision permits repairs to be made even though the rents which could be paid into a court fund would be inadequate to do the job.

A number of provisions of this bill differ from the bill introduced last year. As a result of the hearings and consultations with interested parties, I have decided that the rent trusteeship provisions of the bill should only come into effect where code violations adversely affect the health, safety or basic amenities of the tenant's life. Where the Code violations are de minimis, the court machinery should not be invoked. I think this change should meet a significant objection to the bill which many reputable landlords expressed during the hearings last year.

In addition, last year a number of witnesses criticized the portion of the bill providing for compulsory housekeeping education courses for tenants who violate their responsibilities under the housing code. Many people felt that because the courses would be compulsory, those forced to attend would regard them as a burden and others in the community who might benefit from the courses would stay away from them because of their association with court compulsion. I think there is considerable merit in these views. Education in housekeeping skills is, I believe, as important as consumer education and other skill-training which can make disadvantaged residents of the city better and more effective citizens. These education programs should be presented in a manner best designed to enhance their effectiveness. The bill therefore now provides that the District of Columbia government shall establish free and voluntary housekeeping education courses, coordinated with other programs already offered by other agencies in consumer education and the like.

The bill also now provides that landlords cannot relieve themselves of liability for injuries caused to tenants as a result of the landlord's negligence. Many leases today contain this unfair waiver of liability. And the bill now requires housing code inspectors to give prompt notice to tenants regarding the results of inspections carried out as a result of tenant complaints, and gives tenants the right to appeal adverse findings to the courts. In this respect, the tenant is given enforcement rights which the landlord has always had.

There are a number of other changes in the bill, but these are the most important. I hope that, with these changes, the bill will be generally acknowledged as useful and necessary in making the housing code an effective instrument of housing improvement in this city.

There are, of course, many shortcomings to the housing codes, and the bill I introduce today will not remedy all of these. Housing codes typically require only the most minimal standards of construction and housing maintenance. And even these minimal standards are often virtually impossible to enforce. Rules against overcrowding are one example.

Overcrowding is a persistent, and widespread, housing code violation. Hearings which I conducted at the end of the last Congress indicated that, in Washington, D.C., overcrowding is the single most prevalent housing code violation. This is perhaps the most pernicious of all code violations, since it almost inevitably leads to deterioration of all facilities in the house through simple overuse. But overcrowding is the most difficult of all housing code violations to remedy when there is—as in Washington, D.C.—too few units available to house those who are crowded into the slum dwellings. In virtually every American city, there are far too few housing units available at prices which low or even moderate income families can afford. In addition, racial segregation cuts off many families who can afford better housing, and forces them to remain in competition for the limited amount of housing in restricted zones of the city. As a consequence of these factors, we have a sellers' and a landlords' market for housing, and municipal authorities are reluctant to enforce even the minimal standards of existing housing codes for fear that residents of substandard houses would simply be turned out into the streets by landlords who are unwilling to bear the expense of bringing their properties into compliance with the code.

It is thus evident that housing code enforcement cannot in itself bring suitable, decent housing to those who need it. But the inadequacies of housing code enforcement must not lead us to believe that the code is useless as an instrument of social policy. We must not conclude from these inadequacies that aggressive enforcement of the housing code will bring no useful results. Today in many cities—particularly in Washington—we seem to have fallen into that fallacy. The numbers of code inspectors are hopelessly inadequate. Where code violations are found, followup inspections are often halfhearted or nonexistent. Code enforcement as a general matter seems to have low priority in the city government.

I believe this situation must change. While code enforcement cannot solve all of our housing problems, it can significantly improve many intolerable abuses in the present system. The shameless disregard of elemental decency by slumlords in this city can and should be chopped by aggressive housing code enforcement. There are houses which have no heat in the winter; houses with plumbing that does not work; houses with dangerous and inadequate electrical wiring; houses infested with rats and vermin. There is no excuse for this.

I believe that if the community truly realized the degrading state of much housing in the city, strong public pressure would force city authorities to take immediate, far-ranging steps to meet the problem. Aggressive, well-publicized enforcement of the housing code is the most effective means to create this public pressure. Congressional hearings have their role, of course. And private groups also can and do make an important contribution toward creating public awareness. But the one place in the city where there is a continuing responsibility for overseeing housing conditions is in the governmental machinery responsible for housing code enforcement. From this place, continuing pressure should be created to upgrade the housing conditions of the city. Housing codes may not be the whole answer toward solving our problems. But aggressive enforcement of housing codes can and should be an important catalyst in forcing the community to recognize and deal with our problems. This is a primary purpose of the bill I introduce today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1910) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to landlords and tenants, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of New York), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED STUDY OF SERIOUS INTERRUPTIONS OF CERTAIN ESSENTIAL SERVICES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my able colleague from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill directing the Office of Emergency Planning to undertake a thorough investigation of the effects of serious interruptions of communications, transportation, and other essential public services resulting from major disruptions such as storms, strikes, and blackouts. My action is prompted by yesterday's massive blackout which saw power fail in a four-State area involving 15,000 square miles and 13 million people in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland.

This measure is essentially the same one which I sponsored last March in calling attention at that time to the Northeast power failure of November 1965, and the now legendary blizzard of 1966 which hit the eastern seaboard at the end of January.

The President, in his consumer message earlier this year, promised to propose legislation dealing with the reliability of electric utilities. This measure has not been forthcoming.

Yesterday's experience underscores that Congress cannot delay in seeking action. Our economy, and indeed the Nation's security, cannot risk the jeopardy of future occurrences, involving natural or human-caused calamities. Ways and means must be developed to avert such interruptions as the power failure and to minimize the consequence of natural events.

Under my bill the Director of OEP would be required to submit the results of the proposed study to Congress early next year, together with any recommendations to minimize the adverse effects of power failures. I urge immediate consideration of my bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1911) providing for a study of serious interruptions of certain essential services, introduced by Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. BOGGS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PROHIBITION OF FALSE STATEMENTS PERTAINING TO ANY ALLEGED DEPRIVATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, our law-enforcement officers in the United States for the past several years have been subjected to a particularly cruel type of harassment.

We repeatedly see our law-enforcement officers, who are doing their sworn duty to protect the public and maintain order, being repeatedly accused of violating people's civil rights.

In the vast majority of cases these charges have proved unfounded, and were obviously lodged to embarrass the police and to choke our local governments and courts with needless hearings.

I am introducing a bill today which will amend chapter 13 of title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new section.

This new section will make it a criminal offense for a person or persons knowingly giving or making false statements pertaining to deprivation of constitutional rights who knowingly and falsely accuse any law-enforcement officer.

Mr. President, this bill applies not only to local law-enforcement officers of States or communities, but also to members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I believe that the law-enforcement agencies in the United States are the finest in the world, and nowhere are citizens' rights so jealously guarded. It is shameful that agitators and so-called civil rights leaders can embarrass our police with a barrage of charges of police brutality.

These charges not only result in constant embarrassment of the outstanding professional law-enforcement officers, but they result in the loss of thousands of man-hours of investigations to clear these officers.

The demoralizing effect on law enforcement in general, and its accompanying confusion in attempts to avoid such scurrilous and false charges, is so great that it is difficult to estimate.

The time is long overdue to enact legislation that would prevent, or at least limit, the vast number of these false charges that are made each year.

In 1964, more than 1,700 such complaints were filed against officers throughout the country. Of that total, only five law-enforcement officers were found guilty.

What most people do not know is that during this same year, more than 18,000 law-enforcement officers were assaulted, and 7,738 of these officers were injured as a result of these assaults.

We hear cries for the preservation of civil rights, but civil rights also apply to law-enforcement officers. It seems only fair that if these officers are liable to constant suits for false arrest and so-called police brutality, it is not asking too much to penalize those persons who knowingly and falsely accuse officers of such violations.

Law-enforcement agencies are long overdue for legislative attention which would aid them in pursuing their duties.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1912) to amend title 18, United States Code, by adding section 245, to prohibit the knowingly making of false statements pertaining to any alleged deprivation of constitutional rights, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DOD AUTHORITY TO POSTAUDIT CONTRACTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to halt apparent profiteering on war contracts by making it clear that the Department of Defense has the authority to postaudit records of defense contractors.

This bill would, if enacted, plug a gaping hole in Secretary of Defense McNamara's program to hold down defense procurement expenditures. This glaring weakness in the McNamara program was revealed by hearings recently concluded by the Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee on Federal Procurement Practices. In chairing these hearings, I was shocked to learn of the Pentagon's widespread failure to adequately enforce the 1962 Truth in Negotiating Act.

The Comptroller General, Congress watchdog over the executive branch, told the subcommittee of repeated efforts by his office over the years to persuade the Pentagon to adopt a policy of checking back on defense contracts after final completion to determine whether the Government had been overcharged because of the contractor's failure to disclose vital information.

Documenting his charges through a series of reports, the Comptroller General pointed out that the failure of the Defense Department to postaudit contracts has been one factor in overpricing that has cost the taxpayer $13 million a year at the very least. This is a minimal figure representing spot checks by the General Accounting Office. The actual total waste may well be many times that amount.

For years the General Accounting Office has been insisting that the Pentagon, merely by issuing a regulation, could assert the right to inspect contractor's records. By so doing, the Pentagon could make sure that actual costs incurred in the performance of a contract were in line with estimated costs given at the time the contract was signed. In many cases GAO has shown disturbing discrepancies between the two figures, strongly implying that the contractor has not bargained in good faith.

My bill would make it crystal clear that the Pentagon has this authority. Furthermore, early action by the 90th Congress would let Secretary McNamara know in no uncertain terms that we expect him to use the authority. The winner will be the taxpayer, whose Government might well save hundreds of millions of tax dollars.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1913) to provide authority to increase the effectiveness of the Truth in Negotiations Act, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1913

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10 of the United States Code is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 2306(f) is amended by adding the following paragraph:

"For the purposes of evaluating the accuracy, completeness and currency of cost or pricing data required to be submitted by this subsection, any authorized representative of the head of the agency shall have the right, until the expiration of three years after final payment under the contract or subcontract, to examine all books, records, documents and other data of the contractor or subcontractor related to the negotiation, pricing or performance of the contract or subcontract."

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GREAT SALT LAKE NATIONAL MONUMENT, IN THE STATE OF UTAH—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 206

Mr. MOSS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 25) to provide for the establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill—S. 1582—to foster high standards of architectural excellence in the design and decoration of Federal public buildings and post offices outside the District of Columbia, and to provide a program for the acquistion and preservation of works of art for such buildings, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] be added as a cosponsor of the bill—S. 1726—to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 6, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 58) to provide for the reappointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 12:01 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SPONG in the chair).

DR. WALSH AND PROJECT HOPE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Project Hope is an excellent example of compassionate foreign aid extended by the private sector of the United States.

An excellent article about Project Hope and its originator, Dr. William B. Walsh, of Washington, D.C., appeared in Medical World News of April 21, 1967. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. WILLIAM B. WALSH: THE MAN WHO MADE HOPE A REALITY

Faith created HOPE, but not for charity. "Our object is to teach people to help themselves. And everybody who works with Project HOPE has to believe in it, really believe in it," says Dr. William B. Walsh, the organization's founder, president, and medical director. "Otherwise it couldn't work. Why, if I hadn't really believed in it, I couldn't even have tried to start it. The whole thing was obviously impossible."

It surely seemed impossible back in 1958, when Dr. Walsh, conceiving of a way to help underdeveloped countries help themselves medically, began to take time out from his practice to make it come true. Certainly not many people would have bet that the Washington, D.C., internist would be able to obtain the active support of three Presidents, promote a 15,000-ton ship from the Navy, raise more than $5 million a year in cash and supplies, and enlist hundreds of physicians to volunteer more than $1 million worth of professional services annually.

And few could have expected that in five voyages, the staff of the project's world-traveling, 235-bed hospital ship, S.S. *Hope*, would train 3,300 physicians and paramedical people, treat about 100,000 patients, perform 8,300 major operations, give immunizations, examinations, and other services to more than a million persons, and distribute some two million cartons of milk. Many people believe that no other single effort has succeeded as well as Project HOPE in making friends around the world for the U.S. and the American medical profession.

Now just turning 47, Dr. Walsh has seen his dream come true. And when he looks at what has been accomplished, the tall, ruddy physician grins with unabashed pleasure. "People say doctors have no sense of organization, no feeling for business. But isn't it odd how so many of us do so well financially?"

To do so well for HOPE—an acronym for Health Opportunities for People Everywhere—Dr. Walsh has had to be not only a physician, teacher, and administrator, but also a diplomat, public relations man, author, fund raiser, negotiator, and public speaker. It is likely that only a man of such versatility and improbable energy could have conceived Project HOPE and made it come to pass.

NOT DRAMATIC, BUT EFFECTIVE

The idea first germinated when President Eisenhower proposed his People-to-People plan to involve Americans of specific interests and skills in voluntary international aid projects. He asked Dr. Walsh to head the division on medicine. At that time, many people had proposed various uses for the Navy hospital ships which were laid up after the Korean war. But all the suggestions, which were based on the principle of giving medical service, had been rejected. It was Dr. Walsh who came up with a workable variation.

"Just to send a ship somewhere to treat a number of patients would have been of limited value," he says. "Suppose, instead, we made the ship primarily a teaching center. It could bring the latest and best training to the physicians, nurses, and technicians of an underdeveloped country. They, in turn, could train others after it had gone. Like ripples in a still pond, the circle would keep widening That was where my idea was different."

In practice, Dr. Walsh finds, the project is "not as dramatic as running around treating thousands of people, but it's far more effective. We do treat thousands, but with one purpose—to work ourselves out of a job in every country we visit."

A blunt-speaking, purposeful man, Dr. Walsh went after what he needed with all his vigor. He ruffled some bureaucratic feathers in Washington. But in the end with President Eisenhower's support, he got his ship on loan from the Navy, plus a grant to help pay operating costs. When the Kennedy Administration took over, there was a behind-the-scenes scuffle about renewing the agreement. With the new President's assistance, Dr. Walsh again emerged a winner.

Setting out to find private financial backing, the first man with whom he talked was John T. Connor, then head of Merck & Co. Although Connor was skeptical, he gave Dr. Walsh $5,000, explaining that any larger sum would have to go through the company's corporate-gift committee, where it might be turned down.

Taking this cue, the physician asked a succession of other executives for $5,000 each. All of them contributed, for a total of $100,000, Dr. Walsh had his seed money.

The hospital ship *Consolation* was taken out of mothballs, turned over to Dr. Walsh, and renamed the *Hope*. Refitted, equipped and supplied largely through donations, she sailed from San Francisco on Sept. 22, 1960, bound for Indonesia. Among the equipment aboard was the "Iron Cow," a miraculous machine that distills sea water and, when the other necessary components are added, produces as much tasty milk as a herd of 2,500 real bovines.

Dr. Walsh has since told the story of that first voyage in a book. *A Ship Called Hope*. The vessel island-hopped through the Indonesian archipelago and then went on for three months in Vietnam. Though both countries were undergoing guerrilla warfare, Dr. Walsh wrote afterwards, "Even the [Indonesian] Communists were forced to assist us by turning over their meeting halls for the dispensation of medical aid. To have opposed us would have been political suicide."

And the *Times of Indonesia* editorialized: "The East forgets many things, but never, never loses its reverence for a teacher. Those on the *Hope* will linger long in our memory."

In the following years, the *Hope* successively visited Peru, Ecuador, Guinea, and Nicaragua. Last month, she made fast in Cartagena, Colombia. Each year's experience has brought about new refinements in technique, as well as improvements and economies in methods of operation. The short stay in many ports which characterized the first voyage have been abandoned because not enough could be taught in so little time. In more recent voyages, the ship has spent about ten months in one place in each country. (During the remaining two months of each year, *Hope* comes home for overhaul and vacations for the full-time staff.)

The current voyage will cost almost a million dollars less than the earlier ones did. A major factor in this huge saving is that the *Hope* has established her credentials with the maritime unions. Both to help a good cause and because the ship is tied up in port most of the time, the union permits Grace Lines—which operates the vessel at cost—more modest manning schedules than is customary. Other savings come from more efficient management, improved systems of supply, and a campaign against waste of supplies aboard the ship and ashore.

Dr. Walsh doesn't mind boasting that while *Hope's* people are fed very well, the ship's garbage is weighed regularly. "If the weight varies from a certain level, there's either waste or stealing. And we see to it that the stewards explain what's happening."

The project's development can also be illustrated by the growth of *Hope's* medical staff. On the initial Indonesia voyage, there were 14 physicians supported by 24 nurses and eight other staffers. In Cartagena, the staff totals 142, and it would be 160 if the ship could house that number. As it is, ten "Hopies" live ashore, where about one third of the project's work is done.

HYGIENE LESSONS BEFORE MEDICINE

For *Hope's* doctors and nurses do more than hold classes and treat teaching cases aboard ship. They also teach in the local medical schools and hospitals, and the project's public health workers go out into the slums. They are not just doing good works. They are out to show people how to fill needs which they themselves have defined.

"We don't give the local people charity," stresses Dr. Walsh. "We demand work from them. If they've got a worm problem, we don't hand out worm medicine. First, they must learn to build latrines and wash their hands. *Then* we give them worm medicine."

It is also customary, when the ship sails, to leave a contingent behind to follow through on long-term efforts. In Peru, for example, a group of "Hopies" remained at a new nursing school to take one class through from beginning to end. On the Amazon River, miniature *Hopes* cruise the jungles to establish public health programs. In Guinea, staff members are still at work training laboratory technologists.

The *Hope* doctors learn as well as teach. They see tropical diseases hitherto rare in the U.S., but which are beginning to be brought in by air travelers. They see common ailments exacerbated far beyond anything usually found at home. A study of cervical cancer among Colombian women may well yield results helpful in the U.S. Dr. Rufus C. Morrow, an otolaryngologist of Burlington, Vt., learned a new frontal sinus procedure developed by surgeons in Ecuador. He now uses the technique in his practice and teaches it at the medical college of the University of Vermont.

The average physician who volunteers to serve aboard the ship is about 45 years old and at the height of his professional capacity and earning ability. What makes such men take 60 days off from lucrative practices, literally to work for nothing, and even sometimes to pay their own travel expenses?

"I think it's because they can do what they went to medical school for," says Dr. Walsh. "For two months, they can return to their ideals, treating and teaching with no thought of money. They know they're needed."

Visible progress helps, too. Dr. Walter C. Rogers, the full-time chief of medical staff aboard the ship, describes an unscreened, flyblown operating room in Nicaragua, where it was not uncommon to see surgeons smoke while they worked. "One of the high points of my life," he says, "came a few weeks later when an aide stopped one of our *Hope* surgeons from entering because he was wearing streets shoes."

"The work is very hard, but you don't feel it as you would at home," adds Dr. Nancy C. Kester, a rehabilitation specialist at New York University. "Although people sometimes push themselves pretty far, the stimulation of the situation keeps you going. I found it a most exciting experience."

Other "Hopies" obviously agree, since the vast majority of physicians who volunteer once want to come back again. Dr. Morrow and his physician-wife, Dorothy, have been on all five of *Hope's* voyages and hope to get to Colombia this summer. Their two teen-age sons have accompanied them several times as shipboard volunteers.

Whether they ship out again or not, the medical veterans of *Hope* remain her friends. Dr. John J. McDonough, a Youngstown, Ohio, gynecologist, staged a benefit fine arts festival there a few months ago and presented Dr. Walsh with a check for $10,000. Former volunteers in Michigan expect to raise $500,000 this year.

The project's physicians are often overwhelmed by the gratitude of patients, but the thanks are not always easy to take. Poor patients in Ecuador several times invited Dr. Kester to dinner. Once, she dined on roast guinea pig, served whole, claws and all. Another time, the main dish was lizard, served boiled.

LANGUAGES PRESENT PROBLEMS

Most of the *Hope* people make valiant efforts to learn at least something of the language of the country they are visiting, but inevitably there are some mistakes. One physician came to his first patient on his first day of rounds and saw a tag on her bed reading, *Muestra de Orina*. Taking that to be the woman's name, he addressed her as Senora Muestra, but drew only a blank look. So he tried calling her Senora Orina and threw the entire ward into an uproar. What the tag said was "Urine Specimen."

Sometimes local connotations caused confusion. When two American nurses were sent to Peru as part of the ship's advance party, they had business cards printed, on which *Hope* was properly translated as *Esperanza*. Thereafter, the Peruvians on whom they called seemed to eye them oddly, but the girls could not figure out why. Not until some time later did a friend finally find the courage to tell them that *Esperanza* was the name of Lima's most notorious brothel.

The phrases which the *Yanquis* usually learn first are those most useful in dealing with patients. One physician confesses that he found himself under a social handicap when he was invited out to dinner and discovered that all he knew how to say to his hostess was, "Open your mouth," "Put out your tongue," and "Take off your dress."

In more serious ways, the *Hope* staffers, in turn, often influence the social structure of the countries. "In many countries, for example, nursing is not considered to be a very ladylike job," Dr. Walsh notes. "But when they see our girls at work, the whole social acceptance of the profession is improved. Our nurses do a great deal more good than you could possibly imagine."

In addition to its own work, Project HOPE has mothered another and similar program. When the government was having difficulty recruiting physicians for volunteer service in Vietnam, President Johnson called on Dr. Walsh for help. In a few months, he signed up 119 volunteers, got Project Vietnam rolling, and then turned it over to the AMA for permanent administration. Many of the doctors now serving in Project Vietnam are *Hope* veterans. Project HOPE also continues to maintain a rehabilitation center in Vietnam, although, to Dr. Walsh's regret, war-time conditions make it more useful for service than for teaching.

SOLVING PRESSING NEEDS

If the Washington internist has made his dream come true, it was not without toil and sweat. For the first three years of HOPE's existence, the projects revolved entirely around Dr. Walsh, who literally did such chores as typing his own letters and scrubbing floors. Now, with a capable organization under him, his schedule has "eased off" to its present pace.

For another man, that pace could be a killing one. For example, in a single radiophone call recently between his Washington office and the ship in Cartagena, Dr. Walsh dealt with the quality of surgical gloves aboard, a rumored shortage of diapers, and a diminishing stock of baby blankets ("We'll get some more, though I can't understand why those philanthropic nurses are handing out blankets in 110-degree weather"). There was also a problem of milk supply, an unexpectedly heavy flood of medical students at classes on the ship ("We'll have to send 200 folding chairs"), the scheduling of his next visit to Colombia, and the hasty recruitment of an obstetrician to replace one who had been forced to drop out at the last minute.

When Dr. Walsh visits the ship, he whirls through her from stem to stern. Anyone responsible for carelessness is in for trouble. "Walsh can take someone's hide off for slipshod work," says one staffer. "And while he is most generous with praise for everyone in the books he's written about the ship, he does not personally thank people for work well done." Says Dr. Walsh: "They get thanks from the countries they serve. What I feel for them is not gratitude, but pride."

Dr. Walsh's dream for the future is to add two more ships like *Hope* so there will be one for each of the under-developed continents. "Meanwhile, the challenge of this job never ends. There's not only the satisfaction that every doctor gets in seeing thousands of people benefited, but there's also the pleasure of watching the teachers whom you have taught go on to teach others. The circle keeps widening—that's an immeasurable reward."

REPRESENTATIVE BRADEMAS HONORED BY ST. MARY'S COLLEGE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am pleased to inform the Senate that on June 3, St. Mary's College, of Notre Dame, Ind., conferred on the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS, U.S. Representative from the Third District of Indiana, the degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa. Formerly an assistant professor of political science at St. Mary's, Representative BRADEMAS has had a distinguished career as a scholar, academician, and public servant.

After graduating magna cum laude from Harvard University in 1949, he was appointed Rhodes scholar to Oxford University where he earned the degree of doctor of philosophy in 1954. He later served as an assistant to a number of important public officials, including the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, Senator Pat McNamara, of Michigan, and Representative THOMAS ASHLEY, of Ohio. First elected to Congress in November 1958, he has been reelected to each succeeding Congress where, as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor he has become noted as a leader in helping to formulate and enact major legislation in the field of education.

The people of Indiana take great pride in the outstanding contributions which JOHN BRADEMAS has made to the Nation, both as an educator and as a legislator. As a longtime admirer and friend of this able man, I can testify that the honor bestowed upon him by St. Mary's is truly deserved. In order that his colleagues may have the opportunity to see the full citation read at the time his honorary degree was conferred, I ask unanimous consent that this tribute be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN BRADEMAS

Had the historian Macaulay lived in this century, he might well have been citing John Brademas when he wrote: "he was a man of the world among men of letters, a man of letters among men of the world." For indeed, this versatile young congressman from Indiana is at home in many worlds, and excels in many roles. Teacher, scholar, public servant, humanitarian—his interests and accomplishments range from classroom to Congress, from local problems to international affairs. In 1963, the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce named him one of America's ten outstanding young men. In 1967, the Greek Orthodox Church accorded him the highest honor it bestows upon a layman, the Order of St. Andrew.

A native of South Bend, John Brademas was valedictorian of his class at Central High School. He earned his bachelor's degree in political science, *magna cum laude*, from Harvard University in 1949. He attended Harvard Graduate School and later graduated from Oxford University, England, where as a Rhodes Scholar he concentrated his research in the area of political theory and political institutions.

The year 1957 brought the young scholar to Saint Mary's College as Assistant Professor of Political Science. In 1958, he was elected United States Representative to Congress from the Third District, Indiana, and in November, 1966, was re-elected to serve his fifth term.

Although John Brademas left the academic world, he did not desert it. On the contrary, once this dynamic, articulate teacher-turned-congressman reached Washington, his interest in education soared to new heights. Becoming a member of the important House Education and Labor Committee, Congressman Brademas championed the cause of education on all levels. He was House sponsor for the Teacher Corps Program designed to supply needed teachers in poverty areas, for the Technical Education Program of 1963, and co-sponsor of the Peace Corps Act. In 1965, he sponsored the Teacher Fellowship Program aimed at raising the quality of elementary and secondary education by providing graduate fellowships for teachers; in the same year, he co-sponsored landmark legislation with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which strengthened educational opportunities for the nation's youth.

Congressman Brademas' major achievements, which have brought him national recognition from educators and statesmen, reflect his own deep concern with the role of the citizen and the responsibility of the nation in world affairs. As Chairman of the Special Task Force on International Education and a participant in Anglo-American Parliamentary Conferences on Africa and Latin America he has contributed significantly to the development of a new international awareness among his colleagues on Capitol Hill; as chief sponsor of the International Education Act of 1966, he has fought to implement practical and long-range programs for the development of international and cross-cultural studies in American colleges and universities.

For dedicated leadership, for imaginative, creative legislation, for outstanding service in the cause of education, Saint Mary's College is proud to confer upon her Congressman and former faculty member, John Brademas, the degree of Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa*.

THE KENNEDY ROUND AGREEMENTS AND AGRICULTURAL PROTECTION

Mr. **CARLSON**. Mr. President, after 3 years of negotiations, the Kennedy round of reductions in tariffs on industrial and agricultural products is in its concluding stages.

As a member of the Committee on Finance, I helped to write the International Trade Act of 1962, which is the basis for the Kennedy round agreements.

The members of the committee and the Members of Congress insisted, at the time the legislation was written, that agriculture be protected in these negotiations and that the producer of agricultural products be given an opportunity to expand his export market.

While the Kennedy round did not go as far as I had hoped it would in regard to access to many of the markets in the European Economic Community, I feel that substantial gains were made.

Under Secretary of Agriculture John A. Schnittker spent much time in Geneva and in Washington working with our negotiators. He recently wrote an article which appeared in the June 5 issue of Foreign Agriculture, a publication of the Department of Agriculture Foreign Agricultural Service.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KENNEDY ROUND: 3 YEARS OF TRADE NEGOTIATIONS—U.S. AGRICULTURE, LIKE U.S. INDUSTRY, HAS BENEFITED FROM THE SIXTH ROUND OF NEGOTIATIONS UNDER THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

(By John A. Schnittker, Under Secretary of Agriculture)

U.S. farmers came out ahead in the Kennedy Round of trade negotiations. Concessions won at Geneva will mean larger foreign markets for a number of our agricultural commodities. In my opinion, the trade talks have brought measurably closer the date when our farm product exports—now at the $7 billion level—will hit the $10 billion mark.

The 3-year grains agreement that was concluded will raise minimum prices of wheat moving in world trade—increases that will be reflected in part to U.S. producers. Furthermore, the agreement calls for industrialized importing nations to provide food aid to the less-developed countries, which should open new commercial outlets for U.S. grain. That's not all. We got tariff concessions averaging about 25 percent on a long list of other farm products. The overall trade "package" unquestionably will raise the volume of farm products moving in world trade—and, of course, the general level of U.S. exports.

We didn't get all we asked for. We had hoped for deeper tariff cuts—for more dismantling of nontariff barriers. But trade negotiation must be a process of give and take. If each side were to hold out for all its initial demands, agreement would never be reached. As it turned out, we got part of our demands; our trading partners got some of theirs. The final bargain concluded at Geneva, though a product of compromise, bears out the old saying that a thing need not be perfect to be good.

TWO COMMODITY CATEGORIES

Negotiators dealt with two general commodity categories at Geneva. There were three "group commodities": Grains, meat, and dairy products. All others were "tariff-cut items," including such products as tobacco, tallow, soybeans, grapefruit, canned fruit cocktail, and other fruits and vegetables, both fresh and canned. The effort with these items was to reduce tariffs or to reduce or remove any nontariff barriers that hindered trade.

Much of the U.S. negotiating was focused on grains, particularly on the problem raised by the European Economic Community's variable import levy system—a system we consider a nontariff barrier.

The United States had three key objectives in the grains negotiations at the start of the Kennedy Round:

1. Guaranteed access for American grain to the important markets of the world.
2. An increase in the level of world trading prices presently governed by the International Wheat Agreement (IWA).
3. Establishment of the principle—and the fact—of multilateral sharing of the world's food aid burden.

ACCESS GUARANTEE FOR GRAIN

In seeking an access guarantee, we were looking for an arrangement by which the regular level of grain imports by the EEC, the United Kingdom, and Japan would be continued—an arrangement that would also allow us to share in future growth of grain imports by these countries. The stakes were large. For the EEC they involved total grain imports—wheat and coarse grains combined—of 17 million or 18 million metric tons; for the United Kingdom, 9 million tons or so; and for Japan over 8 million tons.

Grain access negotiations in the last 2 or 3 months of the Kennedy Round were focused on the question of a "self-sufficiency ratio." This was an idea advanced by the EEC, which offered to limit its self-sufficiency in grain to a certain percentage. In this connection the EEC in recent years has been producing grain equivalent to 85 percent of its commercial requirements.

In view of the existing situation, the United States suggested a maximum target of 86 percent for EEC farmers. The Community's best counteroffer was 90 percent of its own farmers. The EEC wouldn't budge from its position; neither would the United States.

We had two reasons for insisting on the 86-percent figure—which, of course, would have meant 14 percent for exporters.

First, and foremost, that's about the share exporters have now. We wanted at least as much from the EEC as we already have.

Second, we didn't want to give our approval to an EEC self-sufficiency ratio as high as 90 percent. That would give EEC grain producers too high a target to shoot at. In other words, formalization of a high self-sufficiency ratio could well encourage efforts by the EEC to push grain production to the "permitted" level. That would be undesirable in our view, because the more of its own grain the EEC produces, the less it needs to import from us and other grain exporting nations.

We didn't see eye to eye on another point. We wanted a continuing access agreement. The EEC was not prepared to consider a continuing obligation even at the 90-percent level.

The stalemate persisted. Finally, at a place in the first weekend marathon negotiating session (two were held in an effort to break the deadlock) the United States decided to withdraw its demands for guaranteed access.

This issue, on which there was no hope for agreement, was stalling progress in other sectors. Also, we were mindful that we retained certain rights under "standstill agreements" entered into during the 1960–61 round of trade talks—the Fifth or Dillon Round. The standstill agreement on grains seeks to maintain the level of imports and authorizes negotiations with the EEC on the basis of rights the United States held as of September 1, 1960. Furthermore, we felt that through the food aid provisions of the new agreement, our access to dollar markets could be improved to some extent. So we decided, in dropping the fight for guaranteed access to the EEC, to take our chances—just as we have been doing in recent years.

WORLD GRAIN PRICES

Pricing provisions of the new accord establish a world price floor at $1.73 a bushel for U.S. No. 2 Hard Red Winter wheat, ordinary protein, f.o.b. U.S. ports on the Gulf of Mexico. For U.S. wheats, the new minimum prices are generally about 23 cents a bushel higher than the minimum under the International Wheat Agreement, which will run through July 31, 1967. Minimum prices for other major wheats are set according to differences in quality and location.

Maximum prices for world wheat trade have been set 40 cents above the minimum for each wheat. This provides a 40-cent range in which prices may fluctuate in line with supply and demand forces. If prices reach maximum levels, exporters will provide agreed quantities to importers at not more than the agreed maximum prices.

Exporters had hoped to reach a slightly higher level of guaranteed minimum prices. Firm importer positions, however, made it impossible to reach a higher minimum price increase in terms of U.S. wheat than was achieved. And this may have been for the best. A higher price poses the risk of production expansion in other grain exporting countries.

A feature of great importance to U.S. farmers and the grain export trade generally provides for adjusting the relationships among minimum prices in the event that at any time the agreed schedule is not representative of actual competitive conditions. Sales below minimum prices set forth in the agreement could occur should consultations among members fail to maintain competitive prices at or above minimum levels.

What will be the effects of the higher minimums?

World trading prices will be affected, certainly. Historically, a floor under wheat prices has put a discipline on exporters causing them to keep their prices well above the minimum. The increased minimum set at Geneva assures a rather substantial rise in world prices over the next 3 years, as compared to the last 3 years. This does not necessarily mean that world trading prices for wheat will rise the minute the new agreement becomes effective. Present world prices, in terms of the reference wheat at the Gulf, are near the highest level of recent years, $1.83 a bushel, which is about 10 cents above the new floor and about 13 cents above the average of the past 3 years. We are in a strong price situation now and I wouldn't be surprised to see that strength continued and added to as a result of the new minimum. World trading prices over the next 3 years could be 10 to 25 cents a bushel higher than in the past 3 years.

For U.S. farmers, the new minimum means additional price insurance. The current $1.50 minimum under the IWA relates to about $1.15 a bushel at the farm—10 cents below the present loan rate of $1.25. The new minimum of $1.73—23 cents a bushel above the IWA minimum—relates to $1.38 at the farm, or 13 cents above the loan rate. Therefore, the new minimum will provide a substantial additional guarantee against low farm prices of wheat. (Prices received by U.S. farmers for wheat in mid-May 1967 averaged $1.58 a bushel nationwide, as compared with $1.44 on the same date in 1966.)

SHARING FOOD AID

Under the aid provisions of the agreement, the developed countries of the world will join in providing 4.5 million metric tons of grain each year to the less-developed countries. Of this total, the United States will provide almost 1.9 million tons, or 42 percent. About the same amount will be provided by the importing countries, including the European Economic Community as a bloc, which alone will contribute a little over 1.0 million tons. The food aid provision represents great progress toward a key U.S. objective—multilateral sharing of the food aid burden.

The importing countries providing food aid include—in addition to the six making up the EEC—the United Kingdom, Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Finland, and Japan. Many of these countries have been part of the India Aid Consortium, on an emergency basis, but this represents the first time a broad multilateral attack has been made on hunger, apart from any obvious and existing emergency. Furthermore, the 1.9 million tons that importers will provide should mean expanded commercial markets around the world for efficient exporters. For example, if the EEC needs to import 17 million tons of grain, which has been the case in recent years, and then puts 1 million tons into food aid, that year the EEC would need to import 18 million tons. In a sense then, the food aid program gives us some access improvement.

Contributions to the food aid program are expected to be wheat, in the main, but coarse grains may be included to the extent agreed upon by donor and recipient countries. This, incidentally, is the only way coarse grains figure in the new grains arrangement. No minimum prices have been established for them.

Whether the agreement will mean any substantial gain in export volume remains to be seen. In any event, the value of U.S. grain exports should rise because of the higher price. Also, through operation of the food aid program, an increased proportion of the exports should be commercial sales, and a reduced proportion concessional transactions.

CEREALS AGREEMENT

Other details must be worked out.

For example, the grains arrangement, which will go under some such name as "International Cereals Agreement," will replace the International Wheat Agreement when the substantive features of the latter expire this coming July 31. It should be noted in this connection that the Soviet Union is a party to the IWA, but, not being a contracting party to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, did not take part in the Kennedy Round and did not have a voice in negotiation of the Cereals Agreement. On May 16, the Director General of the GATT announced that a meeting of GATT country officials would be called at an early date to discuss the matter of how other countries could be brought under the new agreement. It is obvious that a definite effort will be made to broaden the membership of the agreement apart from countries participation in the negotiation.

The writing of the final grain document remains to be done. Then it must go to the U.S. Senate for its ratification. The IWA has been a treaty; the new International Cereals Agreement will also be considered as a treaty.

MEATS AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

Progress in liberalizing trade in meats and dairy products, the other "group" commodities, was much more limited than for grains. When details of the negotiations become available—which they aren't now—they will reveal some instances of tariff reduction in some meat products among various countries. There will be some improved access to markets such as the EEC and some of the Asian markets, but no general liberalization of world meat trade.

Similarly, there will be some modest liberalization of trade in dairy products. But no really substantial changes were recorded in the complex system of price supports, export subsidies, quotas, et cetera, which continue to hamper dairy product trade.

TARIFF CUT ITEMS

Hundreds of products are involved in this category. Although results cannot be discussed in detail at this time, the broad outlines are clear.

According to Ambassador William M. Roth, who headed the U.S. negotiating team, we got a reduction of approximately 25 percent in tariffs on the tariff-cut items. Though not as good as for industry, where the reductions averaged 33 to 35 percent, the result was still quite significant.

Our chief negotiations on these items were with Canada, the United Kingdom, the EEC, and Japan. The United States and Canada have achieved a very respectable exchange of tariff reductions, a negotiation with which both countries have reason to be pleased. We have a lot of two-way border trade with Canada in fruits, vegetables, mill feeds, brewery products, and other commodities. This volume should expand in the years ahead. We import very few agricultural products from Japan but we export a heavy volume of grains, oilseeds, vegetable oil, and other goods. Therefore, in contrast with the two-way U.S.-Canadian agricultural trade, any agricultural bargain with Japan must be an integral part of an overall industry-agricultural negotiation. From the EEC we import some $200 million worth of products, such as wines, spirits, cordials, specialty canned foods. We export about $400 million worth of the same general type of goods, such as variety meats, vegetable oil, and many kinds of fruit, both canned and fresh. After a very difficult and protracted negotiation with the EEC, and one that seemed at times doomed to failure, we concluded what I consider to be a very respectable exchange of tariff concessions. Our biggest trade in tariff-cut items with the United Kingdom is in tobacco, and full details were unavailable as this publication went to press.

DUTY-FREE PRODUCTS TO THE EEC

Several major U.S. farm products already had duty-free access to the European Economic Community—and to some other countries—by virtue of previous negotiations. On the list are raw cotton; vegetable oilseeds, notably soybeans; oilcake and meal; hides and skins. These and certain other duty-free products, which accounted for one-third of our 1966 exports of $1,561 million to the EEC, were not subject to U.S.-EEC negotiations in the Kennedy Round. Some of them, however, figured in negotiations with non-EEC countries. It will be several weeks before complete results of the Kennedy negotiations are officially summarized. It may be late June, because the full bargain involves concessions on industrial items as well as farm products.

In every way, this was a joint agriculture-industry negotiation—the first time in the 20-year history of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade that agriculture was included, in a most comprehensive manner, in trade talks. Our negotiators insisted on maintaining the agriculture-industry link throughout. In keeping with that policy, concessions in one area were "held hostage" until concessions were gained in the other area. It was a policy that benefited both industry and agriculture.

U.S. agricultural exports, favored by strong foreign demand and intelligent, persistent market development effort, are inevitably on an upward trend. In other words, our exports would stay headed upward had there been no Kennedy Round. But the rate of increase unquestionably would be much smaller than we now anticipate.

What does all this mean in terms of exports? It had been estimated earlier that our farm product shipments of about $7.0 billion this year would hit the $8.0 billion mark by 1970 and the $10.0 billion level by 1980. These goals are attainable under any circumstances. But Kennedy Round results are bound to hasten their attainment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the President's special representative for trade negotiations, Ambassador William M. Roth, recently submitted to several Members of the Senate an excellent analysis entitled "Background Paper on World Grains Arrangement." The information contained in this background paper is of great interest and great value to the wheat producers of this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND PAPER ON WORLD GRAINS ARRANGEMENT

Negotiators representing 17 nations[1] have entered into an agreement on the basic provisions of a new World Grains Arrangement. The new arrangement, which will supersede the 18-year-old International Wheat Agreement, (IWA) contains new pricing arrangements for world wheat trade, and incorporates a multi-lateral food-aid program with beginning subscriptions totalling 4.5 million tons.

Wheat trade among the signing countries is annually about 13 million tons, worth $900 million. Pricing provisions of the arrangement, however, govern all wheat trade by member countries. Exports by member countries to all destinations are about 58 million tons, worth about $4.0 billion. This accounts for 90 to 95 percent of world wheat trade.

Under new arrangement, member countries will import the maximum possible share of their requirements from other members. Both exports to and imports from non-member countries by members will be at prices consistent with the agreed price range.

PRICE NEGOTIATIONS

The negotiations between importing and exporting countries regarding the general level of the new world price floor tended to focus primarily upon U.S. No. 2 Hard Winter Ordinary in export position at U.S. Gulf ports. For simplicity, discussion relative to other types of wheat, including those from other countries of origin, all took place in terms of equivalent position; in other words, all wheats had been theoretically positioned at f.o.b. Gulf position before bargaining began over the quality premiums and discounts between different wheats at the minimum and maximum.

Although the price negotiations culminated with agreement on a minimum price of $1.73 for U.S. No. 2 Hard Winter Ordinary, the new accord contained a major departure from the concept of a single guide or pilot-wheat price range such as heretofore used in the IWA. The new world floor price is represented by a series of minimum prices for major trading wheats. Similarly, for each listed wheat there is a separate 40-cent minimum-maximum range within which normal world supply and demand forces will remain free to operate. The significance of this departure is that—

---

[1] United States, Canada, Australia, Argentina, Finland, U.K., Japan, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland and the European Economic Community (France, Italy, Germany, Holland, Belgium and Luxembourg).

(1) there will be less uncertainty as to the levels of the minimums and the maximums which applies to different export loading points in world wheat trade,

(2) the minimum and maximum for any one of the listed wheats will have no more or less significance than that of any other; the floors for Manitoba No. 3 at Vancouver or St. Lawrence position or Australian F.A.Q. at f.o.b. Australian ports will be equally important to the country concerned as will the $1.73 for Hard Winter at the U.S. Gulf.

For simplicity of negotiation and presentation, the recent accord contained agreement upon minimums and maximums for certain wheats in terms of f.o.b. Gulf position. For example, the minimums for Manitoba No. 1, Australian F.A.Q., and U.S. Soft Red Winter were agreed at $1.95½, $1.68, and $1.60, respectively, at Gulf basis, with No. 2 Hard Red Winter at $1.73. In practice, however, the operative minimums for the non-Gulf positioned wheats will first be adjusted for location according to an agreed formula. Presently, based on the level of prevailing freight rates, the actual minimums for the above-mentioned wheats would be approximately as follows:

U.S. Soft Red Winter, f.o.b. Baltimore	$1.61
Canadian No. 1 Manitoba, f.o.b. St. Lawrence	1.97½
Canadian No. 1 Manitoba, in-store, Fort William/Port Arthur	1.81
Australian FAQ, f.o.b. East Australian ports	1.61

One feature of the arrangement of great importance to U.S. farmers and grain traders provides for adjusting the relationships among minimum prices in the event that at any time the agreed schedule is not representative of actual competitive conditions. Sales below minimum prices in the agreement schedule could occur in the event consultations among members do not maintain competitive prices at or above minimum levels.

It is not possible to compare exactly the new minimum and the present IWA prices because of the change from Canadian Manitoba No. 1 as the only pilot wheat. In attempting to arrive at an equivalent of that price expressed in terms of the U.S. No. 2 Hard Winter Ordinary at Gulf ports, an estimate of around $1.50 per bushel is derived. On this basis an increase in the floor price of about 23 cents is indicated. The current net f.o.b price for Hard Winter Ordinary at the Gulf is about 10 to 13 cents above the new minimum.

The complete schedule of minimum prices, adjusted for simplicity to represent a situation where all wheat is shipped from U.S. Gulf ports, is as follows:

[U.S. dollars per bushel]

Canada:	
Manitoba 1	1.95½
Manitoba 3	1.90
United States:	
Dark Northern Spring No. 1, 14 percent protein	1.83
Hard Red Winter No. 2 (ordinary)	1.73
Western White No. 1	1.68
Soft Red Winter No. 1	1.60
Argentina: Plate	1.73
Australia: FAQ	1.68
EEC: Standard	1.50
Sweden	1.50

Minimum prices for any wheat at Pacific Northwest ports will be 6 cents below those listed for the Gulf.

Based on current approximate freight rates, the following factors may be used to adjust the minimum or maximum prices for any wheat in the schedule to those ports from which various wheats are actually exported:

	Cents above or below gulf
Canada, f.o.b. St. Lawrence	+1.5
Canada, in-store, Fort William/Port Arthur	−14.5
West Australian ports, f.o.b	−2.5
East Australian ports, f.o.b	+6.5
Argentine ports, f.o.b.[1]	−12.0
French ports, f.o.b.[1]	+16.0
Swedish ports, f.o.b.[1]	+8.0

[1] Basis shipment to the United Kingdom.

FOOD AID

Agreement on the food-aid package represents further progress toward one of the United States' key objectives in foreign aid—multilateral sharing of the food-aid burden. President Johnson reaffirmed this objective in his message to Congress on the emergency food program for India earlier this year.

The list of contributions making up the new 4.5 million-ton Food-Aid program is as follows:

	Percent	Metric tons (thousands)
United States	42.0	1,890
Canada	11.0	495
Australia	5.0	225
Argentina	.5	23
EEC	23.0	1,035
United Kingdom	5.0	225
Switzerland	.7	32
Sweden	1.2	54
Denmark	.6	27
Norway	.3	14
Finland	.3	14
Japan	5.0	225
Total	94.6	

It is expected that other nations who take part in the final negotiating conference and sign the agreement will provide about 5 percent of the total package not yet pledged.

The contributions are expected to be primarily wheat, although coarse grains may be included to the extent agreed by donor and recipient countries.

MEMORANDUM ON INQUIRIES CONCERNING KENNEDY ROUND CONCESSIONS

For government agencies and members of Congress who wish to reply to requests for specific information about items that may be subject to concessions in the Kennedy Round of trade negotiations, response along the following lines is suggested:

We are informed by the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations that this type of information cannot be furnished at this time. These negotiations will not be formally concluded until June 30, 1967. Participants have agreed that the rule of confidentiality of offers should prevail until the agreement ending the round is signed. Although most major substantive issues are resolved and a successful conclusion assured by the accords reached on May 15, numerous details remain under active negotiation. While specifics are being settled, preparation of the final documentation goes forward. This material must be reviewed by the President before he approves signature of the final agreement.

Specifics of concessions made and received by the United States will become known on June 30. The Office of the Special Representative will then be able to handle inquiries and will have available for public inspection copies of tariff schedules showing the new rates agreed to by the major participants. Texts of ancillary agreements will also become public at that time. Analytical material on the agreement as well as annotated schedules will be made available as rapidly thereafter as they can be prepared.

Within the next several weeks the Office of the Special Representative will announce how and where detailed information on the final Kennedy Round agreement will become available.

It is unlikely that the first of the five annual stages of tariff reduction will take place on before January 1, 1968 so the rate changes will be known at least six months before implementation begins.

LONG-DISTANCE RUNNERS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, at a time when open warfare in the Far East and the Near East commands the headlines, we must still look beyond the ugly and tragic realities of today and set plans and policies which may help to alleviate conditions which could lead to other outbreaks of armed conflict in the future.

It was with that thought in mind that I read with great interest a recent address by Assistant Secretary of the Treasury True Davis in New York City. The title of the address was "Trade Policy and Problems," and the audience was the 22d annual foreign freight forwarders and customs house brokers night banquet of the Foreign Commerce Club of New York.

Mr. Davis outlined the role that trade can play in world affairs. He sees free-flowing foreign trade as a way for human beings to achieve "a better standard of living, a more equitable distribution of the fruits of scientific and technological advance and for friendship based upon mutual respect for each other's culture and mutual tolerance for each other's problems."

I was particularly interested in his discussion of the aims of plans to create a Latin American Common Market. As he correctly pointed out, 10 years ago the European Common Market was a dream. Now it is a reality, serving not only as a base for economic development, but also as a vehicle for creating better understanding among the people of the member nations.

Certainly no one can argue against creating the same sort of vehicle for economic development and international communication in Latin America.

In stressing that much of the impetus for a Latin American Common Market must come from the nations of Latin America, he quoted President Johnson's words which pointed out that the task ahead was "not a job for sprinters, but long-distance runners."

The United States, relatively new on the scene as a world power, has not been known for having the patience of a winning long-distance runner. Our Nation has developed rapidly when compared with other nations, and we, the people who enjoy and sometimes complain about the results of that development, are too often impatient when other countries do not adopt the ways of success of our land.

But I think—I hope—we are learning. As in the world of track, sprinters develop earlier than long-distance runners. Let us now set ourselves to the task of running the entire race in our efforts to help our fellow man, our fellow Americans, to achieve a better standard of living, a more equitable distribution of the fruits of scientific and technological advance, and a friendship based upon mutual respect for each other's culture and mutual tolerance for each other's problems.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of Assistant Secretary of the Treasury True Davis on "Trade Policy and Problems," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE POLICY AND PROBLEMS

There is an old Dutch saying that trade should be free—even in hell. It is unlikely that trade will ever be free there until we make the movement of goods, services, capital, manpower, and technology more free here on earth.

This is precisely what people in countries the world over have been patiently trying to accomplish, especially during the past few years. Trade barriers have gradually fallen. More will fall in the future as we continue trade negotiations with countries, bilaterally and multi-laterally, in private sessions and in public conferences. The course we have been pursuing—and will continue to pursue regardless of temporary road blocks—did not arise primarily from the desire of businessmen seeking profit. Rather, it originated from the desire of human beings seeking a better standard of living, a more equitable distribution of the fruits of scientific and technological advance, and for friendship based upon mutual respect for each other's culture and mutual tolerance for each other's problems.

Most of you here tonight are concerned with imports and exports, with custom duties, regulations and requirements, and with the whole intricate process of expediting goods in and with the whole intricate process of expediting goods in and out of our country so that the minimum time elapses between their shipment and their ultimate use in all corners of the world. We in the Treasury are concerned both with the details of your operations and with the large portfolio of complicated laws regulating the world flow of commerce, the diverse streams of which are the economic and cultural lifelines of every country and every people. The removal of erection of trade barriers, the simplifying or complicating of customs procedures, and the speed or delay at which we arrive at solutions to conflicting problems or diverse interpretations, all these affect your daily operations. They also affect relations between buyer and seller in different countries. They may improve *or* destroy existing attitudes toward our country on the part of foreigners. They may also nurture *or* weaken your confidence in those of us in government who are concerned with building bridges of communication between peoples and countries over which may pass a free flow of goods to enrich the human body and a free flow of ideas to enrich the human mind and spirit. We in government—just as you in private business—are conscious of the necessity of developing between countries unimpeded rivers of commerce: for where these rivers flow, there also flows better understanding between peoples and a more sympathetic attitude toward ideologies different from ours.

Let me briefly review with you the more important things we have done in the trade and tariff area.

One of the most important economic objectives of this Administration, begun under President Kennedy and vigorously continued by President Johnson, has been the reduction of trade barriers so that all nations could reap the benefit of freer trade and all people the benefit of man's creative productivity. The Trade Extension Act of 1962, you will recall, provided the means through which, by negotiations, there would be a general lowering of world trade barriers to accelerate the free flow of goods. Since the passage of this important Act, we have worked patiently in consort with other blocs of countries and bilaterally with individually nations to slash undesirable tariffs. And we shall continue to do so in the future.

We are not—nor is any other nation—about to embark on a program to build impenetrable tariff walls around our country. This can only lead to disastrous consequences for us—or any other nation contemplating wrapping the blanket of protectionism around its borders. Although man is notoriously adept at repeating his past mistakes, he is also ingenious at overcoming obstacles hindering his pursuit of laudable objectives. We know now, to rephrase the poet's lines, that "tariff walls *do* a prison make." No nation today wants to become its own prisoner.

There is more to trade, as you know, than chemicals, textiles, agriculture, and computers. President Johnson recognized this several years ago when he pledged that we would embark on a new and noble adventure of international education, one object of which was "to increase the free flow of books and ideas, works of art, of science and imagination." We have already taken three major steps forward toward fulfilling this objective with the Florence Argeement, the Beirut Agreement, and the arrangement with foreign countries to exchange works of national art.

You will recall that ten years ago the European Common Market was a dream. It has long been a reality. It has brought European countries closer together—in cultural as well as economic pursuits. That it became a reality so quickly, overcoming traditional national barriers, age-old prejudices, and selfish interests, indicates the growing desire on the part of people to eliminate barriers that separate them as human beings. The United States vigorously supported the creation of this European Common Market. Now, ten years later, we have pledged ourselves to help create another common market—this time, a Common Market for Latin America.

II

Last month it was my good fortune to accompany President Johnson to Punta del Este where he met with other Presidents of the Americas. The problem they faced, shadowed by an air of urgency and a feeling that time is running out, was to forge a plan of *united* action that would accelerate social reform and the pace of economic development. Toward this end, they forged the "Declaration of the Presidents." I would like to summarize this for you briefly, for the degree of our participation is significant.

The Presidents agreed—

1. To create and support a Latin American Common Market, which will facilitate the free movement of goods and services;
2. To expand Latin American trade to other countries of the world;
3. To lay the physical foundations for Latin American economic integration through multi-national projects that will bind the nations of the hemisphere in great transportation, power, and river developments of both people and goods throughout the continent;
4. To modernize living conditions of rural populations and substantially increase food production so as to feed their expanding population;
5. To vigorously promote education for development, expand programs for improving health of Latin Americans, and harness science and technology for the services of all; and
6. To eliminate unnecessary military expenditures.

Creating a Common Market for Latin America will not be an easy task. It will begin in 1970. It will take another fifteen years of patient negotiation before barriers are removed to permit the unimpeded flow of goods, capital, manpower, and technology so essential for the economic progress of Latin America. Traditional nationalistic barriers in the Americas will have to give way to regional hemispheric goals. Just as the European Common Market helped unite people of different nationalities and ideologies, so, too, can the Latin American Common Market. The task in Latin America will be more difficult than in Europe, where countries share a common heritage and have been an integral part of Western culture for almost two thousand years. In Latin America the nationalities are many, the ethnic cultures numerous, the physical problems—the geography of terrain—enormous, and the differences of individual countries striking in their size, wealth, and economic development.

Although Latin America was settled by Europeans about the same time as North America, it was not until the 19th century that colonies became free sovereign nations. Up to World War I they were closely oriented to Europe, culturally and economically. It was Europe that furnished Latin America with industrial products, not the United States. Under the influence of Spain and Portugal, Latin American countries were not permitted to deal directly with each other. Such a policy nurtured nationalism, prevented the development of friendly relations between peoples and countries, and precluded cooperative resolution of mutual problems or development of common interests. Since World War I, Latin America has looked to the United States, although strong ties with Europe still exist. Today, as a result of the historic Spanish and Portuguese encouragement of nationalism, Latin American countries are much more closely oriented toward the United States and Europe than toward each other.

The chasm between poor and rich in Latin America, moreover, is greater by far than any chasm in Europe. This will have to be closed—and at a faster pace than heretofore. The impetus will have to come from Latin Americans themselves—from government leaders and enlightened business and industrial leaders. Creating this Common Market will indeed be difficult, but it *will* be done for the simple reason that it *has* to be done. There is no alternative.

To expand Latin American trade to other countries, including our own, will also be difficult. For the entire free world is engaged in competitive foreign trade and commerce. Does such a competition allow for any other philosophy except dog eat dog and the devil take the hindmost? It certainly does! Humanitarianism—concern for other people's welfare—has been and is now the guiding principle already enabling men of good will to reduce tariff barriers to the free flow of trade. We know that as we increase our trade to Latin America and as the Americas increase trade among themselves *and* between us and other highly developed countries, there inevitably will arise problems and conflicting opinions in the complicated area of tariff and trade. Concessions will have to be made by all countries, but particularly by the wealthier ones. We already have committed ourselves to exploring with our industrialized countries the possibilities of temporary preferential tariff advantages not only for Latin America but also for other developing countries in the markets of industrialized nations. The wealthier countries of the world—more than ever before—will have to work in unison to help developing countries increase their trade and accelerate their economic growth rate. For time indeed is running out. Procrastination is the thief of more than time in Latin America. It can steal hopes, dreams and aspirations. Should these flee the human spirit, the mind may turn more and more to revolutionary thoughts of violence as a means of accomplishing desirable ends.

The assistance that we in the United

States can render will be useful, as President Johnson emphasized, only as it reinforces the determination of Latin Americans and builds on their achievements. I was particularly impressed with a phrase the President used at Punta del Este when he said that "this is not a job for sprinters, but long distance runners."

III

No discussion of trade or tariff, however brief, would be complete without reference to our Customs Service. As I mentioned earlier, trade can quickly halt and attitudes quickly change if goods are not expeditiously moved from their origin to their destination. The role of the Customs Service in the nation's economy cannot be measured by the money it collects, although this is important, or by the effectiveness of its law enforcement, which is most important, but rather by the quality of the service it performs in compliance to the laws it must interpret and to the requirements and needs of the people who make possible the Service's existence. Using this criterion as a measure of value, I believe that our Customs Service, which forms an important part in the mosaic of our country's economy, is sensitively responsive to the nuances of our rapidly expanding traffic in trade and tourists. It is "honest, resourceful, efficient," as President Johnson recently emphasized.

Our Customs Service is presently understaffed. We will need more trained personnel in the future to keep pace with the movement of people and goods in and out of our ports. Congress recognizes this fact, and we anticipate authorization to employ and train more people so we can better assist you to aid and service both manufacturer and customer. At present, we have less than 9,000 full-time employees in 360 field offices both here and abroad. This compares, for instance, with 7,200 in the Customs of Canada, with one-tenth the population, with 32,500 in the Federal Republic of Germany, which does only a fraction of our volume of foreign trade. The annual operating costs for our Customs Service is about $100 million, but it collects and turns over to the general fund of the Treasury 26 times this amount—more than $2.6 billion. It returns, in other words, one dollar for every 3½ cents invested, thus making it one of the most profitable enterprises of the Federal Government.

During the time I have been with the Treasury Department, I have carefully observed the Customs Service during its critical period of reorganization and modernization. As most of you know, the Service has been revitalized and modernized in many areas, to the advantage of importers and exporters, the traveling public, and of customs brokers. The reorganization itself, you may recall, was scheduled to take place over a five-year period.

Actually, it was accomplished in one year—with a minimum dislocation and without dismissal or involuntary transfer of Customs personnel. Under the capable direction and leadership of Commissioner Lester D. Johnson, it has reduced paperwork and eliminated obsolete and unnecessary forms. The processing of merchandise entries has been substantially accelerated, which has resulted in faster delivery of imported cargo and less dockside and airport congestion, with substantial savings in both time and money to businesses.

In our Bureau at Baltimore, automatic data processing has been installed. Eventually all Customs collections and accounting procedures will be automated. Customs entry, examination and liquidation operations have been consolidated and put into effect in San Francisco and other ports with satisfactory results. Yet we still have some problems in New York that have prevented the execution and implementation of the Stover report recommendations. Through the excellent work of Mr. Michael Stramiello, Regional Commissioner of Customs, and his capable staff, we are doing our best to satisfactorily resolve these problems. As you know, the regional area of the Port of New York does 40 percent of Treasury's total customs business. It is precisely because of this heavy volume that the resolution of these problems has been difficult.

Through the recently appointed Advisory Committee on Customs Administration, representatives of the importing community and transportation industry meet with Customs employees and Treasury officials to discuss mutual problems and recommend mutually satisfactory solutions. This Committee has proved to be a valuable clearing house for ideas pertinent to Customs matters. It is my desire to soon appoint local advisory committees dealing with problems of Customs administration at Regional and, in some cases, at District levels. We realize that our primary purpose is to serve the public well by facilitating the movement of passengers and cargoes. We would greatly appreciate any thoughts or suggestions that you or your colleagues might have, now or in the future, that would assist us in fulfilling this responsibility.

To the foreign freight forwarders and custom house brokers who are being honored here this evening, I should like to say this: You are directly involved with our Customs Service and with the whole spectrum of foreign trade and tariff. What we negotiate in trade conferences or agree upon in bilateral discussions with other countries has a direct bearing upon the volume of your business. I'm certain, however, that your interests transcend this immediate concern. This is why I have briefly discussed with you some of our trade and tariff accomplishments and problems. The bridges we build through sensible, selfless avenues of commerce, permitting the free movement of goods, services, capital and human beings, can have an enduring effect upon the peace and stability of the world.

Individual citizens, such as you must continue to participate equally as fully as we in government to achieve desirable trade objectives which include the elimination of tariff walls and barriers. Neither can accomplish much alone without the enlightened support of both. Working together, complementing and supplementing each other's efforts, we can help unite people. In doing this we will help to raise the standard of living the world over, help distribute more evenly the benefit of man's creativity, and help destroy those social and economic causes that breed and nurture the seeds of violence, revolution, and war.

IMPROVEMENT OF TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAMS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I recently received a thoughtful essay from Mr. Vaughn L. Weber, one of my constituents in Anacortes, Wash. Mr. Weber, a driver-training instructor for several years, outlines in his article some constructive suggestions for improving present traffic safety programs. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Weber's essay be printed in the RECORD. I feel that it will be of interest to many persons concerned with highway safety.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CART BEFORE THE HORSE?

(By Vaughn L. Weber)

Is our present highway accident and death rate being accepted as inevitable; as an accepted part of the American way of life? Are we meeting the problem honestly and intelligently? Or are we more interested in satisfying the critics and at the same time stepping on as few toes as possible? Are we "putting the cart before the horse"? Sometimes it seems this is the case, when we observe the majority of what I feel are secondary preventive measures being taken in an attempt to curb this mounting highway "blood bath."

Why do I feel I have the right to question the present course of traffic safety? After teaching high school driving education for several years, both in the classroom and behind-the-wheel, I should be more conscious of traffic and driving problems than the average citizen. I don't like to see these students of mine go out on the highway with the odds stacked against them as they are. After twenty-five years of working with high school teen-agers as a coach, teacher, and driving instructor, I feel I understand many of their problems. Granted they do have and are creating ever-increasing problems for society. However, who originated and are perpetuating these problems? Society and the environment it has created can take the credit. These problems originated because of ever-increasing, half-hearted, rationalized guides to accepted behavior, and now society must pay the price. The problems are being multiplied because we are attempting to correct them in the same manner we created them; by not meeting the question intelligently and honestly.

The solution to such problems as that of the delinquent teen-age and adult driver will not come with half-way measures. Let's call a "spade a spade." Let the "chips fly where they may" and step on a few toes if we must—and we must. Safety devices such as collapsible steering wheels, seat belts, and padded dashes will decrease the severity of the accidents. They will not bring a halt to the accidents. We can reduce the number of accidents substantially with a more realistic approach. We do not have to accept them as inevitable.

If our courts are delinquent in administering realistic punishments to traffic offenders, both teen agers and adults; if we parents are afraid to say "no" to our youngsters or perhaps too tired to say "no"; if our automobile manufacturers must shoulder their share of the blame; if our readiness to driver-testing programs and our practically non-existent automobile inspection programs are partially to blame, let's correct them. Let's not get the cart before the horse. Let's get to the root of the problem. If all the safety devices in existence were built into an automobile we would still have the "nut" behind the wheel. Let's straighten him out first.

If 40,000 to 50,000 lives each year (traffic deaths for each of the past five years) are worth facing reality for, then let's approach this problem realistically. Let's stop "beating around the bush." What is a realistic way to approach this? Let me present a few items for thought; items I feel have a definite relationship to the problem.

Has the automatic transmission contributed to the "loading" of our highways with drivers lacking the skills essential to cope with the demands of our modern high speed automobiles and super highways? I feel that the introduction of the automatic transmission alone has contributed to more highway deaths than any other single factor.

As a driving instructor, it is quite evident to me that driving an automatic transmission automobile requires far less physical skills, coordination, and emotional stability than does a manual shift car. Individuals who would have an extremely difficult time mastering the "out-dated" manual gear shift "get by" with the automatic transmission. We are demanding fewer skills at a time when we should be demanding more, with our high speeds and crowded, complicated highway system. What will be the reaction of this individual who just "got by" when a "tight" emergency traffic situation suddenly confronts him? Does this person have the coordination and reactions necessary to avoid this "tight" traffic emergency? What of the other drivers around him if his reaction is slow or the incorrect one? The answer lies in the "statistics." Yet our automobile manufacturers tend to encourage the use of automatic transmission automobiles in public school driver education programs because they have a better resale value when loaded with "extras," not because it is better for a beginning driver to learn on one. Yes, I think it fair to assume that the automobile industry must share the blame.

Are our courts and judges to continue "slapping the hands" of teen-age and adult traffic offenders with mild, meaningless punishments? It seems so, when I read of a recent judicial ruling on a 15 year old, nonlicensed driver who took an owner's automobile without permission. The boy must wait until 3 months past the legal age of 16 years before applying for his driver's license. Is this a realistic penalty to pay for such an indiscretion? Will this make other teen-agers think twice before doing the same thing? When I read of the driver's third conviction in 18 months for drunken driving and finally has his license suspended for 3 months; at that time he can resume driving and likely compile more arrests for the same offense—if he lives that long. Must we mention the fact that he may cause the death of other legal drivers in the process? All the safety devices in the world built into automobiles will not prevent this individual from having his quota of accidents as long as our courts are hesitant to "put teeth" into their punishments. When questioned about allowing such an individual with his record of drunken driving convictions to continue to drive, the stock answer seems to be, "He needs the car in his work in order to support his family." What of those he is likely to kill? What of his family if he is the victim? What of the excuse it provides others to do the same? Yes, definitely, our judicial system could go a long way towards eliminating highway accidents.

How many potential accidents and deaths would be eliminated with a compulsory nationwide reexamination of the driving ability of all drivers at the time of each license renewal. Such a program would be costly to administrate; however, when more citizens die each month on our highways than we are losing in Vietnam, I would be inclined to believe that such a program would be realistic. When we are spending in the neighborhood of $400,000 for each Viet Cong killed, who could question the cost of a more thorough driver examination program at home designed to save American lives?

"Honest Joe's used cars—we are overstocked—forced to clear our lots for new arrivals—free license on all used cars sold this month—guaranteed." Guaranteed for what? To make it around the corner and out of sight of the dealer? Our larger cities all have their "Honest Joes." Is that $150 "jewel" guaranteed not to have a faulty steering mechanism and a front end in need of repair with "non-existent" wheel alignment? Are the tires fit to be on the highway, and will the brakes stop the car in any highway emergency? Is it asking too much to have laws with teeth in them, laws that require each car dealer to guarantee the car he sells to be safe to operate under any and all highway driving conditions? An eating establishment which sells food under unsanitary conditions either corrects these conditions or it is forced to close its doors by the sanitation inspector. Thousands of highway accidents would be eliminated if our unscrupulous Honest Joes were forced to mend their ways by inspections regularly conducted by state and federal agencies. Yes, it would cost money. But once again let me cite the figure of $400,000 for each Viet Cong we have killed. I think we can safely assume that each American life we would save on the highway by instituting a rigid inspection of all used cars sold would not under any stretch of the imagination approach this $400,000 figure.

Are we being kind and considerate of the "old folks" by allowing them to drive at a time when their eyesight, reflexes, and general stability are on the decline? Or is it like asking a faded 50-year-old, has-been boxer to step into the ring with a Jack Dempsey or a Cassius Clay in their prime, just because he deserves the chance? At one time the boxer had the "tools" to hold his own in the ring, just as a great percentage of our elderly drivers at one time had the skills to drive as well as the next person. I can't believe we are being kind and considerate when we unhesitatingly allow them to drive. Shouldn't they be required to take a rigid physical and driving examination each year after perhaps the age of 70, or even earlier? This alone would save thousands of lives each year. Statistics and common sense will support this contention.

Perhaps we are becoming overly concerned with a situation which will gradually "level off" and take care of itself. After noting the statistics I have listed below, you are invited to form your own opinion:

Highway deaths

1961	38,091
1962	40,804
1963	43,564
1964	47,700
1965	49,000
1966	Over 50,000

As you will note, from 1961 through 1966 the rate of deaths on our highways has soared at the rate of 2,000 to 3,000 more each year than the previous one. There were 12,000 more deaths in 1966 than there were in 1961, a span of 6 years.

The number of automobiles on our highways is not going to grow less. The demands on our drivers (skills and degree of emotional stability) must increase. If we are satisfied with an increase of 2,000 to 3,000 highway deaths each year, and if this is a reasonable figure to expect, than we should continue as we are. If we will admit that this is a terrible and unnecessary price to pay, we will get to the "meat" of the problem. We will "step on a few toes," and we will "rock that boat" of complacency.

SECRETARY UDALL ADDRESSES GRADUATES OF DELAWARE STATE COLLEGE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Stewart L. Udall, spoke at the Delaware State College commencement ceremonies yesterday.

I had hoped to be there to hear him but was prevented from doing so by Senate business. My inability to attend was all the more disappointing because of my close association with the college when it was my privilege to be Governor and my pride as a Delawarean in the great progress this fine college has made.

Fortunately, however, I have had the opportunity to read the Secretary's speech to the graduates. Because of its timeliness, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

George Bernard Shaw once remarked: "The first prison I ever saw had inscribed on it, 'Cease to do evil, learn to do good,' but, as the inscription was on the outside, the prisoners could not read it."

I mention this because I think the college diploma is a message, and how you view it is important to your future. If you think of it as an award for accomplishment that has gratified some people, perhaps, and astonished a few others, then, its significance will be lost.

If, on the other hand, you view it as a license, a license to do things, a license to help change and make better our world, then we will know, indeed, that the inscription is written in your hearts, that it will not be tacked up and forgot high on a wall, behind a piece of protective glass, confined by an unchanging frame.

The diploma should be exposed—even as you and I are—to the realities of our world. If it gets dusty, we should have to clean it; in doing so we would remind ourselves that it is perishable if it is not cared for. For what you have attained—education, training to think—what you have attained indeed is perishable if you do not nourish it . . . and constantly. The diploma is your license to dream . . . and to do. And if you leave it on a high, hidden shelf, then you will dream no more, and you will do little of the many things that must be done to humanize this planet . . . for all men . . . everywhere.

Nor should the diploma be limited, confined by a frame. For no frame is big enough to hold it if you want—really want—to make it grow.

Was your major Agriculture and Natural Resources? No frame can hold that in. We will be farming the seas to feed the world's exploding population, even as this year, my Department—the Department of the Interior—will be constructing the first fish-meal plant where high protein, flour-like concentrates, will be produced.

We will be changing the weather, not, I hope, by walling it out, as one prominent architect has proposed, but by modifying rain and snowfall that arid plains may become verdant fields.

We will be discovering new resources . . . and learning to use them. In our own West, out near Four Corners, where Colorado, Utah, New Mexico and Arizona, come together in a common point, we have discovered oil shale formations laid down on this planet some fifty million years ago. Isn't that astounding: fifty million years ago . . . and it is only within the past few years that we have known of its existence . . . have found, through study, that it—this oil shale—contains enough oil to provide for this nation's energy requirements—at predicted 1980 levels of consumption—for almost four hundred years!

Natural resources walled and framed? Impossible. Within the next few years, the Interior Department and NASA will launch the first EROS—Earth Resources Observation Satellite. This will orbit our earth, returning information in *seventeen days* that, by presently available techniques—meaning the airplane alone—would take us *twenty years* to accumulate. From outer space, we will learn more about our resources . . . about where there is fresh water bubbling up from the ocean bottoms, and where underground rivers are flowing into the seas. We will know which fields are being defoliated by plant diseases. We will be able to observe sources of water pollution, and how the currents carry pollution . . . and where. We will be able to keep a watch on volcanoes.

Did you major in Art Education? Then you will lament the damage to the great art of Florence, last year, when the waters rose and the mud silted tapestries whose colors, now, may never be the same. Think what it will mean if we can harness the rivers of the world. Think what it will mean if you—any one of you—someday works with a child who has promise, helps that youngster with his brush and palette, with his chisel . . . helps the world to find and appreciate a new talent.

Did you major in Biology? I notice you have a three-credit course in Ecology. But I wonder if you know that it is only within the past few years that that word—ecology—has been a part of our vocabulary, and that we have been studying the relationships of the various systems that make up our world. Indeed, how can we any longer talk about the disappearance of wildlife species without some awareness of the ways man, both through his increasing numbers, and through his pollution of the air and water, has driven that wildlife to the wall?

Was your major Chemistry? If so, be assured you are entering a field in which change moves so rapidly as to make the Indianapolis Speedway—on Memorial Day—seem like a bicycle path. When I went to college—and I am still young enough to climb the Washington Monument two-steps at a time—there were 92 elements. How many are there today? And how many, tomorrow . . . and the day after? How frame-in chemistry? How hang *that* diploma on the wall? There are jobs, today, for chemists, which did not exist a decade ago. And a decade hence, the training you have received, till now, will be of little or no value to you, or your nation or world, unless you grow . . . unless the dimensions of *you* expand.

Was Economics your major? Here, too, there is change . . . and room for more. We have come a long way from Adam Smith and laissez faire—from the philosophy that there must be a "hands-off" policy towards business. Today we have an Interstate Commerce Commission. In my grandfather's time there was none. Today we still use cash—at least some of the time, in this credit-liking nation. But tomorrow, banking will be different. There are some economists who predict a world without money, where computers will instantly record and make possible even the most complicated of transactions.

If your major was Business, think of the opportunities in advertising, alone, for people who will discover new ways so desperately needed to convince a man to buy a new car for other reasons than its mere horsepower, or to help him understand that government must be quite as vigilant in looking out for the public's interest, as is industry vigorous, in looking about for the public's dollar.

I notice you have a four-year program in Secretarial Science. Here, too, change is—and will be—the thing. A time will come, and not too far from now, when secretarial responsibilities will involve the typewriter hardly at all. Electronic devices will translate the voice directly into print, and the secretarial assistant will be regarded more for her ability to organize and direct than for her technical proficiencies, alone. Her contribution will be in helping to establish priorities, and less and less in handling carbon and copies. I know, for I have one such secretarial assistant, and without her I would be inundated. There is the classic remark about a story in *The New York Times:* "You know," so the remark goes, "this article tells me more about seedless grapes than I really want to know." And that—I guess—is what I mean by assisting with priorities: providing enough, not too much . . . and in the right order. Yes, the career of a secretary can be exciting. I know: I have been one for almost seven years!

If your major was in Education, what can I say except this: culture and civilization advance only through teaching and education. The college and the university, the teacher who does not merely pass on information, but challenges minds to thought—these are the recreators of society and of the state. What the world becomes, and I think history bears me out, is not detailed by despots, but by dreams . . . and education is the foundation of all dreams.

Did you major in English and Literature? If so, you are needed. The world is bogged down by man's failure to communicate . . . man to man . . . nation to nation, and there are many of us who believe that it is the artist and the writer who best communicate man's aspirations.

When Tom Paine wrote "Common Sense," he advanced the cause of American Independence more than did a hundred or a thousand muskets. He reached man's mind, not his trigger finger, to be sure, but then, as so often has been said, there is nothing that can stop the power of an idea whose time has come.

When Upton Sinclair wrote "The Jungle," he hoped to awaken America to his Socialist philosophy, to focus attention on the plight of the packingplant workers in Chicago. He failed, at that, but his book did directly lead to passage of a Pure Food Act, by the Congress. Sinclair later complained that he had aimed "at the public's heart and hit its stomach." No matter. He accomplished a great social good, and in time, along came Steinbeck and wrote "The Grapes of Wrath," a powerful novel which resulted in many states taking action to protect migrant workers.

Do not forget, either, it was Shakespeare who humanized royalty. Do not forget it was Elizabeth Browning, not a Prime Minister, who got across the message which touched the British conscience, which caused a beginning of the end of the use—and abuse—of children, some as young as five and six, in the coal mines of England. She did not make a political speech, but merely wrote a poem called "The Cry of the Children," and it said this: "A child's cry . . . in the darkness, curses louder than the strong man in his wrath."

If you majored in Foreign Languages, your opportunities are vast. But bear in mind that your responsibility will be *not* just to translate from one tongue into another, but from one psychology into another. A "goat" is a baseball player who drops a pop-fly in the sun. A goat is another kind of trouble, elsewhere. George Perkins Marsh, a conservationist and diplomat of Lincoln's time, believed ". . . forests would soon cover many parts of the Arabian and African deserts if man and domestic animals, especially the goat and camel, were banished from them."

If we're half-an-hour late sitting down for dinner, we are likely to say, "I'm starving!" How do you translate that to a family in India . . . especially when, in the first place, it never has learned to read?

Of your majors in Health and Physical Education, including related fields like Physical Therapy, and Recreation, I can say, too, your diplomas will require all the new dimensions you can achieve. We know, now, the importance of exercise and fitness . . . and what is more, we are gaining more and more leisure time, with the thirty-hour week already a fait accompli, in some instances. It will be up to you to devise ways and means sufficiently attractive to our leisure-bound populace, that they will not be content to sit before the TV screen, sipping beer, drinking soda from one-way bottles, or nibbling at chocolates. You must help millions of people understand that the good life is not glut: that recreation is participation, not viewing, alone; that when you travel you must understand as well as see.

In the fields of History and Political Science, change . . . and growth, also are the thing. The discovery and translation of the Dead Sea Scrolls is giving us new insight and understanding of the early days of Christianity. You might be interested in knowing that in Colorado, this year, a freshman legislator, by doing his historical homework, convinced his fellow legislators that abortion was not contrary to church doctrine during the reigns of earlier Popes. And thus, Colorado became the first state to legalize abortion on three principal medical grounds.

And, of course, political science is ever-changing. Today we have a concept known as "creative federalism," through which State and Federal Governments are working together, as never before, on new programs such as the national effort to clean up the rivers and lakes. New issues, new techniques, are the business of the political scientists. And how we need their skills in helping to shape our elections so that the best talent may ever aspire to—and achieve—the most important elective offices.

In Home Economics I expect some of the greatest opportunities will be in packaging. For our nation is reaching the point where litter is more than a national disgrace, but a menace, as well. The top of the flip-top beer can, tossed away somewhere on a beach, can slice off a piece of one's toe. How can you help to convince industry that its sales need not produce an aftermath of sloppiness along our highways and in our parks? How can you convince the consumer that he, too, is responsible, for what he does with his wastes?

And, as home economists, I throw down this challenge to you: Will you ever be able to convince youngsters, again, to drink water? We have a whole generation of youngsters, today, who, like that famous comic-strip character, "Bathless Groggins," never "touch the stuff." Must all thirst-quenchers be flavored with powders and syrups—when, in truth, there may be a question, in some instances, as to the possible harmful effects of some of the chemicals involved?

As to those who majored in Mathematics, I will say this: one of you—it should not surprise me—may discover that two and two do not make four anymore. The new math leaves me ready for anything. But—seriously—I can only urge you to use your skills that the computers may more and more be used to define and help us achieve goals—not just goods . . . the goals of cities that are clean and pleasant, of mass transportation that does not affront the ear while it caters to our sense of haste.

As to Sociology—those who majored in this discipline—I say we need you, desperately, to help us solve our problems, our many problems in the cities. If your major was Anthropology, let me challenge you with the thought that somewhere, sometime, you may find the missing link, the clue that will give us understanding as to what went wrong with man. For surely, he took a wrong turn. As Mark Twain observed: "Man is the only animal that blushes . . . or needs to!"

As to Psychology, we need to understand more of human behavior and potential. Indeed, in my own Department, it would help us, I am sure, with our legislative programs, if we could demonstrate to the Congress that it is psychologically and psychiatrically important that man's roots to the soil, his ties to the elements, not be everywhere bulldozed away into oblivion, not be everywhere paved over with an asphalt that buries aspiration, or concrete impermeable by creativity.

As to Physics—a major in this field—I will say that there is today, great opportunity for astro-physicists. There was no such specialty, as recently as *my* day. Our knowledge of jet propulsion was confined to what happened when we let go of a blown-up balloon whose opening hadn't been tied. Your knowledge of jet propulsion, I am sure, is more advanced . . . but, let me caution you, if you leave your diploma on the wall, it will be obsolete in a few tomorrows: *that* quickly is *your* field changing.

But you—you physicists—as you focus your lasers, think just this: that as they pierce, they must liberate; as they are precise, so must they help man to free himself from waste and war and drudgery and despoilment.

If you majored in Astronomy—then you are right, for we need, perhaps more than anything else, to look up, not oblivious to—nor bound by—man's failings and failures, but aware of his highest hopes. It is right to look at, to reach for the stars. It may be we will never reach them, but in trying, we lift our feet, and our heads, and our vision.

If you majored in Philosophy, we need you, too . . . to define and refine new processes of thought, systems of belief, understandings of experience, syntheses of knowledge. For as you do so, we will find the scientist knowing more of religion, the writer knowing more about engineering, the physician more aware of humanity, and the mathematician better able to comprehend music. In short, philosophical insight can help us cross disciplines, and this we must do. For in so much of our training, we have been taught to analyze, and analysis, almost by definition, requires a breaking-down of, a fragmenting of the whole . . . and sometimes we forget to put the pieces back together again . . . for mankind.

I have saved music—those of you who majored in Music Education—for the end of my talk, not as a matter of priority, but because I wanted to end by reading a brief passage which reflects better than any words I could put down, my belief that music and the arts are terribly critical to man. The passage is from Alfred Noyes' "The Barrel Organ":

"Yes; as the music changes,
  Like a prismatic glass,
It takes the light and ranges
  Through all the moods that pass:
Dissects the common carnival
  Of passions and regrets,
And gives the world a glimpse of all
  The colors it forgets."

In our troubled world, in our despoiled environment, we tend to think too much, perhaps, of what is wrong. These lines say to me—as I now say to you—think a bit of what is right, of what might be. And look up . . . not with naivete, but with confidence: *There are stars!*

WHITEY FORD RETIRES

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the retirement of Whitey Ford as an active player for the New York Yankees may bring temporary joy to fans of other American League clubs, but I am sure that all baseball fans and, indeed, all who respect excellence and the competitive instinct regret that he has been compelled to leave the mound for good.

When another great pitcher, Lefty Gomez, left the Yankees some years ago, he is reported to have said—probably apocryphally—that he wrote on his application for unemployment insurance in the State of New York that he had left his last job "because I couldn't get anybody out." Whitey Ford has the satisfaction of knowing that he left baseball as he entered it, with one of the finest earned-run averages in the league.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Arthur Daley about Whitey Ford's retirement, published in the New York Times of May 31, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN RETIRES

(By Arthur Daley)

It happened just before the fourth game of the 1950 World Series. The Yankees had swept the first three from Philadelphia's Whiz Kids behind those crafty pitching experts, Allie Reynolds, Vic Raschi and Eddie Lopat. So Casey Stengel could afford to gamble with a Whiz Kid of his own, the 21-year-old Whitey Ford, who had come up in midseason and ripped off nine victories.

Standing by the batting cage as Whitey completed his swings was Dizzy Dean, already something of a legend and three years short of his election to the Hall of Fame.

"Hiya, Whitey," greeted the self-confessed Great Man.

"Hiya, Diz," said the twinkle-eyed Whitey, "these Phillies are so easy that I now can understand how you could win so many games in the National League."

For the first time in his life the garrulous Diz was left absolutely speechless.

Even as a rookie Whitey was a delightfully impudent young man, brash and cocky and irreverent. His fresh, bright personality gave sparkle to the Yankees over the years and his trusty left arm gave them victory after victory. But he was more than just a winning pitcher. In many respects he was the soul of the Yankees and their leader. That's why respectful teammates called him, "the chairman of the board."

STATISTICAL MARVEL

Now the chairman has gone on the voluntary retired list, a bone spur in his elbow abruptly ending a truly wondrous career. He won more games than any other Bomber, 236; had the most shut-outs, 45; had the most strike-outs, 1,956; had the stunningly low earned run average of 2.74 and had the highest winning percentage, .690 of any pitcher since the turn of the century.

But the statistics cannot tell the story of what Whitey meant to the Yankees. His other contributions have been immeasurable because he has been a blithe young man whose gay flippancies bolstered morale and whose dedicated, workmanlike approach to his task set an example to those who followed.

Mike Burke, the new president of the stadium tenants, has been trying to remodel a Yankee image that has grown so cold over the years. But if the front office and the rest of the players had imparted to this same image the warmth, the friendliness and the joie de vivre that Whitey always gave it, there would be no need for repairs.

"I hope Whitey Ford will be a Yankee forever," said Burke at yesterday's news conference while announcing that the strawberry blonde would remain as part of the official family in twin roles, public relations and scouting.

Lee MacPhail, the Yankees' general manager, offered another and more provocative thought by remarking that he had every expectation of going gladly to Cooperstown five years hence for Whitey's induction into baseball's Hall of Fame. Why not? The lefthander has all the credentials he will ever need and it's a cinch that he'll add an extra touch of class to the joint.

Ford has always been a light-hearted character with many of the qualities of fun-loving Tom Rover of fictional Rover Boy fame. There invariably has always been a merry, mischievous glint in his blue eyes and a ready smile on his lips. He was quick with the quip.

A BAD YEAR

One of the more unforgettable came after the 1961 World Series, when he broke the record of which Babe Ruth was more proud than even his 60 homers. The record, set in the Babe's youth when he was a remarkable pitcher, was for consecutive scoreless innings in series play. In the 1961 season, Roger Maris also had hit his 61 homers.

"It's been a bad year for the Babe," commented the irreverent Whitey.

Through all of his lively ways, though, fun ended for the slick little lefty when he stepped on the mound. Then he was all business and a truly marvelous pitcher, a clutch performer who was at his best when the stakes were highest. He was the fiercest of competitors. His pal was Mickey Mantle, who also was not averse to enjoying a relaxing moment.

But Whitey took strict care of himself. He'd josh about the rigors of spring training and then would go out and run endlessly on the outfield grass, getting into condition.

When it had seemed last autumn that he might have reached the end of the road, he even could joke about it.

"It was nice while it lasted," he said airily.

It was nice to have him around for 17 years. If Edward Charles Ford was not the ideal Yankee, he will serve as the model until a better one comes along—if that be possible.

THE REVOLVING CREDIT SPIRAL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, revolving credit is one of the fastest growing segments in the consumer credit industry. Although it is only approximately $3.5 billion today, the American Bankers Association has predicted that by 1972, 50 percent of consumer credit will be in the form of bank revolving credit.

Commercial banks have been the most recent entrants into the revolving credit field. In the last year, more than 1,000 banks entered into the revolving credit business. The growth has been so rapid that there has been a proliferation of committees and study groups to study the situation.

The American Bankers have a special committee on revolving credit cards; the Federal Reserve Board is studying the situation, the Comptroller of the Currency is studying the problem, and the FDIC is equally concerned.

Mr. President, there are some who argue that revolving credit ought to be eliminated from the truth-in-lending bill. This argument bears a superficial plausibility in that only 3 or 4 percent of existing consumer credit is in the form of revolving credit.

However, considering the rapid growth of revolving credit, and the inducement to accelerate the change to revolving credit if Congress should exempt revolving credit from the truth-in-credit bill, it would be most unwise for Congress to exempt this segment of the industry from truth in lending.

Mr. President, last year the July issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin contained an excellent article on the developments in consumer credit, including a review of the rapid growth of revolving credit. I ask unanimous consent that the aricle be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The expansion in consumer credit has slowed markedly in recent months. This has resulted to a large extent from a tapering off in demands for credit. But the supply of funds available to consumers has also become more limited as credit grantors have increasingly adopted more restrictive lending policies. The pace of the expansion was slow during much of the winter, particularly in February, when the rise in instalment credit on a seasonally adjusted basis was the smallest in more than a year. Despite some resurgence in borrowing in March, the rate of expansion for the first quarter was sharply less than for any quarter of 1965.

April was a slack month, with extensions of credit generally following the pattern of retail sales. Sales of automobiles were off sharply from their March level and were below the April 1965 level as well. Sales of furniture, appliances, and most household durable goods also showed signs of softening after having risen to new highs in March.

The increase in instalment debt in April amounted to $531 million, even a little less than the $538 million increase in February. A year ago in April the increase was $745 million, the record for a single month. At that time, however, demands for auto credit were exceptionally strong, and borrowing to pay taxes was much larger than usual.

By the end of April 1966 instalment credit outstanding was nearing the $70 billion mark. This was an increase of $7.7 billion, or 12 per cent, from the same month last year. Meanwhile, noninstalment credit has also continued to expand. At the end of April total consumer credit was at a new high of $88.2 billion.

As of mid-June, data for May were fragmentary, but the tempo of credit expansion does not appear to have picked up. New-car sales continued to decline in May as did sales of home goods. At the same time, the policy of many lenders continued to be restrictive as they themselves encountered increasing difficulty in obtaining funds in the credit markets. There have been scattered reports of lenders imposing more stringent contract terms—that is, larger downpayments and shorter maturities. But for most lenders, restrictiveness has simply meant increased selectivity in granting loans. Some commercial banks, for example, have adopted the practice of granting new loans to deposit customers only, or to customers within a specified trading area. Still other lenders report that they have been screening new applicants more carefully than they did earlier.

THE YEAR IN REVIEW

All types of consumer indebtedness have continued to rise this past year. By the end of the first quarter of 1966, home mortgage debt had reached $208 billion, and policy loans on life insurance, loans to purchase securities, and other miscellaneous borrowings amounted to $19 billion. Together the various forms of long- and short-term consumer debt totaled $313 billion, an increase of more than $25 billion, or 9 per cent, from a year earlier. Policy loans showed the largest relative increase—13 per cent—followed by instalment debt, which rose by 12 per cent.

Consumer debt

[In billions of dollars]

Type	Mar. 31, 1966	Mar. 31, 1965
Installment [1]	68.8	60.9
Noninstallment [1]	18.2	16.9
Home mortgage	207.5	192.1
Security loan	9.4	8.3
Policy loan	8.4	7.9
Other	1.0	1.0
Total	313.3	287.1

[1] From Board's estimates of short- and intermediate-term consumer credit. Other sectors from flow of funds accounts.

Automobile credit. The slowdown in consumer borrowing to finance auto purchases became apparent early this year, even before the turnaround in new-car sales. In the meantime, repayments on auto debt have continued their gradual rise, and as a result the average monthly increase in outstanding auto debt has been much less so far in 1966 than during 1965. The rise last year was unusually large and averaged more than $300 million per month; this year the average for the first 4 months was less than $215 million.

Extensions, as usual, have been the volatile factor in the rate of expansion, and to a large extent their movement this past year has paralleled sales of new cars. Seasonally adjusted extensions edged up during most of 1965 to a record level in November. Extensions have been sharply lower this year, except during March.

Auto sales are a major factor underlying the level of auto credit extensions. But extensions are also significantly influenced—particularly in the long run—by changes in the proportion of cars bought on credit and in the average size and length of contract. Between mid-1963 and early 1965, the proportion of new cars bought on credit held steady, but since then it has moved up by almost 3 percentage points. In contrast, the proportion of used cars purchased on credit has changed little if at all during this period. The high rate of new-car sales during much of the period since January 1965 and a much smaller rise in used-car sales, in conjunction with the movements in the proportion of credit sales, suggest that some buyers may have used credit to upgrade their purchases from used cars to new cars.

The average loan on new cars has risen about $30 since early 1965. This increase appears to be the result of a number of divergent influences: On the upside has been a trend toward more expensive intermediate-size cars and away from the compact models, as well as a rise in finance charges. The latter can be traced in part to a further slight lengthening in average maturities and in part to an increase in interest charges on auto loans. On the downside has been a reduction in excise taxes on sales of cars.

The average loan for used cars rose by about $40 during the same period. Higher finance charges may be a factor in the increase, but most of it is probably due to a higher average sale price. With an accelerated scrappage rate for older used cars, the proportion of newer and more fully equipped used cars has increased. At the same time, the high rate of new-car sales during the past 4 years has contributed significantly to a lowering of the average age of used cars sold during the period.

The terms on which auto credit is made available to individual consumers have changed little this past year. The standard new-car contract still has a maturity of 36 months and calls for a downpayment of 20–25 per cent of list price. The proportion written for the 36-month term continued to increase until very recently when it flattened out at about 75 per cent. There continues to be little evidence that the 36-month maximum is being breached in any significant number of contracts; in April, less than 1 per cent of all contracts were written for longer periods.

As for used-car contracts, average maturities have not been lengthened despite the rising proportion of sales of newer model used cars. Indeed, some lenders have reported a significant decline in the past few months in the proportion of long-term contracts, that is, those over 30 months.

Other instalment credit: Instalment credit outstanding for the purchase of consumer goods other than autos rose by $2 billion, or about 13 per cent during 1965. In early 1966 the rate of growth was slightly faster. This type of credit accounted for one-fourth of the increase in total instalment credit during 1965, the same proportion as in the previous year, but it accounted for nearly one-third of the total rise in early 1966 as auto credit declined in relative importance. Credit for the purchase of major appliances and furniture continues to represent a large part of this type of credit, but in recent years an increasing proportion has resulted from the financing of mobile homes, boats, and other high priced goods on a comparatively long-term basis.

Personal loans outstanding increased by a record $2 billion in 1965. Demand for these loans was especially strong in the second quarter of that year when people borrowed to pay income taxes not covered by withholding. The pace thus far in 1966 has been comparatively slow, with tax borrowing again increasing in April—but not nearly so much as in April 1965.

Home repair and modernization loans which make up a relatively small part of total instalment credit outstanding, increased by $140 million in 1965, about the same as the average for 1963–64. However, the rate of expansion was sharply less in the first 4 months of 1966. Well over half of the contracts insured by the Federal Housing Administration are being written for a full 5-year term, the maximum permissible under FHA regulation.

Noninstalment credit. The rate of expansion in noninstalment credit slowed noticeably during the last half of 1965, and the increase for the year as a whole was $1.4 billion compared with $1.6 billion in 1964. The pace picked up in early 1966—particularly in the single-payment and charge-account categories—but slackened again in April. At the end of April total noninstalment credit amounted to $18.6 billion, a rise of about 7 per cent from a year earlier. During the same period instalment credit had increased by more than 12 per cent. Such a differential in growth rates has persisted during most of the period since World War II. Interruptions in the trend have occurred only during business recessions, when instalment credit tends to decline rather than increase.

Consumers have turned increasingly to credit cards to pay their gasoline, lodging, and other traveling expenses. The total amount owed on credit-card accounts at the end of April was estimated to be $765 million, one-fifth larger than a year earlier and twice the amount outstanding at the end of April 1960. This segment is still a comparatively small part of all charge-account credit, but it has been increasing faster than other types of charge-account credit.

Credit-card accounts [1]

[Amounts outstanding in millions of dollars]

April 30:	
1960	383
1961	426
1962	450
1963	473
1964	556
1965	642
1966	765

[1] Includes service station and miscellaneous credit-card accounts and home-heating-oil accounts.

GROWTH FACTORS

Demands for consumer credit are closely related to demands for specific consumer goods. Thus the growth of consumer credit has been a natural accompaniment of the increase in consumer ownership of automobiles and other durable goods. The major durable goods have traditionally been bought on credit because unit prices are relatively high. But in addition, use of credit in these purchases has given consumers a greater flexibility in the timing of their expenditures often permitting acquisition of the goods sooner than would have been possible had credit not been used.

The spreading use of personal loans to finance travel, education, and similar service expenditures has also been an important factor in the growth of instalment credit. In the past 5 years alone, personal loans outstanding have nearly doubled, and their growth has exceeded that of any other type of consumer instalment credit.

Consumer attitudes toward the use of debt have also changed over the year. Individuals stand much more ready these days to commit their future incomes to debt repayment than they were a generation or two ago. Moreover, rising incomes and employment and the increasing security of both jobs and incomes have encouraged borrowers to take on additional debt.

The amount of instalment credit used in

a given period is also a function of the availability of credit on acceptable terms. And there has clearly been tremendous growth in institutional facilities for lending to consumers. At the same time, the greater security of consumer incomes has encouraged lenders to extend credit to an ever-widening segment of the population.

Both financial institutions and retailers have actively promoted consumer credit and have adopted new and more flexible credit plans in recent years to facilitate credit purchases. These include various types of revolving credit plans with lines of credit used in accordance with the borrower's needs and repaid over a period of months. These new credit plans have had as an important outgrowth the extension of instalment credit to the financing of soft goods and services, and to some extent they have been substituted for conventional forms of both charge-account and instalment credit.

Revolving credit plans have spread rapidly at department stores and mail-order houses since their introduction in the early 1950's. As Chart 3 shows [charts not printed in RECORD], there have been two periods of marked growth, in 1959 and again in 1963–64. At the end of 1965 such plans accounted for nearly $3 billion of the $5.3 billion of instalment credit outstanding at these outlets. This represented another substantial gain in the dollar amount of revolving credit outstanding during 1965, but the increase relative to total instalment credit at department stores was smaller than in most other years.

Revolving credit has also been extended to personal loans through bank-check-credit plans that permit customers to draw checks up to a prearranged limit, with monthly payments based either on the total credit line or on the amount actually owed. Banks have also developed charge-account plans under which a customer obtains from his bank a credit card that he can use for credit purchases at any participating store. The bank is responsible for monthly billings, and participating stores usually pay a membership fee and take a small discount on all sales made under the plan.

Both check-credit plans and charge-account banking plans spread rapidly during the late 1950's, but a number of banks discontinued them soon thereafter. Recently, however, there has been a strong revival of interest in plans of this type.

The net result of this interaction between consumer willingness to borrow and growing institutional facilities for lending has been a sharp rise in outstanding consumer debt. Compared with 5 years ago, instalment debt is up $28 billion; over the past 10 years it has risen more than $40 billion. This build-up in debt has added substantially to the buying power of consumers, and as such it has affected both the level and structure of consumer demand for goods and services.

REPAYMENTS RATIO

The build-up in instalment debt actually results from differing rates of growth in extensions of credit and in repayments on debt. Changes in repayments typically lag changes in new credit extensions. Moreover extensions show considerable variability in movement from month to month, whereas repayments tend to rise gradually over time because they are governed largely by the amount of credit extended in earlier periods and by contract terms.

This was the pattern in 1965. Repayments trended steadily upward and reached a total of $67.5 billion for the year, compared with $61.1 billion in 1964. They continued to rise in the first quarter of 1966 to a record annual rate of $71.7 billion. At the same time, they reached a new high—14.7 per cent—relative to disposable personal income.

The ratio of repayments to disposable income stood at 14.4 per cent in the first quarter of 1965, but over the remainder of the year it edged up as repayments grew faster than disposable income. The differential in growth rates continued in the first quarter of 1966. Disposable income rose less than 2 per cent as increased social security taxes took a larger bite out of personal incomes while repayments on instalment debt increased by 2.5 per cent.

The repayments ratio continues to receive considerable attention as a measure of the ability and willingness of consumers to incur more debt. An increase in the ratio is customarily viewed as an indication of decreased ability to take on more debt. Moreover, some observers implicitly assume that there is a ceiling beyond which consumers may not be able or willing to add to their debt.

The continued upward drift in the repayments ratio remains a matter of concern because much depends on whether the new debt is being taken on by consumers already heavily burdened or mainly by those with few or no previous commitments. There is little statistical evidence in this area, but analytical considerations do not suggest that a ceiling on instalment debt repayments has necessarily been reached. Much of the postwar rise in the ratio can be explained by the fact that more and more people are using instalment credit for more and more purposes. Of particular importance has been the increase in consumer ownership of physical assets that provide transportation, household services, and recreation. When these assets are purchased on the instalment plan, the monthly payments represent for many consumers a substitution for expenditures they previously made for services.

The changing composition of the population has also been a factor in the increased use of consumer credit. The number of households with heads under 25 years of age has been expanding rapidly and, moreover, it is likely to increase considerably further over the next few years. These young families are frequent users of instalment credit because their needs for household goods and automobiles generally exceed their ability to pay cash for such goods.

Finally, as noted earlier, consumers have been making use of revolving credit and similar multipayment plans to finance many small purchases that previously would have been on a cash or charge basis. All these influences have contributed to the expansion in instalment credit. The rising repayments ratio, therefore, is a reflection of shifts in spending patterns of the consumer sector of the economy as well as changing attitudes toward borrowing and toward consumer loans as an outlet for funds.

MAJOR LENDERS

Financial institutions—including commercial banks, sales and consumer finance companies, credit unions, and miscellaneous lenders—hold nearly 90 per cent of all consumer instalment paper. Retail establishments hold the rest. Retailers originate the bulk of all instalment contracts, but they sell many of them through prearrangement with commercial banks and sales finance companies. In recent years, however, several large retail companies have organized their own financial subsidiaries to handle their instalment paper.

Changes in ownership of instalment credit in 1965 and early 1966 for the most part followed trends over a longer period. For both commercial banks and credit unions the share increased; for sales finance companies it declined slightly; and for both consumer finance companies and retailers it changed little.

Commercial banks. In recent years banks have promoted all major types of consumer credit. At the end of 1965 they held 12 per cent of their earning assets in the form of consumer loans. Almost all commercial banks hold some instalment credit paper, and their holdings are generally more diversified than those of other consumer lenders. Moreover, they are heavily involved in noninstalment lending as the principal grantor of single-payment loans.

Besides lending directly to consumers and buying instalment paper from retailers, banks make a substantial indirect contribution to consumer credit by making funds available to finance companies and retailers. In total, banks provide over half of all funds used in consumer credit.

The proportion of automobile credit held by the banks has continued to rise this past year, and on April 30 it reached 56 percent of the total. A year earlier it was 54 per cent; and 5 years earlier, 47 per cent. Paper acquired from dealers has accounted for the bulk of the expansion, although loans made directly to consumers have also risen. Small commercial banks have been expanding their operations in the automobile credit market more than medium-size and large banks have. Over the past year small banks reported the largest relative gains in purchased paper, and they also expanded their share of the direct auto-loan market.

The banks presently account for about one-fourth of the credit used to buy furniture, appliances, and other nonauto goods. This proportion has been stable over the past couple of years, although earlier it had declined as some of this business shifted to the newly organized finance subsidiaries of the large retailers. Banks now hold about one-third of all personal loan credit, slightly more than a year earlier. They continue to be the major source of repair and modernization loans, as indicated by their 70 per cent share at the end of April.

Finance companies. Sales finance companies, which supply credit through auto dealers, mail-order outlets, and other retailers, hold about one-fourth of all consumer instalment credit. Their share of the total has declined slightly this past year, as it has each year since 1960. Automobile credit has been—and still is—the dominant form of credit held by most sales finance companies. Nevertheless, severe rate competition for automobile paper in recent years has reduced the attractiveness of such paper, and many companies have been putting more of their funds in other types of paper.

Diversification efforts have included increased emphasis on business loans and on the financing of consumer spending for boats, mobile homes, household durable goods, travel, and education. In the consumer sector, sales finance companies have had most success in increasing personal loans. They now hold 13 per cent of all such credit compared with 10 percent only 5 years ago.

The proportion of instalment credit accounted for by consumer finance companies has ranged between 8 and 9 per cent for the past half dozen years. These companies have most of their assets in the form of personal loans, and they continue to rank second only to commercial banks in their share of this market. This past year, however, personal loans increased by a smaller percentage at consumer finance companies than at other major lenders.

Credit unions and retailers. Credit unions have continued to increase their penetration of the consumer instalment lending business, and their one-tenth share of the total is about double that of a decade ago. Credit unions account for only a small share of nonautomotive goods credit, but they hold more than one-tenth of the automobile paper and about one-fifth of the personal loans outstanding. In repair and modernization loans they rank second, behind the commercial banks.

Retailers hold 12 per cent of all instalment credit, and most of this is paper held by department stores, mail-order companies, and furniture and appliance stores. The share of the total held by auto dealers is less than 1 per cent.

Sources of funds. Instalment credit lenders have been encountering strong competition in recent months in obtaining new funds. Aggregate demands have been pressing against limited supplies in the credit markets, and lenders who have obtained funds have generally paid higher rates of interest than a year earlier.

Notwithstanding the growing pressures on their reserve positions, commercial banks have continued to extend substantial amounts of credit to consumers. Finance companies too have expanded their consumer financing activities, but they have gone increasingly to the commercial paper market to obtain their short-term funds, rather than borrow from the banks. The rate for directly placed finance company paper with maturities of 3 to 6 months rose from 4.25 to 5.38 per cent between last September and June of this year. Rates on paper that the smaller finance companies place through dealers have also gone up, as have costs of bank loans and longer-term credit.

Despite the higher interest rates in short-term credit markets, charges on consumer credit appear to have risen only slightly on the whole. The cost of credit to lenders is only a part of the cost of making consumer loans, and charges on such loans typically change only in response to broader cyclical movements in market rates of interest. Some financial institutions, including a scattering of commercial banks, have recently made moderate upward adjustments in finance charges to consumers. However, other lenders, some of which are already charging the legal maxima, and also most retailers have continued to operate with rates unchanged.

THE NEED FOR A DEFINITIVE STATEMENT OF U.S. POLICY ON THE NEAR EAST CRISIS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the outbreak of war at any time is a most tragic development. But now that war rages in the Near East we must look to the present and future.

The United States has a great concern for peace, but we have an even greater commitment to freedom. I am concerned that in the recent statements by the U.S. Government, those priorities are not at all clear.

Yesterday, a spokesman for the U.S. Department of State said that the United States was "neutral in thought, word, and deed."

That is just not the case.

The United States is nonbelligerent, period.

The people of this country are not neutral in thought and word. Everything I hear, every expression of opinion from people in all walks of life, shows a deep concern for the preservation of the State of Israel.

From the moment the Secretary General of the United Nations withdrew the U.N. peacekeeping forces from the Near East, Israel's neighbors began massing troops on her borders. The last move before the outbreak of war was the announcement that there was a ring of steel around the State of Israel.

Our hearts go out to the gallant people of Israel who are attempting to crack that ring of steel, protect their access to the sea and—hopefully—end the 19-year military threat to their very existence.

The U.S. Government at this hour seems very much confused about what to say in this matter. The Soviet Union has no such qualms. The Kremlin is four-square behind the aggressor nations. It goaded Israel's neighbors into this conflict and it is making hourly statements of support.

Mr. President, I urge our Government to make a definitive statement of policy that leaves no doubt in the minds of the free people of the world where our sentiments lie.

I urge further that we be aware of the fact that the Israelis have the right under international law to free access through the Gulf of Aqaba. Be further aware that the human right prevails when the Israelis fight to defeat the military threat to their existence.

I hope that the United States, in its protestations of being "neutral in word, thought, and deed," will not be a party negotiating away any of those rights that the Israelis may establish through their own military efforts.

You will recall that it happened before. We dare not let that happen again.

THERE MUST BE CALM, STRONG INTERNATIONAL REASONING

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, a conflagration is raging in the Middle East at this hour. The peace of the world is in jeopardy. The truth of the matter is that a nation of 2½ million westward-leaning Israelis are locked in a death grapple with the Soviet-supported regime of Mr. Nasser. The emotion-charged nationalists of the entire area have thrown compromise to the wind and have toppled over the brink of war.

A time has come for the major powers to sit down and work out a swift, equitable cease-fire arrangement. The U.N. can ratify and implement this. I propose that the United States, U.S.S.R., Great Britain, and France create a modus vivendi that will guarantee the frontiers of all nations in the Middle East. Simultaneously, they can address themselves to working out a maritime arrangement within the existing framework of international law, guaranteeing rights of passage to all nations on international waterways.

We have ready at hand the apparatus for carrying out these agreements, once they are arrived at. The United Nations can act as a buffer on frontiers and as a guarantor of international rights and obligations. Whenever the major powers of the world have been willing to work in concert, they have been able to effect such results. Now is certainly the time to do so. The fuse is burning closer and closer to the powder magazine of international conflict.

I caution all responsible men to remember the lessons of past world conflicts. In World War I, a system of entangling alliances hurled all the major nations over the brink, even when they sought to avoid it. We must prevent a repetition of this.

A further word is in order on the progress of military events. It seems that the Israeli David is triumphing over the Arab Goliath for the third time in 19 years. This is a nation America helped to create. A nation we guaranteed territorial integrity to under President Eisenhower. A nation we are pledged to prevent the destruction of.

While offering to sit down with all major powers and work for an end to conflict through the U.N., I also feel we should make it quite clear to all parties that we stand by our guarantees of the past.

Above all, we must act: positively and swiftly. To act is of course dangerous. Not to act would be definitely disastrous.

MARITIME STRIKE MUST BE AVOIDED

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in the last few days there has been a strong indication that on June 15 the Nation may be faced with a maritime strike.

Last week the negotiating committee of the International Organization of Masters, Mates & Pilots notified all union members:

> Unless the shipowners live up to their contractual obligation, your Atlantic and Gulf Coast Committee unanimously and strongly recommends that the vessels stop sailing on June 15, 1967.

While the union was careful to exclude ships supplying our troops in Vietnam from any such strike, there is no doubt in my mind that a maritime stoppage at this moment of world crisis could have profoundly adverse effects upon our national security and foreign policy objectives.

While the contract of the International Organization of Masters, Mates & Pilots with the Atlantic and gulf coast shipowners does not expire until June 15, 1969, the present controversy involves interpretation of certain settlement provisions of the 1965 78-day strike by three officers' unions.

I would strongly recommend that both sides in this controversy make every possible effort to resolve their differences in a manner not injurious to the maritime strength of the Nation. It is my understanding that the existing contractual relationship provides for arbitration of the issues involved. If this be the case, surely such a course of action would be consistent with the critical present demand for a maritime fleet prepared and capable of reacting swiftly and efficiently as events may require. I ask unanimous consent that an article by Helen Delich Bentley on this matter, published in the Baltimore Sun, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Deck Officers Nearing Strike—Getting Way Would Bring Others In, Lines Say

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

Washington, June 3.—The nation's leading deck officers' union has advised its members to stop sailing about 50 per cent of the ships in the American merchant marine after June 15 unless the shipowners grant the union's demands.

A new spiral of labor costs is generally foreseen if these demands are met.

Although the contract of the International Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots with the Atlantic and Gulf Coast shipowners does not expire until June 15, 1969, the union is holding forth now for what it claims are the relief of inequities "obligated" in the settlement of the 78-day strike by three officers' unions in 1965.

PRESIDENT INTERVENED

President Johnson finally intervened to end that tie-up because of the need for the ships.

In a letter sent to all union members this week, the bargaining committee of the Atlantic and Gulf Coast district declared:

"Unless the shipowners live up to their contractual obligation, your Atlantic and Gulf Coast Negotiating Committee unanimously and strongly recommends that the vessels stop sailing on June 15, 1967.

"This does not apply to the ships supplying our troops in Vietnam. If necessary we will sail these ships for nothing."

Edward Silver, general counsel for two of the three management groups involved, said the MMP refuses to take the issue to arbitration to permit the permanent arbitrator to determine what should be done.

Furthermore, he said the American Radio Association which already has gained far more than the 3.2 per cent that was supposed to be the settlement ceiling in 1965 wants "to start the roll again."

"Right now, I see no end, no solution to this maritime donnybrook," Silver declared.

TWO OTHER UNIONS WATCH

The two unions which are sitting on the side, waiting for the outcome of the clash, are the National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association and the National Maritime Union, which last winter worked out a joint economic package through arbitration. And it was hoped this would begin to provide some stability to the industry.

However, both unions have "me too" or "favored nations" clauses in their contracts. If either deck or radio officers should receive any extras over and above the 3.2 per cent, then it can be expected that the suit with no stopping after that.

REYNOLDS EXPRESSES DISMAY

James J. Reynolds, Under Secretary of Labor, who has been in the center of the patchwork maritime labor negotiations since 1961, expressed complete dismay over the picture today.

"When I tried to get the unions to confer with me last year in an effort to sort out the 3.2 percent and nail down what it covered under the 1965 settlement," Reynolds stated, "I was not able even to get off the ground. The unions wouldn't cooperate.

"Naturally, I was greatly discouraged then and am more so now."

The management groups involved are the Tanker Labor Service Committee, representing most of the East and Gulf Coast-based tankers; the American Maritime Association, representing most of the unsubsidized independent dry-cargo ships, and Maritime Service Committee, representing the subsidized lines.

In the letter to the Masters, Mates and Pilots members, the bargaining committee notes that at the conclusion of the 1965 strike President Johnson stated:

"New principles of parity have been built into the pattern of these three contracts. The economic terms are built around specific recognition of the established stabilization policy."

PRINCIPLES OF PARITY

"The MMP accepted the principles of parity at that time and still accepts them.

"The strike in '65 was caused by the shipowners' attempt to use one union against another. They made an out-and-out under-the-table deal with one union, thinking they could strangle another and thus avoid true collective bargaining principles. Today we are faced with the same problem."

The deck officers' officials refer to the awards made by David Cole for the Maritime Engineers and Theodore W. Kheel for National Maritime in February.

The complaint says there is no opinion yet justifying the awards, which it sees as "two massive intellects . . . sprinkling holy water on an unholy deal."

The union asserts that one officers' union, which it did not name, received $2.17 over and above the 3.2 percent, and, therefore, the complaining union should have compensatory inrcease. The cost per man day for that union was $1.68 and per man day for the Masters, Mates and Pilots, $1.77, the letter stated.

"That cost was to remain constant for the four years of the contract," the officers union said. "The shipowners agreed that if they gave any monetary gains to one union, the others would receive the same excess."

TALKED MERGER A YEAR AGO

Supposedly the Masters, Mates and Pilots approached the Marine Engineers a year ago about merging in an effort to try to get the 3.2 percent and asserted inequities straightened out so the officers' unions could work together.

However, since last January, the Masters Union has been reluctant to discuss a leveling off with any other union but has kept citing "disparities."

QUAKERS THROUGHOUT UNITED STATES URGE RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to quote a paragraph from the recently printed 1967 Priorities of the Friends Committee on National Legislation:

> STRENGTHENING THE UNITED NATIONS
>
> The U.N. Human Rights Conventions have been before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for several years. These Conventions would abolish conditions akin to slavery, forbid forced labor, protect political rights of women, and outlaw the deliberate killing of any group—national, ethnic, racial, or religious. FCNL will work for approval of these Conventions by the Senate.

On March 8, 1967, Mr. James M. Read, president of Wilmington College in Wilmington, Ohio, and former Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees in Geneva, Switzerland, testified on behalf of the FCNL in support of U.S. ratification of the U.N. Human Rights Conventions before an ad hoc committee of the Foreign Relations Committee. After quoting Rousseau: "Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains," Mr. Read stated that there are still some places in the world where slavery, forced labor, and political persecution of women exist. He then explained why Quakers feel they have a concern in these conventions and their ratification.

President Read noted that in their efforts for world peace, Quakers have emphasized their belief in the equality and dignity of man. The Friends World Committee for Consultation has, since the founding of the United Nations, exercised its consultative status, both in Geneva and in New York, and its representatives have taken a special interest in the work of the Commission on Human Rights.

The historic commitment of Quakers to the abolition of slavery is well known. Particularly during the 19th century, both in this country and in other nations, individual Quakers were among the leaders of movements to abolish the slave trade, to end all forms of slavery and forced labor, and to assure nondiscriminatory treatment for all persons who had gained their freedom. Today, when the grosser forms of slavery have been abolished, many Quakers are active in the struggle against more subtle forms of bondage such as forced labor. As for the rights of women, Quakers were among the pioneers in establishing coeducational schools, and giving equality of status to women in many respects.

Mr. Edward F. Snyder serves as the executive secretary of the Friends Committee on National Legislation right here in Washington. His efforts to bring about the ratification of the human rights conventions are well known, and I would like to take the opportunity to publicly commend him in his most worthwhile efforts. Mr. Snyder recently noted that breakthroughs in man's slow progress toward a world of peace and justice seemed to become possible because of a change of heart on the part of Members of Congress and administration leaders.

It is this change of heart which not only Quakers throughout the world, but all citizens who are concerned by this body's failure to fulfill our obligations in the field of human rights conventions fervently desire. Let us demonstrate to the world that we do recognize the significance of our role as the only 100 men and women who can consent to the ratification of the human rights conventions, on behalf of the United States of America. Let us have a "change of heart."

ONE SOLDIER'S VIEW OF VIETNAM

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, we hear a lot about the activities of bearded "Vietnik" protestors. The fellow who burns his draft card in public can almost bank on national attention. So can the guitar player who camps in the halls of the Pentagon. The flagburners, the rabble-rousers, the noisemakers and the pickets—we hear about them all until we grow weary of their irresponsible antics.

But we hear very little about Americans like Sgt. Kenneth R. Butcher. This young man from the small mining town of Ely, Nev., saw his duty as a citizen in a far different light and went about fulfilling that duty in his own quiet way.

This young man wrote to me a year ago asking for my help in getting a transfer to Vietnam. At that time he was serving with the Army in Germany, but he said he wanted to "go where I can feel I am doing some good."

In going to Vietnam, Sergeant Butcher wrote:

> I will be fighting so that some people will have a chance to have a taste of the freedom that we take for granted.

I was happy to assist Sergeant Butcher, and he is currently finishing his year's combat tour in Vietnam. He wrote me last month to thank me again for that help.

It should be the other way around—I should be thanking Sergeant Butcher for his dedication to his country and to its ideals and its goals.

So that the quiet and responsible citizen may also have a bit of attention, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my exchange of correspondence with Sergeant Butcher be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 9, 1966.

Hon. Senator ALAN BIBLE.

DEAR SIR: I am a soldier in the United States Army. I was drafted into the Army in November, of 1965. I am from *Ely Nevada*. I have spent three years, in the Nevada National Guard, and one year, and 10 months, in the inactive reserve. I am stationed in Germany at the present.

My problem, is that *I want to go to Viet Nam*. I have put in a request for duty there. I put my request in, in March but I haven't received any reply. I had a very difficult time in getting my request in. My commanding officer didn't want me to leave. I had to go see the Battalion executive officer, before I could send it in.

As I have said before, I was drafted into the Army. I have two years to serve in here. By staying here in Germany, I feel I am wasting two years of my life. I want to go where I can feel I am doing some good. My time won't be wasted. I will be fighting, so that some people will have a chance to have a taste of the freedom that we take for granted.

I am sure there is a young soldier in the Army who would rather come over here to Germany rather than go to Viet Nam.

Sir, part of the soldiers creed reads, "I am an American fighting man. I serve in the forces, that protect my country, and our way of life," but I don't feel much like an American fighting man sitting here in Germany.

If there is anything you can do to help me get my assignment, I would sincerely appreciate it. If I am given the opportunity, I will do my best to warrant your help and consideration.

Thank you for your time, and consideration.

Sincerely,
Pfc. KENNETH R. BUTCHER,
B Battery, 2d Battalion, 75th Artillery,
APO New York 09165.

JUNE 15, 1966.

Pvt. KENNETH R. BUTCHER,
B Battery, 2d Brigade, 75th Artillery, APO, New York.

DEAR PRIVATE BUTCHER: Thank you for your letter of June 9, which I received on the 15th.

I have contacted the Department of the Army regarding your desire to serve in Vietnam and have expressed my interest in your case. The Army must, of course, make the final decision in this matter.

As soon as I hear from them, I will be in touch with you again.

Cordially,
ALAN BIBLE.

JULY 6, 1966.

Pvt. KENNETH R. BUTCHER,
B Battery, 2d Brigade, 75th Artillery, APO, New York.

DEAR MR. BUTCHER: Supplementing my letter of June 15, I am enclosing a letter I received recently from the Army, regarding your desire to serve in Vietnam. I assume you will have been notified of the decision to grant your request by the time this letter reaches you.

I am pleased to have been helpful to you in this matter.

Cordially,
ALAN BIBLE.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF PERSONNEL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: This is in reply to your letter concerning the above named soldier.

Private Butcher has been selected to fill a requirement for his grade and military specialty in Vietnam. He will receive appropriate reassignment instructions through military channels in the near future.

Your interest in this serviceman is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
Maj. Gen. WILLIAM W. BEVERLEY,
Director of Enlisted Personnel.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: This is a reply to your letter dated July 6. I wish to thank you for your assistance, in getting my assignment in Viet Nam. I know, sir, that you are a very busy man, and certainly appreciate your taking time to help me in this matter. I will do my best to end the war in Viet Nam, in whatever small way a single person can.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH R. BUTCHER.

JULY 25, 1966.

Pvt. KENNETH R. BUTCHER,
APO, New York.

DEAR MR. BUTCHER: I wish to acknowledge your letter which arrived July 19 thanking me for my assistance with your transfer request. Naturally, I was pleased to help in any way that I could, and I hope your new assignment in Vietnam works out well for you and provides you the opportunity you seek.

A request such as yours is not a usual one for a United States Senator to receive. I want to commend you for your patriotism and sense of duty to your country that has led you to ask for service in a war zone.

With your spirit I know you will contribute much more to ending the war than the "small way" you suggest.

I salute you and wish you well.

Cordially,
ALAN BIBLE.

MAY 23, 1967.

Hon. Senator ALAN BIBLE.

DEAR SIR: I am nearing the end of my tour here in Viet Nam. I wish to thank you again for your help in getting me over here. I am also nearing the end of my two years in the service, and I want to thank you for helping me make it two years that were not wasted.

I am very happy to have been able to help these people, in their fight for freedom. I feel that if the fine people in America knew these people, they would be proud of what we are doing for these people.

I am now serving as the battalion radio chief, with a combat engineer battalion. In closing I wish to thank you again for your help.

Sincerely yours,
Sgt. KENNETH R. BUTCHER.

A BREAKTHROUGH IN CONSERVATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, over the past few days the news media of the United States and Canada carried the story of what I feel will go down as a landmark in the history of wildlife conservation.

Two biologists from the endangered wildlife research program staff at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center near Laurel, Md., culminated years of research activity with a journey to Fort Smith near Great Slave Lake in Canada where they picked up six eggs of the rare whooping crane and returned them to the Patuxent Center.

This conservation milestone is an example of the best possible spirit of cooperation between two Governments—the United States and Canada. For years officials of the Department of Interior's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife have worked closely with their counterparts in the Canadian Wildlife Service. Representatives of both countries have worked tirelessly both in the field and in the laboratory gathering the mass of scientific information needed before the whooping crane egg pickup could even be attempted. Plans were formulated and carried out with military precision. Every step of the operation has previously been tested with the more abundant sandhill crane. Nothing was left to doubt or chance.

Now we hope that within a few days the eggs—which had been incubated for anywhere from a week to more than 3 weeks in nests in the wild before pickup—will begin to hatch. Thus, from these few eggs, we hope to develop the brood stock of whooping cranes which will eventually produce the numbers to return to the wild.

I am proud to be able to say that I have had a part in this historic conservation effort. Back in 1963 I was able to procure funds for the preliminary work on the sandhill crane which were in danger of being stripped from the budget and in 1965 my amendment was adopted which provided the funds to set up the Patuxent endangered wildlife facility.

Unfortunately I do not have the names of the Canadian Wildlife Service officials who have been collaborating in this work. I do, however, salute the representatives of the Canadian Government for their participation.

As for the U.S. participants any list would be sure to omit some who have contributed greatly over the years. Also, the great conservation groups in the country, such as the National Audubon Society, and others have been in the forefront of efforts to preserve wildlife species and habitat for many decades. To all the people in government and to the officers and members of the various conservation groups a vote of thanks.

It is proper, I believe, to recognize the dedicated staff of the endangered wildlife research program. For these are the people who will be in the forefront of the Government's efforts to preserve and increase the numbers of all forms of rare and endangered American wildlife over the next several years.

Heading the program is the talented, able, and dedicated Dr. Ray C. Erickson. He is assisted by Glen Smart, supervisory biologist of the section of propagation. Five field biologists have been assigned. They are: Winston Banko and John Sincock to Hawaii, Donald Fortenberry to South Dakota, Fred Sibley to California, and Ray Tomlinson to Arizona.

Other members of the permanent staff are: Eugene Cowan, Don Frickie, Bertha Preston, Wayne Shifflett, James Stephenson, Bruce Williams, Robert C. Williams, and Dr. James Miller.

We have made a start down the long road toward preservation and increase of America's rare and endangered wildlife. For success we need the continued cooperation and support of the Government, the Congress, the public, and the country's great conservation groups.

A MARITIME DAY ADDRESS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, May 20 was National Maritime Day.

On that day, in an address to the Propeller Club of the Port of Miami, Commissioner George H. Hearn, of the Federal Maritime Commission, paid fitting tribute to the men who build and sail our ships, to the men who make it possible for the Nation to observe a National Maritime Day.

In his speech, Commissioner Hearn quoted President Johnson's words that the sea and ships are "an integral part of this country's past, present and future." I join Commissioner Hearn in endorsing those words.

Mr. Hearn also took the opportunity to state for the record an area of shipping regulation that was a matter of serious concern to him.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hearn's Maritime Day speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am delighted to be here to address you on the occasion of the national observance of Maritime Day. As many of you know, I have had the opoprtunity to inspect and observe your great port, including Dodge Island, several months ago when I appeared here to discuss the recently enacted Public Law 89–777 commonly known as the Cruise Legislation Act, and the Commission's rules implementing it.

All over this great land of ours on this Maritime Day, public officials and representatives of industry, labor and commerce are addressing themselves to the present maritime situation and putting forth their solutions to the problem. I do not have the promotional responsibility of the American merchant marine and I leave to them the function of announcing their various positions. However, as a citizen who is deeply interested in the American Merchant Marine attaining the position of being the finest in the world, it is timely to acknowledge the merchant marine affiliated industries and the posture of our sea-faring men.

President Johnson acknowledged the importance of maritime endeavors when he said:

"International commerce and the ships which make it possible have contributed immeasurably to America's greatness. The sea and ships are an integral part of this country's past, present and future."

Shipbuilding and ship operating are very expensive undertakings in our country. Each of these endeavors, however is extremely important to our national well-being. When our shipbuilders and our ship operators compete with their much less costly counterparts in foreign lands in my opinion they are competing with much less valuable ships and services, whose nations have more limited goals. Our own builders and operators are second to none in the world. They are entitled to fair rates on their investments. No one in this country can carp with the comparatively meager dividends associated with shipbuilding and ship operating investments, vis-a-vis other commercial ventures. Each of these endeavors requires enormous capital investment. Each suffers more acutely from economic turmoil than do most domestic commercial undertakings. A vessel, for example with an economic life of about 20 years engaging in world trade subjects itself, in addition to economic fluctuations, to international political problems including trade and flag restrictions, the hazards of the elements and acts of God.

American terminal operations also are more expensive than their foreign counterparts. American terminals are constantly being brought up to date at considerable expense and the cost of operating terminals is also higher in this country than in others. But here in America where our standard of living is the envy of the world we must expect that these terminal operations will be substantially more costly than they are in less affluent ports around the globe.

American seamen, likewise, represent a national investment which we can ill afford to lose. All too often we hear how grandly they are compensated. All too often, however, their compensation is compared, to that of their foreign counter-parts—not to that of the white collar or blue collar workers in our own country. You and I know that American seamen possess special skills. We all know of the rigors of their lives and we are all aware, I hope, of the economic opportunities which are ever increasing shore side. I, for one, on this Maritime Day, wish to salute those American seamen who are willing to serve our nation by foregoing, for long periods on end, the fruits of our American high standard of living here at home. I wonder how many of us would trade places with them. They enjoy the company of their families only sporadically, they are on call twenty four hours per day, and they are often imperiled by the elements. Let me assure you, that it is no longer fashionable to stroll on many of the port streets in other lands. American seamen in foreign lands are exposed to health dangers that are unknown to us here at home and orderly police protection in many lands does not approach that which we enjoy here.

This evening, however, I am going to take the opportunity to state for the record an area of shipping regulation that is a matter of serious concern to me.

We have a national business policy—an antitrust policy which, as the keystone of our business life, has served us well. Indeed, the Sherman Act has been referred to as our "Charter of Economic Freedom." Few will doubt that our antitrust policy has stimulated competition which in turn has triggered that business way of life which has caused men to "Build a Better Mousetrap." Indeed, our American initiative spurred on by the challenge and response theory, to borrow the sociologists' phrase, has spawned productivity of such magnitude and excellence, that we enjoy a standard of living hitherto unknown in the history of mankind. We are all aware, I am sure, that our friends across the sea have not subscribed, at least so religiously, to such a way of business life.

A great exception to our national antitrust policy, however, is contained in the heart of the Shipping Act of 1916. Through Section 15 of that Act carriers are allowed to enter into several species of anti-competitive arrangements with each other on condition that such arrangements are given prior approval by that Agency of our Government which administers the Shipping Act. That Agency is now the Federal Maritime Commission.

At the present time, concerted action by carriers in our foreign trades has become a way of life, and Section 15 agreements are becoming more and more sophisticated. They run the gamut from mere rate fixing associations to all pervasive pools. So complex has the system become, that on a single voyage, a vessel may be sailing under the aegis of a half dozen conferences, and at least three of our American Flag lines are members of thirty or more rate fixing combines. You will note that I have not included the many agreements between terminal operators or freight forwarders.

I think we should all be concerned about the entire spectrum of concerted action agreements, not merely because they represent a departure from our traditional way of doing business, but because, in the case of carriers, vis-a-vis shippers, they necessarily tend to create a seller's or carrier's market. In a word, they tend to give an advantage to a carrier in his dealings with a shipper. This is especially true in those trades where the shipper does not have the alternative of a dependable non-conference service.

Now, I want it made perfectly clear that I am not anti-conference. I am sure that, by and large, the conference system does, or should be able to, make a substantial contribution to the development of our foreign commerce. But I want it made equally clear that I view Section 15 approval as a license, and that the granting of the license must clearly serve our public interest. Section 15 approval, once granted, cannot lightly be taken away, but nevertheless it can be taken away. I submit that it should never be casually granted. And the more anti-competitive the device for which approval is sought, the more carefully must we determine whether it serves our public interest.

In every regulated business, monopolies or quasi-monopolies are countenanced on the premise that their existence is necessary for the benefit of the public. Utility companies, transit companies, and even taxi cabs fall into this category. Yet no one denies that the franchises of such entrepeneurs require countervailing safeguards administered by public bodies. So too, in my opinion, it must be where quasi-monopolies in the ocean transportation world are permitted. Obviously, the overwhelming share of our international trade is carried by vessels, and a predominant number of these vessels are devoted to our extremely important liner or general cargo trades, and the vast majority of these liners are banded together, lawfully, into rate setting or price fixing conferences. It is unthinkable, I contend, that in the 20th Century, reasonable men would suggest that quasi-monopolies should exist without a public body's surveillance. In a word, the international commerce of the United States is far too important a matter to be placed, unbridled, into the hands of laissez faire business combines.

The plain facts are that our economy is freer than that of most of the international community; that our government policy, in international shipping, involves less home flag preference than does theirs; and most importantly, many nations, in this hemisphere and abroad, have taken steps not only to protect and enhance their own international commerce, but have promulgated rules and regulations regarding the vessels on which commercial cargo must be carried. In the final analysis, the Shipping Act, as an expression of Congress pursuant to a constitutional grant, is designed for the protection and growth of our foreign commerce. Simply expressed the situation is this: our foreign commerce is open to all, and all those who wish to participate in it do so under the ground rules that the Congress has laid down. Among those ground rules is the Shipping Act, which is administered by the Federal Maritime Commission. Carriers are free to engage or not to engage in our foreign commerce, but once having freely elected to participate in our trade they necessarily assume the obligations, as well as the benefits, which, under law is a condition of such participation.

I trust that I have made the point that the orderly, efficient and economic flow of our international export and import commerce is of prime concern to the Federal Maritime Commission: that carriers of all nations and conferences are welcome to participate in our trades, while observing the spirit of the Shipping Act, and that the Commission intends to use its powers, without fear or favor, without recklessness or timidity, in meeting its public obligation.

In conclusion I compliment this port and the men who had the foresight to build it and the men whose expertise makes it operate. I want you all to do your utmost to think of a better way, a more competitive way, a less expensive way, to get your jobs done so that our own economy will continue to grow, so that we shall be able to meet our international commitments, so that we may be also to continue to assist friendly nations, and more importantly so that we might attain the "Great Society" which is within our reach.

I thank you.

AMERICA 2000—ACTION IN ST. LOUIS

Mr. **PERCY**. Mr. President, in the course of developing the National Home Ownership Foundation Act over the past 9 months, it has been my pleasure to discover literally scores of exciting and imaginative local projects that are based on premises similar to that legislation, or which exhibit many of the characteristics of the program contemplated in it. These discoveries have been immensely gratifying to me, not only because they have been most instructive and helpful to me as I worked with others to develop this legislation, but also because they did so much to increase my faith in the enormous potential of the nongovernmental sector for coming to grips with the problems of building better homes and better lives for millions of American families.

Today I should like to invite the attention of Senators to one such local effort. It is named "America 2000," and was initiated recently in the city of St. Louis through the leadership of Mr. Harold J. Gibbons, president of Joint Council 13 of the Teamsters Union.

America 2000 is a private nonprofit foundation organized to bring know-how, experience, and high professional competence to the solution of the problems of urban planning, low-cost urban housing, recreational facilities, education, health, transportation, and cultural and commercial development.

In all these areas the foundation offers comprehensive planning services; but it goes further by standing ready to serve as the developer of an entire target area; to administer the entire project; to develop associated nonprofit sponsors; to establish community integration and liaison related to the project; to provide comprehensive social planning resources; and to provide necessary project management upon completion, if this is desirable.

As its initial project, America 2000 has on the boards a comprehensive redevelopment plan for a large area of St. Louis riverfront, adjacent to the central business district. The implementation of this plan, involving an investment of some $50 million, would produce a renewed neighborhood featuring commercial development and new and rehabilitated housing for low, middle, and upper income families. Both Federal and conventional financing will be employed.

America 2000, I am happy to note, has foreseen the pitfalls of dealing only with physical problems, divorced from the actual human beings who live in our cities. Its philosophy, akin to that of the National Homeownership Foundation Act, is based on the premise that human problems and desires must remain foremost in our minds, and that any program dealing with physical improvements of central cities must establish close liaison with the residents of the affected area, draw upon their insights and experiences, and allay their fears of dislocation or disruption.

America 2000 has brought together some of the most outstanding citizens of the St. Louis area, representing all occupations and philosophies, in the pursuit of its goal. Serving with Mr. Gibbons on the foundation's board are the following:

Preston Estep, Sidney Salomon, Jr., Miss Jacqueline Grennan, Senator T. D. McNeal, Dr. Benjamin Davis.

In addition, the technical associates of America 2000 offer a striking range of talents in urban redevelopment. At the moment they are:

Ernest Calloway, associate research director—Central Conference of Teamsters, City Plan Commission member.

Charles L. Farris, former director of St. Louis Land Clearance and Housing Authority, president—Urban Programing Corp. of America.

Harry Herring, member of National Institute of Appraisers (MAI), member of St. Louis Real Estate Board.

Eldridge Lovelace, senior partner in city planning firm of Harland Bartholomew & Associates.

Jake McCarthy, director of public relations, Teamsters.

John J. Mincher, vice president of Reliance Construction Co.

Thomas J. O'Toole, member of National Institute of Appraisers (MAI), member of St. Louis Real Estate Board.

Stanley M. Rosenblum, senior partner in law firm of Rosenblum & Goldenhersh.

Arthur F. Schwarz, senior partner in architectural firm of Schwarz & Van Hoefen.

Fred Walton, vice president and director of planning and design—Urban Programing Corp. of America.

Mr. Jake McCarthy, one of the driving forces behind America 2000, is also editor of the Missouri Teamster, a publication serving 45,000 Missouri Teamsters Union members and their families. In the April 28 issue of that publication, there appears an editorial on the National Homeownership Foundation Act which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Percy's Approach to Housing

Illinois' new senator, Charles Percy, has proposed an innovative approach to the problem of decent housing in America's cities. Under the plan, autonomous non-profit associations would be set up by business, labor, education or religious leaders in each community for the purpose of building private housing for low income families, with financing by the federal government.

The Teamsters Union locally has long urged a similar approach and has had considerable success with its own ventures in this field, such as Council Plaza.

Percy's plan essentially aims at fostering home ownership by low income families while preserving private initiative. Its effect would be to encourage corporations, churches and labor unions to assume some of their social responsibilities in solving our most critical urban problems.

Such an approach ought not supplant the responsibility of the government, as representative of society, for decent housing for every American. But if Percy's program were to become a reality, elements of society which up to now have stilled their social conscience would have little excuse for continued inaction.

Mr. **PERCY**. Mr. President, I am pleased by these generous remarks on legislation that so many Members of this body have joined in sponsoring. I assure the readers of the Missouri Teamster and of the Record that all of us are continually seeking ways to improve the proposed legislation so as to make it worthy of widespread support in Congress and among the American people.

One of the findings of the National Home Ownership Foundation Act reads in part as follows:

> Sec. 2(a)(3) that the primary responsibility for generating a rebirth of the declining urban and rural areas of the Nation properly lies with America's free enterprise system, working together with religious organizations, educational institutions, labor unions, foundations, and professional, civic, and rural organizations and associations;

America 2000 has provided an example of how just such a broadly based coalition can begin to take the initiative to achieve the important goals we all seek. I commend all who have had a part in launching this important venture, and wish them great success in the future.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL SUPPORTS SUPREME COURT OPEN HOUSING DECISION

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, once again, one of the Nation's finest newspapers has published an editorial endorsing the right of all men to equal justice under law. The Milwaukee Journal, on May 31, praised the Supreme Court for its decision declaring unconstitutional California's open housing referendum, which, in effect, repealed the State's open housing laws and forbade the legislature to enact any further such laws.

As the Journal editorial so wisely points out, the Court held that "even the voters amending their own State constitution are not unrestrainedly sovereign." Our system combines majority rule and minority rights. Whenever the people deprive a minority of their rights, the courts have a duty to speak out.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Even a Majority May Not Curb Basic Individual Right

Even a state constitution, by majority vote of the people, cannot give color of legality to a practice of race discrimination. The ban of the 14th amendment, on denying equal protection of the laws, forbids it.

This ruling Monday by the United States supreme court, affirming California's high court, is another historic knockout treatment of the insidious cancer of racism in the American body politic. It is doubly important to understand because of its assertion that even the voters amending their own state constitution are not unrestrainedly sovereign.

This principle was conspicuously invoked for the first time two years ago, when the court voided a Colorado constitutional amendment, though a majority of voters had ratified it, because it violated the "one man, one vote" doctrine. Even the majority, the court said in effect, may not abolish its own members' individual right, or anybody else's, to have each man's vote weigh the same. That, too, was an attempted discrimination under color of legality.

California laws include two open housing provisions. Real estate interests whipped up a campaign to repeal them by constitutional amendment, which succeeded. The amendment also forbade the legislature to enact any such laws henceforth.

This, as Justice White wrote, "was intended to authorize, and did authorize," a race discrimination. As a purported constitutional protection of a right to discriminate, it had to be struck down. Its negative form plainly amounted to an affirmative state sanction and support of a specific race discrimination. Plainly, not even a state electorate can be allowed to do that.

The 5–4 split of the supreme court does not imply that the four endorsed the action of California voters. The dissenters mainly were taken aback by the proposition that the Constitution can have occasion to override even the "will of the people" within a state. They sought to rationalize their dissent by suggesting that the repeal amendment merely left the state "neutral" on the subject of race discrimination in housing. It did no such thing, of course; it bound and gagged the state.

It may be a hard lesson to learn in a democracy but it's a vital one, that a majority of voters when misguided can be as oppressive of individual rights as any dictator. The Constitution blessedly operates to defend freedom and equality against tyrannical tendencies of governments and popular majorities both.

RETIREMENT OF ERNEST G. WARREN FROM THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, one of the most popular and most capable members of the Press Gallery retired the first of this month. Ernest G. Warren, known affectionately by many of us as "Ernie" Warren, terminated a brilliant journalistic career of 40 years when he retired. Of these 40 years, 38 were in outstanding service as a dedicated representative of the Associated Press.

I have known "Ernie" Warren most pleasantly during all of my 27 years in Congress, especially since 1946, when he became New England regional Associated Press correspondent for the six New England States. He and his wife, the former Margaret Dayton Glidden, of Elizabeth, N.J., celebrated their 34th wedding anniversary this past Saturday. They have been one of the most popular and congenial couples in Washington's journalistic corps.

Their daughter, Mary Worth Warren, has made an auspicious beginning in carrying on the family tradition of journalistic excellence set by her father as she is now the office manager of the CBS News Bureau in Washington. While "Ernie" received his bachelor of literature from the Columbia University School of Journalism, Mary Worth's college was William and Mary.

Although "Ernie" is a North Carolina-Virginian, having been born in Edenton, N.C., and then having moved to Virginia, he has far-back roots in New England, as does his wife, Margaret. We who are from New England can be very proud that a person of the high caliber of "Ernie" Warren chose to cover Washington news for the New England region, mainly because of his admiration for those who represented New England in Congress. He had been regional desk editor here for 10 years before taking over the New England run. His seniority at that time enabled him to bid in the region.

I am very proud that "Ernie" says that he has never regretted his choice, and that were he to have the opportunity, he would do it again. While "Ernie" graciously characterizes his New England congressional associations and real friendships as "wonderful," I know that it is the unanimous conviction of every Member of the New England House and Senate delegations that the feeling is mutual and that we sincerely regard his friendship and association as "wonderful."

Ernest G. Warren was the son of Ernest F. and Ruth Worth Warren of Edenton, N.C. He was educated in the public schools of New Bern, N.C., and Norfolk, Va. He attended the University of Virginia before going to Columbia University. Following graduation from the Columbia University School of Journalism, he worked on the Norfolk Ledger Dispatch and the Norfolk Virginia Pilot before joining the Associated Press in New York City. There and in Newark, N.J., he served as wire editor before coming to Washington with the Associated Press as editor and writer.

Over the years he has covered such events as the Lindbergh baby kidnaping and all of the political conventions since 1936. As the AP's Washington man for New England, he covered the career of the late President Kennedy from the day John F. Kennedy entered the House of Representatives, became a Senator, and was elected to the Presidency.

These biographical facts on Ernest G. Warren are most impressive and speak for themselves. But they are far from telling the whole story—or even the real story. They do not reveal the depth of respect and feeling that is held for "Ernie" by his colleagues in the Press Gallery and by the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

We all gained mentally and in human warmth from our association with "Ernie" Warren. He was an inspiring example of how to be objective and fair, but not coldly objective, for he wrote with warmth and especially with unusual empathy.

We wish him well in his retirement. We shall miss him. We urge him to revisit the press gallery and our offices when he can find the time from his busy retirement to do so. I am confident that he will do many, many useful and worthwhile things in his retirement.

THE OBLIGATION TO SPEAK AND THE RIGHT TO DISSENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a group of 51 San Francisco lawyers recently issued a statement entitled "The Obligation To Speak and the Right To Dissent." This is an excellent statement on a fundamental principle of democratic government and I commend it to Senators and to readers of the RECORD generally.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement and an editorial concerning it, which was published in the San Francisco Chronicle, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OBLIGATION TO SPEAK AND THE RIGHT TO DISSENT

The undersigned members of the bar believe the time has come for this nation to reaffirm its determination to exist as a free democratic society, where the right to discuss, to dissent, and lawfully to protest in support of one's convictions is nurtured and respected. If this principle of democratic self government is to exist in any meaningful sense at all, it must exist in times of stress and crisis as well as in times of ease and consensus; it must exist and be exercised *before* fateful decisions are made so as to influence those decisions; and it must protect unpopular as well as popular expressions of opinion.

We state these principles because we hear with increasing frequency the charge, either in so many words or in substance, that any dissent or protest from our present policies in Vietnam "give aid and comfort to the enemy" and impedes the conduct of the war. Such charges can have only one purpose—or at least only one effect—to reduce debate, to limit discussion, to frighten the people from a legitimate expression of their views on the critical issues upon which the very life of our nation may depend.

As lawyers we deplore any intimidation of lawful protest or debate. We do not profess to know the answers to the critical problems with which we are confronted in the area of foreign affairs. In varying degrees, some of us are hawks and some of us are doves. But we are all convinced that the one sure way *not* to arrive at a wise course, which has the informed support of the people, is to stifle debate and to insulate our national policies from all dissent.

Sound policies do not need to be shielded from debate; they thrive on it. And unsound policies do not achieve merit by being insulated from public discussion. Until our nation's leaders ask for and obtain the necessary constitutional authority to silence discussion and dissent, let it not be demanded or expected that we conduct our affairs *as if* such a step had been taken. In support of these views, we suggest the following considerations:

First. Those who would discourage free expression of opinions and orderly dissent always assert that they *personally* favor freedom of speech; that they fully subscribe to the right of the people peacefully to assemble, to protest, and to exercise the rights of free men in a democratic society. They explain however, that our adversaries do not understand our concept of democracy and may not fully appreciate that our national policies evolve from a process of free discussion and interchange of views. Accordingly, such adversaries may mistake discussion and debate for lack of resolution or patriotism. These fair weather disciples of democracy proceed then to their inevitable conclusion: we must run our democratic institutions in a way which will *fool* the opposition. We must adopt the very form of decision-making against which we are said to be fighting, i.e. totalitarian thought control by political leaders. One can scarcely conceive of a better way to win a battle and lose a war. If we are to embrace this philosophy, let us make no pretense of loving liberty; let us simply concede that we surrender to that which we deplore, and take our censorship pure, without the base alloy of hypocrisy.

Second. Legitimate debate and orderly protest—and that is *all* we are talking about—are needed for the benefit of our own nation's leaders. Our government is based on a consensus of the governed. It is important that, in determining that consensus, our leaders have an opportunity to measure the *real feelings* of the people. Yet, with increasing frequency we hear views expressed privately, with the comment that the speaker would prefer not to state such views publicly. This nation can ill afford to allow such feelings to gain currency. Once we embark upon a course of stifling discussion, whether by outright censorship, by intimidation or by innuendo, we deprive our leaders of what they need most: guidelines from the millions of people they are called upon to lead; a measurement of their temper and resolution; empathy with their desires.

In short, to stifle debate is to deprive democracy of its strongest weapon—the informed consensus of an enlightened people on a course of conduct, communicated to its leaders. And in that debate, responsible criticism can be more constructive than indifference or unthinking approval.

Third. Once we countenance intimidation of debate and dissent regarding our national policies, where do we draw the line? Our progress in degeneracy from a freedom loving, informed and concerned people, interested in the affairs of state, proceeds at an alarming rate. More and more of us wash our hands of the whole business. And when we do that, we get what we deserve—policies dictated by military and political minds shielded from the views of the people. Once those who peacefully march in protest have been dispersed, how long will we tolerate the opinion polls showing *any* degree of dissent? And once the polls have been eliminated or emasculated, how can we justify allowing our senators and congressmen to make speeches in the halls of Congress criticizing the policies being pursued? As we ride to and fro upon this tiger of intimidation, we will find it increasingly difficult to dismount.

Fourth. The most difficult argument is that by any dissent or discussion we are "letting down" our young men in Vietnam. But are we? If these young men (and many of us were in similar straits not too long ago or have sons who face these perils) are not fighting for democracy, the right to "speak out", and to live as free men, what are they fighting for? More than that, what of the fate of the thousands of troops—and perhaps millions—who will follow?

Fifth. There are two ways to answer arguments with which we do not agree in respect of the Vietnam situation. The first is by seeking to discredit our adversary. Doves are accused of "giving every aid and comfort to the enemy that they can"; certain hawks are accused of advocating escalation of combat for *others* despite their *own* failure to enlist in World War II. It is apparent that such replies do not really *answer* arguments but are directed mainly at dissuading the proponent from even making them.

The second approach is to consider arguments on their merits, dispassionately and without rancor, advancing such opposing contentions as one has.

It may be that *both* approaches are within the technical limits of free speech; but we firmly believe that only the *latter* is truly consistent with a democratic form of government, and with the *policy* underlying the constitutional guarantees. The first approach smothers discussion and discourages inquiry. The second approach promotes critical analysis and encourages understanding. The issues this country faces today are so serious and complex that we can ill afford to choose the former.

Perhaps the only way out is ever increasing escalation. But the American public is entitled to consider and freely debate the possible *consequences* before they occur (e.g., bombing of China, land warfare on the Asian continent) and the *alternatives*, if any, while they exist (e.g. disengagement, Gavin-type defense zones, insistence on SEATO participation, negotiations, etc.). If out of such debate and discussion and affirmation and dissent, comes a sounder policy and a course of action which ends the conflict sooner and with less human suffering, then it is for the common good, both for those who now endure the hardships of war and for those who may be spared them in the future.

As lawyers, we have watched this great nation during the past several months begin to descend incontinently, fecklessly, the stairway which leads to a dark chamber—the end of rational debate, dispassionate discussion, and legitimate protest. We believe we, and our fellow citizens, have an *obligation* to speak up and speak out on the grave issues of the day; and the *right* to do so without fear or recrimination. We believe our newspapers, our columnists, and our representatives should say so, plainly and unequivocally. And we subscribe to the incisive observation of Dante that "the hottest places in Hades are reserved for those who, in a period of moral crisis, maintain their neutrality."

This declaration was signed by the following San Francisco attorneys and released to the news media on May 17, 1967 in the belief that the critical issues of the day call for renewed dedication to the principles of a free democratic society.

It is hoped that other citizens—not just lawyers, but business and professional people, teachers, students and others from all walks of life—will be disposed to sign and disseminate this statement as it is, or with such changes as they feel appropriate, as an expression of their conviction that our democratic processes of government must be nurtured and preserved.

Brent M. Abel Arthur B. Albrecht, Philip H. Angell, Richard J. Archer, John P. Austin, John B. Bates, Peter H. Behr, John L. Bradley, William M. Brinton, Miles A. Cobb, William K. Coblentz, Vincent Cullinan, William I. Edlund, Donald P. Falconer, James B. Frankel, Pembroke Gochnauer, Lawrence Goldberg, A. Crawford Greene, Jr., Joseph R. Grodin, John N. Hauser, Lauffer T. Hayes, Louis H. Heilborn, Henry W. Howard, Raymond W. Ickes, Edward E. Kallgren, Charles W. Kenady, Jr., Roger Kent, Marshall W. Krause, George E. Link, Joseph Martin, Jr., Clark W. Maser, Graham B. Moody, Jr., Albert J. Moorman, Clarence E. Musto, William D. McKee, Robert Ohlbach, Jack H. Olive, Girvan Peck, Atherton Phleger, Edward W. Rosston, William W. Schwarzer, Leonard M. Sperry, Jr., Hart H. Spiegel Robert G. Sproul, Jr., David Strain, James F. Thacher, Peter N. Teige, James L. Tipton, Gary J. Torre, Gordon M. Weber, Max Weingarten.

RIGHT TO DISSENT

We should like to express our hearty admiration for the statement by 51 San Francisco lawyers on "The Obligation to Speak and the Right to Dissent" which was published on this page yesterday.

The time has indeed come, as the lawyers said, for this nation to reaffirm its determination to exist as a free democratic society. In calling for a renewed dedication to the principles of such a society, they said they hoped other citizens—business and professional people, teachers, students and others from all walks of life—would be disposed to sign and disseminate their statement.

It is significant, we think that among the statement's signers were a past president of the San Francisco Bar Association, Brent Abel; the current president, Vincent Cullinan; also two of the top San Francisco leaders in the major political parties, Roger Kent, Democratic, and Joseph Martin Jr., Republican, and such other leaders in the profession as Hart H. Spiegel, John B. Bates, Raymond W. Ickes and William M. Brinton.

THE COLOR OF OUR MONEY

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the dollar, coin or paper, is much on the minds of everyone these days. In this connection we argue about the metallic content of coins and the shortage of coins. We worry about the gold or silver backing of the dollar. And now it is suggested that we think a bit about the color of our money.

The May 21 issue of This Week magazine carried a provocative article on the question of changing the greenback to perhaps a redback or a yellowback or a blueback. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article, "Change the Color of Our Money?" be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGE THE COLOR OF OUR MONEY?

(By Frances Spatz Leighton)

"Please don't think I'm a nut," a man recently wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury, "but if you really want to help the economy of the country, just call in all the present green paper money and change it to different colors.

"There must be millions in safe deposit boxes or hidden in homes by people who haven't paid taxes and keep their assets in cash. Colored money would bring it out of hiding."

The Secretary did not think the man from Winchester was a "nut." In fact, he filed the letter respectfully alongside those of many other Americans—in high places and low, in politics and out—who have been campaigning for years for changes in the color of America's paper money. (Leave the current $1 bill green, say—but color the $5 bill yellow, the $10 bill red, the $20 bill blue, etc.)

For the letter hit upon only one of many valid reasons for a change in the color of the currency—as Canada, to cite just one example among many, many countries, has done since 1870.

1. Colored money would make it easier to identify the different denominations at a glance.

2. It would help people with poor eyesight to identify the amount by the color.

3. It would help businessmen make change in a hurry.

4. It would save millions of tedious hours spent in sorting and re-sorting money in banks and other cashiers' cages.

5. It would save the public millions of dollars a year which are lost in incorrect change.

It was just such a "wrong change" mistake, 20 years ago, that led Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers of Massachusetts to open the first crusade to change the color of money. A cab driver had given her change for $1 instead of for $10. She went to the Secretary of the Treasury—John W. Snyder—on August 22, 1947, and strongly urged him to use his authority to change the colors of the various denominations so they would be easier to distinguish. She reminded him that, in 1929, Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon had used the power vested in him to cut the size of paper money.

After waiting over a year and getting no action, Mrs. Rogers introduced a bill in the

House of Representatives, "To provide . . . new and different colors for each denomination." Congress treated her bill lightly. Not only was she a woman but a Republican in a Democratic Administration. But undaunted, she re-introduced her bill on the first day of her next term. The following day a male colleague, August H. Andersen of Minnesota, rose to chide her from the floor, and an amusing exchange followed:

Mr. Andersen: That is what they did in Russia and Germany and a great many other countries. Does the gentlewoman think we should do what they are doing?

Mrs. Rogers: The gentleman can get no Communistic tinge from this. As a matter of fact it would help the United States to find the Communists. In many instances their money is hidden money. This legislation would bring it out of hiding. . .

Mr. Andersen: What color would the gentlewoman have for the new money?

Mrs. Rogers: Different colors. It could follow the same system as our United States postage stamps so that it would be easier for those who are making change. . . One day I gave a $10 bill to a taxi driver for a $1 bill. He wanted to return it to me, but I told him to keep it. So I made a mistake. Others have made mistakes in making change.

Mr. Andersen: I am sorry to hear that the gentlewoman has made a mistake.

OTHERS IN CONGRESS HAD THE SAME IDEA

That ended the matter until February of 1960 when Congressman James Roosevelt, son of the late President, advocated (but did not introduce) a bill to make two changes in paper money—one was to add tiny perforations or an embossment on each bill so the blind could identify money by touch. And second was a plan to color key the money.

Then the next year big things happened—or almost happened. A new woman Treasurer of the United States, Elizabeth Rudel Smith, called for a change from greenbacks to different-colored money for each denomination. She, too, had been victimized in getting change in a cab one dark night.

She said, "I do feel that it is easy to become confused where there is a single color used. People, of course, have the number to look at but under different lighting conditions and with failing eyesight many people have reported to me that they have given somebody a $20 bill and thought it was $10."

Five years ago, asked whether she felt the change-over to multicolored currency would slow down counterfeiting, Mrs. Smith replied:

"The Secret Service, 20 years ago when recommendations of this kind were first introduced, were very much in favor of the multicolored currency. But now, with the advance in equipment to reproduce almost anything, they are of the opinion it would not make any particular difference. I understand they feel it would slow down the do-it-yourself counterfeiter but not the professional counterfeiter."

COUNTERFEITING IS TOO RARE TO BE A FACTOR

A recent check shows the Secret Service still feels that way. A spokesman added that the total loss to the public in counterfeit notes in 1966 was only $933,000, compared with $40,000,000,000 circulating.

Mrs. Smith's mail ran 4–1 in favor of the change. Many of her letters came from cashiers in stores and restaurants who had to make good on the big bills they gave away by mistake. Many newspaper editorials praised her. But alas, after she had been in office only 16 months, and before she had really had a chance to fight the matter to a conclusion, Mrs. Smith retired because of ill health.

Her successor, Kathryn O'Hay Granahan, did not share Mrs. Smith's enthusiasm—"I feel our money in its present form it a tradition and I would not like to see it changed." Case dismissed.

But now Mrs. Granahan, too, is gone from the Treasury scene—she resigned last November. How will a new Treasurer feel about it?

Acting Treasurer W. T. Howell cites the reasoning of Henry J. Holtzclaw, Director of the Bureau of Engraving, as his own for opposing a change. He told This Week, "Mr. Holtzclaw feels people will tend to rely on color and not look at the denomination. This is a danger because various chemicals can be used by counterfeiters to change the color and enable a bill of a small denomination to assume the color of a larger denomination. The color now used is more difficult to counterfeit than other colors. However, if it is changed by law or by the decision of the Secretary of the Treasury, we will of course abide by the law."

YOU CAN TELL CONGRESS YOU WANT A CHANGE

And it may well be changed, according to three Administration leaders. Two are ranking members of the House Banking and Currency Committee which considers all legislative matters affecting banking and the legal tender—Frank Annunzio (D., Ill.), and Thomas L. Ashley (D., Ohio). The third, Senator Howard W. Cannon (D., Nev.), is a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, which is concerned with the business welfare of the nation.

In discussions with This Week, all three expressed great interest in the subject and willingness to sponsor legislation if the public wants it.

Congressman Annunzio said, "I like the idea. I will talk with Henry Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, about it and I will poll my Committee. I will also talk with bankers who must handle millions of dollars in currency every day to see how a change of this kind would improve their system."

Congressman Ashley went a step further and promised to introduce legislation based on the outcome of the ballot on this page. "I feel the circulation of This Week is great enough to provide an impressive sampling of the will of the American people," Ashley said. "If the results of This Week's poll warrant it, I plan to introduce a bill directing the Treasurer to print money in different colors for each denomination. The change need only be made in the $5, $10 and $20 bills. The $1 bill, most-used, could remain green. This would require development of only three new inks, and should not be very expensive."

The strongest statement came from Senator Cannon: "I don't believe there is anything sacred about the size or color of the American dollar," he said. "Certainly, if it can be established that there is a better way to serve the people, the Congress should look into it. I definitely would support such an inquiry—if there is substantial public demand for it—and I would support any legislation resulting from it that might increase public convenience."

An earlier This Week poll (January 15, 1967) has already resulted in the introduction of a bill to create more 3-Day Weekends. If any of you readers would now like to change the color of your money—or feel strongly against such a change—here's your chance to say so.

Clip and mark the ballot at the top of this page and send it to This Week. We cannot acknowledge letters but we will forward them, along with the tabulated results of the ballots, to the three interested members of Congress.

PASSAGE OF TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL LOOKS LIKELY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently the Progressive, a magazine founded in 1909 by Robert M. La Follette, published an editorial on the truth-in-lending bill. The Progressive has long been the champion of consumer causes, and I am delighted that they have taken up the call for truth in lending. The Progressive concludes that the evidence is overwhelming that American consumers have only a vague idea of the amount they pay for credit and that they are entitled to the facts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excellent article published by the Progressive be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Truth About Credit

For years, former Senator Paul Douglas tried, without success, to persuade Congress to adopt a "Truth in Lending" measure that would put an accurate price tag on credit. Recently, citizen Douglas appropriately led off the testimony in a hearing on a similar bill sponsored by Senator William Proxmire, Wisconsin Democrat, who has taken up the fight.

Proxmire has made a minor but significant change in the measure, which Douglas approved, that greatly improves its chances for passage by the current Congress. Even the cautious *Wall Street Journal* called its passage "likely."

Consumer credit has become one of the nation's largest and fastest-growing businesses. In the past two decades short- and intermediate-term consumer debt has soared almost 1,500 percent. American consumers pay $22 billion a year in interest and finance charges, almost as much as they spend for groceries.

Yet few consumers know with any degree of accuracy how much they are paying for installment credit, revolving charge plans, automobile financing, or almost any other form of credit. A study of 800 families revealed that on the average they thought they were paying 8.3 per cent to their various creditors when the actual rate was 23.2 per cent, nearly three times higher. Credit is apparently the only thing Americans seem willing to buy without knowing the price. Furthermore, when the cost of credit is stated it is rarely the true cost, and frequently is only half, or a third, or even a fourth of what the comsumer eventually pays.

Douglas argued that disclosure of true interest rates would stimulate competition in consumer credit. "If as a result of more vigorous competition," the former Senator testified, "the average rate of interest on consumer debt declined by one percentage point, American families would save $1 billion a year."

Proxmire's bill would require a creditor to provide a consumer with three basic facts: an itemized statement of all finance charges; the total finance charge in dollars and cents; and the total finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate. The last provision is a simplification of the Douglas bill's requirement that the lender provide the "simple annual [interest] rate," a mathematically cumbersome procedure which almost invariably results in a figure running to several decimal places, and which had met strong resistance from lenders and Senate committee members. Proxmire's modification would disclose the *approximate* annual interest rate, which could be easily arrived at, in whole numbers.

The degree of need for such a law can be measured precisely by the powerful pressures opposing it. The evidence is overwhelming that American consumers have only a foggy notion of what they pay for credit. Those who make their profits from extending credit prefer to keep consumers in the dark; the shock of the truth might radically alter current credit practices.

"Truth in Lending" is a simple, practical *measure. It makes no attempt to regulate* credit costs. All it does is require the seller to answer the prospective buyer's age-old question: "How much does it cost?" In a market that absorbs almost as much as the nation's grocery bill, it is a question that deserves a clear and forthright answer.

MIDEAST CRISIS NECESSITATES A STRONGER MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. **BARTLETT.** Mr. President, the recent tragic series of events in the Mideast, culminating yesterday in intense air and ground battles, increases the necessity for expanded and intensified efforts to secure a means of peace in that troubled area.

These events as well present unmistakable proof that the Nation must be prepared to serve the ends of peace and resistance to aggression in more than one sector of the globe. Being prepared to move efficiently and effectively to secure or establish peace, and to actively resist aggression if required, demands that we have an adequate, modern, and efficient merchant fleet.

The relevancy of maritime strength to the course of events in this day of jet airplanes, missiles, and space exploration cannot be overstated. The very crisis facing mankind today in the Mideast was preceded by a blockade against merchant vessels that would seek to pass through the international Strait of Tiran. It was only a few years ago that the United States dramatically and effectively removed the threat of Soviet offensive missiles in Cuba by blockading merchant vessels carrying such cargo.

Moreover, our present effort in Vietnam is critically dependent on our merchant marine. The Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been conducting an extensive probe of the adequacy of our merchant marine and of the policy to be pursued to assure an adequate fleet. We have learned that 98 percent of the supplies going to Vietnam—both military and civilian—are being carried on merchant vessels. This is irrefutable proof of the necessity for a strong merchant marine. But in all candor I must say that we have as well been given irrefutable proof that our merchant fleet is inadequate.

The committee has learned that we do not even have enough U.S.-flag vessels available to take care of our Vietnam requirements, in spite of the fact that more than 70 percent of the total U.S. tramp fleet cargo capacity is now being implemented for that purpose. We have had to rely in many instances on ships of other nations with foreign crews to carry this critical cargo.

Mr. President, the total U.S. privately owned fleet numbers only 955 vessels. It has been necessary because of Vietnam to break out 170 rusted tubs from the reserve fleet. When Assistant Secretary of Defense Ignatius testified before the subcommittee last month, I expressed to him my great concern as to whether the Nation could presently supply another Vietnam type of operation with our current maritime strength. I was assured that the Defense Department considered our fleet adequate; and it was pointed out *that we have a reserve fleet numbering 1,190 vessels. Mr. President, such* a reserve fleet may be real in the view of the Defense Department, but the availability of some 1,190 vessels is a dangerous and misleading fiction.

It is true that on paper we have 1,190 reserve vessels. *But 517 of these vessels*—or almost half—are so outmoded and worthless that they are already tagged for the scrap pile. Another 292 vessels are not cargo ships at all, but rather are military auxiliaries. And, as I have stated, 170 ships—the best of the reserve fleet—have already been broken out for Vietnam service.

That leaves the Nation with a National Defense Reserve Fleet numbering the grand total of 211 ships, none of which are modern or efficient. How well prepared are we to move effectively to secure peace or to resist aggression? I submit that the security of the Nation and our commitments, present and potential, demand an immediate and large-scale rebuilding of our merchant marine.

HIGH COURT SPURNS 10TH AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a column written by James J. Kilpatrick, appearing in the Bluefield, W. Va., Sunset News-Observer on June 3, titled "High Court Spurns 10th Amendment."

There being no objection the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH COURT SPURNS 10TH AMENDMENT

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—The Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution ordinarily is remembered, when it is remembered at all, as the "States' rights" amendment. The term is a misnomer. It ought properly to be known as the "reserved powers" amendment, but in the light of last Monday's Supreme Court decision in the California case, we may refer to it henceforth simply as the Discarded Tenth.

Until last Monday, many of us truly had believed that not even the Warren court could fail to honor the explicit meaning of the Tenth. What the amendment says is that all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively "or to the people."

Those last four words strike to the very heart of popular government. Destroy them, and the structure falls. What the court held on Monday is that the people of California, exercising their ultimate sovereignty, no longer have the power to amend their own State Constitution in order to proclaim an elementary statement of property rights. Five members of the high court—Warren, Douglas, Brennan, White and Fortas—substituted their own naked will for the expressed desire of more than 4,500,000 Californians. Government by the people yielded on Monday to government by the judges.

The facts in the case are well known. In 1963, the California legislature adopted the Rumford Fair Housing Act. The law, intended to reduce racial discrimination, took away from the owners of certain residential property their right to sell or to lease as they wished. The opponents of the law thereupon initiated a referendum, known as Proposition 14, intended to nullify the Rumford Act and to write into California's supreme law a positive statement of every person's right "to decline to sell, lease or rent (his) property *to such person or persons as he, in his* absolute discretion, chooses."

Proposition 14 carried overwhelmingly in the 1964 election Several Negro plaintiffs then brought suit to have the referendum declared void as a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. The California Supreme Court upheld their position. On Monday, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed by a 5–4 vote.

To describe the majority's reasoning as bizarre is to put a useful word to an inadequate purpose. The majority's reasoning was simply incredible. As the five justices saw it, California's constitutional declaration of a man's right to decline to sell his property amounted to "encouragement of racial discrimination by the State." Such a State power is prohibited by the Fourteenth Amendment; it therefore cannot be exercised by the people through amendment of their basic law.

How Proposition 14 could be read as "encouragement" of racial discrimination is beyond comprehension. As Harlan said for the four dissenters, "the provision is neutral on its face." Its effect is merely to restore certain private behavior "to the sphere of free choice." The Rumford Act established a special privilege for buyers. Proposition 14 took that special privilege away, and left the law of property where it was before—in a condition where the buyer's right to buy is fairly balanced by the seller's right not to sell. If the people themselves cannot restore that right, how then is it ever to be restored?

The Supreme Court majority could not even find precedents to support its Olympian view. One cited case involved a railway; another involved a political party; a third involved a restaurant owned by a public parking authority in Wilmington; a fourth dealt with State statutes requiring segregation in restaurants. Speaking for the majority, White feebly acknowledged that "none of these cases squarely controls the case we now have before us." The fact was that none of the cited cases remotely approached a California constitutional amendment dealing with free choice in the sale of private property.

In a concurring opinion, Douglas reiterated his alarming view that rights of free choice no longer exist in any area, such as the sale of real estate, that is handled through agents licensed by the State. He has not yet been able to rally a majority of his brothers to this extremist position, but one finds small comfort in the fact. In last Monday's decision, the high court carried its obsessive egalitarianism to lengths that the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment could never have conceived.

Harlan summed it up: By refusing to accept the decision of the people of California, and by contriving a new and ill-defined constitutional concept to allow Federal judicial interference, "the court has taken to itself powers and responsibilities left elsewhere by the Constitution." This the high court had no right to do. But five of its members did it.

THE FRUSTRATIONS OF WAR

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, reading the mail I receive from people troubled about Vietnam is usually a very painful task. But particularly disturbing was a letter I received last week from an Oregon woman whose son is in Vietnam. This young man had written a very angry letter home, describing how he had been sent on patrol without a magazine or ammunition for his weapon. His mother's letter was written not in anger but in frightened bewilderment.

I quote from this mother's letter and that of her son's.

On May 22, 1967, the son wrote:

> DEAR FOLKS: I am very displeased at the moment but it'll pass. I had to come to the field yesterday and all I have as equipment is my M-16 minus magazines and no ammunition and my steel pot. I guess I'll be sent back in and that would sure make the 1st Sarge mad. I can't help it if I was injured and they gave my equipment to some new replacement. Hell they knew I was coming back.
>
> I'm gonna see what I can do about the situation. This darn army is still screwed up tho we have a good CO now.
>
> I'm sure unhappy at the darn field operation. I wish oh wish I could get back to the base camp and stay.
>
> Lt. Dolphin our platoon leader, is quite concerned with it and I hope he'll be with me when I ask to be sent back. My fingers ache.
>
> Larry hasn't got any equipment either.

On May 31, 1967, the mother wrote to me:

> DEAR SIR: . . . I wanted you to know that my son never asked any one to intervene on his part, and I hope this won't make his service life harder to bear.

I have asked the Secretary of Defense to investigate the circumstances surrounding this case.

This woman's pain and her son's frustration are a part of the human side of this war that I fear we in public life too seldom see. Our involvement in this problem often revolves around appropriation votes and intellectual exercises in policy debates. Few of us lay awake at night suffering the personal agony of having a son or a husband facing death in the jungles of Vietnam.

We avoid this emotional involvement, rationalizing that our sanity demands it and that we must solve this problem with logic. But if, just occasionally, we could experience the suffering of the primary participants in this conflict, perhaps we would be closer to the solution we seek. Perhaps we would begin thinking about Vietnam in terms of the value of human life and in terms of the accumulated agony of years of destruction. I fear we often lose our sensitivity to the human meaning of war in our concern with grand strategies, historical stereotypes and national pride.

Peace in Vietnam will not be just an international situation; it will be the liberation of millions of people from constant suffering. If we could come to understand the human significance of peace, perhaps we would more humbly and persistently seek an alternative to war.

TED YATES, OF NBC NEWS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn this morning of the death in Jerusalem of a distinguished journalist, a close friend of mine, Ted Yates, of NBC News. Ted was hit by machinegun fire in the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem at the outset of hostilities there. We had learned yesterday that he was improving in a Jerusalem hospital, and we had hoped that he would recover. But today the word came that he succumbed to his injuries.

The strife that besets the nations of the Middle East today is a tragedy. And the death of this fine young man, at almost the beginning of the fighting, is tragic too, for his family, his many friends, and the Nation that benefited from his talents during his career in journalism.

Ted Yates came from Wyoming, but his work spanned the whole world. He produced some of the finest television reporting of our time, and he was respected throughout the industry as a gifted producer and a fearless reporter. When he entered the television field in New York City, he had behind him an education at the University of Virginia and experience as a newspaperman in Florida. His unusual talents were quickly recognized when he produced the Mike Wallace show, which set a new standard for candor in television interviewing. Later he went to NBC, where he produced David Brinkley's Journal, a marvelous 2-year series of documentary programs. At the conclusion of that series he began to expand his work to include special news and documentary programs which eventually took him to virtually every part of the globe.

It was the trouble spot which attracted him, for there was always the best opportunity for frontline reporting and the greatest need for objective reporting. He went to Vietnam to cover the war. He went to the Congo when the fighting erupted there. He traveled to the Dominican Republic, to South America, to Central America, to the countries of Asia. As one of his colleagues said this morning:

> When Ted Yates was reporting, he did it the hard way.

He knew there was no substitute for being on the scene and reporting from the center of the action.

Ted Yates had many outstanding qualities. Perhaps the most obvious of these was his tremendous physical courage. He had planned for several months to do a series of documentary films on the Middle East. When the latest crisis came to the Middle East, he did not postpone his schedule. He advanced it, so that he would be there to report the action firsthand. He left this country 8 days ago. The exact details of his death are not yet clear.

The physical courage was matched by his intellectual fearlessness. Ted Yates never backed away from an issue. He never avoided a subject because the subject was too difficult or too sensitive to handle. He was a determined and honest reporter.

And he was a good friend, as I and so many other people know. His death is a loss to me, as it is to television and journalism. Ted Yates was a warm and honest and friendly man. My sympathy goes out to his lovely wife, Mary, and to their children. They can take comfort in the fact that he will be remembered by his friends and colleagues, and by the profession that he served so well.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Ted Yates was a personal friend of mine. I am grateful to the Senator, as will be all of his friends, for the eloquent memorial which the Senator has uttered on the floor. I should like to associate myself with it, and to express my sense of sadness at the loss of so gifted a reporter, a friend with whom I have associated for some time, and to join in the expression of sympathy for the family of Ted Yates.

THE EXPECTED SHORTAGE OF ENGINEERS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this is the third time that I have risen on the Senate floor to call attention to the fact that at the present time our Nation does not have, in the education pipeline, enough engineers to insure that we will possess the needed supply of trained personnel for the years to come.

In the Engineering Manpower Bulletin of April 1967, this prospective manpower deficiency was discussed with clarity. After reading the article it appears that even with the many legislative programs of aid to education, both for institutions and students, this continuing problem has not changed. Engineers graduating this June are insufficient for today's needs, and it is clear from the numbers of freshmen opting for engineering that the supply will be insufficient for the needs of the years to come.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert a table from the Engineering Manpower Bulletin which shows the current situation and projects the situation in the future.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Year	Male college freshmen	Engineering freshmen	Engineering degrees			New engineering graduates entering employment			Total degrees awarded	Total entering employment
			Bachelor	Master	Doctor	Bachelor	Master	Doctor		
1964	508,117	73,682	35,226	10,827	1,693	27,200	5,700	800	47,746	33,700
1965	593,000	79,872	36,691	12,246	2,124	27,500	6,700	800	51,061	35,000
1966	580,000	78,400	35,400	13,100	2,400	26,300	7,500	1,000	50,900	34,800
1967	578,000	76,700	36,600	14,100	2,700	26,900	7,400	1,300	53,400	35,600
1968	584,000	76,000	41,600	17,200	3,400	30,200	7,800	1,600	62,200	39,600
1969	606,000	77,600	45,800	20,100	4,000	32,900	9,000	1,700	69,900	43,600
1970	633,000	79,700	45,500	21,200	4,400	32,300	10,100	1,900	71,100	44,300
1971	661,000	82,100	44,800	22,100	4,700	31,500	10,200	2,400	71,600	44,100
1972	685,000	84,400	44,700	23,200	5,000	31,100	10,200	2,800	72,900	44,100
1973	706,000	86,200	45,800	24,900	5,500	31,700	10,400	3,000	76,200	45,100
1974	727,000	88,000	47,300	27,000	6,000	32,500	10,800	3,100	80,300	46,400

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, one of the reasons for this dearth of engineering talent is the fact that those entering school believe that other fields of endeavor are more exciting and remunerative. It is true that they see only the job market as of their freshman year, and do not project into the future. But the unfortunate truth is, that a fully qualified engineer needs at least 4 years of intensified schooling before he is accredited, and if an individual does not start in his freshman year he is lost to the profession.

It is with this fact in mind that I turn to a matter which has been of great interest to me, S. 366, the Higher Education Scholarship Act of 1967. This proposal which would provide for scholarships of up to $2,000 a year for the first 2 years of college would be of great assistance to the Nation by increasing the pool of students and thereby help to provide for the engineers of the future.

The many youngsters in our Nation who would be interested and could be accepted at a junior college, but who are not attending due to financial problems, would be able to attend school with the adoption of S. 366. The middle student, he who is not the highest achiever, could then receive aid. We all realize that many youngsters do better in school as they mature, and this bill would allow late flowering talent to bloom. I believe that if we made provision for all qualified students to attend some form of higher education, we would see that more students would choose engineering as their future profession. And at this time, as the Engineering Manpower Bulletin points out, such an increase in number is sorely needed.

J. F. (POP) McKALE, R.I.P.

Mr. **FANNIN**. Mr. President, a great American, a great Arizonan is dead. J. F. (Pop) McKale died last Thursday night of a heart attack at his home in Tucson, Ariz., where he had lived since 1911.

He was 79 years old.

Pop McKale lived his life fully and distinguished himself in many ways, most notably as a great coach at the University of Arizona and as a builder of young men. But Pop McKale was more than that. He was a friend to all who knew him, a tireless worker for interscholastic athletics, an informed interested citizen, and, above all else, a loving husband and father.

Arizonans of all ages and of all walks of life mourn his passing.

At the University of Arizona, Pop coached football from 1914 through 1930, winning 80 games, losing 32, and tying six. As a baseball coach he had 302 wins compared to 120 losses and six ties, and his eight basketball teams won 45 games and lost 12. An outstanding record.

Additionally, he was a founder of the American Association of College Baseball Coaches, and holds the association's highest award, the Silver Baseball Trophy, for distinguished service. His other honors included the National College Baseball Hall of Fame, the Helms Foundation Hall of Fame, and the Arizona Baseball Hall of Fame.

But busy though he was, even until his death, he never forgot his boys, many of whom he continued to correspond with until the very end. There was nothing he would not do for them, even long after they themselves had sons attending the great university to which he gave so much, but longed only to give more. It was a mutual love affair. Pop loving the university and the students; the students and university loving him. One week from now he was to have been honored by the University of Arizona Alumni Association.

His death was a great loss to the university, the State, and the Nation, as well, of course, for his family, to whom I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

We are richer having known him.

ARAB-ISRAEL CONFLICT

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, the news yesterday of the outbreak of fighting between Israel and the Arab States comes as a heavy blow. For the third time in 20 years the Middle East is plunged into armed international conflict between Arabs and Jews.

In this time of crisis, certain considerations are of overriding importance.

First is the right of Israel to exist and to maintain her territorial integrity. Concomitant with this is the duty of the United States to guarantee the integrity of Israel's borders under the May 1950 tripartite declaration issued by the United States, Great Britain, and France, to guarantee the integrity of Arab and Israel borders.

Historically, legally, and morally, the State of Israel has earned the right to exist and to live at peace with its neighbors. Moreover, by the ability which the people of Israel have shown three times in the past 20 years to defend their land against military force, they have proven their viability as an independent nation. And as a free and independent nation they are entitled to, and should enjoy, the right to freedom of the seas, which includes access free from harassment to the Gulf of Aqaba and equal treatment with other nations to passage through the Suez Canal.

Second, a cease-fire must be arranged as soon as possible, so that the loss of life and the shedding of blood can be ended. I feel that the offices of the United Nations are the proper vehicle through which a cease-fire should be attempted.

Third, a longrun solution to the Arab-Israel conflict must be found. This crisis, by fanning into flames the smoldering coals of the Arab-Israel dispute and exhibiting their destructive force, must cause the nations of the world to put out the fires altogether. For as much as we may hope for an immediate cease-fire, those who have died will have died in vain unless their sacrifice can contribute to a permanent settlement of the differences between the Arab States and the State of Israel.

Therefore, after a cease-fire has been arranged, the United States must take the lead in providing for a permanent peace. It may be that this can be approached through the United Nations, especially if the U.N. should prove successful in bringing about a cease-fire. If the U.N. should prove unworkable in this instance, then I suggest that the United States immediately propose an international conference between Israel, the Arab States, Great Britain, France, the Soviet Union, and the United States for the purpose of working out a permanent settlement of the differences that continue to plague Arab-Israel relations. These differences are not insoluble, but they are laced with delicate intricacy, and much hard work and willingness to cooperate will need to be exhibited before any real solution will be forthcoming. The present conflagration shows the need for statesmanship lest the fires of conflict in the Middle East engulf the world.

REMEMBER

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, on Saturday last, the President of the United States delivered an address at the New York State Democratic dinner in New York City. In his speech he emphasized the many contributions made by Democratic administrations from the time of Franklin D. Roosevelt onward. While he mentioned the contributions of Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and John F. Kennedy, he neglected to mention the contributions which have been made under his administration. He brought home to the assemblage just what the Democratic Party is doing, just what it has done, and just what it intends to do in the future.

On the occasion of the meeting with the New York State Democrats, the President was most graciously introduced by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. In the course of his remarks, Senator KENNEDY gave full credit to the many contributions which President Johnson has made to the welfare of our Nation, and said in part:

> He has borne the burdens few other men have ever borne in the history of the world, without hope or desire or thought to escape them.

This, I think, sums up the difficulties and responsibilities which have rested on the President's shoulders ever since he assumed office.

The introduction was also a mark of understanding by a great Senator of the responsibilities which are entailed in the office of the Presidency and which he—as no other Member of the Senate—has such a great and profound understanding.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], as well as those by the President of the United States, be incorporated at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that various newspaper stories covering the program of the New York event of June 3, 1967, be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HONORABLE ROBERT F. KENNEDY, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK, AT DEMOCRAT STATE COMMITTEE DINNER, AT THE AMERICANA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, JUNE 3, 1967

SENATOR KENNEDY: Mr. President, Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Vice President, Miss Johnson—Lynda Bird, ladies and gentlemen: I have just returned from England. I had hoped to have the opportunity to introduce President Johnson to you, my fellow New Yorkers. As you remember, just three years ago he was kind enough to come up and introduce me to you, so I wanted to return the favor, and I looked forward to doing so.

If I may take a few minutes of your time, I would like to say some of the things that I had hoped to say prior to the time that he spoke.

Webster defines greatness as largeness in size, being much above the average in magnitude, intensity and importance. That definition could have been written for the man who just spoke to you, and which I had hoped to have the honor to introduce.

The height of his aim, the breadth of his achievements, the record of his past, and the promises of his future, all these bespeak the largeness of size, that magnitude of effort, that intensity of devotion, and that importance of accomplishment. He came to lead this nation at a time of uncertainty and danger, pouring out his own strength to renew the strength and the purpose of all of the people of this nation, and of the nation itself.

Since that day (he has borne the burdens few other men have ever borne in the history of the world, without hope or desire or thought to escape them). He has sought consensus, but he has never shrunk from controversy. He has gained huge popularity, but he has never failed to spend it in the pursuit of his beliefs or in the interest of his country. He has led us to build schools and clinics and homes and hospitals, to clean the water, and to clear the air, to rebuild the city and to recapture the beauty of the countryside, to educate children and to heal the sick and comfort the oppressed on a scale unmatched in our history. This is what this country has done under the leadership of President Johnson.

In 1964 he won the greatest popular victory in modern times, and with our help he will do so again in 1968. With our help, he will have by his side the best Vice President since his predecessor, Hubert Humphrey.

He is the head of our nation and of our party, our Commander-in-Chief and our chief diplomat, our Chief Executive and our chief spokesman, and the chief repository of our hopes and our fears, our advice and our consent, our complaints, and, yes, our prayers. I am very proud that we have in our midst President Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE NEW YORK STATE DEMOCRATIC DINNER, IMPERIAL BALLROOM, AMERICANA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. Vice President, Governor Harriman, National Committeewoman Kelly, National Committeeman Weisl, Chairman Bailey, Chairman Burns, distinguished members of the very able New York delegation in the Congress, ladies and gentlemen:

First, I want to explain the other dates that I have this evening, so that you won't misunderstand that I am just out on a lark.

We have two other Democratic meetings scheduled and we hope to be able to visit with them. We are sorry that we can't find a place in the greatest State in the Union that will house all of the Democrats in one place, but we have so many of you that we have had to divide them up.

I came here first, because you really are the first in our hearts. You represent all of this State.

I wanted to tell you tonight that a time of trouble is not easy for a political leader, particularly when demonstrators wave signs at him, when they call him bad names, when they threaten him with physical abuse. But I have not come here tonight to discuss the problems of John Lindsay.

There is one thought that I wish I could plant in the mind of every man and woman in this country—and for that matter in the mind of every person in the whole world. It is this: You can believe in America. You can believe in your country's ability to fulfill her promise to the people in the world.

I know that you share my deep concern tonight about the situation in the Middle East. We have been working on this problem day and night. The position of your country, the United States, in this crisis is a bipartisan one. It bears the mark of President Eisenhower. It bears the mark of both of our national political parties. It is designed solely to serve the cause of freedom and to serve the cause of peace in the world.

I shall not go into this situation in detail at this delicate period, but I do want to say this: America's determination is to preserve the peace. It is determined to preserve the territorial integrity of the nations involved in that area.

We are keeping in very close contact with all of the leaders of both of the parties in Congress. On May 23 I set forth this Government's views in some detail. We are doing everything we can to assist the United Nations Security Council. You may be sure, also, that we are keeping in very close touch with all the capitals concerned.

To go beyond this tonight would not serve the cause of peace or would not be helpful, but you may be assured that this matter is foremost in our thoughts at all times—even at this hour.

I should like to review with you, very briefly, our country's situation on the domestic front. In doing so, I would ask only one thing of those who doubt America, or who doubt the political party, the Democratic Party, that has guided our destiny over the past three and a half decades.

I would ask you tonight to review with me and to remember.

Remember that Franklin D. Roosevelt pledged a New Deal and a better day for America—and we got it.

Remember that Harry Truman pledged a Fair Deal for America—and Harry Truman redeemed that pledge.

Remember that John F. Kennedy promised to get this country moving again—and he did.

Remember that our party, the Democratic Party, many years ago promised Medicare—and we got it.

Our party promised aid to education—and with the help of your great delegation in Congress, we got it.

The Democratic Party promised Civil Rights legislation—and we passed the first bill in 85 years—and we have passed three more since.

The Democratic Party promised to help the poor—and we passed the first poverty program in the history of this nation.

In all of our American political history, no party could ever say with more truth or more validity, "We passed our progam—we lived up to the pledges and promises we made our people."

When people ask what that promise is, I would answer in the words of Thomas Wolfe:

"To every man his chance—to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him . . ."

That is what America promises its people. And that is what the Democratic Party—this country's oldest political party—has been delivering to its people.

I would suggest to you tonight that unless we keep working on our programs and our promises—all those that we have made and all the programs that we have passed—for schools, and cities, for the health and the aged, for jobs, and for progress—all those programs won't wind up meaning very much.

Those promises have to be funded with propositions. Those legislative measures have to be renewed—they are just a platform.

The Republican Party told us last November—and they have repeated it many times loudly since—that they know they are going to repeal a large part of this program. They are going to fight us every inch of the way. They are out to destroy this progress.

But I am here tonight to tell you something else: Before we are finished, they are going—really going—to know they have been in a fight.

So we have not come here to ask your blessings on the work that we have finished. We have come to ask your support for the work that we have yet to do.

When nearly four million children under five still lack decent medical care: We do have a job to do.

When one American family in 10 still lives in a slum: The Democrats have a job to do.

When hundreds of thousands are trapped in the ghetto and tempted by violence: We have a job to do.

And in this very city—there are little children who see a picture of a teddy bear and identify it as a rat—the only animal they know.

This unfinished business dictates the future of our Party. We need not expect that our job will be easy.

I saw a letter not long ago which complained—and I quote—"that the Government and its supporters are not anxious for peace, and do not accept proffered opportunities to achieve it."

That letter was written to President Abraham Lincoln. You may remember how President Lincoln answered that charge. He told Horace Greeley that he would talk to any person, anywhere, who could seriously advance the cause of peace and union.

I will tell you tonight that your President has been ready for more than three long years to talk to any person, anywhere, who prefers to talk instead of fight.

I saw not long ago a charge by some of the Republicans that the President would "spend the country into bankruptcy."

That charge was made against Franklin Roosevelt. He answered it by saying, "We are not going to turn back the clock."

I saw an opinion poll, not long ago, which showed the President's popularity at a very low ebb.

That poll rated Harry Truman—but it didn't bother President Truman. He just simply went back to work, made one more historic decision and then said, "If you can't stand the heat—get out of the kitchen."

My Democratic friends, let us say here and now tonight: We Democrats can stand the heat.

We believe that history, when it is written, will not be the story of the doubters. Their fate, in the future, will not be headlines, but it will just be a footnote here and there.

For we know history deals with acts; with dreams that have been translated into reality; with victories that are won or lost. History deals with promises made and promises kept.

To make promises and to keep promises; to keep them at home and to keep them abroad is something that the Democratic Party is dedicated to.

To you Democrats who support that party with your talents and with your money, I have come here tonight to meet with three groups of you in the Month of June of this year to tell you how much I appreciate the men that you have sent to help me in the Congress, the men that make up the New York Democratic Delegation in the Senate led by Senator Kennedy and in the House led by Congressman Celler.

That delegation has day by day, week by week, month by month, helped the Democratic Party in this nation build a record of progress; build a record of prosperity. We have moved more than six million people out of the poverty level up to where they could have a decent income.

We have raised the minimum wage for 31 million others this year and we have extended its coverage to seven million more that never knew it before.

Yes, the Democratic Party and the Democratic Delegation from New York are dedicated to giving the greatest good to the greatest number.

We yearn and we pray that we may have prosperity, progress, and peace in the world. But until we do, we must try to find the areas of agreement that unite us instead of the few things that divide us.

We Democrats don't always see everything the same way. If we did, we would all want the same wife. But we do have tolerance, patience, and understanding for different and dissenting viewpoints, provided in the end—after we reason together—we all rally around the banner to do the job for the people who need it most.

We are the Party of All the People.

To those of you who provide that leadership—and provide that support—and give us that comfort, that strength, when the going is hard—when it takes courage to stand up and be counted—those of you are the ones that make us grateful and make us proud of the Party that we belong to.

Thank you for coming here tonight.

[From the New York Times, June 4, 1967]

President Brings Message of Hope to Party in City—Predicts He Will Be Judged by Promises Kept—Vows To Resist Aggression

President Johnson packed a message of political hope and encouragement yesterday into three speeches for elite groups of New York Democrats.

In an evening candidly devoted to partisan pep talk and fund-raising, Mr. Johnson was prepared to predict that his party and administration would be judged by the promises they had made and kept, at home and abroad, and not by the doubts and criticism often hurled at them.

The President's pledge to keep promises and another to resist aggression "wherever it occurs—in Europe, in Asia and in the Middle East"—were his only explicit references to the war in Vietnam or the current confrontation between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

All the other prepared remarks distributed by the White House yesterday afternoon dealt with domestic issues.

Mr. Johnson, who arrived at La Guardia Airport at 5:34 P.M., was to speak first at a dinner of the New York State Democratic Committee at the Americana hotel. Essentially the same message was to be taken by the President to a closed meeting of members of the President's Club, contributors of $1,000 a year, who were dining at the Waldorf-Astoria.

REMINDER TO DOUBTERS

Slightly different remarks were prepared for a third appearance at a reception of Young Associate members of the President's Club, contributors of $100 each; also at the Waldorf.

The essence of the President's political mood was contained in the speech to the Americana diners.

Of those who doubt America or the political party that has guided it over most of the last 35 years, Mr. Johnson said, he asked only that they remember the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt, the Fair Deal of Harry Truman, the fulfilled promise of John Kennedy to get the country moving again, and his own redeemed pledges to provide medicare, aid to education, civil rights legislation and help for the poor.

"I would suggest to you tonight that unless we keep on selling our programs," Mr. Johnson continued, "all those programs we passed—for schools, and cities, and health and the aged—all those programs won't be worth a tinker's dam.

"Those promises have to be funded, they have to be renewed, they have to be built upon. But the Republicans have told us as loudly as they know how that they are going to fight us every inch of the way. They are out to cut those programs.

"But I'll tell you something here tonight: Before we've finished they're going to know they've been in a fight."

It was, in effect, a campaign theme at the start of the stepped-up schedule of partisan appearances for the President. He has indicated that he will run on his record of past years, leaving room either to add the legislative achievement of this year or to denounce those in Congress who now threaten to block him.

Mr. Johnson also plans to address fund-raising meetings in Texas and California this month and perhaps others through the summer.

The President implicitly acknowledged the widespread criticism of his Administration by suggesting that he was not alone in taking his lumps. He quoted approvingly Theodore Roosevelt's comment that it is not the critic who counts nor the man who points out how the strong man stumbles, but "the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood . . . who spends himself in a worthy cause."

RECALLS CHARGES IN PENT

He recalled charges that Abraham Lincoln was not eager for peace and turned aside opportunities to achieve it. He recalled charges that Franklin D. Roosevelt was spending the country into bankruptcy. And he recalled Harry Truman's low standing in the public opinion polls.

"We believe that history, when it is written, will not be the story of the doubters," the President said. "Their fate, in the future, will not be headlines, but a footnote here and there.

"For history deals with acts; with dreams translated into reality; with victories won or lost. History deals with promises made and promises kept."

To the younger people at the Waldorf, Mr. Johnson also took a special appeal for their greater participation in government. No President and no Congress works alone, he said. "In America, we only get the politics and the politicians we deserve."

"I want to welcome all of you into the arena," Mr. Johnson remarked, "and I want to keep you there."

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 1967]

Kennedy Heaps Praise on LBJ for Leadership

New York, June 3.—President Johnson received a glowing, even extravagant endorsement from Sen. Robert F. Kennedy at a fund-raising dinner tonight.

The New York Democrat—flying in from London where he had attended the funeral of Lady Harlech, a family friend—was too late to introduce the President as planned.

But when Mr. Johnson finished, Kennedy stepped forward and praised the President so effusively that Party members wondered whether the Johnson-Kennedy feud had ended.

Kennedy said that since Mr. Johnson became President, he has "borne the burdens of the world as few other men have ever borne them."

At home, Kennedy said, "he has led us to build schools, homes, clinics, hospitals, to rebuild the cities, to clean water, to reclaim the beauty of our countryside, to educate children, to comfort the oppressed on a scale unmatched in history."

"This is what the country has done under the leadership of President Johnson."

Kennedy said the President has "poured out his own strength to renew the strength of the country . . . has sought consensus but he has never shrunk from controversy . . . gained huge popularity but he has never hesitated to spend it" on things he felt important.

"In 1964 he won the greatest victory of modern times," Kennedy said, "and with our help he will do so again in 1968."

"And with our help he will again have at his side the best Vice President since his predecessor, Hubert H. Humphrey." Humphrey was at the dinner.

Kennedy said Mr. Johnson is the "head of our Nation and of our Party, our commander-in-chief and chief diplomat: the chief repository of our hopes and fears, of our advice and consent, of our complaints and, yes, of our prayers."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 4, 1967]

LBJ Asks Fight To Save His Program From Knife

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

New York, June 3.—President Johnson told divided New York Democrats here tonight that they must "keep on selling" their Party's domestic programs because Republicans "are going to fight us every inch of the way."

In speeches before three Democratic fund-raising groups, the President hailed domestic Party gains, but threw no new light on Vietnam and the Middle East, the two principal issues that concern voters here.

It would be unwise at this time, the President said in his first speech, to discuss the Middle East situation.

But he did declare that the United States "is determined to preserve the peace" and to preserve "the territorial integrity of the nations involved in that area."

Expressing his "deep concern," the President said he was working day and night on the Middle East. He said that he was in touch with congressional leaders of both parties and with "all the capitals concerned."

He emphasized that the issue was a bipartisan matter and that his policy followed that enunciated by President Eisenhower.

To say more on the problem at this time, Mr. Johnson said, "would not serve the cause of peace."

Democrats paid nearly $1 million at the three functions to hear the President.

Mr. Johnson arrived at La Guardia airfield at 5:30 p.m. and motored to the Americana Hotel to speak to a dinner sponsored by the Democratic State Committee. Some Democrats declined to attend because of their opposition to the President's Vietnam policies.

The President arrived ahead of schedule and his motorcade got him into the Americana through a side garage entrance before most of the pickets in a planned anti-Vietnam demonstration showed up at the hotel.

While he was making his speech, the peace movement ranks swelled to 1000 to 1500 pickets, who chanted slogans and carried signs saying "LBJ is a Tyrant" and "LBJ the Warmonger."

But the President did not see them, nor did they see him. To their disappointment and that of some 200 friendly by-standers who had waited in the hotel lobby, he was taken out the same way he entered.

He was driven directly to the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel for his next speech. The picketers marched along 7th ave. and across 48th st. to Park ave., where they assembled across the street from the hotel. But he was already inside by the time they got there.

At the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel Mr. Johnson addressed the President's Club, whose members contribute a minimum of $1 thousand to Party coffers, and to the Associates' Division, a group of younger members of the President's Club.

In a veiled Vietnam reference, the President said he recently saw a letter that complained to Abraham Lincoln that the Government was not anxious for peace and had not accepted proffered opportunities to achieve it.

Lincoln replied that he would talk to any person, anywhere, who could seriously advance the cause of peace and union, Mr. Johnson related.

But the President's chief emphasis was on domestic programs, which he said were in danger of being undermined by GOP efforts to cut funds required to carry them into effect.

"Those programs have to be funded; they have to be renewed; they have to be built upon.

"But the Republicans have told us as loudly as they know how that they are going to fight us every inch of the way. They are out to cut those programs. But I'll tell you something here tonight: before we're finished, they're going to know they've been in a fight."

Then, in an apparent reference to his standing in the popularity polls, the President said he recently saw a poll taken during the Truman Administration.

"That poll rated Harry Truman—but it didn't bother him," Mr. Johnson said. "Harry Truman simply went back to work, made one more historic decision, and said, 'If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.'

"My friends, let us say here and now: We can stand the heat."

At the Waldorf, Mr. Johnson told the Associates' Division that "we only get the politics and the politicians we deserve."

ANALYSIS OF SOUTH VIETNAM'S NEW CONSTITUTION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I recently asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a comparison of South Vietnam's new constitution with the 1956 constitution promulgated under the Diem regime, particularly with reference to guarantees of what we in the Western World consider to be traditional political freedoms.

The study reveals that the new constitution offers little reason for optimism over the prospects for its serving as a vehicle for political reconciliation in Vietnam. In view of the unfortunate history of political repressions during the Diem regime, which brought on this war, it would be logical to expect that the document would right some of the wrongs of that era by laying down a framework holding out the promise of political freedom to those now in revolt. Unfortunately, the constitution only perpetuates the political grievances of a decade ago and, under the guise of protecting the "national interest," the political life of South Vietnam can be regulated to suit the whim of the government in power. Here are the opening sentences of the library's study:

> The 1967 constitution provides for a political system that appears to offer a much better chance for development of three strong, interdependent branches of government than did the 1956 constitution, but the new constitution, like the old constitution, imposes limitations on political activity and restrictions on political freedoms.
>
> The broad proscription of Communist activities (under both constitutions), with no attempt being made to define just what such activity includes, might be subject to construction that would operate as a significant restraint on more general political activity. Many of the guarantees under the 1967 constitution can be suspended or modified for such reasons as "security, national defense . . . national interest . . . public safety." There seem to be more of these exceptions under the new constitution than under the old one. . . .

The potential for abuse is great, and I would urge anyone who relies on this document to serve as a blueprint for true political freedom in South Vietnam to view it with healthy skepticism until events prove its merits.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD South Vietnam's new Constitution and the analysis of it prepared by the Library of Congress.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFT OF CONSTITUTION

PREAMBLE

Confident that the patriotism, indomitable will, and unyielding traditions of the people will assure a radiant future for our country;

Conscious that after many years of foreign dominations, followed by the division of our territory, dictatorship and war, the people of Viet-Nam must take responsibility before history, to perpetuate those hardy traditions and at the same time to welcome progressive ideas in order to establish a republican form of government of the people, by the people, and for the people whose purpose is to unite the nation, unite the territory and assure independence, freedom, and democracy with justice and altruism for the present and future generations;

We, 117 deputies of the National Constituent Assembly, representing the people of Viet-Nam, after debate, approve this Constitution.

MARCH 18, 1967.

CHAPTER ONE—BASIC PROVISIONS

Article 1. 1. Viet-Nam is a territorially indivisible, unified and independent republic.

2. Sovereignty resides in the People.

Article 2. 1. The State recognizes and guarantees the basic rights of all citizens.

2. The State advocates equality of all citizens without discrimination as to sex, religion, race or political party.

3. It is the duty of every citizen to serve the national interests.

Article 3. The functions and powers of the Legislative, Executive and Judicial Branches must be clearly delineated. The activities of these three branches must be coordinated and harmonized to realize public order and prosperity on the basis of freedom, democracy and social justice.

Article 4. 1. The Republic of Viet-Nam will comply with those provisions of international law which are not contrary to its national sovereignty and the principle of equality between nations.

2. The Republic of Viet-Nam is determined to oppose all forms of aggression and strives to contribute to the building of international peace and security.

Article 5. 1. The Republic of Viet-Nam opposes communism in every form.

2. Every activity designed to propagandize or carry out communism is prohibited.

CHAPTER TWO—RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF CITIZENS

Article 6. 1. The State respects human dignity.

2. The State will protect freedom, the lives, property and honor of every citizen.

Article 7. 1. The State respects and protects the security of each individual and the right of every citizen to plead his case before a court of law.

2. No one can be arrested or detained without a legal order issued by an agency which has judicial powers conferred upon it by law except in cases of flagrant violation of the law.

3. The accused and his next of kin must be informed of the accusation against him within the time limit prescribed by law. Detentions must be controlled by an agency of the judiciary.

4. No citizen can be tortured, threatened or forced to confess. A confession obtained by torture, threat or coercion will not be considered as valid evidence.

5. A defendant is entitled to a speedy and public trial.

6. A defendant has the right to a defense lawyer for counsel in every phase of the interrogation, including the preliminary investigation.

7. Any person accused of a minor offense who doesn't have a record of more than three months imprisonment for an intentional crime may be released pending trial provided he (or she) is employed and has a fixed residence. Women pregnant more than three months accused of minor offenses who are employed and have a fixed residence may be released pending trial.

8. Accused persons will be considered innocent until sentence recognizing his guilt is handed down. In event of doubt, the court will rule in favor of the accused.

9. If unjustly detained, a citizen has the right to demand compensation for damages after his release, in accordance with the provisions of the law.

10. No one can be detained for indebtedness.

Article 8. 1. The private life, home, and correspondence of every citizen will be respected.

2. No one can enter, search or confiscate a person's property unless in possession of orders from a court or when necessary to the defense of security and public order according to the spirit of the law.

3. Privacy of correspondence will be protected by law. Any restriction imposed on this right must be determined by law.

Article 9. 1. The State will respect and guarantee freedom of religious belief and freedom to preach and practice religion of every citizen as long as it does not violate the national interest and is not harmful to public safety and order or contrary to good morals.

2. No religion will be recognized as the State religion. The State will be impartial in the development of various religions.

Article 10. 1. The State recognizes freedom of education.

2. Basic education is compulsory and free of charge.

3. University education will be autonomous.

4. Talented persons who do not have means will be given aid and support to continue their studies.

5. The State encourages and supports research and creative work by citizens in the fields of science, letters and the arts.

Article 11. 1. Culture and education must be considered matters of national policy, on a national, scientific, and humanistic basis.

2. An appropriate budget must be reserved for the development of culture and education.

Article 12. 1. The State respects freedom of thought, speech, press and publishing, as long as it does not harm personal honor, national security, or good morals.

2. Censorship will be abolished except for motion pictures and plays.

3. Press regulations will be prescribed by law.

Article 13. 1. Every citizen has the right to meet and form associations in accordance with conditions and procedures prescribed by law.

2. Every citizen has the right to vote, run for office and participate in public affairs on

an equal basis and in accordance with conditions and procedures prescribed by law.

3. The State recognizes the political rights of every citizen including the right to petition freely and engage in overt, non-violent and legal opposition.

Article 14. Every citizen will enjoy freedom to choose his place of residence and freedom of movement including the right to go and return from abroad. These freedoms can be restricted by law only for reasons of public health, security or defense.

Article 15. 1. Every citizen has the right and duty to work and receive fair remuneration enabling him and his family to live in dignity.

2. The State will endeavor to create employment for all citizens.

Article 16. Freedom to join labor unions and to strike will be respected within the framework and regulations prescribed by law.

Article 17. 1. The State recognizes the family as the foundation of society. The State will encourage and facilitate the formation of families and will assist expectant mothers and infants.

2. Marriage must be based on mutual consent, equality and cooperation.

3. The State will encourage family cohesion.

Article 18. 1. The State will endeavor to establish a system of social security.

2. It is the duty of the State to establish a system of social welfare and public health.

3. It is the duty of the State to support the nation's warriors both spiritually and materially, as well as to support and raise the nation's orphans.

Article 19. 1. The State recognizes and guarantees the freedom of private property.

2. The State will advocate a policy of making the people property owners.

3. Expropriation or requisition by the State for the common good must be accompanied by speedy and just compensation at price levels existing at time of expropriation or requisition.

Article 20. 1. Freedom of trade and competition will be recognized but it cannot be exercised to secure monopoly or control of the market.

2. The State will encourage and assist economic cooperation which has the nature of mutual economic assistance.

3. The State will give special support to those elements of society which have a low standard of living.

Article 21. The State advocates raising the standard of living of rural citizens, and especially helping farmers to have farmland.

Article 22. On the basis of equality between duties and rights, workers have the right to choose representatives to participate in the management of business enterprises particularly with respect to matters concerning wages and conditions of work within the framework and procedures prescribed by law.

Article 23. 1. Military personnel elected to public office or serving in positions in central government must be demobilized or take leave of absence without salary, according to their choice.

2. Military personnel on active duty are not permitted to engage in political party activity.

Article 24. 1. The State recognizes the presence of minorities in the Vietnamese community.

2. The State respects the habits and customs of the minority compatriots. Customary courts will be established to pronounce judgments on some disputes involving habits and customs of minority compatriots.

3. A law will prescribe special rights in order to assist minority compatriots.

Article 25. Every citizen has the duty to defend the country and the republic.

Article 26. Every citizen has the duty to defend the constitution and respect the law.

Article 27. Every citizen has the duty to fulfill his military obligations as prescribed by law.

Article 28. Every citizen has the duty to pay taxes in accordance with the provisions of law.

Article 29. Any restriction upon the basic rights of the citizens must be prescribed by law and the time and place within which such a restriction is in force must be clearly specified. In any event the essence of all basic freedoms cannot be violated.

CHAPTER THREE—NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Article 30. 1. Legislative authority is vested by the people in the National Assembly.

2. The National Assembly includes two houses, the Lower House and the Upper House.

Article 31. 1. The Lower House includes from 100 to 200 representatives.

2. Representatives are elected by universal suffrage, direct and secret ballot. Candidates run as individuals from separate constituencies no larger than province.

3. Representatives serve for four years. They may be reelected.

4. The election for a new Lower House will be completed at least one month prior to the completion of the term of the old Lower House.

Article 32. Citizens meeting the following qualifications may run for the Lower House:

1. Vietnamese citizenship at birth, or having held Vietnamese citizenship at least seven years, or recovered Vietnamese citizenship for at least five years, counting from the day of election;

2. At least 25 years old on the day of the election;

3. Enjoying full rights of citizenship;

4. Having draft status in order;

5. Meeting other conditions specified in the electoral law.

Article 33. 1. The Upper House will include from 30 to 60 members.

2. Senators are elected at-large by universal suffrage, direct and secret ballot. The election will be by list voting and on basis of plurality. Each list will include from ⅓ to ⅙ of the total membership of the Upper House.

3. Senators will serve for six years. One half of the Senate will be re-elected every three years. Senators may be re-elected.

4. Members of the first Upper House will be divided into two groups by drawing lots. The first group will serve six years, the second group three years.

5. The election of one half of the Upper House must take place at least two months before the term of that half of the Upper House ends.

Article 34. Candidates for the Upper House must be citizens 30 years of age by election day, must meet all the conditions prescribed in the senatorial election law and those prescribed in Article 32.

Article 35. 1. If for any reason a vacancy occurs in the Lower House more than two years prior to the end of the term, an election will be held within three months to choose a replacement.

2. If for any reason a vacancy occurs in the Upper House, the election of the replacement will be held concurrent with the next regular election of one-half of the Upper House.

Article 36. Procedures and conditions for the candidacies and election of representatives and senators, including ethnic minority representatives, will be prescribed by law.

Article 37. 1. Representatives or senators cannot be prosecuted, pursued, arrested or judged for any statement or vote in the National Assembly.

2. During their entire term of office, except in cases of flagrant violation of the law, representatives and senators cannot be prosecuted, pursued, arrested or judged without the approval of three-fourths of the total number of representatives or senators.

3. In cases of flagrant violation of the law, prosecution or detention of representatives or senators must cease if the House concerned so decides.

4. Representatives and senators have the right to keep secret the origin of documents presented to the National Assembly.

5. Responsibilities of representatives or senators are not compatible with any other elected position.

6. Representatives and senators may serve as instructors at universities and advanced technical schools.

7. Under no circumstances may a representative or senator or his spouse bid in or sign a contract with a Government agency.

Article 38. 1. In cases of treason or other serious crime, representatives or senators may be removed from office by the House concerned.

2. Removal from office must be proposed by ⅔ of the total number of representatives or senators.

3. The resolution to remove a member from office must be approved by ¾ of the total number of representatives or senators.

4. The representative or senator concerned has the right to defend himself in debate during all phases of the removal procedure.

Article 39. The National Assembly has the authority to:

1. Vote legislation.

2. Ratify treaties and international agreements.

3. Determine declarations of war and holding of peace talks.

4. Determine declaration of a state of war.

5. Control the Government in the carrying out of national policy.

6. Within the framework of each House, pass on the validation of the election of representatives or senators.

Article 40. 1. Each House, with the agreement of ⅓ of its membership, has the right to request the Prime Minister or Government officials to appear before it to answer questions regarding the execution of Government policy.

2. Committee chairmen in each House have the right to request Government officials to appear before sessions of their committees to report on problems relating to various ministries.

Article 41. The senate has the right to open investigations regarding the execution of national policy and to request public agencies to produce documents necessary in its investigations.

Article 42. 1. The National Assembly has the right to recommend the replacement of part or all of the Government by a two-thirds majority vote of the total number of representatives and senators.

2. The recommendation is binding unless the President has special reasons for rejecting it.

3. In the event of rejection by the President, the National Assembly has the right to vote final approval of the recommendation by a three-quarters majority vote of the total number of representatives and senators. This recommendation by the National Assembly is binding from the day it is voted.

Article 43. 1. Representatives and senators have the right to introduce bills.

2. The President may introduce bills.

3. Bills must be submitted to the office of the Lower House.

4. If the Lower House approves or rejects a bill, it must transmit the bill to the office of the Upper House within three consecutive days.

5. If the Upper House agrees with the viewpoint of the Lower House, the bill will be transmitted to the President for promulgation or will be abolished.

6. If the Upper House does not agree with the viewpoint of the Lower House, it must return the bill to the Lower House within three consecutive days along with an explanation for its action.

7. In the latter case, the Lower House has the right to vote final approval of the bill with a two-thirds majority of its total membership.

8. If the Lower House is unable to reach a two-thirds majority, the viewpoint of the Upper House will be considered as approved.

9. The time limit for debating and voting on a bill in the Upper House may not exceed half the time required to debate and vote on the bill in the Lower House.

Article 44. 1. Bills approved by the National Assembly will be transmitted to the President within three consecutive days.

2. The President must promulgate the law within 15 days from the date of receipt.

3. If the National Assembly appraises the matter as urgent, the bill must be promulgated within 7 consecutive days.

4. If the President does not promulgate the bill within the specified period of time, the bill will automatically become law and will be promulgated by the Chairman of the Upper House.

Article 45. 1. Within the period allowed for promulgation the President has the right to send a message outlining his reasons and requesting the National Assembly to reconsider one or more articles of the bill.

2. In this case, the National Assembly will meet in joint plenary session to vote final approval of the bill with an absolute majority of the total number of representatives and senators. If the National Assembly votes to reject the amendment proposed by the President, the bill will automatically become law and will be transmitted to the President for promulgation.

Article 46. 1. The draft budget must be submitted to the office of the Lower House prior to September 30.

2. Representatives and senators have the right to propose additional expenditures but must at the same time propose equivalent new receipts.

3. The Lower House must vote on the budget prior to November 30 and transmit the approved version to the Upper House by December 1 at the latest.

4. The Upper House must vote on the draft budget before December 31.

5. During the above mentioned period, if the Upper House reconsiders one or more provisions of the draft budget, then the procedures outlined in Article 43 will be applied. In the event that the draft budget has not been finally voted by December 31, the President has the right to sign a decree authorizing expenditure of one-twelfth of the previous budget until the Lower House has voted final approval of the draft budget.

Article 47. Regulations.

1. Each House will meet in regular and extraordinary sessions.

2. Every year each House will meet in two regular sessions, one session beginning on the first Monday of April; the other beginning on the first Monday of October. A session cannot last for more than ninety days. However, the Lower House can prolong its session in order to vote final approval of the draft budget.

3. Either House may meet in extraordinary sessions when so requested by the President or one-third of the representatives or senators. When extraordinary sessions are convened by the President, the President will set the agenda.

Article 48. 1. Each House will meet in open session except when more than half the members present in the House request a closed session.

2. In open sessions complete reports of the debate and documents presented will be printed in the official journal.

Article 49. 1. Each House will elect its chairman and permanent officers.

2. Each House may establish permanent committees.

3. Each House is responsible for establishing its own internal rules.

4. The officers of the two Houses will meet together to determine procedures for maintaining liaison between Houses.

Article 50. 1. The chairman of the Upper House will convene and preside over joint plenary sessions of both Houses.

2. If the chairman of the Upper House is unable to perform this function, it will be carried out by the chairman of the Lower House.

CHAPTER IV—THE EXECUTIVE

Article 51. Executive authority is vested by the people in the President.

Article 52. 1. The President and Vice-President run together on one list and are elected by the entire nation by direct and secret ballot.

2. The term of office of the President and Vice-President is four years. The President and Vice-President can be re-elected once.

3. The term of office of the President and Vice-President ends precisely at 12:00 noon on the last day of the forty-eighth month from the day they took office and the term of the new President and Vice-President begins at that time.

4. The election of the new President will be held on a Sunday, four weeks before the incumbent's term ends.

Article 53. Citizens meeting the following conditions may run for President and Vice-President:

1. Must have Vietnamese citizenship from day of birth and continuous residence in Viet-Nam for ten years as of date of election. Time spent on official assignment abroad or in political exile is considered as residence in Viet-Nam.

2. Must be 35 years of age as of election day.

3. Must have legal draft status.

4. Must enjoy full rights of citizenship.

Article 54. 1. The supreme court will establish a list of candidates, will control the fairness of the election and will announce the result.

2. Candidates will receive equal means in the electoral campaign.

3. Procedures and conditions governing candidacies and election of the President and Vice President will be prescribed by law.

Article 55. When assuming office the President, witnessed by the supreme court and National Assembly, shall take the following oath before the nation:

"I solemnly swear before the nation to protect the fatherland, respect the Constitution, serve the interests of the people, and to the best of my ability fulfill my duties as President of the Republic of Viet-Nam."

Article 56. 1. Duties of the President and Vice President may terminate prior to the end of their terms of office in the following circumstances:

a. Death

b. Resignation

c. Impeachment

d. Serious and prolonged illness such that the incumbent can no longer carry out his duties. This disability must be recognized by three-fourths of the total membership of the two Houses of the National Assembly after complete medical examination.

2. In the event that the duties of the President are terminated more than one year prior to the end of his term of office, the Vice President will temporarily assume the Presidency for a period not to exceed three months in order to organize the election of a new President and Vice President for a new term of office.

3. In the event that the duties of the President, are terminated within one year prior to the end of his term of office, the Vice President shall assume the Presidency for the remainder of the term, except in cases of impeachment of the President.

4. If for any reason the Vice-President is unable to assume the Presidency, the chairman of the Upper House will assume the office for a period not to exceed three months in order to organize an election for a new President and Vice President.

Article 57. The President promulgates laws within the period determined in Article 43.

Article 58. 1. The President appoints the Prime Minister. Upon the proposal of the Prime Minister, the President appoints members of the Government.

2. The President has the right to reorganize all or part of the Government on his own initiative, or upon the recommendation of the National Assembly.

Article 59. 1. The President appoints, with the approval of the Upper House, chiefs of diplomatic missions and rectors of universities.

2. The President represents the nation in international relations and receives letters of accreditation of diplomatic envoys.

3. The President signs and, after ratification by the National Assembly, promulgates treaties and international agreements.

Article 60. The President is the supreme commander of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Viet-Nam.

Article 61. 1. The President grants all types of decorations.

2. The President has the right to grant amnesty and pardon for criminals.

Article 62. 1. The President determines national policy.

2. The President presides over the Council of Ministers.

Article 63. 1. The President communicates with the National Assembly by message. In each regular session, and whenever the President considers it necessary, he will advise the National Assembly of the situation in the country and of the Government's domestic and foreign policies.

2. The Prime Minister and other Government officials may participate in sessions of the National Assembly or its committees in order to present and explain matters relating to national policy and its execution.

Article 64. 1. In special situations, the President may sign decrees declaring states of emergency, curfew or tension over part or all of the territory of the country.

2. The National Assembly must meet no later than twelve days after the date of promulgation of the decree in order to ratify, amend or reject it.

3. If the National Assembly rejects or amends the President's decree, the special situations which were decreed will end or be modified accordingly.

Article 65. In a state of war, and when elections cannot be held, the President, with the approval of two-thirds of the National Assembly, has the right to prolong the terms of office of some of the elected bodies of the country and to appoint some province chiefs.

Article 66. 1. The Vice President is chairman of the Culture and Education Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Ethnic Minority Council.

2. The Vice President cannot hold any other position in the Government.

Article 67. 1. The Prime Minister directs the Government and the administrative agencies of the nation.

2. The Prime Minister is responsible before the President for carrying out national policy.

Article 68. 1. The President, Vice President, Prime Minister and members of the Government cannot hold any position in the private sector whether it is remunerated or not.

2. Spouses of persons holding the above positions may not participate in Government bids or contracts.

Article 69. 1. It is the task of the National Security Council to: examine all matters relating to national defense: propose measures appropriate to the maintenance of national security; propose the declaration of states of emergency, curfew, tension or war; propose declarations of war or holding of peace talks.

2. The President is chairman of the National Security Council.

3. A law shall prescribe the organization and procedures of the National Security Council.

Local administration

Article 70. 1. The principle of local separation of power is recognized for legal regional entities: villages, provinces, cities, and the capital.

2. The organization and regulation of local administration shall be prescribed by law.

Article 71. 1. Deliberative bodies and the heads of executive agencies of local administrative units will be popularly elected by direct and secret ballot.

2. At the village level, village chiefs may be elected by village councils from among village council members.

Artice 72. The heads of executive agencies of local administrative units are:

Villages—Village Chief
Provinces—Province Chiefs
Cities—Mayor
Capital—Mayor

Article 73. The deliberative bodies of local administrative units are:

Villages—Village Council.
Provinces—Province Council.
Cities—Municipal Council.
Capital—Municipal Council.

Article 74. The Government will appoint two civil servants who have the responsibility to assist mayors, province chiefs and village chiefs in administrative and security matters, as well as other administrative personnel.

Article 75. Members of deliberative bodies and heads of executive agencies of local administrative units may be dismissed by the President if they violate the constitution, laws of the nation, or national policy.

CHAPTER V—JUDICIARY

Article 76. 1. Independent judicial power is vested in the Supreme Court and is exercised by judges.

2. A law shall establish the organization and administration of the judiciary.

Article 77. Every court must be established by law with an element which judges and an element which prosecutes, both of which are professionally qualified. Courts must respect rights of defense.

Article 78. 1. The responsibilities of judges and prosecuting judges are clearly delineated, and the two are governed by separate regulations.

2. Judges make decisions according to their consciences and the law, under the control of the Supreme Court.

3. Prosecuting judges monitor the application of the law in order to protect public order, under the control of the Ministry of Justice.

Article 79. Presiding judges can be relieved of their functions only in cases of mental or physical incapacity, conviction or violation of discipline.

Article 80. 1. The Supreme Court includes from 9 to 15 judges chosen by the National Assembly and appointed by the President from among a list elected by the association of judges, association of prosecutors and association of lawyers.

2. Judges of the Supreme Court must be judges or lawyers who have served at least ten years in the judiciary.

3. The term of office of judges of the Supreme Court is six years.

4. The number of electors of the association of judges, association of prosecutors and association of lawyers must be equal.

5. The organization and regulation of the Supreme Court will be prescribed by law.

Article 81. 1. The Supreme Court is empowered to interpret the constitution, to decide on the constitutionality of all laws and decree-laws, and to decide on the constitutionality and legality of decrees and administrative decisions.

2. The Supreme Court is empowered to decide on the dissolution of a political party whose policy and activities oppose the republican regime.

3. In these cases, the Supreme Court will meet in plenary session. Representatives of the legislative or executive branches may participate in order to present their viewpoints.

4. Decisions declaring the unconstitutionality of a law or the dissolution of a political party require a three-fourths vote of the total number of Supreme Court judges.

Article 82. The Supreme Court is empowered to decide appeals from lower courts.

Article 83. The Supreme Court has a separate budget and is empowered to establish regulations governing the judiciary.

Article 84. 1. The Judicial Council has the following responsibilities:

To propose the appointment, promotion, transfer and disciplining of judges;

To advise the Supreme Court in matters relating to the judiciary.

2. The Judicial Council will be composed of judges elected by the association of judges.

3. The organization and regulation of the Judicial Council will be prescribed by law.

CHAPTER VI—SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

Article 85. The Special Court is empowered to remove from office the President, Vice President, Prime Minister, Ministers, Secretaries of State, Supreme Court Justices and members of the Inspectorate in cases of treason or other high crimes.

Article 86. 1. The Special Court is chaired by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and consists of five representatives and five senators.

2. When the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is accused the chairman of the Upper House sits as presiding judge.

Article 87. 1. A motion to bring charges and citing reasons therefore must be supported by more than one half of the total number of representatives and senators. The motion must be signed by two-thirds of the total number of representatives and senators. In the particular case of the President and Vice President the motion must be signed by two-thirds of the total number of representatives and senators and it must be approved by a majority vote of three-quarters of the total number of representatives and senators.

2. The functions of the accused must be suspended from the date of approval of the motion by the National Assembly until the decision of the Special Court is rendered.

3. The Special Court decides removal from office by a three-quarters majority vote of its membership. In the particular case of the President and Vice President, the decision must be by a four-fifths majority vote of total membership.

4. The accused will enjoy the rights of defense during the entire proceedings.

5. After having been removed from office the accused may be tried by an ordinary court.

6. A law will establish the organization, administration and procedures of the Special Court.

Article 88. The Inspectorate is empowered to:

1. Inspect, control and investigate personnel of all public and private agencies directly or indirectly engaged in corruption, speculation, influence peddling or acts harmful to the national interest.

2. Inspect accounts of public agencies and commercial enterprises.

3. Audit the property of personnel of public agencies including the President, Vice President, Prime Minister, representatives, senators, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and the chairman of the Inspectorate.

4. In the cases of the chairman and members of the Inspectorate, the audit of personal property will be conducted by the Supreme Court.

Article 89. 1. The Inspectorate is empowered to propose disciplinary measures against government personnel or to request prosecution by competent courts.

2. The Inspectorate has the right to publicly announce the results of its investigations.

Article 90. 1. The Inspectorate includes from 9 to 18 inspectors, one-third designated by the National Assembly, one-third by the President, and one-third by the Supreme Court.

2. Inspectors will enjoy those guarantees necessary for them to carry out their responsibilities.

Article 91. 1. The Inspectorate has an autonomous budget, and is empowered to establish regulations governing its internal organization and the inspectorate branch.

2. The organization and regulation of the Inspectorate will be prescribed by law.

Article 92. 1. The Armed Forces Council advises the President in matters relating to the armed forces, especially promotion, transfer and disciplining of soldiers of all ranks.

2. The organization and regulation of the Armed Forces Council will be prescribed by law.

Article 93. 1. The Culture and Education Council has the responsibility to advise the Government in the drafting and execution of cultural and educational policy. A national academy will be established.

2. With the approval of the National Assembly, the Culture and Education Council may select representatives to brief the National Assembly on related matters.

3. The Culture and Education Council may contribute ideas before the National Assembly debates laws relating to culture and education.

Article 94. 1. The membership of the Culture and Education Council includes: one-third designated by the President; two-thirds elected by public and private cultural and educational organizations and by parent-teachers associations.

2. The term of office of the Culture and Education Council is four years.

3. The organization and regulation of the Culture and Education Council will be prescribed by law.

Article 95. 1. The Economic and Social Council has the responsibility to advise the Government in economic and social matters.

2. With the approval of the National Assembly, the Economic and Social Council may select representatives to brief the National Assembly on related matters.

3. The Economic and Social Council may contribute ideas before draft laws and economic and social programs are debated.

Article 96. 1. The membership of the Economic and Social Council includes: one-third designated by the President; two-thirds nominated by industrial and commercial organizations and by labor unions having an economic and social character.

2. The term of office of the Economic and Social Council is four years.

3. The organization and regulation of the Economic and Social Council will be prescribed by law.

Article 97. 1. The Ethnic Council representing the ethnic minorities living on the territory of Viet-Nam, has the responsibility to advise the Government in matters affecting ethnic minorities.

2. With the approval of the National Assembly, the Ethnic Council may select representatives to brief the National Assembly on related matters.

3. The Ethnic Council may contribute ideas before draft laws, programs, and plans affecting ethnic minorities are debated.

Article 98. 1. The membership of the Ethnic Council includes: one-third designated by the President; two-thirds elected by the ethnic minorities.

2. The term of office of the Ethnic Council is four years.

3. The organization and regulation of the Ethnic Council will be prescribed by law.

CHAPTER VII—POLITICAL PARTIES AND OPPOSITION

Article 99. 1. The Nation recognizes that political parties have an essential role in a democratic system.

2. Political parties may be organized and may operate freely, according to the procedures and conditions prescribed by law.

Article 100. The Nation encourages progress toward a two-party system.

Article 101. The Nation recognizes the formalization of political opposition.

Article 102. Regulations governing political parties and political opposition will be prescribed by law.

CHAPTER VIII—AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION

Article 103. 1. The President or an absolute majority of the total number of representatives or an absolute majority of the total number of senators has the right to propose amendments to the constitution.

2. The proposal must cite reasons and must be submitted to the office of the Upper House.

Article 104. A joint committee will be established to research the proposed amendment and report to joint plenary sessions of the Assembly.

Article 105. The resolution to amend the constitution must be supported by two-thirds of the total number of representatives and senators.

Article 106. The President promulgates a law amending the constitution according to the procedures prescribed in Article 34.

Article 107. Article 1 of the constitution and this Article may not be amended or deleted.

CHAPTER IX—TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

Article 108. The Provisional Charter of June 19, 1965 is automatically invalidated from the date of promulgation of the constitution.

Article 109. During the transitional period, the national assembly popularly elected on September 11, 1966, representing the people of the nation, will, in the legislative sphere:

1. Draft and approve: laws for the election of the President, Vice President, Upper House, and Lower House, laws organizing the Supreme Court and Inspectorate; political party and press regulations.

2. Ratify treaties.

Article 110. From the time the first President assumes office, the national assembly popularly elected on September 11, 1966, assumes legislative powers until the first National Legislative Assembly is convened.

Article 111. During the transitional period, the National Leadership Committee and the Central Executive Committee will continue in power until the first President and Vice President assume office.

Article 112. During the transitional period, courts presently in operation will continue to exercise judicial authority until the judicial organs prescribed in this constitution are established.

Article 113. The assembly elected on September 11, 1966 will establish a list of candidates, will control the propriety and will announce the result of the election of the first President and Vice President.

Article 114. During the first presidential term the President may appoint province chiefs.

Article 115. The election of the President and Vice President must be organized no later than six months from the date of the promulgation of this constitution.

Article 116. The election of the National Assembly and the organization of the Supreme Court and Inspectorate must be carried out no later than twelve months from the date the first President assumes office.

Article 117. The other structures prescribed by the constitution must be established no later than two years from the date the first National Assembly is established.

SOUTH VIETNAM: A COMPARISON ON THE 1956 AND 1967 CONSTITUTIONS

The 1967 constitution provides for a political system that appears to offer a much better chance for development of three strong, interdependent branches of government than did the 1956 constitution, but the new constitution, like the old constitution, imposes limitations on political activity and restrictions on political freedoms. The broad proscription of Communist activities (under both constitutions), with no attempt being made to define just what such activity includes, might be subject to construction that would operate as a significant restraint on more general political activity. Many of the guarantees under the 1967 constitution can be suspended or modified for such reasons as "security, national defense . . . national interest . . . public safety." There seem to be more of these exceptions under the new constitution than under the old one, but this may be due in part to the fact that a major civil war is under way and the needs of security are deemed to be greater.[1]

There are provisions of the new constitution, which do not appear in the old, which offer additional protection for the individual: for example, accused persons must be informed of charges within established time limits and the accused is considered innocent until sentence is passed, and, in event of doubt, the court "will rule in favor of the accused."

There is a bigger check on the executive, with an enlarged role for the National Assembly, but the system is still best described as a presidential system. Just how potent the legislature will be will likely depend to a large extent on the strength and personality of the President, on the forcefulness of the National Assembly and on the length and intensity of the war.

I. THE EXECUTIVE AND THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES

The 1967 constitution significantly increases the strength of the National Assembly when compared to its weak position under the 1956 constitution.[2] But the political system provided for under the new constitution still can be characterized as a presidential system. Though a prime minister and a cabinet are a vital part of the new system, study of the provisions of the constitution make it clear that the Prime Minister and cabinet are a part of the executive branch, that the President will be chief of state and head of the government. The Prime Minister is not leader of or even representative of the legislative branch. The continuing war and the role of the military are external factors that could tend to increase the power of the executive branch, specifically, the President, in the new system.

The strength of the President is clearly demonstrated by outlining some of the provisions of the constitution: the President determines national policy, the President is the supreme commander of the Armed Forces, the President is chairman of the National Security Council, the President appoints the Prime Minister, the President presides over the Council of Ministers, the Prime Minister is "responsible before the President" for carrying out national policy, the President can reorganize the government, the President during his first term (1967–71) has the power to appoint province chiefs.[3]

Nearly all discussion of the Prime Minister comes under the chapter headed "The Executive." Local government is also discussed in this chapter. The President has the authority to dismiss local assembly members and executive heads of local government. The central government appoints civil servants to assist local governments. Local government has very little authority independent of the central executive government.

But the President had all this power and more under the 1956 constitution.[4] Under the new constitution, the National Assembly does have a noticeably larger role, at least in theory, but only time will tell if the Assembly in fact is able to exercise more power.

The National Assembly will have a Lower House and an Upper House, all members elected by universal suffrage, and by direct and secret ballot.[5]

Under the 1956 constitution, the National Assembly had authority to "vote legislation" and ratify treaties and international agreements. Assembly members had the right to "introduce proposals for laws." Assembly members, under the new constitution, have these rights, plus the authority to "determine declarations of war and holding of peace talks, determine declarations of a state of war and control the government in the carrying out of national policy."

The new Assembly will have a number of other functions, which it did not have under the old constitution, which at least theoretically strengthen its role in the political system: (1) each house, and committee chairmen, can ask the Prime Minister or other ministers to appear before it; (2) the Assembly has the right to recommend replacement of part or all of the government. This is binding unless the President has "special reasons" for rejecting it. But the Assembly can override the President by a ¾ vote; (3) if the President asks for modifications in all or part of a bill, the National Assembly can enact the bill anyway by a simple majority vote; (4) the National Assembly has the right to accept or reject within 12 days a presidential declaration of a state of emergency.

Though the constitution provides for a unitary system, it has a section dealing with local government. There was no mention of local government in the old constitution. Local assembly members and executive heads are elected by direct and secret ballot. But a number of provisions, mentioned above, severely limit the power of local government.

II. THE JUDICIARY

The constitution provides for an independent judicial "power" headed by a Supreme Court, which has the power to interpret the constitution and to decide on the constitutionality and legality of all laws, decrees and administrative decisions. Though there was a lot of verbiage about courts and judges in the 1956 constitution, the equivalent of the

---

[1] The political, military and other conditions prevailing in the country after the constitution goes into effect can be expected to affect the spirit in which its provisions are applied.

[2] The powers of the 1956 National Assembly were listed in 1½ lines. One subtle indication of increased legislative power under the 1967 constitution is the organization of the new constitution. Under the 1956 constitution, the duties and powers of the "President of the Republic" preceded discussion of the National Assembly. In the 1967 constitution the rights and powers of the National Assembly precede those of the "Executive." Such an arrangement does not in itself give the Assembly any more power but it does reflect the different circumstances surrounding the drawing up of the 1956 and 1967 constitutions.

[3] In a state of war, the President has the right to "appoint some province chiefs."

[4] The new constitution also limits the period the President may serve. The term is for four years and the President can be re-elected only once. Under the old constitution, the term was for five years and the President was eligible for "re-election for two terms."

[5] The National Assembly under the 1956 constitution had only one house.

Supreme Court ("The Constitutional Court") was in effect under the control of the President. The President appointed the majority of the judges and his appointments did not have to be approved by anyone.

The judges of the new Supreme Court are selected by the National Assembly from a list elected by associations of judges, prosecutors and lawyers. The Supreme Court (by a ¾ vote) has the power to decide on dissolution of political parties whose "policy and activities" oppose the "republican regime."

III. PROTECTION OF POLITICAL FREEDOMS

To put it briefly, the new constitution appears to provide more protection and guarantees of political freedoms than does the 1956 constitution. But there are a number of loopholes in these guarantees, and limitations remain on the right to engage in political activity and on the rights of speech, press and assembly.

Both constitutions have provisions opposing communism—Article 5 of the 1967 constitution and Article 7 of the 1956 constitution—and the provisions of both are broad enough to serve as a hamper on general political activity, the extent of which would depend in practice on those wielding power. No attempt is made to define communism, so room is left for interpretation.[6]

The provisions for political freedoms under both constitutions have significant limitations:

1967 constitution:

(1) no one can search or confiscate a person's property unless in possession of orders from a court or when necessary to the defense of security and public order.

(2) religious freedom guaranteed so long as it does not violate the national interest, not contrary to public safety or contrary to good morals.

(3) freedom of speech and press respected so long as it does not harm personal honor, national security or good morals. Censorship abolished except for motion pictures and plays. Press regulations to be prescribed by law.

(4) freedom of residence and movement guaranteed except for reasons of public health, security or defense.

1956 constitution:

(1) freedom of residence and movement guaranteed except for reasons of public health or public security.

(2) citizens can travel abroad except in cases of restrictions because of security, national defense, economic, financial reasons or in the public interest.

(3) freedom of meeting and association "within the limits set by law."

(4) freedom of expression, except for slander, incitations to internal disturbance or for the overthrow of the republican form of government.

(5) religious freedom except exercise of these rights shall not be "contrary to morality."

(6) right to strike not recognized for workers in activities related to national defense, public security or "needs indispensable to the life of the community."

(7) "whoever abuses the rights recognized by the Constitution with the object of jeopardizing the republican form of government, the democratic regime, national freedom, independence and unity shall be deprived of his rights."

(8) privacy of correspondence cannot be violated except in cases necessitated by protection of public security or the preservation of public order.

But there are a number of provisions in the 1967 constitution which protect the individual which do not appear in the 1956 constitution:

(1) the individual arrested must be informed of charges within time limit prescribed by law.

(2) confessions obtained by torture, threat or coercion will not be considered as valid evidence. Accused persons considered innocent until sentence recognizing his guilt is handed down. In event of doubt, "the court will rule in favor of the accused."

(3) if unjustly detained, a citizen can sue for damages.

(4) the essence of all basic freedoms cannot be violated.

(5) habits and customs of minorities will be respected.

There are other "new" provisions of the 1967 constitution which expand the role of the state in improving the condition of the people and protecting rights of certain groups:

(1) the state will endeavor to create full employment.

(2) the state will give special support to those elements of society which have a low standard of living.

(3) the state advocates the raising of the standard of living of rural citizens.

(4) workers have the right to choose representatives to participate in management of business enterprises (on wages and work conditions).

IV. POLITICAL PARTIES AND ELECTIONS

The 1956 constitution nowhere refers to political parties as such, whereas the 1967 constitution has a chapter (four articles) on "Political parties and opposition." Communist activity is prohibited but apart from that, political parties "may be organized and may operate freely." Further: "The nation recognizes the formalization of political opposition. The nation encourages progress toward a two party system."

Transitional provisions of the constitution provide for interim government until a president and members of the national assembly are elected. The ruling directorate, under Marshal Ky, has accepted the new constitution and the presidential election will be held on September 3. Assembly elections will be held one month later.

During the interim, the Constituent Assembly is to continue to function, drafting and approving laws for the election of the President, Vice President, Upper House and Lower House, laws organizing the Supreme Court and Inspectorate; and laws on political parties and the press.

The directorate is scheduled to retain its present powers until the new president is inaugurated. At that time the Constituent Assembly will assume legislative powers until the first National Legislative Assembly is convened.

V. OTHER PROVISIONS

A special body, the Inspectorate, has been set up by the constitution to act as a sort of watchdog over all members of the government, but the executive branch, because of its size and operations, would likely be most affected by the Inspectorate's activities.

The Inspectorate has power, under the constitution, to "inspect, control and investigate personnel of all public and private agencies directly or indirectly engaged in corruption, speculation, influence peddling or acts harmful to the national interest . . . Inspect accounts of public agencies and commercial enterprises . . . Audit the property of personnel of public agencies including the President, Vice President, Prime Minister, representatives, senators, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and the chairman of the Inspectorate."

The method of appointing inspectors might limit its apparently broad power, or at least make united action difficult: one third of the inspectors are to be appointed by the National Assembly, one third by the President and one third by the Supreme Court.

A Special Court[7] is to be established to judge high officials charged with "treason or other high crimes." The Special Court is empowered to remove from office the President, the Vice President, Prime Minister, ministers, Secretary of State, Supreme Court justices and members of the Inspectorate. The Special Court is chaired by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and consists of five representatives and five senators. A motion to bring charges has to be supported by more than one-half of the total members of the National Assembly and approved by two-thirds of the members of the National Assembly. In the case of the President and Vice President, the motion must be brought by ⅔ of the membership and approved by ¾ of the membership. A ¾ vote by the Special Court is necessary for removal, and a ⅘ vote is necessary to remove the President and Vice President.

The 1967 constitution states that "the accused will enjoy the right of defense during the entire proceeding." There was no reference to defense in the 1956 constitution's discussion of trial of high officials.

There are a number of references to members of the armed forces, most of which did not appear in the 1956 constitution. The 1967 constitution echoes the 1956 constitution in stating that military personnel elected to public office must be demobilized, but (in 1967) gives the military an out in allowing them to take a leave of absence. The new constitution does state that military personnel on active duty are not permitted to engage in political activity. The 1967 constitution also designates the "Armed Forces Council" as a special body to "advise the President in matters relating to the armed forces, especially promotion, transfer and disciplining of soldiers of all ranks." An article on social security states that the state has the duty to "support the nation's warriors."

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 81, PROVIDING FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF A LABOR DISPUTE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for permission to file the report on Senate Joint Resolution 81, to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees together with individual views, until midnight tonight, June 6.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is the railway resolution which was ordered reported by the full committee of the Senate this morning by a vote of 14 to 1, with the absent member privileged to vote until 2 o'clock p.m. today.

---

[6] Article 5, 1967 constitution: (1) The Republic of Vietnam opposes communism in every form. (2) Every activity designed to propagandize or carry out communism is prohibited.

Article 7, 1956 constitution: "All activities having as their object the direct or indirect propagation or establishment of communism in whatever form shall be contrary to the principles embodied in the present Constitution."

[7] Similar to the Special Court of Justice under the 1956 constitution.

Subsequently, Mr. Morse, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 292) thereon.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 33, Order No. 216, to establish a National Commission on Product Safety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) to establish a National Commission on Product Safety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 33 would create a National Commission on Product Safety first, to determine the extent to which the unsafe design or construction of household products constitutes a significant public health problem in the United States today; and, second, to review the adequacy of existing safeguards against the sale of hazardous household products. By January 1, 1969, the seven-member Commission, to be appointed by the President, would make its final report to Congress and the President, including its recommendations for such remedial action as it deems necessary to protect the public against unreasonable risks of injury from household products.

The historic pattern of national safety legislation in the United States has been largely characterized by reaction to tragedy—specific, preventable tragedy. From epidemic food poisoning at the turn of the century to the escalating highway death toll in 1966, Congress has been moved to satisfy individually each manifest need for protective legislation.

But today we face an unparalleled profusion of new products spawned by space-age technology. Once routine household functions are vanishing before new chemical, mechanical, and electronic marvels. To occupy the new-found hours of leisure, equally complex products abound in and around the home. And a somber byproduct of this proliferation of new products in the home has been the growth of new categories and dimensions of home injuries.

The U.S. Public Health Service estimated to our committee that faulty heating devices today cause injuries at the rate of 125,000 a year; that stoves, power mowers, and washing machines each cause 100,000 injuries a year; glass doors, 40,000; electrical extension cords and wall sockets, 30,000 injuries each per year. We could enumerate many, many other hazardous items which annually produce a substantial number of injuries, many of which result in fatalities.

Consumers Union, the independent, nonprofit organization which evaluates products for consumers, prepared a special report at the request of the committee, analyzing the results of their admittedly limited product testing over the past 10 years. During that period their tests and analyses had uncovered 376 products deemed so hazardous as to be unacceptable in the home.

But the Public Health Service statistics and the Consumers Union test results are pale indexes of the full dimensions of household product hazards. The committee is well satisfied that unsafe products are being marketed in disturbing numbers, but there exists today no definitive study of the extent to which these hazards constitute a major public health problem.

Similarly, the committee was presented with sufficient evidence to raise grave questions as to the adequacy of the measures presently employed to insure the reasonably safe design and construction of the products sold to the American family. There has never been a significant effort to examine the workings and interrelationships of the present systems of voluntary self-regulation, common law product liability, State and Federal regulatory legislation, and municipal ordinance.

A national commission to survey the product safety situation was first proposed by myself and the ranking minority Member, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] on May 12, 1966. It was embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 190, 89th Congress, which was substantially identical to the present resolution. This proposal was unanimously adopted by the Commerce Committee as title II of S. 3298, 89th Congress—the Child Protection Act of 1966—and unanimously passed by the Senate, but was not contained in the law as finally enacted.

On February 8, 1967, I, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], together with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], reintroduced the Commission proposal as Senate Joint Resolution 33. On February 16, 1967, President Johnson sent to Congress his message on consumers. In that message the President urged Congress to enact legislation to establish the National Commission on Product Safety.

In testimony before the committee and in statements submitted for the record, both Government and industry witnesses pledged full support for the work of the proposed Commission. There was little opposition to the objectives of the bill or to the actual proposal. For example, the Consumer Products Division of the Electronic Industry Association said it "welcomes the proposed inquiry into the area of safety of consumer electronic products and pledges its full cooperation."

The General Electric Co., the largest manufacturer in the world of electrical home products, said in a separate statement:

> Congress and the public are entitled to a review of the quality of industrial performance in this area and to assurance that adequate measures are being taken to safeguard consumers. Moreover, the very existence of the Commission should accelerate existing broad-based efforts to develop standards and codes designed to further enhance safety. General Electric looks forward to cooperating with the proposed Commission.

The same type of testimony was given, and the same type of statements were made by representatives of practically all of the manufacturers, such as Western Electric, the power people, and the companies which make all kinds of kitchen equipment using electricity. Some clarifying amendments were suggested which the committee embodied in the resolution. Generally speaking, however, there was little opposition to the proposal.

The industry people welcome this bill because, as the witnesses from General Electric testified, they feel that this legislation would stimulate them to do better work and would help to eliminate from the market hazardous products which give reliable manufacturers of similar products a bad reputation. The committee was extremely pleased with the attitude of all of the industries involved in this matter.

Mr. President, hardly a day passes in which some new, startling product hazard is not brought to light. A few weeks ago, General Electric disclosed that 90,000 color television sets had been designed in such a way as to provide inadequate shielding for X-ray emissions from the high-voltage power supply. Last week, in Paterson, N.J., a woman died of a serious bone marrow disease which was traced to a heavy concentration of new adhesive material in a roll of cloth she used to make a dress. This past Saturday, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] called to my attention the fate of a child in New Orleans who was killed when the lid of his crib trapped the child's neck against the upper end of the crib and strangled him. As an indication that the failure was that of the design of the crib, and not of any freak circumstances, the manufacturer settled the claim of the child's parents with a substantial payment of damages. He undoubtedly would have preferred to have been informed of the unsafe design so that it could have been changed before the product was put on the market.

We could cite many additional cases. In each one, however, I am sure that if the manufacturers had known of the hazard they would have gone out and done something about the product.

A deep and penetrating study and report by the Product Safety Commission is essential if we are to master the consequences of our remarkable technology. I urge that the Senate approve Senate Joint Resolution 33 and speed the creation of the Commission.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, as has been stated by the chairman of our Committee on Commerce, I, acting as the ranking minority member, joined him in sponsoring this resolution, other various resolutions, and the bill that has led to this proposal. I commend the distinguished chairman for his work in this field. I am thoroughly in accord with the very able statement which the Senator has just made with reference to this resolution.

I have little to add to the statement except that, as a practical matter, I think the RECORD might show something more about what has led up to this resolution and the reason for the form in which it appears.

We started out, as has been indicated by the chairman, with the Child Protection Act, which was enacted last year. The attention of the committee was forcefully brought to this matter by some of the very dangerous toys that were being sold. In fairness to our American industries, it should be said that most of them were imported. However, there were extremely dangerous and hazardous toys that appeared to be innocuous on the surface, but which caused injury and, in some cases, even death.

Mr. President, great oaks from little acorns grow, and whenever we scratch the surface of a subject of legislation, immediately during the hearings that result, and the study of legislation, there is brought to light many other steps that should be taken.

Thus, during the course of enacting the Child Protection Act, all kinds of allegedly hazardous appliances and substances were referred to, testified about, and otherwise brought to the attention of the committee. The creation of a commission to study this subject and make recomendations, as was stated by the distinguished Senator from Washington, was added to the Child Protection Act, but it was not accepted by the House. I do not know, of course, the precise reasons for its removal, but I suspect that the Members of the House felt—as we all feel from time to time—that we have had a surfeit of study commissions and the habit of creating commissions, financing them and authorizing them to issue reports and recommendations on a multitude of subjects has grown so great that sometimes we instinctively recoil from the creation of another commission for another study.

However, I think that the RECORD should show, for the information of the Senate, that there is a particularly practical reason for the creation of this study commission.

The attention of the Federal Trade Commission has been called to certain hazardous and dangerous appliances. The committee had reasons to realize that some of the able, aggressive, and bright young lawyers on the staff of the Federal Trade Commission—and here I am not using words in an ironical sense because I greatly admire their work—were prepared to recommend to the President and to Congress immediate legislation on hazardous and dangerous appliances. I believe that the committee felt that to plunge into legislation and undertake the task in the committee, to deal fairly and justly, with careful analysis, with all the multitudinous appliances on the market being manufactured, sold, and uitlized in and about the home, would be a hasty and perhaps unfair method of pursuing this task.

Therefore, it was our opinion that a Commission to make a careful study and analysis and recommend how far we should go, in enacting laws for the protection of the consumer and his family, would be a wiser and better approach. That is the reason for my enthusiastic support of this resolution creating this Commission.

The Commission is directed to identify the catagories of household products which present an unreasonable hazard; to determine what efforts will be needed by industry as to self-regulation; to examine the protection afforded by common law in the various States; and to review Federal, State, and local laws relating to the protection of consumers, including their scope and coverage, advocacy and investigatory powers, quality of enforcement, and so forth.

Mr. President, had we acted on recommendations of the staff of the Federal Trade Commission, it might have led to an immediate enactment of a Federal statute which would supersede but be in conflict with many State regulations. This is another reason for this careful and guarded, but reasonably rapid approach, because the time given for the report is limited.

Some of the household items mentioned in the field for the Commission to investigate include kitchen ranges, boilers, portable heaters, dehumidifiers, blenders, food disposals, power tools, electric fans, lawnmowers, and other appliances.

Speaking as a cosponsor of the resolution I join the chairman in expressing the hope that the Senate will adopt the resolution.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me briefly?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

There being no objection, the committee amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is my purpose to support approval of Senate Joint Resolution 33. I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to commend the Committee on Commerce, and particularly its chairman and the ranking minority member on that committee, for having presented and assembled a very good case for a systematic, thorough, and complete treatment of a very serious and growing problem.

There is already a body of law and regulation existent covering much of this area—statutory law, case law, and common law. Some of the statutory law is Federal, some is State, and there are municipal ordinances.

But the rapid development in technology and the increased varieties of products with their greater general use, and other factors, certainly call for a survey and study of the entire field.

I shall not go into the details, or even the chief categories and descriptions of the various articles that would be embraced in this resolution. That particular task has been discharged well by the chairman and by the ranking minority member. This has been very well stated in the report which they have prepared and filed on this particular resolution.

If the work of the Commission will be done in the fashion described, and done in good faith, then, it seems to me, there will be created a foundation for a judgment as to what remedying action should be taken, by legislation or otherwise.

The method described and provided for in this joint resolution is designed to achieve progress along these lines. It should assist Congress to devise and compose needed remedies which will be acceptable and workable.

It should also operate to exclude the impracticable and clearly unobtainable objectives which are sometimes present in the thinking of people who are well intentioned, but, unfortunately, sometimes just a little too theoretical and not possessed, perhaps, of the commonsense that the members that will comprise the Commission possess.

Notwithstanding its many merits, there are several aspects that I feel it would be well to speak out upon for the purpose of getting a resolution as a working instrument which will serve the purposes of the Commission better.

I have devised some 6 or 7 amendments, which I should like to call up in due time. I might say that, prior to filing them with the clerk, I furnished a copy of them to the chairman and his staff, and to the ranking minority member of the committee. In accordance with their usual cooperative attitude, they were frank enough to tell me which they felt they could accept and which they could not.

I assure them now, as I did then, that in submitting these amendments it is my purpose to be constructive; it is my purpose to be helpful. Having gone through the experience as a member of a commission or two, one of them dealing with food products, I have formed some ideas that are reflected in the amendments which I seek to have approved.

I conclude by saying again that the committee, and its chairman and its ranking minority member particularly, are to be complimented and commended for what they have done. I know that when the full fruits of the work of the Commission and legislation based on its report are completed and proposed, a great deal of credit will be theirs.

Is it the wish of the chairman of the committee that I proceed now to bring up my amendments?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The

amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

S.J. RES. 33

On page 4, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) As soon as practicable, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register a list of the categories of household products which it proposes to study and investigate. The Commission shall afford an opportunity for any interested person to submit his views concerning any category of household product on the published list."

On page 4, line 4, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, section 3(a) of the joint resolution provides for the Commission's publishing a notice of any proposed hearing in the Federal Register and affording a reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present relevant testimony and data.

That is a very good provision. That provision for a notice is very satisfactory. The problem is, however, that the Commission need not hold hearings. It need not engage in the hearing in order to arrive at some conclusion with respect to a given category of household product.

The purpose of the amendment is to provide an opportunity for those concerned with categories of household goods which will be studied and investigated by the Commission in those instances where no hearing will be held.

I believe this simple language, consisting of five typewritten lines, will achieve that purpose, namely, to assure to anyone interested in a particular category of products the opportunity to submit material and technical information and other data to the Commission during the course of its study.

I hope the amendment will be approved and accepted by the Senate, so it will become an integral part of the resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the language suggested by the Senator from Nebraska is the exact language contained in the report. I believe he has submitted the amendment because he is concerned that people may not follow the report and do the things called for in it. However, committee reports are generally followed. I do not know of any exceptions. If this language were put in the bill, it would be mandatory that the Commission do certain things.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and I believe that the Commission should do these things. If the Senator from New Hampshire has no objection, I see no reason why we cannot accept the amendment and put that language in the bill.

We try to keep as much language as possible out of bills in order to make them as simple and understandable as possible. But if the Senator from New Hampshire is agreeable, I would just as soon accept the amendment.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from New Hampshire is perfectly willing to go along with the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is true that this language is in the report. I neglected to mention that. I know what the committee intends. I sympathize with this intention. However, this additional factor is involved: While the text of the resolution will be widely published and read, not always is it accompanied by the report. With this additional language, the public will benefit.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should state, so that the legislative record will be clear, that when we refer to the products involved, we are referring to categories of products.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have no intention, and, in fact, it would be extremely undesirable, for the Commission to refer to specific product A or an individual manufacturer. We are returning to product categories.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I would also add that one of the duties laid upon the Commission is to examine the efforts being made by the industry at self-regulation. The Commission could not perform that duty without conferring with industry, requesting industry to present its views and problems, and inquiring what it is doing about them.

I think the Senator from Nebraska needs no assurance from the Senator from New Hampshire that the Senator from New Hampshire would not be a party to any high-handed proceeding that would not be completely fair to the private sector and to the industrial community of this country, which is doing such a magnificent job in developing these many useful appliances.

The adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska is an added safeguard; but, by the very nature of the performance of the Commission, it could not perform its tasks without constant conference with product manufacturers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 8, delete lines 9 to 12 inclusive and insert in lieu thereof:

"(c) The Commission is authorized to request from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Joint Resolution; and each such department, agency, or independent instrumentality is authorized to cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information to the Commission upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman when acting as chairman."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this amendment would replace subsection (c) of section 3, contained on page 6, as the amendment indicates.

The purpose here is to assure the cooperation of other agencies of Government to assist the Commission in the performance of its mission. In the Attorney General's letter containing his views on this resolution, he noted that subsection (c) differs from the form usually used.

The Attorney General set forth in his letter the language contained in my amendment No. 3, stating that it is the standard and approved method. It would be in line with good bill draftsmanship to include his suggestion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This amendment is suggested by the Department of Justice. It clarifies the language.

Mr. HRUSKA. It clarifies the language and is the standard phraseology for the purpose at hand.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We will be glad to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 9, line 18, immediately before the words "and the" insert the following: "the Federal Firearms Act (15 U.S.C. 901, et seq.), the National Firearms Act (26 U.S.C. 5801, et seq.),".

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, section 6 has to do with definitions of terms. The term "household products" is defined, and then certain exceptions are made to that definition. Thus, those products regulated under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, the Flammable Fabrics Act, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act, the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act, and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act are excluded from the categories of products which are defined as "household products."

The purpose of this amendment is to exclude one other category, firearms. There are two reasons. First, firearms are regulated now, in existing law, in the National Firearms Act of 1934 and the Federal Firearms Act of 1938. Secondly, there is proposed legislation pending in the Senate, which has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, dealing specifically with firearms control. In due time, after the Committee on the Judiciary finishes its hearings and reports on those bills, the Committees on Commerce and Finance will receive the bills for further processing. It is felt that it would be in the interest of orderly process to include this exception as well, because the question of firearms safety standards is a very technical and complex field. It should not be run into the general categories of products to be covered by this Commission's work.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I do not disagree with his premise. The reason we listed products covered by these other acts is because they were regulatory acts now on the books. There is a Firearms Act of 1938, and Congress is considering now, as the chairman well knows, a firearms control bill. I suppose we could have excluded that also. But the difference is that these acts direct themselves to control of the use and sale of firearms, rather than safety. It might be proper for the Commission to look at such questions as the adequacy of safety catches, proper design, and things of that kind, involved in the manufacture of firearms, although no situations immediately come to mind in which they would.

But the bills of which the Senator from Nebraska speaks are addressed, not to the manufacture of firearms or the safety of firearms, but their use and control. There is a difference there.

Mr. HRUSKA. With one exception, if the Senator will yield: One pending bill does refer to safety standards that must be complied with, with reference to imported firearms. So the question is open.

I might say, Mr. President, that I made it my business, one Sunday afternoon last summer, to delve into the safety of firearms, including proof testing. If this Commission wishes to study the subject, the members are going to find themselves precluded from considering a lot of the products that they really should study. It is a very complex study.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would think so.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is a vast subject, as the Senator knows. As chairman of the Committee on Commerce, he has already delved into it himself.

It is for that reason, not with the idea of avoidance of any safety standard, but for the purpose of improved and sensible classification, that the amendment is proposed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the Committee on the Judiciary, if not the Commerce Committee, will do it.

There has never been a real definition of firearms. What is a firearm? We think of it normally as a gun that uses bullets, exploded by powder, or something of that kind. But we live now in an age where I am not so sure but that some so-called toys, not for young children but for teenagers, are firearms.

Mr. HRUSKA. Zip guns, perhaps?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know. But our committee has really been concerned, in all of these safety bills, with the subject of toys. There has not been a single bill on which the subject of toys has not come into the discussion in some way.

I should like to agree with the Senator from Nebraska on this matter. I would not wish to see the proposed Commission shunted off on this complex question of firearms. We would not get the job done that the Senator from New Hampshire and I would like to see done. I hope we can be more definitive about this whole subject of guns, as to exactly what they are.

Mr. HRUSKA. If the Senator will yield, "firearm" is defined quite specifically in the Federal Firearms Act. It is also defined specifically in the National Firearms Act—The Machine Gun Act, as we popularly know it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. But certainly this can be said: Whatever that definition embraces, that will be a legitimate matter for the Committees on Commerce, Finance, and the Judiciary to study.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Anything outside of that statutory definition can be studied by this Product Safety Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is a field that we would not want them to get into, because we are working on that. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska. I hope we may have some kind of meaningful, practical, firearms act. Our coming from the areas that the Senator from Nebraska and I represent would cause us to look upon firearms somewhat differently than people from crowded areas.

Mr. HRUSKA. We do indeed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But I hope we may have some kind of meaningful, practical act to serve the purpose which really was intended: to stop the use of these devices in the Commission of Crime and for other unsafe and unlawful uses.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. COTTON. Many years ago, in my State, following a number of accidents, the State legislature enacted a statute forbidding the sale and distribution of so-called air rifles, which at that time were being used a great deal by children about the home.

For the purpose of establishing legislative history, and for the guidance of the proposed Commission, would it be the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska that if his amendment is agreed to, it would not preclude the Commission from dealing with air guns and—what was the other one the Senator mentioned? Zip guns?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Zip guns; BB guns.

Mr. COTTON. Dealing with the sort of instruments that may be used about the home by children, in contradistinction to a revolver, a rifle, a shotgun, or a regular firearm?

Mr. HRUSKA. That would depend on the definition of firearm and whether BB gun or an air gun or an air rifle would be included in the act. If it is included, then it would be a subject that would be considered with respect to firearm controls by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Commerce Committee.

If the definition contained in the National Firearms Act does not apply to air guns, then the Commission could get into the subject with full force.

Mr. COTTON. We have a Firearms Act. The Senator from Nebraska is discussing an act that is not in force.

Mr. HRUSKA. No. When I discuss the Federal Firearms Act, that is an act that has been in effect since 1938, almost 30 years. The National Firearms Act has been in effect since 1934. Those acts do define firearms. To the extent that they define firearms to exclude certain items like zip guns or anything else, the Products Commission would then have jurisdiction.

To the extent that the definition does include any of these items, it should be handled in the other legislation.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from Nebraska is familiar with the Firearms Act. Could he tell us whether the present Firearms Act would exclude a BB gun or air rifle?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska agree to lay aside temporarily the pending amendment and proceed with another amendment?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 6

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 6 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 7, strike "January 1, 1969.", and insert in lieu thereof "two years from the date of approval of this joint resolution."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this amendment concerns the life of the Commission. Nobody is more anxious than I to see that commissions do not live any longer than they have to. On the other hand, they must have time to do the job.

Instead of making the expiration of the Commission's life January 1, 1969, the amendment would make the life of the Commission 2 years following the approval of this resolution. As I remember it—and the chairman of the Commerce Committee can confirm this—last year the proposal was that there be a 2-year life.

From practical experience, I suggest the change. Only yesterday, there was the first formal meeting of the Commission on Revision of the Federal Criminal Code. That is based upon a resolution that was approved by Congress in October of last year. It took all that time to constitute the membership of the Commission, get candidates for staff, and work out some plan of general procedure. That Commission has a life of 2½ years. It would be my guess that we will have to extend the life of that Commission. So, in an effort to see that there will be better plans for proceeding with their work, I offer the pending amendment to give them an assured life of 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 6, line 15, strike out "When" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), when".

On page 7, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) Prior to a finding by the Commission that the publication of any information with respect to any category of household product, is in the public interest and would not give an unfair competitive advantage to any person, the Commission shall (i) notify to the extent practicable all known manufacturers of any such products of such contemplated findings together with a synopsis of the information being considered for publication, and (ii) afford an opportunity not longer than 30 days for any such manufacturer to submit views with respect to the contemplated publication."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the report at page 4 reads:

> The Commission is also authorized to publish information when it deems such publication is in the public interest so long as such publication would not confer unfair competitive advantage on any person nor reveal confidential information such as individual transactions, trade secrets, or the name of customers.

In the publication of this material it is conceivable that, in the judgment of the Commission, such danger attaches to a particular category that the Commission should publish material that will be distributed to the trade and to the public. All this would be at the sole discretion of the Commission.

I would not sympathize for 5 seconds with any category of household products that is a menace and should not be available to the public for sale or use. At the same time, there should be some safeguard against the exercise or arbitrary power that would amount to the power of destruction without giving at least the opportunity of a person to be heard before such publicity is released.

The pending amendment has for its purpose the giving of timely notice to the manufacturers of such a category of household products so that they can make their views known to the Commission, in the hope that, knowing all the facts, the Commission will see its way clear either to cancel its order or to modify it before its publication.

If the merchandise is flagrantly not safe for public use, there are other ways, through regulatory agencies, that such articles can be reached.

Creation of an ad hoc commission, not schooled in procedural safeguards and not inhibited by any of the procedures of the Administrative Procedure Act, presents a danger that material not founded on fact might be released arbitrarily. This could do much harm to a category of products that might in the long run be shown to be not defective. In the meantime, however, the harm would have been done.

Inventories in these categories are often substantial. They represent a large investment. They represent the exercise of a great deal of care on the part of the manufacturer to build safety factors into its products, knowing that it must depend on repeated sales for success.

The sum and substance of the pending amendment is to give notice, in such a situation, to the manufacturer of the future publication of certain information and afford him an opportunity to be heard as to whether such information is totally or partially unfounded, or is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I so often agree with the views of the Senator from Nebraska that I dislike to disagree with him at any time.

Many times when the Senator from Nebraska offers an amendment, it is a clarifying amendment that makes the bill much better.

The Senator has the very good habit—which I recommend to all other Senators, or at least to a great many of them—of letting one know the kind of amendment he intends to offer and what his feelings are about the bill. He does this in the hope that he will help to improve the bill. I wish all Senators would do that. I recommend that habit to everyone.

However, I must disagree with the Senator with respect to amendment No. 2. The Senator from New Hampshire and I considered at length the points made by the Senator from Nebraska, and we believe that we make this pretty clear in our committee report on page 4, paragraph 3, in which we say:

> In regard to household products on which views have not previously been submitted by the affected industry, prior to the publication of any information obtained by the Commission, it should, where practicable, give notice by letter or wire to known manufacturers and known associations of manufacturers of the product involved and afford them a reasonable opportunity, not to exceed 30 days, to submit their views.

It seems to me that we direct the Commission to do the very thing about which the Senator from Nebraska has spoken. We do leave a slight escape clause. We say "where practicable." There could be some cases where the Commission would find something about which they would have to notify the public and the manufacturers and everybody quickly and immediately, without dilly-dallying. These may be rare cases, and I do not believe a Commission of this type would abuse it. But we do say that in almost all cases—probably 98 or 99 percent of them—they should do the very thing that the Senator from Nebraska suggests.

The Commission would have a responsibility to notify the manufacturers and to give them a reasonable opportunity to submit their views prior to the publication of any derogatory information on the product or the type of product. And we say that they shall do that. But there might be occasions when the Commission could not wait, and this would be an instance where the manufacturers themselves would probably want people notified.

It is true that other commissions—the Federal Trade Commission, for example—have some authority. But that authority does not go as far as this measure does, with respect to the type of products we intend to cover. The Federal Trade Commission, too, is limited to misleading advertising, misleading labeling, and things of that type.

In the many cases we have in mind, there is no intent to mislead at all. It is just that a product is hazardous, and sometimes the manufacturer is not aware of it, nor is the retailer or other seller.

The language of the proposed amendment would impose a rigid requirement on the Commission. For instance, if the Commission discovered that a particular product was extremely hazardous and posed imminent danger of serious injury, the Commission could not make this information public without going through many procedures in notifying all known manufacturers, supplying them with a synopsis of the information about the product, and waiting an undefined period for the manufacturers to submit their views.

We believe that Senate Joint Resolution 33 already provides protection against the publication of information which would result in unfair competitive disadvantage or the disclosure of trade secrets. We were very meticulous about putting in language to that effect.

I must oppose this amendment, because I believe that, in effect, we do what the Senator from Nebraska wishes to do; and we preclude abuse by the Commission in very strong language in the report.

Mr. HRUSKA. The language in the report does not require action by the Commission. It simply is language in the report. And, there will be no way that people who only have a copy of the resolution to study the report and say, "But my rights are found in two places, not in one."

I believe that the conventional instrumentalities of the Federal Government are careful to obey any language in a report. They must come back to Congress time after time, year after year, before either the Appropriations Committee or the authorizing committee, so they want to stay in line.

This would be an ad hoc commission which after so much time would disappear. It would have no reason to come back to Congress for anything.

Mr. President, it seems to me that unless this amendment is put into the resolutions, we confuse the nature of this Commission. This is to be a study commission, one that would make recommendations to Congress. It is not designed to be a commission for discipline or regulation. It would have no expertise to be such. It would have no machinery. It is simply not intended for that purpose, without the amendment, we are going to say, in effect, that this Commission can wield the instrument of brutal publicity. That is not the way we should legislate in a matter of this type.

Let me suggest that we have been getting along for 180 years without this Commission, and I believe we can struggle along for 24 more months with the aid of proper regulatory bodies that have regulatory power at their disposal. In addition we have State laws, city ordinances, and the conscience of the manufacturers, which would assert itself quickly, willingly, and cooperatively, in those cases that are undoubtedly meritorious.

I would urge the chairman of the committee to reconsider. Perhaps we could say, "notify to the extent practicable all known manufacturers." There is no 30-day limitation specified; but the way the amendment is written, it would be a reasonable time. Nevertheless, I would have no objection to the insertion of a 30-day period, if that would bring the amendment closer to the point of acceptance by the very wise and very dedicated chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am certain that the Senator from Nebraska would not want his amendment put into law to afford this opportunity for such manufacturer with no time limitation, because that could go on forever.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. First, in order to perfect his amendment, I believe the Senator should insert "30 days."

Mr. HRUSKA. That is satisfactory.

Mr. MAGNUSON. At least. Second, where the amendment states "the Commission shall notify," I believe the Senator should insert "when practicable."

Mr. HRUSKA. To the extent practicable.

Mr. MAGNUSON. To the extent practicable. We could accept it.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is satisfactory.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because there may be some rare cases where they cannot wait.

Mr. HRUSKA. Then, in the fourth line of the amendment, after the word "notify," I insert the words "to the extent practicable."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. In the next to the last line, after the words "afford an opportunity," I insert the words "not longer than 30 days." Would that be agreeable?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is agreeable. That carries out what we said in the report.

Mr. HRUSKA. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska so modify his amendment?

Mr. HRUSKA. I so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we return to the consideration of amendment No. 5. On page 9, line 18, immediately before the words "and the" insert the following: "the Federal Firearms Act (15 U.S.C. 901, et seq.), the National Firearms Act (26 U.S.C. 5801, et seq.),".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, we have examined, as well as we could in the time we have at hand, the Firearms Act. I am entirely in accord with the Senator from Nebraska about excluding guns and firearms from the consideration of this Commission.

The Senator from New Hampshire feels quite strongly that paper-cap pistols, for instance, which have been very dangerous in the past, are essentially within the province of this committee to study. Many States ban BB rifles, otherwise known as air guns, and things of that nature. The Senator from New Hampshire also felt very strongly about this matter last year and that some action should be taken, because some of these mechanisms connected with fireworks are probably the most dangerous because they are in the hands of children.

In an examination of these two acts—I believe the second one referred to in the amendment of the Senator; namely, the National Firearms Act, 26 U.S.C. 501—there is a rather lengthy definition, but it is stated by categories. There is a definition of shotguns, rifles, and then, it finally states, "any other weappons." However, under "any other weapons," the word "weapons" seems to be the test. I am sure that a paper-cap pistol would not be a weapon, and I doubt very much if a BB gun would be a weapon.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I wish to suggest that the National Firearms Act has to do principally with automatic weapons, such as machineguns.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. Undoubtedly, if our bill is passed—and I have had a bill pending for two Congresses amending this act, on which there has been no action, dealing with bazookas, rockets, and things of that kind—it would not apply in this case.

Mr. COTTON. Except for a catchall phrase "any other weapons" I think that could not cause any trouble whatever. The first statute referred to in the Senator's amendment, the Federal Firearms Act, 15 U.S.C. 901, is technically the transportation of firearms, but it also has more far-reaching consequences than that, and has a broad definition.

I am reading from section 3 of that act:

> The term "firearm" means any weapon, by whatever name known, which is designed to expel a projectile or projectiles by the action of an explosive and a firearm muffler or firearm silencer, or any part or parts of such weapon.

The Senator from New Hampshire would be a little afraid of that one. If the Senator from Nebraska could see fit to amend his proposed amendment by striking out the reference to the Federal Firearms Act, 15 U.S.C. 901, and which is referred to as the National Firearms Act, I think it would give us the protection that we have in mind.

Mr. HRUSKA. The definition read by the Senator does limit the Federal Firearms Act to those contrivances which by action of an explosion will expel a projectile. It would not include, therefore, an air rifle, or a slingshot, or a spring-operated crossbow.

Mr. COTTON. A zip gun.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The spring gun can be deadly.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct; and that would be under the products definition.

Mr. COTTON. As would what is otherwise known as a zip gun.

Mr. HRUSKA. I presume that a zip gun is either on a spring or some kind of a released pressure mechanism. However, some may be built to accommodate ammunition. The air gun, of course, is compressed air and that would not be an explosive, at least in the common meaning of that term.

Mr. COTTON. As a matter of legislative history, having examined and read the definition, is it the understanding and intent of the Senator from Nebraska that in excluding firearms from the authority of this commission, he is not intending to exclude firearms in which explosives do not send a projectile; that he is not excluding air guns, zip guns, and spring guns?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct. That is my full intent. An air rifle would not be a firearm. That is probably contradictory in terms. But any contrivance—air gun, BB gun, zip gun, or one that would depend on pressure by spring or compressed air—should and would remain, if this amendment were adopted, under the jurisdiction of the Product Safety Commission. However, when we get into those contrivances by which bullets or pellets are propelled by action of an explosive, that should be under existing Federal firearms control legislation.

Mr. COTTON. I would say to the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that with this discussion and this expression of legislative history that has been established by the statement of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska who offered this amendment, this amendment should be agreed to. It will not handicap the Commission in dealing with the kind of guns that are children's toys.

Mr. HRUSKA. Also, my amendment would not exclude fireworks such as cherry bombs and firecrackers which should be under the jurisdiction of the Product Safety Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the chairman has been very patient. I have one more amendment. It is amendment No. 4 and I ask that it be stated and considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> On page 9, line 11, immediately after "family" insert the following: "in the performance of services ordinarily rendered in or around the household."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this resolution has to do with household products. When we get to the definition of this phrase, we find that it is not limited to the household at all, but the entire universe could be included.

On page 9 of the proposed resolution, it is stated:

> DEFINITION
>
> SEC. 6. The term "household products" means products customarily produced or distributed for sale through retail sales agencies or instrumentalities for use by a consumer or any member of his family.

Mr. President, that definition in my judgment, would mean anything that human beings use or could use except for the exemptions named in the act. I submit, in all sincerity, that we either remove the name "household" from the text of the resolution, and make it conform to the definition, or in the alternative insert the following in line 11, after the word "family": "in the performance of services ordinarily rendered in and around the household," so that the definition would read:

> The term "household products" means products customarily produced or distributed for sale through retail sales agencies or instrumentalities for use by a consumer or any member of his family in the performance of services ordinarily rendered in or around the household.

In this way, we have the phrase "household products" defined in a logical and meaningful fashion and not in a distorted way.

Mr. COTTON. I can agree that the words "for use" or "used in or around the household" would be a very necessary and meritorious addition but I do not quite get the significance of "in the performance of services." A dangerous toy is not used in the performance of a service. That would refer, perhaps, to a lawnmower or some kind of eggbeater or blender; but I would think it may well be that dangerous appliances and dangerous substances in and around the household are not used in the performance of services.

Mr. HRUSKA. Would it satisfy the Senator's objections if the words "in the performance of services" be stricken, and that the word "rendered" also be stricken so that it would read "ordinarily used in or around the household."

Mr. COTTON. I am not sure I would be satisfied unless we take out the word "ordinarily," because there may be some instruments which ordinarily——

Mr. HRUSKA. All right, strike "ordinarily," but a diamond cutter, I imagine, is not ordinarily used in or around the household——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not in most households.

Mr. HRUSKA. There may be no diamond cutter used anywhere in any household in America but one, and this might make the diamond cutter subject to the jurisdiction of this commission. Perhaps that is the way we want it. We might want a universal tone here. It would be a wide-open door, and I do not think it should be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on page 9, section 6, line 8, we can amend the act, to concern "consumer" products. Just take out "household." This is a national commission on product safety. We use the word "household" because that is the bulk of the things we are talking about. But the Senator's amendment now would eliminate camping equipment, kitchen stoves, boat equipment, outboard motors. All of these things may not be used exactly in the house. Perhaps we did not look at this as carefully as we should have done. We were thinking of things in and around the household, so we used those words. Maybe we should use the broad term "consumer products."

Mr. HRUSKA. I do not know. There are many resorts on rivers and lakes where boats and things of that kind are used in and around the household. That would qualify them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have sports equipment here, football helmets. They do not come in under that.

Mr. HRUSKA. My boys used to wear football helmets in the house.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They did? Well, I was always kicked out of my house when I put mine on. I had to go out in the yard. [Laughter.]

Mr. COTTON. I am afraid I am in disagreement with my chairman. I think if we make it "consumer products," this commission could last 10 years and cover the universe and examine everything ever manufactured. I do not think we want to open it up as wide as that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not suggest that. I merely suggested that we may want to look at some of these other things. I do not know, but perhaps "in and around the household" might take care of that.

Mr. COTTON. The only reason I question use of the word "ordinarily" is that I did not think diamond cutters would interpose any great problem. I have a friend who has a—what is it?

Mr. HRUSKA. A portable saw? A lathe?

Mr. COTTON. Some kind of lathe in his basement. A member of his family lost a hand because of it. He did not know how to handle it. This kind of tool was in this man's workroom in his basement.

There are various kinds of appliances which are not ordinarily found in our homes, but they are found in some homes. Just where do we draw the line it seems to me that household products used by consumers, or any member of the family in or about the household, would take care of dangerous lawnmowers. It would take care of appliances in the household. I do not object strenuously to "ordinarily" being used. I raise the question because I think so long as we have taken out "in the performance of services," we should consider that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator has suggested that we eliminate the words "in the performance of services," is that correct?

Mr. HRUSKA. I will go along and strike also the word "ordinarily," if that is what is wanted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that will take care of it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Very well then. The amendment, as modified, would read:

> On page 9, line 11, immediately after "family," strike the period and insert the following: "In or around the household."

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that would also cover equipment that might be stored in the house to be used further away and not necessarily right around the periphery of the house.

Mr. HRUSKA. It would not be my intent to modify the amendment or restrict it that much. In this context, the commission will be an awfully busy one.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, it will have enough to do.

Mr. HRUSKA. It surely will.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment as just stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Gore in the chair). The amendment is modified accordingly.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 4 of the Senator from Nebraska, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there is only one other item regarding the authorization of $2 million. I know that the Food Marketing Commission struggled along for two and a half years with an authorization of $2.5 million, of which it spent $2.1 million. The National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Law which will not involve scientific research, will struggle along for two and a half years on $500,000. I wonder if we could not scale the proposed authorization here down to $1 million so that there can be better and more effective planning and use of that money to get the job done. If it spends half a million or three-quarters of a million dollars, and it comes in and shows Congress that it has done a good job, then I have no doubt that more dollars would be forthcoming.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am always at a loss to know just exactly how much to authorize for these commissions. I have helped to create many of them. As a rule of thumb, on a commission with this broad a scope—similar to the Food and Marketing Commission which the Senator from Nebraska and I are familiar with—we figure they have about $1 million a year and when they get through, I think that this commission would have a little more staff work to do actually than the Food Marketing Commission, although the Food Commission had to hold hearings all over the country, which resulted in some expense. But this commission will need personnel with technical knowledge in this field, although it will draw on industry.

I would hope we would leave the amount alone. The Appropriations Committee will handle it. I have often found that if we provide for $1 million or $1.5 million, they will come in later and get more. I would prefer that the Appropriations Committee have a broader version of the amount, so it will have more flexibility. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] and I will see that they do not waste money. Also, as a practical matter, the commission will probably find that it will have to spend extra time on certain aspects of this problem. It will perhaps get the bulk of its work done, but will find that on something it will need more time.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am familiar with the watchdog capabilities of both the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I may add this statement, the Commission also has authority to contract out some of the work.

Mr. HRUSKA. I will depend on their support in due time, when an appropriation is requested, to keep the amount within reasonable limits.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Nebraska is a member of the Appropriations Committee. I am sure he will join with us in that effort.

Mr. HRUSKA. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the committee report states that the committee "intends that the members of the Commission be selected from among persons knowledgeable and experienced in product manufacturing procedures and industrial practices, product liability law and consumer protection." Does the committee intend that the Commission should include one or more members who actually come from the relevant manufacturing industries—that is, persons whose job is the engineering and manufacture of household products?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; that is our intention.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in the absence of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], I ask unanimous consent that a statement he has prepared on the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

I am glad to support the establishment of a National Commission on Product Safety. The protection of families, particularly children, from hazardous products has long been a matter of concern to me and I welcome this proposal to enable the Federal Government to review more adequately existing standards of consumer protection.

Recently I introduced legislation, S. 1082, which would require that medicine cabinets used in Federally assisted housing be equipped with latches designed to prevent young children from opening the cabinets. In view of the proposed Commission's mandate to "protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injuries which may be caused by hazardous household products," I strongly urge that this problem be considered by the Commission, once it becomes established, as early as practicable.

In 1959 the Accident Prevention Committee of the American Public Health Association started a drive to provide for inclusion of safety medicine cabinets during construction or remodeling of every home.

Unfortunately, the plan foundered on the rocks of bureaucracy. The number of cases of accidental poisoning among children has continued to grow year by year since then.

In 1965, the most recent year for which the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has figures, there were about 148,000 reported cases of accidental poisonings among children under five years of age in this country. An estimated 400 of these cases resulted in death.

And not all of the cases of accidental poisonings are reported.

The New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association recently observed that there may have been 500,000 such cases in the nation in 1966, and about 50,000 in my State of New Jersey alone.

In the year in which the American Public Health Association began its activity in this area, more children were victims of accidental poisoning than of diphtheria, scarlet fever, hepatitis and polio combined.

The President of the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association has been quoted as saying drug poisoning is like any other household poisoning—the child simply swallows something he has found.

I am glad to note that several manufacturers of medicines have voluntarily agreed to bottle their products in containers with safety caps which are difficult for children to remove.

But pharmacists recommend that we take the further step of providing a means of keeping all medicines in a locked closet out of children's reach. Most homes do not have such cabinets, although at least five companies manufacture them under a government-owned patent which is available to all who want to use it.

The bill I have introduced, and which I commend to the Commission's attention, would apply to eight different federal programs involving housing, including family housing constructed by the Department of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 33

Whereas the American consumer has a right to be protected against unreasonable risk of bodily harm from products purchased on the open market for the use of himself and his family;

Whereas manufacturers whose products are marketed substantially in interstate commerce are entitled to a reasonable degree of uniformity in the application of safety regulations to such products;

Whereas it is desirable to establish a commission to review the scope, adequacy, and uniformity of existing voluntary self-regulation and Federal, State, and local law relating to consumer protection against such hazardous products; and

Whereas it is desirable for such commission to make recommendations as it deems appropriate for remedial action by the President, the Congress, the States, and private industry; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a National Commission on Product Safety (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members appointed by the President from among persons who are specially qualified to serve on such Commission by virtue of their education, training, or experience.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers.

(d) The President shall designate one of the members to serve as Chairman and one to serve as Vice Chairman of the Commission.

(e) Four members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the scope and adequacy of measures now employed to protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injuries which may be caused by hazardous household products. Such study and investigation shall include consideration of the following:

(1) the identity of categories of household products, except such products excluded in section 6, which may present an unreasonable hazard to the health and safety of the consuming public;

(2) the extent to which self-regulation by industry affords such protection;

(3) the protection against such hazardous products afforded at common law in the States, including the relationship of product warranty to such protection; and

(4) a review of Federal, State, and local laws relating to the protection of consumers against categories of such hazardous products, including the scope of coverage, the effectiveness of sanctions, the adequacy of investigatory powers, the uniformity of application, and the quality of enforcement.

(b) As soon as practicable, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register a list of the categories of household products which it proposes to study and investigate. The Commission shall afford an opportunity for any interested person to submit his views concerning any category of household product on the published list.

(c) The Commission may transmit to the President and to the Congress such interim reports as it deems advisable and shall transmit its final report to the President and to the Congress not later than two years from the date of approval of this joint resolution. Such final report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems appropriate.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission, or any two members thereof as authorized by the Commission, may conduct hearings anywhere in the United States or otherwise secure data and expressions of opinions pertinent to the study. The Commission shall publish notice of any proposed hearing in the Federal Register and shall afford a reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present relevant testimony and data. In connection therewith the Commission is authorized by majority vote—

(1) to require, by special or general orders, corporations, business firms, and individuals to submit in writing such reports and answers to questions as the Commission may prescribe; such submission shall be made within such reasonable period and under oath or otherwise as the Commission may determine;

(2) to administer oaths;

(3) to require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all documentary evidence relating to the execution of its duties;

(4) in the case of disobedience to a subpena or order issued under paragraph (a) of this section, to invoke the aid of any district court of the United States in requiring compliance with such subpena or order;

(5) in any proceeding or investigation to order testimony to be taken by deposition before any person who is designated by the Commission and has the power to administer oaths, and in such instances to compel testimony and the production of evidence in the same manner as authorized under paragraphs (3) and (4) of this subsection; and

(6) to pay witnesses the same fees and mileage as are paid in like circumstances in the courts of the United States.

(b) Any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which an inquiry is carried on may, in case of refusal to obey a subpena or order of the Commission issued under subsection (a) of this section, issue an order requiring compliance therewith; and any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(c) The Commission is authorized to require directly from the head of any Federal agency available information deemed useful in the discharge of its duties. Each Federal agency is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission and to furnish all information requested by the Commission to the extent permitted by law.

(d) The Commission is authorized to enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of its duties.

(e)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), when the Commission finds that publication of any information obtained by it is in the public interest and would not give an unfair competitive advantage to any person, it is authorized to publish such information in the form and manner deemed best adapted for public use, except that data and information which would separately disclose the business transactions of any person, trade secrets, or names of customers shall be held confidential and shall not be disclosed by the Commission or its staff: *Provided, however*, That the Commission shall permit business firms or individuals reasonable access to documents furnished by them for the purpose of obtaining or copying such documents as need may arise.

(2) Prior to a finding by the Commission that the publication of any information with respect to any category of household product, is in the public interest and would not give an unfair competitive advantage to any person, the Commission shall (1) notify to

the extent practicable all known manufacturers of any such products of such contemplated finding together with a synopsis of the information being considered for publication, and (ii) afford an opportunity not longer than thirty days for any such manufacturer to submit views with respect to the contemplated publication.

(f) The Commission is authorized to delegate any of its functions to individual members of the Commission or to designate individuals on its staff and to make such rules and regulations as are necessary for the conduct of its business, except as herein otherwise provided.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. Each member of the Commission may receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each day such member is engaged upon work of the Commission, and shall be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 5 (a) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, to appoint and fix the compensation of an Executive Director and the Executive Director, with the approval of the Commission, may employ and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission, but no individual so appointed shall receive compensation in excess of the rate authorized for GS–18 by section 5332 of such title.

(b) The Executive Director, with the approval of the Commission, is authorized to obtain services in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem.

(c) The Commission is authorized to request from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this joint resolution; and each such department, agency, or independent instrumentality is authorized to cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information to the Commission upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman when acting as Chairman.

(d) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting and accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) shall be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of the General Services. Regulations of the General Services Administration for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Administrator for the administrative control of funds shall apply to appropriations of the Commission, but the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

(e) Ninety days after submission of its final report, as provided in section 2(b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

DEFINITION

SEC. 6. The term "household products" means products customarily produced or distributed for sale through retail sales agencies or instrumentalities for use by a consumer or any member of his family in or around the household. Such term does not include products regulated under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.), the Flammable Fabrics Act (15 U.S.C. 1191 et seq.), the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act (15 U.S.C. 1261 et seq.), the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) the Federal Firearms Act (15 U.S.C. 901, et seq.), the National Firearms Act (26 U.S.C. 5801, et seq.), and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 135 et seq.).

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $2,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the preamble, as amended, is agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am sure the chairman of the committee joins me in expressing appreciation not only to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for his helpful suggestions, but to the members of the staff of the Committee on Commerce, who have worked long and hard on this measure and I think have come up with a fine result. I would like to commend them for their diligent work.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I join the Senator and I also thank the Senator from Nebraska for his help.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it was a pleasure to work with such cooperative legislators.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has again demonstrated his incomparable legislative ability. By steering through the committee and today through the Senate this measure which establishes a national commission on product safety, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce has achieved another outstanding success with skill and with dispatch. He ranks without a superior when it comes to effective legislative leadership.

Joining Senator MAGNUSON to insure the overwhelming acceptance of this measure was the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the ranking minority member of the committee. Senator COTTON has always lent his highly competent and astute talents to the accomplishment of vitally important legislative proposals. The Senate is deeply indebted for his strong support and assistance.

The Senate is indebted also to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for displaying the high degree of cooperation that has characterized his many years of public service. Today we again welcomed the gracious assistance of Senator HRUSKA for assuring the efficient disposal of this measure.

Again to Senator MAGNUSON and to Senator COTTON and to the entire committee we owe our deep gratitude for enabling the Senate to act on this proposal promptly and with full consideration for the views of every member.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 65. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Alberto Rojas-Machado;

S. 130. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria Yolanda Rafaela Miranda y Monteagudo;

S. 131. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Valdes-Rodriguez;

S. 133. An act for the relief of Dr. Hector Jesus Sanchez-Hernandez;

S. 134. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael A. Penalver;

S. 135. An act for the relief of Dr. Hilario Anido-Fraguio;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Dr. Ramon Baez Hernandez;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Dr. Anselmo S. Alvarez-Gomez;

S. 173. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis G. Dediot;

S. 175. An act for the relief of Dr. Sherif Shafey;

S. 439. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Jacinto Nobo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo); and

S. 501. An act for relief of Dr. Fernando O. Garcia-Hernandez.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9029) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. MARSH, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. MAHON, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. HARRISON, and Mr. BOW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 58) to provide for the reappointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 281, H.R. 2508; that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 3, line 11, after the word "the", to strike out "States of Hawaii and" and insert "State of"; in line 12, after the word "elect", to strike out "their" and insert "its"; in line 14, after the word "than", to strike out "30" and insert "35"; on page 4, line 1, after the word "order.", to insert "This section shall not apply to any State which was redistricted by legislative Act or under court decree subsequent to the 1960 decennial census in which the percentage of deviation between the population of the largest district and the population of the smallest district as shown by such census does not exceed 5 per centum."; and, after line 6, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. If any of the provisions of this Act or any amendment made thereby, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of such Act or amendment and the application of such provisions to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Consumer Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee recently held hearings on S. 1124, the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967. Many of the witnesses appearing before the committee urged that S. 1124 be amended to incorporate the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 46, a bill to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control. Senate Joint Resolution 46 was introduced by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Senator SPARKMAN and I have conferred and we believe that these two measures should be considered together since they are both directed toward the development of a comprehensive fire safety program. Senator SPARKMAN has agreed to let the Commerce Committee consider his resolution as an amendment to S. 1124.

I wish to extend my sincere appreciation to Senator SPARKMAN for his kind cooperation in this matter. Also I want to commend Senator SPARKMAN for his leadership in promoting fire safety and assure him that the Commerce Committee will consider his resolution at an early date.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 46 and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce for his kind remarks regarding the reference of Senate Joint Resolution 46 to the Committee on Commerce.

It was my original intention to proceed with hearings in the Banking and Currency Committee on the joint resolution, which has an identical counterpart in the House in House Joint Resolution 498. The proposal would establish a 20-member Commission, appointed by the President, but not dominated by the Government, to study in depth the ever-increasing problems of fire prevention and control.

It is my firm belief that this Commission should be authorized and appointed, and that it's recommendations may well lead to progressive steps in lifting this Nation from its very low international ranking in per capita loss of lives and severe property damage caused by fire.

Shortly after I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 46, which was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Washington introduced S. 1124, the administration's bill on fire prevention, which was referred to the Commerce Committee and on which hearings were held rather soon thereafter.

It has never been my intention to block the administration's proposal for an immediate program of some $10 million in research and pilot program grants in this field, but I feel rather strongly that the study in depth by persons of competence and consequence in this field is equally important. I feel, moreover, that this whole subject is not exclusively a Department of Commerce matter. The Department of Housing and Urban Development is, by its very nature, in the midst of this growing problem, perhaps more than previous legislation had envisioned. The vast urban development and housing programs, the community facilities and transportation programs, and all of the programs administered by HUD point out that this Department should and must take into consideration the location and adequacy of fire stations and the standards of fire prevention and control in materials and design. This applies to both the construction and occupancy of the numerous buildings and facilities built or put into operation by programs under the jurisdiction of HUD.

We have enacted into law numerous programs calling for comprehensive planning in housing and urban development. Fire prevention and control should be one of the necessary items of such comprehensive planning. I can envision the possibility of many changes being made in the laws and regulations involving housing and urban development as a result of the Commission's study. Accordingly, the resolution which I introduced makes the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development a necessary member of the Commission.

I would have no objection to the Secretary of Commerce also being a necessary member. It is in this spirit that I have sent the many letters of endorsement that I have received regarding Senate Joint Resolution 46 to the Commerce Committee for inclusion in the printed hearings on S. 1124. If the committee is so disposed as to combine these two proposals, with the necessary and minor coordinating changes, it is my belief and hope that wholesome legislation embodying both an action now and a study-in-depth program will be the result.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the request of the Senator from Washington is agreed to.

DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY BUREAU

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on the nomination of Mr. William Haddon, Jr., of New York, to be Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be referred jointly to the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Public Works, because the effect is that he will be wearing two hats in the automobile safety field. There is agreement with the Committee on Public Works and the rest of the people concerned.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President.

The assistant legislative clerk read the message from the President to the Senate on the nomination of William Haddon, Jr., of New York, to be Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? Without objection, the requests of the Senator from Washington are agreed to, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as I have said many times before, the overriding long-range necessity in the eastern Mediterranean area is for peace and disarmament. The explosive situation which has developed in the Middle East in the last few days has demonstrated our failure to create conditions for an enduring peace.

Our first resort, as it should be, has been to the United Nations. I fully support the President's desire to have the crisis resolved by the U.N. through some form of cease-fire.

However, the United Nations was not able to prevent the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East, and it may well be that the U.N. will be unable to effect a much-desired cease-fire. The Arab world, supported by the Soviet Union, states that it will accept only a cease-fire that calls for the withdrawal of the forces of both sides to their positions on June 4, 1967. The United States cannot condone the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba. The precondition to a cease-fire agreement acceptable to the United States should require withdrawal to the positions of May 18, before the Egyptian forces blockaded the gulf.

The United States did more than any other country to bring Israel into existence and was the first country to recognize Israel as a State. Morally and legally we are an ally of Israel. Their cause is our cause. We are not neutral in thought, word, or deed. I am distressed by our Government's ambiguous declaration of neutrality or, in the alternative, nonbelligerence.

The stark fact is that the 19-year-old nation of Israel is now fighting for its life, and the United States has a solemn obligation to protect and defend the territorial integrity of that tiny democratic nation. We must act to honor that obligation—in concert with others, if possible; but if all alternative avenues are exhausted, then we must act alone.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I can state the substance of the bill very briefly. I do this for the purpose of expediting the matter and bringing us to the real crucial questions involved as speedily as possible.

The pending bill has a twofold purpose. One is temporary in nature and the other is permanent in nature.

The first section of the bill provides in substance that beginning with the 93d Congress, after the taking of the next decennial census, congressional guidelines will apply to all elections for the House of Representatives.

First, section 1 provides that all at-large elections beginning at that time are outlawed, and every Representative must be elected from a district rather than at-large.

It provides, second, that beginning with the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1972, the population of the largest congressional district in the particular State cannot vary more than 10 percent from that of the smallest congressional district in that State.

Third, it provides that all congressional districts, beginning in 1972, shall be contiguous.

It is my understanding that with one possible exception, the members of the Committee on the Judiciary which considered this bill were unanimously of the opinion that the permanent provision contained in the first section was desirable. The exception was that some members of the Judiciary Committee felt that there would be an additional requirement with respect to the permanent features—that is, that the congressional districts should be required to be compact. I believe that was the only difference between the members of the committee with respect to the provisions of the first section.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] if he believes that is substantially correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would mention to the distinguished Senator that there were some serious reservations with regard to the compactness.

Mr. ERVIN. I have mentioned that.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. But this is the essence in regard to that provision.

Mr. ERVIN. In other words, there was a feeling that the first section was desirable, with the exception of the suggestion made by some members of the Judiciary Committee that there should be an amendment to require the districts to be compact as well as contiguous.

The second section of H.R. 2508 is temporary in nature. It applies only to the congressional elections to be held in the fall of 1968 and 1970. As the bill passed the House, it provided that the population of the largest district in a given State could vary as much as 30 percent from that of the smallest congressional district in that State. The bill was amended in the Senate to provide for a variation of as much as 35 percent. This is the provision of the bill which is the most controversial in nature.

When the bill was before the Judiciary Committee, certain amendments were made by the committee, and they have been recommended for adoption by the Senate. One is a provision that wherever a State has been redistricted either under court order or by the legislature and the variation in the population of the largest and the smallest congressional district in the State, according to the last census, was not greater than 5 percent, those States could not be redistricted under the second section of this bill.

There was a provision in the bill, as it came from the House, that there could be no at-large elections in 1968 and 1970, except in the States of Hawaii and New Mexico. The Senate committee adopted an amendment to strike the provision applying to Hawaii and to provide that there could be no at-large elections in 1968 and 1970, except in New Mexico.

Also, there is a separatability clause which provides that if any provision of the bill is unconstitutional, the other will nevertheless remain in full force and effect.

I believe those are substantially all of the amendments, except some to change the phraseology to conform in that respect.

To facilitate matters, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be adopted en bloc, with the understanding that the text will be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not a member of the committee, and I am merely asking these questions for the purposes of information.

Am I correct in my understanding that in each State entitled, in the 93d Congress or in any subsequent Congress, to more than one Representative, the State shall be divided into districts, with the condition attached that no district shall have a population greater than 10 percent above the number of inhabitants in the smallest district?

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator's understanding is correct. That would be the first congressional election after the taking of the next census. In other words, that would take effect in 1972.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Section 2 provides that in the 91st Congress, wherever a State is entitled to more than one Representative, the State shall be subdivided into districts in which the largest district shall not have a population 35 percent greater than the number of inhabitants in the smallest district, except in the State of New Mexico, which has a Congressman-at-large.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is correct. That provision would apply only during the 1968 and the 1970 elections.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So that this bill contemplates taking care of the interim vote, which constitutes the 93d Congress, and thereafter fixes what shall be the districting on a permanent basis.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there any other significant phase of the bill upon which I have not touched, about which the Senator from North Carolina wishes to inform me?

Mr. ERVIN. I believe the Senator has touched on the salient features of the bill. Of course, in section 1 there is a provision that the districts shall be contiguous.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. I renew my unanimous-consent request.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc, and the bill is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr President, I wish to state the necessity or the desirability of the bill. The bill is an outgrowth of the case of Wesberry against Sanders, which was decided by the Supreme Court in a divided opinion on February 17, 1964. The case is reported in 376 U.S. 1. In that case the Supreme Court held that the Legislature of Georgia had malapportioned the congressional districts of that State. This case undertakes to apply the newly devised option of one-man, one-vote to congressional districts.

Mr. President, it is to be noted that in the case of Wesberry against Sanders there was a wide variation between the population of the largest district in Georgia and the other districts, far in excess of the 35-percent variation provided by section 2 of the bill, as amended.

In the Georgia case, which was brought by qualified voters and citizens of the Fifth Congressional District, the variation between the largest district which was the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia, and that of the average district was 100 percent in population. The Court struck that down with an able dissenting opinion by Justice Harlan, who, I think, very soundly said that this was a political, not a judicial question.

Be that is it may, we have in the United States today 21 States whose apportionments by legislatures either involve court actions or may possibly involve court actions prior to the 1968 elections. In other words, about one-half the Members of the House of Representatives do not know at this hour the territory in which they will be compelled to run for renomination or reelection next year, and they may not know for many months. This is, of course, an intolerable condition for persons who desire to be candidates for nomination or who desire to be candidates for election to the House of Representatives. It means that approximately one-half the Members of the House of Representatives as now constituted are now ignorant as to the districts in which they will have to run next year.

It seems to me that the bill should be passed in order to remove that uncertainty.

Mr. President, another consideration which, it seems to me, demands the passage of the bill is that if we do not pass it in its present form, or substantially in its present form, there will be no congressional guidelines of any character in respect to the election of Representatives, and we shall have the courts exercising what I contend is really a political function, or at least a State function, without any guidelines laid down by anybody except, perhaps, judges.

We are told that legislation is the art of the obtainable. I say, facetiously, that if I could devise a piece of legislation all by myself, without the interference of other Senators and without the interference of Members of the House of Representatives, I could draw quite a perfect bill. At least, I so flatter myself in my facetious moments. However, as we all know, before a bill can become law it has to get the assent not only of 51 Senators or a majority of those present and voting, but it also has to get the assent of the majority of the House of Representatives, a majority of the 435 Representatives, or such of them as are present and voting. The bill attempts to let the proper body lay down the guidelines for the election of Members of the House of Representatives.

This is the bill which the House of Representatives, the body which is principally concerned, has passed and by its vote has asked the Senate to pass.

Under the original Constitution, there is no requirement for the election of Representatives by districts. However, all of us recognize that Representatives should be elected by districts. We recognize that to be true because it gives the people at home the best opportunity to get a Representative who will look after the peculiar interests of that district. But that is not a requirement of the Constitution. On this subject, the Constitution provides only that membership in the House of Representatives shall be based upon population and that the population shall be enumerated—that is, the population of the entire State and not the population of a district. Then the State is allocated its proportionate part of the membership of the House on the basis of the statewide population.

Until the decision in the Wesberry case, the Supreme Court had uniformly held that the apportionment of seats in Congress was a political, not a judicial question. The Supreme Court, up to that time, had said, "We will not enter this political thicket." But they did enter it in this case. As a result, there is great uncertainty in the law. The Wesberry case was based upon the proposition that the original Constitution required one man, one vote. The fact is that a more absurd proposition has never been made. Under article I of the Constitution, persons are qualified to vote only if they possess the qualifications for voting as prescribed by the State legislature for the most numerous branch of the State legislature. In a great many States of the Union at that time, there were property qualifications for voting. There is nothing in the Constitution—the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the Wesberry case to the contrary notwithstanding—to justify the theory that the original Constitution ever intended that there should be one man, one vote, since many men were denied the right to vote at the time the Constitution was ratified because they did not have property or other qualifications.

The Court held to the contrary in the Wesberry case. If the Constitution requires one man, one vote in every congressional district in the United States, then it requires one man, one vote in every election ever held for the House of Representatives. Even today, with the rapid growth and shift of population in the United States, there is not a single human being in the United States who can say with any degree of assurance that a single congressional district, of the 435 in the United States, is now apportioned, or will be apportioned in 1968 or in 1970, on the basis of one man, one vote.

As I have said, the Constitution does not require redistricting. But if the Constitution requires the apportionment of congressional districts on the one-man, one-vote theory, not only does it require it immediately after a new census is taken; it also requires it at the next election, 2 years later, and at succeeding elections, 6 years or 8 years hence. Thus, when the Court entered this political thicket, it also introduced a great deal of uncertainty into it. If the Constitution required what the majority states in the Wesberry case, the Constitution would require congressional districts to be reapportioned before every election, every 2 years, in order to make certain that the doctrine enunciated in the Wesberry case was carried out.

Thus, taking this uncertainty into consideration, as well as the factor asserted by me a moment ago, that no human being in the United States can assert with any assurance that in 1968 any district in the United States will be apportioned on the one-man, one-vote theory, it seems to me that the reasonable and sensible thing for Congress to do is to remove the uncertainty from those who might seek congressional seats, and let Congress establish the guidelines.

After all, each House of Congress is the sole judge of the qualifications and election of its own Members. The House of Representatives, which, under the Constitution, is the judge of the qualifications and the election of its own Members, rather than a majority of the Supreme Court, has asked that the bill be passed by a majority vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ERVIN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I strongly approve the position taken by the distinguished Senator and his committee. I note that under the second section of the 14th amendment, there is the provision—"Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers"—and so forth——

Mr. ERVIN. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. But it is not under that section, as I understand it, that the Senator is proposing his legislation.

Mr. ERVIN. No. I would say to the Senator that under the first article, this bill is relevant to section 2—the portion of section 2 of the 14th amendment which the Senator read, stating that—

> Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, . . .

As the Senator from Florida remembers, at the time of the adoption of the original Constitution, slavery existed in the United States. One of the great compromises in drafting the Constitution was that which related to how slaves were to be counted. It provided there that only three-fifths of the slaves would be counted.

Of course, when the 14th amendment came along, after the 13th amendment, which had abolished slavery, the provision which the Senator from Florida read was inserted into the Constitution to take care of the fact that slavery had been abolished. So everybody was to be counted except Indians on reservations and ones not taxed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand the provision. I thank the Senator. But now the Supreme Court has announced its one-man, one-vote principle.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes, but it did that under this provision: It took section 2 of article I, which states:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States—

It said that provision required one man, one vote. But in reaching their conclusion, the majority of the Court ignored the second part of the sentence, which states—

> and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. HOLLAND. I very strongly feel that Congress should speak out on this matter; should leave a guideline for the Supreme Court; should exercise its own jurisdiction; and should not leave the matter where the courts alone, within their own discretion, without much political knowledge, make the decision.

We recently had a case in Florida in the matter of State legislative redistricting which does not make our people highly confident that the courts will use sound discretion in legislative redistricting, either State or congressional under the one-man, one-vote principle.

One other point, if I may make it, is that anything which Congress may do is entirely approximate, because it would be based, at best, on the census which took place 7 years ago. In my State the status of the population in various sections of the State has changed very greatly since that time. That is true in other States. Having in mind that we are to have another decennial census in 1970, 4 years from now, or 3 years after the end of this year, it is by all means the wiser course to allow the next approximation—and that is the best we will have—to be based on the best figures available, under the 1970 census.

To talk about having a new redistricting every year or two is hopelessly confusing to the people and candidates and is not calculated to have the best men offer for office because of the confusion it would cause.

I compliment the Senator. I shall support the proposal.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator from North Carolina is making an extremely compelling case. I do not want to interrupt him with questions during the course of his presentation. There are a number of remarks with respect to which there was certainly wide divergence of opinion in the committee, and I shall, perhaps at some time later this afternoon, ask questions about the legislation, and introduce a substitute, after the Senator from North Carolina has completed his remarks. But, since the Senator from Florida mentioned the question of guidelines being established, and the Senator from North Carolina has talked to that point, I will address myself to it for a moment.

Certainly all of us agree that, both under the Constitution and the various cases which have been decided by the respective courts, there are guidelines necessary in the area of congressional districting. Of course, many of us would maintain that clear guidelines have, to a considerable extent, been established in a number of court opinions.

But there is a fundamental question, to which I would wish to direct the attention of the Senator, with regard to H.R. 2508. What is the opinion of the floor manager of the bill as to the effect of this legislation on the courts when they review what the State legislatures do? Is it the opinion of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina that if this legislation were to pass, those States which have a divergence of 35 percent or above would automatically have to be redistricted, but that those with a figure below 35 percent may maintain their present districts, no matter what the level of variation, and will not be subject to the standards enunciated in recent court opinions? Or would the Senator agree with me that this legislation merely establishes an absolute ceiling of 35 percent and below that figure the States would still be required to comply with the guidelines enunciated by the courts?

Mr. ERVIN. As I construe the bill, it would give any State permission to redistrict under the provisions of section 2 of the bill for the 1968 and 1970 elections.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would like to review the House debate with my colleague, because I put a different interpretation on it than does the distinguished Senator. As I read the debate——

Mr. ERVIN. Was the Senator directing his question to whether this is mandatory to follow the Court's decision, or whether it requires a State to redistrict?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The answer to either question would be fine. I would certainly accept the Senator's interpretation in regard to the fact that the bill would permit States to redistrict. But the question is, what kind of redistricting would it permit?

Mr. ERVIN. If a State is under a court order to redistrict, as I construe it, that State, and that State alone, would be required to redistrict under section 2 of the act in order to get out from under the court order; but if it was not under court order, it would be optional whether it did it or not.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I wish to refer to the ceiling which is contained within the legislation itself, the 35 percent, and ask how that ceiling, as contained in H.R. 2508, is to be a guideline to the various States. Does it mean that they will be able to have a discretionary divergence between the highest and the lowest, up to 35 percent, without giving any reasons or justification, and that only States having a variation above 35 percent will have to be automatically redistricted. Or does it mean that the recent court interpretations, some of which have been referred to by the Senator from North Carolina, will still be the controlling factors in the States with variations under 35 percent?

In that regard, in the course of the debate in the House, there were certain statements which I should like to review with the Senator. Mr. Conyers said:

> I would be delighted to answer that because the same question troubled us in the committee. The bill would be mandatory on the courts. It would invite a great number of courts that have already redistricted to consider some other plan that would produce up to a 30-percent deviation.

The colloquy continued as follows:

> Mr. Holifield. The gentleman's statement is borne out by the committee report.
>
> Mr. Rodino. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
>
> Mr. Conyers. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.
>
> Mr. Rodino. I have a different interpretation entirely. I am sure the language is not mandatory but is merely instructional and a guideline for the courts. There is certainly no attempt to mandate the court that it should carry it out as such. I am sure the gentleman recognizes that.
>
> Mr. Conyers. I stand corrected, then. I was in all of the committee proceedings. If this language is not mandatory but permissive on the courts, I stand corrected. But I must say that after careful review I cannot find anything in the bill or in case law which would indicate that this bill would be anything but mandatorily binding on the courts.
>
> Mr. Celler. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
>
> Mr. Conyers. I yield to the chairman of the committee.
>
> Mr. Celler. I think the gentleman should stand corrected. We could not issue a mandate to the court, as the gentleman from New Jersey said. This language is permissive. When the court would interpret the nature of the lines, it would undoubtedly take the guidelines into most serious consideration, but that would not be absolute. That would be persuasive,

Now I am interested to hear from the Senator from North Carolina whether he interprets the 35-percent provision to mean that any congressional district which has the difference of up to 35 percent will necessarily, as a result of this legislation, still be valid for Congresses up to the Congress which will take its seats in 1973.

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad the Senator has asked that question, because, the way it was explained, I did not understand his first question.

I think as far as the States are concerned, it is permissive; that is, the State can redistrict; it has that authority, even if it is under court order.

Where a State desires to redistrict, even when under court orders, it would have authority to do so under this act.

I think that this act would be permissive, as I see it, as applied to the States and it is mandatory as applied to the courts. If passed it will be an act of Congress. I think the courts would have to recognize the validity of the statute, or say it is unconstitutional.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. There are a number of States which are under court order to redistrict because the Supreme Court has stated that the existing difference between the largest and smallest district has exceeded the minor variations permitted by the Constitution. If we were to pass this legislation, and if it were interpreted to say that as soon as the difference is less than 35 percent, the State will not have to redistrict, the situation, as I see it, would be extremely disturbing. Although the courts have said, on the one hand, that the divergence, whether it is 22 percent or 17 percent, violates the Constitution and must be reduced, we, on the other hand, would in effect be saying that they may have a divergence of 35 percent, and that they still will not have to redistrict for two more elections.

Mr. ERVIN. Well, I would not predict what the Supreme Court might do. As long as the Supreme Court followed precedents, I could predict, I would say rather successfully, how it would rule in given cases. But I would not venture to do that now.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Is it the Senator's intention for the States to have that understanding, that they would not have to redistrict?

Mr. ERVIN. I do not think this bill would require any State to redistrict. I think as far as the States are concerned, this must be considered to be a permissive act, with the exception of States——

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Over the 35 percent?

Mr. ERVIN. With the exception that States under court order would have to redistrict to obtain release from the court order. Of course, if they are under court order, then they would remain under the court order unless they see fit to redistrict in such a manner that the largest district does not exceed the smallest by more than 35 percent.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. But does this mean that, after the courts have found that the districting in a given State with a variance of either 17 or 22 percent is in violation of constitutional rights, the passage of this legislation would allow the State to maintain the invalid districting as long as the variation does not exceed 35 percent. That is, is the Senator suggesting that there will be no obligation, therefore, on the respective States to make any additional adjustments in their congressional districts, if the difference between their smallest and largest districts does not exceed 35 percent?

Mr. ERVIN. I think there is no obligation whatever on any State to act under this bill. I think it merely gives them permission to act in conformity with the bill. If they do not act, they will take the consequences, whatever they may be.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. To bring the matter into more practical terms, would this permit the State of North Carolina, for example, which is now under court order to redistrict and where the State legislature is now considering a redistricting plan with a variation of 5 percent, to redistrict to provide a difference of up to 35 percent?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It is the Senator's understanding, then, that this legislation would permit not only North Carolina, but other States, to redistrict to permit a variation between districts up to the top limit this legislation provides, that is, up to the 35-percent maximum?

Mr. ERVIN. This bill would permit any of the 50 States to redistrict, if they saw fit, provided they did not exceed the guidelines in section 2.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The thing that troubles me is that, as I understand it, the three-judge Federal court in North Carolina, in the case of Drum against Seawell, found that a difference of 19 percent was unconstitutional. What we are now saying, in effect, if I understand the Senator's last response correctly, is that under his interpretation of H.R. 2508, the Legislature of North Carolina would now be permitted to redistrict up to 35 percent, and still be within the law, for at least two more elections?

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad the Senator called attention to the three-judge district court decision in North Carolina. They held that the redistricting in North Carolina was unconstitutional. We had a variation, I think, of about 19 percent. We have a variation now of 17 percent. The court said that notwithstanding the fact that the legislature went ahead and redistricted so that there was a maximum variation of 17 percent, the plan was still unconstitutional, or at least it did not satisfy the one-man, one-vote principle. Nevertheless, the situation being temporary in nature, taking into consideration all the exigencies and uncertainties, they said, "We will permit the election to be held next time with this 17-percent variation."

So, North Carolina has 11 Representatives in the House of Representatives now who have been elected and are exercising their constitutional powers as Members of the House of Representatives on a temporary basis.

I think that proves that the court is likely to sustain section 2, or is likely at least to say: "We will recognize this since it is temporary in nature, and not interfere with it."

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I might perhaps agree with the Senator from North Carolina if the temporary nature were restricted to one election in 1966. However, what we are talking about under the bill is really three elections.

Mr. ERVIN. Two elections.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. There would be a third election before we would have compliance, by 1972, in North Carolina. There would be 1966, 1968, and 1970.

Mr. ERVIN. This would only apply to the 91st and 92d Congresses. The 91st Congress, as I understand it, will be elected in 1968, and the 92d Congress would be elected in 1970. The first part of this measure would go into effect after the taking of the 1970 census.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. There was still an unconstitutional divergence in 1966.

Mr. ERVIN. No. We did not know anything about this divergence then. It was perfectly all right everywhere. It was all very constitutional and everything was all right until the 17th day of February 1964, which was 175 years after George Washington took his oath of office as President of the United States.

Everything was all right from 1789 until the 17th day of February 1964. If the provision existed for that long a time and did not wreck the country, it would seem to me that it would not wreck the country if we were to continue it for an additional 4 years.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It is my understanding that Congress beginning in 1872 had a requirement to the effect that a district must contain as nearly as possible an equal number of people.

Mr. ERVIN. And shortly thereafter that provision was repealed.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It remained in effect until 1929.

Mr. ERVIN. Nobody paid any attention to it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. But it should not come as a surprise that this was one of the criteria that would be considered.

Mr. ERVIN. I would say that would be perfectly all right. The Constitution still said, even after the Supreme Court rendered an opinion in the Westbury case, that the House of Representatives is the judge of its own Members. That is constitutional.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FINANCE COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT ON PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance have such time as it may require, not to exceed the length of this session of Congress, to report on amendments to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, reserving the right to object; I did not hear the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator repeat his request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance have such time as it may require, not to exceed the length of the current session, to report on amendments to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask what the occasion is for asking for consent of that kind? Is there any present time limitation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. We would be required to report today, and we are conducting hearings on the matter, proceeding as rapidly as circumstances permit. However, 6 weeks ago the majority leader made a motion that would require us to report with regard to amendments to that legislation, and we had 6 weeks from the date of that motion.

I have discussed this matter with the majority leader, and I have also let the minority leader know about the matter. One of our assistants has informed the minority leader, who was a member of the committee.

We could ask for some date certain. I would not object to someone coming forth with some suggestion of a date certain. However, it will take us some time to arrive at a conclusion in the committee.

I wish we could study this subject as any other committee would do, giving full assurance that we will report back in this session and will not seek to delay the matter until the next session.

I hope tnat we might have the same consideration on this matter that any other committee would have.

Mr. HRUSKA. I would not have any disposition to be an obstructionist about the matter. However, there was a reason for selecting today as the date.

This is the first time that I have heard of the request. I wonder if the Senator would agree to holding that request in abeyance for a little while to allow for conferences and exchange of views.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance have until tomorrow to report on amendments to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act.

Mr. HRUSKA. Either late this afternoon or tomorrow.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Could we agree that we may have until tomorrow to report? We cannot report today. We cannot schedule a meeting that soon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana that the committee have until tomorrow to report? The chair hears no objection and it was so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, 6 weeks ago the Committee on Finance was mandated to report today its recommendation in the way of legislation for a campaign financing law containing adequate safeguards and guidelines. The chairman of the committee has indicated an additional 45 days are necessary, and I accordingly ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance have an additional 45 days to report on this matter. This request has been cleared with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and with the distinguished ranking minority member of the Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I was somewhat disappointed to find myself on the floor today to discuss H.R. 2508. I had hoped that we would not reach the subject of congressional redistricting until at least the week after next. I mention this not because I have any desire for unnecessary delay in our consideration of this subject, but because this is a subject which deserves the most careful and detailed consideration in this body. As it is, I expect that our discussion on this subject will occupy at the very least a couple of days of our time, and that, therefore, we will be interrupted by priority bills such as the railway labor bill, the Selective Service Extension, and other pending business.

I also raise this question of timing because I believe that the American people and the American press have not yet had an opportunity to examine the very serious policy issues raised by H.R. 2508.

In the last 2 or 3 weeks the media and the public have begun to become aware of, and concerned about, what had been an effort to pass very quietly what many of us believe to be a piece of legislation which would be an embarrassment to Congress if passed in its present form. But it was only yesterday that the public and press had access to the judiciary committee report and the minority and individual views of the six members of the judiciary committee who have serious problems with the bill.

While I am sure that no Member of this body will vote on the measure, or on the amendments which will be offered, without reading the contents of Senate Report No. 291, it will be virtually impossible for us to have time to hear from our constituents unless we have an extended period to consider this bill. From the first reactions which I have received already I know that there will be a great public outcry about the bill, once the public realizes what is happening. Later in these discussions I shall be reading some of the letters I have received which illustrate the public's attitude, but at this time I will say only that the public deserves more of an opportunity to reflect on—and make known their views on—the many controversial aspects of H.R. 2508 raised in the Judiciary Committee report.

Mr. President, the reason the public is and should be concerned about H.R. 2508 is that the bill in its present form will be seen by some State legislatures as an invitation to postpone vindication of a constitutional right which the framers of the Constitution sought to protect 180 years ago, which Congress itself has repeatedly supported, and which the Supreme Court rearticulated 3 years and 3 months ago. The principle I refer to, of course, is that of one man, one vote—the right of equal numbers of people to equal representation in Congress.

And that is not all that the bill does, or rather invites the State legislatures to try to do. The bill in its present form would constitute an invitation and incitement to gerrymandering as bad as, or worse than, present gerrymandering practices, precisely at a time when the States have been put on notice that if they do not improve their record in this regard, the courts will again be forced to do it for them.

I, as much as any one in this body, would like to see Congress pass a bill which would meet the Federal Government's constitutional responsibility to supervise the States in their exercise of the important duty of defining House districts. Such a bill would end the bitter and expensive litigation which has wasted the energy and talent of so many people in so many States. It would assure that the State legislatures stay within the bounds of the Constitution, thus strengthening their districting plans against future attack. It would address the gerrymandering problem in such a way that the State legislatures and State courts and lower Federal courts could deal with the issue on a statutory basis, rather than forcing the Supreme Court to treat it on a constitutional basis. It would be carefully drafted so as to be as clear and as meaningful as possible. It would be a bill, in short, which solves problems instead of creating them. Unfortunately H.R. 2508 in its present form not only fails on each of these counts, but would produce exactly the opposite effect.

Mr. President, again I express my hope and expectation that each Member of the Senate will read the minority and individual views in report No. 291 which accompanies the bill before us. I shall at this time review only briefly the points raised there, since I am sure we will over the coming days have a chance to go into them individually in the course of debate on the bill and on several amendments which will be introduced.

Through all the substantive problems which need to be raised runs the thread of the procedural problems to which I have already referred. That is, not only in the Senate, but also in the House, the examination of this bill has been marked by haste, inadequate public discussion, pro forma committee consideration without hearings, and a general lack of attention on a matter which affects every citizen of the United States and his participation in our democratic government. This is not to say that a speedily passed bill is necessarily a bad bill, or that every bill needs hearings in both Houses; but in this case the haste and low visibility have contributed directly to the many problems of meaning, intent, validity, and efficacy which H.R. 2508 as now drafted presents.

The bill's proponents say that it offers "guidelines" to the States, yet it can hardly do so when its language says one thing, some of its backers say another, other of its backers say something else, and logic suggests still another interpretation. If we look at the bill as reported out of committee, it says only—so far as district population goes—that the population of the largest district may not exceed the population of the smallest district in a State by more than 35 percent. Now, we know that the Supreme Court has already struck down, as violative of the one-man, one-vote rule, districting plans with maximum variations of 22.9 and 21.9 percent, and that the Supreme Court of New Jersey has invalidated a plan with a maximum variation of 17.3 percent. We know that the Supreme Court has said that any variations from equality of districts must be de minimis, and must be justified by rational State policies which support legitimate goals, such as compactness, contiguity, or recognition of legal or natural boundary lines. We know that since the last census, 11 States have achieved equality in districting to the point where their largest and smallest districts differ in population by less than 10 percent. And there are others, including the State of the distinguished manager of this bill, where redistricting commissions, of one house of the State legislature, or a competent court, have redistricted, or are ready to redistrict, with a maximum variation below 10 or even 5 percent. In North Carolina, where the Court struck down a plan with a 19-percent variation, the State senate has passed a bill with 5 percent variation. In Tennessee, where the invalid plan had a variation of 32.7 percent, the Court last weekend adopted a plan with 1.3 percent. And we know that there are many other States where courts have ordered redistricting in time for the 1968 election, notwithstanding arguments that the State would like more time to comply with the mandates of the Constitution.

We have, then, these facts, and we have the simple language of the statute, which merely sets an outside limit on population variation. Yet, in some way which I cannot understand, there are those who believe that, despite the language, and despite the facts, judges will read the present language of the bill to mean something it does not, and could not, mean—namely, that the States may ignore the Constitution, may do whatever they please in the way of districting, and may maintain or institute unequal districts without any justification, so long as they stay within the 35-percent limit.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would prefer to finish and then respond to questions, if that would be agreeable.

Mr. ERVIN. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Certainly, 35 percent is not a minor, or de minimis, variation. Certainly no variation for which no reason is given can be a justified variation. The bill itself recognizes that the Constitution requires something much more reasonable, for in the so-called permanent section of the bill, the outside limit on inequality is 10 percent. It seems to me that if it is the judgment of Congress that 10 percent is the most inequality which should be allowed beginning with the 93d Congress, it is irrational to suggest that 35 percent is a reasonable limit for the 91st and 92d Congresses. The argument that the 35-percent provision is only temporary is no answer. It does not take 5 years to redistrict in good faith—5 months would be more than adequate. What is more, we are not talking about something novel or difficult to achieve, or something which produces hardships for large numbers of people, or which is retroactive. We are talking about a right embedded in the Constitution, central to the principles of our Government and vital to the maintenance of freedom and equality. The Constitution cannot be ignored; it cannot be postponed; it should not be obstructed or subverted. If we are to set an example for the Nation of lawfulness and dedication to justice, it is our responsibility to see that the Constitution is preserved and protected. No public official can believe that 5 years of maintenance of the status quo can be worth dilution and delay of respect for the letter and the spirit of the law.

Thus, Mr. President, I do not think the courts will read this kind of meaning into H.R. 2508 if it is passed in its present form; for the courts will interpret the language and intent to be that of a reasonable Congress, and a reasonable Congress could not intend to flout the Constitution.

Very much the same point can be made about the compactness provision of the bill. For the first three decades of this century, Congress directed that the States constitute their districts from compact territory. Such congressional direction has been lacking since then, and the results have been an embarrassment to our tradition of fairness and reason in government. It is obvious that the States are not capable of doing or are not willing to do the job themselves in many instances, and that the time for congressional action has once again arrived. The original version of H.R. 2508, as well as the bill passed by the House last year, contained a straightforward mandate that the States district in "as compact form as practicable." The House Judiciary Committee added a few words which changed the provision to read "in as reasonably a compact form as the State finds practicable," explaining that this was necessary to give the States flexibility to take account of local governmental units. Again, some people have suggested that this language will be read to have a much deeper meaning—namely, that the Federal courts will be excluded from ever considering compactness of congressional districts. But again, however, I have faith that the courts would ultimately attribute to us a rational intent because we are rational men. Surely, upon finding that the States have for many years been abusing their discretion to draw congressional districts, a rational Congress would not respond by not only sanctioning, but also making inviolate and unreviewable the exercise and abuse of that discretion. Thus, the Federal courts would and should conclude that, in the absence of the most specific language, Congress could not have intended to oust the courts from jurisdiction, and certainly did not succeed in doing so.

Mr. President, it may be asked why, if I believe that the courts will ultimately reach what I consider to be an acceptable reading of these provisions, I believe they should be eliminated. The answer is obvious. The political, judicial, and public debate over the meaning of the 35-percent clause would take the time of State legislatures, courts of all types, and State officials for the next several years. Under certain interpretations, it might even foment new legislation and litigation in States where everyone had believed that a legal and acceptable solution had been reached. In this respect it would be better to have no legislation than section 2 of H.R. 2508. The debate over the compactness clause would, under the bill, not even begin until the 93d Congress, thus insuring that the conflict and controversy over districting extends not only for the next half a dozen years, but for the years following. And the question of interpretation of the clause could only be reached when State legislatures disobeyed the compactness mandate, and yielded to pressures to gerrymander their districts politically, or racially or economically, thus, the bill itself would become an invitation to gerrymandering. Again, here, it would be better to have no bill than H.R. 2508.

However, I do not propose that we pass no bill on congressional districting. I believe that Congress has a constitutional and ethical responsibility to provide the States with guidance on this important matter. And I believe that much of the pioneering and foresighted work of Chairman Celler of the House Judiciary Committee over the past 17 years can be salvaged if we but give this bill the time, attention, and amendment it deserves.

Mr. President, I now call up my amendment No. 202 to H.R. 2508.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. I shall explain the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

Beginning with line 3, page 1, strike out all to and including line 4, page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled 'An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives' (46 Stat. 26, as amended; 2 U.S.C. 2) is amended by striking out subsection (c) and inserting in place thereof the following:

" '(c) In each State entitled in the Ninety-first Congress or in any subsequent Congress to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative. Each district shall at all times be composed of contiguous territory, including adjoining insular territory, in as reasonably compact a form as practicable, and the districts within each State shall contain substantially equal numbers of persons, as determined under the then most recent decennial census, except as provided in subsection (d) of this section. A State may make reasonable deviations from numerical equality in order to take into consideration the factors of contiguity, compactness, extraordinary natural boundaries, and the maintenance of the integrity of political subdivision lines, but only if such criteria are uniformly applied. No such deviation may cause the population of the district with the largest population in a State to exceed by more than 10 per centum the population of the district with the smallest population in that State, as determined under the then most recent decennial census, except as provided in subsection (d) of this section.

" '(d) Districts in compliance with subsection (c) of this section shall be established for the regular election of Members of the House of Representatives next following the year in which each decennial census of the United States is taken. Nothing in this section shall prohibit a State from reestablishing such districts more often than once in each ten-year period. Any reestablishment of such districts within any State which is to take effect for any regular election other than the regular election next following the year in which a decennial census of the United States is taken, shall be based upon population figures compiled by a census of that State taken pursuant to the Act of August 26, 1954, as amended (71 Stat. 481; 13 U.S.C. 8), not more than two years prior to the election to which such districting will first apply.

" '(e) Any person in any State meeting the qualifications for voting in an election of a Member of the House of Representatives from that State may bring an action in the district court of the United States for the district of which he is a resident, without regard to any amount in controversy, or in any court of competent jurisdiction of the State of which he is a resident, to enforce the provisions of this section with regard to the State in which he resides, and the court in which such action is brought shall have authority to issue all orders and decrees necessary to bring such State into compliance with this section.'

"Sec. 2. Each State entitled in the Ninety-first Congress to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled 'An Act to provide for apportionment of Representatives' (46 Stat. 26), as amended, shall have or establish districts complying with the provisions of that section, as amended by section 1 of this Act, before the time of the election of Representatives to that Congress, except that such districts of any State shall be deemed to be in compliance with that section as so amended if they meet the criteria set forth therein as computed on the basis of the Eighteenth Decennial Census of the United States or of any subsequent special census of that State conducted pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1954, as amended (71 Stat. 481; 13 U.S.C. 8)."

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the amendment which I propose today to H.R. 2508 is designed both to clarify any potential confusions in the bill and to set clear standards for the redistricting which will have to be done.

In States entitled to have more than one representative, the number of districts would equal the number of representatives to which the State is entitled. One representative is to be elected from each of these districts and there are to be no representatives at large.

The standards used to determine the districts are clear; the districts must be contiguous and compact. The amendment clarifies "contiguous" to include adjoining insular territory. The reference to a State finding of compactness is deleted in order to avoid confusion about the reviewability of compliance with this requirement.

Any deviations which the State makes from equality must be justified, either by the standards of compactness and contiguity, or by natural barriers or geographical boundaries. They will be considered justified only when these standards are reasonably and uniformly applied throughout the State. In keeping with the House standard, no deviation of more than 10 percent between the population of the smallest district and that of the largest district will be allowed.

Section (D) of the proposed amendment requires redistricting to comply with the established standards in time for the first election following a decennial census which shows the need for such redistricting. This amendment retains the requirement that redistricting for other elections shall be based on special statewide censuses taken within 2 years before the election.

The proposed amendment also includes a provision not found in the House bill which is designed to clarify jurisdiction and standing in the courts. Jurisdiction of both Federal and State courts is recognized, but standing is restricted to persons meeting voting qualifications within the State.

This amendment retains the House bill provisions that redistricting until 1972 may be based on either the 1960 census or a special statewide census.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

(The following proceedings, dealing with the subject of the situation in the Middle East, took place during the delivery of the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]:)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a moment for an extraordinary request, with the understanding that the intervention will appear after his remarks? The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Oregon find themselves in a difficult parliamentary situation. The Senator from New York has to go to Geneva to the North Atlantic Treaty Conference, and I have to go to the White House to meet with advisers of the President in connection with the oncoming railway measure to be taken up tomorrow.

I would like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts to oblige us, and I would appreciate it very much if he would consent to yield to us for not more than 20 minutes, 10 minutes apiece, to discuss a matter that we will discuss this afternoon before we keep these two engagements.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. With the understanding that I do not lose the floor, and that the comments of the Senators will appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD, and with the understanding that the Senator from Oregon after his return from the White House will enlighten the Senate on this matter, I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? Hearing no objection, the Senator from Oregon is recognized.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, few countries have come into nationhood with a greater record of determination and sacrifice than has the country of Israel. The people who survived the Nazi holocaust in Europe provided much of the inspiration and skill that went into transforming a historic national aspiration into a movement that finally resulted in the creation of a Jewish state.

As much as have any people in history, the people who made Israel a state did it by their own muscle, talent, and a resolve born of the knowledge that there was no place left in the world for them, if not Israel. The early years of few nations can match the spirit and defiance of great odds that marked the early days of their nation.

Israel fought for its freedom without outside help. It was the creation of no other country; to the contrary, its creation came only out of the midst of passionate opposition.

In 1948, the United States extended formal recognition to Israel, and thereby gave it a considerable degree of acceptance in the community of nations. The great leadership of President Truman at the time, his support of partition, and the influence he exercised on other nations to recognize the importance of the creation of the Jewish state, will stand to his everlasting historic credit. I do not presume to say that our recognition was responsible for its existence, because the record had shown Americans that Israel was going to stay on the map in face of all odds, and I suspect we recognized a fait accompli.

But nonetheless, the United States responded to the knowledge that here was a nation that had proved itself deserving of diplomatic acceptance.

But we did more than that. After the Arab-Israeli war of 1948, the United States, Britain, and France undertook to underwrite her existence through the tripartite agreement. That agreement, as we know, did not constitute a pact that named Israel as the beneficiary; it simply stated:

> The three governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and without the United Nations, to prevent such violation.

It did not require joint action, but each nation reserved the right to act unilaterally, as well.

It was not Israel that was then, or now, threatening to annihilate her neighbors, or drive them into the sea. The tripartite agreement was drawn up and signed by the parties in a context where only Israel was likely to be the victim of plans to violate frontiers or armistice lines.

In short, we gave Israel reason to think we would assist her in case of attack by her Arab neighbors. The tripartite agreement does not say what kind of assistance, nor need it. It simply says we would take "immediate action," consistent with our obligations as a member of the United Nations.

In 1956, when Britain and France plotted with Israel to violate the borders of her Arab neighbors, the United States lived up to the letter of its signature on that agreement of 1950. We vigorously opposed the effort to seize the Suez Canal; upon our representations, the British forces withdrew. We labored diligently in the United Nations to work out an arrangement whereby Israel forces also withdrew, supporting the United Nations Emergency Force that was sent to patrol the armistice.

We took, in other words, immediate action in 1956 in the form of diplomatic pressure to prevent violation of the frontiers of Egypt when she was under assault.

In light of these events, I found it incomprehensible that the Department of State could announce, as it did yesterday, through one of its spokesmen that the United States was "neutral in thought, word, and deed," in the current war. The tripartite agreement, and the affirmations of it that have followed since 1950, was no declaration of neutrality. To the contrary, it was a declaration that we would take immediate action to prevent violations of frontiers and armistice lines in the Middle East.

I think the President deserves great credit for what he did when notified of this statement by a spokesman from the Department of State. The President made perfectly clear that it did not represent the position of his administration. In fact, the President's statement made it perfectly clear that we were not going to stand by and not carry out the obligations we owed in connection with responsibilities to Israel. It was altered to say the United States is not a belligerent.

In 1956 we took action to carry out our obligation. We did all we could through direct diplomatic channels and through the United Nations to compel Israel to give up what she had won on the field of battle. She did give up what she had won, thinking that she had assurances that henceforth the world would recognize the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran as an international waterway without Israel having to hold their shores by force of arms.

Do not forget that the Arab world went along. Why? They went along because they were defeated. There was nothing that stood between Israel and Cairo had the Israel forces pressed on. There were definite understandings with the Arab countries, including Egypt that those waters, including the Strait of Tiran, would not be used for military purposes. There was international recognition of the Strait of Tiran.

Again, the United States was the major power that gave those assurances. On February 11, 1957, Secretary of State Dulles stated of the Gulf of Aqaba:

> The United States believes that the Gulf comprehends international waters and that no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage in the Gulf and through the Straits giving access thereto.

When on May 22, just about 2 weeks ago, Egypt moved to dismiss the U.N. Force and to reestablish a blockade of the Strait of Tiran, the action taken by the United States to "prevent" violation of what was tantamount to an armistice line was very halting, indeed.

As I said before, U Thant, in my judgment, did not have the slightest justification under his authority to, on his own, agree to have those forces withdrawn. He is not the United Nations; he is the Secretary General and he was under a clear obligation to consult with his principals, which are the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Two weeks later, we still were trying to get the maritime powers of the world to join us in "asserting" something we had been asserting for 10 years—the right of maritime nations to use the Strait of Tiran as an international waterway; the right to be free of any dictator straddling that strait, and saying, "Only ships will pass through my legs," so to speak, "that I approve of." That is an act of aggression against every maritime power in the world, including the United States. That is why the Senator from Oregon said some days ago on the floor of the Senate that we should seek to put a commercial ship through and if Nasser sought to violate our international rights we should make clear that we would put a naval ship through to protect the privilege of the United States on the high seas.

Of course, the response we in fact gave had the result that might well have been anticipated, and was, by some of us. I called it then a "dragging of the heels" response. It merely kept the flame smoldering until it burst into flame. A decisive statement of our position at the time the blockade was imposed might very well have put out the smoldering flame at the beginning. Nations that have eyed each other and armed against each other and aroused their people against the other for nearly 20 years need only a small spark to set off a conflagration. It was obvious that the Arabs and Israelis were going to be at each other's throats over the Aqaba blockade, and they were, when the rest of the free world marked time trying to figure out what to do about it.

Now that the fire has begun, the United States cannot allow Israel to be "driven into the sea," as the Arabs have threatened so often to do all of the years we have been supplying military support in the Middle East. It is about time we began to take some of the immediate action we should have taken 2 weeks ago.

The first action we should take is to assure Israel that we will make available to her in good supply the equivalent of the weapons we have made available to her enemies. A UPI story in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday, June 5, itemizes the extent of American arms aid in various forms to the Arab States. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I point out, however, that although this article reports Israel as having received $27.6 million worth of military aid, the AID summary of assistance from July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1966, shows Israel as having received no military assistance grants, and credit sales in the amount of $7.6 million.

Mr. President, this document also shows Iraq as having received $46.6 million, mostly in the 1953–58 period; Jordan receiving $40.6 million in grant aid and $14 million in credit sales; Lebanon $8.7 million in military aid grants; Saudi Arabia $32.6 million in grants and $75.3 million in credit sales; and Syria a negligible $100,000 in grant aid. These figures are those chargeable to military assistance appropriations. There have been additional grants from Defense Department stocks not recorded in the above figures in the amount of $10.4 million to Jordan, $3.3 million to Iraq, $1.7 million to Saudi Arabia, and $300,000 to Lebanon.

This is during a period of years when the Arab countries were threatening to drive Israel into the sea. The sad fact is, our hands are not clean. The sad fact is, we have been supplying military aid to countries threatening war. We did the same with Pakistan and India, until they went ahead and had their war. That is why, year after year and time after time, I have stood on the floor of the Senate and protested this kind of military aid around the world. For American military aid does not produce peace. It produces war. We have contributed to this war which is now going on by supplying this military aid.

I believe that we should undertake to assure Israel, having armed her neighbors against her to this extent, that we will make available comparable arms aid to Israel. That is one "immediate action" we should take.

A second one is to seek restoration of a United Nations Emergency Force that will be a peace force and not a truce force. The proposal of the Soviet Union for a "drawback" is unacceptable unless the Soviet Union means by it that Egypt also draw back from her blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba. It was that act of aggression that brought about the war, and if the present conflict is to be settled on any "drawback" basis, it must include the reopening of the Gulf of Aqaba.

A U.N. presence in the Middle East can again be a vital force for preserving peace, provided this time it is in fact a peace force and not one that just enforces an armistice. In seeking to reestablish the U.N. presence, I believe that the United States should take the position this time there must be a peace negotiated. The U.N. Force can separate the parties and maintain international maritime rights in the area; but it should do so pending a final treaty, and not pending the next time when the Arabs think the United States is too busy in Vietnam or elsewhere to look to its far more profound interests in the Middle East.

Mr. President, I close by stressing this last point, the proposal that we should get Israel to draw back and have the old status quo reestablished. We have had that now, three times. The time has come when the Arab countries have got to be made to understand that any settlement by way of intervention in regard to this present war must be based upon an understanding that there will be no drawing back, that there will be no retreat, unless it is understood that the peace force goes in there to maintain the peace and the force will have to remain and should remain where they are until the Arabs are willing to negotiate a peace treaty. Then let Israel withdraw to her boundary lines. But, if we are going to surrender again, as we have before, to this strategy of the Arabs, where we can try again, and if we do not win this time, then get the old status quo reestablished, that will mean only postponing the outbreak of another war.

I believe my Government should make that perfectly clear. In my judgment, that is a definite position the United States should take. We can do no less, if we really mean to carry out our moral obligation to the State of Israel which we helped to found, if we are going to carry out what I believe is a clear obligation to support peace in the Middle East, rather than to let dictators constantly threaten the world with another major war in the Middle East.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 5, 1967]

TEN ARAB STATES HAVE RECEIVED $345 MILLION IN U.S. ARMS AID

The United States has supplied at least $345.9 million in military aid to 10 of the Arab countries backing Egypt in its showdown with Israel, a review of Pentagon reports showed today.

The major recipients have been Saudi Arabia and Jordan. Egypt has made what the Pentagon called an "insignificant amount" of purchases.

Additional undisclosed millions of dollars worth of U.S. military equipment has been purchased by Arab nations outside the military assistance program.

AID TO ISRAEL

Israel, according to reports through the 1966 fiscal year, has received $27.6 million worth of U.S. military aid. It also has placed orders for what the Pentagon described as a "modest amount" of military items, including Hawk missiles, aircraft, recoilless rifles, small arms and other weapons, ammunition, vehicles, and communication and other equipment.

Israel has yet to receive the 24 F4 fighter-bombers the United States promised to sell her a few months ago.

Even if a stop order were issued today on U.S. arms shipments to the Mideast, American weapons will figure prominently in Arab-Israeli clashes.

The Soviet Union, with large shipments to Egypt and its more militant allies, is the major supplier of the Arab armed forces.

But the United States through the 1966 fiscal year had provided military aid in varying degrees to these members of the Arab League:

THIRTY-SIX JETS ORDERED

Iraq, which last Wednesday airlifted troops to Egypt, received $46.6 million in U.S. military grants, most of it in the 1953–58 period. It also has purchased some vehicles, small arms, ammunition and other items.

Jordan received $55.6 million under the military aid program, including $40.6 million in grants and $15 million in credits. It also has placed orders for tanks, small arms, ammunition, supporting equipment, and 36 F104 jets—of which five have been delivered.

Lebannon received $8.7 million worth or grants and purchased a relatively small amount outside the aid program.

Libya received $12.5 million in military aid grants.

Morocco received $37.3 million in military assistance, with $31.3 million in grants and $6 million in credits. Morocco has been seeking more aid to counter a buildup of Soviet arms in neighboring Algeria.

Saudi Arabia is the major Arab recipient of U.S. military aid, with a total of $161.7 million, most of it in credits.

Sudan received $600,000 worth of aid last year in its first year under the program.

Syria has received $50,000 in military aid. Like Egypt, it made what the Pentagon described as an "insignificant" amount of purchases.

OFFICERS TRAINED

Tunisia received $19.8 million worth of military aid, including $16.8 million in grants and $3 million credits.

Yemen received less than $50,000 military aid.

The United States has provided military training for hundreds of Arab officers. Last year alone, training was provided for 40 from Iraq, 33 from Jordan, 616 from Lebanon, 140 from Saudi Arabia and 6 from Syria.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr President, first, let me say that while I have always admired the Senator from Oregon, I am especially grateful to him for the statement he has just made. We have not collaborated in any way on our remarks on this subject, but the ones I propose to make today are an exact sequel to those the Senator from Oregon has just stated.

We do have a responsibility in Vietnam. We also have a responsibility in the Middle East. Peace, Mr. President, is indivisible. It can be shattered as effectively in the Middle East as it can be in the Pacific. It can be shattered in the world in the normal course, unless we realize what we have in the Middle East now, which we may not have tomorrow; namely, the valor of an ally—to wit, Israel.

That is exactly what the Senator from Oregon is saying, that if we do not now utilize this force in order to bring about something substantial and permanent in the Middle East, we will face the situation continuously, year after year and time and again.

Now is the time for the President of the United States personally to state to the people what United States policy is with respect to the Middle East, and precisely at the time when it is reported that the Israelis are winning, not losing. Because, Mr. President, we have been mousetrapped on this before—as I shall point out in a moment—and I do not want this country to be mousetrapped again.

The President last spoke to the Nation on May 23, before the hostilities broke out. In light of the actual hostilities, a fresh statement of the U.S. position from the Chief Executive is now necessary, in order to correct any misunderstandings which may have arisen from conflicting statements, one by a State Department spokesman, and another by the Secretary of State himself, as to what is meant by the words "neutral in thought, word, and deed." Highest level clarification also is needed to correct misunderstandings of statements by congressional leaders, misunderstandings which are especially current abroad among those who do not fully comprehend U.S. policy. This means especially, Western Europe.

The President's statement should make clear to people around the world the extent of our interest in the Middle East and our intention to protect our interests there.

The statement should reflect our disquiet as to what the Middle East conflict means in our relations with the Soviet Union. The President should make clear beyond all doubt our resolution to preserve the freedom of the seas and the freedom of transit in the Gulf of Aqaba, and also what we will do in fulfillment of our pledges to Israel. Israel is the nation which is being threatened. Israel is not threatening to obliterate the Arab States. The Arab States are threatening to obliterate Israel. The Arab States are not physically capable of doing it, but given the huge and growing disparity in population they might succeed over time in obliterating Israel, unless we act on the strength we possess today.

Mr. President, the President of the United States must not allow us to be mousetrapped by the U.S.S.R. The U.S.S.R. is now crying for a cease-fire and negotiations.

Why? Because Israel is winning. That is all. Thus, the U.S.S.R. does not wish to veto a cease-fire resolution. It wants one. But, if Israel were to lose, just watch the U.S.S.R. veto every cease-fire resolution.

Therefore, Mr. President, we are not going to certify President Nasser's immunity from retribution for the reckless gamble which he took by mobilizing and closing the Strait of Tiran. That is what I specifically want to see our Government make clear.

As I said, my remarks are an exact sequel to those of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], although we did not collaborate in our statements.

There is going to be a resolution for a U.N. cease-fire now. There is no question about it, because the Russians want it. The question is, what will it say? Will it advise the Israelis to go back from where they are now or will it put us on the road to some kind of lasting peace in the Middle East?

I hope no American is distracted by the sacking of consulates or U.S. libraries or the emotionalism of Arab mobs. They are not going to run the world. They are not going to bring peace to the Middle East. They will accept the situation, whatever the situation is, when the reckless acts of their improvident leaders have been exposed.

The resolution should state that the Suez Canal must be kept open; that the Strait of Tiran must be open to international shipping, as provided by international law; that there must be a stop to outrages against United States, United Kingdom, or other foreign consulates or diplomatic establishments; that there must be a definitive settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict; that there may not be hereafter, unilateral declarations of a continuing state of war between Israel and the Arab States. Finally, the status of the Palestine Arab refugees must, at long last, be settled.

The expression of this resolution by the United States, from the mouth of the President himself, is essential, because the use of the phrase "neutral in thought, word, and deed" by the State Department, though repudiated, has made Europeans especially think this is really the underlying theme of U.S. policy which a spokesman let slip, and that the other statements by the Secretary of State, and so forth, were coverups.

Only the President can make our position clear, and even he will not be able to dispel fully the impression that those words, which seem to have slipped out, are the policy of the United States. They are not true, but that is the way they are going to be taken. The only way to negate that impression is by action of the United States to ensure that the United Nations cease-fire resolution gets to the heart of the matter and paves the way for a broad settlement in the Middle East.

The President should stress that we are seeking more than an armistice to end the present fighting. What we are also seeking is a permanent peace in the Middle East, where the Arabs and Israelis must continue to live side by side. The world must no longer be threatened periodically with a conflagration, as it has been for the past twenty years, in the Middle East, by those, like Nasser, who turn hostilities on and off according to their whims and desires.

This is the time to act vigorously. The United States is not stymied because we are involved in Vietnam. The resources —physical, mental, and moral—of the United States are adequate to the task. Acting with resolution now is the only way to bring peace to the world. I hope the President and the State Department will not miss the boat this time.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr.

President, I rise in support of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts. I believe the bill as reported by the committee is unfortunate in a number of respects.

First, by providing that there may be a variation of as much as 35 percent in the size of congressional districts until 1972, the bill, while intended to establish guidelines, really amounts to an effort to perpetuate existing inequities in congressional apportionment. I think that this provision is clearly unconstitutional and will eventually be overturned by the courts. In the meantime, the result of enacting it will be unnecessary and disruptive confusion and delay while it is being tested in the courts. And of course, the Congress should not be in the position of enacting legislation which is so clearly objectionable under explicit decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. In my judgment, there is no reason why we cannot instead place into immediate effect a standard like that proposed in the pending amendment. That standard is consistent with the decisions of the Supreme Court, and would be a rational statement of congressional policy on apportionment.

Second, the bill as passed by the House and reported by the committee raises serious problems about the abdication of Federal responsibility in overseeing the apportionment of congressional districts by the States. The House version of the "compactness" provision, which Chairman CELLER vigorously opposed on the floor, is at best confusing, and at worst inconsistent with all the principles of one man, one vote, for which we have struggled for so many years.

I would gladly support appropriate legislation to place the Congress on record in support of the decisions of the Supreme Court in cases like Wesberry against Sanders and others. I believe this is the general intent of Chairman CELLER, who has fought for fair apportionment for so many years. And I favor the aspect of the House-passed bill which assures one-Member districts.

But the bill as passed by the House and reported by the committee raises more problems than it solves, and I will be constrained to oppose it unless the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts is adopted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the principle of one man, one vote is, in my judgment, one of the most fundamental underpinnings of our democracy. The invigorating effect of the Supreme Court's reapportionment decisions in State legislatures across the country—transforming these legislatures from tools of special, minority interests to effective instruments of government—is the strongest possible demonstration of the virtues of the principle.

Equal representation is equally important to the House of Representatives. And in my judgment, the Congress has, since enactment of the 1929 Apportionment Act, failed conspicuously in its responsibility to insure that the one-man, one-vote principle was effectively applied in the House of Representatives. In 1929, Congress repealed legislation which provided that congressional districts should be contiguous, compact, and should contain "as nearly as practicable" equal numbers of inhabitants. All attempts to reenact these standards since 1929 have unfortunately failed, in spite of considerable effort in recent years by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives.

Some may argue that the action of the Supreme Court in Wesberry against Sanders makes further congressional action unnecessary. I do not subscribe to this view. I believe that the Congress should assist the Court in making the equal-representation principle a practical reality, by setting out apportionment standards to guide both State legislatures in establishing congressional districts and the courts in reviewing that districting.

H.R. 2508 is intended to accomplish this purpose. In view of the complexity of devising workable standards, I regret that no hearings were held on this bill either in the Senate or the House. Moreover, because of the speed with which the bill has been considered, many aspects of the bill appear unclear. Clarification should have been obtained through extensive and thorough hearings.

The bill is now, however, before the Senate and it has been passed by the House. We must here examine closely the provisions of the bill so that we can determine precisely what we are voting on. I believe that the amendments offered by Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts would clarify the purposes of the bill. I supported those amendments in committee and I support them on the floor today. Generally, these amendments make explicit what is implicit in the House bill.

H.R. 2508, as passed by the House, provides that congressional districts shall be established beginning with the 93d Congress so that—

> The district with the largest population . . . shall not exceed by more than 10 per centum the district with the smallest population.

This language clearly means that congressional districts with population variances greater than 10 percent are conclusively presumed to be invalidly apportioned. But this language does not mean that variances up to 10 percent are conclusively presumed to be valid.

The Supreme Court, in Wesberry against Sanders and other apportionment cases, has ruled that, while equality of representation is the constitutional norm, this does not mean that mathematically precise equality is necessary. Where there have been certain variances in population between legislative or Congressional districts, these variances could be justified by reasons such as historic boundaries or clustering of population, in other words, "legitimate considerations incident to the effectuation of a rational State policy." H.R. 2508 is consistent with this judicial formulation. Its effect would be to give the courts a guideline of 10 percent population variance within which a State can demonstrate rational grounds for the variance in order to uphold the apportionment. But the bill does not oblige the courts to uphold any population variances simply because they fall within the 10 percent formula. As Chairman CELLER stated during the House debate on the bill:

> This language is permissive. When the court would interpret the nature of the lines, it would undoubtedly take the guidelines into most serious consideration, but that would not be absolute. That would be persuasive, and I am inclined to agree that the courts would not likely disregard the admonition laid down by the Congress when it devised the guidelines, but one cannot say that the courts must of necessity follow the guidelines.

In my judgment, a contrary interpretation of the bill—as providing that the court must approve any apportionment with less than 10 percent population variance—is unconstitutional.

This same reasoning, of course, applies to section 2 of H.R. 2508, which provides—as amended by the Senate committee—a 35 percent population variance limit. This figure is, in my judgment, much too high. But the rationale offered by proponents of this bill for giving this temporary breathing spell before the more stringent 10 percent population variance limit is imposed as follows. A number of State legislatures have been embroiled in considerable political turmoil during recent years which has made it impossible for them to apportion their congressional districts without population variances much greater than the 10 percent limit. In view of the present unreliability of the 1960 census figures, and the expense of conducting a special census for all of the States affected when the 1970 census is close at hand, a rigid insistence on the 10 percent variance cutoff would, they argue, be unwise.

I disagree with this argument. But whatever its validity this argument applies prospectively only. It offers no excuse for States which have been able to apportion their congressional districts within the 10-percent population variance limit to reapportion above that limit. The bill is not an invitation to retroactive malapportionment. Such an invitation would undermine the basic purpose of the bill which is to bring all congressional districts within the 10-percent population variance limit no later than 1972.

An amendment adopted by the Senate committee makes this position explicit for some States. The amendment provides that the 35-percent variation figure would not apply to any State whose congressional districts had a variance of less than 5 percent between the largest and smallest districts. I should note that in my own State of Maryland the population variance between the largest and smallest congressional districts is 2.6 percent, based on the 1966 apportionment.

H.R. 2508 does not explicitly provide means for enforcing its apportionment requirements. The enforcement means are, however, quite clearly implicit. Following each decennial census after 1970, State legislatures are required to reapportion their congressional districts if that census reveals a 10 percent or greater population variance between the largest and smallest districts. This reapportionment requirement is mandatory, and courts could and should require legislatures to act if they fail to do so.

The bill also provides that a State

which redistricts 2 years or more after a decennial census shall have a special statewide census for purposes of determining the population distribution throughout the State to provide a current basis for fair apportionment. This provision would apply only to those States which were not required to reapportion on the basis of the most recent decennial census, where there subsequently is reason to believe that population changes since that census necessitate reapportionment.

The bill clearly envisions that, at each decennial census, States whose congressional districts have a 10 percent or greater population variance must reapportion those districts. A State cannot delay this responsibility simply by waiting for 2 years after the decennial census and then claiming a right to more delay while a special statewide census is undertaken. And it should be noted that the bill provides that a State shall reapportion its congressional districts only once each decade.

Finally, I believe that the role of the lower Federal courts in reviewing the compactness requirement in H.R. 2508 should be clarified. At an appropriate time, I intend to offer an amendment for that purpose.

H.R. 2508 is not necessarily a bad bill in all of its particulars. But the manner in which this measure has reached the Senate floor is bad, as a matter of legislative process. No hearings have been held. The bill has been sped through the Senate Judiciary Committee with inadequate time for consideration or clarification of the many details in the bill. Moreover, at least one feature of the bill—the 35-percent population variation limit, which is in effect until the 1970 census—seems unduly lax to me. I regret that this bill has been inadequately considered, because I believe that congressional guidelines are both useful to the courts and important to practical implementation of the constitutional right of all citizens to equal representation in the House of Representatives. But these guidelines must be the product of careful deliberation and detailed hearings which were not provided for this bill.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly in opposition to H.R. 2508, the Congressional Redistricting Act.

My reasons for opposing the bill are stated in the minority views of the committee report, which I have signed, so I need not detain the Senate more than a few minutes at this time.

I believe that the proposal has received inadequate consideration, both in the House and Senate. No hearings have been held in the 90th Congress. In fact, no really substantial hearings have been held since the courts began to implement the one-man, one-vote rule.

No doubt some State legislatures would seize upon the provisions of H.R. 2508 in an effort to ignore court decisions calling for immediate redistricting.

The bill could result in numerous inequities because its provisions delaying the requirement to redistrict would relieve certain States of the need to act now. It would in effect reward their continuing failure to comply with the Constitution and recent Supreme Court decisions.

The passage of H.R. 2508 will inevitably lead to the filing of numerous legal actions, further complicating an already complex situation and further delaying, for years to come, a problem which could be solved immediately if Congress took the necessary steps.

Finally, the provision providing for the compactness of districts could be easily construed by some States as an invitation to gerrymander districts according to the political benefit that would accrue to the party in power.

Therefore, while I favor Senate action in this area, I believe the passage of H.R. 2508 would be unwise.

The very complexity of this problem demands extensive hearings and research by the responsible committees, plus the advice of legal experts in this field.

H.R. 2508 has not had the benefit of this close scrutiny and legal opinion. Until it does, or until a more refined bill is introduced, I think the Senate should not act in this area.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in a speech on this matter which I made on May 25, 1967, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 14016, I outlined my objections to the pending legislation, H.R. 2508.

My comments were principally directed to section 2, of the bill which would make permissible until 1972 a deviation of 35 percent between the most populated and least populated congressional districts in a State. I suggested, first, that the legislation is bad policy because it would delay for 5 years fair congressional districting in 16 States which have nearly one-half the total seats in the House of Representatives.

By illustration, I referred to my own State of Tennessee, where a failure to redistrict according to the one-man, one-vote principle has handicapped the Republican Party and thereby impeded the growth of a strong two-party system. And, secondly, I suggested that the legislation presents a constitutional question of the most serious magnitude: whether Congress may validly modify the constitutional one-man, one-vote principle in a way that would postpone for 5 years fair congressional redistricting in 16 States.

During the past 10 days, I have attempted to determine what reaction this proposed legislation has caused among the people of my State, among my fellow Senators, and in the press and other mass communications media of this Nation.

The response received, in short, has been almost uniformly and completely against the policy of this legislation which would delay fair congressional redistricting now. In three separate visits to Tennessee during the past week, I have talked with dozens of people about this matter, and virtually none of them see an independent, separate or valid distinction between the practices of one-man, one-vote, or congressional redistricting now, as opposed to 5 years from now, and no valid reason why it should be postponed.

A three-judge Federal district court's decision last week reapportioned the State of Tennessee's congressional districts and established a population variance of only 5,048 votes—a difference of 1.3 percent between the largest and the smallest congressional districts in Tennessee. This is the closest to the one-man, one-vote principle yet achieved in any State of the Union. It is a crucial demonstration that fair redistricting can be done, and can be done now.

Mr. President, since virtually no hearings have been held on this legislation since the Supreme Court's decision in *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1 (1964)—the event which signaled the real beginning of fair congressional redistricting—I attempted to solicit in the short time available the opinion of men outside Congress and the Federal judiciary who have been respected and careful students of constitutional law, and especially of redistricting. I therefore wrote men who, in anyone's book, must be considered among the leading experts in this area, and asked their opinion both of the desirability and constitutionality of H.R. 2508, which is the pending business of the Senate.

I have received replies from seven of the 10. All regard the establishment of a permissible deviation between the largest and the smallest districts of 35 percent as bad policy. Most said such a provision is clearly unconstitutional, and the most generous said it was "probably unconstitutional." All were concerned about the inadequate public hearings and lack of extensive consideration by the House of Representatives on this vitally important question.

I might add, Mr. President, that in submitting these inquiries to these recognized constitutional authorities, I was not able to submit a copy of the committee report, since it was only printed and distributed yesterday.

The view was also expressed that rather than clarifying the existing situation, the confusing legislative history of the bill would further confuse the State legislatures and the courts in the redistricting.

The distinguished men from whom I have received replies include two from Tennessee, Dr. E. E. Overton, secretary of the University of Tennessee College of Law; and Paul H. Sanders, professor of law at Vanderbilt University.

I should like to refer to isolated paragraphs from their replies. The first is dated May 30, 1967, the University of Tennessee, College of Law, over the signature of Prof. Elvin E. Overton. He states:

> I agree with you that such legislation—

Referring to H.R. 2508—

> is inconsistent with the United States Supreme Court decisions on apportionment. I agree that the bill is, therefore, unconstitutional and bad policy, or unwise.

Quoting further from Dr. Overton's letter of May 30:

> All in all, poor apportionment in addition to being unconstitutional and contrary to our vaunted democracy and representative government, and the republican form of government, has distorted our whole political picture. The ramifications of the distortion permeate our social and economic picture. By analogy to another case, "all deliberate speed" should be the rule. The time for

deliberate speed has arrived, and in fact gone by.

I might add, Mr. President, in reference to Dr. Overton's letter, that I agree most explicity and most directly that Congress and the courts of the United States should, with all deliberate speed, see that the constitutional guarantee of equal representation in the House of Representatives should be accorded to all the citizens of this Nation.

I refer next to a letter from Paul H. Sanders, professor of law, Vanderbilt University, dated June 1, 1967, and quote in part from his letter:

> Thank you for your letter of May 27, 1967, with the enclosures from the Congressional Record relating to apportionment of congressional districts. I have examined your remarks as set forth in the Congressional Record of May 25, 1967, and feel that you have correctly analyzed the constitutional problems involved in H.R. 2508 which, as amended, would permit a temporary deviation standard of as high as 35%. The proposed legislation is definitely unconstitutional, in my opinion, under established precedent in the United States Supreme Court decisions and there does not appear to be any reasonable likelihood that this established precedent would be changed so as to validate the particular proposal.

In addition to these two noted students of the law from my own State of Tennessee, I received a reply from Dr. Robert J. Harris, the dean of the faculty of arts and sciences at the University of Virginia, and formerly chairman of the department of political science at Vanderbilt University. Dr. Harris' letter is dated June 1, 1967. Once again, I quote in part:

> The rationale and the language of *Reynolds* v. *Sims,* 377 U.S. 533 (1964) and *Wesberry* v. *Sanders,* 376 U.S. (1964), make it abundantly clear that such a broad deviation would be declared invalid by the courts as being inconsistent with the principle of one man, one vote. In some instances it can be argued that in doubtful constitutional matters Congress should not anticipate future judicial discussions and proceed to legislate, but here the issues are so clear that congressional defiance of judicial decisions in this matter would be nothing short of constitutional immorality. On policy grounds, the issues are equally clear because a deviation of 30 or 35 per cent would work gross injustices upon geographic areas, economic and social interests and one of the major political parties.

Mr. President, I have also received a reply from Dean Robert B. McKay of the New York University School of Law. His letter is dated June 2, 1967, and, once again, I quote in part:

> 1. *Population Variation.* The great promise of the 1964 Congressional Districting Case, *Wesberry* v. *Sanders,* 376 U.S. 1, lay in the Supreme Court's assurance that the constitutional "command of Art. I, § 2, that Representatives be chosen 'by the People of the several States' means that as nearly as practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's." 376 U.S. at 8.
>
> It was generally understood at the time of that decision that the Supreme Court, in using the words, "as nearly as practicable," meant to exclude substantial population differentials. Thus, Mr. Justice Harlan, dissenting, concluded that, since the average population of the congressional districts in each state was under 500,000 in 1960, a difference among districts in excess of 100,000 persons would not be "equality among districts 'as nearly as is practicable'. . . ." 376 U.S. at 21.

Mr. President, I have a reply from Mr. Charles L. Black, Jr., Luce Professor of Jurisprudence at the Yale Law School. Professor Black's letter is dated June 1, 1967, and reads in part as follows:

> I should begin by saying that it seems to me self-evidently wrong that such a bill should be pushed through without full and recent public hearings. I do not think this point requires much discussion. If 35 per cent is the right variation figure for the next two elections, that must be so for definite, concrete reasons, having to do with population and politics as they stand in 1967, for the figure cannot without mere arbitrariness be plucked out of the air. The reasons, if they exist, are the sort that call for ventilation and criticism by all interested citizens and groups.

Mr. President, I have a letter from Herbert Wechsler, professor of law at Columbia University. Dr. Wechsler is director of the American Law Institute. I also have a letter from Andrew Hacker, professor of government at Cornell University.

The pertinent portions of the letter from Dr. Wechsler, under date of May 31, 1967, are as follows:

> I share your concern as to the validity and the desirability of the guidelines for State redistricting embodied in this bill . . . The crucial question, therefore, is whether there is adequate support for a Congressional finding that greater equality of districts than a 35 per cent variation is "impracticable" before 1972. Until the Senate Committee report is available for study, I should hesitate to voice an opinion on that question.

I point out that the report was not available at the time I initiated these inquiries, nor at the time Dr. Wechsler framed his reply.

I continue to read from Dr. Wechsler's letter:

> Such knowledge as I have of the progress of redistricting leads me, however, to be skeptical of any such conclusion. The earlier legislative proposals suggesting such a norm were drawn on the assumption that the power of Congress was not subject to a Constitutional requirement of equality.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these letters may be printed at this point in the Record as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The University of Tennessee,
College of Law,
Knoxville, May 30, 1967.

Hon. Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
Committee on Government Operations,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Baker: I am delighted to reply to your inquiry concerning the proposed federal legislation that would stall for five years fair Congressional redistricting in 17 states which include one-half of the nation's Congressmen. The proposal would permit a 30% or 35% deviation between the most-populated and least-populated districts in a state until 1972, and would permit a 10% deviation thereafter.

I agree with you that such legislation is inconsistent with the United States Supreme Court decisions on apportionment. I agree that the bill is, therefor, unconstitutional and a bad policy, or unwise.

I will enumerate a few of the points that caused me to have this view. Many of these are made in Professor Carl A. Auerbach's article, "The Reapportionment Cases One Person, One Vote—One Vote, One Value", in the Supreme Court Review, 1964, The University of Chicago Press (1964).

The court relied upon Equal Protection in dealing with State apportionment, but in dealing with Congressional districting, it relied upon Article I, section 2, providing that representatives be chosen by the People of the Several States. Even Harlan in his dissent admitted that this was the Constitutional intent. Wesberry v. Sanders, 376 U.S. at 34–39. Though he thought that the exclusive remedy would be in Congress.

The decision seems inescapable that the Court would hold that any Congressional specification that allowed any other representation than districts composed "as nearly as practicable" of equal numbers of people, would be unconstitutional.

"One Vote, One Value" is the paramount principle. Decennial reapportionment will satisfy the doctrine if apportionment is perfected a reasonable time after the last Federal census. To wait until 1972 to apportion under the 1960 census is not a reasonable time.

Even the dissenting opinion of Frankfurter did not question the desirability of fair apportionment. Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. at 270. The implications of universal suffrage strengthen the validity of the doctrine. The doctrine is a "logical and desirable concomitant to universal suffrage and the representative assembly in a democracy. No reason consistent with the democratic ideals of equality and majority—or minorities'—rule has been advanced for not effectuating this principle." Auerbach, supra, p. 67.

Legislators whose fates may depend upon the apportionment should not be allowed to modify the constitutional principle as decided by the cases. The court is "following the main stream of democratic thought" in adopting the principle.

Additional delay is unwise because with each passing year the evils and inequities of poor apportionment have been intensified. It seems clear that the "principal obstacles to equitable apportionment seem to be the individual legislator's desire to preserve himself and the willingness of legislators as a group to cooperate with each other to accomplish this objective." Auerback, supra, 69.

Additional delay is unwise, because proper apportionment will help to correct the existing federal imbalance which causes the seeking of direct federal-municipal cooperation, rather than relying on properly apportion legislatures. (This, of course, is significant with respect to state apportionment, rather than Congressional apportionment.)

Of course, poor apportionment has reinforced the seniority system by creating safe district, rather than seeking to serve vital national interests.

All in all, poor apportionment in addition to being unconstitutional and contrary to our vaunted democracy and representative government, and the republican form of government, has distorted our whole political picture. The ramifications of the distortion permeate our social and economic picture. By analogy to another case, all deliberate speed should be the rule. The time for deliberate speed has arrived, and in fact gone by.

In closing, I would like to express my appreciation of your remarks and those of Senator Kennedy concerning the bill and to add that I appreciate the courtesy of being asked to give you my opinion on this important matter.

Yours most sincerely and respectfully,
Elvin E. Overton,
Secretary, College of Law.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY,
Nashville, Tenn., June 1, 1967.
Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: Thank you for your letter of May 27, 1967, with the enclosures from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relating to apportionment of congressional districts. I have examined your remarks as set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 25, 1967, and feel that you have correctly analyzed the constitutional problems involved in H.R. 2508 which, as amended, would permit a temporary deviation standard of as high as 35%. The proposed legislation is definitely unconstitutional, in my opinion, under established precedent in the United States Supreme Court decisions and there does not appear to be any reasonable likelihood that this established precedent would be changed so as to validate the particular proposal.

Since the proposal is definitely unconstitutional, it should be defeated outright or, as you have stated, there should be extensive debate on the merits and underlying philosophy involved before the Senate acts.

Sincerely yours,
PAUL H. SANDERS,
Professor of Law.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA,
Charlottesville, June 1, 1967.
Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
Committee on Government Operations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: You have stated the constitutional and policy arguments so well in your remarks before the United States Senate on May 25th on congressional reapportionment that I feel that I have nothing to add to them. To permit a deviation of 30 per cent between the smallest and largest congressional districts for the 91st and 92nd Congresses as provided by House Bill or by 35 per cent as reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary would raise the gravest constitutional issues.

The rationale and the language of Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. 533 (1964), and Wesberry v. Sanders, 376 U.S. (1964), make it abundantly clear that such a broad deviation would be declared invalid by the courts as being inconsistent with the principle of one man, one vote. In some instances it can be argued that in doubtful constitutional matters Congress should not anticipate future judicial discussions and proceed to legislate, but here the issues are so clear that congressional defiance of judicial decisions in this matter would be nothing short of constitutional immorality. On policy grounds, the issues are equally clear because a deviation of 30 or 35 per cent would work gross injustices upon geographic areas, economic and social interests and one of the major political parties.

Our own home State of Tennessee which you have cited in your Senate speech is as good an example as one can find of the kind of political injustice which has worked to disadvantage of urban areas, geographic regions, and the Republican Party. At any time such a broad deviation as is now proposed would be inconsistent with the underlying assumptions of representative government and the most fundamental of American political traditions. In these days of troubles such a deviation raises even more serious issues because our institutions are in danger of being undermined not by the positive action of subversives but by the negative approach of misguided men whose loyalty to our institutions is beyond question.

While I am writing I wish to add one other observation. Representative John Conyers, Jr., is correct in his assertion that H.R. 2508 does not include an effective provision requiring contiguity and compactness of districts and does not deal in any satisfactory way with the problem of gerrymandering. In this connection, our home State of Tennessee presents another vivid example. The recent congressional redistricting law passed by the General Assembly is a monstrosity which approaches an obscene parody on representative government.

I trust that these observations will be of some use to you. With all best wishes for your success in these laudable endeavors, I am

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT J. HARRIS,
Dean, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

JUNE 2, 1967.
Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: You have asked for my comments on H.R. 2508, proposing modifications in the constitutional standards governing congressional districting, as approved by the House on April 27 and, with significant amendment, by the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 23. For reasons that I shall outline below I believe the bill in either version is unwise and probably unconstitutional.

The House-approved version of the bill proposes alteration of present standards for congressional districting in two significant respects: (1) It would authorize population variations among congressional districts through 1972 of 30 per cent between the smallest and largest districts in a state. The Senate Judiciary Committee proposes to enlarge this differential to 35 per cent, a clear effort to circumvent the recent federal court decision in New York State holding unconstitutional population deviations of 34.5 per cent. (2) In a provision that would permit, or even encourage, gerrymandering both versions provide that "Each district shall be composed of contiguous territory, in as reasonably a compact form as the State finds practicable." This constitutes an attempt to divest state and federal courts of jurisdiction to pass upon complaints of gerrymander.

I believe that H.R. 2508 should be defeated. Reasons for rejecting both of its principal features are suggested below.

1. *Population Variation.* The great promise of the 1964 Congressional Districting Case, *Wesberry* v. *Sanders,* 376 U.S. 1, lay in the Supreme Court's assurance that the constitutional "command of Art. I, § 2, that Representatives be chosen 'by the People of the several States' means that as nearly as practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's." 376 U.S. at 8.

It was generally understood at the time of that decision that the Supreme Court, in using the words, "as nearly as practicable," meant to exclude substantial population differentials. Thus, Mr. Justice Harlan, dissenting, concluded that, since the average population of the congressional districts in each state was under 500,000 in 1960, a difference among districts in excess of 100,000 persons would not be "equality among districts 'as nearly as is practicable' . . ." 376 U.S. at 21.

Moreover, the State Legislative Reapportionment cases, decided later in 1964, stated that population variations among congressional districts within a state were permissible only within narrower limits than among state legislative districts. As the Supreme Court observed in Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. 533, 578 (1964):

"Some distinctions may well be made between congressional and state legislative representation. Since, almost invariably, there is a significantly larger number of seats in state legislative bodies to be distributed within a State than congressional seats, it may be feasible to use political subdivision lines to a greater extent in establishing state legislative districts than in congressional districting while still affording adequate representation to all parts of the State."

This principle has been confirmed by subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court. In *Swann v. Adams,* 385 U.S. 440 (1967), the Court invalidated a Florida state legislative apportionment plan in which the population variations were about 30 per cent from the smallest to the largest district in the senate and about 40 per cent in the house of representatives. Mr. Justice White spoke for the Court:

"We reverse for the failure of the State to present or the District Court to articulate acceptable reasons for the variations among the populations of the various legislative districts with respect to both the senate and house of representatives. 385 U.S. at 443–44."

On the same day the Supreme Court summarily reversed a three-judge federal district court judgment that had upheld Indiana congressional districts that varied only 22 per cent in population from the smallest to the largest. *Grills v. Branigin,* 255 F. Supp. 155 (S.D. Ind. 1966), vacated and remanded sub nom. *Duddleston v. Grills,* 385 U.S. 455 (1967). At the same time the Court affirmed the judgment of a three-judge federal district court that had held unconstitutional the Missouri congressional districting plan in which the population variations were even smaller in percentage terms. It is unmistakable that the unexplained population deviations of 35 per cent (or even 30 per cent) that H.R. 2508 seeks to validate do not meet the already established constitutional test. Legislative fiat is not a sufficient justification for denial of substantial equality in the exercise of the right to vote.

The New Jersey Supreme Court made the point effectively in invalidating congressional districting in that state where the population differential was only 17 per cent.

"The Constitution, as construed in *Wesberry* and *Reynolds,* does not contemplate that there is a range of deviation within which a State may maneuver, with or without reason. On the contrary, the command is to achieve equality, and a limited deviation is permissible only if there exists an acceptable reason for the deviation. *Jones v. Falcey,* 48 N.J. 25, 222 A.2d 101, 107 (1966). See also *Calkins v. Hare,* 228 F. Supp. 824 (E.D. Mich. 1964); *Drum v. Seawell,* 250 F. Supp. 922 (M.D.N.C. 1966), aff'd, 383 U.S. 831 (1966)."

2. *Compactness.* The constitutional problems involved in the attempt to authorize population variations up to 35 per cent are enlarged by the additional proposal in H.R. 2508 that districts need be no more compact than "the State finds practicable." Not only does the bill propose to relieve the states of all necessity for justifying substantial population inequality; it also proposes to relieve them of the necessity of justifying to a court even the most egregious departures from compactness, less politely known as the gerrymander.

This bold attempt to limit the jurisdiction of state and federal courts is reminiscent of recent attempts in Congress, particularly under the leadership of Senator Dirksen in 1964, to withdraw from the courts the power to pass upon the state legislative apportionment formulas. The arguments against denying judicial review of legislative action were carefully examined in extensive congressional debates at that time; and those arguments then prevailed, as they quite properly should. (I reviewed those debates and summarized the arguments in Court, Congress, and Reapportionment, 63 *Mich. L. Rev.* 255 (1964).) H.R. 2508 is open to the same objections that ultimately defeated the earlier proposal. Proposals once rejected for good reason should not be resurrected in slightly different garb as though they presented new concepts deserving serious debate.

In sum, H.R. 2508 seeks no less than to subvert the Congressional Districting Case and, because of doubt about the constitutional validity of that proposal, seeks to prevent any test in the courts of the very question at issue. H.R. 2508 should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Robert B. McKay,
Dean,
New York University School of Law.

Yale Law School,
New Haven, Conn., June 1, 1967.

Hon. Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Baker: I have your letter of May 27th, with the enclosed materials. You ask my views on HR 2508, concerning the variation in Congressional districts.

I should begin by saying that it seems to me self-evidently wrong that such a bill should be pushed through without full and recent public hearings. I do not think this point requires much discussion. If 35% is the right variation figure for the next two elections, that must be so for definite, concrete reasons, having to do with population and politics as they stand in 1967, for the figure cannot without mere arbitrariness be plucked out of the air. The reasons, if they exist, are the sort that call for ventilation and criticism by all interested citizens and groups.

Proceeding to the question of constitutionality, it seems to me that it would be very difficult to uphold this bill, if it be interpreted as a mandate to the courts to allow 35% variation. The Supreme Court, in *Wesberry* v. *Saunders,* 376 U.S. 1 (1964), found in Article I a constitutional mandate for Congressional districts as near equal "as is practicable," *id.* 8. This was a 6–3 decision, and one of the three (Mr. Justice Clark) dissented only in part, indicating that he regarded the Congressional districting as subject to the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, which itself, even taken alone, could hardly sanction an across-the-board 35% variation; id. at p. 18 ff. Certainly, a blanket sanction of 35% discrepancy would directly contradict the holding and reasoning of *Wesberry.*

It is, to be sure, possible that HR 2508 might be interpreted as mere advice, or as stating an outer limit of variation within which the *Wesberry* case could still have force. HR 2508 does not say in so many words that 35% is to be allowed, whether or not a more equal districting is practicable, and I, for one, would sympathize with a court that held that Congress, if it desire affirmatively to authorize reasonless large variations, must say so with absolute clarity. So interpreted, the bill would, of course, be constitutional.

As to the policy of the matter, I will start (as law professors are likely to do) by referring to a publication of my own, *Inequities In Districting For Congress* 72 Yale Law Journal 13 (1962), especially pp. 14–18. As the article (published long before *Wesberry*) shows, I am no thorough-going equalitarian on state-legislature apportionment; I would have wished the court to have proceeded more slowly and experimentally than it has in this field. But Congressional districting, for the reasons given in the passages I have cited, has always seemed to me to stand on a different footing. I am enclosing an off-print containing a copy of this article.

It ought to be added that even in the *Wesberry* case the dissenters (and one dissenter-in-part) did not rest their judgments on any holding that inequality of Congressional districting served any good end. Mr. Justice Harlan's long dissenting opinion actually contains historical materials tending to show that inequality of representation in the House of Representatives was at the very beginning our our history regarded as obviously an evil. (See 376 U.S., 32–39). Mr. Justice Harlan's principal argument was that the Constitution entrusted the correction of electoral abuses to Congress alone. It is beside the point that I think him to have been mistaken in this; the point is that no member of the Court rested his vote on the ground that the constitutional plan, considered as a policy-directive to Congress, favored or upheld unequal districting. Indeed, one who strongly disagrees with *Wesberry,* and strongly agrees with Mr. Justice Harlan's dissent, might nevertheless with entire consistency oppose this bill, and favor equality as the policy of Congress.

Quite aside from *Wesberry,* Congress ought so to act as to implement equality in representation. The bill, in the face of *Wesberry,* seeks to impede or slow down the movement towards equality, without any showing of difficulty in applying the *Wesberry* standard.

I might add a word on the role of the Senate. It might be thought that this is a House matter, courtesy requiring ratification of the House's action. I suppose that the Senate Committee's raising of the variation permissible, from 30% to 35%, should erect an estoppel against this argument. But even without that the argument would be quite wrong. All courtesies and comities aside, this is a matter of vital interest to the whole country. It is, moreover, impossible to escape the fact that the House, in some sense, sits as judge in its own cause. The Senate (and the President, if it comes to that) ought to take a wholly independent line. I hope that line will be the one you are so valiantly fighting for—the defeat of this unreasoned attack on the principle that the House representing the people as such ought to represent them in proportion to their numbers.

I wish you success.

Very sincerely,

Charles L. Black, Jr.,
Luce Professor of Jurisprudence.

The Law School,
Columbia University,
New York, N.Y., May 31, 1967.

Hon. Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Baker: I am grateful for your letter of May 27, calling my attention to H.R. 2508 which, as approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee, purports to allow a 35 per cent variation in the average population of Congressional districts in a State until 1972, and a 10 per cent variation thereafter.

I share your concern as to the validity and the desirability of the guidelines for State redistricting embodied in this bill.

If State legislative action determining the manner of holding elections for Representatives, under the authority of Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, is subject to the requirement that the Supreme Court has discerned in Article I, Section 2 that "as nearly as practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's" (*Wesberry v. Sanders,* 376 U.S. 1, 8), any guidelines prescribed by Congress under its authority to alter State legislative regulations, also derived from Article I, Section 4, must presumably conform to the same standard.

The crucial question, therefore, is whether there is adequate support for a Congressional finding that greater equality of districts than a 35 per cent variation is "impracticable" before 1972. Until the Senate Committee report is available for study, I should hesitate to voice an opinion on that question. Such knowledge as I have of the progress of redistricting leads me, however, to be skeptical of any such conclusion. The earlier legislative proposals suggesting such a norm were drawn on the assumption that the power of Congress was not subject to a Constitutional requirement of equality.

The Supreme Court should, and presumably would, accord due deference to a Congressional finding as to the equality that can practicably be attained. The weight accorded such a finding must, however, be dependent on the factual support on which it rests.

You may, of course, make any use of this letter that you deem to be constructive.

With high regard, I am

Yours faithfully,

Herbert Wechsler.

Cornell University,
Ithaca, N.Y., June 2, 1967.

Hon. Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Baker: Thank you for your letter of May 27th—with its various enclosures—soliciting my views on HR 2508. I will make only two very brief comments.

(1) On the issue of practicality, I enclose an illustration of "what can be done". [Illustrations not printed in Record.] This is an apportionment of the Michigan state senate that was drawn up a year or so ago (the map is from the *New York Times*). As you will see, the population span from the smallest to the largest district is ½ of 1 per cent. (To my knowledge this plan was *not* created by a computer.) My first impression was that this Michigan map would have district lines running through the middle of apartment houses, simply to get the precise number of people in each district. On later reflection I concluded that *even* if that was the case—it is not—it would not be such a terrible idea. And this brings me to my second point.

(2) It is my considered judgment that the cause of both representation and legislation would be best served if Congressional districts were drawn almost at random—if they were drawn with *no* attention to topographical contours, local government boundaries, or ethnic concentrations. The result would be to produce both candidates and Congressmen with the talent and ability to appeal to *heterogeneous* constituencies. It is my experience, as a student of politics, that legislators with the most varied constituencies are not simply men of high quality but men who are compelled by circumstance to take a broad view of their function. There are more such Congressmen in Washington now, due to the *Wesberry* decision. The passage of HR 2508 would be a retrograde step for—to be quite candid—it would have the effect of diluting the character and quality of Congressional personnel.

Sincerely yours,

Andrew Hacker,
Professor, Department of Government.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I point out, in addition, that there have been a number of editorial notices throughout the country dealing with this subject. I have a collection of editorials from Tennessee that I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, May 31, 1967]

Redistricting Would Be Flawed

The U.S. Senate will soon take up a House-passed measure dealing with congressional districting which is untimely and unwise. It would override the courts' one-man, one-vote decisions at least until 1973.

The measure which sneaked through the House would circumvent the Supreme Court's decision of 1962 in Wesberry v. Sanders, requiring that districts be as equal in population as practicable.

Under this measure, a maximum 30% variation between the population of the largest and smallest districts in any state would be allowed in elections through 1970. At that time a more stringent variation would be imposed—10%—after 1972 elections.

That would permit discriminatory situations to exist for some time to come, including that of Tennessee, which could presumably wait until 1972 to change anything.

But the real flaw of the measure is not the delay, or the 10% variation figure which is not unreasonable, but the fact that the bill gives to the states the right to define what constitutes a compact, contiguous congressional district. There would be no judicial review of action gerrymandering districts.

What some sought to do in the case of the Tennessee Sixth district in the legislature last week is illustration enough how far afield politicians can go in determining "a compact, contiguous district."

Congressional guidelines for redistricting would be fine, so long as they are reasonable. The House-passed measure isn't.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, June 5, 1967]

ONE-MAN, ONE-VOTE PURPOSE—GIVE EVERY VOTE EQUAL VALUE IN SELECTING REPRESENTATIVES

It will be understandable if there are outcries in large numbers from over the state as a result of the congressional redistricting which was done by a three-judge federal panel on Friday. It cannot be fairly charged, however, that the court did not give the Tennessee legislature due notice of its intended action. The 1967 legislature was warned that action would have to be taken by the lawmakers on this matter, with June 1 this year as the deadline.

The legislature dawdled along until a week before time for adjournment before even naming a joint committee to draw up a proposed remapping plan. The committee, after the briefest sort of consideration, passed on to the legislature two plans, one by a majority and one by a minority. The first was an obvious monstrosity passed by the Senate, but rejected out of hand by the House, and the minority plan never received any real attention by the legislators. Against this background, prompt action by the federal court was not only predictable but justified and so primarily, criticism, if such there be, of the court plan deserves to be directed toward the legislature itself rather than the court.

So far as the court's division of congressional districts as handed down last week is concerned, it produces a population variance, 5048, which is closer than the two plans which were before the court already and also closer than those which had previously been considered but had not found their way to the court's jurisdiction.

The most obvious basis for criticism, if anyone is seeking such a basis, is that the redistricting of the Eighth and Ninth Districts places two sitting members of Congress in the same congressional district. As Rep. Dan Kuykendall remarked over the weekend, either Rep. Robert A. (Fats) Everett is his Congressman or he (Kuykendall) is Representative Everett's Congressman.

The only congressional district which has absolutely no basis for regret in the court-drawn plan is the Fifth District (Davidson County), which was left intact. It now becomes the largest district in the state, but is only 3000 more than the state median of district populations.

In its redistricting order the court set June 20 as a final date for filing exceptions to the plan it has drawn and under which candidates will run for Congress next year.

There are two things which will be kept in mind in connection with this court procedure, for which the lack of diligence on the part of a succession of Tennessee legislatures has been responsible. It has been recognized for half a century, long before the one man, one vote rule was laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court, that Tennessee's Democrat-dominated legislatures had no intention whatever of redistricting either itself or congressional districts in conformity with the provisions of the Tennessee Constitution itself. Any complaints, therefore, to the plan drawn by the court, as pointed out above, will properly be directed toward the current legislature and its predecessors for, first, defying the Tennessee Constitution and, second, defying the U.S. Supreme Court.

Here are the two things to be kept in mind:

Assuming that the court makes any changes as may seem just to it in response to exceptions which may be filed by interested parties between now and June 20, in future sessions of the legislature there will be an opportunity to make further alterations, subject to court approval. By that time the legislature may be ready to take the court's edict seriously that districting must be done on a one man, one vote basis.

In the meantime, thoughtful people will keep in mind that regardless of the political disappointments and frustrations growing out of the recent remapping the legislature forced the court to do, over the long term the court's action will prove to have been in behalf of justice to the individual Tennessean.

Because of our personal political concerns, whether we happen to be holders of elective offices or not, we are under obligation to keep in mind the objective of the one man, one vote ruling. This objective, to state it succinctly and in a sentence, is to give the vote of every Tennessean as nearly as humanly possible the same value as the vote of any other citizen in the selection of a representative either in Congress, the legislature, or in any other entity of government. A good many people have not paid enough attention to this whole matter to understand what it is all about, but we have summarized it in the sentence above and invite consideration of it.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, May 26, 1967]

SEN. BAKER SPELLS OUT ONE MAN, ONE VOTE DICTUM TO COLLEAGUES

U.S. Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr., of Tennessee, laid before his colleagues an effectively reasoned argument against approval of a House-passed bill which would have continued, during the coming two national elections, the discriminatory variance which now exists in many states of the Union among populations of congressional districts. Aligning himself decisively against the position of his father-in-law, Sen. Everett Dirksen, Baker urged the Senate either to kill the bill or to vote its return to committee.

Passage of the bill, he pointed out, would "postpone for five years fair congressional districting in 17 states which have 214, or about half the total, seats in the House of Representatives." He cited the fact that the measure under consideration was not only unconstitutional under the U.S. Supreme Court's one man, one vote ruling, but also was undesirable as a matter of policy.

"Our nation comes close to true representative government expressed through political party competition", the Tennessee Senator said, "when each man's vote counts as much as the next man's. If a man has only part of a vote, the candidate of his political party has only a part of a fair opportunity to compete for the right to speak for him in the House of Representatives, and his nation has a government which represents only part of the people."

Furthermore, he protested the fact that the bill was being rushed to passage without adequate hearings.

The Knoxville Journal applauds the position which Senator Baker has taken on this issue, one which the federal courts have repeatedly upheld and had confirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court.

We have no way of knowing what will be the fate of the Senate version of this attempt initiated in the House to block congressional districting on a one man, one vote basis. However, the House itself conceded in the bill which it passed the gross inequity which the Supreme Court mandate was intended to cure. As passed by the House on April 27, the bill would permit a deviation of 30 percent between a state's most and least populous congressional districts for 1968 and 1970 elections. (The Senate Judiciary Committee revised this figure to 35 percent.)

After these two elections immediately in the future, however, the House bill would require a variation of no more than 10 percent. This would begin with the 1972 elections, following the 1970 census.

It would appear obvious that, if 10 percent variation between the populations of congressional districts is proper in 1972, then in the two intervening elections a definite injustice will have been continued in the case of millions of voters in districts with a variation of up to 35 percent in district population. There is a legal axiom which fits in this connection to the effect that justice delayed is injustice done.

Finally, as predicted here on numerous previous occasions, it is our conviction that even though this bill under discussion, or any other like it, is enacted by Congress, the Supreme Court will promptly rule it out as unconstitutional, as it should.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, May 25, 1967]

HIGH COURT'S MESSAGE CLEAR ON ONE-MAN, ONE-VOTE RULE

Having gotten the money bills out of the way for this session, the legislature is in the course of wrestling with the thorny subject of constitutional reapportionment of the state's nine congressional districts.

If the plan which is finally adopted—if one is—bears any resemblance to the majority draft which emerged from the Joint Legislative Redistricting Committee, we predict the legislature will be wasting its time in sending a copy to federal court upon conclusion of this session. The Democrat majority on the committee, headed by the mortal foe of all redistricting, House Speaker James H. Cummings, has become so accustomed over the past half-century to gerrymandering against the Republicans that, when this was not possible, the committee came forth with a gerrymandering plan against one of their own party which deserves to receive a medal of some kind for being ludicrous.

They took the Sixth Congressional District of Rep. William Anderson (the man who the late E. B. Bowle's asserted "had been under water too long") and came up with a monstrosity that set a world's record. Beginning with the southernmost county in Anderson's present district, the majority of the committee turned left to Humphreys County and the Tennessee River and then proceeded eastward along a tier of northernmost counties halfway across the state to Campbell County, now in the Second District.

If any such outlandish piece of gerrymandering were presented to a three-judge federal panel, it would constitute an insult to its collective intelligence.

FEDERAL COURTS MEAN BUSINESS

The fact that a duly selected committee, representing both houses of the legislature, could be guilty of this kind of horseplay suggests that at least the majority who voted for it have not yet been willing to recognize that the federal courts mean business in their demand for redistricting congressional districts on a one man, one vote basis, or as near to this objective as humanly possible.

No later than this past January the US Supreme Court rejected two congressional redistricting plans, one brought up from an Indiana court and the other from a Florida court. One represented a maximum variation of 12 percent from the total population divided by the number of congressional districts, and the other showed a variation of only 13 percent. In addition, the high court has frowned upon the practice of gerrymandering for partisan political purposes.

TEN-PERCENT VARIATION TOO MUCH

The two decisions by the US Supreme Court on Jan. 9, 1967, apparently mean that even a 10 percent variation from the state average district population is too large to meet the court's one man, one vote rule. In Duddleston vs. Grills, the case involved Indiana's 1956 congressional redistricting plan which held all district population to within 12.8 percent of the state average district population (423,836). The court ordered a lower court to reconsider its Feb. 17, 1966, acceptance of the Indiana plan in view of the court's Jan. 9 decision involving Florida's 1966 legislative reapportionment.

In the Florida decision, Swann vs. Adams, the court held that a lower court's acceptance of Florida's reapportionment plan for its state legislature must be reversed because it failed "to articulate acceptable reasons for the variations among populations of the various legislative district". While some population variations were unavoidable, the court said, the state had failed to explain the variations in the current plan, adding, "It seems quite obvious that the state could have come much closer to providing districts of equal population than it did."

The other Jan. 9 order, Kirkpatrick vs. Preisler, involved Missouri's 1965 congressional redistricting plan, which kept all district populations to within 10.4 percent of the state's average district population (431,981). The court summarily affirmed a lower court's ruling that the 1965 Missouri redistricting plan was unconstitutional. No opinions accompanied either order.

LOCAL REDISTRICTING POSSIBLE

In addition to these rulings, which seemed to make the message of the US Supreme Court clear, an Associated Press dispatch from Washington Monday reported that the Supreme Court had hinted it may require reapportionment of local governing bodies by the one man, one vote yardstick already laid down for redistricting legislatures and congressional districts.

We expressed the opinion here some days ago that the present legislature would be unable to enact a congressional reapportionment measure which would be acceptable to the federal court to meet a June 1 deadline. We continue to believe this earlier appraisal of the situation was correct.

Fortunately, the court has before it several bills, all of them rejected by the present or past legislatures through inaction, which measure up to the one man, one vote dictum. In the current legislature Senators Brown Ayres and Fred Berry reintroduced a districting bill prepared by the late Sen. Hobart F. Atkins, and also introduced by him, and a similarly computerized bill has also been introduced by Rep. Fred Atchley, of Sevierville. More than a half dozen other bills, varying in their degrees of variation from the requirements of the US Supreme Court, have also been introduced in this session, but have been promptly consigned to the keeping of the appropriate committee. All of these bills will be before the three-judge panel for consideration, selection or amendment if, as we predict, the legislature fails to agree upon a constitutional bill.

TO IGNORE COURT MERE FUTILITY

It may confidently be added that the Tennessee legislature, or that of any other state, is whistling past the graveyard in the enactment of legislation which ignores the clear mandate of the US Supreme Court in the belief that any legislation passed by Congress will take precedence over the court's past holdings. It is the business of Congress to enact laws and the function of the Supreme Court to pass upon their constitutionality. Thus, if the Supreme Court holds that the one man, one vote rule must be followed, the enactment of legislation by the Congress to the contrary will be no more than a new exercise in futility. We know of no route which those who object, in Congress or out, to the one man, one vote rule can follow other than to achieve the adoption of a constitutional amendment similar to that which was backed last year by Sen. Everett Dirksen and subsequently went down in defeat.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, May 17, 1965]

Redistricting by Courts in Other States Is Cited

The Tennessee legislature was shocked into a semblance of action last week when a three-judge federal court in Nashville rejected without hearing a motion filed in the name of the State of Tennessee for an extension of the deadline previously set for reapportionment of congressional districts.

A joint committee from the Senate and the House was named by the respective speakers of those bodies upon the presumption that a bill would be drawn conforming to the one man, one vote requirement laid down by the US Supreme Court on March 15, 1964.

As the reader may recall, the Nashville court had set June 1, 1967, for action by the legislature on this reapportionment matter. Now with only a few days of the regular session to go and the hopper full of bills of more or less importance not yet acted upon, it would appear that a special session of the legislature to run from the closing date of May 26 to June 1 would be unlikely to grind out a redistricting measure to meet the court's requirements.

Fortunately, the three-judge panel has before it from previous litigation some reapportionment plans which were rejected by the legislature of 1965 and, in addition, there have been introduced in the present legislature, but bottled up in committee, several bills which also follow the one man, one vote pattern.

Thus, if the court decides, as courts have done in at least four states, to reapportion congressional districts on its own authority, there will be numerous proposals to choose among or from which to form the basis for a court-drawn plan.

It is certain that plaintiffs in the pending reapportionment case will see to it if the legislature comes up with no plan of its own, or even if it does, that the plans now held in committee will be laid before the court for consideration.

We have referred to the fact that in four instances already federal courts have taken upon themselves the responsibility for constitutional reapportionment of congressional districts in cases where legislatures for one reason or another failed to redistrict:

In Maryland the court struck out on its own and developed a plan.

In Arizona the court settled on a plan which had passed both houses but had failed in conference because too many legislators had gone home.

In Montana the court adopted a plan which the legislature had discussed but had not passed.

In Illinois the court took a plan which had been discussed but had failed to get the approval of the legislature.

In Maryland, Arizona and Montana the three-judge federal courts decided the cases. In Illinois the state supreme court decided the case after consultation with a three-judge federal court which had a similar suit under advisement but deferred to the state court for decision.

Of interest to all of us who are concerned about this question is the fact that there were no appeals to the US Supreme Court except in the Maryland case, which that body summarily affirmed.

In all of these cases, except the one in Maryland, the courts pretty much followed the existing political structure as much as possible. In the case of Tennessee, of course, the one man, one vote reapportionment of congressional districts necessarily involves a substantial push of districts westward, since previous legislatures have managed for a half century to compress East Tennessee's population into the First, Second and Third Districts to such an extent that even the Celler bill recently passed by the House in Washington did not propose to permit existing apportionment in this state beyond this year.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, May 21, 1965]

Defiant Districting

True to widespread predictions, the House of the Tennessee legislature this week passed a bill to reapportion congressional districts which is almost as drastically defiant of the "one-man one-vote" principle as the divisions which have been in effect in the general assembly for more than 50 years.

The bill as passed and sent to the House was drawn to, and does, perpetuate the inferior status which East Tennessee voters have traditionally been allotted by the Democrat majority leadership in successive legislatures.

Herewith is a comparison of the present populations of the state's nine congressional districts with the population totals allotted under the bill passed this week by the House:

	Present population	Proposed population
1st Congressional District	460,583	441,516
2d Congressional District	497,121	453,298
3d Congressional District	412,664	436,613
4th Congressional District	389,563	410,093
5th Congressional District	399,743	399,743
6th Congressional District	324,357	341,468
7th Congressional District	232,652	340,334
8th Congressional District	223,387	340,586
9th Congressional District	627,017	402,138

If this piece of legislation should gain the approval of the Senate and of the Federal Court, to which it is certain to be taken, the reader will see at a glance that the value of ballots cast by voters in the First, Second and Third Congressional Districts will be much less than those cast in all other districts of the state. There will exist in the House-adopted bill a population difference of 112,964 between the Second District, with 453,298, and the Seventh District, with 340,334. It not only ignores a division of the districts on the basis of "one-man one-vote", but it even disregards the 15 percent variation which was passed by the House in Congress but is given no chance to be approved by the US Senate.

The latest division of the state's population into congressional districts represents nothing more than a hodgepodge of the personal political objectives of members of the legislature and we predict will not stand up in court for 20 minutes.

It would be different if it were impossible to give every district a population almost equal to every other one, and hence to make the value of ballots cast by all Tennesseeans the same. To illumine the fact that an equal division of the state's population into nine congressional districts is possible, a bill has been introduced (computerized) which makes the variation in population as between districts less than one percent. While there is no likelihood of this bill, which would equalize the value of the votes cast by all Tennesseeans, being passed, it serves the purpose of showing members of the legislature now, and a federal court later, that this special session had the power to discharge its responsibility but failed, for political reasons, to do so.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, June 4, 1965]

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST GOP

Since the adjournment of the legislature a good many Tennesseans have studied closely the redistricting plans enacted by that body for both its houses, and also the plan approved for apportioning the state's nine congressional districts.

In view of the traditional reluctance of the courts to encroach upon the functions of legislative bodies, it now appears likely that attorneys who were active in the original lawsuits that resulted finally in the "one-man one-vote" ruling from the US Supreme Court will not launch a massive assault against the reapportionment plan adopted for the House and Senate. There seems to be, in the phrase of the President, a consensus to the effect that this redistricting was accomplished about as well as could have been expected.

The reader will recall that part of the redistricting plans adopted for the House and Senate was the carving up of counties with multiple representation into districts. For example, Knox County, under the changed allocation of representation, will have eight House districts from which candidates for the legislature will run and will have two districts from each of which a senator will be elected. This division of House districts in the big counties was the brain child of Sen. Hobart F. Atkins, one of the original lawyers in the reapportionment cases. Senator Atkins was of the opinion that it was only by electing House members from districts within counties with multiple representation that the "one-man one-vote" rule could possibly be realized in accordance with a federal court order.

WHOLE DISTANCE

The legislature as a whole, however, went the whole distance, not only in dividing counties into districts for the election of representatives, but also similarly carving the counties up into districts for the election of members of the Senate.

Out of this last named action there may be some question raised in federal court inasmuch as the Constitution of Tennessee forbids districting within counties for senatorial seats. It has become known that in Shelby County, for example, there is widespread objection on the part of some groups to districting in such a way as to elect six Senators and 16 House members from different districts within the county.

It seems to us—the only question as to districting counties would be whether or not the stricture of the state Constitution against dividing counties for election of senators was to be considered. In view of the fashion in which state constitutions have been frequently overridden and state laws set aside by both the US Supreme Court and Congress, it is believed by us, at least, that the courts will accept the districting process within counties for both Senate and House seats.

Only this week the Supreme Court unanimously ruled that California must reapportion its Senate seats by July 1 on a population basis, even though the state's voters three times have rejected efforts to change the present alignment in that state.

The real contest, it seems to us, in future court action will grow out of the congressional districting plan approved by the legislature. As the reader will note from the map on this page, the legislature managed to give the votes of citizens in the Republican area drastically less value than those of citizens in areas traditionally Democrat. For example, the population of the Second Congressional District under the plan adopted is 453,298 compared to an allocation of 341,468 for the Sixth Congressional District. Obviously, the vote of a citizen in our own congressional district for a member of Congress has only about three-fourths of the value of the vote of one citizen in the Sixth Congressional District.

PARTISAN ADVANTAGE

This is the kind of inequity, or difference in the value of votes cast for the same offices, that the US Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled against.

In the closing sessions of the legislature last month Democrat politicians made no secret of their determination to realign the boundaries of Congressional districts in such a way as to hold the utmost partisan advantage. Not infrequently a Democrat legislator would preface his admonition to his colleagues: "If you are a good Democrat," then you will vote thus and so!

The action of the legislature in continuing to discriminate against heavily populated East Tennessee ignored the fact that a nonpartisan redistricting plan, one that would equalize the populations of the nine congressional districts to be created, was available to the legislature. Senator Atkins offered a proposal, based on computerized figures which would have resulted in a difference of less than one percent in population totals for all nine districts. He was never able even to get this bill out of committee because the Democrat majority was determined to give East Tennessee voters less than equal representation in the federal House. This same majority in a succession of legislatures has persisted in doing this same thing for more than half a century.

[From the Maryville-Alcoa Daily Times, May 26, 1967]

ASSEMBLY MAY HAVE REDISTRICTING UNDONE

It appears likely at this writing that the Tennessee Legislature will be unable to come up with a congressional redistricting plan that will conform to the specifications necessary to preclude court action. In fact, it is typical of this assembly that it waited too late to do the job and will wind up with an ineffective piece of work here as well as in other areas.

This means that the federal court, in its deliberations, will come up with a non-political plan to redistrict the state. Several plans have been offered that fulfill the one-man, one-vote premise of the Supreme Court and the court just might take one of these. The late Senator Hobart Atkins of Knoxville presented one last session which could not pass because it was advanced by a Republican and this is a possibility under court action.

Senator Howard Baker has made a speech in Congress which opposes his father-in-law's position on a bill which would permit a variance of some 35 per cent between congressional districts in a state. He has placed himself unadulterably for doing the thing right this time as a pure expression of representative government.

It is a certainty that the court will move in this direction if the legislature fails to act today. Tennessee will be divided without regard to present lines with a chance that some congressmen may have to run at large during the next election and some may be moved out of their home district into others.

This is a chance that was taken when the congressional representatives did not pressure the state body into moving faster in this area. We will admit that no congressman wanted to lose his home district but this is likely in only one or two districts. The sixth is gerrymandered in the Senate-approved plan so much that even the House threw it out.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I feel the necessity to have this material printed at this point in the RECORD—both the responses from noted students of law and also the response of the public press to our consideration of H.R. 2508 because at no other point in our consideration of this legislation have we had an opportunity to build a record to bring to bear the force of the arguments on one side or the other of this issue.

Let me make one more point. In speaking of the effect of H.R. 2508, there is substantial confusion in some quarters on exactly how extensive our advocacy of the one-man, one-vote principle may be. For my part, I am speaking solely now of the necessity for apportioning the Federal House of Representatives.

I am not, at this point, speaking about the application of the Wesberry rule or the rule in Baker against Carr, or other landmark decisions to the reapportionment and redistricting of State legislatures in one or two houses, as the case may be.

I point out that distinction because I want it to be abundantly clear in these remarks that I am directing my attention to the matter of the guaranteed constitutional requirement of equal representation in the Federal House of Representatives.

In Reynolds against Sims, the Supreme Court in 1964 made this distinction in this language:

> Some distinctions may well be made between congressional and state legislative representation. Since, almost invariably, there is a significantly larger number of seats in state legislature bodies to be distributed within a state than congressional seats, it may be feasible to use political subdivision lines to a greater extent in establishing state legislative districts than in congressional districting while still affording adequate representation to all parts of the state.

Mr. President, I think the fair intent and the weight of the expert authority and the decisions of the highest Court of the land uphold the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States to the effect that the apportionment of seats in the Federal House of Representatives should be as nearly as possible according to the concept of one man, one vote, and that to do otherwise would be to distort the effectiveness of the representative equality of that body.

I submit that if that proposition is meritorious, and I believe it is, it should be done now and not 5 years from now.

I believe this is the only way that we will guarantee the flourishing of competition between two broad-based national parties, in this Nation, each competiting for the minds of men and the right to speak with majority voice.

This is not the time for the adoption of H.R. 2508, which would turn back the clock to the malapportionment of the Federal House of Representatives.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator from Tennessee knows that in the case of Baker against Clement, in 1965, it was found, as I understand it, that a difference of 32.7 percent in the congressional districting required that the legislature take action to redistrict in a constitutional manner.

I do not know whether the Senator

reviewed some of the history on this matter this afternoon. Perhaps he did. However, if he did not do so, I wish he would comment on it briefly, and bring us up to date as to what happened in that State.

As I understand it, the legislature itself developed a redistricting program that the court eventually discarded as being inadequate. It has only been in the last few weeks that the court, after the State had had an opportunity to redraw districts, mandated the adoption of a districting plan in which the difference was actually less than 2 percent.

Tennessee today, therefore, has perhaps the smallest difference percentagewise of any State in the country.

I would appreciate some comment from the Senator from Tennessee, because there has been a great deal of discussion of one of the aspects of H.R. 2508 that some of us find most objectionable, and that concerns the provisions which some think give the States unfettered discretion in the drafting of districting plans.

For example, H.R. 2508 reads in part:

> Each district so established shall at all times be composed of contiguous territory, in as reasonably a compact form as the State finds practicable.

Now as I understand it, Tennessee was not even able to redistrict in compliance with the previous Federal decisions relating specifically to that State, and so the Federal court had to implement a plan in which the maximum difference is only 1.3 percent. This kind of experience is of considerable concern, certainly, to some of us who wonder what will happen if we preclude the courts from having any such opportunity of protecting people's rights when the States do not do so.

If the Senator from Tennessee could direct himself to this point, I believe it would be very helpful, because this question is one of the most fundamental to the bill.

Mr. **BAKER**. I thank my colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts, for his inquiry.

Tennessee has a unique history in this respect. The revolutionary decision in this area was a Tennessee case, Baker against Carr, decided by the Supreme Court in 1962. The case that resulted in our present order for redistricting was Baker against Clement. I hasten to assure my colleagues that it was not this BAKER. It was another Baker. And while the same Clement was my opponent in the last election, that is pure coincidence.

The efforts of the Tennessee Legislature in 1967 to accommodate the requirements for redistricting as enunciated by a three-judge Federal district court proved to be most painful and most difficult. As the Senator from Massachusetts correctly points out, the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, after its full first session, was unable to agree on any plan. In the dying days of the legislative session, a petition was filed with the three-judge panel, asking for a delay of the necessity to redistrict. The petition was based on the theory that there was pending in Congress H.R. 2508, which would permit a variation of 35 percent, and that, therefore, the legislature would prefer not have to face up to the matter of redistricting.

This is in no way critical of the Tennessee State Legislature. I can fully understand why the legislators might believe that the 35-percent variation figure in H.R. 2508 would relieve them of the necessity for such a close and equitable redistricting.

The Federal three-judge panel, almost out of hand, rejected the application for delay and for continuance. The legislature then, in the last days of its session, set about trying to redistrict, and came up with numerous plans to apportion our population among the nine congressional districts which we are assigned. Some of the districts, in their size and their shape, had only the most tenuous relationship of county to county. Some took on the appearance and attitude of a horseshoe. Some were long, crooked lines.

To make a long story short, there was no satisfactory agreement on how we might redistrict. In the last hours of the session, the Tennessee State Legislature agreed that it could not come to agreement on how to redistrict, and all the efforts of all the parties were recommitted for other consideration. The legislature adjourned sine die, and the matter was back in the lap of the court.

The court, on last Friday, handed down a reapportionment decree establishing districts which are reasonably regular in their boundary lines. There is a population variation of only 5,048 people between the largest and the smallest districts, which is a variation of only 1.3 percent.

The point I would draw from the inquiry of the Senator from Massachusetts—I believe it is pertinent to our consideration here—is that were it not for the fact that H.R. 2508, with its 35-percent provision, was pending, were it not for the fact that the legislature, in my judgment, thought the legislation might be adopted, I believe the legislature very well would have gotten down to the matter of successfully deciding how equitably to apportion the congressional districts in our State.

The fact that this bill, with the 35-percent provision, was before Congress, in my judgment, brought about the situation where the State of Tennessee did not act, and the matter of districting our State was left in the hands of the Federal judiciary. This is not good, in my judgment. The State legislatures throughout this Nation have a difficult enough dilemma in trying to bring about equal representation, without waiting to see or without being tempted with the idea that equality means only two-thirds quality.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. **BAKER**. I yield.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. In achieving this situation under the present court order, which the Senator describes, may I inquire as to whether the Federal decennial census of 1960 furnished the basis for the computation?

Mr. **BAKER**. It was.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Has there been any shift of population?

Mr. **BAKER**. I am sure there has.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. If not, it will be the only State in the Union where there has not been substantial shift in population, thereby building into the 1.3 percent an inevitable distortion, as I shall demonstrate later in the case of my native State.

Mr. **BAKER**. I most heartily agree with my colleague, the Senator from Nebraska.

However, I might also point out that the fact that we do not know exactly what the distribution is now, in my judgment, is no justification for waiting 5 years in order to bring into greater approximation the equality of every man's vote.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. But the Senator is very meticulous. I wonder if a special census could be arranged.

It would cost approximately 30 cents a head for each inhabitant of the State of Tennessee, and the Senator's desire for perfection would be almost attained. It would not take long, perhaps 8 or 10 months. Thirty cents times the number of inhabitants of Tennessee—which is approximately what?

Mr. **BAKER**. We have about 3,700,000——

Mr. **HRUSKA**. That is about a million dollars that a special census would cost the State of Tennessee.

Mr. **BAKER**. But if the Senator's analogy is projected, we might even get to the extremely unlikely situation—if this logic is adopted—that, on the day of election, the population distribution would be different when the polls closed and when they opened.

There must be a point of departure and a point of beginning. The fact that we do not know precisely what the population of a given geographical area of Tennessee may be on the 6th or 7th day of June 1967, does not mean, in my judgment, that it follows that we should wait 5 years in order to do the best we can.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **BAKER**. I yield.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. As a matter of fact, the decennial census is established in order that we can—considering our national obligations, considering the gradual growth in the population of the respective States and the shifts nationally—designate the number of Congressmen who will be elected in the respective States. Now as long as this is the basis for the apportionment of Congressmen among the States, it certainly seems logical to use the same base for districting within the States.

It has been the best judgment that if we do this at least every 10 years, we will certainly provide a reasonable reflection of the population trends—although I would remind the Senator from Tennessee that my substitute amendment provides for special statewide censuses, on which mid-decade adjusting of the congressional districts can be based.

Mr. **BAKER**. I agree completely. The Federal census, which is a creature of the Federal Constitution, has many functions, including that of establishing the basis by which we redistrict.

I should like to make one other point in this connection. The most nearly perfectly apportioned legislative body in the world, I suppose, is the Senate of the United States. Every one of us was elected on the basis of one man, one vote, because the people in the respective States voted for each of the respective Members in this Chamber.

(At this point Mr. Pell assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. ERVIN. I ask the distinguished Senator if the provision of the Constitution allocating to each State two Senators is not absolutely incompatible in any theory of one man, one vote?

Mr. BAKER. If I may respond to the Senator from North Carolina, who is a distinguished constitutional lawyer, this is the point I would like to make. The argument is advanced that the Senate is apart from the one-man, one-vote rule because each State has two Members of the Senate, regardless of the population. However, numerical representation in either the House of Representatives or the Senate is an entirely different matter than equality of vote. As I said a moment ago, I respectfully submit that every one of us was elected on the basis of one man, one vote, inasmuch as every person in the State of North Carolina who voted for my distinguished colleague had a vote which amounted to as much as the vote of everyone else in North Carolina. Unfortunately, that is not true in the House of Representatives if there is malapportionment. The total population is fixed and it is equal for every Member in the Chamber. It is not equal in the case of malapportionment of the districts of Members in the House of Representatives.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator agree with me that the Senate of the United States is a legislative body which is more incompatible with one man, one vote than any other body on the face of the earth of which the Senator knows?

Mr. BAKER. Most reluctantly, I do disagree. While we have equality of representation in connection with the two Senators in this body from North Carolina, the two from New York and two from the smallest State, that is not the point. The point is that every one of us was elected on the basis of an equality of vote.

Mr. ERVIN. In connection with the State of California, is not the vote of every citizen of California diluted in respect to Senators, as compared to Nevada, or the State of Alaska, or the State of Delaware?

Mr. BAKER. The California vote is diluted, but it is equal as far as Californians are concerned.

Mr. ERVIN. Then is it the position of the Senator that the theory of one man, one vote is good only within certain limitations?

Mr. BAKER. No, there is a distinction between the number of citizens who cast votes and the equality of that vote in relation to every other vote cast.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Tennessee concede that it is possible the Supreme Court may ultimately hold that the Senate of the United States is unconstitutional?

Mr. BAKER. I think that that is as remote and as entirely an impossible concept as that the Congress might abolish the Supreme Court.

Mr. ERVIN. The provision that provides that each State shall have two Senators is in the original Constitution.

Mr. BAKER. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. Is not the provision for two Senators for each State in the original Constitution?

Mr. BAKER. It is, indeed.

Mr. ERVIN. Shortly after the original Constitution was ratified, there was adopted the Bill of Rights, including the fifth amendment, is that correct?

Mr. BAKER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the fifth amendment say that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law?

Mr. BAKER. By all means.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator from Tennessee agree with the Senator from North Carolina that in any inconsistency between the fifth amendment and the original Constitution, that the fifth amendment would prevail over the original Constitution?

Mr. BAKER. The Senator is correct. Each subsequently adopted amendment takes precedence over a previously adopted portion of the Constitution.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask the Senator from Tennessee if, when the Supreme Court, in an opinion written by the present Chief Justice, handed down the school desegregation decision, did it not base the school desegregation decision on the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment?

Mr. BAKER. I must say to my distinguished friend from North Carolina that that was the case. But I do not see how this chain of logic will abolish the Senate of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I do not have the floor. I have one further question.

I wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee if, when the Chief Justice started to write the school desegregation decision in Bolling against Sharpe, he did not discover the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment applied only to the States and not to the District of Columbia.

Mr. BAKER. I am not sure that I am that familiar with the decision.

Mr. ERVIN. In Bolling against Sharpe the due process clause of the fifth amendment had the same meaning as the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, as applied to the matter at hand.

Mr. BAKER. I wish to say to the Senator from North Carolina that I must have shown by now I am not familiar in that much detail with the decision to which he refers.

Mr. ERVIN. The Court did say in Bolling against Sharpe that the due process clause of the fifth amendment had the same meaning as the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and held that malapportionment is unconstitutional under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

If the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment means the same thing as the due process clause of the fifth amendment, as the Chief Justice said in Bolling against Sharpe, the Supreme Court will have to say that the provision of the original Constitution giving each State two Senators regardless of population was unconstitutional under the due process clause of the fifth amendment, which means the same thing as the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

Mr. BAKER. I follow the Senator's logic. I must say that I strongly and thoroughly disagree with the chain of logic, and still maintain there is a distinction between the force of a single vote and the equality of a vote. Every vote that is cast in the State of Wyoming is equal to every other vote cast in Wyoming for one Member of the House of Representatives. There is perfect equality under the one man, one vote rule for the House of Representatives, but in every other State where there is substantial variation between congressional districts, there is inequality, which is not the same thing as total force and effect.

There may be 6 million people voting for our colleague from New York, but each vote is equal. Yet, obviously, each of those 6 million people does not have as strong a voice in deciding who his Senator will be as the 300,000 people who reside in Wyoming, but there is equality.

That is why I start out with the premise that in the Senate of the United States there is perfect one man, one vote, but in the House of Representatives there is not.

If we pass H.R. 2508, according to its present provisions, we will have two-thirds equality.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I wish to make one observation and then I shall be silent.

I wish to correct the Senator from Tennessee. This was not my logic. This was the logic of the Supreme Court decision. I hope they will be illogical in applying the logic of their decision.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the force and thrust of his remarks. I wish to say by way of comment on the interrogation of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, for whom I have the greatest respect and affection, that the logic by which he says the Supreme Court could abolish the Senate does not follow.

As the distinguished Senator well knows the representation of citizenry in the U.S. Senate cannot be removed from the Constitution of the United States without the consent of the State involved. We could have 98 Senators in the Senate, the entire House of Representatives, and every legislator and legislature in the United States vote for a constitutional amendment depriving the State of Maryland, the State of Tennessee, or any other State of equal representation in the Senate, and it could not be done unless they had the two votes of the Senators of the States involved. There is a reason for that.

The reason lies in the history of the

Constitution, the original Constitutional Convention of 1787 was called because of dissatisfaction with the Articles of Confederation. When the delegates to the Convention assembled, the Virginia delegation, led by James Madison, George Mason, and Gov. Edmund Randolph, submitted what was known as the Virginia plan, which was the basis, or at least the skeleton, of the final Constitution.

The original Virginia draft provided that representation in the National Congress should be based strictly on population or strictly on apportionment. The Virginia plan, so far as representation in the Houses of Congress was concerned, was adopted by a majority of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention. However, the States of New Jersey, Delaware, and Connecticut made their position clear and were adamant, saying that if the delegates, in convention assembled, would not agree to a basic compromise, and recognize, in effect, the sovereignty of the individual States, at least so far as one House of Congress was concerned, those three States, perhaps more, would withdraw from the Constitutional Convention and enter into separate treaties with France. Thus in effect, there would not have been a United States of America.

After the arguments had been propounded, what was called the Great Compromise was effected. Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, was the spokesman for the Great Compromise. Madison backed off. A majority of delegates to the Constitutional Convention backed off. They recognized that they were dealing with sovereign States in that convention and that those States were not going to be involved in any confederation, or any United States of America, unless they had equal representation in one of the Houses. That is the way we developed or derived the equal representation in the Senate. The 14th amendment to the Constitution as used by the Supreme Court in Reynolds against Sims and Baker against Carr, which first recognized the principle of one man, one vote, so far as State legislatures were concerned, is based on the 14th amendment which provides that no State shall pass any law which shall deprive its citizens of equal protection of the law. With due respect to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina, I fail to see his logic.

Mr. ERVIN. Well, Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland, in his eloquent fashion, has given us a history of how the original Constitution came into being, which is very interesting. It is logical to the point I have discussed. It provides that all States shall have two Senators and that no State without its consent shall be deprived of representation. That became a part of the Constitution in 1789. Thereafter, the fifth amendment was adopted. Thereafter, the Supreme Court held, based on certain rules by the one man, one vote, under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, that the fifth amendment meant the same thing as applied to the Federal Government as did the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment in application to the States. Anyone can make the same argument that if we take the decision of the Supreme Court on the one man, one vote, and the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and say that the Supreme Court held that it means the same thing as applying to the due process clause of the fifth amendment, then the Supreme Court could hold that the Senate of the United States is unconstitutional under the one-man, one-vote theory.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, may I make inquiry of the distinguished majority leader as to what the program for the remainder of the day will be, and also for the day ahead of us, and also as to any unanimous-consent requests?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator will yield to me without losing his right to the floor, let me suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] will yield without losing the floor, I should like to present a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me first?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, because of the reprinting of H.R. 2508 with the committee amendments, it is necessary that I modify amendment 202 as follows: Beginning with the word "Beginning" strike everything to the word "following," and insert "strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following."

Those are the words that will put my amendment in line with the recent printing of H.R. 2508.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent agreement and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the proposed agreement, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That effective on Thursday, June 8, 1967, immediately after the prayer, during the further consideration of the bill H.R. 2508, debate on amendment 202, offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] shall be limited to 1 hour for the proponents of the amendment and one-half hour for the opponents and debate on any other amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to one-half hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the manager of the bill [Mr. ERVIN]: *Provided*, That in the event the manager of the bill is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed agreement? Without objection, the agreement is entered.

ORDER FOR SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 81 TO BE MADE THE PENDING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business today, Senate Joint Resolution 81, to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain rail carriers and their employees, be laid down and made the pending business.

For the information of the Senate, we will start the debate on the resolution having to do with railway labor at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. There will be no morning hour.

ORDERS FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW TO 10 A.M. THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock Thursday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW AND THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no morning hour on Thursday morning so consideration of the bill will start promptly after the prayer.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It is my understanding that if we were to complete action on the joint resolution tomorrow, the consideration of H.R. 2508 would go over until Thursday morning, but it would not be considered prior to that time. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the understanding, because of various circumstances which have intervened.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. And if for any reason the Railway Act legislation were to continue until Thursday, what would be our position at that time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We would have to stay with the Railway Labor Act legislation, because of the imminence of a date certain.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The agreement which has been propounded this afternoon would begin sometime Thursday, after completion of the railway legislation. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, if it lasted that long.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, could

that agreement be negotiated at that time, because of the changing situation with respect to absences?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has our assurance that it would be.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAXES ON SOCIAL SECURITY OR RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the other day I introduced a resolution—with the cosponsorship of all of my Republican colleagues—expressing the sense of the Senate in opposition to any plan to subject social security or railroad retirement benefits to Federal income tax.

This action was taken by me in response to that part of the administration's aged proposal which would, for the first time, require all older Americans to include their social security and railroad retirement benefits as taxable income. As the resolution states, I believe it would be wrong for Congress to take a step that would involve a double tax on that part of an individual's benefits which represent a return of his own contributions made out of wages that were fully taxed.

However, since introducing my resolution, I have received a more detailed explanation of this proposal from the Treasury Department. They tell me that counting social security and railroad retirement benefits as taxable income is but one part of a more comprehensive plan that applies the law more uniformly and, in their opinion, more equitably. In fact, I am told by the Treasury that its plan will really mean tax reductions for practically all lower and middle income taxpaying elderly. Thus, according to the Treasury's figures, the overwhelming number of social security recipients—all but about 700,000 out of 14 million—will either be unaffected by the proposal or will actually realize a tax reduction. Moreover, elderly taxpayers not receiving social security because they still must work will also receive tax reductions under the plan, according to the Treasury. This would be accomplished by replacing the social security exclusion and other relief provisions now given the elderly with a blanket exemption that, in most cases, will be more generous than what is now provided.

The Treasury indicates that some elderly—those at higher income levels—will realize tax increases on account of their social security benefits being included as taxable income.

However, even in these cases, they assure me that there will be no double tax because their plan provides an exclusion for even the most wealthy that fully offsets the portion of his benefits which represents a return of his own social security taxes. They state that this was done so as specifically to prevent any double taxation.

In light of my discussion with the Treasury, I think their plan is worth considering further. In fact, I understand they are themselves developing possible modifications and liberalizations to meet some objections which have been raised. If the effect of these changes will be further to reduce the tax burden on the elderly, I think the proposal should be carefully examined. I, therefore, recommend that action on my resolution be deferred until we see the final proposal passed by the House and we have the opportunity to have the judgment of the Senate Committee on Finance.

The Treasury officials were quite in earnest about this matter, Mr. President; and I prefer to bend over backward so that there will be no misunderstanding nor misimpression as to what I thought was actually taking place. They did give me enough fill-in to indicate that this matter merits further consideration.

The residual interest, obviously, is that there be no increase in taxes on the elderly. If the package, generally speaking, brings about a tax reduction, I think that probably will be very satisfactory, and probably will command the approval of both the House and the Senate. But I felt duty bound to make this explanation, in view of the fact that I was the prime mover on this resolution.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R.2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the pending bill, H.R. 2508, is sound legislation and should be approved by this body. There are a number of considerations in favor of approval, including those mentioned by the senior Senator from North Carolina.

Briefly, by way of recapitulation, this is legislation in which the House of Representatives has been very concerned. They have labored hard to produce something which they consider durable and constitutional. Twice this bill has been approved in the House. They know the impact of the legislation. They know what side effects it might have, and they are willing to abide by the decision that they have made. Absent some very obvious constitutional policy or national policy as an obstruction to the taking effect of such act, I think great deference should be paid to the House of Representatives.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on that point?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not the understanding of the Senator from Nebraska, as it is of the Senator from North Carolina, that the vote in the House on this proposal was 289 in favor of the bill, and only 63 against the bill?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is my recollection.

Mr. President, we have heard arguments that it is bad policy to delay the application of the so-called one-man, one-vote rule, by the type of provision embodied in section 2 of H.R. 2508. After all, say these well-meaning people, the protection of equal rights should not be postponed nor nullified and that there is no reason for it.

One way to test whether or not there is a reason for it is to consider the alternative. The alternative suggested by the opponents of H.R. 2508 in its present form is to remove section 2, and to require immediate compliance with section 1 of the bill, and thereby achieve this so-called one-man, one-vote rule.

But as soon as we do that, Mr. President, we run into difficulty, because the question will immediately arise, "On what basis will the States be required to reapportion under section 1? On what population basis will they proceed? Will it be the Federal decennial census of 1960, or will it be the present population of the State?"

That can make a great deal of difference. I offer as an illustration the circumstances prevailing in my own State of Nebraska.

We have a situation where the difference between the largest and the smallest districts, by the Redistricting Act of 1961, is 31.1 percent. I will read the figures for the three congressional districts in my State based upon the 1960 census:

First District, 530,507.

Second District, 404,695.

Third District, 476,128.

However, if we use the July 1966 estimates of the Bureau of the Census, brought up to date by the University of Nebraska's Bureau of Business Research to the end of calendar year 1966, we have these figures:

First District, 556,094.

Second District, 485,222.

Third District, 474,728.

Thus, instead of a difference of 31.1 percent between the largest and the smallest districts, based on the 1960 population, the percentage drops down to 17.1 percent, a figure well within that zone of tolerance which the Supreme Court has blessed as being practicable and workable and in compliance with the so-called one-man, one-vote rule.

Mr. President, I might explain at this point why there was a difference of 31.1 percent between the First and the Third Districts when the Redistricting Act of 1961 was passed. Anyone familiar with the flow of population and the development of the State was aware that the Second Congressional District, which is centered around the metropolitan county of Douglas, in which the city of Omaha is located, was growing very rapidly. It was with design and purpose that the difference of 31.1 percent between the largest and the smallest districts was permitted to exist, because it was recognized that, with the flow of population to the eastern end of the State, there would be, within a very short time, a nearly equitable and acceptable margin of difference.

That expectation materialized. That is exactly what happened. So now we have a situation which is perfectly understandable, and certainly very reasonable.

Mr. President, what is the alternative if a bill consisting of only section 1 is enacted into law? It would mean there would have to be a choice between 1960 and 1966 population figures.

If the 1960 figures are used, it would mean a difference of 31.1 percent. This would result in a built in disproportion which certainly would not achieve the letter or the spirit of the so-called one-man, one-vote rule.

The second alternative would be to use the 1966 population figures. There is nothing sacred about the Federal decennial census, nor is there anything which constitutionally requires that it be used for the purpose of basing congressional redistricting. It always has been used, but any source of population that is considered reliable can be used and be considered constitutional. If, however, the estimates of Nebraska University's Bureau of Business Research are not accepted by the court, then the State would be compelled, in order to avoid the distortion involved in using the 1966 population, to engage a special census taker. This would cost about 30 cents an inhabitant within the State, or approximately $450,000 and it would only prove what we already know, that using the population estimates as of December 31, 1966, there is only a 17.1-percent difference between the largest and smallest districts.

It would be impossible on that basis to create any districts and yet achieve a complete lack of variance.

In the case of *Charles Lucas* v. *James A. Rhodes*, Civil Action C 65—264, in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, in which the reapportionment of the State of Ohio was held constitutional—counsel for the defendant stated:

> An attempt to create new districts at this time with population variance of less than 15 percent would be an exercise in futility. The population figures upon which any district would be based are so out of date that the plan would result in no more equal representation than we have today and might well result in a more unequal representation, even if it appeared equal on paper.

This is comparable to the situation existing in Nebraska and in many other States.

The State of Ohio has a population of approximately 10 million people. At 30 cents per individual, it would cost approximately $3 million to obtain a special census in time to use the figures as a basis for redistricting and still be a basis for the primaries next spring and the election next fall. This would be a formidable task.

This is an alternative which would result in confusion, chaos and uncertainty. In the judgment of many this is much less preferable than to abide by the present boundaries for an interim period as provided in section 2 of the pending bill.

There have been some rather bland predictions as to the constitutionality of the pending bill. I do not know that anyone would be warranted in predicting what the Supreme Court of the land will decide. However, the Supreme Court has, in this type of situation, taken into consideration the plain choice which is given to the House of Representatives and to the States in using the 1960 figures with all of the built in uncertainty and chaos and confusion, on the one hand and on the other hand proceeding on the present basis of redistricting for the 1968 and 1970 congressional elections and then redistricting on the basis of the 1970 decennial census for the elections in 1972.

The Supreme Court, as mentioned by the Senator from North Carolina, has recognized inequities of this type when they allowed a redistricting plan which they admittedly said did not comply with the Constitution. They said in effect:

> Go forth and function under that redistricting plan until the next election.

This put the State under a court order for the next election. So the Supreme Court has recognized this type of consideration in bridging the interim period.

I return to my original proposition. H.R. 2508 is sound legislation. The Senate should approve it. It is primarily of concern and interest to the House of Representatives.

House Members have labored hard. They have applied the best of their considered wisdom to the measure, and by an overwhelming vote approved the measure. In fact, the House of Representatives had approved similar measures twice before. They know the impact. They know the hazards. They know the side effects which might be visited upon the congressional system.

I believe the Senate should take notice of these matters and approve the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield for a question.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I am interested in the answer that the Senator from Nebraska might give to a rather fundamental question pertaining to this legislation. I asked the question of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] somewhat earlier.

I ask the Senator how he views the whole question concerning the temporary provisions which have been established in the legislation establishing a ceiling of some 35 percent on variations between districts. Does the Senator from Nebraska believe that any congressional district which has a variance of more than 35 percent between the largest and smallest districts would be prima facie in violation of this legislation and that it would therefore be necessary to go through the process of redistricting?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am sorry. I did not hear the preface to the question.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Nebraska that any State that has a variance greater than 35 percent would be prima facie in violation of the legislation and would have to go through the process of redistricting?

Mr. HRUSKA. I think it would be prima facie in violation.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Would the understanding of the Senator be that where the variance in any State was less than 35 percent, the courts would or would not have the power and obligation to consider the other factors relevant to the permissible variance which have been enunciated in a number of Supreme Court cases? That is, would the Senator from Nebraska feel that this is what some House Members referred to as "mandatory" legislation or "permissive" legislation?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mandatory or permissive on whom—on the Supreme Court, on the States, or on the Congress?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator from Nebraska, who has been extremely interested in the pending bill and participated in the discussion of it in the committee as well, has agreed that any State which has a variance greater than 35 percent would prima facie have to redistrict. But is it the Senator's opinion that in any State which had less than 35 percent variation, no court could be able to review, for considerations of equality, compactness, and contiguity, the districts to find whether they were violative of the provisions of this legislation or of the Constitution?

Mr. HRUSKA. Nothing in H.R. 2508 would preclude a court from taking jurisdiction of any question within the language of this bill, if it becomes law.

The language with reference to compactness is a little different from that in previous bills. Prima facie, those States having districts varying more than 35 percent between the largest and the smallest would be out of compliance, but that would not be absolutely binding on the court. The court could still take jurisdiction of a case under those circumstances.

The same would be true with reference to States that have less than a 35 percent difference.

I do not see anything in the bill that would deprive a court of jurisdiction in order to construe the language and the constitutionality of it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. As I understand, there is a variance, according to the 1960 census, of some 31 percent in the State of Nebraska. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator's understanding is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The point I am suggesting is that if a case were brought challenging the constitutionality of Nebraska's districts, does the Senator suggest that the State would be able to say, "Since we are, on the face of it, lower than 35 percent, therefore we do not have to redistrict prior to 1972"?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. And does the Senator contend that that would be an effective defense by any of the States?

Mr. HRUSKA. I cannot say how effective a court will guess it to be. The State could rely on that statute and say, "We shall proceed on this basis—namely, continue the districts on the basis of 1960 population figures."

If someone wants to challenge this and bring the matter into court, I cannot predict to a certainty whether the defense of this act would be good or not. My guess is that it would be, because the Supreme Court would take into consideration the many equities and temper-ing factors which enter into the total of the prevailing circumstances.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am somewhat troubled because of my reading of the Swann against Adams case in the Supreme Court. I should like to read a brief portion of the opinion. It is difficult for me to see the constitutionality of the bill, if it is interpreted as the Senator proposes, in light of this portion of the opinion of the Supreme Court:

> *De minimus* deviations are unavoidable, but variations of 30% * * * and 40% * * * can hardly be deemed *de minimus* and none of our cases suggests that differences of this magnitude will be approved without a satisfactory explanation grounded on acceptable state policy. On the contrary, the *Reynolds* opinion limited the allowable deviations to those minor variations which "are based on legitimate considerations incident to the effectuation of a rational state policy." 377 U.S. 533, 579. Thus that opinion went on to indicate that variations from a pure population standard might be justified by such state policy considerations as the integrity of political subdivisions, the maintenance of compactness and contiguity in legislative districts or the recognition of natural or historical boundary lines. Likewise, in *Roman* v. *Sincock*, 377 U.S. 695, 710, the Court stated that the Constitution permits "such minor deviations only as may occur in recognizing certain factors that are free from any taint of arbitrariness or discrimination."

In view of the percentages mentioned of 30 and 40 percent, and the other standards specified, I am wondering how the Senator can hold his previous position.

Mr. HRUSKA. All I can say is that all of the factors of the case would be taken into consideration, and if the Supreme Court decided that the matter was within the tolerance of its view of the law, it would approve; and if the Court felt that the circumstances were beyond the tolerance, it would say no.

In Lucas against Rhodes, concerning the State of Ohio, there was a reported differential of 41.3 percent, and the circuit court approved the districting plan.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. And that is being appealed?

Mr. HRUSKA. The circuit court has approved it, and I believe a petition for certiorari has been filed, but I do not believe it has been ruled upon. The Adams case involved the State legislature, and H.R. 2508, of course, is a congressional redistricting bill. The Lucas against Rhodes case involves congressional redistricting.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. In the Ohio case, Judge Celebrezze gave a very compelling viewpoint asserting the invalidity of Ohio's districting.

Mr. HRUSKA. He did, indeed. He is a very wise and a very accomplished judge, but he was outnumbered 2 to 1 in that instance. I prefer to read the majority opinion in this case.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I was interested because the Senator referred to the case of Swann against Adams as a State apportionment case. But the Senator should remember that in the case of Duddleston against Grills, the latest Supreme Court case on congressional districts, the Court specifically relied on Swann and another State legislature case, Reynolds against Sims, as establishing—with Wesberry—the standards by which Indiana's congressional districting should be judged.

So, it is clear that in the consideration of congressional districting plans, the Supreme Court expects the criteria which were pertinent to the State legislatures to apply.

Mr. HRUSKA. I did quote a congressional case. The Lucas case is a congressional case. It is not a State case.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thought the Senator was making some comment with regard to the criteria utilized in State legislative reapportionment cases.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Swann case is a State case. That is a fact I mentioned before. It would be somewhat distinguishable from a congressional redistricting case, such as Lucas against Rhodes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Not only are they not distinguishable on that basis for those purposes, but it is clear from many court opinions that the standards in the State legislature cases apply a fortiori to the congressional cases.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I will yield after mentioning the fact that section 3 of this bill contains what we call a separability clause. It reads:

> If any of the provisions of this Act or any amendment made thereby, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of such Act or amendment and the application of such provisions to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

So if the Supreme Court in its wisdom were to review a case in which there was a 34.9-percent difference between the largest and the smallest district, this would not affect the application of the act in another case where the circumstances were different. So I do not see how we can lose, under this proposal.

The House of Representatives threshed this problem out. The House did not consider that a separability clause would be necessary. When we reported to members of the House Committee on the Judiciary that we had added section 3, they said there was no harm in it; we could have it. But they did not consider it and did not think that it was needed.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. The Wesberry case, in which the Supreme Court decided the question of congressional reapportionment, involved charges that the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia had been improperly apportioned. The Court, on page 2 of its opinion, stated that the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia had 823,780 inhabitants, and that the average population of 10 congressional districts in Georgia was 394,312. That shows that there was a variation of more than 100 percent between the largest district and the average district. It shows that the population of the smallest district was 272,154, compared with a population of 823,680 for the largest district. That would mean a difference of approximately 3 to 1, which is quite a far cry from a percentage of 100 percent to something like 200 percent, compared with a variation of 35 percent.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has intimated that the proposal should be made uniform as between State legislative districts and congressional districts. If that is so, should it not be made uniform so as to include counties and municipalities?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Did not the Supreme Court, within the last 6 weeks, refuse to review a case in which there were large discrepancies between the members of municipal councils and the members of county organizations?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct. The Court refused to take jurisdiction in two cases and sent two other cases back for further proceedings.

Mr. ERVIN. I wish to ask the Senator if the substitute offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts—and I might say by way of interpolation that it seems somewhat unusual to refer to such a young Senator as the senior Senator—does not provide that the substitute is to supersede this entire bill and take effect with the 91st Congress, which is to be elected in the fall of 1968, whose Members must be nominated next spring?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. And it provides that the highest discrepancy can be 10 percent; is that not correct?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is what it provides.

Mr. ERVIN. I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to page 21 of the minority report and ask the Senator to consider this matter in light of the fact that under the substitute, beginning with the next Congress, no congressional district can have a greater variation between the largest district and the smallest district greater than 10 percent. I wish to ask the Senator if the States of Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia would not have to redistrict prior to the election of 1968?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. That is a list of 33 States. There are five States that have only one Congressman, and another in trouble with redistricting problems; is that not correct?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. There are 45 States left that have redistricting problems and 33 are States where we would have to redistrict between now and the next congressional election under the substitute bill.

Mr. HRUSKA. It would be sooner than that because presumably they have primaries and it would have to be in ample time for the primaries, which are usually in the spring months.

Mr. ERVIN. Is not the Senator from Nebraska under the impression, as is the Senator from North Carolina, that the legislatures of many States have adjourned and they would have to be called back into an extraordinary session to comply with this provision?

Mr. **HRUSKA**. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **ERVIN**. So the substitute, instead of simplifying the matter, would complicate simplicity.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. It surely would. There would be confusion and chaos. The people would not know which district they are in, what candidates are campaigning for office, or which candidate they would vote for. It is not a wholesome or stable situation on which to base a self-governing system.

Mr. **ERVIN**. I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska if under the first section of the bill reported by the committee and passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 289 to 63, the guidelines are simple and understandable in that they only require the congressional districts to be contiguous and have a population relationship under which the population of the largest district cannot exceed that of the smallest district, according to the 1970 census, by more than 10 percent.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. The Senator is correct; and there is also a requirement of compactness.

Mr. **ERVIN**. And it leaves it up to the States to make them compact as they deem practicable.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. As the States find practicable.

Mr. **ERVIN**. With the amendment offered in the nature of a substitute, it states as reasonably practicable without determining who is going to determine what is reasonable and what is practicable.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **ERVIN**. As a matter of fact, that would put it back in the courts with the possibility of a lawsuit in respect to every congressional district except, perhaps, one that is square.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Or where there is one Representative from the entire State. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **ERVIN**. Does the Senator from Nebraska agree with the Senator from North Carolina that the members of the legislature of a State are far better qualified to determine what compactness is reasonable, far better than judges, and especially judges on the Potomac River who have never seen the State being considered?

Mr. **HRUSKA**. I agree. There is no question there are many factors such as economic, geographic, climate, many others, to be taken into consideration.

Mr. **ERVIN**. I invite the attention of the Senator to line 12 of the substitute which states that each district shall contain "substantially equal numbers of persons." Who knows what is a "substantially equal number of persons"? Does the Senator from Nebraska know what a substantially equal number of persons is?

Mr. **HRUSKA**. I would not know what that would mean. Certainly it is not only a substantially equal number of persons but it must be determined under the most recent census.

Mr. **ERVIN**. Which would be?

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Eight years prior to the election of next year. That is cranking antiquity and obsolescence in it by force of law.

Mr. **ERVIN**. Does the Senator from Nebraska think, as far as humanly possible, Members of Congress should determine what the districts should be, or the States?

Mr. **HRUSKA**. That was one of the points I made a while ago.

Mr. **ERVIN**. Does not the expression "substantially equal number of persons" leave the determination up to the courts rather than Congress?

Mr. **HRUSKA**. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **ERVIN**. And it leaves it up to the court to decide and there is no legal guideline for that; is that correct?

Mr. **HRUSKA**. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **ERVIN**. Then, we have a lawsuit there in respect to every district given up.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Yes, leading again to chaos, confusion, and uncertainty, which does not have a place in our system of government.

Mr. **ERVIN**. I invite the attention of the Senator to lines 14 through 19 of the substitute, where it is stated:

> A State may make reasonable deviations from numerical equality—

And so on. Does the Senator from Nebraska know of any rule by which there can be determined reasonable variations from numerical equality?

Mr. **HRUSKA**. The rule would consist of having the court make the best guess it can within its knowledge on numerical equality.

Mr. **ERVIN**. It would vest power in the court to determine the matter as best it could.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **ERVIN**. What are "reasonable deviations" this year from those of the Congress that passed the law? The courts would be running the judicial branch and it would be one with the legislative branch.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. And that would detract from the legislative branch as an independent and coequal department because we would be dependent on the courts for conditions under which we would elect Members of Congress.

Mr. **ERVIN**. Is it not the conviction of the Senator from Nebraska that the value of the bill that has been reported by the committee, and passed by the House, is the fact that it has certainty in it?

Mr. **HRUSKA**. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **ERVIN**. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that on page 2, lines 16, 17, 18, and 19, there is a provision that they can make reasonable deviations from the numerical equality in which it takes into consideration the factors of contiguity, compactness, extraordinary natural boundaries, and the maintenance and integrity of political subdivision lines. But this is what I wish to emphasize, only if such criteria are uniformly applied.

How can we apply criteria about the integrity of political subdivision lines when practically no two political subdivisions in any State in the Union are alike? How can there be any uniformity in any such classification as a political subdivision?

Mr. **HRUSKA**. In answer, I would say there can be no uniformity. The Senator from Nebraska would declare with great astonishment and almost unbelief that a legislative measure would undertake to assign to the courts the determination of the validity of a congressional district on a host of almost ethereal attributes, instead of leaving that to the judgment of the elected representatives who periodically go back to the people of their States for a renewal of their term of office. It certainly puts the responsibility in the wrong place. It rubs out the picture of a self-governing nation in which there will be three independent and coequal branches of Government. The idea of putting the standards of judgment in the hands of people appointed for life who are far removed from an intimate knowledge of these matters, and excluding the elected representatives who have that intimate knowledge, is almost unbelievable.

Mr. **ERVIN**. I should like to ask the Senator another question about these criteria. The State of North Carolina is very much blessed by the good Lord with natural conditions. We consist of three great subdivisions. We have the coastal area in which there are many bodies of water, sounds, and things of that kind. The Senator from Nebraska has been there.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Yes; I have been there. It is always delightful to return to North Carolina.

Mr. **ERVIN**. We have rolling hills in the Piedmont section. In the southeastern part of the State we have beautiful mountains; Mount Mitchell is our highest mountain east of the Rockies. How in the world can North Carolina take and apply these criteria to mountains? "Extraordinary natural boundaries" include mountains. There are, of course, many sounds. How can they be applied to redistricting in North Carolina with any uniformity?

Mr. **HRUSKA**. I know of no way in which it can be done, nor even to approximate something that would be a reasonable approach to uniformity. This should not be entrusted to those who are unfamiliar with the nature, the area, or the scope of different geographical attributes.

Mr. **ERVIN**. As a practical matter, I ask the Senator from Nebraska, considering the vagueness and the lack of definite standards prescribed in the substitute, if the substitute, if it is enacted into law, would, in effect, not only deprive the people of the United States but also deprive the representatives in legislatures and the Representatives in the House of Representatives here in Washington, as well as representatives in the Senate, of the right, in the ultimate analysis, to deal with this problem and confer final jurisdiction upon five of nine judges instead of allowing the people and their representatives to control.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. For all practical purposes, that would be the result of language in the substitute measure.

Mr. **ERVIN**. I do not ask this in the form of a question, but if I were in favor of having supreme power in this country lodged in five members of a judicial body composed of nine men, I would vote for the substitute; but since I believe that the people and their representatives should govern, I will have to vote against the substitute.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Constitution begins with the words, "We, the people." It does not say, "We, the Supreme Court." It says, "We, the people." Under the substitute, that would not be the rule.

Mr. ERVIN. One more question. It is said here that there has been no consideration of these questions. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska if the House of Representatives, which is primarily concerned with this matter and which passed the bill by an overwhelming vote, has not conducted hearings on congressional proposals time after time between the years 1951 and 1964.

M. HRUSKA. Yes, indeed.

Mr. ERVIN. This is about the second time the House of Representatives has passed a bill which is substantially the bill reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee. Is that correct?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is true. There were minor differences but not as to principles, and not even as to any particulars of the present bill.

Mr. ERVIN. As of last year, with the ad hoc committee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which did not hold hearings upon a similar bill, it is strikingly similar, is it not?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. So there have been hearings. Therefore, the immediate question is whether we are willing to vote to allow State legislatures make the variation which the temporary section would authorize, and whether we favor the fine features of the permanent section.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. There is no necessity for hearings on that question except one man says, "I am 'fer' it," and another says, "I am 'agin' it."

Mr. HRUSKA. That is very likely the situation.

I thank the Senator from North Carolina for his intelligent and penetrating questions. I am sure they have added a great deal to the legislative record in this case.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVISION FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF THE LABOR DISPUTE BETWEEN CERTAIN CARRIERS BY RAILROAD AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, the Chair lays before the Senate Joint Resolution 81, to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, as the pending business.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that it stand in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 7, 1967, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, June 6, 1967:

UNDER SECRETARY OF NAVY

Charles F. Baird, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, vice Robert H. B. Baldwin, resigned.

COASTAL PLAINS REGIONAL COMMISSION

J. Russell Tuten, of Georgia, to be Federal Cochairman of the Coastal Plains Regional Commission.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY BUREAU

William Haddon, Jr., of New York, to be Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

J. Z. Anderson, Jr., Coffee Springs, Ala., in place of R. W. Smith, transferred.

Frank V. Chambers, Lafayette, Ala., in place of J. D. Ratchford, deceased.

ALASKA

Robert F. Mott, Fort Yukon, Alaska, in place of V. E. Toussaint, resigned.

G. Galen Swab, McKinley Park, Alaska, in place of M. S. Watson, resigned.

Robertta J. Tachick, Soldotna, Alaska, in place of E. M. Faa, retired.

ARIZONA

David E. Hart, Grand Canyon, Ariz., in place of J. A. Metzger, retired.

ARKANSAS

Carl H. Huber, Elaine, Ark., in place of B. H. Lucy, retired.

Homer E. Mize, Smithville, Ark., in place of J. T. Howard, deceased.

Mattie Lee Hamlin, Taylor, Ark., in place of T. E. Hamlin, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

William T. King, Dunsmuir, Calif., in place of W. M. Welsh, retired.

Ellen L. Frey, Empire, Calif., in place of B. E. Bonsack, retired.

Oley E. Little, San Pedro, Calif., in place of S. C. Smith, retired.

Millard M. Fletcher, Valley Center, Calif., in place of W. C. Atkinson, retired.

COLORADO

Marea T. Deter, Deer Trail, Colo., in place of O. R. Ross, retired.

FLORIDA

Mary K. Beck, Jennings, Fla., in place of I. E. Culbreth, retired.

GEORGIA

Charles E. Cowart, Bronwood, Ga., in place of W. H. Goode, retired.

C. Austin Atkins, Jr., Smyrna, Ga., in place of Z. T. Wills, retired.

IDAHO

Gary N. Gunter, McCammon, Idaho, in place of B. B. Evans, transferred.

ILLINOIS

Mary L. Yocum, Edgewood, Ill., in place of C. L. Altman, retired.

John J. Curbis, Panama, Ill., in place of J. C. Gouy, retired.

INDIANA

Wilma G. Rice, Helmsburg, Ind., in place of Guy Fleener, retired.

Mary J. Griepenstroh, Lamar, Ind., in place of E. A. Bell, retired.

Edna M. Gatewood, Poseyville, Ind., in place of Melborn Grigsby, retired.

Sam D. Talbert, Russiaville, Ind., in place of G. H. Newby, retired.

IOWA

Bruce O. Luett, Baldwin, Iowa, in place of R. R. Kriete, retired.

Mary E. Meggers, Walker, Iowa, in place of D. J. Meggers, deceased.

KANSAS

Morris D. Crouse, Albert, Kans., in place of W. F. Folkerts, retired.

Fay E. Roberts, Council Grove, Kans., in place of C. A. Kirkpatrick, retired.

Creston C. Kern, Mayetta, Kans., in place of O. G. Thomas, deceased.

Donald E. Zeller, Paxico, Kans., in place of F. L. Zeller, transferred.

D. Jay Overocker, Jr., Protection, Kans., in place of D. A. Hopkins, deceased.

KENTUCKY

Virginia M. Hendrickson, Fourmile, Ky., in place of S. L. Shipley, retired.

Jesse D. Ward, Midway, Ky., in place of F. L. McKinney, retired.

LOUISIANA

Clarence A. Rousse, Jr., Buras, La., in place of C. A. Rousse, Sr., deceased.

Irvin R. Gauthier, Hessmer, La., in place of M. M. Fontane, retired.

Anthony J. Collette, Krotz Springs, La., in place of Raoul Meche, retired.

MAINE

Donald A. Hamilton, Bar Mills, Maine, in place of F. C. Sands, deceased.

Joseph E. Howell, Ellsworth, Maine, in place of E. M. Moore, retired.

William J. Flynn, Raymond, Maine, in place of B. M. Sellers, retired.

MARYLAND

Eugene D. Racz, Henderson, Md., in place of E. P. Jones, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Peter P. O'Connor, Barre, Mass., in place of G. S. Whippee, retired.

MICHIGAN

Irene A. Simpson, Presque Isle, Mich., in place of Elizabeth Davis, retired.

MINNESOTA

Louis C. Matter, De Graff, Minn., in place of J. A. Boyle, retired.

Kenneth L. Quandt, Grand Meadow, Minn., in place of A. H. Temanson, retired.

Lorn F. Knuth, Sherburn, Minn., in place of D. E. Lutterman, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Owen E. Medley, Jr., Smithville, Miss., in place of L. C. Cox, deceased.

James L. Box, Stewart, Miss., in place of W. E. Mitchell, retired.

Doris L. Wilson, Vossburg, Miss., in place of G. H. McGee, retired.

MISSOURI

William G. Carroll, Hazelwood, Mo., in place of W. M. Horton, transferred.

Ralph C. Martin, Pacific, Mo., in place of D. R. Hoven, transferred.

Donald J. Pasaka, Sikeston, Mo., in place of P. M. Malcolm, deceased.

MONTANA

Alverd R. Marcure, Frenchtown, Mont., in place of H. L. Lucier, declined.

Lucille T. Roullier, Ronan, Mont., in place of K. E. Johnson, retired.

NEBRASKA

Evelyn A. Black, Beaver Crossing, Nebr., in place of B. T. Larsen, transferred.

John J. Cloidt, Jr., Plattsmouth, Nebr., in place of L. W. Niel, retired.

Ferris C. Preble, Sidney, Nebr., in place of L. M. Gorman, retired.

Edna R. Schufeldt, Whitman, Nebr., in place of F. A. Garrett, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Clifford G. Braack, Pompton Plains, N.J., in place of George Nock, retired.

NEW YORK

Robert E. McMahon, Belfast, N.Y., in place of A. J. Gormley, retired.

Victor F. Mann, Jr., Harrison, N.Y., in place of A. G. D'Imperio, deceased.

Donald P. Havern, Newtonville, N.Y., in place of J. H. Tanney, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Georgia Anne Winfield, Pantego, N.C., in place of E. A. Davenport, retired.

Lenward E. Thomas, Robersonville, N.C., in place of G. J. Weaver, retired.

David B. Wood, Spring Hope, N.C., in place of R. L. Pitts, Sr., retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Gordon L. Vaagen, Taylor, N. Dak., in place of B. G. Goding, retired.

OHIO

William E. Lewis, East Sparta, Ohio, in place of D. A. Cowles, retired.

Harold H. Hottle, Hillsboro, Ohio, in place of L. D. Wise, retired.

Ruth V. Kowalewski, Holloway, Ohio, in place of O. R. Kast, retired.

OKLAHOMA

James R. Orr, Antlers, Okla., in place of Robert Nash, retired.

Kenneth P. Lewis, Quapaw, Okla., in place of C. E. Douthat, retired.

Edward L. Floyd, Quinton, Okla., in place of J. T. Courts, deceased.

OREGON

Wilbur L. Shutes, Boring, Oreg., in place of M. M. Humphrey, retired.

Quentin B. Viegas, Fossil, Oreg., in place of W. G. Hoover, retired.

Thomas F. Tomlin, Vernonia, Oreg., in place of O. T. Bateman, retired.

William S. Sullivan, Wilsonville, Oreg., in place of R. J. Cooper, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Arthur L. Blumer, Allison Park, Pa., in place of J. F. O'Brien, retired.

Harvey L. Martin, Bear Lake, Pa., in place of E. L. Crowe, retired.

Lloyd N. McCray, Columbus, Pa., in place of E. H. Blanchard, retired.

Stewart H. Eberly, Fleetwood, Pa., in place of W. A. Fegely, retired.

Ellis E. Miller, Hegins, Pa., in place of J. A. Coleman, deceased.

Michael L. Vongrey, Jr., Kittanning, Pa., in place of J. P. King, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Doris Disdier, Patillas, P.R., in place of J. E. Avila, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Robert L. O'Harra, Florence, S.C., in place of H. M. Thomas, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Edward L. McDonald, Gallatin, Tenn., in place of L. M. Cook, retired.

TEXAS

William T. Zimmerman, Burkburnett, Tex., in place of A. H. Lohoefener, retired.

James W. McMillan, Kingsville, Tex., in place of P. D. Cauley, Sr., retired.

Marie B. Toombs, Maple, Tex., in place of E. M. Wells, deceased.

Nezie L. Duncan, Willis, Tex., in place of M. S. Berryman, retired.

UTAH

Marjorie C. Christiansen, Mayfield, Utah, in place of S. J. Bartholomew, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Rubye R. Turner, Arvonia, Va., in place of M. P. Chambers, retired.

Trula S. Altizer, Bishop, Va., in place of M. F. Bowling, resigned.

Robert L. Leith, Manassas, Va., in place of E. S. Davies, retired.

Bernard R. Mullady, Springfield, Va., in place of R. T. Bowman, retired.

Alonza J. Moore, Jr., Tangier, Va., in place of V. L. Spence, retired.

WASHINGTON

Eugene A. Brewer, Jr., Medical Lake, Wash., in place of G. E. Gillmore, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Sarah I. Kiger, West Liberty, W. Va., in place of T. F. Manos, retired.

WISCONSIN

Harold W. Pechan, Avoca, Wis., in place of D. J. Delaney, deceased.

Arthur N. Hall, Shullsburg, Wis., in place of F. V. Stephen, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Martin S. Halpern, Shaare Tefila Congregation, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

The Lord of Hosts is exalted through justice and G–d the Holy one is sanctified through righteousness.—Isaiah 5: 16.

O Thou who art the G–d of justice and righteousness: We stand before Thy presence to seek Thy guidance and counsel in this time of crisis and threat to the safety of the world and to the security of all mankind.

Out of the crucible of adversity, O Lord, the Founding Fathers of our blessed America forged our Nation into a citadel of democracy dedicated to the pursuit of justice for all the peoples of the earth.

Grant unto our representatives, here assembled to deliberate in these days of peril, continued courage and wisdom equal to our responsibilities to lead all nations great and small in the attempt to attain peace with integrity and to accord human dignity to men of good will.

Make our country Thine instrument, O G–d, to teach nations who would defy Thy law of justice and love that true and lasting peace must be founded on the practice of truth, righteousness and mutual respect in the council of nations. Thus may we bring to fulfillment the ancient vision of that glorious day when man shall do no evil and work no destruction.

For the earth shall be filled with Thy knowledge, O Lord, as the waters cover the sea.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1352. An act to authorize adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1432) entitled "An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JACKSON, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. THURMOND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9029) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Messrs. KIRWAN, MARSH, FLYNT, JOELSON, MAHON, REIFEL, MCDADE, HARRISON, and BOW.

ISRAEL STANDS ALONE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Israel stands alone. She fights valiantly. The maritime nations cannot even agree on a simple declaration concerning the Strait of Tiran; they slip on Arab oil. England, whose Balfour Declaration created Israel, abandons her child. Even the United States, pledged to protect the borders of Israel and to keep the Strait of Tiran open, falters. A State Department spokesman yesterday, despite the strongest, longstanding commitments, had the hardihood to speak of "our neutrality in action, word, and deed."

A clarification was later made: "neutrality" was merely changed to "nonbelligerency."

General Dayan says he wants no American to fight for the Israelis. They will fight their own battle. They have already given Nasser a bloody nose. They have gone deeply into Egyptian territory and pushed back the Jordanians. Already Nasser seeks a cease-fire. The Israelis would accept the cease-fire but with no strings attached. This is what the United States advocates at the United Nations. But Russia, abetted by India, wants a withdrawal to positions of June 4. Israel cannot pull back. It would leave the Arabs in a position to renew belligerency. To ask the Israelis now to give up even a dunim of the land they have captured, after Nasser's truculence and hostility and the dreadful sacrifices of life and limb, would be grotesque and would only encourage Nasser to renew his outrages.

The Israelis have shown unblanching courage and a determination as firm as a rock and a fervor as fierce as a streak of lightning. They fight a foe bent upon a holy war for their extinction, which would lead to genocide.

You will agree, I am sure, the Israelis are worthy descendants of those who fought at Massada, worthy descendants of the Maccabee, worthy descendants of those who wrote the Book.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us commend the effort of our Government, working through the United Nations, to bring peace in the troubled area of the Middle East, which is such a danger now to the peace of the world.

All of us are equally firm in our hope that the Security Council of the United Nations, and, indeed, our own Government, will not try to find a cease-fire that will leave the causes of the conflict still unresolved.

The only way we can have peace, in my opinion, in the Middle East is for it to become the firm policy, definitely assured by the great powers, that Israel shall live and enjoy full sovereignty as a state in the international galaxy of states, and that no nation or group of nations is going to destroy its territorial integrity or impair its sovereignty.

We should say the same thing for the other states in the Middle East, that all the great powers join in assuring the territorial integrity and the full sovereignty of all those states in the Middle East.

But we should also say that there shall be no more any blockade of any international waterway to the Government and the people of Israel which is open to the governments and the people of other countries of the Middle East and of the world: that includes the Suez Canal as well as the Strait of Tiran.

So in striving for a settlement of the present conflict, as we should, let us solve the larger aspects of the question in a way which will assure permanent stability in the Middle East enforced by the great powers, so that these small but historic nations will not have to waste their substance in preparation for war. Then let all of us together help all those nations in that cradle of civilization and religion to live a better life in peace.

If the pending strife, tragic as it is, shall bring about such a happy situation, it shall not have been in vain.

U.S. FOREIGN AID CONTRIBUTES TO HOSTILITIES

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the world faces a crisis in the Middle East and the United States of America again walks at the crossroads of responsibility.

It is especially frustrating to know that U.S. foreign aid has contributed to those hostilities.

Foreign aid advocates claim that the program improves living conditions in underdeveloped nations, enables them to become self-sufficient, and makes friends for the United States. Yet our "friends" are sacking and burning our embassies, have stopped oil shipments, and now we witness hostile combatants using U.S.-furnished airplanes, tanks, and arms.

Even so, this spending continues and we are now asked by the administration to increase the debt ceiling to $360 billion to cover more and more such spending. Predictions are that we face a record deficit of $29 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the administration must realize that there is a limit to our capacity; that foreign aid from our tax dollars has lowest priority and even then should be authorized only for charitable purposes within our capacity. Fiscal survival demands this.

A pledge by the administration toward that end would encourage many of us to reevaluate our opposition on the debt ceiling measure.

WHERE WE STAND ON ISRAEL

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, some people have a knack for flubbing the ball just at the wrong time. The Johnson administration has goofed many times in the last few years and today is doing so again at a critical juncture in foreign affairs. If there is one thing we should not do at this hour in the present Mideast struggle, it is to give the impression to the world that we are pussyfooting, or turning our back on our friends.

We cannot possibly be neutral in the situation of Nasser versus Israel.

We support Israel, a proud little nation, non-Communist, fearless and courageous, dedicated to its own self-preservation; against Nasser, the Communist agent talking and acting the Communist line, supplied with Communist weapons of war, and funded with Communist money.

U.S. pussyfooting by proclaiming alleged neutrality or hands off the Middle East situation only furthers world disrespect for the United States of America. Such Achesonian diplomacy set the stage for the Korean war by defining areas of U.S. noninterest.

To proclaim neutrally in a situation where Communist allies like Nasser of Egypt make war on Israel is to invite the Communist world to go ahead and defeat Israel. It tells the aggressors that the only nation capable of giving it to them in the neck if needs be, is going to keep hands off as they gang up on tiny Israel.

We are not neutral in this struggle, nor should we be. We support Israel, a democratic and dedicated nation utterly courageous and committed solely to its own self-defense.

GRASPING AT THE GOOD NEWS

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of grim news in the papers these days as evidenced on the floor here today, and I think we have a responsibility to share any good news that happens to come along. I saw some good news in the paper and I want to share it with our colleagues. The Treasury Department happily announced last week that for every man, woman, and child in the country there is $220.16 in cash in circulation.

I wanted to be sure to mention this fine news today because later this week we will be considering a request by this same Treasury Department to raise the limit on the national debt to $365 billion, and I sat down to do a little figuring.

Based on today's population, and on the legal debt ceiling asked by the Treasury, each American's share of the public debt will be $1,845.57. So each one of us is in the red by $1,625.41.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is great news.

THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised at some of the shock that seems to be emanating from some individuals about the position of the U.S. Government in reference to the Middle East situation, because I remember in 1956 we went so far as to intervene at that time on the side of the Arabs when the Israeli were giving them a pretty good licking. Somebody remarked here, I believe it was the gentleman from New Hampshire, about the Atchesonian policy. Well, I do not know exactly what the Atchesonian policy was, but the Dulles policy was to make them pull back and give back to the Arabs everything they had taken away from them.

My position on Vietnam is pretty well known. I believe we have to stand up to dictators wherever they are, and I apply this to the Near East as well. But I would advise on the basis of what I said earlier, and on the reports coming out of the Near East, to just show a little patience and let the Israeli alone for a couple of days, and then the Members may not have to express any shock or surprise, they might even be able to express some joy, because I think they can do the job, if we just remain calm and give them a couple of days, and then if we do not again force the Israeli to pull back again the situation will resolve itself.

THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio expressed surprise at the statement of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN]. I want to express no surprise, but gratification.

I may have been given in the past to partisanship on this floor on domestic issues, but I think the gentleman from New Hampshire and other Republican speakers are indicating not only to the House but to this world that we do not consider aggression a partisan problem, and that just as there is pretty good congressional unanimity on Vietnam, there is emerging now some good and hopeful unanimity on what our posture should be in the Middle East.

I for one want to doff my hat to the gentleman from New Hampshire and all the other Members of the Republican Party for not making this a partisan political issue.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTAL RATES OF THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Postal Rates of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may continue hearings this afternoon while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO FILE REPORT UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight Friday to file a report on the bill H.R. 10480.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

E. F. FORT ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2661) for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DEMETRIOS KONSTANTINOS GEORGARAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1596) for the relief of Demetrios Konstantinos Georgaras (also known as James K. Georgaras).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PUGET SOUND PLYWOOD, INC., OF TACOMA, WASH.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4949) for the relief of Puget Sound Plywood, Inc., of Tacoma, Wash.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DR. MIGUEL ALBERTO ROJAS-MACHADO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 65) for the relief of Dr. Miguel Alberto Rojas-Machado.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 65

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Miguel Alberto Rojas-Machado shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 29, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ALFREDO REBOREDO-NEWHALL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 66) for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Reboredo-Newhall.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DR. MARIA YOLANDA RAFAELA MIRANDA Y MONTEAGUDO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 130) for the relief of Dr. Maria Yolanda Rafaela Miranda y Monteagudo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 130

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Maria Yolanda Rafaela Miranda y Monteagudo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 30, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JULIO VALDES-RODRIGUEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 131) for the relief of Dr. Julio Valdes-Rodriguez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 131

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Julio Valdes-Rodriguez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 9, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. HECTOR JESUS SANCHEZ-HERNANDEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 133) for the relief of Dr. Hector Jesus Sanchez-Hernandez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 133

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Hector Jesus Sanchez-Hernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 25, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. RAFAEL A. PENALVER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 134) for the relief of Dr. Rafael A. Penalver.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 134

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Rafael A. Penalver shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 9, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. RAMON BAEZ HERNANDEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 165) for the relief of Dr. Ramon Baez Hernandez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 165

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Ramon Baez Hernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 30, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. HILARIO ANIDO-FRAGUIO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 135) for the relief of Dr. Hilario Anido-Fraguio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 135

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Hilario Anido-Fraguio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 13, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ANSELMO S. ALVAREZ-GOMEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 167) for the relief of Dr. Anselmo S. Alvarez-Gomez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 167

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Anselmo S. Alvarez-Gomez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 16, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. SHERIF SHAFEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 175) for the relief of Dr. Sherif Shafey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 175

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Sherif Shafey shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 30, 1959.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIUSEPPE TOCCO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1516) for the relief of Giuseppe Tocco.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1516

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Tocco shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on page 1, line 7, after the words, "visa fee." strike out the remainder of page 1 and all of page 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossd and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MERCEDES DE TOFFOLI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1572) for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1572

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mercedes De Toffoli shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu therof the following:

"That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mercedes De Toffoli shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John Molinari, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural father of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENE HUGO HEIMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1619) for the relief of Rene Hugo Heimann.

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection?

GIZELLA ERENYI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1907) for the relief of Gizella Erenyi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1907

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Gizella Erényi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Gizella Erényi. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Gizella Erényi shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORRIS L. KAIDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2278) for the relief of Morris L. Kaiden.

Mr. **TALCOTT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

VIVIAN COHEN KAIDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2279) for the relief of Vivian Cohen Kaiden.

Mr. **TALCOTT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

BRANCA DA GLORIA FREITAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2694) for the relief of Branca da Gloria Freitas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2694

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Branca da Gloria Franco Freitas. From and after the date of enactment of this Act, the said Branca da Gloria Franco Freitas shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. VIRGINIA SUAREZ TEJON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2964) for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2964

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CHU CHAI-HO HAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3492) for the relief of Mrs. Chu Chai-ho Hay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3492

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Chu Chai-ho Hay shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Chu Chai-ho Hay. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Chu Chai-ho Hay shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA DEL BAGLIVO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5028) for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5028

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Del Baglivo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Anna Del Baglivo. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Anna Del Baglivo shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN GEORGIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5364) to provide for the conveyance of the interest held by the United States in certain real property situated in the State of Georgia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5364

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to William M. Ransom and Kerry E. Ransom of Walker County, Georgia, without monetary consideration therefor, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in section 2 of this Act and formerly used as the right-of-way for an approach road to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, Georgia, known as the LaFayette Extension Road.

SEC. 2. The real property referred to in the first section of this Act is more particularly described as follows:

"All that tract or parcel of land lying and being in the eighth district and fourth section of Walker County, Georgia, and being a part of land lot numbered 193 in said district and section and being in the northwest portion of said land lot numbered 193 and more particularly described as follows: Being that portion of the right-of-way, 50 feet wide, lying 25 feet on each side of the centerline of said public road right-of-way as described in deed from William Glass to United States of America dated August 19, 1897, and recorded April 5, 1899, in deed book 13, page 88 and shown on plat attached to said deed recorded in deed book 13, page 89, recorded in the office of the clerk of superior court of Walker County, Georgia, and being that portion of such right-of-way 50 feet wide which lies between the present U.S. Highway Numbered 27 on the east and right-of-way of Central of Georgia Railway Company on the west, and which runs through the lot or parcel of land of William M. Ransom and Kerry E. Ransom as shown on survey and plat of said tract or parcel of land of William M. Ransom and Kerry E. Ransom made by H. L. Campbell, Walker County, surveyor, on April 13, 1960, and recorded in the office of the clerk of superior court of Walker County, Georgia in plat book 4, page 267."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "without monetary consideration therefor," and insert in lieu thereof: "upon payment to the United States of the sum of the fair market value of the land as of the time the conveyance is made and the administrative costs of making the conveyance, both as determined by the Secretary,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. LUIS G. DEDIOT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 173) for the relief of Dr. Luis G. Dediot.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 173

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Luis G. Dediot shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 24, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. RAFAEL JACINTO NOBO Y PIVIDAL (RAFAEL NOBO)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 439) for the relief of Dr. Rafael Jacinto Nobo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 439

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Rafael Jacinto Nobo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 28, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. FERNANDO O. GARCIA-HERNANDEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 501) for the relief of Dr. Fernando O. Garcia-Hernandez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 501

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Fernando O. Garcia-Hernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 24, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MATTEO GROPPO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1517) for the relief of Mrs. Matteo Groppo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1517

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Matteo Groppo shall be deemed to have a priority date of July 20, 1954, on the fifth preference foreign state limitation for Italy.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ALFREDO A. NAVARRO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1532) for the relief of Dr. Alfredo A. Navarro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1532

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Alfredo A. Navarro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of December 31, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ALEXANDER D. CROSS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3221) for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Cross.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3221

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Alexander D. Cross may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JUAN F. CHAVES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5862) for the relief of Dr. Juan F. Chaves.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5862

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Juan F. Chaves shall be held and considered to be lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 21, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN JOSEPH SHEA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1612) for the relief of John Joseph Shea.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1612

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Joseph Shea may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. John J. Shea, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to appear here today in behalf of my bill, H.R. 1612, and the family of U.S. Army S. Sgt. John J. Shea. My bill seeks to temper the justice of our immigration laws with compassion for a family which has been separated from its youngest member for nearly 2 years.

My constituent and a veteran of 23 years of military service, Sergeant Shea married his Korean-born wife in 1956. Sergeant and Mrs. Shea adopted a Korean orphan in 1963. The Sheas returned to Korea on another duty tour and adopted two more Korean orphans, a 12-year-old girl, Theresa, and a boy, John Joseph.

Upon their return to the United States last year, Sergeant and Mrs. Shea received a nonquota status for the girl, but were denied admission for the boy. Sergeant Shea has told me that he was unaware of a barrier, existing in our immigration law, which forbids the admission of more than two unrelated adopted orphans under the sponsorship of one family.

Thus, young John Joseph remained at an Inchon City orphanage when his parents left for the United States. He remains a prisoner of our immigration laws, and the only way in which they can be reunited is through the help of this Congress.

The Judiciary Committee, under the distinguished chairmanship of the dean of this body, the gentleman from New York, has seen fit to process this private bill quickly.

Sergeant Shea and his family await word of these proceedings at Fort Hamilton, N.Y., where he is now stationed.

Mr. Speaker, I can say that it is my true belief that this is a case in which justice must be tempered with mercy. The separation of young John from his family already has worked a hardship on the Sheas. I feel confident that my colleagues will demonstrate the compassion which is called for in this case.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGIOLINA CONDELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1703) for the relief of Angiolina Condello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1703

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angiolina Condello may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Domenico Condello, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. RAUL E. BERTRÁN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1763) for the relief of Dr. Raul E. Bertrán.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1763

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Raul E. Bertrán shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 16, 1960.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6 strike out the date "October 16, 1960." and substitute in lieu thereof the date "January 16, 1960.".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ERNESTO M. CAMPELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1764) for the relief of Dr. Ernesto M. Campello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1764

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Ernesto M. Campello shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 10, 1960.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the date "October 10, 1960," and substitute in lieu thereof the date "August 10, 1960."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. UBALDO GREGORIO CATASUS-RODRIGUEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1765) for the relief of Dr. Ubaldo Gregorio Catasus-Rodriguez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1765

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Ubaldo Gregorio Catasús-Rodríguez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 12, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUIS TAPIA DÁVILA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1769) for the relief of Luis Tapia Dávila.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1769

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luis Tapia Dávila shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 12, 1960.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 3, after the word "That" insert the following: ", for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIOVANNI AND FRANCESCO URGA-FERRARO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1814) for the relief of Giovanni and Francesco Urga-Farraro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1814

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giovanni and Francesco Urga-Ferraro may be classified as children within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of petitions filed in their behalf by Miss Josephine Bonomo, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the language "upon approval of" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "and".

On page 1, line 8, after the word "States," insert the language "may be approved".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. RAFAEL F. SUAREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3522) for the relief of Dr. Rafael F. Suarez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3522

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Rafael F. Suarez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 21, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANG-YOU WU, M.D.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3523) for the relief of Chang-You Wu, M.D.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3523

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chang-You Wu, doctor of medicine, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 16, 1956.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. GUILLERMO FRESCO DE JONGH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5224) for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Fresco de Jongh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5224

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Guillermo Fresco de Jongh shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 18, 1961.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "July" and substitute in lieu thereof "June".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 116, concerning mailing privileges for the U.S. Armed Forces, I was unavoidably absent from the House floor because of official business affecting my district. I strongly favored the enactment of this legislation, and if I had been present I would have voted "yea."

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 117]

Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Battin
Bell
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Clark
Cowger
Diggs
Dow
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Fisher
Green, Oreg.
Halleck
Hanna
Holifield
Ichord
Jacobs
Leggett
Long, La.
Miller, Calif.
Morton
O'Konski
Pool
Rooney, N.Y.
Ruppe
St. Onge
Snyder
Taft
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Williams, Miss.
Wright
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1968

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill—H.R. 10509—making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10509, with Mr. CORMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, today we fight a war halfway around the world and are threatened with another thousands of miles away in the other direction; law enforcement has broken down at home, and waves of lawlessness sweep through our cities as a result of the Supreme Court placing newly discovered "personal rights" ahead of the welfare of the general public. Our great system of public education is threatened by somewhat the same forces which loosed hundreds of thousands of criminals upon the public.

While I have had and will have much more to say in this Congress about the foregoing, we come here today to consider a holding action on that which is essential under any and all circumstances, the bill making appropriations for American agriculture, supplier of our food and key to our economic system, and the base on which we must depend while we try to straighten out all the rest.

The bill before us is $250,516,000 below the budget and $2,251,990,500 below last year. It represents approximately 4.2 percent of the overall Federal budget.

THE ROLE OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

There isn't much glamor to meat, bread and potatoes; but food remains basic to all life. In the United States, the greatest supply of the finest food, with all its built-in frills, at a cost of a lower percentage of our income, sets our Nation apart from the rest of the world. This has been possible with fewer and fewer people on the farm. It has resulted from advanced agricultural technology and greatly increased investments in equipment, machinery, prolific seed, highly developed livestock, electricity, telephones, and costly chemicals—all of which have enabled 6 percent of our people on farms to release the remaining 94 percent of our people for other activities.

With all of this, however, the difficulty of continuing to offset the inroads of existing diseases, pests, and pestilence, while keeping ever-increasing air traffic from bringing in new ones is tremendous. Despite our great advances, the problems of how to maintain inspection of our meats with the constant decentralization and expansion of packing plants, and how to have ready new strains of food plants each 5 years to replace those which may become susceptible to destructive diseases, continue to plague us.

It becomes increasingly difficult to maintain a sound agricultural economy in a society such as ours, with constantly increasing costs of labor resulting from minimum wages and contract bargaining, and with a growing requirement for larger and more expensive farming operations. With the consumer demanding more and more convenience packaging, uniform and high quality eggs and vegetables, all of which takes more and more of the consumer dollar, leaving a shrinking percentage for the agricultural producer, each year the difficulties facing agriculture become greater.

Despite all of this, agriculture continues to be industry and labor's biggest market and the consumer's cheapest and most economical supplier.

How to maintain farm income at a level to meet all these problems so that the 94 percent of us can continue to enjoy the standard of living to which we have become accustomed, while maintaining our soil, our timber, and other natural resources for future generations, is a major undertaking. Thus it is that we have a constantly growing number of specialists in the U.S. Department of Agriculture who, in cooperation with other specialists, working with and for agricultural producers, processors, and others, have made all these wonderful things possible—and at an annual cost of about what we spend each year trying to get a man to the moon.

PROGRAMS WHICH BENEFIT AGRICULTURE BENEFIT ALL

In addition to the broad programs which benefit all Americans, there are many other activities in the Department, such as school lunches, school milk, food stamps, inspection of all edible foods, nutrition and consumer research, and similar programs, the benefits of which go directly to the consumers. Also, programs of the Department for research, extension, and soil and water conservation are of direct benefit to present and future generations of Americans who must depend upon the land and agricultural technology for their supplies of food and fiber. One of the important contributions to the urban consumer, for example, is the work of the wholesale market planning section of the Department, which has been responsible for the planning and development of new and improved wholesale food markets in 65 of the larger cities of the country. The opening of the outstanding new market for New York City at Hunt's Point on May 17, 1967, is representative of the important service of the Department to urban areas. Department officials estimate that in fiscal year 1966, nearly three-fourths of total USDA expenditures had direct benefits to all consumers, businessmen, and the general public.

At this time, when present budgets for other departments of government call for hundreds of millions of dollars to reclaim our cities, plus other hundreds of millions for a fight against the pollution of our streams and water supplies, and when we are spending literally billions of dollars on reclaiming housing in urban areas, it is important that rural people be enabled to remain in rural areas. In an effort to meet this need the Congress on the recommendation of this committee has made possible loans for the construction of some 115,000 rural homes, has aided with some 15,000 soil, water and sewage loans and grants in all 50

States. By making electricity and telephone service available on a repayable basis, great progress in rural areas has been made. These programs will mean more and more in the years ahead and, in the opinion of the committee, are many times more economical than attempting to correct the problems created by congestion in urban areas.

Funds provided through the years by this committee and the Congress for conservation and forestry programs have made a major contribution to the protection of the watershed areas and the curtailment of pollution of the Nation's water supplies. Cooperative surveys and studies in 52 river basins, together with planning in over 1,300 watersheds and improvement work on over 41 million acres in about 800 watersheds throughout the United States, have greatly reduced the loss of valuable topsoil and have increased supplies of high-quality water for the urban users downstream. Protection of our forests from fire, insects, and diseases has contributed significantly to the supplies of clean and unpolluted water. Continued reforestation work, including the planting of some 13 billion seedlings on 15 million acres in the past 10 years, has done much to protect our water supplies and provide valuable timber to meet present and future needs of the people of this country.

PROGRAM OF SCARCITY—DANGEROUS

World conditions and conditions at home make a program of scarcity not only unsound but even dangerous. The lack of surplus foods is not only being felt by the school lunch and other worthwhile food distribution programs, but in view of the Vietnam war, supplies for all types of commodities could become highly important. In the view of the committee, adequate reserves of food and fiber are essential at all times, though they should be properly insulated so as not to have a depressing influence on the market.

A policy of adequate support levels on storables, where one year's crop can be carried over for many years, and purchases of surplus perishables with Section 32 funds (30 percent of import duties) to strengthen markets, with such purchases diverted to school lunch and other worthy needs, still appears to be the best policy. The production and maintenance of merely an adequate total supply can have an adverse effect on the consumer. With a barely adequate supply, never would the supply of commodities be at the right place at the right time.

The prospect of world food shortages and increasing hunger throughout the world presents serious long-range problems. The increase of production, harvesting, and marketing efficiency through agricultural research, extension and marketing programs of the Department, the preservation of our land, water and productive plant through the Department's conservation and watershed programs, together with its price support and credit programs, will enable American farmers to stay on the land to produce the increased food and fiber production which we must have to feed the expanding populations of the world.

WE MUST FACE THE FACTS

In considering the budget for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1968, all of the points outlined heretofore must be taken into account. In forming judgments on the amount of funds to be provided to support the agricultural programs of the country, the many factors which are gradually eroding the position of agriculture in the national economy must be kept in mind.

As stated earlier in this report, we must face the fact that agriculture is no longer an attractive or profitable occupation for most farm producers. We must recognize the fact that the resulting exodus from the farm is creating serious social and economic problems for the urban areas of the country. We must realize that the programs in this bill which provide a measure of stability of income and enable the farmer to continue in operation under an ever-increasing competitive situation must be adequately funded.

As heretofore pointed out, food, clothing, and shelter are as basic to life as ever. Yet we now have only about 6 percent of our population on the farms producing food for themselves and the other 94 percent of our people.

According to Department figures, an average of nearly 800,000 people have left the farms in each of the last 5 years. The farm population has decreased to about 12 million today, compared to more than double that number in 1950. The 1959 census, the latest official data available, shows that some 17 percent of all farmers in the United States were 65 or older. An additional 22 percent were 55 to 64 years of age. By 1970, it is estimated that nearly half of the farmers will be 55 years of age or over.

Few of the farm-reared children are returning to the farm after completing their education and military service. Fewer and fewer young people are studying agriculture, and most of those who do are not returning to the business of farming. A recent review of official USDA statistics shows that the number of agricultural undergraduate students has decreased from 12.4 percent of total enrollment at land-grant institutions in 1951 to 3.9 percent in 1965.

There are fewer people on the Nation's farms, yet capital required to farm has increased as rapidly as the number of people farming has decreased. The number of farms has gone down from 6.4 million in 1940, to 5.6 million in 1950, to 3.3 million in 1966. The average investment of capital required per farm has increased from $6,158 in 1940, to $16,979 in 1950, to $65,960 in 1966.

More capital is required per farm worker than for his counterpart in industry. The average investment per farm worker in 1966 was $35,958 as compared to $20,910 per factory worker.

Due to the constant increase in the cost of farming, net farm income as a percentage of investment has decreased from 23.1 percent in 1947 to 9.4 percent in 1966. Despite an increase in gross farm income through the years, the 300-percent increase in the cost of items used in farm production has reduced the parity ratio to one of the lowest levels in recent years. More and more, the farmer is having to buy at retail prices and sell at wholesale levels.

There is still a wide disparity between levels of income for farm and nonfarm families. Even though he supplies the basic necessities for his city cousins, the farmer apparently is expected by many groups to continue to occupy a second-rate position in our national economy. While disposable personal income of our nonfarm population in 1966 was over $2,618 per capita, the same income for farm families was $1,731, only 66 percent of nonfarm income.

In recent years, despite Government farm programs, industry and labor's take of the consumer's dollars has increased from 50¢ to 62¢, with the agricultural producer's share of course dropping from 50¢ to 38¢. This increase of 25 percent by industry and labor has been passed on to the consumer as part of the retail price. At the same time, corporate profits after taxes have increased from $19.6 billion in 1952, to $28.5 billion in 1959, and to $48.1 billion in 1966. That, too, is passed on as a part of the consumer's retail price. These increasing elements of cost contribute to the increasing cost of food and goods to all consumers, despite the farmer's declining share of the retail price.

The price paid by urban consumers for a one-pound loaf of white bread averaged 22.2 cents in 1966, of which the farmer received only 3.7 cents for the wheat and other ingredients used. While the retail cost of bread increased 1.3 cents over 1965, the farm value increased only .4 cents. The price of a typical cotton business shirt averaged $4.38 in 1966. The amount received by the farmer for the raw cotton used in making the shirt was 24 cents, between 5 and 6 percent of the total retail price. While the retail price increased 12 cents over 1965, the price of the cotton was 2 cents less.

THE LESSON OF HISTORY

Any nation looking to the future must protect the source of its food and fiber. Throughout history, one of the dangers of urbanization and industrialization of society, with population movement to the cities, has been the demand of city consumers for these basic necessities at prices below the cost of production.

The worn-out and food-deficient countries of Asia and other areas of the world are suffering now because too little of what was taken from the soil in food and fiber production was put back to conserve and revitalize the basic resources. Too little attention was paid to the need to make it possible for well-trained, productive, and satisfied people to remain on the land. In the worn-out lands such as India and China, food supplies gradually decreased and hunger and economic stagnation followed.

In some areas of the world, the significance of this historical fact is beginning to be fully realized today. Many of the countries of the world that have neglected the development of their agricultural industry in order to make a spectacular advance in urban industrialization are coming to realize why their economies are unable to support their populations, and why they are dependent on outside sources of food to feed their people.

This is the lesson that the people of the United States must learn from history. The cost of food, clothing and shelter is going to be paid either by the consumer or by the land from which it comes. Unless we maintain a prosperous and productive agriculture in this country, our economic and political strength can be destroyed not merely through the loss of our ability to feed our own people properly but by the decline in this greatest market for the products of labor and industry. This becomes even more serious as increasing food shortages threaten many areas of the world. China and India are examples of what happens when too little of what is taken out is put back into the land.

Mr. Chairman, this is the fifteenth year I have had the privilege of presenting this bill. I have appreciated the part agricultural development has played in our economic well-being so much that last year I had published a book, entitled "That We May Live." Published by D. Van Nostrand Co., Princeton, New Jersey. I would like to quote here from the first chapter:

> In the beginning, man spent all of his time providing for his creature needs: food, the means to keep his body warm, and shelter from his enemies as well as from the elements. With time he learned he could domesticate and use goats, sheep, cattle, and other animals, thereby obtaining a better living from less effort. Then began the hundreds of years in which man was a nomad, roaming the land seeking grass and feed for his animals and for himself.
>
> After many, many years man discovered that he could till the soil, select and grow crops which in turn saved for him much of the time previously spent in his search for food.
>
> For many centuries, and in some areas now, man—busy with the problem of obtaining from his labor enough with which to exist—had little time for other activities and showed little ingenuity and inventive capacity, either in improving the productivity of his crops or in the plows or instruments he used. Only in the last few hundred years has man had a real breakthrough in his struggle for a better life.
>
> It is since man had time for research that he developed newer and more and more effective machinery for tilling the soil, for harvesting and processing his crops. It is only since man has developed better and more prolific varieties of crops for food and fiber; since he has developed synthetic fertilizers so as to provide the maximum food for his own crops; since his own food, clothing and shelter have become easily available; and even more recently when through the control of insects he has saved himself from illness and his food supply from destruction, that man has had time for all the other pursuits which make for our high standard of living. He has been unbelievably successful.
>
> Thirty-five years ago there were no atomic submarines, no missiles, no satellites, no jets, no nylon, no television, no teflon, no dacron, no DDT, and no synthetic rubber. Nuclear fission itself had not been discovered; and miracle drugs were virtually unknown. Manned flights into the stratosphere were merely a dream and the "man on the moon" was only a phrase to indicate the impossible.
>
> Today our knowledge of all these things has literally changed the face of the earth. Man today stands on the brink of controlling the air above us and the elements about us. The man who developed the atomic submarine recently told me that in future wars the nation which controlled the bottom of the sea might well emerge the victor.
>
> Ours is the only nation where the cost of food averages only 18 per cent of our disposable income—income left after taxes and other fixed costs. United Nations' reports show the average for certain other countries as follows:
>
> | | *Percent* |
> |---|---|
> | Canada | 22 |
> | Ceylon | 51 |
> | Sweden | 27 |
> | Great Britain | 27 |
> | Australia | 23 |
> | Italy | 43 |
> | Korea | 51 |
> | West Germany | 36 |
> | Japan | 43 |
> | France | 31 |
> | Yugoslavia | 46 |
> | U.S.S.R. (estimated) | 50 |
>
> Our estimated national income in 1965 was approximately $544.6 billion, of which $98.4 billion went for food. Just think what would be our situation if an additional $51.2 billion of our gross income had to go for food, leaving that much less with which to purchase the products of industry and labor—as would be the case if it took 27 per cent of our income for food as it does in Great Britain. And if it took 50 per cent of our income for food as it does in the USSR, we would have $178.8 billion less for purchasing other goods and services.
>
> We in this great United States have gradually increased our farm productivity until 82 per cent of our income is available for many items thought to be necessities, and for luxuries, too.
>
> As we improve our production of foods and our high standard of living, helped greatly by those relatively few people engaged in agriculture, let us ponder the words of Jonathan Swift:
>
> "And he gave it as his opinion that whoever could make two ears of corn or two blades of grass to grow upon a spot of ground where only one grew before, would deserve better of mankind and do more essential service to his country than the whole race of politicians put together."
>
> John L. Blake felt much the same as Swift on this score:
>
> "It is not known where he who invented the plough was born or where he died, yet he has affected more the happiness of the world than the whole race of heroes and conquerors who have drenched it with tears and manured it with blood."
>
> Yet, the truth is that other scientists, through years of research and study, have helped as much to provide that extra ear of corn and that second blade of grass for human use by saving them from insects and diseases as did those who developed new varieties and new machinery. The important contribution of those engaged in scientific pursuits entitles them to equal credit for the great improvement in the well-being of much of mankind.
>
> If biological study and its application had not flourished in the past, civilization would have been stalemated on an agricultural level with no spare energies or talent for the industrial and scientific revolution.
>
> Fortunately, the vast majority of our people do have full appreciation of scientific study and its contributions of the past, together with its promise for the future. This majority recognizes our great dependence upon the findings of research scientists for the future and has the greatest admiration and appreciation for scientists themselves.
>
> The medical scientists, of course, have already received well-deserved credit from the general public. As we read of the great plagues of years ago, of the great advances in medicine in controlling many of them, such as malaria, we see clearly how medical men have served humanity, but we sometimes slight the entomologists and other scientists who supported their work by isolating the causes and by developing means of controling the fleas, rats, flies, mosquitoes, and other carriers of these dreaded and deadly diseases.
>
> To be sure, there are hazards connected with human invention and progress; but we do not condemn the inventor or the user of the wheel because there are thousands of casualties directly connected with vehicles utilizing this device.
>
> We know as man has lived his life, day by day and year by year, throughout history he has continued to change and to build for himself a synthetic environment. His clothing, his housing, his food, in fact, almost everything about him is the result of his converting natural elements into products useful to him.

Mr. Chairman, it is the bill before us which recognizes and provides for the continuation of our progress in agriculture in all its many phases; that we may enjoy our present high standard of living while protecting our natural resources for those who come after us.

THE FACTS ABOUT SUBSIDIES

Mr. Chairman, the term "subsidy" is frequently used in reference to the cost of the farm programs by those who would seek to stigmatize or otherwise discredit such programs and who ignore the increasing take of the consumer dollar by labor and industry as a result of laws. This cost is passed on as a part of the retail price and is thus unidentifiable. Most of these persons, groups, or organizations are themselves the recipients of some form of special protection, financial support, or special legislative advantage.

When compared with "subsidies" or direct payments for other segments of our economy, the cost to the taxpayer of the various agricultural programs is relatively modest. Official Government statistics show, for instance, that mail subsidies have cost the taxpayers of the United States a total of $11.5 billion since 1946. They reveal that maritime subsidies for ship construction and operating differential payments have amounted to $6.3 billion since 1938. Business reconversion payments (including tax amortization) through 1962 total $47.7 billion—more than double the cost of farm price support programs since 1934. Tax-free mineral depletion allowances increased from $472 million in 1925 to $4.6 billion in 1964; a total of nearly $61 billion was paid out during the period.

There are numerous other types of special programs or subsidies, both hidden and apparent, which are of direct benefit to one or more segments of our national economy. Housing programs, industrial lending programs, special tax benefits to business, tariff protection, minimum wage protection, wartime production subsidies, all are responsible for large outlays of taxpayers' funds each year.

A special report issued by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress in 1965 gives a full analysis of these special subsidy-type programs. This report also quotes Clair Wilcox, professor of political economy at Swarthmore College, as follows:

> Government has subsidized private enterprise, both in industry and in agriculture, throughout the Nation's history. It has done

so directly and indirectly. In some cases, acting directly, it has made outright gifts: grants of public lands or payments from the Treasury. More often, it has given aid in less open ways: by rendering services for which it makes no charge, by selling goods and services for less than they are worth, by buying goods and services for more than they are worth, and by exempting some enterprises from taxes that others must pay. In all of these cases, the cost of the subsidy has been borne, in the end, by the taxpayer. Acting indirectly, Government has subsidized enterprise by sheltering it from the full force of competition and by granting it the privilege of uncontrolled monopoly. And here, the cost of the subsidy has been borne by the consumer in a higher price.

One of the great difficulties, of course, in the consideration of special benefits and subsidies, is the problem of determining the nature of such programs and identifying the recipients of such special benefits.

BENEFITS TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC

Mr. Chairman, the general public frequently thinks of the Department of Agriculture as an organization which benefits only the farmer. This is especially true of the press and urban people. Since only about 6 percent of our population now lives on farms, it is understandable that the other 94 percent of urban consumers can frequently forget that the agricultural programs funded in this bill provide the basic food supply which primarily benefits them—the consumers—and upon which they are dependent for their very existence.

As has been pointed out earlier, a substantial portion of the funds spent by the Department of Agriculture have direct benefits to consumers, businessmen and the general public, as well as farmers. Food distribution programs such as the school lunch, special milk, and food stamp programs benefit primarily the Nation's consumers, both children and low-income families. Programs for the preservation of our national resources benefit both present and future generations of citizens and consumers of this and other countries of the world. Meat and poultry inspection, and grading and inspection of other food products are carried on to protect the health of all people, rural and urban. Disease and pest control programs protect human as well as animal health. Foreign assistance programs such as P.L. 480 play an important role in our national welfare and security throughout the world.

It was stated earlier that data from official USDA sources indicate that, in fiscal year 1966, funds expended for programs which provide benefits to consumers, businessmen and the general public represents nearly three-fourths of the total expenditures made by the Department during that year.

THE 1968 BUDGET FOR AGRICULTURE

Unlike the budget presented a year ago, the 1968 budget for the Department of Agriculture does not propose severe cuts in research, insect and disease controls, extension activities, soil conservation and watershed projects, and special milk and school lunch programs. Fortunately, it recognizes the value of these programs to the Nation's economy and includes adequate funds to retain them at present operating levels, or even expand them in some instances. Perhaps the restoration of the severe reductions proposed for these programs by the Congress last year is to some extent responsible for this more realistic approach by the Executive Branch for the coming fiscal year.

The budget proposes, however, to reduce the 1968 authorization for rural electrification loans by $61,000,000, in view of a projected carryover of unused 1967 loan authorization. The additional request of $314,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, plus the estimated carryover of $76,000,000 from fiscal year 1967, will provide a total of $390,000,000 for this purpose in the coming fiscal year. This compares with an estimated loan level for fiscal year 1967 of $353,000,000 and appears to be adequate to meet electrification loan needs in fiscal year 1968.

There are several areas of reduction included in the 1968 budget—the advance authorization for the 1968 Agricultural Conservation Program and the loan authorization for farm-operating purposes—which are too severe in the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee.

Although the 1968 budget proposes these reductions, the budget document itself fails to include any information to support such action. On the contrary, information obtained from Department of Agriculture witnesses during the hearings on this bill indicates that the amounts eliminated for these two programs are urgently needed to protect our natural resources and to enable our farmers to continue to produce the food and fiber needed to meet our national demands.

In discussing the need for farm-operating loans during 1968 hearings, the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration stated:

> Operators of family farms are continuing to experience great difficulty in obtaining suitable and adequate credit. Farmers are utilizing much more operating-type credit than ever before. The non-real estate debts owed by farmers as of January 1, 1967, were approximately $21.4 billion which was an increase of 12.6% over the amount owed on January 1, 1966, and 65% over the amount owed in 1962. This increase in use of credit is reflected in the change in average size of FHA operating loans. Our initial operating loans have gone up from an average of $5,866 in the 1962 fiscal year to $6,333 in fiscal year 1966. The average subsequent loan has increased from $2,623 to $3,427 during the same period.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The impact of these trends has been an increased demand for Farmers Home Administration operating loans. More than one-half of the states had obligated funds allocated to them for initial operating loans by the end of February of this fiscal year.

These statements would indicate the need for more—not less—loan funds for farm-operating purposes. It is significant to note that the Department of Agriculture initially requested over $500 million for operating-loan purposes in the coming year. It should also be noted that losses have been only about 1 percent of the principal advanced.

This is the 12th time in 15 years that the Bureau of the Budget has proposed a drastic reduction in the Agricultural Conservation Program. While the budget gives no reason for this proposed cut for 1968, in previous years it has been claimed that more emphasis on permanent or long-range type practices would require less funds for this program. In this connection, it should be noted that 85 percent of the full $220,000,000 provided for 1966 was used for these permanent practices. Secretary Freeman's statement to the committee in February of this year on this point is as follows:

> During the 1966 fiscal year, 85 percent of the ACP cost-sharing funds expended were for soil, water, woodland, and wildlife conservation measures classified as enduring-type practices. These types of practices conserve the land and water resources for several years or help shift the land permanently into protective uses such as permanent grass or tree cover and terrace or other erosion control and water conservation and management system.

The budget also failed to indicate that the proposed reduction for the ACP program would result in the elimination of 394 man-years now available to carry out the work of the Soil Conservation Service. In response to an inquiry on this subject during the hearings, the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service indicated that the cut would come almost exclusively at the work unit level—pages 545–6, part 2, 1968 hearings. It is interesting to note that the same budget document proposes increases at the work unit level under another appropriation item.

THE BILL RECOMMENDED FOR 1968

In reviewing the 1968 budget request for agriculture, and in arriving at the amounts included in the accompanying bill, the committee was aware of the large number of employees, research stations, field offices, and other facilities already available to the Department of Agriculture. The number of employees is expected to reach 85,800 permanent and 34,700 intermittent and temporary employees by the end of the current fiscal year, a total of 120,500 employees of all types. About one-fourth of these are in the Forest Service, which is funded in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation, leaving around 78,000 employees in programs financed by appropriations in this bill. This includes a total staff of in excess of 12,000 located here in the Washington metropolitan area, including the Beltsville Research Center, to handle the supervision, direction, and servicing of Department programs throughout the country.

Under the Agricultural Research Service, the Department now has 240 research stations engaged in every possible phase of agricultural research, running from locations of one or two persons to larger facilities employing 400 to 500 people. In addition, the Department has over 10,000 field offices in nearly every city, village, and rural area in the Nation, with 7,640 at the county or work unit level. Also, the Federal-State Extension Service has a total of 3,207 offices throughout the country.

The committee approached the consideration of amounts to be proposed in this bill with full realization of the need to hold Federal expenditures to a workable minimum so as to reduce the large Federal deficit, estimates of which continue to grow. It also was aware of the urgency of limiting proposed budget increases which would contribute to the need for a further tax increase. Against this, it has weighed the importance of every agricultural program in the bill to the health and welfare of the Nation's consumers, the preservation of our natural resources for future generations, and the maintenance of a sound national economy.

With this in mind, the committee allowed a minimum number of highly essential or unavoidable increases for fiscal year 1968 to (1) utilize research facilities previously funded and ready for operation, (2) meet the urgent need for a mechanized agriculture to offset the lack of adequate farm labor, (3) assure continued protection of public health through such programs as pollution research, meat and poultry inspection, plant and animal quarantine inspection, and enforcement of disease control programs affecting both animals and humans, (4) preserve our basic agricultural production capacity by providing technical assistance to new soil and water conservation districts which will enter the Nation's conservation program in the next year, and by moving ahead on the conservation and watershed programs, (5) provide adequate food to children and low-income consumers, through the special milk, school lunch, and food stamp programs, and (6) assure adequate credit to farm operators by providing additional staff to handle the lending programs of the Farmers Home Administration which have been expanded nearly threefold in recent years as a result of new legislation enacted by the Congress.

The increases provided in line with these criteria are to be used for increased work in the field. For some years, the committee has felt that personnel at the Washington level (including national supervision at Beltsville) should not be expanded further. Therefore, the general policy of taking a portion of the increases allowed for overhead at the Washington level shall be deferred for the coming year, except where separately justified and separately approved by Congress.

Many of the increases proposed for the various appropriation items in the 1968 budget, however essential they may be, were not allowed by the committee, because they did not meet the criteria outlined above. Also, it was not possible to include funds for the 200 or more requests received from Members of Congress, private individuals, and various organizations for an additional $242 million for very meritorious projects not included in the 1968 budget. The committee recognizes the urgent need for these important programs and requests the Department to undertake the most essential ones with existing manpower and funds. To assist the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service to handle the increased research needs, the committee has increased his contingency research fund from $1 million to $3 million for next year. To the extent that such additional projects cannot be undertaken next year, they should be given a high priority in the formulation of the 1969 budget for the Department.

A list of requested increases above the budget totaling $13.3 million and 576 additional man-years for research is included in the Agricultural Research Service section of this report. It will be noted from that tabulation that personnel and funds now being devoted to the various additional research activities are substantial for most items, and should be adequate to permit the diversion of manpower, money, and facilities from less essential to more essential projects.

In view of the overriding evidence that the proposed budget reductions for the Agricultural Conservation Program would do irreparable damage to the conservation efforts of the Nation, with long-range harm to both farmers and consumers, the committee has restored funds for the 1968 Agricultural Conservation Program to the 1967 level. The statements from Department of Agriculture officials quoted earlier in this report, together with pertinent testimony from congressional and public witnesses contained in the printed hearings, fully justify this action in the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee.

While the committee has not restored the budget reduction of $50,000,000 for farm-operating loans, it is the firm opinion of a majority of its members that the full $350,000,000 for such loans should have been included in the 1968 budget. These funds are usually exhausted by February each year, and the Department has some 7,700 unfunded applications totaling $90,000,000 on hand at present. Should the need for the additional loan authorization arise, the committee trusts that the Budget will make a timely request for such additional funds.

PERSONNEL INCREASES

The 1968 budget proposes increases in average employment of 2,307 man-years for the programs of the Department financed from appropriated funds. This is offset by a projected reduction of 551 man-years financed by transfers and reimbursements from other departments and agencies, leaving a net increase proposed for fiscal year 1968 of 1,756 man-years for all agencies of the Department except the Forest Service, which is not funded in this bill.

The appropriations recommended for 1968 by the committee provide a net increase of 762 man-years, less than one-third of those proposed to be financed from appropriations in the 1968 budget. In the opinion of the committee, the increases allowed are absolutely essential. They meet the criteria set forth earlier in this report. Despite efforts to hold Department of Agriculture personnel to present levels, these increases are considered to be in the "unavoidable" category and must be approved.

The increases by agency are as follows:

Agricultural Research Service:	
Research programs	104
Disease and pest control	53
Total, ARS	157
Soil Conservation Service:	
Staffing 15 new districts	45
River basin surveys	48
Resource conservation and development	30
Total, SCS	133
Consumer and Marketing Service:	
Meat and poultry inspection	350
Food Stamp Plan	300
Total, C. & M.S.	650
Commodity Exchange Authority	2
Office of Information	5
Farmers Home Administration:	
Loan and grant programs	140
Rural areas development	84
Total, FHA	224
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	20
Total increase allowed	1,191
Less reductions proposed in budget and agreed to by Committee	[1] 429
Net man-year increase, 1968	762

[1] Man-year decreases proposed in Statistical Reporting Service, Consumer and Marketing Service, Extension Service, Rural Electrification Administration, Rural Community Development Service, and Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

RESEARCH

The bill includes an appropriation of $135,587,500, plus a transfer of $15,000,000 from section 32 funds, for fiscal year 1968 for the research programs of this agency. This is a decrease of $1,395,500 in the budget request and a decrease of $410,000 below the 1967 appropriations. Within the reduced amount the committee has allowed the following increases and decreases.

The $4,000,000 increase recommended for staffing and equipping new research stations will provide full funding for all facilities which will be ready for operation early in the next fiscal year, plus partial funding to permit advance preparations for those that will be opened later in fiscal year 1968 or in early fiscal year 1969.

The additional $400,000 for research on environmental pollution will provide for engineering research on rural waste disposal, research on physical, chemical, and biological properties of farm animal wastes, and research on the effects of air pollutants on crop growth. It is essential that research on farm and rural pollution be conducted as an integral part of the national effort in the area of pollution control.

The increase of $300,000 for research on animal diseases will enable the Department to expand its research projects for swine abscesses, anaplasmosis of cattle, equine piroplasmosis of horses, and trichinae in swine. A total of $469,200 is now being spent by the Department for this area of research. The losses to the livestock industry from disease and pestilence are estimated to be close to $1 billion per year.

An increase of $200,000 is provided to undertake research on plant sources of protein. Plants offer enormous possibilities as a means to increase both quantity and quality of proteins for animal feeds and human food. Such crops as peanuts, soybeans, and dry beans offer great potential for cheaper sources of protein foods and feed through increased yield. In a world faced with increased hunger and starvation in the future, it is important that some basic research on new sources of proteins for human diets be initiated at this time.

An additional $200,000 is provided for research on remote sensing principles and techniques in agricultural management of soil and water resources. Great progress has been made recently in sensor technology. This work offers the potential of a relatively inexpensive method for soil mapping, river basin studies, identification of drought and salinity problem areas, and evaluation of sources of water.

A relatively modest increase of $56,000 has been included for research to improve ornamental plants. Bacterial and fungus diseases continue to cause serious losses to the ornamentals industry, which is estimated to have gross annual sales of $1.5 billion. Only $85,000 is presently available to study the more destructive diseases or ornamentals such as black spot of roses and root rots of poinsettias and bulb crops. The importance of this industry to the general economy indicates the need for the additional funds provided.

An additional $75,000 is provided to initiate research on improved mechanical methods of planting, harvesting and handling of vegetables. The 1964 farm value of all vegetables, including strawberries and melons, exceeded $1.3 billion. With the supply of farm labor decreasing rapidly, it is urgent that mechanical methods of supplying high quality and reasonably priced perishables to the Nation's markets be developed as rapidly as possible.

An increase of $100,000 is included in the bill to expand studies for drainage and salinity control in the Imperial Valley and similar areas of southern California. Thousands of miles of drain tiles have been installed in the irrigated lands of the Imperial Valley, which produced over $200 million of crops in 1965, to remove the salt deposited by irrigation water from the Colorado River. Deposits of iron and manganese oxides are clogging these tiles and making them ineffective. Additional research is needed to restore the usefulness of these tile systems.

An additional $41,000 is approved to expand research on the sugar beet root maggot. It is estimated that infestations may destroy from 80 to 90 percent of the beet crops in some areas. In view of the importance of this problem to our $200 million sugar beet industry, the committee believes that the present $12,000 being spent for research on this problem should be increased by the amount allowed.

The additional $574,000 included for pay increases for engineers and scientists results from authorizations by the Civil Service Commission in February, 1967, under Executive Order No. 11073 issued pursuant to basic law (5 U.S.C. 5303). The committee questions the advisability of legislation which permits the executive branch to commit the Congress to mandatory increases of this type.

An appropriation of $2,500,000 is recommended for the construction of a plant disease, nematode, and insect laboratory at Beltsville, Md. The plans, for which $338,000 was provided in the 1965 Appropriation Act, are expected to be completed by November 1967, and construction can proceed immediately thereafter. Scientists currently engaged in research of this type are located in widely scattered, inadequately equipped laboratories. In view of the need for improved methods for controlling insects and plant diseases, the most effective and efficient research facilities are warranted. The amount proposed will permit construction at $30 per square foot in lieu of the $35 per square foot average proposed.

An increase of $150,000 is included for plans for construction of a Grassland Restoration Laboratory at Temple, Tex., to cost a total of $1,800,000. It is estimated that about 146 million acre-feet of water, or 40 percent of the water used in the State, is lost to brush, cacti, and weeds. Additional intensive research is needed to improve chemical and mechanical means of brush control and to reestablish grassland cover for sustained production of forage and conserving water.

Also an additional $150,000 is included for the next fiscal year to enable the Department to review and bring up to date information on the need for (1) additions to the soil and water laboratory at Morris, Minn.; (2) a soil-water-plant research facility at Ithaca, N.Y.; (3) a soil-water-plant research team in Florida; (4) a wine research facility in California; (5) expansion of research facilities at Big Springs, Tex.; (6) additional wool research at Albany, Calif.; (7) a genetic stock center for bees at Baton Rouge, La.; (8) intensifying research on sugar sorghums at existing facilities; (9) research on the engineering and evaluation of forage utilization systems at the Ohio Research and Development Center; and (10) restoration of a cooperative cane sugar refining research project at New Orleans. These activities all have considerable merit and the committee is of the opinion that they should be given full and careful consideration by the Department for inclusion of justified amounts in the 1969 budget.

Both sugar and wool, for example, are commodities in which United States production is deficient, and additional research to increase domestic production could result in additional income to those segments of our agricultural industry. Sugar sorghum appears to have a real potential in those areas of the country which need alternatives to existing crops such as cotton. Additional research on sorghums as a source of sugar at the Meridian Station, and additional wool research at the Western Utilization Laboratory should be undertaken as soon as possible to meet the needs of these industries.

CONTINGENCY RESEARCH FUND

It was pointed out earlier that many members and public witnesses presented statements to the committee requesting the addition of funds to the budget to meet urgent research needs. Some 33 of these requests involving more than 576 man-years and $13.3 million additional were received.

In view of the heavy military demands on the Federal Treasury and the large budget deficit indicated for next year, it has not been possible to include these items in the bill. As mentioned earlier, the committee is aware of the urgency of these proposals and requests the Department to undertake the most essential projects with existing manpower, funds and facilities. In addition, the committee has added $2,000,000 within the total budget request to increase the Administrator's contingency research fund from $1 million to $3 million. It also has requested him to give a high priority to these programs in formulating the 1969 budget for the Agricultural Research Service.

Of all the storable basic commodities, cotton continues to face major problems, primarily because of past faulty governmental policies of not keeping U.S. cotton on world markets competitively. The declining demand for shorter staple cotton, plus the failure of the Bureau of the Budget to recommend adequate funds for cotton research, have greatly aggravated these problems.

Supplies of cotton in Commodity Credit Corporation inventories amount to 5.4 million bales at present. About 62 percent of this is 1 inch or less in staple length and valued roughly at $275 million. The Department recently has announced reduced price supports in an effort to bring a change to the better and longer staple cottons. Additional research is badly needed to produce an earlier maturing variety for certain areas, to develop better classing methods, and to provide for better methods of using shorter fibers in spinning. A total of $275,000 of CCC funds have been earmarked in this bill to undertake some special research work at the Southern Utilization Laboratory, Texas Tech University, and the Clemson Quality Laboratory on utilization of short staple cotton and mechanical classing practices. The committee renews its urgent request that the position of a Sales Manager with real authority be reinstated. Funds received from sales are not only helpful, but become available to the Commodity Credit Corporation to finance its huge operations.

With regard to all types of cotton, there is an essential need for much more information concerning every aspect of cotton in an effort to reduce the cost of production and thereby improve its competitive position. A thorough statement of these needs was prepared and presented at the request of the committee by Dr. C. R. Sayre, formerly a research specialist of the Department and now President of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association. He not only is an expert in the field of research but also has had a varied experience both in production, marketing and handling of cotton for a number of years. This report appears on pages 324 to 331, part 4, of the hearings for 1968.

It is to be noted that the Bureau of the Budget has never submitted estimates for the $10 million "crash" research program which was assured to the cotton industry when the 1964 Agricultural Act was passed. In view of these commitments, the committee has provided substantial increases above the budget for cost-of-production research on cotton since 1964. The committee urges the Bureau of the Budget to consider all these factors in the coming year, and in preparing the budget for 1969. For the present, the committee urges that cotton research needs be considered in allocating the $3 million contingency fund which has been provided for additional research in fiscal year 1968.

CONTROL PROGRAMS

The committee recommends an appropriation of $84,028,000 for fiscal year 1968, a decrease of $1,824,000 in the budget estimate and an increase of $1,362,100 over the 1967 appropriation.

The 1968 bill includes funds for a supervisory group in Washington to coordinate and direct work of field personnel of the Agricultural Research Service in carrying out the inspection of dealers engaged in the transportation, sale and handling of dogs, cats and other research animals under Public Law 89–544. This agency has a staff of over 15,000 people, with about 6,000 of them already engaged in inspection and control activities. After thorough study of this new law, the committee has concluded that the most effective means to meet the new requirements is to provide a supervisory staff in Washington and to assign the field work to existing personnel at some 457 locations throughout the country. It is convinced that experienced personnel at proper locations can do the job far more expeditiously and efficiently than newly recruited and untrained employees and means for such work to be done.

The 1968 budget proposes an increase of $1,000,000 to maintain the screwworm barrier zone between the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean. One-half of this amount is included in the Second Supplemental Act, 1967. The balance of $500,000 is included in this bill to fully meet this need in the coming year. The barrier zone is the only means available to protect the entire country against the natural migration of screwworms from Mexico. Now that the United States is virtually free of screwworm fly populations, it is important that the barrier zone be maintained to prevent reentry of this pest. The economic benefits to the livestock industry are enormous.

In recent years, considerable attention has been given to the problem of salmonella contamination of animal feeds. Additional work must be carried on, however, to assure protection against this disease which can be transmitted to humans. The full budget request of $300,000 is recommended for the coming fiscal year to expand this program to all States and to strengthen monitoring and laboratory studies of this dangerous disease.

An additional $150,100 is also included in the bill to expand regulatory activities under the Virus-Serum-Toxin Act. This increase would be used (1) to test check over 2,000 lots of 76 different animal vaccines which have not been under surveillance due to shortage of manpower, and (2) to permit more adequate testing of the steadily increasing volume and types of veterinary biologics.

An increase of $420,000 is provided to strengthen plant and animal quarantine inspection at ports-of-entry to prevent the introduction of destructive foreign pests and diseases. Entries of people and goods through international land, sea and border ports have increased an average of around 10 percent during 1966. As a result, the inspection workload has increased as follows: Airplane inspections—13.2 percent; baggage inspections—15.3 percent; miscellaneous cargo inspections—7.7 percent; and interceptions of unauthorized materials—17.0 percent.

The boll weevil eradication actvities in the High Plains of Texas have been highly successful, and it is planned to put this program on a maintenance basis in fiscal year 1968. Accordingly, a reduction of $500,000 in the funds needed for this purpose is proposed. The remaining funds, $502,800, will be fully matched by local funds to treat infested "hot spots" found in the area and to conduct surveys and regulatory work.

An additional $500,000 is included in the bill pursuant to estimates submitted on April 28, 1967 (House Document No. 114) to take over the cost of quarantine inspection work formerly handled by the State of California, which has declined to pay the expense of performing this important work for the coming year, though it has done a fine job of enforcing Federal plant quarantine orders and regulations at the maritime ports of San Diego, San Pedro (including Los Angeles), San Francisco, and the international airports at Los Angeles, Oakland, and San Francisco since the beginning of the program in 1912. On February 8, 1967, the California Department of Agriculture notified this Department that it was unwilling to continue to finance this work after June 30, 1967. The additional funds are needed so that this Department can assume full responsibility for enforcement of Federal plant quarantines at ports of entry in California in fiscal year 1968.

An increase of $26,000 is provided to cover pay increases for engineers and scientists authorized by the Civil Service Commission under Executive Order No. 11073 issued pursuant to basic law.

A total of $5,388,600 is included in the bill for the continuation of the fire ant program at the 1967 level of operation. The threat to the Southeast and eventually much of the Nation is far more serious than realized by Department of Agriculture officials at the time of the hearings on the 1968 budget. Recent information indicates that the fire ant infestation covers 106 million acres rather than the 45 million previously indicated. Present procedures seem to be failing to control the spread of this destructive and dangerous pest. Testimony presented to the Committee by State officials indicates that the States of Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana have increased or are proposing to increase matching funds to undertake a program to completely eradicate this serious pest as rapidly as possible.

To determine the full extent of this serious threat to American Agriculture, and to develop a more effective method for eradication through a cooperative Federal-State approach, the Department is directed to reexamine the entire fire ant problem, including (1) an accurate indication of the extent of the infestation, (2) its effects on crops, livestock and people, (3) the most effective techniques and materials available, (4) the time and cost of a full-scale program to eliminate this insect from the United States.

SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

This research is conducted with local currencies in countries in which the United States has foreign currency available in excess of normal U.S. requirements. The dollars appropriated for this purpose are used to purchase these excess currencies from the Treasury Department. Since the dollars remain in the United States, and since this country owns large amounts of excess currencies in some 11 countries, their use for research and market development purposes appears fully justified.

For the coming fiscal year, an appropriation of $7,500,000 is recommended, a decrease of $7,900,000 in the budget request and an increase of $3,000,000 over the 1967 appropriation. The amount provided for fiscal year 1968, plus an estimated carryover of unobligated prior year funds into next year, will continue the program at approximately the 1967 operating level.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

Information provided to the Committee indicates that some State legislatures have appropriated matching funds for construction of research facilities at State Experiment Stations far in excess of the amounts available under the formula distribution of Federal appropriations for this purpose. To partially meet this situation, the Committee has reduced the proposed increases for research activities slightly in view of similar research in other agencies of the Department, so as to increase the grants for facilities to $2,500,000 for fiscal year 1968. The increase of $500,000 is merely a token increase at this time. To fully match the funds available in several States would require an increase of probably $80 million above the 1968 budget for grants for construction of research facilities, in view of the distribution formula contained in the basic law—Public Law 88–74.

EXTENSION SERVICE

The committee recommends the full budget estimate of $96,602,000 for fiscal year 1968 for the various appropriations under this head. This represents a total increase of $3,803,000 for the coming year.

The funds included in the bill for 1968 represent the full budget estimates for each subappropriation item. It will be noted, however, that funds for the community development programs under "Payments to States and Puerto Rico" have been reduced to $700,000, approximately one-half of the budget request, whereas funds for 4–H Club programs which mean so much in training youth have been increased to $1,800,000, an increase of $800,000 in the budget estimates. In view of the many agencies of the Department and the entire Federal Government engaged in community development activities, the committee feels that the additional funds can be used most effectively in programs which work directly with the youth of this Nation. The wholesome effect of 4-H Club activities has been so beneficial to rural youth that additional efforts to bring 4-H programs to young people in the congested and deprived urban areas of the United States would make an invaluable contribution to the moral, spiritual and economic strength of this Nation.

The committee is concerned about the apparent tendency on the part of some States to attempt to reduce State funds as increases in Federal funds are appropriated under the Hatch Act and the Smith-Lever Act. Increases in Federal funds are not intended to replace State funds which would have been available otherwise. Much of the early legislation for these programs expressly stated this principle. The committee believes that reductions in State support following increases in Federal funds should be considered as using Federal funds in substitution. The Congress should take note of such actions in considering future appropriations for this purpose.

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

The 1967 appropriation level of $1,204,000 is recommended again for next year. This is a reduction of $200,000 in the 1968 budget request. Under the criteria established by the committee, as described earlier, the additional funds and employees requested here have not been approved.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

For conservation operations a total appropriation of $113,053,000 is proposed for fiscal year 1968, a decrease of $942,000 in the budget request.

Forty-five additional many-years of staffing at an annual cost of $540,000 is included to provide technical assistance to 15 new districts expected to be formed in fiscal year 1968. This increase is needed in areas not now covered by districts. It is essential to the National Conservation Program that additional districts be encouraged to enter the program as rapidly as possible. To do this, it is important that adequate staff be available to help landowners and operators organize themselves into districts, develop conservation plans, and carry out conservation measures.

The additional $942,000 for 125 man-years of part-time help to existing districts has not been approved. However, the restoration of the full amount for the 1968 agricultural conservation program will more than meet this need by restoring a total of 394 man-years of trained and experienced help now available to existing districts.

The balance of the increase will be used to cover salary increases for scientists and engineers pursuant to House Document 114.

The full budget estimate of $6,377,000 for watershed planning is recommended for the next fiscal year. The net increase of $35,000 will provide for salary increases for professional engineers authorized by the Civil Service Commission on February 12, 1967, pursuant to the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, Public Law 87-793. The 1968 budget proposes that 100 new watershed planning starts be authorized for the coming year, the same number that the committee insisted on for the present year. On the basis of information furnished the committee, it is apparent that applications will greatly exceed this number in 1968. Therefore, the committee authorizes not less than 100 new planning starts for next year. The total number to be started should be limited only by the total funds available.

For the watershed protection program, the full budget estimate of $70,403,000 has been included in the bill for fiscal year 1968, the committee authorizes not less than 80 new construction starts for the coming fiscal year, the figure that it insisted upon for the present year. The Committee feels that projects should be moved into the construction stage as rapidly as plans have been approved, provided adequate funds are available. It is pleased to note the increase in local contributions of land, easements, water rights, and rights of way.

The full budget of $25,753,000 is provided for the flood prevention program for fiscal year 1968. The net increase of $57,600 covers salary increases of engineers pursuant to the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, Public Law 87-793.

The full budget estimate of $16,336,000 is recommended for the next fiscal year for the Great Plains Conservation Program. This is a reduction of $2,168,300 below fiscal year 1967. However, some of the backlog of pending applications was taken care of in the current year. The new appropriation provided will cover about 3,900 additional contracts in fiscal year 1968.

An appropriation of $6,000,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1968 for the Resource Conservation and Development Program. The committee has agreed to nearly one-half of the budget increase for this new program which was set up in 1962 and is still on an experimental basis. It feels that during the next year the Department should study the possible need for a cooperative program on a regional or statewide basis, using the experience gained from this small experimental program.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

The 1967 appropriation level of $12,421,000 is recommended again for the next fiscal year. This is a decrease of $1,225,000 in the 1968 budget request.

The committee's action in this instance does not indicate that the additional work proposed for 1968 would not be of value. It merely indicates that this additional research does not meet the "unavoidable increase" criterion outlined earlier. The new work should be undertaken to the fullest extent possible with present personnel and funds.

STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

The bill includes an appropriation for fiscal year 1968 of $13,821,750, a decrease of $42,250 in the budget request, and a continuation of the 1967 operating level. The amount proposed will provide program increases of $122,000, plus an additional $292,500 for equipment to automate the gathering, processing and dissemination of data to the public, and $136,000 to cover increased mail costs. These increases are fully offset by a nonrecurring reduction of $543,500 due to the completion of the conversion to the new computer system during the present fiscal year.

New automatic equipment will be used both in the field offices and Washington for sending and receiving data at rapid speeds. This will enable field offices to handle larger volumes of data, and will provide an economical means of preparing, maintaining and utilizing larger lists for mail sampling of estimates.

Procedures for computing the agency's mail costs have been revised, with assistance and concurrence of the Post Office Department, to recognize the greatly increased volume of mail, added mail services, and increases in mailing costs.

The committee recommends that further review be given to the need for crop reports on the filbert crop in Oregon. The funds provided for fiscal year should enable this Service to match the $3,000 of local funds now available for this purpose, if the reinstatement of these reports is determined to be feasible and can be arranged.

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

For consumer, protective, marketing, and regulatory programs in the coming fiscal year, an appropriation of $89,010,000 is recommended.

The increase of $3,500,000 included for meat and poultry inspection will provide an additional 350 man-years of inspection time for these activities. In view of the normal lag in recruiting trained personnel for this work, the funds provided should be adequate for the next year. During the past year, about 100 fewer positions were filled than authorized, due to the difficulty of recruiting and retaining this type of personnel.

The 1967 expenditures of $250,000 for public hearings, referendum, to initiate the Cotton Research and Promotion Act (Public Law 89-502), will not recur in 1968. An offsetting reduction for fiscal year 1968 of $250,000 has been made as proposed in the 1968 budget.

The need for a livestock market news service for Wyoming and western Nebraska has been presented to the committee. It is apparent that the lack of such service is a severe handicap to the producers of this important livestock area. Since similar market news information is provided to other livestock producing areas of the Nation, the committee feels that plans must be made by the Department to establish this service during the coming fiscal year from the first balances which will become available from position vacancies or other savings. Since it will provide regional service, it should be considered a category I market news service.

The full budget estimate of $1,750,000 is recommended again for the fiscal year 1968 for payments to States and possessions. In view of the serious budget situation facing the Federal Government, it is hoped the States can meet any additional needs which may develop in the next year in the work financed by this appropriation.

The special milk program is aimed primarily at increasing the consumption of fluid milk by children. Nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, all nonprofit summer camps, and child-care institutions devoted to the care and training of children, are eligible to participate in the program. The full budget estimate of $104,000,000 is recommended for the coming fiscal year. This will permit the program to continue at the level authorized for fiscal year 1967, and will cover an estimated 3.2 billion half pints of fluid milk for the next year.

For the school lunch program, the full budget estimate of $198,735,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1968. In addition, the usual transfer of $45,000,000 from section 32 funds has been included for the procurement of foods for distribution to schools to provide well balanced and nutritional needs. The total available from these two sources is $243,735,000, which is an increase of $30,130,000 over funds provided for fiscal year 1967.

For a number of years, the amount provided for this program has been based on an average of 5 cents per meal for the estimated number of meals to be served, plus the funds for operating and administrative expenses. In addition, a transfer of $45,000,000 from section 32 funds has been carried to provide adequate funds for commodity procurement purposes.

In view of the steady rise in food prices each year, and due to the reduction in surplus foods available to this program, the committee has included $187,000,000 for the cash payments to States based on an average of 5.5 cents per meal for an estimated 3.4 billion meals to be served in the next school year. The majority of the members of the committee feel that the main financial support should be used to strengthen the regular school lunch program which has proved to be of such great benefit to the Nation's school children in the past.

In addition to the cash payment to States, the bill also carries increased funds totaling $5,000,000 for cash assistance to needy schools, $2,000,000 for the pilot breakfast program, $750,000 for nonfood assistance, $46,885,000 for commodity procurement (including the transfer from section 32), and $2,100,000 for administrative and operating expenses.

Federal funds in this bill provide the basis for total school lunch expenditures of over $1.5 billion per year. For fiscal year 1967, for example, Federal contributions of funds and surplus food for the school lunch and special milk programs are expected to reach $411 million. State and local contributions are estimated at $350 million. Payments by children are estimated at $917 million, making a total from all sources of $1,678 million.

The budget requests $195,000,000 for fiscal year 1968 for the Food Stamp Program, an increase of $55,000,000 over funds available for fiscal year 1967. It proposes that the entire amount be financed by a transfer from section 32 funds. It is to be noted that the estimated income of $570,000,000 in fiscal year 1968, plus a carryover of $300,000,000, will be sufficient to fully finance all section 32 procurement and distribution functions, all of the transfers to other programs proposed in the budget, and still leave a carryover balance of $300,000,000 for the following year plus an unused balance of $26,000,000 which will lapse on June 30, 1968.

The committee recommends a total of $195,000,000 for the next fiscal year, $180,000,000 to come from section 32 and $15,000,000—or as much as finally becomes available—to be made available by reappropriation of prior year unused balances for this program.

The language of the bill makes the availability of these funds contingent upon the enactment of legislation to continue this program. The language provides further that, in the absence of such authorizing legislation, the funds shall be available for commodity purchases to reestablish the direct distribution program which was in effect prior to adoption of the present Food Stamp Program.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

For fiscal year 1968, the committee recommends the same amount as provided for 1967, $21,441,500. This is a reduction of $1,170,500 in the 1968 budget request. With some 900 people and $26 million now available to this agency, the committee feels that the additional work proposed for next year can be handled with existing personnel and funds. It should be noted that there are a total of 300 positions in the present overseas attaché posts, with seven posts having 10 or more people. If it is determined that additional attaché posts should be opened in new areas as proposed in the 1968 budget, this could be done by giving up some existing posts or by reassignment of existing personnel from the larger posts.

The budget also proposes an increase of $168,250 in transfers from the Commodity Credit Corporation for the barter program and ocean transportation assistance. Since this proposed transfer would add an additional 14 man-years of employment, it has not been agreed to by the committee.

A transfer of $3,117,000 from section 32 funds is also included in the bill for fiscal year 1968. This will provide a total of $26,433,250 for the operations of this essential agency in the coming fiscal year, not including an estimated $250,000 to be transferred from AID and other agencies for services to be performed for those organizations in 1968.

In the event that it is decided to proceed with participation in the Tokyo Fair, funds now available should be used. It is noted that this agency had over $7 million of unobligated funds on hand as of March 31, 1967. The committee's action is not intended to delay or prohibit participation by the Department in this exhibition.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

The full budget estimate of $1,491,000 is recommended for the next fiscal year. The increase of $57,000, which involves only 2 new employees, is provided to increase trade practice investigations through the use of automatic data processing equipment.

With this system, it is expected that this agency will be able to eliminate the present manual system which permits the analysis of only a limited cross section of transactions annually. The proposed automatic system, which will involve the rental of existing Government-owned or private equipment, will enable it to greatly increase the number of transactions analyzed and speed up the followup investigations of violations disclosed. The number of commodity transactions have gone up each year, from 12.8 million in 1964 to 15.1 million estimated in 1968.

This is one of two exceptions made by the committee to the rule prohibiting additional personnel in Washington. This exception is necessary due to the small size of this agency and the importance of its enforcement activities to the stability of the Nation's commodity markets.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

For the operating and administrative expenses of the various programs of this agency, the budget proposes a total of $205,154,000, $152,665,400 by direct appropriation and $52,488,600 by transfer to cover costs of operating the Commodity Credit Corporation. The budget proposal contemplates an adjustment of $24,500,000 between appropriated and funds transferred from CCC to reflect a decrease in workload related to CCC programs and a corresponding increase in other activities financed by this appropriation.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $137,935,400 plus a transfer from CCC in the amount of $64,728,000—a total of $202,664,000 for the coming fiscal year. This is a decrease of $3,694,500 in funds provided for fiscal year 1967 and is $2,490,000 less than requested in the budget.

The amounts recommended provide for an adjustment of $10,000,000 between appropriated and CCC funds, which appears to be a more reasonable amount than the $24,500,000 adjustment proposed in the budget. The reduction below 1967 is due to expected increases in employee productivity and some reduction in workload.

Appropriations for direction of emergency programs are included in the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill for all agencies and departments of the Government.

Questions have been raised with the committee as to the propriety of the actions of some of the employees of this agency in promoting certain programs of the Department. It is not unusual to have such complaints. However, attention is called to the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, which prohibit the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence Members of Congress in support of or in opposition to farm legislation or appropriation acts.

An appropriation of $80,000,000 is included to make payments to eligible sugar producers in fiscal year 1968. Since the 1967 crop year production will remain about the same as last year, the amount of the appropriation has been retained at the 1967 level. This is a reduction of $6,500,000 in the budget request for next year. During the period 1938–66, collections of $2.4 billion from excise and import taxes have exceeded payments by approximately $552 million. Estimated collections through fiscal year 1968 of $2.6 billion will exceed estimated payments through fiscal year 1968 by $592 million.

The full budget request for an appropriation of $220,000,000 is included in the bill to make payments earned under the 1967 agricultural conservation program authorized last year. Amounts due are legal commitments and funds must be provided to pay all contracts entered into under the 1967 authorization.

The committee has restored the 1968 program authorization to the previously established level of $220,000,000—plus $30,000,000 for administrative expenses included under the appropriation "Expenses, ASCS." It should be noted that more than an offsetting reduction of $167,000,000 has been made in the overseas food donation program under title II of Public Law 480—food-for-peace program.

This restoration will permit the continuation of our nationwide soil and water conservation efforts at the level which has been in existence for 12 years or more. It will prevent the elimination of essential conservation practices which are an integral part of our watershed programs. It will prevent the elimination of 394 soil conservation technicians who are now an essential part of the work-unit offices in all of the 50 States.

In the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee, these conservation practices represent the best possible use of Federal funds in the preservation of our soil and water resources for future generations. In addition, they provide the best possible protection for the land upon which we must depend for our present and future food production. The many problems facing agriculture, such as increasing costs, decreasing farm labor, and increasing financial risks, make it apparent that this Nation cannot afford to reduce its conservation efforts.

The decreasing supplies of foods on hand, the rapidly expanding population, and the decreasing number of people on the farms, indicate that food shortages may face world consumers in the future, unless our agricultural production plant is protected from erosion and similar damages. With U.S. commitments in Vietnam and elsewhere throughout the world, we must continue to give adequate attention to our own natural resources to assure a firm source of supply of food and fiber to the growing populations of this country and the world.

An appropriation of $80,000,000 is recommended for the next fiscal year to make cost-sharing, technical assistance, and adjustment payments on agreements signed under the the 1966 and 1967 cropland adjustment programs. The reduction of $10,000,000 in the budget estimate appears justified at this time in view of the short supply of food crops on hand and current efforts to increase acreage in several basic crops. It is recognized, however, that 1966 and 1967 agreements must be paid under the advance authorizations provided in prior years.

The budget request for an advance authorization of $52,200,000 to enter into new agreements to remove an additional 2 million acres from production in the coming year has been denied. As indicated earlier, a majority of the committee members do not believe it wise to further expand any program to remove acreage from production, since conditions throughout the world and here at home make a program of scarcity not only unsound but even dangerous. Shortages of food for the School Lunch Program and other worthwhile food distribution programs, the need for adequate food reserves to meet the needs of the Vietnam war, and the demands for U.S. foods to combat starvation in Asia, indicate the wisdom of keeping our land in full production.

In this connection, U.S.D.A. officials have pointed out again this year the very low supplies of food commodities now on hand in the United States. These statements, which appear on page 141, part 1, of the 1968 hearings, follow:

WHEAT

Wheat stocks on July 1, 1966 totaled 536 million bushels. Total disappearance including domestic use and exports was 1,609 million bushels. Thus, stocks on July 1, 1966 were equivalent to ⅓ of a year or 4 months disappearance at the rate during the 1965–66 marketing year.

FEED GRAINS

Carryover of feed grains was 42.1 million tons at the beginning of the 1966–67 marketing season. Disappearance for the 1965–66 marketing season was 174.6 million tons. The 42.1 million ton carryover was equivalent to about 3 months disappearance.

SOYBEANS

Stocks of soybeans on October 1, 1966 were 35.6 million bushels, Total disposition for the 1966–67 crop marketing year is estimated at 906 million bushels. Thus, carrying stocks would be equivalent to less than half a month's disposition at the estimated rate for this marketing year.

RICE

Carryover stocks of rice were 8.2 million cwt. as of August 1, 1966. Total disappearance for the 1965–66 marketing year was 82.3 million cwt. Carryover stocks would be equivalent to about 5 weeks domestic disappearance and exports.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

Butter.—Stocks of butter were 52 million pounds on January 1, 1966. Total disappearance in 1966 was 1,157 million pounds or an average of 96 million pounds per month. Stocks would be equivalent to half a month's disappearance.

Cheese.—Stocks of all cheese totaled 308 million pounds on January 1, 1966. Disappearance was 1,955 million for the year. Stocks would be equivalent to not quite 2 months' disappearance.

Nonfat dry milk.—Nonfat dry milk stocks totaled 154 million pounds January 1, 1966. Disappearance was 1,605 million pounds. Stocks would be equivalent to a little more than 1 month's average disappearance.

For the conservation reserve program an appropriation of $123,000,000 is provided for the next fiscal year, a reduction of $2,000,000 in the budget estimate and a reduction of $17,650,000 below funds approved for fiscal year 1967. The decrease below last year is due to the expiration each year of a certain number of long-term contracts entered into under the old Soil Bank Program. Payments will continue through 1973 on a diminishing basis.

The budget estimate of $5,000,000 is proposed for the next fiscal year for emergency conservation measures. This is the same as provided for the current year. There is no way to forecast disasters in advance of their occurrence or the extent of damage which might result. With an appropriation of $5,000,000, estimated recoveries of about $3,500,000 from prior obligations, and an expected carryover of uncommitted funds of $8,000,000, funds totaling $16,500,000 will be available for the fiscal year 1968 to restore damages to farm and rangelands resulting from natural disasters.

The full budget estimate of $450,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1968, a reduction of $202,000 under the 1967 appropriation. The amount provided will support a small staff of 26 people here in Washington to work with and coordinate the rural development efforts of the various agencies of the Department which are carrying on programs in rural areas. This agency is expected to work through field offices of existing agencies.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

The bill includes $11,693,000 for the next fiscal year, a reduction of $630,000 in the budget request and an increase of $189,000 over appropriations for 1967. The increase consists of a transfer of $256,000 from the Consumer and Marketing Service to cover investigative work for the meat and poultry inspection programs. This is partially offset by a nonrecurring rental item of $67,000.

The 1968 budget proposes funds to employ an additional 47 man-years of staff to increase audit and investigation coverage of the Food Stamp Program, Food-For Peace Program, Farmers Home Administration loans, and ASCS county offices. In view of the criteria established by the committee prohibiting all but unavoidable personnel increases, no additional funds have been provided. This office must adjust workload schedules to meet total audit and investigation requirements with existing funds and manpower. It is to be noted that this organization has increased by about 50 percent since it was formed in 1962.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

For a number of years, the committee has believed that the enforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act could be handled more effectively by a separate unit located directly under the Secretary's office. In its report on the 1964 appropriation bill, the committee called on the Secretary to take such action This position had been concurred in also by the Senate Appropriations Committee. In view of many problems facing the meat industry, and in view of the increasing need for the Department to assure free, open, and fair competition and fair practices in the marketing of livestock and poultry, the committee again insisted last year that the Secretary of Agriculture place this unit under his direct supervision. In addition, it removed the funds from the Consumer and Marketing Service and included them in a separate heading in the bill.

Pursuant to these actions by Congress, the Secretary established a separate Packers and Stockyards Administration and transferred all appropriate functions to it on May 8, 1967. The committee expects the new administrator to make this change effective and productive so as to more fully meet the needs of the industry.

For the coming fiscal year, the bill includes $2,569,300, the same amount as provided for fiscal year 1967 and a reduction of $219,700 in the budget request. The committee feels that this new organization should continue to operate with present funds and personnel (198 man-years), certainly until it has had an opportunity to work out its plans, policies, procedures, and practices on the new basis.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

The committee recommends an appropriation for next year for this office in the amount of $4,325,000. This is a continuation of the 1967 level of funding and is a reduction of $415,000 in the budget request.

Here again, it was not possible to provide funds for an additional staff of 44 man-years, in view of the criteria established earlier. The committee is of the opinion that, in view of the growth of this office in recent years, it should be able to meet fully its responsibilities with the amount provided for the coming year.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

The full budget estimate of $1,928,000 is recommended for the coming fiscal year, an increase of $46,000 over 1967 funds. The increase will permit this office to more adequately handle the printing orders for publications, which have increased from 3,949 in fiscal year 1958 to 4,502 in fiscal year 1966, an increase of 12 percent. The increase also includes an additional $25,000 for reprints of farmers bulletins, the demand for which has increased from 11.7 million copies in 1965 to 13.2 million copies in 1966. Also, the cost of printing has risen about 8 percent since 1965.

The small increase allowed for these purposes is an exception to the criteria of no increase in Washington. In this instance, the committee feels that the increased research findings of recent years must be published and distributed to be of maximum benefit to all users, farmer and consumer alike. Further, while research appropriations have doubled since 1959, funds for the functions of this office have increased less than 40 percent.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

An appropriation of $2,458,500 is included in the bill for the library. This is the same as was provided for fiscal year 1967, a reduction of $441,500 in the budget request.

While the committee is aware of the importance of the work of the library, and the desirability of the increases requested, under the tight criteria adopted this year it is not possible to fund the additional 17 man-years of staff proposed for next year.

Several factors are involved in this action. The funds for the organization have increased nearly fourfold since 1959—much faster than research and other programs of the Department. With the new library building at Beltsville scheduled for completion in late 1968, the committee believes consideration of any additional personnel should be delayed until the move to the new location is made.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

The 1967 appropriation of $2,667,000 is recommended again for the next fiscal year, a reduction of $82,000 in the budget request. Since virtually no increases have been allowed in fiscal year 1968 for the agencies serviced by this office, it is believed that this administrative service unit can fully meet its responsibilities with existing personnel.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

An appropriation of $4,457,000 is included in the bill for 1968 for the Secretary and the various staff offices under this heading. This is a reduction of $106,000 in the budget estimate and an increase of $405,000 over 1967 appropriations.

The increase includes $400,000 to provide for shifting the program evaluation activities from the working capital fund to a direct appropriation basis. This action does not establish a new staff or add to Departmental expenditures. It merely changes the method of financing this work.

A budget increase of $5,000 has also been approved to cover salary increases and increased workload for the Office of Hearing Examiners. The number of hearings have increased from 68 in 1964 to 104 in 1966. It is not possible for this small office to absorb this increase, even though nominal.

Many of the funds in this bill are authorized for distribution under formula. The committee points out that neither the Department nor any official thereof has the right to withhold funds thus appropriated from any institution, State, county, or other political entity.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The budget estimate of $314,000,000 is included in the bill for rural electrification loans. This is a decrease of $61,000,000 below the 1967 authorization. With an estimated carryover of $76,000,000 of unused prior year funds, a total of $390,000,000 will be available in the coming year, compared with a lending level of $353,000,000 for fiscal year 1967. Of the additional authorization, only $50,000,000 has been placed in the contingency reserve in lieu of the $150,000,000 reserve proposed in the 1968 budget.

For the rural telephone program, the budget request of $120,600,000 of loan authorizations is recommended for fiscal year 1968, an increase of $3,600,000 over fiscal year 1967. The sum of $25,000,000 has been placed in the contingency reserve in lieu of $50,000,000 included in the 1968 budget. An estimated carryover of $4,494,956 will provide a total of $125 million for telephone loans in 1968.

The rural electric systems are facing a recordbreaking demand for power. Power requirements of the REA borrowers are expected to increase from approximately 50.7 billion kilowatt-hours in 1966, to an estimated 116 billion in 1980. Average monthly kilowatt-hour consumption by farm and residential consumers increased more than 100 kilowatt-hours in the past four years, to a current average of 495 kilowatt-hours per month. There are now 5.6 million consumers being served on REA-financed lines.

Testimony presented to the committee concerning the amount of funds needed in fiscal year 1968 indicates that the $314,000,000 provided in this bill, plus the $76,000,000 carryover will adequately meet the needs of REA borrowers during the coming fiscal year.

The telephone program has been expanding at about the rate of 100,000 new subscribers annually. There is a continuing demand for the improvement of service by all subscribers in rural areas. Eight-party rural service is fast becoming obsolete. Many state utility commissions are ordering telephone companies to adopt long term plans for the provision of a better grade of rural service, and the eventual elimination of 4-party service in the urban areas. Today's telephone is more than a device for social contact and emergency communication. The farmer's telephone, like the electric motor, has become an essential tool in agricultural production. The average rural subscriber now makes three times as many calls over the telephone as he did when he first received modern dial service.

While some evidence has been presented indicating that the $125,000,000 for telephone loans next year is inadequate, the Committee feels that the amount authorized will meet the needs for the coming year.

For the administrative costs of these programs, the full budget estimate of $12,457,000 is recommended for the next fiscal year. The increase of $31,200 is provided to cover salary rates for engineers pursuant to House Document No. 114.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

The budget for 1968 proposes and the bill includes provision for the sale of $800 million of participation certificates based on notes or other evidences of indebtedness to the Farmers Home Administration from the direct loan account and the rural housing loan account. Involved are notes given for farm operation, farm ownership, soil and water, and rural housing loans. The certificate sales are handled by the Federal National Mortgage Association. Apparently funds received from such sales will not be necessary during the coming year to finance the programs in this bill. However, such funds, though credited to the account of the Farmers Home Administration, will be needed to finance other obligations of the Government.

This language is similar to that included in the Independent Approriations Act, 1967, which authorized the sale of $600,000,000 of loan assets during the current fiscal year. As of May 22, 1967, a total of $390,000,000 of these certificates had been sold. The balance of $210,000,000 are expected to be sold in June 1967.

The bill also includes language which provides an appropriation of $13,268,000 for the payment of costs of servicing these sales, including interest costs, during the next year.

As of the end of fiscal year 1967, it is expected that the direct loan account will have a balance on hand of $518,914,433, including $488,000,000 obtained from sales of participation certificates. Estimated collections in fiscal year 1968 of $360,303,000, plus an additional $650,000,000 expected from participation sales in fiscal year 1968, will provide total loan funds of $1,529,217,433 to meet credit needs of this account in the coming year.

From this amount, the bill provides loan authorizations of $410,000,000 during fiscal year 1968, including $300,000,000 for farm operating loans, $5,000,000 for farm ownership loans, and $105,000,000 for soil and water loans. These are the amounts proposed in the 1968 budget, except that the contingency fund of $25,000,000 for operating loans has been eliminated.

The amount recommended for farm operating loans is a reduction of $50,000,000 below the level authorized for fiscal year 1967. The Committee has gone along very reluctantly with this amount in view of the necessity of not exceeding the budget. As indicated earlier in this report, all testimony and all data available indicate the urgent need for the full $350,000,000 for this purpose. Past experience shows that these funds are usually exhausted in February each year, in advance of planting time in most areas of the country. Figures from Department officials indicate that 7,700 unprocessed applications totalling $90,000,000 are on hand at present. Should developments turn out as the committee anticipates, the Bureau of the Budget is expected to cooperate by recommending the increased funds.

Keeping these lower-income producers on the farm is important to the national economy and is a most effective means of dealing with rural poverty problems. Providing these rural people with adequate credit is far more economical to the taxpayer than attempting to deal with problems resulting from congestion in large urban centers. Therefore, the committee recommends strongly that the Executive Branch submit a budget amendment to the 1968 budget to restore this unwise budget reduction.

In view of these facts, the committee believes it to be completely unsound to force small F.H.A. borrowers to refinance their loans at higher interest rates and thereby risk losing the advances which the program is set up to promote.

The funds recommended provide an increase of $20,000,000 for soil and water loans. This money will be used largely to meet the increasing number of applications from public bodies for funds to develop water and waste disposal systems in small villages and rural areas. Since the enactment of Public Law 89-240 in 1965, the number of applications under this fund has increased from 1,422 in 1965 to 4,205 in 1966.

During fiscal year 1967, an estimated $365,000,000 of rural housing loans will be processed, $15,000,000 from the direct loan account and $350,000,000 through insured loans. For fiscal year 1968 it is expected that rural housing loans will total $505,000,000, $15,000,000 from the direct loan account and $490,000,000 through insured loans. This is an increase of $140,000,000 in rural housing loans for fiscal year 1968.

It is estimated that, as of June 30, 1967, this direct loan account will have an unused balance of $252,081,885, including $112,000,000 from the sale of participation certificates in fiscal year 1967. This amount, together with estimated collections of $71,700,000 and proposed participation sales in fiscal year 1968 of $150,000,000, will provide a total of $473,781,885 for the coming year.

The budget language authorizing the use of $15,000,000 of this total next year is approved. This will provide $5,000,000 for building loans to the elderly, $5,000,000 for rural rental housing loans, $1,000,000 for self-help housing loans, $500,000 for small building regular loans, $1,500,000 for natural disaster loans, and $2,000,000 for low-income housing loans.

For rural water and waste disposal grants the full budget request of $30,000,000 is included in the bill for 1968. The increase of $4,000,000 over the 1967 appropriation will be used to (1) assist 65 additional rural areas with plans for water and waste disposal systems, and (2) enable 52 public and quasi-public agencies to undertake the development of water and waste disposal systems.

The committee believe this to be one of the most forward looking and valuable programs in the Department. It is to be hoped that the Bureau of the Budget will recognize this in the future and cooperate with the committee in speeding up this completion of the job facing us in this area.

For rural renewal, the bill includes $1,200,000 for the coming year, the same amount provided for fiscal year 1967. This is a decrease of $800,000 in the budget estimate. The amount recommended will continue assistance to the five presently designated areas at present levels.

For rural housing for domestic farm labor the 1967 level of $3,000,000 is proposed again for fiscal year 1968. This is a decrease of $1,000,000 in the budget request. In 1967, it is estimated that a total of 26 grants will be made to construct housing for some 15,000 domestic farm labor families. The amount provided for 1968 should permit financial assistance to about the same number of projects in the coming year.

For salaries and expenses the committee recommends an appropriation of $54,988,000 for fiscal year 1968, a net increase of $2,531,000 over 1967 and a reduction of $3,102,000 in the budget request. In addition, the bill carries authority to transfer $2,250,000 from the "Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund" and $500,000 from the various programs of this agency as may be necessary to meet unusual or heavy workload increases. This provides a total of $57,738,000 to this agency for administrative purposes.

In addition to the authority mentioned above to transfer funds to meet additional workloads, the committee has provided an increase of $1,600,000, involving 140 additional man-years of staff, to handle the increasing workload involved in administering the various new or expanded credit programs of this agency. Loans made or insured by the Farmers Home Administration are expected to increase from an estimated $1,281,000,000 in 1967 to $1,490,000,000 in 1968—an increase of $209,000,000 or 16 percent. This increase consists primarily of $140,000,000 in the insured rural housing loan level, $25,000,000 in insured real estate loans and $25,000,000 in operating loans.

An additional $1,000,000, involving an additional 84 man-years of staff, is included in the bill to enable this agency to undertake the rural community development responsibility assigned to it last year. The various Federal agencies now engaged in work related to this responsibility, such as Small Business Administration, Office of Economic Opportunity, Economic Development Administration, and Housing and Urban Development, operate through State or Regional offices. The additional funds in this bill will provide additional rural development personnel at the FHA State Office level, where one full-time rural development man is already available, to (1) coordinate rural agricultural programs with programs of the other Federal agencies involved, and (2) to assist other Federal and State agencies in making their programs and services available to rural areas.

All counties in the United States have one or more field offices of the Farmers Home Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, or some other agency of USDA. The senior officer of the Department in each area should head up the rural development activities at the county or local level. The additional state office personnel could be available to provide special advice and assistance to the people working at the local level.

In the opinion of the committee, such an arrangement will not only save a large amount of taxpayers' money, but will also provide the most effective means of helping rural people and rural communities to benefit from the many Federal, state and local services available to them.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

The committee recommends a total of $12,983,000 for administrative and operating expenses during fiscal year 1968, $8,883,000 by direct appropriation and $4,100,000 from premium income. The amount provided includes an increase of $200,000 and 20 man-years of staff to expand this program into 30 new counties in the coming year. This is offset by a nonrecurring rent item of $9,000.

The 1968 budget proposes to increase the direct appropriation by $2,500,000 for the coming year and to reduce the charge to premium income by the same amount. In view of the tight Federal fiscal situation, the committee has not agreed to this proposal. It recommends that a change in basic legislation be enacted at the first opportunity to make it possible to include a factor for administrative costs in the rate structure so as not to further deplete the capital reserves of the Corporation.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The full budget estimate of $1,400,000,000 is included in the 1968 bill to partially restore capital impairment for fiscal year 1966. This is a decrease of $2,155,855,000 below the 1967 appropriation for this purpose.

Total capital impairment for fiscal year 1966 was $2,984,856,389. The committee has followed the budget recommendation that this amount be only partially restored in this bill. With a large Federal deficit expected next year, it was deemed inadvisable to further unbalance the budget at this time. With an estimated carryover on June 30, 1967, of $3.7 billion, the additional $1.4 billion provided in the bill for 1968 should be more than adequate to meet all foreseeable needs of the Corporation in the coming year.

The latest available figures from the Department indicate that the unobligated balance on June 30, 1968—on the basis of the amount recommended herein—will be $2,752 million. Full restoration of 1966 losses would leave an unused balance of $4,337 million—far in excess of the amount actually needed to finance the Corporation's activities next year.

For administrative expenses, the budget request of $31,500,000 is recommended for the next fiscal year, a reduction of $2,800,000 below 1967. It should be noted that the administrative costs of conducting the programs of this Corporation have gone down steadily in recent years, from $47,916,000 in fiscal year 1962 to $31,500,000 proposed for fiscal year 1968.

PUBLIC LAW 480

The 1968 bill carries appropriations totaling $1,605,500,000 for the next year, a net reduction of $11,500,000 in amounts appropriated for the present fiscal year, and a net decrease of $167,000,000 in the budget request. The appropriations recommended include $921,000,000 for Title I foreign currency sales, $384,500,000 for Title I credit sales for dollars, and $300,000,000 for Title II foreign donations.

The appropriations proposed for Title I programs are the full budget estimates, which propose a decrease next year of $119,000,000 for foreign currency sales and an increase of $7,500,000 for credit sales for dollars. The amount included for overseas donations under Title II represents a reduction of $167,000,000 in the proposed budget increase of $267,000,000, and an increase of $100,000,000 over funds available for fiscal year 1967.

The recommended increase of $100,000,000, plus the $100,000,000 carryover expected to be available in fiscal year 1968, will provide adequate funds for donations abroad next year. With the shortage of commodities for the school lunch and other food distribution programs here at home, and with the necessity of maintaining adequate food reserves in view of Vietnam and the unsettled international situation, a larger expansion in foreign donations is not warranted.

The supporting justifications for the expansion of foreign donations next year indicate that increased shipments are proposed for wheat, alternative sources of protein, corn products, dry beans, wheat flour and nonfat dry milk.

Data furnished the Committee by Department of Agriculture economists indicates that our stocks of these commodities are at the lowest level in many years. The figures included on page 141 of Part I of the 1968 hearings on this bill show that we have only a few month's supply or less of these essential food items in the warehouses of this country at the present time.

It is to be noted that surplus food donations to the School Lunch Program have dropped from $213 million in 1965, to $117 million in 1966, and to an estimated $102 million in 1967. Testimony presented to the committee indicates that this reduction, together with increasing food prices, has required many schools to increase the price of meals, some as much as 10 cents per lunch. This has reduced student participation and has closed the program in some schools. Also, distribution of surplus foodstuffs to institutions and low-income families in the United States decreased from $257 million in 1965 to $151 million in 1966 due to the scarcity of many commodities.

The committee has not included funds to activate the "farmer-to-farmer" program authorized in the Food for Peace Act of 1966 since it does not feel that it can recommend an increase above the budget in view of the tight fiscal situation. However, the committee strongly urges the Executive Branch to give more attention to including "bona fide" farmers for assignments to overseas agricultural programs of the State Department and AID. The practical farm approach of the Extension Service has paid large dividends in the United States. A similar approach abroad would appear to be more valuable than many of the present practices.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The committee recommends the full budget request of $3,224,000 for fiscal year 1968, an increase of $91,000 to cover pay costs pursuant to Public Law 85–504.

This year (1967) marks the fiftieth anniversary of the Federal Land Banks and the Farm Credit System. The signing of the Farm Loan Act into law on July 17, 1916, which resulted in the establishment of the Federal Land Banks in 1917, marked the beginning of one of the greatest periods of agricultural development ever known in this country. During this 50 years, the Farm Credit institutions have extended loans totalling approximately $87 billion to U.S. farmers, all obtained from private sources by the sale of debentures or other types of notes and obligations.

Prior to 1917, the credit system of the nation was geared primarily to the needs of industry and commerce. As a result, agricultural growth was limited by the lack of adequate capital needed to improve and expand farm production facilities and techniques. This new source of agricultural credit provided by the Federal Land Banks, together with effective and advanced research and educational programs, has created the most efficient agricultural system in the world and has provided the finest quality and lowest-cost food and fiber ever made available to the consumers of any nation in history.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON FOOD AND FIBER

The National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber was established by Executive Order 11256, dated November 4, 1965, to assist the President's Committee on Food and Fiber, established in the same Executive Order, to carry out its primary function of appraising existing and alternative agricultural policies and related foreign trade policies.

The Commission must submit its final report and recommendations to the committee no later than 18 months after the date of its first meeting in January 1966, and must terminate within 90 days thereafter. It is anticipated that the Commission will make its final report and recommendations in July and terminate in October 1967.

The full budget request of $175,000 is provided to cover the final liquidation costs of the Commission. These include the remaining cost of issuing the final report, publishing technical studies and hearings, making terminal leave and other final closing payments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Again I say we are bringing you a bill which, so far as I know, the full subcommittee supports. In addition to the things I have mentioned, you will find a number of items where we have recognized the continuing research needs. We have asked that the Department continue research in connection with the production of sugar. Sugar is a surplus crop. We have requested that they continue that research and reinstate work on the refining of sugar. There are several laboratories where we urge that the Department make further studies as to whether they will fit into our picture.

In addition, several ladies approached me about the inspection of those dealers who handle laboratory animals. The committee felt that this is a worthwhile program and should certainly be implemented. We have provided additional funds for a unit in Washington to supervise this work and have assigned the job to the Agricultural Research Service, which has about 15,000 people scattered all over the United States. They have the people and funds at the present time to go ahead with this job and to pay their expenses to get this job done.

Mr. Chairman, we feel we have brought you a good bill. We have brought you a bill which with few exceptions holds the line at the present year's spending level. Where we have gone higher it has been because of an increasing need for new facilities, for new soil conservation districts, or for some other development which had to be taken care of.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I would like to check with the gentleman as to mastitis research. It has recently come to my attention that in interstate commerce there are new regulations being formulated which will set up very stringent regulations as to the shipment of milk in interstate commerce. Knowing the problem of mastitis in dairy cattle and knowing the problem we will be faced with when regulations go into effect, it seems to me research in this area for the prevention and cure is very important. It is my understanding that this bill does provide money in this direction. It is my hope some dialog on the floor might be implemented that would accelerate activities in this field.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] would wish to comment upon that situation?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] that that is one of the diseases and one of the problems that has been called to the attention of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and the full Committee on Appropriations. We have provided increased funds for a number of budgeted items in the bill. We recognize that this is one of the major problems, along with several others which now exist, and in which there has been expressed a great deal of interest, but which are not included in the budget.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to calling attention to the need in this area, the committee provided $3 million in research funds to the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture with which to finance the study of many of these problems. Heretofore, Mr. Chairman, we have had only $1 million in the bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, most everyone who comes to me, and I am sure most everyone who comes to other members of the subcommittee and the full committee, come to us wanting a problem to be met or solved. They forget that this Department now has about 85,000 permanent employees. Of this number, we have a tremendous number of these employees engaged in research.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to these people who bring these problems to us—problems such as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] mentioned—who go down to the Department and come away with the Department saying, "You get us some more money and we will get the job done."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as a result this would keep pyramiding. By providing the sum of $3 million to the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture it should help to meet some of those situations. However, all of us recognize that new problems can arise. We recognized that fact in our hearings and we have pointed to what is being done now with reference to these problems. We have also indicated that an allocation can be made for further research on a specific problem from the $3 million in order to expedite and speed up the time during which a solution to the problem can be brought about.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's reference to this situation and to the funding thereof can certainly be applied to other items confronting the agricultural community, which items are certainly of a serious nature.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations upon its approach toward this entire program of agricultural research.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] has raised a very important question with reference to research on mastitis as it relates to milk quality.

However, Mr. Chairman, this program is taken care of—and I believe in an adequate fashion—by the subcommittee setting up this contingency fund and giving it the emphasis which it deserves as indicated during hearings this year.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the subcommittee for its action in recognizing this problem which, indeed, is a very pressing problem in view of the quality control standards which are being set up with reference to our milkshed areas which are engaged in interstate commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, as well as the other members of the subcommittee for their efforts in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, I know of the interest of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] in this problem and it is my opinion they should be commended for their efforts in this important area.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the general statements I have made, the members of the Committee will find set out on page 20 of the report a reference to this matter. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], who comes from a dairying area, and one who is certainly familiar with the problem.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the food stamp program, it is contained in the bill, even though it has not been authorized. If it is authorized, then the funds will be available for the purpose of carrying out that authorization. However, even under the present law, these funds will remain available for food distribution uses.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of the increases in the cost of food, due to inflation, we have undertaken to raise the contribution to school lunches to 5½ cents per meal. After all, this amount is just a minimum amount. But it is an amount which enables the local people to use their own efforts and contributions toward meeting the need and thereby contribute far more than that toward the school lunch program.

Mr. Chairman, we have gone along with about $5 million for lunches for needy schoolchildren and the sum of about $2 million for the new breakfast program. However, we did not feel that we could hold back the regular programs which have proven themselves through the years to expand the new programs which have just recently been authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of provisions of the agricultural appropriation bill which warrant the appreciation of the entire membership of the House of Representatives, including Members who come from the urban areas of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee for providing for this funding for the school lunch program, the school milk program, and for providing for substantial funds in the coming year for meat and poultry inspection.

These programs are of great importance to all consumers, and we are grateful for the sympathetic consideration of the subcommittee on these items.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question about the food stamp program.

The committee report says some fine things about this program, and I thank him for that. But my question is rather technical:

The bill provides for funding of the food stamp program during fiscal 1968 out of section 32 money, that is proposed in the budget. As pointed out in the committee report, there is a great deal of money available to the Secretary of Agriculture next year under section 32, nearly $900 million, of which less than $200 million is to be earmarked for emergency removal of surpluses. So there is no danger that by financing the food stamp and school milk, and some of the school lunch costs out of this huge source, there will not be sufficient funds left to buy up perishables in an emergency situation.

But as we both know, the Senate has passed a food stamp bill which prohibits the use of any section 32 money for the food stamps. I believe the gentleman in the other body responsible for that amendment is also the chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee over there.

May I have the assurance of the gentleman from Mississippi that in case there is any stalemate over the use of section 32 money for food stamp operations the House conferees will make sure sufficient funds are provided in one way or another, either by section 32, as this bill directs, or by direct appropriation if necessary, to cover the necessary costs of the successful food stamp program next year?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentlewoman that the committee has taken action here to provide such funds, and has made it quite clear we are for the program, and we would expect to do our best to see that it is financed. But so far as making flat commitments, I have learned that those can be misunderstood. But I do not believe the gentlewoman can misunderstand the feeling of the subcommittee, and I am hopeful something will be worked out.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier in my questioning of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, Mr. WHITTEN, there are many provisions in this bill which are of great importance to urban residents, and to all consumers, and I want to express my appreciation particularly for the action of the subcommittee and of the Appropriations Committee on the school lunch and school milk programs, meat and poultry inspection, and the food stamp program.

Meat and poultry inspection are primarily public health activities, assuring us the safest, most wholesome meat supply of any people in the world. I am glad to see that the committee recommended substantial increases from the present year's appropriations for these two items. I am also happy to point out, Mr. Chairman, that this is the first time since President Johnson became Chief Executive that he has not called in his annual budget proposals for a user fee on the meat packers for meat and poultry inspection. I hope that my often-expressed opposition to such proposals had some influence on the executive department thinking on this matter.

The committee report says some fine things about the food stamp program, and for that I am extremely grateful. I hope any Members of the House who still have doubts about the effectiveness of the food stamp program as a plan for increasing the sale of agricultural commodities will read the excellent statement on page 38 of the committee report discussing the food stamp program. I thank the author of that report, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], for this vote of confidence in the food stamp program. I hope I will have his support and the support of other members of his subcommittee when the House resumes consideration on Thursday of H.R. 1318, my bill to continue and to expand the program, and that they will help me oppose the Agriculture Committee amendments which would seriously undermine the participation by the States and localities in the food stamp operation.

As the Appropriations Committee report on the bill now before us points out:

> Under the program, families must invest the money they would normally spend for food in the purchase of food stamps. In return, they receive additional stamps without charge. Thus, the normal food budget continues to be spent for food, and the Federal assistance results in the purchase of more food. The increase in retail food stores sales (averaging about 8 percent) in areas in which the program is operating, results in a further expansion in farm markets and acts as a stimulant to the overall economy of those areas.

Mr. Chairman, that is a good, concise and direct statement of fact, but one which opponents of the food stamp program have apparently failed to look into. The food stamp program does increase consumption of farm commodities and thus keeps equivalent quantities of food items from becoming surplus.

The food stamp program in fiscal 1968 is to be financed largely out of section 32 money. Section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935 set aside one-third of all customs receipts for aid to the farm economy. It was, of course, a depression idea, to help the family farmer find a market for his products and thus stay on the farm. That fund has grown tremendously since 1935. Originally, it amounted to about $100,000,000 a year; now it is up to $570,000,000 plus a $300,000,000 carryover from year to year. So, instead of $100,000,000, there will be available $870,000,000 next year. Of this, only about $200,000,000, or less, will be needed for emergency removal of surplus perishables, so the $195,000,000 earmarked for the food stamp program, will, in no way, interfere with the purposes for which section 32 money is usually spent.

Yet I know there will be some opposition expressed to using any section 32 money for the food stamp program, on the theory that section 32 is sacred to one use only—as if the farmer had some sort of divine right to one-third of all customs receipts as his very own special compact with the Treasury. The Senate Agriculture Committee seemed to reflect such a feeling when it amended the food stamp bill last week to prohibit the use of section 32 money for the food stamp program.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that the Members know how section 32 originated, and what it was supposed to do, and the theory on which the one-third ratio was set. I was curious about this, and looked up the legislative history in the report of the House Committee on Agriculture, House Report 1241 to accompany H.R. 8492, which became the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935. What became section 32 of that act was section 31 of H.R. 8492, and here in part is what the committee report said about it:

> Since the farm population of the United States is roughly 30 percent of the total population, this provision will make available for the benefit of the farmer a sum equivalent to his fair share of the tariff receipts.

Note that, Mr. Chairman—the farmer was to get back, in the form of this special assistance, his share of tariff receipts, based on population. But the farm population, which was then roughly 30 percent of the population, is now about 5.9 percent, so the farmer's fair share, so called, of the customs receipts next year would be not $570,000,000 but about $100,000,000. No one should complain that some of this money is now to be earmarked for the food stamp program, for listen to this discussion of the philosophy behind the adoption of section 32:

> Expansion of domestic markets is in the interest of the fullest utilization of our agricultural resources. The current depression has revealed more than ever the existence of areas of substandard consumption of farm products in this country. Even in normal times, the low-income groups would consume more of farm products than has been the case in the past. An expansion of the domestic markets will serve to build up the low-consuming areas within our population to a level adequate for the maintenance of health, and to bring about a permanently larger volume of consumption so as to require a minimum of restriction on our agricultural resources.

This was said back in 1935.

What better endorsement could one ask for the food stamp program, Mr. Chairman, than the language I have just read from the report on the 1935 act which provides the basis for financing the program in the coming fiscal year.

Section 32, if it has any justification at all—and I think it does—certainly can properly be used to help pay for the food stamp program.

TEXT OF HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT IN 1935

Under unanimous consent, I submit herewith the text of the report of the Committee on Agriculture, 32 years ago, on the provision which later became section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935:

THIRTY-PERCENT FUND

> An important addition to the present agricultural program is contained in section 31 of the bill which authorizes an annual appropriation for each fiscal year of 30 percent of the gross customs receipts during preceding calendar year. This authorization contemplates the use of money without regard to the Agricultural Adjustment Act and outside of it for the purposes specified in the section. Since the farm population of the United States is roughly 30 percent of the total population, this provision will make available for the benefit of the farmer a sum equivalent to his fair share of the tariff receipts. Upon the basis of the total customs receipts during the past 3 years, it is anticipated that in the neighborhood of $100,000,000 can annually be made available for the purposes described in the bill. The first of the enumerated purposes for which this fund may be used is that of encouraging the exportation of major agricultural commodities and products thereof by paying benefits and indemnifying losses in connection with such exportation. This provision (as well as the provision authorizing the imposition of a processing tax and the making payments out of its proceeds for exportation of basic agricultural commodities) gives recognition to the necessity of insuring that, so far as possible, adjustment of production and consequent price increases within the United States shall not operate to deprive American farmers of their share of foreign trade in agricultural commodities.
>
> The second purpose to which the fund may be devoted is that of encouraging domestic consumption of the major agricultural commodities and products thereof by diverting them from the normal channels of trade and commerce. This diversion is to be accomplished by the payment of benefits and indemnities or by other means, such as the purchase of these commodities for relief distribution. It is not contemplated that the effect of making such payments will be to put agricultural commodities and their products so acquired in competition with normal business, but rather to remove them from the field of such competition. Expansion of domestic markets is in the interest of the fullest utilization of our agricultural re-

sources. The current depression has revealed more than ever the existence of areas of substandard consumption of farm products in this country. Even in normal times, the low-income groups would consume more of farm products than has been the case in the past. An expansion of the domestic markets will serve to build up the low-consuming areas within our population to a level adequate for the maintenance of health, and to bring about a permanently larger volume of consumption so as to require a minimum of restriction of our agricultural resources.

The funds appropriated are to be used mainly for the two purposes indicated above and the bill so provides. However, they are also authorized to be used for the retirement of submarginal agricultural and grazing lands by purchasing or leasing them on behalf of the United States, and in order to finance acreage or production adjustment of agricultural commodities.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding. I take this time merely to express my appreciation to him personally, and to the other members of his subcommittee, for having recognized the need for a review at the level of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture of some of the priority standings of several agricultural research facilities that have been recommended for a long time, and on which they have not been able to proceed. I certainly appreciate the action taken on the part of the subcommittee.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for his statement. It certainly seems to me that we should recognize some of the increased needs we have in this area.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, this appears on page 18 of the committee report—as the gentleman knows—and I am very pleased to see that specific mention is there made of the long proposed and, I believe, very much indeed soil-water-plant research laboratory that we, of New York, have hoped would eventually be located at our State College of Agriculture at Cornell University in my congressional district. This facility, which was recommended years ago in Senate Document No. 59, 86th Congress, in my judgment would serve a most useful function which would well fit into the national interest developed in recent years—and which interest has found its expression here in Congress—in making sure that this nation preserves an adequate water supply not only for its growing population and to meet the expanding needs of industry, but also sufficient to the needs of our system of agriculture. This laboratory would conduct research into the basic question of whether or not our farmers are making the most efficient use possible of such water as is available to them.

This question assumes its proper importance if one pauses long enough to consider that only about 30 percent of what might be called our Nation's water budget, and that comes to us in the form of rain or snow, makes its way as massed flow into our streams and reservoirs. The remaining 70 percent, or thereabouts, is lost through the process known as evapotranspiration from vegetated lands of one kind or another—and it would be to promote the more efficient use of that percentage to which this laboratory would be dedicated. Again I thank the gentleman for this expression of interest in this particular item, and I would hope that the review would demonstrate, again, its real need so that funds for going ahead with it might find their way into a forthcoming budget.

Might I also say, if the gentleman would yield for one moment more, that I am impressed—as I have been in prior years—by this committee report, which contains a veritable wealth of information, background information, on the problems faced by American agriculture, and on the changes that are taking place in connection with that system, which are very great changes, indeed, and I would say to all my colleagues—especially to the newer members—that they should obtain and preserve copies of this report, for I am sure they will find it extremely valuable, as I do, as a reference guide for future use.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, you are all aware that the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi who preceded me here in the well of the House has brought this bill to the floor for many years, and has done an outstanding job, and is a recognized authority on agricultural affairs.

I would like to draw particular attention this year to our report which, in the main, is the handiwork of our distinguished friend from Mississippi for, in capsule form there, you will find some real good material to use back home in your own individual districts, regardless of whether you come from a rural district or an urban center.

It is carefully laid out, quite well done, and I draw your particular attention to it.

This bill in total calls for appropriations totaling $4,770,580,850. As the chairman indicated, we cut $250,516,450 from the 1968 budget submitted by the Department.

I should point out too that this figure we arrived at is $2,251,990,500 under the funding level for the current fiscal year 1967.

Normally one would come to the conclusion then that things are going so well in agriculture and that is probably the reason for our having such a big reduction from last year's level of spending. But I would point out to you that the biggest reduction is in reimbursement for net realized losses for the Commodity Credit Corporation and in this bill we have fulfilled the budget estimate request of $1,400,000,000 to take care of the net realized losses item. It is by no means a full restoration but quite sufficient. With this allowance the CCC will begin the new fiscal year with $3.7 billion of borrowing authority before reaching the $14.5 billion ceiling of the Corporation.

If we take just this one item alone and compare it with last year's figure in the appropriation bill, you will see that last year to make up for those realized losses we appropriated $3,555,855,000. That is where the big sizable reduction is.

Now what is it? Actually, these are payments under the price support program and diversion programs made by the CCC to farmers throughout the country.

In the aggregate, and I will place it in the RECORD and I have previously obtained permission to do so, a breakdown of those actual losses for the first nine months, of this current fiscal year, 1967, which will show the total program losses of $3,279,704,000. That means for all practical purposes that the agriculture programs have cost us that much more than we are actually appropriating for in this bill.

BORROWING AUTHORITY

CCC operations are financed largely by borrowings, mostly from the U.S. Treasury, under its statutory borrowing authorization of $14.5 billion, this amount being the limit on borrowings that may be outstanding at any one time. CCC reserves a sufficient amount of this borrowing authority to purchase at any time all loans and other obligations held by financial institutions under the Corporation's programs. As of March 31, CCC had in use $10,929,791,000 of this authority; actual borrowings from the Treasury amounted to $9,971,904,000, obligations to financial institutions financing commodity loans amounted to $957,887,000, including interest of $14,586,000. This left a statutory borrowing authority available of $3,570,209,000.

The Corporation's total net realized loss from program operations amounted to $3,279,704,000 for the 9-month period ended March 31, 1967, as compared to $2,310,926,000 for the same period a year earlier. The increased loss over March 1966 is largely the result of program payments to farmers.

These losses for the fiscal years 1967 and 1966 as of March 31, are summarized as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1967 through March 1967	Fiscal year 1966 through March 1966
Realized program gains and losses:		
Commodity inventory operations:		
Sales:		
Proceeds	1,799,496	1,303,094
Cost of commodities sold	[1] 2,149,840	[1] 1,273,926
Net gain (or loss [1]) on sales	[1] 350,344	29,168
Donations (cost of commodities donated)	[1] 151,887	[1] 226,405
Expenses applicable to inventories:		
Storage and handling	[1] 119,941	[1] 184,785
Transportation	[1] 75,846	[1] 86,520
Net gain (or loss [1])	[1] 698,018	[1] 468,542
Export payments and allowances	[1] 133,797	[1] 120,514
Cotton equalization program payments	[1] 20,375	[1] 280,480
Cotton diversion payments	[1] 276,858	[1] 83,549
Feed grain diversion payments	[1] 525,328	[1] 773,617
Wheat diversion payments	[1] 27,133	[1] 38,103
Cotton price-support payments	[1] 489,108	[1] 57,576
Feed grain price-support payments	[1] 777,694	[1] 430,642
Wheat price-support payments	[1] 281,374	
Reseal loan storage expense	[1] 39,364	[1] 50,983
Other	[1] 10,655	[1] 6,920
Total program losses	[1] 3,279,704	[1] 2,310,926

[1] Indicates expense or loss.

We make reference on page 9 of our report to the "Benefits to the general public" and I would commend the reading of that page to you because those of you who come from urban centers will get a little eye opener there on the items carried in this bill that have very little relationship to farmers in the rural community but that are of much more importance to the city dweller and to the urban centers.

What effect have the Department of Agriculture programs had on farmers?

Farm prices today are lower than they were 20 years ago. This is hard to believe until you distinguish between farm prices and retail food prices. Because food costs are 35 percent higher than they were 20 years ago. Only 18.1 percent of consumers' disposable income goes for food. The farmer gets less than 40 cents out of the consumers' food dollar. In fact his farm prices are now from 2 to 3 percent below the 1966 average.

What does the Secretary plan to do about this? He says:

> We will make full use of a wide range of measures to strengthen farm prices and maintain income in 1967.
>
> We expect section 32 purchases this year to total $169 million, which is some 44 percent higher than last year's level of $117 million. Purchase programs for beef, chopped meat, turkeys, lard and shortening, orange juice, peanut butter, dry beans, and certain fruits were conducted or are now underway to help strengthen market prices.
>
> These products along with those made available under section 416 have significantly augmented food supplies for the school lunch program and the commodity distribution program for needy people.
>
> This year we estimate schools will receive food valued at $129 million from section 32 and section 416 compared to $117 million last year. The increase results largely from the greater quantities of beef and cheese made available.
>
> The expanded food stamp program, the plentiful foods program, continued heavy food for freedom shipments, and vigorous export development programs, including the selective use of export subsidies, will also help strengthen farm prices and income.
>
> As you know, we increased support prices on a selective basis this past year. We stand ready to review needs for similar actions in 1967 where authority and funds are available.

Something must be done. The per capita income for farm people is $1,731 as against $2,618 for nonfarm people. The interest on farm debt has increased from $1.352 billion in 1960 to $2.45 billion in 1966. As of January 1, 1966, farm mortgage debt outstanding totaled $21.2 billion.

Even the Secretary has expressed pessimism, as he sees 1967 for the farmer.

We heard the Secretary say:

> We are optimistic that 1967 will be another good year for agriculture although it may not completely measure up to 1966. Gross farm income may climb by $500 million or more to a new record of around $50 billion. On the other hand, if farm production expenses rise around $1 billion as expected, farm net income this year may be substantially as achieved in 1966.

Mr. Chairman, may I point out that in the year 1966, direct payments to farmers totaled $3.3 billion, and the net realized income of farmers last year totaled $16.3 billion. In other words, 20 percent of net farm income came from direct payments from the Government. This represents a 2½-percent increase in just 1 year.

Net realized income and direct payments

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Year	Direct payments	Net realized income	Percent
1960	$0.7	$11.6	6
1965	2.4	14.1	17½
1966	3.3	16.3	20

Cash payments to farmers, 1950–65

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Conservation program	Sugar Act	Wool program	Soil bank program	Feed grain program	Wheat program	Cotton	Total [1]
1950	246	37						283
1951	246	40						286
1952	242	33						275
1953	181	32						213
1954	217	40						257
1955	188	41						229
1956	220	37	54	243				554
1957	230	32	53	700				1,016
1958	214	44	14	815				1,089
1959	228	44	82	323				682
1960	217	50	51	370				693
1961	230	45	56	334	772	42		1,484
1962	224	54	54	304	841	253		1,736
1963	222	57	37	[2] 304	843	215		1,686
1964	227	67	25	199	1,163	[3] 438	39	2,169
1965	215	64	18	150	1,391	[3] 525	70	2,452
1966 [4]	224	61	34	135	1,298	[3] 683	786	[5] 3,275

[1] Includes Great Plains conservation payments since 1958: $1,000,000 in 1958; $5,000,000 in 1959; $6,000,000 in 1960, 1961, anp 1962; $8,000,000 in 1963, and $9,000,000 in 1964 and 1965.

[2] Includes $6,000,000 under land-use adjustment program.

[3] Includes mainly the value of marketing certificates, the cost of which was recovered by the Government from the sale of certificates to processors and exporters of wheat.

[4] Preliminary.

[5] Includes $44,000,000 under cropland adjustment program. $39,000,000 in 1964; $70,000,000 in 1965, and $786,000,000 in 1966.

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Source: Economic Research Service, USDA, Jan. 20, 1967.

During our hearings, we asked that the Sugar Act program's 10 largest payments to producers be set out for the 1965 crop. In my opinion it is unconscionable that the smallest of these 10 is over half a million dollars and that the largest payment is over $1.2 million.

Ten highest Sugar Act payments, 1965 crop

Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii	$1,233,855.42
U.S. Sugar Corp., Florida	1,054,016.53
Mauna Kea Sugar Co., Inc., Hawaii	709,241.34
Puna Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii	$656,133.91
Pepeekeo Sugar Co., Hawaii	630,369.27
Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., Florida	576,433.42
Lihue Plantation Co., Ltd., Hawaii	576,291.52
Oahu Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii	525,645.89
Waialua Agricultural Co., Ltd., Hawaii	516,519.97
Luce & Co., Puerto Rico	515,841.67

Of the payments to producers for all of the ASCS programs, 69 percent were payments of $5,000 or less. Over 3 million producers are in this category; 87,524 producers received payments over $5,000. The six top producers received over an average of $1.5 million apiece.

When the total amount of payments to individual farmers by State is broken out, it reveals that $448 million in payments go to the State of Texas alone; $225 million goes to the State of Kansas, $210 million goes to Iowa, and $174 million goes to Nebraska.

ASCS payments to producers, all programs [1]

	Amount	Percent of total
Total payments	$3,281,621,070	100
Payments below $5,000	2,272,873,381	69
Payments $5,000 or above	1,008,747,689	31

[1] Includes acreage diversion payments on cotton, feed grains, and wheat; price-support payments on cotton and feed grains; wheat marketing certificates; cost-share payments under the ACP, emergency conservation and Appalachia programs; land retirement and conservation assistance payments under the cropland conversion, cropland adjustment, and conservation reserve programs; and payments under the Sugar Act, the National Wool Act, and the milk indemnity payment program. Does not include any price-support loans or purchases.

Size grouping, payments $5,000 and over

Range	Number	Amount
$5,000 to $7,499	40,826	$247,138,690
$7,500 to $9,999	17,700	152,348,812
$10,000 to $14,999	14,709	177,782,063
$15,000 to $24,999	8,992	169,380,812
$25,000 to $49,999	4,049	135,203,381
$50,000 to $99,999	967	64,158,521
$100,000 to $499,999	264	46,381,941
$500,000 to $999,999	11	6,374,836
$1,000,000 and over	6	9,978,633
Total	87,524	1,008,747,689

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

A. Total amount of payments to individual farmers, calendar year 1966, grouped by size

State	Under $5,000	$5,000 to $7,499	$7,500 to $9,999	$10,000 to $14,999	$15,000 to $24,999	$25,000 to $49,999	$50,000 to $99,999
Alabama	$61,971,599	$3,949,604	$2,706,599	$4,171,929	$3,538,263	$2,805,696	$373,200
Alaska	66,203		9,940		21,729		
Arizona	5,408,716	1,281,837	1,076,672	2,422,539	4,488,180	10,353,153	8,288,995
Arkansas	44,479,746	6,004,258	4,415,121	6,858,945	9,043,930	8,523,853	4,226,601
California	25,043,096	6,077,533	5,020,351	8,072,775	11,329,837	12,899,698	11,490,586
Colorado	35,188,559	7,706,580	4,766,055	5,656,819	4,261,960	2,532,816	752,382
Connecticut	870,655	13,215	7,830				
Delaware	1,600,634	94,242	43,360	32,689	35,023		
Florida	11,720,665	849,613	540,516	642,048	581,951	616,400	926,848
Georgia	58,925,393	5,773,927	3,900,672	4,629,721	3,987,614	2,272,305	686,087
Hawaii	3,317,407	120,883	102,916	115,755	20,767		54,731
Idaho	24,688,237	4,352,470	2,561,817	2,679,471	1,894,073	971,066	432,235
Illinois	102,480,899	7,951,439	3,909,985	3,578,433	1,957,592	842,960	331,322
Indiana	79,162,986	5,209,569	2,330,266	2,454,549	1,515,820	629,281	684,741
Iowa	186,345,291	11,820,633	5,023,964	4,104,359	1,839,434	539,239	70,923
Kansas	161,384,546	25,222,748	13,477,606	12,443,843	7,249,588	3,723,592	994,846
Kentucky	40,378,698	832,369	486,244	513,690	377,250	221,541	94,331
Louisiana	29,819,975	3,312,804	2,383,619	4,113,668	4,897,743	4,441,573	1,758,066
Maine	2,072,172						
Maryland	4,921,912	326,983	78,135	71,213	89,242	26,375	
Massachusetts	623,545		9,676				
Michigan	57,835,474	1,964,586	987,471	778,134	462,060	152,475	
Minnesota	121,861,377	7,040,444	2,650,876	2,765,502	823,296	286,467	
Mississippi	56,132,954	5,608,984	4,913,908	8,183,701	13,528,922	18,588,070	12,751,957
Missouri	109,304,712	10,135,514	5,594,000	5,756,807	4,058,419	2,577,778	1,073,713
Montana	36,352,707	10,523,173	6,361,634	5,647,605	3,254,742	838,165	235,569
Nebraska	138,345,706	17,057,685	7,926,158	5,651,673	3,131,372	1,942,884	126,657
Nevada	845,827	81,516	109,284	145,918	129,012	230,859	
New Hampshire	646,790						
New Jersey	4,330,560	233,504	127,726	58,272	56,270	36,290	
New Mexico	15,647,209	3,584,595	3,003,863	4,254,701	4,837,658	3,637,680	1,514,811
New York	21,311,307	374,836	272,069	174,637	36,082		
North Carolina	56,592,280	1,697,588	1,011,225	1,458,881	900,098	488,174	472,061
North Dakota	105,679,695	15,115,111	6,902,292	5,157,353	2,990,482	880,897	114,480
Ohio	73,222,082	3,453,283	1,448,533	1,546,379	917,328	487,354	
Oklahoma	84,357,082	9,523,913	5,027,677	4,033,589	2,247,917	1,013,861	260,946
Oregon	13,668,961	2,754,737	1,886,115	2,285,445	2,000,059	1,316,710	329,106
Pennsylvania	21,811,896	190,634	158,755	66,998	95,317	98,328	
Rhode Island	73,243						
South Carolina	37,434,463	3,344,193	2,580,726	3,298,565	3,379,464	2,386,836	405,971
South Dakota	63,304,860	6,295,946	3,212,704	2,511,266	1,195,948	519,016	52,166
Tennessee	56,852,914	2,943,962	1,839,419	2,245,300	1,828,877	993,897	298,307
Texas	198,666,263	42,835,635	35,414,481	50,461,552	57,824,875	42,777,069	13,684,854
Utah	8,188,293	467,194	326,218	298,644	229,011	209,361	
Vermont	1,493,244						
Virginia	17,009,240	272,574	105,814	146,288	77,957		
Washington	21,399,180	7,450,576	5,640,895	6,400,883	5,268,231	2,464,765	723,278
West Virginia	3,840,646	13,737					
Wisconsin	50,497,753	1,221,739	730,407	473,673	333,976	371,489	79,706
Wyoming	8,075,683	1,286,488	580,950	653,498	518,502	283,955	51,890
Puerto Rico	5,209,210	760,270	684,358	764,803	2,124,941	1,174,896	817,155
Virgin Islands	25,423	5,566				46,557	
Undistributed	2,385,413						
Total	2,272,873,381	247,138,690	152,348,812	177,782,063	169,380,812	135,203,381	64,158,521

State	$100,000 to $499,999	$500,000 to $999,999	$1,000,000 and over	Total			
				$5,000 to $24,999	$25,000 and over	$5,000 and over	Grand total
Alabama	$101,398			$14,366,395	$3,280,294	$17,646,689	$79,618,288
Alaska				31,669		31,669	97,872
Arizona	9,056,353	$1,256,535		9,269,228	28,955,036	38,224,264	43,632,980
Arkansas	2,156,462			26,321,804	14,906,916	41,228,720	85,708,466
California	13,855,585	2,403,527	$7,688,262	30,500,496	48,337,658	78,838,154	103,881,250
Colorado	393,468			22,391,414	3,687,666	26,070,080	61,258,639
Connecticut				21,045		21,045	891,700
Delaware				205,314		205,314	1,805,948
Florida	857,498	576,433	1,054,016	2,614,128	4,031,195	6,645,323	18,365,988
Georgia				18,291,934	2,958,392	21,250,326	80,175,719
Hawaii	4,545,295	1,620,177	1,236,355	360,321	7,456,948	7,816,819	11,134,226
Idaho				11,487,831	1,403,301	12,891,132	37,579,369
Illinois				17,397,449	1,174,282	18,571,731	121,052,630
Indiana	103,540			11,510,204	1,417,562	12,927,766	92,090,752
Iowa	255,195			22,788,390	865,357	23,653,747	209,999,038
Kansas	100,032			58,393,785	4,818,470	63,212,255	224,596.801
Kentucky				2,209,553	315,872	2,525,425	42,904,123
Louisiana	1,079,127			14,707.844	7,278,766	21,986,600	51,406,575
Maine							2,072,172
Maryland				565,573	26,375	591,948	5,513,860
Massachusetts				9,676		9,676	633,221
Michigan				4,192,251	152,475	4,344,726	62,180,200
Minnesota				13,280,028	286,467	13,566,495	135,427,872
Mississippi	4,817,629			32,235,515	36,157,656	68,393,171	124,526,125
Missouri				25,544,740	3,651,491	29,196,231	138,500,943
Montana	501,696			25,787,154	1,575,430	27,362,584	63,715,261
Nebraska				33,766,888	2,069,541	35,836,429	174,182,135
Nevada				465,730	230,859	696,589	1,542,416
New Hampshire							646,790
New Jersey				475,772	36,290	512,062	4,842,622
New Mexico	301,869			15,680,817	5,454,360	21,135,177	36,782,386
New York				857,624		857,624	22,168,931
North Carolina	195,053			5,067,792	1,155,288	6,223,080	62,815,360
North Dakota				30,165,238	995,377	31,160,615	136,840,310
Ohio	127,850			7,365,523	615,204	7,980,727	81,202,809
Oklahoma				20,833,096	1,274,807	22,107,903	106,464,985
Oregon	107,647			8,926,356	1,753,463	10,679,819	24,348,780
Pennsylvania				511,704	98,328	610,032	22,421,928
Rhode Island							73,243
South Carolina	167,083			12,602,948	2,959,890	15,562,838	52,997,301

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE—Continued

A. Total amount of payments to individual farmers, calendar year 1966, grouped by size—Continued

State	$100,000 to $499,999	$500,000 to $999,999	$1,000,000 and over	Total			
				$5,000 to $24,999	$25,000 and over	$5,000 and over	Grand total
South Dakota				$13,215,864	$571,182	$13,787,046	$77,091,906
Tennessee				8,857,558	1,292,204	10,149,762	67,002,676
Texas	$6,249,017			186,536,543	62,710,940	249,247,483	447,913,746
Utah				1,321,067	209,361	1,530,428	9,718,721
Vermont							1,493,244
Virginia				602,633		602,633	17,611,873
Washington	229,097			24,760,585	3,417,140	28,177,725	49,576,905
West Virginia				13,737		31,737	3,854,383
Wisconsin				2,759,795	451,195	3,210,990	53,708,743
Wyoming				3,039,438	335,845	3,375,283	11,450,966
Puerto Rico	1,181,047	$518,234		4,334,372	3,691,322	8,025,694	13,234,904
Virgin Islands				5,566	46,557	52,123	77,546
Undistributed							2,385,413
Total	46,381,941	6,374,836	$9,978,633	746,650,377	262,097,312	1,008,747,689	3,281,621,070

B. Total number of payments to individual farmers, calendar year 1966, grouped by size

State	$5,000 to $7,499	$7,500 to $9,999	$10,000 to $14,999	$15,000 to $24,999	$25,000 to $49,999	$50,000 to $99,999	$100,000 to $499,999	$500,000 to $999,999	$1,000,000 and over	Totals		
										$5,000 to $24,999	$25,000 and over	$5,000 and over
Alabama	647	313	342	190	84	6	1			1,492	91	1,583
Alaska		1		1						2		2
Arizona	210	125	196	235	287	121	50	2		766	460	1,226
Arkansas	977	512	561	470	254	65	12			2,520	331	2,851
California	994	580	667	590	381	169	77	4	4	2,831	635	3,466
Colorado	1,267	552	472	228	77	12	2			2,519	91	2,610
Connecticut	1	1								3		3
Delaware	15	5	3	2						25		25
Florida	141	62	53	31	19	13	5	1	1	287	39	326
Georgia	952	451	383	213	70	12				1,999	82	2,081
Hawaii	20	12	10	1		1	13	3	1	43	18	61
Idaho	718	299	222	102	30	7				1,341	37	1,378
Illinois	1,327	458	304	106	26	5				2,195	31	2,226
Indiana	870	270	205	80	20	10	1			1,425	31	1,456
Iowa	1,973	589	346	100	17	1	2			3,008	20	3,028
Kansas	4,190	1,574	1,034	394	113	16	1			7,192	130	7,322
Kentucky	136	55	42	20	6	1				253	7	260
Louisiana	540	272	336	257	133	27	7			1,405	167	1,572
Maryland	53	9	6	5	1					73	1	74
Massachusetts		1								1		1
Michigan	325	115	65	24	5					529	5	534
Minnesota	1,179	312	231	47	9					1,769	9	1,778
Mississippi	917	568	668	701	546	192	36			2,854	774	3,628
Missouri	1,690	652	482	218	77	17				3,042	94	3,136

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from the "Corn State" of Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We are proud to be known as the "Corn State." I thank the gentleman. Does not the gentleman think that one of these days we ought to cut the administrative expenses for the Department of Agriculture, the money that goes directly for the operation of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture? Do you not think it ought to be reduced down to the caliber and quality of a Secretary of Agriculture who cannot do a better job in behalf of the American farmer than that which the gentleman has just related?

Mr. MICHEL. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. Would this not be something to consider in the future?

Mr. MICHEL. I think the gentleman makes a good point. The tragic thing here is, as we intend to bring out later in our remarks, with the decline in farm population and the movement toward the cities, still we continue to get requests for increase in personnel to operate the Department of Agriculture.

The only bright spot, if there were any in the past year, or at least a difference of recent date, has been in the area of livestock prices. There we do not have the heavy hand of the Federal Government dictating quotas and prices. But when you get to the feed grain program and the cotton control program, we seem to be going from bad to worse.

Mr. GROSS. What is the present parity? About 73 percent?

Mr. MICHEL. I think it is between 73 and 74 percent, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman think of any industry in this country that would continue the employment of a manager who has such an established record of failure as has the present Secretary of Agriculture? The farmers ought to have the opportunity to turn him out to pasture. I cannot think of an industry that would countenance that kind of management that the farmers have been getting in the Agriculture Department.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman makes a good point. Of course, he is free to offer an amendment to that effect at the appropriate time. Whether or not it would stand up I do not know, but it might be surprising to see what support the gentleman would have.

Mr. GROSS Perhaps the administration of the Department ought to be turned over to Betty Furness.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. A number of years ago when I was Administrator of the rural electrification program I was advised by a congressional committee that to engage in political activity was in violation of the law. Do you have any recollection of an admonition of Congress in that respect?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes. In fact, in our bill we have some language that we hoped would be directed toward eliminating some of this propagandizing activity at the taxpayers' expense, particularly with respect to the recruitment ASCS people and those who make political speeches in an effort to drum up support for the Secretary's programs and probably criticism of alternative programs.

Mr. NELSEN. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion. I would like to point out, however, that the REA Administrator made it his business to tour my district with my opponent, and I thought this was going a little bit further than seemed to be the rule when I was the Administrator. I felt we ought to have equal treatment. However, my percentage was up a little. I do not know what was the cause of it.

I hope the Administrator of the REA program continues or at least directs his effort in the area of his responsibility and not in the political arena of the country.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman from Minnesota has made a very great contribution in the past with respect to political activities of some of those who supposedly ought to be under the Hatch Act. I might say further, knowing the gentleman from Minnesota and his qualities, he does not need anyone to speak for him.

He is quite well able to handle himself even under the most trying circumstances.

Mr. NELSEN. I would refresh the gentleman's memory. When I was before the so-called Chudoff committee a few years ago—a good name—I was the Administrator, and a newspaper was displayed in the hearings, showing that I was having a cup of coffee with a Republican in Duluth, and it was said therefore that I was in violation of the act. I called attention to the fact, at that time, that if drinking coffee was a violation of the Hatch Act, most of Minnesota would be in violation.

Mr. MICHEL. I made the point that there has been a decline in the number of farmers. At the same time we see employment levels in the Department of Agriculture going up.

One danger ahead in agriculture is seen in this exodus of young people from our farms. About four out of 10 of the men and six out of 10 of the women who were farm residents when they last attended school have moved to nonfarm areas. The farm population is declining at the rate of 800,000 a year over the past 5 years.

At the same time the Department of Agriculture continues to grow and expand.

Actually employment from June 30, 1965, to June 30, 1966, rose by 2,517. The Department of Agriculture, as usual, had estimated only an increase of 1,120. As of June 30, 1966, there were 84,070 full-time and 34,515 temporary and part-time employees, for a total of 118,585 USDA employees. In addition, there were 15,067 cooperative extension people. The ASC county people, all of whom are on a payroll of some kind, not full time by any stretch of the imagination, number 99,869. Actually in numbers of people receiving paychecks from the Department there are 233,521. This is almost twice the population of the largest city in my district.

It is also interesting to note that the Department of Agriculture has 29,119 motor vehicles as of June 30, 1966.

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Motor vehicles on hand as of June 30, 1966

Agency	Passenger vehicles				Trucks				Total
	Sedans	Station wagons	Ambulance	Buses	1 ton and less (4 by 2)	1 ton and less (4 by 4)	1½ to 2½ tons	3 tons and over	
Domestic based:									
ARS	1,115	86	1	6	3,107	439	297	54	5,105
ASCS					6				6
CCC					143		35	6	184
C. & M.S.	34	19			3				56
ERS	10								10
FS [1]	553	146		2	8,386	1,566	757	403	11,813
SCS	845	39			10,454	320	12	3	11,673
SEC	1								1
SRS	17								17
Subtotal	2,575	290	1	8	22,099	2,325	1,101	466	28,865
Foreign based:									
ARS	12	2			133	62	7	1	217
FAS	1				13	23			37
Subtotal	13	2			146	85	7	1	254
Total	2,588	292	1	8	22,245	2,410	1,108	467	29,119

[1] Does not include Job Corps vehicles.

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Employees and other personnel assisting with programs of Department

	Actual, June 30, 1966	Estimate, June 30, 1967	Estimate, June 30, 1968
U.S. Department of Agriculture employees:			
Permanent full time	84,070	85,800	87,600
Temporary full time Part time	34,515	35,900	34,850
Total, U.S. Department of Agriculture	118,585	121,700	122,450
Cooperative extension employees	15,067	15,100	15,300
Agricultural stabilization and conservation county and community committeemen and employees	99,869	[1] 99,600	[1] 99,600
Total	233,521	236,400	237,350

[1] Represents approximately 21,700 man-years.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the table on page 88 of part I of the hearings, which shows that as of January 31, 1967, the total paid employees of the Department amounted to only 105,225 people. Yet they expect to have on the rolls at the end of this fiscal year 120,500. I cannot determine exactly how many appropriated jobs are in here, but it is in excess of 120,000, as I recall. If these figures are correct, and if I have properly interpreted them, it looks as if the Department had about 15,000 vacancies as of January 31, 1967.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the figures we have show 85,800 regular personnel. Of course, a big part of that is the U.S. Forest Service. In the Department of Agriculture we have the forest fire fighters, and we have people who do many other summer jobs incident to trying to get rid of insects and pests, and many other things. So we have 37,000 part-time employees who are working in connection with these types of things. The regular employment in this bill is 78,000, exclusive of the Forest Service.

The figure the gentleman is using includes forestry, which is not carried in this bill. The disparity is due to the intermittent or part-time workers.

Mr. JONAS. I should like to know whether the Department had 15,000 vacancies on January 31, 1967.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sure that is not correct.

Mr. JONAS. May I direct the distinguished gentleman's attention to the figures in the table on page 88.

Mr. WHITTEN. The date the gentleman uses is a date when the part-time employees were not needed.

Mr. JONAS. I am not saying anything about part-time jobs. I am using the Department's own table. It shows 105,225 on board; 82,740 are under the caption "full-time employees" and there are "other employees" of 22,485. That is a total of 105,225. That table was put in the record by the Department in response to a question to list the employment levels as of January 31, 1967.

Mr. WHITTEN. I say to the gentleman, when one asks for the employment at a certain date, the figures vary. The height of employment is in the middle of summer, when there are folks doing summertime work, work that can be done only in the summer, including the work in the forests and rural areas.

I take it those figures the gentleman has referred to are not the June 30 figures, which would be the highest peak of employment.

I believe they have made clear how many permanent employees they have, plus how many part-time employees they have. From that one can get the average employment. It still ends up with permanent employees on a year-round basis and the part-time employment.

Mr. MICHEL. If I may comment, I am sure that on the other subcommittees of the gentleman from North Carolina the Departments many times much prefer to talk about man-years rather than actual positions. Of course, this gets around the number of people who are part-time employees.

There are a decided number in the Department of Agriculture who fall within that category, the part-time employees.

Mr. JONAS. I would remind the gentleman that Mr. Grant said: "In terms of man-years, the increase is 2,202," as proposed in the budget.

I am trying to find out how many jobs are appropriated for in this bill we are going to be voting on. I do not see how

I can vote for a bill to increase employment in the department if it had 15,000 vacancies only a few months ago.

I am unable to find an answer to my inquiry. I thought we could develop it here on the floor.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not know how to clear it up for the gentleman. I would not say a job is vacant because the time has not come to hire the man. I do not know whether that would meet the gentleman's idea of a vacancy.

We have recognized that they must have so many people at certain times of the year, and those places are vacant until the time comes to hire them.

I can assure the gentleman, from all of our hearings, there was never any indication that they had that many places which needed to be filled. They frequently have that many places to hire somebody at some particular future time. But they do not hire them now because they do not need them now.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Grant also stated, as is shown on page 88, that the fluctuation in employment varies from 10,000 to 12,000 from the low point in the wintertime to the high point in the summertime.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. JONAS. If 12,000 is the highest point in the variation, during the summertime, I still cannot understand why they would need more jobs if they had 15,000 vacancies on January 31, 1967. If we deduct the 12,000 from 15,000 vacancies, that still would provide 3,000 more jobs than they will need according to their own table and testimony.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not follow the gentleman, and I do not seem to be able to clear it up for him.

I repeat, they do not have places of anything like that degree which are supposed to be filled and which are not filled.

Again I point out that we cut them to less than one-third of the total number asked. I stated earlier why we were faced with the necessity in that regard.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the chairman of the committee for those statements, and would say further that 12,000 of the 15,000 people the gentleman refers to are seasonal, part-time, and temporary personnel hired in summer months.

I would like to move on to the Consumer and Marketing Service item which shows a $127.9 million decrease from the fiscal year 1967 appropriation. This comes about because $110 million was appropriated for the food stamp program in fiscal year 1967 while in this coming fiscal year the entire amount will come from a transfer of section 32 funds and a reappropriation. The overall increase in the cost for the food stamp program is $55 million or nearly a 40-percent increase.

The special milk program is at the same level as last year, that is, $104 million. However, the entire amount again will come out of section 32 funds. In fiscal year 1967 we appropriated $51 million for this item.

The school lunch appropriation shows an increase of over $30 million this year over last year. When we take into account all the direct appropriations and transfers we get a total cost of $632 million for the Consumer and Marketing Service. This represents an $88 million increase. I would draw this to the particular attention of our urban and city dwellers.

Mr. Chairman, I should point out or say a word here about section 32 funds and the growing tendency in recent years to draw upon these customs receipts to fund a number of items in this bill. Under this section of the law, 30 percent of the customs receipts go into this fund and no more than $300 million can be carried over from one year to the next. These funds are supposed to be used to encourage exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural products or perishable commodities and contribute to stabilizing market prices. At this point in the RECORD I am going to insert a table which indicates the income, the outgo, and the closing balances for this fund for the fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968.

It will be noted that after meeting all possible needs in fiscal year 1968, including projected transfers to the school lunch, school milk, food stamp, and other programs, an unused balance of $34,000,000 is estimated. Of this, $300 million will be carried forward into fiscal year 1969 and $41 million will lapse and be returned to the Treasury.

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1967 estimate	Fiscal year 1968 estimate
Income:		
Unobligated balance available start of year	300.2	300.0
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	493.9	570.0
Total income	794.2	870.0
Outgo:		
Program costs	175.9	175.9
Transfers to other programs:		
Food stamp program		180.0
Special milk program	53.0	104.0
School lunch program	45.0	45.0
Agricultural Research Service	25.0	15.0
Foreign Agricultural Service	3.1	3.1
Interior Department	6.8	6.0
Total outgo	308.8	529.0
Balance, end of year	485.4	341.0
Disposition of balance:		
Returned to Treasury	185.4	41.0
Available for ensuing year	300.0	300.0

Now may I say a word about diverted acres, because the chairman in our report makes the point that at a time when our reserve stocks are dangerously low now, with the crying need for more and more around the face of the globe and the fact that we are still paying farmers for not growing anything, last year we had a total of some 60 million acres lying idle in this country. This year there will be something like 40 millions acres lying idle. This is made up principally of 15 million acres in the conservation reserve and cropland adjustment programs and about 21 million acres in the so-called feed grains program and 4½ million acres in the cotton program or a total of 40 million to 40½ million acres in the reserve.

In addition to this the Secretary testified in support of 2 million additional acres for the cropland adjustment program. This program sometimes—and oftentimes, I might say—is referred to as a people's adjustment program rather than a cropland adjustment program. The budget authorization or request came up for $52.2 million for this item. Our subcommittee denied that amount principally on the ground that at a time when more land is needed for the production of commodities that are getting in short supply why should we get ourselves bound up to contracts for a minimum of 5 years and a maximum of 10 years and untold expenditures of money to pay out to farmers for simply doing nothing and letting their land lie idle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to congratulate the subcommittee on making this basic decision not to respond favorably to the request for additional funds for new contracts under the cropland adjustment program. What concerns me is the possibility that the Commodity Credit Corporation's funds might possibly be used for this purpose. Then the request for the reinstatement of the funds might be made at a subsequent date. I am wondering if the gentleman can clarify this point. Is there any way, other than the use of directly appropriated funds, by which the Department could carry on with the negotiation of new additional agreements for cropland adjustment?

Mr. MICHEL. Well, frankly, I do not think they can under what we have done by way of this bill and in the language of the report. If this type of language sticks after it goes through the other body, it seems to me it has been made unmistakably clear that we do not intend to see them proceed and get themselves tied up to contracts because we are not prepared to fund them in future years.

Mr. Chairman, if the will of the Congress is thwarted by some nefarious scheme, then I am not prepared altogether to say here what will be done. Perhaps some member of the Legislative Committee on Agriculture would be better able to answer this question.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I certainly would not want the Government to go back upon any commitments which have already been concluded.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] that this is the case in point. When we authorize these programs and get the Government tied up to a contract, you cannot get the Government out by simply withholding the money which some Members of this body might want to do here today. What we are trying to say is this: That looking down the road with reference to this program, we do not want to get ourselves tied down to an untenable situation and we, in effect, say do not proceed now on the previous basis, and, perhaps, we will be able to correct the situation in the future. At least, that is the position which the subcommittee takes today.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, my concern arises as a result of what happened on the supplemental bill which was pending before the House earlier this year. At that time I questioned an item providing for cropland adjustments and if my memory serves me correctly, all the assurance I received in regard to that item was that some of the funds used came from the Commodity Credit Corporation and this is simply not correct on that point. I may be incorrect, but I am glad to have the assurance of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] that this effort is not going to be carried forward under the present circumstances.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I only wish to refer to the statute. While this was financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation, at the outset, subsection (i) of the cropland adjustment program provides as follows:

> *Provided*, That after December 31, 1966 the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not make any expenditures for carrying out the purposes of this title unless the Corporation has received funds to cover these appropriations made to carry out the purposes of the title.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is prohibited under the statute and we have made no money available for that purpose.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for spelling it out very clearly, and it is my opinion that the wording of the statute which has been read by the gentleman from Mississippi answers the question propounded by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the crop insurance item as contained in the bill, the budget request was for $11,533,000. The subcommittee allowed $8,883,000. While the budget called for $1.6 million to come from premium income, it specifically raised that figure to the level of last year of $4.1 million, to be taken from premium income.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, on the basis of the testimony given to us last year and this year, we would like to see a far greater share of the operating costs coming out of premium income. However, it was pointed out that in order to do so, we would have to change the present legislative act; otherwise the capital would have to be depleted below a reasonable level.

And, Mr. Chairman, finally in reference to the section of the bill concerning the Rural Electrification Administration, the committee made available the full amount of the budget estimate of $314 million for the electrification program. With an estimated carryover of $76 million, a total of $390 million will be available for fiscal year 1968 as compared with $353 million for fiscal year 1967. The committee placed $50 million of this amount in a contingency reserve in lieu of $150 million proposed by the 1968 budget.

The rural electrification program has become an increasingly more controversial subject in recent years due first to the emphasis placed on loans for generation and tranmission facilities, some of which have actually raised the price of power to rural consumers, and second, by the promotion of a Federal electric bank for REA borrowers, a scheme that appears to have little support from the borrowers or anyone else. Our subcommittee, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], has made every effort to provide the REA-financed distribution consumers with adequate protection against unreasonable power costs. The gentleman from Mississippi has consistently used his leadership to fill the actual needs of the REA program in the interest of farmers and other rural electric consumers. The program has always been adequately funded. He is to be congratulated again this year for a difficult job well done.

Testimony before the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee by the Rural Electrification Administrator has made it obvious once again that the conduct of REA warrants constant and careful vigilance by Congress. REA's record of interpreting basic law and its habit of skirting around specific instructions by congressional committees raises questions not just about the administration of the present program, but also about the desirability of enacting legislation such as H.R. 10190, to establish a rural electric bank. This legislation would broaden the rural electrification loan program and reduce congressional supervision—steps that should be taken only after the most careful deliberation. The Committee on Agriculture recently ordered H.R. 10190 reported favorably, but the bank proposal remains highly controversial.

To be more specific, I shall cite a few matters that come to light in our subcommittee hearings.

First, let me bring your attention to the fact that REA is again becoming involved in making section 5 loans to industries. REA made a loan of $300,000 this year to an iron and steel company in South Carolina to assist the company in building a new plant. This loan was made despite the fact that in 1962 the House Committee on Agriculture stated that the making of industrial loans by REA under this authority "is inconsistent with the original intent of Congress." Eighty-seventh Congress, House Report No. 1691, page 72.

This new loan proves Congress must sharpen its vigil over REA or the Administrator once again will be using loan funds for snowmaking equipment, golf courses, or swimming pools.

Congress, a few short years ago, thought it had stopped this sort of nonsense. Now, REA is back at it. Congress made the mistake of taking off the heat, and REA is back at its old tricks.

Second, another problem relative to the REA has to do with the perennial question of loans for generation and transmission facilities. In connection with the 1964 appropriation for REA, the House Committee on Appropriations directed that before making any power-type loan the Administrator shall make a power survey and attempt to obtain a reasonable contract in place of a loan. The intent of this was to give rural consumers the benefit of the lowest cost source of electric supply. Mr. Clapp, in answer to a question in the hearings this year, assured the committee that REA is following this requirement with respect to all such loans. Nevertheless, generation and transmission loans were made by REA this fiscal year totaling $149,708,000.

The Administrator, however, claims these loans did not come under the committee's directives. In effect, he states in one breath he is following the committee's instructions, but in the next ignores or skirts them.

Testimony before the House Agriculture Committee on the bank bill this year revealed that in at least one of these loans—for $14.5 million in Arkansas and there may have been others—there was an existing contract with a private supplier and the Administrator made no effort to follow through on procedures required by the Appropriations Committee. Such willful and blatant disregard of specific committee instructions is a matter that should be dealt with severely.

Many Members know there are other examples of how REA has evaded the specific instructions of Congress, whether those instructions be contained in committee reports or in the basic act itself. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this experience with REA has a direct bearing on the desirability of enacting legislation to establish a rural electric bank that ultimately would have at least $9 billion available for electric loans. This would be in addition to funds available under the present REA program, which would be continued.

The REA Administrator has told our committee that rural electric systems will require $8 billion of added capital in the next 15 years and that by 1980 their annual needs will be about $600 million to $700 million. He also told the House Committee on Agriculture that about half of the annual needs would be supplied by the bank and about half by the REA with loans at 2 percent under the present program. I ask you, if only $4 billion is to be loaned by the bank during the next 15 years, why then should the bank have funds available in excess of $9 billion? Is REA intending to ride roughshod with this new program as it has over the existing act? If not, why so much money?

Mr. Clapp told our subcommittee in defense of the bank proposal that—

It is just not realistic to expect that the Congress can in future years take care of the full needs through the present direct loan program. I ask why is it "just not realistic to expect" Congress to take care of the full needs of the borrowers through the present program? It certainly has in the past. In fact, Mr. Clapp inserted at page 332 of part 3 of the hearings a table on "Electric loan authorizations, fiscal years 1952–67." This shows in separate columns the amount requested in the "printed budget" and the amount appropriated in the "act." In 11 of the 16 years shown, Congress provided more money for REA's electric program than the budget requested. In the other 5 years it provided all that the budget requested. In not 1 of those 16 years did Congress provide less than the budget asked.

In the light of this, again I ask why is it "just not realistic to expect" Congress to take care of the full needs of borrowers through the REA program? As Mr. Clapp's own statistics prove, Congress has consistently met the needs of rural electrification. I wholeheartedly endorse the idea of REA borrowers freeing themselves from Federal control at the earliest possible time they are able to do so, but I resent the REA Administrator's implication that Congress is not doing its job for the rural electrics and using this to justify a legislative monstrosity known as the rural electric bank. The fact is that this bank program is designed to foster the expansion of generation and transmission cooperatives at the expense of the locally owned distribution borrowers who actually bring power to the farms and sparsely settled rural areas.

Never has REA presented Congress with an objective statement of its "needs" for any fiscal year. Instead, it submits the gross amount it "wants." There is no attempt to justify the amount realistically. The Administrator just says how much he wants. He has been so far off base on actual needs that this year REA's carryover of unused lending authority totaled $76 million—almost 20 percent of the amount our committee has approved for the next fiscal year.

REA has done the same thing in the case of the Rural Electric Bank. They "want" a bank that will have $9 billion of lending power without reference to need and without defining its program. Never, to my knowledge, has REA presented any objective analysis to justify $9 billion or any other amount. Where are the studies that say $9 billion of lending authority by the Bank is needed? For what purposes will it be used? REA—despite months of hearings on the bank bill—remains tightlipped. Its attitude and failure to produce any tangible evidence of need makes its intent look suspicious, indeed.

Either REA does not know its needs or is not leveling with the Congress on its plans for the future.

Nine billion, plus the continuation of hundreds of millions of dollars under the present REA program, with continued abuse of congressional directives would broaden tremendously, the powers of REA over locally owned rural electric cooperatives and their consumers for decades to come with billions to build his empire.

Past history of REA has given us a forewarning. This bank idea needs a thorough raking from policy and economic and administrative viewpoints before serious consideration of its enactment.

A great deal of information was included in the record on REA appropriations this year which should help to answer many longstanding questions about REA. This information needs to be examined carefully. It can also provide valuable resource material for use in drafting and considering legislation affecting the rural electrification program. It should be analyzed to determine what improvements are needed to correct inequities, to coordinate functions and administration, and to modernize operations.

For example, why should some of the funds provided by the Congress in the past be treated as REA borrowing from the Treasury and some as an outright gift or grant to REA? When REA gets a loan authorization from the Congress under section 3(a) of the basic act it issues notes to Treasury providing for repayment of the funds in 40 years with interest at 2 percent per annum. This appears on REA's books as an obligation, a debt to Treasury that must be repaid.

This is not true when REA gets an "appropriation" under section 3(b) of the act. In that case no notes are issued to Treasury and no obligation is entered on REA's books. Yet, the funds were loaned out to rural electrification borrowers and repaid to REA with interest in the same manner as funds obtained through loan authorizations. Obviously, this inconsistency does not make much sense.

I am hopeful that the material developed will lead to a more thorough understanding of the entire program and its problems. Certainly, the REA program has arrived at the stage where emotion should go out the window and reason enter through the door—the front door in Congress.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois, the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, made commendatory reference to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the chairman of the subcommittee. That prompts me to say that the House of Representatives and the farmers of the Nation and the consumers of the Nation owe Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. MICHEL, and the other members of this subcommittee, in my opinion, a debt of gratitude for their dedicated service to the cause of agriculture, which in turn is a service to the welfare of Americans generally.

Is my reference to Mr. WHITTEN's special interest in agriculture which has been cultivated through his very wide experience in the House, I would make mention of a book which he authored last year, entitled "That We May Live." That book embodies a great deal of the philosophy of the gentleman from Mississippi with respect to agricultural matters, and I read it with interest and profit. I was pleased that favorable note was taken of the book in many areas.

I have listened with interest to the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Illinois as they have presented this bill. In my opinion, they have presented the best bill that is reasonably possible under the circumstances. And I want to add this: that those who are interested in agriculture and in consumers will find the committee report especially helpful.

I would also commend it to the Members of the House for take-home study.

There are many problems involved in this bill, and I do not wish to belabor the issues involved because other members of the subcommittee, and Members of the House generally, will have much to say as the debate progresses.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add for the RECORD, a word about certain criticisms that have been made of the Department of Agriculture. Let me point out that one of the responsibilities of the Secretary of Agriculture is to remain in tune with the problems and needs of farmers. I know that too often the farmer feels that his viewpoint is not adequately appreciated. With this in mind, I think it is a commendable thing that the Secretary has gone before the farmers and farm leaders of the country to explore with them the things that are troubling them.

Moreover, I would say that it appears that the travel that ASCS farmer committeemen have undertaken in order to take part in these conferences is within the purview of their responsibilities. Let us not forget that the committeemen at all levels—State, county, community—are farmers themselves. In their dual role as farmers and farm program workers, it is mandatory upon them to acquaint themselves with the situation of farmers in their areas. As I understand it, these committeemen who have attended the so-called shirt sleeves meetings, have in no case traveled great distances from home; they carry on a certain amount of travel in the normal activities of their office anyway, and this activity added very little to the ordinary travel that they must carry on in order to administer the farm programs realistically and effectively.

As for Secretary Freeman, I would emphasize once again that it is a highly laudable thing for him to undertake this series of "shirt sleeves" discussions with farmers generally. It is well to read reports and study statistics, but there is no substitute for getting out among the farmers themselves and listening to their views. My point is that to do a good job, officials of Government or business must be familiar with grassroots opinion. It has been reported to me that the farmers were not timid about giving the Secretary their views. And it is hard for me to believe that anything but good for agriculture can come out of the recent field meetings carried on by Secretary Freeman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I first yield myself a half minute to thank my chairman for the kind statement he made.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the

Appropriations Committee once again brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture.

We recommend a total appropriation of $4,770,580,950 for the fiscal year 1968. This is a reduction of $250,516,450 in the total budget requests, which called for $5,021,097,400. The reduction of $2,251,900,500 below appropriations for fiscal year 1967 is due largely to the restoration of only a portion of the fiscal year 1966 capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation as proposed in the 1968 budget.

For Agricultural Research Service we recommend a total of $227,115,500. This is $13,952,100 more than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1967, and $11,119,500 less than the budget requests.

We recommend the appropriation of $96,602,000 for our Extension Service. This is $3,303,000 more than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1967, and the exact amount of the budget request.

For Soil Conservation Service we recommend a total of $237,922,000. This is $154,800 more than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1967, and $2,571,000 less than the amount of the budget requests.

Mr. Chairman, we recommend that the sum of $289,495,000 be appropriated for the Consumers and Marketing Service. This is $127,932,000 less than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1967, and $512,000 less than the amount of the budget requests.

We recommend that the sum of $24,558,500 be appropriated for Foreign Agricultural Service. This is $1,170,500 less than the budget estimates.

For our Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, we recommend that the sum of $202,664,000 be appropriated. This is $3,694,500 less than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1967, and $2,490,000 less than the budget estimates.

To continue the agricultural conservation program, we recommend the sum of $220,000,000, which is the same amount authorized for fiscal year 1967.

For the cropland adjustment program we recommend the sum of $80,000,000. This is $18,000,000 more than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1967, and $10,000,000 less than the budget estimates.

For conservation reserve program we recommend the sum of $123,000,000. This is $17,650,000 less than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1967, and $2,000,000 less than the budget estimates.

Mr. Chairman, we recommend that the total sum of $1,641,109,950 be appropriated for general activities. For credit agencies we recommend the sum of $114,913,000. For the corporations under the control of the Department of Agriculture we recommend the sum of $3,014,383,000.

This bill carries adequate funds for continuation of our tobacco research program. Here, Mr. Chairman, we have an industry that pays into the Federal, State, and local tax-collecting agencies over $3,000,000,000 each year, and 21 of our States produce tobacco. Over 700,000 farm families are involved in the production of this commodity. This is a $10,000,000,000 industry.

More than one-half of the total amount recommended in this bill applies directly to benefits for the consumer.

During our hearings we carefully examined all of those who appeared making predictions as to the outlook for agriculture generally. Most of those who appeared are of the opinion that our farmers are expected to have another good year in 1967 if crop and weather conditions are normal. During the year of 1966 we know that the farmers' income in the United States reached the highest level in 19 years.

Total gross income for the farmers was $49.2 billion, compared with $44.9 billion in 1965 and $37.9 billion in 1960. The reason for the rise in gross income was the result of a 7-percent increase in commodity prices received by farmers, and as the result of an increase in Government payments from $2.5 billion in 1965 to $3.4 billion in 1966. Net farm income in 1966 went up to $16.1 billion. In 1965 net farm income totaled $14.2 billion, and as you know, Mr. Chairman, in 1960 the net farm income was only $11.7 billion. Our average net income per farm in the United States in 1966 was $4,900. This was $700 above the average received in 1965, and $1,945 more than the average received in 1960.

Our hearings disclosed the fact that the total value of farmers' assets increased from $203,000,000,000 in 1960 to $255,000,000,000 in 1966. Total debts owed by farmers on January 1, 1967, are estimated at $44,900,000,000. This is $2,700,000,000 more than the year before and some $21,200,000,000 more than the year 1960. The American farmers carried farm mortgage debts on January 1, 1967, which totaled $23,500,000,000. A year ago real estate farm mortgage debts totaled $21,200,000,000. Non-real-estate farm debts increased to $21,400,000,000 at the beginning of 1967, which is $3,000,000,000 more than the year before.

In considering the question of prosperity insofar as agriculture is concerned, we must keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the average capital investment in farms today is something like $66,000. In 1950 the average capital investment was about $17,000. Today a great many of our young people on the farms have no chance to get started in agriculture unless they either inherit a farm or succeed in borrowing a large sum of money to invest in land which is adequate for a livelihood. To give you some idea as to how serious the situation is, we must constantly keep in mind that today the decrease in farms is from 100,000 to 150,000 a year. This has been the situation since the year 1950.

Regardless of the fact that a great many of our people believe that the farmer will have another good year in 1967, the situation to me does not look as good as it did last year. Last year, of course, was the second best year in history, from the standpoint of net income to farmers and the net income per farm, and at the same time, last fall farm prices have declined and today they are about 7 percent below what they were during the month of September of last year. According to figures released during the past few days, farm prices may be up some 2 percent over the amount prevailing in September of last year. Any increase today still leaves us with a price level decline when you compare the prices at the marketplace today and the prices in existence in August of 1966.

During the past several months in my home State of Kentucky and in some 25 or 26 other States, we have had organized opposition to the sale of milk at present prices. When you consider the amount the farmer is receiving out of each dollar for his milk, you can clearly understand why we have opposition to the price received for milk at this time. Out of every dollar received for milk the producer receives approximately 45 cents. When the amount of insurance, upkeep, maintenance, labor, machinery, and all of the other items come out, then his net income from each dollar received for milk is about 8.7 cents. This, of course, is not enough, and something must be done about it.

In addition to the price received for milk, the American farmer is still confronted with low prices for other produce and commodities, and at the same time he is confronted with considerably higher prices for all of his equipment and machinery necessary to operate his farm.

During our hearings, Mr. Chairman, another matter developed, which to me is of great concern to all of the people in this country. For a great many years we heard complaints generally over the surplus commodities which were stored throughout this country and owned by our Government under the price support program. On several occasions the total amount was in excess of $9 billion. We must keep in mind today that, as our chairman has pointed out in the report, any nation looking to the future must protect the source of its food and its fiber, and world conditions and conditions at home today make a program of scarcity not only unsound, but dangerous.

We must keep our good farmland in full production in order to meet the needs of the present Vietnam war and the demands of our own people. In considering surplus commodities, we must remember that today wheat stocks total some 536,000,000 bushels with total disappearance including domestic use and exports amounting to 1,609,000,000 bushels. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, our wheat stocks on July 1, 1966, were equivalent to only one-third of a year, or 4 months disappearance at the rate during the 1965–66 marketing year. Further, we must remember that a carryover of feed grains was 42.1 million tons at the beginning of the 1966–67 marketing season. Disappearance for the 1965–66 marketing season was 174.6 million tons. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the 42.1-million-ton carryover was equivalent to only about 3 months' disappearance. For soybeans our surplus stocks on October 1, 1966, were 35.6 million bushels. Total disposition for the 1966–67 crop marketing year is estimated at 906,000,000 bushels. Therefore, our present stocks on hand would be equivalent to less than half a month's disposition. Carryover stocks of rice totaled 8.2 million hundredweight as of August 1, 1966. Total disappearance for the 1965–66 marketing year was 82.3 million hundredweight. Mr. Chairman, here our carryover stocks would be equivalent to only about 5 weeks domestic disappearance and exports. Our carryover stocks of butter totaled 52,000,000 pounds on January 1, 1966. Total disappearance in 1966 was 1,157,000,000 pounds, or an average of 96,000,000 pounds per month. Stocks would be equivalent to half a month's disappearance.

In order to remain strong this country must have on hand sufficient surplus commodities to meet any and all emergencies. Today our surplus commodities are manageable and this must be recognized by all of us.

Our Soil Conservation Service is more important today than at any time in the history of this service. When we consider the need for more food and fiber, and keep in mind that some of our best land is now being used for airports, interstate highways, subdivisions, and for recreation purposes generally, we must preserve as much of our best land as possible, and at all times have tillable land in production which will produce enough food for our people. Today in our country we have in cultivation some 385,000,000 acres. Of course, the acreage in cultivated crops varies from year to year due to changes in land use. Estimates for 1966 include 289,000,000 acres of crops harvested, 7,000,000 acres of crop failure, 37,000,000 acres of fallow, and some 52,000,000 acres in grasses and legumes.

The situation is so serious from the standpoint of great quantities of our best farmland going out of production and being used for other purposes that it is now necessary for us to have definite planning and programs which will establish a national policy in this country concerning the need for keeping good land in production and systems devised for use of land not so fertile to be used for the many purposes where good farmland has been used in the past. Today our leaders in soil conservation are looking across the United States with a great many planning bodies who are attempting to set some goals as to what kinds of lands will be used, for what purposes, and to support the decisions with local zoning ordinances. If this system is successful we will be able to keep some of our choice land for agricultural use, thereby protecting it from use for other purposes. This is one of the great serious matters confronting our people today, and is one that should be closely followed and supported.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that I definitely am of the opinion that we still have serious problems in agriculture, and certainly this is not the time to turn our back on the American farmer. It is becoming more difficult to maintain a sound agricultural economy due to increasing costs of labor, equipment, and the high cost per acre of good farmland. The interest of the consumer, of course, Mr. Chairman, must be protected, and, at the same time, we must see that the American farmer receives a fair price for his produce. The consumer, naturally, is concerned about the prices of the finished product as it is displayed in the food market, and the farmer, naturally, has the right to be concerned about the price that he receives, which is only a very small portion of the price that must be paid by the consumer. We must give more time and study to the situation that now prevails between the time agricultural commodities leave the farm and are sold, to the time the products go into the homes of our people for consumption.

We have tried to hold the line as far as appropriations are concerned, keeping in mind that the war in Vietnam is costing our people over $2 billion a month, and, further, that the domestic programs now in operation in this country, which are of great importance to our people, are costing billions of dollars. The reductions made in this bill are reasonable, and the overall reduction in the agricultural appropriations bill for fiscal year 1968 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1967 is proper at this time.

Mr. Chairman, our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the bill before you has been as usual very eloquently, precisely, and very specifically outlined for you by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the ranking Member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], which does not leave much except general observations to be made at this time. But, I do have a few items I would like to cover with you.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation would be a lot closer to having a balanced budget, if all Department appropriation bills were comparable to the considerations we are now making on the agricultural appropriations for fiscal year 1968.

It is with some sense of pride that I call to the attention of the Committee the fact that the total appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, as recommended by the committee, are substantially below the Department request, to begin with, and secondly, and more important, also below the 1967 appropriations.

This reduced budget is one of many factors that indicate the great contribution that the agricultural industry and its populace is making to the overall strength of our Nation at this time. May I suggest that in this connection, every Member of the Committee, as well as all interested citizens, ought to make it a point to read this committee report from beginning to end, because it sets forth clearly and precisely the facts identifying the relationship of these expenditures to the benefits that every citizen throughout the Nation derives from them. It ought to be noted that every congressional district has a substantial interest in these appropriations. I shall want to make reference to but a few of them.

First, may I call your attention to the often-repeated fact that American agriculture produces food for our citizens at a cost, when related to the income of our citizens, that is the cheapest in the world —about 18 percent—while at the same time we are also providing food for hundreds of thousands of people in this country and throughout the world at a cost that varies all the way from being provided as a gift, to current world market prices.

These conditions alone should merit the attention and the gratitude of every consumer in this country, the entire processing industry, and certainly citizens throughout the world who benefit from our great production capacity and considerate attitude to their needs.

Page 10 of the report identifies a matter of concern to everyone, in that it sets forth the expenditures of the fiscal 1966 budget as to programs which provide benefit to consumers, businessmen, and the general public, as compared to the programs that are predominantly for the stabilization of farm income, and, I should add, which also benefit everyone.

Let me emphatically note that out of a total fiscal year 1966 budget of $5,949,000,000, $4,344,000,000 are expenditures for programs providing benefits to the general public. This is about three-fourths of the entire agricultural expenditure for fiscal 1966.

About the same ratio applies to the moneys provided in the bill before you at this time. It therefore follows that actually the general citizenry, and those living in metropolitan or urban areas, have a greater interest in these appropriations than does the American farmer. I am sure they should all be concerned were there not sufficient moneys provided for such programs as food stamps, school lunch, school milk, the distribution of food to the needy—in both this country and throughout the world—each of which contributes to the health and welfare of our entire social structure. A year ago, we were substantially alerted to the general public interest in these appropriations, when the Department recommended reductions in school lunch and school milk programs. I recall that the mail encouraging the restoration of these funds. to which the committee responded, was not confined to the farmers of this country. In fact, most of it came from metropolitan areas. Benefits to the general public are well stated in the committee report on page 9.

Important as each of these items is to the everyday needs of our country, there is even a more important asset that is provided by the moneys appropriated in this bill which relates to our future needs. I am speaking now of the long-range programs for the improvement and preservation of our natural resources and their food-production capacity. These, of course, include moneys that provide for soil and water conservation programs, for forestry development, and research which we know has given us the assurance that an adequate quantity and quality of food will and can be produced.

Future generations have a great interest in this bill, for unless we make sure that we maintain the production capacity of our greatest of all natural resources, namely, soil, then surely they will have food problems that would make today's problem look minor indeed.

I stated 2 years ago that but for agricultural research, this Nation would not have been able to feed its own people today. Research has been responsible for accomplishing greatly increased production by developing higher yielding varieties of grains, better strains of cattle, and improving other food products, that has resulted in an adequate supply and the best quality found anywhere in the world. The very same thing is true regarding research that has prevented insects, diseases and pests of every description from completely ruining our production potential of almost every food that is found on the grocer's shelves today. Agricultural research has been just as prominent in the prevention of contamination of foods and water, for the benefit of both human as well as animal health.

I have often been disturbed in recent months and years to have noted the criticisms leveled at American agriculture, implying that it was a burden to the taxpayer, the consumer, and the general welfare of the country. Surely the facts to which I have just referred impressively define that, if anything, the reverse is true, and that American agriculture is rather one of our greatest assets.

As one who has spent most of my lifetime in the business of farming, I can by experience attest to the great dangers of overtaxing productive soil, rendering it almost useless and becoming subject to the ravages of the elements. I think it is important enough to reiterate the statement on page 7 of the committee report which reads as follows:

> This is a lesson that the people of the United States must learn from history. The cost of food, clothing and shelter is going to be paid either by the consumer or by the land from which it comes.

It is to meet this obligation to the generations that will follow us that the various conservation programs carried on today are of great pertinence. Moneys expended for these purposes are investments in the future that have no parallel.

It is equally important that we maintain the production capacity of the individual farms and production units, and unless present income levels can be improved, then there is great danger that we may deteriorate their producing abilities to where there will be little assurance of either the quantities or the qualities of foods that are desired.

The committee report on page 6 identifies specifically and statistically the extent to which present-day farm income is completely out of step and out of proportion with the rest of the economy. With the parity level at the lowest percentage since the depression days of the thirties, it becomes even more disturbing when we note that farm income as a percentage of investment has decreased from 23.1 percent in 1947 to 9.4 percent in 1966. Add to this the fact that there has been a 300-percent increase in the cost of items used in farm production, and it is small wonder that there is great unrest and disturbance among the farm people throughout the entire Nation.

American agriculture has made excellent strides in increasing their efficiency by mechanization and increased production per man-hour of labor—all of which in industry would ordinarily be rewarded by adequate profits. In agriculture, however, the reverse has been true and the return for these efforts has rather substantially declined, particularly when related to the enormous investment that is necessary in order to maintain a productive unit by today's price standards. Any factor that might affect the deterioration of this productive capacity is actually a danger to the future economic well-being and the health of our Nation at a time when we are called upon to defend the freedom of individuals throughout the world.

These are further reasons why there ought to be serious concern on the part of every American citizen that we have taken adequate and appropriate means to insure production stability and capacity of individual farms.

As the committee report points out, this danger is most evident in the worn-out and food-deficient countries of Asia and other areas, because too little attention was directed to returning to the soil what has been taken out by continuous production of needed supplies of food and fiber.

Much has been said and read about farm subsidies. May I call your attention to the item beginning on page 7 of the committee report, entitled "The Facts About Subsidies," which includes a statistical chart on page 8 indicating that subsidies paid for price support programs are actually small when compared to those paid in many other sectors of our economy.

Our present supplies are dangerously low, and page 46 of the report indicates that in many of the major commodities we have supplies on hand that are the equivalent of only a few months or a few weeks at the normal rate of disappearance. I am sure that no one wants to experience again the need for rationing of any variety of food such as was the case during World War II. And it might be well at this time to remember how fast we moved from a food surplus situation to food deficits in the early 1940's. A recent headline in the Fargo-Moorhead Forum, under the date of June 1, 1967, reads as follows: "Rationing Program Ready in Case It Is Ever Needed," which alerts us to the dangers of history repeating itself.

For these reasons, your committee has attempted to provide sufficient moneys for what in our estimation are the true essentials of a productive agriculture. We have provided both money and personnel in the areas of greatest public need and demand. These are identified in six specific categories on the bottom of page 13 of the report. They might be briefly identified as in the areas of research, protection of public health, the preservation of agricultural production, adequate food supply to children and low-income consumers, adequate credit to farm operators, and the needs for mechanized agriculture to offset the lack of sufficient farm labor.

On pages 20 and 21 of the report are listed a number of Agricultural Research Service projects for which additional moneys have been requested, that are typical of the need for expanded research work as a protection for the health and food supply needs of the Nation. Let me refer to one.

As an example of what is involved, note the second item entitled "Research on Mastitis Problems in Milk Quality." The National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments, established several years ago, at a meeting held on April 3 to 6 of this year, approved a program wherein by July 1 of 1970 each health jurisdiction must have in operation a mastitis and abnormal milk control program. This 3-year leadtime was established to permit research to be conducted to determine more about the mythology of determining the incidence of mastitis and abnormal milk, and whether or not an enforcement program which has been suggested would be workable.

Field tests have shown that there are serious limitations in the detecting facilities available today to identify mastitis and abnormal milk. Quite obviously these are factors that could effect available supplies, as well as the quality of milk which today is being shipped in wide areas from production points. For reasons such as this, your committee provided $2 million in addition to the budget request of $1 million, so that there would be additional moneys available to the Department as they would best determine the priority needs in this rather voluminous category of requests.

With all of the problems confronting the dairy industry today, it is obvious how significant this matter could become to both producer and consumer.

Your committee, at the same time, has been ever cognizant of the very difficult budget problem that confronts the Nation and so has made reductions wherever we felt it could be done without jeopardy. It is by this means that we have accomplished the reduction in the budget requests of more than a quarter of a billion dollars, as well as a total appropriation well below the fiscal 1967 estimate of expenditures.

I stated at the outset that if all other appropriations bills had been comparable to the one before you, then our problem tomorrow in considering the need for again expanding the public debt limit would have been substantially reduced. Again, this is evidence of a segment of our national economic structure, namely, agriculture, being most responsive to our national economic well-being.

For the second time in less than 5 months we are called upon to expand the public debt limit, with the two requests totaling more than $30 billion. If this second request is approved by the Congress, it can only mean further inflation and greater tax demands, both of which will attach additional costs to the production of food. It might be well at this point to reflect that while the total budget demands are such that it has required increases of more than $30 billion in our debt limit, the bill before you providing moneys for the Agriculture Department and all of its activities for fiscal 1968 is actually reduced by more than two and a quarter billion dollars. By comparison, the seven appropriation bills which the House has already approved this year show an aggregate increase over the 1967 fiscal year of almost a billion and a half dollars.

While there has been much discussion, and it has been previously called to the attention of the House, that a substantial part of the reduction of more than two and a half billion dollars below last year's appropriation is due primarily to the fact that the bill does not fully reimburse the realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation, it still remains to be specifically noted that even if these figures are ignored, the total appropriation is still below that of last year.

So that the record may be clear, may I refer to the second and third paragraphs of page 63 of the committee report, which identifies that the total impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation for fiscal 1966 was $2,984,856,389, of which $1,400,000,000 is included in the present bill to restore the capital impairment for fiscal year 1966. Therefore, in making the comparison of the total fiscal 1968 appropriation with that of fiscal 1967, it is worthy to note that there is a little more than one and a half billion dollars of the 1966 losses that are not restored.

Even with a full restoration of the 1966 losses, the bill would still be more than $600 million below the 1967 appropriation. There are further unrestored losses that date back to 1961, which have been carried in the same manner ever since that time, but there is every indication that, with the carryover from last year, the additional $1.4 billion that is provided in this bill will more than adequately meet all the foreseeable needs of the Corporation in the coming year. These facts are particularly pertinent when we consider that they come about at a time when, first of all, the Nation is at war, a time when the production of food is always of greatest significance, and second, at a time in history when one of the great concerns throughout the world is that of finding sufficient food supplies with which to feed a world population where more than two-thirds of the people are underfed.

Of equal significance is the fact that these budget figures are being considered at a time when the farm income is at a level that is comparable to that of the depression days of the 1930's. Even with the increase of 2 percent in the parity ratio during the month of April, the parity ratio is still at 74 percent, or 6 percent below what it was a year ago. In view of these facts, surely no one can say this Nation's agriculture is in any form a burden to either the economy, the consumers, the taxpayers, or the economic needs of a country at war. Every budget-minded person ought to salute agriculture for its lack of contribution to the ever-expanding national debt at this crucial time. The fact is that the farmers of America ought to be rewarded substantially. I should like to make a few suggestions on how this can be accomplished.

It seems almost ironic that after their faithful performance over the years, when conditions are such that our supplies have now been diminished and demands have grown, prices have dropped to depression levels. There was a time when farmers could usually depend on improved farm prices during a time of war—this no longer seems to be true; and it becomes a rather sad commentary to realize that it is mostly because of Government actions or lack of Government actions that the deplorable farm conditions of today do exist. Strangely enough, they could have been and still can be corrected without additional cost to Government or taxpayer.

During the past 2 years or more there have been numerous instances of specific Government actions that were designed to depress farm prices. Briefly named, they are: sale of Government surpluses at inappropriate times; actions to stop buying American foods even for our military forces; erroneous prediction of crop estimates and meat supplies available; limiting exports such as hides after export markets have been developed; and permitting imports of dairy products, beef, lamb and pork to increase to a point where markets have been seriously affected.

Appropriate actions could well have saved and reduced the moneys provided for in this bill even further, and to the benefit of everyone. These are not actions that come under the jurisdiction of this bill to correct, but are of direct interest, because they might well have greatly changed the need for additional appropriations. It would serve the Department, the Congress, and the American people well if in the future we did direct our attention to an improvement of these many marketing practices.

An adequate farm income would not only reduce the need for further subsidy and crop adjustment payments, but would also provide relief for many welfare and assistance programs that now demand huge appropriations. To my knowledge, no one has ever answered the question of why the market should not accommodate the cost of production and a reasonable profit on items as important to everyone's well-being as food and clothing, particularly in an economy that supposedly is flourishing. It would seem that the first step in accomplishing this most desirable condition would be to at least permit the law of supply and demand to work when conditions are ripe for them to work. If we are to avoid complete government control of agriculture, this would seem to be the first and most essential step and we ought to be taking it now, at a time when many of those conditions are already in existence.

It is not for me at this time to discuss in detail all of the factors relating thereto, but surely it leaves little hope for an improved agricultural future if, after years of diligent compliance with Government restrictions and limitations on production in order that we may get supply and demand into balance—and then having arrived there—we permit imports to completely upset a desired accomplishment. Nor does it make any more sense that the surpluses that were at one time withdrawn for purposes of attempting to improve the price structure, should then later be used to depress the prices that they were in the first instance intended to improve.

Possibly the greatest difficulty in attempting to accomplish these rather simple actions is the fact that they do not cost any money. It seems that if any objective is to receive constructive and accomplished attention, it must bear a price tag of $2 billion or more. It would be my hope, however, that as we look to the future, we may leave no stone unturned in any of these areas in order that we might be able to further reduce the agricultural appropriations, and at the same time provide assurance for a healthy agricultural market that would greatly insure adequate food supplies for ourselves as well as a hungry world.

To do so, I am sure, would find universal acceptance, would strengthen our economy, and would provide both welcome food and income relief to thousands of people who have endured great hardships through no fault of their own. The accomplishments of American agriculture can surely deserve no less consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Having been delinquent in the first instance, in not having expressed my appreciation for the valuable service the gentleman has performed on the subcommittee, and for the very fine presentation he makes here today, I applaud the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank my colleague for his kind remarks.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I should like to ask a question in regard to line 14 of page 2 of the bill, and also in regard to page 9. It says:

> Appropriations hereunder shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed two for replacement only:

Mr. LANGEN. I do not have a copy of the bill before me at the moment.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Could the chairman of the subcommittee give me an explanation? I ask the question in regard to page 2, line 14 of the bill, where there is a reference to aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed two for replacement only.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LANGEN. I am glad to yield to my chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. For many years the Department of Agriculture, which includes the Forest Service, although it is not in this bill, has conducted aerial spraying and related research on insects and various other pests. This has to do with such things as grasshoppers, screwworms, and various other pests that strike our agricultural products. In connection with these activities these planes have been used.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. These will not be used, then, for administrative purposes?

Mr. WHITTEN. No. They are not administrative in nature but for control of insects and disease.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I have a further question. On page 9, line 6, it asks for operation and maintenance of aircraft, $113,053,000. I would like to inquire what this is for. Is it what it says it is for? Is it for operation and maintenance of aircraft? It seems like a really big amount.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield further, that ties back into the whole appropriation for conservation programs. The money for operation and maintenance of aircraft is a part of it. This large figure is tied to the entire paragraph.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANGEN. May I call your attention in the first instance it is only for replacement of 2 planes and in the second instance the large figure is because this amount of money covers the whole field of the appropriations in this category.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Where do I find any reference to the representation allowance of the Secretary? I looked through the bill and tried to find it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, on page 27, at the bottom of the page, you will find it says:

> *Provided, further,* that not to exceed $2,500 of this amount shall be available for reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick].

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, we all know the amounts of money that we are discussing appropriating today are pretty vast. They cover a wide range of activities. One of these activities—and this is why I am here to discuss it today—is a piece of legislation and an activity I was greatly interested in. This involves the protection of our pets. I think many of us will recall that I introduced the original piece of legislation on this. That legislation was improved upon by the distinguished chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage], and then passed the Senate, and went through a conference committee, where all the kinks were ironed out. I think it would be fair to say that this is one piece of legislation that the Congress worked its will upon. This was not an administration measure but one that I originally introduced because of the problem. This problem still exists. I think we saw the other day the picture of a dog recovered from a Government hospital. We spent a lot of time on this bill and did a lot of hard work to protect everybody involved, to protect the dog dealers and the hospitals, but we felt that our primary responsibility was to protect the American people, because when one steals a dog, one is stealing more than a possession.

Mr. Chairman, pets are something upon which we lavish great love. In other words, our dogs and cats are a part of the family.

Mr. Chairman, it came to me as a terrible shock for one to learn that all of this hard work, all of this effort and the will of the Congress had been tossed aside and that the bill had been completely emasculated because of the $1.5 million required, I believe, $1.2 million was taken out of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] that, certainly, the committee does not feel that it has tossed aside the bill as the gentleman describes it.

However, Mr. Chairman, the stealing of pets is a crime under the laws of practically every State of the Union. It is a crime against the ordinances of practically every city located within every State in the Union. But, notwithstanding that fact, we are aware of all the problems that the gentleman from New York has described.

Mr. Chairman, the committee feels, in all sincerity, that what we have undertaken to do and to bring about is in accord with the intent of the legislation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that the gentleman's bill authorized not to exceed $1.5 million for this purpose. If the gentleman will look at the front page of the report, where we list the programs of this Department, we say "enforcement of the new program for licensing and control of laboratory animals; and various service and staff offices."

Mr. Chairman, we allowed funds for the Washington central office in the sum of $300,000. We did this so as to have a Washington office with which to manage and to handle this problem.

Further, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] will look on page 23 of the report, we provide the following:

> The 1968 bill includes funds for a supervisory group in Washington to coordinate and direct work of field personnel of the Agricultural Research Service in carrying out the inspection of dealers engaged in the transportation, sale and handling of dogs, cats and other research animals under Public Law 89–544. This agency has a staff of over 15,000 people, with about 6,000 of them already engaged in inspection and control activities.

So, Mr. Chairman, if I may say to the gentleman from New York, we have in our judgment provided adequate funds for an ample office with which to handle this matter from Washington. We have assigned the responsibility in the field to the agency which has the trained people with which to handle the problem who are located in the local areas. We did this rather than setting up a new organization all over the United States. We, in this way, hope to handle the program with the staff and personnel already available.

Further, Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion, for what is it worth—having dealt with the subject matter for many years—that we will obtain far better results by the manner in which we have handled this problem, rather than by trying to set up a separate unit and taking the sum of $1.5 million and scattering it among employees and operations all over the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there may be differences of opinion as to how to get the job done. But, certainly, there can be no question but that the committee by the provisions of the bill and the report is trying to get the job done.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the key feature of that bill was the control of the dealer and to make a licensed dealer conform to the law and to have that license worth something and terminated if the licensed dealer did something wrong. In other words, if he did something wrong he would lose his license.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman fom New York has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it now, the dealer in pets, because of this limitation of funds, is, really, in a very protected situation.

Mr. WHITTEN. No.

Mr. RESNICK. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that we do not do this in connection with other facets of our inspection system.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York will yield further, may I say to the gentleman that there has been a lot of misunderstanding about that.

Mr. Chairman, I had a conference with the committee members and with a number of departmental officers and may I state to the gentleman from New York and to many of our friends who are interested in this area that there is nothing contained in the law that permits us to close down a man's business, without his having an opportunity to defend his operations.

Mr. RESNICK. Well——

Mr. WHITTEN. May I finish my statement?

Mr. RESNICK. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WHITTEN. So, until the time that the inspectors can get in and inspect, we are calling upon these people to send in a certificate to the effect that they have conformed to what is prescribed in the law. They are permitted then to operate under that certificate until an inspector gets there to clear them. This is not a permanent arrangement. This is an effort to get started.

Mr. Chairman, in the last supplemental appropriation bill we agreed to transfer certain moneys so that a special group could get to work upon this problem until the time Federal employees could carry out fully their responsibilities in connection therewith.

Mr. Chairman, there was no legal basis on which we could have gone into court to restrain these people from their operations and thereby put them out of business when they had not been inspected.

So this is a strictly temporary matter of having the man certify that he has carried out the provision of the law. We mean to get to him to inspect his operation just as fast as we can, to see that the law is carried out.

Mr. RESNICK. I am glad the gentleman has that intent, and I do not believe it was the intent of any framers of the original legislation to put anybody out of business, but I do feel—and I think the people who have studied this very carefully, people who have made the humane treatment of animals their life's work—feel that the taking away of all of these funds make it virtually impossible to ever reach these dealers. That is the sticking point. This may be the honest difference of opinion; and I believe that this is the problem, that unless these people are inspected and made to comply that we are going to have the same situation that we have had all along.

I would also like to say to the gentleman that we here in the Congress will be busy answering a lot of letters unless this oversight is taken care of.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I wish to say that there are thousands of items in this bill, and if we dealt with each of them separately we never would get through with it. I want to assure the gentleman that we have not even withdrawn money. Certainly it takes money, but it also takes people, and we have turned this job over to the regular agriculture research people who already draw pay, and we feel that they will in turn do the best job. We feel this is better than any other approach.

I also wish to say to the gentleman that he and I both can follow this through, and if it does not work out we can try something else, but in my opinion we mean for it to work.

Mr. RESNICK. I thank the gentleman. I also believe the original concept of the bill was that this was going to be a self-liquidating program in that the fees charged would pay for the costs. In other words, the fees charged for the licenses would cover the cost. And that is again why I feel so disturbed about this whole thing. I do not know if it was changed somewhere between the time it left the conference room and now, but the original concept was that it was not going to cost the taxpayer any money; that the fees were going to cover this. This again is one of the reasons that I am disturbed about the situation.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I plead ignorance in that case? I was unaware of that phase of it, but I do feel that the way the committee has selected is the way to get the job done.

Mr. RESNICK. I do believe that was what it was.

I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding, and I would hope that this situation can be looked into.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, through the courtesy of the gentleman from Florida, Senator HOLLAND, the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, I have in my hand here a document which contains information on aggregate payments to individual farmers, information as supplied to the Senator by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The information in my possession is limited to the State of Illinois, but after conferring with the Senator I am confident that other Members of this body may have similar information about their home States.

My information sets forth the name, address, and county of each person or firm receiving, during 1966, total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans.

I might say that, due to the changed nature of commodity programs, price support loans no longer have major significance as a reflection of Government subsidy of farmers. And that is why they were excluded by the Department in bringing together these individual totals.

The Senator also assured me that consideration is now being given to the eventual publication of a comprehensive national report on individual payments of this magnitude.

He said no decision had been made on the breakpoint in reporting details.

But I did get the feeling that all higher figures will be fully published in due time.

When the committee rises, I will ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the full details in regard to the State of Illinois.

While numerous Illinois farmers get payments under various ASCS programs, the individual totals are actually small compared with some States.

In order to get a fair evaluation of the extent to which direct Government payments go into bank accounts of large farmers, information from all of the States and not just from Illinois should be examined, and as I say it may be that individual Members from other States will find it in the public interest to follow my lead and request permission and place appropriate data in the RECORD.

It does seem to me that the taxpayers are entitled to know who gets how much.

After a look at the committee report I am left in doubt on several items. I cannot figure out how much these individual programs are costing the taxpayers. It may be that it is set forth someplace, but I would appreciate some help from members on the subcommittee on this.

I see on page 10, for example, some budget expenditures for the fiscal year 1966. From this data I have tried to determine the cost of the cotton program.

For example, I see a figure of $116 million representing acreage diversion payments: I see a figure of $57 million representing price support payments; I see a figure of $332 million representing cotton equalization payments.

Now that comes to a total of $495 million representing the cost of the cotton program as set forth in this table.

I would like to ask, if anyone can tell me, is this a fair, accurate, and complete estimate of the cost of the cotton program? There is nothing in there for storage and I am under the impression that we have tremendous expenses for handling the stockpile of cotton.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, there are two or three things that I cannot vouch for and I cannot vouch for the accuracy as to a particular commodity.

We have our figures on page 210 of the budget in which they indicate the various wheat certificate operations and cotton and the milk program and all the rest of the figures are given there. On cotton it is $116 million.

May I say to the gentleman, I oppose the farm bill now in existence, but the farm bill itself provides that in an effort to see that the farmer gets some fair share of the income of the country, it would provide cotton payments to be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I point out in this connection, if the gentleman will permit me, on page 33 of our hearings, volume 1, Mr. Freeman says:

> Payments out of the Treasury made up about 7 percent of gross farm income and about 20 percent of net in 1966.

I think that is wholly unsound. But as has been pointed out by our colleagues on the subcommittee on the gentleman's side of the aisle, and incidentally they do a wonderful job. But as has been pointed out notwithstanding these cash payments, farm income went way, way down and if these payments were eliminated I think you would have a disastrous recession all over the country because again agriculture is the biggest market that industry and labor have. But the best figure I have is $116 million.

Mr. FINDLEY. Can the gentleman tell me what the realized loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation was on the value of the cotton inventory that was marked down about a year ago? As I understand it, as part of the so-called one price cotton programs, the inventory was revalued at a considerable loss to the taxpayers. Can the gentleman give me the figure there?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry I do not have the figure but I can get it shortly.

But may I say again, it does not represent a loss to the taxpayers. Because if you get something and claim that it is worth so much or a certain amount to you and then you bring it down to what it really is worth, you have not lost anything except the bookkeeping figure because what you have graded it down to is the actual value as against the original book value.

Mr. FINDLEY. Can the gentleman give me just a rough approximation of what the storage costs on cotton is currently?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry I do not have that figure at hand. But I will say that the supply of cotton is down to about 5.2 million bales and most of it is in the shorter staple cotton.

I do not have available at this time the figure on storage and handling charges.

Mr. FINDLEY. That was the conclusion I reached. I thank the gentleman for responding. But it would be helpful to the committee, I think, to know how much these programs are costing. So far as I can determine, the committee report does not provide the answer. As I say, the figure I came up with for cotton was $495 million for the calendar year, but I am sure that is not an accurate figure because it does not include storage and realized losses.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I would just like to set forth some figures which indicate the losses for the first 9 months of the fiscal year 1967. That would be ending March 31 this year.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is that cotton alone?

Mr. MICHEL. No, that figure I believe I can possibly supply for the record. I do not happen to have that particular information here. But in total form, this gives you some idea of it, and I included part of it in my remarks in general debate.

The realized program gains and losses, Commodity inventory operations: the proceeds from sales came to $1,799,496,000. The loss from the sales was $2,149,840,000. That was in the first 9 months of the current fiscal year. In other words, the net loss from sales of Commodity Credit was $350,344,000.

Now, you get down to some other individual items, such as donations, the cost of commodities donated, $151,887,000.

The expenses applicable to inventories, storage and handling, $119,941,000 and transportation, $75,846,000.

Export payments and allowances, $133,797,000; cotton equalization program payments, $20,375,000; cotton diversion payments, $276,858,000; feed grain diversion payments, $525,328,000; wheat diversion payments, $27,133,000; cotton price-support payments, $489,108,000; feed grain price support payments $777,694,000; wheat price support payments, $281,374,000; reseal loan storage expense, $39,364,000; other $10,655,000, or a total of $3,279,704,000 of net realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation in those activities which we have mentioned here in the first 9 months of this year.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is very helpful information. I do hope that in time this body can have some accurate figures representing the cost of the individual commodity programs. I have a number of complaints from my constituency about the adverse impact on market prices by the reporting of the Department. They question the accuracy of the reporting in some cases, and I am wondering if the subcommittee has had any indication of why inaccuracy might have occurred, if indeed it did. Was there any reluctance on the part of Congress to provide adequate funds for doing a thorough job of crop reporting? In other words, I raise the question, "what's the problem?"

Mr. MICHEL. If I may, I would point out to the gentleman that on page 33 of our report under the heading "Statistical Reporting Service," we have set actually $13,821,750 for this item. We said:

> The bill includes an appropriation for fiscal year 1968 of $13,821,750, a decrease of $42,250 in the budget request, and a continuation of the 1967 operating level. The amount proposed will provide program increases of $122,000, plus an additional $292,500 for equipment to automate the gathering, processing and dissemination of data to the public, and $136,000 to cover increased mail costs.

But we have been very critical of the fact that some of the estimates have been way off base, and we do have to automate ourselves. The committee has put the pressure on. We hope with the equipment we have given them to work with, they will have refined statistics.

Mr. FINDLEY. Can the gentleman tell me why the emphasis is placed on the premium income limitation that is provided for premiums? Is the limitation really needed?

Mr. MICHEL. Here, while the gentleman, I am sure, is pretty much in sympathy with the same thing I have tried to accomplish by getting as much out of this premium income as possible, we have been advised that unless we amend the statute, we are pretty much foreclosed from making any other move than what we did in this bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's giving me the information. The matter referred to earlier follows:

Names, addresses, and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price-support loans—Illinois

ADAMS COUNTY

Chester Miller, Mendon	$12,301
Cyrill Elbus, Clayton	11,124
E. A. Meyer (H. B. Ihnen), Quincy	10,392
Thomas Hennenfent, Roseville	9,914
E. E. Lawless, Camp Point	8,977
Duke Lyter, Quincy	7,305
Kent Leeper, Lima	6,272
Frank Lewis, Ursa	6,265
Chester H. Smith, Clayton	6,007
J. C. McLean, Quincy	5,581
Melvin Sims & Dean Sims, Liberty	5,457
Lawrence McNear, Barry	5,396
John T. Smith, Ursa	5,101
Total (13)	100,092

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

ALEXANDER COUNTY

Elott Raffety Farms, Inc., Wyatt, Mo	$40,896
Harold Gerard, McClure	19,194
George B. Bader, Jr., McClure	19,095
John R. Greenwell, Cairo	14,235
Marion Waggener, Charleston, Mo	8,356
Kenneth Gentle, Cache	8,211
Donald L. Smith, Mounds	5,446
Aaron Wolford, Cache	5,405
Lee P. Stenzel, Cairo	5,257
Total (9)	126,097

BOND COUNTY

Raymond Zeeb, Greenville	10,729
Edward Bauer, Smithboro	8,052
Raymond Bass, Greenville	5,775
George Marchello, Smithboro	5,227
Geo. L. Schaufelberger, Greenville	5,058
Total (5)	34,841

BOONE COUNTY

Walter Metzger, Poplar Grove	18,356
George & August Zarndt, Clinton	14,805
Frank Bullard, Poplar Grove	13,688
Mark Grenlund, Poplar Grove	13,432
Wayne J. Wright, Jr., Garden Prairie	10,910
Russell Osterberg, Garden Prairie	10,904
John Engelsen, Garden Prairie	8,992
Kenneth H. Osterberg, Garden Prairie	8,673
Walter Mackeben, Garden Prairie	8,429
Troy Doetch, Poplar Grove	8,288
W. F. Benson, Belvidere	8,108
J. E. Dewane Est., Belvidere	8,077
Harold L. Harling, Belvidere	7,461
Fred Fidder, Garden Prairie	6,938
Harold Yates, Garden Prairie	6,617
A. P. Gold Guernsey Co., Fontana	6,066
William J. Adams, Clinton	6,020
Edward Meine, Poplar Grove	5,759
Donald Lindberg, Caledonia	5,696
J. L. Dewane, Belvidere	5,563
Donald H. Gesell, Poplar Grove	5,484
Donald Fidder, Belvidere	5,392
Loren Shattuck, Belvidere	5,379
Francis Schmitt, Caledonia	5,354
Robert W. Erwin, Caledonia	5,027
Total (25)	209,418

BROWN COUNTY

Rolla Colclasure, Mount Sterling	11,306
Harold Markert, Mount Sterling	9,742
Emmett McNeff, Timewell	6,902
Robert Turner, Jacksonville	5,441
Harold Harris, Timewell	5,158
Total (5)	38,549

BUREAU COUNTY

Claude Bailey, Princeton	19,082
Clint Thomas, Sheffield	18,765
Edward Perino, Deer Grove	14,520
Milo McCune, Sheffield	13,764
Oliver Nordstrom, Wyanet	12,134
Richard B. Kelly, Tampico	11,462
Conrad W. Gebeck, Buda	10,753
Leroy Kelly, Tampico	9,941
Raymond Brieser, Mineral	9,728
Donald Bill, Kewanee	8,565
Irving J. Wessel, Princeton	8,349
H. H. Ferris, Est., Princeton	8,306
Arthur E. Swanson, Princeton	8,225
R. William Jack, Princeton	8,221
Carl Koelling, Bradford	8,161
Deward R. Marcum, Lamoille	8,144
Kenneth Brady, Neponset	7,990
Paul Shrock, Tampico	7,835
Glenn Shaner, Neponset	7,763
Ted Strouse, Buda	7,314

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

BUREAU COUNTY—continued

Bob Oberle, Tampico	$7,113
L. A. Dahl, Walnut	6,904
Samuel Longman, Henry	6,668
Eleanor Sapp, Decatur	6,592
Harvey H. Sandrock, Tampico	6,584
Dayle O. Foster, Buda	6,488
Sam Hodgett, Sheffield	6,363
Donald Kunkel, Granville	6,104
Lester Beatty, Lamoille	6,093
Delmar Beams, Tiskilwa	6,091
Orville Bachman, Tiskilwa	6,044
Ed Magnuson, Arlington	5,709
Leonard Longman, Tiskilwa	5,578
Jerry Hadley, Sheffield	5,540
Laurence Amfahr, Mendota	5,434
John Kaufmann, Tiskilwa	5,410
Delight Fredenhagen, Tiskilwa	5,388
Ray Croegaert, Mineral	5,314
Virgil Johnson, Princeton	5,296
Robert Mallonee, Malden	5,157
Charles Adams, Tampico	5,143
Russel Hochstatter, Wyanet	5,101
Total (42)	339,136

CALHOUN COUNTY

Schulze Brothers, Brussels	17,116
Schulze Farms, Inc., Golden Eagle	13,462
Jerome Corbett, Hardin	9,197
David Pence, Mozier	8,162
John Kinscheriff, Pleasant Hill	6,988
Herter Brothers, Golden Eagle	6,329
Robert Meyer Trust, Brussels	6,232
G. A. Clendenny, Mozier	6,204
C. W. Squier, Hamburg	5,060
Total (9)	78,750

CARROLL COUNTY

Richard Eads, Lanark	21,859
Harland Daw, Milledgeville	12,368
Robert Cockle, Wilmington	11,945
Delbert Newcomer, Lanark	10,964
Arlo Paxton, Mount Carroll	10,144
Marvin Martz, Lanark	9,445
Thomas Fritz, Mount Carroll	9,337
Margaret Stransky, Dixon	7,874
Harry H. Jurgens, Thomson	7,785
James Haas, Elizabeth	7,354
Claude Cook, Jr., Chadwick	6,627
Glenn Bremmer, Shannon	6,441
Leland Butts, Milledgeville	6,381
Warren R. Harms, Lanark	6,185
Harold Haring, Savanna	6,156
Sheldon C. Moll, Shannon	6,074
Kyle Brown, Thomson	6,046
Henry Bielema, Thomson	6,037
John McNitt, Savanna	5,930
Chester Scott, Savanna	5,930
Clarence R. Colehour, Mount Carroll	5,886
Ronald Fritz, Mount Carroll	5,886
Paul Fogel, Milledgeville	5,762
Clarence Franks, Milledgeville	5,720
Harold E. Betcher, Osco	5,688
Donald Bremmer, Shannon	5,518
Fred Zemke, Chadwick	5,197
Fred Hook, Thomson	5,177
Raynor Mosher, Lanark	5,053
Van Merchant, Lanark	5,052
Walter Helle, Savanna	5,014
Total (31)	230,835

CASS COUNTY

Bob Hardwick, Beardstown	24,039
S. W. Hardwick, Beardstown	17,717
Charles Turner, Beardstown	12,287
W. W. Lynn, Oakford	11,191
Edward Berger, Beardstown	10,026
Walter S. Harwick, Virginia	9,112
Clyde Eaton, Havana	8,592
Marvin L. Eaton, Havana	8,429
Herzberger & Sons, Virginia	8,286
Galen Watkins, Philadelphia	7,148
Roscoe Hardwick, Arenzville	$6,904
Myron E. Hoffman, Beardstown	6,426
G. D. Jones, Ashland	6,387
Zelle Van Deventer, Meredosia	5,767
Harold G. Kuhlmann, Beardstown	5,643
Robert Hess, Beardstown	5,538
Gilbert Lebkuecher, Beardstown	5,001
Total (17)	158,493

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY

Seeber Farms, Champaign	21,176
C. M. Mooney, Philo	13,434
Leon Struck, Broadlands	10,604
Paul V. Klein, Seymour	10,430
Pat Murray, Rantoul	9,423
Elizabeth Hannagan, E. Champaign	8,535
Blanche E. Gordon, Penfield	8,282
Roy R. Ehler, Thomasboro	7,914
Charles H. Kelly, Monticello	7,647
V. T. Walsh, Monticello	7,300
John Nolan, Ivesdale	6,011
Joseph Feeney, Ivesdale	6,752
J. Vrooman, Bloomington	6,370
George Dohme, Broadlands	6,171
A. R. Temple, Champaign	6,152
Voyle E. Spence, Mahomet	5,912
Carl H. Schmidt, Ivesdale	5,810
Frank Bates, Tolono	5,636
Maurice P. Forrestal, Ivesdale	5,631
Robert J. Kerr, Urbana	5,620
Roy J. Wilson, St. Joseph	5,593
Raphael Kleiss, Pesotum	5,538
Grace Wagner, Ogden	5,509
Charley Miner, Champaign	5,488
Hazel I. Craig, Champaign	5,483
Ray J. Ehler, Thomasboro	5,362
Burnham Heirs, Corpus Christi	5,119
Frank M. Marriott, Urbana	5,104
Frank C. Marriott, Seymour	5,028
Wilbur Clark, Saddrus	5,006
Total (30)	219,041

CHRISTIAN COUNTY

Luster-Deal Inc., Taylorville	17,186
John H. Butterfield, Panagra	15,543
Eugene Snyder, Peoria	12,283
Vida V. Seaman, Taylorville	11,990
Donald L. Kuhle, Assumption	11,587
A. E. Deal, Morrisonville	9,648
Arthur McClain, Rosamond	9,332
Ludwig Schober, Morrisonville	9,130
Florence H. Fels, Springfield	9,015
W. Dayton Keyes, Raymond	8,124
Earl Scholes, Mount Auburn	7,996
Glenn Buesinger, Taylorville	7,902
Cash Corzine, Assumption	7,807
Paul L. Myers, Assumption	6,953
Dorris E. Robinson, Taylorville	6,892
Kenneth W. Gorden, Blue Mound	6,198
Herbert Copenbarger, Mount Auburn	5,625
Harry Griswold, Decatur	5,386
J. Everett Brown, Blue Mound	5,355
George S. Grimes, Rosamond	5,246
Dwight E. Osborn, Pana	5,236
Helen M. Cross, Jerseyville	5,056
John Vancil, Morrisonville	5,042
Total (23)	194,532

CLARK COUNTY

Carroll Heatherly, Martinsville	14,212
Clyde P. Knowles, Marshall	13,755
Doit Biggs, Westfield	12,764
Herbert Huisinga, Casey	12,660
Ray Manhart, West Union	11,911
Forrest H. Ferris, West Union	11,908
Donwill, Inc., Marshall	11,750
Noble Lowery, Westfield	9,903
Glenn O. Pinnell, Westfield	9,613
Glenn Barbee, Westfield	8,111
Richard Strohm, West Union	7,723
Paul Crumrin, West Union	7,690
Edgar Berner, Marshall	7,538
Robert Beard, Marshall	$7,523
Antone Wernz, Marshall	7,499
Bernard Halloran, West Union	7,370
Clayton Gard, West Union	7,132
Fred Perkins, West Union	7,000
Arnold Macke, West Union	6,984
Fred Huffington, Marshall	6,843
Harry Medsker, Martinsville	6,804
Harry Romoser, West Union	6,772
Robert Wernz, West Union	6,699
Robert Ramsey, Casey	6,637
Fenton G. Ledermann, West Union	6,381
Earl Kile, Marshall	6,353
Donald Brandenburg, Casey	6,297
Richard Lindley, Marshall	6,097
Partlow Farms, Casey	5,955
Gayle Barbee, Westfield	5,785
Wayne Lycan, Marshall	5,776
Fred Cooper, Martinsville	5,649
Sydney Yargus, Martinsville	5,631
Wilbur D. Honselman, Casey	5,339
Neal Bumpus, West Union	5,173
Harold Meehan, Hume	5,153
Olen Pence, Martinsville	5,139
Total (37)	291,529

CLAY COUNTY

Francis Morris, Clay City	17,869
Total (1)	17,869

COLES COUNTY

Harold Horn, Charleston	13,196
Elmer Popham, Charleston	11,910
H. O. Miller & Sons, Oakland	11,778
O. W. Funkhouser, Charleston	10,530
Henry Hortenstine, Mattoon	10,321
Ken Degler, Mattoon	9,607
Orren L. Goble, Westfield	9,119
Earl Bumpus, Charleston	8,850
Denny Melton, Westfield	8,122
Ralph Snider, Oakland	7,609
Everett Cassady, Charleston	7,528
Fred Johnson, Arcola	7,248
Wayne Swisher, Mattoon	7,116
C. K. Centers, Charleston	7,076
James R. Pinnell & Donald Pinne, Mattoon	7,059
Paul E. Martin, Mattoon	6,943
Coffey Brothers, Ashmore	6,849
Rufus Snider, Charleston	6,648
Leslie C. Dole, Mattoon	6,615
John Driscoll, Charleston	6,570
David Daily, Mattoon	6,420
Tom Donnell, Mattoon	6,396
L. W. Craig & D. A. Craig, Charleston	6,300
Harry L. Jones, Charleston	5,817
James V. Best, Charleston	5,786
J. Alva Young, Arcola	5,757
Horace Dolf, Mattoon	5,611
Don Degler, Mattoon	5,372
John E. Dolf, Mattoon	5,330
Alvin Ralston, Charleston	5,142
Total (30)	228,625

COOK COUNTY

Marvin Dunieman, Roselle	33,861
Brandau Bros., Tinley Pk	15,470
F. Ottinger, Elgin	11,749
A. Hagemann, Elgin	11,442
Howard Miller, Chicago Hts	8,756
Donald Bacon, Crete	7,887
Evergreen Farms, Cedar Lake	6,940
Robert Bohne, Palatine	6,927
Marvin Cappell, Tinley Pk	6,433
W. Nesler, Hampshire	5,835
E. F. Rosenwinkel, Roselle	5,677
Donald F. Yunker, Orland Pk	5,620
Lloyd W. Brandau, Tinley Pk	5,205
Johnny A. Johnston, Elgin	5,086
Edwin C. Meier, Algonquin	5,027
Total (15)	141,915

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

CRAWFORD COUNTY

L. M. Colliflower, Hutsonville	$11, 084
Dolph Colliflower, Hutsonville	9, 408
Emerson Walker, Palestine	8, 854
Fay S. Racop, Flat Rock	8, 455
Lloyd E. Wartsbaugh, Oblong	8, 451
Ralph Wartsbaugh, Oblong	8, 361
Floyd Stout, Robinson	7, 163
George Rosborough, Oblong	6, 741
Frank G. Mefford, Palestine	6, 731
Charles Dees, Oblong	6, 408
Mark Ford, Jr., Robinson	6, 393
Chester Thacker, Sumner	6, 133
R. D. Mefford, Palestine	6, 082
O. W. Stoner & Sons, Palestine	5, 797
Don Manship, Palestine	5, 601
Forest Colliflower, Palestine	5, 577
	117, 239

CUMBERLAND COUNTY

C. R. Cochonour, Casey	10, 566
W. E. Clark, Toledo	8, 245
Eugene McElravy, Jewett	6, 956
Warren Croy, Toledo	6, 759
James Thompson, Jewett	6, 684
Adam McClain, Sigel	5, 080
Ralph D. Allentharp, Casey	5, 038
Total (7)	49, 328

DE KALB COUNTY

Millard Sawyer, Leland	21, 465
Robert Willis, Clare	20, 357
Herbert Kersten, Kirkland	18, 428
Howard J. Freise, Genda	16, 437
Robert Myers, De Kalb	16, 095
Willard Quincer, Malta	15, 802
James Manggaard, Somonauk	11, 920
J. A. Furnas, Aurora	11, 326
Kenneth Nelson, Malta	10, 795
Mark P. Donnelly, De Kalb	10, 508
Dean N. Lake, Earlville	10, 455
Clifford Hammett, De Kalb	10, 271
Henry Balch, Clare	10, 195
Armin Koehler, Kingston	9, 692
H. J. Krueger, Naperville	9, 464
Donald L. Faivre, De Kalb	8, 954
Donald Lundeen, Somonauk	8, 936
Elmer S. Boston, Earlville	8, 828
Paul Montavon, De Kalb	8, 370
Howard Mullins, Shabbona	8, 183
Olive E. Davis, Sandwich	8, 177
Armand Dannewitz, Somonauk	8, 004
Donald Miller, Sandwich	7, 737
Nimrod Boston, Earlville	7, 573
Ronald Jackson Jr., De Kalb	7, 390
Roy Harbecke, Sycamore	7, 344
Verner Johnson, Maple Park	7, 310
Frank L. Fidler, Earlville	7, 058
Wayne Taylor, Esmond	6, 957
Louis Faivre, De Kalb	6, 610
Elmer Adee, Kirkland	6, 542
John Ward, Shabbona	6, 526
Robert M. Wilson, Waterman	6, 503
Paul A. Johnson, Waterman	6, 435
M. C. Bullis, Earlville	6, 373
Richard Okane, Shabbona	6, 306
Charles J. Faivre, De Kalb	6, 138
Raymond Katz, De Kalb	6, 081
Owen Rolston, Hampshire	6, 045
Rex Nelson, Kingston	5, 895
Patience Towle, Chesterfield	5, 895
Vernon Anderson, Malta	5, 846
Charles L. Riley, Kirkland	5, 843
John L. Fraser, Sandwich	5, 802
Fred Youssi, Earlville	5, 768
Robert H. Scott, Sycamore	5, 681
Marlyn Banks, Kirkland	5, 655
Davis T. Warren, Leland	5, 574
Roy Knecht, Shabbona	5, 544
C. B. Watson, De Kalb	5, 490
Allan Nelson, Somonauk	5, 372
Robert Dewey, Leland	5, 331
Joseph P. Faivre, De Kalb	5, 085
Merrill Anderson, Malta	5, 077
Wallace Reid, Waterman	5, 031

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

DE KALB COUNTY—continued

Robert A. Purdy, Shabbona	$5, 031
Total (56)	471, 510

DE WITT COUNTY

C. H. Moore Trust Estate, Clinton	65, 447
Ralph Kiley, Wapella	10, 569
O'Brien Trust, Wapella	8, 688
Kent Strange, Clinton	7, 773
Charles R. Hammitt, Waynesville	6, 814
Orville Johnson, Clinton	6, 750
Minnie W. Mettler, Clinton	6, 545
Powers Bros., Wapella	6, 384
Paul G. Murphy, Clinton	6, 381
Paul Stapleton, Clinton	5, 687
Lawrence James Toohill, Wapella	5, 438
Leo Shepherd, Clinton	5, 299
Martin Sprague, Clinton	5, 291
James Howell, Maroa	5, 135
Beryl W. Rutledge, Le Roy	5, 049
Total (15)	157, 250

DOUGLAS COUNTY

E. F. Campbell, Murdock	9, 335
John H. S. Hilgenberg, Arcola	8, 436
Ray Wax, Newman	8, 179
Clinton Smith, Champaign	8, 109
John Hemingway, Arcola	8, 063
Russell Helm, Newman	6, 956
Charles H. Anderson, Newman	6, 933
E. F. Parsons, Atwood	6, 577
Ward Maris, Paris	6, 529
J. St. Clair Helm, Jr., Tuscola	6, 113
Thomas P. Hudson, Hindsboro	5, 726
Stanhope Foster, Gibson City	5, 056
Citizen National Bank, Fornof estate, Decatur	5, 012
Total (13)	91, 044

DU PAGE COUNTY

Paul G. Rasmussen, Genoa	16, 907
Richard M. Kuhn, Naperville	11, 451
J. K. Thompson, Wheaton	9, 951
Paul Mogle, Wheaton	9, 820
Howard Cosman, Wheaton	8, 533
Richard Undesser, Aurora	8, 183
Max Gartner, Naperville	7, 971
Bernard Dwigans, West Chicago	6, 242
Gilbert Diehl, Aurora	6, 112
T. H. Anderson, Bartlett	5, 660
Arnold W. Destmann, Westmont	5, 475
Total (11)	96, 305

EDGAR COUNTY

Adin Baber, Kansas	11, 809
M. Farnham, Paris	11, 720
Ralph E. Wilhoit, Kansas	11, 667
Kerrick Helton, Brocton	11, 495
Robert Radcliff, Paris	10, 269
Lester Y. Lacy, Kansas	9, 769
W. Herbert Hawkins, Kansas	9, 738
Max White, Chrisman	9, 468
Michael Sullivan, Paris	8, 384
North Bros. Ptrp., Redmon	8, 214
Wm. Roll, Sr., Brocton	7, 112
Keith Brown, Paris	7, 022
Roscoe Nicholson, Paris	6, 785
Ray E. Roller, Hume	6, 660
William F. Cheatham, Paris	6, 269
James Heelen, Paris	6, 203
Gladys D. Fell, Ex of the est of, Kansas	6, 037
Everett Dewitt, Newman	6, 015
Bert Bonwell, Chrisman	5, 870
Samuel L. Honnold, Kansas	5, 701
Burl Keys, Paris	5, 697
Edwin B. Kendall, Chrisman	5, 689
John Gough, Kansas	5, 681
Wayne Fell, Kansas	5,661
Byron M. Curtis, Chrisman	5, 455
K. R. Ohair, tr H. B. Ohair, Paris	5, 446
William Revis, Dana	5, 337
K. Lyle Hutchings, Paris	5, 277
Earl Walls, Brocton	5, 261

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

EDGAR COUNTY—continued

Earl Lange, Brocton	$5,151
Don Keys, Paris	5, 041
Loren See, Paris	5, 018
Total (32)	230, 921

EDWARDS COUNTY

Lyman D. Works, Albion	30, 406
Walter E. Fishel, West Salem	7, 501
Marks Bros., West Salem	7, 050
Richard Knackmuhs & Son, West Salem	6, 956
Calvin King, Albion	6, 732
Frank Yokel, Albion	6, 503
Chester V. Siegert, Grayville	6, 448
Clarence Tarpley, Bone Gap	6, 155
Don Broster, Grayville	5, 701
Total (9)	83, 452

EFFINGHAM COUNTY

Alphonse Hartke, Teutopolis	7, 616
Hillard D. Morris, Mason	6, 145
Walter Schottman, Wheeler	5, 614
Emil Engel, Shumway	5, 264
Urban Goldstein, Altamont	5, 107
Ralph Zerrusen, Teutopolis	5, 026
Total (6)	34, 772

FAYETTE COUNTY

Sam Smail, Vandalia	11, 295
Alvia Rhoades, Ramsey	9, 099
H. L. Smith, St. Elmo	8, 809
Rollin Sloan, Assumption	7, 685
Chas. V. Clark, Vandalia	7, 151
Glenn C. Francis, Altamont	6, 852
Louis Franklin, Ramsey	6, 573
Chas. Walker, Shobonier	6, 407
K. D. Haskell, Latham	6, 392
Dan Hortenstine, Ramsey	6, 183
Darrel Reichert, Farina	5, 883
Paul Lash, Farina	5, 815
Lee Hunt, Ramsey	5, 708
Warren Halford, Bingham	5, 618
Clyde Wehrle, Cowden	5, 515
Eugene Ireland, Vandalia	5, 415
Geo. Springman, Brownstown	5, 360
Chas. Metzger, Jr., Vandalia	5, 266
Robert Hunt, Jr., Ramsey	5, 256
Walter Ehrat, Vandalia	5, 157
Lawrence Wooters, Findlay	5, 111
Ray Kramer, Fillmore	5, 106
Orville Hinton, St. Elmo	5, 080
Total (23)	146, 736

FORD COUNTY

John P. Gillahue, Piper City	14, 988
H. K. Diehl, Gibson City	10, 181
Emerson Seng, Roberts	9, 794
Lloyd Kemnetz, Roberts	7, 533
Emerson Busick, Melvin	7, 431
A. Hassett, Champaign	7, 201
Joe W. Russell, Piper City	6, 257
Herbert Flessner, Roberts	6, 203
Floyde S. Walker, Gibson City	6, 165
Haley Ptr., Kempton	6, 110
G. Kenneth Stanford, Loda	6, 059
Louis Drendel, Kempton	5, 792
Warren Hanna, Piper City	5, 573
Lela Buhrmaster, Paxton	5, 569
Laurence Walle, Piper City	5, 513
Park Hollenbeck, Manteno	5, 337
Cecil D. Cochran, Buckingham	5, 106
Total (17)	120, 812

FRANKLIN COUNTY

Lloyd Willis, Benton	12, 322
Humbert, Summers, Benton	11, 500
Noel K. Whittington, Whittington	7, 577
Irby Moore, West Frankfort	7, 316
Roy E. Kern, West Frankfort	7, 194
Sherman Browning, Macedonia	6, 739

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

FRANKLIN COUNTY—continued

Buel Buntin, Thompsonville	$6,251
John O. Whittington, Mulkeytown	5,587
Duward Bean, Benton	5,566
Clarence Odom, Benton	5,407
Total (10)	75,459

FULTON COUNTY

Meadowlark Farms, (I. H. Reiss) Sullivan, Ind	60,915
Lowell Wier, Canton	26,396
Harold Burgard, Ipava	11,896
Jay Tompkins, Cuba	11,019
Gale & Son, Inc., Cuba	10,878
Edwin Barrett, Lewistown	10,746
P. J. McNally, Lewistown	10,737
Phil Roddis, Ipava	9,886
Pete Bruketta, Norris	7,553
William Burnside, Fairview	7,251
Tri State Produce, Avon	7,212
Karl Zempel, Lewistown	6,841
Kenneth Effland, Avon	6,712
Albert H. Eshelman, Canton	6,615
Louise H. Schewe, Springfield	5,997
Earl Crabtree, Lewistown	5,770
Arlie Cleer, Lewistown	5,711
Morgan Coal Co., Peoria	5,372
Karl Christian, Canton	5,372
Lavern Estes, Canton	5,117
Total (20)	227,996

GREENE COUNTY

Hartwell Ranch, Hillview	20,938
McWilliams, Champaign	16,975
W. P. Gilmore, Roodhouse	15,534
C. L. McLaughlin, Winchester	15,071
Beams Bros., Hillview	14,755
Gilmore Farms, Roodhouse	14,634
Henry Vantuyle, Roodhouse	11,044
Clarence Steckel, White Hall	11,923
Buell Ford, Roodhouse	11,211
Wayne Hallock, Hillview	10,818
Lynn Meyer, Greenfield	10,223
Ronald Elhoffer, Rockbridge	10,117
Craver Farms, Hillview	10,070
Neil Carter, Hillview	9,907
Edward Weller, Kane	9,798
Wright Farms, Greenfield	8,713
H. G. Banks, Kansas City, Mo	8,488
E. H. Beck, Hillview	8,295
Donald Crane, Kane	8,088
Green Acres Farms, Roodhouse	7,892
Robert H. Wear, Hillview	6,826
James Cressy, Roodhouse	6,662
Jacqueline and James Cerssy, Roodhouse	6,662
Cooke Valley Farms, Carrollton	6,344
Froman Holtswarth, Eldred	6,212
Cypress Land Farm Co., Eldred	6,192
Dean and Cora Morrow, Roodhouse	5,852
Rockbridge Farms, Rockbridge	5,819
Jack Owens, Carrolton	5,629
John M. Keech, Springfield	5,467
Hubert Drainer, Kane	5,410
Dean McPherson, Roodhouse	5,093
W. Roodhouse, Oklahoma City, Okla	5,093
Glenna P. Brass, Petersburg	5,082
Bob D. Price, Carrollton	5,077
Cyrus Keech, White Hall	5,052
E. N. Hazelwood, Hillview	5,006
Total (37)	334,972

GRUNDY COUNTY

James W. Baker, Morris	14,161
Virginia Carper, Morris	12,041
Edward Vitko, Gardner	8,698
David M. Barr, Morris	8,663
Peter Baudino, Kinsman	8,419
Robert Barr, Mazon	8,226
James W. Barr, Morris	7,874
Frank J. Barr, Mazon	7,335
John T. Donahoe, Morris	7,256
Dunn Bros., Morris	7,190
Alice McCabe, Morris	6,808
W. L. Treasure, Gardner	6,248

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

GRUNDY COUNTY—continued

Marie K. Vonqualen, Dwight	$6,113
Clarence Weikum, Gardner	6,093
Aaron Malmquist, Verona	6,035
Lucius Gorham, Morris	5,842
Herman Schaefer, Jr., Morris	5,555
Joseph Franz, Tr., Chicago	5,430
Reuel Hoffman, Dwight	5,379
Thomas Delockery, Morris	5,257
J. Vernon Dollinger, Plainfield	5,246
William C. Peart, Morris	5,201
Joseph Lowery, Kinsman	5,167
Margaret Collins, Morris	5,125
Edwin R. Walker, Mazon	5,117
Earlen H. Vonqualen, Gardner	5,036
Total (26)	179,515

HAMILTON COUNTY

F. F. Frey, McLeansboro	6,830
James E. York, Shawneetown	6,712
Ralph Acord, McLeansboro	5,110
Wilford L. Mitchell, Enfield	5,109
Wyatt Lasater, McLeansboro	5,033
Total (5)	28,794

HANCOCK COUNTY

Hancock Land Co., Warsaw	17,522
Lucie & Dorsett, Augusta	14,031
Grover C. Meeker, Warsaw	11,327
Lawrence Meeker, Warsaw	9,194
Donald Miller, Plymouth	9,116
Calvin Leffler, Warsaw	9,065
Harold Wagner, Dallas City	8,185
Junior Rea, Carthage	7,831
George E. Fecht, Carthage	6,965
William Frakes, Carthage	6,326
Albert A. Johnson, Carthage	6,188
Harvey Meeker, Warsaw	6,185
Robert Roskamp, Sutter	6,122
Elmer Meyer, Warsaw	6,074
Dean Kiser, Sutter	5,746
Andrew Wetzel, Warsaw	5,724
Alex F. Yuskis, Warsaw	5,697
Leo Hanks, Burnside	5,599
Paul Jacquot, Warsaw	5,321
Jess Brooks, Carthage	5,223
Arthur Meeker, Warsaw	5,142
Total (21)	162,583

HARDIN COUNTY

H.O.E. Farm, % Lowell E. Oxford, Cave In Rock	8,665
Ben H. Taylor, Rosiclare	8,403
Raymond Humm, Golconda	6,078
Total (3)	23,146

HENDERSON COUNTY

Sam Stevenson, Carman	34,369
Melvin Roth, Morton	21,828
George Torrance, Gladstone	18,262
Harold M. Richmond, Carman	15,556
Grant H. Gerling, Carman	12,723
Earl L. Ford, Sr., Carman	11,829
Delmar B. Russell, Gladstone	10,714
James Carns, Biggsville	10,549
Robert Davilla, Carman	10,343
Marvin Brockway, Media	10,156
Howard Grigsby (W. C. Bigger), Stronghurst	8,794
Lyle Craig, Oquawka	8,510
Forrest Brent, Gladstone	8,510
John L. Dannenberg, Carman	8,078
Everett J. Johnson, Carman	7,993
Howard A. Smith, Stronghurst	7,935
Kenneth Rankin, Monmouth	7,542
C. L. Dannenberg, Carman	7,365
Milford Dowell, Stronghurst	7,310
William F. Stevenson, Gladstone	7,101
Homer Stevenson, Carman	7,065
William Earl Stevenson, Gladstone	6,868
John Anderson, Galesburg	6,856
Rilious Anderson, Seaton	6,473
Morris D. Roth, Stronghurst	6,397

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

HENDERSON COUNTY—continued

John L. Green, Little York	$6,390
Lee W. Jamieson, Biggsville	6,244
Gerald Anderson, Seaton	6,174
Charles Peasley, Stronghurst	6,031
Lester Amos Edmunds, Dallas City	6,001
Clair W. Smith & Sons, Biggsville	5,998
Fred O. Richmond, Oquawka	5,894
C. J. Woods, Little York	5,887
Dale Adair, Oquawka	5,873
Earl L. Ford, Jr., Carman	5,811
Lloyd Lefler, Stronghurst	5,786
Wayne Covert, Media	5,698
Charles E. Fort, Stronghurst	5,421
Robert Ford, Carman	5,340
Ora Kent Smith, Biggsville	5,285
John S. Brook, Stronghurst	5,063
Phillip Bigger, Biggsville	5,058
Barbara Hyland, % Edna McLean, Agent, Lynn Center	5,000
Total (43)	372,319

HENRY COUNTY

Truman Hays, Prophetstown	20,182
Henry J. Martens, Atkinson	12,736
Wm. H. Dynes, Sr., Annawan	12,373
C. D. Ford & Sons Inc., Geneseo	11,684
Henry C. Anderson, Cambridge	11,602
William Wyffels, Geneseo	9,061
Charles Dhamers, Geneseo	8,357
Myron A. Naugle, Atkinson	8,270
James E. Guthrie, Annawan	8,033
Robert Cassens, Geneseo	7,856
Harry P. Laub, Altona	7,841
George E. Toppert, Sr., Annawan	7,783
Hazel Rutherford, Peoria	7,783
Harold Thompson, Annawan	7,367
Orpheus L. Hoogerwerf, Cambridge	7,338
Bryce Nordstrom, Bishop Hill	6,634
Harley Katschnig, Prophetstown	6,511
Wesley Larson, Geneseo	6,451
George P. Jahn, Geneseo	6,203
Edith K. Vinckel, Cambridge	6,062
Sidney C. Cole, Alpha	5,676
Curtis Walsten, Alpha	5,623
Harold Lowe, Colona	5,557
Wm. Stohl, Geneseo	5,465
Robert L. Stevenson, Orion	5,453
William Currier, Sheffield	5,244
Joseph Franz, Chicago	5,222
T. Gunnard Nelson, Orion	5,180
Earl C. Kirchner, Geneseo	5,123
Donald Roberts, New Windsor	5,116
Howard Johnson, Lynn Center	5,016
Albert Klundt, Annawan	5,009
Total (32)	243,811

IROQUOIS COUNTY

Edward C. Sumner, Jr., Milford	56,818
Edward F. Braden, Watseka	15,350
Gladys DeYoung, Kankakee	14,065
Lawrence McCullough, Watseka	13,730
Louis Hansen, Sr., Clifton	12,685
Walter H. Hasselbring, Watseka	12,399
Hansen Bros., Ashkum	11,796
Benjamin R. West, Watseka	11,459
Samuel D. McCullough, Watseka	10,998
Vincent LeMenager, Clifton	10,917
William Adsit, Milford	10,895
John Allen Monk, Jr., Gilman	10,697
Maynard Mowrey, Milford	10,367
Andrew Meister, Ashkum	8,764
Elmer E. Decker, Milford	7,057
William Donley, Ashkum	7,041
H. C. Adsit, c/o A. Adsit, Chicago	6,914
Harold E. Miner, Watseka	6,780
Raymond Wiltjer, Martinton	6,402
Leslie L. Orr, Onarga	6,302
Lawrence Weber, Ambia, Ind	5,948
Edwin R. Gross, Milford	5,876
James M. Davis, Martinton	5,821
Virgil Morgeson, Milford	5,557
Edward L. Larson, Martinton	5,421
W. E. Davis, Watseka	5,349
Total (26)	285,408

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

JACKSON COUNTY

Francis D. Hill, Murphysboro	$14,395
Otto Frischkorn, Ava	11,375
D. L. Bess, Sr., Bloomfield, Mo	11,252
Glenn D. McCord, Murphysboro	10,528
Robert E. Vancloostere, Murphysboro	9,865
George E. O'Daniel, Rockwood	7,794
Randall Gene Heins, Rockwood	6,656
Earl Frischkorn, Jacob	6,352
Clyde Cheatham, Ava	6,204
E. L. Eastman, Gorham	6,192
Shirley Moeckel, Jacob	6,040
Raymond Grode, Jacob	6,024
Herbert Ebers, agent, M. Ebers estate, Chester	6,017
Don Whistle, Gorham	5,681
W. C. Hawthorne, De Soto	5,518
D. Leon Dillow, Gorham	5,494
Floyd Morgan, Gorham	5,490
Joe Moroni, De Soto	5,364
A. C. McLaughlin, Murphysboro	5,329
Total (19)	141,570

JASPER COUNTY

Arthur Eubank, Willow Hill	9,781
Irvin Steger, Montrose	9,598
J. B. Kidwell, Yale	7,452
Glen Vincent Dappert, Newton	7,191
Lexie Kennedy, Newton	7,108
Harry Bertram Brooks, Newton	5,921
Robert Beam, Newton	5,812
Julius Reis, West Liberty	5,625
Merle D. Yost, Newton	5,565
Total (9)	64,053

JEFFERSON COUNTY

Geo. G. Byars, Bluford	19,373
David Breeze, Bluford	11,798
Clyde Droll, Ina	9,829
Albert Adams, Bonnie	9,770
Jarret McCowen, Jr., Waltonville	6,910
Huel Cross, Belle Rive	6,839
Gene Johnson, Bluford	6,368
Wm. H. Piper, Belle Rive	6,366
Pete Ochap, Waltonville	5,963
Eugene Sargent, Mt. Vernon	5,735
Ellis Roane, Opdyke	5,536
Ray Wilson, Bluford	5,516
E. H. Kiefer, Jr., Belle Rive	5,453
Gene McCowen, Waltonville	5,436
Harry Pierce, Bonnie	5,429
Robert Draege, Mt. Vernon	5,406
Wilburn M. Panzier, Waltonville	5,394
Stanley Rosenberger, Woodlawn	5,314
W. R. Dudley, Bonnie	5,259
Foster Scrivner, Belle Rive	5,256
Total (20)	142,950

JERSEY COUNTY

M. E. Isringhausen, Jerseyville	37,056
Geo. Hoffstetter, Jerseyville	30,196
David Isringhausen, Jerseyville	29,633
Donn W. Lull, Sugar Grove	29,969
Floyd Isringhausen, Fieldon	17,092
Isringhausen Farm, Inc., Jerseyville	12,685
Froman Beach, Jerseyville	11,426
Wm. Gettings, Jr., Fieldon	10,613
Anthony Stiritz, Kane	10,459
Eugene Belser, Jerseyville	10,030
Jack Wock, Jerseyville	9,709
Jacob D. Gettings, Jerseyville	9,354
Wm. Gettings, Eldred	8,678
Joseph R. Kramer, Jerseyville	7,349
Wm. G. Keesler, Jerseyville	6,468
Bernard Heitzig, Jerseyville	6,447
Neil M. Christen, Jerseyville	6,123
Glenn Isringhausen, Jerseyville	6,105
Martin Stahling, Brighton	5,952
Stanley Fraley, Jerseyville	5,777
Thos. Ryder, Medora	5,363
Total (20)	246,515

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

JO DAVIESS COUNTY

Donn W. Lull, Sugar Grove	$29,969
James B. Baber & Burnell T. Huso, Apple River	15,844
A. Dale Meador, Mount Carroll	9,778
Lynge Corp., Chicago	9,426
Joseph F. Lamm, Stockton	8,793
Robert Mills, Hanover	8,515
Herbert Shelly, Hanover	7,275
Arnold G. Heller, Elizabeth	7,041
Harold Hughes, Stockton	6,890
William Sheetz, Stockton	6,879
Raymond Flack, Hanover	6,517
Timber Trail Farm, (Delbert Williams, Sr.), Stockton	6,268
Leland Schmaling, Mount Carroll	5,842
Ronald Aurand, Stockton	5,817
Bert Sullivan, Hanover	5,562
Gerald Williams, Stockton	5,391
Eugene Borsdorf, Stockton	5,219
Wallace Haas, Elizabeth	5,200
Total (17)	126,257

KANE COUNTY

Lyle Lawson, Elburn	26,722
John A. Gorenz, Hampshire	18,230
Robert Probst, Maple Park	17,463
Burnidge Bros., Elgin	17,285
Robert Miller, Dundee	16,633
Arthur Long, Sugar Grove	15,586
Arnold Long, Elburn	14,043
Myron Judd, Aurora	13,019
Maynard Hestrom, St. Charles	11,645
Francis Huss, Aurora	11,507
Harold Gorenz, Maple Park	11,305
James Meredith, Elburn	11,152
Edwin Dunteman, Sugar Grove	11,084
Harry Stoner, Aurora	11,057
Clarence E. Read, Maple Park	9,869
Harry Schoger, Aurora	8,772
Peter Leuer, Sugar Grove	8,711
Leo Bomleny, Maple Park	8,684
Oliver Anderson, Maple Park	8,571
Vincent Lakin, Dundee	8,448
McGraw Wildlife, Dundee	7,555
Leon Meredith, Maple Park	7,551
Dennis Nickles, Sugar Grove	7,540
Leonard Nickels, Aurora	7,540
Henry Vanthournout, St. Charles	7,319
Lester Holze, Hampshire	7,250
Robert B. Howard, Dundee	7,094
Joseph E. Kovalick, Sugar Grove	7,043
Dr. W. G. Eilert, Aurora	7,043
William Divine, Lafox	6,942
Ralph Fleming, Wayne	6,942
Henry Holze, Jr., Hampshire	6,836
Donald M. Dillon, LaFox	6,533
Frances Kothe, Hampshire	6,389
Jack Young, St. Charles	6,385
Dunhams, Inc., Jesse F. Burt, Treasurer, Wayne	6,385
Frank Vanbogaert, Hampshire	6,369
E. P. Debes, Aurora	6,350
Melford Berg, Hampshire	6,164
George Bean, Hampshire	6,092
Richard Welter, Maple Park	6,077
F. G. Schramer, Maple Park	5,808
Don Feece, Elburn	5,493
Warren Stojan, Burlington	5,405
Don Schmitendorf, Hampshire	5,320
Gertrude Nickels, Sugar Grove	5,155
Willis A. Follman, Elgin	5,146
Tom Milnamow, Maple Park	5,145
Werner Carlson, Batavia	5,016
Henry Sieroslawski, Elgin	5,000
Total (51)	480,642

KENDALL COUNTY

Robert N. Herren, Oswego	14,158
Roy Gustafson, Oswego	11,240
Leroy Voga, Newark	10,014
Louis Hardin, Chicago	9,293
Albert Sears, Plano	9,293
Gerald Anderson, Oswego	8,982
C. B. Phillips Est., Aurora	8,141
Forrest Anderson, Newark	8,106

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

KENDALL COUNTY—continued

A. Thurow Est., Yorkville	$7,717
Russell Naden, Newark	6,891
W. Roy Anderson, Oswego	6,849
C. M. Schmidt, Yorkville	6,451
Harold Hage, Yorkville	5,491
Herman J. Hankes, Plano	5,183
Charles Whitfield, Millbrook	5,022
John Hutchings, Geneva	5,003
Total (16)	127,834

KNOX COUNTY

Inness Farm, Galesburg	12,922
Donald Gibbs, Maquon	11,043
Sam Coffman, Jr., Gilson	9,101
Robert Sherman, Maquon	8,535
Block Farms, Maquon	7,523
C. J. Buckman, Maquon	6,513
Glenn A. Threw, Sr., Farmington	6,129
Fred L. Quick, Williamsfield	5,910
Dural H. Lee, St. Augustine	5,769
Lawrence Graves, Williamsfield	5,755
John F. White, Abingdon	5,541
Lyndal Archer, Yates City	5,481
Junier B. Watkins, London Mills	5,332
Reed Gibbs, Victoria	5,003
Total (14)	100,557

LAKE COUNTY

Midlane Farm County Club (Dennis Gent) Wadsworth	70,177
Tempel Farms, Wadsworth	26,465
Elza Gwaltney, Gages Lake	23,111
Grayslake Gelatin Farm, Grayslake	13,391
Fred Stilke, Mundelein	13,058
Gust Stavros, Palatine	12,517
Walter Jahnke, Libertyville	11,035
E. E. Manning, Mundelein	9,473
Edgar G. Stowell, Chicago	8,264
Wm. E. Clark, Libertyville	6,657
Ben L. Sargent, Sr., Grayslake	6,202
Peter Tekampe, Mundelein	6,093
Robert Meyer, Libertyville	6,091
Alfred H. Ames, Zion	5,645
John Knoll, Grayslake	5,495
Marvin Kruckenberg, Mundelein	5,486
David W. Finley, Arlington Heights	5,474
George Umek, Waukegan	5,106
Russell Gwaltney, Grayslake	5,059
Total (19)	244,799

LA SALLE COUNTY

Samuel G. Beetz, Mendota	16,369
Dean L. Johnson, Sandwich	11,304
Marshall Krug, Ottawa	8,881
Joseph Ernat, Peru	8,731
George Lambourn, Lostant	8,712
John Duffy, Serena	7,297
Ignatius Ernat, Oglesby	6,469
Davis W. Chapman, Marseilles	6,093
Axel Swanson, Streator	6,090
John S. Potter, Sheridan	5,461
Glenn Baker, Streator	5,015
Total (11)	90,422

LAWRENCE COUNTY

Earl Minderman, Lawrenceville	22,295
Herbert L. Mahrenholz, Vincennes	16,535
Glenn Mahrenholz, Vincennes	13,098
L-V Airport, Decatur	12,913
Simms Bros., Bridgeport	12,830
Ward Warner, Lawrenceville	11,541
Gene Painter, Vincennes	11,038
Laakman Bros., Vincennes	10,198
Louis Halter, Vincennes	9,737
Verus R. Wright, Bridgeport	9,685
Joe A. Halter, Lawrenceville	9,679
William Hasewinkle, Sumner	8,496
Floyd Collins, Flat Rock	8,165
Loyd Jacobs, Bridgeport	7,634
Clement Buchanan, Francisville	7,432
Herman Painter, Vincennes	7,402
H. A. Dollahan, Lawrenceville	7,035
William Primus, Vincennes	6,738

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

LAWRENCE COUNTY—continued

Rela Anderson, Vincennes	$6,696
Jack Seitzinger, Lawrenceville	5,968
Kathryn M. Funk, Vincennes	5,965
Walter Joe Primus, Vincennes	5,887
Warner Buchanan, Lawrenceville	5,862
Lloyd Bennett, Sumner	5,734
Biggs Bros., Vincennes	5,734
Oscar Thompson, Bridgeport	5,451
Mary Belle Morris, Vincennes	5,369
Paul S. Thompson & Sons, Vincennes	5,205
Total (28)	250,281

LEE COUNTY

Martin Ravnaas, Rochelle	19,416
Henry Knetsch, Seward	11,914
Mary Fulfs, Dixon	11,864
Marvin Haub, West Brooklyn	11,768
Keith Swartz and Sons, Dixon	11,329
Roy Breeze, Lee	10,602
Clifford Albrecht, Amboy	9,242
Donald M. Book, Dixon	9,128
Marvin Squier, Compton	9,113
Howard Hayes, Steward	8,786
Raymond Thompson, Steward	8,728
Earl Lefevre, Dixon	8,719
Marvin Heiman, Compton	8,296
William G. Law, Dixon	7,999
Arnold F. Herrmann, Steward	7,981
Alfons Lippons, Dixon	7,727
Neil Willstead, Harmon	7,712
Lawrence Koster, Harmon	7,666
Roy L. Kenney, Dixon	7,599
John McCabe, Amboy	7,512
Edward S. Hoyle, Harmon	7,456
Ormand S. Baylor, Amboy	7,408
D. W. Shiaras, Dixon	7,406
Lloyd Ewald, Rochelle	7,288
C. C. Macklin, Steward	7,184
Raymond Hicks, Harmon	7,182
Julius Mekeel, Harmon	7,174
Donald Henkel, West Brooklyn	7,085
Albert Butler, Sublette	7,024
Joseph A. Henkel, Amboy	6,890
Lawrence Montavon, Dixon	6,579
Dale R. Jasper, Franklin Grove	6,545
W. M. Dunn, Geneva	6,486
Eugene Sidebottom, Paw Paw	6,448
Forrest Malone, Steward	6,375
Erwin Hackman, Ashton	6,057
Paul V. Herrmann, Steward	5,963
Don Kessel, Franklin Grove	5,715
Lyle Herrmann, Steward	5,703
Robert Kern, Paw Paw	5,652
Richard Appelquist, Franklin Grove	5,638
Woodrow Harris, Paw Paw	5,618
Wilbur Thompson, Steward	5,613
Ray Staker, Harmon	5,547
Joseph Male, Steward	5,461
Henry Warner Trust, Dixon	5,440
Earl Cradduck, Steward	5,434
Howard Herrmann, Steward	5,300
Roland Murphy, Dixon	5,283
Merrill L. Draper, Amboy	5,223
Arnold Stangeland, Lee	5,206
Marlin Jordal, Steward	5,190
James D. Dunn, Ohio	5,188
Albert L. Bauer, Compton	5,166
Arthur L. Book, Compton	5,093
Donald Lytle, Jr., Lee	5,044
Lawrence Reaver, Dixon	5,005
Total (57)	417,370

LIVINGSTON COUNTY

Martin Farms Corp., Roanoke	24,391
EDW Faragher, Peoria	17,851
James Goold, Fairbury	13,507
Giacometti Bros., PTB, Buckingham	11,636
John R. Goold, Fairbury	11,260
Roy Applegate, Blackstone	9,277
John T. Franey, Chatsworth	8,975
Alfred Andree, Streator	8,412

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

LIVINGSTON COUNTY—continued

Howard Taylor, Cullom	$7,878
Donald D. Harms, Forrest	7,346
John E. Harms, Fairbury	7,222
Eldon Ruff, Pontiac	7,140
P. C. James, Jr., Pontiac	7,081
Guyer Farms, % J. C. Wahls, Chenoa	6,914
Edwin Harms, Forrest	6,738
Robert Harty, Dwight	6,509
Frank L. Livingston, Chatsworth	6,497
S. V. Caughey, executor, R. S. Caughey estate, Chatsworth	6,463
Leo Riordan, Dwight	6,326
Harold Kuntz, Fairbury	6,127
Phillip H. Grau, Graymont	6,096
Raymond J. Watson, Odell	6,027
Larry Trainor, Pontiac	5,844
Eugene Mies, Pontiac	5,667
William F. Ledford, Pontiac	5,593
Est F. Jewkes, % F. Sterrenberg, Cullom	5,334
Laverne Dehm, Chatsworth	5,326
Wilbur Wiegand, Saunemin	5,287
A. R. Trainor, Blackstone	5,162
Russell M. Grau, Graymont	5,140
Robert Petree, Emington	5,120
Total (31)	248,146

LOGAN COUNTY

Harold Park, Lincoln	26,772
Elizabeth K. Drake, Elkhart	24,658
Norman Muck, Lincoln	17,691
John L. White, New Holland	13,678
Sam Sparks, Jr., Lincoln	9,857
Neveridle Corp., Highland Park	8,529
Mary Frances Smoak, % National Bank of Decatur, Decatur	7,418
Leo F. Reinhardt, Lincoln	7,391
Estate of Ben H. Pegram Deceased, Centralia	6,639
W. L. Puterbaugh, % P. Johnston, First National Bank, Lincoln	6,574
Andrew & Rachel Wiggers, Mount Pulaski	6,436
Claude Litterly, Mount Pulaski	6,378
Elizabeth Small, % F. Turner, Lincoln	6,230
Emmitt Shellhammer, Mount Pulaski	6,144
Walter Buckles, Elkhart	6,094
George F. Klockenga, Lincoln	5,953
Emily L. White, New Holland	5,894
Vernon Apel, Atlanta	5,780
Leo Bender, Atlanta	5,638
Long Bros, New Holland	5,391
Carl Schwantz, Lincoln	5,233
Koert Bartman, Lincoln	5,164
Edward Schmidt, Hartsburg	5,138
F. & J. Birks, Cincinnati	5,130
Harold Van Hilsen, Hartsburg	5,009
Earl Conrady, Hartsburg	5,006
Total (26)	219,825

MACON COUNTY

C. Wilcox, Springfield	13,114
J. E. Goffinet, Decatur	12,250
Hubert W. Baker, Dalton City	9,821
Nathan J. Brown, Decatur	7,428
Waggoner Lehn, Marda	7,337
Bohlen Brothers, Moweaqua	7,295
Herman Miller, Niantic	6,714
Mill Univ., Decatur	6,695
Thos. Murphy, Macon	6,596
Ann I. Shellabarger, Decatur	6,448
James R. Brown, Decatur	5,606
M. B. Weidner, Dalton City	5,338
Loren M. Pattengill, Cisco	5,251
Herbert Kraft, Decatur	5,233
H. Eugene Leonard, Niantic	5,219
Walter Reeser, Oreana	5,128
Wayne Pistorius, Blue Mound	5,091
Carl A. Dunn, Niantic	5,029
Total (18)	125,593

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

MACOUPIN COUNTY

Robert E. Alford, Girard	$13,118
Moffet Farm Supply, Inc., Modesto	11,304
Glenn Gibbel, Girard	9,855
Albert Love, Modesto	9,116
E. M. Adkins, Carlinville	8,536
Wayne Bates, Carlinville	8,405
Harold W. Heyen, Gillespie	7,927
Howard S. Stampe, Shipman	7,624
Paul Hembrough, Carlinville	7,597
Carl Olive, Gillespie	7,427
Kahl Bros., % H. R. Kahl, Shipman	7,264
Wilbur Long, Chesterfield	7,128
Edwin E. Well, Brighton	7,048
Edward Janus, Benld	7,036
Helen D. Hargrove, % J. J. Denby, Carlinville	6,805
Lawrence N. Albert, Piasa	6,679
James J. Denby, Carlinville	6,632
Joe Tostberg, Carlinville	6,244
Miles Christopher, Shipman	5,992
Harry Heyen, Medora	5,809
Glenn Dickey, Litchfield	5,794
W. O. Cromwell, Bunker Hill	5,629
Windle Lair, Litchfield	5,536
J. Arthur Roberts, Virden	5,496
Marshall C. Shutt, Girard	5,340
Keith Traylor, Waggoner	5,340
Odell Cox, Modesto	5,312
Franklin F. Johnson, Gillespie	5,283
Nelson E. Weidner, Bunker Hill	5,266
Ed Schreiber, Bethalto	5,123
Total (30)	211,665

MADISON COUNTY

Otto H. Romann, Granite City	11,924
H. Balsters, M. Balsters, Bethalto	9,578
James Wells, Jr., St. Jacob	8,582
Edward L. Burton, East Alton	8,245
Charles C. Losch, East Alton	7,858
Joseph G. Haegele, Jr., Marine	6,254
J. R. Frey, Highland	5,937
William M. Frey, Highland	5,937
C. Luehmann, Granite City	5,827
Eckert Mueller, Madison	5,608
Total (10)	75,750

MARION COUNTY

Claude M. Rose, Iuka	7,965
Nellie Blomberg, Kinmundy	6,136
Total (2)	14,101

MARSHALL COUNTY

William Hickey, Wyoming	11,437
Gerald E. Baxter, Rutland	7,904
Wilbur S. Doyle, Henry	6,168
James C. Neuhalfen, Henry	5,988
Albert L. Kimble, Sparland	5,687
Donald Hughes, Sparland	5,530
Allan Taylor, Wenona	5,035
Total (7)	47,749

MASON COUNTY

George Martin, Mason City	21,498
Ronald Friend, Havana	15,721
Paul Friend, Havana	14,504
J. W. McHarry, Havana	12,140
William Garlisch, Forest City	11,622
Donald W. Phelps, Easton	10,937
Wesley Hilst, Manito	10,759
Marcus Sisson, Kilbourne	10,484
J. C. Herget, by T. E. Kirby, Kilbourne	10,271
Ernest Beebe, Manito	9,484
A. R. Kennedy, Chandlerville	9,369
T. R. Kirby, Easton	8,906
Andrew J. Lindsay, Easton	8,712
Jack Lynn, Mason City	8,397
Wilbur Ebken, Kilbourne	8,367
D. Ernest Brown, Chandlerville	8,308
Howard Ermeling, Havana	8,175
C. Kenneth Smith, Easton	7,930

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

MASON COUNTY—continued

Doris H. Weil, by T. E. Kirby, Kilbourne	$7, 628
E. J. Willett, by Hal Willett, Manito	7, 597
C. R. Bell, Chandlerville	7, 353
D. R. Adkins, Sr., Chandlerville	7, 346
T. E. Kirby, Kilbourne	7, 279
Wilbur Bell, Chandlerville	7, 133
Emerson A. Leinweber, Mason City	7, 095
T. J. Kruse, Kilbourne	7, 082
Pekin Mission Soc., by T. E. Kirby, Kilbourne	6, 913
Roy Fletcher, Bath	6, 643
Leslie E. Mathers, Mason City	6, 439
Jon Krause, Mason City	6, 270
Albert K. Krause, Jr., Easton	6, 187
Charles W. Bennis, Lincoln	5, 964
R. W. Allen, Delavan	5, 913
Emerson W. Leinweber, San Jose	5, 871
Ronnie Donavan, Mason City	5, 864
Bayne Fouts, Mason City	5, 817
Doyle Walker, Topeka	5, 721
Walter Behrends, Mason City	5, 470
I. Dearborn by Luther Dearborn, Mason City	5, 308
Morris L. Bell, Chandlerville	5, 261
Clarence Fornoff, Jr, Manito	5, 138
Lester L. Worner, Forest City	5, 092
Gnile Talbott, Manito	5, 054
Henry Wright, Havana	5, 022
Total (44)	358, 044

MASSAC COUNTY

Aldrich Cummins, Karnak	15, 320
Trueman Harris, Brookport	11, 156
Norman Lewis, New Liberty	9, 816
Ira Giltner, Star Route, Brookport	5, 803
Total (4)	42, 095

M'DONOUGH COUNTY

L. M. Null, Colchester	12, 032
Blondell Shoopman, Tennessee	11, 884
Ralph A. Burnham, RR 2, Macomb	11, 654
Harris R. Keating, Table Grove	11, 333
Eben J. Irish, Blandinsville	9, 762
E. Calvert Ex. of Est. Emerson Ca., Vert, Sciota	8, 546
Marion Huston, Blandinsville	7, 006
Harold Bacon, Good Hope	6, 693
Wm. Measley, Plymouth	6, 096
Lawrence Irish, Blandinsville	5, 852
Wayne Lefler, Blandinsville	5, 726
J. Otho Holstine, Colchester	5, 695
Chester Swisegood, Plymouth	5, 589
Albert Dowacter, Plymouth	5, 306
B. B. Bader, Vermont	5, 239
Total (15)	118, 413

M'HENRY COUNTY

Meyer & Schuring, Marengo	35, 770
Geo. F. MacIntyre, Rt. 1, Box 121, Marengo	22, 586
Chally Bros., Rt. 1, Huntley	20, 003
Norman Sass, 16607 Secor, Woodstock	19, 325
Bruce Olbrich, 108 McKinstry Rd., Woodstock	19, 097
Northern Pump Co., 5420 W. McCullom, McHenry	18, 120
Elroy Butenschoen, Rt. 2, Box 140, Marengo	17, 038
Earlroy Farms, Rt. 1, Marengo	15, 518
Gilbert Clausen, Woodstock	15, 279
Lowell Wm. Maushak, Marengo	15, 069
Brickey Bros., Harvard	14, 557
L. O. Napier, Marengo	14, 295
Lyle Paulsen, Woodstock	13, 539
E. Brackmann, McHenry	13, 129
F. Backhaus, McHenry	13, 129
Edwin Betlinski, Harvard	12, 246
Alvin Arnold Tinberg, Union	11, 797
Kenneth R. Marunde, Woodstock	11, 032
G. A. Lange, Hebron	10, 907
Raymond Murphy, Woodstock	10, 516

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

M'HENRY COUNTY—continued

Robert Kegebein, Crystal Lake	$10, 463
Fred G. Gross, Hebron	10, 235
Fred G. Gross, Hebron	10, 235
G. E. Von Rosen, Richmond	10, 046
William Cosman, Garden Prairie	9, 358
William G. Lentz, Harvard	8, 794
Clarence Lockwood, Marengo	8, 707
Edmond Hayden Jr., Woodstock	8, 473
J. L. Napier, Crystal Lake	8, 428
Eugene A. French, Waukegan	8, 385
Allen W. Cosman, Sharon	8, 162
Lawr. Ernesti, Huntley	8, 102
Chas. Ernesti, Huntley	8, 102
Mueller Sod Farms, Ontarioville	8, 091
Robert Stoxen, Harvard	7, 970
Norman Zimmerman, Huntley	7, 935
Herbert O. Becker, Harvard,	7, 441
Stewart Peters, Poplar Grove	7, 054
Raymond G. Frohling, Harvard	6, 801
C. B. Madey, Marengo	6, 642
Mancel C. Beard, Harvard	6, 482
John Palumbo, Barrington	6, 397
Kenneth K. Doty, Woodstock	6, 315
Arthur Wheaton Jr., Richmond	6, 290
Adolph VanLanduyt, Ringwood	6, 240
Charles Weingart, McHenry	6, 235
Ray Ettner, Marengo	6, 232
Robert Seegers, Crystal Lake	6, 175
Calvin Leisch, Woodstock	6, 149
Fred Brown, Harvard	6, 127
Richard Meyer, Marengo	6, 097
Bazil Hackman, Harvard	6, 060
Arthur Hoppe, McHenry	6, 056
John Kooistra, Woodstock	5, 887
McCullom Lake Sportsman's Club, McHenry	5, 803
J. B. Book, Harvard	5, 765
R. E. Book, Harvard	5, 765
Joseph Getty, Marengo	5, 764
Thos. King, Jr., Harvard	5, 728
Lloyd Tuttle, Prairie	5, 676
Norman Schaid, Sr., Woodstock	5, 602
Bernice I. Simes, Hebron	5, 564
Howard Pihl, Harvard	5, 560
A. L. Pihl, Harvard	5, 560
William Barton, Huntley	5, 523
Wm. Barton, Huntley	5, 523
Jesse Hemmingsen, Marengo	5, 499
Knute Olson, Jr., Huntley	5, 402
Harry Bentley, Hebron	5, 396
David Cash, Harvard	5, 325
Emmett Simes, Hebron	5, 313
Fred Christ, Union	5, 310
Stuart Wells, Harvard	5, 271
Arnold N. May, Richmond	5, 185
K. E. Winterscheid, Algonquin	5, 145
Ralph Metcalf, Marengo	5, 144
Leroy Fitzgerald, Huntley	5, 094
Magnus Bundgard, Huntley	5, 077
Raymond Olbrich, Harvard	5, 053
Arthur Swanson, Marengo	5, 048
Marshall Stohlquist, Harvard	5, 042
Arthur Brening, Marengo	5, 016
Total (81)	724, 748

M'LEAN COUNTY

William T. Larkin, Towanda	20, 406
George Arnold, Hudson	19, 756
John Oneall, Cooksville	14, 668
Charles U. Williams, Est, c/o First National Bank, Peoria	13, 958
Homer Lobdell, Colfax	13, 193
Kelley Bros. Ptrp., c/o Robert Kelley, Merna	12, 995
John W. Obrien, Wapella	12, 512
M. J. Cleary, III, Gridley	12, 448
Kinsella Farms, c/o W. H. Kinsella, Cooksville	12, 012
Edward Barnes, Ellsworth	11, 572
Kinsella Bros. Ptrp., c/o H. J. Kinsella, Merna	9, 507
Edward John Seeman, Chenoa	9, 454
John English, Bloomington	9, 094
Virgil Wissmiller, Cooksville	8, 703
King Larson Farm, Inc., Carlock	8, 678

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

M'LEAN COUNTY—continued

John A. Brokaw, Jr., Bloomington	$8, 237
Franklin Farms, Lexington	7, 776
John Power, Saybrook	7, 448
Wm. A. Freed, Lexington	7, 425
William W. Stack, Saybrook	7, 335
Elizabeth Holder, Bloomington	7, 208
Lester Knapp, Leroy	7, 196
Rex Mikel, Downs	7, 126
Paul Weber, Normal	7, 120
Cecil H. Reise, Downs	7, 080
Richard Wick, Lexington	7, 005
John J. Killian, Wapella	6, 904
Daniel T. Kearney, Gridley	6, 797
Reuben Stoller, Gridley	6, 763
George Staley, Leroy	6, 370
Kenneth Benjamin, Bloomington	6, 130
Harry Kline, Leroy	6, 114
Wilbur A. Schertz, Gibson City	5, 926
Carl H. Young, Saybrook,	5, 864
John E. Kline, Leroy	5, 813
H. Schertz Tr., Saybrook	5, 769
John J. Ginter, Bloomington	5, 748
Robert Carmody, Towanda	5, 728
Robert H. Davis, Bloomington	5, 640
Thomas-Thomas Corp., Cropsey	5, 440
Glenn Kemp Tr., Lexington	5, 393
Henry Winterland, Colfax	5, 360
Wesley Rafferty, Le Roy	5, 344
Louis Emil Kieser, Bloomington	5, 310
Timothy Kraft, Towanda	5, 266
Sam Holder, Bloomington	5, 109
David A. Gilmore, Ellsworth	5, 098
Lyle Peplow, Bloomington	5, 088
Roger Wm. Blumenshine, Colfax	5, 062
Vernon Kaufman, Bloomington	5, 033
Frank Nardin, Normal	5, 002
Total (51)	411, 983

MENARD COUNTY

John Hubly, Mason City	12, 726
Cecil Pottorf, Mason City	7. 524
Ben Neumann, Petersburg	6, 828
Edsel Thomas, Petersburg	6, 734
Joe Zillion, Tallula	6, 627
George A. Culver, Athens	6, 297
S. Roy Sampson, Petersburg	5, 835
R. M. Tomlin, Springfield	5, 161
Total (8)	57, 732

MERCER COUNTY

Scott Farm Co., Harrell Mathis, president, Alexis	22, 762
Sheldon Neeld, Muscatine	14, 988
Robert E. Ostrander, Moline	12, 542
North Trust Co., W. J. Cooper, Burlington	12, 199
Bill Frieden, Keithsburg	12, 188
Edmund Morris, Aledo	11, 561
Melvin T. Johnson, Aledo	11, 325
Gerald Stephens, Aledo	10, 744
Calvin D. Bredberg, New Windsor	10, 350
Daryl McCaw, Preemption	9, 358
Lee Lynch, North Henderson	8, 870
Gene Russell, New Boston	8, 558
Victor Irwin, New Boston	8, 390
William Hayman, Aledo	8, 337
Marion Doonan, Preemption	7, 262
Clair McCaw, Aledo	7, 132
Tom Conway, Reynolds	7, 119
George T. Honeyman, New Boston	6, 793
Chester Edward Larson, Lynn Center	6, 770
Weir Brokaw, Joy	6, 735
Leo Mallie, New Boston	6, 682
Lee E. Smith, Aledo	6, 628
W. H. Longley, Aledo	6, 592
R. P. Reason, Seaton	6, 515
Ralph Tomlinson, New Windsor	6, 492
P. J. Anderson, Muscatine	6, 423
Lawrence O. Yung, Alexis	6, 366
William Hart, North Henderson	6, 305
Eli Briggs, New Boston	6, 305
Dave Hampton, Seaton	6, 272
Paul Rowland, Seaton	6, 134

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

MERCER COUNTY—continued

Lucy Keating, P. J. Anderson, Muscatine	$5,969
Lloyd Baker, Aledo	5,952
Robert Weeks, Aledo	5,848
Dean B. Smith, New Boston	5,812
Lorin Willits, New Boston	5,611
Wayne Nelson, Joy	5,544
Forbes Nelson, Joy	5,544
Murray Patton, New Boston	5,451
Carl G. Stephens, Aledo	5,372
H. D. Stubbs, New Boston	5,352
Edward F. Sims, Sherrard	5,306
Howard Smith, Muscatine, Iowa	5,153
R. C. Johnston, Aledo	5,120
Wayne Hampton, New Boston	5,048
Wm. Retherford, Jr., Joy	5,031
Total (46)	356,810

MONROE COUNTY

Lester Niemeyer, Arnold, Mo	10,532
Schaefer Stock Farm, Valmeyer	10,260
Nu Fount Farms, Inc., Columbia	9,978
David Crosby, Valmeyer	8,679
Oliver C. Krueger, Columbia	8,021
Victor J. Krueger, Columbia	7,996
Ben Schilling, Waterloo	7,545
Gummersheimer Farms, Columbia	6,703
Floyd Niebruegge, Valmeyer	6,617
Emerson Campbell, Valmeyer	6,567
Raymond Rusteberg, Valmeyer	6,380
Rippelmeyer Stock Farm, Valmeyer	5,744
Thomas W. Rosenberg, Red Bud	5,500
Delbert Wittenauer, Waterloo	5,327
Total (14)	105,849

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

W. Darrell Kilton, Litchfield	43,516
D. M. Chausse and J. A. Chausse, Nokomis	18,036
Evan Pocklington, Butler	15,093
Wm. Eustace Payne, Hillsboro	10,653
Rufus A. Niemi, Nokomis	9,624
Philip T. Matthew, Litchfield	9,623
William K. Jenkins, Hillsboro	9,468
John F. Rundquist, Butler	9,111
Clifford, Bftzold, Nokomis	8,604
C. Morgan Fogleman, Litchfield	8,359
Ross, Lay, Litchfield	8,335
C. W. Barnstable, Nokomis	7,888
Raymond White, Irving	7,696
Quandon and Yolanda Hitchings, Raymond	7,622
E. L. and John B. Stead, Farmersville	7,547
Edward L. and Elsiha H. Voils, Fillmore	7,348
Darrell Fox, Harvel	7,197
Jerome P. Jordan, Farmersville	6,827
G. Howard Case, Nokomis	6,613
Merrill Wernsing, Raymond	6,420
Wayne Knodle, Fillmore	6,085
Roy Wernsing, Raymond	6,039
Francis J. Marten, Raymond	6,018
Albert Longmeyer, Greenfield	5,987
Carl and Glenn Paden, Hillsboro	5,946
Eldon W. Simon, Farmersville	5,694
Walter L. Bishop, Jr., Litchfield	5,677
Lloyd Hanna, Farmersville	5,610
Harold L. Benning, Raymond	5,471
William Specht, Harvel	5,382
Pete Cervi, Oconee	5,330
Wm. J. England, Morrisonville	5,311
Robert W. King, Hillsboro	5,302
Euris E. Kimbro, Donnellson	5,150
Total (34)	294,672

MORGAN COUNTY

James O. Harris, Alexander	21,463
C. D. Kenny, Franklin	18,040
Louis Werries, Chapin	14,904
A. E. Curry, Jacksonville	14,781
Clark S. Dodsworth, Franklin	12,630
Nickel Bros., Concord	11,518

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

MORGAN COUNTY—continued

Burrus Seed Farms, Arenzville	$10,960
Floyd R. Beadles, Murrayville	10,348
Roy G. Vangundy, Jr., Chapin	10,085
Littleton Adams, Franklin	9,722
William Hahn, Meredosia	8,703
M. F. Walsh, Murrayville	8,556
Charles H. Harris, Alexander	8,315
Bernard Uhnken, Jacksonville	8,072
Hobart F. Rigg, Jacksonville	6,511
Ronald Lockard, Ashland	6,307
Geo. Musch, Sr., Arenzvl	6,298
W. A. Martin, Concord	6,076
George Obertate, Jacksonville	6,021
James E. Johnson, Waverly	5,890
Vancil Brockhouse, Concord	5,864
Virgil Wegehoft, Concord	5,359
Kohl Perbix, Chapin	5,096
Total (23)	221,519

MOULTRIE COUNTY

Robert Waggoner, Gays	10,871
J. F. Murphy, Lovington	8,931
Robert Lumsden, Bethany	8,788
George Shelton, Sullivan	7,737
Homer Johnson, Sullivan	6,097
Leonard Hudson, Bethany	5,872
Delbert Wright, Lovington	5,840
Paul Pierce, Sullivan	5,668
Ennis Farms, (O. R. Dukeman), Hammond	5,161
Total	64,965

OGLE COUNTY

Earl S. Kane, Forreston	18,693
Clyde Koontz, Oregon	16,429
Walter Le Fevre, Mount Morris	13,359
Fred Bushnell, Jr., Stillman Valley	12,635
Ralph Schumacher, Davis Junction	12,289
Edward Olsen, Polo	10,985
Andrew Roos, Oregon	10,192
Edwin M. Nelson, Rockford	10,127
R. B. McLaughlin, Byron	10,009
Russell G. Jones, Polo	10,000
Donald Bybee, Oregon	9,997
M. R. Pieper, Mount Morris	9,522
Irvin Seuring, Baileyville	9,392
Leonard S. Wills, Davis Junction	9,209
Maynard Bruns, Rochelle	8,733
Donald Long, Polo	8,606
Edward M. Tyne, Polo	8,256
Edw. S. Thomas, Polo	7,943
Nestor Metzger, Rochelle	7,894
Dean Gruben, Rochelle	7,349
Clifford Ohlinger, Rochelle	7,325
Jacob Ludwig, Forreston	7,230
Herman Ashelford, Byron	7,039
Blaine Auker, Byron	6,994
Wilbur Chas. Winterton, Oregon	6,889
Dick Greenfield, Ashton	6,542
Richard Davis, Oregon	6,453
John E. Hines, Davis Junction	6,407
Dewayne Mellor, Monroe Center	6,407
Alvin La Verne Ludwig, Forreston	6,304
Gladys Clayton, Polo	6,222
Ralph Bishop, Stillman Valley	6,194
Raymond Hall, Monroe Center	6,157
Philip Kuford, Franklin Grove	6,048
Lullus Fenwick, Rochelle	6,045
Gilbert Gocken, Lindenwood	5,925
Ralph Major, Stillman Valley	5,925
Floyd Eddy, Monroe Center	5,777
D. K. Guest ex est, T. T. Guest deceased, Rochelle	5,768
L. B. Pierce, Creston	5,712
L. B. Pierce & Sons, Inc., Creston	5,703
Raymond Wiltfang, Oregon	5,695
Carl M. Beard, Oregon	5,656
Vernie H. Johnson, Stillman Valley	5,510
Martins R. R. Farms, Inc., Chicago	5,500
Eugene Batty, Davis Junction	5,453
Walter E. Schmidt, Polo	5,378
Harold Baker, Mount Morris	5,342
Wayne Schnulle, German Valley	5,333
Charles C. Koontz, Lindenwood	5,295

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

OGLE COUNTY—continued

Charles C. Beard, Mount Morris	$5,273
Steven Benesh, Oregon	5,211
Harold Schumacher, Byron	5,194
Howard Schoonhoven, Rochelle	5,080
George W. Lusardi, Polo	5,058
William F. Tobler, Rochelle	5,034
Total (56)	424,697

PEORIA COUNTY

Dick Shepard, Chillicothe	11,026
Rolling Acres Farms, % L. C. Graves, Princeville	10,386
William Harmon, Brimfield	9,545
Philip Elsasser, Edelstein	9,325
Pleasure Driveway and Pk Dist, Peoria	7,350
Robert Spillman, Chillicothe	7,092
Ralph K. Carter, Elmwood	6,965
Donald R. Matthews, Peoria	6,676
Julius Lauber, Monica	6,340
Verne Schaffner, Chillicothe	6,261
Robert K. Joos, Chillicothe	5,670
John V. Ratliff, Chillicothe	5,572
LeRoy Miller, Chillicothe	5,552
Forest Park Foundation, Peoria	5,426
Clarence Catton, Brimfield	5,425
Sam Rumbold, Chillicothe	5,319
Fred R. Schafer, Edelstein	5,205
Total (17)	119,135

PERRY COUNTY

Meadowlark Farms, Inc., Sullivan	22,299
Southwestern Coal Co. (A. K. Thomson), Cutler	9,750
Calvin Frederick Ibendahl, Tamaroa	5,707
Paasch Brothers, Pinckneyville	5,654
Warren Burris, Swanwick	5,562
Total (5)	48,972

PIATT COUNTY

Lynn H. Clarkson, Cerro Gordo	20,684
Allerton Farm, Urbana	15,704
J. P. Kratz & Co., Monticello	13,340
J. E. McCoppin, Ivesdale	10,388
Francis A. Hawthorne, Farmer City	8,387
Margaret Wolfe (c/o O. R. Dukeman), Hammond	7,024
Thomas Walsh, Jr., Bement	6,700
Cecil Tracy, Monticello	5,537
Charming Acres, Inc. (Robert C. Miller), Monticello	5,440
Dale Robinson, Monticello	5,195
Raymond Haynes, Bement	5,133
Total (11)	103,532

PIKE COUNTY

Albert Coultas, Winchester	15,336
James M. Byrns, Griggsville	14,756
Floyd, Evans, Pittsfield	12,245
Mike McNary, New Canton	12,226
Norman Main, Barry	11,576
Floyd Wombles, Rockport	11,508
Virgil Borrowman, Kinderhook	10,715
I. B. Sapp, deceased (c/o J. M. Sapp), Rockport	10,622
Stefan Hyk, M.D., Griggsville	9,805
Carl J. Kroencke, Hull	9,512
M. E. Williamson, Kinderhook	9,053
Ralph J. Orr, Mount Sterling	9,026
C. O. Scott, Pittsfield	8,848
Volum C. Vincent, Kinderhook	8,585
Lawrence Kroencke, Hull	7,704
C. W. Curtis, Pittsfield	7,449
Lew Cummings, Chambersburg	7,413
Frank McCartney, Sr., Pittsfield	7,390
Park Lacy, Pittsfield	7,359
Lyndle Gerard and Kenneth Gerard, Pittsfield	7,274
Ronald E. Smith, Rockport	7,082
Hugh Hoskins, New Canton	6,737
William Burlend, Jr., Griggsville	6,626

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

PIKE COUNTY—continued

Sue Ella Garner, Louisiana, Mo	$6,471
Carl Wittmond, Brussels	6,351
W. X. Preble, New Salem	6,141
Fred Bushmeyer, Hull	6,022
Jack Thomas, Pittsfield	5,874
Clayton W. Evans, Milton	5,695
Donald Hunter, Pittsfield	5,656
Loren Moody, Jacksonville	5,522
Les Lohman, Quincy	5,515
J. M. Dunham, Griggsville	5,469
Lowell Lewton, Barry	5,425
M. Muncy, (c/o C. Quintal), Jacksonville	5,339
Total (35)	288,327

POPE COUNTY

Tony A. Harris, Sr., Brookport	10,764
Tracy Compton, Brownfield	9,774
Clyde Broadway, Brownfield	6,828
R. C. Davidson, Jr., Rosebud	5,349
Rue Densch, Golconda	5,272
Total (5)	37,987

PULASKI COUNTY

Vowels Bros., Charleston, Mo	10,849
Inman Bros., Grand Chain	8,859
Troye Easter, Grand Chain	5,883
Heilig Bros., Pulaski	5,444
John W. Crain, Pulaski	5,370
Roger E. Conant, Villa Ridge	5,092
Total (6)	41,497

PUTNAM COUNTY

Leon Balestri, Granville	8,506
Robert Whitney, Magnolia	7,887
Total (2)	16,393

RANDOLPH COUNTY

Bartels Farms, Inc., St. Marys, Mo	40,684
Hugo Delassus, St. Marys, Mo	11,614
Gordon Cohen, St. Marys, Mo	11,395
Clarence M. Otten, St. Marys, Mo	10,719
W. T. Hayer, Jr., Sparta	8,362
H. F. Herschbach, Belleville	8,190
Oliver Lankford, St. Marys, Mo	7,878
Wilbert Schoenbeck, Red Bud	7,546
Harvey Eggemeyer, Sparta	7,539
Travers Doza, St. Marys, Mo	6,951
A. C. Hayer, Sparta	6,633
Oscar McMath, Chester	6,245
Xavier Melliere, Du Rocher	5,727
P. J. Lawrence, St. Marys, Mo	5,518
Total (14)	145,001

RICHLAND COUNTY

Collins Stoll, Olney	8,861
Robert L. Runyon, Noble	8,250
Warren D. Stout, Claremont	6,425
Frank Wade, Noble	5,088
Total (4)	28,624

ROCK ISLAND COUNTY

Eugene Frey, Hillsdale	9,107
J. A. Wedekind, Muscatine	8,306
Burdette Toppert, Hillsdale	7,570
Wayne H. Coers, Cordova	6,891
Cordova Industrial Park, C. Flint, Clinton, Iowa	6,891
J. M. Morrison, Orion	6,243
Raymond Demarlie, Reynolds	6,167
Charles Reynolds, Cordova	5,976
Edward Baumgartner, Cordova	5,967
Addison A. Rursch, Taylor Ridge	5,821
William H. McConnel, Reynolds	5.653
Wm. L. Rutherford, Peoria	5,593
Donald Depyper, Cordova	5,483
Delbert Bowser, Illinois City	5,399
Total (14)	91,067

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

SALINE COUNTY

Lawrence Roberts, Eldorado	$8,937
Wilburn Barton, Eldorado	8,661
George Barnes, Harrisburg	8,055
Lowell Tison, Eldorado	6,581
Joseph P. Hart, Harrisburg	6,129
Wylie Implement Co., Marissa	6,012
Dennis Raben, Eldorado	5,792
Clarence Etienne Jr., Eldorado	5,712
Emil Allen, Eldorado	5,635
Dowe Jones, Galatia	5,546
Lawrence Walls, Harrisburg	5,076
Total (11)	72,136

SANGAMON COUNTY

Dowson Bros., Divernon	34,529
Vincent Braner, Pl. Plains	29,007
Chas W. Mayfield, Sherman	20,452
Ross McNaught, Auburn	17,658
Hiler Bros., Springfield	16,896
George L. Wilson, Buffalo Hart	15,516
J. L. Leonard, Springfield	13,610
James F. Kent, Illiopolis	13,317
Claude Dambacher, Divernon	13,314
Elmer Cramer, Greenview	11,076
F. K. Whittemore, Decatur	8,729
Ted Megginson, Auburn	8,505
Hayward T. McMurray, Divernon	8,470
John H. Bruntjen, Illiopolis	8,349
Norman E. Constant, Williamsville	7,993
James R. Cravens, Buffalo	7,937
Wm. Reed, New Berlin	7,630
J. C. McQuitty, New Berlin	7,594
Carl Adloff, Springfield	7,380
Merritt Cravens, Williamsville	7,049
Dwight Cravens, Williamsville	6,699
Virgil Neuman, Chatham	6,695
Carl Schmidgall Jr., Springfield	6,395
Ernest Minder, Rochester	6,249
I. P. Mueth, Springfield	6,161
Alvin M. Mavis, Rochester	6,133
Homer Mendenhall, Springfield	6,019
Logan S. Ladage, Virden	5,849
Robinson Bros., Buffalo	5,825
Ernest Dudley, Dawson	5,779
E. L. Hagen, Pl. Plains	5,708
Allen Miller, Waverly	5,621
Howard Taft, Rochester	5,524
Eugene Kresse, Buffalo	5,518
Alfred Handley, Springfield	5,406
F. M. Poffenberger, Rochester	5,330
John Harrison, Auburn	5,318
Alden Brown, New Berlin	5,199
Robert Kohl, Edinburg	5,187
Victor Maxheimer, Buffalo	5,155
Frank Morgan, Mechanicsburg	5,104
Leonard Wieland, Springfield	5,040
Donald Skinner, Loami	5,036
Total (43)	395,961

SCHUYLER COUNTY

Ernest Peters, Camden	12,274
Robert and Martha Krouch, Beardstown	8,681
Hildreth and Vernon Barnes, Rushville	7,803
Harold Wells, Rushville	7,205
Total (4)	35,963

SCOTT COUNTY

C. Campbell, Jacksonville	12,050
Russell Hubbert, Winchester	11,915
Earl J. Clark, Manchester	8,888
Sterling Shafer, Winchester	7,865
Howard Hurrelbrink, Winchester	7,665
C. Warren Breeding, Winchester	7,588
James W. Freeman, Bluffs	6,989
Glenn Coultas, Winchester	6,553
Robert Dahman, Winchester	6,440
Clifford Fricke, Jacksonville	5,874
Wilbur Boehs, Bluffs	5,717
Pearl M. Carlton, Winchester	5.601
Edwin Lakamp, Jacksonville	5,431
Herbert Hoots, Winchester	5,303

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

SCOTT COUNTY—continued

Karl W. Meisenbach, Pearl	$5,239
Total (15)	109,118

SHELBY COUNTY

Smith Farm, Inc., Shelbyville	14,818
Forrest Yakey, Stewardson	11,595
Vincent Sommer, Oconee	10,186
Jack Yakey, Mode	10,157
Ora Langley, Jr., Shelbyville	9,810
George B. Roberts, Scottsdale, Ariz	9,579
Finks Farms (c/o J. O. Finks), Shelbyville	9,454
Doverel, Inc. (Shelby Co. State Bank), Shelbyville	8,990
Carroll Odell, Moweaqua	8,790
Bivard, Inc. (Shelby Co. State Bank), Shelbyville	8,594
Wm. Pikesh, Jr., Strasburg	8,211
Burl Evans, Cowden	7,863
Geo. J. Ridlen, Lakewood	7,701
Ervin Strom, Lakewood	6,830
John R. Berns, Oconee	6,643
W. R. Yakey, Stewardson	6,322
W. C. Workman, Findlay	6,315
Wayne Arnold, Beecher City	5,935
Aubrey Duncan, Moweaqua	5,818
Bill Dunaway, Shelbyville	5,802
Geo. Hubbartt, Findlay	5,553
Frank W. Arnold, Beecher City	5,469
Lawrence Krile, Strasburg	5,372
Malcolm Price, Pana	5,335
Ambrose Probst, Sigel	5,254
C. E. McDonald, Lakewood	5,195
Total (26)	201,591

ST. CLAIR COUNTY

Clement J. Wittenauer, Freeburg	8,491
Cletus Biver, Belleville	8,436
Floyd Range, Dupo	6,785
Willard Erb, Marissa	6,688
Oscar Kelling, East Carondelet	6,452
Floyd A. Schlueter, Belleville	6,227
Ralph Weilbacher, Sr., Millstadt	5,073
Louis Taylor, Trenton	5,032
Alfred Vogt, Dupo	5,004
Total (9)	58,188

STARK COUNTY

Roy Rumbold, Princeville	5,490
Total (1)	5,490

STEPHENSON COUNTY

William A. Oppold, Freeport	25,472
Lloyd Leary, Freeport	12,199
Donald Dietmeier, Ridott	9,846
Philip Marks, Pearl City	8,194
Harlen Rigney, Red Oak	7,589
Wallace Leary, Freeport	7,414
Arthur Meier, Ridott	7,302
Allen Brady, Pearl City	7,150
Joe Raders, Pearl City	6,690
Leo Kloepping, Pearl City	6,506
Henry Lillge, Jr., Red Oak	6,497
Clifton Bartelt, Winslow	6,484
William Angle, Jr., Dakota	6,219
R. L. Griffin, Jamaica, N.Y	6,176
Ronald Dornink, Freeport	6,141
Arnold Aisenbrey, Dakota	5,994
Robert Graybill, Freeport	5,969
Gordon Dornink, Freeport	5,913
Ralph Rudy, Freeport	5,790
Richard Beyer, Pearl City	5,692
M. Duane Vickers, Winslow	5,500
Junior Hunziker, Ridott	5,475
Harold Herrmann, Rock City	5,396
Ernest Stabenow, McConnell	5,346
H. G. Hayunga, German Valley	5,272
Frank E. Smith, Davis	5,261
Simon Nieman, Ridott	5,247
Wendell Sargent, Lena	5,180
Donald Shockey, Ridott	5,120
Leonard Bethard, Pecatonica	5,112

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

STEPHENSON COUNTY—continued

Harold Bethard, Pecatonica	$5,112
Carl Fairbairn, Ridott	5,089
R. Earl Farringer, Lena	5,006
Total (33)	227,353

TAZEWELL COUNTY

E. E. Sears, Minier	20,021
Bruce E. Meyer, Manito	10,181
Roy Blosser, Morton	10,041
A. Lee Pray, Leroy	9,896
Foy Geary, Tremont	8,685
Everett Palmer, Manito	8,605
E. H. Herrman, Manito	7,945
Donald W. Hess, Washington	7,868
Robert E. Henderson, Mackinaw	7,570
Robert Talbott, Manito	6,777
Theodore Allen, Delavan	6,723
C. Marlowe Caulkins, Pekin	6,265
M. and I. Roth Adms., Est. E. Roth, Deceased, Morton	6,218
H. Robert Betzelberger, Delavan	6,034
Glen Talbott, Manito	5,958
Lester L. Moushon, East Peoria	5,955
L. Rich Exec, Washington	5,863
J. A. Henderson, Minier	5,746
Homer Muller, Washington	5,574
Donald Morris, Hopedale	5,265
Flanklin H. Allen, Delavan	5,248
Clarence Appenzeller, Mackinow	5,069
F. S. Stillman, Machinaw	5,042
Arnold Henderson, Minier	5,036
Total (25)	183,417

UNION COUNTY

Roger Novack, Murphysboro	44,587
Howard Davis, McClure	19,178
Gerald Cain, Jonesboro	17,127
Charles Lambdin, Grand Tower	14,484
Lee Roy Rendleman, Wolf Lake	12,456
Bill Levan, Wolf Lake	10,936
M. H. Smith, Alto Pass	10,936
Fred Munz, Wolf Lake	9,156
Harold Orr, Jonesboro	8,799
Ted Wilson, Wolf Lake	8,739
Joe S. Littrell, Wolf Lake	8,088
Ernest Penrod, Dongola	7,065
John Lambdin, Wolf Lake	6,909
Harry O. Meyers, Wolf Lake	6,777
Ellis Penrod, Dongola	6,640
Serena Sims, Jonesboro	6,236
L. E. Osman, Dongola	6,125
C. L. Ury, McClure	5,843
Leonard N. Ranson, Wolf Lake	5,684
Orris Mosby Jr., Jonesboro	5,638
Carlos L. Brown, Jonesboro	5,427
Paul Otten, Wolf Lake	5,416
W. H. Ury, Jonesboro	5,402
Vern Gurley, Buncombe	5,329
Ralph E. Spring, Wolf Lake	5,129
Jack Yates, Cobden	5,119
Total (26)	253,031

VERMILION COUNTY

John F. Oneill, Champaign	22,337
Evert E. Berglund, Rossville	21,983
R. C. Morgan, Rossville	19,961
Edward Layden, Hoopeston	17,283
Milton Meyer, Rankin	17,029
Peter L. Gernand, Potomac	16,685
L. J. Larry, Danville	15,024
Francis Emkes, Gifford	13,375
Ivan E. Odle, Hoopeston	12,807
Elmer P. Hoggatt, Urbana	12,309
Steve Janosik, Westville	11,166
Eugene Vermillion, Potomac	11,143
Paul Zook, Hoopeston	10,647
C. W. Burton, Potomac	9,947
D. L. Van Ruskirk, Indianola	9,432
L. F. Miles, Collison	9,232
Oral W. Clark, Potomac	8,750
Hoyle D. Neubert, Ridgefarm	8,719
William H. Acton, Alvin	8,483
Gerhard Frerichs, Ogden	8,073
Wilford H. Catlett, Fairmount	7,984

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

VERMILION COUNTY—continued

Joe Pal, Catlin	$7,777
Milton Wernigk, Armstrong	7,765
John L. Taylor, Fairmount	7,617
Herman Hathaway, Rossville	7,575
Ray Miller, Westville	7,463
Rehn Livestock Co., Danville	7,421
Clifford O. Rohrscheib, Homer	7,353
H. L. Rohrscheib, Homer	7,353
Lloyd Puzey, Fairmount	7,208
J. A. & J. A. Dewey Ptrp., (J. Ansel Dewey), Penfield	7,033
Harold Long, Fithian	6,995
Herman Starr, Alvin	6,939
M. Young Enterprise, Hoopeston	6,886
Robert H. Johnston, Armstrong	6,838
Austin Brooks, Potomac	6,825
Glenn Ilik, Fithian	6,790
E. H. Dubea, Rossville	6,690
John P. Cadle, Rossville	6,531
E. R. Kotcher, Westville	6,516
Rex Wait, Indianola	6,484
F. W. Ward, Indianola	6,484
Merle Prather, Rossville	6,261
J. Cole Morton, Ridgefarm	6,236
Hubert Seymour, Oakwood	6,154
Robert Miles, Collison	6,130
Lowell Puzey, Fairmount	6,073
Ernest H. Sage, Ogden	6,030
Dice, Goodwine, Hoopeston	5,967
Donald Seaman, Rossville	5,942
William H. Prather, Rossville	5,869
Fremont H Crouch, Hoopeston	5,863
Hamilton Farm Co., (By Robt. Hamilton), Potomac	5,822
Richard E. Holt, Potomac	5,781
Frederick C. Neubert, Ridgefarm	5,745
Nino Damilano, Westville	5,719
John F. Meharry, Catlin	5,585
H. E. Crawford, Potomac	5,575
Francis Hargan, Williamsport, Indiana	5,514
Rusel D. Acton, Danville	5,506
Carl Davis, Fairmount	5,323
Sarah Heidrick (By Raymond Dolbee), Westville	5,315
James P. Marron, Fithian	5,299
Wright Bros. (By Carl Wright), State Line	5,293
Raymond Dolbee, Westville	5,214
Mark Seimer, Fithian	5,198
Larry, Smoot, Fairmount	5,168
Elwood G. Matthews, Rossville	5,164
James Taylor, Rossville	5,010
Total (69)	578,668

WABASH COUNTY

Gerald Parmenter, Mount Carmel	10,052
Frank Adams, Mount Carmel	9,816
Walter Schonaman, Belmont	8,232
Aaron Compton, Mount Carmel	8,152
Jack Hocking, Mount Carmel	7,766
P. Jacob H. Zimmerman, Mount Carmel	7,724
Champ Lovellette, Mount Carmel	7,613
Andy Hocking, Mount Carmel	7,063
Maple Crest Farms, (c/o M. B. Payne), Allendale	6,912
Joseph Thompson, Champaign	6,736
Don Kennard, Mount Carmel	6,716
Rudy Christy, Mount Carmel	6,575
Darrell Spencer, Grayville	6,434
Kenneth R. Hocking, Mount Carmel	6,292
John R. Kieffer, Mount Carmel	5,840
Nelson Bros., (c/o Keith Nelson) Browns	5,684
Halbert Broster, West Salem	5,323
Total (17)	122,930

WARREN COUNTY

J. Everett Morss, Abingdon	34,965
Vergil Lehr, Auburn	20,215
Aven Lee James, Alexis	10,634
Everett Lofftus, Roseville	10,437

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

WARREN COUNTY—continued

Harley Morss, Abington	$9,690
Ralph Walters, Monmouth	9,423
Morton Pratt, Roseville	9,108
Paul Crandall, Sr., Roseville	8,949
Evalyn Dixon Est, Monmouth	8,475
Lee Yarde, Alexis	8,275
B. A. Tomlin, Roseville	8,190
Michael R. Hennenfent, Smithshire	8,082
William Arthur, St. Augustine	8,056
John J. Worthington, Smithshire	7,830
Mary Ilo Smith, Macomb	7,830
Wayne Wolf, Roseville	7,771
John M. Walters, Kirkwood	7,689
Roy M. Winbigler, Little York	7,538
Oakin Bros. (c/o Clifford Dakin), Roseville	7,366
W. E. Streeter, Berwick	7,348
Clyde French, Abingdon	7,294
Arnold Ischer, Monmouth	7,285
Lee Coons, Roseville	7,040
Lewis Braselton, Monmouth	6,502
Esther Simmons, Kirkwood	6,300
Charles H. Fritz, Smithshire	6,234
Kendall Gibson, Kirkwood	6,056
Kenneth Ryan, Cameron	5,985
Ethel W. Gridley, Monmouth	5,869
Jack J. Helm, Gerlaw	5,826
Herman Kingston, Roseville	5,731
W. L. Waymack, Berwick	5,664
Milton L. Gibb, Smithshire	5,658
James Dunn, Abingdon	5,561
Everett Birdsell, Kirkwood	5,447
David C. Edwards, Gerlaw	5,416
John R. Gillen, Monmouth	5,402
H. C. Whitman, Cameron	5,342
Mildred R. Jackson, Chicago	5,222
Dorothy B. Lafferty, Monmouth	5,219
John Lafferty, Monmouth	5,219
Leroy Gillen, Monmouth	5,196
Howard Keating, Alexis	5,133
George E. Gillen, Monmouth	5,069
Virgil French, Monmouth	5,034
Lawrence Thompson, Monmouth	5,003
Total (46)	357,578

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Lester Pitchford, Richview	11,708
Ray Francis, Nashville	8,250
Emil G. Pannier, Marissa	5,602
Edw. Bernreuter, Nashville	5,424
Paul Roesner, Nashville	5,277
Elmer Oelze, Jr., Nashville	5,195
Jerry Gates, Tamaroa	5,177
Total (7)	46,633

WAYNE COUNTY

Vertis Spencer, Graysville	11,000
F. E. Greenwalt, Wayne City	10,294
Cletis Hosselton, Clay City	8,733
William Warren Adm., Carlyle	8,728
Frank S. Bunnage, Mt. Erie	8,471
Clyde Robbins, Fairfield	8,040
Harold Barnard, Geff	7,242
Louis Zurliene, Fairfield	6,862
R. Haskell Barnard, Barnhill	6,762
Harvey Greenwalt, Wayne City	6,147
Harlan Greenwalt, Wayne City	5,969
C. H. Wittmond, Jacksonville	5,564
E. H. O'Daniel, Sr., Ellery	5,081
Total (13)	98,893

WHITE COUNTY

New Harmony Realty, New Harmony	41,494
Donald E. Kolb, Evansville	29,958
Wilburn Duvall, Carmi	26,814
F. A. Barbre, Carmi	20,009
Ford Turkey Island, New Harmony	19,843
Floyd Wilson, Monroe City	17,335
C. E. Brehm, Mt. Vernon	16,923
Leo Allen, Carmi	15,125
L. A. Brown, L. R. Brown, Carmi	13,955
Hubert J. Mercer, Crossville	12,696

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

WHITE COUNTY—continued

Walter Schisler, Mount Vernon, Ind	$12,249
Robert J. Williams, Mill Shoals	11,924
Robert J. Spaetti, Rockport, Ind	11,768
William P. Hanna & Helen H. Pea, Carmi	11,397
Harry Phil Pearce, Carmi	11,349
Robert Gowdy, Carmi	10,475
George E. Jacobs, Crossville	10,023
Ralph Campbell, Pearl Campbell, Carmi	9,938
Herman Kittinger, Carmi	9,905
Chas. C. Garner, Crossville	9,563
Wm. T. Allen, Carmi	9,413
Stewart A. Pearce, Carmi	9,134
Jesse Duckworth, Mill Shoals	8,869
E. Wayne Ackerman, New Haven	8,744
Emil Botsch, Carmi	8,699
B. J. Zieren, Carmi	8,507
James A. Walsh, Jr., Carmi	8,321
Glenn D. Whitley, Enfield	8,187
Albert F. Williams, Carmi	8,077
Don E. Welch, Carmi	8,065
Archie Hooser, Carmi	8,062
James Ackerman, Carmi	8,011
Richard Dixon, Carmi	7,910
Larry Williams, Carmi	7,812
Wm. Ackerman, Carmi	7,780
Robert P. Williams, Carmi	7,703
Clarence Holtzclaw, Carmi	7,678
K. Lamont, Wm. F. Lamont, Crossville	7,647
Minita Trainor Shrewsbury, Carmi	7,499
Eugene Sell, Norris City	7,404
Wayne Walker, Carmi	7,192
Herbert Ackerman, Carmi	7,139
Howard C. Ackerman, Carmi	6,985
Ralph Simmons, Carmi	6,883
John N. Fields, Enfield	6,840
Henry Davis, Grayville	6,729
Bill Curd, Mill Shoals	6,513
John W. Storey, Enfield	6,469
C. Greathouse, Jr. & H. Cain, Evansville, Ind	6,384
Ralph Seitz, Carmi	6,232
Martin Stevens, New Haven	6,209
Kenneth Woolsey, New Haven	6,145
Bertis B. Williams, Enfield	6,110
Clarence Williams, Carmi	6,088
Raymond Mundy, Carmi	6,066
Norman Winter, Burnt Prairie	6,030
John H. Schisler, Mt. Vernon	6,005
Walter Puckett, Mill Shoals	5,872
Harold T. Carter, Carmi	5,860
Loren Mundy, Carmi	5,771
Doyle L. Williams, Grayville	5,597
E. M. Fitton Heirs, New Harmony	5,573
Chester Barbre, Carmi	5,464
John Pumphrey, Carmi	5,404
Arthur Bingman, Richard Bingman, Carmi	5,399
Harold Bingman, Terry Bingman, Carmi	5,352
Frances Calvert, Carmi	5,305
Nehi Bottling Co., Carmi	5,269
Sherrill Lamont, Grayville	5,265
Woodlawn Farms, Carmi	5,102
Powell Land, Carmi	5,101
Allen Sailer, Carmi	5,034
Tommy Stokes, Crossville	5,026
Total (73)	682,678

WHITESIDE COUNTY

Leo J. Miller, Sterling	21,379
Wilder Farms, Inc., Erie	20,060
Elmer Larson, Prophetstown	19,911
Lester Larson, Prophetstown	17,550
Joslin Bros, Erie	14,541
Harland Brightman, Morrison	13,848
James E. Chamerlain, Albany	12,736
Henry Depyper, Prophetstown	11,952
Edward J. Grennan, Rock Falls	11,563
P. J. Broderick, Savanna	10,766
Marshall Moody, Erie	10,575
James A. Nowers, Prophetstown	10,564

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

WHITESIDE COUNTY—continued

Eugene F. Wilson, Prophetstown	$10,434
Woodrow Lorke, Sterling	10,301
Arthur A. James, Morrison	9,687
Della J. Besse, Erie	9,473
Ray C. Blasdell, Morrison	9,355
Hugh J. Hermes, Sterling	9,280
Donald E. Behrens, Rock Falls	8,931
Myron L. Cox, Prophetstown	8,829
Joseph Perino, Deer Grove	8,704
Donald Bush, Morrison	8,586
Mary Kobbeman, Rock Falls	8,366
Lester Grau, Morrison	8,256
Dwight W. Parker, Prophetstown	8,020
Wayne Schmitt, Rock Falls	7,841
Clyde G. Chamberlain, Prophetstown	7,641
Wendell Morine, Erie	7,631
Frederick E. Rosenow, Erie	7,608
Wm. J. McKeown, Sterling	7,407
Don Damhoff, Morrison	7,288
Leroy Graham, Fenton	7,059
Laurence W. Calkins, Sterling	7,023
Fulton Ind. Development Co., Fulton	6,970
Richard R. Besse, Erie	6,877
Arthur J. McGinn, Rock Falls	6,780
Peter Temple, Fenton	6,730
Raymond Newlon, Prophetstown	6,684
John Minertz, Sterling	6,391
Leonard E. Myers, Erie	6,232
Alfred Hartman, Morrison	5,792
Elwood Depuy, Sterling	5,674
Clarence T. Sheldon, Morrison	5,655
John Grau, Morrison	5,549
Donald E. Ebersole, Sterling	5,515
Karl S. Over, Sterling	5,363
John Bennett, Erie	5,343
Richard Hamstra, Morrison	5,304
W. Wayne Harms, Tampico	5,273
Stacy Arnett, Prophetstown	5,266
William Widolff, Rock Falls	5,204
Glenn Nelson, Rock Falls	5,175
Total (52)	464,942

WILL COUNTY

Al Rink, Wilmington	9,981
John E. Francis, New Lenox	8,638
James Phelan, Wilmington	7,686
Chas. E. Deutschman, Elwood	6,032
John W. Fitzpatrick, Jr., Custer Park	5,484
Robert E. Goodwin, Wilmington	5,022
Total (6)	42,843

WILLIAMSON COUNTY

Loy Forcum, Marion	6,053
Total (1)	6,053

WINNEBAGO COUNTY

Lester Gummow, Rockton	28,469
Edw. A. Gummow, Rockton	21,210
David Nystrom, Cherry Valley	20,414
Edward E. Savage, Shirland	19,436
Rex H. Light, Durand	15,835
Dr. A. M. Swanson, Rockford	15,134
C. R. Farms, Durand	13,791
K. B. Farms, Inc., Belvidere	13,223
Andrew J. Dwyer, Rosco	12,796
Claire Wilke, Davis	11,035
Robert E. Johnson, Rockford	10,500
Robert Price, Rockford	10,376
Robert U. Winters, Shirland	10,353
Irving J. Swanson, Rockford	10,312
John A. Berg, Pecatonica	10,039
Duane Oliver, Winnebago	9,903
Roy S. Neely, Pecatonica	9,402
Lester Remer, Winnebago	9,016
Wilbur Koch, Winnebago	8,750
John J Gallagher, Rockton	8,711
Charles B. Howe, Cherry Valley	8,481
Allen Thompson, Pecatonica	8,021
Edward B. Heffran, Jr., Winnebago	7,863

Names, addresses and total payments of $5,000 or more under ASCS programs, excluding price support loans—Illinois—Con.

WINNEBAGO COUNTY—continued

John Danielson, Pecatonica	$7,815
Harold F. Doran, Winnebago	7,705
Myrtle Johnson, Oregon	7,671
Franklyn R. Carpenter, Rockton	7,566
John L. Neely, Pecatonica	7,276
Pecatonica Farms, Rockford	7,269
Fred A. Davis, Cherry Valley	7,179
William Gundry, Rockton	7,141
Hugh H. Neely, Pecatonica	7,015
Ted Long, Pecatonica	6,973
Joseph Gaffney, Durand	6,863
Richard Shade, Rockton	6,784
Roy F. Lundquist, Rockford	6,695
James H. Conklin, Rockton	6,485
Russell L. Carpenter, Rockton	6,405
Richard Doyle, Rockford	6,299
John H. Swanson, Rockford	6,257
Paul R. Britton, Rockford	6,243
Laurence Kindell, Rockford	6,023
Paul Bainbridge, Rockford	6,013
Floyd Hilton, Pecatonica	5,996
Harold B. Bridgeland, Winnebago	5,920
Charles D. Dow, Rockford	5,890
Edgar Oliver, Pecatonica	5,805
Lem H. Harrington, Rockford	5,743
Lawrence E. Ralston, Roscoe	5,463
Einar Nelson, Durand	5,386
Allen L. Hamer, Rockford	5,250
Verna L. Christen, Pecatonica	5,241
Elmo H. Greene, Durand	5,230
Fred Worthington, Pecatonica	5,173
Keron Walsh, Durand	5,084
Milton Espencheid, Pecatonica	5,071
Laurence Dolan, Durand	5,055
John F. Carpenter, Rockton	5,037
Total (58)	512,093

WOODFORD COUNTY

Martin Bros. Implement Co., Roanoke	77,965
Earl Schirer, Roanoke	16,087
Robert Kennell, Roanoke	11,549
Shep & Carson, Bloomington	11,405
Lyle F. Stewart, El Paso	10,545
Millard Bally, Roanoke	10,498
Clarence Schirer, Roanoke	9,610
Marion Schirer, Roanoke	9,449
J. W. Albrecht, Flanagan	9,362
John Woelfle, Secor	8,926
Ada M. Zimmerman, Eureka	8,472
Reuben Kennell, Roanoke	8,227
Raymond Hodel, Roanoke	8,068
James Brady, Gridley	7,844
Lyle White, Washburn	7,591
Leroy Fehr, Eureka	7,215
Lowell A. Crustius, El Paso	7,038
Harley Moser, Roanoke	6,957
Gerald Crump, Carlock	6,843
Walter E. Krug, El Paso	6,775
Roger W. Bachman, Metamora	6,468
Lloyd D. Schertz, Lowpoint	6,038
Kenneth Kennell, Benson	6,035
Walters S. Dyar, Metamora	6,011
Gilbert Kaufman, El Paso	5,984
Eugene Knoblauch, Washburn	5,803
Louis Vogel, Roanoke	5,115
Total (27)	291,880

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question or two. First, as have other Members, I commend the subcommittee for having done a generally fine job.

I had planned to offer an amendment on page 20 in an effort to clarify what are and what are not proper expenditures for ASC personnel, including county and community committeemen, attending so-called "shirt sleeve" rallies being held around the country by Secretary Freeman.

One of these meetings was held in the State of Kansas on April 19, 1967. The crowd was estimated to be about 1,600. Perhaps a rather high estimate, as it was a USDA estimate. Of the 1,600, 400 were ASC county and community committeemen, office managers or other ASCS employees. They were paid mileage and some, I understand, certain other expenses to attend this meeting. The total cost for attending this meeting, according to committee records, was $3,827.39. There were exactly 400 Federal people in the crowd, so that is about $10 per person to hear Secretary Freeman.

It is important for county committeemen and community committeemen, office managers and others to have certain information to properly administer farm programs. Let me remind the House, however, that this was not the purpose of the meeting. This may have been the announced purpose, but the purpose was, in the opinion of many, to bolster support for lagging administration farm programs. In the June 2 National Farmers Union Newsletter, there is a statement by Secretary Freeman in which he blasts critics of his farm programs. This occurred at "shirt sleeve" meetings, in Athens, Ga., and Alexandria, La. Because of the nature of the meetings, payment of expenses were not proper expenditures.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I say the gentleman from Kansas is on this committee, and I do not know any greater Americans or finer Members of Congress than my colleagues [Mr. DOLE and Mr. MICHEL]. I say the same thing with respect to my colleagues on this side. We certainly have not intended the money to be used in any type of political pressure or in any partisan nature. In an effort to try to see that such is not done, I would like to point out that in the report this year, the committee has this to say:

> Questions have been raised with the Committee as to the propriety of the actions of some of the employees of this agency in promoting certain programs of the Department. It is not unusual to have such complaints. However, attention is called to the provisions of Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 1913, which prohibit the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence Members of Congress in support of or in opposition to farm legislation or appropriation acts.

That is in the statute. In the bill before us, we tried to reach still further.

On page 20 we have the following provision:

> *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act shall be used (1) to influence the vote in any referendum; (2) to influence agricultural legislation, except as permitted in 18 U.S.C. 1913; or (3) for salaries or other expenses of members of county and community committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for engaging in any activities other than advisory and supervisory duties and delegated program functions prescribed in administrative regulations.

I realize it is mighty difficult in a bill or in a report to reach and to control things like this. In view of what the gentleman says, I am sure the committee will go into it, as it has occasion, and study the matter of too much travel funds for any type of purpose similar to that described.

As the gentleman knows, we have had to face this in season and out of season. Sometimes it is the county agent extension service, and sometimes the ASC. Certainly the committee is sound in not wishing funds to be used for partisan purposes.

Mr. DOLE. The section which the gentleman read, which does appear on page 20, does satisfy any objection I might have had.

Certainly I do not quarrel with anybody who may have attended this meeting but I cannot see any more justification for paying expenses of a committeeman or office manager to attend this type meeting, than for paying the expenses of others who attended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLE. Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I feel it is almost impossible for a county committeeman or a community committeeman or an ASC office manager, when he is more or less directed, or authorized, to attend a meeting where the Secretary will be present, not to do so. In some cases they feel it necessary to attend or at least they understand the urging to attend such a meeting is because Secretary Freeman will be present.

It makes no difference to me whether he may be a Republican or a Democrat occupying the Office of Secretary of Agriculture. If he is going around the country to shore up administration farm programs and condemn others that is one thing, but Federal funds should not be expended to make certain ASCS personnel attend.

I would guess that most of us could have a fair-sized rally if mileage and certain other expenses were paid. The point is that I believe it is clearly the intend of the subcommittee, as explained by the chairman, and of the committee to prohibit further expenditures of this kind.

I should like to take another minute to ask another question.

In the Food for Peace Act of 1966, section 406 of the act authorizes the sum of $33 million for what is known as a farmer-to-farmer program.

I testified before the subcommittee and recognized then that money was and is very tight. While I did not receive any money for the program, I did receive a little testimonial, on page 66 of the committee report, for which I am grateful.

I did point out that this program deserves serious consideration. I believe it is a well-known fact that this country simply cannot feed the world. We cannot afford it, and in fact, we cannot produce enough.

I believe it is time that we considered a program based on the transfer of practical American know-how and show-how.

It was said in our committee that one fault we have in America is that we send too many overdeveloped people to underdeveloped countries. The farmer-to-farmer program was designed, so that people with practical experience and practical training in agriculture could go to countries where the food needs are the greatest and where they can be of real service.

While I recognize the great job the committee has done, like most people with a personal interest I was hopeful there might be some small allocation made in the bill.

I have talked with my friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] about this program and know it was considered by him and the other members of the subcommittee.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, let me commend my colleague for his interest in this most important field not only to American agriculture but also to hungry people around the world.

The committee did discuss the farmer-to-farmer program. It was primarily the difficult budget situation we had with the many items requiring appropriations that prompted the decision. It seemed we could not go beyond the point we did during the course of this consideration.

As the report does point out, it certainly is a move that has worked well in this country. We might do well to give consideration to this program in the administration of future programs in foreign countries.

There are so many areas in which there are food shortages. I think the subcommittee had an exposure to this problem in their trip to Mexico last fall where we noted the extent to which American assistance has been helpful to them in their food production ability. They have gone from a food deficiency to a food surplus country. Therefore, in view of that, the committee is conscious of the worthy suggestion that the gentleman made. I hope that the future will hold a better use and funding for this program.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I think the gentleman made an excellent suggestion, as usual. We have to realize the main thrust of his suggestion should go not to the Committee on Appropriations but, rather, should go to the administration, the Great Society administration, which, not only in this field refuses to make budget requests but in another very similar case, that of the International Farm Youth Exchange, has refused to make adequate budget requests. For the International Farm Youth Exchange they included less money in the State Department budget than for the tour of the Woody Herman orchestra through Africa. This certainly does not make sense. Those of us aware of the importance of the people in agriculture who actually work on farms must emphasize over and over again the great worth to the underdeveloped countries of learning the techniques and know-how that only American farmers and farm people can impart to them.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the gentleman.

I might add that the farmer-to-farmer program had broad bipartisan support not only in our committee last year but in the Congress. We are hopeful that the budget situation will be a little easier next year, because we must face up to the world hunger problem which is nearly upon us. Many experts are talking now about widespread famine in India by 1975. I do not believe, we can turn our backs on hunger and further believe the "farmer-to-farmer" program can help prevent such a tragedy if not delayed too long.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-four Members are present, not a qorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 118]

Ashbrook
Ayres
Baring
Battin
Bell
Bray
Clark
Dickinson
Diggs
Dorn
Edwards, Calif.
Esch
Fisher
Halleck
Hanna
Hawkins
Holifield
Ichord
Jacobs
Kluczynski
Long, La.
Morton
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Pool
Resnick
Rooney, N.Y.
Ruppe
St. Onge
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Udall
Williams, Miss.
Younger

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CORMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 10509, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 398 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, so many references have been made to the meetings in the Midwest that I believe a few brief comments may be in order to set the RECORD straight.

Following some political statements of some farm organization leaders in Des Moines about a week ago, I checked on this particular matter. They had said that the meetings were stacked by Government employees.

In Iowa, I can report to you, not one single thin dime was paid to a county or a community committeeman.

These are locally elected people, elected by the farmers, not under the employment of the Secretary of Agriculture. They are local leaders. It is natural they would go to a farm meeting in that area.

As a matter of fact, many, if not most of these people are Republicans in Iowa and the Midwest. If these were political meetings, they were Republican political meetings, because that is mostly who was there.

I understand that some expenses were erroneously paid in Kansas, but that is the only State. Other than that, expenses were not paid as alleged.

I doubted the wisdom of those meetings, but now I find that they were good in some ways. For years, you know, some self-appointed commodity groups and also some farm leaders in Washington obviously have been out of touch with their members on the farms. Some had to be out of touch because they disagreed with one another. They could not all be right.

Some of the Washington leaders simply had gone political. They had become subsidiaries of political interests or special interest groups other than agriculture.

Many attending those Midwest meetings were strong critics of Freeman and of the administration. What got under some of the farm leaders' skin was, when they asked how many were for the Farm Bureau Curtis farm bill, only about one out of 100 held up his hand. This irritated them, in view of the fact that they had more members than that there.

Farmers remember the period of 1953 to 1960. During that period—and I will take the December figures—corn dropped from $1.50 a bushel down to 91 cents a bushel. That is a drop of 45 percent. By last December, it crawled back up to $1.29. That is an increase of 45 percent.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In just 1 second I will.

So it is interesting to me to note those who opposed the Secretary of Agriculture most in complaining about these prices have been the ones who have done the most to prevent the prices from climbing back up. In fact, some of them even voted against the feed grains program. That is the ultimate in being against farm prices improving. But for that feed grains program, $8 billion worth of feed grains would have been raised on diverted acres. You can't make me believe that extra production would not have hurt farm prices. We should remember that most of the new programs in the last few years that are funded in this bill are for nonfarm purposes such as water and sewers, affecting not only the Midwest but especially the small towns in the Northeast.

They include more meat inspectors, and consumer activities of various kinds. Criticism directed at ridiculing farmers for this increased employment is simply not just, because the programs are to help the nonfarmers. It is unfair and is antifarmer. This is a consumer bill as well as a farmer bill. It is a good bill and I urge its support.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I think the gentleman will agree that Secretary Freeman should not call public meetings and then authorize payment of expenses to anyone attending those meetings. That is the point I was making.

I want to add, however, that now the farmer receives only about 72 percent of parity, which certainly is not very good.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Part of this is because we changed the farm program in 1963 so that instead of taking the corn into the Commodity Credit Corporation and selling it at a loss, we are just making a direct payment to the farmer which is not reflected in the parity figures. That, of course, is not comparable to anything that we had in previous years. And the CCC appropriation is reduced $2 billion from last year.

Mr. DOLE. I think we will both agree it is not the purpose of this bill to appropriate money to pay the expenses of anyone to attend meetings in order to hear Secretary Freeman talk.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is right. And it is the policy of the Department not to make such payments. I understand a few were erroneously made in Kansas City.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, we all recognize the difficult task faced by members of the Appropriations Committee in view of our fiscal situation. The committee is to be commended for its responsibility in attempting to place first things first.

In regard to the budget for the Agricultural Research Service I note that a number of worthy projects were recognized by the committee as having unusual merit even though it was not possible to earmark funds for them.

However, the committee did make an added $2 million available for contingency operations to be used at the discretion of the Administrator. I am particularly concerned about the need for dependable tests to assist dairy farmers to detect and control mastitis. Dairying is an important source of livelihood to many of the farmers in my area. Not only are these dairy farmers caught in a price-cost squeeze today, they face increasing competition from cheap imports from foreign countries and now to have their permits to sell milk canceled because of the lack of research information from USDA would literally be the last straw.

The problem at hand has particular urgency since Federal and State public health officials indicate strict enforcement of a new mastitis control program effective July 1, 1970. The basic problem stems from the fact that there are numerous tests for screening abnormal milk. However, scientists in USDA who have been studying the methodology concerned with these tests and some university scientists agree that these tests are not reliable for obtaining results that are uniform and consistent. Therefore, there is much to be done in the field of methodology in working out a satisfactory test for the detection of mastitis. One ray of hope is that the enforcement officials have appointed a special committee to follow the progress of the program and report back at a 1969 meeting of the Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments. Thus, it is possible that the enforcement phases might be modified before 1970—if research is being conducted or if results are available by that time.

If we are to avoid widespread economic loss to dairy farmers throughout the country, it is imperative that the Administrator of ARS begin now to solve the problem of a reliable and accurate testing program for mastitis. I hope that he will use a portion of the contingency funds made available in this bill to initiate this much needed work.

I am sure that the statement by Mr. Robert H. North before the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee amplifies this point and I include with these remarks along with an article from Hoard's Dairyman:

Gentlemen, members of the committee, my name is Robert H. North. I am executive vice president of the Milk Industry Foundation, a trade association of milk plant operators that process and distribute fluid milk and fluid milk products in every state of the union. We are here today to plead for assistance on a problem that has now become acute and which will seriously affect the dairy farmers of this nation.

We realize that this is an eleventh hour appeal, however we did not believe the regulatory officials of the country would begin instituting enforcement programs for the control of abnormal milk between now and July 1, 1970.

To give you some idea of the scope of the problem, the National Mastitis Council, a voluntary group to which this organization contributes support, composed of dairy farm representatives, processors of milk, and regulatory people engaged in the control of mastitis and abnormal milk, has estimated that the loss through mastitis and abnormal milk annually is 12 billion pounds of milk. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has estimated that it costs the American dairy farmers somewhere between 350 and 500 million dollars annually in direct loss in animal and milk production. Additionally the dairy farmers are thought to spend an estimated 250 million dollars annually for drugs and veterinarian fees. This makes the total bill something between 600 million and 750 million dollars—a bill now being absorbed by dairy farmers in our 50 states! The time pressures in the problem arise out of the fact that the U.S. Public Health Service develops for adoption by the various states, municipalities and other political subdivisions, a Pasteurized Milk Ordinance.

The latest edition, the 1965 Pasteurized Milk Ordinance, calls for, in a general statements, the control of mastitic and abnormal milk.

There is in existence an organization known as the interstate Milk Shippers Conference. It is a cooperative state—U.S. Public Health Service program under which sources of milk are certified for interstate shipment. The Conference itself is designed to promote the free movement of wholesome milk between the states and other political subdivisions. In the Conference, the state regulatory officials from each state vote in the plenary sessions to adopt programs and procedures which become part of the reciprocity agreements. Industry has no vote in the plenary sessions.

Sometime ago, the Conference organized a committee on abnormal milk. It prepared a report calling for a control program consisting of three phases—a screening phase, a partial control phase to begin as soon as adopted by the Conference and the states, and on July 1, 1970, enforcement measures whereby farmers with high leucocyte counts would lose their permits to sell milk to approved plants when they had three high counts exceeding a certain numerical limitation out of five samples.

It was the position of industry that, instead of penalizing the farmer who may have high counts, programs should be initiated to help him reduce the incidence of high counts and incidence of mastitis. We do not wish to get into a technical discussion here, but mastitis and high leucocyte counts are not synonymous. However, the results in either case are very disastrous to potential dairy farm income. In our estimation the one and only source where we can get assistance is the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Department has the resources and expertise in this field. As a matter of fact, some landmark work has been done in a minor way in studies conducted by ARS.

To pinpoint the real problems, there are numerous tests for screening abnormal milk. Five of them have been listed in the committee's report on abnormal milk of the Interstate Milk Shippers Conference. However, scientists that are studying the methodology carefully within the Department and in some of the universities, seem agreed that we do not, as yet, have tests that are reliable for getting results that are reproducible or uniform. Information has been published in the scientific journals which is confusing and conflicting. All of these tests are compared against the direct microscopic leucocyte count and no scientific group has satisfactorily standardized or established the limit of accuracy and precision of the direct examination. Therefore, there is much to be done in the field of methodology alone. We have raised the question with the regulatory officials—how can you have a fair enforcement program when it is based on tests which are not above suspicion?

The second phase of the program would be to develop, after a study of the factors that are leading to high counts control programs of a practical nature that the farmer can participate in under supervision on his own farm to avoid these high counts, the threat of a loss of a shipping permit and, hence, the threat of economic disaster. There are many factors in the physiology of the cow in mechanical milking and other areas that may be causative insofar as high counts are concerned. This program should be one that is operated under controlled conditions in various sections of the country so these programs can be evaluated as to their efficacy.

With the Federal assistance that is available through the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the field, such as Federal veterinarians, agricultural engineers and others at the State level, programs could be developed to abate mastitis and reduce high leucocyte counts.

Following this type of control program evaluation, we would hope that there would be developed a proposed uniform mastitis abatement program. Industry would then propose to the Interstate Milk Shippers Conference and regulatory people that they use this program of assistance rather than rely solely on punitive system of permit suspension in order to abate mastitis and abnormal milk.

SUMMARY

In view of the tremendous economic loss to the American dairy farmer, this would be one of the most constructive things for the dairy industry that could be done through the Department. Because of the adoption of the target date for enforcement program, the studies would have to be initiated at once.

The Department of Agriculture has the resources, the expertise and relationship with State experiment stations in order to carry out research on a control program. It is our understanding that the Department does not have funds to start this work immediately. We are also advised that under normal procedures, this probably would not be considered for inclusion in the budget until 1969, the year in which a report must be made to the Interstate Milk Shippers Conference if the enforcement program is to be modified to an assistance program rather than punishment for the dairy farmer.

While we realize this is an unusual procedure, we are in an unusual and unhappy situation. The farmer is the pawn in this game. He has had nothing to say about the kinds of enforcement programs or the dates of their initiation. He is at the mercy of a screening program to be followed by enforcement which is inadequate. While some meager attempts have been made to evolve methods of reducing mastitis and abnormal milk, no comprehensive program has ever been put together to attack the problems so broadly as to have some hope of success.

We plead with this committee to examine the emergency nature of this situation and to provide for the needed assistance as soon as possible.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this committee.

[From Hoard's Dairyman, May 10, 1967]

MASTITIS CRACKDOWN ORDERED BY SANITARIANS—MIAMI MEETING REVERSES NATIONAL MASTITIS COUNCIL; SETS JULY 1, 1970, AS CUTOFF DATE FOR DAIRYMEN SHIPPING "ABNORMAL" MILK

In a stormy session at Miami Beach in early April, the National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments put its stamp of approval on an "abnormal milk program" calling for farmers to meet definite requirements or their Grade A milk cannot move interstate.

The conference, made up of official representatives of state departments of health and agriculture, thus rejected the counsel of the National Mastitis Council, which voted 19 to 11 in February against cutting farmers off a market on the basis of a screening or "indicator" test (Hoard's Dairyman, March 25 issue).

Though the conference is now on record for the cutoff, it will establish a special committee to follow the progress of the program and report back to the 1969 meeting of the organization. Thus, it is possible that the Phase III, or cutoff portion, of the plan might be modified before it goes into effect July 1, 1970.

Before approving the report of an 11-man committee headed by Dr. John Herrick, Iowa State University, the conference also raised the cutoff level from 1 million leukocytes to 1½ million. In addition, it rejected a requirement for signed statements from milking machine servicemen and veterinarians following inspections required by the health officers.

The program is divided into three different phases with different dates or deadlines set for each phase:

PHASE I—EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1967

The agreements of the National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments state, in Section 11A.5 that "effective July 1, 1967, laboratory examinations or screening procedures for the presence of unwholesome, altered mammary secretions, whether of an inflammatory, infectious physiological or environmental origin, in raw milk for pasteurization shall be made at the same frequency as specified for bacteriological tests in the milk sanitation standard specified in Section 1.A.2. The official indicator test shall be conducted by an approved laboratory utilizing the official indicating tests for the detection of abnormal milk published by the USPHS and subjected to the State Laboratory Certification Program.

"PHASE II—EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1968

"After July, 1968, only those interstate milk shippers that are certified to be following an indicating test program shall be listed in the quarterly publication, 'Sanitary Compliance and Enforcement Ratings of Interstate Milk Shippers.'

"It is recommended that the U.S. Public

Health Service adopt official laboratory indicating test(s) for the detection of abnormal milk and that such test(s) be published by the U.S. Public Health Service and subjected to the State Laboratory Certification Program.

"After this date, when a herd milk sample tested by an approved laboratory indicates the presence of 1,500,000 or more leukocytes per milliliter, the following procedure shall be followed:

"a. A warning letter shall be sent to the producer notifying him of the high leukocyte count. The letter also shall list the principal causes of excess leukocyte counts.

"b. Following the second consecutive indicating test indicating a raw milk count of 1,500,000 or more leukocytes per milliliter, an inspection shall be made by an official sanitarian or a person designated by him.

"c. A third herd milk sample shall be taken after a lapse of three days. If this sample also indicates a leukocyte count of 1,500,000 or more per milliliter, the milk regulatory authority shall, if he deems it necessary, require producer to:

"1. Have equipment analyzed by a milking equipment serviceman.

"2. Have individual animals examined by a veterinarian. Those cows producing abnormal milk shall be milked separately and the milk shall be withheld from milk supply.

"PHASE III—EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1970

"A penalty clause shall be added for noncompliance with leukocyte standards. Milk supplies having 1,500,000 or more leukocytes per milliliter on three out of five of the last tests and continued violations of applicable items of sanitation (1r and/or 14r) shall have their permit suspended and/or court action shall be taken in accordance with Section 3 and/or 6 of the Grade 'A' Pasteurized Milk Ordinance—1965 Recommendations of the U.S. Public Health Service; provided that leukocyte counts of 1,500,000 or more per milliliter shall not have been officially recorded nor penalty applied unless corroborated by the direct microscopic leukocyte count or the equivalent as published."

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that the committee report directs the Agriculture Research Service to review a forage project proposed by the scientists at the Ohio Research and Development Center in Wooster, Ohio, and recommends that it be given full and careful consideration for inclusion in the 1969 budget.

This is one of the most interesting and potentially most valuable research projects that has come to my attention recently.

The project grows out of a discovery by Ohio center scientists that the physical properties of forage determine its rate of movement through the digestive tract of the ruminant animals, which in turn determines the extent to which the animal may derive maximum value from its food.

Millions of dollars might be saved America's dairymen and cattle growers if methods can be devised to prepare forage so that the animals are able to extract all of the nutritive values in alfalfa and various grasses. This should mean savings in turn for American families and increased consumption of beef and dairy products.

The proposed project would have as its objective the development of a method of dehydrating legume or grass forage and a method of shipping, storing and feeding that will maintain the physical form needed for maximum digestibility in cattle.

As I have said, success in developing an integrated system of harvesting, processing and storing forage could mean millions of dollars in reduced feed costs to dairymen and beef producers throughout the Nation. The initial cost of the program, over a 3-year period, is expected to be approximately $130,000, a small investment indeed, when compared with the anticipated benefits. I hope that the ARS will use the funds provided in this bill to develop a justification for this project in the 1969 budget. My only regret is that it cannot be undertaken at once.

Mr. Chairman, this is only one of the many fascinating and immensely beneficial developments that have come from the Ohio Research and Development Center at Wooster. I have the highest regard for the director of the center, Roy M. Kottman, and for the distinguished men and women who work with him. I know of no investment of the Government of the United States that has yielded greater benefits and rewards per dollar spent than the money we have devoted to the Wooster research installation and the other fine agricultural experiment stations throughout the Nation.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Plant and animal disease and pest control: For operations and measures, not otherwise provided for, to control and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases and for carrying out assigned inspection, quarantine, and regulatory activities, as authorized by law, including expenses pursuant to the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended (21 U.S.C 114b–c), $84,028,000, of which $1,500,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the control of outbreaks of insects and plant diseases to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions: *Provided*, That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year that does not require minimum matching by any State of at least 40 per centum: *Provided further*, That, in addition, in emergencies which threaten the livestock or poultry industries of the country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in such emergencies for the arrest and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry, and for expenses in accordance with the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred under this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts;

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the other members of this committee, as well as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], on the minority side, for their very fine work and for a job well done, because certainly when we consider the problems of agriculture in this country and the costs that have been involved in their various programs over a great many years, it is no mean task for these gentlemen to be confronted with.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time specifically to direct a question or two to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] with reference to a matter of some considerable importance to some of us in the great State of California, and it has to do with some of the funds as contained in the bill for the research program of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to particularly compliment the committee for what I believe has been a good job.

Mr. Chairman, the contingency fund of the administrator of the research program has been increased from $1 million to $3 million. It would seem to me that this would give greater flexibility and provide for a more adequate opportunity to do a good job in the area of research.

Mr. Chairman, this is particularly true and is very vital and represents a continuing area of agricultural concern.

Mr. Chairman, I specifically would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] about the situation with reference to the pink bollworm. This, of course, has been a problem in the cotton industry for a great many years. It has become a vital and pressing problem in the State of California since it has caused substantial damage in the Imperial Valley last year and in other areas of the State of California, although it has not as yet been found in the San Joaquin Valley of California.

Mr. Chairman, of course all of us are interested in keeping this pest under control, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if the gentleman will comment upon what the committee proposes to do or has done with reference to the pink bollworm research and eradication program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] that in volume I of the explanatory notes of the budget of the Department of Agriculture, on page 121, there is a statement with reference to the pink bollworm and the problems caused thereby.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California has pointed out the fact that for many years this bollworm has been in existence in areas such as Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and other States. All of us are familiar with the tremendous amount of damage that it does when it comes up from Mexico. As the gentleman says, it does constitute a real threat to the cotton crops in these areas.

Mr. Chairman, in the last year or two it has become a real problem in the State of California; in fact, the explanatory notes say that it has been necessary to augment the program of the pink bollworm control in California with certain chemical controls during the past year and that 107,104 acres were treated in this fashion in California.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from California that the total funds carried in the bill for the control of the pink bollworm amount to $2,132,400.

But I can assure the gentleman from California that the Department of Agriculture will expend the money where the problem exists, and I certainly think that the gentleman's area is one where such efforts should be made.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his comments, because the State of California has just voted a 50-cent-a-bale levy upon growers in an effort to have them put up money of their own to try to help eradicate this pest, plus the fact that the State of California is putting one-half million dollars additional with which we hope to zero in on this particular problem.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment upon one other aspect of this particular appropriation bill, and this has reference to the Farmers Home Administration and specifically to the area of the self-help housing program.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program that I have had an opportunity to observe quite closely. I have been very much impressed with the job that has been done with the expenditure of a very small amount of money. There have been no grants involved directly in this program. This is a program where certain people fall within a certain category, and it is a very limited category because they have to have a very low income and yet have a sufficient income with which to meet their payments, because these loans are made by the Farmers Home Administration and they carry interest and require a great deal of effort on the part of a family in order to qualify. I say this particularly, Mr. Chairman, because in my area of California among the Mexican-American community they are utilizing this program to a very great extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, we all hear a great deal of criticism today, as indicated in the debates in this Chamber over the past few months, from many of our constituents who are concerned with Federal expenditures. These people, as well as some of my colleagues, are interested and desirous of cutbacks in those Federal programs which they classify as giveaway programs.

The program I speak of today does not by any stretch of the imagination fall into that category. I cannot see why any Member of this House, no matter what his political philosophy, should not be in full support of the expansion of the self-help housing program. There is a minimum of Federal involvement; the recipients provide their own labor; and it has proved successful over the past 3 years. Those eligible for these loans by statute are in rural areas. As we all recognize, these people have a great need for better housing.

Direct loans, at 4 percent, are available to those willing to help themselves. The Farmers Home Administration provides the loan, which averages $7,500 per house, for the land and construction material. In my area, technical assistance is provided by Self-Help Enterprises, which is funded under the Economic Opportunity Act. All members of the family work on the new home. Individuals from other applicant families, who possess particular talents, such as carpentry, plumbing and plastering, assist one another.

I firmly believe that this program is so successful primarily because of the fact that families have their own initiative, work, and motivation in these homes. Unfortunately, many of our housing programs are in the category of what some people refer to as handout or giveaway programs. We have seen some of our public housing wrecked and destroyed, apparently because of lack of any particular interest or concern on the part of the occupant. The families under the self-help program have great pride in their homes. They tend to take care of them, protect them, and keep them painted and clean in a way which I feel a home should be.

As you might imagine, the demand for these direct loans has increased during the 3 years the program has been in operation. The Farmers Home Administration deliberately started the program with a small sum—approximately $60,000 for fiscal 1965. The next year $700,000 was used. The $1.5 million appropriated for this year was allocated before February, and I have been informed by the Farmers Home Administration that an additional $2.5 million could have been used.

I feel that under this program a great many low-income people can be given better and improved housing. It represents a step out of poverty, while at the same time, providing these people with a feeling of self-dependence and a desire to do what is necessary to lift themselves from the poverty level.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would urge that my colleagues give serious consideration to an increase of approximately $3.5 million over the $1.5 million presently earmarked for this program.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take the time of the Committee, but this is a subject, as I say, that I have been very much interested in, and I would hope as the years go by we can make more flexible a program and funds available in a loan program to meet this need. I simply want to call to the attention of the Members of the Committee a picture which I have here indicating some of the problems we have in my area, and I am sure exist in some other areas, some shacks in the rural areas that certainly do not look very good. Unfortunately, we have too many of our farm people and particularly farm laborers living in this kind of a home.

Here is a family that found themselves qualified under this self-help house loan program, and through the help of their neighbors and family they went in and built a home.

Here is a very beautiful, modern home in which they take a great deal of pride. The average cost of these homes is something like $7,500, but a lot of blood, sweat, toil, and tears of these families, the children and the wives, have gone into the home, and they do take a great deal of pride in these homes.

We find them to be adequately landscaped and well cared for, painted, and kept up.

So, Mr. Chairman, as I say, I want to call the attention of the committee to this program in the hope that the committee may be more generous in the future. It is my understanding that as far as direct loans which would be 4-percent loans, there is provided only $1.5 million in the line items in the program. I feel this is totally inadequate. I do not propose to offer an amendment, but I would hope in the years to come we can demonstrate the great job that this particular program is doing, and we can receive additional funds for this program through the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses of the food stamp program pursuant to the Food Stamp Act of 1964, $180,000,000, to be provided from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), and in addition, $15,000,000 appropriated under this head in the "Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1967", may be transferred to and merged with this appropriation: *Provided*, That these funds shall become available for the food stamp program only upon the enactment of authorizing legislation: *Provided further*, That, in the event legislative authorization for the food stamp program is not enacted during the present session of Congress, such funds will remain available for surplus commodity purchases for direct distribution.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 17, lines 1 through 15, on the ground that appropriations for this food stamp program are not authorized for fiscal year 1968.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the committee acknowledges in its report that such authorizing legislation has not yet passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PARTICIPATION SALES AUTHORIZATION

The Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, is hereby authorized to issue beneficial interests or participations in such loan assets of the Farmers Home Administration direct loan account and rural housing direct loan account as may be placed in trust with such Association in accordance with section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, as amended, for the account of the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture, in addition to amounts heretofore authorized, in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed $800,000,000: *Provided*, That this authorization shall remain available until June 30, 1969.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. JONAS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 29, strike out lines 11 through 23.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I also have an amendment to the next section on page 30 of the bill to strike that out entirely, which would naturally fall of its own weight if this amendment is adopted, and I think it would be appropriate to consider the two amendments together, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 30, strike out lines 1 through 8.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I have offered a similar amendment on other bills this year, but I have not in each instance tried to strike out the entire authorization. I do it in this case because the record is clear that the Farmers Home Administration does not plan to use the $800 million for financing any of its loan programs.

As a matter of fact, the committee makes that very clear in its report, and I congratulate the committee on its frankness in giving the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, which has this bill under consideration today, the correct information indicating that this $800 million is to be used by the administration to pay the ordinary expenses of the Government. That is just one of the reasons why those of us who were opposed to this program in the beginning did oppose it. Because we do not think the proceeds from the sale of participation certificates should be used to pay general and ordinary expenses of running the Government.

There is an argument as to whether this is actually a sale or a special way of borrowing money. If it is a borrowing tactic or gimmick, then I submit it is the most expensive method that can be used to borrow money, because the subsidy involved in this case is 1.66 percent. That amounts to $13,268,000. If these certificates are outstanding for 10 years, that means we will be paying out $132,680,000 in subsidy, or $265,360,000 if they are outstanding for 20 years.

I do not think we can afford to pay a subsidy of 1.66 percent for borrowed money.

But if it is not a loan and if it is a sale of an asset, as has been alleged, then I submit to this Committee that we ought not to sell capital assets and use the proceeds to pay the operating expenses of the Federal Government.

That is like selling a share of stock to raise money to pay your house rent. It is like cashing in a savings account to pay your grocery bill. When you operate that way, you are liquidating your capital assets and consuming the proceeds in operating expenses. I do not think that is a sound way to run a railroad or a government. If this is a sale of capital assets, as the proponents contend, then the proceeds surely should be used to reduce the national debt. Certainly a part of this debt was incurred to make the loans involved, and it seems to me that if the loans are disposed of the proceeds should be applied to reduce that debt.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I hope the Committee will defeat the amendment. I see the matter somewhat differently from the sponsor, the gentleman from North Carolina. We tried to be completely candid in our report. The $800 million consists of notes and other instruments of indebtedness that are presently held by the Farmers Home Administration for loans and advances that it has made in its various programs.

Some time ago the Congress voted to authorize the sale of participation certificates which are backed up by these notes. It is the belief of the Committee that the proceeds from the sale of these notes, which the Government now holds, will not be necessary to finance the programs in the bill. But involved here is the question of Government policy to which the Congress agreed some time ago—and, may I say, at that time I did not happen to vote for that legislation. But the Congress agreed that, with respect to obligations which the Government has incurred for Government operations in its various programs, instead of borrowing more money at the bank or selling more Treasury certificates, they would cash in on some of the instruments that they already held.

So, while the gentleman from North Carolina says that we are selling something that we have in order to pay current expenses, I would express it in this way: You are selling some of the instruments that you have, to keep from going across the street and borrowing more money from the bank. That is exactly what it is. So, with the sale of these participation certificates, we finance these obligations.

In the final analysis the question arises: Shall we cash in some of the assets that we have or shall we borrow more money? It is as simple as that.

The committee felt that since the Congress had spoken and had declared that this was a governmental policy, that the Participation Certificates could be sold and the money used to run the government instead of borrowing additional sums over and above what we already owed. The committee felt that we ought to go along with the policy since that law had been passed. For that reason we followed the budget recommendation.

Though these funds may not be necessary to operate programs in this bill, it is quite apparent that they will be needed to operate other programs of the government unless we borrow more money through normal channels.

Another factor to keep in mind is that, if the certificates now held by the Farmers Home Administration are sold, the money realized will be credited on the books to the Farmers Home Administration. For that reason, and since the Congress has spoken and fixed the policy of the government, I trust that the Committee will back our committee as we have backed the policy of the Government which was established some time ago.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONAS) there were—ayes 54, noes 65.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JONAS and Mr. WHITTEN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 102, noes 104.

So the amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DIRECT LOAN ACCOUNT

Direct loans and advances under subtitles A and B, and advances under section 335(a) for which funds are not otherwise available, of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 (7 U.S.C. 1921), as amended, may be made from funds available in the Farmers Home Administration direct loan account as follows: real estate loans, $110,000,000; and operating loans, $300,000,000.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment I wanted to offer to this bill, but I have been told they are not sure it is germane. I may have to wait and offer it to the foreign aid bill.

What I was going to propose, since I am sure that when the war is over in the Middle East the Arab Nations will all be wanting some surplus grains again, was that we make a trade with Israel. I thought it would be nice if we could trade them about 400 F-111 planes for that one-eyed general, and send him to Vietnam, and we could solve our problem about like he is solving theirs.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Does the gentleman not believe that to be fair we owe them a little more than that? They need their general.

Mr. HAYS. I am a great fellow to get the best bargain I can. I was going to start with 400 F-111's, and if we had to we could go higher, because he probably is worth it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAYS. I yield, but do not get me too high. You will ruin my deal.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I just wanted to know if the Secretary of Defense ought to be thrown in on the bargain? I do not believe our generals are the problem.

Mr. HAYS. I must say the gentleman has a little different opinion, apparently, of the Secretary of Defense from mine. I think he has done a great job.

If we have an objective in Vietnam and if we know what it is and if we can get a fellow out here who can carry it out I am optimistic that we have the men and material out there to do it.

I believe this General Dayan is the one who could do it. I would just like to get him away from the Israeli and put him in charge of our Marines.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RURAL RENEWAL

For necessary expenses, including administrative expenses, in carrying out rural renewal activities under section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010, 1011(e)), $1,200,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to speak out of order.)

ASTRONAUT EDWARD J. GIVENS, JR.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, it is with deep regret that I bring to the attention of the House the death early this morning of Astronaut Edward J. Givens, Jr. The tragedy is compounded and made ironic by the fact that Major Givens was killed in an automobile accident—he becomes another statistic in the record of the horrifying slaughter that occurs on the roads of the United States each year.

Major Givens was another splendid example of the outstanding young men who are serving in our manned space flight program. He was a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy in 1952 who joined the Air Force and received his flight training at the U.S. Air Force Flight Training Command. In 1954 he was a flight commander and fighter pilot with the 35th Fighter Interceptor Group in Japan.

He was accepted at the U.S. Air Force Experimental Test Pilot School at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., in 1958, and graduated with distinction, receiving the outstanding graduate certificate.

His next several assignments included duties as instructor and as project officer on new aircraft development programs. He attended the U.S. Air Force Aerospace Research Pilot School, from which he graduated in 1963. Shortly afterward he was selected for astronaut training by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and was assigned to the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston.

Major Givens was a man of high professional achievement. He was a leader of that new breed of Americans who are highly trained and schooled through broad experience in the science and technologies vital to the success of our manned space flight program. He personally—as well as his outstanding abilities—will be sorely missed.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that you, as well as the other Members, join with me in extending to Mrs. Givens, their children, and the family of Major Givens the profound sympathy and condolences of the House of Representatives in their hour of sorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 32, line 11, strike the figures "151".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a pro forma committee amendment. By some inadvertence the figure "151" is carried in the middle of page 32. It has no connection with anything. Its deletion will not destroy or change anything. It just has no purpose there. This bill was proofread half a dozen times, but by some manner this figure got in there. Therefore, I ask that my amendment be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Nothing in this Act shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided*, That not to exceed $31,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That $945,000 of this authorization shall be available only to expand and strengthen the sales program of the Corporation pursuant to authority contained in the Corporation's charter: *Provided further*, That not less than 7 per centum of this authorization shall be placed in reserve to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for use only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided further*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. M'DADE

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McDADE: On page 34, line 2, after the colon insert the following: "*Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used for the payment of salaries or expenses for processing or administering aggregate price support and land retirement payments of more than $1,471,000,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Is the gentleman from Mississippi offering a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. He is reserving the right to make a point of order at the conclusion of your statement.

Mr. WHITTEN. I was trying not to cut the gentleman off from discussing his amendment. I expect to make the point of order later, but at this point I am reserving it so that the gentleman might discuss it.

Mr. McDADE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, this amendment is neither complex nor complicated.

Through it, I am making an effort to do only one thing, and that is, to make the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture responsible to the Members of this House when it comes to those programs involving price support payments and land diversion payments.

Mr. Chairman, the manner in which this program is presently being operated permits the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture to proceed, under borrowing authority to carry out the program. The result is that this program is not subject to this House or to the approval of the members of the Committee on Appropriations in one iota.

Mr. Chairman, all I am proposing to do in this amendment is to say to the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, "When you submitted your budget to this House, you said you would spend $1,417 million on these programs."

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to say, "Spend no more, unless you want to come back to the Committee on Appropriations and to this House and obtain further authorization to do so by way of supplemental appropriations, but under the control of the House of Representatives."

So, Mr. Chairman, everyone who is in favor of making the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture responsive to this body will support this amendment and stop him from using the procedure which he now has which involves a backdoor spending approach to the Department of the Treasury, an operation over which each and every one of us has absolutely no control.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill. I would like to cite the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, which provide as follows:

The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to cooperators for any crop of any basic agricultural commodity, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such crop, at a level not in excess of 90 per centum of the parity price of the commodity nor less than the level provided in subsections (a), (b), and (c) as follows: * * *

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a Corporation. This Corporation was set up as such so that it could buy and sell in its own right. The law providing for the setting up of this Corporation provided that the Secretary was directed to take these various actions.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] would attempt to provide that the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture could not carry out this directive of law, for, in pursuance of this directive as contained in the law, the Secretary has acted and entered into these contracts much in excess of $1,471 million. In order to insure against the type of attack that is made upon the price support program in this proposed amendment, the Congress in the Corporation Control Act provided that:

> Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with the initiation, operation and administration of the agricultural price support program and no funds (other than funds for administrative expenses) available for price support, surplus removal, and available under section 612(c) of Title 7, with respect to agricultural commodities shall be subject to apportionment pursuant to this section.

So, Mr. Chairman, when these corporations were brought under the control of the Congress it was carefully provided that nothing in that act gave Congress the right to interfere with their price support functions. Prior to that time the control was limited only to the charters of the corporations.

Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully submit to the members of the Committee that this language here does not say, "First come, first served." The amendment would require a determination as to which producer will get this money and which producer will not.

Mr. Chairman, may I repeat again the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation was set up as a corporation, free and independent, with the right to buy and sell under the various other authorities granted in its charter.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress, after a period of years, provided that we should have some supervision over the Corporation. But in the act it said that nothing in this section shall be used for the purpose of impeding the Corporation in carrying out its price-support obligation.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDade] is in contradiction of the established law. For that reason, it would in effect repeal a law and therefore would represent legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I do. I shall confine my remarks to, not the merits of the bill, but simply to the question of the point of order.

I quote first from Cannon's Procedures:

> The House in Committee of the Whole has the right to refuse to appropriate for any object, either in whole or in part, even though that object may be authorized by law. That principle of limitation has been sustained so repeatedly that it may be regarded as a part of the parliamentary law of the Committee of the Whole.

Quoting further:

> Of course in appropriating for any object the House may describe the object. If it is a ship, the length, breadth, material, etc., may be specified with any degree of definiteness; provided that none of these specifications violates an existing law. If a law forbids the construction of ships over 300 feet long, an appropriation for a ship 400 feet long would violate existing law and be against the express words of the rule. But having appropriated for a definitely described object, competency of the appropriation bill as a means of legislation ceases, except for the power to prescribe limitations. Thus the power of limitation is solely a negative power, capable of setting up a barrier, and not a positive power, capable of creative functions. The appropriation may interfere with Executive discretion only in a negative way. It may decline to appropriate for ships to be built in a navy yard by saying that no part of the appropriation shall be used for that purpose. These negative prohibitions are within the power of the appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would further like to quote from Hinds' "Precedents," volume IV, paragraph 4005, which states:

> 4005. An amendment that no part of the appropriation for the Army should be available for an army of over a certain size was held to be a limitation.—On January 11, 1905, the Army appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, when the first paragraph was read, as follows:
>
> "*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the following sums be, and they are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the support of the Army for the year ending June 30, 1906."
>
> To this paragraph Mr. John S. Little, of Arkansas, offered an amendment:
>
> "Add, after the word 'six,' in line 6, page 1, the following proviso:
>
> "'*Provided, however,* That no part of the moneys appropriated in this act shall be expended for the support and maintenance of more than 30,000 men, including officers and enlisted men.'"
>
> Mr. John A. T. Hull, of Iowa, made the point of order that the amendment would change the existing law, in that it would reduce the size of the Army.
>
> After debate, the Chairman held:
>
> "The Chair would state to the gentleman from Iowa that this amendment appears to be drawn in conformity with a number of precedents in the form of limitations. Careful examination discloses the fact that this amendment does not in terms cut down the number of officers or enlisted men in the Army, but simply limits the appropriation in this bill to a certain number of officers and men. It is quite clear to the Chair that the officers and enlisted men who are not provided for in this bill would have a clear claim against the United States Government for their services; but it also seems to the Chair that this amendment is in the form of such a limitation as has been held not to be subject to a point of order, and that the amendment therefore should be left to the vote of the committee."

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the precedents are clearly in accord with providing amendments to any such limitations in appropriation bills. It seems clear to me that this amendment does that, and I submit the amendment is in order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that this section which I read happened to be in the Antideficiency Act. There are two provisions that have the same effect.

But let me repeat.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was created as a Corporation under the laws of Delaware. It was created as a Corporation so that it could buy and sell and carry out and discharge all the duties and rights of action that any corporation can.

That was the intent of the Congress under its charter. Then we passed the Antideficiency Act and we passed the Corporation Control Act, both of which I read to you awhile ago. The section of the law does not leave any discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture. It says "He shall" in the section of the law that I read to you.

When the Government Corporation which had complete freedom in this area was brought within the surveillance of these acts, under the Antideficiency Act as I said awhile ago, it says, "Nothing in this act shall prevent the carrying out of price control obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation."

The Corporation Control Act carries the following provision in section 849.

> The provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing government corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law nor as affecting the provisions of section 831y of title 16.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that with respect to all the arguments made here today with reference to the limitations of the appropriation amounts involved here, as to whether you can tie the hands of a corporation in that manner, the Congress clearly said "No" in two instances—you cannot.

We do not make appropriations for the administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. We fix a limit on what part of its own funds it can use.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that to overrule this point of order would destroy the efforts of this Congress to see that there should be no impediment to the price support programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Corman). The Chair is ready to rule.

After listening to the arguments on both sides, it is the opinion of the Chair that the law cited by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] is applicable in this case, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Findley: On page 34, line 18, after the word "hereof" strike the period and insert the following: "*Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to formulate or carry out price support or commodity programs during the period ended June 30, 1968, under which the total amount of payments in excess of $25,000 would be made to any single recipient as (1) incentive payments, (2) diversion payments, (3) price support payments, (4) wheat marketing certificate payments, (5) cotton equalization payments, (6) cropland adjustment payments, and (7) compliance payments."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] is recognized.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment that I have offered would, one might say, set a new poverty guideline for one section of our country and would set it at a $25,000-a-year level.

It is intended to recognize the curious fact that commodity programs involve tremendous payments to some individuals.

For example, under the sugar program there are direct payments to producers which come to the tidy sum of approximately $1 million a year in a few cases.

Under the cotton program there are equalization payments that run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars and even as high as a million dollars a year.

In the material that I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, there are listed payments under the diversion and price support programs for wheat and feed grains in the State of Illinois. You will find that they fall considerably short of the $25,000 level with a few lone exceptions. We are not exactly in the million-dollar-a-year Treasury payments class.

It is high time we take some steps to bring this monstrosity which is represented by the commodity programs under control, and it is my suggestion that we start by putting a ceiling of $25,000 on the aggregate amount which any single person, corporation, or business firm can receive from all of these various sources.

The present appropriation bill provides about $3.3 billion in payments of various sorts, and I am sure that most Americans will not object at all to payments which go on a moderate level to individual farmers.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, the $25,000 limitation would be in the aggregate for all payments of whatsoever nature that a farmer might receive.

Mr. FINDLEY. The seven types that I have enumerated, which would be payments from the Government under its programs.

Mr. GATHINGS. You would total them, and the total could not go over $25,000.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is correct. I feel that when they get $25,000 of the U.S. Treasury that ought to be plenty.

Mr. GATHINGS. Suppose they have signed up for three programs. If the funds that they would receive would total $26,000, then they could not receive more than $25,000?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes. In that circumstances the ASC office would have the responsibility of cutting off payments at the $25,000 level. It would not destroy the programs. It would simply disqualify any single person from getting more than $25,000 a year from the Treasury.

Mr. GATHINGS. What if a man is depending upon receiving $50,000 in the aggregate? You would cut the amount he would receive in half. Then what would he do?

Mr. FINDLEY. I would suggest that the man really ought to look to other sources than the U.S. Treasury for his livelihood, at least that portion of his livelihood reaching above $25,000.

Mr. GATHINGS. What you are saying is that you are opposed to the act that was put on the statute books by this Congress.

Mr. FINDLEY. I tell you that this is one great feature which I think is objectionable. I am glad to have the gentleman clarify that point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Here is an opportunity for those who claim to be interested in the family-size farm. I do not see how anyone can possibly quarrel with a $25,000 limitation to farmers for participation in these Government programs. I do not see how anyone can oppose this amendment if they believe, as they say they do, in the small farmer and the maintenance of the small farmer.

Mr. FINDLEY. I would say to the gentleman that I am not wedded to the $25,000 figure. If some Member wishes to offer an amendment to bring it lower, I would be glad to support such an amendment.

Mr. GROSS. The only trouble with the gentleman's amendment is that it is somewhat high. If I had my "druthers." I would cut it down. However, I support the amendment and urge its approval.

Mr. FINDLEY. If the gentleman sees fit to offer an amendment to the amendment, I assure him that I would give it my enthusiastic support.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against the amendment. While the gentleman's amendment applies to a number of things that might be tied to appropriations in the bill, the amendment will stand or fall on all of its provisions. As I pointed out earlier, the Commodity Credit Corporation was set up as a corporation with certain rights and powers. Later it was brought under surveillance, and under both acts which brought it under congressional surveillance it was provided that—

> Nothing in this act of surveillance shall interfere with the operations of the Corporation in maintaining price supports.

If you read the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois, you will see that item 3 states, "Price support payments may not exceed $25,000." So that language clearly would interfere with price support payments and would repeal the two acts that I mentioned. It would, to that extent, change the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Some of the other provisions in the amendment might be in order, but if you look at provision No. 3, it states:

> None of the funds in this bill may be used for payments in excess of $25,000 for price support payments.

So it comes clearly within the arguments that I made on the other point of order with respect to the amendment to limit total expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that the point of order on the amendment should be upheld.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment comes clearly within the Holman rule. It is negative. It represents a retrenchment. It designates things for which funds may not be spent.

I would call the attention of the Chair to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 9, page 11656.

On that occasion the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] offered an amendment which had almost the same, almost the precise language—the substantive phrases at least. The Chair overruled the point of order made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. So I do believe this is very much in order and in keeping with previous amendments of the same sort.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

On January 26, 1965, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Harris, was in the chair when a similar amendment was offered to a bill appropriating funds to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Chair ruled that the proposed amendment was a limitation that applied only to the appropriations carried in the bill before the Committee at that time. The Chair therefore overruled the point of order.

Also, on May 18, 1959, when the Committee of the Whole had under consideration the Agriculture Department appropriation bill, which included funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation, an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Avery, which provided that "no funds appropriated in this section shall be used to process a Commodity Credit loan which is in excess of $50,000." That amendment was held to be a limitation and in order by the Chairman, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Kilday.

The Chair holds that the amendment is a limitation and, therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that while I come from a rural area, none of the people in my district receive any of these payments. I would like to point out to my distinguished colleagues here—especially to those from the cities, who are puzzled, let us say, by the workings of the farm legislation—that if this amendment is passed, that is the end of the farm program as we know it today. It is that simple.

We can hear all kinds of stories and they will give us all kinds of figures, but basically the farm program is going to be completely dismantled. The family farmer, together with the corporate farmer, is going to be wiped out, and we are going to return to the depression days of 1933. This is what this amendment will do. Because it is phrased very cleverly. It seems like a wonderful thing, but I can only say that with this limitation on the amount of commodities, on cotton or whatever it is, that can be grown, we are going to have just complete chaos.

I would like to point out—and I will yield in just a moment to my distinguished friend from Iowa—that when I was on the House Committee on Agriculture as I recall, the gentleman from Illinois voted against every piece of farm legislation and as far as I know he did it before I got on the committee.

So we ought to look at what this amendment will propose. If there is one thing that I am trying to do on the Committee on Agriculture, that is to try to protect the family farmer. I do not believe that this legislation will protect the family farmer and it will just throw the entire farming community into chaos.

So I ask all of my colleagues, especially those from the cities who are confused, to believe this amendment is very bad, and to please join me in voting it down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman being a nonfarmer——

Mr. RESNICK. That is not true. I would like to keep the record straight. I am a farmer. I was born and brought up on a farm.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman really does not believe what he is saying, does he, that to put a limitation of $25,000 on subsidies to individual farmers is going to gut the farm program? The gentleman does not really believe that.

Mr. RESNICK. I believe that, sir; as much as anything in my life. I know what happens when a farm program is thrown into chaos. We see it today when we have overproduction in items not covered by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as far as this family farmer is concerned, is it not true that if the family farmer would have to make the total adjustment, he would not have as many acres to farm as he does today? What this amendment would do is to prevent the farmer with the large acreage from making enough adjustments so the family farmer does not need to reduce acreage so much.

This will make his income even less. This is an antifamily farmer amendment, pure and simple.

Mr. RESNICK. Absolutely. I would like to point out to my friends again that the family farmer of yesterday, of 10 or 25 acres, is gone. The family farmer of today has a farm which consists of 300 or 400 or 500 acres. We have big machines and a lot of equipment. They need a lot of acreage in order to work it.

I stand on my original statement. This will simply gut the whole farm program.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHERLE. I certainly appreciate the remarks made by the gentleman from New York. I believe I am one of the few actual dirt farmers in the House Chamber.

I doubt sincerely that this will gut the farm program. I know that these payments are made to the farmers for participation. I know it is a part of the present program. But in no sense of the word is the farmer of the last 20 years——

Mr. RESNICK. If the gentleman will yield for a question, I should like to ask how many acres he farms?

Mr. SCHERLE. I farm 980 acres.

Mr. RESNICK. Does the gentleman consider himself a family farmer?

Mr. SCHERLE. Yes, I do.

Mr. RESNICK. That is the point. I believe the gentleman made the point right there, that this is the kind of acreage one needs. This is why the limitation is going to put the so-called family farmer out of business.

Mr. SCHERLE. This is not true, because there are many farmers in Iowa who farm about 240 or 300 acres. The $25,000 limit will not put them out of business. In fact, it will save the taxpayers a lot of money.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Since the word "subsidy" has been thrown around here so much, I want to clear that up a bit.

These payments are made to participants for doing something. Some farmers receive more than others because they contribute more land or make a bigger contribution to the program. Some farmers put in 50 percent of their land, and others put in 20 percent.

The payment is not a subsidy. It is in lieu of money the farmer would have received if he had been able to raise the crop on the land and get a decent price for it. It is an attempt to balance supply with demand.

These are not subsidy payments to an individual for doing nothing. These are payments for doing something. His payment is in accordance with his contribution to the program.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I just want to concur in the remarks which have been made that this amendment would have a disastrous effect on the farmer, on the consumer, and on orderly programs for agriculture. I join others in expressing the hope that it will be decisively defeated.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I concur in the remarks made by the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to oppose an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, who is a fine Member, one of the best Members of the House of Representatives, but I believe this amendment is offered under a misconception. I believe it is offered with the idea that it will save money for the taxpayers.

I do not know too much about very many agricultural commodities, but I know a little bit about cotton. I am here to say that this amendment will cost the taxpayers money so far as cotton is concerned.

The farmer who raises cotton, who is trying to do it cheaper, who is trying to put aside money for research and development in order to raise it cheaper, happens to be mainly a farmer who has been able to plant large acreage. The days in which one can efficiently raise cotton on a small acreage, I am sorry to say, are gone forever.

The so-called family farmer in the western cotton area farms a lot of acres. If we take this efficient farmer out of business, as this amendment certainly would do, then in my opinion, cotton in the United States will be gone forever. Those who will be able to stay under the limitation and to continue to raise cotton will be those who do not raise the high grade of cotton which goes into the market, which can compete in the markets of the world on a parity with cotton which is raised in other parts of the world. It will be the poor-grade cotton which will be grown, and it will go into the Commodity Credit Corporation. And, Mr. Chairman, it will stay in the Commodity Credit Corporation, because no one will want it.

So this amendment is offered under a complete misconception. I asked the gentleman from Illinois not to offer the amendment because of this situation. He tells me that there would be a snapback and that we would go back to a former farm program which would be based on higher subsidy payments. This would be bad for the taxpayer. It would also be bad for the cotton farmer because it would result in even higher production of low-grade cotton, higher surpluses, and eventually, in lower prices.

Now, I ask you if this is any way to save money. The answer certainly is "No." The result of this amendment would be to bring about utter chaos as far as cotton is concerned. I do not think I can speak with regard to any other commodity, but believe me, as far as cotton is concerned, you cannot do a worse thing for the cotton farmer or the cotton processor or the consumer who wears cotton clothing than to pass this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I have the attention of my colleagues.

This amendment goes much, much further than anyone seems to have realized, including the preceding speaker.

The last agricultural bill, which I did not vote for, did provide for a snapback provision, so that if payments were not paid the program would revert to operating under the old law. Not only that, but this amendment says that none of the funds shall be used to make payments in excess of $25,000. The Secretary of Agriculture enters into a contract with many Americans under our law. These Americans can go into any court and sue in order to have the Secretary make those payments. There are also diversion payments under the law. The Government has entered into contracts with many people to divert their land from production to other uses.

Now, when you come to price support

payments, this has an appeal on the face of it. It looks as though this is in favor of the little fellow. Let me say that I am for the little fellow as much as anyone. However, if you try to feed the United States with the production of those folks who would be entitled to only $25,000, we would find that, instead of Americans paying 18 percent of our income for food, we would be paying 50 percent. You cannot produce food for the United States today with small uneconominal production units any more than you can produce cars by hand.

Let me show you what else this amendment does. We make money on the Sugar Act. We levy processing taxes. Some producers of sugar get as much as $1 million in payments per year. But what do they do for it? By this processing tax we collect, as much as they receive, in taxes. What do we find? My friends, in this day, when everything in the world has been going up, up, and up, what do we find about sugar prices? We find that in 1960 they were 11.6 cents per pound. In 1966 sugar prices were only 12 cents. In other words, they increased only 0.4 of 1 cent in 7 years. I am saying to you this amendment might have some appeal on the face of it, but let me remind you that what you are doing is playing with the future of agriculture, which is just as big and just as important as it ever has been in history.

The record shows that a few people on the farm substitute the products of industry and labor for the people that they have lost. Farm producers, for example, spend $30 billion a year for goods and services. They spend another $12 billion for the same things that city people buy, namely, food and clothing. The farm producers buy 320 million pounds of rubber. They use 28 billion kilowatts of electricity. They consume 5 million tons of steel. The steel that they consume accounts for 40,000 jobs alone in that industry.

Now, here is the "piano part," as they say in my section. I opposed the present farm law but it is the law and it is the only law we have. Secretary Freeman said that 7 percent of the total gross farm income and 20 percent of net income results from payments from the Treasury.

I heard my friends on that side of the Chamber say that we are down to 73 percent of parity. If you adopt this amendment and cut the 20 percent that they now get from the Treasury, you have really fixed agriculture. And in the process you have fixed industry and labor that sells agriculture all of this equipment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated because it would ruin the country.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I want to point out that some of us are most concerned about farmers getting less than $25,000. That is the category we express concern about by this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that may be what his intention is, but what we are dealing with is the American economy. We are dealing with 200 million Americans who eat and the 6 percent of Americans who feed the rest of us. While I have a great deal of sympathy for the small farmer, I would like to say that you will starve to death if you look to him alone to feed you.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that I should let this time pass without attempting to suggest to the members of the Committee why this proposed amendment would wreck the entire farm program.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a program to help the man who does not make but $300. It does not add a dime to what he is going to get.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this does not help any small farmer. It does not put a dime in his pocket.

Mr. Chairman, the proponent of the amendment has not attempted to show the Members of the Committee how his amendment, if adopted, is going to put a dime in the pocket of any farmer.

Mr. Chairman, he just tells the Members of the Committee that he is going to take money out of the pockets of certain farmers, but the gentleman thinks that certain farmers are wicked. He thinks certain cotton farmers—possibly because there are not any in his district—are wicked. He thinks that certain sugar farmers—possibly because they do not grow any sugar in Illinois—are wicked.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there happen to be some corn and wheat farmers in the great State of Illinois and they receive these payments also. Some of them are small and they are helped by these payments also. The communities are helped by these payments. But these payments are not simply something to add to the income of the farmer who collects the payment.

Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], explained and as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] so well expressed it, these are payments made to someone who has done something we wanted done to bring about a desired balance between supply and demand in our agricultural system. They are not gifts, they are payments for services rendered. In some cases they are rent for land.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we do not achieve that balance between supply and demand we will destroy the income of the small farmer, the smallest of the small farmers. And, if you want to take away from that smallest farmer these benefits, you just destroy that balance. You increase the surpluses and you take away from the income of that small farmer who will have to make it up—you will have to make it up, and you will make it up in relief payments.

Now, do you want to add to the relief rolls or do you want to give these farmers a chance to make a living themselves? If you break down this entire farm program—and I know that there are Members of this House who say we should break it down though there is not a one of them who has come before our Committee on Agriculture and actually asked to be heard to break it down. So I here now invite them to come over to our committee and we will give them an opportunity to get on record in favor of breaking this down.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if these large farmers are driven out of these programs—and that is what this amendment does; obviously that is what it does; it drives them out of the programs—it means that in order to achieve the desired results that the small farmer must make greater cuts and sacrifices. In other words, he must cut not 20 percent, but he must cut probably 40 or 50 percent of his acres. That is what this amendment proposes to bring about.

Mr. Chairman, I submit it is exactly the thing that most of us do not want to do. But I understand full well, as you do, how easy it is to send some word home to the effect that "I voted for the small farmer," but somehow or other those small farmers will get the true story because they are reading the newspapers, and it is my opinion that a great many of them know that you are just voting to send them to town or to get them on relief, and they are not going to think that you have been such a savior to them, even though you get them a right good relief check. That is all there is to it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. As the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, would the gentleman comment on the excellent statement made by the gentleman from Arizona? In other words, it is true cotton costs the taxpayers money too.

Mr. POAGE. Of course it does. This amendment has less effect on cotton than it has on any other commodity because, as the gentleman from Arizona pointed out, and the gentleman from Illinois verified, there is a snapback provision in the cotton law. It is the only law in which there is any such provision. And all that would happen as far as cotton is concerned, if you pass this then you raise the price at which you are going to take cotton into the loan to about 32 cents instead of 20 cents.

In other words, the taxpayers will be paying $60 a bale more for each bale of cotton that the Commodity Credit Corporation takes, than it is now paying. Is that any intelligent way to save the people's money? I think that the most charitable thing we can say is that it is clear that the gentleman from Illinois, who I know to be an intelligent gentleman, has been so absorbed with foreign affairs that he has no thought of the ultimate effects of his amendment. Clearly, this proposal should be defeated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure who the gentleman from Texas insists will be put on the relief rolls as a result of this amendment, whether it is the small farmers or those Texas farmers who lead the list in this country with $62.5 million a year in subsidy payments of over $25,000 each.

Is it those farmers in Texas who have been knocking off $25,000 each per year, or is it the little farmers out in Iowa, the family-size operators?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I think I know, but I will listen to the gentleman for just a minute.

Mr. POAGE. I am surprised that the gentleman should ask a question of that kind. He knows that the farmers who are getting $25,000 a year are not the ones who are going to be on the relief rolls.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have the gentleman admit that.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman said he would listen to me for just a minute.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute; yes.

Mr. POAGE. All right. Now give me the minute.

The gentleman knows full well that when those large farmers cease to be a part of the program and produce without any limitation or controls, that the amount of production is going to destroy the income of these small farmers.

Mr. GROSS. No; I do not agree with that statement.

Mr. POAGE. He cannot make it up by increasing his production, as can that $25,000-a-year farmer who, he says, may be the one who is going on the relief rolls.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman from Texas has had——

Mr. POAGE. The truth is that the small farmer, not the big farmers, is the one who is going to be on the relief rolls as a result of this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. That is the longest 2 minutes I ever knew of.

Mr. POAGE. One minute.

Mr. GROSS. I give the farmers in Texas more credit for astuteness than to go out and produce cotton under those conditions, knowing they cannot sell it at a reasonable price. The gentleman does not think that if we put on this $25,000 subsidy limitation that they are going to go out and produce a lot of cotton that they cannot sell, or at a bankrupt price. I give them more credit for intelligence than that.

And when we get to Arizona, they are among the top of the list subsidy with about $27 million, and Mississippi got $36 million in 1966 for payments to farmers of more than $25,000 each.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. The point that we perhaps do not understand correctly is that under the existing law, unless the payments are made, there is a snapback provision, and the cotton that would be produced would go into the Commodity Credit Corporation loan at something like 32 cents instead of 20 cents a pound, as it now does. That is the law. In that event, the mills would pay about 10 cents a pound more for cotton, and the Government would be out a good deal more for loans. Under the old law the price would be at the support level, which would be at 32 cents a pound, not at the 20-cent level that now prevails.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. What the gentleman from Mississippi has said is true only if the Agriculture Department does not do its job, and come forward with a real cotton bill.

I believe that is obviously what is needed—a better program, one that does not cost the taxpayer so much money.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, I did not want this program. But it is the law, the only one we have, and in this particular case, if we do not carry out the terms of this law, we will have to go back to the old law. I think the gentleman would have to agree to that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois simply because it would have a disastrous effect on the great agricultural industry of the San Joaquin Valley and other areas of our agricultural industries in the United States.

We grow quality cotton in the San Joaquin Valley that is in demand throughout the world. Such an amendment that is offered today would especially be disastrous to this crop and the many other crops that are grown in this agricultural valley.

Eighty percent of the economy is based on agriculture in my district, and to accept this amendment would disrupt the entire economy and, therefore, I oppose this amendment.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind the Members of the House, especially those from the big cities, that adoption of this amendment will mean higher prices for food. Let us take one important item, sugar, for example. As was so ably pointed out by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi, it is our effective control and compliance program that we now have the situation where the price of sugar has been kept at the low and reasonable price of today.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is accepted, consumers will be paying double or even triple the price that they are now paying for sugar. The experience of the past will prove that. Study the history on this one item of sugar and you will find that if you vote for this amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, and if adopted, the consumers will be paying a higher price not only for sugar but for other control-products, as well.

This amendment is not only against the farmers, it is against the consumers.

There appears to be some feeling that there is something evil in the mere fact that something is big—there is the feeling that there is evil in bigness. But this very "bigness" has made it possible here in America for less than 7 percent of our population who are engaged in agriculture to produce more food than the entire population can consume.

Compare this with Russia where more than 40 percent of the population is engaged in agriculture yet are not able to produce enough food for all Russians. Think of Red China where more than 50 percent of the people in Red China are engaged in agriculture yet are not able to produce all the needed food for the people of China.

I urge my friends to defeat this amendment, for by so doing you will indeed be voting for the farmers and for the consumers.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to simply ask one question.

Mr. Chairman, would this amendment in any way affect my pickle pickers and pickle packers?

Mr. WHITTEN. No, the 30 percent of import duties set aside under section 32 to take care of perishables, in my opinion, would cover the gentleman's pickle pickers.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I just wanted to be sure because my pickle pickers are very grateful for that and they want to be sure that they will not in any way be affected by this bill because we want to have plenty of pickles for the pickle pickers to pack.

Mr. WHITTEN. I congratulate the gentleman on his use of the language.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FINDLEY), there were—ayes 47, noes 136.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 506. No less than $1,500,000 of the appropriations of the Department for research and service work authorized by the Acts of August 14, 1946, July 28, 1954, and September 6, 1958 (7 U.S.C. 427, 1621–1629; 42 U.S.C. 1891–1893), shall be available for contracting in accordance with said Acts.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not know at this stage whether or not a motion to recommit with the usual 5-percent expenditure cut will be offered or not. If it is, of course, it will not be debatable. So I have taken this time to point out that your committee has cut this bill 4.9 percent. That is only one-tenth of a percent less than cutting the budgeted expenditures by 5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, we have applied those cuts in the places where we felt those cuts should be taken. It has been a joint undertaking by Republicans and Democrats.

A motion to recommit with a 5-percent cut in my opinion would not save a dollar, in that the funds could be spent the day after the fiscal year ends.

But the point that I wish to make at this time is that, in the event a motion to reduce the bill by 5 percent is adopted, while at most it would affect only one-tenth of 1 percent more money than we have eliminated, it would be an invitation to the Bureau of the Budget to apply cuts where they wish to make them. And I wish to remind you that last year the Bureau of the Budget applied those cuts to the school lunch program, to school milk, to insect control, to research, and to soil conservation districts. This committee saved you from those drastic cuts then.

What I am trying to say is that if you substitute for the fixed cuts in the amount of 4.9 percent which your committee has made a motion which would enable the Bureau of the Budget to cut the bill 5 percent, you know what you are likely to cut. Last year they showed their hand when they applied those cuts to school lunches, school milk, pest control, research, watersheds, and soil conservation service.

So I respectfully urge, if such a motion is made, that you vote against it. I feel certain that you would not want what would likely occur if the motion were adopted.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman has taken time to make an inquiry concerning a motion to recommit, and I am delighted to respond and to inform him and the other members of the committee what the motion to recommit will be. It will be offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL]. It will provide for a 5-percent cut. But there will be a specific exclusion for the school lunch and the school milk programs. It will be applicable to all other parts of this appropriation bill, and if it is approved, it will in effect reduce expenditures in this bill below the President's budget by around $260 million.

I bring up the amount because it is appropriate in light of the fact that tomorrow this House is going to be asked to increase the debt limitation on a permanent basis to $365 billion, allowing for an increase of some $35 billion, and in effect providing for the contingency of a deficit in the next fiscal year of $29 billion.

So it just makes a little sense, I believe, to cut back on some of the expenditures, including those in this bill—of course, excluding the school lunch and school milk programs.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WHITTEN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has just pointed out the danger of this kind of motion to recommit. He would exclude from the motion the school lunch and the school milk programs. But it is to be noticed that the Bureau of the Budget could cut out meat inspection, they could cut out research programs, experiment stations, or they could cut out watershed treatment programs.

What I am trying to say is that we have just finished considering a bill to which anybody in the House could offer an amendment to reduce funds if he could justify it. The motion to recommit might cut an additional one-tenth of 1 percent. That is possible. But, in my opinion, it is not significant. But the author has seen fit, according to the announcement, to be sure they do not hit the school lunch and school milk programs.

May I say there are other things in here just as valuable in many ways. I, for one, would hate to see Congress turn over to the Bureau of the Budget or anyone else the right to make an item veto. The minute we do, we have abdicated our responsibility. It has been my experience in some 25 years here that when we leave it to the bureaus downtown to apply the cut, they will apply it in the worst possible places.

I hope we vote down the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 507. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RIEGLE

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIEGLE: On page 37, immediately following line 6, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 508. No part of the aggregate of the appropriation for the Agricultural Research Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Consumer and Marketing Service (except the special milk program, the school lunch program, and the food stamp program), the Commodity Exchange Authority, and the Office of Information in title I, or of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation in title III, shall be used to pay the compensation of any persons numbering in excess of the level of personnel authorized for fiscal year 1967."

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to address an area that I believe is the No. 1 Federal disease that we have some control over, and that is the growth in Federal bureaucracy. I offer this amendment today in an effort to make what I consider to be a very modest, but a very necessary, reduction in Federal spending next year. This amendment only seeks to hold the line on manpower in certain selected areas within the Department of Agriculture, and to hold the level of employment in those areas to the manpower levels of last year. So this amendment is aimed only at limiting the number of new Federal employees, and then only in certain areas.

Even with this amendment, if it should pass, the Department of Agriculture next year will have 95 additional employees. This is in light of the fact that every day we have a decreasing number of farms and farmers in this country. It is also in light of the fact that there are a substantial number of job vacancies not filled today in the Department of Agriculture.

Specifically exempted from this amendment are the food-stamp plan, the Farmers Home Administration, the school lunch program, and the school milk program. What is left are those areas where I think we can really address ourselves to today. The first area is the Soil Conservation Service. They ask us for 133 new employees. We ask them to live next year with last year's manpower level. I would add that at the present time they have 18,000 people working in this department. I do not believe they need that additional 133. That is not a matter of national priority at this time, in view of the soaring deficit and the debt increase request we have to face tomorrow.

Second is the Agricultural Research Service. They ask for an additional 157 people, but they already have 16,000. I say they can get the job done next year with 16,000.

On the consumer and marketing services, again they come here and ask for 300 new employees in this area. They have 14,400 already. I suggest that is enough to get that job done next year.

And this reduction will not apply to the school lunch program, the milk program, and the food-stamp program.

As to the Commodity Exchange Authority, we would reduce that manpower request by two, and hold them to their figure for last year.

For the Office of Information, reduce their request by five employees. That would hold it to last year's figure.

For the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, the same thing. We would reduce that by 20, and hold them to where they were last year.

What does this mean in the way of savings? Six hundred and sixty-seven employees. The minimum saving we can expect from this is $15 million.

One might say, "that is not very much." But it is $15 million we can save now. We can save it by not adding new Federal bureaucrats in areas where we can get along for a year without them.

This will still allow the Department of Agriculture 95 new people in the coming year.

Think of the paradox that these increases and this request for increases offers. While the Secretary of Agriculture is asking for new Federal bureaucrats, the number of farms and farmers in this country goes down every day.

From 1964 to 1966 the total farm population went down from 13 million to 11.6 million. It is down 10 percent, yet we see the Federal bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture going up.

The number of farms, from 1964 to 1967, went down 9 percent. The Federal bureaucrats in agriculture have gone up

In 1966 the net income per farm fell each quarter during the year. It was down to $4,700 at the end of last year.

With figures like these, how can we justify, in the face of a declining farm population, more bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture? It just is not sound. It does not make sense.

Here we see a situation in which the number of farms is declining and the Department of Agriculture continues to grow and grow and grow. This has to stop. This is an opportunity for us to stop this growth in the amount of 667 employees and to save some $15 million.

I believe that everyone here is painfully aware of the fact that we face a deficit this year in excess of $25 billion. We need economy in Government. This is an opportunity for us to reduce that deficit and still adequately meet our national needs in the field of agriculture.

I make this final point. At the end of January of this year the Department of Agriculture had 15,000 job vacancies that it could not fill. Only 4½ months ago there were 15,000 open jobs in the Department of Agriculture.

I am saying, let us not add another 667 to that. That is reasonable. I believe the people of this country will feel it is reasonable.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have had an opportunity to look into the employment figures since my colloquy with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The difference between the number of employees on last January 31 and the number needed on next June 30 is around 15,000.

In the middle of the summer is when they need the intermittent and part-time employees. Of course, they do not have them in the wintertime when they do not need them.

Your committee has tried hard to hold down employment. With bigger and bigger farms, and with fewer people on the farms, we have had to substitute high-priced machinery, and research, and so on, to enable fewer people to free more of us to go to the cities and still maintain the high standard of living we have.

The gentleman's amendment, I believe, would affect this program seriously. There are some 25 laboratories for which we have spent money to build. They are now ready for operation and need research scientists. The records show, for example, that every 5 years we must have new strains of wheat, because the old strains reach the point that they fall to disease and insects.

The amendment could be taken to cut out 350 meat inspectors. The packing industry has moved away from Chicago, St. Louis, and Kansas City, and scattered all over the 50 States. In order to guarantee wholesome meat to the American public, we have had to provide more meat inspectors. The gentleman's amendment would eliminate these 350 inspectors necessary if the American public is going to be protected in the eating of meat.

For years and years—and prior to the gentleman's coming here—we have provided conservation technicians to the watersheds and other areas of the United States. Next year we will need 15 new districts. Are we going to say to those new districts, "You shall not have the same treatment we have been giving to others in the United States."

Thus it is, in considering such an amendment, that we frequently fail to see just how it would work to the disadvantage of the thing we believe in.

May I say again, your committee—Republicans and Democrats alike—provided in this bill that they should not have any more people in Washington, with one or two very minor exceptions. One such exception is the Information Service, which is responsible to disseminate the research results that you get.

With all of the transactions going on in the commodity exchanges, we felt that agency was entitled to a little increase.

May I say again, that you have as conservative a committee as any in Congress. We worked very hard to limit increases to those places where they were fully entitled to it. New soil conservation districts are entitled to everything that the old ones have. It is ridiculous to have 25 new research laboratories and then say that they cannot use the scientists to do the research which is so essential if the farmer is going to feed us during these trying times. I am afraid that we will be begging the farmers to grow everything in sight next year. Certainly, if we get involved in the Middle East as we are in the Far East, we will be pleading with them to grow whatever they can. I say to you, it is not sound that these scientists, that enable 6 percent on the farms to feed the rest of us, should be cut off. They permit the rest of us to live on a higher standard of living than any nation has ever known.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIEGLE) there were—ayes 62, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CORMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10509) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MINSHALL. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MINSHALL moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On Page 37, immediately following line 6, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 508. Excluding the Special Milk Program and the School Lunch Program, money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond niney-five percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H.Doc.15)."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 175, nays 222, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—175

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashmore
Baring
Bates
Bennett
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Bolton
Bow
Brock
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrnes, Wis.
Carey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dowdy
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Findley
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fulton, Pa.
Gardner
Gathings
Goodell
Goodling
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gude
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hammerschmidt
Harsha
Harvey
Heckler, Mass.
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
MacGregor
Mailliard
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Meskill
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse, Mass.
Mosher
Myers
Nelsen
Ottinger
Pelly
Pettis
Pirnie
Poff
Pollock
Price, Tex.
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Sandman
Saylor
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Stratton
Taft
Talcott
Thompson, Ga.
Tuck
Utt
Vander Jagt
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyman
Zion

NAYS—222

Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Belcher
Berry
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.

Cabell
Cahill
Carter
Casey
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hagan
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Irwin
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kyl
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Long, Md.
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Rees
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Schwengel
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Staggers
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Watts
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zwach

NOT VOTING—36

Ashbrook
Ayres
Battin
Bell
Betts
Bray
Celler
Clark
Dorn
Dow
Edwards, Calif.
Esch
Fallon
Fisher
Halleck
Hanna
Hébert
Ichord
Jacobs
Karth
Long, La.
Morton
O'Konski
Patman
Pool
Rooney, N.Y.
Ruppe
St. Onge
Smith, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wylie
Younger

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Morton for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Smith of California for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.

Mr. Esch for, with Mr. Patman against.

For this day:

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Wylie.

Mr. Clark with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Dow.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Willis.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 357, nays 38, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—357

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watson
Watts
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—38

Adams
Brock
Buchanan
Carey
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Corbett
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Devine
Dickinson
Eshleman
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fulton, Pa.
Goodell
Grover
Hosmer
Mailliard
Minshall
Morse, Mass.
Ottinger
Pike
Reid, N.Y.
Saylor
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Smith, N.Y.
Taft
Utt
Watkins
Whalen
Whalley
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wolff
Wydler
Zion

NOT VOTING—38

Ashbrook
Ayres
Battin
Bell
Betts
Bray
Celler
Clark
Dorn
Dow
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Esch
Fallon
Fisher
Halleck
Hébert
Holland
Ichord
Jacobs
Karth
Long, La.
Morton
O'Konski
Pool
Rooney, N.Y.
Ruppe
St. Onge
Smith, Calif.
Staggers
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wylie
Younger

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Esch against.

For this day:

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Wylie of Ohio.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Dow of New York.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Pool.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Eilberg.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

TO INCREASE THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT—CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10328

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 504, Rept. No. 340), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 504

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10328) to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ADJUSTMENTS IN THE AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING SILVER CERTIFICATES—CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7476

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 503, Rept. No. 339), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 503

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7476) to authorize adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the committee amendments now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 7476, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1352 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 7476 as passed by the House.

THE PRESIDENT HAS A PROBLEM—HE IS A HUMAN

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jack Spalding, the editor of that respected and influential newspaper, the Atlanta Journal, Atlanta, Ga., contributes an article to the June 1, 1967, edition, describing his feelings about President Johnson.

In my judgment, this is the most excellent statement I have seen regarding the splendid qualities of President Johnson.

This distinguished editor's verbal picture of our President's personality and effectiveness, as well as his comments on Mr. Johnson's opponents and critics, will be of interest to all Members of this House; and, therefore, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following piece.

WHAT DO WE WANT?—THE PRESIDENT HAS A PROBLEM—HE IS A HUMAN

(By Jack Spalding)

I may be a minority of one, but I find myself liking Lyndon Johnson more and more instead of less and less.

For one thing, I underestimated him in the beginning. Therefore he hasn't embarrassed me by letting me down, as he seems to have embarrassed so many of my peers and betters.

I checked the files and see where I described him at the Democratic Convention of 1960 (where he became John F. Kennedy's running mate), as a politician worthy of any office within the gift of the county unit system.

He still impresses me that way, though I'd now add that he is a lot smarter than any other politician I've seen. But he still looks, talks and acts like he learned his lesson in a Georgia courthouse and could be cousin to a lot of my best friends and close relatives including myself.

So I identify with him, as we say today, and that my middle name is Johnson and that Mrs. Spalding says he is the only man in the world who dances like me doesn't hurt.

He's a human being, even on television. Anybody who can come through television as a human being is made of real stuff. When he tries he tries hard and when he fails it hurts and shows and this is a trait which a lot of humans have.

So right now I'll take him to the unblemished tin soldiers the opposition has, and I'll take him to the crisp, bloodless young members of the new breed of his own party. This new breed is flat and one dimensional compared with the President, and Sen. Robert Kennedy even has a one dimensional voice.

On television these new young men look more like cardboard cutouts than real people and time may prove that that is what they are.

As my sympathy for the President grows, my tolerance for his critics lessens.

Now, criticism is fine and criticism is all part of the system, but the viciousness of the criticism President Johnson gets makes you wonder about his critics.

Boil it down, and he's criticized for being human. He's criticized for being rural, and he's criticized for being a politician.

He's criticized for all these things and particularly for the last.

What of it? He is a politician, he is rural and he is human.

And what do we expect in the White House? Let's face it, we're the country of the common man and about as ornery as we can be. Have we forgotten our origins? Have we forgotten the idea of representative government and the thought that in our elected officials we find accurate reflections of what we are and what we want?

It seems to me that President Johnson is a pretty good synthesis of the people of the U.S.A. We've got them finer and we've got them coarser, but run them all through a grinder, and we'll come up with something pretty close to the President.

Why the violent criticism? Maybe the national critical establishment, including so many Washington correspondents, are more enchanted with each other and more out of touch with the common man than usual.

We're still a rough country, and if it shows up in our leaders, that's all right. In fact it is good, for it means the system still is representative.

THE FAR EAST CRISIS

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is still premature to say what the outcome will be in the war in the Middle East. I think, however, that certain observations are in order and certain moves can be foreseen. The chief observation we must make is that the diplomatic process broke down completely over the Middle East question during the course of recent weeks. The Western Powers showed themselves incapable of exerting the necessary pressure on countries far weaker than themselves to avert a war. They showed that the world could still be put at the mercy of irresponsible demagogs if the major powers could not themselves agree and act with decisiveness. We may yet, despite ourselves, emerge from the current crisis without a general conflagration. Certainly we all hope and pray that this is so. But are we going to let this lesson go once again unlearned?

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that after a few more days of fighting, we will have before us the alternatives of either a totally disproportionate power balance in the Middle East or of a power balance that an international concert is willing to guarantee.

At this point, it appears that Israel is winning the war. Israel wants only to be left alone to develop within its own borders. I am astonished that the Soviet Goverment could maintain otherwise, or, for that matter, that the Indian Government is so blind to this truth. If the major powers continue to abdicate their role, Israel, assuming a victory, will have no choice but to police a peace—and this will not be beneficial to Israel, the Arab States or the world. Israel does not want to become a military state, which would be necessary if, by itself, it had to police the entire Middle Eastern area.

The alternative is an arrangement guaranteed by the major powers, either inside the U.N. or outside. In practical terms, the United States and the Soviet Union will have to reach an agreement on preserving a settlement in the Middle East, a settlement that will guarantee boundaries and will assure Israel access to the sea from its port of Elath, if not usage of the Suez Canal itself.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no middle ground. The current war is the consequence of the failure of the big powers to assume clearly the duties incumbent on them. After 1956, there were vague assurances given to Israel. One cannot blame Israel for refusing to accede to the same sort of uncertain system again. We must be prepared to make our obligations explicit. We cannot repeat the error of 1956, when we forced the Israelis to surrender territory they had won on the battlefield without our offering any meaningful support to preserve the integrity of Israel's borders. We cannot vacillate in our responsibilities if we undertake them. We must be prepared to see that a fair settlement is made and then to do our part to preserve it. Unless that is the case, turmoil will continue to characterize the Middle East, which means a threat hanging over the head of us all.

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE PRESERVATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE RESOURCES

Mr. **GONZALEZ**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GONZALEZ**. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to establish a National Commission for the Preservation of Foreign Language Resources. Our non-English-speaking or bilingual citizens possess knowledge of their languages and cultures, which should be considered as a priceless national resource. This is true if we speak only of our national defense requirements in an uneasy, shrunken world in which most peoples are neutral and precise communication is essential. Our knowledge of such languages as Czechoslovak, Bulgarian, Rumanian, Russian, Arabic, Swedish, Norwegian, Finnish, Japanese, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Hindi is in woefully short supply, and yet we do not utilize our citizens who might know these critical languages. My bill would initiate a systematic approach to identifying and compiling our foreign language resources.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my bill to establish a National Commission for the Preservation of Foreign Language Resources, and a statement on the necessity of such a Commission from Dr. Jacques M. P. Wilson, chairman of the foreign languages department, Our Lady of the Lake College, which is one of our fine San Antonio institutions. Dr. Wilson provided valuable assistance in drafting this legislation, and I recommend his statement to all my colleagues.

H.R. 10558

A bill to establish the National Commission for the Preservation of Foreign Language Resources

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE OF COMMISSION

SECTION 1. There is established a commission which shall be known as the National Commission for the Preservation of Foreign Language Resources (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall:

(a) Develop national policy for the identification, preservation and improvement of national foreign language resources.

(b) Evolve an active program for the conservation of the foreign language resources of the United States.

(c) Serve as consultant and coordinator to National and State professional educational associations for the development and implementation of programs and activities designed to preserve and identify national foreign language resources.

(d) Identify information needed to inventory foreign language resources, and coordinate the development of this data with the various Executive Departments.

(e) Provide data on national foreign language resources to Federal, State, and local government agencies; educational systems, colleges, universities and private businesses, in accordance with demonstrated needs and the national interest.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of ten members who shall be appointed by the President, and the U.S. Commissioner of Education or his designated representative. The President shall appoint as members of the Commission scholars, educators or public servants who have made notable contributions to the field of bi-cultural and bi-lingual studies. A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(b) Members shall be appointed for four years. Five members of the initial Commission shall be appointed for two year terms. All Commission Members shall be eligible for reappointment by the President.

(c) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as the expenses authorized by section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(d) Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(e) The Chairman of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission from the Commission membership.

POWERS OF COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with (1) the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and (2) the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(b) The Commission may obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) When so authorized by the Commission, any member or agent of the Commission may take any action which the Commission is authorized to take by this section.

(d) The Commission may secure directly from any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, such department, agency, or instrumentality, shall furnish such information to the Commission.

REPORT

SEC. 4. The Commission shall submit a report annually of the results of its program to each House of Congress and to the President.

Statement in Support of a Bill To Establish the National Commission for the Preservation of Foreign Language Resouces

(By Dr. Jacques M. P. Wilson)

Never before in this nation's history has there been such a pressing demand for individuals qualified to communicate with the world community in their native tongues. Man's destiny—indeed his absolute survival—is to an unprecedented degree dependent upon his ability to develop effective intercommunication in the family of nations. The vital questions of our time cannot be safely resolved by military force. Survival in this thermonuclear age depends as it never has before upon the ability to communicate effectively with other peoples in their languages and on discussing the issues and problems which beset us without filtering them through the admittedly imperfect tools of translation and interpretation.

Our national interest forced us to develop and utilize our non-English resources to meet World War II military commitments. Thousands of speakers of non-English languages were pressed into service to accomplish tasks such as teaching languages, preparing radio and press releases, intercepting radio transmissions, censoring mail, and hundreds of other duties too numerous to mention. The nation suddenly realized the value of this hidden resource possessed by our non-English speakers.

Concomitant with the utilization of the non-English language skills of these citizens, our nation's educators began to question the effectiveness of foreign language instruction at all levels of the educational structure. It became immediately apparent that the reading and translating objectives of foreign language instruction in high schools and colleges did not produce the skills and aptitudes needed by our nation. A rarity indeed was the foreign language student who developed the proficiency approximating that of a native speaker. Few were the college or high school students able to understand the foreign language they studied when spoken by a native speaker. Fewer yet were those able to converse intelligently in a foreign language. The number was pitifully small who could write acceptably in a foreign language.

While we needed non-English resources in such languages as: Czechoslovakian, Bulgarian, Rumanian, Russian, Arabic, Portuguese, Swedish, Norwegian, Finnish, Italian, Tagalog, Japanese, Mandarin, Cantonese and Hindi to name but a few, we discovered that most secondary school and college curricula offered: French, German and Spanish. Very few school systems or institutions of higher education helped those who spoke non-English languages to preserve the linguistic and cultural heritage of the ethnic group to which they belonged. Our twentieth century educational philosophy was a reflection of an 18th and 19th century ideal that the United States is a melting pot; that we embrace all who come to our shores as equals—but that they must forget their past: their culture, their traditions, their heritage and become homogenized copies of Mr. Babbitt on Main Street, U.S.A. Our 19th century culture developed what amounted to an ethic that the individual who spoke with a "foreign" accent hadn't become quite completely Americanized. Those who spoke a non-English language at home were looked upon with suspicion and as somehow slightly un-American.

Teachers and educators reflected the prevailing opinion by systematically discouraging pupils and students from using or preserving the language and culture of the ethnic group to which they belonged. The schools' rejection of the home language, of those who spoke languages other than English, subconsciously denigrated their culture. Our local and state educational policies were monolingual and monocultural. We were a safe, secure continental island, separated from the rest of the world by broad oceans. In our dealings with those from other shores, we used English, and in many cases still do. Yet, as Joshua A. Fishman, in his study *Language Loyalty in the United States*, points out, at the national level, America has rarely implemented policies to "hasten the linguistic and cultural enfeeblement of its immigrant groups. . . . Immigrant minorities were never forbidden to organize and maintain their own communities, organizations, schools or publications."

After the end of World War II, the momentary recognition given those who possessed non-English language resources subsided. Some forward-looking educators and linguists, capitalizing on the advances in foreign language teaching technology pioneered by the Army Language School and other such projects, began conducting research in the development of foreign language teaching materials, the training of foreign language teachers, and the updating of our school and college curricula. In general, foreign language teaching returned to the pre-World War II rut from which it had given promise to emerge. With the exception of a few cosmopolitan urban centers in the nation, our value systems still reflected a degree of mistrust of those who spoke another language than English. If not quite un-American, they certainly were not as "fully" American as those of white, Anglo-Saxon, English-speaking, protestant, ethnic origin.

The advent of the first Russian Sputnik jarred the nation's leaders from their complacency. Since then, this country has made significant strides in expanding its reservoir of foreign language skills. Under the authorization contained in the National Defense Education Act, basic research in the field of foreign language teaching was subsidized. Thousands of teachers received crash training in hundreds of NDEA Institutes designed to improve their own qualifications in the languages they taught, as well as to receive training in the most up-to-date and scientific methodology of teaching foreign languages. Thousands of scholars were given opportunities to pursue advanced study in hundreds of languages classified as "critical" or "exotic" in terms of our national need.

As a result of the leadership of Congress, and the U.S. Office of Education, an aroused foreign language teaching profession has striven to expand our non-English language resources. Millions have been spent supporting programs which have been generally well-designed and carefully implemented. The entire national academic structure reflects the new value placed on acquisition of foreign language skills. Yet, at this time we have only attempted to do half the job.

In this nation, there are millions of individuals who speak other languages. Some are completely bi-lingual; others have yet to learn English. Each year many migrate to our shores and bring with them additional non-English language skills, language resources which are desperately needed. The nation's attitudes to these resources have changed but little since the 19th Century. Non-English speaking, non-Anglo-Saxon ethnic groups are still pressured to forget the past, to forget their cultural heritage, to forget their language. No systematic program exists to identify and inventory these resources. No agency or branch of government is charged with the responsibility of encouraging social, educational and political associations, educational institutions and educational systems at the state and local level to develop programs to preserve these priceless resources in our national interest.

In a democratic society such as ours, educational policy, whether at the national, state, or local level, should be based on the needs and well-being of the individual as well as the needs of the state. The failure to dignify the home language and home culture of the pupils has damaged the self-concept of speakers of other languages. Eventually, this attitude forced children to reject their home language. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that those who went through such an experience reach adulthood without acquiring literacy in their mother tongue. In such cases, their home language is practically useless for any professional or technical utilization where language proficiency is important. A valuable resource is thus wasted; but more importantly, an individual has been psychologically damaged in the process. Instead of bi-cultural, bi-lingual children, it has produced generations of citizens who are linguistic cripples, who are neither functional in their home culture, nor the dominant culture of this nation.

It is my strong conviction that Congress should take the initiative and establish a Presidential Commission for the preservation of the non-English language resources of this nation. This Commission should be a panel of leading educators, scholars who have made notable contributions in the field of bi-cultural and bi-lingual education. Through the Commission's statement, policies, and programs it can insure not only the preservation of an important strategic national resource, but a valuable counterpart to existing programs for the development of foreign language skills in this country. Truly, it can be said—It makes little sense to spend countless millions to teach people language skills in one segment of the population, while the same system unwittingly works systematically to stamp out these same, as well as other non-English language skills, in other ethnic groups. I respectfully urge the 90th Congress to support this greatly needed and long overdue legislation.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PETITION ON VIETNAM

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam has aroused concern among broad sectors of Americans. Growing unease with the policy of continued escalation is widespread in the American university community.

Yesterday, a delegation of students and professors from Columbia University delivered a petition to the White House, carrying the signatures of more than 5,000 members of that university. The petition reads:

JUNE 4, 1967.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We the undersigned join the significant and growing number of Americans who for moral and political reasons oppose United States policies in Vietnam. Our opposition is reinforced by the recent escalations which indicate that the Administration is no longer primarily in search of a political settlement but is instead increasingly committed to a military victory. This policy must be reversed. We call for an end to the bombing and for further steps to assure immediate de-escalation of military activity.

Among the faculty members signing are Eric Bentley, professor of English; Walter Gellhorn, Betts professor of law; Warner R. Schilling, associate professor of public law and government, and William S. Vickrey, professor of economics.

Also signing are Dr. John C. Bennet, president of Union Theological Seminary, Ellis R. Kolchin, chairman of the department of mathematics, and Kevin Sullivan, associate dean of the graduate faculties.

Students included David Langsam, past president of the Columbia University Student Council, Seth D. Shulman, president of the Graduate Faculties Student Council, and Ronald Pristan, President of the Columbia-Barnard Young Democrats.

Harold M. Ickes is president of the Graduate Students of Columbia To End the War, the group which organized and assembled the petition.

Included among the names on the petition is the following distribution:

School	*Total signed*
Barnard College	470
Columbia College	817
Graduate faculties	903
Law school	195
Medical school	160
School of social work	290
Other professional schools	150
General studies	205
Affiliated schools	220
Staff and administration	120
Teachers College	1120

The petition was presented to Mr. William Jordan, a senior staff member of the National Security Council.

An article in the New York Times of June 5, 1967, which describes the activity resulting in the petition follows:

[From the New York Times, June 5, 1967]

FIVE THOUSAND AT COLUMBIA SIGN WAR PROTEST—200 FACULTY MEMBERS JOIN STUDENTS IN PETITION

More than 5,000 students, teachers and administrators at Columbia University have signed a petition to President Johnson opposing the war in Vietnam.

The petition is to be delivered today in Washington to William Jordan, a senior staff member of the National Security Council.

The Graduate Students of Columbia University To End the War, the group which drew up the petition, said the protest was the largest of its kind from a single university.

In recent months, petitions against the war have been sent to the President from a group of 100 student body presidents and college newspaper editors, from Rhodes Scholars, from returned Peace Corps Volunteers and from other university groups.

PETITION LISTED

The petition says:

"We, the undersigned, join the significant and growing number of Americans who for moral and political reasons oppose United States policies in Vietnam.

"Our opposition is reinforced by the recent escalations which indicate that the Administration is no longer primarily in search of a political settlement, but is instead increasingly committed to a military victory.

"This policy must be reversed. We call for an end to the bombing and for further steps to assure immediate de-escalation of military activity."

200 FACULTY MEMBERS

Among the signers, the organizers of the petition said, were more than 200 Columbia faculty members, including:

Eric Bentley, professor of English.

William T. R. Fox, professor of public law and government and director of the Institute of War and Peace Studies. Warner R. Shilling, associate professor of public law and government and assistant director of the Institute of War and Peace Studies.

Walter Gellhorn, Betts Professor of Law.

William S. Vickery, chairman of the economics department.

Robert Cross, chairman of the history department.

Alexander Dalling, director of the Russian Institute.

There are 4,600 signatures, arranged by the schools that make up the university, on the bulky, mimeographed document that was to be delivered today. Organizers said that 600 more signatures were too illegible to make out and could not be included in the list.

The signatures were gathered in the last two weeks, despite the pressures of final examinations and papers.

Harold M. Ickes, the president of the graduate student group, said that he hoped the petition would show "the widespread opposition to the war because of the diversity of the people who signed it. This came from a broad-based university; it is not a New York aberration."

MIDDLE EAST

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, I was shocked to learn that a spokesman for the State Department considered our position in the Middle East "neutral in thought, word, and deed." This statement by Mr. McClosky, the Press Officer, was later qualified and interpreted as not in conflict with our historic commitment to defend Israel's sovereignty. Nevertheless, Secretary of State Rusk, indicated we should remain neutral for the present, because we do not know "who fired the first shot."

In these circumstances, as the New York Times put it, a declaration of American neutrality is "grotesque," both in terms of our interests and commitments. The first shot was fired by Nasser, when he deliberately took the aggressive action of blockading the Gulf of Aqaba. And it is hardly necessary to remind this House that Arab efforts to wipe out the State of Israel did not begin last week. The present crisis is only the latest episode in a 20-year campaign of aggression against Israel.

Fortunately, for the present Israel seems able to defend herself. Yet I perceive a serious danger developing that, as various nations consider their own narrow interests, they will find it expedient to sacrifice their commitments to Israel, should the crisis deepen.

Britain and France, which have also made protestations of neutrality, must be reminded that they signed the 1950 Tripartite Declaration guaranteeing Israel's sovereignty. The Soviet Union must be dissuaded from its reckless course of emboldening Arab designs. And we must recall that the United States has never been "neutral in thought, word, and deed" on the matter of Israel's right to exist.

Mr. Speaker, the United States should use all of its diplomatic influence to bring about a prompt cease-fire. But unlike the stalemate resolutions of the 1948 and 1956 conflicts, our efforts cannot end there.

In 1948, in 1956, and again in 1967, Arab States have sought to destroy Israel by force. Each time the people of Israel have courageously repulsed the attack, yet each repulsion serves to keep alive Arab resentments.

If we are not to be confronted with a major Middle Eastern war each decade, we must spurn the temptation of being satisfied with another stalemate cease-fire and use every diplomatic measure to achieve a general settlement in the area. This means direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab States, to achieve a treaty of peace and formal recognition of Israel.

The present tragedy can become an opportunity to confirm, once and for all, the security of Israel against future aggression.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe President Johnson showed wise leadership when he moved swiftly yesterday to correct any misunderstanding or misapprehension about this Nation's neutrality regarding the Middle East conflict. He quite properly stated that case when he said at this time we are a nonbelligerent but not a neutral.

Let there be no question about our position in the Middle East. Four Presidents of the United States have firmly stated their belief in the integrity and the sovereignty of the State of Israel.

Over the weekend President Johnson forcefully and unequivocally stated that we consider the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba as international waters.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad the gentleman is making this statement.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has spoken on this subject. Yesterday the Secretary of State said that the position of the President, which is the position of the United States, is, and I quote:

> We support the territorial integrity and independence of all states in the Middle East. We support the efforts in the Security Council to put an end to hostilities. We are in favor of a fair and just peace. We will join with other countries in seeking this end.

This is the statement of the President of the United States, and it represents the official position of this country and, of course, of the State Department.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

I believe it would be a great mistake to think or to say that this country is neutral when it comes to the question of the integrity and the sovereignty of our ally Israel in the Middle East.

Certainly it would be a great mistake to think that the United States would not take appropriate action. Right now we are nonbelligerent because we are trying to find a solution through the Security Council.

I am confident that if the State of Israel should ask for our assistance that assistance would be forthcoming. For the destruction of Israel would be an abandonment of the entire Middle East and ultimately Africa to the Communists.

Our interests are totally involved in the Middle East and the American people should know this.

Any suggestion that the United States should remain neutral in this conflict is an invitation to disaster. We need only look to history when the United States enacted the Neutrality Act in 1939, and virtually issued an invitation to the despots of Europe to launch their aggression.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the United States stands ready to give Israel all the military assistance she needs if and when she asks for such assistance because our national interest is involved.

I say this because four Presidents have spoken out on the subject clearly and unequivocally.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in what the majority leader said, because if we are going to maintain the territorial integrity of all the states out there in the Middle East, we will possibly have to get in against Israel. I say this because I can tell you—and I did not get it from any briefing—that the Jordanian air force is gone and the

Jordanian part of Jerusalem is surrounded. King Hussein, who was stupid enough to sign this alliance with President Nasser, is pushing the panic button. His regime is about to topple. I think if we would let the Israelis alone, they will take care of this themselves.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am certain the Israeli victories will force the Arabs to the peace table. Our biggest concern now is that the hard-won gains Israel has scored in the battlefield not be wiped out by any cease-fire agreement which would force Israel out of the territory she has captured until she has total assurance she will not be attacked again and will have full access to all the waterways including the Suez Canal.

RESOLUTION BY THE PHILADELPHIA CITY COUNCIL

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Paul D'Ortona, president of the Philadelphia City Council, has brought to my attention Resolution 319, which was adopted unanimously by the council at a meeting on May 25, 1967. Since the security of Israel is of vital importance to my constituents in the Third District of Pennsylvania, and to all citizens, I am therefore bringing this resolution to the attention of my colleagues:

Resolution memorializing the President of the United States to use his good offices within the Government and the United Nations to preserve peace in the Middle East and insure the security of Israel.

Whereas, The current crisis in the Middle East occasioned by the massing of troops and military armor along the Arab-Israeli border is fraught with the imminent danger of war; and

Whereas, The withdrawal of the United Nations peacekeeping force from the Israeli-Egyptian border heightens the danger of open conflict resulting from some provocative incident and aggressive action; and

Whereas, The mounting tensions in this area of the Middle East pose a serious threat to world peace, making the presence of a United Nations Emergency Force more necessary now than ever before; therefore

Resolved, by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the President of the United States to take all possible steps within the Government and the United Nations, to stabilize and preserve the peace in the Middle East.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Senators from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Congressmen representing Philadelphia in the House of Representatives.

Certification: This is a true and correct copy of the original Resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Philadelphia on the twenty-fifth day of May, 1967.

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President of City Council.

Attest:

NATHAN WOLFMAN,
Chief Clerk of the Council.

MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the news reports from the Middle East remain unclear. Still, it is obvious that the events are tragic, because blood is flowing. This is a dispute that should have been settled by diplomatic means. Death was unnecessary. I believe that now we must think ahead to what we can do to prevent a recurrence of the same needless catastrophe. None of us doubt, Mr. Speaker, that in the absence of decisive diplomatic action by the major powers, this war will break out again.

Israel, Mr. Speaker, is the child of Western humanitarianism and U.N. diplomacy. Yet since 1948, Israel has had to fight, without a moment's respite, for its survival. Israel has never had a moment to relax, to devote its full energy to its own internal development. Israel knew that if for a second it dropped its guard, it would be overwhelmed by enemies from without.

If Israel wins this war—which appears at this point to be possible—then I believe we must change the system which has made the Middle East into a powder keg. I think our country must face the reality of its duty. We must get together with the Soviet Union and the other major powers and assert the principle that we will not tolerate the interference by one country with the peaceful development of another. We must assert our determination to guarantee frontiers, maritime rights and the God-given opportunity to live, as Franklin Roosevelt said, in "freedom from fear." Israel does not want to threaten its neighbors. The Arab States must not be allowed to threaten Israel. We must act to de-fuse this region of the world permanently, by a sensible system of disarmament and, hopefully, of reconciliation.

Perhaps it is too early to talk about peace, Mr. Speaker, when war is raging and we do not know what the outcome will be. But I think we must resolve that we will not permit the restoration of anarchy in the Middle East, in which nations are beholden to no law but their own hysteria. When this war is over, the great powers must assure the preservation of a genuine peace.

INDIANA FIFTH DISTRICT SCHOLARSHIP TRIP TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes of the House of Representatives' time today to describe the Washington Scholarship trip for high school juniors which we have begun in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana this June.

It seems to me that good government stems from an abiding and eager interest in government on the part of all our citizens—and that this interest should start at an early age.

With this in mind, I initiated the "Fifth District Scholarship Trip to Washington." Through this program I hope to bring the educational advantages of my congressional office closer to students, their families, and the communities in my district. Service groups and civic-minded citizens have been invited to lend their support by sponsoring the students. And I might add, they responded most enthusiastically.

On Sunday, June 4, the first of two groups arrived at Washington National Airport to begin a 3½-day introduction to "what goes on in Washington." Their schedule is so planned that the students will have the opportunity to actively learn about the executive, legislative, judicial, and administrative processes of our Government. They will meet with Representatives and Senators of both political parties, view sessions of the House and the Senate, speak with a Peace Corps representative, attend a Department of State foreign policy briefing, visit the Supreme Court, and hear the proceedings of a congressional hearing.

We hope and believe that this will be a rare opportunity for the students to get firsthand answers to questions raised in their high school government classes. We hope they will return not only with some answers, but with a continued interest in these processes of government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point to include the names of these specially selected, capable students who are pioneers in the new program which promises to offer an unusual and educational "inside" look at how our Government works.

Joseph Power, Oak Hill High School, Converse, Ind.

Linda Stahl, Alexandria High School, Alexandria, Ind.

Mary Sprunger, South Adams High School, Berne, Ind.

Richard Till, Huntington Catholic High School, Huntington, Ind.

Norman Walker, Frankton High School, Frankton, Ind.

Samuel Cleland, Western High School, Russiaville, Ind.

Timothy Lengerich, Decatur Catholic High School, Decatur, Ind.

Richard Cloud, Huntington County Community High School, Warren, Ind.

Carl D. Meyer, Kokomo High School, Kokomo, Ind.

Diana Wynant, Pendleton High School, Pendleton, Ind.

Thomas Quick, Eastern High School, Greentown, Ind.

BRITISH TESTIMONY ON AIR POLLUTION

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. **STUBBLEFIELD**. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable publicity in recent months on problems of air pollution and measures to cope with it. And I think we can all agree that we must undertake to rid the air of pollutants that do us harm.

But we should also agree not to be swayed by assertions that are not based on experience or adequate laboratory findings.

I therefore welcome the hearings recently conducted by the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works and the planned hearings by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I am confident that these hearings will permit Congress to obtain the true facts so that we may deal with the problem of air pollution in a responsible manner.

Already the hearings before the Senate subcommittee have brought out some vital information on this subject. Two distinguished witnesses—G. N. Stone and A. J. Clarke, of the Central Electricity Generating Board, London, England, who had presented a paper before the American Power Conference in Chicago—were able to appear at the Senate air pollution hearings on May 10.

The Central Electricity Generating Board is responsible for about 230 powerplants of some 42,000 megawatts total capacity.

As everyone knows Britain was one of the first nations to suffer the adverse effects of air pollution—London, especially, because of weather conditions and the density of industrial development.

Now, while our Federal Government is relatively new at efforts to cope with air pollution, centralized supervision of certain industrial emissions by a government agency has existed in England for more than a hundred years.

As our two British visitors pointed out, an established public awareness of the problems of air pollution is part of the background against which the Generating Board's clean air policies have been worked out.

I will not discuss their testimony in detail but I do want to emphasize two vital aspects of it.

First, the British studies and experience indicate clearly that the construction of tall stacks are not merely a stopgap solution for the problem of air pollution. They are a sound and economical technique for proper control and abatement of emissions due to burning of fuels such as coal and oil.

Second, and perhaps of even greater significance, these eminently qualified witnesses testified that despite 15 to 20 years of intensive research and testing British scientists have been unable to conclude that sulfur dioxide emissions such as caused by the burning of oil and coal contribute to respiratory disorders and other illnesses, as claimed by some less experienced persons in this country.

These are important findings and I am convinced that the appropriate committees will quite properly give them serious consideration in whatever legislative recommendations they make.

Certainly Congress will wish to keep the British experience in mind as it takes into consideration dangerous proposals by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to bar the use of coal or oil with more than about one-half of 1 percent sulfur content.

Such a standard would raise havoc with the national economy in general and the coal industry in particular.

In 1964 my district in Kentucky produced 32.4 million tons of coal. All of this coal contained more than 3-percent sulfur except for a few thousand pounds—and these few thousand pounds had more than 1-percent sulfur content.

Translated into living economic factors those 32.4 million tons of coal production equals about 8,000 jobs for miners and 6,000 jobs for railroad, barge, and trucking company workers.

On the business side, coal in the State of Kentucky means $274.5 million a year—$168.2 million for wages, $95.8 million for services and supplies, and $10.5 million for taxes.

Coal is one of the biggest sources of income in our State. If my district were not able to sell its coal, the economic effect would be disastrous.

And yet that could very well result from stringent and unrealistic air pollution regulations.

We must avoid doing more harm than good in the effort to abate air pollution.

And that is why, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the testimony of Messrs. Stone and Clark be recognized at this point in the RECORD, for this testimony is vitally important to our deliberations on the Air Quality Act of 1967.

I strongly urge all Members to read the complete text of this testimony which is recorded in the transcript of hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works. Copies of the testimony are also available from the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.

MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. **BURKE** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BURKE** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deepest concern over the outbreak of war yesterday in the Middle East. The brave little country of Israel today finds itself surrounded by hostile countries which contain a total population of approximately 54 million. There are 643,000 armed men prepared to ravish Israel's countryside, 2,700 tanks aimed toward its boundaries, and 1,090 warplanes strafing the land the Israelis have struggled so long to protect. Israel is considered by military men to be most highly vulnerable if left on its own for defense.

In terms of geography, Israel as a nation possesses no natural barriers to invasion by land. Most of Israel's strategic points are within 40 miles of Arab territory. Tel Aviv, a vitally important city is only 13 miles from the Jordanian border. Seven miles above Tel Aviv, at the town of Herzliya, the Jordanian border comes within 10 miles of Israel's coast.

In the south, at the head of the Gulf of Aqaba, the Israeli seaport of Eilat is only 3½ miles from the Jordanian port of Aqaba.

No Israeli city is more than a few minutes from Arab airfields, which are heavily supplied with Soviet-made jets. No other country is more vulnerable than is Israel to damage by ground-to-ground rockets or airborne bombs.

In addition, the well-publicized move to send 10 Soviet naval vessels through the Turkish Straits will add 20 to 30 percent to the naval tonnage and gunnery the Russians have been maintaining in the Mediterranean.

I have been in Israel and have seen the spirit with which its citizens have been moved to build a strong country, capable of a great contribution to our world economy, culture, and ideals. Our longstanding commitments to uphold the safety and integrity of this small nation are quite clear. We are morally and legally tied to Israel in her defense against territorial aggressors.

There are presently in Israel over 6,000 American citizens and I strongly urge that steps be taken to extend full protection to these people as well as U.S. property in the area of conflict. I deplore and condemn the attacks being made on our Embassies in Arab nations and protests should be directed to Government leaders in these countries.

The U.S. Government is, at this time, attempting to develop a meaningful cease-fire in the Middle East through the offices of the United Nations. Should this prove impossible, I urge our Government to turn to our allies in Great Britain and France, whose stake in the liberation of Israel is just as great as our own, and, united, extend every effort to negotiate an effective multilateral drive for a quick and permanent end to the hostilities.

I cannot be more emphatic in my plea that the United States at this time announce its firm intention to defend this small country which has always supported the policies of our Government and has endeavored for so many years to gain the respect of the world as a free nation, desirous of world peace and world progress.

The hearts and minds of the American people are today with the citizens of Israel in their desire to bring about an end to this holocaust and restore a sound economy and stable peace to their small, brave country.

I include in my remarks the following chart from the Washington Post, which summarizes the picture of the overwhelming forces against so courageous a people:

Comparison of Arab and Israel forces

	Egypt	Syria	Iraq	Jordan	Lebanon	Saudi Arabia	Combined Arab forces[1]	Total Israel forces
Manpower: Active reserve	310,000	115,000	82,000	70,000	11,000	55,000	643,000	300,000
Army	280,000	104,000	70,000	69,000	10,000	50,000	565,000	291,000
Active	160,000	54,000	--------	38,000	--------	30,000	--------------	71,000
Reserve	120,000	50,000	--------	30,000	--------	20,000	--------------	220,000
Navy	[2] 11,000	1,300	1,800	--------	200	1,000	15,300	3,000
Air Force	15,000–20,000	9,000	10,000	1,500	600	4,000	40,000–45,100	8,000–14,000
Hardware:								
Tanks	1,400	600	300	250	150	--------	2,700	800
Missiles	100 SAM and about 100 SSM and 1 battery of U.S. Hawks						200	[3]
Aircraft	550	150	200	80	50	60	1,090	[4] 400
Fighters	400	105	95	61	39	50	800	190
Bombers	70	28	44	0	0	0	142	103
Transports	140	6	80	17	9	5	257	48
Ships[5]	114	47	23	3	5	25	217	37

[1] In addition to these forces is the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), formed by Arabs trained in guerrilla and desert warfare Created in January 1964, its army is sworn to destroy Israel. Headed by Ahmed Shukairy, the PLO claims to represent the 1,300,000 Palestine refugees in countries bordering Israel. As many as 12,000 of its troops are said to be in the Gaza strip in Egypt, others in Syria.

Also not included in these totals are Kuwait's 2,400-man army and small (6 to 8 aircraft) air force.

[2] Plus 5,000 reserve.

[3] 1 battery SAM.

[4] Approximately.

[5] Warships of the combined Arab forces total about 215 and over half of those are Egyptian. The United Arab Republic's ships include 6 to 8 destroyers, 9 to 14 submarines, 44 patrol craft, 20 landing craft, 14 minesweepers, and 44 torpedo boats. The seapower of other Arab countries include Syria's 12 and Iraq's 20 torpedo boats.

Israel's Navy totals about 37 warships, including 9 to 12 torpedo boats, 15 patrol craft, and 7 landing craft. Israel also has 2 destroyers and from 2 to 4 submarines.

Source: Washington Post, June 6, 1967.

NO TIME TO WEAKEN THE RESERVE COMPONENTS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East has created another crisis which this Nation must meet with resolution and commitment. Hopefully, we can point the way to peace without military involvement.

Yet the developments, ominous and foreboding as they are, bring us face to face with problems which prove what many have been saying for years, that preparedness should be a central theme of this Nation's policies. Now, more than ever, it is obvious that our Nation may need every trained military man that it has. This includes the Reserve components. It appears equally obvious that we should be strengthening, not weakening our Reserve Forces; that the dedicated, trained, experienced manpower, organized and ready, and the drill strength Reserves of both the National Guard and the U.S. Army Reserve be given full support and encouragement to carry out the assignments which could at any hour be theirs.

This is not to be the case if a new plan for reorganization of the Reserve components is carried out as proposed last Friday by the Secretary of the Army. Under this plan the organized Reserves would be composed entirely of support forces. All combat elements now in the Reserves would be transferred to the National Guard or abolished. In substance, the Reserves would become hewers of wood and carriers of water. I do not decry the function of support forces. They, too, are essential. Without them no army can win. But I am concerned, and seriously concerned, with the proposal to abolish four infantry brigades which I am informed are now full strength and capable, and several hundred U.S. Army Reserve combat units. It would appear that the thirst for economy or for the merger of the Reserves, as the case may be, would not be sufficiently compelling to cause a weakening of the Nation's military capability in the face of its serious commitments worldwide, at a time of grave international pressures.

The Reserve Officers Association's National Executive Committee, at Saturday, issued a public statement with regard to this issue. This statement represents the sincere view of a highly motivated, patriotic group of citizen-soldier leaders from all parts of the country. It includes Reserves of all the services—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. This statement, which is highly significant, should be read and considered by every Member of this body.

I have also asked for permission to insert in the RECORD an analysis of this new proposal by the national president of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Maj. Gen. Horace B. Hanson, Jr., which follows:

STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, JUNE 3, 1967

The Reserve Officers Association of the United States for sometime has been deeply concerned about the persistent effort of the Department of Defense to reduce the Army Reserve, and to restrict and discourage its Citizen-Soldiers in their willingness and ability to serve their country in time of continuing and deepening crisis.

The plan, announced yesterday intensifies this concern because its basic result is to abolish several hundred high-priority, highly trained combat units, composed of the most highly motivated experienced officers and men in the entire United States Army. More than 30,000 men are in these Army Reserve Units; by circumstance, if they are to continue to serve they must do so in the National Guard, and many of them must be retrained, and reassigned. The plan therefore is to carry out a merger of the Army Reserve, a fully Federal force, into the National Guard, with its responsibility to the respective Governors.

For these more than 30,000 men and their units, this is Merger by any definition.

Merger of the Army Reserve and the National Guard has been repeatedly rejected by the Congress as being opposed to the national interest.

Also involved in this plan is the deactivation of 15 National Guard divisions, strategically located throughout the United States, and providing a vital element of the nation's mobilization base.

The Reserve Officers Association, with its record of 45 years' service to adequate national defense, cannot accept as sound military policy the destruction of any major part of the nation's military training and mobilization base. We view the plan as having been dictated largely by political expedience. We applaud those officers of the National Guard who frankly recognize and call public attention to the military weakness of this compromise: destroying 400 Army Reserve Combat Units and giving them to the National Guard in payment for loss of the Guard's 15 Divisions.

ROA has been cautioned against strongly opposing this plan.

However, convinced as we are that it is unsound, and that the steps proposed might dangerously impair the combat readiness of both the Reserves and the National Guard—each a vital part of the One Army of the United States of America—we reject any self-serving position. Our concern is only for the safety of the United States, and the right of every Reservist to be ready by virtue of adequate training.

To carry out this plan of further reducing the Reserve strength in the light of the present situation in the Near East, as well as the Far East, seems little short of folly. Involved in the turbulence of these massive changes in the Army Reserve and National Guard are more than 170,000 soldiers.

We look to the Congress, in meeting its responsibilities under the Constitution, critically to review this plan of June 2.

In its review, we urge the Congress to obtain fully independent and professional military testimony, basing its final conclusions in the law.

As the vehicle for public hearings, to which we think this issue must be subjected, the Reserve Vitalization Bill (H.R. 2), passed by the House on 20 February by a vote of 324–13, and recognized publicly by many Senators as containing elements of law vital to a viable, responsive and ready Reserve, should be scheduled for consideration by the Senate at the earliest date.

Maj. Gen. Horace B. Hanson, Jr., USAR, National President, Birmingham, Ala.; Maj. Gen. Donald S. Dawson, Air Force Reserves, Washington, D.C.; Lt. Col. Adolph H. Humphreys, USAR, Alexandria, Va.; CWO Victor Rusgaitis, USAR, Manchester, Conn.; Lt. Col. Charles E. Fisher, USAR, Columbus, Ohio; Lt. Col. Russell J. Mittelstadt, USAR, Monona, Wis.; Capt. Vincent A. Primerano, USNR, New York, N.Y.; Lt. John Trice, USNR, Dallas, Tex.; Capt. William A. Adam, USCGR, San Rafael, Calif.; Maj. Lehman A. Moseley, USMCR, Greenville, S.C.; Col. Homer I. Lewis, Air Force Reserves, Eagle Pass, Tex.; Capt. Richard C. McMahon, Air Force Reserves, Kansas City, Mo.; Lt. Col. John A. Johnson, Air Force Reserves, Seattle, Wash.; Col. Gerald A. Hart, Air Force Reserves, Southfield, Mich.; Col. John T. Carlton, USAR, Executive Director; Rear Adm. Alexander Jackson, Jr., USN, Retired, Deputy Executive Director.

ANALYSIS OF JUNE 2 RESERVE FORCES REORGANIZATION PLAN BY MAJ. GEN. H. B. HANSON, JR., NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES.

The plan announced by the Secretary of Defense on Friday has all the appearances of a streamlining of the Army's Reserve components but the Congress and the Nation need to take a look behind the reasons given the press release.

"A. Bring the force structure into conformity with that needed to satisfy military requirements and for which equipment procurement has been authorized."

This was the same reason given in 1964 when merger was first proposed. Apparently equipment posture has not improved so that a further cut in Army Reserve trained strength is necessary. In 1964, Army Reserve paid drill strength was 300,000; then in 1965 low priority units were inactivated and strength of remaining units raised to about 90% of TO&E so that the net result was a cut of 30,000 paid drill spaces now it is proposed to cut the Army Reserve again by another 30,000 spaces. Trained men are being sacrificed to lagging equipment procurement.

"B. Update the Reserve force structure."

It is our understanding that moderization has been at a standstill for 2½ years while the merger has been argued. Thus it would appear that this need is self created. However new TO'S or new logistical concepts would seem to be normal evolution and not require major realignment of functions.

"C. Provided adequate forces for the needs of each State."

This reason does not seem to hold together for several reasons. The needs of each State for civil emergencies and natural disasters does not by any stretch of the imagination need 400,000. But if that is true, then there will be no combat forces available in the Federal Reserve. This seems to be a serious drawback to the concept of having all units of one type in the guard. Although it looks neat, it does not allow: for much flexibility for State and Federal needs. The value of tanks, artillery and such for civil disturbance or floods seems minimal and both components would seem much better off with balanced forces in each.

"D. Locate the units in the proposed structure geographically, etc."

The only known geographic imbalance is that created by the inactivation of the combat divisions of the USAR in December 1965 which created certain gaps in the distribution of USAR units. Since DOD has not permitted any relocations or reorganizations since 1964, these situations have of necessity gone uncorrected.

"E. Diminish the need to assign involuntarily to reserve units individuals who have completed two or more years of active duty."

The Army Reserve does not now assign involuntarily any person out of the reserve pool who has more than two years active duty. Of those it does use from this source, most are skilled specialists who are not readily available from other sources. This is not to say that the Army Reserve could not be a fully volunteer force if left alone to develop its program but the use of these legally obligated personnel who have been superbly trained by the active Army provides an expertise which will be difficult to replace readily. In addition it has been estimated that the use of these personnel, which constitute about 15% of the USAR, save nearly 100 million dollars yearly in training costs. The government has an obligation to keep these people trained if they are to be used in combat as fillers, and training in the units offers them the best possible advantages.

In summary, it appears to us that this plan:

1. Cuts trained combat power from the Reserve components at a time when it is needed.
2. Creates added turnmoil to solve problems largely created by Defense Department's preoccupation with the merger effort.
3. Sacrifices trained personnel: to reduce equipment requirements.
4. Continues to cut the Army Reserve while leaving the National Guard at their old strength of 400,000.
5. Creates a dangerous imbalance in the Federal Reserve while overloading the States with types of units and equipment which they do not need for local missions.

What is needed is a strong balanced modern force in both the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard, each fully equipped and supported, each relying upon the trained manpower now available to provide the United States the Federal Reserve it needs. State needs are important but not at the cost of a strong Army Reserve oriented to the needs of the whole country.

MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I joined with the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], in supporting on the floor the May 23 statement of President Johnson declaring the United States firm commitment to the independence and territorial integrity of Israel and her neighboring states and to free and innocent passage into the Gulf of Aqaba.

Today I believe it is imperative that we make unmistakably clear our steadfast conviction in these Halls of Congress that the United States is not neutral in her commitment to free and innocent passage; not neutral in her commitment to the independence and territorial integrity of the State of Israel and the other states in the area; and not neutral in her commitment—voiced by four American Presidents—to oppose and to seek to prevent aggression in the Near East.

Mr. McCloskey's statement yesterday in a State Department briefing was unfortunate in the extreme. It admitted of misinterpretation at a time when the United States must remain firm in its position and flexible in its capability to deliver military and medical supplies and other appropriate assistance to the State of Israel.

Secretary Rusk sought to clarify the statement later last night in referring again to President Johnson's statement of the 23d. The Secretary noted that the word neutral is not an "expression of indifference" in light of our commitments and our "heavy responsibilities as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council."

But the question is not one merely of no indifference. We must show not only our concern—but our resolve to stand by the commitments we have solemnly pledged. We must reaffirm that the United States—true to its word—will work within and without the United Nations, to effect a cease-fire, to guarantee the territorial integrity and independence of Israel, and to assure the paramount right of free and innocent passage in the Gulf of Aqaba and through the Suez Canal in consonance with our stated policy going back to 1956 and the unanimous resolution of the Security Council of October 13, 1956—calling for the operation of the canal "insulated from the politics of any country."

Mr. Speaker, today the United Nations faces perhaps the most critical test of its peacekeeping abilities in its 22 year history. The Indian representative to the Security Council is reportedly prepared to offer a resolution calling for the withdrawal of armed forces to the positions occupied as of June 4. The acquiescence of the Council to this resolution would constitute recognition by, and the imprimatur of, the United Nations on an illegal act of aggression undertaken by the United Arab Republic in clear contravention of generally accepted principles of international law.

The United States should oppose the Indian resolution. We should work for either of a cease-fire in place or a cease-fire which would return armed forces to their positions prior to the illegal blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba and conditioned upon free and innocent passage into the Gulf. The United Nations must take action. But it must act with honor.

STATE DEPARTMENT'S STATEMENT OF NEUTRALITY WITH REFERENCE TO THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked to have heard the State Department's description of the administration's position in the Middle East crisis as being "neutral in thought, word, and deed."

Despite the late White House qualifications of this statement, the fact remains that little assurance has been forthcoming to disprove the fact that this is our policy.

To continue to follow such a course would be sheer hypocrisy and spurious rationalization. It would be reprehensible in terms of our commitments and America's interests. Not only would it be a betrayal of Israel but of America's own principles.

This tragedy will be even more compounded if, under the guise of neutrality, we followed France in announcing that we will send no military aid, especially when the Soviet Union has been unqualifiedly siding with the Arabs and has so overtly encouraged, exploited, and instigated Egyptian belligerence after providing Nasser with his modern war machines.

It is not enough for the United States to pass the buck to the United Nations or to expect the maritime powers to band together with us to come up with a multilateral solution. All indications to date point to the frustration of this approach.

How can the administration expect Israel to seek a solution through the United Nations when it was the U.N. that made it possible for Nasser to blockade Israel's vital port of Elath? The Secretary General of the U.N., by hasty, arbitrary action, removed the United Nations' emergency forces, making it possible for the Egyptian Army to mass on Israel's southern border, and to poise tanks, divisions of troops, and Soviet-made rockets to strike at the heart of Israel.

Let us face it. The United Nations, dominated as it is by so-called neutralists and Arabs who are backed by the Soviet veto in the Security Council, will not save Israel, nor deter Arab aggression.

It did not do so in the past. Why should we now assume that the Arabs and Communists will have a change of heart?

We are talking today not only of Israel's survival but of freedom's survival. We are talking of the fate of America and of democracy.

Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—all of them have voiced assurances to guarantee the territorial integrity of Israel. In the present crisis, Israel called to her American friends in Washington. Where is our response in terms of really telling the Arabs that America is on the side of Israel? The hour calls for action. We must demand that our Nation honor its commitments. We must point out that we must be consistent in helping to thwart aggression in the Near East if there is to be validity in our commitments elsewhere. We must not permit those valiant people in Israel, standing guard for our freedoms, standing guard for the interests of the United States, to stand alone.

Let us take heed of Secretary Rusk's often expressed statement, "Aggression unchecked, is aggression unleashed."

Let us make it unequivocably clear that we fully support Israel in this crisis.

THE AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION CELEBRATES ITS 60TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest aspects of the American character is the fact that it is based on so many different ethnic strains. America is truly a conglomerate melting pot and it has been the interaction and commingling of these various national and social backgrounds that has stiffened the fibre of the American character and has made us the strongest society in history.

Credit for the preservation of this strength and for the perpetuity of the dissimilar cultural heritage of the various groups in America must, of course, go to the many fine organizations devoted to this great work. They not only preserve the identity, the customs, the languages, and the art and music of their respective ancestors, but they provide a vehicle to integrate those customs and traditions peacefully and intelligently into American society.

One of the foremost of these groups is the American Hungarian Federation which this year celebrates its 60th anniversary.

The federation was chartered in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1907 and has been in continuous existence ever since. During its 60 years, the federation has been engaged primarily in educating Hungarians in this country about American values, about our history and political principles, so that they may become loyal, well informed citizens.

The federation serves the dual purpose, of course, of educating other Americans about their Hungarian neighbors through the distribution of books and manuals concerning Hungarian history and the Hungarian national character.

The federation has always been characterized by its unequivocal stand against totalitarian governments and Godless societies. Its opposition to nazism in the thirties and forties, and its outspoken opposition to communism today are familiar stories to most Americans. As spokesman for the oppressed peoples of Hungary today, for those enslaved behind the Iron Curtain, the federation is almost totally responsible for the mood of keen sympathy and understanding among all Americans.

The record of its work in behalf of Hungarian refugees is most impressive. In the wake of the abortive Hungarian revolution of 1956, the federation helped more than 35,000 refugees immigrate to the United States. The federation also sponsored some 22,605 Hungarian refugees in America following World War II.

Between 1945 and 1952, the federation sent aid to Hungary and to Hungarians living in Western Europe to the tune of almost $1.5 million. Its relief action in the aftermath of the 1956 attempted revolution amounted to some $512,500. This, incidentally, was contributed even before a special separate organization was chartered to undertake relief work.

The federation today consists of two American Hungarian fraternal associations, the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, and the William Penn Fraternal Association. The federation has its own national structure with State and local chapters, American Hungarian churches, associations, study groups, and clubs.

Its officers at present include Judge Albert A. Fiok, of Pittsburgh, Pa., national president. The Right Reverend Dr. Zoltan Beky, bishop emeritus of the Hungarian Independent Reformed Church of America, and president of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, is chairman of the board of directors.

U.N. PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1945 AS AMENDED

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, constituents frequently inquire as to what Congress could and would do in the event the runaway U.N. organization would declare a "peace war" and call the U.S. President to send American troops into battle.

The U.N. Charter, chapter VII, provides:

> ARTICLE 39
>
> The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.
>
> ARTICLE 41
>
> The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.
>
> ARTICLE 42
>
> Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.
>
> ARTICLE 43
>
> 1. All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.
>
> 2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.
>
> 3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.
>
> ARTICLE 45
>
> In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, Members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined, within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in Article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committeee.
>
> ARTICLE 48
>
> 1. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

2. Such decisions shall be carried out by the Members of the United Nations directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members.

The U.N. Participation Act of 1945, as amended through 1966, reads in full text as follows:

4. THE UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1945, AS AMENDED

(Text of Public Law 264, 79th Congress [S. 1580], 59 Stat. 619, approved December 20, 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, 81st Congress [H.R. 4708], 63 Stat. 734, approved October 10, 1949; Public Law 86–707 (H.R. 7758), 74 Stat. 797, approved September 6, 1960, and by Public Law 89–206 [S. 1903], 79 Stat. 841, approved September 28, 1965)

An act to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United Nations Participation Act of 1945".

SEC. 2. (a)[1] The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative of the United States to the United Nations who shall have the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and may serve ex officio as representative of the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations other than specialized agencies of the United Nations, and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may, from time to time, direct.

(b)[1] The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint additional persons with appropriate titles, rank, and status to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations and in such organs, commissions, or other bodies as may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament (control and limitation of armament). Such persons shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the Representative of the United States to the United Nations. They shall, at the direction of the Representative of the United States to the United Nations, represent the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations, including the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council, and perform such other functions as the Representative of the United States is authorized to perform in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations. Any Deputy Representative or any other officer holding office at the time the provisions of this Act, as amended, become effective shall not be required to be reappointed by reason of the enactment of this Act, as amended.

(c) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall designate from time to time to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations not to exceed five representatives of the United States and such number of alternates as he may determine consistent with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. One of the representatives shall be designated as the senior representative.

(d)[2] The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in organs and agencies of the United Nations. The President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act without additional compensation as the representative of the United States in either the Economic and Social Council or the Trusteeship Council (1) at any specified session thereof where the position is vacant or in the absence or disability of the regular representative or (2) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified session of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The President may designate any officer of the Department of State, whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the absence or disability of the representatives provided for under section 2 (a) and (b) or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter.

(e)[3] The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative of the United States to the European office of the United Nations with appropriate rank and status who shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the Secretary of State. Such person shall, at the direction of the Secretary of State, represent the United States at the European office of the United Nations, and perform such other functions there in connection with the participation of the United States in international organizations as the Secretary of State may, from time to time, direct.

(f)[3] Nothing contained in this section shall preclude the President or the Secretary of State, at the direction of the President, from representing the United States at any meeting or session of any organ or agency of the United Nations.

(g)[3] All persons appointed in pursuance of authority contained in this section shall receive compensation at rates determined by the President upon the basis of duties to be performed but not in excess of rates authorized by sections 411 and 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724, Seventy-ninth Congress) for chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers occupying positions of equivalent importance, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated under subsections (c) and (d) of this section as a representative of the United States or as an alternate to attend any specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly shall be entitled to receive such compensation.

SEC. 3.[4] The representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, when representing the United States in the respective organs and agencies of the United Nations, shall, at all times, act in accordance with the instructions of the President transmitted by the Secretary of State unless other means of transmission is directed by the President, and such representatives shall, in accordance with such instructions, cast any and all votes under the Charter of the United Nations.

SEC. 4.[5] The President shall, from time to time as occasion may require, but not less than once each year, make reports to the Congress of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein. He shall make special current reports on decisions of the Security Council to take enforcement measures under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and on the participation therein, under his instructions, of the representative of the United States.

SEC. 5.[6] (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, whenever the United States is called upon by the Security Council to apply measures which said Council has decided, pursuant to article 41 of said Chapter, are to be employed to give effect to its decisions under said Charter, the President may, to the extent necessary to apply such measures, through any agency which he may designate, and under such orders, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by him, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, in whole or in part, economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication between any foreign country or any national thereof or any person therein and the United States or any person subject to the jurisdiction thereof or involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(b) Any person who willfully violates or evades or attempts to violate or evade any order, rule, or regulation issued by the President pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or, if a natural person, be imprisoned for not more than ten years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation or evasion shall be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both, and any property, funds, securities, papers, or other articles or documents or any vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, or vehicle, or aircraft, concerned in such violation shall be forfeited to the United States.

SEC. 6.[7] The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate Act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general locations, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said Charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said Charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the armed forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: *Provided,* That, except as authorized in section 7 of this Act, nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose armed forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

SEC. 7.[8] (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President, upon the request by the United Nations for cooperative action, and to the extent that he finds that it is consistent with the national interest to comply with such request, may authorize, in support of such activities of the United Nations as are specifically directed to the peaceful settlement of disputes and not involving the employment of armed forces contemplated by chapter VII of the United Nations Charter—

(1) the detail to the United Nations, under such terms and conditions as the President

---

[1] As amended and restated by sec. 1(a) of P.L. 89–206, 79 Stat. 841, September 28, 1965 (22 U.S.C. 287).

[2] As amended and restated by sec. 1(b) of P.L. 89–206, 79 Stat. 841 (September 28, 1965).

[3] Subsecs. (e) and (f) were redesignated subsecs. (f) and (g) respectively, and a new subsec. (e) was added by sec. 2 of P.L. 89–206, 79 Stat. 841 (22 U.S.C. 287).

[4] 22 U.S.C. 287a.

[5] 22 U.S.C. 287b.

[6] 22 U.S.C. 287c.

[7] 22 U.S.C. 287d.

[8] 22 U.S.C. 287d–1.

shall determine, of personnel of the armed *forces of the United States to serve as* observes, guards or in any noncombatant capacity, but in no event shall more than a total of one thousand of such personnel be so detailed at any one time: *Provided*, That while so detailed, such personnel shall be considered for all purposes as acting in the line of duty, including the receipt of pay and allowances as personnel of the armed forces of the United States, credit for longevity and retirement, and all other perquisites appertaining to such duty: *Provided further*, That upon authorization or approval by the President, such personnel may accept directly from the United Nations (a) any or all of the allowances or perquisites to which they are entitled under the first proviso hereof, and (b) extraordinary expenses and perquisites incident to such detail;

(2) the furnishing of facilities, services, or other assistance and the loan of the agreed fair share of the United States of any supplies and equipment to the United Nations by the Department of Defense, under such terms and conditions as the President shall determine;

(3) the obligation, insofar as necessary to carry out the purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection, of any funds appropriated to the Department of Defense or any department therein, the procurement of such personnel, supplies, equipment, facilities, services, or other assistance as may be made available in accordance with the request of the United Nations, and the replacement of such items, when necessary, where they are furnished from stocks.

(b) Whenever personnel or assistance is made available pursuant to the authority contained in subsection (a) (1) and (2) of this section, the President shall require reimbursement from the United Nations for the expense thereby incurred by the United States: *Provided*, That in exceptional circumstances, or when the President finds it to be in the national interest, he may waive, in whole or in part, the requirement of such reimbursement: *Provided further*, That when any such reimbursement is made, it shall be credited, at the option of the appropriate department of the Department of Defense, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the purposes for which expenditures were made.

(c) In addition to the authorization of appropriations to the Department of State contained in section 8 of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense, or any department therein, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse such departments in the event that reimbursement from the United Nations is waived in whole or in part pursuant to authority contained in subsection (b) of this section.

(d) Nothing in this Act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure is prohibited by any other law of the United States.

SEC. 8.[9] There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the United Nations as apportioned by the General Assembly in accordance with article 17 of the Charter, and for all necessary salaries and expenses of the representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, and of their appropriate staffs, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; travel expenses without regard to the standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, the *Travel Expense Act of 1949*, and section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1933, as amended, and, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, travel expenses of families and transportation of effects of United States representatives and other personnel in going to and returning from their post of duty; allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the Act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U.S.C. 118a); cost-of-living allowances for personnel stationed abroad under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; communications services; stenographic reporting, translating, and other services, by contract; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; rent of offices; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111); allowances and expenses as provided in section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946 (Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress), and allowances and expenses equivalent to those provided in section 901(3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724, Seventy-ninth Congress); the lease or rental (for periods not exceeding ten years) of living quarters for the use of the representative of the United States to the United Nations referred to in paragraph (a) of section 2 hereof, the cost of installation and use of telephones in the same manner as telephone service is provided for use of the Foreign Service pursuant to the Act of August 23, 1912, as amended (31 U.S.C. 679), and unusual expenses similar to those authorized by section 22 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended by section 311 of the Overseas Differential and Allowances Act, incident to the operation and maintenance of such living quarters; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State; all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5).

HISTORICAL NOTE

Reference in text of section 8 to the following should be changed to read:

"Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is now the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 305, 5101–5108, 5110–5113, 5115, 5331–5338, 5341, 5342, 5509, 7154).

"Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, (5 U.S.C. 5701, 5702, 5704–5708).

"Section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1933, as amended (5 U.S.C. 5731).

"Act of June 26, 1930, as amended (5 U.S.C. 5912).

"Section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 287r).

"Section 901(3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 is now codified as 5 U.S.C. 5921–5925 by P.L. 89–554, 80 Stat. 378, at 510, September 6, 1966.

"Section 22 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, is now codified as 5 U.S.C. 5913 by P.L. 89–554, 80 Stat. 3378 at 510, September 6, 1966."

The following are excerpts from both the 1945 and also June 16, 1949, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the U.N. Participation Act.

13. INVITATION TO LOCATE THE SEAT OF THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION IN THE UNITED STATES, DECEMBER 11, 1945

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United Nations be, and hereby are, invited to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America.

14. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS ON THE UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1945, NOVEMBER 8, 1945

Economic sanctions

The Charter of the United Nations contemplates that force will be used to settle disputes only as a last resort. In the first instance *the parties obligate themselves to* seek a solution of a given dispute through the various peaceful settlement procedures prescribed by the Charter. Thereafter, in the event the machinery for peaceful settlement fails to function satisfactory, there would be contemplated enforcement measures short of the actual use of force. It would be only if these measures were determined to be inadequate that armed force would be used in connection with any particular dispute. Article 41 of the Charter has to do with enforcement measures short of war, and section 5 of the bill is designed to empower the President to lend this country's effective collaboration in action taken by the Security Council under this article.

Section 5 in substance would empower the President to join with other countries in applying enforcement measures short of the use of armed force in dealing with particular disputes. It also prescribes penalties to enforce regulations issued by the President in the exercise of this power. The section refers to the severance of economic relations and communications; the severance of diplomatic relations, which is referred to in article 41 of the Charter, is omitted from section 5 of the bill since this is a mater concerning which full authority is vested in the President by virtue of his constitutional powers and obligations with respect to the conduct of this country's foreign relations.

The committee realizes that the powers proposed to be granted to the President under this section are very great. However, the basic decision in this regard was made when the Charter was ratified and this provision is simply a necessary corollary to our membership in this Organization. The committee also believes that the Security Council must be placed in the most effective position possible to act under article 41 since the prompt and effective application of economic and diplomatic sanctions by all the United Nations (or even the threat or possibility thereof) may avoid the necessity for the use of the armed forces available to the Security Council.

The better prepared this country is to participate promptly in action of this kind, the more effective will be the Security Council and the more hope there will be that the United Nations may serve its major purpose, namely, the prevention of armed conflict.

There exist several well-recognized and long-standing precedents for the delegation to the President of powers of this general nature. Without going into detail, the committee would refer to the embargo legislation approved June 4, 1794, giving the President power to lay embargoes on all ships and vessels in American ports whenever in his opinion the public safety should require (1 Stat. 372). Legislative enactments in 1798 (1 Stat. 565–566), 1799 (1 Stat. 613, 615), 1800 (2 Stat. 7, 9), 1808 (2 Stat. 490) and 1809 (2 Stat. 506) suspended commercial relations with various countries but left the discontinuance of the restraints to the discretion of the President. In addition the Supreme Court held in *Cargo of the Brig Aurora* v. *U.S.* (11 U.S. 382 (1813)) that it was constitutional for the President to extend further the provisions of the Non-Intercourse Act of 1809 (2 Stat. 528) by proclamation to Great Britain although such a method of invoking the statutory provisions had not been stipulated in the statute. Congress has likewise, in 1886, authorized the President to exclude foreign vessels for retaliation against discrimination to American commerce (24 Stat. 79). There are many subsequent examples of such delegation of power to the President, one of the more recent of which was upheld by the Supreme Court on the issue of unconstitutional delegation of power in the well-known case of *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation* (299 U.S. 304).

---

[9] 22 U.S.C. 287e.

Use of armed forces

Section 6 of the bill concerns the important question of the supply of armed force to the Security Council. It deals with two problems in this respect which were the subject of considerable discussion during the course of the consideration of the Charter in this committee and in the Senate last July.

The first part of section 6 would authorize the President to negotiate a military agreement or agreements with the Security Council for the purposes and within the limits prescribed by article 43 of the Charter. While in constitutional terms, the prior authorization of the Congress is not needed to enable the President to negotiate an international agreement—particularly when such an agreement is necessary in order to give effect to existing treaty obligations—the committee believed it desirable that on a matter of this scope and importance the Congress should record its views in advance. In this way the President may proceed with full assurance that the Congress as a whole desires an agreement to be entered into on this subject. At the same time the bill, by providing that the Congress shall approve any such agreement or agreements as may be negotiated, insures that the Congress will have full opportunity to pass upon the terms and provisions thereof.

The bill provides that such approval by Congress shall be expressed by appropriate act or joint resolution. During the debate in the Senate on the Charter last July, there was considerable discussion as to whether the military agreements should be considered as treaties or whether they might be approved by the Congress through the joint resolution procedure. The preponderant view was that the latter procedure was preferable since the agreements would be entered into for the purpose of giving effect to the obligation assumed by this country under article 43 of the Charter to make available to the Security Council the armed force necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Under this view, the precise details of the obligation—such as the exact amount of the forces to be contributed and the places where they are to be stationed—is not a matter for treaty consideration but for legislative sanction by the Congress under its constitutional powers to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces (art. 1, sec. 8, pars. 12, 13, and 14 of the Constitution). There were those who expressed a preference for the treaty method of considering these agreements, but all were agreed on the basic proposition that the military agreements could not be entered into solely by executive action. On the last day of the debate in the Senate, July 28, the President, then attending the Potsdam Conference, sent a message to the Congress in which he stated that "When any such agreement or agreements are negotiated, it will be my purpose to ask the Congress by appropriate legislation to approve them." The committee believes that it is desirable to determine this question once and for all, and that it is appropriate to specify that the military agreement or agreements should be submitted for approval to the Congress.

The second part of section 6 deals with the authority of the President to make available to the Security Council on its call the armed forces, facilities and assistance provided for in the special agreement or agreements. In this connection, this committee stated in its report on the Charter last July, as follows:

"The committee is convinced that any reservation to the Charter, or any subsequent congressional limitation designed to provide, for example, that employment of the armed forces of the United States to be made available to the Security Council under special agreements referred to in article 43 could be authorized only after the Congress had passed on each individual case would clearly violate the spirit of one of the most important provisions of the Charter. One of the fundamental purposes of the Charter is to provide forces which will be immediately available to the Security Council to take action to prevent a breach of the peace. Moreover, if a reservation to this effect were to be adopted by the Senate, the very nature of the Charter itself would be changed, and further negotiations with the other signatories of the Charter would unquestionably be necessary.

"Preventive or enforcement action by these forces upon the order of the Security Council would not be an act of war but would be international action for the preservation of the peace and for the purpose of preventing war. Consequently, the provisions of the Charter do not affect the exclusive power of Congress to declare war.

"The committee feels that a reservation or other congressional action such as that referred to above would also violate the spirit of the United States Constitution under which the President has well established powers and obligations to use our armed forces without specific approval of Congress.

"The special position of the United States as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council whose approval is needed for any enforcement action needs to be emphasized once again in this connection. No United States forces can be employed, no enforcement action of any kind against a nation breaking the peace can be taken, without the full concurrence of the United States acting through its delegate on the Security Council."

In order that there may be no doubt about the availability of our armed forces, the committee believed it wise that the Congress should in this legislation confirm its view that the President has the power and obligation, in compliance with our undertaking under the Charter, to make the forces provided in the agreements available to the Security Council. This act on the part of the Congress will contribute not only to public understanding within the United States but will also serve notice upon the world that as a nation we are prepared to carry out our obligations promptly and effectively. At the same time the committee felt it important to make it clear that nothing contained in the statute should be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose, armed forces in addition to such as may be provided for in the military agreements.

Appropriations

Section 7 authorizes appropriations for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the United Nations and also for expenses in connection with the representation of the United States therein. The section provides for the waiver of civil-service and classification laws and certain related matters which the committee deems necessary to include in this bill in order to provide for the most effective participation by the United States in this work.

16. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS ON THE AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1945, JUNE 16, 1949

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, having had under consideration S. 1073 to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 in order to strengthen the United States participation in the United Nations, reports its own bill (S. 2093) of an identical title, amending said act to the Senate and recommends that it do pass.

Contributions of members to U.N. commissions

For these reasons, personnel and equipment have been supplied to these commissions by member governments on an ad hoc basis. The amounts and numbers involved, while they would be a major item in the small UN budget, have not been a significant outlay for the individual UN members which have made contributions. Considerable equipment has in the past been furnished by the United Kingdom, France, Netherlands, China, Australia, and Turkey. Personnel have been detailed by these countries as well as by many other members of the UN. Ready availability in the area involved has been a principal determinant in the UN's decision as to whom to ask for assistance.

Reimbursement to United States

Ordinarily, assistance rendered to the UN under these provisions will be on the basis of reimbursement to the United States for any direct and additional expenses which the United States may incur as a result of granting such assistance. This is not intended to include a charge for the loan of of equipment, or other costs not attributable to the UN operation, such as the salaries of the military personnel which the United States would have paid even if these individuals had not been assigned to the United Nations. The committee also recognized that there may be exceptional circumstances in which a requirement of reimbursement might impede the operation of a commission, or be otherwise contrary to the interests of the United States. The committee decided, therefore, that reimbursement shall not be an absolute condition and that the matter can be left to the discretion of the Executive.

A survey of the pros and cons of the President's authority to conduct the war in Vietnam without a declaration of war by the Congress follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT THE WAR IN VIETNAM WITHOUT A DECLARATION OF WAR BY THE CONGRESS

A SURVEY OF THE PROS AND CONS

1. The President's authority to conduct war under the Constitution

The President's Constitutional authority to employ the armed forces of the United States arises from his powers as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces, his special responsibilities in the field of foreign affairs, and his duty to see that the laws be faithfully executed.[1] As the "Executive Power" the President has additional powers in the field of foreign affairs derived from the position of the United States as a soverign nation with rights and obligations under the law of nations.[2]

Because treaties are the law of the land and it is the President's duty to take care that they be faithfully executed as laws, the President has the authority and duty to fulfill the treaties of the United States.[3] This has been interpreted by some as permitting the dispatch of the armed forces in those instances which involve the implementation of security treaties. Such was the authority cited in the instance of the Korean conflict when the President acted to carry out recommendations made by the United Nations Security Council in accordance with the U.N. Charter—a treaty to which the United States is a party.[4]

Since the Constitution was adopted there have been a great many instances when the President, without Congressional authorization, and in the absence of a declaration of war, has ordered the armed forces to take action or maintain positions abroad. From President Jefferson's decision to order the American Navy to put down the Barbary pirates in the Mediterranean to President Roosevelt's occupation of Iceland in 1941, it is possible for the advocates of Presidential prerogative to cite dozens of examples of when the President has acted without previous Congressional approval—and in some cases has not consulted Congress at all.[5]

---

[1] Article II, Section 2, Clause 1; Article II, Section 2, Clause 2; Article II, Section 3.

[2] In fact, in one recent Supreme Court decision the President was referred to as the "sole organ of the nation" in foreign affairs. (U.S. v. Curtiss-Wright, 299, U.S. 304 318ff.)

[3] See the Supreme Court discussion in Ware v. Hylton, 3 Dall. 199 (1796).

[4] See: Powers of the President to send the Armed Forces outside the United States. Prepared for the use of the joint committee made up of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, 82d. Congress, 1st Session. Committee print, February 28, 1951, p. 3.

On the other hand, the Constitutional power to declare war and raise and support the armed forces is vested in the Congress.[6] While there is general agreement that the Congress' power to declare war does not restrict the President's power as Commander-in-Chief to employ the armed forces to repel invasion and repress insurrection in the case of a sudden emergency; the determination of the existence of such an emergency and the discretionary power of the President in such instances is still a matter of some debate among legislators and political scientists.[7]

Those who urge limitations on the President's use of his power as Commander-in-Chief cite several qualifying interpretations of the arguments cited by those favoring greater Presidential prerogative.

The opponents of Presidential prerogative point out that there is no Constitutional mention of the President in connection with the power to declare war and that this omission is significant.[8] Thus, they believe it is evident that the power to make war is vested solely in the Congress.

Against those examples of when the President has acted on his own initiative to commit armed forces abroad they cite several examples of when the President has sought and obtained the approval of Congress for his punitive expeditions as well as those instances when, such as in the case of the American entrance into World War I and World War II, the President has asked Congress for a formal declaration of war. Those who favor strong Congressional control over the war-making powers argue that, although there are many instances of when the President has committed the armed forces with neither a formal declaration of war nor the approval of Congress, in the matter of the excessive use of Presidential powers one hundred wrongs do not destroy a correct Constitutional principle.[9] Furthermore, they contend, the vast majority of those actions undertaken by Presidents without the approval of Congress were on a rather small scale and of a short duration. The Korean conflict is excepted, in the case of those who accept its legality, because it is considered a direct response to an obligation which the United States assumed as a member of the United Nations Charter.[10]

Even if the Presidents' vigorous exercise of their authority as Commanders-in-Chief has tended to erode the war-making power of the Congress, Congress still retains a considerable amount of authority when it wishes to pass specific legislation in this area. The limitations placed on the use of American troops under the North Atlantic Treaty are one demonstration of the power of Congress to pass specific restrictions on the employment of American armed forces when it so wishes. If it wishes, Congress can refuse to raise any armed forces at all or provide for the appropriations necessary to the conduct of war. Furthermore, with the refusal of implementation it could in effect abrogate a treaty to which the United States was a party.

Some scholars are of the opinion that a final and precise solution to the Constitutional question of where the President's power ends and that of Congress begins may well be impossible to achieve. They offer a plea for a moderate recognition by each branch of the particular authority and responsibility of the other. Such a solution to the problem, in one view, would require Congress to recognize that the President's power as Commander-in-Chief must be "unqualified, unrestricted, and untrammeled by impossible restrictions," and the President, for his part, to respect the powers possessed by Congress in the declaration of war clause of the Constitution. Such respect would include the right to advise the President of the sense of Congress with regard to his actions through such means as the concurrent resolution.[11]

2. *The authority of the President to conduct the war in Vietnam*

(a) Under the Constitution

Whether or not the President has the Constitutional authority to conduct the war in Vietnam without a declaration of war by Congress depends on one's interpretation of the President's power as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces of the United States and his duty to see that the laws are faithfully executed.

According to the Administration, the President's authority and duty to conduct military operations in Vietnam stem from the following: our commitments under the Southeast Asia Treaty, the pledges to the Republic of South Vietnam made by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, assistance programs annually approved by Congress since 1955, declarations issued at the SEATO Ministerial Council Meetings of 1964 and 1965, the joint Congressional resolution of August 6–7, 1964, and the supplemental defense appropriations for Vietnam operations of May 7, and September 17, 1965.[12]

As a treaty-in-force the Southeast Asia Treaty is a law of the land to which the United States is bound as a sovereign nation with rights and duties under the law of nations.[13] The Treaty is designed to protect its members, and any of the three non-Communist states growing out of former French Indo-China which asks for protection, against "Communist aggression." Those arguing the case for Presidential prerogative point out that Congress has passed no specific restrictions on the President's execution of American responsibilties under the Treaty other than that the "aggression" referred to under Article IV of the Treaty be "Communist aggression." They further point out that economic and military aid to South Vietnam began in 1954 under President Eisenhower, and that since 1955 Congress has annually approved overall economic and military assistance programs in which the continuation of major aid to South Vietnam has been specifically considered.[14]

The Council of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization issued communiques on April 15, 1964 and May 5, 1965 concluding that "the defeat of this Communist campaign is essential not only to the security of the Republic of Viet-Nam but to that of Southeast Asia" and in 1965, that ". . . the Council welcomed and expressed warm support for the policy of the United States Government as outlined by President Johnson on April 7, 1965, when he affirmed the determination of the United States to provide assistance to South Viet-Nam to defend its independence, stated the readiness of the United States for unconditional discussion with the governments concerned in search for a peaceful settlement, and offered the prospect of enriching the hopes and existence of more than 100 million people by a program of economic and social assistance in Southeast Asia."[15]

The advocates of Presidential prerogative in Vietnam point out that Congress has in no way attempted to restrict the President's actions to carry out such policies in support of SEATO and American pledges to South Vietnam. The annual assistance programs, which have been passed by bi-partisan majorities since 1955, are offered as just one indication of the support which the President has received from Congress. Another example is the Southeast Asia Resolution of August 1964, passed concurrently by the House and Senate by a combined vote of 502 to 2, which concludes in part: ". . . the United States is therefore prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."[16]

In addition to the Southeast Asia Resolution the Congress has overwhelmingly approved two recent supplemental appropriations to support the conduct of the war in Vietnam, including the 1.7 billion Southeast Asia Emergency Fund passed on September 17th after the President had announced his intention to substantially increase American military participation in Vietnam.[17]

Supporters of the Administration point out that Congress' willingness to use its strongest weapon in foreign affairs, that is, the control of appropriations, to support the President's policy, is a firm indication of its recognition and support of the President's authority to conduct the war in Vienam without a formal declaration of war by the Congress.

Those who reject the authority of the

---

[5] See: Commager, Henry Steele. Presidential power: the issue analyzed. The New York Times magazine, January 14, 1951, p. 11, 23–24.

For a comprehensive list of instances when the United States has used its armed forces abroad see: U.S. report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Background information on the use of U.S. armed forces in foreign countries. House report No. 127. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1951. pp. 55–64.

[6] Article I, Section 8, Clause 11; Article I, Section 8, Clause 12.

[7] Nor is the Supreme Court entirely clear on this matter. The most often cited authority for *both* sides is the famous *Prize Cases* involving Lincoln's decision to blockade the Confederacy in April of 1861, which provides a split decision (5–4 in favor of Lincoln's authority) offering substantial arguments both for and against the President's prerogative.

[8] A recent statement of this position appears in a Memorandum of Law: American policy in Vietnam, in light of our Constitution, the United Nations Charter, the 1954 Geneva Accords, and the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 18, pp. 24906–24909.

[9] See: Corwin, Edward S. The President's power. New republic, January 29, 1951, p. 16; Memorandum of Law, *op. cit.*, p. 24909.

[10] Discussed in more detail on page 14 below.

[11] See: Rossiter, Clinton. The Constitution and troops to Europe. The New leader, March 26, 1951, pp. 12–13.

[12] See: Secretary Rusk. The tasks of diplomacy. Why Vietnam. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1965, pp. 10–12; New York Times, June 19, 1965, p. 10.

[13] Approved by the U.S. Senate by a vote of 82–1, entered into force by the United States, February 19, 1955.

[14] Secretary Rusk, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

[15] U.S. Department of State bulletin, May 4, 1964, p. 692; June 7, 1965, p. 924.

[16] Public Law 88–408, August 10, 1964.

[17] H.J. Res. 447; H.R. 9221; for the President's speech see: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 14, p. 18812.

President to conduct the war in Vietnam contend that the President does not have the authority to conduct the war under either the Constitution or the Southeast Asia Treaty and, in fact, the American participation in the Vietnam war is a violation of the United Nations Charter and the Geneva Accords of 1954.

Those who contest the Constitutionality of the President's course in Vietnam generally present the case for strict Congressional authority over the power to make war presented above. Some also contend that there is no Constitutional authority for the United States Government to conduct a war without a formal declaration of war whether it has the support of Congress or not. They hold that Congress cannot delegate its exclusive power to declare war to the President regardless of its wishes.[18] Thus, they hold that the Southeast Asia Resolution, since it is not a formal declaration of war, does not present the President with any authority to conduct an American war in Vietnam. As for the Congressional resolutions voting supplemental appropriations for the increased American military commitment in Vietnam, critics of the President's authority hold that Congress was confronted with a *fait accompli* and had little choice in the matter.

(b) Under the U.N. Charter

Several critics of the President's conduct of the war in Vietnam contend that the American operations in Vietnam are a violation of the United Nations Charter and, because the U.N. Charter is a treaty-in-force and thus the law of the land, a violation of the U.S. Constitution. As a member of the United Nations, the United States has pledged to refrain "from the threat or use of force," and recognizes that only the "Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression" and decide upon what measures shall be taken.[19] Under Article 33 of the Charter members are bound to first seek a solution to their problems by peaceful means, and if that fails, Article 37 requires them to submit the dispute to the Security Council. Administration critics hold that the United States has not fulfilled its obligations under Articles 2, 33, and 37 of the Charter and is thus violating the U.N. Charter.[20]

There are two exceptions to the above articles, one is Article 51 of the Charter which states in part:

"Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations."

The other exception occurs in Article 53 which refers to the right of regional organizations to take measures against the enemy states of World War II.

Critics of the Administration's actions in Vietnam contend that:

"Article 51 cannot be properly invoked for (1) South Vietnam does not have the political status of a state; (2) even if South Vietnam were deemed a de facto state, the infiltrations do not constitute an 'armed attack' within the purview of article 51; and (3) the United States cannot claim the right of 'collective self-defense' in respect of a regional system involving southeast Asia." [21]

The position of the Administration on this matter is that the United States is properly responding to armed aggression under Article 51 of the Charter. Secretary Rusk contends that because the infiltration began slowly and grew gradually to its present scope over a period of several years does not disguise the fact that it is indeed "armed aggression" from North Vietnam.[22] Furthermore, Secretary Rusk contends that Vietnam became a Republic in 1955 when it was recognized by thirty-six nations; moreover, it is recognized by more than fifty today.[23] Thus the United States, he contends, is participating in the collective self-defense of the Republic of Vietnam against armed aggression from the North under the authority of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter and through its commitments as a member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

Supporters of the Administration contend that the President has done everything possible within reason to settle the Vietnam conflict peacefully through the United Nations. The issue was publicly placed before the United Nations in the President's address at San Francisco last spring and the Administration continues to work both publicly and privately through the Secretary-General of the United Nations to find a means of settlement.[24] Administration supporters hold, however, that action in the Security Council is inadvisable due to the fact that three members to the dispute are not United Nations members and there is strong opposition to considering the matter among some Security Council members.[25] Furthermore, the Hanoi and Peking governments have thus far "pushed aside and rejected participation by the United Nations." [26]

Critics of the Administration's policy vis-a-vis the United Nations, in pointing out the Charter obligations in Article 37 (for the parties to a dispute to bring the matter before the Security Council), contend that whatever embarrassment would result from debate in the Security Council or failure due to a Soviet veto to implement a workable solution through the United Nations would be a great deal less harmful than "being an outlaw nation under the charter." [27]

(c) As a member of SEATO and the U.N.

Opponents of the Administration's policies in Vietnam also point to Article 103 of the United Nations Charter which states that the obligations assumed by members under the Charter will take precedence over any other international agreement when the two may conflict. Pointing to the provisions of Article 1 of the SEATO Treaty, which pledges the members to refrain from the threat or use of force in "any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations," they hold that any military action taken under SEATO in lieu of bringing the matter before the United Nations Security Council is a clear violation of the U.N. Charter.[28] In addition to the responsibilities of member nations under Article 37 to bring disputes before the Security Council, such critics point to Article 53 which states in part:

"But no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council."

Those defending the Administration's policy feel that the key word in Article 53 is "enforcement." They would point out that there is no enforcement action being taken in Vietnam but only the defense of the Republic of Vietnam from armed attack directed from the North. Hence they hold that action taken through SEATO by the United States is being accomplished under Article 51 of the Charter,[29] which provides for collective defense against armed attack, and under paragraph 1 of Article IV of the SEATO Treaty, which provides for the use of force by one or more member states in the case of "aggression by armed attack."

Many critics of the Administration do not accept the view that the conflict in South Vietnam involves "aggression by armed attack" from the North; therefore they feel that the American action in Vietnam is authorized neither under the U.N. Charter nor the SEATO Treaty.

Indeed, a good deal of the question over whether or not the United States is acting within its rights as a member of the United Nations in responding as it is to the Vietnam Crisis depends on one's opinion of whether or not there has been an "armed attack" from the North. Unfortunately, this is not a matter which is possible to fully explore in this short report.

(d) The Geneva Accords of 1954

The United States is not a signatory party to the Geneva Accords of 1954. It did, however, participate in the discussions which led to them and issued a unilateral declaration on July 21, 1954 which stated that the United States would "refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb them, in accordance with Article 2(4) of the Charter of the United Nations." [30]

Critics of American policy contend that the United States thus recognized that any violation of this declaration would be a violation of its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and, therefore, indirectly, a violation of the U.S. Constitution since the former's treaty status makes it the law of the land.

Once again whether or not the United States has violated the United Nations Charter would appear to depend on whether or not an "armed attack" has occurred from the North. Supporters of the Administration claim it has and that the United States is acting within its rights to defend the independence of South Vietnam in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter and the Geneva Accords.[31] Opponents of the Administration's policy claim the opposite.

---

[18] See: Statements of Senator Wayne Morse. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 15, p. 19841; also, Memorandum of Law, *op. cit.*, p. 24909.

[19] Chapter I, Article 2(4); Chapter VII, Article 39.

[20] See: Statements of Senator Ernest Gruening, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 10, pp. 13606–13611; also Memorandum of Law, *op. cit.*, pp. 24904–24906; Senator Morse, *op. cit.*, pp. 19840–19847.

[21] Law Memorandum. *ibid.*, pp. 24904–24905.

The first assumption, i.e., that South Vietnam does not have state status is based on the Geneva Accords of 1954; the second on a restrictive interpretation of Article 51 based on the words "armed attack"; the third on an interpretation of "collective security" as referring only to regional organizations where the member states all are located within the same region, thus ruling out the U.S. as a state existing outside of the Southeast Asia land area.

[22] The tasks of diplomacy, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

[24] See: Address by President Johnson. U.S. Department of State bulletin, July 19, 1965, pp. 98–101; Goldberg offers appeal to Thant. New York Times, July 29, 1965, pp. 1, 10.

[25] See: Reston, James. United Nations: The frustrations of the U.N. New York Times, February 19, 1965, p. 24; Rosenfeld, Stephens S. Russia hits any Viet role by U.N. Washington Post, August 12, 1965, p. A22.

[26] Secretary Rusk. C.B.S. TV Special Report—Vietnam perspective: winning the peace. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 16, p. 21677.

[27] Senator Morse, *op. cit.*, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 15, p. 19843. See also his statements in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 18, pp. 24797–24799.

[28] Memorandum of Law, *op. cit.*, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 18, p. 24907.

[29] See pages 9 and 10 above.

[30] U.S. Committee on Foreign Relations. Senate. Background information relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam. (rev. ed.) Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1965, p. 61. It has been suggested that the U.S. declaration to abide by the Geneva Accords stated as *"provided"* that other states did likewise; (Trager, Frank N. Back to Geneva '54? An act of folly! Vietnam perspectives. New York, American Friends of Vietnam, Inc., 1965, p. 2), however, there is no such qualifying statement in the declaration itself.

This report makes no attempt to reach any final conclusions on the question of the constitutionality of the American commitment in Vietnam. Nevertheless, it seems clear that whereas a declaration of war by Congress would end any question of whether the President is authorized to conduct the war under the Constitution, such a declaration would in no way affect the status of United States actions in Vietnam, in regard to the United Nations Charter, SEATO, or the Geneva Accords.

3. *The authority of the President to conduct operations in Korea and Vietnam: a brief comparison*

Those who supported President Truman's authority to take action in Korea held that the President, by virtue of his authority as Commander-in-Chief and his duty to see that the laws are faithfully executed, acted properly to carry out recommendations made by the U.N. Security Council in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

Article 39 of the U.N. Charter provides for a determination of the existence of any "threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression" by the Security Council and the Council's determination of what measures shall be taken to restore the peace. The Security Council resolution of June 27, 1950 called upon member nations to assist the Republic of Korea in repelling the armed attack from the North and to aid in restoring international peace and security in the area.

Those who challenged the authority of the President in Korea held that the Security Council resolution of June 27, 1950 was purely of a recommendatory nature; hence the United States was not legally obligated to act.[32] Furthermore, they claimed that although there were some precedents for the President to exercise his powers as Commander-in-Chief independently of Congress such actions usually involved only small forces, nothing approaching the scope of the commitment in Korea.

Some of those who have questioned the authority of the President to commit American troops in Vietnam have been willing to accept the commitment in Korea on the basis of the United Nations Security Council resolutions urging such action. Others would accept neither on the basis of the Constitutional interpretations opposing the use of Presidential prerogative mentioned in part one above. Still others would contend that the use of American troops in Vietnam represents a more legitimate use of Presidential authority than in the Korean instance. They contrast the swift and decisive commitment of a vast number of American forces to Korea in 1950, without prior consultation of Congress, to the gradual buildup of forces which has taken place in Vietnam with the frequent consultation of a Congress which has continually expressed its approval of the President's actions both through the Southeast Asia Resolution and monetary appropriations for the war.[33]

Those favoring Presidental prerogative might point to the United Nations commitment in Korea and the frequent consultations with Congress in the case of Vietnam, as well as arguing that the Korean war represents something of a precedent for Presidential action without a declaration of war in Vietnam. Those opposed might argue that both actions were taken without sufficient authority from the Congress and that a bad precedent in Korea does not excuse another Constitutional wrong in Vietnam. The two represent such different political situations—domestically as well as internationally—that a meaningful objective comparison is extremely difficult.

Mr. Speaker, some Representatives relax secure in the belief that if in no other way, Congress—the people's representatives—in our constitutional system of government can control runaway promiscuous warmaking by controlling the use of funds appropriated for U.S. military forces. An interesting paper for the art of reprograming of taxpayers' dollars follows:

How could Congress use its "powers of the purse" to control Presidential deployment of U.S. troops, as he might do, for example, in helping to implement a U.N. Security Council resolution?

It is helpful to consider this subject in two parts: (1) expenditure of funds before Congress can act or chooses to act; (2) possible Congressional action controlling the expenditure of funds.

1. *Expenditure of funds before Congress can act, chooses to act, or is requested to act by the Executive:* Congressional interest in controlling Defense expenditures for military deployments probably should focus on the reprogramming of appropriated funds rather than on emergency or contingency funds. Department of Defense contingency funds averaged only $15 million a year in fiscal years 1965, 1966, and 1967. The President's emergency fund, which can be used for emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense, averaged only $1 million in these years.[1] By reprogramming the Department can cover large expenses not anticipated when a particular annual budget is drawn up and then approved by Congress. In commenting on the President's January 24, 1967, budget message, the *Washington Post* observed:

"The President noted that the above spending total [in the fiscal year 1967 Vietnam supplemental appropriation request] comes to $5.2 billion. The actual amount will come to $9.1 billion, he said, because of the spending of other funds. Presumably, much of the other money came from extensive reprogramming done by the Pentagon in recent months." [2]

This Vietnam reprogramming was in large measure accomplished under specific provision of law, namely Section 640 of the fiscal year 1967 Department of Defense appropriation law (P.L. 89–687), yet this illustration indicates roughly how much can be accomplished through transfer of funds within general appropriations categories.

A Report of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the House Committee on Armed Services states:

"Reprogramming is the word used to describe the shifting of appropriated funds by a department or agency from the purpose for which originally justified to the Congress to another use. In the case of the Department of Defense, authorization and appropriation laws provide funds in lump-sum amounts for broad categories. Detailed justifications are presented to the Committees of Armed Services and Appropriations to support the requests for funds; the Congress has made clear that the Department of Defense is committed to the programs as justified to its committees and that any significant deviation from such programs is beyond the normal authority of the Department.

"However, the Congress has recognized that because of the lengthy period between justification of a program and expenditure of funds some shifting of appropriations is virtually inevitable to be responsive to technological breakthroughs, changes in the nature of the threat facing us, and similar unforeseen contingencies. Reprogramming of funds in valid instances had thus been permitted and over the years procedures have gradually evolved under which reprogrammings are reviewed and approved by committees of the Congress.

The Congress has long been concerned with possible abuses of this reprogramming privilege and has gradually extended its surveillance of this activity." [3]

Most Department of Defense appropriations are "no year" funds, with the result that reprogramming can conceivably involve unexpended balances from fiscal years prior to the year in which the reprogramming takes place.[4]

The theoretical upper limit to the funds the Defense Department could spend on an extraordinary military deployment would thus seem to depend on a number of factors, including among others: a) how much money in a lump-sum, broad appropriations category, such as "Operations and Maintenance, Army," could be devoted to a particular deployment without jeopardizing other missions for which the Defense Department is responsible; and b) the Defense Department's interpretation of appropriations laws, and the results of or the Department's concern over surveillance of such transfers by Congress.

2. *Possible Congressional action controlling the expenditure of funds:* If the President and the Department of Defense conclude that a particular military deployment could not be paid for out of appropriated funds, including reprogrammed funds, a supplemental appropriation could be requested of Congress, or perhaps the request might be included in the next regular appropriations estimates. Congress could refuse the request, of course.

So far as other possible Congressional action is concerned:

(a) At least certain legal precedents exist to the effect that Congress can direct that Federal funds shall not be paid out for a specific purpose.[5] This avenue or approach would have to be explored very carefully and its feasibility would seemingly require extensive analysis. However, Congressional restrictions of this type have been placed in legislation authorizing foreign economic assistance. One example of such restrictions so placed provides that "no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to the government of any country unless the President determines that such country is not dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement."[6]

---

[31] No mention is made here of the complex and still unclear issues involving the holding of elections under the Geneva Accords scheduled for 1956 since it does not directly involve the questions considered in this report.

[32] Other arguments were also presented which centered around an interpretation of Article 6 of the Charter; however, they are not directly relevant to the question of action in Vietnam considered here.

[33] Congressional opposition to the President's actions in Korea appears to have been at least quantitatively greater than in the case of Vietnam. See the statements of Senator Robert A. Taft. Quoted in Rees, David. Korea: the limited war. New York, St. Martin's Press, 1964, pp. 200–201.

[1] *The Budget of the United States Government for the Fiscal Year Ending 1967*, Appendix, 89th Cong., 2nd Sess., House Doc. 335, Pt. 2, pp. 67, 307.

[2] *Washington Post*, Jan. 26, 1967, A19.

[3] U.S. Congress, House Committee on Armed Services, *Department of Defense Reprogramming of Appropriated Funds, A Case Study*. Report of the Special Subcommittee for Special Investigations [Committee Print] Washington, D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1965, p. 1.

[4] See, e.g., U.S Congress, Senate Committee on Government Operations, *Legislation Authorizing Appropriations and Establishing Revolving Funds*, Doc. No. 73, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., Washington, D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1965.

[5] See, e.g., U.S. Library of Congress. Legislative Reference Service, *The Constitution of the United States of America*, U.S. Congress, Senate, 88th Cong., 1st Sess., Doc. No. 39, Washington, D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1964, p. 372.

(b) Congress can issue instructions preventing the diversion of funds from one account to another within a lump-sum appropriation category. This has been done in the past.[7] Whether this could be done once the diversion is under way is not only problematical but somewhat analogous to Congressional authority to rescind an appropriation already made. Representative George Mahon, in testimony given to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, stated:

"It is probably not widely known that under the rules and precedents in the House—I understand likewise in the Senate, but I am not certain—it is not in order under the standing rules to include in general appropriations bills provisions rescinding all or a portion of an appropriation previously made. Yet it seems elementary that regular rules of order ought to admit germane provisions changing what has gone before. I suggest for study the proposition that it would strengthen the regular rules on control of the purse if the rules allowed recision provisions."[8]

And we return to the basic question. Mr. Congressman, what will you do? Congress must seek return of its powers and prestige as a sovereign segment of the constitutional system or else the theory of separate of powers is a farce.

Forget the party and personal reputations of the leaders. The Republic—our country and people are at stake.

OUR GRAVEST DOMESTIC ISSUE: THE DILEMMA OF INTERRACIAL RELATIONS

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in its fundamental aspects, what is happening in the United States and elsewhere in the world today in the way of racial agitations is not new but traces back for centuries. The only new feature is that since 1937 the Communist Party has obtained many positions of influence over leadership in our country with the ultimate objective of using the race issue for creating a Soviet America.

As clearly foreseen since 1954 by competent students of the race problem, the situation in the United States has become acute with widespread disorders, mounting crime, and even insurrections. On numerous occasions in various parts of the Nation these have required the use of the militia by State governments, in the exercise of the police power reserved to them under the Constitution, for protection against domestic violence.

The vast volume of attending propaganda has been dominated by vote-seeking demagogs seeking political power, egalitarian exhibitionists searching for utopia, pseudo-scientists promoting some of their fallacious racial ideas, "do-gooders" whose idealism is superior to their judgment, and Communist revolutionaries exploiting minority groups for their own special purposes.

A servile or intimidated mass news media, including most of our scientific journals and the advertiser-dominated press, by failing to expose what has been taking place in forthright and competent manner and to report the fundamental nature of the racial problems facing the United States, has served to bring about a second Reconstruction era in the South and to cause immeasurable harm in the northern, central, and western parts of the United States, especially in our great cities. In the last three areas, the race problems have become far more acute than in the South.

Not satisfied with limiting their agitations to the United States, "modern abolitionists," including some of our highest political leaders, have urged what amounts to sedition in friendly countries whose strategic position makes them vital to the security of Western civilization, most notably, Portugal, Rhodesia, and South Africa. Moreover, scientific discussions of the problem of race have been virtually excluded from our educational institutions and professional magazines, thus denying basic information to the people of the United States and thereby contributing toward genetic destruction of both the white and black races of catastrophic proportions.

Fortunately, the censorship and suppression of scientific information so long evident in our country is not universal. A most illuminating and objective article on the dilemma of race by Col. Robert Gayre, distinguished anthropologist, educator, author, speaker, and traveler, now editor of the Mankind Quarterly, an international journal dealing with race and inheritance in the fields of ethnology, genetics, ethno-psychology, racial history, demography, and anthro-geography, was published in the April–June 1966, issue of that magazine.

In this general connection, I would invite attention to several recently published books: Carlton Putnam's Race and Reality, by the Public Affairs Press, 419 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.; Earnest Sevier Cox's White America, Noontide Press, Post Office Box 76062, Los Angeles, Calif., and Peter A. Carmichael's, The South and Segregation, by the Public Affairs Press of Washington, D.C.

Because the indicated article by Colonel Gayre reflects a life-time of study, travel, and observation in various parts of the world, I quote it as part of my remarks and commend it for study by leaders of all racial groups, minority as well as majority, and especially by editors, clergy, professors, scientists, writers, and commentators; also by members of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our State and Federal Governments.

The indicated article follows:

The Dilemma of Inter-Racial Relations

At the present time the problems of inter-racial relations in Africa and elsewhere have become even more difficult to solve than they have always been because they are being exploited by political forces, particularly communism, and by organisations influenced by communist political philosophy. To the emotional atmosphere thus created is added a puerile kind of name calling directed against those "Fascists," "Nazis," "white supremists," "colonialists" and "imperialists" who refuse to accept the proposition that integration is the only moral solution to the problem. This has deterred many qualified people from questioning the powerful propaganda of integrationism.

The following outline is an attempt to analyse various solutions or alleged solutions to the difficulties which arise when different races come into contact with each other.

When human codes of conduct only concerned obligations within the family, clan, tribe or folk a simple solution was applied which left behind very little to trouble later generations. This was the destruction of the weaker racial units by the dominant stock—and within living memory some of the most primitive tribes of men still practised it.

The English-speaking peoples used a modification of this solution against the Amerindians, the aboriginal Australians and the Maoris. It is often forgotten that scalping was used by the Europeans in America as a means of accounting for Red Indians killed—for which payment was made—just as rats' tails are used nowadays. The practice was developed by the Indians in reprisal and in their own self-defence. The Amerindians were either destroyed or driven steadily into more and more inhospitable lands where they were almost wiped out by starvation—and even at the present time a trace of these conditions is still reflected in the average longevity of the Canadian Amerindians, as low as thirty years in 1965, and in their annual income, only about $1000 in most cases, very few earning over $2000. Although the reserves into which the Amerindians had been driven had become recognised as their own territories, when they became economically valuable to the Europeans these lands were sometimes seized and the inhabitants were rounded up and, in one notorious instance, were sent on a death march the horrors of which equalled anything the Germans did in the last war. It is therefore hardly surprising that in the American War of Independence many Red Indians supported the British cause, and in the American Civil War some aided the Confederacy against the highly moralistic, "liberal," anti-slave northern Yankees.

Similarly short shrift was given to the aboriginal Australians in the region now occupied by the Whites. The Black Fellows have only survived because they are specialised enough to live in deserts of no interest to the Whites. In New Zealand the Maoris resisted the Whites but were defeated and driven off their best lands. They have only survived in those parts which the English-speaking invaders were at that time unwilling or unable to occupy. Only now have their numbers recovered to about what they were a century ago.

The Canadian Government has found or blundered into the same kind of solution in the far north, where the ruthless exploitation of land within the last decade has so restricted the Eskimo economy that it has brought starvation and death to large sections of the population.

These examples are mentioned to indicate what one racial stock—even composed of people with the highest religious and moral principles—is apt to do when its own interests or survival are at stake. I am not concerned here with allocating blame but merely with trying to analyse the principles underlying inter-racial relations in the past. Obviously these historical events are not the responsibility of those Whites who now occupy the countries in question, but the fact remains that the territories they inhabit belonged to the ancestors of those people who are now in the American and Canadian reserves, the Australian desert, or the restricted areas of certain recognized native districts in New Zealand.

---

[6] U.S. Congress, Committees on Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs, *Legislation on Foreign Relations*, 90th Cong., 1st Sess., Joint Committee Print, Washington, D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1967, p. 47.

[7] U.S. Congress, Legislative Reference Service, Report, "Estimates and Appropriations for the Military Budget," March 14, 1955, p. 4.

[8] U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, Hearings, Pt. 2, 89th Cong., 2nd Sess., Washington, D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1966, p. 1659.

This then is one way of dealing with a native problem—wipe them out, or kill most of them and drive the remainder into a restricted living space so that they give no more trouble.

It will be seen that the survival until the present time of the Amerindians, the aboriginal Australians and the Maoris is partly or largely due to the recognition of territories in which they have been allowed to live. The deserts provided sanctuary for the native Australians but the other native populations took refuge in reserves of one kind or another which they managed to salvage from the wreckage of their countries under treaties with the incoming English-speaking peoples.

In none of these cases has a system of integration—and certainly not cross-breeding—been officially encouraged. All the dominant European peoples have practised separate development with as little racial integration as possible.

If the Whites entering these countries had merely occupied waste lands—which would have been the worst in every respect—not only would they have been much fewer in number than they are today but the native populations in possession of the richer lands would have been numerically very much greater. Indeed they might even have been more numerous than the Whites, as is the case in other territories where the incoming Whites have been much less ruthless than, in particular, the English-speaking settlers in the United States. However, under American, Canadian, Australian and New Zealand administrations the native populations have declined, in a disastrous manner except for the Maoris.

It is therefore quite astonishing that among the peoples who are most condemnatory of the present racial policies of the Whites in South Africa are the Canadians, Americans, Australians, New Zealanders, and the British—the people whose colonists carried out the policies already described. This is in spite of the fact that these people are in no small measure enjoying the results of ruthless aggression such as was only equalled elsewhere by the Spanish in Central and South America, although neither the Spanish nor the Portuguese were able to destroy the Amerindians in the way the English-speaking peoples destroyed the natives of their colonies, and so the Europeans are still a minority in Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking America. Among these English-speaking peoples in Canada, America and Australasia, who are so clamant in their condemnation of the Rhodesians, South Africans and Portuguese in Southern Africa, there seems to be no great disposition to restore even a tithe to the native populations whom they have so deeply injured—as they ought to do if their own principles are to be accepted as genuine.

In the United States another racial problem is posed by the Negroes, who were first brought to that country as slaves—following a well known pattern of race relations. But mammoth organisations have been mobilised, mass propaganda has been released and legislation has been enacted, in favour of the Negroes who, unlike the Amerindians, have no hereditary rights in the land—although that does not mean they have no right to fair treatment. In further contrast to the native Americans the Negroes have increased in number under the rule of the English-speaking population. It is also surprising that the well-being of the Negroes is in every way better catered for than is that of the Amerindians, whose claims are equal on moral grounds and immeasurably higher on historical and legal premises. We might wonder at this racial discrimination—which is common to liberally minded Americans and to anti-"racialist" pressure groups—were it not self-evident that only the Negro problem fits into the world pattern of international political warfare directed against the Western Countries by communism, aided and abetted by allies and well-wishers in all the European countires, and given the power it possesses by well-meaning but simple-minded masses of decent people who lack the ability to discriminate and from whom the facts from which to reason and form wise judgments are in any case withheld.

In the course of history a widely practised form of inter-racial relationship, even between stocks of basically the same origins, has been the conquest and enslavement of the weaker racial type by the dominant element. Thus the Romans enslaved the Germans and Celts, and the Germans enslaved the Celts and Slavs. Indeed, enslavement of the weaker tribes and clans even occurred within the same linguistic group. In contrast to the vertical division between one group and another which occurs when the weaker group is allowed to survive in reserves, the practice of conquest and enslavement results in a horizontal stratification or caste system. This horizontal division is much more marked when one race conquers another than when the two groups are distinguished merely by linguistic or tribal differences. The classical example of the caste system is provided by India where the Caucasoid Hindus or Indians conquered the subcontinent and reduced the largely Australoid indigenous black population to slavery and thraldom. The caste system was established so early and has been so long in existence that it has become fortified by legal, social and religious sanctions. It has survived in full vigour to the present time in spite of missionary opposition and legislation passed against it under Nehru. That it is racial in origin is obvious since everywhere in India the caste Hindus are fairer than the outcastes. Indeed, the high caste Hindus in the north are clearly Caucasoids or Whites even to this day.

In the expansion of European power from the sixteenth century onwards a widespread conquest of Negroes occurred during which they were shipped as slaves from Africa tc colonial territories especially in America and the West Indies. There the same kind of caste relationship existed between the Whites and the Blacks. Miscegenation was frowned upon, and although it occurred—as it must in such situations—the hybrids passed into the mass of the enslaved class and formed no part of the dominant Whites.

The caste system can rarely survive indefinitely, however, when the ability of the two stocks is very nearly the same, even though the defeated stock usually shows some defect which has resulted in subordination to the conquerors. Thus, although the Germanic or Gothonic conquerors of the southern half of Britain and most of the continent of Europe established themselves as a nobiliary caste which had the sanction of custom and law, and was supported by economic power, the difference between the two stocks has now largely disappeared. Since at least the fifteenth century able individuals have worked their way into the upper classes and in time have become members of the aristocracy. For this reason very few of the present nobility of England can trace their ancestry back to the Norman conquest, although much of the nobility of Scotland dates from that period—indeed from considerably earlier—since Scotland was much less affected by these invasions.

However, if the conquered are markedly inferior to the conquerors in those abilities which contribute to the technological development of the dominant civilisation it is probable that they will always remain an outcaste element at the bottom of the social structure. Although miscegenation with the conquerors will by genetic segregation tend to produce elements which rise higher than the mass of the serf classes and to some extent vie with the conquerors, this is merely because they have inherited the ability from their conquerors.

These principles have in fact operated in the United States and parts of Central and South America where the Negroes are still at the base of society, although from time to time intellectuals and professional men come into prominence who are usually described as Negroes but are actually hybrids with Caucasoid ancestry. Of course, since there is overlap in every trait between different populations it follows that the upper Negro element will often show higher ability than the lower White element, and so occasionally some able Negroes who have little or no Caucasoid blood will come into prominence. Generally, however, the leaders of any civilisation showing a markedly specialised form of development—such as the European civilisation, which is based upon dynamism, creativeness and accumulation of material things—are those who have created it, not aliens who have shown no inherent ability in that direction.

It seems that this horizontal division cannot be obliterated, however desirable that might be on ethical or religious grounds, because it results from something much more profound than a mere accident of history. The Negro slaves of the Americas were there not as a result of one battle but literally thousands. Nor was their capture merely due to the fact that the Europeans had firearms and the Negroes had not—although that fact alone indicates the difference in aptitudes and development between the two races. In fact many of the enslaved Negroes were captured and sold to the European slavers by Negroes of more advanced, powerful and aggressive tribes. The slaves of America and elsewhere were selected for inability to preserve their independence, as their enslavement must have been due to such factors as lack of courage, lack of numbers—through failure to be successful in their environment—or lack of intelligence to organise resistance or escape, which would have made it not too difficult for the aggressive tribes to conquer and enslave them. In view of this, as long as any degree of natural selection exists the Negroes of the United States can never be expected to compete successfully against the Whites in their industrial and technological society, and so they are virtually condemned to a permanently inferior social position.

It is this self-evident fact which the forces of liberal thinking—and of much religious thinking—in the United States and elsewhere are being mobilised to overcome, and every form of pressure, including Acts of Congress and rulings of the Supreme and Federal Courts, is being applied in the attempt. But unless the Negroes are to be specially privileged—which surely no democracy dedicated to egalitarianism can tolerate indefinitely—it seems quite impossible to alter their position in society which results from their failure to equal the performance of the Whites in practically all activities fundamental to the technological civilisation of a Western state. Thus integration, which is the basis of this misdirected policy, places the Negroes in direct competition with the Whites, with the result that the majority of them are worsted and indeed psychologically injured in a very serious manner. In fact the racial hate welling up from the Negroes who are victims of this integration policy is evidence of the great damage which is being done. Of course the racial egalitarians—the so-called liberals—do not accept this because they will not have anything to do with the facts of heredity. Believing that nurture is more important than nature, and that education and improved social conditions can work miracles, they are the modern followers of Lamarck—despite the fact that his doctrines of environmentalism are destroyed by every genetic experiment which takes place. These people occasionally turn for support of their point of view to certain well publicised sociologists and geneticists—who appear to suffer from induced schizophrenia, because as long as they deal with infra-human species they adhere to the Mendelian laws of heredity and the facts of nature but when considering man they abandon all that and apply an entirely different set of Lamarckian nurturists theories. While this would be astonishing in objective scientists it is not surprising in these individuals who invariably have procommunist leanings. Indeed many of them are contributors to the *Daily Worker* and similar communist or communist front publications—and no communist can accept the implications of the laws of heredity when applied to man as they would render his political philosophy entirely worthless.

No matter how eminent a scientist may otherwise be, his theories cannot be accepted if he subscribes to a doctrine which denies the application of science to man and so prevents him from giving true and unbiased testimony—as is the case with communists and communist sympathisers. It is therefore relevant to know if the expert witnesses in any scientific inquiry subscribe to doctrines which prevent or are likely to prevent them from applying purely scientific genetic principles to man unfettered by considerations of political dogma. For this reason such widely publicised people as Ruth Benedict, Franz Boas, Leslie C. Dunn and Otto Klineberg, who have all been contributors to the *Daily Worker* and have participated in other activities generally considered favourable to communist ideology, and Theodosius Dobzhansky, a supporter of the American Council on Soviet Relations and an executive committee member of the American-Soviet Science Society, can not be considered unbiased authorities on racial differences in man.[1] If these communist or communist-orientated sociologists and scientists are ignored there are very few others to sponsor the notion that nurture is the key to the problem of race relations—or even that it is of equal importance with heredity.

It will thus be seen how very far astray are the modern nostrums for the solution of the racial problems of countries such as the United States where society is divided horizontally into two quite distinct stocks which are unequal in aptitudes, desires, energy and acquisitiveness. A solution to these problems must be found, but it will never be obtained from falsification of the facts of heredity and racial history. Those who persist in approaching this matter from the racial egalitarian point of view do so in such an aura of liberal moralising that there is a very great danger that they may continue to be listened to, which will be very much to the disadvantage of the backward and undeveloped Negroid stocks whom they ostensibly want to assist. In the past, charity, love and Christian consideration have been exercised where possible to shelter the weak from the full effect of unequal competition and the hard realities of life, but it is a curious phenomenon of the present time that those people who so loudly—and sometimes so impudently—claim a monopoly of virtue for desiring to aid the backward stocks of mankind are the very people who are insisting upon exposing the Negroes to an unequal struggle with the Whites. This can only end in tragedy for the Negroes wherever they become the victims of these theorists who are determined, no matter who suffers, to try to establish their quite unproved—indeed untrue—doctrine that with changes in social and physical environment they can equalise all races of men.

Since mankind is divided into races each of which arose by natural evolutionary processes through grappling with the particular problems presented by its own habitat, it is self-evident—and has never been called in question before the creation of the sociological theory that man is above nature—that man is made to live in groups of his own kind, competing against his kin and using an intellectual and physical apparatus which is common to all within his group. Scientific demonstration is not needed for any honest man of common sense to realise that this is manifestly true, although ample evidence for these premises could be produced.

In contrast to the caste system of horizontal segregation involving slavery or serfdom of some kind for the weaker strains, another solution to man's racial problem is the natural system of vertical division or separate development of ethnic units. In fact there are only a few—mainly partial—exceptions to this form of development. These include the gypsies, the Jews—until recently—and to some extent the Scots, of whom as many as 30,000,000 are probably distributed throughout the English-speaking world compared with a home population of just over 5,000,000. Despite their world-wide *diaspora*, however, the Scots have always remained firmly based on their own homeland; and in recent years the Jews have re-established a homeland for themselves. Only the gypsies have remained an entirely dispossessed people. In general, all the European peoples and the Negro tribes and nations, as well as many of the peoples of Asia, have carved out living spaces for themselves, in each of which the *folk* have developed as a distinct entity. In fact, most of the states in existence today, particularly the more stable ones, have evolved in this way.

Thus there should be no need to stress the naturalness and the desirability of this form of evolution. Yet the countries of Southern Africa in which this separate development is taking place are being assailed as though it were something unnatural and contrary to accepted custom. The application of the principle of separate development in Southern Africa must be right if practically all peoples have developed in this way, and if those countries in which this evolution has been largely unimpaired have less communal strife than occurs, for instance, in India, where this natural development has been impaired with the result that constant communal trouble leads to murder, riots, looting, and burning down mosques, temples and bazaars. Human society is never perfect, and no system of government can ever be perfect either. In satisfying the needs of one part of a community, inconvenience and sometimes even injustice may be suffered by another. From some points of view, therefore, there may be objectionable aspects to what is happening in the course of the application of this principle in Southern Africa, but this does not invalidate the principle. Where hardship or injustice is created, efforts must be made to ameliorate this without vitiating the principle itself.

Separate development is at present found in two stages in Southern Africa. In Rhodesia the foundations have been laid by the Group Areas Act, although the results have not yet emerged, but in South Africa the principle is well established. In Rhodesia there are major tribal groups—such as the conquering Matabele invaders and the more indigenous and more peaceful Mashonas—which constitute potential nations. These have retained their tribal form despite the bad effect of British rule which has often destroyed it elsewhere in Africa—except in some restricted areas such as parts of West Africa like Nigeria where, thanks to Lord Luggard, the great exponent of separate development and indirect rule, this erosion of native culture was prevented.

If it is permitted by enlightened government, the natural development of the greatest benefit to Rhodesia would be the emergence of three or more distinct ethnic zones. One would be for the Whites, whose considerable industrial and urban development would be backed by large-scale farming enterprises, and there would be others for the main tribes under paramount chiefs—supported by their councillors right down to the heads of kraals. It might be necessary for the smaller groups to be administered by some kind of trustee authority of the Rhodesian Government in order to avoid their extinction under the cultural and political domination of their more powerful neighbours. Three or more semi-autonomous governments might thus emerge, one White and the others Black, under a Rhodesian Government in which the Bantu would be represented, perhaps by a Chamber or Estate of Parliament for the chiefs and councillors of Rhodesia's major Bantu nations. It might also be necessary to increase the number of Estates so that other interests would be represented in the legislature. This kind of development might well leave the final control in the hands of the more advanced communities—as would be necessary in any case for the welfare of a progressive agrarian and technological state. With adequate representation of the organic elements of the whole country it is unlikely that such a government would be oppressive to any particular community.

There are at present upwards of half a million aliens working in the industries established in Rhodesia by the Whites. These rootless people are unrelated to the tribally organised Bantu and have no permanent place in the country. Under a properly planned economic and tribal policy they should be returned to their own countries. Incidentally, much of the sedition with which the Rhodesian Government has to deal would be automatically removed by the adoption of this measure, as the agitation is largely sponsored by these aliens living in the urban regions.

In South Africa itself the tribal structure was rather more intact than elsewhere, so the policy of separate development and indirect rule is more firmly established and in some areas is approaching successful completion. Already the Transkei, the state of the Xhosa nation, has come into being, and to the north in Zululand another nationality will be given self-government under its paramount chief. There is a possibility of somewhat parallel developments in the northern Bantu Homelands, and in South West Africa the Bastards of Rehoboth, who have long had their own Volksraad, are a small self-governing ethnic unit. However, much of South West Africa must eventually become some kind of protectorate for the Bushmen, whose salvation will largely depend upon the actions of the present Government of South Africa. Some special arrangement will likewise be required in Namaland for the Hottentot nation.

In addition to these self-governing nations there are the three British High Commission territories, to which Britain has given and is giving independence. If they are to survive at all they will have to come to terms with South African policies—and some of them will certainly be willing to do so. We may well ask what these territories are if they are not Bantustans already, as they fit exactly into the pattern now well on the way to completion. Thus Swaziland forms the homeland for the Swazis, Basutoland for the Sothos, and Bechuanaland for the Tswanas—although some of this territory should be appropriated for the Bushmen to whom it rightly belongs.

---

[1] This information is taken from *6000 Educators*, Circuit Riders, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1959, Vol. I. No doubt equally revealing information on certain other persons will be found in Volume II.

Within South Africa, therefore, Bantu and Khoisan peoples are progressing towards nationhood within their own homelands where they are protected from White competition and have the opportunity of developing their own institutions.

It is said in condemnation that South Africa does not intend to give these states independence in foreign policy and defence, but this is not surprising as any one of them could become a South African Cuba or Zanzibar and open the country to the possibility of hostile action from powers outside Africa. In any case Britain does not give absolute independence to Northern Ireland, the Isle of Man, Jersey, Guernsey or Sark, which are all self-governing under the Crown, but their defence and foreign policies are controlled by the British Prime Minister. What Britain does in relation to highly advanced White ethnic groups cannot therefore be so heinous when applied to backward and emergent peoples in Africa who are liable to be exploited by communist imperialist powers and other troublemakers.

The advantages of separate development are overwhelming. For instance, the people are ruled by their own leaders instead of by outsiders—whereas, in an integrated state with two quite different stocks having radically different abilities, the ablest people of the weaker group would, despite all their efforts, prove to be inadequate in competition against the more able members of the dominant racial strain. Under one system racial strife is avoided but under the other is inevitable, if only because of the envy and hatred shown by the less well endowed group who find themselves inadequate in the face of overwhelming competition.

Administratively everything is made much easier by separate development. Thus, the vernacular is used for communications and education; one set of local customary laws is known to everyone; and the principles governing customs and ways of doing things are common to the whole nation. There is no minority to feel aggrieved or majority to believe the weaker group is holding back their own progress, as is now the case in Britain and the United States over schooling and other matters where non-Europeans have settled in formerly all-White neighbourhoods—where, moreover, they know they are greatly resented by the native Whites.

Separate development also overcomes great inherent difficulties in certain vital practical matters—for instance, blood transfusion. The integrationists may go on reiterating that we are all the same under the skin but in fact nothing could be less true, although no doubt they expect that, according to the Goebbels maxim of the great lie, the more often they repeat it the sooner it will be accepted as true—and in this respect they have had some success. The racial differences between the great groups of mankind are not restricted to skin colour but involve dozens of features including brain formation, natural intellectual abilities and, not least, blood groups. With regard to racial differences in blood groups, Dr. John Scudder has shown that the practice—found in "integrated" or would-be "integrated" countries—of not keeping blood banks racially separate is very dangerous, as the result of using blood which is not of the same racial group as the patient can be lethal.[2] This problem is of course greatly reduced where the hospital services are serving mainly one racial stock rather than a multiracial community.

Many uniform and easily applied systems of education are also possible under separate development, as a tightly knit ethnic unit will obviously present far more common factors of natural ability and temperament. Furthermore, a system of education which is much fairer to the pupils and students is possible under separate development than is the case when such wide variations have to be provided for that they exceed the ability of the machinery of education to deal with them all as adequately as is possible where the variations are less pronounced.

There is overwhelming evidence of marked differences in aptitude and ability among the races, particularly between the Whites and Yellows in comparison with the Blacks. Nevertheless, great efforts have been made to disprove this, and in order to do so sociologists intent upon denying the truth of heredity have undertaken and given widespread publicity to limited studies of no representative value, as well as to wider studies in which either certain essential facts have been suppressed or the subjects have been from selected elements of the Negroid races. The fact remains, however, that the majority of studies have shown that there are great differences in mental ability between the races, and that when Blacks and Whites are judged according to ability to operate in the milieu of White ideas and aptitudes the Europeans are decidedly in the lead.[3] This should not surprise anyone. Of course, if the two races are judged by standards appropriate to Negroid aptitudes the reverse is true.

In view of these differences it can be seen that it is not a friendly, charitable, or Christian act to enforce Black and White school integration as it unjustly consigns the Negro children to scrambling continually along behind and trying to keep up with the White children who are naturally suited to the prevailing educational system. Of course there is overlap, so that White morons are easily surpassed by average Negro children, but in general the Negro children are at a disadvantage at every mental and educational level, except when they are very young.

This is seen not merely with White and Negro children but also, for instance, in the great tribal area of Bastar in Central India where tribal children attend the same schools as Hindu children. The black Tribals, who are probably more Australoid than Negroid, start equal to—indeed a little in advance of—the brown-to-fair Caucasoid Hindu children. Very soon, however, the Hindu children draw level and pass them, so that after eleven years of age the gap widens consistently.

Thus, if great distress and psychological harm are to be avoided and the best type of education is to be provided for each ethnic group, segregated education is greatly preferable and from a moral point of view is the only system which can be justified, although some clerics have claimed, when denouncing segregated schools in the United States, that the school integration problem is a moral issue—but this seems to be a perverted kind of morality based upon complete misunderstanding of the biological factors involved. Morality is surely on the side of giving the most suitable kind of education to each human stock in its own environment, so that each individual competes fairly against others of the same ethnic group instead of, perhaps, against individuals of a strange race which has had thousands of years' start in the evolution of the mental processes which have led to the development of modern Western education.

Perhaps quite rightly if human happiness is considered, the Negroes have never shown interest in invention and creative work of the kind which has led us step by step towards the industrial revolution and modern technological civilisation. The events which led to our present form of civilisation were not mere accidents of history but occurred because the minds of Caucasoid men have developed along these lines from an early period—and the same is true of the Mongoloids whose evolution has been similar. In the course of time these characteristics have become more and more emphasised by natural selection as survival has come to depend upon them. To throw human beings—with all their delicate sensibilities—from an entirely different line of evolution into direct competition with the Caucasoids on their own ground, where they have all the advantages, is in my opinion the height of cruelty, and there is therefore nothing moral but rather the opposite about the demands for integration. Not only is segregation necessary for the well-being of all, but the further it is developed the better—

---

[2] Sensitising Antigens as Factors in Blood Transfusions" by John Scudder, Shivaji B. Bhonslay, Aaron Himmelstein and John G. Gorman, THE MANKIND QUARTERLY, Vol. I, No. 2. October 1960, pp. 89–104.

[3] For a thorough review of this subject see *The Testing of Negro Intelligence* by Audrey M. Shuey, J. P. Bell, Lynchburg, Virginia, 1958. See also the following studies published in THE MANKIND QUARTERLY: "Klineberg's Chapter on Race and Psychology: A Review" by Henry E. Garrett, Vol. I, No. 1, July 1960, pp. 15–22; "A New Anthropometric Approach" by S. D. Porteus and J. P. Kleman, Vol. I, No. 1, July 1960, pp. 23–30; "Psychological Test Score Differences and the 'Culture Hypothesis' " by Frank C. McGurk, Vol. I, No. 3, January 1961, pp. 165–175; "School Achievement of White and Negro Children of the Same Mental and Chronological Ages" by R. T. Osborne, Vol. II, No. 1, July-September 1961, pp. 26–29; "Psychological Tests of the Kalahari Bushmen" by Helmut Reuning, Vol. II, No. 4, April-June 1962, pp. 265–273; "Misuses of Overlap in Racial Comparisons" by Henry E. Garrett, Vol. III, No. 4, April-June 1963, pp. 254–256; "Dobzhansky's 'Equal-Opportunity' Concept" by H. George Classen, Vol. IV, No. 2, October-December 1963, pp. 111–117; "Cultural Bias of Psychological Test Items" by R. T. Osborne, Vol. IV, No. 3, January-March 1964, pp. 134–137; "Australid 'Assimilation' " by S. D. Porteus, Vol. IV, No. 4, April-June 1964, pp. 187–196; "Human Genetics and Psychological Differences" by Donald A. Swan, Vol. IV, No. 4, April-June 1964, pp. 197–201; "Genetics and Intelligence" by Henry E. Garrett, Vol. IV, No. 4, April-June 1964, pp. 202–204; "Klineberg's 'Negro-White Differences in Intelligence Test Performance' " by Henry E. Garrett, Vol. IV, No. 4, April-June 1964, pp. 221–222; "The Intelligence of the African Negro" by Gérard Wintringer, Vol. V, No. 1, July-September 1964, pp. 35–44; "I.Q. and School Achievement of Negro and White Children of Comparable Age and School Status" by Henry E. Garrett, Vol. V, No. 1, July-September 1964, pp. 45–49; "Psychodiagnosis, Prognosis, School Desegregation and Delinquency" by Clairette P. Armstrong, Vol. V, No. 2, October-December 1964, pp. 63–80; "Problems of Aboriginal Mentality" by S. D. Porteus, Vol. V, No. 3, January-March 1965, pp. 123–130; "Race and Mental Differences" by Donald A. Swan, Vol. V, No. 4, April-June 1965, pp. 196–203; "Race, Psychology and Education: Wilmington, North Carolina" by H. M. Roland and Donald A. Swan, Vol. VI, No. 1, July-September 1965, pp. 19–36; and "Reading Achievement of White and Negro Pupils in Certain Georgia Schools" by Bernice Cooper, Vol. VI, No. 2, October-December 1965, pp. 81–85. On the psychological differences between the races of man see also: "Racial Psychology" by Ilse Schwidetzky, Vol. II, No. 1, July-September 1961, pp. 10–12; and "The Family of Mankind: Some New Light?" by Elizabeth E. Hoyt, Vol. II, No. 1, July-September 1961, pp. 13–15.

and I believe that only by separate development is the optimum degree of well-being attainable. No matter how good are the schools and their staff in a horizontally divided society, the races are so close together in the same communities that a degree of unnecessary competition occurs with harmful results. Certainly in that milieu segregated schools are better than integrated ones, but the ideal is only attained when a particular region is inhabited exclusively by people of one ethnic stock who compete solely against each other in the schools and colleges, with the result that an élite emerges which assumes the leadership of the people—an élite which can feel satisfaction in its leadership, and a people who can be proud that men like themselves are at the apex of their national world. This is in fact what has happened where Britain and other colonial powers have given independence to overwhelmingly Negroid states like Nigeria, Ghana and the rest, but it is manifestly impossible in South Africa and Rhodesia as they contain too many Whites and are modern technological states whose continued well-being and development depends upon their European populations. Yet the same effect can be achieved by dividing these states into areas to which modified independence can be given, and the development of indirect rule through the growth of separate national units in South Africa is in fact doing this—despite a campaign of misinformation alleging it to be some kind of enslavement. Far from this development being to the disadvantage of the Bantu, it is actually demanding considerable sacrifice by the Whites. For instance, the Europeans have to withdraw from the town of Umtata, the capital of the Transkei, within a period of time—and this means losing their businesses. There are, moreover, other areas where Whites are not allowed to settle and own land. A corollary to this, legislation to limit the number of household servants to one in White areas, has caused great indignation among certain White housewives who would prefer integration and the large servant force it would put at their disposal. This draws attention to the fact that it is the integrated society which exploits the Black man. The huge numbers of "coloured" immigrants who have entered Britain since the last war are mainly filling labouring jobs which the British—particularly English—workers would not do, and many of them are living in property already condemned as unfit for occupation by the native Whites. Not only do left-wing publicists and churchmen strongly support "coloured" immigration in their attempts to justify and prove their quite unfounded theories—for which the immigrants are nothing more than guinea-pigs—but certain employers are equally favourable to it. In South Africa a large part of the opposition to Apartheid by business and mining interests in places like Johannesburg is probably for the same reason—the desire for adequate supplies of cheap labour—but the criticisms of separate development are cloaked under the guise of "moral" indignation and "liberal" principles.

It is as well to conclude this discussion of separate development by quoting the Australian aboriginal boxer George Bracken on the subject of his people's development:[4]

> In my opinion what is needed now to train the aborigines to live in a white world, as they must, is to give them a self-contained community of their own.
>
> This should take the form of an aboriginal township, complete with all the shopping facilities, housing and schools found in any community.
>
> With this difference: Every official, every teacher, every business-man in this community would be an aborigine. It would be an experimental township teaching citizenship to aborigines—with aborigines, already trained in the white world, as the instructors.

Bracken continues:

> White Australia has come a long way since Governor Philip met his first aborigines. Is not Black Australia also entitled to some advancement?
>
> In fact, it has been held back as a deliberate policy. The outback needs its cheap labour force and the aborigines have been compelled to provide it. Only recently has this been reversed in any way.
>
> But the aim of this suggested advance must not be to blend white Australia with black.
>
> My own view is that total assimilation would be a pity because it would remove from the Australian scene one of the differences that makes Australia an individual country.
>
> My people don't think white thoughts.
>
> Our culture is not yours either. It has a truly Australian individuality about it and a vigour which can, and does, stimulate yours.
>
> The painting of Albert Namatjira, for one example, showed European painters that there were other ways of looking at the Australian scene than theirs.
>
> Aboriginal music and dancing, again, is uniquely ours.

The political motives—as well as the extent to which those who oppose separate development represent moral values—are obvious from this final quotation:

> Under the present system, and with the efforts of a lot of well-meaning people—and a few, quite a few, not so well-meaning—we aborigines are being pressured into some kind of off-white uniformity, and never mind what *we* want.
>
> Deep down the aborigine does not want to be pushed into some shape that he rebels against as an individual, nobody does! He wants to be able to make his own way of life.
>
> The pressures brought to bear on him can make him ready material for the trouble-makers and the groups who like to jump on the social bandwaggon of "working for the aborigines' welfare."
>
> Much of the latest agitation about the aborigine is stirred up by communists and other left-wingers who like to make trouble by becoming the self-appointed champions of the underprivileged black man. The aboriginal soul is not communist but highly individual. At bottom he wants to retain and foster this individuality.
>
> He *is* under-privileged and teaching him to live on handouts until somehow he is assimilated, or forgotten, is not the answer.
>
> It breeds resentment. That resentment is strongest against those who try to use the aborigine for their own purposes, taking advantage of his position.
>
> One such group is the communists, who hypocritically take over our cause on the pretence that they intend to help us. Their only genuine intention is to use us for their own ends, as the reds and other left-wingers have operated in the United States.

Besides South Africa and Rhodesia some mention must be made of Angola and Mozambique—the Portuguese territories of Southern Africa—where we find an interesting situation. The Portuguese have repudiated segregation and stand firmly for integration. They are as much integrationists as are all those nurturists in the United States, as well as in Britain and other European countries, who are such vocal exponents of integration. Indeed, they are among the strongest critics of the policy of separate development. This, however, has not endeared them—as one might in all innocence have expected—to the advocates of integration, who denounce them as "colonialists" and "white supremists," and point to the fact that under the Portuguese system the White are at the top and the Negroes are still at the bottom—a situation which they infer has been jerrymandered.

If I understand the Portuguese system correctly, advancement depends upon merit. In other words even without any colour discrimination at all, the Negroes still fail to oust the ruling Portuguese Whites. But surely this is exactly what we should expect if the premises I have advanced are right—and I challenge anyone to disprove them on biological grounds. As I have already said, integration permanently condemns the Negroes to an inferior position in the society of which they have become part, and even if integration is enforced a caste system or horizontal form of segregation will remain because, in the context of European technological civilisation to which European minds are more attuned, the Whites will rise to the top and the Negroes, who are adjusted to a different evolution of society and have different inherent needs and responses, will remain at the bottom—except for a few exceptional persons who are able to cross the racial barrier.

For integration to succeed an entirely different kind of society would have to be created—one born equally of the Negro mind and the European mind. This would mean abandoning many ways natural to Europeans, as well as all technological progress, and reverting to a non-industrial and non-technical society. Only then could an integrated social order have any semblance of being theoreticaly possible.

No doubt what I have said will be strenuously resisted by those sociologists, politicians, and churchmen, who are exponents of integration, but they can only base a coherent argument on the premise that all men and all races are equal or potentially equal. If this is accepted it can be argued that the Negroes are laggard in terms of the ideals and achievements of European society solely because they have not had the opportunity for better things as their physical and social environment has been against them, but given special opportunities—a specially privileged status in society—to correct these disabilities they too will produce their Cicero, Archimedes, Pythagoras, Aristotle, Copernicus, Shakespeare, Dante, Newton, Watt, Napier, Darwin, Mendel, Fleming, Baird, Einstein and all the others necessary to the development of every aspect of a fully mature civilisation.

Considered in the light of racial history, however, this premise is manifestly absurd and unprovable. It is disproved by the thousands of breeding experiments which are taking place all the time, by twin and fosterage studies, and by intelligence tests of every kind—not only literacy ones but Porteus Maze and other culture-free tests. This absurd theory, derived from the long-discredited biological school of Lamarck, would have been as dead as the dodo long ago were it not kept alive by politically orientated persons whose political philosophy depends on the destruction of any basic knowledge of the real nature of men and the races into which they are divided.

Since it is virtually self-evident that racial integration will not work—even to many of its aggressive proponents—the more extreme integrationists, including a leading Anglican churchman, are now advocating something which they all denied was their aim a few years ago; racial crossing as the solution to the problem of integration. These people still have the pre-twentieth century idea that just as, say, orange colour can be mixed with black to make brown, so racial mixture can create a coffee-coloured population. This shows their lack of any scientific knowledge, for our physical traits are borne on the same chromosomes which carry our mental and emotional qualities; and genetic segregation follows racial crossing, since a permanent cross cannot be created in this haphazard way but can only be achieved by vigorous selection involving destruction of the types not needed for reproduction. Thus a horizontally stratified society again emerges with the dominant stock still at the top and the weak one at the bottom, but infinite trouble and misery are created in the process of this genetic segregation. It seems astonishing that people cloaked in the utmost of moralising and religious humbug could wish to reduce mankind to such chaos and misery.

---

[4] "The Aborigine," *The Australian International News Review*, 28th May 1965, pp. 19–20.

In Haiti and other places where a White ruling stock has been eliminated and a racially mixed population has taken control there has been no burgeoning of great, progressive nations endowed with leadership, but the racial elements are gradually segregating themselves out and the less Negroid strains are rising to power. This is true of most of Central and South America where, no matter how hybrid the populations may be, the upper classes are mainly or even entirely White. The same was also true of Cuba before Castro's regime committed genocide in attempting to eliminate the White element.

It is my opinion that the Negro peoples are being made the victims of a political philosophy—disguised as a desire to promote their welfare—which will distort their natural development, rob them of their own self-respect and of satisfaction in their own achievements and ways of life, and do them untold harm. Black racialism comparable to Nazism or any other form of racialism of the past has already been created in certain quarters. This can only incite those afflicted by it to clash with those White nations which decide there are limits to the unreasonable concessions they are prepared to make to militant Black nationalism, and in such a clash the Negro peoples in certain areas might be largely destroyed.

The way of peace must be pursued if successful solutions of the racial dilemma are to be achieved. This means that interference in Africa and in America's Deep South by often well-meaning but usually profoundly ignorant and sometimes emotionally disturbed people must stop, in order that the *modus vivendi* best adjusted to each situation may be allowed to develop naturally. In South Africa and probably in Rhodesia separate development may be expected, but some kind of segregation is likely in the United States, Britain—with its already large Negro influx—and the Portuguese territories. Whatever systems are adopted should be designed to give each stock the education and way of life best suited to its needs.

The object of good government is the happiness and well-being of all men, but in large areas of Africa as well as elsewhere man has been set against man, and unhappiness, strife and anarchy have already resulted from rigid adherence to militant integrationism—with its insistence on "one man—one vote" even in contexts where that system is completely inapplicable. Incidentally, the Negro mentality prefers strong government to democratic government, and the imposition of universal franchise on Negroes merely forces them to transfer allegiance from their chiefs to political adventurers not bound by tribal law and custom who rapidly develop one-party states—as in Ghana, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Kenya and elsewhere. Integrationism has clearly failed to achieve ends beneficial to man's happiness and well-being. Indeed forced integration is bound to fail in the end since all crazy political theories break on the rock of the nature of man—but before they do they bring tragedy to the peoples upon whom they are inflicted.

Our duty should be to see that each stock develops along natural lines consistent with man's nature of "everything after its kind." In so far as these lines of development—the only ones which can ultimately produce stable societies—may need to be adjusted and softened for the well-being of all, particularly the weaker stocks, we should see that this is done. To advocate that each stock should develop in its own milieu does not mean that we should abandon charity and love. Nevertheless, kindness and Christian concern for the well-being of our neighbors of other stocks are fast being dissipated as men are driven by the pressure of forced integration to defend their own long-cherished traditions and ideals.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REORGANIZATION PLAN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter on the District of Columbia Reorganization Plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has again asked the Congress to share with him the responsibility and the honor of fashioning a modern government to meet the 20th century needs of the Nation's Capital.

The President's reorganization plan is clear. It is logical, and it is badly needed. It proposes a unified and coordinated executive-council form of government to replace dispersed and decentralized Commission rule. It proposes to give clear-cut powers to identifiable executives, so that policies can be effectively implemented and program responsibility fixed. It proposed to choose either the chief executive officer or his chief assistant from among residents of the District, while searching out the best available administrative talent in the United States.

Any objective observer cannot deny that District government has been bypassed by modern challenges of urban living. The District needs a new structure if we are to guarantee the wise and efficient use of the new funds being voted by the Congress. The District needs a new declaration of support in its ability to govern itself and move needed social, economic, educational, and health programs forward.

I am pleased to insert in the Record an objective and forward-looking editorial in support of the President's plan by the Washington Post of Friday, June 2, 1967. I would like to echo the Post's words:

> President Johnson's . . . . reorganization plan is precisely the right solution to this city's increasingly serious troubles with its divided and powerless leadership. This reform has been long and urgently needed. Only good can come out of it.

The Congress now has the clear opportunity to help Washingtonians move themselves forward into a new era of progress.

[From the Washington Post, June 2, 1967]

The Reorganization Plan

President Johnson is now acting to bring modern and effective local government to the city of Washington. His reorganization plan is precisely the right solution to this city's increasingly serious troubles with its divided and powerless leadership. This reform has been long and urgently needed. Only good can come out of it.

The city's present style of government, split up under three Commissioners, was hastily adopted as a temporary expedient in 1874 in the aftermath of a local scandal. Like many another temporary expedient in Washington's history, the passage of time turned it into a permanent institution. But it has never worked well, and the increasing responsibilities of the city make its ineptitudes not only irritating but monstrously wasteful and even dangerous. A great city's government needs to be able to act quickly and decisively; Washington's cannot. As Johnson points out, the troika of Commissioners was set up at a time when the city's annual budget was $4 million; next year it will exceed half a billion dollars, and there is no one official who is in control of all of it.

President Johnson proposes to replace the three Commissioners with one, unifying and strengthening the sadly eroded executive power in the city government. Equally important, the reorganization plan will establish a Council of nine members. The Council will give the neighborhoods of Washington a degree of genuine representation in the District government for the first time since the demise of the elected Legislature 93 years ago. The President's reorganization powers do not run far enough to create a truly democratic city government, chosen at the polls; but by changing the form of the government it can bring a strong element of public representation into the dusty corridors of the District Building.

While the consolidation of the executive power in one Commissioner will assure far greater efficiency, the consolidation of the rule-making power in the Council will equally assure greater sensitivity and responsiveness to the public. The Council's own influence will be substantial, since it will inherit the present Commissioners' authority to set the real estate tax rate, to establish boundaries for urban renewal projects, and to pass the annual city budget.

This reorganization plan will no doubt be opposed by those Congressmen who prefer to keep the city government weak and divided, for the greater enhancement of their own influence. It will be opposed by those lobbies whose interests are mainly negative and best served by inaction.

Curiously, the reorganization apparently may also be opposed by the District's Democratic Central Committee, on the trivial grounds that the new plan will not require the Commissioner to be a resident of the District. No doubt patronage is a consideration; certainly the Democrats also feel that local people can best fill local offices. But the President is clearly right to keep this crucially important job open to the best man in the country, wherever he may currently be living.

One very large benefit in this reorganization will be to remove Army officers from the key positions in making the city's social policy. Opposition to the reorganization plan is, willy nilly, support for the practice of leaving urban renewal, highway planning and relocation to Army generals and colonels. The present group of Army officers are very able men, but a large American city ought not to be under Army rule.

The city, like the President, continues to urge Congress to enact democratic government in this Capital of the democratic world. In the meantime, this plan recasts the city administration into a form that would be more easily adaptable to a future elected government. Once again, the President is stepping into a major political fight in Congress in behalf of the city of Washington. He deserves the unqualified support of everyone in Congress, and in the city, who believes in the principle of forceful and responsive local government.

A FALSE ISSUE RAISED TO BLOCK DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REORGANIZATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter on the District of Columbia reorganization plan.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have heard some critics oppose President Johnson's reorganization plan for the District of Columbia government on the curious ground that it would do away with the Engineer Commissioner.

One may reasonably ask these critics: Do they really want to perpetuate military rule over District of Columbia affairs?

If they do, I can tell them that the military itself has no such desires or ambitions. In a statement last week Lt. General William F. Cassidy, the Chief of Engineers, said that "he agrees that a contemporary form of government with a single executive head is desirable for the future development and growth of the District of Columbia."

The general said that he has "no interest" in perpetuating the role of the Engineer Commissioner, "whose public works responsibilities can be carried on effectively within the government framework proposed by the White House."

Now, what does the general want for the District? Let me quote again from his statement:

> The time has come for the District of Columbia to adopt a form of government which cities of comparable size have found essential and effective.

The point is well taken. I believe that those who are opposed to this reorganization plan have created a phony issue by alleging military opposition to this plan.

The facts are on the record. The Chief of Engineers agrees with the need for such a reorganization. He sees no problems arising over the elimination of an engineer commissioner. He makes it clear that the Corps of Engineers will cooperate fully on any engineering problems affecting the District—as they have in the past.

Let us not be duped by the injection of irrelevant and untruthful issues into the consideration by Congress of the President's reorganization plan.

The 90th Congress has the opportunity to be responsive to a plan that will modernize the creaking machinery of District of Columbia government. I believe we shall respond promptly to this opportunity—and positively.

I insert into the Record the statement of General Cassidy supporting President Johnson's reorganization plan:

General Cassidy Endorses the District of Columbia Reorganization Plan

The Commissioner-Council plan of government for the District of Columbia which President Johnson sent to Congress today has the full support of the Army's Corps of Engineers. Lt. General William F. Cassidy, the Chief of Engineers, said that he agrees that a contemporary form of government with a single executive head is desirable for the future development and growth of the District of Columbia.

Since the Office of Engineer Commissioner was established in 1878, these Presidential appointees have always been officers of the Corps of Engineers. General Cassidy said that he is pleased that the Corps of Engineers has played a significant role in the development and government of our Nation's capital, but that he has no interest in perpetuating the role of the Engineer Commissioner, whose public works responsibilities can be carried on effectively within the government framework proposed today by The White House.

The Chief of Engineers noted that the President's message to Congress today recognizes the high caliber of past and present District Commissioners. He said that the time has come for the District of Columbia to adopt a form of government which cities of comparable size have found essential and effective.

HONORING OUR MIDDLE EAST COMMITMENTS

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in protest against the administration's declaration yesterday of neutrality in the current Middle East crisis. While our technical status as a nonbelligerent may be appropriate to protect the safety of Americans in the area, our position cannot be neutral.

Arab aggression against the State of Israel, backed fully and openly by the Soviet Union, clearly calls for our affirmative response in accordance with our worldwide moral and policy positions.

U.S. commitments against any aggression in the Middle East, running back to 1950, and reaffirmed by President Johnson last week, required our affirmative response.

U.S. commitments to Israel, in reliance upon which Israel, in good faith, withdrew from the territory she had occupied in 1956—including territory commanding the international waters of the Strait of Tiran—require our affirmative response.

It is incredible and inconceivable that the United States should declare itself neutral or uninvolved in the face of these clear commitments and clear Arab aggression. The United States should express her dedication first through the United Nations. We should propose effective United Nations peacekeeping action to counter the Arab military aggression and restore and maintain peace in the area—not just proclaim pious platitudes. We should force such a proposal to a vote in the United Nations, regardless of the prospects for its adoption.

If the United States is unable to obtain United Nations action, however, we should support Israel against her vicious attackers with whatever measures appear required, certainly with due regard to the grave dangers of broadening the war and with resulting restraint, but certainly also with resolve to assure that this Arab aggression shall not succeed.

One can only hope that the administration's vacillation and reluctance to commit itself in this situation is not in any way attributable to the ugly resentments expressed by some administration spokesmen and Congressmen against those American Jews who have expressed reservations about administration policies in Vietnam. In the first place, these administration views of Jewish unanimity in regard to Vietnam are clearly wrong. More importantly, this whole issue is completely irrelevant and in appropriate to our vital policy determinations in the Middle East.

One must also profoundly hope that our failure to publicly affirm our commitments in this situation is not due to any equation of Israeli lives with American oil interests in Arab lands.

The Secretary of State's qualification yesterday afternoon of the administration's initial declaration of neutrality—that this does not mean we are "indifferent"—is completely inadequate.

I call on the administration to make clear today its determination to honor its commitments to support Israel, and to oppose any aggression in the Middle East.

IMPRESSIONS OF AFRICA—UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE NICHOLAS deB. KATZENBACH

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a statement by Under Secretary of State Katzenbach to the Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Africa.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following statement by Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach before the Africa Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Tuesday, June 7, 1967:

Statement by Under Secretary of State Katzenbach to Subcommittee on Africa

I am pleased to come here to share my impressions of Africa with this committee, which has done so much on behalf of Congressional and public understanding of Africa and which has played such a helpful role in the formulation of our policies there.

When we left for Africa, it was with a single purpose: to learn. Now, 12 countries, 19 days, and 20,250 miles later, there is one fact of which I am certain:

Despite your efforts and ours, perhaps the most primitive thing about Africa is the outside world's understanding of Africa.

One cannot go to Africa for the first time and not be awed by the splendor of its natural sights—the unchallenged flow of the mighty Congo River—or the two Niles; the serenity of the Indian Ocean under a full moon; the sight of Mount Kilimanjaro piercing the clouds; or the sight of a pride of lions in a vast game reserve.

These are the well-known sights of Africa, and are justifiably so. But today they are only the scenic dackdrop to a blossoming continent. There are man-made wonders also:

There are modern cities like Abidjan or Nairobi. There is the graceful SICAP urban renewal project in Dakar, housing 60,000. There is the gleaming symbolism of the copper dome atop the new parliament building in Zambia. There is the colossal new dam astride the Volta River. There is Africa Hall in Addis Ababa, the home of the Organization of African Unity.

And yet even these sights cannot, I believe, give one a full appreciation of the new Africa. That can come only from talking at length with its people. This is something I tried to do at every stop, to talk with students, lawyers, labor leaders, and businessmen as well as government leaders.

The impression I come away with is strong and it is greatly assuring. These new nations, having plainly demonstrated their will to freedom, are now demonstrating their capacity for it.

I am most pleased and heartened at the realism, especially toward economic development, I found among African leaders. Their self-appraisal is honest and they are working to solve their problems. Perhaps more important, in spite of the need and desire for foreign assistance, I believe these leaders are uniformly aware that in the final analysis development and progress depend on a willingness and determination to help themselves.

Too often, the sometimes discouraging political news from Africa—unrest, disorder, coups—diverts us from a more perceptive look into the future. Within 25 years the vast natural resources and potential of the African continent surely will weigh heavily in the affairs of the world. As a measure of this prospect, one need only reflect, on the one hand, on the accelerating world pressures for food and, on the other hand, on Africa's enormous potential for agricultural development.

The self-evident gulf is in trained human resources. The African leaders with whom I spoke are intensely and wisely concerned about education as the key to manpower—manpower capable of dealing with public administration, political organization, economic development, and advanced technology.

They are beginning to make progress toward these goals and as it continues, we cannot help but see enlarging development and change. As education and development spread, the organization of traditional African society will be transformed—perhaps violently, often painfully.

I believe our policies toward Africa are grounded on an understanding of this philosophical fact of political life and hence I was encouraged to observe the close and friendly relations which the United States enjoys in Africa.

There is not full agreement with us—nor would it be realistic for us to expect the full agreement of other nations. Nevertheless, American assistance is welcome and appreciated—and we owe much to this committee for espousing and supporting it.

At the same time, I detected a real concern about the degree and future of America's commitment to African development. This originates, I believe, partially from concern about America's preoccupations elsewhere.

If there are also some concerns regarding the recent modifications in our aid policy, I think there will be increasing recognition that the regional and multilateral approach to aid in fact will accord with political and economic realities—as long as we retain flexibility. The needs and the conditions in Africa will change. Our policies must be adaptable to new and changed circumstances in our own interest as well as that of recipient countries.

There are abundant examples of the level of African recognition of the need for self-help and the need for American and other assistance. The Volta River Dam in Ghana is an impressive symbol of the viability of a project involving several donors, including the United States.

A more personal manifestation of regional assistance comes from the work of Mal Whitfield. This former Olympic champion is working with the youth of East Africa in sports. Through his extraordinary work, they are learning not only how to improve their athletic endeavors but also to develop the discipline, team spirit and sense of pride which can be accomplished so well in sports.

* * * * *

As one who spent more than five years in the great American effort toward racial justice and equal opportunity, I went to Africa with particular interest in the question of race.

While the countries I visited are intently focused on internal development, they nevertheless share a basic impulse for freedom for those areas in Africa which do not have it.

And that is an impulse in which I believe the United States shares deeply. Efforts to achieve self-determination and majority rule parallel the central strain of the American experience.

I believe Africa understands and respects this commitment. I found an occasional tendency to exaggerate American capacity to solve the problems in southern Africa. At the same time, what happens in Rhodesia, in the Portuguese territories, in Southwest Africa, and in the Republic of South Africa in coming months and years has clear importance for a series of reasons.

The most obvious reason, and one which hardly requires elaboration, is the cause of self-determination or majority rule and the elimination of apartheid within those areas. Of perhaps equal importance is the bearing these problems have on the rest of Africa.

I was encouraged to observe that, despite a lingering legacy of bitterness from the colonial past, for the most part there is cooperation and racial harmony in the countries I visited. Such harmony is not merely of moral or psychic significance; it is fundamental to national development. The maintenance of racialism on one-sixth of the African continent leaves an infectious threat to other nations. It must not be permitted to corrode the encouraging progress now being made in those nations.

Finally, the racial problems of the southern sixth of the continent—and our continuing responses to them—will have a major bearing on our relations with free Africa. These are not problems that will be solved quickly. Nor can they be solved by others. The United States has a stake in assisting—because we support our self-interest in Africa, because we support racial justice, and because we support the development of free nations. But a critical factor will be the success free African nations demonstrate in solving their own problems and in building viable societies.

I believe African leaders know that the fruits of independence will be harvested, at the end of the day, only through the work of Africans. In the words of President Nyerere of Tanzania, "Our people do not believe that it is better to be a wealthy slave than a poor free man."

One does not need to go to Africa to recognize the central importance of development to the new nations of that continent. One does not need to go to Africa to recognize that free men are deeply outraged by racial injustice.

But behind a desk in Washington, these are abstract conceptions. There is wisdom in the old Congolese proverb: "Let him speak who has seen with his eyes."

I return from this arduous, too-brief journey having seen a continent that will be difficult for its people to harness, but also having seen people with the spirit and leaders with the wisdom to succeed.

I felt that these are men and nations which, having earned independence, prize it. But I also felt, in every visit, that I was among friends.

MESKILL PRAISES SUPREME COURT INSPECTION DECISION

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Meskill] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court Monday handed down a landmark decision, which effectively concluded a battle I have been vigorously conducting with the Federal bureaucracy on the legislative front.

I salute the Court for its wise decision, and for its protection of the due process guaranteed by the Constitution.

I refer to the decisions by which health, welfare, and safety inspectors will now be required to obtain warrants before entering private property without the permission of the owner.

The situations which gave rise to my concern—and which, in another part of the country, gave rise to the Court's action—presented grave threats to the constitutional protection of the right of privacy of the individual and property rights.

HOW QUESTION AROSE

The question arose in the following manner:

In order to qualify for Federal assistance in urban renewal and related programs, a community must have a plan called a "workable program," which must be approved by the Federal Government. The Department of Housing and Urban Development properly sets strict standards for such workable programs. Among these standards, a very strict minimum housing code is required to be adopted by the community. Codes had to contain language authorizing unrestricted inspections of residences. A typical ordinance is one adopted by the city of Bristol, Conn., which reads:

> SEC. 35–2. INSPECTION OF DWELLINGS, DWELLING UNITS, ROOMING UNITS.
>
> (a) The Director of Health or his representative is hereby authorized and directed to make inspections to determine the condition of any dwelling, dwelling units, rooming units and premises located within the City of Bristol in order that he may perform his duty of safeguarding the health and safety of the occupants of said dwellings and of the general public. For the purposes of making such inspections, the Director of Health or his representative is hereby authorized to enter, examine and survey at all reasonable times all common hallways, common stairways, and all other common areas and yards of all multiple dwellings *including the private rooms or quarters of any owner or tenant*. (Emphasis added.)

That is strong language, Mr. Speaker, but required by HUD in order for the community's workable program to win approval and for the community thereby to become eligible and remain eligible for Federal urban renewal funds.

CARROT AND STICK

The implications of this carrot-and-stick technique, the rapid expansion of its use in Federal-State-community relations, and the impact this technique is having on the social and political fabric of this Nation is material for a very lengthy essay. Suffice it to say for the purposes of this statement that I endeavored from the beginning of this year to persuade the Department of Housing and Urban Development to accept a modification in the code inspections provisions.

A certain amount of fencing through the mails occurred. On April 17, I attempted again with a letter to HUD containing this paragraph:

> My question is: would HUD approve a community's workable program if the local housing code contained a provision requiring inspectors to have reasonable belief that violations of the code existed before they could enter a residence?

I received, in due course, a negative reply but nonetheless marvelous for its tone and for the nebulous nature of the social theory it expressed. It seems to be saying "We know best here in Washington—we are going to make everyone happier and healthier and give them better lives. When they realize how good we are and how much good we are doing them, they will gladly submit to our invasion of their privacy."

A MUSEUM PIECE

I offer the letter, in its woolly entirety, for the RECORD. It is a classic of its kind and, thanks to the wisdom of the Supreme Court on Monday, may now be regarded as a museum piece.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS J. MESKILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MESKILL: This is in response to your further inquiry of April 17, 1967, concerning inspections under the housing code. We regret that we apparently did not fully respond to the question raised in your previous inquiry.

As stated in our letter of February 23, the primary objective of a planned, systematic housing code compliance program is to secure a decent, safe, and sanitary living facility in a suitable neighborhood environment for every resident of the community. This is accomplished through enforcement of minimum housing standards, in conjunction with other related public and private programs.

Experience has shown that a single blighting influence can spread rapidly like a cancerous growth and soon envelope an entire neighborhood. Experience has also shown that dangerous, unsanitary, and unhealthy accommodations can, and often do, exist behind an imposing building exterior. It is in recognition of these facts that the standards of all nationally recognized model housing codes are made to apply to all dwelling units within the community. In order to meet the objectives of the compliance program, it is anticipated that each dwelling unit in the community will be subjected to an inspection at some time during the first complete cycle of the communitywide code enforcement activity.

Experience has also shown that the majority of an informed citizenry are fully cooperative, when treated politely, reasonably, and with consideration for their individual circumstances. If people are appropriately informed of the basic purpose for compliance, the maximum cooperation will be received. Knowing that their neighbors are subject to the same impartial requirements, a great many owners make improvements over and above the basic code requirements.

Those responsible for code compliance—inspectors, code experts, advisers, or others—should not conceive of it merely as a device for law enforcement if its objective is to be successfully achieved. They must see it as a cooperative relationship between the local government and property owners for maintaining or improving property in their own self-interest, as well as the interest of the whole community. To foster this relationship, they must seek the understanding and support of individual residents, owners, and organized groups. They must be a ready source of information, guidance, and referral, not only on technical matters dealing with property improvement, but also on the broader aspects of neighborhood improvement, including special problems, non-conforming land use, financing of repairs, etc.

A program conducted as outlined above and in our previous letter should not be cause for any substantial concern of the citizenry on the issue of indiscriminate inspections. Furthermore, the code provision proposed could seriously hamper achieving the objectives of a code compliance program. Therefore, the Department could not consider approving a Workable Program for Community Improvement of a community whose code contained such a provision.

Sincerely yours,
(S) HOWARD J. WHARTON,
Acting Assistant Secretary.
DON HUMMEL,
Assistant Secretary.

QUESTIONNAIRES TO CONSTITUENTS RESPONDED TO OFFER ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS ON SIGNIFICANT ISSUES OF TODAY

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, early in April, I mailed out questionnaires to all of the homes in the Sixth Congressional District—some 130,000 of them. To date more than 20,000 of them have been returned to our office here in Washington. Apparently, this unusually large return—better than 15 percent—indicates special interest on the part of our people in the significant issues of today. The average return is around 9 percent.

I appreciate very much the time and effort that Sixth District citizens put forth in answering and mailing the questionnaire back to us. In fact, more than two-thirds of these had additional comments or letters with them.

They have been very helpful in indicating the feelings of our people on these matters. I always want to keep in touch with their attitudes and opinions. Some 1,300 miles separate our district from Washington, too often insulating Government here from the real needs and demands of the people.

The questionnaire indicates several important things. First, only 6 percent of the people in our district favor continuing the war in Vietnam on its present basis. Most of our constituents believe that the Vietnam conflict should be fought to a quick and honorable victory, 60.25 percent so marking their questionnaires and 18.85 percent want to hold key defensible positions and try to negotiate, while 2.7 percent are for withdrawal as soon as possible.

The people have also rated the performance of President Johnson: 9.9 percent rank the President's overall performance as good; 42.8 percent says that he has done a fair job; and 46.9 percent mark his performance as poor.

The poll shows 95 percent of the people believe that Federal spending should be reduced rather than having an increase in income taxes; 2.6 percent think a tax increase would be all right, while 2.4 percent are noncommittal. Also 84.3 percent are opposed to the proposed 6-percent surcharge on income taxes, while 11.8 percent approve of it.

In another overwhelming mandate, 90.8 percent of those answering favor the tightening of the beef and dairy import laws, and 90.1 percent believe that the poverty program requires substantial revision to make it more effective.

Not all of the questions show such easily defined trends.

In regard to the selective service program, 22.6 percent are for the establishment of universal military service, and 19.85 percent want to see an end to deferments for students. Another 14.9 percent are in favor of the present selective law with no change, and 14.65 percent are for universal service for your men, giving them a choice between military and some form of social service. Another 10.2 percent want to abolish the draft and rely on volunteers, while 11.1 percent are for a draft lottery.

The questionnaires showed 66.2 percent in favor of setting aside a portion of Federal taxes for distribution to the States, 25.9 percent against this proposition, and 7.9 percent did not give an answer.

If social security benefits are to be increased, 79 percent are for a 10-percent increase, while 16.3 percent are for a 20-percent raise and 4.7 percent give no answer. Some 29.7 percent of those 63.6 percent are against it and 6.7 percent are noncommittal.

In regard to postal service, 64.3 percent are against further rate increases, and 63.9 percent are against expanding the delivery service to include small towns and driveway service in the rural areas.

On the economic scene, 58.55 percent feel that the cost of living has increased a great deal in the past 12 months, 36.85 percent thought it has increased slightly, and only 4 percent think it has not increased at all.

Of the people answering the questionnaire, 84.6 percent are against another debt increase in July and 9.6 percent are in favor of it, many qualifying their answers by saying, "if it is necessary."

Also, 79.6 percent do not feel that the policies of the Secretary of Agriculture are in the best interests of the farmers, while only 12 percent think that they are.

The credibility gap seems to be as big as ever, 80 percent of the people feeling they are not getting enough reliable information from the Government, and only 15.7 percent are satisfied.

A constitutional amendment permitting reading of the Bible and prayers in public schools was favored by 69.2 percent of the people, while 27.6 percent are opposed and 3.2 percent made no choice.

Because of ambiguous wording, no clear decision was reached on the people's opinion on the handling of the Adam Clayton Powell affair. The question asked was:

> Are you satisfied with the handling of the Adam Clayton Powell affair?

Many questionnaires have additional comments saying that they are not satisfied because the punishment had not been soon enough nor severe enough. Others are not satisfied because they think there was racial discrimination; 46.5 percent are not satisfied with the handling of this case, while 44.9 percent vote in the affirmative.

REASONABLE RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTED MEAT PRODUCTS

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [ZWACH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, at the present time meat imports coming into the United States are controlled by Public Law 88–482, passed by Congress in 1964. This law has been very inadequate. Today meat imports are pouring in around the adjusted base quota, especially in the form of preserved and canned products.

Today I am introducing a bill which I believe will put reasonable restrictions on imported meat products, and will afford our farmers proper protection. This proposal will supersede H.R. 7787, a bill that I introduced on March 23. The new legislation ought to protect American farmers from the danger of foreign meats flooding the domestic market in the future.

Mr. Speaker, my bill maintains the same adjusted base quota—725,400,000 pounds—that was established by Public Law 88–482. But my legislation would include under this 725,400,000 figure, first, fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of lambs; second, fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of swine; third, all beef and pork sausages, whether or not in airtight containers; fourth, prepared or preserved pork; and fifth, prepared or preserved beef and veal. These items are added to those which were already included under Public Law 88–482; namely, fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of cattle, goats, and sheep.

Although the policy of Congress—as stated in Public Law 88–482—specified the quantities of beef, veal, and certain mutton products which may be imported, no statutory provision exists to check such imports unless the Secretary of Agriculture estimates, in advance, that the volume is likely to exceed the adjusted base quota by 10 percent. This language has made it possible for an extra 10 percent of foreign meats to come in the United States above the quota.

My bill would eliminate these additional imports and would forbid importation of the specified meats above the 725,400,000-pound total. It would not be necessary for the Secretary to make any estimates before imports could be checked. By this bill the quota would be imposed by the law itself, and would not be dependent upon the Secretary's estimate.

This proposal would also require that no more than one-fourth of the products imported each year be allowed on the market during any one calendar quarter. This would protect against flooding the domestic market during any particular period of time.

Finally, my bill provides that offshore purchases of meat by the Defense Department for the use of our troops at home or abroad shall be charged against the quota applicable to such meat.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we frequently are being told of the rising prosperity of the Nation, we seldom hear of the plight of the American farmer. Even while the gross national product is at record levels each year, the farmer has not enjoyed a rising standard of living.

According to figures released by the Department of Agriculture, the index of prices paid increased from 331 to 340 between March of 1966 and March of 1967. The index of prices received by the farmer during the same period, however, declined from 269 to 250. The parity ratio fell from 81 to a devastatingly low 74 in March of this year.

I believe that it is up to the Congress to take action immediately to correct this dire situation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the text of the proposal be printed below:

H.R. 10582

A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it is the policy of the Congress that the aggregate quantity of the articles specified in item 106.10 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen cattle meat); item 106.20 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep (except lambs)); item 106.30 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of lambs); item 106.40 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of swine); items 107.10, 107.15, 107.20, and 107.25 (relating to sausages, whether or not in airtight containers); items 107.30 and 107.35 (relating to pork, prepared or preserved (except sausages); and items 107.40, 107.45, 107.50, 107.55, and 107.60 (relating to beef and veal, prepared or preserved (except sausages)) of the Tariff Schedules of the United States which may be imported into the United States in any calendar year beginning after December 31, 1967, should not exceed seven hundred twenty-five million four hundred thousand pounds; except that this quantity shall be increased or decreased for any calendar year by the same percentage that estimated average annual domestic commercial production of these articles in that calendar year and the two preceding calendar years increases or decreases in comparison with the average annual domestic commercial production of these articles during the years 1958 through 1963, inclusive.

(b) Before the beginning of each calendar year after 1967, the Secretary of Agriculture shall estimate and publish the aggregate quantity prescribed for such calendar year by subsection (a).

(c) The President shall by proclamation limit the total quantity of the articles described in subsection (a) which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during each quarter of any calendar year to one-fourth the aggregate quantity estimated for such calendar year by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to subsection (b).

(d) The President may suspend any proclamation made under subsection (c), or increase the total quantity proclaimed under such subsection, if he determines and proclaims that—

(1) such action is required by overriding economic or national security interests of the United States, giving special weight to the importance to the Nation of the economic well-being of the domestic livestock industry;

(2) the supply of articles of the kind described in subsection (a) will be inadequate to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices; or

(3) trade agreements entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act ensure that the policy set forth in subsection (a) will be carried out.

Any such suspension shall be for such period, and any such increase shall be in such amount as the President determines and proclaims to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture shall issue such regulations as he determines to be necessary to prevent circumvention of the purposes of this section.

SEC. 2. Prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter the Secretary of Defense shall certify to the Secretary of Agriculture an estimate of the quantity in pounds of meat to be accepted for delivery during such quarter, procured from appropriated funds by the Defense Department from foreign sources, of any of the articles with respect to which quantitative limitations have been imposed under the first section of this Act. Any such limitation for a calendar quarter shall be diminished by the amount of such meat, as estimated by the Secretary of Defense, to be accepted for delivery during such calendar quarter.

SEC. 3. All determinations by the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Agriculture under this Act shall be final.

SEC. 4. Effective January 1, 1968, section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the free importation of certain wild animals, and to provide for the imposition of quotas on certain meat and meat products", approved August 22, 1964 (Public Law 88–482), is repealed.

IMPROVING LAND ACQUISITION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the varied and conflicting policies and practices followed in acquiring real property for Federal and federally assisted projects have concerned many persons for many years. In 1961 the House Committee on Public Works established a Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition to study the many problems. After more than 3 years of intensive study, the staff of the select subcommittee, on December 22, 1964, issued a comprehensive report describing the major problem areas and recommending that appropriate changes be made in existing laws and policies. Since the issuance of the report of the staff of the select subcommittee, numerous bills have been introduced in the Congress; but so far the major recommendations contained in the report have not been implemented.

Mr. Speaker, the problems which led to the creation of the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition have not lessened since the staff of the subcommittee made its report. In fact, the problems have become more serious and affect many more people because of the expansion in Federal and federally assisted construction programs. It is time for the Congress to take effective action to solve these problems.

Today I am introducing three bills designed to make real property acquisition policies and practices more uniform and more equitable to the people whose property is taken for a public use.

The first of these bills, which would be known as the Fair Compensation Act of 1967, is based on the recommendations of the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition. If enacted, it would go a long way toward assuring fair and equitable treatment to property owners and tenants on a basis as nearly uniform as practicable.

The second bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for more equitable treatment of persons affected by capital gains caused by involuntary sales of real property through eminent domain to the Federal Government or for federally assisted programs. The bill provides that an owner of property taken for public use may defer any recognition of gain on the transfer if he reinvested the compensation received for the property in, first, any interest in real property; second, any property used in trade or business; and third, any property to be held by the taxpayer for investment.

The third and final bill of this interrelated legislative unit is an amendment to the Small Business Act to provide assistance for owners and employees of small business concerns displaced or injured by Federal or federally assisted programs. This assistance would take the form of loans, information, and other assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this legislative proposal has been divided into three parts so that the various elements of the proposal can be referred to the committees of the House having jurisdiction and expertise in the various component parts. It may be that upon examination and evaluation these committees will decide that some modifications or amendments may be needed to clarify and improve the bills. In any event, I urge the members of the committees to which these bills will be referred to join in a bipartisan effort to take early action to assure fair, equitable, and uniform treatment to persons deprived of their property because of a Federal or federally assisted project.

LEGISLATION TO PERMIT HOMEBUILDERS TO SEGREGATE LAND IN AN INVESTMENT ACCOUNT

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, unlike persons who deal in securities, persons who engage in the realty and homebuilding business have no statutory grant—such as provided in section 1236 for dealers in securities—to earmark realty as investment property, and thereafter dispose of such property as a capital asset.

As a result, the courts have generally precluded homebuilders from capital gains treatment on realty even under circumstances where the property involved was purchased and sold in an unimproved state. The homebuilder may prevail under present law only by establishing facts sufficient to establish conclusively that the realty in question was not held principally—or of first importance—for the purpose of sale to customers in the ordinary course of business. The judicial decisions, however, are unclear and create substantial uncertainty as to the tax treatment of realty acquired for investment rather than development purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to remove the existing uncertainty and create express statutory rules which, if satisfied, will permit an electing homebuilder to make genuine investments in realty and thereafter dispose of such property with the clear assurance of taxation on the gain thereof as a capital gain. Section 1260 would provide that in the case of a dealer in real property, the gain derived from the sale of certain property could, at his election, qualify for capital gains treatment as gain derived from the sale or exchange of a capital asset or real property used in a trade or business, as the case may be.

Adequate safeguards are provided in the proposal in order to insure that the provisions of this section would be applicable only to realty which was held for investment purposes. The category of real property which would qualify under this proposal is limited to property which has been held by the taxpayer for more than 18 months, on which no substantial improvement was made during the holding period, and as to which the taxpayer, within 30 days of acquisition, clearly identifies such property as real property held for investment. The manner of identification shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

NORTHEASTERN STATES POWER FAILURE

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the power failure that affected a number of our mid-Atlantic States yesterday reminds us once again of our failure to prepare adequately for these emergencies. Fortunately, this failure did not take place at night with all the added inconvenience and danger of the November 1965 blackout, but we cannot be complacent. Power officials have indicated that we may be in for more of these blackouts, or "brownouts" in the coming months when electric systems will be strained by the use of air conditioning and related equipment.

Last year I introduced legislation calling for a special study by the Office of Emergency Planning of the effects of serious interruptions of essential public services and recommendations for legislative or administrative action to minimize them. No action was taken on the measure.

If the November 1965 emergency is receding in our memory, the blackout here in the Northeast yesterday has refreshed our recollection sharply. I am again introducing legislation calling for an OEP study, with a reporting date of July 31 of this year. I urge immediate action.

CONVERSATION WITH AVERELL HARRIMAN

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 21, the National Broadcasting Co. televised an hour-long "Conversation with Gov. Averell Harriman." Although Governor Harriman's service to the Nation is well known and universally respected, few of us are really aware of how intimately he has been associated with nearly every major diplomatic decision, and crisis of World War II and the postwar period. Among his attributes as a statesman, a distinguished Ambassador, and an effective international negotiator, Governor Harriman is a committed partisan of his political party. A number of his comments during the conversation reflect that party loyalty. Nevertheless, his comments have the ring of personal recollection and will be an important source for historians of the period. In that spirit, I include the text of Governor's Harriman's conversation with NBC newsmen Joseph C. Harsch, Chet Huntley, and Ray Scherer in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A CONVERSATION WITH GOV. AVERELL HARRIMAN, WITH NBC NEWS CORRESPONDENTS JOSEPH C. HARSCH, CHET HUNTLEY, AND RAY SCHERER

SCHERER. Governor Harriman, we find ourselves sitting here between busts of Franklin Roosevelt, the first President you worked for, and Lyndon Johnson, the latest but perhaps not the last President that you worked for. This is a considerable span of American history. I wonder if we might ask you to compare these two Presidents in terms of their style of command.

GOVERNOR HARRIMAN. Yes, I will be glad to.

briefly, in terms of working for them. It was my privilege to work for President Roosevelt particularly during the war. I reported directly to him rather than through the State Department, both when I was in England and Russia. He never wanted to make a decision until all the evidence was in. I think that was a very wise quality of his, because a premature decision can get the country in a lot of trouble.

So when I would go to him before I went to Britain or to Russia, I would ask him questions on what his policy was. He always talked around the subject. He gave me the idea or the ideas he had in mind, but he would never say, "You do this." And he depended upon, I think, the men that worked for him, to use their own judgment as to the manner in which they applied the ideas he had in mind.

Now, he was quite impersonal, let's say, about the way he dealt with his emissaries. If they came through all right, you were all right; if you made a mistake, you were out on a limb. And you knew that and it made it rather interesting to work for him. But I was very fortunate because I had known him since I was a young boy, and he trusted me.

President Johnson in many ways is a disciple of President Roosevelt. You know, when he was a young Congressman he was the only Texas Congressman that got reelected—I think it was 1938—who had voted for the minimum wage, 25 cents an hour minimum wage. Every other Congressman in Texas—I think there were half a dozen—got beaten.

And I find in many of the things he is doing it's either inspired by the New Deal or unfinished business of the New Deal. And in foreign affairs I think I have perhaps inherited his confidence in me, because he never asks me to—tells me what to do. He says, "You have been through this. You handle it the way you think best."

Now, they are quite different in their manner, but in a sense I find the same kind of confidence in the manner in which they treat me.

SCHERER. Governor, you have brought us from the beginning, so to speak, to the end. Suppose we go back to the beginning. What was it that first impelled you to become an international citizen?

Governor HARRIMAN. Well, it dated back to my business activities. I was involved in railroading, you know, and I got my training in business in the railroad. But after the war I felt that New York would take over from London as the international banker, and I formed a small firm to do international banking business. And that led me to travel a great deal in Europe and other parts of the world. I got to know what was going on. Incidentally, I thought that the Russian Revolution would play a very important role.

SCHERER. What year was this, sir?

Governor HARRIMAN. This was 1921, I think. So in order to find out about it as bankers we did business with them, and we made loans for credits, we found export trade, and that sort of thing, and we found they paid their bills.

And then one of my associates made a deal for a concession under Lenin's new economic policy, and in 1926, just 40 years ago, I first went to Moscow. And I found that Stalin was moving up, Trotsky was moving out, the new economic policy was on the way out, and the idea Lenin had to hire foreign enterprise to develop their resources was not a new policy. So we negotiated a withdrawal of the concession and gave it up. We got our money out with interest and with a little profit.

But at that time I saw all of the leaders with the exception of Stalin, who was very hard to see in those days.

HUNTLEY. Governor Harriman, I guess—would it be 1928 that you first identified yourself with domestic politics?

Governor HARRIMAN. Well, I wouldn't say I first identified myself with domestic politics. That is the first year I became a Democrat. I voted for Al Smith, if that's identifying myself in politics. I was a voter, nothing more.

But that was due—that was quite a rupture in my life, because I had been brought up a good, solid, conservative Republican, you know, and I felt that Republican policies at that time were going to lead to international disaster. We had to go back to Wilson's idea of participating in the League of Nations, you remember, and also we were lending money abroad in large sums and building up tariff barrier, and I felt it was going to be impossible for the Europeans or the South Americans to repay those loans under that policy.

The Democrats were supposed to be the free trade party. I didn't like the speculation going on in Wall Street. And I knew Al Smith. He was very much interested in parks, and I had been involved in parks ever since I was a boy—my father and mother were—in state parks. And so I voted for Al Smith, and I have been a Democrat ever since.

HUNTLEY. Your first role in public service was with the NRA, as I recall. How good an economist was FDR?

Governor HARRIMAN. Well, I think he was not a particularly good economist. He had a brain trust that had different views, as you remember, and he had different ideas.

I think his important contribution was his willingness to experiment, and the fact that he wasn't tied to any particular scheme or plan, and the great revolution was the acceptance of the need for the Federal Government to take responsibility for individuals, the acceptance of the fact that this was not—no longer the kind of economy where man could fend for himself, if not a West where he could pick up and migrate and carve out a farm for himself.

When we had this terrific depression, men were thrown out of work and they couldn't fend for themselves, and since that time there developed a sense of responsibility on the part of the Federal Government that both parties have accepted. None of the proposals that Roosevelt carried through have been repealed by the Republicans, even in the eight years under President Eisenhower. And that was the great contribution that he made.

SCHERER. Governor, when you went to London in those war years you spent an awful lot of time with Winston Churchill. I have had the feeling that Mr. Churchill liked to have you around. He took you wherever he went to see the war damage, and that——

Governor HARRIMAN. That was the first two months I was there. That was the winter of 1941, before we were in the war. And he very soon told me that he recognized that their best chance was to hold out in Britain and hold the Middle East. He also wanted to hold Singapore.

But he knew that they couldn't win the war without American support, and he thought sooner or later we would come in the war. But of course he put up a very bold front, and he was extraordinary in the manner in which he tried to keep the morale of the British people. And during that year that I was there they stood alone. I think it was the most thrilling year I've ever spent because every man, woman and child had only one purpose, and they looked to Churchill for leadership.

So he did take me around with him when he visited the cities that had been badly hit by the blitz, you know. I remember once in Bristol, we got there rather by accident very early in the morning, just after Bristol had been hit, and there was a ceremony giving honorary degrees by the Bristol University, of which Churchill was Chancellor. People all thought he'd come immediately after this very bad blitz that had taken place.

He went around the city after the ceremonies at the university, and I happened to be alone with him in his car. This is one of the nice stories, I think. As we pulled out of the railroad station—and he used to wave to people that were looking out of the windows of the apartments as we went out of the city—he said—he used to tell me—he said, "I try to catch people's eyes. If you catch a person's eye, something is exchanged between you."

And then as we left the station he picked up the newspapers. You know, he used to read the newspapers avidly in spite of all the reports that he got. He wanted to know what people were thinking about. And he put it up in front of his face, and there were tears running down his cheeks. And he said—he wasn't elated by this applause that he had from everyone at all—he said very simply, "This is a grave responsibility. They have such faith." And that was his—that was the man in war. He wasn't—he knew the dangers, he had the determination, and he knew his responsibility to the people.

SCHERER. You then went to Russia with Winston Churchill and you first saw Stalin. How do you equate the two men as war-time leaders?

Governor HARRIMAN. No. It was the second time I saw Stalin. I went with Beaverbrook in '41. Roosevelt and Churchill sent this—it was still before we were in the war—sent this supply mission, in which I represented the United States and Beaverbrook the British. And we tried to develop what the requirements of Russia were to keep them in the fight.

As I have said, Roosevelt hoped that keeping the Russians in the war would make it not necessary for us to send troops in the continent, although he recognized we would have to intervene with our Naval and Air Force when it was developed.

So I saw Stalin for four nights with Beaverbrook, and I think it was the end of September, early October, of '41. The next year Churchill went to discuss military strategy and the President asked me to go along. Churchill wanted me to, in order to show that we were together. And Stalin was driving for the second front at that time. It was very rough with Churchill, and I thought that Churchill's handling of that situation was brilliant, when he talked about the British Navy turning back.

"Never before in history," said Stalin, "had the British Navy turned back." Roosevelt—Churchill made, I think, the greatest speech he's ever made in his life, in which he went through all of the history of the war, what the British had done, the manner in which they had stood up alone. He didn't—he never remembered that you had to interpret, and the British interpreter got so fascinated by what he said that he put down his pencil and listened.

And suddenly Churchill realized this, you know, and he said, "You'd better translate." So he started in, and the man was stumbling over his notes, and he pulled him by his shoulder, "Did you tell them this, did you you tell them that." And after a little bit Stalin started to laugh. He said something to this effect. He said, "Your words are no importance. What is vital is your spirit." This was Stalin to Churchill.

SCHERER. Did you sense any special chemistry between those two?

Governor HARRIMAN. Well, there was later on. That last night we were there he spent the better part of the night with him, as is recorded, and there they had a very intimate talk. And later on I think they got to respect each other as war-time allies.

I don't think Stalin ever thought that he would work with Churchill after the war, but I remember his making a—I think it was the time De Gaulle was in the Kremlin for a banquet. Stalin toasted both Churchill and Roosevelt, and I wrote down his toast to Churchill because I thought it was so significant He toasted the Prime Minister, "My friend and collaborator in this war, a man of indestructible fighting spirit." He underlined "in this war."

But with Roosevelt it was different. Roosevelt—in the first place, Stalin respected American power, American industry. And also I got the feeling that the New Deal was not in the Communist books, you know. It wasn't part of the Marxist concept of capitalism. He was concerned to know what was going on in the United States. He seemed to listen with the greatest of attention to everything that Roosevelt said and he treated him with a great deal more respect, with Roosevelt—as far as Roosevelt was concerned. With Churchill, Stalin didn't mind weighing in. I think he rather liked his reaction.

Huntley. I believe you thought Stalin was an unquestioned war-time leader with great ability, didn't you?

Governor **Harriman.** Yes, I did. I differentiate between his brutality and the manner in which he dealt with his internal affairs, which were utterly ruthless and brutal, although he did have ideology back of it—and that's a long story. I hope we will get some of it from his daughter, but—the memoirs will be most interesting, but he had—he was the leader. He understood every aspect of the civilian problem, the supply problem, the food problem, and also every aspect of the military problem.

And I found him with great determination. When I saw him in September, early October of '41—that was when the Germans were first at the gates of Moscow, only 30 miles away—he was determined to hold out. When all the diplomatic corps left, he stayed in Moscow. And he told me at that time—he said, "If they take Moscow we will continue to fight, but we will have to go back of the Ural Mountains." He thought that Hitler had made a great tactical blunder by not driving to Moscow instead of fanning out in three attacks. You know, one towards Petrograd, or Leningrad, and one towards Moscow, and one down towards the oil fields.

If they had driven to Moscow they would have broken the control. The capital is the heart of the nation, and with all the communication and the center of industry, and all, it would have broken them. But he said, "We'll never surrender."

Huntley. Well, Yalta was sort of the culmination of those years. Mr. Harriman, have you ever sympathized with any of these many doubts about the Yalta Conference?

Governor **Harriman.** Well, there has been a myth which developed about Yalta which has nothing to do with the truth—Tehran, Yalta, and other occasions, when Churchill came to Moscow. President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill tried their best to get Stalin to agree to give independence to those areas of Eastern Europe, Poland and the whole of Eastern Europe, which they knew would be dominated by the Red Army as the Red Army advanced and forced the Nazi forces back into Germany. And they got an agreement finally that—in Yalta—Stalin agreed to hold free and unfettered elections.

Huntley. Why did he do that?

Governor **Harriman.** My guess is that Stalin thought that the Red Army would be looked upon as an army of liberation from the Nazi terror; and I think they were very disappointed when they found the Red Armies looked upon as a new invading force. I found that out, not only Poland but also Rumania. And they were determined not to be —the body opinion of those countries were determined not to be dominated by a new invading force.

I think Stalin thought that if they had an election rather quickly—he urged that election take place in Poland within a month of the liberation—that in that enthusiasm for the Russians they would give—they would elect enough of a Communist party in power to be able to take over. That's the only explanation I can give.

But you know, Stalin was very ruthless. If he made a decision and he believed that it wasn't the right one he would change it without the slightest consideration.

Harsch. Governor Harriman, you came back to San Francisco at the end of the war. I think it was the United Nations Conference, wasn't it?

Governor **Harriman.** That's right.

Harsch. And startled a good many people by saying what I suppose you said to Roosevelt when you referred to that by telling everyone that there was going to be trouble with Russia after the war. Would you go back and tell us the point at which you first realized that we were going to have a lot of trouble with Russia and why? What brought you to that point of view?

Governor **Harriman.** Well, all through the war it was a question of whether they would cooperate or not. I realized they were treating us as potential enemies. They wouldn't tell us where their radio stations were, they wouldn't give us the facts about their own Red Army order of battle.

We exchanged daily the order of battle between each other as to what we knew about the German or the enemy order. But we would—they were very suspicious of us, and I thought it was very doubtful one way or another all the way through, but I still agreed with Roosevelt and Churchill, we should try to come to an understanding. And of course through the United Nations declarations and otherwise, they—through the Moscow declaration—they took some very strong positions which encouraged people to believe they were going to cooperate with us.

Now, I felt that there was a difference of opinion within the Kremlin councils, even Stalin's Politburo. There were differences of views. Some thought we ought to cooperate in the postwar world to help the reconstruction. Others thought that the dislocations were so great in the postwar world that was the time to drive Communism forward. And of course the decision was to go it alone, to drive it forward.

Now, I don't want to give you an idea that Stalin didn't control the Politburo, but I was led to believe by what certain individuals told me who were there, that there were very free discussions in the Politburo of a new subject until a decision was made; but then when Stalin said, "Well, this is it," anyone who left the room with a shrug of the shoulder was a marked man and was in Siberia the next day.

But I felt that there was a difference of opinion. And the decision was made. Stalin himself, and I saw him at Sochi in October 1945, said we had decided to pursue an isolationist policy, as he called it.

Harsch. When do you think he made that decision?

Governor **Harriman.** It's very hard to tell, but I think—my feeling was that he made it when he broke the agreements in Yalta—that he decided to go his own way, you know, when he refused to go through with the agreement on Poland.

But at that time I think I offended a number of—I don't know whether you were offended, Joe, but I offended a number of people by telling them a very simple fact, that we had to recognize that our objectives and the Kremlin objectives were different. They wanted to communize the world. We wanted what we called a free and democratic world, but that we'd have to try to find a way to live at peace in this small planet. And that was such a shock. I think you were at one of those meetings.

Harsch. It shook a lot of people at that time, of course.

Governor **Harriman.** Do you remember anything about the talks which you attended?

Harsch. Well, I remember that one or two of our colleagues walked out, they were so shaken by it. It was the first time, I think, that a high person in Government had just stated flatly that we were in for real trouble with Russia after the war.

Governor **Harriman.** Those were off-the-record talks, if you remember, and it was one of the few times in my life that the press has broken an off the record. But some people were so shocked they wrote that I was so unfriendly to the Soviet Union, I ought to be recalled as Ambassador.

Harsch. But Stalin didn't regard you as unfriendly, did he?

Governor **Harriman.** Well, you know he—the strange thing is that I've been very bluntly frank with him and also bluntly frank with his successors, but they know I'm frank and they know that I am strongly in favor of American objectives; but they know that I'm honest about it. And it becomes one reason why President Kennedy used me in dealing with some of the important negotiations with the Russians.

Scherer. Before we move on, I just wanted to ask you one thing. The American public has seen a lot of Svetlana Stalina lately. Do you recall her?

Governor **Harriman.** I never met her. I think my daughter, who was with me, believes that she met her, remembers meeting her. My daughter was with me in Moscow. My wife was not very well. But she was one of the few Western women who were in Moscow and she had an extraordinary experience during the war. But I think the closest I ever came to knowing about Stalin's daughter was in the time I was in Moscow in August '42.

The last night Churchill went around alone. The other three nights I was with Churchill. Stalin asked him to stay for dinner, and he stayed from, I think, 7:30 until 3:00 o'clock in the morning, and he said he went to the living quarters, the apartment in the Kremlin, and this girl came in, who was a redheaded girl, a teenager, who had quite a devoted attitude towards her father, kissed him, and then helped lay the table. They of course said, sit down with them. And he told me about it the next day.

Scherer. Certainly in April of 1945 you found yourself working for a new President, Harry Truman, a man that you hardly knew. Were you able to help him, to assist him in picking up the reins of government?

Governor **Harriman.** Well, I don't know whether I helped him or not. I felt that it was very important for me to get back to Washington as fast as possible in order to tell him that Stalin was breaking his agreements in Yalta and give him a real pitch on the developments of the situation, and so I came back. I came back in forty-eight hours. It was a record, I think, from Moscow, in those days. I had a plane at my disposal. And I went in to see him.

I thought we were going to have a very long talk. I thought it was going to be rather difficult to persuade him, just as it would have been quite difficult to persuade Joe. I found that he had read all the messages that I had sent and that Roosevelt had sent to Stalin. He already knew that Roosevelt recognized that Stalin was breaking his agreements. And our conversation turned out to be quite brief.

He understood it. And that was the first time I realized what an extraordinary faculty Mr. Truman had of reading all of the documents. I found as I worked for him more and more it became even embarrassing, because things which I was supposed to know about as Secretary of Commerce he had read detailed reports when I had only read the summaries. .

But by the time I saw him, which was shortly afterward, within a week of the time President Roosevelt died, I found he was fully aware fo the problems, and I did try to get him to still work on it, and I got him to send Harry Hopkins to Moscow in June, the end of May, I think, of that year, to try to make a last pitch for coming to an agreement. And I never gave up on the possibility of working with the Russians and never have today. I have always said we must have a friendly hand out and our guard up.

But I became quite close to him, of course, over the years. In the beginning I had a very —I hardly knew him, as you say, but I got great respect for him at once even though in the beginning he was somewhat concerned over the lack of experience. For that reason I think he depended a little bit too much upon Jimmy Byrnes as Secretary of State. He was much wiser when he got control of things himself.

SCHERER. Well, as I recall, Governor, you had hardly gotten home from Moscow when you were off again as Ambassador, this time sent to London. How was that?

Governor HARRIMAN. I came back from Moscow in, I think it was, January—early February of 1946—and resigned. And Jimmy Byrnes, Secretary of State, asked me to come and see him. I was cleaning up some of the affairs, several weeks after I had been home, perhaps the end of February, early March. And he said, "Now, it would be very nice if you went to London."

I said, "No. I have been overseas five years, and I want to stay home with my family and go back to business." I think that was a quite natural thing to do.

He said, "Well, you'd better go talk to the President about it." So I arranged an appointment with the President, and I marshaled my——

SCHERER. Your arguments?

Governor HARRIMAN. Arguments, as to why I couldn't go, and I went to see him. And like most of my talks with him, they were very brief. I have forgotten what he called me—Averell or Ambassador—but in any event, he said, "I want you to go to London. We are having difficulty with the Russians over Iran." You remember, there was the treaty they had with the British to pull their troops out of Northern Iran when the British pulled out of Southern Iran. "They're refusing to take their troops out of Iran, and this may lead to war. I must have someone in London that knows the British, as you do, and whom I have confidence in."

So my arguments dropped away, and I simply said, "Mr. President, when do you want me to go?"

He said, "As soon as you can get there."

And I did add, however, that, "Mr. President, I hope you won't forget me." Sometimes Presidents forget their ambassadors. "And don't leave me there too long."

So actually I was only Ambassador in Britain for six months.

SCHERER. Didn't he suddenly need a—how was it—Secretary of Commerce, and then brought you back into that?

Governor HARRIMAN. Yes, that was the famous difference with Henry Wallace over his speech on international affairs, which—and he had his choice of losing his Secretary of Commerce or losing his Secretary of State. So he lost his Secretary of Commerce. And then he called me up.

SCHERER. You were in London?

Governor HARRIMAN. I was in London. Actually I was with Mr. Churchill at his country place. And the sentry came in—he was then out of power, of course, but I still kept in contact with him—and he said, "The President of the United States is on the telephone." This made Mr. Churchill quite interested, and he said, "What do you think he's calling you about?"

And I said, "I think he's going to offer me the Secretaryship of Commerce."

SCHERER. Premonition.

Governor HARRIMAN. Well, I thought he'd live up—I trusted him, you know. I thought he'd live up to his promise to get me home, and this was in the news. Nobody had suggested it. So I said to Mr. Churchill, "What would you do?"

He said, "I'd go home, important as the ambassadorship to Britain is."

So he did call me up, and I said—the President said, "Will you come back as Secretary of Commerce?" And I said, "Yes, sir."

He said, "Did you hear me? I want you to come back as Secretary of Commerce."

I wasn't surprised. I think he was a little disappointed that I wasn't, but anyway, again I said, "When do you want me back?"

He said, "As soon as you can get here."

So I did get back within a couple of weeks after. It is a little bit hard for an ambassador to disengage. He has to say goodby to a lot of people. But that was—then of course from then on I got to know Mr. Truman very well, and later on I had a number of different jobs for him.

HUNTLEY. Governor Harriman, as you said earlier, as early as 1945 you could see a Communist threat to Western Europe and the need for a job of picking up. It was two years and more before this country responded, but we responded in an unprecedented way with the Marshall Plan. There was a figure in that stage of our history by the name of Senator Arthur Vandenberg, whom I am sure you knew. What about Vandenberg?

Governor HARRIMAN. I knew him very well. You know, he was an isolationist. That was perhaps one of his strengths. And he made a great speech in January 1945 recanting, and then President Roosevelt appointed him on the United Nations, on the commission, American Commission of the United Nations, and I saw him frequently.

Sometimes Truman didn't like all of his proposals for changes. He insisted that a Republican be appointed as administrator of the Marshall Plan, which led to Paul Hoffman's appointment.

But I think that he had an extraordinary influence at that time. He was a great parliamentarian. He converted some of the recalcitrant or the difficult Democrats, as well as the Republicans, and I think history should record the great role that he played at that time. In that way we had a real bipartisan foreign policy for that great period of international action.

HUNTLEY. Justifiably, Governor—

Governor HARRIMAN. May I say that does not detract from President Truman. President Truman had the initiative, had the determination, had the courage, to propose these great measures, but Vandenberg—his ability to get them through was all important.

HUNTLEY. You are recognized as a very charitable and kind man, and yet you have had quite a political and diplomatic life. I think possibly the roughest speech you ever made was in reference to Senator Taft. Was there much commotion about that?

Governor HARRIMAN. Oh, yes. That was the speech I made in September 1950, I think it was, and I was very strongly against McCarthyism. I thought that was going to— that we were going to have to pin the— we'd have to protect ourselves against the accusation that the administration was filled with communism, communists. You remember, he said there were 240 or something communists in the State Department.

So I always think an offense is the best defense. So I said, the real man that Stalin likes in this country, that is working for him—he doesn't know it, but it's Taft, because Taft opposed the Marshall Plan, opposed adequate funds for the Marshall Plan, opposed NATO.

And you remember Stalin declared war on the Marshall Plan even though they were originally invited to join. They were left out.

So I was sincere in that, but I got, I think, about 3,000 or more letters of condemnation saying that, how did I dare attack this great and honorable man.

Of course the newspapers to some extent exaggerated my statement. I didn't call him a communist. I said that this was the attitude, this isolationist policy was the attitude that played into Stalin's hands, and I said, "There is no doubt that Taft is honorable but he doesn't understand the importance of these other measures." I never called him a communist, as I was accused of doing.

HUNTLEY. But that speech gave you credentials as a politician in addition to being a diplomat, didn't it?

Governor HARRIMAN. I don't know. Truman never read the speech, but I asked him whether he would want me—I was then in the White House. You know, I had this sort of a Mac Bundy job. And Truman said, "If that's what you want to do, go ahead and do it."

You know, Truman called a spade a spade. And he didn't object to his colleagues doing the same. So I was brought up in that school.

HARSCH. During the Truman Administration we fought what is known as the Korean War. That was called a limited war for limited objectives. Did you agree with keeping it a limited war? Do you believe that the United States should fight that kind of wars?

Governor HARRIMAN. Oh, I felt very strongly that President Truman was right when, the second time, he stated that the 38th parallel—opposed expanding the war into China. He was under a great deal of criticism, you remember, at that time.

HARSCH. Very clearly.

Governor HARRIMAN. A lot of people said we didn't win the war. Of course we won the war. The objective was to stop and roll back the Communist attack, and that was what we wanted to do.

HARSCH. Governor, at the time of the Korean War there was a great deal of controversy in the Government over the decision to march to the Yalu. I remember that General Bradley, for example, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at that time, was strongly of the opinion that we should halt somewhere along the parallel or at one time at what they called the Narrow Waist.

Governor HARRIMAN. That's right.

HARSCH. There was a decision, however, to strike for the Yalu and we were thrown back. What was your position on that issue at the time?

Governor HARRIMAN. Well, that wasn't quite that way. There was never any decision as far as the Government was concerned, as I recall it. I think it would be very hard to have stopped the United Nations forces from moving back and attempting to destroy the armies of North Korea.

There was very strong opinion—the British had it—that we should hold at the Narrows. And it was General MacArthur that moved ahead. The Joint Chiefs of Staff sent him telegrams saying, "Are you sure that you're not getting extended?"

And I don't think they fully knew that General MacArthur had divided his two armies, one to the east and one to the west, and it was through the center that the Chinese poured—didn't realize how exposed they were because it all happened so fast, but I remember very clearly being gravely concerned by the fact that the Marine Division went up into the reservoir, remember, and the Seventh Division moved up to the Yalu in the North, and I was gravely concerned because General MacArthur felt convinced the Chinese would not intervene.

I was at Wake Island, you remember, at that discussion, and I remember General MacArthur saying, "Mr. President, I know the Chinese well. I can assure you that they will never intervene."

His intelligence did not conform with that of Washington, and Washington kept warning him; but we have a system of giving the field commander a great deal of discretion. And this was not a decision. There was a lot of difference of opinion, but I know that I was gravely concerned by the attempt to move into the mountains.

SCHERER. Governor, moving on a bit, you then took a plunge into elective politics in New York State. Did you find that that gave you as much satisfaction as serving in diplomatic lines?

Governor Harriman. Well, I was elected Governor of New York, and I was always tremendously interested in New York, had been interested, and lived there all my life. My father had taken an interest in it, and I thought that—I started a lot of new things. I brought some people from Washington who had had experience in the New Deal and in the developments.

I started an anti-poverty program which was cut out, old age program, particularly interested in care of mental cases. We changed the whole system from custodial care of mental hospitals to attempt to cure them so they could get home. And then we had a juvenile delinquency program. We had about a dozen or more new programs. But that was only four years. We didn't have a chance to carry through.

I might tell you an amusing story about that. I have had a lot of different jobs, you know, and I think the last time—the last job I had with President Truman was being Director of Mutual Security. He swore me in. And I remember very clearly one of my—he told about the different things that I had done for him in the years he was President. I think there were half a dozen. There was one of my good friends in the White House, in a rather loud aside said, "When do you suppose Averell is going to be able to hold a steady job."

Well, you know, I thought when I was elected Governor I was going to have a steady job, but the people of New York didn't seem to think I was as good a Governor as I was, and they threw me out after four years. They elected another fellow. I've forgotten just what his name is—Rockefeller?

Scherer. I think that's his name.

In 1959 you went to Russia as a private citizen, and you met a new kind of Russian leader, Nikita Khrushchev. What did you make of him?

Governor Harriman. Yes. That was during the period when I was involuntarily unemployed. But I had a very long talk with him. As a matter of fact, it lasted—the first talk lasted—I had several later, but the first lasted ten hours, from one o'clock in the morning until eleven o'clock at night, and I never realized how much you could learn about a man at one sitting, because we covered almost everything.

Now, he—this may seem odd to say, but I don't remember—I hadn't remembered meeting him before, but he remembered me, because he had attended one of the banquets in the Kremlin. I used to sit on Stalin's left when these banquets occurred, De Gaulle or Churchill, or whoever it might be, on his right. And so he knew about me. Everybody knows about me because I was Ambassador during the war, and I was built up as a friend of Russia. I found him very amusing, a great sense of humor.

And he was hopeful, very hopeful, of improving relations between our two countries. But I think he wanted to do too much on the Russian line rather than on the American.

But he told me about the death of Stalin and the fact that they had had to demote the authority and strength of the secret police.

He said, "You know, in the later days of Stalin's life he was very arbitrary, trusted no one. We never knew when we were called to his office whether we'd ever see our families again." He said, "You know, people can't work under that kind of a fear." And he said, "We got together after his death and decided that we could never have the secret police with the authority they had because that's controlled by one man."

He said, "We had a certain amount of trouble with one individual, Beria."

I said, "What was the trouble with him?"

He said, "He was a little overly ambitious. You remember, they shot him." But it's interesting that he's the last one that they have shot.

And now he is retired. He, himself, is retired, and he's living as a private citizen. Molotov is living as a private citizen, or rather out of the government, and we see him occasionally. They feel sufficiently confident. They have control of the country. Although they have abandoned terror, you know, the knock at the door at midnight doesn't exist any more—but let me quickly say they rule the country by very stern discipline.

You know there is only one employer, namely, the Government. If you get into that one employer's bad graces there's no way that you can exist. And so that's the way they control not only the working people but also control the intellectuals.

But there is a pressure for more freedom. You know, with more consumer goods the people want greater consumer goods. There is pressure to do more, in addition to which they realize after fifty years that they have to show a success of communism. That is one interesting thing.

You know, Stalin used to tell me that communism would sweep the world because of the mistakes of capitalism, great depressions, capitalistic wars, and once he rather colorfully said, "Communism breeds in the cesspools of capitalism." As Khrushchev fifteen years later, sitting in the same office, leader of the Russian people, said, "We are making such an enormous success of communism that other countries are going to have to follow our example."

Now, Khrushchev was a little over-optimistic. You know, he would always tell you where they would be in five years and attempt to negotiate on that basis. But they really believe that it's a necessity now to make a success of it, and of course that's good.

And I think one of the most subversive things for communism that's being devised is this Fiat deal, you know, the automobiles.

Scherer. Sending the automobile to Russia?

Governor Harriman. I found that although people were very unhappy about the poor accommodations, the apartments are very crowded, a family living in one room, and that sort of thing, they think they're going to get that in time—they long for an automobile. It gives them a certain freedom.

And I think when they begin to get enough of them around—I found every family wanted an automobile, the pressure for automobiles and the need of all the things that go with automobiles, the roads and services, and one thing and another. That's why I say the Fiat deal is very subversive to communism, and I think it's one of the best things that's been contemplated.

Scherer. We have still another leader in Russia, Mr. Kosygin. You talked with him, too. Many people have the impression that the Soviet Union under Kosygin is less militant, that the outward thrust of international communism has subsided. Would that be your view?

Governor Harriman. No, I don't think the cold war is over.

I believe—I think the Cuban missile crisis was a watershed, where President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev looked down that nuclear barrel. They don't want to go through that again. And they realize that that was a great shock to them, that we would stand up, and I don't think they want nuclear war.

But they are all still, as you notice from your dispatches, still helping Castro's Cuba interfere in the internal affairs of Latin American countries, and there's no secret about this.

President De Gaulle is absolutely wrong in thinking the cold war is over, and I am delighted, of course, that the other fourteen nations, members of NATO, are sticking together. We have an integrated force, and I think the other fourteen realize that they would be knocked off one by one.

The Kremlin would like to fragmentize Western Europe, and they would do it if we didn't stick together. So the policy of holding NATO together is absolutely important, and those who think that the cold war is over are wrong.

When I think of the enormous change, when I sent the telegram in '45, I was then really concerned that Russian communism would take over the whole of Europe, and in my judgment they would have done so if it hadn't been for the extraordinary far-sightedness of the people of the United States, the President and the Congres and the Marshall Plan, NATO, aid to Turkey and standing up in Berlin. They were tough times.

But we see that we now have such a—instead of an impoverished Europe, a vigorous, vital Europe, more vigorous than ever, coming together. We have been supporting integration from the very beginning. I think we have every right to be gratified by the events of the last twenty years, even though we have this very unhappy war still on in Vietnam. The progress in the period has been enormous.

Huntley. Governor Harriman, 1960 then came on and that opened the beginning of the—opened the Kennedy era. Again you were called to service, roving Ambassador, and you brought in such things as a negotiated settlement on Laos, a nuclear test ban treaty, very important things. Again I would assume that these agreements the Soviet Union will sign when they can see it's to their advantage.

Governor Harriman. Yes, that is true.

It's tough to negotiate with Russians. It's very easy to lose your temper and shout at them; but you have to be calm and sit through things, and then finally can come to an agreement, when if you try to find out what they want, see whether it can be meshed with what we want, even though our objectives may be the same as we now have, on the non-proliferation agreement, it's very hard to find a way of agreeing to it because they don't like to have people roaming around their country. They don't like to have any inspectors, you know. So we may have common objectives, but it's hard to find the formula to agree.

Harsch. Now, you said when we were talking about the Korean War that General MacArthur had taken the firm position the Chinese would never enter that war. They did enter the war. We again today are having a similar controversy. It's very much like the Korean, with some people saying, "Look out, the Chinese may come in," others saying, "Never, they won't come in."

Are we in danger of repeating the mistake that General MacArthur made?

Governor Harriman. I don't think as long as we have President Johnson as President we'll repeat the mistakes. I think he thoroughly understands the risks involved.

If you went at the North recklessly and invaded the North, I think it is quite plain that they might very well come in if we were to attack the North, attack China as they want to attack it, but North Vietnam does not want to bring the Chinese in. They want to be independent of China. And if we were to attempt to block them out or take the north over, which the President has no intention of doing, or changing the government in North Vietnam, they would come in.

By the same token the Russians are gravely concerned. They're not involved out there. But they consider themselves the great communist power, and this is a sister communist state, North Vietnam. I think they feel frustrated, that state can undergo the punishment which is going on with their being unable to do it, and they have given a very considerable amount of help.

I still believe, however, that the main—the opinion in Moscow that I know about is for ending the war if they can find a way to do it. But they haven't got the influence at the moment to do so. But I wouldn't be surprised if they played a part at one time in attempting to bring the war to a conclusion.

I know that the Eastern European countries, a number of whom I have talked to at the President's request—the Poles, for instance, a year ago last January, sent one of their senior foreign office men all the way to Hanoi to try to find a way. They were unable to find the formula. But they want to see the war over because they don't want to have a confrontation between the United States and Russia.

SCHERER. Governor, that brings us up to this very moment. How do we end the war in Vietnam?

Governor HARRIMAN. Well, I think the President has given us instructions to follow every lead. He has told me to spend my entire time on that subject, and I can assure you that every lead is being followed through.

So far there is no indication that North Vietnam is ready to come to the conference table. They have been—they're tough people. They've been fighting—Ho Chi Minh and his colleagues—for a long time. They want to take over the South. And they believe that we will—that they can hang on and we'll get tired.

I think the statement of the liberal Senators ought to disillusion them as to that.

So I think in time, with the number of people in the world that want to see peace, with a President that does, and with the growing strength—I have a great deal of confidence in the growing strength, prestige of the government in Saigon.

You know, it's an extraordinary thing in the middle of a war to have a constituent assembly develop a constitution, the elections are going on, on the village and the hamlet basis. There will be an election in the autumn, September and October, for a president, for a national assembly. This will give the government real authority in respect to world councils, and I think that will be an important improvement in the situation.

But above all, I think that President Johnson has the determination but at the same time the restraint which is needed, as it was under Truman, to see us through that conflict, to a successful conclusion.

But let's remember this is a limited war, limited objectives, and when it comes to the solution it's got to be a solution which achieves our limited objectives.

But he's quite ready, as you know, to announce that he's ready to have our troops come out and neutralize the area, and I am inclined to think the Russians don't want to see the Chinese expand and would be quite ready to accept a neutral area in Southeast Asia, just as they are willing to accept a neutral area in the subcontinent, India and Pakistan.

BEEF IMPORTS

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to revise the quota system on the importation of certain meat and meat products. The rising tide of meat imports is jeopardizing the income of our farmers, and I feel that the time has come for us to review and strengthen the existing limitations.

For many months now, the American farmer has suffered from rising imports. As of March 30, the farm parity ratio was 74, the lowest since 1934. Per capita farm income last year was $1,731—less than two-thirds the level of per capita income for the entire country.

In addition to this, cattle prices have fallen behind the rise in general price level. For example, on the Chicago market, beef averaged $24.67 per 100 pounds in March of 1967 as compared to an average of $29.22 in March of 1966.

With these facts in mind, I think it is obvious that the Meat Import Act of 1964—Public Law 88-482—has failed to bring any relief to American meat producers.

The bill I am introducing today would bring about the following six things. First, it would eliminate the 10-percent overrun clause so that imports could not exceed the actual adjusted quota.

Second, it would relieve the Secretary of Agriculture of the duty of estimating in advance the level of imports and determining whether they will exceed quotas. Quotas would be imposed by the bill itself.

Third, the period on which our present quotas are based would be changed. Quotas would be based on the average of the 5-year period 1958–62, a more representative base period than 1959–63.

Fourth, quotas would be imposed quarterly instead of annually, thus preventing seasonal surges.

Fifth, the administration would have the power to impose quotas on meats not covered in the legislation if these imports should become a threat to domestic producers.

Finally, meat purchases abroad will be charged against import quotas for such meats.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this much needed legislation which would help provide an equitable solution to the problem of beef imports.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND TAX LAWS

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the present tax laws to extend the "head of household" benefits to all unremarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 1 year or more.

Today the single person bears an unfair burden of our Nation's taxload. In reviewing the tax structure I find that Congress in 1948 legalized "income splitting" for married couples who filed joint returns and then 3 years later in 1951, enacted a "head of household" provision which granted tax relief to single, divorced, or widowed individuals who supported one or more dependents. Quite frankly, the present laws affecting single, widowed, or divorced individuals with no dependents are unrealistic in view of the demands and expenses of present-day living requirements.

According to a study by Joseph A. Pechman, director of economic studies for the Brookings Institution, who conducted the first comprehensive study of the tax system since the tax reduction and reform bill of 1964, the income tax law discriminates heavily against single persons. The present joint return system for married couples assumes, according to Mr. Pechman, "that it costs twice as much for two persons to live as it does for one. This is not so—studies of family budgets indicate that it costs about three-fourths as much as for one person to live as it does for two."

Looking at the problem realistically, the expenses incurred by the adult person alone are not too very different from those incurred by a family or household head with dependents. For example, the single person must also provide housing, furniture, home maintenance, food, insurance, and so forth, just as the family does. It costs no less for him to live, yet he bears an unfair burden of the taxload. To be more specific, the tax differential in income levels between $6,000 and $12,000 for single persons and heads of households ranges from $70 to $290. One point which emphasizes the need for this legislation is the fact that of the 18 million single persons in the United States 35 and over, 13 million are women. Maintenance of decent and safe living accommodations for them is a must.

For this reason, I am introducing this bill today and am hopeful my colleagues will carefully consider enacting this much-needed legislation to correct the present inequity in our tax laws.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, this week the House Armed Services Committee began hearings on the huge military construction bill requested by the Defense Department for fiscal 1968. It totals $2.6 billion and is the largest single authorization bill for military construction ever brought before the committee.

It appears that the Defense Department has done an abrupt about-face regarding military construction. Two years ago, after Congress passed a rather large military construction bill, the Secretary of Defense deferred most of the projects. Then last January, the secretary released the funds for these withheld projects. At the same time he ordered the military services to add about $1 billion to the military construction program that was being reviewed by the President's Budget Bureau. This strange change of heart by the administration raises a serious question of whether considerations other than military requirements have been used in drafting the proposed military construction program. Is the Johnson administration using our military construction program as an economic pump primer? Or is the administration proposing projects for key congressional districts as barter items in trying to win congressional support for the President's costly and controversial domestic programs? If either of these are true, it is a sad state of affairs, indeed, that the Nation's security is being used as a political or economical yo-yo for the benefit of the controlling administration.

The distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], has served notice that our committee will demand a full explanation by the Defense Department for increasing the bill by $1 billion. Mr. RIVERS has appropriately stated that the committee will look at this bill "with some apprehension and a degree of skepticism" because of the Defense Department's actions. I should like to applaud the chairman for taking such a forthright stance in this serious matter.

A BILL TO AMEND THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to amend title 23 of the United States Code to add 1,726 miles to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to further designate such mileage as the route for a highway on such Interstate System from Brownsville, Tex., to the North Dakota-Canadian border.

This great new Interstate System would run generally along and parallel to U.S. Route 83 to the North Dakota-Canadian border, through the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota. The mileage designated by this bill shall be in addition to and not in place of mileage which has already been designated for the Interstate System of the States affected.

The wonderful pioneering people of the Panhandle of Oklahoma have for too long been ignored insofar as road systems are concerned. This proposal will allow to these hardy prairie farmers and ranchers for the first time, real access to the States to the north and south, and to the other road nets which would cross this new system.

This proposed new system would stretch for only 34 miles across the Oklahoma Panhandle, but the benefits to the forgotten men and women in the panhandle would be immeasurable.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important measure.

IT'S A SIN TO WIN

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as is generally known, the theories of progressive education were a radical departure from time-tested methods in the educational field. It was reasoned that the student should be comparatively free of discipline—and that the teacher was of secondary importance in the learning process. The age-old concept of competition and excellence was to be eliminated and the character of the pupil's work was of minor importance. In this way the student's abilities would be released and his full capabilities realized.

The May 1967, issue of Literary Cavalcade, a national high school publication, featured a first-award short story by Robert Lindauer, Jr., entitled "Present Progressive." Robert is a junior at Henry James Memorial High School in Simsbury, Conn., whose satirical treatment of progressive educational thinking is both witty—and more importantly—thought provoking. One can well imagine the losses our Nation and culture would have sustained if this type of thinking had been prevalent since the birth of this country—Abe Lincoln, devoid of the idea of excellence, dying a virtual unknown in his log cabin; Gen. Douglas MacArthur, an inept and fumbling leader during the dark days of World War II; Babe Ruth and Joe Louis, untested in their God-given talents for they had never learned the merit of winning.

Although written in a light vein, Robert Lindauer's story conveys a powerful message, and for this reason I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

PRESENT PROGRESSIVE

(By Robert Lindauer, Jr.)

Phil Porter's carefully-constructed daydream collapsed as Miss Bailey, the new head of the Guidance Department called for the hall to come to order.

"Awright, kids," she bellowed as the roar of voices died out, "you all got two books and a paper in fronta ya, right?"

Phil glanced at these three items, which he had neatly arranged on his table when he first arrived in the cafeteria, and silently nodded. In the corner his pencils and his eraser were in neat order. Directly in front of him were stacked a test book bearing the cryptic heading: "NLQE" and the caption "Do Not Open Until Told To Do So," a similarly marked booklet, and a machine-scoring answer sheet. Phil had spent a few minutes trying to fathom the meaning of the title soon after he arrived, but after coming up with such unlikely combinations as "Nudists Love Queen Elizabeth" and "Nationalistic Leopards Quip Exasperatingly," he had tired of the sport and had passed on to more important matters.

"Open up this here pink book," Miss Bailey instructed, waving the booklet above her head, "and read what it says. I won't read it to ya 'cause I cain't read too good."

Phil had long since ceased to be astonished by Miss Bailey's revelations. He had heard her say many similar things since the latest antidiscriminatory legislation had opened her job to her. Phil did feel, however, that the "equal rights for all" movement had been carried to an unnecessary extreme. Nevertheless, he spread the booklet Miss Bailey had indicated across the top of the table and began to read:

"NLQE—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE NATIONAL LUCK QUOTIENT EXAMINATION"

Following was a handwritten passage superimposed over the Great Seal of the United States and bearing the President's signature.

"Congratulations! You, the student about to take the NLQE, are entering a new era of democracy. You are among the first to witness another result of the long battle against discrimination. As you read these instructions and as you take the examination itself, please keep in mind the serious nature of the NLQE. If you do so, a happier, more prosperous, and more independent future will be yours."

Phil, who had been expecting to take the SAT, looked about the hall in order to see how other students were affected by what they had read. He learned little, however, because every other student, each motivated by much the same type of curiosity, was already craning his neck and attempting to see his neighbor's face. Disappointed, Phil went back to his reading.

"I. Filling out the answer sheet

"The National Luck Quotient Examination is similar to many other tests you have taken during the past several years in that it is machine-scored. Although most students are undoubtedly familiar with the procedure for filling out a machine-scored answer sheet, this procedure will be reviewed here:

"1. Use a #2 pencil at all times. If you make an error, be sure to erase completely.

"2. Print (do not write) your name, your school's name, and your school's address on the lines provided for this purpose at the top of Side A of the answer sheet.

"3. Turn the answer sheet in such a manner that its right edge is on top. Print your name in the blocks provided for this purpose in the following manner: Last name first, skip a block, first name last."

Phil quickly skimmed through this section of the instruction booklet. His acquaintance with this type of instruction sheet was a long one, and he felt little need to renew it. For this reason, he simply read a sentence here and a sentence there, making sure that each agreed with his memory.

"4. Darken in the circle to the right of your name that stands for your sex—male (m), or female(f). Or, if you wish, you may exercise your right to refuse to answer by darkening in the third circle (x)."

Phil remembered when this change had been made, just over a year before; all answer sheets had been revised in order to make them acceptable under a new federal law that had been passed at that time. Several years earlier, the Supreme Court, prodded into action by the American Civil Liberties Union, had asked Congress to produce new legislation dealing with sexual discrimination. Phil felt that the real reason why the law took so long coming into being was the fact that Congress was hard pressed to keep the law from sounding like a racy story.

He soon completed reading the first section of the instructions and went on to the next.

"II. Taking the NLQE

"The NLQE is primarily intended to determine the relative luck of all students. In order to achieve this goal, students will be asked certain questions, the answers to which have been selected at random by computer.

The answers are arranged in no set order—do *not* attempt to find a pattern.

"Use a # 2 pencil at all times. If you make an error or decide to change an answer, be sure to erase your first answer completely. Make certain you do not omit a question and that you do not write an answer in the wrong space.

"Students are not allowed to use any aids or reference materials during the examination. Included on the list of items students are forbidden to use are slide rules, dictionaries, rabbits' feet, four-leaf clovers, and any similar aids.

"The NLQE is divided into two parts—NLQE-verbal and NLQE-mathematical—each of which will take one hour. NLQE-verbal is divided into five parts: reading, comprehension, analogies, meanings in content."

Phil glanced at the examples given after the description of the test. It seemed to him that these questions and answers were the most ridiculous and yet the most fascinating he had ever seen in his life. Although he would have liked to have been able to study the examples further, he forced himself to go on to the third and final section of the instructions.

"III. Background of the NLQE

"(Note.—This section of the instructions is optional material and is not necessary for the successful completion of the examination. Read this section only if you have finished and thoroughly understand all previous instructions.)

"The test you are about to take, the National Luck Quotient Examination, has superseded all previous college admissions examinations—henceforth, this test will be taken in place of the PSAT, the SAT, Regents' Examinations, the Achievements, and all similar tests. To be taken by all students who intend to go to college, the NLQE is given with the sole intent of determining the students' relative LQs (i.e., how lucky one student is in comparison with another).

"There are two principal reasons why the NLQE has been adopted:

"1. National educators have long been of the opinion that, as a method of selecting students who most deserve going to college, the results of intelligence and aptitude tests have been of steadily decreasing value. They have realized that, regardless of the scores students receive on these exams, these students never work to the smallest fraction of their abilities once they are in college. Thus, it is plain that only the lucky students—the students who consistently guess correctly during examinations for which they haven't studied and who are able to bluff their way through classes for which they haven't prepared—are successful in college. For this reason it has become evident that, in order to make the best use of America's limited college classroom space, only these lucky students should be selected to go on to institutes of higher education. The purpose of the NLQE is to identify these lucky students.

"2. In keeping with the latest Supreme Court rulings and Congressional legislation banning intellectual discrimination, all intelligence and aptitude tests are now unconstitutional and have been abolished. A special Senate subcommittee, in cooperation with the College Entrance Examination Board, has produced this more accurate and fairer replacement for the old tests."

Phil remembered the exact moment when he had first learned of the Supreme Court's decision. He had been adjusting his slide rule in front of the TV when he paused to listen to the midafternoon news:

"Would you tell me, sir," a commentator was asking, "why the Supreme Court elected to rule upon this matter, and what effects this ruling will have on our American way of life?"

The Chief Justice, still attired in his black judicial robe, edged toward the microphone, cleared his throat, made certain that the TelePrompTer was in operation, pulled a note card from a pocket, and began to speak.

"The challenge presented to democracy—as well as to the happiness of all American citizens—by intellectual and ability discrimination is a major one, and the Supreme Court has acted accordingly," the Chief Justice read. "Through the entire course of our deliberations, we Justices have kept in mind one basic question: Why should one's whole future depend upon one's intelligence and one's abilities, two factors over which one has no control? Why should one student have the right to go to college and another be denied the same right merely because the latter was unable to pass the entrance examinations? Why should one man get a job and another be refused the same job merely because the latter was bumbling, unskilled, and inept?

"It is the opinion of the Court that stupidity and ineptitude are not vices. The Court feels that intellectual and ability discrimination must go the way of racial, religious, and political discrimination—they must be eliminated. Therefore, the Court declares these two forms of discrimination to be unconstitutional and recommends that Congress undertake legislation to eliminate them."

Within a day of this announcement, Yale, MIT, and the A&P food chain announced intentions of leaving the Union.

Soon thereafter, Congress passed a whole new universe of antidiscriminatory, anti-intelligence, and antiskill legislation. Members of the National Honor Society were instructed to register with the Attorney General's office and were called to appear before Senate investigating committees. The use of intelligence and aptitude tests for securing any post—federal, state, local, private, or scholastic—became a federal offense. Another law stated that any institution continuing to accept the best qualified applicant for any post would lose its federal funds. It was for this reason that Phil's school system had leaped at the opportunity to hire Miss Bailey, the most unqualified guidance counselor in the entire Northeast.

"Do not begin the test until you are instructed to do so."

Closing the booklet and sliding it to the opposite side of the tabletop, Phil glanced at the clock, checked his neat pile of pencils and his eraser, brought himself up to date on Miss Bailey's whereabouts, and began to study the faces of his fellow students. The faces of the others registered almost universal amusement, as if they thought the NLQE were a joke, a joke, that would have no conceivable effect on their futures. Phil, whose many years of taking tests on subjects about which he knew nothing had acquainted him with the fundamentals of guessing, was unworried. He was amused to note that some were not as unworried as he—the boy at the table to his left was already praying to his car keys, his most valuable possession, for luck.

When Miss Bailey perceived that most students had completed their reading, she again rose to her feet.

"Awright, kids," she called. "If you got any questions, ask your neighbors."

Miss Bailey tolerated about ten seconds of the resulting uproar and then again called for silence.

"You tell me when a hour's up," she charged a boy in the front row. "Now, start the test!"

Breaking open the seal of his test booklet, Phil spread his materials across the tabletop and began to read:

"NLQE-Verbal

"Time: 60 minutes

"Part A: Reading Comprehension

"Directions: Read the following passages as quickly as possible. Select the best answer for each of the multiple-choice questions following each passage. In the case of two acceptable answers, we reserve the right to choose the better.

"Passage I

"My mother and your mother were washing the clothes. My mother socked your mother right in the nose.

"1. What color was the blood?

"(a) yellow
"(b) green
"(c) blue
"(d) purple
"(e) black

"Please turn the page. ☐"

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Kuykendall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to increase trade with and to provide millions of dollars of credit to Russia poses a grave danger to the future security of this country.

The President and his advisers advocate "building bridges" between the United States and Red Soviet Russia. Let us see to what kind of government they would have us "build bridges." Americans are being slaughtered in Vietnam because North Vietnam, encouraged and goaded by the Soviet Union, attacked free South Vietnam in a further effort to reach the Soviet goal of world domination. Russian weapons, Russian planes, Russian bombs, Russian missiles are keeping the fighting going in Asia, and Americans continue to die.

Reports coming out of Cuba are that the Soviet Union is now readying the next crisis right at our doorstep. Without any protest from the Johnson administration, Russia is continuing its military buildup in Cuba with daily arrivals of new military equipment. Full-scale war is now in progress in the Middle East and this war was fomented, encouraged, and inflamed by Communist Russia. While our representatives in the United Nations beg, plead and grovel in an effort to persuade the Security Council to act, Communist Russia boldly gives full backing to the Arab States and dares the United States to indicate even verbal support for Israel to which we are morally and responsibly committed to protect from aggression.

I submit that we are heading toward national suicide when we espouse programs which will build up and strengthen our enemies and weaken the United States. In continuing to encourage trade with Soviet Russia, in advocating huge loans to establish credit for the Communist, such as the proposed $50 million worth to help Italy build a Fiat plant in Russia, we are contributing to the aggressive aims of the worldwide Communist conspiracy.

Those in the State Department who advocate trade with the Communists try to make us believe that such trade will be only in nonstrategic materials. How stupid do they think the American people can be? Anyone knows that the same equipment that is used to build automobiles can be swiftly converted to the manufacture of materials of war. And what is a more important ingredient of war supply than food and fibre?

Mr. Speaker, America cannot afford to slumber while the storm clouds of destruction gather. The administration is evidently incapable of advocating or carrying our policies to meet the challenges and Communist-inspired crises, so it is up to Congress to save freedom in the world. Congress must announce loud and clear that we are not going to support programs designed to strengthen the warmakers in the world and weaken our own capability and resolve.

LEGISLATION FOR AN IMPROVED NORTH-SOUTH HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KLEPPE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would add to the National Interstate System a 1,726-mile highway running from the Canadian border north of Minot to Brownsville, Tex., on the Mexican border.

The proposed highway would closely parallel the present North-South Route 83.

Today most of the major highway, railroad, and airline facilities serving the Great Plains area are East-West oriented. I believe an improved North-South highway transportation system would be of enormous economic benefit to the entire region.

The proposed addition to the Interstate System would greatly facilitate travel within the six States it would traverse. It would promote additional tourism within these States, as well as to and from Canada and Mexico.

It would also provide a much improved highway link between western North Dakota's two largest cities, Minot and Bismarck.

The proposed route would run slightly west of Pierre, S. Dak., continuing through western Nebraska, Kansas, and the Oklahoma-Texas Panhandle and on to Brownsville.

THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE IS ORGANIZED

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years, there has been discussion about the need for preserving the great backlog of film heretofore produced and going back to the turn of the century.

Because of the great cultural potential, film and other reproductive devices deserve additional thought and assistance.

My colleagues will be interested in the fact that the American Film Institute has been organized as a nonprofit, nongovernmental corporation to preserve, protect, and develop the artistic and cultural use of film.

It will be noted that George Stevens, Jr., involved in the production of well-respected USIA film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," will be the chief executive officer of the new corporation.

The New York Times article of June 6 regarding this organization and the public figures connected with it follows:

AGENCY TO PRESS MOVIES' ARTISTRY—AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE FORMED IN WASHINGTON

(By Vincent Canby)

WASHINGTON, JUNE 5.—The American Film Institute, a nonprofit, nongovernmental corporation, has been formally established to preserve and develop the nation's "artistic and cultural resources in film."

George Stevens Jr., 35-year-old director of the United States Information Agency's film division, is resigning that post to become director and chief executive officer of the new corporation, which will be guided by a 22-member board of trustees.

Formation of the institute, which will have headquarters in Washington, was announced at the Madison Hotel here today at a press conference held by George Stevens, Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the National Council of the Arts, and Gregory Peck, the actor who is acting chairman of the institute's board of trustees.

OTHER SUCH GROUPS LARGER

With an estimated budget of $5.3-million for the first three years, the American Film Institute comes into being as the third-largest such organization in the world in terms of money. Its Soviet counterpart has an annual budget of between $4-million and $5-million, and the Swedish Film Institute an annual budget of $2.25 million.

The United States, where motion pictures had their birth, is one of the last of the major producing nations to establish such an organization. Britain, France, Italy and India have them.

As outlined by Roger Stevens, the institute will concentrate on the following areas:

¶Filmmaker training. It will establish one or more Centers for Advanced Film Study, to act as a bridge between college or university study and a filmmaking career.

¶Film education. The institute will explore ways to help develop and improve the study of film as an art form "with its own esthetics, history and techniques."

¶Film production. The institute will make grants to young filmmakers for the production of documentary and experimental films, both short and feature-length, and will finance the production of such films at its Centers for Advanced Film Study.

¶Film archives. The institute will work to catalogue and preserve old films.

The institute will commission publications of film news, criticism and textbooks.

Of the institute's initial three-year budget three-quarters is already in hand or firmly committed.

COUNCIL GRANT IS LARGEST

The National Council on the Arts, in the largest single grant it has ever made, has given the institute $1.3-million. The Ford Foundation and the Motion Picture Association of America have each pledged themselves to grant $1.3-million, leaving $1.3-million still to be raised.

George Stevens Jr., son of the Hollywood filmmaker and no relation to Roger Stevens, pointed to the dominating influence of film today and said: "We cannot be casual about the training of the people who create these images."

PECK REPLIES TO CRITICS

As head of the U.S.I.A.'s film division for the last five years, Mr. Stevens has been responsible for the production and distribution around the world of 600 documentaries and newsreels annually. Under his leadership, the U.S.I.A. began an "interneship" program to train young filmmakers. A number of their films, notably the documentary feature on President Kennedy, "Years of Lightning; Day of Drums," have been well received.

Taking notice of criticism that the present board seems to be weighted in favor of the Hollywood motion-picture establishment, Mr. Peck noted:

"I have been in the theater and films for 25 years, and this is the first production in which I appeared that was reviewed before it opened."

The trustees other than George Stevens and Mr. Peck:

Elizabeth Ashley, the actress.

Charles Benton, educational film producer.

Francis Ford Coppola, film writer and director.

Sherrill Corwin, president of the National Association of Theater Owners.

The Rev. John Culkin, director of Fordham University's Center for Communications.

Bruce Herschensohn, documentary filmmaker.

Francis Keppel, former United States Commissioner of Education.

Arthur Knight, film critic and historian.

Richard Leacock, filmmaker.

Donald H. McGannon, president of Westinghouse Broadcasting Company.

David Mallery, director of studies for the National Association of Independent Schools.

William L. Pereira, architect and member of the National Council on the Arts.

Arnold Picker, executive vice president of United Artists Corporation.

Sidney Poitier, the actor.

Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., the historian.

George Seaton, the firm director and producer.

Dan Taradash, film writer.

Jack Valenti, president of the Motion Picture Association of America.

Richard F. Walsh, president of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employes.

Fred Zinnemann, the director.

EQUAL SALARIES FOR EQUAL WORK IN OUR NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK POLICE

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] in introducing a bill to insure that salaries of the police in the National Zoological Park shall equal those of members of the U.S. Park Police, who have comparable duties.

Enactment of such a bill would correct what I consider to be a present inequity in pay scales among Federal employees who duties are basically comparable; and such enactment would be in compliance with the principle of equal pay for equal work.

Such a bill was introduced in the 88th Congress and came before the Committee on House Administration. At that time, hearings established that the zoo park police have duties basically comparable to those of the uniformed policemen in the park service. And since then, statistics have been submitted to substantiate the fact that these men are not guards, but that they are, indeed, policemen.

As a matter of fact, in order to qualify for a position with the zoo police force, an applicant must have had 1 year of general experience and 2 years of specialized experience in police work.

Yet their salaries are not comparable with their counterparts in the park service and my bill would grant each member of the zoo park police a salary increase of two grades and make their salaries comparable to those of the park police.

This is an issue that has been before us for several years and should be equitably settled by passage of this bill.

URGES 6TH FLEET TO WAR ZONE

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, here is the text of a telegram, I sent today to the President regarding the delicate situation in the Middle East:

> DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I respectfully suggest that appropriate units of the U.S. Sixth Fleet be dispatched at once as a flotilla of mercy to zones of conflict in the Middle East. The ships would there be available to evacuate children, aged, infirm, mothers and other innocent people endangered by the war.
>
> Because the conflict is already raging, the ship movement should be undertaken without delay. Other maritime nations should be invited to join the flotilla.
>
> PAUL FINDLEY,
> *Member of Congress.*

ANFUSO AMENDMENT PENALTIES

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation to restore wheat acreage allotments lost to producers as a result of a serious and widespread misunderstanding in 1964 regarding the penalty application of the Anfuso amendment.

Because of this misunderstanding of the Agriculture Department's intentions, many Washington State wheat growers through no fault of their own are faced with annual loss of a portion of their wheat acreage allotments. These producers have exhausted every means of appeal to the Department in their attempts to get this inequity corrected, but to no avail. The bill which I have introduced would effectively clarify and extend the Agriculture Department's authority to take corrective action in situations such as this.

The directives from Washington, D.C., in 1963 concerning the application of the Anfuso amendment to wheat production were interpreted by many farmers, county committeemen, Agriculture Department employees and others to mean that overplanting in 1964 would bring penalties in 1966 and the following even years only. This interpretation was completely consistent with historical precedent and the local farming practice of odd-even rotation, but farmers who overplanted on this basis later learned to their dismay that the U.S. Department of Agriculture took an entirely different view, and intended to invoke penalties annually instead of every other year.

My bill would broaden certain provisions of existing law which provide administrative relief for farmers who rely on erroneous, though well-intended advice of authorized agents of the Department of Agriculture.

Honest mistakes are bound to occur, but they should always be quickly corrected. In the interests of justice and equity, this mistake must be corrected as rapidly as possible, and its ill effects wiped out for those farmers who were given wrong information by representatives of the Agriculture Department.

SUPPORT GROWS FOR H.R. 6165, MEDICAL DEVICES STANDARDS COMMISSION

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, on February 27 of this year I introduced H.R. 6165, a bill to create the National Medical Devices Standards Commission. The purpose of this legislation is twofold: First, to assist the physician in providing the maximum protection for the patient when such devices are used; and second, to offer maximum stimulation for investigators to develop new devices which will provide still better medical care in the future.

The field of medical device research, manufacturing, and usage is very broad, very complex, and very advanced. For instance, there are nearly 25 different varieties of medical devices, and surgical implants involved in heart surgery and treatment. There are hundreds and hundreds of instruments and devices used to treat patients for as many diseases and ailments. New discoveries are being made in this area almost daily.

The administration has sent to this House a bill, which is being introduced today by the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, calling for amendments to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to extend the provisions of this law to include medical devices.

Great alarm has been expressed by the medical devices industry, by the medical profession, by medical researchers, and by many others that this proposal would be harmful to the future development of advanced medical device technology.

At the time that I introduced H.R. 6165, in February, I quoted in my statement to the House the words of Dr. James L. Goddard, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration. In a very fine address on July 27, 1966, to the convention of the Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation, Dr. Goddard said:

> I believe that protective legislation in the medical devices and instrumentation field is probably necessary. I believe many of you here this evening would agree with that. And I would, therefore, ask that you not wait for us to put together what has to be ultimately presented before the Congress, but rather that you actively participate in this process. I would have you evaluate some of the problems and anticipate some helpful solutions. This is the way our kind of Government works at its best, with ideas coming from concerned citizens and framed into law by public servants who listen to and respect the voice of knowledgeable people.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, to create the National Medical Devices Standards Commission will carry out Dr. Goddard's invitation. It will bring together the leadership of concerned citizens in this area of endeavor. It will provide the opportunity for the knowledgeable, the concerned, to "actively participate in the process" of putting together the necessary protective legislation in the medical device and instrumentation field.

This National Commission, created by H.R. 6165, will be composed of 20 members equally representing five groups of interested and knowledgeable people: First, the private medical devices manufacturing field; second, the research laboratories and university medical centers; third, the private practice of medicine; fourth, the public health agencies, and fifth, the Congress, as custodians of the public interest.

The Commission will study quality controls and manufacturing procedures of medical devices, surgical instruments, artificial organs and limbs, therapeutic instruments and devices, and other medical and hospital equipment. They will determine the need for and the extent of Federal regulation of such medical devices. They will advise on such specific manufacturing practices and minimum performance standards as may be recommended to it by the President, the Surgeon General of the United States, the Food and Drug Commissioner, or competent private medical authorities. They will establish methods for determining constructive minimum performance standards for the research and design, and the manufacturing of such medical devices and instruments. The Commission will also establish methods for determining the medical value of devices manufactured and the therapeutic consequences thereof. And, finally, the Commission will recommend to the President and to the Congress feasible methods for Federal regulation of medical devices.

The proposal sent to the Congress by the administration will require premarketing clearance of certain types of medical devices. There is some question as to when a medical device is being developed and researched, and when it finally is ready to pass a "premarketing clearance." The bill contains a few feeble attempts to provide for consulting with various experts in the medical device field. But this consulting action is completely at the discretion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He will if he wants to, and he will not if he does not want to. The bill gives power to HEW to set mandatory standards for the materials and design and efficacy of medical devices. This clearly gives to HEW vast powers to regulate out of its own ignorance.

With the complexity of this area, Mr. Speaker, there could not possibly be in HEW enough experts of sufficiently high caliber to determine mandatory standards for medical devices. In most cases the only person who really knows the facts and the efficacy and the potential of a medical device or surgical implant is the man who invented it. This careless procedure, if enacted, could seriously stifle medical research in the devices field. It is clearly an unnecessary extension of Federal regulatory power in which the Government will be acting out of ignorance.

It is absolutely necessary that we conduct a careful study of this matter before we recklessly rush in with mandatory standards. We must be sure that the mailed fist of government power does not cripple the surgeon's hand in his delicate work of healing, and in his seeking for new ways of alleviating the suffering of mankind. My bill, H.R. 6165, will do this.

Mr. Speaker, I have received many, many letters from all over the Nation, and from Canada, expressing interest and support in my bill. Letters of support have come from medical doctors, medical researchers, medical school professors, distinguished professional societies, dental supply manufacturers, medical device manufacturers, and electronics manufacturers.

The following organizations have expressed to me their endorsement and support: The American Medical Association "supports the principles of study and research as contained in H.R. 6165, to develop safeguards in this area."

The American Heart Association says:

> We would prefer to see the appointment of a National Medical Devices Standards Commission, as would be provided by the Reinecke Bill (H.R. 6165), to examine in depth the need for regulation and to determine through careful analysis how that need should be met.

The American Surgical Association "does feel that your efforts are correct and it believes that an approach through the establishment of a Commission with proper representation should be encouraged."

The American Urological Association "highly recommends and approves the bill H.R. 6165, and believes that it will be instrumental in offering the best medical and surgical care to patients in this country with safety associated with instrumentation."

The American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons writes:

> It is obvious to the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons that a crash program for the development of standards would be harmful to all concerned. Much background study is essential for the establishment of proper permanent standards. We, therefore, support H.R. 6165, and H.R. 7621—bills which create a national commission to study quality controls.

The executive director of the American College of Cardiology expressed his support, as did the executive secretary of the California Association of Clinical Laboratories. The National Electrical Manufacturers Association, and the Association of Nuclear Instrument Manufacturers have endorsed H.R. 6165.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to report that my distinguished colleague Representative DON FUQUA, Democrat of Florida, has cosponsored this bill in the House. His measure is H.R. 7621. In the Senate the distinguished Senator, the Honorable GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, has introduced identical legislation. His measure is S. 1598.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Dwight E. Harken, M.D., past president of the American College of Cardiology, and currently clinical professor of surgery at the Harvard Medical School, wrote in March:

> Bill H.R. 6165 is so obviously correct conceptually and administratively that I assume it will have automatic favorable action in the House of Representatives.

I appreciate Dr. Harken's spirited support. I wish "automatic favorable action" by the House were possible. However, I only urge at this time that the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee move as quickly as possible to set hearings on the subject of medical devices legislation. My bill, H.R. 6165, Mr. FUQUA's bill, H.R. 7621, and the administration's bill can all be discussed together. There are a number of competent authorities in this matter who are eager to testify. The House should move as quickly as possible. The health and the welfare of the American people are at stake.

CARDINAL PATRICK A. O'BOYLE

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, it was with immense joy that all Americans greeted the announcement of the Vatican last week that four American prelates would be raised to the rank of cardinal. For Pennsylvanians, it was a matter of greater pride to note that three of these eminent clergymen were from our Commonwealth.

Finally, for myself and for all the people of Scranton, Pa., there was a particular source of joy and pride in seeing one of the sons of Scranton named as the first cardinal-archbishop of the Nation's Capital.

The distinguished career of Patrick A. O'Boyle, cardinal-archbishop designate of the diocese of Washington, D.C., needs no review here. He is a man whose profound wisdom is known to all of us who have lived in Washington. Appointed the first bishop of Washington when it was separated from Baltimore as a separate diocese, Archbishop O'Boyle quickly became one of the great spiritual and social leaders of the Nation's clergy. He has pioneered a vigorous ecumenical spirit in conjunction with other religious leaders in this city. He has been in the forefront of programs to improve the social and educational development of deprived children, to build for them a strong foundation for their own future betterment.

I wish to pay my own personal tribute to our soon-to-be Cardinal O'Boyle, and to express to him the warmest regards and best wishes of the entire Congress.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I append to my remarks here two editorials on Archbishop O'Boyle which appeared in the Scranton Tribune and the Scranton Times:

PATRICK CARDINAL O'BOYLE

People through the Scranton Catholic Diocese, particularly residents of this city, are expressing happiness and pride over the great honor that has been accorded Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle, his selection by Pope Paul VI for membership in the College of Cardinals.

Area pride and gratification occasioned by this singular tribute to the cardinal-designate stem naturally from the fact that he is a native of Scranton who has maintained firm ties here though the considerable duties and responsibilities of his ministry have necessitated his presence elsewhere.

Archbishop O'Boyle has been the head of the Washington, D.C., archdiocese since 1948 and prior to that served many years in the New York archdiocese. He has been a visitor to this city on several occasions and has many relatives residing in the city.

The elevation of Archbishop O'Boyle to the status of "Prince of the Church" is, of course, a recognition of his outstanding abilities as a spiritual leader and administrator, his fidelity and his splendid record of achievement. It is perhaps significant that in honoring Archbishop O'Boyle, and calling upon him for an even broader service, Pope Paul VI is according distinction to one who has been most active in welfare work and whose activities in recent years have concerned improved race relations.

Cardinal-designate O'Boyle, in a comment on his appointment, offered the thought that the designation recognizes the increasing importance in the world of the capital city of the United States, its importance in the church and the contributions many people in the capital have made to help overcome racial and social injustice.

As Bishop J. Carroll McCormick, Scranton Catholic Diocese noted, the cardinal-designate has performed outstanding work for the church and there is joy and thanksgiving at his progression to a station where he will be a member of the closest advisory body of

Pope Paul. Needless to say, Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle will have the prayers and best wishes of all as he takes on his new responsibilities.

[From the Scranton Times, May 31, 1967]

GIVEN RANK OF CARDINAL

The people of the Scranton area, regardless of their religious faiths, are taking justified pride in the elevation of Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle, head of the Washington, D.C., archdiocese of the Roman Catholic Church for nearly 20 years, to the rank of cardinal.

For Cardinal O'Boyle was born in Scranton and while his long service to the church has kept him away from his native city for the most part, he has maintained close touch by his frequent visits here to see his relatives. Following his ordination to the priesthood in 1921, he had been assigned to the New York archdiocese and served there until he was appointed, early in 1948, as the archbishop of Washington.

In recent years he has visited the Scranton area several times on "official" assignments, the most recent of these having been as a speaker at the dedication of the Pocono Catholic Mission Elementary and Secondary School in Cresco in September, 1961. Nine years earlier he came here for the dedication of St. Paul's Church in the Green Ridge section where he was born. He visited his relatives here last October.

The appointment of Cardinal O'Boyle by Pope Paul VI to membership in the Sacred College of Cardinals is clearly a recognition of his service to the church and of his many major achievements as a priest and as an administrator. In rejoicing at the elevation of Archbishop O'Boyle, we can also join other Pennsylvanians in expressing gratification at Pope Paul's selection of Archbishop John J. Krol of Philadelphia and the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis J. Brennan of Shenandoah, long stationed in Rome, as members of the Sacred College of Cardinals. The Scranton Diocese is part of the Philadelphia Archdiocese of which Cardinal Krol is head.

RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO PURCHASE DOMESTIC DAIRY PRODUCTS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined in sponsoring a joint resolution requesting the Department of Defense to utilize dairy products produced in the United States in the rations of all branches of the Armed Forces.

When the country experienced a shortage and increased costs of dairy products last year, the Secretary of Defense ordered that our Armed Forces be served margarine instead of butter. That was in February of 1966.

But now the situation is changed considerably, and dairy surpluses are mounting. Dairy prices are now depressed because of the plentiful supply as a direct result of the sharp increase of dairy product imports, and American dairymen are scraping to make a decent profit—in some cases any profit at all—on their produce.

It should be apparent that there no longer exists a reasonable need to continue the Secretary's emergency order replacing butter. For that reason, I feel it is high time for both Houses of Congress to request the Secretary to return to a policy of utilizing domestic dairy products for our troops to the greatest extent possible.

STOPGAP RAILROAD LEGISLATION DEFEATS PURPOSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfortunate that Congress seems to be headed for a new responsibility; namely, as a court of last resort to the resolution of strikes and lockouts that threaten the national economy. By this I mean that Congress has become a sort of stopgap which results perhaps in a temporary halt in any crisis, but obviously does great violence to serious collective bargaining between management and labor. In other words, when temporary legislation is passed to postpone a strike, it throws cold water on collective-bargaining efforts.

Mr. Speaker, once again Congress is being called upon to provide a solution to an impasse between union negotiators and the railroad industry. Three times since 1963 this situation has arisen. In 1963, Congress enacted a compulsory arbitration law over the elimination of certain jobs. In 1966, only a last-minute settlement by five major airlines of their dispute with the machinist union terminated some sort of similar legislation, and this year already two times legislation has been passed to provide delays between six shop craft railroad unions and the major railroads. Another strike deadline extension has been requested by the President which is called mediation to finality.

All temporary expedients serve to discourage collective bargaining. Right now railroad management is hoping for passage of compulsory arbitration; the unions are hoping for Government seizure.

Meanwhile, the President has failed to keep his promise made in the 1966 state of the Union message when he said he intended to ask Congress to consider measures which, without improperly invading State and local authority, will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest.

I was shocked to discover recently the apathy with which the public considers the possibility of a railroad strike. This was true when the airlines were in a similar situation; no one seemed worried before the strike occurred, and then only those directly affected became concerned. Recently, I instigated a poll of my constituents as to whether or not they would favor compulsory arbitration in the event of a nationwide railroad strike. Very few took the trouble to respond. I do not think there is any widespread understanding of how devastating and paralyzing a nationwide railroad strike would be. Everyone figures the President or Congress will provide some solution. They figure that with the war in Vietnam and other national interests a strike cannot occur. Of course, if we did have a crippling nationwide railroad strike, Congress would have to take action and railroad management knows this. No doubt this is one of the reasons why negotiations between them and the unions have broken down. On the other hand, the unions, recognizing that the Government will not permit a strike, feel they, too, will gain by Government action. If the Government seizes the railroads, they would have nothing to lose in the way of jobs, and the Government may make the concessions that private management refuses to grant.

Mr. Speaker, this is the situation as we come to the deadline on June 19, with a great diversity of views among Members of Congress. I would hate to see any more temporary postponements or stopgap solutions. This whole issue of arbitration versus collective bargaining must be met head on and must be met not only for the railroads, but also for the airlines and all bargaining having to do with the national interest. Some people say we will never solve this problem until we set up courts of arbitration for such industries where strikes cannot be used in the normal way; in other words, as an economic weapon between the contending parties. The courts would settle the dispute in the same way they settle other disputes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any answer except to say that I have a strong prejudice against compulsory arbitration and an equal prejudice against Government seizure of the railroads. There must be some alternative and not just temporary stopgap solutions. As a believer in collective bargaining, my fear is that in some national crisis, labor or management rights—one or the other or both—will be destroyed. Surely the President could have done better than "mediation to finality." Surely he could have appointed a committee of distinguished citizens to come up with a plan which would not jeopardize the rights of property nor the rights of persons.

Mr. Speaker, as one who recognizes the seriousness of this situation, I can only hope a miracle will occur and that railroad management and labor will reach some accord before and not after Congress passes some ill-advised legislation. Meanwhile, I call upon the President to institute a study looking toward some permanent and fair means of settling strikes which constitute a threat to our national economy.

In the meantime, I plead with railroad management and the unions to meet and settle their own differences in the public interest. Otherwise the crisis that faces the Nation could spell the end of nationwide collective bargaining.

INVESTIGATION OF NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in view of the highly distressing news stories that have been issuing out of the uranium mines in the Rocky Mountains, I must conclude that Congress has no alternative but to undertake an investigation of the Atomic Energy Commission.

An Associated Press dispatch appearing in newspapers last May 25 quoted the U.S. Public Health Service as stating that uranium miners are dying at an alarming rate. Here are three paragraphs from that AP report:

> The Public Health Service facility in Salt Lake City says that during the 1945–1955 uranium boom in Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona and Wyoming, thousands of underground miners breathed harmful doses of radioactive material.
>
> And of the 3,415 miners studied by the service who worked two or more years in the mines, there were 63 cases of lung cancer—a rate of 10 times higher than the national norm.
>
> Dr. Victor E. Archer, who heads the Public Health Service study, says the incidence of lung cancer among the miners is climbing steadily and he estimates between 200 and 1,000 of the men studied will die of the disease within the next 20 or 30 years.

What Congress needs to know is how long the AEC has been aware of the deadly working conditions in those mines, and why the men were permitted to go in and contract fatal dosages despite the obvious danger. If the hazards were not recognized by any of the many scientists on the AEC staff, then an even broader investigation is in order, inasmuch as the Washington Post reported on March 9 of this year that the deadly effects of radon daughters, which Dr. Archer and his colleagues attribute as the cause of the lung cancer "have been known for decades in scientific literature."

The AP further reported:

> Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, who also is on the Federal Radiation Council, threatened to withhold government contracts from mines which fail to freshen air underground to .3 picocurie per liter.
>
> The uranium industry has been shooting for a 1.0 picocurie "working level" but thus far has been unable to achieve it in many mines. Some "hot" mines average as high as 10.0 picocuries.
>
> Allen E. Jones, Atomic Energy Commission manager in Grand Junction, said it would be "virtually impossible" for mines to achieve the .3 level by the deadline, June 9.

Well, Mr. Speaker, June 9 occurs on Friday of this week, and it will be interesting to learn what develops. If the AP or another news service provides a followup, that is. Apparently the whole story about human suffering and loss of life caused by inhuman policies in the AEC would never have been brought to light were it not for the curiosity and initiative of some newsmen.

Even more pertinent, what action was taken by the AEC prior to June 9? If the lives of miners were threatened because working conditions could not be properly improved, would the possible loss of Government contracts remain the predominant factor in whether the mines would continue in operation? One would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that all work would have been curtailed in every single uranium mine wherein a scintilla of danger presented itself immediately after the first tragic case was discovered. Or at least made public, for evidently the terrible conditions would have continued ad infinitum had the AEC succeeded in maintaining the insidious secrecy that allowed the situation to persist for so many years.

Congress also needs to know what is stimulating the AEC's appetite for uranium despite the human toll that it is costing. No defense considerations are involved, so why must the AEC insist on producing so much uranium that miners are automatically committed to a sentence of death?

The answer lies in the many nuclear power stations that AEC wants to have constructed around the far reaches of the Nation. Which brings up another matter that must be a part of the congressional investigation which I am proposing by House Joint Resolution 599.

Mr. Speaker, let us get down to where we can have a real look at the atomic powerplant and to the safety of the communities involved. We have been hearing lofty platitudes about how it will solve the air pollution problem, but we have neglected to find out what would happen if an accident were to occur at one of the economy-size plants. In 1957 the AEC estimated that a single accident at one of the baby-size atomic power packages could cost 3,400 lives and injure 43,000 more persons. But that was 10 years ago and it would seem reasonable to want an estimate on the projected disaster list that would come with an incident at a 1967 model plant.

We recognize that the danger of an untoward event is minimal because every precaution has been taken—providing the cost is not unreasonable. In its issue of March 11, 1967, the Philadelphia Inquirer reported this statement by a spokesman for a utility on a plant to be located on the Delaware River:

> We feel there should be no fear at all about pollution.

The article continued:

> As for radiation leakage, AEC safety standards are so stringent that this is a "virtual impossibility," the spokesman said.

Maybe "virtual impossibility" is not enough for some of us, Mr. Speaker. Not when millions of lives are at stake. We should also like to know why, if the chances of trouble are so small, the American public cannot obtain insurance protection against damage from radiation originating at a nuclear power station.

Some of our people are understandably terrified at the thought of a breakdown at an atomic plant that might release radioactive material into a water supply system serving a metropolitan area. Again, we recognize that the chances of such an accident are negligible, but so was the probability of the kind of accident that killed three of our astronauts.

The AEC could be moving too fast in its lust for atomic power, and it is the responsibility of Congress to make a firm determination on all aspects of what the Commission is doing. We now know that there has been either complete disregard or carelessness involved in the tragedy of the uranium mines. If AEC has similar disdain for the general public at the other end of the line—those who will be living within a broad radius of the atom plants—then we are confronted with a case of double jeopardy. Meanwhile, we must also look into the matter of safety in transportation of nuclear materials, and we must find out more than we know now about the hazards of burying nuclear waste. My resolution will enable us to look behind, at long last, the wall of secrecy which, prior to inquiry on the part of some alert newspapermen in the Rocky Mountain area, has defied penetration.

AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to take the floor today to pay tribute to the American Hungarian Federation on the 60th anniversary of its origin. Several of our distinguished colleagues are joining in this recognition of an outstanding organization of Americans of Hungarian descent who represent the finest traditions of freedom, justice, truth, and human dignity.

It was back in 1907 when the State of Ohio chartered a new organization, one which was formed at the end of 1906 by the representatives of Hungarian immigrants and citizens of Hungarian descent meeting in Cleveland from all the larger cities and States of our Nation. The organization was called the American Hungarian Federation which already contained at that date most of the churches, fraternal associations, and civic and cultural organizations of Americans of Hungarian descent.

Today, Mr. Speaker, as the American Hungarian Federation celebrates the 60th anniversary of its charter, its leaders, representing a combined membership of more than 120,000 Americans of Hungarian descent belonging to its constituent groups, may say with pride that they have fulfilled the pledge of being loyal unto death. This parole was first used by the Hungarian-born hero of the American War of Independence, Col. Michael de Kovats, and his spirit of courage, service and loyalty were the guidelines for the American Hungarian Federation.

The federation has always been in the frontlines when the American way of life and democracy has been threatened. For example, in April 1941, they addressed a memorandum to President Roosevelt stating among other things:

> American citizens of Hungarian origin, united in the American Hungarian Federation, are fully conscious of the duties which citizenship in the world's greatest Democracy, the United States, entails, and are willing and anxious to fulfill such duties until death.
>
> American citizens of Hungarian origin, united in the American Hungarian Federation, are fully aware that the United States ever since the gaining of its own independence—for which our Hungarian forebears, with Colonel Michael de Kovats at their head willingly sacrificed their lives—true to the principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence has always sup-

ported the cause of nations whose independence was threatened by another power.

When the Nazi danger was replaced by the Communist danger engulfing Hungary, the federation again let its voice be heard condemning the Communist movement and excluding anyone subscribing to its tenets from membership in the American-Hungarian Federation. Besides a constant unequivocal stand against the danger of Communist totalitarianism, the federation has recently testified before the House Judiciary Committee on the proposed legislation on flag-burners and upheld the sanctity of the U.S. flag by supporting my bill and the bills of my distinguished colleagues Mr. ROUDEBUSH of Indiana, Mrs. KELLY of New York, and Mr. ASHBROOK of Ohio.

The loyal and patriotic American spirit of the American-Hungarian Federation is well known to both the U.S. Government and Congress. Many of our Presidents have in the past received the leaders of the American-Hungarian Federation and considered its memorandums on American policies toward Hungary, and we, in Congress, have also been appreciative of the well-reasoned and expert information and conclusions provided to us by the American-Hungarian Federation and its foreign affairs committee, composed of professors, professional political, economic, and military experts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to include at this point two recent memorandums of the American-Hungarian Federation, one of the bills proposing to make flag burning a Federal crime and the second on the legal and military status of military forces of the U.S.S.R. in Hungary which was sent to all U.N. delegations:

MEMORANDUM ON THE LEGAL AND POLITICAL STATUS OF MILITARY FORCES OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS IN HUNGARY

At the present time, there are about 75–80,000 Soviet Russian troops stationed in Hungary. Though their presence is disliked by the overwhelming majority of the Hungarian people, their presence is enforced under the May 27, 1957 Agreement between the Kádár authorities in Hungary and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It is the contention of the American Hungarian Federation that the May 27, 1957 Agreement was concluded with a State still in the state of *debellatio*, and which was, therefore, unable to exercise the attributes of its political sovereignty vis-a-vis its contract partner. Therefore, the Treaty of May 27, 1957 cannot be accepted as a valid and binding contract between two full subjects of international law falling under the dictum; *pacta sunt servanda*. As a result, the Treaty fails to create any rights on the part of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any obligations on the part of the sovereign State of Hungary.

It is also the contention of the American Hungarian Federation that even if the Treaty should be recognized as one of limited validity by having been concluded between one sovereign State and one State which had still preserved limited international personality, the presence of Soviet Russian armed forces in Hungary still remains a fruit of aggression condemned in numerous resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly. The only counterclaim of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could be an express invitation on the part of a Hungarian Government "responsive to its national aspirations and dedicated to its independence and well-being (U.N. Gen. Assembly Res. 1004–ES II).

It is our respectful request to those Governments whose representatives voted for the various General Assembly Resolutions of the United Nations between 1956 and 1962 demanding the withdrawal of Soviet Russian armed forces from the State of Hungary, to increase their diplomatic and political pressure upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in order that these Soviet Russian forces be withdrawn from Hungary. For only such a step would restore full political sovereignty and national independence to the people of Hungary, who are in the final analysis the ultimate possessors of Hungarian State sovereignty.

In support of our contentions, we present the following evidence:

A. THE FACT OF RUSSIAN AGGRESSION OF NOVEMBER 4, 1956

The Kádár Government and its political residue, the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasant Party, was formed on Czechoslovak territory in the early hours of November 4, 1956. It consisted of a few Communist leaders (János Kádár, Ferenc Muennich and Antal Apro) who deserted the legal Government of Hungary headed by Prime Minister Imre Nagy. The Nagy Government was brought into power in accordance with the constitutional provisions of the 1949 Constitution of the People's Republic of Hungary, though under popular pressure of widespread demonstrations. The legal character of the Nagy Government was recognized in a radio address by János Kádár himself, and later objections to the Nagy Government by Kádár and his colleagues were restricted to certain actions of that Government rather than to its inherently legal status.

Thus, on November 4, 1956 the Kádár Government could not be considered as a belligerent part to a civil war in Hungary, even by the application of the most flexible standards of international law. The Kádár Government, at the moment of its conception did not (a) possess jurisdiction over any Hungarian territory; (b) maintain any armed forces of its own, except for isolated and uncoordinated bands of armed secret police units, and (c) it did not represent even one Hungarian political party, as the Hungarian Workers Party was split in regard to loyalty between Prime Minister Imre Nagy and János Kádár. Therefore, it was not an international personality and had no rights under international law to ask for the intervention of a foreign power into the affairs of the Hungarian State.

To quote the British international lawyer, George Schwarzenberger:

". . . the rule prohibiting intervention in exclusively domestic affairs makes illegal in relation to a recognized government any premature recognition of rebels as belligerents, as an alternative government, or as a separate state." (*A Manual of International Law* (*New York; 1963*) *I, 63*).

Schwarzenberger adds also:

"Until a revolution or a civil war has reached serious proportions, any form of intervention by another State in favour of insurgents constitutes an illegal interference in the domestic affairs of a sovereign state."

This state of affairs refutes clearly the argument of the Kádár representative to the United Nations that "the Hungarian Government asked the Soviet Union as one of the signatories of the Peace Treaty, to re-establish democratic order in Hungary." (*U.N. Document A–3521, 1957*).

This state of affairs was aptly characterized by various General Assembly Resolutions on the subject whether Russian intervention in Hungary was a clear aggression against a sovereign State, or whether it was a justified entry into a civil war in that State.

There was no resistance against the Nagy Government by persons or groupe sympathetic to the Kádár view as of November 3, 1956 and the leftist opponents of the regime had no organized armed forces. This evidences that

(1) The Kádár forces had no sizeable popular backing;

(2) Could not assemble for the purposes of forming a Government on Hungarian soil over which they claimed sovereign rights.

(3) They were not even *bona fide* rebels but only efficient administrators of a foreign power invading Hungary.

Resolution 1004 ES–II of the United Nations General Assembly of November 4, 1956 reenforced by Resolution 1131 of the 11th Sessions clearly recognized Soviet Russian interference as a breach of the Paris Peace Treaty of 1947 and the United Nations Charter, and described it "as an intolerable attempt to deny to the Hungarian people the right of a Government freely elected and representing their national aspirations."

Modern international law literature confirms that the General Assembly during its 1956 Emergency Session and its 11th Session has given true expression to existing law rather than just making a political judgment in condemning Russian aggression. In 1949 the International Court of Justice declared in the *Corfu Channel Case*:

"The Court can only regard the alleged right of intervention as the manifestation of a policy of force, such as has in the past given rise to the most serious abuses and such as cannot, whatever the defects in international organization, find a place in international law . . . Between independent states, respect for territorial sovereignty is the essential foundation of international relations."

The Peruvian draft to the Special Committee on International Law of the United Nations in 1956 defined aggression as follows and received considerable support from Western delegations:

(a) Invasion by the armed forces of a State of territory belonging to another State or under effective jurisdiction of another State;

(b) Armed attack against the territory, population or land, sea and air forces of a State by land, sea or air forces of another State;

(c) The organization, or the encouragement of the organization by a state of armed bands within its territory for incursions into the territory of another State, or the toleration of the organization of such bands in its territory, or the toleration of the use by such armed bands of its territory as a base of operations, or as a point of departure, for incursions into the territory of another State as well as direct participation in or support of such incursions."

There exists no doubt that the actions of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics following November 4, 1956 in Hungary have exhausted all three definitions of the Peruvian draft on aggression.

Even the Soviet Russian draft to the same Commission in 1956 enumerated several acts of aggression in a similar context, emphasizing the finding that whoever commits the enumerated acts first must be considered as the aggressor. Finally, the Soviet Russian doctrine of *bellum justum* contending the righteousness of "wars of national liberations waged to defend the people from foreign attack and from attempts to enslave them, or to liberate the people from capitalist slavery, to liberate colonies and dependent countries from the yoke of imperialism" fails to have any validity in the case of Hungary. For here there was no other aggression except a Russian one; no other power made an attempt to enslave Hungary, and the socio-political order of Hungary was a people's democratic one.

In reaffirming the view that intervention into the politico-social order of a State by another State must be regarded as an act of aggression, two more international lawyers may also be mentioned:

Professor Quincy Wright in his book *The Role of International Law in the Elimination of War* (1961) writes:

". . . in a situation of civil strife, the state is temporarily prohibited from acting. A government beset by civil strife is not in a position to invite assistance in the name of the state." (P. 61)

As a result, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would have had no legal basis to interfere even if the so-called Kádár Government were a *bona fide* rebel government and would have asked for Soviet Russian intervention in the affairs of the Hungarian State.

Professor Wolfgang Friedmann in his book *The Changing Structure of International Law* (1964) establishes the following principles of international law on intervention:

(1) " . . . that it is based upon a society of sovereign states, regardless the structure and ideology of the regime. From this follows the illegality, by international law, of foreign interference in internal changes as such, as distinct from internal changes which constitute an actual or imminent attack upon the security of another state . . ."

(2) " . . . it would follow from this premise that any attempt by a foreign power to interfere with internal change, either by assisting rebels to overthrow the legitimate government, or by helping the incumbent government to suppress a revolution, is contrary to international law." (pp. 264–65).

Neither of the exigencies (i.e., actual or imminent attack) occurred in the case of Hungary. The Nagy Government of the Hungarian State did not menace the Soviet Union. Rather, it publicly proclaimed its neutrality and was willing to assume the international law obligations of the status of neutrality. The Nagy Government asked for the opening of formal negotiations on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary, thereby showing its peaceful intention regarding the solution of the major outstanding issue between the two Governments.

In conclusion, both the opinion of most international law writers, advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice, and resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly between 1956 and 1962 unanimously agree that the intervention of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with its armed forces in Hungary leading to the forcible removal of the constitutionally organized Nagy Government and its replacement with the Kádár group which was willing to do its bidding, was a clear and complete violation of both international customary law and existing treaty obligations of the U.S.S.R.

B. THE VALIDITY OF THE TROOP STATIONING TREATY OF MAY 27, 1957

International society is based on the principle of sovereign equality. As a corollary, only fully sovereign States qualify as proper subjects of international law and may conclude treaties which establish rights and obligations under international law. In the twilight zone are so-called dependent states, in the past best-known as protectorates. The Permanent Court of International Justice in the case of *Nationality Decrees in Tunis and Morocco* (1924) emphasized that the legal relationship between the protecting Power and the dependent State varies from one case to the other and that the fact and degree of dependency may only be determined by the knowledge of the particular facts of the treaties involved.

According to Professor J. L. Brierly of Oxford University, a treaty establishing a protectorate is not needed for establishing the dependent status of a state. In his *Law of Nations* (1950) he refers to the *de facto* dependency of many of the Central American states during the first two decades of the 20th century to the United States without any treaties establishing a protectorate "Even when native governments have been allowed to function, American officials have controlled the expenditure, collected the customs, commanded the constabulary, had the right to construct naval bases for American use and a practically complete control of foreign relations. A similar de facto protectorate by Great Britain in Egypt also existed from 1882 until 1914, when a protectorate was declared." (p. 119)

Let us investigate the position of the Kadar Government in Hungary in May 1957 vis-a-vis the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the legal bases as defined by the two Contracting Parties.

The legal basis for the agreement was given as the membership of the Hungarian State in the Warsaw Mutual Security Treaty of June 2, 1955, which in Article 5, provides:

"The Parties agree on the establishment of a Joint Command for certain elements of their Armed Forces which shall be allocated by agreement between the Parties, and which shall act in accordance with jointly established principles."

This, of course, contains no express authorization of the stationing of the troops of one member on the territory of the other, but implicitly includes such a possibility by the establishment of a Joint Command for parts of their armed forces. To rely on the Warsaw Pact for the legal status of the Soviet Russian armed forces in Hungary would be at best speculation, at worst legal casuistry.

Thus, the legal basis for the Agreement must evolve from the character of free consent on the part of the Government of Hungary, a sovereign and equal partner of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics during the negotiation, signing and ratification of the May 27, 1957 Treaty.

What were, however, the facts of the case and their legal implications under international law?

It is the contention of the American Hungarian Federation that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics exercised far-reaching sovereign powers in Hungary in the period preceding and during the negotiation, signing and ratification of the Troop Stationing Treaty of May 27, 1957 and therefore, the State of Hungary had not yet recovered its full political independence and territorial sovereignty when asked to agree to a significant auto-limitation of its territorial and political sovereignty. As a result, the May 27, 1957 Treaty is at best of limited validity, having been signed by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with a state which had had a dependent relationship to it. At worst, Hungary was in the state of *debellatio*, and the signature of the externally imposed Kádár Government has been null and void.

As evidence, we present the following facts:

As late as March, 1957, the Soviet Russian Military Command was in direct control of peace and tranquility in Hungary. It established curfews, designated crimes against public security, and its advisors, and some Rumanian advisors as well, were instrumental in crushing attempts of resistance against the so-called Kádár Government and investigating prisoners by the Secret Police. Thus, military and police power in May 1957 still rested directly or indirectly with the armed forces of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in Hungary. The Hungarian army was still in a state of partial disarmament and reorganization and could not exercise an independent function at that time.

Forces of the Soviet Russian military command in Hungary were instrumental also in destroying the legal Government of Hungary by arresting the Minister of Defense, General Paul Maléter on November 3, 1956, while negotiating at the headquarters of the Soviet Russian forces; by arresting Prime Minister Imre Nagy as soon as he had left his asylum at the Yugoslav Embassy upon receipt of a letter of free conduct by the so-called Kádár Government; and by arresting other members of the cabinet, including Minister of State Istvan Bibo, who holed himself up in the Parliament Building as a last symbol of the legal Government of the Hungarian State.

From this state of affairs even the status of *debellatio* may be deduced, as all of Hungary had been occupied by Soviet Russian armed forces, the opposing Government was destroyed and no armistice or peace treaty signed with the legal regime.

The claims of the so-called Kádár Government of Hungary to speak in the name of the sovereign Hungarian State in May, 1957, cannot be taken on face value. Though acquiring the State of burocracy by the violent destruction of the Nagy Government by military forces of the Soviet Union, they had not yet organized a stable government and Party structure and there was no clear agreement even within the ranks of their new Party on the advisability of the presence of Soviet Rusisan troops in the country. The Central Committee of the Socialist Workers and Peasant Party had been organized only in February, 1957, and the first Party conclave was held only after signing the Troop Stationing Agreement.

These facts are not only known to the historian of the period, but they formed the basis for the interpretation of events by the General Assembly of the United Nations, which, though not a law-creating agency, certainly can, with some reservations be accepted as a law-interpreting forum.

Between November 4, 1956 and December 10, 1957 the General Assembly voted in favor of twelve resolutions on the situation in Hungary with overwhelming majorities ranging from 48 against 11 with 16 abstentions on the most comprehensive Resolution 1005 on November 9, 1956, to 60 against 10 with 10 abstentions on Resolution 1133 on September 14, 1957, approving two reports of its Credentials Committee (February 27, 1957 and December 9, 1957) in failing to accept the credentials of the representatives of the Kádár Government as the proper representatives of the Hungarian State.

The principles laid down in the various U.N. General Assembly Resolutions during these 13 months may be summarized as follows:

1. The Hungarian people "have demonstrated clearly the desire . . . to exercise and to enjoy fully their fundamental rights, freedom and independence" (*Resolution 1005—ES II*) and have "the right to government responsive to its national aspirations and dedicated to its independence and well-being." (*Resolution 1004—ES II*)

2. In order for them to enjoy fundamental rights, "the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungary is necessary." (*Resolution 1005—ES II*), as "the overwhelming demand of the Hungarian people for the cessation of intervention of foreign armed forces and withdrawal of foreign troops is manifest." (*Resolution 1131—XI*)

3. The Soviet Russian army of occupation "has been forcibly deporting Hungarian men, women and children from their homes to places outside of Hungary, thereby violating both the principles of the United Nations Charter and the principles of the Convention of the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, in particular articles II (c) and (e), to which Hungary and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are parties, and also article two of the 1947 Peace Treaty." (*Resolution 1127—XI*)

4. "The present Hungarian regime has been imposed on the Hungarian people by the

> armed intervention of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." (*Resolution 1133—XI*)
>
> Thus, the lack of binding character of the May 27, 1957 Agreement evolves from the findings of the U.N. General Assembly Resolution alone. The Government is not based on a free consent of the Hungarian people (this has nothing to do with free elections, it is the absence of any free consent including toleration of a coup d'etat by domestic forces), rather the people have specifically demonstrated their will against the conclusion of such a Treaty and the former legitimate Government of Hungary was officially asking for their removal. Furthermore, the Soviet Russian forces of occupation have been guilty of severe and repeated violations of international law over and beyond the illegality of their presence in Hungary.
>
> C. THE POLITICAL PROBLEM OF SOVIET RUSSIAN TROOPS IN HUNGARY
>
> It must be made clear that while the international legal basis for the presence of Soviet Russian troops in Hungary is very questionable at least, they are still stationed there now for ten years in defiance to the twenty-three United Nations General Assembly resolutions requesting their withdrawal. This is a clear and undeniable flouting of the United Nations Charter and prestige of that organization which would be in the interest of the member states to remedy in a peaceful, but effective, manner.
>
> May the American Hungarian Federation respectfully request Your Government which agreed with the principles laid down in the various resolutions of the U.N. General Assembly, to search for ways in which the withdrawal of Soviet Russian troops may be secured from Hungary so that the Hungarian State may reacquire its political sovereignty and national self-determination. We are aware that the Hungarian question forms part of the overall question of European security and its solution presupposes agreement on force levels between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union in Central Europe, but we hope that Your Government will take active steps to further the solution of the underlying problem: the presence of Soviet Russian forces in Hungary in violation of United Nations General Assembly Resolutions and the dicta of international law against intervention into the domestic affairs of a sovereign State. If the forces of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics are withdrawn, we believe that the other problems, like lack of free elections and the regard of the Government toward national aspirations, will be slowly corrected in an evolutionary manner, but any real progress toward such a state of affairs remains manifestly impossible as long as Soviet Russian forces continue to be stationed in Hungary, or until their return is possible without any effective countersanctions.

It has been indeed a specially gratifying accomplishment of this organization that despite its continued interest in the fate of Hungarians in Hungary and other Danubian States, it has managed to remain American in spirit and has never assumed any of the characteristics of an emigre organization which is often the fate of ethnic groupings. In return, the Government and Congress have always recognized the American Hungarian Federation as the official spokesman for Americans of Hungarian descent and listened to the federation's opinion on immigration and naturalization matters.

The American Hungarian Federation is led by distinguished and devoted Americans indeed. The national president, Hon. Albert A. Fiok, is a renowned municipal judge in the city of Pittsburgh. The chairman of the board of directors is the Right Reverend Dr. Zoltan Béky, a bishop emeritus of the Hungarian Reformed Church in the United States, and the president of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, the second largest American Hungarian fraternal insurance company. The board of directors consists among others of three university professors, 10 clergymen, including monsignori and conference chairmen of Protestant churches, well-known business and management leaders, and writers as well as civic leaders of the American Hungarian community, including the recently arrived refugees after the tragic ending of the glorious Hungarian revolution of 1956. The two national secretaries are Dr. Louis Fury, one of the best-known Hungarian-language fiction writers in the free world and Prof. Z. Michael Szaz of Seton Hall University, a well-known authority on international law and relations.

It gives me a great pleasure to call the attention of the House to the 60th anniversary of this organization with a great past and a dynamic present, and I thank my colleagues for having joined with me today on this subject.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from the Garden State of New Jersey.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed proper that my colleague from New York [Mr. HALPERN] has asked for a special order on commemorating the 60th anniversary of the American Hungarian Federation.

In the past, I had many opportunities to work with the leaders of this organization devoted to the American principles of freedom and democracy and to the furthering of human rights of suppressed Hungarians in Communist-ruled Hungary and Rumania, especially with the Right Reverend Bishop Dr. Zoltán Béky, who is the chairman of the board of the federation and with Prof. Z. Michael Szaz, from the Department of Political Science of Seton Hall University, who is the federation's foreign relations secretary.

The federation's work in exposing Communist abuses and violations of human rights has been outstanding indeed. Their information, analyses, and memorandums were attentively listened to by many of my colleagues and by people in the U.S. Government. They are, however, not only interested in strictly political issues of freedom. Social problems and their political implications are also investigated, and I would like to insert at this point a memorandum prepared by the foreign relations committee of the federation to the American Medical Association on the social, economic, and political implication of the immorally liberalized abortion laws of the country under the present Communist government.

The federation takes an active role as a spokesman for the complaints of their former fellow countrymen in Hungary and Rumania, and to inform us on the lack of human and civil rights and national self-determination which are all barriers to bridge building and a permanent peace in the world.

Another role of the federation has for decades consisted of promotion of translations of books by Hungarian authors and sometimes also of promotion of American authors regarding Hungary. Some of the books in the past included: Prof. Joseph Remenyi's "Hungarian Literature," John F. Montgomery's "Hungary—The Unwilling Satellite," Dr. Julius Kornish's "Hungary and European Civilization," Bishop C. Kornish's "Transylvania—The Land Beyond the Forest," Dr. Watson Kirkconnell's translation, "A Little Treasury of Hungarian Verse," and last but not least the "D.A.R. Citizenship Manual."

Bibliographic works were also encouraged, as the New York chapter spearheaded an effort supported by me to get a bibliographic list of works about Hungarians in Rumania contained in the holdings of the Library of Congress which I am proposing now in the House Administration Committee to be published for the use of scholars and interested parties by the Government Printing Office.

At the same time, the federation never was a haven for extremism. In 1941 as well as in the late 1940's and 1950's, the federation was in the advance guard of those organizations which reaffirmed their commitment to our American way of life and rejected any totalitarian ideology. In their constitution, they put it very succinctly that nobody may be a member of the federation who believes in any totalitarian ideology, and/or maintains continued contact with representatives of atheistic, totalitarian, ideologies. The board consists of the intellectual, business, and religious elite of the American Hungarian community and they are par excellence the national representation of the citizens of Hungarian descent in America.

It is with sincere feeling that I am joining my colleagues in congratulating the federation on its 60th anniversary for a job well done and wishing them an ever more successful future.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the American Hungarian Federation is the oldest and perhaps the most active organization among large and small American Hungarian communities throughout the country. Since its founding in 1906 it has rendered valuable and most useful service in acquainting and educating immigrant Hungarians with the ways and ideals of American democracy. It has performed this self-imposed duty with distinction and honor, helping Hungarian immigrants become intelligent, loyal, patriotic, and law-abiding citizens.

It is not easy to evaluate with any accuracy the extent of aid the federation has rendered to more than 1 million Hungarian immigrants since its founding, but the fact that its useful work has extended to all communities with sizable numbers of American Hungarians, and its services have been duly appreciated, is an indication that in many ways it has become a principal agency striving to achieve lofty and laudable aims in such communities. As we all know, the education of immigrants is not an easy task; even the best of our educational institutions often cannot perform this task effectively without the aid of organizations composed of former immigrants. They understand the problems facing the immigrants better, and they are best prepared to help newly arrived immigrants solve their problems. That is why I consider the value of the service rendered by the American Hungarian Federation of supreme importance, and am indeed happy to join my friends on the observance of the federation's 60th anniversary.

In recent years the federation has taken upon itself another function, one almost as important as educating Hungarian immigrants in our way of life. Its new function is that of keeping Americans of Hungarian origin constantly informed, and also the public of this country, of the sad and unenviable lot under which the Hungarian people suffer under Communist tyranny. In obtaining information through devious and difficult channels about actual conditions in Hungary, and by passing on such information to the general public through the press and other news media, the federation is performing a thoroughly worthwhile service. In the performance of these dual duties I wish the federation success on its 60th anniversary.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the distinguished gentleman from New York, my good friend, SEYMOUR HALPERN, in commemorating the service to the United States which the American Hungarian Federation has provided through its years of existence. We recognize the fact that the great contributions made to the United States by immigrants from many lands are among the reasons why we have been able to achieve national greatness. The American Hungarian Federation is one of the finest groups of its type and has effectively served Americans of Hungarian origin in a multitude of fields.

It is especially important that we emphasize the historic relationship between Americans and Hungarians and the great devotion to liberty of Americans of Hungarian origin since at this time the people of Hungary continue to suffer under the Soviet-imposed atheistic Communist ideology.

We can see the relationship in Communist manipulation of the Middle East crisis and, just as we saw 20 years ago through the acquiescence of President Roosevelt, Communist control of Eastern Europe.

May I also point out that it is of special importance for groups such as the American Hungarian Federation to rededicate themselves to the historic and fundamental principles that contribute to the continued strength of our country. They also look forward to the day when freedom can replace communism in the land of their forefathers.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in saluting the American Hungarian Federation. For 60 years, since its chartering in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1907, the federation has given uninterrupted service to Hungarian immigrants enabling them to become loyal, productive citizens of the United States while serving as a spokesman of their aspirations and needs.

The American Hungarian Federation, during the last two decades, has also served as an informal spokesman for those inside Hungary who were deprived of their national self-determination and a free democratic government due to occupation by the armed forces of the Soviet Union. During this time it has also sought to inform the American public on political, religious, and economic situation in Communist-ruled Hungary and thereby give expression to some of the longings of the suppressed Hungarian people.

Culturally, the federation has promoted the knowledge of Hungarian history and literature among Americans not of Hungarian descent.

Charitably, the federation, between 1945 and 1952, sent help to Hungary and to Hungarians living in Western Europe in the amount of $1,457,743 and its relief action after the Hungarian freedom fight amounted to $512,560 even before a separate organization was chartered to do relief work.

In addition, the federation has invariably taken an unequivocal stand against any atheistic and totalitarian ideology, having opposed both nazism and communism.

The yeoman service of this organization should no longer go unacknowledged or unsung. With a deep appreciation for the outstanding contribution the federation has made to both America and Hungary in particular and the cause of freedom in general it is my privilege to participate in the observance of its 60th anniversary today.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the American Hungarian Federation is celebrating the 60th anniversary of its charter. Founded in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1907, the federation has helped Hungarian immigrants to the United States become loyal Americans who have added much to our Nation's progress.

During the past 20 years, the federation has also served as the unofficial representative to the Government of the United States of the Hungarians still in their native country who have been denied self-determination by the occupation of Hungary by Soviet troops. It has, in addition, distributed books and manuals on Hungarian culture and literature to Americans not of Hungarian descent in an effort to promote mutual understanding.

The organization has taken a strong stand against all atheistic and totalitarian ideologies, opposing both communism and nazism. It is in constant contact with the State Department and with Members of Congress on issues relating to Hungary and to Eastern Europe in general. Several Presidents have received delegations from the American Hungarian Federation to discuss these problems.

The federation's foreign affairs committee has recently completed major studies on the international legal status of Soviet armed forces stationed on Hungarian soil, abortion laws in Hungary, a statement to the House Judiciary Committee on making flag burning a Federal crime, and a memorandum to the President on American policies toward Hungary and Eastern Europe.

It sponsored over 20,000 Hungarian refugees to America after World War II and over 35,000 more after the Hungarian uprising of 1956. In addition, the federation sent almost $1.5 million to Hungary and Hungarians living in Western Europe between 1945 and 1952. Over $500,000 was given after the 1956 freedom fight even before a separate organization was established to do relief work.

The American Hungarian Federation is composed of the two Hungarian fraternal associations—the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America and the William Penn Fraternal Association—its own local chapters, American Hungarian churches, associations, clubs, and study groups, all of which send delegates to the triennial convention. The convention then elects the officers and members of the board of directors.

In this 60th anniversary year, I extend heartiest congratulations to the American Hungarian Federation, its president, Albert A. Fiok, and to Bishop Zoltan Beky.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, members of the American Hungarian Federation are this year celebrating the 60th anniversary of that patriotic organization's charter. I believe it is appropriate for my colleagues to pause and give recognition to the fine contributions the American Hungarian Federation has made to the cause of democracy throughout its existence.

For three-fifths of a century now the federation has been engaged in educating Hungarians about American political principles and values so that they might become loyal American citizens knowledgeable about our form of government. The federation has also promoted a knowledge of Hungarian literature and culture among Americans of all national origins by sponsoring various cultural activities.

I believe the very worthwhile activities of the American Hungarian Federation should not go without recognition in this 60th year of its existence. I offer the federation my most cordial best wishes for its continuing success.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today several of our colleagues, under the able leadership of my colleague from New York [Mr. HALPERN], have paid tribute to one of the oldest American ethnic organizations, the American Hungarian Federation. Organized 60 years ago, the federation has been active in educating Hungarian immigrants to the American way of life while simultaneously it also published translations of Hungarian literature in order to familiarize the American public with the cultural heritage of Hungarian authors.

The federation, besides its educational activities, always took an unequivocal stand where freedom and democracy were concerned and tries to give expression also to the aspirations of the suppressed peoples of Hungary, while remaining American in spirit and ideals.

The federation is led by the outstanding members of American Hungarian churches, intellectual and business community, and jurists. Their study committee on foreign policy has composed many valuable memorandums on conditions in Hungary and American-Hungarian relations which were received both by us and the State Department with lively interest.

Recently, the federation made a statement for the House Judiciary Subcommittee on the bills making flag burning a Federal crime and expressed its wholehearted support for the bills upholding the sanctity of our flag by the federation and its more than 120,000 members. They are also testifying later in this session at the East-West relations hearing of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and take an active interest in the bills trying to promote "bridge building" where they warn of one-sided steps by the Government.

The federation also played a role in reminding the American Hungarians as well as the general public of the role played by Americans of Hungarian descent in the history of our country, they took part in sponsoring the Louis Kossuth stamps issued in the early 1960's, in the designation of the parade ground at The Citadel in Charleston, S.C., as Col. Michael de Kovats Place, after the Hungarian-born hero of the American War of Independence and the erection of a life-size statue of Agoston Haraszty, a pioneer of American viniculture, in California.

During the years of war and revolution, the federation also helped Hungarians by relief actions, $1,457,743.26 were sent in relief funds to Hungary between 1945 and 1952, and 22,665 assurances to various individuals and institutions to facilitate the admission of Hungarian refugees in Western Europe to the United States between 1948 and 1953. While the second relief action after the 1956 revolution was for the most part financed by an independent organization, the federation itself collected and distributed in cash, food, clothing, medicine, and school aids $512,560.68 after the 1956 revolution.

It is indeed proper that we remember the valiant and freedom-loving work of this organization of loyal and dynamic Americans today and wish them an even more active and successful next 60 years.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the course of European history the struggle for democratic principle has played a dominant role. This is true not only in Western Europe, where democracy has flourished, but also in much of Eastern Europe, so long oppressed by tyranny of every kind.

Among the gallant advocates of freedom in Eastern Europe, the people of Hungary captured the admiration of the 19th century world in 1848, and the 20th century in 1956. On both occasions they fought for democracy at great sacrifice and in face of overwhelming odds.

Under the circumstances, it is only natural that thousands of Hungarians should have emigrated here, following both abortive democratic revolutions in their native land. And in so doing they have proven themselves invaluable to the American democratic cause.

The American Hungarian Federation has served the same cause for the same purpose, and with remarkable effect. Founded with the dual object of acquainting Hungarian immigrants with American ideals, and of preserving the Hungarian culture within the American Hungarian community, the federation has carried out its work with considerable success, and deserves the highest praise for a job well done.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in congratulating the American-Hungarian Foundation for 60 years of service in the interest of America, of the people of Hungary and of Hungarian extraction, and of the principles of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, as one reads the history of the United States he cannot but understand the contributions which various nationalities have made to the greatness of our country as they settled in this vast land of ours. The Hungarians, along with other nationals, have sought to give their best to the ideals that can flourish only under a free system. They offered the rich cultural traditions, diligence, honesty, and hard work as their contribution to the most unique nationality yet recorded—the American Nation. It is an ideal no other country has ever really understood, or so eagerly promoted. Naturally, such accomplishment was not without the leadership of various organizations which helped orient the assimilation of immigrants to the American scene. These organizations also helped promote the most valuable and colorful aspects of their former homeland to enhance the beauty of our Nation.

A leader in this quest is the American Hungarian Federation celebrating its 60th anniversary today. Obtaining its charter in 1907, it has coordinated the cultural, civic, and religious efforts to help in the transition for American citizenship. The federation has also shown interest in seeing that the American concept of freedom is extended to all Hungarians and was a vocal spokesman in presenting the harsh treatment of Hungarians under oppressive regimes during Nazi and Communist domination.

The world will not easily forget the events of 1956, when Hungarian people raised their voices and weapons against Soviet occupation forces, and the role which the American Hungarian Federation played in aiding the besieged freedom fighters. Helping in the settlement of the many refugees in the United States, the American Hungarian Federation offered those refugees a channel through which their message of the values of freedom was and still is being presented.

I believe that the past 60 years are replete with deeds of which the American Hungarian Federation should be justly proud, and I take pleasure with my fellow Members of Congress in saluting them.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues in commemorating the 60th anniversary of the American Hungarian Federation.

This federation has taken an active part in educating Hungarians, and bringing about harmonious relationships between Americans of Hungarian descent and other Americans. It has done much to help these people become useful and valuable citizens of our Nation. It has also disseminated information among Americans about Hungarian customs and traditions.

The federation has steadfastly opposed any atheistic and totalitarian ideologies, looking forward to the day when freedom can replace communism in the land of their forefathers.

Groups such as the American Hungarian Federation are to be commended for the services they render in helping newly arrived immigrants solve their problems.

I congratulate the federation upon this, its 60th anniversary, for a job well done, and wish it ever-increasing success in the future.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 60th anniversary of the American Hungarian Federation. I feel that it is most appropriate to salute this fine organization on reaching an important milestone, and to note its many accomplishments.

During its entire existence it has served Hungarian immigrants in the United States and aided them in becoming loyal and useful citizens. In addition, the federation has acted as a focal point and spokesman for the problems and needs of American citizens of Hungarian background. For the last 20 years, the American Hungarian Federation has also served as the unofficial representative of the Hungarian people living in Hungary, who have been deprived of their democratic rights and free expression.

The federation has its own local and State chapters and in addition consists of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, the William Penn Fraternal Association, American Hungarian churches, associations, clubs, and study groups. All of these organizations send delegates to a triennial convention which elects officers and members of the board of directors.

After World War II, the federation sponsored over 22,000 Hungarians for admission to the United States, and later aided some 35,000 Hungarian refugees in coming to this country after the ruthless and tyrannical Soviet subjugation of their homeland. Between 1945 and 1952, the federation sent nearly $1.5 million to help Hungary and Hungarians living in Western Europe. After the valiant struggle for freedom in 1956, the federation provided $512,560 in relief funds prior to the time a separate organization was designated to provide this service.

The federation has long taken a strong and unequivocal stand against any form of totalitarian or atheistic ideology, and was in opposition to both nazism and communism. Over the past two decades it has sought to keep the U.S. Government and the American people informed on political, religious, and economic conditions in Hungary under Communist domination. This effort has been carried out by the publication and the dissemination of information with the hope that it will keep alive the spark of freedom in the hearts of those living under Communist imperialism.

The American Hungarian Federation was chartered in 1907 in Cleveland, Ohio. Its present officers are: The Honorable Albert A. Fiok, municipal judge, Pittsburgh, national president; Rt. Rev. Dr. Zoltan Beky, bishop emeritus of the Hungarian Independent Reformed Church of America and president of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, chairman of the board of directors; Prof. Dr. Emery G. Szekely, Temple Medical School, Philadelphia; Dr. Janos Nadas, president, Kossuth Chapter of AHF, Cleveland; Mr. Stephen Miko, president, AHF of the State of New York, Inc., and Mr. Zoltan Vasvari, president, Cross and Sword Movement, Garfield, N.J., the national vice presidents; Mr. Richard J. Phillips, William Penn Fraternal Association, Pittsburgh, treasurer; Mr. Bela Karlovitz, Pittsburgh, general counsel; Messrs. Gabriel Bodaner, Garfield, N.J., Andrew Eross, Sr., Bridgeport, Conn., and Dr. Julius Hovany, Chicago, Ill., comptrollers; Dr. Louis Furt, Washington, D.C., and Prof. Z. Michael Szaz, department of political science, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., national secretaries.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I recognize the very significant accomplishments of the American Hungarian Federation. On its 60th anniversary, I extend my best wishes and hope for its continual success and achievements. The federation typifies the contribution made by our citizens of Hungarian background to this Nation's greatness. Through its efforts and ours we may look forward to the time when the Hungarian nation is again able to regain and enjoy the independence and freedom which it so eagerly seeks.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the American Hungarian Federation was chartered in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1907. It has been in continued existence ever since. Its present officers are: The Honorable Albert A. Fiok, municipal judge in Pittsburgh, Pa., as national president; the Right Reverend Dr. Zoltan Beky, bishop emeritus of the Independent Hungarian Reformed Church of America, and president, Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, as chairman of the board of directors; Prof. Dr. Emery G. Szekely, medical school, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Janos Nadas, president, Kossuth chapter, AHF, Cleveland, Ohio; Mr. Stephen Miko, president, American Hungarian Federation of the State of New York, Inc.; Mr. Zoltan Vasvari, president, Cross and Sword Movement, Garfield, N.J., as national vice presidents; Mr. Richard J. Phillips, William Penn Fraternal Association, Pittsburgh, Pa., as treasurer; Mr. Bela Karlovitz, counselor at law, Pittsburgh, Pa., as general counsel; Messrs. Gabor Bodnar, Clifton, N.J., Andrew Eross, Sr., and Dr. Julius Hovany, editor, Chicago, Ill., as comptrollers; Dr. Louis Fury, writer, and Prof. Z. Michael Szaz, department of political science, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., as national secretaries.

During its 60 years of existence, the federation was engaged in educating Hungarians about American values and principles of democracy so that they may become well-informed citizens of the United States. The federation also promoted the knowledge of Hungarian culture and literature among Americans not of Hungarian descent by sponsoring and distributing books and literature.

The federation has taken an unequivocal stand against any atheistic and totalitarian ideology, having been opposed to nazism as well as communism. For the last two decades it has informed the American Government and public about the political, religious, and economic situation in Hungary under Communist rule by dissemination of information and memorandums and thereby give expression to some of the aspirations and demands of the suppressed Hungarian people.

Several Presidents of the United States have received delegations of the American Hungarian Federation, and the federation is in constant touch with the State Department and Members of Congress on problems of American policy toward Hungary in particular and Eastern Europe in general.

The federation assisted 22,605 Hungarian refugees after World War II to come to the United States, and helped 35,705 refugees after the 1956 Hungarian fight for freedom to come to America.

The federation, between 1945 and 1952, sent help to Hungary and to Hungarians living in Western Europe in the amount of $1,457,743.26, and its relief action after the Hungarian revolution amounted to $512,560.08, even before a separate organization was chartered to do the relief work.

The federation consists of the two American Hungarian fraternal associations—Hungarian Reformed Federation of America and William Penn Fraternal Association—its own State and local chapters, American Hungarian churches, associations, clubs, and study groups which send delegates to the triennial convention, which, in turn, elects its officers and board of directors.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to join today on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the American Hungarian Federation in recognizing this significant event and extending my heartiest congratulations and best wishes for the future to the federation and all its officers and members.

The American Hungarian Federation was chartered in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1907. It has been in continued existence ever since. Its present officers are: The Honorable Albert A. Fiok, municipal judge in Pittsburgh, Pa., as national president; the Right Reverend Dr. Zoltan Beky, bishop emeritus of the Independent Hungarian Reformed Church of America, and president, Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, as chairman of the board of directors; Prof. Dr. Emery G. Szekely, Medical School, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Janos Nadas, president, Kossuth chapter, AHF, Cleveland, Ohio; Mr. Stephen Miko, president, American Hungarian Federation of the State of New York, Inc.; Mr. Zoltan Vasvari, president, Cross and Sword Movement, Garfield, N.J., as national vice presidents; Mr. Richard J. Phillips, William Penn Fraternal Association, Pittsburgh, Pa., as treasurer; Mr. Bela Karlovitz, Esq., counselor at law, Pittsburgh, Pa., as general counsel; Messrs. Gabor Bodnar, Clifton, N.J., Andrew Eross, Sr., and Dr. Julius Hovany, editor, Chicago, Ill., as comptrollers; Dr. Louis Fury, writer, and Prof. Z. Michael Szaz, Department of Political Science, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., as national secretaries.

For its 60 years of existence, the federation was engaged in educating Hungarians about American values and political principles so that they may become well-informed and loyal citizens of the United States. The federation also promoted the knowledge of Hungarian culture and literature among Americans not of Hungarian descent by sponsoring and distributing books and manuals.

In the past the federation took an unequivocal stand against any atheistic and totalitarian ideology, having been opposed to nazism as well as communism. For the last two decades it also tried to inform the American Government and public on the political, religious, and economic situation in Hungary under Communist rule by dissemination of information and memorandums and thereby give expression to some of the aspirations and demands of the suppressed Hungarian people.

Several Presidents of the United States have received delegations of the American Hungarian Federation, and the federation is in constant touch with the State Department and Members of Congress on problems of American policy toward Hungary in particular and Eastern Europe in general.

Recently major studies by the federation's foreign affairs committee included one on the international law status of the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. stationed on Hungarian soil, sent to 111 U.N. ambassadors; a statement to Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Judiciary Committee, on bills proposing to make flag burning a Federal crime; an analysis of the abortion laws of Hungary, submitted to the American Medical Association; and, a memorandum to the President of the United States on American policy toward Hungary and Eastern Europe.

The federation sponsored 22,605 Hungarian refugees after World War II to this country, and helped 35,705 refugees after the 1956 Hungarian fight for freedom to come to America.

On charitable matters, the federation, between 1945 and 1952, sent help to Hungary and to Hungarians living in Western Europe in the amount of $1,457,743.26 and its relief action after the Hungarian Revolution amounted to $512,560.08, even before a separate organization was chartered to do the relief work.

The federation consists of the two American Hungarian fraternal associations—Hungarian Reformed Federation of America and William Penn Fraternal Association—its own State and local chapters, American Hungarian churches, associations, clubs, and study groups which send delegates to the triennial convention, which in turn, elects its officers and board of directors.

I may add, Mr. Speaker, that my interest and admiration for the great Hungarian people have always inspired be to exert every possible effort to sustain and assist them and to support their struggles for freedom and personal liberty for themselves and for other people feeling the lash of Communist tyranny.

Moreover, my personal interest in people of Hungarian blood, who have so enriched our own country has been greatly stimulated by the very distinguished and admired spiritual leader, Rev. Alexander St.-Ivanyi, pastor of the historic Bulfinch Church of Lancaster, Mass., mother town to my hometown of Clinton.

Reverend St.-Ivanyi has long been profoundly interested and active in the affairs of the Hungarian people of this country as well as of his native land. He is a devoted, courageous leader, very deeply devoted to the cause of Hungary and the cause of freedom.

I know that he will be greatly pleased to know that the Congress of the United States as well as the executive department of this Government joins him and his friends of Hungarian blood in hailing this memorable anniversary and reaffirming loyalty to the principles of freedom and personal liberty that we share in common with the beloved and honored Hungarian people whose way of life and whose culture and virtues and amiable qualities have made such a deep impression on our fellow Americans and all those who prize the cherished heritage of the free world.

Mr. **BROYHILL** of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in offering my congratulations to the American Hungarian Foundation on the occasion of its 60th anniversary. This splendid organization has for 60 years promoted knowledge of Hungarian culture and literature among the American people. They have busied themselves in educational and charitable pursuits over the years in helping Hungarian Americans to become well-informed and loyal citizens of the United States.

In recent years, the foundation has worked tirelessly against the atheistic and totalitarian ideology which has engulfed Hungary. They have sponsored over 50,000 Hungarian political refugees who have fled the oppression in their homeland to become citizens of the United States.

I congratulate them, Mr. Speaker, and wish them all success in the future.

Mr. **LUKENS**. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to join my colleagues in commemorating the 60th anniversary of the charter of a fine, loyal American organization devoted to the values of our way of life and individual freedom, the American Hungarian Federation.

During its 60 years of existence the Federation worked both for the adaptation of Hungarian immigrants into our society by acquainting them with our culture and a knowledge of our governmental and social institutions and for the preservation of the valuable aspects of Hungarian culture among the sons and daughters of these immigrants.

However, since the tragic fate of Hungary in 1945, and then in 1956, when Soviet Russian communism engulfed their native country, the leaders of the American Hungarian Federation did not shrink from the task of denouncing atheistic communism and its misdeeds and tyranny both in Hungary and in other parts of the world. They also pointed out to American citizens of Hungarian origin the pitfalls and dangers of communism in this country and also served as informal spokesmen for the people of Hungary deprived of its national self-determination and individual freedom.

Recently, the Federation has been active in publishing and disseminating studies on the various aspects of American policy and conditions in Hungary. The Foreign Affairs Committee headed by Prof. Emery G. Szekely, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., and Prof. Z. Michael Szaz, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., produced excellent studies on the international law aspect of the continued Soviet occupation of Hungary, a memorandum to President Johnson on American policy toward East Central Europe in general and Hungary in particular which was received by high-ranking State Department officials, and one on the abortion laws of Hungary. They testified in favor of making the burning of the American flag a Federal crime and are slated to testify before the House Foreign Affairs committee on East-West relations.

The work and quality of the organization which comprises the two American Hungarian fraternal organizations, many of the American Hungarian clubs, associations and churches with a membership exceeding 120,000, is led by Judge Albert A. Fiok, from Pittsburgh, Pa., as national president and the Right Reverend Bishop Dr. Zoltan Beky, chairman of the board.

Today, when many subversive and misled elements consider patriotism as obsolete, it is well to congratulate this organization which quotes on its seal the saying of the Hungarian-born hero of the American War of Independence, Colonel Nicolas de Kovats: "Loyal unto death," and which organization has shown its loyalty to this country and to the values which made America the land of the free.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. **HALPERN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TURMOIL IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. GETTY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **ADDABBO**. Mr. Speaker, as the turmoil and fighting in the Middle East continues, it is my prayer and hope that the tragic Arab-Israel war will be brought to the conference table before its proportions grow to the point where the peace and security of every nation in the world is endangered. We are committed to the integrity of the borders of the countries in the Middle East, a commitment which we must honor.

As doubts arose as to our position, I was sincerely pleased to hear the clarification of the word "neutral" as applied to our position. I believe that it is now crystal clear that, as used, it means that we are not a belligerent, but we have assured all parties concerned that we do not intend to betray our commitments.

Since its inception in 1948, Israel has been a stepchild of the United States. Her very beginning as a state was largely dependent on U.S. recognition, and in 20 years the moral bond between the Israel and American democracies has been reaffirmed by legal commitments made by four U.S. Presidents. If necessary, this country must defend Israel's territorial integrity.

But more bloodshed in the Middle East or victory by either side will not resolve the difficulties which have plagued that area of the world since Israel's birth and before. Nor will a stopgap cease-fire, although the shooting must stop before a permanent settlement can be pursued. The lamentable history of war in the Middle East will continue to repeat itself until a broad and lasting armistice, which would provide greater security for Israel, is attained.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that while this country meets its commitments to the Israel people it will also search, through every possible channel, for this lasting armistice. Indeed, the future of many countries and many peoples depends on that.

THE RISE OF A FARMWORKERS' UNION

Mr. **PATTEN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BURTON** of California. Mr. Speaker, the farmworkers of California have periodically banded together in a union, but each time their organization has been crushed by the overwhelming power of the big growers, aided by strikebreakers, injunctions, and the police. Another union has now been set up, this time with an excellent promise of not only surviving, but growing, even though it still lacks the protection of the National Labor Relations Act, which covers all other kinds of workers.

David F. Selvin, editor of San Francisco Labor, recently wrote an article on the AFL–CIO United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, for the American Federationist, the official AFL–CIO monthly magazine. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include this informative article in the RECORD:

THE RISE OF A FARM WORKERS UNION

(By David F. Selvin)

Once again, as they have so many times in their agonized past, California farm workers have a union of their own. They have sustained a strike for recognition and union rights deep into a second year. They have won path-breaking collective bargaining agreements. In one immeasurably significant victory, they have captured a major citadel in the growers' open shop. The future of their brave young union, given any decent measure of help, seems bright.

Other generations of farm workers have won their strikes and written union contracts. They have counted their members in tens of thousands and spanned great stretches of California's green and golden valleys. But their unions were shattered, their contracts torn up, their members scattered. Bitterly, inevitably, they were forced back into an unending competition of too many people for too few jobs, the low wages, the miserable housing, the school-less, doctor-less, near hopeless, grind of poverty.

Will it happen again? Is the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, in fact, the "effective and permanent union for agricultural workers" that the AFL–CIO Executive Council saw on the horizon a year ago? What are the odds that this union, unlike its countless predecessors, can survive the enmity of these wealthy and powerful employers?

A half century of failure argues against it. The casual, disorganized, uncertain labor market in agriculture multiplies the difficulties. The lack of legal sanctions for unionism in the fields strengthens the employers' stubborn, unchanging resistance. Employers show no signs of giving up the weapons of war they have wielded these many years: the strikebreakers, armed guards, influence with (or over) local authorities, arrests, injunctions. Poverty, chronic underemployment and migration, as they always have, withhold resources of money, political weight and manpower from the union.

On the other hand, the emergence of an almost totally domestic workforce and the drastic reduction of imported labor hold promise of more unionism rather than less. Relatively high levels of industrial employment help to reduce competition for jobs and toughen the farm workers' bargaining power. Rapidly developing mechanization of farm production should add still more strength, but it will also reduce job opportunities.

Beyond these factors, though, perhaps the strongest argument that unionism will extend its beachhead is in the record of these last 19 months. Few thought it was anything but another local dispute in September 1965, when the then Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee called a strike in the vineyards around Delano, in the southern end of California's great central valley. It was joined on strike soon after by the National Farm Workers Association.

AWOC was the remnant of an earlier AFL–CIO union drive. NFWA was more of a community organization, oriented more toward welfare than unionism. AWOC was largely Filipino in membership, NFWA largely Spanish-speaking. The former drew union support, the latter involved church and civil rights groups as well.

Still, this unlikely combination hung together and, somehow, saw the strike through its first winter. They survived the police bullying, the harassment of their pickets, the growers' strikebreaking efforts. They survived frequent days when the strike larder was low and the winds on the valley floor were cold and biting.

As spring came, the strikers began a march to Sacramento, the state capital some 300 miles to the north. It was a demonstration, a protest, a cry for help.

On Easter morning, on the capitol lawn, the few score who had set out a month before were multiplied a hundredfold and more. They came from every corner of the state and from every walk of life to give witness to the cause.

That morning they cheered the announcement that Schenley, second largest of the grape growers, had yielded and recognized the union. They heard, too, that the giant DiGiorgio Corporation, biggest of the growers, made a first, tentative but at that time unworkable offer for an election.

Today, these farm workers—organized now in the AFL–CIO United Farm Workers Organizing Committee—hold a contract at Schenley, a second at DiGiorgio, a third in the making at Christian Brothers. They are pressing their fight against other growers by picket and by boycott, with whatever leverage they can bring to bear. It is a beginning.

Perhaps the DiGiorgio contract—resolved by lengthy negotiations and final arbitration in April—is the pattern of the future. Little in it is new—except for farm workers. Little in it hasn't been duplicated often in union agreements—except for farm workers.

Its wages will make no farm worker wealthy or—considering the seasonal nature of the work—particularly comfortable, but they will make his lot substantially better.

It represents a breakthrough against a giant of an employer and one who had successfully turned back every effort to unionize its farmhands. In that sense, it marks a 30-year high and an important precedent.

Even more important in the long run, though, is almost surely to be the hiring hall, with the contract provisions surrounding it and the beginning it offers of welfare programs for the agricultural worker.

Basically, the hiring hall makes the union the first and major source of labor for DiGiorgio. Employes with the longest continuous service are given preference in filling vacancies and in sharing the available work. Seasonal layoffs will not break the continuity of service.

If farm work is ever to provide a decent, year-round living, it must offer job opportunity not merely at the seasonal peak but, somehow, for all or a large part of the year.

Farm work is not the first to face this necessity. Longshore work, for instance, was no less casual. Yet it has been decasualized and regularized to provide a decent living 12 months a year.

In much the same way, farm work could be decasualized as well. It would call for a central source of labor, working closely with farm placement services and growers over relatively large stretches of agricultural country in crops stretching around the calendar. A government agency could set it up. Growers could do it if they cooperated in their labor use as closely as they do in fighting unionism.

However organized, though, it would be neither complete nor fully effective without a union and collective bargaining. No other way offers equal protection for the workers' interests or as great a potential for winning participation, cooperation and support. The hiring hall is the key.

The union is a key, too, to the development of welfare services. Here, as in industry, pooled funds encompassing multi-employer units—the larger the better—offer the most efficient means of developing the necessary health and welfare services. They can go far beyond anything a single grower or even a group of growers could reasonably offer on their own.

The DiGiorgio contract makes a start by instructing the company to apply for unemployment insurance for its farmhands. It sets up a fund for health and welfare services, requiring a $25,000 company contribution to start and five cents an hour per worker from January 1, 1967. Starting April 3, 1968, the fund may be used, as the parties decide, for health and welfare benefits, life insurance or pensions. So, in these rudimentary beginnings, the way is pointed toward bringing the farm workers into the mainstream of the benefits that are almost universally a part of every other job.

But many barriers remain. The California farmer for a good hundred years has made an abundant supply of cheap labor a cornerstone of his economic credo. He has gone to unconscionable ends to guarantee it.

At the start, migratory harvest hands reaped the wheat that grew in the state's hot valleys. Once the crop was in, they departed and were forgotten. As specialized crops replaced the "bonanza" farms, the Chinese supplied the growing demand for labor. The anti-Chinese agitation drove them from the farms and their places were taken at first by the Japanese, then by the Filipinos and Hindustani, the Italians and Portuguese and Armenians and countless others.

Through it all, the grower was guided by two major requirements: that there be more men than jobs; that between crops he would accept no responsibility for his temporary, however essential, employes.

Then the Mexicans came. The Great Depression sent many of them back to their native land. Their places were filled by a flood of Arkies and Okies fleeing the dustbowls and depression of the Midwest and the Southwest. By the mid-30s, California's farm labor force was almost totally native. A keen and perceptive observer of "factories in the fields" saw this new domestic workforce as a promise of a new farm workers' unionism. But it was not to be.

The grower had always fought unionism at every turn, with every weapon he could command. Hundreds of strikes had swept across the fields and orchards. Some won higher pay and many were defeated. Some unions gained a foothold, hung on precariously for a time, then were trampled under. Unemployment, two men or more, it seemed, for every job, undermined the union's strength and made strikebreaking easy. Violence and vigilantes, hunger and want strengthened the growers' hand. Unionism clung in a few packing sheds and in the processing plants, but it was wiped out in the fields.

World War II drained agriculture of much of its workforce. An emergency program imported thousands of Mexican nationals to work the fields. The bottomless supply of labor, the grower-controlled contracts, the collaboration of government agencies all helped to stabilize wages. For most of the war, wages were held steady at about 1940 levels where they were not actually rolled back.

When the first wave of braceros was ended soon after the war, a new wave of "wetbacks" supplied the abundance of workers that broke the wage rates and prevented the farm worker from pushing ahead.

Then a second program of imported labor was undertaken under Public Law 78. Again, the growers were able to hold the line against wage increases and unionization. Finally, after several extensions and accompanied by the growers' wailing, Congress wiped out Public Law 78 on the last day of 1964. The growers seemed unable to believe that it was happening to them. They made virtually no preparations to replace the workers they were to lose.

In the five years between 1959 and 1964, contract foreign labor had supplied 26 percent of the state's seasonal man-year requirements—a great deal more in certain crops. In 1965, the proportion was cut back to less than 3 percent. Last year it was cut back even further—to less than 1 percent.

The number of domestic seasonal workers jumped from 105,000 to 120,000 between 1964 and 1966. A large part of the increase was among local workers.

There had been 10 recognized labor disputes in 1964, 57 in 1965. A partial count showed 466 domestic workers involved in strikes in 1964, 7,457 in 1965. Average hourly farm rates jumped from $1.35 an hour in mid-1964 to $1.54 in mid-1966.

This was the background against which, in September 1965, the grape pickers at Delano launched their strike. It set the stage for the next act, although in many ways it had already started.

Mechanization cut the workforce in cotton from 120.000 seasonal workers in 1949 to 25,000 in 1961. In 1964, the tomato harvester machine was in the final stages of development. In 1965, though, growers used 266 machines to harvest some 30,000 acres of canning tomatoes. The 1966 season saw about 800 machines harvest well over 100,000 acres. An acre of tomatoes required about two man-weeks of labor in 1965 and less than three-quarters in 1966.

Speeded by a special appropriation, the University of California is spurring an extensive research program to put technology to even wider use. About 80 projects are looking into such devices as a grape harvester that jars fruit off the vine and a lettuce planter that picks up one seed at a time. The projects involve some 20 crops, including such fragile and highly perishable ones as grapes, peaches, cantaloupes, as well as tomatoes and lettuce.

They often spend as much time adapting crops to the machines as in designing and testing the machines. They are exploring, in addition to the grape shaker and the precision lettuce planter, a tree-shaking and fruit-catching system for picking peaches, a tree-shaker to bring down prunes and olives, mechanical methods for moving human pickers up and down trees and through orchards.

The research program, too, is working on a "tight-fill" system of shaking fruit into packing boxes in place of the laborious hand method. Mobile packing plants and countless varieties of conveyors and loaders are moving into the fields. Almost no crop is without some experimenting, some development of mechanical aids.

The higher skills that these machines are likely to require, along with their greatly increased productivity, hold out a prospect of higher pay. Skill in itself is a prime source of bargaining strength, of course; organized, it is even more powerful. The onsweep of technology, however, also reduces the workforce and job opportunities and puts a premium on higher levels of education and technical competence. These can, of course, be turned to the service of the union and its members and that is a main face of the challenge.

The need for some human labor in the fields and orchards, especially in California, is more likely to remain for some time to come. Feed grains and cotton have proved particularly susceptible to mechanization, but vegetables and fruits are tougher crops to crack. California has a lion's share of these labor-intensive, specialized crops. But California growers are pushing mechanization hard even in these hard-to-mechanize crops. At best, they are bound to reduce the human labor needed to grow and harvest them; at worst, they will come close to eliminating it.

Beyond this, farms grow still larger. California had 7,000 fewer farms last year than the year before without a comparable fall in acreage. Manpower requirements are falling, even in the labor-intensive specialty crops which fell by a third between 1947 and 1965. Agricultural productivity mounts at a 5.5 percent annual rate.

A recent conference on farm labor yielded these predictions of things to come: ". . . the proportion of hired labor will rise while the total labor force will decline . . . farmworkers with improved training and skills will be in demand and . . . migratory labor will be reduced to a minimum with the growth of a regular labor force."

Thus, more and more, California agriculture takes on an industrial cast. Farm labor comes increasingly to resemble industrial labor and their problems increasingly coincide. Given some special requirements that are peculiar to agriculture, the gap between the two is nevertheless closing. As it does, the prospects of unionism brighten.

But mechanization and the changing structure of the workforce is only one major problem facing the farm worker and his union.

They suffer under liabilities imposed on no industrial worker, nor have they been for some 30 years. The farm worker is outside the unemployment insurance system. Only a small fringe of farm workers are covered by the minimum wage law. (The California law applies only to women and minors.) Similarly, he stands only on the edge of the social security system. In California, he has only recently been brought under the state disability insurance plan. A Senate subcommittee recently urged a re-examination and extension of workmen's compensation for farm workers.

Beyond this, the farm worker is penalized by low pay, aggravated by the seasonal and migratory nature of his work. He suffers in health care, housing, education for his children. He is compelled to live in slums and is denied an effective part in community life. He is exploited at every turn. Some tentative steps have been made in the direction of meeting his needs but they always seem too little and too tentative.

Most of all, the farm worker is denied the right given every industrial worker by law; the right to bargain collectively through a union of his own choosing. He is, in the main, excluded from the National Labor Relations Act. In the face of employer retribution, he has no appeal. In the face of employer resistance, he has no alternative but to strike. The DiGiorgio collective bargaining relationship was patched together largely by private parties—the representation election was conducted by arbitrators. It had no foundation in law, its sole official support the goodwill and informal intervention of friendly officials.

The upshot is that labor relations on the farm are more often conducted under the rules of jungle warfare than under the more civilized restraints of legal recognition and rational procedures. Such a setting is more appropriate to the longtime anti-union attitude of most California growers. It lends itself more readily to armed guards, police harassment, incitement to violence. It remains a high and craggy barrier to decent and democratic labor relations in the state's increasingly industrialized agriculture.

At bottom, the job of building a farm workers' union belongs to the farm worker himself. No one else has either the incentive or the opportunity to do the job or to do it as well. Yet, he is more urgently in need of the tools to do the job than any other American worker on the American scene today. The very poverty of his job, the almost total lack of legal protection, the almost complete denial of participation in the welfare aspects of this welfare society, the anachronistic anti-union attitudes of growers—all these put him in the disadvantaged position of the industrial workers of the early '30s and with even fewer resources.

If the farm workers' union is to survive in this unfriendly, even hostile clime, it will need a full measure of assistance. It will need money and organizers. It will need all the help it can muster to secure remedial legislation, to win an equal place in the state and national framework of rights and welfare. These last months since September 1965 have made it perfectly clear that, given this help, the farm worker is determined to make his union both permanent and effective.

Chavez on Unionism

"If the farm worker of America, especially the migrant, is to have any measure of his fair share of the good life, then he will have to struggle for it. In such a struggle, his greatest asset is himself and his fellow workers banded together in an organization dedicated to the mutual benefit and improvement of all.

"This is the definition of unionism. That is why the farm worker today is a unionist, devoted to the idea of unions and determined to make collective bargaining serve him and his family as it has served the best interests of workingman families for many years in this nation.

"Just as the strength of the worker is greater within a union, so is his union's strength greater within the family of American unions . . . the AFL–CIO. That is why the farm worker today is a unionist and an AFL–CIO unionist.

"Farm workers are determined to build a union of, by and for farm workers . . . one that can take its place with pride among the other unions in this great family and merit their support and respect in the process."—*Cesar Chavez, Director, United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.*

GIRARD P. CLARK RESIGNS AS HEAD OF OFFICE OF CONTRACT COMPLIANCE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, recently we learned in the press that the Department of Defense has placed the contract compliance program under the control of the Defense Contract Administration Service. The effect of this is to remove the war against racial discrimination in defense employment from civilian control and place it under military command. It is a move I personally view with concern and believe should be reversed.

More recently I have learned that the Office of Contract Compliance for the Western region has been ordered to move from San Francisco to Burlingame on July 1. Such a move, placing this office in an almost totally white suburb of poor accessibility to the urban workers who most need its services, is outrageous.

I have asked the Department of Defense to reconsider both these matters: The transfer of this function from civilian to military control and the physical transfer of the Office of Contract Compliance from San Francisco to Burlingame.

These actions by the Department of Defense have caused much consternation and drawn much criticism from concerned citizens in my district. The placement of the compliance program under military command has resulted in the resignation of the director of the program, Mr. Girard P. Clark.

This is regrettable, inasmuch as Mr. Clark has performed admirably in this position, and his effectiveness is generally recognized in the area. At this time I would like to enter his letter of resig-

nation into the RECORD, and also a column on this same subject by James A. Wechsler which appeared in the New York Post on June 5, 1967:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
CONTRACTS COMPLIANCE OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS D. MORRIS,
Assistant Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is written to further explain to you my reason for resigning from the Federal service. Were I in any way to blame for what I see happening to the Equal Employment Opportunity Program for Defense contractors, I would be content with a quiet and graceful exit. Since this not the case, I will be frank.

I am well aware of my transfer of function and retention rights guaranteed by the Civil Service Commission. I decided to leave because I could not bring myself to preside over the further erosion of this program. I regard what is happening to be a major betrayal of both the President and the minority group soldiers who are bearing such a disproportionate share of sacrifice in Vietnam. One day the Department of Defense will be made answerable to both, and I refuse to be part of the team responsible for that betrayal.

During the past four years I have developed and operated the largest, toughest and most productive contract compliance programs in government and I have no regrets. Under Navy I had the full cooperation, encouragement and support of my superiors. Three times during that period I took part in successful campaigns to block consolidation of the four Defense programs because I foresaw the results of such a merger.

When the consolidation finally developed, I had a choice between operating the kind of low key program that would not disturb Defense or running the kind of aggressive program I had run at Navy. In the fortunate absence of any kind of policy direction from your office, I chose the latter course.

I submit that there are only two measures of the success of my program, neither of which were used or even touched upon by the management study you used as a vehicle to restrict the program and divest yourself of responsibility in the area. They are: the statistical gains of minority group people employed by Defense contractors and the endorsement and support of minority group leaders interested and involved in the Equal Employment Opportunity aspect of Civil Rights.

Attached to this communication is a suggested statistical sampling which would be useful only if you should have any interest in verifying the accuracy of my claims. Part I suggests a comparison of Navy contractors with comparable non-Navy Defense contractors based on the 1966 submission of Standard Forms 100. Part II invites a comparison between certain non-Navy Defense contractors before and after they were treated to my brand of program, based on their 1966 and 1967 SF-100 submissions. I challenge you to make these comparisons.

As for the second yardstick, I imagine you have become aware in the past few months of the high degree of support and respect I enjoy among the leadership of the Negro, Mexican-American, American Indian and Jewish communities.

When you brought my program to a standstill on February 20, 1967, you ended the President's last chance to implement a substantial part of Great Society Program under a war-time economy. While many Defense contractors, I know, applauded your action, and some may have even influenced it, the over-protective staff of the President kept the facts from his ears even as word was prevented from reaching Secretary McNamara.

By this same action, and the raw and relentless power of the Defense Department which was exhibited, you cracked and crushed the thin veneer of aggressiveness previously displayed by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance which is supposed to exert policy control over the government-wide programs. The OFCC, in its confusion and trepidation, failed to apprise the Secretary of Labor of the true implications of your actions. It is now apparent that the force and direction of the OFCC since early 1966 were predicated primarily on the actions of my program prior to its suppression.

Your subsequent move, contrary to all of the pledges and pronouncements emanating from your office, to turn over my people not only to military control, but to the control of the hardware merchants who are largely concerned with attaining an industrial sinecure after retirement firmly sealed the fate of the program.

While Defense has lost and will continue to lose several of the outstanding people in the program, enough will remain, in spite of all that is being done, to insure a relatively better contract compliance program than all but a few of the other contracting agencies and certainly a better Equal Opportunity Program than any your office has permitted to be developed in the military or civilian fields.

I have remained at my post for over three months since you ordered the program paralyzed. Now, with all hope for a reversal clearly exhausted and the ultimate fate of the program clearly in sight, I must depart. I am not leaving your program; rather you have left my program and those of us who were committed and dedicated to its success.

Sincerely,

GIRARD P. CLARK,
Director.

POTOMAC COUP

(By James A. Wechsler)

A long, undercover struggle for control of the war against discrimination in defense employment has ended in a triumph for military rule—and a disastrous defeat for the equal-opportunity movement.

A hitherto unpublicized directive signed many weeks ago by Deputy Defense Secretary Cyrus Vance and scheduled to take effect on July 1, places the civilian-dominated contract compliance offices under the command of the Defense Contract Administration Service.

The unmistakable impact of the move is to give regional military potentates dominance over civilians in regional offices throughout the nation who have been waging a serious if far from wholly successful fight to obtain corporate compliance with executive orders of the federal government.

Details of the shift are camouflaged to some degree in bureaucratic gobbledygook but men in and out of government concerned with the anti-discrimination effort view the decree as a crucial turning point.

In concrete terms the new setup means that in key defense areas throughout the nation colonels and other brass whose primary concern is "production at any price"—and whose passion for equal opportunity programs is rarely intense—will now have large new authority to soft-pedal the anti-discrimination effort. Many of these officers have long been apathetic to prejudiced practices in the employment offices of the multi-billion dollar defense contractors; too often such men are grooming themselves for places in the industries with which they are doing business for the government.

The independent operations of spirited men in the Defense Dept.'s Equal Opportunity programs was the major counterweight on the side of fair hiring and corporate compliance. They are now destined to become subordinates to military figures who administer the contracts and procurement policies of Defense and are unlikely to welcome critical scrutiny of their labors.

Actually the order climaxes a long, internecine conflict; the casualties are unheralded men like Girard Clark, who long led the Navy's EEO drive and was widely recognized for tenacity and dedication above and beyond routine calls of duty. In the reorganization process that began some months ago, his services have been gradually reduced and now terminated.

No doubt there will be others down the line who become expendable as the military takeover is executed.

The deterioration in fair employment procedures has been discernible for many months. Richard Clark, who runs the Hallmark Employment Agency here and has devoted himself to Negro employment breakthroughs, reports that there has been "a feeling for many months that the heat is off." Some defense contractors in flagrant defiance of federal policy have been unmolested, and their immunity has emboldened others, he says.

In part, the changed climate may be the predictable result of the deepening pressures of the Vietnam war; in part it may be ascribed to the "backlash" atmosphere. The danger is that these regressions will be given new stimulus by the formal emergence of military supremacy in the contract compliance field.

With the preoccupation created by the Middle Eastern crisis, there may be further disposition to brush off the questions stirred by these retreats at home. But no military considerations justify the surrender. During global World War II the first great advances in the battle against discriminatory hiring were registered—under the prodding of A. Philip Randolph. This is hardly a moment to sound retreat.

The story has been buried too long. But as word of the Vance order spreads, there remains the chance that a storm sufficient to halt this process will blow up before the July 1 deadline. Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the NAACP, said he was unaware of the shift when I first reached him; soon thereafter he reported that independent inquiry had confirmed the story and he commented:

"This is a further example of the administrative nullification of civil rights laws and federal executive orders. The NAACP has filed many complaints against private companies operating with billion-dollar contracts from the Defense Dept. Even though there have been interminable delays and awkward administrative procedures, it was possible to achieve some relief for aggrieved workers.

"Now it appears that even the limited machinery that existed in the past is to be severely crippled by turning over enforcement responsibilities to those often responsible for the discriminatory patterns. The NAACP will make the sharpest protest and every effort to transform this into a major national issue."

It is late in the day, but it may not be too late for Defense Secretary McNamara to take a long look at the nature of the coup staged in his bailiwick amid the distractions of war and crisis. The new order professes to assure "improved direction" of the contract compliance program. It is in fact a capitulation to military mindlessness and ancient industrial custom.

REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the kindest word that can be used to characterize the District of Columbia government structure is the word "anomaly." I choose that word because the District of Columbia government is certainly out of keeping with the notions of fitness and order that prevail in our Nation. I refer to the District residents' lack of voice in their own government and especially to their lack of representation in the National Congress.

This Nation was founded on the declaration that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. "No taxation without representation," was the rallying cry of our fighting forefathers. The Constitution of the United States opens with the enacting sentence that—

> We, the People of the United States . . . do ordain and establish this Constitution.

Participation and control by the people of their governments is clearly the basic premise of our Nation.

Yet the citizens of the District do not elect and do not have, by any process, any representative, or any voice whatever, in the Congress—neither a Member of the House, or of the Senate. This omission was never voted or decided upon in any formal action. Apparently it was a historical accident.

The U.S. Constitution adopted in 1787 provided that House Members should be chosen by people of the several States and should be inhabitants of the States choosing them, and that the Senate should be composed of two Senators from each State. At that date these provisions included all citizens resident in the United States. Three years later, however, when Congress accepted the cession of 10 square miles from Maryland and Virginia for the seat of the Federal Government, that area ceased being part of any State and its inhabitants, as an almost casual incident thereto, lost their right to vote for U.S. Representatives and Senators.

At that time there were few people in the District and this loss did not seem very important. Georgetown had been incorporated previously and had its own city government. The city of Washington was incorporated by Congress in 1802 with its own city council and with increasing authority to elect the council and city officials being granted in 1812, 1820, 1848, and 1867. Alexandria was, of course, an old town with its own government and succeeded in 1846 in getting the area across the Potomac River retroceded to Virginia. With the Nation itself in infancy, voting for Congressmen was hardly of monumental importance.

Since then times have changed, to put it mildly. The Nation has grown from 13 to 50 States. The size of our population, our national business, and the complexity of our affairs have increased immeasurably. And the District of Columbia has grown likewise. The 1960 census gives the District of Columbia population as 763,976 persons. It has more people than 11 of our States. Each of those States has, of course, two Senators and one or two Members in the House of Representatives. These are the statistics:

State	1960 population	Estimated 1968 voting age population	Number of Congressmen	Senators
Alaska	226, 167	151, 000	1	2
Delaware	446, 292	306, 000	1	2
Hawaii	632, 772	421, 000	2	2
Idaho	667, 191	404, 000	2	2
Montana	674, 767	412, 000	2	2
Nevada	285, 278	285, 000	1	2
New Hampshire	606, 921	418, 000	2	2
North Dakota	632, 446	370, 000	2	2
South Dakota	680, 514	408, 000	2	2
Vermont	389, 881	244, 000	1	2
Wyoming	330, 066	202, 000	1	2
District	763, 976	515, 000	0	0

These population figures reveal the significant inequity that has developed. Six States with less population have two Congressmen each and five have one each—in great contrast to the District's zero. It is almost unbelievable.

A comparison with my own State may be clarifying. Milwaukee and Milwaukee County are only slightly more populous than Washington, D.C. Yet they have two Congressmen and Washington has none. Coming closer home, Washington has almost twice as many residents as my own congressional district, but is not allowed to have any congressional elections, a process which we consider essential to democracy.

It would be a mistake to assume that the District's residents are "nobodys" and thus not deserving the vote, or unable to cast an intelligent vote. In the first place, such an assumption runs contrary to our national philosophy favoring one vote per person. In the second place, such an assumption is decidedly inaccurate in the economic sense, for the people living in the District of Columbia have the highest per capita income of any State in the Nation, yes, even higher than that of my own great State. Including all kinds of personal income—wages, proprietal profits, dividends, interest, rents, and so forth—the District of Columbia residents average $3,708 per year. Connecticut is next with $3,401 and Delaware next with $3,392 per year. This gives a total individual income for District residents of $2,832,823,008 per year.

It is clear from such figures that District of Columbia residents pay substantial amounts in Federal income taxes, social security taxes, and all forms of revenue for the Federal Government. Yet they have no voice in the decisions of the Congress on how much they or we should be taxed or on how the Government should spend it.

District citizens are as much concerned with the welfare and progress of this country as the citizens of any State. They are as concerned as we with the foreign policy of our Nation. Their sons as well as ours are called to the Armed Forces and their mortality rate is as high as ours. They, too, are interested in the Nation's social security policies, in the promotion of interstate commerce, the soundness of the economy, the conservation of natural resources, the problems of crime and juvenile delinquency, and the challenge of urban areas, school development, and the inner city. The Congress has just established a new Department on Housing and Urban Development. Ironically, the ninth largest city in the Nation was barred from participating through a representative in the debate and vote on that issue.

It is time for the Nation to act now to correct the accident of history which led to this inequity. In fact, it is overdue.

Both of the political parties of the District have informed the Members of the House that they support a proposal to amend the U.S. Constitution to provide that the citizens of the District may elect every 2 years a regular Member of the House of Representatives and may also elect such additional Representatives and/or Senators as the Congress may subsequently provide, up to the number the District would have if it were a State. The President of the United States has recommended such a proposal. I understand that all District organizations interested in political affairs support it. I believe it is incumbent upon us to hear their petitions and give them an affirmative answer.

I am convinced this lack of representation must be remedied, and I am introducing today a House joint resolution incorporating the above provisions, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The people of the District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall elect at least one Representative in Congress and, as may be provided by law, one or more additional Representatives or Senators, or both, up to the number to which the District would be entitled if it were a State.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 3. This article shall have no effect on the provision made in the twenty-third article of amendment to the Constitution for determining the number of electors for President and Vice President to be appointed for the District."

A BILL TO EXTEND THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions until 1972.

Present law provides for the allotment of funds to strengthen State services for older people, and enables States to make grants to governmental agencies and nonprofit organizations serving older persons. Further provisions authorize direct financial support through grants and contracts to develop new and better methods and facilities for taking care of our older citizens.

The importance of this proposal is obvious. We must extend and improve these all-important services in order to provide for the well-being of America's older citizens.

The bill provides for the extension of the grant provisions under the Older Americans Act through 1972, and provides an increase in the funding levels above those authorized under the present act. The proposed appropriations levels would total $10,550,000 for the State grants program, and $6,400,000 for the research, demonstration, and training grants for fiscal year 1968. The act would authorize further funds as may be necessary to carry out the programs for the subsequent 4 years.

The expected effects of the bill are in themselves reasons to strongly support it. Extending the provisions of the act and increasing funding levels will, first, provide for the continuation of already existing projects; second, permit States to fund about 240 to 300 new projects; third, provide for the continuation of research, demonstration and training projects; and, fourth, permit the funding of many additional projects.

For these reasons Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to sponsor this bill and I strongly urge its enactment.

CULVER INTRODUCES DAIRY IMPORT LEGISLATION

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Culver] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of American agriculture as a whole, the United States must be extremely cautious about the restrictions we place on the flow of agricultural products into this Nation.

We have made a major step forward in insuring American access to foreign markets in the agricultural concessions of the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations just completed in Geneva, and it would accomplish little if we take protectionist action at home which would halt the momentum toward freer world markets.

However, the inordinate increase in dairy products coming into the country, in evasion of the existing quota system, necessitates action in the interests of both American producers and consumers, and I am therefore introducing today legislation to revise the system of regulating dairy imports.

This legislation is designed to insure an adequate fluid milk supply, to maintain stable dairy prices, and to promote for the dairy producer in this country an adequate return on his investment.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of this legislation has become necessary because of the consistent and expanding circumvention by importers of existing regulations under Executive order as authorized by section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act.

Since 1953, when this authority was first invoked, dairy imports have risen 567 percent according to Department of Agriculture estimates. In one year alone, from 1965 to 1966, these imports increased by 433 percent.

Such increases have been possible because the existing dairy import quotas are easily evaded by making minor changes in the content of the products imported.

I would like to commend the Secretary of Agriculture for his prompt action in recommending to the Tariff Commission under section 22 stricter restrictions on Colby cheese and Junex, the sugar-butterfat mixture which was contrived to get around earlier restrictions, as soon as it became apparent that these imports were interfering with the domestic price-support program.

However, the necessarily slow process through which these recommendations are now being considered indicates the need for a regulatory system which is more responsive to the needs of the time. Further, even if the Tariff Commission does agree to set limits on these two products, it would be a fairly simple matter for foreign importers to so reconstitute their products that imports could be continued under a slightly different form.

The legislation I am introducing would overcome this problem by establishing a general quota on all dairy products, instead of depending on specific restrictions on a particular item.

It would not close American markets to foreign producers, but would in fact establish a quota in the amount equivalent to the 1961–65 average of imports. And it would insure that foreign producers would share in the expansion of American markets by providing for proportionate quota increases according to the growth of domestic consumption of dairy products.

Furthermore, it would give the President the power to authorize additional imports, above established quotas, if it is in the national interest to do so, thus providing the flexibility necessary in the overall foreign trade picture.

Mr. Speaker, as I have already indicated, this legislation is important equally for dairy producers and for consumers.

Increasing imports can destroy the balance between supply and demand with resulting lower prices for dairy farmers. As a consequence, more and more dairy farmers would be forced out of the business.

The long-range implications for the consumers are critical. Because the domestic supply of fluid milk, which is an irreplaceable staple in the American diet, will not be able to meet demands, and fluid milk is too perishable to be imported.

The primary objective of the Government's role in agriculture must be to help stabilize prices according to the realities of supply and demand, and thereby to prevent the boom-bust cycle of agricultural economics which benefits neither producer, consumer, nor importer.

The legislation I am introducing today is directed toward that objective.

It is not a protectionist measure. It does not make any fundamental change in the policy of this country over the past 14 years with regard to dairy imports.

It can help bring some order and stability to the situation.

In this sense, it is valuable for both domestic and foreign producers, because it will establish a known level of imports to which the market can adjust, and on the basis of which American dairy farmers and non-American importers alike can make sound plans for the future.

A BILL PROVIDING FOR THE RETURN TO THE STATES OF ONE-HALF OF FEDERAL TAXES COLLECTED ON ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AND TOBACCO SOLD WITHIN THE STATES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am seeking the support of all my colleagues for the Federal tax-sharing bill I introduced yesterday. This bill provides for the return to the States of an amount which is equal to one-half of the Federal taxes collected on alcoholic beverages and tobacco products sold within the States.

This measure represents one of many Federal tax-sharing proposals which are currently before the Congress to provide some measure of Federal financial assistance to our needy State and local governing bodies.

Many of the bills introduced thus far during the 90th Congress would rebate a certain percentage of Federal income tax collections to the States. Included in these is another measure which I introduced early in this session—H.R. 3127—which makes provision for the return of 3 percent of Federal individual income tax collections to the States from which they are collected.

This bill takes a little different approach than most of the other tax-sharing measures introduced this year in that it would rebate a portion of the taxes collected by the Federal Government on alcoholic beverages and tobacco products sold within the States.

According to very recent data published by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, during the calendar year 1966 the Federal Government collected $3.9 billion in alcohol taxes and $2.1 billion from levies imposed on tobacco products, or a total of $6 billion in revenues from these sources. Under terms of this bill, one-half of this amount—or $3 billion—

would be rebated to the States with the distribution by State determined on the basis of the sales of these products within the individual States.

Senator Richard Stone, of the Florida State Legislature, has already introduced Senate Memorial Bill No. 73 petitioning the Congress to enact such legislation. And I want at this time to commend Senator Stone for his leadership in sponsoring this legislation. The Senate of Florida, realizing the critical need of the States for additional revenue sources, fully supports him in his efforts to secure this assistance.

I realize that the war in Vietnam must have primary claim upon our national purse strings and that our fighting men must have all the financial support that is required to bring this conflict to a successful conclusion. However, I am hopeful that by the time thoughtful consideration is given to Federal tax sharing as a means of assisting State and local governments and action is taken on this proposal, that the situation in Southeast Asia will have eased and will make such assistance possible.

The fiscal dilemma facing State and local governments is well known to all of us, I am sure. Much of their difficulty has arisen from a rapid population growth which has greatly accelerated the need for additional schools, hospitals, transportation facilities, health and welfare services. Especially is the need urgent in my own State of Florida which is one of the fastest growing States in the Union. From 1960 to 1965 it experienced an average annual population increase of 3 percent—which increase was exceeded only by Arizona and California among the other 50 States.

The financial difficulties of State and local governments are further aggravated by the fact that the Federal Government, to a large extent, has appropriated the most lucrative revenue source—the income tax. Since such high rates are levied by our National Government on the incomes of individuals and corporations, State and local governments have found it necessary to depend principally upon sales and property taxes to pay for their programs. And while Federal income tax receipts are highly sensitive to changes in overall economic conditions, and have expanded rapidly during the economic upswing we have experienced during the past few years, State and local tax revenues have increased only moderately.

Hence, it is only fair that the Federal Government return to the States a portion of the gains it has reaped during this period of economic expansion.

State legislatures, in an effort to meet their growing obligations, have been very active during the past few years in levying new taxes or increasing existing ones. Some indication of this activity may be derived from the following information reported by the Federation of Tax Administrators for the period from 1959 through 1966:

> In the eight legislative years from 1959 through 1966, every State but one raised rates or adopted a new levy in at least one of six major tax fields: sales taxes, personal income taxes, corporate income taxes, motor fuel taxes, cigarette taxes and alcoholic beverage taxes. Many States increased the rates of one or more of these taxes several times. In total, in the eight-year span, there were 230 tax rate increases and 19 new tax adoptions.

Many State authorities now feel that the saturation point has just about been reached in levying additional taxes, and any further increases will be firmly resisted by their citizens. Hence, they are looking to other alternative means which will help them to solve their financial difficulties. Federal tax sharing will offer some measure of relief to these needy governing bodies.

The return to the States of 50 percent of the Federal tax revenues derived from levies on alcoholic beverages and tobacco products with few or no strings attached will enable these governments to determine those programs which merit the highest priority and to make the wisest allocation of these funds which will be in the best interest of their citizens. Enactment of such a proposal will eliminate a great deal of unnecessary and costly redtape at the Federal as well as at the State level. It will also free the States from burdensome Federal controls which are now imposed in the administration of many existing Federal grants-in-aid.

Enactment of this bill will bring us one step closer toward achieving our goal of a "creative federalism" whereby a real working partnership between all levels of government—Federal, State, and local—will be realized. I, therefore, urge your thoughtful consideration and approval of this measure.

PRESCHOOL CENTERS SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to tht request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Headstart program has proven to be one of the most successful and popular aspects of the war on poverty. The program has shown that impressive results can be achieved by providing preschool education for 3- to 5-year-olds.

Not all young children receive the benefits of the Headstart program. As a part of the Economic Opportunity Act it is limited, quite properly, to children from low-income families.

Many children not eligible for Headstart, however, spend the day in public and private nonprofit child day care centers, which in some respects are similar to Headstart centers. The major difference is that Headstart provides educational services, while most day care centers are limited to custodial care. Many day care centers, which serve the children of mothers working to supplement moderate family incomes, do not have the resources to provide learning experiences.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentlelady from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink], has recently introduced legislation which would extend the benefits of Headstart to children enrolled in day care centers. Her bill, the proposed Preschool Centers Supplementary Education Act, would help insure that these children will have an educational program with adequate books, equipment, and trained teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join our colleague in sponsorship of this legislation and I should like to congratulate her for her leadership in this effort. I hope the House will give favorable consideration to Mrs. Mink's bill.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO PERMIT PERSONS ENGAGED IN THE REALTY AND HOMEBUILDING BUSINESS TO EARMARK REALTY AS ACQUIRED FOR INVESTMENT PURPOSES AND THEREAFTER DISPOSE OF SUCH PROPERTY AS A CAPITAL ASSET

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Herlong] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill the purpose of which is to permit persons engaged in the realty and homebuilding business to earmark realty as acquired for investment purposes and thereafter dispose of such property as a capital asset.

The courts have generally precluded homebuilders from capital gains treatment on realty even under circumstances where the property involved was purchased and sold in an unimproved state. There is no settled basis whereby homebuilders can make genuine investments in realty which will be held for an extended period of time and thereafter disposed of in the same manner as any other capital investment.

The effect of this bill is to remove the existing uncertainty and create express statutory rules which, if satisfied, will permit an electing homebuilder to make genuine investments in realty and thereafter dispose of such property with the clear assurance of taxation on the gain thereof as a capital gain. Section 1260 would provide that in the case of a dealer in real property, the gain derived from the sale of certain property could, at his election, qualify for capital gains treatment as gain derived from the sale or exchange of a capital asset or real property used in a trade or business, as the case may be.

Adequate safeguards are provided in the proposal in order to insure that the provisions of this section would be applicable only to realty which was held for investment purposes. The category of real property which would qualify under this proposal is limited to property which has been held by the taxpayer for more than 18 months, on which no substantial improvement was made during the holding period, and as to which the taxpayer, within 30 days of acquisition, clearly identifies such property as real property held for investment. The manner of identification shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

DR. JOHN RETTALIATA FINDS STUDENT QUALITY RISING

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Annunzio] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of our country are filled with headlines and stories about student demonstrations, about flag burning and draft-card burning in which young people are involved, and about general disruption of the orderly processes of our society by students expressing their objections and dissatisfactions. So much is heard about be-in's, sit-in's, psychedelic parties, and students being "turned on" with LSD.

Yet, only 5 percent of our student body are actually involved in these activities, and unfortunately, so little is heard about the other 95 percent of our young people who are occupied with constructive endeavors and who are accomplishing many wonderful things.

It was refreshing, therefore, to read in today's Chicago Tribune the interview with Dr. John T. Rettaliata, president of the Illinois Institute of Technology, located in Chicago, Ill., who feels that student quality is rising and outlines the achievements of the students attending his school.

The young people at IIT work harder because 140 credit hours are needed to graduate, rather than the usual 120, drinking is not allowed on campus, and dormitory visitation privileges are not permitted. The students are earnest in their desire to secure a good education and work hard to excel in their chosen field. Little time is left for disruptive and wasteful activities.

Dr. Rettaliata, who holds bachelor of engineering and doctorate of engineering degrees from Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Md., is to be congratulated for his courage in enforcing regulations on campus which are in the best interests of the entire student body. It is due in good measure to Dr. Rettaliata's inspired leadership that IIT has risen to the forefront of technical institutions in the United States.

In addition to his administrative achievements, Dr. Rettaliata is a published author and has written several technical books and articles relative to the field of engineering. He holds several honorary degrees, including an LL.D. from DePaul University, and has been associated with IIT since 1945, first as director of the department of mechanical engineering and then as dean of engineering. Dr. Rettaliata became vice president of the institute in 1950, and served in this post until 1952, at which time he assumed the office of president.

It is my pleasure to insert in the Congressional Record the interview with Dr. Rettaliata, which follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 6, 1967]

RETTALIATA FINDS STUDENT QUALITY RISING

Q.—Dr. Rettaliata, how have the spectacular advances in technology in the last decade affected I. I. T.?

A.—More than other types of institutions, I. I. T. obviously must keep up with technological changes. One example is the computer. We were one of the first in the Chicago area to use a computer. We have one of the largest computer operations in the country, if you include our research as well as educational facilities. We require all our students to take a course in computing because they will be exposed to computers beyond their college period.

Q.—Are you turning out students who are too specialized in one narrow field?

DANGER IS RECOGNIZED

A.—No, I don't think so. There was a danger of that some years ago. But particularly in engineering education, this danger has been recognized and the program broadened. We have made the technological part much more fundamental and less specialized. We require 20 per cent of the program in the humanities. We think our engineers have a fairly broad background in the humanities. There is a need for specialization, but it should be done in graduate work, not undergraduate.

Q.—How has the quality of your students changed in the last 10 years?

A.—I am confident it has improved. In fact, I would be reluctant to try to get into college today myself. I don't know that I could be admitted to this institution, which is a tough one. In our last freshman classes, about 50 per cent were in the upper 10 per cent of their high school graduating class. About 80 per cent were in the upper quarter. Almost 100 per cent were in the upper half.

COULD THAT NARROW?

Q.—Because of the increasing numbers of young people who want to get into top rated institutions, do you think the day will come when I. I. T. will take students who are only in the upper 10 per cent of their high school classes?

A.—I don't think we would want to do that. If students were associating with colleagues who were only in that top echelon, I don't think they would turn out as well-rounded graduates as if they associated with people with a broader spectrum of backgrounds.

Q.—Can you cite some specific ways in which students have changed over the last decade?

TAKE STUDIES SERIOUSLY

A.—Academically, students who get into an institution like I. I. T. are better prepared. They take their studies more seriously. But other students get the headlines today—students who are demonstrating. They're probably only 5 per cent of the student body, but they get the recognition.

In that respect, times have changed since I was in college. We didn't think it was our right to tell the administration how to run the institution. We didn't think it was our right to demonstrate any time we felt something was being done that we didn't approve or understand. There seems to be the tendency to get groups together and put on demonstrations and disrupt orderly processes. I don't think this is the way it should be done. I'm entirely in sympathy with free speech, but some people have gone beyond the realm of good taste. I hope that is corrected.

Q.—Why aren't there student demonstrations at a technological institution such as I. I. T.?

WORK LOAD TOUGHER

A.—You will not find as many at an institution like this as you would in a large university with many more disciplines. One reason could be that in a technological institution, a student needs 140 semester credit hours in four years to graduate. In a liberal arts college, he needs only 120 hours, so he has more time on his hands. He doesn't have afternoon laboratories, which take up much of his time. We probably just work the average student here harder. He doesn't have as much time to devote to these other activities.

Q.—Do you think its mandatory for a student in a technical field to go on to graduate school?

A.—It's becoming more that way. Engineering claims to be a profession. Other professions do not stop at the bachelor's degree. If a scientist wants to do anything important in physics or chemistry, for example, he gets a doctor's degree. The day when the bachelor's degree is the badge of admission into the engineering profession is disappearing. Ultimately, engineering will require a doctor's degree like other professions.

JOB'S NEVER DONE

Q.—Because of the continuing explosion of knowledge, will a student graduating from I. I. T. this year have to reeducate himself in a decade or two from now?

A.—That's an excellent point. It's one we have given much consideration. We call it continuing education. A student graduating today is well founded in newer developments—computers and solid state physics. He can be more useful to a company as a new employe than a man who has been with the company for 10 or 15 years. Unless he has kept in touch thru continuing education, the older employe does not know what is going on as much as this young man.

This has caused a problem in some industries. The young man starts at a higher salary than the older man because of the lapse of time. But he really is more valuable to the company because of his greater knowledge of newer developments. But this young man will be out of date in 10 years unless he makes a determined effort to keep up. The companies recognize this and we are making a determined effort to help. Various companies—the most notable example is the Bell system—send employes from all over the country to live on campus here six months. They take formal courses, then go back to their jobs. Then another group comes on campus for six months. It's primarily in electrical engineering and electronics that we are conducting these courses.

INDIVIDUALITY AN ISSUE

Q.—Some young people want to steer away from careers in large businesses because they fear they might lose their individuality. Do these fears have any grounds?

A.—Not in my opinion. Some students actually believe that the business world does not give them an opportunity to develop themselves as fully as they could in other fields. But I think many of them are mistaken. There's just as much opportunity for human development in many ways in business as in other endeavors.

Q.—To use a current phrase, you think that business is "where the action is"?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What do you think troubles students the most these days?

SOME ARE FRUSTRATED

A.—They feel that they should have more freedom. They want visitation privileges in dormitories. Altho some colleges have permitted this, we have not. I'm not convinced it's a wise thing to do. They want drinking privileges, but we do not permit drinking on this campus. We're having pressure for it. So many students are frustrated. The draft situation has bothered many of them. Enrollment in our undergraduate school is higher because of the draft situation.

PETROLEUM'S UNIQUE CONTRIBUTIONS TO OUR NATIONAL LIFE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, the importance of petroleum to the economy and well-being of the United States is common knowledge. Oil and natural gas now provide three-quarters of our energy requirements; they will continue to furnish the major portion of our rapidly expanding demand for energy in the foreseeable future.

A series of articles by Royal H. Plenty, which appeared recently in the Philadelphia Inquirer, highlights the petroleum industry's unique contributions to our national life and, at the same time, outlines a number of the problems that oilmen face in meeting the world's increasing requirements for petroleum.

Under unanimous consent, I would like to insert these timely and informative articles in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

[From Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, April 23, 1967]

THE PETROLEUM CRISIS—UNITED STATES FACES DEARTH OF OIL SUPPLIES BY 1980, EXPERTS SAY

(By Royal H. Plenty)

We are begging a $100 billion question.

Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall has recently estimated that the U.S. will consume more oil and natural gas in the next 14 years than we have used in all the 107 years that the oil industry has been in existence.

This means we'll use 78 billion barrels of oil and 283 trillion cubic feet of gas between now and 1980. A barrel holds 42 gallons.

But where's it all coming from?

We have only 31 billion barrels of known oil reserves and the rate of discovery has been slowing in recent years. In the last decade we have discovered an average of only 2.7 billion additional barrels a year. Thus, even if we continue to import a billion barrels a year, we could be just about out of domestic crude oil by 1980.

"As a nation," Robert O. Anderson, board chairman of Atlantic Richfield Co., warns, "we must recognize that we are approaching a crossroad in our energy supplies, and decide whether or not we can drift into growing dependence on foreign sources or take a strong and immediate stand on self-sufficiency."

And demand for oil is growing even more rapidly abroad. The industry will have to double its world-wide capacity by 1980.

OUTLAY OF $150 BILLION NEEDED

Anderson, speaking before the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School Alumni Society last fall, put the growth and capital problems of the oil industry into focus.

"I would like to point out," he said, "that the monetary requirements to meet present forecasts of world demands through 1980 would require an estimated $150 to $200 billions of new capital funds."

These billions would be in addition to the billions that the oil companies will supply from retained earnings, depreciation and other internal sources.

Anderson pointed out that it's "no small task" to double within 12 to 15 years an industry of the magnitude of the petroleum industry, but he warned, "It must be done if the Free World is to continue to grow."

The stakes are high—much more than the billions of dollars that have already been invested by American oil companies and the billions more that will be invested.

For one thing, our national defense is involved, both from a military and an economic standpoint, as is that of the other nations of the Free World. There are many aspects of the problem that portend international economic blackmail.

Our international balance of payments is also involved. We must pay out dollars when we buy oil or invest in foreign oil facilities, and we receive a mounting flow of funds from our foreign oil investments.

NATION'S ECONOMY AT STAKE

Our domestic economic health and welfare is involved. The motorists, who spend $18 billion a year for gasoline, the truckers, the bus companies and the railroads that buy diesel oil and all the millions of users of other petroleum products are involved since one possible repercussion is higher prices.

The two million people who work directly or indirectly in the U.S. oil industry also have a stake.

The economic well-being of regions hinges on the actions—and lack of action—in the crisis.

Broad policies involving pollution and our over-all future energy needs also will affect and be affected by the course we take.

In a recent interview, Anderson summed up the Nation's crude oil supply problem this way:

The U.S. consumed 12 million barrels of petroleum products a day in 1966.

Of this amount 9.5 million barrels a day came from domestic supplies with the remainder being made up of imports.

By 1980 the U.S. demand will be about 17 million barrels a day.

It does not appear that the U.S. will be able to produce more than 115 million barrels a day, if technology advances are similar to those in the past and crude oil prices parallel the price trends of our total economy.

Thus, by 1980, we will still have at least a 5.5-million-barrel-a-day gap to be supplied from alternate sources.

How can this gap be filled?

Anderson does not believe it would be wise to become overly dependent on imported oil.

He pointed to the major share in oil production being carried by the Middle East and warned that "the consuming countries of the world cannot permit themselves to become too heavily dependent upon any one country or area for the bulk of their energy."

Quite aside from the dangers of depending too much on foreign oil, Anderson believes we have a much more basic problem in the adverse effects of oil imports on our balance of payments.

"Historically," he said, "every nation of the world except the U.S. has recognized the principle that it can ill afford to purchase abroad a service or commodity that it can reasonably duplicate at home."

Anderson said that "fortunately" there were three major alternative sources of liquid hydrocarbons in North American, each of which "compares favorably with the reserves of the Middle East." These are the oil shale deposits of the Western U.S., our bituminous coal reserves "which can be hydrogenated" to produce gas or liquids, and the tar sand deposits of Northern Alberta, Canada.

But even these, he warned, may not be ready in time to fill the gap envisioned by 1980.

"Unfortunately," he said, "we are probably looking at a minimum of 10 to 15 years to put any one of the three into a significant level of production. Each will require vast capital expenditures and additional research before large-scale development can be undertaken. For the Canadian tar sands (which are being developed by a unit of Sun Oil Co.), we have the technical knowledge for immediate development; yet it would take at least a decade to supply as much as 5 or 10 percent of our domestic demand from this source alone."

The problem may be even more severe than Anderson indicates.

The drilling of exploratory wells has declined sharply in the last decade—from 16,000 in 1958 to 10,000 last year—and, in turn, the amount of new oil reserves found each year has also declined. Between 1951 and 1955 an average of 3.2 billion barrels was found each year, while in the 1961–65 period only 2.5 billion barrels were added each year.

Because our consumption of crude oil has been increasing, the picture looks bleaker. In the 1961–65 period our net crude reserves dropped an average of 50 million barrels a year.

But the oil industry is dynamic. It has changed radically in the last decade and there are indications that even more fundamental changes are ahead.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Apr. 24, 1967]

THE PETROLEUM CRISIS—RISE IN OIL DEMAND MAY FORCE UNITED STATES TO SEEK NEW SOURCES

(By Royal H. Plenty)

Is the United States running out of oil?

Many times in the past alarmists have raised the cry that the end of our crude oil reserves is in sight. But as the years passed we have always seemed able to satisfy our needs and increase our reserves.

In 1946, the industry faced the postwar period with proven reserves of 24 billion barrels of oil and an annual demand for more than 1.8 billion barrels. More than 20 years later, the industry has consumed 56 billion barrels of crude and it still has more than 39 billion in reserves.

Nevertheless, many Government and oil industry leaders are concerned about how the industry will meet the demands that lie ahead.

J. M. Jamieson, president of Standard Oil Co. (N.J.), points out that since 1950 U.S. oil reserves have declined slowly but steadily from the equivalent of about 13½ years' supply to slightly more than 12 years'.

"If the present ratio is to be maintained in the face of rising consumption through 1980," he warns, "annual additions to liquid reserves must average more than half again as much as they have in the past 15 years."

GROWING DEMAND FORESEEN

Jamieson said the United States could expect new discoveries and some additional production through new and better techniques for getting the oil out of the ground.

"Yet the probability exists," he declared, "that the United States will have to turn in the future to other petroleum sources to meet its needs."

How big will the demand for oil be?

Here most oil experts and industry leaders are, generally, in agreement.

John E. Swearingen, chairman of Standard Oil Co. (Ind.), for instance, predicts U.S. oil demand will grow from 12 million barrels a day in 1966 to 17 million barrels by 1980 and natural gas demand to 27 trillion cubic feet per day from 17 trillion.

While forecasting rapid growth in nonenergy uses for petroleum, such as petrochemicals, fertilizers and paving materials, Swearingen believes the energy market is likely to continue as the major consumer of oil and gas.

"Oil is uniquely suited for the transportation market," he said, "where its prospects for growth are steady and substantial."

One of the undecided questions is the extent to which Government measures designed to reduce air pollution will place limits on the use of petroleum products.

NUCLEAR POWER AS RIVAL

Nuclear power already has become economical for the production of electric power, but even with the added push from air pollution regulations it is doubtful that it will materially affect the growth of the demand for oil by 1980.

In a recent report on the Nation's oil prospects, the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation points out that the cost of power generation by atomic energy is not yet substantially below that of conventional power generation.

"Furthermore," the foundation's study states, "power generation costs account for only a relatively small share of the total cost of electricity delivered to end users. Hence, the advent of atomic power does not herald the availability of electricity at low enough costs to displace oil in a significant scale.

"Furthermore, excluding imported residual fuel oil, some 70 percent of our oil is used for purposes for which electricity or atomic power cannot be considered practical competitors for the foreseeable future."

The most immediate threat to oil's position in the transportation market may be from the electrical car, but oil industry leaders do not seem particularly concerned here.

Robert G. Dunlop, president of Sun Oil Co., told a Senate committee hearing recently that automobiles powered by internal combustion engines would win out over electric cars.

Speaking for the industry in his role as chairman of the American Petroleum Institute, Dunlop said that emissions from internal combustion engines would be controlled long before a practical electric car can be mass-produced and marketed.

CONTROL EQUIPMENT TESTED

He said 1968 model cars will emit 60 percent less hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide than was the case a few years ago because of pollution-control devices on the vehicles.

Currently being evaluated, Dunlop said, are other types of control equipment that will cut hydrocarbon losses to 17 percent of precontrol levels and make massive reductions in emissions of nitrogen oxide.

If the United States demand for oil is going to grow by 5 million or so barrels a day by 1980, where are the additional supplies of crude oil coming from?

One answer would be to drill more oil wells.

But the number of wells drilled in this country declined from a peak of 57,000 in 1956 to but 36,000 last year. Exploratory wells dropped from 16,000 to 10,000, while the percentage of these that found oil or gas dropped from 19.1 to 17.6

Yet the only way to find oil is to drill for it.

Oil is not found in underground rivers or lakes, as many believe. It is formed from the animal and vegetable materials in age-old sediments.

As these sediments formed sedimentary rocks, oil accumulated in the tiny openings between the individual grains. Being light, the oil tended to work its way upward through the porous rocks until it met a nonporous barrier or trap.

The droplets of oil then accumulated and saturated the reservoir rocks, forming upside-down pools of erratic shapes.

RISKS OF SUCCESS

To understand the problems involved in finding oil you must understand the risks involved. No matter how much geology, paleontology and geophysics you use, you still must eventually drill to find the oil.

Only one out of nine exploratory wells—wildcats—find oil, and these wells cost an average of about $160,000, including the exploration costs.

If you find oil, your risk may even increase.

You have to find out whether you have found enough oil to have a commercially valuable discovery—at least 1 million barrels. This calls for drilling development wells.

These have a one in four chance of finding oil. And you can't wait until you're absolutely certain before you start investing in pipelines and other equipment to get the oil out of the ground and to market.

Humble Oil Co. production people a few years ago put the cost of discovering a commercial oil or gas field at $5 million.

Shell Oil Co. spent 15 years and $60 million before it took its first barrel of oil out of its field on the continental shelf off the coast of Texas on Dec. 30, 1965.

FACTORS IN DECLINE

The main reason there has been a decline in drilling in the United States is that even the large producers have come to doubt they will receive an adequate return for their effort and investment. In other words, it appears too risky.

This resulted from a decline in the price of crude oil; regulations that cut back on the amount of oil each well could produce, and the simple fact that it has become harder to find oil in the continental United States, since the most likely sites were, naturally, drilled first.

The leaders of the oil industry, nevertheless, feel they can deliver the oil from domestic production if they have the "proper incentives."

To some, such as Stanley Learned, president of Phillips Petroleum Co., this means higher prices.

Citing the 7.4 percent decline in crude oil prices since 1957, Learned said, "It should seem obvious that the prices for both oil and gas are inadequate to provide the incentive sufficient to find and supply the needed petroleum for the future."

POTENTIAL ASSAYED

It is possible that the additional oil this Nation needs could be supplied by further technological advances in drilling techniques and improved methods of recovering the oil that is already known to be in the ground.

The continental shelves surrounding the United States offer a possible source for all the oil we will need in this century.

Not nearly enough is known about the continental shelves, but according to Jamieson, "What we do know suggests that their potential is very large.

"Geologists who have made rough estimates of the oil potential of the shelves up to depths of 1000 feet," he said, "have suggested that even within that limit, the reserves are of the magnitude of hundreds of billions of barrels and very possibly exceed the total of our present proved reserves."

A number of wells have already been drilled in waters deeper than 500 feet, and drilling equipment is available capable of drilling in waters as deep as 1000 feet.

Technologies to gather and transport the oil from these depths economically are being developed.

New methods of squeezing oil out of the ground also could play a major role in satisfying our future oil needs.

One recent study, performed for the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, estimated that new secondary recovery methods already have increased our potential oil reserves by 79 billion barrels—this equals the oil that already has been produced in the 107-year history of the American oil industry and is enough to supply our estimated domestic needs for the next 14 years without increasing imports.

FINDINGS OF STUDY

The study found that almost 18 billion barrels could be recovered economically by conventional methods now in use.

The study also found there were an additional 61 billion barrels that can be recovered physically, but not necessarily economically, at this time by unconventional fluid injection processes, usually involving the use of heat.

But many in the industry feel that higher prices are necessary if the domestic oil industry is to put forward the effort to provide the crude oil that will be needed in the years ahead.

The huge proven reserves of low-cost foreign oil, now exceeding 350 billion barrels, could tend to restrict price increases of crude oil in this country.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Apr. 25, 1967]

THE PETROLEUM CRISIS—OIL SUPPLIES PERILED BY FOREIGN BLACKMAIL

(By Royal H. Plenty)

A pattern of threats and pressure that smacks of international blackmail has created doubts the United States can depend on foreign oil for its growing demands.

As early as the 1920s, Congress set forth a policy to encourage American firms to invest in oil production abroad with an eye on the time when we would run out of our own crude oil.

The United States oil firms performed their task well. We have become the leader in the highly competitive international oil business.

Now, however, when there are serious doubts that the United States will be able to supply domestically the 5.5 million additional barrels a day it is expected to need by 1980, the outlook for the international oil industry has also clouded.

The United States oil industry has found enough oil reserves throughout the Free World to satisfy everyone's needs well into the next century. In the past decade, American oil firms invested $50 billion abroad, swelling proven oil reserves outside the United States to more than 350 billion barrels.

Most of the oil that has been discovered abroad, however, is in the Persian Gulf area.

PRICE WARFARE

The governments of the oil producing nations of this area and Venezuela in 1960 formed the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) with a view toward boosting their share of the income derived from oil and eventually forcing prices higher.

Nor is OPEC bringing the only pressure being felt by the international oil industry.

Russia has been waging open economic warfare with its oil.

France, Italy and a number of other nations have set up nationalized oil companies that have worked with the OPEC countries, and sometimes Russia, to squeeze the American oil companies.

LOOK TO AMERICA

And the high profit margins of the traditional international oil companies—Jersey Standard, Royal Dutch-Shell, Mobil, Texaco, Gulf, British Petroleum and Standard of California—have attracted almost too much competition from other American companies. In the past two decades more than 40 firms have joined the ranks of the original seven international oil firms. Since 1955, the return on invested capital abroad for the United States oil companies has plunged from 30 percent to 12.5 percent, just about what it is domestically.

A recent study by Kenneth E. Hill and Fred E. Coqueron, of Eastman Dilon, Union Securities & Co., predicts that "little new money is likely to leave the United States" for investment in foreign oil in the next decade.

Robert O. Anderson, chairman and chief executive officer of Atlantic Richfield Co., told a group of financial analysts recently that he saw "a transition home from abroad" for the United States oil industry.

"After careful analysis of all the risks and rewards in the search for foreign crude, we are looking again to North America with more interest and keenness than we have for over a decade," Anderson said.

The manner in which the producing countries have knocked profits down for United States firms operating abroad is exemplified in Venezuela.

In 1956 and 1957 Venezuela asked for bids for new oil concessions. The industry invested $688 million in these concessions based on the belief that the taxes and other conditions then prevailing would continue. In December of 1958, however, Venezuela increased corporate income taxes 50 percent, retroactive to the beginning of that year.

In 1961 it required the companies to pay their taxes currently instead of at the end of the year.

Last year it announced another change in its oil policies under which the oil firms must pay an estimated $190 million more to the government.

A new policy required the companies to pay taxes on the basis of "reference prices" rather than the prices at which they actually sell the oil. These reference prices are 50 to 60 cents a barrel higher than current world market prices.

TAXES RAISED

The oil companies were also required to pay the government back taxes of $155.6 million based on the government's claim that they underpriced their oil from 1958 through 1964 by not using the "reference" prices.

The basic corporate tax was increased again, this time by 4.5 percent.

And an excess profits tax on oil company earnings was voted.

The increasingly successful efforts of the producing countries to take control of their oil resources has not only endangered the profits of the oil companies but it presents threats in several other areas:

The possibility exists that the producing nations someday may be able to force world prices higher or may use their control of oil supplies to wring political and economic concessions.

Unless adequate oil supplies are assured for the United States and the other oil consuming nations of the Free World our national security could be endangered.

Our balance-of-payments position could be hurt.

The eight nations in OPEC—Venezuela, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq, Qatar, Libya and Indonesia—control about three quarters of the world's oil production and more than 80 percent of its known oil reserves.

OPEC's ultimate goal is to control world oil output, much as the Railroad Commission controls the output in Texas, and to thereby be able to control prices.

An official release by the OPEC frankly stated its views:

"This organization questions whether oil companies are capable of sustaining a level of crude oil prices necessary to assure smooth operation of the industry in the future."

Oil is obviously important to our national security, both from an economic and a military standpoint and also to the security of the other nations of the Free World.

In the Second World War more than half of all the tonnage shipped to our military forces consisted of petroleum products. Most of the explosives for Allied bombs came from petroleum. In subsequent emergencies—the Korean conflict, the closing of the Suez Canal, and in Vietnam, oil produced and controlled by American countries has played a vital role.

Finally, the importation of petroleum products has played an important role in our balance-of-payments difficulties. Before the Second World War we were net exporters of petroleum products, but over the last 15 years, the balance has swung the other way.

We are now substantial importers of petroleum. In terms of dollars we now spend between $1.5 and $2 billion a year to purchase petroleum from foreign nations.

TREND LOWER

But in spite of the profit-margin squeeze, the international oil companies are strong and thriving as are the dozens of other hardy American companies which have now joined their ranks.

Frank N. Ikard, president of the American Petroleum Industry, estimates the global oil industry will have to invest around $250 billion between now and 1980 in exploration and new production facilities. Most of this will have to be spent abroad and a healthy international oil industry will be needed to accomplish it.

It is still merely a possibility that OPEC could force oil prices higher. These nations have shown little indication thus far that they would be willing to have their own production controlled.

The price trend abroad has been downward rather than upward.

M. A. Adelman, a professor at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has long predicted a declining price trend for oil.

FAVORABLE EFFECT

In spite of the pressures of nationalistic governments, the international oil industry continues to grow more productive, diverse and resilient.

Important new oil discoveries in Libya, Nigeria, Alaska, Canada and Australia and the big gas strikes in the North Sea have again demonstrated the ability of the industry to find new sources of oil—all of which make it more independent.

Even though our imports of oil have been increasing, the international transactions of the United States petroleum industry have had a favorable effect on our balance of payments in recent years. Although, for instance, we imported $1.7 billion in petroleum products in 1964 we in part offset this with exports of petroleum products of more than $1 billion. In addition, we received almost $2 billion in earnings on our foreign oil investments while investing less that $900 million abroad. The net result was that the oil industry brought into the country nearly half a billion dollars more than it sent out.

The question still remains, however, should we accept a growing dependence on Middle East oil or make a very determined effort to achieve a higher level of self-sufficiency.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Apr. 26, 1967]

THE PETROLEUM CRISIS—SUN SPENDS MILLIONS IN HUNT

(By Royal H. Plenty)

In an outstanding example of business courage and leadership Sun Oil Co. is investing almost a quarter of a billion dollars to open up new sources of oil in this country and Canada.

The success of this project to mine the bituminous bearing sands in northeast Alberta, Canada, along the Athabasca River could mark the beginning of a new era for the oil industry and end any concern over whether the United States and Canada can satisfy their own oil needs far into the future.

The Athabasca tar sands, as they are called, look something like molasses mixed with used coffee grounds. These tar sand deposits are sprawled over a 30,000 square mile area bordering on the banks of the Athabasca River. They contain an estimated 600 billion barrels of tar or bitumen which can be converted into more than 300 billion barrels of synthetic crude oil, an amount almost equal to the world's present known crude oil reserves.

Up until Sun's $230 million venture, these rich tar sand deposits have thwarted commercial development for almost two centuries.

The first recorded mention of the sands was in 1788 when Peter Pond, an adventurer and fur trader, traveled to the junction of the Athabasca and Clearwater Rivers. He reported the Indians there were using a "stickly substance oozing from the river banks to waterproof their canoes."

It was not until the early 1930s, however, that a smallscale commercial attempt to recover tar was made. This failed as did several other ventures between 1930 and 1950.

In the early 1960s, Great Canadian Oil Sands, (GCOS) Inc., which was one-third owned by Sun Oil Co., Canadian Pacific Oil & Gas Co. and Canadian Oil, received approval from Alberta to undertake to produce 31,500 barrels a day of synthetic crude oil from the sands.

A feasibility study, by Canadian Bechtel Ltd., however, found that the profit margin on the proposed project would be too slim to be attractive, and both Canadian Pacific Oil & Gas and Canadian Oil pulled out leaving Sun the lone interested partner.

Because of the great potential and because Sun held a 75 percent interest in one of the best areas in the entire Athabasca region, Sun decided to go it alone.

A second application was made to the Alberta Oil Commission in October, 1963, requesting permission to increase the rate of production to 45,000 barrels a day and to refinance the project with Sun putting up some $67,500,000 and obtaining about 82 percent of the GCOS stock. This request was granted with one of the conditions being that the project be in full production by September, 1967.

The risks were formidable.

Great Canadian Oil Sands had to be able to mine 100,000 tons of tar sand per day (about two railroad hopper cars per minute) in the sub-arctic regions of northern Alberta where temperatures fell to 60 degrees below zero and frost penetrations were 13 feet deep.

In 1963, no commercial process was available to recover tar from the mined sand. Finally, GCOS was embarking on a mining operation a new field for a petroleum company.

STARTING SOON

Because of the early dateline, GCOS had to move ahead in preparing the site, constructing a 266-mile pipeline, building roads and a large bridge, designing the refinery and ordering equipment, before it could work out the design of the extraction plant.

Robert G. Dunlop, Sun president, estimates more than $50 million had been spent before Sun's designers had taken the data from its pilot plant operation and developed a full-scale design for the extraction plant.

Construction is on schedule with preliminary operations to start next month. The sands, running in a vein about 130 feet thick, are located about 100 feet below the surface. After the overburden has been stripped away two great bucketwheel excavators—each weighing 1600 tons and extending 100 feet in height by 200 feet in length—will scoop up the sand and dump it on highspeed conveyor belts to be transferred to the extraction plant.

The bitumen then will be extracted from the sand, and processed into high-grade synthetic crude oil and pumped to Edmonton in the new pipeline at the rate of 45,000 barrels a day. Sun has agreed to take 75 percent of the products, Shell Canada, Ltd., 25 percent.

During the extraction operation, initially two by-products will be produced—coke and sulphur.

Coke will be extracted from the bitumen at the rate of 3000 tons a day and used to fire the facility's 65,000 kilowatt power plant a plant large enough to supply a city of 50,000 population.

Sulphur will be extracted at the rate of 300 tons a day and sold.

PLAN COMMUNITY

Other by-products, such as vanadium, may eventually be extracted commercially from the coke ash.

More than 2000 construction workers, often putting in 60-hour weeks, have been pushing the job to completion. Hometown for GCOS' approximately 500 permanent operating and maintenance employees will be Fort McMurray, located 20 miles south of the plant site.

When the project began in 1964, Fort McMurray was a frontier community of about 1200, most of them Indians and Eskimos. Its population is expected to soar to 5000.

GCOS has initiated a program for a planned community with parks and recreation areas. In all, 500 homes are being built by GCOS in varied styles with prices ranging from about $15,000 to $19,000. The town also boasts several modern hotels and motels, a new general hospital, shopping centers, apartment buildings and modern new schools.

Although the present GCOS working lease contains but five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total Athabasca oil sands area, the lease has enough sands to supply the plant's scheduled needs for the next 30 years.

Dunlop said he was confident that, with the plant going into full production on schedule, it would immediately begin to offer a satisfactory return on the huge investment.

He noted that if GCOS were permitted to increase its output, further economies of large scale operation would enable the company to appreciably increase its profit margins. He said the lease area could support a 100,000 barrel-a-day operation. The present plant, he pointed out, could be increased to a capacity of 65,000 barrels-a-day with minor additions to its equipment.

OIL FLOW RISES

But the prospects are doubtful that Alberta will permit an increase in the daily production rate of the plant in the near future.

In the first place, just two years ago a huge new oil discovery was made in the Rainbow Lake area of northwestern Alberta. This discovery was made in a deeper geological formation than western Canada's other fields and has not only added billions of barrels already to Alberta's proven reserves but suggests deeper drilling throughout the oil bearing areas of western Canada may pay off with additional major discoveries.

The situation is further complicated by a new method for prorating oil production in Alberta by reserves rather than number of wells. This mean the new Rainbow field will have a disproportionate effect on other fields.

Oil wells in Alberta are already limited to half of their productive capacity and since GCOS' project cannot economically operate at less than its full 45,000-barrel-a-day capacity it will automatically add that much to the Province's total output.

Although United States may need more of Canada's oil before the end of the 1970s, the present outlook is not too bright for the Canadians.

WELL SUPPLIED

"For the immediate future, United States is well supplied with oil," J. K. Jamieson, president of Standard Oil Co. (N.J.) told a group of Canadians a few months ago.

"To increase imports from Canada beyond their normal growth, other sources of supply would have to be displaced, which does not seem reasonable. In other words, I do not think it is realistic to expect that major new supplies can be forced on the market: there is timing to consider in the matter of access, and it is a critical factor."

But the United States is fortunate in that the Athabasca tar sands are available. An estimated 2 million barrels a day of synthetic crudes could be produced from these sands by strip-mining projects similar to Sun's GCOS operation.

And Shell Canada Ltd. has offered to undertake a project to extract oil from the deeper tar sands that cannot be strip-mined. More than 10 times as much oil could be produced each day from these deeper sands.

United States, however, has two alternative sources of oil of its own that dwarf the 300 billion barrels available by the Athabasca tar sands—oil shale and coal.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Apr. 27, 1967]

The Petroleum Crisis—$325 Million Needed To Safeguard Supply

(By Royal H. Plenty)

Wanted: $100 million.

With this sum we might be able to solve our oil supply problems for at least a century, and if we can find another $225 million we could possibly solve them for a few more centuries.

The $100 million, according to current estimates, would be enough to build a shale oil mine and plant that could produce 50,000 barrels of synthetic oil a day. We have about 2 trillion barrels of the shale oil locked in the rocks of Colorado, Utah and Wyoming.

The $225 million would buy a plant to produce 50,000 barrels a day of high-grade synthetic oil from coal. The potential oil reserves in our coal fields are four times that of our shale deposits.

Engineers contend that both a plant to produce oil from shale or from coal is now economically feasible, but unlike the Canadian tar sands, no one has as yet come forward with the risk capital necessary to finance either project.

That the completion of either project, however, would have the effect of opening up huge new oil reserves is demonstrated by the statement of J. Howard Pew, board chairman of Sun Oil Co., to his firm's annual stockholder meeting last week.

Pew said that when Sun's $230 million Athabasca tar sands project in Alberta goes into full-scale commercial operation this September, Sun's proven oil reserves would be increased by 450 million barrels.

Since an estimated 17 billion barrels could be taken from the Athabasca tar sands by stripmining projects such as Sun's and still another 383 billion barrels if projects to remove the tar oil from the deeper stratas prove economical, North America's oil reserves have in a real sense been expanded greatly.

HUGE ROYALTIES

A similar increase in the oil reserve of the United States will occur when commercial projects to produce oil from either shale or coal get under way.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has called our shale oil reserves "probably the most valuable untapped natural resource in the United States."

The potential economic value of 2 trillion barrels of oil dwarfs the imagination. Former Sen. Paul H. Douglas (D., Ill.) estimated that just the royalties alone on this fabulous treasure could yield $340 billion—enough to pay our national debt. Three-fourths of the oil shale land containing 80 percent of the shale oil belongs to the United States Government, but since 1930 the Government has refused to lease any of these lands.

But even the oil shale land in private hands contains some 50 billion barrels of shale oil and could support a score of 50,000 barrel-a-day projects.

Oil shale is found throughout the world and has been used as a source of liquefied fuel many times. It has never, however, been able to compete economically with crude oil.

Our huge Western shale oil deposits have long been known. The Colorado Indians called the oil shale "the rock that burns." Prospectors used it for heating and cooking and the ranchers still use it on occasion to heat their branding irons.

LEGAL PROBLEMS

Oil shale is neither oil nor shale. It is a petroleum like substance called kerogen contained in a relatively hard rock called marlstone. The problem of wresting the kerogen from the marlstone and turning it into a commercially usable synthetic oil has long thwarted American industry.

The dry, sparsely populated, mountainous terrain in which the oil shale is found, a maze of legal and political complications, and a power struggle between the giant oil companies have all tended to delay the commercial development of these valuable reserves.

But progress is now evident.

Advances in earth-moving and rock-crushing equipment have made mining of the oil shale practical. Research is advancing rapidly on methods to remove the kerogen from these crushed rocks by heat. Recent technological progress in refinery techniques, particularly in the area of hydrogenation, have made it economical to upgrade kerogen for oil refinery use.

And Secretary of the Interior Udall has spelled out a policy to remove some of the roadblocks to the development of our shale oil resources.

Udall's plan includes the leasing of some Federal land, the exchange of some Federal tracts for private holdings to permit the assembling of sufficient acreage for commercial mining, action to remove clouds on titles of disputed land, a plan to work with the Atomic Energy Commission on underground nuclear explosions for shale oil recovery and a $100-million research and investigation program.

The most difficult technological problem still presented by the oil shale is that it must be heated to more than 800 degrees to extract the kerogen.

Progress is apparently being made in solving this problem, but the huge fortunes that are at stake have brought about an aura of secrecy that rivals anything the Defense Department had devised.

HEAT METHOD

Apparently ahead in the race is Colony Development Corp.—a combination of The Oil Shale Corp., (TOSCO), Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, and the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co.

Colony uses a heat exchange method developed by TOSCO involving ceramic balls. H. I. Koolsbergen, president of TOSCO, recently spelled out cautious progress: "The tentative results to date gives us no ground for discouragement on the competitive role of shale in the present petroleum environment."

But Koolsbergen also hinted that oil shale could play an important but limited role in our energy supplies by 1980.

"Moreover," he declared, "assuming that the first 50,000 daily barrels of shale oil reach the market in 1970, and assuming that 100,000 barrels are added every year thereafter to 1980, the shale reserves would be contributing approximately 6 percent of the national petroleum demand in 1980."

James R. Garvey, president of Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., sees a somewhat similar role for coal in the liquid fuel market.

He notes that research on processes to convert coal to liquid fuels has improved economies to the point of "approaching the commercialization stage."

"From these processes," Garvey said, "it appears that the wholesale cost for coal-derived gasoline will be 11 cents per gallon." This would give coal competitive edge over the wholesale price of petroleum-based products, which he said, were running about 11.5 cents at East and Gulf Coast refining centers.

ROLE FOR COAL

Garvey said two processes, one being researched by Consolidation Coal Co. and one by Hydrocarbon Research, Inc., are expected to be commercial realities in the early 70's.

"It is estimated," he declared, "that if the coal-derived liquid products can capture 10 percent of the growing market, estimated at 5.34 billion barrels, it could mean a new annual coal consumption of 134 million tons by 1980."

If coal were to supply 1.7 million barrels a day of the estimated 17 million barrels a day we'll need by 1980 and shale produced more than 1 million barrels, we will be well on our way to closing the gap that has been forecast of 5.5 million barrels a day between our output and our demands. And, if we need it, another 2 million barrels a day could probably be supplied from the Canadian tar sands.

But even if these alternate sources of liquid hydrocarbons make a much more modest contribution to satisfying our petroleum needs by 1980, they could have a revolutionary effect on the oil industry.

Advancing technology and the economies of large-scale operations may lead to further substantial cost reductions in the production of these fuels.

It has been the improvements in efficiency and the reduction in costs of these projects that has made them economical in the last decade and not an increase in the price of crude oil.

In real terms crude oil prices are considerably lower than they were 10 years ago.

Major new technological breakthroughs are even possible. The low cost production of hydrogen by nuclear power, for instance, would immediately make coal a much more important factor in the picture.

Even more important may be the effect that the creation of reserves ranging into the billions of barrels that would result from the successful inauguration of each major new project to produce oil from coal, shale or tar sands.

There is nothing sacred about the figure of 12 as the minimum times proved reserves should equal annual production. In fact, if adequate future supplies are assured and declining costs are threatening to put pressures on prices, the oil companies might find it prudent to reduce their proportion of reserves to production.

There is no question that the oil industry will be able to satisfy demands that the future may place upon it, but the capital requirements are vast and the industry must remain vigorous and healthy.

"The problems ahead are many," Robert O. Anderson, board chairman of Atlantic Richfield Co., declared, "yet I am confident that given a sound economic climate, the petroleum industry not only will meet the growing needs of our domestic energy market but also will continue its position of leadership in all sources of energy throughout the world."

THE NEAR EAST CRISIS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make three observations and one recommendation relating to the war crisis in the Near East.

Since President Wilson's support of the Balfour Declaration in 1917, endorsing the establishment of a national homeland for the Jews in Palestine, the United States has exerted every effort to uphold the objective of that declaration and to preserve peace in the Near East.

My second observation is that, in recent years, the internal tensions in the Near East have been systematically exploited by the Soviet Union in an effort to obstruct the establishment of peace in that vital region, and to bring about the eruption of open conflict.

Third, it seems to me that while the U.S. Government may endeavor to stay clear of any direct military entanglement in the Near East, we cannot do so at the cost of sacrificing the principle of freedom of the seas which has been flagrantly violated in the Gulf of Aqaba by President Nasser's recent declarations and actions.

Mr. Speaker, later I propose to make a more comprehensive statement on this entire subject. In the meantime, however, I emphasize that the time for patient waiting and hoping is long over, and that we must take the steps required to reestablish the principle of the freedom of the seas, which is one of the basic prerequisites for the maintenance of freedom and order in this world.

To this end, I want to recommend that the United States in concert with other maritime powers, or alone if necessary, move immediately to reestablish our right to navigate international waters, including in particular the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba.

The longer we wait the more confused and complicated will this situation become. I urge that we move promptly, and I will have some further observations to offer on this subject tomorrow.

RESOLUTIONS FROM THE RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the fishing industry is a very important aspect of the economy of the Nation and the State of Rhode Island. It deserves our close attention and strong support for its growth and development has great significance to our economy and welfare.

I have received a resolution from the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island memorializing the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to insure and provide a sound and healthy domestic trawl fishery through tariff or quota protection on imported ground fish. I would at this time like to insert this resolution into the RECORD and call the attention of my colleagues to the message contained within.

I would also at this time like to insert into the RECORD another resolution received from the Rhode Island General Assembly requesting enactment of necessary legislation and soliciting cooperation of the U.S. Corps of Engineers in the study of the flooding problem and use of flood plains along the Blackstone River.

The resolutions and letters accompanying them follow:

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND
PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
Providence, May 31, 1967.

Hon. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN: I am directed by the General Assembly to transmit to you the enclosed certified copy of resolution (S. 817), introduced by Senators Hanaway, Fontaine, Varley and Costello, entitled "Resolution memorializing Congress of the United States, requesting enactment of necessary legislation and soliciting cooperation of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in study of flooding problem and use of flood plains along Blackstone River," passed by the General Assembly at the January Session, A.D. 1967 and became effective May 25, 1967.

Very truly yours,

RONALDO E. LEMAY,
Second Deputy, Secretary of State.

S. 817

Resolution memorializing Congress of the United States, requesting enactment of necessary legislation and soliciting cooperation of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in study of flooding problem and use of flood plains along Blackstone River

Whereas, the Blackstone River has a long history of devastating floods that have previously destroyed life and caused considerable damage to property in Rhode Island; and

Whereas, although certain flood control projects have been constructed along the River, the danger of flooding is not known to communities situated further downstream; and

Whereas, natural flood plains previously available to reduce the full impact of flood waters are being gradually eliminated through development; and

Whereas, the importance of maintaining these natural flood plains is uncertain; and

Whereas, the Division of Rivers and Harbors of the State of Rhode Island has requested that a study be made by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers of the flooding problem and use of flood plains on the Blackstone River; and

Whereas, the General Assembly supports and endorses this study; now therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island that the State of Rhode Island through its General Assembly now requests the Congress of the United States to give its deliberate consideration to this serious problem to the end that such legislation as may be required may be enacted, and that the cooperation of the United States Army Corps of Engineers may be solicited in the early undertaking and completion of the requested study by said Corps of Engineers of the flooding problem and utilization of the flood plains along the Blackstone River; and be it further

Resolved, that the Honorable Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island be and they hereby are earnestly requested to employ a concerted effort to effect an early resolution of the problem; and the Secretary of State is hereby authorized to transmit certified copies of this Resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress and to the United States Army Corps of Engineers in Washington, D.C.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
Providence, May 31, 1967.

Hon. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ST GERMAIN: I am directed by the General Assembly to transmit to you the enclosed certified copy of resolution (S. 791), introduced by Senator E. Rex

Coman, entitled "Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to ensure and provide a sound and healthy domestic trawl fishery through tariff or quota protection on imported groundfish" passed by the General Assembly at the January Session, A. D. 1967 and approved by the Governor on the twenty-fourth day of May, 1967.

Very truly yours,

RONALDO E. LEMAY,
Second Deputy, Secretary of State.

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to ensure and provide a sound and healthy domestic trawl fishery through tariff or quota protection on imported groundfish

Whereas, The importance and nutritional value of fish and shellfish in the world (F.P.C.) and the American diet are becoming increasingly more important as a protein resource; and

Whereas, our federal agencies involved have found on three occasions since 1953–1954 that our domestic trawl fish industry was being hurt or injured by importations, and yet executive administrative action has not been forthcoming to provide this needed protection; and

Whereas, the United States domestic fishery production has decreased and diminished consistently since 1954 to the point of having dropped in world production from second place to fifth place (1964) with Norway over-taking the United States in 1966; and

Whereas, the domestic fishing industry, having been severely criticized for not having up-graded itself, has found so doing impossible as long as any and all foreign nations can so conveniently ship fishery products into the United States; and

Whereas, the United States production of these species in 1966 was only 19.2% of the total United States supply and that from imports was 80.8% (U.S.D.I. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries Annual Summary, "Packaged Fishery Products—1966", C.F.S. No. 4343); and

Whereas, foreign fishing on our coasts and importations are one and the same problem, and are destroying the domestic trawl industry; and

Whereas, some processing plants in the United States are limiting the landings of other trawled seafoods due to the heavy and steadily increasing imports of similar species; now, therefore be it

Resolved, that the Congress of the United States take appropriate action to ensure and provide a sound and healthy domestic trawl fishery through tariff or quota protection on imported groundfish, and be it further

Resolved, that duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the vice-president of the United States, to the speaker of the house of representatives of the United States, and to each of the senators and representatives from the state of Rhode Island in the congress of the United States, earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to enact legislation which would carry out the purposes of this resolution.

RONALDO E. LEMAY,
Second Deputy Secretary of State.

CRIME IS A NATIONAL PROBLEM

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the Ninth District Law Enforcement Conference is called because crime is a national problem.

It is called to talk about crime in America and in southern Indiana, about those who commit crime, those who are its victims, and what is being done and should be done about it.

A wit remarked the other day that the crime rate is up 25 percent and crime conferences are up 50 percent. This may be true. We do not presume this morning to solve the crime problem.

The war on crime will be waged by our children and our children's children. There will be no instant victory. Ancient evils are not easily subdued. Even in the year 600 B.C., Ezekiel wrote:

> The land is full of bloody crimes and the city is full of violence.

But because the war against crime is old and complex and difficult, we should not despair, but rather resolve to do effort, and greater ingenuity, greater effort, and greater determination.

A century ago Thoreau, a wise American, wrote:

> There are a thousand hacking at the branches of evil to one who is striking at the root.

The purpose of this conference is to seek out the roots of crime.

EXTENT OF CRIME

Crime marks the life of every American. Consider these facts. In our Nation there is:

One murder committed every hour.

One forcible rape every 23 minutes.

One robbery every 4½ minutes.

One aggravated assault every 2½ minutes.

One burglary every 27 seconds.

One serious larcency every 41 seconds.

One auto theft every minute.

Five serious crimes each minute during 1965.

There is no sanctuary from crime. Even in the U.S. Capitol and its related buildings in recent months criminals have robbed a beauty parlor in a congressional office building, assaulted a Congressman working at night in his office, and ripped up some of the most valuable paintings in the Capitol. Last Christmas a figurine of the baby Jesus was stolen from a manger scene on the Ellipse near the White House.

Not long ago one of the great banks of America, troubled by the crime situation, ran this ad in the newspaper:

> Notice: Here's warning to bank robbers. All of our bank offices are equipped with multiple unit, automatic motion picture cameras that take pictures, daytime, nighttime, Saturday too. Remember to smile for candid camera.

FBI statistics disclose that crime nationally is increasing five times faster than the population.

The fear of crime marks the life of every American. Recently a survey made in a high crime area in two of our great metropolitan cities found that:

Forty-three percent of those interviewed stayed off the streets at night.

Thirty-five percent did not speak to strangers.

Twenty-one percent used only cabs and cars at night.

Twenty percent like to move to another neighborhood: all because of their fear of crime.

Crime among the young people is especially disturbing. In the United States today, one boy in six is referred to a juvenile court. It is estimated that 40 percent of all male children now living in the United States will be arrested for a nontraffic offense in their lives.

The President's Crime Commission reports that 15- and 16-year-olds have the highest arrest rate in the United States.

The FBI reports that in the period 1960–65 police arrests for all criminal acts rose 10 percent, but during the same span of years arrests for persons under 18 years of age jumped 54 percent.

The cost of crime to the Nation is staggering, perhaps as high as $27 billion a year.

The language of statistics allows us only to count the number of crimes and the cost of crime. Statistics do not measure lost or shattered lives, the mounting fear among our citizens, the erosion of our public spirit, the lack of confidence in the processes of law.

CONCERN ABOUT CRIME

There are some hopeful signs. Chief among these is a rising tide of concern. J. Edgar Hoover has noted:

> Recent years have witnessed a marked increase in citizen awareness of the crime problem. This growing interest, particularly that shown by persons who previously have taken the position that crime is solely the responsibility of the law enforcement profession, is most encouraging. It offers promise of materially aiding police efforts in controlling crime.

A Presidential Commission has recently issued a landmark report entitled "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society." It will serve as the basis of study and legislation for years to come.

In Indiana, Gov. Roger Branigin, expressing the concern of Hoosiers, has recently established an Indiana Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice to make a comprehensive survey of the causes and cures of crime and delinquency.

Hardly a day goes by in the Congress of the United States that at least one Congressman does not comment on some aspect of crime in the Nation.

Although Barry Goldwater did not win the presidential election of 1964, all of us would agree that in raising the issue of crime in the streets he pointed to a serious and legitimate defect in American society.

Today we are especially concerned about crime in southern Indiana. Every day the letters which come to my office reflect the concern of Ninth District residents about crime. In scores of small groups across the district, I am impressed with how frequently and how deeply the concern about crime is felt. The Ninth District, as we all know, is a predominantly rural grouping of 17 counties in the southeastern part of the State.

Despite a general increase in the incidence of crime in the State as a whole, and of course in the Nation, there has been a decline in the incidence of serious crime in these 17 counties.

Indiana State police advise me that there were 879 serious offenses investigated in the 17 counties of the Ninth Congressional District in 1964. The number declined to 816 in 1965, and in 1966 it declined still further to 726.

The breakdown by county and type of crime is as follows:

Offenses known to police

County	1964		1965		1966	
	Offenses	Cleared by arrest	Offenses	Cleared by arrest	Offenses	Cleared by arrest
Bartholomew	38	12	34	7	38	9
Clark	210	42	174	44	146	27
Dearborn	52	15	61	16	67	16
Decatur	15	7	17	6	23	10
Fayette	11	4	13	9	9	5
Franklin	50	13	26	7	24	13
Jackson	106	16	119	17	103	21
Jefferson	37	15	25	15	20	4
Jennings	25	7	12	3	8	4
Lawrence	25	7	49	11	40	10
Ohio	16	----------	17	----------	11	----------
Orange	59	6	54	6	40	8
Ripley	89	29	84	20	73	13
Scott	47	18	33	18	21	6
Shelby	45	25	58	15	62	16
Switzerland	3	----------	9	2	8	3
Washington	51	10	31	10	33	13
Total	879	226	816	206	726	158

Types of crime—9th District totals

	1964		1965		1966	
	Number	Cleared by arrest	Number	Cleared by arrest	Number	Cleared by arrest
Homicide and manslaughter	9	7	8	6	10	8
Rape	1	1	6	3	4	3
Robbery	18	5	20	9	19	9
Assault	33	22	28	21	27	21
Burglary	480	86	470	77	417	62
Larcency	189	40	156	35	136	36
Auto theft under 18	146	63	128	54	113	42

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Law enforcement is a local responsibility. We preach this in the Nation and we practice it. New York City alone has more law enforcement officers than the Federal Government. The Federal Bureau of Prisons has less than 5 percent of the prison population of the Nation.

The Federal judiciary is a tiny fraction of the judiciary of the States. Our safety and our liberty depend upon the excellence of local and State law-enforcement officers. In this part of the State, we can take considerable pride in their performance in recent years. Faced with an exploding crime rate in the Nation, the crime rate of the Ninth Congressional District counties has actually been going down.

So we approach this conference today with great respect and appreciation for our local law-enforcement officers. They are the frontline soldiers in the war on crime.

THE CONFERENCE

But I am confident that not one of us is satisfied, and that is why we are having a conference today. We have brought together Indiana's top authorities to discuss their areas of expertise and to bring into perspective the challenge of crime in southeastern Indiana.

Our participants include: Superintendent Robert A. O'Neal, Indiana State Police; Anthony S. Kuharich, commissioner of the Indiana Department of Correction; James T. Neagle, agent in charge of the Indianapolis Office of the FBI; G. Robert Blakey, associate professor of law at the University of Notre Dame; Dr. Robert Borkenstein, director of the Indiana University Department of Police Administration.

The audience is as distinguished as the panel. We have invited mayors, judges, prosecuting attorneys, city and county officials, members of sheriffs and police departments, and officials of public agencies involved in the control of crime. We have also invited the public to attend.

We will be talking about more effective police action, more efficient courts, improved corrections, comprehensive planning. All these things are urgently needed.

QUESTIONS

There will be many questions on our mind today.

Why do we have an extremely low rate of success in efforts to reform those who have committed crime? The Attorney General said not long ago that 70 percent of those who committed crime, do it again.

Why is it impossible to keep police departments adequately staffed? There are 50,000 vacancies in police departments today. The average starting salary for a patrolman in small cities is $4,600. In large cities the average is $5,300. The typical maximum pay is less than $1,000 over the starting salary. In a recent conference of police chiefs of 24 major cities, only two of the police departments were up to strength.

Should we have a broader range of alternatives in dealing with offenders? In 1965 more than 2 million offenders were placed in prison or on probation.

Can our system of criminal justice in the courts win respect and cooperation from all citizens?

Are we putting enough of our resources and effort into research to understand the causes and the techniques in fighting crime? Only 1 percent of the criminal justice system's total budget is spent on research. Until recently, the Justice Department was the only Cabinet Department with no share of the roughly $15 billion Federal research budget.

Are citizens deeply enough involved in the war against crime?

How can we achieve higher levels of knowledge, expertise, integrity, initiative by police, judges, prosecutors, correctional authorities?

How can we prevent more crime? What social conditions must be eliminated? How do we detect, apprehend, judge, reintegrate into their communities those who commit crimes?

CONCLUSION

There have been many, but not enough, studies on crime. Those that have been conducted agree on one point. We can control crime if we will. There can be a significant reduction in crime. Whether or not there will be a reduction depends on the citizens.

It is the citizen who finally determines whether law enforcement agencies are adequately staffed and equipped and competently trained. It is the citizen who maintains and enlarges respect for law and order. It is the citizen's dedication to public order which is the most powerful deterrent of crime.

It is the citizen who will determine whether the streets will be safe to walk, whether homes will be secure, whether property rights will be respected, whether integrity and honest dealing will govern relationships between men.

Government action is not enough. Crime is a social problem that is interwoven with every aspect of American life. It involves improving the quality of family life, the way schools are run, the way cities are planned, the way workers are hired. Crime is the business of every American institution. Crime is the business of every American. A citizen on his own, and through the organizations he belongs to, must interest himself in the problems of crime and criminal justice.

If he does crime will be controlled.

A TRIBUTE TO MARK BORTMAN

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, the newly inaugurated President, John F. Kennedy, exhorted the people of this Nation with these words:

> And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country.

Few men in our time have taken up this challenge with the selfless devotion

of Mark Bortman. With his passing, America and the world have both lost a friend and a benefactor. This was a man whose ideals were never limited by provincialism, nor his dreams by cynicism.

After founding the Bortman Plastic Co., and skillfully leading it to an important role in Boston industry, he turned his attention to countless areas of human concern. He was an avid collector of Americana. But his collections were never jealously hoarded, to provide enjoyment for a special few. They were, rather, given freely to universities, museums, and even the White House, in order that all Americans might share in their beauty and meaning.

It was he who gave an 18th-century Sheffield silver coffee urn, used by Abigail Adams while she was First Lady, to the White House. It was he who spearheaded the drive which brought the original Paul Revere Liberty Bowl to the Museum of Fine Arts. It was he who gave a priceless collection of more than 6,000 documents from the pre-Revolutionary and Revolutionary periods in American history to the library at Boston University.

But it was people, not things, that remained his main concern. He was a central figure in the people-to-people program, which has contributed so much to the cause of international understanding. He first became involved in the program after being appointed by President Eisenhower, and remained influential throughout the administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. It was Mark Bortman who arranged the travel expenses for the Pakistani camel driver whose visit to this country, at the invitation of then Vice President Lyndon Johnson, delighted the country and the world. It was, perhaps, this people-to-people program that gave him the most effective outlet for his commitment to the ideals and history of this Nation.

Although he never went to college himself, he was nonetheless awarded many honorary degrees in recognition of his service to mankind. He held decorations and citations given by many foreign leaders and governments, from Japan to the Vatican. Indeed, he had been recognized and honored the world over.

In many ways, the story of Mark Bortman is an American success story. Foreign born, and from humble beginnings, he rose to prominence and greatness as a result of his unbounded enthusiasm and extraordinary talents. Those of us who were privileged to know him feel an immeasurable loss. But his contributions in the service of peace and understanding will remain as a monument to his dedication and vision. This was, indeed, a man who thought not of selfish gain, but of service to Massachusetts, the United States, and all nations. He was, in every sense of the word, a great American.

MR. WALTER CASPER

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a speech made recently by Mr. Walter Casper, a valued friend of mine. Mr. Casper is a German industrialist who is also the head of the German Peace Corps. While in the United States last month Mr. Casper addressed the inaugural meeting of the American Advisory Board of the Carl Duisberg Society. The Carl Duisberg Society is dedicated to a better understanding among peoples and is deeply interested in the student exchange programs which as we all know contribute much to international good will. The Carl Duisberg Society has sponsored the exchange of American students to Germany and German students have come to the United States.

The speech follows:

I. THE ORIGINS OF THE CARL DUISBERG SOCIETY

We have come together for the inaugural session of the American Advisory Board of the Carl Duisberg Society. This board has been founded to assist and advise the society in its American activities.

The Carl Duisberg Society has in the past years played a significant role in the field of international exchange of students and trainees. But before I shall give you a brief survey of the tasks and accomplishments of our organization, let me try to answer one question which I can read distinctly on your faces: Who was Carl Duisberg?

So let me first talk to you about the man whose name our society bears. Carl Duisberg was, above all, a man of science. His epoch-making discoveries in the field of pigments as well as his revolutionary innovations in largescale chemical production have had their historic impact on the industrial development of his country until this very day. In Germany and in the world of chemistry Carl Duisberg's name will forever be associated with the establishment and the build-up of the IG Farben Company.

However, what has made this man so remarkable is not alone his pioneer work and legacy in the field of industry. What distinguished Carl Duisberg among the other great industry founders of his time was his strong social consciousness and dedication which reached far beyond national boundaries towards the tasks of international cooperation. It was his moral inspiration that made him devote his influence and experience untiringly to programs designed for the international exchange of students, especially after the First World War.

Some day in the early Twenties he received letters from German students in the United States who reported enthusiastically about the management style and working atmosphere they had found in American companies. These reports gave Carl Duisberg the idea to create a regular German American exchange program for young students and professionals. His thoughts were soon turned into action with the result that through Carl Duisberg's initiative between 1925 and 1930 each year 200 young German engineers and farmers could be given the opportunity of a two years' training in the United States. The great economic crisis of the Thirties ended this program abruptly.

Yet already during those early beginnings the program had gained the magnanimous support of the U.S. Department of Commerce. It had been operated by the New York Office of the "Economic Aid of the German Students' Organization" which was at that time also assisted by an American Advisory Board. I should like to mention here the names of three Americans whose wholehearted and active help was particularly beneficial in those years: first the then Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover; secondly Mr. William Walter Husband, at that time chief of the US Immigration Authorities, and, last not least, YMCA President Mr. John D. Mott.

During this early stage of our exchange activities, all in all, 500 young people were sent to the United States and at the same time the first American exchangees were brought to Germany.

II. ACTIVITIES OF THE SOCIETY AFTER 1945

One of the most difficult problems for post-war Germany was to find a way out of the deadly isolation. Ties that had been disrupted so tragically had to be renewed. In those days the experience and the old connections of our former America returnees proved to be highly instrumental in opening new relations with the outside world. First contacts were established, old ones revived and soon a genuine interest in taking up the old exchange work again grew on both sides of the Atlantic. In 1949 a group of our American friends with the help of the Rockefeller Foundation was able to send a first study commission to Germany. Together with a number of former German exchange students the "International Council for the Progress of Youth and Self-Help" was founded. This organization changed its name into "Carl Duisberg Gesellschaft" in 1955 after its operational basis had been considerably broadened. The difficult task of reconstructing the society was mainly accomplished under the direction of the late Herr Johannes Funke who had also been in charge of our New York office during the Twenties. His close personal relations with many American personalities were especially gratifying for this work.

What has this society accomplished during the past years?

Financing had initially been managed with the help of private donations. This was gradually improved when funds of the then High Commissioner Mr. John McCloy and of the German Ministry of Commerce could be made available. In 1951 the first group of German engineers and farmers set off for the United States. Other groups followed. In the same year a memorandum was submitted to the Marshall Plan Administration proposing an extensive "On the Job Training" Program which was to include all the other OECD countries. Based on this proposal which found the approval of the American Government the "Work Study Training for Productivity Program" was then established.

Until 1955 400 young German businessmen, engineers and farmers participated in this program, organized in close cooperation with American universities and colleges. While between 1955 and 1958 exchange programs had been carried out mainly among European countries, American exchange programs could be continued after 1958 with means from the ERP Special Funds.

This German-American exchange program of the Carl Duisberg Society which engages on the American side more than 30 universities and colleges follows a pattern that has proved to be wholly successful: it combines a college or university curriculum of one or two terms with a subsequent professional or industrial training period of up to 18 months. 1,100 young Germans have participated in this program since its start. During the same time 80 American students joined the program arranged for them by the Carl Duisberg Society in Germany.

Before I turn to the details of the German-American exchange activities of our society I must draw your attention to the new and important responsibilities that have accrued to us in the recent past. First I can report about a remarkable growth of our internal European exchange capacity, which brought 3,500 Germans to European countries and 1,800 Europeans to Germany. But our main energies are concentrated on a comprehensive vocational training program for young people from development countries. This program covers a wide range of basic and advanced courses in fields from technical crafts and skills to agriculture, management, medicine, soical work and sciences, to mention only some.

This work is being done by our 11 regional branches with their 140 branch offices in the Federal Republic. The total staff of our centers consists of 200 fulltime regular employees supported by over 1,000 volunteer helpers. In the past years our staff has carried out orientation and professional training courses for 12,000 young people from development countries. At present we are sent an annual total of 2,500 participants from these countries. Their study and training periods are financed through German Government grants. If we add to this figure the number of development country students enrolled at German universities who also use our facilities, one can say that Carl Duisberg Society at present takes care of about 8,000 to 10,000 young people from development countries per year, who come to Germany for academic studies or vocational training. To give you another overall figure: we estimate that about 30,000 to 40,000 students and young practitioners have been participants of our society's programs during the last ten years.

It was also the Carl Duisberg Society which played a major part in stimulating the idea of volunteer service in overseas countries. Thus Herr Funke, whom I have mentioned before, was the ideal person to preside over the commission that handled the preparatory work for the DED, the German Volunteer Service, inspired by and built after the American Peace Corps. Together with President Kennedy and Minister Scheel he signed the document of the foundation of DED. I had the honour to be elected as chairman of its Administrative Board. This may give you an idea of the very friendly relations and the close cooperation that exist between the German Volunteer Service and the Carl Duisberg Society.

These few facts and figures may demonstrate to you the effective contribution our society has been able to make and is making within the framework of foreign aid policy. This work has found the support and backing of both the German government and the German people. Its successes have had international repercussions.

The training of foreign practitioners in German companies offers a unique chance to bring the German population also in small and remote communities into personal contact with young people from overseas countries. With the help of the press, of the churches and of the German youth organizations the support of the German public for the mission of foreign aid could be mobilized on a broader basis. Thus many a young German came into touch with the German Volunteer Service through the training centers of the Carl Duisberg Society. In fact, many a young German joined the Volunteer Service after initial volunteer work for the Carl Duisberg Society.

A few words about the organizational structure of the society: its supreme body is the board which is supported by an advisory council, comprising representatives of the churches, the universities, the government, of industry and of the unions. Our managing directors are Dr. Krug, who is also a member of the board, and Winfried Böll. The latter is also a member of the Administrative Board of the German Peace Corps.

III. FUTURE PLANS AND OBJECTIVES

Of course, the imminent question to be raised at this our first meeting must concern itself with the practical work that is expected of our American Advisory Board.

First of all, the board members can help us to expand our German-American exchange projects, because it is on this area that we shall concentrate our major and continuing attention. This is, by the way, precisely what our first Advisory Board did in the Twenties. Today your aid and guidance could certainly facilitate many of our sometimes complicated negotiations with interested public and private groups, with government agencies and with American universities. Your help could at the same time be greatly instrumental in properly placing our participants. I may also mention that as a concrete step for the near future we plan to establish a branch office in New York or Washington.

Moreover, we would like to receive your support and encouragement for a project which we consider to be equally important and to which we shall devote increased energies. I am speaking of our German program designed to bring young Americans to our country. This program definitely needs beefing up. I have already told you how small its scope is compared to what could be accomplished for our German students in the United States. It is, however, our firm belief that a combined studying and training period for young Americans in Germany conveying to them academic education together with a first-hand professional orientation will be as relevant and instructive as it has evidently been for our participants in your country. After all, we want to operate this program on a basis of active exchange and in the spirit of a genuine give-and-take. Both sides have much to contribute and much to learn.

Finally, let me summarize in a few observations some principal aspects of the work done by the Carl Duisberg Society. This summary will also bring us back to the origins of the society as I have described them to you earlier.

We do not see our purpose in magnifying what critical minds have come to call, somewhat ironically, "academic tourism". Our endeavours are focused on small and carefully selected groups of qualified young academics and practitioners. To them we want to offer a unique chance of theoretical and practical education abroad. But we do not want to send them abroad because abroad is the fashionable place to have been. Our programs are constructed in a way that enables the participants to make themselves familiar with the ingredients of American progress in science, technology and management. The solid educational benefits of such participation lie in the immediate insight and experience to be gained in new and different methods of research and production. In addition to improving his language proficiency and broadening his general outlook this experience will strengthen the young participant's ability to adjust, his critical judgment and his self-confidence. Thus our cause exceeds that of the average "student abroad" movement, both in impact and substance. Our program is aimed at the future leaders of our countries. We also wish to create a nucleus of talent for the future partnership between our two nations. For the gifted members of our young generations we want to open a way out of their national narrowness and routine, to confront them with the demands of a new environment. We believe that this challenge will help to prepare them for their future roles in managing the complicated mechanism of an interdependent international society.

You know as well as I do that mankind will only be able to cope with the evergrowing problems of tomorrow if the advanced nations bring forth leaders of high standards and dedication. It is our responsibility to help these leaders grow.

Let me end by saying that I hope that in this spirit of cooperative efforts you will share and support the increased activities of the Carl Duisberg Society. I am fully aware that your own offices impose upon you manifold duties and commitments. The more encouraging and inspiring to our society will be the aid and advice you will be able to contribute as members of its American Advisory Board.

I thank you.

PANEL TO STUDY EXPANSION OF MEDICARE TO COVER DRUG EXPENSES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I read with pleasure last week that John W. Gardner, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, appointed a panel of seven highly qualified Government officials to examine the question of expanding medicare to cover the cost of prescription drugs. Early in this session, I introduced legislation which would allow medicare payments to be made for the fair cost of drugs which had been prescribed by a physician. It was my opinion then, and seemed implicit in Secretary Gardner's statement, that the cost of drugs is so high, and is such a burdensome but essential expense for our elderly citizens, that the Federal Government must lend a helping hand to those on social security who cannot afford such drugs.

There has been much controversy lately surrounding the respective merits of generic and brand-name drugs, and I am glad to note that the Secretary specifically requested his panel to examine that much-discussed question. In my bill, I called for reimbursement for the cost of generic drugs which a formulary committee had deemed to be of equivalent quality as the essentially identical brand-name drugs. The panel may well arrive at a different solution to this problem. The important point is not the details of whatever proposal is finally accepted, but the urgency of providing additional coverage for our older Americans, many of them living on fixed incomes, who are in very great need of payments for their heavy drug costs.

I now insert the New York Times article in the RECORD which described the panel Mr. Gardner has established and its areas of study which he outlined.

MEDICARE STUDIES WIDER COVERAGE OF DRUG EXPENSES—PANEL APPOINTED TO WEIGH INCLUSION OF PRESCRIPTION COSTS IN THE PROGRAM

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 31.—The Department of Health, Education and Welfare named a special panel today to recommend within six months whether or not to include prescription drug costs in the Medicare program.

"For many older Americans the cost of needed drugs prescribed by a physician is a heavy burden, representing 15 to 20 per cent of their medical care costs," Secretary John W. Gardner said in announcing the group's task.

But Secretary Gardner went on to state that the high officers of his department named to the group would have no prior commitment to recommend for or against the inclusion of prescription drugs.

The drug cost of Medicare beneficiaries are now covered only for persons in the hospital when the drugs are used. New legislation would be needed to broaden the coverage.

Mr. Gardner appointed Dr. Philip R. Lee, who is Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, to the chairmanship of the special panel.

At a news conference following the announcement, Dr. Lee outlined the major areas that would be included in the study.

STUDY GOALS OUTLINED

These include the relative merits of buying drugs by generic or by brand names; as well as the impact of various proposed methods of drug purchasing on costs, quality of patient care, on doctors, pharmacists, the drug industry and Government.

Also under study will be the present patterns of drug prescription by physicians as well as patterns of drug use and expense to the patient. Many of the other economic factors in the use of prescription drugs will also be considered.

The appointment of the study group today was in answer to President Johnson's directive in January that the department look into the merits of expanding Medicare to include drugs.

Dr. Lee said studies on aspects of the question were in progress, some nearing completion and others just starting. He said the panel would review this work and make recommendations by the end of the six-month period even though some questions would probably remain unanswered.

In his opening statement, Secretary Gardner said it might take years of work including laboratory research and clinical trials to answer some of the questions.

Among the thorny items is that of whether generic name drugs can be considered equivalent to brand name drugs in their effects on the patient. Ordinarily brand name drugs are considerably more expensive than generic drugs composed of the same chemicals.

For example prednisone is the generic name of a hormone preparation used in the treatment of inflammation, rheumatoid arthritis and other conditions. It is also sold under many brand names including Meticorten, Deltasone, Metreton, Sterapred, Sterasal-K and Sterazoildin.

There has been much publicity recently over the spread in prices consumers pay for prescription drugs. Yesterday, for example, the Medical Letter on Drugs and Therapeutics, a news letter for physicians, reported a survey showing that some prednisone products sold for 30 times as much as others.

Mr. Gardner said he has asked the study group to measure the value of possible solutions not only in terms of dollars to be saved, but also in the quality of health care to be given.

Also named to the study group with Dr Lee were:

Dean W. Coston, Deputy Under Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

Lisle C. Carter Jr., William Gorham and James F. Kelly, all assistant secretaries.

Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration.

Dr. James L. Goddard, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration.

Joseph H. Meyers, acting Commissioner of the Welfare Administration.

Dr. William H. Stewart, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

Dr. Milton Silverman, special assistant to Dr. Lee, was named executive secretary and staff director of the group.

GUARANTEEING BASIC LEGAL RIGHTS TO OUR MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Court of Military Appeals has demonstrated in yet another opinion the pressing need for guaranteeing basic legal rights to our military personnel. If, for example, the military cannot see its way clear to provide every accused individual with counsel, I believe that this Congress should move forthrightly on such legislation as my bill, H.R. 6555, the Military Personnel Legal Counsel Act of 1967. I first introduced this bill in the 89th Congress, and have addressed my colleagues on previous occasions concerning the second-class legal status of our men in uniform. My bill would provide legal counsel in all cases of a special, as well as a general, court-martial, and would require that all accused or suspected personnel be apprised of their right to legal counsel before being interrogated.

In the Tempia decision of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, handed down on April 25, 1967, Judge Homer Ferguson delivered the opinion of the court to the effect that a staff judge advocate had prejudiced the case against Airman Tempia by stating that no military lawyer could be furnished to represent him. It was not enough to advise Airman Tempia that he had the right to obtain civilian counsel at his own expense. This opinion states:

> As the accused was informed no counsel would be appointed for him, it follows that the statement taken from him was inadmissible in evidence.

In a different case, this same judge delivered an opinion recently accusing the armed services of a "cavalier disregard" for the legal rights of military personnel, and suggested that legislation might be necessary.

It appears to me imminently desirable for this Congress to insure that the full heritage of our legal liberties is no longer denied to our military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point an editorial from the Washington Post of April 28 on the Tempia decision, as well as a June 3 article from that newspaper concerning the more recent decision of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals:

JUSTICE IN UNIFORM

The United States Constitution's procedural safeguards against arbitrary authority belong to men in uniform as well as to civilians. This is the essence of the ruling handed down on Wednesday by the United States Court of Military Appeals that the limitations on police interrogation of civilians which the Supreme Court's *Miranda* decision imposed a year ago apply equally in military law. The ruling reflects much more than deference to the Supreme Court. It reflects a recognition that members of the American armed forces do not lose their citizenship or their status as free men by reason of their military service; they are entitled to the widest protection of the Bill of Rights consonant with the maintenance of national security.

National security is not going to be impaired by giving men in uniform a fair trial with all the protections of due process. It costs something in time and money to assure a defendant the assistance of counsel and to insulate him from improper pressures. But these expenditures are indispensable to a civilized system of justice. This is simply to say that they safeguard the community as well as the individual; they avert injustice. Americans who have sons or brothers or other kin in the armed forces can feel greater confidence for their safety as a result of this ruling. They can also feel a heightened pride in the knowledge that the armed forces themselves observe the great traditions which it is their function to shield from foreign foes.

MILITARY JUSTICE SAID TO DISREGARD RIGHTS OF ACCUSED

A U.S. Military Court of Appeals judge yesterday accused the armed services of a "cavalier disregard" for the rights of accused military personnel.

Judge Homer Ferguson, a former United States Senator from Michigan, said in an opinion that military justice "has not materially changed" from the days when "a fellow was put in the clink and held there for weeks, sometimes months before he was brought to trial."

Unless the armed services change their attitude, Ferguson said, additional legislation may be needed to protect the rights of military defendants.

The judge's charges were contained in a dissenting opinion that challenged the conviction of an Air Force enlisted man who was not brought to trial until 119 days after his arrest.

The defendant, Airman Clinton A. Smith, 22, of Brooklyn, N.Y., spent 63 days in a stockade without being charged. He was not released, Ferguson said, until "his presence without charges was discovered during the course of . . . a Congressional inquiry regarding another individual."

After the airman was finally released on April 7, 1966, another 27 days passed until charges were placed against him and he was arraigned for stealing drugs.

Under civilian procedures, such a delay would probably result in charges being dropped.

Ferguson, one of three judges on the military Court of Appeals—the Nation's highest military tribunal—called the airman's case "a flat disregard" of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

"Certainly, the Congress will be interested in noting how its mandates are ignored, and I should think that the Department of the Air Force would be both embarrassed and ashamed that, in a day of pushbutton warfare and rocketry, an American accused can be locked up in the stockade and forgotten for over two months, without even the preference of charges."

Airman Smith was arrested on Feb. 3, 1966 and immediately signed a confession that he stole 100 containers of morphine from a "nuclear casualty kit" at Amarillo (Tex.) Air Force Base.

In upholding his conviction, Chief Judge Robert E. Quinn and Associate Judge Paul Kilday acknowledged that the serviceman was subjected to an unusually long period of detention without being charged.

However, they ruled that Smith's military prosecutors proved the delay was unprejudicial to the defendant and that the Government "furnished (sufficient) reasons for the delay."

Smith's prosecutors said the delay was caused by an investigation "for supporting evidence" that "took quite a bit of time and required numerous phone calls and several letters . . ."

Smith was sentenced to a bad conduct discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances and two years of hard labor.

UNDER SECRETARY WOOD REPORTS ON HUD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1967, the Honorable Robert C. Wood, Under Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development addressed the Governor's Conference on Community Development in Boston, Mass. Knowing of the interest of the many Members of this body in the activities of HUD and particularly its community development programs, I am inserting a copy of his address in the RECORD, so that all may read and know of the progress being made by that Department:

I am glad to join the Governor's Conference on Community Development for the second successive year—and for several special reasons. That we should be together again demonstrates some durability on my part—as HUD moves well into its second year—and considerable endurance in the field of luncheon speakers on yours.

I miss very much my old associations with you in Massachusetts—although enough of you journey often enough to Washington chasing your grants-in-aid applications to keep me from feeling lonely.

There are more important reasons for wanting to return. First, I feel the need to exchange views on the urban situation with those on the firing line; and second, I'd like to share with you our estimate of where the nation stands now on its community development programs compared to where it stood a year ago.

My simple themes are these:

That we have moved in a year, from the challenges of establishing modern urban aid programs to the challenges of putting them to work and producing meaningful results.

That, in this new phase of action, all of us at every level of government have new responsibilities of organization, management and execution.

That we will succeed in our endeavors to the degree that we realize our mutual obligations and responsibilities. In urban America of 1967, no one government, no one agency, no one individual goes it alone.

A year ago when I spoke with you, we were just beginning a new level of Federal effort to build and rebuild the urban areas of this Nation. I spoke of the Rent Supplements program and its problems of getting funded. Model Cities, Metropolitan Incentive Grants, and New Communities Aid were then proposals of the President that had not even been considered by the Congress.

Indeed, some experts announced that the new programs were "dead" even before the legislative hearings.

They said the Administration was foolish to try to update our urban strategy. They said we would be better off just requesting more money for old programs—even though such requests produced only yawns in the halls of Congress.

Those new proposals, once written off so prematurely, are now the law of the land and open for business.

We are doing business, moreover, at a new stand.

HUD is not HHFA simonized. It is a substantially different organization directed through new management practices, operated by means of new allocations of functions carried on by a new field structure. Some 5,000 HUD personnel are now either in new positions, new units, or new locations as a result of organizational changes. New budgets, new reporting systems, new review procedures are now in operation.

That is all background for my themes of today. In 1966, the big news was enactment of Model Cities, Metropolitan Development and New Communities legislation. In 1967, the big news is action.

The cities and towns of Massachusetts have expressed great interest in Model Cities. The Commonwealth heads all States in the number of cities planning to apply. I am glad that Senator Kennedy made possible the Worcester Conference on Model Cities last Monday, and that our Regional Office could provide technical assistance and—I hope—warm moral support.

We are receiving more proposals daily from potential Model Cities across the country and we expect to be making the first planning grants within sixty days from the initial $11 million authorized last year.

In the fiscal 1968 budget, we are asking the Congress for the full $412 million authorized—$400 million to carry the first Model Cities into the execution stages, and $12 million to begin a second generation of Model Cities. This program is not a competition, as some have said, among our cities, or among the poor of our cities. To see it thus is a gross burlesque of the endeavor. Rather the Model Cities program is a sustained effort to move to new and higher levels of Federal urban investment, and to new and improved levels of performance. As cities qualify, they will move forward to increasing participation in the program.

President Johnson has put his full commitment and enthusiasm behind this effort. We have just concluded our first week of appropriation hearings where the interest and enthusiasm of Congressman Boland has been an enormous aid. We look forward to the testimony of John Collins on our behalf as a distinguished national leader in urban affairs. And, this program has never been a partisan one. Congressmen Morse and Conte lent important support to the passage of last year's urban legislation.

The same drive for funds to support action on our new programs applies to Metropolitan Incentive Grants and the New Communities program.

All in all in our current requests to the Congress, we are seeking $3.2 billion compared to the $2 billion received last year. If the Congress responds favorably, we can increase significantly the impact of every major program in the Department.

We hear often from those who lament the inadequacy of Federal financial urban contributions. I think we can differ on how much is really adequate but we cannot really differ over whether or not the national contribution has been substantial and has been growing rapidly. It has, and we can show it.

In 1961, Federal financial commitments affecting urban areas totaled $17 billion. Between 1961 and 1964 they increased each year by 7.8 percent. By 1966, Federal commitments stood at $29 and a half billion. That means an annual increase from 1964 to 1966 of 17.7 percent. Our estimate for 1967 is $30.8 billion and for 1968 it is still higher at $33.8 billion.

So the national commitment, including HUD and other Federal agencies that help urban populations in many ways, has been rising twice as fast as the Gross National Product, and two-and-a-half times as fast as total Federal spending.

These figures are not a reason for complacency. They should not be interpreted to mean this Administration believes we are doing enough to solve urban problems. Clearly we have to do more and that is why we are seeking the new obligational authority for the Model Cities and other programs.

Yet simply agitating for more resources is not enough. As we seek greater and greater public investments, we must recognize the increasing public and Congressional insistence that we produce a product for the price we ask. As budgets grow, we must show results in urban development.

Let me make this point clear. The Vietnam war is not the only restraint on urban investment, nor is space, nor is foreign aid. These are great national missions. We will not abandon them. We will succeed in each of them. But these commitments do not rob the urban purse. Even if we include Vietnam costs, the traditional administrative budget, as a percent of Gross National Product, is at 17 percent—no more than it was in 1955. And the public debt, as a percent of Gross National Product, has been steadily decreasing—from 134 percent in 1946 to an expected 41 percent at the end of fiscal 1968. We can afford what we can wisely spend.

The real issue of urban development today is not just spending—but prudent, effective and humane spending. Our principal challenge is not money but competence. Our real need is for every level of government to improve its capabilities, revise its procedures, upgrade its manpower, increase its sophistication and accept the necessity to work together to secure results. Our concern must be the viability of the Federal system in a time of stress and strain.

That is why we have put so much effort in revamping HUD's organization this year.

That is why we welcome the new efforts of State governments to rethink their role in community development—efforts such as the proposals to reform Massachusetts state agencies just put forward by Governor Volpe.

That is why the Model Cities Program places such emphasis on the need for many levels of government to pull together, and for private enterprise, quasi-public agencies, charitable and non-profit institutions to come together in an interdependent and democratic pattern.

It is heartening to see so many states, cities, towns, and counties facing up to the challenge of administration and execution, exploring ways to work together, concentrating on tangible solutions of complex problems. These governments avoid the error of continuing to promise more—and produce less.

In contrast, it is sometimes disturbing to see that there are still those in responsible positions in urban affairs who assert that there are simple, easy tidy solutions to the subtle, complex, and revolutionary processes of change in urban society.

These spokesmen would have you believe that mere strokes of the pen, decisions of the President, reforms by the United States Treasury would solve our urban dilemma. They insist they can take care of their own city if only the Federal bureaucrats or the Congress,—or the taxpayers—would send the cash and then get out of the way.

Their favorite theme to Federal officials is this: Just give us the money and throw out the rules: more dough; less advice.

Now this kind of fiscal fantasy has a lot of appeal. Every Federal agency head has probably had day dreams of a world of full appropriations and no General Accounting Office, no departmental legal office, and no Congressional investigation.

In the current spate of tax-sharing and so-called "unconditional grant" proposals (both in and out of Congress) there resides a similar hope that direct, simple, and perhaps painless ways can be found to solve the very real financial problems of State and local governments. These proposals, however, raise more questions than they settle—and they quite properly will call forth a good deal of national study and debate.

For example, there is the question as to what governmental body or what level of government should be the recipient of Federal tax largesse. Quite understandably, the governors are rather interested in seeing it go directly to the States; the mayors are convinced that it should go to the cities; antipoverty and urban renewal agencies prefer dealing directly—as at present—with federal agencies; school boards are inclined to favor direct aid channeled to school districts. And so it goes.

To attempt to turn back Federal taxes by formula to municipalities presents great practical problems as well as serious policy questions.

To separate financial and program responsibilities—to tax at one level of government and spend at another—is fraught with dangerous consequences.

There are obvious problems of how you get the money where the need is, and how you ensure that it is not spent frivolously. These questions are quite properly part of the Federal responsibility when it comes to the disbursement of national tax resources. The "go it alone" posture of certain city officials is the counterpart of national isolationism—just as appealing and just as impossible in the modern world.

For the time being, I would like to return from fiscal unrealities to deal with management realities.

And here, I suggest, we all have problems. Take the field of urban renewal, for example: Currently, the preparation of local plans for urban projects takes an average of 25 months. Project execution (not counting construction) has taken an average of another five years for those projects completed to date. But many more are still unfinished. One-half of urban renewal projects started in 1950, the first year of the program, have not yet been completed.

Recently we have had to suspend Federal renewal assistance in Cleveland because of the inability of the city to move forward. Holding that progress on the city's urban renewal projects was "generally unsatisfactory", Secretary Weaver refused to consider an enlarged application for one project and withdrew a $10.4 million fund reservation on another project that has been in planning since the middle of 1961.

Recently, we suspended open space and other metropolitan development programs in Montgomery County, Maryland, when for time it was uncertain that a genuine planning process was in operation as required by law.

We will continue to examine performance records in our assistance programs to see how we can reduce the time now required to move from planning to execution. For in a period when needs for our programs are mounting, we can ill afford to set aside large sums of Federal money, year after year, without seeing measurable progress. Such carelessness with scarce resources would be the greatest waste of all.

Meantime, we will move forward to improve operational capability in urban programs as a national responsibility. The Committee on Appropriations is now considering our request for 1½ million for continuing the urban fellowships program (of which the first 93 awards have just been made) for initiating the new program of grants to States for urban information and technical assistance services to small communities; and for getting underway the grant program for training public technical and professional employees in the community development field.

These programs will help to meet the critical shortage of trained personnel in the urban field. In 1964, the American Society of Planning Officials found over 500 unfilled positions for urban planners, and predicted the creation of 11,000 to 11,500 *new* planning positions in the following five years, as the planning requirements in many programs became more demanding. The need for preservice and in-service training for public employees has likewise increased dramatically, as developing technology and rapid urban growth place new demands upon them.

There is also a need for national resources to go into a research and development program that no community and no state could undertake. That is why we are asking Congress for the funds for research to move toward a basic foundation in urban knowledge *that can be used in communities.*

There is a need for national resources to experiment with and demonstrate new and innovative solutions to urban problems that no community could undertake on its own. That is why we are asking local governments to move ahead on the Model Cities and other *demonstration programs.*

So the new thrust and the new reality of urban affairs does not allow an escape into the world of a municipal Big Rock Candy Mountain where the budget is unlimited, taxes non-existent, and voters inactive. Nor do they permit a retreat to the old bread and butter politics of the past, when the city existed for selfish exploitation by its managers, public and private. Instead, urban realism requires the recognition of complexity, the development of new capabilities, and for all of us in this interdependent system a reliance on mutual respect and a spirit of cooperation.

Those of us in the service of the city, whether local, state, or national, can ill afford these days our private disputes. Back-biting, gossip and intrigue ill become us. We have too much to learn, too much to do. We know that modern American cities will not be built by the innocent, or the ignorant, or the arrogant.

The stakes in the urban game are high—they involve four-fifths of the next generation.

They involve the places in which nearly all people will live, and work, and play, their community designs, their opportunities for the good life.

Our urban tomorrow will not be built by whim or impulse, but by reason, knowledge, humility and cooperation.

MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR U.S. ARMED FORCES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the request of the gentleman from New York, Hon. Thaddeus J. Dulski, on Monday, June 5, 1967, I wish to extend my remarks in the Record in support of H.R. 10226.

I am most pleased that the House of Representatives on Monday approved H.R. 10226, which I cosponsored, by such an overwhelming vote—316 to 0. This legislation will provide swift and efficient postal service for our servicemen and women assigned to overseas points.

As stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski], I was unavoidably absent from the House on Monday and was on official business in my home State of Montana.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a more *or less natural result of the concern and* earnest desire on the part of the American people to express our deep and abiding gratitude and our respect for our young men and women in uniform.

It is the outgrowth of the studies and recommendations the members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee have made in three reports to the House, on the basis of on-site investigations and reviews in Europe and in the Far East.

On the basis of those studies and recommendations, in which I participated, I sponsored legislation during both the 89th Congress—H.R. 12267—and during the 90th Congress—H.R. 4771—to fulfill the military mail program which we em*barked on 2 years ago. I feel that I was* honored to be a cosponsor of H.R. 10226, which now has received the unanimous support of the House of Representatives.

The bills that were introduced early in the 90th Congress were assigned to the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, of which I am chairman. We immediately began plans to review the matter and to schedule hearings. I want to thank the members of the subcommittee for the diligence evidenced by their attendance at the hearings and particularly for their unanimous support of this legislation. They are to be commended for the patience and understanding that was necessary to be able to work out a compromise that was accepted by our full committee so overwhelmingly, and as I have stated, was passed by the House by unanimous vote.

We had 16 bills before our subcommittee for consideration which, generally speaking, could be divided into two groups. The one group of bills represents the legislation that has been passed by the House, and the second group of bills would have included an additional major mailing privilege. This privilege would have extended the free mailing privilege to include a sender in the United States when the letter was mailed to the serviceman in a combat area, and would have amplified the category of mail entitled to the free mailing privilege from letters, post cards, and sound-recorded communications, to include the news publications and parcels of any class of mail not over 5 pounds.

I wish we could have included this benefit in our legislation, but we felt that we should reject the proposal at this time, primarily on the basis that the estimated additional $30 million cost would be excessive under the existing circumstances. Also, such a mailing privilege would extend far beyond any similar mailing privileges afforded members of the Armed Forces during our past military conflicts.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, I am most pleased that the House has acted favorably on this proposal, and I am hopeful that the Senate will be able to schedule H.R. 10226 for early consideration.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 10226 was brought to the floor for passage yesterday I was unavoidably detained in New York City at a meeting with other public officials whose areas will be adversely affected by construction of the Port of New York Authority's World Trade Center. The meeting was a long-standing commitment which could not be broken.

This legislation is most timely and worthwhile. Had I been present, I certainly would have voted for it.

IMMEDIATE CEASE-FIRE IN MIDDLE EAST A MUST

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the fuse has been lit. Who lit it is not the question with which we ought to be primarily concerned. Every effort should be first exerted to put the fuse out before it is too late.

Unless an early settlement is reached, the situation in the Middle East is more likely to explode into world war III than the conflict in Vietnam. It is my fervent hope that the United Nations Security Council will act with wisdom and dispatch to effect a cease-fire. If it fails to do so the usefulness of the United Nations as a peacekeeping organization will have ebbed to zero.

As responsible leaders of the most powerful member of that organization let us give full support to President Johnson's plea for immediate cease-fire action by the United Nations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Everett, on Wednesday, June 7, 1967, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Saylor, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Erlenborn) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Berry, for 1 hour, on June 7.

Mr. Halpern, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. Steed, for 1 hour, on Thursday, June 8.

Mr. Addabbo (at the request of Mr. Patten), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Wolff (at the request of Mr. Patten), for 30 minutes, on June 7; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Michel and to include tables and extraneous matter in his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. Findley (at the request of Mr. Erlenborn) to include a table and other extraneous material with his remarks during the debate today.

(The following Members and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Martin.

Mr. Schadeberg.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Patten) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Farbstein.

Mr. Downing.

Mr. Eilberg.

Mr. Tenzer in two instances.

Mr. Daniels.

Mr. Hamilton.

Mr. Bennett.

Mrs. Sullivan to revise and extend her remarks in the Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Giaimo and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $275.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 7, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

808. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of agreements signed for the use of foreign currencies in April and May 1967, under Public Law 480, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

809. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for improvements in supply and maintenance support for F–4 aircraft, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

810. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in certain cases of aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

811. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment of Federal savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 10340. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 503. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7476, a bill to authorize adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 339). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 504. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 10328, a bill to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 340). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 10541. A bill to amend the act of April 14, 1966, for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 10542. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to add 1,726 miles to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to designate such additional mileage as the route for a highway in such Interstate System from Brownsville, Tex., to the North Dakota-Canadian border; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10543. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10544. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 10545. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 10546. A bill to amend the act of October 24, 1951, in order to insure that the salaries of the police for the National Zoological Park shall equal those of members of the United States Park Police having comparable duties; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 10547. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 10548. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide assistance for owners and employees of small business concerns displaced or injured by Federal or federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10549. A bill to provide for equitable acquisition practices, fair compensation, and effective relocation assistance in real property acquisitions for Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 10550. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to provide for more equitable treatment of persons affected by real property acquisitions in Federal or federally assisted programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 10551. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 10552. A bill to amend chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in regard to certain investments by dealers in real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 10553. A bill to further extend the period of restrictions on lands of the Quapaw Indians, Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10554. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code with respect to civil service retirement credit for employees injured in line of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself, and Mr. Blatnik):

H.R. 10555. A bill to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10556. A bill to authorize the retirement on full annuity after 30 years of service of employees subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 10557. A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 10558. A bill to establish a National Commission for the Preservation of Foreign Language Resources; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 10559. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY (for himself, and Mr. Aspinall) (by request):

H.R. 10560. A bill to provide for the economic development and management of the resources of individual Indians and Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 10561. A bill to amend chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in regard to certain investments by dealers in real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 10562. A bill to assist State and local governments in combating the incidence of crime, to improve law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 10563. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed thirty years cf railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California (for himself, Mr. Moss and Mr. Leggett):

H.R. 10564. A bill to amend section 2(3), section 8c(2), and section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.R. 10565. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to add 1,726 miles to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to designate such additional mileage as the route for a highway in such Interstate System from Brownsville, Tex., to the North Dakota-Canadian border; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 10566. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Sac and Fox Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 10567. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 10568. A bill to amend section 2(3), section 8c(2), and section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 10569. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 10570. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the basic workweeks of firefighting personnel of executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 10571. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record, to eliminate certain special requirements for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, to equalize the criteria for determining dependency of a child on his father or mother, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's or father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. Aspinall, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania, Mr. Cohelan, Mr. Daniels, Mr. Dent, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Hanley, Mrs. Kelly, Mr. Leggett, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Moss, Mr. Multer, Mr. O'Hara of Michigan, Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Tunney, Mr. Charles H. Wilson and Mr. Zablocki):

H.R. 10572. A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 10573. A bill to provide authority to increase the effectiveness of the Truth in Negotiations Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 10574. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 10575. A bill to permit West Virginia to obtain social security coverage under its agreement with the Federal Government for policemen and/or firemen in positions covered by State or local retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10576. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 10577. A bill to reclassify certain key positions and increase salaries in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 10578. A bill providing for a study of serious interruptions of certain essential services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 10579. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to provide certain benefits for reserves of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and members of the National Guard, who are injured in connection with inactive duty training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H.R. 10580. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to add 1,726 miles to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to designate such additional mileage as the route for a highway in such Interstate System from Brownsville, Tex., to the North Dakota-Canadian border; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 10581. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit payment to the recipient of medical assistance, for physician services furnished under the program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 10582. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 10583. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10584. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 10585. A bill to create a body corporate known as Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, 1861–65; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10586. A bill to reclassify certain key positions and increase salaries in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 10587. A bill to amend the Public

Health Service Act in order to establish in the Public Health Service the position of Chief Veterinary Officer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. CORBETT):

H.R. 10588. A bill to increase the amount of real property which may be held by the American Academy in Rome; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 10589. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 10590. A bill to prohibit the disposal of the Naval Academy dairy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 10591. A bill to permit the administrative adjustment of certain wheat acreage allotment reductions resulting from action taken by farmers prior to 1965 in good faith reliance upon representations or advice of authorized representatives of the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 10592. A bill to amend section 255 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to eliminate epilepsy as an affliction prohibiting employment of aliens on board vessels arriving in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 10593. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1899, to authorize the United States to recover by civil actions the cost of removing certain obstructions from the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 10594. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 10595. A bill to prohibit certain banks and savings and loan associations from fostering or participating in gambling activities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 10596. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 10597. A bill to establish the Tremont-Rice Cabin National Historic Site in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 10598. A bill to amend the act of October 19, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes," so as to control all types of illegal transportation of cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 10599. A bill relating to the Tiwa Indians of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 10600. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to all unremarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 1 year or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 10601. A bill to require the registration of pistols in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 10602. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 10603. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 10604. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to provide for family planning programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 602. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.J. Res. 603. Joint resolution requesting the Department of Defense to utilize dairy products produced in the United States in the rations of all branches of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 604. Joint resolution concerning a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.J. Res. 605. Joint resolution requiring an adequate representation of all the residents of the District of Columbia on the advisory bodies established by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.J. Res. 606. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 607. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the power of the Supreme Court to declare any provision of law unconstitutional; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 368. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the crisis in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H. Res. 499. Resolution requesting the Department of Defense to use butter in its rations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Res. 500. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of water pollution hearings; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 501. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that certain social security and railroad retirement benefits shall not be made subject to Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROTH:

H. Res. 502. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that social security and railroad retirement benefits not be made subject to Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

220. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to increasing the funds available to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for basic biological investigation in connection with water projects on the north coast of California; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

221. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, relative to reimbursement of State advances to municipalities for planning studies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

222. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, relative to providing a sound and healthy domestic trawl fishery through tariff or quota protection on imported groundfish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

223. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to changing the method of dividing funds allotted under the Federal cropland adjustment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 10605. A bill for the relief of Lynn Jestina Joseph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 10606. A bill for the relief of Sheila Monica Estick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 10607. A bill for the relief of Lila Everts Weber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 10608. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yoshi Kitao Brown and her son, Alfred Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 10609. A bill for the relief of Shirley Levitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 10610. A bill for the relief of Miss Juliana C. Casino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10611. A bill for the relief of Judith Virginia Edge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 10612. A bill for the relief of James Peters, Jr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 10613. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Grace Patton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10614. A bill for the relief of Guiseppa Serra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10615. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Ragusa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 10616. A bill for the relief of Dr. Reynaldo A. Aseron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 10617. A bill for the relief of Walter L. and Thelma M. Bossard; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 10618. A bill for the relief of Garbis Tarakci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 10619. A bill for the relief of Alessandrina Medina de Ibanez and children, Norah Sylvian Ibanez (age 16) and Juan Lewis Ibanez (age 12); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

98. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the District of Columbia Republican Committee, relative to District of Columbia self-government; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Aircraft Carrier U.S.S. "John F. Kennedy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, on May 27, 1967, the aircraft carrier, U.S.S. *John F. Kennedy*, was launched by the Newports News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., at Newport News, Va. This was truly a momentous occasion, which was attended by an enthusiastic crowd of nearly 30,000 people.

So many dignitaries were present that it was impossible to afford everyone the hospitalities and courtesies that we would have desired. In addition to President Lyndon B. Johnson, we were graced by the presence of Mrs. John F. Kennedy and her lovely children, Caroline and John. Caroline sponsored the great ship, with her mother serving as her matron of honor.

In addition to those mentioned, the KENNEDY brothers and their lovely wives were present, as well as the vivacious mother of the late President, Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy. The presence of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and Secretary of the Navy Paul H. Nitze also gave significance to this great occasion.

It was a beautiful day in Newport News, Va., and it was a great day for the Navy.

The President of the United States delivered the principal address, and it was eloquent, timely, and extremely appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the remarks of the President at the christening of the aircraft carrier, U.S.S. *John F. Kennedy*, at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., at Newport News, Va., on May 27, 1967, in the RECORD.

The address is as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE CHRISTENING OF THE AIRCRAFT CARRIER U.S.S. "JOHN F. KENNEDY"

Mrs. Kennedy, Caroline and John, Mrs. Joseph Kennedy, Senators Kennedy and other members of the Kennedy family, Secretary McNamara, Secretary Nitze, Mr. Holden, distinguished ladies and gentlemen:

In March, 1943, almost a quarter of a century ago, a young naval lieutenant assumed his first command—a tiny PT boat—and sailed intrepidly into the savage battle for the Solomons.

Next year 5,000 Americans will put to sea in this giant ship named John F. Kennedy, for whom the voyage of destiny began in the Solomons and ended tragically at the pinnacle of national affection and respect, the Presidency of the United States.

This is the third carrier since the end of the Second World War to bear the name of a man. Carriers are normally named for famous battles, or great ships of the past. Its only companions are named for Franklin Delano Roosevelt and James V. Forrestal.

This is highly appropriate because these three singular men had a great deal in common:

Each of them died in the service of his country.

Each of them understood that, whatever the risk, men must defend freedom, the leaven in the bread of life that alone makes true peace possible.

Each of them believed—in John Kennedy's moving words: "It is the fate of this generation . . . to live with a struggle we did not start, in a world we did not make. But the pressures of life are not always distributed by choice. And while no nation has ever been faced by such a challenge, no nation has ever been so ready to seize the burden and glory of freedom."

To face that challenge, John Kennedy knew, took strength as well as idealism: he knew it as a student who saw the failure of appeasement in the 1930's; he knew it as a Naval Officer in the South Pacific; he knew it as President of the United States.

Because John Kennedy understood that strength is essential to sustain freedom, because he recognized that we cannot afford to mark time or stand in place, he requested funds for this carrier from the Congress in 1963.

In the year 2000—and beyond—this majestic ship we christen today may still be sailing the oceans of the world. We pray that her years will be years of peace. But if she must fight, both the flag she flies and the name she bears will carry a profound message to friend and foe alike.

For the five thousand Americans who will man this great ship—and for all their countrymen, whose hopes ride with them—this is a moment of reflection.

Today, as throughout our history, we bear fateful responsibilities in the world. From the moment of our national creation, American ideals have served as a beacon to the oppressed and the enslaved.

In times past, it has often been our strength and our resolve which have tipped the scales of conflict against aggressors, or would-be aggressors. That role has never been an easy one. It has always required not only strength, but patience—the incredible courage to wait where waiting is appropriate, to avoid disastrous results to short-cut history. And sacrifice—the tragic price we pay for our commitment to our ideals.

No President understood his Nation's historic role and purpose better than John F. Kennedy. No man knew more deeply the burdens of that role. And no man ever gave more.

Let this ship we christen in his name be a testament that his countrymen have not forgotten.

Thank you, very much.

Military Mailing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, along with several hundred other people yesterday, I found myself a captive passenger of the Pennsylvania Railroad. Since the service between Washington and my Philadelphia home was just about completely electrified, the just about complete failure of electrical power supply yesterday morning halted the train on which I was a passenger and left me cooling my heels for several hours.

I do not make the claim that I was inconvenienced any more than my fellow passengers, but I do make the claim that it caused me to lose an opportunity I very much wanted. I am referring to the opportunity to cast my vote in this House yesterday in favor of H.R. 10226.

This is a bill I have had my eye on for some time and this is a subject with which I am more than slightly familiar and completely in accord. There is no doubt in my mind that mailing privileges for members of our Armed Forces should indeed be extended to include many more Americans who are not scrimping on their services to us.

I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the failure of electrical power cost me my opportunity to vote for that bill. If my train had stopped closer to the Capital than Wilmington, Del., I may even have considered—like our infantrymen and letter carriers themselves—walking.

Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, in April I mailed out approximately 68,000 questionnaires to people in my district. We had a most gratifying return of approximately 13 percent. Listed below are the results of this poll.

One of the most timely and significant questions was number 1, in regard to what should be done in Vietnam—66.5 percent felt we should mount an all-out effort for military victory; only 6.5 percent agree with present policies in the conduct of the war; 4.3 percent advocated our withdrawal as soon as possible; 15.4 percent favor a negotiated peace; and 7.3 percent were undecided. With the four alternatives as an answer, it is most significant that two-thirds advocate strong military measures, utilizing all of our military might to win this war as quickly as possible.

Question number 4 concerning the success of the war on poverty indicated that 84 percent of our people feel that it is not successful, with only 4.8 percent feeling it had been successful. The mismanagement and waste in this program has certainly elicited no support from the people of Nebraska.

Sixty percent of those who answered the questionnaire favored my bill, H.R. 333, which would amend the Sherman Antitrust Act and bring the labor unions under its provisions. Thirty percent were opposed, and 10 percent undecided. This legislation would eliminate the monopoly, which, under the current law, is granted to the labor unions, but not to business.

Question number 6 dealt with a bill which I have introduced in the last four Congresses that would allow a $1,000 tax exemption for each child in college, where the parents contribute to their main support. The results were an overwhelming 80.6 percent in favor, with only 15.6 percent opposed. This clearly shows that Nebraskans are definitely opposed to sending millions of dollars in tax money to Washington and then having the Federal Government redistribute part of these funds for education and other welfare programs.

The questionnaire follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. What should be done in Vietnam?			7.3
A. Continue present policies?	6.5		
B. Mount an all-out effort for military victory?	66.5		
C. Withdraw as soon as possible?	4.3		
D. Make a negotiated peace?	15.4		
2. Do you favor increased social security benefit payments financed by both employee and employer?	21.5	67.0	11.5
3. Do you favor a change in our draft laws by			58.4
A. Eliminating all education deferments?	.8		
B. Eliminating education deferments for postgraduate work only?	4.0		
C. Using a lottery system in determining order of call-up?	36.8		
4. We are spending this year, $1,500,000,000 on the war on poverty. Do you feel this program has been successful?	4.8	84.0	11.2
5. Do you favor my bill H.R. 333, which would amend the Sherman Antitrust Act and bring labor unions under its provisions?	60.0	30.0	10.0
6. Do you approve of the bill which I have introduced to allow parents who have children in college an additional $1,000 tax exemption per year for each student?	80.6	15.6	3.8
7. Do you favor import quotas on all beef and lamb imports?	83.0	7.9	9.1
8. Do you feel that crime has increased because of			35.4
A. Lack of Federal controls?	4.8		
B. Failure of the courts?	53.3		
C. General moral decline in America?	6.5		
9. Do you favor eliminating the electoral college and substituting the election of the President and Vice President by popular vote?	77.4	11.4	11.2

Representative John M. Murphy of New York, Addresses Dinner of American Veterans of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 27, 1967, my friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN M. MURPHY, of New York, addressed a dinner of the American Veterans of Israel at the Carnegie Endowment Center, New York City.

Representative MURPHY attributed the survival of the State of Israel primarily to the unfailing spirit of its people and to their commitment to democratic principles.

The example of the Israel people's struggle for survival serves as a constant reminder to people throughout the world that the preservation of freedom requires a continual commitment. Thus, it is my pleasure to submit Mr. MURPHY's statement for the benefit of all our colleagues who today are gravely concerned over the Middle East situation:

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY ADDRESSES DINNER OF AMERICAN VETERANS OF ISRAEL AT CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT CENTER IN NEW YORK, MAY 27, 1967

Just 2 weeks ago the State of Israel celebrated its 19th year of Independence. Like any birthday, it was a chance to pause and reflect on the past, take inventory on the present, and plan for the future.

But Israel was celebrating more than another year of progress and prosperity; it was celebrating another year of survival. All that Israel has achieved has come only through struggle and conflict. Those of you who manned the freedom ships which carried immigrants through the British blockade, and those of you who joined in the Israeli War of Independence, know the extent of that conflict, the difficulty of that struggle, and the miracle of that survival.

Even before Israel was founded, the Jews faced serious obstacles. After World War II, those who had survived the Nazi slaughter of nearly six million Jews sought refuge in Palestine. But there were already many Jews there, and the Arabs opposed additional immigration. The British, who controlled the Palestine area under a U.N. Mandate, reduced the immigration quota. Thus the Jews arriving from Europe had to cross a British Naval blockade before even reaching Palestine, and had to face Arab terrorism when they finally arrived.

By the time the British announced the date of their departure from Palestine the lines of battle had been drawn. Even before the British left, Arab armies invaded the area in defiance of the U.N. General Assembly. They harassed the Jewish population with border raids, ambushes, assassinations and terrorism. It was in the midst of this turmoil, on May 14, 1948, that the Jews proclaimed their independence, and the State of Israel was born.

The next day Azzam Pasha, the Secretary-General of the Arab League, made a statement which, in effect, announced the coming war and set the tone for Arab-Israeli relations from that time to the present day. He said:

"This will be a war of extermination and a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacres and the Crusades."

With that, the war began.

We all know the events that followed; Arab aggression encountered Israeli determination and the cause of freedom prevailed. The peace that followed was a tenuous peace, but it enabled Israel to turn to her own problems of growth and development. In the Years that followed Israel developed a thriving agriculture and a strong, modern economy where before a barren desert had existed. In addition, it produced a strong and stable democracy in an area where democracy and stability are the exception.

But again it was progress with struggle. Egypt closed the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping, and the rest of the Arab nations joined in economic boycott. Terrorist border raids continued and intensified. Nineteen years of progress while surrounded by aggressive opposition can only be explained by the unfailing spirit of the Israeli people.

This, I think, is the unique explanation of Israel's survival; whatever the obstacle, the spirit of of the Israeli people has prevailed. But it explains more than the success of one country. It prophesies the eventual triumph of freedom everywhere. All men yearn to be free, and though many are today under the oppressive heel of tyranny, as long as the spirit still burns in their hearts, their cause will prevail.

I think the Arab countries today would profit from an evaluation of the Israeli nation before pursuing a reckless course of aggression. Israel's determination to survive is no less today than it was nineteen years ago. And let there be no mistake—the United States and free nations everywhere will do whatever is necessary to maintain peace in the Middle East and to preserve the independence and territorial integrity of all nations.

The spirit of freedom that Israel has demonstrated so well has special significance for those of you who are Veterans of the Israeli War of Independence. The word Veteran usually means someone who did something in the past; it implies distance and isolation. But there is more to being a Veteran than reflecting on past accomplishments, although those accomplishments are worthy of reflection. Being a Veteran suggests a spirit that does not cease with the completion of a job, that does not die out, that can never be completely tucked away as a memory. The spirit of freedom which you all knew so well in 1947 has as much meaning today as it did then. Today, and every day, we are faced with obstacles no less threatening to our freedom than those you faced twenty years ago; our success today and tomorrow will require no less a dedication of spirit.

And so, I hope you use this annual gathering not just to pause and reflect, but to renew your commitment to freedom. You, better than most Americans, know that the preservation of this country depends on the strength of that commitment.

Fino Introduces 30-Year Civil Service Retirement Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing my bill to allow postal and civil service employees to retire after 30 years of service on full retirement annuities.

My purpose in reintroducing this legislation is simple. I believe that in our booming economy, we can afford to give our workers greater leisure periods, both during and after employment. There is no reason today why civil service employees ought not to be able to retire after 30 years of public service.

I strongly feel that any such 30-year retirement authorized ought to be allowed on a full annuity basis. If we are to allow and encourage civil servants to retire after 30 years on the job, we should not penalize them by giving them something less than full annuities.

A Commitment To Resist Aggression in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the Middle East situation has exploded into a senseless and dangerous war. This is a time when we must unite behind the President who must face difficult decisions in the days ahead.

The U.S. foreign policy to resist aggression in the Middle East was reiterated by President Johnson in clear and uncompromising terms in his statement of May 23, 1967, just as three Presidents before him stated over the past 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, during the last 10 days more than 116 Members of the House of Representatives have signed the statement made by our colleague, EMANUEL CELLER on May 23, 1967, pledging our fullest support "to measures which must be taken by the administration to make our position unmistakably clear to those who are now bent on the destruction of Israel that we are now prepared to take whatever action is necessary to resist aggression against Israel and to preserve the peace." As one of the Members who endorsed and cosponsored this statement of congressional resolve, I am prepared to support the President in any action necessary to help Israel resist Arab aggression in the Middle East. Our Nation's policy as restated by our President spells out our commitment to our only ally in the Middle East. This commitment must be backed up by any means necessary to convince the Arab forces that there is no place in the 20th century for "holy wars."

Israel fights valiantly while the maritime nations remain unable to agree on a simple declaration to guarantee freedom of passage through the Straits of Tiran, an international waterway.

Israel stands alone, even though the United States, England, and France guaranteed the independence and integrity of her territory.

Israel, in reliance on these solemn commitments, voluntarily withdrew her forces in 1957 from Sinai and from Sharm el Sheik. Today these solemn commitments are being challenged.

The Israeli Ambassador and General Dayan have stated that they do not want Americans to fight for Israel while the United Arab Republic by their lies and exaggerations are constantly seeking to encourage a confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union.

With his nose bleeding, Nasser now seeks a cease-fire. The Israelis would undoubtedly agree to a cease-fire, but with no strings attached. This is what Ambassador Goldberg is now advocating at the United Nations. The Soviet Union, together with India, are suggesting a cease-fire, including a withdrawal to positions of June 4, the lines which existed prior to the opening of the present hostilities.

Should Israel pull back as it did in 1957 and leave the Arabs in a position to renew belligerency at another time? Is this not the time for the United States and the other nations of the world to support a realistic and permanent solution in the Middle East?

This is the time for the United States to insist upon direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States. To achieve these desirable results our Government should give to Israel all possible material assistance and political support to bring an end once and for all to Nasser's policy of aggression and expansionism, designed to destroy the State of Israel, a member in good standing in the United Nations.

Notwithstanding the grave danger inherent in unilateral action by the United States I believe it is imperative that we declare our intention to meet our commitments should the United Nations and other diplomatic efforts fail. We cannot turn our back on an ally threatened with destruction at the hands of a group of nations who have proclaimed a "holy war."

In the face of the breaking of diplomatic relations with the United States by Egypt, Syria, and Algeria, it is my hope that the U.N. will take quick action to intervene and to bring about a cease-fire without strings attached.

The seeds of conflict in the Middle East were planted long ago and the tense situation has exploded just as predicted openly by Egypt and her allies.

On October 17, 1966—in the daily RECORD, page A5336—I warned of the grave danger in the Middle East represented by Syria's attempts to goad its Arab neighbors into an attack against Israel. I stated then that—

> The Syrians have openly admitted that they are conducting a "people's war of liberation" aimed at the destruction of the State of Israel. They have boasted that Israel will become a second Vietnam with the El Fatah terrorists playing the role of the Vietcong and Syria acting as a North Vietnam.

I have also called for a cessation of U.S. contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Administration which has fed, housed and educated 10,000 to 15,000 Arab refugees who enrolled in the Palestine Liberation Army trained in the Gaza strip and Sinai for the purpose of destroying the State of Israel.

On January 30, 1967, I called for a four-point policy to maintain peace in the Middle East. The proposal included a U.S. resolution calling upon the United Nations to institute full-scale peace talks between Israel and Arab countries; a substantial increase in the United Nations Emergency Force and border patrols to prevent aggression; a major diplomatic offensive to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on a cessation of the arms race in the Middle East and a suspension of financial assistance to Arab refugees who are enrolled in the Palestine Liberation Army.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the United Nations will rise to the occasion and will take this opportunity to achieve a cease-fire without strings and to settle once and for all the disputes which have kept the fires of conflict burning for 20 years in the Middle East. But we cannot build our foreign policy on hopes. We must look past the United Nations and decide now on a foreign policy which will make it clear that we will not tolerate aggression or international seaway robbery in the Middle East—and that we seek and will support a permanent solution to the tensions and disputes which have reigned in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation must stand firm and hope that the knowledge that the United States will not stand idly by will spur the United Nations to greater efforts and to greater achievements.

Let the nations of the world and the Members of the United Nations know that if they do not act, the United States will act—notwithstanding the grave dangers inherent in such action.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to once again voice their support for firm U.S. policy in the Middle East.

The 60th Anniversary of the American Hungarian Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to point out to all Members that this year the American Hungarian Association is celebrating its 60th anniversary.

The American-Hungarian Federation has been a great force in promoting better relations between Americans of Hungarian extraction and other Americans. The federation has done yeoman work in educating Hungarians about American values in order that they might become useful and productive citizens of this Nation. In addition, the federation has done much to inform Americans about the ancient culture of the Hungarian nation.

The federation has done effective work in opposing totalitarianism of both the Nazi and the Communist variety and it has been a strong force for individual liberty and freedom, for not only the Hungarian nation, but for all people everywhere who live without freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this useful organization on its 60th anniversary and it is my earnest wish that it enjoys the same success in the next threescore years as it has in the last.

Vocational School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the rare privilege and pleasure to address a fine group of young citizens at the first commencement ceremonies of the new Southeastern Indiana Vocational School in Versailles.

I am proud of this school. It has been established through the cooperative efforts of citizens in seven counties. They have realized that they can act together to develop far better programs in vocational education than they ever could while they acted separately.

I am proud of the students. Their intelligence, their dedication, and their new skills will be an important contribution to the economic development of their counties of southeastern Indiana and the Ninth Congressional District. Without these young people, and those who will follow after them, economic development would be very difficult, perhaps even impossible.

The promise of this school is so great that it has begun to set a remarkable example to other rural areas of Indiana. Evidence of this can be found in a recent editorial of the Bedford, Ind., Daily Times-Mail.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial and my address to the students in the RECORD:

COMMENCEMENT FOR SOUTHEASTERN AREA VOCATIONAL SCHOOL, VERSAILLES, IND.

Vocational education is vitally important to the nation, to Indiana, as well as to your own personal lives.

This afternoon is no ordinary graduation. It may be hard to realize it sitting in a pleasant commencement exercise, in the pleasant Southern Indiana town of Versailles, on a pleasant May afternoon. But this area vocational school, and especially the graduates of this school, are vital parts of the strength, the productivity and the security of this nation.

I can hear you mumbling to yourself now. You are probably saying, "That Congressman has really gone off the deep end this time—saying that vocational education is vital to the security of the nation, and talking about how important it is to the nation."

But in spite of your mumblings, I'll stand my ground and I'll tell you why.

One of the most critical goals of this nation is to enable every American citizen to realize his potential and to utilize it fully in his own and the nation's best interest.

Thomas Wolfe, the great American writer, wrote, "So then to every man his chance, to every man regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity; to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him. This seeker is the promise of America."

By completing this course of vocational study, you are doing just what he wrote about. You've seized a chance, a golden opportunity. You've exercised your right to become whatever your manhood or womanhood and vision can combine to make. And that as Thomas Wolfe says, is the promise of America.

But it's more than just the promise of America, it is also the strength of America. It is only when men and women from across this broad and vast land are enabled to develop their abilities, their potential that America lives up to its commitment that human beings, individuals, are what really count. And it is only then that America is strong, free and productive.

I do not need to remind you of the enormous productivity of this nation. A new government statistic is that the manufacturing capacity of this nation has doubled since 1951. We have added as much capacity in the last 15 years as we did in the first 150 years of the nation's history.

Whether it is the American farmer producing 70% more per acre than he did in 1940;

Or the American postal worker handling 114,000 pieces each year (by far the best record in the world);

Or the American athlete running a 3 minute 50 second mile or pole vaulting 17 feet;

Or the American inventor turning out some 50,000 patents each year;

Or the American automobile worker producing 10,358,000 (1966) number of cars each year.

The lesson is the same—the American worker is enormously productive. And his productivity is the strength and therefore, the security of the nation.

You are now becoming one of America's productive workers. This should be a measure of personal satisfaction for you. Not all of us are in that category.

The other day my wife and I bought an outdoor grill. It was one of those fancy kinds with wheels, shelves, hooks for your utensils and all the rest. The problem was it came in a box completely disassembled. I'll not burden you with details, but suffice it to say that after two hours work with wheels, nuts, bolts and grills and a miscellaneous assortment of tubular pipes all over the basement floor, I came to the somewhat humiliating conclusion that I was not among that category of productive American workers.

But more seriously, and unfortunately, it is still true that despite our enormous productivity and prosperity, this country has some manpower problems. This is one of the paradoxes of prosperity.

12% of our young people were looking for jobs at the end of 1966.

Minority groups have unemployment rates double the overall rate.

Joblessness runs close to 10% in some slum areas.

During the course of 1966, probably about 10½ million workers suffered some unemployment.

Much of this unemployment occurs not because jobs are unavailable, but because people are unable to fill jobs.

Often the job is one place and the worker another place.

Sometimes the job calls for a special skill, the unemployed person does not have it.

Sometimes the employer insists on a high school diploma. The job seeker quit school.

Sometimes the employer demands a clean record and the applicant's record is marred by juvenile arrest.

Sometimes a job offers one day's work a week and a worker needs five days to support his family.

One of the problems, then, of our economy is this imbalance between the kinds of jobs there are and the skills of people who are available to take these jobs.

And this is why vocational education is so important to the nation. It helps to right the balance, to assure that skilled people are available to fill specified jobs. Frankly, I don't think we pay enough attention across the nation to this problem and the contribution vocational education can make toward solving it. Too little attention is paid to the 2 out of 3 people who do not go to college and the many others who do not finish college.

I hope, then, you are beginning to see why this vocational education area school is so important, why these teachers, administrators and participating school districts are playing such a vital role.

Let me put the task of vocational education to you in hard statistics.

Over 2 million people leave school with no more than high school education.

About 400,000 at most have a marketable skill. Now that leaves a million six hundred thousand people each year who must learn a skill. The conclusion must be that our educational system in America must move toward a system that will prepare the great majority more effectively for work. That's precisely the task that vocational education seeks to do.

Now we've been thinking about the broad national view. Let's think a little bit about Southern Indiana. All of us want to see Southern Indiana grow and prosper and develop. Ask the men and the women in the 17 counties of the 9th Congressional District, "What does your community need most?" Many will reply, "Industrial development."

My friends, there will be no industrial development in the 17 counties of the 9th District without skilled people. Vocational education is needed in Southern Indiana if we are to forge ahead or even to keep pace, in the decade of the 70's.

The years ahead are not going to be easy for Indiana. Industrial development is tied more and more to technology and science. I'll make a little wager with you. If you'll show me the state or communty that is today pouring vast resources into technology and science, then I will show you the state or community with a bright future in industrial development.

Indiana has made a remarkable transition from a purely agricultural economy to an industrial and agricultural economy. The question is now, whether Indiana will move ahead aggressively into science-based industries while maintaining and developing the health of our present basic industries.

Our leadership in the state must not falter in planning and providing for the vocational, technical, and scientific education for a growing industrial economy, hopefully moving toward a scientific economy.

Now this challenge is a formidable one. For this school cannot teach every occupation. It must emphasize those skills broadly representative of several occupational areas. Students must recognize that they will work four or five occupational areas in a life-time. And they must learn the essential skills that can be found in all job areas regardless of shifts to different occupational areas within the economy. It makes no sense to teach key punch operations in a vocational school when data processing is developing in the economy.

Southern Indiana will only grow as this school, educators and industrialists stay alert to the shifting occupational demands of a space age economy.

Vocational education is of great importance not only to the nation and state, but also to you.

Not long ago a young man who had just completed vocational education wrote a letter to me. He said, "The things I have learned are many and opportunities like these are few. I feel proud to have participated in this class. The things I have learned will not leave me after this school ends but will stay with me to build a better future for my family."

The plaque which hangs in this school expresses the same thought, perhaps more eloquently, "The doors shall be open to anyone who sincerely wants, needs and can profit from vocational and technical instruction so that our people will have the opportunity to become equipped with sale-able skills, become gainfully employed, make a positive contribution to society and lead more useful and satisfying lives.

That's what we are all working for—an assurance that you, and hundreds who follow after you, will be equipped with marketable skills and able to make a positive contribution to society by leading useful and satisfying lives. Vocational education enables you to unlock your own potential. This is one of the great blessings in life—a sure sense of your own usefulness.

Fortunately, communities, people, governments are becoming aware of the importance of vocational education. Enrollments in vocational education courses have increased to more than 6 million in 1966, almost double the number enrolled in the previous years. The number of vocational education schools increased from 405 in 1966 to 756 in 1967. But with the great number of young people coming onto the labor market in the years ahead, we must constantly search to find better ways to reach and train them, for their benefit and the benefit of our state and nation.

Progress in vocational education and manpower is not the kind of thing you read about in the papers too much. Progress in this area are quiet victories. But each day victories are being won. We count 48 such victories today as the graduates step forward to receive their certificates.

This progress, these victories, come about because like-minded people in Southern Indiana have worked together for constructive purposes.

This school is a marvelous illustration of cooperative effort. The 7 counties that participate in this area vocational school were not big enough by themselves to have a large school, sponsoring a broad program of vocational education. But what they could not do individually, they have been able to do cooperatively.

This area vocational school serves as the vocational education department for several high schools. The participating school districts own property jointly and contribute money for its operation with a special levy. Now that's cooperation for a constructive purpose.

But that's not all of the cooperation. Business and industry have cooperated with this school. Advisory committees have been set to advise on the curriculum of the school to assure that the training young men, young women and some older ones too, get here will be needed in this area.

State, local and federal governments have worked together too in this creative partnership.

Now I know that there have been plenty of problems. I've had to involve myself in a few of them, just as many of you have. We also know there will be some more. But human beings are problem solvers—that's their most remarkable talent. And the overwhelming fact today is that this school is here, teachers are teaching, students are learning and all of us are the beneficiaries. All these things because like-minded people have worked together so you and those that follow, will become equipped with skills, will become gainfully employed, will make a positive contribution to society and will lead useful and satisfying lives.

It's worth all the effort, isn't it? Congratulations to all of you who have made it so.

[From the Bedford (Ind.) Daily Times-Mail, May 27, 1967]

VOCATIONAL SCHOOL

Congressman Lee Hamilton makes a strong point for the proposed new North Lawrence vocational school in a speech prepared for delivery tomorrow at the Area Vocational Educational School at Versailles.

The proposed new vocational school here will be part of a new high school and will provide facilities which until recently were found only in large cities. The school corporation already has approximately $300,000 in federal money to help pay for the vocational school.

In his prepared address, Hamilton says that vocational education is vitally important to the nation, to the state and in the personal lives of the students.

"By completing this course of vocational study," he said, "you are doing just what he (Thomas Wolfe) wrote about. You've seized a chance, a golden opportunity. You've exercised your right to become whatever your manhood or womanhood and vision can combine to make. And that is the promise of America."

The congressman said that vocational education is so important because it helps to right the balance, to assure that skilled people are available to fill specific jobs. "Frankly," he said, "I don't think we pay enough attention across the nation to this problem and the contribution vocational education can make toward solving it. Too little attention is paid to two out of three people who do not go to college and the many others who do not finish college."

Over two million people leave high school each year with no plans to go on to higher education. About 400,000 at most have a marketable skill. That leaves 1,600,000 each year who must learn a skill.

The Versailles school is apparently something akin to the one proposed near Bedford. Seven counties participate in the school and none of the seven was big enough to do the job by itself. What they could not do individually is being accomplished cooperatively.

While the North Lawrence vocational school will be strictly a project of this school corporation, facilities of the school will be open to transfers from other school corporations.

The school should be a great asset to this area. It should do much toward helping to keep high school graduates at home by training them for jobs in local industry. And with first-class training facilities available in the school system, prospective industries will no doubt give this careful consideration in their selection of plant sites.

The Longest Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that today is the "longest day"—in more ways than one—but in one way in particular. Today, 23 years ago, the Allied landings in Europe began.

June 6, 1944, was the longest day for millions of people all over the world, as the fate of a continent hung in the balance. All Americans would do well to pause and reflect on the courage of those who smashed through Festung Europa. On that day, American troops combined with the Allied forces waded ashore into enemy fire. The result of one of the most momentous invasions in history was the liberation of Western Europe within a year.

It is with deep sadness that we mark this day in the midst of war and not peace. We again feel the shadow of war spread over the world. We are now more than two-thirds through this century and still the "guns of August" are firing.

Since we live in a world of continuing crises, it is a common tendency for many to become absorbed in the present and to forget the past. Yet, we should never fail to remember that the strength of America made June 6, 1944, the longest and one of the brightest days of free men.

If We Don't Increase the Debt Limit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, recently I asked the Secretary of the Treasury the question: What will happen if the Congress fails to pass legislation to increase the debt limit? His answer has just come to me in the following letter. It seems to me that, in view of the contents of this letter, a Congressman might vote against the measure as a symbolic protest; but not as a cost-saving device. The only realistic way to save money is vote to cut and eliminate authorizations and appropriations.

The letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, June 5, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: In reply to your question: "What will happen if the Congress fails to pass legislation to increase the debt limit?"—the simple and direct answer is that the United States Government would not be able to pay its bills or repay all of its maturing debt after June 30, 1967.

Under existing law, the temporary debt ceiling of $336 billion reverts, after June 30, 1967, to $285 billion. We estimate that the actual level of debt, which was $331.1 billion on May 31, will be about 327 billion on June 30—some $42 billion above the ceiling which would take effect the next day.

The debt in existence at that time would have been issued legally, but without Congressional action to raise the ceiling from the $285 billion level it would not be possible to issue new debt—including even the refunding of outstanding obligations as they came due.

The cash balance we would have on hand at that time—amounting to perhaps $7 billion—would not last long. Whether that limited amount would be used to meet current Government payments—for example, to purchase defense material, pay salaries, or pensions—or for repaying maturing debt obligations, is beside the point. The point is that without action on the debt limit the United States Government would not be able to meet its lawful obligations, and that is not a tolerable position to be in.

One might ask how long $7 billion of cash could last. The mere repayment of the first three weekly issues of Treasury bills coming due in July would use $6.9 billion—and that cash would not be available unless all other Treasury cash expenditures were shut off completely; that would mean no payments on defense supplies, no payments of Government salaries, no payments of Government pensions, Social Security, unemployment benefits, and so on. Not only could no new savings bonds be sold, but we could also run out of cash to redeem existing bonds.

Last January, in spelling out the need for an immediate increase in the temporary debt ceiling, because an excessively tight debt limit had been interfering with normal Treasury cash and debt management operations since December 1966, I pointed out that unless the ceiling was raised by the beginning of March the Treasury would be able to pay only about half of the anticipated bills coming due in the first half of March.

The situation facing us at the end of June will be far more serious than that of early March. On that earlier occasion, it was a question of gradually pressing up to, and then byond, an existing debt ceiling of $330 billion. At the end of June, however, the current legislation provides a precipitate *drop* in the debt ceiling to a level, as noted, some $42 billion below the actual level of debt anticipated for June 30.

This country has never defaulted on its obligations, and I do not believe the Govrnment should be put in a position where its ability to fulfill its obligations is jeopardized.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

President's Science Adviser Calls for Noise Abatement Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I recently wrote to Dr. Donald F. Hornig, the President's science adviser and Chairman of the White House Aircraft Noise Abatement Task Force for a status report on certain aspects of the administration's noise abatement program.

I made this inquiry because of my interest in aircraft noise abatement in general and my bill, H.R. 1398 in particular. H.R. 1398 would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to establish noise abatement standards for aircraft certification similar to that proposed in the administration bill.

In addition my bill would authorize Federal regulations concerning modifications to airports as well as aircraft to reduce noise. Reimbursement for part of the cost of modifying aircraft and airports and acquiring land near airports for buffer zones is authorized by H.R. 1398.

I have met with Dr. Hornig and his assistants from time to time during the past year to discuss these problems and I include in the RECORD at this point our latest exchange of correspondence:

MAY 19, 1967.

Dr. DONALD F. HORNIG,
Director, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HORNIG: I am pleased with the progress which the White House Aircraft Noise Abatement Task Force has made during the past year in coordinating various programs designed to reduce jet noise. As Chairman of that White House Task Force, you have been directed by the President to "frame an action program to attack this problem" and for that reason, I would appreciate your comments on the following aspects of federal efforts in this field:

1. The NASA appropriation request for $50 million over 5 years to develop a "wholly new quiet engine".

I have been concerned that this proposed 5 year program may represent a duplication of effort both within the federal government and private industry. While I will continue to support long range programs to reduce aircraft noise, I am concerned that we may not be placing enough emphasis on short range programs and on this point I would like your comments on the feasibility of a project to scale down the JT 9D jet engine already developed by a major engine company.

2. The White House Task Force recommended legislation last year to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to set aircraft noise standards for use in certifying aircraft under the Federal Aviation Act. Hearings on the Administration bill have not been scheduled as yet and I urge you to restate the importance of early action on this proposed legislation.

3. The Task Force has also emphasized the importance of developing programs to encourage and assist local communities in connection with compatible land use planning near airports—both present airports and future sites. I have proposed legislation H.R. 1398 which would provide federal grants to local communities for the acquisition of land near airports for light industry, parkland, and other compatible uses.

Would you please advise me what progress the Task Force has made in connection with recommendations for executive or legislative action in this area?

I appreciate your efforts to bring relief to the ever-increasing number of citizens living in the shadow of the Nation's airports and your consideration of the points raised in this letter.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT TENZER,
Member of Congress.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1967.

Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TENZER: Thank you for your letter of May 19, 1967, concerning our efforts on behalf of aircraft noise alleviation. I appreciate your kind remarks concerning the progress of this program to which you have contributed so much and so am happy to comment on the points you have raised in your letter.

With respect to the *quiet engine program*, I should emphasize that it is a concept aimed at producing the quietest engine that is possible with current technology, as a standard for commercial engines rather than as a commercial engine development. At the present time, no authorization or appropriations for the complete program have been requested. NASA has requested $2 million for FY-1968 to conduct research in component technology leading to the *potential* development of such an engine, which would be significantly quieter than the JT–9D engine being developed by the Pratt and Whitney Aircraft Division of United Aircraft Corporation.

With respect to the duplication of efforts, our review of Federal research programs has not revealed any duplication within the government. Naturally, we would watch with care that any Federal program takes advantage of progress which has been made by private engine companies and does not duplicate their efforts. Of course, the government has no control over duplications of effort among the private companies. We know that noise reduction technology is a highly competitive matter, and some duplication among industrial concerns may prove generally advantageous, providing more complete exploration of possible routes to noise reduction and earlier and more economic results.

My review has revealed that it may be possible to scale down the JT–9D engine which has been designed for use in the Boeing 747. In fact, it is my understanding that tentative discussions are now underway within the air transport industry concerning the possibility of using a scaled down JT–9D for retrofit to reduce noise in current aircraft. However, there are many technical and economic problems which will need to be resolved before this route to aircraft noise alleviation can be shown to be practicable.

Concerning noise standards, I regard the passage of legislation authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to set *aircraft noise standards* to be critically important. In the long run it is the only way I can see to protect the public interest in this respect and legislation for this purpose was resubmitted by the Administration during the early days of the current Congress. I share your concern that hearings have not yet been scheduled. I cannot overemphasize the key importance in Federal efforts for aircraft noise alleviation of the authority which this legislation provides. Unless the government has power to set noise standards for future aircraft, progress simply cannot be assured.

It seems clear that Federal cooperation and assistance for states and communities will be necessary as part of a comprehensive program of *compatible land usage* near airports. A Task Force under the leadership of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has been exploring what can be done to encourage and assist local communities. Among the proposals being studied are various means of providing financial as well as other forms of assistance to communities for achieving the basic objectives outlined in your proposed legislation. I will be in touch with you when we are ready to propose recommendations, and I hope they will receive your support.

I appreciate your interest in this important and difficult problem and if I can be of further assistance to you please let me know.

Sincerely,

DONALD F. HORNIG, *Director.*

The President's science adviser has called the passage of aircraft noise abatement certification standards "critically important." I certainly share this view and have urged passage of effective noise abatement legislation since January of 1965.

I urge my colleagues to support the efforts of the White House Task Force on Noise Abatement and to call for early congressional hearings on all bills introduced on this subject.

Proposed Change in Patent Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in this Congress H.R. 7454, which, if enacted, would revise and update our patent laws. Inasmuch as this legislation is very technical in its provisions, I have had the following fact sheet prepared, summarizing the changes proposed by my legislation and comparing these amendments with both the present laws and H.R. 5924, an alternate proposal for revision:

Changes Made in Title 35 of the United States Code, "Patents", By H.R. 7454 and H.R. 5924 of the 90th Congress, Two Recodifications of This Title

PART I

§§ *1 and 2*. Neither bill makes any change with respect to these sections, establishing the Patent Office as part of the Department of Commerce and providing it with a seal to be used for the authentication of its documents.

§ *3*. Both bills increase the authorized maximum number of examiners-in-chief from 15 to 24. Both bills continue the provision for the appointment of the commissioner by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Both bills transfer the power of appointment of assistant commissioners and examiners-in-chief from the President to the Secretary of Commerce upon nomination of the Commissioner of Patents. Both bills fix the maximum salary of assistant commissioners at that provided for Grade 18 in the General Schedule of positions referred to in Section 5104 of Title V of the United States Code.

§ *4*. Both bills continue the existing restrictions on officers and employees obtaining an interest in patents.

§ *5*. Both bills continue existing bonding provisions.

§ *6*. Both bills subject all regulations issued by the Commissioner of Patents to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce. At the present time only regulations pertaining to the conduct of proceedings are specifically subject to approval of the Secretary of Commerce.

§ 7. H.R. 5924 in addition to continuing the present provisions of the code extends the jurisdiction of the Board of Appeals to cover, review or consideration of actions pertaining to re-examinations of published applications, as provided in section 136 which is added to the Code by this bill, and review or consideration of actions pertaining to the validity of a claim in an issued patent, as provided for in section 257 added to the Code by this bill. And, this bill also transfers to the Board of Appeals the functions of the boards of patent interferences.

H.R. 7454 makes no change in this section of the Code.

§ *8*. Neither bill makes any change which affects the establishment of the Patent Office Library.

§ *9*. Both bills modify the authority in reclassification of patents to spell out authority to classify published specifications of United States patents, and of scientific and technical information to facilitate the determination of the novelty of inventions.

§ *10*. Both bills rewrite the provision for supplying certified copies of the records of the Patent Office, to require specifically the payment of a fee and to limit the supplying of certified copies to persons entitled thereto. There is no definition as to who are "persons entitled thereto".

§ *11*. Both bills extend the publication authority of the Commissioner to allow publication of: patent abstracts, indexes of published applications and applicants, classification manuals and indexes of the classifications of patents, and the trademark laws. H.R. 5924 also adds to the publication authority the right to publish applications and patents. Both bills delete the authority of the Commissioner to exchange the Official Gazette, the annual indexes of patents and trademarks, the annual decisions in patent and trademark cases and pamphlet copies of the laws and regulations for publications desirable for use in the Patent Office.

§ *12*. Both bills delete this section which authorizes the exchange of copies of patents with foreign countries and add the provision as subsection (d) to rewritten section 41. H.R. 5924 substitutes a new section 12 which imposes upon the Commissioner the duty to conduct a program of research and development to expedite the handling of patent research and the duty, in consultation with the Advisory Council, to conduct studies of the needs and effectiveness of the patent system. H.R. 7454 imposes only the first of these duties.

§ *13*. Both bills delete this section, authorizing the supplying of public libraries with printed copies of specifications and drawings of patents.

§ *14*. Both bills delete this section requiring the Commissioner to make an annual report to Congress.

§ *15*. H.R. 5924 establishes an Advisory Council on patents of between 12 and 14 persons selected from public sectors affected by the patent system to study and evaluate the patent system.

§ *21*. Neither bill makes any change with respect to taking action or paying a fee when a due date falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday.

§ *22*. Neither bill makes any change in the requirement as to the printing or typewriting of papers to be filed in the Patent Office.

§ *23*. Neither bill makes any change in the requirement as to the taking of affidavits and depositions in patent cases.

§ *24*. Neither bill changes the provisions covering the subpoenaing of witnesses in contested patent cases.

§ *25*. Both bills continue the present provisions of subsections (a) and (b) as subsections (b) and (c) and insert as a new subsection (a) a provision spelling out who may administer oaths and how their authority may be approved in language practically identical with that now in section 115 of the present Code.

§ *26*. Both bills continue the provision of this section authorizing the Commissioner to accept provisionally defectively executed documents.

§ *31*. Both bills continue this section of the Code, which allows the Commissioner, subject to approval by the Secretary of Commerce, to prescribe rules and regulations for governing recognition and conduct of agents and attorneys.

§ *32*. Both bills restate the provisions of the Code covering the suspension or exclusion of persons, agents, and attorneys from practice before the Patent Office.

§ *33*. Both bills continue the provisions of this section of the Code which imposes penalty for unauthorized representation as a practitioner.

§ *41*. H.R. 5924 rewrites this section, which at the present time fixes definite fees, so as to allow the Commissioner to prescribe fees by regulations which will in effect provide an overall recovery in the range of 65 to 75 percentum of the costs of the operation of the Patent Office. H.R. 5924 also adds a subsection (d) which is the provision formally carried as section 12 of the Code, which this bill deletes. H.R. 7454 restates the existent fees and adds the provision of the deleted section 12 as subsection (d). The wording starting with the word "special" on line 5 of page 9 and ending with the word "year" on line 7 of page 9 should be deleted from H.R. 7454, because of the previous deletion of section 13.

§ *42*. Both bills continue this section which provides for the deposit of fees in the Treasury and permits refunds of overpayments of fees.

PART II

§ *100*. Both bills continue the present definition of "invention", "process", "United States", and "patentee". Both bills add to the definitions, the term "applicant" to mean any person who has filed an application for a patent as provided in Title 35. H.R. 5924 further defines the term "effective filing date" to include, when used in reference to a complete application for patent, the filing date to which such application or the subject matter of any claim thereof, may be entitled under Section 119 (which pertains to benefits of early filing date in a foreign country) or under Section 120 (which pertains to benefits of early filing date in the United States). H.R. 5924 also provides that a complete application or the resulting patent may contain separate claims for subject matter having different effective dates.

§ *101*. Both bills extend the right to obtain a patent to successors in title of the inventor or the discoverer.

§ *102*. H.R. 7454 restates the provisions of the Code. H.R. 5924 rewrites the section to provide that a person shall not be entitled to a patent if prior to the effective filing date of the application the subject matter: was known to the public; had been disclosed in tangible form; had been in public use or on sale; had been disclosed in a published United States application or patent having a prior effective filing date unless the applicant is the same person as the prior applicant.

§ *103*. H.R. 5924 fixes the date for controlling the denial of a patent because of the obviousness thereof to a person having ordinary skill in the art as of the filing date of the application. H.R. 7454 continues the Code provision which fixes the date at the time the invention was made.

§ *104*. H.R. 5924 deletes this section of the Code which limits the establishment of a date of invention abroad to procedures under Section 119, and which entitles a person domiciled in the United States and serving in a foreign country on behalf of the United States to the same right of priority with respect to an invention made abroad as if the invention were made in the United States. H.R. 7454 continues this section as it is in the Code.

§ *105*. H.R. 5924 adds this new section to the Code to provide that a public disclosure of subject matter concerning an invention made less than six months prior to the date of filing a complete application shall not bar issuance of patent if such information was derived from the inventor and the disclosure was in violation of an obligation not to disclose. This section also authorizes the Commissioner to establish procedures for determinations hereunder which determinations in favor of an inventor shall not be subject to direct judicial review. H.R. 7454 does not add this section.

Both bills add a section to provide that computer programs are not patentable. H.R. 5924 (§106) and H.R. 7454 (§105).

§ *111*. Both bills amend the Code section to authorize the owner of an invention to make application for a patent. And both bills require that the application by the owner shall include a statement of the facts supporting the allegation of ownership. Neither bill changes the required contents of an application. H.R. 5924 adds three subsections to this section of the Code: (c) permitting the filing of a preliminary application; (d) providing that the omission of an inventor's name without deceptive intent may be corrected; and (e) providing that published abstract of the technical disclosures of a complete application shall not be used to determine or interpret the scope of the invention claimed.

§ *112*. Neither bill changes this provision of the Code pertaining to what must be contained in the specification.

§ *113*. Neither bill changes the requirement for supplying drawings.

§ *114*. The provisions as to models and specimens are not changed by either bill.

§ *115*. Both bills amend this section of the Code, pertaining to the oath so as to provide for the making of oaths when the applicant is other than the inventor.

§ *116*. Both bills amend this section, pertaining to joint inventors, to permit publication of an application when a joint inventor is omitted in the application.

§ 117. Neither bill changes this Code provision authorizing applications by legal representatives of deceased or incapacitated inventors.

§ 118. Both bills authorize the filing of an application by a person other than the inventor when oath and assignment cannot be obtained and when necessary to preserve the rights of the parties.

§ 119. H.R 5924 gives the benefit of an earlier filing date in a foreign country to any person, his predecessor or successor in title who has filed a complete application instead of as provided in the Code to any person, his legal representative or assign who has filed an application for a patent. It also deletes these Code provisions: that a patent hereunder shall not be granted if the invention had been patented or described in a printed publication in any country more than a year prior to filing of application in the United States; that the invention had been in public use or on sale in the United States; that priority rights based on a subsequent regularly filed application shall not be entitled to priority rights if the first application was laid open to public inspection. Further, the bill provides that no right to priority hereunder shall be given unless the applicant makes claim therefor at the time the complete application is filed and complies with any regulation prescribed by the Commissioner. As now provided in the Code, no right to priority shall be granted unless the applicant makes claim therefor and files within six months of the application's filing date certified copies of the original foreign application, specifications and drawings along with the translation of any papers filed in connection therewith if so required by the Commissioner. H.R. 7454 amends this section to shorten the time provided by the Code for filing certified copies of the original foreign application, specifications and drawings required to obtain priority emanating from an earlier filing date in a foreign country.

§ 120. H.R. 5924 provides that a complete application for patent shall have the benefit of an earlier filing date in a preliminary application filed not more than one year previously and the benefit of an earlier filing date of a prior complete application including any benefits therein from an earlier date in a preliminary application thereto of foreign filing. The requirements as to the same inventor, the making of claims, and the filing of foreign application and so forth of the previous application are not materially changed from the provisions of the Code. H.R. 7454 is the same as the Code provisions.

§ 121. Both bills delete this Code provision which provides that a patent issued as the result of a requirement for restriction shall not be used as a reference in the Patent Office or the Courts against a divisional application or the original application if the divisional application is filed before the issuance of a patent on the other application.

§ 122. This provision of the Code as to confidential status of an application is not changed by either bill.

§ 123. This is a new section added by H.R. 5924 to the Code to provide that a pending complete application shall be published as soon as practical after the earliest effective filing date claim but not less than 18 months nor more than 24 months thereafter. H.R. 7454 does not add this section.

§ 131. Both bills are the same as the Code with the exception that H.R. 5924 provides that the examination shall be made of the "complete" application.

§ 132. H.R. 5924 amends this section of the Code pertaining to rejection and reexamination of claims by the substitution of the "completed application" instead of the "claim for a patent" as the base for determination. H.R. 7454 makes no change in the Code provision.

§ 133. Providing for the controlling of the time for prosecution of an application is not changed by either bill.

§134. This provision of the Code for appeals from twice rejected claims to the Board of Appeals is not changed by either bill.

§135. This provision covering interferences is deleted by H.R. 5924 from the Code. H.R. 7454 adds a new subsection (e) to this Code provision to provide that in making a determination of priority under this section and other sections of the Code the party shall be able to show any and all such dates for respective acts but shall only be entitled to rely upon dates of conception and reduction to practice no earlier than two years prior to the date of filing the first filed parent application for patent in the United States Patent Office.

§136. This is a new section added to the Code by H.R. 5924 to provide that any person (whose identity shall not be disclosed without his consent or unless required by an act of Congress or deemed necessary by the Commissioner) may cause a reexamination after publication of an application for patent upon giving written notice within three months or such further time as the Commissioner may fix but not longer than six months after the publication under Section 151, and upon citing the pertinency of patents or publications affecting the attacked patent.

§ 137. This section is added to the Code by H.R. 5924 to provide that in all proceedings in the Patent Office in which the patentability of a claim is in issue the applicant shall have the burden of persuading the officer that the claim is allowable. H.R. 7454 does not add either of these last two sections to the Code.

§ 141. This section pertaining to appeals to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals is amended by H.R. 5924 to extend the right of appeal from the Board of Appeals, now possessed by applicants, to successors in title and to patentees. It also deletes references to appeals from boards of interference as these boards were abolished and their functions transferred to the Board of Appeals earlier in this bill. H.R. 7454 does not make these changes. It does, however, eliminate reference to waiver of right to appeal to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in interference cases; this is done in order to conform with the deletion made later in the bill of Section 145 providing for such appeals.

§ 142. H.R. 5924 deletes from this section the necessity of including in the Notice of Appeal the reasons for the appeal. H.R. 7454 does not delete this provision of the Code.

§ 143. Proceedings on appeal are not changed by H.R. 7454. H.R. 5924 adds a provision which permits the Commissioner in proceedings on appeal to appear in Court by representative for the purpose of presenting the position of the Patent Office and it deletes the provision of the Code which requires the Commissioner to furnish the Court in ex parte cases with the grounds of the decision of the Patent Office touching all points involved by reasons of the appeal.

§ 144. H.R. 5924 amends this section to provide that the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in the case of a review of a refusal of a patent may adjudge the applicant entitled to receive a patent as specified in any claim involved in the decision of the Board and in case of a review of a revocation of a claim, a finding by the Court that a claim should not be allowed cancels the claim from the patent. H.R. 7454 deletes from this section the provision that decisions of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall be limted to the evidence produced before the Patent Office and adds a provision allowing either the applicant or the Commissioner to petition the Supreme Court for a review of the Court's decision.

§ 145. H.R. 5924 amends this section to extend the right to proceed against the Commissioner in a civil action in the United States District Court in the District of Columbia (now possessed by applicants) to successors in title to the applicants and to patentees. H.R. 7454 deletes this section from the Code.

§ 146. This section of the Code providing for civil actions in case of interference is deleted by both bills.

§ 147. H.R. 5924 adds this section to the Code to authorize any party or the Commissioner of Patents dissatisfied with the decision of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals to appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. H.R. 7454 does not add this provision to the Code.

§ 148. This section is added to the Code by H.R. 5924 to provide that in all actions before the Board of Appeals and in civil actions, Patent Office decisions shall be given the presumption of correctness and shall be upheld unless without substantial basis or not in accordance with law. H.R. 7454 does not add this section to the Code.

§ 151. This section is amended by H.R. 5924 to provide for publication in connection with the issuance of patents. H.R. 7454 does not change this section of the Code.

§ 152. This section of the Code providing for the issuance of patents to assignees is deleted by H.R. 5924 and is left unchanged by H.R. 7454.

§ 153. H.R. 5924 deletes the present requirement of this section that the Commissioner's signature on patents shall be attested by an officer of the Patent Office designated by the Commissioner. H.R. 7454 does not delete this provision from the Code.

§ 154. Both bills rewrite this section of the Code in identical language so as to change the term of a patent from 17 years after issuance to 20 years after effective filing date of the application plus any period of time, if any, the patent has been kept secret for national security reasons.

§§161–164 pertaining to Plant patents are not changed by either bill.

§§171–172 pertaining to Design Patents are not materially changed by either bill.

§181. H.R. 7454 makes no change in this Code provision pertaining to secrecy of inventions and the withholding of patents. H.R. 5924 amends this section to provide that the authority to withhold disclosure of the invention for security reasons shall be extended to disclosure by publications.

§182. Neither bill changes the Code provision pertaining to abandonment of an invention for unauthorized disclosure.

§183. Neither bill changes the Code provision pertaining to the right to compensation when patent is withheld for national security reasons.

§184. H.R. 5924 defines the term "application" when used in relation to U.S. application for purposes covered by §§183–188, pertaining to secrecy of certain inventions and foreign applications, to mean a "complete application".

§§185–188. Neither bill changes these Code provisions.

§§191–194. H.R. 5924 adds to the Code a new chapter covering these sections which authorize the initiation of a deferred examination system by the Secretary of Commerce. H.R. 7454 does not add this chapter.

PART III

§ 251. Both bills delete from this section the provision which authorizes an application for reissue patent to be made and sworn to by the assignee of the entire interest if the application does not seek to enlarge the scope of the claims of the original patent. H.R. 5924 also deletes from this section: the authority to reissue a patent defective because the patentee claimed less than he had a right to claim; the authority to reissue defective patents enlarging the scope of the claims of the original patent if applied for within 2 years from the grant of the original patent; and the authority of the Commissioner to issue several reissue patents for distinct and separate parts of things patented

upon demand of the applicant and upon payment of the required fees for reissued patents.

§ *252*. Neither bill changes this provision of the Code.

§ *253*. H.R. 5924 adds subsection (c) to provide that the expiration at the same time by means of a terminal disclaimer or dedication shall have no effect in the determination of the patentability or the validity of the claim in either.

§§ *254 and 256*. Neither bill changes these sections.

§ *256*. Both bills reword this section by identical language without making any substantive changes therein.

§ *257*. H.R. 5924 adds this section to the Code to provide that any person upon payment of a fee of $500 or the head of any agency of the Government may, within three years of the issuance of a patent, petition for determination of the validity of a claim in view of cited patents and publications. If the Patent Office determines on the basis of the petition that the claim should not have been allowed, the owner of the patent has two alternatives: he may amend the claim and file for reissue of the patent or he may request reconsideration by the Board of Appeals. Denial of the petition shall not be subject to direct judicial review and in such case the petitioner shall be subject to reasonable costs and not to exceed $1000 for attorney fees. If the claim is cancelled or amended on the basis of patents or publications presented by the petitioner previously under the provisions for reexamination the fee shall be refunded.

§§ *261 and 262*. These sections pertaining to ownership and assignment were not changed by either bill.

§ *271*. H.R. 5924 adds a new section to the Code which subjects importers of products for use and trade or industry made in another country by a process patented in the United States to infringement claims, provided the process is not entitled to patent protection in the country of origin. H.R. 7454 adds this provision without the proviso.

§ *272*. Neither bill changes this section.

§ *273*. H.R. 5924 adds this section to the Code to authorize the recovery of reasonable royalties for infringements beginning during the period after the occurrence of all the following events: (1) publication of the application containing such claim; (2) such claim is indicated as allowable by the Patent Office; and (3) actual notice to the alleged unauthorized practitioner that such claim has been indicated as allowed and how his acts are considered to constitute unauthorized practice of the subject matter of such claim; and ending upon the issuance of the patent.

§§ *281–290*. Neither bill changes these sections.

§ *291*. H.R. 5924 deletes this section which grants the owner of an interfering patent relief against the owner of another by civil action in the courts.

§ *292*. This section pertaining to false marking is not changed by either bill.

§ *293*. This section of the Code pertaining to service and notice upon non-resident patentees is not changed by either bill.

§ *294*. H.R. 5924 adds this section to the Code to provide that in any action in the Federal Court in which the issue of the validity or the scope of a claim of a patent is before the Court a final adjudication thereof shall work an estoppel against the patentee and those in privity with him in any subsequent Federal action.

The foregoing are all of the definitive sections of Title 32, as rewritten by these bills.

H.R. 5924, in addition to enacting transitional provisions amending the judicial code, authorizes the District Court to appoint "civil Commissioners" to assist the Court when the volume of litigation arising under the patent laws so justifies such action.

SENATE

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 6, 1967)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf).

Rev. Paul Ciholas, professor of religion, Campbell College, Buies Creek, N.C., offered the following prayer:

Our God, creator and sustainer of life, we lift up our hearts to Thee in gratitude for this new day, asking Thee that through our lives and work today we might be faithful servants of mankind.

May Thy guidance be granted to men into whose hands Thou hast entrusted great responsibility and leadership. We pray that we might be dedicated to causes which Thou canst bless.

In all situations, be they joyful or tragic, may we be aware of the resources which lie in the knowledge of Thy power and wisdom.

Grant, we pray, Thy continued blessing upon our country and her leaders and upon all those who seek to promote justice among men.

In a generation divided by hatred—may we be messengers of Thy love.

In a time marked by despair—may we be conveyers of Thy hope.

In a world afflicted by war—may we be instruments of Thy peace.

For we ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 6, 1967, was approved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nominations of Hugh Heily to be postmaster at Columbus, Mont., and Marian E. Tollefson to be postmaster at Beltrami, Minn., which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Alexander B. Trowbridge, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably sundry nominations in the Environmental Science Services Administration. Since these names have previously appeared in the Congressional Record, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Terry C. de la Moriniere, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Environmental Science Services Administration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Fred B. Burke, of Michigan, to be alternate Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the acting minority leader, be granted some time, not to exceed 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lausche in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

A DANGEROUS EXPERIMENT WITH AMERICAN JUSTICE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the life of our democracy rests in large measure upon the faith and trust of the American people in a strong system of justice. An ordered society is the only framework within which true freedom and liberty may be enjoyed. When Americans lose hope in the law, when they despair in the processes of justice and cast aside order for chaos, they undermine the strength of a society and threaten the tranquillity of a nation. It is a tragic and frightening situation when reason is replaced by fear and hope by despair and distrust.

There was a time, in the early history of California, when people disregarded all semblance of law and order. It was a time when adroit and ambitious politicians were emersed in corruption; a time when crime and lawlessness were widespread and respect for the law had little meaning in the minds of men. But more importantly, it was a time when men did not stop to use the judicial tools within their grasp—they preferred instead to experiment with a new kind of justice. And the result was the creation of the infamous vigilante committees of 1851 and 1856.

This historic experiment in justice was a confession of failure on the part of the people, as is every political scandal, every parody of justice, and every lynching. When men fail to abide by the laws established by society for the purpose of self-government, they resort to expediencies that smack of anarchy. The experiment of the vigilantes did not lead to constructive reform, it deteriorated into a lawlessness which destroyed personal liberty, inflicted punishment without due process of law, and bloodied and disgraced the system of justice so carefully designed by our forefathers. Mr. President, it is not an experience to be repeated again.

I was greatly distressed, therefore, when information was brought to my attention concerning a possible new breed of vigilantes that may arise from a modern experiment with justice. The information concerns the use of an untrained and unprofessional youth patrol for the purpose of spotting potential trouble spots and reporting instances of "police brutality." This so-called community alert patrol, which has operated in the highly sensitive Watts area of southern California, was recently granted $238,429 by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in order to continue its activities.

The patrol is composed of 15 to 20 youths, many of whom are school dropouts with records of juvenile arrest. Their efforts in attemping to observe the police as well as trouble spots in Watts have proven largely sporadic. As a matter of fact, the Los Angeles Police and Sheriffs Departments list but a series of harassing incidents and reports from the patrol. This questionable record plus the prospect of a highly subsidized group of untrained youths patrolling the streets of an explosive area raises serious and fundamental questions regarding the basis for the Federal grant.

What exactly is this patrol supposed to do? Authorities at HEW contend that the group will not only check on the police but will also spot potential trouble spots and serve as a buffer between citizens and the police. But the assistant director of the so-called CAP has publicly stated that the patrol will only report incidents of police brutality and will not report any criminal acts which they may witness. If this be true, Federal money will be used to assist a group of local people who have declared their intent to ignore their responsibility as citizens to report incidents of crime and lawlessness. The Federal Government will be subsidizing private citizens who hold themselves above the law and constitute themselves a "super" policing agency. Such action will effectively undermine law enforcement, and weaken the organization of our society. I cannot believe that Congress intended such a consequence in adopting the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, the act under which this grant was made. For that matter, I cannot believe that Congress would adopt any legislation to authorize a Federal subsidy to local groups of private citizens desiring to police the police.

Authorities at HEW claim this grant is but an experiment to determine the value of such patrols in bettering police-community relations. But is the peace of a community to be jeopardized on behalf of a social experiment? Watts has known the terror of a riot. The burning buildings and the roving gangs are still fresh in the memory of the residents of this strife-torn community. To be sure, a great deal has been done by Government, by police, and by private industry to erase the causes of that outbreak. But a tremendous social challenge still remains, and it must be met in a sensitive atmosphere already filled with emotion, fear, and hatred. If the patrol means only to check on the actions of the police, then the vital ingredients of greater violence will be present each time the law is enforced in Watts. Surely, the Federal Government must not be allowed to gamble with life and property on such a questionable experiment in justice.

The threat of such violence is further heightened by the fact that local government and law enforcement agencies have declared their opposition to the funding of such a patrol. Improved cooperation between police and community cannot be achieved when Federal funds are dispatched regardless of the feelings of local authorities.

The enforcement of the law is a sensitive and difficult task. The quality of performance by police departments must be judged by all the people, not supervised by a select group of untrained youths. To justify this experiment is to justify the creation of similar patrols in every city and town in America, patrols devoted to spying on the police. Indeed, this same reasoning could go so far as to justify the creation of additional patrols to check on the patrols. And where will it all end? If we distrust the enforcers of the law, enforcers who must by necessity operate subject to public scrutiny, it will not be long before we distrust the very law itself—and, surely, the next step will be nothing less than anarchy itself.

There is no question but that recent civil disorders have emphasized the need for improved relations between law enforcement officials and residents of the community. But the challenge is not to emphasize antagonisms but to encourage cooperation; it is not to change or undermine existing responsibilities but rather to understand the obligations of each and to work together in achieving a respect for law and order. This was the type of cooperation envisioned by the passing of the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961. This is the type of cooperation HEW officials must seek to advance in granting Federal money to any experiment in justice.

I do not believe the community alert patrol as it exists today falls within the guidelines prescribed by the Congress under the act. The questions I have raised here point to the friction and chaos that will result from this grant. I therefore have directed a letter to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, and have urgently and officially requested that no Federal funds be provided to the patrol under the present circumstances on the grounds that there is no legal authorization for such action. It is my belief that unless such funding to the community alert patrol is halted immediately, the Federal Government will be participating in an extremely dangerous experiment with American justice, an experiment which threatens the very law and order of our society.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter to Secretary Gardner be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

June 6, 1967.

Hon. John W. Gardner,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: A matter of the gravest concern to the people of California and the Nation has been recently brought to my attention. It concerns a situation which, if left unchecked, will jeopardize America's system of justice and undermine the very stability of ordered society. There is little question but that respect for the law is essential to the preservation of democracy. To directly or indirectly encourage disrespect or distrust in the law is to dangerously gamble with the very foundation of justice in America.

In 1961, the Congress enacted the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act. The policy of this legislation is clearly stated in its opening paragraph:

"The policy of the Federal Government is to assist in developing techniques for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses, and to encourage the coordination of efforts among governmental and nongovernmental educational, employment, health, welfare, law enforcement, correctional, and other agencies concerned with such problems."

Coordination and cooperation are essential elements of this entire proposal. It seeks to prevent juvenile delinquency by advancing cooperation in the community. Grants authorized under this Act must therefore seek to promote understanding and better relations between the police and the community.

In May of 1967, however, your Department, under the provisions of the Juvenile Delinquency Act, announced a grant of over $238,000 to the so-called Community Alert Patrol (CAP) in Los Angeles, California. It is my understanding that despite local opposition, over $60,000 has already been made available to this experiment. There are, I believe, several important arguments by which the basis for such a grant may be effectively challenged.

What is the purpose of the Community Alert Patrol? Your Department claims that the patrol will improve police-community relations by reporting instances of police brutality as well as spotting potential trouble-making situations and serving as a "buffer" between citizens and police. The Assistant Director of CAP, however, has proclaimed that the sole purpose of the patrol is to report incidents of police brutality. If this be its sole purpose, the antagonisms and tensions between the police and the community will be heightened, not reduced.

How will the patrol operate? To date, no firm guidelines have been established by either the CAP or HEW. Some authorities at your Department envision a central control point at which patrol cars will be dispatched to designated areas, but this is still uncertain. No method of reporting incidents has been prescribed. No pattern of cooperation with official law enforcement agencies has been established. No firm qualifications on the type of individual to be selected for the patrol has been outlined. In essence, a chaotic and confused organization has been designated to help control chaos and confusion in the community.

In what ways has this experiment been coordinated with local law enforcement authorities? It is my understanding that your Department has proceeded on this program in complete disregard of the opposition of local police authorities in the Los Angeles area. Los Angeles Chief of Police, Thomas Reddin, as well as the Board of Police Commissioners, vigorously oppose the funding of such a patrol. Though discussions were held between the various parties concerned, no serious attempt was made by your Department to obtain the full support and cooperation of law enforcement agencies. Without that cooperation, the existence of such a private police force of untrained youths challenges the authority of the police and provides the very ingredient for future violence.

Mr. Secretary, in my view, Congress did not intend in adopting the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act, or in adopting any other legislation, to authorize any Federal subsidy to local groups of private citizens desiring "to police" the police. Indeed, Federal assistance to subsidize such an ill-considered undertaking would effectively undermine law enforcement, and weaken the organization of our society.

Respect for law and order and the enforcement of law are vital to the preservation of American freedom. Encouraging local people to hold themselves above the law and to constitute themselves a "super" policing agency, and paying them a Federal subsidy for such action, would establish disrespect for law and would accomplish the breakdown of law enforcement.

Under these circumstances, I respectfully and officially object to any Federal funds going to the Community Alert Patrol on the grounds that there is no legal authorization for such action. The Federal Government must not in any way sanction this dangerous experiment with the future of justice in America.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF THE RAILROAD LABOR DISPUTE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the pending business, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Senate Joint Resolution 81, a joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments on page 4, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "extension" and insert "settlement within the limits"; in line 10, after the word "bargaining", to insert "and mediation efforts"; in line 21, after the word "table", to strike out "extension" and insert "settlement within the limits"; in line 22, after the word "bargaining", to insert "and mediation efforts"; on page 5, line 3, after "Sec. 5." to insert "(a)"; after line 13 to insert:

(b) In the event of disagreement as to the meaning of any part or all of a determination by the Special Board, or as to the terms of the detailed agreements or arrangements necessary to give effect thereto, any party may within the effective period of the determination apply to the Board for clarification of its determination, whereupon the Board shall reconvene and shall promptly issue a further determination with respect to the matters raised by any application for clarification. Such further determination may, in the discretion of the Board, be made with or without a further hearing.

And, after line 23, to insert:

(c) The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction of all suits concerning the determination of the Special Board.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a Special Board for the purpose of assisting the parties in the completion of their collective bargaining and the resolution of the remaining issues in dispute. The Special Board shall consist of five members to be named by the President. The National Mediation Board is authorized and directed: (1) to compensate the members of the Board at a rate not in excess of $100 for each day together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses, and (2) to provide such services and facilities as may be necessary and appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this resolution. For the purpose of any hearing conducted by the Special Board, it shall have the authority conferred by the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance and examination of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 26, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49, 50).

SEC. 2. The Special Board shall attempt by mediation to bring about a resolution of this dispute and thereby to complete the collective bargaining process.

SEC. 3. If agreement has not been reached within thirty days after the enactment of this resolution, the Special Board shall hold hearings on the proposal made by the Special Mediation Panel, in its report to the President of April 22, 1967, in implementation of the collective bargaining contemplated in the recommendation of Emergency Board Numbered 169, to determine whether the proposal (1) is in the public interest, (2) is a fair and equitable settlement within the limits of the collective bargaining and mediation efforts in this case, (3) protects the collective bargaining process, and (4) fulfills the purposes of the Railway Labor Act. At such hearings the parties shall be accorded a full opportunity to present their positions concerning the proposal of the Special Mediation Panel.

SEC. 4. The Special Board shall make its determination by vote of the majority of the members on or before the sixtieth day after the enactment of this resolution, and shall incorporate the proposal of the Special Mediation Panel with such modifications, if any, as the Board finds to be necessary to (1) be in the public interest, (2) achieve a fair and equitable settlement within the limits of the collective bargaining and mediation efforts in this case, (3) protect the collective bargaining process, and (4) fulfill the purposes of the Railway Labor Act. The determination shall be promptly transmitted by the Board to the President and to the Congress.

SEC. 5. (*a*) If agreement has not been reached by the parties upon the expiration of the period specified in section 6, the determination of the Special Board shall take effect and shall continue in effect until the parties reach agreement or, if agreement is not reached, until such time, not to exceed two years from January 1, 1967, as the Board shall determine to be appropriate. The Board's determination shall have the same effect (including the preclusion of resort to either strike or lockout) as though arrived at by agreement of the parties under the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 151 et seq.).

(b) In the event of disagreement as to the meaning of any part or all of a determination by the Special Board, or as to the terms of the detailed agreements or arrangements necessary to give effect thereto, any party may within the effective period of the determination apply to the Board for clarification of its determination, whereupon the Board shall reconvene and shall promptly issue a further determination with respect to the matters raised by any application for clarification. Such further determination may, in the discretion of the Board, be made with or without a further hearing.

(c) The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction of all suits concerning the determination of the Special Board.

SEC. 6. The provisions of the final paragraph of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 160), as heretofore extended by law, shall be hereby extended until 12:01 o'clock antemeridian of the ninety-first day after enactment of this resolution with respect to the dispute referred to in Executive Order 11324, January 28, 1967.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have contacted all interested parties, and I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the opening statement of the Senator in charge of the joint resolution, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the ranking minority member, the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], there be a time limitation of 1 hour on each amendment, the time to be equally divided between the proposer of the amendment and the Senator in charge of the joint resolution; with 1 hour on the joint resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wanted to mention this to the majority leader. As I recall, we will probably have eight Members of the Senate absent tomorrow. I think it is almost imperative that we finish action on the joint resolution today, particularly if there are to be 3 or 4 days of leadtime before the carriers may be notified. I respectfully suggest that we probably ought to stay in session today until we complete action on the measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree. This matter is of such transcendental importance that we almost have to; we have no choice.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to have not more than 15 minutes to speak.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator will get the time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] has not heard the time proposed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** No objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withhold the unanimous-consent request.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The unanimous-consent request is withheld.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I repeat the unanimous-consent request, with the same stipulation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I thoroughly agree with the request. I would like to note that in the course of my opening statement I propose to yield to the second ranking minority member of the committee to speak on this matter. He says he will take 15 minutes or so. I do not wish the request to be changed, but I wish to notify the Senate that I will accommodate the second ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty].

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would respectfully request that the attachés of the Senate notify Senators of the time limitation and that their presence would be appreciated and that we are going to try to finish action on the measure today.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that additional staff members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted on the floor during the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 81.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall make a brief opening statement in regard to the resolution, and deal in greater detail with the substantive features of the various provisions of the resolution as the debate progresses. I think it is desirable at the opening of the debate to make an explanatory statement in regard to the nature of the resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 81

Whereas the labor dispute between the carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees represented by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America; International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers functioning through the Railway Employees' Department, AFL–CIO, labor organizations, threatens essential transportation services of the Nation; and

Whereas Emergency Board Numbered 169 (created by Executive Order 11324, January 28, 1967, 32 F.R. 1075) has made its report; and

Whereas, under procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act as extended and implemented by Public Law 90–10 of April 12, 1967, as amended, the parties have not succeeded completely in resolving all of their differences through the processes of free collective bargaining; and

Whereas related disputes have been settled by private collective bargaining between the carriers and other organizations representing approximately three-quarters of their employees, so that the present dispute represented a barrier to the completion of this round of bargaining in this industry; and

Whereas a Special Mediation Panel appointed by the President upon enactment of Public Law 90–10 proposed settlement terms to assist the parties in implementation of the collective bargaining envisaged in the recommendations of Emergency Board Numbered 169; and

Whereas it is desirable to provide procedures for the orderly culmination of this collective bargaining process; and

Whereas the national interest, including the national health and defense, requires that transportation services essential to interstate commerce be maintained; and

Whereas the Congress finds that an emergency measure is essential to security and continuity of transportation services by such services: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a Special Board for the purpose of assisting the parties in the completion of their collective bargaining and the resolution of the remaining issues in dispute. The Special Board shall consist of five members to be named by the President. The National Mediation Board is authorized and directed: (1) to compensate the members of the Board at a rate not in excess of $100 for each day together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses, and (2) to provide such services and facilities as may be necessary and appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this resolution. For the purpose of any hearing conducted by the Special Board, it shall have the authority conferred by the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance and examination of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 26, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49, 50).

Sec. 2. The Special Board shall attempt by mediation to bring about a resolution of this dispute and thereby to complete the collective bargaining process.

Sec. 3. If agreement has not been reached within thirty days after the enactment of this resolution, the Special Board shall hold hearings on the proposal made by the Special Mediation Panel, in its report to the President of April 22, 1967, in implementation of the collective bargaining contemplated in the recommendation of Emergency Board Numbered 169, to determine whether the proposal (1) is in the public interest, (2) is a fair and equitable settlement within the limits of the collective bargaining and mediation efforts in this case, (3) protects the collective bargaining process, and (4) fulfills the purposes of the Railway Labor Act. At such hearings the parties shall be accorded a full opportunity to present their positions concerning the proposal of the Special Mediation Panel.

Sec. 4. The Special Board shall make its determination by vote of the majority of the members on or before the sixtieth day after the enactment of this resolution, and shall incorporate the proposal of the Special Mediation Panel with such modifications, if any, as the Board finds to be necessary to (1) be in the public interest, (2) achieve a fair and equitable settlement within the limits of the collective bargaining and mediation efforts in this case, (3) protect the collective bargaining process, and (4) fulfill the purposes of the Railway Labor Act. The determination shall be promptly transmitted by the Board to the President and to the Congress.

Sec. 5. (a) If agreement has not been reached by the parties upon the expiration of the period specified in section 6, the determination of the Special Board shall take effect and shall continue in effect until the parties reach agreement or, if agreement is not reached, until such time, not to exceed two years from January 1, 1967, as the Board shall determine to be appropriate. The Board's determination shall have the same effect (including the preclusion of resort to either strike or lockout) as though arrived at by agreement of the parties under the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 151 et seq.).

(b) In the event of disagreement as to the meaning of any part or all of a determination by the Special Board, or as to the terms of the detailed agreements or arrangements necessary to give effect thereto, any party may within the effective period of the determination apply to the Board for clarification of its determination, whereupon the Board shall reconvene and shall promptly issue a further determination with respect to the matters raised by any application for clarification. Such further determination may, in the discretion of the Board, be made with or without a further hearing.

(c) The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction of all suits concerning the determination of the Special Board.

Sec. 6. The provisions of the final paragraph of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 160), as heretofore extended by law, shall be hereby extended until 12:01 o'clock antemeridian of the ninety-first day after enactment of this resolution with respect to the dispute referred to in Executive Order 11324, January 28, 1967.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the committee report on the bill is a short one, consisting of the statements of the majority, the individual views of Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pell, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and what I

would describe as special concurring views with the majority, in the form of individual views, of Mr. Javits, I ask unanimous consent that the marked excerpts of the report on the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpts from the committee report, together with individual views, ordered to be printed in the Record, are as follow:

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 81

The committee adopted four amendments to the resolution as originally introduced. These amendments are more in the nature of correcting and technical amendments than substantive changes in the bill.

(1) Section 3 is amended to change the second factor which the Special Board is to consider in determining whether there should be changes made in the recommendations of the previous bodies which attempted to promote a settlement of the dispute. The amended language reads as follows: "* * * to determine whether the proposal * * * (2) is a fair and equitable settlement within the limits of the collective bargaining and mediation efforts in this case." The purpose of this amendment is to insure that the outside limits within which the Special Board shall consider possible terms to recommend to the parties shall be based upon the efforts which have already occurred in attempting to mediate the instant dispute; specifically, the actual bargaining proposals of the parties on or after the appointment of the Special Mediation Panel on April 12, 1967, and the proposal, dated April 22, 1967, by the Special Mediation Panel which had been appointed by the President on April 11, 1967, the so-called Fahy Panel. These terms of reference specifically do not include the report of Emergency Board No. 169, which was not a mediation proposal but in the nature of a decision upon a record.

(2) Section 4 was amended so that criteria used by the Special Board should reflect the change made in section 3, above, and for the reason stated above. Accordingly, the second (2) criteria was amended to read: "achieve a fair and equitable settlement within the limits of the collective bargaining and mediation efforts in the case."

(3) Section 5 was amended by adding a new subsection (b) which indicates that in the event the Special Board's determination goes into effect upon the expiration of the 90-day period and thereafter there is some disagreement between the parties as to the meaning of part or all of the determination or of any action deemed necessary to implement such determination, any party may request, during the life of the Special Board's determination, that the Special Board shall reconvene and promptly issue a further determination with respect to the matters raised in the request. Such further determination may be with, or without, a further hearing. The purpose of this amendment is to remove a latent ambiguity as to the power of the Board to clarify its determination and specifically limits such powers to the period during which the determination of the Special Board is in effect.

(4) Section 5 is further amended to add a new subsection (c) which states "the U.S. district court for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction of all suits concerning the determination of the Special Board." The purpose of this amendment is to make clear that if any basis shall arise upon which to challenge the determination of the Special Board, such suit may be brought only in the U.S. district court for the District of Columbia.

PURPOSE AND MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE RESOLUTION

Briefly stated, the purpose of this resolution is to maintain the Nation's railroad transport without interruption while attempting to allow the greatest freedom of collective bargaining permissible under the premises.

The method chosen to achieve these results is the establishment by the President of a five-member Special Board to operate during a 90-day no-strike, no-lockout period which is to begin immediately upon enactment of this resolution. This Board will have several distinct phases during each of which the object of the Special Board will be to assist the parties in arriving at mutually acceptable terms for the settlement of the dispute. These stages may be summarized as follows: During the first 30 days of the life of this Board it would undertake intensive mediation efforts with both sides in the dispute in an effort to find a mutually agreed upon and satisfactory solution. If no agreement is reached by the parties, beginning on the 31st day, the Board would be authorized to hold hearings to study the equity of the proposals of the President's Special Mediation Panel of April 21, 1967. Again, during this period the parties would be free at any time to reach an agreement to settle the dispute.

However, if there is still no agreement reached by the 60th day following enactment of the resolution, the Board would file its determination with the Congress and the President, stating whether any modification of the Special Mediation Panel's proposals are deemed necessary and what such modifications may be. The parties would again be given an opportunity to reach their own collective-bargaining agreement, but if they failed to do so, on the 91st day the determination of the Special Board would take effect and become the collective-bargaining agreement of the parties for such period, up to 2 years from January 1, 1967, as the Special Board shall state in its determination. Regardless of the operative period of the determination of the Special Board as stated in its determination, such determination shall cease to have any force and effect upon the signing of a collective-bargaining agreement by the parties.

It should be further noted that if the determination of the Special Board becomes effective, it shall be considered for the purposes of the Railway Labor Act as though it were a collective-bargaining agreement freely arrived at by the parties.

Senator Morse, who introduced the resolution for the administration on behalf of himself, Senator Mansfield, and Senator Dirksen, during the hearings on the resolution discussed the definitive nature of the resolution, clearly outlining the differences between mediation and arbitration:

"It has not come to be recognized yet in the Congress but I think it will before this historic debate is over it will be recognized that this really is not an arbitration proposal. That is a label. We have to understand what the process of arbitration is.

"The Board set up under this resolution is not given any arbitration jurisdiction whatsoever. Arbitration is a straight judicial process, not a compromising process at all.

"The procedure provided for in this resolution is completely a compromising procedure, it should be, because that is what collective bargaining and mediation are. When you walk in an arbitration hearing room you walk into a hearing room that is bound by judicial processes, not compromising processes. Arbitration, voluntary or compulsory, is a strict judicial process.

"The obligation of the arbitrator is to follow two very important judicial rules. The proponent of any issue has the burden of proof on that issue. Second, he has the obligation of establishing that burden of proof by preponderance of the evidence. It is the evidence that is controlling. When you walk into mediation and collective bargaining you walk into a give-and-take process of trying to reach conscionable compromises and the mediator tries to lead the parties to a fair, equitable compromise of their differences, irrespective of the evidence.

"Yes, let me say quite frankly, he takes into consideration in part the economic power position of one or both of the parties. The mediator has to take into consideration the question as to whether or not a failure in the mediation may result in a lockout or a strike which is the exercise of economic power and what the effect of the exercise of that economic power will be upon the party. The arbitrator does not have any right to do that. If he did he would disqualify himself as an arbitrator.

"The arbitrator has exactly the same responsibility as a judge. He can't ever justify changing himself from a judicial officer into a compromiser. That is what a mediator is.

"Now, what the President is trying to say to the parties in this resolution, and I know something about its birth and the thought that went into its aborning, that these parties must be given every opportunity to reach compromises between themselves. If they can't do it in regard to their own voluntary initiative enterprises between themselves, then Government officials will try to help them compromise.

"I want to point out to the committee and to the parties that if you will analyze this resolution, the primary function of this special Panel that the President is going to appoint is to reach a compromise settlement within the framework of the mediation and the collective bargaining you have already participated in, not go outside of the framework.

"An arbitrator is always free and has the duty to go outside the framework of the collective bargaining and the mediation that has preceded his taking jurisdiction as an arbitrator and decides the case on the basis of the evidence in the issues raised and in the arguments and evidence raised and submitted to him in that case.

"That is not the case here at all. This resolution marks out a framework within which this Board has to operate. It also means that this Board is free to make its suggestions and its recommendations to the parties in regard to all the differences that exist.

"If the parties can't come to the judgment of agreeing voluntarily to a final acceptable compromise, then the Board makes its recommendations. It makes its recommendation to the President, it makes its recommendation to the Congress."

Senator Morse also pointed out during the hearings that the procedure to be utilized under this resolution, the process of collective bargaining and mediation leading to finality, was utilized during World War II:

"This is not an extraordinary procedure. It is an extraordinary bill legislatively for we haven't legislated this type of procedure before. But this procedure has been used in literally scores and scores and scores of cases, labor dispute cases, that have been settled, particularly in World War II. When we were at war this was a common procedure of the War Labor Board in many, many cases.

"In fact, I think the statistics would show that more War Labor Board cases were settled in the mediation procedure by the intervention of the Board, than were settled by way of mediation finality, by decision of the Board.

"Many of the cases washed themselves out in the mediation process. In those cases, it is true the final papers were filed with the Board setting out the mediation settlement, combined mediation-collective bargaining settlement, that the parties reached at the end of the war.

"There were many cases of the Board that went to arbitration. The arbitration voted by the labor members of the Board, as well as the employer members or public members of the Board, time and time again.

"When we came to the finding of fact that we were dealing with a case in which a successful prosecution of the war effort required finality either by way of mediation finality which was a Board decision or by an arbitrator that was appointed by the Board to give finality to the decision.

"That process had the support of labor time and time again only because all of us on the Board opposed to compulsory arbitration decided that this particular case, defense plant, munition plant, all sorts of plants, the products of which were vital to the prosecution of the war, were about to shut down and an arbitration procedure was adopted in those cases.

"But that is not the procedure in this case, although I respect those who do not share my views. This procedure provided for in this legislation is not extraordinary at all. We followed it in many, many cases during the War Labor Board under the procedures of the Board."

In sum, this proposal guarantees fair dealing to the parties and to the public by: (1) the protection of the public interest; (2) the protection of the collective bargaining process; (3) the protection of the purposes of the Railway Labor Act; and (4) the assurance of a fair and equitable extension of true collective bargaining if the parties wish to protect that precious right of economic freedom. This resolution is not intended to be and does not constitute permanent legislation. Nor does it amend the Railway Labor Act. The resolution is not intended by the committee to indicate a precedent for congressional or executive action with respect to any future labor dispute.

The committee, as it has stated in the past, does not believe it, or the Congress, should, except in extraordinary circumstances, become involved in or intervene on an *ad hoc* basis in any labor dispute.

BACKGROUND OF THE LEGISLATION

This legislation is the result of the unadjusted labor dispute between almost the entire class I railroads of the United States and their shopcraft employees represented by the Railway Employees Department, AFL–CIO.

There are 138 line-haul railroads and terminals and switching companies which are parties to this dispute. The individual carriers are represented by the National Railway Labor Conference (comprised of the Eastern, Western, and Southeastern Carriers' Conference Committees).

The six labor organizations involved, comprising the Railway Employees Department, AFL–CIO are:

International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers;

International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers;

Sheet Metal Workers' International Association;

Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America;

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; and

International Brotherhood of Firemen & Oilers.

These unions represent approximately 137,000 shop craftworkers employed by the railroads party to this controversy.

The collective bargaining out of which this controversy arose began on May 17, 1966, almost a year ago, when at that point the six labor organizations served notices pursuant to section 6 of the Railway Labor Act, requesting a general increase of 20 percent in all wage rates and differentials, the establishment of procedures for periodic cost-of-living adjustments, shift differentials, additional overtime pay, vacation and paid holiday improvements, jury duty pay, and the establishment of a 30-minute paid lunch period on each shift; all changes to be made effective as of January 1, 1967.

In June of 1966, the following month, various proposals were served by the individual railroads on the labor organizations. Among the changes requested were a revision of the vacation agreement, elimination of certain craft jurisdictional barriers, revision of the rules governing the work of car inspectors, greater freedom to institute technological, operational, and organizational changes, establishment of entrance rates, compulsory retirement age limits, revision of the 40-hour workweek rules, establishment of a rule to prohibit duplicate holiday payments, elimination of the advance notice requirement for emergency force reductions, and the establishment of a rule that would require adherence to the common law rule for damages for breach of collective bargaining contracts.

Following the formal change of notice by the organizations and individual carriers, a number of conferences were held between the individual carriers and the organizations. No agreements were reached through these individual negotiations and the carriers and the organizations authorized so-called national handling of the controversy.

Discussions at the national level began on September 28, 1966, in Washington, D.C. Subsequently, a 2-day meeting was held in Chicago beginning October 11, 1966. Following this meeting the parties sought the assistance of the National Mediation Board.

On October 14, 1966, the National Mediation Board docketed the case as No. A–7049. Mediation sessions began under the auspices of Chairman Francis A. O'Neill, in Chicago, on October 19, 1966. Subsequent mediation sessions were held in Chicago on October 20, and in Washington, D.C., on October 24, 25, 26, and 27.

On October 27, 1966, Chairman O'Neill submitted a mediation proposal to the organizations. The proposal provided for a 1-year contract effective January 1, 1967, with a 5-percent increase in base wage, 3 weeks' vacation after 10 years, and the withdrawal by both carriers and labor organizations of all other demands.

At that time the spokesman for the labor organizations, then six, indicated that he was not prepared to respond until after the organizations had held an executive council meeting scheduled in Chicago for November 10, 1966. Throughout this period Chairman O'Neill was in touch with both the carriers and the labor organizations' representatives.

From early October until January 13, 1967, Mr. O'Neill was also actively handling, in mediation, the then current wage disputes for the following organizations:

Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen;

Brotherhood of Railway Clerks;

Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees;

Transportation Communications Employees' Union (formerly Order of Railway Telegraphers);

Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen; and

Joint Council of Dining Car Employees.

Mr. O'Neill made a mediator's proposal to each of these organizations substantially along the lines of the proposal made to the shop craft unions on October 27, 1966. These are the same issues; namely, 1 year, 5-percent general wage increase, coverage of the vacations.

That was then followed, on November 17, by a settlement which was reached, and it is important to note that this basic settlement was reached almost entirely and exclusively in private negotiations, and almost without any mediation at all. On November 17, that settlement was reached between the railroads and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. It provided for a 5-percent general wage increase which was to run until December 31, 1967. There was also a provision in that settlement for 3 weeks' vacation after 10 years, so this round started with a private collective bargaining agreement which was basically on a 5-percent for 1967 basis.

Four days after that, on November 21, 1966, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen signed a mediation agreement with the carriers providing a basic wage increase of 5 percent, effective August 12, 1966, to extend through December 31, 1967, 3 weeks' vacation after 10 years, and the disposition of other issues in their respective notices. The Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, on December 15, 1966, signed a mediation agreement with the carriers providing chiefly for a basic wage increase of 5 percent, effective January 1, 1967, and extending to December 31, 1967, 3 weeks' vacation after 10 years, and the provision of arbitration of the issue of "away-from-home expenses."

The remaining four organizations listed above did not accept the mediators' proposal and insisted upon an agreement of longer duration. On January 10, 1967, Mr. O'Neill made a new proposal which suggested an agreement providing for a basic wage increase of 5 percent effective January 1, 1967, and an additional 2½ percent effective January 1, 1968, to run through June 30, 1968. It was at this point that the possibility of an 18-month settlement on a basis similar to the 1-year settlement came into the picture. Mr. O'Neill also proposed again 3 weeks' vacation after 10 years, and arbitration of the "away from home expenses" issue.

On January 13, 1967, the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, the Transportation Communication Employees Union, the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, and the Joint Council of Dining Car Employees signed a mediation agreement with the carriers incorporating this 18-month proposal. This represents a settlement with 74 percent of the railroad employees on the basis of the 5 percent for 1 year; 5 percent for 1 year and 2½ percent for the next 6 months, with the settlement of a relatively small number of said issues. That 5 percent settlement ran through 1967, but also went back to August 12, 1966, as also did the firemen's settlement. That was on a 5-percent basis for the period running to December 31, 1967, when it was made in October. They were both made in October and in November of 1966—but they went back in their effective date to August 12, 1966. The clerks' settlement was the 5 percent for the 12-month period which was covered by that agreement.

On December 8, 1966, after there had been some of these other movements, settlements, in Chicago, the labor organizations—the six involved in the present dispute—submitted to Chairman O'Neill a reply to the mediation proposal received from him on October 27, 1966. At that time, in December, the organizations indicated that they found the proposal, in the terms which come from their advice, "totally inadequate and unacceptable." They added that under certain circumstances they would be interested in a longer term agreement than the 1-year proposed by the carriers and that they would be pleased to pursue this matter if the carriers were prepared to discuss it. The carrier representatives, however, had orally advised Chairman O'Neill that they were not prepared to negotiate an agreement in excess of 1 year.

Chairman O'Neill met again with the parties in Chicago on December 20, 1966, and was in frequent contact with them by telephone from December 20, to January 6, 1967. During this period the organizations requested on several occasions that the National Mediation Board proffer arbitration in accordance with the procedures of the Railway Labor Act. On January 6, 1967, the Board having determined that further mediation efforts would be fruitless, communicated to the parties a formal proffer of arbitration.

On January 9, 1967, the labor organizations formally declined the proffer of arbitration. Thereupon, on January 13, 1967, the National Mediation Board informed the parties that it was withdrawing from the case, which is, again, part of the established procedure. (Subsequently, by letter of January 16, 1967, the carriers informed the National Mediation Board that they were willing to accept the proffer of arbitration.)

The National Mediation Board notified the President on January 19, 1967, that in its judgment this dispute threatened to substantially interrupt interstate commerce so as to deprive the country of essential transportation service. Thereupon, on January 28, 1967, the President issued Executive Order No. 11324, creating Emergency Board No. 169. The Board consisted of Messrs. David Ginsburg, attorney, Chairman; Frank J. Dugan, of Georgetown University School of Law; and John W. McConnell, president of the University of New Hampshire.

The act provides that no changes may be made by the parties to the controversy, except by agreement, for 30 days after an Emergency Board has made its report to the President. In this case the parties by stipulation, approved by the President, agreed to extend the time for the Board to report its finding to the President until March 13, 1967, and to extend the period of statutory restraint until 12:01 a.m., April 13, 1967.

The Emergency Board opened its public hearings in Washington, D.C., on February 1, 1967, and formal proceedings were held for 7 days between February 1, and February 9, 1967. The record of the hearings consisted of 1,073 pages of testimony and 36 numbered exhibits. At the conclusion of the hearings the Board requested from each side a final brief on their respective positions.

The Emergency Board submitted its report to the President on March 10, 1967. Briefly, the Emergency Board recommended a 5 percent general wage increase, a job evaluation study and the establishment of an escrow fund to correct wage inequities between skilled and unskilled shop craft employees, a third week vacation after 10 years rather than 15 years, a 2-year contract with a wage reopener which could be effective at the end of the first year, and withdrawal of all other proposals.

Immediately after the Emergency Board submitted its report to the President the labor organizations requested a meeting with it for the purpose of seeking clarification of certain aspects of the report. Such a meeting was arranged by Chairman Ginsburg, and on March 15, 1967, he and Mr. Dugan met with representatives of the labor organizations. Clarifying statements were issued and subsequently conveyed in writing to both parties.

Subsequently, the parties met on several occasions without the presence of a Federal mediator. The carriers informed the labor organizations that they were prepared to accept the report of the Emergency Board No. 169 in principle and to negotiate an agreement within its framework. The unions announced that they did not find the Emergency Board's recommendations acceptable and on March 29 submitted a counterproposal to the carriers. During this period of exchanges the parties were informally advising the National Mediation Board of their respective positions. As a result of these reports, and in view of the complete lack of progress by the parties in privately resolving their differences, on March 31, 1967, the Mediation Board requested that the parties meet again under its auspices and scheduled such a meeting for April 4, 1967.

Chairman O'Neill met with the parties on April 4, April 5, and the morning of April 6. Following the latter meeting and after discussing the state of the existing impasse with Under Secretary of Labor James J. Reynolds, Messrs. O'Neill and Reynolds requested the parties to meet with them at the Department of Labor Building in Washington on the afternoon of April 6.

The parties met at the Department of Labor on April 6 and 7. These sessions indicated to the mediators that a settlement could not likely be achieved prior to the strike deadline of 12:01 a.m., April 13, 1967. The mediation began to explore with the labor organizations the possibility of obtaining a 1-week extension in the statutory strike deadline. Discussions concerning the proposed extension continued on April 8 and April 9. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz requested personally and on behalf of the President that the period be extended. The organizations rejected these requests.

On April 10, 1967, the President sent a message to the Congress requesting the enactment of a joint resolution to amend section 10 of the Railway Labor Act to extend the status quo period with respect to this particular controversy for an additional 20 days. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee adopted the resolution immediately. Thereafter, following hearings in executive session on the same date, this Senate committee adopted the resolution. The following day, April 11, 1967, the Congress passed Senate Joint Resolution 65. The resolution extended the period of statutory restraining until 12:01 a.m., May 3, 1967.

The President signed Senate Joint Resolution 65 on April 12, 1967, and in accordance with his message to the Congress appointed a Special Panel of Mediators consisting of Judge Charles Fahy, recently retired Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; George W. Taylor, professor of industry, University of Pennsylvania; and John T. Dunlop, professor of economics, Harvard University.

Thereafter, this Special Mediation Panel met with the parties, both separately and together, but were unable to find during the course of 28 meetings a method of achieving a settlement by the parties. Finally, on April 22, 1967, the Special Mediation Panel made a proposal of its own, for the settlement of the outstanding disputes between the parties. This proposal was found to be unacceptable in whole or in part by both parties. As a result of this impasse, the President on April 28 again requested the Congress to avert the strike, which was then scheduled for 12:01 a.m., May 3, 1967, for a period of 47 days. Public Law 90–13 was signed by the President on May 2, 1967.

While Emergency Board No. 169 had found that there were separate requests for contract modifications by the parties, in fact tentative agreement or withdrawal of the request for change had been made in all but three of the areas of dispute. These were, and are, the length of the contract term, the amount of the general wage increase, and the amount of the differential to be paid to the skilled craftsmen. In its proposal for settlement, the Special Mediation Panel resolved each of these outstanding areas of dispute. It suggested as the basis for an agreement an 18-month contract, a 6-percent general wage increase, and a wage differential of 5, 5, and 5 cents to be paid April 1, 1967, October 1, 1967, and April 1, 1968. As noted earlier, this proposal was not found to be acceptable. Unfortunately there has not apparently been any further collective bargaining by the parties despite the continuous offer of mediation services by the Secretary of Labor and his associates.

HEARINGS AND EXECUTIVE CONSIDERATION

The resolution introduced and referred to the committee required the Congress to find and declare, because of the effect of this unresolved dispute, that emergency measures are essential to the settlement of this dispute and to the security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers.

The Subcommittee on Labor held public hearings on 7 days: May 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, and 24, 1967. At these hearings the subcommittee received testimony from the Secretaries of Labor and Transportation, the members of the Fahy Panel, and representatives of the carriers and of the employees involved in the instant dispute. It considered the resolution in executive session on June 5, 1967. The resolution was reported with certain clarifying amendments from the Subcommittee on Labor to the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The committee considered the resolution as amended by the subcommittee on June 6. Several amendments, all of which involved various types of seizure of the railroads, were offered for consideration by members of the committee. A majority of the committee felt that the resolution as reported by the subcommittee represents the most appropriate solution of the instant dispute. It is designed to promote free collective bargaining to the fullest extent possible while insuring that there will not be an interruption of railroad service. If, and only if, the parties fail to agree on a collective bargaining contract will the determination of the Special Board go into effect and then only until the parties are able to reach their own agreement.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

The "whereas" clauses note that the labor dispute between certain named railroad carriers and their employees essential transportation services of the Nation; that the parties have not succeeded completely in resolving all of their differences through the processes of free collective bargaining under the procedures of the Railway Labor Act or through the mediation services of the Special Mediation Panel appointed by the President April 12, 1967, upon enactment of Public Law 90–10; that the Special Panel proposed settlement terms to assist the parties in implementation of the collective bargaining envisaged in the recommendations of Emergency Board No. 169; and that it is desirable to provide procedures for the orderly culmination of the collective bargaining process.

Section 1 provides for the appointment by the President of a five-member Special Board for the purpose of assisting the parties in the completion of their collective bargaining and the resolution of the remaining issues in dispute.

Section 2 directs the Special Board to attempt by mediation to bring about a resolution of the dispute and thereby to complete the collective bargaining process.

Section 3 provides that if there is no agreement 30 days after the enactment of this resolution, the Special Board must hold a hearing on the proposal made to the parties by the Special Mediation Panel in its report to the President of April 22, 1967. The section also provides that the parties are to be given full opportunity to express their views on the proposal and that the Board shall determine whether the proposal (1) is in the public interest, (2) is a fair and equitable settlement within the limits of the collective bargaining and mediation efforts in this case, (3) protects the collective bargaining process, and (4) fulfills the purposes of the Railway Labor Act.

Section 4, provides that the Special Board shall make its determinations on or before the 60th day after the enactment of the resolution. The Board shall incorporate in its determination the proposal of the Special Mediation Panel with any modifications it finds necessary under the four criteria set forth in section 3. The determination shall be promptly transmitted to the President and the Congress.

Section 5, subsection (*a*), provides that if no agreement has been reached by the parties within 90 days after enactment of the resolution, the determination of the Special Board shall go into effect. The Board shall include a time period, not to exceed 2 years from January 1, 1967, during which its determination will remain effective. The terms of the Board's determination, and the time period, are made subject to any subsequent agreement of the parties.

Section 5, subsection (b), provides that the Special Board shall reconvene and promptly issue further determinations, with or without a hearing, at the request of any party if there is disagreement as to the meaning of any part of its determination or as to the terms of any agreements necessary to give effect thereto.

Section 5, subsection (c), gives the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia exclusive jurisdiction of all suits concerning the Board's determination.

Section 6 extends the no-strike, no-lockout provisions of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, with respect to this dispute, until 12:01 a.m. of the 91st day after enactment of this resolution.

Individual Views of Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pell and Mr. Williams of New Jersey

We feel that the reported resolution fails to provide an equal incentive to the parties to the dispute to settle the dispute voluntarily without Government intervention. As reported, if a voluntary settlement is not achieved within 90 days, labor will be forced to work at wages set by a Government board; labor will not be free to strike. Labor will be denied its traditional route to attainment of its economic goals under our free collective-bargaining system. Labor is thus disarmed, but no corresponding detriment or burden is imposed on management. And there is every reason to believe that the settlement in this case will be an involuntary one, for the railroads have made it clear in their testimony before us that they desire a settlement arrived at through "legislation to finality." The railroads are seeking that solution not only in this specific instance, but in any permanent legislation that might be considered in the future.

To remove the right to strike from American labor is a drastic step. Testimony has shown that it is clear in this case that the parties have failed to make every effort to see to it that collective bargaining works, and although a full strike would be intolerable, it must be restated that the elimination of the right to strike is a difficult and heavy responsibility on us all. When we must act in this fashion we are agreed that some equal loss of freedoms must be placed upon management—for the failure of collective bargaining cannot be laid solely at the doorstep of labor. Yet our concern is not to bring punishment to bear on these private parties; our main concern is the life of collective bargaining, both in this case and throughout our economy, if we are to maintain a true free enterprise system. We believe, therefore, that the resolution should contain sufficient inducements to both sides to bargain—not the inducement to one of the parties to wait our procedures out, thus arriving at an imposed settlement. The resolution reported by the committee does not meet the test of basic equity; it does not hold out any reasonable guarantee that free collective bargaining will be relied upon.

The committee considered several proposals aimed at more fairly balancing the burden of the legislation. Senator Yarborough's amendment sought through "fiscal seizure" to restrain the profits of the railroads during the period they would benefit from labor working under compulsion.

Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts offered an amendment that was designed to provide certain legislative sanctions, the nature of which would clearly induce the parties to arrive at their own negotiated solution. Under this proposal, the railroads would be seized and run for the Government account and the unions forbidden to strike while negotiations continued for 90 days. The profits of the roads during this period would be held in an escrow account. If a voluntary solution was not arrived at during that period and a settlement was imposed on the parties by a special panel, the roads would forego the return on their profits and the unions denied retroactivity in their settlement.

The rationale of these approaches was that a freely negotiated settlement would appear to the parties as the only economically justifiable solution; for significant losses of profits and wages would be the result of continued inaction at the bargaining table. It is unfortunate that a majority of the committee would not look favorably on some form of these proposals, for some degree of seizure should be coupled with the compulsory labor aspects of the resolution to insure fairness.

We feel that the committee's bill is an imperfect *ad hoc* response to a specific labor dispute that can be supported only for that purpose. It forms no precedent for any action the committee may take in any similar future situation. It is our expectation and hope that the committee will never again report a bill containing the imbalance found in the present measure.

Harrison A. Williams, Jr.
Claiborne Pell.
Ralph Yarborough.
Gaylord Nelson.
Edward M. Kennedy.
Robert Kennedy.

Individual Views of Mr. Javits

Because the entire Nation cannot be permitted to grind to a halt as a result of a work stoppage on the railroads, which would amount to practically a general strike, the bill before us is a necessary expedient. It is about the best we can do in the way of an ad hoc measure at the present time, although I personally believe that limited seizure, in the form I proposed in my amendment No. 191, is a preferable alternative.

The difficulty we are confronted with now is largely the result of our past failure to enact permanent legislation. Once again we find ourselves faced with the necessity of taking precipitate action to avoid the effects of a work stoppage which would imperil the national health and safety. Now, as in 1963, a work stoppage is threatened on the railroads; last year it was the airlines.

For years now we have been proceeding under the delusion that it is possible to handle these recurrent crises on a purely ad hoc basis. There was a moment when it appeared that the administration had realized the necessity of a permanent approach. In his 1966 state of the Union message the President promised to recommend permanent legislation to deal with these crises. A task force of distinguished men was appointed to find the best solution. But the results of the work of the task force are unknown, and the President has failed to send up any recommendations. The reason: no consensus has been achieved among those differing interests and views with respect to the necessary legislation.

During the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 81, Secretary of Labor Wirtz informed the committee that he could not say when, if ever, the administration was going to recommend any permanent legislation to deal with national emergency labor disputes, and it is now apparent that no such recommendations are going to be forthcoming from this administration. This, of course, does not excuse Congress from acting; indeed we have been remiss in our duty in not acting before now. Until now, however, none of us who have introduced legislation have even been able to obtain hearings due to the administration's unwillingness to face up to the issues involved.

The utter futility of continuing the ad hoc approach to these crises should now be apparent. Not only are we faced with the present necessity of legislating to prevent a nationwide shutdown of the railroads because of a strike by the six shop craft unions on June 19, 1967, but there is a distinct possibility that within a few days after we act with respect to the shop craft dispute we may have to start all over with the shop craft unions on the Long Island Rail Road, and, a month or so later, with the conductors and brakemen on the nationwide system.

In the case of the Long Island, an emergency board has already been appointed and made its report, so the final stage of the Railway Labor Act's countdown is underway; in the case of the conductors and brakemen, an emergency board has just been appointed, so the full 60-day countdown has just begun.

The only way in which we can avoid this kind of unseemly spectacle in the short and the long run is to stop abdicating our responsibility to the Nation. Permanent legislation is necessary—with or without the administration's cherished consensus—and it is imperative that full-scale hearings on the bills which have been introduced by myself and a number of other Senators and Representatives be commenced without delay. In the absence of such hearings the only alternative open to us will be to offer the necessary measures as amendments to pending legislation. This is an unsatisfactory course, at best, but it is certainly preferable to no action at all.

Jacob K. Javits.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the report speaks for itself. It really is an accurate description of the resolution but I can summarize it under these points.

The report sets forth the chronological history of this dispute. This dispute has gone through a long process of collective bargaining between the parties of many months duration. It has been before the National Mediation Board for a good many months under the very able chairmanship of Mr. O'Neill, who has taken a very prominent part in carrying out his statutory duties in seeking to bring this dispute to a settlement by way of collective bargaining and mediation between the parties.

I wish to pay my very high regard and respects to Chairman O'Neill and other members of the National Mediation Board for the dedicated public service they have rendered in their attempts to obtain a settlement between the parties to this dispute, so that we would not find ourselves in the position we are in at the present moment in the Senate.

When the National Mediation Board was unable to obtain an agreement between the parties under the statute, it proffered arbitration of the dispute, which the statute provides, and the brotherhoods turned it down. Then, there followed more months of mediation attempts on the part of the Department of Labor, including the continuation of the efforts of the National Mediation Board. Under the statute, the Railway Labor Act, when the brotherhoods rejected the proffer of arbitration by the National Mediation Board, it was necessary for the President to appoint an emergency board.

That emergency board was appointed. The chairman was a very distinguished

American, Mr. David Ginsburg. It conducted the hearings of record. Mark the words I have just used, for I will have more to say about that particular procedure momentarily. As an Emergency Board it conducted hearings of record; it handed down its recommendations; the brotherhoods rejected the report of the Ginsburg emergency board, and a strike would have ensued had not Congress passed ad hoc legislation which postponed the strike for 20 days so that the parties could further seek to resolve their differences. Thereafter the President appointed a Special Mediation Panel and when that Panel's recommendations, as I shall discuss more fully later, were not accepted by the parties, a second 47-day postponement was enacted.

This was done so Congress could give consideration to ad hoc legislation in an endeavor to prevent a stoppage of the transportation facilities of the entire railway system of the country.

That is where we are at this moment. The President, early in that 47-day period, sent up for consideration of Congress Senate Joint Resolution 81.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to learn, first, what public agencies have acted in the matter thus far. Do I correctly understand that Emergency Board No. 169, created by Executive Order No. 11324 of January 28, 1967, did make a report?

Mr. MORSE. That is the Ginsburg Board to which I just referred. I might as well do it at this point, discuss the actions of the Special Mediation Panel, if the Senator will bear with me. When the Ginsburg Board's report was rejected by the brotherhoods involved in the dispute, the issue then was: What would be the next step? They had 30 days, of course, under the Railway Labor Act, to seek a settlement among themselves.

Following the rejection of the Ginsburg report, the President set up a Special Mediation Panel.

Please note my words, because the matter of definition will become very important in the debate as we progress. I hope to make the definitions a matter of record rather early in the debate.

The Ginsburg Board was an emergency board. It was a board of record, a quasi-judicial board. It followed the procedures of arbitration.

The Special Mediation Panel appointed by the President was headed by a great American judge, now retired, a man with a brilliant judicial record, Judge Charles Fahy, formerly a member of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The other two members were Prof. George Taylor, of the University of Pennsylvania, formerly Vice Chairman of the War Labor Board, under whom I had the privilege of serving and from whom I learned a great deal when I was a member of the War Labor Board; and Prof. John Dunlop, of Harvard, who was the Chairman of the Boston Regional Board of the War Labor Board and who was appointed many times by the War Labor Board both to arbitrate and mediate major cases during World War II.

I want to stress, however, that the Fahy Board was a mediation board, not an arbitration board.

It made its recommendations. Those recommendations, as the Senator from Ohio knows, were rejected by the brotherhoods. Following that rejection, the President sent to Congress what became Senate Joint Resolution 81, which I shall describe shortly. But that is an account of the steps which were taken by the Government to try to help the parties to reach an amicable settlement of their differences.

I have already mentioned that throughout this period the National Mediation Board continued to proffer its services. The Department of Labor, through Secretary Wirtz and Under Secretary of Labor James Reynolds, did yeoman service—outstanding service, I think—in seeking to lead the parties to a mediated settlement.

Knowing the intricacies of this case, I cannot begin to pay tribute too high not only to Chairman O'Neill of the National Mediation Board, but also to Secretary of Labor Wirtz and Under Secretary Reynolds, for the great service they rendered the country and their President, as well as the parties, through their mediation efforts to reach a settlement of this case.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then this correctly summarizes the proceedings which have, thus far, taken place generally, under the Emergency Board created by the President, under Executive Order No. 11324; but the Board was not able to produce a settlement of the dispute.

Mr. MORSE. The proposal was rejected by the Brotherhoods.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Second, in conformity with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, the National Mediation Board officials participated, but were not able to bring about a settlement of the dispute.

Mr. MORSE. The National Mediation Board, prior to the appointment of the Ginsburg emergency board, carried out its responsibilities under the act, trying to bring the parties to a mediated settlement. It finally offered arbitration, which was rejected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Third, a special mediation board appointed by the President acted and tried to bring about a settlement; is that not correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So there were at least three official agencies which participated in attempting to settle the controversy.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. After the failure of these three efforts, the President is now requesting Congress to enact the legislation now before the Senate; is that not correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am ready now to describe the procedure provided for in the resolution.

The President has proposed that we agree to this resolution which would empower him to appoint an additional Special Board.

Let me make perfectly clear that this is not an arbitration board.

Let me make perfectly clear that this resolution does not in it have a single element of what is known as arbitration.

In spite of the fact that opponents of the resolution, in and out of Congress, and some of the leaders of labor, keep referring to it as a compulsory arbitration resolution, there is not an element of compulsory arbitration in it.

This is a 100-percent mediation proposal. The Board will have to act upon it within the framework of mediation. If it were to go outside the framework of mediation, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has helped so to clarify the resolution that such action by the panel would be subject to court attack, just as an arbitration report is subject to court attack if an arbitration board or emergency board goes beyond its terms of reference.

I want to dwell on this point momentarily because there is so much misunderstanding about the resolution in the publications which have appeared.

It is a very difficult and complex concept of law regarding the distinction between arbitration and mediation. However, it is vital to a proper understanding on the part of the parties and on the part of Members of Congress, to state what this resolution really is.

The Special Panel that would be provided for under this resolution could not even make use of the Ginsburg report, for that report is a judicial report. It is one based upon what we call a record hearing. It is a report bound by the evidence which was submitted to it at the official record hearings of the Board.

The Ginsburg Board had, of course, the responsibility of documenting its recommendations with evidence the parties submitted on the record.

The special panel that is being set up by the President under this resolution is a mediation panel, a panel which seeks to lead the parties to a conscionable compromise of the dispute over the unsettled issues. In making its recommendations, it is not found to, or confined by, evidence submitted on the record. I want to repeat that the resolution provides for a mediation procedure, and not an arbitration procedure.

What is arbitration, Mr. President? Arbitration is the judicial process, as we point out in the committee report, and as was discussed during the hearings in much greater detail than I propose to outline today. I simply want to call attention to the point in the report that lays down the legislative history of the measure, and not take the time of the Senate to repeat what I have already said in the committee hearing and in the report, a copy of which is on the desk of each Senator.

In broad-brush outline, arbitration is the judicial process in which the arbitrator, or the board of arbitration if we are dealing with more than a single arbitrator, is bound by two very important judicial rules: First, the parties that appear before the arbitrator have the burden of proof on each issue in accordance with the burden on the proponent. That is, if the brotherhoods in this case, for example, speaking hypothetically, make a proposal for a change in the vacation provisions of the old contract, then they have the burden of proof on that proposal. The arbitration board is bound by the second rule of procedure; namely, the proponent has to establish that burden of proof by the preponderance of the evidence.

If the proponent of a particular issue fails to establish his contention by a preponderance of the evidence, then the arbitration board has no course available to it other than to rule against the proponent. Usually the recommendation is in such language as this: "The request of the proponent is denied," or "The board's recommendation is that the request of the proponent be withdrawn."

The arbitrator is subject to review. If it can be shown that the arbitrator went outside of those two points of procedural rules, that arbitration award can be subject to attack in court. The law books contain many, many cases in which arbitration awards have been channeled into the courts on the ground that the arbitrator went outside of his frame of reference or that the arbitrator failed to abide by these two important procedural rules.

Mr. President, what is a mediation procedure? Mediation is not a judicial process at all. The mediator is not bound by any rules with reference to the burden of proof. The mediator is not bound by the rule that the request of either party must be sustained by a preponderance of the evidence. The mediator's job is to lead the parties to a conscionable compromise, irrespective of what the evidence may be. Of course, a mediator does not ignore the proof and evidence that the parties advance in support of their arguments in the mediation process.

Let us get down to the nub of the question. The mediator also takes into account the economic position and the economic strength of the parties to the dispute. He takes into account what he thinks would be a fair and reasonable compromise of their differences.

Unless we understand that vital difference between arbitration and mediation, the Senate today will never be able to understand the differences that will probably develop in the debate between the proponents of the resolution and the opponents of the resolution. Sincere men, just as dedicated to the public interest as those of us who are supporting the resolution, have honest differences of opinion with those of us who are supporting the resolution. They sincerely believe that this is not the way to seek to settle this case legislatively. I have the utmost of respect for them. I simply disagree with their conclusions, as they will state them. I think this is the fairest possible procedure that can be adopted at this time in seeking an equitable settlement of the dispute while protecting the public interest.

Mr. President, one cannot understand the position of the proponents of the resolution and of the manager of the resolution unless he understands that we are convinced that there are three interests involved in this case: The legitimate interests of the brotherhoods; the legitimate interests of the carriers; and the superior interests of the public in an hour of national crisis. Unless one understands that, he cannot understand the position of the President of the United States on this resolution. The President of the United States is offering this resolution with his recommendation for adoption in the settlement of this dispute on the major premise that the superior public interest dictates the passage of this resolution. That is the position of the President of the United States.

I happen to be in a position of responsibility to bespeak his position on this issue. I completely agree with him.

So we have before us today a resolution calling for a mediation of this dispute between the parties under the following timetable: During the first 30 days the responsibility of the Special Panel to be appointed by the President will be to seek to lead the parties to mediation and agreement between themselves for the resolution of the dispute without further action under the resolution. But if the parties are unable to resolve their differences in mediation, under the aid and assistance of the Special Panel, then the resolution provides that for the next 30 days the panel shall conduct hearings—and they will be public hearings—at which the parties will have to be called upon to show cause as to why the mediation proposal of the Fahy Board should not be adopted as a solution of this dispute for a period up to 2 years.

Mr. President, there will be time, in that 30-day period, if it goes that far—and I hope it will not, may I say parenthetically. I think the probabilities that it will not are very great, because I know from personal experience similar cases by the score in which, once the parties knew that they were obligated to reach a mediation settlement, they reached a settlement without it being necessary to go forward to the last step, as provided for in this resolution, called the step of finality.

But let us assume that they cannot reach a mediation settlement in the first 30 days. We have, then, a public hearing, in which the parties will be able to address themselves not only to the Board, but to the American people, telling why they think the Fahy Board mediation proposals should or should not be accepted, or to what degree they should or should not be accepted.

That is very important, Mr. President. Anyone who has followed my work in the matter of settling labor disputes for the past 32 years—and I arbitrated my first case 32 years ago, and have mediated and arbitrated scores of them during the intervening period of time, Mr. President—has heard me say throughout that period of time, that the final judge, the final mediator, the final arbitrator, is Mr. and Mrs. Public, the citizens of the country. We call it public opinion.

Once again I say, advisedly and respectfully, but most sincerely, to the parties to this dispute: Do not forget that eventually you will have to face that final mediator and judge, the public, if in an hour of great national crisis, you, the parties to this dispute, are unable to reach a settlement in accordance with the great precious principle of economic freedom that under our form of government is available to you—collective bargaining, mediation, and voluntary agreement.

Mr. President, after the Board has made the record, during the second 30 days under this resolution, the Board would have the responsibility of making its recommendations for a final settlement. But it would not be final even then. Every possible attempt has been made by the President of the United States, in this resolution, to keep alive, up to the ultimate moment of finality the precious principle of voluntarism between the parties to a labor dispute, for implementation by them, if they are willing to stand up—or rise up, may I say—to what I think is their clear responsibility in this case, to get it settled between themselves, it will not be necessary for the Government to say: "In the interest of the public, it now is necessary for us to lay down these requirements for settlement for a duration of 2 years."

Oh, I know, Mr. President. I know that there will be criticisms and attacks upon me for that statement. I have had them for 32 years. Yet I am proud to stand on that record, because, when the conflict is over, invariably the parties to the dispute have always been fair enough to come to me and say, "We recognize that under the circumstances there was nothing else that you could do, and carry out your public trust."

I say to American labor right now that I would be derelict in my responsibilities as a public official if I did not say to the members of these brotherhoods and to the carriers, "Your Government has no other course of action if it is to represent a free people in an hour of crisis, but to say to both parties that there cannot be and there must not be a stoppage of the operation of the railroads of this country." That public interest is so much greater than the interests of labor and the interests of the carriers in this dispute that the Government has no other course of action.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. About 15 minutes ago, when we discussed the several agencies that have already acted in this matter, it was pointed out that there had been three. Can the Senator from Oregon state how much time has already been consumed in the efforts to resolve the dispute?

Mr. MORSE. The chronology?

Mr. LAUSCHE. About how much time?

Mr. MORSE. It started May 17, 1966, more than a year ago.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, more than a year has elapsed in the efforts to resolve the dispute, and the parties are still separated in their judgment of what the settlement ought to be?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the joint resolution to which the Senator from Oregon is asking the Senate to agree, how much more time will be given to the parties to negotiate, under the free collective bargaining system, in an effort to reach an agreement?

Mr. MORSE. Ninety days from the day

that the President signs the joint resolution, if the joint resolution setting forth this procedure shall be passed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, 30 days will have to elapse while the Special Board waits to see if the parties themselves have been able——

Mr. MORSE. It will not be waiting; the Special Board will be working with the parties, trying to help them reach a mediation settlement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At the end of the period of time just mentioned, if the parties have not reached a settlement, the Board is empowered and directed to make a report?

Mr. MORSE. After that first 30 days, the Special Board will conduct a public hearing we call it a show-cause hearing—and the issue before the Board and the parties will be this simple one: The parties will be called upon to show cause as to why the Fahy Special Mediation Panel's report should not be the basis for a final settlement of the case.

That takes us through 60 days. Following that second 30-day period, the parties will have an additional 30 days in which to determine whether they think the recommendations of the Special Board, which will flow from the show-cause hearing, should be modified in any way.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] offered an amendment yesterday in committee, which I accepted because I thought it was a very important clarifying amendment. As I stated, the Board would be responsible for doing it anyway, but it is well to have it in the resolution so that there will be no doubt about what the Board will do, in its relationship with the parties, during the last 30-day period. It is the procedure that all Mediation Boards follow anyway, but it should have been spelled out in the resolution, and I am glad that the Senator from New York did spell it out with his amendment, which I accepted.

What is the amendment? Senators will find it in the resolution. It is simply, in essence, that the parties can call upon the Board to clarify its recommendation.

It happens all the time. However, the Senator from New York submitted the amendment, and it is a very important amendment. I was pleased to accept it. That is the procedure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The situation is that about 13 months have now elapsed in trying to reach an adjustment. The pending joint resolution will allow 90 additional days for negotiation and mediation. At the end of that 90-day period, if the dispute is still unsettled, what will be the situation?

Mr. MORSE. On the 91st day, the recommendations of the Mediation Board will automatically go into effect for a period of not more than 2 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And the parties will continue their negotiations?

Mr. MORSE. They are free to modify them any time they want to do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the alternative, and what will the people of the Nation be faced with unless the joint resolution is passed?

Mr. MORSE. The main alternative, if one assumes that no other procedure is provided to prevent a stoppage of the railroads, would be a strike if the joint resolution is not passed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Oregon and the President are of the opinion that the country cannot hazard the economic damage that would come from a paralyzing of the railroad industry.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think there is the slightest doubt about that. Later in the debate I shall offer a letter from the Secretary of State and a memorandum from the Secretary of Defense which the President has made available to me for use in the debate. These documents leave no room for doubt about the national emergency.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If there has been no settlement at the end of 16 months, have any of the parties suggested how long they should be permitted to continue?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator means by way of a strike?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, if they are allowed to strike, they will stay out until they think they can force their demands or until other forces in the Republic cause them to think they had better not continue the strike.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It seems to me that ample time has been allowed for securing a settlement through the processes of mediation and negotiation. It is the belief of the Senator from Oregon that inasmuch as the settlement may not be achieved, the proposed legislation ought to be passed.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur in the recommendation of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]? I want the Senator from Texas to know that at every point in the development of my case in regard to the pending joint resolution I seek his attention, intervention, and suggestion.

I am not suggesting that we involve ourselves in substantive debate at this point, but on all procedural matters, I want the Senator from Texas to know that I seek only complete cooperation with him.

Mr. President, no one could possibly have had finer cooperation from a colleague than I have had from the Senator from Texas. The Senator from Texas has a grave responsibility. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, and he has been very understanding and appreciative of the position in which the Senator from Oregon is placed.

I am perfectly willing to assume that position, but I have the responsibility of presenting the administration case under the resolution.

I present the administration's case not only because I am pleased to extend this courtesy to the administration, but also—and I wish the RECORD to be perfectly clear on this—because I completely agree with the administration on the merits. The Senator from Texas knows that.

I want the RECORD to reflect the tribute I make to the Senator from Texas for his complete cooperation. Yesterday, for example, the Senator from Texas made it perfectly clear that he would not take any more time than necessary to present his case in chief on the various amendments he had to offer.

The Senator has been completely cooperative in arranging the hearings of the subcommittee for the benefit of the Senate and the administration to his great inconvenience.

For example, the night before last, he drove and flew all night. He drove in a rented car to an airport a great distance away so that he could catch a plane in order to be here and open the executive consideration on the resolution.

That is one little incident of many I can cite to show the great cooperation that the Senator from Texas has extended to those of us who are presenting the pending joint resolution.

I want the RECORD to show my appreciation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his very kind remarks.

Although I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, I could not present the case on behalf of the administration because I regard this as a measure aimed at the heart of labor and loaded in favor of management. I will not use any delaying technique. I have not done so in the committee and will not do so here.

I do not desire to interrupt the argument of the very distinguished and able Senator from Oregon. The Senator has a great knowledge of labor law, as is well known. However, we will debate the merits of the joint resolution.

The entire Labor Subcommittee is in complete accord that, with respect to the national state of affairs at the present time, we cannot have a railroad strike.

The disagreement concerns the quality of the burdens to be placed upon the parties engaged in the dispute.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Texas has just proved the complete reliability of my testimony, and I appreciate it.

Mr. President, the Senator from New York has suggested that I read into the RECORD at this time a letter from the Secretary of State and the memorandum from the Secretary of Defense received by the President of the United States in regard to this dispute. I am going to read them now so that they will be in the RECORD for reference by the Senator from New York in the speech he is about to make.

Mr. President, the first letter is dated June 6, 1967, and is addressed to the President and signed by Dean Rusk, Secretary of State. It reads:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, June 6, 1967.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to express my deep concern at the possible interruption of our national rail system by a strike at this time. In my opinion, it is absolutely essential that our domestic transportation be maintained at full capacity during this present critical period in our foreign relations.

The continuing supply of our forces in Viet-Nam is heavily dependent upon our domestic rail system. They should have the highest priority. In addition, the United States is engaged in supplying essential goods in trade channels or as part of our assistance programs to other countries throughout Southeast Asia and other very vital areas in the world. Any interruption of these supplies in their movement to our ports could have the most serious consequences for our nation and for freedom in the world.

Further, the unfortunate hostilities which have erupted in the Middle East have created a new series of potentially heavy burdens on our economy. Fighting or political action may disrupt the movement of food and fuel to much of Europe and Asia. To the extent this occurs we will need our full resources to meet the contingencies which may occur.

In these circumstances, the United States simply cannot afford a crippling strike. All our strength will be needed to meet our obligations to our soldiers in Viet-Nam and to our friends and allies around the world. I hope and pray it can be avoided.

Respectfully,

DEAN RUSK.

Mr. President, under date of June 6, 1967, the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, sent the following memorandum to the President:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1967.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

The Defense Department has just completed a review of the effects of a rail strike on our national security. I feel I must tell you that it is the unanimous opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Mr. Vance and me that acceptance of an interruption of rail movements of defense equipment and defense-related supplies at a time when we have 500,000 men engaged in military operations in the Pacific and simultaneously face a crisis of unpredictable dimensions in the Middle East would be an act of utter folly, an incredible evasion of our responsibility to our nation.

I realize these are strong words, but I know of no others to describe the effect on our military posture were rail transport of defense goods to be interrupted.

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

Mr. President, I have completed my statement in regard to the importance of there being a mediated settlement at the end of 90 days, which carries out the description of this resolution as set forth in its title—"To provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers of the railroad and certain of their employees."

The next point I wish to make it this: We have described this resolution as collective bargaining and mediation extended, leading to finality. That was the procedure of the War Labor Board during World War II, which was used in settling a great majority of the cases during World War II.

Many people do not understand where this procedure came from. I want the RECORD to show that this procedure was the result of extended discussions involving top labor experts in this country, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, and the Under Secretary of Labor, Mr. Reynolds, and the Chairman of the Mediation Board, Mr. O'Neill.

In the course of those discussions, pointed out that this was the procedure that was followed in the settlement of the overwhelming majority of the labor disputes handled by the War Labor Board, and is the procedure of this resolution, so far as its mediation aspects are concerned.

During World War II, there was mediation leading to finality. Let me make very clear that the War Labor Board did not operate on this time schedule. We did not have a time schedule of three 30-day periods. The War Labor Board, however, settled most of its cases by way of mediation. We sought to get the parties to compromise their differences. The parties compromised their differences in most of the cases because they knew there was finality in case of a failure of compromise. But they also knew that the Board would stay within the framework of mediation when we started with mediation.

I want to make that clear, because some misunderstanding may develop if those who are not fully familiar with the procedure of the War Labor Board think that we followed an arbitration process. There were specific cases in which it was decided by the Board, on the basis of the history of the case, that mediation was impossible. The Board decided that the case should be arbitrated. But let me make perfectly clear that in most instances in which the case went to arbitration, it went to arbitration on the basis of the votes of the labor members of the Board as well as the votes of the public members and the employer members. And I never heard a whisper from a labor leader sitting on that Board about compulsory arbitration, in that hour and time of great crisis.

Mr. President, those were rare cases. They were cases in which we were dealing with intransigence. Those were cases in which there was no way of reaching a mediated settlement; and because we could not get parties to sit down and talk about sensible and reasonable compromise, the Board had no alternative other than to order arbitration. We appointed arbitrators, usually. I have already mentioned Dr. Dunlop, who was on the Fahy board, who was one of our top arbitrators, and there were many others.

The labor members of the Board and the employer members of the Board joined with the public members of the Board in case after case for settlement to be reached on the basis of the same procedure that is involved in the resolution before the Senate. Here, again, labor member after labor member on the Board joined in that procedure, and I never heard a whisper from one of them that they were being involved in compulsory arbitration.

Some of the great labor leaders who served on the Board with me were the following:

Van A. Bittner, assistant to the president, United Steelworkers, CIO. He succeeded Thomas Kennedy, secretary-treasurer of the United Mineworkers of America, CIO, a labor member of the Board, we joined in this procedure time and time again.

Another one was George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the AFL at that time, now the head of the AFL-CIO. Time and time again, George Meany recognized that we had no other course to follow in a period of war emergency but to follow this procedure. He recognized that it was a fair procedure. This does not mean that George Meany and these other labor members always voted with the majority. Our decisions were not always unanimous. But the procedure was accepted, and that is the point I wish to stress.

The procedure was accepted. Why? Because the country was at war and because that public interest was superior.

I shall mention some of the other labor leaders.

R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile, Aicraft & Agriculture Implement Workers of America, CIO, one of the labor representatives on the Board. He participated in these solutions time and time again. I speak with some sadness, because, as we know, in the very recent past this great labor leader died. He left behind, however, a record of great labor statesmanship.

Mathew Woll, vice president, Photo-engravers Union of North America, A.F. of L., one of the great strengths on the labor side of that Board. He recognized the importance of the very type of mediation procedure that is embodied in the President's proposal that is now before the Senate.

We had other labor members. They served as alternates. John Brophy, director of Industrial Union Councils, CIO. Martin Durkin, president of United Association of Plumbers and Steamfitters of the United States and Canada, AFL. Later, for a time, he was Secretary of Labor of the United States. Clinton S. Golden, regional director, United Steelworkers of America, CIO. Emil Rieve, president of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO. Robert J. Watt, international representative of the AFL. And there were others whom I could mention.

These men were recognized in our country as great labor leaders, and they recognized that at a time of great national emergency, the parties should be given every opportunity, under the direction of and with the assistance of the War Labor Board, to reach compromise settlements of their disputes. But if they could not reach a compromise settlement, then there had to be that hour of finality at which the board would have to say, "We think this is a fair and conscionable set of principles for a settlement of your issues, and therefore this will be the decision of the board, until the parties themselves work out a solution of their own."

That is all we are asking for now.

All right, what are the differences? There is one element that does not differ, Mr. President, and that is the national emergency. There is not a labor leader in this country who can come forward with evidence of any weight that denies the statement I now make. This Republic is faced with a serious emergency, national in scope and worldwide in implication. In such an hour, the interest that must receive the primary consideration of Congress is the public interest.

During the course of this debate the Senator from Oregon is never going to be led away from that public interest. These workers who are involved in this dispute are entitled to a fair and equitable settlement, and the Senator from

Oregon can be counted on to do everything that he can to see that they get it; and the carriers are entitled to fair and equitable protection of their managerial rights and interests, and the Senator from Oregon will do everything that he can see that they get it. But, Mr. President, there is a greater right, and that is the public interest.

That causes me to deal with a most delicate question that is always raised and one that causes many people in labor to see red if you suggest what I now state as a legal fact under our system of government by law, which cannot be denied by a single labor leader of this country, as far as legal facts are concerned, and that is that no union has an absolute right to strike, and no management has an absolute right to lock out if following that course of action jeopardizes a superior public interest.

The right to strike under our system of law is a relative right. It is a right so precious and vital to the preservation of economic freedom in this country that any restrictions placed on it by government can be justified only if there is a clear showing that the national interest will be jeopardized by the exercise of that right. Therefore, the right to strike and the right to lock-out has to be exercised by labor and by management under our constitutional system within that framework, and not jeopardizing and not endangering a superior national interest. So, we have a question of fact. Are we at this hour in such a situation in this country that it can be said that there is a national crisis or a national emergency?

I am at a loss to understand anyone who will not take judicial notice of that fact. Everyone in this body knows my position on the war in Southeast Asia. Everyone in this body knows I am against that war in the sense that I do not think we should ever have been involved in it; in the sense, as I have said over and over again in the last 3½ years, I think we are outside the framework of international law in the prosecution of that war; and I think we are outside the framework of the Constitution of the United States in that war. But we are in it. Men are dying in it. The interests of the Republic are jeopardized.

While we are in it, the Senator from Oregon is going to insist that we maintain this economy in such a viable condition that there will not be the slightest interference of the interest, welfare, safety, and support of our men in Southeast Asia.

Oh, I know—and I will make a passing reference here, because if I do not, somebody will throw it at me before the debate is over—it will be said, "But the Senator from Oregon votes against appropriations for it." Yes, and I shall continue to vote against appropriations for it, but I do not let down the men. The pipelines will be full as far as supplying them necessary protection for that period of time to permit the President to change his policy, if we exercise the check of the purse strings by Congress and make clear through that means that we want the course of action changed.

But Congress, in its wisdom—or what it thinks is its wisdom—has not decided to do that. Until it does that we cannot justify a stoppage of the railway industry in this country which, as the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and many others have said would leave those men stranded. A vote against appropriations means they will be brought home, many of them, or have their operations reduced. But a rail strike would mean they would be cut off from supplies and that is something else.

That is what faced us on the War Labor Board. It is said, "There is this difference, Mr. Senator. In World War II we had a no-strike, no-lockout agreement; and all were bound to not strike or lockout." Does anyone infer from that that American labor cannot be depended upon to subordinate self-interest to the public welfare because there is not a no-strike, no-lockout agreement?

I want to be the first to rise to the patriotism of American labor. Once they understand that is the situation, there is no cause for concern regarding whether or not labor will stand and carry out its public responsiblity. It must be made clear to labor, and I hope they understand, that we are in that kind of emergency. Who are these workers? They are fellow citizens, they go to our same churches, they belong to the same lodges, they send their children—or in my case, their grandchildren—to the same schools, and their children or grandchildren associate daily with our children or grandchildren. They are fellow American citizens entitled, may I say, to exactly the same credit for a sense of responsibility to the welfare of our society as a whole as anyone else in this country, including every Senator.

I do not think we should be diverted by that kind of irrelevancy in regard to the question of responsibility of American labor. We have a question of fact. What is the degree of this emergency? There were honest differences of opinion about that among some of my colleagues up to the outbreak of the crisis in the Middle East. I have not heard any of them say anything since then about the degree of the national emergency.

We get to the question of whether the Government has the right and also the clear duty to say to rail management and rail labor, "You cannot justify stoppage. If you cannot settle it between yourselves, we have to help lead you to a settlement; and if you will not accept the final suggestions of a mediation board—not an arbitration board but a mediation board—we will have to make it final in protecting the public interest for not more than 2 years."

That is the public interest. I offer this as fair procedure for accomplishing protection of the public interest and assuring to labor and assuring to management conscionable and equitable settlement of the matters on which they stand in dispute.

I wish to make one further point. What is the alternative? One alternative is to let the parties go to an economic war while the American Republic is at war on an international basis. This is no time for an economic war in a regulated industry. Do not forget, Mr. President, these workers and carriers stand in an entirely different position than does the employer and the union in a plant down the street that is manufacturing paper boxes, women's dresses, or bicycles, or one of thousands and thousands of items of consumer goods. Mr. President, in the absence of a no-strike, no-lockout agreement, there is no doubt about the fact that in such employer-employee relationships as those particular industries the Government does not have any right to interfere and say, "You cannot strike or you cannot lock out." That is not this case.

When we get into a situation in time of war or other national emergency when the public interest will be jeopardized by a lockout or a strike, the same general rule I have already outlined applies.

The public interest comes first. The Government has a duty to intercede because there is no absolute right to strike or to lock out in any fact situation in which such economic stoppage would result in jeopardizing the public interest.

We have here a situation in which there cannot be the slightest question of the duty of the Government to prevent this strike or lockout. I have said many times in this case that we have a mutuality of responsibility here. The Fahy board made clear that the statistics of the settlement were not sacrosanct, that they were subject to modification. I have no doubt, as a result of the procedure in this resolution that that will be changed somewhat. That is up to the parties to show the mediation board that the changes which are sought are fair, equitable, reasonable, and just. However, we are confronted here with a situation where we cannot justify the stoppage because of the devastating effect it would have on the public interest.

Thus, if we are going to stop a strike, what other procedures are being suggested? I speak respectfully here. There are various kinds of seizure procedures being offered. There is the general seizure program. In my judgment, there are times when we need to resort to seizure. If we had a no-strike, no-lockout agreement, as we had in World War II, there are instances arising in which seizure is the only course open to the Government.

One of the first seizures in World War II was the seizure of the Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad. It was a belt line going around the Chicago yards.

Why was it seized? Because the company was intransigent and refused, in that case, to agree to any arbitration, in spite of all the voluntarism written into it that we could write into it and still have finality, giving them great procedural rights on the selection of the arbitrator or the board of arbitration, giving them broad procedural rights in determining the terms of influence of the arbitrator, on the issues to be submitted to the arbitrator. Yet the company adamantly refused. Under no circumstances was it going to countenance any interference by the Federal Government in the operation of its railroad.

The decision of the Board was unanimous. Every labor member, every employer member, and every public member joined in that unanimous decision. The Board assigned me the responsibility of writing the opinion. The president of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., later mayor of San Francisco, whose cases had come before me on innumerable occasions over a period when I was a west coast arbitrator on maritime disputes on the west coast, and therefore knew my position in regard to arbitration as a judicial process, was so concerned about the intransigence of the company in this case that this great American industrialist, businessman, and ship company president, Roger Lapman, wrote a special concurring opinion. That special concurring opinion was so much stronger than mine, in calling attention to the refusal of the company to cooperate with its Government in time of war, that the comments I made in my opinion almost paled into insignificance.

That case was settled by arbitration, nonetheless.

I wrote all the seizure opinions of the War Labor Board, with possibly one or two exceptions—and I cannot even recall them, because seizure cases became my baliwick. I was the compliance or enforcement officer of the Board. I had the responsibility of preparing the recommendations for the Board as to enforcing any decision of the Board when there was the slightest indication of defiance of the Board.

Every seizure case had to be taken by me to the President and he had to be convinced that it was the only course open to the Board. All papers had to be signed by the President, for it was the President who did the seizing.

The Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad case was the first one, after the declaration of war, in which the Army was moved in in order to seize and operate the railroad for the duration of the war on the basis of a fair settlement of the issues which had split the parties.

Seizure is justified in such a case as that, but seizure is never justified—and please catch this great significant point I want to make in regard to the application of seizure: Seizure is never justified as a leverage by the Government to force an employer to yield.

The criteria must be present for seizure. Those criteria have to be related to the acts of the parties. They must be related to the question of wrongdoing. There is not a single criterion of seizure present in this case. In my judgment, there is not the slightest justification for seizing the railroads. They are just a little way apart on the money issue, Mr. President. The difference here is an economic difference. The union is not jeopardized. Here is no attempt on the part of the employer to refuse to recognize the union. Here is no attempt on the part of an employer to seek to destroy a union. Here is no attempt on the part of an employer to refuse to bargain. The union does not like the modus operandi which the carriers have adopted in bargaining. The opposite is also true. The carriers do not like the collective bargaining procedures of the union.

I do not know what the facts are in regard to it, except that I know this fact cannot be rebutted: Both sides should have settled their differences in collective bargaining.

I make the point, however, that there are no criteria for seizure involved in this case. Therefore, Congress would make what I think would be a great mistake to support seizure in this case. What it should do instead of seizing is to pass a resolution saying, "We, the Congress, have decided that the carriers should surrender to the brotherhoods and give them what they ask for."

Seizure would put the carriers in a position that no railroad president could possibly justify in his relationship with his stockholders. He could not refuse, or hesitate to throw in the towel, so to speak, and surrender, if Congress says it is going to seize; because no carrier could possibly justify putting his stockholders to such a loss.

Therefore, let me say, we want to be fair about this. If we want to grant the brotherhoods what they are asking for, regardless of whether it is justified, then pass a bill and say, "We settle this case by giving the brotherhoods what they ask for." That would be direct. There would be no question as to what the purpose was there.

I want to point out that any type of seizure bill in this case is simply using a legislative weapon upon the carriers to surrender. That is why it is completely inappropriate in this case.

Other types of seizure have been suggested, for example, fiscal seizure, whereby the funds of the carriers would be impounded and they would be held. It will be discussed later as to how the carriers would get their profits back, if there were any profits, but they would have to go to court to get them back.

This is another position in which, in my view, the Congress would not take an impartial position, but would take sides in the dispute, so that the carriers would not be able to hold out for 24 hours. They would have to fold and surrender. That is not a responsible course of action for Congress to take in this situation.

Another type of seizure being discussed is a partial seizure based upon an offer on the part of the brotherhoods that will move those trains necessary to move essential goods. That has a great appeal. It sounds plausible. The layman will say, "What is wrong with it?"

What is wrong with it is that it would create a legislative monstrosity, which would bring the railroads, in the use of their yards, to a jungle stoppage. No one could get through that jungle because of the chaotic conditions created. It has been gone into by the committee. I insisted upon some railroad presidents being called to testify to the effect of that kind of operation. Read the hearings, Mr. President. No one can answer it.

We talked to Government advisers who are concerned with transportation problems, including the Secretary of Transportation and his experts. The railroads could not possibly be operated on that basis. There would have to be a business agent available to make a decision on every problem. It would involve great interference with the rights of management. We would in effect put the Government in control, because the ultimate decision would have to be made by the Government.

As the hearings will show—and I will go into that in greater detail—we would have a series of disjointers created by that situation until the operation of the railroads would represent nothing but a jumble and a jungle.

It was suggested that during World War II the railroads were operated on the basis of a priority system, under which goods were moved on the basis of priorities. But the railroads were operated in full, 100 percent, during that time. Not a mile of track was not used. Not a car or engine was not used. There was a totality of operation across the country.

The priority system of World War II has no relationship to the proposal made by the brotherhoods for partial seizure of the railroads.

As the Secretary of Transportation and others pointed out to our committee, how are we going to make the decision as to what is essential and what is not? Is supplying steel to a plant that is making equipment that may be used on the battlefield essential, or is supplying steel to a plant which will manufacture much needed boxcars essential, and another not essential, because the boxcar shortage is essential to a successful prosecution of the war? What about food going into an area to feed the workers in a defense plant? Is that essential? Is it not essential to send food into a community where there is no war plant? Is it or is it not essential to see to it that commuters are transported to the metropolitan areas to keep our economy viable, which is necessary if we are going to have a successful prosecution of the war effort?

Name the hundred Solomons who can solve those problems. The problems embodied in that proposal are so very complex that they are beyond the human comprehension of living men. That sort of seizure is just patently unworkable and unthinkable, in my judgment, as a reasonable solution of this problem.

So I close by saying that I think the committee has made its case in the committee report. I think the President has made his case. The hour calls for emergency action by the Congress to meet a national emergency. The hour calls for the carriers and brotherhoods to recognize the fairness of this procedure as the best way to get a fair settlement of this dispute.

A strike would only produce havoc and chaos and also be exceedingly costly to that very labor group, both economically and in an intangible way. In the long run, the loss may be a loss more precious than any economic amount they may be able to coerce out of their country in an hour of crisis through a strike. That is the loss of the exceedingly high regard the American people have for the railroad workers.

I know the railroad workers. I have lived with their problems ever since I was chairman of the Railway Emergency Board in 1941. When the emergency report was not accepted by the brotherhoods in that case, they asked the President, and the carriers joined them, to appoint me as a mediator in that dispute.

But that was mediation with finality in 1941. I made perfectly clear to them that I would mediate, I would help them reach a compromise, but I would have to have an understanding by way of mediating finality. For 38 hours of continuous meetings, without a break, I held them in session in the Raleigh Hotel. There were six committee rooms, each room with an employer and a brotherhood representative, working on an issue in each committee room. I moved from room to room for 38 hours, making proposals for settlement, suggesting modifications of a recommendation of the union on this issue or the carrier on that issue. We worked out a settlement that ended that threat of a national railroad strike on December 6, 1941, 1 day before Pearl Harbor.

The President of the United States later asked me, "Suppose they had gone out on strike and on Pearl Harbor Day there was not a railroad moving in the country?"

Mr. President, when the railroads stop, one does not simply blow a whistle and start them operating again. If we do not pass this legislation at a reasonably early date, there is the danger that the carriers are going to have to start putting embargoes on certain goods. They are going to have to stop moving or move by railroad certain goods because of the nature of the goods. The economic and administrative operation of the railroads is complicated, and no group involved, including the Congress, can justify our not passing this resolution and all parties cooperating with it.

I am satisfied that, if the resolution is passed, when a final settlement, either by agreement between the parties or by final recommendation of the Board, becomes a reality, it will not be very long before the members of the brotherhoods themselves—for they are fair—will say, "Well, under the circumstances, we came out very well, very fairly, and we have no real complaint."

I fully understand the concern of labor in this case, and that of management as well. But I must stand on this floor and say to them again, as I have said many times in the past years of my service in this field, "There comes a time when, after all, your Government has to prevail, in the interest of the public. That hour is now."

I urge the Senate to agree to this resolution in the public interest, thereby being fair not only to the public, but also to the brotherhoods and the carriers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc, and that the joint resolution as thus amended be considered as original text, for the purpose of amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has very clearly set forth the highlights of the controversy, the main points which will be raised by the major amendment, and the basic reason for adopting this legislation. I shall add only what I think is necessary to supplement that position, rather than repeat it.

Mr. President, in my judgment, one fundamental consideration must guide the minority in this matter, and that is that under no set of circumstances can we stand by and permit the U.S. Government and the commercial operations of the country to grind to a halt. It is a basic finding of fact in this matter that a railroad strike of the magnitude which is threatened on June 19 by the so-called shop-craft unions would represent the equivalent of a general strike in the United States, and bring the economy of the country, as well as the operations of the Government, to a grinding halt.

It is for that reason, Mr. President—because we are faced with a real national emergency—that this legislation is justified, in my judgment, constitutionally and on the basis of policy.

One other thing must be made crystal clear: There is nothing in the resolution which forces any man to work. That is servitude, in violation of the 13th amendment, and nothing in this law, if it becomes law—and I hope it does—makes that a condition. No man can be made to work. Organized activity on the part of the trade unions to prevent men from working, in the way of a strike or work stoppage, and organized activity by management in the way of a lockout, can be enjoined by action of the courts. But any individual who does not feel that he wishes to work under those conditions is not forced to work.

That is a very important point, Mr. President, because the same is not true for the railroad properties. Those properties are to be used and operated if there are personnel to work them.

On the other hand, we pass this measure—and this is, in my judgment, critically important—with the deep confidence that notwithstanding the strong feelings of the shop craft unions about the resolution—and they are not for it; they testified that they want seizure—nonetheless, in my judgment, they will, as patriotic Americans, because there is a national emergency, operate the railroads and follow through with the plan we lay out in this measure.

I do not ask Congress, and I know the Senator from Oregon would not ask Congress, to pass a statute which we feel would not be obeyed. I am confident that this one will be obeyed. Certainly we would inform Congress as to any doubts we had on that subject. I have none. I believe that this is most essential, because if it is obeyed, the statute will be effective.

The effectiveness, to me, lies in the fact the railroads will operate, and in the emergency situation which we have described, their operation is indispensable to the national security. The value of the letters of Secretaries Rusk and McNamara is that they certify to that fact.

These are the basic essentials, and we are doing our duty here, because it is our duty to see that the railroads continue to operate. That is the public interest. The paramount public interest is not the settlement of the dispute; the paramount public interest is the operation of the railroads. That is the way this legislation must be tested. I believe it will meet that test.

Mr. President, I am opposed to compulsory arbitration. I have tried for many years to work out some plan which would involve seizure in preference to any form of imposed agreement. I must say there are certain colorations and aspects of this resolution which represent an imposed agreement. You can call it mediation to finality, as the Senator from Oregon does and as the Secretary of Labor does, or you can call it mandatory settlement, as I do; it comes to the same thing. But I do not believe, Mr. President, that it is compulsory arbitration. And though I have great concern about the resolution, I realize, and I certainly have found by hard experience, considering the number of votes that could be mustered, that any form of seizure is so complex in its reach and so challenging to basic philosophic and political concepts of Members of Congress, and I think of most of the people of the country, that to work out any such plan would take very much more time, effort, testimony, and analysis than can possibly be given under these emergency circumstances.

Therefore, it is impractical to fight even for my seizure bill, which I have introduced on a number of occasions as a substitute for the pending measure. I tried in the committee, and I received exactly one vote—my own. Though I have had little success in promoting that concept, I should like to point out that this is by no means merely a crackpot idea of mine, or of the unions involved. The New York Times—certainly a very reliable medium—in an editorial of December 1, 1966, advocated that the President of the United States in order to deal with national emergency strikes or regional emergency strikes, should have a range of means, that "he"—meaning the President—"should be free to choose on the basis of each specific emergency whether to move for factfinding, compulsory arbitration, or temporary seizure of all or part of an industry."

This, of course, is very authoritative support for the idea that seizure should be one of the means entrusted to the President. The form of seizure which I proposed to the committee was exactly that—to give to the President that kind of an alternative, and to give him that alternative if he did not approve of what the special board which would be appointed under this statute did. Indeed, it also provided for a congressional veto over the President's decision that the Special Board's decision should go into effect—if he so decided.

But, Mr. President, the proposal received no support in the committee, and for very understandable reasons. It is complicated. It needs a lot of support from business as well as from labor; and it would have to be fought out in terms of permanent legislation in this field.

For years I have urged permanent legislation. I have tried to keep the feet of the administration to the fire, in view of the President's promise, in his state of the Union message of January 1966, that he would suggest such legislation to us. Indeed, we have a report that a task force for that purpose has been working for a very considerable period of time.

But the President is looking for a consensus in this field, rather than making an Executive decision himself as between various alternatives. He cannot, obviously, find a consensus. Labor or management will be strongly against anything the other suggests, or perhaps both would be against a given proposal. Therefore, we have had nothing.

In political terms, I condemn that. I think it is a very serious failure of the administration not to have given us a suggestion or recommendation for permanent legislation on this score.

The administration having defaulted, notwithstanding the President's statement in his state of the Union message well over a year ago, Congress should have done it itself. There are many bills pending here, my own, the Pickle bill, and others, which could form the basis for such action. But these are questions that are not central to the particular issue now before us. They may be central to who gets elected in respect to the labor issue, but they are not central to this issue. The central point for us to consider now is that it is our duty to keep the railroads operating.

As this is the only practical legislation upon which a necessary majority can be mustered, I have been for it.

As I said before, I am against compulsory arbitration. This does have some elements of the imposition of settlement. However, I do not consider it to be compulsory arbitration.

I submitted an amendment that was accepted by the principal author of the bill, the Senator from Oregon. It was backed by the minority on the committee. It is to be found on page 4, lines 8 to 10 of the bill. That language saves the bill from being compulsory arbitration because it requires the Board to make its determination on the basis of "a fair and equitable settlement within the limits of the collective bargaining and mediation efforts in this case."

That gives a guideline and a base which, as the Senator from Oregon has properly said, if violated, would furnish the basis for court attack. To put it simply, the special board's determination must be within the collective bargaining of the parties, their offers and counteroffers, and within the mediation efforts, which the Senator from Oregon properly defined as "the efforts of the so-called Fahy Board, rather than the decision of the Ginsberg Emergency Board" which were of a judicial character.

I believe, therefore, that this is a matter of first impression, a unique kind of approach which cannot be categorically classed as "compulsory arbitration."

I hope that the trade unions will not persist in their opposition on the classic ground—that they are opposed to compulsory arbitration. I do not believe this is compulsory arbitration.

I further point out that the right to litigate with respect to determinations made hereunder is contained in subsection c of section 5 at pages 5 to 6 respectively.

That is also an amendment which I submitted. It was backed by the minority and was accepted by the Senator from Oregon. It recognizes the right to test in court matters which can be tested. The essential matter is whether the ground rules and guidelines laid down by the pending measure have actually been followed by the special board as well as the usual questions of fraud, inadequate hearings, and so forth. It is all made subject to the jurisdiction of one court—specifically, the district court for the District of Columbia.

I think it is fair to say—speaking for myself, and I will not even try to speak for the senior Senator from Oregon—that my record has indicated here an understanding of the needs and requirements and, indeed, the desires of American labor second to few other Senators, if any.

I have paid very great attention in the long course of this matter to all aspects of the problem. Let us remember that we have now had two statutory stays of either a strike or lockout, totaling some 67 days.

We have been considering this matter for some months. So, it is not by any means a matter of first impression. There has been a lot of time to think it over, not only for ourselves, but also for the country. There has been sufficient time to reflect on what the bugs in this thing may be.

Mr. MORSE. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope that I do not in any way injure the Senator, because that is the last thing I would want to do. However, when the Senator refers to his record and the part he has played in the field of labor issues in the Senate and labor legislation, I want the RECORD to show that I have sat with the Senator from New York with the executive branch of the Government in conferences in the case.

Although I must speak within the bounds of privilege, I want American labor to know that time and time again in those conferences it was the Senator from New York who spoke up to make certain that very basic rights of labor were protected in connection with various proposals that we made.

It has always been a pleasure for me to stand shoulder to shoulder with the Senator at those conferences.

I think I will not violate any privilege if I say this, and it ought to be in the RECORD: The Senator from New York knows there was a proposal for straight out and out compulsory arbitration that was seriously advanced. The Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon made perfectly clear our complete opposition to it.

I said to the President of the United States at that time:

> I want you to know, Mr. President, that if that proposal goes to the Hill, I shall oppose it with every weapon at my command, parliamentary and otherwise.

The Senator from New York left no room for doubt that he stood completely on the same premise with the Senator from Oregon in opposition to an out and out compulsory arbitration proposal.

Such a proposal was seriously proposed, and there was a considerable amount of support for it at the beginning of that argument in the Cabinet Room. However, when we got through with our criticism of that proposal, we heard no more about it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to my friend, the senior Senator from Oregon, for that observation which I confirm, and I pay tribute to him for his devotion for over 3 years to the highest interest of American labor and the American people in labor-management matters.

Mr. President, no other feasible way could be worked out than this way. Upon this matter we heard the unions, and I have heard them publicly and privately with the greatest devotion and attention.

The rock upon which we founder is composed of two elements.

First, there is no way available to pass a seizure bill. We cannot even get any appreciable support, let alone majority opinion concerning a seizure bill, as far as I can see in the Senate and, from everything I know, in the other body as well.

My basic point is that the railroads must be kept running. We must, then, go to some course other than seizure. We have been asked to let the unions strike, with some form of procedure or agreement upon which essential goods could be moved and the necessary negotiations could continue for national security, health, safety. Every shred of evidence that we have been able to acquire from every side which is competent to judge, and not merely management, but also Government officials at the highest level and experts, tells us that this is simply impossible, and that it would be such an administrative monstrosity that we could not cope with it. It would thwart and frustrate what we are trying to accomplish.

Under those circumstances, Senate Joint Resolution 81 seems to be the only remedy short of compulsory arbitration or even worse forms of coercion. At the same time, it is a procedure which will command a majority of the Senate and, I believe, of the House of Representatives as well.

We have now surrounded this form of approach with very important protection concerning litigation and important protections of definition so that labor is assured that it will not have a runaway special board, as it is called in the pending measure.

It seems to me that we have done as much as any human beings, who have deep feeling and sympathy for everything labor wants, can do in order to accomplish the result of preserving our Government and enabling it to function under these emergency circumstances.

I urge American labor not to avoid the issue, not to wait until the crunch comes, as it has here and in airlines and in the firemen and engine strike, but to address itself as a major course to permanent legislation which will deal with this issue of national emergency work stoppages or lockouts. Labor has been very loath to do that, just as loath as the White House, just as loath as Congress.

But we cannot defer this matter any longer. It is unseemly and demeaning that we must constantly deal with matters of this character in the face of an emergency.

I am confident that we can provide a better law than the one that Congress will probably pass today, and which may well become law. I am confident that we can do better, but we cannot possibly do so when we are constantly looking down the muzzle of a gun.

In conclusion, I beg of American labor to address itself as statesmen to this proposition, to this issue, and they will earn the respect and regard of the whole country as true statesmen.

Mr. President, as I suggested to the majority leader, I yield for such time as he may desire, which I understand will be about 15 to 20 minutes, to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who has been so helpful and so cooperative in respect of this as in every other matter in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. PROUTY. I am grateful to the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, it is with great reluctance and some trepidation that I have concluded that I should support Senate Joint Resolution 81 in the form reported from our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

My hesitation is not due to any doubts on my part that a national railroad strike would have detrimental effects upon the health and welfare of our Nation's citizens or drastically impair our national defense at a time when we are faced with major commitments in both the Far and Mideast. Unquestionably, this is so.

Rather, my delay in deciding to support this resolution has been occasioned by my deep convictions against any form of compulsory arbitration being imposed upon the collective bargaining process by a Government fiat.

Although I have decided to support this resolution, I have no intention of playing terminology games or pretending that the administration's proposal is something other than it actually is. There is no question but that when all the frills are stricken from it, Senate Joint Resolution 81 imposes compulsory arbitration upon the parties, regardless of whether it is characterized by its supporters as "mediation to finality" or described in some other terms. Thus, if either side wishes to gamble that it can obtain more generous concessions as a result of a third party determination, it merely has to go through the preliminary steps without reaching a voluntary settlement of the dispute in order to have the compulsory arbitration features of this legislation take effect.

This dispute had its origin last spring, when the six shop-craft brotherhoods and the individual carriers served notices on each other with respect to changes in their collective bargaining agreements which they desired to become effective on January 1, 1967. The National Mediation Board became involved in this dispute on October 19, 1966, and attempted to mediate the differences between the parties until January 6, 1967. On that date, the National Mediation Board concluded that further mediation efforts would be fruitless, and made a formal offer of arbitration to the six shop-craft brotherhoods and the railroads.

The railroad carriers agreed to accept the National Mediation Board's offer of voluntary, binding arbitration, but this offer was rejected by the brotherhoods. As a result, the National Mediation Board notified the President on January 19 of this year of its conclusion that this dispute threatened to substantially interrupt interstate commerce to the extent that the country would be deprived of essential transportation services.

As a result, the President created Emergency Board No. 169 on January 28, 1967, the so-called Ginsburg board, to investigate and report its findings on this labor dispute. On March 10, 1967, Emergency Board No. 169 submitted its report to the President, including its recommendations for settlement of the dispute. Thereafter, the carriers informed the brotherhoods that they were willing to accept this report in principle and to negotiate a settlement within its framework, but the shop-craft unions rejected this proposal on the ground that they did not find the recommendations of the Emergency Board acceptable.

Despite further mediation efforts by the National Mediation Board and Under Secretary of Labor James Reynolds, the parties failed to resolve their differences. As a result, President Johnson submitted a request for legislation to Congress on April 10 designed to forestall a nationwide rail strike and preserve the status quo for an additional 20-day period. On April 12, 1967, the President signed Senate Joint Resolution 65, which had been passed by Congress on the preceding day, extending the status quo until May 3, 1967.

At the same time, the President appointed a special panel of mediators consisting of Judge Charles Fahy, Professor Taylor of the University of Pennsylvania, and Professor Dunlop of Harvard University. This panel, called the Fahy Board, submitted its report and recommendations to the President on April 22. Both the railroad brotherhoods and the carriers rejected the terms recommended by the Fahy Board.

Accordingly, the President requested an additional extension of time to permit consideration by Congress of legislation designed to protect the public interest. Congress then passed Senate Joint Resolution 79 on May 1, 1967, which extended the statutory ban on strikes and lockouts over this dispute to 12:01 a.m., on Monday, June 19.

On May 4, 1967, President Johnson submitted a special message to Congress on this subject. His recommendations were embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 81, which was introduced by the Senior Senator from Oregon for himself and the distinguished majority and minority leaders.

Our Labor Subcommittee subsequently held 7 days of hearings on this proposal, which have culminated in the bill reported to the Senate by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. With a few minor modifications, the bill now before us for consideration is the legislation requested by the administration.

I think it should also be noted as part of the background to this legislation that the six shop-craft unions are negotiating under what is referred to as a "rule of unanimity." In other words, any offer by the carriers must be acceptable to all six unions or it will be rejected. Thus, five unions could be in favor of agreeing to the terms of a voluntary settlement but be forced to reject it under the rule of unanimity because of the sixth union's rejection of it.

Mr. President, it has become clear to us on the Labor Subcommittee that the parties are not too far apart in negotiations. In reviewing the chronology of events concerning this dispute, I think it is also important to note that the carriers agreed to accept voluntary arbitration as recommended by the National Mediation Board, but that the shop crafts rejected this proposal and that the carriers later agreed to negotiate within the framework of the recommendations of Emergency Board 169, which offer was also rejected by the shop-craft unions.

In my opinion, it is a tragic circumstance that the parties have failed and to date continue to refuse to agree to submit their differences to voluntary arbitration. This, unfortunately, has not been done, although it seems to me to be the most desirable way to resolve their differences through an extension of the free collective bargaining techniques rather than bringing them here to us in Congress.

I am also greatly distressed by reliable reports which I have received which indicate that it is the International Association of Machinists which has prevented a voluntary settlement of this dispute under the rule of unanimity. It is a well-known secret that a substantial number of leaders of organized labor, including many leaders of other railroad brotherhoods, are very unhappy with the course of action followed by the machinists in this case. Even though these labor leaders cannot state their views publicly because of the necessity for union solidarity, they recognize that the irresponsible action of the machinists is having a deleterious effect upon the concept of collective bargaining and may well be bringing all regulated industry closer to permanent legislation providing for compulsory arbitration of their labor disputes.

Mr. President, this is the same union whose unreasonable demands brought about the crisis in our airline industry last summer which resulted in the passage of emergency strike legislation by the Senate. During the debate on that measure, I made the following statements on the floor of the Senate:

> On principle, I am opposed to any legislation which prohibits, denies or impedes a union from engaging in a legitimate economic strike. This is so, even where as here, I believe that the union is completely wrong and should never have called the strike in the first place. I realize the crippling effect that removing the right to strike has when the parties sit down at the bargaining table.
>
> But in a larger sense, I am afraid of what may come from precedents of this type. Many segments of the public and a substantial number of Congressmen have already expressed their desire for compulsory arbitration, at least in transportation and commu-

> nication industries subject to governmental control.
>
> I understand that both management and organized labor are completely against compulsory arbitration. They should be made aware, however, that support for this concept has gone far beyond the point of mere talk.
>
> I am unalterably opposed to compulsory arbitration. I know that if compulsory arbitration comes to government regulated industries, it will be that much easier to take the next step and apply it to our basic industries, and to then take the final step and apply it to free enterprise generally. The result obviously will be the end of free collective bargaining as we have known it, and which has been greatly responsible for making our nation the economic giant it is and giving its people one of the highest standards of living the world has ever known.
>
> For all these reasons, I regret it deeply when a segment of organized labor engages in irresponsible conduct which arouses the emotions of the general public to a degree where they begin clamoring for this type of legislation.

Last summer I voted against a proposal which would have imposed compulsory arbitration on the machinists and the airline carriers. I also voted with organized labor against the Senate resolution designed to break the machinists' strike against the airlines. I voted as I did because of my belief in what free collective bargaining could accomplish, even though I felt that the machinists were completely wrong in having called the strike against the airlines. It is a sad commentary on the leadership of this particular union to realize that once again their irresponsible conduct may well result in legislation detrimental to the entire labor movement, which can easily change the bargaining processes we have known in the past.

Because of my feeling with respect to compulsory arbitration, the decision to support Senate Joint Resolution 81 has been an extremely difficult one for me to make. One compelling factor to me is the unfair and disadvantageous position the carriers would be placed in at the bargaining table under the fiscal seizure amendment which I assume will be offered by the senior Senator from Texas.

The inequitable bargaining posture of the railroads under this proposal has been ably and eloquently pointed out by my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, in his statements both at the hearings and during the executive sessions of our subcommittee and full committee.

My support of this resolution, Mr. President, constitutes no change in my basic thoughts as to the merits of compulsory arbitration legislation, and will not necessarily serve as a precedent for any action which I may take in the future with regard to other permanent or temporary emergency strike legislation. I urge the six shop-craft unions, particularly the machinists, and the carriers to engage in intensive good faith bargaining in order to resolve their differences by voluntary agreement before such time as the compulsory arbitration features of Senate Joint Resolution 81 come into play.

I hope that my friends in organized labor will understand why I am taking the position that I am today. I would merely add that if blame must be fixed for having compulsory arbitration lurking in the background or for its eventual use to resolve this labor dispute, a substantial amount of this blame must be placed squarely on the shoulders of the machinists' leadership.

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. President, I intend to support and vote for Senate Joint Resolution 81.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show my high commendation for the cooperation which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has extended to me as the manager of this resolution in committee.

The Senator from Vermont does not agree with the Senator from Oregon on various facets of labor legislation and various facets of this proposal. I would like to have the RECORD show that in the opinion of the Senator from Oregon the Senator from Vermont, after he added up both columns, those on the deficit side and those on the asset side, came to the conclusion that he could support the resolution for the reasons he explained, and because he felt that was what the public interest dictated. In my judgment, that is the highest level of statesmanship that can be exhibited by any of us.

I would like to have the RECORD show further that I commend the Senator from Vermont and thank him for the cooperation he gave me on this matter and other matters, as well as procedural matters.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am grateful for the remarks of my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. Without his support and guidance, I am certain that this resolution would not be before us today in its present form. I know that this problem has been very distasteful to him, but his record over the years demonstrates his friendship to and support of organized labor. While we may disagree as to how Senate Joint Resolution 81 accomplishes its purpose, I know that he is thinking in terms of the national interest, as all of us who serve on the committee and the subcommittee have tried to do, in how best and most fairly to prevent a disastrous nationwide rail strike. I also wish to commend the senior Senator from New York for his contribution and efforts in attempting to resolve the somewhat distasteful issues with which we have been faced.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the friendship of the Senator from Vermont.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Does the Senator yield time on the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair requests the Senator to suspend briefly. The Chair wants it understood that hereafter all time will be under control. There will be 1 hour on each amendment, to be divided equally between the sponsor of the amendment and the Senator from Oregon; and 1 hour on the bill, to be divided equally between the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Who yields time?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Delaware wishes to be recognized for 1 minute. I yield to the Senator from Delaware for 1 minute.

INCREASED ALLOWANCE FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on May 23, 1967, the junior Senator from Missouri introduced Senate Resolution 130, the purpose of which was to increase the 1967 allowance for his subcommittee from $165,000 to $200,000.

In view of the seriousness of the charges which were made in the May 26, 1967, issue of Life magazine concerning certain financial arrangements of the junior Senator from Missouri, I am asking the leadership of the Senate to defer consideration of this resolution until after he has had an opportunity to submit his records of the transactions in question to the Senate Ethics Committee and that committee has had an opportunity to issue a report to the Senate.

I have written to the chairman of the Ethics Committee calling attention to this article and the charges therein and requesting that if the committee is not already doing so it examine these charges and issue a report to the Senate.

These charges are of such a nature that in fairness to the junior Senator from Missouri and the U.S. Senate they should not be ignored or left unanswered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, initially I would like to subscribe to the words just uttered by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

When the appropriations resolutions were before the Senate several weeks ago to finance the work of the separate committees, I made extensive inquiry concerning the special committee that was investigating the use of bugging systems. I inquired why that investigation was continuing for such a protracted period of time. I had doubts about the advisability of granting $165,000 for the continuation of that work, but I finally subscribed to it, believing it would be brought to an end, at least within this session of Congress. It now appears that $35,000 more is being asked to finance the work of that subcommittee for this year's work alone.

I do not by my words want to cast reflections either expressly or implied upon any Senator. I do, however, believe that before added money is given to the subcommittee that is conducting the investigation on the use of electronic systems and bugging systems, some explanation should be given to the Senate concerning the serious charges that have been made in public about the activities of that committee.

Mr. President, I wish to add that the number of letters I am receiving, asking what is happening in the Senate, are entirely too many for me to remain silent on the issue that has been raised by the senior Senator from Delaware.

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF THE RAILROAD LABOR DISPUTE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with respect to the pending joint resolution, in my judgment, there should be no further delay on the part of the administration in submitting its recommendation about the problem of work stoppages industries which are of national importance. We have had several ad hoc pieces of legislation submitted to us. This is an ad hoc approach to the problem confronting the people of the Nation in the labor-management dispute in the railroad industry. We should not continue to approach the problem on an ad hoc basis. Permanent legislation should be enacted. We should not permit jungle fights to settle disputes which have an adverse effect upon the national economy.

Mr. President, unless the legislation advocated by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and other Senators is passed, we are likely to witness what I call a war of the jungle to settle a dispute between management and labor leaders in the railroad industry, a war which will adversely affect innumerable innocent persons throughout the country. That should not be permitted to occur.

I have previously stated, and repeat, that, in my judgment, legislation should be passed by Congress requiring compulsory arbitration in all labor-management disputes involving industries for which the rate of charge for services rendered is fixed by a public utilities commission or other governmental agencies of a similar character.

That has been my concept of what should be done. I have held that concept for the past 20 years since I became mayor of Cleveland, where I first had my contacts with the very excellent work performed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the War Labor Board.

Let me point out the need for voluntary recognition by management and labor of what is likely to happen to the ability of the consumer to buy goods with a grossly cheapened dollar.

Mr. President, the forces of inflation are growing. In my judgment, with the arrival of fall this year, those forces will take hold, and the prices the public will have to pay will be increased in such amounts that shock will be felt by all buyers throughout the country.

What are some of the forces now in operation? At this point, Mr. President, I desire to read excerpts from some of the correspondence which I have received from Ohioans on this vital subject.

Here is an excerpt from a letter dated May 15, 1967:

> I am alarmed over the exorbitant increases being granted by new labor-management contracts in the construction field. There have been talks of holding wage increases to around three and a half percent. Recent increases agreed to in Ohio amount to 16 percent per year and better. At this rate, labor, in six years, will be increased by 100 percent. This is obviously beyond reason and without justification. No matter how healthy and proper our present economy may be, greed can destroy it.

Mr. President, I repeat that last sentence:

> No matter how healthy and proper our present economy may be, greed can destroy it.

Mr. President, I now go to the second letter, which is dated May 16, received from an Ohioan citizen:

> Frankly, I am disturbed about inflation. When I hear of the building trades in Cleveland getting an hourly increase of $2.20 per hour, my blood runs cold. The Congress will probably give the Old Age pensioners $10 per month. When the person on Social Security hires a plumber, carpenter, or painter to do some repair work, the retiree cannot do so because his $10 increase will not go very far.

Mr. President, I read further:

> The little bit of savings people have been putting away for years for a rainy day has depreciated 60 percent since 1939. I began in 1941 to purchase E-bonds. I did this then to support the war effort. I own a certain amount of bonds and they are now worth today in purchasing power 60 percent less than they were when I bought the bonds.

I go to another letter, dated May 29:

> Let us look at some of the demands by the unions. The operating engineers have been asking for $1.30 per hour per year plus more conditions plus more rights of the employer. If the union wants to run things they should go into business for themselves. The laborers in Columbus at one time were asking $1.50 per hour per year for 4 years.

This would mean $6 an hour plus in 4 years.

In the Cleveland area the wage increases demanded by the building craftsmen's union were 31 percent in a period of 3 years. The plumbers, plasterers, painters, and carpenters will be earning $7 an hour. In one of the letters which I received, a humble houseowner asked, "How can I afford to hire a painter at $7 an hour, which is $56 a day, to paint my house?"

Mr. President, until 2 years ago, the guideline was that pay increases shall be commensurate, in percentage, with the increased productivity of the worker, but in no event to exceed 3½ percent. That guideline is gone.

When the last ad hoc bill was before the Senate, I listened to the Senator from Oregon point out the excessiveness of the demands made. Three and one-half percent was the limit.

What is the fact? As I pointed out, in the Cleveland area, to build a house the cost of labor will be, in the course of 3 years, 31 percent more than it is today. How can the ordinary worker buy a house? How will he be able to keep it? How will he be able to maintain it? There will not be a chance in the world.

Tragically, not one word has come out of the Labor Department or out of the housing agencies, pointing out this gross contribution to inflation by the inordinate demands that are being made.

I go to another letter, dated May 11, which states that the Akron Beacon Journal has reported that the structural steel union has gained a wage increase of $2.30 an hour. Mr. President, I think that covers a period of 3 years; $2.30 an hour, for 8 hours a day, would mean an increase of $18.40 a day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes, to close?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it has not been simple for me to express these views, but I think the primary obligation that we owe to the people of our country is to see to it that the dollars of the humble, retired minister, the schoolteacher, the professional man, the laborer, and the farmer are not eroded by unrelenting inflationary forces that are at work. We will rue the day. It is going to be a costly one because of deficit spending, artificially beefed-up economy by congressional action, and the increased demands of war.

How did these $2.30 an hour wage increases become effective, and how were they obtained? It is shocking and tragic, and we will be held responsible for it. I will support the measure before the Senate, but I hope the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and other Senators will attempt to bring before the Senate a bill that will, at least in that one field, provide protection for our people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the wage rates in some of the new 3-year contracts in the Cleveland area.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an extract from a letter to me, dated March 26.

There being no objection, the table and the extract from the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Some of Cleveland's new 3-year contracts

[Figures include fringe benefits]

Trade	Old rate	Total increase	Installments in cents			Percent increase
			1967	1968	1969	
Bricklayers	$5.66	$2.30	50 and 40	75	65	41
Carpenters	5.61	2.30	50 and 20	60 and 20	80	41
Iron workers	5.61	2.30	50 and 35	75	70	41
Laborers	4.57	1.80	60	60	60	39
Painters	5.12	1.50	35 and 15	50	50	29
Plasterers (tentative)	5.31	2.05	50 and 20	50 and 10	75	39
Plumbers	5.51	2.20	50 and 20	75	75	40

> This letter is to protest any further building financed with federal funds at the current building trade wages of approximately $7.00 per hour.
>
> I just cannot afford to have my tax dollar pay for construction at the rate of approximately $7.00 per hour and I should imagine that there are thousands upon thousands of citizens who cannot afford to have their tax dollars paid out for building at the rate of $7.00 per hour.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his support. I respect the courage which he always shows.

I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. President, there is a good old American saying: "Three strikes and you're out." Apparently the administration has forgotten that saying. Apparently the railway unions have forgotten that saying. Apparently Congress is about to forget that saying.

This is the third time, within a period of 2 or 3 months, that we have been called upon to deal with the threatened stoppage of one of our Nation's lifelines of the economy, the railroad systems of the Nation. Each time we have dealt with it by ad hoc legislation. That is legislation that settles nothing at all except how this particular problem may be solved at this particular time, without reference to what is going to happen in the future, and without any encouragement that we are setting up or even are planning any machinery to deal with the permanent problem.

We have been inclined to blame the President. I heard during the earlier debates that "we are waiting for the President to send his proposal, which he said in his message he was going to send us." Mr. President, we cannot wait any longer.

I heard the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] plead with the railway labor unions to bring up something they are willing to agree to. We cannot any longer afford to look for relief from that source, because it is not going to come from that source.

The real question is, When is the Senate, when is the Congress, going to rise to our responsibility and propose and pass legislation which protects the public against these stoppages in industries which are so important and so indispensable to the national welfare and economy that they must not be allowed to shut down?

Mr. President, I went out in the reception room a while ago and looked at the pictures of the five great Senators whom the Members of this body chose, by our votes, as being Members of the Senate who are so distinguished and so recognized for their courage that we could name them from among the hundreds of men who have served in the Senate as being worthy of permanent accolade.

One of them is Bob Taft. I remember when he, as a minority member—minority not from the standpoint of his political party, but from the standpoint of his philosophy—insisted on bringing out a bill which was not in accord with the thinking of a majority of his committee and forcing it to the attention of the public and of the Congress and securing a vote here in the Senate and a vote in the House which was so impressive that, even though the President at the time vetoed that bill, more than two-thirds of the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives overruled the veto, and it became the Taft-Hartley Act.

It was not a perfect measure, but the very President who vetoed it had to rely upon the relief afforded in it in a matter of months in order to keep important activities on the road and going.

Everyone in the Senate cannot deal adequately with this complicated subject. I think, referring to my two good friends the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York, it is a challenge to them, and it is to others with equal experience, capacity, grasp, and competence in this field. I believe the whole country is hungry to see leadership in the House and the Senate in this field. And it does not take a very great amount of courage to show that leadership, because the great body of the citizenry of the country wants to see some measure on the law books which will protect this country against shutdowns in these vital national industries. I am not appealing only to those two distinguished Senators. I am appealing to other Senators who serve on the committee that deals with this subject. I have repeatedly said I have not been able to get consideration of two bills which I have proposed, which are not all encompassing. One of them deals with commercial airlines and asks for compulsory arbitration; the other intends to undo the adverse effect of the Wisconsin decision so that States may, under their own laws, deal with threatened stoppages in vital public utilities.

I am not here to blame anyone. Perhaps we have had more to do than we can do. But I plead with these two distinguished Senators and with the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], who is the chairman of the Labor Subcommittee which deals with this subject: Let us come to grips with this problem, because this pussyfooting along with ad hoc solutions from time to time is not only a weak way of dealing with the matter, but it is also an unsatisfying way. It does not satisfy the people back home. It will make more enemies within the ranks of labor than will a forthright effort to deal, on a permanent basis, with the problem.

I have had some acquaintance with politics and political thinking over a fairly long lifetime, and I am just as sure as I am standing here that the very members of the unions involved will respect more a real effort to come to grips with this problem and bring forth some basis upon which this great Nation can depend to keep the vital wheels of industry moving in this confusing world, just as they did in the case of Bob Taft. We in the Senate will respect it more. The whole public will respect it more.

I do hope we may find such an attitude, and a willingness to present to the Senate permanent legislation with some teeth in it, which will assure this great country that our vital industries can continue to operate in any situation; whether it is war or whether it is any other emergency that we are in, that the railroads, the coal mines, the gas pipelines, and all the other things that are so completely essential to our normal national economy can continue to operate. I have not endeavored to name them all. One could, of course, bring in the atomic energy field. One could bring in the maritime industry, and many others. But it is a limited group. No one questions the undesirability of applying compulsory arbitration to the ordinary industry that manufactures, for example, shoelaces. But there must be a method for solution, and for securing our people against stoppage in these vital national industries.

I think we have delayed too long in coming to grips with the problem. I do not think we have any excuse to say we are waiting for the President, with all due respect to my friend from New York. I do not think we have any excuse to say we are waiting for labor to accept. I wish they would accept some constructive suggestion, but I do not think they will. I do not think it is their job to come up with the solution to the problem; but I do think it is the vital business of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States. I do hope we will have some helpful and constructive suggestions offered.

Mr. President, I shall, of course, support the pending resolution. After all, it is vital to keep the railroads in operation. Who can picture a more insane thing to happen, at this time in the history of the world, than to sit supinely by and see our railroads stop operating? We could not do that, in the interest of the people or in the interest of the vital industries of this country. Because of the self-respect of this Nation, and because of our reputation in the world, if for no other reason, we could not permit that kind of thing to happen. So, while I shall support the resolution, I am sorry it is an ad hoc resolution, and I say again in closing, as I did at the beginning, just remember, three strikes and we are out.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that I always profit from listening to the Senator from Florida. He has taken this position time and time again; it is a position of complete consistency.

I wish to say, in behalf of the Senator from New York, that he does have a bill pending. I have introduced bills several times. I think other bills should and will be introduced. I believe we will have to go ahead with final legislation on this subject.

But I also wish to say to the Senator from Florida, in lighter vein, that sometimes after those first two strikes, that third pitched ball becomes a home run; and I believe the President is offering us an opportunity to swing for a home run today. As far as this game is concerned, I think it will solve the present dispute.

Of course, as the Senator knows, a home run does not always win the game.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** All time has expired.

Mr. MORSE. To clear the matter up

for the Chair, I am handling the entire hour in behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope this third strike will prove to have been a foul ball, so that we will have one more chance at it; and I hope we will have some real developments on this next chance toward reaching permanent legislation.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. May I say, there will be no foul balls from this pitcher.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield very briefly?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I say to the Senator from Florida that I, too, value what he has said. I shall continue to press for hearings upon the pending bills. I think the White House has put the cork in the bottle for the present, but I hope very much that we will be able to uncork it, and actually begin to move into the situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since it seems to be incumbent upon me to locate the next speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum, asking unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and myself, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from New York, and I commend both the senior Senator from New York and the senior Senator from Oregon for their excellent handling of the pending legislation.

I was very proud to be on the committee and to work with them. I certainly appreciate their efforts in getting this legislation in its present form.

Mr. President, I support this legislation and urge its enactment. I supported it as a member of the subcommittee and I supported it in the full committee. The idea of a nationwide strike is intolerable, and there is no doubt that Congress has the obligation to act to ward off the catastrophic effects of any such stoppage. In my opinion, there is no alternative to this proposal, given the existing circumstances. Seizure, partial seizure or fiscal seizure of the railroads is not the answer. Not only would such a measure paralyze the railroads, which are certainly not solely at fault, but it would be a shocking experience for the American public. Clearly then, there is no alternative to this measure.

As I have said many times before, I regret the situation that gave rise to the need for this action. It is a national disgrace and a serious indictment of our labor laws that again and again Congress has had to step in on an ad hoc basis to deal with disputes in a public service industry. This deplorable situation should make clear the need for permanent legislation to deal with emergency strikes which threaten irreparable damage to our national interest.

The present administration policy of having Congress settle each labor dispute as it arises is both unsatisfactory and unwise. It confuses the responsibility of the executive and legislative branches of government, it erodes public confidence and morale, and it further weakens the normal process of collective bargaining. The time clearly has come when the American people must be protected, permanently, against strikes and walkouts that inconvenience the public, that burden the economy and that jeopardize national security.

It has been obvious for years that the emergency provisions of the Railway Labor Act and the Taft-Hartley Act are inadequate. And it is difficult to understand the reluctance of the President, and to only somewhat less a degree the Congress, to meet the problem forthrightly. There is no need for the President to run hat in hand to the Congress each time for a special labor law. Temporary solutions no longer are enough. If, as in the railroad dispute, a threatened strike is serious enough to warrant legislation, it is serious enough to require a permanent answer.

One answer, at least from the standpoint of public service industries, is legislation to permit, if necessary, mediation to finality. Some union officials argue that a settlement reached by an impartial third party would of necessity be detrimental to the best interests of their members. But the charge has no basis in fact. America is a Nation of laws, not men. We—including union officials—accept the principle of disinterested third party determination in life and death decisions of criminal law. We do not hesitate to permit a jury of our peers to determine the dollar value of a man's arm, or leg, or life. We empower the National Labor Relations Board, which supposedly is impartial, to settle questions of great importance to labor and management. Why then should we hesitate to allow a group of reasonable men to determine, in a fair manner, the worth of a man's labor? Clearly, there is no logical reason.

It is of course regrettable that any type of enforced mediation is required, but the unique character of these industries demands that this minimum protection be provided. But I want to make it perfectly clear that I favor its use only as a last resort and then only with regard to public service industries. I very much oppose its widespread application.

It would be, however, an exercise in futility for the Congress to concern itself only with a solution to the railroad strike, or only to strikes affected by the Railway Labor Act. The issue involved here is more important than any one strike, any one industry. The important question is whether, through the adoption of needed laws, Congress will meet its responsibility to save the country from hopelessness in the face of emergency strikes.

In closing I pay tribute to the senior Senator from Oregon for his masterful handling of this legislation in a most difficult situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his statement and for the great cooperation he extended to me and to the senior Senator from New York in connection with the pending measure.

Mr. President, because we must wait for another speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I supported the pending resolution while it was being considered in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I shall support it now on the floor. But I cannot do so without calling attention again to the fact that this is only a one-shot, ad hoc treatment that deals temporarily with only one small phase of a much larger and much more serious problem.

One would think—and I am sure the public has the right to think and expect—that this crisis in the railroad industry, following on the heels of a crisis in the airline industry not so many months ago, would have provided the incentive for the administration and Congress to face up to their responsibilities in a broader sense.

It has already been mentioned on the floor by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that in January of 1966, President Johnson told Congress and the American people of his concern about the inadequacy of our basic laws dealing with nationwide strikes and lockouts; that he then promised Congress and the people that he would submit recommendations for revisions in those basic laws.

Congress has waited, the American people have waited, and we still have no recommendations or proposals from the administration.

But, Mr. President, I am even more concerned about the fact that Congress has not faced up to its responsibilities and has taken no initiative. Unfortunately, Congress has looked the other way, and has chosen to deal with each crisis as it occurs, on a crisis-by-crisis basis.

We have refused to face up to the question, for example, whether or not the Nation even in peacetime could actually tolerate a strike or lockout affecting the entire railroad industry.

It is an unhappy circumstance today, although it is a convenient circumstance, that we can point to the war in Vietnam as justification for the adoption of this resolution. However, really, I think we know and the American people know that a more basic question is whether or not we can tolerate a nationwide strike or a lockout in the transportation industry at anytime, during war or peace.

During our hearings on this particular resolution we had before us a very distinguished witness, Prof. John Dunlop, who did an excellent job on reviewing the history of the development of our labor-management legislation. He pointed out that it has been the policy in the past, at least, of trying through legislative devices to establish substitutes for the exercise of jungle warfare in labor-management disputes; in other words, to narrow the areas in which the strike or the lockout would be used as a means of resolving disputes.

For a while this Nation seemed to be gaining ground; we were making progress in finding substitutes for the use of the strike. As Professor Dunlop pointed out, the Congress established an election process whereby the question of whether or not employees should be represented by a union, and whether or not an employer should recognize a particular union, was to be settled by free and fair elections by secret ballot. This was a substitute for the use of the strike to resolve a dispute. Unfortunately, as the result of decisions by the National Labor Relations Board, this fundamental procedure, which is a substitute for the strike, has been distorted and watered down. For example, in recent years the Board has been holding that if cards are signed by employees, sometimes under very questionable circumstances, the right of election can be ignored.

I suggest that when the Board departs from the basic principle of guaranteeing free and fair elections, we are moving in the wrong direction. The Board moves toward the use of force and coercion, which is used in getting those cards signed, in some instances, and moves the Nation backward in the direction of economic jungle warfare.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I know of the long experience of the Senator in this field. I wish to ask the Senator if there has been any change in the Board toward moving away from this practice of approving decisions, made by the signing of cards. There has been great criticism of this practice and there has been much talk about legislation to prevent it; but has the Board itself moved away from the practice in recent decisions?

Mr. GRIFFIN. To my knowledge, there has not been a significant change in this trend. Some of the recent decisions may have indicated that the Board is taking some notice of such protests, and the concern around the country. But it is my impression that the basic concept, which the Board has developed, has not been corrected by its decisions.

Mr. COOPER. I think it is not compatible with the freedom of the individual that choices are made by secret ballot, with the possibility of coercion rather than by secret ballot. I am glad the Senator raised the point.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Senator.

I would point to the fact that in the Taft-Hartley law and the labor law of 1959, Congress sought to narrow the areas in which there would be resort to strikes by making it clear that strikes should not be directed at innocent third parties. In other words, secondary boycotts were prohibited. Unfortunately, in my opinion, the Board, and, in some instances, the Supreme Court, have distorted the intent of Congress and have moved in the direction of enlarging the area in which strikes are utilized by weakening the secondary boycott provisions in the law. Ironically, we have legislation before the Congress, recommended by the administration and known as the common situs picketing bill. This legislation would widen and enlarge the strike area still further; it would actually legalize and encourage new strikes in the building and construction industry; strikes which are now illegal and which have been illegal under the law since 1947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

It seems clear to me that the policy of the Congress and the Government should move in the direction of finding new substitutes for the strike and the lockout—substitutes which are fair and in the public interest.

For example, we should do what we can to encourage labor and management voluntarily to agree to arbitration whenever possible. In recent years there has been a tendency of parties engaged in collective bargaining to agree to the arbitration of disputes while a contract is in effect. However, the effective device that must accompany voluntary arbitration is a pledge on the part of the union not to strike while the agreement is in effect, and along with the pledge on the part of the company not to lock out.

Here again, unfortunately, the Supreme Court has interpreted the Norris-LaGuardia Act, perhaps with justification—and if it is with justification then I think Congress should do something about it—has ruled that there is no authority to require specific performance of a promise on the part of a union not to strike. In this situation, again, we find ourselves moving away from the principle that Professor Dunlop was advocating. Our policy should move in the other direction; we should be trying to narrow the areas in which disputes are going to be resolved by strikes.

Since my time is very limited, I wish to call attention to a resolution I have introduced a number of times to establish a joint committee on the subject of industry-wide bargaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Senator.

A number of times I have introduced a resolution to establish a joint committee on industry-wide bargaining, with a specific mandate to review the laws which deal with industry-wide strikes and industry-wide lockouts, and to recommend revisions in those laws. My resolution provides that there would be an equal number of Republicans and Democrats on such a committee. I have proposed this because I realize, at least I believe, that one of the reasons for inaction on the part of Congress is the fact that this is such a politically sensitive subject. This is an area, I believe, in which both political parties should assume and share responsibility if we are to take steps that will be in the public interest. The blame, the credit, or the responsibility should be equally shared.

If we were to adopt such a resolution, I believe we could make progress in this very difficult and complex field which so desperately needs attention.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, without the Senator from Texas losing his right to the floor, and without the time for the quorum being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, first, I yield myself 25 minutes on the amendment, which I now send to the desk, and ask that its reading be dispensed with but that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is as follows:

Page 6, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following new section 6:

"SEC. 6. (a) During the period that the determination of the Special Board is in effect as provided in section 5 of this joint resolution, the United States shall impound and hold all income received from the operation of any carrier to which such determination is applicable in trust for the payment of general operating expenses incurred in the operation of such carrier's facilities. Any such income of each carrier remaining after deduction therefrom of its operating expenses shall be available for the payment of such fixed and other charges as are determined, pursuant to accounting rules which the Comptroller General shall establish, to be proper charges against operating income in determining net income. Ten percent of net income from operations remaining after such charges shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. Payments for such operating expenses and fixed charges shall be made in accordance with regulations promulgated under subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized to make and promulgate such regulations as he may find necessary and appropriate to provide for the receipt and disbursement of such trust funds for such purposes in the regular course of conducting carrier operations and in accordance with the safeguards normally attending the receipt and disbursement and accounting for funds of the United States. The obligations imposed by the regulations promulgated under this subsection, upon suit by the Attorney General, shall be enforcible through such orders as may be necessary by any court of the United States having jurisdiction of any of the parties.

"(c) Any claim which any party may assert for just compensation based on the impounding of income from operations or the covering of net income from operations into the Treasury of the United States shall be heard and determined by the United States Court of Claims. In determining such claim in the said court and in any review of such proceedings due consideration shall be given to the fact that during the period to which this section applies the carriers' operations would have been interrupted by a strike but for the enactment of this joint resolution."

Page 6, line 3, renumber "SEC. 6" as "SEC. 7".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas is now before the Senate for consideration. The Senator from Texas is allotted one-half hour on the amendment. How much time does the Senator allocate to himself?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 22½ minutes at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 22½ minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at this time, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the text of the amendment is being distributed on each Senator's desk. Its purpose is to try to hold the scales of justice evenly between management and labor in this labor dispute.

In my opinion, the present resolution is heavily loaded against labor. There is nothing in it which would place any obligation upon management to try to settle the dispute. In fact, management wants this resolution.

I desire to say this to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who has introduced this resolution on behalf of the administration, and who has long been known for his espousal of the cause of labor. He has explained it fully in the past 2 hours, at the urgent request of the administration.

In the debate today, in much of what has been said, I have noted the clear distinction in the position of the Senator from Oregon and the position of a number of other Senators who have been calling for permanent legislation of this kind; while the Senator from Oregon has made it crystal clear that so far as he is concerned, this is an ad hoc solution of an emergency situation, he has not joined in any request for permanent legislation along this line.

I think that should be pointed out, in fairness to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who has long been known as a friend of labor.

Let me point out to Senators the seriousness of this legislation. It will be found in the majority report—those supporting the resolution—on page 4, three paragraphs above the bottom:

> It is an extraordinary bill legislatively for we haven't legislated this type of procedure before.

Mr. President, I think the Senate should clearly understand that if it adopts this resolution, this will be the first time. That is what the majority reporting the bill have stated. Never before has there been such a resolution so loaded against one side in a labor-management dispute.

The majority itself voted this out. I believe that will be recognized further when we read that they felt some hesitancy in voting for such a measure, because they point out, on page 5 of the majority report:

> This resolution is not intended to be and does not constitute permanent legislation. Nor does it amend the Railway Labor Act. The resolution is not intended by the committee to indicate a precedent for congressional or executive action with respect to any future labor dispute.

I think, Mr. President, when the majority of the committee wrote that into the report, they recognized the basic unfairness of the resolution. They did not want that to be a precedent for any vote. If it is that unfair, why cast a vote against it?

There have been excuses for this; namely, because of the war in Vietnam. Well, I have voted for every appropriation asked for by the administration to support the war in Vietnam. My amendment would not stop the railroads from running. I voted for one compulsory labor resolution here in this matter on April 12, when we passed Public Law 90–10 extending for 20 days the period of negotiation. I voted for another compulsory work order here on May 2, 1967, Public Law 90–13 of this session, calling for 47 days of extension.

But when we come to the responsibility of extending it for more than 2 years, then labor must work whether it wants to or not. I am not going to enter into any dispute about what is or what is not compulsory legislation. The resolution provides that they have got to work on an order of a Government board at a salary fixed by a Government board, whether they want to or not.

We have heard the arguments of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that this does not tell anyone that he has to work. No, he can quit. He cannot strike. The only protection he normally has for not working is to strike. He can give up his job on which he may have accumulated 15 years of seniority by hard work. But, when he quits, he loses that seniority. He possesses a skill which is not transferable to another kind of job. He goes down in the pits, as a machinist, to work on the railroad engines. He possesses a technical skill, but he cannot go out and get any other kind of work.

If he were a mechanic in a garage, he would have no problem. He would then have a trade or a skill that he could take from coast to coast, and he would be able to find a job anywhere. But these men have learned only this skill, which cannot be used anywhere except in the pit under an engine. It was in the pit, under the engines, in 1880, in Atlanta, Ga., that the machinist's union was formed.

So he would lose his seniority. He could not transfer his skills. His retirement pay would not be totally portable.

It is not corrert to say that this proposal is not compulsory, because we tell him that if he quits he loses everything he has built up in his job. It is compulsory when we say that he shall lose the benefit of his skills, his seniority, and maybe his retirement pay. Of course, he can go on the relief rolls. That is the alternative. If the laborers move out as a unit, an injunction will be brought against them by the Government, which will force them to work. They have no right to strike. So it means they will work under compulsion.

I refer to the individual views signed by six members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which appear on pages 12 and 13 of the report. In the interest of time, I shall not read those views, but I merely invite them to the attention of Senators and request that they read them.

As presently worded, Senate Joint Resolution 81 limits the right of the employees to strike, but does nothing to limit management in its quest for greater profits at the expense of its workers. The excuse for this double standard is often heard as the war in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I stand second to no man in my desire to insure the proper supplying of our boys, no matter how they got there. The vote on this joint resolution will not be a vote for or against the war in Vietnam. That is a smokescreen that gets around the real issue.

As we are now fighting an undeclared war, and a second war is possible at any minute, I agree that it would not be in the national interest to have a cessation of railroad operations. However, if the national interest is to supersede labor's right to strike, should not the national interest also impose some burden upon railroad management?

During the course of our hearings of this legislation, reference was often made to the situation which prevailed during the Second World War. However, it was not until the last day of the hearings that it was brought out that during World War II, while there was a no strike, no lockout agreement, there also were excess profits taxes and price stabilization.

Have we heard of any proposal for price stabilization here, any effort to say the railroads cannot change their rates? Have we had any proposal for excess profits legislation to take some of the profits out of war? Our brave men are fighting and dying on the battlefield, and yet skilled workers are proposed to be drafted for 2 years. Have we heard any proposal that management will share some of the cost and the burdens of this situation? No; it binds down only labor, and says to management, "Make all you can."

Our amendment would not stop the roads from running. We would merely say that some little burden shall be placed on management, so that there will be some incentive to settle this dispute.

Not only is there no excess profits tax now in existence, but last week we passed a bill providing for an investment tax credit. There was nothing in that bill for labor. That was for management. It gave them 7 percent to put on top of the rest of their profits.

Why do we ask labor to give up its right to strike, but not ask for anything in return from management? I do not have the answer, but I do not think this type of unequal treatment is proper. Both sides have failed to show an outstanding willingness to bargain in this dispute. Both may bear the burden of some fault. Both should bear the burden of this legislation.

Let me call attention to page 10 of the report, the sixth line of that page, which recounts that the special mediation panel was appointed by the President under a former resolution or former laws. The special mediation panel made a proposal in an effort to settle this dispute. The majority of Senators voting for the joint resolution stated in the report that this proposal was found to be unacceptable in whole or in part by both parties. As found by the majority of the committee supporting the joint resolution, the responsibility rests just as much on management as on labor. Both of them refused the proposal of the President's Board. Yet the joint resolution puts the whole onus on labor and shackles only labor.

These members of labor are being legislated, for 2 years, into the pits, on Government orders; not by an agreement that has been negotiated, but by what the Government says.

I think, since both sides have failed to show an outstanding willingness to bargain in this dispute, both should bear the burden of that cost. Both should bear the burden of this legislation. At present they both do not; only the railroad workers do.

My amendment proposes a fiscal seizure in a very limited sense, which I believe more fairly treats all the parties to this dispute.

I presented to the committee what I thought was a fair amendment. It provided for fiscal seizure, not of all the moneys, but of profits only. It provided that the companies would pay all operating expenses, and all fixed charges, including taxes and interest. The profits would be held by the Comptroller General, who would decide what was a fair profit. The amendment would merely assign the profits. It would not stop a company president's salary, even if he were earning $150,000 a year. It would not stop the payment of operating expenses. Only what were determined to be the net profits would be seized.

Some members of the subcommittee felt that that was too much to seize. They said that only 10 percent of the profits should be seized. So the amendment which I have at the desk provides for a seizure of only 10 percent of the profits.

That is merely a token seizure compared with requiring the workers to be forced to work for 2 years, with no chance to ask for a redress of grievances or for loss of pay. My amendment would merely require the railroads to set aside, for the duration of the dispute, 10 percent of what they said were their profits. That 10 percent would be placed in the control of the Comptroller General.

This is merely a token, to show that there is some semblance of consideration for labor in this body. I do not see how any Senator could propose to do any less than that.

The amendment does nothing to change the pending joint resolution as it affects the employees of the railroads involved in the dispute. My amendment adds a provision which would require the railroads to pay to the U.S. Treasury 10 percent of their profits, as determined in accordance with regular accounting procedures of the Comptroller General. The Comptroller General would determine the profits under regular accounting procedures, which are well known. Also, the railroads must comply with the accounting procedures of the Interstate Commerce Commission. In any event, they would pay 10 percent of their profits, as determined by the Comptroller General, into the Treasury of the United States.

The railroads would not have to pay the 10 percent if they reached a settlement before the expiration of 90 days.

There is nothing in the joint resolution which was reported by the committee to cause a railroad to want to settle anything. Senator after Senator said that that was a kind of permanent legislation; that it would deprive labor of the only economic right or only economic weapon it has—the right to strike. I do not argue that they should strike. I voted twice at this session to say that they should not strike. But when we take away the right to strike, we put the whole onus of settlement on the labor unions.

I think we should at least require a token from the railroads. My proposal is now amended to provide 10 percent seizure of profits, a mere token—to show that we expect fairness to be shown to the workers.

The railroads would have the right to sue in the Court of Claims to regain the 10 percent of the profits. The court would allow such profits as the railroads would have made had the employees been free to strike. In accordance with the underlying theory of the entire joint resolution, if the parties reached an agreement through collective bargaining, before it became effective, the fiscal seizure would terminate.

My amendment would have a balancing effect on the joint resolution, because each side would suffer somewhat if it failed to bargain.

This is merely a recognition of the fact that were this legislation not pending, and were we not fighting in Vietnam, the railroad employees would be free to strike, and the railroads then might lose some, if not all, of their profits.

When the unions proposed that in case of a strike they run all the trains carrying war material or crucial material not only for war but for health and welfare, the railroads objected strenuously and said it could not be done.

Mr. President, I do not object to their not wanting to lose money. Nobody wants to lose money. But we ought to think of the money these 137,000 workers are going to lose by this resolution.

Mr. President, we have had a debate about the three interests here: the public interest, the carriers' interest, and the workers' interest. It has been stated that the public interest is paramount.

That, of course, is a principle to which we all subscribe. In this emergency situation, with the war in Southeast Asia, the public interest is paramount. But that does not mean that we must say to the labor segment of the economy, "You pay the cost of the war," and at the same time say to management, "We will vote you a 7-percent investment tax credit, with no profit control and no regulation whatever. The sky is the limit; you make what you can."

I think the superior public interest here, Mr. President, dictates that the Congress of the United States consider the situations of both management and labor and be fair to both of them.

The pending resolution places no burden upon management, that I can see. That is why they are testifying so strongly for the resolution. This is what management has always wanted. I say the war is a false issue. We are not trying to stop the railroads from running; we are trying to keep them going.

The unfairness of this resolution, Mr. President, was recognized in an editorial in the Washington Post of Thursday, June 1, entitled "Railroad Strike Problem," from which I shall read a few lines:

> We think Congress should also consider adding to the Administration's bill stronger incentives for serious bargaining before the "determination" of the proposed special board would go into effect at the end of 90 days of fact-finding and mediation. If the railroads should be willing to accept the board's recommendations, they would have no incentive to bargain further. Their inclination to bargain up to the last moment could be substantially enhanced by giving the President authority to apply the board's formula with or without seizure of the railroads. In case of a lockout or of arbitrary refusal of the carriers to bargain, use of the seizure power might be necessary.

Even the Washington Post recognized the basic unfairness of this proposed solution to the workers:

> With some amendment of this sort, the Administration bill might afford strong encouragement for meaningful bargaining.

Mr. President, there is no encouragement for meaningful bargaining by the carriers or by management provided in this resolution. The editorial continues:

> The present tendency is for routine compliance with the "cooling-off" provisions of the Railway Labor Act before serious bargaining begins. If the law required some kind of logical resolution at the end of the bargaining process, the parties might well be disposed to agree more readily before letting the decision, however temporary its effect, get out of their hands.

Seizure is mentioned in that context, that there ought to be some burden on the railroads if you are to have meaningful bargaining. Look at the effect on the stock market. I have here in my hand the Wall Street Journal, and hold it up only because one cannot put a chart in the Record. This is the Wall Street Journal for Wednesday, June 7, 1967, page 31, the Dow-Jones averages. Look at the line which shows what has happened to industrial stocks in this country. It is up and down, with industrial stocks lower now than they were in February.

Look at the bottom line, the utilities. There has been a steadily downward trend of utility stocks since the 21st of April, week by week.

But look at the railroads. They are now higher than they have been previously this year. They are going up and up and up, because they think they have a law that is going to make the workers work and receive little benefit from their efforts.

People say, "Why, they have drafted men to fight in Vietnam." That is true. This proposal is not like putting your life on the line. But it does take one segment of society at home and say, one side has got to work free, and the other side can make all the money it wants to.

I think we owe it to the men overseas, to see to it that the Government will be fair to both groups, and not let those men come back to an economy loaded on one side or the other.

I say that the public interest demands that we be fair to both sides. We have heard the argument that this does not draft anybody. Mr. President, we have already drafted the unions twice this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield myself 2½ more minutes.

Mr. President, in closing, the distinguished Senator from Oregon said that seizure was never justified to force management to arrive at a solution. But if we are justified in taking from the worker his right to strike, if we seize his rights, why is there no justification for seizing management's right to a mere 10 percent of profits?

We are told it is not compulsory arbitration.

A rose by any other name would smell as sweet. A thorn by any other name would feel as sharp.

This is the thorn that labor will have pressed against its breast by an overwhelming power if the Government does this to them. I hope that they do not, because this is something that will be felt all over the country by more than the mere 137,000 men involved here.

We hear people say that this is a test and a model.

The Senator from Oregon has not stated that this is a test with a view toward permanent legislation. However, he has put a caveat in the report that this is not a report for future legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Texas, and he knows I speak out of great respect for the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor on which I have the pleasure to serve under the Senator from Texas, that we usually find ourselves shoulder to shoulder on issues. It is always a source of regret to me when we are not shoulder to shoulder. However, on this issue we are so far apart that the difference between the poles would not measure the difference.

I make a brief reply to the Senator. If I were to characterize the amendment of the Senator, I would say it is legislation by way of a bludgeon.

Let us take a look at what the effect of the pending amendment would be. My good friend, the Senator from Texas, talks about being fair to both sides. The resolution is fair to both sides. Both sides are treated in exactly the same way.

The carriers lose the right to lock out. The workers lose the right to strike, and they should in times of emergency. As I said earlier, there is no absolute right to strike in an hour of great national emergency.

Both sides are treated equally under the pending measure. They are not treated equally under the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The amendment of the Senator from Texas would place the Government, through the Comptroller General of the United States, in the business of operating the railroads to the degree that it would take over all control of the financial operation of the railroads for that period of time that the panel's recommendations would be in effect, if the parties do not reach an agreement themselves. And so the Government would go into the business of financially operating the railroads.

That is going to involve a considerable amount of expense to the Government.

The amendment of the Senator, if agreed to, would serve as a great employment agency for lawyers of the country that would be hired to represent the carriers as they take various aspects of the pending amendment to court. The amendment smacks of confiscation of private property without due process and without justification. To that extent it would not meet the test of constitutionality.

The pending amendment, if it were agreed to, would not only have the Comptroller General of the United States take over all the financial areas of the operation of the railroads and keep them under his control, but the amendment would also cause the Government to take 10 percent of the net profits and put them aside and keep them unless the railroads were able to win before the Court of Claims their claims to get some of these profits back.

For what justification? Why should the pending amendment provide for this course of action unless the railroads can show that it would have cost that much if a strike had occurred?

That is what we call penalty legislation, and penalty legislation without the committing of a wrong.

Employers have not committed any wrong in this case. The brotherhoods have not, either. However, we do not impose a penalty unless a wrong has been committed.

Oh, but my good friend, the Senator from Texas, says: "We are going to do this in order to give them an inducement for settling in 90 days."

We can, of course, blackjack and bludgeon the people into surrendering. We can force a penalty on them so that they will surrender.

Consider the effect of the pending amendment. How would the Senator like to be the president of a railroad with responsibility to his stockholders at a time when Congress passes the pending amendment?

The Senator knows what he would say. He would say: "Here is the sponge. I throw it in, and I surrender."

The Senator, if he were the president of a company, would owe it to his stockholders to take such action. However, if we were to take such a course of action by way of legislation, it would lead to some very interesting litigation all the way up the judicial ladder through a series of cases before the Supreme Court.

We do not have the slightest justification for saying that we will take 10 percent of the profits and keep them in the Treasury of the United States and not give them over to the railroad unless the railroad can get before the Court of Claims and have the Court of Claims find that the railroad is entitled to have the money returned because it would cost us more if a strike had occurred.

Is that being fair?

Let me say, and I speak most respectfully—I said it in the committee yesterday, and I say it now—that if this is what we want to do to accomplish the objectives of the pending amendment, and this objective is inherent in the amendment, if we really want to surrender to the brotherhood's claims, then a substitute resolution should be offered providing that the Congress here and now decides that the demands of the union should be granted.

That will be the result of not only this amendment, but also another amendment that may be offered later this afternoon.

We should not put the Government in the position of operating the railroads fiscally. It is not our business under the facts here.

Congress cannot confiscate property by legislation without just compensation, and just compensation is not involved in this kind of a seizure contemplated in the pending amendment.

This is penalty legislation and, in my judgment, the court will so find and throw it out.

I want to say in opposition to the pending amendment that, although the Senator from Texas is right in quoting from the report of the committee that this is extraordinary legislation, the next sentence provides that this is not an extraordinary procedure, but it is the identical procedure, as I said in my opening speech today, that the War Labor Board followed in scores and scores of cases.

This is the way we settled most of our cases, by this kind of collective bargaining and mediation extended to finality, and in most cases that did go to finality, all of the labor leaders joined in decision after decision of the Board.

I never heard the slightest objection from any of the labor leaders to the effect that it was compulsory arbitration, the argument that has been made in this case

Arbitration is not involved in the joint resolution. This is mediation. This is fair to both sides.

It means that the Panel will simply try to lead these parties to a fair solution of their differences. And if they will not accept a fair solution, then, within the framework of mediation, they will impose finality for a period of time.

I point out that the workers under this procedure are not losing anything. We all know what the workers will get. They will get an improvement in their situation, in my judgment, even over the Fahy report. They will get retroactivity.

It is unthinkable that they will not get retroactivity. Nobody is talking about impounding any wages. Nobody is talking about impounding any money out of the pockets of the workers in order to see that they will mediate.

Why, if we pass the pending amendment, does the Senator know what those workers will say in the course of that mediation? They will say: "We are going to sit tight. We are going to demand what we are demanding because these carriers run the risk of running a lot of money through litigation and having it kept by the Federal Government in the Treasury of the United States."

There is nothing fair about that. This would not create a balance. It would create an imbalance in favor of the brotherhoods to such a degree that, in my judgment, the president of any railroad would throw in the sponge.

If we want to support a tried procedure that has settled scores of emergencies in World War II when we were at war—and we are at war now—we will support the President in his resolution this afternoon concerning the appointment of a mediation panel that will lead the parties to a fair settlement of their dispute.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join my colleague, the Senator from Oregon, in opposition to this amendment. It was considered in the committee, was very sharply debated there, and lost. I believe the vote in the committee was 10 to 6.

Now, I will say this about the situation. It is well known that I am in favor of a type of seizure of struck facilities in matters of this character and their limited operation under an order of the court. But this is not that kind of seizure—or anything, in my judgment, remotely approaching it.

This amendment is properly headed by the Senator from Texas, "fiscal seizure." Although he tries to make it as palatable as possible by only seizing 10 percent of the income of the railroads—incidentally, that is a considerable change from the 100 percent which was proposed to the committee—it is, in my judgment, fatally defective, for two reasons.

First, once you start on the business of seizing business profits, you have absolutely destroyed the private enterprise system in this country. The one thing which gives the private enterprise system integrity is the fact that if any property under the Constitution is seized, that property is to be compensated for. The option in receiverships, for example, is in the company itself to determine whether it is going to operate and get the avails of profits or just compensation if there is a seizure by the Federal Government.

In this case, the gimmick is contained in the last sentence, because this proposal says, sure, you can go into the Court of Claims and claim compensation, but the compensation is to be such as would apply to you running a railroad which has been interrupted by a strike. This means no compensation at all, because in a strike situation the railroad would not operate.

The matter of seizing profits goes to the very essence of the private enterprise system of this country and completely destroys it. No matter how one may feel about the seizure idea, this certainly is not the type of seizure that he would be in favor of because of its infinitely destructive character far above and beyond what we think of when we think of a governmental seizure of facilities in order to operate.

The other fatal defect in this amendment is that it proceeds upon a completely erroneous premise so far as the action of Congress is concerned. The proposed amendment seeks to punish the carriers by seizing 10 percent of their profits. It is not the function of Congress to punish one of the parties to a labor dispute. It is the function of Congress to keep the wheels rolling on the railroads, for national security interests, and for no other reason. It is not our job to equalize collective bargaining or to be punitive on one of the parties because we believe it has been unreasonable, whether it has or has not been. The minute we undertake to do that, we might just as well do what the Senator from Oregon has so truly said—let us pass a bill setting down the settlement itself. If it is constitutional at all, I believe it would be one of the most fatal mistakes we could make.

Those are the two reasons why I oppose the proposed amendment. First, the private enterprise system is destroyed the minute you seize profits and condition compensation on the fact that there is a strike situation, which means you eliminate compensation, so you have appropriated the profits of business. I do not care whether it is 5 percent or 100 percent. This is exactly the way to destroy the free enterprise system.

Second, the minute we become punitive with respect to one of the parties to the dispute, everything is political. If a majority in the Senate favors labor, they will beat the devil out of management. If a majority in the Senate favors management, they will beat the devil out of labor. Nobody would win in that game, and that is not the base on which this country was organized.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will—as the committee did—in its wisdom, decisively turn down this amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATFIELD in the chair). The Senator from Texas has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. President, I have been astonished by the argument of the distinguished Senator from New York that you destroy the free enterprise system if you take a share of profits. Apparently, to him free enterprise applies only to management and not to labor. In my opinion, free enterprise applies to all segments of our country. The proposed resolution would destroy free enterprise for 137,000 railroad workers. I believe it is no more destructive to require a token 10 percent of management's profits than it is to say to the workers, "You have to go to work." If the right to strike is taken away, the Senator from New York implies, in effect, that it would not hurt free enterprise. I believe that free enterprise is for labor as well as management.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon argues that the proposed amendment is unconstitutional. This amendment has been worked on for days and days. Legislative counsel were consulted and they have assured us that this amendment is constitutional. I believe it is constitutional, under the decisions of the Federal court.

There has been talk about the penalty to the carriers. The only penalty to the carriers under my amendment would be that 10 percent of their profits would be held unless this matter is settled. But the penalty on the railroad workers would be that they continue to work at a wage they do not want.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield myself 30 seconds.

A machinist for another branch of the transportation industry receives a higher hourly wage than a railroad machinist. If it is another branch of the transportation industry, he often gets 75 cents an hour more than those who work on the railroad.

I submit that my amendment is modest, and I do not see how people can turn it down.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

All this legislation has been worked on very diligently in the legislative process; but if this is not confiscation and penalty legislation, without the slightest basis for confiscation, then I have never seen confiscation legislation.

This amendment would not even up the parties. It would put the workers in the position where they could sit tight for the 90 days, trying to force the carriers to agree to their demands; because if the carriers do not agree, then after the 90 days, for the duration of the application of the recommendations of the panel, the money of all the railroads will be in the control of the Comptroller General of the United States. The carriers will lose 10 percent unless they could prove to the Court of Claims—which means starting up the ladder to the Supreme Court—that they would have lost that much money if there had been a strike.

This is penalty legislation, without any basis for a penalty. There is no wrongdoing in this case on the part of the carriers or on the part of the brotherhoods.

I yield back the remainder of my time, but in doing so I ask for the yeas and nays on the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield myself 30 seconds.

The Senator from Oregon says that all labor would do is sit tight if this amendment were adopted. That is exactly what management is doing now. This can be found in the report.

I call the attention of the Senate to the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on this bill, on page 10:

> This proposal was found to be unacceptable in whole or in part by both parties.

Mr. President, I have a pragmatic amendment. We are proposing something which is so weak that it should be voted for by everyone, and even those who do not have sympathy for labor. My amendment would give the resolution some semblance of fairness to labor.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is necessarily absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 59, as follows:

[No. 126 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Burdick
Cannon
Case
Church
Gore
Harris
Kennedy, Mass.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Moss
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NAYS—59

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Hansen
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Aiken
Bartlett
Brewster
Brooke
Dodd
Ellender
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Nelson
Talmadge
Tower

So Mr. YARBOROUGH's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. JAVITS moved to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON subsequently said: Mr. President, at the time of the yea-and-nay vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] to the resolution, I was conducting hearings for the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Small Business Committee in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building, and notice was not delivered to me that there was a vote going on.

I supported the amendment of the Senator from Texas in committee. If I had been in the Chamber at the time of the vote, I would have voted for the Yarborough amendment.

I therefore should like the RECORD to show that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I send to the desk my amendment and ask that its reading be dispensed with but that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That (a) the Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that a dispute exists between the carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees represented by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America; International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers functioning through the Railway Employees' Department, AFL–CIO, labor organizations;

(2) that it is vital to the national interest including the national health, safety, and defense, that essential transportation services be maintained;

(3) that all procedures for resolving the dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act, including a report and recommendations of the Emergency Board Numbered 169, and an extension of the statutory period for making no change of conditions under section 10 of such Act to May 3, 1967 pursuant to a joint resolution of the Congress approved April 12, 1967, and an additional extension of such statutory period to June 19, 1967, pursuant to a joint resolution of the Congress approved April 28, 1967, have not resulted in settlement of the dispute;

(4) that it is desirable to achieve a settlement of this dispute in a manner which preserves free collective bargaining; and

(5) that emergency measures are essential to the settlement of this dispute and to the security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers.

PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION OF EMERGENCY

SEC. 2. If the President determines, after consultation with appropriate departments and agencies of the Government, that the labor dispute referred to in the first section of this joint resolution, if permitted to continue, imperils or threatens to imperil the public health and safety of the United States, or of any substantial part thereof, or impairs or threatens to impair the national defense, he shall order the Attorney General to petition the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for the relief authorized under section 3.

APPOINTMENT OF RECEIVER

SEC. 3. (a) The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall, upon petition brought by the Attorney General pursuant to this joint resolution, have jurisdiction to hear, consider, and render judgment on the labor dispute referred to in the first section of this joint resolution in accordance with the provisions hereof.

(b) If, in a proceeding held on the basis of such a petition, such court determines, on the basis of the evidence presented to it in such proceeding, that such dispute, if allowed to continue, imperils or threatens to imperil the public health and safety of the United States, or of any substantial part thereof, or impairs or threatens to impair the national defense, such court shall issue an order enjoining the parties to such dispute from calling or continuing any strike or lockout during the effective period of such order (as provided in subsection (d)) and appointing a special receiver to take immediate possession, in the name of the United States, of the transportation facilities which are the subject of such dispute, and to retain possession thereof and to operate the same for the effective period of such order.

(c) In granting an injunction or relief under this section, the jurisdiction of such court sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code, to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes", approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101–115).

(d) Any order granted pursuant to subsection (b) shall be dissolved (1) upon settlement of the dispute, (2) when such dispute no longer imperils or threatens to imperil the public health and safety of the United States, or of any substantial part thereof, or no longer impairs or threatens to impair the national defense, or (3) upon the expiration of a ninety-day period which commences on the date such order is issued.

OPERATION OF FACILITIES BY RECEIVER

SEC. 4. (a) Any receiver appointed to operate facilities pursuant to an order under section 3 shall operate such facilities by utilizing, to the fullest extent practicable, existing management personnel. During the period that such receiver is in charge of such facilities, the wages, hours, or other conditions of employment of personnel involved in the labor dispute giving rise to such order shall be the same as the wages, hours, or other such conditions existing immediately prior to the appointment of such receiver, except that such receiver may make such changes with respect thereto as are consistent with the recommendations of the Special Meditation Board appointed April 12, 1967, with respect to such dispute pursuant to joint resolution of the Congress approved April 12, 1967, and as may be authorized by the President.

(b) During the period during which facilities are under receivership pursuant to this joint resolution, the United States shall impound and hold all income received from the operation thereof in trust for the payment of general operating expenses incurred by the United States in the operation of such facilities. Any income remaining shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. In determining just compensation to the owners of such facilities, due consideration shall be given to the fact that the United States took possession of such facilities when their operation had been interrupted by a stoppage of work or operations or that a stoppage of work or operations was imminent; and to the fact that the United States would have returned such facilities to their owners at any time when an agreement was reached settling the issues involved in such stoppage of work or operations: *Provided*, That any increase in wages or other compensation or any increase resulting from a change in the method of computing wages or other compensation which is agreed to retroactively for the period of Government operation or any portion of that period shall be deemed costs or expenses for such period.

(c)(1) The President shall appoint a Compensation Board to determine the amount to be paid as just compensation under this section to the owner of any facilities of which possession is taken. For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by such Board the provisions relating to the conduct of hearings or inquiries by the Special Railroad Arbitration Board as provided in section 6 are hereby made applicable to any such hearing or inquiry. The members of such Compensation Board shall be compensated in like manner as are the members of the Special Railroad Arbitration Board.

(2) Upon appointing such Compensation Board, the President shall make such provision as may be necessary for stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities, services, and supplies as may be necessary to enable the Compensation Board to perform its functions.

(3) The award of the Compensation Board shall be final and binding, unless within thirty days after the issuance of such award, a party moves to have such award set aside or modified in the United States Court of Claims in accordance with the rules of such court.

(d) The fact that facilities are under receivership under this joint resolution shall in no wise operate to make inapplicable to such facilities any State or Federal law concerning health, safety, security, or employment standards, and the receiver operating such facilities shall comply with such laws as if such facilities were privately operated.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

SEC. 5. (a) Upon issuance of a court order granting the relief prescribed in section 3 (b), the parties to the dispute shall continue or immediately resume collective bargaining with respect to all issues raised in the notices of May 17, 1966, and the counterproposals submitted thereto, and shall exert reasonable efforts to resolve such dispute by agreement. The Secretary of Labor and the National Mediation Board are hereby directed to give all reasonable assistance to the parties and to engage in mediatory action directed to promoting such agreement.

(b) If the parties do not resolve the dispute during the first thirty-day period after the issuance of an order granting relief prescribed in section 3 (b)—

(1) the Compensation Board established under section 4 (c) to determine the amount to be paid as just compensation shall not consider the profit to the carriers for the period of receivership in such determination unless the Special Railroad Arbitration Board appointed pursuant to section 6 certifies to the Compensation Board that the failure to consider such profit would be inequitable, and

(2) the provisions of section 6 shall take effect.

SPECIAL RAILROAD ARBITRATION BOARD

SEC. 6. (a) Thirty days after the issuance of a court order granting the relief prescribed in section 3(b), if the dispute has not been resolved, the President shall notify the representatives of the carrier and organization parties to the dispute that within five days from receipts of such notice each such party shall name two persons to serve as members of a Special Railroad Arbitration Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall be composed of seven members. The four members chosen by the parties shall select three additional members. The seven members shall then elect a chairman. If the members chosen by the parties shall fail to name one or more of the additional three members within ten days, such additional members shall be named by the President. If either party fails to name a member or members to the Board within the five days provided, the President shall name such member or members in lieu of such party and shall also name the additional three members necessary to constitute a board of seven members, all within ten days after the date of the receipt of such notice. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Mediation Board is authorized and directed: (1) to compensate the arbitrators not named by the parties at a rate not in excess of $100 for each day together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses, and (2) to provide such services and facilities as may be necessary and appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution.

(b) Promptly upon the completion of the naming of the Board the Secretary of Labor shall furnish to the Board and to the parties to the dispute copies of such information, memoranda and other data as the Board may request setting forth the matters with respect to which the parties were in tentative agreement and the extent of disagreement with respect to matters on which the parties were not in tentative agreement. The Board shall make a decision, pursuant to the procedures hereinafter set forth, as to what disposition shall be made of the issues raised by the notices of May 17, 1966 and the counter-proposals submitted thereto. The Board shall incorporate in such decision any matters on which it finds the parties were in agreement, shall resolve the matters on which the parties were not in agreement, and shall, in making its award, give due consideration to those matters on which the parties were in tentative agreement. Such award shall be binding on both the carrier and organization parties to the dispute and shall constitute a complete and final disposition of the aforesaid issues covered by the decision of the Board.

(c) To the extent not inconsistent with this joint resolution the arbitration shall be conducted pursuant to sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act, and the Board's award shall be made and filed as provided in said sections and shall be subject to section 9 of said Act. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia is hereby designated as the court in which the award is to be filed, and the Board shall report to the National Mediation Board in the same manner as arbitration boards functioning pursuant to the Railway Labor Act. The award shall take effect on the day on which it is filed in such District Court, and shall continue in force for such period as the Board shall determine in its award, but not to exceed two years from the date the award takes effect, unless the parties agree otherwise. No award made by the Board under this section shall contain provisions to make the terms of such award applicable for any period prior to the date such award takes effect, unless the Board determines that equity and the public interest require the award contain such provisions.

(d) The Board shall begin its hearings as soon as practicable and shall make and file its award not later than thirty days after its initial meeting.

(e) In making any award under this joint resolution the Board shall give due consideration—

(1) to the effect of the proposed award upon adequate and safe transportation service to the public and upon the interests of the carrier and employees affected,

(2) to the narrowing of the areas of disagreement which has been accomplished in bargaining and mediation, and

(3) to the recommendations of the Special Mediation Panal appointed April 12, 1967 to consider the dispute.

(f) The obligations imposed by this section, upon suit by the Attorney General, shall be enforcible through such orders as may be necessary by any court of the United States having jurisdiction of any of the parties.

REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 7. At the earliest practicable date after the termination of any receivership ordered pursuant to this joint resolution, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and complete report of the dispute giving rise to the ordering of such receivership, the management and operation of the facilities under receivership, and all pertinent data concerning the relationship between the parties to the dispute and between such parties and the receiver during and at the end of such receivership, together with any recommendations he may desire to submit to the Congress with respect to such dispute or with respect to labor disputes in general.

At the beginning of the joint resolution, strike out the preamble.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators now in the Chamber, I understand that we have a unanimous-consent agreement for an hour's debate on each amendment, one-half hour to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I do not believe that I shall take the full time, but I should like the attention of Senators in the Chamber to review briefly but concisely, the thrust of the amendment and the relative aspects and perfections to the present resolution.

Mr. President, I yield myself 17 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusets is recognized for 17 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, this is the second time in less than a year that the Senate has been called upon to act in a final manner in a specific labor dispute. In the case of the railroads alone, this is the third time that the Senate has acted in this session. We have been forced to act because of the inability of private parties to exercise a right that has become basic and fundamental to our free enterprise system; namely, the right to bargain collectively and freely over the wages, hours, and working conditions of hundreds of thousands of employees. Because they have failed, we must act. We must act because a total shutdown of the 137 railroads involved would be intolerable. The damage would be great to the economy in the presence of a rail strike; and it would be irremedial in its effects on our brave fighting men in Southeast Asia. But by acting we must recognize that traditional freedoms will be, of necessity, legislated away. How such freedoms are lessened should be a matter of great concern to us all.

The story of labor relations and collective bargaining in the railroad industry is not a story of vitality, imagination, or one of firm commitment to the bargaining process. We know that in this industry especially, national labor policy has been relied upon not as a guide to free action, but more as an excuse to escape the heavy responsibilities of arriving at a voluntary agreement. The emergency board procedures under the National Railway Labor Act have become almost meaningless—they have been employed too often in disputes that were not truly of an emergency nature, and because the parties know that emergency boards will be formed at the first hint of a potential strike, they have incorporated Federal emergency boards into their bargaining strategy. As a result, collective bargaining is never undertaken in earnest until an emergency board has been formed, or later. The parties hardy meet, they hardly talk, they wait for the Government to act and then are inclined to take rigid stands while waiting for the Government to act again.

In this dispute especially, the parties have waited, not only for the Government to act but for the Congress to act, and their waiting has been rewarded. It is my fear, Mr. President, that as a result of this dispute, as a result of the airlines dispute last summer, and even the 1963 railroad dispute, the Senate of the United States is in danger of becoming simply another emergency board to be relied upon by the parties to extricate themselves from the burdens of their own responsibilities. It is because of this fear that I introduced an amendment in committee which was designed not only to induce a revival of collective bargaining in this sad situation, but also to do it in such a way that the parties will be hesitant to rely upon us again.

We have before us a joint resolution introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I need not remind the Senate of his experience in matters of labor relations. We look to Senator MORSE and the Senate Labor Committee as the Senate expert in labor law and we know of the high regard that both labor and management have of his work. This is not to say that we must agree at all times with his counsel, but when we disagree it is only after great thought and with great respect for his knowledge.

Mr. President, when the Congress must act in the face of a specific labor dispute and in an ad hoc fashion, I believe that there are certain rules that must guide our actions. First, we must act with absolute impartiality, for we cannot as a body involve ourselves in the substantive merits of the dispute, in the personalities involved, in the day-to-day bargaining behavior of the parties—we cannot do this and maintain the freedom of private action.

Second, when we do act, we must be able to defend our procedures as those designed to encourage, not further discourage, the collective bargaining process. Most importantly, we must not act in any manner that will prove to one or the other of the parties involved that they were correct in relying upon us to solve their problems.

And, finally, when our actions are concluded we must be assured that all those who have been involved in the private negotiations as neutrals assisting the parties have not had their role impaired. That is to say, in this specific case we witnessed the work of an outstanding Panel of eminent citizens under the leadership of Judge Fahy. They arrived at a solution after days of hard work. We will want to call upon these men again as a nation, and we should be insured that the integrity of that Panel remains.

On many of these points the proposal before us fails, I believe. For no matter how worded, it does appear to restrict the right to strike pending an imposed solution to the dispute. It does appear to make a judgment that one party to the dispute behaved less well than another and thus the legislation should be more detrimental to labor than to management. And, finally, it does appear that this resolution encourages, does not discourage, further reliance upon the Congress in the future, and thus lessens the reliance upon collective bargaining.

Mr. President, I see nothing in the legislation before us that would cause the railroads involved to bargain collectively since it provides at the end of the road the procedures for settlement that they have long advocated—namely, a procedure marked by "finality."

Mr. President, to take away the right to strike from American labor is a drastic step, not a step that we should take lightly but only when a true national emergency is before us, as is the case here. But if we believe that collective bargaining failed because of the actions of both parties to this dispute and that to avoid a strike certain freedoms must be given up, then I feel it is incumbent upon us to hold out the loss of freedoms to management as well as to labor. But in the final analysis, our emphasis must not be on the loss of freedoms or the punishments that we can impose, but upon ways that will guarantee more fully than we have in the current proposal before us that collective bargaining will be relied upon to reach a settlement and thus preserve it and enhance it for the vast majority of Americans who do not wish to see it diminished.

It was with this end in mind that I introduced in committee an amendment in the form of a substitute bill that I firmly believed would make collective bargaining seem more attractive to the parties over the next 90 days than sanctions they would face at the end of 90 days.

Under this proposal, the railroads would be seized by the Government for the 90-day period and run for the account of the Government. Just compensation to the roads would be determined by a Presidentially appointed Compensation Board, and of course this determination could be tested in the courts. Revenues of the roads over and above what was determined to be just compensation would be held in an escrow account in the U.S. Treasury.

During the 90-day period labor and management would continue to bargain with each other with the assistance, after 30 days, of a special panel of mediators. This special panel of mediators would meet with the parties and assist them to arrive at a voluntary solution. If that were impossible, however, this panel would arrive at its own solution with great reliance upon the earlier recommendations of the Fahy board.

If at the end of 90 days the parties had not found it possible to close the exceedingly small gap that exists between them, the Board's recommendations would go into effect for a 2-year period, but that Board would be empowered to recommend that the profits of the roads held in escrow be turned over permanently to the Federal Government and the union wage increases be granted without retroactivity.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that although these sanctions appear to be harsh, my proposal is constructed in such a way that neither an imposed solution, the loss of retroactivity, or the loss of profits will ever result.

It would be most difficult for the unions involved to report to their members that, because of a failure to reach an agreement voluntarily, they had been denied a retroactive settlement. It would be just as difficult for railroad management to report to its stockholders that, because they failed to reach a voluntary settlement, they gave up 3 months of profits. It would appear that reasonable men would be forced to act in a reasonable manner and find that free collective bargaining is the only course that is economically justifiable.

Much has been said about seizure in our committee deliberations. Seizure has been characterized as the most drastic step that the Congress could ever take and that it sets an unfortunate precedent and a loss of confidence in the free enterprise system. Mr. President, I maintain that the loss of the right to strike and compulsory arbitration is also a drastic step and is just as detrimental to the best interest of a democratic society. One is not worse than the other, even though we seem to find it easier to justify the loss of the right to strike and the use of an imposed settlement.

Mr. President, I shall support the legislation before us today, not because I agree with it, because I do not; not because it enhances collective bargaining, because it does not; or not because I consider it to be equitable to both parties. I support it only because I am convinced that a national railroad strike would be intolerable both to our economy and to our defense efforts.

Mr. President, only yesterday I modified the amendment which was introduced in the committee to take into consideration one question that was posed during my deliberations on this matter, and that is to provide that at the end of the 90 days the Arbitration Board would be permitted to restore the complete profits that would be held in escrow to the railroads if they felt that that would be equitable or an important part of the total settlement, just as retroactivity of wages could be permitted by the Arbitration Board. I think this would add an additional consideration for the Arbitration Board in helping to bring the parties to a settlement. I think it would strengthen the initial proposal I introduced in the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

So with that slight adjustment, it is substantially the amendment I introduced in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare yesterday.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Do I understand that the right of retroactive pay, which was very difficult for labor unions to achieve—and I was an active member of unions during that period—they worked so hard to achieve retroactive pay, would be given up under the proposed amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. If the Arbitration Board felt, after being forced to impose a settlement that retroactivity was equitable they could do so.

Mr. MURPHY. In other words——

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. If the Board found, in considering the Fahy recommendations, as well as the temperament and the attitude of the respective parties, that it was in the interest of equity that retroactivity be extended, or, in turn, that the profits withheld should be returned, they could make that judgment. I would give that flexibility to the Board.

Mr. MURPHY. In other words, to make sure that I understand the Senator, definitely and directly, the question of whether or not the retroactive pay for the men, who may or may not be on strike, shall be granted, is left to the decision of the Board, is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is correct, in reaching the totality of its recommendation.

Mr. MURPHY. In other words, there are two things considered by the board. One is the retroactive pay, on the side of the rank and file of labor, and the other is the profits of the railroads. Those two factors are to be put in balance?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is correct; exactly.

Mr. MURPHY. How would they arrive at their decision?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Just as they would arrive at any decision under the administration proposal. This, I feel, would strengthen the degree of flexibility that the Board has and would lend encouragement to the respective parties to bargain freely. The greatest advantage I see in this recommendation is that it would give to the Arbitration Board the ability, in considering the collective bargaining procedures during these 90 days, to either provide retroactivity or return of profits, or not.

If, for example, one of the parties said, "We are not going to bargain, we are not going to sit down, we will not meet," then, obviously the Arbitration Board can take that into consideration and, in their final recommendations, can state that, for one reason or another, they are not going to allow retroactivity or the return of profits.

What this will do, I believe, is add an additional incentive for both parties to bargain together in good faith.

Mr. MURPHY. Suppose they bargain, and let us assume that they bargain in good faith, and the two parties cannot arrive at what they believe is a just settlement. Somebody must make the final judgment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Yes; just as the Arbitration Board is going to make the final judgment under the joint resolution we are considering here today.

Mr. MURPHY. Does this not put a restriction on the side of labor, that these men have to give up their retroactive pay in the event that their representatives tell them they should go out on strike?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. There is absolutely no guarantee that they would have to give up their retroactive pay, particularly if they are bargaining in good faith. The recommendation of the Arbitration Panel could be extremely clear on that point and restore retroactivity.

What it would do is give the Arbitration Board which will make the final declaration as to the terms of the agreement a kind of additional carrot and stick for both the parties, so that the two parties will be brought together and will know that when they bargain in good faith, the Arbitration Board, if it is to make recommendations, will be able to make its recommendations in the light of fairness and equity. What it also does, on the other hand, is say that if they will not bargain, or if one of the two parties refuses to bargain, the Arbitration Board can take that into consideration.

I feel that that provision will strengthen the Arbitration Board and will also provide additional flexibility, which is advantageous.

But I wish to make clear that the fundamental theme of this amendment is understood. It runs to the same point that was enunciated so well and so articulately by the Senator from Texas, that we must create an atmosphere within this period of 90 days that will lead to effective collective bargaining. It was my contention, at least, and that of other members of the committee, that this kind of a balance does not exist under the present resolution, and it was in an attempt to provide such balance that I have offered this amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. May I finish?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The Senator has used 17 minutes of his time, and has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. One further question.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Then the Senator does not share my concern over the possibility, the danger of the rank and file of labor, the members of unions, agreeing to give up their right to retroactive pay?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am sure that the Senator shares my feeling of abhorrence of compulsory arbitration.

I feel that, in considering the totality of the situation, both considering the current legislation and looking down the course, looking at the recent history, certainly, in the Labor Committee as well as on the floor of the Senate, I feel, fundamentally, that this is a useful and constructive step in strengthening the process of collective bargaining. I do not share the apprehensions of my distinguished and good friend from California.

Mr. MURPHY. One final question. In spite of the conditions suggested by the Senator's amendment, do we not wind up at the final condition where, if we find management and labor unable to agree, and, assuming that they have both bargained, as far as they are concerned, honestly and fairly, they cannot come to an agreement, which I assume is the position of the parties to the present dispute, must the matter not finally be put in the hands of some final board to make the decision?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is the resolution before the Senate this afternoon. That is what, regrettably, we will have to do, as I stated at the outset, because of national considerations, including the war in Southeast Asia.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Let me see if I understand the Senator from Massachusetts completely. First, he states as a predicate that we have an emergency, and therefore a strike would be intolerable?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. May we have order, Mr. President?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. PASTORE. If I understand the Senator correctly, he sets the predicate that we do have an emergency, and that a strike would be intolerable?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Therefore, because of that situation, he suggests that the Government seize the railroads?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is, that the President order the Attorney General to petition the district court to establish a receivership for the railroads.

Mr. PASTORE. All right. Therefore, if this Board which the Senator suggests finds that the railroads themselves are not behaving in good faith in the process of collective bargaining, they stand the risk, at the discretion of the Board of Arbitration, of losing their profits; and, at the same time, if the unions, the workers themselves, do not behave in good faith, they stand the possibility of losing the retroactive element?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Therefore, because of that situation, the inspiration is here to sit down at that bargaining table and handle the matter through the processes of collective bargaining?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Exactly.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Would the Senator's amendment impound all profits, as seemed to be implied by the question of the senior Senator from Rhode Island, or would it be a portion of the profits?

Mr. PASTORE. All of them.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. No; the President appoints a Compensation Board, and the Compensation Board determines just compensation for the railroads, and any income in excess of that will be held in escrow.

So it is just a part of the roads income. This would be that part which would be above the compensation paid to establish just compensation during this period.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has made a very eloquent and impressive argument, which appeals to me.

I do not find any choice that is very agreeable in this, but the Senator has certainly alerted us to the possibility that the Senate itself may, by the repetition of this process, become an arbitration committee. And that is not the function of the Senate.

I am inclined to support the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we went through all of this under the administration of our former beloved President, John F. Kennedy, and we held protracted hearings before the Commerce Committee.

It was not too long before we discovered that there was obstinancy and stiffness on either side, depending on where the evidence was.

What the Senator from Massachusetts is trying to do is to remove the advantage from both sides and say to these people: "You each have something to lose unless you get down there and bargain in good faith."

I think that is the answer. I think that might bring an end to all this, because we are meeting this situation time and time again.

These people sit down and talk and talk and talk and say nothing. Finally the matter comes up to the Senate, and then we are being lobbied on both sides.

I say that the time has come when we should take the bull by the horns and, as the Senator from Oregon has so often said, come to grips with the problem and settle it once and for all.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I incorporate in my statement everything that I said with reference to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Texas with regard to this amendment.

Let us come to grips with what is involved here. We have a pending dispute in which the parties are separated a little way, and they are all money issues, and in order to resolve the differences the President has proposed a resolution to set up a special Presidential Mediation Board which extends collective bargaining and mediation to finality, if the Board has to go to finality.

That is exactly the procedure that was followed in most of the War Labor Board cases without seizure, without any necessity for seizure. We have not the slightest need for seizure in this case because the Board will bring the parties to the collective bargaining mediation table to seek to iron out their differences under the good offices of the Board.

They will narrow down their differences.

I have gone through scores of these cases during the War Labor Board era. Let me say that we do not have to worry about their sitting there adamant and not bargaining during the 90-day period. Of course they will, because the President's proposal puts them in a position where they know there will be finality, but a finality within the framework of mediation.

The proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts does not put us within the framework of mediation, but within the framework of arbitration, which goes far beyond mediation.

In my judgment, there is not the slightest need for arbitration in this case. If they cannot reach an agreement and resolve the narrow differences, the Board will then hand down recommendations that will be binding on the parties and thus make the decision.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, maybe the pending amendment does not put us within the area of mediation or arbitration, but it does give us a good shove toward collective bargaining. And that is what we need, more collective bargaining.

Mr. MORSE. No. It puts us in the area of compulsory arbitration if we follow this course of action.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield after I finish this argument.

What we would do under this proposal is to get these very narrow differences resolved with the probabilities that we would get them resolved in the first 30 days or in the second 60 days. However, we would have a solution.

What do we propose seizure for? What is the basis for seizure? Where is the wrongdoing? Who has committed a wrong in this connection?

We do not have any intransigent employers here. We have employers and a group of unions, as I have said, that are almost together. And we would have the Government go to the expense of having the Attorney General go to court and have a receiver appointed and have the Government run the railroads.

It is certainly unthinkable that we would impose that kind of a burden on the taxpayers of the United States and say that we are seeking to protect the public interest.

There is no need, let me repeat, for seizure. We do not have a case for seizure. What we would do would be to create a lot of U.S. Supreme Court cases if we were to follow this course of action because there is no justification for seizure.

Do Senators think that the passage of legislation makes it possible to have seizure unless there are the facts and the basis for confiscating and taking over property, and unless there is a basis for putting the Government in the position in which it will spend huge sums of the taxpayers' dollars in administering the railroads?

If Senators think that the railroads are making too much money—and I think their profits are excessive—they should go to the Interstate Commerce Commission and get the rates reduced. However, the public ought to be protected.

The pending amendment would impose a seizure on the pocketbooks of the taxpayers and would put the Government through an administrative process for which there is no need.

If there were a need, the Senator from Oregon would join with the others in such action.

If we had a case in which the carriers had acted improperly, then we would have a basis for such action. We do not have any basis now.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, what is the difference between the seizure of a fundamental right, like the right to strike, which is what we are doing, and the seizure of real estate? What is the difference?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is talking about an absolute right. There is no absolute right to strike in this country in time of national emergency. There never has been. It is a relative right. There is no right to lock out in this country in time of a national emergency. There never has been. It is a relative right.

All that we are saying and all that the President is saying in this resolution in this hour of great national emergency is: "You must come in and agree to resolve your differences through mediation and collective bargaining."

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator actually saying that unless we pass this measure that the workers have not an inherent right to strike? Of course they do. Of course they do. And that is what we are trying to stop here. We are taking that right away and confiscating that right to strike.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am saying that in time of great national emergency the Government has the right to impose other procedures on the employers and workers so that they cannot exercise the right to strike or the right to lock out. Neither is an absolute right. They are relative rights that must be exercised relatively in an hour of national emergency. In this case, under this bill, labor loses the right to strike and management loses the right to lock out workers.

We followed this procedure all during the War Labor Board days. Is the Senator trying to tell me that we violated any basic rights of labor or management during World War II when we imposed the same procedure that the President is seeking to impose?

There is nothing wrong about this procedure. This is the identical procedure that was followed—not on the time element of the three 30-day perods—during World War II, when labor and management had to conform to the same procedure.

Name the great labor leaders of this country that served on the Board whose signatures appear on every one of the settlements.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator saying that we have never seized the railroads in this country in the case of emergency? Of course we have.

Mr. MORSE. I wrote the recommendations for seizure, but someone was intransigent.

These carriers have committed no wrong.

Mr. PASTORE. What wrong have the brotherhoods committed?

Mr. MORSE. The brotherhoods have committed no wrong either. They have not reached agreement on their differences with respect to hours and wages and conditions of employment.

Is the Senator saying that therefore we should come in and take away the property of the railroads and subject them to all of the cost and expense of litigation when there is no need to do so?

I think that Senators ought to keep their eyes on the question: What is the need? The need is to get the case settled.

The President has given us a procedure with which to settle it fairly. We would end up with the same kind of settlement under the Kennedy proposal, but with all these violations to basic property rights in the country and all of the cost to the taxpayers and all of the conflict that would be caused.

There is no need or justification for it.

I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the proposed amendment is not printed. I have not been able to see it until a few minutes ago. I wonder whether the Senator will advise me when the seizure would be permitted under his amendment.

Mr. MORSE. It would take place at the time of the appointment of the Board.

Mr. HOLLAND. And how long is the time permitted for the receivership to run?

Mr. MORSE. Up to 2 years.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It would only run for a period of 90 days, during the period of time that has been established with regard to the same number of days that is in the Senate resolution. It would only run for a period of some 90 days. We are not talking about seizing over a profound period of time. It is limited to that 90-day period.

It is the purpose of the amendment to recognize, as has the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, that the right to strike is as sacred as freedom from seizure, and that they certainly should be considered equally.

In this particular question or dispute we are not looking for the motives of either the railroads or the unions. We are trying to establish a climate in which collective bargaining can take place.

Mr. MORSE. There must be a basis for procedure in the beginning.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. This is for the very same reason that we are considering this legislation—because the national interest demands it, demands that we have some kind of action. It is my recommendation that we need some kind of action in this matter, that the national health and safety are threatened.

Mr. MORSE. The national emergency does not justify the seizure unless there is wrongdoing. There has been no wrongdoing. The same result would be obtained, so far as the settlement of the case is concerned, without seizure, under the President's proposal.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure that the Senator from Massachusetts meant that this receivership should end at the end of 90 days. On my hurried reading, I found no such wording in the amendment.

It is quite possible that under this amendment, as I read it hurriedly—I am sorry that the distinguished Senator did not have copies printed so that I could examine it—it could run an additional 2 years.

I side so strongly with the Senator from Oregon because of the fact that I had the opportunity at one time to analyze very fully what happened to our Government in connection with the seizure of the railroads during World War I. I did that in 1949, when we were considering the Elbert-Thomas amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. I found that that seizure had not yet been terminated, more than 30 years after the date of the seizure. I found that there was a sizable office then functioning and set up in the Capitol, with quite a personnel, trying to untangle the details of that seizure and operation.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on my time?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield in a moment, if the Senator will allow me to conclude.

I found that there had been damage suits, that there had been all kinds of defenses and prosecutions brought by and against the United States because of that operation, and that it was about the worst snarl and the most tangled mess that could possibly be imagined.

I shall never vote for a Federal seizure and operation of the railroads, particularly for an indeterminate time, which, as I read this amendment, might be for a longer time than we operated the railroads during World War I. Because I believe that we should learn something from experience, I very strongly support the position of the Senator from Oregon, and I hope we do not approve the seizure.

Now, as between the two amendments—I invite the attention of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]—I believe it would have been infinitely preferable, if we wanted seizure, to seize and hold together a percentage of the profits, awaiting the outcome of the matter. It would result in much less involvement on the part of the Government and much less troublesome detail in straightening out the seizure than it would to adopt the proposed amendment. The seizure and operation of the railroads is a terrific undertaking, having been undertaken only in time of warfare, when we were fighting for our national life, and I certainly would not favor the application of such a drastic remedy in this case.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is responding on his own time?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am. I should like to draw the attention of the Senator from Florida to page 3 of the amendment. I believe he has it in his hands. The seizure would expire under one of three conditions:

> (1) upon settlement of the dispute, (2) when such dispute no longer imperils or threatens to imperil the public health and safety of the United States, or of any substantial part thereof, or no longer impairs or threatens to impair the national defense, or (3) upon the expiration of a 90-day period which commences on the date such order is issued.

It is extremely explicit and clear on this point. The amendment would not go beyond this 90-day period.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator

for calling the Senate's attention to that provision. I am sorry I did not pick it up earlier.

I call attention again to the careless approach to this matter, when a typewritten amendment of three or more pages is submitted——

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It is mimeographed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, it is a mimeographed seven-page amendment—without our having general access to it, and we are expected, on the spur of the moment, to understand every detail of it. The Senator is adopting a procedure which does not lead to sound understanding.

I understand this much about it: It involves seizure and operation by the United States, as the Senator says now, for 90 days, of the railroads of this Nation. I do not want to see our Nation open up that kind of can of worms again, because I do not know whether we have wound up yet the national operation of the railroads under the seizure of World War I.

We had not done so in 1949, when I last looked into this matter. It is quite possible that some of it is still under liquidation.

When we get into this kind of situation, we are in an indeterminate, almost interminable, matter—one that involves terrific expense, operation, and trouble, as if we do not have troubles enough now.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the Senator from Florida talking on the time of the Senator from Massachusetts or on the time of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts is limited.

Mr. MORSE. So is mine. I did not yield to the Senator from Florida to talk on my time. He did not ask for it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not believe the Senator from Massachusetts yielded to have a talk made at this time by the able Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts had yielded to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MORSE. In fairness, I ask unanimous consent that the time that has been consumed by the Senator from Florida not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I have 1 more minute, under that gracious unanimous consent?

I thank the Senate.

If the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts had had the privilege or duty, as I had in 1949, to look into what is involved in the national operation of the railroad systems of this country, I do not believe he would ever have suggested such a course of action. We have never done it, except in time of major war, when we were fighting for our life. I certainly would not want to see us do it in a matter of a mere effort to settle a labor-industry fight.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 1 minute, and then I yield 5 minutes, or whatever time he desires, to the Senator from New York.

The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts was offered in committee. It was defeated in committee by a vote of 10 to 6. The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts might just as well be interpreted as an amendment that says to the carriers, in effect, "Surrender." No carrier is going to hesitate to give the brotherhoods everything they ask for, if you are going to subject the carriers to the complexity and the cost and the liabilities that result from seizure.

If Senators really want to give the union what it wants, offer a substitute and say that it is our decision to give them what they want. But a seizure, when there is no justification for it, is a bludgeon held over the heads of the carriers to surrender. I know what is going on with respect to the brotherhoods to get variation in the President's proposal. I am going to stand behind the President. He has given us a proposal which is fair to both sides and assures a settlement of this dispute in 90 days. That is what Senators should be working for, rather than proposing a seizure amendment. A seizure amendment is one of the most extreme proposals that can be made, as is compulsory arbitration. The proposal of the President is a mediation proposal. It has worked time and time again. We should give the President a workable procedure, rather than something that would be a penalty on the carriers. It would put them in the position of having to support the stockholders and they would have to surrender.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am compelled to oppose this amendment. In the first place, this is how the proposal would work: There would first be a seizure and there would be discussion afterwards. This is not the classic approach of giving a range of means to the President. A range of means is not afforded by seizing things immediately.

The other difficulty is as follows. I speak as one who was a sponsor of a seizure proposal, but my proposal was the classic approach of court administered seizure. It is not tricked with picking management or labor as a part of the board. That is the real deviation in this amendment. This amendment is not based on procedure to keep the wheels rolling in the national interest of the United States, but to pick on management or labor, whichever the Government does not like at the moment. If we are going to make collective bargaining a political exercise of that kind we are in for it. We will settle every dispute by a group of people appointed by the President, depending on the climate.

I wish to call this language to the attention of the Senate and ask that they listen to this. The Senator from Massachusetts is a very nice man. We like him very much, but we are going to pass on this amendment and not him. I ask that the Senate listen to this language:

> (1) the compensation board established under section 4(c) to determine the amount to be paid as just compensation shall not consider the profit to the carriers for the period of receivership in such determination unless the Special Railroad Arbitration Board appointed pursuant to section 6 certifies to the compensation board that the failure to consider such profit would be inequitable * * *

On what ground and by whom would it be determined that it would be inequitable?

I shall refer to another gimmick in this language: How is this compensation to be adjusted? On the basis that the facilities are struck. That means they would get nothing. That was the gimmick in the Yarborough amendment, and it is the gimmick in this amendment. I think it is basically defective, as a matter of law.

I shall tell the Senate what the amendment comes down to. We have no more business to be here debating this amendment than we would my own seizure proposal.

This would only bedevil us because it requires much more study by labor and management in a deliberative way and study by the executive department in a deliberate way. It may finally unlock the door but it does not belong in an ad hoc bill for one situation. The administration has been derelict and we have been derelict for not coping with this matter, but to cope with it in a detailed and involved proposal which has had no real study—we first heard of it yesterday morning in committee; it has had no hearings—is not the way to proceed.

I think it would be very wrong to adopt this amendment. The only justification for seizure would be if it were necessary to get the wheels rolling in time of war. We are in a war, but there should not be a seizure to punish management. That is what this proposal is and it is what the Yarborough proposal was. The Senate would be improvident if it adopted this proposal rather than the plan which has been submitted. I agree with the Senator from Oregon. I would not adopt it as a permanent measure to deal with strikes but we are in default and we have not dealt with the problem.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Why does the Senator say that this is a proposal to punish management and labor? Why can we not say that it is a proposal to encourage collective bargaining? That is the underlying purpose: to make people understand they cannot continuously come to the Senate to resolve the issue; and that we have a basic law of collective bargaining

Mr. JAVITS. If I were sitting as a judge, I would say that the Senator from Rhode Island has described the situation better than I in connection with this procedure. The Senator is going to make them do this and that by collective bargaining, and what the Senator has described as the seizure. The Senator has described it better than I.

Mr. PASTORE. Fortunately, or unfortunately, the Senator from New York is not a judge.

Mr. JAVITS. We all are in this case.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I could not disagree more with the Senator from New York. The Senator spoke about punishing someone. We are not trying to punish anyone. When the Senator says we are starting out with seizure, I would point out that under the administration bill we start out by taking away the right to strike first. The entire argument of the Senator from New York is that it is drastic to start with seizure, but not so drastic to take away the right to strike.

This amendment would attempt to right the balance between a no-strike and imposed-settlement bill and seizure, by introducing seizure into the law. Why is it more equitable to say we should not go ahead and seize the railroads? Why is seizure less equitable than a proposal that would not permit the workers to strike? Why is that not unfair to the working people?

It seems to me that the matter comes down to this fundamental fact. No one in this body is going to be happy with the resolution which is being proposed by the Senator from Oregon. No one is happy with it. However, we have a war, and we have a responsibility to the public interest and we must pass something. We cannot permit the strike to take place. If we are going to pass something, I see little wrong in trying to create an atmosphere that will induce the parties to come together through collective bargaining. It is in that spirit that this amendment was offered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as I understand the thinking of the Senator from Massachusetts, he believes in the American workers' right to strike unless there is a national emergency. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There has been something said about the previous taking over of the railroads when Americans were fighting for their lives. Is it not a fair observation to say that Marines at Danang and other members of the military have been fighting for their lives?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Except for this particular case implying that there is an emergency in the United States—and certainly every Senator knows how I feel about there being an emergency—does the Senator from Massachusetts know of any other request made to the American people, either business, or banking, or labor, or management, to emphasize that there is a national emergency?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. There have been great sacrifices so far as taxes and loss of life are concerned, but as to extraordinary measures which is pertinent to the Senator's question, I see none.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have already mentioned the sad loss of life, and taxes have been high for some time.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. But I certainly agree with the observations of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this bill is honeycombed with penalties; we cannot read penalties out of the resolution. There are great tax penalties which will fall upon the taxpayers which will cost them millions of dollars in unnecessary expenditures for a seizure which need not take place at all in order to get a settlement. A great penalty will fall upon the carriers, because we leave them in great doubt as to any recovery they will make, if any. It will create a complicated litigious settlement. But, we have no penalty on the part of the workers except the provision or the recommendation for retroactivity. We know what will happen when the case is settled. The workers will get their retroactivity back to what it was at the beginning of the dispute.

I am at a complete loss to understand why we even want to consider seizure of this kind, which is why it was turned down in committee. I rest my case on the unconstitutionality of this type of seizure.

We have in the resolution itself a procedure which can be used. It is a procedure that will work and a procedure that will give us a settlement, a procedure that will redound to the economic advantage of the workers.

We get back again to the question in regard to the right to strike. We have also removed the right to lock out. The employers cannot exercise this the usual employer privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MORSE. They cannot exercise the employer privilege which existed during the period of conflict between union and employer. That is taken away from the carrier. Under the President's proposal, as is the so-called right to strike which, as I have said, is not an absolute right, there is the responsibility to help the workers get a fair settlement. The President's procedure will give them a fair settlement. The Kennedy proposal will give us a conflict in this country and a dissatisfaction in this country that we do not need to arouse, because we are going to follow a procedure in the President's proposal that will give the workers a fair and equitable settlement of the dispute.

I think it is most unfortunate that the Senator from Massachusetts would go to the extreme of seizure, when there is not the slightest need for seizure in order to do justice to the parties.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield briefly to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I intend to support the Senator from Massachusetts in his proposal. Seizure of the right to strike is already written into Senate Joint Resolution 81. What the Senator is proposing is in addition to that. What this amendment will do is to partially seize property as a balance to the seizure of the workers' rights.

I believe that the Senator's proposal has great merit. It is a logical approach to the situation. We have discussed it in committee and I intend to support it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we are not seizing anything in regard to the right to strike, but the correlative rights are involved. We cannot deny to employers all their rights. We exercise economic force against the workers and the right of workers to use their economic force against employers. But there is a superior right and that is the public right to be protected from this kind of harassment and this kind of conflict in an hour of crisis. So here it is proposed that we harass the public further by going to the extreme of seizing property without the slightest need to seize that property because we have no reason for a seizure.

There is not one single fact in this case under law to justify taking the property of the carriers in order to keep them operating.

Mr. President, I do not intend to stand before the Senate and be kidded as to what the real objective is. The real objective is to come forward with an extreme seizure in order to put every railroad president in this country in a position that he knows he will have to capitulate, throw in the sponge, and settle the case by use of legislative bludgeoning, of legislative coercion, instead of economic coercion.

As I close, I plead that the Senate will protect the public interest by not yielding to the demands for a seizure in this case when there is not the slightest need for seizure, in order to reach an equitable settlement of this dispute on its merits, to the everlasting benefit of the workers and also, in fairness, to the carriers.

Both sides are entitled to that kind of justice and equitable treatment. The President has proposed a procedure that has been used over and over and over again in World War II, in cases more complicated and more serious, and with wider differences of opinion between the parties than the narrow differences which exist in this case.

I am at loss to understand why we would want to walk out on a proved procedure. Yet there is some support for the seizure proposal when it has not even had the benefit of witnesses on the proposal.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MURPHY. Has there been the slightest evidence to indicate that the railroads will not bargain in good faith, or that the unions have not bargained in good faith?

Mr. MORSE. There is not the slightest evidence that they have not bargained in good faith with the President's panel.

Mr. MURPHY. They have bargained in good faith up to the point that they have reached honest differences of opinion; is that not correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct; there is no evidence to the contrary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, let me make the point again, in terms of whether the carriers can get any profits back. That concerns the word "inequitable" in the Senator's amendment. The same vagueness exists with respect to retroactivity.

Read the fine print:

> No award made by the Board under this section shall contain provisions to make the terms of such award applicable for any period prior to the date such award takes effect, unless the Board determines that equity and the public interest require the award contain such provisions.

There are thus really no criteria for determining retroactivity, or what the compensation to the carriers will be, except whatever the Board would like to do. I do not think this will stand up for 10 minutes in any court.

Mr. MORSE. That is why it is an arbitration board and not a mediation board.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I do not agree with the Senator from New York on that. We are all agreed that in the end the Board may have to make recommendations for the total settlement, as to terms, conditions, wages, and other conditions of employment. The Board under Senate Joint Resolution 81 can certainly consider the question of retroactivity with regard to wages, according to description of the Senator from Oregon. Thus, it seems to me that this does not add any other degree or element other than the attempt to create the atmosphere in which the arbitration board will be provided with one more element, one more tool, to help the parties themselves to bargain collectively.

Mr. JAVITS. If I may speak to one more point——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JAVITS. The resolution before us, not the Kennedy amendment, is a fair and equitable settlement now. Of course, what we do within the limits of collective bargaining and mediation, in this case, is precise. The determination must be within the limits of collective bargaining and mediation in this case. This is part of the resolution which is precise. This is what the resolution provides. That is what it should say. That is the kind of thing we would have to contend with in a real seizure provision in permanent legislation.

Personally, I believe that it would be a mistake to adopt the Kennedy amendment, under these circumstances, when we have a measure which I agree with the Senator from Oregon will work.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to state as my final argument that that is the difference in procedure between the Kennedy proposal and the President's proposal. In the President's proposal, the Board has to stay within the mediation collective bargaining process that the parties have participated in along with the Fahy board. Under the President's proposal, they would not even go back to the Ginsburg board, because the Ginsburg board was an arbitration board. The pending amendment is proposing an arbitration board which takes the parties outside the proposal of the parties and the mediation negotiations that have gone on. That Board, under the Kennedy amendment, can take anything out of the air it wants to.

That kind of procedure just cannot be justified in contrast with the proven procedure of the President of the United States with the Board set up here. I think the Senator from New York has done very well in pointing that out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 1 minute. I close by saying——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All of the Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds. In terms of reference, the Arbitration Board that is suggested in my amendment is identical with the board suggested by the Senator from Oregon. He talks about the recommendations of the special mediation panel appointed to consider the dispute. The Boards and their basic functions are identical.

In conclusion, as I mentioned a moment ago, no one is happy with these pieces of legislation, but I believe we are trying to create an atmosphere during the period of 90 days in which the parties can bargain collectively in good faith. Once we feel that way, we should relate the question of compulsory arbitration to the question of seizure, and we ought to treat the parties equally. It is the purpose of my amendment to so relate them.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. For a question.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that, in terms of retroactivity, the Senator does not appy the standard he stated? That is all I claim. I referred to retroactivity. That is where the words "equity and the public interest require" occur.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Retroactivity in my bill is related to the retroactivity recommendations of the Fahy Panel. It is specified in the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Alaska, [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is necessarily absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 127 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Burdick
Church
Dodd
Harris
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Moss
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NAYS—64

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—14

Aiken
Bartlett
Brewster
Brooke
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Talmadge
Tower

So the amendment of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts was rejected.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. **RANDOLPH**. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Mr. President, earlier in the debate, I made mention of the miserable history that occurred during the operation of the railroads by the United States in World War I. I now have the exact figures, which I should like to place in the RECORD.

That operation began on January 1, 1918, and lasted for 26 months. The net loss from that operation to the United States was $1,616,000,000.

In the early 1950's, more than 30 years after the time of the Government's operation of the railroads—and I am sorry I do not have later facts—there were still large amounts of claims in litigation, and an active office was still open, handling the matter.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] proposes an amendment, as follows:

> On page 5, line 2, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", along with appropriate detailed comments regarding the Board's mediation efforts and the willingness or unwillingness of any party to the dispute to engage in bona fide collective bargaining."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Who yields time?

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require. If I may have the attention of my fellow Senators, I do not believe that this amendment will take very long to discuss. It is a relatively simple amendment.

As I understand the proposed resolution, the special board is to engage for 30 days in mediation efforts. If those mediation efforts are not successful, then it will take 60 days to undergo hearings and make a determination on whether or not the special mediation panel's findings and report should be adopted, along with any modifications which may be indicated; and then it will make a determination on the point, and transmit that determination to the President of the United States and to Congress.

Mr. President, if I gage the temper of many of my fellow Senators correctly, they are much concerned about the fact that we are on the verge of doing something which could impede the collective bargaining process.

We all say we are for collective bargaining; and I think it is our national policy that it is very much in the public interest that collective bargaining be preserved. Of course, it is just as much if not more so in the public interest that we preserve the national defense effort and public safety and health. If there is any way we can still hang on to the collective bargaining process, short of a compulsory arbitration result, I think we should do our best to achieve that end.

There is nothing in the resolution to provide for any kind of determination or public report indicating whether any of the parties have failed to genuinely engage in the collective bargaining process. My amendment would provide that, once the 60 days has gone by and this special board makes its report to Congress and to the President, not only will it determine whether the panel's recommendations should go into effect, along with any modifications, but that it also include in that report detailed comments regarding the Board's mediation efforts, and the willingness or unwillingness of any party to the dispute to engage in bona fide collective bargaining.

Mr. President, I submit that the public is entitled to know if any party to this dispute has not engaged in bona fide collective bargaining, or the degree to which it has dragged its feet. I think it is little enough to give that information to the general public, and I suggest this: That any party to the dispute which might be inclined to drag its feet is not likely to be very much so inclined if it knows that that fact will become a matter of public knowledge if the dispute continues beyond the 90-day period.

Even after the 30-day period, when the board starts its hearings, the collective bargaining can still go on. I hope, and I think that there is a very excellent chance, that collective bargaining will prevent a compulsory arbitration result. But we are going to have to do something about getting the information to the public so that they will know where the blame may lie, if there is indeed any blame.

That is the extent of the amendment. I think that we have a duty to the public to have this information furnished. And if there is any way that we can prevent the compulsory arbitration result, I think we ought to take the opportunity to do that.

I cannot see that it can do any harm, and it might be very, very helpful.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I will be very brief. It is typical of the courtesy of the Senator from Iowa that he came to me in advance of offering his amendment earlier this afternoon and asked if I would accept the amendment.

I explained to him that I could not accept the amendment.

I cannot accept the amendment for the primary reason that this mediation panel has the responsibility of seeking to lead these parties to a fair compromise settlement. That is what mediation is, as contrasted to arbitration. This is a compromising procedure.

This board has to maintain the confidence and the very close working relationships with the parties to the dispute.

Congress should not seek to involve itself in any way at all in the operations of that board in respect to its relationship to the parties.

The board has 30 days more after the 60 days. It is going to hand down recommendations after 60 days, and it has to make a report to the President and to Congress in regard to its recommendations. Do not forget also that second 30-day period when the show-cause hearings will be held as to why the Fahy recommendation should not be put into effect. This is a matter of public hearings, and the public will be able to judge the attitude of the parties in those public hearings.

Do not forget the last 30-day period. This Board has to continue to work with the parties during that last 30-day period.

Imagine the position it will put the men in if they hand us a report—speaking hypothetically—saying that carrier X was uncooperative and did not bargain in good faith, or that this leader of this craft union was rude and uncooperative and did not bargain. How will that help? That goes with negotiations.

You ought to sit down on the receiving end as many times as I have. You know that you are the whipping boy and you have to take a lot of expressions of disapproval of some of the things you say.

Do not put the Board in a situation in which they have to pass on the motivation of the parties to this dispute. They have that last 30-day period in which to try to get them to a final settlement. They will carry out their responsibility. We can count on this high-caliber Board to do everything that it can do.

The report will contain all that we need to know and all that the public needs to know at that point.

When they make their final report, they are free to say what they want to say.

We would not think of trying to tell a court what it ought to put in its report in regard to a decision that it hands down.

This is just foreign to the problems of the mediation art that a board has to follow if it is going to remain effective in its dealings on its part in good faith with the parties.

Do not put the Board in a position in which it has to make a report that in fact is bound to be offensive to any one of the parties toward which a report seems to be critical.

The only important thing is the issue and the merits of the issue. That is what we are appointing the Board to give us a report on.

This gets into the realm of personal relationships between the Board and the parties that I think would jeopardize the chances of getting a better settlement. I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, I certainly want to take cognizance of the tremendous experience in labor-management relations of the Senator from Oregon. I do not know of any other Senator who has had anywhere near the amount of experience he has had in arbitration and mediation matters.

I recognize that my experience in this field is nothing when compared to his.

The Senator expresses primary concern over my amendment because of its impact on the mediation process, because, he says, if the Mediation Board is going to have to come out later on with some kind of a statement regarding the willingness or unwillingness of the parties to the dispute to engage in bona fide collective bargaining that it could have a bad effect on the mediation process.

Mr. President, this may or may not be true. I do not know. I suggest that there is something more important than this impact on the mediation process, and that is the preservation of collective bargaining.

We are up against some hard choices here, and if we might possibly have a little impediment to the mediation processes on the one hand, but on the other hand have a better chance to preserve the collective bargaining processes. I think we ought to take the second choice.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, I am not so sure that this would be an impediment to the mediation processes, certainly not to the mediation result, because why should this Board not take into account whether one of the parties to this dispute has been dragging its feet in its collective bargaining? After all, why should the public not know that one of the parties has not been genuinely engaging in collective bargaining?

If that has happened, it probably is the reason why we are here today talking about a measure which for all practical purposes is a compulsory arbitration measure.

Why should we be so concerned that the Mediation Board might have to put into a finding whether one of the parties has been dragging its feet?

In fact, why should the Mediation Board or the special Board not take that fact into account in reaching its findings and determination?

I think that a party to a labor-management dispute which has caused so much concern and threat to the national health and safety should not complain too loudly that the Board is going to take that fact into account in determining what the results are going to be.

I am perfectly willing to accede to the point of the Senator from Oregon that this might be an impediment to the mediation processes, but I say that we have another choice and that choice is to do our utmost to preserve collective bargaining, and if by impeding a little of the mediation processes we can hang on to collective bargaining, I think that the latter choice is the proper one for the U.S. Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the position of the Senator from Iowa.

If the Board is to give a report in 60 days it ought to have the widest discretion as to what ought to go into the report. We should not in any way seek to direct the contents of the report.

I repeat by reference what I said before. I urge the Senate not to agree to the amendment.

It could prove to be a very serious impediment in the relationships between the Board and the parties. We should not do anything to jeopardize those relationships in any way.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am sympathetic to what the Senator from Iowa wants to do. I would like to see his contribution made by his making the point.

Mr. MORSE. He has already done that.

Mr. JAVITS. The position of the Senator, I gather, is that the Board can, if it chooses, accompany its determination which it sends to Congress with a report or comments.

Mr. MORSE. I just said that I want to see the Board have the widest discretion to say whatever they want to say in the report. But I do not want to direct what they must say in the report.

We must leave that to the Board. There is nothing that will stop the Board, if they think it will be helpful in their further mediation with the parties, to do a little negative, critical comment about any of the parties.

They have a right to do it. But I do not want to direct them to write anything in that report, because they have to live with the parties. We, in the Senate, do not have to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator not believe it would be appropriate to make such a comment?

Mr. MORSE. That is up to them.

Mr. MILLER. Of course it is. I am asking what the Senator's view is on the basis of the experience he has had. I value the Senator's experience very much.

Mr. MORSE. I was about to give the Senator proof that was convincing. I wish I could pull the decisions out of the files. There have been cases in which I have had to point out in my report what I was confronted with in regard to intransigent people who were before me, because I owed it to the rank-and-file membership, so the rank-and-file membership could better understand the decision of either the panel or the Board.

It should be left up to the officer. He should not be directed as to what he must put into his report.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, this is the issue between the Senator from Oregon and myself. But, as a matter of the Senator's experience, and since he already pointed out that he has done this on previous occasions, does not the Senator believe that when you have a dispute that threatens the national health and safety, such as this one does, it would be appropriate for those comments to appear in a report that is made by the Board?

Mr. MORSE. My answer is "No," unless the officer himself feels that he best serves the interests of the case by making such comments. I would not want to put him in the position where he has to make such comments.

Mr. MILLER. I am sorry that the Senator from Oregon and I cannot agree on this matter. I still say that if the choice is between possibly impeding the mediation process and retaining the collective bargaining process, I believe the choice is quite clear. I do not know that we have any other choice.

I also suggest that we have a duty to make it clear, to write it into the law, that the general public will be informed on this point; because there is only one reason for having this bill before us today, and that is for the sake of the general public. So why should not the general public be informed on this point?

I yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senator from Oregon is willing to do so.

Mr. MORSE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I know of no further amendments. I am ready for third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

Mr. MORSE. I yield time to those who wish time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois can yield some time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am the only one who has time remaining.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I share the concern of all that some settlement to the railroad dispute be found. The welfare of the country, of industry, and agriculture requires an efficient and reliable transportation system and the special needs related to the Vietnam war give additional urgency to the effort to settle this problem.

The question before us today is about the means to reach a settlement. The committee bill involves a procedure which relates not only to national transportation needs but also to the system of free collective bargaining.

It is in the interest of our economic system and the general welfare of the Nation that the Federal Government allow labor and management, insofar as possible, to work out arrangements regarding wages, hours, and working conditions and that the Government not intervene directly to impose a settlement.

If under emergency conditions the national interest requires that action be taken, then such action must be carefully limited to preserve the rights of both parties and to provide equal risks to both sides for failure to reach a settlement. If this is not true we are imposing a unilateral compulsory settlement.

It is my view that the committee bill fails to provide equal terms, equitable to both sides, and that the risks of failing to reach a settlement under the provisions of the bill are not equal.

In addition to the question of equity in the settlement of this particular dispute, we must also keep in mind the precedent which will be established by a measure of this kind. If we adopt a measure for the settlement of this particular dispute which does not provide equal or nearly equal incentives and risks, the process of collective bargaining in a whole series of labor-management disputes will be weakened.

Unless the committee bill is amended to provide equal incentives and risks to both sides, I oppose its adoption.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish to place on the record my opposition to the pending legislation which has been reported to us by the Labor Committee.

I am mindful of laborious hours that the members of that committee have devoted in an attempt to find some kind of equitable solution to the problems inherent in a nationwide railroad strike, and I know all my colleagues are grateful for those efforts.

However, what has emerged is a proposal that strikes at the very heart of the cherished right to strike.

A rose is a rose is a rose, Mr. President, and "mediation to finality" is arbitration—compulsory arbitration, a prohibition against the right to strike. Semantics cannot disguise this fact.

No one in this body is any more unhappy than I over the prospects of railroad strikes occurring at this critical time in our country's destiny—or for that matter at any time. All of us desperately desire a healthy interplay—a give and take negotiation—between labor and management that would arrive at satisfactory and workable compromises of the various disagreements that sometimes arise in our economic system.

But I think it would be a tragic mistake, Mr. President, to enact harsh, precedent-setting legislation which would strike at the very heart of a principle, yes, a right, that has been tortuously earned and philosophically endorsed by the majority of fair-thinking Americans. The imminence of a strike in a time of some crisis is not a sufficient justification to discard a well-established and democratic principle.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the purpose of the resolution (S.J. Res. 81) which is before us today is to maintain the Nation's railroad transportation system without interruption while extending a further opportunity for labor and management to engage in collective bargaining for an additional 90-day period.

Aside from several technical amendments, the resolution reported by the committee is substantially the same as the resolution recommended by the President in his special message to the Congress on April 10.

Last year the Congress enacted Senate Joint Resolution 186 to deal with the airline strike. Today we are voting on another joint resolution dealing with a threatened strike of the Nation's railroads.

In the course of the airline strike last year, I called attention to the need for Congress to overhaul the emergency dispute section of the Taft-Hartley Act and certain provisions of the Railway Labor Act in order to provide permanent legislation for dealing with nationwide strikes in the transportation industry that imperil the Nation's health and safety. At that time I stated:

> This is one of several strikes in the past year that has affected the Nation's entire transportation system. I believe it is time that the emergency dispute section of the Taft-Hartley Act should be overhauled, as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. Morse) the other day on the floor.
>
> Where a dispute exists between a regulated industry and its employees and a national emergency is created, then certainly Congress has an obligation to establish, by legislation, some procedure for safeguarding the public interest. I am hopeful that the Senate Labor Subcommittee can begin hearings soon on bills now pending before the subcommittee.

Although the President indicated in his state of the Union message in 1966 that he would recommend permanent legislation to deal with these crises, no recommendation from the administration has been forthcoming to date. In the absence of recommendations by the administration, I believe it is incumbent upon the Senate Labor Subcommittee to begin hearings on those bills which are now pending before the subcommittee which propose to establish permanent legislative machinery for dealing with this national problem.

I say again today as I said last year that "we cannot continue to limp along from crisis to crisis in the field of national transportation, when so many industries are affected and the livelihood of so many individuals beyond the parties to the dispute is involved."

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I intend to vote for this resolution on final passage. I have reached this decision after the most long and thoughtful consideration of the issue involved, and I have reluctantly concluded to support the recommendation of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

It is extremely unfortunate that Congress has to be called upon to provide a solution to the dispute which is threatening to result in a closedown in the rail industry. The primary responsibility for providing a solution of the existing differences between the parties rests squarely on the shoulders of the two parties to the controversy. In my view, they are charged with protecting the public interest above all and should not let their own private interest cause them to show a complete disregard for the public interest.

If Congress is to be continually called upon to provide machinery to solve disputes of this nature, then I think that Congress should provide permanent procedures. In his state of the Union message in January 1966, the President stated that he would send to Congress a proposal to create such permanent procedures. Unfortunately, he has to this day not done so. All the blame cannot be placed at the President's doorstep. The Congress must share equally for failing to take the initiative. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 9, which would authorize and direct a study leading to the creation of such permanent procedures. Action should be taken on this proposal immediately so that Congress will be prepared in advance to cope with any similar situation which may arise in the future.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I will reluctantly vote in favor of the resolution on final passage.

I was a signer of the individual views which were filed by a number of the members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. I believed and continue to believe that the legislation imposes a serious burden on labor without imposing a corresponding detriment on management.

If no settlement is reached within 90 days, labor will have to go back to work at wages fixed by a public board, while management would suffer no disability.

Because of these reservations, I supported the proposals made by Senators YARBOROUGH and KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Now these proposals have failed of adoption, and the question is whether we will enact legislation to avert a disastrous nationwide railroad strike. Such a strike would throw hundreds of thousands of people out of work and cause severe economic disruption. The national security is clearly involved as well. Under these circumstances legislation must be enacted, and I shall support it although I do not think it is an evenhanded approach to the problem.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the distinguished majority leader about the schedule for tomorrow and possibly Friday, and what he contemplates for the weekend.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is understood, of course, by the Senate that H.R. 2508, a bill having to do with congressional districting, will be taken up at the conclusion of the prayer tomorrow morning. There will be no morning hour. Following that, it is anticipated that we will take up the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act, S. 1030, and then S. 450, a bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands. There is the possibility that other bills reported today or expected to be reported tomorrow may be passed on the Consent Calendar prior to the completion of business Friday.

On Monday it is anticipated that we will take up two bills reported unanimously by the Committee on Commerce—S. 1566, the Interoceanic Canal Study Commission and H.R. 5424 the Coast Guard Authorization Act.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator anticipate any voting on Friday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator should be here on Friday and find out. I would not like to say "No," and then have the Senate vanish into thin air and somebody ask for the yeas and nays on some minor matter.

Mr. MILLER. I know that the majority leader cannot guarantee that, but the majority leader knows that many of us have commencement speeches and other business, and we would like to accommodate these engagements if at all possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator ask me in private tomorrow afternoon?

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW, AND FROM TOMORROW TO 10 A.M. FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock Friday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF THE RAILROAD LABOR DISPUTE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a little management problem. There seems to be a little confusion with regard to the remaining time. I am not going to use any time, but I believe the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], to whom I wish to pay the highest respect for his complete fairness to the manager of this bill in handling it from the beginning, desires a few minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Three minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I should like the cooperation of the leadership to obtain unanimous consent that the Senator may be allowed 3 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. From my time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, first I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, although I am not in favor of the resolution. As the Senator knows, I cooperated fully with the administration so that they could bring the resolution to a vote. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, I held a hearing Monday. We did not filibuster on any of our amendments. It was completed then. I helped obtain quorums in the full committee on Tuesday. Our whole procedure has been to agree and expedite matters so the Senate could work its will without undue delay.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield. I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I wish to supplement the words of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] in commendation of the Senator from Texas. Our esteemed colleague is the very capable chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The committee record indicates my expressed recognition of the conduct of the hearings on the proposal which we will shortly pass in this body. Just prior to this vote I again express praise for the prompt, fair, reasonable, and patient manner in which Senator Yarborough considered the resolution.

The Senator from Texas and the Senator from West Virginia have disagreed on the Presidential approach, working toward a settlement of the railway labor-management controversy. We are all in agreement that the committee members acted in good faith in coping with this problem. It is my considered judgment that the amendments of the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] were not in the public interest or indeed the best interests of the workers or the carriers. Their proposals were substantially defeated as they had been in committee, itself. Mr. President, from the beginning I have believed that this resolution contained the equities to the parties at dispute and gave full weight to the overriding national welfare. It is my hope that the final vote will be decisive in favor of the resolution, which has been so capably presented by Senators Morse and Javits. We must meet our responsibility and in so doing recognize the valid rights of loyal labor and the proper industry considerations. We are avoiding extremism of seizure on the one hand, or compulsory arbitration on the other.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator. We have a great committee. I believe we have one of the greatest committees in the Senate, and I am proud of the privilege of serving on it with these distinguished gentlemen.

It has been demonstrated that there is a division of opinion in the Senate with respect to this resolution and general legislation. The Senator from Oregon has made it plain that he is in favor of this ad hoc, one-shot resolution, but is not in favor of general legislation along this line. I shall vote against the resolution, and I wish to state the reasons.

I do not believe it fair to anybody to say that the issue is the war in Vietnam, as to whether we are for or against it. A nephew of mine is a captain in the Green Berets, and has been fighting for 15 months in some of the most exposed combat in Vietnam. I have voted for every measure to support this Government in all the moneys it has asked.

We are faced now with the question whether on this particular resolution we are going to throw the power of the U.S. Government on the side of management, against labor.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] truly stated the issue when he said what you are doing here is confiscating the right to strike. When you confiscate the right to strike, you confiscate the freedom of those workers, because they are machinists for railroads, with a special competency on engines and trains, and they cannot transfer to garages or other similar jobs. So you destroy for those workers the free enterprise system. You do not touch management. This is a loaded resolution, and it is unfair.

I supported both seizure amendments offered today. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts and my own in an effort to provide justice to both sides. I do not want to see a strike. I fought it on Public Law 90-10 and 90-13. One provided for 20 days and one provided for 47 days without strikes or lockouts. Now, we would vote for enforced labor for another 2 years.

Mr. President, if this matter is really tied to Vietnam, there should be a provision in the resolution that 30 days after the cease-fire in Vietnam, it would expire. However, it is not tied to that. This is tied to freezing labor for more than 2 years. I know that the resolution will pass overwhelmingly. We know that by the vote that has been had thus far on the amendments.

My reasons for voting against the proposal are not to try to prevent legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 additional minutes?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have twice voted to require the railroads to continue to operate. My vote is an appeal to the House of Representatives, which has not passed on it, to write a reasonable resolution. Then we can take it to conference, and I would expect to vote for whatever the conference committee reported.

This resolution is an unreasonable resolution aimed at labor and labor alone. The resolution does not give that fairness which I think this body should give to labor as well as to capital. My request is not for an anticapital or antimanagement resolution; this is a request for fairness.

I wish to point out to Senators that on page 4 of the report it is stated:

> This is not an extraordinary procedure. It is an extraordinary bill legislatively for we haven't legislated this type of procedure before.

That is the statement of the majority that reported this matter. For the first time we are passing this type of legislation. The majority that reported the resolution did not like it because they wrote:

> The resolution is not intended by the committee to indicate a precedent for congressional or executive action with respect to any further labor dispute.

The committee said: "We do not want to be tied to this; we do not want to indicate we are for it, but we have to do something." Mr. President, I agree, but let us do something that is fair. We are not doing something that is fair. As the Senator from Rhode Island said, we are confiscating the rights of labor. I shall vote against the proposal. We have to have action because of our vast commitment in Vietnam, but let us take the matter to conference and get a reasonable resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I shall vote against this proposal, not to kill legislation, but rather hopeful that with some votes against it we can say to the House: "Let us write a fair resolution and get something that is fair to both sides."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MILLER. On this vote, I have a live pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], The Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is necessarily absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 15, as follows:

[No. 128 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—15

Bayh
Church
Harris
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Nelson
Proxmire
Symington
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—15

Aiken
Bartlett
Brewster
Brooke
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Miller
Talmadge
Tower

So the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) was passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the joint resolution was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this hour, the one Member of this body who deserves the deepest gratitude of the Senate is the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. Lending his unsurpassed legislative ability and articulate advocacy to Senate Joint Resolution 81 tells only part of the story. He assured its overwhelming acceptance by the Senate. But his keen appreciation of the issues involved in this labor dispute, his vast knowledge of the problems facing both labor and management and his broad understanding of the ramifications that surely would grow out of a breakdown in our rail transportation industry at this time served more than anything else to develop the sound measure just adopted.

Senator MORSE brought to the Senate a proposal shaped carefully out of the vast reservoir of his experience—an experience spanning nearly 30 years—from his service on the Railway Emergency Board in the early 1940's right down to the present. He steered the proposal first through the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and obtained swift and favorable action with the same high degree of skill that has characterized his many legislative triumphs. He today presented it to the Senate in the articulate and astute manner that compelled a strong endorsement. For this achievement a grateful nation will remain forever in his debt.

Valued equally in the discussion leading to the success of this measure was the strong and able support of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senator JAVITS has consistently worked to satisfy the vital needs of the national interest. His response in this instance demonstrated the same high caliber of effort that has characterized his many years of public service to the Nation. We are deeply grateful.

We are grateful also to those Senators who, while urging a somewhat different course of action, in no way impeded the prompt and orderly disposition of the measure. I refer to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. They have always expressed an abiding devotion to the resolution of problems facing both labor and management. That concern was shown in this as in every instance. They urged their views with deep sincerity and with articulate understanding. At the same time they cooperated to permit the most efficient disposition of the measure, for which they deserve the highest commendation.

Other Senators joined to assure the Senate's overwhelming approval. Noteworthy were the efforts of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], whose views are a welcome addition to the discussion of any proposal. The Senators from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], and Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] also joined to assure an outstanding success, as did the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], whose eloquent assessment of the issues involved is always highly valued. Of course, the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and all of the committee members deserve the praise of the Senate for performing this task effectively and with dispatch.

Today the Senate has responded to avoid a crisis. It has responded swiftly and effectively. We may all be proud.

ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 536. An act to provide that the United States shall hold certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Okla., in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment by the Cherokee Nation of $3.75 per acre to the Federal Government;

H.R. 1516. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Tocco;

H.R. 1517. An act for the relief of Mrs. Matteo Groppo;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo A. Navarro;

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli;

H.R. 1612. An act for the relief of John Joseph Shea;

H.R. 1703. An act for the relief of Angiolina Condello;

H.R. 1763. An act for the relief of Dr. Raul E. Bertran;

H.R. 1764. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernesto M. Campello;

H.R. 1765. An act for the relief of Dr. Ubaldo Gregorio Catasus-Rodriguez;

H.R. 1814. An act for the relief of Giovanni and Francesco Urga-Ferraro;

H.R. 1907. An act for the relief of Gizella Erenyi;

H.R. 2694. An act for the relief of Branca da Gloria Freitas;

H.R. 2964. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon;

H.R. 3221. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Cross;

H.R. 3492. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chu Chai-ho Hay;

H.R. 3522. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael F. Suarez;

H.R. 3523. An act for the relief of Chang-You Wu, M.D.;

H.R. 5028. An act for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo;

H.R. 5224. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Fresco De Jongh;

H.R. 5364. An act to provide for the conveyance of the interest held by the United States in certain real property situated in the State of Georgia;

H.R. 5862. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan F. Chaves; and

H.R. 10509. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 65. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Alberto Rojas-Machado;

S. 130. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria Yolanda Rafaela Miranda y Monteagudo;

S. 131. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Valdes-Rodriguez;

S. 133. An act for the relief of Dr. Hector Jesus Sanchez-Hernandez;

S. 134. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael A. Penalver;

S. 135. An act for the relief of Dr. Hilario Anido-Fragulo;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Dr. Ramon Baez Hernandez;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Dr. Anselmo S. Alvarez-Gomez;

S. 173. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis G. Dediot;

S. 175. An act for the relief of Dr. Sherif Shafey;

S. 439. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Jacinto Nobo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo); and

S. 501. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernando O. Garcia-Hernandez.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 536. An act to provide that the United States shall hold certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Okla., in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment by the Cherokee Nation of $3.75 per acre to the Federal Government; and

H.R. 5364. An act to provide for the conveyance of the interest held by the United States in certain real property situated in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1516. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Tocco;

H.R. 1517. An act for the relief of Mrs. Matteo Groppo;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo A. Navarro;

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli;

H.R. 1612. An act for the relief of John Joseph Shea;

H.R. 1703. An act for the relief of Angiolina Condello;

H.R. 1763. An act for the relief of Dr. Raul E. Bertran;

H.R. 1764. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernesto M. Campello;

H.R. 1765. An act for the relief of Dr. Ubaldo Gregorio Catasus-Rodriguez;

H.R. 1814. An act for the relief of Giovanni and Francesco Urga-Ferraro;

H.R. 1907. An act for the relief of Gizella Erenyi;

H.R. 2694. An act for the relief of Branca da Gloria Freitas;

H.R. 2964. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon;

H.R. 3221. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Cross;

H.R. 3492. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chu Chai-ho Hay;

H.R. 3522. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael F. Suarez;

H.R. 3523. An act for the relief of Chang-You Wu, M.D.;

H.R. 5028. An act for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo;

H.R. 5224. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Fresco De Jongh; and

H.R. 5862. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan F. Chaves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10509. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

FEDERAL SAVINGS BANK ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RENTAL AGREEMENTS WITH POSTMASTERS AT FOURTH-CLASS OFFICES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to negotiate and enter into rental agreements with postmasters at fourth-class offices (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the 1967 Convention of the New York State Federation of Women's Clubs, of Schenectady, N.Y., praying for the reduction of excessive and unnecessary Federal civilian spending, and so forth, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; with amendments:

H.R. 4717. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn. (Rept. No. 293).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

H.R. 6431. An act to amend the public health laws relating to mental health to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 294).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1914. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ahmad Al-Rikabi; and

S. 1915. A bill for the relief of Abdollah Albert Kudsi-Zadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1916. A bill to establish the District of Columbia Independent School Board; and

S. 1917. A bill to establish the District of Columbia Independent School Board and to provide for its independence in all matters relating to the school system of the District of Columbia other than fiscal; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOMINICK when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1918. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gabriel Gomez del Rio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 1919. A bill to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH:

S. 1920. A bill for the relief of Maj. Louis A. Deering, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1921. A bill for the relief of Carlota Figueira Miguens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1922. A bill to amend the authorization of appropriations for the support of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 1923. A bill for the relief of the estate of Arden A. Longcroft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

TO PRINT "ENACTMENT OF A LAW" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 134); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 134

Resolved, That Senate Document Numbered 55, 83d Congress, first session, entitled "Enactment of a Law," relative to the legislative proceeding of Congress in connection with the passage of a bill, from its introduction through the various parliamentary stages until its enactment into law, be revised and reprinted as a Senate document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed ten thousand additional copies for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ELECTED SCHOOL BOARD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills, one to create a fiscally independent elected school board for the District of Columbia and the other to create an independent school board but without taxing power.

The District of Columbia must surely be the only place in the United States where appointed officials—judges—appoint officials—school board members—who appoint an official—superintendent—to run a school system.

To make matters worse, the appointed school board members must look for approval of their budget to appointed commissioners who in turn must depend on a large share of their funds from elected Members of Congress who were not elected by those dependent upon the funds.

Recently, the Federal judges in the District asked that they be excluded from this appointment game and in my judgment there are compelling reasons why their request should be granted.

The fact is that the existing method of selecting our school board members is intolerable.

The most obvious answer to the problem is complete self-government for the District of Columbia—including an independently elected school board. I support home rule and I want to emphatically state that I will continue to expend every effort to make self-government a reality for the residents of the District.

Home rule will be a long and difficult struggle.

There is reason to hope that an elected school board can be achieved in the immediate future.

Certainly the arguments for an elected school board are persuasive.

Education should include the total involvement of the entire community. The Board of Education should be responsive to the public; to the taxpayers who support the schools; to the parents whose children are educated in the schools.

This, regrettably, is not the case under our present system.

Of course, many outstanding appointments have been made to the Board of Education; many Board members have served with distinction.

But that is not the point.

There is, in fact, no significant way in which the citizens of the District can now become directly involved in their school system. It has been said that, "the only sound policy is that which frees the members of the Board of Education from any allegiance except that which they owe to the whole public. Such freedom can best be assured through nomination by petition and election on a nonpartisan ballot at a special school election."

I believe that not only should the Board be elected but that it should be fiscally independent. The Board should clearly have the right to raise the taxes necessary to support its programs and the citizens of the District should have the opportunity to participate in the decisions concerning both policy and expenditures.

I am confident that, if this were the case, the residents of the District would chose to pay higher taxes as an investment in excellence in education. The citizens in the District deserve the right to set their own standards of excellence. They should not be left with a secondrate school system where financing decisions are made three times removed from those most vitally affected.

The majority of other school systems of comparable size have elected school boards who are fiscally independent. Out of 40 of the largest school systems, 23 are elected and completely fiscally independent. Three others are fiscally independent except for capital outlay. Only five school systems including the District have both appointed and fiscally dependent school boards.

While I favor a fiscally independent school board, I have introduced a second bill which would establish an elected school board but one without taxing power. This leaves unchanged the current method of financing the District of Columbia schools. There are some in Congress who feel that it is desirable to maintain control over the finances of the District. Since I feel that the concept of an elected school board is of primary importance, I want to give this concept every opportunity for favorable consideration.

I introduced a similar bill in the last Congress; but as you know, Mr. President, the bill was not given a hearing. The only argument I heard advanced for this was that a school board bill would hurt chances for passage of home rule. While I do not believe that was the case last year, it certainly is not the case this year.

While I do not in any way consider these bills as substitutes for home rule, I do feel that, if enacted, the concept of an elected school board could pave the way for home rule. I am confident that the citizens of the District would act responsibly to the small degree of "home rule" found in the elected school board concept and this would allay some of the unfortunate apprehensions a few Members of Congress have about complete self-government.

A great deal of interest in an elected school board has already been expressed by the local newspapers. On January 3 of this year the Washington Post ran an editorial entitled "Program for Washington." The editorial stated in part:

> Washington also needs an elected school board and unlike most of these proposals, it would certainly require legislation. Congress having refused general self-government to the city ought now to be asked to extend democracy at least to the school system, in which the Federal interest is nil but the local interest is compelling.

Last night the Evening Star carried an editorial entitled "The Judges' Response" wherein they stated:

> The most obvious alternatives are to permit local school board elections or to assign the appointive responsibility to the President.

I do not contend that these two bills are perfect. I would expect constructive amendments; I would welcome constructive alternatives, I am, for example, concerned whether I have provided an adequate means for raising revenue. This is a matter which can easily be resolved.

I do hope, however, that these bills will provide the vehicle for extensive hearings where the basic bills will receive discussion and will ultimately lead to a fiscally independent elected school board for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bayh in the chair). The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Dominick, were received, read twice by their titles, and referrred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, as follows:

S. 1916. A bill to establish the District of Columbia Independent School Board; and

S. 1917. A bill to establish the District of Columbia Independent School Board and to provide for its independence in all matters relating to the school system of the District of Columbia other than fiscal.

FEDERAL SAVINGS BANK ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, at the request of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, a bill recommended by the Board to authorize the establishment of Federal savings banks.

I ask unanimous consent that the section-by-section analysis and the transmittal letter from Chairman John E. Horne, be printed along with my remarks in the body of the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1919) to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks, introduced by Mr. Sparkman, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter and section-by-section analysis, presented by Mr. Sparkman, are as follows:

Federal Home Loan Bank Board,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1967.

The President of the Senate.

Sir: The Federal Home Loan Bank Board recommends that the Congress enact the enclosed draft bill dated June 1, 1967, to authorize the establishment of Federal savings banks. A section-by-section analysis is also enclosed.

Federal chartering of mutual savings banks was recommended in 1961, in the report of the Commission on Money and Credit, whose membership included a broad cross-section of leaders in banking, economic, management, and related fields, and in 1963, in the report of the President's Committee on Financial Institutions, comprising Federal officials from major departments and agencies.

In his Economic Report transmitted to the Congress in January, the President, as he did in 1966, urged the provision of Federal charters for such banks, to enlarge and strengthen our system of thrift institutions. The 1967 Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers, transmitted with the Economic Report of the President, noted the desirability of such action.

The draft bill transmitted herewith is similar in substance to the draft transmitted by the Board in October 1965 and introduced in the 89th Congress as S. 2598, H.R. 11433, and H.R. 11508 of that Congress. The only major difference is that title IX of those bills, which contained detailed provisions as to enforcement proceedings, has been omitted. That title is now unneeded in view of the enactment last October of title I of the Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966, whose enforcement provisions, in view of specific provisions included therein, would automatically be applicable to Federal savings banks if the draft legislation transmitted herewith were enacted.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that the proposed legislation is consistent with the objectives of the Administration.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

JOHN E. HORNE,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF DRAFT DATED JUNE 1, 1967, FOR A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL SAVINGS BANKS

Section 1. Short Title. The unnumbered first section states the short title, "Federal Savings Bank Act".

TITLE I. FEDERAL SAVINGS BANKS

Chapter 1. General provisions

Section 11. Definitions and Rules of Construction. Section 11, the first section of title I, contains certain definitions and general rules.

The term "mutual thrift institution" would mean a Federal savings bank, a Federal savings and loan association, or a State-chartered mutual savings bank, mutual savings and loan association, mutual building and loan association, cooperative bank, or mutual homestead association.

In turn, "thrift institution" would mean a mutual thrift institution, a guaranty savings bank, a stock savings and loan association, or a stock building and loan association, and "financial institution" would mean a thrift institution, a commercial bank, or an insurance company. By a special definitional provision in this section, the term "financial institutions acting in a fiduciary capacity" as used in sections 53 and 54 would include a credit union, whether or not acting in a fiduciary capacity.

"State" would mean any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and any territory or possession of the United States.

The term "merger transaction" would mean any transaction between or among any two institutions, at least one of which is a Federal savings bank, which will result in a merger or consolidation or pursuant to which any of such institutions, otherwise than in the ordinary course of business, acquires any assets of, or assumes liability to pay any deposits made in or share accounts of, or similar liabilities of, another of such institutions.

As used in relation to a merger transaction, "resulting bank" or "resulting institution" would refer to a bank or other institution (whether or not newly chartered in connection with the transaction) which, after its consummation, and as a result thereof, carries on the business or any part thereof theretofore carried on by one or more parties to the transaction.

Section 12. Rules and Regulations. Section 12 authorizes the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to make rules and regulations, including definitions of terms in title I.

Section 13. Examination. This section provides for general and special examinations by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board of Federal savings banks, and also provides that the Board may render to any bank or officer or director thereof such advice and comment as it may deem appropriate with respect to the bank's affairs.

Section 14. Reports. Section 14 provides that the Board may require periodic and other reports and information from Federal savings banks.

Section 15. Accounts and accounting. The Board would be authorized by section 15 to prescribe, by regulation or order, accounts and accounting systems and practices for Federal savings banks.

Section 16. Right To Amend. The right to alter, amend, or repeal title I would be reserved by section 16.

Chapter 2. Establishment and voluntary liquidation

Section 21. Information To Be Stated in Charter. This section makes provision for the contents of charters for Federal savings banks.

Section 22. Issuance of Charter for New Bank. A charter for a new Federal savings bank could be issued by the Board on the written application (in such form as the Board may prescribe) of not less than 5 applicants and upon the making of specified determinations by the Board, including a determination that there has been placed in trust or escrow for an initial reserve such amount, not less than $50,000, in cash or securities approved by the Board as the Board may require, in consideration of transferable certificates to be issued by the bank in such form, on such terms, and bearing such interest or other return as the Board may approve.

Section 23. Issuance of Charter for a Converted Bank. Subsection (a) of this section would authorize the Board to issue a charter for a converted Federal savings bank on written application (in form prescribed by the Board) of the converting institution and determination by the Board among other things that (1) the converting institution is a mutual thrift institution and (2), if the converting institution is a Federal savings and loan association, the conversion has been favored by vote of two-thirds of the directors and two-thirds of the votes entitled to be cast by members.

To such extent as the Board might approve by order, and subject to such prohibitions, restrictions, and limitations as it might prescribe by regulation or written advice, a converted bank could retain and service the accounts, departments, and assets of the converting institution.

Subsection (b) of the section provides that the Board shall not issue a charter under subsection (a) unless it determines that, taking into consideration the quality of the converting institution's assets, its reserves and surplus, its expense ratios, and such other factors as the Board may deem appropriate, and making appropriate allowances for differences among types of financial institutions, the converting institution's history has been of a character "commensurate with the superior standards of performance expected of a Federal savings bank".

Section 24. Conversion of Federal Savings Banks Into Other Institutions. Under subsection (a) of section 24 the Board, on written application of a Federal savings bank, could permit it to convert into any other type of mutual thrift institution, on a determination by the Board that (1) two-thirds of the directors have voted in favor of the proposed conversion, (2) the requirements of section 45 have been met, (3) the conversion will not be in contravention of State law, and (4) upon and after conversion the institution will be an insured institution of the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation (i.e., the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, whose name would be changed to Federal Savings Insurance Corporation by section 201) or an insured bank of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Subsection (b) of the section provides that no institution into which a Federal savings bank has been converted may, within ten years after the conversion, convert into any type of institution other than a mutual thrift institution which is either a bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or an institution insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, regardless of whether the later conversion took place directly or through any intermediate conversions.

Enforcement of this prohibition would be by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in the case of an institution having a status as an insured institution of the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation and by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in the case of an institution having a status as an insured bank of that corporation. On a determination that a violation had taken place, the relevant board, by order issued not later than two years after any such violation, could terminate such status without notice, hearing, or other action. For the purposes of this subsection and subsection (a) of section 26, the terms "conversion" and "convert" would be defined as applying to mergers, consolidations, assumptions of liabilities, and reorganizations, as well as conversions.

Section 25. Voluntary Liquidation. A Federal savings bank could not voluntarily go into liquidation or otherwise wind up its affairs except in accordance with an order of the Board issued under section 25. Upon application by such bank, the Board could permit it to carry out a plan of voluntary liquidation upon a determination by the Board that (1) two-thirds of the bank's directors have voted in favor of the proposed plan, (2) the requirements of section 45 have been met, (3) there is no longer a need in the community for the bank, or there is not a reasonable expectation that its continued operation will be financially sound and successful, and (4) the plan is fair and equitable and in conformity with the requirements of section 26.

Section 26. Distribution of Assets Upon Liquidation. Subsection (a) of section 26 provides that on liquidation of a Federal savings bank under section 25, or liquidation of any institution while subject to the prohibition in subsection (b) of section 24, the net assets after the satisfaction or provision for satisfaction, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Board may prescribe, of all proper claims and demands against the institution, including those of depositors or shareholders, shall be distributed to the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation. In the case of institutions subject to subsection (b) of section 24, the claims of depositors or shareholders are to be limited to amounts that would have been withdrawable by them in the absence of any conversion (as defined in said subsection) while the institution was so subject.

The object of this provision is to deter conversions of Federal savings banks to nonmutual operation and to deter unneeded voluntary liquidation of Federal savings banks. Under section 24 Federal savings banks are prohibited from converting *directly at one step* into any other type of institution except a mutual thrift institution insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Section 26 is designed to deter, to the extent of its provisions, the conversion of a Federal savings bank *indirectly or by successive steps* into an institution other than such an insured mutual thrift institution.

Subsection (b) of section 26 provides that on liquidation of a Federal savings bank otherwise than pursuant to section 25 the net assets remaining after the satisfaction or provision for the satisfaction, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Board may prescribe, of all proper claims and demands against the bank, including those of depositors, shall be distributed to the depositors in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Board may prescribe.

Section 27. Authority of Board. This section authorizes the Board to make rules and regulations for reorganization, liquidation, and dissolution, merger transactions, and conservatorships and receiverships, and to provide by regulation or otherwise for exercise during conservatorship or receivership of functions by depositors, directors, officers, or bodies which may select directors.

Chapter 3. Branching and merger

Section 31. Branches. Under section 31 a Federal savings bank could establish a branch or branches with the approval of the Board, upon a determination by the Board that (1) there is a reasonable expectation of the branch's financial success based on the need for such a facility in the locality, the bank's capitalization, financial history, and quality of management, and such other factors as the Board deems appropriate, (2) its operation may foster competition and will not cause undue injury to existing institutions (including commercial banks) that accept funds from savers on deposit or share account, and (3) if the bank were a State-chartered financial institution other than an insurance company it could establish the proposed branch or an office of an affiliated institution of the same type could be established in the same location.

The object of item (3) in the paragraph above is to limit the establishment of branches by Federal savings banks to States (defined in section 11) where financial institutions other than insurance companies may conduct multi-office operations either through branching or through affiliates. It is of course to be recognized that multi-office operation through affiliates is not branching, but the competitive effect on other financial institutions can be as great as if the multi-office operation were conducted by means of branching.

Section 31 also provides that, under such exceptions and conditions as the Board may prescribe, a converted Federal savings bank may retain any branch in operation immediately prior to the conversion and shall be deemed to have retained any right or privilege to establish or maintain a branch if such right or privilege was held by the converting institution immediately prior to conversion.

Finally, the section provides that subject to approval granted by the Board not later than the effective date of a merger transaction a resulting Federal savings bank may maintain as a branch the principal office or any branch operated by another institution which is a party to the transaction and shall be deemed to have acquired any right or privilege then held by such an institution to establish or maintain a branch. The Board could not grant such approval except on compliance with a requirement analogous to item (3) of the first sentence of this analysis of section 31 unless the Board, in granting the approval, determined that the merger transaction was advisable because of supervisory considerations. Examples of such situations could include those where one or more of the institutions was in a failing or declining condition, one or more of the institutions was not rendering adequate service in its territory, or one or more of the institutions had an unsafe or unsound management.

Section 32. Merger Transactions. A Federal savings bank may carry out a merger transaction from which the resulting institution will be a mutual thrift institution, but only with the approval of the Board. The section provides that the Board shall not grant such approval unless it determines that—

(1) Every party to the transaction is a mutual thrift institution;

(2) In the case of every party which is a Federal savings bank, two-thirds of the directors have voted in favor of the transaction and the requirements of section 45 have been met;

(3) In the case of every party which is a Federal savings and loan association, two-thirds of the directors, and two-thirds of the votes entitled to be cast by members, have voted in favor of the transaction, at meetings duly called and held for that purpose within six months prior to the filing of the application;

(4) In the case of every party which is a State-chartered institution, the consummation of the transaction will not be in contravention of State law;

(5) There is a reasonable expectation that the resulting institution will be financially successful, based on its proposed capitalization, the financial history of each of the institutions involved, and such other factors as the Board may deem relevant;

(6) In the case of a merger, consolidation, or acquisition of assets in which the resulting institution is a Federal savings bank, its assets will be such that, with such exceptions as the Board may prescribe, it will be able to dispose of those not eligible for investment by Federal savings banks;

(7) The resulting institution will be an insured bank of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or an insured institution of the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation;

(8) The proposed transaction is approved pursuant to section 410 of the National Housing Act, if applicable, and section 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, if applicable.

In connection with this section attention is called to section 202 of the draft bill, which lays down, in a new section 410 of the National Housing Act, ground rules for mergers and similar transactions involving institutions insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, which would include but would not be limited to Federal savings banks. Those rules would parallel the rules laid down for insured banks of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by Public Law 89–356, commonly known as the Bank Merger Act of 1966, which made amendments to subsection (c) of section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

For a more detailed discussion of the proposed new section 410 of the National Housing Act, reference is made to the summary of section 202 of the present draft bill, beginning at page 10 of this analysis.

Chapter 4. Management and directors

Section 41. Board of Directors. A Federal savings bank would have a board of directors of not less than seven nor more than twenty-five. The Board could prescribe regulations as to the management structure, and subject thereto the board of directors of a bank could by bylaws or otherwise delegate such functions and duties as it might deem appropriate.

Section 42. Initial Directors. The initial directors of a new bank would be elected by the applicants. The initial directors of a converted bank would be the directors of the converting institution, except as the Board might otherwise provide, consistently with subsection (b) of section 44 where applicable.

Section 43. Election of Directors by Depositors. Except as provided in sections 42 and 44, directors would be elected by the depositors. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board could by regulation provide for the terms of office, the manner, time, place, and notice of election, the minimum amount (and a holding period or date of determination) of any deposit giving rise to voting rights, and the method by which the number of votes a depositor would be entitled to cast would be determined.

Section 44. Selection of Directors of Banks Converted From State-Chartered Mutual Savings Banks. Section 44 applies to a State-chartered mutual savings bank which is in operation on the date of enactment of the title and later converts to a Federal savings bank, where the directors of the converting bank were, on the date of such enactment and thereafter, chosen otherwise than by depositor election. If such a converting bank files as part of or an amendment to its application for a Federal charter a description in such detail as the Board requires of the method by which and terms for which its directors were chosen, and if the converted bank has not elected by vote of its directors to be subject to section 43, the method of selection and terms of office of the converted Federal savings bank would be in accordance with such description, with such changes, subject to the discretionary approval of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, as might be made on application by the converted bank. It is to be noted that this provision would not authorize the Board to approve any such changes in the absence of such an application by the bank.

Section 45. Approval of Proposed Merger, Conversion, or Liquidation. Under subsection (a) of section 45, no Federal savings bank whose directors were elected by depositors could make application to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for approval of a merger transaction, a conversion, or a liquidation pursuant to section 25 unless two-thirds of the votes entitled to be cast by depositors had been cast in favor of making the application at a meeting duly called and held for such purpose not more than six months before the making of the application. The Board would have regulatory authority with respect to such meetings as set forth in the section.

No Federal savings banks whose directors were not elected by depositors could make any such application unless two-thirds of the votes which would be entitled to be cast for the election of directors had been cast in favor of making the application.

The Board could except from any or all of the foregoing provisions of this section any case in which it determines that such exception should be made because of an emergency requiring expeditious action or because of supervisory considerations.

Section 46. Proxies. Any proxy by a depositor for the election of directors would be required to be revocable at any time. A proxy given for a proposal to be voted on under subsection (a) of section 45 would likewise be so revocable, would be required to expire in any event not more than six months after execution, and would be required to specify whether the holder shall vote in favor of or against the proposal. It is further provided that the Board shall prescribe regulations governing proxy voting and solicitation and requiring disclosure of financial interest, compensation and remuneration by the bank of persons who are officers and directors or proposed therefor, and such other matters as the Board may deem appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors.

In addition, it is provided that the Board shall by regulation provide procedures by which any depositor may at his own expense distribute proxy solicitation material to all other depositors, but these procedures are not to require disclosure by the bank of the identity of its depositors. It is further provided that the Board shall by order prohibit the distribution of material found by it to be irrelevant, untrue, misleading, or materially incomplete and may by order prohibit such distribution pending a hearing on such issues.

Section 47. General Provisions Relating to Directors, Officers, and Other Persons. Section 47 provides that except as provided in paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of the section no director of a Federal savings bank may be an officer or director of any financial institution other than such bank. Said paragraph (2) provides that a director of a converted bank who held office on the date of enactment of this title as a director of the converting institution, and whose service has been continuous, may continue to be a director of any financial institution of which he has continuously so been a director, unless the Board finds after opportunity for hearing that there exists an actual conflict of interest or the dual service is prohibited by or under some other provision of law.

At least one more than half the directors would be required to be persons residing not more than 150 miles from its principal office. No director could receive remuneration as such except reasonable fees for attendance at meetings of directors or for service as a member of a committee of directors, but this provision is not to prohibit compensation for services rendered to the bank in another capacity. The office of a director would become vacant when he had failed to attend regular meetings for a period of six months unless excused by resolution duly adopted by the directors prior to or during that period.

The section also contains stringent provisions against self-dealing by directors, officers, employees, and other persons connected with Federal saving banks. Additional provisions of this section would prohibit any bank, director, or officer from requiring (as a condition to any loan or other service by the bank) that the borrower or any other person undertake a contract of insurance or any other agreement or understanding as to the furnishing of other goods or service with any specific company, agency, or individual; would prohibit deposit of funds except with a depositary approved by vote of a majority of all the directors, exclusive of any who was an officer, partner, director, or trustee of the depositary; and would specifically provide that no Federal savings bank should pay to any director, officer, attorney, or employee a greater rate of return on the deposits of such director, officer, attorney, or employee than that paid to other holders of similar deposits with the bank in question.

Where the directors or officers of a bank knowingly violate or permit any of its directors, officers, employees, or agents to violate specified provisions of this section or regulations of the Board thereunder, or any of the provisions of specified sections of title 18 of the United States Code, every director and officer participating or asserting to such violation shall, the section provides, be held liable in his personal and individual capacity for all damages which the bank, its depositors, or any other person sustain in consequence of the violation.

Except on written consent of the Board, no person could serve as a director, officer, or employee of a Federal savings bank if he had been convicted of a criminal offense involving dishonesty or breach of trust, and for each wilful violation the bank would be subject to a penalty of not over $100 for each day the prohibition was violated. Finally, no officer, director, or employee of any corporation or unincorporated association, no partner or employee of any partnership, and no individual, primarily engaged in the issue, flotation, underwriting, public sale, or distribution at wholesale or retail or through syndicate participation, of stocks, bonds, or similar securities could serve at the same time as an officer, director, or employee of such a bank except in limited classes of cases in which the Board might allow such services by general regulation when in the Board's judgment it would not unduly influence the investment policies of the bank or the advice given by it to its customers regarding investments.

Chapter 5. Sources of funds

Section 51. Reserves. A Federal savings bank for which a charter is issued under section 22 could not commence operations until the amount required by that section had been paid to the bank for an initial reserve, and such reserve could be reduced only by the amount of losses or by retirement of the certificates referred to in that section. The bank would be required or permitted to have such other reserves, including valuation reserves, as the Board might prescribe or authorize.

Section 52. Borrowings. To such extent as the Board might authorize by regulation or advice in writing, a bank could borrow and give security and issue notes, bonds, debentures, or other obligations or other securities, except capital stock.

Section 53. Savings Deposits. A bank could accept savings deposits except from foreign governments and official institutions thereof and except from private business corporations for profit other than financial institutions acting in a fiduciary capacity. It could issue passbooks or other evidences of its obligation to repay such deposits.

Under subsection (b) of this section, a bank could classify its savings depositors according to specified criteria and agree in advance to pay an additional rate of interest based on such classification. However, it would be required to regulate such interest so that each depositor would receive the same rate as all others of his class.

Further provisions of this section would authorize a bank to refuse sums offered for deposit and to fix a maximum amount for savings deposits and repay, on a uniform nondiscriminatory basis, those exceeding the maximum. The bank could require up to 90 days' notice before withdrawal from such deposits, notifying the Board immediately in writing, and the Board, by a finding which must be entered on its records, could suspend or limit withdrawals of savings deposits from any Federal savings bank if it found that unusual and extraordinary circumstances so required.

Interest on savings deposits could be paid only from net earnings and undivided profits, and the Board could provide by regulation for the time or rate of accrual of unrealized earnings.

Section 54. Time Deposits. Subject to the same exceptions as in the case of savings deposits a Federal savings bank could accept deposits for fixed periods not less than 91 days and could issue nonnegotiable interest-bearing time certificates of deposit or other evidence of its obligation to pay such time deposits.

Section 55. Authority of Board. The exercise of authority under sections 53 and 54 would be subject to rules and regulations of the Board, but it is provided that nothing in this section shall confer on the Board any authority as to interest rates other than the additional rate referred to in section 53(b).

Chapter 6. Investments

Section 61. Definitions and General Provisions. Section 61 contains definitions and general provisions for the purpose of the investment provisions of the bill.

Among other things, "general obligation" would mean an obligation supported by an unqualified promise or pledging or commitment of faith or credit, made by an entity referred to in section 62(1) or 63(a) or a governmental entity possessing general powers of taxation including property taxation, for the payment, directly or indirectly, of an amount which, together with any other funds available for the purpose, will suffice to discharge the obligation according to its terms.

The term "political subdivision of a State" would include any county, municipality, or taxing or other district of a State, and any public instrumentality, public authority, commission, or other public body of any State or States; "eligible leasehold estate" would mean a leasehold estate meeting such requirements as the Board might prescribe by regulation; and "conventional loan" would mean a loan (other than as referred to in section 70) secured by a first lien on a fee simple or eligible leasehold estate in improved real property.

Section 61 also provides that the Board may authorize any acquisition or retention of assets by a Federal savings bank (including, without limitation, stock in service corporations) on a determination that such action is necessary or advisable for a reason or reasons other than investment, and may exempt or except such acquisition, retention, or assets from any provision of the title.

The same section also provides authority and limitations for acquisition (as distinguished from origination) of loans and investments, and for acquisition by origination or otherwise of participating or other interests in loans and investments. Any such interest must be at least equal in rank to any other interest not held by the United States or an agency thereof and must be superior in rank to any other interest not so held and not held by a financial institution or a holder approved by the Board. It also provides authority for the making of loans secured by an obligation or security in which the bank might lawfully invest, but such a loan may not exceed such percentage of the value of the obligation or security, nor be contrary to such limitations and requirements, as the Board may prescribe by regulation.

Section 62. Investment Eligible for Unrestricted Investment. Section 62 provides that a Federal savings bank may invest in (1) general obligations of, obligations fully guaranteed as to principal and any interest by, or other obligations, participations, or other instruments of or issued by the United States, any State, one or more Federal Home Loan Banks, banks for cooperatives (or the Central Bank for Cooperatives), Federal Land Banks, or Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, or the Asian Development Bank, (2) bankers' acceptance eligible for purchase by Federal Reserve Banks, or (3) stock of a Federal Home Loan Bank.

Section 63. Canadian Obligations. Section 63 provides in subsection (a) that, subject to the limitations in subsection (b), a Federal savings bank may invest in general obligations of, or obligations fully guaranteed as to principal and any interest by, Canada or any province thereof. Subsection (b) provides that investments in obligations under this section or investments in Canadian obligations under section 64(2) may be made only where the obligation is payable in United States funds and where, on the making of the investment, not more than 2% of the bank's assets will be invested in Canadian obligations and, if the investment is in an obligation of a province, not more than one percent of its assets will be invested in obligations of that province. "Canadian obligation" is defined as meaning the above mentioned obligations and obligations of Canada or a province thereof referred to in section 64(2).

Section 64. Certain Other Investments. Subject to a limitation of 2% of the bank's assets invested in securities and obligations of one issuer, and to such further limitations as to amount and such requirements as to investment merit and marketability as the Board may prescribe by regulation, a bank may invest in (1) general obligations of a political subdivision of a State, (2) revenue or other special obligations of Canada or a province thereof or of a State or political subdivision thereof, (3) obligations or securities (other than equity securities) issued by a corporation organized under the laws of the United States or a State, (4) obligations of a trustee or escrow agent under section 22(5) or certificates issued thereunder, and subordinated debentures of a mutual thrift institution insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the

Federal Savings Insurance Corporation (the name to which the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation would be changed by section 201), or (5) equity securities issued by any corporation organized under the laws of the United States or of a State. This authority is subject, in the case of such equity securities, to a further requirement that at the time of the investment the reserves and undivided profits of the bank equal at least 5% of its assets and that on the making of the investment the aggregate amount of all equity securities then so held by the bank not exceed 50% of its reserves and undivided profits and the quantity of equity securities of the same class and issuer held by the bank not exceed 5% of the total outstanding. For the purposes of this section the Board could by regulation define "corporation" to include any form of business organization.

Section 65. Real Estate Loans. Conventional loans could be made, subject to such restrictions and requirements as the Board might by regulation prescribe as to appraisal and valuation, maturity (not over 30 years in the case of loans on one- to four-family residences), amortization, terms and conditions, and lending plans and practices. No such loan could result in an aggregate indebtedness of the same borrower exceeding 2% of the bank's assets or $35,000, whichever was greater. Also, no such loan secured by a first lien on a fee-simple estate in a one- to four-family residence could exceed 80%, or in the case of any other real property 75%, of the value of the property except under such conditions and subject to such limitations as the Board might prescribe by regulation. Further, no loan secured by a first lien on a leasehold estate could be made except in accordance with such further requirements and restrictions as the Board might so prescribe.

Loans for the repair, alteration, or improvement of any real property could be made under such prohibitions, limitations, and conditions as the Board might prescribe by regulation. Loans not otherwise authorized under the title but secured by a first lien on a fee-simple or eligible lease-hold estate in unimproved property could be made, provided the loan was made in order to finance the development of land to provide building sites or for other purposes approved by the Board by regulation as in the public interest and provided the loan conformed to regulations limiting the exercise of such power and containing requirements as to repayment, maturities, ratios of loan to value, maximum aggregate amounts, and maximum loans to one borrower or secured by one lien which were prescribed by the Board with a view to avoiding undue risks to such banks and minimizing inflationary pressures on land in urban and urbanizing areas.

The section contains a provision that a bank investing in a loan where the property securing the loan is a one- to four-family residence more than 100 miles and in a different State from the principal office of the bank must retain for such loan a Federal Housing Administration-approved mortgagee resident in such other State to act as independent loan servicing contractor and to perform loan servicing functions and such other related services as were required by the Board.

Section 66. Loans Upon the Security of Deposits or Share Accounts. A Federal savings bank could make any loan secured by a deposit in itself or, to such extent as the Board might permit by regulation or advice in writing, secured by a deposit or share account in another thrift institution or a deposit in a commercial bank.

Section 67. Loans Secured by Life Insurance Policies. A Federal savings bank could make a loan secured by a life insurance policy, not exceeding the cash surrender value.

Section 68. Unsecured Loans. Unsecured loans not otherwise authorized under the title could be made, but only to such extent as the Board might permit by regulation, and then not if the loan would increase the outstanding principal of such loans to any principal obligor, as defined by the Board, to more than $5,000. No loan could be so made if any obligor was a private business corporation for profit.

Section 69. Educational Loans. Subject to such prohibitions, limitations, and conditions as the Board might prescribe by regulation, a Federal savings bank could invest in loans, obligations, and advances of credit made for the payment of expenses of college or university education, up to a limit of 5% of the bank's assets.

Section 70. Guaranteed or Insured Loans. A Federal savings bank could, unless otherwise provided by regulations of the Board, make any loan the repayment of which was wholly or partially guaranteed or insured by the United States, a State, or an agency of either, or as to which the bank had the benefit of such insurance or guaranty or of a commitment or agreement therefor.

Chapter 7. Miscellaneous corporate powers and duties

Section 71. General Powers. Section 71 provides that a Federal savings bank shall be a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United States and sets forth miscellaneous corporate powers, which are to be subject to such restrictions as may be imposed under the title or other provisions of law or by the Board. It also provides that such a bank shall have power to do all things reasonably incident to the exercise of such powers. The specified powers would include the power to sell mortgages and interests therein, and to perform loan servicing functions and related services for others in connection with such sales, provided the sales are incidental to the investment and management of the funds of the bank.

Section 72. Service as Depositary and Fiscal Agent of the United States. Section 72 provides that when so designated by the Secretary of the Treasury a Federal savings bank shall be a depositary of public money, except receipts from customs, under such regulations as he may prescribe, and may be employed as a fiscal agent of the Government, and shall perform all such reasonable duties as such depositary and agent as may be required of it.

Section 73. Federal Home Loan Bank Membership. On issuance of its charter, a Federal savings bank would automatically become a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank of the district of its principal office, or if convenience required and the Board approved, of an adjoining district. It is provided that such banks shall qualify for such membership in the manner provided in the Federal Home Loan Bank Act for other members.

Section 74. Change of Location of Offices. A Federal savings bank could not change the location of its principal office or any branch except with the approval of the Board.

Section 75. Liquidity requirements. A Federal savings bank would be required to maintain liquid assets consisting of cash and obligations of the United States in such amount as, in the Board's opinion, was appropriate to assure the soundness of such banks. Such amount could not, however, be less than 4% or more than 10% of the bank's obligation on deposits and borrowings, and the Board could specify the proportion of cash and the maturity and type of eligible obligations. The Board could classify such banks according to type, size, location, withdrawal rate, or such other basis or bases as it might deem reasonably necessary or appropriate for effectuating the purposes of the section.

In addition, the Board could require additional liquidity if in its opinion the composition and quality of assets, the composition of deposits and liabilities, or the ratio of reserves and surplus to deposits required further limitation of risk to protect the safety and soundness of a bank or banks. The total of the general liquidity requirement and of this special liquidity requirement could not exceed 15% of the obligation of the bank on deposits and borrowings.

The general liquidity requirement would be computed on the basis of average daily net amounts covering periods established by the Board, and the special liquidity requirement would be computed as the Board might prescribe. Penalties for deficiencies in either requirement are provided for. The Board would be authorized to permit a bank to reduce its liquidity if the Board deemed it advisable to enable the bank to meet requests for withdrawal, and would be authorized to suspend any part or all of the requirements in time of national emergency or unusual economic stress, but not beyond the duration of such emergency or stress.

Chapter 8. Taxation

Section 81. State Taxation. Section 81 provides that no State or political subdivision thereof shall permit any tax on Federal savings banks or their franchises, surplus, deposits, assets, reserves, loans, or income greater than the least onerous on any other thrift institution. It further provides that no State other than the State of domicile shall permit any tax on such items in the case of Federal savings banks whose transactions within such State do not constitute doing business, except that the act is not to exempt foreclosed properties from specified types of taxation. The section also defines "doing business" and other terms used in the section.

TITLE II

Section 201. Change of Name of Insurance Corporation. Section 201 would change the name of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, which is more accurately descriptive of its function.

Section 202. Mergers and Similar Transactions Involving Insured Institutions. Section 202 would provide, for institutions insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation (which would include but would not be limited to Federal savings banks), ground rules for mergers and similar transactions which would parallel those laid down for insured banks of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by Public Law 89-356, commonly known as the Bank Merger Act of 1966, which made amendments to subsection (c) of section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

Under the new provision, which would add to the National Housing Act a new section 410, an institution insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation could not, except with approval of said Corporation, merge or consolidate with another institution, assume liability to pay deposits, share accounts, or similar liabilities of another institution, or transfer assets to another institution in consideration of assumption of liabilities for any portion of the deposits, share accounts, or similar liabilities of such insured institution. Notice of any proposed transaction of this kind (referred to in the new section as a merger transaction) would, unless the Corporation found it must act immediately to prevent probable failure of an institution involved, be required to be published as set forth in the section in a newspaper of general circulation in the community or communities of the main offices of the institutions, or, if there was no such newspaper, in the newspaper of general circulation published nearest thereto.

Before acting, the Corporation, unless it found that it must so act immediately must request a report from the Attorney General on the competitive factors involved. The report is to be furnished within 30 calendar days from the request, or within ten days if the Corporation advises the Attorney General that an emergency exists requiring expeditious action. Under subsection (d), the Corporation could not approve any proposed merger transaction which would result in a monopoly or would be in furtherance of any combination or conspiracy to monopolize or attempt to monopolize the business or thrift institutions in any part of the United States. Further, it could not approve any other proposed merger transaction whose effect in any section of the country might be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly or would in any other manner be in restraint of trade, unless it found that the anticompetitive effects were clearly outweighed in the public interest by the probable effect of the transaction in meeting the convenience and needs of the community to be served. The same subsection would direct the Corporation to take into consideration in every case the financial and managerial resources and future prospects of the existing and proposed institutions and the convenience and needs of the community.

The Corporation would be required to give immediate notice to the Attorney General of any approval of a proposed merger transaction. If the Corporation found it must act immediately and the report on competitive factors had been dispensed with, the transaction could be consummated immediately on approval by the Corporation. If the Corporation had advised the Attorney General of the existence of an emergency requiring expeditious action and had requested such report within ten days, the transaction could not be consummated before the fifth calendar day after such approval. In other cases it could not be consummated before the thirtieth calendar day after such approval.

Any action brought under the antitrust laws arising out of a merger transaction must be commenced prior to the earliest time under which a merger transaction so approved might be consummated and the commencement of such an action would stay the effectiveness of the approval unless the court specifically ordered otherwise. In any such action, the section provides, the court "shall review de novo the issues presented." In any judicial attack on an approved merger transaction on the ground that such transaction alone and of itself constituted a violation of antitrust laws other than section 2 of the Sherman Act, the standards applied by the court must be identical with those the Corporation is directed to apply under subsection (d).

On the consummation of a merger transaction in compliance with the section and after the termination of any antitrust litigation commenced within the period prescribed (or on the termination of such period if no such litigation is commenced therein) the transaction cannot thereafter be attacked in a judicial proceedings on the ground that it alone and of itself constituted a violation of antitrust laws other than said section 2. However, the provisions of the new section are not to exempt any resulting institution from complying with the antitrust laws after the consummation of the merger transaction. In any action brought under the antitrust laws arising out of a merger transaction so approved by the Corporation, the Corporation and any State banking supervisory agency having jurisdiction within the State involved may appear as a party of its own motion and as right and be represented by its counsel. The section does not contain any provision purporting to validate any merger transaction consummated before its enactment.

For the purposes of the new section "antitrust laws" would mean the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and "any other Acts in pari materia". The Corporation must include in its annual report to the Congress a description of each merger transaction approved by it during the period covered by the report, with (1) the name and resources of each institution, (2) whether a report was so submitted by the Attorney General and, if so, any summary by him of the substance thereof, and (3) a statement by the Corporation of the basis for its approval.

Section 203. Insurance by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation. Section 203 would require the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation to insure the deposits of each Federal savings bank and authorize it to insure the deposits of mutual savings banks chartered or organized under the laws of the States, the District of Columbia, and the territories and possessions.

Section 204. Conforming Amendments to Section 406 of National Housing Act. Section 204 would make conforming amendments to provisions of section 406 of the National Housing Act affected by the extension of insurance under title IV of that act to deposits in Federal savings banks and mutual savings banks of the States, the District of Columbia, and the territories and possession.

Section 205. Conforming Amendment to Section 407 of National Housing Act. Section 205 of the draft bill would amend section 407 of the National Housing Act (relating to termination of insurance of accounts by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation) so as to include Federal savings banks along with Federal savings and loan associations among the institutions which cannot voluntarily terminate their insurance with the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation.

Section 206. Change of Insurance From Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to Federal Savings Insurance Corporation. Section 206 provides that when a State-chartered mutual savings bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation qualifies to be insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation or is converted into a Federal savings bank or merged or consolidated into a Federal savings bank or a savings bank which is, or within sixty days becomes, an insured institution under section 401 of the National Housing Act (relating to the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation), the FDIC shall calculate the amount in its capital account attributable to such mutual savings bank, as set forth in the draft bill. This amount is to be paid, as set forth in the draft bill, by the FDIC to the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation.

Section 207. Eligibility of Mutual Savings Banks for FDIC Insurance. Section 207 would end the future eligibility for FDIC insurance of those mutual savings banks which the draft bill would make eligible for Federal Savings Insurance Corporation insurance. It would not affect the FDIC insurance of mutual savings banks which on the effective date of the new provisions were insured by the FDIC.

Section 208. Amendment of Criminal Provisions. Section 208 would amend a number of specified provisions of title 18 of the United States Code, which relates to crimes and criminal penalties. The principal object of these amendments is to extend those provisions so as to make them applicable to Federal Home Loan Bank members and institutions insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, which would have the effect of making them applicable to Federal savings banks since all such banks would be required by the draft bill to have such membership and insurance.

Section 209. Amendment of Section 602 of Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. Paragraph (11) of section 502 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (which section was renumbered as section 602 by section 6 of the Act of September 5, 1950, 64 Stat. 578) provided that nothing in said 1949 act should affect or impair any authority of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or any officer or constituent agency therein, with respect to the disposal of residential property, or of other property (real or personal) held as part of or acquired for or in connection with residential property, or in connection with the insurance of mortgages, loans, or "savings and loan accounts" under the National Housing Act. Although the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (whose name would be changed to Federal Savings Insurance Corporation by this draft bill) ceased to be a constituent of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, subsection (b) of section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as added by section 109 of the Housing Amendments of 1955, preserved the applicability of the exemption to the Corporation. Section 209 of the draft bill would change the language "savings and loan accounts" in said paragraph (11) to read "savings and loan or other accounts" so as to make the exemption applicable with respect to the operations of the Corporation in connection with Federal savings banks. The last sentence of said section 209 has been included because the present applicability of the exemption is by means of saving provisions.

Section 210. Technical Provisions. Section 210 provides that headings and tables shall not be deemed to be a part of the act and that no inference, implication, or presumption shall arise by reason thereof or by reason of the location or grouping of any section, provision, or portion of the act or of any title of the act.

Section 211. Separability. Section 211, the last section, is a separability provision along usual lines.

JUNE 1, 1967.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 207

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 2508.

My amendment would change one of the interim standards specified in section 2 of H.R. 2508. It would establish as a standard to be followed in the creation of congressional districts for the 91st and 92d Congresses a 15-percent maximum by which a congressional district's population could deviate—either greater or less—from the average population of the State's districts. This standard would replace the present standard in section 2 whereby the district with the largest population shall not exceed the population of the district with the smallest population by more than 35 percent.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks and that a table prepared by the Bureau of the Census, "Population of Congressional Districts for the 90th Congress: 1960 and 1950" be printed immediately thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment and table will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 207) is as follows:

Beginning with line 13, page 3, strike out all to and including the word "persons" in line 15, page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "No district of any State may have a population which is more than 15 per centum greater or less than the average population of all districts of that State."

The table, presented by Mr. SCOTT, is as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Population of congressional districts for the 90th Cong., 1960 and 1950*

[Minus sign (—) denotes decrease or percent below State average district population. An asterisk (*) identifies a State which redistricted for the 90th Cong.]

State and congressional district	1960	1950	Increase, 1950-60		Percent deviation from State average district population
			Number	Percent	
*Alabama	3,266,740	3,061,743	204,997	6.7	(1)
1st	414,392	341,625	72,767	21.3	1.5
2d	386,075	370,389	15,686	4.2	—5.5
3d	383,782	378,189	5,593	1.5	—6.0
4th	403,961	386,111	17,850	4.6	—1.1
5th	435,092	420,388	14,704	3.5	6.6
6th	442,761	393,080	49,681	12.6	8.4
7th	417,052	450,502	—33,450	—7.4	2.1
8th	383,625	321,459	62,166	19.3	—6.1
Alaska (1 Representative at Large)	226,167	128,643	97,524	75.8	(1)
*Arizona	1,302,161	749,587	552,574	73.7	(1)
1st	456,529	251,361	205,168	81.6	5.2
2d	440,415	253,245	187,170	73.9	1.5
3d	405,217	244,981	160,236	65.4	—6.6
*Arkansas	1,786,272	1,909,511	—123,239	—6.5	(1)
1st	444,094	509,174	—65,080	—12.8	—.6
2d	443,892	431,299	12,593	2.9	—.6
3d	444,719	490,189	—45,470	—9.3	—.4
4th	453,567	478,849	—25,282	—5.3	1.6
California	15,717,204	10,586,223	5,130,981	48.5	(1)
1st	533,807	353,800	180,007	46.9	29.1
2d	406,506	329,060	77,446	23.5	—1.7
3d	502,778	277,140	225,638	81.4	21.6
4th	310,669	234,712	75,957	32.4	—24.9
5th	301,872	350,079	—48,207	—13.8	—27.0
6th	438,444	425,278	13,166	3.1	6.0
7th	333,530	363,438	—29,908	—8.2	—19.4
8th	373,286	308,376	64,910	21.0	—9.7
9th	383,498	188,501	194,997	103.4	—7.3
10th	460,210	170,547	289,663	169.8	11.3
11th	444,387	235,659	208,728	88.6	7.4
12th	379,010	262,819	116,191	44.2	—8.4
13th	368,100	212,867	155,233	72.9	—11.0
14th	409,030	298,984	110,046	36.8	—1.1
15th	407,283	327,981	79,302	24.2	—1.5
16th	496,859	383,259	113,600	29.6	20.1
17th	376,115	203,648	172,467	84.7	—9.1
18th	510,341	424,341	86,000	20.3	23.4
19th	377,991	156,101	221,890	142.1	—8.6
20th	388,171	338,080	50,091	14.8	—6.2
21st	364,865	373,755	—8,890	—2.4	—11.8
22d	393,907	122,549	271,358	221.4	—4.8
23d	408,099	293,589	114,510	39.0	—1.3
24th	399,322	248,262	151,060	60.8	—3.5
25th	372,357	128,107	244,250	190.7	—10.0
26th	388,421	309,606	78,815	25.5	—6.1
27th	360,558	199,528	161,030	80.7	—12.8
28th	588,933	358,883	230,050	64.1	42.4
29th	396,813	357,253	39,560	11.1	—4.1
30th	391,541	436,243	—44,702	—10.2	—5.3
31st	396,220	331,337	64,883	19.6	—4.2
32d	435,458	294,746	140,712	47.7	5.3
33d	503,591	281,642	221,949	78.8	21.8
34th	447,421	110,011	337,410	306.7	8.2
35th	473,511	206,233	267,278	129.6	14.5
36th	420,015	231,149	188,866	81.7	1.5
37th	395,989	225,639	170,350	75.5	—4.3
38th	378,296	233,021	145,275	62.3	—8.5
Colorado	1,753,947	1,325,089	428,858	32.4	(1)
1st	493,887	415,786	78,101	18.8	12.6
2d	438,974	200,481	238,493	119.0	.1
3d	415,187	339,290	75,897	22.4	—5.3
4th	405,899	369,532	36,367	9.8	—7.4
Connecticut	2,535,234	2,007,280	527,954	26.3	(1)
1st	422,766	348,822	73,944	21.2	.1
2d	411,919	318,621	93,298	29.3	—2.5
3d	409,693	335,107	74,586	22.3	—3.0
4th	482,135	391,767	90,368	23.1	14.1
5th	404,520	312,633	91,887	29.4	—4.3
6th	404,201	300,330	103,871	34.6	—4.3
Delaware (1 Representative at Large)	446,292	318,085	128,207	40.3	(1)
*Florida	4,951,560	2,771,305	2,180,255	78.7	(1)
1st	379,288	249,543	129,745	52.0	—8.1
2d	443,885	380,032	63,853	16.8	7.6
3d	455,411	304,029	151,382	49.8	10.4
4th	412,021	260,073	151,948	58.4	—.1
5th	374,975	138,603	236,372	170.5	—9.1
6th	397,788	249,894	147,894	59.2	—3.6
7th	386,593	220,479	166,114	75.3	—6.3
8th	374,665	159,249	215,416	135.3	—9.3
9th	410,020	200,429	209,591	104.6	—.6
10th	387,459	88,004	299,455	340.3	—6.1
11th	475,640	267,154	208,486	78.0	15.3
12th	453,815	253,816	199,999	78.8	10 0
Georgia	3,943,116	3,444,578	498,538	14.5	(1)
1st	420,294	393,068	27,226	6.9	6.6
2d	358,133	350,784	7,349	2.1	—9.2
3d	357,295	306,974	50,321	16.4	—9.4
4th	418,131	281,220	136,911	48.7	6.0
5th	405,549	337,211	68,338	20.3	2.8
6th	455,575	402,519	53,056	13.2	15.5
7th	450,740	367,598	83,142	22.6	14.3
8th	338,848	319,143	19,705	6.2	—14.1
9th	329,738	305,991	23,747	7.8	—16.4
10th	408,813	380,070	28,743	7.6	3.7
Hawaii (2 Representatives at Large)	632,772	499,794	132,978	26.6	(1)
*Idaho	667,191	588,637	78,554	13.4	(1)
1st	364,984	318,024	46,960	14.8	9.4
2d	302,207	270,613	31,594	11.7	—9.4
*Illinois	10,081,158	8,712,176	1,368,982	15.7	(1)
1st	412,259	486,162	—73,903	—15.2	—1.9
2d	422,395	394,810	27,585	7.0	.6
3d	425,533	342,071	83,462	24.4	1.3
4th	422,612	205,221	217,391	105.9	.6
5th	400,642	343,244	57,398	16.7	—4.6
6th	419,840	409,329	10,511	2.6	(2)
7th	415,591	480,867	—65,276	—13.6	—1.1
8th	451,092	493,810	—42,718	—8.7	7.4
9th	451,042	485,518	—34,476	—7.1	7.4
10th	433,497	273,411	160,086	58.6	3.2
11th	451,322	397,099	54,223	13.7	7.4
12th	394,714	237,468	157,246	66.2	—6.0
13th	407,052	189,535	217,517	114.8	—3.1
14th	439,182	249,818	189,364	75.8	4.6
15th	410,650	323,111	87,539	27.1	—2.2
16th	394,481	321,365	73,116	22.8	—6.1
17th	428,519	362,355	66,164	18.3	2.0
18th	401,503	361,015	40,488	11.2	—4.4
19th	410,402	375,239	35,163	9.4	—2.3
20th	401,919	387,987	13,932	3.6	—4.3
21st	417,760	463,577	—45,817	—9.9	—.5
22d	441,332	387,958	53,374	13.8	5.1
23d	412,709	408,500	4,209	1.0	—1.7
24th	415,110	332,706	82,404	24.8	—1.2
*Indiana	4,662,498	3,934,224	728,274	18.5	(1)
1st	454,208	334,286	119,922	35.9	7.2
2d	431,064	351,866	79,198	22.5	1.7
3d	384,079	326,616	57,463	17.6	—9.4
4th	450,937	370,594	80,343	21.7	6.4
5th	426,110	359,306	66,804	18.6	.5
6th	438,961	292,543	146,418	50.1	3.6
7th	369,663	360,163	9,500	2.6	—12.8
8th	443,252	430,003	13,249	3.1	4.6
9th	424,933	370,197	54,736	14.8	.3
10th	406,218	330,641	75,577	22.9	—4.2
11th	433,073	408,009	25,064	6.1	2.2
Iowa	2,757,537	2,621,073	136,464	5.2	(1)
1st	403,048	372,574	30,474	8.2	2.3
2d	442,406	391,765	50,641	12.9	12.3
3d	403,442	377,677	25,765	6.8	2.4
4th	366,119	376,569	—10,450	—2.8	—7.1
5th	391,489	342,684	48,805	14.2	—.6
6th	397,877	398,409	—532	—0.1	1.0
7th	353,156	361,395	—8,239	—2.3	—10.4
*Kansas	2,178,611	1,905,299	273,312	14.3	(1)
1st	435,145	424,489	10,656	2.5	—.1
2d	450,661	395,555	55,106	13.9	3.4
3d	394,056	294,380	99,676	33.9	—9.6
4th	453,901	352,909	100,992	28.6	4.2
5th	444,848	437,966	6,882	1.6	2.1
*Kentucky	3,038,156	2,944,806	93,350	3.2	(1)
1st	437,135	429,362	7,773	1.8	.7
2d	421,346	383,752	37,594	9.8	—2.9
3d	432,494	415,811	16,683	4.0	—.4
4th	457,688	310,340	147,348	47.5	5.5
5th	417,544	503,399	—85,855	—17.1	—3.8
6th	427,128	389,480	37,648	9.7	—1.6
7th	444,821	512,662	—67,841	—13.2	2.5
Louisiana	3,257,022	2,683,516	573,506	21.4	(1)
1st	449,491	350,311	99,180	28.3	10.4
2d	499,561	392,891	106,670	27.2	22.7
3d	387,207	299,747	87,460	29.2	—4.9
4th	391,541	333,069	58,472	17.6	—3.8
5th	345,013	323,891	21,122	6.5	—15.3
6th	536,029	417,898	118,131	28.3	31.7
7th	384,330	315,933	68,397	21.6	—5.6
8th	263,850	249,776	14,074	5.6	—35.2

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Population of congressional districts for the 90th Cong., 1960 and 1950*—Continued

[Minus sign (—) denotes decrease or percent below State average district population. An asterisk (*) identifies a State which redistricted for the 90th Cong.]

State and congressional district	1960	1950	Increase, 1950 to 1960		Percent deviation from State average district population
			Number	Percent	
Maine	969,265	913,774	55,491	6.1	(1)
1st	463,800	435,346	28,454	6.5	—4.3
2d	505,465	478,428	27,037	5.7	4.3
***Maryland**	3,100,689	2,343,001	757,688	32.3	(1)
1st	388,478	309,421	79,057	25.5	.2
2d	393,210	231,583	161,627	69.8	1.5
3d	385,209	376,835	8,374	2.2	—.6
4th	382,881	359,043	23,838	6.6	—1.2
5th	389,967	217,597	172,370	79.2	.6
6th	384,927	331,606	53,321	16.1	—.7
7th	388,433	323,887	64,546	19.9	.2
8th	387,584	193,029	194,555	100.8	(2)
Massachusetts	5,148,578	4,690,514	458,064	9.8	(1)
1st	376,336	350,567	25,769	7.4	—12.3
2d	388,578	323,451	65,127	20.1	—9.4
3d	441,558	368,650	72,908	19.8	2.9
4th	444,069	386,323	57,746	14.9	3.5
5th	450,716	366,311	84,405	23.0	5.1
6th	452,956	408,322	44,634	10.9	5.6
7th	392,350	379,526	12,824	3.4	—8.6
8th	420,596	488,866	—68,270	—14.0	—2.0
9th	478,962	544,910	—65,948	—12.1	11.6
10th	456,308	396,347	59,961	15.1	6.4
11th	441,180	348,522	92,658	26.6	2.8
12th	404,969	328,719	76,250	23.2	—5.6
Michigan	7,823,194	6,371,760	1,451,428	22.8	(1)
1st	416,667	471,072	—54,405	—11.5	1.2
2d	414,385	317,392	96,993	30.6	.6
3d	416,580	337,221	79,359	23.5	1.2
4th	404,898	327,753	77,145	23.5	—1.7
5th	406,319	326,450	79,869	24.5	—1.3
6th	408,117	334,533	73,584	22.0	—.9
7th	416,239	306,757	109,482	35.7	1.1
8th	407,578	347,358	60,220	17.3	—1.0
9th	404,789	341,402	63,387	18.6	—1.7
10th	403,263	341,726	61,537	18.0	—2.1
11th	403,469	390,743	12,726	3.3	—2.0
12th	411,800	190,052	221,748	116.7	(2)
13th	416,452	566,495	—150,043	—26.5	1.1
14th	417,026	421,315	—4,289	—1.0	1.3
15th	413,573	188,200	225,373	119.8	.4
16th	414,872	374,091	40,781	10.9	.8
17th	415,948	353,750	62,198	17.6	1.0
18th	416,830	223,726	193,104	86.3	1.2
19th	414,389	211,730	202,659	95.7	.6
Minnesota	3,413,864	2,982,483	431,381	14.5	(1)
1st	438,835	371,792	67,043	18.0	2.8
2d	375,475	349,852	25,623	7.3	—12.0
3d	445,898	190,440	255,458	134.1	4.5
4th	474,957	389,876	85,081	21.8	11.3
5th	482,872	521,718	—38,846	—7.4	13.2
6th	420,235	407,048	13,187	3.2	—1.5
7th	377,675	393,665	—15,990	—4.1	—11.5
8th	397,917	358,092	39,825	11.1	—6.8
Mississippi	2,178,141	2,178,91 4	—773	(2)	(1)
1st	449,361	474,630	—25,269	—5.3	3.2
2d	427,468	467,738	—40,270	—8.6	—1.9
3d	428,447	390,684	37,763	9.7	—1.6
4th	423,300	463,590	—40,290	—8.7	—2.8
5th	449,565	382,272	67,293	17.6	3.2
Missouri	4,319,813	3,954,653	365,160	9.2	(1)
1st	475,667	391,207	84,460	21.6	10.1
2d	460,501	300,060	160,441	53.5	6.6
3d	469,888	563,872	—93,984	—16.7	8.8
4th	402,526	292,947	109,579	37.4	—6.8
5th	406,067	417,918	—11,851	—2.8	—6.0
6th	394,236	373,982	20,254	5.4	—8.7
7th	425,820	427,301	—1,481	—.3	—1.4
8th	443,747	374,175	69,572	18.6	2.7
9th	451,121	388,781	62,340	16.0	4.4
10th	390,240	424,410	—34,170	—8.1	—9.7
***Montana**	674,767	591,024	83,743	14.2	(1)
1st	327,066	298,229	28,837	9.7	—3.1
2d	347,701	292,795	54,906	18.8	3.1
Nebraska	1,411,330	1,325,510	85,820	6.5	(1)
1st	530,507	506,203	24,304	4.8	12.8
2d	404,695	324,585	80,110	24.7	—14.0
3d	476,128	494,722	—18,594	—3.8	1.2
Nevada (1 Representative at Large)	285,278	160,083	125,195	78.2	
New Hampshire	606,921	533,242	73,679	13.8	(1)
1st	331,818	276,945	54,873	19.8	9.3
2d	275,103	256,297	18,806	7.3	—9.3
***New Jersey**	6,066,782	4,835,329	1,231,453	25.5	(1)
1st	394,619	302,068	92,551	30.6	—2.4
2d	374,996	307,635	67,361	21.9	—7.3
3d	413,388	267,868	145,520	54.3	2.2
4th	432,974	361,314	71,660	19.8	7.1
5th	405,533	263,423	142,110	53.9	.3
6th	439,756	266,519	173,237	65.0	8.7
7th	384,398	211,333	173,065	81.9	—5.0
8th	406,618	337,093	69,525	20.6	.5
9th	395,857	327,806	68,051	20.8	—2.1
10th	427,513	434,021	—6,508	—1.5	5.7
11th	426,402	429,177	—2,775	—.6	5.4
12th	398,557	276,138	122,419	44.3	—1.5
13th	388,804	385,985	2,819	.7	—3.9
14th	397,258	426,203	—28,945	—6.8	—1.8
15th	380,109	238,746	141,363	59.2	—6.0
New Mexico (2 Representatives at Large)	951,023	681,187	269,836	39.6	(1)
New York	16,782,304	14,830,192	1,952,112	13.2	(1)
1st	398,254	183,067	215,187	117.5	—2.7
2d	372,645	113,451	259,194	228.5	—9.0
3d	399,067	202,134	196,933	97.4	—2.5
4th	393,811	196,626	197,185	100.3	—3.8
5th	403,178	253,616	149,562	59.0	—1.5
6th	417,367	335,380	81,987	24.4	2.0
7th	459,844	436,014	23,830	5.5	12.3
8th	432,776	307,779	124,997	40.6	5.7
9th	428,700	417,677	11,023	2.6	4.7
10th	422,745	414,241	8,504	2.1	3.3
11th	403,790	394,497	9,293	2.4	—1.4
12th	471,001	505,810	—34,809	—6.9	15.1
13th	455,172	459,287	—4,115	—.9	11.2
14th	463,957	511,938	—47,981	—9.4	13.3
15th	350,635	375,941	—25,306	—6.7	—14.3
16th	352,901	322,015	30,886	9.6	—13.8
17th	382,320	449,591	—67,271	—15.0	—6.6
18th	431,330	501,581	—70,251	—14.0	5.4
19th	455,175	518,270	—73,095	—14.1	8.8
20th	439,456	490,659	—51,203	—10.4	7.4
21st	361,069	397,308	—36,239	—9.1	—11.8
22d	359,751	384,555	—24,804	—6.5	—12.1
23d	353,809	337,687	16,122	4.8	—13.6
24th	350,186	331,727	18,459	5.6	—14.4
25th	438,409	325,842	112,567	34.5	7.1
26th	402,204	320,281	81,923	25.6	—1.7
27th	409,349	326,682	82,667	25.3	(2)
28th	396,122	324,032	72,090	22.2	—3.2
29th	452,826	411,859	40,967	9.9	10.6
30th	460,748	407,683	53,065	13.0	12.6
31st	353,183	328,950	24,233	7.4	—13.7
32d	385,406	330,476	54,930	16.6	—5.8
33d	415,333	360,813	54,520	15.1	1.5
34th	423,028	341,719	81,309	23.8	3.3
35th	386,148	363,829	22,319	6.1	—5.7
36th	410,943	340,737	70,206	20.6	.4
37th	410,432	354,713	55,719	15.7	.3
38th	382,277	362,495	19,782	5.5	—6.6
39th	436,243	283,107	153,136	54.1	6.6
40th	435,282	319,572	115,710	36.2	6.3
41st	435,432	486,551	—51,119	—10.5	6.4
***North Carolina**	4,556 155	4,061,929	494,226	12.1	(1)
1st	384,300	372,585	11,715	3.1	—7.2
2d	419,370	413,174	6,196	1.5	1.2
3d	377,293	309,777	67,516	21.8	—8.9
4th	416,477	357,389	59,088	16.5	.6
5th	439,672	379,341	60,331	15.9	6.2
6th	411,687	324,521	87,166	26.9	—.6
7th	448,933	388,701	60,232	15.5	8.4
8th	409,759	332,923	76,836	23.1	—1.1
9th	419,416	396,439	22,977	5.8	1.3
10th	409,174	366,714	42,460	11.6	—1.2
11th	420,074	420,365	—2,192	—.1	1.4
North Dakota	632,446	619,636	12,810	2.1	(1)
1st	333,290	330,626	2,664	.8	5.4
2d	299,156	289,010	10,146	3.5	—5.4
***Ohio**	9,706,397	7,946,627	1,759,770	22.1	(1)
1st	417,614	375,362	42,252	11.3	3.3
2d	446,507	348,590	97,917	28.1	10.4
3d	439,438	348,129	91,309	26.2	8.7
4th	354,129	307,400	46,729	15.2	—12.4
5th	354,537	302,584	51,953	17.2	—12.3
6th	380,847	316,937	63,910	20.2	—5.8
7th	369,910	297,234	72,676	24.5	—8.5
8th	414,929	344,491	70,438	20.4	2.6

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Population of congressional districts for the 90th Cong., 1960 and 1950*—Continued

[Minus sign (—) denotes decrease or percent below State average district population. An asterisk (*) identifies a State which redistricted for the 90th Cong.]

State and congressional district	1960	1950	Increase, 1950 to 1960 Number	Increase, 1950 to 1960 Percent	Percent deviation from State average district population
*Ohio—Continued					
9th	456,931	395,551	61,380	15.5	13.0
10th	366,741	339,509	27,232	8.0	—9.3
11th	436,933	276,223	160,710	58.2	8.0
12th	319,968	211,446	108,522	51.3	—20.9
13th	398,141	280,497	117,644	41.9	—1.6
14th	457,774	379,083	78,691	20.8	13.2
15th	362,994	291,964	71,030	24.3	—10.2
16th	434,465	349,306	85,159	24.4	7.4
17th	414,871	360,576	54,295	15.1	2.6
18th	411,103	399,641	11,462	2.9	1.6
19th	435,743	369,471	66,272	17.9	7.7
20th	439,835	440,080	—245	—.1	8.8
21st	426,216	366,505	59,711	16.3	5.4
22d	396,089	335,315	60,774	18.1	—2.1
23d	385,755	247,632	138,123	55.8	—4.6
24th	384,927	263,101	121,826	46.3	—4.8
Oklahoma	2,328,284	2,233,351	94,933	4.3	(1)
1st	521,542	439,518	82,024	18.7	34.4
2d	368,976	394,872	—25,896	—6.6	—4.9
3d	227,692	266,995	—39,303	—14.7	—41.3
4th	252,208	294,577	—42,369	—14.4	—35.0
5th	552,863	436,620	116,243	26.6	42.5
6th	405,003	400,769	4,234	1.0	4.4
*Oregon	1,768,687	1,521,341	247,346	16.3	(1)
1st	468,809	401,670	67,139	16.7	6.0
2d	444,919	403,101	41,818	10.4	.6
3d	450,794	402,880	47,914	11.9	1.9
4th	404,165	313,690	90,475	28.8	—8.6
*Pennsylvania	11,319,366	10,498,012	821,354	7.8	(1)
1st	399,628	443,620	—43,992	—9.9	—4.7
2d	406,028	396,864	9,164	2.3	—3.2
3d	396,538	500,349	—103,811	—20.7	—5.4
4th	383,154	277,612	105,542	38.0	—8.6
5th	417,164	453,160	—35,996	—7.9	—.5
6th	448,441	456,317	—7,876	—1.7	7.0
7th	390,008	283,295	106,713	37.7	—7.0
8th	356,821	171,428	185,393	8.1	—14.9
9th	373,754	290,080	83,674	28.8	—10.8
10th	419,666	436,976	—17,310	—4.0	.1
11th	453,350	503,259	—49,909	—9.9	8.1
12th	482,201	473,004	9,197	1.9	15.0
13th	481,547	336,186	145,361	43.2	14.9
14th	390,512	459,130	—68,618	—14.9	—6.9
15th	455,396	407,297	48,099	11.8	8.6
16th	390,436	332,877	57,559	17.3	—6.9
17th	480,834	461,734	19,100	4.1	14.7
18th	409,291	312,253	97,038	31.1	—2.4
19th	415,058	341,391	73,667	21.6	—1.0
20th	404,997	417,961	—12,964	—3.1	—3.4
21st	359,731	320,240	39,491	12.3	—14.2
22d	442,373	454,980	—12,607	—2.8	5.5
23d	429,009	416,324	12,685	3.0	2.3
24th	456,157	410,290	45,867	11.2	8.8
25th	434,552	377,632	56,920	15.1	3.7
26th	418,933	437,860	—18,927	—4.3	—.1
27th	423,787	325,893	97,894	30.0	1.1
Rhode Island	859,488	791,896	67,592	8.5	(1)
1st	399,296	374,559	24,737	6.6	—7.1
2d	460,192	417,337	43,855	10.3	7.1
*South Carolina	2,382,594	2,117,027	265,567	12.5	(1)
1st	421,478	345,953	75,525	21.8	6.1
2d	375,576	305,122	70,454	23.1	—5.6
3d	399,847	360,856	38,991	10.8	.7
4th	414,215	365,475	48,740	13.3	4.3
5th	377,176	355,527	21,649	6.1	—5.0
6th	394,302	384,094	10,208	2.7	—.7
*South Dakota	680,514	652,740	27,774	4.3	(1)
1st	351,901	344,046	7,855	2.3	3.4
2d	328,613	308,694	19,919	6.5	—3.4
*Tennessee	3,567,089	3,291,718	275,371	8.4	(1)
1st	441,516	409,383	32,133	7.8	11.4
2d	453,298	438,021	15,277	3.5	14.4
3d	436,421	403,831	32,590	8.1	10.1
*Tennessee—Continued					
4th	411,585	402,909	8,676	2.2	3.8
5th	399,743	321,758	77,985	24.2	.9
6th	341,468	337,568	3,900	1.2	—13.8
7th	343,843	297,302	46,541	15.6	—13.2
5th	380,636	360,685	19,951	5.5	—4.0
9th	358,579	320,261	38,318	12.0	—9.5
*Texas	9,579,677	7,711,194	1,868,483	24.2	(1)
1st	378,334	430,764	—52,430	—12.2	—9.2
2d	387,794	368,945	18,849	5.1	—6.9
3d	407,990	296,330	111,660	37.7	—2.0
4th	411,041	407,109	3,932	1.0	—1.3
5th	423,079	272,644	150,435	55.2	1.6
6th	379,731	316,884	62,847	19.8	—8.8
7th	416,218	285,505	130,713	45.8	—.1
8th	409,498	321,127	88,371	27.5	—1.7
9th	454,784	359,060	95,724	26.7	9.2
10th	456,301	418,920	37,381	8.9	9.6
11th	389,954	356,963	32,991	9.2	—6.4
12th	439,500	312,315	127,185	40.7	5.5
13th	380,542	317,757	62,785	19.8	—8.6
14th	459,050	340,454	118,596	34.8	10.2
15th	418,183	362,096	56,087	15.5	.4
16th	394,679	266,354	128,325	48.2	—5.2
17th	376,200	363,546	12,654	3.5	—9.7
18th	394,582	317,056	77,526	24.5	—5.3
19th	425,517	298,703	126,814	42.5	2.2
20th	450,994	411,337	39,657	9.6	8.3
21st	453,334	307,652	145,682	47.4	8.8
22d	417,442	200,069	217,373	108.7	.2
23d	454,930	379,604	75,326	19.8	9.2
*Utah	890,627	688,862	201,765	29.3	(1)
1st	451,864	359,629	92,235	25.6	1.5
2d	438,763	329,233	109,530	33.3	—1.5
Vermont (1 Representative at Large)	389,881	377,747	12,134	3.2	(1)
*Virginia	3,966,949	3,318,680	648,269	19.5	(1)
1st	401,052	285,644	115,408	40.4	1.1
2d	419,642	293,552	126,090	43.0	5.8
3d	408,494	328,050	80,444	24.5	3.0
4th	386,184	401,329	—15,145	—3.8	—2.6
5th	386,179	375,917	10,262	2.7	—2.7
6th	381,611	343,444	38,167	11.1	—3.8
7th	377,511	345,718	31,793	9.2	—4.8
8th	400,812	289,665	111,147	38.4	1.0
9th	386,948	413,707	—26,759	—6.5	—2.5
10th	418,516	241,654	176,862	73.2	5.5
Washington	2,853,214	2,378,963	474,251	19.9	(1)
1st	420,548	342,766	77,782	22.7	3.2
2d	366,395	283,392	83,003	29.3	—10.1
3d	342,540	321,162	21,378	6.7	—16.0
4th	414,764	357,416	57,348	16.0	1.8
5th	399,093	341,869	57,224	16.7	—2.1
6th	399,362	346,697	52,665	15.2	—2.0
7th	510,512	385,661	124,851	32.4	25.2
West Virginia	1,860,421	2,005,552	—145,131	—7.2	(1)
1st	408,794	433,437	—24,643	—5.7	9.9
2d	329,612	360,834	—31,222	—8.7	—11.4
3d	396,871	411,732	—14,861	—3.6	6.7
4th	422,046	425,951	—3,905	—.9	13.4
5th	303,098	373,598	—70,500	—18.9	—18.5
Wisconsin	3,951,777	3,434,575	517,202	15.1	(1)
1st	408,677	319,185	89,492	28.0	3.4
2d	397,918	328,232	69,686	21.2	.7
3d	381,830	383,457	—1,627	—0.4	—3.4
4th	396,763	312,226	84,537	27.1	.4
5th	399,374	429,359	—29,985	—7.0	1.1
6th	391,743	330,415	61,328	18.6	—.9
7th	387,077	375,278	11,799	3.1	—2.1
8th	400,567	347,122	53,445	15.4	1.4
9th	398,153	215,363	182,790	84.9	.8
10th	389,675	393,938	—4,263	—1.1	—1.4
Wyoming (1 Representative at Large)	330,066	290,529	39,537	13.6	(1)

[1] Not applicable.

[2] Less than 0.1 percent.

HEARING ON COSTS AND DELIVERY OF HEALTH SERVICES TO OLDER AMERICANS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly of the Special Committee on Aging, I announce that a subcommittee hearing will be conducted on June 19 and 20. The hearing will be the first of several on the subject "Costs and Delivery of Health Services to Older Americans."

Our subcommittee study, coming as it does almost a year after the inauguration of medicare, is intended to improve our understanding of present inadequacies or difficulties in providing health services to the elderly and also to suggest actions that may be needed to solve present problems.

Our fundamental premise is that medicare—necessary and historic as it is—deals primarily only with financing of certain health care services, not with other basic needs. Medicaid, another important breakthrough, is very welcome, but does not necessarily improve the fundamental structure of health services, though it is of growing importance to the medically indigent.

What is needed now is a study of the organization of medical services as they affect the elderly, in hopes that we generate discussion of, and possibly answers to many questions, including:

Are rising medical costs causing special difficulties for the elderly?

Do many of the elderly face insuperable obstacles in obtaining needed health services?

Are present health services remote geographically and sociologically from many of our older persons?

Are present medicare and medicaid policies intensifying old problems in the organization of health services or causing entirely new problems?

Are shortages of trained personnel in the medical and medical-related professions especially severe in fields that serve the elderly?

Mr. President, it seems almost self-evident that the problems of medical care for the aged are more severe than for other groups because, in the words of a distinguished professor of public health, Milton I. Roemer, University of California, Los Angeles:

> (*a*) The illness burden is higher in this age group;
>
> (*b*) The economic resources are more limited; and
>
> (*c*) The simple problems of transportation and communication are more serious than in other age groups.

The subcommittee study is intended to explore the dimensions of such problems and determine whether strenuous actions should be taken in government and in private practice to provide more adequate and helpful services. I am pleased that our hearing will take place 1 week before the National Conference on Medical Costs. I believe that our deliberations will help focus attention on our older citizens, and to the relationship of costs to the organization of services.

I make this announcement, Mr. President, so as to invite oral testimony and written statements from Senators and others who may have a contribution to make to our hearing. I also wish to thank the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], new chairman of the Special Committee on Aging, for the support and enthusiastic assistance he is giving in this project, as he is doing with regard to other subcommittees of that committee.

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, one of the great universities of the world, the University of Michigan, is observing its 150th anniversary in this year, 1967.

Since its birth in Detroit in 1817, the university has been a source of great pride to the people of Michigan. In return, the university has developed outstanding leadership in almost every field of human endeavor.

A distinguished past is justifiable cause for pride on the part of any university, but the university that will be important in the future is the one which recognizes the nature of the world in which we live and strives to meet contemporary needs.

As was the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], I was graduated from the university's law school—the oldest law school west of the eastern seaboard. While this law school has a distinguished past, even more impressive, I suggest, is the way it has continually broadened its concerns and its service to meet the challenges of the future.

Since the close of World War II, expanding world trade, worldwide financial transactions, legal arrangements that transcend international boundaries, and the exploration of outer space have made it clear that previous concepts of legal education are too narrow to serve the needs of today. New courses being taught in the law school include "Tax Affairs of American Corporations Engaged in Foreign Trade" and "Antitrust Law in the European Common Market," for example.

For a number of years, the law school's publications have dealt with such subjects as Soviet legal institutions, American enterprise in the Common Market, and the growth of law relating to the use of atomic energy.

Leadership at the University of Michigan has been traditional. The university was the first in the country to give a course in "sanitary science," in 1883, and its hygienic laboratory was the second such laboratory established in the world.

From these beginnings has come today's School of Public Health, chosen a number of years ago to conduct the nationwide field trial of the Salk polio vaccine. Its faculty researchers did the basic work on the development of flu vaccines, and one of its faculty helped develop the whooping cough vaccine.

Mr. President, we all know the importance of training teachers for the challenging task of preparing our children for today and the future. The University of Michigan is credited with being the first American university to recognize the importance of professional training for teachers by establishing the Nation's first permanent professorship of the science and art of teaching, in 1879.

The list of leadership achievements by the University of Michigan is so long that it would take too long to catalog them all. Each of the schools at the university has good reason to be proud. And so do the people of Michigan.

In closing, I should like to point out two special areas in which the university has shown outstanding leadership—areas of interest which have particular significance today.

Through its highway safety research institute, the university has taken a leading role in searching for better answers to one of the most complex problems of our contemporary society—highway safety.

Established 2 years ago with initial gifts of $10 million from the automobile industry, the institute has moved swiftly to coordinate and organize a systems approach to the problems of highway safety.

Emphasis is being placed upon interrelationships of driver, vehicle, and external conditions—rather than upon a single factor at a time. The first of a series of symposia on problems of highway safety was held in Ann Arbor in April, bringing together experts from a variety of fields for consideration of the prevention of highway injury, with special attention to the topics of the alcoholic driver and vision, as well as biomechanics—the relationship of the human body to the machine.

The world's first course in aeronautical engineering was offered at the University of Michigan, in 1914. Since then the university has awarded nearly 3,000 degrees in aeronautical and aerospace engineering, since World War I.

Six of its graduates, including the late Col. Edward H. White, are among our astronauts.

Leadership, then, is accepted as an everyday responsibility at the University of Michigan. Its graduates and all the people of the United States have reason to be proud of its achievements over the past 150 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] in connection with the sesquicentennial of the University of Michigan be printed at this point in the RECORD. Senator HART is unable to deliver his remarks personally because he is in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HART

When a politician makes a statement about a constituent university, the result is as predictable as a bishop's evaluation of virtue.

In political rhetoric, clearly, even the tiniest college must become a "great hall of learning." And lest all those alumni and voting professors be offended, even the most doubtful institution must be searched for some admirable trait.

So what does a fellow do when a university comes along that is *really* great?

Well, he tries to find words that have not yet been eroded by overuse. And if he is a graduate of the place—as I am of the University of Michigan—he finds an additional complication: How can he describe the school as a "molder of great careers" without sounding somewhat self-congratulatory?

Happily the University of Michigan on its 150th birthday is in no great need of admiring words. Its reputation is solidly based on scholastic and scientific achievement . . . so solidly based, in fact, that its scholastic reputation in academics has handily survived even the great football years.

Every graduate carries a little of this reputation with him and U-M alumni are respectfully received in just about every quarter of the nation.

If I were to choose some part of the university for particular praise, it would be most natural for me to pick the law school, where I labored back in the thirties.

It is a superb law school that has launched innumerable brilliant legal careers. The course of training might have had a very benign effect on my own life had I kept different company.

But one of my classmates was a fellow who later became governor. G. Mennen Williams doubtlessly had good intentions when he offered me a job in state government but my willingness to be diverted from a wholesome legal career has doubtlessly been a disappointment to my professors and has provided no real test of the school's proficiency.

Certainly, I am willing to give the law school the highest recommendations but I have no guarantee that the law school would be willing to accept them.

But even though my professors might be hard put to find evidence of it, the disciplines of Michigan's legal training have been useful, indeed, to this lawmaker.

One of the characteristics most admired about Michigan, I think, has been its versatility, its willingness to undertake education in many different fields and its ability to do a good job in each of them.

One of these is certainly the School of Natural Resources, one of the schools that I have enjoyed a good deal of contact with since my arrival in Washington.

In fact, the state is indeed fortunate that its two largest universities—Michigan and Michigan State—have devoted so much attention to this area.

Water pollution control, for example, is a tremendously important item to a state surrounded by four quadrillion gallons of water, not counting its 11,000 inland lakes.

Conservation is tremendously important to a state that numbers tourism as its second largest industry.

Since it is not MSU's birthday, I will not dwell on its proficiency in this area in this statement, although its proficiency is considerable.

But U-M's work in this field should not pass without mention. Michigan was one of the first universities to give instruction in forestry, beginning in 1881. The school of Forestry became the School of Natural Resources in 1950 and now graduates some 500 students yearly.

This is good. We all know what a threat man is to his environment. And whatever this annual 500 can do to head off the depredations of their fellow humans deserves a vote of thanks from all of us.

But in speaking of the university in general, I find that the institution is so well known and so highly regarded that there is little to say that has not been heard before.

That does not ordinarily stop me from speaking further but I do recognize that this is an institution that no one needs to hear reassurances about.

It has had a remarkable 150 years. And there is every indication that it will grow to be even more remarkable. It is already one of the finest in the nation—and its standards are still going up.

DEATH OF TED YATES IN JERUSALEM

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, all of us in public life are saddened by the death in Jerusalem yesterday of Ted Yates of NBC. To those of us who knew him personally as well, his loss is a severe and tragic one indeed. His talent and integrity are demonstrated in every foot of documentary film he produced, whether in Asia, Latin America, or here at home. That talent and integrity are, fortunately, preserved in his work, and his friends will always recall the vitality, courage, and curiosity he demonstrated in life.

CEASE-FIRE IN THE NEAR EAST

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, we can all welcome the United Nations call for a cease-fire in the Near East, but a cease-fire is not enough. We must deal with the causes of the conflict, by insuring a permanent and enforceable guarantee of Israel's right to live secure from invasion, and free passage for ships of all nations through the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal.

REMOVAL OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION'S PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES FROM GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on Wednesday, March 9, 1966, I spoke on the floor of the Senate about a serious situation which had occurred in regard to the Small Business Administration's removal of its procurement center representatives from the various agencies, including the Department of Defense. I said at that time that this was the first mistake that SBA had made during that period, and I went on to point out that this false economy would mean that a small businessman who was experiencing a problem in trying to bid on a contract could no longer come to the Small Business Administration and expect that SBA would have a field representative in that agency with which he was dealing. I went on to point out that in my own State of Rhode Island, 94.8 percent of the industries are considered small business by the SBA; and therefore, this act would have detrimental effect on small business in both Rhode Island and the Nation. I am very sorry to say, Mr. President, that the Small Business Administration did not heed my warning; and therefore, small business has suffered the dire consequences of this ill-founded, ill-conceived act.

I would like to take this opportunity to go into the background of how the procurement center representatives came about and their importance to the small businessman. In recent years various measures have been employed in efforts to establish the most efficient and effective means for assuring that a fair proportion of Government procurement be placed with small business concerns. One such measure was the joint set-aside program, authorized by the Small Business Act, section 15. Pursuant to this act, the Small Business Administration—SBA—and Government contracting officers are authorized jointly to determine to set aside proposed procurements for exclusive competition among small business concerns when such action is first, in the interest of maintaining or mobilizing the Nation's full productive capacity; second, in the interest of war or national defense programs; and, third, in the interest of assuring that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts and services for the Government are placed with small business concerns. These determinations may be made for individual purchases or for classes of purchases.

Under this joint set-aside program SBA assigned procurement center representatives—PCR's—to the Government's major procuring activities. PCR's were stationed at principal Department of Defense—DOD—and General Services Administration — GSA — procurement centers and were available on an itinerant basis to other military and civilian agencies. Many of the smaller DOD procurement activities did not have SBA personnel available for making joint set-aside determinations. At these activities DOD's full and part-time small business specialists were responsible for carrying out the program on a unilateral basis; that is, these specialists recommended set-aside actions to contracting officers which, when approved, became unilateral set-asides.

The above joint determination set-aside procedure proved a practical and effective method of insuring that contracts which small manufacturers are capable of performing are, in fact, placed with them.

On July 1, 1965, the SBA, pursuant to a decision made by its then Administrator, eliminated the joint set-aside program. This elimination of the program constituted, in effect, a decision not to carry out the statutory mandate embodied in section 15 of the Small Business Act.

As a result of this decision 34 Government procurement centers which were covered by PCR's on a full-time basis, 36 covered on a part-time basis, and 410 covered sporadically, had been left to the discretion of the procuring agency's officials as regards set-asides. In other words, these procuring officials were from then on the sole arbiters of whether or not a planned procurement would or would not be set aside for small business.

In order to provide a check on the procuring agency's unilateral set-aside activities, an agreement was reached on or about November 1, 1965, with the DOD regarding procedures to be followed in a so-called surveillance program designed for the purpose of affording SBA personnel review authority over the contracting actions taken unilaterally at major procurement centers. During the 10 months that the surveillance program was in effect, reviews made revealed a varying level of effectiveness among the procurement centers with respect to the small business assistance program, with the result that the small business share of defense contract award was constantly decreasing; this in the face of increasing military requirements, including those historically within small business capability.

In fact, Mr. President, when I recently attended the 1967 congressional presentation of the Small Business Association of New England, it was pointed out to me that in the fiscal year ending 1965 under the joint set-asides plan, the defense set-asides were 31 percent of the contracts awarded to small business. Under the unilateral plan, this dropped to 22.7 percent in fiscal year 1966; and in the first quarter of fiscal 1967, it further slipped to 20.8 percent. This is a 33-percent dip from fiscal 1965 to the first quarter of fiscal 1967, all in the interest of so-called economy. These statistics graphically illustrate that this has been a costly adventure by the Small Business Administration.

Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the Government Procurement Subcommittee of the House Select Committee on Small Business, held hearings regarding the elimination of SBA's PCR's and the transfer of SBA's set-aside responsibility to others. In a report issued in December 1966, the subcommittee found that the set-aside change was ill conceived, unwarranted, and detrimental to small business. It disclosed that the substitute plan failed. The subcommittee concluded that SBA's participation in the joint set-aside program is essential if small business is to receive a fair share of Government procurement.

I am pleased to note that a new Administrator for the Small Business Administration, Mr. Bernard L. Boutin, evidently sees the wisdom of restoring the procurement center representatives to the various agencies and that in the past 90 days he has advised the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that he is desirous of appointing 61 SBA representatives for the purpose of reestablishing the joint set-aside program. It is my understanding that these procurement representatives of SBA will not only carry out the set-aside effort, they will also work on breaking out requirements upon which small businesses can bid competitively, seek out small business competition on sole sources or other limited competition situations, help to relax unduly rigid specifications and continuously survey the procuring agency's small business programs.

Mr. President, it is my hope that the Administration would get the reestablishment of the SBA set-aside program and the appointment of procurement center representatives underway immediately. The facts speak for themselves, for in a growing, leaping economy, the small business has again found itself shortchanged. I look forward to early implementation of the above-mentioned program, and I intend to press as hard as I can to see that this comes about.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HATFIELD BEFORE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, MARK O. HATFIELD, speaking at the annual conference of the Southern Baptist Convention at Miami, Fla., on June 1, stressed the great challenge and call of the Christian church today.

In his message, Senator HATFIELD mentioned the place of the church in our everyday social order and insisted that it is time that the church of Christ obey her Lord and take the task of meeting the social needs of the world, in the love and power of Christ.

It is a challenging message and should be read by everyone.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator HATFIELD'S message be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Address of Senator Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon Before the Southern Baptist Convention, Miami, Fla., June 1, 1967

The Great Commission of Jesus Christ to his disciples and to his Church was threefold and I would like to use this as the text for my comments to you this morning. First of all he said, "Go teach all nations." The second part of that Commission was, "Baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." And the third part of that Commission was, "Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." And then he promised to be with us always, unto the end of the world.

I believe the Scriptures are very clear as to what Christ meant by that third part of the Great Commission. Yet this is the aspect of our mission which we most often fail to accomplish.

Let us take, for example, the very important matter of Christ's dealing with human suffering and need. The life of Christ, as recorded in the Gospels, is crystal clear on the point that God does not intend that human beings should suffer endlessly under pressures of poverty, hunger, social decay, racial persecution, disease, ignorance, unemployment, war or violence.

The major part of Christ's public ministry on earth was spent in the healing of human suffering, in alleviating the sickness and social deprivation of mankind. Christ *did* heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the leper, feed the multitudes, give purpose to the wandering, sight to the blind, forgiveness to the repentant. Then he said, "Greater things than I have done, you shall do. Keep my Commandments, if you love me."

I believe that there has developed within the Church a spirit of withdrawal from the world, a seclusion in non-involvement. Some people have left the Church spiritually to join in the task of using the powers of the State to create a perfect world and to legislate virtue. They have cared for man's social and temporal needs. Others have taken a suspicious look at these advocates of the social gospel and have decided not to become involved in the worldly affairs of man and have tended only to the soul and to the defense of theology. Both groups, I submit to you this morning, are forgetting the example of Christ.

The Christians in this country and especially in the mission fields throughout the entire world, have done a very creditable job of pioneering in social concern for suffering mankind. We dare not forget the loving sacrifice of Christian men and women who have sought to rescue the soul, the mind and body of men in every nation of the world. We find that there have been missionary doors closed, countries under political philosophies and political policies that have said to our missionaries in all of the Churches of the Christian faith, "No longer are you permitted to come to our land to preach this gospel." But we have found that where the missionaries have created an indigenous, native church and leadership, the removal of the missionaries has not resulted in the cessation of the gospel. But, rather, these indigenous groups, these people who have learned a sense of independence, have stood on their own feet and have carried forth the Commandments. And that is because they have been committed to a cause, to a person, and they have been willing to sacrifice.

Is there not an analogy that we can draw today in this world at war, an analogy which says to us very clearly that—regardless of our political label, regardless of our political philosophy, regardless of our religious persuasion—men who are helping themselves are men whom we have a responsibility to help but that we cannot do for others that which they are not willing to do for themselves?

John Foster Dulles and John F. Kennedy very eloquently translated this into the world of international politics when they said, "You cannot superimpose the cause of freedom upon another man unless he is willing to fight and die for it himself."

This is why some of us are concerned that in Southeast Asia we are involved in a conflict that is calling on us to do for the Asians that which they should be doing for themselves. We are committing more and more American boys—500,000—at the same time that the South Vietnamese forces continue to desert their own cause. Now we have taken over the pacification program. We ask the question, "Why?" Today our boys are called upon to go fight other nations' wars. But why are not the words of our President—which were so eloquently stated in 1964—just as true today as they were then when he said to the American people, "This is an Asian war that must be fought by Asian boys." Are we more and more to do for other people what they are not willing to do for themselves?

We must be willing always to stand by to aid and abet the cause of liberty and freedom, and the cause of mankind throughout the entire world. That's our role in world leadership. But, my friends, let us not forget that the United States of America does have limitations on resources, both manpower and material resources. We cannot become a world policeman and dissipate our resources wherever a crisis may evolve. All nations have a responsibility, especially those who are peace-loving and democratic, to give leadership to the cause of peace. But our nation must hear a voice of the people that says, in effect, to our government: "We want to uphold our responsibilities but we believe we have an obligation to use our creative genius to find alternatives to war, alternatives that will not consign our youth, our greatest national resource, to an endless conflict that has been going on for 20 years—a conflict in which the French lost 96,000 dead troops.

And yet, we are told it may go on yet another two, ten or 20 years. These are the questions that we must raise today, in Christian concern; not that we are going to agree on the answers. But we all ask today as Christians, as Americans, for guidelines, accurate information, facts upon which we can depend and make our judgments and our evaluations. I believe, therefore, that we must as Christians be involved in these great issues and not abdicate them to the diplomats or to the military generals. This is a responsibility of all citizens of this nation.

We also should have a great concern as Christians today for man's physical well-being, as represented by his needs for a strong physical body. A recent magazine ad stated that if the hungry of the earth were lined up at your door, they would encircle the world 45 times. Jesus Christ said, "Feed my sheep." I don't believe that people who have never seen hunger can truly imagine the horrors of hunger. May I share with you something that will never be removed from my mind no matter what my age, no matter what my experience.

It was in 1945. The part of the U.S. Navy in which I was serving was ordered into the area then called Indochina. We landed to pick up part of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Army. We were to take them aboard our ship and up around the coast of China into Northern China to fight the Chinese Communists. This was after the conclusion of World War II. I recall that as we went into that port that morning we could see the troops that were lined up on the beach ready to move aboard our ships and we could see the sacks of rice which they had brought with them to be their food supply. We could see the Vietnamese women with large baskets in their arms. As each sack of rice was lifted from the beach they would literally dig their hands into the sand to pick up the few kernels of rice that had sifted through the burlap bags to put into their baskets, later to sift them out of their baskets in order to try to keep body and soul together.

And as we drove into the city of Hanoi along that road we saw dead Vietnamese, dead not because of bullet wounds, but dead because of starvation, grinding starvation.

And I submit to you that hunger will shape the destiny of more nations and their political philosophies, than any other force in the world today.

We in America, the well-fed part of the world, cannot comprehend this. In many instances the missionary does. And the churchman who has been a supporter of and acquainted with and close to that missionary, understands. But do you realize that in many parts of the world they spend four-fifths of their annual average income of $100 just for food? Many of us in America spend over $100 just to keep our pets alive and well-fed. I did not come here to attack the agricultural progress of America. It is magnificent. But all I say is that this agricultural progress has tended to make many Americans oblivious to the hunger of the rest of the world. And we as Christians have this as a clear obligation: to see our relationship to the world and to these problems.

What has happened? *Has* the Church failed in its mission? *Has* the Church lost its impetus to help troubled and hungry people? Christ told us to dare, to sacrifice, to use our resources for the service of others. But many times in America we tend to cater more and more to our own congregations. Do we assume the responsibility for the whole community in which we are situated and even of the world of which we are a part?

Here is God and His Commandments for social concern on the one hand. And here is the need of the world and of man on the other hand. The Christian is supposed to be the minister of reconciliation: bringing together God's resources and man's need. The Christian is to be the instrument for the total solution of the problem.

Often when Christians come to the church seeking meaning for their lives, they are offered a cup of coffee rather than a demand upon conscience. The Church has been rendering unto Ceasar its role of concern for people. The Good Samaritan story might be edited a bit: He is the man today who votes to give other peoples' money to anybody left hurt along the wayside. Or, as one Kentucky lawyer said, "We Christianized the federal government because we would not tithe to do the job ourselves." Too many Christians today have no twinge of conscience when they pass the sick man on the road. We rationalize that we have paid the Good Samaritan to come along after us to take care of this rather unpleasant social obligation.

The average layman in our church today is often left with an incomplete Christian experience. By abdication of its concern for others, by deliberate delegation of its Good Samaritan responsibility, the Church in effect leads its members into the sin of self-concern. The layman is invited to use the church for only self-improvement instead of service. The Christian, of all men on earth, should be the best qualified, the most able to relieve human suffering and to change the world in which he lives. No other culture or religious background has given birth to social progress equal to that made in Christian lands. Why is this? The theology of the Christian faith, I believe, releases the creative energies of man for his life here on earth.

Many religions are oriented toward preparing man for the life hereafter only. They are what your would call "other worldly." They try to negate man's life here on earth. They point always to the release from suffering which will come only after death. But there is never the security, the assurance in these regions that guarantee life after death. The tension of this insecurity keeps the followers of these religions oriented to the mystery of the other world.

But look at Christianity: The resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead guarantees our life after death. God has given us victory over death and fear of what lies beyond the grave. Our faith, then, is secure. Our eternal destiny is established. So now, because of this truth, and because of the love-dynamic of Christ, we can turn our efforts and our creative energies to the revolutionizing of our world: to the alleviating of the suffering of man and to the work of God on earth. This is potential. But we have fallen short. We have painted Jesus Christ into a respectable, suburban, stand-pat establishmentarian, defending the status quo, instead of recognizing him as the greatest political, social, economic and spiritual revolutionary the world has ever known.

And so today we find that the most critical of the government's welfare program and poverty programs often come from orthodox evangelical Christians. They say that government cannot eliminate poverty without changing poverty of the spirit. *And they are right*. They criticize the government by saying that it is trying to change the society without first trying to legislate virtue. *And they are right*. They accuse the government of trying to legislate virtue without redeeming man from his sin. *And they are right*. Yet all of these criticisms are made from the safety of our churches, isolated many times from the social needs of our world. We point the critical finger at the government, at the war on poverty, at the social gospeller; but many times we refuse to obey the mandate of Christ to heal, to redeem, to feed, and nourish the spirit, to cleanse and uplift, to educate and change the heart, to house and clothe, and to share the love of Christ.

If the Church had been doing the job it had been called to do, and which only it can do rightly, there would be no need for the Government to enter the picture.

It is high time that the Church of Christ obeyed her Lord, and took the task of meeting the social needs of the world, in the love and power of Christ.

Let me give you an example of what can and could be done with a pressing domestic problem: The hard-core unemployable today in America totals about one million. We have today in America about 320,000 church congregations. If each church congregation only took responsibility for three such persons in this group of unemployables, I think we could see that this kind of government welfare program would not be necessary.

We believe that human beings can be changed. We as Christians believe that they can be redeemed. They can be renewed.

And the Christian should know that you cannot train a man for a new job without also giving him new purpose in life. We Christians should know that you cannot heal a man's body without also healing his spirit—his soul. We Christians should know that you cannot feed a man without nourishing the spiritual hunger of his heart.

This to me is the great challenge and the call of the Christian Church today and to the individuals who are redeemed people of God: To go forth and identify and to involve themselves in the completion of the Commission. "Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." And remember the other words of our Lord if we become discouraged and tend to believe the task to be insurmountable, when He said, "And greater things than I have done, you shall do."

NATURAL GAS SAFETY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Commerce has held 2 days of hearings on S. 1166, the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act. Three more days of hearings are scheduled, June 20 to 22. During these several days of hearings, government, industry, and the consuming public will have had ample opportunity to explore and explain the matter.

The hearings held to date make it clear that both the industry and the Government are attempting to reach a common goal through legislation; the differences are about the vehicle and not the trip. One of the clearer statements on the matter was delivered by Federal Power Commissioner Bagge before the Federal Bar Association on February 16, 1967. The speech will be given serious consideration by the committee in its deliberations on the bill.

This pipeline legislation will be reaching the Chamber later during this session. As pertinent background information, I ask unanimous consent that Commissioner Bagge's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC SAFETY AND PIPELINE TRANSPORTATION: A PLEA FOR A RATIONAL NATIONAL POLICY

(By Carl E. Bagge, Commissioner, Federal Power Commission)

I. INTRODUCTION

The inclusion of pipelines within a program relating to "How Safety and Accident Investigation Affects Industry" together with the railroad, aviation and the maritime industry would appear to be entirely rational and reasonable. Under existing circumstances, however, it is quite illogical. For, unlike each of these other areas, the Federal Government's role has not yet even been established as to natural gas pipelines and is not yet fully defined as to petroleum product lines. Hence the Federal Government has not evolved comprehensive accident investigation programs for pipelines. For this is a relatively new industry and one which has had a relatively low incidence of accidents affecting the public. As a consequence it is an area in which national concern for public safety has not yet been transformed into definitive and comprehensive public intervention through the establishment of national minimum standards. The transformation of such public concern into legislation and regulation is now in various stages of development.

The fact that my participation in a program relating to Federal regulation of industrial safety is illogical under these circumstances does not deter me from addressing myself to the subject of Federal pipeline safety regulation. For this is a subject which has interested me since joining the Federal Power Commission and about which I speak whenever the opportunity presents itself.

In my opinion, the public's involvement through its Government in pipeline safety is presently fragmented and irrational. We are dealing in the pipeline industry with simply another mode of transportation which is equally as much an instrumentality of interstate commerce as are the railroad, trucking, maritime and aviation segments of the transportation industry. Notwithstanding this, no uniform pattern of safety regulation of the pipeline industry presently exists. It seems to me that the time has come in the evolution of this industry to treat pipelines like all other modes of transportation which are subject to comprehensive safety regulation in the public interest.

Because no national pattern of safety and accident investigation has yet evolved, I cannot treat this subject within the context of my assignment. In order to discharge my general obligation of participating in this program, however, I will address myself to: (1) definition of the scope of the problem, (2) a review and critique of the efforts which have been made up to now to deal with the problem, and, finally, (3) a suggestion as to what constitutes the basic elements of a rational national policy of comprehensive safety regulation of this form of transportation.

II. SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

Permit me first to define the economic importance of the pipeline industry to the Nation and suggest the areas in which thought is presently being given to expanding the utility of the pipeline concept.

Natural gas presently provides thirty percent of the energy requirements of the Nation. Over two hundred thousand miles of large diameter, high pressure transmission pipelines transport this natural gas from production areas to areas of consumption. A network of equal mileage of oil and products lines transport much of the oil and fuel requirements of the Nation. The recent, severe drought in many areas of the country has prompted a new look at pipeline transportation of the large volumes of water required by urban industrial areas.

As a former member of the railroad fraternity, it grieves me to admit it, but new uses are presently contemplated for pipelines based on the economic attractiveness of pipeline transportation of coal, woodpulp, iron ore and other raw materials in slurry or capsule. Natural gas imported by refrigerated tankers and piped from seaports in liquified form through insulated and cased pipelines to inland cities is approaching economic feasibility.

Engineering research has recently shown the feasibility of rapid transportation of freight and people in tube-flight by high high speed trains of up to two thousand miles per hour utilizing pneumatic propulsion. These tubes could follow present railroad or highway rights-of-way and may hold the key to needed advances in land transportation in addition to providing pollution-free transportation for an expanding population without the concurrent dedication of vast tracts of land to highway development.

The industrial stability and growth of the Nation is, therefore, dependent on reliable, efficient and safe pipelines. The hazardous nature of the materials presently transported by pipelines and a number of tragic pipeline accidents have recently stirred public interest in pipeline safety. There are inherent safety problems in connection with gas and some that are unique with high pressure transmission systems. Other problems are inherent in products lines. I believe that industry and government are equally concerned about the maintenance of reliable and safe pipelines. Areas of difference between them center primarily on methods of approach and the degree of emphasis upon public versus private spheres of responsibility and influence.

Public confidence in the safety and reliability of high pressure gas transmission systems as well as local distribution systems is a pre-requisite for the continued growth and continued acceptance of natural gas as an economic source of energy. The safety record of the natural gas industry has been good, measured in absolute terms. Yet this record may lead us to be complacent about the potential dangers involved. For example, it takes an occurrence like a tragic explosion to remind us anew of the dangers to persons and property which comes along with the many benefits of natural gas transmission and distribution. While there is little question that management acted in good faith when the pipelines and distribution mains were built, as the systems grow older, as formerly sparsely populated areas increase with population shifts, and as new knowledge of pipeline technology emerges, it is essential that the gas industry and its regulators review the adequacy of existing safety and reliability standards.

It is because I believe that public confidence is vital to the success of the natural gas industry's important effort to compete with the electric power industry that I believe that Federal regulation of safety standards is essential. The assumption of a specific responsibility for the promulgation of safety standards by the Federal Government should, it appears to me, enhance rather than tend to destroy the public's confidence in the safety and reliability of natural gas as an energy source.

III. EFFORTS TO DEAL WITH THE PROBLEM

A. Industry safety effort

Industry's effort toward uniform safety standards for pipelines has centered in such organizations as the USA Standards Institute (formerly the American Standards Association), the American Petroleum Institute and committees of the American Gas Association notably the accident prevention committee. Promulgation of the USASI codes for natural gas transmission B31.8 and oil transportation B31.4 and the voluntary adherence to these codes by industry has contributed in no small way to the commendable safety record of natural gas, oil and products carriers. These codes delineate accepted industry practice in the areas of pipeline design, installation and maintenance.

Recognition should also be given to the extensive research funded by the pipeline industry in progress at Battelle Memorial Institute and other research organizations to more clearly define the mechanisms of pipeline failure, and to develop methods of pipeline production, transmission facility design and installation which tend to minimize the frequency of failures. The limitations of the existing code approach are that: (1) the code is voluntary. Its provisions are not compulsory or binding on any natural gas company, except within states which have incorporated all or parts of the code into statutory law. (2) in other areas its provisions are guides or objectives rather than requirements. (3) There is no independent policing agency within the industry to enforce its provisions. (4) The code establishes minimum requirements. A number of natural gas transmission companies as a matter of independent judgment have established their own safety standards which are more stringent and more comprehensive than code requirements.

B. State regulation

To supplement the industry effort, twenty-eight states have enacted mandatory provisions covering gas transmission pipelines. Twenty-seven of these twenty-eight states use the USASI code as a basis for their regulations. Twenty-one of these twenty-seven states either added independent safety standards or strengthened some provisions in the USASI code.

There are still twenty-two states and the District of Columbia without safety regulations. This, it should be noted, involves fifty-three percent of the transmission mileage. Most of the twenty-eight states with safety regulations have not incorporated requirements for the review and upgrading of existing facilities in the light of population expansion along existing rights-of-way. Five of the twenty-eight states with safety regulation do not apply these requirements to interstate lines. Several states which have adopted the USASI code as the basis of their regulations have not provided for updating their safety regulations as the USASI code is revised and improved. The improved safety practices of the industry may, therefore, not be incorporated in the state safety requirements.

There is at present an effort by the Committee on Gas of the National Association of Railroads and Utilities Commissioners to increase the number of states having safety codes and to improve the provisions of the state codes. Our Commission staff is actively participating in the work of a Staff Committee of the NARUC which has drafted a "model" state code. The new "model" state code, containing fewer optional provisions and more stringent provisions generaly than the USASI code, is now awaiting consideration by the NARUC Gas Committee. The Commission Staff also participates on the industry committee which administers and periodically revises the code.

C. Federal regulation

The large gaps remaining in the regulation of the safety practices of pipelines together with the heightened public interest in pipelife safety has prompted Federal agencies in other aspects of interstate regulation of pipeline carriers to seek authority to set minimum safety standards for these pipelines. Safety standards for oil and products lines came under Federal jurisdiction with the passage of Public Law 89-95 on July 27, 1965. The I.C.C. at that time was charged with the responsibility of setting safety standards for these pipelines and investigating failures. This responsibility has since been consolidated in the Department of Transportation with safety authority over other transportation mediums.

In the absence of express authority to prescribe pipeline safety standards, the Federal Power Commission has been able to take a number of steps that we believe are constructive. Under order No. 324, issued June 30, 1966, the Commission will prescribe safe operating pressures in all future certificates for jurisdictional natural gas pipelines. In the absence of Federal standards, such as would be adopted under Federal legislation which I hope will be introduced in the present Congress, the Commission will use the present industry code, the USASI code for pressure piping, gas transmission and distribution piping systems, USASI B31.8 as a guide in setting the maximum safe operating pressure.

The Commission also issued order No. 327 on September 8, 1966, which requires jurisdictional natural gas companies to notify the Commission by telegram or telephone of certain pipeline failures, defined in the rule, and to submit a detailed report within twenty days. In addition, the pipeline company is required to furnish a copy of both of these reports to the State Regulatory Commission in the State or States where the accident or failure occurred and the telegraphic report to the State Commission in those States where service might be affected.

The receipt of this information will now permit the Commission to investigate serious failures. Such investigations should be useful to obtain information on the cause of failures as a guide to prevention of future failures. The Commission should direct its investigations to the most serious failures and to those in which the cause is unusual, difficult to determine, or symptomatic of a widespread corrosion problem. Publication of investigation results should be helpful to State and local government and to the industry. The Commission is now in a position to investigate accidents and prescribe requirements for new lines but cannot now reach existing lines.

For the past thirteen years the F.P.C. has recommended to each session of Congress an amendment to the Natural Gas Act giving it authority to set minimum safety standards for natural gas pipelines. This authority would not pre-empt the States from imposing additional safety requirements. The F.P.C., at the request of the Senate Commerce Committee, directed a questionnaire to all pipeline companies under its jurisdiction to ascertain the extent of the problem. Replies to the questionnaire developed the information that a total of sixty-four persons were killed and two-hundred twenty-five injured as a result of transmission system failures during a fifteen and one-half year period covered by the questionnaire (1950 to the middle of 1965). Of those killed, thirty-five were gas company employees and twenty-nine were non-employees. Of the two-hundred twenty-five persons injured, one-hundred thirty-five were gas company employees and ninety were non-employees.

The Commission report disclosed that nearly all of the non-employee deaths occurred as a result of line failure. Causes of failures as reported were predominantly mechanical damage from earth-moving equipment, corrosion, weld defects and manufacturing defects also caused failures.

IV. ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF FEDERAL SAFETY REGULATION

The foregoing discussion brings us up to the point where we are now. The limitations of the pipeline industry's own efforts and the existing limitations of both State and Federal regulation are apparent. I am confident that legislation will again be introduced in the current session of Congress to obtain Federal regulation of the safety aspects of natural gas pipelines. As we evolve a national policy of comprehensive safety regulation of the pipeline industry, consideration should be given to the essential elements which such a policy should contain. In my opinion the essential elements of such a policy should reflect the following considerations:

1. Jurisdiction of the promulgation and enforcement of minimum safety standards should be reposed in the department of transportation. Since the pipeline industry's economic function is essentially that of transportation, logic and administrative convenience dictate that the public's concern for safety in this industrial area be administered as part of a broader program of safety among all the modes of transportation.

2. The scope of the Department of Transportation's safety jurisdiction should embrace the pipeline concept as a technology and include pipeline transportation irrespective of the commodities transported now or in the future. Because of the inter-relationship of pipeline technology, the administration of pipeline safety should be reposed in a single agency.

3. The jurisdiction of any rational national program of pipeline safety should extend all the way down to the distribution level. The public's concern for pipeline safety cannot be circumscribed by existing jurisdictional concepts which are based upon economic and rate regulation. It is essential that any national program of pipeline safety include the distribution level for precisely the same reasons that Federal safety regulation extends to other modes of transportation notwithstanding the fact that they may otherwise be regulated as to intrastate rates and services by the State commissions.

4. Comprehensive safety regulation which extends to the distribution level must also include jurisdiction over municipally-owned gas distribution systems. There presently exists approximately 1,000 municipally-owned gas distribution systems throughout the nation. Only a handful are presently subject to any regulation by State commissions. It would be irrational to exclude from such a national program municipally-owned systems merely because of the form of their ownership, and merely because they are not otherwise subject to State regulation.

5. The relationship between the Department of Transportation's jurisdiction over pipeline safety regulation and the continuing responsibility of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Power Commission over economic regulation of the industries must be carefully considered and reflected in legislation which seeks to implement such a program. I am concerned about the administrative and regulatory conflicts which might arise if the relationship between D. O. T. and the regulatory agencies which have continuing responsibilities for economic regulation are not clarified initially. If, for example, safety regulations promulgated by D. O. T. would require the replacement of a transmission line, the Federal Power Commission must nevertheless authorize the abandonment of such a line and issue a certificate for the construction and operation of new facilities. The abandonment and proposed replacement of a line, however, raises broader problems in the area of economic regulation because of the commission's obligation to find its abandonment and replacement to be consistent with the public convenience and necessity. An abandonment of a line may well raise the question of whether that line's replacement or whether service by an alternative supplier would be more consistent with the public interest. Another problem lies in our certification authority for facilities which have an innovative impact upon existing technology. These problems are not as acute in the relationship between D. O. T. and the I. C. C. because the I. C. C. does not certificate the construction or abandonment of products lines and because the transportation of petroleum products does not involve the same critical impact in terms of the need for continuity of service as does natural gas.

6. Regulations must be flexible enough to reflect the realities of regional and population differentials. Provision must be made for exemptions under the proper circumstances.

7. Safety regulation must also accommodate changes in pipeline technology. Existing codes and regulations are, by their nature, predicated upon existing technology. When new materials and new techniques which are not contemplated by existing regulations come into being, a mechanism must exist within the structure of such regulations to provide the opportunity for sufficient experimentation to permit the employment of such changes in technology. This must be an essential feature of the regulations. It must be recognized that greater safety can be achieved in part through technological change. Such improvements can be achieved by experimentation. Hence, innovation must also not only be accommodated but be affirmatively stimulated. Any code which does not provide for such incentives is self-defeating.

8. Such code must never revert to or become fused with the problem of industrial relations.

9. The experience of the pipeline industry which has been concerned with the problem of safety since the development of pipeline technology must be exploited to the fullest possible extent. The opinions of the industry's experts and the consulting institutions which have long-established relationships with the pipeline industry should be solicited at every level in the promulgation of these standards.

10. I suggest that the professional engineering associations, as they exist independently of the pipeline industry, be delegated some responsibility in the enforcement of the standards once they have been prescribed. This concept could be implemented in the following manner: once having prescribed minimum standards, the Department of Transportation could accept certifications from independent engineering firms attesting to the fact that new or existing construction has complied with the standards. Such a procedure would offer two advantages. First, it would elevate the level of professional responsibility of the engineering profession. Secondly, it would negate the need for a new level of Federal enforcement officials by retaining this function in the private sector thus providing an effective means of achieving desired goals without unduly expanding the Federal effort.

CONCLUSION

A Federal policy embracing these elements in legislation could, in my view, initiate an era of Government-industry cooperation not only in the safety aspects of pipelines but in realizing the broader economic potential of pipelines. The USASI code committee consists of a highly informed and knowledgeable group who would be invaluable in any attempt to draw up meaningful Federal safety standards for pipelines. The experience of the States in administration of existing State standards would provide valuable guidelines. Employing these groups within the Federal effort should create new opportunities for the further exploration of the pipeline concept.

The technology of pipelines is constantly changing. For regulation to await the complete development of new technology without ascertaining the safety aspects at an early stage in development would tend to induce a stultifying effect on innovation. The regulatory engineer must keep abreast of expanding technology in his area of regulation.

Exemplifying the utilization of the corporate engineer by Government in areas of rapid technological change is the work of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers as a professional organization in preparing boiler codes which have been incorporated into State commission regulations. The National Fire Protection Association has provided expertise to local governments in the formulation of fire, power and flammable storage codes.

As I mentioned before, failure modes noted in pipelines are common to pressure vessels in general. Much research in progress under Government auspices may have application to pipeline technology. Greater Federal activity in the safety aspects of pipelines should concurrently realize greater Federal participation in the attempt to advance pipeline technology.

Having acknowledged that the industry has, generally speaking, a good record of performance, but that regulation, nevertheless, has a legitimate interest in insuring the continuation of this level of performance in the future, it would seem essential that the regulatory response preserve the positive values which have, in the past, made such great contributions to safety and reliability. It is essential, therefore, that whatever posture is assumed, pipeline regulation should not: (1) disturb the ultimate responsibility for management to manage, plan and operate their own systems or (2) retard or impair innovation or experimentation. In short, regulation should share with, not usurp from, management the ultimate responsibility for providing the public with safe, reliable and economical pipeline service.

WHAT KIND OF CITY DO WE WANT?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the primary question of an urban society is how to bring order to the continuing chaos in our cities. But there are so many problems that one scarcely knows where to start. So we begin at the beginning—by talking to people and exchanging our views.

A conference of 33 urban experts recently addressed themselves to this subject. The conference was sponsored by the National League of Cities, the American Institute of Architects, the Lincoln Foundation, and the Luce magazines.

Their report, entitled "What Kind of City Do We Want?" should be read by every citizen concerned with our future. It is a mandate both for hope and for action. As the concluding paragraph points out:

> What's wrong with today's cities could be cured a lot faster if people could be given a better understanding and a clearer vision of what kind of city to demand and insist on getting.

The report was published in the April 1967 issue of Nation's Cities, the magazine of the National League of Cities, and will also be published in the Journal of the American Institute of Architects.

In addition, another article deserves our close attention. Prof. Daniel Bell's concluding article in the Life magazine series—May 12, 1967—on the individual in modern society speaks to a fundamental problem of whole societies as well as modern cities. Professor Bell is chairman of the Columbia University sociology department.

I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Nation's Cities, April 1967]

WHAT KIND OF CITY DO WE WANT?

This is the most urgent question facing urban America today.

Everybody is talking about it, writing about it, making speeches about it. But the more they talk and write the greater the confusion about it seems to grow. Much of the talk seems to come from people who don't like cities and just want to get away from them; and too much of the talk comes from people who think the local needs and problems of our cities can only be solved from Washington.

In the hope of bringing some order into all this confusion the National League of Cities joined The American Institute of Architects, the Lincoln Foundation, and the Luce magazines in sponsoring a roundtable conference of 33 experts described by New York's Mayor Lindsay as "The Who's Who of Urban Development". Purpose of the conference was not to seek new ideas and new solutions, but rather to explore how broad an area of expert agreement already exists behind all the seeming confusion.

The roundtable panel represented many different disciplines and many different viewpoints. Perhaps surprisingly, perhaps not so surprisingly, the roundtable revealed a broad area of almost unanimous agreement an almost every urban problem.

No one panelist subscribed to every conclusion and every recommendation in the consensus. Nevertheless, this conference report reflects hundreds of comments and suggestions by the participants during the months which followed the original roundtable discussions. More than an expression of personal opinions and experiences, it stands as a collective document which attempts to confront honestly the widely diverse elements of the contemporary city.

Our urban problems would be hard enough to solve in a static urban economy with a static urban population, a static racial and social mix, and a static transportation method and system—but our urban economy and population are anything but static. On the contrary, our urban economy, society and technology are all undergoing great simultaneous changes; our urban population is doubling to a projected 1999 level well over 250 million-plus, and before 1999 our urban wealth will at least quadruple, as the average income of twice as many families doubles to a projected $15,000-a-year-plus-of-today's-purchasing-power. And even now, before these increases, our urban transportation system is already near the breaking point.

So within the next generation, our cities will have to be almost completely rebuilt twice as big and, we hope, at least twice as good. Within a generation we will have to erect and find the money for more new urban homes, business buildings and facilities than we have built in all the years since Jamestown and Plymouth Rock. We will have to replace at least half of all today's urban dwellings because they will no longer be good enough for anyone to want to live in when the average family has sufficient income to qualify for a $25,000 FHA-financed house. (This means we should build at least half as many new homes to replace decaying housing inside or close in to our cities as we add on the outskirts.) And we will probably have to replace half of today's business and industrial buildings because they will no longer meet the vastly different needs of 1999 business.

In addition, many of our cities will almost certainly have to be restructured to fit some new and radically different means of transportation. High-density cities like New York are finding that the additional facilities needed to bring in just one more car per day during commuter hours will cost $21,000; low-density cities like Los Angeles are finding the cost, in money, time and space, of relying solely on the automobile equally bad.

Most of today's cities "just growed" (and often "growed" too fast) in response to yesterday's different social and economic demands. This is one reason why most central cities are already in deep trouble with problems they have neither the money nor the authority to cure—most of them problems that call for major rebuilding and/or restructuring. They are deep in problems concerned with slums, traffic, parking, sprawl, ugliness, housing; with recreation needs; with air and water pollution; with overtaxation and undertaxation.

They are stuck with far more than their share of the costs created by national problems like education, poverty and segregation. Their municipal costs are climbing twice as fast as their local tax base.

They are choked by obsolete political boundaries that 1) encourage both people and industry to seek tax havens in the suburbs and 2) make coordinated planning difficult and often just plain impossible. They are losing prosperous families and their money to the suburbs almost as fast as they are herding more poor families and their costs into the slums. They are losing blue-collar jobs to the outskirts almost as fast as they can add new white-collar openings downtown. They consume four times as much land as they use. They are stuck with a tax system that penalizes improvements and subsidizes obsolescence, blight, sprawl and the spread of slums, and they are stuck with a concept of landed property that lets landowners capitalize for their own private profit all the economies and advantages of urbanism, so city dwellers must pay twice over for the multibillion-dollar values they themselves create living close together—values they have already paid for once by an enormous investment of both public and private money.

North, south, east and west, big cities and small, new cities and old, all alike suffer in greater or lesser degree from all these problems. High-density cities like New York may have more trouble with congestion; low-density cities like Los Angeles may have more trouble with sprawl, but the latter has congestion at its center and the former has sprawl on its outskirts. The bigger the city, the bigger its problems have seemed to grow; the older the city, the more deeply they are likely to be entrenched. And the former president of the American Institute of Architects adds a word of urgent warning:

"We cannot remake our cities without solving their painful social problems. As blight, congestion and lack of good-enough schools drive middle-income residents from our urban centers, the poor move in, the gap between the rich and poor grows, and the suburban noose draws tighter. If the present trend continues, the untrained and undereducated poor will become the dominant population group in almost all our major cities within the next few years. The consequences of allowing our cities to become the poorhouses of America had better be recognized while there is still time to avoid them."

Despite all these troubles and problems, there must be something very good, very compelling and very magnetic about our cities because year in and year out more and more people are flocking to live in or near them. America's whole population growth in the next generation will be concentrated in cities and their suburbs; by the year 2000 they will add something like 150 million more people. Just when our cities seem to be suffering from more troubles than ever before, they are in fact enjoying the greatest urban and suburban boom the world has ever known.

Thus the building and rebuilding of our cities becomes an enormous problem and an enormously exciting challenge—a far greater opportunity than if there were less need to do almost everything over, new and better.

WE WILL SPEND TRILLIONS

To meet this challenge and seize this opportunity, our cities will need all the help they can get—from architects and planners, from the upper-income families who have fled to the suburbs to escape the cities' problems, from the state governments and from the federal government, of course.

All of us applaud and welcome the growing interest in urban problems shown by the federal government, but, alas, this interest is still finding expression more in words than in dollars. The federal government is busy casting itself in the role of the great benefactor of cities and the great subsidizer of urban improvement; but the hard fact is that the federal government takes many, many more times more money out of our cities in taxes than it would dream of returning in subsidies.

In 24 years the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its successor, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, has not kicked back to the cities a nickel of taxpayer money for housing and urban development; in every year but two, its receipts from insurance and other nontax sources have exceeded its expenditures. For fiscal years 1966 and 1967, HUD actually budgeted *minus* $100 million of tax money for housing and urban development. City dwellers pay most of the federal taxes, but the farmers still get back from Washington eight times as much money as the cities; by some calculations, 13 times as much. And most of the money the cities do get back is earmarked, not to ease the cities' present financial burdens but to encourage new municipal spending by offering to share the increased cost of meeting responsibilities the cities are not yet meeting.

This is no time to think small about the money our cities will need. It will cost not billions but trillions of dollars to correct what is wrong with our central cities today, while they are doubling their metropolitan populations and their more-and-more affluent citizens are doubling their demands for better everything.

Between now and the year 2000, someone will have to put up close to $1,500 billion for new and renewal nonfarm housing alone (nearly half of it urban replacement housing); someone will have to put up at least another $1,000 billion for new and replacement commercial, industrial and utility construction; and someone will have to put up at least another $1,000 billion for all the new and better community facilities needed to go with the new and better housing: new streets, highways, parking; new and better schools and colleges; new park attractions, playgrounds, transportation; new smoke controls, sewers and sewage treatment, water supplies; hospitals, etc., etc., etc. (Metropolitan New York alone projects a need for 61 more college campuses for 1.3 million more students, 100 more hospitals with 45,000 more beds, etc.).

Over 33 years, the money needed to build and rebuild our cities twice as big and twice as good will average out to over $100 billion a year, and even in tomorrow's far more affluent economy, it is just plain nonsense to hope that even half that annual amount will be provided by any government: national, state or local. Governments will be hard pressed to find enough tax money to meet the $30 billion-a-year need for more and better community facilities.

The rest can be found only by harnessing the profit motive, much more effectively than now, to urban renewal and urban improvement, and making as much as possible of this enormous enterprise attractive and profitable for the investment of private capital. Private capital will get its money's worth only if we make good planning, good design and good building more profitable than bad. And it will be a lot easier to interest private capital in urban betterment if the local tax system is modified to encourage new construction and better land use, instead of (as now) penalizing improvements and subsidizing blight, slums and sprawl.

PEOPLE CAN HAVE FULLER CHOICE IF WE STOP LOOKING BACKWARD

"Tomorrow's cities can be designed to provide much greater efficiency, much greater joy and delight than people have any notion of," says city planner Ballard.

Adds Mayor Naftalin: "Right now today few cities measure up to their greater opportunities for better living."

And Mayor Maier: "We can and must make tomorrow's city a far better place for its people. All our urban institutions must work together to make tomorrow's city a place where each citizen will have a chance to achieve his own full potential in an atmosphere of freedom, opportunity, openness, community and, let us hope, culture."

And ex-Parks Commissioner Hoving: "Cities should be much more fun for everybody—poor and rich alike."

With our fast-growing affluence and our fantastically expanding technology, there is no earthly reason why American cities should have to be dull or ugly or dirty or polluted or traffic-choked or expensive to live and work in.

There is no reason why cities should sprawl far out beyond their boundaries to blight the countryside with leap-frogging and premature subdivision.

There is no reason why cities should let slums and other inadequate, obsolete or decrepit buildings clutter and pre-empt most of their good close-in locations.

There is no reason why our cities should waste most of their land, most of their streets, their parks, their open space, their waterfronts, their rooftops.

There is no reason why cities should waste most of the third dimension that could multiply their convenience and their livability at much less cost than sprawl.

There is no reason why people who like high-density living should not also enjoy open-space recreation quite near at hand, nor any reason why people who prefer low-density living should not enjoy it much closer to where they work and shop.

There is no reason why good urban planning should constantly be frustrated by obsolete political boundaries.

There is no reason why city governments should be kept too broke to make their services good and desirable instead of just cheap and tolerable.

There is no reason why our cities should not be good places to bring up children, with good schools and provision for safe outdoor play nearby.

There is no reason why our central cities should be abandoned to the poor and the disadvantaged, or why they should be stuck with so much more than their share of the problems of poverty and segregation.

There is no reason why all our thinking about cities and city living should lag 60 years behind our time.

Making our cities twice as livable for tomorrow's twice-as-big and twice-as-affluent urban populations will take a lot of money; it will take a lot of replanning, redesigning and rethinking—both thought and forethought.

But we are all agreed that tomorrow's city could, should and would offer its people far better, easier, healthier, more convenient living closer to where they work, shop and play, IF.

We are likewise agreed that tomorrow's city could, should and would offer its business far better and more profitable working conditions closer to bigger markets, closer to supporting services, and closer to more abundant and more specialized labor, IF:

If we accept the simple mathematical fact that for most people, urban living has to mean living close together, and *if* we focus our planning and spending on practical ways to make living close together more rewarding and less expensive.

If we stop looking backward and dreaming that tomorrow's urban life could be more like yesterday's village life, and relinquish the notion that low density is somehow better for everybody.

If we make good use of the new tools offered by today's fantastic new technologies—new tools so numerous that we can mention only two:

1. Airconditioning, which the ex-vice president of the National Association of Home Builders calls "the greatest improvement for indoor living and indoor working since we brought the toilet indoors," an improvement that makes cities as livable in summer as in winter.

2. The electronic elevator, which—almost unnoticed—is changing the potentials of urban living almost as much as the automobile.

If we make sure the city has a vibrant downtown to draw people and business from far and near to live, work, shop and have fun.

If we give some governmental agency the responsibility, the authority and the money needed to coordinate and make sense out of today's chaos of conflicting urban and suburban planning.

If we stop asking local government to pay costs that are not essentially local—costs that are borne by the central government in almost all other lands.

If we restructure our biggest cities as radiating clusters of high-density land use.

If we persuade or compel city people and city industry to stop trying to get something for nothing at other people's expense, i.e., stop trying to save a little of their own money by choking the city streets, polluting the city water, polluting the city air, etc.

If we harness the profit motive forward instead of backward to good land use and good planning, so private enterprise will find it profitable to assume, without subsidy, most of the cost of rebuilding our cities bigger and in every way better.

If we stop letting landowners make city living expensive by capitalizing, for their private profit, all the benefits of today's huge urban investment of other people's money.

If we stop waiting for massive state and federal aid before tackling all the little jobs that need doing first.

If we give more thought to making cities good places for rich and poor to live in and enjoy, and less thought to getting out of them.

If we can find a cure for the problems and costs of segregation and one-class neighborhoods.

For people, this means living closer together to maximize their freedom of choice in housing, career and employment opportunities, direct personal contact and confrontation, meeting people and making more kinds of friends. This closeness also increases freedom of choice in places to shop, and places to pursue leisure-time cultural and recreational activity.

The more people who live close together, the greater their variety of choices should be and the greater their chance of being able to get what they choose to want. The more people who share the cost of each choice, the smaller its cost to any individual, and the greater the combined ability of the group to support cultural activities and special services they could not otherwise afford.

Some people like to live closer than others. Some people choose high density because they want to be closest to the center of urban life; people who work downtown have an added reason for living close to downtown. Other people choose lower density because time-saving is less important to them than having their own little half-acre; people who work in an outlying research center, university or factory have an added reason for living farther out.

But these differences are only differences in degree. Cliff dwellers and suburbanites alike are drawn to the city to enjoy advantages only close-in living can offer, and most suburbanites wish they could enjoy their kind of living without traveling so far each day to get it.

For business, minimizing the handicaps of distance means easy access to more abundant and more specialized labor, to a greater variety of supporting services, to government offices, to low-cost mass transportation, to supplies in greater volume and greater variety, and to more customers and bigger markets.

For business as for people, the consequence of closeness and concentration should be greater efficiency, greater economy and lower costs.

Some kinds of business have to locate closer to the center than others. Some must locate downtown for maximum access to markets, to clients, to supporting service or to a great variety of labor. Other kinds of business are more self-contained and so find it more profitable to trade maximum access for greater space—to accept less accessibility on the outskirts in order to get more space than they could afford at the center. Still others may find easy access to a freeway more important than easy access to downtown.

But once again, the difference is only one in degree. The advertising agency downtown and the factory in the suburbs are both drawn to the city for advantages only closeness can offer, and most suburban industry would relocate closer to the labor center and the transportation hub if closer-in land were cheaper.

The shape and pattern and density of our metropolitan areas are changing as cars and trucks lessen our urban dependence on mass transportation to a single center, and the telephone makes semipersonal contact fast and cheap over great distances. Motorized road transportation has made, is making and must continue to make an enormous contribution to ease and flexibility of urban movement and urban contacts. And it is no longer necessary to go to the transportation center for so many kinds of shopping, or to find employment in those kinds of industry that are least dependent on quick access to markets or supporting services (notably big factories).

But however their pattern may change, the reason and purpose of cities remains unchanged and unchangeable—the same today as in the railroad age, the canal-boat age, and the stagecoach age—to bring people and businesses together for ease and variety of access and contact.

HIGH CENTRAL DENSITY WOULD HELP PRESERVE CLOSE-IN AMENITY

Overcrowding is no problem at all on Park Avenue with up to 1000 people to the acre. Overcrowding had nothing to do with the explosion in Watts, where the density was not much more than 20 to the acre.

At the urban densities that command the highest rents from those best able to afford to live as they like (i.e., on New York's Park Avenue, Chicago's Gold Coast or San Francisco's Nob Hill), there are only three U.S. cities whose entire population could not live, work, shop, skate, swim, play tennis, worship, attend concerts and go to the movies on the 18,000 acres within three miles of the center, leaving all the land outside that three-mile circle for heavy manufacturing, golf courses, market gardening, low-density living and acre zoning.

For example and specifically: At the density proposed for New York's new World Trade Center and Battery Park Addition, the biggest city's whole population could live and work and shop and play in Manhattan Island and the close-in quarter of Brooklyn, leaving most of Brooklyn and all of Queens, the Bronx and Richmond for open space. At the density which tenants seem to like in Chicago's Marina City, the whole population could live and work and shop and find plenty of recreation within two blocks of the Chicago River between Lake Michigan and the Merchandise Mart.

We are not suggesting that all our cities should be rebuilt for any such concentration. And most certainly we do not recommend that all the people of any big city should concentrate downtown, for many people would do better to live closer to some satellite density planned and developed around some activity that benefits from being near the city, but does not need to be right at the hub (such as a university, a big manufacturing plant or a shopping center).

Nevertheless, we think the simple geometric and mathematical facts about living close are important to remember. And we are all agreed that our cities should be planned for living and working as close together as is compatible with the other requirements of good business and the good life.

None of us is against low-density living with private outdoor space around each home. On the contrary, all of us wish people who want low-density living could enjoy it much closer to town than they can today, to save them the countless hours they now waste getting to and from their homes, and we all agree with landscape architect Halprin that "Low density offers people something that high density doesn't especially for families with young children."

But we wish more people would face up to the obvious fact that as our urban population doubles, the only way to bring low density close in is to develop much higher density at the center, with much less land waste everywhere. Says city planner Ballard, "With rising population we will have to design our central cities to much higher densities to make any sense at all." Mayor Naftalin adds, "The test is how we combine high density and low density."

And almost all of us sympathize with the former AIA president who says, "Sprawl city—and by that I mean the great megalopolis spreading from Boston to Washington, from Pittsburgh to Milwaukee, from San Francisco to San Diego—is too wasteful because you duplicate your services, your streets, your utilities, all the civic functions people pay for in taxes. You spread them out thin; you use up your land. In the process you destroy the countryside and waste our heritage."

If the No. 1 reason and purpose for cities is to maximize the advantages of closeness and overcome the handicaps created by distance, it follows that sprawl is the direct denial of that reason and purpose.

URBAN GROWTH WILL BE VERTICAL

Two generations of urban Americans have been obsessed, bewitched, dazzled and blinded by the outward explosion touched off by the automobile, which made millions of outlying acres newly accessible and deflated the price of close-in land by temporarily lifting the pressure to maximize its use.

Ninety years ago, the limit on urban spread depended upon how long it took to get to work by foot or by carriage. Sixty years ago the limit had been doubled, defined by how long it took to get to work by foot and train or trolley. Thirty years ago the spread limit had doubled again, to how long it took to drive to work on streets laid out for horse-drawn traffic. Today the spread limit has doubled once again, and now depends upon how long it takes to drive to work with an assist from our multibillion-dollar expressways.

We have been so obsessed with this two-dimensional explosion that we have given far too little thought to the third dimension. Average building height in every city except New York and Chicago is still only about two stories; average ground coverage is still only about 15 percent; in some central cities, nearly half the ground is preempted by streets and parking lots. Many municipal costs per family are multiplied as the urban radius sprawls farther and farther out; average families spend more than half as much money on their cars as they spend to eat, and almost two-thirds as much as they spend to own or rent their homes; and millions of workers spend a quarter as much time getting to and from their jobs as they spend actually working.

Making today's urban area twice as big horizontally for tomorrow's twice-as-big urban population would be impossibly costly in dollars, intolerably costly in wasted land, unbearably costly in added travel time to and from work and to and from open-space recreation. Doubling their area by growing up instead of out would cost far less and add only seconds instead of minutes to everybody's travel time.

Whether we like it or not, most urban growth in the next 30 years will have to be up, not out.

The problem is not whether we would like to grow upward, but how to grow upward in a way everybody would like.

Even sprawling Los Angeles is finally learning this simple lesson and building three times as many new apartments as single-family detached homes; even in suburbia, the trend from coast to coast is to two-story houses instead of one.

Today's greatest land waste is not the vacant lots and underused acreage of suburban sprawl. It is our failure to put more high-value, close-in land to more than one use, on more than one level. For example, in Chicago only half the land inside the downtown Loop is profitably rented above the retail level, and right beside the Loop, land enough for half a million people to live and work and play on is used only for railroad yards that would better be covered over. Los Angeles actually squanders nearly a quarter of its downtown on single-level parking.

Architects, planners, builders and civic officials were all too slow to grasp the full significance of two great changes:

1. Today's high-speed automatic elevators make vertical transportation much quicker, cheaper and more convenient than horizontal and

2. Whereas most products can be used only once at a time, the new economy of vertical transportation makes it possible to use land simultaneously as often as a hundred times, with each repeated use apt to be more desirable than the use below (i.e., with the highest floors commanding some of the highest rents). The lower levels are best for stores, parking, schools and other places of assembly, but the upper floors are much more valuable for offices and apartments.

Just because land has been used once for a railroad yard is no reason why it cannot be used again for a sports arena or an office building or an apartment or all three. Land used once for a store on the lower floors can be used again for a residential hotel. Land used once for a block-size parking garage can also be used for a block-size city park. A school building site can be used again for a football field on the roof.

Now, at last, architects, planners and developers are beginning to correct this multibillion-dollar waste by learning the economics and applying the economics of horizontally stratified land use. They would have stopped the waste sooner had it not been subsidized by today's ubiquitous practice of underassessing and undertaxing underused land. Chicago's Loopside railroad yards and Los Angeles' one-level parking lots would have been built over for multiple use long ago had they been taxed at more nearly their potential multilevel land-use value, instead of a fraction of their actual single-level value.

Twenty years ago, examples of stratified land use were hard to find, except that in nonprestige neighborhoods people "lived above the store." New York had an office building built over a church; Chicago had a church perched on top of an office building. Chicago had the Merchandise Mart and New York had a dozen luxury apartments and the Waldorf-Astoria sitting over the New York Central tracks; New York had one luxury apartment with a small swimming pool and two tennis courts in the basement. Cincinnati had a new hotel terraced on top of a department store.

But now the change is coming with a rush. New York is tearing down its monumental Penn Station to make room for a new below-ground terminal under a new sports arena and a new office building; covering the Pennsylvania yards with an office building wrapped around a terminal warehouse; and getting set to recover the land cost of new schools by letting private builders erect high-rise apartments above them. Washington is wrapping high-rent offices around parking garages that occupy otherwise hard-to-rent interior space and seeking free land for public housing over new expressways. Philadelphia is running pedestrian malls block after block below street level. Bartlesville has a Frank Lloyd Wright tower—half apartments, half offices.

Chicago offers the outstanding example of stratification's potential in Marina City, which puts 40 stories of apartments on top of 20 stories of parking on top of two levels for shopping on top of a marina for 200 pleasure boats, all integrated with 16 floors of offices, a theater, bowling alleys, tennis courts and a swimming pool, thereby setting a precedent that New York, Denver, Pittsburgh and San Francisco have been quick to follow. Hartford has bridged two avenues to create a three-city-block open plaza, two stories up on the roofs of the street-level stores, banks and garages. Apartments in many cities are including swimming pools and other recreation in space that would otherwise be wasted. And most cities are beginning (not always wisely) to require off-street parking under all new high-rise buildings, even in areas where more parking facilities can only serve to bring in more cars and create more congestion.

Examples of multilevel, multipurpose reuse of the land are still too few, but the trend is obvious and the potential for making high densities much pleasanter, more efficient, more economical and more convenient is enormously exciting.

This exciting potential includes the much broader use of many devices, such as:

Arcaded sidewalks to permit wider downtown streets;

Decked-over streets to create pedestrian malls between one-floor-up shop windows;

Nursery and primary school classrooms, day-care and babysitting centers built into every high-density apartment block (already standard practice in Russia);

Coed bachelor apartment houses with swimming pools and other recreational centers on the lower floors, to solve that most urgent middle-income urban problem—boy meets girl, girl meets boy;

Outdoor play and recreation space high above the streets, either on the rooftops, on an open floor or in interior courts built over street-to-street lower levels;

Underground sidewalks running for blocks, as in Rockefeller Center;

Ample off-street loading facilities replacing the almost-unrentable ground floor under central-city loft buildings (like New York's now-almost-impassable garment center);

Highways decked over railroad and rapid transit rights-of-way.

Whenever land is put to stratified multipurpose use, human activities should get top priority on light and air; service functions should go underground (as in Victor Gruen's revolutionary plan for rescuing downtown Fort Worth).

VIBRANT DOWNTOWN IS MAGNET

The essence of urbanism is variety, and only a vibrant night-and-day "downtown" (i.e., center of urban life) can provide and support the variety of shopping, services, contacts, job opportunities and culture and recreation needed to make the city a magnet, drawing people and business from far and near. Without such a magnet, there is no good-enough reason for people to want to live in the city instead of outside. And without such a magnet, it will be difficult, perhaps impossible, to persuade enough middle-class families to return from the suburbs to the central city.

Downtown variety needs thousands of people to support it; it takes great variety to bring in thousands of people. The bigger the crowds, the greater the variety they can support; the greater the variety, the bigger the crowds. To support this maximum variety, downtown needs people not just 9 to 5, but all day long and far into the night; and it helps to have people living and sleeping close in, as they do in most of the cities whose downtowns have the strongest pull: New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Denver, New Orleans, Washington, Boston and Philadelphia. The more attractions downtown can offer, the more people will want to live close; the more people who live close, the easier it will be for downtown to support more attractions, night and day.

The more compact downtown is kept, the easier it will be for more people to take advantage of its variety for business and pleasure. The easier downtown is to get to, the less pull it will need to draw people in, and the farther it will pull from.

A strong downtown magnet is well worth spending money to create, if the city has none. It is well worth spending money to preserve and strengthen, if such a magnet is already present and pulling. But there is a limit to how much public money should be spent to protect the real estate investment in pre-Depression buildings, in what used to be—but no longer is—the heart of town.

Downtown is not a location; it is an activity; it is where the action and variety are today—not necessarily where the action and variety used to be. New York's Wall Street area has not been a true downtown since before the Civil War. Today it is just a high-rent, one-purpose satellite in an off-center location, miles from the nearest railroad station, bus terminal or airport connection; miles from the shopping center, the amusement center, the cultural center and the fastest-growing commercial center. Likewise, what calls itself downtown Los Angeles has not yet been remade into a true downtown, even though the multmillion-dollar public investment in expressways has made it the easiest-to-reach spot in that hard-to-find-yourself-anywhere metropolis, and even though the multimillion-dollar investment in new office buildings shows promise of making it once again the business center.

Says architect Gruen: "In Los Angeles, if you want to find the best hotel, you don't go downtown. If you want to see a first-run movie, you never go downtown. If you want quality and variety of merchandise, you never shop downtown, for the stores there are just a shabby second-rate shopping center, catering to the low-income areas south and east. Everything connected with the better way of life has moved away. Until just recently, Los Angeles downtown has been supported mostly by the huge civic center, which employs 10,000 people on the public payroll, and by the political lawyers and financial lawyers and the like who feel they must stay close to the seat of government."

As for New York's Wall Street, there are no big stores there, for stores cannot live on the lunch-hour trade; there are almost no restaurants there other than quick lunches, for restaurants cannot prosper on one meal a day. There are no hotels there, no theaters, no movies; even the aquarium is gone; and after 6 p.m. and on weekends there are almost no people.

URBAN RESPONSIBILITY IS CHAOS

A more chaotic chaos would be hard to dream up than the chaos over what government should do what, and what government should pay for what, to meet our urban needs.

Responsibility is divided horizontally four ways between local, county, state and federal government. It is divided vertically scores and sometimes hundreds of ways, first between the central city government and all the surrounding town and village governments, and then again between all these governments and a still greater proliferation of special tax districts, administrations and authorities—bridge authorities, park authorities, water districts, sewer districts, fire districts, school districts, library districts, garbage districts, hospital districts, etc. Within the local governments, authority is often divided still further, with the school board going its own way to spend more money than anyone else. In Washington the same confusion is repeated. Both the Senate and the House scatter responsibility for urban affairs legislation among half a dozen uncoordinated committees. Fifty different federal agencies are now working on the problem of water supply and water pollution (up from 25 found by the Hoover Commission in 1955). Grants for urban renewal come from one department, grants for roads come from another, grants for pollution control from a third. The Interior Department is spending $25 million to preserve and beautify the historic heart of Philadelphia, but the millions of dollars needed to cover over the expressway that will cut it off from the river will have to come (or not come) from the Commerce Department.

No city government collects anywhere near enough money of its own to take on the whole job of coping with all problems that confront it. One reason no city government has enough money is that few states let the cities collect enough taxes, even if they want to. The second reason is that few cities like to collect any more taxes than they have to; they would rather get grants-in-aid from the states or from Washington. The third reason is that most cities are afraid to raise taxes for fear of speeding the exodus of industry. The fourth reason is that the cities' only exclusive revenue source is the property tax, and most states make their cities collect most of their property taxes, not on land (which is undertaxed) but on improvements (which are already so overtaxed that the tax inhibits even some of the most needed improvements). The fifth (and perhaps the biggest) reason is that in this country, local government is stuck with enormous costs that in other countries are paid as a matter of course by the central government, so, paradoxically, the local tax burden in most cities is too high even though the tax take is too low!

One result of keeping city governments poor is that too few city services are good enough. A second is that few suburbs want to be annexed to cities that can't afford good schools and other top-grade services. The third result is the proliferation of special tax districts to pay for services the cities have no money to provide (Los Angeles has 246 of them). Fourth, cities are afraid to raise more taxes even if they could, for fear of driving still more people and businesses to tax havens in the suburbs. Fifth, many industries are moving to suburban tax havens anyhow. Finally, the sixth result is that nobody can tell just who is responsible for what. Schools, for example, are paid for partly by the local school district, partly by the state, a little by Washington, with the state setting the standards, the local authorities picking the teachers and the federal government decreeing the racial balance. Streets and highway costs are split four ways, and the city cannot control how new state and federal highways cut them up. (Says the past president of the AIA, "We rip our cities with motorways and delude ourselves that we are doing it in the name of progress.") Too many in-city expressways are allowed to split neighborhoods like a Chinese Wall; even depressed roadways like Detroit's divide the two sides like a river.

Most of us agree that the political boundaries of our cities are archaic and should be brought in line with today's realities by annexation, by metropolitan federation or otherwise. All of us agree that the tax limitations and tax policies forced on our cities are archaic and should be corrected.

Too many planners today are planning at cross purposes. Highway planners plan new roads and new interchanges with too little regard for the way they destroy neighborhoods and cut cities to pieces, and how many families they dislocate. City planners plan for urban growth while suburban planners too often plan to block it by large-lot zoning. Suburbs want upper-income families planned in, factory workers planned out, city money planned in, city problems planned out. New York's bridge authority plans $21,000 per car to bring more cars into a city already half-paralyzed by too many cars which nobody plans to park. San Francisco's Bay area plans a billion-dollar transit system that is sure to force rebuilding everything near each station, but nobody plans what to rebuild. Neighboring Oakland and Berkeley each make great plans so uncoordinated that they leave streets dead-ending at the city line; plans that would put Oakland's heaviest industry right next to Berkeley's waterfront park.

And the minute any plan starts taking shape, speculators too often double its cost by skyrocketing the price of land needed to carry it out. "Good land planning is impossible in the face of land speculation," is the dismal dictum from the International Housing Center in Rotterdam.

Getting anything done about good plans is difficult and discouraging at best. It is doubly difficult and discouraging in urban America, where it is next to impossible for any government or government agency to get the clearly recognized responsibility, authority or money needed to coordinate scores and hundreds of conflicting plans and see that a coordinated plan is carried out.

WHY MUST CITIES SHOULDER TWIN BURDEN OF POVERTY, EDUCATION?

Perhaps the worst consequence of today's chaos and confusion over what level of government should do what is this: The federal government is being asked to get involved in a lot of local problems that could better be handled locally, while the local governments are being forced to pay a lot of not-really-local costs they cannot afford.

One big reason so many city governments are too poor to pay their full part in making their cities pleasant for people and profitable for business is that, in the U.S., most of the cost of public education is charged to local government (sometimes the city itself; sometimes the school district). These costs were small enough for local government to carry when few children went beyond eighth grade, and schooling meant mostly the three R's; they are now far too heavy to charge against the revenues traditionally reserved for local government (i.e., the property tax), and they will soon redouble.

The United States is almost the only country on earth where the central government does not pay all the costs of free public education.

So instead of saying that our state and federal governments are helping our local governments pay for schools that are a local responsibility, it might be more correct to say that our local governments are crippling themselves financially to help our central governments pay for schools, whose support should be the responsibility of the central government.

A second reason why our city governments are too poor to make their local services good is that the local property tax is still being tapped for many of the costs of poverty and many of the costs required by today's much-more-generous spending for poor relief. These costs are set by state and federal policy and most of us think they should all be paid out of state and federal taxes. Urban poverty is now concentrated in the central cities, so Professor Netzer's research for the Brookings Institution states flatly that "Before the tax differential between cities and suburbs can be erased, the cost of poverty services will have to be taken off the back of the property tax."

Poverty and education are not local problems or local responsibilities in the same sense, or to anything like the same degree, that police and fire protection, water supply, garbage collection, sewage disposal, parks and playgrounds, local streets, off-street parking, suburban commutation and urban mass transportation are local problems and local responsibilities. Half the people on relief in almost every city and half the ward patients in the city hospitals came there from somewhere else; half the children in the city schools came from somewhere else and will grow up to work somewhere else.

The director of the Advisory Commisson on Intergovernmental Relations stated it: "Because welfare and educational programs have lost their essentially local character and have acquired critical importance for the well-being of state and nation, they should no longer be left to the vicissitudes of local boundaries, the geographic distribution of taxable properties, the policy leanings of tax assessors, or even the political courage of local governing boards."

Poverty and education now account for more than 60 percent of all local government spending. They cost local government more than all the revenue now provided by the only revenue source reserved for local government—the property tax.

If these not-primarily-local poverty and education costs were all paid by the state and federal governments that call the tune for them, our local governments would have plenty of money of their own to cover all their own, strictly local costs and make all their own local services good without sending their mayors to the state capital or to Washington, hat in hand, to beg for subsidies.

The first rule of good management is to fix responsibility (including financial responsibility) where it belongs. Instead of asking the state and federal governments to subsidize strictly local costs like parks and sewage disposal, it might be much wiser to ask the state and federal governments to face up to their own primary responsibilities—the states on education, the national government for poverty. With some 60 percent of the property tax load thus removed, cities and counties could pick up the difference and meet their own clearly local responsibilities.

Shifting the basic cost of education to the states would not necessarily require giving the states any more control over local schools than they now exercise, and communities that want better schools than the statewide standard could still afford to supplement what the state was willing to spend.

ATTITUDES MUST BE BROADER

Living close requires more, rather than less, willingness to cooperate, to share the cost instead of trying to get away with something for nothing at somebody else's expense (usually the taxpayer's). The implications are enormous. For instance:

Industries, utilities and apartments should not expect to hold down their own costs by pouring tons of soot and garbage ash into the air to fall on somebody else's property, for someone else to pay for cleaning up. (In New York, this cleaning bill is officially estimated at $500 million a year; almost as much each year as it would cost to put smoke control devices on all the city's garbage incinerators and factory and utility chimneys.)

Towns and factories should not expect to save money by pouring untreated sewage and waste into our streams for someone else to purify for eventual reuse elsewhere downstream.

Drivers should not expect to foul up traffic by parking free or cheaply at other taxpayers' expense, on land priced up to $100 a square foot. As long as motorists can park free, or almost free, on busy streets, how can we expect them to pay by the hour for off-street parking?

If the primary reason for cities is to minimize the handicaps of distance and maximize the advantages of easy access, it is almost unbelievably foolish to subsidize traffic congestion by letting parked cars cut four-lane roadways down to two.

Transit riders should not expect to ride long distances for a fraction of the cost by getting the city to subsidize most of the fare.[*]

(But all of us recognize that as long as commuting to the cities by expressway gets a subsidy running as high as 10 cents a car-mile, mass transportation will also have to be subsidized. It is much cheaper to subsidize mass transportation than to subsidize driving to work at the present scale.)

Most notoriously, upper-income commuters should not expect the state or federal government to subsidize their flight to the suburbs by paying half the cost of their commutation.

Urban landowners should not be allowed to get rich by getting other taxpayers to pay the cost of all the public facilities without which their land would be good only for market gardening, and not much good at that.

We all sympathize with the cities' money problems; we all agree that the cities need money relief from state and federal governments.

But too many of our cities' money problems are of their own making. Cities would need less money help from above if they could screw up their courage to stop subsidizing obsolescence, blight and sprawl by undertaxing valuable underused land, and subsidizing water waste, traffic jams, air pollution and water pollution by far-below-cost user charges. We could get much better cities much sooner if our cities would just stop subsidizing their worst faults.

The purpose of cities is to maximize the citizens' freedom of choice, but that does not mean citizens should be free to do as they choose at somebody else's expense (specifically, that of other taxpayers). Most of us think the best way to let people decide for themselves what they want and what they don't want is to let the market govern their choice, by letting them pay for it.

People who choose to drive to work should be willing to pay what it costs to park their cars. People who choose to burn their garbage should be willing to pay for adequate smoke-control devices; industries which choose to dump industrial waste into our streams should be willing to pay the cost of first purifying their own waste; landowners who want a neighborhood park which would increase the value of their property should be willing to pay an annual assessment to buy the land. (This neighborhood assessment policy is one big reason why Minneapolis citizens enjoy the best neighborhood park system in America.)

ADVICE FOR SATELLITE TOWNS

Metropolitan New York will have more than 30 million population within a generation; metropolitan Los Angeles will reach 15 to 20 million.

Small cities can and should be centered around a single high-density hub, but big cities must inevitably be structured or restructured as close-in clusters of high density, radiating from a still-higher-density hub, for obvious and complementary reasons.

There is no reason why low-density land users such as one-floor factories or suburban shopping centers should pay for central-city space. These land users benefit by being near the urban center but need not be right *in* it, for they are largely self-contained, i.e., they do not need maximum access to supporting services, markets, diversified labor, etc. (Central-city colleges should adapt themselves to central-city land use in compact buildings like those around them.)

There is no reason why assembly-line workers, shopping center customers, etc., should travel all the way downtown 200 times a year. For them it is much more efficient and economical to relocate their destination closer to where they live.

Low-density land use in a maximum-density center defeats the whole purpose of the center. There is no reason why lawyers or admen, for example, should have to waste time crossing a ruralistic college campus to reach a client's office.

Each of tomorrow's clustered satellites should combine good high-density living at the center with good low-density living between satellites. Each should make multilevel, multipurpose use of its most central land. Each should have a quick and economical connection to downtown by highway and/or mass transit. Each should include as great a variety of shopping, services and amenities as its area can support (but obviously this local variety will seldom be anywhere near as great as the variety made possible in downtown, which has the whole metropolitan area to draw on and serve).

Recognizing the need of high-density cluster development close in, Paris is planning six new suburban centers, each with 250,000 to 400,000 population, with a strong regional government overall. This French scheme of high-density subcenters close in is almost the direct antithesis of the not-too-successful British attempt to grow low-density, garden city "new towns" far out beyond the green belt. It follows quite closely the precedent set in Sweden, where Stockholm has already built two close-in model satellites, Vallingby and Farsta, both within nine miles of the center. Now New York's Regional Plan proposes rationalizing the metropolitan sprawl around 12 suburban subcenters, each of which will soon have a million people living within a 10 mile radius.

---

[*] Panelist Gruen dissents. Says he: "Mass transit is such an essential city service that it should not just be cheap; it should be free, like the sewers. And this would save all the money now wasted collecting fares, which can run more than a quarter of the total cost of the transit system."

Sometimes whole new towns like Baltimore's Columbia and Washington's Reston will be needed. More often, existing centers (like Newark, New Brunswick, New Rochelle, Yonkers, Jamaica and White Plains around New York) will have to provide the nucleus for tomorrow's clustering satellites, for the costs of starting a brand new town are staggering. People hesitate to move there until jobs and shops are ready; shops and jobs try to wait for people; and the developer of a medium-size town may well have to sink $60 million before he turns his first profit.

Brand new towns can profit by one great advantage: They can be coherently planned to offer better living in tomorrow's world than older communities handicapped by having "just growed" to meet yesterday's needs.

But—to those who would sponsor new towns or new suburban centers, we offer these three bits of caution and crticism:

Too many of today's new towns are too far out to give people easy access to the variety only the central city can provide. And each passing year makes it harder and costlier to assemble a big enough acreage close enough in.

Too many (if not all) of today's new towns are planned just to siphon off what is best in the central city, leaving behind all the problems like poverty and segregation. The greater the success achieved in this escapist maneuver, the greater the danger that the new towns will destroy themselves, by destroying the central city on which they must all depend for many essential services and attractions.

Too many of today's new centers are planned too small, and will soon be a mess. For example, the Northland Shopping Center on Detroit's city line was such an outstanding success that what was planned for a million square feet of stores is now 1.4 million, and around it has grown a whole new urban complex of high-density apartments, hotels, laboratories, restaurants and even Detroit's only legitimate summer theater—all requiring parking and sitting in a lake of parking five times as big as the building it surrounds. People living in the high-rise apartments can see the shopping center nearby, but they cannot get there on foot because they find it unbearable to walk through these vast parking areas and cross the multiline highways constructed to make the center accessible.

This development now sprawls over 450 acres. It could have been achieved with much greater convenience and economy on a hundred acres, if only the planers of Northland could have foreseen what a magnet their model shopping center would be and had had the means to implement that foresight.

As for the new cities (as distinct from new towns), all of us think they are a fine idea, for there is a limit to how much population today's metropolitan areas can accommodate pleasantly, and how much industry they can accommodate efficiently. When, as and if a new city is built, we hope it will escape all the mistakes our older cities have made. But the hard fact is that no new community big enough to be called a city is being built and only one is being planned; and Bill Levitt, who ought to know, says it will require at least a billion dollars to finance the development of a new city of 100,000 population.

NO QUICK CURES FOR CONGESTION

Big old cities like New York, Philadelphia, Boston and Chicago, tightly structured by railroads and mass transit, find it hard and perhaps impossible to adjust to the street parking needs of the automobile. Whether New York elects to spend another $21,000 per car for new approaches to bring more cars into lower Manhattan, there is no room on the streets for more cars, and no parking space off the streets for them, and the more people who come in by car, the more people who decide just to stay out to avoid the congestion.

Conversely, new cities, loosely structured by the automobile, will find it hard and perhaps impossible to adjust to reliance on mass transit, which is efficient only if many thousands of people want to get to a reasonably small number of destinations from a reasonably small number of points or origin. Los Angeles shelved its mass-transit plans when a traffic survey showed 230 points of destination, some of them spread over a three-mile diameter and few of them important enough to justify track-bound transportation to reach them.

In Washington, Gruen's transit survey for the National Capital Planning Commission projected a need of first restructuring the District around a dozen new urban subcenters at the major stations of the proposed transit system, each incorporating a bus terminal and a big parking garage to make the station an easy point of interchange from other means of transportation, and each providing the incentive for a 150-acre high-density development incorporating housing, retailing, cultural entertainment and employment facilities.

Meanwhile, the Bay area around San Francisco is going ahead regardless, with an $800 million, 75-mile mass transit project that could have some startling results. For one thing, it will give landowners around the 30 stations a windfall profit of more than $800 million, i.e., an unearned increment that could (but won't) be recaptured to pay off the entire cost of the system. (Most of the cost of the Erie Canal 140 years ago was paid off by a special tax on the lands whose value it multiplied.)

BART will also start a building boom around each station that could, for example, rebuild San Francisco's Market Street 30 stories high, with something like an eight-square-block platform providing direct access to 2 million square feet of office space and shopping. (Nothing so coherent will happen, because no one is planning for it.)

Some kind of subcentered restructuring will probably be necessary anyhow to make big cities livable as they redouble their population, but it is foolish to think mass transit can replace the private car (especially on the periphery), or that any single means of transportation can meet all the needs of tomorrow's big cities. The Bay area transit system is not expected to absorb more than 10 percent of the trips now taken by auto. Says economist Wheaton: "People accustomed to the convenience of driving direct to their destination will take a lot of persuading before they will walk to a bus, bus to rail transit, ride to their station, and then bus and finally walk again to where they want to get." But others cite examples in New York, Chicago and Philadelphia where better mass transportation has brought thousands of commuters back to the rails.

Moving jobs to the outskirts is no cure-all for highway congestion in commuter hours, for there is no use expecting people to make nearness to their jobs the No. 1 consideration in choosing where to live. In New York thousands of commuters from Westchester ride the subway from Grand Central to Wall Street, passing on their way thousands of commuters from Staten Island and Brooklyn who work near Grand Central. In Los Angeles, thousands from the valley jam the freeways on their way to work in Orange County and vice versa. Almost everywhere, morning and evening rush hours find some freeways traffic-jammed in both directions.

The bigger the city, the bigger the cost of putting primary reliance on automobiles to handle the commuter rush. A three-lane expressway, costing up to $95 million a mile, can carry no more workers to their jobs in an hour than a single seven-car train, and New York's estimate of $21,000 for the capital cost for bringing in one more commuter car is exceeded by Washington's $23,000. Neither figure includes any money for adding more parking facilities, though each added mile of expressways requires seven times as much space to park the cars it brings in. Already parking lots and local streets give over to the automobile 54 percent of the downtown area in Atlanta, 50 percent in Los Angeles, 40 percent in Boston, 44 percent in Denver.

Sooner or later—and we hope sooner—most big cities will have to work out their own new balanced solution to their traffic and transportation problems. This solution will almost certainly involve some return to much more use of man's original means of locomotion: walking. It will also involve much more reliance on high-speed vertical transportation, and wide acceptance of moving sidewalks and the revolutionary new lowcost systems for automated mass transit that are already well past the design stage. It will also reflect some equally revolutionary but still visionary changes in cars and trucks.

In many cities, traffic and transportation will probably entail keeping cars off some of the busiest streets and reserving them for pedestrians, as in Gruen's very successful reshaping of downtown Fresno, California.

One part of the realty tax is the tax on improvements. The other is the tax on the unimproved value of the land on which the improvement stands. It would be hard to imagine two taxes whose impacts on urban development are more different.

TAX POLICY CRIES FOR REVISION

Heavy taxes on improvements are bound to discourage, delay or even deter owners from making improvements; the bigger the improvement tax, the smaller the owner's incentive to spend good money to improve his property, instead of investing the money somewhere else or putting it to some other use.

Contrariwise, heavy taxes on unimproved land values (more correctly, site values, or perhaps still more correctly, *location* values) tend to encourage, speed or sometimes even compel improvements. The bigger the land tax, the bigger the leverage on owners of underused property to do something to increase its earning power—or sell it to someone who will.

Heavy taxes on improvements are bound to lower the supply and raise the cost and rent for improvements, but land taxes heavy enough to bring more land on the market are bound to lower the price of land.

The dualism of property was recognized by the classical economists, and few students now question the conclusion reached long ago by Turgot and Adam Smith that taxes on unimproved land values cannot be passed on (except under rent control, which survives only in New York State), so it is nonsense to suggest that heavier taxes on the land under slum properties would make the poor people who live in slum buildings pay more rent.

Almost all of us agree with the conclusion reached by Dr. Netzer's research for the Brookings Institution that "the present property tax tends to discourage investment in new construction and rehabilitation. A change to the site-value tax will encourage building and rehabilitation. . . . Heavy taxation of land values would increase substantially the holding costs of land, and thus encourage more intensive utilization." More than two-thirds of today's property tax now falls on the improvement, less than one-third on the land. So shifting the whole weight of a 3 percent-of-true-value property level to the site would require a 10 percent rate on the land to produce the same revenue.

Nothing less than a 10 percent rate would be adequate to make the owners of underused land release it when it is needed for more intensive use, instead of holding it off the market waiting for higher and higher prices. And with the federal government absorbing more than half the local levy as a tax deduction, and the present euphoric expectation that land prices will continue to soar 15 percent a year compounded, many believe that the land-tax rate would have to be even higher than 10 percent to be effective.

If we want private enterprise to make its maximum contribution to rebuilding our cities bigger and better, it is foolish to penalize and discourage that contribution by overtaxing improvements. As all bankers can figure, but too few tax men seem to realize, a 3 percent-of-true-value tax on improvements actually costs improvers almost as much as a 50 percent sales tax paid off on the installment plan over 60 years at 5 percent interest. And it should be obvious to everybody that, in an economy where every business decision must first be checked against its tax consequences, the equivalent of a 50 percent sales tax can be a mighty powerful and effective deterrent.

An improvement tax like Boston's 6.1 percent-of-true-value is the installment plan equivalent of a 10 percent sales tax, and such a levy can make improvements so unprofitable that even prime building sites will have a negative value (i.e., be worth less than nothing). So the only way Boston could induce Prudential Insurance to pay $3.7 million for 28 prime Back Bay acres for Prudential Center was to cut the maximum tax on new buildings to about half the tax on existing structures—a concession worth much more than $3.7 million to Prudential. No other industry's products—except liquor and tobacco—are taxed as heavily as the building industry's product.

If we want to get rid of slums, it is foolish to subsidize them by assessing and taxing slum properties only half or a third as heavily as good housing with the same market value (i.e., by tying the land assessment to the building assessment and assessing the land as almost worthless because the building on it is almost worthless, instead of assessing the land high because the location could be valuable if put to a better use). In the words of New York City's 1961 adviser on housing and urban renewal: "No amount of code enforcement or tenement rehabilitation can keep pace with slum formation unless and until the profit is taken out of slums by taxation." Almost all of us agree with the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, which found that "state and local governments have failed to make maximum use of the enormous potential inherent in the property tax for either the prevention or the cure of poor housing and other blight conditions. In fact, since today's property tax is based mostly on the value of the improvements, those who permit their property to deteriorate, reducing area property values, are rewarded with lower property taxes. Landlords who enhance the value of their property have their assessments raised."

If we want to speed up the replacement of obsolete buildings such as now pre-empt most of the land in and around most central business districts, it is foolish to keep them standing and profitable by taxing not only the aging buildings but also the land under them, less and less as the buildings get older and more and more rundown. Tract-by-tract research conducted by the Urban Land Institute, with the cooperation of the Milwaukee tax commissioner, showed that it would be profitable for private enterprise, *without any subsidy*, to tear down and replace practically all the obsolete buildings downtown if the property tax were all on the valuable land they cover, so the tax burden on the replacement would not be many times heavier than the tax burden on the relic. Says Professor Gaffney, who conducted the research: "Today's property-tax practice is slowing down the replacement of obsolete structures by 20 to 30 years."

One very big reason so many cities are in trouble downtown is that they "growed" like Topsy without, at the same time, cleaning out the decay of age at the center.

The horses and carriages of our grandfather's day are gone with the wind, along with the cobblestone streets, trolley cars, steam trains and coal stoves, but most of the buildings our grandfathers knew are still standing today. Nearly a third of all of the people of Manhattan still live in railroad flats that were banned before 1900, and these slums are so underassessed and undertaxed that it has cost an average of $486,000 an acre to buy them up for demolition!

Too often, renewal has come too late. Too many cities have let old buildings stand so long that their neighborhood has died around them. St. Louis is not the only city whose core is ringed with rubble because it waited too long for the bulldozer to force a renewal that should have gone on year by year and piece by piece while the area was still alive.

If we want to minimize suburban sprawl and stop blighting the countryside with premature subdivision, it is foolish to assess and tax pressure to release their land at a reasonable price when it is needed for orderly urban growth. Too many assessors seem to confuse the property tax with the income tax; they assess valuable land far below its asking price as long as it is producing no income. On Long Island, idle land priced at $20,000 an acre is commonly assessed as low as $500 an acre.

If we want to lessen the cost of slum clearance, it is almost unbelievably foolish to inflate the price of land needed for urban renewal by undertaxation. Once again, consider how New York has had to pay an average of $486,000 an acre for the slum properties condemned and demolished for public housing. One reason for these high prices is the low tax these properties had been paying. At land costs like that, how can anyone expect private enterprise to provide good housing for low- or even middle-class families without enormous subsidies?

If we want to check the land-price inflation that threatens to price good new homes out of the market, it is foolish to subsidize that inflation by assessing and taxing land lightly, and then penalize the homebuyer who has just paid too much for his land, by taxing him too much on his house. Since 1954, while all other homebuilding costs have been held steady or actually lowered, land costs have been soaring 15 percent a year compounded, and before the 1966 tight-money crisis, a three-to-one majority of homebuilders voted this their most urgent problem.

Likewise, if we want to make low-density living possible closer to downtown, it is foolish to subsidize the waste of central-city land by undertaxation. The Urban Land Institute research referred to before showed that full utilization of the land within three or four miles of the center of Milwaukee would satisfy most of the demand that is now proliferating sprawl, thereby making land available for low density less than half as far out as now.

If we want to hold down the cost of municipal services, it is foolish to undertax underused urban land and so encourage sprawl right inside the city limits, for almost all these costs—water supply, sewage disposal, garbage collection, street, fire protection, police protection, as well as gas, electricity, telephone connections and other utilities—are multiplied by distance.

In brief, there is hardly an urban problem today that is not aggravated by today's practice of undertaxing land and overtaxing improvements.

State governments must take much of the blame for the undertaxation of land and the overtaxation of improvements, for most states presently compel cities to apply the same tax rate to land as to improvements, and most states condone the practice of assessing land half as heavily as improvements.

STATES DESERVE MUCH OF BLAME

The states must take full responsibility for the shocking proliferation of suburban tax shelters, where the tax rate is sometimes only one-tenth as high as the city rate because the suburbs can get away with bringing in industry while keeping out industrial workers with children to educate.

Local assessment inequalities are made worse by state-sponsored exemptions. These include the limit of a few hundred dollars which some states impose on the assessment of any land that is farmed (even when it may be held for development at many thousands of dollars per acre), and the homestead, veterans' and senior citizens' exemptions, by which some state governments have sought to subsidize favored voters at the expense of local tax revenues. The limit on homestead exemptions is usually set at or below $5,000 of assessed value, but where assessments run to only 25 percent of market value, this means that a home worth $20,000 may be completely tax-exempt.

Federal tax policies (or practices) likewise make urban problems worse:

Speculative land profits are taxed not more than half as heavily as ordinary income, provided the landowner does nothing to improve his property for sale (i.e., provided he does nothing to earn his profit).

The 25 percent capital-gains tax makes land assembly for large-scale development difficult, for a locked-in owner can often mortgage his property for almost as much as he could realize on a sale after deducting the gains tax.

Letting each new owner depreciate the same building all over again is one more serious deterrent to replacement. The older and more decrepit the building, the shorter its life expectancy for tax purposes, and the bigger the depreciation the new owner can take.

Shoddy construction is encouraged by the accelerated depreciation-allowance which makes it advantageous for the builder to sell out within seven years.

Neighborhood assessments are denied the income tax deductibility enjoyed by local taxes. This is just about the most serious deterrent to neighborhood financing of neighborhood improvements.

Federal corporation and income taxes dilute the impact of the property tax by letting corporations deduct 52 percent of the local levy from their federal tax bill, and letting individuals deduct up to 80 percent. (On the good side, it should be recorded that this helps make the tax on improvements tolerable by cutting its impact in half.)

But on the bad side, it should also be recorded that it helps inflate the price of land, by absorbing more than half the tax cost of holding idle land off the market.

With the federal government absorbing 50 percent of the local land tax, and assessors assessing idle land at not more than 20 percent instead of the theoretical 100 percent, the effective yearly tax cost of holding a $100,000 tract off the market is not the $3,000 it is supposed to be but a quite negligible $300.

Good living in the city should be inexpensive, because there are so many people to share the cost of the multiplicity of community services, amenities and attractions that the city offers.

Actually city living is more expensive than country living, and one big reason is that we let landowners capitalize all the economics of urban cost-sharing for their private profit. The greater the saving achieved, the more the landowner can add to his ground rent. Of this, the simplest example is cited by Winston Churchill: When London abolished the penny toll which workers had to pay for crossing the Thames to reach their jobs, rents on the workers' tenements were promptly raised a shilling (12 pence) a week.

By definition, the unimproved value of urban and suburban land derives, not from anything any past or present owner has done to improve it but from an enormous investment of other people's money to create the community around or near it. Some of this investment is made by private enterprise; some is made by those who support hospitals, museums, colleges, etc.; much of it is made by government.

No matter who makes the investment, the landowner cashes in on it. When New York extended the subway beyond Spuyten Duyvil, land prices in Riverdale zoomed upward. When taxpayers spent $350 million to bridge the Narrows to Staten Island, landowners there got a much-bigger-than-$350-million windfall. Spending $800 million taxpayer dollars for Bay area rapid transit will almost certainly enrich landowners around its stations by at least an equal amount.

For a smaller-scale example, consider the prediction by the New York Regional Planning Association that taxpayers will have to invest $16,850 in highways, schools, water, sewers, etc. for each family added to the metropolitan population. Change that "per family" to read "per lot" and it becomes clear that other taxpayers will have to invest $16,850 in community facilities to enable a landowner to sell his suburban lot for $8,000.

What all this adds up to is that citizens and suburbanites must pay twice over for all their community facilities. First they pay for them on their tax bills, their charitable donations or their business investments. Then they pay for them all over again, in higher ground rents to landowners who have been allowed to capitalize all this investment of other people's money into the price of their land.

Under today's tax and assessment policies, the owners of idle and underused urban and suburban land make only a minimum contribution to the huge community investment needed to make their land reachable, livable and richly salable. The less they do to improve their property and the longer they keep it idle or underused, the less they are taxed to help pay for the community facilities needed to multiply its value. Said Winston Churchill: "The landowner's profit is often in direct proportion to the disservice he does the community by holding his land off the market until other people's investment has multiplied its price."

Many municipal costs are multiplied by distance, and correspondingly reduced by reducing distance. Consider, for example, water distribution. If demand for water doubles in a fixed area, all we need is to expand pipe diameters. But if demand doubles by doubling the service area, we must double our pipe mileage; increase the cross-section of our old system at its base to transmit the extra load to the new extension; increase pressure at the load center to maintain pressure at the fringes; and increase the allowance for peaking.

Or consider the far more urgent problem of streets and highways, which now cost local taxpayers more than any other item except schools. The greater the sprawl, the more miles of streets needed to get from A to B, and the more cars that will have to travel more miles along those streets. Fewer people can get where they want to go on foot, and fewer can get to and from where they want to be by mass transit. Residential sprawl does not take cars out of the traffic centers; on the contrary, it brings in more. Sprawl is not a flight from traffic congestion but its principal cause.

Multipurpose high density can even out the peaks and valleys of demand and utilize municipal services seven days a week around the clock; conversely, specialized areas waste these costly services most of the time. For example, New York's Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts comes to life only from 8 p.m. to midnight and during matinees; New York's Wall Street area is alive only from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. five days a week. The rest of the time it is so dead that the girl arrested for posing nude on the Sabbath on the steps of J. P. Morgan was acquitted because there was no one within blocks whose morals could be corrupted!

With high-density stratification, private enterprise seeking tenants and customers can be expected to absorb many costs that are otherwise borne by the taxpayers. For example, private enterprise pays *all* the costs of transportation and utility services above the street level (a cost that runs close to a third of the first cost of high-rise construction); and private enterprise is beginning to find it profitable to offer built-in amenities and recreation (swimming pools, etc.) that might otherwise have to be provided by additional facilities in public parks.

High-density stratification often permits major savings through round-the-clock use of facilities. For example, Chicago's Marina City owes much of its $200,000-a-year garage revenue to triple use of part of its parking space for apartment tenants by night, for business tenants by day, for bowling alley and theater patrons in the evening.

The renaissance that saved Pittsburgh started when its business and political leaders decided their city was worth saving and took on the job of saving it. The first thing they did was tackle a local problem no one else could correct for them—the air pollution that had made Pittsburgh almost synonymous with smoke.

The same kind of civic leadership made Fresno the model of what small cities can do to revitalize their downtown—a model which is bringing visitors from all over the world to study, praise and imitate. The same kind of civic leadership inspired (but alas could not execute) the plan for saving downtown Fort Worth, and the same kind of civic leadership explains the award-winning project for clearing the oil derricks out of downtown Oklahoma City to create the most beautiful, the most practical and the most fun downtown in mid-America.

Some of our cities' problems may be too big for the cities to meet without outside help (most specifically, the problem of poverty, which is a national rather than a city problem); but most of our cities' problems are too small and too local for any outsider to take on. Consider, for example, the first six things the slum dwellers in Pittsburgh's notorious Hill District asked the Redevelopment Agency to get done for them. They requested that the city: Collect our garbage, repair our streets, put in more street lights, tear down 357 vacant and boarded-up buildings as a neighborhood nuisance, provide safe playgrounds for our children (perhaps on the boarded-up building sites), give us a voice in determining what is to be done with our own neighborhood instead of having all the decisions made for us by somebody else—perhaps somebody in Washington.

Only the city itself can clean the streets. Only the city can stop the multimillion-dollar waste of free-for-all air pollution (much of it from the city's own chimneys). Only the city can stop the multimillion-dollar waste of make-work and conflicting building codes—a waste that adds at least 10 percent to the cost of building and rebuilding. Only the city can ease downtown street congestion by coordinating traffic lights, designating one-way streets, requiring all street and understreet repairs to be done at night, banning onstreet parking and otherwise discouraging the downtown use of private cars. Only the city can lower the foolish minimum ceiling height for parking garages to cut their cost and maximize their car capacity per cubic foot. Only the city can make streets and parks safe at night. Only the city can end the scandalous and underassessment and undertaxation of slums and other ill-used and underused land.

There are hundreds of other small things our cities could and should be doing to help themselves without waiting for outside help—small things whose cost could be proportionately small, but whose cumumlative value could be very big indeed.

BETTER RECREATION IN THE CITY

Everybody talks about the need for open space, but most of the talk is about special tax concessions to help farmers keep on farming on close-in land that has become too expensive for farming, or to help golfers keep on golfing on close-in land that has become too expensive for private links.

Some of us think farms and private golf links belong a few miles farther out, where thousands of people won't have to drive added miles past their "no trespassing" signs on their way to work.

All of us support the movement for wildlife preserves, state parks, national seashores, etc., but all of us wish there could be more talk, more action, and more private and public spending for the kind of *close-in* urban open space without which only the rich can enjoy the good life in our cities.

The open space our cities need most of not just something green and shady to look at. The open space our cities need most is open space people can use and have fun in, and its use-value will depend on how many people can use it how much, how often, how safely and how near home.

Every neighborhood needs its own neighborhood park and playgrounds. The denser the neighborhood's population, the greater its need for nearby outdoor recreation; and the poorer the neighborhood, the more urgent this need is apt to grow. A dozen small parks close to home can often be more important than one big park too far away.

Neighborhood parks must always be tailored to neighborhood needs. One that would be fine in a high-class residential area might be no good at all in the slum. Good neighborhood parks need not be expensive to equip or maintain; imagination and clear thinking about what kind of park facilities the neighborhood needs can sometimes make a small budget go a long way toward both first cost and maintenance cost. New York is budgeting only $37,500 apiece for 200 small new parks in crowded areas, most of them on tax-defaulted lots the city already owns.

Neighborhood parks are beneficial in other ways than merely providing recreational space close at hand. They are also good indeed for neighborhood property values, so property owners petitioned for one and volunteered to finance its first cost by a special neighborhood assessment at so much per front-foot. (This plan may need some subsidy in the poorest sections.)

But neighborhood parks and playgrounds can meet only part of the urban need for outdoor recreation. There are many activities and enjoyments for which only the bigger central parks can provide the needed space and draw the crowds needed to support them. For example, only a big central park can support frequent outdoor concerts or a zoo or a large skating rink or space enough for riding and hiking, etc.

For city children, safe outdoor space to play in is almost as important as good schools to learn in, but most cities spend 50 times as much for schools as for parks and playgrounds. New York, for example, allocates only seven-tenths of 1 percent of its budget to parks and recreation.

As for city adults, those who can afford it show how much they want open space and open space recreation by moving to the suburbs or by jamming the expressways for their weekend exodus; either way, they spend far more money to get to open space and open space recreation than it would cost to provide good open space and open space recreation close at hand right inside the city—private open space for those who can afford to be exclusive, public open space and recreation for everybody. In a recent survey in Milwaukee, most people put better recreation facilities in that city's fine park system first on their list of desired civic improvements.

We all agree with the director of the Institute of Public Administration that "Instead of spending millions of tax dollars for highways to help people escape from the city to find outdoor recreation, we should pay more attention to providing recreational facilities inside the city." In San Francisco, enormous numbers of suburbanites drive *into* the city to enjoy the city's parks and beaches; some say that as many suburbanites drive in as citizens drive out for recreation. More cities should study and follow San Francisco's lead.

New York could serve as a good example of what needs to be done (and has recently begun doing something about it). New York has more waterfront than any other city in the world—540 miles, much of it city-owned, with 35 miles of beaches—but the city pours in nearly half the untreated sewage that makes almost all its waters unsafe for swimming and even kills off most of the fish. New York has 37,750 acres of park land, most of it underdeveloped and way out where few people can enjoy it. Says the former park commissioner: "Most of the people of New York have to get their recreation on vacant lots that are stinking with garbage and littered with old cars and mattresses. The ball fields our kids have to play in are ridiculous and disgraceful."

Until last year, New York has wasted most of its billion-dollar-plus investment in Central Park; says the former president of the AIA: "Central Park has been a big wasteful space that people couldn't use, a beautiful dead spot in the daytime and a dangerous place at night." New Yorkers still get less use and fun out of Central Park's 846 acres than the Danes get out of 22 acres in Copenhagen's Tivoli Gardens, among whose trees and flowers are six big restaurants, an open-air theater, a dance hall, two bandstands providing almost continuous afternoon and evening music, a lake and an amusement park complete with miniature railroad, etc.

In Russia the government builds all the new apartments around big hollow courts that provide safe play space for the tenant's children (as well as nursery schools and shared baby-sitting and day-care facilities). In America it is hard to find examples where the open space around new high-rise apartments is widely used.

Sooner or later, as urban population swells, the logistics of moving millions of people out of the city for weekend outdoor enjoyment will become intolerably costly. It is high time to start giving much more thought and spending much more money to make our cities good places for outdoor as well as indoor living, instead of devoting so much thought and money to getting out of them.

We need to develop a whole new urban package that will give people with children what they need inside the city, instead of making parents who can afford to go move out. And we need to give much more thought to making city life pleasant and rewarding for the poor, who are now pouring into our cities, not so much because they want to but because they have no other place to go for jobs.

THE GHETTO: A NATIONAL PROBLEM

Racial segregation is not a local problem; it is a national problem. In origin it is not an urban problem, but it has been dumped on our cities to solve, with nearly 95 percent of all Negroes outside the South urbanized. It is now many cities' No. 1 problem, and one city governments cannot cure without many kinds of help, including all-out cooperation from state and national governments. It is a problem nobody can solve until millions of people, both white and nonwhite, understand it better and pitch in to play their own large or small part in the solution.

And unless somebody solves it, many great cities like Washington, Philadelphia, Detroit, Baltimore and Chicago may find themselves deserted by the white middle-class and abandoned (except for small enclaves of luxury housing for the rich) to the nonwhite poor, trapped in the slums by their poverty, and the nonwhite middle-class, trapped on the border of the slums by segregation and the lily-white suburbs' refusal to let them in. Already Washington has become 63 percent nonwhite, Detroit 39 percent, St. Louis 37 percent, Philadelphia 30 percent, Chicago 30 percent. Between 1950 and 1960, as everyone knows, Washington offset a growth of 181,000 Negroes with a loss of 226,000 whites; Chicago, a growth of 321,000 Negroes with a loss of 399,000 whites; New York, a growth of some 700,000 Negroes and Puerto Ricans with a loss of some 800,000 other whites.

Racial segregation is not a single problem but the sum of many different ones—a different community problem for almost every city and neighborhood, a different personal problem for every segregated nonwhite. Different as all these are, they are all parts of two basic problems—one almost new and seething with new bitterness, the other old and deep rooted in old prejudices.

One problem is the plight of the 5 million-odd urban nonwhites who are almost desperately poor—the plight of the 45 perecnt of all Negroes the 1960 census found living in "deteriorating" or "dilapidated" housing.

The other problem is the frustration of the other 5 million-odd nonwhites who are no longer poor—5 million-odd urban nonwhites who, against great handicaps, have earned their way up to family incomes over $6,000 (up from 4.74 million indicated by census in 1963). These million nonwhites have adjusted their lives to middle-class aspirations but still find themselves denied middle-class acceptance and status.

These two very different problems call for equally different housing solutions, money solutions, opportunity solutions, timing solutions—and nothing but more confusion can result from confusing the two.

It is just plain nonsense to think all nonwhites are alike and to act as though their problems could be solved in the same way. The fact is that there are more differences among nonwhites than among whites because on top of all their other differences is superimposed a wide range of difference in how many white ancestors they have and what social, educational and financial advantages this white blood may have given their grandfathers. Caste lines among nonwhites are at least as strong as among whites, not just in lands like Haiti and Jamaica whose population is nearly 100 percent nonwhite but in this country too.

College-educated nonwhites (and there are more Negroes in U.S. colleges today than white men in English universities) have the same aspirations as college-educated whites, and have good reasons for feeling they should be accepted for what they are, instead of being rejected for what their great-grandfathers were. Middle-class nonwhites (and nonwhites have to work a lot harder to achieve middle-class incomes and values) have the same aspirations as middle-class whites, only more so. After long years of frustration they are more eager for status; market surveys show that they spend more of their incomes to be nicely dressed, spend more for "personal care," buy more expensive shoes, spend more for their home entertainment equipment. They limit their families to fewer children, work harder on their lawns and plantings, and seem to have made good neighbors in every tract where they are accepted, from Levittown on the East Coast to Eichler on the West.

These people do not need special relief or special subsidies. They do not need special schools for their children, for their children have little trouble keeping up with white classmates. What they need now is recognition of their past achievements, freer access to better-paying jobs (Negro incomes still average 47 percent lower than white), a wider door to escape their present segregation on the edges of the nonwhite slums, and a better chance for further progress toward assimilation into the rest of our social and economic life.

These nonwhites moving up have little in common with the poor nonwhites sunk in the slums except their color and their common resentment of segregation. They have so little in common that when New York tried to speed desegregation by moving poor Negroes out of Harlem's slums into new public housing in middle-class areas, the middle-class Negro owners of nearby homes protested as angrily as their white neighbors.

Most of the Negroes now crowded into urban slums are newly arrived fugitives from the farm mechanization that wiped out a million field hands' jobs in the South, and sent them fleeing to the cities to seek jobs for which they had neither skills nor training. On top of this came a mass migration of 700,000 penniless Puerto Ricans, mostly to New York, and a mass migration of Mexican peons that made Los Angeles the world's sixth largest Spanish-speaking city. For this huge and sudden influx, the cities—north, south, east and west—were completely unprepared, without jobs, housing or schools ready to receive them.

The newcomers were equally unprepared for urban living. Old established urban Negroes welcomed the Negro newcomers with little enthusiasm, and the Spanish-speaking newcomers with even less. Poor whites greeted them with open bitterness and hostility, for they threatened their low-pay unskilled-labor employment just at a time when automation was eliminating millions of cheap-labor jobs.

Poor nonwhites need much better housing, but the sad fact is that as long as there are 6 million fewer decent homes in the urban housing inventory than there are urban families in need of homes, it is inevitable that 6 million urban families will have to live crowded into substandard units. Most of these 6 million victims of the urban housing shortage are bound to be the poor, and a disproportionate number of the very poor are nonwhite.

So we agree with HUD Secretary Weaver that the best answer to the nonwhite slum problem and the housing segregation problem is to build enough good housing so there will be a good home available for everyone. Some of this new housing will have to include building new low-rent units, but most of the low-rent need could be met better by trickle-down work, just as the auto needs of low-income families are better met by second-hand cars than by cheap new models. With today's land costs, today's building-trades wages and today's code and labor restrictions, private enterprise cannot hope to build good enough new homes cheaply enough for poor people to buy or rent without big subsidies. Two of the wisest contributions government could make to better housing for the poor would be to help finance the purchase and resale of sound used dwellings, and to help finance low-cost modernization.

But more good enough housing is only a small part of the answer.

Poor nonwhites need freedom to move out of their racial ghettos and live closer to available jobs—but when all restrictions are ended, most nonwhites still will prefer living with their own people, just as almost every other ethnic group has tended to stick together for a generation or more; often for three generations.

Poor nonwhites need better schools and better education, but bussing white children to nonwhite-neighborhood schools cannot be a good enough answer, when it means holding white children back because poor nonwhite parents cannot give their children the advantages needed to start even and stay even. School buildings in nonwhite-neighborhoods are notoriously inferior, partly because they are old buildings in old neighborhoods; teaching in nonwhite-neighborhoods averages below the white-neighborhood level, mostly because the teacher's work is harder and the pay no more.

But in all fairness it should also be realized that New York, for example, spends as much per pupil (well over $1,000) to educate nonwhite children in the public schools of Harlem as the tuition charged by the city's most exclusive private schools—quite a bit more money than most lily-white suburbs pay to educate their own. Furthermore, in Philadelphia and elsewhere the drive for school desegregation is tending to turn segregation upside down, with more and more white children taken out of public school, and more and more desegregated public schools getting to be almost 100 percent Negro. How will this affect the willingness of the white population, which carries some 95 percent of the local tax load, to pay increased taxes for better schools that few of their own white children will be attending?

Nonwhites need more human contact with the rest of the community. The primary cause for the trouble in Watts was *not* that the housing in Watts is so bad (it isn't; not so long ago Watts was a fairly good middle-class white neighborhood). It was not because the area is overcrowded (it isn't; the density in Watts is not much more than 20 per acre). The primary cause of the trouble in Watts is the fact that it had been allowed to become an island apart. Not enough people outside had any contact with their fellow citizens walled off inside Watts. So it took a riot that cost $40 million and 34 dead to make outsiders realize that Watts had no good hospital for 87,000 people, no modern schools for more than 30,000 children, no movie house, only one public swimming pool and almost no public transportation to let people get to the kind of jobs they could hold. No wonder 30 percent of all the job seekers in Watts are unemployed; no wonder its residents felt forgotten, bitter and almost hopeless.

But most of all, poor nonwhites desperately need more money, more jobs and more job opportunities, particularly more jobs for male heads of families and for young people, both boys and girls. Everybody knows that unemployment among nonwhites is more than twice as heavy as among whites, averaging out to 8.2 percent, but too few people seem to understand the peculiar patten hidden behind the 8.2 percent average—a pattern which helps explain the bitterness of Negro youth, and also accentuates the matriarchal character of Negro home life which, in turn, accentuates the school problem of poor Negro children. An unemployment rate of 8.2 percent is bad enough, but what the "average" conceals is a jobless rate that often exceeds 30 percent among some of the nonwhites most in need of jobs.

Unemployment among college-educated Negroes is actually much less than among college-educated whites, because so many companies are making a special effort to find qualified nonwhites to hire. Unemployment among middle-class Negroes has to be small almost by definition (otherwise they could not enjoy middle-class incomes); unemployment among adult Negroes with less than a grade school education is also low, probably because they seem willing to take menial jobs that nobody else wants. And one-third more Negro women than white have jobs outside the home—despite a 34 percent unemployment rate among teen-age Negro girls (three times the unemployment rate among teen-age white girls).

In other words: Negro unemployment is concentrated among Negro men who were high school dropouts, and is heaviest of all among young Negro men, who are most likely to have young children. In big city slums, their unemployment rate often runs higher than 30 percent.

A tragic consequence of this unemployment pattern is that the No. 1 breadwinner in too many slum-trapped nonwhite families is a working mother, and in some 40 percent of these poor families there is no man at all because the working mother is either deserted or unwed (in Harlem 43.4 percent of the children are illegitimate). So there is no one at home all day to care for and bring up the children. Of all Negro children, 36 percent live in broken homes; in the slums this percentage is much higher.

What all this adds up to is that the hard-core problem of nonwhite segregation is very largely a poverty problem, and it cannot be solved until employers, labor unions and the government (mostly federal) work out a good way to let nonwhites escape from poverty and male unemployment. Says Philadelphia's Joseph V. Baker: "A Negro does not need a college degree to put gasoline in an empty tank, or to turn a wrench as far as the threads have been cut, or to collect tickets on trains."

Desegregation, in the sense of living next door to white neighbors, is mostly for upper- and middle-class nonwhites. For the great mass of poor nonwhites, desegregation means mostly a chance to escape from poverty, slum housing and male unemployment, plus a chance for better education to help their children work their way up.

THINGS THAT ONLY CITIES CAN DO

No local government can solve all the problems of the nonwhite poor, but few of their problems are likely to be solved unless and until local governments take an active part in their solution. For example and specifically:

Only local governments can deflate the bootleg price of slum housing by code enforcement and/or taxation. Dean Abrams' block-by-block research shows that in Philadelphia, vigorous code enforcement has so deflated central-city housing prices there that a large percentage of the 14,400 row houses now vacant can be bought (or put) in decent move-in condition for $4,000 cash or less. (Compare this with an average cost of $20,500 for new public housing, and $12,300 now budgeted by the Housing Authority to buy units and do them over completely, regardless of how much fixing up they really need.) If FHA or other special financing is made available, this $4,000 cost would make it possible for even relief clients, black or white, to buy or lease decent used homes. Pittsburgh, on the other hand, has been fearful that strict code enforcement might leave the 10,000 families homeless, and in New York the mayor's special housing adviser declared in 1961 that "no amount of code enforcement can stop the spread of slums unless and until the profit is taken out of slums by taxation."

Only local governments can locate some of their own employment centers where they will be easy for the nonwhite poor to reach.

Only local governments can tear down the obsolete and decaying school buildings found in most nonwhite slums, and replace them with up-to-date plants less likely to encourage high school dropouts (the average nonwhite boy quits school after the ninth grade.)

Only the local government, with financial support from Washington, can provide the nursery schools and the day-care centers needed to keep the preschool slum children of broken homes and working mothers off the streets, giving them some of the care, attention and mental stimulation middle-class children get from their families, so these slum children will be ready to keep up with their classes when they reach school age. This kind of need is already met by the state in Russia (another case where most mothers work outside the home) by including day-care centers, playgrounds, nursery schools and primary schools in the center of every new apartment block. In this respect it is high time for American cities to catch up with Russian ones. In New York, 80 percent of the 600,000 relief recipients whose support costs local, state and/or federal taxpayers $700,000 a year belong to no-male-breadwinner families.

Only the local government can provide or encourage the kind of bus or jitney service poor non-whites need to get from where they live to jobs they can hold.

Local governments can provide neighborhood centers to help slum owners who want to improve their property understand and take advantage of all the various state, federal and foundation grants and aids available to them.

Local governments can pressure the state to stop forcing them to discourage and penalize improvements with increased assessments and taxes. (Personal interview surveys in Newark and elsewhere make it clear that fear of higher assessments is a prime reason why slum property owners won't spend money to maintain or improve their properties.)

Finally, the job needs of the nonwhite poor will not soon be met until local government cooperates in attracting and encouraging not just high-wage industry but also the kind of low-wage industries and services in which unskilled workers could expect to find steady jobs.

Racial segregation is the worst kind of segregation because it is so rigid, so hopeless and so humiliating; but we deplore all one-class neighborhoods big enough to segregate their people from the larger community.

Suburbia is the great segregator, segregating not only white from nonwhite but also the lower-middle-class from the middle-middle-class, and the middle-middle-class from the upper-middle-class and the wealthy. We think this is as bad for those who are segregated in as for those who are segregated out. For example, it makes it harder for those who are segregated in to employ the kind and variety of help they need, while at the same time making it harder for many of those who are segregated out to get the kind of service jobs they need and could fill.

Small enclaves of people with the same background and about the same income are perfectly natural and no problem at all; there is no reason why millionaires should live next door to relief clients, and no reason why relief clients should want to live between millionaires. But there are many good reasons why rich and poor, white and nonwhite should live close enough together to know how the other half lives, and to share the community of life and the openness of opportunity whose sharing is the first essential of urbanism. Big one-class or one-race neighborhoods frustrate ease of contact and ease of access; they deny variety, opportunity and the exchange of services; and the bigger the one-class or one-race ghetto, the more complete the frustration and denial.

Middle- and upper-income families pay in more ways than one for their flight from the city to one-class enclaves in the suburbs. They pay in travel time and all the extra hours they spend getting to and from the center. They pay in lost leisure, doing household chores they could otherwise find someone else to do. They pay in loss of variety and stimulation because they live too far from town. (Says the former AIA president: "One-class neighborhoods are just plain dull.") And they pay in higher prices and heavier state and federal taxes for supporting on relief millions of people who, in a better-integrated metropolitan society, might be self-supporting and helping to meet the labor shortage and up the gross national product in our full-employment economy.

It is more than a coincidence that the most underprivileged people in urban America must also be the most heavily subsidized (in Philadelphia, for example, 80 percent of the relief clients are nonwhite).

Unfortunately, nobody has ever seen or experienced a city that comes anywhere near measuring up to today's potential. Nobody has ever seen or experienced a really good city—a city that takes full advantage of today's better technology, design and planning. Nobody has ever seen a city planned so almost everybody could walk to work in less time than it takes to get there now by car, train or subway. Nobody has even seen a city planned for all the convenience and economy of three dimensions instead of two. Nobody has ever seen a city where full utilization of the center at high density lets the people who prefer low density enjoy it close to town. Nobody has seen a city whose best close-in locations are not cluttered with obsolete and inadequate old buildings that should have been torn down long ago—old buildings that live on and on only because urban decay is now subsidized by underassessing and undertaxing obsolescent properties. Nobody in our generation has seen a city whose busy streets are not choked with parked (and moving) cars; or a city whose air is good to breathe and whose water is good to swim in. Nobody has seen a city that provides plenty of usable open space for fun and recreation where open space is most needed; where all the children could safely play outdoors within two blocks of home—often without even leaving their own building. Nobody realizes that with today's technology such a city could cost much less to live and work in than the anachronisms that urban Americans live in today. What's wrong with today's cities could be cured a lot faster if people could be given a better understanding and a clearer vision of what kind of city to demand and insist on getting. Computers can now predict quickly and quite correctly all the effects of changed planning, zoning, transit and highways. This is an important development that should be a great help to city planners and city officials in choosing wisely between alternative programs, but it cannot close the communications-gap between planners, with their eyes fixed on the future, and average, citizens, with their understanding stuck in the past. Perhaps what our cities need now is a new Hugh Ferris to give their citizens a fresh vision of what tomorrow's cities and tomorrow's city living could and should be like.

[From Life, May 12, 1967]

A Way Must Be Found To Preserve an Individual's Values As We Evolve Toward a Communal Society

(By Daniel Bell)

The most salient fact about American society—the root fact necessary to comprehend so many other bewildering aspects which mark off our times from the past—is the "change of scale" in our lives.

Urbanization, the population explosion, the pace of our activities, the constant bombardment of new ideas, new knowledge, new people, our very comprehension of the nature of the universe—all these factors are changing continually. The simple and crucial result for the individual is that no longer will any child be able to live in the same kind of world his parents and grandparents inhabited.

For millennia, children retraced the steps of their parents, were initiated into stable ways and ritualized routines, and maintained a basic familiarity with place and family. Today, not only is there a radical rupture with the past, but a child must necessarily be trained for an unknown future.

Not only is all this the defining characteristic of our times—it is the root of its disorientations. For, as the world becomes more open to us, there is a greater hunger experience. There is a desire for change and novelty and the search for sensation. Out of it comes the erosion of old creeds, to be replaced by a mingling of all creeds and all styles a jostling of primitive and classical modes. It is this syncretism of culture which so distinctively sets the rhythm of contemporary life, which underlies the restless feeling that afflicts so many individuals in their search for "meaning" in the contemporary world.

Every human society in the past has made some distinction between what is held to be sacred and what is considered profane. But ours is a secular age, and nowhere more so than in the U.S.

Some of our "nothing sacred" attitude derives from the lack of a past and of a continuity in time. The United States is, after all, a "created nation"; in fact it was the first new nation—long before the new nations of present-day revolutions. The disdain for the sacred is also part of the rough-and-ready egalitarianism of American life, with its lack of social caste and of respect for individual differences. Such casualness has its costs. When the rules of status and achievement are unclear, the result is often anxiety, even though the idea of reality, of meaning and achievement, is a fairly simple one sociologically. Reality is a confirmation by "significant others." In the Jewish faith, traditionally, the *bar mitzvah* is a confirmation by the community; in a similar way, graduation from college is the confirmation of a new role and a new status, a judgment by one's teachers of maturity and manhood.

When a person is confirmed by others, there has to be some sign of recognition. Reality "break down" when the confirming "others," for whatever reason, have lost their meaning for the person who seeks to locate himself as an individual, or to find a place in the society. Today, individuals have left old anchorages, no longer follow inherited ways, are constantly faced with the problem of choice and can no longer find authoritative standards or critics to guide them.

THE CHANGING NATURE OF THE FAMILY

Nowhere is this more evident than in the change in the nature of the family. In the traditional world, work and home life were one, and the family was both an economic and a social unit. Not only that, but it was the setting for almost all the other social functions as well—welfare, recreation, education and religious instruction.

The modern world has witnessed the separation of the family, as an institution, from most of these functions. There is, more radically, a separation of family from occupation whether it be the breakup of the family farm, the family business, the family enterprise or the family tradition, such as medicine, law, carpentry, fishing. Education has been taken over almost entirely by the schools, recreation primarily by commerical enterprises, welfare by the government or by social institutions. The family is now focused largely on fulfilling psychological and emotional needs. and not sufficiently allowed to do this, according to some sound psychiatric thinking.

The change in the nature of the family—historically the most crucial of all human institutions—has had a contradictory effect on a person's sense of individualism. In a psychological sense, as the ties with a family have weakened or been cut altogether, the feeling of individualism has been enhanced. To the classic question of identity—"Who are you?"—a traditional person would answer: "I am the son of my father." But today a person says, "I am I. I come out of myself, and in choice and action I make myself." The great thrust of the American character—the urge, the compulsion to strike out on one's own, to cut away from the father and even to surpass him—has been one of the richest of the sources of dynamism in American life.

But there has also been a deeper meaning to this change in the nature of identity: in striking out for oneself, *experience*, rather than tradition, authority, revealed utterance, and even reason, has become the touchstone of truth and understanding. To this extent, the sense of generation has become the focus of individual indentity, leading in turn to strains and conflicts between generations in society, and opening the way to rebelliousness among the young.

Another defining characteristic of our time is that masses of persons will no longer concede their "exclusion" from society—a situation expressed most dramatically in our own decade by the Negro revolution. In a fundamental sense, this development grows out of the historic claims of individualism—the demand to be treated as a person, not as a category. Yet, paradoxically, this claim of the individual is being made by the group and is being realized by the government. Since inequality in our society arises from disproportions in power, privilege and talent, the effort to redress such disadvantages necessarily involves the individual only as a member of a group, or as possessing a particular status—as a worker, or a Negro, an aged person, or one of the poor. This social fact is reshaping our basic institutions.

It is only within the past few decades that the United States has become a truly *National Society,* in which economic or political or social action in one section immediately affects every other.

Beginning with the massive increases in regulatory agencies under the New Deal, and continuing with a massive involvement in science, armaments, and research and development which has reworked the economic map of the country, the federal government has become our most significant and conscious agent of social change and transformation. Today that is most visible in the area of civil rights and segregation, in the passage during 1964–65 of federal antidiscrimination and voting laws. Less dramatic but equally decisive are the federal government's recent large-scale support of education, medical care for the aged, subsidies for housing, innovations in transportation, the protection of natural beauty, extended income benefits for the poor, and the like.

The rise of the welfare state, which all this implies, necessarily prefigures a new role for the state governments, for such ambitious programs can succeed only with strong federal aid. Finally, among these factors that combine to create a national society, one must single out, for its overwhelming socio-psychological power, the national popular culture that has emerged out of modern mass communications and transportation. To the extent that one can date a social revolution, the evening of March 7, 1955 can perhaps be taken as a landmark: On that night, almost one out of every two Americans was watching Mary Martin perform in *Peter Pan* before the television cameras. Never before in history had a single person been seen and heard by so many at the same time. This was what Adam Smith had called the Great Society—but "great" in a way that he could never have begun to imagine.

But obviously it is not in entertainment alone that such a gigantic visual impact can be felt. The close-ups of snarling police in Selma, Alabama chasing Negroes with gas, clubs, pistols and riot guns made that city an instantaneous symbol of moral indignation; within a week thousands of Americans poured from all over the country to protest the outrages. And the death of President Kennedy brought an estimated 85% of the television sets of the nation together in a common beholding of the funeral, and a common mourning of the late young President of the United States.

While the National Society is relatively new, the National Idea, of course, is not. It goes back directly to the very founding of this country, to the great political debates that went on in the first decades of its life. The debate over the National Idea, as Harvard Professor Samuel H. Beer has most recently reminded us, goes back to the theory of the Constitution itself: Was this country, as the Jeffersonians contended, a compact of states, each with its own sovereignty, or was it a union, as the Federalists argued, created not by the states but by "we the people"—a national community that formed the foundation of a national authority?

THE FOUNDING FATHERS AND THE "NATIONAL IDEA"

This was, Beer continues, the basis of the famous Webster-Hayne debate in 1830 over the propriety and necessity of the "general government" using federal funds to build roads and canals, improve rivers and subsidize education. From Hayne's point of view South Carolina had no interest in a canal in Ohio, because Ohio and South Carolina were different governments entering into a compact that could annul unconstitutional acts of the federal government. According to Webster, on the contrary, "Carolina and Ohio [were] parts of the same country; states united under the same general government, having interests, common, associated, intermingled."

Today the National Idea and the National Society are conjoined. But the vast centralization that has resulted poses the question, more significant than ever before, of the liberties of the individual. In order to create viable communities, the individuals must have a sense of participation in, and control over, the events that affect their lives. It is to this central problem that we now turn.

In the National Society, highly intertwined, crowded and dense, a new social shape is emerging. It is what might be called the Communal Society. The Communal Society is characterized not only by greater interdependence, but by the fact that more and more of the things done to satisfy individual wants have to be undertaken through group or communal instruments, rather than by the individual.

Such a group basis for politics can easily lead to a conflict of objectives and a conflict of rights, and traditional theories based on the natural rights of individuals do not always offer clear principles with which to mediate the issues. And yet if the individual is to survive, it must be within this new and ill-defined context. In order to re-define the role of free men, therefore, we must first take a careful look at the coming shape of the Communal Society. Surely the extension of the idea of group rights is one of its inescapable consequences, and one of the coordinates of the welfare and planning state.

There is another coordinate. It is the simple fact that more and more of the goods and services required in our society will have to be purchased communally.

Take something as simple, basic and necessary as air. In every economic textbook, air used to be the classic illustration of the only item that is a "free good." Everything else, including water, has a cost. Yet the irony is that in the next 35 years one of the scarcest natural resources we have, in terms of increasing costs, is clean air.

One cannot ask for and individually buy in the market place one's share of unpolluted air, even if one were willing to pay for it. We can seek to assign the costs of air pollution to its sources, whether industrial, municipal or individual. But these are coordinated actions that have to be taken through public channels.

A NEW SOCIAL SHAPE—COMMUNAL SOCIETY

Another context for communal action is the cities. By the year 2000 more than 80% of the increase in our population will live in urban areas. During the next 15 years, 30 million people will be added to our cities—the equivalent, as President Lyndon Johnson said in his "Message on the Cities," of the combined populations of New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit and Baltimore.

"In the remainder of the century," he pointed out eloquently, "urban population will double, city land will double, and we will have to build in our cities as much as all that we have built since the first colonist arrived on these shores. It is as if we had 40 years to rebuild the entire urban United States."

When we add to these tasks the efforts to eliminate poverty, to provide better medical services for the population, to maintain open spaces, to purify our lakes and streams and have adequate water for a growing population, to provide an efficient and fast mass transportation system, it is evident that we need a coordinated balance sheet that specifies our natural goals and charts our performance.

How do we do it? And how do we know what resources are available for what purposes? Recently a book by Leonard Lecht, which was an outgrowth of his survey for the National Planning Association, sought to "cost out" some national goals and to see how much could be done by 1975 in realizing them. His projected net spending added up to $1,127 billion. Even assuming a constant annual 4% increase in the gross national product, the total at that time would be about $981 billion, or a deficit of about $150 billion.

The projections are important for two reasons: One, they puncture a growing myth of "economic omnipotence"—the idea that our economic machine is a magic cornucopia that can always offer up all the goods that anyone might wish to produce. As the author of the study remarks:

"Concentration on our society's objectives in terms of individual goals overlooks the fact that our objectives make up a system of competing claims on resources. We could well afford the cost of any single goal at levels reflecting current aspirations, and we could probably afford the full cost for any group of goals over the next decade. We could rebuild our cities, or abolish poverty, or replace all the obsolete plant and equipment in private industry, or we could begin to develop the hardware to get us to Mars and back before the year 2000. We can make substantial progress on many of the nation's goals . . . but we cannot accomplish all of our aspirations at the same time."

Secondly, if we cannot meet all such goals simultaneously, we need some mechanisms that would allow us to balance competing claims and to make conscious choices: What proportion of added national income should go to private persons and what for public spending; within the public sector, what proportion needs to go for defense and the conquest of outer space, and what for community needs; within community needs, what priority should be given to urban planning, to health, to the relief of poverty?

At present we have no mechanism for making these decisions properly. Nor do we know, for example, where within the complex of social ills that can be broken down into poor housing, low educational achievement, delinquency and family disruption the first steps should be taken. To say that they are all interrelated is commonplace. Like a diagnostician who must try to prescribe a remedy, we have to know where in the labyrinthine system one can enter if the maximum effective change is to come about. Our knowledge, unlike that of most diagnosticians, is slim.

But it should strike anyone that in a society confronting the kind of problems we have, the existing economic, political or social organization of 50 states is totally inadequate to solve them. What is the rationale for the boundaries of Delaware, Rhode Island, Maryland or New Jersey? (In his 1966 inaugural speech Governor Hughes stated that New Jersey was undergoing an "identity crisis." Well it might.) Under the federal Constitution, such concerns as education, welfare, local services and the like are powers reserved to the states and municipalities. But these are no longer competent entities for performing such services. Their tax bases are inadequate, their administrative structures archaic and inefficient.

Our problems are compounded when we go to a lower-level unit of government. The situation at the local level is chaotic. There is no decentralization but only disarray. The proliferation of government gives rise to serious problems in the coordination of public programs, in reducing public accountability, in making decisions affecting multi-unit areas, and in contributing to the wide disparities between available financial resources and community and human needs. The complexity of the problem can be seen from the fact that in 1962 the San Diego metropolitan area had 11 municipalities, Phoenix 17, Houston 25, Cleveland 75, St. Louis 163, Chicago 246, and the New York metropolitan region some 1,400 local governments—small villages, school districts, each with its own administrative powers.

These local-government boundaries—historic growths that could at one time adapt to local needs—are no longer meaningful. Clearly what is necessary in the next several years is a comprehensive overhauling and modernization of governmental structures to determine the appropriate size and scope of units that can handle the appropriate tasks.

The group of businessmen who have formed the Committee for Economic Development recommended, in their report, *Modernizing Local Government*, that the number of local governments in the United States, now about 80,000, should be reduced by at least 80%. They further recommended that "the 50 state constitutions should be revamped—either by legislative amendment or through constitutional convention concentrating on local government modernization—to provide for boundary revisions, extensions of legal authority, and elimination of needless overlapping layers." It would be absurd to aim at reducing the number of existing states—for historical, traditional, and political reasons. But all sorts of state functions could be "detached" and taken over by multistate or regional "compacts."

NEEDED: A NEW WAY TO PLAN OUR GOALS

Clearly there are no easy answers. (Imagine the effort to reduce the number of local political jobs by some form of rationalization.) Even the favorite theme of regionalism would provide no real solution, for the definition of a region is not hard and fast, but varies with different functions: A water region, a transport region, an educational region, and even an economic region have different "overlays" on the map of the

United States. One must first determine what is to be centralized and what is to be decentralized.

Our present system of economic accounting does not allow us to reckon the social costs of change and to decide, rationally, who is to bear the costs. A new plant in an area may create new employment opportunities, yet its by-products—water pollution and air pollution—may create additional costs to the community. The substitution of natural gas and diesel oil for coal has meant economic gains to certain producers, but also social debits in the distressed Appalachian areas, where the displaced coal miners, because of their age, cannot find employment elsewhere.

What all this adds up to is a need for planning—for priorities, and for the specification of goals. This is not to suggest, particularly in the use of the word "planning," that it would take the form of directives from a government to its people. Rather, what is needed is planning that anticipates change, can facilitate change and can adjust to change, once we have decided what we want, in the same sense that a corporation today plans on a five-year, 10-year and even 20-year basis to anticipate changes in markets, in products, in capital needs, and the like.

In the area of public needs and communal services, the case for a stronger national government rests upon a simple proposition—the fact, as Harry V. Jaffa, a political adviser of Barry Goldwater, has put it, that "the problems which face the American people, to an extent unprecedented, are national problems and can be dealt with . . . only by the common direction and close coordination of the efforts of all Americans."

But in such a vast, broad undertaking, what role can the individual citizen—or even the individual community—hope to play? The question of the size and scope of the social unit—the creation of a "human scale" in a mass society—is the most crucial sociological problem created by the forces which have shaped our time. What, then, are the final considerations of this issue?

In contemporary sociology a debate has been raging that goes to the root of the issues expressed in this series in Life and in this article. It is the effort to assess the impact of modern society on the individual. There are, on the one hand, writers who see contemporary society as providing greater opportunity for the individual because of new vistas, greater mobility, and the whole array of new ideas and new cultures. To be modern, writes one sociologist, means to see life as alternatives, preferences and choices. There are, on the other hand, writers who see human beings as more alienated, fragmented between home and job, and isolated than ever before—crowded, harassed, depersonalized.

How does one thread one's way through this confrontation, especially if one believes, as this writer does, that both points of view are correct? The resolution, perhaps, lies in understanding a number of different perspectives.

By opening up more windows onto the world, by making it more accessible in imagination and in practical fact, by creating new skills and higher education, a person can find greater individual fulfillment and autonomy through the choices he makes. But equally, by ripping up old anchorages, by making more severe the psychic and social as well as the economic costs of failure, by emphasizing material success as the criterion of achievement, and by allowing mass taste to impose itself on culture, a sense of alienation is increased.

There is a second, more direct element, the fact that the social history of the last 150 years has been shaped by two powerful contradictory impulses: the drive to social equality and the increase in bureaucratization. In politics, in opportunity for advancement, in legal protections, men have sought the goal of equality. But in one's job there has been more specialization, detailed division of labor, greater impersonality and bureaucratic rules. In one's occupation one lives in a controlled, hierarchical, bureaucratic world. In the remaining areas one seeks to express opinions freely—in politics, culture, etc. It is in the tension of these two that a sense of disparity and depersonalization appears.

And finally, there are two considerations which explain perhaps the radical left and the radical right. One is summed up in the catchword "the revolution of rising expectations." As the English writer W. G. Runciman has expressed it:

"Although at first sight a paradox, it has become a commonplace that steady poverty is the best guarantee of conservatism: if people have no reason to expect or hope for more than they can achieve, they will be less discontented with what they have, or even grateful simply to be able to hold onto it. But if, on the other hand, they have been led to see as a possible goal the relative prosperity of some more fortunate community . . . they will remain discontented with their lot until they have succeeded in catching up."

THE RISE OF RADICALS—LEFT AND RIGHT

On the other hand, any rapid social change necessarily erodes the position of established groups, especially those attached to traditional ways of life. If what defines the radical left is *impatience,* what marks the radical right is *disposition*.

It is somewhat misleading to seek an economic location for the "dispossessed," for it is not economic interests alone that account for their anxieties. A small businessman may have made considerable amounts of money in the last decade yet strongly resent regulation in Washington, the high income tax and, more to the point, his decline in status.

To the extent that any structural location is possible, one can say that the social group most threatened by the recent social changes in American society is the "old" middle class—the independent physician, farm owner, small-town lawyer, real-estate promoter, home builder, automobile dealer and the like. And what gives fuel to their emotions is the nativist nationalism and fundamentalist outlook which divides the world into good guys and bad guys, which assigns virtues and vices on the basis of such moralism.

Any rapid social change in a society which cannot unite against some outside threat—as in the case of the national unity produced during World War II—is bound to throw up political extremes which seem to polarize the society and break up its consensus. And these are the tensions we confront today.

Periods of social disruption produce what sociologists have called anomie, a society where individuals have no traditions or sure rules of conduct to guide them. Anomie sets in where there is breakdown of communal forms of solidarity, particularly the family, and where there is no effective regulative ethic to restrain excesses of conduct. Individuals no longer feel a sense of belonging.

Nothing is sacred; anything goes. Anxieties increase. There is a search for new faiths. The stage is thus set for the charismatic leader, the secular messiah who, by bestowing upon each person the semblance of necessary grace and the fullness of personality, supplies a substitute for the older unifying beliefs that the mass society has destroyed. This has been the common diagnosis to explain the rise of dictators, strong political personalities, or cultist gurus. It is an apprehension that many people have about the United States today.

It is quite true, I believe, that a society achieves liberty and stability when men have rooted attachments to homes and work, and where there is a sense of participation in the society. Throughout modern industrial society there have run the intertwined, contradictory currents of bureaucratization, rationalization, impersonality and efficiency in one channel, and egalitarianism, individualism, hedonism and permissiveness in the other. It is too simple to fault one in favor of the other. Specialization and efficiency are a condition of mass production and a rising standard of living for all. Bureaucratization, paradoxically, is often a condition of fairness, for without specified rules or contractual arrangements a subordinate or a worker may often be at the mercy of the arbitrary whims and caprice of a supervisor or boss who is exercising his "individualism." Yet the problem of balance remains.

In the next several decades the decisive sociological problem for the emerging communal society will be to work out new social forms which will, in the area of work, relax the authoritarianism of bureaucratic hierarchy and, in the community, maintain and increase the citizen's participation in its affairs.

THE PARALYSIS OF TOO MANY PARTICIPANTS

The major problem will be in the creation of such viable communities, for it is there that the political decisions which directly affect our lives are shaped. The problem is twofold: how to achieve some realistic functions for local communal groups in a national society, and how to give the individual a sense of effective participation in the policy.

Now, the saving grace of America has been precisely the variety and number of "secondary groups" between the state and the individual—this is a nation of joiners, exclaimed Tocqueville in amazement—which have provided social attachments for the individual citizen in voluntary associations. In a remarkable book entitled *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society,* Edward Banfield of Harvard contrasted the situation in a small town in Utah and one in southern Italy. "A single issue of the weekly newspaper published in St. George, Utah (pop. 4,562) reports a variety of public-spirited undertakings. The Red Cross is conducting a membership drive. The Business and Professional Women's Club is raising funds to build an additional dormitory for the local junior college by putting on a circus. . . . The Future Farmers of America . . . are holding a father-son banquet. . . . A local church has collected $1,393.11 in pennies for a children's hospital 350 miles away. The County Farm Bureau is flying one of its members to Washington, 2,000 miles away, to participate in discussions of farm policy. Meetings of the Parent-Teachers Association are being held in schools. . . ."

In Montegrano (the name is a pseudonym), a commune of 3,400 poor farmers and laborers in southern Italy, there is no newspaper nor is there one "in any of the 13 other towns lying within view on nearby hilltops. . . . Official notices are posted in the salt and tobacco store, a government monopoly, and on a bulletin board in the town hall. . . . Twenty-five upper-class men constitute a 'circle' and maintain a clubroom where members play cards and chat. Theirs is the only association."

It is the extended network of voluntary associations which has been the source of so much independent initiative, in politics and social life, in the United States. One might argue that with our increasing urbanization such civic consciousness would diminish and that in this decline one could find the source of the disorientation that individuals feel in the large, urban environment. And yet I would argue to the contrary. In American life today there is probably more voluntary association, more local community and suburban newspapers and more participation in a variety of organizations, professional, hobby and civic, than at any previous period in American history.

One of the elements that makes New York almost ungovernable today is precisely that proliferation of groups. Forty years ago, New York City had a single political boss whose power was based on a small number of neighborhood clubhouses, and a business community relatively cohesive and influential in the affairs of the city through some key banks and old families. It is the vast multiplication of organizations in New York—block associations, neighborhood councils, Parent-Teachers Associations—each clamoring for attention to its problems, which has swamped the mayor's office. The picture of small economic and social oligarchies running the large and small towns of America—true once in Middletown, true still in Dallas, certainly not true in New Haven—is fading. In New York, the directory of social and health agencies published by the Community Council of Greater New York lists some 1,200 organizations (including hospitals, churches, social welfare agencies, as well as neighborhood and voluntary associations) within the city, and if one adds further the large number of church societies, PTA groups, block associations and the like, the number of voluntary groups in New York adds up to a much larger total.

In a paradoxical way, it is the multiplication of organizations and the increase in participation which often enhances a feeling of ineffectualness. For where there is a boss, or some identifiable source of influence, it is easier to get things done. Where there are hundreds of clamoring groups, each seeking its own projects or protecting some specific interest, the attainment of consensus or direct action is more difficult.

SOCIAL CHOICE VERSUS INDIVIDUAL VALUES

It is here that one comes to the nub of the problem of the communal society—the relation between social choice and individual values. Where an individual needs something for himself, he can buy it in the market. But where one has to arrive at joint decisions, how does one amalgamate the discordant preferences of individuals who want different things in order to achieve a social choice?

The answer, quite simply, is bargaining—the bargaining and trade-off of preferences within and between groups. But short of some arbitrary and dictatorial knocking of heads together, what other mechanism is there in a free society which is responsive to the play of conflicting opinions?

The idea of bargaining may seem prosaic when matched against some of the great ideals and utopias of human aspirations. Yet it is this very principle which is the foundation of a continuing civil society. Few countries in world history have escaped violent internal civil and political disorder within the lifetime of any single generation. Few countries have been able to institutionalize the mechanism of a peaceful transfer of political power, where the loser goes off to work as an ordinary citizen, rather than seeking to organize a coup, or being shot. Except for a handful of countries, mostly on the north rim of the Atlantic community, few nations in the world have been able to escape civil war within the last hundred years. Even France, mother country of the civilized style of life, as recently as six years ago was threatened by the spectacle of paratroopers descending onto Paris from the army base in Algeria to seize power. It is the ability to achieve and maintain consensus that represents the triumph of democracy.

In one of the last, moving essays of his life, the German sociologist Max Weber distinguished between two fundamental political orientations: the "ethic of ultimate ends," and the "ethic of responsibility."

The ethic of ultimate ends is, at best, an ethic of conscience. It is an absolute ethic which insists, unconditionally, that the end is so crucial or justifiable that all means necessary may be taken to achieve it, and that no compromise is possible. This is, for example, the ethic of Bolshevism.

The ethic of responsibility is the ethic of compromise. It asks not who is morally right and who morally wrong, but given the potential conflict, how can one solve the problem with least damage for all concerned? With its concentration on civil peace, however, the corruption of this ethic is the loss of principle, or opportunism, into which endless compromise can lead.

The political man, if he is to achieve the "calling" of politics, is aware of both risks, and he knows, in his own maturity, that no single formula or answer will suffice. His only guide is a sense of responsibility—a commitment to his own principles, and a sensitivity to those of others. He acts, as Weber says, "by following an ethic of responsibility, and somewhere he reaches the point where he says: 'Here I stand; I can do no other.' That is something genuinely human and moving. And every one of us who is not spiritually dead must realize the possibility of finding himself at some time in that position. Insofar as this is true, an ethic of ultimate ends and an ethic of responsibility are not absolute contrasts but rather supplements which only in unison constitute a genuine man—a man who can have the 'calling for politics.' "

In the modern world, politics is inescapable as one of the arbiters of life. But an open society—one which necessarily lives by the give and take of bargaining—can only survive by maintaining the distinction, so firm in Roman law and Western tradition, between the public and private, and sharply defining the scope of each. The political world can only be sustained by voluntary associations which freely provide the underpinnings of a common order; the private sphere is the precious one in which the individual works out his own will and his own destiny.

THE DEATH OF TED YATES IN ARAB-ISRAEL WAR

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the pursuit of truth has brought death to many men. It brought death this week to a former Wyomingite, Ted Yates, who died of head wounds received in Jordan while covering the Arab-Israel war for the National Broadcasting Co.

Ted Yates was a journalistic craftsman to whom the inscribing of history on celluloid and in words was both a profession and a passion.

He had been honored many times by his profession. In 1965, he received the George Polk Award for his reporting in Vietnam. He was cited only last year by the Overseas Press Club for his reporting of the war in the Dominican Republic. One of many programs which he produced for the National Broadcasting Co., "The Undeclared War," was also cited by the Overseas Press Club.

Mr. Yates would have stood tall in any field of journalism, but he stood particularly tall in the television field, which has not generally distinguished itself for the quality of its product. He distinguished himself also as a man of personal courage and intellectual character.

Had Ted Yates lived, I am certain that the history of the current Middle East crisis would have been perhaps more accurately reported in a graphic fashion than will now be the case.

The sympathy of all Americans can go out to the family of Mr. Yates, as well as to the loved ones of another journalist killed in the fighting, Paul Schutzer, of Life magazine. Mr. Yates is survived by his wife, the former Mary Olberg, and three sons, all of whom live in Washington.

The deaths of these journalists struggling to record the sights, sounds, and causes of war, are particularly tragic because the public awareness which could have resulted from the success of their efforts might have been a factor in preventing future conflicts.

I ask unanimous consent that an article pertaining to Ted Yates and Paul Schutzer, published in the New York Times of June 7, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. TV AIDE AND PHOTOGRAPHER ARE KILLED IN MIDEAST FIGHTING

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL, June 6.—Two American newsmen have been killed in the Middle East fighting, one in Israel and the other on the Jordanian side, it was reported today.

Ted Yates of the National Broadcasting Corporation, a television producer-director, died today of wounds he received in the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem yesterday.

Mr. Yates was leading a crew of five from NBC in filming a documentary of the fighting when he was hit in the head by a bullet.

Paul Schutzer of New Rochelle, N.Y., a Time-Life photographer, was shot and killed covering a battle in the Negev yesterday, an Israeli Army spokesman confirmed.

According to the Time-Life bureau in Paris, a Life reporter, Michael Mok, cabled that a 57-mm recoilless rifle shell had hit the halftrack in which he and Mr. Schutzer were riding. The vehicle caught fire, but Mr. Mok escaped.

YATES HAD NARROW ESCAPES

Mr. Yates, a Marine combat correspondent during the war in Korea, had covered many combat zones and had had several narrow escapes during his career as a producer of television documentaries.

NBC recalled yesterday that he had been fired upon by North Vietnamese in Laos, stoned by Communists in Sumatra, expelled from Cambodia and caught between rioting students and a bayonet charge by a palace guard in Java. During that charge his driver was bayoneted in the mouth.

A newspaper reporter who like Mr. Yates covered the events following the United States intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965 said that the tall, slender, goodlooking producer seemed to have an affinity "for going wherever surprise trouble would develop."

He said that Mr. Yates was at an intersection-checkpoint when a Miami Herald reporter and photographer were machine-gunned and badly wounded by United States Marines.

He also was on hand when Dominican rebels fired on six United States marines who had taken a wrong turn. Two of the marines were killed and a third was fatally wounded.

Mr. Yates' colleagues said he was just inside the lobby of the Intercontinental Hotel in the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem Monday when machine-gun fire hit the hotel. They reported that the others had dived for cover but that Mr. Yates had remained standing to watch what was going on. He suffered serious head wounds.

The producer-director, who also was a writer, narrator and reporter, headed a five-man NBC team that had been preparing a documentary on the Middle East situation for the last 10 days. He went from Amman, Jordan, to Jerusalem early Monday.

Regarded as one of the most talented producers in television, Mr. Yates had won many awards. In 1965 he received the George Polk Award for his reporting on Vietnam and the following year an Overseas Press Club citation for his coverage in the Dominican Republic.

Recently he and Robert Rogers of NBC were cited by the Overseas Press Club for their news special, "The Undeclared War," on the social and political unrest in Guatemala, Colombia and Peru.

Mr. Yates was born in Sheridan, Wyo., on Oct. 1, 1930. When he was 18, his back was broken as he was thrown while working as a rodeo rider.

After a year at the University of Virginia, he joined NBC but became a marine the following year. He returned to NBC in 1952 as a White House correspondent and producer of an NBC–TV program, "Your President's Week."

He is survived by his wife, the former Mary Olberg of La Crosse, Wis., and three sons, James Hamilton, 10; Frederick Langdon, 8, and Angus Forbes, 6. They lived in Washington.

SCHUTZER'S COURAGE CITED

Mr. Schutzer had, in the word of a newspaperman friend, "almost too much courage." The friend said that despite the photographer's years of experience he never tired of accepting dangerous and arduous assignments.

A spokesman for Life magazine said that he not only had volunteered to cover the Middle Eastern crisis but had insisted that he would go in any case if Life did not assign him.

He was in one of the leading armored half-tracks of an Israeli armored column counter-attacking Monday across the Gaza Strip toward the town of Gaza when it was hit by a burst from an antitank weapon and broke into flames.

Mr. Schutzer was born in Brooklyn July 11, 1930, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Hyman Schutzer. His father is a lawyer. The son's interest in photography began at the age of 10 when he found a broken camera in a neighbor's wastebasket, taped it together and began taking pictures.

After studying at the Cooper Union Art School and then for a time at the Law School of Long Island University, Mr. Schutzer decided he wanted to be a photographer.

After freelance work he joined Life in Washington, in 1956 as its youngest staff photographer. His first assignment was a Long Island hurricane. Three years later he was badly injured while covering Hurricane Audrey at Lake Charles, La.

HE WORKED IN LEBANON

In 1958 he was a member of a Life team in Lebanon during the crisis that brought the landing of United States troops.

The following year he was awarded the grand prize, first and second prizes and two honorable mentions in a competition among White House photographers. That year he also won the News Photographer of the Year Award sponsored by the University of Missouri and the Encyclopedia Britannica and the best in show award in U.S. Camera Magazine's Washington exhibit.

He traveled with President Eisenhower in the United States and abroad and covered President Kennedy's 1960 campaign.

With Paris as his base from July, 1961, he covered many assignments. He photographed the building of the Berlin wall and the Algerian war, and was the first reporter-photographer allowed to travel on a Polaris nuclear submarine.

Twice in 1961 he went to Cuba during the United States-Cuban crisis after the unsuccessful invasion attempt and he spent 24 hours in jail there.

WORLD'S LARGEST AUTOMATED CEMENT-MANUFACTURING PLANT

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, we in Missouri are very proud of the progress being made to increase economic development throughout our State.

One of the important new additions to the industrial growth of northeast Missouri is the world's largest fully automated cement-manufacturing plant.

This plant is located on the Mississippi River, 10 miles south of Hannibal, and is operated by the most complete computer-control complex in the cement industry. Two closed-circuit television cameras provide the computer operator with a constant televised look into the kiln. There will be two self-unloading cement barges—the Huck Finn and the Tom Sawyer—to help ship cement to the surrounding markets.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article about the plant be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, June 2, 1967]

Universal Atlas Cement Introduces New Automated Hannibal Plant—Division of United States Steel

Hannibal, Mo.—Universal Atlas Cement Division of United States Steel Corporation Friday will take the wraps off the nation's most fully automatic cement manufacturing plant here.

Ralph C. Moffitt, UA division president, further describes it as the largest operation of its kind in the western hemisphere.

The plant will be opened to more than 1000 invited visitors which include Missouri's Governor, Warren E. Hearnes; business executives from throughout Iowa, Illinois, Kentucky, Wisconsin and Missouri; officials and civic leaders from Hannibal; and newspaper, television, radio and magazine newsmen, it was reported by Thomas J. Griffeth, plant manager.

Guests will arrive at the new plant, which is located about 10 miles south of Hannibal, by river boat due to the road improvement work on Missouri route 79 which has closed the main road leading from Hannibal to the plant, Mr. Griffeth explained.

The new plant, he said, is a single-kiln, wet process operation. The new single-kiln, approximately 620 feet long, is one of the longest cement-clinker producing units in the world. It replaces the Hannibal plant's 14-kiln, dry process operation which has been completely phased out of operation. Capacity of the new plant, he said is significantly larger than the old plant's.

Insuring a consistent high quality product, the new plant's production facilities are operated by the most complete Computer-control complex in the cement industry.

The plant is under the full, on-line, closed-loop control of a process automation computer. The computer communicates with a centralized control and instrumentation system which directs the chemical blending of raw materials as well as the burning process in the kiln. It also prepares detailed reports for management on all phases of the manufacturing process. In addition, an X-ray analyzer continuously examines the composition of the raw cement slurry and automatically adjusts the material flow and the chemical balance to assure a consistent high-quality product, Mr. Griffeth explained.

He added that, for the computer to control the burning process in the kiln, it makes all appropriate changes in fuel, speed, draft and feed, and thus keeps the kiln at a maximum stable level at all times.

Two closed-circuit television cameras provide the computer operator with a constant televised look inside the kiln where pulverized coal burns the limestone and shale slurry mixture into clinkers at 2600 degrees F. After firing, the clinkers and gypsum are ground into finished cement and stored in 10-story high silos for shipment by barge, rail or truck to bulk cement distribution stations throughout the Midwest and to local ready-mix producers as well.

To support the new plant, the division has built new distribution stations in Bettendorf (Davenport), Iowa, and Summit, Ill., in addition to an existing station in St. Louis. Two new self-unloading cement barges—the Huck Finn and the Tom Sawyer launched recently—will supplement the four-year-old Hannabelle:

"Every component of the entire cement production and distribution system was designed and engineered to provide its important marketing areas with 'the best' in fast and economical shipments of quality bulk and packaged cements, by rail, water and truck," Mr. Moffitt said.

He emphasized that the new plant was indicative of U.S. Steel's determination to strengthen Universal Atlas' competitive position in a cement consuming market of increasing importance.

The original Hannibal plant, Mr. Moffitt added, was the first cement plant built west of the Mississippi River. Ground was broken for the old plant in 1902 and shipments began in 1903.

Located on the limestone bluffs overlooking the Mississippi River, the plant mines its limestone and shale from quarries on the site and needs only to ship in relatively small quantities of gypsum to make the fine white powder that is transformed into roads, bridges and skyscrapers. He added that the local supply of raw materials for the new plant are estimated to meet the plant's requirements for the foreseeable future.

OUR NO. 1 ENEMIES: FEAR AND INDECISION

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, it took longer than usual for the story to come out with respect to the difficulty our military leaders had in persuading the Pentagon to permit a movement into the southern half of Vietnam's so-called demilitarized zone.

Despite the heavy damage being done to American forces by Communists who had violated the uncertain neutrality of the DMZ, our generals had to "get down on their knees to beg Washington for permission to rid themselves of the deadly menace of the Communist infiltration and violation of the DMZ," according to an editorial published in the Wyoming State Tribune of May 24, 1967.

The Tribune's editor, James M. Flinchum, continues by asserting that—

> The war in Vietnam cannot be terminated, much less won, by such reluctance to make vital decisions.

He further says:

> Such conduct raises the possibility that the Johnson administration has become so inhibited that it cannot provide efficient, capable direction to the war effort in the Far East.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our No. 1 Enemies: Fear and Indecision

The so-called Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) between North and South Vietnam was created by the Geneva agreement of 1954 presumably settling the conflict over political disposition of the former French Indo-China. It was supposed to be as advertised: A military neutral zone.

But in recent months the Communists had violated that agreement, as they do everything else when it suits their purpose; and had moved troops and war material into the DMZ, attacking U.S. troops to the south of it and using it as a sanctuary.

Under the circumstances it would have seemed only logical to counter this with an attack on this fortress sanctuary; but when the U.S. field commanders in Vietnam broached the subject to Washington, they found slower going than slogging through the rice paddies of the Mekong Delta.

The startling account of this struggle on the part of our military leaders in the field, seeking to gain permission for something that should have been granted on an automatic basis, is told today. It is testimony to the fear complex that has gripped the Johnson Administration, paralyzing it from making decisions of the greatest importance to the war effort.

The Pentagon, and presumably the White House, just did not want to get the U.S. involved in the DMZ invasion operation because of the reaction it might engender from some of our socalled friends in other parts of the world. But finally, after stalling repeatedly, it yielded and gave reluctant permission to the field generals and this very necessary operation was launched, thus terminating a threat for the time being to the northern part of our military operating zone.

This obvious timidity, resting in the spectre that to do too much might incur further ill-will among the other powers of the world, raises the possibility that the Johnson Administration has become so inhibited that it cannot provide efficient, capable direction to the war effort in the Far East.

No administration in this country's history has allowed itself to become so hamstrung by its concern over the side effects of a certain military commitment, as this one. That is, excepting the initial act which was sending American field troops into Vietnam in February, 1965.

This was a stroke of daring, taken by President Johnson when the chips were down and the South Vietnamese faced the prospect of being overrun by the Communists; and it is to the eternal credit of Mr. Johnson that he did what he did when he did it.

But nothing since then has been commensurate with this move, and the miserable story made public today for the first time of how the U.S. commanders in the field virtually had to get down on their knees to beg Washington for permission to rid themselves of the deadly menace of the Communist infiltration and violation of the DMZ, bears eloquent testimony to the erosion of that once bold attitude.

The war in Vietnam cannot be terminated, much less won, by such reluctance to make vital decisions.

Someone else is going to have to take the helm of this country next year, unless by some unimaginable product of circumstance the war is ended before then; and the prospect appears very remote.

This is someone else who possesses the courage, determination and the moral capacity of acting on the recommendations of the military directors of this war, who are the only people with the training and genius for carrying it out.

Computerized decisions made from the Pentagon cannot do this for us. It is going to take a strong, field leadership backed to the hilt by the civilian management in Washington, dedicated to prosecuting this war without fear of what others outside this country may think, to do the job.

THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE APPLETON COATED PAPER CO.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to invite the attention of the Senate to an important milestone recently attained by one of Wisconsin's leading industrial firms. The Appleton Coated Paper Co., of Appleton, Wis., is celebrating its 60th anniversary. Incorporated in May 1907, the company is representative of the dynamic, growing economy of my State.

The Appleton Coated Paper Co. produces a wide variety of coated printing and decorative papers, and custom-coated papers for diverse industrial needs. The company engages solely in "off the machine" coating, applying coatings to both raw paper and synthetic materials. It markets its products nationwide and exports all over the world to Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Japan, Korea, Lebanon, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa, and Spain.

The second largest employer in the city of Appleton, Appleton Coated is an integral part of the Fox River Valley area, closely related to the communities in which it operates its plants and offices. A modern, progressive employer, 11 percent of its more than 700 employees have worked for the company for over 25 years. Its staff includes professional and technically trained personnel from America's foremost educational institutions, and men of extensive industrial experience.

The growth and achievements of the Appleton Coated Paper Co. are typical of an industry that has established Wisconsin as the leading papermaking State in the Union. Approximately 43,000 people, earning over $300 million, are employed in Wisconsin's papermaking industry.

Appleton Coated is one of some 100 paper companies which support the Institute of Paper Chemistry in Appleton. This unique school educates students on the graduate level and carries out fundamental and applied research projects. Appleton Coated is also one of the original organizers of the Wisconsin Paper Group, an industrial association which in 1934 began pool-car shipments for fast, economical transport to major markets on a dated-frequency schedule.

On the occasion of its 60th anniversary, the Appleton Coated Paper Co. is justifiably proud of its pioneering development and continued growth in an industry which has contributed significantly to Wisconsin's and the Nation's progress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of an anniversary letter issued by Appleton Coated Paper Co.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPLETON COATED PAPER CO.,
Appleton, Wis.

DEAR SIR: Anniversaries, in themselves, are not important. They are only meaningful in terms of what they signify at the time of their observance.

Appleton Coated is 60 years old this year.

Going back in our history to 1907, we believe, is not particularly important to our customers, potential customers, suppliers, or friends.

The important thing is, "What is Appleton Coated Paper Company today?" What does it offer customers today? What does it mean to its employees and various business friends today?

Enclosed is a brochure called "Accent on Appleton". It is designed to answer such questions. Principally oriented toward our customers and potential customers, this brochure should also be of significant interest to you.

We're personally proud of the pioneering that went into development of our company. We're sincerely grateful for the heritage which has been passed on by our predecessors.

But, we're equally proud to be able to say today: "This is our company and the job it can perform." This is a company in which customers and employees can place their faith. This is a company as up-to-date in its field today as the scientific era demands it to be. Here we are as we should be, not as we used to be. This is a modern-day "Accent on Appleton".

We hope you find this an interesting and meaningful presentation.

Cordially,

JOHN P. REEVE,
President and Chief Executive Officer.

ALCOHOLISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an excellent address by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] on the increasingly critical problem of alcoholism in the United States.

Senator TYDINGS forcefully and eloquently presented a most persuasive discussion of this problem and the need for a more enlightened approach in dealing with it, in an address on May 23 to a luncheon meeting of the Washington Council on Alcoholism.

During my administration as Governor of Georgia, I was most pleased to affix my signature to legislation enacted by the Georgia General Assembly to establish the Georgia Commission on Alcoholism. This commission originated in a bill sponsored in the Georgia State Senate by then State Senator G. ELLIOTT HAGAN, now the Representative from the First Congressional District of Georgia. This action established Georgia as an early national leader in coping with the problem of alcoholism, and over the years it has been of tremendous benefit to countless numbers of our citizens.

Representative HAGAN has shown a continuing interest in this matter, and he introduced Senator TYDINGS at the luncheon on Tuesday. I ask unanimous consent that Representative HAGAN's introduction and Senator TYDINGS' address be printed in the RECORD. I commend all Members of Congress for their efforts regarding the problem of alcoholism.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF G. ELLIOTT HAGAN, BEFORE THE WASHINGTON AREA COUNCIL OF ALCOHOLISM IN INTRODUCING SENATOR JOSEPH TYDINGS

As I stand here today, I cannot help but note the difference over 20 years ago, when I first decided to try to do something about the problem of alcoholism. It was a lonely road I traveled when, as a member of the Georgia Legislature, I set out to get an alcoholism care and control measure passed. I was successful and my bill resulted in the formation of the Georgia Commission on Alcoholism. But this was only the beginning of the hard job of undercutting the public apathy *and* the official apathy toward what has developed into this country's fourth greatest public health problem.

I am glad to say that we have seen a gradual change of attitude on almost all levels. President Johnson underscored the problem of alcoholism in his message on crime to Congress this year.

The Federal courts have ruled that a chronic alcoholic cannot be convicted merely on the basis of his alcoholism . . . and increasing numbers of responsible citizens are realizing that alcoholism *must* be treated as a public health, rather than a law enforcement problem. And I can think of no better time than this to pay tribute to the Washington area council on alcoholism for its instigation of the test case which led to the *most* significant *Easter* decision. Your actions rendered *considerable* help to the cause.

I think you will agree that this is the time for which all of us who have been active in alcoholism care and control over the years, have been waiting. The timing is right for action. And the place for that action is the U.S. Congress.

I predict that my colleagues in Congress, including your speaker today, will join me in doing something about this problem during the 90th Congress.

As an attorney and former U.S. District Attorney for Maryland, this gentleman has seen firsthand the shocking senselessness of our society's punitive, revolving-door treatment of chronic alcoholics. A graduate of the University of Maryland law school and a Member of the Maryland House of Delegates for six years, he is today ably following in the footsteps of his famed father, the late Senator Millard E. Tydings. Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and a privilege to present the distinguished junior Senator from the free State of Maryland, the honorable Joseph D. Tydings.

The Chronic Alcoholic: A Challenge to the Efficient Administration of Justice

(Address of Senator Joseph D. Tydings at the Washington Council on Alcoholism luncheon, May 23, 1967)

It is a great pleasure for me to be here today, to meet with the organization that has led the fight for the last three years for the just and humane handling of derelict inebriates. The accomplishments of the Washington, D.C. area council on alcoholism will go down in history as one of the truly great contributions to criminal justice and to humane welfare ever made by a voluntary health organization.

When I met with the judicial conference of the District of Columbia a year ago I talked broadly about the reforms needed in the administration of criminal justice in the District of Columbia. Today I would like to discuss with you one particular aspect of that subject—the problems posed when the intoxicated citizen comes into contact with the criminal system.

The District of Columbia has, because of the landmark *DeWitt Easter* decision, been a testing ground during the last twelve months for new theories on handling the derelict chronic inebriate. And although some progress has been made in those twelve months, the District is still seriously deficient in its procedures for handling these unfortunate individuals. Let me briefly outline where these deficiencies reside:

The police are still arresting known alcoholic derelicts who present no threat to the safety of any other person.

Arrested derelicts are not routinely provided with medical treatment, and therefore some have died in police precincts.

The District of Columbia Department of Corrections also has no alcoholism program, although numerous inmates have drinking problems that will contribute to their recidivism when they are released.

Perhaps the most shocking fact is that District of Columbia employees with an alcoholic problem are fired, rather than treated, thus virtually guaranteeing their swift decline into the derelict status.

The new District of Columbia detoxification center, funded under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act a year ago, is still only in the planning stage and may not be available for another year or even longer.

Although a new inpatient center has been established at Occoquan, it is presently being used more as a prison than as a treatment facility.

The court of general sessions is still committing alcoholics to grossly inadequate and improper programs, contrary to the recommendations of the D.C. Crime Commission, to plain common sense and to fundamental principles of humanity.

The outpatient programs and facilities in the District are wholly inadequate to meet the demand, with the result that voluntary patients can no longer be handled, and individuals who come from the inpatient center with a good prognosis for rehabilitation inevitably relapse back into drinking for lack of effective follow-up treatment.

This outlines a dismal picture for the District of Columbia. But it is even more distressing to learn that the rest of the country, including my own State of Maryland, is in much worse shape. Very few communities have begun to face up to the problems that exist.

Let me first discuss the problems with current District of Columbia police practices. No one will deny that any individual, drunk or sober, who threatens physical harm to another person, should immediately be arrested. But very few, if any, of the harmless derelict inebriates who stumble along the streets in a drunken stupor present even the most remote danger to the community's safety.

Yet, inexplicably, the police persist in wasting their time and the court's by arresting these people and charging them with the awesome crime of public intoxication. And the next day, these same police must come to court on the chance that they may be required to present testimony that the individual was, indeed, drunk on the occasion when he was arrested. The D.C. Crime Commission has reported that a substantial amount of time even of the special forces of the District of Columbia police have been engaged in this trivial work.

The heavy burden on our law enforcement agencies which results from handling public alcoholism as a criminal offense is a national problem. In 1965 two million persons were arrested, in the Nation, for public alcoholism. This amounted to one-third of all arrests in the United States. Indeed, if arrests for traffic offenses are not considered, arrests for public alcoholism account for almost half the arrests in the country. This is an enormous misuse of law enforcement agencies—keeping police from more urgent crime-fighting, jamming places of detention, clogging already crowded court calendars—to handle public health, not criminal law, problems.

Certainly, the police should not be involved in dealing with alcoholics. Inebriates should be taken to a medical facility, not to a police precinct, and this should be done by public health personnel, not by the police. To continue the present arrest policy is a shameful waste of time, energy and valuable community resources.

The District of Columbia Court of General Sessions has, to its great credit, seen through the senselessness of the repeated arrests of chronic alcoholics and, under the Easter decision, has refused to convict any adjudicated alcoholic for simple public intoxication. There are now over 4,500 individuals who have been adjudged chronic alcoholics in the court of general sessions, none of whom may again be convicted for public intoxication in the District of Columbia. The court has not waited for these derelicts to raise the defense of alcoholism themselves, because it realizes that it has an obligation to protect the rights of these men on its own motion.

This community was indeed fortunate to have judges of the high ethical standards and courage of Judge Neilson, Judge Halleck, and Chief Judge Greene during the chaotic months immediately following the Easter decision, when this responsible judicial policy was first developed.

More recently, under a new member of the court, Judge Murphy, this policy has been carried to its logical conclusion. Since January of this year, few if any persons arrested for simple public intoxication have been convicted. Those who are adjudged chronic alcoholics are either released or referred for treatment. Those who are not chronic alcoholics, but may have some underlying job, emotional, family, or other problems which led to their intoxication, are now referred to the new citizens information service, which will attempt to determine the real problem and refer these people to appropriate community resources. In this way, drinking problems can be caught at their incipiency, not when they become full-blown.

These court procedures are obviously well-formulated and humane, but they are just the beginning. Courts should not be forced to take over what is essentially a public health function.

We should all look forward to the day when public intoxication will no longer be a matter of any concern to the court. It should be taken completely out of the criminal area, and handled wholly as a public health and welfare concern.

In contrast to the court of general sessions, the District of Columbia Juvenile Court has made no progress whatever in attempting to head off incipient alcoholism among the youthful offenders who appear in that court. At the very minimum, this court should establish a liaison with the department of public health in order to make use of all available community resources in this area.

If incipient alcoholism is not caught at an early age, it will inevitably lead to chronic alcoholism and to the very derelict inebriate problem that has created such evident havoc in the District of Columbia during the past year.

Our penal institutions in the District of Columbia suffer from the same deficiency. Although minor attempts have been made during the past 20 years to set up an alcoholic anonymous program in one or more of these institutions, it has for the most part been only a token effort. We cannot sit back while a potential alcoholic gradually makes his way down to the depths of skid row, and only then attack the problem.

We must hit at it at every stage: in the courts, in the jails, on the streets. Our penal institutions will be correctional in name only unless effective rehabilitation programs for the alcoholic as well as for the other problem offenders are built into them.

And we must also meet this problem at its very beginning, when it is first manifested by absenteeism and inefficiency on the job. Today, many private industries are doing a far better job of working with their problem drinkers in alcoholic rehabilitation programs than is the District of Columbia or the United States Government.

It was a shock for me to learn that the only arm of our Government that has an alcoholic rehabilitation program is the Navy Department. District of Columbia employees who have a drinking problem are fired. Veterans of our armed services are thrown out of veterans hospitals for their drinking. Misconduct caused by alcoholism is a ground for an undesirable discharge from the armed services, and seldom results in a medical discharge. Instead of working with these people, our Government throws them out, virtually guaranteeing their rapid decline into the skid row derelicts who are daily handled through our criminal system. A more inhumane and unjust and stupid method of handling these people could not be imagined.

The recent reports of the District of Columbia and United States Crime Commissions point the way out of some of these dilemmas. To those of you who have followed developments in the District of Columbia since the *Easter* decision, the conclusions of those crime commissions may seem obvious and long overdue. You are, I would imagine, far more concerned now about rapid implementation of the crime commissions' recommendations that you are about further discussion of them.

Let me review, therefore, the progress that has and has not been made in the District of Columbia during the past year to meet the *Easter* crisis and to implement the crime commissions' recommendations.

The D.C. and U.S. crime commissions have made their positions perfectly clear. Of fundamental importance, they state, is to take the entire problem of public intoxication out of the criminal law system and to handle it in the future as a public health, welfare, and rehabilitation matter. As a person deeply interested in the improvement of our courts and our criminal law system, I can only applaud this conclusion.

Yet, as I have already pointed out, in the District of Columbia only the court of general sessions has come to this important realization in the past year. The police still persist in carrying out their traditional function, honored by time alone, of daily sweeping the streets of defenseless drunken derelicts.

The Crime Commission recommended immediate establishment of detoxification centers, staffed by competent medical personnel, to whom inebriates could be taken for sobering up. It is a little-known but important fact that delirium tremens, a withdrawal symptom of alcoholism, is more threatening to human life than the withdrawal symptoms of morphine. If left completely alone in the police precincts without medical supervision, as drunks usually are, a substantial number of alcoholics who go through delirium tremens will die. This fact, alone, demands the immediate establishment of detoxification centers.

The District of Columbia was extremely fortunate to have the Department of Justice agree to fund a model detoxification center under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act. The District first learned about this grant in May 1966.

Yet in spite of the crisis caused by the *Easter* decision, and in spite of the insistent prodding of the Ad Hoc Committee on Alcoholism of the Public Health Advisory Council, the District of Columbia Bar Association, and the D.C. Crime Commission, there has been virtually no progress to date on this center. Construction has constantly been delayed, and there is not yet even a firm date when it will begin.

In contrast to the experience found in the District of Columbia, the city of St. Louis received funds for a new detoxification center under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act and had the center in operation less than 30 days later. And St. Louis did not have the prod of the *Easter* decision and all the organizations that have been concerned with this problem in the District of Columbia.

This type of administrative neglect is incomprehensible and inexcusable. Last week I wrote to the Department of Justice to determine why the officials who administer the Law Enforcement Assistance Act have allowed this delay to take place. I also wrote the District of Columbia Commissioners to ask them to give me the specific and detailed reasons for the delay. As Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I am vitally interested in how our communities will be handling drunken derelicts in the future. And as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I am deeply concerned about the total failure of our local officials to accomplish so simple a task as setting up a detoxification center.

The Crime Commission also recommended establishment of inpatient facilities for diagnosis and intensive treatment of derelict inebriates. In this area the District of Columbia made an impressive start late last year. The former Women's Prison at Occoquan was converted into a modern treatment facility with a total of 425 beds.

Unfortunately, however, the potential value of this facility has been virtually thrown out the window. The D.C. Crime Commission, which studied the problem thoroughly, warned the community that an inpatient treatment facility cannot, by itself, succeed in rehabilitating alcoholics. The Commission cited the conclusions of numerouns authorities on alcoholism that inpatient care should be given only for a very few weeks, and that rehabilitation, if it is to be successful, must come from community-based outpatient care and treatment. Indeed, the Commission said that an inpatient facility can be no more successful in rehabilitating alcoholics than a penal institution, unless residential facilities and after-care treatment programs are provided in the heart of the District of Columbia.

The prophetic words of the D.C. Crime Commission have now come home to roost. The Occoquan Treatment Center has proved to be a total failure, and it will remain a total failure until the necessary supportive facilities are provided in the District. Even worse, it is a cruel hoax upon the alcoholics who have gone there with high hopes that at last they could find appropriate treatment for their problems.

The D.C. Crime Commission recommended that commitment to the inpatient facilities should be stopped, and that treatment for alcoholism should be handled on a voluntary basis.

It is highly unfortunate that the court of general sessions has ignored this recommendation. Judges who commit alcoholics to the Occoquan Treatment Center are clearly sending them there for punishment, not for treatment. They are allowing the District government to hide the fact that adequate treatment for alcoholics cannot be found, and they are condoning the District's failure to establish adequate treatment programs. A judge who fails to make certain that adequate treatment is available, and sends an alcoholic to the treatment facilities simply because it is there and it is not filled, is not discharging his judicial obligations in a wise and humane way.

Unless the court of general sessions continues to maintain a close surveillance over the adequacy of the treatment available for derelict inebriates in the District of Columbia, that treatment will continue to be penal rather than rehabilitative in nature, and we will all be doomed to the spectacle of continued arrests and detention for simple public intoxication. In short, the problem will be magnified rather than reduced, and the mandate of the Easter decision will be frustrated.

In summary, this brief review readily demonstrates that the District of Columbia has a long, long way to go before an adequate replacement for the criminal system of handling derelict inebriates is actually in operation. It should have been in operation before now, and there is no excuse for the delays that have occurred. I have therefore introduced a bill, S. 1740, that will accelerate these changes. We cannot wait another one or two or five years before detoxification centers replace our police precincts, and inpatient and outpatient facilities replace our criminal courts. The wise and efficient administration of criminal justice, as well as simple humanity, requires that this be done now, not later. My bill will establish the facilities that are needed, and will spell out the procedures under which they may be properly made.

I would like to note that my bill, S. 1740, is patterned after a House bill, H.R. 6143, introduced by Congressman G. Elliott Hagan of Georgia earlier this year. Congressman Hagan has been fighting a lonely battle in Congress for an enlightened approach to alcoholism, ever since he came here from the Georgia State Legislature. We are all grateful for his initiative and leadership in this matter.

A House subcommittee, chaired by Congressman John Dowdy of Texas, has already held one day of very helpful hearings on Congressman Hagan's bill. The suggestion made by Congressman Dowdy and the testimony presented at those hearings, together with comments obtained from the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, led me to revise Congressman Hagan's bill in a few respects. The Senate Committee on the District of Columbia will be holding hearings on S. 1740, and I understand that Congressman Dowdy will be holding further hearings on H.R. 6143. I look forward to working with the House in developing final legislation that will fully and adequately meet the crisis that now exists.

Let me now turn to the situation as it presently exists in the rest of the country. I wish I could report to you that my home State, Maryland, or indeed any State in the country, has a more progressive procedure for handling derelict inebriates than the one I have just described in the District of Columbia. But I cannot do so.

In Maryland, during the 18-month period extending from January 1, 1964 through July 1, 1965, 12,785 individuals were convited of public intoxication. And 3,533 of these people had more than one conviction for this so-called offense within a 12-month period during that time. Think of the incredible waste of our police force, and the degrading effect upon the judges who must daily pretend to dispense justice to these unfortunate individuals. And I am informed that the Baltimore Sun papers have reported some 27 deaths of persons arrested for drunkenness, while waiting for a court hearing, in the past five years alone. It is incredible that a civilized society could perpetuate as barbaric a custom as this one.

And what of the rehabilitative treatment available for derelict inebriates in Maryland? A recent report of the Department of Mental Hygiene tells the whole story:

"The State hospitals have no treatment program for habitual drunkenness offenders, although the State Department of Mental Health has proposed, and requested financing for, a rehabilitation facility for long-term re-education of these individuals."

The few facilities which are available for intensive treatment are over-crowded and under-staffed. Although State department mental health officials are aware of the need to develop new facilities, no funds have been appropriated for this purpose. Thus, it is clear that the State of Maryland, and indeed the rest of the country, has hardly begun to face up to the problems in this area.

I was startled to read in a newspaper several months ago that judges in Rockville, Maryland, had issued a report stating that although the *Easter* decision is not applicable to them, the problem of the chronic inebriate offender should be studied and dealt with because, at some time in the near future, the Maryland courts might also adopt this approach. These judges either did not understand, or were totally unaware of, or simply were refusing to apply, the *Joe Driver* decision handed down by the Fourth Circuit

Court of Appeals in January, 1966. In that case, the court held that the eighth amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits conviction of a chronic alcoholic for public intoxication.

I cannot overemphasize the fact that the *Driver* decision, which adopts the identical rule as the *Easter* decision, is binding upon every judge in every court in the State of Maryland today. The Maryland judiciary is therefore obligated, just like the District of Columbia judiciary, to inquire into the possible applicability of the defense of alcoholism for every inebriate who appears before the courts. Thus, my own State is facing the same problem that the District of Columbia has been facing for the past year.

The U.S. Crime Commission, like the D.C. Crime Commission, has pointed the way out of this archaic use of the criminal law to punish inebriates.

Our communities in Maryland and throughout the country undoubtedly have not had sufficient time to react to it, and to begin to make new plans. They must be given the incentive to do so.

I have co-sponsored with 35 other Senators the Javits-Moss bill, S. 1508, which would provide Federal incentives to assist the States in meeting their responsibilities in this area. As the U.S. Crime Commission has recognized, the Federal Government has a large stake in assisting States in removing the problem of public intoxication from the criminal system and handling it through public health, welfare and rehabilitation procedures.

The bill that has been introduced can, I am certain, be strengthened. I would like to suggest four points which I believe should appear in any final legislation.

First, S. 1508 presently contemplates that detoxification facilities would be provided through law enforcement agencies. It is now evident that the entire problem of public intoxication should be handled outside the sphere of law enforcement, and S. 1508 should therefore be revised in that respect.

Second, it is clear that the problem of public intoxication can be removed from the criminal system only through the coordinated efforts of all interested public and private agencies and institutions. The requirement for a broad community-wide plan for the control of intoxication and alcoholism, to be coordinated with other comprehensive health planning already provided for in Federal legislation, should be included in S. 1508.

Third, it is apparent that the problem of alcoholism has been sadly neglected by the Federal Government for the last twenty years during which significant health and welfare legislation has been enacted covering other serious problems. S. 1508 should include a congressional mandate that all other Federal legislation in the field of health, welfare, and rehabilitation must be utilized in the fight against alcoholism, and the specific statutes pertinent to this problem should be listed.

Fourth, as I have already noted, it is shocking to learn that the problem of alcoholism among Federal employees is handled by firing them, not rehabilitating them. S. 1508 should contain a specific statement of Federal policy abolishing this inhumane practice.

Finally, the Federal efforts in the area of alcoholism are presently split up among a number of departments and agencies. Provision should be made in S. 1508 for an intragovernmental committee that will coordinate these efforts, reduce duplication of work and insure a more efficient and effective treatment program.

The problems that I have discussed today are just really beginning to appear around the country. Courts in other States are beginning to study these problems, and soon will force local communities throughout the country to change their ways if these changes do not come voluntarily. The Federal Government must make certain that our local communities have the resources to meet these problems, and to resolve them, before they overwhelm us.

WATER FOR PEACE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on May 23, thousands of participants from all over the world joined in the opening of one of the most significant international conferences in recent history—Water for Peace.

It was a milestone in conferences. Never have so many thousands of experts, leaders, citizens, and administrators come together in one forum to analyze and plan the world's needs and uses for water.

We ought to be proud that such a conference was convened in Washington, and that President Johnson was the moving force behind it when he announced a year and one-half ago that it would take place.

The conference was a success. It has focused world attention on national and international policies concerning water use, water power, water pollution, and water for peace in a troubled world.

President Johnson's record on water resources is one of the best in American history. He has taken a deep personal interest in the subject as only a man can who was born in an area where water is precious and limited.

There are few Presidents who have so actively promoted water resource studies, regional river basin control, desalinization, and pollution control to assure Americans—and others—of an unlimited supply of this essential resource.

President Johnson moved us and the world a stride forward by sponsoring this conference with its keynote,

> We share the challenge to use water—more abundant water—as the enduring servant of peace.

I share the President's sentiments and support his efforts. I ask unanimous consent that his speech to the conference be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF THE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE WATER FOR PEACE CONFERENCE

Distinguished delegates, Members of Congress, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen:

This conference has a vital mandate: The questions you will consider deal directly with the future of life on earth.

No President has ever welcomed a gathering with greater expectations.

I come from land where water is treasure.

For a good many years, I have done my share of agitating to increase the water resources of my native state. I have known the frustrations of this task. A member of the Texas legislature once recited some lines on this subject:

"Oh the glamor and the clamor
That attend affairs of state
Seem to fascinate the people
And impress some folks as great.

"But the truth about the matter,
In the scale of loss and gain:
Not one inauguration's worth
A good, slow two-inch rain"

As man faces the next century, one question stands above all others: How well—and how long—can the earth sustain its ever-growing population?

As much as anything, water holds the key to that question: water to drink; water to grow the food we must eat; water to sustain industrial growth.

Today, man is losing his race with the growing need for water.

We face, on a global scale, the plight of the Ancient Mariner:

"Water, water, everywhere—
Nor any drop to drink."

For a planet two-thirds covered with water this is a strange shortage.

There is so much plenty all around us.

Yet ninety-seven percent of our waters are in the oceans—thus far, but I hope not for long, of little use for drinking or irrigation.

Another two percent lies frozen in glaciers and icecaps.

The one percent remaining could meet most of man's needs—if only it were distributed when, and where, we need it.

But today, while millions suffer the ravages of storms and floods, other millions are thirsty.

While men barely tap the abundance of lakes and rivers and streams, other men watch their crops shrivel with drought.

More and more, people dwell in cities, where clean water means the difference between sickness and health.

Yet today, forty percent of the world's city dwellers—four out of ten—have no water service.

If this is the problem now, what will the future bring?

By the year 2000, the world's population will have doubled to six billion. Our need for water will have more than doubled.

I call upon this conference to take, as its point of perspective, the year 2000.

Imagine, as you meet here, that you are facing the needs of your children and your children's children. Examine what we must do to move the world from now until then.

Ask yourself the big questions:

How can we engineer our continents and direct our great river systems to make use of the water resources we now waste?

How can we tap the vast underground waters now undeveloped?

How can we modify the weather and better distribute the life-giving rain?

How can we desalt the waters of the ocean and freshen brackish waters?

How can we use our water supplies again and again before yielding them to the sea?

How can we curb the filth that pollutes our streams?

During the past three years I have proposed and the Congress has supported programs in each and all of these areas—Water Management, River Valley Development, Desalting, Pollution Control, and Research on Weather Modification. But we have barely begun.

And you must consider the most important question of all: How can we awaken the world's people and the world's leaders to this urgent task?

Even at the risk of being called dreamers, you must ask these questions, and seek the answers. Unless you do, you will not measure the true dimension of mankind's great need. You must chart the specific steps toward a more abundant future.

One step must be this: to quicken the pace of science and technology.

Last week, I signed an Act of Congress to make possible a new plant which will more than double the world's present capacity for desalting water.

A decade ago, the best plant design could produce only 50,000 gallons per day at a cost of five dollars per thousand gallons.

This new plant, powered by nuclear energy, will eventually produce 150 million gallons of fresh water per day—at a cost approaching 20 cents per thousand gallons. That is three thousand times as much, at one-twenty-fifth the cost!

But the world needs fresh water at even lower costs.

This is my country's pledge: to continue work in every area which holds promise for the world's water needs. And we pledge to share the fruits of this technology with all who wish to share.

American scientists will begin discussions next month with India on experimental rainmaking projects which may hold promise for drought-ridden countries all over the world.

A second need is to train more manpower.

We must attract the best technicians and planners to this life-giving science. And we must devise programs to educate all our people in the wiser use of water.

Third: We need to build better institutions for managing water resources.

This point cannot be over-stressed. We need improved management as much as we need new technology.

We must support the United Nations and the international agencies which provide world leadership in this field.

We must develop more effective forms of local, national, and regional cooperation.

For this truth is self-evident: Neither water nor weather is a respecter of boundary lines.

Finally, we need to support new programs in water resource development.

Projects of international cooperation must be multiplied many times—like those now underway in the Mekong and the Indus river basins.

Frankly, I am not satisfied with the progress now being made. We are not using all the imagination and enterprise that this task demands. We need agents who will push and prod and shove ahead our international efforts. We need planners to help develop concrete projects, financial experts who know how to interest the world's lending institutions, educators to recruit and train skilled manpower.

To set top priority for these endeavors in our own government, I have directed the Secretary of State to establish a Water for Peace Office. Its major role will be to lead and coordinate this country's efforts in the world's water programs.

But we also need to create strong regional offices throughout the world to provide leadership and stimulate cooperation among nations. The United States is prepared to join others in establishing a network of regional Water Resource Centers. We will provide our fair share of the expert assistance, the supplies and the equipment, and the financing.

We are confident that the United Nations and other international organizations represented here today can and will play a key role in this enterprise. We should seek to put the first two centers in operation within 24 months—to serve as the spur and the goad in promoting Water for Peace.

We have called this conference to learn—and to share.

No group could have a more exciting mission.

You study the life-cycle of our planet. You deal with nature's elements as men have always known them: the river, the sea, the sun, and the sky.

Man once looked to these elements and found his poetry. Now he must find his preservation.

You will grapple with the political as well as the physical problems of mankind.

For ages past, men have fought over water without adding one single drop to the world's supply.

Now we share the challenge to use water—more abundant water—as the enduring servant of peace. Let this be your vision during the next week—and in the years to come.

Thank you.

ED JOHNSON, OF COLORADO, WRITES TO THE PRESIDENT ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of the most respected Members of this body, when I entered the Senate, was Senator Ed C. Johnson, of Colorado. He is a man of vast experience and wisdom. Recently, he wrote a very perceptive letter to the President of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Denver, Colo.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. President: I must write an open letter to you concerning Southeast Asia. I cannot resist doing so any longer. Numerous times in recent months you have brought me back to reality when I have heard you ask honest, trusting, and sincere war protestants—"*What would you do?*" I believe you ask that pertinent question because you really want to know. You need not ask me, however, because I shall tell you frankly and humbly what I would do in Southeast Asia. I do this with deep personal affection and respect. Few men carry the awful burden resting on your broad shoulders. Please do not permit me to add to its staggering weight.

To begin with, however, you inherited the Southeastern Asian War. That assertion requires no proof. Vietnam was not born overnight. My farewell address to the United States Senate in 1954 was concerned with Indo-China. For years I have been fretting about it. Now the very worst is about to happen, unless strong action is taken. The historians will be speculating for decades on Vietnam developments, and their very definite impact on all human progress.

The questions, "What should we do now?", and "What should we not do?", are on our doorstep and will not go away. Not to search for Divine Guidance from above with respect to them, would not be wisdom. I joined you in prayer at eleven o'clock today as you suggested. I asked for the courage and strength of our leaders to bury their pride and stubbornness if any, and for them to search for the *right steps,* not necessarily the easiest.

We must not abandon our exalted determination to adhere to the doctrine of "Peace on Earth and good will towards men." In this instance "men" includes our enemies. Under such a spiritual concept we will not pack our bags and pull out of the Southeast between suns like a thief in the night. To hold the respect of American citizens and the other good people of the earth is our desire and our motive.

Since the sixteen U.S. Senators, classified by the press as "doves", signed and dispatched to Ho Chi Minh a manifesto warning him that they will never support a unilateral American withdrawal from Vietnam, we should hear no more about a pullout.

However, I urge, with all the sincerity which I can muster, that the United States wholeheartedly at this late date join, without reservation, the clear and affirmative position of Great Britain, France, North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and all other persons and nations who were parties to the original Geneva pact and that we go strictly on the defensive in Vietnam south of the demilitarized zone and that we confine our military activities henceforth to that area. Furthermore, that we defend this area by land, by sea, and by air against every and any type of invasion or infiltration. Circumstances dictate such a policy and such a step for the foreseeable future.

As you know, the Geneva agreement was signed on July 21, 1954 by Great Britain, France and the representatives of North Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. It divided Vietnam into two areas—the North going to the Communists, so called, and the South portion going to the anti-communists.

However, the United States and South Vietnam's representatives refused to sign the Geneva pact. Apparently John Foster Dulles objected to dividing Vietnam into two parts. In my opinion, the failure to agree to such details has resulted in a desperate and bloody war which might continue through generations. China and Russia have seized upon its exploitation as a grand opportunity to advance the cause of communism.

At that time, President Eisenhower told a Washington press conference, the Agreement "contains features which we do not like" but then added he was glad the agreement had been reached to stop bloodshed. Churchill sent congratulations to Britain's Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden on "the success which has rewarded your patient persevering skill."

The United States, even though they refused to sign the Geneva pact, claims now that the communists broke the Geneva agreement by open aggression. And the communists contend that the United States who refused to sign, is guilty of military aggression to open violation of the Geneva Pact. I see no sincerity in either case.

I do not know what the ten thousand American youngsters and the 32,500 dead soldiers of the North and the unknown thousands of civilians dead, who were caught in the crossfire, would say if they could speak on this Holy Memorial Day 1967, and what their reactions would be to this unholy stalemate by American and North Vietnam political leaders.

Mr. President, you inherited the Vietnamese war, its background, its causes, its obligations, and its participants. Furthermore, it is not a military caused war. No responsible military expert would ever start a war on China's doorstep. Frankly, it is a political war pure and simple. And it can be ended only by statesmanship. You are the one man, in my humble opinion, who can successfully start that very involved movement to end it.

It is no secret that for a generation China has been our bitter enemy, and citizens who now urge turning this war over to our military "lock, stock, and barrel" seem to forget that under our system of government, the Congress determines public policy and the Military is and must always remain civilian controlled. The President, a civilian, is our Commander-in-Chief and is clothed with absolute authority and power, in time of war, which he exercises now.

This monstrous Vietnam war is making a futile attempt to settle with lethal weapons the reunification of North and South Vietnam; the dream of John Foster Dulles. However, the bitterness of this gigantic struggle has engendered too much hate and too many ulterior motives to bring about unification by this generation on terms other than outright conquest or unconditional surrender, which we must abandon as being ridiculous.

Russia and China,, who have come up from obscurity to the heady position of world powers through their exploitation of the Vietnam debacle, are enjoying their world wide gold fish bowl exposure. The false reports that the United States is having its hands full disposing of a very small power has shocked the world. But Russia and China are in this war up to their eyeballs. They have too much going for them now to permit Ho Chi Minh to go to the peace table.

But our task is not to assess blame, but to advance the cause of peace. The United States has earned a large "E" for excellence in appealing to Ho Chi Minh to stop the war. I cannot imagine a more futile exercise. We can blast him and his people from the face of the earth, but we cannot move him one inch toward the peace table. Russia and China will not permit it.

By reinstating the Geneva Pact, you can get the United States squarely on the peace trail. Please give it a thorough exploration and study.

Most sincerely,

ED C. JOHNSON.

MAY 30, 1967.

ARCHIE D. CRAFT NAMED OREGON STATE DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have just been informed that the Bureau of Land Management will have a new State director in Oregon. He is Archie D. Craft, now chief of the Bureau of Land Management's forestry staff in Washington.

The Bureau of Land Management administers 13 million acres of public lands in Oregon. It also administers the 2 million acres of the unique and valuable Oregon and California revested lands. These kinds of responsibilities demand the best in a land manager. I am pleased that Boyd L. Rasmussen, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, has selected a man of Craft's high professional and administrative attainments. Craft has served ably both in the field and in Washington.

He is well versed in the resource management problems of Oregon both east and west of the Cascade Mountains. In fact, he began his career with the Bureau of Land Management in Bend, Oreg., in 1948. He was district manager at Roseburg from 1959 to 1962, when he came to Washington, where he was appointed chief of the forestry staff in 1965. Craft has also served in Idaho and Alaska. His standing in the forestry profession is documented by his service on the U.S. Committee for the Third Session of the North American Forestry Commission of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Last year he was on the U.S. Committee for the Sixth World Forestry Conference and participated in the Conference.

Craft is a graduate of Montana State University. He also attended the University of Missouri and the University of California. He will replace James F. Doyle, a veteran public career lawyer and administrator of long service who is retiring on July 31, 1967.

I ask unanimous consent that the Department of the Interior press release announcing Mr. Craft's appointment to succeed Jim Doyle be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ANNOUNCES NEW OREGON STATE DIRECTOR

Archie D. Craft, chief of the Bureau of Land Management's forestry staff since 1965, will succeed James F. Doyle as State Director for Oregon on July 31, BLM Director Boyd L. Rasmussen announced today. Doyle is retiring after 29 years in the Department of the Interior. Craft, 46, will be responsible for the multiple-use management of public domain land in Oregon and Washington and the Oregon and California grant lands in Oregon.

In announcing the appointment, Rasmussen praised both men, stating, "Jim Doyle is completing an outstanding career in government conservation work, and I have selected Archie Craft as the most able and qualified man in the Bureau of Land Management as his replacement."

Doyle is completing a second assignment as the Bureau's Chief in Oregon. He was Chief of BLM's Office of Appeals and Hearings when appointed to his present position by Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall in June, 1966. Doyle was Area Administrator in Portland from 1954 to 1961 before transferring to Washington, D.C.

Craft, a native of Amsterdam, Mo., and a forestry graduate of Montana State University, started his BLM career at Bend, Oreg., in 1948. Later he transferred to Idaho to supervise BLM forestry activities in that State. From 1957 to 1959 he served in Alaska. In 1959 he returned to Oregon as District Manager at Roseburg. He transferred to Washington, D.C. in 1962.

"Seldom does a man come to this position with as many qualifications as Archie Craft possesses. His work in Oregon, his steady rise in experience in forest management, and other multiple uses of the public lands, and the respect he has gained from the forestry profession will serve him well in this responsible post," Rasmussen said.

Craft served on the U.S. Committee for the third session of the North American Forestry Commission of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and on the U.S. National Committee for the Sixth World Forestry Conference at Madrid in 1966.

Prior to enlisting in the Army in 1942, he attended the University of Missouri and University of California. During World War II, he served as a bomber pilot. He is a member of the Society of American Foresters and the American Forestry Association. Craft and his wife, Kim, have a son, Charles, and a daughter, Lynn.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, yesterday, during the debate on H.R. 2508, I placed in the RECORD letters from seven distinguished constitutional lawyers who regard the proposed legislation as unconstitutional.

The letterwriters included such distinguished correspondents as the director of the American Law Institute, the dean of the Law School of New York University, and the dean of the faculty of arts and sciences at the University of Virginia.

Today I received another reply, this one from Alexander M. Bickel, who is the Chancellor Kent professor of law and legal history at Yale Law School.

Professor Bickel, first, agrees, as does nearly everyone else, that there is no excuse for the bill to be pushed through without full-scale hearings.

I am especially interested in the fact that Professor Bickel questions the desirability of H.R. 2508, which would slow down congressional redistricting, despite the fact that he has never been a great admirer of the Supreme Court's intervention in the apportionment problem.

I have consistently pointed out that, for my own part, I am not grouping together H.R. 2508 and the problem of reapportioning State legislatures. I am concerned about 2508 because it has not been thoroughly considered, has a confusing legislative history, and establishes a permissible deviation between the largest and smallest congressional districts in a State, which is inconsistent with what the Supreme Court has said the Federal Constitution requires.

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Bickel's letter and an editorial published in the New York Times of today, June 7, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YALE LAW SCHOOL,
New Haven, Conn., June 6, 1967.

Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAKER: Forgive me for delaying this long a reply to your letter of May 27, asking for my opinion on the apportionment bill now pending in the Senate.

In what I am about to say, you must realize that I speak as one who has never considered the Court's intervention in the apportionment problem wise or, indeed, justifiable. On perhaps rather idiosyncratic grounds, quite different from those cited by the Court, I have been able to explain to myself, and to accept, the initial decision in *Baker* v. *Carr*, and the decision striking down the Georgia county-unit system. But that has been as far as I have been able to go.

I think nevertheless that I would oppose the bill on which you ask my opinion. It seems to me that for Congress to establish a permissible percentage of deviation is to invite that percentage of deviation virtually everywhere, whether or not justifiable in the particular circumstances, and I do not see the desirability, let alone the necessity, of doing that. I think the Court's intervention has been unwise because it has relegated to the control of judges an area of policy they are not fit to control, but also because it represents an attempt to deal with the apportionment problem by means of a uniform and relatively rigid rule imposed from on high. Viewed realistically and intelligently, the problem will not, in my judgment, yield to any such rule. And uniformity and rigidity imposed by Congress is not much better than uniformity and rigidity imposed by the Supreme Court.

Unless it was willing to overrule itself, implicitly or explicitly—and this is, to be sure, always a possibility—it is difficult to see, in light of its prior pronouncements, how the Supreme Court could accept a congressional fiat to the effect that a 35 percent deviation is under any and all circumstances constitutional. But that does not mean that the Court would necessarily hold the bill we are discussing unconstitutional on its face. Actually the Court would scarcely have occasion to do so, since the test of the bill would come in some case presenting the deviation in the context of the particular facts of the situation in a particular State. The Court might well hold the bill unconstitutional as applied to such a particular situation, or what is perhaps more likely, it would construe the bill as not applying in a situation in which, in the Court's judgment, a 35 percent deviation would be unconstitutional.

I need hardly say that there is no excuse, in my opinion, for pushing such a measure through without the fullest kind of hearings.

Faithfully yours,

ALEXANDER M. BICKEL,
Chancellor Kent Professor of Law and Legal History.

[From the New York Times, June 7, 1967]

Invitation to Confusion

The Senate is now considering the badly drawn bill already passed by the House which attempts to permit the states to gerrymander their Congressional districts with little restraint until 1972. Whether or not it accomplishes that unworthy objective, it is sure to prove a rich source of litigation and conflict.

As passed by the House, the bill would permit the largest district to be as much as 30 per cent larger in population than the smallest. When it was discovered that New York would not qualify under this provision, the Senate Judiciary Committee arbitrarily raised the figure to 35 per cent. There is no justification for such wide discrepancies. Many states have found it possible to redistrict with a spread of 5 per cent or less. Moreover, there is no certainty that the Supreme Court would regard state plans containing such wide variations as constitutional.

Then there is the muddled issue of compactness. When he originally introduced this bill, Representative Celler of New York provided that the districts be in "as compact form as practicable." But the House Judiciary Committee revised this language to read "in as reasonably a compact form as the state finds practicable." This probably makes the compactness criterion meaningless, leaving the whole issue of bizarre-shaped districts where it now rests—at the political mercies of the legislatures and beyond the review of the Federal courts.

No legislation on this subject is necessary. The standards being evolved by the courts are reasonable and will serve as a guide to legislatures in future redistricting. But if any bill is to be passed, there should first be hearings to receive expert testimony and then careful committee consideration. As we have previously observed, the unseemly haste with which the Judiciary Committee rushed this bill to the floor without hearings is a disgrace. Recommittal and reconsideration are clearly in order.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL GIVES QUALIFIED SUPPORT TO PRESIDENT'S CAMPAIGN FUND PROPOSAL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal of June 1, 1967, carried a superb editorial praising President Johnson's campaign-financing proposal.

The editorial calls the President's plan for financing presidential campaigns "the best plan Congress has yet had."

The editorial is a balanced one, in that it is critical of certain aspects of the plan, among them the mechanism recommended for providing full public disclosure of Treasury payments to candidates and of their expenditure.

But the editorial concludes that the President has given Congress and the country "a basic plan upon which to build a financing program and needed reform."

I commend the editorial to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Public Campaign Funds; Johnson Plan Is Better

President Johnson's proposals for financing presidential campaigns offer congress the best plan it has yet had. His suggestion that financing of lower level campaigns be studied with a view to action is most welcome also.

The new law providing a tax check-off of $1 for any taxpayer who wishes to make a political contribution is in deep trouble, largely because of the stubbornness of its sponsor, Sen. Long (D-La.). It does not become effective without further congressional action and congress has failed to bolster it with badly needed controls and reforms.

Under the president's plan, most costs of presidential campaigns would be paid from the federal treasury through congressional appropriation. Use of these funds would be limited to such campaign activities as radio and television, campaign literature, travel and advertising. In 1964 these items cost the two major parties together about $25 million.

The president seeks to show that he is not just thinking of his own campaign next year. He would leave it up to congress whether to put the plan in effect then or in 1972. Sen. Kennedy (D-N.Y.) has warned that a presidential candidate with a huge block of federal funds could use it in one or two major states to gain political control and punish candidates he opposed. Johnson eliminates that problem, too, by proposing a limit on how much could be spent in a single state—no more than 140% of what it would be if the fund were split up on a per capita basis nationally.

The president's plan calls for full public disclosure of treasury payments to candidates and of their expenditure. But it has one weakness: Such reports would not be made until after an election, allowing possible abuse to go undetected by the comptroller general's audit until too late. A president-elect could then stand accused of having violated the law, a most unhappy possibility.

The Johnson proposal would limit any private contribution to a candidate to $5,000 and would require strict reporting of all donations of $100 or more, whether made directly to a candidate or to a committee supporting him. This would apply to all federal candidates, thus including congress, but the reports would be made, as now, to the clerk of the house and secretary of the senate, neither of whom has facilities or personnel to do more than file them.

Federal funds for presidential candidates would have to be spent not more than 75 days before and 30 days after an election. Presidential candidates would still have to seek funds from private sources for a myriad of campaign expenditures not covered by the proposal. Citizen participation in campaign financing would thus continue to be important.

As the president says, "the costs of campaigning are skyrocketing." He has given the congress and the country a basic plan upon which to build a financing program and needed reform.

SOIL EROSION CONTROL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention was recently called to an article which appeared in the May 1967, issue of Soil Conservation, a publication of the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The article, entitled "Erosion Control Means Money to Wheat Farmer," was written by Mr. Edgar F. Baumann, work unit conservationist with the Soil Conservation Service in Pendleton, Oreg. It is, in my judgment, an excellent description of the way in which a sound program pays dividends to Oregon farmers.

I ask unanimous consent that it and an article entitled "Boy Scouts Learn Conservation Methods," written under the byline of George L. Green, soil scientist with the Soil Conservation Service at The Dalles, Oreg., detailing the cooperative arrangement that the Central Wasco Soil and Water Conservation District in Oregon has had with the Boy Scouts of America, be printed in the Record.

The program of Camp Baldwin reflects great credit on all who are cooperating in this successful operation. I extend to the Central Wasco Soil and Water Conservation District and to Mr. Ron Sumner, camp director, my best wishes for the future.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Erosion Control Means Money to Wheat Farmer

(By Edgar F. Baumann)

Following unusually heavy winter rains in Southern Umatilla Soil and Water Conservation District in Oregon, SCS conservationists at Pendleton set out to get some answers to the basic, down-to-earth question: "What's the dollars and cents value of conservation?"

Soil scientists working in that eastern Oregon wheat-growing area had observed for years the serious erosion on sloping wheatlands. But they wanted facts and figures to support their observations.

They chose for study a field in the Speare Canyon area 18 miles west of Pendleton. The soil was Condon silt loam on a north slope of 7 to 20 percent.

Winter wheat had been seeded late in October and November the previous fall because rainfall was inadequate at the usual seeding time in September and early October. Unusually heavy rains totaling more than 6 inches—of 50-year frequency—occurred in December and January causing heavy runoff and much soil erosion.

In March, the conservationists made measurements and estimated the soil loss on the field at 165 tons an acre, equivalent to 1.1 inch of topsoil from the entire area.

Rill and gully erosion was so severe on 40 acres of the 160-acre field that the wheat yield there was only 10 bushels an acre. The other 120 acres, only slightly eroded, yielded 42 bushels an acre.

Hence, it was concluded that erosion on the eroded 40 acres had reduced the farmer's harvest by 32 bushels an acre or 1,280 bushels of wheat. With wheat at $1.50 a bushel, the gross monetary loss was $1,920. Charged against the entire 160 acres, this amounted to $12 an acre.

What would be the cost of a conservation program adequate to prevent such loss of income? The conservationists made some estimates for the field being studied.

A sound conservation program for the field would require 5,000 feet of diversion terraces and 1,700 feet of grassed waterways. The estimated cost of these two practices would be $1,510. The Agricultural Conservation Program payment would be $955, leaving a net cost to the farmer of $555 or $3.50 an acre. In addition, he would need to plant on the contour and to seed wheat early in the fall if moisture was adequate. These practices would add little to his expenses.

Boy Scouts Learn Conservation Methods

(By George L. Green)

Since 1950, the *Central Wasco Soil and Water Conservation District, Oreg.,* has cooperated with the Boy Scouts of America, Government agencies, private industry, and local people in providing a planned outdoor training program for Boy Scouts at Camp Baldwin, on the eastern slopes of Mt. Hood.

Ron Sumner, camp director, believes that in 1 week's camping experience, a Scout receives more training, has more opportunity to learn leadership, and receives more instruction in scouting methods than in a year of weekly meetings.

The camp is on the site of an early logging camp and mill, surrounded by more than 600 acres of mountainous timberland rich in various kinds of trees and wildlife.

Camp Baldwin provides an excellent opportunity for boys who are working toward soil and water conservation merit badges. Special conservation days provide an opportunity for boys to work on projects.

Within the camp area, the boys can get experience in soil and water conservation, woodland and wildlife conservation, rifle marksmanship, archery, riding, camp-craft, nature studies, and other outdoor activities. Campfires are held in the evenings. An outdoor area provides space for church services.

A Scouters' Weekend is held each year, when families of the Scouts take part in cleaning trails, camping areas, outdoor classrooms, and in preparing the area for the summer. In recent years, nearly 500 persons have participated in these events. This acquaints parents and local scout leaders with the many activities of the camp.

A popular feature of Camp Baldwin is its new 6-acre lake, which the boys use for boating, canoeing, or swimming. Assistance from Soil Conservation Service through the Central Wasco District helped make the lake a reality.

COMPARISON OF RUSSIAN AND UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Soviet Union has decided to cut its losses in the Middle East. It has decided not to bet on a losing cause—the cause of the Arab States.

I commend them for their good judgment.

I only wish that U.S. policy in Vietnam was guided by a similar judgment of the harsh realities of American involvement there. Long ago we should have been perceptive enough to see that we have been supporting a losing cause—supporting a man and a regime doomed to failure no matter how successful this Government is in its use of arms.

I would hope at this point, Mr. President, that the administration might give serious consideration to a pause in the bombing of the north. I can think of no action that could at this moment do more to move us toward peace.

There is a relationship between what Russia does and does not do in the Middle East, and what the United States does and does not do in Vietnam. Make no mistake about this.

Peace, as we have seen in the last few days, is dependent upon the attitude of the two super powers—the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Russian realism in the Middle East was forced upon them by the magnificent performance of Israel, and forced upon them by the burning nationalism of that new nation. The Russians have pulled back from their rash promises and semicommitments to the United Arab Republic.

American realism in Vietnam should now recognize the regime we support there is corrupt. We should be wakened to the burning nationalism of the Vietnamese people who want nothing of foreign troops on their soil.

The time has come for the President to make a bold move—a move calculated to ease tension throughout the world. He must cease bombing of the North as a first step toward peace in Vietnam.

Such a move by the President at this moment would electrify the world.

I urge him to do so.

THE VALUE OF THE JOB CORPS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is interesting to see the critics of the Job Corps become supporters of the program once they actually visit one of the centers. This has happened many times in the past. I invite the attention of Senators to a recent letter to the editor of the Ogden Standard-Examiner, of Ogden, Utah, from Edna Orrell, secretary of the NARCE Layton chapter in Layton, Utah.

Mrs. Orrell relates in her letter that she heard so much about the Clearfield Job Corps Center that she decided to see for herself. After she left the center, she was so moved that she wrote the editor a public letter urging all persons to visit the Job Corps centers to see the progress underway.

One important point she makes in her letter is that there is no comparison with the cost of the Job Corps per enrollee when considered along with the welfare payments for only 5 years. I urge that every Senator read Mrs. Orrell's letter because she has brought to our attention several points which should be considered relating to the Job Corps program.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Orrell's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOB CORPS CENTER

EDITOR,
Standard-Examiner:

I have read in the papers and seen on TV so many different views on the Clearfield Job Corps Center and corpsmen themselves that we are as a group decided to visit the center and see for ourselves.

NARCE Layton Chapter No. 829 was served luncheon cooked and served by the job corpsman which couldn't be duplicated in any of our high class cafes for any price. We were charged only $1.00.

We then toured the center. The facilities these boys have are outstanding. Modern in every way. We listened to Lee Jorgenson from Community Relations explain how these boys, are admitted and the standards they have to keep to stay in such a center. One of the recently graduated corpsman, Lewis Ashley, conducted part of the tour. He was a very well mannered and very interested and dedicated young man. He is going into community relations at a California Training Center.

If more of our politicians and neighbors could visit this center and see the kind of training and rules and regulations these corpsman have to adhere to, we would have many many more of these centers throughout the United States, welcomed with open arms. It may cost what seems like an outrageous sum of money for each of these boys, but stop and think how much of our tax dollars would they be paid if they stayed on welfare for even five years. This way we get our money back in a short time when they are trained and placed on a job and start paying taxes themselves.

Our own local underprivileged kids should have more of a chance. I say let's do something to get some more of these centers going.

EDNA ORRELL,
Secretary, NARCE Layton Chapter No. 829, Layton, Utah.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, in my discussion of H.R. 2508 yesterday I indicated that the public and press had not had an adequate opportunity to examine H.R. 2508, but that the initial reaction demonstrated that the feelings of the American people would be strong and strongly antagonistic to the bill in its present form. I thank the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] for his excellent job in gathering and presenting for the RECORD the opinions of leading constitutional law professors and experts on government. I had spoken with many of the same experts, and I can confirm that they had the most serious problems with the bill in its present form. Certainly if nothing else, their letters prove that the bill would be a source of confusion, litigation, and conflict for years to come.

The New York Times stressed this aspect of the bill in an editorial this morning entitled "Invitation to Confusion." The editorial begins this way:

> The Senate is now considering the badly drawn bill already passed by the House which attempts to permit the States to gerrymander their congressional districts with little restraint until 1972. Whether or not it accomplishes that unworthy objective, it is sure to prove a rich source of litigation and conflict.

The Times goes on to point out that any legislation on districting would merely supplement the reasonable standards and guidelines already enunciated by the courts. And it criticizes the lack of hearings and expert testimony and adequate committee consideration. It concludes that—

> The unseemly haste with which the Judiciary Committee rushed this bill to the floor without hearings is a disgrace. Recommittal and reconsideration are clearly in order.

It is my sincere belief that the amendment I have proposed, since it is based principally on the language of the Supreme Court opinions themselves, would remove all of the confusion and most of the potential for litigation from the bill. I would have preferred to have had it considered at proper hearings before the committee, but this was not possible. Without some such effort to clarify the bill, the bill certainly does not merit passage at this time, and I will be constrained to seek to recommit the bill for hearings, if clarification on the floor is not achieved.

I think the Members of the Senate should know about some of the other reactions to the bill which have been expressed over the past couple of weeks. The labor unions, who traditionally have been most eloquent spokesmen for the constitutional rights of their members and of all Americans, have expressed themselves clearly and effectively on H.R. 2508. Mr. John H. Beidler, legislative director of the industrial union department of the AFL–CIO, has written to say that:

> As reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee this bill would seriously derogate the one-man, one-vote rulings of the Supreme Court. . . . The thirty-five percent population variation is clearly derogatory of the

constitutional principle, and any confirmation of it by the Congress would be unconscionable. As to the compactness provision, this provision makes the principle of compactness farcical, enforceable in 50 different jurisdictions in 50 different ways. We would urge that the Federal Congress, while establishing principles of congressional districting, provide for their enforcement by institutions of the Federal Government of which it is a part.

I have also received similar views from Jack Conway, executive director of the IUD, from the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, from the Americans for Democratic Action, and others. This position has also received previous editorial support from the New York Times on May 17 and 18, from the Washington Post on May 20, and from many other newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that the letters and editorials to which I have referred be included in the Record at the end of my remarks.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senate will meet its responsibilities tomorrow when H.R. 2508 is considered.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 7, 1967]

Invitation to Confusion

The Senate is now considering the badly drawn bill already passed by the House which attempts to permit the states to gerrymander their Congressional districts with little restraint until 1972. Whether or not it accomplishes that unworthy objective, it is sure to prove a rich source of litigation and conflict.

As passed by the House, the bill would permit the largest district to be as much as 30 per cent larger in population than the smallest. When it was discovered that New York would not qualify under this provision, the Senate Judiciary Committee arbitrarily raised the figure to 35 per cent. There is no justification for such wide discrepancies. Many states have found it possible to redistrict with a spread of 5 per cent or less. Moreover, there is no certainty that the Supreme Court would regard state plans containing such wide variations as constitutional.

Then there is the muddled issue of compactness. When he originally introduced this bill, Representative Celler of New York provided that the districts be in "as compact form as practicable." But the House Judiciary Committee revised this language to read "in as reasonably a compact form as the state finds practicable." This probably makes the compactness criterion meaningless, leaving the whole issue of bizarre-shaped districts where it now rests—at the political mercies of the legislatures and beyond the review of the Federal courts.

No legislation on this subject is necessary. The standards being evolved by the courts are reasonable and will serve as a guide to legislatures in future redistricting. But if any bill is to be passed, there should first be hearings to receive expert testimony and then careful committee consideration. As we have previously observed, the unseemly haste with which the Judiciary Committee rushed this bill to the floor without hearings is a disgrace. Recommittal and reconsideration are clearly in order.

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 1967]

Emasculated Bill

What started out to be a congressional mandate for fair redistricting by the states has degenerated into a rather shabby compromise. As originally conceived on the House side, the bill laid down guidelines to which the states would have to conform in creating their congressional districts. Each district was to be compact, contiguous and nearly equal in population with permissible variations from the average of no more than 15 per cent. In the House and the Senate Judiciary Committee, however, the bill has been seriously weakened.

The House changed the allowable variations to 30 per cent between the largest and smallest districts in a state. Now the Senate Judiciary Committee has tentatively stretched this to 35 per cent, presumably to save New York from the necessity of redistricting before the 1968 elections. New York is under court order to remake its districts because of a variation of 34.5 per cent. The effect of the bill awaiting final action by the Judiciary Committee would be to relieve lawsuits for that purpose under the Supreme Court's fair districting decision.

A bill originally designed to compel fair districting, therefore, has become in part a device for defeat of court redistricting orders. This is most unfortunate. In our view, this is an area in which Congress should act. It has a primary responsibility to put its own house in order. The decision as to how much leeway is to be given the states in shaping their congressional districts is chiefly a political one that should be made by Congress. But Congress should not leave its guidelines so loose that the courts may be tempted to upset them for want of equal protection of the laws.

The only excuse that may be offered for this laxity is that it would remain in effect for only the 1968 and 1970 elections. After the 1970 census figures are available, permissible variations would be reduced to 10 per cent. But the strictness of this standard designed to be permanent merely emphasizes the excessive leniency of the temporary requirement. It is unfortunate, too, that the Senate committee did not close the door to gerrymandering—a door which the House had foolishly left open.

Since no hearings have been held on the Senate side, it is especially important that this problem be aired thoroughly in the Judiciary Committee and on the floor, if necessary. Certainly every effort should be made to improve the bill before it is brought to a vote.

Industrial Union Department,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1967.

Hon. Edward M. Kennedy,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kennedy: The Senate will shortly act on H.R. 2508, a bill establishing population tolerances for Congressional districts and requiring that such districts shall be compact and contiguous.

As reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, this bill would seriously derogate the one-man one-vote rulings of the United States Supreme Court. A population variance of 35% would be permitted until new districts are established following the 1970 census, at which time only a 10% variation would be allowed.

The 35% population variation is clearly derogative of the Constitutional principle, and any confirmation of it by the Congress would be unconscionable.

The bill further provides that the principle of compactness shall be left to the states to enforce, depriving the Federal courts of any jurisdiction in this question. This provision makes the principle of compactness farcical, enforceable in 50 different jurisdictions in 50 different ways. We would urge that the Federal Congress, while establishing principles of Congressional districting, provide for their enforcement by institutions of the Federal government of which it is a part.

On behalf of the Industrial Union Department and its sixty affiliated unions, I therefore urge that you oppose these provisions of H.R. 2508.

Sincerely yours,
John H. Beidler,
Legislative Director.

Washington, D.C.,
May 22, 1967.

Senator Edward M. Kennedy,
Judiciary Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of industrial union department, AFL–CIO, I urge you to vote to reject H.R. 2508, the congressional redistricting bill. Public hearings have not been held in either House. Provisions for 35% population disparity and depriving Federal courts of jurisdiction over compactness are unconscionable. Urge hearings be held before further action taken.

Jack T. Conway,
Executive Director, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.

Washington, D.C.,
May 22, 1967.

Senator Edward M. Kennedy,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

ADA registers strong opposition to the congressional districting bill which has passed the House (H.R. 2508) and is now pending in the Senate. The 90th Congress has held no hearings on this bill; the bill is regressive in that it seeks legalized malapportioned districts until 1972; violates the one-man vote principle; fails to establish requirements that districts be compact and contiguous to the extent possible; and precludes judicial review on compactness. We call upon you to reject this bill.

Leon Shull,
National Director.

OBITUARY FOR A MARINE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Congressional Record the eulogy delivered by the Reverend Everett F. Briggs, M.M., pastor of St. Stanislaus' Church, Monongah, W. Va., for L. Cpl. William Joy, U.S.M.C., who was recently killed in Vietnam. This young man was the first casualty in the Vietnam war from Monongah. The eulogy was given during the Requiem Mass offered by Father Briggs in Our Lady of Pompeii Church, May 8.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Eulogy for Monongah Marine Story Praising Unsung Hero

At this point in our Requiem service, we pause to say goodbye to William Joy, Lance-Corporal of the United States Marines.

In the name of all assembled here this morning to pay honor to this patriotic young American, I extend our heartfelt sympathy on this sad occasion to the family of William Joy, especially to his good father and mother.

William Joy left his little community for bootcamp in South Carolina, without any fanfare. He returned home from bootcamp, without any fanfare. And without any fanfare, he left his country for South Vietnam. He was wounded there in action. Rehabilitated, he was restored to duty in the front lines, again without any fanfare—until a Communist bullet cut short his young life.

Communists took the life of William Joy in South Vietnam, but here are many people in this country, right here in the United

States, who must share responsibility for his death. Every long-hair, every beatnik, ever peacenik, every Vietnik, every Communist Nyetnik who clutters the campuses of our American colleges and universities protesting against the established policy of the United States government, also must answer for the death of William Joy. Yes, every member of the United States Congress who insists on his right to dissent, even though his dissent begets dissension, is equally responsible for the death of William Joy.

In foreign countries, American tourists sometimes must apologize for the so-called ugly American who throws his weight around, and otherwise conducts himself in unbecoming ways. Americans, of course, for the most part are decent, respectable people, who are ashamed of the so-called ugly American away from home.

Today, however, dear people, we witness the rise of a new, far worse breed of ugly American, whom we must aptly call the cowardly, unpatriotic traitorous American. That new breed of ugly American is the ugliest American of all. He has no love for anyone but himself. He is not really interested in anyone else. His bleeding heart, be-moaning North Vietnam, is only subterfuge: He laments the fate of North Vietnam, lest he be required to share in the tragedy of South Vietnam.

In most cases, the new breed has had everything served up to him on a silver platter. Usually, he is too young to have accomplished anything worthwhile in a man's world. Often, he is said to be highly educated, but he has not yet learned the meaning of such terms as civic responsibility, public-spirited citizen, patriotic American, and the like.

The new breed has created in this country an atmosphere of confusion, distrust, and dissension. By his irresponsible protests, he has led the enemy to suspect that we are not united behind our government and our military forces, thus encouraging the enemy to hold out longer.

Recently, General (William C.) Westmoreland warned that these anti-war protests of the peaceniks will cost many more American lives, because all they serve to do is to encourage a badly-battered Communist enemy to continue his aggression in South Vietnam, hoping to gain politically what he has not been able to win militarily.

The fine men fighting for this country and for our way of life on the ramparts of Southeast Asia deserve far better from us. It is high time, I think, that this nation should take action against the traitors in our midst, whether they operate under the umbrella of religion, conscientious objection, democratic dissent, academic freedom, Civil Rights, or unadulterated Communism.

We, whose sons, fathers, brothers and husbands risk their lives daily in Vietnam, are sick and tired of these traitors who are undermining a legal and moral commitment of the United States government in South Vietnam thus endangering the lives of our loved ones.

If this war had not been prolonged by traitors, William Joy probably would be alive today, in this little community. Many of these young boys all around us this morning, not yet of military age, eventually will have to leave this small community to die in the rice fields of South Vietnam, if this fifth column has its way. William Joy, but for them, probably would be alive here today. His death is at once a reproof and a warning to all of us.

Wrapped in his country's flag, he slumbers here in quiet glory. Let no traitorous guttersnipes dare hope ever to inherit glory such as this!

After his long trek across troubled lands and tumultuous seas, William Joy is home again. Now we shall proceed to lay him to rest, not far from here, on a green knoll that overlooks his boyhood home. There, we trust that the memory of his patriotic sacrifice will inspire the youth of this community to love this dear unloved land of America.

In dying for America, William Joy died for all of us. Greater love than this, said Jesus, no man has: That one should lay down his life for his friends.

Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him. May he rest in peace! Amen.

ELECTIVE GOVERNOR BILL FOR THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, Mr. President——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] pursuant to a list of requests which are now at the desk.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me briefly?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. I certainly thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his courtesy.

Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post is published an advertisement entitled "34 Reasons Why a Bipartisan Group of the U.S. Congress Should Take a Careful Look Into the Present Conduct of the Government of Virgin Islands Before Congress Votes on the Elective Governor Bill for the Territory."

This advertisement was placed in the newspaper by the publisher of the Daily News of the Virgin Islands, in Charlotte Amalie.

I commend its reading and careful consideration on the part of all Senators, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

Once more I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Thirty-Four Reasons Why a Bipartisan Group of the U.S. Congress Should Take a Careful Look Into the Present Conduct of the Government of the Virgin Islands Before Congress Votes on the Elective Governor Bill for the Territory

Thirty years ago, when the first Organic Act was being drafted by Congress, the lawmakers found it necessary to look into the operations of the government of the Virgin Islands.

The examination of the local government gave congressional leaders first hand information on the condition of the insular government as well as on the general political, social and economic well being of its people. It was on the basis of their findings that the territory was granted its first Organic Act in 1936.

Less than twenty years later, a revision of the act appeared to be timely, and again the Congress probed into the conditions of the Virgin Islands before instituting any changes.

The revision was finally completed with the passage of the 1954 Organic Act—the local constitution under which the government is presently operating.

Today this act is slowly undergoing a piecemeal change without the customary and necessary Congressional examination of the affairs of the government. Already the Organic Act has undergone three significant changes; the raising of the ceiling of the bonding authority of the Virgin Islands government from ten to 30 million dollars; allowing the Virgin Islands legislature to set the salary of its members and increasing the legislature from nine to 15 members.

The act is again faced with the possibility of another major change: Provision for the election of the governor and lieutenant governor.

Currently strong attempts on the part of influential and enthusiastic supporters of the measure are being made to waive a searching examination into the social, political and financial conditions in the islands prior to the adoption of any further amendment to the Organic Act.

Congress is generally aware of the situation in the Virgin Islands, mainly through the views of persons who are in charge of administering the territory and a handful of senators and congressmen touring the island, mainly as tourists. From the record of various hearings held in Washington it is very clear that members of Congress are either being misinformed or they lack the basic information necessary to getting a true picture of the Virgin Islands.

We would like to recommend that before final action is taken on the elective governor bill, it would be most helpful to the lawmakers and a service to the people of the Virgin Islands, to conduct an exhaustive examination and study into the social, political and financial affairs of the territory to determine whether there is need in any of these basic areas for strengthening, before greater autonomy is entrusted to it.

It is the duty and responsibility of Congress to obtain first hand knowledge of the territory before it proceeds to legislate for its future, to make sure—beyond any reasonable doubt—that it has charted a right course for the Virgin Islands and their people.

We believe the proposed elected governor and lieutenant governor for the Virgin Islands is the right course. However, many citizens are concerned that when Congress withdraws further from territorial involvement, it does not leave a large segment of the population victims of a government which is neither truly democratic nor responsive to the freely exercised will of the people—a government which shows frightening signs that are reminiscent of dictatorial regimes.

A Congressional Probe is Urgently Needed to:

1. Determine whether the appointment of a major dairy farmer as Commissioner of Agriculture, with hundreds of acres leased from the government, constitutes a conflict of interest.
2. Determine whether a privately constructed sewage plant at Estate Tutu was accepted by the government despite the fact that the Planning Board, the Public Works Department and the Director of the Bureau of Environment Sanitation all disapproved it because it did not meet standards.
3. Determine whether the Governor used a sum of approximately $20,000 of taxpayers' monies to institute changes which should have been made by the developer of the plant before the system was accepted by the Governor.
4. Determine whether the number of persons employed by the government is approximately 35% of the voters of the territory.
5. Determine why the average cost of government to each man, woman and child in the Virgin Islands is $1,000 while the same cost of government—Federal, State and local—in the United States is $700.
6. Determine whether Virgin Islands government is operating a lottery subsidized by the taxpayers.
7. Determine whether there has been an increase in the number of patronage appointments in the government service from under 100 in 1961 to currently over 800.
8. Determine whether expansion of the spoils system as practiced by the majority political faction with the Governor's cooperation has any adverse effect on the Merit Sys-

tem which all agree is the cornerstone of fair and equal opportunity in government.

9. Determine whether most of the unclassified and a number of classified workers ranging from laborers and cooks to commissioners were active during election time garnering votes for the party during regular working hours.

10. Determine whether positions which are now exposed to patronage and the spoils system are positions which have nothing to do with policy, but are really technical, professional and career type positions.

11. Determine whether patronage conditions when attached to such as Building Inspector, Safety and Payroll Inspector, Wage and Compensation officer and Planning Director subjects the encumbent employees to unreasonable political pressure which adversely affects the objective and impartial performance of their duty.

12. Determine whether the Legislature controls the appointment (and dismissal) of government employees, especially in the so-called unclassified service.

13. Determine whether the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare has repeatedly taken exception to many of the positions which the Governor has allowed to be placed on the patronage list.

14. Determine whether the Governor has approved legislative grants or special treatment to certain selected employees in the form of larger pensions than provided under the retirement law of the Virgina Islands.

15. Determine whether the growing army of unnecessary assistant commissioners and deputy commissioners in a government the size of the Virgin Islands is a device to circumvent or undermine the Civil Service.

16. Determine whether there is a two party system or two factions of a one party system in the Legislature with the present Governor belonging to one before he took office and to the other two years after he was in office.

17. Determine whether conflict of interest exists in a situation where a member of the cabinet is engaged in purchasing materials and equipment and awarding contracts on behalf of the Government while at the same time operating a private firm which deals with these sources of supplies.

18. Determine whether there was any irregularity in the acquisition by the President of the Senate of a twenty year lease at the Submarine Base for a business site, two weeks BEFORE the area was actually deeded by the Federal Government to the Government of the Virgin Islands.

19. Determine whether two V.I. Senators are the first to stake claims for building sites at the newly acquired Sub-Base and whether the Senate is required by the law to ratify leases approved by the Governor.

20. Determine whether a relative of the Governor who is also a member of the Senate is about to acquire a fifteen year lease on the ball field at the Sub-Base for a business complex.

21. Determine whether government employees violated the Hatch Act in their participation in the general elections last November.

22. Determine whether two senators (one a former judge) who are also attorneys may practice before a Judge, whose nomination has been held in abeyance pending legislative action thus exposing justice in the courts of the Virgin Islands to undue pressure.

23. Determine whether the Governor was responsible for distributing a lampoon letter to his influential friends in the U.S. calculated to discredit and have removed from office the Government Secretary who is also a presidential appointee.

24. Determine whether the Governor really knew what was printed on the campaign button which he wore proudly at that same election, as he indicated at a recent House hearing he was not sure.

25. Determine whether laws of the Virgin Islands are being waived in the interest of special persons and groups and friends of the administration and the majority party.

26. Determine whether the Governor acquiesces to the demand of the majority bloc in the Virgin Islands Legislature for ruthless dismissal of government employees for purely political reasons.

27. Determine whether there was conflict of interest in a former president of the legislature who, after his defeat in 1962 was granted a pension of $3,600 per annum and a $10,000 government contract to manage the abattoir in St. Croix despite the law stating that persons on government payroll could not collect government pension.

28. Determine whether political party clearance is a prerequisite for appointment of eligible candidates who qualify for employment under the Merit System.

29. Determine whether the morale of the government and indeed the community (except among the Governor's party members) is declining because of rising intimidation and fear.

30. Determine whether intimidation and fear is so prevalent that people are even afraid to be seen speaking with their friends or relatives because they happen to be of a different political belief.

31. Determine whether the interests of the people of the Virgin Islands were adequately protected in the negotiations for the construction of the Altona Housing Project and whether serious irregularities exist.

32. Determine whether control of elections by the legislature is proper when that body appoints the election supervisor, the board of elections, who in turn appoints the judges, clerks and inspectors for each polling place. Also to determine if it is proper for the executive director of the Public Housing projects to be chairman of the elections board.

33. Determine whether it is necessary to have ten (10) assistant attorneys general to care for the legal work of the government (not including about three counsels to the Governor) many of whom are engaged in private practice at the same time.

34. Determine whether the Governor's office is used for the enrichment of friends and special interest groups at the expense of the taxpayers of the Virgin Islands.

RESOLUTION OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY ON THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me briefly?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, due to the Mideast crisis and the railroad resolution just passed, I was unable to attend the meeting of the Political Committee of the North Atlantic Assembly, which is the new name for the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, on which I am a rapporteur on the Political Committee. The occupant of the chair at the present moment, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], is well acquainted with that organization.

The committee saw fit, at my request, as I cabled them, to consider the Middle East issue. I should like to cause to be read into the Record—which I shall do now—the statement which the committee adopted, as it represents the European view of the distinguished parliamentarians and members of that committee.

The statement is very brief and will take just a minute to read:

> The Political Committee of the North Atlantic Assembly, at which a draft report prepared by its rapporteur, Senator Jacob Javits of New York, was considered today, issued the following statement:
>
> The committee noted with concern the grave developments in the Middle East and expressed support for the United Nations Security Council in its efforts to bring about a cease-fire leading to a just settlement of the problems involved there and eliminating all possible conflicts, including the acceptance of the right of Israel to exist and have free international access to the Strait of Tiran.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin very much for yielding to me.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT AT GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, during the last week of May, four Senators, Senators Fulbright, Brooke, Pell, and I, and two Members of the House of Representatives, Representative Patsy Mink and Representative Brown of California, attended the convocation of Pacem in Terris, which took place in Geneva, Switzerland. In spite of the fact that the convocation got a bad press, it was a most rewarding experience, about which I expect to speak at greater length sometime next week.

One of the most interesting, thoughtful, and provocative addresses made at the convocation was by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright. His paper—he was one of a panel of several—was entitled "Beyond Coexistence."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this excellent and thought-provoking address may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Beyond Coexistence

(Statement by Senator J. W. Fulbright, May 30, 1967, Pacem in Terris, Geneva, Switzerland)

Far from being an end in itself, coexistence is no more than a precondition. It embodies no positive values but only a precarious commitment between hostile parties not to try to destroy each other. That, to be sure, would be progress in the primitive moral environment in which we live, but still only a precondition for some positive advance in civilization. Only when men are liberated from the concern with survival which is now their principal occupation can their energies be focused on the realization of positive values. Coexistence, therefore, must be regarded as only the first, necessary step in a long civilizing process. Beyond it lies the necessity for community and beyond that—if we can look that far—is the dim prospect of a positive advance in the evolution of human morals.

The power drive of men and nations traditionally has been checked by the power drive of other men and other nations. The system of countervailing force has, until recently, worked tolerably well in international relations. It has not prevented all wars but it has almost certainly prevented some wars and, since the rise of the nation-state system in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it has prevented any one nation from gaining permanent domination over all others. It has done so, however, at accelerating cost: a quarter of a century of general European war was required to defeat the aggression of revolutionary and Napoleonic France; in the twentieth century two world wars, taking tens of millions of lives and culminating in the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, were required to defeat the aggressions of Germany and Japan.

The balance of power system can be said to have worked in the past in that bids for world domination were defeated, albeit at horrendous cost, but another war, fought with nuclear weapons, would involve incomparably greater cost. No "war game," no "scenario," however scientific and sophisticated, could possibly give us a picture of what the world would be like after a holocaust of unimaginable horror.

Even if organized societies survived a nuclear war, what would the state of civilization be? what would become of nations and ideologies as we now know them? and, perhaps most important of all, what would the state of mind of the survivors be? what capacity would they have, in the wake of the greatest catastrophe in human history, to lay the foundations of a better world? Both of the two world wars wrought profound changes in the world, changes which were neither foreseen nor desired by the leaders and peoples of the nations which fought those wars; all that we can say with confidence about the consequences of a nuclear war is that none of us can conceive what they would be.

For these reasons, the principle of unregulated countervailing force is no longer an acceptable basis for organizing the world. Although it has prevented the imposition of a global tyranny, it has not prevented global war and the survival of our species requires a system that will prevent global war, not just by "crisis management," which may prevent a particular crisis from getting out of hand, but permanently and reliably. The new principle that is required is a principle of *community*, one which will end the no longer tolerable anarchy of unlimited national sovereignty. As the distinguished psychiatrist Dr. Jerome Frank writes, "survival today depends on reducing, controlling, channelling, and redirecting the drive for power and the impulse to violence and fostering the countervailing drives toward fellowship and community."[1]

The principles of community and of countervailing force are by no means antithetical; they are indeed complementary, the function of a community being not to eliminate but to regulate competition. On every level of human activity, from the family to the nation, there operates a principle of countervailing force which, more often than not, makes for a rough equity by preventing any one person, group or nation from gaining domination over all others. Competition is necessary to protect us from tyranny but, unless it is kept within bounds, it either becomes intolerably destructive or else one contestant or another succeeds so well as to eliminate its rivals, gaining a monopoly of power and putting an end to the competition.

Community controls therefore become necessary to keep the competition going and to assure the survival of the competitors. In our domestic economies we have long since recognized the dangers of unregulated capitalism and have imposed legal controls which help to prevent economic competition from becoming too socially destructive and to prevent the most powerful productive units from eliminating entirely their competitors. Similarly, the American Constitution has worked well because it has institutionalized political rivalries perpetuating them but also regulating them in the interests of the community.

In international relations, on the other hand, there is rivalry but no regulating mechanism. Nothing has yet arisen to replace the *de facto* security community known as the Concert of Europe which collapsed in 1914. We have created excellent international organizations in the 20th century, but neither the League of Nations nor the United Nations have been infused with the life blood of community spirit.

At the same time the great nations have acquired weapons which, for the first time in all history, threaten the survival not just of individual men but of much or most of the human species. Our hopes for survival therefore rest on the improbable prospect that a system which has never worked for very long without regulation will now, for the first time, do so, and do so at a time of maximum pressures and strains.

For the last decade or so we have been surviving on a certain amount of "crisis management" and a larger amount of luck. But what of the next ten or fifty or a hundred years?

The major source of instability to an unregulated balance of power is the acquisition by one nation of such great power that it threatens both the system and the participating nations, including—if it could only understand how and why—itself. Such was the case with France in the early 19th century and with Germany in the early 20th century. Both Russia and China are potential threats to the world equilibrium but at the moment the only nation whose power is great enough to threaten the world equilibrium is my own.

America is restrained by democratic and humanitarian traditions, but power is the greatest of intoxicants and that power which is restrained only by the good principles of its possessor is in the end not restrained at all. Thomas Jefferson said that "whatever power in any government is independent, is absolute also." The point is no less valid when applied to international relations.

In the absence of an international community the only recourse of nations confronted with the greatly superior power of one of their number is to band together against that superior power. In the past such defensive, or counterbalancing, coalitions have taken little account of ideology and differing social systems: constitutional England did not hesitate to join with absolutist Austria and Russia against Napoleonic France; nor did republican France shrink from alliance with tsarist Russia against imperial Germany; nor did the democratic West have to think twice about allying itself with Stalinist Russia against Nazi Germany. As Churchill so cogently put it: if Hitler invaded hell, he, Churchill, was prepared to make a favorable reference to the devil in the House of Commons.

I should not like America to create the need for pacts with the devil. If, however, America becomes arrogant in its great power, it is far from certain that the bonds of democracy which now link western Europe with America will prove equal to the strain. History indeed suggests that they will not. Power isolates the powerful and, in these last few years, as my country has acquired greater and greater power and used it with less and less restraint, it has become progressively more isolated, so that today its world policies command less sympathy and less support than at any time since the emergence of the United States as a world power.

It is, therefore, with a special regard for my own country—for the safety and happiness of its people, for the good name which it will have and which it will also deserve if it remains true to its own principles—that I stress the need for international community, for arrangements in the world that will restrain the arrogance of power. Whether such arrangements can be devised will depend in no small part on the wisdom of the most powerful, on whether they can be brought to understand the terrible danger of their power—and that not least to themselves.

We have tried twice in this century, after each of the two great wars, to create international communities for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. There was nothing very much wrong, certainly nothing irreparable, with either the League of Nations Covenant or the United Nations Charter. Both, however, failed of their initial promise, not for lack of legal content but for lack of spiritual commitment on the part of their members. The United Nations, however, though not vigorous, is still alive and its promise, though not fulfilled, is still possible of fulfillment.

Realizing that unfulfilled promise is now the world's most important work. There are many ways in which that work can be advanced: to a far greater extent than any nation has thus far been willing to do, we can use the procedures of the United Nations for mediation and the peaceful settlement of disputes; we can strengthen the International Court of Justice by repealing crippling reservations which deny its compulsory jurisdiction; we can, and should, channel greatly increased assistance to the less developed nations through the World Bank and other international institutions; we can, and should, expand our international educational exchanges; and, as another extremely promising step toward building an international community, we could create a United Nations volunteer service to draw upon the enormous idealism of the younger generation, applying it to tasks ranging from school building to population planning in needy places all over the world.

The first, indispensable step toward the realization of a new concept of community in the world is the acquisition of a new dimension of self-understanding. We have got to understand, as we have never understood before, why it is, psychologically and biologically, that men and nations fight, why it is, regardless of time or place or circumstance, that they always find *something* to fight about, why it is that we are capable of love and loyalty to our own nation or ideology and of venomous hatred toward someone else's. We have got to understand whether, and how, such emotions satisfy certain needs of human nature and whether, and how, these needs could be satisfied in a world without war.

Psychologists of late have been restating the truism that man is a civilized animal. Their emphasis, however, is not on the fact that man has built a civilization—we all know that—but on the fact that he is an *animal* which has built a civilization. We *don't* all know that, at least not to the point of being really at peace in our own minds with our own anthropoid origins. We pay lip service to Darwin but, in our heart of hearts, how many of us really believe that we are not fallen gods but unusually precocious apes? Not many, I dare say. And why should we? Who wants to associate with chimpanzees when he has the words and the ideas which enable him to believe that he is only slightly lower than the angels?

It may be indeed that there is a spark of the divine in man. I do not wish to deny it; I do wish to make the point that overemphasis upon it, coupled with extreme resistance to the acknowledgment of our animal nature and instincts, fosters dangerous illusions in the human mind. It permits us to believe that our passions are principles, our ambitions noble causes, and our conflicts crusades.

In his recent book *On Aggression* Konrad Lorenz makes the point that evolution has bred the strongest inhibitions on attacking their own species into exactly those animals, such as lions, wolves and ravens, whose teeth or claws or beaks are so deadly that, if used without restraint against their own species, would soon wipe it out. The animals, on the other hand, with the least inhibitions on attacking their own kind are the ones which are least threatening to their species' survival, the slow and clumsy ones, that is, which are easily escaped from, and the ones with blunt teeth, short claws and small beaks which are easily resisted—including, for one interesting example, doves.

---

[1] Dr. Jerome Frank, *Sanity and Survival: Psychological Aspects of War and Peace*.

Man, with his small teeth, small claws, and miniscule inhibitions, is in the second category. In his natural state he is not particularly menacing to his fellow man, but technology has equipped man with artificial teeth and claws which have become ever more deadly with the advance of civilization. It has not, however, equipped man with inhibitions to counterbalance his artifically acquired capacity for killing; he has become, as it were, a dove with the beak of a raven. This is not to say that evolution will not catch up—Konrad Lorenz thinks it probably will, unless we blow ourselves up in the meantime—but until and unless it does breed inhibitions to match his power into the human animal, there will remain a gap, a terrifying gap indeed, between the capacity for killing conferred upon us by our technology and the meager inhibitions bred into us by nature.

Being neither a psychologist nor an anthropoligist, I make no claim to the validity of any one theory of human behavior. My purpose is to stress the great importance of a coming to terms by man with his own nature. We are, for reasons entirely beyond our control, endowed like all other living creatures with primeval instincts of sex, hunger, survival, flight and aggressiveness. Unlike all other living creatures, we are also endowed with a capacity for reason and, being so blessed, we claim to be endowed *only* with reason, rejecting and denying our animal natures. We do not of course eliminate them by denying them; we drive them underground where they function without recognition and, therefore, without control. That is the critical point: an unacknowledged instinct is an unregulated one and therefore a dangerous one. We must acknowledge and come to know our own irrational instincts because then, and only then, can we bring them under the guidance of reason; then, and only then, can we hope to be at peace with ourselves and at peace with each other. Far, therefore, from denigrating man's moral and religious nature, an awareness of our irrational instincts must inspire us with a new respect for the power of reason and moral responsibility, which came into the world with man and which give him the power to civilize his animal inheritance.

The implication of all this for international relations is the advisability of extreme caution in the conduct of our rivalries and extreme skepticism about the ostensible causes which we believe to have set nations against each other. I am reasonably sure that a careful, dispassionate examination of the ideological issue between the western countries and the communist countries would show that at the root of the cold war is a lesser degree of intellectually derived principle and a greater degree of plain animal competitiveness than either party has hitherto supposed.

We have got to come down to earth in our assessment of ourselves and of our ideologies—and not merely for the sake of intellectual accuracy. We have got to do it because technology has destroyed nature's balance between man's inhibitions and ability to kill, with the result that man is now, for the first time, in a situation in which the survival of his species is in jeopardy. Other forms of life have been endangered and many destroyed by changes in their natural environment; man is menaced by a change of environment which he himself has wrought by the invention of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles. Our power to kill has become universal, creating a radically new situation, which, if we are to survive, requires us to adopt some radically new attitudes about human and international relations. As Lorenz writes: "An unprejudiced observer from another planet, looking upon man as he is today, in his hand the atom bomb, the product of his intelligence, in his heart the aggression drive inherited from his anthropoid ancestors, which this same intelligence cannot control, would not prophesy long life for the species." [3]

We have got to proceed, as best we can, with the great and difficult task of bringing under the control of human reason the awesome weapons which are now at the disposal of primeval instincts unregulated by moral restraint. More important, therefore, than the politics and the ploys, the small victories and the small revenges of conventional diplomacy, is an effort to know ourselves as we never have known ourselves before, not with a view to conquering our animal nature, because that we cannot do, but rather with a view to bringing it under the restraints of reason and morality, with a view to reconciling that which is Darwinian within us with that which we believe to be divine. We have got to make peace with our own human nature; we have got to learn to treat it with compassion and respect.

Only on the basis of an understanding of our behavior can we hope to control it in such a way as to insure the survival of the human race. Only on the basis of such understanding can we hope to go beyond coexistence, creating step by step the state of mind which will breathe life into the United Nations, turning an organization into a community. Our chance of success is probably not very great, but even that is beside the point because there is no choice but to try when the alternatives are a small chance and no chance at all.

And if we do try, maybe—just maybe—we will be able to make of the United Nations what Woodrow Wilson hoped his League of Nations would be, "a living thing," something both "practical" and "humane," with "a pulse of sympathy in it" and "a compulsion of conscience throughout it"—in short, a community.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO CUT SPENDING SHARPLY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the prospects for a gigantic Federal deficit in the coming fiscal year loom larger every day. The chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee indicated a few days ago that we face a potential deficit in the fiscal year beginning July 1 of $29.2 billion. This is a frightening figure. It would be a far larger deficit than any we have encountered since the end of World War II. And, obviously, it will have a major effect on our economy.

Surely, this alarming figure will jolt the Congress into recognizing that in this inflation-prone economy in which we have been living recently the priority need is for a reduction in expenditures. This is the most obvious of economic adjustments in an inflationary economy, but it is one that is too often shunted aside in favor of an "easier out." But, now, Mr. President, I think it is time Congress recognized that we can and must cut spending. For too long, the argument has held sway both in Congress and, indeed, in the top echelons of the business community as well, that it is hopeless to try to reduce Federal spending. I recently spoke with a group of some of America's top businessmen and I found them surprisingly pessimistic about the possibility of Federal spending reductions. Such attitudes, I fear, are based on little more than deceptively convincing myths. I think we can cut spending. All we need is the will to do it.

The Joint Economic Committee, which I have the honor to chair, is very much concerned about the predicted deficit in fiscal 1968, about the state of the economy and the need for expenditure and tax adjustments. We plan to hold hearings beginning June 27, at which time we will have representatives of the administration as well as outside experts provide the most up to date information on the state of the economy and the relative desirability of alternative means of dealing with pressures generated.

Meanwhile, there is urgent need, it seems to me, for some immediate consideration of Federal financing prospects and their implications for the economy. Obviously, he who predicts the future does so at his peril, and I am not about to invoke the visions of the crystal ball. On the other hand, there is patent need for analyzing the situation in the light of our present knowledge. In addition, there is a certain amount of confusion about what the deficit really means. People have different concepts of the budget, and often they become confused in the public mind.

It may be recalled that the President, in his Economic Report, discussed the Federal finances in terms of the national income accounts. This is the budget concept that takes into account all of the income that the Federal Government takes out of the national income stream and it includes all of the expenditures that the Federal Government puts back into the national income stream. Obviously, if the Government puts more into the income stream than it takes out, it expands purchasing power and stimulates the economy; conversely, if the Government takes out of the income stream more money than it puts back into it, the effect will be deflationary.

The so-called administrative budget, which is still what most people think of when they talk about the Federal budget, includes those accounts over which the Federal Government exercises budgetary control. It does not include a number of self-financed programs, such as the huge social security trust fund, which currently takes in approximately $45 billion and expends at the rate of $41 billion a year.

This huge amount, as I say, is excluded; is not included in the administrative budget, the budget which is usually discussed by Congress and the press.

Secondly, the administrative budget is on a cash basis and does not take into account that the major economic effect of Federal expenditures will be felt at the time that these obligations accrue rather than at the time payment is made.

There is an important and very distinct difference, and there is much confusion on what effect the budget will have on the economy, because tension is not focused on accrual, but too often is focused on expenditures.

Moreover, the administrative budget includes certain changes in assets in Government revolving funds and similar activities that are more the nature of asset transactions rather than income transactions.

---

[3] Konrad Lorenz, *On Aggression* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1966), p. 49.

In the fiscal year ending June 30 of this year, the Government receipts were estimated at approximately $149.8 billion and expenditures at $153.6 billion, on a national income accounts basis. This involved a relatively small deficit in the amount of $3.8 billion. By way of contrast, the so-called administrative budget showed receipts of $117 billion and expenditures of $126.7 billion—a deficit of $9.7 billion.

In presenting his fiscal 1968 budget, the President estimated that the Vietnam war cost would increase only slightly to a $22 billion level. He estimated a $6 billion increase in social security, mostly for proposed legislation, $4 billion in defense needs over and above Vietnam, and about $2½ billion for other Federal programs.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief observation?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have the privilege of serving with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin on the Joint Economic Committee. In the operation of that committee I believe he is performing a great public service in bringing to the attention of the American people the growing problems of the economy. I simply want to associate myself with his remarks and to congratulate him for the superb manner in which he is handling the Joint Economic Committee. I am proud to be a member of the committee which he so ably chairs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I want to thank the Senator from Missouri. It is of tremendous advantage to have on the committee a man who has been a smashing success in American business, and a man who, certainly in Congress, has had unparalleled experience in the executive branch as well as the legislative branch. He has served in both branches with greater distinction.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is most gracious. I appreciate his kind remarks. I would make this prophecy: By the end of this session the studies made and the hearings held by the Joint Economic Committee and staff, under the direction of the Senator from Wisconsin, will be among the most important and informative guides for the future handling of the economy by the administration. I would hope they receive the attention they merit.

As I have often said, to me there are three legs to the security and well-being of the United States. There is the political-diplomatic leg; there is the military leg that serves the political-diplomatic leg; and there is the economic leg. Much attention of the Government is devoted to the first two legs of the platform of security and well-being of the United States. On the other hand, in my opinion, the economic leg is at least as important. As the Senator from Wisconsin has consistently throughout his work pointed out, there are growing dangers incident to the very heavy spending going on today. I would hope that Members of the Senate, the administration and the American people, realize the great service which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is performing in the interest of the security and prosperity of this country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. There is no question that the economic security of this Nation is essential. As the Senator has said, if we are going to have the kind of military force we must have in the world in which we live, if we are going to have the capacity to work constructively for peace, this is the most fundamental element we can have in our society. It is not exciting and dramatic. It does not hit the headlines in the same way as the others do. There is confusion involved in it. But we are going to have to give closer attention to it in the future than we have in the past if we are going to continue the remarkable show of strength that the economy has shown, and if we are to use that strength, as we must use it, to achieve a peaceful world and a strong America.

Mr. President, as I stated, the President estimated a $6 billion increase in social security, mostly for proposed legislation, $4 billion in defense needs over and above Vietnam, and about $2.2 billion for other Federal programs.

After allowance was made for the increased revenues that may normally be expected in a growing economy, the President and his advisers estimated that the Government would be incurring a deficit of approximately $5 billion a year for the first half of the calendar year 1967. It was estimated that the deficit would rise to about $7 billion in the 6 months beginning July 1. Because of this prospect of a rising deficit the administration recommended a 6-percent surtax effective July 1, 1967, to remain in effect for 2 years. This was designed to offset the stimulus of the growing deficit and to avoid the inflationary pressures that it might be expected to generate.

So far as the general economy is concerned, the administration judged that the private sector would be suffering from a slowdown in the rate of increase during the first half and that it would recapture its normal vigorous rate of growth in the second half. The improvement in the economy would be aided in part by a step-up in housing construction aided by easing money, according to administration forecasts.

Since then, as I indicated, the prospects for a deficit have loomed much larger. In the first place, the Secretary of the Treasury has already indicated that the expenditure estimates must be increased at least $1½ billion. Then, in the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on the economic impact of the Vietnam war, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] indicated that budget estimates for this purpose might have to be increased some $4 to $6 billion for the coming fiscal year. To be on the safe side, let us assume that the fiscal year increment will be about $6 billion. Finally, the January budget was based on the premise that some $5 billion would be raised through the sale of participation certificates. Since the Congress up to now does not seem to be going along with the basic idea of these certificates, we will have to add this amount to expenditures rather than treat it as an offsetting capital transaction.

On the basis of these developments, the deficit for the fiscal year 1968 on an administrative budget basis has grown from a level of $8.1 billion in January to $20.6 billion. If we then make the further assumption that the 6-percent surtax is not enacted in July, it would add to this deficit. I think we can make that assumption safely. If we make the assumption that it is not enacted at all, it would add aproximately $6 billion to the deficit, bringing it up to almost $27 billion, and then if we allow for the fact that the anticipated slowdown in the first half of the calendar year may be proving more stubborn than was expected, tax receipts would be lower. Thus it is easy enough to come up to the $30 billion figure. Even when we translate this to the so-called national income basis—which I indicated before is more meaningful economically—the deficit could go as high as $17 billion. I should emphasize that these numbers are not my own estimates or those of the Joint Economic Committee staff. They are derived from various statements that have appeared in official or semiofficial sources, or in the press as reports of official revelations.

Now if there is one thing that we have learned in fiscal policy, it is that deficits stimulate the economy and certainly a deficit of this sizable proportion is going to do just that. We already have the problem in respect to the built-in cost-push inflationary pressures, caused by wage and price increases over and above the guidelines. They can only be aggravated by a large deficit.

Moreover, a combination of a high deficit and an inflationary wage-price situation would, in all probability, bring about a return of the excessively high interest-tight money conditions of last year. In my opinion, this is a meat-ax approach to the problem involving great harm to those sections of the community least able to bear it—the consumers, the small businessmen, the farmers, the homebuyers. It would be a tragic mistake to repeat the monetary errors of last year.

Let me expand for a moment on the monetary prospects that derive from a large deficit. Treasury requirements for new money in the next fiscal year would be largely concentrated in the period from July 1 to December 31. In view of the deficit, the Treasury demands will probably range somewhere between $12 and $20 billion at least, in addition to the refinancing. Such large borrowings coming on top of large demands in the private sector could create a squeeze on financial markets even without a tightening of Federal Reserve policies, that would exceed the pressures of last year which, as you know, produced the highest rates in 40 years. A situation like that, involving extremely tight financial markets and exceptionally high interest rates, would probably precipitate an economic decline of substantial proportions. And, in any case, it would certainly reverse the recent incomplete recovery in housing. It could be a potent factor in bringing about a sharp decline in spending for plant and equipment as well as a liquidation of inventories.

In March of this year when the prospects for a deficit were appreciably lower, a majority of the Joint Economic Committee took the position that Federal expenditures not absolutely essential to national defense or economic growth or welfare should be sharply reduced. The committee pointed out that, under the administration's projections, the deficit, measured on a national income basis, would be increasing in the second half of the calendar year and running at a rate of somewhere between $7 and $10 billion a year, assuming relatively high unemployment. A majority of the committee took the position that Congress must find ways to reduce expenditures for fiscal 1968 by at least $5 to $6 billion a year.

This is a majority of a committee that consisted of 10 members from the House of Representatives and 10 members from the Senate, 12 Democrats and eight Republicans, and it was a very distinct and heavy majority of the committee which came to this conclusion, after extensive economic hearings on the budget. I must also add that this was a committee which represented, I think, a very accurate cross-section of Congress.

The current prospects argue the case more strongly. The deficit on an NIA basis now threatens to reach the $15 billion level or thereabouts in the second half of the year. With rising commitments in Vietnam and substantial growth in other public outlays, we obviously have to cut back somewhere. If the Government does not do it, then inflation or tight money will do it for us at great cost and dislocation to the public.

What we face in fiscal 1968 is the prospect of an economy overstimulated by large Government deficits. This is a distorted version of fiscal policy. Our economic goals, to my knowledge, and I might add, the administration's goals, look to a high employment, vigorously growing economy, stimulated by vigorous private investment and consumption. In such a situation, the effect of the Government finances should be as neutral as possible. That is, on a national income basis, the budget should be balanced or there should be a slight surplus.

Deficits, we were taught, were appropriate when the economy is in a recessed state and needs stimulus—when investment and consumption are too low to fully utilize our productive capacity. In such a case, Government deficits serve to trigger off expansion in demand that helps to bring the economy back to a full-employment equilibrium. In periods where inflationary pressures dominate, traditional fiscal policy calls for Government surpluses to help dampen demand and reduce the excess pressures on available goods and services.

In view of the most recent prospects for a deficit, and remembering that we are in a period of expanding State and local expenditures, it becomes obvious that the 6-percent surtax recommended by the President will not do the job. It may well be that we will need both the tax increase and an expenditure decrease in order to keep the economy on even keel in 1968. And the Congress should be ready for it. I believe that we can cut back expenditures for fiscal 1968 by $5 billion with a minimum of dislocation. We have to keep in mind that, if this country avoids further substantial increases in military outlays and other Federal expenditures, our inflationary problem will surely be short lived. Over the long pull, as our Joint Economic Committee study shows, revenues probably outrun expenditures due to the operation of the fiscal drag effects of our progressive tax system. It would be relatively easy and relatively harmless to postpone certain public expenditures for a year or two. The reductions that I am proposing will not give rise to any irreparable deficiencies or to any serious dislocations in the economy. These reductions are as follows:

Public works is certainly a category inviting reductions and stretching out of expenditures. The fiscal 1968 budget proposed over $4½ billion for direct Federal projects and more than $5 billion in grants for civil projects—in other words, a total of $9.5 billion. As a matter of fact, on the basis of our experience in past wars, in the Korean war and World War II, here is where Presidents have either completely suspended Federal spending or sharply cut it back; but I think this is the highest expenditure on nondefense public works in the history of our Nation, by far. Over a billion dollars is recommended for the Corps of Engineers and $3.6 billion for the highway program. I think much of this is political "pork barrel" and should at least be postponed until the economic and military demands are reduced.

A second area where expenditures could be postponed is the space program. I feel that post-Apollo funds can be cut by over a billion dollars. This would postpone such projects as a soft landing on Mars, which has nothing to do with our present goal of a Moon landing.

A third area which invites reduction is in the development of the supersonic transport. The Federal Aviation Administration is requesting $198 million for fiscal 1968. If this amount is approved it would raise our total appropriations for the SST to $729 million. At a time when we must carefully scrutinize the priority of our expenditures, we certainly can forgo this expensive frill.

Just a few days ago, I discussed the supersonic transport in considerable detail on the floor of the Senate, and pointed out the enormous problems that will be raised by the sonic boom, and by other technological difficulties, that the FAA is not beginning to solve.

I also pointed out the very minor advantage, if any, that the SST will represent once it is developed.

Finally, I think we can curtail military costs by further reducing our troop strength in Europe. I have welcomed the administration's decision to cut our forces there by 35,000 as part of the recent agreement reached with West Germany and the United Kingdom. This is an encouraging start, but will still leave about 225,000 troops there. There will still be nearly 1 million American citizens there, including dependents. I think we can make further substantial reductions which would materially help our balance of payments as well as our budgetary deficit.

It is obvious, I think, that the expenditure decreases that I am advocating would have a selective impact upon the economy, particularly since it would involve a postponement and not a cancellation of the programs for the most part. It would, I believe, have a less depressing effect on business than an across-the-board tax increase.

The situation that we face in fiscal 1968 involves an economy dominated by a heavy Federal deficit, no matter how it is measured. If these circumstances materialize, there is no question about the immediate urgency of substantial expenditure reductions such as I have recommended. We may need a tax increase too, but first priority by all means should go to the reduction of spending. It is possible that a general inflationary situation and even deficit could also be accompanied by weaknesses in some sectors of the private economy. A general tax increase might further weaken these sectors and aggravate the imbalances in the economy. But I would certainly urge that we reduce expenditures first. This is the priority need. Then, if strong inflationary pressures still threaten, even with an expenditure reduction, in that case we should adopt a tax increase too.

In my opinion, Mr. President, Congress must be ready to act on spending now. The very size of the prospective deficit makes the situation most serious.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation prepared by the Joint Economic Committee comparing the fiscal 1968 budget estimates made in January with the latest estimates be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fiscal 1968 budget

[In billions of dollars]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Deficit (—)
January 1967 estimates:			
Administrative	126.9	135.0	—8.1
Cash	168.1	172.4	—4.3
National income accounts	167.1	169.2	—2.1
Latest estimates:			
Administrative	117.7 to 120.4	136.5 to 146.5	—16.1 to —28.8
Cash	158.9 to 161.6	173.9 to 178.9	—12.3 to —20.0
National income accounts	158.7 to 161.4	170.3 to 175.3	—8.9 to —16.6

HOUSE CONSIDERS RESOLUTION URGING SENATE RATIFICATION OF THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to a resolution which has been introduced in the other House of Congress. As introduced on February 8, 1967, by Mr. **SEYMOUR HALPERN** of New York's Sixth District, House Resolution 231 reads:

> *Resolved,* That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which the United Nations General Assembly recommended on December 9, 1948, be ratified by member states.

It is interesting that such a resolution should be introduced in the other body of the legislative branch. Article II, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States reads:

> The President . . . shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, providing two thirds of the Senators present concur. . . .

It is the responsibility of this House, of the 100 of us who comprise the Senate of the United States, to give our consent to the ratification of the Genocide Treaty. And yet, because of our 18 years of negligence, of shirking our responsibility in this vital field of human relations, a Member of the other body has introduced a resolution designed to persuade us to take action. Mr. President, I congratulate Mr. **HALPERN** for his action. He is dead right, but such a resolution should not be necessary. We, in this body, should take pride in our constitutional responsibility, as granted in article II, section 2. We should not be forced into a position where the House calls us to task for our inaction.

Mr. **HALPERN** declared to his colleagues on February 9 of this year:

> Under our Constitution the Genocide Convention and other treaties are matters for the Senate to resolve. But we in the House can take little comfort from this. The Senate has all but ignored this unfinished business. I urge House passage of my resolution calling for approval of the Genocide Convention.

Again, Mr. President, Congressman **HALPERN** is right, but such a resolution should not be necessary. We all know our responsibility. It is time we fulfilled the confidence our Founding Fathers had in us. It is time for the Senate to ratify the Genocide Convention.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 8, 1967, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 7 (legislative day of June 6), 1967:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Dale Wayne Hardin, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1972, vice Charles A. Webb.

Grant E. Syphers, of California, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1973, vice Abe McGregor Goff.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 7 (legislative day of June 6), 1967:

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Fred B. Burke, of Michigan, to be alternate Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate June 7 (legislative day of June 6), 1967:

POSTMASTERS

The nomination sent to the Senate on March 13, 1967, of Hugh Heily to be postmaster at Columbus, in the State of Montana.

The nomination sent to the Senate on May 4, 1967, of Marian E. Tollefson, to be postmaster at Beltrami, in the State of Minnesota.

◆

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

That He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man.—Ephesians 3: 16.

Our Father God, who art the light of life and the glory of every noble endeavor, we thank Thee for this quiet moment when facing important issues and carrying heavy responsibilities we can turn our hearts to Thee who alone can renew our strength and hold us steady amid the troubles of this time. In the secret place of the Most High may we find the resources we need for this high hour.

In all the perplexities of this period may we not lose our perspective and certainly not our poise. May the principles of freedom and justice upon which this Nation was founded still be our support as we face the challenge of this day. Grant that our faith may be triumphant over our fears, our courage surmount every discouragement and our loyalty to truth and good will be the solid ground upon which we walk together.

Strengthened by Thy spirit may we think clearly, plan creatively and act courageously. In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I do not share the feeling of complacency that appears to be the general reaction to Israel's welcome military successes. The major issues remain to be resolved. Dangers still surround the situation. A satisfactory permanent settlement in the Middle East depends greatly on the position the United States will take on the substantive issues. The United States remains publicly uncommitted.

I am very apprehensive about the U.S. support of the Security Council's Middle East cease-fire resolution without any United States or Security Council commitment to resolve the basic underlying tensions in that troubled area.

I believe we should insist on a resolution for United Nations peacekeeping action which will go to the heart of the Middle East unrest, which will end the state of war which has been asserted by the Arabs as the excuse for closing the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran, resolve the plight of 600,000 restive Palestine refugees, and guarantee Israel's borders and international rights. Any United Nations peacekeeping action must be such that it cannot be canceled unilaterally by any party.

A truce which offers no solutions to the threats posed by Arab aggressions offers no hope for an enduring or meaningful peace.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FREEMAN HAS MEETINGS IN FARM AREAS

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday when we debated the appropriation bill for the agricultural pursuits of this Government, criticism was made of the meetings that Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman had been making in the country.

The Secretary of Agriculture came to my district and to my hometown, Athens, Ga., on May 22. There was a meeting at that time and it was one of the finest agricultural meetings we have had in the State of Georgia and in our section.

I think instead of criticizing the Secretary of Agriculture for holding these grassroot meetings that he should be complimented for the work he has done.

I think one of the difficulties that we have as Members of the Congress is the fact that people who are responsible for the programs and responsible for the conduct of affairs in the administrative branches of the Government, and who are not elected, seldom come down and expose themselves to what the electorate is saying, like you and I have to do when we run for office.

I want to say that there were over 3,500 people who attended this meeting and only 30 were States ASCS personnel. They were from the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. It was a most worthwhile event and I hope such a practice will be continued. I would like to see other Cabinet officials come down to my district and let the people who are being affected by their proposals and by their actions express themselves.

DESIGN FOR PEACE MUST BE WORKED OUT AS CAREFULLY AS THE DESIRE FOR PEACE

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, there have been many sober words expressed about the conditions that have had to be faced by this country and by the world in the events that have occurred in the Near East. But there is one lesson that I would like to emphasize as one person in this House, and that is the making of peace. There is no question about the great desire for peace; nor of the easiness of expressing that desire for peace. But the working out of peace is a very difficult matter.

So I would ask for a few moments of consideration by all the people of the United States for our President. You can now see what it is like to work for peace in a situation in which he must have working at the loom, as he weaves a peace, Nasser, De Gaulle, and Kosygin, with no design and no desire to work a design by those individuals.

So turn your faces farther toward the East and see where that other workshop of the weaving is to be done, and who does the President have to work by his side there? Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh.

Let us take a lesson from these times and realize that the weaving of peace takes the hands of all who should be in the shop, and the design for peace has to be worked out as surely as the desire for peace. I hope the American people have learned a significant lesson during these times. That their sympathies will be with their President as he seeks an agreement for a design of peace and as he earnestly solicits the cooperation of those who prefer recalcitrance and self-interest to world peace.

THE NEXT STEP IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this morning I wrote to President Johnson and to Ambassador Goldberg, congratulating them on the success of their efforts in bringing about the adoption by the United Nations Security Council of a resolution calling for a cease-fire in the Middle East.

The Security Council resolution is but the first step on the long road to peace in that area. In order to advance the cause of peace in the Middle East, I urged President Johnson to take the following actions:

First, to exert every effort through diplomatic channels in order to effectuate the cease-fire provisions of the Security Council's resolution;

Second, to initiate immediate discussions in the United Nations with a view to reestablishing a United Nations presence and a peacekeeping force in the Middle East, and

Third, to prepare the groundwork for the convening under United Nations auspices of an international conference to deal with the political issues which underly the Middle East conflict.

These political issues, in my opinion, must include—

First, acceptance by all concerned of Israel's right to exist as a nation, and respect for its people and territorial integrity;

Second, guarantee of freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran for the ships of Israel and of all other nations, or, the placing of both waterways under international administration;

Third, permit settlement of the border issues, including those relating to the status of the Gaza strip and Jerusalem; and

Fourth, agreement by all concerned on the principle of peaceful settlement of other disputes in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that these suggestions will help to advance our search for lasting peace, with justice, in the Middle East.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, page 13899 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 24, 1967, records me as having not voted on final passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967. The RECORD also shows me as having been paired against final passage with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER]. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the RECORD reflect the fact that I was necessarily absent from the floor at that late hour due to the fact that I had to catch a plane for my home district in California in order to meet several official obligations there.

I left instructions with the pair clerk to pair me against final passage in event that the Quie amendments were not included in the final bill. Little did I suspect that many of these provisions would be included in the form of the amendments proposed by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and finally included in the final bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show that had I been present I would have voted for final passage of the bill. Although the measure does not include all of the amendments I had hoped for, it does take a major step in the right direction, and I would support that step.

A CEASE-FIRE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, once again I am happy to take the floor to commend our great President, Lyndon B. Johnson. His handling of the Middle East crisis was of the highest order of statesmanship. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg is also entitled to great credit for the manner in which he represented the United States in the United Nations. It is so easy for those who are not charged with the responsibility of negotiating delicate matters to have all the answers. Invariably they make the best Monday morning quarterbacks.

Once again, President Johnson has justified our confidence in him.

He served notice in advance that his country was committed to protecting the political and territorial integrity of the State of Israel, and that the blockading of the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba were acts of aggression.

In accordance with his promise, he has done everything possible within the United Nations to bring an end to the hostilities. The first step has been accomplished in calling for a cease-fire.

Unlike the Arabs, who are constantly threatening war and destruction, Israel asks for peace and has indicated that, when necessary, she will fight for peace. In accordance with the traditional cry, Sholom—peace, she has indicated that she will lay down her arms as soon as her enemies, who are bent upon her destruction, do the same. When the belligerents stop fighting, they can start talking—the talking that Israel has been begging for for so long.

The next step, and I am sure President Johnson can be counted upon to be among the first to take that step, must be the initiation of negotiations for permanent peace treaties in that area of the world with international guarantees—guarantees this time that will be enforceable against aggression in that area. The cessation of aggression must include the prevention of any further infiltration and terrorism. The international waterways of that area, both the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba, must be kept open to all nations, including the State of Israel.

I am sure from here in we can take one page from the book of the Arabs, the page on which they wrote: "the friend of my enemies is my enemy." We want to be friends to all but let us stop being friends to those who would cut our throats.

ALCOHOLISM CARE AND CONTROL

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined with our colleagues Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. CAREY, in introducing a bill that would provide for a comprehensive program for the care and control of alcoholism.

Alcoholism is a major disease affecting people in all areas of these United States. Effective legislation dealing with the cause, treatment, and cure, is an absolute necessity if we are to have any hope of combating this serious problem.

A major provision of this bill would be to establish a Bureau of Alcoholism Cure and Control within the Public Health Service. The Bureau would serve as a clearinghouse for information and as a coordinator of various activities presently carried out within existing instrumentalities of the Government. The Bureau would further provide information and technical assistance to State and local governments in establishing programs and procedures in dealing with this problem, and would engage in basic research on the causes, treatment, and cure of alcoholism.

The bill also provides for grants to public and nonprofit agencies for demonstration projects including detoxification, treatment, and rehabilitation centers, and authorizes appropriations for this purpose through fiscal year 1971. Additional grants would be made to research programs designed to discover the best uses to which professional talent can be put for the care and control of alcoholics.

In addition the bill would establish a National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism Care and Control consisting of members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the necessity of enacting this bill cannot be stressed too strongly. Alcoholism can no longer be considered a criminal offense but a disease whose effects have destroyed the bodies and minds of too many people. I strongly urge the support of our colleagues in enacting this bill.

POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF A NATIONAL RAIL STRIKE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a national railway strike at this time in the history of this Nation is unthinkable.

I ask unanimous consent, in this connection, to insert in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of State and a letter from the Secretary of Defense to the President of the United States on this subject.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The letters are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1967.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to express my deep concern at the possible interruption of our national rail system by a strike at this time. In my opinion, it is absolutely essential that our domestic transportation be maintained at full capacity during this present critical period in our foreign relations.

The continuing supply of our forces in Viet-Nam is heavily dependent upon our domestic rail system. They should have the highest priority. In addition, the United States is engaged in supplying essential goods in trade channels or as part of our assistance programs to other countries throughout Southeast Asia and other very vital areas in the world. Any interruption of these supplies in their movement to our ports could have the most serious consequences for our nation and for freedom in the world.

Further, the unfortunate hostilities which have erupted in the Middle East have created a new series of potentially heavy burdens on our economy. Fighting or political action may disrupt the movement of food and fuel to much of Europe and Asia. To the extent this occurs we will need our full resources to meet the contingencies which may occur.

In these circumstances, the United States simply cannot afford a crippling strike. All our strength will be needed to meet our obligations to our soldiers in Viet-Nam and to our friends and allies around the world. I hope and pray it can be avoided.

Respectfully,

DEAN RUSK.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1967.

Memorandum for the President.

The Defense Department has just completed a review of the effects of a rail strike on our national security. I feel I must tell you that it is the unanimous opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Mr. Vance and me that acceptance of an interruption of rail movements of defense equipment and defense-related supplies at a time when we have 500,000 men engaged in military operations in the Pacific and simultaneously face a crisis of unpredictable dimensions in the Middle East would be an act of utter folly, an incredible evasion of our responsibility to our nation.

I realize these are strong words, but I know of no others to describe the effect on our military posture were rail transport of defense goods to be interrupted.

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

PERMANENT PEACE TREATY FOR MIDDLE EAST

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I commend President Johnson and Ambassador Goldberg for the success of their efforts in securing the cease-fire resolution of the United Nations. The resolution is an important first step, but there is still a long road to final and lasting peace in this troubled area. A peaceful solution must be reached, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest and urge a permanent peace treaty with international guarantees.

A Middle East permanent peace treaty must include the following essential elements:

First. A guarantee of freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran for the ships of Israel and other nations. Second. A guarantee of political independence and territorial security and integrity of all nations in the area. Third. A permanent settlement of border issues and acceptance of Israel's statehood. Fourth. A guarantee against any further infiltration, terrorism, and threats of destruction by the Arab States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER.** Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 121]

Ashley
Ayres
Battin
Bell
Bray
Celler
Clark
Dow
Downing
Everett
Fulton, Tenn.
Holland
Ichord
Jacobs
Karth
Long, La.
Nelsen
O'Konski
Pool
Resnick
Ruppe
St. Onge
Saylor
Smith, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Williams, Miss.
Younger

The **SPEAKER.** On this rollcall, 407 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9029, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 9029, the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 504 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 504

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10328) to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the minority, to the very able and distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN], and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of my colleagues, this is a very important matter we propose to consider today. As the reading of the rule by the Clerk discloses, it is a closed rule providing 4 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, that will mean that when the general debate is over under the rule the only amendments which can be offered will be committee amendments. Of course, under the rule the minority or, in the absence of the minority, someone else who is opposed to the bill may offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Since the House is to be circumscribed in its ability to work its will on this legislation, is it anticipated, to the gentleman's knowledge, that there will be any amendment or amendments on the part of the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I know of no committee amendments to be offered.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman from Iowa is correct, and, of course, the gentleman from Arkansas also is correct. His committee has that privilege.

Personally, I am traditionally, as I believe the House knows, opposed to closed rules. I am particularly opposed to this one. I believe there ought to be some other people opposed to it who have joined in the request for it, who say that they would like to see it amended.

What will the bill do, in brief?

It will increase the ceiling on the national debt from the present $336 billion to $365 billion, an increase of $29 billion; and that notwithstanding the fact that the debt ceiling was raised three times last year and once already this year.

That is one thing the bill will do.

Another thing it will do is to provide for counting in the debt the certificates the Treasury sells for the year 1968.

I think this is a very commendable thing, because those certificates are national obligations and they should be included in the national debt. However, I raised a question in the hearings before the Committee on Rules. The question was, "If it were a good thing, then why limit it to 1 year; why not put it all in for the succeeding years?" The answer of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the very able gentleman from Arkansas, was that in effect—and I cannot quote him literally—they wanted to try it out. At any rate, I just want to commend the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee for taking this step to reflect the true picture of the national debt, to that extent at least.

I am not going to go into a detailed explanation of the bill, because the members of the committee will explain the bill in detail. I just want to go back for a moment and raise the question here with those who are here today, who have the responsibility for carrying out in an orderly fashion the Government of this young Republic. I want to pose the question. "Where are we going in our fiscal affairs?"

The table on page 2 of the committee report shows that in 1941 the national debt was $49 billion. As I said a moment ago, today it is $336 billion. This is in the short period in the life of the Nation of some 25 years. Now, of course, under this bill we increase it another $29 billion to $365 billion. In all of those years, as I recall it from memory, we have had only two balanced budgets notwithstanding the fact that in all of those years up to the shooting in Vietnam we have enjoyed the greatest peacetime prosperity and been burdened with the highest rate of peacetime taxes in the history of the Republic. One would think that prudent people, the Presidents of the United States of both parties during that period, the Members of Congress during that period, with their responsibilities, would have been trying to cut down that national debt rather than to increase it.

On the contrary, though, we have been throwing the taxpayers' money around like a drunken Santa Claus, both at home and abroad, until today we are faced with this very serious situation in the fiscal affairs of the country. We are told—and the argument will no doubt be made here today as it has been made elsewhere—that we are in a war and that we have been in a war now for some 3 years or more and that defense spending accounts for this.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply not true. The record shows that on the domestic front spending has increased in the 3 year period of fiscal 1965 to 1968 from $46 billion in 1965 to $66 billion in fiscal 1968.

Mr. Speaker, moreover I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House an article which appeared in the reputable and authentic U.S. News & World Report of May 29, 1967, showing some figures on this subject. That article listed defense spending in 1961 at $44.7 billion. In 1967, due to the Vietnam situation, it had increased to $68.8 billion, representing an increase of $24.1 billion, or 54 percent. While on the domestic front with reference to the other budget expenditures, in 1961 the total was $36.8 billion. Six years later, in 1967, it was $58.7 billion, or an increase of 59 percent, in domestic spending.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we cannot charge this spending to the defense program, because the record shows—and I am sure that this is authentic—that we have spent at a greater rate on the domestic front than on national defense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have often referred to the fact that I ran for Congress the first time at the same time Franklin D. Roosevelt ran for the Presidency. Incidentally, at that time, both of us ran on an economy platform. At that time we were spending a little less than $4.5 billion with which to operate the entire Federal Government—the Post Office Department, the Congress, the Defense Department, and everything else.

Also I recall that Mr. Roosevelt called poor old Herbert Hoover a spendthrift, because he was spending that much money.

However, Mr. Speaker, today we are spending $14.4 billion—for interest alone on the national debt, or better than three times what it cost to operate the entire Federal Government 34 years ago.

Yes, I know that the argument is made by the "spenders" that the gross national product goes up and so why worry about the debt?

Well, I get very little comfort out of that line of logic, because I know somewhere down the line there has got to be a day of reckoning. In other words, there is a limit to the Government's ability to spend just as there is a limit to what a corporation or any businessman can spend.

It would seem this is a time in the affairs of the Nation that it should stop, look, and listen. We should take inventory and see where we are going. This concerns me very much.

Now, what accounts for this? What accounts for all of the domestic spending? We cannot sit here and point with the finger of scorn to the White House and say that the President of the United States is solely responsible for this situation. After all, we have our responsibility, we, the Members of Congress, authorize and appropriate the money.

Now, why has this domestic spending been constantly accelerated? It is because this Congress has been passing all of these new programs, whether they are Fair Deal, New Deal, or Great Society, or whatever else they are designated. The Chief Executive cannot spend a dollar unless the Congress appropriates it.

Mr. Speaker, while I recognize my part of the responsibility for the fiscal situation we find ourselves in, I do want to point out, if necessary, to those who honor me here with their presence and their attention, that I have voted against most of these programs—I would say 90 percent of them. I recognize, as you must recognize, and you do recognize when you stop to think about it, that when a new program is started here it is going to be followed with the necessary appropriation to implement it, and furthermore that it is going to be accelerated as it goes along. But Mr. Speaker, as evil as deficit spending is within itself, the twin monsters that it creates are ruinous inflation and an all-powerful centralized Government in Washington at the expense of the States and deprivation of the liberties of the people. These are truly the great evils that flow from this deficit spending.

Oh, undoubtedly some of my colleagues are going to vote against increasing this debt limit here today, just as they have voted in the past, and yet most of the Members here a few days ago for the second time voted for a great gargantuan new program of Federal aid, general Federal aid, to education at a cost of some $6 billion.

I am not going to argue the merits of that, because I do not have the time here, except to say that the States, forgetting the evil of Federal control of education—the States are better qualified fiscally to take on that job and to carry it on than is the Congress of the United States or the Federal Government.

There is not a State in the Union that has anything near the proportionate debt of the Federal Government; and yet we are building up a sentiment back home—we are offering the carrot—to come to Washington and get what you need—and at the same time we are depleting the sources of revenue that the States could enjoy.

So it all winds up in one strong socialistic state. I do not know anything else to call it, if this trend is not reversed.

Now I have voted against every debt increase that has been brought to this House. I have not voted for one such debt increase and I voted against them on the theory that maybe somewhere along the line we might do a little soul searching and take a little of this inventory and see where we are. In the past I have reasoned that it might not be a bad idea to have a little chaos and confusion that we are told would ensue if the debt ceiling were not lifted—let some Federal employees go without their checks for a few days—to bring about a realization of the true situation as it exists in our fiscal policies.

You have another bill coming in here. It will be in in a few days or a few weeks at the most—the so-called poverty program. How the hearts will bleed around here for the poverty stricken people of the country. I yield to no one in trying to help people who really need help. But with all of the prosperity that the administration boasts of, with a bloody war being waged in Vietnam and the threat of another costly war threatened in the Middle East, I ask you is this really necessary.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have taken?

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed 23 minutes.

Mr. **COLMER**. Mr. Speaker, I will have to conclude my remarks shortly because I have promised time to my colleagues who want the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about this. As I say, I voted against most of these programs and against all of these debt limit increases.

Therefore it may come as a little surprise to some people that I propose to vote for this increase—as large as it is—as distasteful as it is—and not feeling responsible for it. Why am I going to vote for it? I am going to do it because I have voted for every dollar of appropriations that have been necessary to carry on this war in Vietnam and because I have voted to take the flower of the young manhood of this Nation and send them over there to that frontless and rearless war that is going on in Vietnam.

I am not going to take the responsibility for denying them whatever is necessary to defend themselves and win this war.

I would like to see a lower ceiling. Some of my friends to my left—and they are my friends, appeared before my committee asking for this closed rule, but at the same time saying that they wanted to cut it down. That does not make sense to me. I say to you now, my friends, I have never voted for a closed rule either. If you will offer the proper motion to vote down the previous question so that you can have an open rule and cut this down, I will go along with you.

Let me express this final thought. Let us assume our responsibility here. I expect you to vote just like I am going to vote: Vote your conscience. If your conscience tells you to vote differently from the conclusion I have reached, I expect you to do what you think is best for our common country. But if this country is worth fighting and dying for over there in the bogs of the ricelands, then it is worth fighting for here on the homefront.

Let us here and now, conscious of our responsibility, resolve to put our fiscal house in order lest we lose this young Republic on the home front while these precious boys are dying for it on the foreign front.

Mr. **MARTIN**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 504 provides for 4 hours of debate and a closed rule on H.R. 10328. As the able and distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee has just explained to you, this is a bill to increase the debt limit of our country to $365 billion.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that since 1961, the Congress has authorized increases in our debt limit 10 times; this is the 11th appearance of this legislation since 1961.

It is also interesting to note that in 1961 our temporary debt ceiling was $293 billion. We are being asked to increase this to $365 billion, or a net increase since 1961 of $72 billion.

Only a few months ago the Congress increased our temporary debt ceiling by $6 billion. Here we are, again today, considering the same legislation for an additional $29 billion increase, or a total increase in this year alone—and we have only covered about 5 months—of $35 billion. This $72 billion increase in the debt limit since 1961, Mr. Speaker, is the record of the New Frontier and the Great Society.

Why is it necessary to have this national increase of $29 billion, on top of the $6 billion which we had about 3 months ago? We are going to hear 4 hours of debate on this subject today. Undoubtedly one of the main points that will be stressed is the increased expenditures in the war in Vietnam.

But take a look at the report itself, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this. I quote from page 17 of the report:

> The level of domestic spending in the administrative budget alone—wholly apart from our defense requirements in the war in Vietnam—has increased from about $46 billion for fiscal 1965 to approximately $66 billion for fiscal 1968.

That is a $20 billion increase for nondefense spending, Mr. Speaker, in the last 3 fiscal years. Now I continue to read from the report:

> Two-thirds of the $28.3 billion increase in Federal expenditures from calendar 1963 through 1966—as measured in the national income accounts—is accounted for by nondefense spending. Moreover, as projected in the January 1967 budget message, over half of the proposed $37 billion increase in outlays from fiscal 1966 through fiscal 1968 is to be in nondefense programs.

The interest on our national debt today is over $14 billion a year. In testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, stated that there was a strong possibility that our deficit for fiscal year 1968 could run from $24 to $29 billion. If we have an increased deficit in 1968 of the maximum figure of $29 billion, this is going to add approximately $1.5 billion to the cost of the interest we are paying, or a total interest payment of $15.5 billion for 1 year. This is the second largest item in our budget, next to the appropriations for the military. It seems to be the policy of the Great Society to go deeper and deeper into debt, saddling the burden of this debt and the increased interest charges on our children, our grandchildren, and future generations.

We, Mr. Speaker, Members of this Congress are responsible men and women. We have a responsibility to the taxpayers of the entire Nation. We in the Congress authorize the programs. We in the Congress appropriate the money. It is time, Mr. Speaker, particularly in view of the tremendous increase in the national debt which is asked for today, for the Congress to stop, look, and listen as to where we are going, as to what road we are going to follow now and in the future.

I favor the adoption of this rule.

I also favor, Mr. Speaker, sending this bill back to committee so that the committee can call up the administration and the departments concerned downtown and request from them a complete reappraisal of the domestic and nondefense spending programs of our Government. Then, after this careful reappraisal has been made, they should come up to make recommendations in regard to the priorities as to which programs are more important than the others, to cut back on these domestic and nondefense spending programs so that our budget will get back into balance and we will not continually have to consider legislation such as we have before us today, to increase the national debt limit.

Mr. Speaker, I favor the adoption of this rule this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I of course favor bringing this legislation to the floor for the House to consider but, as I have in the past, I object to a closed rule. I believe it particularly inappropriate to have a closed rule on this legislation. We have not only the factor of judgment on how much the debt ceiling should be, on which the House should work its will after listening to the debate on both sides, but also the issue involved of this participation certificates, which involves a sale of capital assets, likewise a matter on which the House should be able to work its will after listening to debate.

There is a third area. I know it is particularly true there is interest of a number of people on the Democratic side of the aisle in this issue. It is the issue in regard to the interest ceiling on long-term securities.

I should like to have an open rule on that so I could have an opportunity of trying to persuade my colleagues, enough Members of the House, that the whole interest ceiling is working aflainst flexibility and lower interest rates and against lessening impediments on the money market for those who have to compete for capital. I know there are those on the other side who do not even want to do the liberalization which is provided in the bill.

But under a closed rule, of course, there is no opportunity for the House to work its will.

It is about time it be emphasized that when we remove the power of amendment we in effect have removed the power of debate. The House should recognize this.

There is no fiction that can be resorted to in this regard. I repeat, no fiction. When we consider a tax bill, the statement is made that it will open up the whole Internal Revenue Code. I regard that as a fiction. Now there is not even that fiction.

The only reason the House is going along with a closed rule—and I know it will—is because the Members have been lulled into this habit.

Frankly, I did not intend to take the floor to discuss this, because my views on this are pretty well known. The only reason I have is because the chairman of the Rules Committee, whom I honor, who is coming before us with this closed rule although he says he is against it, went on to talk about the inability of the House of Representatives to zero in on the serious question of balanced budgets and appropriations and expenditure policy.

Now, bottled up in the Rules Committee right now is the Monroney-Madden-Curtis bill, which came out of the bipartisan, equal Democrats and equal Republicans, Reorganization Committee. It was a special joint committee appointed some 2 years ago. A great bulk of the measure of reforms in the Monroney-Madden-Curtis bill constitute those in the area of improving our methods of handling appropriations and expenditures.

I do not know what is happening with the bill. I know the gentleman who is chairman of the committee on the other side of the Capitol who is deeply concerned in the appropriations process did a great deal of work in developing these techniques. I tried to help on it. This bill, again I repeat, is bottled up in the Committee on Rules. I pled with that committee not to duplicate the work that had been going on for 2 years by his Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. The excuse for sending that bill, which passed the Senate early this year, to the Committee on Rules was that the Senate put on a number of amendments which the joint committee had not considered. I agree that this was a proper reason. However, the Committee on Rules should have limited its concern to these amendments, to be sure that the House did not need hearings on this new matter that the special committee might not have gone into and which were put on the bill in the Senate. This plea was not heard. I do not know what the Committee on Rules is doing. It had only 1 day of hearings on the bill. I was not even able to get time to testify. However, I do know this bill is effectively bottled up. That is the reason why I took the floor today, I will say to the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I want to get that bill out on the floor of the House. Then maybe the House can do something in the future about appropriations and expenditures. Right now we do not have the legislative machinery to do the job.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, I place in the Record the policy statement adopted:

House Republican Policy Committee Statement on Public Debt Ceiling—H.R. 10328

We are opposed to the Administration requested $29 billion increase in the Debt Ceiling. This increase, in addition to the $6 billion increase that was enacted less than three months ago, is the largest since World War II. It would establish a debt authorization of $365 billion.

Since 1961 the Democratic Administrations have embraced the philosophy of unlimited government spending and budget deficits. Budget subterfuge and gimmickery financing have become the trademark of the Great Society. Notwithstanding repeated and ever more urgent danger signals, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has refused to place its fiscal house in order. It has consistently underestimated the cost of the war to avoid a cutback in nonessential spending.

In January 1966, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration submitted a $112.8 billion budget that proposed defense expenditures of only $60.5 billion. Immediately it became apparent that this was a totally unrealistic figure in view of the massive federal spending, the Administration continued to adhere to its original Budget. In fact, on September 8, 1966, the President not only reaffirmed the earlier Budget figure but assured the American people that total expenditures would be cut back by at least $3 billion. It was not until *after* the November elections that the American people were finally told the truth. In January 1967, when the Administration submitted its Budget for fiscal 1968, the Administration disclosed that fiscal 1967 expenditures would amount to $126.7 billion and not the $112.8 billion previously reported.

Incredible as it may seem, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is again repeating the same misleading budgetary tactics. Last January, a deficit of $8.7 billion was forecast. Now the Treasury officially estimates that the deficit for fiscal 1968 will be $11 billion. However, the Administration is seeking borrowing authority to accommodate a deficit of $29 billion. Significantly the difference between the $11 billion estimated deficit and the $29 billion request is accounted for by the Secretary of the Treasury in the following manner:

"But as I have mentioned, the deficit in 1968 is vulnerable to greater than usual uncertainties, and we must take the account of these in determining a prospectively secure debt limit level to carry through fiscal year 1969.

"One contingency is that Vietnam spending could bulge well above the current estimate.

"Another is the timing of the passage of the tax surcharge.

"And still another is the possibility that corporate tax receipts would fall short of estimates."

It is more than mere coincidence that the "contingencies" alluded to by the Secretary of Treasury add up to $29 billion if the Administration is also unable to borrow an additional $5 billion through the sale of participation certificates.

Although the Administration is attempting to justify the fiscal plight of this country on the basis that the Vietnam War is a "costly war," the facts do not bear out this contention. The level of domestic spending in the administrative budget alone—wholly apart from our defense requirements in the war in Vietnam—has increased from about $46 billion for fiscal 1965 to approximately $66 billion for fiscal 1968. Two-thirds of the $28.3 billion increase in Federal expenditures from calendar 1963 through 1966—as measured in the National income accounts—is accounted for by non-defense spending. Moreover, as projected in the January 1967 budget message, over half of the proposed $37 billion increase in outlays from fiscal 1966 through fiscal 1968 is to be in non-defense programs.

Alarmed by the fact that "red ink" in the federal Budget could "burst all bounds," the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has stated:

"We must continually re-evaluate existing expenditure programs in the light of a very objective measurement of the benefits which they convey and the costs which they will impose. Every new program should be viewed not in terms of its first year cost alone, but in terms of what its cost will be five years from now, ten years from now or perhaps fifteen years from now."

The Republican Members of Congress and the Republican Policy Committee have repeatedly called for a cutback in nonessential spending and for honest reporting of anticipated government expenditures. We have opposed increases in the Debt Limit that did not provide basic budgetary reforms. In March of this year, a Republican Resolution was introduced which would return the Budget to the President and request that he indicate the places and amounts where he believes that reductions can be made. It was noted that the passage of a similar Resolution during the 85th Congress resulted in recommended reductions of $1.342 billion in a Budget of $73.3 billion. Unfortunately, the Democrat-controlled Congress in 1967 has refused to grant this Resolution any consideration whatsoever.

It is important that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration cut nonessential spending and place before this Congress an accurate estimate of projected defense costs. In addition, the Administration and the Congress may have to find additional sources of revenue that will cut the deficit to a manageable level. A deficit of the magnitude that is now contemplated is intolerable. It would further escalate prices and interest rates in what is already a seriously strained domestic economy. In April, the cost of living increased 0.3%. Another period of "tight money" similar to that experienced last Fall when interest rates soared to new heights is a grave possibility.

The ducking and dodging of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration which is typified by the vague and evasive testimony of the Secretary of Treasury must stop. Hard facts and realistic projections of future spending must be made available. If we are to avoid a runaway economy that may lead to governmental control of wages, prices and credit as well as further increases in taxes, there must be restraint in federal spending and an immediate implementation of expenditure priorities.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes of my time to the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], is recognized for 8 minutes.

A VOTE AGAINST PREVIOUS QUESTION ON THE RULE IS A VOTE AGAINST HIGH INTEREST RATES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for yielding me this time.

I share his views about what he said awhile ago that is bothering him about fiscal affairs. I want to be specific rather than general. He made a wonderful speech. I wish he had an hour's more time, because this is a very difficult subject and one that should be resolved in a little better way in the Congress.

I think that the entire cause of the unbalance in our fiscal affairs is due to one thing—high interest.

Much of our national debt can be traced to high interest payments piled on top of high-interest payments.

In the next fiscal year, beginning on July 1, the U.S. taxpayers will be forced to shell out $14.2 billion just to pay the interest on the national debt for 1 year. This sum is second only to our expenditures for defense needs. Each year this sum grows.

Mr. Speaker, today the interest charges on the national debt are double what they would have been had the country maintained the interest rates prevalent under the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

Had interest rates been kept at the levels existing in 1951, we would be paying only $7.5 billion on the national debt instead of $14.2 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this fact illustrates why the Congress must guard against higher interest rates. That is why I am so opposed to changing the definition of a Treasury note from 5 to 7 years. Treasury notes carry no limit on interest rates—no ceiling of any kind. Therefore, under this new definition of a note, the Treasury can market securities at any interest rate so long as they do not bear a maturity longer than 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote against the previous question on the closed rule on this bill because I am opposed to this provision for higher and higher interest rates. A vote against the rule on H.R. 10328 is a vote for lower interest rates. Mr. Speaker, an open rule on this bill would have given the House an opportunity to clearly voice its opinion on changing the definition of a Treasury note from 5 years to 7 years. We should have had a separate vote on this issue. Those interested in lower interest rates cannot help but be deeply concerned about increasing the authority of the Treasury to market more and more securities at higher and higher interest rates.

It is time that this Congress started protecting the American people against high interest rates and usurious interest rates. It can be done if the Congress will take up its responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, when William McChesney Martin became Chairman of the Federal Reserve in 1951, the country had experienced 12 long years—through times of depression, through times of war, and through times of extreme inflationary pressures—of stable interest rates maintained by cooperation between the Federal Reserve and the Democratic administrations—both at that time working in the public interest. During these 12 years—a period of varied economic conditions—interest rates on long-term Government obligations never did climb above 2½ percent. And during most of this period, the interest rates were actually well below the 2½-percent figure. Short-term interest was actually as low as three-eighths of 1 percent.

Now these were the conditions that Mr. Martin inherited when he became Chairman in 1951. He maintained this beneficial policy—a policy which saved the country billions and billions of dollars—throughout the remainder of President Truman's term.

As soon as the Republicans came into power in 1953, the manipulation started. Martin and the Republicans got rid of one issue of long-term obligations at 2⅜ percent in early 1953—just to take the heat off and to delude people into thinking that they would continue the low-interest policies of the Democratic administrations.

But it was not long before Mr. Martin and Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey figured a way to jack up interest rates. In fact, on May 15, with Eisenhower in office less than 4 months, Martin and Humphrey got together on another long-term issue which went for 3.25 percent. Now, they did not actually need the money at this time, but they wanted to sell the bonds at this higher interest rate for the purpose of breaking the Democrats' 2½-percent line.

This manipulation of the long-term market on Government obligations was the break in the dike which has brought us a flood of higher and higher interest rates. We are now reaping the sad and tragic consequences of this Martin-Humphrey-Eisenhower policy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD a table, taken from the records of the Federal Reserve, which plainly shows what has happened to yield on long-term Government obligations. This data is regarded as significant in judging the Federal Reserve's performance in protecting the public interest in the money markets. The table plainly shows that during the Democratic administrations, from 1939 to 1952, we kept yields on these bonds near 2½ percent. But look at the years after 1952, and you will see what William McChesney Martin has done to the Government bond market and to the country.

Yields on long-term Government bonds, by months, 1939 to present

[Percent per annum]

Year	*Yield*
1939	2.36
1940	2.21
1941	1.95
1942	2.46
1943	2.47
1944	2.48
1945	2.37
1946	2.19
1947	2.25
1948	2.44
1949	2.31
1950	2.32
1951	2.57
1952	2.68
1953	2.94
1954	2.56
1955	2.84
1956	3.08
1957	3.47
1958	3.43
1959	4.08
1960	4.02
1961	3.90
1962	3.95
1963	4.00
1964	4.15
1965	4.12
1966	4.65

Mr. Speaker, this table clearly indicts the policies of the present Chairman of the Federal Reserve. These are irrefutable facts. To allow interest rates to have climbed in this manner can be the result of only two things—either gross incompetence or behind-the-scenes manipulations. These rates did not go up by themselves; they went up bcause Mr. Martin and his allies in the big business world—mainly large banks—wanted it to happen.

These manipulations have added at least $43 billion in excess interest charges on the national debt since 1951. In other words, this would be $43 billion worth of the taxpayers' money that could have been saved if interest rates had been kept at the levels existing during the Democratic years from 1939 through 1952. I do not have to remind anyone here what $43 billion would do for the country if spent for some productive purposes other than paying excess interest to a handful of big bankers.

This $43 billion is just the beginning of the story. More than $200 billion in excess interest charges taken out of the pockets of the consumer can be traced to Mr. Martin's policies. We cannot turn our backs on such a gross betrayal of the public trust.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD two tables which establish and prove the figures I have cited. Table I shows the excess interest charges on the net public and private debt. The table compares the interest costs compounded at the 1951 rate with the actual interest costs that have been paid as a result of the Martin increases. Table I follows:

TABLE I.—*Net public and private debt, total interest paid, and average rate of interest in the United States, 1951–66*

Year (1)	Total debt (in billions) (2)	Interest paid (in billions) (3)	Computed average interest paid (3÷2) (4)	Interest costs figured at 1951 computed rate (5)
1951	$524.0	$17.8	3.397	$17.8
1952	555.2	19.7	3.548	18.9
1953	586.5	21.9	3.734	19.9
1954	612.0	23.7	3.873	20.8
1955	672.3	26.0	3.867	22.8
1956	707.5	29.8	4.212	24.0
1957	738.9	34.0	4.601	25.1
1958	782.6	36.0	4.600	26.6
1959	846.2	40.8	4.821	28.7
1960	890.2	45.7	5.134	30.2
1961	947.7	48.4	5.107	32.2
1962	1,019.3	53.4	5.238	34.6
1963	1,096.9	59.8	5.452	37.3
1964	1,174.3	66.5	5.663	39.9
1965	1,270.3	74.0	5.825	43.2
1966[1]	1,368.3	82.7	6.044	46.5
Total		680.2		468.5

[1] Estimated.

Note.—See the following table:

Total col. 3	$680.2
Less total col. 5	−468.5
Excess cost	211.7

Source: Economic Report of the President, 1967.

Table II shows the same comparison in relation to the total interest paid on the Federal debt. Like table I, the comparison is between the interest cost compounded at the 1951 rate versus the actual payments resulting from the Martin increases. The unnecessary increases imposed by Martin have actually amounted to $43,200 million in excess interest charges as this table shows:

TABLE II.—*Total Federal debt and interest paid, fiscal 1951–68*

Fiscal year	Total Federal debt (in millions)	Total interest paid (in millions)	Computed annual interest rates	Computed interest cost at 1951 rate (in millions)
1951	$255.3	$5.7	2,233	$5.7
1952	259.2	5.9	2.276	5.8
1953	266.1	6.6	2.480	5.9
1954	271.3	6.5	2.396	6.1
1955	274.4	6.4	2.332	6.1
1956	272.8	6.8	2.493	6.1
1957	270.6	7.3	2.698	6.0
1958	276.4	7.7	2.786	6.2
1959	284.8	7.7	2.704	6.4
1960	286.5	9.3	3.246	6.4
1961	289.2	9.0	3.112	6.5
1962	298.6	9.2	3.081	6.7
1963	306.5	10.0	3.263	6.8
1964	312.5	10.7	3.424	7.0
1965	317.9	11.4	3.586	7.1
1966	320.4	12.1	3.777	7.2
1967[1]	327.3	13.5	4.125	7.3
1968[1]	335.4	14.2	4.234	7.5
Total		160.0		116.8

[1] Estimated.

Source: Economic Report of the President, 1967.

We probably will never know the total cost of these higher interest rates. During the period since 1951—and particularly in the Eisenhower years—our economy has often been plagued by underutilization of resources, unemployment, and wastefully idle industrial capacity. It is true that the Vietnamese war has, in many areas, pushed the country to full use of its industrial capacity, but this is an unusual situation for which the Federal Reserve could hardly claim credit.

But it is a fact that during the Eisenhower years, the Federal Reserve's policies led directly to three recessions and to high unemployment and to an extreme waste of the country's resources.

Mr. Speaker, to illustrate this point, I quote from the 1967 Economic Report of the President:

> Because of the excessive unemployment and idle capital in previous years, the Nation sacrificed the opportunity to consume and invest a large amount of the output that it was capable of producing. At the trough of the recession in the first quarter of 1961, the "gap" between actual and potential GNP amounted to $57 billion (1966 prices). From 1958 to 1965, the cumulative gap totaled $260 billion.

These are the conclusions of a distinguished group of economists who make up the Council of Economic Advisers. Their findings clearly illustrate the severe and permanent damage that Mr. Martin's policies have brought to the United States.

I cannot overemphasize what the policies of the Federal Reserve Board have done to the programs enacted by the Congress. High interest rates in many areas—particularly in housing and education—have negated much of the effort of progressive Congresses. We have seen high interest rates wipe out more housing and more school buildings than we could ever possibly build through Federal appropriations.

Of course, the rising cost of interest on the Federal debt is placing all programs and the entire Federal budget under heavy pressure. Today, thanks to the policies of Mr. Martin, we are paying $14.2 billion in interest on the national debt. This is second only to the outlays for national defense—it surpasses every other item.

The housing industry, as a result of Mr. Martin, is in a depression. I have been concerned directly with housing for many years particularly the homebuilding industry, the construction trades, the savings and loan institutions, the furniture and appliance manufacturers and dealers. All of these industries have shared in this depression.

The loss of these housing units in 1966, and in the early months of this year, have set the country back years in its efforts to wipe out slums and to provide decent housing for its citizens. It has cost the average homeowner thousands of dollars in added interest charges.

A 1-percent increase in interest charges on a $20,000 home loan costs the buyer $4,734 over 30 years. Most home loans have gone up from 1 to 2 percentage points since the December 1965 action of the Federal Reserve. So this means that in most cases, the homebuyer has shelled out anywhere from $4,800 to $10,000 in extra charges. With the national median income something less than $5,000, this means that the average person will be contributing at least 1 and probably 2 years' wages just to pay extra interest charges imposed by that single act of the Federal Reserve.

The situation in the housing industry is dramatic. But the same conditions exist to some degree throughout the economy. The 37½-percent increase imposed by the Federal Reserve on December 1965 raised the cost of all products in the economy. So the consumer paid, and paid heavily, every time he made a purchase in 1966, and he is still paying for the Federal Reserve's folly in 1967. By increasing prices, the Federal Reserve fanned the fires of inflation.

The club of high interest rates has fallen unevenly on the economy since December 1965, creating especially heavy burdens for the low- and middle-income families. The monetary situation since December 1965 has been a burden on the poor and a bonanza for the rich.

Mr. Speaker, there are many in the House who shed crocodile tears over spending. All of us here are opposed to wasteful spending and fiscal mismanagement. But I wonder why those who complain the loudest about spending, say so little about high interest rates.

As I pointed out earlier, interest charges—$14.2 billion—are the largest single item in the Federal budget for next fiscal year outside of defense expenditures. I would suggest that those who are truly concerned about reducing the budget and saving the taxpayers money take on the cause of lower interest rates. Even a small cut in interest rates would save the taxpayers billions of dollars and would allow our defense and domestic programs to go forward without hindrance.

Let those interested in cutting the budget start the cutting where it would do the most good—on interest rates. If our Republican colleagues are really serious about saving money, then let them join the Democrats in a drive to lower interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, it says here in the debit ceiling bill that they are changing the name, the definition of notes—U.S. notes—so it will be 7 years instead of 5.

Mr. Speaker, an effort was made to lengthen it to 10 years and the Ways and Means Committee wisely brought it back to 7. But you are lengthening it to 7, and this means high interest for 7-year obligations. This particular increase is bad; it should be kept at 5 years. It is changing the entire concept of Government finance materially and substantially and leads us toward higher interest rates.

So when you vote to increase that period to 7 years, you are voting to allow higher interest rates on more of the national debt. There is no limit on securities up to 7 years. The sky is the limit. The lid or limit is taken off. You can sell these notes at a discount—15 percent, 20 percent, or 25 percent, or any amount. There is no restriction whatsoever on notes.

So, if you vote for this bill, like it is, you are forgetting the fact that low interest on Government securities would help this country more than anything else on earth. You are voting to perpetuate the highest interest rates we have had in the history of this Government.

So I ask my friends to consider this very carefully. I am going to vote against the previous question. I agree with my friend from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], that this is the kind of bill that should be brought out under an open rule. Each Member has his own judgment on what should be done on these vital issues in Congress, and we will be denying them the right to vote their own judgment if we vote for this gag rule, and it carries; we will be denying our colleagues their right to vote their individual judgment on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think the previous question should be voted down, and then we could offer amendments to this bill. That is the only way we should proceed on this, we should debate these things.

CONGRESS SHOULD PROTECT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE BY CANCELING $45 BILLION WORTH OF BONDS HELD BY THE FEDERAL RESERVE

I would also prefer an open rule on this bill so that the House could work its will on some of the absurdities of our national debt.

I refer specifically to the $45 billion worth of bonds residing in the vaults of the New York Federal Reserve Bank. I seek an open rule so that the Members could decide, once and for all, how this huge sum should be handled. I cannot believe that my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—would condone a system whereby the American people are required to pay a debt twice.

That is exactly what is happening so long as we allow the Federal Reserve System to continue to hold this $45 billion worth of bonds and to require the American taxpayers to pay $1.9 billion in interest each year.

Mr. Speaker, these bonds have been paid for once. They have been paid for through the exchange of non-interest-bearing Federal Reserve notes for interest-bearing Government securities. They have been paid for in full. No one can refute that statement. I would be happy to yield to anyone on this floor to present any evidence of any kind to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that these bonds have been paid for once cannot be refuted.

Mr. Speaker, I have through the years questioned dozens of officials of the Federal Reserve System all the way from the days of Marriner Eccles to the regime of William McChesney Martin. All of them agree that these bonds have been paid for in full. Nearly 2 years ago, I conducted hearings on H.R. 7601, a bill which would have required that most of these bonds be canceled and retired. I had William McChesney Martin before the committee as a witness for most of one morning. He admitted—without any ifs, ands, or buts—that these bonds had been paid for once. I quote from the hearing record of July 6, 1965:

> Mr. Martin. The bonds were paid for in the normal course of business.
>
> The Chairman. That is right.
>
> Mr. Martin. And that is the only time they were paid for.
>
> The Chairman. Just like we pay debt with checks and credit.
>
> Mr. Martin. Exactly.
>
> The Chairman. In the normal course of business they were paid for once. You will admit that, will you not? They were paid for once and that's all?
>
> Mr. Martin. They were paid for once and that's all.
>
> The Chairman. That's right.

To my knowledge, no one has questioned the obvious—that these bonds have been paid for once.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, these bonds should be retired and subtracted from the national debt.

The collection of this $45 billion worth of paid-up bonds is one of the monstrous frauds of our Federal Reserve System. These bonds have been piled up as part of the Federal Open Market Committee's portfolio, which is operated and controlled out of the New York Federal Reserve Bank.

Each year, the Federal Reserve System—basking in the glory of its seized independence—sends the U.S. Treasury a bill for $1.9 billion in interest on these bonds—again, bonds that have been paid for once and the U.S. Treasury obligingly sends off the check for $1.9 billion.

Mr. Speaker, can anyone on this floor support the idea of paying interest on an obligation that has been completely paid up? I know of no parallel anywhere. Does anyone continue to pay interest to their bank after they have paid for their automobile in full?

This is an absurd situation which the Congress has allowed to develop through the years. Mr. Speaker, it would indeed be difficult for any Member of this body to explain to the American voters just why we have allowed this to go on. I don't think there is a congressional district in this country where the people—regardless of their political leanings—would approve of paying a debt twice.

This is just like an individual who engages a broker to pay off his mortgage, and then finds that the broker, after paying the mortgage holder, has retained the mortgage for himself, continuing to collect the interest, and asserting the right to come around and collect the principal again when the mortgage matures.

Is this the kind of ridiculous position that the Congress wants to present to the American people? Mr. Speaker, the American people are also curious about what the Federal Reserve System does with the $1.9 billion it receives in interest each year. Unfortunately, none of us—although we are public servants, supposedly watching over the activities of the Federal Government—can give them this answer. In fact, no one can provide the answers except the handful of insiders within the Federal Reserve System itself.

As my colleagues know, the Federal Reserve is not audited. The Federal Reserve and its lobbying ally, the American Bankers Association, have consistently opposed an audit by the General Accounting Office. The GAO cannot look at the books of the Federal Reserve despite the fact that it audits every other Government department and agency. Does it not seem strange that the Federal Reserve—with all of this huge sum of money—is exempt from the scrutiny of the GAO? Does that not raise questions in the minds of every Member of this House?

Of course, the $1.9 billion of unaudited funds provides the Federal Reserve with a huge slush fund. This money is not appropriated; it is just paid by the U.S. Treasury as interest on those paid-up bonds.

There are many on this floor who jealously guard the Congress' prerogatives in the area of appropriations. Most of us regard the appropriations process as an important means by which the Congress can serve as a watchdog over the Federal Government and its use of the people's money. Yet, we abandon the people and refuse to serve as an overseer of the use of money—the people's money—by the Federal Reserve. We abdicate our role and again, I say this is a fact that would be hard to explain to most American voters.

How do we justify letting a Government agency—the Federal Reserve System—use $1.9 billion without the remotest kind of check by this Congress? It is obvious that we are not doing our duty.

Through the years, I have been able to discover a few of the activities for which the Federal Reserve has been using the people's money. For example, I have discovered in hearings that the Federal Reserve spends $90,000 in dues to State, local, and national banking associations each year. In other words, the Federal Reserve uses the people's money—taxpayers' funds—to pay the American Bankers Association to come up here and lobby the Congress.

They pay the ABA to come to Capitol Hill and lobby to keep the books of the Federal Reserve unaudited and to keep this slush fund flowing into their coffers. They pay to have the ABA lobby against the cancellation of the $45 billion worth of paid-up bonds.

To my knowledge, the Federal Reserve System is the only Government agency that is given money to pay a lobbying organization. The Federal Reserve is the only agency of our Government that is a dues-paying, card-carrying member of a full-fledged lobby.

Mr. Speaker, the $90,000 to the American Bankers Association and the other lobbying organizations is only a small part of the wasteful expenditures of the Federal Reserve System. In 1964, the Banking and Currency Committee had extensive hearings under the general title of "The Federal Reserve System After 50 Years." I quote from the staff report on these hearings of August 25, 1964:

> In addition, testimony given before the subcommittee indicated that despite the System's internal audits and reviews of same, its remarkable freedom from any external public audit has led to many questionable expenditures. A random sample by the committee staff of the System's expenditure vouchers reveals such items as $4,697.61 for an employees' dinner, including $125 for a comedian and $435 for an orchestra; $462.59 for an employees' bowling banquet; a contribution of over $5,000 to a local chapter of the American Institute of Banking; and $5,350.85 for a luncheon given by the New

York Federal Reserve Bank for the New York Bankers Association at the Waldorf-Astoria. No expenditures of these kinds without congressional approval would be allowed in the case of other Government activities subject to the Budget and Accounting Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is what happens when we allow the Federal Reserve System to continue to draw massive interest on the $45 billion worth of paid-up bonds. We cannot justify such a system and we should face up to our responsibility and cancel these bonds.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the House three basic questions concerning the $45 billion worth of bonds:

Why should the American taxpayers be compelled to pay interest on bonds that have already been paid for in full?

Why should the American taxpayers be required to pay for these bonds again?

Why should these bonds continue to be charged against the national debt when they have already been paid in full?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a division.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 291, nays 99, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—291

Abbitt
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bates
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Biester
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hunt
Irwin
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Railsback
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
St Germain
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Watkins
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wyatt
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion

NAYS—99

Abernethy
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baring
Bennett
Bevill
Bingham
Blanton
Bow
Brinkley
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Chamberlain
Cleveland
Colmer
Conte
Cunningham
Curtis
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Esch
Findley
Flynt
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Gardner
Gathings
Gibbons
Gross
Grover
Gude
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Heckler, Mass.
Hungate
Hutchinson
Jarman
Joelson
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kupferman
Kyl
Lennon
Lipscomb
McClure
MacGregor
Mathias, Md.
Minshall
Montgomery
Nichols
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Patman
Pickle
Pike
Quillen
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reuss
Rogers, Fla.
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Sandman
Satterfield
Scherle
Selden
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Stafford
Stuckey
Sullivan
Talcott
Thompson, Ga.
Tuck
Wampler
Watson
Whitten
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Zwach

NOT VOTING—43

Adams
Ayres
Battin
Bell
Boland
Bray
Carey
Celler
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Conyers
Dorn
Dow
Edwards, Calif.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Flood
Foley
Hansen, Wash.
Holland
Ichord
Jacobs
Karth
Long, La.
Macdonald, Mass.
Mize
Morgan
Morse, Mass.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nelsen
O'Konski
Pool
Resnick
Rivers
Rooney, N.Y.
Ruppe
St. Onge
Saylor
Smith, Calif.
Staggers
Thompson, N.J.
Williams, Miss.
Younger

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Younger.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Ruppe.-

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Mize.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Clark with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Adams.

Mr. Boland with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Ichord.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Pool.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Dow with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Foley with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. HUNT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. RANDALL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10328) to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10328, with Mr. FASCELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] will be recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Ways and Means is back today with a bill dealing again with the very vexing subject of the ceiling on the amount of debt the Treasury, in the name of the credit of the United States, may have outstanding at any given time.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that my colleagues are aware of the gravity of the issues which are involved in this discussion today. However, permit me to remind them in the course of my remarks.

But before doing that let us look at our experience with debt limit earlier this year. I would like to have the Members, if they will, follow me by having at hand a copy of the report which has been filed by the Committee on Ways and Means to accompany this bill. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], in presenting the rule for consideration of this measure, called attention to the fact that he had not in the past voted for increases in this ceiling, but that on this occasion he proposed to vote for this bill realizing, as he does, the very serious situation that faces the American people and the American Government at this time.

Mr. COLMER called attention to the fact that there is a table on page 2, which indicates a development which he does not like, a development which I do not like, and a development which the Members on the floor, I would say, do not like.

This table shows the growth in the public debt limitations in effect since 1941. At the beginning of World War II we had a permanent debt limitation of $65 billion. That rose in 1946, right at the end of World War II, to $300 billion. It was possible for us to reduce that by some $25 billion. In part this reduction would be made because we departed from the practice of counting securities at face value and converted over to the actual amount owed at the given time on these securities. In addition, we did not actually need during World War II all of the $300 billion provided by the limitation.

If the Members will notice, on August 28 of 1955 it became necessary for us to increase the public debt above the then permanent limit of $275 billion, and at that time we departed from the method we had followed up to that time in handling the debt. That is, instead of providing for a permanent increase, we provided a so-called additional temporary debt limitation.

If the Members will look down through that table, they will see that in some fiscal years it was necessary for the Congress to act as many as three times to adjust this temporary ceiling on the debt in order to enable bills coming due to be paid.

Earlier this year, the last time we had this matter before the House, the Members will recall, the bill provided a further $6 billion increase in order to enable the Treasury to pay the bills coming due in February and March and still stay within the ceiling.

In large part the additional expenditures which occurred were related to Vietnam. Most of us—although there were a few, perhaps, who did not—voted for the supplementals providing these additional expenditures for Vietnam.

The total of the additional Vietnam or defense expenditures, were, if I remember correctly, $9.7 billion.

We increased the debt ceiling however by $6 billion.

In connection with that bill, the other body decided in its wisdom in its Finance Committee to make that $336 billion a permanent debt ceiling and to do away with the temporary debt ceiling. They raised the $285 billion permanent ceiling to $336 billion and did away with the temporary ceiling.

It is a strange thing. It is only in the House of Representatives apparently where debt limits are decided by just a few votes. I do not know what the difference is, but on occasions when we have had some very warm discussions in this body, as I recall, debt limit bills have gone through the other body by lopsided votes. Anyway, the bill passed in the Senate on this occasion with the increase in the permanent ceiling, and we met in conference on it. The Senators receded from their position and agreed to go along with the House—making it temporary again—or $51 billion over and above the $285 permanent debt ceiling.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think maybe the attitude of the other body on this matter might be a reflection of its attitude also on spending—which apparently passes that body with much less difficulty than in this body.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I understand my colleague's views on that subject.

At any rate, we in conference, the gentleman from Wisconsin and I and other members of the conference, I believe, made the same statement: that when the debt ceiling for the fiscal year 1968 was considered, we, the House members of the conference committee, would recommend to our other colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means that we return to the more realistic approach of a permanent debt ceiling. That is one of the things we have done in this bill.

We have established a debt limitation this time which is concerned with the "permanent" ceiling rather than the "temporary" ceiling. The provision we made in the ceiling for a greater allowance for contingencies is consistent with the concept of a permanent ceiling. A temporary limitation intended for a single fiscal year, or for a portion of a fiscal year, appropriately contains little allowance for contingencies. A permanent limitation, on the other hand, must provide a greater allowance if it is to offer any hope of remaining in effect for a longer period of time than a temporary limitation.

Recent experience with the temporary debt limitation has shown that the procedure followed in establishing a temporary limitation makes it necessary to raise the debt limitation more than once during a given fiscal year whenever unexpected events occur. Often this means that the increases which occur during the fiscal year must be considered within a climate of imminent financial crisis. The debt limitation is more likely to be an effective control over nonessential spending when Congress has ample time to examine projected receipts and expenditures and determine an appropriate limitation.

I should also point out that the current permanent debt ceiling of $285 billion has very little meaning. The level of the public debt is now around $330 billion. All agree that it would be impossible to reduce the debt to $285 billion in a short period of time. As a result, having this unreasonably low permanent debt ceiling cannot have any real effect on our fiscal situation.

We are establishing in this bill a limit which we hope will remain in effect beyond the fiscal year 1968 if some of the contingencies I shall point out in a moment do not occur—and we all hope they do not.

Oh, a great deal has been said about the fact that we are proposing an increase of $29 billion over the present temporary ceiling of $336 billion.

If a person wanted to, I suppose he could also point out that we are raising the permanent ceiling from $285 billion to $365 billion. All of these things are completely accurate, but there is, I believe, a good explanation.

Let us then examine this question as to the appropriate level for the debt limitation in the period ahead.

When we studied this question in the Committee on Ways and Means, it was readily apparent that the problem this year is different and more complex than in years past. In the past, it was possible to proceed by obtaining estimates of receipts and expenditures from the administration and then providing a debt limitation based on these estimates together with a minimum allowance for contingencies.

We could have brought back a ceiling of $345 billion plus $3 billion for the normal contingencies. This is the practice we followed in the past. Had we been dealing with a temporary ceiling under the usual circumstances we would have done this. This could be computed from the data in the table on page 5 of the report. It points out the limit required on this basis for the beginning and middle of each month, assuming a $4 billion cash balance. That is the way we have operated in the past. That takes into account a deficit, according to the administration's changed estimates, of $11.1 billion instead of the $8.1 billion, I believe it was, which was estimated in January. We have come here and told you that is the best we could do. We could have said that was our best judgment. Then, we probably would be back here asking you for some relief from that situation by January of next year or perhaps even earlier.

Why? Let me point out that this year the contingencies are unusually numerous and potentially very large. Furthermore, they are related primarily to uncertainties over defense spending and the level of receipts. They do not involve uncertainties over the level of nondefense spending. The job we face is that we must provide an adequate allowance for these very real contingencies but at the same time make it clear that this allowance must not be used to enlarge our nondefense spending.

Mr. Chairman, let us begin by examining as objectively as we can the real contingencies with which we are faced.

Let us look at the table on page 7. First is the $3 billion contingency that we normally allow. You would want to include that, which would raise the $345.2 billion of requirements to $348.2 billion. If we were following the old practice of trying to deal with a temporary ceiling, that is all we would allow.

One of the important contingencies which must be considered in fixing the debt limitation is the fact the administration's estimates assume $5.5 billion in receipts from legislation that has been proposed but as yet at least has not been enacted. Most of these receipts are tied to the 6-percent surcharge on individual and corporate income tax liabilities which the administration proposed to become effective on July 1 of this year.

Does anyone now believe that there will be such a proposal enacted and in law by July 1? The full amount of the revenue of such a proposal for the entire fiscal year is $5.5 billion. Certainly at this time at least we should not take these revenues into account.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is talking about contingencies. When do you propose to bring in a tax bill?

Mr. MILLS. At the proper time we will deal with that.

A second contingency relates to receipts under existing law. The administration currently estimates that receipts in the fiscal year 1968 will be roughly $120 billion without taking any proposed revenue increases into account. This estimate, however, is based on certain assumptions regarding the level of individual incomes and corporate profits. At this time, these assumptions are surrounded by more than the usual degree of uncertainty. I believe the Treasury estimates assume a corporate profit level of $83 billion for this year. I find there is wide agreement that corporate profits may well be considerably lower than this.

Our own staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation tells us that, according to their estimates, the Treasury revenue estimates are $2.5 billion high. This is based on the somewhat lower estimate of $80 billions for corporate profits. The Treasury representatives when they were before us said that these estimates of the staff appeared to represent a reasonable allowance for this contingency. They did not quarrel with this figure. So that $2.5 billion has to be added to what you need in the coming fiscal year.

A third contingency concerns the subject of participation certificates which seems to be quite a live issue. The treatment of these certificates in the past has been not to treat them as debt, but rather as the sale of an asset. Therefore, they have not been included in the debt subject to limitation. However, if the proposed volume of certificates is not sold, Federal debt obligations subject to the limitation have to be issued to offset the expenditures that would otherwise occur.

In the January budget, the administration assumed that it would sell $5 billion of participation certificates during the fiscal year 1968. However, the House has already denied the authority to sell $2.4 billion of these participation certificates and has not yet expressed its view with respect to all of the remainder of this total. We, of course, do not know how Congress will finally dispose of this issue. But it is clear that the change in policy has gone far enough so that we must now make provision in the debt limitation for the possibility that Congress will not permit the proposed sales of participation certificates to take place.

That has to be added in then, does it not? The $5 billion for participation certificates. I am just using simple arithmetic that anybody can understand to see whether or not we are being realistic.

A fourth contingency concerns the level of military spending. While the administration can make estimates of military requirements 18 months in advance, the accuracy of these estimates ultimately depends, in no small part, on the actions of our adversaries. If they take aggressive steps which must be met with greater efforts on our part, military spending will necessarily be greater in the final analysis than it was initially expected to be.

While the administration presented its best estimates of defense spending for the fiscal year 1968 in the budget message released this past January—only 4 short months ago—there already have been indications that actual defense spending may be higher than the January estimates. One informed source, the chairman of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, has stated that he believes defense expenditures will be $4 to $6 billion above the January estimates.

Now I see my good friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, on the floor, the man who knows as much—if not more than—anybody else, in my opinion, about what lies ahead of us in the case of military expenditures. If he has any quarrel in his own mind with what the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness has said some time ago, about how much more it would cost in his opinion to carry on the situation in Vietnam, I will yield to him.

I remember last year my friend from Texas called our attention to the fact that the budget then understated military expenditures by anywhere from $5 to $15 billion, and it turned out to be about $10 billion. Does the gentleman think we have enough in here for Vietnam already for 1968, or will it take more?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to comment briefly with respect to this matter.

The House committee report of June 24 on the fiscal 1967 Defense bill last year made it clear that as the fiscal year proceeded, if combat operations should continue at a high level, substantial additional funds would be required. The report pointed out that the Defense Department had advised the committee that if the Vietnam war should continue, a substantial supplemental request for additional funds would be made when requirements could be more accurately computed. The regular fiscal 1967 request for defense funds was based upon the arbitrary budget assumption that the war would end on June 30, 1967. This was recognized at the time as being a purely arbitrary assumption for budget purposes and not a prediction that the war would end at that time. No one, of course, can predict when the war will end.

The situation is entirely different this year. The budget for fiscal 1968 assumes that the war will continue beyond the end of the fiscal year 1968. The Defense Department does not agree that an additional appropriation beyond what is requested in the budget for 1968 will be required for the war in Vietnam. Officials do, however, recognize that if the war should escalate beyond requirements anticipated and included in the January budget for 1968, then additional funds would be required.

I simply say that it appears to me that the war will very probably escalate and that additional funds will probably be required. But it would be impossible to now fix a meaningful figure as to any additional sums that might possibly be needed during fiscal year 1968 for the continuation of the war. The point is, that the budget assumptions underlying the 1968 budget for defense are entirely different from those underlying the 1967 budget for defense.

Mr. MILLS. Let me ask my friend from Texas: Are we as a Committee on Ways and Means being unrealistic if we provide a permanent ceiling high enough to accommodate a contingency of $5 billion of additional expenditures in Vietnam in fiscal year 1968?

Mr. MAHON. I believe that it is a very prudent thing for the committee to do and for the Congress to do, to provide this additional flexibility.

I say to the gentleman that while it is very disappointing to be called upon to vote for the legislation now pending, it seems to me we have no other responsible course to pursue under all the circumstances and I support the position of the gentleman from Arkansas in the matter.

Mr. MILLS. I thank the gentleman.

The contingencies I have listed are merely the more important ones now known to us. Other contingencies may arise. For example, the explosive situation in the Near East may require additional expenditures. Even the contingencies I have listed, however, add to a large total. As you will see from page 7 of the committee report, they add up to some $19 to $22 billion when the normal contingency allowance of $3 billion is included. Added to the peak debt of $345.2 billion currently projected by the administration for the fiscal year 1968, assuming a $4 billion cash balance, they result in a total ranging from $364.2 billion to $367.2 billion.

The committee recommends that the debt ceiling provided for the coming period be large enough to meet these contingencies should they arise. I wish to emphasize that the debt ceiling of $365 billion recommended by the committee does not include any allowance for the contingency that nondefense expenditures will be increased above the levels authorized by Congress. Should it become apparent that such spending is being increased above the levels covered by appropriated funds, the committee will be in a position to review the level of the debt limitation to see whether it should be lowered to foreclose the possibility of any additional nondefense spending.

Now, Members of the House, this is a serious situation. The type of deficit which would be realized if all these contingencies occur clearly is too high for us to countenance in time of war—and we are in a war—assuming the economy will otherwise stand, without becoming stagnant or going downhill, an increase in taxes.

You know it, and I know it.

I have been withholding my own judgment about additional taxes for two reasons. I want to find out whether the Congress of the United States, in view of what is taking place throughout the world, will be able to make any sizable, material reductions in the rate of Government spending. Second, I want to find out whether the imposition of higher rates of taxes upon our people will produce additional revenues. If taxes are imposed on an economy when it is stagnant—or in a period of pause, as they refer to it now—it is entirely possible that tax rates could be imposed that would not have a desirable effect. I have not yet reached a determination on either of these questions.

When one looks at the budget projections for fiscal year 1968 he should bear in mind that the administration figure of an $11.1 billion deficit allows for no contingencies other than some relatively slight revisions in the January budget estimates. Without the $5½ billion of revenue involved in the 6-percent income tax surcharge and the speedup of corporate tax payments and with $2.5 billion less in receipts under existing law, the deficit would be $19.1 billion.

Even if one looks only at this last figure and does not allow for any other contingencies, it alone points the finger to the need for additional revenues.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I believe it would be fair to point out, with respect to the question of whether Congress is going to cut spending——

Mr. MILLS. I am not criticizing my friend from Texas. The finger is pointed at all of us.

Mr. MAHON. I am not raising that issue at all. What I want to say is that as of this date we have reduced the appropriation requests in bills passed by the House this session by about $1,750,000,000. Within the next few weeks we will have opportunities to make further reductions, and probably we could safely say that reductions will be made by Congress in appropriation bills this session to the extent—very roughly—of $2½ billion or more.

But even that would not all be reflected in a reduction in actual spending in fiscal 1968 so it is becoming apparent that Congress is not going to reduce appropriation bills and spending sufficiently to eliminate a deficit which appears to be unacceptable.

Mr. MILLS. My friend from Texas has been here slightly longer than I have. Both of us are aware that the job of holding down expenditures is not completed when we pass the regular appropriations bills. I have seen us make reductions in regular appropriations, and then turn right around before the fiscal year was out and vote for a supplemental that undoes what we initially did. Members know I am right. We have done it. We will probably continue to do it to some degree.

I am troubled that—and I want the membership to believe me—it would be very difficult for us in view of the existing level of economic activity, in my opinion, to so adjust the tax rates on individual and corporate incomes so as to bring into balance a budget that involves as much as $150 billion of spending under present conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

If the current rate of spending continues, as it looks like it will, we may lose the use of a vital policy tool in this country; that is, the adjustment of tax rates to serve long-range economic needs. We just cannot reduce taxes in such circumstances.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly to me?

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman says he does not know where we are going or words to that effect. I am not trying to put words in his mouth. This is the same as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], pointed out are his views with respect to this matter. Now let me ask my friend from Arkansas, the very able chairman of this Committee on Ways and Means and one of the most knowledgeable people in this whole Congress, if it is not a fact that if we want to stop this deficit spending, we are going to have to cut back, to retrench, and above anything else not start any more of these new and extravagant programs.

Mr. MILLS. Well, I think it is absolutely essential that we exercise a high degree of concern and caution with respect to new programs. My friend from Mississippi, I know, agrees that this country has never been able to carry on any sizable war and still go on at home as though we were not at war at all. You know it, and I know it. We cannot do that. If we try, this proposed $365 billion debt ceiling may perhaps not even be sufficient to carry us through this upcoming fiscal year. I hope it will for I hope these things will not happen.

I want you to think it through with me: Has the committee been unreasonable in the amount we fixed? It is really $360 billion if you take account of the required inclusion of FNMA participation certificates.

While $365 billion is the limitation requested by the administration, the treatment we have accorded participation certificates in this bill, in effect, reduces the debt ceiling by $4 to $5 billion below the level requested by the administration. Under the terms of the bill, participation certificates sold by the Federal National Mortgage Association during the fiscal year 1968 will be included within the total of the debt subject to limitation.

This action removes a source of uncertainty. As a result of this action, it will not make any difference as far as the debt level is concerned whether FNMA certificates are sold or they are replaced by the issuance of debt obligations. In the budget, the administration proposed the sale of $4 to $5 billion of FNMA certificates.

Including the sale of these certificates in the debt ceiling, however, has the effect of making $4 to $5 billion of the $365 billion of debt subject to limitation unavailable for general debt purposes, as it would have been under the general debt limitation proposed by the administration. Therefore, the effect of the bill is to provide a limitation lower than that for which the administration asked.

The FNMA participation certificates sold during fiscal year 1968 will be included within the debt subject to limitation as long as they remain outstanding. No change is contemplated, however, in the way these certificates are handled for accounting purposes in the Federal budget accounts. Nor is this provision intended to affect the nature of the Government's legal obligation with respect to these certificates.

In addition, this treatment of FNMA participation certificates does not necessarily represent the committee's view as to what constitutes the appropriate way of treating future issues and other currently outstanding issues of participation certificates. We intend to continue to study the question of how these certificates should be treated, and we will review any recommendations on this point made by the President's Commission on Budgetary Concepts.

These participation certificates are contingencies which I think we should take into consideration and make allowance for in the fixing of a permanent debt ceiling. If we were proceeding again with a temporary ceiling, I would say, "Oh, Congress will be here all fall and will be back early next year. Maybe we will want to legislate three times on this subject." But this permanent limitation offers the opportunity to take us, I hope, well into the fiscal year 1969 if not all the way through it. I certainly hope it will.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman asked whether or not this was unreasonable. I think there is a final contingency that should be mentioned and one I sought to mention during our hearings and in our discussion; namely, the contingency of the executive branch of the Government resubmitting a budget on nondefense areas and cutting back in the nondefense spending. That is a contingency that the gentleman did not include.

I want to bring out in debate what I think honestly is a matter of choosing between your fiscal year and what we are recommending here; namely, this one contingency. That is all I am seeking to do.

Mr. MILLS. I agree with the gentleman. I think something needs to be done about controlling expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the

gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MILLS. We need to find a way to control expenditures. We cannot always leave this to the executive departments. Mr. Chairman, I have always been opposed to an item veto in appropriation bills, or otherwise. But I tell you one thing—if we are going to insist constantly upon the executive department doing something that we will not do here, I am going to join the advocates of the item veto.

Mr. Chairman, I would rather have the expenditure control provided by the legislature rather than give to the President and the executive carte blanche authority to cut wherever they want to cut. I just do not like that approach.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLS. I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I think, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas is making a very proper point. There is no question that by having the President retrench in this way, it does constitute what the gentleman from Arkansas has said is a sort of an item veto.

But, Mr. Chairman, insofar as I am personally concerned, when there is not the discipline in this body—and certainly I have tried and have voted against appropriation bill after appropriation bill, and shall continue to do so—and when I feel that the survival of our country is at stake, then I will say to the Executive or to everyone else, let us cut back. This is the contingency to which I referred.

Mr. MILLS. My friend, the gentleman from Missouri wants to give the Executive more authority than I do.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not want to give authority to the Executive; I want to take it away.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, certainly there are two things with which this Congress is specifically charged. One of them is a right to legislate with respect to revenue and the other is the right to make appropriations. We have not even been asked to give those rights to the executive branch. Now, Mr. Chairman, I refuse to do so, and I think the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means feels the same way. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to give up any more of the prerogatives that were reposed in the Congress of the United States. We have already given up enough.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will say that my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], is leading himself into a position in which I know he does not want to be placed. It is the position of saying, "We will pass whatever the President sends up here in the way of budget requests. Then we are going to restrict him with a debt ceiling and thus require him to reduce his own budget requests instead of doing it ourselves." Mr. Chairman, either we give him complete control over the where, when, and how moneys are expended——

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLS. Yes. Have I misstated the situation?

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has not stated the situation exactly right. The gentleman is correct in saying that the gentleman from Missouri——

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman does not like that?

Mr. CURTIS. You may be certain that I do not. However, we part on this issue when the security of our country is at stake.

Mr. MILLS. I am trying to point out to the Members of the Committee that we should do something about expenditure control at the legislative level for the very reason that it is a vital issue.

Mr. Chairman, at the same time I ask the Members of the Committee, is there anyone who does not realize that we cannot go into fiscal 1968 without some increase in the size of the ceiling on the debt? We cannot do it. We can argue about whether it should be $365 billion, $360 billion or $363 billion. But, Mr. Chairman, I call upon any Member of this Committee to stand up who thinks that we can go into fiscal 1968 with a permanent debt ceiling of $285 billion. You all know we cannot do it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman who now occupies the well of the House knows that he enjoys the greatest respect and affection on the part of all the Members of this body for his ability and for his forthrightness in presenting legislation to this body which comes from the Committee on Ways and Means.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am terribly concerned, but I ask the gentleman to tell the Members of this House where we are going and why? Do we have any pattern as to how we can influence this House of Representatives in an effort to stop spending some of the unnecessary moneys which we are spending at this particular time? And, of course, the gentleman from Arkansas knows we are doing it, and so do I.

Mr. Chairman, there ought to be established a priority list by this Congress, beyond which this Congress is not willing to go in the field of Federal spending.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that someone will drive home the point of the seriousness of that problem, the spending problem, this afternoon.

Mr. MILLS. I am delighted to undertake to do so, and I will do the best I possibly can.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Arkansas will yield further, I would hope that the gentleman from Arkansas, when these appropriation bills come up for consideration will stand up in that well and use his great influence and persuasive powers and say that we should put a brake on this spending.

Mr. Chairman, as everyone knows, we could not even put a 5-percent reduction on a recent appropriation bill which was considered by this body, a move which any sensible man knows could be made an effective instrumentality in cutting back Federal expenditures. Yet, Mr. Chairman, we have not been able to do that on bill after bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. To keep the statement from our distinguished and good friend from Illinois going unchallenged, may I say the motion made by his side of the aisle yesterday wiped out the 4.9-percent cut that the committee had made, where we had pinpointed the cut and substituted 5 percent, which is only one-tenth greater, and left it up to the Bureau of the Budget to cut it. That was the issue yesterday.

Mr. MILLS. I do not want to get yesterday's problem too deeply involved in this.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I appreciate the gentleman from Arkansas yielding. I must respond to what the gentleman from Mississippi said by saying he is talking about apples in one case, and oranges in the next. The cut the committee made—and I applaud those reductions—were in the area of obligation authority. The gentleman knows better than I do because of his long, able, and dedicated service on the Committee on Appropriations, the fact that if you cut obligation authorities by 4-plus percent does not reflect itself in any way—that is somewhat exaggerated—it does not reflect itself identically as far as spending is concerned in the next fiscal year.

Mr. WHITTEN. There is some merit to the point the gentleman has made, but all our discussion here today concerns the fact that we are spending as fast as we can obligate, unfortunately. So I think what I said is substantially true: that there is some distinction between obligations and spending, but it is that 2 seconds' difference in time between the one and the other.

I come back with the fact that for all practical purposes the 4.9 percent that we cut, and we applied that cut, was wiped out by the motion by the other side, because that motion was tied into the budget recommendation.

Mr. MILLS. Whether we cut the appropriation 4.9 percent, or 5 percent, in all probability we will have a supplemental back in here restoring most of the funds.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Why do not the gentleman from Arkansas and myself make a solemn pledge here and now that, except in cases of defense, we will jointly, vigorously, and affirmatively oppose any supplementals, and let the Bureau of the Budget and the White House know that right here and now?

Mr. MILLS. I join the gentleman in expressing the very sincere hope that we will not have supplementals involving the nondefense sector of our economy. I also join the gentleman in an expression of hope that we can have a study—which could not be completed by June 30, which is one reason why I do not think the motion to recommit this bill ought to carry—as expeditiously as it can be done on cutting back nondefense expenditures. I know it can be done. The gentleman knows it can be done.

What I am saying is this: I do not believe we can fight this war in Vietnam, get it over with, and still live at home as though we were not fighting a war.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I agree entirely with the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. And since we cannot do that, I think we ought to reevaluate our expenditure position.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the thing that I am interested in is this: Am I wrong in assuming that in adopting this increase in the permanent debt ceiling that the President will not take some notice of the fact that he shall try to keep this budget for the next fiscal year within this permanent debt ceiling, and not send us up a phony budget cutting out some milk and school lunch programs, and things like that, that he knows are popular?

I will be willing to vote for this bill if I can have some assurance from the leadership, both on this side of the aisle and on that side of the aisle, that what we are doing is that we mean business when we make this permanent debt ceiling, that we are going to try to do all we can do, and that we are sending word to the President that we expect him to try to remain within that ceiling?

I want to know what the gentleman's feeling is on what the effect of this permanent debt ceiling is.

Mr. MILLS. Let me reply to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, this way. We have come here in the past because we have been in a dilemma at the end of each fiscal year. The ceiling was going to fall to the permanent level of $285 billion. Everybody knew we could not live within it and that we could not get down to it.

There will be a difference when we have a permanent ceiling of $365 billion. It will not expire on June 30 next. It is to be a permanent ceiling.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No, that is just 23 days from now so I do not think it will expire.

Mr. MILLS. I am talking about June 30, 1968. It goes on—it is permanent. The House then can deal more realistically, as I see it, with this situation. I think everybody should be advised of the fact, that it is going to be far more difficult to get a $365 billion permanent ceiling increased—except for requirements of war or things of that sort—than it has been in the past to get a temporary ceiling increased.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I want him to do that for this reason. Last year the President, when I talked to him about not carrying forward this Vietnam war and not hitting where we should be hitting and that we were giving sanctuaries, why his face lit up and he said, "There are no sanctuaries in this war."

Then 6 or 7 months later, they began to bomb some of these places that we had refrained from bombing and that is the thing that has been carrying this on. I want the chairman of this committee to know and everybody making appropriations, and the President, that we expect this $365 billion ceiling to be a ceiling through fiscal year 1969 at least.

Mr. MILLS. There is no way to be sure of that. No one knows what is likely to happen in Vietnam.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am talking about here—if we are in a war we can cut down on some of this domestic spending.

Mr. MILLS. But certainly we could not cut down on any expenditures in the Near East.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Are you telling us now that we are going to send troops to the Middle East?

Mr. MILLS. I am not saying that, I do not know what is going to happen. All I am saying is, there may not be room to offset all of these expenditures by cuts in expenditures on the domestic front.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not in favor of putting troops in the Middle East. Some want to take them out of Vietnam and to send them over there, but I do not want to do that.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. For a long time I sat on two committees where the proposition of establishing priorities in spending was discussed. Personally, I think there is some merit to this. But before we accept it as a general philosophy, I think the people who make the suggestions ought to set up their list of priorities of what we are going to spend money on and show to the rest of us exactly what is going to be cut out. If you do that, then I will really be glad to consider it.

I voted yesterday on the motion to recommit with the 5 percent reduction, but I think in reality that is too vague a way of doing it. It sounds easy—well, just cut everything 10 percent. But I do not think you can do it that way. Since there is no listing of priorities, if those who are now suggesting that this is a good way to run things would set up their own tests or list, I can tell you now that I will be happy to look them over and I will tell you whether or not it is worth voting on.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. I want to ask my colleague and friend to help us on another matter. We have heard today about the possibility of, in some magic fashion, canceling about $45 billion of this debt, which has been paid for once. Is that a fact or is it fancy?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad the gentleman from Iowa has called that to my attention.

I ask our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, to give me his ear, please. I want my friend, the gentleman from Texas, one of the most personable and one of the most likable men that I have ever known in my life, to listen to this. I have always enjoyed my association with him, and he is always most persuasive and always so generous to me. He has been helpful to me ever since I have been in the Congress.

I want to know if his bill, H.R. 9156, which he introduced, and which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, embodies the philosophy which he announced here in connection with what he said on the rule. Does the bill, H.R. 9156, which would provide for the retirement of $40 billion of interest-bearing obligations held by the 12 Federal Reserve banks embody the philosophy the gentleman expressed?

Mr. PATMAN. It is based upon that theory; yes. Instead of $45 billion, we made it $40 billion, letting them keep $5 billion.

Mr. MILLS. I understand. The gentleman introduced the bill, and I am satisfied it was not just the fact that he was the author of the bill and chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee that prevailed on the Speaker to refer the bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the bill is now before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Now, my friend came to the Committee on Ways and Means and expounded this philosophy and asked us to incorporate the proposal in the debt ceiling bill. During consideration of the rule he talked about opening the rule so that he could offer his bill as an amendment. Of course, if the rule had been opened, I would have made a point of order against his amendment because the subject matter of his amendment is presently before his own committee.

I am not being critical. I never want to be critical of my friend from Texas or any other of my colleagues. I wish to analyze just what his bill proposes to do, and if I am wrong, I will yield to the gentleman when I get through so he can show men where I am wrong. Let me analyze it first.

I do not wish to yield at the moment, because I am afraid the gentleman will lead, and I do not want to be led. I want to make my own explanation, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

The gentleman proposes that we take back these obligations. What purpose do these obligations serve? They serve as the collateral for the issuance of Federal Reserve notes. What are Federal Reserve notes? They are the $10, $20 and $50 bills, the currency that you carry around in your pocket. I think—$38 billion or more of them are outstanding. H.R. 9156 would withdraw the securities backing this currency.

The gentleman in his bill specifically recognizes that under the act establishing the Federal Reserve System, the act itself imposes primary liability for the amount of those notes outstanding upon the Federal Reserve banks. His bill specifically cancels this liability when it provides for the canceling of the $40 billion of obligations.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. No, I am not yielding until I get through. I intend to be courteous to the gentleman, but I do not want him to lead me.

The gentleman I believe recognizes this fact, section 2 of this bill provides that—

> Each Federal Reserve Bank shall be relieved of its liability in the amount of Federal Reserve Notes issued to it equal to the

> valuation at which the obligations transferred by it to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the first section are carried on its books and the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer an equal amount, on the books of the Treasury, from contingent liability on Federal Reserve notes to direct currency liability.

What does the bill do? It transfers the liability for Federal Reserve notes, after it cancels the obligation supporting them, to the Secretary of the Treasury, so that then they become not contingent liabilities of the United States, but direct currency liabilities of the United States. They join the other $166 billion of U.S. notes or greenbacks as they are sometimes called that we have outstanding. That is what it amounts to.

But let me point out the clever thing about this bill—and I am surprised I did not pick it up before this, because I have struggled so hard to find some way to get around raising the debt ceiling. Even though under this bill Federal currency would become a direct obligation of the Treasury, because it would be a currency liability like U.S. notes, it would not be included in the public debt subject to limitation. But it would be just as much of a debt, whether or not under the limitation. The currency which is outstanding and issued by the Federal Reserve presently is backed up by securities of the Federal Government which these banks hold. Now, my friend from Texas cancels these securities but creates a direct currency obligation. He has fallen for a mirage; he has changed the type of direct obligation but not the amount of direct obligations.

I yield to him.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid the gentleman from Arkansas has fallen for the mirage. He is accusing me of trying to make these direct obligations of the Federal Reserve.

Mr. MILLS. I just read the gentleman's bill which makes them direct currency obligations of the Treasury Department.

Mr. PATMAN. The best evidence is the law. They had more discussion over whether or not the Federal Reserve notes would be direct obligations of the Federal Government or Federal Reserve banks than on any other one point. It is in the Senate and House and committee reports.

Mr. MILLS. Let us see what the Federal Reserve Act says as to what they are now.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will listen, we will see where the direct obligation is. I will read. Section 16 says: "Federal Reserve notes, to be issued," and so forth, and I am quoting:

> The Federal Reserve Notes . . . shall be obligations of the United States.

Mr. MILLS. But the gentleman left out the next subsection, subsection 2 of section 16. It says they shall be direct liabilities against the assets of the Federal Reserve banks. Actually they are presently only contingent liabilities of the Treasury as indicated by your own bill.

Mr. PATMAN. The section in present law says they shall be obligations of the U.S. Government.

Mr. MILLS. Read the entire section.

Mr. PATMAN. Section 16 says:

> Federal Reserve Notes, to be issued at the discretion of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the purpose of making advances to Federal Reserve Banks through the Federal Reserve agents as hereinafter set forth and for no other purpose, are hereby authorized.

Mr. MILLS. Read the part which says——

Mr. PATMAN. I am reading it.

Mr. MILLS. No; just a second now.

Mr. PATMAN. I am reading it all.

Mr. MILLS. Why did the gentleman say in section 2 of his bill that each Federal Reserve bank shall be relieved of its liability? I am talking about the gentleman's bill.

Mr. PATMAN. That bill does not refer to the obligations of the U.S. Government.

Mr. MILLS. I am talking about the gentleman's bill. I am reading the gentleman's bill. The way this liability is offset at present is by the obligations of the United States which the banks hold and which he wants to cancel.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman yielded to me. I am not reading the bill but the law.

Mr. MILLS. Well, read all of section 16.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not read the law changing the obligation, because the law itself says since 1913, and that was the biggest fight on the Federal Reserve Act.

Mr. MILLS. I understand the history of it, but I want my friend to read it.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. MILLS. I will not yield unless the gentleman will read all of the section.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman yielded, and I will read it with him.

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will let me have it, I will read it.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me hold it now.

It says here:

> Section 16. Federal reserve notes, to be issued at the discretion of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the purpose of making advances to Federal reserve banks through the Federal reserve agents as hereinafter set forth and for no other purpose, are hereby authorized.

The gentleman never read that.

Mr. MILLS. I have read it. Read the rest of it.

Mr. PATMAN. It says further:

> The said notes shall be obligations of the United States—

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. MILLS. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. It also says—

> and shall be receivable by all national and member banks and Federal reserve banks and for all taxes, customs, and other public dues.

Mr. MILLS. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. It also says:

> They shall be redeemed in lawful money on demand at the Treasury Department of the United States, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, or at any Federal Reserve bank.

Now let me read the next part:

> 2. Application for notes by Federal Reserve banks.
>
> Any Federal Reserve bank may make application to the local Federal Reserve agent for such amount of the Federal Reserve notes hereinbefore provided for as it may require. Such application shall be accompanied with a tender to the local Federal Reserve agent of collateral in amount equal to the sum of the Federal Reserve notes thus applied for and issued pursuant to such application. The collateral security thus offered shall be notes, drafts, bills of exchange, or acceptances acquired under the provisions of section 13 of this Act, or bills of exchange endorsed by a member bank of any Federal Reserve district and purchased under the provisions of section 14 of this Act, or bankers' acceptances purchased under the provisions of said section 14, or gold certificates, or direct obligations of the United States. In no event shall such collateral security be less than the amount of Federal Reserve notes applied for. The Federal Reserve agent shall each day notify the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System of all issues and withdrawals of Federal Reserve notes to and by the Federal Reserve bank to which he is accredited. The said Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may at any time call upon a Federal Reserve bank for additional security to protect the Federal Reserve notes issued to it.

Mr. MILLS. The collateral referred to here are the Government securities.

Let me ask the gentlemen a question: Are Federal Reserve notes also a liability against the assets of the Federal Reserve banks?

Mr. PATMAN. I think primarily they were. And we might have to dissolve the Federal Reserve to get at the assets they are using for their own purposes.

Mr. MILLS. If they are primarily obligations of the banks at present they must be only contingent liabilities of the Treasury. Is the dissolution of the Federal Reserve what the gentleman wants to do?

But now let me go ahead, if I have answered the question of the gentleman from Iowa.

The gentleman from Texas also accuses us of having approved of high interest rates.

Let us look at the provision to which he refers. This provision of the bill authorizes the Treasury to issue U.S. notes which have a maturity of up to 7 years. Under present law, these notes can be issued only if they have a maturity of not more than 5 years. As you know, these notes are not subject to the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling presently imposed on Government bonds.

The Treasury requested authority which would permit it to take steps to reduce the extent to which the average maturity of the outstanding debt is being shortened. It has difficulty doing so now because bonds with an interest rate no higher than 4¼ percent cannot be placed in the present market. Right now, long-term interest rates are above the interest rate ceiling. During such a period, more and more of the debt becomes concentrated in issues with a relatively short period remaining to maturity. This development may become a problem for debt management and monetary policy if continued too long.

The committee recognizes that any increase in the interest rate on new issues of Government bonds would be viewed by some as an endorsement of a general policy of higher interest rates. This we certainly do not intend. For that reason, the committee did not grant the administration's request to remove the interest rate ceiling on $2 billion of bond issues. This also accounts for the relatively mild action taken in extending the period for which notes may be issued. Even this was approved only after it was concluded that it—by itself—would not have any effect on interest rates. It will, however, give the Secretary of the Treasury added flexibility with respect to shortening the maturity of the debt.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that the debt ceiling provided in this bill is realistic in view of the very real contingencies we face today. I want to emphasize that it does not contain any allowance whatsoever for an increase in nondefense spending.

The most important of these contingencies concerns the cost of supporting our troops in Vietnam and wherever else they may be engaged. The only remaining contingencies allowed for, relate to uncertainties as to revenues, or proposed revenues, and as to the treatment Congress will decide upon for participation certificates. A debt limit that does not provide a sufficient allowance for these contingencies might impede the administration defense effort.

All of us must also recognize that the approval of a debt limit with a larger than usual margin for contingencies is normal in a period in which we are engaged in armed conflict. During World War II, the permanent debt limit was increased by 400 percent. The permanent debt limit which was established in the postwar period contained such a large margin for contingencies that it was not necessary to increase the debt limitation during most of the Korean war period. Provision of an adequate debt ceiling now will merely insure that we do not run the danger that increases in expenditures needed to support our fighting men will be in any way delayed.

I repeat that the approval of this debt limitation in no way implies that we should lessen our efforts to maintain a tight rein over nondefense Federal expenditures. Indeed, we must be more vigilant than ever. I believe my view on this—if not already known—is suggested by the Commission I am proposing for Government program evaluation. To my colleagues who are as concerned as I am about expenditure control, I say let us direct our attention toward a critical review of these expenditure programs but let us not inhibit the operation of our Government by too low a limit on the debt.

I urge your support for this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill as it has been reported to the House by the committee; but before going into the fundamental argument with respect to this legislation I want to comment on three items in the bill that I believe are salutary changes.

All of these have been proposed for some time by the minority members of the committee in one form or another. We proposed two of them in February of this year in our motion to recommit the first debt ceiling bill to the committee.

At that time we felt it essential that the Treasury be given additional latitude in the interest rates on Government obligations, in order to better manage the debt that was outstanding, and we urged that the current 4¼-percent ceiling on obligations over 5 years be relaxed. This bill does provide for some relaxation in that interest ceiling.

As the chairman has just said, this bill raises the time limit on notes from 5 to 7 years so that a 7-year obligation can now be issued at interest rates that reflect market conditions. It provides a period, therefore, of 2 additional years in the maturity of the obligations that can be issued outside of the 4¼-percent interest ceiling.

This is not what the Treasury recommended. I should say to the Members of this House that in the committee the Republican members supported the Secretary of the Treasury in his recommendation. That was rejected by the Democrat members of the committee. However, the compromise was submitted and we unanimously supported that compromise in the committee.

It does not do as much as many of my colleagues and I think should be done to remove the restrictions on the Secretary of the Treasury in managing our debt. However, a little relaxation of this restriction is better than maintaining the rigid restrictions that exist in the law today. Therefore, I applaud this action by the committee as a move in the proper direction.

The other matter which we included in our motion to recommit to the committee with instructions to amend when the debt ceiling legislation was before us in February related to the participation sale certificates. We said at that time that these certificates are really obligations of the U.S. Government. According to an opinion of the U.S. Attorney General, they carry the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government. They are sold to trust funds, including the social security trust fund; therefore they are as much a debt of the United States as the other bonds issued by the Treasury. Of course, this again was turned down by what was in essence a party-line vote last February. I am pleased to say that a concession has been made, though, in this bill. The participation certificates that are proposed to be sold during fiscal year 1968 will come within the debt ceiling that is established by this bill. Those are two steps in the right direction.

The third salutory change is the elimination of the fiction that we have a "temporary ceiling" superimposed on top of a "permanent ceiling." Fundamentally, we have had only one ceiling through the years and that is the top dollar figure that could be outstanding in debt obligation under the law. The only temporary feature has been the certain necessity of reconsidering the ceiling by June 30 of every year, the date on which the "temporary ceiling" expired. In the latter part of the 1950's we even went so far in the Congress then in control as to have a temporary ceiling on top of a temporary ceiling on top of a permanent ceiling. It has been a silly device, in my opinion, giving the people, and maybe even ourselves a false sense of the real level of debt. I think all of us have been around here long enough to know that there is nothing concerning the laws of the United States that is either temporary or permanent. That is certainly true as far as our debt ceiling is concerned. At least in this bill we have gotten rid of the fiction of a "temporary" ceiling. The chairman is right when he says we could be saying today, if we wanted to be demagogic, "Why, you are increasing the permanent ceiling by $80 billion from $285 billion to $365 billion."

But, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means certainly knew that our side would not raise this specter, because we have ourselves tried to get rid of this fiction.

Mr. Chairman, it does not require any great comprehension to know that under the law today we have a $336 billion ceiling. That is the figure the Congress established last February when we granted an increase in that temporary debt ceiling of $6 billion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is proposed under this bill to provide another $29 billion of borrowing authority and to raise that figure from $336 billion to $365 billion. And, Mr. Chairman, that is the real issue that we have pending before us today.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all of us know that our Nation faces many grave problems. But in my book none of them are any more grave than the fiscal problem which we face.

Mr. Chairman, I say this because unless we can put ourselves in a proper fiscal posture, our chances of solving the other grave problems becomes not only more difficult, but maybe next to impossible. This I say because the one item that any nation has to have is a sound currency and a sound fiscal management of its governmental business. Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that this bill focuses attention upon the fiscal problems with which we are faced today.

This bill provides authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow $29 billion in the next fiscal year. Last February we authorized an additional $6 billion in borrowing authority. If we pass this bill, we will have authorized $35 billion of additional borrowing authority on the part of the Government of the United States during the course of this year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while our fiscal problems are grave, while they are complicated and do not admit of simple solutions, the answer to this bill is simple.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this request to borrow $29 billion, to go $29 billion further into debt, should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, what we really have pending before us today is two propositions with respect to our deficit picture, and neither of these propositions justifies a $29 billion increase in the borrowing authority of the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, proposition No. 1, is that the deficit for fiscal 1968 will be $11 billion. Based on the administration's projection of expenditures and revenues, this is the deficit that must be accommodated for fiscal 1968. That is the official amount.

We have been told that one of the aspects of this problem with which we have to deal is the projection of the expected deficit. That projection comes down to us from the administration. It is based upon the budget submitted to this Congress as the official document of the administration and of the executive branch, projecting expenditures and revenues of the Federal Government. This is based upon the official budget of the United States.

This is the document that normally guides our action on the debt ceiling, but this time we have added a second proposition—that there are contingencies which make it likely that the deficit will be $29 billion instead of the $11 billion projected by the administration. This illustrates the credibility gap that has existed with respect to how much confidence we can have in what the executive branch does in terms of its monetary affairs.

I do not question anybody for being concerned about a credibility gap in this area after what happened last year. As late as September of last year we were told we were going to have a deficit for fiscal 1967—the current fiscal year—of only $1.8 billion. Four months later the administration finally told us the truth and informed us we were going to have a deficit of nearly $10 billion in fiscal 1967.

In the short space of 4 months the administration came in and gave us this drastically revised picture of the financial and fiscal plight that we were in.

I do not want to quarrel with my chairman for suggesting that we should not put our complete reliance on the budget message of the President, or even on the slightly revised budget figures which were given to us a few weeks ago when we were told that, instead of having a $9.7 billion deficit for fiscal 1968, it is now projected to be $11 billion.

I do not question or criticize the chairman for suggesting that we have to look beyond the official facts given to us by the administration, and that there are some contingencies. I am not going to question that.

But let me say this as far as both of these propositions are concerned. If the real deficit is $11 billion for fiscal 1968, then a grant of $29 billion of new borrowing authority would simply make the debt ceiling a meaningless provision. If the deficit is $11 billion, as projected by the administration, then there is no excuse for increasing the borrowing authority by $29 billion. We would do this only if we wanted to remove the discipline provided—and it appears to be little enough—by the ceiling to control expenditures. This is not a very good tool, I will admit, but it is one tool that we have to exert some kind of pressure on the executive branch in terms of spending levels.

Let me remind my chairman, and the Members of this House, that the level of expenditures from day to day, from month to month, and from year to year, is fundamentally in the hands of the executive branch. We give the President obligational authority, and to that extent the Congress of the United States is responsible, but once the authority has been provided, it is the executive branch that determines the level of spending from month to month and from day to day. They are the ones who can defer the letting of a contract this year, so that the bill will not be due until 18 months from now, rather than having it due at this time when our fiscal situation is in a difficult plight. The executive does that.

This debt ceiling can exert some influence. It has in the past, if you will look at the record on executive spending policy. Do the Members want to remove what little tool they have?

My chairman said, and I agree with him, there is concern over where we are going in this Nation as far as expenditure policy is concerned.

And he suggests that we have to have some better tools. He has introduced legislation establishing a commission to review the expenditure side of our budget. As I understand it, it is a kind of Hoover Commission, to make policy recommendations in the area of expenditures.

Let me assure him today that I will support his legislation. I am willing to do anything that will give us some control. If the control is not here, give the President some control that can be exercised and used to get our expenditures in line with what we can afford under the current circumstances.

But I am not going to quibble at this time as to what the device is. One thing I am not going to do: I am not going to vote to give the executive so much borrowing authority that the debt ceiling is eliminated as a tool providing some discipline for mitigating this spending profligacy that is going on in our Nation's fiscal affairs.

If you grant a $29 billion increase in borrowing authority to accommodate an $11 billion official deficit, what are you doing? You are simply blowing off the roof. If this Congress desires to do that, may I suggest to you, my friends and Mr. Chairman, why not go all the way. Let us simply repeal the provision of Liberty Loan Act establishing a ceiling on how much the Government can borrow. Forget about it. It is either going to be meaningful or we might just as well throw it out of the window and stop all this exercise.

So far as I am concerned, I think we should keep it. I think it can be useful. I think it has at least some value. This $29 billion increase in borrowing authority cannot be justified on the basis of the official figures given to us by the executive branch. If you want to accept the figures of the executive branch, then you should vote against this bill that is before you today.

But let us move into this second proposition concerning the contingencies discussed earlier.

What about the contingencies mentioned by the chairman? Is there a real possibility that if we continue on our present course that we will have a deficit of between $29 and $30 billion in the fiscal year 1968? We have to do something to accommodate this deficit, if it is real?

Frankly, I do not know how real it is and how fixed these contingencies are.

The chairman admits he cannot say what they are with any definiteness—except that they are on the scene.

We asked the Secretary of the Treasury to try to establish these concretely, and to make them a permanent part of the official figures. He would not do that.

Let us assume that these contingencies are real possibilities. This bill assumes all of them are real possibilities, because it increases the ceiling by $29 billion, when the projected deficit is $11 billion.

Is not that assumption a signal—a signal to you, to me, to the executive branch, and to our people—that at this point we should review and revise our spending plans so we can avoid a debt of such magnitude?

Real or potential as these contingencies may be, they are not a signal to me to give the administration $29 billion more borrowing authority. It is a signal to me that something is wrong; that we should take another hard look at what our spending and revenue plans are for the next year; that we should do something to avoid this huge deficit and to avoid having to go to the marketplace for that amount of money under the current situation.

The official budget of expenditures and revenues submitted by the President to this Congress is the document on which our Appropriations Committee functions. They point out in some cases that they have not exceeded the Executive budget, sometimes, I am afraid, in the belief that since they have not gone above the President's budget, they have done a good job. I have never interpreted it that way.

I merely thought we were doing just as bad a job as the President, if that is all we could come up with. But this is the budget of expenditures as submitted to this Congress, and it is the official document upon which the development of all our appropriations and our tax programs depend. That budget was developed in the context of a $9 billion deficit for fiscal 1968, because that is what it projected.

The determination of the priority of expenditures was based on the contemplated deficit of around $9 billion. A deficit three times that amount should, it seems to me, require the establishment of different priorities, both as to expenditures that we can afford, and different priorities as far as our revenue and tax picture is concerned.

Let me point out that we already have a debt approaching $336 billion, and we have an interest bill this year amounting to $14.2 billion—the second biggest item in our budget.

If you and your family, or any prudent family in this country, were faced with new and unforeseen costs, and you already had a heavy burden of debt with large interest costs, what would you do? Would you run down to the bank and borrow more and add more to your debt obligation, more to the interest charges that you had to carry? I do not think you would. I do not think the prudent

American family would approach the problem in that way. They would not take the easy course, because in the long run they know that it is not the easy course.

I think you would take a look at some other aspects of your family's financial affairs before you simply ran down to the bank, and that is what I think this Government should do. I do not think we should automatically borrow another $29 billion and add $1.5 billion to our interest charges, which are already extremely high. What would a prudent family do?

I believe it would first look at what it had been planning to spend, and say: "We have to cut back. Some of the things that we could afford when we had only these normal costs, we now cannot afford, because we have this new added cost. Maybe we have to defer buying another car. Maybe we have to forgo a coat, a suit, or a dress, or some clothes for the children that we were planning to buy. We will have to defer those items."

I believe that is the first thing a prudent family would do under those circumstances. They would see how far they could cut back to live within their means and assume the responsibility of this new burden.

Why should the Government be any different? An expenditure that this Government planned last January in anticipation of a deficit of $9.7 billion takes on a new priority status when we are faced with a potential deficit of $29 to $30 billion? I believe there are many items in this budget that take on a new significance when we are confronted with a deficit of this magnitude.

What is the next thing that a prudent family does? If they cannot cut back sufficiently on their expenditures to avoid borrowing a big amount, I believe they might talk in terms of Dad doing a little moonlighting. I believe Mother might think of some ways of adding to the family income, before running to the bank and piling up a higher and higher deficit to meet bigger and bigger interest costs. I believe some of the kids might think in terms of looking for some part-time work, so that they can add to the revenue side, in an attempt to avoid borrowing any more money than was absolutely essential under the circumstances.

I believe that is what the prudent family would do, instead of rushing to the bank. My friends, that is what this Government should do at this time. It should stop, review, and revise. How do we get that revision? How do we get that review?

I am not just saying it should be the executive branch. I am not putting all the responsibility on the executive branch. Let us recognize the situation under which we operate. We look to the Executive for guidance and that is why we have the Budget Act which requires the President to set out his proposals. The Executive knows more than we know, as a body, about what our problems are, what our potentials are in the defense area, what the expenditures will cost, and how real the contingencies are that the chairman talks about. They certainly are in a much better position, having all the facts, than we are. They should certainly go back and examine this budget on the basis of the new priorities, based on a $29 billion potential deficit, because all they did was look at it in the light of the proposed $9.7 billion deficit.

They should take another look. We should also take another look. Both of us should do it. These are the kinds of conditions that, to me, at least, dictate that we avoid simply running to the money market to borrow more money.

These are the kinds of conditions that require that we take a second look. The Executive had better take a second look, and the Congress had better take a second look.

I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, am going to oppose this bill, No. 1, because the $29 figure cannot be justified on their own projections. I believe, if all they looked at was the deficit of $11 billion for fiscal year 1968, the chairman would not be here recommending a $29 billion increase.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Of course I would not.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I know. The gentleman is basing this on the possibility of these contingencies.

Mr. MILLS. I am taking into consideration some facts I know exist. My friend is not willing, I am sure, to tell me he believes that the deficit is not going to by any more than $11 billion.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I know it is. I grant that.

Mr. MILLS. Of course it is.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. But if we assume it will be the full $29 billion, then there is all the more reason why we should not automatically say, "Go to the money market, run down to the bank, take the easy way out."

That is all the more reason to say, "We have to reexamine the priorities of some of our expenditure programs. There must be some at the bottom of the list that can be put off and deferred."

I am saying that the only way we can get that—and it is a tool we have at our disposal here—is to turn down this bill, because the message soon will go to the President, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and to the Bureau of the Budget that this Congress wants a change; that it is not going to vote for $29 billion of borrowing authority and approve a $29 billion deficit; and that we want them to come up with their recommendations as to what expenditure items they want to defer in order to adjust our fiscal affairs to the facts confronting this Nation.

We want to know from them what they will suggest in the area of revenue.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, this is the way to get it. The only way is by turning this bill down at this time.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. I have just as much interest, I believe my friend knows, in this business of reevaluation and reestablishment of priorities as anyone, including my friend. That cannot be done, however, realistically, as I see it, in the short period of time between today and the first day of July.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Very well.

Mr. MILLS. On the first day of July the debt ceiling will revert to $285 billion.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I want to be constructive, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest if we turn this bill down today the gentleman would have no difficulty in getting legislation through this House very quickly providing sufficient borrowing authority. The only real problem is that ceiling will revert to $285 billion on June 30. I believe that the current $336 billion ceiling would meet the borrowing needs of the Treasury at least until September or October, even under the table presented to us by the Treasury. The gentleman could get a continuation of the $336 billion borrowing authority without any difficulty, which would give them the time to make the review.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I conclude by reading the final paragraph of the separate views of the Republicans, filed in conjunction with the committee report. Those views begin on page 17.

> In conclusion, before enacting an additional increase of $29 billion in the debt limit—making a total of $35 billion since the first of the year—the administration and the Congress have the solemn duty and obligation to reappraise the priority of domestic and foreign expenditures—and to consider additional sources of revenue—in order to reduce the need for an increase of this magnitude in the Government's borrowing authority. The administration steadfastly refuses to meet this obligation. Instead, the administration asks Congress to give it a "blank check" to run up a deficit of $29 billion. This we refuse to do.
>
> The failure of the administration to meet its obligations to the American people leaves us no course except to oppose this bill. It is the only recourse left to us. Only by this means can we bring about a reappraisal of expenditures and revenue needs in the light of a threatened budgetary deficit which is intolerable.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], has clearly brought before the House and this committee the issue. It is a question of whether or not this contingency that I pointed out to the chairman during his remarks, when he so kindly yielded to me, the contingency that he had not mentioned, would come about. This is the contingency that this administration would cut back on nondefense expenditures. There is a flexibility in spending money that the President has without any reference to the Congress in his power to accelerate or decelerate programs. Every President has exercised this power from time to time. This President at one time did exercise it and continued to exercise it although requesting still larger new power to spend and new obligational authority from the Congress in the form of appropriations. However, the carryover balances of unspent power to spend began to mass, and it exceeds today well over $100 billion although beginning in September 1965 the President began accelerating his spending. Various estimates are made as to what flexibility in setting expenditure levels the President has. It is probably around $40 billion. This is the contingency that the leaders on the Democratic side here in the House refuse to face up to. They can talk all they want to about lowering the expenditure level and it means nothing if nothing is done about it. I honor our chairman for his views on this, but they can talk all they want to about insisting on cutting back on nondefense expenditures and it means nothing. However, when the debt ceiling does not allow for that contingency and allows for all of the other contingencies that are here, then that is something else. This is unreasonable.

Let me ask the gentleman from Arkansas if these contingencies he mentioned—and I recognize them and I think he has made a very sound case in presenting this matter—let me ask him, suppose the contingencies on the Vietnam war were to increase by $5 billion; should not the administration then, in the light of that contingency occurring, even if it is not ready to now, should it not then look to whether or not it might cut back on nondefense expenditures to make way for that contingency? I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas for that.

Mr. MILLS. I would agree with the gentleman from Missouri. If these expenditures for war purposes are going to rise, we have to look to see whether or not we can reduce expenditures on the nondefense side; but bear in mind, if the gentleman will yield further, this is not just a permanent ceiling for 1 fiscal year. We hope it will go beyond that fiscal year.

Mr. CURTIS. I am hopeful, too, but I am simply putting in the reason why the ceiling need not be what it is, as the gentleman suggests and as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], pointed out—and I will put it bluntly—it is simply that we do not believe the President's figures. There is every reason not to believe them. They are false both on the revenue estimates and they are false on the expenditure estimates. This same committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, was before the House last October with figures that the administration had given us that were false, and I say now, knowingly false. I do not like making such strong statements, but apparently this is the only way you can get through on it. We have an administration that is in default to the Congress on telling the truth and in default to the people of this country in telling them the truth either about revenue estimates or expenditures. As long as this Congress fails to face up to this situation, and call the Executive to task in effect we have a dictatorship here in the United States.

Now, I think it is necessary for this Congress, controlled by the Democratic Party, to face up to this or indeed to face up to it in the election in 1968, stating that they are perfectly willing to permit the President of the United States not to come forward with correct information to the Congress so that the Congress could exercise judgments on these serious fiscal problems.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has pointed out, as forcefully as he can—and it is my opinion that one can get the overtones of what the gentleman has been saying—that in his judgment we are in serious fiscal difficulties.

Mr. Chairman, this is, of course, always a matter of judgment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this debt ceiling increase. There is no question but what a vote against the debt ceiling increase would be a vote of "no confidence" in the fiscal policies of this administration.

However, I ask my colleagues—whether you are on the Democrat side of the aisle or on the Republican side of the aisle—in light of the record that appears in the committee hearings, in the committee report and in the debate of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and others, how indeed can you cast a vote of confidence in the fiscal policies of this administration?

Mr. Chairman, if a vote of "no confidence" were to occur in the House today, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has pointed out what the situation would be. This administration has bluntly told the Committee on Ways and Means that "We are not going to revise our budget estimates on nondefense expenditures."

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury said to me, "You cannot expect the President to take a new look at the figures." I said, "I do expect the President to do so."

I say this, Mr. Chairman, not as an individual, but as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means trying to represent the interests of the Congress, the House of Representatives, and as a Member trying to represent the point of view of the people of the United States. I, indeed, Mr. Chairman, can expect the President to take a new look at these expenditure figures and come in, just as the British Labor government was forced to do by international fiscal disciplines to withdraw its lush budget and resubmit an austere budget, a budget that no member of the Conservative Party during the campaign had dared even suggest.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, you can balance any budget; yes, the crises are here and they reflect serious problems that need solutions.

However, Mr. Chairman, are we going to wait, until that point when the United States is forced to act by having imposed upon it these international disciplines, disciplines that will force this administration to cut appropriation requests previously made and expenditure estimates under Democratic leadership to really move in to present an austere budget?

These, Mr. Chairman, I say are the fundamental issues now pending before us. Only these issues. Are we going to do something on the expenditure side to the extent we can, or are we going to do nothing? We can do something now through the device of the debt ceiling.

Mr. Chairman, a vote to vote down this proposal would bring the administration back before the Committee on Ways and Means immediately and the representatives of the administration would fully understand from this debate what is required to be done.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we can go ahead and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], is so right—we have to increase the debt ceiling. The argument is over what amount of debt ceiling should be established—possibly $336 billion? But I would even go beyond that, on a temporary basis, on the assumption and understanding that the administration would pull back its budget and would establish priorities and resubmit an austere budget with these kinds of priorities.

Mr. Chairman, under a unanimous-consent request which I shall obtain when we are back in the House, I shall insert in the RECORD some additional documents on this subject, because I now want to briefly move into another area of discussion.

Mr. Chairman, the area in which I now would like to move and to discuss is the area of what is wrong with debt.

First, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that there is nothing wrong with debt per se. Debt is a very fine and wonderful economic tool that can be used by the individual, it can be used by the family, it can be used by business, it can be used by local governments, State governments and, indeed, the Federal Government.

But like any power or tool, if not used properly it can be very damaging. It is comparable to fire. Fire is a great boon to mankind properly used, but fire can be a bane.

And the way to estimate what the debt can be of any family or any institution is to relate it to two things, one the earning capacity, the other to the wealth or the assets that lie behind it.

It is very proper for the new economists to refer to the Federal debt as a ratio of gross national product because gross national product is economic activity, and our ways of raising Federal revenues are taxing economic activity; namely, our corporate income tax and individual income tax. But the fallacy of the argument advanced by the new economists is apparent just in looking at it. They say, "Well, the Federal debt as a ratio of gross national product has declined considerably since 1946." The fallacy is, is 1946 the optimum year that we want to set as our example, and what we seek to have as the proper ratio between Federal debt and the earning capacity of our society? Why, it is the worst period they could possibly have picked, and it was picked because of this, I guess, because this was right after World War II, where we had to indulge in heavy deficit financing in order to finance and win that war.

Let us take a look at the ratio of debt to gross national product during the 100 years this country has grown great, with good, sustained, healthy growth, and we see that the Federal debt up until World War I never was as high during the peacetime periods as 15 percent of the gross national product, and during the 1920's, after the war, it got down below, and well below 20 percent.

Here we are 20 years after World War II, and the ratio of Federal debt to gross national product has just gotten below 50 percent, and the bulk of the reduction, I might say, was the result of heavy post-World War II inflation. This is a neat little trick. You can inflate the dollar and change that ratio rapidly because gross national product, of course, is measured in current dollars, while debt is measured in the fixed dollar.

So here we are without much resiliency, without much flexibility, because the ratio of debt to gross national product is so high, still 47 percent of gross national product instead of what it should be, around 15 percent.

I am going to put in the RECORD, by the way, a table showing the debt, and the gross national product, on back to 1874, and any of the Members can look at these ratios.

Another point is the wealth of our society. I am going to put in the RECORD a very interesting study of the wealth of the United States, but the essence of it is this: distributing wealth by sectors, the Government holdings, percentages in 1900, 1929, and 1958—the last year that we have the figures—the Federal percent was 1 percent in 1900, 1 percent in 1929, and 3 percent in 1958, but the crucial ratios are the percent owned. These reflect the net assets of the Federal Government, the assets over and above the debt, and the Federal Government is minus 8. It was zero in 1900, minus 2 in 1929, 1958 minus 8. It is the only institution in our society with this negative figure. State and local is a plus 6, and when we get to our corporations and our businesses, it is a healthy plus 23. When we get to our households we have the healthiest picture of them all.

There are more up-to-date figures, but I happen to have with me figures of 1966. Total consumer assets as of September 30, 1965, were $2.245 trillion—$2,245 billion.

The current liabilities which means consumer credit debts, mortgage debts and so forth—$280 billion.

That gives a net worth of $1.9 trillion.

There is a similar picture I might say so far as the corporate debt related to corporate assets is concerned.

The State and local debt related to assets, likewise is a healthy figure in the black. Only the Federal Government has this disastrous negative figure.

Let me say, even that figure needs revision because so much of what is listed as capital assets of the Federal Government, is military equipment and land and buildings. I want to call attention to the very fine work that the House Committee on Government Operations does every year in keeping up the inventory on Federal real and personal property. As of their June 30, 1966, publication, we can see that Federal assets—the total assets of all personal property and realty amounts to $347 billion. But then when you adjust it for the $189 billion which is the military inventory including real estate and adjust it downward, because so much of this is expendable items not really capital assets you can see that we have this negative figure of a Federal debt greater than the Federal assets.

Mr. Chairman, I want to close by calling attention again to the minority views of the Republicans on this committee. All 10 signed these views. I am going to ask unanimous consent that these views be placed in the RECORD during the debate and I hope everyone has read them because I think they are well stated.

I want to read from the committee hearings on this issue on May 15, 1967, at page 47, where I was interrogating the Director of the Budget, Mr. Schultze. That record is as follows:

Mr. CURTIS. No, my criticism is on the record and the record is there for anyone else to look forward to see the points that I am trying to make, and the crucial political point is this: That if the concern I am expressing in regard to expenditures and revenues and how you finance the expenditures, either through current revenues or debt, if this were believed to be a true picture, then I think there would be considerable sentiment among the public and the rest of the Congress to insist on an austere budget.

As long as this kind of climate goes on I can't blame the people of this country for thinking that the President, after all, is running things and therefore, we ought to be able to rely on the fact that we have this great society that can afford all of these things.

Mr. SCHULTZE. As clearly we disagree, Mr. Curtis, to the extent that we have made recommendations in the budget with respect to the Great Society we believe they are important recommendations.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand it and you would have it put on the basis that you are concerned for human beings and that those who disagree with you aren't.

Mr. SCHULTZE. Have you ever heard me say that?

Mr. CURTIS. I have never heard you, but I have certainly heard the President say it and I am tired of hearing it on the floor of the House. I have heard it for the past 17 years. That is the usual argument against people who are concerned about these expenditures. We are concerned about people and I am very concerned about our programs that would meet their problems.

Mr. SCHULTZE. Mr. Curtis, I didn't raise it. I will take your word for it. Obviously you are——

Mr. CURTIS. No, no; I am the one who is putting this on the record because I feel that the decisions the Congress made last year in regard to budget and expenditures were in light of the incomplete information and in fact an entirely too rosy picture presented by the administration. Had what turned out to be the facts of the situation been anticipated by the administration there is no question in my mind that the Congress would have acted considerably differently in regard to expenditures and the appropriation bills. I can still say that the climate in just these few months of the Congress in respect to appropriations is just that there is going to be no tomorrow, that people like myself who argue that we are in a very serious fiscal situation, they don't quite believe it. I can understand that to rely on the picture that has been presented to us here today by the administration, if they rely on that, yes, they can continue to vote out these appropriations.

If you gentlemen on the Democratic side will rely on that—yes, you can continue to vote out these appropriations. That is why the issue is clearly drawn. The President of the United States must tell the people of this country and the Congress that we are in serious fiscal difficulties; that we have a war going on; and that we cannot have bread and butter and, as my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin has added—jam.

The following are the tables and documents to which I referred in my remarks along with some other pertinent reference material:

Ratio of public debt to gross national product

[Dollars in billions]

	Public debt (June 30)[1]	Gross national product[2]	Debt as percent of GNP
Calendar year:			
1874	$2.2	$7.4	29.7
1884	1.6	11.2	14.3
1890	1.1	13.1	8.4
1895	1.1	13.9	8.0
1900	1.3	18.7	7.0
1905	1.1	25.1	4.4
1910	1.1	33.4	3.3
1915	1.2	38.7	3.1
Fiscal year:			
1916	1.2	44.2	2.7
1917	3.0	54.5	5.5
1918	12.5	68.4	18.3
1919	25.5	80.2	31.8
1920	24.3	87.8	27.7
1921	24.0	80.6	29.8
1922	23.0	71.9	40.0
1923	22.3	79.6	28.0
1924	21.3	84.9	25.1
1925	20.5	88.9	23.1
1926	19.6	95.1	20.6
1927	18.5	96.0	19.3
1928	17.6	96.0	18.3
1929	17.0	100.1	17.0
1930	16.2	96.7	16.7
1931	16.8	83.1	20.2
1932	19.5	66.9	29.1
1933	22.5	55.8	39.6
1934	27.1	60.3	44.9
1935	32.8	68.7	47.8
1936	33.8	77.4	43.7
1937	36.4	86.5	42.1
1938	37.2	87.6	42.7
1939	40.4	90.4	44.7
1940	43.0	95.0	45.3
1941	49.0	109.4	44.8
1942	72.4	139.2	52.0
1943	136.7	177.5	77.0
1944	201.0	201.9	99.6
1945	258.7	216.8	119.3
1946	269.4	201.6	133.6
1947	258.3	219.8	117.5
1948	252.3	243.5	103.6
1949	252.8	260.0	97.2
1950	257.4	263.3	97.6
1951	255.2	310.4	82.2
1952	259.1	337.2	76.8
1953	266.1	358.9	74.1
1954	271.3	362.1	74.9
1955	274.4	378.6	72.5
1956	272.8	409.4	66.6
1957	270.5	431.3	62.7
1958	276.3	440.3	62.8
1959	284.7	469.1	60.7
1960	286.3	495.2	57.8
1961	289.0	506.5	57.1
1962	298.2	542.1	55.0
1963	305.9	573.4	53.3
1964	311.7	612.0	50.9
1965	317.3	651.8	48.7
1966	320.0	712.0	44.9

[1] All public debt figures from U.S. Treasury. Includes certain securities not subject to statutory limitation. Public debt includes debt incurred to finance expenditures of wholly owned Government corporations and other business-type activities in exchange for which securities of the corporations and activities were issued to the Treasury, but excludes those holdings outside the Treasury.

[2] 1874–1915 estimates from National Bureau of Economic Research (1874 figure is decade average, 1869–78; 1884 figure is decade average, 1879–88). 1916–39 figures are derived from calendar year estimates of the Office of Business Economics. 1940–66 figures are from Bureau of the Budget, which are derived from the quarterly estimates of OBE.

THE WEALTH OF THE NATION

(NOTE.—The following article was written for The Morgan Guaranty Survey by Dr. John W. Kendrick. In 1963–64 Dr. Kendrick directed a study involving nearly 200 scholars and other specialists which explored the problems and feasibility of national wealth measurement. Stimulated by that project, governmental statistical agencies have since expanded their work in the field of wealth estimation. As a result, there is now promise that in the not too distant future the U.S., for the first time in its history, will have comprehensive and reasonably accurate official estimates both of total national wealth and of its distribution among various groups in the economy. Dr. Kendrick's article focuses on the significance of this development and suggests some of the ways in which it should improve economic analysis. Dr. Kendrick, presently Professor of Economics at the University of Connecticut, will shortly return to the faculty of The George Washington University.)

The pursuit of wealth is one of the ancient activities of man. Men are interested not only in how they are doing in the acquisitive game; they also are interested in the wealth of others. In the presidential campaign of 1964, for example, questions were raised as to how much each of the candidates was "worth," financially, and figures were produced. Men who own businesses, as proprietors or stockholders, are interested in the net worth of their enterprises. Citizens are interested in the assets of governmental bodies in relation to public debt. And we are all interested in the wealth of our nation—its growth and its size in comparison with the wealth of other nations—as an important indication of the relative material strength of the United States.

Estimates of wealth, besides their capacity for satisfying curiosity, are of considerable importance to economists in their attempts to understand and predict economic behavior. For example, the accumulated stock of wealth of any country—its land, structures, equipment, inventories, and the skill and know-how of its work force—is the basic determinant of that nation's potential for further economic growth. And the buying patterns of households and businesses are clearly influenced by their holdings of both physical and financial assets.

The estimation of wealth has lagged behind the development of national income and product estimates, and still represents a large gap in U.S. economic accounts. In the pioneering days of national income work, to be sure, economists like Sir William Petty in the late 17th century were concerned with wealth as well as with income. Indeed, a century after Petty, in 1776, Adam Smith called his masterpiece *The Wealth of Nations*. Smith even restricted the national income concept to the production of *tangible* goods, since it is only material goods that can be be accumulated to add to the nation's wealth—an approach which carries over today in the "material product" accounts of the communist countries.

But once countries began preparing estimates of economic aggregates on an official, regular basis during the interwar period and after World War II, the estimates were predominantly confined to national income and product. Not only was it much easier to gather data relating to current flows of income and product than to assemble information pertaining to accumulations from past production, but also fewer conceptual problems are entailed in income estimation than in wealth estimation. In addition, neglect of wealth estimates may have been due to the influence of modern macro-economic theorists, such as Lord Keynes, who emphasized income and product, paying little attention to the influence of wealth on economic behavior.

But the balance is being redressed. In recent years, economists have placed increasing emphasis on the role of wealth in production and expenditure decisions. Individuals or governments in a number of countries are beginning to prepare estimates of wealth to supplement the national income and product accounts. For example, Japan conducted a sample wealth survey in 1955, and the Soviet Union began a complete census of structures and equipment in 1959. In more than a dozen other countries, individual investigators have pieced together estimates from fragmentary and scattered sources.

In the United States, Professor Raymond Goldsmith of Yale University put together rough calculations of the national wealth, by major type, from the beginning of the 19th century through 1958, and followed this with balance-sheet estimates both for the nation as a whole and for major sectors (agriculture, nonfarm households, corporations, etc.). Dr. Goldsmith's balance sheets included financial (intangible) as well as tangible assets, liabilities, and equities. In recent years, the Department of Commerce has published estimates of stocks of selected types of tangible wealth (reproducible business capital goods); and since the mid-1950's the Federal Reserve Board has published partial balance sheets for the nation and its major sectors, which cover financial items but not the tangibles.

It now appears that a major break-through with regard to balance sheets and wealth estimates is in the making. In 1963, the Wealth Inventory Planning Study was set up at The George Washington University, under the direction of this writer, to study the possibilities of a comprehensive national inventory and continuing wealth estimates. The report of the study group, *Measuring the Nation's Wealth*, was published in December 1964 by the Joint Economic Committee as background for hearings in June 1965 by its Subcommittee on Economic Statistics. The subcommittee subsequently issued a report strongly supporting expansion of wealth data collection and estimation by federal government agencies. The Office of Statistical Standards in the Bureau of the Budget is providing leadership to the federal statistical agencies concerned in that effort. The Census Bureau, in particular, is expanding somewhat the question on tangible assets included in its economic consensus, which cover most industries on a five-year cycle, and population and housing in the decadal years. The Office of Business Economics is simultaneously expanding its work in the area of wealth estimation.

It seems likely that official, comprehensive wealth estimates—possibly as part of national and sector balance sheets developed to complement the national income and product accounts—will appear within less than a decade. Certainly, it is none too soon for economists and the interested public to learn more about concepts and measures of wealth, their content, how they relate to balance sheets and the economic accounts generally, and what they are good for.

THE CONCEPT OF WEALTH

In the very broadest sense, a nation's wealth consists of all resources which contribute directly or indirectly to the production of commodities or services that people want. This would include, of course, human as well as nonhuman resources, and in recent years there has been a great renewal of interest in investments which enhance the productive powers of human beings and thus add to "human capital." As a practical matter, however, the collection of wealth data by government agencies will have to be confined, at least for the present, to nonhuman resources possessing the capacity to produce future income or direct satisfactions, and capable of being bought and sold in asset markets. This is simply because of the impossibility of measuring human wealth in any sort of objective way. Some economists, it is true, have become interested in imputing a value to human resources; that is, in assigning a monetary value to human capital reflecting such things as the basic expense of rearing children and the costs entailed in education and training. These endeavors, however, still must be regarded as highly experimental and do not—for the time being—promise a basis for useful qualification. Somewhat arbitrarily, for this reason, the estimation of national wealth by official agencies must be confined to the valuation of nonhuman resources.

From the layman's standpoint, this particular concept of wealth is likely to seem deficient not so much because it omits human capital but rather because it disregards financial assets, such as currency, bank deposits, and securities. And these indeed are relevant to a calculation of the wealth or "worth" of any individual economic unit. The reason they do not figure in the wealth of the nation as a whole is that one person's financial asset is somebody else's financial liability. For instance, a bank deposit is an asset to the depositor but a liability to the bank, while a Treasury bond is an asset to the investor but a liability to the government. When all accounts are consolidated into one account representing the entire country, financial assets and financial liabilities cancel out, except to the extent that U.S. parties viewed collectively have a net-claim or net-liability position vis-à-vis foreigners. It is the combination of the residual net foreign position and real productive resources that constitutes the nation's wealth.

If economists were interested solely in a single figure summing up total U.S. national wealth, data gatherers could ignore the financial veil overlying the economy. Their procedure would simply be to estimate directly the value of tangible asset holdings sector-by-sector in the economy. The sum of these sector amounts, plus net foreign assets, would then give national wealth. It is important to recognize, however, that such an approach would not yield true wealth estimates by sector, since the assets held or used by one particular sector are not necessarily owned by it in an ultimate sense. A company's equity in a mortgaged building, for example, is not measured by the building's market value. Nor can a consumer include in his "net worth" position the full value of an automobile which won't be his until an instalment loan is paid off.

To get at the true wealth of the various sectors of the economy, it is necessary for estimators to proceed by an alternative route, one which does involve intermediate use of financial data. Specifically, the method which U.S. statisticians will be employing in their wealth calculations entails as a first step the construction of sector balance sheets. In conventional accounting form, the left-hand side of each such balance sheet will show holdings of both tangible and financial assets, while the right-hand side will show liabilities and net worth, with net worth arrived at, of course, by taking the difference between total assets and total liabilities. The net worth entry, assuming proper valuation of the sector's assets and liabilities, will constitute that sector's true claim on tangible assets, that is, its owned share of total wealth. National wealth can then be calculated by adding together the net worth figures of each individual sector. This balance-sheet approach to wealth estimation clearly yields much more useful information than would the alternative approach of estimating the value of tangible assets directly. Among other things, it gives both the wealth holdings and the wealth ownership for individual sectors, each of which is of interest to the economist.

Proper valuation is unquestionably the most difficult task facing estimators. Ideally, what is desired is market prices (or proxies therefor), since having such prices makes for comparability among different types of wealth, as well as for consistency with the national income and product estimates, which are valued at market prices. Unfortunately, many of the balance-sheet data readily available are not in the form of current or market prices. Corporate balance sheets, for instance, carry property (land, plant, and equipment) at acquisition costs; thus values are a mixture of previous years' prices. The wealth estimator must try to revalue the estimates to current replacement costs less depreciation, and at least obtain an approximation of market value. Information on the age-composition of assets of various types, appropriate price indexes, and depreciation rates for reproducible structures and equipment are necessary to accomplish this revaluation.

In addition to valuation in *current* prices, it is also desirable to obtain estimates of wealth in *constant* prices, so that the growth of *real* stocks from one period to another can be measured. The same price indexes used for revaluation of assets from acquisition costs to current prices also can be used to "deflate" current values into constant prices.

RELATION TO EXISTING ACCOUNTS

To maximize their usefulness, it is important that wealth estimates be prepared and presented within a systematic framework consistent with estimates of other variables to which wealth is related. The general shape of such a framework is suggested by the national income accounts—not just as they stand today, but, preferably, as they could be elaborated to include a full range of saving and investment accounts for all sectors of the economy.

The link between sector wealth accounts and sector saving-investment accounts is direct and obvious. At any given point in time, of course, the real wealth held by any sector of the economy is the sum of all that sector's past investments (financed typically in part by its own saving and in part by borrowing), less cumulative depreciation. And the extent to which that sector's wealth holdings grow or diminish in a particular accounting period is determined by how much the new investment made in that period by the sector exceeds or falls short of current depreciation. Thus, apart from price fluctuations, the change in a sector's wealth holdings from one date to another would be precisely equivalent to the net investment which it undertook in that time period. In a parallel way, the change in a sector's wealth ownership from one date to another, as distinguished from its wealth holdings, would be equivalent to its net saving in that period. Changes in market prices of assets will also affect current wealth values, of course; and separate statements can show the effect of such revaluations.

At present the only saving-investment account maintained by the U.S. Department of Commerce is restricted to business investment (including all residential construction), plus net foreign investment. This overlooks the fact that wealth, defined as goods which yield benefits over a number of years, is by no means confined to business ownership of tangible assets. It embraces as well durables possessed by households, structures and equipment owned by governmental bodies, and the inventory stocks of both. Acquisitions of all such items should be classed as investment (and recorded in separate saving-investment accounts for each sector), and stocks of such items should be treated as wealth.

A major advantage of presenting saving-investment accounts by sector is that they can be readily extended into complete capital accounts. That is, in addition to tangible investment, investment in (net acquisition of) financial assets can be recorded, by type; and, in addition to saving, funds obtained through net increases in liabilities can be shown, also by type. Basically, this is what is provided by the Federal Reserve Board's "flow-of-funds" accounts. While this is not the place to describe capital accounts in detail, it can be seen that such accounts (plus revaluations) provide a direct link to sector balance sheets.

ESTIMATES OF WEALTH

The data compiled by Professor Goldsmith spanning the years 1900 to 1958, and extended by this writer to 1964 for this article, can be employed to illustrate some of the general uses of wealth estimates. No problems of consistency are involved, since Dr. Goldsmith's definition of wealth is essentially the same as that recommended by the Wealth Inventory Planning Study. In using his estimates, however, it is appropriate to bear in mind that they may entail considerable error. Many of the underlying data available to Professor Goldsmith were fragmentary, and some of the techniques which he employed in his pathbreaking effort were of necessity relatively crude.

The dollar value of total U.S. national wealth, on the basis of the Goldsmith data, grew some 25-fold between 1900 and 1964—from $88 billion to $2.2 trillion, an average annual rate of increase of about 5% (table at end of article). Approximately half the rise in U.S. wealth during this century is accounted for by inflation in tangible asset prices. Thus, the country's real tangible wealth has grown by about 2½% a year, on average. Since population growth has averaged about 1½% a year, real wealth per capita has risen at an average annual rate of about 1%.

Wealth, people, and product

	1900	1929	1948	1958	1964
Total U.S. wealth:					
In current dollars (billions)	88.0	439.0	928.0	1,703.0	2,223.0
In constant 1947–49 dollars (billions)	315.0	778.0	883.0	1,244.0	1,481.0
Gross national product		104.4	259.4	444.5	580.0
Expressed in 1964 prices		217.8	350.4	486.0	622.0
Population (millions)	76.8	122.4	147.9	175.6	193.4
Per capita wealth:					
In current dollars	1,145.0	3,586.0	6,274.0	9,698.0	11,497.0
In constant 1947–49 dollars	4,099.0	6,355.0	5,970.0	7,084.0	7,660.0
Net national product, in current dollars (billions)	16.0	98.0	250.0	417.0	577.0
Ratio of total wealth to net national product	5.6	4.5	3.7	4.1	3.8

Source: Wealth estimates are from R. W. Goldsmith, The National Wealth of the United States in the Postwar Period, tables A-1 and A-2, extended to 1964 by J. W. Kendrick, assisted by A. Japha. Net national product estimates for 1929 through 1964 are based on Department of Commerce numbers with depreciation revalued to current replacement cost by J. W. Kendrick; NNP for 1900 is based on a compilation by Simon Kuznets.

The forms wealth takes

[As a percent of total]

	1900	1929	1948	1964
Structures	39.8	43.2	48.4	50.2
Residential	19.8	21.8	25.2	24.7
Business	16.4	14.8	12.4	13.1
Public and other	3.5	6.6	10.7	12.4
Other reproducibles	27.5	28.1	30.9	30.9
Producer durables	7.4	8.7	9.4	10.9
Consumer durables	7.0	9.6	9.2	11.7
Business inventories	11.3	8.7	9.3	7.4
Monetary metals	1.8	1.1	3.0	.9
Nonreproducible assets	35.3	25.8	19.3	16.8
Agricultural land	18.4	8.7	6.4	5.7
Business land	3.6	5.2	4.2	3.9
Residential land	8.4	8.2	5.0	4.7
Public land and other	4.9	3.8	3.7	2.5
Net foreign assets	−2.6	2.8	1.4	2.1
Total wealth	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: R. W. Goldsmith and R. E. Lipsey, "Studies in the National Balance Sheet of the United States," vol. I, table 11, extended to 1964 by J. W. Kendrick, assisted by A. Japha.

Distribution of wealth by sectors

	Percent held			Percent owned		
	1900	1929	1958	1900	1929	1958
Government	7	9	13	3	2	−2
Federal	1	1	3	0	−2	−8
State and local	6	8	10	3	4	6
Agriculture	27	15	11	20	9	8
Nonfarm households	33	37	38	51	62	63
Nonfarm business	33	39	38	26	26	30
Unincorporated business	8	9	7	5	3	4
Nonfinancial corporations	24	29	30	18	20	23
Finance	1	1	1	3	3	3
All sectors	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: R. W. Goldsmith and R. E. Lipsey, Studies in the National Balance Sheet of the United States, vol. I, table 1.

As is shown in the bottom line of the table shown above, there has been a declining tendency during this century in the ratio of wealth to national product. (Since the wealth estimates are net of depreciation reserves, it is appropriate to relate them to net national product [NNP], which is gross national product less capital consumption allowances.) Whereas in 1900 wealth was approximately 5½ times the size of NNP, by 1964 the ratio had declined below 4.0. This, of course, is a welcome development, signifying that the nation's stock of tangible assets is becoming more productive—i.e., that the same dollar volume of wealth is producing more income. The improvement in efficiency would appear even more marked if the comparison were limited to the relation between NNP and the stock of producer wealth alone (capital-goods in the conventional sense and producers' holdings of land and inventories). This is because producers' wealth has fallen as a share of total wealth.

The broad types of tangible assets that compose domestic wealth are shown in the table on page 8 for selected years since 1900. At the most recent yearend for which data are available, 1964, about half of total tangible wealth consisted of structures, and about half of these were residential. Almost one-fourth of the total consisted of durables, with stocks of consumer durables slightly larger in value than stocks of producers' durable equipment. Land and other natural resources accounted for about one-sixth of total wealth, almost one-third of which was agricultural land. Inventories, including monetary metals, made up less than one-tenth of total wealth at the end of 1964.

Looking at the change in the picture during this century, one is struck first by the decline in the proportion represented by natural resources, from more than one-third in 1900 to one-sixth in 1964. In part this has been due to the fact that the acreage of farm land in use has shown little change since World War I; the increase in farm production has been due to rising yields per acre. Also, the value of residential land has declined in relation to total wealth, and to residential structures in particular.

The proportion of all structures in the wealth total has grown from about 40% to 50%. In part this was the result of an expansion in the supply of housing relative to other kinds of wealth; it was due even more to the relative rate of growth in the number and value of nonresidential structures used for nonprofit purposes—schools, churches, government buildings, etc.

Both producers' and consumers' durables have shown large relative growth in this century—together rising from roughly 15% to 25% of all wealth. Inventory stocks fell significantly, in part due to the declining relative importance of agricultural and other commodities in gross national product; but more importantly because of a declining trend in inventory-sales ratios. Monetary metals (gold and silver) were relatively less important in 1964 than 1900.

The wealth holdings of a particular sector of the economy, as emphasized earlier, typically differ from its wealth ownership or net worth. The extent to which this is true can bee seen by examining the data contained in the table at end of article. In 1958, for instance, nonfarm households owned 63% of the nation's wealth, while holding only 38% of it. The agricultural sector, by contrast, held more wealth than it owned. And the federal government, although holding some 3% of the nation's tangible assets (excluding military goods), actually had a minus net worth position, reflecting the fact that its debt exceeded its nonmilitary asset holdings.

The table also reveals some striking changes during this century in sector shares of wealth, on both a held and an owned basis. Most conspicuous is the drastic decline in the share of total wealth held and owned by the farm sector.

Notable also is the very marked deterioration in the federal government's net worth position. Here, however, the picture would be considerably different if the armed forces' military hardware were not excluded from the calculation. Actually, a persuasive case can be made for treating military goods in precisely the same way as other want-satisfying assets. Military goods, after all, furnish the much-wanted utility of national security.

The sharp increase that has occurred since the beginning of this century in the portion of total wealth owned by nonfarm households—from 51% in 1900 to 63% in 1958—dramatizes the mounting affluence of the consumer sector of the economy. In some ways, wealth figures give a better picture of changing consumer welfare than do income figures. The latter do not impute a rental value or "return" to consumer holdings of tangible assets, except for owner-occupied homes. This emphasizes the desirability of having wealth estimates to supplement the income and product estimates, since the two types of measures reveal different facets of national economic development.

This look at the highlights of Dr. Goldsmith's estimates gives some notion of the information and insights that can be provided by wealth statistics. Certainly, recurring estimates in some detail, by type and sector, and in current and constant prices, can significantly increase our understanding of economic movements and relationships, and thus our ability to predict and to formulate policy measures for achieving economic goals. Economists generally are only beginning to understand the nature and uses of wealth statistics. But it is possible that within the next decade or so balance sheets and wealth estimates will become as familiar and widely used as the national income and product accounts are today.

CONSUMER BALANCE SHEET

Asset and debt position of American consumer at end September 1965 showed 20.9 to 1 asset-to-debt ratio of all assets and debts excluding those involving homeownership where ratio was 2.7 to 1. Ratio of all assets to debts was 8.0 to 1. Owner's equity stood at 87.5% of consumer assets on September 30, 1965.

Current assets were $1,449 billion with $258 billion in currency and bank deposits, $115 billion in savings shares, $306 billion in insurance and pension reserves, $119 billion in government securities and $651 billion in corporate and other securities. NCFA's estimate of the value of investment company and other preferred and common shares owned by consumers at end September reflects a 5% rise in stock prices during third quarter 1965.

Fixed assets included $529 billion in homeownership and $267 billion as value of durable goods for a total of $796 billion. (Value of consumer held durable goods is total consumer durable purchases October 1956 through September 1965 depreciated 10% annually.) Total consumer assets as of September 30, 1965 were at $2,245 billion. Current liabilities stood at $82 billion and fixed liabilities of mortgage debt at $198 billion to bring total liabilities to $280 billion.

Net worth of American consumer—total assets minus liabilities—was $1,965 billion at end September 1965.

Grand recapitulation of the personalty and realty assets of the U.S. Government agencies, offices, and establishments of the Government, including the Department of Defense, as of June 30, 1966, 1964, and 1963 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Classification	June 30, 1966	June 30, 1964 [1]	June 30, 1963
PERSONAL PROPERTY			
Cash:			
With Treasurer of the United States	12,407	11,036	12,116
On hand and in banks outside the Treasury	1,224	689	738
Investments (other than public debt)	7,579	5,946	5,843
Accounts and notes receivable	6,183	5,179	5,269
Commodities for sale	3,434	4,673	4,942
Work in process	1,017	812	811
Materials and supplies	8,229	9,098	9,167
Loans receivable	31,717	30,347	28,361
Machinery and equipment	14,608	13,494	13,042
Other assets	13,996	13,660	11,815
*Department of Defense (equipment, supplies, stock inventories, etc.)	143,714	134,912	132,577
Corps of Engineers (equipment, etc.)	311	258	244
Total, personal property	244,419	230,104	224,923
REAL PROPERTY			
Departments and agencies (other than Department of Defense)	23,251	20,206	18,640
*Department of Defense (including Corps of Engineers, civil functions)	46,148	43,599	43,043
Architect of the Capitol [2]	496	471	459
Other (including construction in progress, etc.)	11,071	10,186	9,849
Realty donated or otherwise acquired at no cost [2]	284	290	295
Public domain acreage and mineral resources [2]	21,328	19,024	18,026
Total, real property	102,578	93,777	90,312
Total, all property	346,997	323,881	315,235

[1] Figures as of June 30, 1965, were not compiled.

[2] Computed at estimated present-day evaluation.

NOTE.—All properties reported are shown in gross amounts without deductions for allowances for losses and depreciation. Only wholly Government-owned corporation assets and other wholly owned assets are included. Assets held under trust arrangements and interagency assets, including public debt securities owned, are excluded. The properties have been valued at acquisition cost or estimated cost when the actual costs were not known. Public domain, donated property, and properties under supervision of the Architect of the Capitol are shown at estimated present-day values. Properties acquired as gifts or without cost to the Government are shown at estimated present-day values.

V. SEPARATE VIEWS OF THE REPUBLICANS ON H.R. 10328

The undersigned members of the Committee on Ways and Means oppose the enactment of H.R. 10328. The bill would increase the borrowing authority of the Government by an additional $29 billion, superimposed on an increase of $6 billion enacted less than 3 months ago. In the space of only a few months, the Congress is being called upon to enact debt increases totaling $35 billion, the largest since World War II. If the additional $29 billion of debt provided for in this bill is authorized, the limitation on the public debt—and in course the debt itself—will have been increased by $72 billion in 6 years of Democrat administration.

TABLE 1.—*Debt limit increases and expiration dates under Democrat administrations*

[Dollars in billions]

Public law	Period covered	Debt authorization
87-69 (H.R. 7677)	June 1, 1961 to June 30, 1962	[1] $298
87-414 (H.R. 10050)	Mar. 13, 1962 to June 30, 1962	300
87-512 (H.R. 11990)	July 1, 1962 to Mar. 31, 1963	308
	Apr. 1, 1963 to June 24, 1963	305
	June 25, 1963 to June 30, 1963	300
88-30 (H.R. 6009)	May 29, 1963 to June 30, 1963	307
	July 1, 1963 to Aug. 31, 1963	309
88-106 (H.R. 7824)	Sept. 1, 1963 to Nov. 30, 1963	309
88-187 (H.R. 8969)	Dec. 1, 1963 to—	
	June 29, 1964	315
	June 30, 1964	309
88-327 (H.R. 11375)	June 29, 1964 to June 30, 1965	324
89-49 (H.R. 8464)	July 1, 1965 to June 30, 1966	328
89-472 (H.R. 15202)	July 1, 1966 to June 30, 1967	330
90-3 (H.R. 4573)	Mar. 2, 1967 to June 30, 1967	336
(H.R. 10328)	July 1, 1967	365

[1] Prior authorization of $293,000,000,000 expired on June 30, 1961.

Excessive Domestic Spending Real Threat to the Economy—Not Vietnam

A Democrat administration and a Democrat-controlled Congress have proceeded on the assumption that there was no deficiency in our society which the Federal purse and the heavy hand of Federal regulation could not cure. We have seen each piece of legislation beget more legislation, each new expenditure by the Federal Government beget other expenditures.

The level of domestic spending in the administrative budget alone—wholly apart from our defense requirements in the war in Vietnam—has increased from about $46 billion for fiscal 1965 to approximately $66 billion for fiscal 1968. Two-thirds of the $28.3 billion increase in Federal expenditures from calendar 1963 through 1966—as measured in the national income accounts—is accounted for by nondefense spending. Moreover, as projected in the January 1967 budget message, over half of the proposed $37 billion increase in outlays from fiscal 1966 through fiscal 1968 is to be in nondefense programs.

To finance the expansion of its so-called Great Society—in the face of ever-increasing costs of the war in Vietnam—the administration proposes that the Federal Government go deeper and deeper into debt. This policy has resulted, not only in this proposal to increase the Government's borrowing authority by $35 billion in just 3 months, but inflation at home, an ever-increasing deficit in our balance of payments, disruptive pressures on the financial markets at home, and a concern over the integrity of the American dollar abroad. The American public is being called upon to pay for the administration's profligacy through higher prices, higher interest charges, tight money, and the jeopardy of the future of our economy.

DEBT INCREASE NOT ATTRIBUTABLE TO VIETNAM COSTS

While the proponents of the bill argue that the $29 billion additional debt increase is brought about solely on account of the war in Vietnam, the facts belie that claim. During the past 3 years—which encompass the period of the Vietnam escalation—Federal tax revenues have increased sufficiently to more than offset any costs attributable to the war. The administration seeks this debt increase notwithstanding its estimate that Federal revenues in fiscal 1968, even without a tax increase, will exceed by $28 billion tax collections for fiscal 1965. If the administration had held the line on the domestic front, the increased tax revenues—which are partly attributable to the "feedback" resulting from defense expenditures—would be more than adequate to finance all present and projected costs of the war.

The Secretary of the Treasury told the committee that the Vietnam war was a "costly war." But a budget was submitted by the administration for fiscal 1967, and again for fiscal 1968, on the assumption that we could fight this costly war and at the same time continue unrestrained spending on the domestic front. That is what this bill is intended to finance. It is the direct result of the administration's policy of "guns, butter, and jam."

ADMINISTRATION OFFERS NO ALTERNATIVE TO DEBT FINANCING

Before asking the Congress for a debt increase of $29 billion—superimposed on a debt increase of $6 billion only 3 months ago—the administration should be prepared to offer to the Congress constructive alternatives. The priorities of domestic expenditures should be reappraised in the light of the magnitude of the deficit. However, neither the Secretary of the Treasury nor the Director of the Bureau of the Budget were willing or prepared to discuss any reasonable alternatives.

Under interrogation by the committee, the Secretary of the Treasury steadfastly refused to consider a reappraisal of the priorities of domestic expenditures. He was not even prepared to discuss the proposed tax increase as an alternative to further debt. In a colloquy with Congressman Curtis, the Secretary made clear that he was offering for consideration solely a proposal for increasing the public debt, irrespective of any alternatives: [1]

"Mr. Curtis. This is what bothers me. I think there is an obligation on the executive to make these decisions. This is where we were last October. You wouldn't give us an estimate on expenditures because you said it was too difficult. Granted it was a difficult thing, but the previous estimates we had were back in the January budget which everyone knew were way out of date, so any new estimates were bound to be better.

"You are asking us to take serious action on fiscal matters in which an item of $4.7 billion is of considerable importance. Now, practically I would observe, the way the administration is handling this request for the 6-percent increase, that there will be none.

"Now, I think there is a responsibility of the administration to make a judgment here. You gave us a judgment in January that July 1 is when you wanted to have this surtax imposed. Now you have gone away from that date.

"Now, what date will you give us? If you haven't made it I think the administration should make it before this committee gets done considering this matter of the debt ceiling.

"Secretary Fowler. I am not here, Congressman Curtis, to fix any date at this time. I have tried to treat in my statement as frankly as I could the fact and I call your attention to the comments on page 8 that—

"'I am not here today to talk about the tax surcharge. That will be taken up in due course. Let me make a brief comment about the need for the increase.'

"Mr. Curtis. I read your statement, Mr. Secretary. I know that you have said that, but I as a Member of Congress still have a responsibility not just to my colleagues in the Congress as a member of this committee, but to the people to tell you that the administration has a responsibility to talk about it right now.

"I know you don't want to talk about it. That is clear. But I don't see how you can ask the Congress to render a judgment on the debt ceiling without some idea of what the administration now has in mind on the revenue side."

ADMINISTRATION CONSISTENTLY UNDERESTIMATES DEFENSE COST TO AVOID CUTBACK IN DOMESTIC SPENDING

Instead of acknowledging that the increased cost of the war in Vietnam requires a change in its domestic programs, the administration has consistently underestimated the cost of the war to avert any cutback in domestic spending. For example, in January 1966, the administration submitted a budget proposing defense expenditures of $60.5 billion. This estimate was challenged as unrealistic. However, the administration refused to revise its estimates. In the course of hearings on suspension of the investment credit—some 9 months later—the administration still adhered to its original budget for fiscal 1967. In fact, the President was assuring the people that total expenditures would be cut back by at least $3 billion. At a press conference held at Johnson City, Tex., September 8, 1966, the President was still adhering to his original budget estimates. The President said: [2]

"First, we are reviewing very carefully at the present time the appropriation bills that have reached us. There are some three or four of them that are being examined. There are some eight appropriation bills that have not yet cleared through the Congress. We do not know what they will contain.

"We are asking the executive branch to carefully review their appropriations that have been received and make recommendations as to the low priority items that can be eliminated. We have given a target goal, as you will observe in the message.

"When and as we receive the other eight appropriations bills, we will go through the same procedure.

"We are hoping that in light of this message, and the prudent attention and consideration that the Congress will be giving the remaining eight bills, that they will be somewhere in reasonable proximity of the budget and the request that I made earlier; namely, a budget of $112 billion 800 million." [Italic added.]

It was not until January 1967, when the administration submitted its budget for fiscal 1968, that the Congress and the people were told that fiscal 1967 expenditures would amount to $126.7 billion, not $112.8 billion reported a few months before. Thus, expenditures were $14 billion in excess of estimates made by the President in his news conference of September 8, 1966.

ADMINISTRATION PLANNING $29 BILLION DEFICIT FOR FISCAL 1968

It is not a case of being unable to forecast the cost of a war. Members of the Appropriations Committee of this body apparently have had no difficulty realistically forecasting the cost of the war in Vietnam. The failure of the administration to do so inescapably leads to the conclusion that the understatement of costs was deliberate, and not just an error in judgment. Not only did the administration fail to exercise fiscal restraint, but it kept from the Congress information on which the Congress might have exercised such restraint.

The administration has repeated the same tactic in the budget submitted for 1968. Last January, the administration's budget forecast a deficit of $8.7 billion. The Treasury now "officially" estimates that the deficit for fiscal 1968 will be $11 billion. Notwithstanding this, the administration seeks—and this bill provides—sufficient borrowing authority to accommodate a deficit of $29 billion for fiscal 1968. In effect, the administration is saying that it is not willing to rely on its own budget. In explanation, the Secretary stated: [3]

"As indicated in the table attached to this statement, the projected peak level of debt in fiscal year 1968 is $345.2 billion. This assumes an operating cash balance of $4 billion. Adding to this prospective 1968 deficit, now roughly estimated at about $11 billion, one arrives at about $356.2 billion as an approximately peak debt level in fiscal year 1969. That is before any contingency allowance.

"But as I have mentioned, the deficit in 1968 is vulnerable to greater than usual uncertainties, and we must take account of these in determining a prospectively secure debt limit level to carry through fiscal year 1969.

"One contingency is that Vietnam spending could bulge well above the current estimate.

"Another is the timing of the passage of the tax surcharge.

"And still another is the possibility that corporate tax receipts would fall short of estimates.

---

[1] Hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 90th Cong. First sess. on administration proposal to increase the public debt ceiling (May 15 and 16, 1967), p. 41.

[2] The President's news conference of Sept. 8, 1966, Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, p. 1242.

[3] Hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 90th Cong., first sess. on administration proposal to increase the public debt ceiling (May 15 and 16, 1967), p. 7.

"If I were to 'price out' each of these contingencies separately, the total could conceivably be placed somewhere in a $10 to $13 billion range of additional 1968 deficit. It is not reasonable, of course, to expect all the contingencies to work adversely; significantly higher military spending, if it occurred, would make tax action all the more imperative, and would also bolster revenues at existing tax rates.

"Still, the uncertainties are such that I believe it prudent to add a contingency allowance approaching $9 billion to the prospective peak 1969 debt level of $356.2 billion—leading to the recommended permanent debt ceiling level of $365 billion."

If we add to these "contingencies" the additional contingency resulting from the fact that the administration may be unable to borrow an additional $5 billion through the sale of participation certificates in fiscal 1968, the resulting deficit could amount to $29 billion.

When the administration requested the debt ceiling of $365 billion, the Congress and the people were told that this was intended to accommodate any required borrowing to June 30, 1969. When the Secretary was asked how much borrowing authority he would need to carry through to June 30, 1968, his conclusion was that because of these "contingencies" the Treasury would still need a debt ceiling of $365 billion. The Treasury is thus in an anomalous position. The administration adheres—at least for the present—to its estimated budgetary deficit of $11 billion for fiscal 1968. However, the Secretary of the Treasury has come before the committee and suggested that there are contingencies—not provided for in the budget—which could result in a deficit of $29 billion.

THREAT OF $29 BILLION DEFICIT REQUIRES BUDGET REVIEW

Facing a deficit of this magnitude, the administration and the Congress should "stop, review, and revise" our whole fiscal policy. The impact of such a deficit on our economy could be disastrous.

In a recent statement at Rochester, N.Y., the chairman of this committee emphasized the need for reappraisal. After pointing out that in the absence of a reappraisal, the budget deficit for fiscal 1968 could go as high as $29.2 billion, the chairman said:[4]

"I again emphasize tonight that we must continually reevaluate existing expenditure programs in the light of a very objective measurement of the benefits which they convey and the costs which they will impose. Every new program should be viewed not in terms of its first year cost alone, but in terms of what its cost will be 5 years from now, 10 years from now, or perhaps 15 years from now. It is only by this process that the full impact of spending programs can be objectively evaluated in terms of their demands upon the entire economy."

The administration in January submitted a budget for fiscal 1968 showing a deficit of $8.1 billion. Presumably, the priority of expenditures in the budget were evaluated on that basis. If it now appears that without remedial action the deficit may run as high as $29.2 billion, as the chairman of this committee estimates, the reappraisal of all expenditures and the adoption of new priorities are absolutely essential.

Regardless of the urgency of any domestic needs, realistic expenditure priorities must be established in the light of the potential budgetary deficit. It is imperative that the risk of such a deficit be minimized by cutting expenditures. Even some good programs should be deferred, and wasteful programs should and must be eliminated. This is the time for "austerity" at home.

At the same time, a potential deficit of $29 billion requires a new appraisal of revenue requirements. While no one likes to increase taxes, yet an increase must be considered as a step toward reducing both the deficit and the need for an additional $29 billion in borrowing authority.

FAILURE TO ACT MAY BRING MORE INFLATION AND TIGHT MONEY

A deficit of $29 billion for fiscal 1968—financed wholly through additional Federal borrowing—presents a real danger of escalating both price and interest rates in the domestic economy. The economy is already feeling the effects of the administration's fiscal policies. Bond prices are going down and interest rates are going up. The cost of living increased 0.3 percent in April, the largest price rise in the past 6 months. The housewife well knows what this means. If we are to avoid shrinking the food dollar, we must cut back on the Government's spending at home.

To the $29 billion of additional debt, there must be added existing debt which must be financed each year through relatively short-term borrowings. The enactment of this bill will set the stage for a repetition of the conditions which prevailed in the money market last fall, when interest rates reached the highest point in 40 years. Many businesses have not yet recovered from the effects of tight money last fall. A repetition of that mistake could have a disastrous effect on our economy.

IF BUDGET DEFICIT NOT $29 BILLION, DEBT INCREASE NOT NEEDED

On the other hand, if the contingencies which could result in a $29 billion deficit for fiscal 1968 are not real—and are not likely to happen—there is no justification for providing the additional $29 billion increase in the debt limit. For all practical purposes, an increase of $29 billion in the debt limit would remove any effective limitation on Government spending.

DEBT LIMIT CONTRIBUTES TO ECONOMIC STABILITY

There may be those who argue that the debt limit is meaningless, that this bill is just part of a "fiction" which the administration, the committee, and the Congress engage in each year. We disagree. For fiscal 1968 the Government will be paying more than $14 billion—that is more than $1 billion per month—in interest on the Federal debt. There is no "fiction." The increased debt provided for in this bill will entail the payment of about $1.5 billion in additional interest. That likewise is no "fiction." After national defense, interest expense is the largest item in the Federal budget.

The limitation on the public debt is a means whereby the Congress can review on an overall basis the administration's plans with respect to revenues and expenditures. If this review has not served a useful purpose in recent years, it is only because the administration has submitted misleading budgets—both with respect to revenues and expenditures.

In addition, the expenditure restraint that should be inherent in the debt limit serves to protect our currency in the international market. A meaningful debt limit is necessary for this protection. Under our monetary system, the Federal Reserve banks issue currency backed up by obligations of the United States. The debt limit fixes the maximum amount of those obligations which can be outstanding. Unquestionably, the restraint—which results from a realistic limitation on the amount of obligations outstanding—is necessary if we are to avoid a possible "run on the dollar" in the face of our deteriorating balance of payments. The magnitude of the debt increase proposed in this bill could seriously impair the dollar, and could well bring about an unprecedented demand on our depleted gold reserves.

Conclusion

In conclusion, before enacting an additional increase of $29 billion in the debt limit—making a total of $35 billion since the first of the year—the administration and the Congress have the solemn duty and obligation to reappraise the priority of domestic and foreign expenditures—and to consider additional sources of revenue—in order to reduce the need for an increase of this magnitude in the Government's borrowing authority. The administration steadfastly refuses to meet this obligation. Instead, the administration asks Congress to give it a "blank check" to run up a deficit of $29 billion. This we refuse to do.

The failure of the administration to meet its obligations to the American people leaves us no course except to oppose this bill. It is the only recourse left to us. Only by this means can we bring about a reappraisal of expenditures and revenue needs in the light of a threatened budgetary deficit which is intolerable.

JOHN W. BYRNES.
THOMAS B. CURTIS.
JAMES B. UTT.
JACKSON E. BETTS.
HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI.
HAROLD R. COLLIER.
JOEL T. BROYHILL.
JAMES F. BATTIN.
BARBER B. CONABLE, Jr.
GEORGE BUSH.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I would remind the Members of this House that this year we may very well spend $80 billion for national defense, and we must remember that during World War II our maximum spending—in fiscal 1945—was only $81 billion. So we are spending dollarwise at approximately the same rate we were during the height of World War II.

When you look at the budget this year that is included in this debt ceiling, you see approximately $80 billion directly for national defense. You see $14 billion for interest on the national debt, and over $6 billion for veterans' costs. These are all fixed expenditures over which we have very little control—and they total over $100 billion for defense and fixed expenditures.

So when you contemplate a total administrative budget of around $136 billion, you will see that there is about $36 billion left for all other Federal expenditures. When you put this in perspective by looking at our gross national product—which is well above $760 billion—it seems to me that this country is not in a great financial crisis when it spends $36 billion for nondefense items.

I believe in economy and I think every Member of this House does. But we must remember that when we vote on this bill to limit the Federal debt, we as Members of Congress cannot shift this responsibility to anyone else. It is our responsibility. We authorize and appropriate every dime of expenditure that is spent by the administration, and I think it would be a little bit embarrassing to sit back, as many Americans are doing, and witness us here attempting to shift this responsibility somewhere else.

These are not normal times. As I said before, our military expenses, dollarwise, are at the peak of World War II. We are in crisis today, and we are living in a world where crisis piles upon crisis. If we are going to tie the hands of an administration during these times by refusing to let them pay the bills that we authorized and appropriated, in my judgment we are failing the American people in our responsibilities to them.

---

[4] Speech by Hon. Wilbur D. Mills at 75th anniversary celebration, Security Trust Co., Rochester, N.Y. Monday, May 22, 1967.

I do not agree that we can have guns and butter. I believe there are a lot of things we should be cutting down on, but this great Nation can afford guns and bread. We have great problems here at home, and we cannot kick them under the rug. If we delay their consideration, they are only going to pile up on us. We must face up to the critical domestic problems we have.

I am not saying every dollar we spend is wisely spent, and our Appropriations Committee looks into these matters. I hope we will look into them more carefully in the future to make sure that they are spent wisely. But, believe me, we cannot cut $36 billion for nondefense, nonfixed expenditures and resolve the critical problems that face this Nation today.

At a time when every American is willing to tighten his belt, we need leadership; we need it on the administration level, and on the congressional level. Americans are willing to tighten their belts, if every other American and every other segment of our economy likewise tightens their belts. It is a great challenge to us and to the administration to come forward this year with that leadership.

If we need tax increases, let us put the tax increases where they are equitable. If corporate profits are too high, let us cut into corporate profits. If the only way we can achieve economic stability is to selectively return to excise taxes, let us go back to excise taxes. But let us use some imagination and ingenuity. There is no easy way out of this kind of problem. The suggestion of the committee minority, proposed this afternoon, sounds like an easy way out, but, believe me, it will not bear the light of examination.

I am going to talk just a minute or two about the part of the bill that is of most concern to me. That is the Secretary of the Treasury's recommendation that the committee lift the ceiling on long-term obligations to the extent of $2 billion, and redefine a U.S. Treasury note to extend its maximum maturity to a 10-year period. These notes have been historically limited to 5-year maximum maturities, and I remind my colleagues that they are exempt from any statutory interest rate limitations.

I so strongly opposed that proposal that I would be here in the well today talking against the passage of this bill had we accepted the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Treasury, in my judgment, is looking for an easy way out, too.

Certainly it would be easier for them to finance the national debt if there were no ceilings and if they could go into the marketplace and sell long-term obligations at 6 percent or 7 percent. It would make their job easier. But what would it do to the American economy? What would it do to our basic standards of interest rates that we have lived with these last 48 years and under which we financed two major wars?

Let us go back. What was the long-term interest rate in World War II? Approximately 2.5 percent. We financed World War II at 2.5 percent. We financed Korea at about 3 percent. Under present and existing law, it is completely possible to do the same thing today. It does not take any act of Congress. It takes some change of values and a change in the tone of leadership on the part of both the administration and the Federal Reserve Board and on the part of Congress, too. It is another part of the belt-tightening process that, if this crisis gets any deeper, we are going to have to look into—because we cannot finance a major war at the kind of interest cost we are paying today.

So when this matter came before the committee I made my position clear. As the chairman said, the Secretary and I were instructed to talk over the matter and to arrive at an agreement. We had a very lengthy conversation. We went into the matter in great depth. I will not say that we arrived at a mutual agreement. The chairman indicated that was the case, but I would say it was, on the part of the Secretary, a "reluctant agreement." The formula we arrived at, which is in this bill, eliminates the $2 billion of long-term indebtedness free from the interest rate request and confines the change in definition of notes to an extension to 7 years. The Secretary finally conceded that this would give him some flexibility in his efforts to lengthen the debt.

This compromise will give the Secretary some flexibility. This will allow him considerable authority in his efforts to control the lengthening of the debt.

I believe it is a reasonable compromise between the Secretary's original position, which I so strongly opposed, and my concern that the 4¼ ceiling on bonds be preserved.

I am serving notice that as of right now, in my judgment, this is a long-term solution, not an eating away solution, and I will not now or in the future agree to further lengthen the 7-year definition of a note. I will continue to be adamant in my opposition to any lifting of the long-term ceiling which is now in the law, and has been for 40 years.

I do this on the basis of the fact that the administration and the Fed do have the power and the authority, if they wish to use it—and we have a responsibility to use our fiscal power and our authority—to so manage the economy so that the interest rate structure will be kept at a level which permits the whole of the American economy to survive.

Last September we were able, by action in Congress and by the Fed, to turn the tide of interest rates and get them going down. I am greatly concerned today that the trend has turned again, that the long-term interest rate structure is increasing again. The money markets are tightening. We could very well be in another financial crisis this summer.

This is why I call upon the Federal Reserve System and the administration to take strong action to keep the economy under control.

Mr. Chairman, I join this afternoon with the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means in recommending to the House H.R. 10328. I have discussed with many of my colleagues, and with the administration, my serious reservations for some features of this important legislation. However, after careful deliberation, I have concluded that the bill we are now considering is a sound attempt to place a realistic limit on the public debt, while providing the Secretary of the Treasury with some useful tools for discharging his responsibilities in the arena of debt management.

Only 4 months ago, the Congress was required to suspend its business and grant an urgent "temporary" limitation of $336 billion to the "permanent" public debt limitation of $285 billion. The Secretary of the Treasury was scrambling to pay the Nation's bills in the wake of the tightest money in 40 years and under the extraordinary demands of a major military commitment. America's involvement in Vietnam has not lessened, and we are threatened today with even more serious problems in the Middle East. To fulfill these obligations swiftly and surely, this Congress must provide for possible extension of the public debt, while maintaining the financial discipline implicit in the Second Liberty Bond Act.

Temporary limits on the debt automatically expire with each fiscal year and, as we have seen in recent years, frequently require temporary extensions. These temporary limitations have become so commonplace that they have lost all impact as a restraint to spending, and are merely an encumbrance on legislative planning.

The committee's recommendation that we abandon the temporary designation will put an end to this deception. Further, by setting the limit at $365 billion, we may hope that the Congress will have ample opportunity to frequently review the Government's fiscal operations without the pressures which accompanied last February's consideration of the public debt limit.

Before continuing, I wish to emphasize that the large increase in the limit is not an invitation to expand our nonmilitary expenditures at this time. In view of our international commitments, the Congress must exercise vigorous restraint and postpone unnecessary domestic spending.

Another provision of this bill includes certain participation certificates in the debt limit. During our earlier consideration of the public debt limit, H.R. 4573, I emphasized my consistent record in opposition to these financial instruments. At that time, I recommended that we suspend further use of sales participations. Since that time, the House has in fact removed authorization to sell $2.4 billion of these certificates. In the light of this development, there is considerable doubt whether or not the administration will succeed in marketing an estimated $5 billion of these expensive certificates in fiscal 1968. But if all or part of their expectations are realized, the accounting for these sales belongs under the debt limit.

When our committee discussed H.R. 4573 on February 8, it seriously considered including participation sales under the limit. At that time, I recommended comprehensive study of our budgetary and accounting procedures before the matter could be definitively settled. Since those discussions, the President has established a Commission on Budgetary Concepts. I am hopeful that this Commission will determine the proper treatment of all contingent liabilities, including the participation certificates.

Mr. Chairman, the final provision of the bill before us today recommends that the maximum maturity for U.S. notes, as authorized in section 18 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, be extended to 7 years. As many of my colleagues are aware, this recommendation represents a compromise between the Secretary of the Treasury's request for flexibility in debt management and rigid adherence to the 4¼-percent ceiling on Government bonds of over 5 years, which has served us so well for half a century. Because of the role I played in achieving the 7-year recommendation, I would like to explain in some detail my position on this matter. As a Representative from the Nation's No. 1 lumber-producing State—vitally dependent on a healthy home-building industry and mortgage market—I have stood in Congress for 11 years in opposition to high interest rates. Through the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations, I have condemned policies of the Executive and the Federal Reserve Board which have permitted interest rate escalation. The homeowner, the homebuilder, the small businessman, the farmer, the person living on a fixed income, States, and municipalities—and the Federal Government—simply can't afford the debt service costs which peaked last summer and still prevail in the long-term money markets.

When the House considered H.R. 4573, I stood on this floor and warned the Congress of the consequences of abandoning the 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term Treasury bonds. I am proud to say that the House did not accept a recommital motion which had as its objective the elimination of the long-term ceiling. By a record vote of 155–261—although final passage possessed a margin of only 16 votes—the House of Representatives emphatically rejected abandonment of the 4¼-percent ceiling.

Last month, Secretary of the Treasury Fowler came before our committee with a more modest request. To gain flexibility in debt management, he averred that it would be helpful to permit $2 billion of bond issues above the traditional ceiling, and to extend the definition of U.S. Treasury notes to a maximum maturity of 10 years.

The Secretary faces some very difficult problems in the management of the public debt, particularly in this time of national emergency. We are in a war of major proportions, and face the threat of additional involvements in our determination to build the foundations for a peaceful world.

If it were not for Vietnam, we would have a balanced—perhaps even a surplus—budget and extension of the public debt would not be necessary. But we have these commitments, with their attendant budgetary problems, and it is the duty of the Congress to provide for the financing of our obligations.

Three previous times in this century we have encountered similar war budgets with substantially the same laws as today. The 4¼-percent ceiling was adopted to meet the obligations of World War I, and served us well throughout World War II and the Korean conflict. The Treasury financed the Second World War at long-term interest rates in the vicinity of 2.5 percent, and the Korean war at rates under 3 percent. The average maturity of the public debt for World War II was close to 9 years and almost 7 years for the Korean involvement. What permitted these reasonable interest costs and healthy maturities? During both World War II and the Korean war the administration carefully coordinated their public debt operations with the Federal Reserve System. When bills, notes, and bonds were issued to finance the war, the Federal Reserve would buy at fixed prices in the open market. This policy successfully kept interest rates down, permitting reasonable carrying costs for the enormous public debt, assuring confidence in the Government's obligations, and easing the reconversion to a peacetime growth economy at the cessation of hostilities.

This coordination was abandoned in March of 1951. The Federal Reserve, in their belief that high interest rates and tight money would slow post-war inflation, stopped pegging Treasury issues. Interest rates on Federal bonds were left very much to the whims of the money markets.

The Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board has the same authority today to coordinate its operations with Treasury borrowing that it did during the earlier military crises. Let no one say that the Government does not have the power under existing law to restore reasonable interest costs to public financing.

The underlying assumption of those who wish to lift the 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term issues is that the Treasury is subservient to the money market. During times of balanced budgets—when debt operations are primarily refunding—this may have some validity. But when a national emergency exists and severe dislocations in our economy result, the Government must exercise its ability to be the controlling factor in the marketplace.

The Federal Reserve need not acquire every Treasury issue or set the interest rate. The mere presence of the Fed in the marketplace—and this was demonstrated again last week—will force interest rates down in all sectors of the money market.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation must not permit the self-serving money interests to profit from the war economy. We have the means of financing our obligations at reasonable and sensible interest costs below the 4¼-percent ceiling.

The Secretary of the Treasury is alarmed by the diminishing average maturity on the public debt, and I, too, am deeply concerned. The average length of the Federal debt has declined to 4 years and 5 months, and Secretary Fowler fears the consequences of sole reliance on short-term financing if interest rates zoom back to their lofty heights of September 1966. Further, he notes the failure of the Treasury to issue a new obligation of more than 5 years since May 1965.

How did this situation develop? As my colleagues know, I have repeatedly scored the administration and the Federal Reserve for their overreliance on monetary restraints to combat inflation. The tight money policies pursued in 1965 and 1966 by the executive branch brought us to the brink of financial panic last September, and today accounts for the dilemma the Secretary is faced with in his debt management operations.

First, let us consider the diminishing average maturity on the public debt. I noted earlier that the average maturity of the public debt was nearly 7 years during the Korean war. Except for a slight improvement in the early sixties, it has deteriorated seriously since 1950. During the Eisenhower administration, the Treasury pursued a peculiar policy—it refrained from issuing long-term obligations during the boom periods because of high interest costs—and it refrained from issuing bonds in the three recessions of the 1950's because it feared loss of liquidity by tying up investors in long-term securities.

By 1960, the average maturity was down to 4 years, 4 months. In this decade, the Kennedy-Johnson administrations attempted to improve the situation. Between 1961 and 1965, long-term public offerings of Government bonds jumped from 22.2 to 40.8 percent of all coupon issues. However, in mid-1965, interest rates in the long-term marketplace made further bond issues prohibitive. Of course, as I have said previously, there has been no effective Federal Reserve-Treasury coordination of public debt financing.

The Treasury has complained about the statutory ceiling for years. The supposed problems caused by the 4¼-percent ceiling during this period are questionable. Even when bonds could be issued below this level, there was a negligible lengthening of the public debt. Part of the difficulty can be laid at the door of the Federal Reserve. In amassing its present portfolio of $45 billion in Federal securities, the record shows that the Federal Reserve has followed a bills-only policy since March 1963. My learned colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], in a carefully prepared statement in Monday's RECORD traced the history of this policy and showed that a mere 3.07 percent of the Fed's $45.5 billion portfolio is in over 5-year bonds.

It should be pointed out that last week the Federal Reserve engaged in heavy buying of long-term bonds. Whether this represents assistance for the mortgage and other long-term markets, or is a revival of Operation Twist—buying long and selling short—for balance-of-payments reasons, or some other consideration, will not be known for some time.

The Fed muffed one opportunity already this year to really help the long-term market. In February, 20-year Government bonds relaxed from their high of 5.12 during the tight money crisis, to 4.44 percent yield in the secondary market. Prompt and immediate action by the Fed and the Treasury at that time would have kept the decline going—to the benefit of the entire long-term marketplace and the Nation. Instead long-term rates have rebounded, and these same bonds are now yielding 4.91 percent interest.

In fact, municipal, corporate, and Government bonds are on the way back up the interest ladder. The best municipal bonds are trading around 4 percent—their September high was 4.17; and the corporate Aaa are close to 5¼ percent. Conventional new home mortgage rates, which lag behind other market prices, show a miniscule improvement at 6.41 percent from their 40-year high of 6.49 last December. To put the mortgage rate situation in perspective, a $15,000 conventional 20-year mortgage which went at 5½ percent in December 1965, would cost $2,000 more for the home purchaser at today's 6½ percent rate.

Market experts see many reasons behind the failure of the long-term rates to follow the improvement in Treasury bills and investment paper. Banks, remembering the pinch last year, are investing heavily in short-term securities and making short-term loans, in expectation of a tight money Federal Reserve policy later this year. Corporations, unable to borrow long in sizable amounts, are floating bond issues, and clogging the long-term markets with unprecedented demands. The corporations have sold $4.6 billion worth of bonds on the public markets in the first 4 months of this year. Corporate treasurers then turn around with the proceeds of a bond issue and invest in short-term securities rather than let the money lie idle. Many traditional investors in mortgages are staying away from the market or turning elsewhere. Insurance companies and pension funds are lured away by the attractive yields in corporate and municipal bonds. Savings and loan associations are still consolidating their position from last year's drain on their resources.

Under these circumstances, it is hardly advisable for the Treasury to enter the long-term marketplace. If the Treasury was permitted to disregard the 4¼ percent ceiling at today's rates, we would tie up large portions of the debt at 5 percent costs for 10 and 20 years. It is also reasonable to conclude that the dislocations in the money market would be even more severe if new high-priced long-term Treasury bonds were active in competing for funds. Therefore, I refused to accept the Secretary's request for authority to issue $2 billion in Treasury bonds irrespective of the statutory ceiling.

The Secretary's recommendation that the U.S. note be redefined does have some merit, particularly if it results in a lengthening of the debt.

The problems of borrowing by governments and private borrowers are affected far less by the average maturity of the debt than by the overall adequacy of the supply of credit. Yet, it is advisable to improve the mechanism for extending the maturity of the debt only when money supply is expanding.

By the way, I have no quarrel with the recent policies of the Federal Reserve in this regard. In the first quarter of 1967, money supply increased by a 6.5 percent annual rate. The net free reserve condition of member banks of the Federal Reserve System remains around $250 million, indicating that the Fed will continue its easier money trend.

Increasing the length of the debt in a recession, or in a plateau economy, does have certain benefits. Selling longer securities may be done for the purpose of retiring shorter debt, thus tending to drive short-term rates down. This encourages banks to expand loans instead of using their funds for short-term investment. It therefore assists in meeting the demands of business.

Of course, with proper Treasury-Federal Reserve coordination, buying long and selling short in a plateau period will result not only in a healthy lengthening of the debt, but may have some balance-of-payments benefits. An expanding money supply must be available under these circumstances to avoid an adverse effect on housing and other economic areas sensitive to long-term rates.

The Secretary informs me that roughly half of the 5- to 10-year debt outstanding is in 6- and 7-year maturities. This portion constitutes 5½ percent of the total outstanding issues. To permit the Secretary to utilize this portion in his present debt management difficulties would provide some modicum of relief.

It is for these reasons that I sympathize with Secretary Fowler's desire to lengthen the debt and support the committee's recommendations to permit an extension of Treasury notes to 7-year maturity. In February, the Treasury issued their most recent offering of 5-year notes, at a 4¾ percent interest cost. I would hope that the Secretary resists the temptation to use the proposed authority to tie up the U.S. Government for 7 years at this type of rate. Any additional competition that might be added to the long-term market at this time would be particularly unfortunate.

Mr. Chairman, before concluding my remarks I would like to make some brief comments on the allegation that the size of the Federal debt is the greatest inflationary threat to our economy today.

The only way that you can realistically assess Federal spending and the Federal deficit is in relation to the Nation's ability to produce. As a percentage of our gross national product, Federal spending has declined steadily from a high of 134 percent in 1946 to 41 percent in 1967. Far from dramatically increasing, the Federal deficit itself has expanded only 16 percent since the end of World War II. By contrast, the debt of State and local governments has multiplied eightfold, debt of individuals is 820 percent as large, and corporate debt is 640 percent greater than it was in 1946.

Any increase in spending does have an inflationary effect. But, as the tight money crisis of 1965 and 1966 proved beyond a doubt, the inflationary villain is to be found in corporate overexpenditure on plants and equipment, overextension of consumer credit, and high interest escalation.

I warned this House, on March 16, that the restoration of the investment tax credit was premature. The expectations of the money market outlined above, and the repeated predictions of the Council of Economic Advisers, lend credence to my fear that we may have re-created the conditions for another tight money crisis.

On the consumer credit point, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an unpublished Commerce Department study cited in the May 31 Wall Street Journal. According to the article the average family in the United States spends a fantastic 22 percent of its income in debt service charges on mortgages, installment charges, and other loans. This percentage has doubled since 1949, and suggests that consumer credit has provided an inflationary source of tremendous proportions.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I would like to emphasize again that now is the time for the Federal Reserve Board to live up to their public trust; now is the time for the administration to take the initiative in coordinating their policies with the Federal Reserve; now is the time for the Congress to exercise their fiscal responsibilities to eliminate nonessential programs. The immediate issue today is to raise the public debt to levels consistent with the demands of the Treasury and the financial discipline of the Congress. The real issue is to provide orderly growth for a wartime economy at reasonable interest costs. H.R. 10328 will contribute to these goals.

I recommend favorable consideration of the committee's bill, H.R. 10328.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there has never been a time in the history of this Nation that our fiscal situation has been in a worse mess than it is today and it has developed through policies adopted by the past two administrations and condoned and even approved by the majority of the Members of Congress.

Budget estimates have gone from bad to worse, and those submitted by President Johnson in January seem to depart farther from reality as each month passes. To go into any detail on the miscalculations for the current fiscal year and discuss the illegitimate deductions made for the so-called participation certificates would be repetitious of the contents of the minority report and dialog that has been presented on the floor of the House since the inception of the participation certificates program of gimmickry.

Relating to the public debt—a nationally known economist and syndicated writer said:

> The outlook is appalling, yet few Congressmen seem to be appalled by it. Mountains of figures are dull and confusing. When the administration presents three different budgets—administrative, cash, and "national income accounts"—confusion and apathy only increase.
>
> Besides—

He says—

> criticizing big spending and deficit financing seems to have proved futile in the last 35 years and looks even more futile today.

Yet the consequences of deficits get constantly more serious. Huge deficits mean huge Government bond offerings to pay for them. This prospect has been depressing bond prices and raising long-term interest rates. Increased budget deficits also lead to increased deficits in the balance of payments. In sum and substance, we face a situation in which the confidence in the dollar is undermined and huge deficits have caused inflation which has eroded the purchasing price of the dollar.

During the six terms that I have been a Member of this legislative body, I have been subjected to certain criticisms in certain places, and particularly during political campaigns, for my opposition to particular authorization and appropriation bills and to new and sometimes wasteful spending programs. There are those of us who are frank to admit that everything that might be desirable in the way of federally sponsored programs is not always fiscally feasible. It is also a fact that opposing certain Federal programs naturally deprives various segments of our citizenry of the bounties of the Federal dole which can often be translated into votes for more liberal spenders on election day. Failing our responsibility—we had a responsibility to be prudent, we failed in that.

Even those things which go beyond our domestic frontiers have been furnished from Washington without fiscal judgment and often without rhyme or reason. For example, 10 years ago I suggested in opposing the foreign aid bill that we were pouring money down the drain in the case of arming small nations around the world and I suggested at that time that we divide our aid bill into three separate and distinct categories: technical assistance, economic assistance, and military assistance.

Looking at the world situation today and recognizing that we have poured nearly $4 billion into the Arab bloc, $350 million of which went for military aid to these nations, is either evidence of the folly of our actions or a confirmation of the position I have taken in this regard since that time.

Other programs involving big spending have been punctuated with waste and maladministration as the monstrosity of bureaucracy grows. There is hardly a Federal program that has not mushroomed to the point where Federal tax dollars are dissipated in a shameful manner.

If ever there was a legislative measure which embraces a demand for some serious reevaluation of both foreign and domestic spending programs, it is the bill before us today. Its roots go even deeper than the increasing burden upon the taxpayers of this country. It goes deeper than the specter of an eventual socialistic system. Rather, it resolves itself to a matter of good, commonsense in the conduct of our fiscal affairs. The theorists who have nurtured the Keynesian philosophy must today recognize the pitfalls of the thinking that seems to have permeated our Government hierarchy in recent years.

And with all of the bloated programs, well meaning as they may be in some cases and politically motivated in others, the Great Society that they were intended to create leaves us with a view of a pretty dismal picture of turbulence both at home and abroad. Perhaps it is not too late to reconnoiter and make some reappraisals and that is what I sincerely hope this Congress will do in the months ahead. Never have we had a more demanding responsibiilty.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mrs. MINK). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Madam Chairman, every time we bring up the question of the increases of the debt limit for discussion the statement is made over and over again that the good faith and credit of the U.S. Government is at stake, and that under no conditions should we permit a situation to develop where the U.S. Treasury is unable to pay its bills and meet its obligations.

Of course, Madam Chairman, economic chaos would develop and the credit of the United States would be placed in jeopardy. This point is made, however, in order to make it appear that we have no choice but to vote for the pending debt increase legislation. And, this point has been made several times here today.

I should like to point out at the outset, Madam Chairman, that all of us agree that we must pay our bills. We must meet our obligations. We should all stand together in demanding that whatever revenues are necessary to pay our bills to provide for a sufficient national defense, particularly at a time when American troops are fighting on foreign soil, should be provided.

But, Madam Chairman, I do not agree that an arbitrary increase in the debt limit is the best answer to this problem. I think at best it is an oversimplification; it is the most dangerous and irresponsible way to solve the problem and, at the very worst, it is the most unfair way, because we pass it on to future generations to pay.

I agree one of the good features of the bill is we are eliminating this fictitious $285 billion temporary increase. There is nothing temporary about a debt limit, any more so than there is anything temporary about a tax increase.

As I said before, there is nothing more permanent than a temporary Government building built during the war here in Washington. But experience tells us that the "temporary debt ceiling" runs a close second. It is silly to think that at the rate we are going we are ever going to be able to reduce our national debt. In fact, unless the administration shows a willingness to hold the line on domestic expenditures, we will be increasing the debt ceiling again next year.

When I said we were considering an arbitrary increase in the debt ceiling, I did not mean it was arbitrary from the standpoint of the Committee on Ways and Means. There has been a lot of study and hard work given to this entire problem by the committee, by the staff of the Joint Committee on the Internal Revenue Taxation, and particularly by our chairman.

Our chairman has done a splendid job in prodding and probing and trying to find out the proper amount to raise this national debt ceiling. I think the committee has done an excellent job with the information that has been made available to it.

I think the increase is arbitrary, however, from the administration's standpoint, because the debt level proposed in this bill is based on a series of deceptions and misrepresentations by the administration over the last 2 years. We must oppose this bill in order to require the administration to submit an honest budget, recognizing that the demands of the Vietnam war require that new priorities on domestic spending be established.

The administration has consistently told the American people that they can have guns and butter—that they can finance a major war in Southeast Asia and continue to undertake multibillion-dollar programs of social welfare on the domestic front. In order to convince the American people of the possibility of attaining both these goals, the administration has consistently underestimated the cost of the Vietnam war.

In its budget estimates for fiscal 1967, the administration budgeted $10.3 billion for the Vietnam war. As late as September of last year the administration was still adhering to its budget estimates submitted to the Congress in January 1966. Not until 1 year later—January 1967—did the administration admit to the Congress that the Vietnam war would cost nearly $20 billion, almost twice its original estimate. However, during the interim, it was apparent to everyone that the administration's estimates were no longer valid.

The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Congressman MAHON, indicated last August that expenditures of the Vietnam war were greatly underestimated, possibly by as much as $15 billion for fiscal 1967. The chairman of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, Senator STENNIS, made similar statements.

In addition to understating the cost of the Vietnam war by 100 percent, the administration attempted to understate expenditures by a new gimmick—participation sales. Participation sales certificates are in essence a new Government security which is outside the debt limit. The proceeds from these sales are accounted for as a reduction in Government spending. Through this "gimmick," the administration understated the size of the deficit.

Finally, receipts were distorted through a series of one-shot revenue measures—accelerated corporate payments, graduated withholding, and semimonthly deposits of income and payroll taxes withheld by employers. This temporary bulge in income made the Government's fiscal affairs look much healthier than they actually were.

Many of us in the Congress pointed out

that the administration's economic and fiscal forecast, as well as its proposals for domestic spending, were based on misleading and outdated estimates. Instead of revealing the true facts to the Congress and the American people, the administration claimed that we were opposed to programs for the poor, programs to solve the problems of the cities, aid to education, and other proposals. This is simply not true.

We were concerned that by misleading the Congress, vastly increased expenditures for domestic programs, when added to the Vietnam expenditures, would cause inflation, drive up interest rates, result in economic dislocation, and adversely affect our balance-of-payments problems. Unfortunately, the administration remained obstinate and our prediction came true. Interest rates reached their highest level in 40 years last fall. The Consumer Price Index increased from 109 in March of 1965 to 115 in March 1967—an increase of 6 percentage points.

When Republicans in the Congress asked for accurate cost estimates for the Vietnam war so that priorities on domestic expenditures could be adequately considered by the Congress, the administration accused us of wanting to make "the poor pay for the war." In fact, the poor are paying for the war because of the severe inflation caused by the administration's policies. Inflation is a cruel tax affecting the poor more adversely than any other element in our society. As under previous Democratic administrations, the poor are paying more and they have less to pay it with.

The American public expressed its disapproval of this performance at the polls last November, but the administration failed to get the message. The nearly disastrous performance in connection with the 1967 budget is being restaged in connection with the 1968 budget. Expenses of the Vietnam war are deliberately being underestimated. Expenditures and the deficit are being artificially reduced through the participation sales gimmick.

The Congress is being urged to provide both guns and butter, and is being misled about the price of both items. Interest rates are going up again. Inflation, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, is creating a real problem for all of our citizens. The housewife, the homeowner, and particularly the poor are paying for the deceptions of this administration.

Of particular concern to me is the impact the administration's deception may have on the international financial situation and America's balance-of-payments problems. The willingness of foreigners to refrain from cashing in dollars for our dwindling gold reserves depends on the faith they place in the fiscal integrity of the U.S. Government, and the determination of the administration to maintain a sound dollar.

For the second year in a row the administration is showing the world that its credibility is suspect. They underestimated defense expenditures for Vietnam in fiscal 1967 by $10 billion; in fiscal 1968 they have underestimated these expenditures by at least $6 billion. They underestimated the deficit for fiscal 1967 by around $10 billion; in fiscal 1968 they underestimated the deficit by perhaps $29 billion.

This administration shows no readiness to maintain the value of the dollar. President Johnson is encouraging—even demanding—that large domestic expenditures be authorized by the Congress at a time when we may be running the largest deficit since World War II. The increased demand generated by this expansionary policy is bound to increase imports—a critical factor in the decline of our export surplus over the last 2 years. By driving up the price of American goods we impair the ability of our industries to compete in the international market and drive down exports.

It is time for Congress to call a halt to this fiscal subterfuge and strike a blow for integrity on the part of the U.S. Government. By voting against this bill we can require the administration to provide the Congress and the American people with realistic estimates about the Vietnam war, estimates provided to the Business Council only last month by the familiar "administration sources." We can demand that the administration develop domestic spending priorities based on the $20 to $30 billion deficit actually contemplated for fiscal 1968, rather than the $11 billion estimate the administration is adhering to for political purposes.

Certainly the relative priority of proposed expenditures must be readjusted if we are facing a deficit of nearly $30 billion instead of the $9.7 billion deficit on which the January budget message was predicated.

Economic necessity requires that we abandon the fiction that the increase in our national debt limit is due to the increase in defense expenditures.

Expenditures have been going up in all areas for the past 6 years.

Military expenditures have gone up 54 percent since 1961.

Nondefense expenditures have gone up 59 percent since 1961.

We are still adding more to nondefense programs and still trying to have more and more butter and jam along with the guns. We are not exercising restraint commensurate with the present fiscal posture of this Nation.

When we were considering an education bill 2 weeks ago providing for an expenditure of approximately $3½ billion, the principal argument was whether or not the State or the Federal Government would exercise more control over the program, and which plan would give the States and localities the most money.

Not one word was mentioned as to the necessity of adding the cost of that program onto the national debt, or that the Federal Government was not taking in enough revenue to pay for the cost of the program.

There was no great amount of consideration given to the shifting of responsibility from the local communities to the Federal Government; or that the program itself would result in the construction of additional schools or better schools in this country, or that the States and communities were better able to solve their educational problems.

The primary issue discussed during that debate was which side or which group could present themselves as providing the most money for schoolchildren and motherhood.

Of course, the poverty program is another example of a nonessential boondoggle. We can use thousands of examples from that program.

I have a very interesting example that appeared in the Washington Post of May 29, written by William Raspberry—a Negro. I point that out because whenever you criticize a program in which Negroes are involved, you are charged with being inconsiderate of that particular group.

The title of this particular article had reference to summer jobs going begging here in the Washington area. This is the type of thing that is making this debt increase today necessary.

He pointed out in this article that the National Capital Housing Authority—and incidentally this is a federally financed organization and a federally financed program—was advertising a stay-in-school program in this particular housing development, offering jobs, 16 hours of work per week for teenagers living in this public housing development at the rate of $1.40 an hour.

After expensive advertising in the project itself, only 98 applications were made for the 154 available positions.

Then there were 300 full-time jobs available for teenagers from 16 to 21 years of age—full-time summer jobs and only 43 applicants showed up for 300 vacancies.

Then there were 50 adult positions open as supervisors and only four applicants—and those four were women.

There were 20 other vacancies for laborers in other housing projects and there were no applicants for those jobs.

Mr. Raspberry concluded that the so-called poor people did not seem to want to work and suggested that the United Planning Organization—which is the group that administers the poverty program—should send some of their warriors out to find out what is the trouble.

There are a lot of other "political mileage" programs that should never have been originated that cost billions of dollars of Federal funds. They also involve the loss of untold billions of dollars because of a lack of production and a lack of incentive that is created as the result of such programs.

That is the reason why this debt increase is necessary this afternoon. It is not due to an increase in military costs. Of course, the second alternative is a tax increase and I think we are going to have one. It is going to be unpleasant, undesirable and politically unpopular—but so is inflation and so is tight money and so are high interest rates—all of which are inevitable with continued deficit financing.

In conclusion, Madam Chairman, we should reject this bill before us because it is based on inaccurate, incomplete, and outdated information. The Founding Fathers provided the legislative branch of the Government with the "power of the purse" in order to insure a balance of powers within our constitutional system. Under our Constitution, a revenue-raising measure must originate in the House, the most representative body. Congress will be abdicating these powers if it continues to exercise them without the necessary facts. I urge all of my colleagues to weigh these issues carefully and vote against any increase in the debt until the administration provides the American public and their representatives in the Congress with a new set of expenditure priorities and with realistic revenue estimates based upon the actual facts—not the underestimates, overestimates, contingencies, and other myths that have been making up the fiscal dream world the administration has been inhabiting.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my opposition to the administration's request for a $29 billion increase in the debt ceiling. The administration still maintains that there will be only an $11 billion deficit, but, at the same time, they continue their program of spend, spend, spend, and request an increase in the debt ceiling of $29 billion. The inconsistency between the statements of the administration is matched by the inconsistencies of the administration's fiscal policy of spending more than it takes in. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the administration and the Congress to honor their solemn duty and obligation to reappraise the priority of domestic and foreign expenditures, and to consider additional sources of revenue, in order to reduce the need for an increase of this magnitude in the Government's borrowing authority. I must oppose this bill because the administration has failed to meet its obligations to the American people, and its ever-increasing budgetary deficit is intolerable. Mr. Chairman, we must meet our military needs, but to reduce our budget deficits we must place domestic spending on a priority basis.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSH], a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the requested increase in the debt ceiling. First, let me be very clear on one point. My opposition is not based on the belief that the only way to live within our means as a country is to vote against the ceiling increase. The Secretary of the Treasury, of course, must have funds to pay the bills, and some of those must come, in time of tremendous budgetary deficit, from increased debt.

Rather, my opposition is twofold. The increase is too large and it is too fat. A close analysis of the Treasury's figures indicates this.

Second, I strongly subscribe to the principle of discipline that comes or should come from a proper use of the debt ceiling. The Secretary made it clear that he was tired of having to come before the Ways and Means Committee over and over again to ask for an increase, and I detected that the Treasury's position was that this exercise was somewhat of a waste of time.

My feeling is the opposite. As long as we operate with mammoth deficits, I think it is most useful to have the type of hearings we have had this year on the debt ceiling. These hearings get before the people the financial position of the country, and they highlight the accuracy or inaccuracy of Government accounting, and in the hearings, under the very fair chairmanship of our distinguished chairman, every member of this Committee on Ways and Means—and I speak as the most junior member—is afforded ample opportunity to ask questions, and I for one reject the contention that these hearings are not a very important exercise.

In addition, if the ceiling is increased prudently and cautiously—prudently so that the bills can be paid and cautiously so as not to encourage a reckless use of debt—then the ceiling can in fact exercise a certain discipline on the administration and on the Congress.

Had this committee used the Treasury's figures alone, we could get by in fiscal year 1968 with a ceiling of $345.2 billion without contingencies.

In order to give the Secretary realistic operating room, we should add to this "no contingency" concept, which incidentally includes $4 billion of cash on hand, the following contingency:

First, $3 billion normal contingency allowance;

Second, $700 million—the Secretary's estimate of the increased cost of the war in Vietnam;

Third, $3.4 billion for no tax increase; and

Fourth, $5 billion of projected participation sales which come under the debt ceiling.

These contingencies total $12.1 billion. So you add this to the $345.2 billion and you get a ceiling of $357.3 billion.

In discussing contingencies, there are two "supercontingencies." One is the war in Vietnam. Frankly, I was disturbed when the Secretary in his statement indicated that the war would cost only $700 million more than his original estimate. In fairness, he did suggest that this was only an estimate. But the very day of the Treasury's appearance before our committee, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, my colleague from Texas, was being quoted on a $5 billion increased cost, and so were many other people.

So it may very well be that the $700 million is already hopelessly outdated.

The other "supercontingency" is the tax increase. The committee took out any revenues for a tax increase in computing the necessary ceiling.

My own strong conviction is that before you can stand a $29 billion deficit, a figure mentioned as a possibility by our able chairman, before we can contemplate such a whopping deficit, we will have to have a tax increase.

I have been saying, "Let us cut down domestic spending." I still say that, but we are in a costly war, and we cannot simply finance it entirely from increasing the debt. I recognize the political liabilities of proposing a tax increase, but it was one thing to talk about no tax increase with a projected deficit of $11 billion and it is something else again to talk about no tax increase with a deficit of $29 billion.

The chairman mentioned that taxes at certain levels can result in lower total revenues. As one who studied economics to a certain degree, I agree that certainly we must study any increase carefully, but we simply cannot let this country's credit go down the drain. Unpopular though it may be, it is becoming increasingly clear to me that, because of exorbitant projected deficits, we are going to have to have a tax increase.

I for one will not consent to finance this solely through Government borrowing.

I do not want the housewives to have to pay that extra-high milk bill to pay all this increase, and I do not want our credit abroad to deteriorate any further—this so-called balance-of-payments drain.

So these two supercontingencies—the increased military costs and the tax increase—will work in opposite directions, and certainly should hopefully offset each other.

A ceiling of $358 billion would exert a certain discipline. It would give the Treasury leeway based on their own figures, and it would exert a tight discipline based on the more lenient committee figures.

I would vote for and support a debt ceiling of $358 billion, because increased borrowing is absolutely essential; but, I will vote against the $365 billion ceiling recommended by the committee.

I commend the Treasury and the administration for their attempt to gain relief from the long-outdated 4.5-percent interest restriction on long-term borrowings. I support the Treasury's original request to permit 10-year notes to be classified as short-term and to exempt $2 billion of bonds.

Present restrictions force the Treasury to borrow in the short-term market. They force short-term rates up to exorbitant rates. I wish the committee had adopted the original Treasury request, but at least the committee compromise is a step in the right direction.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Committee to vote down the recommended $365 billion ceiling.

A tighter figure will exert more discipline and, should this discipline fail, it will result in the administration's having to tell the Congress, and thus having to tell the people, where this country stands.

Such a disclosure can only be worth while.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, any difference that I have with my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, is certainly not a personal difference. We have never in our lives—we are neighbors down in the great Gulf Southwest—had a personal difference. We do not have one now and will not have one in the future. But he has strong feelings about his convictions and I have strong feelings about mine. I know that the distinguished chairman [Mr. MILLS] is one of the finest and best Members of the U.S. Congress. If we want to pay a Member of Congress the greatest compliment that we can, we say that he has the respect and admiration of his colleagues. Certainly we can say that about the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

In our colloquy a while ago, this afternoon, Mr. MILLS took the position that the Federal Reserve notes issued by the Federal Reserve banks, printed in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing—a Government institution here—were secondary obligations of the U.S. Government, contingent liabilities. Of course, that is the first time that argument has been brought up in the 30 years that I have interrogated members of the Federal Reserve, and the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, and others, so I will just respectfully have to refer to my friend the fact that certainly that is an "operation twist."

It is kind of going around a different way from what the facts have been during the time I have been here, about 39 years. That is a new approach, a new attack.

I can assure the gentleman that his statement, although sincerely made, is not justified, because the law is very plain and direct. That was one of the principal discussions in the passage of the Federal Reserve Act. All the time, in the Aldrich bill, the Republican bill, they insisted upon having the money that was issued obligations of the central bank which they wanted to create. They did not get their way. Mr. Carter Glass insisted that they be obligations of the U.S. Government, that we did not want any money in circulation that was issued by banks, that we wanted Government money. Mr. Glass' insistence prevailed.

That is very clearly drawn out in the reports of the various committees handling this legislation and the amendments thereto over a long period of time.

There can be no doubt that these direct obligations of the Government are handled by our fiscal agents, the Federal Reserve banks. Our fiscal agents owe an obligation to the Government and the people. They are supposed to be our trustees and looking after us. If they are, when they trade those Federal Reserve notes for U.S. Government obligations they should either cancel them or issue instead obligations bearing no interest. That has been suggested by a lot of economists. It would save a lot of money. I will not go into this matter here since I have discussed it previously.

We have a question here which has been called to my attention, concerning language in the Ways and Means Committee report. I read in the report which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] presented to the House of Representatives, on page 11:

> The extension of the definition of U.S. notes to those debt instruments with a maturity of not over 7 years will not have any effect on interest rates but will afford the Secretary of the Treasury aid in preventing still further shortening of the maturity of the debt.

I should like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas a question. Did the gentleman mean, when he says that, by increasing the length from 5 to 7 years, interest rates will not be raised above what they have been on the 5-year notes?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Yes. The statement in the report is the statement made to the committee, in the executive session of the committee, by the Secretary of the Treasury that this action changing the definition from 5 to 7 years would not have any effect on interest rates.

I wish to add that, when people downtown make statements to me I like them to stand up. If I should find that this would have the effect of raising interest rates generally I would ask the Secretary of the Treasury not to use this vehicle. He was positive in his statement to us that he merely wants to act to lengthen the average maturity of the securities issued by the Government and that this action is not intended to have and will not have any effect raising interest rates.

Of course, that is his judgment.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. But that is the basis on which we accepted the provision.

Mr. PATMAN. May I ask a specific question, please? Does the gentleman believe that they will keep interest rates down as low as or lower than they were on the 5-year notes now outstanding—the coupon rate?

Mr. MILLS. I could not say that. The point is the Secretary expressed to us his own judgment, which caused us to take this action, that the mere extension alone of the maximum maturity of these notes from 5 to 7 years would not result in any increase in interest rates.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is voting for this believing that is true?

Mr. MILLS. Absolutely. I would expect it to be borne out by the facts.

Mr. PATMAN. And if there is any attempt to do anything else, you will raise more sand than an alligator when the pond went dry or something like that? You will really get on them?

Mr. MILLS. Well, I will get my friend to help me do it. I think that would do some good.

Mr. PATMAN. Fine. Then on the motion to recommit I do not think my friends on the Republican side or others can escape the argument that they are trifling with the House or being political in offering a straight motion to recommit, because you could have had the opportunity to vote against the previous question. Then you would have the whole bill before the House for amendment, and for any changes or corrections. However, you chose to vote against that course. Now you will present something which you cannot expect to win. Therefore, when it is all over you have just divided the House in a way where you could not expect to get any consideration. So I hope that motion does not prevail, because it would just be helping our friends on the minority side to get out of a political hole, and I do not think we owe that obligation to them at all. Not at all.

The gentleman from Arkansas made a good statement about the fairness of the committee chairman and the committee in granting every Member, even the most junior Member, everyone, an opportunity to ask any question that he desired to ask. You know, that is my way of conducting a committee. That is my opinion of the proper way to conduct a committee. In fact, when I became chairman, I made sure first that every Member had a few minutes in the first go-around. Then, if they wanted more time, why, they would get that time. I assume that that is the way the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] is operating his committee. Since he has given every member an opportunity to ask any question he wants to, I do not see where we would be doing a thing except spinning our wheels if we were to vote to send this bill back to the committee, because they have already had full and complete hearings on it. It would just be a question of delay. Why go through the same thing again?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not care whether you sent it back to the committee. I would just as soon you killed it when it comes up for passage and vote against passage. I do not know what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. PATMAN. I understood your motion to recommit would be a straight motion to recommit. Is that right?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is my intention. Yes. Why? Do you want me to give it to you so you can use it for instructions or something?

Mr. PATMAN. No.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not quarreling with whether you send it back to the committee or not. I do not know whether I will ask for a rollcall vote on that or not. I will on final passage.

Mr. PATMAN. I would say that the gentleman in good grace could not expect it to be adopted, because if he really wanted this bill up on the floor where it could be considered, he could have voted against the previous question, and with the Republicans sitting here with the number that we have, we would have done well enough to defeat the previous question. But you chose not to do that.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It would not have accomplished anything.

Mr. PATMAN. So you had a chance and you did not use it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. You just would have wasted more time. I do not want to waste more time than is necessary.

Mr. PATMAN. All right. Then, they will offer a motion to recommit. So, Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting that we vote against the motion to recommit when it is offered. I have never failed to vote for an increase in the national debt when it could be justified, although I do not think it should be passed without deducting the $45 billion held by the Federal Reserve in the Open Market Committee portfolio. I have had a chance to present this matter to the Committee on Ways and Means. My testimony is in the hearings. I have had a chance to discuss the rule and I have had a chance to discuss the bill here this afternoon. It is essential that we vote for the debt increase. Therefore, I hope that the motion to recommit is voted down.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I resent most strongly the very fact that for the ninth time since I entered Congress in 1963, the Members of this body are considering another raise of the public debt limit. In view of the record which illustrates we have voted 14 times to raise the "temporary" debt ceiling since the "permanent" debt ceiling of $285 billion was set in 1959—how can we expect to put any real stock in the bill before us now. Today, every Member of this body must surely realize how meaningless we have made the "permanent" debt figure. I would further question how any of us can believe that we will today be voting on any debt dollar limit which will be realized other than on paper.

I am reminded of a currently popular "potato chip" commercial which dares us to eat "just one." The public debt of this Government seems to have also become the irresistible "potato chip." Every time we have raised the debt ceiling, we have merely served the appetizer for those who see no limits to government spending. I can only describe the action requested of us today to set a "permanent," and I put that in quotes, debt ceiling—as a fiasco.

This practice to which we have become so accustomed makes our budget procedure meaningless, casts great doubt on our fiscal integrity, a very dark shadow on our respect for the taxpayers we represent and most important—it further adds to the great burden we are packaging for our descendants.

It seems to me we have assumed the posture of a man who lives in a great house and gives the impression of great wealth. All come to him for money, he works to preserve his wealthy image, and keeps up a great front while the roof is collecting weather-worn holes. Ultimately, the roof falls in. Gentlemen, instead of raising our ceiling, we should concentrate on repairing it. We should show some intention to lower it back into reality.

Let us make clear to the taxpayers that the second largest item of our Federal expenditures for fiscal 1968 is the interest on the national debt—the interest alone. May 25, we passed and sent to the Senate an appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and other related agencies in fiscal 1968—which totaled $13 billion, a whole billion short of our "dead horse" payment on the national debt interest. It is time to bring this outlandish expenditure into perspective, to emphasize that it constitutes this year the second largest item on our budget, and to make clear that this expenditure constitutes nearly 12 percent of those estimated by this Government for fiscal 1968.

Let me repeat my remarks of February 8 of this year, the day which marks the most recent raise of our "temporary" national debt limit. I am fully aware of the problems which might result should the Congress refuse to increase the debt ceiling. But I know of no other way to sound the warning, to impress upon the "spenders" that we go this far and no further. There is virtue in a balanced budget and a limit to what we can afford. These principles are not so outmoded as to be ignored in our "Great Society." The time has come when those who believe in a sound fiscal policy must vote against further proposals to increase our indebtedness.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing quite so temporary as the ceiling on the national debt. I can remember when it was temporary because we actually thought it would be reduced. Now, of course, it is temporary only with regard to how long it will be before it must be increased again.

It is therefore somewhat refreshing to find that we have dropped the word "temporary" and admitted that the new ceiling is permanent. That is about the only place where the administration has acted with candor as far as the Federal debt is concerned.

The Treasury pegs the deficit for fiscal 1968 at $11 billion, and the committee chairman estimates it will be closer to $29 billion. Since this is a repetition of what happened last year—when the administration deliberately underestimated the deficit it was running up then—the chairman's figures are probably closer to the truth.

Support of this bill in effect sanctions approval of the President's spending policies, and that I cannot do. I am opposed to the wild spending which is forcing our consideration of the increased debt limit. It is high time we brought a little commonsense into this debate over fiscal policies.

The President has tried to mislead the American people in another respect. By increasing his domestic program, he has given the illusion that we are not really at war, that we proceed from day to day on a business-as-usual basis.

However, the people of this country realize we are in the midst of a war and that our efforts must be channeled toward victory abroad. Why cannot the President see this?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, if this administration has been consistent in any one thing it is this: passing legislation that would permit the hiking of our national debt limit.

The present statutory debt limit is $285 billion, and I cannot help but remember that when I first came to Congress in 1961, the actual debt limit was somewhere in the area of that figure. In just a few years—6 years, in fact—the temporary debt limit has leaped to $336 billion, and now we are being called upon to establish a new permanent debt limit of $365 billion.

This means we are being asked to approve an increase in the debt limit of $29 billion over the present temporary debt limit and to heap an $80 billion increase on top of the old statutory debt limit of $285 billion. This difference between the old statutory debt limit and the new debt limit that would be permitted by law represents a debt growth averaging over $13 billion per year.

That is a lot of money, Mr. Chairman, and I gather little consolation from assurances given by the administration that this level of debt is all right because it can be absorbed by our expanding gross national product. Nor do I gain much comfort from the contention by the administration that this debt is really of no consequence since, after all, we only owe the money to ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that we cannot push this matter of the national debt off to the side with such general references, because this very same national debt has a definite effect on our economy, either on the inflationary or deflationary side.

For instance, if the national debt is handled through our financial institutions, the effect can be inflationary, with the prices of things in the store going up and the contents of the consumer's pocketbook going down.

By the same token, if the national debt is financed through sales to the general public, this would have a deflationary effect, and this would act to throw a wrench into the wheel of our economy, bringing low-scale buying activities and unemployment.

In short, then, the national debt can exert a negative influence of one sort or another on our economy; hence, it should be kept to a minimum.

The time has come, then, when we must abandon this "sky is the limit" philosophy with respect to the national debt, and we must exert some effort to control it.

To do this we are either going to have to increase taxes or cut Government spending, and remembering that the American taxpayer already is overburdened, the answer is not in more taxes.

Mr. Chairman, we must cut back on Government spending, for we are trying to do too much. Not only are we trying to finance a war in Vietnam, but we are also striving to carry out a lot of domestic programs that are not absolutely essential. In short, not only are we trying to have guns and butter, but we are also trying for cake, too.

The result of this is that our deficits each year are increasing, and deficits are, of course, the seed of our national debt.

For instance, early this year President Johnson talked in terms of deficits ranging between $4 billion and $8 billion on the fiscal 1968 budget. Just recently, however, Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee indicated that the U.S. Government might go into the red $29.2 billion by next year. On top of this, Secretary of the Treasury Fowler indicated that the deficit could reach $24 billion; that is, if the 6-percent surtax recommended by President Johnson were not imposed—and there is a serious question on this—and if corporate tax receipts fell.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should be sharply conscious of the fact that there is a limit to the "stretchability" of our economy. Just like a rubberband, it can stretch only so far before it snaps. I think we have reached the danger point, and I feel it is high time we introduce some sense into the management of our fiscal affairs. High national debt holds the seed of economic troubles—why sow the seed?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I have not been a party to the extravagant spending of this and the last Congress, and I have, through the years, voted against many authorization and appropriation bills because of the need to keep down Federal expenditures. However, I have not felt that a vote against raising the debt limit would cut expenditures. I have always felt that it would only be a protest matter without any effectiveness for economy. So I plan to vote for raising the debt limit this time, because of the fact that to do otherwise would not seem to actually save money and it might at this time hinder the progress of the war in South Vietnam. If the debt limit lift is defeated and if the result actually does save money, it may well be that this is the last time, for some considerable time in the future, that I will vote for any debt limit lift legislation. I recently received the following letter from Secretary of the Treasury Fowler on this subject:

> THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
> *Washington, June 5, 1967.*
>
> Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. BENNETT: In reply to your question: "What will happen if the Congress fails to pass legislation to increase the debt limit?"—the simple and direct answer is that the United States Government would not be able to pay its bills or repay all of its maturing debt after June 30, 1967.
>
> Under existing law, the temporary debt ceiling of $336 billion reverts, after June 30, 1967, to $285 billion. We estimate that the actual level of debt, which was $331.1 billion on May 31, will be about 327 billion on June 30—some $42 billion above the ceiling which would take effect the next day.
>
> The debt in existence at that time would have been issued legally, but without Congressional action to raise the ceiling from the $285 billion level it would not be possible to issue new debt—including even the refunding of outstanding obligations as they came due.
>
> The cash balance we would have on hand at that time—amounting to perhaps $7 billion—would not last long. Whether that limited amount would be used to meet current Government payments—for example, to purchase defense material, pay salaries, or pensions—or for repaying maturing debt obligations, is beside the point. The point is that without action on the debt limit the United States Government would not be able to meet its lawful obligations, and that is not a tolerable position to be in.
>
> One might ask how long $7 billion of cash could last. The mere repayment of the first three weekly issues of Treasury bills coming due in July would use $6.9 billion—and that cash would not be available unless all other Treasury cash expenditures were shut off completely; that would mean no payments on defense supplies, no payments of Government salaries, no payments of Government pensions, Social Security, unemployment benefits, and so on. Not only could no new savings bonds be sold, but we could also run out of cash to redeem existing bonds.
>
> Last January, in spelling out the need for an immediate increase in the temporary debt ceiling, because an excessively tight debt limit had been interfering with normal Treasury cash and debt management operations since December 1966, I pointed out that unless the ceiling was raised by the beginning of March the Treasury would be able to pay only about half of the anticipated bills coming due in the first half of March.
>
> The situation facing us at the end of June will be far more serious than that of early March. On that earlier occasion, it was a question of gradually pressing up to, and then beyond, an existing debt ceiling of $330 billion. At the end of June, however, the current legislation provides a precipitate *drop* in the debt ceiling to a level, as noted, some $42 billion below the actual level of debt anticipated for June 30.
>
> This country has never defaulted on its obligations, and I do not believe the Government should be put in a position where its ability to fulfill its obligations is jeopardized.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> HENRY H. FOWLER.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 10328 and associate myself with the views of the minority members of the House Ways and Means Committee as found in the accompanying report on pages 17 through 23.

In making its second request for more deficit financing within 90 days, the administration would have us believe that none of this would be necessary if it were not for the war in Vietnam. Certainly, no one who has served in the Congress during the last 7 years can take such a statement seriously. Since it took office in January 1961, the administration's fiscal policy has been one of planned deficit spending. They have been notoriously consistent. By the end of this month they will have increased the debt by over $40 billion. They now wish to have the authority to increase it another $29 billion by the end of next June, even though they refuse to say clearly for what this borrowed money will be used. It is the same old tactic that they have used the last several years, of keeping the budget picture as confused as possible, of deliberately underestimating defense spending in their budget until domestic programs are pushed through Congress.

There are only two choices facing Congress today—either to give a "blank check" to the administration or to protest the administration's failure to exercise fiscal restraint at a time when we are confronted by heavy responsibilities in Vietnam.

I would close by offering some unsolicited advice to the party in power, in the words of some of its most famous forebearers. In a letter to Governor Plumer in 1816, Thomas Jefferson wrote:

> I place economy among the first and most important of republican virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared.

Then on July 4, 1824, Andrew Jackson wrote:

> If a national debt is considered a national blessing, then we can get on by borrowing. But as I believe it is a national curse, my vow shall be to pay the national debt.

In a speech in Pittsburgh, July 30, 1932, Franklin Delano Roosevelt said:

> Let us have the courage to stop borrowing to meet continuing deficits. Stop the deficits.

These are sentiments to which I can subscribe without reservation.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the administration's request for a $29 billion increase in the debt ceiling. The adoption of H.R. 10328, would mean that the Federal Government's borrowing authority has been increased by $35 billion, over and above the budget requirements, in the past 3 months.

On February 8, 1967, during the debate on H.R. 4573, the most recent bill to raise the public debt ceiling to $336 billion, I stated that:

> It is time the Federal Government should be established on a sound fiscal policy. For too long, our government has been practicing deficit spending.

Today I want to reassert this position and emphasis that deficit spending is unwise for the U.S. Government as it is unwise and unsafe for an individual to attempt to live on borrowed income.

The Johnson-Humphrey administration has tried to blame the Vietnam conflict for the need to raise the debt ceiling by $29 billion. However, we all know that this is not true. The real reason is attributed to the administration's desire to finance an expansion of its Great Society programs in addition to supporting our military efforts in Southeast Asia.

President Johnson proposes that we go deeper into debt to finance his domestic programs. The level of domestic spending in the administrative budget, apart from the defense requirements in the war in Vietnam, has increased from $46 billion for fiscal 1965 to approximately $66 billion in fiscal 1968.

As is evidenced by the administration's desire for an increase in the public debt, there just is not enough money in the budget to provide both.

However, instead of cutting domestic spending or offering other alternatives, Congress is asked to authorize an increase in the Government's borrowing power. The administration's unwillingness to exercise restraint in its expenditures and its failure to advise the Congress and the American people of its spending intentions has created the current crisis to raise the national debt limit.

Realistic expenditure priorities must be placed on domestic spending in order to reduce the risks involved in deficit spending. Such spending has resulted in inflation, an increasing deficit in our balance of payments, disruptive pressures on U.S. financial markets, and a concern over the integrity of the American dollar abroad. Regardless of the apparent urgency of some domestic needs, it is imperative that we cut domestic spending to a minimum.

The interest charge on the national debt is the second largest item in the budget for fiscal 1968, or $14.2 billion. To put it another way, 6 cents out of every tax dollar is used to pay the interest on the national debt. If H.R. 10328 is passed by this Congress raising the total debt to $365 billion, the budget requirement for interest will greatly increase in the next budget.

Before enacting an increase of $29 billion in the debt limit, the Johnson administration and the 90th Congress should reappraise the domestic and foreign expenditures in an effort to reduce the need for an increase in the Government's borrowing authority. However, since it is apparent that the President is not going to meet this obligation, there is no course left to this Congress than to oppose H.R. 10328. Only by this means can we bring about a reappraisal of expenditures and revenue needs in the light of a larger budgeting deficit.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I speak in opposition to H.R. 10328, the bill before us today which will provide a permanent debt limitation of $365 billion.

Let us clearly understand what this bill would do. After increasing the borrowing authority of the Federal Government by $6 billion just a few months ago, we are called upon again to increase the debt limit by an additional $29 billion. This increase of $35 billion in 1967 would be the largest annual increase since World War II.

This increased borrowing cannot be justified by our defense spending for the war in Vietnam. Two-thirds of the $28.3 billion increase in Federal expenditures in the calendar period 1963–66, measured by national income accounts, was caused by nondefense expenditures. It is these domestic programs—the Great Society, give-away program—which have padded the national budget to such a point that we are now asked to raise the debt ceiling permanently to $365 billion. The debt limit does not have to be raised to meet the costs of military operations in Vietnam—Federal tax revenues have increased sufficiently to pay for these costs. The debt ceiling must be increased only if we are to continue to support and encourage this administration's follies: flowers and shrubs at every stop sign, $45,000 flagpoles, some hundred thousand dollars to study local speech dialects and close to $10,000 to study comic strips, among other items in the budget.

We are faced with the possibility of a deficit of 29 billion dollars, the economic consequences of which do not need to be elaborated. These figures are of such immensity that to most people they are meaningless. Let us put them in perspective and conceive of them as the personal burden of each of our children, of each of our grandchildren, and of each of our great-grandchildren—a burden which we pass on to them in an action which is unworthy of us as men of honor. To each of the 408,677 people in the First District of Wisconsin, whom I have the privilege of representing in this Congress, this increase since 1960 represents an additional indebtedness of $294; for each four-member family in my district, it means an additional indebtedness of $1,176.

In fiscal 1968 the Government will be paying $14 billion, not for hospitals, schools or roads, but solely to pay the interest on the national debt. If this debt limit is increased today, it will require the expenditure of an additional $1.5 billion in interest payments.

Since June 1961 I have repeatedly and regularly opposed increasing the debt limit, and I have urged this body to join me in opposing it. Again, I say let us reassess the policy of deficit spending, which now appears to be an accepted part of U.S. budgetary practice, and let us seek to return to the concept of a realistically balanced budget and a sound, reliable dollar.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, this is the seventh year in which I have been privileged to be a Member of this House, and I believe during that time the debt ceiling has been increased at least 10 times. Today, it is proposed that we make a very major increase for an 11th time, in less than 7 years.

For the record, I want it known that today I will again vote against the increase in the debt ceiling, as a protest against this entire procedure.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the way it has been used, I see absolutely no reason to vote a so-called ceiling on our national debt. I believe it is worse than useless, and I believe there is an urgent necessity for the Congress to find a much more effective device by which we can discipline ourselves in the management of this Nation's fiscal policy.

More than 4 years ago, I made this same point in a statement which appears in volume 109, part 7, page 8622 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that year, and I want to repeat today a few of my remarks on that occasion.

The debt ceiling, as it has been used, is a farce. Regardless of what it may be in theory, in practice it has become simply a device for fooling the public, and actually for fooling the Congress. It is a device by which we pretend to have some degree of control over expenditures, when actually we do not.

The way we operate it, there is in fact no debt ceiling or limit. It is only seeming. It is only pretense.

The Congress, urged on by the White House and others, simply approves excessive spending, without any real concern for the amount of revenue available, nor concern for whatever the legal debt limit may be at the moment. And then, after the fact, after the money has been committed, the legal limit is adjusted upward, merely as a matter of convenience and necessity.

I repeat, that procedure has become a farce, simply a ritual dance to divert the taxpayers' attention from our own lack of fiscal responsibility.

Therefore, as a personal gesture against what seems to me an irresponsible procedure, I have consistently voted against the many debt ceiling increases on which the House has acted in recent years. I will do so again today.

Experience has proved that whatever so-called ceiling or limit we vote today, the Congress and the White House will simply ignore it, and certainly no later than next year we will again be called upon for another increase. I submit that we would be far more honest with the taxpayers and with ourselves, if we did without the limit entirely and instead began to develop the willpower here in the House, and somehow a more responsible procedure by which we might exert some real self-control, some genuine discipline over the limited revenues actually available to us to spend.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is time that Congress responds to the will of the people. They are crying for help from the only body that can help them, their elected representatives. It is the responsibility of this body that spends the citizens money, to use good judgment, and to be aware that our Government cannot be, all things to all people. If it tries, the national debt will continue to rise, and someone will have to pay the bill.

Responsible Government must be brought about if we are going to stop our Nation from being spent into ruin.

The people of America are being taken for a ride by their own Government, a Government that taxes and taxes, and spends and spends, in order to perpetuate its own ends.

Who else will look after the taxpayers of this great Nation, other than we, their duly elected representatives. I wonder how long the taxpayers can be burdened before their will is broken.

I ask you to join with me in defeating this $29 billion debt increase as a warning to all elected officials that the day of the big spender is a thing of the past, and that responsible government for the people and by the people has been restored.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, the easiest thing for the Government to do is to go into debt. For as long as the Government can go deeper and deeper into debt—the more it can spend and spend and spend, then the more it can, in turn, expand the grasp of the Federal Government and its influence and control over the individual citizen.

And that has been the pattern—borrow, borrow, borrow; spend, spend, spend—and let the country sink deeper and deeper into debt.

I believe this country is already too deeply in debt. It is time—it is past time—to take a new look at automatic increases in the national debt. If we can stop this present debt increase—then perhaps the administration will take account of the fact that the 90th Congress will not give rubberstamp, blank-check approval to the proposed 1968 administration budget. That budget is not built on the premise that we ought to have lean, efficient, minimum government at the Federal level.

Rather its basic character is that of continually growing, continually expanding Federal Government that lays continuous layers of Federal bureaucracy on the individual American citizen. And if there is no limit to the amount of debt that this country can incur—then there is no responsible limit to what an administration can spend when it has a majority in both Houses of Congress. And if there is no meaningful limit to the Federal debt—then there is no limit to the amount of strangling Federal bureaucracy that can be imposed upon the people of this country.

The annual interest on the existing Federal debt is over $14 billion. That means that over 10 percent of our Federal budget must be spent on interest alone.

And is this annual interest expense of $14 billion productive? Does that wasteful interest cost of $14 billion rebuild the slums of Harlem? No. Does it provide new schools or new education programs? No. Does it provide for a broadened Headstart program? No. Does it provide needed funds for increased social security benefits—or funds to mount an all-out attack against the causes of inflation? No. Does it provide for the national and international defense—does it pay for our program of military, social, economic, and political activity in Vietnam? No. Does it serve to reduce the need for the 6-percent surtax the President has called for; does it possibly serve to reduce the need for our present high level of taxes so that we might reduce taxes in the amount of $14 billion? No. The answer to all these questions, I am sorry to say is, "No."

The interest cost is nonproductive. It does not add to national vitality; it saps national vitality. And this is not the only damage that is done.

Let us consider inflation—the vicious, unrelating increases in the cost of living that have become the hallmark of the present administration. More debt for more Federal spending and ever-increasing deficits means more inflation. Are we, as a Congress, going to say no to more debt, and more deficit, and more inflation? Well, as one vote of 433 votes in this Chamber, I am going to vote to stop the inflation; to stop the soaring deficits and put an end to the easy expedient of loading more debt on present and future generations.

With my single vote, I hope to strike one blow for economy in Government; one blow for fiscal responsibility; one blow for the individual citizen; the man on the street who is sick and tired of endless Government spending, endless Government debt, endless deficits and endless inflation.

If we who vote against this debt increase lose when the votes are tallied, then the country loses, and each citizen who is hoping and praying for some relief from inflation will lose with us. But unless someone here in the U.S. Congress is willing to stand fast in the fact of a policy of Government by giveaway, then what hope is there for the individual citizen who tries his best to balance his own budget and be a responsible citizen?

Today, the interest on the present national debt is costing the American taxpayer over $25,000 a minute; $25,000 a minute, 60 minutes an hour, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year. Are we going to let this cost balloon even higher? I hope not. This is not sound government, it is time for all public officials to stand up and say it is time to stop the slide into easy debt increases, which only create hard inflation.

There is no middle course on this issue; either you stand with the individual citizen and oppose these continuing increases in the Federal debt, or you take the low easy road of more debt, more Federal bureaucracy, more deficits, more taxes, and more inflation. I wish to stand with the individual citizen, win or lose, and oppose the increase in the debt limit.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so, be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject matter of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this proposed increase in the debt ceiling. How long must this farce be perpetuated? Time after time, we go through this ritual of raising a ceiling which is becoming meaningless by its incessant breach. Either this is a meaningful ceiling or it is not. Either this ceiling should be scrapped—or it should be observed.

I personally believe that we should observe the debt ceiling—if not during this war year, then next year. I am tired of the Johnson administration spendorama, which is taking ever higher taxes from the people of my district without giving them anything in return. I say this regretfully, because I am very sorry that the Johnson administration has turned to taxing the many for the benefit of the few. That is a very reactionary policy. In 18th century France, the king taxed the many for the benefit of the few, and that is just what L. B. J. is doing today. He is taxing the many to pay for the poverty program which bankrolls a small clique of social planners and rioters. He is taxing the many to pay for rent subsidies for a few. He is taxing the many to pay for "city demonstrations" for a small group. He is using public funds to promote paired schools, educational parks and school bussing programs, which favor the few over the many. He is taxing the many to pay for "honor system" welfare for another special interest group—I refuse to call them "clients" even if that is becoming fashionable.

I think it is time that the taxpayers of this Nation rose up and told Lyndon B. Johnson to stop robbing the middle-income group, to split the loot between the fat cats and rioters. The people who count with this administration are oil barons, fat cats from Wall Street, big builders, and others who are getting rich thanks to the "Great Society," and the other beneficiaries of the "Great Society" are rioters and welfare chiselers. What about the taxpayer? The little guy who owns his own home because he worked hard and never yelled "deprivation." What about him? He votes—he proved it last November.

Every time we in Congress vote to raise this debt limit, we are voting to take another piece out of the hide of the typical American taxpayer, who will be paying this debt for the rest of his life, and whose taxes will be bigger tomorrow because the "Great Society" is too big today. This administration has got to stop trying to play God in the ghetto, the deserts, and the rice paddies all at the same time. We cannot afford it. This administration has got to learn that while the Government can be its brother's keeper, it cannot be its brother's spoon-feeder.

The people of my district are sick of paying taxes to support Texas oil companies and ghetto rioters. While the Federal Government funds school boycotts with antipoverty program money, the people of my district cannot get tax deductions for parochial school tuition payments. While the Federal Government hands out money to rioters, social security beneficiaries who have worked all their lives wait for a benefit increase. No doubt they will have to wait until an election year, but then there will be an increase, so that our President can pretend he does something for others besides Texas oil companies and rioters.

I am sick of the way that this administration takes money from the many to give it to the few. In history, when other governments have done this, they have been given their comeuppance. I am sure that the "Great Society" will be taught a lesson, too, in the not too distant future.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have carried around with me for some time a slip of paper. It is getting pretty dog-eared, and there are a few holes in it. It is a quotation from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the date of February 24, 1964, when the Revenue Act was before the House, the act by which taxes were cut. I voted against that cut in the belief that a reduction in revenue would only compound the Federal deficit and debt.

Let me read to you one paragraph:

> In enacting this revenue bill . . . we are choosing tax reduction as the road toward a large, more prosperous economy and we are rejecting the road of expenditure increases. We do not intend to try to go along both roads at the same time. If we fail to limit the growth of Federal expenditures, we will be leaving the tax reduction road. Even a one-year detour may make it extremely difficult to get back on it.

Who do you suppose made that statement? I am sorry that he is not in the Chamber. That was the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in advocating a tax reduction before the House in 1964 about the time the Vietnam war was beginning to heat up, when everybody had every reason to expect that expenditures for that war would increase.

Of course, the Congress did not reject the road of expenditure increases, including new and costly domestic Great Society programs as well as expansion of old ones. Since 1964 the Democratic majority has traveled both roads until today it is confronted with a $29 billion debt increase, and a total ceiling of $365 billion.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I do not think everybody had reason to expect that the war would cost more at that time. We were advised by the Secretary of Defense at that time that the war would be over within a year.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and he happens to be the same Robert Strange McNamara who, if he has ever made a correct prediction in his life, including the Edsel, I have never heard of it, and he happens to be serving the Democrat administration. I do not know precisely what his politics may be, but I doubt he is a very good source to quote either for or against the proposition here today.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly I will yield.

Mr. HERLONG. I understand as far as his politics were concerned when he made the Edsel, that he was a Republican.

Mr. GROSS. That may be. I say that today he is claimed by the Democrats. He has also made a real contribution to what we are faced with here today, the Federal debt, when he authorized the flying Edsel, otherwise known as the F-111.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unrealistic to blame all of the increase in the budget to the Vietnam situation, for as far as I recollect a substantial increase has been made in the domestic programs, programs that could have been deferred in view of the international problems we are faced with.

Mr. GROSS. There is no question at all about that. There are those today who have alluded to that fictional yardstick known as the gross national product as a measure of prosperity and the excuse for loading terrific debt on the citizens of this country. To those who prate about the gross national product let me ask this question: if we are wallowing in prosperity how can we be wallowing in poverty? Why a multibillion-dollar expenditure each year on poverty and welfare?

Mr. Chairman, we cannot police and finance the world. Six percent of the world's population cannot police and finance the world, and expect to travel any road to any other end than national insolvency.

That is exactly where we are heading. We are cowardly passing on to the generations to come the debt that we are piling up today.

Instead of reducing taxes, this administration ought to have continued these revenues and given serious thought perhaps to providing additional revenue. This is the time for austerity and not for passing the buck to the youngsters of today and tomorrow.

That is exactly what we are doing. We here today are trying to eat filet mignon steaks on a hamburger income.

We are not skating on good solid financial ice in this country—we are just walking in the water with our skates on and a hell of a lot of people do not seem to know it. I am opposed to this enormous debt increase.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, the Committee is being asked today to raise the debt limit for the 11th time since the Democrats took control of the White House in 1961.

In less than 3 months the Congress is being asked to raise the debt limit by $35 billion. If the House agrees to this increase, the debt limit will have been raised $72 billion in 6 years of Democratic administrations. That is an average of $12 billion per year.

It is clear that the cost of the Great Society of this administration is the great debt. And, friends, let us realize now and ponder this—a greater debt will not really give us a greater society. This debt, I remind you, we are passing on to future generations.

What does this administration offer as assurance that spending will be brought under control should this measure before us be approved? I will tell you. Absolutely none.

In fact, at this time it refuses to say whether it will even press for a tax increase. Its record at attempting to predict the costs of the Vietnam war has been unreliable—and that is being charitable.

A good case can be made for the allegation that war costs have been consistently underestimated to ward off cuts in domestic spending. Despite a good deal of talk about spending priorities made by the President earlier this year, no evidence that any priorities have been set has been seen by this Member of the House.

As a result, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means himself has estimated that the budget deficit for the next fiscal year could reach over $28 billion.

Spending priorities—holding the line—these words of the administration now it seems to me have a very hollow ring.

It is clear to me that it is up to the Congress to take the leadership in bringing its disjointed fiscal policy back into focus.

It seems to me, for instance, that a more serious view of their responsibilities could be taken by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, and indeed by the majority of the members of this Committee.

I must say that I was encouraged by the recent statement of the distinguished chairman if the Committee on Ways and Means which, in effect, asked for restraint in spending and asked that the Congress more often ascertain the long-range effect of its action, especially in the authorization of new programs.

But I ask you, Is it not distorting the function of the Committee on Ways and Means for it to consistently come before this House with requests for debt limit increases?

The best way to solve fiscal matters like this is not always avoiding meeting its responsibilities to raise the money to pay the bills.

When I served in the Iowa general assembly, the Committee on Ways and Means consistently kept the assembly aware of the implications and aware of the results of its appropriations. This is what ought to be done more often here.

The constitution of the State of Iowa prohibits the State from going into debt and we should emulate Iowa and the example that it sets in this regard.

Thank goodness that the constitutions of many States contain the same sort of provision that the Iowa constitution contains. If the States were allowed to follow the same fiscal policy set by this administration, there would be utter economic chaos in this country. Instead of bringing a bill before the House to increase the debt limit, I believe the Ways and Means Committee would serve the public interest much better if it would come before us with a frank and forthright report of the revenues available under present taxes and a frank and forthright statement of what new revenues would be needed to cover appropriations over and above revenues available, and finally its frank and forthright recommendation of how these additional revenues should be raised.

I am sure that these statements would act as a restraint on Government spending.

Lest anyone misinterpret what I have said permit me to hasten to say that I do not advocate a tax increase. Instead I am asking that spending requests be reduced. Tax loopholes should be closed and spending priorities should be set.

Certainly we can and must make sure that our efforts in Vietnam are supported to the fullest extent. But there are other areas in which spending should be cut and this must be done.

I oppose the bill before us. I urge its defeat.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I have one more request for time. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to at least part of this debate, and particularly the last two speakers, Mr. SCHWENGEL and Mr. GROSS. I have frequently listened to my friend, H. R. GROSS—and he is my friend—make speeches in the well of the House in relation to the national debt and how the country was on the road to ruin.

I am going to place in the RECORD some statistics drawn from the Budget Bureau which I think will be of interest. I happen to have a few of the figures in my hand at the present time.

I want to call to the attention of the gentleman and to all Members of the House that in 1942—25 years ago—the gross national product was $139 billion and the national debt was $77 billion. That meant that the national debt was 55 percent of the gross national product.

In 1946—and this was after the war—the gross national product was $201,600,000,000 and the national debt was $269.9 billion. In other words, the national debt was 133.9 percent of the gross national product.

Let us now jump down to 1960. The gross national product was $495,200,000,000 in 1960, and the gross national debt was $286.5 billion, or 57.8 percent of the gross national product.

Let us go to 1966, 6 years later. Then the gross national product was $712 billion and the national debt was $320.4 billion. That was 45 percent of the gross national product—the lowest point percentagewise of the national debt against the gross national product since the year 1942, or for 25 years.

The prosperity of this country is not determined by the national debt. The prosperity of this country is determined in the relation of national debt to the gross national product. If a man is making $10,000 a year and he owes $5,000, and he gets to the point where he is making $15,000 a year and he owes only $5,000, or if he owes $6,000 or $7,000, he is in better financial condition than he was when he was making $10,000 a year and owing $5,000.

The point I am making to the gentleman is this: that the prosperity of this Nation is not controlled by the level of the national debt, nor is the downward trend toward bankruptcy controlled by the total of the national debt, but by the relationship of the national debt to the gross national product. I shall place in the RECORD, when I obtain permission, a complete comparison of this from the year 1942 until 1966.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would go back, with his comparison, and get the last year of the Hoover administration, when the national debt was larger than the gross national product. But, in all charity, I am a little surprised at this, because the gentleman is spoiling the speeches of the gentlemen on the other side. They do not want to talk about the gross national product. There is no political fodder in that. They apparently do not know we have a gross national product, but only that we have a national debt.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That is why I brought this to the attention of the gentleman from Iowa.

I yield now to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I did not think the gentleman was going to yield, after he used my name.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was going to yield.

Mr. GROSS. I have heard of a few high school students—and only a few—who have the same attitude, that of what difference does it make what the Federal debt is, we owe it to ourselves. The gentleman surely does not believe the fiction of the gross national product, does he?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is not a fiction, my friend. It is the gross amount of the wages and profits and interest earned by the people of America. It is a very real thing, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, many people in California have requested a brief outline from this office of the relationship between the gross national product, which is the total market value of all goods and services produced by the Nation in a given year, and the public debt, which is the amount of Federal indebtedness to investors holding U.S. Treasury securities. The public debt is a cumulative figure, that is, it increases each year unless efforts are made to reduce it. The gross national product is based on yearly economic activity and is not calculated on a cumulative basis.

Another fact which is important to understand is the method by which the Government keeps its books. If the Government constructs a post office or other public facility, the cost of that facility is charged off as current expense during construction. It is not capitalized over several years as is the case in most plant and facility construction by private enterprisers. To put it another way, the Federal Government does not set up a column of assets for the long-term investment made by public money in the construction of public facilities. The average businessman by contrast shows his investment in a new plant as an asset and depreciates its cost over a period of several years. If the Government calculated its vast public investment by means of a capitalized budget, as private enterprise does, there would be no such thing as a national debt without an offsetting group of assets. The national debt would be more than balanced by the offsetting total of public investment assets. Many people do not understand this and are critical of the huge size of the public debt, although, as I will show presently, the public debt has decreased percentagewise since the end of World War II, and is now smaller in relation to the gross national product than it has been in any year since 1942. In the fiscal year 1967, the public debt will be an estimated 42.9 percent of the gross national product, the lowest in modern history.

During the years of the Second World War, 1942 to 1945, the gross national product grew from $139.2 billion to $216.8 billion. Immediately following the war years, the gross national product fell off due to the relaxation of the wartime economy, however, from 1946 to 1950 it gradually grew from $201.6 billion to $263.3 billion. From 1951 until 1960, the gross national product continued to grow steadily from $310.5 billion to $495.2 billion, and since 1960 it has accelerated upward rapidly to an estimated $762 billion in 1967.

If we look at the Federal public debt during these same periods we find that in 1944, a year in which the gross national product was $201.9 billion, the Federal public debt was $202.6 billion. In other words, the Federal public debt surpassed the gross national product. This was the situation from 1944 to 1948. During that entire period the Federal public debt was greater than the gross national product, at one time peaking as high as 133.9 percent of the gross national product. This meant that the Government was spending more money—by borrowing from the public through war bonds, and so forth—than the total economy, both public and private, was producing.

Since 1949, however, the Federal public debt has steadily diminished in relation to the gross national product. In 1949, the Federal public debt was 97.2 percent of the gross national product. As the gross national product has grown, the debt has also increased, but at a much slower rate. This widening gap of production over Government spending has caused a constantly declining percentage of Federal public debt compared to the gross national product. In 1967, the Federal public debt is estimated to run about $327.3 billion, which should be compared to the figure given above of $762.5 billion for the 1967 estimated gross national product. This comes out at about 42.9 percent. What some people may forget is that the remarkable growth of the national product has been greatly stimulated by the wise investment of public funds by the Government.

Although the national debt, relative to the gross national product, has declined to the lowest point in 25 years, this does not indicate a lack of concern on my part with reducing the overall total.

Reduction of the total level of the national debt must come from a surplus between expenditures and national tax income. Such a surplus can only be obtained by increasing taxes or reducing expenditures. Several tax reductions have been made in recent years consistent with public demand and, of course, such reductions mitigate against the accumulation of a surplus.

National expenditures have increased because of the necessity of increased defense expenditures and pressing social problems such as housing, health, education, et cetera. These expenditures have been given priority over reduction in the level of the national debt by the Congress on the basis that they are of greater importance to our national security and the building of our domestic strength than debt reduction.

The table I am enclosing should give you some idea of the relationship between the two very important economic indicators, that is, gross national product and Federal public debt for the past 25 years:

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Fiscal year	Gross national product	Public debt at end of year	
		Amount	Percentage of GNP
1942	$139.2	$77.0	55.3
1943	177.5	140.8	79.3
1944	201.9	202.6	100.4
1945	216.8	259.1	119.5
1946	201.6	269.9	133.9
1947	219.8	258.4	117.5
1948	243.5	252.4	103.6
1949	260.0	252.8	97.2
1950	263.3	257.4	97.7
1951	310.5	255.3	82.2
1952	337.2	259.2	76.8
1953	358.9	266.1	74.1
1954	362.1	271.3	74.9
1955	378.6	274.4	72.5
1956	409.4	272.8	66.6
1957	431.3	270.6	62.7
1958	440.3	276.4	62.8
1959	469.1	284.8	60.7
1960	495.2	286.5	57.8
1961	506.5	289.2	57.1
1962	542.1	298.6	55.1
1963	573.4	306.5	53.4
1964	612.0	312.5	51.1
1965	651.8	317.9	48.8
1966	712.0	320.4	45.0

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment is in order to the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, there are no committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FASCELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10328) to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 504, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill H.R. 10328 to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 211, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—197

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bennett
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Carey
Casey
Celler
Cohelan
Colmer
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Rees
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Watts
White
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—211

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baring
Bates
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Bolton
Bow
Brinkley
Brock
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dowdy
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Gardner
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Heckler, Mass.
Horton
Hosmer
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Moore
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Myers
Nichols
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Pelly
Pettis
Pirnie
Poff
Pollock
Price, Tex.
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Younger
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—25

Ayres
Battin
Bell
Bray
Clark
Dow
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Helstoski
Holland
Ichord
Karth
Long, La.
MacGregor
Nelsen
O'Konski
Pool
Ruppe
St. Onge
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Thompson, N.J.
Vander Jagt
Williams, Miss.
Willis

So the bill was not passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Battin against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. Karth for, with Mr. Vander Jagt against.

Mr. Holland for, with Mr. Nelsen against.

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Pool against.

Mr. Helstoski for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Dow with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GUDE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I was attending a function in the Rayburn House Office Building in the basement, where the bells did not ring. I arrived in the Chamber at the time the Clerk was calling the O's on the roll. May I qualify to vote "No" on this measure?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must have been present and listening when his name was called, and he did not hear his name called.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the response of the Speaker, and regret that I cannot be recorded as voting "No" on this vote.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the minority leader, Mr. Speaker, we will continue with the consideration of the food stamp bill, as previously announced. If that bill is finished at an early hour we will add to the program the bill H.R. 7476, redemption of silver certificates.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished majority leader indicate whether there is any intention to call up the conference report on the Selective Service Act?

Mr. ALBERT. We will have a conference report on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. On the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, but not on the Selective Service Act?

Mr. ALBERT. Not tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE TO INCLUDE EXTRANEOUS MATTER

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so who participated in the debate on the bill H.R. 10328 this afternoon may be permitted to include extraneous matter with their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

WEST POINT GRADUATION

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I had the distinct pleasure today to attend the graduation exercises of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., and I proudly witnessed not only the graduation of my two appointees, cadet captain and brigade commander, Jack B. Wood, and Frank J. Fabish, both from Johnstown, Pa., but also the presentation of diplomas to 582 others as well.

It was an impressive ceremony attended by thousands of relatives and friends of the cadets. All of us had the opportunity to hear the eloquent address by Stanley R. Resor, Secretary of the Army, and I include his speech in the RECORD at this point so that my colleagues and the general public will have an opportunity to read the message conveyed by the Secretary to those assembled.

ADDRESS BY HON. STANLEY R. RESOR, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, AT THE GRADUATION EXERCISES, CLASS OF 1967, U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY, WEST POINT, N.Y., JUNE 7, 1967

General Bennett, Congressman Everett, Congressman Saylor, General Bradley, General Haines, Other Distinguished Guests, Members of the Class of '67 and their Parents and Friends, Ladies and Gentlemen, West Point is always a source of pleasure and inspiration for me. Today this is particularly so, for there is a special happiness and a special excitement at commencement time. All of us who come to share this day with you sense the mixture of emotions and the feelings of endings and beginnings which mark every commencement at every college. But at West Point those emotions and feelings are heightened by the beauty of our surroundings, the tradition of excellence which pervades the Military Academy, and most of all by the knowledge that you are going forth to join and swell a 165 year old stream of graduates in the direct service of the nation.

The importance of this institution which you are about to leave cannot be measured by the number of its graduates alone. But some idea of its contribution to our nation can be derived from the fact that when Mr. Anastasi receives his diploma a few minutes from now he will become the 27,241st graduate. Nearly three-quarters of this number are still living and almost half are in the active service of our country today.

I first encountered the spirit of West Point 25 years ago when I served with and under graduates of the Military Academy. In the course of nearly four years of training and combat, I came to know, to admire and to respect the qualities which had been nurtured in them here—integrity, idealism, consideration for others, and a passion for service.

In the quarter century which has gone by since those war years, my early impressions about the greatness of West Point and its graduates have become fixed convictions. I now am privileged to serve again with the Army, but it is a quite different Army from the one which I entered in 1942. Then, the Army was expanding rapidly from a very small permanent establishment. The relatively few career officers and non-com's were spread thin, but they taught and guided the rest of us. It was their professionalism which held a citizen force together and made it into a magnificent fighting Army. Today we are expanding again—this time to meet the demands of our commitment in Southeast Asia. In less than two years, the strength of the Army has increased by more than 50%, but it remains a professional organization in every respect. It should be at once sobering and stimulating for you to consider that the roots of that professionalism lie here.

Soon you will be leading American soldiers actively engaged in the defense of freedom. Since World War II, the United States has played the principal role in that defense. We have done so at immense cost in men and material things because we believe deeply in the dignity of the individual and in his right to choose freely his form of government, and because a world in which these principles are not honored cannot in the long run be a peaceful world, for us or for anyone else. Today our commitment to these ideals is being put to the test of battle in Vietnam.

Most directly affected by our commitment is the American soldier. He and his family bear a heavy burden in our society today. The danger, separations and hardships which most Americans associate with World War II, when our whole nation was mobilized, are once again a part of the Army's way of life. Most of his fellow citizens today are not personally involved in the Vietnam war, but this merely accentuates the demands placed upon our soldiers. By willingly accepting the challenges thrust upon them, by not counting the price but pursuing their difficult tasks with a sense of patriotism and service, America's fighting men are setting the example for all of us.

In talking to soldiers throughout the world I have learned that they do not regard their hardships as sacrifices. They undergo danger and inconvenience willingly and in good spirit because they believe in our cause.

These men who will soon be placed in your charge are a cross-section of America's youth. They are bright, eager, inquisitive and enthusiastic. Of them General Westmoreland has said: "They are a credit to our country and our society. Their mothers and fathers and their wives can be truly proud of their attitude, their courage, their understanding, their compassion, their integrity and their endurance."

I add that they are superbly led. Despite the doubling of our officer strength from 70,000 to 130,000 since the post World War II period, the overall skill and educational level of our officers has steadily increased. Then less than half were college graduates; now more than three-quarters are. Today 90% of our regular officers hold college degrees, but that does not tell the whole story, for well over one-third of our regular lieutenant colonels have received degrees at the Masters or Doctoral levels. And these men are not simply educated men; they have gone through the test of battle, the ultimate test in the profession of men at arms. No other Army in the world has the depth of combat experienced officers that we possess in every grade. You are joining a tested and talented officer corps which has never been exceeded in effectiveness, professionalism and service in the history of our nation.

There are doubtless many ways to define what makes a profession truly rewarding, but surely any definition would include at least two elements: a sense of service to others, and opportunity for growth in knowledge, understanding and responsibility. Both these elements are markedly present in the careers you are about to take up. First, you have an unusual opportunity to serve your fellow man. Second, as you give this service you will be exposed to a truly remarkably diversity of tasks, people and places which will stimulate your growth as a person and, as you grow, will increase not only your capability to serve, but also the sense of personal worth which is essential to the happiness of man.

You will have opportunities for adult education which are as great as, or greater than those offered by any other career. In the course of the next two decades, many of you will have four or five more years of formal education at military institutions and civilian universities. But above and beyond this opportunity lies that of learning through exposure to a variety of experience and responsibility. In the course of your career, you will have more duties, dealing with a wider range and diversity of problems, than is the case with any other profession, and it is certain that you will be asked to perform tasks and meet challenges whose nature and existence we are quite unaware of today.

As a cross-section of American society, the Army often reflects many of the tormenting problems which the continuing process of social change engenders. With its command structure, its discipline and its institutional drive to solve rather than avoid problems, the Army is in many ways America's best proving ground. Witness the Army's remarkable success in rooting out racial discrimination. Here is proof to the rest of America—and to the world—that not only is social justice within our country's reach, but also we are stronger for having achieved it. There will be other changes sweeping through our society and through the Army and you will have the challenge of dealing with them as they occur.

Ours is an Army of many missions, each of which offers opportunities for service and individual growth. This wide diversity of missions requires, in turn, individuals with a diversity of talents. Your basic mission as an officer is to lead, but officers also teach, plan, budget, study, judge and govern as they move from command to staff to support roles and back again. Your primary responsibilities in time will range from troop leadership to maintenance, communications, supply, transportation and all the other functions which enable our Army to live and to fight. Depending on your talents and aspirations, your assignments may find you engaged in military assistance to other nations, research and development, civil administration, designing manpower policies, developing the water resources of the United States, advising ambassadors, teaching foreign languages or devising new applications of nuclear energy. Indeed, our Army today offers countless opportunities for you to pursue excellence, to be pushed to the limit of your talents in that pursuit and to rise to high responsibility in your chosen field.

For you these opportunities are about to unfold. You will find that your early years as lieutenants will always be remembered as a particularly rewarding period. You have been students drawing from society; now you are about to become teachers in the largest educational establishment in the world. Your direct, personal involvement with the lives of the men serving under you will never be as great again as in the next three or four years.

Your new duties will be incessantly demanding—of your time, of your energy, of your inventiveness. Unlike those who practice the other professions involving human life and welfare, whose responsibilities end when the patient is cured, when the case is solved, or when the lesson it taught, the platoon leader has continuing responsibilities similar to those of a parent, only forty times over. They never end. They shift continually to meet the full gamut of problems in which human beings can become involved. Frustrating as they may seem at times, solving these problems will be a deeply rewarding experience for you.

The soldier who possesses a skill because you have helped him to learn it; the soldier whose personal affairs have been put in order through your guidance; the soldier who enjoys a hot meal, or a bath, or clean clothes as a result of your perseverance; the soldier who survives in combat because of the way you have trained him or led him—none of these men will ever pay you for services rendered. Often, they will not even express their gratitude in words. But as you win their confidence, you will have the satisfaction of seeing them follow the example that you set. They will begin to help each other and your unit's cohesion and effectiveness will grow right under your eyes and you will know that you are responsible for it. These are tangible rewards of service, and you can begin to reap them soon.

As the years pass you will move up to positions of greater responsibility. Paradoxically, as you do, the direct tangible evidence of your impact on men and institutions will diminish, but your total influence on the course of events will be ever larger. If that influence is at times imperceptible from day to day, nevertheless your presence, your stimulus, your foresight will mean change and improvement for years thereafter.

Sixteen or more years ago you began your education. Now you have completed four years of arduous college studies. The foundation is laid, built on your innate abilities, your enthusiasm, your ideals. Now the never ending education of adulthood and leadership begins. Now you go forth to serve in the Army of your country in the first of a series of ever more challenging assignments. The great opportunity to learn and to grow and to serve lies ahead for you. Here at West Point you have made the beginning which will enable you to seize that opportunity. The future of our Army's leadership and of the security of our country will depend on your achievements. I am confident of that future.

Good luck and God speed to all of you.

Mr. Speaker, also, I would like to include the names of those in the class of 1967 according to general merit.

Class of June 7, 1967, U.S. Military Academy

1. Ernest Clayton Heimberg, Jr.
2. Martin McCurdy Cassity, Jr.
3. Ronald Lee Weitz.
4. William Arthur Richards
5. Robert James Carpenter.
6. Charles Philip Hernandez.
7. Wilbur Stone Jones, Jr.
8. Ernest Robert Natalini.
9. Terry Davies Hand.
10. Roger Joseph Arango, Jr.
11. Roger James Purcell.
12. Norman Louis Nesterak.
13. Charles Jeffrey Mills.
14. Albert Jack Nahas.
15. Thomas Raymond Hankard.
16. Michael Bennis McBride.
17. Richard Ernest Radez.
18. William Douglas Brown.
19. Michael Alan Heyne.
20. John Daniel Montanaro.
21. Richard Arthur Jones.
22. Raymond John Winkel, Jr.
23. Lawrence Leonard Izzo.
24. Jim Neal Brantner.
25. Michael Frank Delleo, Jr.
26. Wallace Earl Walker.
27. Norbert Joseph Reder, Jr.
28. Charles Shrader Thomas.
29. George Beverly Winton.
30. Robert Howard Miller, Jr.
31. Peter Paul Summers.
32. Hobart Burnside Pillsbury, Jr.
33. William Walter Sharkness.
34. John Ruzick Hadorn.
35. Gerald Graham Threadgill.
36. Bruce Bagley Hedrick, Jr.
37. Vernon Parker Saxon, Jr.
38. Stephen Robert Sears.
39. John Stephen Garay.
40. Richard William Kline, Jr.
41. William Reed Morrell.
42. William Richard Lynn.
43. Mark Rowland Fischer.
44. Robert Allan Haeffner.
45. Harry Edward Rothmann, Jr.
46. Chad Whitney Keck.
47. Edward Nolan Tipton.
48. Jack Bruce Wood.
49. Daniel Roger Wells.
50. Karl Henry Jacobs.
51. John Edward Newton.
52. William Ray Pennington.
53. Bartholomew Bernard Bohn II.
54. James Robert Sargeant.
55. William James McDowell.
56. Brian Eugene Hayes.
57. Steven Peter Yambor.
58. Thomas Norman Swett.
59. Palmer John Penny III.
60. Karl Donus Sakas.
61. John LeRoy Combs.
62. Christopher Scott Commons.
63. Robert Emmett Keenan, Jr.
64. Richard Hardwicke Rice, Jr.
65. William Wayne Obley.
66. Harry Alva Tucker, Jr.
67. John Edward Kelly, Jr.
68. Thomas Dale Blaney.
69. Jon Stuart Behrens.
70. Brian James McCrodden.
71. David Lewis Powers.
72. James Thomas Reilly.
73. Gordon Mason Brown II.
74. Robert Nelson Davie, Jr.
75. Thomas Paul Jacobus.
76. John Paul Kuspa.
77. Giuliano M. Toneatto.
78. Todd Lawren McConnell.
79. Jack Edward Obert, Jr.
80. Jeffrey Ross Madsen.
81. Monte Merryman Parrish.
82. Karl William Mills.
83. Charles William Streit.
84. Anthony Von Dida.
85. Richard Andrew Phalan.
86. Richard Henry La Bouliere.
87. Earl Richard Refsland.
88. Joseph Ernest Root III.
89. Warren Michael Sands.
90. Edward John Dewey.
91. Nielsen Raymond Palmer.
92. Rufus Hale Shumate, Jr.
93. Stephen Allan May.
94. John Anthony Yankus.
95. Thomas Andrews Petrie.
96. John Elza Adamson.
97. David Carl Jones.
98. Thomas Marshal Curtis.
99. William Randolph Condos, Jr.
100. David Brice Bean.
101. Alexander Richard Jansen.
102. Dennis Michael Mikale.
103. Edwin Paul Smith.
104. George Alphonse Schaefer, Jr.
105. James Byers Allen.
106. Richard Volney Gladstone.
107. Asa Alan Clark IV.
108. Richard Edward Foelsch.
109. David Richard Evan Hale.
110. David Elliot Peixotto.
111. Joseph Visconti, Jr.
112. Robert Leaming Portney.
113. Kent Edward Kraus.
114. James Kenneth Brierly.
115. William Edwin Cates.
116. John Richard James.
117. George Stephen Viney.
118. Ronald Edgar Dionne.
119. Hartmut Henning Lau.
120. James Byron Cowart.
121. Tital Windham McCoy.
122. Calvin Bricker Delaplain.
123. William Langfitt Wilby.
124. Lawrence Remi Smith.
126. Dennis Edward Coates.
126. William Henry Eggering.
127. Charles Costanza, Jr.
128. Walter Edward Mather, Jr.
129. Walter Lee Murfee.
130. Thomas Ross Still.
131. Mark Wayne Miller.
132. Michael Minoru Kishiyama.
133. John Edward Goodnow.
134. Roger Thye Heimann.
135. Montgomery Cunningham Meigs.
136. Paul John Kern.
137. Burk Everett Bishop.
138. Eddie Lee Marion.
139. Robert Keith Williams.
140. Robert Peter Hagen, Jr.
141. Charles Harlan Swanson.
142. Jerry Lee Hines.
143. Michael Joseph Aiello.
144. Alton Parker Donnell, Jr.
145. Christian Frank Vissers.
146. Steve Gradon Barbee.
147. James Harold Saine.
148. Charles Michael Rankin.
149. Richard Leslie Kiper, Jr.
150. Robert Arden Hixson.
151. Harvey Grant Taylor, Jr.
152. Richard Thomas Newell.
153. Richard Earl Waterman.
154. Frank Henry Kreger III.
155. John Charles Gale.
156. Robert Neal Stromberg.
157. David Harold Kelley.
158. Reginald Graham Moore, Jr.
159. William Leonard Brigadier.
160. Thomas James Waraksa.
161. Richard Miller Hill.
162. Rand Karl Shotwell.
163. Edward Richard Hubshman.
164. Louis John Colella.
165. Tadashi Glenn Yuguchi.
166. Thomas Jackson Parr.
167. Paul Ballance Haseman.
168. Steven Thomas Kurtyka.
169. Gary Levone Hall.
170. Lawrence Hugh Marlin.
171. David Lee Tye.
172. Thomas Christopher Pettit.
173. Thomas Donald Thompson, Jr.
174. Frank Marchman Perry.
175. George Edward Dials.
176. Jean Marc Ducharme II.
177. David Joseph Bucchieri.
178. Carlton Gerald Savory.
179. Harry Oliver Taylor.
180. David Samuel Rowley.
181. Richard Michael Mullane.
182. Gary Lee Hyde.
183. Richard Adrian Ankener.
184. Dennis William Huyck.
185. James Edward Pryor.
186. Andrew William Maron.
187. John Harris Douglas.
188. Douglas James Pringle.
189. Donald William Dietz.
190. Thomas Bernard Dyer III.
191. Gary Thomas Downs.
192. Jon Christopher Shuler.
193. Francis Lee Smith, Jr.
194. Joseph Garside Terry, Jr.
195. Richard Dabney Estes.
196. John Edward Cunningham.
197. Augusto Lim Palomar.
198. Charles Gordies Sutten, Jr.
199. William Alan Pittenger.
200. Robert Lewis Segal.

201. Donald Pedersen Albers.
202. James Robbins Balkcom, Jr.
203. Tom Emerson.
204. Roger Wayne Waltz.
205. John Edwin Severson.
206. Jan Philip Askman.
207. James Anthony Tankovich.
208. Frederick Richard Schremp.
209. Max Powell Bailey III.
201. James Daniel Fowler, Jr.
211. Richard David Hulse.
212. Michael Lewis Barney.
213. William Michael Langlois.
214. Robert Lee Harris, Jr.
215. Ronald James Naples.
216. William Frederick Hausman, Jr.
217. John Lawrence Banks Smith, Jr.
218. Robert Charles Keck.
219. John Spencer Caldwell, Jr.
220. Robert Springer Metzger II.
221. Robert Kenaston Griffith, Jr.
222. Cole Wesley Minnick, Jr.
223. Richard Alan Grube.
224. Robert Felix La Raia.
225. Daniel Patrick Ragsdale.
226. Kenneth Allen Rice.
227. Thomas Parnell McManus.
228. Robert Fields Shaw.
229. Frederick Howard Thomas.
230. Thomas Eugene White, Jr.
231. Marvin La Verne Tieman.
232. Parker Tonjum Anderson.
233. Stephen Lynn Frankiewicz.
234. Charles Michael Hickey.
235. Anson Slappey Ramsey.
236. Anthony Henry Cortese.
237. Robert Aldo Cenci.
238. David Mel Partridge.
239. Elmer Michael Casey, Jr.
240. David Robinson Ellis.
241. Emmett Earl Hughes.
242. Richard Howland Gooding.
243. Malcolm Howard Philips, Jr.
244. Dean Douglas Hansen.
245. Frederick John Barofsky.
246. Michael Noboru Nii.
247. Richard Thomas Altieri.
248. James Judson Findley.
249. Michael Wai Lim Yap.
250. Benjamin Landis Weakley, Jr.
251. Gus Blakely Robinson.
252. Andrew Joseph Nusbaum.
253. Jerry Dale Walker.
254. Joseph Schuyler Hardin, Jr.
255. Robert Hughes Evans.
256. Peter Gustaf Hanelt.
257. Harry Douglas Hoskins III.
258. Kenneth Roger Bush.
259. Michael Rob Hardy.
260. Andrew Komblevitz.
261. Dean Masao Kunihiro.
262. John Albert Bornmann, Jr.
263. George Frederick Kolesar.
264. Mark Randall Hamilton.
265. Frank Allen Hill 3d.
266. Arlin Cornelius Ruthven.
267. David Richard Mosser.
268. James Robert Baker.
269. Joe Melvin Dietzel, Jr.
270. Peter Bray Krause.
271. David Merriam Snyder.
272. Ferdinand Loray Schwartz, Jr.
273. Richard Dale Releford.
274. Edward Van Schaick Moore.
275. Ralph Gregory Mohler.
276. George Atencio Rodriguez.
277. Charles Robert Meyer II.
278. Michael William Shelton.
279. Lewis Prichard Kasper.
280. Colin Craig Smith.
281. Douglas Holland Starr.
282. Richard Angelo Comi.
283. Robert Irvin Curtis.
284. Gary Lee Moyer.
285. Robert John Love.
286. Henry Mathias Uberecken II.
287. James Thomas Ralph Johnson, Jr.
288. Darrel La Verne Mooney.
289. Robert Adam Wysocki.
290. William Joseph Donohue, Jr.
291. Daniel Patrick Schrage.
292. Robert Shiel Mc Eldowney.
293. Gerald Joseph Molnar.
294. Richard Arthur Black.
295. John Thomas Boyt III.
296. George Perry Hubert.
297. William Patrick Foley.
298. William Terence McMahan.
299. Randall William Moon.
300. John Joseph Boretti.
301. John Raymond Ouellette.
302. John Harry Jorgenson II.
303. Michael Franklin Kush.
304. Gregory Arthur Rice.
305. Richard Curtis Adkins.
306. Daniel Leo Neuburger.
307. Jonathan Kent Burns.
308. Milford Berten Hutchinson III.
309. Joseph Edmund DuBois.
310. George Paschal Lupton.
311. Robert Douglas Murrill, Jr.
312. Michael Francis Lascher.
313. Gary Michael Chambers.
314. Paul James Cmil.
315. Thomas Robert Guignon.
316. Joseph Porter Jackson, Jr.
317. William Gustav Held.
318. Mario Armando Loyola.
319. Bruce Shepley Richardson.
320. Randall Martin Pais.
321. David Richard McAdoo.
322. Robert Ralph Angell.
323. Michael Edward Alverson.
324. John Patrick Brown.
325. Donald George Helmstadter.
326. Ronald Lloyd Frazer.
327. Donald Homer Dwiggins, Jr.
328. George Harry Kellenbenz.
329. Henry Paul Timm, Jr.
330. Dana McGhee Groover.
331. Carl Allen Bowen.
332. Timothy Bruce Russell.
333. John Wilbert Thiltgen.
334. Thomas Lanyi.
335. Robert Charles Doheny.
336. Paul Richard Kokonowski.
337. Leonard Lee Preston, Jr.
338. Steven Albert Toelle.
339. James Michael Miley.
340. William Allen MacDonald.
341. Virgil William Stone.
342. Sealon Romane Wentzel, Jr.
343. Michael Thomas Segraves.
344. William Carl Groman.
345. Barry Edwin Nickerson.
346. Richard Scott Farr II.
347. Garth Lynn Fowler.
348. Gary Lee LaBelle.
349. Gordon Lee Rankin.
350. Thomas Hamilton Jackson.
351. William Price Moore III.
352. Charles Warren Trainor.
353. James Louis Walden.
354. Michael Norton.
355. David McKell Hadly.
356. Michael Dirk Kelley.
357. Edward John Beck.
358. James Alan Alich.
359. Michael Calhoun Winton.
360. George Washington Watts III.
361. Robert Armin Frank.
362. Val Duane Millard.
363. Glynn Walter Hale.
364. Daniel Wayne Jinks.
365. Michael Montgomery Cain.
366. Jerry Lynn Nowels.
367. James Ray Horton.
368. Charles Lee Baker.
369. Thomas Roy Hill.
370. Robert Jacoby Mengert.
371. James Ford Jackson.
372. Sherwood Clark Spring.
373. Joel Trevor Matulys.
374. John Reginald Hall II.
375. Gary Allan Wikert.
376. Michael Scott Lancaster.
377. Forrest Douglas Williams.
378. John Charles Mackerer, Jr.
379. Thomas Allen Schwartz.
380. George Pejakovich.
381. Robin Allan Walker.
382. James Milton Weller.
383. William Lloyd McMillan.
384. Jeffrey Alan Stark.
385. Terry Owens Atkinson.
386. Peter Economos.
387. James Paul Jones.
388. Jack Arthur Windeler.
389. Philip Anthony Burkett.
390. Donald William MacPherson.
391. John Thomas Corley, Jr.
392. James Francis Ruhl.
393. Philip Allison Hogue, Jr.
394. Richard Barlow Adams.
395. Richard Oliver Bickford.
396. Frank John Fabish.
397. John Edward Marshall, Jr.
398. John Peter Canevet.
399. James Paul de Santis.
400. Bruce Carl Baccei.
401. Richard Lee Ehrenreich.
402. David Lynn Baggett.
403. Lloyd Philip Kinney.
404. Willis Freed Lowrey, Jr.
405. Lodwick Kirkland Alford.
406. Herbert Lewis Altshuler.
407. Clark Alfred Stave.
408. William Paulson Koch.
409. James Edward Stewart.
410. Kenneth Alan Harris.
411. Edward John Locke.
412. Paul Augustus Bigelman.
413. Richard Essington Karl Brawn.
414. Paul Edwin Lima.
415. Gary Waldon Atkins.
416. John Marion Willard Graham.
417. William Lyman Haines.
418. Alan Eric Seyfer.
419. Carlan Joseph Kraft.
420. William Hoagland.
421. Donis Rainey Wolfe.
422. Claude Paul Herman.
423. Thomas Michael Murphy.
424. James Frank Cali, Jr.
425. Norman Billings Mekkelsen, Jr.
426. John Edward Thomson.
427. Joseph Carney Theis.
428. Thomas Natunen Thornton.
429. Gary William Carlson.
430. Randall Loftin Kinnard.
431. Frederick Edward Hartman.
432. George Richard Fischer.
433. Steven Gregory Honzo.
434. Douglas Taylor Gray III.
435. James Lee Milliken.
436. Phillip Michael Fracker.
437. Michael Gramling Parr.
438. Thomas Peter Condon.
439. Kenneth John Leonardi.
440. Wayne Allen Monroe.
441. Michael Thomas Spinello.
442. Dean Philipp Risseeuw.
443. Douglas Earl Cole.
444. Myron Solon Steere III.
445. Alan Douglas Olson.
446. Loren Herbert Horman II.
447. Thomas Joseph Cullen, Jr.
448. Benjamin Rodriguez.
449. Everett Dennis Lucas, Jr.
450. David Paul Rivers.
451. Gary La Verne Frazier.
452. Robert Lawson Sellars.
453. Michael Anthony Hood.
454. James Robert Adams.
455. Elwood Marc Eme.
456. Emett Robert White IV.
457. Richard Wesley Platt, Jr.
458. Terry Lee Hegglin.
459. George Edward Newman III.
460. Raymond Thomas Roe.
461. Kenneth Edward Williams.
462. Jack Alvin Ziemke.
463. John Allen Frink.
464. Raymond Alonzo Heath, Jr.
465. James Oliver Vance.
466. Michael James Cox.
467. Gerald Stanley Misurek.
468. Robert John Nolan.
469. Joseph Paul Stock, Jr.
470. Aaron Edward Coe.
471. Robert Franklin Griffin.
472. James Carroll Crowley.
473. David Michael Bishop.

474. Jose Manuel Pena.
475. Gregory Lewis Crawford.
476. Louis Bailey Trevathan, Jr.
477. Dale Jay Hikes.
478. Michael Scott Lighthill.
479. John Patrick Charters.
480. Roger Alan Fulkerson.
481. John Arch Rollow IV.
482. Gregory Wayne Smith.
483. David Dwight Horton.
484. Michael Edward Dunn.
485. Edward Anthony Bernard Bryla.
486. Steven Wayne Kujawski.
487. William Francis Freccia.
488. Davis Henry Loftin.
489. Derek Lodge Younkin.
490. William Charles Gonser.
491. Hampton Allen Etheridge III.
492. Thomas Charles Rothrauff, Jr.
493. William Whitaker Horn.
494. John David Hart.
495. William Fuger Cusack, Jr.
496. Kenneth Du Pont Strong.
497. Donald John Nelson.
498. F. Scott MacFarlane.
499. James Ernest Roberts.
500. James David Osborne.
501. Craig Damien Butler.
502. John Joseph Avard.
503. George Ronald Sutton.
504. Robert James Lenz.
505. Michael Carl Kempf.
506. Henry Joseph Berthelot.
507. Michael Joseph Neuman.
508. James Ronald Siket.
509. Sterling Wayne Mc Colgin.
510. Gerry Lynn Fox.
511. Arnold Cano Arosemena.
512. Robert Douglas Herb.
513. Ellis David Greene.
514. Michael George Riess.
515. Charles Marion Stancil.
516. Townsend Sutherland Clarke.
517. William Jackson Ervin III.
518. Alfred Earl Burer.
519. Christopher Allen Biltoft.
520. Brian Edward Mahoney.
521. Michael Chenoweth Wimert.
522. Robert Eugene Knapp, Jr.
523. Donald Charles Hertzfeldt.
524. Paul Marcus Cline, Jr.
525. Robert Charles Unterbrink, Jr.
526. Thomas Clifford Coker.
527. Edwin Neil Jordan, Jr.
528. John Arthur Graziano.
529. Kerry Leigh O'Hara.
530. Lee Emir Cage, Jr.
531. Michael Hunter Warren.
532. Wesley James Spincic.
533. Steven Everett Doty.
534. Victor Clayton Pangle II.
535. Robert John Libutti.
536. Michael Leo Nathe.
537. Norman Ray Jones.
538. Robert MacHartley.
539. William Allen Pollitt.
540. Robert Jean Paul Begin, Jr.
541. Carrol Jaye Howard.
542. James MacDonald Warner.
543. George Littler Harmon.
544. John Brandeau Landgraf.
545. Marshall Kirk Bolyard.
546. Gordon Adam Socher.
547. Clarence Emmett Mahle.
548. John Nathan Stewart.
549. James Otto Haas.
550. William Allen Norton.
551. Thomas Havard Sayes III.
552. Mathew Stewart Mathews III.
553. Terry Lee Ketter.
554. Raymond James Enners.
555. Robert McGarvey Colson.
556. Jimmy Nelson Bondurant.
557. William Thomas Platt.
558. William Frank Petruzel.
559. Hugh Bernard Brown III.
560. Ward Franklin Dean.
561. John Hampden Murrell.
562. David Kennedy Hewett.
563. Joseph Charles Casey.
564. Michael Bland Ellzey.
565. Stephen Kenton Grove.
566. Timothy Paul Gilbert.
567. George Edward Perkins.
568. Richard Thomas Clapper, Jr.
569. Charles Stephen Horwath.
570. Robert Andrew Kunselman.
571. Manuel Alvarez.
572. Robert Wayne Rettig.
573. Howard Martin Harmless II.
574. Bobby Gaither Whaley.
575. Michael Allen Andrews.
576. Edward Arthur McShane Sullivan.
577. John Edward Mikula.
578. Charles Thomas Heisler.
579. Kenneth Wayne Smith.
580. Thomas Richard Francisco.
581. Peter Joseph Gizzi.
582. David Gair Blanchard.
583. Wayne Keith Schaltenbrand.
584. Richard William Anastasi.

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF SUEZ CANAL TO FINANCE U.N. OPERATIONS

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I and five other Members of Congress have today sent an expression of what we feel ought to be done in the Near East crisis, to Hon. Arthur Goldberg, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. The telegram is as follows:

JUNE 7, 1967.

Hon. ARTHUR GOLDBERG,
U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations
New York, N.Y.:

Suggest internationalization of Suez Canal under management of U.N. Revenues after necessary obligation and expenses to be used to finance U.N. operations.

Further discussion and study of other canals connecting international waters, to prevent future crises, would free U.N. from pressure of due paying nations and make U.N. truly into a world organization.

Congressman JOHN H. DENT,
of Pennsylvania.
Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
of Oregon.
Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO,
of Illinois.
Congressman CLEMENT ZABLOCKI,
of Wisconsin.
Congressman DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
of Illinois.
Congressman FRANK J. BRASCO,
of New York.

THE HISTORY OF LANCE CPL. WILLIAM DONALD "BILL" JINKS OF BAY CITY, TEX.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article and a letter on the life and service of "Bill" Jinks from the Daily Tribune of Bay City, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the high quality and dedicated character of our American youth comes as no surprise to you and the Members of this House who are much closer to our people than the hard-shelled skeptics who enjoy finding fault with everything good about our Nation, including the courage and patriotism of our American boys. Because of the ill-considered and ill-founded conclusions that are drawn by some of our young Americans from the few miserable misfits who desecrate their flag and burn their draft cards, it is fitting to enter into the permanent RECORD of this House accounts of patriotism which are typical of the great majority of our American youths.

The story of Lance Cpl. William Donald "Bill" Jinks, of Bay City, Tex., is just such an account. Bill Jinks was a patriotic young American who took himself seriously, who took his country seriously and who took his God seriously. He was a religious boy who found religion thoroughly compatible and a complement to all other good things as well, among these being the love for his country and the desire to defend it against its enemies. To this end he gave his life.

Mr. Speaker, I desire also to include in the RECORD a letter from Mrs. Edward J. Anderson from the Bay City Tribune of May 23.

BILL JINKS DIES IN VIETNAM ACTION

Marine Lance Corporal William Donald "Bill" Jinks, 21, of Bay City, son of Rev. and Mrs. C. P. Jinks, was killed Friday in Vietnam action.

A member of an artillery unit firing at enemy positions, Jinks was fatally struck by a mortar round launched by North Vietnamese trying to knock out the big U.S. guns.

Rev. Jinks, now minister of Central Baptist Church in Lamoni, Iowa, notified Bill's uncle, Don Bell of Bay City by phone Sunday afternoon of the tragedy. Mrs. Jinks is the former Irene Bell, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Bell who live at 3000 10th Street in Bay City.

Bill, although having lived in Canada, Alabama, Florida and Washington during his life, called Bay City home because of his grandparents and many aunts and uncles residing here. He joined the Marines while living here Feb. 28, 1966 and had been in Vietnam since Sept. 9, 1966.

The young Marine was still a member of Calvary Baptist Church and the funeral will be held in the church here when his body is returned from Vietnam.

In his last letter from Vietnam—to his brother, Kenneth W. Jinks of Bay City—Bill, writing by candlelight as mortar shells flew over his head, said, "I'm doing what I want to do and feel I should be doing; there are a lot of guys over here taking a bigger risk than I am . . ."

Members of his immediate family surviving in addition to Ken are two other brothers, Claude E. Jinks of Kansas City and Rev. Charles P. Jinks of Port Hueneme, Calif., and a sister, Mrs. Keith (Nancy) Becker of Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

Bill was a graduate of Chelan High School in Chelan, Washington, and attended college in Oakland, California, and Kansas City prior to the family's moving to this area. The young man then attended Houston Baptist College.

Jinks had received a promotion to Lance Corporal only last month for his outstanding record in the Corps.

MARINE CORPORAL BILL JINKS IS DEAD, BUT THE EXAMPLE HE SET WILL LIVE ON

To the EDITOR:

In recent weeks I have become more concerned than ever before with the growing change in attitude of our country and its modernistic trends. With headlines giving more and more space to race riots, Cassius

Clay-type draft dodgers and agnostics or proclaimed atheists shouting "God Is Dead," my entire being has been filled with a terror unmatched by any I have known before.

How could I as a mother hope to teach my children strong ideals and an immovable loyalty to God and Country with half the world thinking God Is Dead and the other half too unconcerned to do anything about it?

How might I teach them to know the thrill of seeing Old Glory swirl and unfurl its stars and stripes with a pride that brings a lump into the throats of the men and women of my generation? . . .

Even greater than the problems mentioned, how might I show them that God is indeed alive and tangible?

Is it possible to teach a child in today's troubled world that high standards are still something to maintain and that Christian faith is to be cherished?

With all the confusion of our hurried world, until today, I was filled with doubts.

Until now . . .

On Friday, the 19th day of May, Marine Corporal William D. Jinks died in Viet Nam.

He was not old fashioned, but he died a patriot.

He was not radical, but he served a living God.

He was one of our new generation. The kind we can look upon with great pride.

Last year when Bill announced to his parents and friends that he planned to leave Houston Baptist College where he was studying the ministry, to join the Marines, we were appalled.

Why? You have a college deferment. You don't have to go now. Wait til you finish school. Wait til the war situation is not so bad.

Bill answered quite simply that he felt led by God to go. He felt he was needed in Viet Nam.

He amused many of us with his efforts to get into shape before taking his physical so basic wouldn't be so rough . . .

Some of us still questioned his decision. When he passed the physical he walked in tall cotton for days because he felt it was God's way of showing him he was going in the right direction. He knew he faced hardships and that he had a 50% chance of not returning. Yet he wanted peace for his country and wanted to fight for it in a land so foreign to most of us we can't find it on a map.

He never wavered in his conviction that God was sending him or calling him to Viet Nam. When he got there, he was faithful to write, talking very little of the war, writing of the familiar things he missed, always gratefully thanking the sender for each letter or package sent, steadfast in his faith in God, and always asking for our prayers.

Sunday when I learned that Bill was gone, I felt a great personal loss. But sadness always brings a great flood of memories, for me, loving memories, and among my precious memories of Bill Jinks I found a renewed faith in God, my country and my fellow man.

God is not dead! He could not be dead, and speak to a young man's heart so loudly that he would go bravely into battle and fight for freedom.

Patriotism has not vanished, for with his love of God and his strong desire to do the will of God, Bill carried to war a great love for his country and a real concern for the souls of the young men who will mold its future.

We will not share light, gay and happy moments with Bill again, but because he was a living witness for Christ in a place where young men could not deny God, some of our young men will return with a different outlook on life and perhaps change our world greatly.

For those who follow Bill in death, some who had shared his life briefly in a troubled land may now walk with him as he walks beside a living God looking down on a proud country.

MRS. EDWARD J. ANDERSON.

BAY CITY, TEX.

AMERICAN ACHIEVEMENTS AT INTERNATIONAL AEROSPACE EXPOSITION

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged last week to be a member of the congressional delegation assigned to attend the Paris Air Show. In this important event in which all the major countries involved in aerospace industry were represented the United States of America should indeed be proud of our presentations. I am particularly pleased to report that the State of California and more specifically the Los Angeles area and the 31st Congressional District which I represent were outstanding in the products and displays presented. I hope to discuss more thoroughly the individual participation of the many California companies on the floor of the House during the next few days. I feel all of the Members would be pleased to be informed on these matters.

As I approached Le Bourget Airport in Paris' autorante, the first awe-inspiring sight was the sleek X–15A–2 research plane suspended high above the pathway entering the U.S. pavilion. All visitors to the popular pavilion could not avoid noting the colossal progress made by air industry as they passed under the "Spirit of St. Louis" replica and the X–15 rocket plane built in my district by North American Aviation's Los Angeles division.

On entering the pavilion, I was enveloped by the eerie sounds of space satellite communications and the sight of a myriad of galaxies representing that beyond the fringes of our planet's 20th century realm.

In the pavilion I noted with pride the display of America's technology. One could trace the progress of our technical society from Lindbergh's flight in 1927 to the current flights by the 2,000-mile-per-hour XB–70 and the 5,000-mile-per-hour X–15. A look at the expectations of tomorrow's hypersonic vehicles and space travel assured each visitor that the United States was not faltering and had no intentions of slackening the pace of our present aerospace technology.

Climax of the pavilion visit was the Apollo spacecraft's command module. It was the same command module that had endured the fiery penetration of our atmosphere after the unmanned mission in February 1966. It was not a mockup. The actual spacecraft was there for all to see—complete with charred heatshield and painted image of our glorious flag. It served as vivid proof that America was not concealing her peaceful intentions in space. Astronauts Dave Scott and Mike Collins visited the display with the Russian cosmonauts. They invited the cosmonauts to crawl inside the spacecraft to satisfy their curiosity.

I arrived with the congressional group in the Douglas DC–8 stretched version, midweek of the show. It was bearing Eastern Airlines' colors and markings and represented the latest entry in our country's commercial airlines fleet. Later, parked underneath its wing stood another stretched airplane—the Sabreliner business jet series 60. This product of North American Aviation's Los Angeles division gained early attention at the Paris Air Show. A retired industrialist, Arthur Knapp, flying his recently purchased Sabreliner, set a new world's record from St. John's, Newfoundland, to Lisbon, Portugal. He bettered the previous record of the British-built fan jet Falcon by an impressive 24-minute margin.

During the last 2 days of the show, a multitude of flight demonstrations took place. I saw the OV–10A Bronco perform short takeoff and landings and very tight turns which demonstrated the maneuverability required for direct close-in support of combat field operations.

This versatile and rugged airplane is being built by North American Aviation, Inc., for the U.S. Marines and Air Force and would be a welcome addition to the forces fighting in Vietnam today. Considerable interest in this airplane has been expressed by many other countries and its potential use in the air forces of the developing nations should be fully recognized and exported.

Our country's grand finale was the outstanding aerial demonstration by the U.S. Air Force Thunderbirds in their colorful F–100 Super Sabres—another product of the California-based North American Aviation, Inc.

On visiting the various chalets, I found an audiovisual presentation geared for the serious-minded businessman, politician, layman, or engineer. Produced by North American Aviation, I must describe it as an experience rather than presentation. The North American Aviation people had synchronized a series of slides, films, and spotlighted panels containing sealed models of products presented in French and English versions alternately, the 14-minute presentation drew great praise from American and foreign dignitaries—both military and civilian. It truly represented our Department of Commerce message by depicting and predicting the many benefits made available and accruing to mankind through NASA's technology utilization program, and the aerospace industry in general.

Every American visitor to the Paris Air Show could feel justly proud of the many displays and flight demonstrations. I am especially proud of the contributions to the progress of our aerospace technology by southern California industry which was so dramatically displayed to the world once again.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FARBSTEIN**. Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear from the dispatches that the war in the Middle East is all but over. It is a misfortune that this war had to be fought. The major powers have no reason to be proud of the role they played in its unfolding. The power of the United Nations proved farcical. The Russians continued to make trouble until they saw that, beyond doubt, they were attached to the losing side. I fear that our own role was indecisive, until President Johnson held tenaciously to the policy that any cease-fire could not be accompanied by a return to positions held prior to the commencement of military action. It is only because of his steadfastness, that unanimous consent was obtained to an unconditional cease-fire. Israel has won a big victory, of which it is justifiably proud. This was a victory unwanted by the victor, and a defeat which the politics and self-esteem of the defeated make peculiarly difficult to swallow. I think we on this floor of Congress are all glad that the war has ended as it has, but I think that none of us deludes ourselves with the belief that the Middle East will be inherently more stable as a consequence of it.

Now it is time for the responsible powers of this world to stand up and perform their duties. The time for abdication is past. Without a decisive assertion of law by the major powers, this war will have been just another exercise that will lead only to another war, the outcome of which will be far less felicitous. Let us consider ourselves lucky that in the desert war of 1967 a confrontation between the nuclear powers was avoided. We may not be so fortunate again.

We Americans are now presented with a great and challenging opportunity for enlightened diplomacy. We have before us the chance to act to forestall further conflict in this area for the foreseeable future. We must seize this occasion, for it may never present itself again.

It seems obvious, at least for this moment, that the Russians have called a truce in the cold war in the Middle East. This is not something they have done willingly but that scarcely matters. They suffered a grievous diplomatic defeat. while the nations they supported were being beaten on the battlefield. They are no longer able to strut and swagger, just as Colonel Nasser must now behave with considerably more modesty. The Russians are not in a position to bargain from strength to continue to make trouble as they have in the past. They can no longer defend the indefensible or inflate the uninflatable. Their role in the Middle East must now take on a totally different tone.

I think it is vital, Mr. Speaker—and I cannot emphasize too strongly the word vital—that the United States and the Soviet Union make themselves direct parties in guaranteeing the peace that emerges from the current debacle in the Middle East. The time for vague promises, uncertain understanding and tacit agreements is over. What emerges from this war is the clear need for a peace treaty; one that is fair to Arabs and Jews in the Middle East, and equally important, one that is guaranteed in black and white and on the dotted line by the world's super powers.

Let me say that by lending themselves directly to a new peace treaty, the United States and the Soviet Union have the opportunity to influence its content. They can see that the rights of both victor and vanquished are protected. And they can also make certain that the Arab countries are no longer in a position to nourish the prospect of wiping Israel out. They can help write a treaty that is wise and without vindictiveness. The United States and Russia must make sure that the peace treaty is an honorable one for all concerned; then they must guarantee their power as the chief instrument of its enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I can foresee much good coming from such an arrangement. The most immediate benefit will be an end to the absurd arms race in the Middle East. That arms race brought us to the present pass, and threatened to involve the entire world in its clutches. The two super powers can see to it that this never again happens.

Equally important, a peace treaty to which all parties in the Middle East agree will be a liberating force. It will, of course, liberate Israel from the constant threat of attack. But it will also liberate the Arab countries of the temptations and distractions of war. I would hope that a just peace treaty will liberate Arab energies for the construction of a more just society in the Arab lands. Thus the Arab countries may reap unforeseen benefits from the events of the last few days. History has given us few examples of such paradoxes. I would hope that this war is a prelude to peace, a peace to which all parties in the Middle East consent and from which they will all prosper. But only if the great powers behave in a fashion incumbent upon them and upon the grave responsibilities that they possess will this happen. I hope I am not being unduly optimistic.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON PROVEN RIGHT IN MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I am sure freedom-loving people all over the world will agree that President Johnson has written a new chapter in profiles in courage by tenaciously holding fast to his view that the way to resolve the problem in the Middle East is through the United Nations.

I think all of us offer our prayers of thanks today that the President has been proven right, and that a cease-fire order has been voted by the United Nations Security Council.

Last Friday I was among those who warned that if the Security Council failed to find a solution to this problem, then the whole United Nations was threatened with extinction. I am happy today to be able to say that the United Nations has given new hope for mankind throughout the world in the action it took yesterday.

It is my hope that the United Nations Security Council will now address itself with the same vigor to the problems in Vietnam, and bring a cease-fire and understanding in that troubled part of the world, so that mankind can address itself to the great problems of the future.

The Security Council's action yesterday, however, is only the first step, as President Johnson has quite properly stated. Certainly it is my hope that this Congress, this House, and this Nation will stand behind the President in demanding that if the Arab States do not acquiesce in the cease-fire, that a U.N. peacekeeping force be dispatched, a multination U.N. peacekeeping force, be dispatched to this troubled area so that the cease-fire order can become effective, and so they then can address themselves to the longstanding historic problems.

I think one of the most important things we must be sure of is that the cease-fire order does not again rob Israel of the gains she has won on the hard-fought fields of battle.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are now on the verge of an era when we can solve the problems in the Middle East, and this again can lead to solving the problems in Vietnam.

We are deeply concerned that the Soviet delegate is behaving as if he has second thoughts on the agreement for a cease-fire reached yesterday, but I am hopeful that reason will prevail and that the cease-fire will indeed become fully effective.

There are great problems still ahead but the first step has been taken, and for this we can all be grateful. Israel's integrity and sovereignty must be preserved. If the Arabs are wise, they will now accept Israel's noble offer to work together toward a solution of problems which have plagued the Middle East for centuries.

I think today we can look to the future with a great deal more confidence because the President of the United States has shown us the way, and has led us in a manner that can bring peace instead of escalation of hostilities, not only to the Middle East, but to Vietnam as well.

The **SPEAKER**. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. **SIKES**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SIKES**. Mr. Speaker, the astonishing Israel forces are close to victory.

That nation's military campaign to date has been flawless. It is significant that the Israel forces are well on their way to a solution of all the points of contention which so long have existed between Israel and the Arab nations. They should soon find themselves fully in control of the territory west of the Jordan and of the Sinai Peninsula. I would suggest that the Israelis simply annex both areas and eliminate future problems. They would then control, essentially, the Jewish homeland and they, and the Western World, would have access to the Suez Canal and to the Gulf of Aqaba. The Western Powers should welcome this solution with its promise of longtime peace.

What is particularly significant is the ability of the Israelis to take care of themselves militarily. The Arab nations have more men, more planes, and more weapons, but the Israelis are well armed, better trained, and they have a fierce zeal for their homeland which is matched by few peoples in the world. They stand as an example to many other nations which are getting soft and fat and careless.

The U.N. resolution calling for a cease-fire comes too late. All it does is point up the ineffectiveness of the organization. It was a U.N. blunder which helped set the stage for war in the Middle East. The U.N. resolution will not be effective until the war has substantially run its course. Then it will not be needed. Future arguments there could hardly be expected to improve the situation which actually exists.

In 1967, as in 1956, there is an opportunity in the Middle East to settle once and for all the problem of boundaries and of access to navigable water. The Israelis are well on their way to achieving this. Let us hope that our well-intentioned efforts in the U.N. do not serve simply to muddy the water. Had we and our allies kept hands off in 1956, the situation could have been solved permanently at that time.

FOCUS ON CONSERVATION

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial from the May 1967 issue of Soil Conservation magazine, by Harold Jenkins, entitled "Focus on Conservation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, the editorial to which I refer is as follows:

Focus on Conservation

> Conservation has become increasingly competitive.
>
> It is competitive as to meaning.
>
> It is competitive as to function.
>
> It is competitive within government.
>
> It is competitive outside government.
>
> It means many different things to many different people.
>
> It is many things to many different people.
>
> Modify "conservation" by "natural resources" and you eliminate frill types of conservation employed by Madison Avenue—gasoline and tire mileage, armchair TV tuning, erasing washday blues, and the like.
>
> Modify "conservation" by "renewable natural resources" and you eliminate another kind of conservation—that pertaining to coal, minerals, gas, oil, and similar resources.
>
> "Renewable natural resources" include soil, water, trees, grasses and other plants, and wildlife.
>
> Most of these basic resources are in the ownership and under the care of private citizens. About three-fourths of the area of our 48 mainland States is privately owned.
>
> The conservation practiced on these lands makes it possible for all citizens to ultimately enjoy their own particular form of conservation.
>
> Far too few of us realize that the principal guardian of our heritage of forests, soil, water, trees, grass, and wildlife is not the Federal Government, or the State conservation departments, but the millions of individual landowners throughout the Nation.
>
> The Federal and State conservation agencies can counsel and assist the private owners, but the responsibility and the initiative are theirs. Their collective response is the reality of conservation.
>
> In the Federal establishment, it is the Department of Agriculture that provides the conservation assistance available to the owners and managers of the three-fourths of our land that is in private ownership. The Soil Conservation Service is the principal technical agency charged with this responsibility. The 3,000 soil and water conservation districts that blanket the land coordinate and direct these conservation efforts in the public interest.
>
> How little this is understood!
>
> For within the realm of "renewable natural resources" are many highly specialized interest groups.
>
> Those interested mainly in flowers or birds.
>
> Those interested mainly in hunting and fishing.
>
> Those interested mainly in swimming or boating or hiking, or nature study, or picnicking, or the like.
>
> Those interested mainly in preserving wilderness areas and wild rivers.
>
> Those who oppose all other "conservation" activities such as major reservoirs or highways or public parks that they think would harm their main interest.
>
> Conservation is all these things and more.
>
> It is a diverse and complex subject. It is little understood in its broad totality because it has so many adherents who see it from so many different viewpoints and view it in so many different lights.
>
> But conservation has a common denominator. Underlying conservation in all its varieties and forms—and upon which all kinds of conservation depend completely—is the land itself and its soil and its water and its plants.
>
> From these basics spring all forms of conservation. Without them conservation by any definition has no form or substance. Without them conservation is only a meaningless word.
>
> Conservation begins with soil, water, and plants. They are the base.
>
> These basic resources form the common bond joining the varied interests of all resource users, whatever may be their specialized definition of what conservation means.
>
> Upon this base is built a policy of cooperation between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the owners and operators of three-fourths of the American land—a policy that recognizes the legitimate ends of resource use for the benefit both of the individual and of the larger society.—H. J.

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF M–16 RIFLE

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter from a career officer fighting in Vietnam who charges that the M–16 rifle "is both worthless and dangerous as a soldier's primary shoulder weapon."

> The tendency towards jamming unless kept impeccably clean is sheer folly in an infantryman's rifle.

Claims this officer, an Academy graduate who writes me that he must remain "unfortunately anonymous."

The officer charges that the M–16 cannot withstand ordinary fighting conditions in Vietnam and that it is inferior to the Communist weapon.

He writes and I quote:

> The only personnel who honestly have no difficulties with the M–16 are officers who carry it but never fire it, and the soldiers who fire it from fixed positions, usually with overhead cover to protect both themselves and their weapons from the harsh Vietnam elements.
>
> I have talked with many an infantryman just in from a search and destroy mission who felt that his enemy had a much better weapon in the Soviet or Red Chinese AK–47. It simply boils down to the fact that the 30-round AK can come up out of a muddy rice paddy firing while the 20-round M–16 should not even be allowed to get dusty.

My correspondent has entrusted his life to a supposedly less modern weapon, rather than use the M–16. He says:

> I long ago exchanged my M–16 for an old M–2 carbine. It may not have the impressive statistics of the newer rifle (rate of fire, muzzle velocity, etc.), but it *always* shoots. And do you know that it is probably the only rifle we have ever made with a 30-round magazine? (There are supposed to be 30-round M–16 magazines available, but I have never seen any over here in Vietnam—typical).
>
> The AK–47 [that is, the Communist rifle] is a superb weapon and I dare say it costs but a small fraction of what the M–16 does. It may not make as big a hole as the latter rifle, but it is guaranteed to make one hell of a lot of smaller holes. I would take that guarantee over what the M–16 offers any day . . . and especially when *my* life is hanging in the balance.

The officer in Vietnam regrets that because of the rank of those endorsing the M–16, and I quote:

> The olive drab cards are already stacked to back these "experts" up. With declarations such as this [my correspondent referred to General Walt] the reputation of the man supersedes the value of the subject at issue. Therefore, an objective comparison of the AK and the M–16 will not be done if it is entirely conducted by the uniformed services.

The officer suggests a method whereby an impartial and independent test might be made.

> What should be done—

He writes—

> is to take two crates—one containing brand-new M–16s, the other brand new AK–47s (the latter are available, incidentally), and then pick the weapons to be tested at random. These weapons would be cleaned, oiled,

loaded, and fired . . . then progressively abuse both weapons (water, dust, dirt into the receiver, submerge in muddy water, etc.) and see which weapon best provides the foot soldier with what he really needs . . . *reliable* firepower. Testing infantry weapons only under ideal conditions (which no doubt has been the situation with the M-16) is farcical.

This might redden some important faces, but much more important to most of us is that it will save some lives.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times today quoted a Pentagon description of the M-16 rifle as it was designated a standard service weapon:

> Lightweight, fast-firing, rugged and hard-hitting," the Pentagon claims of the M-16, "it has demonstrated its versatility and effectiveness in combat.

It seems to me that its effectiveness in combat is far from a proven fact.

This is the second letter I have received from Vietnam in as many weeks expressing serious reservations about the rifle. I urge the Pentagon, and this Congress, to conduct as complete and impartial an investigation of the M-16 as is humanly possible. As my correspondent so forcefully reiterates—American lives are at stake.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the unanimous cease-fire resolution of the Security Council is to be welcomed. But it is only a first step. The mistakes and failures of implementation, of and since 1957, must not be repeated, and no withdrawal should occur without completely new conditions of stability and peace obtaining.

Most important is whether the states in the area will now move forward to peace and resolutely away from war.

Israel cannot be expected to go back to a status quo ante—where there was no peace—and where belligerency was proclaimed as a matter of right by the United Arab Republic.

Lest we forget, Israel believed her withdrawal of forces in 1957 was based on acceptance of four major assumptions reinforced by recognized principles of international law:

First, the Suez Canal would remain open to Israel ships and cargo;

Second, the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba would comprehend international waters with rights of free and innocent passage guaranteed to all nations;

Third, the Gaza strip would not be under United Arab Republic administration;

Fourth, efforts would be made to move toward relationships of peace and detente.

In fact, the past 10 years have seen these concepts violated and the right of belligerency proclaimed and implemented.

For the future—and given a cease-fire in place—Israel has the right to expect from the community of nations a new era—completely new relationships of stability and peace; an end to belligerency contrary to the Charter of the United Nations; and free and open transit in the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal.

As Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban eloquently stated the case before the Security Council last night, acceptance of Israel's statehood and rejection of the fiction of nonexistence; direct contacts between the parties as part of pacific settlement; and recognition by external powers of broad principles such as peaceful commerce as opposed to belligerency—these are basic starting points.

The United Nations should seek to get the parties together—and work for an enduring and substantive peace—that will not again be shattered in 10 years—but hopefully will last for 10 generations.

THE LIGHT AT THE END OF THE ROAD

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most notable events in American journalism each year is the series of awards by the University of Missouri for outstanding achievement.

This year the honor award recipients included a number of individuals and institutions of special distinction in both Missouri and other States. I was happy that one of them was the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, which was selected for the distinguished service in journalism award.

The Globe-Democrat is the State's oldest daily of continuous publication, and it was fitting that it should be honored, as the citation declared, for "its resurgence as a newspaper voice in its community's affairs and its unrelenting assault upon the blight of civil disorder, crime and stagnancy of purpose, with the goal of revitalizing the city's pride in its heritage."

At the recent ceremony at Columbia, Mo., the Globe-Democrat publisher, Richard H. Amberg, gave an address entitled "The Light at the End of the Road" which was of such importance in defining the role of the newspaper in today's troubled world that I believe it should be made widely available. He is indeed a great soldier, citizen, and journalist.

An article from the Globe-Democrat reporting on the 1967 award winners and the address by Mr. Amberg follow:

THE LIGHT AT THE END OF THE ROAD

(An address by Richard H. Amberg, publisher of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat)

It is a wonderful thing the University of Missouri does in honoring journalism and journalists, and The Globe-Democrat is tremendously proud to be one selected for the honor.

This distinction is doubly appreciated because of the vast amount of criticism which any newspaper inevitably receives, and most especially a crusading paper such as ours. You can't make an omlette without breaking eggs, and you can't do a job for the people without occasionally and *not* unintentionally stepping on a lot of toes.

I am strengthened by the thought that the press has always been subject to criticism—even from biblical times. I refer you specifically to the gospel according to St. Luke, Chapter 19, verses 1-3 which says: "And Jesus entered and passed through Jericho. And, behold, there was a man named Zacchaeus, which was the chief among the publicans, and he was rich. And he sought to see Jesus who he was; and could not for the press."

The Globe-Democrat has had a long and glorious history. Founded in 1852, we were the first paper in the United States to come out for Abraham Lincoln for President; even before the Lincoln-Douglas debates in 1858. After Mr. Lincoln's nomination in 1860, we campaigned effectively for him. President Lincoln later said that The Globe-Democrat was worth more than a division of troops in keeping Missouri in the Union.

In those days John Hay, who became Lincoln's secretary and much later Secretary of State, was a stringer for The Globe-Democrat in Springfield, Illinois.

The Globe-Democrat (it was The Missouri-Democrat in those days) was the first paper of national importance to call for the nomination of Andrew Johnson (a too much maligned and under-rated man) for Vice President under Lincoln in 1864, and we were generally credited at the time for his winning the nomination.

During the Civil War The Globe-Democrat was among the first papers in the country to have a war correspondent on its staff—long before Richard Harding Davis won fame in Cuba in this role.

The Globe's history was often brilliant and always honorable. My predecessor, E. Lansing Ray, was one of the sponsors of Lindbergh's flight forty years ago. But I like to think that The Globe-Democrat entered upon its greatest days when Samuel Newhouse purchased it in 1955.

I want to talk to you this evening about two facets of the newspaper business which are of enormous importance: crusading and the play of the news. The editorial page and its extension into other parts of the paper in the form of editorial crusades is the heart and soul and mind of a newspaper.

The editorial page gives spirit to the entire paper. A newspaper can no more rise above its editorial page than the human body can rise above the capabilities of the human heart and brain.

In the St. Louis area in the last dozen years there has been a fertile field for crusading because so much needs to be done. St. Louis is like the traditional bride's cake where she uses the best milk, butter, eggs and flour—yet the cake somehow doesn't rise.

St. Louis has everything which should make for huge success. We have unlimited water power, unexcelled transportation, a pleasant climate—in spite of last year's All-Star football game—a diversified and well balanced labor force, a wonderful location for air, railroad, truck and barge transportation, excellent electric and other utility facilities—and yet somehow we have been losing population and industrial strength relative to the national growth pattern.

Most of our crusades have stemmed from the general inquiry into finding answers to this all-pervading question.

We believe that one union is at the root of much of the featherbedding and intolerable labor practices of our area—and that if we can civilize them, much of the rest will fall into place. Certainly they epitomize the problems of St. Louis.

This union, Steamfitters Local #562, is an organization of only about 1100 members but of enormous importance. They have been our chief target in the past two years. They have the community by the scruff of the neck and are absolutely controlled, more than any other I have ever known, by the union leadership under an ex-convict named Lawrence Callanan and his henchmen. They keep the membership in a strait-jacket because they have a rigid hiring hall policy where no one can work except by tolerance of the union's leaders.

They have the employer in exactly the same vise because he cannot even hire his own foreman, much less his workers. As a result, unless he rolls over and plays dead, he finds that he has nothing but the lame, the halt and the blind as a foreman and as workers. You have never seen anything until you have seen a lame, halt and blind steamfitter.

Additionally, the steamfitters have a lug of a dollar a day on every member and $2.00 a day on every permit man. It's voluntary to the extent that you voluntarily pay it or you don't work. This lug produces almost $600,000 a year without a penny of accountability. This, of course, enables the steamfitters to make massive political contributions, which they have done in recent years—some contributions to individual candidates being well up in six figures, reading left from the decimal point. They had sufficient political muscle to get a Presidential commutation for Callanan which enabled him to return to union control. This kind of influence obviously is not in the public interest, whether it is wielded by the steamfitters or outstanding families, individuals or corporations.

I wish that I could tell you that we had cut these rascals down to size. We have not yet, but we will. One steamfitter has already been indicted and half a dozen others are under the most intense scrutiny. The income tax people have moved in, as well as the Department of Justice, the F.B.I. and several grand juries. Several Senators, though none from Missouri, have them in mind for future attention. I think additional will be forthcoming and all of this is because of The Globe-Democrat and The Globe-Democrat alone, the other St. Louis newspaper being content with rapidly re-writing our stories.

Perhaps one indication of eventual success is the fact that half a dozen steamfitter candidates for the legislature, all running in areas generally heavily Democratic by as much as four or five or six to one, were defeated by Republicans last November—and the entire Democratic slate of Circuit Court Judges in St. Louis County was defeated by Republicans because three of the Democrats were tainted with steamfitter associations. This is pretty meaningful crusading, and I would like to believe that it exemplifies the qualities inherent in today's award.

In the past dozen years we have had a great many other campaigns, many of which have brought success. One of our campaigns some years ago entitled "What's Wrecking the Railroads?" was the first series of articles in the country to focus attention on the frightful featherbedding in the railroad industry. As a result of this series and my open letter to President Eisenhower, a Presidential commission was appointed to look into the matter, the successor to which under President Kennedy gave the first antifeatherbedding award against railroad firemen.

Even more important than this, our series gave the railroads guts enough to stand up and fight for themselves for the first time in modern history. Much of the recent progress in the railroad industry, in the opinion of qualified observers, stems from this series—although we have won about as few popularity awards from the railroad firemen featherbedders as we have from the steamfitters!

Another series of articles, "Tank Town on the Airlines", resulted in enormously better airline service for St. Louis. The Globe-Democrat was the only organization willing to fight for better airline service, since the Chamber of Commerce was then dominated by railroad interests.

It may seem like a small thing, but a dozen years ago, as those of you who drive in St. Louis will recall, there was scarcely a single signalized intersection in the city where the motorist could make a left turn on an arrow and none on a green light, and there were thousands of useless stop signs. Today, left turns are permitted at virtually every intersection in the city—either on arrow or on a green light, and hundreds of stop signs have been removed. Traffic which has strangled our city now flows far more freely.

Missouri was one of eight states where the people's funds did not draw interest in the banks. After a penetrating series of articles and editorials, we persuaded the Governor to submit a message to a special session of the legislature for a constitutional amendment, and for the past 9 years the taxpayers have been enriched by more than 25 million dollars from interest on their funds which had previously been a special sop to the banks, one of whom reported at the time that the state's deposits, for which he had paid not a penny, were worth over $300,000 annually to his bank.

Another editorial crusade against a highly restrictive building code resulted in the code being amended, with the result that building in downtown St. Louis, which had languished terribly without a single building having been built in the past thirty years, has now—with the amendment of the code to permit modern practices—erupted in a tremendous building boom which would not have been possible before.

The Globe-Democrat and The Globe-Democrat alone campaigned almost twelve years ago for the Riverfront Memorial which had lain dormant for almost thirty years, and brought the project back to life. As a result of our series—implemented by Senator Symington, Congressman Cannon and Congressman Curtis—we now have the beautiful Gateway Arch and revival of our downtown riverfront.

There are but a few specifics of the past dozen years. To them might be added literally dozens of crusades for individual highway safety, for mental health, and the like, and strong and active support for measures for air pollution, clean water, etc., to the last of which the other paper in St. Louis added its voice to ours. Most importantly, there never is any doubt which side of the street we are working. We have tried to make the middle of the road exciting and have been a strong and dedicatedly pro-American voice in an area where the forces of timidity, doubt and retreat have too long held sway.

I cite these examples to illustrate, by our actions, the tremendous importance of editorial crusades.

I scorn the timid editor who screams implications at Jimmy Hoffa a thousand miles away but will not take out after the very great abuses on his very own doorstep.

A paper which is four-square against sin in Afghanistan but winks at sin in its own backyard really isn't kidding the people very much.

It takes a lot of courage to fight the bad guys like the steamfitters. In many ways, however, it takes even more courage to fight the good guys when you feel they have been wrong, as for example the bankers on interest on idle funds in the banks, and our thus far unsuccessful campaign to drag Missouri and Illinois into the 20th century by enacting branch banking in these states.

It is much more difficult to be against someone when you know him very well and when they may belong to your club or lodge. The same thing is true when one must necessarily take a stand against a candidate for public office in your own town. But it has to be done and if newspapers are worth their salt they have to do it. I suggest to you far more newspapers than have been doing it must turn to this in future years.

In the newspaper business there are two schools of thought—the thermometer and the thermostat. The thermometer merely tells you what the temperature is; the thermostat not only tells you what the temperature is but does something about it. I am proud that The Globe-Democrat is of the thermostat school and I hope and pray that our number increases.

Perhaps we are fortunate in St. Louis in having two competing newspapers which certainly makes for competition. It is easier to run against a live opponent than to chase the mechanical rabbit of your own conscience if you live in a single ownership community, although even in these there is generally more than enough competition in TV, radio and other media.

Crusading is important, however, not only for itself because it helps lead our communities up to higher ground, but it is important because it is the one area in which we can remain entirely non-competitive. We cannot compete with the speed of radio or the entertainment of TV or even with the high fidelity reproduction printing and in-depth reporting of national magazines.

The one place we can and must be strong is in leading in our community, state and nation. Here and here alone we have as close to a monopoly on virtue as we can ever hope to have.

Crusading in the public interest is indeed the exemplification of Theodore Roosevelt's view that "fighting for the right is the noblest sport the world affords". A newspaper is pretty weak tea without it.

The second thing I want to talk about pertains to the treatment of news. Webster defines news as "Something strange or newly happened: a report of a recent event: new information: fresh tidings."

With this as a guideline, we obviously have to publish in our papers unusual events and happenings that are newsworthy. This leads us unwittingly into a kind of negativism where we play up the negative and in entirely too many cases the bad part of our national life.

Perhaps this is in the nature of our business, but it seems regrettable to me that a couple who live in wedded harmony for 50 years may get only a paragraph or two on their Golden Anniversary, but if a man takes after his wife with a meat cleaver, he makes the headlines.

By the same token, safe driving is never mentioned, whereas if you wrap your car around a tree you are in the news. The good in our civic life almost has to be researched and sought out to appear in our newspapers, whereas the bad is featured all the time.

Many of the off-beats and oddballs of our society are really creatures of the press' own creating. I know that we must print the news, but somewhere it seems to me we have to find a better formula. Let me give you a few examples.

Last week, General Westmoreland, a perfectly wonderful man who commands almost a half-million of the cream of American manhood in Southeast Asia, gave a splendid speech to the Associated Press in New York. Outside, a handful of bearded bums and beatniks paraded, yet they had almost equal billing with General Westmoreland in many newspapers and on television.

The same thing is true of the pictures of the draft card burners and alleged atrocities in Vietnam which somehow seem to appear far more often in the dove newspapers than those of us who support our war for liberty and freedom in Vietnam.

The other paper in St. Louis, which has found very little to praise in America in recent years, had on the front page this week a picture of a man in Sweden stamping on the American flag. They also had a front page story reporting the hideous mockery of a trial held by a senile old fool in Stockholm. Surely the detestation of America thus powerfully featured does not reflect the feeling of overwhelming numbers of people in Sweden or anywhere else in the free world.

Aren't we really, perhaps in an effort to balance the news and to give both sides of a story, weighing a mountain and a mouse.

The old adage about horse and rabbit stew—one horse and one rabbit—is being terribly abused these days.

A while ago we had one of our thankfully few racial incidents in St. Louis when a handful of no more than twelve to eighteen members of CORE demonstrated against one of our banks. The situation was so bad that I simply could not believe the stories that our photographers and reporters told me, and I went out to watch the demonstrations myself.

When no newspaperman, photographer or cameraman was visible, the demonstrators laughed and joked with the police, but as soon as a photographer or reporter appeared, they threw themselves into wild gyrations, put their faces half an inch away from the police and screamed unbelievable obscenities at them and disported themselves like crazy people—all for the benefit of the news media who dutifully played it up on some front pages and television screens.

Still on the subject of racial violence, the press pays very little attention to the overwhelming majority of good citizens of the Negro race, but gives acres of space to such wild men as Stokley Carmichael and Floyd McKissick who, according to the best figures available, are actually generals without an army in that they have relatively few followers and very little respect from anyone but suspiciously large sums of money with which to incite riots and rebellions.

I do not intend to say that if we ignore these people, they will go away, for many of them have a legitimate complaint against society. I do protest, however, playing them out of all importance to their position and influence. Are not they really the creatures of the news media and have not we made them what they are?

The same thing might be true of an adulterous actress whose every movement is faithfully reported, while the marital fidelities—I suppose there must be some—of good people in the entertainment world go unnoticed.

In another connection, one disgruntled stockholder, perhaps for reasons of personal publicity or in the hope of provoking a nuisance value, brings suit against a large corporation. To what extent are we obligated to play this up when we say nothing about the tens of thousands of satisfied stockholders of the same corporation?

Certainly, we cannot ignore a riot in Harlem but somewhere, it seems to me, the newspapers have the obligation to bring the matters of dissent into far better perspective than we have been doing in recent years. Our failure to play the news properly and to put things into reasonable balance is a disservice to our readers and, far more importantly, a disservice in a very deep sense to the nation we love.

In our paper we make a conscious effort to play up the good news in our community, particularly in matters concerning the Negro where there is so much bad news, and in matters of self-help and courage and self-reliance, to offset the devastating effects of the current obsession of the Administration for poverty, real or imagined, in all phases.

I am not at all sure that we do this even as well as we should, although it is the very rare feature story which can ever capture the excitement of current news.

One of the great tasks of newspapers, it seems to me, with our great resources of mind and spirit and the vast news gathering services which are available to us—equated with the judgment of our editors—is to place the news in its proper perspective and to be a balance wheel in a disturbed world.

Newspapers have come a long way since the classic John Peter Zenger trial in 1733. The Globe-Democrat too, has come a long way since its turbulent, brawling days when it fought slavery in a slave-holding state in the 1850's and kept Missouri in the Union in the 1860's. The newspaper business is one which brings pride to all of us who have made it our life work, and I have no hesitancy in commending it to my sons.

I am not one of those who feels that newspapers are entering into the evening of their service. Quite to the contrary, I think there is great light at the end of the road. This light, in my opinion, takes the form of crusading for the public interest and of being a stabilizing force for good in a world tortured by dissent and civil strife.

Newspapers have had a great role to play throughout all of our nations' history in the past. We have an even greater one to play in the future.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, May 6, 1967]

GLOBE HONORED AT MISSOURI UNIVERSITY FOR NEWS, CIVIC INTEREST

(By Sue Ann Wood)

COLUMBIA, MO.—The St. Louis Globe-Democrat was honored here Friday by the University of Missouri for "its unrelenting assault upon the blight of civil disorder, crime and stagnancy of purpose, with the goal of revitalizing the city's pride in its heritage."

Richard H. Amberg, publisher, accepted the Honor Award for Distinguished Service in Journalism from Dean Earl F. English of the university School of Journalism in special ceremonies in the auditorium of Jay H. Neff Hall on the campus.

OTHER AWARDS

Other honor award recipients were:

Paul Miller, native Missourian who is president of the Associated Press as well as the Gannett Co. Inc. newspaper chain, with headquarters in Rochester, N.Y., where he is publisher of the Democrat and Chronicle and Times-Union.

Robert M. White II, editor and publisher, Mexico, Mo., Evening Ledger.

Marvin D. McQueen, an alumnus of the School of Journalism who is vice president of D'Arcy Advertising Co., St. Louis.

Die Welt, outstanding newspaper in the Federal Republic of Germany, with acceptance by Axel Springer, publisher.

Wckt-tv, Miami, Fla., honored for "its distinguished civic service," with acceptance by Sidney D. Ansin, president.

Mr. White, who is national president of Sigma Delta Chi, professional Journalism society, spoke at the ceremonies, a highlight of the 58th Journalism Week at the school.

The 1967 medalists then were honor guests of Chancellor and Mrs. John W. Schwada at at reception at the Chancellor's home on the campus and at the Journalism Banquet in Rothwell Gymnasium, at which Mr. Amberg and Mr. Miller were speakers.

BRONZE MEDALS

Dean English presented each of the award recipients with a bronze medal and citation. The citation to The Globe-Democrat hailed:

"Its 115 years of service to the St. Louis area and Missouri as the state's oldest daily of continuous publication;

"Its resurgence as a newspaper voice in its community's affairs, and its unrelenting assault upon the blight of civil disorder, crime and stagnancy of purpose, with the goal of revitalizing the city's pride in its heritage;

"Its militant editorials and news campaigns demanding new labor laws, new building codes, new freeways and schools, better housing, more industry, better local government and cultural improvements for the city and its people; and

"Its consistent practice of a newspaper's first function: to report the news forthrightly, and to provide constructive leadership for its public."

The citation to Mr. Miller praised his "sensitive leadership of the Associated Press" and his influence in building the wire service into "a news-gathering giant serving 8000 newspapers, radio and television stations in more than 100 countries."

Mr. White was cited for leadership in the newspaper field and "his reputation as a thoughtful and articulate journalist, earned with his own newspaper at the grassroots level and with newspapers in Chicago and New York at the metropolitan level."

Mr. McQueen's "distinguished advertising career" was recognized in his citation, which also praised "his devotion to his alma mater, manifest in his leadership of the Journalism Alumni Association and of the Alumni Association of the University of Missouri."

The newspaper Die Welt was cited for "its concern for national and international stability and confidence, and its determination, under the leadership of its publisher, Axel Springer, to break down walls of ignorance, prejudice and fear that divide the Germans into two nations and the rest of the world into many hostile camps."

Mr. Springer spoke at a Journalism Week program Thursday night.

The Miami television station received a citation for "influence and impact in its community through superior news reporting, hard-hitting documentaries and courageous editorials" and for "dedicated efforts to reduce juvenile delinquency and other forms of anti-social activities in the Greater Miami area."

SERIOUS THREAT

Mr. White in his address warned that the American Bar Association "now poses a serious threat to a vital area of the people's right to know."

He said the Reardon Committee of the Bar is seeking greater secrecy in arrests and trial. Some persons do not realize the value of their right to know, he said, because the media have failed to make it clear.

"The reason for our being is accuracy and truth," Mr. White asserted. "Only by serving the truth can we keep the faith and walk the hard and hazardous course that is our line of duty."

MEAT IMPORT LEGISLATION

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which will further control the import of foreign meats in order to protect the Nation's farmers and ranchers who might otherwise be slowly choked to death by the vast quantity of low-cost foreign meat coming into the country.

Despite the restrictions made by the Meat Import Act of 1964, Public Law 88–482, today's ranchers suffer the lowest prices in many years, and without bold new steps in the field, the outlook for the future is not at all bright.

Over the past year and a half, the price of cattle has declined sharply. Last week, a slight increase was seen when the Department of Agriculture made their mid-May announcements. But even those figures show that the prices are not up to what they were a year ago. Beef cattle averaged $22.20 per hundredweight in mid-May, up from $21.60 in mid-April. But in April of 1966, the price was $23 per hundred. The current level does not even match the price of a year ago, much less reflect the normal growth rate which could have been expected.

The losses shown in these figures focus even more sharply when considered in light of the fact that the cost of production and living supplies purchased by farmers rose one-third of 1 percent in the month of April, to hit a new high, now 3 percent above a year ago. Prices remain lower than last year; costs continue to rise.

When net beef imports in the year 1966 are totaled, including those which are not covered in the law, they amount to almost 10 percent of the total U.S. commercial beef production. And for the first 3 months of 1967, beef imports were 23 percent greater than the comparable period for 1966. There has been a steady increase in canned, cooked, and cured beef imports in this same period.

As to other meats, average hog prices were $21.70 per hundred in mid-May, compared with $17 in mid-April, and $22.30 in May 1966.

In brief, these figures reveal that the farmers and ranchers of the Nation have not enjoyed the normal growth experienced by the rest of the economy. Indeed, they have suffered serious setbacks.

In the light of several years' experience, some weaknesses have revealed themselves in the Meat Import Act of 1964. In addition to using a base period including an abnormally high year for imports, Public Law 88-482 contained two provisions which virtually assured a high level of imports. First, it provided for a too-generous quota increase based on the growth of domestic marketings. Second, projected imports were allowed to exceed quotas by 10 percent before such restrictions could become operative.

The bill I am introducing today is designed to relieve the problems of imports faced by the cattle raisers and livestock producers.

Briefly, my bill makes mandatory restrictions on the levels of import of fresh, chilled, and frozen beef, goat, and sheep, as well as on other categories of pork and processed meats. It differs from many similar bills now pending before the Congress in that most of those bills leave the import levels of pork and prepared meats to the President's discretion, while my bill creates a similar kind of mandatory limitation for import of all the abovementioned categories of meats.

Under my bill, the President does have the power to adjust the import quotas when required to preserve the national security when domestic production is inadequate to meet the demand, and when subsequent trade agreements insure that the purpose of this act will be maintained.

When foreign meat imports stand as such a threat to all meat producers, I do not feel that only a certain class of producer should have import protection. It is for that reason that my bill extends the mandatory limitations to protect all of the meat producers of the country, whether they produce beef, pork, goat or mutton.

There are essentially six things my bill would do, and I would like to take this opportunity to outline them for you.

First. The bill would eliminate the 10-percent cushion which must now be used before mandatory import limitations take effect.

Second. The import levels, on which the limitations would take effect, would not have to be estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture. Rather, the limits would be keyed to the average imports expected in that year, and actually experienced in the preceding 2 calendar years.

Third. The bill would change the period on which the total quotas would be based. The bill uses the average of the 5-year period from 1958 to 1962. This would eliminate the highest year on record, 1963, and lower the base from the present 725 million pounds to 585.5 million pounds. As to prepared meats and sausages, the quota would utilize the same base period, 1958-62, and establish a limit of 348,887,000 pounds.

Fourth. The bill states that quotas be imposed quarterly, instead of annually. This move will "even out" the flow of imports during the year, and prevent seasonal surges.

Fifth. The bill provides mandatory restrictions on the importation of other products, such as canned and cured beef and pork. It would extend the restrictions to fresh, chilled, and frozen lamb and swine; sausages; and preserved and prepared beef, pork, and veal.

Sixth. The bill provides that foreign purchases by the Department of Defense will be included in the meat quotas established for the United States. Under the old procedure, foreign purchases by the Defense Department were not taken into account in setting quotas. Consequently, the American producers were again cut out of a potential market.

The present bill has the endorsement of most all of the stock producers in my district. I have received much correspondence on the subject. As to the mandatory restrictions on pork-processed meats, the Texas and Southwest Cattle Raisers Association have endorsed such moves. I think it is good to see that all of the producers have joined together in an effort to curb the influx of meats.

And I sincerely hope that under the leadership of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who has introduced similar legislation, that this matter will receive quick consideration.

CARDINAL-DESIGNATE PATRICK ALOYSIUS O'BOYLE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the action of Pope Paul VI in choosing to bestow the honor of the cardinalate upon Archbishop Patrick Aloysius O'Boyle has been universally recognized as a fitting recognition, both of the personal qualities and achievements of the new cardinal himself, and of the importance and influence of the city and archdiocese of Washington. Archbishop O'Boyle, in the excellent statement which he issued upon learning of his selection, turned, immediately after the declaration of his gratitude and loyalty to the Holy Father, Pope Paul VI, to the significance of this action as constituting a recognition of the community which he serves.

> The generous action of His Holiness—

He proclaimed—

> is a deserved recognition of the increasing importance of our Nation's Capital in the affairs of the Church and of the world. In a very real sense this honor which has come to me is an expression of the Holy Father's gratitude, not only to the priests, religious and devoted laity of the Washington Archdiocese, but also to the many clergy and laymen of other faiths who have labored beside us in attacking the problems of racial and social injustice which are of common concern.

It was typical of Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle that he could see his personal elevation to one of the highest positions in the Catholic Church as a tribute to those around him, more than to himself. Through a long and strongly influential career, his success as a leader has consistently come from his evident concern, not with his own power or prestige, but with the achievement of needed results. Like Pope Paul, he combines a respect for the dignity of the office he happens to hold with a complete personal simplicity and humility. He has not sought leadership, but has achieved leadership by moving steadily, powerfully, and inexorably toward the elimination of evils in our society, and the achievement of social justice. Jovial and unpretentious in personal contact, the Cardinal O'Boyle can yet be formidable and decisive in public controversy, as witness his fierce attack, in 1962, on the sterilization of the medically indigent, particularly under government auspices, as in Fauquier County, Va.; and his denunciation, in a sermon in 1965, of proposed Government birth control programs as an "intrusion in the private rights of citizens."

The new Cardinal can look back upon a long career of steadily increasing responsibilities, and of solid and lasting accomplishments. His direction in life has been steady, though his goals have broadened and his powers developed through the years. His first assignment as a young curate at St. Columba's Church in New York, as director of the Catholic Guardians Society, an organization of institutions caring for dependent children in the New York Archdiocese, pointed the way in which young Father O'Boyle's career was to proceed. A practical and constructive concern for the helpless and disadvantaged, particularly for the orphans, the ill, the impoverished, and the victims of racial and religious discrimination, has marked Cardinal O'Boyle's life and character at all periods. Like Tennyson's Ulysses, he can say:

> I am a part of all that I have met.

As a boy of 10, delivering newspapers on both morning and evening routes in order to help his mother support the family after his father's death, he learned to appreciate the importance of dissemination of the news; and it may well be that this understanding, born of experience, entered into his motivation when, as one of the fathers of the Vatican Council, Archbishop O'Boyle acted as one of the leaders in the move to set up the American bishops panel, to provide for better communication between the council and the press. Father O'Boyle, while serving in the archdiocese of New York, studied in the New York School of Social Service Work, and taught at Fordham University's School of Social Work; he gained an intimate acquaintance with the institutional care of poor children by serving as a director of three different homes for dependent children, one of them for Negroes, all at the same time. During this period, too, he became a member of the American Association of Social Workers and of the New York City Child Welfare Committee. He served the New York Catholic charities in various capacities, from assistant director of the children's division to executive director of Catholic charities of the archdiocese. During World War II, he was made director of War Relief Services—National Catholic Welfare Conference; and of his work in that post, the late Archbishop John T. McNicholas of Cincinnati, then chairman of the NCWC administrative board, said that it would "ever live in the annals of the history of our country and the world."

The rare combination of administrative efficiency and human concern, acquired by Cardinal O'Boyle through native inclination, training, and years of exacting work in highly responsible positions, has been of immense benefit, not only to the conduct of the affairs of the Washington archdiocese, but to the hierarchy of the Nation as well. In November 1961, Archbishop O'Boyle was elected chairman of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and was reelected to that post in 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965. Upon his retirement from the post, following the completion of his fifth term as chairman of the administrative board, he was prased by the board for "his patience, his unselfishness and his skill in achieving a superb degree of harmony and unity among our hierarchy." The board adopted unanimously a resolution proposed by Cardinal Spellman, stating that Archbishop O'Boyle "presided over the progress of NCWC during the historic years of Vatican Council II and has been the quiet architect of the revised structure of our secretariat."

Cardinal O'Boyle has received honors far too numerous to attempt their listing here, but perhaps the one that best epitomizes his achievement here is the Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, which was presented to him for his "eminent leadership in fostering interracial understanding" and for his "courageous pronouncements in behalf of human rights, especially the underprivileged."

Cardinal O'Boyle was the first American to be raised directly from the status of Monsignor to the position of Archbishop. He was the first Archbishop of the newly created Archdiocese of Washington, in 1948, and he has now been chosen as Washington's first Cardinal. The people of Washington are justly proud and pleased that this great church honor has come to one who has so ably and devotedly served people of all races and all creeds in this great metropolitan center. Mrs. McCormack and I, in particular, are most happy, and we share the happiness of the people of Washington in celebrating the elevation of that great churchman and true progressive, Patrick Aloysius Cardinal O'Boyle.

A CALL FOR RESISTANCE TO AID OR TRADE WITH NATIONS ENDANGERING WORLD PEACE

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, recently I returned from the Middle East. While I was there I had an opportunity to discuss the situation with the Assistant Director General of U.S. Affairs in Israel, with the U.S. Military Attaché in Israel, with the Embassy staff at Tel Aviv, and with the consular staff at Jerusalem.

It is the firm conviction of these people that Israel can take care of itself if we will only stop helping its enemies.

We are making the same mistakes in the Middle East that we have made in other parts of the world. First we give economic aid, then military aid, then we send military advisers, and then we are in a full blown war.

In the past 20 years we have spent $13 billion in aid to the Middle East. We have followed a policy of building up a country so that it can wage war on its neighbors, and then we have to come to the aid of those neighbors.

We did this with the Greeks, with the Turks, with the Indians and with the Pakistani. Now there is great pressure on us to help Israel defeat the Arab nations we have been subsidizing.

There is an old expression:

> If you fool me once, shame on you. If you fool me twice, shame on me.

We are spending these billions of dollars of boondoggling money to potential enemies right now in Latin America. Mr. Speaker, I call for support of a concept of a world association of free nations. I believe we should use the leadership of which we are capable to help only those nations which are not involved in territorial expansion. We have to stop using tax dollars to subsidize war all around the world.

I call on my colleagues to join with me in resisting all aid or trade with nations that are endangering world peace.

THE OTEPKA CASE: A DISCOURAGEMENT TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, on June 1, the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman H. R. GROSS, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Government Employees' Exchange, a publication for workers in Federal service, concerning the Otepka case. The article dealt in part with the decision to drop 10 of the 13 charges against Mr. Otepka which were concerned with the mutilation of classified documents. Stated the Exchange:

> The informant added that the reason for the recommendation is Mr. Jaffe's fear that Mr. Otepka obtained positive information regarding the identity of the persons actually involved in the "mutilations" and, in the event the charges are maintained in their present form, he will be able to expose the persons at the hearings. In this event, the Department of Justice will have no choice but to bring criminal proceedings against the persons so exposed.

The rest of the above paragraph gets more interesting as it goes on:

> In turn, these persons have already indicated they will reveal the identities of the "top persons" in the Department of State who had instructed them to "mutilate" the documents and to "plant them" in Mr. Otepka's burn bags in such a way as to make it appear that Mr. Otepka had carried out the mutilations.

After what has already transpired in this famous case, the above statement comes as no surprise. It will be remembered that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee held hearings on State Department security procedures which involved Mr. Otepka, the hearings of which amounted to 20 parts. The report on these hearings is still being written and should soon be available. On the House side there is concern that Mr. Otepka will receive fair and just treatment. If the State Department thinks it will eventually slide this case under the rug and the whole affair forgotten, it is mistaken. Meanwhile, the American public can be of immense assistance by learning the facts and making their sentiments known here in Washington. Democrats and Republicans alike realize the importance of encouraging responsible and competent people to seek Federal employment; they likewise have the responsibility of assuring such employees that they will receive just and fair treatment if they clash with the Federal juggernaut.

To provide some background on the Otepka case, I include the article "Dismiss All But Three Otepka Case Charges," by Willard Edwards, appearing in the Chicago Tribune of June 7, 1967, in the RECORD at this point:

DISMISS ALL BUT THREE OTEPKA CASE CHARGES—SECRET HEARING IS STARTED

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, June 6.—Ten of 13 charges, filed against Otto F. Otepka when he was fired three and one-half years ago, were dismissed today at the opening of a secret hearing in the state department.

The motion to drop the charges was made by Irving Jaffe, representing the justice department which is acting as prosecutor before a state department hearing examiner.

The cancelled charges, once offered as justification for dismissal of Otepka for conduct unbecoming a state department officer, related to his alleged "declassification" of confidential documents; his "mutilation" of similiar papers; and his supposed providing of questions to be asked of witnesses at a Senate hearing.

ISSUE OF JURISDICTION

Asked by Otepka's attorney, Roger Robb, the reason for dismissing the charges, Jaffe said they did not relate to the main issue in the case—the conflict of jurisdiction between the executive and legislative departments.

Three charges remain against Otepka. They accuse him of giving confidential papers to J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel of the Senate internal security subcommittee, for use in an inquiry into lax security procedures in the state department.

Otepka was the former chief of the division of evaluations in the department's office of security when he was locked out of his office in June, 1963, denied access to his files, and placed in isolation. Formal dismissal followed in November, 1963. He has been seeking an opportunity to defend himself ever since.

OTEPKA'S PHONE TAPPED

Otepka's troubles began during the Kennedy administration when he challenged the procedure of waiving security checks for hundreds of high-ranking department employes. The department placed a tap on his telephone. Subsequently, three officials admitted they had not told the truth in denying knowledge of this "bugging" operation.

One of those officials, John F. Reilly, then deputy assistant secretary of state for security, hastily resigned but was later given another high-salaried position with the Federal Communications Commission. He has been summoned as a witness but Jaffe told Robb at the hearing that Reilly had not stated whether he would answer the summons.

Jaffe wanted to know the nature of the questions to be asked Reilly. Robb told him the questioning would cover "everything about his relations with Otepka."

PROTESTS SECRECY RULING

Over Robb's protests, the transcript of the proceedings was declared to be a "classified" document, not open to later inspection by press or public. Jaffe explained that certain documents to be introduced were confidential.

"Every one of those documents has been made public in the published hearings of the Senate internal security subcommittee on this case," Robb noted. "Even if they are to be classified, there is no excuse for secrecy on the remaining portions of the transcript There is no precedent for such a ruling."

The hearing is expected to last 10 days. Otepka has not yet testified. His defense is that the only unauthorized information he supplied to the subcommittee was material disproving the testimony of others that made him out a liar.

SOMETIMES HARD TO TELL FRIEND FROM FOE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in the Middle East is of grave concern to every peace-loving person in the world. We are in a tense situation, where miscalculation can explode into world destruction.

As we read the treaties which we have made, often with those who have had no hesitancy to break the spirit or the word of our documents, Americans sometimes wonder. It is sometimes hard to tell friend from foe.

We have asked as a nation and as a people more times than can be counted for someone to tell us one inch of ground we covet in South Vietnam. We thought that the world had learned that you cannot appease aggression—even when it is a primitive land like Ethiopia.

I believe that the United States must see that Israel's integrity as a nation is preserved.

Without question, Nasser and his Nazi-style allies exploit the big lie to implicate the United States in their miserable failure on the battlefield. He hopes to bring a confrontation between the big powers—to save his faltering course, just as he had failed miserably on the economic front.

I am disturbed, however, that the United States has contributed a great deal to these hostilities with its foreign aid that these same lands—now engaged in mortal conflict—have received from us.

Even when Nasser told us literally to go and drink out of the sea, it was considered by many foreign aid advocates as unthinkable that some of us would think that we should cease our gifts that helped to perpetuate his despotic course.

Foreign aid advocates claim the program lifts up the underdeveloped nations—and their most foolish statement is that it makes "friends" for the United States.

I thought of this as I watched the King of Jordan, himself the victim of the wrath of Nasser, rush to disassociate himself with a land that had befriended him.

I wonder how a soldier in Israel must feel as he battles an American-made tank.

These "friends" we have made are sacking our embassies. An American can be hacked to death among such friendly people today.

We have requests before the Congress for more foreign aid in spite of predictions of fantastic deficits. There seems to be something bizarre and yet strangely comic as we witness opposing sides both using U.S. airplanes and arms. In this same context, we send our money so that they can be stronger to cut off oil shipments to those who have given them foreign aid, to burn the buildings of the Nation which has won so many "friends" with its bounty.

The right hand does not seem to know what the left hand is doing. I think foreign aid ought to have a pretty low priority on governmental expenditures, particularly in light of the fact that deficits of the magnitude we have heard projected in some quarters, seriously threaten the American economy.

There is a limit to what the American people can do. The thousands of lives that have been lost in South Vietnam is a tremendous sacrifice.

How many of the "friends" we have made have come to our aid?

Most are derisive, insulting, spit in our faces, and trade with the enemy as the opportunity of a lifetime to increase their trade.

Sometimes it is hard for me to tell friend from foe.

But it is not hard for me to tell that we need more commonsense in foreign aid.

NEED TO ESTABLISH A LASTING PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, Israel, standing alone, has repulsed the enemies bent on her total annihilation. A resolution for a cease-fire, with no strings attached, has been adopted by the United Nations Security Council. The situation is approximately what it was in 1956. Mr. Speaker, we must not repeat the error we made that year.

We stepped in to stop an Israel-Egyptian shooting war then, too. And so anxious were we to stop the bloodshed that we did not adequately provide for really meaningful, long-lasting settlement. While our efforts then apparently caused us to gain some favor with the Arab nations, it was of a most transitory nature; those nations seemed this week almost in a race for the privilege of breaking diplomatic relations with the United States.

Should the cease-fire be accepted I hope, instead of returning to the old status during any negotiations—as we did in 1956—that the territorial status existing at the beginning of the cease-fire will be maintained until all negotiations to establish a lasting peace in the Middle East have been completed.

VALIANT ISRAEL DEFENDERS

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, though the hope for peace in the Middle East crisis has been enhanced by last night's cease-fire call by the United Nations Security Council, Nasser and his stooges still leave no doubt of their long-sought objective—the complete annihilation of Israel.

Despite their military defeats, their aim repeated now even with more vehemence than ever—to destroy Israel—as obviously impossible as that grand design may be.

For years this fanatical cause has obsessed Nasser and his stooges. They left no doubt for a long time that they are the aggressors. Their public declarations, their massive troop mobilizations on Israel's borders, their illegal blockades, their military alliances encircling Israel made this war inevitable.

The brave and valiant Israeli people—yes, Mr. Speaker, I say people, for Israel's defenders are men, women, and children of all ages—have amazed the world with their determined might. They not only have thrown back their enemies, but have pushed them far into the Arabs' own territories.

Unlike the Arabs, whose repeated objective has been one of destruction, a vow reflected so vividly by recent developments, Israel seeks only to live in peace and in cooperation with her Arab neighbors. In this war, as well as in the hostilities in 1956, Israel sought only to defend its land, its people, and its freedom.

The fundamental issues remain unchanged.

We are committed to resist aggression and defend freedom. To the dismay of so many Americans who have faith in our commitments—and no nation could have been more reassured by our pledges through the years than Israel—our Government announced a policy of neutrality.

Ironically, as a cover for Arab military defeats, Nasser now claims the United States is secretly fighting much of Israel's battle, which is typical of the Egyptian dictator's wild and blatant lies.

Now, in desperation, he compounds his belligerence and irresponsibility by cutting off diplomatic relations with the United States. He has cut off access through the Suez. He cuts off Arab oil.

Surely at this point with the break in diplomatic relations, we should nullify our status of being "neutral" in "thought, word, and deed" and let Israel and the world know that we will insist on a settlement of this war on terms that will not leave the way for any outbreaks in threats to world peace in the future.

We welcome the cease-fire call, and we hope the cease-fire will be just that—and not leave the way open to the need for a cease-fire later.

The United States, in order to yet give meaning to its commitments, should take the leadership in insisting that any settlement include the resolving of the heretofore hopelessly confused question of boundaries and the question of transit rights through the Suez and the Gulf of Aqaba. It must be implemented in cooperation with and protection of a United Nations force or other international authority.

And, most important, any settlement must include willingness of the Arabs to accept the legal existence of Israel and recognize her accordingly.

For 20 years there have been three devastating wars in the area. The Arab States have never accepted the reality of the existence of Israel and for the 19 years since its statehood they have considered themselves in a state of war with the Israelis.

How can there ever be peace unless Egypt and other Arab States accept the State of Israel?

Israel has indicated its willingness to accept the cease-fire, depending upon the acceptance by the other side, which up to this moment vehemently declines.

A cease-fire and a following settlement depends upon cooperation of all parties. There must be acceptance of the very realistic fact that Israel is a very much alive member of the community of nations and there must be elimination of the fiction that it is nonexistent. Lasting peace can only be built on the foundation of mutual respect for the rights of all.

IMPROVED WEATHER FORECASTING

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, 1967, a tornado which struck northern Illinois caused extensive damage to Oak Lawn, Hometown, Chicago Ridge, and other communities in the suburban area of Chicago and in the city itself.

The destruction inherent when a tornado strikes is very often complicated by the lack of adequate warning and this was a factor in causing the shock and confusion which naturally reigned at the time of the disaster. Therefore, I deem it of special interest that the Senate of the State of Illinois passed a resolution calling upon the Congress to expand research and development programs to improve weather forecasting. I ask leave to insert the resolution into the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

[From the State of Illinois, 75th General Assembly]

S.J. RES. 67

Whereas, The tornado is the most violent of all storms; and

Whereas, In the most recent such storm disaster involving the northeastern section of the State of Illinois, the tornado dipped its death dealing spout over the communities of Belvidere and Oak Lawn killing fifty-nine and causing property damage which mounted in the hundreds of millions of dollars; and

Whereas, since the Federal government is spending billions of dollars on national defense, space research and development, and a multitude of various welfare programs, it is appalling that so little of the taxpayer's dollar is spent on research and development in the area of weather forecasting; and

Whereas, The Federal government has preempted the area of weather forecasting, and it has failed in discharging its responsibility; and

Whereas, A relatively small amount is spent for research and development in this vitally important area; and

Whereas, there was no warning given to the residents of Belvidere and Oak Lawn of the imminent disaster; and

Whereas, Now after dozens of tornadoes have inflicted grievous loss and destruction on life and property, and thus far we have not found a way to control weather, there is an obvious need for the Federal government to push more vigorously in the research and development of weather forecasting so as to facilitate effective warning systems that will protect the people from disaster; therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Senate of the Seventy-Fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to expand its efforts in research and development of weather forecasting by substantially increasing the appropriation to the Environmental Science Services Administration, which has charge of the U.S. Weather Bureau so as to discharge fully its fiscal responsibility for the safety and well being of the people; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State of Illinois to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each member of the Congress from this State.

Adopted by the Senate, May 15, 1967.

SAMUEL M. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FENNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the House of Representatives, May 26, 1967.

———— ————,
Speaker of House of Representatives.
FREDRIC B. SELCKI,
Clerk of House of Representatives.

MEMORIAL SERVICE IN COMMEMORATION OF LIDICE

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, the 25th anniversary of the destruction of the Czechoslovakian town of Lidice will be marked by a special memorial service in Lidice, Ill., on June 11. I would like to insert the following article which appeared in the Joliet Herald-News—May 9, 1967—to remind us that the struggle for freedom is a constant one.

THE COMMEMORATION OF LIDICE, JUNE 11, 1967

In June 1942, a merciless oppressor destroyed the village of Lidice, Czechoslovakia. The destruction of this tiny village was an act of calculated cruelty which has never ceased to shock the conscience of the world.

However, despite humanity's collective conscience there have been many Lidices on our planet since June 1942.

And even as the list of Lidices has thus grown longer and longer, mankind's means for perpetrating new horrors have steadily grown more and more awesome and more and more terrible.

We Americans are brought up believing in the sacredness of human life, in the sacredness of human values, and in the sacredness of the individual human being.

In America, first among the individual's basic rights is the right to life. It must follow then that we Americans are opposed to the blind and wanton destruction of homes and villages—wherever—and to the blind and senseless taking of human life—wherever.

For the dark reality of the destruction of Lidice stands at the far end of the road from the shining promise of our American Dream.

It must follow then that we solemnly commemorate the destruction of Lidice as a reminder to all of man's continuing inhumanity to man.

And thinking on the forces which produced Lidice and its terrible consequences can only strengthen and reaffirm our faith in the Ideals of America.

For through the Commemoration of the destruction of Lidice we reaffirm our faith and our belief in the dignity and the brotherhood of all mankind which is nothing less than our American Dream.

LEST WE FORGET

On June 9th, 1942, a few miles west of Prague, Czechoslovakia, in the softly rolling hills of Old Bohemia, four thousand miles from the United States, stood a little mining village.

On June 10th, 1942, this little hamlet died as a martyr village, and its death knell was heard around the world. It was blasted, burned, and plowed under. The ruins of its church became the gravesite where its dead were buried in a mass grave.

Lidice was the name of the village annihilated by the Nazis on June 10th, 1942, in reprisal for the assassination of Reinhard Heydrich of the Nazi Elite Guard. They shot, by a firing squad, 185 men and teen-age boys, condemned most of the 105 children to the gas chambers, and sent the 203 women to concentration camps.

Lidice, Czechoslavakia was completely destroyed, and barley planted to cover the mass grave of the dead. Its name and past were erased from the public records, but from the onset the outrage for revenge and a drastic example to frighten the people failed in its purpose.

This tyranny so shocked the entire world that Winston Churchill and President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued an appeal to rechristen "Lidice" in the United States, to perpetuate in the hearts of all people the love of human freedom and the courage to maintain it.

Mr. Dominic Romano was at this time developing the subdivision of Stern Park Gardens fronting on Theodore Street in Lockport Township, Illinois. Through his efforts in conjunction with the Federal Housing Authority and Marshall Field, "LIDICE, U.S.A." was born. The formal dedication on July 12th, 1942 was witnessed by thousands of people. Compassionate Americans at this dedication vowed never to forget the atrocity that shocked the world. They knelt in prayer and wept for those who had sacrificed so much for freedom. Many notable speakers were on the program. Wendell Willkie, Republican Candidate for President in 1940 delivered the dedication speech. Others participating were Col. Vladimer Hurban, Czech Minister to the United States, Clifton Faddiman of "Information Please" radio fame, and Dr. Walter H. Macpherson, Pastor of the Universalist Church in Joliet, Illinois. A message from President Roosevelt was also read. The program was broadcast by WCLS and the National Broadcasting System on a coast to coast hook-up. The British Broadcasting System rebroadcast it over Europe.

One of the high points of the day was the lighting of a torch known as the Light of Liberty and the dedication of a memorial shaft inscribed "In memory of the people of Lidice, Czechoslovakia destroyed by barbarism, but living forever in the hearts of all who love freedom, this monument is erected by the free people of America at Lidice, Illinois". LIDICE, U.S.A. is now part of the City of Crest Hill, Illinois. June 10th, 1967 will mark the 25th anniversary of the great sacrifice that was made by Lidice, Czechoslovakia in the struggle for freedom. Because of the historical significance to this area, the Crest Hill Women's Civic League, Inc. feels a civic responsibility to rededicate the pledge of 25 years ago "That liberty shall not perish from the earth", and will on June 11th, 1967 sponsor a commemorative program at the Memorial located on Prairie Avenue, one block north of Theodore Street in Crest Hill, Illinois.

FREE AIR TIME FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress a matter of great importance and one which has already been receiving some attention in the other body.

With every presidential election, the costs of campaigning are becoming progressively more burdensome to the major candidates. This can have the unwanted effect of compelling these candidates to expend too much time and effort raising money, and that much less time on the issues of the campaign.

Some reasonable alternative must be found, and in this regard I call to your attention two recent and timely newspaper articles. The first, by William J. Eaton, appeared in the June 1, 1967, Philadelphia Inquirer and was titled "Free Air Time for Presidential Candidates"; the second article is by Roscoe Drummond and appears in today's Washington Post.

I suggest that, rather than attempt to solve this problem with an untried system of voluntary contributions by taxpayers, we look instead to the radio and television industry.

Radio and TV stations operate under licenses from the FCC. They are therefore under an obligation to operate in the public convenience and necessity in return for the Federal Government's authorization to use the public airwaves. Why should we not require, then, that these stations, as a matter of public necessity, provide a small portion of their air time to the major presidential candidates?

Adequate precedent for this has already been established. In 1960, the television industry, acting under a special grant of authority from Congress, provided free air time for the Kennedy-Nixon debates.

Only the major party candidates would be entitled to this free time, with criteria for determining such candidates to be established in congressional hearings. One major criterion might be the number of votes which a particular party received in the prior presidential election.

The FCC recently ruled that radio and TV stations must provide equal time to opponents of cigarette smoking who wish to present an answer to the great volumes of advertising. It would seem that the next logical step would be to extend this ruling by analogy, as suggested by Mr. Drummond, to politics. The articles I have referred to are as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 1, 1967]

HOW ABOUT FREE AIR TIME FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES?

(By William J. Eaton)

WASHINGTON.—Nobody is thinking much about how to save the taxpayers' money in the various proposals for Federal financing of Presidential election campaigns.

Yet it seems likely that Congress could provide for a reduction in campaign expenses without dipping into the U.S. Treasury if it were willing to take bold action.

The skyrocketing costs of radio and television time—a must for modern-day candidates—is given as one of the main justifications for campaign financing plans.

No one has suggested, however, that radio and television stations be required to provide a certain amount of time to major Presidential contenders without charge.

Radio and TV stations operate under licenses from the Federal Communications Commission. They are under an obligation to operate in the public convenience and necessity in return for the Federal Government's authorization to use the public airwaves.

Why isn't it logical, therefore, to insist that these stations allocate a small fraction of their air time, once every four years, to the principal candidates for the White House?

The television industry, acting under a special grant of authority from Congress, provided free time for the debates between John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon in 1960. The precedent has been established.

Even if the crowd-pleasing debate formula is not used in the future, cannot Congress provide for free air time for the major contenders, presuming the radio and television station owners go along?

The law was needed in 1960, it was argued, so minor party candidates would not demand "equal time" on the networks to espouse their views.

The campaign financing proposals debated in the Senate and forwarded by President Johnson, however, do almost nothing for third-party contenders. Only the Republicans and Democrats would get funds in 1968, for example, if such a law is passed.

If Congress is willing to reject third-party financing through the Treasury, it should be equally willing to bypass them if it decides to provide free radio-TV time in Presidential election years.

The amount of time and scheduling of political broadcasts could be worked out after Congressional hearings. The law might even ban the purchase of air time by supporters of either major candidate to prevent saturation coverage of the networks by the richer side.

Critics of such a plan might complain that the radio-TV stations were being deprived of profits they were entitled to earn from political advertising.

The demands of public service, however, should have a stronger claim on the industry, particularly since we elect a President only once in four years.

Newspapers, protected by the First Amendment from Government domination, might want to volunteer advertising space for the White House contenders if they want to keep up with their electronic brethren.

If the law is passed to reimburse Presidential candidates for expenses, the free-time and free-space offers would be one way for the communications media to reduce Federal spending directly.

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 1967]

RULE OF REASON—FCC SHOULD EXTEND IT TO POLITICS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The usually cautious, don't-stir-things-up Federal Communications Commission has really stirred things up this time. There are fascinating and far-reaching potential consequences of the FCC's decision that radio and television stations must provide substantial time to answer controversial cigarette advertising.

This decision is to the air waves what the Supreme Court ruling on one-man, one-vote is to politics—it is going to be felt everywhere and in ways which cannot immediately be foreseen.

The FCC has taken only one step. It has applied its doctrine of "fair treatment" only to cigarette commercials by ruling that stations which carry such advertising must also broadcast spot announcements, programs, and news items concerning the possible perils of cigarette smoking.

But this is only the beginning. The ruling that the stations must give free time to reply to cigarette advertising will have to be extended to other commercials if the FCC is to have a coherent and logical policy.

A formal complaint was lodged with the FCC against a New York City station (WCBS–TV) under the fairness doctrine. It contended that the station had a duty to make "equal time" available to "responsible groups" for presentation of the case against cigarette smoking.

The FCC agreed substantially and disagreed only in not requiring "equal time" for the answers which, it said, could well come from the American Cancer Society or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It ruled that it would be enough for each station to provide "a significant amount of time."

But there are bound to be other complaints and further decisions. It is hard to see how the Commission can rule that, while one aspect of controversial advertising requires making time available for reply, another doesn't.

Responsible people may want to warn against health hazards of drugs as well as smoking.

I am not saying that the FCC will have to guarantee radio and TV time to every dissenting group which asks for it, but I am suggesting that it will not be able to halt its "fairness doctrine" at cigarette advertising only.

It is wise not to make equal time mandatory. I think it is a mistake for the FCC to have made equal time mandatory in election campaigns since, in effect, it prevents the networks from giving the major candidates any free time at all for debate and discussion.

The FCC applied the rule of reason in the case of cigarette advertising. It ought to apply the same in the case of politics.

THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, now that the armed forces of Israel have virtually won the war forced upon them by the Arab States and the work of peacemaking has begun, I believe it is especially important to review the basic issues of the Middle East crisis and our own position.

On May 23, I joined with approximately 95 of our colleagues in the House—Republicans and Democrats alike—in publicly denouncing the warlike acts and words of Arab countries against Israel. We pledged our fullest support to those measures taken by our Government to make it unmistakably clear to those who proposed to destory Israel that we were prepared to take whatever action might have been necessary to resist aggression against Israel and to preserve peace in the Middle East.

The outbreak of war and the remarkable victories of the Israeli forces have changed the strategic, and to some extent the political, character of the issues. But, fundamentally, they remain manifestly clear, and I believe the time is appropriate to repeat our pledge of support to the integrity of Israel.

Led by President Nasser of the United Arab Republic, the Arab States, Mr. Speaker, left no doubt in anyone's mind that their objective was the complete destruction of Israel as an independent nation. They, the Arab States, were the aggressors. Their vitriolic, public, and repeated declarations of hostility, the mobilization of their military forces on the borders of Israel, the military alliances they formed for the specific purpose of surrounding and threatening that beleaguered country, and their illegal blockade of international waterways which are vital to Israel—these events, swiftly following one upon the other, combined to make this war inevitable.

Israel's position was equally clear. It sought—and still seeks—only to defend its land, its people, and its freedom. It has freely renounced, despite the relative ease and broad sweep of its victories, any intention of holding the lands it has conquered. The evidence is conclusive, I believe, that this young and vigorous nation desires only the assurance that its neighbors will leave it alone.

This is the issue that must be faced in the hours and days ahead, Mr. Speaker. We cannot expect a tiny nation, which has fought successfully to save its life against great numerical odds, to sit back and allow the same combination of hostile forces to recoup and reassert their vengeance. Such an expectation would be grossly unreasonable, and would contribute nothing to world peace. Our objective now, of course, must be the ending of the war at the earliest possible time. As of this hour, Israel has formally accepted the cease-fire ordered by the Security Council of the United Nations with the understandable condition that the other belligerent forces cease their operations at the same time. Only Jordan, among the nations arrayed against Israel, has also agreed to the cease-fire.

But a cease-fire, Mr. Speaker, can only be the beginning of efforts to build a stable peace in the Middle East. At the heart of such a peace must be effective guarantees or other enforceable assurances that Israel will no longer be subject to aggression by its neighbors, whether directly in the form of military attack, or indirectly through the blockade of waterways essential to its needs.

We of the free world are commited to resist aggression and defend freedom. Though our own Government declared a policy of "nonbelligerence" during the present fighting, this did not mean indifference to the fate of Israel, nor did it indicate a weakening of our commitment to its territorial integrity or to the search for a lasting peace. That search must now be pursued more vigorously than ever.

INCREASING THE EARNINGS LIMITATION FOR SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues now being studied by the Ways and Means Committee in its comprehensive review of all aspects of the social security program is the question of the earnings limitation governing the income of beneficiaries who continue to work while receiving social security benefits.

As our colleagues know, the present law permits beneficiaries to earn up to $1,500 a year without loss of benefits. If earnings exceed $1,500, the general rule is that $1 in benefits will be withheld for each $2 of earnings over $1,500 and up to $2,700. And if a beneficiary earns over $2,700 in a year, $1 in benefits will be withheld for each $1 of earnings over $2,700.

In common with many of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I have long been convinced that this limitation, especially at its present low level, works to the disadvantage of everyone concerned. It is inequitable, first of all, because it limits the income of persons whose only other source of income is social security, while it does not apply to persons who derive additional income from such sources as investments, interest on savings, and royalties. The limitation also deprives those beneficiaries for whom work would be socially, psychologically or physically rewarding. In addition, it denies the economy, at a time when the shortage of skills in many areas is a national problem, the services of many retired persons who are ready and able to fill these gaps.

As a case in point, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the effect of the earnings limitation on a very valuable program in my own State of New Jersey. Under this program of homemaker-home health aides for the acutely and chronically ill and for medicare patients on extended home care services, trained and qualified women are employed as "visiting homemakers" to go into households disrupted by illness for the purpose of providing light housekeeping, cooking, and similar services, thereby helping to keep families stabilized until crises have passed. Many of the homemakers, however, are social security beneficiaries who are forced to cease their work once their earnings reach the legal limitation.

In a recent letter to me, Mr. Earl S. Christman, president of a nonprofit organization which provides such homemaker services in my congressional district, described the problems created by the earnings limitation, and under leave to extend my remarks I shall include his letter for the information of our colleagues.

Our colleagues, too, Mr. Speaker, may be interested in the results of a recent public opinion survey which I conducted among a broad sampling of the residents of my district. To the question whether Congress should increase the amount of earnings which social security beneficiaries are allowed to receive without loss of benefits, 72 percent replied "yes" while only 8 percent answered "no." The 72-percent vote, by the way, was far higher than the vote favoring any of the alternative means of increasing social security benefits.

While I feel sure this result, as one-sided as it is, does not come as a surprise to our colleagues who have experienced the great and continuing interest in this issue among the American people, I do hope it will further strengthen the conviction held by many of us that Congress should substantially increase the earnings limitation in this year's Social Security Amendments. For the past six Congresses, I have introduced legislation for this purpose, and I know of no other legislation which has attracted such overwhelming support. Recognizing what inflation has done to the dollar since the earnings limitation was first imposed, appreciating that the skills of those over 65 are still in demand, and understanding the importance of encouraging retired persons who want to continue working, I am hopeful that the time has come for a major updating of this anachronistic provision of the social security laws.

The text of Mr. Christman's letter, to which I referred, follows:

Summit Area Association for
Gerontological Endeavor,
Summit, N.J., May 31, 1967.

Hon. Florence P. Dwyer,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Dwyer: We wish to go on record strongly urging that you support a substantial increase in the earnings limitations of persons receiving Social Security Benefits, or, better yet, completely eliminate them.

Since 1954 when our organization was incorporated as a non-profit Council on Aging, we have been employing qualified and trained women called "Visiting Homemakers" to go into homes disrupted by illness, for the purpose of doing light housekeeping, cooking and other duties, thus helping to keep the family stabilized until the crisis is over. This has now developed into a state-wide program of Homemaker-Home Health Aides for the acutely and chronically ill and for Medicare patients on Extended Home Care Services.

Many of our Homemakers are women receiving Social Security benefits. As soon as they reach the limit of earnings prescribed by the law, they leave our employment although many times they are desperately needed by the patient. But they will not take a chance that they might have an accident or become ill themselves and, having earned over the limit, be in the predicament of not having any more income for the rest of the year.

This is not only a great hardship to the women employed but also for their aged and chronically ill patients who must depend on them for assistance in the home. With the decrease in the value of the dollar over the past 10 years these women are in dire need to earn much more than the $1500 a year in order to adequately support themselves.

We are now employing 60 women as Homemaker-Home Health Aides. Even with this number, we are not able to service all the requests that we get. At the present time, with only the first third of the year over, two of our women have earned up to $1500 and are notifying us that they are going to have to stop working for the rest of the year. As the year goes on, we will be faced with many more women who will have to leave us and their patients for the same reason. This situation has obtained ever since the inception of our Home Care Program but is rapidly getting worse. The need for these women to serve in our community is very great and their need of income increases with inflation.

Therefore, we strongly urge you to work for and support a substantial raise in the earnings limit or eliminate it entirely, and end this most unfair restriction.

Since there is no limit on *unearned income*, what is the virtue in restricting earned income? We feel that the earner deserves much more at the hands of our government, especially since he has already contributed to this "insurance program" and must continue to pay the tax while he is employed, no matter how old he becomes!

Sincerely,

Earl S. Christman,
President.

VALUABLE WORK OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF YOUNG POLITICAL LEADERS

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I recently enjoyed the opportunity of meeting with a group of 16 young European Christian Democratic political leaders visiting Washington under the sponsorship of the American Council of Young Political Leaders.

Our discussion ranged over most of the vital domestic and international issues confronting us today, and I was impressed by the usefulness of such an exchange of ideas, which cannot help but be to the profit of all involved. In addition, I had the opportunity to explain to the visiting Europeans some of the intricacies of our own unique system of government.

If the program in which I participated is a typical example of the work done by the American Council of Young Political Leaders, that organization deserves a great deal of credit for the fine work it is carrying on and we all ought to consider how we might best assist this bipartisan group of young American political leaders in their efforts. I am sure that my Democratic colleagues, William Ford, of Michigan, and Richard McCarthy, of New York, who also participated in the program, will concur in this view.

The following leaders of European Christian Democratic youth organizations composed the delegation I met with:

Austria: Fritz Koenig, Kurt Sörö, Walter Heinzinger.

Belgium: Willy Laevaert, Leo Teugels.

France: Mr. and Mrs. Bruno Coiraton.

Germany: Lothar Kraft.

Luxembourg: Jean Spautz.

Netherlands: Piet Van Engelen, Rob Vermaas.

Italy: Angelo Sferrazza, Alfredo De Poi, L. Faragui, Miss Gabriella Geniola, Mrs. Franca Fagotti.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECTS

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Burton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, May 31, 1967, was a truly memorable day in the history of my State of Utah. A ground-breaking ceremony at the Starvation Dam site commemorated another stage in the construction of the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah project—a project that will greatly benefit the citizens of Utah. This occasion signified the results of more than 20 years of planning by local, State, and Federal agencies.

The Starvation complex of the Bonneville Unit will consist of Starvation Dam and Reservoir, Knight Diversion Dam, and Starvation Feeder Conduit. Stored water will be used to supplement the presently inadequate irrigation supplies in the Duchesne, Utah, area, and to replace some water now used in that area that will be diverted by the Strawberry aqueduct to the Bonneville Basin, which contains the greatest proportion of the people of the State of Utah. Benefits will also be provided at Starvation Reservoir for outdoor recreation, fish and wildlife conservation, and flood control.

The citizens of my State were indeed fortunate to have as guest speaker, our good friend, the very capable chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House, Mr. Wayne N. Aspinall of, our neighboring State of Colorado. As always, the chairman of our great committee, which handles about one-fifth of the legislation passed by the House, accomplished a superior job. He pulled no punches with respect to the problems facing the Colorado River Basin, the Upper Basin, or my State of Utah. He demonstrated keen awareness of future problems that will face this region, if we don't get to work now and pursue with vigor an augmentation of the water supply. He endeared himself in the hearts of Utah citizens by telling them that so long as he is a Member of the Congress he will work diligently to assure that Utah will receive her fair share of use of the waters of the Colorado River system. Those of us who know him, know that he means what he says. When, during inclement weather at the onset of a cold, mountain rainstorm, he was forced to curtail his prepared statement by saying, "It is time to conclude these ceremonies because the rains have come," the people of Utah knew for sure that they have a real friend in Chairman Aspinall.

As much as Utah citizens appreciate Mr. Aspinall's gracious endeavors in attending their Starvation Dam ground-breaking ceremonies under extremely adverse conditions, they appreciate even more his willing and able efforts in the Congress in aiding them to fulfill their dreams and aspirations for future water and related land resource development.

Coming from a State that takes pride in having pioneered modern-day irrigation and reclamation on the North American continent, this strong feeling toward a good neighbor is a genuine compliment.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of Chairman Aspinall's address at the Starvation Dam ceremonies in the Congressional Record at this point:

Remarks of the Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall at the Starvation Dam Groundbreaking Ceremonies, May 31, 1937

I am glad to be here today and participate in these ceremonies signaling the start of construction of this great project that means so much to the State of Utah. In celebrating this occasion. I am glad to join Governor Rampton and my colleagues in the Congress, Senator Bennett, Senator Moss and Representatives Burton and Lloyd, and also former Governor Clyde, former Senator Watkins, and Commissioner Dominy. This is a particular pleasure for me because I am proud of the part that I played in the enactment of the legislation that made this event possible.

The Central Utah Project is the largest and most comprehensive of any single participating project of the Colorado River Storage project and it will benefit more people than any of the other projects. The Bonneville unit and the other units that make up the initial phase of the Central Utah project will provide enough water to sustain substantial growth in the great metropolitan area stretching along the western slope of the Wasatch Mountains. By the construction of these units, the water needs of Utah's expanding economy will be assured for at least the next 20 to 25 years.

But what about the period beyond?

Must the growth of your State and my State be limited by the water supplies available to us from our entitlement from the Colorado River—or will we find the way and the water for our States to continue to grow and to prosper. This is the challenge we face today even as we celebrate the past and present success which this event represents. The water situation in the entire southwest is fast approaching the critical stage. It is appropriate, therefore, as we celebrate this occasion, that we reflect upon the past history of this great Colorado River, how the present development on the River came about, and the problems we face in the future.

It was around the turn of the century that water was first diverted from the lower Colorado River on a large scale for agricultural purposes. These first diversions, in 1901, by private enterprisers, to the Imperial and Palo Verde Valleys in California were soon followed by Federal developments under the Reclamation Act of 1902. By 1920, irrigation in the Lower Basin has expanded to the point where the unregulated flow of the Colorado River was completely utilized during periods of low flow, and further expansion was dependent upon the construction of storage reservoirs on the river.

It was about this same time that officials of your State and mine started to view with alarm the rapidly increasing use of Colorado River water in the Lower Basin. We are fortunate that we had men in our States who had the foresight to recognize the threat to our future if all of the water of the Colorado River was put to use in Arizona and California before our water needs developed. Such a man was Mr. A. F. Doremus who served as your State Engineer from 1901 to 1905 and later worked with the Utah Storage Commission. Mr. Doremus visualized much of the present day development of the Colorado River Basin and has been referred to as the father of the Central Utah Project. This concern of our water pioneers over the rapid development in the Lower Basin led to establishment of an organization called "The League of the Southwest", the purpose of which was to permit the orderly and equitable development of the entire Colorado River basin. You will be interested, I am sure, in knowing that it was your own Governor, Governor W. J. Spry, who called a meeting of that organization in Salt Lake City on January 18, 1918, to discuss the problems of development on the Colorado River. Subsequent meetings of the League of the Southwest were held in Los Angeles and Denver, and these meetings were marked by debate over Upper versus Lower Basin storage sites and by discussion of the possibility of an interstate compact. Out of these meetings came a resolution, the substance of which was that the use of the waters of the Colorado River should be settled and determined by a compact among the basin States. This was the genesis of the Colorado River Compact.

Legislation granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiations of a compact among the States with respect to the apportionment of the waters of the Colorado River was enacted in August of 1921. A few months later, President Harding appointed Herbert Hoover as Federal Representative on the Colorado River Commission. Each of the States named a Commissioner with Mr. R. E. Caldwell being named by the State of Utah. Mr. Caldwell was at that time your State Engineer and he was assisted in his Compact Commissioner duties by Dr. John A. Widtsoe. The Colorado River Commission convened in Washington, D.C., on January 26, 1922, where it held seven executive sessions. In March and April, 1922, the Commission held public hearings throughout the Colorado River Basin including hearings in Salt Lake City on March 27 and 28, 1922. The Commission held its 8th business meeting in Phoenix on March 15 and its 9th in Denver on April 1. It convened in Santa Fe, New Mexico, on November 9, 1922 for its 10th meeting and remained in session there until the signing of the Compact at its 27th meeting on November 24, 1922. All the States except Arizona ratified the Compact in 1923. It was not ratified by Arizona until 1944.

While the initial effort of the Colorado River Commission to allocate waters individually to the several states was not successful, the Commission was able to reach agreement on division of the basin and on the apportionment of water to each division.

I am not going to discuss the provisions of the Colorado River Compact. I believe they are generally familiar to all of us. However, I think it important to mention that agreement on the compact was reached on the basis of the clear impression and view of all the Commissioners that there would be much more water in the Colorado River than history has proved to be the case. For example, your own Commissioner, Mr. Caldwell, in reporting to the Utah Senate at the time he asked for ratification, stated that the Colorado River would have an average annual flow of from 20 to 22 million acre feet annually. He indicated there would be four to six million acre-feet of unapportioned water and that when a new apportionment was undertaken, an adjustment for the sake of equity could be made, taking into consideration, of course, any Mexican burden which the United States assumed. While you have these figures in mind, I want to call your attention to the fact that virgin flows of the Colorado River at Lee Ferry during all the year since 1922, the year the compact was signed, have only averaged about 13.8 million acre-feet annually. Instead of having an annual average of 7.5 million acre-feet for consumptive use in the Upper Basin plus some part of the unapportioned water thought to be available at the time the compact was signed, the best engineering judgment at the present time indicates that the amount available to the Upper Basin will be about 6.2 million acre-feet and, after acounting for losses due to evaporation, only about 5.5 million acre-feet will remain for division among the Upper Basin States. We are even in danger of losing part of this if it is put to use in the Lower Basin without some assurance that the water supply of the Colorado River will be augmented. These are the hard facts that we face today.

Now, back to the history of the River—

With the signing of the Compact, each of the two Basins—the Lower Basin and the Upper Basin—was in position to go forward with development, and I would like to discuss very briefly what took place in each Basin.

In the Lower Basin, the Compact made possible the enactment of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. However, this legislation was held up for many years because of Arizona's failure to ratify the Colorado River Compact, and because negotiations among Arizona, California and Nevada, with respect to division of the Lower Basin's apportionment of Colorado River water, failed to produce an agreement. Finally, in December of 1928, even though there was still no agreement among the Lower Basin States, the Boulder Canyon Project Act was passed with the provision that it would not become effective until California agreed to limit its consumptive use of Colorado River water. California met this requirement by passing the California Limitation Act in March of 1928 and thereby accepting an annual limitation of 4.4 million acre-feet of the 7.5 million acre-feet apportioned to the Lower Basin by the Colorado River Compact. Thus, the project Act not only reserved Lower Basin water for the States of Arizona and Nevada, but it provided protection to the Upper Basin States against California proceeding with unlimited development, and it provided assurance that the Compact would not be nullified. It also left the way open for the Lower Basin States to get together on water use by the inclusion of a provision authorizing the three States to enter into an agreement apportioning 4.4 million acre-feet annually to California, 2.8 million acre-feet annually to Arizona, and 300,000 acre-feet annually to Nevada, with Arizona and California to divide equally any surplus or excess water available above 7.5 million acre-feet. However, as you know, the three States never entered into such an agreement.

The Boulder Canyon Project Act was declared effective in June of 1929 and, in 1930, construction of the Boulder Canyon dam was initiated. Legal attempts by the State of Arizona to halt construction failed and the dam started impounding water early in 1935. Parker dam was completed in 1938 and Davis Dam was completed in 1950. Development in California proceeded rapidly with completion of the All-American Canal system and the Colorado River Aqueduct of the Metropolitan Water District, and California is presently using not only 4.4 million acre-feet but an additional 700,000 acre-feet from surplus flows.

The Mexican Water Treaty, which was a matter of discussion and negotiation from the time of the Colorado River Compact, was finally entered into in 1944 during a war period when our government was under great pressure to resolve this controversy with our neighboring country to the south. The Treaty guarantees annually to Mexico 1.5 million acre-feet of water with a little flexibility provided in years of surplus and in years of extreme drouth.

Arizona finally ratified the Colorado River Compact in 1944 and in this same year entered into a contract with the Department of the Interior for 2.8 million acre-feet of water pursuant to the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. Soon thereafter Arizona initiated its long and controversial fight to obtain authorization of its Central Arizona Project.

After failing in several Congresses to obtain authorization of the Central Arizona Project, and after the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in April of 1951 passed a resolution postponing action on the Central Arizona Project until the water in the Lower Colorado River Basin had been adjudicated, Arizona brought suit against California in 1952. Arizona's complaint alleged that, pursuant to the Colorado River Compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act, Arizona was entitled to the beneficial consumptive use of 2.8 million acre-feet of water each year from the Colorado River. This litigation extended over a period of 12 years and the final decree of the Supreme Court was not issued until March of 1964. The decision of the Supreme Court was favorable to Arizona. Using the Boulder Canyon Project Act as the basis for its decision, the Supreme Court provided that Arizona would receive 2.8 million acre-feet of an available 7.5 million acre-feet in the mainstream of the Colorado River and its tributaries above Hoover Dam, that California would receive 4.4 million acre-feet, and that Nevada would receive 300,000 acre-feet, with Arizona and California dividing equally any surplus water. Arizona was thus given the water of the Gila River without charge. Under the Decree, in years of water shortage, the Secretary of the Interior has authority to allocate and distribute the waters of the mainstream of the Colorado available in the Lower Basin. Thus, the Decree places a very heavy responsibility upon the Secretary of the Interior for, as we all know now, when the Upper Basin States use the water apportioned to the Upper Basin under the Colorado River Compact, even though it may be the consumptive use of only 6.2 million acre-feet as I indicated earlier, every year in the Lower Basin will be a water-short year unless there is augmentation of the water supplies of the Colorado River.

The Engineers tell us that, when the Upper Basin makes full use of its water, it will require 2.5 million acre-feet of new water in the Lower Basin to meet our commitment under the Mexican Water Treaty and deliver 7.5 million acre-feet of mainstream water to the three Lower Basin States. One of the purposes of the Colorado River Legislation which we are presently considering is to implement the Decree of the Supreme Court in Arizona vs. California and establish guidelines for water management throughout the entire Basin.

As I intersperse this brief history with figures on water availability, you can begin to see that this is the real problem which makes it so difficult for us to reach any agreement with respect to the Colorado River Project legislation now before us.

Now let us turn briefly to the Upper Basin States and see what has transpired there since the signing of the Colorado River Compact—

In the Upper Basin, the problem of reaching an agreement on a Compact to divide the water apportioned to the Upper Basin States by the Colorado River Compact was much less controversial than in the Lower Basin.

After many years of study and preliminary negotiations, the Upper Basin Compact was executed in October 1948 at Santa Fe, New Mexico. The States involved were the four Upper Division States plus Arizona which has a small area in the Upper Basin although it is a Lower Division State. Utah was represented in these compact negotiations by Edward H. Watson, who was then your State Engineer, and by Grover Giles, your Attorney General. The compact agreed upon gives to the State of Arizona 50,000 acre-feet annually of the water apportioned to the Upper Basin States by the Colorado River Compact. The remainder is apportioned to the other States on the basis of a percentage formula. Colorado receives 51.75 percent of the amount available; New Mexico, 11.25 percent; Utah, 23 percent; and Wyoming, 14 percent.

It seems appropriate at this point to point out that, using these Compact percentages and assuming the availability for consumptive use of 5.5 million acre-feet in the Upper Basin which, as I have already mentioned, is the best engineering estimate we have at the present time, Utah would be entitled to the consumptive use of 1,265,000 acre-feet annually; Colorado, 2,846,000 acre-feet annually; New Mexico, 619,000 acre-feet annually; and Wyoming, 770,000 acre-feet annually. When we develop the figures this way we can see that the water is not as plentiful as we had thought and that the situation in the Upper Basin is as critical as in the Lower Basin. Utah's entitlement, on the basis of these figures, will provide the water needed for the initial phase of the Central Utah Project and other expected water needs in your State during the next 20 to 25 years. However, there would not be sufficient water to meet more than half the supply for the ultimate phase of the Central Utah project as presently planned.

Before referring to the challenge we face in providing the water necessary to our future economic growth, let me fill in the remaining gap in the history of our water development.

After the Upper Basin Compact was executed, the Upper Basin States were then in position to go forward with development, and this brings us to the legislation which makes possible the event we are celebrating today—the legislation which authorized the Colorado River Storage Project and the initial stage of the Central Utah Project as one of eleven participating projects.

After more than ten years of study by the Bureau of Reclamation, the feasibility report on the Colorado River Storage Project was submitted to the Congress in December, 1950. Five storage units and 11 participating projects were recommended for immediate authorization and construction.

The first legislation was introduced in April 1953, and the first consideration by the Congress was in January 1954 when the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held nine days of public hearings. At that time, Utah was represented on the Committee by the Honorable Bill Dawson. One of the bills which the Committee had under consideration was the bill he introduced. There was also a bill in the Senate which was cosponsored by Senator Watkins and Senator Bennett. Utah's presentation to the Committees of the Congress in behalf of this legislation was led by George Clyde, who was then Interstate Streams Commissioner and Director of the Utah Water and Power Board, and later Governor. He is still one of your most active and effective water leaders. At those hearings we had the Echo Park issue which so closely resembles the Grand Canyon issue of today. In addition to the attack by the preservationists, the legislation was opposed by the water agencies of southern California. Their interest, of course, was in delaying Upper Basin development and thus keeping the surplus water flowing into the Lower Basin and available for their own use.

After the Committee hearings on the legislation were completed and the Committee was in the process of marking up the legislation for reporting to the House, President Eisenhower modified the previous position of the Executive Branch by recommending the immediate authorization of only two storage units—Echo Park and Glen Canyon. All of the participating projects were recommended for further study prior to authorization. Nevertheless, the Committee favorably reported Mr. Dawson's bill on May 18, 1954, with the Glen Canyon, Echo Park, and Curecanti storage units and 11 participating projects including the initial phase of the Central Utah project. The favorable vote in Committee was only 13 to 12 and, in view of the controversy and the lateness in the session, we agreed that it was best not to press for House consideration at that time.

You will recall that the 84th Congress convened in January of 1955 with the Democrats in control. The late Clair Engle of California became Chairman of the Committee and I became Chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation. Numerous bills to authorize the Colorado River Storage Project and participating projects were reintroduced in the early days of the 84th Congress. Basically, this legislation was in the same form that received Committee approval in the 83rd Congress with the exception that the Flaming Gorge storage unit was included.

Committee hearings were held in March and April, 1955, with about the same groups opposing the legislation that had opposed it the year before. Many of you will recall the attacks made on the legislation by General U. S. Grant III, speaking for the preservationist groups, and former Wyoming Governor Leslie A. Miller, as well as the southern California water agencies. However, the mood of the Committee was more favorable to the legislation. The bill was marked up during June 1955 and was favorably reported after Echo Park, by agreement, had been deleted. Those of us on the Committee and in the House at that time, including your own Representatives, Bill Dawson and Henry Dixon, reached the conclusion, after a very careful survey and appraisal of the feeling among House Members, that the legislation could not be passed in the House with the Echo Park unit included. I personally favored the inclusion of Echo Park and was disappointed that it could not be retained. As a matter of fact, I offered an amendment which provided, in lieu of keeping the Echo Park unit in the bill, for the establishment of a three-man board of eminent disinterested engineers to review the Echo Park plan and alternatives thereto and report their findings and recommendations to the Congress. This amendment was adopted in Subcommittee but was later defeated when the legislation was in Full Committee.

As approved by the Committee, the legislation included the Glen Canyon, Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, and Navajo storage units, and 11 participating projects. The Committee filed its report on the legislation on July 8 of 1955 and a rule providing for Floor debate was granted by the Rules Committee on July 21. However, less than two weeks later, on August 2, the first session of the 84th Congress adjourned and there was not time to consider the Storage Project legislation.

During the adjournment period between the first and second sessions of the 84th Congress, there were several meetings by the Upper Colorado River Commission and others which had an important bearing upon the final form of the legislation. The most important matter taken up at these meetings related to the apportionment of surplus power revenues among the States so that each State could proceed expeditiously with development of its water resources. Because of the direct relationship between water availability and development, it was my thought that the surplus power revenues should be divided in the same proportion as the remaining undeveloped water in each State. This seemed to be an equitable solution and this principle was finally accepted. For instance, under this principle, it was determined that Utah was entitled to 21.5 percent of the remaining undeveloped Upper Basin water and therefore 21.5 percent of the surplus power revenues from operation of the storage units should be assigned to Utah to assist development of its remaining resources.

Those of you who are familiar with the legislative history of this project will recall that we made a special concession to Utah on this matter of assignment of excess power revenues. I mention this because of the special meaning it has for the project we are starting today and because I want you to know that I accepted this concession to Utah after specific studies which I requested convinced me that the arrangement was equitable. We agreed that the power revenues of the Central Utah project could all be applied toward the repayment of the cost of that project and would not have to be divided among all of the States. In other words, Utah retains all of the surplus power revenues of the Central Utah project and, in addition, gets 21.5 percent of the surplus power revenues from operations at Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge and Curecanti.

Before leaving my discussion of this matter, I have some dollar figures that will be of special interest to you. On the basis of latest estimates from the Bureau, the Central Utah Project will produce, over the storage project repayment period, $92 million in excess power revenues to assist development in your State, and the 21.5 percent of the storage project excess power revenues over the same period will amount to about $208 million. This total of $300 million is roughly $170 million more than the amount required to repay the cost of the initial phase of the Central Utah project which means that Utah has about $170 million which can be used for future development providing water is available.

Now, let me get back to the Colorado Storage Act to quickly conclude this brief history. It can be said that as a result of the meetings and negotiations during adjournment period between the first and second sessions of the 84th Congress there was general agreement among all Upper Basin interests as to the provisions to be included in the final legislation.

In February 1956 we secured permission from the House of Representatives to reconsider the legislation we had favorably reported from the Committee. The legislation was called up in the Committee on February 8, 1956 and amended in several respects, the most important of which was the provision calling for division among the States of the surplus power revenues. The agreement with respect to this matter which had been worked out among Upper Basin interests was adopted by the Committee Another important amendment from the standpoint of project financing was a provision which made non-reimbursable the costs allocated to the irrigation of Indian lands and beyond the repayment capability of such lands.

The Committee's supplemental report was filed on February 14, 1956, and the legislation was called up in the House on February 28, 1956, in a much more favorable atmosphere than had previously existed. After three days of debate on the legislation, and coincident with President Eisenhower's announcement for reelection, the House of Representatives approved it by a vote of 256 to 136. At the time the House acted favorably, similar legislation had already passed the Senate. We went to conference on the differences between the two versions of the bill and held three meetings before final agreement was reached. The language finally agreed upon was, for the most part, the language of the House bill. The scope of the House-approved plan did not change. In other words, the Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navajo storage units and the 11 participating projects including the Central Utah were approved. The $760 million limitation on funds authorized to be appropriated was retained in the Conference Report although it was recognized by the Conference Committee that this amount would not be adequate to construct the authorized units and participating projects. The time is approaching when this ceiling on appropriations must be raised.

The report of the Conference Committee was filed in the House on March 27 and was approved in both bodies of the Congress on March 28. The legislation was signed into law by President Eisenhower on April 11, 1956. Thus ends the legislative history except to say that since 1956 we have added several additional participating projects.

As I have gone through this brief history of Colorado River development, I have mentioned a few of your water leaders, and I know that there are many others who should be mentioned and who deserve a lot of credit for the fine record of your State in the water field. One that none of us will forget is William R. (Uncle Billy) Wallace, whose water career in your State bridged the entire interval between the Colorado River Compact of 1922 and the Upper Basin Compact of 1948. "Uncle Billy" gave unselfishly of his time to keep water studies and development moving in your State. He was Chairman of the Utah Water and Power Board for many years and was a most active leader in the Utah Water Users Association. He played an important role in getting our States together in connection with the Upper Basin Compact negotiations. Associated with Mr. Wallace was Tom Jensen, who was the long-time Secretary-Manager of the Water Users Association.

In closing these remarks I want to say a few words about the future of the Colorado River Basin and the challenge which we face. Our future population and economic growth will be governed by the water that is available. Full development of the resources of your State and mine depends upon the availability of the water.

The figures which I have given you on water availability from the Colorado River makes it quite clear, I believe, that our economic growth will be limited unless we find new sources of water. The time to start looking for these new sources is now. As you know, the principal problem relating to authorization of the Central Arizona Project is that its long-term water supply is dependent upon Upper Basin water or augmentation of the water supplies of the Colorado River. It seems to me that if we are to authorize further development which depends upon water other than that available from the Colorado River, then, at the same time, we must set in motion the necessary steps to find these new supplies. As I have said, the best engineering estimates we have indicate that Colorado River water will have to be augmented by 2.5 million acre-feet annually just to keep the river whole—that is, just to furnish the amounts already committed by compacts, contracts, the Supreme Court decree in Arizona vs. California, and the Mexican Water Treaty. In other words, we have divided more water than is available and 2.5 million acre-feet of new water is the very minimum amount which will resolve our immediate problem. Meaningful studies to find new sources for at least this amount must be initiated immediately. Authorization of the Hualapai dam and power development adds real meaning to these augmentation studies because power operations at Hualapai would help finance any augmentation project.

I have stated on several occasions that I believe that the first step we in the West must take to meet our long-term water needs is to adopt the philosophy of water planning on a west-wide basis, giving consideration not only to regional transfers and exchanges of water supplies but to all other means of augmentation such as water salvage, desalination, weather modification, etc. We in Colorado and you in Utah long ago accepted the principle of water resources planning on a state-wide basis and that is the reason we are celebrating today the start of a transbasin water project. Now, in my opinion, we must extend this philosophy beyond State lines and beyond river basins to make it apply west-wide. When our late beloved President Kennedy was in my State shortly before his untimely death, he said this:

"What I preach is interdependence of the United States. We are not 50 countries. We are one country of 50 States and one people, and I believe that those programs which make life better for some of our people will make life better for all of our people."

President Kennedy was referring to water resources development, and he was saying that we must plan the development of our water resources for the maximum benefit of all of our states. West-wide water planning will require the highest degree of water statesmanship and can succeed only if the states themselves get together and agree upon planning procedures which will protect the interests of all of the states while permitting our water resources to be put to full use. It is my opinion that the complicated issues involved in western water planning and development cannot be resolved by some neutral group given a national rather than a specific duty to perform.

So, today, as we reflect upon the past and celebrate the start of this great project, let us look to the future and resolve to cooperate in meeting the challenge which it presents.

THE TRAGIC OCCUPATION OF LITHUANIA

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the week of June 12–16 again commemorates the tragic occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet Union. Since June 15, 1940, when these nations were taken over by force of arms, they have suffered the terrors and anguish of slavery and captivity.

House Concurrent Resolution 416, which calls for freedom for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, was adopted unanimously by the House in June 1965, and by the Senate in October 1966. Though this was a step in the right direction, it is not enough. We must now direct our efforts to carrying out the provisions of the resolution and effecting by peaceful means the withdrawal of Communist control over these brave countries, so they may be assured of the freedom and independence which are rightfully theirs.

AMERICAN NEWSPAPER WOMEN'S CLUB 35TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, early this spring the American Newspaper Women's Club celebrated its 35th anniversary. In celebrating the occasion the club held a reception at the Australian Embassy at which it honored a number of Members of Congress who began their life in the same year; namely, 1932. Included in this group was the new Member of Congress from Massachusetts 10th Congressional District, the Honorable MARGARET M. HECKLER. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the remarks of Anne Blair, mistress of ceremonies at the event and former president of the ANWC:

REMARKS BY ANNE BLAIR

Thirty five is a very nice age. Not necessarily the most glamorous, or the best—but it's a lot better than 21, and less awesome than, say, 80, or 90, or 100. Thirty five is not exactly a ripe old age, but to those approaching it, it certainly has a sense of maturity about it . . . and to those of us on the other side of it, it really was great. And don't ever, for a single moment, agree with anyone who claims life won't really get under way for another five years.

All birthdays are good times to celebrate, and the American Newspaper Women's Club reached that nice age of 35 back on April 4—but we usurped the Queen's prerogative (especially appropriate since we're celebrating today on Commonwealth soil!) and just picked our own birthday for purposes of celebration. You'll have to admit it's a nicer day than yesterday that we chose—and who cares what happens tomorrow?

Some of our very special guests made their own debuts into this world the same year the Club did—1932—and probably didn't attach very much significance to events beyond their cradles. There were some pretty hot political campaigns raging that year—there was plenty of unemployment, and breadlines—but we did have Glen Gray and his Casa Loma Orchestra.

Even the apalling lack of air-conditioning here in Washington would be a matter to read about later in their history books. To understand a bit better the atmosphere into which our club was born, you have to remember that back in 1932 skirts were actually quite long. It was money that was short. And a principal activity of the Treasury Department was destroying imported liquor (imported from such exotic points as Appalachia and Jersey City!) instead of collecting excise taxes. There really was such a thing as a nickel cup of coffee (with the second cup free)—there were lovely trolley cars—or, if you preferred, you could ride—in style in a taxi—all the way to the Capitol for 25¢. And incidentally, the Capitol seemed plenty roomy enough for its occupants in those days. Of course the White House was here then, although it has since been entirely gutted and remodeled, and pretty much redecorated.

To round out this backgrounder, let me remind you that the specie known as "women in radio and television" hadn't quite made its appearance yet. Of course, we did have Kate Smith and Connie Boswell, but the news was being handled by men like Lowell Thomas and Gabriel Heatter, and it's interesting to reflect that the 16 women reporters who met on April 4, 1932, and organized this professional club, worked for four, separate, distinct, competing newspapers—all here in Washington.

Enough of the past—let's turn to the present, and possibly the future. As I mentioned, 1932 was a political year—and maybe some of the babies born that year breathed in a little of the strong campaign atmosphere. The year spawned one Senator, who unfortunately couldn't be with us this afternoon—Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts—and 1933 is the birth year of three members of the House of Representatives.

Congressman Tom Railsback of Moline, Illinois, is a graduate of Grinnell College, and Northwestern Law School. He served as an enlisted man in the U.S. Army from 1957 to 1959, practiced law in his home state, served in the Illinois State Legislature, married, and is the proud father of four daughters. He was elected to the 90th Congress last November, and is a member of the House Judiciary Committee and is Treasurer of the 90 Club. Congratulations on being born in 1932!

Back in that year another future Member of Congress from Massachusetts was born in Flushing, Long Island. (Massachusetts and Long Island seem willing to exchange political talent. . . .) Married at 21, admitted to the Massachusetts Bar at 23, and elected to the 90th Congress from the 10th District of Massachusetts last fall, this first-termer is already an experienced attorney, a seasoned political campaigner, the wife of an investment broker, and the mother of two girls and a boy: Rep. Margaret Heckler.

Now you've met two freshmen Republican Congressmen born in 1932. To even the score a little, here's Rep. Andrew Jacobs, Jr., a Democrat, who is representing the 11th District of Indiana for a second term. He comes by his political calling naturally, because his father served the same district in the 81st Congress. Mr. Jacobs saw active duty with the Marines, was an enlisted combat infantryman with the 1st Marine Division in Korea. He is a graduate of Indiana University, class of '55, and got his law degree there, too, in 1958. He practiced law in Indianapolis before coming to Washington—and I want you to be very nice to him—because he's a member of the District Committee.

Although WPA hadn't been invented, some of the 1932 babies took an artistic bent. One of them, born in New Mexico, began drawing as soon as she could sit up in her crib. She grew up to come to Washington as an Art Major at George Washington University, and then set up her studio here. Ever since, VIP's including the President of the USA—have been simply putty (or should I say clay?) in her hands. We're all familiar with her bust of President Johnson—and the one of Chief Justice Vinson which is in the Supreme Court Building—her latest subject is Senator Richard Russell of Georgia, Now she's thrilled to be going to Italy this summer, commissioned by Congress to do a bust of Constantino Brumidi, author of the famous frescoes that adorn the Capitol. I'm sure Jimilu Mason thinks 35 is a wonderful age!

Our other distinguished 35-er has certainly learned how to capture far out assignments. Lt. Col. John S. Pustay has been flying high, literally and figuratively ever since graduation from the Naval Academy when he chose the Air Force, He's seen service in Korea, Japan, and other Far Eastern points—and after collecting medals and citations, he took the academic route for a while, collecting an MA and a PhD en route, but remaining true to the Air Force to become Ass't Dean of Faculty at the Air Force Academy. He's found time to write a prodigious amount on both military and international affairs—and produced a book with a staggering title: Counterinsurgency Warfare. He has also helped produce four small Pustays. Now, he is a White House Fellow, with the job of keeping up—sometimes, forging hopefully, a jump ahead—of Secretary of State Dean Rusk as he travels to official meetings. We're delighted he hit the right hemisphere and the right time-zone to help us celebrate being 35 . . .

Some other highflyers who are 35 wanted to be with us—but couldn't make it. We have a telegram here from five Astronauts. . . .

SCRAG: THE WEAPON OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, while our diplomats and leading administration officials have been busy winning diplomatic victories, trading with the nations which supply our enemy on the battlefield, and variously building bridges of trade, culture, and so forth with the Communists, we seem to be falling even farther behind in the essential area of being able to guarantee to the American people a semblance of the ability for self-preservation—the ability for actual military defense.

Dr. Stefan T. Possony, strategy and military affairs editor of the American Security Council's Washington Report, recently wrote an article entitled, "Scrag: The Weapon of the World Revolution," which points up the latest addition to the Soviet arsenal, a weapons system with the devastating potential which brings to mind shades of Buck Rogers—and the ominous thought that we face the unilateral threat of destruction.

As Dr. Possony states:

> The American public never heard of Scrag and if asked, might well confuse it with a new beach resort in Hawaii. It is even more disturbing that the present civilian "high command" of the Pentagon does not think Scrag is very important and needs to be neutralized by an ABM system adjusted to handle both orbital and missile warheads.

It is past time for the administration, and the Department of Defense in particular, to tell the American people where we stand, and even more important, to stop quibbling and start deploying an ABM defense system which military men advocate.

I think Dr. Possony makes his point very well and therefore include the article in full at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Report, May 29, 1967]

SCRAG: THE WEAPON OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION

(By Stephen T. Possony)

For several years now, American strategists have been debating the question of whether it would be useful to develop or deploy nuclear space weapons. Space weapons, notably bombs or radiation weapons, could be built but need not be orbitted before the onset of a crisis; or they could be deployed in orbit to win cold or hot conflicts through space mastery, just as during the 19th century Britain was able to prevail through its dominion of the high seas.

The dominant Washington attitude has been that space weapons offer no advantages over conventional ICBM's. Some scientists have even argued that a space weapon is a "stupid weapon" because it is more expensive, less accurate, and less usable than the weapon which, according to their uncritical assumption, it replaces, namely the long-range missile. (The was the classical argument of the gun against the airplane and of the airplane against the missile. Incidentally, new weapons usually do not "replace" old weapons, but the new and the old arms join in novel combinations of mutually-supporting systems.)

As usual, when the American strategic community indulges in flights of fancy and tries to prove that a plausible weapon is neither feasible nor advisable, or in any event is too expensive, the Soviets just move forward and produce the weapon which our conformist chorus denigrates.

In the present instance, the Soviets did something which no one expected: they came up with a weapon which can be used as a normal ICBM *or* as a space bomb *or*, for good measure, as a fractional orbital weapon. This three-stage triple-in-one Soviet weapon code-named "Scrag" was announced by Brezhnev on July 4, 1965 and first exhibited on November 7, 1965.

By the end of 1966, some characteristics of this remarkable instrument had become known. According to the best presently available information, Scrag, used as an ICBM, could carry a 50 MT warhead; in its orbital configuration, the warhead would have a yield of 30 MT. The yield of the sub-orbital assembly is unknown, but it may be estimated at about 40 MT. It is probable that with some reduction of overall yield, all Scrag configurations, including the orbital assembly, can be fitted for the delivery of *multiple* warheads. (The Soviets may not have full test-validated data on space configurations for the Scrag, hence, there could be some "bugs" yet in the weapon.)

In terms of firepower, one orbital Scrag is the equivalent of 20–30 of our Minuteman Missiles. One ICBM–Scrag equals more than five Titan II or 50 Minutemen. A major technological surprise, therefore, *has* been achieved by the Soviets, contrary to the often-voiced Pentagon conviction that significant surprises no longer are likely.

The information about this new threat became known at the very time when the United States was signing a treaty outlawing space weapons. The information was soft-pedalled, lest it disturb our greatest venture in space diplomacy. The widely acclaimed and rarely analyzed treaty was sent to the Senate. Ratification was achieved by unanimous vote. Yet, the treaty provides no defense whatever against Scrag or other space weapons. On the contrary, it inhibits the U.S. from protecting itself against space attack.

The American press did not pick up this sensational counterpoint story. Hence, the American public never heard of Scrag and if asked, might well confuse it with a new beach resort in Hawaii. It is even more disturbing that the present civilian "high command" of the Pentagon does not think Scrag is very important and needs to be neutralized by an ABM system adjusted to handle both orbital and missile warheads.

What are the additional capabilities which Scrag gives to the Soviet Union?

1. Though it is not too difficult to extend the range of missiles, each ICBM is essentially targetted against a few locations. By contrast, Scrag provides the Soviets with a genuine capability to hit every spot on earth, at very short notice.

2. In terms of target selection, missiles do not have the operational flexibility of a combined orbital, sub-orbital and ballistic system.

3. The presumed capability of Scrag to be fitted with single and multiple warheads renders this weapon effective against a whole spectrum of targets, ranging from strongly hardened poinpoint targets like missile and nuclear storage sites, to soft large targets like metropolitan clusters, and to numerous smaller and semi-hardened targets within a large area like industrial installations and airfields.

4. Soviet military thinking has been impressed by the idea that a major offensive should be run in three successive "waves" or blows. If the three different configurations of Scrag are fired simultaneously, the ICBM would hit after half-an-hour, and the sub-orbital version after one-hour-and-a half. The orbital bombs could be used for subsequent salvo, serial or individual attacks, at the discretion of the Soviet high command.

5. The orbital bombs also would be available as a strategic reserve, for days, weeks or months. Thus, they would provide the Soviets with an option to fight a short or a long nuclear war. If the U.S. has no defenses against the space threat and if it does not pursue an effective counter-force stategy, Scrag would be invulnerable while on the ground, in space, and on its target run. If so, the orbital bombs would be available after the so-called nuclear exchange in which the U.S. would have expended its nuclear weapons. In this case, these bombs would embody a war-winning nuclear monopoly.

6. The orbital weapons could be directed at targets that escaped destruction during the initial blow or at targets that were spared for the ultimate phase of the conflict. The weapons could be used to compel surrender, or else to punish the resister by destroying one city after the other. After surrender, the space weapons would facilitate occupation, allowing the Communists to take over, control or devastate the vanquished country.

7. Through simultaneous launch, the missiles and the sub-orbital configurations could be used to destroy American strategic power, whereas the orbital bombs would terminate and win the war. In a staggered-firing series, the Soviets could launch the orbital Scrags hours or days before the rest of their force is released. Whenever the Soviets estimate that a credible and overwhelming nuclear *threat* is enough to force us to our knees, they may be satisfied just to *orbit* the space bombs and rely on purely psychological effectiveness. But if a physical nuclear attack should become necessary, pre-launched Scrags could be used to negate existing warning systems and to execute very rapid pre-emptive counter-force strikes against the United States.

8. The sub-orbital and orbital Scrags provide the Soviets with a significant capability of detonating high-yield explosions at very high altitudes and through a drawn-out firing series to keep U.S. electronics and communications inoperable. With such a capability, they would be able to "pin down" our strike forces. Under certain circumstances and given certain assumptions, Scrag could be used for sustaining high-altitude X-ray screens, thus delaying or precluding retaliation. (High-altitude explosions could blind many millions of people. High-yield bombs launched from space would allow genocidal strategies.)

9. The new Scrag capability, notably the sub-orbital version, allows the Soviets to intervene with increasing effectiveness into local crises and to threaten any country that may take an anti-communist position. Further, the information on Scrag is still another item in our current intelligence regarding Soviet weapons that indicates the strategic balance is changing. This change—in the Soviets' favor—is one reason why the U.S.S.R. has not hesitated to intensify the Cold War.

10. Except perhaps for SLM systems, Scrag represents the first genuine global weapon in history. Once the U.S. has been neutralized or destroyed and provided a sufficient number of orbital warheads is left over, Scrag could force each heretofore free country to establish a Communist government and would ensure that this government remains obedient to Moscow. Scrag therefore, is the optimal weapon for the completion of the world revolution and for the preservation of Communist world rule.

11. If the U.S.S.R. elects to orbit Scrag space bombs without a concomitant missile strike, the U.S., depending upon the magnitude of the unexpected Soviet space deployment, might suddenly find itself in a posture of accentuated military inferiority. (For example, 50 Scrags may position 250 to 500 additional warheads.) Given present U.S. capabilities, the Scrags could not be shot down; if we intercepted some of them, the Soviets might elect to regard such action as U.S. aggression. If, upon a sudden Soviet space deployment, we attack the U.S.S.R. forthwith, regardless of whether we still have the strength to win, we could invite our own physical destruction. If we did not attack, the Soviets could destroy us politically. Thereupon, the orbital bombs could blackmail one country after the other. Ultimately, and entirely in accordance with the Kremlin's preference, the world revolution would be completed by "peaceful means."

Thus, Scrag will increase the effectiveness of nuclear psychological warfare; enhance the effectiveness of Soviet physical nuclear strategy; possibly deter or prevent counterstrikes and retaliation; conceivably maneuver the U.S. into self-destruction or surrender, as well as facilitate and perhaps bring about world conquest.

The Soviets are deploying Scrag simultaneously with their ABM weapons. The resulting strategic imbalance is dangerously aggravated by these other gaps in our own capabilities: Our erstwhile numerical superiority may be giving way to quantitative inferiority. Our Minuteman missiles allow only a very narrow target selection and are not capable of taking out strongly hardened or large area targets. We do not have up-to-date weapon systems for multiple or serial strikes, nor can we preserve portions of our main strike forces as a strategic reserve. We are not prepared to fight a long war; once our bombers are completely obsolete, attrited, deactivated or destroyed in battle, we will lack a strategic system suited for winning the terminal phases of war. We also lack offensive and defensive space weapons. And we refuse to build defenses against missiles, and to protect three-quarters of our population against the hazards of nuclear war.

In summary: The United States is confronted by an entirely new and dramatically augmented threat. The ominous development of Scrag* was not predicted by U.S. intelligence nor by U.S. computers, let alone by Messrs. McNamara and Brown. Since our country continues to see no evil and hear no evil, time is beginning to run very short. It just may be that we are too gullible, too bemused, and too disinterested to survive.

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Watson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the present administration has been highly vocal in its support of so-called civil rights legislation but, ironically, it has been amazingly silent in regard to advocating a bill of rights for civil service employees.

During this past session, I pointed out that a legislative must is enactment of a bill of rights for our civil service employees. Today I am again introducing a bill to attain that end. This bill is comparable to that introduced by my colleague in the Senate, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin].

I fail to see any reason why the administration is not giving this legislation its support. When a person takes a position with the Federal Government, this in no way should impair his rights as a free citizen. Yet, in all too many instances, we have seen examples of where the constitutional rights of Federal employees are being violated.

In introducing this bill, I want to commend those diligent members of the press who are constantly pointing out examples of where Federal workers have been subjected to invasions of their privacy and undue harassment by overly zealous bureaucrats. In this brief time, I would not attempt to cite these examples, but I am certain all of us are aware of their existence. Washington area papers remind us almost daily of various infringements upon the rights of Government employees.

One of the strongest features of this bill is its provision to create an independent Board of Employee Rights. This Board will enable employees to lodge their complaints without fear of reprisals and, additionally, the independent nature of the Board will free it from administrative and executive interference.

Legislation of this type has widespread support. It is completely bipartisan and represents a real attempt to give civil service employees the same employment rights enjoyed by those in the private sector. Administration support or not, I urge its passage immediately.

PAUL SCHUTZER AND TED YATES

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the two courageous and talented American newsmen who gave their lives under dangerous circumstances in the Near East served in the highest traditions of journalism. Paul Schutzer, of New Rochelle, N.Y., a Time-Life photographer, and Ted Yates, a television producer-director for the National Broadcasting Corp., were killed while covering the fighting on two separate fronts in the Near East yesterday.

Mr. Schutzer joined Life magazine in Washington in 1956 as its youngest staff photographer. His last assignment was representative of the courage and professionalism he evidenced throughout his career. Mr. Schutzer not only volunteered to go to Israel to cover the current crisis, but insisted that he would go even if Life did not send him.

He was riding in one of the leading armored halftracks in an Israel armored column counterattacking across the Gaza strip when his vehicle was hit by an antitank weapon and burst into flames.

Mr. Schutzer, who received numerous prizes for his work including the White House Photographers Grand Prize, was a member of the crack Life team that covered the Lebanon crisis of 1958; he photographed the building of the Berlin Wall, and covered the Algerian war; he made two trips to Cuba in 1961 and spent 24 hours in a Havana jail; and he photographed most of the country's political notables.

Ted Yates sustained a fatal wound on Monday from gunfire in the Intercontinental Hotel in the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem. His distinguished career as a combat correspondent and producer of television documentaries took him into countless hazardous situations in the pursuit of a story. Mr. Yates was the recipient of many awards, including citations for his coverage of the crisis in the Dominican Republic and a recent news special on social and political unrest in Guatemala, Colombia, and Peru. I had occasion to work with Mr. Yates and admired and respected his talents and commitment to his profession.

My deepest sympathy is extended to Mrs. Bernice Schutzer and her two children, Dena and James, and to Mr. Schutzer's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hyman Schutzer of Long Island, as well as to Mrs. Yates and her family. The dedication and high professionalism of these men will be long remembered by the American people.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the same hand that is directing the killing of Americans in Vietnam is directing the crisis in the Middle East from the Kremlin. The same fleet which bumped our naval vessel in the Sea of Japan a few days ago is shadowing our fleet in the Mediterranean, 10 additional Russian warships having just passed through the Dardanelles.

The same voice which attacks the U.S. defense in Vietnam attacks Israel before the United Nations Security Council. I speak of the voice of Soviet Russia.

I suggest to the House that we had better watch for some deal with the Russians at our expense as the price for peace in the Middle East instead of carrying out our treaty obligations to maintain the freedom of the seas.

I would recall to you that the current crisis in the Middle East follows by only a few days the demand by Russian Communist Party Chairman Leonid Brezhnev "for the removal of the U.S. 6th Fleet from the Mediterranean Sea."

It is painful to say, "I told you so," but the fact that the United States withdrew the missiles it had given Turkey through NATO as one outcome of the Cuban missile crisis in late 1962, has forced the Turks who control the Dardanelles to compromise with the Russians.

These missiles had been zeroed in on the Russian oilfields, and their presence assured Turkey's safety from Soviet bluster, threats, or action. Premier Khrushchev called publicly for the removal of these missiles just as his successor Brezhnev is now calling for the U.S. Fleet to get out of the Mediterranean. The removal of our missiles from Turkey makes possible the present demand about removal of our fleet.

We now have an object lesson of the danger of appeasement and of the compulsion on the part of too many in this administration to appease. The results speak for themselves.

CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. HECKLER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, since I was out of the country on official business of the Government Operations Committee when the Middle East crisis erupted, I would like to state for the RECORD that, had I been present, I would have signed the statement of policy circulated among the Members of Congress by the gentleman from New York, Representative EMANUEL CELLER.

It is quite apparent that the present situation in the Middle East has been brought about by a combination of factors—Nasser's struggle for power within the Arab world, his expressed goal to annihilate the State of Israel and Russia's desire to secure a dominant influence in the Middle East.

In light of the existence of the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, the position of the United States should have been considered clear cut. Since 1950, our Government has made a deep commitment, reiterated by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, to take steps to preserve peace and stability and to unalterably oppose aggression by any of the states of the Middle East.

Historically, we have had a close and special relationship with the State of Israel from the time of its inception. Consequently, I rise to protest against the administration's declaration of "neutrality" in this great crisis. While our technical status as nonbelligerents may be appropriate to protect the safety of Americans in the area, our position cannot be "neutral" if we are to live up to the commitment made by past Presidents.

There is no doubt that, to date, Israel has won "the first round." Israel has bled, but America and the free world have also been the winners. The adoption of the cease-fire resolution by the United Nations indicates a capitulation of the silent aggressor in this strife—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Israel, however, has won wars before but has yet to win at peace.

In accordance with our previous commitments, I would urge that the influence and power of this great Nation be brought to bear on all future negotiations to see that Israel becomes the victor in both war and peace.

It would be a tragedy if, 20 years after 6 million Jews had been extinguished on the European continent, the conscience of the world was so untroubled that they were not even entitled to a strip of the earth's surface to occupy as their national homeland. This is still at stake. This current conflict bears wide application—beyond the concerns of merely the Israelis or the Arabs.

In the words of a great religious and civic leader of Massachusetts, Rabbi Baruck Korff:

> Think and think some more before our nation reaches a point of no return and is incapable of withstanding Communist aggression.

TRIBUTE TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ESCH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to lead a tribute by many of our colleagues to the University of Michigan as it observes its 150th anniversary. We who have been privileged to attend this outstanding university and others who represent the State where it makes its home, stand today to reflect on its heritage, its contributions, and its future.

We share deep pride in being associated with an institution that has contributed so much to her State, her Nation, and, indeed, the entire world. Having earned three degrees from Michigan and having made my home in Ann Arbor for nearly 20 years, I hesitate to use such a cold and empty term as institution, for the term institution certainly does not reflect the dynamic quality which is Michigan. No, the University of Michigan is much more than an institution.

Our Michigan is people, most of all—people concerned with problems, people striving to learn, to create, to discover, and to contribute.

Our Michigan is a meeting house for scholars of the liberal arts who seek to gain from our heritage solutions for contemporary problems.

Our Michigan is a vast research complex developing new methods and ideas in the fields of science and technology.

Our Michigan is a community for the creative who contribute so much to the continuation of the living and thriving American cultural scene.

Our Michigan is a forum for free expression in which the controversies of the day are given searching and thorough discussion and debate.

Our Michigan is a catalyst welding together diverse elements of our society to work out solutions to the problems of all sectors, both public and private.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, our Michigan is responsible for contributing leadership to the Nation, both past and present. Today it counts in its ranks some 21 Members of Congress and countless others in high national positions.

Indeed, we in this high assemblage cannot possibly do justice to the diversity and greatness that is our Michigan. But, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I commend to you and to the entire Nation the following statements of our colleagues who are honored to be associated with the University of Michigan.

Through this means, we call widespread attention to the past contributions, the present high stature, and the great expectations of the University of Michigan during this, its sesquicentennial year.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the University of Michigan has long been recognized as one of the truly great institutions of higher learning in America. As an alumnus of the University of Michigan, I therefore take great pride in adding my voice to those who this year are saluting my alma mater on the occasion of her 150th birthday.

I salute the University of Michigan for its leadership in education, for recognizing that a well-trained and dedicated teacher is the most important conduit in the learning process, for producing some of the finest doctors and dentists in the world, for concentrating on research in the vitally important field of public health, for turning out excellent engineers and scientists fully capable of tackling the complex tasks of our scientific and technological world, and, not least, for growing with the Nation and its people.

The University of Michigan has only one standard—excellence. Its doors swing open on the world and to the world. It is cosmopolitan. Its horizons are unlimited.

It is in this atmosphere that the University of Michigan has made contributions in the area of graduate education that have won it wide acclaim. The American Council on Education, in its 1964 assessment of quality in graduate schools, placed Michigan among the top 10 in the country. This is a status enjoyed only by Michigan and California among the public universities.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and a distinct twinge of nostalgia that I join with my Michigan colleagues today in saluting a great school, a universally recognized center of learning, my own University of Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we salute the University of Michigan for demonstrating a new level of public-private cooperation in the financing of higher education.

The university's campaign to secure $55 million in private gifts has been a resounding success. In fact, completion of the goal was announced 8 months ahead of the original time schedule. This was the largest campaign for private support ever undertaken by a tax-assisted university, and will doubtless be regarded as a precedent by many others.

Significance of the campaign, beyond its immediate usefulness to the university, lies in its demonstration of the degree to which a public university may call upon private individuals, foundations, and corporations for additional support which may provide the "margin of excellence." Michigan is no newcomer to this field, for in past years private gifts have supplied nearly half of its physical plant and have provided it with one of the largest endowments among State-supported institutions.

One of the tests of an educational institution is the degree to which it receives support from a wide spectrum of our society. This test the University of Michigan has met, and certainly the success of the fund-raising program is evidence of that fact. Education, if it is to meet the needs of our society, must be supported not only by the taxing bodies of our State and Federal Government, but also by such other elements of our society as business and industry and private philanthropy.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, we salute the University of Michigan for its distinction and contributions in the area of graduate education. The American Council on Education ranked Michigan among the top 10 graduate schools of the Nation.

Within the State of Michigan, the University of Michigan awards approximately half of the advanced degrees given by all the universities of the State. It awards master's and doctor's degrees in 167 fields of specialization. Recently, Michigan was selected as one among 10 graduate schools in the country to receive grants from the Ford Foundation totaling $81 million to undertake improvements in programs leading to the Ph. D. degree. The graduate school also ranks high in its ability to attract winners of graduate fellowship competitions. Among Woodrow Wilson scholars, Michigan ranked third in preference nationally, 1963–66, and this year ranked second. It ranked seventh nationally in 1967–68 among National Science Foundation traineeships. It is second nationally in awards of NDLF title VI fellowships in language.

Within the graduate school are several notable research and service units. Among them is the Rackham arthritis research unit, committed to basic and clinical investigation for the rheumatic diseases and to the provision of advanced training for workers in this field. Another such organization is the Institute for Human Adjustment, providing research and professional training in psychology, in geriatrics, and in dealing with a wide range of problems and concerns in urban communities and economically and emotionally deprived children.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in today's salute to the University of Michigan, with particular emphasis on the University of Michigan law school, one of the great law schools of the Nation. I commend it particularly for being among the pioneer law schools of this Nation in an early recognition of the broadened scope of law in world affairs, and of the resultant need for education in international and comparative law.

Michigan's law school is one of the oldest in the Nation—indeed, the oldest west of the Atlantic seaboard. Like most of the Nation's topnotch law schools, for many years it emphasized the teaching of English and American precedents and their impact and involvement in the American scene. Michigan's outreach beyond this began with some attention to the civil law of Rome and the modern European codes based upon it. It was my personal pleasure to have studied in this area under Prof. Jack Dawson, one of the Nation's most brilliant and able law professors. Since the close of World War II, the curriculum has branched further and further into the fields of world trade, worldwide financial transactions, legal arrangements that transcend international boundaries, and even the exploration of outer space.

Some 15 years ago, Michigan began the steady enlargement of its instructional and research programs in international and comparative law. Among courses now taught are those in "Tax Affairs of American Corporations Engaged in Foreign Trade," "Antitrust Law in the European Common Market," "Comparative Criminal Procedure," and "International Organization Law."

Research carried on by faculty and visiting scholars has also broadened to reflect this world view. Among the distinguished publications of the law school in the past decade have been books on Soviet legal institutions, on American enterprise in the European Common Market, on the growth of law relating to the use of atomic energy, and on foreign personal representatives.

A distinguished past is a cause for pride on the part of any university. The university which will deserve to be called great in the future, however, is the one which recognizes the nature of the world in which it lives, and, at the same time, sees the dream of and the prospects for the future ahead of it and makes certain that the education carried on within its halls helps train its students to meet both the needs of the present and the needs of the future. By this measure Michigan has been and bids fair to remain a great university.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, we salute the University of Michigan for its fundamental research on political behavior. The studies conducted by its survey research center have provided important new understanding in this field, and the book, "The American Voter," written by members of its staff, is a landmark publication.

The survey research center is also responsible for nationwide studies of consumer plans and behavior, and its quarterly reports on consumer intentions are eagerly awaited by both business and Government. These reports, based on interviews with a national population sample, have been issued over a period of two decades and give business and Government economists an invaluable source of information.

The survey research center is part of the university's Institute for Social Research, now recognized as a world leader in scientific research on the behavior of man. Its studies have ranged over such topics as political behavior, consumer attitudes and plans, management procedures and techniques in business and labor, juvenile delinquency, effectiveness of different types of group organization, and the ways in which scientific discoveries are absorbed into the common body of knowledge and put into use.

Several similar centers of social research now are established at other universities, but Michigan led the way in 1946 when it established the Institute for Social Research.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly pleased to join other Michigan Members of the House of Representatives in saluting the University of Michigan as it celebrates its 150th anniversary. During its century and a half of existence, the university has earned for itself a reputation of academic excellence of which the entire State of Michigan is proud.

The university had its beginning in Detroit in 1817 when the territory of Michigan had but 7,000 residents. In 1837, the campus moved to Ann Arbor, then a small community of some 2,000 residents. Michigan and its university have both grown and prospered tremendously during this last century and a half. The university has proven itself worthy of the grand vision of its pioneering founders by adapting to new circumstances so that it could meet the educational and intellectual needs of the growing State.

The growth of the university is evidenced most spectacularly at its main campus in Ann Arbor, but there have been developments in other areas of which I am particularly proud. I refer, of course, to the Dearborn campus of the University of Michigan.

The Dearborn campus is a small urban school which combines the best features of a great university and a small college. It is an integral part of the University of Michigan, and shares with the main campus in Ann Arbor the 150-year-old traditions of academic excellence which have given the university a richly justified international reputation. The standards for admission and graduation are the same, and the degree the Dearborn campus student receives when he graduates is a University of Michigan degree, identical in stature and prestige with all other UM degrees. At the same time, however, the Dearborn campus is a small college, and its students share the friendly informality, the familiarity, and the close student-faculty relationships which give small colleges their charm. Campus students have available to them the many services available in the charming and viable smaller city of Dearborn. Additionally, since the campus is located in close proximity to Detroit, it also offers its students access to the excellent resources of a great city. For all its closeness to the metropolis, however, the Dearborn campus has an almost rural setting, being built amid the wooded acres of the famous Henry Ford estate, Fair Lane.

The campus has three academic divisions: literature, science, and arts; engineering; and business administration. In the first of these, L.S. & A. the campus offers degree programs in 10 distinct disciplines, as well as a teacher certification program of special merit. Liberal arts students comprise nearly half the student population, and the L.S. & A. faculty is the largest of three divisions. The division is able to offer many special advantages to its students, among them the opportunity, for science students, to have access to excellent, modern laboratories and to an outdoor environment which is so rich in wildlife and plantlife that it makes a kind of natural outdoor laboratory. For prospective teachers and social scientists, several programs which enable the undergraduate student to do actual field work in surrounding cities are of unusual value.

The engineering and business administration divisions are both organized completely on the cooperative education plan. Under this system students alternate semesters of study with equal periods of work internship in businesses and industries throughout the country. The advantages to the student are many: he gets extensive on-the-job experience before he ever graduates; he has a rare opportunity to apply his education immediately—which serves two purposes: to make that education more concrete and meaningful to the student, and, from the school's standpoint, to keep the educational process current and in constant touch with reality; it enables the student to reach an early understanding of his own goals and abilities; and, in the process, it enables the student to earn a substantial amount of money—in many cases enough to make his college education essentially self-supporting.

The participating companies benefit greatly from the co-op system as well, as evidenced by the fact that in any given semester the school receives offers of several times as many co-op jobs as it has students. Further testimony to the success of the Dearborn campus co-op programs is offered by the fact that starting salaries for its graduates are among the highest in the Nation every year.

This degree of success is remarkable for a campus which is so young as the Dearborn campus—which held its first classes with a handful of students in 1959. This success has not come as a surprise, however, because it was almost assured by the nature of the campus' origin.

The University of Michigan established its Dearborn campus in response to growing needs of local residents and industry. Industry provided complete cooperation to the university. Ford Motor Co. approached the university in 1956 with a set of serious problems. They were: an inability to find a sufficient supply of qualified manpower, and an inability to retain the qualified manpower they were able to hire. The cooperative education program was formulated as an answer to these needs. To fully serve the Dearborn area with a strong, representative campus of the University of Michigan, the liberal arts division was made an integral part of the plans, and Ford gave the university a large parcel of land on the Fair Lane estate, including the Ford mansion, and several million dollars to establish the Dearborn campus.

The campus was established as a senior college, admitting students only at the junior level and above, and it has since worked in close cooperation with its educational neighbor, the Henry Ford Community College. Enrollment has grown to over 700 students since 1959; a graduate engineering program has been added to the curriculum. The campus also serves the community as a center for adult education classes.

Fair Lane, the home of the late Henry Ford, has been entirely refurnished since it was given to the university in the late fifties. It serves the university and the Detroit-Dearborn area now as the Fair Lane Conference Center, a private meeting place for groups small and large from the university and the community at large. It is also the home of a new international summer music festival, the Fair Lane Festival, and it has been designated a National Historic Landmark by the U.S. Department of the Interior.

The Dearborn campus is thus off to a most vigorous start. As the years go by, I am confident that this new campus will succeed in emulating the great achievements of its parent at Ann Arbor.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, we salute the University of Michigan for its research and instructional programs which relate to the Great Lakes. Through fundamental studies of the lakes themselves, through research on water quality and water purity, and through research and training pertaining to Great Lakes ships and shipping, the university has contributed substantially to the health and economic welfare of its own region.

Its Great Lakes Research Institute, with a fleet of four research vessels, is making long-range studies of the lakes—the quality of the water, the sediments at the bottom of the lakes, the plant and animal life within the waters, the winds and currents which affect the distribution of water. These studies are basic to wise use of this great fresh water resource upon which some of our most populous States depend.

Through the university's School of Public Health, several studies on the problems of water pollution are underway. One of these has involved the construction of a "miniature river," where all aspects of pollution and pollution abatement may be studied.

And, through its department of naval architecture and marine engineering, the University of Michigan has contributed to the design of the great ships which ply the lakes and to the training of engineers and designers responsible for future developments of shipping.

One of the songs beloved of the Michigan glee club and of the university's alumni is entitled "Goddess of the Inland Seas." The work of Michigan faculty and students is doing much to earn for the State and the university the continuation of that title.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to pay tribute today to the University of Michigan, one of this Nation's outstanding universities, which this year is celebrating its 150th anniversary.

I am particularly proud of Michigan's stature as an international university, and for its tradition of enrolling students from countries throughout the world. Michigan today has one of the largest international enrollments among American universities.

This international standing dates back to the university's early days. In 1880, James B. Angell, then president of the university, was sent by the American Government to head a delegation to China to negotiate an agreement regarding emigration of Chinese laborers.

As a result of friendships which he formed in China, students in that nation began to come to the University of Michigan. Students from China, from Asia, and from all other parts of the world, have been coming to Michigan, ever since that time.

The vice chancellor of the Chinese University in Hong Kong, on a recent visit to Ann Arbor, commented:

> The University of Michigan has for years been a truly world institution, and through its graduates and faculty it has had a profound influence on the development of many countries.

The vice chancellor also pointed out that the Michigan Alumni Club is the largest American university alumni association in Hong Kong.

The University of Michigan also conducts a broad training and research program to study nations of the world. It has five area centers—for Chinese studies, Japanese studies, South and Southeast Asian studies, Near and Middle Eastern studies, and for Russian and East European studies. These centers emphasize the languages, culture, economy, and history of these areas.

As a further indication of Michigan's international standing, the International Congress of Orientalists, a world group of specialists in the Asian world, will meet next August at the university—their first meeting in over a century in the United States.

The worldwide fame of the University of Michigan has brought fame and prestige to the State of Michigan, and to our Nation. I salute this fine university on its 150th birthday, and wish it many, many more years of continued success.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with particular personal pride an honor to join in this special tribute to the University of Michigan which is celebrating its 150th anniversary during 1967. It was my privilege to enter the University of Michigan in 1940 shortly after high school graduation. As was the case for many, military service in World War II delayed my educational goals for a period before finally attaining my law degree from the University of Michigan law school in 1948.

So, I am honored to speak with personal knowledge on the many accomplishments of this great educational institution. Today, in these brief remarks, I would like to bring to the attention of all Members the University of Michigan's leadership in education and research in the vitally important field of public health.

For example, the university was the first in the country to give a course in "sanitary science," in 1883, and its hygienic laboratory was the second such laboratory established in the world.

From these beginnings has come today's School of Public Health, one of little more than a dozen such schools in the Nation. Enrollment approaches 400 students, who come from virtually every State in the Union and from 26 foreign countries.

Michigan's School of Public Health was chosen a number of years ago to conduct the nationwide field trial of the Salk polio vaccine, resulting in the verdict that the vaccine was safe and effective. Its faculty researchers did the basic work on development of flu vaccines, and one of its faculty helped develop the whooping cough vaccine. In the past several years, the school has organized a broad-scale program of research and training on one of the world's most important problems: population planning. Extensive studies are also underway on water resource problems, radiological health, respiratory viruses, industrial health, and aspects of automotive safety.

Public health, as the very name implies, is a matter of vital public concern, and this is evidenced by the support given to the Michigan program by the Federal Government. Federal funds are helping to construct a much-needed addition to the School of Public Health building, and many national public health agencies provide fellowships and research funds.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, we salute the University of Michigan for its leadership in research and training in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Shortly after World War II ended, the university established the Michigan Memorial-Phoenix project as a memorial to those of its faculty and students who lost their lives in that conflict. The purpose of the memorial was to conduct research upon the peaceful applications of the most awesome and potentially destructive force man had at his disposal—atomic energy.

Entirely supported by donations from individuals, corporations, and foundations, the Phoenix project includes several important laboratories, including one of the largest college-owned nuclear reactors in the country. The reactor is extensively used by industrial researchers as well as by students and faculty on campus. The University of Michigan College of Engineering was the first in the world to offer a degree program in nuclear engineering, and this program now attracts students from many foreign countries as well as from all parts of our own Nation.

University of Michigan researchers have pioneered in the use of atomic energy in medicine, in radiocarbon dating of archeological artifacts, in the preservation of food by irradiation, and in a variety of industrial applications, as well as in theoretical physics. The bubble chamber, used for the detection and tracking of elementary particles, was developed at the University of Michigan and won for its inventor, Donald Glaser, the Nobel Prize in physics.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress, I am particularly aware of the fine contributions being made by the university in this important area of technological advancement.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, we salute the University of Michigan for the enrichment it gives to the lives of the people of its State through music. Home of one of the Nation's outstanding schools of music, the university also offers a year-round series of concerts, recitals, and festivals by professional musicians from throughout the world.

Its annual May festival, featuring the Philadelphia Orchestra and noted soloists, is known throughout the musical world. Each year, the professional offerings include approximately 50 concerts by orchestras, chamber groups, choruses, opera, and instrumental and vocal soloists.

The university faculty and students add to this rich cultural program tremendously by their own series of recitals and concerts. The school of music faculty is made up of professional musicians, each of whom presents at least one recital for the community each year—

all, we might note, without charge. Individual students in performance fields also give their recitals, and the university band, orchestra, choir, and glee club are frequent performers.

The university has also had a role of which it can well be proud in the establishment and maintenance of the National Music Camp, at Interlochen. This famous summer program for musically talented young people has had an impact upon musical education throughout the Nation. Founded by the late Dr. Joseph Maddy, a longtime member of the Michigan faculty, Interlochen is the site of university level summer courses and seminars.

Wherever music is played, the name of the University of Michigan is known. And whenever William Revelli directs the university band in Louis Elbel's "The Victors," every listener is a Wolverine.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud, indeed, to join with other members of the Michigan delegation and alumni of the University of Michigan here in saluting that great university on its 150 years of service to the people of Michigan and of the whole United States and, indeed, the world.

The University of Michigan traces its beginnings to the establishment of a small private institution located in Detroit in 1817. It became a State university in 1837 soon after Michigan's admission to the Union. Its reputation as an outstanding institution of learning was established in the late 19th century and, during the 20th century the University of Michigan has become among the foremost in America.

I am proud to be counted among the graduates of that great university, having been a student there for 6 years in the 1930's where I earned two degrees, one in literature and the other in law. Later as an officer in the Army during World War II, I was sent back to Ann Arbor for a period to take a course in the Army judge advocate generals school which was then established at the university's law school. In subsequent years my interest in the university and its preeminence for scholarship continued because of my duties in the Michigan Legislature where I sat on both the appropriations and education committees in the State senate.

Mr. Speaker, a university is properly a place of learning, a repository of knowledge. It maintains disciplines of excellence. It should require high standards and propriety of conduct. No one is compelled to attend a university, and to study there should be a matter of privilege, not of right. If a student so strongly disagrees with a university's standards or its disciplines that he cannot conform, he should leave it and seek elsewhere for an environment more to his liking. I disagree with those who seek to make our great universities battlegrounds for social revolution. I believe that every university in America has a duty to require a certain standard of social and personal conduct among its students just as it has a duty to require certain standards of scholastic excellence.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 150th anniversary of the founding of the University of Michigan, established in Detroit in 1817. In 1837, when Michigan was admitted to the Union, the State legislature created a board of regents for the young university and moved its site to Ann Arbor.

During the ensuing period the university has matured in a magnificent fashion until today it includes three campuses and nine extension centers. It serves in excess of 30,000 students, and the volumes in its libraries total in excess of 3,350,000 books. The University of Michigan has been listed among the top 10 colleges selected by national merit scholarship finalists, which is indicative of a longstanding and continuing tradition of academic excellence both in its undergraduate and in its graduate and professional schools.

Much credit for this tradition of educational excellence at the University of Michigan must be attributed to the man who in many respects stands as the originator of that tradition—Dr. Henry Philip Tappan, president of the university from 1852 until 1863. It was through the extraordinary foresight of this man, that the University of Michigan became an early center for innovative and creative undertakings in higher education. His wisdom, his courage, and his dedication to a broadened concept of higher education made him challenge the accepted norms in the business of higher education.

Dr. Tappan's educational philosophy, the result of his own experience as a student and teacher, made him uniquely suited for the highly influential role he played in the development of the University of Michigan. Trained for the ministry at Union Theological Seminary, and later, for reasons of health, going to teach in the State University of New York, he extracted from his experience in public and private institutions of higher learning, a distinct notion of the need for stronger State-supported universities and colleges. Resigned to the entrenched preeminence of private universities in the East, he saw a unique opportunity for development of the kind of public institution he envisioned at the infant University of Michigan.

The reforms he instituted in his presidency at Michigan, the programs he initiated, may seem to us today commonplace. But in his time they were often revolutionary. For example, he insisted that the scientific disciplines be given attention in the same degree as the humanities, and he instituted the first really advanced work in sciences and organized professional education programs. He disavowed the time-honored system of residential dormitories for students, insisting instead that they should live in private homes and boarding houses, and that the State should instead invest its money in instructional facilities. He believed that the university should strive for excellence in faculty selection. And while he knew it to be a time-consuming process, he pointed the university in the direction of the establishment of a general minimum standard of achievement for entrance into the university.

The University of Michigan, after 150 years, stands as a tribute to the American educational dream. Such a tribute is possible because of the dedication and service of men like Henry Philip Tappan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, during 1967 the University of Michigan is celebrating its sesquicentennial. This observance has a special meaning to me since I am an alumnus of the University of Michigan as well as a graduate of its law school. It is also a significant occasion for the entire Nation. The university has been attended by students from all parts of America and its contributions to scholarship have enriched our culture and improved our way of life.

The founders of the University of Michigan, in establishing the school, conceived and put into practice revolutionary concepts of public higher education. The school's founders—a Protestant minister, a Catholic priest, and a judge—argued that a State has an important responsibility to provide its citizens with a complete educational system, including institutions of higher learning. They believed that tax support should be provided for public universities and colleges, and that the cost of education to the student should be relatively low.

The principles upon which the University of Michigan was founded are now widely accepted. Forty-eight States have institutions of higher education based on the pattern pioneered by Michigan. The University of Michigan, during its 150-year history, has proved the soundness of its founders' foresight.

The university has been an educational innovator. It offered the first courses in modern languages and sciences in an otherwise classical curriculum; it had America's first chemical laboratory building; its first seminar courses; the first college courses in forestry and journalism; first coeducational university program and first college of education. There are today 215,000 living graduates of the university.

As the University of Michigan enters its 151st year, I think it has earned our congratulations for a job well done. I am confident that we can depend upon the university to continue in the future, as it has in the past, to contribute in a meaningful way to the intellectual, social, cultural, and economic progress of our Nation.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of the University of Michigan, I am honored and proud to salute my alma mater on its 150th anniversary.

I owe a special debt of gratitude to the university for its vision and foresight in establishing the Flint College of the University of Michigan. It has been by means of this community-centered branch college that so many young men and women have been able to work their way through college. Without this opportunity, it is doubtful that I would have been able to complete my education and today serve in the U.S. House of Representatives.

So, it is with pride and gratitude that I salute my alma mater—the University of Michigan—and wish it a continuation of its record of excellence in the next century and a half.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, we salute the University of Michigan for leading the Nation in aerospace engineering education. Just over a half century ago, this university offered the world's first course in aeronautical engineering, and today its graduates in this field have leading roles in every area of aeronautics and astronautics.

Six of its graduates, including the late Col. Edward H. White, are among our astronauts. Others occupy important positions in NASA and in the companies which design and build our aircraft and spacecraft.

It was in 1914 that Prof. Felix Pawlowski came to the United States and sought a position in an American college for the purpose of teaching aeronautics. He was turned down by college after college, all of which considered his proposal fantastic—until he wrote to the University of Michigan, whose dean of engineering, Mortimer E. Cooley, hired Pawlowski for $800 a year to teach that first course in aeronautics. It attracted seven students, four of them from other countries. By 1917, interest in aeronautics—perhaps stimulated by the Lafayette Escadrille—had grown enough for the University of Michigan to grant its first degree in aeronautical engineering. Since then, Michigan has awarded nearly 3,000 degrees in aeronautical and aerospace engineering. Its facilities, not only for education but also for research, in these areas are among the Nation's best. In 1964, just after their Gemini IV flight which included America's first walk in space, Astronauts Edward White and James McDivitt returned to their alma mater for a visit which included the dedication of a NASA research laboratory on the campus.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, this year the University of Michigan is celebrating its 150th anniversary.

For a century and a half the University of Michigan has had a beneficial impact far beyond the confines of its gracious campus in Ann Arbor. In this century, and particularly in the shrinking world of the postwar period, the university's impact has become international. Over 1,500 men and women of the present student body of 33,000 are from abroad. And many of the American students are destined to work and live overseas during some period of their lives.

The University of Michigan was conceived, born, and raised in a manner which was constantly enlightened, bold, and visionary. The men directing the university's affairs did not evade the tough requirements which have led to excellence. Academic standards are high and demanding. Research is wide ranging and often dramatic, "from the cell to the cosmos." Graduate programs rank among the Nation's finest.

The university's greatness is rooted in the sum of the personal achievements attained by its students and alumni. These achievements are superbly supplemented by the activities of its institutes and centers. Among the latter are, for example, the Institute of Continuing Legal Education, the Institute of Public Administration, and the Center for Chinese Studies. This gives a suggestion of the range. I can testify personally to the fact that these activities are an invaluable resource for the State of Michigan and for our Nation.

As a graduate of the University of Michigan who spent 7 years there in pursuance of liberal arts and law degrees, I am proud of my school. The quality and intensity of my appreciation has increased as I have entered more fully into the life of law and public service.

In my work and in my travels I have met graduates of the University of Michigan all over the world. Invariably they are living up to the university's ideal of knowledge, wisdom, and the courage to serve.

Of course, what a man gains at a university depends, in the main, more on himself than on the university. Nevertheless, the character of the university does make a substantial difference.

The quality of a University of Michigan education and the character of the men leading it are gracefully suggested by two statements I have recently read about the university.

> The frailty of memory—

Howard H. Peckham writes in his book, "The Making of the University of Michigan"—

> is nowhere better evinced than in our faith in giants of the past, in a lost Golden Age. Not now, but *then* great and good men directed University affairs and taught its courses, while earnest and hardworking students sat at their feet. It is a pleasant myth, despite its implication of a declining institution. Upon examination the truth is that there were little men in the past as well as big ones, delinquent students as well as serious ones, and nothing new has been added to University problems since 1850. The University of Michigan has flourished because there have always been a majority of men of vision and wisdom to project its potential steadily toward the high goal of excellence in teaching and learning, which in itself attracted a preponderance of students avid to secure the advantages of varied opportunities. Insofar as success is a secret, this is it.

President Harlan Hatcher spoke the following words of wisdom at a 1964 convocation:

> At the University the student has a few years of latitude and leisure for self-cultivation. He has a supportive and tolerant or indulgent environment, favorable but not too tightly planned, where he may associate with his peers in a common mission individually pursued under diminishing supervision as he hastens toward maturity. He has available all the tools of learning we know how to provide. He may know and be guided by the wisest and most learned men in all fields. He has a chance to recognize the ongoing forces of our world, how they take on new forms and new directions, to learn how we preserve the good in the old while creating the new, and how to minimize crises, eruptions and neurotic tensions, through natural growth and creative evolution. He may construct a new and vivid pattern and style of life for himself.

These words can serve as our guide for a thousand years on the nature of the good university.

I know the University of Michigan will continue to serve our State, our Nation, and the world. Its goal will continue to be excellence, unqualified. And as long as I live my affection for it will be unbounded.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my distinguished colleague from Michigan for allowing me this opportunity to join with him in saluting the University of Michigan on the occasion of its 150th centennial.

My legislative assistant, Harold Posey, from Columbus, Ga., is a 1963 graduate of the University of Michigan School of Law, where he received his master of laws degree in international law. Through him, I have become keenly aware of the excellence of this great university.

Mr. Speaker, education is the cornerstone of America's greatness and we must never lag in our support of education at all levels. The University of Michigan is the personification of what a great university should be, and I congratulate the people of Michigan who are responsible for this achievement.

In conclusion, I must add that this excellence does not necessarily extend to the football field, as witness the last encounter between my alma mater, the University of Georgia and the University of Michigan in 1965, which Georgia won, 15 to 7.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Committee will soon begin its final consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 which will authorize over $3 billion for next year's foreign aid programs.

In 1949, President Truman outlined his famous point 4 program of technical assistance for the underdeveloped countries of the world. The proposal was based upon the concept of self-help. America's approach to foreign aid has veered sharply from this original idea, however.

One of the Nation's most knowledgeable persons on the point 4 program, its concept and its operations, particularly in the Far East, is Dr. Raymond W. Miller.

While serving as president of World Trade Relations, Inc., Dr. Miller is a resident of California. His achievements reflect an unexcelled record of work for his fellow man and his biography is an impressive one. Dr. Miller is a farmer, lecturer, and author. He has served as a consultant to the United Nations and United States in helping to assist other nations, and has traveled hundreds of thousands of miles under three Presidents as a key member of the U.S. team in this effort. He also has emeritus status as a lecturer at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.

Dr. Miller's record of accomplishments goes on and on, but suffice it to say that he is eminently qualified to point up, as he has done, how our aid program has strayed from the original concept of self-help to one of giving money and things. While his article deals primarily with the problem of India, it is also applicable to our entire AID program.

My remarks today draw in a very large part from a studied report which Dr. Miller and his associates prepared after much research and deliberation. The study is entitled, "Men or Beasts?" and is, in my judgment, one of the finest appraisals of the problems of India, the role of the United States, and the needs for changes in our approach to a staggering food problem, that has been done.

In the introduction to his article, Dr. Miller points up the fact that there should be strings attached to our aid to India. His study places equal emphasis on this need throughout the AID program. He says:

India has made, and is making, heroic efforts to increase food production through increased irrigation facilities, manufactured fertilizer, better seeds and plants, and improved agricultural practices. India is now in its fourth "5-year plan." None of these has succeeded in materially increasing food supply on a per capita basis, largely because of increasing human population, and the constant loss of calories because of the inherent reverence for animal life on the part of the people.

Unless India will re-examine her reverence for the life of animals, there is little hope for her to stave off starvation of untold millions of her people—and little use for the world to deplete its granaries in a futile attempt to do the impossible—to provide food for humans while these very humans allow their indigenous food supply to be depleted because of an ancient reverence for animal life.

Recently, many Indian scholars say that the ancient writings have been misinterpreted, and that present-day animal reverence is not based upon the scriptures, but upon custom and tradition. We have not made reference to this in this study because that is a matter for Indians to determine, but we do have enough written statements from Indian sources to lead us to recommend that our Indian friends take a long, hard look at their own historic sources of a situation which adds so gravely to today's hunger problems in India.

MEN OR BEASTS?

Dr. Miller goes on to explain, by way of background, the seriousness of our population-food race. He says:

On October 19, 1949, at the invitation of Sir Morris Guire, who had been the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India and was at that time Vice Chancelor of the University of Delhi, at New Delhi, India, I addressed a convocation with these words as my opening paragraph:

"Tomorrow there will be 65,000 more persons for breakfast than there were in the world this morning, and so on daily—an increase of about 24 million persons annually."

Were I to give that speech today, I would have to revise my figures to say:

"Tomorrow there will be 185,000 more persons for breakfast than there were in the world this morning, and so on daily—an increase of about 65 to 70 million persons annually."

The final paragraph of that 1949 speech read:

"The *net* world population gain is at the rate of about three more persons every four seconds, which means there are 1,200 more inhabitants on the earth now than there were when I began speaking twenty-seven minutes ago."

That same statement today would have to read:

The *net* world population gain is at the rate of eight more persons every four seconds, which means there are now 3,450 more inhabitants on the earth than there were when I began speaking twenty-seven minutes ago." [1]

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Miller prefaces the questions of India's problem with some comments on the broader relationships between man his food. He writes:

Dr. Albert Sweitzer often referred to "a reverence for life." For this paper, let's amend that to read: "A reverence for human life." I am assuming this is a matter in which we, as members of the human race, all have a mutual, if not a vested, interest. I never cease to marvel at the wisdom of our forefathers in declaring "*life*, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" among our inalienable rights. We all warmly endorse "pursuit of happiness" and some of us, on occasion, may even reflect on "liberty"—but "*life*"—why that's just to be lived and taken for granted. Most of us took life for granted until some of us watched it uselessly, needlessly ebb away from emaciated human beings in many countries—human beings guilty only of being too many and too poor on today's earth.

Basically, man is dependent on his adjustment to all other competitive forms of animal life for his ability to survive upon this earth. He is in direct competition for food, water, air and space. As the living creatures upon this earth become more numerous, the competition becomes stronger.

This spaceship, Earth, upon which we humans were born, have lived and will die, is inhabited by many different types of life—the fish of the sea, the birds of the air, the animals on the land. These, coupled with millions of bacteria and other organisms, constitute our competing-coactive world. Each of these inhabitants adds to the general welfare of the spaceship, and each has something of a deteriorating effect upon it. Each is more or less at war with others, and, again, at peace. The scientists term the study of ecology that branch of knowledge which enables us to understand something of the balance between various types of beasts, birds, fish, bacteria, plant life and man.

When the world had many wide open spaces and was only partially inhabited by man, nature kept a balance between the various types of life. Of course, all these lives were utterly dependent upon the photosynthesis of the green cells of chlorophyll where the chemistry of the growing leaf combines hydrogen, carbon, oxygen and other elements with sun light and, from the beginning of time, has constituted the basis of all life. What happens when the life cycle gets out of balance?

He says:

World Trade Relations, Inc., which I represent as President, has for thirty years actively participated in local, national and world affairs. Our studies have taken us over wide fields in distant places. We have made reports for individuals, universities, corporations and governments, covering various parts of the earth. These have been, not in the field of exact natural sicence, but in the related field of social science, both as it is affected from within and as it is affected by the results of natural science. In the case of this particular report, I hope it will prove to be a document which will provoke some discussions and perhaps help us arrive at an ultimate determination of the way in which we, as American citizens, should proceed in an attempt to effect a balance between food and people in the immediate decades ahead, and on into the 21st and succeeding centuries.

The focus of Dr. Miller's attention is, of course, upon India, which he calls the No. 1 food deficient area:

First of all, our work around the world confirms that man during the past few years has, by scientific knowledge, increased his life's span upon this earth and the population has grown at a tremendous rate largely because death has been postponed. Just a century ago the overwhelming majority of the children of the world died before they reached five years of age. Today, even in the parts of the world that are considered "backward," the life span has, in most cases, more than doubled.

The problems today have grown to such enormous proportions that to attempt to solve the food dilemma of the last half of this century will be the greatest crusade ever undertaken by mankind.

While there are many, many food deficient areas in the world, India ranks as Number One. [2] Because of this, we have selected that country to be the focal point of our observations in this paper. We are continuing, however, to make studies of other areas as well.

The American Legion Magazine, in its March, 1967, issue, carried an article entitled "The World's Crisis in Food and What Must Be Done About It." The author states:

"India looms large in all this because its food problems are worse than those anywhere else—possibly excepting Red China—because India's 500 million people make up more than a third of those in the underdeveloped free world. . . . Her production per acre is almost on the same level as in 1880, a time when crowded Japan—by going modern in food as well as in manufactures—launched a rapid rise in food yield that has been sloping upward ever since."

"The religious scruples," the article goes on to say, "with respect to cattle in India are a unique complication."

One of the most poignant passages in Dr. Miller's article is the discussion of his introduction to India's poverty. He writes:

Through the years, my associates and I have come to the conclusion that most of the world's problems are rural. Because of this, we have concentrated our activities in villages and rural areas of many countries. In the course of various assignments, we have visited with and advised local leaders in hundreds of Indian villages.

I want you to relive with me now an experience I had in Calcutta in late February, 1949. I was there on an assignment for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, for which I traveled some 300,000 miles in the changing parts of the world between February, 1949, and January, 1956, basically implementing the Truman Point 4 idea.

We arrived in Calcutta late in the evening aboard a British "Flying York." We landed in the river, were transferred to a surplus PT boat which had been given to the Indian government and, once ashore, were conveyed to the Great Eastern Hotel in a converted American jeep.

As we went along the narrow streets, I was struck by the sheer number of people shuffling along. Our horn was blown incessantly and the slow-moving pedestrian traffic moved aside. The people were thin and gaunt if adults, and pot-bellied if children. That this situation has changed little unfortunately, in the intervening 18 years is evidenced by an article which appeared in the April, 1967, issue of *These Times*. In his report, "The Population Crisis of Asia," author George C. Thomas states:

---

[1] All figures are from the Population Reference Bureau, Washington, D.C.

[2] The Hindu Weekly Review, February 27, 1967, headlined one of its articles: "50 M Tons of U.S. Food Given Since 1951."

"All of a sudden there is an explosion of people. Millions of them. Everywhere in cities and in countries are masses of humanity. Even those who frequent New York's Times Square at five in the evening are stunned as they view the overpowering masses of Canton or Calcutta.

"The vast number itself may not really shock a visitor. But the number of boys and girls with skinny legs and distended bellies, the number of beggars with empty bowls, loiterers ready to stoop to anything that would bring some money, or the number of refugees searching for a roof to live under—these leave only the most hardened untouched."

That was how I first saw Calcutta in 1949. There in the streets, also, were innumerable thin, scrawny cows blocking traffic, and they didn't mind the horn. We detoured around them if we could, or waited until they moved along of their own accord. No one tried to hurry them along. The cow in India remains sacred and nourished in a perpetually hungry land where only a thousandth of the grain crop can be stored in modern silos and one-third of the annual production of food is destroyed by pests.[3]

He details the issue of the sacredness of the cow as follows:

Also lumbering along through the streets were countless oxcarts carrying supplies from the docks to the city. These were propelled by bullock power, not by cow power as used in Germany, Austria and in other countries where the cow has become a beast of burden. I have never seen a cow in India being worked as a draft animal, nor have my associates who have been there. The fact that the cow is regarded as sacred goes back to the centuries during which India developed a community-type life based upon nonnomadic people. While much of the earth was populated by nomadic tribes who spent their time hunting animals for food, the Indians developed thousands of self-sufficient villages, and the cow became the symbol of stability. She was the source of a permanent food supply through her milk; she nourished the soil through manure and this manure was also then, as now, a major source of fuel for heating and cooking; and she mothered the hard-working bullocks which became the power plants of the people.

If the cow were slaughtered for food, then the source of milk and manure was destroyed and so there developed a basic veneration for the cow. Here, then, as I first saw them roaming the streets, were the rawboned descendants of those once proud cows, scrounging now for food and being allowed to live out their life span at will, to end in a natural death after a time on earth subject to disease and abuse not allowed nor practiced in Europe or in the North American countries.

Darkness was settling as I arrived at the Great Eastern Hotel, and I was compelled literally to step over the bodies of men who where lying on the sidewalk. Some had a little roll of jute for a pillow and a few had a rough jute cover, but most had nothing to protect them but their ragged clothes. I learned later that there were a million refugees in Calcutta, sleeping on the streets at night. All I saw were men—I don't know where the women found shelter.

The hotel covered nearly a full city block and had a huge wooden awning stretching out over a wide sidewalk. This was one of the most sought-after places to bed down as the canopy afforded some small protection from the almost-constant rain. This introduction to the misery prevalent in the sub-continent of Asia came as a shock to me, as did some of the other sights I was to experience of the hunger and despair of part of our human race in a land where food is wasted and vultures thrive.

The next morning, as is my custom, I was up at six o'clock to take a walk. The men who had been on the sidewalk the night before had disappeared, with a few exceptions. In my innocence, I first thought those that remained were late sleepers. I soon learned—with another shock to my American senses—that they were quite dead. A bullock cart was making its way around the hotel and the bodies were heaved into the cart for conveyance, I was told, to the banks of the Ganges. They were not to be cremated there with due ceremony because of the scarcity of wood for a pyre, but they would be scorched a little before being cast into the waters of the holy river.

During the day I did many things and visited with many people, but always in my mind were those souls on the sidewalk. When I returned to the hotel that evening, I again zig-zagged through the sleepers and wondered how many would not awaken the next morning. For several days I saw the same pattern repeated, with fifteen to twenty bodies being carted off each morning—men who had died during the night from starvation coupled with the devastation of exposure to the elements and to disease.

One of these evenings I had my dinner in the main dining room of the hotel, right on the ground floor. The meal was excellent—well cooked, beautifully served and in bountiful supply. My seat was right by a window and as I moved the drape slightly to glance outside, I found myself, to my horror, returning the stare of the near-dead on the sidewalk. They were staring, as if hypnotized, at the food on my plate. I couldn't finish my meal. As I walked out of the room I asked the manager, a Britisher, how these people could resist throwing a rock through the window and grabbing a plate of food within reach since they were literally starving there within sight of plenty.

He turned to me and taught me one of the basic lessons of Asia. He said: "Mr. Miller, this must be your first trip to India. You'll learn many things, and among these will be that a Hindu is loyal to his faith. His faith is that if he endures all that comes to him here, he will go to Nirvana and stop the eternal birth and rebirth of which he has been a part for thousands of transmigrations of his soul from one form to another. He won't throw a rock through that window." It was a lesson I have never forgotten.

Dr. Miller also traveled in Pakistan that year, but the comparison between cattle in Pakistan and the cattle in India is striking:

During that same trip in February, 1949, I went on to Karachi in Pakistan. I had occasion there to visit with Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan, who was a most delightful gentleman. Incidentally, he later took my suggestion and that of others and visited California to study conditions there in a climate much the same as that of his native land. The Prime Minister returned to Pakistan in due course and was murdered by one of his fellow Moslems, but that's another complete story.

At the conclusion of a long session with him about many things, I told the Prime Minister that I understood there were proportionately more refugees in Karachi than there had been in Calcutta, but this time they were Moslems who had crossed hundreds of miles of desert to leave their native India to be a part of the new Moslem country of Pakistan. There were cattle in the city streets, too, and they were as poor as those I had seen in Calcutta. These were remnants left behind when the Hindus fled to the Punjab. I asked the Prime Minister why, since the Moslems did not venerate cattle, the animals were not used for food, which was so desperately needed.

The Prime Minister seemed interested in the idea. I'll never know if my question served as a suggestion to him or whether it came about in some other way but, at any rate, when I returned to Karachi in October of that year on another visit there was not a single cow or bullock to be seen wandering the streets. The refugees had devoured them—with the permission of the office of the Prime Minister.

RELIGION, LONG CUSTOM, TRADITION SEEM IRRATIONAL TO OTHERS

Many more stories could be recounted, but these examples are enough to point up the fact, that, while men are basically the same physically, our religious motivations and the long, long trail of custom and tradition lead us to do things which seem to be irrational to men of other faiths and cultures.

From the dawn of history, crude and unchanging farm implements have been used not only in India but in most of the world. Even today, 90% of the land in India and Pakistan is turned over by wooden plows pulled by bullocks—never, in India, by cows. The main power source of all Asia is largely bovine, be it a bullock or a water buffalo.

When Thomas Jefferson and others developed the first moldboard plow in America, it was our time to turn from the old to the new. Out of that simple beginning later came the reaper, the four-row cultivator and the air-conditioned tractor. America greatly increased its food supply in relation to inputs when we shifted from animal power to the internal combustion engine on wheels, with air-filled rubber tires. Henry Wallace commented on this to me in 1940, observing that we were changing our whole concept of the quantity of food we could grow because as the farms became tractorized the land that had been used for animal feed could be used to grow food for commerce.

There are no accurate figures available but, till the tractor came along, roughly one-quarter of America's farmland was devoted to producing food for work animals. One of the reasons why we suddenly became a nation with huge surpluses was the rapid mechanization of the American farm, coupled with increased use of fertilizers, better seed and improved farming techniques. Such changes have been delayed in India and today she must make up for the past or she will starve herself into the 21st Century.

A wooden plow, native to India and Pakistan, incidentally, was the immediate cause of the passage of the India Wheat Loan Bill by the United States Congress in 1951. This was the forerunner of Public Law 480 in 1954, which provided for the shipment of millions of tons of food. My associate, the late C. Leigh Stevens, and I conceived the idea of bringing a typical plow and some other crude tools back with us from India and Pakistan to show the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee some of the problems involved in balancing food and people in Asia. When we made our appearance before them, they were fascinated by the exhibit and were clearly impressed by the indisputable evidence the primitive plow provided.

The bullocks that provide the power for the plows are not strong. They are hungry, tired and often have open sores under their yokes. The cows, on the other hand, often lead a much easier life—at least they have more time to scrounge for food because they are not hooked to plows, water pumps nor carts.

There has been some slight progress over the years, but not much. In January, 1964, the United States Department of Agriculture published *Agriculture in India*, giving a great many figures and showing completed plans of the past and projected plans for the future. At that time the best available figures, which were a little outdated, showed there were 36,000,300 wooden plows of the type we brought back in use in India. There were

---

[3] Figures from *New York Times*, 2/24/67.

1,400,000 steel plows and only 21,000 tractors. Based upon our questioning of a great many people, both nationals and foreigners, we find those figures may have changed perhaps 10%, but that's not very much—leaving some 33,000,000 wooden plows in an age of rapidly increasing population in a world that has advancing technology available.

GREATEST CATTLE POPULATION IN WORLD IS IN INDIA

But what about the cows that do not work and give but little milk? India has not practiced, as a good forester does, "sustained yield through selective cutting." While she has the greatest cattle population in the world—some 200 to 250 million head, including water buffalo, or approximately one kine for every two persons—she has not developed a livestock nor dairy industry as such. The study projects of a cooperative nature by the United States aid program and the Indian Government have seldom included any in the field of animal husbandry.

The few exceptions are marvelous experiments such as those in Bombay, where dried milk products from New Zealand and the United States are mixed with the rich, 8% butter fat milk of the water buffalo and a very healthy product results. But, as a whole, there is little dairy or livestock industry of importance in the land. The March, 1967, issue of the magazine, *Natural History*, in its timely and authoritative article, "The Myth of the Sacred Cow," states:

"It must be admitted that the Indian dairy industry is among the least efficient in the world. In India, the average annual yield of whole milk per cow has been reported at 413 pounds, as compared with an average of over 5,000 pounds in Europe and the United States. Furthermore, of the 79.4 million cows maintained in 1961, only 20.1 million were milk producers. Among the 47.2 million cows over three years old, 27.2 million were dry and/or not calved. If we go on to accept the proposition that India can make no profit from the negligible slaughter of its enormous cattle supply, we have completed the case for the great cattle bungle. Hence the conclusion of a 1959 Ford Foundation report on India's food problem:

"'There is widespread recognition, not only among animal husbandry officials, but among citizens generally, that India's cattle population is far in excess of the available supplies of fodder and feed . . . At least one third, and probably as much as one half, of the Indian cattle population may be regarded as surplus in relation to feed supply.'

"This view is endorsed by government agronomists, and the Indian Ministry of Information insists that 'the large animal population is more a liability than an asset in view of our limited land resources.'"

In the United States part of our livestock industry is devoted to milk production, but a larger part is devoted to using the animal as a converter of grains into meat and other foods eaten by man. Beef is abhorred by Hindus and, while there are some 55 million members of exterior or untouchable groups in India and several million more who are pagan, Christian or Moslem and do not stress the beef-eating taboo, the fact still remains that the overwhelming majority of Indians are vegetarians. This in itself is all right—we have Seventh Day Adventists in this country who are vegetarians, too, but they use supplemental plant protein. The Indians, too, have excellent sources of plant protein such as peanuts, but they often use them for fertilizer instead of for food.

HIGH-PROTEIN DIET MEANS LEADERSHIP

Protein, animal and plant, is a building block for life. Today, in an age of rapid technological change, it seems that those countries that have a large amount of protein in their diets are the leaders in education, scientific thought and development. Those nations that are deficient in protein are those that are making less original progress than the others. This fact is dramatically presented with charts and figures on Pages 212 and 213 of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations' bulletin, *The State of Food and Agriculture, 1966*, but additional conclusions need to be drawn. FAO's current study, "Codex Alimentarious," is the world's first real effort to assemble human nutritional standards on an international basis.

Figures from the U.S.S.R. and mainland China are not available but, from conversations with Canadians who have been in China, and with the United States and Canadian citizens who have studied the U.S.S.R. in depth and have been there, it is apparent that these two countries are cognizant of the value of protein and students for technological honors and scientists are having at least a tolerable protein diet. Attempts are being made to increase protein for the multiplied millions of people who are inhabitants of this great Eurasian complex.

It is our opinion that, unless India upgrades its protein diet, her people—as fine as they are—will not be able to compete in the technical 21st Century, even if they have warded off starvation before then.

INDIA VERSUS UNITED STATES IN RELATIONSHIP TO ANIMALS

Today, India is racked by demonstrations aimed at protecting the cow from slaughter. In most areas of the nation it is illegal to slaughter a cow. There exists an economic waste of millions and millions of cattle that live out their lives as venerated cows or as hard-working bullocks. After death their lean bodies are consigned to the vultures and their hides, in many cases, are torn apart by the claws of the birds and fangs of hungry dogs. The dry, bleached bones are the chief product turned over to the hungry world. The bone business from the dead bovines of India is of staggering proportions. Such material is the basis of much of our gelatine and related products. The leather from the hides of the dead cattle is often of poor quality because, as a rule, the animals have had no protection from insects, worms, skin diseases and the elements during their lifetime nor, as mentioned earlier, from the scavengers after death.

Probably the biggest single hurdle the Indian farmer must jump, if he is ever going to feed his own, is the matter of his relationship with animals. Let's compare his views with those we hold in the United States.

MAN-ORIENTED VERSUS ANIMAL-ORIENTED ECONOMY

When our ancestors took over this continent, most of the great middle Mississippi and Ohio Valleys were inhabited by countless herds of buffalo. From a practical point of view, if the buffalo had not been killed off we would not today have a surplus of food to ship to India or any other place. If we had treated the bovine animal the same way the Indians do we would never have developed the great yields of wheat and corn, soybeans, barley and oats, and dairy and meat products which today are being shipped to the ends of the earth to help fulfill America's part in saving the world from starvation.

The February 1967, issue of *The American Motorist*, the publication of the American Automobile Association, includes an article about Dodge City, Kansas. In talking about the days of the Old West, the article states:

"The vast herds of buffalo—estimated as late as 1870 at up to 25 million head—provided easy living for any man with the price of a few bullets. A good shot could effortlessly make $100 a day and never lose sight of his prey.

"Buffalo hides were coveted back East and in three years the Santa Fe shipped 1,350,000 tons of buffalo bones back to fertilizer plants. Within five years the southern herd of gentle, lumbering beasts were almost extinct.

"The cattle industry stepped in to fill the gap."

Yes, the pioneers shot the buffalo and, in spite of poor conservation practices, went on to develop an animal industry of horses, mules, cattle, sheep and hogs, but these were meant to be the servants of man, not his masters. They provided not only power, milk and hides, but they helped to fill the stomachs of a growing nation with protein. Protein is the great food foundation upon which man depends for his life, his health, his energy—yes, his brain. It is my firm conviction that India is wasting enough food on its nonproductive animals of all sorts to more than fill the deficiency in the present Indian diet. Its a strange paradox that we are today exporting goods derived from a man-oriented economy to make up the deficiencies in an animal-oriented economy clinging to traditions of the dim past.

THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION—FOOD FOR ANIMALS OR MEN

Now, the Indian has a perfect right to his religion and traditions. He does *not* have the right, we believe, to call upon us for our reserves of food to enable him to cling to those old attitudes. Even the Prime Minister of India raised this question in an article which appeared in the January 16, 1967, issue of *The Hindu Weekly Review*. An article entitled "P.M. Calls for Fusion of Tradition & Modernity" stated:

"The Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, said in Bangalore on January 8 that the conflict in India today was not primarily one of ideology as such but a clash between those who cling to the old ways of thought and those who want India to understand the changes which were taking place all over the world and adopt itself to the needs of the second half of the 20th century.

"'In our religion,' Mrs. Gandhi said, 'we have had reformers and rebels challenging earlier beliefs and thus changing accepted values. This is an example of what I mean when I say that tradition involves movements. Only that society absorbs new challenges and ideas which refuses to let old prejudices and the weight of the past inhibit its attitude and direction. And to be creatively alive, it must mould the future out of its own experience. It must recognize the difference between mere imitation and assimilation.'"

In March, 1964, the Society for International Development held a conference for its members on the "Motivations and Methods of Development of Foreign Aid." One series of speeches published in the proceedings of the Society, under the title "Religion and Development," is noteworthy. The introductory statement was made by Professor Benjamin Nelson, Chairman of the Department of Sociology, the State University of New York, at Stoneybrook, New York. His concluding remarks were:

"Once again, as in the waning Hellenistic and Roman periods, an old world is dying and a new one is being born in the midst of a clash of mighty world religions and political mystiques."

A BALANCE BETWEEN MAN AND ANIMALS IS NEEDED

Our India food problem is basically one of public relations and not of logistics. We can grow for export certain amounts of food and have the means of transporting these quantities halfway around the world to the ports of India. The calories therein contained, when added to what the Indians produce themselves and what they import from other sources, make a certain supply available for internal use. This combined amount might be compared to a food bank, from which sums can be withdrawn by the Indian people. This fund would be enough, we feel, to feed them adequately if they withdrew amounts for their own needs plus a supply for their animals comparable to the ration in regard to man vs. animals which is prevalent in the countries from which they are now getting tons and tons of relief. As matters stand, however, animals competing for food in India are getting excess calories above the share to which they are entitled in line with their contribution to the general welfare of the land. The need for a balance between man and animals is known, and the means for controlling animal numbers are available. If the Indian people would accept this fact, and begin to control the number of animals as well as humans, they could fulfill their immediate needs and gain precious time to build fertilizer plants, introduce better seeds and feeds, and otherwise improve their other cultural deficiencies.

ERRORS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE

It is our opinion that two great errors have been perpetuated with regard to the Indian food situation. First, because of our built-in fear of offending the religious convictions of those who have a different faith than us, we Americans and others have not publicly warned the Indians that our generosity and our supplies of food cannot be stretched indefinitely to feed the people of India unless those same people stop food from being used indiscriminately by non-production animals.

The second mistake is on the part of the Indian government and scientific leaders who have recognized that in a matter of only a few years foreign aid will not be sufficient to feed the hungry but have been reluctant to so inform their people.

The Indian people have accepted these millions of tons of food from us for so long that the new generation is rapidly coming to look upon our shipments as a just claim on their part. When the supplies of necessity taper off, the resentment of the Indian people will be terrible.

Suppose, for instance, that another dust bowl of the proportions experienced in North America in the '30's should develop again. Imagine the disruptions to India if tensions in the Middle East resulted in the closing of the Suez Canal, or if trade was affected in the Straits of Malacca. There would be little food for the bowls of the world's needy. The whole world could suffer terribly because the surplus supplies have been nearly exhausted by India receiving more than her share of the available total without doing her part to avert the disaster.

INDIAN OUTLOOK HAS BEEN KNOWN TO CHANGE

Here are some incidents which will illustrate that the Indian people can be amenable to change:

I was in the old United Provinces in 1949, and learned the farmers were sustaining terrible losses to growing and already-harvested crops from an animal they called the Neel Gai (the blue cow) which resembled an antelope in appearance. These animals went at will across the land, destroying crops as they roamed. There were thousands of them—I personally saw herds of over a hundred animals in each. Their destructive powers were enormous and their stomachs never seemed to be full. While I was still in the area, an Indian scholar completed some research he had been doing, and announced that the blue cow was not a kine at all, but was, in reality, an antelope. Almost immediately, the government issued a notification declaring the new name and classification of this animal. It was called the Neel Ghora (blue horse), and this automatically removed the protection of the cow from the animal. Within a matter of months their ranks were decimated, largely by Hindu farmers.

In another instance while I was in Lucknow, a young woman student at the Lucknow Cultural Society was literally shouted down by the assemblage when she drew attention to the fact that monkeys, which also roamed free, had destroyed her family's garden and she felt something should be done about it. About the same time, a farmer was sentenced to jail for killing a monkey, the animal being revered because legend had it that its distant ancestors had helped Lord Rama build a bridge of rocks to Ceylon to free his kidnaped wife. The Indian farmers, however, being reasonable individuals, were disturbed by this incarceration of a man for protecting his crops from destruction by a descendant of the monkeys of mythology. Within a few years enough pressure was brought to bear that the protection of the monkeys was removed in the United Provinces, and it even came about that an application for renewal of a tiger gun license had to be accompanied by the ears of at least two monkeys.

These occurrences are historically correct, but too few in number. Some provinces have made very little progress in changing from yesterday to today, but there is a hopeful sign that the frozen block of traditions in regard to agricultural production and livestock control is beginning to crack. In a few areas, for instance, there are recorded cases of cereal production increasing from 600 pounds per acre to 3000 pounds per acre through the use of improved seed, better fertilizers, improved tillage and the controlled wanderings of livestock. We feel these trends will continue at an accelerated rate but, since this is a race between millions of people and immediate starvation, the change must come almost overnight as it did with the Neel Gai. Otherwise, by 1980, there will be such famine in India that the records of the world from the beginning of time will have nothing to compare with the calamity.

We have discussed these problems with Indian leaders since 1949, and have always received recognition of the validity of our ideas, even from Mr. Nehru. As early as 1950, before our Point 4 relief was started, Mr. Norris E. Dodd, Director General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations at that time, brought the animal-man food problems forcibly to the attention of the Indian Government during a conference in which I participated.

FOOD LOSSES ENORMOUS FROM RODENTS, PESTS

Perhaps the greatest mistake the non-Indian world makes is to blame all the maladjustment of food supply on the venerated cow. Other animals eat and destroy probably more calories than does the cow, and give nothing in return, whereas the cow does give some milk and manure. Many non-domestic animals could be controlled with a minimum of public resentment as I have pointed out in the case of the monkeys in the United Provinces.

An article which appeared in *The Washington Post* of January 4, 1967, points up the seriousness of this problem. It is entitled "India's Revered Rats Gobble U.S. Grain," and concludes that there are probably five rats for each of India's roughly 500 million inhabitants. Most of these rodents live out their lives unharmed in order to avoid offending the Hindu god of good luck, Ganesh, who reportedly rides on a rat's back. The FAO of the United Nations, in its aforementioned report, states:

"The losses in stored rice caused by rodents consist of losses in weight, losses in quality, and other losses from gnawing on bags, structures, lead pipes, electric wires, etc. If rat population equals human population, as has sometimes been suggested, and if one rat consumes about 9 kilograms of grains per year, the annual loss in quantity alone in a country with a human population of 50 million would be 450,000 tons."

This loss figure when applied to India, therefore, would be multiplied ten-fold, or a total of 4,500,000 tons if we use FAO's conservative one-to-one rate. If the *Post's* five-to-one ratio, as developed by a West German research team in India, is used, that figure escalates rapidly to an impressive 22,500,000 tons consumed annually by rats!

Incidentally, the foreword of this population is by the courageous and forthright Indian gentleman who is FAO's Director General, Dr. B. R. Sen. It is upon his recommendation that our organization cooperates with the American Freedom from Hunger, Inc., of whose Board of Trustees I am a member.

The Washington Post article goes on to name other pests in India which live a good life, quite undisturbed for the most part. Among these are bandicoots, which resemble cat-sized rats, and do immense damage to crops at the same time that they are a threat to infants. Wild birds, crows, roaming dogs and monkeys add to the damage, and the national bird, the peacock, has become a major pest.

Following the advice given him by Mr. Horace Holmes (a former County Agent from Tennessee working in 1949 for a private contractor in India on developing better agriculture), a particular farmer in the Etawha area had succeeded in developing some very fine stands of a certain cereal. I had wanted to see this for myself, and was visiting there when an amazing calamity befell. A very large flock of peacocks settled on the beautiful green farm. They strutted about and flapped their wings before settling down to eat. The farmer, being a very pious and religious man, stood there wringing his hands but doing nothing to drive the birds away. It wasn't long before his crop was largely destroyed.

Of measures against animal pests and insects, the United States Department of Agriculture says in its publication, *Agriculture in India*, January, 1964:

"The use of chemical insecticides and fungicides is retarded in India by economic and religious considerations. The low yields for most crops make the use of chemicals economically prohibitive, and the vast majority of Indians are Hindu, part of whose philosophy, *ahimsa*, prohibits the killing of any animal life. Therefore, plant protection measures directed toward the destruction of insect and animal life have two formidable deterrents to overcome before widespread progress can be made."

FENCES AND INDIAN FARMERS' CHILDREN

Another of Asia's problems comes from the lack of fencing. Perhaps the largest single vocation of the Indian farmers' children is to follow the animals and to herd them from morning until night. We hear much about the farmer in Asia looking upon a large family as a built-in security. That may or may not be so. I have met hundreds of them, however, who felt they must have a large group of children to herd the animals. Fences, as we know them in North America, are almost non-existent. They are one of the simple developments that might at least be explored by the Indians and other Asians. We have never seen—although it might be there—a recommendation concerning fencing in any of the five-year plans. My personal observation is that the herding that goes on is one of the greatest "make-work" wastes of time I have ever seen on any continent.

Jack Wilson, a columnist who writes the items for "Potomac Fever" in *The Washington Post*, said on February 4, 1967:

"LBJ says India needs birth control as much as food. In India they claim a family needs lots of kids to chase the cows away from the rice patch."

VIEWS CONFIRMED

At the request of the Committee on Discussion and Debate of The National University Extension Association, in the spring of 1966, we prepared an article on foreign aid policy for their publication, *The Forensic Quarterly*. This was one of several position papers used by high school students throughout the nation. On Page 216 of the May, 1966, Quarterly, under the sub-heading, "Religion is a Factor Not To Be Overlooked," we pointed out a number of the things we have discussed in this paper.

As a result of the foregoing article, and knowing of our intense interest in the matter, I was invited by President Vernon Alden of Ohio University at Athens to make several appearances on the campus before students, members of the faculty and invited guests. This I did on March 7, 1967, using the material which now appears in this paper as the basis for my lectures.

Almost as if in confirmation of points we have made here, the *U.S. News & World Report* of April 3, 1967, carries an interview with Dr. S. Chandrasekhar, India's new Minister of Health and Family Planning. The article is entitled "Too Many People—Is India Facing Disaster?" On a page headed " 'We have two population problems—human and bovine,' " Dr. Chandrasekhar is reported as saying:

"I am one of those who believe we can lick the problem of our food supply. But we do not because we have traditional methods, traditional ways of doing things. The average Indian is indolent, because of very poor nutrition. Our Government has to go very slowly, grind very slowly, and, when we say something, we really don't mean to carry it out, because there are so many institutional obstacles.

"For instance, let's take the destruction of rats. If the Government can really implement this decision, I am sure we can save at least 20 per cent of our total food-grain production. But in India this is not a very popular subject to speak of. I have a sneaking suspicion that in the countryside people just don't want to kill an animal. They are sacred. They represent 'life.' There are a variety of other factors, but the result is they just don't kill the rats.

"There has been a tremendous all-India agitation asking the Government to ban cow slaughter. This is a subject on which no politician, no member of Parliament, could take a stand for fear of being misunderstood. But I am going to take a stand. People go around paying lip service to the principle that the cow is sacred and it ought to be protected. My position is that it is more religious, more spiritual, to kill some useless cows and useless cattle which wander the streets and cause traffic hazards and who have nothing to eat—no silage, no pastureland. If some of the useless cattle are destroyed, maybe our cattle-population problem can be solved, because, as you know, we have two population problems—we have the human-population problem and the bovine-population problem—they show a direct ratio in their increase! People talking about cows being sacred are the very people who illtreat them and maltreat the cow. And I don't think anywhere in the world does the cow have as miserable an existence as in India."

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S GREAT POINT 4

I mentioned earlier that I traveled in India on behalf of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. That had come about one day in early January, 1949, when Norris E. Dodd, then Director General of the organization, invited me to his office and asked me to work with him as a public relations consultant "with the world as my parish."

When we had finished discussing various aspects of the work, he handed me a torn envelope with some writing on it. "Read this, Ray," he said. "Mr. Truman wants something to include in his Inaugural Address to show how we, through 'know-how' and 'show-how,' can help people to help themselves on a two-way street where we will also learn as well as transmit knowledge. What do you think of this?" And there on that torn envelope was the outline of the famous Point 4. Two weeks later it was elaborated upon in the President's message and became the North Star of Hope for millions. It was my privilege to help interpret this program to the world from 1949 through 1955, as an adviser to both the FAO of the United Nations and to the United States Department of State. Since then World Trade Relations, Inc., has been in constant touch with the Indian situation and its relation to the Point 4 concept.

Many interested citizens are wondering how we, as a nation, ever got caught in the quicksand of Indian population and food pressures. It's very simple. Our missionary traditions, coupled with the vision of President Truman's Point 4 ideas, stimulated an intense interest in the problems of India. Unfortunately, in our enthusiasm to "do good and save the world" we ignored the example of the missionaries who helped people to help themselves, and we appended a give-away concept to the Truman program which was never intended to be included.

THE MESSAGE

The Inaugural Address of 1949, in its entirety, is one of the really great state papers of these times. Point 4 of the speech heralded the greatest attempt ever made by those who had discovered technical knowledge to share it with those who had not been exposed to its findings.

In Mr. Truman's exact words:

"Fourth. We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas.

"More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas.

"For the first time in history humanity possesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering of these people.

"The United States is preeminent among nations in the development of industrial and scientific techniques. The material resources which we can afford to use for the assistance of other peoples are limited. But our imponderable resources in technical knowledge are constantly growing and are inexhaustible.

"I believe that we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life. And, in cooperation with other nations, we should foster capital investment in areas needing development.

"Our aim should be to help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens.

"We invite other countries to pool their technological resources in this undertaking. Their contributions will be warmly welcomed. This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies wherever practicable. It must be a world-wide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty and freedom.

"With the cooperation of business, private capital, agriculture, and labor in this country, this program can greatly increase the industrial actvity in other nations and can raise substantially their standards of living.

"Such new economic developments must be devised and controlled to benefit the peoples of the areas in which they are established. Guaranties to the investor must be balanced by guaranties in the interest of the people whose resources and whose labor go into these developments.

"The old imperialism—exploitation for foreign profit—has no place in our plans. What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair dealing.

"All countries, including our own, will greatly benefit from a constructive program for the better use of the world's human and natural resources. Experience shows that our commerce with other countries expands as they progress industrially and economically.

"Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace. And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technical knowledge.

"Only by helping the least fortunate of its members to help themselves can the human family achieve the decent, satisfying life that is the right of all people."

The Marshall Plan, also inaugurated earlier by President Truman, was proposed as the world's most comprehensive rehabilitation program and was basically a plan to put Europe back on the production line. What we had developed in North America was largely the result of education, techniques, and abilities imported from Europe over the past 300 years. We had developed a climate of political freedom and individual initiative under which the basically European discoveries had flourished. We had become the greatest power on earth by the blending of a technical heritage from Europe with the pioneer spirit and political understanding of a people who had combined a written Bill of Rights with an unwritten Bill of Duties. Out of this homogenization of knowledge and political theory a powerful America was created.

The Europeans had built a civilization of a scientific structure from the beginning of the industrial revolution in the 18th Century to the beginning of the War of the 20th Century in 1918. During the first two phases of this latest war which is still with us, in the periods known as World War I and World War II, Europe was blown to pieces materially and politically.

Communism, Karl Marx's modern mutation from the theories of Plato, found an optimum climate for growth in Russia, and thrived there under the name of Bolshevism. It threatened to first take over Europe and then all the rest of the world, even if it had to go to Paris via Peking. Into this situation—with a largely-destroyed industrial Europe—with nations in bankruptcy and the tentacles of Bolshevism reaching out to enmesh new areas—was introduced the Marshall Plan. It was hoped that this fast-growing "plant," with its roots firmly embedded in the soil of freedom, would send out heavy growth to smother the weeds of Bolshevik Communism. This was largely accomplished in western Europe, and the miracle of its growth is unequalled in human history.

When it was evident that the Marshall Plan was going to be a success, President Truman wanted to present a separate proposal for the cultivation of the plant of freedom in areas of the world that had not had the benefits of centuries of industrial and scientific growth. Most of the world that was neither European nor North American had little experience with modern technology as applied to agriculture, fishing or industry. Its educational institutions were few and those that did exist were concerned primarily with perpetuating the mental status quo of the past rather than looking to the future of change and the acceptance of new ideas.

The new proposal, outlined by Mr. Dodd at President Truman's suggestion, offered these emerging areas benefits of our knowledge and experience. It envisioned their literally being able to leap-frog across centuries of European-American research and experience through our "know-how" and "show-how" efforts. A careful reading of the afore-cited Point 4 of the 1949 Inaugural Address shows how strong was the basic idea of self-help. *No mention is made of a give-away program save in terms of knowledge.* President Truman's vision was predicated upon each nation doing what it could to help itself with its own resources combined with the world's technical knowledge. Food would be shipped to cover emergencies such as droughts, but this was not to become a perpetual program.

Unfortunately, the Point 4 program was still in its infancy when it became obvious that it was being misconstrued here at home and the emphasis shifted from giving *ideas* to giving *things*. The program has been so administered that practically the whole world has come to think of it in terms of material goods, accompanied by the philosophy of "Just ask—Uncle Sam will provide."

This resultant attitude reminds one of the story of the ancient Greek philosopher who, upon being told that a citizen had made some very disparaging remarks about him, said to his informer: "I can't understand why he should speak so—I don't remember ever *giving* him anything!"

WE MUST GO BACK TO THE BASIC SELF-HELP IDEA OF POINT 4

A change is becoming apparent, however, and we seem now to be going back to take a look at where we very largely left the track in 1952. Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, for instance, publicly stated on February 16, 1967, that it has become impossible to feed the world through charity and relief and that it must be accomplished, if at all, through self-help coupled with technical advice. Dr. B. R. Sen, in the afore-mentioned foreword to the report of the FAO of the United Nations, frankly stated:

"It has always been emphasized by FAO that, invaluable as food aid may be . . . in the long run greater production in the developing countries themselves is essential for any lasting improvement in their food situation."

Thus it is hoped that the basic intent of the Truman Point 4 program will be resurrected once again after billions of dollars have been wasted and irretrievable years have been lost in an often-futile attempt to buy the friendship of other areas of the world.

President Lyndon Johnson, recognizing the imperativeness of getting the food problem to the "grassroots producers" and away from the acedia of government, told the Congress in his Message on India Food on February 2, 1967:

"All of us know where the real battle is fought. Whatever the efforts in world capitals, the real tale is told on the land. It is the man behind the mule—or the bullock—or the water buffalo—who must be reached. Only his own government and his own people can reach him."

CONCLUSION

In the spring of 1951, I returned from my third extensive trip to Asia. My associates here at home had been carrying on exhaustive research. I was requested by the editor of the *Harvard Business Review* and Dean Donald K. David of Harvard's Graduate School of Business Administration, where I was a member of the faculty, to prepare a document for the publication which would reflect our evaluation of the economic problems of Asia. This was published in the July, 1951, issue of the *Review*, and entitled "Our Economic Policy in Asia." There has been so little change in the situation in almost 16 years that it is sad but true that the report which we wrote then could stand as our evaluation of our economic policy in Asia in the spring of 1967 by changing a very few words and adding several paragraphs.

Its concluding statement is still true. We said:

"Hunger is the most important fact in the world today. The real challenge of the 20th Century is the race between man and starvation. Today the great majority of the people of Asia live in rural and urban slums under economic restrictions and social customs and superstitions of the past. We in the United States must with other free countries cooperatively attack the conditions which cause these people to be poorly clothed and hungry and to live in hovels. Within these dirty domiciles men are generating internal volcanic pressures. These will erupt in this decade—as, indeed they have already started to do—unless the 'lending of a hand' takes the place of a mere handshake. What Asia wants the United States to be is a good neighbor, not a patronizing philanthropist."

In conclusion, may I emphasize again that there is no time to waste in hobbling the horseman of hunger in India. India must bring herself to be a nation with a man-oriented economy, with a 20th Century balance between culture, tradition, practical technology and economics.

Time is of the essence.

CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the explosion of hostilities in the Middle East came as a shock to the people of the world, but not as a surprise. The uneasy situation slowly smoldering in that quarter of the world has long been the object of much attention and consternation among those who hold peace dear. For over 20 years, the Arab nations have threatened to do exactly what has finally come to pass, that is the attempted annihilation and total destruction of the Jewish nation of Israel. The aggression is being led by Nasser of Egypt, the same Nasser who last week bombed a Red Cross convoy on its way to give aid to those who were gassed in attacks on Yemen. Reports continue to come in of Israeli military victories and the complete breakdown of the Arab military machine.

And although the region is beset by confusion and conflicting reports at this hour, we can be sure of the fact that the state of Israel has every legal right to exist and they are, at this minute, defending that right with their blood and every thread of energy and courage at their disposal.

The United States has a vital and paramount interest in the survival of the state of Israel, an interest that is as basic as the very democracy upon which this Nation was founded and in which we so firmly believe. Israel stands like a small but powerful beacon of democracy amid the shadows cast by the despots in Arab States. Freedom to the citizens of the United States is a concept that we have fought for and for which this Nation would go to war again to protect if it were challenged. Freedom is the concept now being challenged in Israel by the dictators of the Arab States who would usurp that principle by the force of their Russian-equipped armies. If the United States does hold freedom and liberty to be the inviolate right of all people, then we, as a nation, must support the valiant nation of Israel which now faces the enemies of democracy.

Withstanding the pressures, threats, and the aggressions of the destroyers of freedom is nothing new to the people of Israel. Since 1948, they have withstood countless attacks against their integrity in the form of infamous raids and infiltrations. Before 1948 and the founding of the modern State of Israel, the Jewish people were swept beneath the onslaughts of the Russian pogroms and the Nazi exterminations, but they survived and sustained their dream of an Israel reborn. The realization of their dream, the restoration of Canaan that God promised Abraham, finally came true through the determined efforts of a handful of courageous fighters and builders who created with the sweat of hard work and the blood of inspired combat the state that is now besieged in the Middle East.

The United States has a responsibility to the nation of Israel, a responsibility we share with every other free nation on the earth. We, as a nation, must protect the freedom of the Israelis to establish and maintain their nation regardless of the distaste for them expressed in the Arab capitals. We have a responsibility to the people of the State of Israel to insure that they need not face the tyrants of the Arab countries who are so bent on the destruction of Israel, for it is the rightly held belief of the United States that all peoples have the right to live in peace and to enjoy the fruits of their labors.

It is obvious now that the Arabs are acting as the pawns of the Soviets and inspired by Moscow. This aggression against Israel is one more even in a chain of recent happenings around the world instigated to harass and cause embarrassment to the United States. Russia in the Mideast is using its friends in the Arab world to activate the war with the added prize offered to the Arabs that they will be able to undo the embarrassment caused them by Israel in 1948 and 1956. And they are now using Arab oil to fight their economic battles for them in their attempt to force the United States to abandon our responsibility to Israel.

The United States must continue its constant vigilance against the aggressors who play the Communist game. Israel has become the object of the most recent attempt and this Nation must not allow them to destroy Israel. The price we pay for vigilance is our inability to respond to acts of violence such as we now witness in the Middle East. While we are contesting aggression in Vietnam, we are being challenged on a new front in the Middle East to see if we are willing to withstand the pressures of this new kind of global struggle. The United States will live up to its responsibility to defend freedom in Southeast Asia and in the Middle East and wherever the Communists wish to test our mettle.

It is time for this Nation to take the necessary action demanded in the current situation to defend Israel from the Arab countries. Israel is opposing the Arabs with all the determination and courage that they have displayed in the creation of their State and the United States can do no less than display the same determination that this outpost of democracy in a desert of despotism shall survive. The United States should be prepared to institute sanctions against the aggressors in the Middle East.

The United States should not just urge that the Arab States return to a peaceful stance, we must demand it, and be prepared to enforce that demand through the concerted actions of the four powers or the United Nations. We must demand direct negotiations between Israel and the Arabs.

The alternative to action by the United States is the death of Israel. That alternative is unacceptable. I last visited Israel 4 years ago when I saw firsthand the miracle wrought in that land by Israeli initiative and perseverance. I was to have left for Israel and another long-awaited visit on last Sunday, at my own expense I might add, but due to difficulties in arranging transportation, I was not able to go. My trips to the Middle East have been enlightening and have provided me with a knowledge of the area and the people that is invaluable. Six years ago, when I interviewed President Nasser in Cairo, I discovered then the expressed aims of the man and his intense hatred of Israel and America. I speak as one who has witnessed firsthand the dangers faced by Israel in their surrounded and embattled position in the midst of the Arab war machine. This tiny land of Israel, the Middle East's only free nation, must be and shall be preserved.

The United States must lead the way to an implementation of the cease-fire to end the useless destruction of property and to halt the taking of life. After the cease-fire, this Nation must insure the proper atmosphere for a permanent and lasting peace and a final settlement of the questions of boundaries, shipping rights, and the international integrity of the State of Israel by enforcement of a peace treaty not just a truce that will lead to another war. To perpetuate the hollow truce is not enough, nor is a return to the status quo through blackmail. It is the responsibility of the United States to see that Israel be given the assurances of the international community that the next aggression against Israel and her brave people will be answered not by words from sympathetic souls but by action from the free nations of the world. Israel has the unequivocal right to exist and that right should be expressed at the highest level in terms so direct as to be beyond interpretation.

It is past the time for consideration and conferences that produce nothing and waste valuable time. It is time for action by the United States. I call upon the President of the United States to take immediate action to implement the cease-fire and insure the continued integrity of the State of Israel. I further call upon the Congress of the United States to support the President and to guarantee that this Nation is not ready to surrender Israel to a meaningless truce but to insist upon a treaty that will end aggression and provide a lasting peace in this troubled area.

FRANCES PAYNE BOLTON

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of May 22, the Cleveland Men's Club of Washington, D.C., honored our colleague, Mrs. BOLTON, in a rather unique ceremony.

Unique—because the award came from a men's club, but of course many honors have come to our distinguished colleague, who came to Congress in 1940, succeeding her late husband. Of all her interests, perhaps nursing is the one closest to her heart and she has won the undying affection and gratitude of many who have benefited by her compassion and charity in this field. However, this charming, poised, brisk, and forthright woman was destined to take a place of leadership in the history of the U.S. Congress.

She came from a family dedicated to public service. Both of her grandfathers served in the Ohio State Legislature. One of them, Hon. Henry B. Payne, was a Member of this body and a U.S. Senator. She had the singular distinction of having her able son, Oliver, serve with her—the only mother-son team in Congress. She is endowed with a sharp wit and keen sense of humor. She has indeed brought honor to Cleveland as an articulate and well-versed legislator.

If there was a time when she first came to Congress that her male colleagues showed deference to her because she is a woman, and the widow of their colleague, she promptly dispelled that attitude, and by her own firm stand, let it be known that she is here, as their peer, in this great legislative arena, to represent her district—able to assume the same responsibilities they carry, and she has firmly established her ability to hold the office to which she was elected. She has always been able to match her male colleagues in impromptu debate, and has ably earned the award she received for "devoted and distinguished public service."

Following is the award given to Mrs. BOLTON for "devoted and distinguished public service":

The Harold Hitz Burton Award for Devoted and Distinguished Public Service is herewith presented by the Cleveland Men's Club of Washington, D.C., to Honorable FRANCES PAYNE BOLTON, Member of Congress.

For outstanding service as Congressman from the Cleveland 22nd District since 1940, as first woman U.S. Delegate to the United Nations, Dean of the Ohio Republican Delegation and ranking minority member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and as an authority on African problems. A mother, humanitarian and lawmaker, she has brought added distinction and honor to the City of Cleveland, Ohio

WASHINGTON, D.C., *May 22, 1967*.

JOSEPH M. GAMBATESE,
President.
EDWARD A. SEITZ,
Secretary.

THE AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION CELEBRATES ITS 60TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to have the opportunity to join in commemorating the 60th anniversary of a fine organization, the American Hungarian Federation.

I particularly want to congratulate the leaders of the federation at this historical juncture for outstanding service not only to Hungarian immigrants who are now productive and happy citizens of our country, but also to our society at large.

For in its history of 60 years, the American Hungarian Federation has sought to acquaint new citizens and immigrants with the tenets and forms of the American way of life and has helped them become good citizens and loyal members of American society. At the same time, the federation has endeavored to preserve the culture and traditions of American Hungarians through generations from Col. Nicolas de Kovats of George Washington's army; through the Hungarian brigade during the Civil War to Edward Teller; and to the many soldiers of Hungarian descent now fighting the battle against Communist aggression in Vietnam like their brethren had fought the Russian tanks in Budapest a little more than 10 years ago.

The American Hungarian Federation is not only a national representation of Americans of Hungarian heritage with 120,000 members in its constituent organizations, but it is also a realization of an ideal: the ideal of freedom and individual dignity, loyalty to America, and an active interest in the human rights of the country from which they come, or from which their ancestors came.

Today it is heartening to see that Americans of Hungarian heritage, together with other Americans from many diverse backgrounds, are united in the defense of the values and traditions that have made this country great and free.

Mr. Speaker, the glow of freedom and the desire for fulfillment of human rights remains alive in Hungary as well as in the loyal hearts of our citizens of Hungarian descent. I hope that the American Hungarian Federation will continue to preserve the unity of the American Hungarian community and its devotion to the principles of our way of life and to the rich traditions of Hungary during these difficult days of dissent and unrest in America.

STRONG CIVIC SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REORGANIZATION PLAN

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's reorganization plan for the District of Columbia government enjoys the strong support of many outstanding business, civic and political groups in this area and across the country.

This strong support is a tribute to the soundness of the plan and the obvious necessity for its implementation to bring modernization to the government of our Nation's Capital.

In recent days, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, headed by Detroit Mayor Jerome P. Cavanaugh, has gone on record as warmly supporting the reorganization plan.

Said the conference of mayors:

> Within the restraints imposed by Congress, this plan places full executive responsibility in the single office of a District official and places legislative responsibility within a council of the community. We will support the President's plan in Congress as the best possible way, short of the vote, of the people of the District to bring representative government to this Hub of the nation's fastest growing metropolis.

These same sentiments were echoed by the Committee on Community Relations of the Archdiocese of Washington, which said:

> This plan promises to bring a new element of public representation and responsibility to the citizens of Washington . . . We encourage the support of the reorganization plan by everyone who believes in the principle of efficient and responsive local government.

Strong endorsements have also been sent by the Presbytery of Washington, and the Cooperative Lutheran Parish.

The League of Women Voters of the District declared:

> Long years of experience in working for more effective city government convinces us that the change to a single executive is of urgent importance for greater governmental capacity to act on the wide-ranging, interrelated needs of the District.

These endorsements underscore the strong civic support for this reorganization plan. The fact is that 800,000 residents of Washington look to this plan to help fulfill the growing needs of this complex, burgeoning Capital City.

I commend those community leaders who have championed the President's reorganization plan. I believe my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are impressed with the overwhelming support this plan enjoys and will join with the community in supporting this proposal.

TVA, UNIONS MARK 30 YEARS OF HARMONY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, "TVA, Unions Mark 30 Years of Harmony." That was a happy headline to read in the current issue of the AFL–CIO News.

Since we read so many headlines telling about war, riots, murders, and strikes, it is refreshing to get the other side of the picture, and to commend both management and labor for cooperation that has continued for over a quarter century. In particular, Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that this cooperation involves an agency of the Federal Government—demonstrating that contrary to the views of some pessimists, collective bargaining is entirely feasible in public employment. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert the article in the Record at this point:

TVA, Unions Mark 30 Years of Harmony

Chattanooga, Tenn.—Three decades of harmony between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Tennessee Valley AFL–CIO have produced a "yardstick" of labor relations for the entire power industry, Pres. Gordon M. Freeman of the Intl. Brotherhood of Electrical Workers declared here.

Freeman returned to his former home to speak at a banquet highlighting the central labor body's annual valley-wide conference, which marked 30 years of successful collective bargaining. The two-day session drew nearly 750 representatives of labor and management from all the TVA states and included a number of high-ranking union officials.

SUCCESS HAILED

"The success of this yardstick merits its support," Freeman said in hailing the years of cooperative labor-management relations.

Dir. William E. Simkin of the Federal Mediation & Conciliation Service praised the bargaining relationship as "a living monument deserving of careful study and emulation by other governmental agencies and unions representing government employees."

In other parts of the country, he said, relations between federal agencies and unions of their employees are at about the stage that industry passed through in the late 1930s and early 1940s. Agreements, he warned, should be studied with "great care" by union and government officials who are new at bargaining with each other.

Chairman A. J. Wagner of the TVA board of directors renewed "my personal commitment" to the labor relations program and paid tribute to the TVA's first board for "the wisdom and foresight that made possible this partnership between union and management which has flourished and grown."

He also gave a brief review of the TVA's growth and outlined plans for future moves.

Other speakers included Pres. John McConnell of the University of New Hampshire and Dr. John Dunlop of the Harvard University Dept. of Economics. Presiding at various sessions were Pres. C. C. Hobbs of the valley AFL–CIO and John E. Massey, TVA personnel director; L. J. Van Mol, TVA general manager, and Don McBride, a TVA director.

Union officials present included Pres. Thomas J. Murphy of the Bricklayers; Pres. John H. Lyons, Jr., of the Iron Workers; Pres, Hunter P. Wharton of the Operating Engineers; Pres. S. Frank Raftery of the Painters and Pres. Matthew Lynch of the Tennessee AFL–CIO.

Also, Vice Pres. Maywood Boggs of the Boilermakers; IBEW Vice Pres. W. D. Petty; Vice Pres. John Walsh of the Iron Workers; Vice Pres. G. K. Fritts of the Painters and Treas. Peter Terzick of the Carpenters.

A SOCIAL ROLE FOR PRODUCTIVITY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, all of us know that American working men and women have been producing more and more in recent years. Irving Beller, an economist in the AFL–CIO Department of Research, says in an article in the current edition of the American Federationist, published by the AFL–CIO, that productivity today is twice as much as it was 20 years ago and that this increase seems likely to continue.

Mr. Beller's article tells how productivity is measured, looks at trends, declares that the worker has not received his fair share of the wealth he helps produce, and asserts that the proper use of the benefits of higher productivity means that urgent social problems can be solved.

Since I found the report most informative and I know that many of the rest of us would like the opportunity to ponder its points, under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of Mr. Beller's article in the Record as follows:

A Social Role for Productivity

(By Irving Beller)

The American worker today produces nearly twice as much as he did 20 years ago. Employes in the private sector of the economy are turning out $4.97 worth of goods and services during each hour of work this year, compared to $2.59 in 1947 (in terms of 1966 prices).

If productivity continues to grow at the same pace, by 1969 the value (in constant dollars) of goods and services produced during each hour of work in the private economy will be more than double that of 1947. And, if it continues for another 11 years beyond then, in 1980 Americans could have as much income per person as they now have by working 24 hours per week, 31 weeks per year—or retiring altogether at the age of 44 or less.

This enormous increase in productive power explains much about American development in recent years. It explains in part, and frequently in large part:

Why job opportunities are shifting from agriculture and manufacturing to services;

Why unit labor costs for production and maintenance workers in manufacturing have remained virtually constant during the last dacade despite increases in the average hourly compensation of factory workers;

Why profits have skyrocketed in spite of the general rise in employe compensation;

How federal, state and local government purchases of goods and services can expand even while consumers and business expenditures are rising; and

How the annual increase in per capita output in the United States can be greater than the entire per capita output in over 40 nations.

Lower costs, rising income and greater leisure are universal goals. Higher productivity is, therefore, a primary target not only of the United States but of all nations. The government of Great Britain, another advanced industrial nation, is urging far-reaching changes in British institutions, customs and attitudes in order to increase productivity. And the developing nations, representing two-thirds of the people of the world, are struggling desperately to increase productivity and lift their economies into the 20th century.

WHAT IS PRODUCTIVITY?

Productivity is a measure of efficiency in production. Like other measures of efficiency familiar to everyone, it expresses a relationship between a result and something required to produce that result. The efficiency of a baseball player is measured by comparing the hits he produces with the number of times he comes up to bat; of a football player by the number of yards he gains compared to the number of times he carries the ball; and of an automobile by the number of miles it travels compared to the number of gallons of gasoline it uses.

Similarly, efficiency in the factory, the store or the office can be measured by comparing the output of goods or services with the number of hours of work required to produce such goods and services. The result is a rate—output per manhour—which indicates how much can be produced by the labor of one person during one hour.

The rate of productivity will remain the same if both the output and the hours of work to produce it remain constant or if both change at the same pace. However, the rate of productivity will increase:

If output rises faster than working hours;

If output rises without any increase in hours at all; or

If output remains the same while hours of work decline.

The rate of productivity will increase, in fact, even when output is falling if hours of work fall even faster.

The actual measurement of productivity leads to greater complexity. Output, the upper part of the productivity ratio (output divided by hours of work), would be easy to measure if all units of production were identical. Simple addition would be all that would be necessary. In most cases, however, measuring output is more complicated. Since most plants produce a variety of products, combining physical units of production would not yield a useful measure of total production for the plant as a whole and certainly not for the economy as a whole. Adding cheesecake, autos and shoes together would make little sense.

When adding physical units of production is not feasible, an alternative method of determining the value of output is available. The dollar value of all goods and services produced can be added together after adjustment for price changes.

If the price adjustments are inaccurate, of course, the result will not reflect real changes in output. For example, recent studies show that inadequate price adjustments have led to an understatement of the real changes in the output of the construction industry and, consequently, to an understatement of that industry's productivity growth. Normally, however, this method results in a reasonably accurate estimate of the physical changes in output.

The lower part of the productivity ratio, hours of work, is only one of the factors required in the production process. Other factors could be used to measure productivity, also. It could be measured in terms of output per dollar of investment in plant and equipment, in terms of output per kilowatt of electricity or output per unit of raw material.

Hours of work are most frequently used, however, because they are involved in all production, because they are relatively easy to measure and because information about output per manhour throws light upon crucial economic matters such as employment and unemployment, unit labor costs, profits and economic growth in general.

Output per manhour figures for the total private economy are published annually by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor. The figures are based on the value of goods and services produced in this sector (adjusted for price changes) and the corresponding hours of all persons employed. They are the most comprehensive official productivity statistics available. They cover 85 percent of total economic activity, including governmental functions such as the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Post Office. Other governmental activities are excluded because of the difficulty of determining the value of goods and services which are not sold.

The Department of Labor also publishes indexes of output per manhour for the farm and non-farm sectors of the economy. In addition, it publishes indexes for a small number of separate industries.

Productivity figures for most industries, however, are either nonexistent or, if developed by trade associations, they are frequently not a matter of public record. This is even more true of productivity data for particular companies. Unions seeking information about productivity must, therefore, often make their own estimates based upon limited government data, bits of information in financial reports to stockholders and to the Securities and Exchange Commission, and their own educated guesses.

PRODUCTIVITY TRENDS

According to government figures, between 1909, the earliest year for which official data is available, and 1966, output per manhour in the total private economy almost quadrupled. On the average, it rose at an annual rate of 2.3 percent.

Although the trend throughout this period was clearly upward, there were distinct differences in the rate of productivity growth from year to year and from one subperiod to another. In view of the major economic and social changes which occurred during these 57 years, such differences are not surprising. It was a period, after all, of two world wars, one catastrophic depression, 12 recessions and several intervals of rapid economic growth.

In spite of such variations, the upward trend continued and even accelerated. This acceleration in the rate of productivity growth is clear, whether or not the extremely abnormal years of depression and world war following 1929 are included.

From 1909 to 1919, output per manhour in the total private economy increased by less than one percent per year. It speeded up perceptibly after World War I and it moved ahead even faster following World War II as computers and other forms of automation spread rapidly. During each of these periods, the average yearly rates of change were as follows:

	Percent
1909 to 1919	0.7
1919 to 1929	2.5
1929 to 1947	2.2
1947 to 1966	3.3

At first glance, an increase of about one percentage point may appear to be insignificant. Actually, its significance is enormous. If productivity had grown only 2.2 percent instead of 3.3 percent since 1947, it would have taken about 700,000 more workers each year to produce the same amount of goods and services.

What is more, the overall rate conceals enormous increases in productivity in particular sectors and particular industries. In the agricultural sector, output per manhour rose at the phenomenal rate of 6.2 percent from 1947 to 1966. Among the industries for which official productivity figures are available, output per manhour for all employes rose at these yearly rates between 1947 and 1964:

	Percent
Gas and electric utilities	7.4
Cigar manufacturing	6.6
Petroleum refining	5.7
Communications	5.5
Primary aluminum	5.4
Railroads	4.8
Hydraulic cement	4.8
Hosiery	4.5

In virtually all of these industries, output per manhour for production and maintenance workers alone increased even more rapidly than for all employes combined.

FUTURE PRODUCTIVITY GROWTH

Overall, productivity is certain to continue to move upward. There is good reason to believe, moreover, that it will move upward even faster than it has thus far.

A projection of the nation's economic growth prepared for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress last year—a projection described as "a practical target" based on assumptions reflecting "past relationships and trends in the economy as well as current and known policies"—assumes output per manhour in the private sector will average 3.5 percent from 1970 to 1975.

Another projection, one made by the highly respected National Planning Association, "subject to the constraints both of institutional arrangements (e.g., absence of price or wage controls) and economic feasibility," assumes an average 3.5 percent growth in output per manhour for the period from 1965 to 1976.

Why is it reasonable to assume that the growth of productivity in the future will be even greater than it has been in the past?

At any point in time a host of factors are at work, influencing productivity at that time and far into the future as well. Among those which seem certain to push the rate of productivity upward in the period ahead are the following:

1. The profound changes which automation and other recent technological developments have made in the way of producing goods and services are only a beginning. Further changes are bound to be rapid and far-reaching. Within the past decade, company expenditures on research and development have about doubled; federal research and development expenditures have quadrupled. The number of scientists and engineers has increased from a little over one quarter of a million in 1938 to over a million in 1960 and is expected to reach about 2 million in 1970.

Also, information concerning new developments in science and technology is being distributed far more widely and systematically through trade journals, professional publications, conferences and special government efforts.

For these and other reasons, "in the estimation of most working technologists, the next stage of advance is likely to be by far the most expansive in this century," a recent article in Fortune magazine notes. It is likely, as Fortune observes, to result in the regeneration of old industries such as ground and sea transportation and construction. It is also likely to invade those service sectors in which productivity has lagged in the past as these become increasingly important. "Invention follows the lure of profit," declares economist Robert Heilbroner and, therefore, "one would expect the service occupations which now bulk so large in the spectrum . . . to be interesting to work with from a profit-potential point of view."

2. Investment in plant and equipment has grown at a phenomenal rate in the past three years. In each of these years, such outlays have exceeded those of the previous year by an average of almost 12 percent in real terms. This was over twice the average annual rate of growth in Gross National Product (the total value of all goods and services produced) for the same period. Not only was the level of investment exceptionally high, but also much of it embodied the latest technology. Some payoff in terms of increased productivity should begin to appear shortly.

3. Recent advances in government policies and programs in three areas in particular could have an even more telling effect upon productivity in the years ahead. Between 1953 and 1960, the rate of productivity advance was considerably below the average for the postwar period as a whole. The reason for this is not hard to find. The economy was permitted to operate well below capacity during this period. "Even the manpower employed was not fully employed," says Professor Neil Chamberlain. Since existing equipment was also less than fully employed, business had far less incentive than it would otherwise have had to invest in new and more modern plant and equipment. Thus, the persistent under-utilization of resources during this period affected current produc-

tivity and, by discouraging investment, it affected future productivity as well.

Between 1961 and 1966, however, the emphasis in national economic policy shifted. A narrow concern with balancing federal expenditures and federal revenues was replaced by a determination to achieve more rapid economic growth. Expansionary government measures were adopted to boost production and sales and, as a result, the U.S. experienced the longest peacetime expansion in its history.

The expansionary policies of the Sixties made it possible for the nation to use its resources more fully and more efficiently. If such policies are retained and strengthened, men and machines will continue to be used more efficiently. Furthermore, the rate of investment is likely to be higher and more stable than in an economy which alternates between periods of recession and slow growth.

A second area of government policy certain to pay enormous dividends in terms of higher productivity is the recently stepped-up investment of federal funds in human capital formation—in the development of creative, intelligent, productive human beings. Professor Frederick Harbison declares "that investment in man is equally as important as investment in material things and that a country's rate of growth is dependent as much upon the development of human resources and the rate of human capital formation as upon its rate of physical capital formation." Studies indicate, in fact, that the increase in education and general knowledge have accounted for fully 40 percent of U.S. economic growth in recent decades.

Certainly, future productivity growth will benefit enormously from the increased funds recently allotted to educational programs at all levels, including the Head Start program, the work-study program, the GI Bill, and the Manpower Development and Training Program. This is equally true of the many new programs designed to improve the health of the American people, including medical assistance for the poor under Medicaid and grants for the construction of additional health facilities and the training of medical personnel.

Closely related to investment in human beings as a source of future productivity growth is the effort to eliminate racial discrimination. The Negro people still constitute one of the great untapped resources of America. The steps thus far taken to provide Negroes with equal opportunity in education and employment are only a beginning. Further progress, however, must surely come and when it does it will provide still another powerful boost to the nation's productivity.

The importance of achieving the full measure of productivity which these and other forces make possible is enormous. In the years ahead, the growth in the American labor force and the elimination of existing unemployment could result in a yearly increase of about 1.7 percent in total hours of work (even after allowing for a decline in hours of work per person).

If output per manhour in the private economy rises by 3.3 percent during this period, output per manhour in the total economy (as conventionally estimated) would rise by about 3 percent. An increase of 3 percent in output per manhour, combined with an increase of 1.7 percent in manhours of work, would yield a 4.7 percent increase in production for the economy as a whole.

With only a tiny boost in productivity, however, production for the economy as a whole could increase by 4.9 percent annually. On the surface, the change appears minute. Over the next 10 years, however, this difference of two-tenths of a percent in the annual rate of growth would increase the amount of goods and services available for distribution by more than $109 billion for the decade as a whole, or about $11 billion a year, on the average (in terms of 1966 dollars).

THE NEED FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT

The importance of increasing productivity is apparent. However, a society which aspires to greatness must do more. It must increase productivity without injuring millions of people in the process. Secondly, it must pay careful attention to how the gains of increasing productivity are used.

Rapidly rising productivity can create enormous problems. As a mater of fact, the promise of rising productivity can be transformed into the reality of mass unemployment in which income disappears and leisure becomes worse than meaningless.

Rising productivity makes it possible to produce as much as before with fewer workers. One way to provide jobs for all those previously employed is to reduce hours of work. Another way is to produce more goods. Unless hours of work are shortened, production and sales must grow as fast as productivity in order to maintain existing levels of employment. In fact, to prevent unemployment from rising, output must grow even faster than productivity since the number of people seeking jobs is continually growing.

Average hours of work declined during the decade after 1953. Nevertheless, the combination of rapid advances in productivity and rapid growth in the labor force required a growth in production of about 4 percent just to prevent unemployment from rising. Unfortunately, the growth in production which occurred during this period averaged only 2.9 percent. As a result unemployment rose sharply. It reached 6.8 percent of the civilian labor force in 1958 and remained above 5 percent for 6 years thereafter.

Since then, the economy has grown at a much more rapid pace. It has grown rapidly enough to offset increases in productivity and in the labor force and to reduce unemployment as well. The U.S. still has not reached full employment. Nevertheless, we have seen that when government policy is deliberately designed to increase sales and production we can avoid the hardship which rising productivity in combination with lagging sales has imposed in the past.

Full employment and rapid economic growth will not, of course, solve all the problems created by rising productivity. Even if overall unemployment declines to 3 percent or less in the future, there will almost certainly be fewer jobs than there are today in mining, agriculture, petroleum refining, railroad transportation and possibly in auto and steel manufacturing as well. In each of these the prospect is for output per manhour to grow more rapidly than output, even though the economy as a whole is operating close to capacity.

This means that many workers in industries which are declining or growing slowly will have to change jobs. Some will suffer a period of unemployment while making the transition. Some will drop to the bottom of the seniority ladder, losing their accumulated rights in pensions, insurance and vacations. Some will be compelled to uproot their families and move to other areas. And some will have to accept lower paying jobs.

In a full employment economy, however, the problems of displacement can be minimized and the victims more easily protected. A full employment economy reduces layoffs; creates more openings for the disadvantaged and the unskilled; increases opportunities for training and promotions; exerts upward pressure on substandard wages; makes more funds available for public programs; and provides a more favorable environment for collective bargaining.

For these reasons, full employment is the one requirement for adjusting to technological change which stands out above all others. This is why the economy must grow rapidly enough to reduce unemployment to 2.5 percent of the labor force or even lower and why it must keep expanding production at a rate of about 4.5 percent a year thereafter—the rate required to offset potential growth in productivity and the expected growth in the labor force in coming years.

SHARING THE BENEFITS OF RISING PRODUCTIVITY

America, however, must concern itself with more than rapid economic growth. It also must be concerned with the distribution of the gains resulting from rapid growth. The sharing of productivity gains must be equitable, it must give priority to social needs and it must not block continued economic growth.

As a matter of equity, all groups are entitled to share the benefits of rising productivity. No one group can claim all the credit for the steady increases in productivity the nation has enjoyed and no one group is, therefore, entitled to all the benefits which flow from such increases.

Business investment in machines and management skill increase productivity, but they are not the only sources of increased productivity. American labor's willingness to accept change and to spend time and money in developing new skills are also basic factors in this process.

In fact, if an attempt were made to disentangle the various sources of productivity and to place a value on each, one might well conclude that the most powerful single source of productivity growth is society in general. Public agencies at the local, state and national levels make an enormous contribution through the accumulation and transmission of knowledge, the support of research and development, the construction of roads, airports, hospitals and other public facilities, the maintenance of law and order, the elimination of trade barriers between states and countless other activities.

As a matter of social justice, Americans cannot overlook the fact that close to 50 million people either live in poverty or hover on its edges and that one group in particular, the Negro people, has been shut out and denied basic human rights. This imposes a special obligation upon the nation—an obligation to devote a major portion of its productivity gains to the correction of such injustices as quickly as it possibly can.

Continued economic growth also requires that productivity be properly channeled. Consumers are the main source of demand. They purchase about 70 percent of all the goods and services produced. They are able to do so primarily because of the income they receive as wages and salaries.

If wages fail to rise sufficiently, while profits and dividends and other forms of income increase disproportionately, consumer demand for goods and services will lag. Wealth will become concentrated in the hands of those who tend to save much of their income or to invest it. And the result, inevitably, will be a further widening in the gap between the ability to produce and the ability to consume.

In the 1930s, America had an unforgettable demonstration of what happens when business retains the lion's share of the benefits of increasing productivity. A lopsided distribution of income combined with other factors to deprive growing mass production industries of their mass markets. As a result, the American economy was thrown into the worst tailspin it has ever experienced.

This year the nation has received another reminder of the dangers of imbalanced income flows. Fueled by a fantastic growth in profits, business investment in plant and equipment soared to a level which could not possibly be sustained. The splurge in investment brought vast amounts of new productive capacity into being at the very time that the growth of consumer purchasing power and consumer expenditures was slowing down. As a result of these and other factors, the longest peacetime expansion in the nation's history reached a virtual standstill in the first quarter of 1967.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE POLICIES

The implications for public and private policy are clear. The government must help close the gap between actual and potential production by increasing expenditures for the nation's most urgent needs.

Measures to stimulate profits and investment which have received so much emphasis in the past are only likely to widen the gap.

"We have to recognize," Walter Heller, the former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, has said, "that too rapid expansion of capital goods production can generate inflation . . . undermine our international competitive position . . . and create overcapacity . . . Extremism in the pursuit of productivity through private capital spending can be a vice, at least temporarily. To distinguish between economic vice and economic virtue and adjust policy accordingly is absolutely essential for balanced economic expansion."

Instead of the emphasis on capital goods investment, balanced economic expansion, equity, justice—and higher productivity as well—call for greater public investment in the training, education, health and other needs of people. This investment is needed particularly for poor people whose development has suffered because of past underinvestment in human resources.

They call for greater expenditures to make the cities more pleasant and more efficient places in which to live and work. They call for the creation of jobs for millions of unskilled workers in badly needed public service employment; for higher minimum wages; for improved welfare programs and for many other kinds of action which only governments can undertake.

In fact, much of what has to be done by government today, including the remaking of the cities, the elimination of air and water pollution and the stepped-up manpower programs, involves either reparation for the ravages of past technological change or adjustment to the new requirements imposed by such change.

The proper distribution of the gains of increasing productivity will depend to an even greater extent upon decisions made in the private sector. If these decisions are based on a rigid and unrealistic formula tying wage increases to productivity increases, the distribution is likely to be neither equitable nor economically sound. They must be based instead on a flexible application of the basic principles underlying the relationship between wages, prices, profits and productivity.

These principles should become a standard part of the education of every American. It should be a matter of common knowledge, for example, that wages can go up without putting pressure on prices. While hourly pay has been increasing over the years, so has output per manhour. When both rise at the same rate, unit labor costs (hourly labor costs divided by hourly output) remain constant.

And when hourly pay rises less rapidly than output per hour, unit labor costs go down. In the former case, the higher compensation exerts no pressure on prices. In the latter case, it even leaves room for price cuts. The cost of labor per hour goes up but the unit labor cost remains the same or declines.

If unit labor costs fall or remain constant, there is no need to raise prices because of labor costs. The consumer pays for labor by the unit, not by the hour. When he buys a pencil or makes a telephone call, the price which he pays must cover the cost of the labor embodied in the pencil or the call, not the cost of labor per hour.

Secondly, when wages are rising as rapidly as productivity, profits can rise just as rapidly without any increase in prices. Since more items are being produced each hour at the same unit cost (assuming that unit costs for material and all other things, as well as labor, remain constant) total profits can rise as a result of greater sales volume. If the employer now has twice as many items to sell at the same price as before, his profits can double even though the profit on each item remains the same.

Total profits can more than double, as a matter of fact, because some unit costs are likely to fall as output increases. Such overhead costs as rent, for example, may remain fixed regardless of the level of output. When output rises, the burden of such fixed costs can be spread over more units of production. Therefore, even though unit wage costs remain the same, other unit costs may decline, allowing unit profits to rise and total profits to go up even faster than productivity.

Thirdly, it should be clearly understood that if the general price level is to remain stable, some industries must lower their prices. Industries with exceptional gains in productivity will have lower unit labor costs even if they grant liberal wage increases. They can lower their prices to offset the higher prices charged by industries with only small gains in productivity.

Finally, as the original formulation of the wage-price guideposts indicated, there is no basic reason why wages should always be limited to productivity increases alone and why labor and non-labor incomes should rise proportionately. The 1962 Economic Report of the Council of Economic Advisers stated:

"The proportions in which labor and non-labor incomes share the product of industry have not been immutable throughout American history, nor can they be expected to stand forever where they are today. It is desirable that labor and management should bargain explicitly about the distribution of the income of particular firms or industries. It is, however, undesirable that they should bargain implicitly about the general price level."

Business pricing policies, however, have largely ignored these principles. For example, even though unit labor costs in manufacturing fell 1.6 percent between 1960 and 1965, the wholesale price index for manufactured goods rose 1.7 percent. And in 1966, when unit labor costs in manufacturing rose 1.7 percent as a result of increased social security contributions and the efforts of workers to catch up with the rising cost of living, the wholesale price index for manufactured goods jumped 2.8 percent.

As a result, workers have been shortchanged. They have not shared equitably in the gains made possible by increasing productivity during recent years—not even by the Administration's guidepost standards which sought to achieve stable unit labor costs and hence stable prices by tying wages to the national productivity trend.

From 1960 to 1965, the real hourly compensation of all employes in the private economy (including salaried employes, including fringe benefits, including employer contributions for social insurance and even before the deduction of taxes) went up 2.5 percent, not 3.2 percent as they would have had the guideposts for prices and wages been fully observed. And, in 1966, this all-inclusive measure of real hourly compensation of all employes rose only 2.7 percent. In manufacturing, the corresponding real increases were even less; they were 2.2 percent annually during 1960 to 1965 and only 1.8 percent last year.

Even more striking are the figures which show how badly production workers alone fared. In 1966, a year in which the Gross National Product rose by 5.4 percent, the real buying power of the average factory worker's weekly take-home pay actually declined. In spite of a lengthened workweek, the weekly take-home pay of a factory worker with three dependents, after taxes and after adjusting for price changes, dropped three-tenths of 1 percent last year.

Corporate profits after taxes, on the other hand, have risen almost twice as fast as the Gross National Product and about twice as fast as the compensation of all employes. As a result, the distribution of income has grown more unequal. For the six years, 1961 to 1966 as a whole, the total compensation of all employes in the private economy fell more than $50 billion—more than $8 billion per year—short of the amount it would have been if the incomes of all employes had risen sufficiently to provide them with a real hourly increase of 3.2 percent a year, the increase required under the guidepost formula to maintain the proportionate shares of labor and non-labor income. This is one measure of how workers have been shortchanged in recent years.

The disparities have been so striking that Gardner Ackley, the present Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, felt compelled to warn a U.S. Chamber of Commerce audience in May of 1966 that "now that profits after taxes . . . are providing the highest sustained rate of return on owner's equity in our modern history, it is time to ask whether a further rise in the share of profits after taxes . . . are providing the highest of the health of the nation's economy or in the interest of business itself."

The erosion of wage gains by price increases in recent years illustrates why other factors besides productivity must be considered in collective bargaining. If wages rise only as rapidly as productivity when prices are rising, workers will not receive real increases which correspond to the gains in productivity. When prices rise, a 3.2 percent increase in money terms is not 3.2 percent in real terms. When prices rise as they did last year at the rate of 2.9 percent, a 3.2 percent increase in money terms leaves a worker with only a .3 percent increase in purchasing power. When they rise that rapidly, not even a 5 percent wage increase will yield the 3.2 percent increase in purchasing power which presumably the guideposts would provide if all parties abided by them.

To restore balance between income flows and to achieve balanced economic growth, parties to collective bargaining must, therefore, consider changes in the cost of living as well as productivity trends. They must also consider past as well as current and potential profit levels, the need to eliminate substandard wages and a host of other factors as well. Rigid adherence in collective bargaining to a single factor such as productivity can only lead to a continuing lag in real earnings behind the nation's rising productive efficiency, a continuing decline in the share of national production going to labor and a serious weakening of consumer markets.

The shameful waste of America's enormous productivity as a result of such lopsided developments need not happen again. With proper public and private policies, sales and output can grow rapidly enough to provide useful work for all at the highest levels of productivity the nation is capable of achieving.

Such growth is vital. Even the most rapid economic growth possible will not be rapid enough to satisfy all of our needs and aspirations in the next decade. Moreover, the faster such needs are satisfied, the faster we can reduce hours of work and provide the leisure necessary to realize our full potential as human beings.

Higher productivity and the greater output it makes possible must, therefore, be a major concern even in a country as wealthy as America.

But higher productivity cannot be the only concern. A Great Society must also be concerned with the proper uses of productivity. The income it creates must be shared equitably to assure markets for all that we are capable of producing and a major portion of that income must be used to eliminate poverty, to wipe out the effects of years of discrimination and under-investment in human beings, to protect the victims of technology against unnecessary hardship, to repair the damage to the environment wrought by technological change and to assist millions of people in other parts of the world who are living in abject misery.

Only by using the nation's vast productive powers to cope with such fundamental problems can we be sure that productivity will grow even more rapidly than it has in recent years and become a major source of well-being for all people.

COMMUNISM AND THE DOUBTING STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. **PRYOR**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Rarick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RARICK**. Mr. Speaker, the American people are unable to adjust their thinking to policies of the Department of State. Especially is this true in "no win" policies and wars without goals.

Possibly the State Department theorists have been so busy talking only to themselves that they believe one another.

As far back as 1962, the U.S. Senate Committee on Armed Services, Special Preparedness Subcommittee, completed a report upon its investigation of military cold war education and speech review policies. Under my unanimous-consent request I present subtopic D of chapter II, "Application of Policy Censorship to Cold War Themes" which relates to State's policies, to be here inserted for all my colleagues to review and evaluate. State's "party line policy" does not appear to have changed one iota in 5 years of losing.

D. Application of Policy Censorship to Cold War Themes

The carving out and separation of the strictly military aspects of the cold war is a virtual impossibility. President Eisenhower succinctly expressed the inseparability of military and nonmilitary considerations in his statement to the subcommittee as follows:

"I need not remind this committee, especially, that in these times military considerations and economic, political, and ideological considerations are interrelated to such a degree as to make an arbitrary dividing line between the military and the nonmilitary increasingly unrealistic—a truth, indeed, which gave rise 15 years ago to the establishment by law of the National Security Council (H–6)."

This undeniable fact undoubtedly accounts for the absence of any serious attempt to enforce those portions of Department of Defense Directive 5230.13 and Department of Defense Guidance No. 18, confining the public statements of personnel of the Department of Defense to strictly military policy. Any statement about our defense posture or policy can be interpreted as containing foreign relations implications. This interlocking of military and nonmilitary matters makes the judgments handed down by the Directorate of Security Review as to whether foreign policy or foreign relations are involved in any particular material purely subjective. The special emphasis placed by the Secretary of Defense on the Defense personnel not infringing on foreign policy resulted in their adopting a more cautious approach, and watering down what they had to say. Doubts of Department of Defense reviewers were resolved in favor of submission of the material to the State Department for review.

Within the framework of the inherent overlapping of military considerations into nonmilitary areas, a study of the material changed or deleted by the State Department, or by the Department of Defense under guidance of the State Department, revealed that rarely did the censored material deal with subjects which were primarily in the area of foreign policy or foreign relations. Even more rare, and virtually nonexistent, was the inclusion in a proposed speech or article submitted for review by Defense personnel of material indicating intent to controvert established—and well-known—foreign policy.

The speeches, prior to censorship, do reflect the nature of the Communist offensive as viewed by the speaker from the vantage point of his knowledge and experience. It is at this point that the majority of deletions and alterations made in the process of censorship appear; and since the deletions and alternations reveal the conflicting views as to the nature of the problem, they also reveal the policies and attitudes based on a particular view with which the censor quite obviously sought to make the submitted material consistent.

The application of policy censorship to cold war themes, as carried out by State Department censors and by Defense Department reviewers under State guidance, went beyond the achievement of consistency or "one-voice" on foreign policy. Applied to subject matter of this type, policy censorship was obviously directed also at maintaining "one-voice" regarding the nature of the problem—the international Communist conspiracy—which military, economic, and diplomatic policies are supposed to solve. A study of the censorship of cold war themes shows that the basic conflict in approaches to policy formulation is rooted in a more fundamental conflict than the policy itself. The basic conflict stems from disagreements on the nature of the menace and, obviously, the manner in which the problem is pictured limits the choice of antidotes.

1. SOURCES OF CENSORSHIP

Once the fact and nature of the policy censorship of cold war themes were established by the subcommittee, the responsibility devolved upon it to determine whether the censorship represented conscientious and efficient application of established government policy, individual opinion, or a misapplication of policy through misinterpretation or inefficiency. Examination by the subcommittee of the individual who made a particular change or deletion could conclusively resolve the question in each instance. The subcommittee was prevented from achieving this because it was unable to determine the identity of the individual who censored any particular speech or portion of it.

The organization and procedural system of censorship, both in the Department of Defense and the Department of State, is impervious to attempts from outside the system to pinpoint the origin of any particular censorship action. The subcommittee was able, without difficulty, to determine the identity of those assigned presently, or in the past, to the Directorate of Security Review in the Department of Defense. Because of the way the censorship system operates, this by no means was indicative of the identity of whomever originated a particular censorship action. Personnel of the Directorate of Security Review normally confer and coordinate their work with the "gray-flanneled field marshals," as the civilian appointees in the various staff sections at Department of Defense level are popularly known, or with the uniformed assistants to these civilian officials.

By far, the bulk of the policy censorship of statements dealing with communism, the "cold war," and related subjects was accomplished somewhere in the State Department, rather than in the Department of Defense (H–412).

Whether a particular speech was referred to the State Department depended, at least prior to the change in procedures which came about largely as a result of the investigation, on the individual judgment of the reviewing officer in the Directorate of Security Review as to whether the particular subject matter was or was not in the field of foreign relations (H–304–305, 358). No specific directives or guidelines could be found by the subcommittee which would enable personnel in the Directorate of Security Review to determine with consistency whether any particular subject matter proposed for an article or speech fell within the area of foreign policy. What a reviewer in the Navy branch of the Directorate of Security Review might consider a historical analysis of Communist imperialism, the reviewer in the Army branch might consider as dealing with foreign policy, with the result that of two speeches containing the same materials, one might be sent to the State Department, the other not.

Presumably, records are available within the Department of Defense and the Department of State as to what person reviewed or censored each speech or article, and the subcommittee requested this information from officials of both (H–337–338, 730–731). Officers of both Departments, confronted with demands for the identity of the censors of particular speeches, acting under authority and direction of the President of the United States, invoked "Executive Privilege" and refused to answer. The noncooperative attitude officially adopted by the administration, in deliberately and defiantly withholding information from the subcommittee, effectively prevented it from pinpointing the source of censorship in any particular case, thereby blocking conclusive determination of the basic question as to the reason for the censorship. It was not sufficient for the subcommittee to be given the names of those who comprised the group doing the censoring unless individuals could be interrogated about why they made specific speech alterations.

The information sought by the subcommittee was essential to the determination of the true origin of the censorship. No personal papers of the Executive were sought. Nevertheless, as soon as the issue developed it became clear that the executive branch would claim executive privilege. At the same time, it became obvious that the Congress would not take the forthright action necessary to overcome the claim of executive privilege, despite the fact that the claim was clearly without legal validity. In recent years, the Congress has become increasingly less jealous of its constitutional authority when it is challenged or thwarted by the executive branch. Particularly is this true when the Executive and the majority in the Congress are of the same political party. Under the circumstances, it was futile to attempt to persuade the Congress to accept the challenge to its constitutional authority, which the claim of executive privilege in this instance constituted.[1]

Since both the Defense Department and

---

[1] For a history of the increasing use of "executive privilege" and its unwholesome effects, see Clark R. Mollenhoff, "Washington Cover-Up" (Doubleday, 1962).

the State Department reneged at any direct examination by the subcommittee of the censors in connection with any specific case, the subcommittee had no choice but to pursue the next best course of accepting written explanation of specific instances of censorship, prepared by the Defense and State Departments. This was a very poor substitute. (The Under Secretary of State testified that the written explanations furnished the subcommittee over his signature were not prepared by the persons who censored the speeches (H–2794).) It is apparent from the written reports of both the Departments, with reference to the items censored by each, that the explanations furnished were largely contrived from the vantage point of retrospect rather than being the record of the actual motivation of the censor at the time a particular speech or article was reviewed. This fact is evidenced by the rather stark contrast between the candid tone of the occasional comments of the censors, contemporaneously scribbled on the face of the speeches being reviewed, and the "reasons" subsequently submitted to the subcommittee, after some weeks of deliberation, by the Departments of State and Defense.

For example, the written retrospective explanation of the State Department for the substitution of the term "Sino-Soviet" for "Communist," in a speech submitted to the State Department for review on March 9, 1961, was: "In speaking in geographical terms of the Communist threat 'Sino-Soviet' is more accurate than 'Communist' which would include, for example, Yugoslavia" (H–3304). In another speech prepared for delivery on March 9, 1961, the State Department inserted the term "Sino-Soviet" just before "communism" in the phrase, "Witness the steady advance of communism for over a century." In the margin of the speech, opposite the insertion, the censor commented, "It is only the externally aggressive type (Sino-Soviet) which the United States is committed to check" (H–55). The carefully worded, but nevertheless ambiguous, reason submitted by the State Department, standing alone, is relatively meaningless, but the candid comment of the censor, scribbled at the time the change was made on the face of the speech, reveals the heart of the policy with which he was requiring consistency. Whether this policy was personal with the censor, or whether it was a correctly interpreted official policy, could only have been conclusively determined by an examination of the censor by the subcommittee on this specific point. Neither the written explanations by the State Department, nor the studiously evasive language of the verbal responses of the high-level official spokesman who testified before the subcommittee, provided any conclusive evidence as to whether such a policy was, indeed, official.

Considering all the censorship actions, the censors' comments, the State and Defense Department replies, together with the testimony, the conclusion is inescapable that either the policies revealed by the censors' contemporaneous comments are official or, if unofficial, are the considered viewpoint of a large number of State Department personnel in responsible positions. The effect of such policies, whether official or unofficial, is equally disastrous.

2. Justifications advanced for censorship

During the months of our study, various themes were advanced by the State Department and Defense Department spokesmen justifying the rigorous policy censorship of cold war themes.

Initially, the Secretary of Defense, in his appearance before the Armed Services Committee on September 6 and 7, 1961, relied heavily on the "sensitivity" of various diplomatic negotiations in progress as the principal basis for the necessity of policy censorship of cold war themes proposed for public speeches by Defense personnel. When asked why it was necessary or desirable to censor particular statements during the first 6 months of 1961, the Secretary alluded repeatedly to "negotiations" which were underway at the time. He referred specifically to negotiations concerning release of the RB–47 fliers by the Soviets on January 25, 1961, and the negotiations which preceded the meetings in Vienna of President Kennedy and Soviet Premier Khrushchev in June 1961. Less emphasis was placed on this particular justification in later "explanations," although Secretary Ball did make references to such a justification in both his first and second appearance before the subcommittee, as well as in his written explanations, without any meaningful effort to connect the relevance of particular negotiations with particular speech changes or deletions, except in isolated cases.

Considered in a vacuum, the justifications based on "sensitive negotiations" might appear to have a degree of validity. When considered in connection with the actual censorship actions, however, they are plain fatuous.

In the first place, an examination of the speech changes reveals that degrees of antagonism and belligerence toward the Soviets or other Communists was by no means the sole or even the major criterion which prompted a censorship action. By far more crucial, judging from the actual changes and deletions made, was the speaker's degree of incisiveness about the intent of the Communists and the nature of their offensive against free peoples everywhere. For example, one statement which was deleted is:

> In fact, the big question of our day is just simply this: Will the future world, that is the emerging world order, be in our image, the image of the Western World, or will it be in the image of world communism? (H–3177.)

Whatever degree of belligerency is reflected in this statement is slight and, indeed, far less than in some of the statements which remained uncensored in both this speech and others prepared for delivery in the same time period. In effect, this proposed statement is nothing more or less than a paraphrase of the idea so often projected by high Communist officials that there is between communism and the West an "irreconcilable conflict of systems." It is difficult to conceive that this and similar statements could disturb the flow and prospects of diplomatic negotiations in process.

The consistency of deletions and changes also belies the validity of the "sensitive negotiations" justification. For example, in May 1960, the censors deleted a warning about the dangers of Communist advances. This, of course, was in the period immediately preceding the Paris meeting of heads of state. The same type of warning was deleted, however, on April 13, 1960; April 27, 1960, January 29, 1961; January 30, 1961; March 17, 1961; March 25, 1961; April 26, 1961; April 28, 1961; May 16, 1961; May 17, 1961; and August 14, 1961. The degree of consistency of the censorship would indicate that were such censorship to have been based on the fear of disrupting "sensitive negotiations," it would be rather conclusive that the Communists, by the simple tactic of keeping negotiations in process, would have succeeded in completely paralyzing efforts by our official spokesmen to alert the American public to the menace posed by the Communist movement. Obviously, our Government's actions would be of more concern to negotiating parties than mere words, and the question arises that if words must be tempered, and even silenced, because negotiations are in progress, would not a pursuance of the same policy necessitate absention from any action to counter the Communist threat for the same fear of disrupting such negotiations? Were the existence of "sensitive negotiations" to be accepted as a justification for the censorship which the subcommittee found, a strong presumption would arise that the entire conduct of our national response to the Communist menace was reduced to a state of paralysis by negotiations.

Neither the consistency of speech deletions over extended periods nor the substantive arguments advanced on the question of sensitive negotiations lends credibility to this justification.

A number of high ranking witnesses who testified with regard to the censoring of their own speeches seemed quite reluctant to say that there was any consistency to the speech changes, or that the altered speeches more accurately reflected official foreign policy than did their proposed statements prior to censorship. From such testimony there was an implication that the censorship reflected caprice and the substitution of individual judgment of generally low-ranking censors. For instance, Admiral Burke testified:

"Later on I thought that the speeches were being reviewed a little capriciously. Sometimes the identical statement would be left in; sometimes the identical statement would be taken out. I did not see any pattern to the thing except that any statements against communism, the statements against the danger of communism were frequently removed, and I thought that was probably due to the individual who was reviewing the speech, not the administration, not the senior official (H.–148)."

As Admiral Burke pointed out, and as others, particularly General Trudeau, confirmed, there were instances in which identical statements were deleted or changed in one speech and left untouched in another, although occasionally the speeches fell in almost the same time period. The officers who were subjected to such censorship were naturally perplexed at the seeming inconsistency, General Trudeau testified.

However, there were other such changes, with the source unidentified, which gave my staff and me equal cause for wonder about the motivation involved (H–31).

The witnesses who were actually most familiar with the censorship activities, however, were not those whose speeches were censored, but those who had participated in censorship activities. These witnesses assured the subcommittee that there was an absolute minimum of inconsistency in the policy censorship of cold war themes. From the Defense Department, three witnesses who had responsibilities for censorship activities testified before the subcommittee. These were the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Mr. Arthur Sylvester; the Assistant Director for Policy and Procedure of the Directorate of Security Review, Mr. Willis Lawrence; and the Director of the Department of Defense Directorate of Security Review, Mr. Charles W. Hinkle. The last of these, Mr. Hinkle, who testified on January 31, 1962, had only been appointed on December 4, 1961, and had during the interim been working exclusively on ways to improve procedures. Thus, he was in a position to throw the least light on previous operations of the Department of Defense censorship activity.

The first two witnesses in this category testified that official policy, not capriciousness, was responsible for speech changes. Mr. Sylvester stated:

"I think they (the censors) are completely dedicated and devoted to following policy and using their judgments within the confines of it to the best interests of the United States (H–419)."

Mr. Lawrence was asked:

"In your opinion, then, have the speeches been censored to conform with the existing policy, or have they been censored as a result of an individual substitution of judgment which is not in accord with the direct interpretation of policy?"

Mr. Lawrence replied:

"No, sir; it would not be censored according to individual judgment. It would be the best—the best action they could take in carrying out policy (H-335)."

The testimony from the State Department witnesses was to the same effect. Witnesses from the State Department were the Under Secretary of State, Mr. George W. Ball; the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Mr. Roger W. Tubby; and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Mr. Phillip H. Burris.

Mr. Ball, on his first appearance before the subcommittee, was asked:

"Mr. Secretary, I just want to say it is gratifying for you to confirm what I have been convinced of since I first studied the speech deletions and changes:

"That is that the speech deletions and changes are the result of a knowledgeable application of our foreign policy to the speeches, to insure conformity with our foreign policy."

Mr. Ball responded: "That is right" (H-756).

On March 29, Mr. Ball submitted to the subcommittee in writing a list of explanations for censorship actions initiated by the State Department. In the covering letter from the State Department, signed by Mr. Ball, the Under Secretary stated:

"The explanations herewith furnished to the committee have been prepared by specially assigned officers working under my personal direction."

He also reemphasized his above quoted testimony by stating:

"You will recall that in my testimony I stated that, by and large, we are satisfied that the Department has performed its duties in connection with the review of speeches in a credible and responsible manner. I would like to say that in assembling the speeches at the request of your committee, I have become more than ever confident that this statement is correct (H-3283)."

Mr. Tubby, when queried as to whether he agreed with Mr. Ball's evaluation, was correct (H-810). Mr. Burris, while noting that there was always a matter of judgment involved, affirmed that "generally," if not in 100 percent of the cases, the censorship reflected an accurate application of foreign policy (H-862).

In considering what appears to be conflicting conclusions of those whose speeches were censored and those who participated in the censoring, several of the facts which were brought out in the testimony were pertinent. In the first place, the high-ranking witnesses whose speeches were censored had no specific familiarity with the details of foreign policy. General Trudeau, when asked whether he had been able to find any consistent application of official policy reflected in the changes in his speeches, responded:

"I do not know because I do not know what the policy—and not only the question of policy, but, more importantly what are the directions given by those who are to follow policy at the top level to the subordinate officials who actually exercise the censorship judgment?

"I do not know.

"So it can be policy, if that exists, or it can be their personal opinion, and I am sure that is one of the answers you are seeking (H-38-39)."

The witnesses whose speeches were censored did not have access to National Security Council papers or, if they had access, they had not had occasion to study them.

It is also apparent from the testimony that the high-ranking witnesses who testified with regard to their own censored speeches were not knowledgeable in the procedures by which their speeches were censored and could not, therefore, be expected to pinpoint the reasons for the apparent inconsistencies.

Considering all the testimony, it seems most likely that the occasional instances in which statements were deleted or changed in one speech and passed in another speech, resulted from the fact that a different reviewer within the Department of Defense Security Review Section made the initial decision as to whether the speech had foreign policy ramifications, and, therefore, whether it should be sent to the State Department for review. From the testimony of Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Hinkle on what criteria are used in determining whether a speech should be sent to the State Department for review, it is quite evident that the test is subjective, rather than objective. It also appears that a particular statement might not, in the opinion of the reviewer, in and of itself, require clearance by the State Department. If, however, any portion of the speech required review by State, the entire speech was sent to State Department, and the judgment there on the foreign policy context of a particular statement might well be divergent from that of the reviewer from the Defense Department.

The testimony also revealed that for a short period following the change of administrations, the directive of the Secretary of Defense that military personnel would speak only on defense matters was interpreted by some reviewers literally. This resulted in deletion at the Defense Department of material considered to have foreign policy ramifications without referring it to the State Department.

It is logical to assume that these factors account for the great majority of the apparent inconsistencies.

These apparent inconsistencies, however, were very few. Considering the number of personnel in the State Department who allegedly participated in the censoring of speeches of defense personnel, the consistency of the changes and alterations of this particular type subject matter is a tribute, either to the efficiency with which details of foreign policy were promulgated throughout the State Department or to the unanimity of attitude among State Department employees participating in the speech review.

In the written explanations of the censorship actions submitted to the subcommittee by the State Department, the deletions and changes were justified primarily by statements in defense of policies or views of the Communist operation with which the uncensored statement was allegedly in conflict. Some of the policies revealed in the explanations, however, drew so much congressional and press criticism when publicly disclosed that Under Secretary Ball subsequently, in his second appearance before the subcommittee, attempted to repudiate his own explanations. In one instance, a speaker proposed to state: "Victory on each of the four battlefields of the cold war is essential to the survival of freedom." The word "victory" was deleted and the phrase "Defeat of Communist aggression" was substituted. The written explanation submitted by the State Department for this speech alteration was:

"The word 'victory' has a militaristic and aggressive ring, less suited than the substituted phrase to describing our national objective. It also implies an 'all or nothing' approach leaving no room for accommodation (H-3302)."

Mr. Ball thereafter described the written explanation as "inartistic" and "foolish" (H-2795). This repudiation of his written explanation by Mr. Ball was no isolated instance. In his covering letter to the subcommittee when the written explanations were submitted, Mr. Ball stated:

"There have, of course, been a few instances in which the reviewers may have been arbitrary or have exercised poor judgment. Where there seem to be no reasonable explanation for any particular deletions or changes, we have had no hesitation in simply stating, 'No explanation' (H-3284)."

Despite Mr. Ball's written assurances, there were at least 11 other instances during his oral testimony in which Mr. Ball retreated from his previous written explanations, and these instances did not include those where he had in his written response stated: "No explanation." This is a very high percentage in view of the fact that, because of the time limitations, Mr. Ball was questioned specifically with reference to only a relatively few of the explanations he submitted.

In retreating from his written explanations on censorship actions, Mr. Ball repeatedly fell back on the justification for particular censorship actions that it was necessary to make a change to avoid distortion of the proposed remarks by the Communist propaganda machine. Assistant Secretary of Defense Sylvester and Under Secretary Ball expressed their concern with the possibility that the Communist propaganda machine could make effective use of "warlike" and "bellicose" statements of high-ranking military officers to prove to allied, uncommitted and neutralist countries that the United States was controlled by warmongers.

Mr. Sylvester stated:

"It is no secret to you, of course, that the Communists listen with particular care to the statements of our civilian and military leaders. They try to exploit statements by top officials to split us from our allies, to mislead neutral countries into a belief that we are the perpetrators of tension in the world, and to make plausible the absurd fiction that we are an imperialist nation bent on dominating them (H-379)."

Mr. Ball at one point stated:

"The real impact of 'warlike' statements by our military leaders is most likely to be felt on the other two audiences—the governments and peoples in the Allied countries and in the uncommitted nations.

"One of the pernicious myths that the Soviet propaganda machine seeks to spread around the world is that America is dominated by a bloodthirsty and irresponsible military clique prepared to unleash atomic destruction unless kept in check by Communist might.

"Anyone who keeps abreast of the Communist propaganda line put forth by the Soviet or Chinese radio or set out in the speeches of Communist officials or in Communist publications must necessarily be impressed with the amount of space and time devoted to this attempt to create the impression that U.S. policy is dominated by warmongering generals and admirals.

"The absurdity of this propaganda—and, of course, it is absurd—does not necessarily diminish its effectiveness among people who have either been sealed off from direct access to the free world or who are so ill informed or ill educated that they lack the ability for critical judgment (H-720)."

The "pernicious myth" which Secretary Ball describes as believable to the "ill informed or ill educated" was the theme of the Fulbright memorandum sent to the Secretary of Defense and the President in an effort to stop military personnel from speaking out on cold war issues (H-3054-3068). Failure to recognize this "myth" as a Communist propaganda product can and does result in its perpetuation. Each repetition by a non-Communist lends credence to it, and its pronouncement by high Government officials accomplishes what the Communists, left to themselves, could never in their fondest dreams even aspire to.

As he fell back from his written explanations, Under Secretary Ball increasingly emphasized the susceptibility of statements of American military officers to distortions by Communist propagandists. Mr. Ball refused to concede that Communist propaganda effectiveness would be little altered by the availability or unavailability of direct quotations from military officers in the conduct of their propaganda campaigns. When it was pointed out to Mr. Ball that the statements of the President, various Members of Congress, State Department officials, Cabinet officials, Peace Corps officials, and numerous others were commonly distorted and unfavorably characterized by the Communists to suit their particular propaganda objective, Mr. Ball emphasized that characterizations by the Communists of American speeches were far less effective as propaganda than were the use of direct quotations which the Communists could adapt (H–2939).

When Mr. Ball had his attention called to the fact that even his own prepared statement was susceptible to being quoted out of context to reinforce the very type of Communist propaganda which he had described before the subcommittee, Mr. Ball denied that this was the manner in which the Communists operate. The example consisted of a part of a sentence in Mr. Ball's statement which reads:

"America is dominated by a bloodthirsty and militaristic clique, prepared to unleash an atomic destruction unless kept in check by Communist might (H–720)."

Mr. Ball's answer was:

"I think that you will see from the examples that we will bring this committee that what they do is to quote words accurately—I mean whole paragraphs accurately, but put them in a distorted context, and this is the technique which they follow (H–794)."

Mr. Ball did supply examples of Communist propaganda to the subcommittee. In all, he submitted 27 examples. It is interesting to note that of these 27 examples, 14 of them contained no quotations from U.S. sources whatever; only two contained a quotation of as much as a paragraph; three others contained quotations of whole sentences; five of the examples contained quotations of less material than a complete sentence, similar to the example proposed to Mr. Ball from his own statement; and three of the examples were characterizations of an official statement by newsmen of the non-Communist world (H–737–746).

Mr. Sylvester also furnished to the subcommittee examples of Communist propaganda totaling three items of "external" propaganda promulgated in other than the United States, and one item which Mr. Sylvester titled "internal" propaganda from the Worker. Two of the three "external" examples contained no quotations from U.S. sources whatsoever, and the third, which was a duplicate of an example furnished by Mr. Ball, contained a one-sentence quote taken out of context of a major general's testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee. The "internal" example is an antimilitary article from the Worker, published in 1960, and based on official U.S. denials that the U–2 was a military airplane (H–420–423).

Mr. Ball made it extremely clear that he thought that the real test of whether an official statement was subject to distortion by the Communist propaganda machine depended on whether it lent itself to use by the Communists in the form of a direct quotation. Mr. Ball's attention was called to a number of Communist propaganda publications and broadcasts. One was an article in Pravda, on what was characterized as a "bellicose speech in a Texas town" by U.S. Vice President Johnson. The article stated:

"Regarding the Soviet Union, he indulged in cynical threats such as we have not heard in a long time from the lips of a United States official ocupying such an exalted post (H–2937)."

To this, Mr. Ball's comment was:

"From the point of view of anyone listening to that, it has very little credibility because it is not in quotation marks (H–2938)."

Similarly, when questioned about a Communist propaganda distortion of a speech by then Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, Mr. Ball stated: "I mean the significance there is that they didn't quote Mr. Bowles" (H–2938).

Under Secretary Ball categorically denied that the Communists invent quotations for use in their propaganda. He was asked:

"Don't they manufacture; don't they lie; don't they make any statement they want to carry out their ends, that is what I am getting at?"

To this Mr. Ball replied:

"No. You will find very little evidence of their inventing quotations from people. What they do is quote language, and this is a distinction of importance.

"They invent characterizations, but not quotations, and there is a difference in credibility (H–2939)."

Mr. Ball is, to say the least, poorly informed. On June 2, 1961, Mr. Richard Helms, Assistant Director, Central Intelligence Agency, testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. The subject of the hearing was "Communist Forgeries." Mr. Helms related in his testimony, and documented, how the Communists forged any number of type documents, including U.S. State Department cables, letters from State Department officials, and State Department directives—all of which were planted and used in Communist propaganda. Not only scattered quotes, but whole documents were "manufactured." Such false documents were planted, for the most part in the press of Western nations and then immediately picked up and used by the Communist propaganda machines. The complete history, in detail, of such forgeries is available to the public in sworn testimony along with reproduction of the forged documents. The authenticity of this type activity by the Communists is attested to by a high official of the official intelligence agency of the U.S. Government. What is more incredible is that many of these forgeries involved the State Department. In one case, the Communists actually forged on a State Department letterhead an attack on our CIA by "Foreign Service Employees for Separation of Foreign Service and Espionage." This forgery was widely distributed and was reported in national news magazines.[2] There can be no more vivid demonstration of the need for widespread public education on Communist techniques than this—that the number two officer in our State Department can demonstrate such ignorance and incompetence in the field of Communist tactics. This instance is most revealing about what is wrong with our foreign policy and why State Department personnel repeatedly try to play down the Soviet threat. They don't understand it.

Mr. Ball's denial that the Communists manufacture whatever "quotations" they need for propaganda purposes is a categorical contradiction of Mr. Helms' testimony and the documentation he provided.

The attempt to justify censorship actions on the theory that by censoring statements of Defense personnel, the Communist propaganda machine would be reduced to paraphrasing and characterizing, rather than quoting, statements of such personnel for their propaganda efforts, illustrates the totally unsatisfactory nature of the explanations. The only word which approaches adequacy in characterizing the nature of such justifications is "nit-picking." Mr. Ball, however, found such insignificant explanation acceptable because, in his opinion, the speeches which were censored were of little importance. Mr. Ball made it clear that he considered the speeches of military officials, except in rare instances, to have little overall usefulness (H–2939–2940).

In spite of all the afterthoughts tendered as excuses, explanations, and justifications of the censorship actions, it is clear that the changes and alterations made in the speeches reflected either official U.S. foreign policy or the prevailing attitude of responsible officials in the State Department, who, according to Mr. Ball, actually did the censoring (H–722).

3. REFLECTIONS OF FOREIGN POLICY IN CENSORSHIP ACTIONS

Reflections of foreign policies in the censorship actions, and explanations by the censors, are fairly obvious in cases where the policy involved has, through development of events, become known to the American public.

For instance, it has been well known for some years that American foreign policy did not consider Laos a place where Communist expansion should be vigorously contested by U.S. activity, despite the strategic military and political importance of that southeast Asian country. As far back as 1959, and as late as 1961, the State Department censors deleted statements which attributed strategic importance to the control or freedom of Laos. In October 1959, Admiral Burke proposed to state:

"Laos is the key to control of the whole of southeast Asia. It adjoins free Thailand, free Cambodia, and free Vietnam. Free Malaya is just to the south. Indonesia is only a short sea distance farther south. In the hands of the Communists, Laos would be a pistol pointed at the heart of every free country in southeast Asia (H–682–683)."

This material was mandatorily deleted by the State Department and in the margin, opposite the deletion, the censor or some State Department official scribbled the following explanation:

"Under present circumstances, Laos should not be treated as a geopolitical problem, but as a small nation whose independence is being threatened (H–683)."

Subsequent developments have confirmed beyond doubt that at that time, and subsequently, it was official U.S. policy to play down the importance of Laos to the cause of freedom in southeast Asia and the world.

Similarly, it is no secret now that the policy of the State Department prior to and following the 1959 takeover in Cuba by Castro was based on the position that he was an independent revolutionary, and that his movement has no connection with communism. On March 4, 1960, Admiral Burke proposed to state:

"We know and the Communists know that they cannot take Cuba by force of arms, but can they take Cuba by intrigue? Could they take Cuba even more readily if our attention was drawn to the Taiwan Straits or to Berlin or to someplace else? These are serious things. They are things we must think about to evaluate the whole threat in its proper context (H–683)."

This material was also deleted, and again on the face of the speech someone in the State Department penciled an explanation:

"Reference to Cuba of this sort, by senior naval officer directly connected with Guantanamo Base could damage current arrangements for treating with Cubans by State (H–683)."

Again our official policy toward the Castro government was revealed by the deletion, and illuminated even further by the censor's comment.

The continuing policy of our State Department in Cuba is illuminated by other censorship actions. In a speech proposed to be made on August 29, 1961, General Carroll, present Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, proposed to refer to the Cuban Government as the "Communist Government of Cuba," but the censors did not permit such a reference to be made. In justifying this censorship in its written explanations to the subcommittee, the State Department stated:

"At the time this speech was made, a policy decision had not yet been made as to whether Cuba should be treated as a Communist government, though it was considered proper to refer to it as a Communist line government. It was not until December 1961 that Castro openly stated that he was a Marxist-Leninist and was leading Cuba into communism (H-3335)."

---

[2] "Newsweek, Sept. 1960, p. 25.

This explanation is particularly illuminating of our Cuban policy, since the speech change in this case was actually made in the latter part of August 1961, more than 4 months after the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion, which we admittedly sponsored in an effort to overthrow the Castro regime.

The State Department policy with regard to Cuba and Laos can be easily detected in the censorship because it has become evident by the development of events. Other policies and attitudes, more general in nature, while less evident to the public, are also reflected in the censorship and in the various censors' comments and explanations.

Among the most fundamental of the policies reflected by the censorship is the State Department's attitude or policy of treating the continuing struggle of the Communists against the non-Communist world as being within the traditional framework of "peaceful" relations, or "peaceful competition" between nation-states. This is clear because the censors have gone to great lengths to prevent any characterization in public speeches and articles of the continuing struggle launched by the Communists for world domination as war, even when it is modified by the somewhat undescriptive, but generally used modifier, "cold." The same policy, of course, requires that such terms as "battle" and "conflict" be eliminated in favor of softer terms, such as "struggle" or "challenge." A comparison of language before it was censored, with that, if any, which was permitted after censorship, illustrates better than any description the antipathies of the censors on this point.

Before censorship	*After censorship*
1. "And this balanced force of seapower will be able to meet any situation in the spectrum of the *cold, the limited, or the general war* requirement."	1. "And this balanced force of seapower will be able to meet any situation in the spectrum of the *political or military* requirement."
2. "One cannot reflect upon these startling facts without considering their influence in our *life or death competition with the Communists.*"	2. "One cannot reflect upon these startling facts without considering their influence in our *lives today and in the future.*"
3. "Even though this distinction exists the present state of affairs is nevertheless *an actual war.*"	3. "Even though this distinction exists the present state of affairs is nevertheless a *challenge and a struggle.*"
4. "The X-15 is the Man o' War of the stable of research aircraft to date."	4. (Deleted with comment: "let's use another steed—Zev, Gallant Fox, etc., but not this one.")
5. *"As we engage the Communists,* let us be fully aware of the significance of two which are part and parcel of *the vicious worldwide conflict forced upon us."*	5. "Let us be fully aware of the significance of two which are part and parcel of our lives and our future."
6. "A negative philosophy won't sustain us *in this conflict."*	6. "A negative philosophy won't sustain us."
7. *"Make no mistake; we are at war right now—a total war of ideas. War becomes total when the price is total; the world itself."*	7. " ’
8. "Citizens who realize all that is *at stake in the world struggle that we call the cold war* cannot remain apathetic or complacent."	8. "Citizens who realize all that is *jeopardized by the threat of Communist aggression* cannot remain apathetic or complacent."
9. "Such a national emergency exists today. We are at war. In the military sense of course we are just sparring. Ideologically and technically we are in an all-out conflict. Economically the war is just beginning."	9. " "
10. *"The cold war,* of course, has been with us almost constantly since the closing days of World War II."	10. *"International tensions caused by Sino-Soviet aggression or threat of aggression,* of course, has been with us almost constantly since the closing days of World War II."

If there was any doubt that this particular attitude or policy underlies the deletion of the word "war" or "enemy" from speeches, the Under Secretary of State, in his testimony, made it perfectly clear. Mr. Ball was asked: "Do you consider any group or any country that is dedicated to the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government as an enemy to the United States?" To this, Mr. Ball replied, " 'Potential enemy' might be a more accurate expression. It has a system in opposition to us" (H-2913). Thereafter Mr. Ball was asked: "Mr. Secretary, we have troops in Korea today. They are there for some purpose. Who is our enemy in Korea today up on the frontlines?" To this Mr. Ball replied: "The troops that are in Korea today are there to sustain the Korean Government and to help protect the integrity of Korea, but there is no shooting going on there" (H-2913-2914). Mr. Ball was then asked, "Who is the enemy? There must be some enemy there or we would not have troops there?" Mr. Ball's response was: "Well, no. We have troops many places in the world where there is no enemy, where there is potential danger." Mr. Ball was then asked to "Name some place where we have troops where there is no enemy." To this Mr. Ball replied: "We have troops in Berlin" (H-2914).

Mr. Ball took the attitude that to say we are at war with communism is an "abstraction" (H-2915). He clearly indicated that he is not concerned with the international Communist movement as such. At one point, he stated: "Let me make a distinction which I think is an important one, Senator. Foreign policy deals with nations and with relations between nations * * *" (H-2805). These remarks make it quite clear that State Department policy is not directed in opposition to the international Communist conspiratorial movement, but rather is concerned with the particular official actions of what the State Department considers to be "nation-states." Since there has been no declaration of war by the Congress of the United States against another nation-state, State Department policy and attitude confines itself to a peacetime framework, and this, of course, precludes the present existence of any war or any enemy except a potential one, regardless of the tempo of the Communist offensive against the interests of the United States and freedom everywhere.

The censorship actions, and the explanation for them reveal a pervasion of State Department thinking by a "defensive" attitude. In describing U.S. policy, Under Secretary Ball stated:

"The United States is committed to check any actions which would have the effect, or tend to have the effect, of resulting in the extension of control of Communist power over other countries that are not now under that control" (H-2829).

Essentially this is a policy which limits the United States to reflex actions, to rigidly defensive steps in response to Communist offensive tactics. It is this same "defensive" attitude which prompts such assertions as that contained in an explanation for the deletion of the word "victory," which stated: "The word 'victory' has a militaristic and aggressive ring * * *" (H-3302). The same defensive thinking is apparent in the deletion of such terms as "beat the Communist challenge," "extend freedom," "win the cold war," "destroy the virus of communism," "to achieve victory," and "emerge victorious." This "defensive" or reflex thinking accounts for the timidity which led to the deletion of proposed statements which described communism as "vicious," "godless," or "tyrannical."

To counter the obvious implication that the State Department had revealed a "defensive" attitude and a distaste for the word "victory" by its censorship actions, Mr. Ball furnished to the subcommittee extracts from speeches of State Department personnel and requested that they be inserted in the record of the hearings (H-2763). In some of them, the word "victory" was used, and there were statements in terms of "winning." The context of such remarks were usually such, however, as to limit or specifically define the normal meaning of "victory." From a speech of Mr. Walter Rostow, Chairman of the Policy Planning Council of the State Department, "victory" is found in this context:

"The victory we seek will see no ticker tape parade down Broadway. It is a victory which will take many years and perhaps decades of hard work and dedication—by many people—to bring about.

"It will not be a victory of the United States over the Soviet Union.

"It will be a victory of men and nations that aim to stand up straight, over the forces that wish to entrap and to exploit their revolutionary aspirations (H-2767)."

From the speech of Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland is this reference to a new kind of victory:

"When the world of consent has thus seduced the world of coercion, we will be face to face with a new kind of victory.

"It won't be 'total'—the real world can never be described with absolute words, real goals are never achieved.

"But it will be the kind of victory that has rational meaning in the nuclear age. It will not be won by killing or impoverishing others. It will be the best of all possible victories, for it can be shared with all mankind (H-2768)."

Another use of "victory" is found in a speech of Secretary of State Rusk:

"The way to measure the cold war is to recognize it as being a contest between—again between those who are involved with the Communist revolutionary movement on the one side and those who are trying to build a kind of world set forth in the Charter of the U.N. on the other. Wherever you see a country that is independent, secure, relaxed about managing its own affairs, there is a victory in the cold war (H-2763)."

Such references as these would seem to indicate that the State Department either has a wholly "defensive" attitude or is entrapped in a semantic wilderness.

In a speech prepared for delivery on March 9, 1961, a general officer proposed to state: "Witness the steady advance of communism for over a century—and it still remains unchecked, as no successful counter force has been adequately developed" (H–54–55). The State Department censors inserted in this sentence the word "Sino-Soviet" before the word "communism"; so that after being censored, the statement read, "Witness the steady advance of Sino-Soviet communism for over a century," etc. The censor's comment penciled in the margin of the speech at the time stated: "It is only the externally aggressive type (Sino-Soviet) which the United States is committed to check" (H–55). From this, it is obvious that the State Department views communism not as an international conspiratorial movement with a high degree of unity of purpose and actions, but rather as a type of political system which has varying attributes in the numerous nation-states which it dominates.

This censorship action further reveals that U.S. policy is not concerned with communism as such, or even with the threat posed by all Communist-dominated states, but on the contrary, is concerned with and committed to check only those particular states which are "externally aggressive."

The State Department's preoccupation with traditional forms of aggression by nation-states is reflected in a number of the censorship actions. On one occasion a speaker proposed to state: "This new equipment is evidence of the technological progress which we as a nation must continue to enjoy on a broad basis if we are to meet and beat the Communist challenge." The State Department deleted "and beat the Communist challenge," and inserted instead, "the threat of foreign aggression" (H–3303). Such censorship makes the conclusion inescapable that the State Department shapes its policies to respond to actions by particular Communist states which fall within the category of traditional "foreign aggression"; that is, open and naked military invasion. While this was an adequate test a century ago, it is as anachronistic today as the use of 18th-century medical devices in place of modern antibiotics.

The censorship actions and the comments of the State Department, indicate that the State Department follows a rather rigid test in determining what constitutes aggression. On February 11, 1961, in speaking of the continuously growing Communist power, the Chief of Staff of the Army proposed to state: "Aggression and subversion in Africa, Asia, and Latin America are today examples of means used to pursue their aims of world domination." The State Department censor substituted "intervention" for "aggression." In the written explanation for this, submitted to the subcommittee, the State Department made the following comment: "The methods used by Communist nations in the areas referred to had not been officially labeled by the U.S. Government as aggression" (H–3297). If the methods used by the Communists in Asia, including Laos, Vietnam, China, Korea, and Tibet, and in Africa and Latin America, are not officially considered by the U.S. Government as aggression, and if, as the State Department censor noted, it is only the "externally aggressive" type of communism which the United States is committed to check, policy objectives are so circumscribed as to preclude realistic resistance to the continuing Communist offensive, based on the "total resource approach."

Certainly the inferences flowing from these censorship actions, and from the explanatory comments, are consistent with the statement of Mr. Edward R. Murrow: "What we object to fundamentally is the aggressive nature of the Communist state."[3] Such a policy or attitude is totally unresponsive to the Communist strategy of fusing war and peace, and of using the nation-state framework as a "front" through which to operate. Within the framework of such a policy, military and economic aid to Yugoslavia, even while acknowledging that Tito is a dedicated Communist, is perfectly consistent, so long as there is no conclusive proof to show that Yugoslavia is committing acts which meet the Department of State's definition of "external aggression." Within the framework of such a policy or attitude, aid to Poland, although it is completely dominated by a Communist regime which is, in turn, dominated by the international Communist movement, is consistent, so long as Poland's Communist government is not caught in an act which the State Department defines as "external aggression." Within the framework of such a policy, serious consideration could be given to aiding the government of British Guiana, despite the fact that it is headed by a Communist, Cheddi Jagan, for it is fairly obvious, in view of British Guiana's economic poverty, that this state is—at least momentarily—incapable of "external aggression."

Such an attitude or policy would not be consistent with directing our national efforts toward discouraging or blocking Communist Activities within nation-states which are not overtly or admitted Communist controlled.

The illusions which underlie any such attitudes or policy foreclose any realistic understanding of what are mistakenly referred to as "local wars," or, in Communist terminology, "wars for national liberation." Our State Department seems incapable of understanding that such overt hostilities are not spontaneous outbreaks, but are planned and premeditated actions by the directors of the international Communist movement. In a speech scheduled for delivery on May 19, 1960, General Everest, Commander of the U.S. Tactical Air Force proposed to state:

"They (the Soviets) have employed every means, from economic pressure and subversion, as in Iraq, to indirect military actions—limited in area and scope, as in Korea and Indo-China."

The reference to Korea and Indo-China was deleted by the State Department censor. In its written explanation of the deletion, the State Department averred:

"As noted by the reviewing officers, the reference to Soviet action in Korea and Indo-China was inaccurate, since intervention in these areas was by Communist China (H–3287)."

When queried about this explanation, Under Secretary Ball stated in part:

"I think that the general impression is that this was a decision made by the Chinese Communist government and that the initiative did not come from Moscow (H–2872)."

The official policy of the United States on Soviet involvement in Korea was publicly released by the Department of Defense dated May 15, 1954 (H–2875). This release documents the fact that the Soviets not only supported, but actually directed, the Korean conflict to the extent that Soviet citizens held the positions of authority, in both the political and military organizations of North Korea. Even the field orders of the North Korean Army, were written originally and distributed in the Russian language, down to commanders of line units before being translated into the Korean language. The official U.S. position could not have been unknown to the State Department. Nine North Korean field orders, written in Russian were exhibited by the U.S. delegation in the U.N. to support the U.S. position in that body, "that in any postarmistice political conference, Russia could not be considered a neutralist participant, but must be present as a nation with, at the least, a 'special interest' in the Korean conflict." Because the Communists were not operating within the framework of traditional nation-state relations in their covert directions of the North Korean puppet regime and the Korean conflict, the State Department, judging from their written comments, is unable to accept official U.S. policy that the Soviets did direct the Communist action in Korea. Such blind stubbornness by State is neither a mute question nor solely a past impediment, for history is now repeating itself in Vietnam.

Both the written explanation and the answers of Under Secretary Ball reveal that the State Department, itself, will not accept official policy if it is contrary to the ingrained diplomatic concept that only those events which fall within the framework of a nation-state versus nation-state relation is acknowledgeable.

The State Department censorship of military speeches was in clear contravention to President Kennedy's direction for a reexamination of our cold war strategy and tactics. The President stated on April 20, 1961, just after the ill-fated Cuban invasion attempt:

"We dare not fail to see the insidious nature of this new and deeper struggle. We dare not fail to grasp the *new concepts, the new tools*, the new sense of urgency we will need to combat it, whether in Cuba or South Vietnam. And we dare not fail to realize it is this struggle which is taking place every day without arms or fanfare, in thousands of villages and markets and classrooms all over the globe * * *. No greater task faces this Nation or this administration * * *. Too long have we fixed our eyes on the traditional military needs; on the armies prepared to cross borders; on missiles poised for flight. Now it should be clear this is no longer enough; that our security may be lost piece by piece, country by country, without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border. We intend to profit from this lesson. We intend to *reexamine and reorient our forces of all kinds, our tactics and our institutions* here in this community. We intend to intensify our efforts for a struggle in many ways more difficult than war." [Emphasis added.]

Despite the obviously studied evasiveness of State Department witnesses on the particular subject, the censorship actions and the comments of the censors indicate that, within the State Department, there is an attitude or policy founded on the possibility of "evolution" of the Communist system in dominated territories. Gen. Arthur Trudeau proposed to State in one of his speeches:

"Either we can remain the champion in this vicious race by exerting our full strength and rise to great heights for the benefit for all mankind, or we can sulk and skulk like fearful and frustrated people and go down in the ignominy of defeat. The choice is ours; the hour is late; the time for decision is now (H–3189)."

A State Department censor penciled in the margin of the speech, opposite this paragraph, the following comments:

"This section might well be tempered since it largely rules out any chance of an evolution of the Soviet system. It is a little too militant on the eve of the Summit. Eliminate either or concept to allow possibility of evolution of Soviet system (H–3189)."

Under Secretary Ball was questioned extensively in an effort to determine from him to what extent the State Department policy or attitude placed reliance on the possibility of evolution of the Soviet system in order to make the prevailing policy of containment ultimately successful. Mr. Ball's answers, although lengthy, were neither enlightening nor reassuring. He testified that U.S. policy is not based on a firm belief that the Soviet system will evolve, but he then proceeded to attempt to convince the committee of the fact that such an evolution is now in process (H–2805). He testified that no one could be sure what turn this "evolution" would take, but also explained:

"They (the Communists) are losing their international militancy, becoming more nationalistic in character, becoming capable of living in a society of free nations without creating any menace for them (H–2804)."

---

[3] AFIF 98. "Challenge of Ideas," a training film produced by the Department of Defense and narrated by Edward R. Murrow (released Sept. 1961).

In view of the consistency with which any paraphrase of what the State Department called the "either-or-concept" was deleted in Mr. Ball's rather specious testimony on this point it is difficult to find anything that would refute the implication inherent in the censors' actions and comments—that the policy or attitude governing their conduct was based on the hope of holding the line through containment and, given time, the Communists would abandon their aggressive nature. The implication of such a policy or attitude is supported by its consistency with the statement that our policy is "to deter foreign aggression," for such a purely defensive attitude could only hope to succeed if the Communists ultimately changed or "evolved."

Even the very speeches of State Department officials, which Under Secretary Ball provided to the subcommittee to show that the Department's attitude was not antagonistic to "victory," strongly indicates that the State Department's policy is, in fact, based on a belief that the Communists will change or "evolve." In a speech of Secretary of State Rusk is found this statement:

"We have no doubt that *the peoples of the Communist world will increasingly bring pressure on their leaders* to grant them the benefits of the free community and the individual rights and liberties which become the dignity of man (H–2764)." [Emphasis added.]

Mr. George C. McGhee of the State Department said in one of the speeches furnished for the record:

"Rather our purpose is to offer the rulers and the peoples of the Communist world powerful incentives to abandon the 'cold war' and to substitute genuine peace and cooperation for the vague and mysterious 'coexistence' they have offered (H–2765)."

From another speech of Mr. McGhee come these statements:

"We should not, however, despair for the future. Increasing Communist awareness of the perils of the arms race, *internal changes within the Communist society*, and continuing joint study and consideration of the need for inspection and the varied forms which it might take—all these may eventually create some opportunities for agreements which will moderate present risks (H–2766)." [Emphasis added.]

and:

"Indeed, fulfillment of this goal—the creation of a strong united community of free nations—*offers the best hope for the ultimate withering away of the Communist offensive* (H–2766)." [Emphasis added.]

And from another speech of Secretary of State Rusk comes this statement:

"We should take no cheap comforts from the deep schisms within the Communist bloc. On the other hand, we should be aware that the concept of independent nationhood, of national interest, and of national culture are day to day asserting themselves strongly. And if we are wise, we can patiently find ways to pick up the strands of overlapping interest between Communist nations and the free world, moving toward a cushioning of raw clash of power (H–2764)."

If, indeed, official U.S. policy is not based on the expectation that the Communists are in the process of "evolving," then, at the very least, it is obvious that the State Department is permeated by such a belief.

The policies and attitudes revealed by censorship actions, comments of censors, and the State Department's explanations includes an abhorrence of the use of such phrases as "victory in the cold war," "win the cold war," "extension of freedom" and similar terms. One written explanation of the State Department, with reference to the substitution of the phrase "defeat of Communist aggression" for the phrase "victory on each of the four battlefields of the cold war," despite Mr. Ball's subsequent characterization of this quote as "inartistic," rings true and consistent with the pattern of censorship. This explanation was:

"The word 'victory' has a militaristic and aggressive ring less suited than the substituted phrase to describing our national objectives. It implies an 'all or nothing' approach leaving no room for accommodation (H–3302)."

Although this explanation was accompanied by a letter from Mr. Ball stating that it was prepared under his personal supervision, Mr. Ball later retracted the explanation after it was greeted with derisive protests in the press and on the Senate floor. After the criticism, Mr. Ball declared that this explanation did not really reflect American foreign policy, and was "inartistic."

The conclusions indicated by the censorship actions and the comments of censors emanating from the State Department were reinforced and supported by the subsequent written explanations and oral testimony. This conclusion is that we have either a policy or a predominate attitude which can be summarized as follows: The U.S. foreign policy objective is containment of direct foreign military aggression. It does not seek victory over communism, but only to deter aggression while seeking grounds for accommodation, so that the Communist dominated territories will have the necessary time in which to "evolve" into nonaggressive, socialist states.

It is possible that censorship actions indicate only individual, although widespread, thinking among personnel involved in the censoring, rather than our official foreign policy. However, the distinction makes little difference in the net results, if such thinking dominates those who occupy positions of responsibility in the daily execution of our foreign policy.

One factor, however, weighs heavily toward the conclusion that such implications flow from official foreign policy.

The basic foreign policies of the United States are incorporated into written form, and presumably, kept reasonably up to date. Some of these basic policy papers are National Security Council papers, others are State Department papers. It has been repeatedly publicized in the newspapers, for instance, that Mr. Walt W. Rostow, Counselor to the State Department, has recently been engaged in preparing an overall policy paper, including foreign and military policy, for the present administration (H–2953–2954). There was no need for officials to resort to verbal protestations that the censorship actions did not reflect official foreign policy if such were not the case. The policy papers themselves could have settled the matter conclusively.

These policy papers were requested for the subcommittee's examination in executive session, so that there would have been no public disclosure of security matters. These papers were requested of the Under Secretary of State when he was before the subcommittee. He stated that the paper prepared by Mr. Rostow was still a "working paper," and as such, could not be furnished to the subcommittee (H–2954). Other policy papers, he stated, were in the control of the President, since they are National Security Council papers. The President was then asked to make these policy papers available to the subcommittee, which he declined to do (H–3160–3161).

As noted hereinabove, military personnel, except those in the Department of Defense Directorate of Security Review, were not exposed to the full spectrum of censorship, and, therefore, were not able to discern this pattern from the State Department actions and comments. There is little doubt, however, that the recorded spontaneous reaction of one officer, who had the limited experience of seeing only the censorship of one officer's speeches, was typical of the reaction to a slight exposure. Col. Edward B. Rasmessen, Staff Assistant to Gen. Thomas D. White, while discussing on the telephone the reasons for the censorship by the State Department of one of General White's speeches, with Frances W. Herron, Deputy Director of the Policy Plans and Guidance Staff of the State Department, penciled the following notes on the back of the censored copy of the speech:

State

(1) Don't like hard line.
(2) Play everything soft—tonedown.
(3) States Russians are unhappy because they are unable to pick up provocative phrases for their propaganda.
(4) Mr. Herron—took it higher. Where—no one knows (H–893).

Even with such limited exposure, military personnel could hardly miss the "no win" tenor of the State Department's actions and attitudes.

CONCLUSIONS

The study of the subcommittee revealed that there are many procedural and organizational matters which need improvement or remedy in the review of military speeches and articles, in the internal information programs on the cold war and in the policies and procedures under which the military participates in cold war seminars for the public. These have been set forth in specific recommendations following the discussion of each specific phase of this study.

More important, however, is the overall issue which gives rise to the circumstances which the subcommittee undertook to study.

The information developed by the subcommittee shows conclusively that there is no threat from the military to civilian supremacy.

It is clear that difficulties in each of the three phases of the study stemmed directly from a fundamental conflict of views as to the nature of the Communist threat, and, consequently, regarding the approach which should be adopted to defend against and counter that threat. In the hearings of the subcommittee, as in this report the two views are revealed in some detail. One is represented in large part by the remarks and statements of military officers which were censored, as well as the testimony of some of the witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee. The other view is represented largely by the written comments of the censors, the explanation of the cenorship actions, and the testimony of the State Department.

This conflict of views must be resolved if our Nation is to survive the cold war. It cannot be resolved by reorganizations within the Government, certainly not by "splitting the difference." In the final analysis, the decision between the two views must be made by the ultimate authority in the Nation—the electorate.

The right decision is not likely to spring from the American people unless they are informed—fully and accurately informed. Most of the facts on which the American people could base a sound judgment are in the possession of the Government, but there has been little communication of them to the public.

Indeed, it appears that the State Department has made a concerted effort, to the limit of its power, to keep the facts from both the Congress and the people and, contrary to President Kennedy's expressed desire, to prevent a full and free discussion of the issues the Nation faces. If we are to judge by the evasiveness of the State Department spokesman, this effort springs from the insecurity and ignorance which surround the State Department's arguments on the nature of the Communist threat and the policies which should be followed in combating that threat.

The hearings held by the subcommittee, and its study based on the hearings and documents in its files, will contribute to the national interest in the exact proportion that it has made facts available to the public on which they can base a responsible judgment as to the proper policy and course for our Nation to follow in the cold war. Not by the fondest stretch of the imagination could this study have communicated all the facts and information that are needed by the America people.

The most important recommendation which this subcommittee could make is to paraphrase the words of Winston Churchill to Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin in the Munich era: "Tell the truth, tell the truth to the American people."

BALTIMORE SUN STRONGLY SUPPORTS PRESIDENT'S DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REORGANIZATION PLAN

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's reorganization plan for the District of Columbia government has drawn strong support from the Nation's press—and particularly from most of the newspapers in this area.

I was particularly pleased to note that the Baltimore Sun has come out foursquare for Mr. Johnson's plan. In a June 3 editorial, the Sun declared:

> The new District of Columbia government would have much greater flexibility and would be more responsive to the wishes of Washington citizens.

The Sun continues:

> To understand this, one has only to imagine a situation whereby Baltimore or some other problem-ridden modern city were suddenly robbed of its mayor and council and placed under the kind of remote-control government Washington has lived with since 1874.

I commend the Baltimore Sun for articulating the basic issue in the President's reorganization plan. That is, the need for the residents of Washington to possess modern governmental machinery to provide good government to District citizens.

I insert this editorial into the RECORD:

REORGANIZATION

The proposed reorganization of the Washington city government, though far from being a blueprint for home rule, is an essential first step in that direction—all the more so since the ultimate goal seems as far out of reach as ever.

Under the Johnson Administration's proposal, which takes effect automatically unless Congress vetoes it, the powers now divided among three commissioners would be brought together in a single office. It is important to remember that the executive occupying this office would not have sweeping new powers. What he would have basically is a freedom of action impossible to conceive under the present arrangement. He could, for example, shift money between municipal agencies or even consolidate agencies without congressional approval. His actions could be overridden only by seven of the nine members of a council which would be appointed to help administer city affairs. Ultimate authority, of course, would rest with Congress, and all the officials, the commissioner as well as the council, would be appointed (by the President) rather than elected.

Still, despite these drawbacks, the new District of Columbia government would have much greater flexibility and would be more responsive to the wishes of Washington citizens. To understand this, one has only to imagine a situation whereby Baltimore or some other problem-ridden modern city were suddenly robbed of its mayor and council and placed under the kind of remote-control government Washington has lived with since 1874.

NEW FCC RULING STAGGERING IN ITS INVASION OF CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY AND ITS USURPATION OF POWER OVER THE NEWS AND PROGRAMING CONTENT OF OUR RADIO AND TELEVISION STATIONS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, June 3, the Federal Communications Commission issued a new ruling under its "fairness doctrine" that is staggering in its invasion of congressional authority and its usurpation of power over the news and programing content of our radio and television stations.

This ruling, the FCC maintains, applies for now only to one product—cigarettes. But if this assumption of power by FCC is allowed to stand, my powers of imagination are not up to the possibilities of having our airwaves filled with nothing more than self-appointed, so-called responsible groups demanding time to argue about the merits of practically every type of commercial that may be aired. And it is not inconceivable to think that some other agency may attempt to apply a similar doctrine to all publications—as indeed, the Federal Trade Commission not too long ago attempted when it sought to dictate the content of print advertisements for cigarettes.

Completely aside from the pros and cons of the cigarette smoking controversy, let us consider just what the Federal Communications Commission has done in this ruling:

First, it has ruled that any radio or television station carrying perfectly legitimate advertising for a legal product must tailor its news reporting and its other program content so as to include each week a significant amount of free messages from the people who do not like the product.

The FCC even specifically designated one private, fundraising agency as an acceptable source of such messages. Heaven help us when all other such agencies, regardless of the merits of their particular causes, realize the potential of such free time mandated by a Government agency.

I can only conclude those who conscientiously oppose the use of alcoholic beverages and believe them to be harmful, will be happy at a chance to go after the beer and wine advertisements.

Second, but equally important, in making this ruling, the FCC has in effect written new laws for Congress in an area where Congress specifically and expressly avoided legislating. In fact, the FCC, in citing the Senate Report No. 195 relating to the cigarette labeling legislation, so distorted the passage quoted therefrom as to reverse its meaning. The FCC emphasized an introductory clause from one sentence in that report but completely omitted the rest of the sentence that made the positive assertion that—

> It was the committee's unanimous judgment that no warning in cigarette advertising should be required pending the showing that these vigorous, but less drastic, steps have not adequately alerted the public to the potential hazard of smoking.

Yet, the FCC has created a fiction that it is carrying out a congressional intent by its ruling that if radio or television stations carry cigarette commercials they must also carry—free, if necessary—warnings about cigarettes, a requirement the Congress specifically rejected.

The cigarette commercials at which the FCC's ruling is aimed do not, so far as I know, discuss the health aspects of cigarette smoking one way or another. The FCC itself says that the advertisements promote the use of a particular cigarette as attractive and enjoyable. But the free time of news and other programs that the FCC is requiring will permit groups to spread charges that "the normal use of this product can be a hazard to the health of millions of persons," to quote the FCC.

There are many recognized authorities who take issue with such broad general accusations. The appropriate congressional committees heard some of these authorities during deliberations on the Cigarette Labeling Act in 1964 and 1965 and presumably took their testimony into consideration when the decision was made not to require warnings in advertisements.

One of these authorities, Dr. William B. Ober, the director of laboratories, at Knickerbocker Hospital in New York City, told the House and Senate Commerce Committees in his testimony, that many sincere opponents of cigarette smoking seem to belong to what he called the Puritan school of cancer causation. Dr. Ober said:

> They tell us that smoking causes lung cancer, sexual intercourse causes cancer of the cervix, and drinking causes cancer of the throat. Lord help us all! What will they find next? I think if one starts off with the notion that anything a man does which gives him pleasure is probably sinful, it is only one step to think it is harmful, and the next thing to do is pass a law against it . . ."

Dr. Ober further said:

> The only really scientific statement one can make at the present time is that no one really knows what causes lung cancer. (Hearings, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Serial 89-11, p. 343)

Other scientists have come to similar conclusions about the possible relationship between cigarette smoking and other diseases.

Yet, despite the unproven and uncertain state of research in these fields, the FCC has now endorsed one of these theories—the smoking theory—and ruled that broadcasters must devote public time to propagandizing it. By so doing, the FCC has made a scientific decision, which is entirely outside the area of its competence.

Should not the FCC's fairness doctrine also direct broadcasting stations to air both sides—or rather all aspects—of the cigarette smoking controversy? I should think it should.

Should not the FCC require broadcasters to invite Dr. Ober and other scientists to rebut the propaganda of the American Cancer Society and the Public Health Service? I should think it should.

However, my overriding concern is that this arrogation of authority will be extended beyond cigarettes, if it is allowed to stand.

What is to prevent the FCC upon petition of any individual with a pet peeve from insisting that the broadcasting stations doctor up their news and programing to allow—

The auto safety critics to answer automobile advertisements that suggest power and speed are essential and that there is nothing but fun and glamour in driving a car?

The antifluoridation forces, which are potent, to demand free time to spread their messages in rebuttal to toothpastes which advertise fluorides for cavity control?

The Women's Christian Temperance Union to appear weekly or more frequently on every station that carries beer or wine commercials?

The perennial aspirin antagonists to demand use of their press releases about what they think aspirin does or does not do to health when misused?

Such a list of those demanding free time to argue with advertisements could go on and on—touching practically every product that is advertised on the air.

I can almost hear the news programs of the future now—a series of one release after another from fundraising and other pet peeve organizations complaining about the commercials that make it possible for them to get their free news time.

The wars in the Far East and the Middle East would be relegated to minor bulletins on the air. Actions of Congress and Government would be given short shrift while the newscaster drones on about arguments whether or not to drive a car, whether to smoke or not, whether to drink beer or not, whether to brush your teeth with fluorides safely, and whether to try to relieve headaches by taking aspirin.

We will have come into a brave new world, not of gods and antigods, but of commercials and anticommercials pouring out endlessly over the speakers of big brothers.

My head reels as I consider the possibilities of the evils that may be committed under this enormous stretching of the innocuous-sounding "fairness doctrine."

In all fairness, this kind of big brotherism should be stopped now—before it gets out of hand.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES TRAINING ACT, PUBLIC LAW 85-507

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Henderson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today, the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is releasing a report concerning the implementation of the Government Employees Training Act, Public Law 85–507. Last year the Federal Government spent over $180 million training some 906,000 Federal civilian employees. About 77 percent of this training was developed and conducted by the departments and agencies themselves for their own employees. In fact, less than 5 percent of the employees were trained through interagency programs.

This report reflects the first congressional review of this most important and expensive Federal personnel function; namely, training of Federal Government personnel. The purpose of the review by our subcommittee was to determine such items as: First, the overall cost of training; second, recent trends in the programs; third, numbers of personnel who have received training; and, fourth, types of training being given. Through the cooperation of the departments and agencies in the executive branch, plus on-site reviews by our subcommittee staff, we were able to respond factually to the various stated objectives.

This report, House Report No. 329, of June 1, 1967, covers not only the findings of the subcommittee but also recommends actions for improving the many training programs in the Federal Government. It points up a definite need for a more effective leadership role by the Civil Service Commission. One of the several recommendations proposes a better and more effective cost system. The report also indicates that the various types of training justified under the Government Employees Training Act are in need of clarification.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this report will be of considerable assistance to the departments and agencies of the executive branch. It is going to provide management officials guidelines for closer and more objective reviews of civilian personnel training. Officials in several departments and agencies, including the U.S. Civil Service Commission, have already indicated to our subcommittee staff the value of the report in this respect.

I plan to make copies of the report available to the various interested committees of the House; and, may I assure you and the Members, that the subcommittee will have a continued and active interest in this important function of personnel administration.

FLYING A BIG FLAG

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, to most of us the sight of Old Glory fluttering in the breeze stirs deep reverence for this wonderful Nation, the greatest hope on this earth for men who seek to be truly free. On occasion the sight of the Stars and Stripes has been known to produce a tear in the eye as past remembrances of the good, the proud and the magnificent moments of American history come to consciousness that is too often occupied with more pressing day-to-day problems.

Most of us have been hurt and shocked by the disrespect that has been shown to the U.S. flag by a very small number of publicity-seeking rabble rousers. They profess protest but the entire focus of their action is designed to alienate, destroy and divide. In spurning constructive activity which might alleviate their problem and in disregarding ordinary process for redress of their real or imagined grievances, they demonstrate in actions that override their words that their most basic aims are troublemaking and publicity seeking.

While these rare instances of disaffection and disrespect for the Stars and Stripes rate considerable attention, I want to point out to my colleague a far more impressive article, one of proper respect and honor for our flag.

The current issue of Reynolds Review, a magazine for the employees of the Reynolds Metals Co., tells the story of Mr. Frederick J. Diggle, Sr., a retired employee of the Reynolds Alloys Plant in Sheffield, Ala.

Although not a native son, Mr. Diggle knows the significance of our Nation's beautiful flag and of the glorious potentials it represents for every citizen who will apply himself.

He was one of four Alabama residents to be honored with the Americanism Award of the Daughters of the American Revolution last year. No ordinary American flag is good enough for Mr. Diggle. He flies an unusually large American flag from the pole in his front yard.

Mr. Diggle will be flying his flag next week as thoughtful Americans honor the Stars and Stripes on June 14, Flag Day.

In commemoration of the 190th anniversary of the adoption by the Continental Congress of the Stars and Stripes as the official flag of the United States of America I will have the article from the Reynolds Review printed in the Congressional Record as a part of my remarks:

He Flies a Big Flag

He is a proud American—some might say, one of a disappearing breed.

A man who is humble, loyal, and above all, patriotic. He jumped ship at the age of

19 to swim to America's shore, arriving without a penny in his pocket.

That's the same man who last year accepted the coveted DAR Americanism Award with tears in his eyes.

Fiction? No, rather a brief biography of Frederick J. Diggle, Sr., a former chief draftsman who retired from Reynolds alloys plant, Sheffield, Ala., in 1959.

The story of how Fred arrived in this country and eventually became a Reynolds employee is more exciting than fiction. He was 19 and serving as a junior engineer aboard a British Merchantman when he met an American stowaway. During the long voyage to Mobile, Ala., the two became friends and soon the stowaway sold him the idea of staying in America. When the ship reached Gulfport, the captain refused him an advance in salary and shore leave. He and his new-found friend, John Groutch, swam ashore with their clothes tied to their backs.

The day was July 4, 1912.

As the Diggle success story is unveiled, Fred recalls the difficulties of finding work because he was not an American citizen, living on ten cents a day, and taking whatever work he could find.

Finally, his skill as a machinist, his father's trade, landed him a job working for the railroad and because it reminded him of Birmingham, England, he settled in Birmingham, Ala. He later married and became naturalized in 1921.

By 1941 his skill as a machinist led him to Reynolds alloys plant as general shop foreman. True to his American dream, Fred moved up the ladder at the plant and prior to his retirement, was in charge of the engineers and draftsmen who designed plant equipment.

The DAR Americanism Award was presented to Fred last year in Sheffield. He is one of only four Alabamians to receive the distinguished honor. The local chapter of DAR must submit the individual's qualifications to state and national organizations for review. Only after a national committee has approved it can a local chapter present the award.

Fred can and would talk about Americanism all day. An ordinary American Flag is not good enough for him. He flies an unusually large flag on a ten-foot pole in his yard. Fred knows and looks forward to the days having special patriotic significance and urges all his neighbors to fly their flags on these days.

JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR SETTLEMENT OF RAILROAD DISPUTES

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution with the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Adams] to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees in order that there may be a responsible alternative before the committee when the railroad legislation is considered.

Our resolution authorizes the President to issue orders directing the carriers to transport necessary materials. He may make whatever rules and regulations will be needed. The resolution provides for the setting of rates as well as the modification of wages, hours, and working conditions.

GROWTH OF JUNIOR COLLEGES AND VERNON COURT JUNIOR COLLEGE IN NEWPORT, R.I.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the junior college movement in these United States had made extraordinary gains during the past few decades and has attained a position of great significance, admiration, and respect in the vital field of education.

It has expanded the field of education and strengthened it through imaginative and bold approaches to the process of education. The junior colleges across our land have reached out to embrace many special groups who perhaps would not have attained a higher education had they only been confronted with the prospect of entering a university. They have also served to inspire and guide many of their graduates to still higher education.

We are deeply indebted to those who have contributed towards the phenomenal growth of this movement for it has significantly contributed towards the growth of our Nation and will continue to do so in the future as well.

Though Rhode Island is the smallest State, it nevertheless boasts four junior colleges, all of which have greatly added to the reputation of Rhode Island as an area having many fine educational institutions.

One of those is Vernon Court Junior College situated in historic and picturesque Newport. The meteoric growth of this fine junior college is worthy of much praise and one of the voices raised in praise of this fine institution is that of the distinguished president of the University of Rhode Island, my highly respected and good friend, Dr. Francis H. Horn.

Dr. Horn delivered the commencement address at the third annual commencement exercises at Vernon Court Junior College at which I was privileged to be present. I would at this time like to submit Dr. Horn's eloquent address for the Congressional Record. In addition to mentioning Vernon Court's development, it contains a very meaningful message centered upon the importance of the individual and clearly points out that "the single individual counts and counts frightfully in the modern world." I believe that my colleagues will find Dr. Horn's remarks most inspiring and worthy of great consideration.

Dr. Horn's remarks follow:

The Individual in a Mass World

(Commencement address by Francis H. Horn)

It is a pleasure to speak at this third commencement of Vernon Court Junior College. I have watched its almost miraculous growth since Dr. Ashley first established the College and before it enrolled any students. I have done this with more than the usual interest that the president of an older and larger institution of higher learning demonstrates when a new college becomes his neighbor. This more personal interest springs from the fact that I am an old junior college man myself, having begun my administrative career over thirty years ago as head of a small privately-controlled junior college in New Haven, a college I served for six years until I entered the Army in 1942. This was a young college too, in its sixth year when I accepted appointment to its staff.

In retrospect, those years in a young, vigorous, growing junior college, in which everyone, faculty and students, knew everyone else, were from some angles, the most exciting and satisfying of my educational career. They created in me, moreover, an abiding interest in the junior college movement, a solid appreciation of the role of the junior college in American higher education, and a lasting dedication to the enlargement and enrichment of junior college opportunities throughout the country.

I was more than happy, therefore, to learn of Dr. Ashley's plans for a junior college for women here in Newport, and to provide whatever assistance I was able to render as head of Rhode Island's state university. The success of Vernon Court Junior College has been phenomenal, and all of us in higher education within the state are delighted to see how much has been accomplished in such a short time. I want, therefore, to pay my respects to President Ashley and to his associates in the administration, faculty, and staff for what they have achieved here. Among these associates, I want especially to mention my good friend and former boss, Dr. Michael Walsh, who, I assume, first admitted all you graduates to the college; and my former colleague, Admiral Scott Umsted, a distinguished naval officer and a superb teacher, whom I hope many of you have enjoyed in the classroom. There are many others here at Vernon Court whom I don't know, but I'm sure you will remember them with pleasure and with appreciation for what they have contributed to your education.

To you parents, may I say that your daughters have been privileged to be students at Vernon Court. The College is an exciting place in which to live and study, and the more I see of Newport, the more envious I become of those who can live here, even if for only two years. I felt so confident of the advantages of being a student at Vernon Court that I sent my daughter here last fall. I regret to asy that she dropped out—I'm afraid that living all her life in the academic world has caused her to revolt against it—and I'm sorry she won't be here a year from now at the 1968 commencement exercises. But if I had another daughter ready for college, I'd be happy were she to come to Vernon Court. I'm sure you graduates have been generally happy here, have found your studies challenging and interesting, and have laid the foundation for a future life of satisfaction and usefulness. Certainly, I congratulate you upon your graduation today and predict that you will come to look upon your two years here at Vernon Court as among the happiest of your life.

Perhaps I ought to stop here—and I'm sure you wouldn't object if I did. But tradition—and it's a tradition of over three centuries in America—requires that there be an address of some length and seriousness of thought as part of the commencement exercises. And though Vernon Court is a very young college indeed, I believe one tradition it must hold to is that of the commencement address. So I want to speak to you about a matter that I believe to be important and that I hope will seem relevant to you and your future. I want to discuss some ideas concerning the attitudes of students, and older adults as well, that I believe deserve your consideration. I give to these remarks the title of "The Individual in a Mass World."

Let me begin by reminding you of what the scientists have done to our concept of the world. The astronomers have shown us that our universe is only one of thousands or even millions of similar universes. By way of contrast, the physicists have demonstrated that even the atom is a universe in itself. Geologists tell us that our world is billions of years old, with the anthropologists pushing the beginning of man farther and farther back in time. Two years ago, while on a photographic safari in East Africa, I camped near the Olduvai Gorge, where Professor L. S. B. Leakey in 1960 discovered the fossil bones of an ancestor of ours estimated to be 1,300,000 years old, and where he found the remains of a possible progenitor of man some 20,000,000 years old. The individual seems insignificant in this perspective of aeons of time and the immensity of space.

The social scientists also contribute to this impression of insignificance. They too deal with fantastic figures. The demographers report that before the year 2000, the world's population will double its present figure to over six billion, with 1,600,000,000 Chinese alone. Educators predict over ten million students in American colleges by 1975. The economists have long since accustomed us to thinking in terms of billions, what with an annual federal budget of over $120 billion, a national debt ceiling just raised to $365 billion, and an annual gross national product that in 1967 will exceed three-fourths of a trillion dollars.

These and similar figures that we deal with daily make the number "one" seem very small and insignificant indeed. The developments of our society, moreover, from plans for one-thousand-passenger airplanes to mergers involving giant business and industrial interests, are on an ever vaster and vaster scale, so that our lives seem endlessly caught up in bigness; the single individual tends to feel helpless in the midst of this mass world of ours.

The sense of helplessness, of insignificance, is further enhanced by three other aspects of modern life. These suggest that man has little control over his own destiny, that he is the prey of conditions or forces about which he can do little or nothing, in short, that it is mockery to claim, with the poet, that man is the master of his fate, the captain of his soul. One of these factors contributing to this point of view is the fatalistic determinism of some of the behavioral scientists. The sociologists, for example, often lay the blame for what a person is not on the individual, but on society. Psychologists maintain that we are coming closer and closer to predictability in the field of human behavior and some of them suggest that the time will come when "we can direct human destiny as easily and as competently as we now control atomic fission." God spare the day!

Another phenomenon of our day which contributes to this sense of futility so far as the individual is concerned is the publicity given to the techniques of promotion as used in selling and public relations. Our lives are dominated by the mass media of communications. We appear to be at the mercy of the great advertising agencies. We know about the opinion-makers, the hidden persuaders, the power elite. We are aware that we are being subjected to constant propaganda, even in the press. We suspect that our thinking is being done for us, that we are being manipulated and exploited, and that, in general, there is little which we, as individuals, can do about it.

The third factor that contributes to our feeling of helplessness and insignificance is what for years has been called the "cold war," but which in Southeast Asia is now a very hot war indeed, and, unfortunately, war at its ugliest and most sordid. As the conflict is enlarged, our manpower commitment increased—it appears likely that a further buildup of troops will bring our total strength in Viet Nam to about half a million American men by the end of the year—and our operations accordingly stepped up, such escalation forces us to live daily with the nightmarish thought that the powder keg upon which we are sitting may blow up at any time and we can do nothing about it. We know that civilization, perhaps mankind itself, hangs in the balance; that the power of destruction now in man's hands is total. We know too that not only the President or the Secretary of State by miscalculation or error or even downright stubbornness may lead us into the third world war, but also that a young officer in charge of a defense post somewhere, or piloting a bomber toward some target, possibly dangerously close to Red China, may unwittingly trigger the third world war and perhaps bring the world crashing down on our heads. The uncertainty and the fear affect us all, but especially college students who are graduating this May and June. The draft hanging over the heads of men graduates makes them especially aware of how little they may be in control of even their immediate future. Long-laid plans hang in a balance of uncertainty.

I could set forth more of these factors in our daily lives that on the one hand seem to make man smaller and smaller and on the other to shift the control of his destiny from himself to others. But I have suggested enough of the forces at work in the world that contribute to his sense of frustration and insignificance and helplessness.

The result is that the individual today is losing himself in the group; he becomes a face in the lonely crowd, a statistic in a report, a number stored in a computer. In any case, he is convinced that as one individual, he doesn't count for much. He looks to others to provide the answers for him, to take action to settle his and the world's problems. As a matter of fact, a study reported last year, finds "distinct signs of growth of a totalitarian mentality in American youth," because, the researcher maintained, people who worry about events beyond their control, such as a world war, tend to favor totalitarian control of society. The military coup in Greece, according to Max Lerner in a recent column, was possible because of the Greek people's willingness to scuttle their traditional democratic traditions in order to leave the answers to the nation's complex problems to dictators. Here in America the individual, especially the college graduate, tends to throw up his hands and lament, What can I do in this world in which the forces in control are so vast and so indifferent to the individual? This is an attitude that disturbs me very much. The college graduate in 1967 is looking toward the world outside his present academic walls, and wondering not just what the future holds for him, but whether he can do anything about his future. What good, he asks himself, are ambition and determination and making plans in this kind of a world?

I would urge you Vernon Court students to set yourselves firmly against this point of view. I believe that not only does the individual still count for something, but also that he remains the key to the world and what happens to it. Regardless of what we have learned from the scientists regarding the vastness and the impersonality of the universe, of the trends toward bigness that are everywhere evident, and of our seeming inability to control our own lives, I say to you that in the last analysis the fate of the world lies in the hands of individuals, of men and women like you and me, and that ambition and determination and planning are significant and desirable for each one of us. I say also that the problem of what we will do with our lives is not greatly different in the space age from what it was a century ago when our country was recovering from the Civil War, or three centuries ago when our Puritan forefathers were carving a new nation out of the wilderness, or indeed 2500 years ago when Socrates exhorted his fellow citizens to live virtuously in ancient Athens. I would have you understand that the reason for all the economic, social, and political agencies that have developed throughout history is not the welfare of society with a capital S or of mankind with a capital M—their goal is the welfare of the individual man and woman. I would have you understand also that the individual man and woman definitely help determine that welfare.

Consider why all of us are worried about a third World War, particularly about the escalation of the conflict in South Viet Nam. Impersonal and ideological forces such as nationalism and communism are at work contributing to conditions of tension and conflict that have led us to the present dismal situation in Southeast Asia and that can lead to a world war. But communism was loosed in the world by Marx and Lenin, and now is preached by Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. Consider some of the movers and shakers of today's world from Castro to de Gaulle to Nasser.

Above all, consider that it is clearly evident that President Johnson alone is responsible for the final decisions affecting our involvement in Viet Nam. It is individuals who make the decisions that set forces in motion that subsequently seem inevitable. If certain individuals had the intelligence, the courage, and the will to change current trends, the great burden of armaments could be lifted from the world's shoulders, peace could be restored, and the fear of annihilation disappear from the earth.

Okay, you may say, of course individuals such as President Johnson and General de Gaulle and other big shots like them count for something and influence history. But I'm just an ordinary person—I don't really count in the vast scheme of things. But you do!

You count more than ever, and can make your influence felt more widely and more positively than ever before. Just look around you in your own home town, and you will find ample evidence of what individuals can do to improve their communities if they really put their minds and energies to work on the task.

If you want a superb example of what one determined and dedicated individual can do in this world of vast giants and in the face of seemingly impossible odds, consider the case of the young lawyer, Ralph Nader. Here is a modern David attacking the Goliaths of American industry—the auto manufacturers—and not only surviving but literally bringing them to account.

There is no cause for young people to feel insignificant or helpless; it is wrong for you to be indifferent or apathetic on the basis that the world is too vast, its problems too complex for one individual to do anything important about them. The single individual counts and counts frightfully in the modern world. The world will be what individuals want it to be. The world will be a better world, a happier world, a safer world for us and our children and our children's children if the individuals making it up are certain kinds of individuals. Let me now very briefly suggest several characteristics that I would urge you students to strive for. I would point out just three broad objectives to serve you as guideposts as you face the future.

First, make knowledge your guide to action. In this complex world, our decisions must be taken only after reasoned judgment based upon the facts. You have received a good foundation at Vernon Court for making this a guiding principle through life. But in view of the rapid changes in knowledge, because research is constantly adding to the world's stock of information, you cannot be either educated in the intellectual and cultural sense or competent in your profession, if you assume that your education is complete when you graduate from here, or when you have earned a B. A., should you continue your formal education, as I hope many of you will; or even when you have achieved a Ph. D. should you continue further in graduate school. Education is a lifetime process, and if you are to make wise decisions and act intelligently, you must never stop learning.

Second, maintain intellectual integrity. Think for yourself. Fight pressures for conformity of thought. Be independent. Remember the Rhode Island tradition of independence, symbolized in the statue of Independent Man on top of the State House in Providence. Remember also that independence is the basis of freedom—and in the words of Pericles, "the secret of happiness is freedom."

Third, set high values for yourself. Studies of the values of college students have proved uniformly depressing. Professor Philip Jacob, for example, found that "the great majority of students appear unabashedly self-centered. They aspire for material gratifications for themselves and their families. They intend to look out for themselves first and expect others to do likewise." Though he was writing several years ago, even now after several years of student involvement in civil rights, of unrest on college and university campuses, and of support of such service agencies as the Peace Corps and Vista, the vast majority of students are still uncommitted to high values. But unless young people have higher values, unless they put consideration for mankind above self-interest, the world is indeed doomed. Unless they recognize the importance of moral and spiritual values as guides for conduct, their lives, regardless of any material success, or of the power or influence that is attained, will be a failure.

If you graduates strive to make these three guiding principles govern your lives, you have great days ahead of you. I am convinced that never before have young people, both men and women, had such a promising future. The challenge to your best abilities and effort are greater than ever; the opportunities are comparable. The world, in my opinion, is on the threshold of its greatest development in recorded history. Man holds within his grasp the possibility of ending everywhere the age-old scourges of hunger and disease and war. Given individuals with the intelligence and good will and moral courage to bring it about, the world can achieve golden days of peace and prosperity such as it has never known.

I envy you college graduates of today. It's an exciting time to be young and graduating from college, far more exciting than when I graduated thirty-seven years ago. It's exciting because the future holds out such great promise for you; it is a future needing and demanding as never before, your talents and your energies and your dedication to something bigger than yourself. You enjoy unusual opportunities for service and achievement and happiness. Those of you who are continuing your formal education, as I understand about one-fourth of you are, must wait several more years before you can grasp these opportunities. But whether it is this June, or June of 1969, or even later, when you terminate your full-time studies, the challenge is there. I hope that perhaps these remarks will set you to thinking about these opportunities and about the years ahead and what you want to do with those years.

May I again congratulate you upon your graduation today and wish you good luck and Godspeed in the future.

JOB CORPS WOMAN

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a young constituent of mine, Willye Evans, now a resident adviser at the Guthrie Job Corps Center in Oklahoma. Willye heard of the Job Corps by accident. She was a college dropout and was very uncertain as to what her future might be. She decided to give the Job Corps an opportunity to present its program to her. It was not easy for Willye at first. She was homesick, and she admits she was disappointed.

An article appearing in the Daily Oklahoman tells of Willye's story, how she dropped out of Langston University for financial reasons, became uncertain, enrolled in the Job Corps, and has had several interesting jobs since she left the Job Corps. But perhaps the most important part of Willye's story is that she wanted to return and help train other young girls in the Job Corps so that they too would have a chance to make a better life for themselves.

I urge all of my colleagues to read Willye's story and, under unanimous consent, include it in the RECORD at this point:

"ACCIDENT" CHANGES LIFE FOR JOB CORPS WOMAN

(By Ford Hubbert)

By accident, Willye Evans, resident advisor at the Guthrie Job Corps Center, heard of the Women's Job Corps.

The Idabel college dropout answered the telephone at her mother's home two years ago and through a conversation with a Job Corps representative who was inquiring about a cousin of hers, she learned of the program.

"She asked me if I knew where my cousin was, she wanted to talk with him and see if he wanted to join the Job Corps," Willye said.

"I asked what Job Corps was and she told me. I attended Langston University for one year but had to drop out because I didn't have the money to continue," she said. "I made it the first year because of scholarships."

After her first encounter with the program, Willye was called into a Job Corps recruiting center where she was tested and interviewed. Soon she was sent to the Women's Job Corps training center in Los Angeles.

"I was afraid," she said.

"I had never been away from home and I was homesick. Building was still under way at the center and I was disappointed.

"But I stuck it out."

Willye was the second graduate from the Women's Job Corps program and the first graduate to be placed in employment with a private industry.

Her first job was "a great experience." She was employed with Consolidated American Service, Inc., in Washington, D.C.

She quit the job after eight months to take a position at the Job Corps center that opened last year in Guthrie.

"I felt I should put back into Women's Job Corps what I had received," she said.

"If it hadn't been for the Job Corps I still would be in Idabel looking for a job."

"My whole life has been changed. I've been to places and seen things I never knew existed.

"When they told me about Job Corps and what it could do for me, I didn't believe them.

"Even when they called me in for an interview with the man from Washington, I didn't believe him. I couldn't see how all these things could be happening to me.

"You don't know what it is not be able to believe them, but nothing like this (getting a job) had ever happened to me," she said.

Willye completed the Job Corps' secretary training the same year she began it.

While in Washington she was a special consultant for a group of exchange students from Africa. She was mentioned in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD twice.

Like many other trainees at the center, Willye had to live by rules.

One of the first, listed in a booklet given each new recruit when she leaves her city for the training center, was, "women must not wear rollers in public areas." Another was "no hitchhiking."

Other rules came under headings such as attendance and schedules, care of property, obeying local, state and federal laws and manners and appearance.

"If the rules were not obeyed, it meant loss of pay or promotion or a discharge from the Job Corps," Willye said.

At Guthrie, she is a counselor in a dormitory where trainees unload their problems.

"You'd be surprised at the kind of problems these girls have," she said. "Each thinks hers is the worst. I did."

Girls, between ages of 16 and 21, are eligible for the program. They must be involved in a series of circumstances to qualify. High on the list are "reared in impoverished surroundings" and "unable to find or hold an adequate job."

Eleven training centers located across the United States, with the addition of four new ones opening currently, are providing vocational training in secretarial and clerical skills, bookkeeping, educational studies and home and family life and personal hygiene.

Oklahomans have been entering the centers at the rate of 25 per month since the first one opened two years ago, a spokesman for the state headquarters of the Women in Community Service, Inc. (WICS), recruiters for the program, said Wednesday.

But more are needed to fill new quotas. She said the state's new goal is 50 per month.

They are needed to fill the four new training centers and to fill vacancies left by graduating trainees.

WICS headquarters are in the Federal Building in Oklahoma City.

WE CANNOT AFFORD POVERTY—IT'S JUST TOO EXPENSIVE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert N. Hilkert, first vice president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, addressing the 41st annual meeting of the National Council of YMCA's, in Philadelphia on May 12, 1967, offered a very practical and positive view of the antipoverty program and the response it demands of every American.

Mr. Hilkert, a new member of the Business Leadership Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity of the Office of Economic Opportunity, explains in simple terms the meaning and need, of what I believe to be a newly coined phrase—"job power." His address should be read not only by every Member of the Congress, but every person in this great country of ours—for we must all be concerned with the well-being of America.

The address follows:

Responsible Citizen Action

I think it is accurate to say that, materially, our country has done more good for more people than any country in all of history. A system that has succeeded in raising the living standards of 80 percent of its people to present levels deserves some kind of medal of merit.

This point I want to emphasize so that in speaking of a job still to be done I convey no impression that I am downgrading America. One can point to the achievements of our society without being callous toward those who are in need. It does, however, point to the moral problem.

The bald fact is that ours is hardly a livable society for a large number of underprivileged, deprived and handicapped people. Our goal must be to make our society livable for all. No one can feel comfortable about an America which is accurately described both at home and abroad as a land in which dire poverty exists in the midst of unmatched affluence.

A decent America simply had to declare war on poverty. However much we may differ about the logistics of this war, no moral and rational person can quarrel about our need to wage it.

The problems are difficult, complex and massive. They must be solved in ways which do not sacrifice the very forces which have operated to make ours an economically strong society. We must not be trapped by soft-headed answers to baffling economic problems.

The quest is for economic and social justice. The road is rough and tortuous. We must pursue it vigorously, imaginatively, and steadfastly, no matter how rough the way. Our society is on trial. Harry Emerson Fosdick used to say, "The basic test of any society is what happens to the underdog."

The war on poverty must be waged because we as citizens must meet our responsibilities which so clearly fall within the framework of justice and morality. Just as our country could not exist half-slave and half-free, so it cannot continue to be 80 per cent affluent and 20 per cent poverty-ridden. The call is for responsible citizen action in an all-out effort to reach those whom the Scriptures call "the least of these."

But the problem is not only moral! It is economic too. Poverty is an economic drag on our nation. We cannot achieve fullness of economic health and strength with this weight around our neck. The plain and basic truth is that we cannot afford poverty. It's just too expensive.

While I wish to make some comments on the subject of social welfare and the welfare state, I want first to say some things about the anti-poverty war, the programs arising from the Equal Opportunity Act of 1964. I do this first for the reason that this activity is to be clearly differentiated from "welfare" as commonly conceived. When we talk about the anti-poverty war we are not talking about traditional "welfare" programs. We are talking about *investing in America*. We are talking about *investing* in citizens. We are talking about investment programs which pay off far more than we lay out. We are talking about converting unemployables to employables and tax-eaters to tax-payers. We are not talking about merely doubling our money, we are talking about increasing it many times over. When the businessman says, "to make money, you have to spend money" he doesn't regard this as a handout procedure. Well, the anti-poverty programs are not handouts either.

Do businessmen really believe what I am saying? Do I sound way off base to any hard-hitting, profit-seeking, I-have-to-meet-a-payroll industrialist? Well, let's see.

Two days ago I attended in Washington a meeting of the Business Leadership Advisory Committee of the Office of Equal Opportunity (home of Sargent Shriver). I am a new member, and so I was "all ears." Seated around the tables were some 50 top officials of blue chip companies of America. I wish every person who has, at one time or another, accused businessmen of lacking social responsibility could have heard them. They told not only what they believed, but what they are presently doing, and what they intend to do, in support of the anti-poverty war. To a man they are not only fully behind the program, but to a man (and it is a bipartisan group) they are fully behind the President's proposed anti-poverty legislation. What struck me so forcefully was that they were not just "going along", but they were enthusiastic, and they were creative and innovative in giving the advice which is so genuinely and eagerly sought by our government, and which is being acted upon.

To be sure, these men are socially responsible men. But they are also hard-hitting free enterprisers who have to meet a payroll, and have to face stockholders. They believe that eliminating, or at least minimizing, poverty is essential to the *economic* health not only of the country as a whole, *but to their companies*.

This was one of the best examples I have seen of government and the private sectors working together in an all-out effort to solve our top socio-economic problem.

Many of us here today have special interests in supportive services. We need to remember that basic problems of human need are not solely related to health, welfare, and recreation services, especially as narrowly conceived. The crucial problem is income.

Let's look at this in terms of a power concept. Power, of course, is very much in the news these days—white, black, military, atomic, and so on. We don't hear quite enough about job power. Perhaps it is the most important of all.

Job power could virtually eliminate poverty. It could shrink the need for private charity and public welfare to a fraction of its present proportions. It could greatly reduce crime and delinquency. It could aid immeasurably in the struggle for civil rights and human dignity. Job power could accomplish all these things, and more, *because jobs create income*. And, as you in this room know well, when a man's income is adequate he can, to a large extent, satisfy his physical and psychological needs pretty much on his own. Spiritual needs are something else again, so I won't try to be too inclusive.

I am not saying job power *will* do all these things—only that it *could*—in very large measure—if somehow we could get it functioning with full efficiency. And that's far easier said than done. There are many problems to overcome, but there are practical ways by which much more job power can be generated.

These businessmen who were gathered in Washington two days ago talked this way. These men know that a strong economy, one characterized by sound, sustainable economic growth depends in our society upon valid profit expectations. They know that without a strong, well-functioning economy, based upon profitable business, industrial and agricultural foundations, there can be no "Great Society." Knowing all this, they are helping to fight the war on poverty. They believe they are investing in America. They believe they are exercising sound business judgment. They believe that what is good for the country is good for their companies. They believe that it is in the interest of our country and of the nation's business for them to be working *with government* in the field of *private job creation*.

The experience of meeting with these businessmen made it much easier for me to understand what Vice President Humphrey said some time back when he predicted that:

"In five years the biggest supporters of the war on poverty will not be the social workers, but the big corporation executives, the lawyers, and the bankers."

If Wednesday was a sample, we are well on the way.

To be sure, it is going to cost money, and I'm not for wasting money—it's even part of my occupational bias as well as my New England upbringing. But it would take a lot to convince me that we can't afford to do all that is proposed, remembering that OEO programs are dedicated *primarily to training, education, and motivation*—none of which is in any "handout" category. An article in Newsweek (April 2, 1967) points out that among industrialized nations (with two small exceptions) total taxation in America, even with Vietnam, is a lower percentage of gross national product than in any other country. We're not bleeding to death. I don't want to see us cut down on our investment in educating, training, and motivating the underprivilegd to become useful members of our society—using the argument that "we can't afford it." It wouldn't be true. It would only mean that we don't want to change any of our priorities and that we would rather not make much of a sacrifice for the common good. And with this let me leave the businessman, and turn to government; and from anti-poverty to social welfare.

Having been reared and educated in New England, I have found it hard to come to the conclusion which I now hold—which is that there is no solution to the social welfare problems of this nation without government involvement on a massive scale. The expenditures required—and my belief does not rest solely upon money cost—are so vast that they are far beyond anything that can be expected from the voluntary movement. Government is in the welfare business now, it will continue to be in it. It is in it because there is no alternative and because the welfare of the people *is* a continuing responsibility of government.

Not everyone believes this as strongly as I do. One reason is that many do not want to believe it. They long for a return to a world that was. They do not look dispassionately or always compassionately upon the world that is. It is, of course, hard to give up a belief long held that every man is both the captain of his soul and the master of his fate, poetic thoughts, plainly not true in the society in which we now live. I am sorry to say that some of my friends who are fast on the draw in criticizing government involvement and intervention are quite slow in setting forth feasible alternative solutions.

Having said this, I quickly turn to a grave fear. I have a certain fear of government, a fear born of the lessons of history. What I fear specifically is that the American concept of government of the people, by the people, and for the people may become simply, and tragically, only government *for* the people.

Here then, is the dilemma. On the one horn is the conviction that without a deeply involved government the needs of the people—all the people—cannot possibly be met. On the other horn is the fear that government the servant of the people may become the master of the people, and that the most effective and seductive way for government to become master is to travel the welfare road.

I am sure that there are many thoughtful people who find themselves struggling with this dilemma. I am sure that most of us who are crusaders for voluntarism are wrestling with it.

The trouble with referring to an issue as a dilemma is that we too quickly conclude that there are but two choices and that only one can and must be chosen. I do not believe that such is the case in this issue. An optimist by nature, possibly naively so, I believe it is possible to have the best of two worlds—the world of government and the world of voluntarism. My optimism is based on the belief that not only do we need government *but government needs us*.

Two years ago, Mayor Arthur Naftalin of Minneapolis spoke to this point by saying:

"The federal government has discovered this need again and again. As many new welfare programs have been undertaken the federal government has made clear its feeling that their success requires more than government action, that the problems are too deep and too broad for government to cope with by itself."

He continued with numerous illustrations to demonstrate that:

"There is now a long and growing list of federal programs which are based on social planning on the part of local communities and on the part of nongovernmental agencies."

My own observations and experience convince me that government does realize the need to work with us, the volunteers. It is in fact working with many volunteers right now, and this is not new.

I am not sure that enough of us are convinced of the need for volunteers to work with government, and so our educational program must be directed to the firming up of this conviction. If we do not believe that an informed and enlightened citizenry can influence its government, then we don't really believe that our kind of government can work in accordance with fundamental American principles in this new day.

To influence government policy, government legislation, and government operation is a *major field for responsible citizen action*. For us not to be playing on this field is to be mere observers from the sidelines, and the game isn't won from there. This business of working with and influencing government at all levels is the most essential ingredient in the new dynamics of social planning. We can no longer travel alone.

I do think that too many people become overwrought emotionally with the term "welfare state." Too often it is a slogan used to whip up opposition to almost any kind of progressive legislation which one does not personally favor. We don't pin down our definitions. After all, who wants to live in an America whose government is *not* concerned with the welfare of people, a government not concerned with protecting and fostering the unalienable rights of man?

With equal fervor we must link this thought with another. Who wants to live in an America in which the people, as individuals and joined in voluntary association, fail to shoulder in substantial degree the welfare burdens of a responsible citizenry? Americans who take kindly to that government which "governs least" need to remember that it can be had only in a land in which "citizens do most."

Americans cannot enjoy the great privileges of citizenship without performing the duties which that citizenship places upon us.

I have been talking about "we" and "us"—meaning those of us who are active participants in the voluntary movement. *We* must now adapt to the new situation in which the concept of "we" has been greatly expanded. Just as democratic government must be broadly based, representative of all sectors of the community, so too must voluntarism be broadly based, representative of the total community. Citizen involvement cannot be limited—and indeed is not now limited—to the traditional, long-established, so-called "power structures" of our communities. The real power must be vested in the many, and not in what Gunnar Myrdal has called "the lively few." We are turning to the concept of the "lively many" as the only condition which befits the American concept—of, by, and for the people.

This expansion, this change, is not in every respect occurring in the most orderly and tidy ways. Democratic processes do not come easily and quickly to many who have hitherto had little experience with those processes, but we can remind ourselves that even our forefathers did not find the Constitutional Convention altogether orderly.

It is *indeed* much more difficult to work efficiently and effectively within a broadly-based order comprising individuals with heterogeneous backgrounds of experience than it is to work in the less broadly-based, more homogenous and more comfortable circles.

Nothing could be more tragic than for the new order not to include the old. When we talk about the involvement of the citizenry, we must exclude no segment, including that to which we belong, whatever that segment may be, or be called.

The new dynamics calls for adaptations on the part of volunteers (and public servants too) and calls for the exercise of a high degree of patience, tolerance, and understanding by both old and new. We must not be overly disturbed or influenced by name-callers, the few messiahs struggling for power who would have the community believe that progress will come only when we are rid of professionals, social workers, and all who comprise what they refer to as the "old establishment."

I should like to comment on what has been, and still is, a controversial subject, namely, the direct involvement of the citizens who are indigenous to our community "pockets of poverty," those beneficiaries of "community action programs" who are to be involved "to the maximum extent feasible." While certain aspects of implementation need far more thought than has been given to them up to now, *there is one central idea that must not continue to be controversial*. It is that responsible citizen action must include all groups, *including the economically and culturally deprived*. There should be no question in our minds that our disadvantaged citizens can and will provide new insights and perspectives, and will create a new community enlightenment. We see this happening. We observe a growing and justly deserved respect for the poor and dispossessed of our society, and a growing confidence in their ability to contribute to the making of a better society, not just for them, but for all of us.

Having said this I want to express strong disagreement with an idea that is spreading throughout cities, at least in some quarters, that *only* the poor comprehend the problems of poverty. This is as much an absurdity as to say that physicians cannot understand illnesses with which they have not personally been afflicted. It is unfortunate that there is developing a feeling that there is no diagnosis like self-diagnosis, and that there are no remedies like folk remedies.

In this *highly complex work* of social welfare the insights, abilities, and skills that are required are many and varied. Among these are executive and administrative abilities, business judgment and foresight, analytical talents and fiscal competence, economic as well as social perspective, and a knowledge of history. These essential attributes, and many others, are *not necessarily associated with low incomes*. The qualifications for handling huge, complex, costly programs go beyond sincerity, dedication, grass-root sociological insight, empathy, and personal income.

This is why we must make the big pitch to enlist our best businessmen, and I use that term broadly. They simply must become actively involved in the work of social welfare. Bear in mind that these programs are going to go on *whether they are in or out*. I just happen to believe that it will be better for the nation if they are in.

This is equally true of the professional community, including—in fact, especially inincluding—the social work professions. Responsible citizen action rests upon the ability of the community to achieve unity of forces and utilization of all pertinent talents—to the "maximum extent feasible."

We cannot plunge ourselves into this work for the primary purpose of protecting vested interests. Our interests must be in promoting the well-being of *all* the people, including many whom the voluntary agencies have traditionally not served too well. Our concern must be not only with the victims of inequity and injustice, individuals in trouble. *Our concern must also be for the social ills* which cause so many of our citizens to be in trouble. We shall have to broaden our interests to include concerns which go beyond those typically coming within the immediate purview of health and welfare agencies. You in the YMCA's are doing this.

I know that our society must look to government for many things, but I really believe that the *quality* of the society that we look for in America will best be determined by the collective influence of volunteers, working with government. Some have spoken of this as a partnership. I happen to believe that it ought never be a true partnership, as I understand the word, because it is important for public institutions and private institutions to maintain a continuous healthy state of tension. In a true partnership it is too easy for one to fall for the ways of the other, and I'm afraid of that. My fear stems from an old adage about purse strings.

There is a lot of hard work ahead, for all of us. The goal—that of achieving a better society—is worthy of our best efforts. We can succeed. Remember the words in the Book of Nehemiah, "So built they the wall, for the people had a mind to work."

CUT OUT THE CIRCUS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic objectives of my legislative career has been to seek a shortening of our presidential campaigns. Since I began this fight back in 1960 many people have supported my position. The most recently announced advocate of the shorter campaign is Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial, which appeared in the Hartford Times on June 1, 1967, in the RECORD as another illustration of the widespread editorial support for cutting the length of presidential campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of testifying today before the Senate Committee on Finance which is studying legislation on political campaign financing methods. I recommended to the committee that they incorporate my proposal for a shorter presidential campaign in the bill which they will propose, and I also include my statement to the Senate Finance Committee:

[From the Hartford Times, June 1, 1967]

Shortening the Run

Once again agitation is beginning for shorter presidential campaigns.

The latest efforts have been launched by Senator John J. Williams, Delaware Republican, who says that the best way to cut impositions implicit in skyrocketing presidential election campaign costs would be to slash the campaigning period drastically.

Senator Williams thinks that five weeks would be sufficient campaign time in contrast to the present custom of carrying on for two or more months.

Congressman John S. Monagan, who represents our Fifth District, has been agitating for years for shorter election campaigns. He has said that he considers about 60 days enough for candidates to explain their views to the voters.

This is a huge country. It used to take a lot of time for candidates to cover even a small part of it in person. But radio, television and swift air transportation have erased the earlier necessity for protracted campaigns.

Today, candidates can get their messages into millions of homes in a single day and touch half a dozen states to address the people in several cities on one brief tour.

After the first few weeks of campaigning, candidates begin to hash over the same topics with such frequency the people tend to become fed up and lose interest.

Shorter campaigns are going to come some day. Why not in 1968?

Political Campaign Financing Methods

(Statement of Representative John S. Monagan, Democrat of Connecticut, before the Senate Committee on Finance, June 7, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, ever since I was first elected to Congress in 1958 one of my objectives has been to shorten our Presidential campaigns. Specifically I have introduced legislation in every Congress since 1960 seeking to cut the length of these contests. I doubt if there is a political expert or commentator who would disagree with my position that our presidential campaigns are unnecessarily long, physically taxing on the candidates, unduly boring for the general public and extraordinarily wasteful in terms of the money spent and the physical and intellectual efforts expended.

I am testifying before this Committee today to assert my conviction that if the Federal government is going to get involved in the subsidization of presidential election campaigns then it must, as a prerequisite to this involvement, set realistic limits on the length of the quadrennial circuses to which our presidential and vice presidential candidates are otherwise irrevocably committed.

Mr. Chairman, my efforts up to now have not been successful. Unfortunately, the strength of the opposition to long presidential campaigns dissipates rapidly after each election. It is not a meat and potatoes issue.

The enactment of the "Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966" in the last session of Congress provided, I thought, an excellent vehicle for calling attention to this needed reform of our campaign procedure. Thus, on the 1st day of the 90th Congress I introduced H.R. 892 amending the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. My amendment would have imposed a further limitation on the distribution of funds to a political party so that no funds would have been available to a party if its candidate for President or Vice President were nominated more than 60 days before the day established for the appointment of electors. Title III Section 1 of the U.S. Code provides that "The electors of President and Vice President shall be appointed in each State, on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in every 4th year succeeding every election of a President and Vice President." Thus if my amendment were now in effect, in the 1968 Presidential election no political party could hold its nominating convention before September 6, 1968 and still be eligible for funds under the Campaign Fund Act.

My bill, H.R. 892, is no longer relevant in the light of the enactment of the investment tax credit bill which contained a rider making the campaign Fund Act inoperative until guidelines are enacted by Congress. Nevertheless the objective of H.R. 892 can, and should be incorporated in the bill reported by this Committee.

Some may question the connection between shortening Presidential campaigns and a bill providing for Federal financial support for such campaigns.

The first and most obvious connection is that if the Federal government is going to subsidize these campaigns it should be interested in limiting this expense by preventing waste. Sixty days is more than enough time to bring the issues to the public and debate them thoroughly; in fact, in almost every civilized country in the world 30 days is the electoral period. We can do the same as Israel, Britain or India. Second, President Johnson in his recent message proposing the financing of campaigns said "Public participation in the processes of government is the essence of democracy. Public confidence in those processes strengthens democracy." I submit that long, drawn-out campaigns tax the endurance of our citizens and undermine their "confidence in . . . democracy." Even more important, they eventually tend to bore people, which is even more serious. Third, the bill recommended by the President is tentatively entitled "The Election Campaign Reform Act of 1967." No reform of our campaign procedures can be complete unless we come to grips with one of the most glaring deficiencies in our system: The inordinate amount of time that we devote to campaigning.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Federal government can play an important role in stimulating "public participation in the process of Government." We are living in the 20th century, however, with communication satellites, jet-powered commercial airplanes, network TV and radio we continue to tolerate a political campaign system which has not changed since the days of torch fire parades. Modern transportation renders long campaigns unnecessary, modern communications render long campaigns wasteful. I would not begrudge the time if it were serving a useful purpose, but in the political business, the area of diminishing returns on campaign exchanges is very rapidly attained.

This Committee and this Congress can discharge its obligation to the American people by proposing and enacting an Election Reform Act which will eliminate one of our most obvious political liabilities—the 4 to 5 month Presidential campaign.

COUNTY SHARE OF FOREST RECEIPTS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill to the House which would clarify the laws relating to the disposition of moneys obtained from the sale of materials from the national forests.

In 1908, the Congress set down the basic policy for the sharing of revenues derived from our national forest reserves. The law provided that 25 percent of the revenues should be turned over to the State and local governments in lieu of the taxes which would have been paid, had the land been in private ownership.

The creation of the national forests early in this century has had a dramatic effect on the State and local taxation in the Western States. It has precluded the ad valorem tax from millions of acres of productive land. But the burden is even heavier, for the State and local governments still have the responsibility of administering the State police powers over these large areas. They still have to provide for the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens in our national forests. And the States still have the primary responsibility for education and road construction in these remote areas of our country.

It was in recognition of this latter burden that Congress enacted the revenue-sharing provision in the 1908 act. And, until recent times this law has served to support the administration of State responsibilites in national forest lands.

It is unfortunate that the drafters of the 1908 act did not specify that the 25-percent payments should come from the gross receipts of the timber sale, as was obviously the intent of Congress at that time.

It is unfortunate because the Forest Service has chosen to interpret the act as requiring the 25-percent fund to be taken—not from the gross receipts, but from the net receipts of the timber sale. This interpretation has had two serious consequences.

First. It has provided the Forest Service with a discretionary "slush fund" for which they are accountable to no one. The money can be turned over to the States or it can be applied to forest service expenditures for which they are unwilling, or unable to receive congressional appropriations.

Second. This interpretation has also left the local county governments with slowly diminishing returns from the 25-percent fund. In addition, the local county officials are forced to budget, not only with the erratic fluctuations of the timber market, but also they must guess how much 25-percent money the regional forester will allow them.

Mr. Speaker, the act of 1908 has been misinterpreted by the Forest Service. It is clearly a case of "administrative legislation," and it is the purpose of my bill to return the administration of the act to its original congressional intent.

A HOPEFUL SIGN IN THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the United

Nations Security Council's appeal for an immediate cease-fire in the Middle East is a hopeful sign.

It is admittedly only the first step, but a very necessary step, in the direction of peace.

The Security Council's unanimous approval of the cease-fire resolution brings credit to the efforts of President Johnson, and of Ambassador Goldberg, who have labored tirelessly to find a solution to a situation fraught with great danger.

I am certain that the Council's action was also favorably affected by the eloquent plea of Mr. Abba Eban, the Foreign Minister of Israel, who once again demonstrated his earnest desire "to build a bridge to peace."

These three great leaders, with whom I have had close working relations for many years, deserve our congratulations and commendation.

In taking the floor today, I want to express my personal conviction and my hope that Foreign Minister Abba Eban's three principles, outlined last night to the Security Council, will merit our full support.

Those principles simply ask that the reality of Israel's statehood be accepted; that her historic roots in the Middle East be acknowledged; and that the disputes which have rent the area be solved in a peaceful manner.

Certainly no one can challenge the reasonableness of these three propositions. They are based on reality—and they attest to Israel's desire to achieve peace with justice.

Mr. Speaker, the U.N. Security Council has rendered a great service. But the road to peace is long and there are many tasks which still lie ahead.

For that reason, I want to urge the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole to continue in the effort to find a lasting solution to the Middle East conflict.

The fighting is still to be brought to a stop.

The principle of freedom of navigation is still to be made secure. This applies particularly to navigation through the Suez Canal and the Strait of Tiran.

And the whole complex of controversies relating to national borders, refugees, and the like, remain to be solved.

The United States has worked with the United Nations in taking the first step. We must now move boldy ahead, until the job is finished, committing our best efforts to these vital tasks.

THE REAL TRADE TRENDS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, now that the Kennedy round has been negotiated in Geneva this country should make an effort to determine where we stand competitively in world trade on the eve of the drastic tariff reductions now facing most of our industries.

We would never know from scanning the official statistical reports of the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture that our industries and farms enjoy anything but the most satisfactory competitive position in foreign markets. These Departments would have us believe that we enjoy a whopping export surplus year after year. They have been misleading the public with their padded reports of our exports and deflated reports on the size of our imports.

As a result the public is not aware of the really weak competitive position of this country in private foreign trade, leaving out the goods that we give away or subsidize in order to find a market for them abroad.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the General Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I can say after many months of hearings, that scores of our industries are already suffering from low-cost import competition. If it were not for the defense expenditures numerous industries would be in distress today as a result of imports.

Quite aside from the testimony of the industries that appeared and gave testimony, the more detailed trade statistics which show trends in imports and exports by classes of goods, show that this country is being crowded in foreign markets for our manufactured goods and that we are losing out to other countries. In our own home market for manufactured goods we are also being badly crowded by lower cost imports.

It is in the production of manufactured goods that most of our industrial employment takes place, not in raw materials, and it is a fact that our exports of manufactured goods are lagging while our imports of these goods have been booming. Labor takes the brunt of this trend and will continue to take it. Industry can in many cases cover itself by opening up production abroad, as it has been doing on a grand scale in the past 5 to 10 years. With the exception of exports of machinery and semi-manufactures of chemicals, we are shrinking our export markets through these foreign investments.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD the statement of O. R. Strackbein, who is Chairman of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy. He devotes himself to an analysis of the trends in our imports and exports, with special attention to manufactured goods.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that all Members of this body who are interested in what is happening to our trade—and that should include all of them—should examine this analysis. The story it tells about the trends in our trade cannot be ignored. The handwriting is on the wall.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert at this point the testimony of Mr. Strackbein:

EMPLOYMENT AND IMPORTS

(Statement of O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, before the Dent Subcommittee on Labor, May 24, 1967, on H.R. 478 and H.R. 479)

The completion of the so-called Kennedy Round of tariff reductions brings to a halt, if not to an end, thirty-three years of tariff reductions under the Trade Agreements Program, which was first enacted in 1934.

Under a succession of tariff-reducing agreements and conference the average duties collected by this country on imports subject to a duty has fallen from 50% in the 1931–35 period to 12% in 1965. The effect of the Kennedy Round should bring the average level to 7% or 8%. Some 35% of our imports are on the free list. Averaged over total imports the duty burden will be about 5% at the end of five years, or not far from free trade, when the Kennedy Round reductions take complete effect.

These tariff reductions, because of many trade and economic disruptions in two decades, did not produce a notable surge in imports until 1962. Then they rose 74% between 1961 and 1966, while exports increased only 42%.

However, the 74% average hides important variations that point to a trend in imports that is alarming to many industries. More on this later.

The most characteristic feature of our imports since 1961 has been the relatively greater growth of imports of manufactured goods. These have risen much more rapidly than imports of raw material and crude foodstuffs.

This diversity of trends was no accident. It reflects the anatomy of our competitive position in the world of trade.

If rising imports reflect relatively lower costs of foreign goods, which they do if domestic industries are not able to compete with them in the domestic market, we should be interested in the economic source of the relative cheapness of imported goods.

Why do foreign producers and manufacturers succeed in achieving lower costs in an increasing number of products over American producers?

One of several answers suggest themselves. One might be that they are more efficient producers, that they get more output from their workers per hour than we do in this country. Another possibility would lie in having access to cheaper raw materials, either because of richer soil, a more suitable climate in the case of agricultural products or richer ore or other mineral deposits than we enjoy in this country; or because, again, they are more efficient producers even if they lack superiority in soil, climate and mineral deposits.

The other possible explanation of cheaper goods would be found in lower foreign wages in realtion to worker productivity compared with this country. This combination would account for the lower costs without suggesting greater productive efficiency. Very low wages could tolerate a wide margin of lower productivity, and yet result in lower unit costs.

Usually it is contended that American manufacturers are more efficient than their foreign competitors. Europeans, in fact, complain about what they call the technological gap between themselves and this country. This would mean that while our workers may not be more diligent or industrious they nevertheless produce more per hours than their foreign competitors because of the superior machinery with which they work.

It is indeed strongly contended that we can afford to pay higher wages than the other countries precisely because our productivity does exceed their level; and the contention is justifiable in most instances. It is one of the modern mysteries, however, how instantly this superior efficiency disappears when American producers and manufacturers complain about their inability to compete with imports. They are then accused immediately by American importers and a variety of seemingly omniscient editorial writers of inefficiency. Otherwise they should obviously be able to compete with low-wage countries. Inefficiency is the handicap from which they suffer.

It is equally remarkable how quickly an American industry can be switched by these apologists for low-wage foreign competition from a highly efficient industrial giant that can well afford to pay higher wages than other countries, into a backward, complacent and inefficient industry, burdened with obsolete machinery and equipment, when they find imports a menace. There seems to be no exception to this magical switch. Even the steel industry falls a victim to it.

When that industry points to an average wage exclusive of fringe benefits reaching $3.57 an hour early in 1967 compared with wages of a third to a quarter as high in competing countries, it is said that it should have no complaint. Rather, it should be delighted with its advantages in higher productivity; but if the industry complains about imports the tune is changed. The trouble suddenly lies with the inefficiency of our steel companies. They are accused of letting other countries surpass them in technology.

The critics are supreme experts at eating their cake and still having it. From such an accusation of inefficiency as just related to a taunt that a great industry in the forefront of the American economy should have nothing to worry about from import competition is made without shifting gear into reverse. The operation is so smooth that eating a cake and still having it is a minor miracle by comparison.

The formula is somewhat as follows: If an American industry is efficient it has nothing to worry about from imports. If imports do cause trouble, the domestic industry must be inefficient and deserves the trouble it is in. In other words, the domestic industry is damned either way. On the other hand, if a foreign industry is inefficient it needs a greater outlet in this country to help it move ahead.

Unquestionably competitive capabilities vary from industry to industry and even from product to product within an industry. The same is true of foreign competition. It varies from country to country and from product to product.

Nevertheless the trend of imports of this or that class of goods, visible from import statistics properly broken down, provides the answer. If imports rise steadily we may assume that a foreign competitive advantage exists. American industry does not usually suffer from lack of productive capacity and, with well-known exceptions, readily supplies the market. If imports capture a rising share the reason is not far to find: Simply examine relative domestic and foreign costs.

In imports and exports, whatever the variations are, the competitive realities come out in the wash, so to speak; or to put it differently, the test of the pudding is in the eating of it.

If differentials in cost determine in large part the relative rise or fall in imports and exports, as they do in a competitive market, we should look at the wage contents of goods if we wish to find an explanation of trade trends—for the simple reason that the labor going into the making of a product, from raw material, farm or mine, through the various stages of production account for some 75–80% of the total cost.

Manufactured products incorporate more steps of labor than do raw products. A manufactured product may go through a number of processes and fabrications in each of which additional labor is applied. A raw product goes through a minimum of steps, possibly only one or two exclusive of transportation. Semi-manufactures fall into a halfway slot between raw products and finished manufactures.

From this recitation it would follow that a high-wage country would more easily dispose of its raw products in foreign markets than finished products because the raw material is not loaded with so many successive man-hours of high-cost labor. Finished goods would be less likely to enjoy a competitive advantage. Of course, they might still sell abroad if (1) foreign countries experienced shortages, (2) were not yet adequately equipped to produce particular goods competitively, or (3) especially if we should subsidize or give away these products. By that route we could continue to achieve handsome export surpluses without really trying.

On the other hand, the advantage would lie in the reverse direction with imports.

A high-cost country would find it more advantageous to buy finished products from lower-cost foreign countries precisely because these goods do incorporate successive stages of production. While it is advantageous to import raw materials from low-wage countries the advantage broadens as still more of the cheap labor is incorporated in the product. This is the case with respect to finished goods or finished manufactures, as our Census Bureau classifies these products.

The importation of raw materials and crude foodstuffs would under the same circumstances offer a lesser incentive, simply because they contain the least amount of low-wage labor.

If we now examine the import trends of these classes of products from 1961–66, which is the latest 5-year period and coincides with the biggest upsurge in imports since World War II, we will discover a remarkable correlation with the expected trends as just set forth.

From 1961 to 1966 imports of crude foodstuff increased from $1.60 billion to $2.12 billion, or 32.4%.

Crude material imports rose from $2.87 billion to $3.85 billion, or 34%.

Under our formula imports of semi-manufactures should have increased appreciably more because these products have had more low-cost labor applied to them. Imports increased from $3.38 billion in 1961 to $5.49 billion in 1966. This was an increase of 65.3%, or about twice as much as the increase in imports of raw materials and crude food products.

Our formula calls for the highest increase of all in the form of finished manufactures, since these goods incorporate the greatest amount of labor of all. Here we find imports rising from $6.68 billion in 1961 to $13.99 billion in 1966. This was an increase of 109.5%. This was over three times the increase registered in the importation of raw products, including foodstuffs, and nearly 70% higher than the rise in imports of semi-manufactures.

A small table will present the foregoing facts in handy form:

U.S. imports

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	1961	1966 [1]	Percent increase
Crude foodstuffs	$1.60	$2.12	32.4
Crude materials	2.87	3.85	33.9
Semimanufactures	3.38	5.59	65.3
Manufactured goods, including food	6.68	13.99	109.5

[1] 1966 imports are preliminary and unrevised and represent general imports.

These facts override whatever theories might be invoked to produce different results. The marketplace sometimes flunks its tests in theoretical economics.

The conclusion to be drawn from the import trends of the past five years is that our national trade policy aims a sharp arrow at the heart of the labor standards in this country, including not only wage levels but employment.

With this country facing yet further tariff reductions the trends of the past five years may be expected to accelerate. The evidence presented to this Subcommittee is sufficient to substantiate this expectation.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT—FLOW OF CAPITAL INTO FOREIGN PLANTS AND SUBSIDIARIES

Import pressure will produce at least two effects, both to the detriment of labor and employment: (1) it will stimulate more mechanization and automation, and (2) it will accelerate the flight of capital to foreign countries as a means of supplying foreign markets from within rather than increasing exports from this country. In some instances the foreign subsidiaries will ship to yet other countries rather than from the United States; and in the same or other instances they may ship into the American market those lines that the home company does not produce here, but that other domestic companies may produce here.

The great surge of foreign subsidiaries of American industry in recent years has been marked by an amazing growth. Sales made abroad by these subsidiaries have grown much more rapidly than our exports. This fact has meant more employment abroad rather than at home. The industries engaging in this great foreign expansion are making feverish efforts to prevent the debacle that a collapse in exports would mean. There can be little doubt that exports have been sustained by these foreign investments. Parts and component shipments have helped maintain export levels, and the export of machinery has risen sharply in response to the foreign investments. In time, however, the foreign countries will supply their own parts for the assembly plants, as Mexico, Brazil and India are notably striving to do. Restrictions on imports of parts and components are tightened from time to time, with the goal of virtual self-sufficiency.

Also, while our machinery exports have boomed, machinery imports have risen and continue to rise more sharply. We still enjoy a surplus in machinery exports, but it was only a few years ago that we also enjoyed an export surplus in steel, automobiles, textiles, typewriters, sewing machines, petroleum and a number of other products. Now we import more of these products than we export. Machinery is on a rapid trend in the same direction. We have but to consult the export-import statistics to find that from 1958–65 machinery exports rose 75% while machinery imports climbed 272%. Thus, while exports still have a comfortable lead, the same could have been said of some of the other products before the reverses occurred.

EXPORT TRENDS

If we turn to trends in exports we will find the same principle exemplified as in imports.

Exports of inedible raw materials, incorporating the least labor, expanded 67% from 1958–65, while exports of manufactured goods other than machinery rose only 45%.

Again carrying out the same principle, *imports* of inedible raw materials increased only 30%, compared with the *export* increase of 67%. There was less advantage in importing raw material because there was less saving. On the other hand, other countries bought more readily our raw materials precisely because these materials had the least amount of our high-cost labor expended on them.

In a different classification of exports and imports, published by the Department of Commerce, we find one grouping that is called "Other Manufactured Goods". This is exclusive of machinery and transport equipment.

Here we find further corroboration of what has already been said. These Other Manufactured Goods include such categories as Metals and Manufactures, Textiles Other Than Clothing and Textile Clothing, and a broad miscellany of other goods.

From 1958–65 exports of Other Manufactured Goods rose only 29.7%. Imports rose 125.1%.

The breakdown reveals some of the details. Exports of Metals and Manufactures rose only 31.9% compared with an import rise of 146.8%.

Textiles Other Than Clothing (meaning

fabrics, cloth, etc.) had an export increase of 22.2% while imports rose 110.7%.

Textile clothing recorded an export increase of 52.1%, which was fairly brisk; but imports climbed 212.1%.

Surely these statistics which strongly corroborate those cited earlier can leave no reasonable doubt about the weak competitive position of this country. This is attributable almost exclusively to the higher labor costs. However, this is not said in derogation of our wage levels. We need high wages to absorb our unmatched volume of output of consumer goods. We cannot reduce labor costs without displacing workers; and total costs cannot be reduced in any meaningful sense without reducing labor costs, for the reasons already given.

From the statistics cited here it is incontrovertible that the wage-productivity combination in many other countries comes out with a distinct and appreciably lower cost per unit of production, let the classical economists sing their outworn songs as long as they like. Competitive realities of the marketplace, reflecting innumerable governmental interferences both here and abroad, make of their chanting something that should preferably be put on a record for preservation in a museum. Yet it is their song that has guided the national tariff and trade policy.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

There is perhaps no better example than our merchant marine as an exhibit of this country's relative status *vis-a-vis* foreign competitors.

Our ships compete with foreign ships both in respect of construction and operation. Our shipyards are manned by American workers receiving American wages. Those of our ships that fly the American flag are also manned by American crewmen and paid the American level of wages.

Foreign ships are built in foreign yards and the ships are manned by foreign seamen who receive wages according to the country. Therefore we have the spectable of our costs, based predominantly on our wages, competing directly and without a cushion with foreign costs. The findings of our government as the basis for a subsidy is that our costs, both in building and operation, are a little more than double those of foreign shipbuilders and operators.

The same discrepancy in cost may be expected to exist in other domestic industries face to face with import competition. However, at least three other factors help to cushion most of the other industries against naked competition. (1) Some 65% of our imports carry a duty averaging 12%. (2) Beyond import duties, our inland markets are further protected by freight charges from ports of entry on imports. (3) Many of our industries enjoy the benefits of mass production. Shipbuilding at the current rate of production makes mass production impossible. Only the materials going into the ships may be mass-produced, such as steel, lumber, electrical equipment, etc.

It is possible therefore to look upon the competitive position of the merchant marine and to reflect that every other industry in this country is in the same position, modified only by the tariff, inland freight and mass production. What is so open and visible as an impossible competitive position in the merchant marine becomes less visible with respect to other industries. In some instances it may, of course, be true that the other factors cited, especially mass production, overcome the competitive gap. In a few instances heavy inland freight charges may do the same, although not on the seaboard. Cement is a good example.

The most important of these factors may indeed lie in mass production; but the degree of mechanization and automation varies greatly. To the extent that it does lie in mass production the advantage is subject to disappearance as other countries modify their productive systems on our model. This modification is occurring rapidly. Therefore the advantage that we have enjoyed may be regarded as a fading one. As for the advantage offered by the tariff—that too is fading. There remains only inland transportation; and this is a varying asset as insulation. No average percentage of cost advantage accruing to domestic producers compared with imported goods from this source has been calculated; and it is doubtful that a reliable yardstick could be devised.

In any event, the insulation enjoyed by domestic producers over the merchant marine is disappearing. In time the labor employed by these other industries will come face to face with a competition from abroad that will be little different from that of the merchant marine, i.e., without insulation.

This is a bleak prospect when we learn that the American merchant marine has been so badly battered that it carries less than 8% of our total import and export trade under the American flag; and that it would be eliminated completely were it not subsidized by the government, as a matter of national security.

It becomes quite evident that as matters stand today the tariff is destined to recede more and more as a competitive equalizer. Therefore substitutes must be found.

HAVING THE CAKE AND EATING IT

The free-trade contingent of this country may regard itself as friendly to labor—at least those of them who are of the liberal persuasion. Nevertheless their position on trade places two great burdens on labor: the constant pressure for automation, such as is exemplified today by the steel industry, in a competitive race with foreign costs. It would require the sacrifice of a very large number of jobs, for example, in the steel industry to reduce the cost of steel by even 10%. In another example, that of coal, the cost of remaining in a competitive position was the jobs of more than 300,000 coal miners, or two of every three. Most of their competition, it is true, came from domestic sources, but the principle is the same.

The free-trade view is that domestic industry must become competitive with imports or be indicted for inefficiency. Efficiency in nearly all cases, however, is a question of productivity per man-hour; and this can be increased appreciably only by the installation of labor-displacing machinery, as already indicated.

Thus the free-trader is in the position of holding industry's feet to the fire, with labor's feet held outward at the perimeter the first and foremost to be scorched and roasted. Generally the free-traders supported the legislative enactments that, outside of war, brought the American wages to their high and vulnerable level. Now they blame industry for its inability to carry the handicap in competition with foreign countries where the same legislation did not apply and to which it does not extend.

In other words, legislative enactments, hand-in-hand with war, placed American wages on a plateau, surrounded by low-lying wage levels in other countries. This was an effect that is quite outside of the operation of normal economic forces. Yet the economists insist on treating the American competitive position as if it had been a normal peacetime development, which it is not. They seem to be willing to wreck industry after industry on this theory and have the government pick up the pieces through adjustment assistance.

This bizarre insistence is inequitable and unjustifiable. Instead of adjusting their theories to the facts of life, the free-trade economists insist on forcing the American economy into the molds of their unrealistic thinking.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation represented by H.R. 478 and 479 would be of great help in focusing the attention of the Department of Labor on the effects of tariff reductions. We should not forget that it is not only the reductions forthcoming under the Kennedy Round that are of concern. Past reductions have already produced far-reaching effects and will produce yet more.

The Kennedy Round will accelerate forces that are already in motion. Distress will come to more industries.

There will be a need for reversing tariff reductions in those instances in which the tariff is a useful instrument. In other instances quantitative restrictions will be called for. In yet other instances, a combination of tariff and import quotas will be the most useful instrument. This combination is usually referred to as tariff quotas.

It is obvious today that the adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 are a dead letter. The very system in any case was misconceived. Why should imports be permitted to wreck our industries at our expense? Why should it be incumbent on the United States to make all the adjustments? What crimes have our industries and their workers committed that they should suffer the punishment that is implicit in the trade program? Why, if our economy has been so sinful and criminal, is it the support of the world, and why is it the subject of copy by so many other industrial countries?

These questions remain unanswered because answering them would uncover the inconsistency of our national trade policy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the week of June 12, on account of official business.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for June 8, 1967, on account of official business (Select Committee on Small Business).

Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for tomorrow, on account of official business as member of subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business holding hearings in Kansas and Utah.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. PRYOR), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. WYLIE), for 10 minutes, on June 8, 1967, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WYLIE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fino.
Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Pryor) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Kee.
Mr. Tunney.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts.
Mr. Minish.
Mr. Culver.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 65. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Alberto Rojas-Machado;

S. 130. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria Yolanda Rafaela Miranda y Monteagudo;

S. 131. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Valdes-Rodriquez;

S. 133. An act for the relief of Dr. Hector Jesus Sanchez-Hernandez;

S. 134. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael A. Penalver;

S. 135. An act for the relief of Dr. Hilario Anido-Fraguio;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Dr. Ramon Baez Hernandez;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Dr. Anselmo S. Alvarez-Gomez;

S. 173. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis G. Dediot;

S. 175. An act for the relief of Dr. Sherif Shafey;

S. 439. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Jacinto Nobo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo); and

S. 501. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernando O. Garcia-Hernandez.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 8, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

812. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit, transmitting a resolution in support of the enactment of S. 1509; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

813. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit, transmitting a resolution requesting the amendment of District of Columbia Code (1961), title 31, section 101; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

814. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit, transmitting a resolution regarding implementation of the report of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

815. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings by revising procedures relating to the default of guaranteed housing loans in the State of Illinois, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

816. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to negotiate and enter into rental agreement with postmasters of fourth-class offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

817. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 21, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Trinity Bay Soil Conservation District, Texas, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 30, 1948. No authorization by Congress is recommended as some of the desired improvements have been constructed by local interests and the remainder have been authorized under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566); to the Committee on Public Works.

818. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 79th quarterly report on export control for the first quarter 1967, pursuant to the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 162. A bill to grant the masters of certain U.S. vessels a lien on those vessels for their wages and for certain disbursements; with amendment (Rept. No. 341). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 168. A bill to amend the act of June 20, 1918, relating to the retirement age requirements of certain personnel of the Coast Guard (Rept. No. 342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington: Committee of conference. H.R. 9029. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 343). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marines and Fisheries. H.R. 169. A bill to increase the amounts of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service, and thereafter to provide for cost-of-living increases in benefits payable to such widows and to such former employees; with amendment (Rept. No. 344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 3351. A bill to amend the act of August 19, 1950, to provide annuity benefits for an additional number of widows of employees of the Lighthouse Service. (Rept. No. 345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 10620. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 10621. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 10622. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to encourage investment in the independent American Great Lakes merchant marine by providing a program of assistance in the construction of vessels, to correct inequities, to stimulate the domestic commerce of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10623. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of commutation fares paid by an individual in traveling to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 10624. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to eliminate the requirement that a person must be 60 years of age or older in order to receive retired pay for nonregular service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10625. A bill to exempt from the antitrust laws certain combinations and arrangements necessary for the survival of failing newspapers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10626. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to returns and deposits of the excise taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (by request):

H.R. 10627. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 10628. A bill to provide Federal leadership and grants to the States for developing and implementing State programs for youth camp safety standards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 10629. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 10630. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a portion of the retirement benefits of a public employee shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 10631. A bill to amend the joint resolution of October 23, 1965, relating to National Parkinson Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 10632. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 10633. A bill relating to the conservation of natural resources upon lands of the United States and amending certain provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and the Mineral Leasing Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 10634. A bill to provide for the adjustment of annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10635. A bill to impose quotas on the importation of certain textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 10636. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H.R. 10637. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 10638. A bill to amend section 39-201 of the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 10639. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 10640. A bill to exempt from the antitrust laws certain combinations and arrangements necessary for the survival of failing newspapers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER (for himself, Mr. Rooney of New York, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Carey, and Mr. Wolff):

H.R. 10641. A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the care and control of alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 10642. A bill to amend an act approved May 23, 1908, relating to the disposition by the Secretary of Agriculture of moneys obtained from the sale of materials from national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 10643. A bill relating to the conservation of natural resources upon lands of the United States and amending certain provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and the Mineral Leasing Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 10644. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 10645. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to carry out the activities of Federal Committees for Development Planning in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 10646. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny-Cumberland Parkway in the States of Virginia, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 10647. A bill to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 10648. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.J. Res. 608. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 609 Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:

H.J. Res. 610. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for representation in the Congress for the district constituting the seat of government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. Moss, and Mr. Adams):

H.J. Res. 611. Resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.J. Res. 612. Joint resolution amending the Gulf of Tonkin resolution to provide for the adjudication by the International Court of Justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

224. The Speaker presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, relative to increased appropriations for research and development in weather forecasting, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 10649. A bill for the relief of Jean Claude Sam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10650. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ingrao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10651. A bill for the relief of Pietro Filippazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 10652. A bill for the relief of Yip Shing Butt, his wife, Kum Wah Chan Butt, and their minor daughter, Siu Wah Butt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 10653. A bill for the relief of Gee Pui Shung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 10654. A bill for the relief of Violetta Guanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 10655. A bill for the relief of Arthur Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 10656. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aya H. Gray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10657. A bill for the relief of Michele D'Aleo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10658. A bill for the relief of Gianiale and Anna Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

99. By the SPEAKER: Petition of New York State Federation of Women's Clubs, Schenectady, N.Y., relative to unnecessary Federal spending; to the Committee on Appropriations.

100. By Mr. UTT: Petition of Lester M. Andrew, Tristin, Calif., and others, relative to establishment of a Support Our Servicemen Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Edwin Carl Ekstrom of Corpus Christi, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN YOUNG
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention today and to pay tribute to a man who was the founder of the Greyhound Bus Co., and could literally be called the father of our modern bus transportation system, Mr. Edwin Carl Ekstrom of Corpus Christi, Tex.

"Mr. Ed," as he was affectionately known to his friends, was born in Ludington, Mich., on March 19, 1889, and died in Corpus Christi, Tex., on May 8, 1967. During that span of 78 years his life was distinguished by remarkable achievements and personal greatness. He was a quiet man; he shunned publicity, devoting his energies to making himself expert in the business he loved and helped create. A partial chronicle of the greatness and achievements of Ed Ekstrom would take more space than is possibly available. Suffice it to say that he was truly an outstanding man representing a great business: as a man of fine character and an outstanding American, he set an example in the transportation industry that will not soon be surpassed. His dedication, his tenacity and his determination was source of inspiration to all who knew him. The world is a better place for his having lived. This, indeed, is the richest legacy that any of us could hope to leave.

Mr. Ed was born the son of Swede-Finns who emigrated from Finland in the early 1880's and settled in Ludington, Mich., later moving to Hibbing, Minn., where he completed his grammar school education in 1901. Due to dire circumstances, it was necessary that he should work to help support his family, so during the next 2 years he was employed as a tallyboy in an underground mine, located about 3 miles from Hibbing, then was transferred to their office as a supply clerk. He worked as a bookkeeper and accountant in Hibbing where he became acquainted with the men who later developed jitney service into transcontinental bus service. Ekstrom kept books for these jitney drivers who hauled ore from town to town in the Minnesota ore fields. When one of the original six jitney drivers died in 1917, Ekstrom bought into the company which at that time was transporting passengers between Hibbing and Duluth, Minn.

The firm was known as the Mesaba Transportation Co. and charged a 15 cent fare for a 3-mile trip from Hibbing to Alice The bus company pioneers finally split up in 1923 and Ed Ekstrom moved to Madison, Wis., where he bought a bus line running from Madison to Fond Du Lac, and named it the Eastern Wisconsin Co.

Ekstrom then moved to Michigan and opened the Safety Motor Coach Lines which ran from Grand Rapids to Muskegon. This later turned out to be the nucleus of the Greyhound Lines and it was later extended to Chicago.

It was in 1926 that the now famous Greyhound name was born. Frank Fageol, builder of the first twin coaches for Transcontinental Lines, sold Ekstrom 52 buses, a figure that was unheard of at this time. For this sale, Fageol presented Ekstrom with a white greyhound dog which was promptly named "Bus." "Bus" soon became the symbol of the Safety Motor Coach Lines, and was used extensively in its advertising program, although Ekstrom never bothered to register it as a trademark while he owned the firm. The dog was killed a few years later when it was struck by a car in San Antonio.

Ekstrom was a pioneer in snow removal on the route north of Muskegon, which he kept clear with his own plows, in order to see that the regular schedules that he had set up were maintained. Together with this, he also established a permanent system of stations, garages, and other equipment, in order to keep pace with his expansion program.

In 1928, Ekstrom sold out to one of the original jitney drivers, C. E. Wickman, and a group of his associates. Wickman not only took the greyhound name, but also the famous blue and white color scheme of the buses which are now seen all over the country.

Ekstrom then moved to San Antonio in 1928, where he organized the Red Ball Transportation Co., which later became the Southland Greyhound Lines, soon becoming tied in with the one operating farther north. The operations spread out over almost all of Texas, and 2 years later, Ekstrom again sold out to Wickman. Ed then became associated with the Yellow Taxi Co. in San Antonio during the depression years of 1931 and 1932, but he again sold out and moved to Corpus Christi. It was in Corpus Christi that Ed Ekstrom bought out the Central Power & Light Co. Bus System, and the Colunga Bus Lines, as well. Ekstrom also owned the Nueces Mack Co. Truck Sales and the Nueces Mack Leasing Co. He sold these shortly after he sold the Nueces Transportation Co. to the city of Corpus Christi in late 1966.

Mr. Ed was not only an outstanding example of initiative and perseverance in the world of business and transportation; he was an outstanding civic leader as well. He was a member of the board of directors of the chamber of commerce, an original member of the Area Development Committee, and a vestryman of the Episcopal Church of the Good Shepherd.

He was a benefactor of the Carmelite Day Nursery and served as chairman of a fund drive in 1965 to raise funds to construct a new building which has since been named in memory of him.

Last September 22, Ekstrom was cited by his city council for contributions to the community during the years that he owned and operated the bus system. They praised him for his part in making the city of Corpus Christi lovelier, and particularly for making life better, both individually and collectively by his financial contributions in time of crisis, and his liberal donations to hospital and child care programs and facilities.

Although he gave a substantial portion of his income away, Ed Ekstrom did not want applause or acclaim, he was merely trying to give aid to the needy throughout America without any reference to race or creed. He deplored greed in every form and felt that money's worth could only be measured by the good it could do. Loved and respected by his friends and associates, it was often said of him, "the pattern was lost when they made Ed."

It is because of men like Ed Ekstrom that our free enterprise system stands as a shining example of limitless opportunity and good will not only to the people of these United States, but also to all other people in the world today. Ed was a stalwart defender of the American way of life, and gave his all to see that it was maintained. He held all of his employees in respect, and they, in turn, gave their respect to him. In one of the bulletins that he sent to his employees, he pointed out the necessity of cooperation if there is to be success in business. He told his employees to do their best at all times, and to "Smile; results will amaze you if you heed this tip."

Ed Ekstrom is survived by his wife, Ethel; a son, Edwin Carl Ekstrom, Jr.; a daughter, Mrs. Paul S. Peck; a brother, Harold Ekstrom, all of Corpus Christi. Four sisters: Mrs. Howard Smith, and Mrs. Arthur Luchs, both of Glen Ellyn, Ill.; Mrs. Mark Wilson of Rochester, Minn.; Mrs. Frank Rauschel of Chisholm, Minn.; and two grandsons: Carl and Randal Peck.

We may never leave a legacy such as was left by Edwin Ekstrom, and we are in his debt, for truly the world is a better place for his having lived.

Fino Seeks Change Making Commutation Expenses Tax Deductible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to allow taxpayers to deduct commutation expenses.

There is no reason that commutation expenses—a necessary part of holding remunerative employment to so many people—should not be treated like other business expenses and made tax deductible.

Under the tax laws as they now stand, commutation expenses may in certain odd circumstances be deductible, but those ordinarily incurred are not. The typical commuter gets no tax relief with respect to the large amounts of money spent by him each year reaching the place of his employment. This expense, to my way of thinking, is very clearly a business expense—particularly where you have the situation in which a company almost dictates an executive's choice of residence. I think that it is high time that the Congress gave this tax break to the hard-pressed middle-income taxpayer.

National Teacher Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is the National Teacher Corps.

The newscast follows:

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

The National Teacher Corps was created two years ago to pioneer in the development of better teaching techniques to help the youngsters from poverty-stricken families.

The formation of this special group was frankly an experiment. It was in no sense a criticism of the splendid men and women who teach in the nation's public schools. On the contrary, it was designed to provide special help for those elementary school teachers who are working under the handicaps usually found in city slums and rural slums as well.

The growth and development of this country is bound up with the progress made in educating our youngsters. In most civilized countries, the male school master had come to be traditional. So Europeans were amazed that in the developing public school system of the United States, most of the teachers were women. They predicted that American children, coddled by their female teachers, would grow up unable to cope with the harsh realities of adult life.

The prophets were wrong. Our dedicated lady school teachers were such a success in teaching the three R's that the little Red Schoolhouse became a symbol of all that is good in America. And the youngsters trained in those schools became known both for their character and their initiative.

But today's teacher must do more than teach reading, writing, and arithmetic. Where the majority of children come from poor families, the teacher in the lower grades must be health consultant and guidance counselor as well.

American educators were among the first to appreciate that hidden health defects very often caused children to fail in school. So regular health check-ups were started and it was soon found that the so-called backward boy or girl was suffering from poor eyesight, poor hearing, or some other physical defect which could be corrected by proper medical treatment.

But this enlarged role for the primary

grade teacher is very difficult when classrooms are over-crowded and the work load is heavy. This is where the Teacher Corps comes in. A special team composed of an experienced teacher and college graduates with special training is sent in to help the regular teacher. This team helps carry the teaching load, and the members of the group do much more to help the children.

In North Carolina, one teaching corps is serving oatmeal breakfasts before classes to hungry youngsters. In Tennessee, the children had no playground and the members of the corps built one for them. In one rural community, it was found that many children suffered from speech defects. Local doctors were persuaded to give them free corrective treatment.

In the city slums, the task of the Teacher Corps is far more complicated. The temptations of a big city are many and the youngsters who grow up without proper guidance may easily fall into a life of crime. And the job of present-day educators is to teach good citizenship as well as the elementary subjects of grade school education.

The Teacher Corps is still in its infancy. The dedicated young men and women in its ranks are learning as well as teaching. They are trying to find the surest way of converting under-privileged children into useful citizens.

Thank you for listening.

Representative Henry P. Smith III Lauds Advances Made by Hooker Chemical Corp. in the Field of Fire-Retardant Chemistry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is an interesting story behind a recent announcement by a Department of Defense procurement agency regarding the awarding of contracts for some 16,000,000 yards of cotton oxford cloth for use as tent liners. It is especially interesting, in my opinion, because of two words included in the specifications which the successful bidders must meet—fire resistant.

The facts behind this story are known to me because they so intimately involve a company which has achieved a number of significant technological developments in the very sophisticated field of fire-retardant chemistry. Hooker Chemical Corp.'s firmly established predominance in this field results from many years of experience in developing and supplying industry with products and systems which reduce or eliminate fire hazards in a wide range of applications.

There is no need to dwell here on the grim statistics published annually by the National Fire Protection Association, or the Public Health Service. Fire does kill or maim thousands of people every year, many of them children. The tragedy of it all is that much of this crippling and killing could be prevented or significantly reduced.

Some years ago Hooker management decided to support research efforts aimed at utilizing its proficiency in fire-retardant chemistry through the development of chemical systems that could be used in textiles, such as cotton fabrics used in manufacturing protective work garments. Working closely with leading mills, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Southern Regional Research Laboratory at New Orleans, La., Hooker did develop chemical systems for treating fabrics which set new standards for durable fire retardancy.

It is to the credit of the American free enterprise system that others also worked and continue to work on providing compounds or materials that will help alleviate this flammable fabrics problem. Hooker, which pioneered in this effort, continues to this day to work on it. Notable progress has been made.

There's comfort to be derived in the knowledge that the Department of Defense is providing the best in fire-resistant tenting, mattress ticking, and flight suits for our service personnel. However, it is not just in the military field that milestone applications have been achieved. There are a good many more commonplace and mundane uses for this technology than tenting liners, such as fire-retardant blankets, bed linens, cubicle curtains, work garments, and even sweat shirts. These products are now available or could be produced by leading mills and suppliers under various labels, many of them as the result of Hooker's efforts.

It is to be hoped that steady progress will continue to be made in those continuing efforts aimed at speeding the day when consumers generally can look for and expect to find those same two words—fire resistant—on a growing range and variety of everyday clothing and household fabrics.

World Crisis in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time of crisis when, without responsible leadership, war will inevitably continue its rampage in the Middle East, the United States should act firmly to preserve peace and security. An encouraging step in this direction was Ambassador Goldberg's support of the peace resolution in yesterday's meeting of the United Nations.

I now strongly urge the President of the United States to use the great influence and prestige of this Nation to protect the international rights of all nations to open waterways, particularly the right of Israel to free access to the Gulf of Aqaba.

I further urge the President to continue the presence of the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean as a display of this Nation's resolution. This country, having served as midwife during the birth of Israel as a free and independent nation, now has a moral responsibility to protect her rights as such, As a sovereign nation, Israel can expect to have free access to international waterways.

I sincerely pray that the forces of reason and moderation will stop the present conflict. When the fighting has ceased, it is my earnest hope that the Israeli nation will have a guarantee that her future rights to the Gulf of Aqaba will remain forever inviolate.

Culver Urges Official Recognition of Eastern Orthodox Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, last week, a significant event took place in the State of Iowa as Rev. Alexander George, pastor of St. John's Eastern Orthodox Church in Cedar Rapids, delivered the invocation in the Iowa General Assembly.

Father George was the first Orthodox priest in Iowa history to offer these opening prayers, and on that occasion, Iowa became the 37th State to so recognize the church as a major faith.

It is past time, Mr. Speaker, that the U.S. Government gave its formal recognition to the Eastern Orthodox Church, which is already in fact—if not in form—a major faith in our Nation.

I reintroduced legislation earlier this year—House Resolution 410—to accomplish this objective by requiring that all references by Federal agencies to major faiths include the Eastern Orthodox Church.

According to the latest Yearbook of American Churches, there are over 3 million Eastern Orthodox Christians in the United States today. And since in the Orthodox Church only heads of households are counted as members, the total is probably well over 6 million with women and children included.

That same yearbook lists 5,585,000 members of the Jewish community, 44,874,371 Roman Catholics, and 66,854,200 Protestants in the United States.

Yet we automatically consider only "three major religious faiths"—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish.

However, there is a growing recognition of the important position of Orthodoxy in the United States:

The Armed Forces use the letters "EO" on dog tags to identify Eastern Orthodox Christians.

A representative of the Eastern Orthodox faith has been invited to participate in recent Presidential inauguration ceremonies.

Legislatures of at least half the States have enacted resolutions officially designating Orthodoxy as a separate fourth major faith.

Enactment of House Resolution 410 would not require any direct public expense. It would not ask any major effort by the Government. But it would give the full and proper recognition to Orthodox Christians which they have a legitimate right to expect.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of House Resolution 410, and urge the prompt consideration of the matter in the House of Representatives:

H. RES. 410

Whereas the Eastern Orthodox Church is a major faith in the United States and throughout the world; and

Whereas Senate bill 106, Eighty-fourth Congress, led to the designation of the Eastern Orthodox faith as a separate religious faith in the Armed Forces of the United
Whereas several Federal agencies have
States; and
omitted Eastern Orthodoxy in projects in which Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths have been invited to participate; and

Whereas more than half of the States in the United States through their legislators have passed resolutions recognizing Eastern Orthodoxy as a major religious faith; and

Whereas the Eastern Orthodox faith has millions of communicants throughout the world including several million in the United States; and

Whereas where anything is said concerning the major faiths, usually the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths are referred to; and

Whereas it therefore follows that a religious distinction is being made in omitting the Eastern Orthodox Church, which is contrary to the prevailing principle of democracy and freedom of religion in this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Eastern Orthodox Church is a major faith in this country; and that all references by Federal agencies to major faiths now limited to Protestants, Catholics, and Jews include the Eastern Orthodox Church.

A Letter to a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] issued a very interesting and provocative newsletter which will be mailed this evening to some of his constituents in the Seventh Congressional District.

I believe that the letter from the gentleman from Wisconsin to his constituents should be called to the attention of all Members of this body and insert it in the RECORD at this point. The letter referred to follows:

JUNE 7, 1967.

DEAR FRIEND: June is the time of year for report cards. As our young people graduate or as they are advanced from one grade to the next in their educational careers, they are presented with an accounting of how well or how poorly they did in their efforts to obtain a good education.

Government should be no different. It seems to me that this is a good time to issue a "report card" on the progress being made by the Johnson Administration and its three to two Democratic majority in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Of course, as Chairman of the Republicans in the House of Representatives, my grading may be questioned by some. But I do not believe the facts which are presented on pages two and three of this letter can be disputed.

AGRICULTURE

With parity at a depression-time low of 72, compared with 80 in 1960, farmers are in near-revolt. Imports of dairy products, mink pelts, wool and meat—eased by Administration policies—are driving prices down. Production costs, meanwhile, keep mounting, forcing more and more farmers off the land. Since 1960, the total number of farmers declined by nearly four million. Yet Department of Agriculture employees continue to increase, with one for every 26 farms in the country today compared with one per 39 farms in 1960. The Administration's solution? More of the same control and quota policies that led to the problem in the first place.

COST OF LIVING

Since 1960, the cost of living has shot up 10.5%, eroding the savings and pension plans of millions of older citizens and wiping out income advances of the younger ones. Inflation is like a national sales tax which affects everyone. Today's dollar is worth 45¢ compared to the one of 1941—and $2.22 is required to buy what $1 would have bought 25 years ago. What's the Administration's solution? More spending. More deficits. This year, the deficit could go as high as $29 billion and a large tax increase may be unavoidable. This means more inflation, not less. Since 1963, the Johnson Administration has spent some $40 billion more than it took in—mostly on domestic programs. Since 1960, defense spending, goaded by the war in Vietnam, jumped 68% while domestic spending skyrocketed 97 percent.

CREDIBILITY

From the President on down, the Administration's spokesmen have lost the confidence of the American people and the press in what they say and do. War statistics and cost estimates for example have been withheld, twisted, or reshaped. The American Society of Newspaper Editors among many others has publicly complained about this record. The Administration's answer seems to be more press agents. The General Accounting Office estimates that nearly 7,000 publicists are presently on the federal payroll—the largest number ever employed by an Administration—to "sell" Administration programs to the American people.

CRIME

Since 1960, crimes of all types in this country jumped an amazing 46%, the largest increase in any comparable period in history, while the nation's population increased only 8%. In other words, crime rose nearly six times faster than the population. In the past year, crimes shot up 11% across the country and a startling 27% in the nation's Capitol. Crime is estimated to cost the nation $50 billion annually. The Administration's solution appears to be merely more Crime Commissions, study groups and categorical grant programs. Last year the President vetoed the only anti-crime bill Congress enacted and opposed the Republican-sponsored anti-riot measure.

FOREIGN POLICY

Around the world, U.S. prestige has dipped sharply since 1960. American citizens abroad are attacked, embassies sacked, missions stoned, and U.S. flags burned. Yet, the Administration continues to pour foreign aid into these nations in a seeming effort to buy the friendship and respect it appears unable to earn. In Vietnam, U.S. forces now number over 450,000 and are expected to reach half a million shortly. Casualties mount daily, now totaling some 10,000 American dead and 60,000 wounded. We now have a Middle East Crisis and the possibility of other crises in Latin America and Africa. There is no clear indication of what our foreign policy is and no attempt to put the Soviet Union—the principal instigator and supporter of these wars—on the defensive in the court of world opinion.

At home and abroad, the situation continues to grow worse. Though progress has been made on some fronts, the records in these major fields of public concern certainly do not add up to very high marks when measured in terms of the results we have witnessed so far. It is good, I think, in a Democracy for the Minority Party to continually review the actions and measure the results of the programs of the party in power so that the public can be informed. Only in this way can better programs and better approaches be devised for the massively complex problems that face our society.

This past past month was an extremely busy one for your Congressman. As the ranking Minority Member of the Committee which provides all the funds for the health activities of our federal government, I spent several days in Geneva at the Twentieth World Health Assembly. The picture at left was taken during a general session which both Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass) and I attended as members of the U.S. Delegation.

The Labor, Health, Education and Welfare Appropriations Bill was also passed by the House of Representatives during the month of May. As the ranking minority member, it was my responsibility to manage the bill during debate on the Floor of the House. Though my amendment which provides that the new $16.5 million Food and Drug Research Laboratory cannot be built in the Washington area was challenged by a Democratic Congressman from this area, the House overwhelmingly supported my position. This insures that the Laboratory will be built at the University of Wisconsin in Madison.

This month, the House will act on the massive Defense Appropriation bill which finances our activities in Vietnam and also provides all the money for the national security needs of our country. The bill this year will contain well over $70 billion and will occupy much of my time for the remainder of this month.

Best regards

MEL LAIRD.

Remarks of the Honorable Jerome Waldie at the Democratic Volunteer Committee Convention in Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I hereby insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech that was made by my friend and colleague, the Honorable JEROME WALDIE, of California, at a convention in Los Angeles, on Saturday, June 3, of the Democratic Volunteer Committee and all elements of the official Democratic Party.

American history has frequently demonstrated that our strongest and best Presidents are often those who have been exposed to the most hostility and abuse of the people.

The reason is perhaps best explained by an old proverb: "Behold the turtle. He makes progress only when he sticks his neck out."

Our best Presidents—most of whom needless to say, were Democrats—have made progress for this magnificent Nation of ours by using the same anatomical methods as the turtle.

The saving grace, of course, is that while we abuse "That Man in the White House," we seldom fail to re-elect them.

All of which is to say that the strident and harsh voices of scorn, abuse and vilification directed at President Johnson indicate that he is doing his job—and doing it well.

Let me make something very clear: I am not speaking of those who criticize American policy *responsibly* and *compassionately*. I am speaking of those who trade on fear and hatred.

The racists abuse President Johnson for being the President who has done more for civil rights than any other President in our history.

The reactionaries and far right-wingers abuse him for being the President who has most strenuously advocated social reforms in our domestic structure. And the far-out left wing abuses him for our Nation's stand against Communist aggression.

Personally, as far as these groups are concerned, I think we would all congratulate the President on the excellent enemies he has made.

But I do believe it is time that the great majority of responsible Americans—and, in particular, members of our own Democratic Party—take a more active role in rallying to the President's cause against the hateful and insulting *personal* attacks that defame his integrity, honesty, patriotism and sincerity.

The President has emphasized the necessity for preserving freedom of speech—without excepting from that protection, the speech of those who are little more than rabble-rousers or demagogues. But the President and the Nation has the right to expect responsible dissent.

For, as the President said recently, "dissent is a two-way street." There must be a responsible dialogue on the issues, if the dissenters are to serve the best interest of the Nation.

It is one thing to oppose our policies in Vietnam. But is quite another to collect funds for the enemy or burn our flag.

And let me add quickly, that it is one thing to strongly protest the conduct of some of the dissenters, but it is quite another to seek to abridge their basic rights of freedom of speech or of lawful asesmbly.

Short of unlawful behavior, we—all of us who call ourselves Americans—must urgently insist for the dissenters the right to be heard.

I emphasize this very fundamental point because I believe that there has been a dangerous escalation of bad judgment by both the far left and the far right.

We have paid a high price in the past for such uncontrolled, irresponsible behavior. We have seen the sad results that occur in a climate of hatred and blind emotionalism.

Have we forgotten so soon the shame of our treatment of Japanese Americans during World War II?

Have we forgotten the nightmare of the McCarthy period?

Have we forgotten the horror of President Kennedy's murder?

These terrible events have one common denominator—they occurred during the periods of hatred, distrust and disunity.

The meaning of all this is clear: it is high time for the Democratic Party to end its bickering and local wranglings and stand with the President in these difficult times.

I know that there are some Democrats who so strongly oppose Vietnam that they have turned a deaf ear on pleas for support for the President or his policies. Let me address them for a moment.

Our Nation prides itself on upholding a bipartisan foreign policy. The agreements entered into by previous Aministrations—whether Republican or Democratic—are upheld by subsequent Administrations, regardless of party.

President Johnson has honored an agreement that he himself did not make. This is as it should be. For the word of a great Nation must never be doubted by friend or foe.

He has honored our commitments in Vietnam. And he will honor our commitments in the Middle East.

It is difficult to speak about Vietnam without sounding like a hawk or a dove. Yet, the truth is that neither hawks nor doves truly reflect the President's policy in Vietnam.

We want peace in Vietnam—not military occupation of a conquered Nation. And the President has only one objective for Vietnam—a peaceful and honorable settlement.

Those who actively protest against our involvement in this conflict accurately convey our Nation's distaste for the necessity of war.

I can tell you that not one of these peace-marchers or draft card burners detests this war as much as President Johnson does.

And no one in the world is working harder or is more anxious to find a peaceful settlement.

Let me say to my sincere friends who believe the President has conducted the Vietnam war without restraint, patience or reason that of those entities in our Government who have most to say about the conduct of the war, the President is the *only* one who advocates and exercises reasonable restraint. There are actually only three groups vested with any part of the responsibility to escalate, de-escalate or hold the line in Vietnam. The President, as Commander-in-Chief; the Pentagon, representing the military; and the Congress. Clearly, the Pentagon believes escalation to the ultimate is required; equally clearly, the Congress, *overwhelmingly*, and particularly since last November, advocates a far more "hawkish" stance in Vietnam than has occurred to date. The President, then, is the *only* person of those who can make these decisions, to advocate and, fortunately, to compel, a policy of reasoned restraint in the application of our unbelievable military power.

I have heard from deeply concerned people the accusation that the President is personally responsible for the war in Vietnam. I have heard the obscene charge that the war is "Lyndon Johnson's War." I have heard the equally obscene charge that the President continues this war for his own personal and political gain. Frequently, the same person concludes with the solemn prediction that the President will be defeated because of the Vietnam war—that his popularity has severely declined because of his policies in that war.

I reply to these critics that there is an inconsistency of considerable proportions in that charge.

If it is true that the Vietnam war represents a loss in political support to the President, how can it similarly be true that he seeks personal gain from the war?

Obviously, the presence or lack of political popularity resulting from the war plays no part in the determination of Administration policy. Equally obviously, the President's policy, rightly or wrongly, is predicated on his deep conviction that the Nation's and the World's best interest are served by repulsion of aggression whenever and wherever it occurs.

Such motivation governed President Truman when he confronted aggression in Korea; when he confronted similar aggression in the Berlin blockade.

Such motivation governed President Kennedy when he confronted aggression in Cuba and in Vietnam.

And such motivation governed President Eisenhower when he began the confrontation with aggression in Vietnam.

Reflect for a moment, how the course of history might have been changed had similar motivation been present when Hitler tested the resolve of the democracies in Europe prior to World War II—when Mussolini tested that resolve and found it wanting in Ethiopia.

Consider how the history yet to be written might read had the motivation to meet aggression not been present in Korea; in Cuba; in Vietnam—and now in the Middle East.

I believe this Nation, as the most powerful and responsible Nation in the Free World, will continue to be tested by the other World. I dread the day when their probes, wherever they occur, result in finding an absence of resolve on the part of this Nation to meet their challenge.

It is not always easy to be a citizen of the most powerful free Nation in the World. It might be personally easier to be a citizen of a small nation with responsibility to no one—but it also would not be as challenging nor would it be as satisfying. At the risk of sounding "jingoistic," I am proud to be an American—I believe in this country—I want it to continue a great Nation. I am convinced under the leadership of men such as Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and now Johnson, there is every reason to hope and believe its greatness will not diminish.

Address by Postmaster General at Seton Hall University Commencement Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to submit for the attention of our colleagues the noteworthy address delivered by the Honorable Lawrence F. O'Brien, Postmaster General of the United States, at the commencement exercises at Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., on June 3, 1967.

An honorary degree of doctor of public service was conferred upon the Postmaster General in recognition of his distinguished and dedicated service to our Nation.

The text of the address follows:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE SETON HALL UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

Let me begin by congratulating you who are graduates of this Class of 1967. You and your fellow graduates from colleges and universities across the nation make up the largest graduating class in the history of American higher education. There are one-half million young Americans in the Class of 1967, composing one-fifth of all Americans in your age group, and representing the best that our society has yet produced.

Though it is popular with the older generation to look with dismay at the younger generation, I am convinced from my observation that today's college graduate is on the whole undoubtedly more earnest, more informed, more free of the dead weight of old illusions, more passionately committed to truth and justice than any of his predecessors.

And you should be better. You have grown up in an unusually trying period in our history. Never before have the penalties of a major mistake of miscalculation in our foreign policy loomed so large; and never before have the answers been so obscure, stubborn, and unyielding to both good will and good sense. Never before in history has there been a nation with as much military and economic power as the United States; and never before in history has it been so necessary to show restraint in the use of that power. And never before has a nation met problems of racial and economic justice so successfully. Never before has a domestic revolution—and that is precisely what we have experienced—been compressed in so short a time.

You have grown up in a time when men look back nostalgically to the days when the mere flexing of our national muscle, even though it was an infinitely smaller muscle, was enough to produce the action we desired.

You leave this fine school armed with knowledge and filled with hope and purpose. But one of your first tasks, and perhaps your first disenchantment, will be to realize that the nostalgic men with their vast reserves of old memories exercise powerful influence, and that your good intentions are simply not enough. Each new generation of American college graduates forms a collective St. George who faces the dragon of shopworn but easily and widely accepted ideas. Some generations know what they must do, realize that this is the destiny with which they have a rendezvous, and slay the dragon with the weapons of truth and of conviction.

Other generations start equally well armed. But the lance rusts away from the corrosion of compromise, and the edge gives up its once keen temper to the enervating heat of the ivy-covered cottage of selfish contentment. Your days at Seton Hall may be defined as a period when you could move at a fast gallop over a smooth path to the bright horizon. They were days of great expectations for yourself and expectations of others for you—all to be fulfilled at an unspecified time called "someday." Well, you are graduating, and your name on that sheepskin signals the arrival of "someday."

The transformation of someday into now—means that you are being offered the role of St. George. And there are dragons in abundance waiting for you. The torch has passed to this new generation of Americans—a generation so eloquently described by President John Fitzgerald Kennedy as one ". . . born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

At home there is the struggle for full achievement of racial justice. In recent years we have come very far, very fast in this area. The four major Civil Rights laws passed in this decade signal the fact that at least we are honoring the check issued by Thomas Jefferson and endorsed by Abraham Lincoln. We have come far, but in a sense we have only exhausted all the simple ways. For achievement of racial justice can no longer be confined to questions of civil rights alone. It is no longer so easy—and it is no longer so distant.

Today also the world continues to suffer from the chronic illness of a peace that is not peace and a war that is not war. The Class of 1967 may well complain of the legacy of inflamed international antipathies which faces it. About that legacy I can only say—it could be far worse. We destroyed the most evil and inhuman tyranny since Attila. We avoided stumbling into atomic holocaust. And we can take pride in passing along to you a world which gives the latent strength of democracy a grudging but nonetheless genuine respect.

The concern of this generation of college students with the course of our foreign affairs is a sign of health and vigor. For America is a nation that grows through dissent; and only through critical examination of old policies can we find better ones. So, I would ask you not to permit your growing domestic involvement with building a career to turn your eyes away from questions of foreign affairs. Foreign policy is too important to be left entirely to the experts—and a truly American foreign policy must reflect the real aspirations of America.

By the same token, however, I would ask that you build your criticism on the foundation of real knowledge of the world in which we live. The greatest, and potentially most dangerous, fallacy of all in dealing with foreign nations is to confuse what *should be* with what *is*.

Other nations should recognize our essential objectives. But some do not. Other nations should see that we have no desire for territory or expansion. But some do not. All nations of the world should cooperate in the common interest rather than fight over selfish interest. But, as we see, there is often far more conflict than cooperation.

This is not the world we would make—but this is the world as it is. In such a world, as President Johnson observed:

"We must recognize the obligation to match national strength with national restraint. We must be prepared at one and the same time for both the confrontation of power and the limitation of power. We must be ready to defend the national interest and to negotiate the common interest. This is the path that we shall continue to pursue. Those who test our courage will find it strong, and those who seek our friendship will find it honorable. We will demonstrate anew that the strong can be just in the use of strength; and the just can be strong in the defense of justice." That is what our President has said.

And this is the foundation of our policy, not alone in Vietnam, but wherever the virus of terror and aggression threatens to rupture the membrane of freedom.

There is much that you can do to help us move more firmly toward a world of peace and of mutual trust—but only if you clearly see that willingness to compromise differences is matched by vigilance in safeguarding our essential freedoms.

That truly is the test.

I would also like to make a specific comment about the problem of finding a durable peace in Southeast Asia and of some of the less considered reactions to the President's search for peace in that troubled area. As you recall, the Sermon on the Mount says, "Blessed are the peacemakers." It doesn't say anything about *peacelovers*. There's nothing special about a peacelover. Even a loud one. It's easy to be a peacelover. But it takes considerable thought, energy, imagination, diplomacy, and, in the world in which we live, sometimes force to be a *peacemaker*. The President needs help in making peace. He's asked for it, but sometimes he can only hear the anguished cries of peacelovers.

U.N. Secretary General U Thant recently proposed some steps that could be taken to make peace. The President was quick to support his initiative. But North Vietnam wasn't. Ho Chi Minh shot down General Thant's proposals. As you may know, the President has also made it plain that he will respond favorably to almost any action from Hanoi that indicates a desire for negotiations. But the only reaction so far has been a beautifully contrived piece of psychological warfare that seems to have taken in some gullible people—that we should just stop bombing the north and someday, perhaps, there might be some kind of response—maybe.

The economic problem that you face is far different from the bleak prospect that often made other graduating classes contemplate an advanced degree. But in a way even the task of graduates who leaped out into the gray landscape of the depression was easier than your own. Because then the problem was how to survive in an economy of scarcity. Though not a pleasant situation, at least it wasn't new. Others had been coping with problems of scarcity since the beginning of organized society.

But now, we are in a new economic dimension. Traditional reactions to economic problems no longer suffice, simply because the problem today is no longer that of scarcity—but of abundance. We need new responses. We must bridge the gap between private affluence and public necessity. We must assure the opportunity of better distribution of our enormous wealth without sapping the incentives that made that wealth possible. And we must seek a continuance of the expanding economy—because only through the resultant expansion of opportunity will we be able to wipe away the remaining vestiges of poverty and of unemployment.

Thus, you have a whole new set of problems facing you, problems that need fresh solutions—and finding those solutions will move us into a world of opportunity and challenge undreamed of by any other generation.

In a very real sense our economy is expanding because of the force of democratic education. Our American educational system based on equal opportunity is perhaps one of the greatest social developments of all time; and during the last few years we have made greater progress in education than ever before in our history.

This progress is a direct reflection of the passionate belief of President Johnson that this mighty nation cannot and should not rest until every American has access to superlative education. This sentiment is not new. We have all realized the importance of widely available quality education in a democracy. But never before has a President succeeded in translating this aspiration into the law of the land.

But, though we have new laws, a vastly increased availability of funds, and a national commitment to quality education to all, how well these laws will be excuted, how creatively the money spent, how successfully the commitment implemented depend in the final analysis on leadership in the States.

Certainly, New Jersey is fortunate in this regard.

You have a Governor who sees clearly, has always seen clearly, that human history is the record of the race between education and catastrophe.

He has left no doubt about his intention to have education win the race in the State of New Jersey. He has left no doubt not because of words, but through a series of brilliant actions. These include establishment, just last year, of the first Department of Higher Education in the history of New Jersey. Governor Hughes clearly perceives that higher education, quality education, is the key to the affluent individual and the affluent State.

Under the leadership of your Governor, State aid to local school districts nearly doubled in the past two years—from $120 million to over $228 million.

Still another reflection of that leadership was the fact that the State of New Jersey assumed responsibility, for the first time, for the public operation of two medical schools, one right here at Seton Hall, which is now the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry.

Through these and other actions your State government has fully committed itself to quality education.

This record, this creative record, is one more reminder of what so many seem to forget so soon: that political institutions exist for one purpose only, to solve problems. They have not been created to hinder solutions.

Your generation is in the enviable position of being alive at a time when American history is in the process of making a gigantic, unprecedented swing. We are moving into a unique kind of society, away from a strident conflict over needs, to meaningful cooperation in determining how we can best meet those needs.

Already new Federal programs to aid education are helping to create a fresh kind of interaction among traditional levels of government and helping to form fresh political associations designed on regional or problem areas.

This is a creative building process that reflects the vigor of our political institutions—which shows beyond doubt that they are not political dinosaurs destined for oblivion, but flexible forms capable of growth and evolution.

In a democratic society, the power of the individual expressed through the ballot box is the ultimate power. And it is a very real, tangible and effective power. As educated Americans, it is not only desirable, but it is your duty to play an active role in the political process. Through public service you can magnify your education and turn the knowledge you have acquired here at Seton Hall into active programs for the betterment of America, to change the hearts and minds of men, for the creation of a more perfect society.

Another great Governor of New Jersey, Woodrow Wilson, once said:

"The vision of America will never change. America once, when she was a little people, sat upon a hill of privilege and had a vision of the future. She saw men happy because they were free. She saw them free because they were equal. She saw them banded together because they had the spirit of brothers. She saw them safe because they did not wish to impose upon one another. And the vision is not changed.

". . . America will move forward, if she moves forward at all, only with her face to that same sun of promise."

If Woodrow Wilson were alive today, I think he would agree that you still possess that vision and that your eyes are directed toward the sun of promise.

Science has found ways to extend the length of our lives.

But only the individual can control the scope and the depth of his life.

The prescription for such a life is ready at hand: Commit yourself fully and commit yourself without reservation.

I ask you simply to lift your eyes, I urge you to reach for the stars . . . for you have a rendezvous with excellence.

John F. Kennedy "Prominent American" Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, 1967, Boston, Mass., was proud to host leaders from the political, business, and academic worlds who gathered to pay tribute to our late, beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

On the occasion of the birthdate of this truly great American, the U.S. Post Office Department issued the 13-cent postage stamp to be used for international mail to honor his memory.

The principal speaker at the luncheon for the dedication of the stamp was Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien who vividly described Kennedy the man, the politician, and the statesman.

From the lips of one of his closest friends came this story and tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE CEREMONY DEDICATING THE JOHN F. KENNEDY "PROMINENT AMERICAN" STAMP, BOSTON, MASS., MAY 29, 1967

I have very mixed emotions in dedicating this new stamp honoring President Kennedy.

I am proud and pleased, of course, for it is fitting that this latest monument to his memory be a postage stamp, since the postal service is the channel most often used by the American people to communicate with each other—and John F. Kennedy was a master communicator who touched the mind and the heart with the brilliance of his thought and his wit.

The denomination of this stamp was purposely chosen to permit it to be used on international mail. This, too, is appropriate, for John F. Kennedy's life and the tragic nature of his death seemed to reach out over barriers of race, and ideology, to brush aside old suspicions, and to touch men sharply and directly. For a moment the world was united through grief, and the loss was felt equally and shared as deeply in Dublin and Durban, in Moscow and Monrovia.

He was our man for all seasons, and for all peoples. And this stamp will be used 50 million times a year, a silent traveler through the world reminding all who see it of a great and noble spirit.

And so it is gratifying for me to dedicate this stamp.

Mixed with that gratification is a feeling of sadness.

Last fall I travelled to Runnymede, England, and I visited the Kennedy Memorial there. The inscription on that memorial reads: "This acre of English ground was given to the United States of America by the people of Britain in memory of John F. Kennedy, born 29 May, 1917, President of the United States 1961–63, died by an assassin's hand 22nd November, 1963." And then the most famous lines of his Inaugural Address. So on this day John Kennedy would have been 50 years old. And our sadness comes from the realization that long before its proper span, a giant tree was felled in the forest of our land, and has left an open place against the sky that will long remain.

In the three and a half years since his assassination, there have been dozens of books, thousands of articles, millions of words written about President Kennedy.

Almost all have tried to serve his memory well. They have tried from the same sense of loss that we feel, from the need to remind ourselves of the uniqueness of a splendid human being.

Along with many of you here today, I knew John Kennedy intimately. We worked with him closely, and saw him in moments of great stress as well as great success. However, having that experience and that knowledge, I am sometimes befuddled about the way he is depicted. Some have tried to recreate his image as a modern day Sir Galahad, wearing the invincible armor of righteousness, slaying all the dragons, with a charmed sword, marching toward victory unhindered.

I do not wish to argue about, and certainly not lower, the stature of John F. Kennedy in our history.

I do not even wish to disagree with those well-meaning Americans who seek always to make him larger than life.

For we seem to live in a cynical age, marked by lack of values and a dull sense of drift, anchorless on a dark and angry sea. Some of our young people seem consumed with hate for their own nation or their own personalities. They burn their flag with fire or their minds with drugs. So, in a time such as ours, when there are men proclaiming uneasily that "God is Dead" it is important and it is useful to honor a hero.

But in this hero building, there lies a dangerous element. Not only is it a wasteful and a ridiculous excess to add another hue to the rainbow, perfume the violet, and paint the lily—but in the case of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the real man, the real human being and, yes, the real politician, are all submerged somewhere beneath the slowly accumulating weight of all those millions of feather-like words.

I say Kennedy the politician purposely. In our culture the word "politician" has somehow taken on an accumulation of barricades, We have always suffered from a national split personality about politicians. The politician was someone we wished somehow we could do without. And when we found we couldn't do without him, he was accepted only grudgingly.

Our Constitution was called by Gladstone "the most remarkable work . . . to have been produced by the human intellect, at a single stroke . . . in its application to political affairs." This Constitution was the product of politicians working together, hammering out creative compromise, holding us together when so many forces existed that might have torn us apart.

Our national folklore is full of jokes about politics and politicians, all of which would seem to indicate that an honest, effective, dedicated politician is the human equivalent of the square circle.

And yet men like Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Daniel Webster, John Adams were politicians. The men in John Kennedy's *Profiles in Courage* were politicians. John Kennedy, himself, was certainly a politician.

And he was a *working* politician.

He began his career the hard way and the right way. His political career opened with a tough campaign in the Eleventh Congressional District. It was said then, "He doesn't even need to campaign. He can go to Washington now and forget the primary and election."

But John Kennedy wanted to campaign. And so he put in 18-hour days bounding up the rear stairs of those three deckers in Charlestown, knocking on doors, telling the voters who he was and what he thought he could do in Washington.

Well, the rest is history.

And despite the hero worship, it never came easily. Throughout his political career he had to do the equivalent of climbing the stairs of those Charlestown three deckers.

He had overcome the barrier of his religion. And he faced that issue directly and won.

He had to overcome the rumors that he was in failing health. And, despite a body that often was wracked with pain, he was a man of determination who proved again the power of mind over body.

He had a long and grueling struggle through the Presidential primaries.

And his campaign against Mr. Nixon was in the same tradition—fighting, working, travelling, little sleep, always on the move.

Since that grim November day three and a half years ago, there have been many monuments and memorials built to grace our land and honor his name.

We now have a Cape Kennedy instead of Cape Canaveral, and a Kennedy Space Center. We have a Kennedy Memorial Highway that helps connect Washington to the outside world. We have Kennedy memorial bridges and dams and roads and airports to dignify our nation. Just last Saturday we had the launching of a new aircraft carrier—the Kennedy. We now have this postage stamp that will remind so many millions overseas of John F. Kennedy.

But, though it is fitting and proper that we build physical reminders of his greatness, I think he would have preferred to be remembered for the product of his political genius. "By their fruits ye shall know them," the Book of Matthew tells us.

And I think we should therefore assess John Fitzgerald Kennedy in the way that he would have preferred: through the political events that he brought about.

Let us never for one moment overlook his accomplishments—accomplishments that are a splendid record of political action aimed at helping people in their most basic and vital aspirations, their hopes for peace, for prosperity, for progress, for a future for themselves and their children.

Let us not forget that the Alliance for Progress was launched by John F. Kennedy.

Let us not forget that he proposed The Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which recently reached fruition in the Kennedy Round of negotiations, and which was the most important piece of legislation affecting economics since the passage of the Marshall Plan.

Let us not forget that he initiated action that revitalized our economy . . . got America moving again . . . and created millions of jobs.

Let us not forget that he resisted Communist blackmail over Berlin and faced down, prudently but firmly, the terrible confrontation over the missiles in Cuba.

Let us not forget that he saw that a threat to freedom and American interests was growing in the Pacific as it receded in the Atlantic. As early as October 1961, President Kennedy said firmly that ". . . the United States is determined to help Vietnam preserve its independence, protect its people against Communist assassins, and build a better life through economic growth."

Let us not forget that John F. Kennedy was a compassionate man—perhaps best reflected in his call for a national program to combat mental retardation.

Let us not forget that he enlisted early in the fight for civil rights.

Let us not certainly ever forget that the world took a major step away from the brink of war with the conclusion of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty he fought so hard to create.

And then we saw him in a car on a street in Dallas—he waved, one last time. And the flame was gone.

But his work, though still not completed, his dreams though still not fully realized, were not abandoned.

The Congress—under the leadership of Speaker McCormack and with the help of our own Massachusetts Congressional delegation here with us today—has worked together with President Johnson to build the kind of worthy memorial to John F. Kennedy—a memorial in the form of the greatest surge of progressive legislation in the nation's history coupled with the greatest economic boom in this or any other country.

John F. Kennedy was a hard-fighting politician, with solid, concrete goals. And we must remember him because of what he stood for.

A century ago, Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote:

"I find the great thing in this world
  Is not so much where we stand,
As in what direction we are moving . . .
We must sail sometimes with the wind and
  Sometimes against it—
But we must sail, and not drift, nor lie at
    anchor."

President Kennedy often quoted these words. They expressed his philosophy. And they pose a challenge to us who survive him.

To those of us who served his cause, who followed his leadership, what is that challenge: It is not to permit ourselves to drift, never to depart from his program of compassion. It is the unfinished agenda, the programs of the Kennedy Administration and the Johnson Administration.

My friends, we can serve his memory best not by looking passively at monuments in marble and steel or issuing postage stamps, but by working together for a better America and a better world, where there is peace preserved, freedom guarded, mankind exalted, and where the chains and fetters that keep man from achieving his God-given potential are struck away, and we are free to be what it is in our power to become.

John F. Kennedy often quoted from a poem by Robert Frost that expressed his understanding that we cannot stand still and admire achievement, no matter how compelling it might be. "'The woods are lovely, dark and deep," he said. "But I have promises to keep, And miles to go before I sleep, And miles to go before I sleep." He did not go the many miles he might have, and so it is up to us to keep those promises for him—for they are, after all, promises made to ourselves and our children—promises of a better America.

We can achieve those promises, and reach those goals through the political process—and it is to John F. Kennedy the politician that I wish to dedicate this stamp.

World Poverty and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 2, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY spoke at Johns Hopkins University on the subject "World Poverty and World Peace." In a most informative speech, the Senator points out that world peace is not possible when nations are poor and people are miserable. He says:

> If we hope to avert Vietnams in the future, if there is ever to be a greater measure of peace and stability in the world, the legitimate aspirations of the 1.5 billion people of the underdeveloped countries for a better life must be satisfied.

And, the Senator urges a long-range foreign aid program to help these underdeveloped countries through the stages of development. He says:

> Our aid should not turn on and off, depending on how "threatened" a nation is, but be a long rang program, with long-term appropriations, on which the poor nations can depend, so they can plan to do their part in their development.

I would like to share Senator KENNEDY's address with my colleagues and include it in the RECORD:

WORLD POVERTY AND WORLD PEACE

(Address by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, May 2, 1967)

The critical struggle for freedom and humanity, over the next ten and fifteen years, is going to come in the underdeveloped nations, where two-thirds of the world's people live in abject poverty. The task will be to help bring them a decent standard of life, and some hope for their future.

In the last eight years, there have been over 170 outbreaks of serious violence in various parts of the globe, aimed at overthrowing the existing governments. Almost all of them have taken place in lands where the income per person is under $300 a year. Of the 38 poorest countries in the world, with incomes of less than $100 a year, 32 of them have suffered significant wars and conflicts.

If you seek the underlying causes of the war in Vietnam, one will be poverty. Even the tensions between India and Pakistan and between the Arab countries and Israel, founded as they are in religious differences or territorial questions, are intensified by poverty. When nations are poor and people are miserable, there will be insurgencies and violence; and governments will mount adventures of aggression against other countries, to divert their own peoples' attention from their hopeless lives.

If we hope to avert Vietnams in the future, if there is ever to be a greater measure of peace and stability in the world, the legitimate aspirations of the 1.5 billion people of the underdeveloped countries for a better life than they have must be satisfied.

At the present time, the process is not going well. Despite all the foreign aid, despite the significant attempts poor nations have made to develop themselves, there has been no measurable improvement in the lives of most of these people. In some countries, the standard of life has deteriorated over the last few years. The poor nations of the world face a harsh decade. There is the prospect of widespread famine in Asia and Africa, because production of food has not kept pace with their swelling populations. They face the near certainty that their exports will not be able to pay for what they must import, since the commodities that give them the bulk of their export earnings are declining as a share of the world market. The gap in living standards between the poor nations of the world and the rich grows greater. Last year, the national income of the United States increased by $40 billion. This increase was more than the total national incomes of the 700 million people in India and the nations of black Africa.

INDIA AS AN EXAMPLE

To illustrate the difficulties and the dangers, I would cite India. For years we have been told that India is the crucial testing ground of whether a poor nation can develop under conditions of freedom. After three five-year plans, after immense efforts by her planners and her people, the results, in human terms, have been very disappointing. The economic growth of India since 1946, when adjusted for population, has been 1 per cent a year. For the average Indian, this has meant an increased income of 70 cents a year. India today has 12 million unemployed workers. A bitter famine has spread to 60 million people in two large states. As a result of the recent Indian election, in which a major issue was economic discontent, the majority of India's states have rejected the ruling Congress Party, two in favor of left-wing governments. This is just a taste of what could come if the pace does not improve.

THE CYCLE OF REVOLUTION

We cannot ignore the cycle by which development failure breeds insurrection and revolution. It could involve us as deeply as we are involved today in Vietnam. Lest we feel these countries and their problems are remote, just think of the difficulties we would be in if, at the same time we were fighting in Vietnam, widespread anti-American revolutionary movements were overturning governments by force in Latin America and Africa.

This danger increases, year by year, but the efforts to meet it do not. The total amount of public development capital moving from the developed to the undeveloped countries of the world, for the last six years, has remained static at the level of a little over $6 billion. Support in the United States for an adequate foreign aid program has slackened. Since 1962, the foreign aid budgets proposed by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have been cut, in Congress, by 10 to 20 per cent a year. This year, the outlook is even grimmer. Last year's foreign aid budget was saved from a 30 per cent cut by a margin of only two votes. Thirty-three of the Congressmen who voted against the cut were defeated in last November's election.

AN OUTDATED RATIONALE

And so we must greatly increase, and improve our foreign aid program and we must begin by recognizing that the current rationale for American foreign aid is out of date. Senator Vandenberg of Michigan, the man who led the Republican Party out of isolationism, once advised President Truman that to gain acceptance for the revolutionary idea of foreign aid, he would "have to scare hell out of the country." We have continued to do this for eighteen years. One secretary of state after another, in testimony and public statements, have tried to sell foreign aid to the American people as the way to stop the spread of Communism. Of course, we wished to build healthy economies; of course, we wanted friendly nations to maintain their independence; of course, it was the right and moral thing to do; but behind all these was the persuasive argument that foreign aid, by fighting Communism with money, could avoid the need to fight it with troops.

Regarding foreign aid as an instrument of the Cold War has hurt the program in many ways. It has resulted in too much aid going for military purposes, and too little for economic development. Money that could have gone to build a dam or irrigate a valley has gone to prop up a general or strengthen an unpopular regime.

We have sent most of our assistance not to the places where the opportunity for development was best, but to where the Communist threat was strongest at the time. The aid budget for this year proposes more money for South Vietnam than for all the nations of Latin America combined. In Africa, where very small investments could yield great returns, the aid program in most countries, for all practical purposes, has ceased, simply because the short-run Communist threat is considered to be on the wane. In Kenya, for example, there is a chance for important break-throughs in the new farm technology, and to build agricultural cooperatives that could be a model for the entire continent. But there aren't enough Communists in Kenya, so the aid is not forthcoming.

The anti-Communist rationale for foreign aid has led us to surround our program with political restrictions that tend to undermine some of the most important development efforts. There is no more hopeful project in Asia today than the international development of the Mekong River Basin. It premises energy for industry, irrigation, flood control and agricultural development that will greatly benefit 30 million people. The four nations of Southeast Asia, despite their political differences, are working on it together. Yet just two months ago, our government had to withdraw its support for a dam in Cambodia, a key to the entire project—because Cambodia has sent food to Hanoi, and we forbid aid for countries that trade with Hanoi.

We also forbid aid to countries that trade with Cuba, or in other ways assist the Communist "bloc." To the poor countries, all these restrictions make it look like we are using our aid as a club, to force them to support us in foreign affairs. Nations like Burma—non-Communist nations desperately in need of assistance—have all but ended American aid because they feel their national independence is being put into jeopardy. Nations that are poor are nonetheless proud. They do not want to be wards of wealthy countries, taking their aid in return for voting for them in the UN or supporting their foreign adventures.

In all these ways, the anti-Communist rationale has hurt foreign aid in the past. We followed it because foreign aid was a new and controversial program. It was felt Americans would not support the so-called "giveways" unless they could be linked with fighting Communism. But if the detente with Russia grows over the next ten years, and if China becomes so preoccupied with its internal convulsions that it loses interest in aggression, where will the rationale be then?

The receding of the Communist threat might well take with it the American foreign aid program—long before it has accomplished its real purposes, and at a time when it is needed more than ever.

A NEW GOAL FOR AID

So we must begin with a new rationale. Foreign aid should be designed not to combat any enemy or doctrine, not to win support for our foreign policies, when that support is really for our comfort instead of our aid. Some foreign aid will continue to have as its purpose the strengthening of the security of these nations and, indirectly, of our own. But henceforth the real goal of foreign aid should be to preserve the peace by completing the modernization of the planet.

We should adopt a well-planned, and well-enunciated strategy of development, based on the accepted principles of what nations must do and must have, to pass through the stages leading to self-sustaining economic growth. Our aid should not turn on and off, depending on how "threatened" a nation is, but be a long range program with long-term appropriations, on which the poor nations can depend, so they can plan to do their part in their development.

I would like to block out tonight five imperatives of such a strategy of development.

First, we must be patient. The French have an expression that "it takes three generations to make a Frenchman." The task of world economic modernization will take almost that long. No nation on earth, with the exception of Japan, has been able to do it in less than sixty years. We sometimes get impatient with the progress that the newly independent nations have made since foreign aid began fifteen years ago. But we should remember that fifteen years after our own independence, most of our states were in default on their obligations.

Second, we must be more generous. One of the reasons a nation like India is in such difficult straits is because, on a per capita basis, the aid to her has come to only $3 per year. Neither we, nor the other developed nations, have really made the effort that is going to be necessary. We all pay lip service to the pledge taken in the United Nations to devote 1 per cent a year of our national production to foreign assistance. But in totaling up our contributions, we include such things as Social Security payments made to persons living abroad, and some of them include loans made at very high rates of interest. Even the six billion plus I mentioned previously is in many ways a misleading figure. In recent years, the poor nations have had to pay back almost half this much in interest and amortization on loans received in the past. Added to their increased need to import goods, this means the many poor countries are being drained, each year, of more foreign exchange than they receive as aid.

The poor nations must be able to predict, with some certainty, how much aid they will receive, so they need not abandon development projects midway for lack of foreign exchange. The best estimates are that the poor countries could use effectively at least $4 billion a year more than they are receiving. To make this possible, I believe that all the developed nations should agree now to achieve a transfer of at least 1 per cent of their gross national products to world development programs by 1970.

For the United States, this would mean a doubling of the present level of aid. I surely think, that for this important purpose, we can manage to spend as much, each year, as we spend on toys and cosmetics.

Third, a larger part of our aid should be given on a multilateral basis. Bilateral aid cannot be accepted in the spirit it is given. When white men offer dollars and come in to supervise how they should be spent, it causes resentment and loss of self-esteem in the poor countries. There is too much danger such aid will have, even indirectly, political strings. There is a role for bilateral aid, in countries where the leadership will not undertake solution of difficult problems without our prodding. But we must be prepared to give increasing amounts of aid through international organizations.

We need not fear that international control of our aid would bring waste or corruption—although bilateral aid has not avoided it. Organizations like the World Bank and the International Development Association have developed strict procedures and controls. They have, or could be given, sufficient personnel to supervise each project as well as we could ourselves.

I would hope that over the next ten years we could channel an increasing percentage of our aid through the World Bank, IDA, the UN development program, and the regional development banks which are now beginning to operate. To further show we believe aid should be removed from international politics, we should join with the Russians to fund a significant aid project for a nation like India—and then ask the other advanced Communist countries to join us in further programs for other poor nations.

Fourth, our other economic policies should be consistent with the aims of the aid program. Much of the aid we give is today being cancelled out by other policies we pursue. To understand this, you must realize that in purely economic terms, what foreign aid does is to increase the amount of foreign exchange a poor country has available to use to purchase the things it needs. Poor countries also try to increase their foreign exchange earnings by exporting goods and entertaining tourists. If we pursue policies that take foreign exchange away from them, we cancel the benefits of the aid.

For example, almost all of the trade policies of the rich countries of the world are stacked against the efforts of the poor to increase their trade. The Common Market with its high levies on imports of agricultural goods and many of our tariff restrictions and our import quotas are reminders of the old colonial days, when poor countries existed merely to provide cheap raw material for the industries of the mother countries.

In the early years of the 1950's, the nations of Europe, still recovering from the war, told us that trade, not aid, was their most important need. The poor nations of today are in the same position. Eighty-five per cent of their export earnings come from the sale of primary products. They cannot make progress if the few goods they can now offer the world cannot bring a decent price. They are not going to be able to develop modern industries, no matter how many power grids or factories foreign aid puts in, if they cannot sell their manufactures to the countries that use them. The modernization we seek will not take place unless and until we revise the whole web of arrangements by which rich nations make trade more difficult for the poor.

To see how severely trade policies can retard development, we need only look at Latin

America. Since 1954, we have made $12 billion in aid available. But the money Latin America has received from exporting its coffee, copper, rubber and other commodities over the same period has declined by $12 billion. In terms of the money available for development, all our aid, including all in the Alliance for Progress, has been wiped out.

Of the eighty underdeveloped countries of the world, almost fifty of them depend for foreign earnings on the export of one or two crops or commodities. These exports are a source of much more money for development than is foreign aid. But in recent years, these poor countries have been severely injured by the steady drop in world community prices. Colombia, for example, used to be able to count on up to $500 million in foreign exchange each year from its sales of coffee. This year, it will be a little more than half of that—and as a result, Colombia must cut its economic development plan by one-third. Eduardo Frei, the President of Chile, is one of the most progressive leaders in all Latin America. For a long time, his administration was a symbol of how the Alliance for Progress can work. But President Frei's government is in deep trouble today, primarily because the price of copper on the world market fell in one year from 56 to 42 cents a pound.

The goal should be to increase the export earnings of the poor countries by 6 per cent each year. To do this, the nations of the world should formulate price stabilization agreements on commodities like rubber, tin, cocoa, tea and petroleum, similar to the coffee agreement of 1963, which has been partially successful. Until these can be worked out, international organizations should be allowed to make quick grants of funds to single countries dependent on one or two commodities, to cushion them against sudden drops in the world price of what they sell. We should try to agree with the Common Market to eliminate duties on tropical agricultural products.

For our own part, it will involve reappraising the entire network of restrictions we have erected, for the benefit of our own industries, over the years. I refer not only to tariffs and quotas on imports, but to the laws which require aid-receiving nations to buy American products and ship them in American bottoms. These laws lower the value of our aid by almost 20 per cent. I refer, as well, to our depreciation allowances and our many other subsidies to domestic business that make it harder for the poor nations to compete in our market. President Johnson's statement at the Latin summit conference—that he would be willing to look into the possibility of creating tariff preferences for the manufactured goods of the poor countries—shows his willingness to consider these possibilities. We should spread this willingness to the nation as a whole. Changing these policies might involve temporary dislocations in some parts of our economy. But the last few years have shown how expansionist, and wonderfully flexible, the American economy has become. Millions of jobs have been destroyed, through automation, geographic shifts and changing defense needs—but even more jobs have been created. Domestic industries that might be adversely affected by the trade policy I have mentioned should be eligible for the same adjustment assistance as the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 provides—but I think the industries where this would happen are very, very few.

Fifth, we must encourage private enterprise to join in the development process. Even if world aid is doubled, there will still be a gap between what the rich countries provide and what the poor countries are going to need. This can best be supplied by private investment. It is no coincidence that the handful of developing countries which have enjoyed good growth in recent years—Korea, Mexico, Venezuela, Taiwan—are countries which have encouraged local and international private investment.

The most important potential field for private investment is in industries producing products, like fertilizer, that agriculture needs, and industries using agricultural products. In many ways, this is the most critical of all the areas of development, and the most difficult. Unless the poor nations can modernize their agriculture—unless they experience the same technological revolution of the farm that we have had, their people, very simply, are going to starve. As we see in India today, the other efforts in development will come to a halt, as nations are forced to spend all their capital on food.

The giant new "agribusiness" industries of the developed countries have the know-how to change this. They have learned how to increase production, develop better strains of crops, conserve the soil and make the available water go around better. They can help develop the buying and selling co-operatives, and the pricing systems that would allow the farmers of these countries to invest even their meagre funds in the new techniques. But private firms cannot be expected to invest in the agricultural improvement of poor nations unless they have the reasonable confidence of making a profit. Our government can help in this through better guarantees against risk, similar to what was given to the New York City Bank that has agreed to supervise the modernization of the agriculture of Thailand. We can help, as well, through interest subsidies, through disseminating of more information about investment opportunities, and by helping our companies cut the red tape that surrounds doing business with the governments of many poor nations. All of this is vital to development, for it will determine, in large part, whether poor countries can have a balanced growth, or whether they will have to spend all they have to buy food to ward off starvation.

CHALLENGE OF DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT

Democratic development is not just a process of economic change. In many ways it will require a social revolution. And it will require much more effort on the poor nations' part than on ours. Japan was able to modernize her economy in thirty years without any foreign aid at all, because she was a nation. Her people were one with her leaders and they worked with tremendous energy.

The process of modernization is a fundamental process of social and economic change. The American people are not going to support a development program that merely makes the rich richer and the class structure more rigid. Nations must be willing to change their ways so that their people can have a share in the fruits of the development process. Farmers will not be inspired by shiny machines and modern methods if they do not own the land they till. Commodity agreements will not help if the higher prices go only to wealthy growers who salt the money away in European banks. The most modern schools and school books will be useless if the class system is so rigid that people cannot rise according to their ability, for then they have no incentive for education. Nor will they be inspired by a growing industrial system, if it is dominated by foreign managers and gives them no opportunity to rise through the ranks.

In short, social justice and individual opportunity are going to be indispensable to economic progress and to the efforts the nations must make for themselves.

To create world peace through world development is an immense task, but it is no different, in philosophy, from what we have done in our own country. Since the beginning of the century, we have known that the greatest source of domestic discord and danger lay among those who lived in poverty. And we know that increasing their demand for goods is the surest foundation of a healthy economy. Most of our grant-in-aid laws, for schools, hospitals, airports and such, contain "equalization" formulas that insure more for our poor states than our rich states. Our farm price supports are directed not just to the wealthy farmer, but to the family farmer. Fifty years of government effort, from the New Freedom to the New Frontier and the Great Society, have resulted in a redistribution of wealth to the underpriviledged, which has increased everybody's wealth, and created the strongest economy the world has ever known. So there is nothing revolutionary or untried in this.

THIS GENERATION'S TASK

I have not come here tonight merely to ask you to support the foreign aid program. This generation of college students should have higher sights. I would propose that you take up, as the task of your generation, nothing less than the modernization of the poor nations of this planet. I propose you do it hand in hand with the young people who today comprise a majority of those countries, and who, in your lifetime, will be no more than two or three hours away from you by supersonic transport.

By modernization I do not mean merely the kind of material growth we associate with the Industrial Revolution of the West. This is important, but if there is anything that your generation has taught its elders, it is that material goods are not enough to make a satisfying life. And this is also in the deepest tradition of Asia, Africa and Latin America. We are interested as well in the development of the mind and the spirit, the improvement of the quality of life and the quality of social justice here in our own country and in the poor nations.

There is more to this challenge than the preservation of world peace, vital as it is. There is the creative explosion of whole cultures. We speak of poor peoples, but many of them belong to some of the oldest, most creative cultural traditions on this earth. If the people of these countries, now bound down by poverty, could live in a way in which they could use their talents and historic cultural abilities to the fullest, they could make this world infinitely richer and more exciting for all of you.

Your generation is especially qualified to undertake this, for you will have at your command all the marvels of the new technology—to automate industry, teach through machine, irrigate the deserts, tap the ocean depths and create new sources of food and fabric.

Eight years ago, President Kennedy called the gap between the rich nations and the poor the most critical challenge in the world. Today the gap is greater and more dangerous than ever. The United States owns fully half the wealth of the entire free world. Is this great blessing not also a danger? Can we remain aloof from the poverty and misery of the world? As Pope Paul said, in his Encyclical on Peace and Development, "If today's flourishing civilizations remain selfishly wrapped up in themselves, they could easily place their highest values in jeopardy, sacrificing their will to be great to the desire to possess more."

But I do not think that you want that kind of America. I think you want a deeper involvement. The spirit of democratic development in all its fullness of material, social and spiritual change is the spirit that excites our young people and excites the enthusiasm and commitment of people around the world.

I hope you are ready to take up this challenge as the great task of your generation—to take this as your responsibility to the wider world community of which you are a part, and which in your time, you are going to lead.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Chaplain (Capt.) Alan M. Greenspan, Fort Dix, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Sovereign of the Universe, in whose hands lie the destinies of all mankind, we pray for Thy guidance during these troubled days. As we weigh decisions of great consequence, grant us the wisdom and foresight that our deliberations might ring true. Give us the insight to arrive at just solutions to those awesome problems which face us. Protect the dignity of our fellow men, all of whom have been created in Thy image. Enable us to live in harmony, free from the fears of oppression, hunger, or want. May the world see and accept the truth of that inspiring line, engraved into the Liberty Bell and signed with the blood of those who have sacrificed their lives to insure that its message of hope becomes a reality—

"And ye shall proclaim liberty throughout the land and to all the inhabitants thereof."

In a more general sense, may the nations of the world recognize that not by power nor by might will mankind live together in harmony, but by the Word of God.

Then shall the words of the prophet be fulfilled that "The lamb shall dwell with the lion; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore."

Almighty God, how goodly upon mountains are the feet of Him that bringeth good tidings that declareth peace.

May this be Thy will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Product Safety; and

S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 67-10.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM, TO EXPAND THE PROGRAM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6133) to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Act of July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 328), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951 et seq.), is hereby further amended as follows:

"(a) In section 8 strike out '$90,000,000, plus such additional sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize and appropriate but not to exceed $185,000,000,' and insert '$105,782,000, plus such additional sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize and appropriate but not to exceed $169,218,000,'.

"(b) In subsection 2(b) after 'laboratory,' insert 'test bed,'.

"(c) At the end of subsection 2(b) change the semicolon to a colon add the following: '*Provided*, That a detailed report concerning any test bed plant, module, or component costing in excess of $1,000,000 shall be submitted to the respective Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That the five demonstration plants authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958 (70 Stat. 1706), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1958 (d)), shall hereafter be regarded as test beds subject to the provisions of this Act, but the provisions of sections 3 and 6 of such Act and those provisions of section 4 relating to the method of disposal and disposition of the proceeds of sale shall continue to be applicable to them;".

"(d) In subsection 2(c) strike out 'demonstration' and insert 'prototype'.

"(e) By adding a new section 9 to read as follows: 'This Act may be cited as the "Saline Water Conversion Act".'

"SEC. 2. Of the amount of $105,782,000 authorized to be appropriated by section 8 of the Saline Water Conversion Act, the unappropriated balance of $23,282,000 may be appropriated and combined with $3,500,000 heretofore appropriated but remaining unobligated at the end of fiscal year 1967, to carry out the program during the fiscal year 1968, as follows:

"(i) Research and development operating expenses, not more than $18,532,000;

"(ii) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds and test facilities, not more than $4,298,000;

"(iii) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion modules, not more than $2,190,000;

"(iv) Administration and coordination, not more than $1,762,000:

Provided, however, That expenditures and obligations under any of these items except the last may be increased by not more than 10 per centum if such increase is accompanied by an equal decrease in expenditures and obligations under one or more of the other items, including the last."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALINE WATER PROGRAM

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I address the House in order to explain the Senate action on H.R. 6133.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate went along with the House amendment to the administration bill limiting the appropriations authorized for the saline water program to 1 year rather than 3. Also, with one exception, the Senate accepted all the other House amendments, including the redrafted form of the bill and a breakdown of the annual program into major categories.

The one exception follows:

The House bill contained as an amendment to the basic act the following proviso:

Provided, That any test bed plant, module, or component costing in excess of $1,000,000 shall not be undertaken until specifically authorized by Congress:

The Senate amended this proviso to read:

Provided, That a detailed report concerning any test bed plant, module, or component costing in excess of $1,000,000 shall be submitted to the respective Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives:

Thus, while the Senate language does not require specific authorization for items of hardware costing in excess of $1,000,000, it does require, for these items, a detailed report to the committees.

Since we will be authorizing the appropriations for the saline water program each year, the requirement in the House bill for specific authorization of major items of hardware does not have the significance it otherwise would have. In other words, we will have the opportunity to approve or disapprove these major items in our consideration of the annual program. Every test bed or module which OSW wants to build will have to be included in an annual program for which we will be authorizing appropriations. If the detailed justification reports required by the Senate proviso are submitted to the committees, these reports can be the basis for our approval or disapproval of these major items for inclusion in the annual program.

Under these circumstances, it is my recommendation that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 6133.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, Mr. ASPINALL, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 6133, a bill to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1967, the House passed H.R. 6133, authorizing the additional appropriation of $26,782,000 for fiscal 1968, for the saline water conversion program and changing the basic act to provide authority for "test bed plants" and redesignating "demonstration plants" as "prototype plants." The same bill provides that the demonstration plant program is integrated into the regular research and development program and the authority for using the existing demonstration plants as test bed plants. The bill also contained a committee amendment requiring that any test bed plant, module, or component, costing in excess of $1 million be specifically authorized by Congress.

The Senate has amended the House bill to provide that a detailed report concerning any test bed plant, module, or component costing in excess of $1 million shall be submitted to the respective committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

In view of the fact that the Office of Saline Water is required to seek annual appropriation authorizations, I see no objection to the Senate amendment. However, I should like to point out that concurrence in the Senate amendment is not a carte blanche approval of any future activities of the Office of Saline Water.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that the increasing popularity of the saline water conversion program requires careful and continuous scrutiny by the Congress. In a span of 15 years, Congress has appropriated approximately $110 million for basic and applied research and for demonstration plants in the saline water conversion program. During this period of time, the Office of Saline Water has failed to achieve the original program objectives of producing low-cost potable water from sea and brackish waters. I can only conclude that in these 15 years considerable time, money, and effort has been wasted.

It is most important that the record of the Office of Saline Water in the past 15 years be reversed. H.R. 6133, as amended, is a step in the right direction. The bill while expanding the program also consolidates the saline water conversion program within administrative limits by defining the full sequence in the development of a process and confirming the program to current use throughout the industry.

The need for a careful examination of the saline water conversion program was clearly indicated by the "Statement of the Managers on the Part of the House" when similar legislation came out of the conference committee in 1965—House Report No. 720, 89th Congress. At such time the conference committee concluded that the Office of Saline Water should be given a basis on which to plan operations over a 5-year period but such program should be reviewed annually and that actual appropriation authorization should likewise be sought annually.

The "Statement of the Managers on the Part of the House," stated:

> The language recommended by the Conference Committee is necessary, in our judgment, if the responsibilities of the Congress for this program are to be met. . . . By its very nature, saline water conversion is a program where it is quite uncertain from one year to the next what direction the research effort is to take . . . The prosecution of this program for another five years will involve important policy decisions which cannot be made at this time—decisions which are primarily the responsibility of the Congress.

Since 1965, the Office of Saline Water has sought to circumvent the clear intent of Congress by engaging in latent activities which set in motion procedures and events designed to require congressional approval of Federal participation and expenditures. An example of this conduct is as recent as the approval of the Federal participation in the Metropolitan Water District desalting facility in southern California.

Let me again state that while such projects, in and of themselves, are meritorious, there exists no basis to justify Federal participation on the record of the Office of Saline Water within the past 15 years. The record should be made clear that latent commitments by the Office of Saline Water for Federal participation and expenditures will not be forthcoming if the responsibilities of the Congress for this program are to be met.

H.R. 6133, as amended, provides the authority to continue the saline water conversion program with changes in the basic act as requested by the Office of Saline Water except for the 3-year authorization of appropriations. The effect of this legislation is to breathe new life into the saline water conversion program. On the other hand, Congress has again clearly illustrated its intent to review this program on an annual basis by limiting the authorized appropriation to a 1-year period. Within these limits it is not unreasonable to require that the Office of Saline Water submit a detailed report of its programed activities for each fiscal year including test bed plants, modules, or components costing in excess of $1,000,000. On the other hand, all expenditures costing less than $1,000,000 should, of course, be part of the annual appropriation authorization request.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I remind my colleagues that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will watch closely the efforts and results of the Office of Saline Water. If the Office of Saline Water proceeds and moves forward in the manner they have told the committees of this Congress, then that program will have the hearty support of the Congress.

On the other hand, let notice be served upon the Office of Saline Water that if attempts are made to deviate and stray from the present programs without having produced the objectives already set, then it is incumbent upon this body and its committees concerned to call the Office of Saline Water to task and change the basic law and authority of this agency.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 6133 and approve of its adoption and passage by the House.

FLAG DAY CEREMONIES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Flag Day Committee, I would like to announce that your committee is making progress toward a suitable program honoring our great flag.

We have made arrangements for the U.S. Marine Band and the Air Force "Singing Sergeants" to participate in the program. Representatives of all the services are taking part and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have accepted our invitation to attend.

Your committee is making every effort to prepare a fitting tribute to our Nation's emblem. We urge all of our colleagues to join with us next Wednesday, June 14, to take part in this occasion.

TRAGIC MISTAKE

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was with heavy heart that we learned a little while ago of the tragic mistake which occurred in the Mediterranean when an Israeli ship mistakenly attacked an American ship and killed four boys and injured and wounded 53 others.

These are the tragic consequences of armed conflict. Such mistakes happen frequently in Vietnam.

It would be my hope that this tragic mistake will not obscure the traditional friendship we in the United States have with the people of Israel. The Israeli Government already has apologized. Instead, it would be my hope that we would reaffirm our demands this afternoon when the United Nations Security Council meets that the cease-fire order be enforced. Israel has already agreed to the cease-fire and we hope Egypt will follow. Certainly hostilities must end, because so long as these hostilities continue there will be more and more chances of mistakes such as we have been informed occurred just a little while ago.

INCREASE URGED FOR INDIAN VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill that would increase the amount authorized for adult Indian vocational training programs to

$25 million annually. This program, one of the most popular, successful, and productive Federal programs that we have, is sorely in need of this $10 million increase.

The sad fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we have here a program that is making skilled, trained wage earners of Indians, and over 25 percent of those who want to take advantage of this opportunity are not receiving services when they request them. Many Indians who have received this training came to the program off welfare. They had never known steady employment. Now they hold good jobs in areas where they can support their families in an environment that enables them to receive all of the benefits in this society that they are entitled. They have become taxpaying producers instead of welfare loads. But we are having to turn down many applicants for this opportunity because the program lacks adequate funds.

Not only is the program inadequate for present demands, but projected educational statistics promise an added 5,400 Indian high school graduates, plus an undetermined number of dropouts, many of whom will be in need of vocational training in the fiscal year 1969.

Mr. Speaker, about 45 percent of the Indians in America are unemployed. The Muskogee Area Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in my own district reports that of the employable Indians, 23 percent are unemployed and about 50 percent are underemployed. Yet we have a wonderful vocational training program that makes skilled wage earners of these Indians—and it can not come near serving the present demands because we have not given it enough money.

It will be a shame if a shortage of funds continues to prevent Indians who want to learn to hold productive jobs from doing so. This program can be one of the finest that we have for eliminating poverty and unemployment. It is a sound investment.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in my effort to enable this vital program to mature to its full potential.

THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, now that the United States has been apparently saved from having to intervene unilaterally because of the efficiency of the Israel military, it is imperative that this country seek political means of achieving a lasting peace in the Near East. If the Israelis had not been so competent militarily, and Egypt and her allies so misguided in their aggressive actions, we might now find ourselves drawn into a global war with the Soviet Union. We must not let the situation again develop whereby Israel must again go to war to protect her sovereign rights as a nation.

It would be foolish for anyone to suggest that Israel give up what she has now gained as a result of Arab aggression. In 1956 the Western powers made guarantees to Israel that her rights would be protected, but when it came to the test, Israel was left on her own. Fortunately, for Israel and the rest of the world, this little nation had the determination and might to resist unprovoked Communist aggression. Israel has learned the hard way that international guarantees are not enough. Israel is going to demand, and rightly so, much more than United Nations Emergency Forces that can be withdrawn unilaterally. She is going to demand more than tripartite declarations which may not be honored. She is going to demand that her country be more than a fortress against attack from hate-filled neighbors. She is going to demand more than a precarious right to use international waterways. She is going to demand more than de facto recognition by her neighbors. All of these demands are justified and I urge this Government to help Israel keep at the conference table what she has won on the battlefield—and that is the right to live in peace with her neighbors.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE SHOULD BE NAMED FOR LT. COL. VIRGIL GRISSOM

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to name the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore for one of our favorite and most lamented fellow Hoosiers, the former Lt. Col. Virgil Grissom.

There are many reasons why the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore should bear Grissom's name. Lieutenant Colonel Grissom was and is one of the national heroes of our space endeavors. He was one of the seven Mercury astronauts. He was command pilot of the first manned Gemini space flight in March of 1965. Along with astronauts Ed White and Roger Chaffee he was engaged in testing the spaceship for the most important of all the ventures, the Apollo voyage to the moon, when he suffered a tragic death. We continue to mourn this loss to our Nation, to his family, to my State of Indiana.

For Gus Grissom, whom I knew as a result of my membership on the Science and Astronautics Committee, was indeed a Hoosier. His home was in Mitchell, Ind., and he married a local girl there. He received his B.A. degree in mechanical engineering for one of our most famous Indiana universities, Purdue University in 1950. Lieutenant Colonel Grissom's roots were in Indiana and we continue to think of him as especially our own.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it seems appropriate to me that we name this historic Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore for Lieutenant Colonel Grissom in recognition of the place of his birth, in recognition of the role he has played in our national history; as a reminder to future generations of the deeds of a great man from Indiana.

SETTLEMENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the dramatic successes of the Israeli armed forces, the next step in the Middle East, after a cease-fire, must be direct negotiations between the Arabs and the Israelis to achieve a permanent peace. The U.S. Government should take the lead in the U.N. Security Council and elsewhere to insist upon such direct negotiations, and to insist that there be no more uncertain truce, no more threat hanging over Israel, but the stability of a permanent settlement, agreed to by the parties directly involved, and guaranteed by the great powers.

Such a settlement must involve a recognition of Israel's existence as a State and her right to that existence. It must provide for full access to the Gulf of Aqaba and internationalization and unfettered use of the Suez Canal. As a part of the agreement, provision must be made for the resettlement of the Arab refugees now in camps operated by the United Nation's Relief and Works Administration. Israel can and will accept some of the refugees, but the majority will have to be resettled in Arab lands. Like the other sources of tension and uncertainty that have prevailed, this problem must be resolved once and for all.

In addition effective guarantees must be provided against the continuation of the terrorist raids across Israel's borders which have been such an irritant.

The U.S. Government should stand ready to provide financial support where necessary for the implementation of the agreement whether through the U.N. or otherwise.

In the meantime, as I have previously stated, the United States should be ready to provide whatever economic assistance is needed by Israel during the present period of stress and strain, caused by the Arab States' aggression.

If a permanent settlement can be achieved, all the peoples of the Middle East will share in the blessings of peace and of a brightening future. The State of Israel could and would play a great role in the peaceful development of the entire area.

PERMISSION FOR SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the request been cleared with the ranking minority member?

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes, it has.

Mr. ARENDS. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRO-ISRAEL RALLY

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, today I attended a rally in Lafayette Park here in Washington, which was sponsored by 21 major Jewish organizations throughout the country.

I was impressed with the dignity of the meeting. It was an honor to participate in this gathering of responsible and eminent Americans of the Jewish community—all interested in one common goal of establishing a permanent peace in the Middle East—all interested in an effective guarantee of free access to international waterways in the area.

It was the fervent hope of all present that the fighting and unrest in the Middle East be ended and a permanent solution be found to guarantee the integrity of the democratic State of Israel and free her of Arab aggression, terrorism and harassment.

IMPORTANCE OF STABILITY AND LASTING PEACE IN THE NEAR EAST

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the events of the past week underscore the importance of stability and lasting peace in the Near East. Israel has demonstrated her capacity and determination to fight for survival on the field of battle but the nations of the world must join forces to eliminate the necessity of repeating this struggle.

The United States of America participated with the world community in establishing the State of Israel. It is now our obligation to take the lead in assuring the development of this nation in the peace and tranquility which she has earned. No one can guarantee the future in an age of confusion and international tension, but we can assuredly take steps to prevent the constant recurrence of meaningless wars in this area of the world.

Our country, along with others dedicated to the preservation of peace, must undertake the difficult task of helping the people of Israel, and the people of the Arab world as well, to help themselves. The fantastic sums of money expended in the maintenance of military forces throughout the Middle East, if devoted to the establishment of schools, food production, medical care, and industry could immeasurably raise the living standards of millions of destitute families and eliminate many of the sources of bitterness, misunderstanding and conflict which now exist.

It would be the sheerest folly to permit a new temporary armistice or military truce which could be interrupted at the will of any party. What is needed in the Middle East is an earnest recognition of the grave danger that a new war in this area could quickly become a worldwide conflagration endangering every nation of the globe. We must not permit this knowledge to recede into the background.

Permanent peace can be established by men determined to achieve this goal.

I call upon America to lead in this effort.

HALPERN URGES REALISTIC BORDERS, MASSIVE ECONOMIC AID FOR ISRAEL

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the settlement that must follow compliance with the cease-fire will pose the real test for the community of nations.

The United States must take the leadership in pressing Israel's aims, after that nation has won the gallant fight for freedom and democracy. The tiny nation, surrounded by arrogant and ever-threatening foes, has proved her ability to protect herself militarily, and overcome her enemy neighbors.

But that is not Israel's ultimate aim. Her goal is to live in peace and cooperation with her neighbors. Despite her military victories, she cannot alone achieve the permanent terms she must have to preserve her sovereignty and prevent continuing harassment.

To the dismay of many of us who believed so strongly in our repeated assurances of the past 20 years, the United States failed to come forth in unequivocal support of Israel immediately prior to the present bloody conflict.

Then, when war erupted, our State Department announced a neutral position "in thought, word and deed." Without any material help from any nation, Israel has been fighting a brave, heroic, almost unbelievable fight to push back her enemies.

Despite our so-called neutrality, the United Arab Republic has cut off diplomatic relations with us. I see no reason why we should not now at least fulfill our commitments to Israel of the past two decades by diplomatic means.

The world can no longer accept a diplomatic stalemate like the one of 1956, which contains the seeds of continuing incidents of aggression, and leaves the way open for an eventual flare-up of a hot war in the Middle East.

Israel must have the rights which have been denied to her during the past decade. If the Arabs expect Israel to leave the territory she has won, then Israel is entitled to a treaty of peace, signed by the Arabs. Israel can also expect guarantees of free, peaceful access to Suez and Aqaba.

She must have absolute acceptance by the Arab States of her full sovereignty as a nation. And in order for any peace to be firm and lasting, it must be based on realistic borders for the State of Israel.

Furthermore, now that Israel has fought the good fight for freedom and democracy, the United States should provide a massive emergency economic assistance program to help rebuild war-torn Israel.

Israel cannot win her goals for future peace alone. She needs the support of the United States and the support of the entire community of nations. Indeed, the entire world needs an assurance of peace in the Middle East. All the peace-loving peoples demand the assurance that Nasser and his Arab bullies will stop rattling the sword and stop blackmailing the rest of the world with the threat of Armageddon.

DEMOCRATIC RECORD OF FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, against the backdrop of the unanimous Republican vote yesterday on the debt ceiling legislation, I believe it might be well to bring out the record of the Democrats in Congress during the Eisenhower administration, both when Democrats controlled the House and when Republicans controlled the House, because the record of the Democrats is one of unquestioned fiscal responsibility.

In 1953 during the first year of the Eisenhower administration, with the Republicans in control of the House, the vote to increase the debt limit was 239 to 158.

In 1954 the increase was approved 193 to 31 without even a rollcall vote.

In 1955 the Republicans voted 133 to 13 for the increase; the Democrats voted 134 to 43 for the increase.

During 1958 the Republicans voted 142 to 42 for the increase; the Democrats voted 186 to 29 for the increase.

In 1958, for a second increase, the Republicans voted 120 to 65 for it; the Democrats voted 166 to 44 for the increase.

In 1959 the Republicans voted 88 to 48 for the increase; the Democrats voted 168 to 69 for the increase.

In 1960 the Republicans voted 83 to 60 for the increase; the Democrats voted 140 to 114 for the increase.

Mr. Speaker, the record during the Eisenhower administration, speaks loud and clear for itself. The record of the Republican Party in Congress is also clear during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. It was a consistent policy of opposition and of fiscal irresponsibility. Here, Mr. Speaker, is the record:

The 1961 increase approved 231 to 148: Republicans voted 40 for, 113 against; Democrats voted 191 for, 35 against.

The 1962 first increase approved 251 to 144: Republicans voted 60 for, 98 against; Democrats voted 191 for, 46 against.

The 1962 second increase approved 211 to 192: Republicans voted nine for, 153 against; Democrats voted 202 for, 39 against.

The 1963 first increase approved 213 to 204: Republicans voted one for, 172 against; Democrats voted 212 for, 32 against.

The 1963 second increase approved 221 to 175: Republicans voted two for, 158 against; Democrats voted 219 for, 17 against.

The 1963 third increase approved 187 to 179: Republicans voted none for, 147 against; Democrats voted 187 for, 32 against.

The 1964 increase approved 203 to 182: Republicans voted none for, 154 against; Democrats voted 203 for, 28 against.

The 1965 increase approved 229 to 165: Republicans voted six for, 122 against; Democrats voted 223 for, 43 against.

The 1966 increase approved 199 to 165: Republicans voted one for, 165 against; Democrats voted 198 for, 44 against.

VOTING RECORDS ON DEBT LIMIT EXTENSIONS

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to make several observations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I certainly assume that the figures given by my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, are accurate, but unfortunately he did not include in those figures the amount that was requested in each instance for the increase in the debt limitation. I think that the record is accurate when I say that the $29 billion increase in the debt limitation which was sought—and I underline the word "sought"—by the Administration yesterday was by far many, many times larger than any increase ever sought by the Eisenhower administration. The tremendous magnitude of this debt increase that the White House sought points up very vividly the fiscal irresponsibility of the Johnson-Humphrey administration.

What we are trying to do—and I am delighted that we voted unanimously on our side yesterday—is to point up to all Members and to the American people the fact that we are in an extremely serious financial situation. Unfortunately, despite this crisis, the Administration has not given to the Congress or to the American people the facts upon which we can make an accurate judgment. As I said at a meeting this morning, we on our side of the aisle or many of us on our side, in order to avoid any chaos or confusion as to the capabilities of the Government to pay its obligations during the next several months, will join with those on your side to extend the present debt limitation of $336 billion for several months. Then during that interval of time we respectfully urge that the President and the Bureau recall their budget submitted to the Congress in 1967 so that they can reanalyze and resubmit it to the Congress with reductions that will not only reflect reductions in obligation authority but reductions in expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, the circumstances have changed between January of this year and the present time, and the Administration, along with the Congress, must make a unified effort to meet the current crisis in which we shall cooperate 100 percent.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, would my friend yield to me at this point?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, my friend will certainly agree with me when I say that we left it to the judgment of the President as to what was needed during the Eisenhower administration. We were not at war at that time. Gentlemen on the other side of the aisle may applaud that statement, but if the same circumstances had prevailed during the Eisenhower administration that prevail now, we would have been at war then, because it was in 1954 that commitments to the Republic of Vietnam were made by President Eisenhower. President Kennedy and President Johnson have kept those commitments.

Mr. Speaker, may I remind the gentleman from Michigan that during fiscal year 1959 the Republican administration predicted a surplus in the budget; however, if I remember correctly, we had a deficit of some $11 billion or $12 billion-plus, and an increase in the debt limit was necessary, even though we were at peace.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman, I do not think—with all respect for his observations—has justified the increase that was sought yesterday, an increase of $29 billion in the debt limitation. That figure is infinitely greater than any ever sought by any administration since the end of World War II. No request of this magnitude ever came from former President Truman, former President Eisenhower, or the late President Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, this administration by a request of this size—$29 billion—points up the seriousness of the fiscal crisis we face.

Mr. Speaker, in order to get out from under the problem, I respectfully urge the House to consider a temporary extension of the debt limit at the current level in order to give the administration an opportunity to revise the budget that it submitted in January so that the House of Representatives and the other body can cooperate with it in making the necessary reductions in expenditures that will preclude the need and necessity of a tax increase, as recommended by the President, and that will preclude the dangers of inflation in 1968 which most economists say are about to begin, very shortly.

CAN THE MINORITY LEADER DELIVER THE SAME NUMBER OF VOTES ON THE 6-PERCENT SURCHARGE AND AUTOMOBILE EXCISE TAX AS DELIVERED AGAINST THE PROPOSED DEBT INCREASE?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Republican leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], if the gentleman is willing and can guarantee that he will deliver the same number of votes on the 6-percent surcharge that he delivered against increasing the debt ceiling, and if this is, in fact, what the gentleman is asking for?

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if he is aware that from his side of the aisle many suggestions have in fact already been made to the effect that we reinstitute the automobile excise tax.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if he is for it; if he will vote for it?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan will yield, permit me to respond by saying that I shall be delighted to make an observation upon the questions which have been propounded to me by the distinguished gentlewoman, insofar as I understand them.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury has not asked to appear before the Committee on Ways and Means in behalf of the proposed tax increase which was included in the President's budget message. So, the administration, even though it inferred that it wanted it, has not really come up and asked for it.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, the question which I asked and to which I want an answer is this: Is the gentleman demanding of the Democratic Party that we institute at once the surcharge tax?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentlewoman will yield further, no, of course not; of course not.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Are you——

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Our recommendation is that we make a massive effort to try and reduce expenditures.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Is the gentleman asking now that we reinstate the excise taxes?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Nobody has asked for them.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. But is the gentleman asking it?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. No, I am not asking for such action.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Now, I want to ask once again as I asked yesterday afternoon if the gentleman wants a list of priorities, I would be very interested in seeing the gentleman's list of priorities on which we are going to spend the money, and the things that we are going to cut out of this budget, the proposed list.

The Members on that side of the aisle talk about this. Let us see the list.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I believe we have consistently voted for reductions in expenditures.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. No, the gentleman has not. I would say to the gentleman that the Members on that side of the aisle have not done that, they have voted for shotgun reductions. I want to see the things they are going to cut out.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, June 9, to file a privileged report on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

Mr. LIPSCOMB reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID ALLOCATIONS

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as many of the recipient nations of our foreign aid have broken diplomatic relations with the United States, and incidentally, there are hundreds of millions of dollars in the budget for these nations, I wonder if we are going to find some other way to give away this money, or could we, in discussing the debt ceiling, take into account that billions of dollars in our giveaway program could be taken out of the budget, thereby reducing expenditures and the necessity for at least part of the proposed increase in the public debt.

Mr. Speaker, I am doing a bit of needling, but it makes sense, nevertheless.

THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days the world has watched with chagrin the conflagration in the Middle East. Fortunately for all nations, the war has been confined to this region and has not spread to other areas. For this we are most grateful, since another world war has at times seemed imminent.

The news reports would indicate that Israel has scored a series of victories in the Sinai, as well as in Jordan. But we should not equate these military successes with a conclusion that the problems between the Israelis and Arabs have now been disposed of and settled. These problems were not settled in 1948, nor were they set at rest in 1956. It is my personal belief that the danger of another war in this area cannot be insured against until we have a real settlement of all of the issues by the parties directly involved.

We in the United States recognize the sovereignty of all the nations involved. The United Nations has admitted to its membership all of these nations as sovereign states. Now these sovereign states must sit down together and work out their differences and disputes.

It is my belief that the United States should lend its good offices in arranging, hopefully through the United Nations, for a peace conference. The matters involved, ranging from free passage of all vessels in international waterways to the refugee problem, must be worked out at the peace table by the parties directly involved.

We all want peace, but this time it must be a real peace, a lasting peace. I feel that this can be accomplished only in the way described—by the Israelis and the Arabs.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 124]

Ashley
Ayres
Battin
Blackburn
Bolling
Bray
Burton, Utah
Clark
Dawson
Dent
Diggs
Dow
Fino
Flood
Gettys
Giaimo
Green, Oreg.
Hanna
Hays
Holifield
Horton
Ichord
Kluczynski
Long, La.
McClory
Mize
Nelsen
O'Konski
Pike
Pool
Reid, N.Y.
Ruppe
St. Onge
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Stratton
Taft
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Vander Jagt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Younger

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 392 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9029) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The Conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 343)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9029) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 6, 14, 18, 25, 36, 47, and 53.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 8, 9, 13, 22, 23, 27, 31, 49, and 51; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$49,253,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$40,770,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,190,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$24,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,460,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,980,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$23,809,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$44,148,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,475,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$40,672,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$29,821,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,627,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$770,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,881,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$185,618,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$41,257,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,751,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$82,005,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,848,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$23,913,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$240,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 7, 11, 12, 16, 20, 21, 30, and 41.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN O. MARSH, Jr.,
JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr.,
CHARLES S. JOELSON,
GEORGE MAHON,
BEN REIFEL,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE (reserve on No. 12),
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON (reserve on Nos. 11 and 12),
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
ALAN BIBLE,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9029) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Public Land Management

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $49,253,000 for management of lands and resources instead of $49,013,000 as proposed by the House and $49,451,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill provides $140,000 for processing applications by the State of Arizona for land granted to it under the State Enabling Act; and $100,000 for accelerated examination of desert land applications in Idaho.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $3,900,000 for construction and maintenance as proposed by the House instead of $4,108,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement that the $400,000 budgeted, which has not been approved will be applied to the lowest priority sites as provided by the Bureau of Land Management, except that no State in which recreation development work was budgeted will be left with no such development.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $2,600,000 for public lands development roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the House instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $47,179,000 for resources management as proposed by the Senate instead of $47,200,000 as proposed by the House. The decrease below the House bill includes a reduction of $200,000 for work resulting from Indian Claims Commission awards; an increase of $93,000 for the Sioux Indian Museum and Craft Center, Rapid City, S. Dak.; and $86,000 for renovation and improvement of exhibits at the Museum of the Northern Plains Indians at Browning, Mont.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $40,770,000 for construction instead of $40,525,000 as proposed by the House and $41,530,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes $115,000 for dormitory facilities at the Phoenix Indian School, Arizona; $40,000 planning funds for a kitchen-dining hall building, Wahpeton Indian School, North Dakota; and $90,000 for the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project, Montana.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $18,000,000 for road construction (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the House instead of $19,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide language which would prohibit use of Indian Claims Commission and Court of Claims awards, except for attorney fees, litigation expense, and program planning expenses, until after enactment of legislation setting forth the purposes for which the awards may be used.

Amendments Nos. 8 and 9: Provide for the acquisition of 55 vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 70 vehicles as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $4,190,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $4,140,000 as proposed by the House and $4,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Land and Water Conservation Fund

Amendment No. 11: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $119,191,000 for the land and water conservation fund instead of $119,500,000 as proposed by the House and $122,135,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to allocate $32,269,000 of the land and water conservation fund to the National Park Service instead of

$34,458,000 as proposed by the House and $33,463,500 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes the following increases over the House bill: $1,500,000, Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore; $1,500,000, Piscataway Park; $100,000 Herbert Hoover National Historic Site; $600,000, Everglades National Park; and $100,000 Wolftrap Farm Park. It also includes the following reductions below the amount provided in the House bill: $1,250,000, Whiskeytown-Shasta National Recreation Area; $2,439,000, Assateague Island National Seashore; $1,500,000, Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area; and $800,000, Fire Island National Seashore.

The conferees direct that no individual responsible for land acquisition in Piscataway Park shall take any action, including declaration of taking or condemnation proceedings, which will obligate the Federal Government in excess of the total funds made available for this purpose.

Amendment No. 13: Allocates $15,247,000 of the land and water conservation fund to the Forest Service as proposed by the Senate instead of $15,367,000 as proposed by the House. The reduction of $120,000 below the House bill is for tract 13009(68) in Colorado.

Amendment No. 14: Allocates $1,900,000 of the land and water conservation fund to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife as proposed by the House instead of $2,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Allocates $2,000,000 of the land and water conservation fund to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for emergency planning and acquisition instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement that before any of the funds provided under this allocation are expended by the Federal agencies, the proposed uses shall be presented for prior approval by both the House and Senate appropriation committees.

Amendment No. 16: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $9,191,000 instead of $9,500,000 as proposed by the House and $12,135,500 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement with language contained in Senate report No. 233, which directs the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to terminate approved Federal acquisitions at the beginning of the third fiscal year following such approval. The residual funds from such action are to be reprogramed, such proposed reprogramings to be submitted to both the House and Senate appropriations committees for approval.

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $24,000,000 for the development program in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands instead of $17,500,000 as proposed by the House and $25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $85,499,000 as proposed by the House instead of $86,299,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes a decrease below the House bill of $500,000 for the International Hydrological Decade; and an increase of $500,000 over the House bill for the Federal-State cooperative water resources investigations program.

Amendment No. 19: Provides a limitation of $14,460,000 for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations instead of $13,960,000 as proposed by the House and $15,260,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $35,821,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources instead of $38,180,000 as proposed by the House and $36,121,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease below the House bill includes reductions of $2,224,000 for initiation of a tunneling research program; and $135,000 for Operation Anthracite Refuse and an increase of $400,000 for increased research related to air pollution, particularly regarding removal of sulphur from coal.

Amendment No. 21: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide for the transfer to this appropriation item of $400,000 from the appropriation "Appalachian Region Mining Area Restoration", Bureau of Mines.

Amendment No. 22: Deletes language for the conduct of a tunneling technology program.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $3,367,000 for solid waste disposal as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,232,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Coal Research

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $10,980,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $9,180,000 as proposed by the House and $11,180,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes $800,000 for continuation of the Pittsburgh Midway Coal Co. low-ash coal project; and $1,000,000 for project COED.

Office of Oil and Gas

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $740,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $814,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $23,809,650 for management and investigations of resources instead of $23,194,650 as proposed by the House and $24,219,650 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes $180,000 for additional technological research on shrimp; and $435,000 for leasing a fish protein concentrate plant.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $2,428,000 for anadromous and great lakes fisheries conservation as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,678,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $44,148,800 for management and investigations of resources instead of $43,010,000 as proposed by the House and $44,810,800 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes $50,000 for bird banding and recovery data and updating data processing equipment; $16,000 for a fishery biologist in Nevada; $62,000 for research on fish physiology in South Dakota; $30,000 for a fishery biologist for the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N.C.; $250,000 for accelerated management research and program for migratory birds other than waterfowl; $100,000 for staffing of the Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center, Jamestown, N. Dak.; $70,000 for initiation of a polar bear research program; $100,000 for increased predator control work; and $460,800 to fund all cooperative wildlife research units and all cooperative fishery units at a minimum annual level of $40,000.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $4,475,600 for construction instead of $2,568,000 as proposed by the House and $5,090,600 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $440,000 for fish research facility construction at Cortland, New York; $50,000 planning funds for a proposed laboratory administration building at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center; $150,000 for improvements at the Willow Beach National Fish Hatchery, Arizona; $65,000 for improvements at the Lahontan National Fish Hatchery, Nevada; $134,600 for additional construction at the Valley City National Fish Hatchery, North Dakota; $375,000 for continued construction at the Kooskia National Fish Hatchery, Idaho; $100,000 for initiation of an Atlantic salmon fish hatchery at Green Lake, Maine; $338,000 for construction in the Camp Cornelia area at the Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge, Georgia; $300,000 for development of waterfowl production areas, South Dakota; $100,000 for development of the UL Bend National Wildlife Refuge, Montana; and $255,000 for continued improvement of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, Oklahoma.

The conferees direct that the reduction in the budget estimate be applied to the last-named refuges on the priority list supplied by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife as it appears on page 582, part I, of the House hearings.

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide for the transfer of $400,000 to this appropriation item from the appropriation "Appalachian Region Fish and Wildlife Restoration Projects," Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $2,425,000 for anadromous and great lakes fisheries conservation as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,675,000 as proposed by the House.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $40,672,000 for management and protection instead of $40,442,000 as proposed by the House and $40,730,400 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: $27,000 for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial; $40,000 for the New York City group; $20,000 for archeological and salvage work in Georgia reservoirs; $50,000 for support of two additional elk traps in Yellowstone National Park; and $93,000 for employment of 11 park police in the National Capital Area.

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $29,821,800 for maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities instead of $29,581,000 as proposed by the House and $29,946,800 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $25,000 for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial; $10,000 for the New York City group; $200,000, National Capital Parks; and $5,800 for elk traps in Yellowstone National Park and to provide necessary access roads within the park.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $11,627,000 for construction instead of $11,197,000 as proposed by the House and $12,671,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $400,000 for an interpretive production facility at Harpers Ferry, West Virginia; and $30,000 for the procurement of two portable live elk traps.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $770,000 for the preservation of historic properties instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $470,000 as proposed by the Senate. This provides $300,000 for matching grants-in-aid.

Office of Water Resources Research

Amendment No. 36: Provides $11,130,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $12,130,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $6,881,500 for salaries and expenses instead of $6,776,500 as proposed by the House and $7,064,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes $105,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Water Pollution Control.

Amendment No. 38: Provides a limitation of $300,000 on use of consultants instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House and $400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $185,618,000 for forest land management instead of $185,063,000 as proposed by the House and $186,218,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $80,000 for preparation of design and specifications for a dam at Eagle Lake, W. Va.; $125,000 for recreation development, Caney Lake Area, Kisatchie National Forest, La.; $300,000 for the Mammoth Visitor Center, Inyo National Forest, Calif.; and $50,000 for preparation of design and specifications, administrative headquarters, Superior National Forest, Minn.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $41,257,000 for forest research, instead of $40,180,000 as proposed by the House and $42,029,000 as proposed by the Senate. Conference action includes a reduction of $40,000 for wildlife habitat research in Missouri; and increases of: $182,000 for forest recreation research; $100,000 for aerial logging research; $700,000 for construction of a Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; $60,000 for a feasibility study for plywood manufacture, Black Hills, S. Dak.; $220,000 for construction of a Forest Range Management Laboratory, Fort Myers, Fla.; $50,000 for staffing the Forest Research Laboratory at Alexandria, La.; $50,000 for staffing the Forest Research Laboratory at Princeton, W. Va.; $100,000 for staffing the Southern Hardwood Laboratory, Stoneville, Miss.; $30,000 for staffing the Forest Hydrology Laboratory, Wanatchee, Wash.; and $25,000 for staffing the Forest Research Laboratory at La Crosse, Wis.

Amendment No. 41: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide for the transfer of $400,000 to this appropriation item from the appropriation "Timber Development Organization Loans and Technical Assistance," Forest Service.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $19,751,000 for state and private forestry cooperation instead of $18,251,000 as proposed by the House and $20,251,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Public Health Service

Indian health activities

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $82,005,000 for Indian Health Activities instead of $82,000,000 as proposed by the House and $82,645,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes $5,000 for employment of a counselor for the practical nurses training program at the Sioux Sanitorium, Rapid City, S. Dak.

The conferees are in agreement that concerted efforts shall be made for expansion of the professional nurse training program at the Sioux Sanitorium, Rapid City, S. Dak.

Construction of Indian health facilities

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $16,848,000 for construction of Indian health facilities instead of $14,733,000 as proposed by the House and $17,606,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $1,425,000 for the Phoenix, Ariz., Medical Center; $500,000 for quarters at the Tuba City Hospital, Ariz.; and $190,000 for health stations at Minto and Alakanuk, Alaska.

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $11,200,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $10,700,000 as proposed by the House and $11,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates $3,500,000 for carrying out section 7(c) of the act instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public Land Law Review Commission

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $860,000 for salaries and expenses as provided by the House instead of $1,360,000 as provided by the Senate.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates $23,913,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $23,790,000 as proposed by the House and $24,323,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $35,000 for the National Collection of Fine Arts; $23,000 for the National Portrait Gallery; and $65,000 for building management.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $2,316,000 for museum programs and related research (special foreign currency program) as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates $1,125,000 for restoration and renovation of buildings instead of $1,100,000 as proposed by the House and $1,168,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes $25,000 for the Fine Arts and Portrait Galleries.

National Gallery of Art

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates $3,054,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Federal Development Planning Committees for Alaska

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates $240,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $190,000 as proposed by the House and $325,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Lewis and Clark Trail Commission

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates $25,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $35,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Julia Butler Hansen,
Michael J. Kirwan,
John O. Marsh, Jr.,
John J. Flynt, Jr.,
Charles S. Joelson,
George Mahon,
Ben Reifel,
Joseph M. McDade (reserve on No. 12),
William Henry Harrison (reserve on Nos. 11 and 12),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include miscellaneous tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the statement made in the conference report, I wish to make the following additional comments:

The conference total is $1,399,048,350, and on a comparative basis reflects the following: It is below the appropriations for 1967, in the amount of $11,680,950.

It is below the 1968 budget estimate by $89,869,650.

It is above the House bill by $17,538,200, but it is less than the Senate bill in the amount of $16,511,200.

Mr. Speaker, while the conference report provides a total of $17,538,200 over the amount approved by the House, I feel that it represents a reasonable compromise between the amounts recommended by the Senate and the House. Of this amount $6.5 million is for the additional authorized funding for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

I think it will be of interest to Members of the House that even though the amount of the bill has been increased over the amount previously approved by the House, it is still $11,680,950 below the total appropriations for these activities for fiscal year 1967 when funds included in the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1967, which was recently approved, are taken into consideration.

There was a total of 53 amendments to the House bill, most of which involve rather routine adjustments that could be normally expected in a conference of this type. However, the conference did involve a few items that seem to have generated some particular interest, and I would like to take a moment at this time to comment on them.

For the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, the budget estimate included $6.5 million. The House bill provided no funds for this item. The Senate approved $2 million. After extensive discussion in the conference, the conferees finally agreed to funding at the level of $1.5 million. The committee has received extensive correspondence in this connection, and I might say that the communications received by the committee were in the ratio of about 13 to 1 in favor of funding acquisition of land for the Indiana Dunes. While the amount approved by the conferees is less than was requested in the budget estimate, I would point out that in our consideration of these items we had to be mindful of keeping Federal expenditures at the lowest possible level. With the amount provided in the conference report for this purpose, reasonable progress can be made in fiscal year 1968 on the initial acquisition of land in this area.

The land across from Mount Vernon, known as Piscataway Park, was also an item in conference. The budget estimate provided $2,738,900 for acquisition of land at this location. The House bill provided no funding for this purpose. The Senate provided $2 million. The conferees agreed on a funding level of $1.5 million for this purpose. The same considerations governed conferee action in this instance as pertained to funding for the Indiana Dunes. The conferees were dubious that all of the land and scenic easements that are proposed for Piscataway Park could be obtained at the estimated cost. Therefore, the conference report includes language which stipulates that no action shall be taken by any individual, including declaration of taking and condemnation proceedings, which would eventually obligate the Federal Government in excess of available funds.

Other increases included in the conference report relate to operations of the Forest Service. This represents an investment in the country's overall economy.

In addition, as I pointed out to the Members of the House earlier, activities funded in this bill will generate revenue of about $1,041 million in fiscal year 1968.

Mr. Speaker, there are other items which I will not take time to discuss in detail, such as various facilities of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, which at present are either understaffed or on which construction has not been completed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to adopt this conference report.

At this point in the Record, I insert a summary tabulation of the action taken on the various items in this bill:

Interior Department and related agencies appropriations bill, 1968 (H.R. 9029)

Item	Appropriations, 1967 [1]	Budget estimates, 1968	Allowances			Conference allowance compared with—			
			House	Senate	Conference	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR									
Public land management	$337,405,300	[2] $380,296,000	$339,546,000	$352,771,500	$346,251,000	+$8,845,700	−$34,045,000	+$6,705,000	−$6,520,500
Mineral resources	148,262,800	155,144,000	149,084,000	150,034,800	148,660,000	+397,200	−6,484,000	−424,000	−1,374,800
Fish and wildlife and parks	215,478,700	226,600,000	217,223,650	225,670,750	223,055,850	+7,577,150	−3,544,150	+5,832,200	−2,614,900
Office of Saline Water	29,851,000	23,282,000	9,800,000	9,800,000	9,800,000	−20,051,000	−13,482,000		
Office of Water Resources Research	6,910,000	12,700,000	11,130,000	12,130,000	11,130,000	+4,220,000	−1,570,000		−1,000,000
Office of the Solicitor	4,821,000	5,130,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	+279,000	−30,000		
Office of the Secretary	5,165,900	7,570,000	6,776,500	7,064,500	6,881,500	+1,715,600	−688,500	+105,000	−183,000
Total, direct appropriations	747,894,700	810,722,000	738,660,150	762,571,550	750,878,350	+2,983,650	−59,843,650	+12,218,200	−11,693,200
Total, appropriation of receipts	126,844,700	125,703,000	125,703,000	125,703,000	125,703,000	−1,141,700			
Total, borrowing authority	26,000,000	18,200,000	16,200,000	16,200,000	16,200,000	−9,800,000	−2,000,000		
Total, annual contract authority		12,500,000					−12,500,000		
Total, title I, Department of the Interior	900,739,400	967,125,000	880,563,150	904,474,550	892,781,350	−7,958,050	−74,343,650	+12,218,200	−11,693,200
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES									
Department of Agriculture, Forest Service:									
Total, direct appropriations	362,955,000	[3] 356,521,000	354,494,000	359,498,000	357,626,000	−5,329,000	+1,105,000	+3,132,000	−1,872,000
Total, appropriation of receipts	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000				
Total, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture	363,735,000	357,301,000	355,274,000	360,278,000	358,406,000	−5,329,000	+1,105,000	+3,132,000	−1,872,000
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	178,400	162,000	162,000	162,000	162,000	−16,400			
Commission of Fine Arts	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000				
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service: Indian health activities	90,025,00	[4] 105,769,000	96,733,000	100,251,000	98,853,000	+8,828,000	−6,916,000	+2,120,00	−1,398,000
Office of Education, arts and humanities educational activities	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000				
Indian Claims Commission	394,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	+106,000			
National Capital Planning Commission	1,005,000	1,100,000	995,000	995,000	995,000	−10,000	−105,000		
National Capital Transportation Agency	10,455,000	(5)	(6)	(6)	(6)	−10,455,000			
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	9,019,500	16,370,000	11,700,000	12,700,000	12,200,000	+3,180,500	−4,170,000	+500,000	−500,000
Public Land Law Review Commission	907,000	860,000	860,000	1,360,000	860,000	−47,000			−500,000
Smithsonian Institution	31,726,000	36,926,000	32,093,000	32,064,000	31,611,000	−115,000	−5,315,000	−482,000	−453,000
National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources	1,100,000	1,330,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	+200,000	−30,000		
National Visitor Center Study Commission	10,000					−10,000			
Federal Development Planning Committees for Alaska	190,000	325,000	190,000	325,000	240,000	+50,000	−85,000	+50,000	−85,000
Lewis and Clark Trail Commission	25,000	35,000	25,000	35,000	25,000		−10,000		−10,000
Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission	25,000					−25,000			
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission	80,000					−80,000			
Total, direct appropriations	509,209,900	521,013,000	500,167,000	510,305,000	505,487,000	−3,722,900	−15,526,000	+5,320,000	−4,818,000
Total, appropriation of receipts	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000				
Total, title II, related agencies	509,989.900	521,793,000	500,947,000	511,085,000	506,267,000	−3,722.900	−15,526,000	+5,320,000	−4,818,000
Grand total	1,410,729,300	1,488,918,000	1,381,510,150	1,415,559,550	1,399,048,350	−11,680,950	−89,869,650	+17,538.200	−16,511,200
Consisting of—									
Direct appropriations	1,257,104,600	1,331,735,000	1,238,827,150	1,272,876,550	1,256,365,350	−739,250	−75,369,650	+17,538,200	−16,511,200
Appropriation of receipts	127,624,700	126,483,000	126,483,000	126,483,000	126,483,000	−1,141,700			
Borrowing authorization	26,000,000	18,200,000	16,200,000	16,200,000	16,200,000	−9,800,000	−2,000,000		
Annual contract authorization		12,500,000					−12,500,000		

[1] Includes 2d supplemental, 1967 (Public Law 90-21).

[2] Includes $12,500,000, S. Doc. 22.

[3] Includes $500,000, H. Doc. 104.

[4] Includes $1,425,000, H. Doc. 114.

[5] Proposes reappropriation of 1967 unobligated balance not to exceed $400,000.

[6] Provides for transfer of $250,000 from "Construction, Rail Rapid Transit System."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington yield to me at this point?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, although I was one of the conferees on the bill, I did not sign the conference report. I did not because, in my estimation, the House conferees failed and failed miserably to uphold the judgment of the House on the level of appropriations to be provided in this bill and as to which programs were to be funded.

As a result of this conference, the House is being asked today to appropriate $17,538,200 more than the $1,381,510,150 which it approved on April 27. Of course, the $1,399,048,350 the House is being asked to approve is $16,511,200 less than the amount approved by the other body on May 18. But, I say to you that simply splitting the arithmetic difference between what the two bodies approved hardly represents any attempt by the House conferees to preserve the House position on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, is there no limit to which this Congress will not go in appropriating funds for domestic spending? However desirable many of the spending programs in this bill may be, we cannot escape the fact that they go far beyond what we can afford at this moment in history.

Estimates of the budget deficit in fiscal 1968 are now ranging upward of $30 billion.

Just yesterday, this House turned down by a vote of 197 yeas to 210 nays the administration's proposal to increase the public debt limit to $365 billion.

Tomorrow, the Appropriations Committee will be reporting a bill to finance the Vietnam war and our defense activities in other areas of the world during fiscal 1968.

A serious conflict is raging in the Middle East and it could impose additional demands upon our resources.

What more must occur to convince the administration and this Congress that the time is long past for taking stock of our fiscal situation?

Must we continue down the road of fiscal irresponsibility until our economic health is beyond repair?

Is there nothing at all that can be done to alter this course of fiscal folly?

With humility and sincerity of purpose, I say to you we must stop this compulsive race to economic disaster. We could take a first step in that direction if the House would reject this conference report and the amendments in disagreement, and send the bill back to conference. Additional efforts then could be made to sustain the position of the House, or for that matter, reduce the size of this appropriation to a level even lower than the House approved originally.

The other body has followed its consistent pattern of restoring items cut by the House and of adding unbudgeted projects. As is usual, the initial appropriation for each of these added-on projects is modest indeed. But, once the add-ons are funded the pressure will be on to finance the projects to completion.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to commend the conferees and to especially commend the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. Hansen] for their forthright and effective action as represented in amendment No. 17, in which they have agreed upon the figure of $24 million as put in the bill for appropriations to the trust territory.

Mr. Speaker, I should further like to point out the fact that this action is deserving of our support. It is deserving of our support very distinctly in view of the fact that at this very moment the United Nations trusteeship council is looking over our stewardship of our trusteeships.

Mr. Speaker, while it is my opinion that this action on the part of the committee at this time is making certain that we shall be able to proceed with a good, sound and constructive program for the peoples in those areas and represents an action on the part of the conferees which should be applauded by everyone.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate tne conferees and especially the conferees on the part of the House led by the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. Hansen].

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York. The conferees and the committees of both the House and the Senate were well aware of the problems involved there. It is our hope the program can go ahead to the fullest possible advantage to those people in developing the economy in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 125]

Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Battin
Blackburn
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Burton, Utah
Celler
Clark
Corman
Daddario
Dawson
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Dow
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Everett
Fallon
Fino
Flood
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gettys
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Grover
Gude
Hanley
Hanna
Hays
Hébert
Holifield
Horton
Ichord
Irwin
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Leggett
Long, La.
McClory
Mailliard
Mize
Monagan
Nelsen
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Pickle
Pike
Pool
Railsback
Reid, N.Y.
Rooney, N.Y.
Ruppe
Sandman
St. Onge
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Stratton
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Williams, Miss.
Wolff
Younger

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At the time when the point of no quorum was made the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. Hansen] had yielded 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel], whom the Chair now recognizes.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. Hansen, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that has this conference report before the House. I think she did an outstanding job of getting the bill back down to around half of what was added to it in the other body. Those additions made in the other body I think will be acceptable to most Members of the House, and I certainly urge acceptance of the report.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 321, nays 49, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—321

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brasco
Brinkley
Brock
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Colmer
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holland
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Irwin
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
N'chols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Sandman
Satterfield
St Germain
Saylor
Scheuer
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler

Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zwach

NAYS—49

Arends
Ashbrook
Bennett
Betts
Bow
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Byrnes, Wis.
Chamberlain
Collier
Conable
Curtis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Ford, Gerald R.
Gardner
Gross
Grover
Hall
Halleck
Hutchinson
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Laird
Lukens
Meskill
Michel
Minshall
Montgomery
Myers
Pollock
Reid, Ill.
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Shriver
Stanton
Sullivan
Thompson, Ga.
Utt
Watkins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Zion

NOT VOTING—63

Ayres
Battin
Blackburn
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Burton, Utah
Clark
Corman
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Dent
Diggs
Dow
Evins, Tenn.
Fino
Flood
Frelinghuysen
Gettys
Goodell
Gude
Halpern
Hanley
Hanna
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Holifield
Horton
Ichord
Jacobs
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Long, La.
McClory
McEwen
Mize
Nelsen
O'Konski
Pickle
Pike
Pool
Railsback
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Ruppe
St. Onge
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Stratton
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Walker
Williams, Miss.
Wolff
Younger
Zablocki

So the conference report was agreed to:

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Brademas with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Fino.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Walker with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Mize.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Pike.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. ARENDS, and Mr. BROWN of Michigan changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: On page 8, line 21, strike out the proviso and insert: "*Provided further*, That nothing contained in this paragraph or in any other provision of law shall be construed to authorize the expenditure of funds derived from appropriations in satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims, except for such amounts as may be necessary to pay attorney fees, expenses of litigation, and expenses of program planning, until after legislation has been enacted that sets forth the purposes for which said funds will be used:".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: On page 10, line 25, strike out "$119,500,000" and insert "$122,135,500."

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$119,191,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: On page 11, line 3, strike out "$34,458,000" and insert "$33,463,500."

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$32,269,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: On page 11, line 18, strike "$9,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$12,135,500".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$9,191,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: On page 16, line 10, strike "$38,180,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$36,121,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$35,821,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: On page 16, line 10, add: "and in addition $400,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Appalachian region mining area restoration', Bureau of Mines".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: On page 22, line 20, add: ", and in addition $400,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Appalachian Region Fish and Wildlife Restoration Projects', Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, to remain available until expended."

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 41: On page 31, line 20, add: ", and in addition $400,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Timber Development Organization Loans and Technical Assistance', Forest Service."

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by

which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mrs. **HANSEN** of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just passed.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

AMENDING AND EXTENDING THE DRAFT ACT AND RELATED LAWS

Mr. **RIVERS** submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. **POAGE.** Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1318) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 1318, with Mr. LANDRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **CHAIRMAN.** When the Committee rose on Monday, May 15, 1967, the Clerk had read the first section of the bill and the committee amendments thereto. Without objection, therefore, the Clerk will again report the committee amendment to the first section.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 1, line 5, strike out lines 5 through 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the word 'and' the first time it appears therein and by inserting after the word "1967;" the words 'not in excess of $195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968;'."

Mrs. **SULLIVAN.** Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

I rise in opposition to the first committee amendment which would limit to the 1968 fiscal year only the authorization for the appropriation of funds to continue the food stamp program. As I said Monday during general debate, I do not challenge or dispute the right of the Committee on Agriculture to review annually, or even more often if it so chooses, the operations of any program it authorizes. It has that right under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It can propose at any time amendments to, or limitations on, this program.

The food stamp law is permanent legislation. It was enacted in 1964 with no time limit on its operations. The only time limit was in the form of specified ceilings on appropriations for the first 3 fiscal years. So we have known since 1964 that a law would have to be passed before June 30, 1967, to permit the appropriation of funds to continue the program beyond that date. The committee could have amended the law in 1965 and 1966, but it did not bother.

I introduced a continuation bill last summer. It was not acted on. I introduced it again this year. Now it is before us. The deadline is on top of us. We are under the gun to get a law through right away. I am sure it will pass in time—I certainly hope so—but, under the committee amendment we would then have to go through this very same procedure next year and presumably every year thereafter—and always, I am afraid, the fight would be exactly on the same issue as it was in 1964 and as it is this year. The committee is not very enthusiastic about this program, as shown by both the majority and minority reports. It regards it primarily as some sort of welfare program rather than as a food utilization program.

Whenever the Committee on Agriculture takes up the food stamp bill, it seems to devote very little deliberation to the value of the program in expanding food sales and increasing domestic utilization of food, and instead argues over welfare policies. That committee does not have jurisdiction over welfare legislation. I have been urged for years to redraft the food stamp legislation to place the program in the Department of Welfare, and I resisted that because I believe the people in the Department of Agriculture know far more about food utilization than the people in the Department of Welfare. But if we keep running into this constant sniping at this program by the Committee on Agriculture as being some sort of terrible welfare program, then perhaps we should take this program, and the school lunch program, and the school milk program, and the feeding of the needy through direct distribution, and turn them all over to Ways and Means or Education and Labor for administration by HEW.

The Committee on Agriculture asks to have the right to rule on this program again next year, before permitting any of the existing food stamp projects to continue. But if you look through the hearings, you will not find a single word of testimony by any witness who indicated this program was not operating honestly, and as Congress intended. Of course, some of the members of the committee who are against the food stamp program grumbled a bit about rumors of abuses, but no evidence was presented that I know of to show any abuses.

What the committee wants to do is to cut back the program's cost by making the States pay more and the Federal Government less. This is the nub of the issue. The committee tried that in 1964 with a 50-percent sharing amendment, and we licked it. It is trying again this year with a 20-percent sharing amendment, and I hope we beat that, too. If we do not defeat this pending amendment for a 1-year limitation the committee undoubtedly will try once again next year to add further limitations and restrictions which could only have the result of damaging the effectiveness of the program, for any support voiced by the committee, for the program is at best lukewarm.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of agricultural programs which could stand annual review by the Congress a lot more than this one requires it. Section 32—which sets up a special reserve of hundreds of millions of dollars in customs receipts to be used exclusively to help the farmer—has not been the subject of a bill before Congress in 13 years, to the best of my recollection. It was enacted in 1935 as a depression measure. Should we keep it? Have the farmers some divine right to nearly $1 billion to be set aside next year just for removal of agricultural surpluses?

The wheat-cotton bill which we passed in 1964 as the price for getting the food stamp bill that same year does not require annual review by the Committee on Agriculture. But I think it is safe to say that if the committee amendment for mandatory annual reauthorization of the food stamp program carries, a lot of Democrats who have in the past voted for farm programs recommended by the Committee on Agriculture, are going to insist, first of all, that each such program have only a 1-year life, and then, perhaps like many of those on the Committee on Agriculture who voted against the food stamp program even after loading it down with crippling amendments, the urban Democrats may still not be satisfied.

I stress the word "Democrats" because in this bill today, the Democrats on the Committee on Agriculture who helped to amend this bill have been running interference for the other side of the aisle, which would like nothing better than to have the Democrats help the Republicans to kill one of the most successful of all of the antipoverty programs.

If you do not believe that, Mr. Chairman, take a look at the vote in the Committee on Agriculture. Three years ago, every Republican voted against food stamps. This year, the overwhelming majority of them voted against the program. Yet, they all believe wholeheartedly in these committee amendments. Who is kidding whom?

The opposition must be strictly political because this program is just as successful in the Republican districts as it is in Democratic districts. Perhaps the Republicans are against it because it is a Democratic program which works so well. I urge you to vote against this amendment to limit the authorization to 1 year.

Mr. **ARENDS.** Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. **ST GERMAIN.** Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. **ST GERMAIN.** Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk to the committee amendment, and I wonder if it is proper to offer it now?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may offer his amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ST GERMAIN

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ST GERMAIN to the committee amendment: On Page 2, line 2, add the following after "1968;": "not in excess of $275,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; not in excess of $350,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1970; and not in excess of such funds as may thereafter be authorized by the Congress for any subsequent fiscal year."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, it seems incredible that in these affluent United States we should allow some of our citizens to be faced with starvation and yet it does occur in some counties across our land.

And though the surplus commodity and food stamp programs were introduced to overcome this, we have, for the most part, failed to arrest the problem in accordance with our capabilities. While the former program involves local storage and distribution costs, the latter entails recertification and administrative costs. But regardless of the cost of operating these programs in an efficient and effectual manner, they are necessary for those people who need our help most and, therefore, should be continued.

Though the merits of both of these programs are worthy of much note, Mr. Chairman, today I would like to dwell upon the food stamp program.

There are many things that one in need can do without for awhile but food is not one of them. Therefore, when we consider the needs of the poor, food should be the primary consideration before all else.

The food stamp program is an attempt to meet the primary need of the poor. If it is to realize the success that it should, meeting the basic need of our poor, it must be given sufficient time and support. We should authorize adequate appropriations for a long enough period so that the States may plan and implement their programs in accordance with the overall needs across the Nation. This will allow the States sufficient time to generate a program that will embrace all the needy within its borders.

In scanning the Nation, we noted that in Mobile County, Ala., there are 99,000 poor, yet no one has access to food stamps. In close by Virginia I am told that only 1.9 percent of the poor have access to their commodities or food stamps, and in Pulaski County, Ark., only 3,483 of its 67,000 poor participate in a food distribution program.

It is quite possible that while thousands of tons of food are shipped overseas, a majority of our Nation's poor go without necessary food.

What is needed, Mr. Chairman, is a firm commitment by the Federal Government to provide assistance to the States in building a strong food stamp program to meet the needs of the Nation's poor, not only today and not only for next year but for the next decade at least.

We must assure the States that adequate funds will be made available in the future to support their efforts to provide the poor with food.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 127]

Aspinall
Ayres
Battin
Bell
Blackburn
Bolling
Brademas
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Clark
Corman
Dawson
Dent
Dow
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Ford,
William D.
Frelinghuysen
Gettys
Giaimo
Goodell
Gude
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Holifield
Horton
Ichord
Irwin
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Long, La.
McClory
McEwen
Mize
Nelsen
O'Konski
Pickle
Pike
Pool
Reid, N.Y.
Ruppe
St. Onge
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stratton
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Younger

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 1318, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 376 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I would initially like to express my thanks to the minority for placing emphasis on the importance of this amendment.

For those Members who may not have been present when the amendment was read, the amendment extends the authorization under the legislation beyond the 1-year period in the committee amendment to 1969 in the amount of $275 million, and to 1970 in the amount of $350 million.

My colleagues, if we are going to take care of the undernourished, the underfed, and the starving of this Nation, we must allow our States to plan ahead of time. It is impossible, Mr. Chairman, for our States to plan ahead under a 1-year authorization.

The committee might state that they have not held hearings on the amounts covered in my amendment. By the same token I would say to the committee they had ample time to hold hearings, and that these amounts are what we feel are accurate projections of the needs in view of applications already approved, and not funded, and in view of applications that will be submitted.

The point of fact, as stated earlier, is the cities of Boston and New York are waiting implementation of their programs because of a lack of funds.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If I understand correctly, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island has offered an amendment to the committee amendment which would authorize appropriations for this program for 3 more years rather than just 2.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. That is correct.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. And it is not an open-end authorization for appropriations?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. It would limit the authorization.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. At the end of the amendment it says, after June 30, 1970, "not in excess of such funds as may thereafter be authorized by the Congress for any subsequent fiscal year."

Mr. ST GERMAIN. For any fiscal year subsequent to 1970, that is correct.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. So it is not open ended. I want to say that 3 years' time is sufficient to meet my objections to the committee amendment. I just felt we could not accept a 1-year authorization because it would destroy all planning of the programs for future expansion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. BARRETT, Mr. ST GERMAIN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I have a list here of some 232 counties which have requested the food stamp program in their areas. They have been approved, but they have not been able to initiate the program.

I have another list of 140 counties throughout the States which have requested the food stamp program, but which have not yet been approved for participation. It takes time to put these programs into being. You cannot plan ahead with just a 1-year authorization.

But if the committee would accept a 3-year authorization, as the gentleman proposes, I believe we could live with it and have a good program.

Both of the lists I have referred to were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 14, 1967, at pages 6656–6665.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to join with the gentleman from Rhode Island in support of his amendment. I know from experience in many of the programs that we are confronted with, programs in the educational field and in other types of programs, that some long-range plans are absolutely essential. I believe it would be wholly unworkable to restrict this to a 1-year authorization.

I want to thank the gentleman for presenting his amendment, and I will support it.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that a great many of us have received similar communications to that which I received from my director of social welfare in the State of Rhode Island.

I would like to quote very briefly from that communication:

> As we noted earlier the State of Rhode Island firmly committed itself to the Food Stamp Act of 1964. This commitment led to a large expenditure of time, effort and money to establish a Food Stamp Program in the State of which we could be proud.

As I stated, I am sure that many of you here on the floor today have had a similar experience in your own State.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RESNICK. I would like to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island on his amendment. I think it is a very worthwhile amendment and a very necessary amendment.

As a member of the committee, I would like to point out that the only way the bill could get out of the committee in the first place was with this crippling amendment which you have put an amendment onto. The people who proposed the amendment then voted against the bill in the committee.

In other words, your substitute will alleviate that problem.

As I say, this is a very good substitute and I think everybody should understand that if it does not carry and the original committee amendment carries, it will virtually wreck the food stamp bill.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. I want to commend the gentleman for offering this amendment.

I, too, believe that this should be at least a 3-year program instead of the 1-year period as provided by the committee amendment. This has been a very important program in our area of the country and the welfare officials are bipartisan in nature and we support this program very strongly. I hope the gentleman's amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. When I read from the communication from my director of social welfare in Rhode Island, I am sure the gentlemen on the minority side of the aisle are aware of the unfortunate situation in the State of Rhode Island where the State administration is led by a Republican Governor and as a result those in charge of our agency are Republicans and the head of this agency is a Republican but this particular administrator of social welfare happens to be one of the more effective administrators in the Nation so far as I am concerned.

I cited to you the plan that had been implemented in the State of Rhode Island for its effectiveness and its desirability.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman on offering his amendment. I certainly urge its adoption.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would want to call to the attention of the Committee the fact that there is much to be said in favor of some kind of assurance as to the length of a program. Your committee recognized that fact. But here on the floor we are faced with a practical problem just as we were in the committee. We originally had a bill introduced which was a completely open-ended proposition with no limitation upon the amount that would be spent other than that which would from year to year be written in by the Committee on Appropriations.

I do not think the substitute amendment changes that situation very much. It is true that it puts some figures in, but in fiscal year 1969 it will be $50 million more than the other body has already provided and the year after that it would be $100 million more than that body has already provided.

I do not think this House expects that we are going to appropriate funds of that magnitude.

Just yesterday the majority of this House said that they did not want to increase the debt limit. Well, you can vote on the debt limit—the debt is what is really vital and the way you limit the debt is by limiting what you spend. If you are going to spend $100 million a year more than the other body has provided, then I doubt that any limit is going to amount to much.

What we are talking about here is spending money. Your Committee on Agriculture was not hostile to this food stamp program. I was disappointed and chagrined when the gentlewoman from Missouri got up and castigated this committee as being hostile to the food stamp program. This is the committee that brought the food stamp program before this House. This is the committee that sponsored and passed the food stamp program. This is the committee that brought it to the floor this year.

I have said publicly that I was going to vote for a continuation of this food stamp program, whether you adopt the committee amendments or whether you do not. I think it is a good program and I think it is something which we should continue. I think that it will be a better program if we adopt the committee amendments. It is something that we will continue, but I think it is something that we should have a chance to review from year to year in the open.

If this committee amendment is not adopted, you will get a chance to review this program only before the Appropriations Committee, but how many of you can go down there and be heard? How many of you can hear what testimony is given before that committee? How many of us can read the testimony before the appropriation bill is before us?

The Committee on Agriculture does not function that way. Any Member of the House can come over there and be heard before our committee. All of you who wanted to be heard were heard this year. There was not a one of you who asked to be heard who was not heard. You have a chance to be heard before the legislative committee. You have a chance to present your attitude.

If you leave the review with the Committee on Agriculture, as this committee amendment provides, you will have an opportunity to be heard next year. If you kill the committee amendment, you will have no chance to be heard. You will have no chance to make any determination or to present any reason as to what should be done in the way of improving or changing the program or fixing the amount that is to be spent.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I appreciate the remarks of the chairman. I am convinced of his sincerity. But by the same token, it is one thing to approve the United Givers Appeal or the United Fund Appeal, but it is another thing to make an actual contribution. As I stated previously, Mr. Chairman, I feel from the evidence that we have, individuals who have heard from our own constituents and others, in order for the States to implement these programs and keep them going, they have to have an authorization of more than 1 year.

There was some thought of an open-end authorization, an amendment for an open-end. This was changed to keep the authority with the Committee on Agriculture. This would merely give them 3 years to know that they can work on this program and look forward to its implementation for these 3 years. They are already spending a goodly amount of money on the administration of these programs.

Mr. POAGE. I do not want to discuss the second amendment right now. The gentleman has, I believe, been attempting to discuss the second amendment. But the first amendment relates to the review procedure, and the effect of it is simply to keep it in the hands of the Committee on Agriculture during each of the 3 years. The substitute amendment would go further and would provide an authorization for expenditures of $155 million more during the next 3 years, than it provided in the bill that has been passed by the other body.

I do not believe you could get that amount of money, and I do not think any of you think you will. I think that all you do by this is to say in effect that the Committee on Agriculture cannot review this program during the next 3 years.

I fear that it, too, emphasizes what the gentlewoman from Missouri and the gentleman from Rhode Island have both made very plain, and that is they feel our Committee on Agriculture is unfriendly to their proposal.

The gentleman suggests it is one thing to talk about making subscriptions to good causes, and that it is another thing to actually put up the money. I wonder what committee in this House "put up the money"? I wonder what committee brought the food stamp program before us? Where did it come from, if not from the Committee on Agriculture? Ours is the committee which brought this program here. Yet we are charged with simply giving mouth service and doing nothing substantial.

I do not think it is a fair charge. I believe it is hardly worthy to make that kind of charge against the Agriculture Committee that has brought this program before the House and that wants to try to keep a program going.

I do not believe that this is the effective way to get a good program. What we are doing is laying the predicate to have the committee reject the entire thing.

I believe we have brought a workable program, one that provides for a fair review, and a review that I wish the House would let us carry through.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe that in my remarks I did praise the gentleman for his fine cooperation and for bringing this bill to the floor. I have always been happy to give public recognition to the support he has given to this program in past years. But when we look at the vote of his committee—if I recall the vote correctly, the vote to bring this amended bill to the floor, the vote was 19 to 14, even after these amendments were added. It is my understanding that in order to get the bill out of committee, it was necessary to put these limitations on the authorization for appropriations and to add the 20 percent cost-sharing amendment. So next year we would have to go back again and have the same fight all over again, and always we would be hit with the same limitations or a requirement for cost-sharing participation by the States such as in this case of 20 percent. Three years ago it was for 50 percent and we had to knock it out. Most of those on the gentleman's committee who voted for the restrictions in the bill are going to vote against the bill anyway, so I do not think one could say it is a sympathetic committee, because if it were, we would not have this fight on these same grounds each year the bill comes up. That is why I have said that whereas the committee always has the power to report out bills to amend this law, we should not be forced to go before an unsympathetic committee every year and be required to get a bill to continue the program.

Mr. POAGE. I do not want to speak for other members of the committee, Mr. Chairman, but as far as I am concerned, I will vote for the bill with or without the amendments.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if anybody was in doubt at all about this being a good amendment, I believe he would just have to change his mind when he would find the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and me both opposing it, because I believe this is one of the very few times that we happen to have been on the same side. I believe that would be about all the information he would need.

I am going to have to admit now that there are some members on the Committee on Agriculture who are not sympathetic to this program. I plead guilty as one of those. But the committee as a whole is not unsympathetic to this particular program. I have never been able to understand why they were sympathetic, but nevertheless the majority of them have been.

This program, instead of being a charity program, does away with a program for the people that actually need food, for the purpose of giving a better diet to those who already have money. I cannot understand why we should feed or give a better diet to a fellow who already has cash with which to buy his own groceries, and take away from the person who has no means whatsoever of getting commodities or any other kind of food. That is one of the reasons why I have been unsympathetic.

Another reason is that this program, as far as I can see, is going to get bigger and bigger. If we have any doubt, just look at what is happening right now. Instead of $195 million, they want $275 million, and $350 million. They want $820 million right at the very start of this program, and that is only the beginning.

Some who might think they do not have any chips in this game should stop and think that last night the House of Representatives voted down the debt ceiling bill. If we are going to continue to do that, every dollar that goes for the food stamp program is going to have to come out of somebody's private program. So those who are interested in other projects and other improvements and other expenditures which they feel are essential and good, should just stop and think that out of this budget is going to have to come money for the food stamp program. If we put a ceiling on, we are going to have to get this money from somebody.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman had 10 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I would have been happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELCHER. The gentleman had 10 minutes and I did not object at all to his statement. Would he just let me finish my statement, and if I get an additional 5 minutes, I will be glad to yield to him.

The gentleman made quite a thing of the fact that a Republican Governor up in Rhode Island was behind this program. I can let the Members in on a secret. Every Governor in the United States—Republican, Communist, or Democrat—is going to be for this program, because he will get a completely free ride for his budget. The Federal Government is going to pay for the entire thing.

On this very bill—which is going to be violently opposed by the people sponsoring the bill—there is a proposal to just make them pay 20 percent.

When they get a free ride on this program, do we not believe they are going to saddle every single thing on this program that they possibly can? On all the other programs they have to participate anywhere from 20 percent to 50 percent.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York. The gentleman took up half of my time the other day, but I know he just cannot keep still over there, so he can go ahead.

Mr. RESNICK. I am just articulate. The gentleman pointed out that the other programs cost from 20 percent to 50 percent.

As to the commodities program, I believe those commodities are supplied free. I should like to ask the gentleman why, if he is opposed to the food stamps going free, he does not oppose the commodities going free?

Mr. BELCHER. The commodity program was set up because we had the granaries of this country just bulging with surplus commodities. We set it up as much to get rid of the surplus commodities as we did for a charitable program back home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BELCHER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BELCHER. There is another thing, Mr. Chairman. The commodity program is never going to even be a drop in the bucket compared to what this program is going to be, when it escalates from $195 million up to $820 million by 1970.

As I said, we are going to see Republican Governors and we are going to see all of the Governors in here asking for this particular program.

That is how I felt, and how I still feel. My own State of Oklahoma has a Republican Governor, who has felt we should feed the poor people first.

Apparently the proponents of this bill would rather feed those people who already have cash to buy part of their groceries with. We prefer to feed those who have no cash at all.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I merely wish to say to the gentleman that people come to see me on this food stamp program, and they say how happy they are, because they are getting $48 or $52 or $60 a month to live on, for gas, electricity, food, heat, and light.

I do not believe that to supplement the diet of people who are receiving so little per month to live on is feeding someone who is not in need. I feel that these people are in need.

Mr. BELCHER. Would the gentleman not agree with me that a man with $52 a month is a darned sight better off than a man without anything?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. That is correct, but why eliminate those who have only $52 a month?

Mr. BELCHER. Why would the gentleman want to take care of the fellow with $52 and let the other fellow starve?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I say, let us take care of those who do not have the $52 also. Let us help them also.

Mr. BELCHER. It cannot be done under this bill. This bill stops the commodity program. When Members vote for this bill they vote to stop the commodity program.

Whom should we take care of first?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. It is my understanding that there is also a downgrading of the amount, based on the amount of the individual's income. There are criteria, or some authorization given in this program, to allow a basic commodity to go as low as 50 cents or $2.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. In all courtesy I believe I should yield now to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I should like to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that the cost of the present direct distribution program is $175 million, for the free food given out to States like his. His State has 73 counties receiving free food handouts. If the State would pay the administration costs of the food stamp program instead, the people in those counties could get a much better diet, instead of having to live on flour, dried beans, powdered milk, and a few items such as those.

Mr. BELCHER. There would be a lot of them that would not get anything under either one of those programs if we put the stamp program in.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Only if they chose not to participate, because they are now getting something free but they are not getting a proper diet—not the kind of food Americans should have for an adequate diet.

Mr. BELCHER. The commodity program would go out in Oklahoma and we prefer that program there. I assume sooner or later the State administration in Oklahoma will figure out that if you can get this for nothing, they will take it on rather than the commodity program.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Would the gentleman be willing to do without the Public Law 480 program that feeds India and all of the other countries all over the world? That is what our people are complaining about. Why feed people all over the world when you are so chintzy about feeding your own?

Mr. BELCHER. We feed those people all over the world with a commodity program. That is the only one that I voted for. I say before we send it to India and cut it off from Oklahoma and establish a program for the Middle East, I say keep the commodities in Oklahoma.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. But you are in favor of sending it abroad under the Public Law 480 program?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes. Reluctantly I have voted for the passage of Public Law 480. Of course, the passage of that law in the very beginning was for no charitable purpose at all. It was for the purpose of establishing a market for American commodities all over the world. Eventually, as we went along, we gradually saddled it up with a charitable program, too. I have gotten so much in the habit of voting for Public Law 480 that I guess I have just continued. I do not want to get in the habit of voting for the food stamp plan, because I might continue that, too.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I want to point out in answer to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] the primary difference between the food stamp program and the commodity program is that the commodity program was a surplus disposal program. That is why there was no participation by the States. Under the food stamp program, section 3 defines food as any food product except alcoholic beverages and tobacco and those foods and meats which are imported.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Belcher was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BELCHER. I yield further to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. There is a vast difference between what you can buy in the food stamp program and a commodity program.

Secondly, as I pointed out in the report at page 31, in nearly every other program the States and local governments pay about 30 or 40 percent of the cost. We are not setting a precedent by asking the States to pay 20 percent.

Mr. BELCHER. Members of the House, I have only 1 minute left. I think first we should defeat the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] and sustain the committee amendment. I think those of you who are in favor of the food stamp plan will do well to do that, because if you start forcing this food stamp plan too fast, I think you may wind up on the wrong end of the horns. So the best thing you can do is let the committee take another look at it 1 year from now.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BELCHER. I will if I have any more time.

Mr. WYDLER. I want to clear up one thing, because I heard the gentlewoman say that this is a program for free food. I am trying to get clear in my own mind, is this food really free? Does not somebody have to pay for it?

Mr. BELCHER. If you need $16 worth of groceries and you put up $10 in cash, the Federal Government puts up $6. They give you $16 worth of food stamps. To the extent of the difference between $10 and $16, that is free.

Mr. WYDLER. It is free to the consumer, but somebody has to pay that $6, does he not?

Mr. BELCHER. That comes out of the taxpayer, and everything that comes out of the taxpayer is supposedly free.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in order to seek unanimous consent to limit the time on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that everyone is interested in this question, most of whom have spoken thereon, and Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the committee amendment and all amendments and substitutes thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, as well as substitute amendment thereto, close within the period of 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, is it in order to advise the House that the United Arab Republic has just notified the United Nations that it has accepted the cease-fire?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Matsunaga yielded his time to Mr. Resnick.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Randall].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Randall yielded his time to Mrs. Sullivan.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pucinski].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Pucinski yielded his time to Mr. Resnick.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Barrett].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Barrett yielded his time to Mrs. Sullivan.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make only one point here in opposition to the amendment, and that is with reference to the level of authorizations in future years.

We are now funding this program at a $195 million level. I just cannot see how we can raise this authorization to $350 million in view of the financial plight we are in. Sometime, somewhere, we have got to hold the line. We cannot do it alone on the Appropriations Committee. This is the time to hold the line and I for one do not like the idea of shooting the moon, so to speak, at authorizing time and then expecting our Appropriations Committee to take the heat at funding time.

Mr. Chairman, in 1965 this program cost us $36 million. In 1966 it cost us $70 million. In 1967 it is projected that it will cost us $125 million.

And, Mr. Chairman, if this bill is enacted into law we will, I am sure, come up with $195 million in the Agriculture appropriation conference report since it was knocked out on a point of order in the bill we passed last Tuesday.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the gentleman's substitute amendment which provides for a much larger authorization should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Vigorito].

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island, and against the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment, and in favor of the committee amendment. I supported the creation of the food stamp program. It is a fine program. I want to provide adequate authorizations for its expansion.

The $275 million for the year 1969 is a little excessive in view of the fact that at the current rate of expenditures we are spending $160 million. The Committee on Appropriations brought in $195 million for the new year starting July 1.

To increase the authorization to $275 million 1 year later would be speeding the effort probably faster than new areas could be brought in. The Senate has approved a bill extending the Food Stamp Act for 3 years authorizing $200 million for fiscal 1968, $225 million for 1969, and $250 million for 1970. I oppose the amendment authorizing $275 million for 1969 and $350 million for 1970.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN].

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I can speak on this amendment inasmuch as I have already spoken on the amendment. I therefore defer my time to a subsequent amendment.

As I understand, the motion was offered on the pending amendment and all subsequent amendments. I would ask to be recognized later on for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] for 3 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman who brought up the question of the increase in cost each year in the food stamp program, I think the gentleman knows from being on the Committee on Agriculture all these years that the reason the appropriation was low the first year was because it was an experimental pilot program which included only eight counties, and then it was expanded to 41 pilot projects and it has grown year by year as its advantages became evident to more and more municipalities. That is the reason we have these escalating amounts each year in the appropriations; because each year more and more counties and more and more people are coming in after they have been certified.

As I stated before, 232 counties which have already been approved are waiting to come into the program until there are sufficient appropriations. There are 140 counties that have made applications that have not yet been certified and approved, because the funds are not yet available. Nine States are not yet in the program at all.

In the district of the gentleman from Illinois, there have been requests for the food stamp plan, but it has not yet been put into operation there. So the gentleman's own people do want to get into the program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to show the Members these voluminous petitions I have received. These are from people in the city of St. Louis, the only community in the whole State of Missouri which so far has been getting food stamps. My constituents want them, and they want them continued. They have sent me these petitions signed with their names and addresses, and I am most impressed by this outpouring of support from my city.

I hope we can vote for the St Germain amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma brought out in the exchange here this afternoon a very important point with regard to this program. We have persons who cannot qualify for the food stamp program, but who do need food. In my own county, for example, the county commissioners are in favor of inaugurating the program, and they have passed a resolution to that effect, but they hesitate to implement this resolution because they have been informed that many of the people who today are receiving surplus commodity food in order to keep body and soul together would not be able to qualify for food stamp money or qualify under the food stamp program provisions.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, at the proper time, not today, I intend to offer either a bill or an amendment to the existing law so that we can provide that those counties who want to come into the food stamp program, and qualify in it, also will be able to keep at least some residue of the surplus commodity program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK].

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately the general debate on this bill took place a few weeks ago and we went through this then.

Very briefly, I would like to tell my colleagues just what this is all about. It is very simple and very clear—these amendments were offered by the minority side to virtually gut this food stamp bill.

Now you heard my distinguished chairman of the committee say that he would vote for this bill with the committee amendments or without the committee amendments. You heard my distinguished colleague, the minority member of the committee say he was going to vote against it.

I think this is very simple—that they put these amendments on so that they could go back home and say, "We voted for the food stamp program." But they put in these hookers that are just going to ruin the program. That is the long and short of it.

I would like to say in defense of my distinguished committee chairman that he fought hard in committee to get this bill out and that the only way he could get the bill out was with these crippling amendments.

I do not want anybody to have any allusions about how this bill got out—that is the only way it got out.

This amendment and the following amendment, which I hope we will have a little more time to debate, I will say again, if we do not defeat these amendments, we will be ruining the food stamp program.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have here a letter from the Wayne County Department of Social Service which covers Detroit in the administration of this program.

I want to point out to the Members of the House that if the 20-percent provision is carried, it is estimated that it will cost at least $600,000 to administer the food stamp program and it would lead them to consider abandoning the whole program.

Mr. RESNICK. I thank my colleague. We have all received letters and we are all aware of this. This is just a device to gut and ruin the food stamp program.

If the minority Members are so interested in the States sharing, I suggest that the States share in the commodity programs and I suggest also that the reason my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, voted for public law 480 is that he just happens to have a few wheatgrowers in his district.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, there are two issues before us—one is the question of review. I think it is quite clear that this Committee should have the opportunity to review this program.

The committee amendment does give us an opportunity to review this program annually. Unless the committee amendment is adopted, we will have no such opportunity.

The other question is the question of the amounts which you want to authorize for expenditure. When you authorize expenditures, you place your appropriations committee in an embarrassing position if they do not appropriate and you place the House in an embarrassing position when we create an obligation that is beyond the size which we intend to pay.

I would call your attention to the fact that the amount authorized in this substitute is 10 times the amount that was actually spent just 5 years before. That ratio of increase seems to me is unreasonable.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. St Germain and Mr. Belcher.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 90, noes 143.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mrs. Sullivan and Mr. Belcher.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 148, noes 91.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 3, insert the following: "Sec. 2. Section 15 of the Food Stamp Act is amended by adding the following subsection:

"'(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each State shall be responsible for financing, from funds available to the State or political subdivision thereof, 20 per centum of the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments. Each State shall transfer such sums to, and they shall be made a part of, the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act. Each State shall transfer such sums to such amount within one calendar month following the calendar month in which the coupon allotments are issued to eligible households. The provisions of this subsection shall not be effective for any coupon allotments issued prior to July 1, 1969, to enable each State to take such action as is necessary under the statutes of the States to comply with the provisions of this subsection.'"

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise against the second committee amendment. I appreciate the sincerity of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in wanting to improve the food stamp program. I am glad that some of those on the committee who opposed the program 3 years ago are for it now—provided this amendment is adopted. However, I feel that they are placing too high a premium on their offer to vote for this bill.

The amendment to require the States to pay 20 percent of the value of the bonus coupons issued to participants in the food stamp program is a little brother to the amendment we defeated 3 years ago to require 50-percent sharing. It comes from the same ancestry—that is, from a sense of suspicion about the food stamp program, if not actual opposition.

It is significant, I believe, that this amendment carried in committee largely with the votes of members of the committee who then voted against the bill even with this amendment. Are they for the bill? No indeed. Are they for the food stamp program? Not at all. I think most of those in the Committee on Agriculture who voted for this amendment and then voted against the bill do not have the food stamp program in their districts and presumably think the rest of us should not have it either.

EXCELLENT CAMPAIGN ISSUE

The record is clear that those States which have been making the greatest use of the food stamp program since it was inaugurated by President Kennedy in 1961 will not be able to participate if this amendment prevails. We have heard from many of the Governors and welfare directors to that effect. So a vote for this amendment is, in effect, a vote against the food stamp program in most of the 41 States and the District of Columbia now participating. Fortunately, it will not be possible to kill this program through a secret or nonrecorded vote. For, if this amendment is not defeated in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, it will be subject to a rollcall in the House.

Let me say very frankly that I cannot think of a better issue to take to the people in an election campaign than this food stamp program. I placed in the Record on May 15, during general debate, a list of the States which pass along to their participating counties all of the costs—I repeat, all of the costs—now assessed to the States for the food stamp program. I hope the Members will look at that list before they vote on this amendment. I hope they will note that in at least 13 States every cent of additional cost you shoulder upon the States for the food stamp program is going to be passed down to the county courthouse in those counties which have the food stamp program, or which want it.

COSTS ASSESSED ON COUNTIES

The Members know—or should know, from the material I placed in the Congressional Record on March 14—which counties in their districts have the food stamp program now, and which are scheduled to have it shortly. They were all listed by congressional district. Just compare that list, Mr. Chairman, with the information I placed in the Record on May 15 on how the States now assess their share of the substantial administrative costs of the food stamp program within each State, and the Members will have some realization of what this amendment would mean to Clay County or Jefferson County or any county in terms of higher local taxes to meet the costs of the food stamp program. Any Member who wants to add a million dollars or more a year to local taxes in his district through this amendment is welcome to his principles.

But I do not go along with the Republicans and some of the Democrats, who may not have the food stamp program in their districts, who are trying to make it impossible for St. Louis to have it. Those Members who might succeed in forcing us to a rollcall on this amendment—unless we defeat it here and now—undoubtedly have good reasons to give to their constituents for the substantial increase in the costs of local government such an amendment would mean to such States as Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, Minnesota, Kansas, Iowa, Colorado, California—there are 13 States which pass along to the counties every cent of the cost of the food stamp program. There are 16 others which make the counties pay, on an average, about 50 percent of all of the State costs for the food stamp program. In only 12 States would this amendment be a charge on the State itself. It is on page 12628 of the May 15 Record.

There are food stamp costs already assessed upon the State and localities, and they are substantial. One of the tables on page 12628 of Monday's Record shows what those administrative costs will be in the 1970 fiscal year if the program expands as contemplated. At that time, the States would be paying more than $22 million in administrative costs. Under this amendment we are now considering, we would be adding three times that much to the States' expenses, or a total of $86 million. Let those who want to kill the food stamp program vote for this amendment; all the rest of us will vote "no."

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will be happy to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. DWYER. I join the gentlewoman in her opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the position of the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan] that the proposed requirement that States pay 20 percent of the cost of the food stamp program should be eliminated from the committee bill.

This is a critically important issue in my judgment. Its fate will determine whether the program will be free to provide maximum help to people who need it most or will be significantly limited in its impact on poverty.

Ordinarily, Mr. Chairman, I would support language requiring State sharing in the costs of Federal grant programs. As a general principle, it is a sound one. It has the effect of encouraging States to accept their responsibilities for the welfare of their own people, and it introduces an element of prudence in the spending of public funds.

But as a general principle, too, it is subject to certain exceptions. The food stamp program, I believe, should be such an exception—for the following reasons:

First, there is already a substantial degree of cost-sharing built into the food stamp program by virtue of the fact that issuance of free stamps is conditioned on the cash purchase by recipient families of an even higher value of the stamps. In addition, State and local governments must now bear the costs of program administration which are estimated at 7 percent of the total value of the bonus coupons.

Second, in its first 2 years or so of operation, the food stamp program has demonstrated a marked degree of success, free of waste, abuse or scandal. To impose, now, a requirement that States pay 20 percent of the cost of stamps would discourage expansion and would probably result in the abandonment of the program by States for whom the added costs would be too heavy a burden. Almost inevitably, the States least able to pay the added share of costs would be the States whose people need the program most.

Third, unlike many Federal grant-in-aid programs, the food stamp program allows for little, if any, discretion in the use of funds. Regulations are both strict and enforcible. As a result, there is little incentive for States to compete for a growing share of Federal funds, even without the restraint of an additional cost-sharing requirement.

Fourth, the exclusive beneficiaries of the food stamp program are low-income families who cannot otherwise afford to provide adequate, well-balanced diets for their children. No unnecessary restrictions should be imposed on this highly desirable national objective.

Fifth, in a majority of the States participating in the food stamp program, all or a part of the additional costs resulting from the proposed amendment for State cost sharing would be borne by counties or other local units of government rather than by the States themselves. In 16 States at present, the costs of certification and coupon issuance are shared by the State and local governments involved. In 13 States, including my own State of New Jersey, those costs are met entirely by the county or local governments. Consequently, the depressing effects of the proposed requirement would be even greater in these States.

At a time when poverty is still very much with us and when the Nation has undertaken a commitment to eliminate it, the Congress should be encouraging a program of the high caliber of the food stamp program rather than restraining it. In New Jersey, four counties have been participating for some time; two other counties joined the program last month, and two more, including my own Union County, have undertaken the program this month. Adding program costs to the already substantial administrative costs would only discourage further progress.

The food stamp program, I believe, is one of the best Federal programs we have. It is efficient, it is effective; it is humane. Not all Federal programs, unfortunately, can make this claim. I voted for it when the program was first enacted in 1964. I have watched it since and been pleased with what I have seen. I was delighted when Union County decided to join the growing number of New Jersey counties participating in the program.

The food stamp program is essentially a welfare program. But it is a program that works—without cheating, without waste, without embarrassment to the recipient.

There are several reasons why the food stamp program is so effective.

First, it is simple and it is private. With a minimum of redtape, welfare, and other low-income families need only buy the stamps at a bank and redeem them at grocery stores.

Second, it is an almost foolproof way of preventing abuses. Unlike cash, food stamps can be used only to buy food. And the food cannot include luxury items, imported products, alcoholic beverages, tobacco, household goods, or other nonfood items.

Third, it is most beneficial to the neediest families. It increases the amount of food poor families consume by an average of 50 percent.

Fourth, it discourages waste in the use of welfare payments because it provides a bonus for those who devote a greater share of their welfare checks or other available cash to the feeding of their families.

The food-stamp program is a national program. It can help greatly to ease the burdens of local welfare programs, and to make them function more effectively. It has been good for farmers, and it has increased the sale of food in participating stores by as much as 10 percent. Most importantly, it has been of direct benefit to the poor.

I hope the House will approve the food stamp bill without the cost-sharing amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Missouri has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, as I stated previously, I wish to associate myself completely and wholeheartedly with the position which has been taken by the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. In view of the fact that the distinguished gentlewoman is opposed to this amendment, as well as the second amendment which has been proposed thereto, it is my hope that both amendments will be defeated and that all members of the committee will support H.R. 1318 as introduced.

However, Mr. Chairman, I shall ask the distinguished gentlewoman this question: As the distinguished gentlewoman pointed out in her statement, 13 States which now have the food stamp program—

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No; 41 States have it. In 13 States which have it, however, I said all of the costs were passed along to the counties which participated.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentlewoman will yield further, that is what I was starting to ask—is it not true that in these 13 States, the added costs proposed by the committee would go to the local courthouses, not to the State itself; that in those States the burden would be on local taxpayers entirely?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am completely and wholeheartedly in support of H.R. 1318 as introduced by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], and I oppose the amendments added to the bill by the Committee on Agriculture. These amendments would seriously harm the program; one of them—requiring 20-percent sharing by the States of the value of the extra coupons given to the low-income families purchasing the food stamps—would probably force Philadelphia back on the direct surplus distribution program which was so inadequate and unsatisfactory.

Mrs. SULLIVAN, who serves with distinction as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing, of which I am chairman, of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, has always been deeply concerned with the plight of poor families struggling to provide their children with at least the minimum comforts of life. She is compassionate and humane, but she is also extremely realistic and she is a great enemy of wasteful spending. I know that very well from her outstanding work on housing legislation. She was the author of the low-income homeownership plan which we wrote into law last year and which the Republican Party has been trying to adopt. She believes in aiding people to help themselves up the ladder to better living standards.

FINE RESULTS IN PHILADELPHIA

Besides working hard on housing legislation to aid the poor, she also developed the food stand idea as a means of assuring decent, minimum diets for low-income families. I am proud to say that I have voted with her and supported her on this legislation ever since she introduced her first food stamp bill 13 years ago.

As the Representative for the First Congressional District of Pennsylvania, located in the city of Philadelphia, I have firsthand knowledge of the fine results of the food stamp program in my city. We have only had the program in operation for 1 year—since May 1966—but already we have seen the vast difference in effectiveness and helpfulness of this program compared to the previous program of giving some surplus food packages to the needy each month from special municipal depots.

When there was nothing better available, the direct distribution program helped many families which otherwise would have had very little to eat; but, on the whole, it was not a program anyone could regard with pride or satisfaction. The people who went to the distribution centers for the free food had to carry home large sacks of flour and cornmeal, powdered milk, powdered eggs, lard, and things of that nature—not a balanced diet, certainly, and not a very appetizing one either. It was demeaning and somewhat cruel for the poor people who had to stand in line for these packages.

Under the food stamp program, on the other hand, the people whose incomes and family size make them eligible for food assistance buy their food in the regular grocery stores. They can choose from the wide variety of domestic food products available, and thus give their children balanced, healthy, attractive meals. And they pay most of the cost of this program themselves.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS ARE STRICT

As I understand it, the cost to the Federal Government is about the same for both programs of food assistance—one which allows families to eat properly and well and the other which just hands out a few limited items in surplus.

I am mindful of the fact that under the direct distribution program there were widespread abuses which the General Accounting Office uncovered in special studies made in various parts of the country, including Philadephia, where the extreme difficulties of maintaining up-to-date certification records for free food eligibility were spotlighted. The main objective of the direct distribution program was just to unload a lot of surplus foods at one time, with no thought to nutritional standards or even whether families could use the flour and cornmeal and lard and other commodities.

The situation is completely different under the food-stamp program. The eligibility requirements are strictly enforced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Pennsylvania Department of Public Assistance. The families which participate are checked and rechecked periodically to assure continued eligibility and to make sure that the food-stamp purchase requirements are correct. The certification is done by trained social workers.

PEOPLE THEMSELVES PAY MOST OF THE COST

Philadelphia has approximately 50,000 persons from low-income families enjoying the good, well-rounded, nutritious diets the food stamp program makes possible. The people themselves pay out of their own money for an average of two-thirds of the dollar value of the coupons they receive, with only one-third representing a subsidy. Yet this one-third, averaging about $5.50 per month per person, means the difference between well-fed and undernourished citizens.

The people in need, for whom we must have compassion, have informed me personally, as well as by letters and telegrams, of their wholehearted support for the program and their real concern and fear that the program would be killed if the States have to assume part of the cost. It would be a gross injustice to adopt the crippling amendments offered by the committee.

If 20 percent of the value of the bonus coupons is assessed upon Pennsylvania, as proposed in the pending committee amendment, it will cost an additional $660,000 a year for the Philadelphia project alone, at present levels of participation. For the entire State, this cost would be about $3,000,000 a year at current levels and $5,500,000 to $6,000,000 a year at the program levels projected for the 1970 fiscal year, when the 20-percent sharing requirement would take effect under the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment must be defeated. It was added to the bill largely through the votes of members of the committee who are against the food stamp program and who voted against it, perhaps because many of them do not have the program operating in their own districts and are therefore not as aware as we are of its dramatic effectiveness in upgrading nutritional standards for low-income families.

On this vote, I will stand beside the gentlewoman from Missouri who pioneered the food stamp program, and who has worked so hard to make it the fine program it now is. I favor Mrs. SULLIVAN's bill as introduced.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, a moment ago I voted for the committee amendment limiting the food stamp program to a 1-year authorization. I supported the committee position that there should be an annual review of this program, particularly in its early years. I think this amendment should satisfy any Member who is concerned that the costs of the program will not be properly reviewed or that its operations will not be sufficiently supervised.

The adoption of the committee's first amendment only deepens my opposition to the second committee amendment now before us. This amendment, which would require a 20-percent participation by the States in the cost of the food stamp program, must be defeated. I do not question the sincerity of any member of the Committee on Agriculture, and I deeply regret the necessity to disagree with my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. But I am persuaded that the adoption of this committee amendment would strike at the heart of one of the most successful programs that has ever been undertaken by the United States for the assistance of low-income families.

The food stamp program encourages and assists families of poor or modest means to purchase and provide for themselves a more healthy and nutritious diet. Its dividends will be found in the improved health and well-being, the greater efficiency and productivity, the better and longer life of hundreds of thousands of our citizens. Many of these citizens will be recipients or the dependents of recipients of public assistance. For many years we have heard complaints—and not always unjustified complaints—that some public assistance funds designed to feed and clothe and house dependent parents and their children have not been properly directed to those purposes. One of the great benefits of this program lies in the encouragement, indeed the healthy pressures it applies, to channel such assistance funds to the most basic and beneficial use: purchase of healthy and nutritious food. This is a fine and effective program and it would be tragic to cripple it in its infancy.

Some of my colleagues have expressed concern about the cost of this program.

I must say—with no disrespect to any Member of the House, that it concerns me deeply when some Members of the House on each side of the aisle vote for billions of dollars in foreign programs—as I do—and billions of dollars for domestic and military programs—as I do—and yet these Members find the opportunity and the necessity to plead for economy in Government only when it deals with something like food for low-income families. Perhaps these Members might consider whether it is entirely unconscionable to economize with the health and well-being of hundreds of thousands of children and aged when the American Republic is at the peak of prosperity for the vast majority of her citizens.

How can we, in this country, at this time, justify denying a healthy and nutrious diet to any of our citizens? The suggestion is especially repugnant when it is within the relatively easy power of our society to provide for this most basic of human needs—as indeed it is.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLE. I would point out to the gentleman that if this amendment is adopted it would provide about $39 million more in funds. This is not an economy amendment, it is a responsibility amendment to the States. This 20 percent is something that turns out to be about $39 million.

Mr. FOLEY. I wish I could agree with the gentleman's evaluation. I think on the contrary it will lead some States to completely remove themselves from the program, because some counties that may be benefited by this program will not have sufficient strength in their legislature to adopt the 20-percent contribution, or because the State in question simply is without sufficient resources under their present circumstances to go ahead with the 20-percent contribution.

I would remind the gentleman that many Members on both sides of the aisle have introduced bills to provide for direct support to the States and municipalities, from Federal revenues.

The so-called Heller plan is widely supported in this House, but many of the same Members who say they support revenue sharing are now demanding instead cost sharing by the States I find their positions inconsistent.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, again I must express regret at the turn of this debate. The implication is repeatedly made that those of us who favor the committee amendments are opposed to the food stamp program, and that just simply is not true.

So, for the third time this afternoon permit me to say that I expect to vote for this whether we adopt the amendments or whether we do not. I hope we will adopt this amendment. I think the amendment is a very fine amendment. I realize there are many Members here who disagree with me. There are many Members here who do not believe in the federal system of States. There are those who believe in a strong national government with departments or provinces as administrative agencies. I do not accept that philosophy of government.

I believe the States of this Union are and should remain a vital part in policymaking, as well as mere administrative agencies.

If I am going to ask that my State have a part in policymaking, I feel that I must in fairness accept for my State the obligation to pay a share of the costs.

As far as I am concerned, I am willing for the State of Texas to pay a share of the cost of the food stamp program. I believe we should, and I know that we will.

If there are States that feel it is more important for them to get something from the Federal Government than it is to care for their poor, I can only say that I would not want to be here representing that kind of State. I represent a State, and I am proud that I represent a State, which believes that it should have a part in the policymaking of our Government, and is willing to carry its share of the burdens of our Government. There is not a State in this Union that is so poor that it cannot pay 1 dollar out of 5 to feed these poor people.

Every State in this Union can contribute this modest amount—and it is not the poor States that are coming here pleading their poverty—it is the rich States who are coming here this afternoon and pleading that they ought not to be burdened with even a small share of the obligation to care for their own needy.

Now I do not come from the richest State in the Union, and I do not come from the poorest State in the Union, but I come from a State which is willing to pay its bills and is willing to take care of its poor people, and I am willing to take care of them and I am willing for them to have the food stamp program. I think this is a better program than the other programs we have used.

But I know that if we want to have efficiency in administration, the best way to get it is to put in some provision of responsibility on the part of the local people.

I am pleading with those who believe in control by the States and then I am pleading with those who do not care whether their States control anything or not but who are interested in seeing that this program is honestly and efficiently and effectively administered.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will ask unanimous consent that he may have 3 additional minutes when his time expires.

Mr. POAGE. I would suggest to the gentlewoman that I do not believe I need any more time.

Mrs. KELLY. But I would like the gentleman to have additional time so that I may ask him some questions.

First of all, I would like to know where the money is coming from to pay for the food stamp program.

Mr. POAGE. It is coming from the taxpayers of America.

Mrs. KELLY. Is it not budgeted under section 32?

Mr. POAGE. I beg the gentlewoman's pardon?

Mrs. KELLY. Is it not carried in the budget under section 32 out of a special fund consisting of one-third of all customs receipts?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, the section 32 money comes from the tariffs.

Mrs. KELLY. That is my understanding. Now how much money is in that fund at the present time?

Mr. POAGE. I could not tell you that.

Mrs. KELLY. I will tell you—it is about $570 million for the 1968 fiscal year, plus a $300 million carryover. Therefore, is there not more than enough money in this fund to pay for the modest cost of this program to help the poor people who need it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Is there not more than enough money in this special aid-to-agriculture fund to pay for this 20-percent assessment that you are trying to charge the States for the food stamp program?

Mr. POAGE. I think undoubtedly there is enough money to pay the 20 percent. There is enough money in the U.S. Treasury to pay it. There is enough money in the Federal old age assistance fund to pay it. There is enough money in the road fund to pay it. But that does not get to the proposition of who should pay it. The people who should pay it are the people of the States of this Union who should contribute something for their own welfare and to their own welfare.

Mrs. KELLY. I am very happy to say that I come from one of those States that is supposed to be a "rich" State. My State gives over $15 billion to help support some of the other States of this Nation. I am very proud that my State of New York can contribute over $15 billion to help pay for these things that are needed in common by all of our people, wherever they live.

Therefore, I say to you: The committee amendment is wrong. The food stamp program is to be paid for out of a fund which was established originally in 1935, when there was a depression and when there was a need to help both the farmer and the city unemployed. That was what section 32 was intended to do. There is a need for the use of these funds now, also, to help those who are in need in the United States today, to obtain a good nutritious diet—to get the proper food. That is a proper use for section 32 money.

Mr. POAGE. The gentlewoman suggested how happy she was that her State was able to contribute to the other States in the Union and to the poor people of the other States of the Union. I see the gentlewoman on her feet—did I misquote her?

Mrs. KELLY. No, the gentleman did not misquote me. The States should pay taxes to the best of their ability and, of course, I am very willing for them to do that. But, it is not fair that States which already pay so much should be forced to pay an additional assessment of 20 percent for the food stamps. It is not right.

Mr. POAGE. I do not think it is fair for any of these States to have to pay for the debts of other States. I am in full agreement with the lady.

Down on the Brazos River we have poor folks and those of us who live there making our living along with those people ought to contribute in some proportion to help those people.

This bill requires only 20 cents out of every dollar. This bill requires only that you put up four nickels and it says that Uncle Sam will put up 80 cents. That is not a very heavy burden on anyone, but it strikes at a proposition that is fundamental, and that is the problem of local self-government, which is the best government ever devised by man and is the most effective and certainly the most efficient and frugal government that you can get. If you want to prevent fraud and corruption, you are going to keep this program as close to the people as you possibly can, and the way to make people understand that a program is close to them is to make them get out their pocketbook and at least put a few nickels in the box.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a list I am glancing through right now—a long three-page list—of domestic benefit programs of the Department of Agriculture which do not require any matching by State or local government tax funds. Let me read a few of those programs:

There is the feed grain program, the wheat marketing certificate program, the upland cotton program, the cropland adjustment program, the agricultural conservation program, the cropland conservation program, the REA loan program, the Farmers Home Administration loan and grant programs, the perishable commodities surplus removal program—section 32—Soil Conservation Service programs, the whole price support program, and I could go on and on. Would you be willing that your State should pay 20 percent of the benefits from each of those programs?

Mr. POAGE. I do not think I would on every one. Most of these programs, unlike the food stamp program, are for the purpose of improving the general, not individual, welfare. But I think I would on those programs which benefit only certain individuals or certain areas.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. How about the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance? Should the oil States pay a portion of that?

Mr. POAGE. I would only wonder if it were not possible for the opponents of the committee amendment to present some arguments in favor of their proposal? I had supposed that there were arguments in favor of their position. The oil depletion allowance is, in my judgment, a sound and wise tax law. I have very rarely heard it seriously criticized in an impassionate manner. But regardless of its merits or demerits the depletion allowance has exactly as much to do with this question as the question of selling gold from Alaska has to do with it. It is utterly unrelated, and there can be but one purpose for bringing in a question of that kind, and that is to try to bolster up a very poor case that cannot stand on its own merits.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the committee amendment to the Food Stamp Act of 1964—H.R. 1318—as reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

There was considerable opposition within the committee to extension of the Food Stamp Act in any form and this is reflected in the minority views set forth in House Report No. 189. It is my own opinion that it would have been impossible to obtain a favorable report on this legislation without inclusion of the provision for 20-percent coupon allotment cost sharing by the States and the 1-year extension and $195 million cost limitations. Quite clearly, there was little or no sentiment within the committee for making the food-stamp plan a permanent, open-end program.

There is ample precedent for State sharing of costs in Federal welfare and assistance programs. In fact, the States are required to shoulder much more than 20 percent of the costs of most of these programs. Application of the Federal-State cost sharing program to the Food Stamp Act would, in my opinion, help to insure more efficient administration of the program and would, at the same time, be an effective safeguard against abuses.

The $195 million authorization for fiscal year 1968 is, I believe, more than adequate. And here is why, in fiscal 1965, although $60 million was appropriated for the food stamp plan, only $35.6 million was used. In fiscal 1966, the appropriation was $100 million, with $70.5 million actually expended. In fiscal 1967, the authorization was for $200 million, with $139.5 million appropriated. Department of Agriculture estimates are that between $120 million and $125 million will be used.

The decision to limit extension of the program to 1 year is sound. This will give the Congress another year to study the operation. With a prospective budget deficit for fiscal 1968 that may fall somewhere within the $20 billion to $30 billion range and with vital American interests threatened in many parts of the world, it seems to me that this is no time to commit ourselves to further long-term, costly, nondefense expenditures.

I am not greatly impressed by the argument that the food stamp plan serves to strengthen farm prices. In fact, farm prices declined steadily during the very period when food stamp expenditures were being sharply increased. For that reason, I believe that costs of the plan should properly be charged to public welfare, rather than agriculture.

Another year of experience with the food stamp plan may develop procedures for its improvement and justify some further extension and expansion.

For these reasons, I support this amendment to H.R. 1318, as reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] for having conceived this program and staying with it for many, many years. I hope that you have success in a continuation of this program. It is an excellent program.

Second, I am on the Agriculture Committee. However, I cannot congratulate the committee for the work it has done on this bill. I am not in favor of the two amendments that will be in the bill because it ultimately will kill the bill. We seem to have an idea that people on welfare or people receiving benefits are well fed. That is not so.

There are 30 or 40 million people in this country who eat very, very little meat—if any at all. I would like to read here a little note that I received from an old couple back home. It says:

Congressman JOSEPH VIGORITO.

DEAR JOE: It is a pleasure to know you as our favorite Congressman even takes time to recognize small folks like ourselves. Thank God for you and Senator Dirksen who was a champion of the Put the Bible and Prayer back in the Schools. Joe, I have been very ill with pneumonia for nearly a month, lost 22½ lbs, am trying to eat so I can get better, but Joe it is hard for me to get red meat, as it is too expensive for us folks who are on Old Age Welfare, my wife is a Diabetic, we get a grant of $47.00 every 15 days, and my wife get $6.00 for dietetic foods, I get Social Security $52.00 a month; $50.00 goes for rent leaving $2.00 for extra food a month, so you see the chances we have, we are God-fearing folks. God Bless you Joe.

Your friends,

TOM and DOROTHY BALDWIN.

There are at least 5 million—if not 10 million—senior citizens in the United States who are not getting proper food.

The day after the last election, in the morning, as I was coming off the porch, an old lady was there to greet me. She congratulated me on my victory and then said:

Congressman, please see if you can do something about getting us more food.

We are the richest Nation in the world. I am surprised to see so many Members who, deep down in their hearts, are against this food stamp plan. If they had a chance to kill it without having their names put on the RECORD, I am sure they would.

In the next 50 hours I am sure most of us are going to eat a steak or a lobster. Please, with every bite, remember there are people in the United States who do not know what it is to eat a steak.

I am on the Agricultural Committee, and I go along with most of its programs. I believe they are good programs. But I can say this, that if this food stamp plan is defeated, come what may, when these programs for cotton and tobacco and peanuts and wheat come up, I will vote against them. I will do whatever I can to defeat them.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, if the committee amendments to H.R. 1318 were to promise greater efficiency and more economy without imperiling the objectives of the food stamp program, I would not hesitate to point in their support.

I cannot subscribe to the proposed revision of a program which admittedly must be continued, but for which no one can guarantee successful continuation if the amendments were to be adopted.

The Committee on Agriculture in its report on H.R. 1318 has "commended the care with which the food stamp program has been organized and administered." Those are the committee's own words. The report then sets out to destroy arguments against the proposal to require participating States to accept 20 percent of the cost now borne exclusively by the Federal Government.

I applaud the committee for its thorough study incident to its final recommendations, but my own conclusion is that the study was not as thorough as it should be, else H.R. 1318 would have been reported out exactly as written by our distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. She has familiarized herself with every facet of this program. She lived with its possibilities long before the Food Stamp Act of 1964 became law, and she has full knowledge of its economic and fiscal as well as its humanitarian implications.

If the committee is correct in assuming that the States have an obligation to accept a share of the cost of financing the bonus stamps, I would suggest that it has chosen a poor time to make the shift. To administer a program of this magnitude required considerable planning on both Federal and State levels, and to call a change of signals when the operation is being conducted in a smooth and responsible manner would be neither wise nor productive.

Certainly it would be illogical to impose an unexpected burden on individual States when Federal taxes leave little to cover urgent operating expenses. The State of Pennsylvania was one of the first to substitute the food stamp program for the direct distribution of surplus foods, and we have gone to considerable effort and cost to set up and carry out the program in the most expeditious and efficient manner possible. Under the proposed amendments, Pennsylvania would be forced to contribute an estimated $2,835,297 on a matching fund basis during the coming fiscal year.

To recognize the impact of the proposed change in the law, will you please listen to the following communication from the Honorable Max Rosenn, Pennsylvania's secretary of public welfare:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
Harrisburg, Pa., April 12, 1967.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
The House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: H.R. 1318, the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as reported out by the Committee on Agriculture, is unacceptable to this Department. We are requesting your support in opposing the amendment requiring States to pay 20% of the cost of food stamps starting 1970.

Pennsylvania was one of the first States to substitute the Food Stamp Program for the direct distribution of surplus foods. Starting in Fayette County in 1961, the program has expanded operations to 29 counties, with 12 more to be added this fiscal year. Currently over 166,000 persons, slightly less that half of whom are also receiving public assistance, are participating in the program. As of the end of January 1967, over 31 million dollars worth of free food had been made available through this system without any cost to the Commonwealth except for some sharing in the expenses of administration. H.R. 1318 would now impose new State costs in excess of $1.5 million a year, and additional amounts if the program is extended throughout the State as we now plan. We believe that such required State expenditures would jeopardize the continuance of any Food Stamp Program in Pennsylvania. We are therefore recommending that the amendment inserted by the Agriculture Committee requiring State participation be deleted so that as at present no State contribution is expected for the cost of food stamps.

It is important to note that the Food Stamp Program as originally conceived was an agricultural program and not a welfare program. If a change in objectives is contemplated we would urge that the Food Stamp Program separate from other public assistance programs be abolished, and that the Federal funds available for the Food Stamp Program be appropriated to DHEW to augment State funds for public assistance payments. In this way State expenditures could earn additional Federal funds and thus strengthen the effectiveness of the basic welfare programs for low income families.

The Food Stamp Program is an effective means of increasing the available funds for food purchases for low income families. If it is to be continued we urge your support in eliminating the amendment inserted by the Agriculture Committee.

Sincerely yours,

MAX ROSENN.

Mr. Chairman, I shall also insert letters from officials of counties in the 22d Congressional District, where 12,165 families are participating in the food stamp program. Estimated costs of bonus coupons to be used by those citizens during fiscal 1968 is $854,088, which is actually far less than might have been anticipated when the law was passed in 1964. Our economy is rising and we look to the day when many more of the present recipients of food stamp benefits will be able to sustain themselves without this assistance.

Meanwhile we most surely do not want to expose them to the hardships and dietary deficiencies that haunted so many of our people before the food stamp plan was inaugurated. I am confident that no member of the committee which reported out the amended version of H.R. 1318 would be willing to inflict a return to these conditions on affected families, yet this is the situation that would be created with the changes in the law that have been recommended.

Maybe we all should get just a little more realistic about our position with respect to the food stamp program before there is a vote to reduce Federal participation or establish a ceiling for expenditures. May I remind my colleagues that the U.S. Government is still—after two decades—sending billions of dollars abroad under the foreign aid program? I do not think that one should be accused of overdramatizing if he were to ask how many of those nations are sending troops to battle the forces of communism that our foreign aid program is supposedly helping to resist. But I can tell you that any number of families helping to be kept alive and healthy under the food-stamp program has sons and relatives out there on the front lines of Vietnam or in training and waiting for the next call.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, this would be an extremely poor time to make any changes in the food stamp program.

The letters mentioned above follow:

COMMISSIONERS' OFFICE,
ARMSTRONG COUNTY,
Kittanning, Pa., May 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have had the Food Stamp Program in effect in Armstrong County since February, 1967. As Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners, I wish to go on record as being very much in favor of this Program over the Surplus Food Commodity Program that was formerly used in this County.

We have had good response in Armstrong County to the Food Stamp Program and I would like to see it continue.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH J. GEORGE,
Chairman,
Armstrong County Commissioners.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
CLARION COUNTY,
Clarion, Pa., June 2, 1967.

Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: We in Clarion County appreciate the support you are giving the Food Stamp Program. Please do continue to support this program, as we feel it is far superior over the surplus foods, which we originally had to give out to needy families.

The main reasons being that with the Food Stamps, persons can buy what they can and will use for their families.

We feel the Food Stamp Program has been a very valuable asset to Clarion County Needy Residents.

Very truly yours,

CLARION COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.
C. H. BELCHNER, Jr., *Chief Clerk.*

INDIANA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Indiana, Pa., April 26, 1967.

Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: We, the Indiana County Commissioners, are deeply concerned over the possibility of a cutback or the discontinuance of the food stamp program.

Of all the Federally aided welfare programs operated in Indiana County, we feel that the food stamp program has been the most successful and beneficial. This program has not only aided the poverty stricken; the food merchants have likewise been helped.

If the food stamp program is discontinued and the commodity program is reinstated, we feel that an orderly process will only evolve into chaos. The administrative problems in storing and distributing surplus commodities in a management nightmare.

We urge you to support the existing food stamp program and to oppose any changes now under consideration. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

INDIANA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.
FRANK M. BARKLEY.
WILLIAM W. JONES, Sr.
PATRICK J. STAPLETON, Jr.

THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
JEFFERSON COUNTY, PA.,
Brookville, Pa., May 26, 1967.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is to advise you the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners are very much pleased with the way the Food Stamp Program is working out in Jefferson County.

We hope that through your efforts it will continue.

Very truly yours,

FRANK A. REED,
SILAS A. WEAVER,
Jefferson County Commissioners.

CAMBRIA COUNTY BOARD OF ASSISTANCE,
Johnstown, Pa., May 22, 1967.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: I have your request for my comments concerning the merits of the Food Stamp Plan.

To my mind, it is almost a perfect plan and should be continued. It is relatively inexpensive for the federal government when we consider the total financial cycle of the plan.

First, the participants pay for the major portion of the stamps they receive. Secondly, the bonus stamps given to the participants are used with the various approved retailers. This increases their income and profits which increases their tax payment back to the federal government. This same circumstance applies through the total process from the retailer, to the wholesaler, to the processor, and to the farmer. All benefit from the use of the stamps and each as a result pays more taxes to the federal government, reducing the net cost of the plan for the federal government. Transportation facilities such as trucking, railroads, and water transportation are also involved in the benefits of the Plan and results in increased tax payments by them to the federal government.

The cost of the plan versus the Surplus Food Distribution plan is less expensive because existing facilities and experienced personnel in commerce, finance, and business are utilized. Government is neither duplicating nor competing with existing institutions and personnel.

Waste is eliminated in the Food Stamp Plan. Participants buy in amounts commensurate with their needs and according to their taste preference. Consequently, the diet of the people is improved because they have what they like to eat and it is fresh. The benefits of an improved diet must be dissertated by others—I believe it.

We must consider too that in our society the government is established for the commonweal of its people; and, this includes the dignity with which it provides for its people. The Food Stamp Plan is a dignified and respectful procedure.

I want to say again that all benefit from the Food Stamp Plan, including the federal government. The latter benefits in that the gross cost is reduced through increased tax returns.

May I take this opportunity to suggest that if there is still a provision in the bill to transfer a part of the cost of the Plan to the States that this provision be eliminated. Basically, the Food Stamp Plan is an effort to help the farmer through an improved diet for people. This is good; it is a sound approach. However, to help the farmer is a federal plan. A state should not be required or even expected to absorb any cost for a strictly federal plan. The states have accepted the costs of making the benefits of the plan available to its people. For example, Pennsylvania provides an experienced staff to measure applicants' eligibility to participate in the Plan; I think they pay the banks a fee for receiving and processing the "stamps" back to the Federal Reserve Bank system; and certain other incidental costs too.

These are proper charges on the State. In my opinion though it is not a proper charge on the State to be charged for a part of the cost of the bonus stamps, which is strictly a plan for moving farmers' surplus crops.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. GOLOB,
Executive Director.

Mr. Chairman, the National Grange has also taken a position on this important legislation and I place the letter received from its legislative representative at this point in my remarks:

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1967.

Re Food Stamp Plan and 20-percent matching provision.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Food Stamp Bill, originally passed as a part of the Wheat-Cotton Bill of 1964, has proven to be a highly acceptable substitute for the old surplus food delivery program, which is no longer usable because of the unavailability of surplus foods for disposal, except for cereals.

According to the Congressional Quarterly, there are 249 Congressional Districts which at present have a Food Stamp Program. Another 92 programs have been requested, some of them in the districts already having a Food Stamp Plan in effect.

It is interesting to note that of the 92 districts with requests pending, 50 of them are represented by Democrats and 42 by Republicans, indicating that this is certainly a nonpartisan problem.

In the Grange testimony before the Agricultural Committee, we gave enthusiastic endorsement to the Plan, but were both surprised and dismayed at the provision to make the bill conditional upon a 20 percent matching of the costs by the states. We believe that the inclusion of the matching fund places an unnecessarily heavy burden on the several states. Not only would it forestall the expansion of the Plan, but it would probably force the abandonment of the Plan in the very states where it is most needed. The enclosed table indicates what this amendment would cost your state, if the matching provision is included.

We do not believe that the Food Stamp Program should operate at the exclusion of welfare programs. However, we do believe that those who are able to pay a part of their basic food needs should do so. The Food Stamp Program has brought the procurement of food into the regular market channels where the recipients have access to the same food available to others in our society. The dual results of upgrading the diets by making essential food available, and the normalizing of the market system for food distribution are commendable and worthwhile objectives.

We urge your support for the continuation of the Food Stamp Program when this bill is presented on the floor of the House, minus the 20 percent matching provision.

Respectfully yours,

HARRRY L. GRAHAM.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can get an agreement as to the amount of time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the extension and expansion of the food stamp program. I am, however, unalterably opposed to the committee amendment that would require States to match 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons.

I have followed the course of the food stamp program very closely since the city of Cleveland and all of Cuyahoga County joined the pilot test of the food stamp program in May of 1963. Cuyahoga County, together with Lucas County, were two of the 43 pilot areas in which the program was tested between 1961 and 1964.

Ohio now has 34 counties participating in the food stamp program. In April, some 189,000 needy people in Ohio were benefiting from the program. Their food purchasing power was being increased by $1,200.000 a month.

These 189,000 people were getting more meat, more milk, more fruits and vegetables. And they were doing this on a self-help basis. These people were investing some $2,300,000 of their own money in purchased coupons each month—in order to receive the additional $1,200,000 in free coupons.

But, the benefits of the program extend beyond the direct food help to the needy. Retail food sales increase as the families spend the extra $1,200,000 in grocery stores each month—with the benefits of larger markets flowing back to the farmer through the commercial marketing system.

These increased retail sales act as an economic stimulus to the local economy. After the program was in operation for a year in Cuyahoga County, the president of the county board of commissioners stated:

> This [food stamp] program has contributed greatly to the economic growth of the entire community.

He also stated that the value of the bonus or free coupons was equal to the annual payroll of an industry employing several hundred workers.

The success of the food stamp program in Cuyahoga County—and in Ohio—has been repeated in area after area and State after State.

In the light of this success story, I want my colleagues fully to understand the real implications of the committee amendment to require States to match 20 percent of the cost of the free coupons. Its real purpose and its real impact have become clouded behind such justifications as the "need for more State control" or the "protection against program abuses" or "States will administer the program better if their own funds are involved."

First, let us review those issues—I believe that a review of the record will find such arguments without merit. Second, let us realistically look at the impact of the 20-percent matching requirement. That look will conclusively demonstrate that 20 percent matching provision will kill the food stamp program.

What about State control?

No one in the State of Ohio—from Governor Rhodes down to the local government and welfare officials—has raised the question of unwarranted Federal interference. On the contrary, they have made known their concerns that the 20-percent matching provision will put the program beyond the reach of the State and its needy people.

Why have not the States raised the question? Because they now exercise control.

The State must request the program. The Department of Agriculture cannot put one single food stamp program in operation unless the State formally requests it to do so. The State sets the eligibility standards; the local offices of the State welfare agency qualifies each individual family. The States and localities decide when, how, and where the coupons are to be issued.

What about the prevention of program abuses?

I answer that argument with another question: What abuses? The committee itself, in reporting out the bill, took the trouble to commend the Department of Agriculture on the care with which the program had been planned and carried out in the past 3 years. Member after member stood up during the course of general debate and praised the program as one of the best administered Federal programs now in operation.

What about the argument that States will administer the program better if their own funds are involved?

The answer to that argument is that State funds are now involved. They now pay the costs of intrastate administration—costs that run to about 7 percent of the Federal subsidy.

Second, the Congress wisely provided in section 10(g) of the Food Stamp Act that States shall be financially liable to the Federal Government if there has been gross negligence or fraud on the part of States in the certification of applicant households. So, both States' funds and specific State financial liability for poor administration are guaranteed without a 20-percent matching amendment.

Now, having disposed of the red herrings developed by the supporters of the 20-percent matching provision, let us look at the impact of that proposal.

A look at its impact reveals that it can have but one result. It will kill the program as effectively as if the Congress fails to provide any authority. A vote for the 20-percent matching amendment is in effect a vote against the continuation of the food stamp program.

States are now sorely pressed to find revenues to support their own public assistance programs. If they cannot raise the funds to meet the basic needs of welfare recipients, then how can we expect that they can—or would—raise the funds to help pay the cost of the stamp program that is directed only to the food needs of low-income people?

There was no discussion of this State matching proposal during the course of the hearings on H.R. 1318. I have carefully read the testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry where this State matching provision was discussed. Witnesses before that committee uniformly testified that the States said that the maching requirement would force them to withdraw from the food stamp program.

Ohio will have to withdraw. There is now a proposal before the State legislature to raise welfare payments for aid to dependent children—an increase that is sorely needed because grants to ADC families are now only about 70 percent of what the State itself says is an acceptable minimum amount. Ohio's financial position is such that even this proposal contemplates that the counties would have to finance 50 percent of the added cost. And, it is clear that many counties could not raise their proposed share of the added cost.

Under the proposed 20-percent matching amendment, Ohio would need to put up nearly $7,000,000 a year in order to bring the benefits of the food stamp program to its low-income people. It will not be able to do so.

Federal requirement for State matching—contrary to the contentions of the proponents of the matching provision—does not guarantee State matching, because most, if not all, States simply cannot find extra money in already tightly stretched budgets to meet such a new demand. Some States—particularly the lower income States—are still not taking advantage of all of the Federal public assistance funds available to them because they have not been able to raise the required State matching funds. They have had to forego the full benefits of Federal aid just as they will have to forego the benefits of the food stamp program.

It has been suggested that the States could require county or local governments to bear the 20-percent cost. This is untenable. It would mean that the communities most in need of the food stamp program would be the least able to raise the required tax funds.

Finally, the States would be forced to return to the less desirable surplus commodity donation program, because the States would not have to match the cost of those donated foods.

No advocate of 20-percent matching for the food stamp program proposes that the States should be required to pay 20 percent of the Federal cost of the donated commodities that would be provided to needy families in lieu of food stamps.

I think it becomes clear that advocates of the 20-percent matching would end the food stamp program, by pricing it out of reach of the States. They want to force the surplus commodity donation program on the States, although their reasons for doing so are hard to understand.

I urge my colleagues to stand up and be counted for a well-administered, effective program that brings our abundance of food within the reach of our needy—whether they reside in cities such as Cleveland or in farming areas in the Mississippi delta counties in the South. You will be for the food stamp program only if you vote against the 20-percent matching amendment.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my wholehearted support of the Sullivan food stamp program. Although the present bill under consideration bears the name of the gentlewoman from Missouri, the House Agriculture Committee has added an objectionable provision which would require the participating States to pay for 20 percent of the program. I join with Mrs. SULLIVAN in her move to strike this provision from the bill so that the program may continue as originally authorized. I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mrs. SULLIVAN is to be commended for her pioneering in this field. Her efforts and those of the Department of Agriculture have produced an outstanding program—one which induces self-reliance and in no sense can it be branded a "give away." She feels that the 20-percent provision would seriously endanger the program in many States and this holds true for my own State, the State of Illinois.

In Illinois 20 percent would amount to $2,147,957 at the present level of operation. In Cook County alone the local participation would be $1,056,895. Illinois, like all States, already has its budget problems and could not, according to Governor Kerner, divert over $2,000,000 for other urgent items of need under our public aid program to assume its portion of the cost. Already, Illinois is spending something over $1 million a year in State moneys for operating expenses of the stamp plan.

Governor Kerner has stated that the adoption of the 20-percent provision would "compel the State of Illinois to two alternatives, both undesirable: (1) withdrawal from the Stamp Plan or (2) lowering of our food standard to accommodate for the monies diverted to paying the proposed 20 percent of bonus Stamp Costs."

The program has been operating in Cook County since April 1, 1965, and has been expanded to include 67 counties in Illinois since that date. Attesting to the success of the program in the Chicago area are stories which appeared in the Chicago Tribune and the New World.

Under date of July 11, 1965, the Chicago Tribune carried a story with a headline reading "Food Stamp Program Catches On, 30,641 Families Participated"—"Bonus Plan Helps Poor Beef Up Their Diets." The reporter wrote:

> From the vantage point of families using the stamps, the program is a menu brightener and a boon, despite some complexities and a bit of confusion. Many said they were eating better food, with the emphasis on more and better quality meats, fruits and vegetables, since they joined the program.

Some of the results cited are:

> Ten children of a near northwest side mother are now drinking fresh milk.
>
> A middle-aged couple treated themselves to oranges, grapefruit and bananas.
>
> A mother of two served her teenagers roast beef, a novelty on their table.

The New World on June 25, 1965, carried a story with the banner headline "Food Stamp Program Aids Needy Families by Increasing Their Purchasing Power" which cited the help which was being given in the Chicago area to low-income and welfare-supported families which could not afford otherwise to obtain the food they need.

The Food Mart News of Chicago on July 1, 1965, carried a story under the headline "Food Stamps Increase in Popularity" which discussed at some length the successful operation of the program.

But, unfortunately, the food stamp program in Illinois is in jeopardy. A requirement of 20-percent financial participation by the States, which is contained in legislation to extend the program as reported by the House Agriculture Committee, would in all likelihood sound the death knell for the program in Illinois. The 20-percent State contribution requirement should be amended out of the bill and I urge my colleagues to support and adopt the bill as originally introduced by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think there is no question but what, if this amendment is adopted, it will kill the program. I happen to represent a State which is considered to be quite wealthy, but my own State has already indicated it will probably drop this program if the 20-percent requirement is added to the bill. So I think your vote on this amendment determines whether you are for the program or against the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois yielded his time to Mr. ANNUNZIO.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that when the Congress, in its wisdom, develops and enacts a program which works in the manner in which we had intended—without scandal or abuse or blundering administration—we should all rejoice and take pride in our work.

Instead, there are voices here telling us the program we enacted in 1964 to provide adequate nutritional standards for low-income families works so well we now cannot afford it any longer.

These are the same voices which told us 3 years ago it would not work at all. Southern Illinois was selected as a pilot area to test the program and it has worked very well.

Some of the Members on the other side who fought the program so hard in 1964 say they are ready to support it now if we just mess it up a little and adopt their amendments to cripple it. They say they are for it now—but.

Others, of course, say they are not for it and never were—and at least they are consistent.

But I do not believe the opposition party has anything in the way of suggestions today to make this program work better than it has been working. No one on the other side has proposed relaxing the purchase requirements so that people who now find it difficult to scrape together the money they must pay for the food stamps can get them at less cost. No one on the other side has urged an increase in the food allotments to match increases in the cost of living.

They have not proposed anything to widen the scope or improve the effectiveness of the program in its primary purpose—which is getting enough of the right food to people who cannot afford to eat properly without some help.

This program is not perfect, by any means. But it works. It does what we intended it to do. It does it efficiently and effectively. It helps people eat properly—old people who otherwise would skimp on food and use their little bit of money for other things. Do not let the enemies of this program kill it, Mr. Chairman. It is one the Democratic Party can be proud of.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the Committee on Agriculture, I take great pride in the fact that I played a role, however small, in the enactment of the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

The food stamp program has been a highly important and most effective means of providing a more equitable share of our food abundance to low-income families throughout the Nation.

The program was started late in fiscal year 1961 on a pilot basis to test the effectiveness of this approach. The success of the pilot operations led to enactment of the Food Stamp Act of 1964. Special evaluation studies clearly show that the program has been achieving its goals. The bill which is again before us, H.R. 1318, amends the 1964 act to extend it for 1 year. The committee amendment to the bill further amends the act by providing that beginning July 1, 1969, each participating State or political subdivision thereof will pay 20 percent of the cost of free—bonus—stamps distributed to eligible households. Under the program as currently operated, the Federal Government is responsible for the total cost of the bonus coupons issued to needy families.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the extension of the food stamp program. However, I just as strongly oppose the committee amendment to shift 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons to the participating States. This amendment should be defeated.

If this change is made in the program, many of the States now participating will likely end their participation in the program.

Many of the States now participating in the program continue to have serious difficulty providing sufficient funds to support their own public welfare programs. Some States—particularly the lower income States—are not now taking full advantage of available Federal public assistance programs because they have not been able to raise the matching funds required. This amendment would limit still further their ability to assist their needy families.

Mr. Chairman, our welfare programs, be they State-sponsored or Federal-sponsored, must continue to provide for the pressing needs of poor families, including a better nutrition through increased food consumption, if we are to merit the recognition of an affluent democracy. The States' welfare programs must provide for the needs of all their needy families, and State resources must be effectively allocated to achieve that objective in order to achieve any degree of success. If the several States were able to finance such a public assistance program, it would not be necessary to continue the food stamp program.

As the program now operates, it is not without cost to the participating States. Many purchasers of food stamps use welfare money received from the States, in the first instance. States or the local areas also finance the costs of the program administration. The Department of Agriculture estimates that these administrative costs amount to about 7 percent of the value of the bonus coupons. To add 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons to these costs would price the program out of reach of those States in which the program is most needed.

Estimates indicate that, if this cost sharing amendment is adopted, the total financial burden to the States participating in the food stamp program in fiscal year 1970 would be increased by $64 million. In my own State of Hawaii this increase would amount to at least $100,000.

Mr. Chairman, the committee amendment providing for cost sharing by the participating States would in effect defeat the very purpose for which the food stamp program was established. It would deprive the areas in greatest need of the benefits of the program. If we can agree that the food stamp program has worked, and I believe we can readily so agree, then we can certainly agree that any crippling amendment such as this should go down in resounding defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ARENDS yielded his time to Mr. GOODLING.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of this House, yesterday we saw in this House a red flag raised against irresponsible Federal spending. This was the voice of the people of the United States speaking. For the next few weeks we will probably be seeing Members with arms in slings.

But, be that as it may, if this bill and this amendment is defeated—and all of us have heard over and over again certain dire consequences as a result of the adoption of this amendment, if this 20 percent is not retained the States will not be able to bear this additional burden.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us be realistic and face facts.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union what I said in connection with this matter just recently. I assume you will agree Ohio and Pennsylvania are two of the poorer States, yet they receive the greatest amount under this bill.

Let me also remind you that at a time when our economy is at an all-time high, our unemployment at an all-time low, we are expanding a welfare program.

A vote for this committee amendment is a vote for some sense of fiscal responsibility at the Federal level.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ECKHARDT].

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, in my State of Texas there are 10 counties which utilize the food stamp program. This constitutes only about 4 percent of the State's counties. However, it represents a significant number of people, now about 11,000 persons, who need the added nutrition provided by this most desirable program. If the committee amendment is adopted, this 4 percent of the Texas counties will have to convince the majority, including 96 percent of the counties which are not affected, to support a State legislative appropriation. If they cannot do so, they are denied the choice they now have to use the food stamp program rather than the surplus commodity program. I am against the committee amendment because it would deny the local self-determination that now exists and permit the State to dictate uniformity in an area in which there is much diversity amongst the counties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SCHERLE yielded his time to Mr. BELCHER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, the first food stamp program was inaugurated and placed into effect in McDowell County of the congressional district which it is my honor to represent, the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, based upon my experience with this program, I can assure the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the food stamp program represents persistent work and diligence, and is an investment in the future of America and we must keep and maintain it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARRETT yielded his time to Mrs. SULLIVAN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to remind the Committee that at no time during the debate on this bill has any question been made as to the efficiency and honesty of the administration of this program.

What this money does is to provide increased nutritious food and better diets for American families. That is the best possible investment that can be made with Federal funds.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TEAGUE of California yielded his time to Mr. BELCHER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point out that in no Federal welfare program does the Federal Government pay 100 percent of the costs. In the old-age assistance program, for example, it is paying 65.6 percent. In the aid to families with dependent children it is paying 56 percent. Aid to the blind program, it is paying 55.7 percent. Aid to the permanently and totally disabled, it is paying 64.7 percent. And in the medical programs it is paying 53.5 percent.

Beginning in July 1968, States and local governments will pay 20 percent of the costs of some of the poverty programs. So I believe the committee amendment is entirely consistent with the other ongoing programs of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN.]

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this program is to insure that the poor people of this country are not denied minimal nutritional needs. The food stamp program, as originally envisioned by our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], provided a creative means of increasing food consumption among indigent citizens, while aiding the agricultural economy and helping local retailers.

In 1964, when this program was first approved, an attempt was made to require the States to pay 50 percent of its costs. This was rejected, because in practice, it would have fallen upon those very areas least able to afford the costs. The States are currently paying about 45 percent of the administrative costs. An increase in this burden, even to 20 percent of the entire program would effectively cripple it, for the same reasons it would have in 1964.

I urge the defeat of the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO].

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment, and I commend the gentlewoman from Missouri for her years of hard work on behalf of the needy and hungry people of America.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment to require the States to pay a greatly increased share of the cost of the food stamp program. I am not going to take very much time, because I expressed my views during the general debate on this bill on May 15. I believe very strongly in this program, pioneered by my chairman on the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. We are talking about food for the stomachs of hungry people—or people who would be hungry if this program were not allowed to continue in the manner in which it has been operating so well.

How can we make such an issue out of the comparatively few dollars we spend on the food stamp program compared to the billions of dollars worth of food we give away all over the world? I cannot understand that kind of reasoning. This program and the attacks being made upon it. Is a dollar more important than a child's eating a proper meal? I cannot understand that kind of reasoning. This is not a program where we are spending billions of dollars. For about two million people, we are spending something like $160 million at current levels of operation of the food stamp program. This is the difference between going without proper food and having a minimum adequate diet. You would think we were giving Fort Knox away.

Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing that has characterized the United States of America for the past generation, it has been a willingness to help the people of other countries to improve their standard of living and their opportunity to pursue a good life for their people in freedom. We helped Greece and Turkey to stay free; we spent billions upon billions of dollars under the Marshall plan and other programs to aid other nations. Some begrudge the money we have spent to try to achieve a better world.

Our generosity has often brought us ingratitude, and worse. But we have persisted because we felt freedom was worth preserving—that we could not keep ours unless every nation had a chance to achieve freedom, too.

We are now spending nearly a billion dollars a year to add a tiny bit of additional nourishment to the starving people of India. Our wheat farmers benefit from this, of course, but our motives are better than that. We give this food away. We have given away untold billions of dollars worth of food all over the globe.

Is it not ironic that some Members rise in great alarm over the fact that in the coming year we will spend somewhere around $200 million—one-fifth of the food aid to India alone—in aiding very low income Americans to enjoy a basic minimum diet? Are we that destitute of the spirit of humanity for our own people?

These are not people getting a handout. They must earmark a certain percentage of their entire income for nothing but food. And if they agree to do that—to buy as much food as they can possibly afford out of their own money—we agree to supplement their food purchasing dollar with an additional 50 cents worth of food, on the average. Those who oppose this plan apparently would rather give that food away abroad, or let it rot in the fields or warehouses. I favor the food stamp program in preference to the breadline.

I absolutely oppose the committee amendment to destroy this program.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want, first, to indicate support for the food stamp program.

A broader food stamp program should be authorized. It has proved itself in the 7½ years it has been operating.

I am, however, opposed to the proposed committee amendment which would require that States and localities finance 20 percent of the cost of the free coupons to be issued. This provision will not strengthen the program as its proponents contend. It will kill it. Those States and localities most in need of a stamp program would not be able to take advantage of it.

Supporters of this State-matching provision support it because they say it is necessary to keep the program from getting "out of hand." But, there are no State-matching requirements for the value of the Federal foods now being provided to States for donation to needy families and this program has not gotten out of hand. So, matching funds are not needed to control the stamp program.

Supporters say that matching funds are necessary to protect the States' prerogatives in making major decisions in welfare programs. But, we have no evidence, no complaints from States, that the current food donation program has interfered with their rights or prerogatives. Nor have any of the States in which the food stamp program is now operating, on an unmatched basis, indicated that the Department of Agriculture is interfering with State welfare programs.

The matching provisions of this bill will make the program inoperative and keep it from helping low-income families and U.S. farmers.

Mr. Chairman, the question we are being asked today is not whether the States should share in the cost of this program. They do now. The real question being asked is: "Are we going to price this program out of reach of the States?"

At the present time the intrastate administrative costs borne by the States equal approximately 7 percent of the value of the bonus coupons. To ask the States to furnish 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons, in addition to present costs, is entirely unrealistic. The States have said so.

So, I ask the supporters of the 20-percent matching amendment, are you willing to vote to prevent States from exercising their right to choose between commodity distribution and food stamps?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment is designed to help those States which have always opposed social legislation to kill this program, and to force the indigents from those States into the big cities of our country. We in Chicago have seen a steady migration of indigents from the South simply because many of our southern communities refuse to accept their own responsibility to the poor. Can you imagine the State of Mississippi appropriating 20 percent of State funds for this program? If this amendment is adopted you will see these States kill the program simply by not appropriating their share.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Miller].

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the State of Ohio has received, as I understand it, $18 million from this program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is time that we stand up and be counted. Yes, in our State of Ohio we have received more funds from the food stamp program than any other State, but I support this amendment because I believe firmly that we must pay our share at the State level.

I know our Governor of Ohio has asked us not to support the amendment, and I can understand his reason for asking this. However, I favor it because I feel we should support these programs at the State level.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

We have prepared legislation here in the legislative hoppers that would force States and various localities, as a matter of fact, into sharing. Numerous bills are in the hopper to share revenues, and now we suggest that the revenues we are supposed to share shall be taken away from the State.

Where is the logic to that?

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is neither the time nor the circumstance under which we should be currently considering this amendment to provide for State contribution for the food stamp program. I hope this amendment will be defeated.

In my community, food stamps have kept welfare families alive despite welfare grants which give them only about 78 percent of minimum living costs. Food stamps since 1963 have given the poor a chance to add 25 percent more food to their scanty diets.

Governor James A. Rhodes has warned that if the bill passes with the amendment as it now is, food stamps would probably have to be abolished in Ohio.

At this particular time, all States, including Ohio, are burdened with special needs to implement the medicaid and public welfare programs. It would be most unfortunate to add this overwhelming burden to compel the State to contribute to the food stamp program.

Every month, more than 19,500 families in Cleveland and Cuyahoga County utilize $453,000 in food stamps to supplement their food purchases and their diets.

The poor of my community and the poor of America would have to pay for the economy extorted from their budgets by this devastating amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Randall].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Randall yielded his time to Mrs. Sullivan.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Myers.]

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

There has been a lot of discussion here this afternoon about raising the 20 percent in relief rolls of the States.

Who is going to pay this? You and I—the taxpayers of this country.

It is true that it is going to raise the States 20 percent but just yesterday we proved that unless we start curbing this thing and tightening our belt, actually we are going to raise taxes 6 percent for every taxpayer in this country.

I think that notice was served yesterday and now there is an opportunity for every one of us to really and sincerely back up what we did yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, let us look at the arguments that have been presented here.

MAINTAINING STATE RESPONSIBILITY

Let us look at the argument that making the States pay 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons will result in greater responsibility on the part of the States. Is there any evidence that the States have been lax in living up to their responsibilities under this program? There was none in the hearings. I saw no testimony, or heard none, indicating that any State participating in the food stamp program was not carrying out the letter as well as the spirit of the food stamp law.

The States do not now have any key to the Treasury vaults in this program. The standards they adopt for participation must be approved by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and signed in a formal compact of agreement. If anything, the States have been tough in the administration of the program. I found that true in Missouri when St. Louis came into the program. We had a terrific battle with the State welfare department and the Department of Agriculture here in Washington to persuade them to wake up to the facts of life on urban living costs and to amend the regulations so that the people who needed the food stamp program could participate. It was a real battle.

Generally, the same caseworkers who make investigations for welfare also investigate food stamp eligibility. The standards for the various States are given at pages 12625 and 12626 of the Record of May 15, when we had general debate on this bill.

The States are now responsible for running the program properly. This is not going to make them more conscientious; this amendment would only make it more difficult, or in many cases impossible, for the States to participate at all.

Was any State official asked to testify on this bill? None appeared. No evidence was spread on the record of the hearings to show that any State is not exercising "prudence" in the operation of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Belcher].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, the thing that I have in my hand is not a recommendation from me and it is not a recommendation for the food stamp plan.

I just want to bring a few facts before you.

I believe that every Governor of every State in this Union feels a responsibility toward the poor people in his State. If this program is such a poor program that no Governor is willing to pay 1 dollar out of 5 dollars of the cost of it, it certainly is a lousy program in my book. That is to say, a State or Governor who will not pay 20 percent of the cost of this thing because he does not think it is worth as much as 20 percent to his people—and if I had a program in which I could not sell $5 for $1, I would feel that I had a pretty poor program.

Every proponent of this who has come to this well has said, "If you ask our State to pay 20 percent of this, it will be the absolute end of this program." If it is not a better program than that, then we here in the Congress should not buy it either.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it is quite plain that most of those who have discussed this recently have been arguing in favor of the food stamp bill. There is no argument there. You have not heard anybody make a speech against the food stamp bill.

It is merely a practical question of how to get the best administration. The committee tried to be fair about it. We said that we would ask for State participation but that we would put no unreasonable burden on the States. We knew that all of the States would not have a legislature in session sometime within the next 2 years, and we provide that they do not have to make these contributions until the 2 full years have elapsed and until they have had the chance to have their legislature meet and pass a bill and appropriate the money.

Had there been any spirit or any desire to destroy this program, our committee would not have been so considerate.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I feel it is incumbent upon us to eliminate the requirement of this legislation that States be required to participate in the program in the future by providing 20 percent in participating funds. This program seems to be working effectively in the areas of greatest need in our Nation today. The States simply do not have the necessary funds that are required of them in the event this amendment is adopted. If we mean for this program to work and to give an opportunity to a number of unfortunate families in America today to receive adequate and necessary foodstuffs in the local marketplace, then this amendment must be defeated.

I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, will not support the amendment and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mrs. SULLIVAN and Mr. BELCHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 141, noes 120.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: Add the following new section at the end of the bill:
>
> "SEC. 3. Section 5 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:
>
> "'(c) The Secretary shall issue regulations providing that—
>
> "'(1) families with very low money incomes may not be excluded from the program by minimum stamp purchase requirements which exceed their budgetary resources.
>
> "'(2) sliding scales, lower than minimum purchase requirements in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection, be established for families with very low money incomes.
>
> "'(3) families with very low money incomes may not be required to commit themselves to purchase stamps every month as a condition of participation in the program.'"

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the food stamp program, a creative mechanism to expand purchases of food by our poorest citizens, is based on the premise that everyone should make some minimal expenditure for food, and the further premise that, if this purchasing power can be expanded through stamps, the poor family, the local grocer, and the farmer will all benefit.

However, ample evidence suggests that in the poorest areas, where people are heavily in debt or entirely outside a money economy, some citizens are unable to pay even the current minimum required to participate.

When we are told in the words of the title of a disturbing article in the New York Times magazine of June 4, 1967, by Robert Sherrill "It's Not True That Nobody Starves in America," our first reaction is that this cannot be so. I quote from the testimony of the distinguished civil rights leader, A. Philip Randolph, before the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty:

> Government administrators seem not to understand that the poorest people simply don't have money.

Dr. George Wiley, director of the Poverty Rights Action Center, in his testimony to the House Committee on Agriculture on March 15 of this year, stated:

> The most fundamental and universal complaint of food stamp recipients is that they are forced to commit a major portion of their already inadequate budgets to the purchase of food stamps. Most recipients feel that the amount they must tie up in food stamps is more than they can afford to spend on food and still meet the other needs of their families. In addition, restricting the use of a sizeable portion of a meager budget greatly increase financial hardship.

When legislators learn that intended recipients do not always benefit in spite of the existence of this worthwhile program, the reaction may be to rail at the ingratitude, or we hear the response that the food stamp program was not meant as a welfare program in the first place, and that people so poor they cannot even afford the stamps are, or should probably be, on charity in any event.

I do not propose in my amendment to alter any functions of the food stamp program. My amendment, which is now before the Committee simply directs the Secretary of Agriculture to use his existing authority to remove those impediments which are preventing the most needy people from participating in this program.

The Secretary presently approves the administrative regulations of each State. In Mississippi, where the minimum monthly stamp purchase requirement is $2 per person, a poor family of six must put up $12 monthly if it wishes to participate. For a sharecropper with a total cash income of perhaps $20 a month or less, this requirement might just as well be $1,200.

If a family has debts, as so many have, it is often unwilling or unable to commit 50 percent or more of its income to stamps even if the stamps would be of great benefit to it.

My amendment also goes to a certain administrative inflexibility in the existing program. In the program as it now operates, there is a general requirement that participants commit themselves to buy a certain amount of stamps each month in order to qualify. This procedure acts as a deterrent to those whose meager incomes are irregular and fluctuating.

Basically, the amendment I have offered will do two things. It will remove the requirement that stamps be bought every month, and it will require the Secretary to lower the minimum so that the poorest people will not be deterred or prevented from participating in this program on either ground.

Furthermore, although the older commodity distribution program is deficient in many respects, at least people did not starve under it. But as localities have switched over to the food stamp program, participation inevitably declines, for the reason I have just cited. Our colleague the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] in her testimony before the Committee on Agriculture noted that after St. Louis changed from commodity distribution to food stamps, participation dropped by 80 percent. And even after an intensive education program, it rose to only half its former level

In New York representatives of welfare recipients and poverty groups have objected to the food stamp program, partly for the reasons I cite. One constituent writes:

> The surplus food plan desperately needs to be abolished or revised, however we do not see the stamp plan as the least bit satisfactory as a substitute. This plan makes it impossible for a family to adjust its budget.

Mr. Chairman, let us consider the plight of the poor family when it is confronted with a stamp program which may appear to be a blessing but which is simply beyond the reach of that family.

All my amendment asks is that the Secretary use his existing powers, the powers which he has under the 1964 act, to make the program available to such individuals and to such families.

There was a very important article which I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, published in the New York Times magazine of last Sunday, June 4, 1967, written by Robert Sherrill, which points up the inherent difficulties in this program and how it does not reach a great many citizens of this country who simply do not have the budgetary resources to allocate $2 per person in each family to the purchase of food stamps.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be adopted. It will make clear the sense of the Congress to the Secretary that the minimums should be reduced to bring more poor people under the food stamp program so that they can benefit from this investment in the nutritional health of our Nation.

I include at this point in the RECORD, Robert Sherrill's article from the New York Times magazine of June 4, 1967:

IT ISN'T TRUE THAT NOBODY STARVES IN AMERICA

(By Robert Sherrill)

(NOTE.—Robert Sherrill is the Washington correspondent for The Nation and author of "The Accidental President.")

Heywood Broun, watching a breadline in 1932, is said to have remarked with cynical sympathy, "Poor people wouldn't be such a bother if they didn't starve so publicly." Since the end of the Depression, and especially in recent years with the development of more sophisticated welfare programs, poor people have been much more discreet about their starving.

Occasionally, the public peace of mind is elbowed by a news story indicating that something may not be quite right—a Mississippi family is reported to have eaten a cat; some Kentucky coal miners are seen eating only potato peelings for lunch; in Washington, D.C., pensioners scramble for discarded lettuce and cabbage leaves behind one of the largest markets. But most poor people are not observed in their ingenuities, and, in any event, the Government lists only 1,279 deaths from "malnutrition" and 197 deaths from "hunger, thirst, and exposure" in 1965, the last year for which there are statistics.

This, coupled with the natural optimism of Americans, has pushed into public faith an almost religious tenet—a second miracle of the loaves and fishes—called Nobody Starves in America, with the alternate title, No Adult Is Completely Broke For Long.

As with most economic dogmas, both are false, yet the foundation heaves a bit when either is challenged. And this may account for the present unease and unhappiness among some high Washington officials as they observe the Senate Anti-Poverty Subcommittee going around the country holding meetings and reviving the political topic of hunger as it has not been revived since the nineteen-thirties. (When, on Senator George

Murphy's motion, the subcommittee unanimously asked President Johnson to send emergency food to Mississippi to stop wide starvation, even the Office of Economic Opportunity jumped in to belittle the subcommittee's findings.) With all the powerful antagonisms the tour is arousing, its revival mood would probably not achieve much, except that one of the evangelists on the subcommittee happens to be Senator Robert F. Kennedy, whose disciples fill many a grotto and thrive on opposition.

The problem that a majority of this subcommittee—Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania, both Kennedy brothers, Jacob Javits of New York, *et al.*—is attempting to attack is illustrated perfectly in the two charity food programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The older program deals in surplus commodities. The men who put it through Congress never posed as humanitarians—the basic purpose of the commodities program is to support and stabilize farm prices, not support and stabilize needy people. It distributes free food from a larder stocked with whatever the Government's price support program has piled up, and the major items include flour, cornmeal, rice, grits and dry beans.

None of this is expected to supply more than three-fourths of minimum diet requirements. The only meat, when there is any, is a canned variety which the department states in its literature is not expected to provide a family with more than one-seventh of its needs. Each member of the family gets about $5.50 worth of food a month, but the food never includes eggs, citrus fruits, green or yellow vegetables, potatoes, sugars or sweets.

A diet of nothing but "commodities" is guaranteed to produce physical lethargy, mental depression and frequent onslaughts of disease. But, after all, this is called a supplemental program, and the optimistic Agriculture Department assumes that there is other *food in the house to be supplemented*. As for the quality of the commodities, that is debated. I attended a welfare rights conference at which the delegate from New York City said the commodities are "not fit for pigs." This came as something of a surprise to the delegate from Mississippi, who pointed out that in those relatively few parts of the South which have permitted this Federal program to operate, thousands of Negroes live on nothing else.

The other Federal anti-hunger program run by the Agriculture Department is food stamps.

Enaction of this program was the first thing President Kennedy did in the White House. Today 41 states participate to varying degrees; all major cities are in it except New York and Boston, and New York may join if pending Congressional legislation increases its funds.

Theoretically, it is a gorgeous program, constructed around the notion that everybody spends something for food each month, but poor people just don't spend enough. Solution: Allow the poor people to pay the Department of Agriculture what they would ordinarily spend for food, and in return give them bonus stamps which are just as good as money for buying any U.S.-produced food in the stores. A scale had to be worked out arbitrarily to decide what people "ordinarily" spend, but the department had no trouble settling on a scale starting at $2 a head, with a maximum payment of $12 a month for the largest family with the lowest income. In exchange for the $12, the family would get $70 worth of tickets.

The assumption is that any adult breadwinner can manage to raise $2 for each member of his family once a month. For Congressman Jamie Whitten of Mississippi, chairman of the House Subcommittee for Agriculture Appropriations, this is more than an assumption; it is a certainty. Whitten is a powerful man in agriculture. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman sometimes says, "I have two bosses. One is President Johnson. The other is Jamie Whitten." So when Freeman wants to clear something important, he takes it to Whitten.

Recently he went to Whitten for a private consultation on the idea of lowering the food stamp prices, maybe to 50 cents for people with no income. After all, there was a lot of rumbling in Mississippi. There were rumors, even, that some Negroes were so desperate they were contemplating breaking into Government warehouses. Well, what did Whitten think about it? "Nonsense," said Whitten. "There's nobody in Mississippi who can't raise $2 a month. If there is, just bring me a list of them and we'll take care of them." Freeman left the proposal at that.

If he ever gets around to making up the list—which should be about the longest noncensus list in history—Miss Marian Wright, Jackson attorney for the N.A.A.C.P., will be glad to give him her file of several hundred sworn paupers. Gene Roberts, head of The New York Times bureau in Atlanta, can probably add plenty of names. He recently wrote of one Locket Mayze, 59, who said "he could not remember when he last had a dollar in his pocket or when—with the exception of a hog's head given him by a friend—his wife and eight children had eaten anything other than surplus farm commodities." A couple of weeks ago Jim Hyatt told, in The Wall Street Journal, of meeting Richard Bogen, 62-year-old Negro farmhand, in an Arkansas plantation store, where he sat "with cap in hand and tears filling his eyes" because "Right now I've got just 2 pennies in my pocket." These people may be invisible to politicians, but any reporter who covers the South is constantly running into the Mayzes and the Bogens.

"Government administrators seem not to understand," Negro leader A. Philip Randolph told the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, "that the poorest people simply don't have money." The South is thick with Negroes who live in a primitive world of barter. They work or they don't work, but when they do work it is for past debts or to establish future credit. No money changes hands. They wear cast-off clothes, they eat charity food. They buy nothing. The sharecroppers wound up the season last October either in debt to their landlords or coming out of the cotton year with, say, $50—which promptly went to pay debts in town. Their pockets have been empty for six or seven months, at least. To them, $2 a head—or even 50 cents a head—for the stamp program might as well be $2,000 a head. They simply can't raise it. If they could raise it, it would only be by borrowing from their landlords, who charge up to 50 per cent interest.

The best proof of the nonexistence of money in some areas lies in the Agriculture Department's own file cabinets, where records show that in eight Mississippi counties that changed over from commodities to food stamps (the department won't permit both programs to operate in the same county because, with its usual optimism, it assumes a family getting cheap food doesn't need additional free food) the list of participants fell off by 21,000—which can be presumed to be the number who did not have the money to stay in.

Although these two programs at present are social booby traps, with relatively minor adjustments they could be perfected and with even fewer changes could be spread. Agriculture officials concede that in the South there are 17.5 million people in poverty (nearly half the nation's total) but only two million are receiving Federal food.

Of the 283 poorest counties in 15 Southern and border states, 93 counties—the home of three million people considered poor by O.E.O. standards—have no form of food distribution whatever. In the other 190 counties live 7,100,367 poor people, but only 1,029,331 get food aid. There are several reasons the other six million may have been excluded: maybe they can't afford to pay for the stamps; maybe the commodities distribution center is too far from their home; maybe local welfare workers have not bothered to tell them about the programs or welfare officials have refused to qualify them for help. In some states it isn't easy to qualify. Department of Agriculture officials acknowledge, for example, that if a four-person family in South Carolina earns more than $1,400 a year it cannot qualify for the stamp program (the only aid available), although the O.E.O. rates nonfarm families of four as poor if they don't earn more than $2,250 a year.

Hard times aren't limited to the back country. Of the 310,000 persons living in Mobile County, Alabama, 99,000 are judged poor by Federal standards. None has access to either commodities or food stamps. Of the 67,000 poor in Pulaski County (Little Rock), Arkansas, only 3,483 get Federal food. In Harris County, Texas, location of the South's largest city, Houston, there are a quarter of a million poor people but only 20,000 get food aid, and only the commodities.

Unquestionably it is easier, however, to exist in the urban clumps. The odd job is easier to come by. Proximity helps—it is more convenient to send the children to a neighbor's table, or to borrow a dollar from a relative whose welfare check hasn't been held up. It is easier to wangle an Aid to Dependent Children check in urban counties because hunger is unsightly and the cities are more sensitive to esthetics these days.

The family living in the shanty on the "back 40" of the old plantation is out of sight, out of the county officials' minds, and therefore usually out of luck. In this respect, the forces squeezing the blacks out of the rural South and into the Northern cities may be nutritionally beneficial. The squeezing forces are fourfold: there's a cotton cutback in some areas; mechanization of many jobs is almost total; weed-killing chemicals are eliminating the need for a human being on the end of a hoe; and the $1-an-hour minimum wage that went into effect this year is re-hardening many a planter's heart. The same people who were considered "good ol' darkies" a few years ago are now considered deadwood, hardly worth keeping alive.

Nowhere are the faults and the promises of the Government's food distribution program seen better than in Mississippi, which has one of the most complete programs in America. Every county in the state participates in some form of Federal assistance, which is rare not merely by Southern standards but by national standards. Nowhere else in the Bible Belt are poor folks given anything like a comparable amount of assistance.

One-fourth of all Mississippians (about 470,000) are eating federally paid-for food, more even than New York's charity food population (440,000). The food comes via Washington, but at least Mississippi lets it in. By comparison, South Carolina won't let the commodities program into the state at all and permits the stamp program to operate in only 10 of 46 counties; in only three of the 20 poorest counties are the stamps sold, and on such a tight basis that only 10,900 of the 715,000 poor in these counties are assisted. Virginia has food programs for only 1.9 per cent of its impoverished people; Texas covers only 5.6 per cent; Louisiana, 7.9 per cent. In the Deep South no state but Mississippi allows more than 10.9 per cent of its poor people to participate in food programs—and Mississippi offers them to 42.3 per cent.

Yet Mississippi is a laboratory of hunger and of Federal fumbling. On the Delta—that northwestern bulge of the state that arches along the river from Memphis to Vicksburg—one can stand on a steaming summer day and be persuaded that God created the world simply to give Adam a cotton allotment. There is big money here. Delta plantation owners will take out of the soil more than a quarter of a billion dollars this year, most of it in tax-supported crops. In the same area, because of newly mechanized farming techniques, Government officials estimate there will be between 60,000 and 100,000 unemployed hands by this summer. And, since Mississippi has no general state or local welfare programs, these people must depend on Federal largesse.

Choose any shanty; only the number of bodies inside will vary. Here is a mother and six children, residents of Washington County, against the river. Four of the children are asleep on the floor. They sleep most of the day as well as all night. Their lips and legs are covered with scabs and open sores. The youngest has a distended stomach and from it the umbilical knot sticks out like a valve from an innertube. Some days they eat nothing. Most days they have one meal, of cornmeal. Washington County quit the commodities program in March and went on food stamps. Leftover commodities are all this family has. Now, it is after 2 P.M. and they have eaten nothing, but the mother says she will cook "a little something" later on. She points to a bag on the floor by the stove; a couple of inches of meal are left of what has lasted them two weeks. When she runs out of cornmeal, she will borrow something from a neighbor. Yes, she nods, the neighbors are in bad shape, too. But she will get something.

This must be an extreme case, so drive on, northeast into the Delta's proudest county Sunflower, home of Senator James O. ("Our Jim") Eastland, who operates a 5,800-acre plantation near Ruleville, which is also the home of Sunflower County's next best-known politician, Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, a leader of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic party. Mrs. Hamer used to be a sharecropper, but, like many thousands of others, she was chased off the land. Being well imbedded in the 32-million in this country officially designated as impoverished, Mrs. Hamer speaks empirically: "The main problem about bein' poor is that it only leaves you the choice between not eatin' at all and eatin' so bad you wonder if that is a improvement."

Although reared on a farm and now middle-aged, she has eaten turkey only twice in her life, once a couple of years ago when comedian Dick Gregory shipped a batch of the birds to Mississippi Negroes and the other time when she bought a turkey on the installment plan and paid for it at the rate of 70 cents a week. When the conversation turns to food, Mrs. Hamer will always mention those two turkeys, because otherwise she has nothing to talk about except the customary meal that gets on her table—meat that is thinly attached to hog neckbones (she broke off a front tooth discovering just how thinly attached). She is a big woman, built out in rings of starch—rice and grits and more grits and flour—held together by bean proteins. Perhaps once a year she eats fruit, but only if a friend who has moved to the relatively luxurious welfare rolls of the North sends it. She cannot afford it herself.

Even the little towns of Mississippi, places like Indianola, county seat of Sunflower, have their slums and they are full of farm hands who no longer have a farm to work on and have come into town to do their starving. I met a boy in Indianola who had had nothing to eat that day but a plate of butterbeans; the day before it had been bread and butterbeans; the day before that, again just butterbeans. Sometimes, he said, it was bread alone. One-course diets are commonplace. Kenneth Dean, executive director of the Mississippi Council on Human Relations who has moved among these people for many months, describes a typical hardship case:

"Breakfast will be grits, molasses and biscuit. For lunch, the adults will eat nothing, and the children who are at home will be given a piece of bread and a drink of Kool-Aid or water. The evening meal usually consists of boiled beans and cornbread." In the worst cases, which are not uncommon, "there is usually no table on which to eat, and what little food there is is eaten by hand out of a bowl or from a newspaper on the floor."

With hunger so abundant and easy to find, it might be anticipated that the Department of Agriculture would react to it in a dramatic fashion. But this has not been the case. Seventeen months ago, Congressman Joseph Resnick, Democrat of New York, made a tour of Mississippi and came back to Washington writing letters to all the appropriate Administration leaders about the "desperation point of . . . . starving Negroes." Nothing happened.

A month later 35 Negroes invaded the abandoned Greenville, Miss., Air Force Base, and before a phalanx of troops was flown in to evict them they distributed leaflets explaining: "We are here because we are hungry and cold and we have no jobs or land." It made the front pages as a protest story, but their appeal for food somehow went astray. Last summer the Department of Agriculture's own Civil Rights Advisory Council held hearings in Jackson, Miss., and made confidential recommendations to Secretary Freeman that he act upon their "deep sense of urgency" that something must be done swiftly "before suffering, hopelessness and frustration make an evolutionary approach extremely difficult and infinitely more expensive, if not—for an interim—impossible." About the same time, across the Mississippi River, Arkansas State Welfare Director A. J. Moss was writing letters to Freeman, warning that thousands of families would soon be unemployed on the Arkansas Delta and that the food situation was critical. Neither warning disquieted the adamant Agriculture Department calm.

Then, in April, the Clark-Kennedy troupe hit Mississippi, accompanied by TV cameramen, journalistic jongleurs and the usual ballyhoo machinery. It made a difference. At this point Freeman began to move cautiously. He dispatched two of his aides—Howard Davis and William Seaborn—to Mississippi for a confidential report. Davis and Seaborn found, of course, what everyone else had been reporting for more than a year: many Mississippians are limp with malnutrition, many cannot afford to buy the food stamps, and some landlords are profiteering off the programs. Among the cases of suffering they cited a man in Winstonville, father of six, who got into the food stamp program only because "a New York A.B.C. newsman on assignment in Mississippi gave him $12 twice to buy food stamps. He does not know what he will do when his present commodities and stamp supplies are gone."

Another case: Mrs. Effie Mae Jackson of Billy May Plantation, mother of five, "has a problem of having the date to buy stamps come prior to receipt of her check from welfare. To meet this she borrows from her landlord the $22 each month, and when her check comes he charges her 50 cents on the dollar, which means she has to pay $33 for the stamps each month." This, plus her $10-a-month rent, means that she must pay $43 for food and rent out of the $55 she gets from welfare.

For some reason, the story Davis and Seaborn brought back penetrated where others had failed. Freeman wrote Senator Clark that he was "deeply concerned about their findings" and that he might change the rules to make persons with no income pay only a fourth as much as at present. He said this before talking with Congressman Whitten. After the latest Whitten conversation, Freeman told Jack Conway, head of the Industrial Union Department of the A.F.L.–C.I.O. and unofficial boss of Walter Reuther's Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, that he isn't going to try to cut the stamps' cost "until the department budget gets out of Whitten's committee."

And that is where reform of the program stands today. It hasn't started.

Civil rights leaders damn Freeman for not opening his ears until two winters had passed since he was first alerted to the predicament of the foodless Southern Negro. But Freeman is not his own man in this dispute. In many respects he is the prisoner of the Southerners who command the agriculture committees and the agriculture appropriations subcommittees in both houses of Congress. As human-support programs, neither the free commodities nor the food stamps are popular with these groups. A bill is now being pushed by some House Southerners that would kill the food stamp program by making it prohibitively costly for many states, particularly those states in Dixie with the highest concentrations of Negroes. Many farm-oriented legislators have a hoary suspicion that any give-away program promotes shiftlessness among the menials.

Nowhere is this attitude better seen than in Alabama, where the distribution of Federal food is made inversely to need, and also inversely to the concentration of Negroes. The 30 richest counties, in the top half of the state, participate in the free-food program; the 37 poorest counties in the bottom do not. Although not notorious for pampering Negroes, the Alabama administration nevertheless encourages the acceptance of Federal surplus foods by the counties because it is a sure-fire way of "beating" Washington. For a very small expense—about one or two cents a day per recipient—the counties receive a cornucopia of food. Montgomery County, for example, would pay about $15,000 a year as the cost of distributing almost $1,000,000 in commodities to its people.

But Montgomery County won't enter the program. Neither will other counties where most of the state's Negroes live. Tallapoosa County, home of the State Welfare Commissioner, refuses to pay the $10,000 required to distribute $700,000 worth of surplus foods. The Negro leaders of Hale County have been trying for two years to get county officials to bring in a food program. First the officials said it was too expensive, but when Washington offered to bear the total cost, they still refused. Agriculture officials refuse to fight this kind of local obstinacy. Secretary Freeman promised a commodities program for Hale last August, but he hasn't delivered it yet.

Could the Federal Government just send the food in anyway, without local approval, and have Federal workers distribute it or let the poor people distribute it themselves? Yes; for 30 years the Secretary of Agriculture has had power to distribute food where emergencies exist. And, when pressed hard enough, he will. When Negroes in Dallas County, already warmed up by the Selma civil rights activities in 1965, began demonstrating loudly because they wanted food, Federal officials told Dallas County leaders the food was coming in, and if they wouldn't distribute it, civil rights leaders would. Dallas County surrendered and took the goods, but the scope of the victory is disputed. Some say it only hardened the will of surrounding counties to resist.

This kind of tugging and heaving reveals the great weakness of the food programs: commercial interests of the South use them for reprisal and coercion. They are the political and social weapons of a region. Free Federal food was valued by the Delta planters for many years because, by allowing their hired hands to live off it through the winter, it became a kind of subsidy for the farmers. (Free commodities were never given to Delta Negroes after spring plowing time, because a little hunger was expected to make them eager to earn $3 a day in the fields.)

But now that farming has become almost totally mechanized, field hands are, as one planter put it, "as useless as a mule." They and their shotgun shanties only clutter the landscape, chafing the consciences and the pocketbooks of the region. Get rid of them. And what better way than to shift to a food program they cannot afford? Half of the Delta counties have already dropped the commodities and put in food stamps. "What does that mean?" asked Amzie Moore, a Negro leader from Cleveland, Miss. "That means starve or go to Chicago. Well, we're not going to Chicago. We don't want the stamps unless it's a free stamp program."

The angry Negroes have some support. That faint thunder in the distance may develop into a real challenge. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has circulated a memo implying that Freeman has ignored his obvious powers to bring relief. The commission urges free food stamps for the penniless and both programs operating simultaneously in the poorest counties. The leaders of Reuther's Citizens Crusade want to strip Freeman of his role in distributing food and turn the whole job over to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—which was in fact Senator John Kennedy's proposal in 1959. The Crusade is putting out some pretty snappish statements about the preeminence of nutrition over profits. And now Senator Javits has asked the Senate Executive Reorganization Subcommittee to consider the "strip Freeman" proposal.

If impoverished Southerners are judged strictly as an economic factor, more food to keep them alive can be viewed skeptically as merely a temporary solution to the problem of making them profitable. But for them temporariness has always been a relative matter, and they would probably just as soon be fed even on that basis—for, as one high Citizens Crusade official pointed out: "We've been keeping them alive on a temporary basis for 300 years." Something more permanent, he felt, is not wholly impossible and is "limited only by the amount of money that American capitalism, with its Dixiecrat-dominated agriculture committees in Congress, is willing to spend to create a 20th-century civilization in the South." The vagueness of the statement is important; here is a man who for a lifetime has been professionally concerned with labor and housing conditions of the Southern poor, and yet he has no specific plans to improve them, and the specific planners have not come much farther.

Many say that the salvation of the hungry Negro lies in modification of the agricultural South with industry. It is an old dream. Since the days of Gov. Hugh White's "Balance Agriculture With Industry" program a generation ago, Mississippi has been trying to bring in the smokestacks, and the same has been true for the South as a whole since the days of Henry Grady. Yet the skies over the South's vast boondocks are just about as blue and unsmudged as ever. Others, including such practical groups as the Southern Regional Council, are pushing for farm cooperatives to give the landed Negro independence from a repressive social structure. But this, too, though spottily successful, is something that has been tried off and on for years without more than denting the general poverty of the black farmer.

These efforts and failures are quite beside the point to the Negro who faces another one-meal, beans-only day. Very much to the point is the knowledge that his life can be changed, and immediately, by the simplest of Agriculture Department fiats.

If change does come, it will probably take some powerful motivating emotion to achieve it. But there is hope for that, too. When Robert Kennedy returned from his safari into Mississippi's shanty jungles, he told of seeing people who eat one meal every two days, but he described the results only as "extreme hunger." For politicians, "starvation" is a smut word. They don't like to come right out and say it exists in this country—so it becomes "hunger" or "malnutrition"—and even less do they like to see that which the taboo word describes; it embarrasses them. Testifying before a Senate group about swollen bellies and running sores and all the cottonpatch grotesqueries he had seen, Kennedy several times became so embarrassed he laughed. The last best hope of "extremely hungry" folks is that that discomfort will spread.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the purposes or objectives of this bill, that it does not amend any of the sections covered by this bill or the subject matter touched on by this bill.

This bill relates only to sections 15 and 16. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York relates to section 5 of the Food Stamp Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RYAN. Briefly, Mr. Chairman, on that point.

The purpose of the bill before us, H.R. 1318, as spelled out in its title, is to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964. My amendment would do just that. It would be an amendment to the Food Stamp Act of 1964, just as have been the amendments offered and debated during the course of the afternoon.

I submit that the amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANDRUM). The Chair is ready to rule.

The bill, which has been amended, amends two sections of existing law.

The proposed amendment to add another section to the pending bill would amend a third section of existing law.

The Chair rules, therefore, that the amendment is germane.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I support the food stamp program as it was enacted into law in 1964. Some Members of the House have had no firsthand experience with this program so I think it might be well to explain just how it works.

First of all, the county or city or the local unit of government must want the program. They must ask for it. This request is made to the State agency which is charged with the operation of State-administered, or aided relief programs.

Thus, not only must the local unit approve, but so also must the individual State government. The Federal Government does not deal directly with the local unit. The program is designed in this manner so as to maximize State control and regulation, and to minimize overlapping of administrative responsibility. The crux of the Federal direction is the requirement that the State must use the same criteria for food stamp eligibility as is used for its own welfare programs. This assures the Federal Government of uniformity of regulation in keeping with the State's existing programs. Further, it assures the Federal Government of the employment of the regular State administrative machinery in the determination of eligibility for the program. The State is also responsible for the safekeeping and transmittal of the food stamps to the individual participant.

Each year, following the congressional appropriation, Federal food stamp officials enter into extensive discussions with the States. Each State then determines the priority of counties within the State and submits formal requests for participation in the program. New areas are then designated to insure equitable national distribution.

Once a new area is designated, a program of instruction and information is begun to fully acquaint the locality with the program.

The next step is certification of eligible families and the issuance of identification cards. This is done by regular, local welfare personnel. Families are certified for a specific amount of bonus coupons, dependent on need, income, and assets. Each family is required to contribute toward the purchase of coupons that amount of money which it would normally spend on groceries. Both the amount the families pay and the value of the bonus coupons are limited, and this will vary from State to State, dependent on local conditions.

The family must then budget its income in order to have on hand the necessary money when the authorization to purchase is received. This authorization to purchase is set up on a monthly, biweekly, or weekly basis. Food coupons can be purchased when the participant shows his identification card and surrenders his authorization to purchase and pays his share of the cost. The amount of the authorization and the family's share will change as the family's circumstances change.

The local agency decides where the coupons will be sold but it is usually banks or government offices. Once the individual has the coupons in hand, he may spend them as he would money in any approved retail food store. Retail outlets—grocery stores—may win approval simply by demonstrating they are a bona fide retail food outlet and have a knowledge of the rules and willingness to comply with them. The rules are simple and pertain principally to proper identification of the purchaser and the eligibility of the merchandise. Imported foods, tobacco, alcoholic beverages, and nonfood items are prohibited. The store owner handles the coupons just as he would money, depositing them in his bank. The bank is reimbursed for deposited coupons by the Treasury Department through the normal banking channels.

Cooperation among store owners and banks has been excellent. The stores vary from the simplest corner store to the largest of the chain-operated outlets. The stores are checked out from time to time by a limited staff of Federal employees who divide their time between the food stamp program and other activities of the Consumer and Marketing Service.

Briefly, that is how the program works. Now, I would like to just recap the highlights of the program:

First. It is a voluntary program.

Second. It is administered by the States through existing channels.

Third. The food is getting to those who need it and in proportion to their needs.

Fourth. It is a model of administrative simplicity and is working very smoothly.

Fifth. Abuse of the program is minimal—almost nonexistent.

Sixth. The cost-benefit ratio is very low.

Seventh. It has expanded farm markets.

Eighth. It stimulates the overall economy in every area where it operates.

The present food stamp program results from one of the outstanding legislative accomplishments of the 88th Congress. It should be continued as it is now operating.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my unqualified support for extension of the food stamp program as presently operative.

The program, in making food available at discount price to low-income families, has received an enthusiastic reception in Hawaii, with approximately 6,000 participants who will purchase an estimated $405,192 worth of coupons in fiscal 1968.

The food stamp program, which benefits some 2 million people throughout the country at present, is operative in 229 congressional districts, and many others have applied for inclusion. This simple expedient of enabling needy people to obtain about $26 worth of food for $20 in coupon purchases, has drawn the support of the public, retail merchants, and State and local governments, as an effective way to allow poor people to meet their family's basic nutritional needs without any sacrifice of dignity.

The program was inaugurated in Oahu, Hawaii, on April 12, 1966. Only 300 families in the State had signed up for the program in its early stages; now 1,911 families or 7,412 individuals benefit from this assistance; more will be added, hopefully in the near future. By Presidential designation, Maui and Kauai Counties were added on September 10, 1966, as among 402 new food stamp districts. The State administration of Gov. John A. Burns has moved expeditiously to implement the program and arrange for the necessary administrative costs; it recognizes fully how this remarkably simple food utilization program adds to the variety of social services extended to our citizens in greatest need. The county of Hawaii was designated to receive such aid on January 23, 1967, by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman; the inauguration of the Hawaii County program as of April 3 of this year means that food stamps are available in every area of my State.

According to April figures released by Christina Lam, food stamp coordinator for the State department of social services, these 1,911 families received $149,200 worth of groceries for $106,758 of their own money. The need for the program is emphasized in an article by Barbara Milz, "Food Stamp Program Turns Out Quite a Tasty Dish," which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser of May 11, and which I am adding at the end of this statement as a record of the need for continuing food stamps.

I have heard no serious criticism leveled at this Federal-State cooperative program, have heard of no charges of misuse or fraud in connection with it. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am filled with dismay at the inclusion in H.R. 1318 of an amendment that will require the participating local political subdivisions to pay 20 percent of the bonus costs effective July 1, 1969. I am at a loss as to the logic of such a provision which I fear will effectively kill the program in many, if not all, areas. In calling for the States to meet a modest share of the cost of this program, the committee report expresses the view that "State and local cost sharing will bring greater local responsibility and control into the operation of this program" without documenting a single instance of the absence of such local responsibility. Indeed, since the program is a voluntary one, requiring administrative arrangements and the bearing of costs for same on the part of the States, we have prima facie evidence of local sharing of the responsibility wherever the program is in operation. Administrative costs borne by the States include those for such activities as data processing, checkwriting, making payments to the banks for issuing coupons, and paying the salaries of local administrative personnel.

It is probably true that many of the congressional districts not now participating in the food stamp program have been held back by the necessity for meeting these administrative expenses, and I fear that the pending amendment requiring assumption of 20 percent of the bonus costs of the stamps will not only effectively keep all nonparticipating districts from ever applying, but will eliminate Hawaii and many other States from future participation.

Using the Department of Agriculture projections made available to us by our very able colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri, who is leading the fight against adoption of this amendment, I note that Hawaii's participation by fiscal 1970 will approximate $500,000 worth of bonus coupons. This means that passage of the 20-percent amendment will require my State to appropriate $100,000 per year in addition to the costs it is already bearing.

Mr. Chairman, the food stamp program has always been a federally initiated project and should remain so if its benefits are to continue. As far back as the 86th Congress, legislation was passed to allow for distribution of food to needy citizens under a stamp plan, but it remained for President Kennedy to exercise the Executive authority to actually put such a plan into operation in 1961. This pilot program of assistance to eight depressed communities was expanded to a nationwide operation with the passage of H.R. 10222 in 1964 and the subsequent signing of Public Law 88-525 by President Johnson on August 31 of that year.

The President requested an appropriation of $195 million for this program in fiscal 1968, and I applaud the Agriculture Committee's recognition of the value of the plan by authorizing the full amount requested. One Member after another has stood up in this debate to extol the food stamp program for its effectiveness in his district, and the only arguments I have heard expressed against it are to the effect that we are already doing too much for the poor in America. Mr. Chairman, I submit that in a land as prosperous as ours, when there are still vast numbers of citizens, young and old, not capable of adequately feeding themselves, then we are not doing nearly as much as conscience and humanity demand. To deprive some 2 million people of this one additional means of securing the very basics of life can only be regarded as a reversal of the great strides we have made in attempting to provide a richer, fuller life for all Americans. I urge my colleagues to extend the food stamp program without the 20 percent amendment so that we may not witness the slow demise of this meaningful and vital Federal assistance to the less fortunate among us.

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Advertiser, May 11, 1967]

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM TURNS OUT QUITE A TASTY DISH

(By Barbara Milz)

Food stamps issued under a joint Federal-State program added more than $42,263 worth of food to the tables of low-income Hawaii families last month.

"I just wish we could tell everybody about this," said Christina Lam, food stamp coordinator for the State Department of Social Services.

"All our lower income families should be able to eat better, and through this program, we can help them do so."

When the food stamp started in Hawaii a year ago, only 300 families signed up. The rolls now list 1,911 families—7,412 individuals.

"This isn't simply a welfare program," Miss Lam said. "It's a program that helps these people help themselves."

Miss Lam explained that while many of the food stamp plan members are on welfare, some are not. "We even have student families, families where the couple is attending the University and getting by on very little income," she said.

"We couldn't aid them in any other way, but with this food stamp program, we're seeing well fed, healthy babies.

"Tomato puree is much cheaper than canned tomatoes. Mainland eggs are just as good as Island eggs, and they're much cheaper. And we're teaching our participants things like this."

"This is an educational program, too. We have an obligation to teach the people to make better use of food, to serve better meals with what they have."

Miss Lam named with obvious pride members of the advisory committee of nutritionists who work out low-cost menus and recipes for the food program participants.

Participating members in the program receive a new recipe or a shopping hint each month. "They complain if they don't," Miss Lam said.

"And this is the first time many of our people using the program have been in banks.

"The people who qualify for the program come in here to the Social Services Department and are certified for the program.

"They receive an authorization to purchase food coupons and an identity card.

"Then, the person goes to the bank once a month with his authorization, and buys the food coupons there. Only, he gets more coupons than he pays for."

Miss Lam pulled out a chart to explain. "Say for instance you are living alone and your net income is $100 a month. You would be paying about $20 for food items alone. If you spend that $20 for food coupons, you'd get $26 worth of coupons."

Miss Lam pointed to another line in the chart. "Look at this one. If a five-member family has a net income of $275 a month, they can spend $84 for food stamps. For this amount they will receive food stamps worth $112. That's an increase of $28 they can spend for food."

"Mamas like this plan. Papa can't use the food stamps for beer."

Miss Lam switched back to banks and the food stamp plan.

"The First National Bank, all but in some places on the Big Island, is where our people go to buy their food stamps. The banks have been cooperating beautifully.

"For many of our people this is the first time they've ever been in a bank. It's one of those things we're doing that's educational.

"The banks get a tiny service fee for handling this, but we think it's important to get our people into banks, get them used to things other people are used to.

"When people first come into our program, some are disappointed because they think we are going to give them money.

"We don't. They have to make that first investment on their own. They have to use their own money to buy the stamps, but then they get so much more for their money that way."

April figures show that the 1,911 families in the program here spent $106,758 of their own money for food. For this they received $149,200 worth of groceries in the stores.

The Federal government will pay the grocers for the stamps the stores accept instead of cash.

"It's so much better than the old surplus food program," Miss Lam said.

"Under that, the people got only what happened to be in surplus at the time. Our local people might not like too much beans, corn meal, that sort of thing. But that's what they got under the old program.

"And the butter we used to get," Miss Lam remembered, shuddering slightly. "It would come in by ship, and there wouldn't be room for it on the docks, and it would get all melting, and we'd have to scurry around trying to find a place to store it until we could get it to the people. This program is ever so much better.

"But so many of the people remember the old program, and they may think the new program is like that. They need to be convinced that the program is good before they'll sign up.

"It's a long, slow process, getting all the eligible families told about the program. Please help us get them the word!"

Miss Lam also wanted people to be told that if they can't get to the department to sign up, it's possible a worker can visit them at home.

"We know it's difficult for some people to come in here," she said. "Ask those in rural areas to call us at 507–711, ext 262, and we'll take the applications in the field.

"We'll also call at the homes of people who are too elderly to get around easily, or who otherwise just can't get to our office.

"On the Neighbor Islands, the low income families can get the same service by calling their Social Services office there."

Miss Lam is armed with comments from people who like the food stamp program.

A telling statement from a mother of 10 children sums up the feeling: "I wish they had it when I was a child."

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation to continue and expand the food stamp program, but in opposition to the committee amendment requiring 20-percent cost sharing by the States.

Pennsylvania is one of 16 States which passes along a 50-percent administrative cost charge to its municipalities under existing law, so there is already cost sharing in certification and coupon costs. Since the principal need for a Federal assistance program to aid needy households with grocery bills stems from the fact that States and localities were unable to raise the funds to finance public assistance programs that would provide a minimum level of food for low-income families, it is unrealistic to expect that these same governments could now absorb an additional 20 percent of the cost of bonus coupons. In my county of Allegheny this would amount to an additional $700,000.

In Allegheny County 60 percent of the people participating in the food stamp program are also public welfare recipients; so States and localities already contribute significant sums indirectly to the program in the form of moneys used by welfare people to make regular coupon purchases. Pennsylvania would then have to contribute to the cost of bonus coupons for families not on welfare, as well as those receiving assistance, because many families who would qualify for assistance in the Federal food stamp program do not qualify for public assistance.

Public assistance is probably the most complex social welfare problem in this country, and one of the greatest difficulties in Pennsylvania has been funding. Until all of our States and municipalities are able to prove their readiness and ability to raise revenues for this purpose, I believe it is the continuing obligation of government to continue to support the distribution of food and nutrition to low-income families.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of H.R. 1318 without the 20-percent cost-sharing proposal—and the immediate restoration of the authorization for this program when the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill reaches the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I support the food stamp program because it has proven to be one of our better programs for the relief of poverty.

The self-help principle which is a feature of food stamps should be encouraged.

I hope that my colleagues realize that the program is not a handout from Washington. States and localities must spend their own funds to cooperate in the program. In addition, the recipients must purchase approximately 66 percent of the food stamps which they receive in order to obtain the bonus coupons. Imported foods, tobacco, liquor, and nonfood items may not be purchased with food stamps.

I regret that the House Committee on Agriculture saw fit to include the amendment requiring 20-percent State participation. I am convinced that retention of the cost-sharing provision will result in discontinuance of the program in most States because of the difficulties most States are experiencing with their budgets.

States and localities already share in the cost of the program. They are paying the costs of administration which amount to 7 percent of the Federal participation. To require additional cost sharing is unrealistic.

It should be brought out that farmers are benefiting from the program as well as the needy. It utilizes their ability to produce and helps prevent surpluses by moving additional foodstuffs through the marketplace to the consuming public.

It does not displace money normally spent for food.

It increases the food budgets of those who are qualified to participate.

Increased sale of food and its consumption has been reflected in every study conducted on this program. An analysis of one of the pilot programs showed a 24-percent gain in grain products consumption through direct use of cereal products and increased meat consumption. Consumption of fresh vegetables was shown to have doubled. Use of fresh fruits was up 70 percent. To the housewife, this means a pound of hamburger rather than neckbones. To the child, it means an apple or an orange in his lunch box. To the farmer, it means a bigger market for his produce.

By the end of this fiscal year that expanded market will consist of 2 million people in 42 States. This is an expanded market for American food products.

The economic stimulus from this increased retail activity benefits the total economy of these areas and our farmers share in that as well.

I urge elimination of the committee amendments and passage of the Sullivan bill as originally introduced.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the food stamp plan sponsored by my good friend and distinguished colleague, Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN, of Missouri, and against the amendment recommended by the Committee on Agriculture.

We have before us today a bill which was so amended by the committee that it would destroy the food stamp program which is functioning successfully in 40 States and which will be expanded to others if it is permitted to continue in operation.

The 20-percent State participation provision would unquestionably compel Washington and other participating States to withdraw from the program. The director of the Washington State Department of Public Assistance estimates that Washington would have to contribute several million dollars under provisions of the amendment. I urge that this committee amendment be stricken from the bill in order to restore the original legislation sponsored by Congresswoman SULLIVAN.

The food stamp plan is a successful operation and it should be expanded rather than terminated. I believe that we in Congress should enact more programs which incorporate the self-help features which are a part of the food stamp plan.

Self-reliance and industriousness are encouraged when participants in a Government program are required to pay approximately two-thirds of the cost of assistance, as is the case with the food stamp program. The fact that the remaining one-third of the stamps are received as a bonus permits a more balanced and healthy diet of most unfortunate citizens who are required to resort to the program.

When the nine more Washington State counties now scheduled to enter the food stamp program by early summer start their programs, all but three of the State's 39 counties will be offering this food help to their needy and low-income residents.

One of the reasons that Washington localities have adopted the food stamp plan so widely is that the program is not only less expensive to administer than surplus food distribution but also is more effective in improving the diets of the poor.

The low-income persons currently enjoying the benefits of being able to buy more and better food than they could before the coming of food stamps are strong supporters of the plan, too. For example, in Oakville, Wash., in my district, there is a mother of eight children who is an enthusiastic user of food stamps. Each month she puts $116 of her own money into Federal food coupons, and receives in return a total value of $160 in coupons to be spent on foods of her choice. She says that food stamps enable her to feed her family much better, and her eight healthy youngsters, ranging in age from 3 to 13, testify to her attention to nutrition.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, last week the Senate, by a unanimous vote, accepted in essence the extension of the Food Stamp Act for another 3 years as proposed by the President. The great weight of evidence points to the fact that the Senate acted wisely and that we should today vote to extend the act without any change in the administration or the methods of cost sharing.

As I have said in the past, the Food Stamp Act has justified itself by performing smoothly and efficiently during the last 3 years and, most of all, it has given poor families throughout the country a means to obtain an adequate supply of food which in the past had been denied them by rising food costs.

Mr. Chairman, the food stamp programs have on the whole been admirably administered by local agencies and the overall direction of the act has been commendable. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has lent his dynamic and outstanding leadership to the effort and I think the results are ample testimony to his success.

I foresee a great future for the food stamp programs and I foresee an even greater impact toward relieving the tremendous and overpowering burden of providing a livable subsistence which bears most heavily on those whose economic resources are limited.

Mr. Chairman, the Food Stamp Act provides a dignified means for a poor family to help themselves to an adequate supply of nourishment. This act is a means of strengthening our Nation by assuring food to those in the lowest economic strata.

The proposal to add a cost of 20 percent of the bonus coupons on the existing cost to the States is unrealistic and will make the program infeasible in many areas. The States and localities already hold absolute control of the program and they presently contribute a percentage of the total cost of the program. To require more is to place an unjustifiable burden on these governments.

The Food Stamp Act was passed by the Congress as a national program and as a supplement to the States in their efforts to aid the poor, not as a measure to add to their burdens.

I am hopeful and I urge most strongly that we reject any proposal which would work to compound the problems of the poor in the areas where those hardships are most severe.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the food stamp program as it presently exists.

In order to maintain the program in its present form it is necessary to amend the bill, H.R. 1318, to eliminate the 20-percent State participation requirement. I urge that this provision be eliminated because if it is retained it will certainly mean the end of the program in the State of California. In that connection I wish to correct the record with regard to the effect of the 20-percent State participation provision of the program in the State of California. During the general debate on the bill my good friend and colleague from California [Mr. Teague] stated that our Governor, the Honorable Ronald Reagan, had not expressed concern over the State participation amendment.

Without objection I would like to include in the Record a copy of a memo which was prepared by the California State Department of Social Welfare under the administration of State Welfare Director John Montgomery, who was appointed by Governor Reagan. This memorandum sets forth the fact that additional funds in the amount of $1,258,327 would be required to be appropriated by the legislature or provided by the participating counties to maintain the program at its present level if the present amendment were adopted.

The memo strongly urges the deletion of the State contribution portion of the bill and solidifies the opinion of those of us who maintain the 20-percent cost-sharing proposal would have the effect of killing the food stamp program.

The California State Department of Social Welfare memorandum is reprinted herewith:

California Food Stamp Program

1. ISSUE

The House Agriculture Committee approved (March 20, 1967) the extension and budget authorization for the Food Stamp Program. However, H.R. 1318 was amended by the committee to require, *effective July 1, 1969, participation by state (or county) to the extent of 20% of the bonus food stamps.*

2. FACTS

Throughout the whole history of the Federal Food Stamp Program (which in its infancy was designed to move surplus foods to needy families) the cost of the "bonus stamps" was assumed as a basic responsibility of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Note.—The program operates by low-income families purchasing a certain amount of stamps to which is added additional "bonus" stamps to increase their food purchasing power. These bonus stamps have heretofore been financed 100% by the Federal Government.

The actual value of bonus stamps in California for February 1967 amounted to $524,303 or $6,291,636 annually. If HR 1318 passes with the present amendment, it would require an additional appropriation by the Legislature (or by those counties now participating) of $1,258,327—not counting future expansion.

3. DISCUSSION

The Food Stamp Program is not considered to be a welfare program. It is specifically designed to expand agricultural markets through enlarged food purchasing power of low-income groups. This is traditionally—and properly—a function of the Federal Government operating through the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

If the statute is changed to require state participation in the cost of bonus stamps, it is no longer an agricultural program but just another one of many public assistance programs with all the complexities of differing matching formulae, different agencies exercising overlapping functions, etc.

A continuing trend by the Federal Government of adopting federally financed programs and then shifting a portion of the burden to already overburdened state and local funds can only contribute to increasing fiscal chaos in state and local government financing. In California such action is almost certain to kill the program, rather than continue to stimulate the agricultural markets and benefit low-income families.

4. RECOMMENDATION

The State Department of Social Welfare strongly urges the deletion of any requirement in the way of state contributions to the cost of bonus stamps to avoid loss of benefits supplementing public assistance and other low-income families, and to continue the present stimulus to California agriculture.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment which would require the States to pay 20 percent of the cost of participation in the program.

I strongly support the food stamp program. My constituents, particularly in the eastern half of my district, have greatly benefited by this program. It has enabled them to obtain a more nutritious, better balanced diet.

Adoption of the committee amendment would mean that Kentucky would have to pay one-fifth of the cost of the program, although it is financially unable to do so.

Therefore, I strongly urge that the committee amendment be rejected and that the bill be passed. A vote for the bill and a vote against the committee amendment would be votes for the poor and undernourished children of Appalachia and for many of our senior citizens who have no subsistence, except what they receive in the form of old-age assistance or social security. In most cases, these old-age assistance and social security payments are unrealistically small. Therefore, I once again strongly urge defeat of the committee amendment and passage of the bill.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the food stamp plan has proven to be a most effective program and I support its continuation in its present form.

I urge adoption of the amendment to remove the 20-percent State participation feature which would have the effect of wrecking the program.

In that connection, I would like to take note of the efforts which have been put forth by my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable CHARLES A. VANIK, on behalf of the establishment of the program in Cleveland. Representative VANIK's effort is the subject of laudatory comment which appeared in an editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on May 30, 1967. In addition, the editorial praises the program in its present form and urges that the crippling 20 percent state participation amendment be eliminated.

Without objection, I would like to include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

SAVE THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

People living in poverty areas in Cleveland are in danger of being scorched by a bill scheduled for floor action in the U.S. House Monday.

Food stamps have kept welfare families afloat despite welfare grants which give them only about 78% of minimum living costs. Food stamps since 1963 have given the poor a chance to add 25% more bread, macaroni and maybe meat and eggs to their scanty diets.

The Senate Agriculture Committee has approved not just extending the present stamp system three years but expanding it.

But House Resolution 1318 has one amendment in it which can go off like a booby trap and sink this lifesaver. The amendment would require the state of Ohio, which never paid anything into the food stamp program, to ante up $3.5 million, which is 20% of the program's cost. This amendment should be killed.

Gov. James A. Rhodes has warned that if the bill passes with the amendment as it now is, food stamps would probably have to be abolished in Ohio.

For the poor, this is not a matter of a dollar or two more in taxes. They would have to pay for this new federal economy in bread and macaroni and meat and eggs. They would have to eat less.

U.S. Rep. Charles A. Vanik, D-21, has fought valiantly for the food stamp program. He is the one who landed it for Greater Cleveland four years ago. He took the floor to plead that food stamps be kept going at their present level.

More than 19,500 families in Cuyahoga County manage to put on their tables $453,000 worth of food each month, food they could not have if the stamp program got blasted.

Ohio is wrestling with the basic cost of welfare. The state and the counties are worrying out how to bring their poor relief measures to a subsistence standard.

To take away their food stamps now would be a blow to the breadbasket. It would compound the misery of children and adults who have a grim enough survival problem, living in the most troubled part of town.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, 3 years ago, at its inception, I opposed the food stamp program because I felt it was ill conceived, and for the benefit of farmers and merchants more than for the benefit of the needy. I thought this because, while it is basically intended as a welfare program, it had a number of serious flaws. Let me name a few:

First. It is not coordinated with other Federal, State, or local welfare programs.

Second. It requires the welfare family to spend a prescribed portion of family income on food whether or not this is the family's primary need at the time.

Third. It is administered at high cost by the Agriculture Department. It should be under a Federal, State, or local department concerned with welfare.

Fourth. It pays a full profit markup on each dollar of subsidy provided. No one should make a profit from welfare needs.

Fifth. Its application over the Nation is spotty and inequitable. In December of 1966, only 42,074 Ohioans received help, while 411,205 from Mississippi benefited.

Sixth. It encourages States to avoid their responsibility for participation in and support for legitimate welfare programs.

These defects in the program have been substantiated by the performance since, and the program should be radically overhauled or abandoned.

However, having gone into operation, there are now many communities that are so reliant upon the program that it cannot be abandoned without creating a danger of severe privation and hardship to those who can least afford it. Nor does any other alternate support adequate to replace the program appear likely of enactment. For this reason only, I shall support the bill this year.

At the same time, I shall support the committee amendment to require State participation to the extent of 20 percent in fiscal 1969. Such a change would be an improvement since it would improve administration, and it would help eliminate improper inflation of the program at the expense of other welfare efforts.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the 20-percent increase proposed in the States participation in the cost of the food stamp program. In my opinion, such an assessment will place the program in great jeopardy. I fear that many States, including my own State of New York, would be forced to discontinue the program. Those who need the program—persons in the lowest income brackets and those on public assistance—will be the ones to suffer. The food stamp program has been an important one in combatting poverty and is permitting these people to receive adequate amounts of proper food.

Mr. Chairman, I also strongly oppose the limiting of fund authorization through fiscal 1967. As introduced, H.R. 1318 provided for "open end" authorization. I think this provision should be restored to the bill.

The food stamp program, put into effect by Public Law 525 of the 88th Congress, authorized appropriations for 3 years through June 30 of this year. The program requires the participating family to use some of its own income to purchase food, and provides them with the opportunity to buy more food and better food for less money. This is not a welfare program. Eligible individuals and families who choose to participate exchange an amount of money equal to about 60 percent of their food allowance for food stamps worth more. The U.S. Department of Agriculture pays the difference between the amount the family pays and the value of the coupons it receives. Participation by individuals and households is voluntary. In this great country of ours with an abundance of food, there is no reason for any American to go hungry, or lack a proper, nutritious diet.

Although the food stamp program is not yet in operation in New York City, it has been in operation in other sections of New York State. We have requested the program for New York City for fiscal 1968 and the Department of Agriculture is expected to give approval if we have State funds available to match the Federal funds. It is estimated that 200,000 in New York will benefit if the program goes into effect. However, at the projected level of the program for next year, the 20-percent assessment would cost my State $6 million for the food stamp program—an increase of $4.4 million. In all likelihood we will not be able to continue and extend the program in New York if the 20-percent increase in State participation remains in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, 41 States and the District of Columbia now support the food stamp program. More than 2 million needy, low-income families throughout the country are being assisted. Many other States, including New York, want and need this program. The States participating and those wishing to participate should not be penalized by a burdensome 20-percent additional cost.

I call on my colleagues in the House to join me in supporting the amendment to eliminate this increase and also to support the amendment to restore the "open end" authorization.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to voice my support for the food stamp program recently passed by the House of Representatives. It is, I think, one of the strongest and most effective programs in the war on poverty.

Although New York State is just beginning to participate in the program, the early success is encouraging and many more areas of the State are expected to participate in the future. In New York City alone, it is anticipated that over 177,000 people will benefit from the program.

There are, I think, a number of reasons why the program has been a success. For one, it is both simple and private; the individual uses his own money to buy food, but the stamps enable him to get more for his money; because he buys food in a store, the somewhat humiliating system of "handouts" is avoided.

A second reason is that the program is almost foolproof in preventing abuses; unlike cash payments, the food stamps cannot be used for nonfood items such as tobacco and liquor.

Third, the program is most beneficial to the neediest families; that is, the poorer the family, the higher the food stamp value they receive.

Fourth, the program is beneficial to farmers as it increases domestic food consumption, and it helps the participating stores by increasing their sale of food.

It was for these reasons that I support the food stamp program. Not only will it provide needed assistance to poor people in my own district, but it will generally enable the poor throughout the Nation to improve their diets.

It was for these same reasons that I opposed the amendment requiring the States to share 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons. In my State of New York, the cost of the program is shared by State and local governmental units. If this amendment had passed, much of the 20-percent share of the cost of bonus coupons would have been passed on to the local governmental units, and as most local governments are already under considerable financial strain, they would have had to either curtail or terminate their participation in the program.

This problem would be even more serious for the poorer States, many of whom require the local governmental units to provide part or all of the expense of the program. The 20-percent cost-sharing amendment would, in many cases, have terminated the food stamp program.

It is significant to note that the 20-percent amendment carried in the Agriculture Committee largely with the votes of members who then voted against the bill even with the amendment. It is clear, I think, that the amendment was designed to cripple the program, and not to strengthen it.

In closing, I would like to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], whose dedication and energy over the years has made the food stamp program a reality. The opposition to the program has been considerable, and without her leadership it may have succeeded in destroying one of the truly successful programs in the war on poverty.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1318) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, pursuant to House Resolution 471, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER**. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mrs. **SULLIVAN**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment on page 2, line 3.

The **SPEAKER**. Is a separate vote demanded on the other amendment? If not, the question is on the other amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 3, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 15 of the Food Stamp Act is amended by adding the following subsection:

"'(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each State shall be responsible for financing, from funds available to the State or political subdivision thereof, 20 per centum of the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments. Each State shall transfer such sums to, and they shall be made a part of, the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act. Each State shall transfer such sums to such account within one calendar month following the calendar month in which the coupon allotments are issued to eligible households. The provisions of this subsection shall not be effective for any coupon allotments issued prior to July 1, 1969, to enable each State to take such action as is necessary under the statutes of the States to comply with the provisions of this subsection.'"

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the amendment.

Mrs. **SULLIVAN**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 191, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—173

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baring
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Biester
Bolton
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Findley
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gardner
Gathings
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harvey
Henderson
Herlong
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Lukens
McClure
McEwen
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Montgomery
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Myers
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pettis
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price, Tex.
Railsback
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Sandman
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman

NAYS—191

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bevill
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Carter
Celler
Cohelan
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Delaney
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyros
Latta
Leggett
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Madden
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse, Mass.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Quillen
Randall
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Saylor
Scheuer
Selden
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Tenzer
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watts
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—69

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ayres
Battin
Blackburn
Bolling
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brotzman
Burton, Utah
Carey
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Dawson
Dent
Devine
Dow
Evans, Colo.
Fino
Flynt
Gettys
Giaimo
Gubser
Hanley
Harrison
Harsha
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Holland
Horton
Ichord
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kluczynski
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
Meeds
Mills
Mize
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Konski
Patman
Pelly
Pike
Pool
Pryor
Purcell
Quie
Rooney, N.Y.
Ruppe
St. Onge
Schwengel
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Stanton
Stratton
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Whalen
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wyatt
Younger

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Jonas for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Pryor against.

Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. Meeds against.

Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. McClory for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.

Mrs. Heckler for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Smith of California for, with Mr. Hanley against.

Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Horton against.

Mr. Pool for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Giaimo against.

Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Ruppe against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holland with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Patman with McCulloch.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Dow with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Pike with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Quie with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Schwengel with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Mize with Mr. Pelly.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BELCHER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. BELCHER moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1318, to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 128, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—230

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Carter
Celler
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Delaney
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Esch
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gude
Hagan
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kyl
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Martin
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Poage
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Randall
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Sandman
St Germain
Saylor
Scheuer
Schweiker
Schwengel
Selden
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Tenzer
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watts
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wylie
Wyman
Young
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—128

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baring
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Brinkley
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Findley
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jarman
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kuykendall
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias, Calif.
May
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Montgomery
Morton
Myers
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pettis
Pickle
Pirnie
Poff
Price, Tex.
Quillen
Railsback
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Scott
Shriver
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Watson
Whalley
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wydler
Zion

NOT VOTING—75

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ayres
Battin
Blackburn
Bolling
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brotzman
Burton, Utah
Carey
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Dawson
Dent
Devine
Dow
Evans, Colo.
Fino
Flynt
Gettys
Giaimo
Griffiths
Gubser
Hanley
Harrison
Harsha
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Herlong
Holland
Horton
Ichord
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kelly
Kluczynski
Lloyd
Long, La.
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McEwen
Meeds
Mize
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Konski
Ottinger
Pelly
Pike
Pool
Pryor
Purcell
Quie
Rooney, N.Y.
Ruppe
St. Onge
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Stanton
Stratton
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Watkins
Whalen
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wyatt
Yates
Younger

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mosher for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. McClure against.

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota for, with Mr. McClory against.

Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Watkins against.

Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Younger against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Devine.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Pryor with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Bow.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Mize.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Pike with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Dow of New York with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Whalen.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Dawson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill—S. 953—to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 953

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1967;" the following: "not in excess of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1969; not in excess of $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970;".

Sec. 2. Section 16(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "This Act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POAGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Poage: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 953 and insert the provisions of H.R. 1318, as passed, as follows:

"That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out the word 'and' the first time it appears therein and by inserting after the word '1967;' the words 'not in excess of $195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968;'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 1318) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND THE WEEK OF JUNE 12, 1967

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the rest of this week and the schedule for next.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have completed the legislative business for the week and will ask to go over upon the announcement of the program.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day. There are no District bills. But we do have H.R. 7476, to authorize adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates, under an open rule, with 2 hours of debate.

Tuesday, the Department of Defense Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1968.

Wednesday is Flag Day. Appropriate ceremonies will be conducted in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Also on Wednesday we have H.R. 2082, to authorize travel, transportation, and education allowances to members of the Armed Forces for dependents' schooling, under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate.

On Thursday we have H.R. 10480, to prohibit desecration of the flag. This is subject to a rule being granted.

The announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

I would like to say for the information of the House that we expect the conference report on the draft bill and maybe others.

I must advise the House that there is certainly a possibility, and a strong probability, that the bill involving the railroad situation may come out of committee, and if it does, of course, it will be programed under our reservation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would it have a priority?

Mr. ALBERT. It would have a high-ranking priority.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AID AND ASSISTANCE FOR THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, songs will be sung and tales told of the heroic nation of Israel and its people who live in the cradle of reason and hope, yet who cherish freedom so much they could accept nothing less. It is the reenactment of the battle of David and Goliath and the entire free world stands thrilled.

With the acceptance of the cease-fire by Egypt, Israel appears on the verge of a great accomplishment. She has answered the continued aggressions of the Arab nations with an astounding, almost Biblical victory over them. She has demonstrated to them that if they refuse to accept the peaceful solutions to world problems as a rule of international life then she too can fight back, that she can answer force with force. That she can do more than survive.

It is unfortunate for wars to occur. It is not good to see people dying, Jews or Arabs, South Vietnamese or North Vietnamese, Americans—but when international law and order are violated by one nation, as President Nasser's call of a holy war by Arab nations against Israel, then one can resist or surrender: Israel chose to resist.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to look ahead. Israel while conducting a brilliant campaign nevertheless has incurred great losses. The loss of life can never be replaced but on her other losses she can be helped. She should be helped and helped immediately.

I have suggested to the executive branch that immediate economic assurance be made available to Israel. As a result I have been informed that we will shortly make available to Israel both economic assistance and medical and food supplies. This will not come out of the Foreign Assistance Act. For Israel gets no foreign aid. On Monday we will begin the markup of the new foreign aid bill. At that time I intend to offer amendments which will give the President authorization to assist Israel out of the foreign aid bill in accordance with her requirements to return to normalcy after the drastic dislocation of her economy forced on her by the war.

When one considers the dangers of world war III posed by Nasser, the dilemma in which not only the United States was in, but the entire world on the waterway issue alone, I think it can be quickly understood that the free world owes a great debt to Israel.

I hope we will move quickly to assist her. I hope too that the peace that follows will be a lasting peace. Israel has proved that she is here to stay. Perhaps the best witness to give testimony to this fact is Mr. Nasser.

Mr. Speaker, as you know last year I represented our country at the opening of the Israel Parliament, the Knesset. As I was leaving Israel I was reminded of one of Solomon's songs. I mentioned it then and as the war heads for a cease-fire and guns grow cool, I would like to repeat it now:

For, lo, the winter is past,
The Rain is over and gone,
The flowers appear on the earth,
The time of the singing of birds is come,
And the voice of the turtle-dove is heard on
our land.

Let us pray that the voice of the turtledove will soon be heard again in Israel. Let us hope it will be heard in Vietnam, in our land and in every land by all men.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order scheduled for today be transferred to Wednesday, June 14.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, on a previous vote, rollcall No. 129, I was unavoidably detained outside the Chamber. I ask that the RECORD show that, if I had been present, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER. The statement of the gentleman will appear in the RECORD.

CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN SALUTES MERIDEN RECORD ON 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Meriden Morning Record recently reached the impressive milestone of 100 years of continuous publication as an outstanding Connecticut newspaper. I call this anniversary to the attention of my colleagues for it is an achievement deserving of more than casual mention here for we all value a newspaper that serves the public interest with knowledge, experience, and dedication.

Noteworthy, too, is the fact that the Wallingford Chamber of Commerce, representing one of the communities served by the Meriden Record, observed its 25th anniversary by honoring the Meriden Record on the occasion of its centenary. I, unfortunately, was unable to accept the invitation of the chamber of commerce to attend the recognition ceremonies since I had been assigned to an onsite study of the disposal of U.S. Government properties affected by the withdrawal of our NATO forces from France. I have, however, extended my greetings to the publisher of the Record, Mr. Carter White, and to his mother, Mrs. Blanche Smith, executive editor, and to the editor of the Record, Mr. Warren F. Gardner.

In typical modesty, the Meriden Record has expressed its thanks to the Wallingford Chamber of Commerce and I include at this point a copy of the editorial which appeared in the Meriden Record of June 2, 1967, in which the Record also pledges itself to a continuing "conformity with the high traditions of our newspaper past and the best interests *of the community's future*":

THANK YOU, WALLINGFORD

The Wallingford Chamber of Commerce paid The Morning Record a graceful and much-appreciated compliment on Wednesday evening. Itself celebrating 25 years of active organization and well entitled to do honor to its own Silver Anniversary, it chose instead to hold its dinner in honor of this newspaper's 100th anniversary.

As Senator Abraham Ribicoff observed, it is practically unprecedented for a Chamber of Commerce to choose to honor a newspaper in such a fashion, especially when it has such an occasion of its own to celebrate. And, the Senator added, it is even more unusual when the newspaper in question has its home base in a neighboring town.

The spirit of the occasion, as well as the tenor of the remarks of the speakers, made it plain that the relationship between The Morning Record and Wallingford is a two-way affair. The Record has been in Wallingford almost as long as it has been in Meriden, and has taken equal pride in its coverage of events in each community.

It's a relationship which should strengthen and deepen as the ties between the two communities continue to become closer and more numerous. We were reminded that Wallingford is the parent community, from which Meriden broke away to establish itself separately back in the early 1800's. Now in the 1960's and beyond, Wallingford and Meriden are destined to be drawn back into closer partnership.

Community problems from water pollution through industrial development and airport control can best be attacked on a neighborhood or regional basis. And the encroaching pressure of the metropolitan giants to the north and south makes it increasingly important for median-sized communities like Meriden and Wallingford to pool their resources in order to preserve their separate identities.

We at The Morning Record take pride in our part in advancing and in serving the Twin Silver Cities and in preserving the unique identity of each. We are deeply grateful to the Wallingford Chamber of Commerce for its tribute to our history, and humbled at the glimpse it has given us of our responsibility for the future.

We pledge ourselves and The Morning Record to the continuing service of the people of Wallingford to the best of our ability in conformity with the high traditions of our newspaper past and the best interests of the community's future.

NEED FOR THE RETURN OF DIPLOMACY IN MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now time for the return of diplomacy to the crisis in the Middle East. Regretfully, diplomacy was displaced by military power on the part of the countries involved in the crisis. But, in this complex and peculiar situation, military power cannot provide a genuine resolution. Diplomacy failed when the going was roughest but now it must make its comeback. It is the only sensible way for nations to conduct their relations with one another. It is the only way out of chaos in the Middle East.

I am encouraged by the President's appointment of McGeorge Bundy to direct a special task force to devise diplomatic solutions in the Middle East. This is recognition by the President that ordinary diplomatic machinery is inadequate to handle the problem. The team under Bundy can be expected to focus on the Middle East energy and intellect that would otherwise be diffused. My only word of admonition is that this team must work quickly. Time is a very important factor. It must be prepared to take the diplomatic initiative before the initiative is once more taken away from us.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I called for our Government to make itself a direct participant in peace negotiations in the Middle East and a guarantor of the provisions of any settlement. I continue to believe that this is essential. I believe that there is no hope for stability without assurance by the superpowers that they are prepared to do their duty for peace in the Middle East.

Today I add the word of caution that we make certain the aggressors in the Middle Eastern war—and let it be understood that the aggressors were in Cairo and Damascus—do not somehow emerge the victors in a peace settlement. I am not suggesting a peace treaty full of vindictiveness or revenge. Quite the contrary—I believe that peace can last only if it is just. But I say there can be no repetition of the fiasco of 1956 when Colonel Nasser demonstrated how inept he was on the battlefield, only to have the Western Powers bail him out at the peace table. Israel must be given guarantees to its security. These guarantees must be ironclad against future aggression, whether it be by hostile armies or by bands of saboteurs, or by the closing of international waterways, or even by the diversion of rivers. Israel must be allowed to live in peace, free to concentrate on its own internal development. That is the long and the short of it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to hurry. There are now hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of refugees in the Middle East, victims of the fighting of the last few days. They must be cared for. They cannot, as the refugees of 1948, be turned into a cause celebre for the demagogs of the future. We must act to reduce all areas of friction. Israel lacks the resources to give proper attention to these refugees; the West must help.

We as a nation have agonized enough, Mr. Speaker. Now we must assume our diplomatic stance and speak decisively to turn a temporary military resolution into a long-term force for stability in the Middle East.

NEW YORK'S BETTING PARLOR BANKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Red Smith, the distinguished sports editor of the Chicago Sun-Times, has likened the operation of the New York State lottery to a gigantic "come-on" game.

Mr. Smith, in his column in Monday's Chicago Sun-Times, points out that the odds against winning in the lottery are fantastically high, and for the maximum yearly prize are an astronomical 360 million to 1.

The Banking and Currency Committee held 2 days of hearings last week on legislation which I have introduced, which would prohibit federally chartered or federally insured financial institutions from becoming involved in the New York lottery as ticket sellers or, as Mr. Smith might term them, "ticket hustlers."

It is not the purpose of this legislation to impede the New York State lottery in any manner, or to question the morality of such a lottery. But, rather, the legislation seeks to keep banks' activities limited to normal banking operations, which certainly do not include selling lottery tickets.

Witnesses who have appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee testified that one of the main reasons banks were chosen as lottery ticket sellers was to add respectability to the lottery. In short, to provide "instant status" for the get-rich-quick scheme. It would appear from Mr. Smith's column that banks have not lent respectability to the lottery, but, conversely, the lottery has dragged New York's banks down to the level of bookie joints.

In describing the first day's operation of the lottery, Mr. Smith wrote:

> Now, how about that projected handle of $360 million? Did Thursday's long, restless lines at the banks around town mean Rocky really has hooked an eaglebird? Or was it just the novelty of being able to walk into the austere lobby of the Chase Manhattan or Manufacturers Hanover and get down, where in the past they'd always had to go to Sam's Smokeshop or the Happy Hour Pool Room?

It is clear from the hearings on the antibank lottery bill that your Banking and Currency Committee members do not intend to let federally chartered or federally insured financial institutions be operated as betting parlors. Your committee will shortly report out a bill that would prohibit the sale of lottery tickets by these financial institutions, and in the near future this legislation will be brought to the floor for a vote.

I am enclosing in my remarks a copy of Mr. Smith's column, as well as a syndicated column, "Business Today," written by Elmer Roessner, which appears in some 40 newspapers around the country. The column cites the pitfalls of the lottery:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, June 5, 1967]

IT'S "BET A MILLION" ROCKY NOW

(By Red Smith)

NEW YORK.—At 12:01 a.m. last Thursday, a man stepped up to a glass booth in the Americana Hotel, slid a five-dollar bill through the wicket, received five green and white chits, and at that moment Honest Nels Rockefeller took his place in history alongside Frank Erickson, Frankie Costello, Sleep-Out Lou, and the Reliable Jersey House—not to mention the Hon. John Morrisey, Richard *Canfield, or G. Keith Funston of the* New York Stock Exchange.

The booth in the Americana is one of approximately 3,850 branches of Rocky's Joint, New York's new and gaudy gambling hall where the loyal citizenry will be encouraged to bet a million dollars a day, 30 million a month, 360 million a year, come hell, high water, or bankruptcy.

Bet-A-Million Rocky is not the first modern American statesman to double as Governor of a state and pit boss for a chuckaluck crib, but he hopes to run the biggest game, with the possible exception of the pitch that Gov. Grant Sawyer has been operating out in Nevada.

New York City's lively response to the opening of ticket sales in the monthly state lottery encouraged optimism among the raffle's sponsors.

Optimism, that is, that the grift will reach the massive growth which some soothsayers have forecast, in spite of the fact that by all rules of the game this is a skin joint and an alibi store.

Consider a few comparisons. The thousands at Aqueduct for the Belmont Stakes Saturday were bucking a far hungrier tiger than they would face at the roulette wheel or the dice table, for they were going up against a takeout of 16 per cent.

In Rocky's Joint the house takes 70 per cent.

In Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant and other sporting precincts, the odds against the player in a numbers bank are figured at 1,000 to 1, and a hit pays off at 500 to 1.

The true odds against one of Rocky's clientele getting anything back for his frogskin are 4,166 to 1 (240 of every million tickets sold will be redeemable for something).

HURRY, HURRY, HURRY!

The monthly payoffs are scaled from $150, the smallest consolation prize, to $100,000, the grand prize. Thus winners can collect at odds ranging from 150 to 1 to 100,000 to 1, but it is no mere 4,166 to 1 shot where the grand prize is concerned. Since there's only one of these among each million tickets sold, the big winner gets 100,000 to 1 back on a million to one chance.

To sweeten the come-on, Rocky has "snowballed the layout," as the happy phrase goes. He has hung up an annual super prize of $250,000, a beautiful, beautiful figure. For one lousy buck you get a shot at a cool quarter million, before taxes.

Hurry, hurry, hurry! How can a Rockefeller himself afford to look the other way?

Ask Bad Sam Engelberg, and he'll tell you how. A solid figure man. Bad Sam wouldn't need a pencil to recognize this underlay. If the store does the anticipated annual business of $360 million, then the odds against your one dollar ticket qualifying for that quarter million are 360 million to 1. Correct? And the payoff is 250,000 to 1.

SPINNING IN HIS GRAVE

To paraphrase the classic line of Pittsburgh's beloved Chilly Doyle, if Arnold Rothstein were alive today he'd be spinning in his grave.

Now, how about that projected handle of $360 million? Did Thursday's long, restless lines at the banks around town mean Rocky really has hooked an eaglebird? Or was it just the novelty of being able to walk into the austere lobby of the Chase Manhattan or Manufacturers Hanover and get down, where in the past they'd always had to go to Sam's Smokeshop or the Happy Hour Pool Room?

Nobody can offer more than a guess, for the only precedent we have is New Hampshire, where Honest Johnny King's venture into the lottery dodge produced $2,800,000 in its first year and dropped to $1,850,000 last year. This year's tickets are selling like hot stoves.

With 3,850 banks, hotels, and motels operating *at the start, outlets all over the state* must sell an average of 260 tickets each, day-in and day-out, to reach the goal of a million a day.

[From "Business Today" column]

AS TEXAS GUINAN SAID, "NEVER GIVE A SUCKER AN EVEN BREAK"

(By Elmer Roessner)

The State of New York today begins one of the greatest schemes ever devised by a state to mulct its citizens since John Law in 1717 persuaded the Duke of Orleans, regent of France, to print unlimited amounts of currency.

The citizens of Oklahoma are called Sooners. From now on the citizens of New York State are entitled to be called Suckers.

For today New York starts its 12-times-a-year lottery with odds against the player that would make the operator of a bust-out gambling joint blush with shame.

For every million $1 lottery tickets sold, there will be one $100,000 prize, one $50,000 prize, one $25,000 prize, one $10,000 prize, 11 $5,000 prizes, 15 $1,000 prizes, 15 $700 prizes, 15 $400 prizes, 15 $250 prizes and 165 $150 prizes.

The total is $300,000. That's odds of 7 to 3 against the suckers.

THEN COME THE TAXES

The winnings are fully taxable. The federal government will tax all winnings as personal income. If the winner is a resident of New York State or any other state that levies an income tax, he will pay a state income tax. And if he is a resident of New York City or any other city with an income tax, he will be hit a third time.

If the winner of a $100,000 prize has a yearly salary of $7,500 and lives in New York City, he will pay $40,589 in federal taxes, $9,636 in state taxes and $1,835 in city taxes, for a total of $52,060. However, since most players are expected to be in a low income tax bracket (people on relief can play although they will have to repay recent aid if they win), the taxes may be only about $50,000 on an average $100,000 prize.

Even if all the winners have small or no incomes, the federal, state and city governments will collect about $100,000.

Thus, out of every $1 million spent for tickets, the sucker will net only $200,000, or about 20 per cent.

IT'S BITE, BITE, BITE

If a man is in the 25 per cent income tax bracket, he must earn $1.25 before taxes for each $1 he spends on tickets. And if he does win anything, both New York State and City will collect sales taxes when he spends it for anything except food and medicine.

The state appears to be somewhat embarrassed by the heavy tax bite because it announced that there would be an annual super prize of $250,000 paid in 10 annual installments of $25,000, to ease the tax liability of the winner. The money will come from the breakage, the receipts over even millions of dollars at each drawing.

However, a winner earning $7,500 a year will still pay about $11,000 more a year in taxes, or $110,000 over 10 years, and more if his basic income increases or federal, state and/or city taxes rates don't go up.

The state initial take of 70 per cent of every dollar constitutes some of the worst odds in the world. At the Las Vegas crap tables, the take is only 1½ per cent on each roll. The house take on roulette wheels is less than 5½ per cent. Even in chuck-a-luck and Shanghai-style roulette wheels, which have four zeros, the house bite is only around 20 per cent. Parimutuels give back 83 per cent and bookies a little less.

Of every $1 million played, the state will pay winners, before taxes, $300,000, give $550,000 to schools, and use 15 per cent for expenses, which has already created a large number of state jobs.

The allocation of 55 per cent to schools is, of course, a good thing. Perhaps if enough money is spent for education, the citizens of New York State may some day become smart enough not to make sucker bets.

THE SUCCESSFUL FOOD STAMP PROGRAM AND ITS CHAMPION, MRS. SULLIVAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, 1964, by the passage of the Food Stamp Act, the House of Representatives took a firm forward step to improve the nutrition of this Nation's poor. This act, most simple in concept, has since proved an effective instrument for getting more and better food to the people who need it. I supported this legislation in 1964 and strongly advocate its extension and expansion by this Congress because of the superb job already accomplished.

At the time of the 1964 action, the food stamp program was operating in 43 areas in 22 States under the 3-year pilot program by which it was carefully tested and developed. The House Committee on Agriculture held extensive hearings on the program. They drew on the experience of the pilot program and the prior food stamp experience of 1939–43. We further refined the program on the House floor. As a result of this accumulation of knowledge and experience, we passed, in 1964, a remarkably good piece of legislation. That legislation has been complemented by sound administration, and soon nearly 2 million people in some 800 areas will be enjoying better meals because of it.

Our experience today is much broader than that of 1964. And it still demonstrates conclusively the effectiveness of the food stamp approach. It is improving the diets of low-income families. It is increasing retail food sales. It is expanding farm markets. And it is stimulating the economy of areas in which it operates.

The objectives of the program were sound, and the results are a stronger, healthier populace.

The matching of results with objectives is never an easy task and it was not accomplished by chance in the food stamp program. The approach of this program to its objectives embodies tested principles in which I strongly believe. It is voluntary to the States at a mutually acceptable level of cost sharing. Expansion has been gradual and orderly. The program has been carefully administered. And the stamp concept insures that more health-giving food is actually being bought.

It is this stamp or coupon concept properly administered to people in need that underlies the success of the program.

Low-income families spend a much higher percentage of their total income on food than does the average American family. But, because that income is low, even if 50 percent is spent for food, it will not buy the food necessary to maintain adequate levels of nutrition. The retail food industry of this Nation, which serves so many so well, cannot serve those who just do not have the means to participate as full retail customers.

The objective of the food stamp program is to assist in overcoming the food buying limitations of low-income families in direct relaton to their need. The need is gaged in accordance with income and assets and the family continues to spend a portion of its income for food coupons. The food coupons have a higher value than the amount the family invests and can be redeemed at local grocery stores for the purchase of food—and food alone.

The States pay the major share of administering the program within their borders and the Federal Government pays the difference between what the family pays and the value of the bonus coupons. I think this is as it should be. Poor diets and malnutrition should not be local problems in a land of national food abundance. The repercussions of inadequate diets go far beyond the families immediately concerned and have profound consequences for all families in the Nation.

The scope of the problem and its consequences demand a national solution and the food stamp program has been far more effective than any other yet devised. The Federal Government pays the cost of the bonus coupons precisely because poor diets are a national problem in a land of national food abundance, where the food distribution is also organized on a national basis. The States bear the burden of the administrative costs because they identify the areas and persons in need and administer the program within the States. This is a practical division of cost and responsibility which has proved workable. The program as designed and administered has permitted no abuses in either expansion or participation.

This is a remarkably good program and the success it has enjoyed—as I earlier indicated—is in large part due to the remarkable gentlewoman from Missouri, LEONOR SULLIVAN. Legislative programs such as this do not come into being unless someone recognizes and defines the need, and then responds to the challenge and does something about it. This LEONOR SULLIVAN has admirably done. She has shepherded the food stamp program through every step of its legislative course. On every occasion that this program has been in committee or under consideration by this House she has demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the problem and the possible solutions. She has done so with compassion for her fellow man and with respect for her colleagues. The success of the food stamp program bears witness to her great foresight and keen legislative skill. The program deserves to be extended on its observed merits, and the gentlewoman from Missouri deserves our deep appreciation. On behalf of the countless families throughout this Nation who are the beneficiaries of her work, may I presume to say to our honored colleague, thank you for a job timely begun and a job extremely well done.

RECENT CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN PATMAN AND FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD ON SECURITIES UNDERWRITING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 5, I issued a statement revealing the confused and contradictory position of the Federal Reserve Board on the highly controversial question of securities underwriting by commercial banks, particularly "revenue" bonds.

This statement has caused quite a stir, and I have received numerous requests to make public the recent correspondence between myself and the Federal Reserve Board upon which my statement was based.

I therefore include, Mr. Speaker, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my letters to Governor Robertson, dated May 17 and May 27, and Governor Robertson's reply to my May 17 letter. As of today, no reply has been received to the May 27 letter.

The letters follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1967.

Hon. J. L. ROBERTSON,
Vice Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C.

DEAR VICE CHAIRMAN ROBERTSON: While reviewing our recently published "get acquainted" hearings with department and agency officials, I noticed one particular question which I wish to pursue further with you.

As you may recall, last year I seriously questioned the legality of the Federal Reserve Board's ruling that our Federal banking laws do not prohibit member banks from engaging in the issuance and underwriting of equity securities. This, of course, is the now celebrated First National City Bank case currently before the Federal courts.

When you appeared before our Committee on March 15, you stated that the Board had concluded that neither section 20 nor section 32 of the Banking Act of 1933 prohibited the specific activity conducted by the First National City Bank. You further stated that the Board expressly refused to comment concerning violation of the criminal provision contained in section 21 of that Act.

Now as I recall the Board's ruling with respect to the First National City Bank application, you stated that the investment company would merely be an arm of the bank and therefore the prohibition against management interlocks in section 32 would not apply. However, a subsequent decision by the Securities and Exchange Commission provided that the investment company must have at least 40 percent of its directors completely independent of the bank.

This requirement, which I understand the bank has complied with, certainly is in conflict with your earlier finding that the investment company would merely be an arm of the bank itself. Inasmuch as no more than 60 percent of the directors of the fund will be bank management, it seems to me that the problem of management interlocks raised by section 32 has not yet been resolved. I suggest that the Board reconsider its advisory decision in view of the new facts of the case resulting from the SEC ruling and the actual operation by the bank of the fund.

Also, I fail to notice in the Board's official decision any mention whatever of the applicability of section 20 of the Banking Act of 1933 with respect to this activity by First National City Bank. This is contrary to your representation before our Committee of March 15 where you stated that the Board had, in fact, considered the bank's proposal in light of section 20.

I do not understand how you can permit First National City Bank to actively engage in this activity without first determining that there is no violation of section 20 of this Act. Congress wanted to get commercial banks out of the investment banking business because of a long history of abuses, many of which involved the predecessor of First National City Bank itself. I understand the bank has publicly offered and sold several million dollars worth of shares in this fund. Inasmuch as the SEC in its decision last year specifically ruled that First National City Bank is to be considered an "underwriter", I suggest that the Board give its immediate attention to this question in light of section 20.

I will greatly appreciate your prompt attention to this very serious matter inasmuch as in my opinion the Board has rewritten our banking laws without benefit of Congressional action in much the same way as former Comptroller of the Currency Saxon. The fact that it is the subject of pending litigation is no reason for the Board to permit an erroneous decision to remain outstanding.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1967.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This refers to your letter of May 17, 1967, with regard to certain aspects of the Board's interpretation published at 1965 Federal Reserve Bulletin 1410 (12 CFR 218.111) concluding that section 32 of the Banking Act of 1933 (the "Act") does not forbid officers of a national bank to serve at the same time on the committee of a commingled investment account operated by the bank.

Your letter first asks that the Board reconsider its interpretation in view of the decision by the Securities and Exchange Commission that the account in question (as a regulated investment company, for the purposes of the statutes administered by the Commission) must have at least 40 per cent of its directors independent of the bank. In reply, I refer you to a letter of the Board dated March 31, 1966, to William Everdell, Counsel to First National City Bank of New York, a copy of which was forwarded to you under cover of a letter of April 1, 1966. In this letter, the Board expressed agreement "with the conclusion apparently reached by the Commission that having 40 per cent of the members of the committee unaffiliated with the bank will not prevent the proposed account from being operated under the effective control of the bank."

Your second question has to do with the fact that the Board's published interpretation does not discuss section 20 of the Act. Section 20 forbids affiliation of a member bank with any organization engaged "principally" in certain described securities activities. As is clear from my testimony before your Committee on March 15, 1967, the Board necessarily considered both section 32 and section 20 in reaching its original conclusion in the matter, although the question presented was limited to section 32. You will recall that in his response of December 15, 1965, to your letter of September 26, 1965, Chairman Martin discussed the possible application of section 20 to a hypothetical situation described by you, involving the acquisition by a national bank of controlling stock of a securities business primarily engaged in activities of the kind described in that section.

The Board's interpretation referred to above dealt not with a situation where a separately formed subsidiary has been acquired by a bank, but rather with an extension of existing banking activities, under the effective control of, and effectively integrated with the bank itself. It should be emphasized again that the Board was not asked to comment on the propriety of such an activity by a national bank, which was a matter within the jurisdiction of the Comptroller of the Currency, nor does it have statutory authority to conclude that the activity violates section 21 of the Act, which is a matter within the competence of the Department of Justice and the Courts.

As noted above, the question before the Board was limited to the possible applicability of section 32 to a collateral aspect of the matter, i.e., whether interlocking service could exist between two arms or departments of the same entity. A fortiori, the Board's conclusion that the bank and its commingled account constituted a single entity also requires the conclusion that section 20 does not apply.

If I can be of any further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,

J. L. ROBERTSON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1967.

Hon. J. L. ROBERTSON,
Vice Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: While it is not my intention to pursue further the question of the registered investment company operated by the First National City Bank, I do wish to raise one final point about this matter.

Your interpretation of the law reaches the anomalous conclusion that Congress, in 1933, was concerned about stopping banks from having an interlocking relationship with securities issuers and underwriters but was not concerned about banks' engaging in these operations themselves in a direct manner. I hardly believe that the legislative history supports such a conclusion.

Furthermore, while the prohibition in section 32 speaks in terms of "interlocks," section 20 speaks in terms of "affiliates." The latter section flatly prohibits member banks from being *affiliated* with securities underwriters. An "affiliate" is defined, among other things, as any association of which a member bank "controls in any manner the election of a majority of its directors, trustees, or other persons exercising similar functions . . . " Insofar as section 20 is concerned, can a valid argument be advanced that it makes a material difference that the bank and the underwriter constitute a single entity rather than having an interlocking relationship? I think not. What is meant by an affiliate is made quite plain in section 2(b).

As you know, First National City Bank controls 60 percent of the board of directors of the investment company. My final question is, therefore, and I make this in the form of a request for an official opinion of the Board, which for some reason the Board failed to include in its published decision (12 C.F.R. 218.111), is, or is not this investment company an "affiliate" of First National City Bank within the meaning of section 2(b) of the Banking Act of 1933? Is not this investment company a securities issuer and underwriter?

In addressing yourselves to these questions, I would suggest to the Board that with respect to the legal ramifications of its present interpretation of section 32 and its apparent interpretation of section 20, I have been advised that member banks would be free to establish controlled affiliates to engage in most any securities or other enterprise they would deem profitable, including the underwriting of revenue bonds.

I must respectfully reject the legal arguments advanced in your reply letter of May 24, and once again urge you to reconsider your earlier decision. This concludes my statements to the Board in this matter.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

CONGRESSMAN GONZALEZ RECEIVES NEWS AWARD

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure to inform the House that the gentleman from Texas, Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ, has been selected by the San Antonio chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, the honorary journalism fraternity, as the chapter's Man of the Year for 1966.

The award is given to the San Antonian, not in journalism as a profession, who has been outstanding in his cooperation with the news media during the previous year.

It was not surprising that the gentleman from Texas was given an award for his cooperation with the news media, for his cooperation has always been outstanding. He is not only a valued member of the Texas delegation, but one of the outstanding members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

It was indeed fitting that Congressman GONZALEZ should have been selected for this award.

I am enclosing in my remarks newspaper accounts of the award presentation:

[From the San Antonio News & Express, June 4, 1967]

GONZALEZ TO RECEIVE PLAQUE FROM JOURNALISTIC GROUP

A special bronze plaque will be presented to U.S. Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez, who has been chosen by San Antonio chapter, Sigma Delta Chi, as the chapter's "man of the year" for 1966.

Gonzalez will receive the plaque at the annual dinner of the journalistic society at 12:30 p.m. Sunday at the Menger Hotel.

Congressman Gonzalez is being cited as the San Antonian not in journalism as a profession who was outstanding in his cooperation with the news media during the past year.

Prof. Paul Busch, chairman of the journalism department at Trinity University, is president of the chapter. Awards for excellence in journalism during the past year will be presented at the dinner. Busch has announced winners in the 13 categories. Busch said that in order to avoid any scintilla of favoritism in the judging, the record number of 124 entries submitted by local news media were sent to Phoenix, Ariz., for judging by the Sigma Delta Chi chapter there. Robert J. Early of the Arizona Republic headed the committee which did the judging.

Winners in the 13 categories are:

Newspaper spot news story—Sam Kindrick, San Antonio Express, for the Charles Whitman story.

Newspaper spot news story—Kemper Diehl, San Antonio Express-News, for "Clergy Go Through Open Window to the World."

Newspaper editorial—E. J. Slayman, San Antonio Express-News, for "The Mayors Take Right Approach to the Problem."

Newspaper sports story—Dan Cook, Express-News, for "Former Grid Star Quits Role as Hustler."

Newspaper news photo—Al Ransom, San Antonio Light, for burglary suspect picture published Aug. 17, 1966.

Radio feature story—Jerry Moon, KTSA radio.

Radio or television editorial—Harry Nickelson, then of KONO-TV, now with KENS-TV.

Television spot news story, film and script—Ed Bragg and Billy Long of KONO-TV, for three-alarm fire Jan. 8, 1966.

Television feature story, film and script—Gary Gossett, WOAI-TV, for "Nuns at Playland Park."

Television sports story, spot or feature, film and Script—Bob Rogers and Virgil Teter, for "The Boxer in Training," used Oct. 15, 1966.

Television script only, accompanied by film—Joe Brake, KONO-TV, for March 17, 1966, "Skunk Capture."

Radio sports story—Dick Porter, KONO radio.

Radio news story—Dick Porter, KONO radio.

Tickets for the dinner at $5 each are available from Prof. Busch at Trinity. In addition to individual ticket sales, reservations of tables for various organizations also are being taken.

[From the San Antonio Express, June 5, 1967]

REPRESENTATIVE GONZALEZ GETS AWARD, PRAISES PRESS

Pointing out the power of the press, U.S. Representative Henry B. Gonzalez accepted a Sigma Delta Chi award for outstanding contribution to the press Sunday.

The presentation was made at the annual awards banquet of the journalism honorary fraternity at the Menger Hotel. Gonzalez praised San Antonio and national news media representatives and noted that his father worked for La Prensa for 44 years. He said that during his career as a public servant he had never had to write complaints of unfair treatment by the press.

Gonzalez' award was presented by Louis Engleke, a former president of the society. A special Sigma Delta Chi award to a member for meritorious service was awarded to Bill Cunningham for the editorial of the San Antonio Express.

Winners of local awards were presented by David Burkett of the Trinity University Journalism Department. Winners were:

Kemper Diehl, Express News, feature story.

Sam Kindrick, Express News, spot news story.

E. J. Slayman, Express News, editorial.

Dan Cook, Express News, sports story.

Al Ransom, San Antonio Light, news photo.

Jerry Moon, KTSA radio, radio feature story.

Harry Nickelson, then of KONO-TV, television editorial.

Ed Bragg and Billy Long, KONO-TV, television spot news story.

Gary Gossett, then of WOAI-TV, television feature story.

Bob Rogers & Virgil Teter, KONO-TV, television sports story.

Joe Brake, KONO-TV, television script only.

Dick Porter, KONO-radio, radio sports story and radio news story.

THE READER'S DIGEST AND FEDERAL AID: A STUDY IN HYPOCRISY

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, which is so ably chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Montana, [Mr. OLSEN] was treated to a rare spectacle 2 days ago. That self-proclaimed champion and guardian of the free enterprise system, the Reader's Digest, told the subcommittee that it was not only fair, but in the best interest of the Nation that the taxpayers of this country subsidize 70 percent of the cost of mailing this rich magazine to its millions of subscribers. The Digest came to what I can only describe as the fantastic conclusion that the facts do not justify an increase in second-class postal rates. The Digest made this statement just minutes after citing the Post Office Department's own figures showing that the revenue from second-class mail pays only 23 percent of delivery costs.

The Reader's Digest statement sounds like something out of George Orwell—pure doublethink. The postal deficit this fiscal year is expected to be about $600 million. First-class mail is operating just about at the break-even point. The $600 million is being lost on the delivery of the other classes of mail, primarily second- and third-class mail. Yet the Reader's Digest says, and I quote from its testimony:

> It is both unfair and discriminatory now to ask second-, third-, and fourth-class mail to make up the heavy losses on first class.

How, you might well ask, does the Digest come to the startling conclusion that the categories of mail which are losing money are being asked to make up the losses on the only class of mail that is now paying its own way? Well, if you think like the Reader's Digest that is not really very difficult. The Digest contends that the fair way to run the postal service is to have first-class mail show a 40-percent profit—to pay 140 percent of its costs. The Post Office could use this profit to make up for the money it loses on delivering the Reader's Digest at a ridiculously low rate.

All that is needed to make first-class mail show is a 40-percent profit is for the Congress to raise the cost of an ordinary postage stamp to 7 cents, instead of 6 cents as recommended by the Post Office and the administration. The Digest was even kind enough to point out to the Postal Rates Subcommittee that with a 7-cent stamp we could completely wipe out the postal deficit without having to raise second-, third- or fourth-class rates at all. The 7-cent stamp would still be a great bargain, according to the Digest. But the Digest did not mention that the greatest part of the bargain would be the fact that with a 7-cent letter the Reader's Digest Association, Inc., would continue to enjoy a free ride on the delivery of the millions of magazines, books and records it sells for profit.

The Digest complained bitterly that since 1951 second-class postage rates have increased 122 percent. That is true—that is a fact. But as is as often the case with the Reader's Digest, it was highly selective with the facts it used. What the Digest failed to mention, through an oversight I am sure, was that it is also true that if we compare second-class rates with those charged 50 years ago the increase would still be about 100 percent. Second-class rates were lower in 1951 than those enacted in 1917. The Digest did not bring up that point. If it had, it would have had to admit that the doubling of postage rates in 50 years is not an excessive increase by any stretch of the imagination.

The whole argument made by the Reader's Digest is in keeping with the Alice-in-Wonderland approach to second-class postal rates that mass-circulation magazines have employed for years.

To hear these magazines tell it, the postal balance sheet contains a mystery deficit of $230 million. That is the amount the Post Office Department is now losing on the delivery of regular second-class mail.

Regular second-class mail is composed of commercial newspapers and magazines, and by far the major users of this class of mail are the Nation's mass circulation magazines. And there is the rub—or in this case, the mystery. Almost without exception the big magazines claim they pay their own way on postal costs.

The Reader's Digest has for years implied that it pays its own way on postage. Mr. Speaker, this claim simply defies credibility, even if you are speaking only of the Post Office's so-called incremental or out-of-pocket costs in delivering the Reader's Digest. For some reason that escapes me, the Reader's Digest and other big magazines say that very little or none of the Post Office's overhead costs, such as the costs of maintaining, heating, and lighting postal buildings, should be charged to them. According to this argument, all of the Post Office's fixed and overhead costs should be charged to the users of first-class mail, because the Post Office exists primarily for the delivery of first-class mail and all these overhead costs would be present even if there were no second-class mail.

This argument is as full of holes as the proverbial swiss cheese. I do not buy it for a minute, but for the sake of today's discussion, let us say this is a valid argument. Even measured against out-of-pocket costs, it is ridiculous on its face to say that the postage paid by the Reader's Digest covers the Post Office Department's costs of delivering it.

It costs the Post Office almost 7 cents a minute for the productive labor time of one employee. I am informed by the Post Office Department that the average postage paid for the delivery of a single copy of Reader's Digest is 2½ cents. In other words, the postage paid on the average Reader's Digest covers about 25 seconds of a single postal employee's time. If the handling, processing, and delivery of a copy of the Digest takes more postal employee time than that, the Post Office loses money on labor alone.

Granted that the Reader's Digest presorts its magazines by ZIP code. And granted that the Digest performs other tasks that the Post Office must do itself on other types of mail. Still, the Post Office must perform a number of operations to get the Digest to the letter carrier who will deliver it. Then the carrier must place in its proper sequence each individual copy of the Digest going to a patron on his route and deliver it.

A letter carrier is limited to not more than 35 pounds of mail in his bag at any one time. After he has delivered a 35-pound load, he must make a relay trip to a storage box located on his route to pick up another 35 pounds. This process is repeated until the carrier has delivered all of the day's mail.

The average copy of the Reader's Digest weighs 9 ounces. Naturally, on the day the Digest is delivered, with quite a number of individual pieces in his bag that weigh over a half pound each, the carrier must make repeated trips to the relay box. This is a time-consuming process—and since time costs the Post Office 7 cents a minute—it is an expensive process.

I have discussed only the final steps in the delivery of a single copy of the Reader's Digest for the average postage of 2½ cents. There are, as I said a moment ago, a number of other operations the Post Office must perform to get the Digest to the carrier.

And we have not even considered the cost of transportation—a cost which I am confident even the Reader's Digest would admit is a legitimate postage charge which it should pay.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Reader's Digest does not pay the full cost of the postal service it receives, all of its claims to the contrary notwithstanding. The Reader's Digest is a rich and powerful magazine. And the plain truth is it receives a substantial subsidy from the Federal Government in the form of preferential postal rates.

Now my colleagues may point out that preferential postal rates for second-class matter are traditional—that the subsidy the Reader's Digest receives is completely justified. They would be quite correct on the first point, and the second point is one on which there is ample room for an honest difference of opinion. But let us call a subsidy a subsidy, and proceed from there. Let us once and for all clear the air of this statistical nonsense that the Reader's Digest, or any other major magazine for that matter, pays its own way on postal costs.

Mr. Speaker, the Reader's Digest has often attempted to expose congressional wrongdoing and the dangers of "big government." I know that the Digest, in this same spirit of vigilant Americanism, will join me in roundly condemning the postal rate subsidy, which it has been enjoying for so long, as an odious example of "creeping socialism."

Freedom of the press is the cornerstone of our democratic system. Over the years, the Reader's Digest has published literally hundreds of articles warning that Federal aid invariably leads to Federal control. I am confident, therefore, that the Digest would no longer want to be the recipient of a Government subsidy. In totalitarian countries government subsidies give politicians effective control of the mass media. Needless to say, if this has been the pattern, a Government subsidy for newspapers and magazines is unthinkable for America.

OUR GOVERNMENT MUST STAND FIRM ON THE SIDE OF ISRAEL

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it can be said that the past is to instruct and learn from, the present to live in, and the future to plan for. I think we should apply this thinking to what has occurred, is occurring, and will occur in the Middle East.

From the past we learn that after two wars Egypt, Jordan and the other Arab States in the Middle East have no intention of respecting the sovereignty of Israel. We also learn from the past that diplomatic pressure brought to bear by the United States on Israel, Britain, and France following the campaign in 1956 was largely responsible for losing the peace so far as the interests of Israel and Western Europe were concerned.

Egypt shortly after the armistice refused Israel ships the use of the Suez Canal. Only a few days ago Egypt again broke the agreement by blockading the Gulf of Aqaba which precipitated the present conflict.

It is apparent that one of the mistakes in the past was not allowing Israel some voice in exercising control over the international waterways and indeed this has proven to be injurious not only to Israel but the entire of Europe, who is so dependent on oil from the Middle East.

Today, in the present, we see that war has once again been thrust on Israel and Israel in responding to the challenge has given early and stunning defeats to the United Arab Republic and other Arab countries.

Today, Israel troops are, we are told, on the banks of the Suez, and in control of Sharm el-Sheikh at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba and are on the west banks of the Jordan.

The future must be planned so as to insure, for the good of Europe and the entire Western World, that Israel will not be placed in such a vulnerable position and so subject to abuse again.

The U.S. Government through its diplomatic missions must insist that Israel be allowed a voice in the control of the international waterways and this can only be accomplished by internationalizing some of the lands which Israel has seized in the last few days.

Mr. Speaker, by planning today, and through U.S. efforts, design to assure Israel that they will not be as vulnerable to attack as they have been in the past. The interests of the entire free world will be served.

Israel and the Western World have been subject to the arbitrary and dictatorial decisions of Nasser, who has had no regard for the international character of the waterways. This must not be allowed to occur in the future.

Today, diplomatically our Government must stand firm on the side of Israel. It is only by this action that we can assure the future peace tomorrow.

EFFECTIVE OIL IMPORT PROGRAM NEEDED

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years the domestic oil industry of the United States has been pleading for reasonable restraints concerning our Government's policy on oil imports. Many protests have been lodged, particularly by independent domestic producers and Members of Congress, against the administration's policies only to have them ignored. As a result, exploration and development of new domestic reserves has declined alarmingly, particularly in the past 5 to 10 years.

Kansas, where 45 of the 52 counties in my congressional district produce oil or natural gas, or both, has experienced a sharp decline in exploration, development, and drilling for oil the past few years. Oil and gas production and related businesses and industries account for 30,000 jobs in Kansas. Approximately 30 percent of State taxes are received from fuels and vehicle taxes. About one-fourth of the total land area of the State is productive or leased for mineral rights. These figures point out that the people in my district have a big stake in the oil industry, and they are concerned that it remain the strong, aggressive, and progressive industry that it should be. The slackening of activity in the oil industry is not a healthy one. It threatens the economy of my district and my State and imposes a real threat to our national security. Secretary Udall is well aware of these facts. During the latter part of May, his Department held hearings on this subject; however, it was generally conceded this was simply another in a series of actions to placate the domestic oil industry.

Mr. Speaker, since the outbreak of fighting in the Near East, casting a cloud over the availability of Arabian oil, the Johnson administration has suddenly become concerned over free world oil shortages.

The Wall Street Journal of June 7, 1967, in an article by James C. Tanner stated that one clear-cut gain to U.S. oil operators may be political—that the war gives new ammunition in their fight to lower oil import quotas.

It is extremely unfortunate that the threat of a world upheaval is required to bring about the objectives long sought and imminently deserved by our domestic oil industry. In my opinion, increased domestic production on this basis could, in the long run, be extremely harmful unless safeguards are provided insuring some stability.

I am therefore joining a number of others today in introducing legislation which would insure effectiveness of the oil import program.

MOSS LANDING MARINE LABORATORIES DEDICATION

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a consortium of five leading California State Colleges at Fresno, Hayward, Sacramento, San Francisco, and San Jose are sponsors of the Moss Landing Marine Laboratories that were dedicated recently, functioning as a marine extension of the five supporting colleges rather than as a separate institution, Moss Landing Marine Laboratories will offer courses and programs allowing students from the sponsoring colleges to earn credits in marine science at their home institutions.

This is an important new innovation in this area of higher education. I commend these institutions for their foresight.

Monterey Bay provides an ideal location for the Moss Landing Marine Laboratories. An unusual feature of the bay is the deep submarine canyon which winds 50 miles seaward from Moss Landing, where it dives more than a mile deep, providing a deep sea environment of special interest to geologists, physicists, and other scientists investigating geology, currents, sound, and other factors relating to the sea.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD the dedicatory speech of the Lieutenant Governor of California, the Honorable Robert Finch, and the address by Dr. Glenn S. Dumke, chancellor of the California State Colleges, Moss Landing Marine Laboratories:

TRAIL BREAKING IN CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION

(by Dr. Glenn S. Dumke)

When the wagon trains came west in the 1840's they were led by a man called the trail breaker. This was a tough and demanding task, particularly through the mountain regions, and it carried no tenure. A man continued in the job only as long as his strength to move boulders and logs held out and as long as he continued to make good decisions about the route he selected for the party to reach its ultimate destination.

In the history of higher education in California the trailbreaking task has moved from one institution to another. At various times the forward-moving decisions have been made, in turn, by distinguished private institutions, by the University of California, by State Colleges and by junior colleges. Now quite clearly we have reached a point in the journey where the State Colleges, individually and as a system, will be breaking trail for at least a large share of the crucial decisions and actions which must be made in the next several years.

Today we have dedicated a laboratory devoted to one of the newest of sciences, an innovation in itself. Whether the sea holds the promise that has been claimed for it is still a question, but someone must plunge into the wilderness, climb the mountain peaks, or—more appropriate in this case—sail over the watery horizon to find what new lands beckon. It takes some stamina and courage, but also it is highly necessary.

It is necessary simply because the problems facing the world are new and some of them are terrifying. Never before has the world faced the prospect—and that within the next two years—of becoming so overcrowded that starvation literally threatens mankind's millions. Never before have trouble moving or breathing in our cities. And as we elbow and jostle each other in a choked and hungry world, war and revolution and political turbulence inevitably loom.

Never before has mankind possessed the power of destroying itself. Just as some astronomers hold that the universe was formed by a gigantic cosmic explosion, so now it is evident to everyone that the big bang theory may well be applied to man's termination as well as to his creation.

Narrowing our sights somewhat, we have never before had to build a new school every week in Los Angeles merely to keep up with the student population. For the first time in the last two decades, the people of California have increased in numbers at the rate of 1500 a day. Never before have we had State College and University budgets of more than $200 million. Never before have we had a world in which half of its population is very young and—I am sure we would all agree—badly in need of education, or at least of some kind of discipline. Never before have professors found themselves in such a happy seller's market.

Never before have we had a communications system which thrusts disturbing ideas upon us with drumfire rapidity, and which demands that we learn to control them before they shake us from our moorings. Never before have we had so much iconoclasm in ethics and philosophy and religion, to the extent that bishops of the church and priests in holy orders preach against their faiths and rebel against their institutions. Not often have we had students and professors and proponents of many beliefs and factions competing for control of our colleges and universities. Seldom have we had so many claims upon our attention, so many invitations to tastelessness and vulgarity and the things that history has proved are bad for man and his progress.

On the other hand, we have never before had so much technical competence so much sheer ability to do the things that we wished to do, if we could only straighten out our thinking about them. We have never in all of human history had so many glorious opportunities.

In other words, never before have we had so many new problems—and they cry out for new solutions.

But new solutions are hard to find, and, once found, are hard to manage. But I submit to you, and I present to you as a model, a set of colleges which not only found themselves confronted by a batch of new problems, but also managed a little trail-blazing in their solution.

In 1960, the legislature of the State of California decided that in order for the state to be able to continue to serve its young people, it would be necessary for its colleges and universities to bring about some added efficiency through specialization. This was the root of the Master Plan, which has since served as a model for many state systems of higher education throughout this nation and the world. One of the parts of the Master Plan was the opportunity for the State Colleges to organize their own academic government, to create a state college system, and to acquire the strengths that come from unity.

This was where our trailblazing started. Most systems of higher education grow through centrifugal forces from a mother institution. Berkeley is an example. The parent campus establishes branches, and these eventually mature.

But in the State Colleges the reverse was the case. Here we had more than a dozen highly independent, ruggedly individualist institutions of higher education, all of which operated on the same principles that South Carolina exhibited on the eve of the Civil War. I have often felt that the State Colleges have encountered every problem which was encountered by the 13 colonies on their march to nationhood. They have had their constitutional convention, their Federalist papers, their whiskey Rebellion—and at least one of our policy positions as having marked similarities to the Monroe Doctrine.

We had to do a good many things in reverse order, at least as compared to the more traditional colleges and universities. Most colleges agree on a set of admissions standards, and then come up with the percentage of students they find they are serving. The State Colleges agreed to upgrade their admissions standards to the top ⅓ of the high school ability groups, which made them more selective than most state universities, and—given this percentage, we had, through a fantastically complex crystal-ball operation which was complicated by computers, to come up with a set of admissions standards. We did so, our crystal-ball prognoses came out to hair-line accuracy, and we emerged with a study in admissions technology which was a real trail-blazer in American higher education.

Nor could we even face the ordinary problems of locating new administrative officers in the ordinary, traditional way of approaching the problems one at a time. We found ourselves faced, during a single year, because of a combination of retirements and resignations, with the task of locating six college presidents at one time. Now finding college presidents is easy—there are many people who feel they would like to try their hand at the job, despite the low pay and long hours. But the trick was to find college presidents who, after they arrived, could really run the college, and this presented an added complication. However, we succeeded magnificently, thus proving it could be done, and some of the happy results of our novel project are in the room with you today.

We succeeded in something else, almost as difficult. The State College Trustees upgraded the architecture of an entire educational system. Before the Master Plan our campus sites were chosen on the basis that if you found a piece of land that you couldn't use for anything else, you could at least build a college on it. And the colleges that went up on thse swamps, barrens, and rocky pieces of low-cost real estate developed an architectural style that was known variously as "moneysaver modern" or "early San Quentin." The Trustees came to grips with this problem and solved it by some more bold trailblazing. They brought in private architects to compete with the state division, thus applying the catalytic influence of competition, they began to devote careful attention to site location, and they master-planned the architecture of each educational community. Today the California State Colleges present a far different picture. Aesthetics are considered, and our campus architecture, though considerate of the taxpayer, is developing an educational and inspirational value of its own.

One of our new problems, which demands ever-new solutions, is our tremendous size. We are reasonably certain we are the largest system of four-year higher education in the westernworld; we suspect that we may be the largest in the world but we are worried about the University of Calcutta which counts its students in a relatively free and easy manner. We haven't bothered to research this out, on the assumption that there are things more important than bigness, but our size is always with us, and it constantly surprises us. We currently have more than 170,000 students, making us more than twice as large as the University of California. We currently have in our classes 55% of the seniors registered in all the four-year colleges and universities in the state of California, public and private. We have about 39,000 students who are preparing to enter engineering mathematics or science, and we are training 70% of all the teachers trained in the state of California. We estimate that by 1980 one out of every eight California voters will be an alumnus of a state college. The citizens of California have invested more than half a billion dollars in the State Colleges already, and yet they are due to grow still more, and almost as rapidly as they have in the past.

We have had a history of innovation. Out of San Francisco State came the Winnetka Plan, one of the early significant programs in education and teaching. We have asked the president of each of our new campuses to try something, to experiment with something, even if it doesn't work and has to be abandoned, because we feel that somewhere along the line higher education must break loose from the medievalisms that hold it in thrall. Consequently we have some very interesting things going on.

At our new college in Dominguez Hills in southwestern Los Angeles we have a college within a college modelled after a similar Florida pattern but with its own innovations. We are at Dominguez relating teacher education to all of the curriculum, instead of considering it as a separate division, and through a generous Ford Foundation grant, we are exploring the use of the computer in all phases of college activity—associating computer technology with the growth and development of the college from the ground up. To demonstrate further willingness to temper with tradition, students serve on most faculty committees, and professors serve on most student committees.

At our new college in San Bernardino, now in its second year of operation, two basic educational plans have been merged in an innovative manner and the merger appears to be working well. The 3/3 plan, in which each student takes courses during each of three quarters, has been combined with the so-called Ruml Plan, which balances a small number of very large classes with a number of small classes. At San Bernardino during his four years, the student will be enrolled in a total of eight large lecture courses with about 200 students and in 28 classes where the class averages 15 students.

The San Bernardino approach offers significant advantages to student, professor and taxpayer alike. It stresses education in depth, more contact between teacher and student, but also greater self-dependence on the part of the student. It promises increased control over course proliferation and greater integration of the educational program, and with all of these things, it may even turn out to be more economical.

A rich source of new ideas lies in the special service programs we design for special clientelles. Last month, seven of our State Colleges each received 15 South Vietnamese students who will spend a year and one half, at least, studying with us. This spring and summer will be spent in building competence in the English language and in gaining understanding of American culture. Shortly after their arrival, for the first time they engaged in the democratic process of electing one of their own number to represent them in protocol visits to my office and elsewhere. They were thrilled by the experience and could talk of little else. But so rapidly did they mature in the ways of freedom that before the month was out they were appointing committees to watch their elected representatives and were seriously considering electing an ombudsman.

We hope that the time those students spend with us will be a real benefit to them and in turn to their nation. We know that the experience has already benefitted us, as it does all the institutions who engage in such activity, because it causes us to look critically at our educational programs and our methods of transmitting knowledge.

The State Colleges are involved internationally, and again, in new ways. We have nine student groups overseas, totalling just under 300 students. But the novelties are evident. The students must speak the language. They must be mature enough to profit academically from the courses they take in a foreign university. We have no Little Americas overseas, no real estate, no large staffs. The program is not costing the California taxpayer one dollar more than would equivalent education of the same students in a California State College. And they are all enrolled in California State Colleges and getting course credits for their work under rigorous but not overstaffed supervision.

More traditionally, we have AID and other types of international projects ranging from Tanzania and Liberia through Jamaica and Brazil to Thailand.

Many projects now being conducted on State College campuses are aimed at the disadvantaged members of our society. We are trying all sorts of approaches to reach and assist those persons who have drifted out of the educational mainstream. These new approaches also lead to educational innovation.

The administration and faculty of Cal-State, Los Angeles, recently went on record as recognizing an urban focus as one of the major concerns of the college they have encouraged efforts by the college in research, instruction, and public service toward the solution of urban problems.

Actually, Los Angeles has been heavily engaged in urban projects for some time. Project "Teach," a two-year program completed last year under HEW funds, developed new curricula and provided special preparation for 60 teachers in the Watts area. Project "Gap" has the objective of equipping teachers with techniques which will eliminate some sources of children's dissatisfaction with school.

Project Incentive brings disadvantaged junior high school students to the campus for well-planned visits. Its objective is to stimulate each youngster to think about college attendance as a part of his future. Project Epic (Educational Participation in Communities) is a massive activity involving members of the Cal State student body in tutoring high school students; serving as teacher aides; teaching art, music and other skills at Teen Posts and community centers; advising youth groups; and providing assistance in hospitals and clinics.

In line with the general objectives of the State Colleges, these projects show concern for effective teaching and also for the growth and development of individual persons.

San Francisco State College also has been engaged in numerous programs for the disadvantaged. The college's drama demonstration project is designed to show that drama is an effective medium for motivating and teaching the educationally disadvantaged child. Students at San Francisco State are involved in a variety of tutorial projects in the toughest sections of the city. Perhaps the most adventurous program of the college has been the Streetwork Training Project, which converted juvenile gang leaders into advisors to younger boys and also sought to determine the educability of such youths.

Last month, the Board of Trustees selected the Edgewood Hills site near San Carlos for the new state college in the San Mateo-Santa Clara Counties area. What I should like to develop there—and it should be fully functioning within 10 years—is an institution that might represent a wide departure from traditional educational forms. Perhaps few, if any, organized classes, but emphasis on independent study, field experience, public service internships, research internships and on-site teaching. A great deal of responsibility would be fixed on the individual student for his own education but there would be elaborate technological support for him by use of the various technological developments I have described. There would also be innovations in physical facilities, with flexible and convertible study spaces and learning centers for individual study. With resources like this, the good undergraduate social science student of tomorrow may be a better researcher than most dissertation-writing doctoral students of today. Nor does contemplation of such ideas raise the spectre of fewer jobs for faculty. It merely permits faculty to do what they should be doing—teaching—rather than doubling inefficiently for textbooks, laboratories and electronic gadgets.

In this kind of environment the role of the professor may be that foreseen by Richard Baer:

> Broadly speaking, the professor of the future university will serve within it in three major roles: providing material for self-instruction by the students (i.e. films, tapes, programs for learning); advising students as to sources and helping them over difficult spots by individual or group conferences; and leading seminars, conducting investigations, or preparing lectures in which are treated . . . significance and relationship of the core material. The professor will no longer routinely and repetitively conduct classes in which core material is largely predigested and fed to students, who are then lulled into the belief they have been given all field content of importance. The predigested material which the professor prepares will be stored in the form of tape or film at the library. He will occasionally update it, but otherwise he progresses to the preparation of more study material.

I have merely touched upon a few things that the California State Colleges are doing by way of innovation. I have not mentioned those items which I suspect those of you in this room are well acquainted with, such as the tutorial program at San Jose, the educational resources concepts being applied at Hayward, the student experimental college at Francisco, the individual variations in the fundamental liberal arts curricular base applied by all colleges in different ways. This all illustrates no basic innovation by the Trustees—though they are responsible for a system, they are devoted to diversity and to the concept that no college or university can be all things to all men. We would rather build academic spires and mount strength on strength than to reduce the curricular landscape to a monotonous plain of mediocrity.

President Esther Rauschenbush of Sarah Lawrence College has said:

"Serious students have never questioned more seriously their purpose in being in college than they do now. Their anxieties and sense of dislocation often come from not being able to find the connections between their academic studies and the social, political, personal dilemmas, the violence and need they find in the world they inhabit."

It is up to us as educators to be the first to recognize that new problems demand new solutions and that it is not always only the other fellow who must break through the cake of custom, as Turner expressed it, for the sake of finding an effective answer to a puzzling problem. But we who are professors are the most reactionary of conservative professional groups, and such breaking away is hard indeed. Yet trail-breaking is not only something to give speeches about. You cannot program a satellite on an abacus, nor can you educate the citizens of a crowded, hungry, turbulent frightened world with the lessons that served a peaceful, pastoral, uncrowded generation. Nor can you use techniques that have been inherited, largely unchanged, from Bologna and Paris of the Middle Ages.

If it had not been for the trailbreaker, the wagon trains would never have made it to the Pacific Coast, and we would not be here today for the purpose of dedicating a facility aimed at probing a very new frontier.

THE OCEANS—AMERICA'S NEWEST CHALLENGE

(Text of dedicatory speech by Lt. Gov. Robert Finch at Moss Landing Marine Laboratories)

I wear two hats today—state and federal. I am pleased to take part in the ceremonies here today dedicating the Moss Landing Marine Laboratories.

This institution, a consortium of five leading California State Colleges, is providing an example in the marine sciences for the entire nation to acknowledge and emulate.

From a federal standpoint there is ever reason to believe that Moss Landing Marine Laboratories will become one of the first beneficiaries of the landmark Sea Grant College Act of 1966.

Although this was passed last year, it has already been an astounding stimulus to the oceanology effort of the United States. Colleges and universities in almost every state have taken a fresh look at existing programs in the field, and they are coming forward with new and exciting concepts for research and for training of undergraduates and graduate students in this needed area.

As we near the end of the 20th century—a period in which technological and scientific revolutions have occurred and reoccurred—we are looking to the oceans and probing the dimension of their mysteries in a wholly tentative way.

For the simple truth of the matter is this: the United States has a lot of catching up to do in closing the "oceanographic gap"—the difference between our excellent scientific capabilities and the present, rather poor, state of the American performance in exploitation of the seas.

We may be racing toward the moon, but we are lagging in our effort to unlock Davey Jones' locker.

To me, it is ironic that we now possess marvelously detailed photographs of the lunar surface—photographs transmitted from 250,000 miles away—while we were barely able to get rough pictures of the wreckage of the nuclear submarine *Thresher* as it lay on the ocean bottom off New England a few thousand feet below the surface.

The Surveyor spacecraft in an amazing feat, scratched the moon's surface a few days ago to give us information on its composition. We now know something about the texture of the moon—and this is exactly 100 per cent more than we know about the bottom of a good part of the Pacific Ocean out there.

The "oceanographic gap" also affects us in two very practical areas—food and transport.

It is no secret, especially to a Californian, that our once viable American fishing industry has been surpassed both in total production and quality of equipment by nations far poorer than the United States, and vastly inferior to this nation in science.

To take one example: Huge "factory" ships, capable of processing thousands of tons of fish for human consumption, travel with the fleets of fishing vessels dispatched by the Soviet Union to all parts of the world.

These "mother" ships enable Soviet fishing boats to remain on station at productive fishing grounds for months at a stretch so that every usable fish is caught. American boats, their competitors, are forced to abandon the grounds once their holds are full.

Even as we meet here today, the Soviet Union is demonstrating its opinion of the value of modern fishing fleets. Vessels flying the Red flag are working the waters off Northern California. They are able to operate effectively so far from home because they employ modern techniques. It's all perfectly legal. All we can do is insure that our fishing limits are observed—and look on with considerable envy.

Our maritime industry, so important to the economy of our state, is really in serious trouble. The same industry that helped Great Britain in the dark early days of World War II and furnished the hundreds of ships supplying the Allied military from Murmansk to Manila Bay continues to decline despite subsidies and other antidotes. During the last 20 years, the U.S. maritime fleet has shrunk from 5,000 ships, totaling more than 50 million deadweight tons, to 1,095 active vessels aggregating 14.8 million tons. A mere 8 per cent of our country's foreign commerce moves in U.S. flagships today.

Fortunately, within the last five years, the United States has begun to awaken to the importance of oceanology.

In one area of oceanology alone—the capability of this country in deep submersible vehicles—there has been gratifying progress. I remember very well how helpless we felt when the *Thresher* went down off New England, and the only deep submersible available to reach the depth of the stricken submarine was 3,000 miles away. It took weeks for the bathyscaphe *Trieste* to reach the scene of the *Thresher* disaster. It had to be transported from San Diego through the Panama Canal and up to New England. Even the *Trieste* was of limited value. It photographed the wreckage, after locating it. But it was incapable of retrieving remnants large enough to determine the cause of the tragedy.

As often happens, the *Thresher* disaster triggered a frenzy of action. I sometimes wonder what would have happened had the *Thresher* survived and the United States continued sedately along with the *Trieste* as its sole submersible having capabilities in deep waters. You will recall the pressure upon us to recover the nuclear bomb lost in the sea off Palomares, Spain. What would have happened had we not developed a submersible able to retrieve that bomb?

We were prepared for Palomares. And ever slowly we are getting prepared on the full spectrum of oceanology. The fuller enlargement of our knowledge of the living resources of the ocean.

Congress, after many a session of sputtering and spinning, dealt with oceanology in a substantive manner last year. There was created the legislative base for a new and more vigorous start in this country's oceanology effort. The keystone, of course, was passage of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act. Supplementing that piece of legislation was the Sea Grant College Act.

The Marine Resources Council will hopefully be the federal government's major voice in setting oceanology goals. It has enough prestigious members—the Vice President is chairman—to yank the various bureaucrats involved in oceanology into line so that all can march together. And the proliferation of government bureaus, agencies and departments in oceanology has sometimes held back our progress. There are 23 bureaus in 11 departments today involved in oceanology. A little consolidation, a little streamlining, seems to be in order here.

In terms of money, the government's oceanology effort continues to grow. The President has asked Congress for $462 million in fiscal 1968 compared with $408 million spent on oceanology in the current fiscal year.

To implement the Sea Grant Act, the administration has proposed:

First—reprogramming of current fiscal year funds to obtain $1 million.

Second—a total of $4 million in fiscal 1968.

It appears evident Congress will approve both of the expenditure proposals.

It pleased me, incidentally, that Moss Landing Marine Laboratories was in the vanguard of schools ready to submit proposals for funds under the Sea Grant College Act. Even in this day and age, it is important for an institution to "get there fustest" and Moss Landing was no laggard in that regard. As a trustee of the State Colleges, I compliment Glenn Dumke, his staff and particularly Dr. John Harville for it.

Our state, thanks to the excellent reputation enjoyed by California institutions of higher learning, must play a greater and greater role as the United States enlarges its programs aimed at unlocking the ocean's secrets for we have the unrivaled shoreline at hand.

All Californians can subscribe to the definition of America's oceanology goals put forth by Dr. Edward Wenke, executive secretary of the Marine Resources Council. As Dr. Wenke said:

"Our objective is the effective use of the sea by man for all purposes peculiar to his life in the terrestrial environment. These include commerce, industry, defense, recreation and—more generally—knowledge and understanding."

We are making progress at last in all of those fields. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration recently approved fish protein concentrate for human consumption, a needed step toward alleviating the hunger in today's world. Nutritionists say that only 10 grams of fish protein concentrate will provide enough animal protein to meet the daily requirements of a child—and at less than a penny a day. Much remains to be done in this area. For one thing, we face the task of changing the dietary habits of millions of potential beneficiaries of this food supplement. But we have made a start.

The Navy's man-in-the-sea program already has demonstrated that man can function without impairment at shallow depths beneath the ocean's surface for weeks at a time. The goal is to show that man can extend his domain to areas of the sea from 600 to 1,000 feet below the surface, and live there for months at a time.

The man-in-the-sea program has obvious defense capabilities. So does the research now under way at Scripps Institution of Oceanography, Woods Hole and other oceanographic institutions trying to develop more effective ways of locating and identifying enemy submarines.

But the goals of the American oceanology program can not stop with meeting defense requirements, important as they are to our survival. We will look to the oceans in the future for all kinds of treasure.

The riches of the ocean encompass more than just food for mankind. Geologists estimate that as much as 25 per cent of the world's petroleum reserves lie offshore. Extractable from the near offshore regions of the world's continents are an enticing array of minerals—diamonds, gold, tin, iron, manganese, copper and several exotic metals.

Profitable industries already thrive in this country for the extraction of salt, iodine and other chemicals from the ocean.

The industrial know-how of American business is all ready to move into these fields, and programs such as the Sea Grant College Act will eventually result in the break-throughs necessary to industry. Of that I am confident.

A hundred years ago, America was a rural nation—sparsely populated in relation to its land area. Farming was the principal occupation of our people, and yet we barely managed to produce the food we need. Today, we are an industrial nation made up mostly of city dwellers. Farming is the sole occupation of only 6.4 per cent of the populace, and yet these farmers produce all of the country's basic food needs and a surplus for export. Much goes to feed millions of hungry people elsewhere in the world.

The land-grant college concept embodied in the 1862 Morrill Act was a major impetus, in the view of every authority, in this agricultural revolution. The land-grant colleges provided the knowledge and trained the people in the amazing transformation.

I do not think it is too much to believe that the same can now be accomplished in oceanology.

Speaking for Senator Murphy and the Federal Government. Speaking for the entire State of California, I salute all of you who have made Moss Landing a reality.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, last month free world shipping to North Vietnam continued to increase. During May nine more ships—seven British, one Cypriot and one Maltese—carried goods to North Vietnam. This is nearly double the number of arrivals that occured in April.

Again, in May, and for at least the third month this year, strategic goods have been delivered by free world ships. This is an intolerable situation. We have now lost over 10,000 American boys in Vietnam. We have lost more than 500 aircraft over North Vietnam in our efforts to stop the flow of supplies to the south: yet the pipeline supplied by free world ships remains open. The administration must do more than wring its hands and watch the ships sail by.

This May traffic brings the total number of arrivals for the first 5 months of this year to 28, which is substantially more than the 19 ships that arrived during the last 5 months of 1966. These 28 ships represent a total cargo capability of 180,000 tons, more than 50,000 tons of which is attributable to this May trade.

The ships that arrived in May have made some 38 voyages to help supply the war economy of the Hanoi regime since January 1966. The persistence of this traffic is a clear indication of its importance and contradicts the State Department's attempts to depreciate this trade as an excuse for failing to take fully effective measures to eliminate it.

I have spoken out against this vicious and immoral traffic many times in the past, and I shall continue to do so until effective action is taken and there is nothing more to report. The sacrifices being made by our servicemen in Vietnam demand that our Government not stand idly by while some in the free world would betray the cause of freedom for a few pieces of silver.

Free world ships arriving North Vietnam

Month	British	Maltese	Cypriot	Total
January	6	0	0	6
February	3	1	1	5
March	3	0	0	3
April	4	0	1	5
May	7	1	1	9
Total	23	2	3	28

THE CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress a statement issued in Boston on Monday afternoon of this week by a group of 19 leading Roman Catholic and Protestant church leaders calling for an end to the war in the Mideast and protection for the State of Israel.

The "declaration of Christian principle," signed by religious leaders, called for a speedy cease-fire in the Mideast crisis and a recognition of Israel "as a viable nation in the community of nations."

Recognizing that peace based on moral principle is the basic requirement of civilization, the clergymen declared that "none of us can be indifferent or uninvolved in confronting the moral issues inherent in the current conflict in the Middle East."

Continuing, they said:

> We cannot stand by idly at the possibility of Israel's destruction, of decimating the two and a half million Jewish people, many of them survivors of the Hitler holocaust, who are Israel's citizens today.

It argued that the military defeat of the Arabs would not mean the destruction of any Arab nation while a military defeat for Israel might well mean death for all its citizens and the end of the hope of the Jewish people to preserve a remnant of its former strength.

"As religious leaders," they said, "we cannot countenance any action in the Middle East now which might be a prelude to world war III," and expressed fear that the localized conflict might be allowed to spread into a worldwide nuclear holocaust.

Along with an immediate cease-fire, the statement called for international guarantees of the territorial integrity of all Middle Eastern nations, and "the right of all nations without exception to free passage through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba."

It placed the responsibility for bringing peace to the Middle East in the United Nations, and efforts failing there, upon the major powers of the world including the United States.

The clergymen also called upon governments and their fellow Christians to contribute generously to the rebuilding of the wasted areas and the elimination of poverty everywhere in the Middle East when the hostilities have stopped.

Among the signers are seven heads of Christian churches in the Bay State. These are:

His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston; the Right Reverend Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., Episcopal bishop of the diocese of Massachusetts; the Reverend Albert J. Penner, president and minister, Massachusetts Conference of the United Church of Christ; the Reverend James K. Mathews, Methodist bishop of New England; the Reverend Paul L. Sturges, executive director, Massachusetts Baptist Convention; the Reverend Theodore A. Webb, executive director, Massachusetts Bay District of Unitarian-Universalist Churches; and Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, national president, Unitarian-Universalist Association.

Other signers include:

Dr. Myron Fowell, secretary, Massachusetts Conference of the United Church of Christ; Dr. Allen Hackett, minister to the Metropolitan Boston Association, United Church of Christ; the Reverend Boardman W. Kathan, Christian education minister, United Church of Christ; Dr. James A. Nash, director of the Department of Social Relations, Massachusetts Council of Churches; the Reverend Harold R. Fray, Jr., chairman, Committee or Religious Concern for Peace, and minister, Eliot Church, Newton.

Also, the Reverend Donald A. Thompson, Unitarian-Universalist minister for social responsibility; the Reverend Gordon D. Gibson, Theodore Parker Unitarian Church, West Roxbury; the Right Reverend Edward G. Murray, Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Roslindale; the Right Reverend Francis J. Lally, editor, the Pilot; the Reverend James D. Riddle, First Parish Church, Lincoln; the Reverend Shirley B. Goodwin, executive secretary, Department of Social Relations, Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts; and the Reverend Kenneth L. Garrison, director of community witness, Massachusetts Baptist Convention.

A DECLARATION OF CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE

"Blessed are the peace makers, for they shall be called sons of God." (Matthew 5:9).

Peace is the basic requirement of civilization. It can be established and sustained only on a basis of moral principle. None of us can be indifferent or uninvolved in confronting the moral issues inherent in the current conflict in the Middle East.

We cannot stand by idly at the possibility of Israel's destruction, of decimating the two and a half million Jewish people, many of them survivors of the Hitler holocaust, who are Israel's citizens today. The military defeat of the Arabs would not mean the destruction of any Arab nation. A military defeat suffered by Israel might well mean death to all its citizens and to the hope of the Jewish people that a remnant of its former strength be preserved. As religious leaders, we cannot countenance any action in the Middle East now which might be a prelude to World War III. The conflict which is now localized, cannot be allowed to spread, bringing the doom of nuclear holocaust upon the world.

We earnestly pray for a speedy ceasefire. The end of hostilities, however, must be followed by a firm and permanent peace: one which will recognize Israel as a viable nation in the community of nations and which will include international guarantees of the territorial integrity of all nations in the Middle East. The peace must also guarantee the right of all nations without exception to free passage through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

Every effort must be made by the United Nations, with the cooperation of the major world powers, to confine the war and bring it to a speedy halt. Any failure of the United Nations to act promptly, still places upon the United States and the other major powers, this responsibility for peace.

We call upon governments and our Fellow Christians when hostilities shall have ceased, to contribute generously to the rebuilding of wasted areas and the elimination of poverty everywhere in the Middle East.

Before God, let us not be guilty of silence.

THE CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to bring to the attention of the House my updated thinking on the rapidly changing Middle East crisis. As you know, I spoke briefly on the floor the other day in expressing my displeasure with the ultimately unilateral action of U Thant, in removing the U.N. peacekeeping forces from the contested Egyptian-Israel border.

This morning, in my office, I had the privilege of holding a conference with some constituents from my district in California. They were obviously knowledgeable about the Middle East, having lived in that section of the world in years past.

As a result of this meeting, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of my impressions and recommendations. Also, I want to go on record as associating myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris] who has so very well stated the situation and the problems in this dispute. I fully concur with his views.

Mr. Speaker, for too many years the Arab-Israel dispute has kept people on both sides of the question living in a state of fear, hate, and growing animosity. The problems are well known to any person who has concerned himself with this continuing controversy.

With the U.N. cease-fire resolution having now been adopted, I would hope we would now move forward to bring about a settlement that will stabilize that area once and for all. It must, however, be a permanent solution and if I can make a recommendation, it should be our objective to place maximum emphasis on the Israelis and the Arabs taking the lead to work out the final settlement. I believe they can and must do the job in order to have the necessary lasting effect.

Also, I would hope we can sustain this initiative toward stabilization and peaceful cooperation in this perennial trouble spot. Mankind cannot stand this reoccurrence. This area is strategically located, Israel has become a showcase of effective economic development and constructive free democracy in action.

I am equally concerned about the plight of the Arab people. It seems to me there is so much in the way of potential benefits for these people if they can once and for all move toward programs that concentrate on mutual cooperation to uplift the standard of living for Arabs and Israelis alike. This must be our aim. We must use our influence to carry forward this objective. The long-term security requirements of the United States demand that we hold to and advance this commitment.

The United States and our free nation allies must see that Israel is fully recognized as a permanent and sovereign member in our family of nations—a country that is fully dedicated to promoting freedom, prosperity, and justice under law in that vital section of the world.

Once again, we have seen Nasser improperly lead his people against the best interests of the United States and the free world. He and his regime must go. The Arab people deserve better leadership, hopefully a more moderate and rational type of leader whose desires are to cooperate with and contribute to the best interests of his people and his neighbors, rather than dominate, dictate, and coerce.

Two years ago I argued against helping this dictator under our foreign assistance program. I believe this should convince our colleagues of the correctness of my position at that time—enough so that you will give serious consideration to my plea now. Nasser and his kind must go. I sincerely believe this is essential to the future security, political stability, and economic development of this potentially prosperous section of the world.

In 1957, when Israel permitted the U.N. troops to "occupy" the area in question, they had every right to expect security and stability under this "peacekeeping" agreement.

The unwise, and in my judgment, totally unwarranted decision by the Secretary General of the United Nations to withdraw these troops, set the stage for this obvious outbreak that was inevitable. I do not know who "struck the first blow"—I do not believe we will ever know. Right now this is relatively unimportant. I do believe, however, that the United Nations walked out on its commitment. Therefore, the member nations, in my judgment, have a moral and legal commitment to multilaterally make up for and/or carry out this commitment under existing and previously negotiated agreements.

In effect, I believe Israel was "sinned" against in this case and is entitled to retain whatever gains she has made in the interim. Our support for negotiations should include those lands in the Sinai Peninsula and Jordan now occupied.

If this is accomplished, I believe history will record this incident and the regrettable losses associated thereto as a constructive incident. It could set the stage for the settlement of the refugee problem with both, and I emphasize, both the Israelis and the Arabs participating. Again, it is for this reason that I place the emphasis on insisting that the negotiating forum be comprised principally of Israelis and Arabs, hopefully to put an end to belligerency and set the stage for a lifetime of cooperation.

The international waters must be protected to enhance the capability for maritime activities, expanded commerce, and development program implementation.

These countries cannot go back to the status quo. I just want to serve notice on the House that this Congressman from the First District of California, by these remarks wants to go permanently on record for demanding a permanent solution to this Middle East problem and urge you to join me in doing everything possible to secure and enhance this showcase for democracy in this strategic location. We have a legal, cultural, religious, and humanitarian obligation to stand firm in this resolve.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that I have today introduced, on behalf of myself and the Republican leadership in the House and the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, bill H.R. 10661. The bill would make permanent the existing temporary public debt limit of $336,000,000,000.

I have introduced this bill in order to carry out the assurance I gave the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, during the debate on the debt ceiling legislation yesterday, that if the bill then being considered was defeated, I would do all in my power to avoid the problem of July 1 when the statutory borrowing authority would drop from the present temporary ceiling of $336,000,000,000 to a $285,000,000,000 level.

I include at this point the colloquy between myself and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills]:

Mr. Mills. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. Mills. I have just as much interest, I believe my friend knows, in this business of reevaluation and reestablishment of priorities as anyone, including my friend. That cannot be done, however, realistically, as I see it, in the short period of time between today and the first day of July.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin. Very well.

Mr. Mills. On the first day of July the debt ceiling will revert to $285 billion.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin. I want to be constructive, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest if we turn this bill down today the gentleman would have no difficulty in getting legislation through this House very quickly providing sufficient borrowing authority. The only real problem is that ceiling will revert to $285 billion on June 30. I believe that the current $336 billion ceiling would meet the borrowing needs of the Treasury at least until September or October, even under the table presented to us by the Treasury. The gentleman could get a continuation of the $336 billion borrowing authority without any difficulty, which would give them the time to make the review.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, according to information given to the Ways and Means Committee by the Treasury Department, should take care of the borrowing needs of the Treasury through the month of September. This then should give the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and the various departments of Government ample time to make the review and revision of expenditure and revenue plans that is so essential if we are to act intelligently on the matter of establishing a debt ceiling for the fiscal year 1968.

The text of the bill which has been cosponsored by myself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. RHODES of Arizona, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. UTT, Mr. BETTS, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BATTIN, Mr. CONABLE, and Mr. BUSH is as follows:

> A bill to make permanent the existing temporary public debt limit of $336,000,000,000
>
> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, effective July 1, 1967, the first sentence of section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 757b) is amended by striking out "$285,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$336,000,000,000".

SANTA CLARA COUNTY ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION VOTER REGISTRATION DRIVE

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the Santa Clara County Economic Opportunity Commission, which operates on Federal funds distributed through the Office of Economic Opportunity, is currently laying plans to conduct a voter registration drive among the poor, to be conducted by this federally financed agency.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that this activity is probably a violation of the law and it certainly violates the intent of the law.

First, let me state quite clearly that I believe the poor should shoulder their voting responsibilities as full-fledged citizens of these United States. They should be encouraged to do so and certainly the poverty program is justified in informing the poor of their right to vote and of the mechanics of voter registration. It would be just as proper for any Federal employee to inform the poor regarding where and how they can register to vote as to inform them of where and how they could mail a letter at the nearest post office.

But this type of activity is entirely different from actually performing voter registration, which in many States is along partisan lines.

On December 1, 1966, the Office of Economic Opportunity issued memorandum No. 50-A, which superseded CA Memo No. 50. Under the designation "Purpose of this Memorandum," it is clearly stated as follows:

> This memorandum provides a summary description of the restrictions on political activity now applicable to the personnel of grantee and delegate agencies financed under Titles II-A and III-B. . . .
>
> Federal law, including the provisions known popularly as the Hatch Act restricts the political activities of both Federal employees and some employees of federally-assisted State and local public agencies. A 1966 amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act extends restrictions to many of the employees of private agencies administering programs financed under the Economic Opportunity Act and requires that community action programs be administered so as to keep them from involvement in partisan political activity.

Mr. Speaker, later in the same memorandum it is stated that the restrictions contained in the memorandum included—

> All *public agencies,* whether grantee or delegate agencies . . . and all *Community Action Agencies* (CAA's), whether public or private non-profit. A CAA, as defined in Section 603 of the Economic Opportunity Act, as amended, is an agency "which assumes responsibility for planning, developing and coordinating community-wide anti-poverty programs."

The restrictions outlined in memorandum No. 50-A clearly prohibit any person covered in the above-mentioned definitions from using his official position, authority, or influence for the purpose of "affecting the result" of an election. Obviously, voter registration, which in some States determines the eligibility of voters to vote in an election, does affect the result of that election.

Later in the memorandum it is specifically stated that a covered employee cannot "help to get out the votes on election day" and that such activity is forbidden under the 1966 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. It is true that the memorandum does not explicitly prohibit the conduct of a registration drive, but I submit that the act of registration is as essential to the process of voting and affects the results of an election every bit as much as activity which would "help to get out the votes on election day."

Mr. Speaker, any fair-minded interpretation of memorandum 50-A, which was promulgated for the purpose of implementing the law of the land, leads to the inescapable conclusion that a voter-registration drive is not permissible when it is conducted by federally financed agencies and/or personnel.

Some proponents of this plan argue that the key to its legality lies in keeping the registration drive on a nonpartisan basis. I make no allegation that those who would participate in such a drive would attempt to influence the registrants on a partisan basis. But I point out that no allegation was ever made that those who transported voters to the polls had attempted to influence them in behalf of any particular party. Yet when Congress learned of this activity, even though it was nonpartisan, legislation was passed and regulations written which specifically restricted it.

Those who disagree with me have already started their defense of this voter-registration drive by challenging the motivation of us who honestly oppose it. They glibly employ the cliche that to oppose the federally financed drive is to deny the poor equal participation in government. Some go farther and vilify honest opposition based upon principle with the partisan inference that Republicans fear that most poor persons would favor the Democratic Party.

Although some in my district have gone so far as to allege that the poor are afraid to sign a registration affidavit because they do not understand it, that they will not register unless approached in their native tongue instead of the English language, and they must be encouraged to register through the use of skits because they are not accustomed to reading, I do not share their lack of confidence in poor people. If they are encouraged to register, I, as a Republican, am willing to take my chances with full confidence that my party will receive a substantial share of their votes.

Those who challenge motives ignore principle. Throughout political history it is an accepted practicality that any administration, regardless of its political complexion, has the power to exert pressure against its employees. This is the reason the spoils system was rejected in favor of the protected civil service system. This is the reason for the Hatch Act and numerous other Federal laws and regulations. Who can be so naive as to say that in this political day and age, an administration—any administration—will not see to it that the employees it has hired conduct themselves to the political advantage of the party in power? It is easy to talk in high-sounding platitudes and profess good intentions, but in the final practical analysis you will not subdue partisan influence if it is furnished a field in which to grow.

One of the great strengths of our free government is the system of checks and balances against an administration in power. This voter-registration drive, conducted by federally paid employees with Federal tax dollars, could be the beginning of an erosion of that principle.

Let the Economic Opportunity Commission cooperate with both of our great political parties, urging them and the duly appointed registrars to redouble their efforts to contact the poor. Let the community action agencies talk to the poor, explain the registration process and urge that they assume the responsibilities of citizenship along with other Americans by walking to the firehouse or any other place of registration and registering to vote. Let the Republican and Democratic Parties, the labor unions, the League of Women Voters, and other groups go to their homes and register them. But to use Federal employees to plan, direct, or actually conduct the registration is, first of all, wrong in principle. Second, it is certainly a violation of the intent of Federal law, and last, it is Federal intervention into what is constitutionally a State function.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Office of Economic Opportunity will be consistent in the application of principle and will extend the restrictions in memorandum 50-A to include the actual registration of voters as a prohibited activity.

JOHNSVILLE INVENTION SAVES NAVY $1.5 MILLION

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BIESTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks the Members of this House have spent many hours in consideration of billions of dollars of appropriations to be spent by the Federal Government. Many of my colleagues have brought to the attention of the Members the dangers of deficit spending, the waste in spending, and the increased level in spending in recent years.

Therefore, I was very impressed when it was brought to my attention that an employee of the Department of Defense, who lives and works in the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, had actually saved our country nearly $1,500,000.

Mr. Frank R. Previti, 550 Winchester Road, Warminster, Pa., working with Mr. Oscar Shames, 1652 East Walnut Lane, Philadelphia, Pa., invented a frequency synthesizer for generating radio frequencies simulative of the frequencies used in air-to-air tactical air navigation ranging systems. Mr. Previti and Mr. Shames, employees of the Aero Electronic Technology Department of the U.S. Naval Air Development Center in Johnsville, Warminster, Pa., applied to the Patent Office and were granted a patent for this invention, which saved the Government from buying $1,437,244 worth of new test equipment for the Navy's revised tactical air navigation—tacan—system. The frequency synthesizer modified equipment originally designed to simulate only air-to-ground tacan frequencies by giving it 42 additional operating channels.

In recognition of the service these gentlemen performed for our Government, they were granted an award of $2,440 to be shared equally between them. They are also being considered for the Civil Service Commission Honor Roll of Economy Champions, and there exists the possibility that they may be named Super Economy Champions at the end of fiscal year 1967.

It seems to me significant that this invention was accomplished at all, since the contractor and the systems engineers had agreed that such a modification was impossible. But even more significant is the fact that the major work in the development of this invention was performed by Mr. Previti on his own time at home. No assignment, official or unofficial, was made at that time to Mr. Previti. It was only after Mr. Previti had made disclosure of the success of his work to his immediate supervisor that he was assigned the task of constructing a model of the invention for test and evaluation purposes.

I bring this information to the attention of the Members of the House because I am proud of the accomplishments of Mr. Previti and Mr. Shames, I am proud of their contribution to the national well-being, I am proud that Mr. Previti is a resident of my congressional district, and I am proud of the honor that these men have brought to the Johnsville Naval Air Development Center and the dedicated men who work there.

TREASURY SILVER TODAY AND TOMORROW'S PROSPECTS

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Stephen Davis Hopkins, my constituent, is a financial analyst.

My colleagues will be interested in the fact that as of November 17, 1966, he predicted that the last remaining bond between intrinsic value coins and bullion-backed paper currency would be broken by the Treasury Department. This prediction was covered by Coin World, the weekly newspaper for the numismatic field.

Mr. Hopkins' views on the silver question are set forth in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of Thursday, May 11, and I bring this to the attention of my colleagues:

TREASURY SILVER TODAY AND TOMORROW'S PROSPECTS

(By Stephen Davis Hopkins, U.S. Monetary Analyst, New York City)

(A leading scholar in the field of money, Mr. Hopkins cites chapter and verse to back up his indictment of Treasury's failure to honor our country's statutory silver redemption pledge. He says that Sect. 3518 of the Rev. Statutes is in effect which calls for the recoinage of silver bullion for individual or private account. Points out that: (1) the small holder has been illegally denied constitutional right to obtain silver dollars; and (2) the issuance of silver dust or granules by the Treasury is neither bullion nor silver dollars and, hence, unlawful. Blames our coinage shortage on currency debauchment and flays Treasury practices as a travesty, fraud and repudiation of our laws.)

The current request by the custodian for 200 million domestic currency users that their elected representatives in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled authorized, and the President of the United States then approved, the confiscation of silver bullion backing their legal tender warehouse receipts, known as silver certificates, bearing the Seal of the Treasury Department of the United States of America, is a travesty on that Seal and what it stands for and a fraud on the currency users.

TRAVESTY OF TREASURY SEAL

The Seal's three component parts are the key for security, scales for honesty and carpenter's square for integrity. The Latin legend means "The Seal of the Treasury of North America."

Designed by Gouverneur Morris about 1778, it was approved by the Continental Congress and slightly modified by Alexander Hamilton who adopted it as first Secretary of the Treasury under our Constitution.

The Seal may antedate the Great Seal of the United States. It has appeared on all government sponsored paper currencies since 1861, excepting first two issues of fractional currency, attesting to our government's good faith and Treasury Department's integrity.

The Monetary Act of 1963 stated that ". . . The Secretary of the Treasury shall maintain the ownership and the possession or control within the United States of an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates . . . Silver certificates shall be exchangeable on demand at the Treasury of the United States for silver dollars or, at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury . . . for silver bullion of a monetary value equal to the face amount of the certificates."

July 22, 1963, the Secretary issued instructions concerning silver certificate redemption. They stated in part that ". . . Delivery of the silver bullion shall be effected at the assay office in fine silver bars of approximately 1,000 ounces . . ." That directive specifically stated that silver would be in "bars" which is bullion, and was reaffirmed March 25, 1964. Dust or granules were not mentioned.

SMALL HOLDERS RIGHTS DENIED

Today, holders of small amounts of certificates are denied their Constitutional right to receive silver dollars. Unless they can afford to accumulate about $1,300, they cannot obtain silver bullion in the form of 1,000 ounce bars or larger which are obtainable through Federal Reserve banks as fiscal agents for the Treasury Department.

In order to save face during the coin shortage, after depletion of silver dollar supply, Treasury started redeeming (Mar. 26, 1964) at the two Assay Offices, small amounts of silver certificates with dust and granules in manila envelopes. This was then considered a temporary expedient by currency users but that practice has continued.

This writer has been stating for over two years that the issuing of this silver dust-granules does not have Congressional authorization. Small amounts are being redeemed in person at both New York and San Francisco Assay Offices, with manila or plastic envelopes containing pure silver dust (N.Y.) and granules (S.F.) with, most if not all, weighing less than the monetary value of 371¼ grains of pure silver as required by law. No deviation or tolerance from this amount is permitted. No market exists for this type of merchandise unless sold at a discount. This dust/granules is NOT bullion and its issuance is NOT lawful. (See Coin World, Mar. 31, 1965 and The Commercial and Financial Chronicle, Nov. 17, 1966—Ed.).

With the coin shortage officially terminated August 1, 1966 to continue to issue silver in such form is nothing less than a fraud on domestic currency users and a display of total disregard for the security, honesty and integrity of Treasury's renowned Seal.

MINOR COINS PRODUCTION

With the coin shortage now history, the only advantage to the Treasury in maintaining the silver dollar at par by holding the dollar price of silver at $1.2929 per fine ounce, is to allow the mints more time to manufacture minor coins. During first three months of 1967, minor coin production, compared with same period last year, was as follows: cents—down 46%, nickels—down 60%, quarters—down 36% and dimes—up 103% attesting to the adequate supply of all pieces excepting the dime which supply situation should be soon corrected at present accelerated pace.

Currency users should never forget that the Treasury acted in dual role of middleman, when it was buying silver bullion, and custodian when it released legal tender warehouse receipts for circulation. These certificates are in reality receipts for ore and bullion purchased at a huge discount by middleman which were then monetized by being placed in daily trade as legal tender by custodian at the marked up to parity price of $1.2929 per ounce for the dollar and its certificates and $1.38 for fractional subsidiary silver pieces, to realize an extremely handsome profit. Domestic purchases cost Treasury absolutely nothing but about 9 mills to print each certificate. Sole obligation incurred by Treasury, when certificates were issued was to honor pledge to redeem that paper on demand in either legal tender discs at 412½ grains, 900 fine (standard silver dollars) or bullion bars stamped by the issuing agent with name, weight and fineness.

Subsidiary silver pieces are all dated 1964 or before, while our new minor coins, the quarter and dime, bear the year 1965 or later. Fractional coins are not subsidiary unless they have a silver content which is less than their unit, the silver dollar. Complete transition to the new coinage will not be completed until dollar price of silver rises to $1.38 per fine ounce or higher.

THE REASON FOR REDEMPTION

The corridors of time are replete with examples of financially embarrassed governments casting covetous eyes on their subjects' precious metal and finally yielding to temptation by substituting for gold and silver coins, precious bullion and representative certificates, non-interest earning irredeemable legal tender promissory notes (I.O.U.'s). Monetary authorities recognize the Federal Reserve note as a forced loan or forced currency.

In times of crises, currency users the world over invariably reach for security in the form of the precious metals. That has always been the prime function of gold and silver. The only reason rulers have been required by their subjects to maintain one or both of these noble metals behind their paper issues is to insure redemption on demand and thus maintain their government's domestic and international integrity and credit.

$1 Federal Reserve notes were placed in direct competition with our silver coins and certificates with the full intent to drive them all out of circulation. This is known as debauching the currency and is the prime factor responsible for our recent coin shortage.

With Fed's notes selling at a huge discount in terms of silver (26.9c) our forced currency is in excessive supply and grossly redunant. The standard silver dollar with its workhorse certificates are now the most valuable legal tender in the United States. Having a 77+ percent content of a pure ounce of silver, the price rise of that commodity since November 1961 has riveted currency users' attention on the long-dormant store-of-value role which our unit plays when silver reached $1.2929 per fine ounce (Sept. 1963) and the dollar and its certificates were worth exactly $1.00 in silver. From then on, daily decisions have been whether our dollar and its paper were more interesting as legal tender or as investment media or hedge in the second stage of the most virulent paper currency inflation which this country has witnessed since 1776. That bygone currency was finally redeemed 1c on the paper dollar as measured by the silver dollar then current.

As metallic money, the silver dollar and certificate serve the four time-honored functions of money: Unit of value, measure of value, legal tender and storage of value. In this latter role, our silver money is functioning in a normal manner for the first time since 1874. The Federal Reserve note serves only as legal tender for the settlement of debts in daily trade and is not considered money but its paper substitute.

Our first standard silver dollar coinage for government account took place 1878 because the dollar price of silver was declining and it was economic to do so. From 1794 to 1873, it has always been coined for private or individual account. In order to increase dollar's appeal and use in daily trade, representative silver deposit certificates were first authorized in 1878 and went into circulation stating that custodial agent had one or more silver dollars awaiting redemption on demand. Supreme Court declared them to be warehouse receipts.

These deposit certificates in circulation totalled $387,073,075, June 30, 1929. Small sized certificates were issued July 1, 1929. The large size were finally dropped from Treasury's books under the Old Series Currency Adjustment Act of 1961. $15 million were written off as lost, destroyed and never to be presented for redemption Oct. 21, 1961, $14.5 million Nov. 16, 1964 and $280,000 May 26, 1966 for a total of $29,780,000 which are still outstanding. Treasury's admitted balance as of Mar. 31, 1967, was $143,671 (est.) with 2,981,603 standard silver dollars in Treasurer's vaults and 46,980 in the entire Federal Reserve System to insure redemption as authorizing Act stated that "Nothing contained in this Act shall impair the redeemability of any currency of the United States as now provided by law."

Precious monetary metals, with a free international market, are the only reliable and time-honored measure of the value of a country's domestic paper. Retail and wholesale price indexes are apt to be inaccurate and misleading.

Created by the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, the new silver certificates again represented the standard silver dollar which became our de facto domestic unit of value while the new gold dollar was earmarked to be our de jure international trade unit. Later, the International Monetary Fund selected that gold dollar to be one of its two reserve currencies for settlement of international balances.

WHAT THE LAW STATES

The 1934 version blandly stated on its obverse side that there was on deposit "one dollar in silver" which was payable on demand thereby reflecting that bullion was allowed to act as cover for the first time. That law flatly stated that these certificates were redeemable "on demand at the Treasury of the United States in standard silver dollars" and the Secretary of the Treasury was "Authorized to coin standard silver dollars for such redemption." None have been struck since September 1935. Under the Monetary Act of 1939, amended 1946, coinage into dollars was mandatory for all silver purchased by Treasury excepting government's seigniorage or profit. Under those two acts some 487 million silver dollars have been denied domestic currency users.

Currently, our custodian has 427.3 million ounces (Apr. 27, 1967) of silver bullion backing certificates in amount of about $555 million, the breakdown of which is estimated to be $390 million in 1's, $130 million in 5's and $35 million in 10's, a large part of which is represented by Treasury as being lost, destroyed and thus never to be presented for redemption. This condition is purely artificial. This monetary fallacy will continue as long as the Treasury refuses to honor its pledge to currency users to redeem certificates with silver dollars and/or bullion. Small owners are locked in and will accept no other substitute unless compelled to do so by personal circumstances. Hardcore paper currency collectors may possibly withhold 6–7% of what is outstanding if large size certificates are any criteria.

SECTION 3518 OF REVISED STATUTES

With the Silver Purchase Acts of 1934, 1939 and 1946 repealed in 1963, it may well be that Section 3518 of Revised Statutes now is in full force and effect as far as silver is concerned. Research fails to reveal that it has ever been amended or repealed.

Section 3518 states that "At the option of the owner gold or silver may be cast into bars of fine metal, or of standard fineness, or unparted, as he may prefer, with a stamp upon the same designating the weight and fineness, and with such devices impressed thereon as may be deemed expedient to prevent fraudulent imitation, and no such bars shall be issued of a less weight that five ounces."

EXPERIENCING REPUDIATION

At 2 p.m., Tuesday, March 28, 1967, this writer presented two $1 silver certificates at the New York Assay Office for redemption in silver. He was told that silver could only be issued in dollar multiples but not simultaneously for each separate certificate. Both had been issued by Treasury Department and both carried that Department's renowned Seal.

One certificate was then withdrawn and other was presented for redemption. A small manila envelope was received which was pocketed by receiver. Request had previously been made, and denied, for a covering letter certifying contents as to quality and quantity as well as issuer's identity.

The second $1 silver certificate was then presented and demand was made three times in a firm voice for redemption in silver. This was refused. The bearer was told that he would have to leave the premises and then return in order to redeem that certificate.

When the heavy doors clanged shut on that unhonored and unredeemed $1 silver certificate, the bearer had just witnessed the repudiation of our currency by its issuing agent. A few minutes later, he returned and exchanged it for another small envelope.

Both envelopes were then taken to a reputable assayer, marked by that person and weighed. The contents of envelope received for first $1 certificate weighed 370.89 grains and the second 371.09 grains with weigher reporting that one piece of dust was stuck in a corner of envelope and could not be dislodged. In order to be of monetary value, weight must be 371.25 grains without any remedy of the mint or tolerance factor permitted.

Other currency users have reported that they had similar experiences in both Assay Offices and in most, if not all cases, silver certificates have not been redeemed with the required legal amount of silver in amounts less than 1,000 ounces. Redemption of small amounts must be made in person at Assay Offices. No redemption is permitted by mail.

FREE CHOICE DENIED

Freedom of monetary choice between metallic money and a redundant forced paper is being denied currency users. That freedom of choice was guaranteed today's 200 million currency users when the same Gouverneur Morris penned into Section 10 of the Constitution of the United States that ". . . No State shall make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts . . ."

It would seem to be in the public interest that once again our silver dollar of 371¼ grains of pure silver be coined for individual account and small currency users be returned the option to obtain dollars or bullion for their certificates.

Confiscation, travesty, fraud and repudiation are strong words. With one of the world's best coin and currency systems a shambles, if stronger words could be found, they would be used.

U.S. silver monetary stocks—Ounces

[In thousands]

Month	Total stock	Certificates outstanding	Treasury free stock	Certificates in F.R.Bs.[1] [2]
1965				
June	980, 277	683, 654	296, 623	42, 800
July	954, 876	651, 819	303, 057	43, 500
August	942, 845	617, 686	325, 159	34, 000
September	901, 858	591, 820	310, 038	33, 700
October	865, 735	567, 625	298. 110	27, 400
November	829, 294	547, 012	282. 282	19, 800
December	801, 320	529, 474	271, 846	24, 800
1966				
January	782, 234	517, 470	264, 764	29, 200
February	762, 980	505, 286	257, 694	25, 900
March	746, 106	490, 931	255, 175	20, 200
April	725, 969	480, 464	245, 505	19, 700
May	705, 930	470, 114	235, 816	12, 900
June	687, 119	463, 356	223, 763	13, 300
July	672, 897	457, 893	215, 004	13, 400
August	649, 956	451, 783	198, 173	12, 200
September	628, 836	447, 149	181, 687	10, 100
October	615, 667	442, 481	173, 186	7, 200
November	601, 477	439, 770	161, 708	5, 900
December	591, 941	437, 657	154, 283	6, 700
1967				
January	565, 707	434, 950	130, 757	7, 900
February	547, 828	431, 785	116, 044	6, 700
March	529, 397	429, 545	99, 852	7, 000
April[3]	516, 869	427, 340	89, 529	5, 000

[1] Included in "Certificates outstanding."

[2] Estimate

[3] April 27.

U.S. Treasury silver transactions, July 1965 to date

[Millions of ounces]

Month	Total stock	Silver certificates	Free balance
1965			
July	−25. 4	−31. 3	+5. 9
August	−12. 0	−34. 7	+22. 7
September	−41. 0	−25. 9	−15. 1
October	−36. 2	−24. 2	−12. 0
November	−36. 4	−20. 6	−15. 8
December	−28. 0	−17. 5	−10. 5
1966			
January	−19. 0	−12. 0	−7. 0
February	−19. 0	−12. 2	−6. 8
March	−16. 9	−14. 4	−2. 5
April	−20. 1	−10. 4	−9. 7
May	−20. 1	−10. 4	−9. 7
June	−18. 7	−6. 7	−12. 0
July	−14. 3	−5. 5	−8. 8
August	−22. 9	−6. 1	−16. 8
September	−21. 1	−4. 6	−16. 5
October	−13. 2	−4. 7	−8. 5
November	−14. 2	−2. 7	−11. 5
December	−9. 5	−2. 1	−7. 4
1967			
January	−26. 2	−2. 7	−23. 5
February	−17. 9	−3. 2	−14. 7
March	−18. 4	−2. 2	−16. 2
April[1]	−12. 5	−2. 2	−10. 3

[1] April 27th.

Sources: Daily Statement of the U.S. Treasury; Monthly Statement of U.S. Currency and Coin.

HUALAPAI DAM SHOULD GENERATE MAXIMUM ENERGY

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the American Public Power Association, certainly one of this Nation's foremost management organizations, has given its considerable endorsement to a power development plan that substantially enhances the economic attractiveness of pending Colorado River Basin project legislation.

In a resolution adopted at its recent annual meeting in Denver, Colo., the APPA said it "recommends the immediate investigation" of the Hualapai 5 million-kilowatt hydroelectric-pumped storage peaking powerplant—on the lower Colorado River in Arizona—proposed by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. And if the department of water and power analysis is confirmed, the APPA resolution stated, the organization recommends the adoption of that plan in the Federal construction of the Hualapai Dam and powerplant.

The APPA, which represents more than 1,400 municipal and other local publicly owned electric systems in the United States, has informed the House Interior Committee of its action. For the Record, I am enclosing a copy of the APPA resolution, as well as a copy of the letter of transmittal from Alex Radin, general manager of APPA.

It was before the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee that Floyd L. Goss, chief electrical engineer and assistant manager of the department of water and power, first submitted the outline of his Hualapai plan almost 3 months ago. This occurred on the final day of our hearings on H.R. 3300 and other related bills on the Colorado River Basin project, the economic heart of which is the development of the Hualapai site.

All of the pending House and Senate bills containing provisions for developing the Hualapai site contemplate a Federal power project that would cost the United States an estimated $540 million and would have an installed capacity of only 1.5 million kilowatts.

However, under one alternative approach of the Goss plan the Federal investment could be reduced to $254 million with the participation of department of water and power and other Southwest public and private utilities. And, mark this, the power output would be more than treble that of the other existing proposals.

Mr. Goss' plan made a tremendous impression on members of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee and I said then, and will repeat again, that this is the most constructive, visionary idea that ever has been put forth for developing the immense potential of the Hualapai site.

The partnership arrangement suggested by Mr. Goss is similar to that which enabled Hoover Dam to be such an eminently successful and efficient operation. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, which was a major contributor to that success, now stands ready to more than match that effort for the Goss plan.

In fact, as Mr. Goss stated during the recent Senate Water and Power Resources Subcommittee hearings on these bills, department of water and power is willing to take at least one-fifth of Hualapai's proposed capacity, or one million kilowatts. That is nearly Hoover's entire capacity now. And if additional capacity is made available, he added, department of water and power would be interested further to contract for substantially more than that amount. That is putting your money where your mouth is, I would say.

The arrangements under which Hoover Dam was constructed bear another important similarity with this new Goss plan. I do not believe it is a widely known fact but the Federal Government established an unusual precedent in laying down the ground rules for Hoover Dam. One of the conditions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1929 stated that no funds could be appropriated or spent on construction of the dam until the Secretary of the Interior had first made contracts for the sale of power and storage of water at Hoover Dam adequate to assure—in advance—repayment of the Government's investment there.

Well, California met those conditions and Hoover Dam was completed in 1938. Never since has the requirement for guaranteed repayment of Treasury funds been made part of a Federal waterpower, multipurpose project.

Now along comes the Goss proposal which will also require execution of firm contracts by the power utilities to market Hualapai energy under similar terms. This likewise will guarantee repayment to the United States of the funds it would invest in the project. But the Goss plan goes further yet. It proposed prepayments by the utilities to reduce the amount of the Federal capital investment. In other words, when the Hualapai project is approved, the United States will know the power is already sold and its money will be returned.

So, here we have, as a starter, the department of water and power—the largest municipal water and power utility system in the Nation—willing to stake millions of dollars in this project. With that lead, others will certainly follow. Gentlemen, our Government could not ask for a better deal. And with the interest that will be paid by the water and power users, we have got a proposal that is better than gilt-edge bonds.

What Uncle Sam should be doing right now, I daresay, is wooing and romancing the department of water and power and other proponents of the Goss plan. And if we cannot arrange a marriage right now, let us at least get engaged.

The endorsement of maximum development of Hualapai Dam site by APPA and the APPA's June 5 letter to Senator Jackson regarding the subject follow:

ENDORSEMENT OF MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT OF HUALAPAI DAM SITE

The American Public Power Association approves and endorses the maximum development of the nation's hydroelectric sites as sources for electric power to satisfy the needs of public agencies. The Association opposes the principle proposed by the Secretary of the Interior in S. 1013 which would substitute a plan calling for pre-payment to utilities for steam power in place of federal construction of the badly needed hydroelectric plant at the Hualapai Dam site on the Colorado River.

The American Public Power Association reaffirms its endorsement of the federal construction of the Hualapai Dam to such height and with such installed capacity as will effect the maximum economic development of the power resources at this site, subject to the preference rights of public agencies under applicable federal statutes. It recommends the immediate investigation of the pumped-storage plan for the Hualapai power plant with a capacity of approximately 5 million kilowatts, proposed by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, and, if the City's analysis is confirmed, recommends the adoption of that plan in the federal construction of the Hualapai Dam and power plant.

The Association reaffirms its recommendation that associated water resource studies proposed be conducted, as expeditiously as feasible, under the direction and control of a National Water Commission composed of citizens outside of federal government service, as proposed in Senator Jackson's bill S. 20, 90th Congress.

AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1967.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: The American Public Power Association is a national trade organization representing more than 1,400 local publicly owned electric utilities, mainly municipal systems, in 45 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

On May 11, 1967, at the APPA 24th annual conference held in Denver, the Association's membership adopted the attached resolution endorsing Federal construction of Hualapai Dam on the Colorado River and investigation of a proposed 5 million kilowatt pumped storage project at this site. The resolution opposes the principle proposed by the Secretary of the Interior in S. 1013 which would substitute a plan calling for prepayment to utilities for steam power in place of Federal construction of the hydroelectric plant at the Hualapai Dam site. In addition, the resolution reaffirms the Association's support of a National Water Commission.

Because our resolution was adopted after the close of hearings conducted by your Committee on S. 1013, it was of course not possible for us to submit our views at the hearings. We are therefore taking this means of transmitting our resolution to you and the other members of your committee, and would also like to elaborate somewhat on the position taken in our resolution.

In February, 1967, Secretary Udall announced his proposal by which the Federal government would pre-pay for 400 megawatts of power from a non-Federal thermal plant to obtain pumping power for the Central Arizona Project. He has termed this plan "non-controversial"; however, a pre-payment plan constituting a purchase of power represents a major step away from Federal multiple-purpose water resource development policies and programs approved by Congress in the past and eliminates entirely the concept of hydroelectric power as a "paying partner" for reclamation.

The Colorado River is the life-blood of many thousands of people throughout the Colorado River Basin. Taken together, existing and planned dams on the Colorado constitute a system for conserving and utilizing water resources for the entire Pacific Southwest. They provide power, flood control, water storage, stream flow control and distribution of water for irrigation, municipal and industrial uses, silt control, recreation, and fish and wildlife conservation. The components of the basin system do not all provide the same services or to the same degree; indeed, they are not designed to do so. On the contrary, they supplement and complement each other.

Hualapai Dam would constitute a new part of the system. It would provide power, water storage, and silt control. Its power plant would be integrated with other regional generating plants, both hydraulically and electrically.

An essential component of Hualapai Dam is the power generating capability of this project which could provide substantial revenues—not only for repaying the reimbursable costs of the dam, but also for a development fund financing facilities to make maximum use of existing water in the region. Under the Administration proposal, however, the Government would share in the cost of the power plant without benefit of ownership or the revenues that would accrue from Government construction of the dam.

An innovating approach to Hualapai Dam, made possible by technological advances, was proposed by Floyd Goss, Chief Electrical Engineer and Assistant Manager of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, earlier this year. By use of reversible pump turbines, a 5 million kilowatt peaking pumped-storage project could be constructed at the Hualapai site. The Los Angeles analysis of this proposal indicates its feasibility and its economic benefits.

Growing demand for electricity in the Southwest, plus the necessary increased use of thermal plants, insures the marketability of this peaking power. In the years 1970 to 1980, an additional six to nine million kilowatts of peaking power will be required in the states surrounding the Hualapai site, and by 1990 the regional need for peaking power will reach approximately 19 million kilowatts. These states are interconnected with other states, which will also provide a market area for this power.

While power available from the development of the Hualapai site will serve Arizona, Southern California, and Southern Nevada directly, its influence will extend broadly over the area referred to as Region VIII by the Federal Power Commission, which encompasses most of Arizona, Nevada and California.

Region VIII is in the midst of a tremendous population explosion. Southern California is expected to have 30 million people by the year 2000. The Phoenix metropolitan area is expected to reach 2.5 million by the year 2000.

FPC projections indicate that overall per-capita energy demand will grow in a spectacular fashion. In Southern California and Central Nevada, the per-capita demand will increase from the current average of 4200 kwh per annum to over 10,000 by 1990; in Arizona, the per-capita demand will increase from 8300 kwh per annum to 14,200. In Region VIII from 1965 to 1980 the total *peak demand* for power will increase from about 20 million KW in 1965 to 52 million KW in 1980.

In view of the historic role of Federal power in this region, and in recognition of the fact that power produced from the Lower Colorado River project will be marketed under Reclamation law, every effort should be made to insure that preference customers are given a full opportunity to share equitably in the benefits of hydro peaking capacity—directly or indirectly.

If the feasibility analysis made by Los Angeles is confirmed, the American Public Power Association endorses prompt construction of the project by the Federal government, in conjunction with the traditional preference clause for marketing the output of the project. We believe that a potential asset of 5 million kilowatts of capacity, and 5 billion kilowatt-hours of energy available to preference customers, is too important a resource to forgo.

The Administration has recommended deferral of authorization of Hualapai Dam because of concern over scenic considerations. We feel the project's cost-benefit ratio and the future demands for power suggest that it be made an integral part of the Lower Colorado River development now. From the standpoint of accepted tests of economic and financial feasibility, Hualapai Dam represents an exceptionally sound investment. Further, it lays an impressive financial foundation for works to develop the water supply of the Hualapai Dam on the scenic grandeur of the Grand Canyon would be imperceptible, while access to more remote portions of the Grand Canyon would be greatly enhanced. Construction of Hualapai Dam would enable thousands of people annually to appreciate the scenic beauties of areas of the Canyon which only a handful of "river-runners" are able to view today. We feel that deferring action on this aspect of the project on the ground of destroying aesthetic values is not justified.

In 1919, when Grand Canyon National Park was created by an act of Congress, the necessity for multiple use was anticipated, requiring the balancing of water-development and park-preservation values. Accordingly, the following language was included in the Act:

"That whenever consistent with the primary purposes of said park, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to permit the utilization of areas therein which may be necessary for the development and maintenance of a Government Reclamation project. . . ."

In the debate in the House at that time, Arizona's Senator Carl Hayden, then a Representative, expounded the purpose of this amendment as follows:

"The provision contained in the bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior, when consistent with the primary purposes of the Park—that is, not to impair the scenic beauty—to allow storage reservoirs to be constructed for conserving the water of the Colorado River for irrigation purposes."

Furthermore, as Hualapai Dam (formerly called Bridge Canyon Dam) relates to Grand Canyon National Monument, which was established with its present boundaries by Presidential proclamation on December 22, 1932, there is the following letter of January 11, 1933, from Horace M. Albright, then Director of the National Park Service, to Dr. Elwood Mead, then Commissioner of Reclamation:

"As I see it, the Bridge Canyon Project is in no way affected by the Grand Canyon National Monument proclamation . . . We have had in mind all the time, the Bridge Canyon project. While I did not handle this personally, I am absolutely certain that the men who did handle it for me kept the project in mind in formulating the Grand Canyon National Monument plan."

Thus, we have this evidence of long range recognition, extending back to the days when the National Park and Monument were created, that ultimately there would be a Reclamation project that would affect the Park and Monument.

Although Hualapai Dam would not invade the Grand Canyon National Park, it has been claimed that if reclamation projects are constructed within national parks, a dangerous precedent may be established which will threaten the unaltered appearance of all our National Parks. This argument is misleading. There are at least four precedents, that I am aware of, for combining reclamation projects and national parks.

1. Jackson Lake Dam is within Grand Teton National Park. It stores water for the Minidoka Reclamation Project, providing irrigation for 1,162,000 acres of land in Southern Idaho. Although the Park was created after the dam was built, this is recognition by Congress that a reclamation project may complement a national park.

2. The reclamation reservoir behind Sherburne Dam is almost entirely within Glacier National Park. In this instance the park was created first. The Milk River Project which it serves provides irrigation for 120,000 acres around Havre, Montana.

3. The Lower Two Medicine Dam also is in Glacier National Park. This is a Bureau of Indian Affairs operation for the benefit of the Black Feet Tribe. While it was washed

out last year, it is now being rebuilt by the Bureau of Reclamation.

4. Fontana Lake forms the boundary for miles of Great Smoky Mountains National Park and provides 248 miles of shoreline. It was built by TVA for power generation and flood control.

No one has asserted that Grand Teton, Glacier, or Great Smoky Mountains are less majestic because of these dams. To the contrary, an argument can be made that their beauty and usefulness have been greatly enhanced.

Some contend that Hualapai Dam would "flood" the Grand Canyon. *If* a dam could be built big enough to flood the Grand Canyon, the stored water would solve the water problems of the Pacific Southwest for centuries. Nobody advocates this solution to the water problem.

The fact is that after the Hualapai Dam reservoir is constructed, over 99 percent of the park will remain in its natural condition. The Colorado River forms the northwest boundary for the Grand Canyon National Park and serves as the southern boundary for most of the Grand Canyon National Monument. Hualapai Dam would back water up the Colorado for 93.8 miles, and the last 13 miles at the head of the reservoir would form the park boundary. Hence, the water impounded by Hualapai Dam would not back up "into" the park or "throughout" the monument. Nor can it be considered to "flood" this area. For instance, the normal level of the river at the extreme northwest boundary of the park with Hualapai Dam would be raised by only 90 feet, and this added depth would decrease to nothing 13 miles upstream. The canyon wall of the inner gorge at this point is 1200 to 1500 feet above the river bed. Furthermore, this stretch of river is inaccessible by normal means and cannot be seen from any viewpoint on the canyon rim within the park. A stretch of 104 miles of natural river will remain between the headwaters of Hualapai Dam and the Marble Canyon Dam site. This 104 miles of natural river will include about 91 miles within the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park. The same matchless and unaltered view will be available from the North or South rims. The same mule-back trips or long arduous foot descent and climb will be possible and in no way deteriorated or impaired.

The National Park Service has reported that from 1955 to 1963, 1,300 persons made the boat trip through the Grand Canyon and viewed the area where Hualapai Dam reservoir would be if the project were constructed. Accessibility to this part of the river would be increased. The National Park Service estimates that hundreds of thousands of people would be able to visit the area annually. The beauty of the Hualapai Dam reservoir would be comparable to that of Lake Powell and Flaming Gorge. Making this area accessible to interested persons is certainly consistent with the National Park program. Creating a lake with the beauties of Flaming Gorge and Lake Powell is certainly not inconsistent with the objectives of the National Park program.

Intrinsic to the APPA resolution endorsing development of the Hualapai site is the creation of a separate National Water Commission as approved this year by the Senate. Independent of any government agency, this commission would be able to make an objective study of water resources and needs of the nation, and to formulate recommendations for meeting projected water needs. Without a specified importation proposal, development of Hualapai Dam proposes no threat to the present water supply of any region of the country. Water needs and methods of meeting these needs would be entirely within the jurisdiction of the National Water Commission, which could consider, among other matters, means for further supplementing the water supply of the Southwest.

APPA urges that the Senate Interior Committee support Federal development of the Hualapai site, and encourage immediate studies by the Department of the Interior of the feasibility of the Goss plan to insure maximum utilization of this reach of the Lower Colorado River.

Sincerely,

ALEX RADIN.

OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to outline for my colleagues in the House, the major proposals that are incorporated in the Republican opportunity crusade that I have introduced today. This opportunity crusade is launched with the view not only to vastly improving operative programs, but also to developing new programs that will find all levels of government working with the private sector of our society in a concerted effort to provide rewarding job opportunities and a full measure of human dignity for this Nation's poor men and women.

I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to commend my able colleague from New York [Mr. GOODELL], for his many outstanding contributions to this bill. Mr. GOODELL is in the vanguard of those in the House who are genuinely concerned and actively working toward the implementation of measures that will find those isolated and forgotten Americans—the poor—once again assuming a meaningful and rewarding place in American society.

A special word of recognition and appreciation goes out to Representatives WILLIAM H. AYRES, ALPHONZO BELL, EDWARD J. GURNEY, JOHN N. ERLENBORN, JOHN R. DELLENBACK, MARVIN L. ESCH, EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, WILLIAM A. STEIGER, PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, JAMES V. SMITH, DON H. CLAUSEN, and ED REINECKE—all of whom are joining in the sponsorship of this measure, for their untiring efforts and their constructive and creative roles in the development of this bill.

Among the new Republican ideas is the creation of a high-level, three-man Council of Economic Opportunity Advisers to the President. The Council would be patterned after the existing Council of Economic Advisers and be charged with responsibility for helping the President coordinate and eliminate the contradictions among the manifold and multiformed poverty-oriented programs now spread throughout virtually every agency of Government.

The Republican proposals would eliminate the Office of Economic Opportunity, transferring its functions to existing Federal agencies. No independent agency can hope to coordinate effectively the many Federal activities designed to help the poor. Only the President can do that. The new Council would be the kind of strong right arm the President needs. In addition to making recommendations for action by the President and Congress, the Council would develop new data and perform continuing evaluation and research studies, charting our Nation's course in a "crusade for opportunity" that will eliminate poverty.

The opportunity crusade would drastically revise and redirect the war on poverty. We do not offer this as a final or inflexible substitute. It is a collection of proposals and suggestions that we are advancing prior to the opening of hearings, just as the administration has advanced its various suggestions in a single bill. We note a major congressional shift in sentiment toward the poverty war, and we believe it will be possible this year to make major changes on a bipartisan basis. We intend to strive for that objective, cooperating to the extent possible with the Democrats during the hearings and the writing of the legislation.

Although the opportunity crusade would cost $300 million less in Federal expenditures the first year than the war on poverty, it would make available a total of $2.4 billion from State, private, and Federal sources, as contrasted with a little over $2 billion in the war on poverty.

The opportunity crusade would substantially increase funds for Headstart and unearmarked funds for community action programs. It would begin the process of infusing into existing agencies the new spirit and new approach that can be generated by true involvement of the poor in helping themselves.

In the opportunity crusade the Job Corps would be phased over into the vocational education system, with a mandate that, wherever possible, new residential skill centers be combined with technical institutes, area vocational schools, and community training centers for regular trainees who are not poor. A new Industry Youth Corps, along with employer tax credits, would provide "jobs with dignity" in private enterprise. Military career centers would be available to upgrade volunteers who cannot meet Selective Service standards. Part-time jobs for high school students who need money to stay in school would be administered by the school systems themselves. Headstart would be transferred to the Office of Education and administered, with State coordination, through local community action boards. Community action and VISTA would be transferred to a new Community Action division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare headed by an Assistant Secretary. All poverty programs would be transferred to existing agencies at the Federal level.

The opportunity crusade provides a realistic, coordinated administrative structure. It contains specific guidelines that will eliminate the waste and overlap in the present program. It prohibits any political activity by poverty workers. It emphasizes jobs rather than doles. The poverty war desperately requires major redirection. We intend to give impetus to improving the program and to getting meaningful help to the poor themselves. Without a new direction, we believe the present poverty war will not survive this Congress.

FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Extension Service is part of the cooperative extension service partnership in which the three levels of government—Federal, State, and county—share in financing, planning, and carrying out extension educational programs.

The Extension Service acts as the education agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the land-grant universities. This Cooperative Extension Service presently is in operation in almost all rural areas, as well as most metropolitan areas of the Nation. But there is no program in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, having seen what this service has done to educate and polish the talents of young men and women in Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District, I believe that there is considerable merit in providing such a program for these young folks in the District of Columbia.

Today I have introduced legislation to establish this service, including 4-H youth development and home economics programs, in Washington.

This bill would authorize $5 million annually. Four percent of this money would be appropriated for administrative, technical, and other services of USDA in carrying out the provisions of the bill.

The legislation directs the implementation of this service by Howard University, inasmuch as Howard has the facilities and personnel to carry out these programs.

Mr. Speaker, this money spent in the District could be a tremendous investment. The Extension Service has done a wonderful job in other metropolitan areas, assisting people with special education needs—low-income families, the elderly, career-seeking youth, and many others.

I should point out to all of my colleagues in the House that cost estimates for 1966–67, provided by the Office of Economic Opportunity, indicate that the cost per participant in VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—is about $3,000. In the Neighborhood Youth Corps program, the cost per participant is some $800.

These figures can be compared with the cost of the Extension Service, in which the cost per participant is an amazingly low $30.

I ask that my colleagues compare this $5 million expenditure—for a year-round program—with the $3 million that has been supplied for an emergency fund for the Office of Economic Opportunity's program for this summer in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, during my short service on the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I have been made more familiar with the critical problems that we face in the Nation's Capital. I believe that the programs of the Extension Service would help to assist in solving many of these, as well as alleviating some of the tensions which such difficulties cause over the long run.

In order for other Members to review the provisions of this legislation, I ask that it be printed below:

H.R. 10680

A bill to establish Cooperative Extension Services in the District of Columbia

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish and maintain Cooperative Extension Services in the District of Columbia, which will include 4-H youth development and home economics programs administered by the United States Department of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"), to promote the welfare of the people of the District of Columbia. The Secretary is authorized to provide for such modification of any such program extended to the District of Columbia as he deems necessary in order to adapt it to the needs of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The programs authorized by this Act shall be developed in cooperation with the government of the District of Columbia, and shall be covered by a memorandum of understanding agreed to by the government of the District of Columbia and the Department. Such memorandum of understanding shall provide for implementation of the programs by Howard University. The Secretary may also utilize the agencies, facilities, and employees of the Department, and may cooperate with other public agencies and with private organizations and individuals in the District of Columbia and elsewhere to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated five million dollars per annum to carry out the purposes of this Act. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this Act shall be in addition to, but not in substitution for, sums appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department, and may be allocated to such agencies of the Department as are concerned with the administration of the program in the District of Columbia. Four per centum of the sum so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Federal Extension Service for administrative, technical, and other services of the Department in carrying out the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 4. All provisions of the Act shall terminate five years from the date of enactment of this Act.

PROPOSED CHANGE OF EARNINGS LIMITATION UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Social Security Act to increase to $3,600 the amount which individuals are permitted to earn annually without suffering a reduction in benefits.

The present earnings limitation of $1,500 annually was increased only slightly from $1,200 last year. This is inadequate in these times for our senior citizens.

The average benefits under social security are low indeed considering the steady rise in the cost of living. It is true that increased monthly benefits have been approved in recent years, and are under consideration again in this Congress. Those presently living on fixed incomes are having great difficulty waiting for the maximum benefits to be made available.

The spirit of social security is impeded by the limitation on a continued effort to improve one's earnings. The present law tends to destroy the incentive through which the country has achieved its great strength and discourages many elder citizens who have valuable skills which can contribute materially to the economic well-being of this Nation. These citizens should be encouraged, not frustrated, in the desire to use their full capabilities.

Today we permit those over 72 years of age to qualify for their eligible social security benefits regardless of their earnings. However, we discriminate against others in this regard.

To my mind, the limitation should be increased or entirely removed so that the morale of our elder citizens can be restored. We continue to discuss ways and means of improving the lot of our senior citizens. This is one of the best ways to help those who wish to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I joined with other members of the Kansas delegation in the House in introduction of a resolution designed to thwart the administration's proposal to tax social security and railroad retirement benefits.

The language of this resolution states:

> Whereas inflation, which in itself is a form of hidden taxation, imposes especially heavy burdens on persons living on fixed incomes; whereas beneficiaries of these Federal programs rely on fixed incomes for their basic necessities; whereas adoption of the proposal to tax Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits would involve double taxation; and whereas there are certain questions as to the constitutionality of this proposal to tax such benefits; now, therefore, be it resolved, that it is the sense of the House that such Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits shall not be made subject to Federal income taxes.

I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to give careful consideration to this resolution, and also request that prompt consideration be given to legislation I am introducing to remove the existing inequities and discriminatory practices which are penalizing those who receive the benefits for which they paid in earlier years.

POSITIVE ACTION FOR BOYS IN VIETNAM

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it seems that the best means of gaining national attention today is to protest the war in Vietnam by some extreme word or action while the efforts of dedicated Americans in support of our servicemen in Vietnam go unnoticed except in their own communities. Consequently, I think every effort should be made to publicize the fine projects by which patriotic citizens identify themselves with the sacrifices of our boys in beleaguered Vietnam. One such project which came to my attention was Operation Enterprise, a 2-week drive in Zanesville, Ohio, to collect books for their sailors and airmen aboard the U.S.S. *Enterprise*, the Navy aircraft carrier now operating in the waters of Vietnam. When the final count was in, a total of 21,000 books was collected, some of which will be shared by various service hospitals, both here in Washington and by the Good Samaritan Hospital in Zanesville.

The people of Zanesville and Muskingum County are to be commended for showing in a concrete way that they really care and that the flag and draft-card burners are but a small and insignificant element in our midst.

To encourage similar projects throughout the Nation for our servicemen, I include the article, "Parade Closes Drive for Books for Sailors," from the Zanesville Times Recorder of June 7, 1967, in the Record at this point:

Parade Closes Drive for Books for Sailors

"Operation Enterprise" ended Tuesday with the roll of drums, a patriotic parade and a brief but impressive program on the Courthouse Esplanade under warm sunny skies.

Yesterday's send-off celebration came just two weeks to the day the campaign was launched to collect the books for the sailors and airmen aboard the USS Enterprise, the Navy's giant carrier operating in the waters off Vietnam.

Today, a Navy cargo plane will ferry 10,000 paperback books, collected during the unique United Fund project, to Alameda Naval Air Base in California from Lockbourne Air Force Base near Columbus. They will then be shipped to the Far East.

A highlight of the ceremony was the acceptance of the books by Navy Captain W. J. Wehmyer, commanding officer of the Navy ROTC at Ohio State University.

The veteran naval officer had high praise for citizens of Zanesville and Muskingum County.

"It is with great pleasure that I accept your gift on behalf of the men of the Enterprise. This expression of support is indeed reassuring to our men overseas. Your books will provide many hours of relaxation, and reflection for our fighting men," he said. "The people of Zanesville and Muskingum County are to be congratulated on the successful completion of Operation Enterprise."

Captain Wehmyer added:

"This expression is more than a mere gift of books. By Operation Enterprise, the people here are saying, "We want to do our part at home. We understand, and are aware of, the courageous efforts of the Enterprise and other units made up of young men willing to pay the ultimate cost to protect our heritage . . . Thank you again for a wonderful community effort."

Mayor Marvin Rutherford and County Commissioner President Hutson J. Barnes also praised citizens of the community for their role in donating, collecting and packaging the books.

The ceremony came at the end of a 20-minute parade headed by a color guard representing the military services and the drum corps from Maysville High School. Participating were a number of United Fund Agencies such as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, YWCA, YMCA, Community Center, Salvation Army, Red Cross; Goodwill Industries; the hospitals; Sohio and Naval Reserve and Navy Recruiting.

Rev. James Hill served as master of ceremonies. Rabbi Mendel Lewkowitz gave the invocation, Rev. W. W. Reily, the dedication of the books, and Rev. Fr. Charles Benedetti, the benediction.

A total of 21,000 books were collected during the drive. The remaining books will go to Bethesda Naval Hospital and Walter Reed Hospital in the Washington area and Bethesda and Good Samaritan hospitals here.

CHANGE IN WHEAT LAW PROPOSED

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Skubitz] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to correct a serious inequity that wheat farmers in my district now face.

My bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make the appropriate upward adjustment in the wheat allotment of any farmer who, prior to January 1, 1965, acted in good faith in reliance upon the advice of Department of Agriculture officials and exceeded his allotment.

The bill is necessary because of the peculiar operation of a much discussed, but very complex provision in our wheat law known as the "Anfuso amendment."

The Anfuso amendment, which was adopted in 1957, simply says that any farmer who exceeds his wheat allotment will lose 7 percent of his allotment 2 years later. It was originally put into the wheat law at a time when there was a mandatory marketing quota program.

When wheat farmers voted in the spring of 1963 to reject the mandatory wheat certificate plan, the Department of Agriculture went through a period of uncertainty as to whether the Anfuso amendment should apply to the 1964 crop.

Many farmers were given the impression that the Anfuso amendment would not be in effect, because marketing quotas were not in effect.

Later Congress passed the so-called voluntary wheat certificate program for the 1964 and 1965 crops.

In the meantime, the Department decided that the Anfuso amendment would apply to the 1964 crop.

Many farmers therefore lost wheat acreage history in 1966—2 years later—for the overplanting they did in 1964.

My bill simply allows the Secretary to take action to correct this inequity, and I hope it will receive quick and favorable consideration.

"THE NEED FOR EXCELLENCE"

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in this season of commencement addresses, we read and hear much that is stimulating, some alas that is not. I have asked for this time in order to share with you all the very challenging talk given by our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Arch Moore] at Morris Harvey College at Charleston, W. Va., on May 28. It makes me proud to be one of his colleagues in this 90th Congress.

The Need for Excellence

(Address of Congressman Arch A. Moore, Jr., First District West Virginia, at the graduation program, Morris Harvey College, Charleston, W. Va., May 28, 1967)

The Greeks, who had a word for everything, called it arete (ăr-ĕ-tē); the Romans, not to be outdone, called it *virtus*. The meaning of our own equivalent, *excellence*, is not so rich or diverse as are those of its Classical antecedents. For the Greeks, arete meant excellence of body, mind, and soul; outstanding character; manly courage; and devotion to the ideals of humanism. For the Romans, *virtus* meant essentially the same thing: moral excellence, valor, bravery, virtue. The definition of our own word, while connoting *superiority*, *worth*, or *quality*, does not necessarily imply the universality of the ancient concept. We mean, by *excellence*, the quality of high worthiness which defines one's character or performance.

To be sure, our definition implies moral worth: we generally would not define as *excellence* a superiority either of character or accomplishment—which was either immoral or unethical. But we do *not* mean, by *excellence*, the total and uncompromising moral uprightness, coupled with outstanding achievement in every aspect of living, which the Greeks and the Romans understood as implicit in the meanings of their words. For the duration of my talk to you today, I should like to use *excellence* in its ancient definition: the physical superiority of bodily prowess, the intellectual acuity which seeks the truth; the spiritual virtues of bravery, character, and moral awareness. I should like to suggest that all of these qualities are greatly needed in America today. The pursuit of excellence must characterize the whole fabric of American society if this Nation is to retain the position of leadership which it occupies today.

To attain excellence, we must devote ourselves unreservedly to the ideal. Excellence, like faith, demands wholehearted allegiance, and the strength of conviction. Excellence, like duty, will brook no compromise with its standards, and will tolerate no weakness of will. Excellence requires the most we can give, and a sincere belief that its attainment is true and good, the intended purpose of human life.

Excellence, of course, may manifest itself in many forms. Like the mythological Zeus, it appears often where it is not expected, in guises wholly incongruous with its popular image, Excellence is visitor in the abodes of carpenters, shopkeepers, or plumbers, as well as in the palaces of kings, the towers of scholars, or the cloisters of Godly men.

Excellence may be visible in the simple handiwork of the weaver, as well as in the glorious, fire-like words of Shakespeare, or the lucid and reasoned measures of Mozart.

Excellence makes only one demand: the total surrender of the self to the end of accomplishing the highest attainment of which a man is capable. It requires setting the nerves on edge, straining—without breaking—every fiber of body, mind, and soul in order to realize, as far as our human natures permit, the fullness of every potential with which we were born.

Commensurate with the need for excellence in our society is the demand for leadership. It is true that excellence may not show itself as leadership; and it is obvious that leadership is not always excellent.

But I wish to say that in this age, as in no other, we need to produce leaders who are imbued with the qualities of excellence, as I have defined it—leaders who are not frightened by responsibility and decision, leaders who are motivated by the same high goals as were Thomas Jefferson and Daniel Webster, Thucydides and Demosthenes, Churchill and Marlborough.

You may ask how I propose to cultivate excellence and leadership.

It would be appropriate to mention first the need for excellence in the educational process, by which most endeavors are nurtured and from which they grow. Dr. S. Douglas Cornell, President of Mackinac College, offers the following insight into the current problem: "It was Jefferson's conviction that the function of education in a democracy must be to pass to each new generation the best in both the intellectual and moral heritage of the past." It is the duty of education to teach not only facts and scientific verities, but also wisdom, and the truths of the human heart. If we lose our understanding of men and of human motives, then all the knowledge of the universe will not suffice to regenerate an incinerated and blackened earth. It is as the Nobel Prize-winning author, William Faulkner, has written: "Truth is one. It doesn't change."

It covers all things which touch the heart—honor and pride and pity and justice and courage and love. . . . They all touch the heart, and what the heart holds to, becomes truth, as far as we know truth."

There is a need for leaders who understand these verities. Those who are concerned with the widening gap between technological expertise and leadership ability, which many believe are fast becoming incompatible. You may have asked yourself, why is it so difficult today, out of a vastly greater population, to produce men of the caliber of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Franklin, Madison, Monroe, and others of the late eighteenth century? In reply may I say that I feel that we are immunizing our young people against any tendencies to leadership.

The current emphasis on specialization reduces the role of men in society to the function performed by cogs in a vast machine—a social, economic, and technical apparatus too complex to be operated by any one person. Leaders must rely on experts who understand not the whole, but those who devote themselves to the individual parts in which they specialize. Our formula for success has visibly changed: where a goal and a sense of direction were formerly demanded, a knowledge of facts is now required. Where faith was once requisite, the power of analysis is now sufficient. We are, in fact, losing our respect for spirituality, and with it our comprehension of human motives. We are in danger of becoming computerized, soulless automatons, much like the celebrated hollow of men of T. S. Eliot:

> ". . . the stuffed men
> Leaning together
> Headpiece filled with straw. Alas!
> Our dried voices, when
> We whisper together
> Are quiet and meaningless
> As wind in dry grass
> Or rats' feet over broken glass
> In our dry cellar."

It is from this arid spirituality that we must redeem ourselves: it is the task of education to breathe new life into the ancient concept of *arete*—human excellence, moral vigilance, brave concern; and to inspire leadership derived from that excellence.

To this I would add these thoughts on higher education:

Higher education is largely irrelevant unless it fulfills its function as society's instrument for continuous, constructive self-criticism and social change. It should help young people to gain a theoretical framework of values and ideas, and scientific habits of thought and action—so that they may understand, regulate, control, and improve their natural-social environments. Schools will fulfill neither of these first two functions until they become integrative rather than fragmenting; until we tear down the narrow, restrictive, disciplinary boundaries.

We need also to encourage excellence in the arts. There are too many today who have succumbed to the disease of *relativism*, who mistake pretension for talent, and incoherent babbling for communication.

We must remember that all men are created with equal *opportunity*, not with equal *endowments;* and that, while, in the words of Hemingway, "real seriousness (in regard to creativity) is one of the two absolute necessities, the other unfortunately, is talent." To succeed, art must be imbued with a high sense of purpose, a communicative spirit, and a sense of spiritual enrichment. Too long have we listened to those who have sat outside the clubhouse of the talented, dictating the rules governing entrance. Too long have we given deference to the aborted progenies which are presented to us as works of creative genius, but which in reality are only stillborn imitations of life. If art is a spiritual path to truth—and if, in the words of Goethe, "the highest problem of every art is . . . to produce the illusion of a loftier reality"—then we must look to the future for a revitalized spirit to replace the tawdry reflections of our souls apparent in much of the art of today.

For it is the treating of the commonplace with the feeling of the sublime that gives to art its true power. We need not fall into the trap that Ruskin set for himself in maintaining that good art must depict moral virtue. Rather, we must be ever conscious of the moral *purpose* of art, an attribute of its excellence.

Business and industry, no less than education and the arts, are demanding men of excellence—of vision and vigor—like those who wrested this Nation from the primitive wilderness. There is a real danger that, in the competitive economic sphere, no less than in the educational sector, men are being guided by motives of getting the biggest promotions fastest, the highest salaries, with little concern for the good of the corporate whole.

I should advise you that excellence is not measured in terms of immediate success—nor, for that matter, in terms of material reward. What matters more is that you remember that today—as always—endurance, perseverance, and willingness to overcome hardships—plus hard work—are the qualities which nurture excellence and foster leadership.

The willingness to make decisions—and to take the risk of error—the capacity to deal with the larger problems, which cannot be calculated in terms of formulae and mathematical certainty—these are necessary components of that leadership which ceaselessly strives for purposeful self-enlightenment. I think that this capacity to accept the world as non-guaranteed, tricky, full of accidents and unexpected events, is necessary at all levels of our national life. You will never have all the facts you need.

Leadership means risk-taking; and this is particularly true of a world which is changing as rapidly as ours. This great quality of being willing to move in the face of uncertainty is something you are going to need in generous amounts if you are going to succeed.

Our government, too, needs excellence, particularly in leadership. In world diplomacy we must ever seek the high goal of world peace, to the end of alleviating human suffering and misunderstanding. We must endeavor to eliminate poverty and injustice at home. The excellence which we seek will require the utmost of us; for we are committed to the principles of justice and liberty. We must maintain that commitment. We must not neglect what some call "moral leadership," in the face of an increasingly complex social order. It seems to me that so much of our energy has been devoted to tending the machinery of our complex society, that we have neglected this element in leadership. I am using the world *moral* to refer to the shared values that must undergird any functioning society. The thing that makes a number of individuals a society rather than a population or a crowd, is the presence of shared attitudes, habits and values, a shared conception of the enterprise of which they are all a part. shared views of why it is worth-while for the enterprise of which they are all a part, shared views of why it is worth-while for the enterprise to continue and flourish.

Leaders, imbued with a moral excellence, are necessary to the maintenance of any enterprise. Let us take care that we continue to train men and women who believe in the worth of our national experiment—who share in a human concern for the human race, and who know that it is men, not things, or abstract concepts, with which we are rightly concerned. It is as Daniel Webster once said:

"If we work upon marble, it will perish; if on brass, time will efface it; if we rear temples, they will crumble into dust; but, if we work upon immortal minds, and imbue them with principles, with the just fear of God and love of our fellow men, we engrave on those tablets something that will brighten and brighten to all eternity."

In short, we must strive for a heightened moral and ethical awareness. There are too many today who would confuse the right to dissent with the right to riot; too many who think that freedom means license, and who believe that responsibility to laws and men in some way hinders their freedom of action.

The moral heritage of this Nation is grounded in the Judeo-Christian concept of the worth of the individual, which imposes on each one of us a moral responsbility to other human beings. That ethic is based upon the incontrovertible assumption that there is an absolute standard of right and wrong which inevitably affects human behavior.

Similarly, our concept of government owes much to the Greek democratic ideal, interpreted by the philosophers of the Enlightenment—an ideal which holds that every man is born with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—and that the granting of these rights by the State presupposes a sense of responsibility in the citizens.

Private morality, no less than public morality, is governed by the belief that the individual is worthy of respect.

And yet all too often we read that the sanctity of the individual has been violated, that the distinction between right and wrong has been reduced to the gray mid-region of equivocation and "situation ethics."

Students are educated to become more and more highly sophisticated—intellectually and morally. I quote the daughter of an Eastern educator, speaking of her educational experience at an Eastern school: "Students today are educated to become clever enough to rationalize any course of action they may pursue."

The wide prevalence of outright crime is appalling. John Steinbeck, in an excerpt from his new book *America and Americans,* offers this chilling commentary:

"Perhaps one can judge the health of a society by the nature as well as the incidence of crimes committed against it. Consider us today not only in the cities but in small towns and the country as well. There are of course the many crimes against property, but increasingly these are destructive rather than for gain. But the greatest increase is in crimes against people, against the physical bodies of people."

We urgently need to strive to make standards respectable, to gain an insight into the values and concepts on which our democracy was built. It is in our common response to individual concern that excellence is especially demanded—more compellingly than in any other aspect of our complicated existence; *indeed moral* and *ethical responsibility* governs the pursuit of excellence in every human endeavor: in education and art, industry and business, politics and diplomacy. The promise which our system holds for you, I believe, can best be set forth in this way. In the long climb to the present, man has never found a more fulfilling and personally satisfying form of human organization than democracy or one more difficult to live. When infused with the moral and religious spirit of the Christian-Judaic heritage, democracy ennobles and elevates man to full human dignity. It is a form of government and a way of life. In both it brings to man freedom of soul, mind and action, but with self-discipline.

The belief in these principles should never, can never be accepted lightly.

Their imperatives lay upon man the most awesome responsibility of life: To love God, to love others as one's self, to govern one's self and others with justice, intelligence and dignity. No finer life can be lived than one based on these verities. Most Americans profess them. I'm sure most of you profess them. When they live them, no one lives more nobly or more beautifully. How well any man acts on these precepts measures the heights he and his civilization attain. Whether we accept or reject these verities is the current issue of today. Let us heed the call of greatness, that our civilization not fall from the heights it has attained.

Excellence, then, is a many-faceted gem. Excellence of the intellect, without excellence of the spirit, is worth very little.

Wholeness of mind and soul, without wholeness of body, falls short of the mark. We would do well, in this atomic age, to hearken back to the ancients—particularly to Greece—where the concept of excellence was first given breath and form and meaning.

For it was there that men first climbed from the slime of animal darkness to the clear, pure light of human reason. It was there that poetry and philosophy, drama and oratory, mind and soul were born. It was there, in the shady forest of Arcadia, that the ideal of physical excellence gave fire to the Olympic flame. It was there that Sophocles, author and general, and Pericles, statesman and orator, stood firm to defend a barren patch of rock against the barbarian hordes.

And it was there that manliness and vigor; morality and honor; strength of mind, grace of body, purity of soul were forged together to give form and definition to *arete*—that untranslatable word which lives on and on, long since its creators have vanished from the earth.

Let us look to the future, to the challenges and the bold threats, keeping firmly in mind the belief that excellence should be pursued, and can be obtained—that only through constant and unsparing effort will the prize be yours. I leave you with this timely advice—let no youth have any anxiety about the upshot of his education whatever the line of it may be. If he keep faithfully busy each hour of the working day, he may safely leave the final result to itself. He can with perfect certainty count on waking up some fine morning to find himself one of the competent ones of his generation, in whatever pursuit he may have singled out.

Silently, between all the details of his business, the *power of judging* in all the class of matter will have built itself within him as a possession that will never pass away.

It is the power of judging which men call wisdom; and wisdom is the first attribute of excellence.

And, so it is that your State, your Nation, and above all your innerself demands that you strive to obtain excellence in all your public and private undertakings, keeping in mind that you truly are of another generation, confronted by different challenges and tortured by different causes, but I caution that you should firmly fix in your mind that the sands of time and the winds of change alter not the definition, nor the demands, nor the need for excellence.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BUDGET REDUCTIONS

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, 1967, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes], chairman of the House Republican policy committee, and I introduced identical House resolutions—House Resolution 406 and House Resolution 407—respectfully requesting the President to reconsider his fiscal 1968 budget and to indicate where substantial reductions in spending could best be made.

These resolutions were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, which has taken no action upon them. Meanwhile the administration's own estimates of the probable deficit under the 1968 budget have increased, and the House of Representatives, by yesterday's vote of 210 to 197 rejecting the administration's request to raise the national debt ceiling to a record $365 billion, has emphatically reflected the strong sentiment of the American people that ever-rising deficits and runaway spending must be curbed in this time of international and fiscal crisis.

Therefore, I am today joining with Mr. Rhodes to introduce a special House resolution under rule 27, section 4, of the Rules of the House of Representatives, calling for immediate floor consideration of our earlier proposal to send the budget back to President Johnson for revision downward. Under this rule, when a public bill or resolution has remained in a standing committee 30 days or more without action, Members may file a special resolution with the Rules Committee to bring the bill or resolution up for immediate consideration by the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the text of this special resolution, and of our previous resolutions, House Resolutions 406 and 407:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall immediately resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H. Res. 406, requesting the President to submit to the House of Representatives recommendations for budget reductions. After general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and and ranking minority members of the Committee on Appropriations, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

House Resolution 406 and House Resolution 407

Whereas the House of Representatives must, in the public interest, make substantial reductions in the President's budget for the fiscal year 1968: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President be respectfully requested to indicate the places and amounts in his budget for the fiscal year 1968 where he thinks substantial reductions may be made.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the President.

ISRAEL-ARAB CONFLICT

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, although we are nonbelligerents in the current Israel-Arab conflict, we are in no way neutral in our support of Israel.

As a maritime power, the United States must guarantee to maintain access to the Gulf of Aqaba for free world shipping.

Interested as we are in peace, the United States must continue to push for an early and meaningful cease-fire, and for a permanent settlement that will guarantee for all times the existence of Israel as a democratic nation with permanent and inviolate boundaries.

We cannot merely reinstate the uneasy status quo that has existed since 1956.

We must lead the way in concert with other nations to establish the territorial integrity of Israel and her surrounding nations.

HERBERT HOOVER NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, WEST BRANCH, IOWA

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, needless to say, I am disappointed that the conferees on the Interior appropriations bill did not accept the Senate proposal for the funds needed to complete the land acquisition program at the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site at West Branch, Iowa. I feel it is unfortunate that the full amount requested is not appropriated in this conference report.

This is a historic site that honors a former great President. It is his birthsite and gravesite. To deny the funds needed to complete the project as soon as possible is unprecedented.

I urge that the Appropriations Committee, as soon as possible, perhaps in a supplemental request, appropriate the remaining funds needed to complete the Hoover park project.

I am grateful that $170,000 will be available for the next fiscal year. While the project will be delayed somewhat, at least some work will be done. It appears now that all of the land can be acquired except for the big tract of land owned by the Greater Iowa Corp., and the scenic easement to be obtained on the west side of the park.

It is regrettable that the entire project cannot be completed this year. It is false economy not to do so because it will cost more next year.

Mr. Speaker, as an addendum and further testimony to the argument, I should like to point out that Hoover turned back enough salary while he was President to more than pay for what has been deleted from the President's request for this project.

STRONG DEVELOPMENT IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ESCH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has often expressed its belief that all citizens of our Nation should receive the best possible education—an education that prepares them to meet the challenges they will face in our world. The strong development in vocational education throughout our Nation is an especially encouraging development in this direction.

Only through vocational and technical education can our schools reach those students who do not intend to attend our colleges and universities. Only if our students have skills which are needed in the marketplace will they be able to acquire useful and productive jobs upon graduation—and make a significant contribution to the economic life of our Nation. Vocational education has proven to be one of the most encouraging developments in the nationwide efforts to keep students in school through the end of high school.

It is, therefore, with great pride that I draw the attention of the House to the outstanding vocational training program formulated by the Monroe County, Mich., intermediate school district. This school, centrally located in the county, would give students training in diverse fields: from plumbing to secretarial training; from child care and homemakers assistants to industrial electronics; from dental assistant to cabinetmaking. It is an imaginative program which would give all students a basic education as well as the specific training in skilled trades which they so greatly need.

Quite obviously, such a project has great potential, not only for the students, but for the community also. With better and more specialized trained individuals, business and industry will be encouraged to locate in Monroe County and the economic growth will be stimulated. Because its graduates will be more productive citizens, the community will have fewer economic and social problems and fewer unemployed.

The school will also undoubtedly serve as a focal point for the involvement of the private sector which is so vital in any training endeavor. From this center students will go out into the industrial community for actual on-the-job training to take advantage of schoolroom instruction and ultimately to gain meaningful employment.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that Monroe County is leading the way in this significant field of education, and I hope that the citizens of Monroe County will overwhelmingly approve the construction of this facility in their referendum on June 12.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS: A LESSON IN SEAPOWER

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, approximately 1 year ago, I had the opportunity of speaking before a group in San Diego, Calif., on the subject "American Seapower—Where Are We Going?" My remarks on that earlier occasion manifested my deep personal concern over the current shocking deemphasis in our national maritime efforts. It is a concern which still persists today, and which has only been enhanced as a result of the lesson in seapower so dramatically pointed up in the current Middle Eastern crisis.

As I noted last year:

> In its broadest sense, and conceived as an integral whole, sea power is the ability of a nation to project into the world ocean in times of peace its national sovereignty; in times of war, its military might. It is composed of all those elements enabling a nation to use the oceans advantageously during either peace or war—its Navy, its merchant shipping, its shipbuilding, its fishing industry, and its knowledge in the field of marine science and engineering . . . It is within this frame of reference that the United States, as a world leader with global security commitments, must face up to the issue of the future sufficiency of its elements of sea power.

This issue is all the more pressing when considering that we face today and in the future what has been referred to as the new four-ocean challenge. One of these four is the Afro-Asian ocean embracing the broad expanse of the South Atlantic and Indian Oceans extending all the way from New Guinea across to the southern shore of Asia and Africa. As so aptly demonstrated by events in recent months, the withdrawal of France from Indochina leaves us as the only Western nation capable of filling the power vacuum in the Asian theater, a factor which has been further enhanced by Great Britain's intention to phase out its fleet air arm and the hint of eventual military withdrawal to "west of Suez." The ramifications of this most awesome responsibility has been dramatically underscored in the current crisis in the Middle East.

Since World War II, the Soviet Navy, like the Soviet merchant marine and fishing fleet, has been transformed from what was formerly a coastal defense force into a "blue water" offensive fleet. The intensity of this Soviet seaward thrust has not faltered for the lack of funds, as has been so sadly apparent with our own maritime efforts.

The British publication, Jane's Fighting Ships, once assessed this Soviet drive for seapower in the following terms:

> The Soviet Union is reaching out with her naval units and infiltrating in a multipronged movement into all the seven seas, not only with combatant ships but with intelligence trawlers and research ships in a determined effort to achieve a worldwide naval capability in conjunction with a challenging increase in her merchant fleet and developing a maritime strategy as a major factor in her overall policy of extending her influence throughout the world.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> There is no doubt that the Soviet Navy is growing with the object of challenging U.S. supremacy at sea. The Soviet Union now understands the value of sea power.

I would only hope that we, too, would experience a reawakening of the value of sea power. There is a growing need for national leadership to marshal and direct the national will to meet the expanding challenge at sea and to develop the foresight to provide adequately for the tools of seapower—fast, modern ships and skilled seamen to man them. Yet it is disconcerting indeed to note that two and a half years have passed since the President said, in his state of the Union message of January 1965, that he would "recommend—a new policy for our merchant marine." We are still waiting upon the submission of that promised new policy.

If there be any illusions about the growing stature of the Soviet Union as a major sea power and the pressing need for a rebirth of national leadership in the maritime field in the United States, then I commend to my colleagues the following article by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, June 2, and which points up the significance of this new

Russian seapower capability demonstrated in the current Middle Eastern crisis:

SOVIET NAVAL POWER—FORCE RESPONDING TO MIDEAST CRISIS HAS GROWN AND MATURED IN A DECADE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Intelligence officers think that the reinforcement of Soviet naval forces in the Mediterranean is far more significant than its effect on the Middle Eastern crisis.

They agree that it demonstrates a newfound Russian naval capacity and a Communist understanding of the use of sea power for political, psychological and diplomatic ends that were impossible a decade ago. In 1956, when Gen. Nathan F. Twining, then Air Force Chief of Staff, visited Moscow for Air Force Day, Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev pointed to a rowboat manned by Soviet sailors on a Moscow lake and remarked, "There's our Navy."

Cruisers, he felt, were "showboats," useful only to take dignitaries on state visits; the Soviet Navy was weak physically and in prestige, and particularly in the support it received from Soviet political leaders.

A RENAISSANCE AFLOAT

But in the last decade there has been renaissance of Soviet maritime power—naval ships, merchant marine, fishing fleets and oceanographic vessels—a renaissance that is influencing history and casting a long shadow.

From a landlocked, defensive, coastal navy, the Soviet fleet has developed into a deepwater navy, keyed at least in part to offensive concepts.

Its submarines have been encountered in many waterways, including the Mediterranean, the Sea of Japan, the East China Seas, the Pacific, the Gulf of Alaska and various parts of the Atlantic. Its electronic intelligence vessels—trawlers equipped with special equipment—dog United States, British, and other naval concentrations far from Soviet shores—in the Gulf of Tonkin, the Mediterranean, the Red Sea and the Carribbean and off Scotland, Spain and Guam.

In the Mediterranean, the Russians have maintained for the last few years a "fleet" that has learned well the lessons of strategic mobility pioneered by the United States Navy in World War II.

Its ships have no fixed and permanent bases but rotate from the Mediterranean to the Black Sea and the Baltic. During their tours in the Mediterranean they are normally sustained by tankers, store ships and tenders.

The Soviet ships use anchorages in protected bights of the sea—all in international waters—for repairs, transfer of supplies and refueling.

Such anchorages have been identified off the Greek island of Kithera, in the Gulf of Hammamet off Tunisia, in the Gulf of Sirte off Libya and off Alborran island east of the Strait of Gibraltar.

Visits are paid to Yugoslav, Algerian and most often Egyptian ports.

Normally, the Soviet Navy maintains four to seven combat ships and an equal number of tenders, tankers, service vessels and electronic trawlers in the Mediterranean. There are one or two destroyers and two or more submarines.

When the new Middle Eastern crisis developed, the largest Soviet ship in the Mediterranean was a cruiser. The reinforcing fleet, now transiting the Turkish straits, totals 10 vessels, about half of them service ships.

The Russians' Mediterranean fleet includes the Kynda-class missile frigates, about 6,000 tons fully loaded, and the Kashin class, somewhat smaller. Both classes carry torpedoes, four 3.35-inch guns, anti-submarine-warfare weapons and antiaircraft missiles.

The Kynda-class vessels carry eight launchers for ballistic missiles, designed and built for use against shipping and specifically against United States aircraft carriers.

Within range of the ship's radar these missiles are regarded as quite accurate. They are believed to have far more range than any naval guns, perhaps upward of 100 miles.

The Soviet submarines in the Mediterranean are believed to be armed with torpedoes rather than missiles, for use against shipping rather than in shore bombardment.

PLANES BASED ON LAND

The Soviet fleets have no sea-based air power, but the naval air arm is sizable and has many long-range planes capable of reaching much of the Middle Eastern area from Soviet bases. The Russians have developed air-launched homing missiles for use against ships; these, too, are regarded by United States officers as formidable weapons.

Today the United States Sixth Fleet remains more powerful than its reinforced Soviet counterpart. But yesterday there was no Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean. Today, there are Soviet naval, merchant, fishing and oceanographic ships in all the seas of the world in increasing numbers. The maritime challenge is major and increasing.

"PANAMA CANAL ISSUES AND TREATY TALKS": DEFECTS AND VALIDITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAGAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain reports, comments, and related material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for the last decade, I have addressed this body many times on the subjects of the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally. As regards my attitude and judgments toward them, I assure you that I take no pleasure in registering disapproval of the administration, which, in general, I have supported. My views, however, are influenced by close associations going back to early youth and long study of the issues and problems involved. I cannot do otherwise than to speak as I do, for I must place my country above party in matters of such grave import as are now under discussion.

Furthermore, I believe that the President has been grossly mislead by his trusted advisers and that he has been beguiled into the adoption of policies that would be fatal to all concerned. I trust that he may become better advised and, in consequence, will take the position that many of us in the Congress who have studied interoceanic canal questions believe the wise and indispensable course for our Nation to pursue.

In approaching my subject, I wish to stress that the issues are fundamental. Thus, they transcend all personal or political considerations and must be considered on the highest plane of statesmanship. Also, I desire to emphasize that, as regards the Republic of Panama and its people, I hold both in the highest esteem, and have had the privilege of counting many Panamanians among my valued friends.

To the task of clarification, I now address myself.

PANAMANIAN MOBS ATTACK CANAL ZONE, JANUARY 1964

Mr. Speaker, on the evening of January 9, 1964 at an American High School in Balboa, Canal Zone, on American territory, fine patriotic American high school students sang "The Star-Spangled Banner" and prevented Panamanian students from the Republic of Panama from lowering the U.S. flag and hoisting in its stead the Panamanian flag on the mast in front of the school. Seized upon by Red agitators and other radicals in Panama as a false motive concealing the real one, this incident was made the occasion for massive mob assaults on both ends of the Canal Zone that had long been planned as shown by their detailed preparations.

Overcoming the Canal Zone police, the invaders were well on their way to make the zone the scene of a Red bath of murder, pillage, rape, and sabotage, which was prevented only by the use of the U.S. Army stationed there for the protective purposes to defend the lives of our citizens and to prevent the damage or destruction of the Panama Canal itself.

This assault was a direct challenge to U.S. treaty-based rights, and power and authority over the territorial possession of the United States known as the Canal Zone.

ATTACKS ON CANAL ZONE FOCUSES NATIONAL ATTENTION ON CANAL PROBLEMS

For 3 days, a reign of terror prevailed along the zone borders and in Panama. The volume of destruction of American property in both these areas was enormous and, so far as known, the total value of the property damage has never been calculated. Nor has the extent of the injuries suffered by our citizens in Panama ever been published or redressed.

Four of our soldiers were killed by Panamanian snipers and others wounded. Moreover, five of our citizens in Panama are reported as having been hanged and other atrocities committed.

Unfortunately, the mass news media of our country, following the Communist version, attempted to place responsibility for the instigation of the riots on our patriotic high school students, failed to report the cruel crimes committed against our citizens and property in Panama, and endeavored to create a sense of guilt on the part of the people of our country. Such failures and distortions of news I attempted to counteract on March 9, 1964, in a major address in the Congress on the "Panama Canal: Focus of Power Politics"—House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, pages 305 to 344.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I wish to emphasize that despite the gravity of the situation, the Panama Canal, lying in sight of the riot lines, continued to operate in normal manner, without interruption in transit. This notable achievement was possible only because of the loyalty and efficiency of our civilian employees of the canal enterprise and the effective work of the Canal Zone Police and our Armed Forces in protecting the lives of our citizens and the canal. Instead of having a sense of guilt as regards our successful operation of the Panama Canal, the people of our country, if they had known all the facts, would have taken great pride in the manner in which the 1964 Panamanian mob assaults were met and dissipated.

Regardless of the tragic consequences and the failure of the press to deal adequately with the attack on the Canal Zone, our citizens grasped the essential facts. Thus the situation at Panama made a greater impact on our country than any other crisis affecting interoceanic canals since the famous dash of the *Oregon* in 1898 from the Pacific around South America to join the fleet for the Battle of Santiago. Moreover, it started a chain of events affecting the canal that has not ended.

PANAMA OUTMANEUVERS THE UNITED STATES

Events occurred in quick succession. On January 10, 1964, the second day of the attack, Panama broke diplomatic relations with the United States, denounced the treaty under which the Panama Canal had been built, and subsequently maintained, operated, sanitated and protected, and filed a complaint with the Organization of American States charging "unmerciful acts of aggression" by the United States.

In a White House statement on January 14, immediately following the riots, President Johnson asserted:

> The United States cannot allow the security of the Panama Canal to be imperiled. We have a recognized obligation to operate the canal efficiently and securely, and we intend to honor that obligation in the interest of all who depend on it. (*Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., Jan. 14, 1964, Stock Final edition, p. 1, col. 7.)

Notwithstanding this statement by the President of the United States, Panamanian officials kept up their agitations for renegotiation of the 1903 treaty, outmaneuvering our Government and placing it on the defensive. The result was that on April 3, Panama and the United States agreed to restore diplomatic relations and to appoint special ambassadors to consider the causes of the conflict between the two countries. Later, on December 18, 1964, President Johnson, reversing his forthright statement on January 14, agreed to negotiate a new treaty to replace the 1903 treaty and announced that our Government would proceed with studies for a new canal of sea-level design to replace the existing canal. These decisions, Mr. Speaker, were made on the advice of the President's ex parte advisers and without adequate inquiry or consideration. These advisers seem only to think of appeasement as supplying solutions.

CONGRESS AUTHORIZES INQUIRY OF A PREDETERMINED OBJECTIVE

Meanwhile, the Congress, on insistent administrative recommendations, enacted Public Law 88–609, approved September 22, 1964, for the "purpose of determining the feasibility of, and the most suitable site for, the construction of a sea-level canal" across the American Isthmus.

The legislative history of this statute is truly amazing. In the Senate, the bill was passed by voice vote without debate after perfunctory hearings, attended only by those supporting the pending legislation. In the House, I testified before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on June 4, 1964, voicing strong opposition to the administration bill, which was narrow and limited in scope, and precluded the study of any other plan or the appointment of a broadly based and independent body to the required study. I urged the creation of a broadly constituted and independent Interoceanic Canals Commission.

The impact of my testimony was obvious, with evidence of approval on the part of certain members of the committee, indications of great interest on the part of representatives of the press who attended, and confusion and distress on the part of advocates of the pending legislation who were present. When news stories of the hearings were published in the mass news media the statements of the official witnesses were prominently featured and my own was completely ignored.

The hearings on this important measure, contrary to custom, were never published and the House was called upon to pass the bill on September 1, 1964 under a suspension of rules that did not afford ample opportunity for debate—a gag procedure. For more complete information on this legislative history, attention is invited to two of my addresses on the "Interoceanic Canal Problem: Inquiry or Cover Up?" on April 1 and July 29, 1965, particularly their documentation—House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, pages 428 to 516.

The inquiry that was authorized was not that of an independent and broadly based agency created under congressional enactment, but by a part-time consulting board of five men, appointed administratively and committed in advance to a predetermined solution. Certainly, this was not the way that the vital canal question should have been approached.

Thus, in addition to the crucial question of continued United States sovereignty over the Canal Zone, the Isthmian situation was further complicated by authorizing an inquiry wholly ex parte in character; and our chief negotiator was later appointed as chairman of the five-man, sea-level canal study group in addition to his diplomatic duty as head of the treaty negotiating team.

BASIC CANAL ISSUES MUST BE UNDERSTOOD

The situation thus developed was not accidental but brought about by amateur canal builders, policymaking theorists, and others in our Government who ignore the lessons of experience.

Because of the necessity for a clear understanding of the basic canal issues in connection with what will be later developed in this address, I shall repeat them:

First, the transcendent responsibility of our Government to safeguard our indispensable sovereign rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone for the efficient and adequate maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal.

Second, the subject of the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing canal through the modification of the authorized third locks project—53 Stat. 1409—to provide a summit-level lake anchorage in the Pacific sector of the Panama Canal to correspond with the layout in the Atlantic end, on which project some $75,000,000 was expended, largely on enormous lock site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores before work was suspended in May 1942; and which excavations could contribute materially toward the suggested lake-lock type of improvement for the present canal.

Third, the question of a new Panama Canal of so-called sea-level design, or modification thereof, to replace the existing canal.

Fourth, the matter of the construction and ownership of a second canal at a site other than the Canal Zone, including Nicaragua, and treaties therefor.

From the above it is obvious that the principal canal policy questions, as historically evolved, are the best type at the best site for vessels of commerce and war of all nations on terms of equality as provided by treaty and at low cost of construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection. Have our amateur canal builders and policymakers attempted to clarify these issues in realistic manner? They have not, but have tried to cover their operations with the mantle of secrecy and confusion. Nevertheless, in view of what I shall later state in this address, these key issues must be thoroughly understood and brought into the open.—See House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, pages 177 to 192.

PANAMANIAN BLACKMAILING PROPAGANDA AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The story of the successful effort of the United States in the acquisition of our Canal Zone territory and its sanitation, the construction of the Panama Canal, and its subsequent maintenance, operation, and defense, constitutes one of the most outstanding and inspiring chapters of American history. Yet, the communistic treatment of all this has been seized upon and exploited by Panamanian radicals to the effect that the United States has been guilty of the grossest selfishness and imperialistic and oppressive design. There could be no greater falsehood.

Constantly repeated in the press of the United States, this adverse propaganda has not only had the effect of creating a widespread sense of shame among certain bleeding heart "liberals" and "intellectuals" of our country but also to brainwash and cow our negotiators and the President of the United States himself.

No one in the executive branch of our Government since early 1964 has ventured any statement of contradiction and this harmful propaganda of self-condemnation has been allowed to circulate without rebuttal, creating a condition conducive to political blackmail.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, a most glorious chapter of our history has been, and is still being, distorted into an infamous chronicle. In the atmosphere so created, new treaties with Panama have been proposed for the surrender of our indispensable rights and authority with respect to both the Panama Canal and Canal Zone.

As to such nefarious cession, I quote the 1923 statement of Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes, who, when faced with a similar situation, called in the Minister of Panama and bluntly stated to him:

> It was an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any American administration, no matter what it was, any President or any Secretary of State, ever to surrender any part of these rights which the United States had acquired under the treaty of 1903. (*Foreign Relations*, 1923, Vol. III, p. 684.).

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, no one in authority in our Government speaks that way today? There can be no adequate explanation except a news blackout induced by appeasers engaged in a conspiracy of silence and their exploitation of a sense of guilt created by false propaganda, originally initiated by Soviet authority.

CONGRESS TRIES TO COUNTER THE NEWS BLACKOUT

Recognizing the dangers involved in the failure of the mass news media to alert the people of our country, informed leaders of the Congress in 1966 brought about the publication of a volume of my principal addresses under the title of "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions"—House Document No. 474, 89th Congress. This volume contains a wealth of carefully researched material on key canal problems and it was widely distributed throughout the Nation and to all Members of the Congress.

With the information therein developed readily available, it should not be possible for the executive branch of our Government to stampede the Senate into ratifying the current treaty proposals with Panama by a surprise submission of the treaty or treaties with plausible pleas of emergency. Any attempt to do so on the basis of threats of possible renewal of Panamanian riots would, in essence, be a form of guerrilla warfare, which has no place in the Halls of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would urge all editors, reporters, and other publicists of the mass news media to study the indicated volume, which is available in Government depositories throughout the Nation or can be obtained without charge from Senators and Representatives. If the disseminators of news will present essential facts in the canal situation to the people of our country, the latter will know how to prevent the projected surrender and betrayal at Panama. The total book value of our investment in the Canal Zone from 1904 to 1966 provided by the taxpayers of the United States, as recently furnished by the Secretary of the Army, is $4,889,051,000. This is a startlingly large figure even in this land of prodigal spending—see Reports of the Secretary of the Army, April 10 and 21, 1967, quoted by me in a statement to the House of Representatives on May 10, 1967.

U.S. POLICIES MUST BE WISE AND REALISTIC

The U.S. diplomatic team for the current negotiations with Panama is purely an administrative body committed in advance to giveaway policies, and as already stated, with the Chairman of the Sea Level Commission created under Public Law 88-609 serving as Chairman of the treaty negotiating team. It is significant also that this body has no member experienced in military and naval features of the canal problem. This shows how narrow and provincial it is. It amounts to nothing more than a number of "yes men" named to do a specific task—giving away the Panama Canal with the mistaken idea that appeasement will settle all the problems involved. Certainly, this is not characteristic of statesmanship or vision of what the future may bring forth. Indeed, the whole diplomatic effort seems to have been, and still to be, to abase our Nation and its wise and beneficent policies which have obtained for more than half a century with respect to the canal and to accept as true all that in recent years has been described as evil and oppressive on the part of the United States—charges emanating from communistic and demagogic sources. Such policy will in no wise close the lid of the box of Pandora but will open it wider and tremendously augment the confusion and chaos which our recent policies have already produced.

In truth and in fact those undertaking to act for the United States in the current negotiations with Panama are, in effect, acting not for the United States but for Panama and are motivated by the desire to do anything, however unwise or fatal, for the purposes of appeasement. The base surrenders in the projected new treaty proposals are justified by our officials to prevent riots of Panamanian mobs and assaults on the Canal Zone. Such a policy is unwise, unpatriotic, and oblivious of the requirements for the successful maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, thus imperiling the best interests of both the United States and Panama, and the world at large. The occasion demands a firm and just policy, and the present policy is neither just nor wise but is, in the opinion of many informed persons, altogether pusillanimous and contemptible. Like giving in to blackmail such surrenders can only result in greater extortions and our complete abandonment of the canal enterprise, with its takeover by Communist power, direct or indirect, and the destruction of Panamanian independence. Thus, Panama could become another Cuba. The radical policy now being pursued by Panama is absolutely suicidal.

PROPOSED SURRENDER AT PANAMA TREASONOUS

The United States joined in World War I and II to defeat aggression against free nations and was largely responsible for winning those wars in the name of freedom. As so often is the case, what was won on the battlefield was lost at the council table. Then we went half way around the world to fight the Korean war to check communistic aggression. That war, an inglorious defeat for the United States, has never been ended but is in a state of "suspended animation." Now, also half a world away, we are fighting the war in Vietnam under the most difficult conditions and at tremendous cost and sacrifice to check communist aggression, and it is yet undecided.

Were it not for the support of North Vietnam by Red China and the Soviets, particularly the latter, our efforts in that area would have been crowned with success long ago with relief of South Vietnam and Southeast Asia from Red power. Because of the efforts of the two large Communist countries to infiltrate every nation in the Western Hemisphere from Cuba as a base of operations, we are kept on the brink of another war—in the Western Hemisphere—to stay the onward march of Red power.

In the light of all these facts is it wise or safe to divest ourselves of our just and equitable rights with respect to the Panama Canal, the maintenance, operation and protection of which must always remain with the United States if the cause of freedom is to be served? Is it not the sheerest folly and criminal stupidity at this critical juncture in world affairs to ignore the situation involved and render ourselves impotent through the surrender of the greatest factor in Western Hemisphere security?

We are indeed in actual war with the Soviet and Red China because both of these countries are accessories to the struggle now being waged in South Vietnam, supplying modern weapons, munitions, and training that are necessary for Red forces therein engaged. In view of these circumstances is not the attempt to dilute and destroy our treaty based and indispensable authority and control of the Panama Canal and its protecting Canal Zone frame, in essential fact, treasonous in character?

It is significant, indeed, as previously indicated, that on our treaty negotiating team there is not a single member with responsible military or naval experience. The only apparent reason for not including such really qualified members is that such men could never be brought to disregard the hemispheric protective factors involved and might be able to thwart the contemplated surrender.

AN INDEPENDENT INTEROCEANIC CANALS COMMISSION REQUIRED

As shown by what I have already stated, the interoceanic canal problem is highly complicated, requiring the resolution of many questions. It is not a task for routine officials or yes men, or for a part-time consulting group inquiry rooted in the executive branch of our Government, but one for an independent and broadly constituted inquiry composed of the best qualified persons of practical and far-reaching vision that our country can muster.

The bills introduced by certain colleagues and myself in the present Congress, as well as in previous ones, for the creation of an 11-member Interoceanic Canals Commission to study the entire subject and make report thereon, call for the appointment of experienced line officers of the three Armed Forces as well as others of special qualifications. Certainly, the gravity of the canal problem, including those of military character, requires that any proper study in these connections be made by an independent body with members of specialized knowledge and experience.

In order that the Congress and the Nation may know the type of inquiry required, I shall quote the text of pending House bills in the documentation at the close of my address along with the text of Public Law 88–609, and invite a comparison of their provisions; also to my statement on June 4, 1964, before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries—House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, pages 457 to 461.

BOOKLET ON PANAMA CANAL ISSUES AND TREATY TALKS DESCRIBED

In the course of the last 2 years much adverse propaganda has been published about the canal situation, altogether lacking in objectivity and comprehensiveness. The latest contribution of significance is a booklet on "Panama Canal Issues and Treaty Talks" prepared by an unofficial nine-member panel of the Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, which I have read with much interest and studied with care.

To a large extent, its statements of fact are based upon the information developed in my own researches and embodied in my addresses as published in the volume on "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions"—House Document No. 474, 89th Congress. Because publications by the Center for Strategic Studies are influential in molding public opinion and its Panama Canal booklet has serious shortcomings, I shall undertake to appraise it objectively.

The booklet consists of a "Preface" under the signature of Adm. Arleigh Burke, Director of the Center for Strategic Studies, a list of "Members of the Panel," a statement of the "Conclusions of the Panel," a "Majority Report" in part I, a "Minority Report" in part II, and "Appendix," consisting of a description of the "Choco Development Project" in Colombia and "Additional Notes About Panama."

It is evident from reading the booklet that there was much discussion and probably contention in the course of the proceedings of the Panel. It is significant that in the conclusions of the "Majority Report" there is this statement:

> The members of the Panel have not directed their attention toward the merit of this (surrender) policy change, but rather, because it was a Presidential announcement, believe that the position (of surrender at Panama) is now established as a *fait accompli*.

The Majority Report's conclusions are premised on this erroneous assumption.

In contrast, the "Minority Report," prepared by Dr. Donald M. Dozer, a distinguished and experienced historian, and Vice Adm. T. G. W. Settle, an outstanding naval officer of vast experience, does not accept a Presidential pronouncement of intended action as an accomplished fact but approaches the problem on the basis of the merits of the issues.

PREFACE ANALYZED

The most significant part of the preface is that in which it lists what are described as "key Isthmian Canal questions."

The first one on sovereignty, though it does not so state, implies support for the surrender policy. As regards this, I would say that, if and when the 1903 Treaty is annulled and the current extreme demands of Panama are crystallized by a new treaty for a short period then we may expect that Panama will in all likelihood undertake to expropriate the existing canal under the contention that the Canal Zone has passed back wholly and exclusively to Panamanian jurisdiction, and that such right of expropriation could be exercised by Panama within the purview of international law.

Elsewhere, the "Preface" emphasizes that the "progress of negotiations" has been "so limited" that it expresses the desire to "help resolve the unsettled questions." In other words, the "Preface" aims to expedite the surrender processes. This is an open invitation to the people of the United States to support the policy of surrender and betrayal at Panama, regardless of the basic wrongs involved.

In order that the full text of the "Preface" may be easily available, I shall quote it among the documents appended to my remarks. I would urge all who seek to understand key canal issues to compare this prefatory note with the basic canal issues as summarized by me earlier in this address.

CONCLUSIONS OF THE PANEL MAJORITY EVALUATED

The majority of the Panel as earlier stated frankly admits that it supports the position of surrender at Panama as an accomplished fact. As to such assumption, I would declare that, under our Constitution, there could be no greater fallacy. The majority conclusions unequivocally accept the viewpoints of the present treaty negotiating teams and of the current canal study group under Public Law 88–609. Their conclusions certainly do not reflect the opinions and judgments of a host of informed citizens of the United States, who include experienced statesmen, officers of our Armed Forces, engineers, navigators, nuclear warfare and other experts of eminence.

Communistic influences in Panama will never permit a settlement of radical demands except by the complete withdrawal of all United States authority with respect to any Isthmian Canal. If mobs are permitted to dictate to the Panama Government then every surrender will lead to new mobs to bring about further surrenders and this process will continue until we are driven from the isthmus. It is the sheerest folly to believe that anything less than our complete abandonment of the canal enterprise will satisfy the communistic demands of Panama.

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot control the Panama Canal and Canal Zone over which we hold sovereignty in perpetuity under treaty grant with responsible treaty rights and which we own by purchase from individual owners, how can we hold any canal over which we do not have such authority and ownership and what is to prevent our country from being driven altogether from the isthmus? Then, who would control this vital interoceanic link and who would operate it to serve the needs of world commerce as required by other treaties to which we are committed?

Again, Mr. Speaker, I ask why should there be any change in the existing treaty as long as we have the existing canal? To say the least, any basic change as regards the canal and zone should be deferred until any new canal is undertaken and completed. Yet, in their maddened zeal to take over the canal, Panamanians demand immediate surrender of all our basic and indispensable rights over the canal and complete cession of the Canal Zone to Panama.

In view of the world situation with war clouds all around the horizon, including Latin America, the principal conclusions in the "Majority Report" are not only stupid but amount to criminal folly, and are in utter disregard of the taxpayers of the United States, the vast expenditures defrayed by our Government, the sacrifices made by the builders of the canal, and the security of the Western Hemisphere. The Congress ought to investigate this entire matter on its objective merits and advise the Nation at large of the identity of the miners and sappers in our Government responsible for the projected betrayal at Panama. They have grossly misinformed and misled the President.

MAJORITY REPORT SUPPORT PANAMANIAN VIEWS

The greater part of the booklet under discussion is the "majority report," pages 3 to 67. It consists of a condensed historical summary from 1848 to June 17, 1966, a chapter on "The Dimensions of the Negotiation," another on "The Canal Studies," another on "The Special Problems of Nuclear Excavation," and, finally, one on "The Climate of Public Opinion."

Because my comments on various statements in the "majority report" are extensive, I shall not discuss individual points here except to state that virtually the entire "majority report" is devoted to the support of the projected surrender and toward securing authorization of a vast construction undertaking in Panama that is wholly unprecedented in the isthmian area and unjustified from every practical angle.

Entirely unrealistic, the "majority report" fails to evince the fact that the grave concessions which have been proposed would not, if granted, satisfy extreme Panamanian demands but would be accepted by Panama as the justifying foundation for divesting the United States of its last vestige of control as regards the canal enterprise and for its complete takeover by the Panamanian Government. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I venture the further prediction that if the United States is driven from the isthmus that Panama itself will lose control of the canal immediately because of Soviet domination.

As indicative of the shortsightedness of advocates of a new canal in the Canal Zone or in Panama of so-called sea-level design is the fact that these partisans also urge a treaty of short duration under which the canal should be built and operated. Thus, after the U.S. taxpayers provide the vast sums required for its construction, indemnities, and annuities, such treaty for a new canal will end after a brief period, and Panama will be privileged not to renew it with the result that our further investment will be wholly lost. If the people or our country understood what is thus involved they would voice justifiable indignation and resentment. It is for reasons of this character that those responsible for the new treaty proposals are moving heaven and earth to keep facts in the present situation from becoming generally known. Thus, our taxpayers stand not only to lose the nearly $5 billion invested in the present canal and its defense but also the investment in the proposed new canal running into billions.

If such treaty proposals as those accepted by the "majority report" as accomplished facts, are ever ratified by the Senate, it will be because responsible administrative officials, in their fatuous pursuit of policies of appeasement and the practice of the un-American policy of managed news, were able to prevail. But when our people realize what has happened they will understand that the best interests of their country have been betrayed and their elected representatives in the Congress, influenced by such sentiment, will deal most charily with the subject of implementing appropriations. The present treaty negotiators of the United States, as reflected in the "majority report," show an absolute indifference to the best interests of our taxpayers and consider the interests of the Nation altogether inconsequential.

Moreover, it must be understood that in all the Central American states where a new Isthmian Canal might be constructed, Communist revolutionary influence is so strong and political instability so prevalent that a canal operated under any authority except the exclusive authority of the United States would not be an asset to our country but a detriment.

PANAMA CANAL CANNOT SERVE TWO MASTERS

Even now, under our extreme "liberal" policy with respect to the canal we are permitting the transit of vessels that carry munitions and other supplies for North Vietnam armies. Thus, the canal is being made into an accessory in behalf of Red forces at war with the United States. This is bad enough as it is but it would be far worse if Panama is made a comanager of the canal.

In such event, Panamian policy would be adamant against any use of the canal that might offend Communist powers and the result would be that our Government would be involved in a constant state of friction with Panama concerning matters of this character, and others less serious. Should the Panama Canal ever become a political plum for Panama it would be the target in ceaseless struggles between Panamanian factions for highly paid positions, with grave consequences affecting canal security. For efficient operations, the United States must have exclusive responsibility; and from this fact we cannot escape, for the canal cannot serve under two masters.

It follows, therefore, that the United States must have, as it has always had, adequate authority to perform the tremendous tasks imposed by solemn treaty obligations and which, for more than 60 years, it has so wisely and efficiently exercised. The Panama flag now displayed in the Canal Zone equal with the flag of the United States with funds from our taxpayers is a symbol of divided authority and must be hauled down.

MINORITY REPORT PROTECTS U.S. INTERESTS

Though less extensive than the "Majority Report," the "Minority Report" repudiates the idea that a Presidential pronouncement is a "fait accompli" and evaluates the canal problem on the basis of merit. Drawing upon authentic independent sources of information, the authors reveal themselves as possessing a remarkable store of digested knowledge, with a clear and realistic understanding of the problems involved, and the capacity and courage to state their views with effective clarity.

Of particular interest to informed Members of the Congress will be the fact that the "Minority Report" contains a program for action by the United States. Because of its importance, I shall summarize its highlights:

First. Terminate immediately the present negotiations with Panama while holding Panama to strict and just accountability for respecting and enforcing its treaty obligations for the maintenance of law and order in the terminal cities of Panama and Colón.

Second. Withdraw any and all arrangements for shared management of the canal.

Third. Reassert the position of the United States in the sovereign control of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

Fourth. Insist upon Panamanian recognition of the full force and validity of the 1903 treaty, allowing, however, an adjustment of the annuity in that treaty.

Fifth. Require, as a necessary condition to the resumption of treaty negotiations, that Panama agree to a revocation of certain major concessions made to her in the 1936 and 1955 treaties, which, in perspective, appear to have been only stepping stones for the ultimate takeover of the canal from the United States.

Sixth. Insist upon receiving from Panama in perpetuity the entire watershed of the Chagres River, necessary for canal purposes.

Seventh. Abandon plans for the excavation of a new canal of so-called sea-level design, whether by nuclear or conventional methods.

Eighth. Proceed with the improvement of the existing canal in accordance with the Terminal Lake-third locks plan in order to provide necessary additional transit capacity and operational improvement.

This program, Mr. Speaker, enables the maximum utilization of all work done to improve the canal since 1914, including that on the suspended third locks project. It is authorized under existing treaty and does not require the negotiation of a new one. Such improvement would provide a two-way ship channel in the summit level with ample lock capacity at each end arranged to provide optimum conditions for the convenient and economic transit of vessels. This is what the shipping using the canal needs and it is what they should have with the least possible delay.

UNITED STATES MUST NOT SURRENDER CANAL ZONE SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Speaker, when the Congress approaches the canal problem let us not be deceived by pleas of emergency in Panama, however plausibly expressed. Such entreaties are induced by timidity on the part of our officials who desire to create a fine "image" in foreign lands or by fear of Panamanian mob assaults on the Canal Zone. The President of the United States cannot know everything and has to depend on his advisers.

Is it not the duty of the Congress to protect him and the Nation from irretrievable error inherent in a policy of reacting to contrived situations?

The struggle in which our country is now engaged against aggressive communism is global and transcends all questions of partisan nature. The Panama Canal, as the key strategic point in the Western Hemisphere and the greatest single symbol of U.S. prestige and power, is marked for a takeover by Red revolutionary force. Its loss will serve as a mighty spark to encourage and activate Communist revolutionary overthrows of constitutional governments not only in other Latin American countries. Moreover, such loss would make a calamitous impact on other crucial strategic spots—Southeast Asia, where our fighting men are dying; Gibraltar, the gateway to the Mediterranean; the Suez Canal—already under Soviet domination—and the Red Sea, the transportation artery to the Indian Ocean; and southern Africa, which dominates the sea lanes around the Cape of Good Hope.

As important as our winning the Vietnam war may be in fighting Communist revolutionary aggression, the loss of that war would be less disastrous in its long-range consequences to the United States and the Western Hemisphere than the proposed surrender of the Canal Zone now being advocated by elements in our Government.

If the jurisdiction over the Canal Zone is ceded back to Panama it will mean that all the courts, schools, police and fire forces, and other civil activities will pass to Panamanian control. It will mean that all the public and private buildings in the zone erected and maintained at great expense by our Nation, including hospitals, barracks, military installations, school buildings, streets, bridges, and the like now bearing names bestowed by the Congress, directly or indirectly, in appreciation of services rendered by the builders of the canal, will become subject to a new system of nomenclature by Panama that will completely ignore the commemoration intended by our Government. Also, it will mean that the slums and brothels of Panama City and Colon will be extended into the Canal Zone area, bringing worldwide condemnation on the United States.

The Canal Zone is to our people a holy and sacred spot made sacred by the services and sacrifices of those who built the canal and have since maintained and defended it. Any policy or action, by our Government to ignore these facts will constitute an inglorious and abject effacement for what is dear and precious to our citizens, and wake angry repercussions.

In view of all these facts, Mr. Speaker, under no circumstances should the United States cede its sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama, for we would do so at the peril of Western civilization.

SUMMATION

In the way of summation of the principal points in the canal situation, I would emphasize the following:

First. The United States has a fine canal at Panama now with indispensable sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone territory for its efficient maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection but it is rapidly approaching capacity saturation and requires operational improvement.

Second. Experience has shown that the present canal will work and how to provide for its major increase of capacity and operational improvement, without a new treaty with Panama.

Third. This modernization program, developed during World War II and known as the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan, can be accomplished "at comparatively low cost" and in far less time than a sea-level project would require.

Fourth. Between 1904 and 1966 we invested more than $4,889,051,000 on the Panama Canal and the Armed Forces defending it.

Fifth. Through our obsession with the construction of a canal of so-called sea-level design, we are losing control of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal through a policy of surrender.

Sixth. If we cannot hold the canal which we built, own, and have maintained at our expense and over which we are sovereign, the United States will be completely driven from the Isthmus and Panama will become another Cuba.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for a prompt reappraisal by our Government of its policy of surrender at Panama, for the assertion of our just rights in the Canal Zone, and for the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the Panama Canal along the lines of the program outlined in the "Minority Report" previously mentioned. To that end, instead of extending the limits of time and expenditure of the present canal study group created under Public Law 88-609 as requested by the administration, the Congress should create without delay an independent broadly based Interoceanic Canals Commission as provided in pending bills.

NEAR EAST CRISIS EMPHASIZES PERIL AT PANAMA

Mr. Speaker, in speaking bluntly as I have done today, I have so spoken because of the gravity of the situation at Panama demands such treatment, especially as regards the transcendent question of maintaining our full sovereignty over the Canal Zone. The basic question in the proposed surrender of our sovereignty there is not U.S. control over the Panama Canal versus Panamanian control but American control versus Communist control. In the Near East, Egypt, with Soviet collaboration, not only denies transit of the Suez Canal to some countries but also threatens to block that waterway completely if any move is made contrary to the dictates of Nasser and the Soviet. These facts emphasize with greater force than anything I can say about the peril at Panama.

Except for the bold and truculent support given to Dictator Nasser by the Soviet Government he would never dare to challenge the free world or to threaten it. If Soviet power is permitted to dominate the Panama Canal then every country in Latin-America will be lost to Red revolutionary power and the control of two strategic canals will enable communism to sweep over the world with its long continued and avowed policy of bringing all nations into the Soviet orbit.

How blind are those who will not see: The United States must maintain its exclusive sovereign rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal undiluted and in perpetuity.

In order that those studying this address may have the benefit of significant parts of the previously indicated booklet and certain other documents, I quote them and my commentary on the "majority report" as parts of my remarks:

[From the Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., Special Report Series No. 3, March 1967]

PANAMA CANAL ISSUES AND TREATY TALK—PART II—MINORITY REPORT

(Part two is a report by a minority of the Panel. In our consideration of Panama Canal problems we are unwilling to be limited by the joint announcement of Presidents Johnson and Robles on September 24, 1965. We do not accept the view that a presidential statement that purports to abrogate a treaty which has been constitutionally ratified and to relinquish sovereign control over legally acquired territory of the United States should be allowed to serve as a definitive guideline for this study or to block a full and open-minded consideration of Canal problems. Our analysis dealing more broadly with those problems therefore leads us to some conclusions different from those of the preceding report.—Donald M. Dozer, Vice Admiral T. G. W. Settle, U.S.N. (Ret.))

HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

Panama, despite its small population of only 1.2 million, enjoys a status of singular importance because of its geographical position astride the Isthmus connecting the continents of North and South America. At the same time, its location makes it a focus of envy of the predatory communist nations that are working constantly to seize and control it. The Isthmus is one of the great strategic and military centers of the world.

Panama's independence was protected by the United States under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty from 1903 to 1939, but since World War II its independent status has been compromised by a succession of crises, some fomented by communist-oriented agitators and some by surrenders to Panama by the United States of important rights, power, and authority, which is indispensable to effective management of the Canal and to safeguarding U.S. interests there. The global implications of these mounting crises in Panama, aimed at wresting control of the Canal from the United States, may be seen in the coincidence of events there with those in the Suez Canal, in South Africa, and in Vietnam, all directed toward gaining control of the strategic waterways of the world. The preservation of the sovereign control of the United States over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal is more vital to this nation than victory in Vietnam. The further forfeiture of that control will constitute a major surrender by the United States and may be expected to trigger communist takeovers of governments in Latin America.

The United States was acknowledged in 1903 by all the maritime nations to have an international mandate to construct, maintain, operate, sanitate, and protect a canal across the American Isthmus for the benefit of world commerce. It chose Panama over Nicaragua as the site of the Canal because of its superiority and because Panama offered as an inducement a grant of sovereign control over a canal zone and other concessions outside the zone which were indispensable to the discharge of that mandate. These were embodied in the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, which granted "in perpetuity" to the United States "all the rights, power and authority . . . which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory . . . to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority" (Article III). This article, which still remains legally in full force and effect, granted the United States the sovereign control which has been demonstrated ever since as essential to enable it to discharge its canal responsibilities. It was intended to remove "in perpetuity" any possibility of claims against the United States for the exercise by Panama or any other nation of extraterritorial rights in the Zone. Panama gave the United States these extensive rights "in perpetuity" in return for the obligation of the United States to operate the canal in perpetuity and to guarantee its independence. Just as Panama committed itself to granting to the United States in perpetuity a strip of its own land for building, operating, and maintaining an interoceanic canal the United States committed itself also in perpetuity to operate and maintain the canal. Panama thus gained an advantage which she would forfeit only at her cost and peril.

It should be noted that the Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty was constitutionally ratified by both Panama and the United States and that when Panama adopted its first constitution in February 1904 it expressly ratified all the measures that had been enacted by the Provisional Government including the Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty.

In implementing the treaty the United States proceeded to acquire outright ownership of all land and other property in the Canal Zone by purchase from the individual owners. The rights exercised by the United States in the Canal Zone are derived therefore from both the grant from the government of Panama and purchase from the individual property owners.

The total cost of the acquisition of the Canal Zone, as reported by the Deputy Secretary of the Army on March 31, 1964, is as follows:

Original payment, 1904 (treaty of 1903)	$10,000,000
Annuity, 1913-1963 (treaties of 1903, 1936, 1955)	30,150,000
Property transfers:	
In Panama City and Colón, 1943	11,759,956
Water system in Panama City and Colón	669,226
Under treaty of 1955	22,260,500
Colombia (1922)	25,000,000
Compagnie Nouvelle du Canal de Panama (1904)	40,000,000
Private titles, stocks, and claims	4,728,889
Total	144,568,571

The principal objectives of the Isthmian Canal policy of the United States, as historically evolved, have been to construct, maintain, and operate the best possible type of canal at the best possible site for the transit of vessels of commerce and war of all nations on terms of equality as provided by treaty and to do so at the lowest possible cost of construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection. The United States has traditionally considered the Panama Canal as vital to her security and commercial interests and has operated it on a self-sustaining basis.

For more than ten years the United States has been enmeshed in crisis diplomacy with Panama and has responded with one concession after another, each of which has been followed by new and greater demands from Panama. While retaining the responsibility, embodied not only in the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty with Panama but also in treaties with Great Britain (Hay-Pauncefote, 1901) and Colombia (Thomson-Urrutia, 1914–1922), the United States has progressively relinquished its authority in the Canal Zone under pressure from communist-led demonstrations and demagogic Panamanian politicians thus furthering the long-range communist objective of gaining control of the strategic waterways of the world.

To this pressure the United States has responded only with concession after concession. In the treaty of 1955 it increased the annuity to Panama by $1,500,000, to make a total annual payment of $1,930,000. At the same time it gave to Panama approximately $25 million worth of miscellaneous parcels of lands, relinquished its treaty responsibility for sanitation in the cities of Panama and Colôn, and turned over to Panama the railroad terminals, passenger stations, and freight yards in those cities, all without compensation.

Over and above the financial benefits which the Panamanians derive from the Canal enterprise they have received from the United States between 1946 and 1964 a total of $128 million in financial aid or more than $100 for every man, woman, and child in the country. This aid from the United States exceeds the total amount given to any other Central American country except Guatemala and the per capita amount given to any other Central American country except Costa Rica.

In return for the concessions which the United States made to Panama in the treaties of 1936 and 1955 Panama promised to "strengthen further the bonds of friendship and cooperation" with the United States to promote mutual understanding and friendship of her people with the United States. Panama has not fulfilled her part of this bargain. Meanwhile, the concessions made to her are increasingly seen to have been unwise, for they appear as part of a plan to wrest control of the Canal from the United States through piecemeal erosion. The agitation and demonstrations in Panama against the treaty position of the United States in the Zone, if continued, can only result in driving the United States from the Isthmus. Panama's repeated thrusts are directed toward the total liquidation of United States sovereignty and control over the Panama Canal. In December 1958 Panama took the bold step of proclaiming the extension of its territorial waters to a twelve-mile limit thus encompassing within its own territory the area beyond the three-mile limit of canal operations at both ends of the Canal Zone which was stipulated in the treaty of 1903. Panama thus established a legal basis for bottling up the United States in the Zone.

KEY ISSUES

The key Isthmian Canal issues facing the United States are: (1) whether the United States should insist upon preserving its existing treaty rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone in order that it may adequately discharge its treaty responsibility for the efficient maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal for the benefit of its own commerce and the commerce of the world and that it may at the same time defend and protect its own security interests and those of other nations of the western hemisphere, and (2) whether, because of the approaching traffic saturation of Canal capacity, the United States should construct additional Canal facilities required to meet increased traffic demands. This latter question has reopened the old debate as to the advisability of constructing (1) a so-called sea-level canal across the Isthmus, possibly with nuclear excavation, or (2) an alternate canal at a site other than the site of the existing canal. The United States has allowed itself to be impaled on the dilemma as to how far it can go in acceding to Panama's demands while retaining the control necessary to discharge its treaty obligations and protect its own vital interests in the Canal Zone. The problems of the Canal, which involve primarily matters of engineering and operation, have been allowed to become seriously intertwined with matters of politics and diplomacy, and the advocates of a sea-level canal, taking advantage of the resulting confusion, are again pushing their favorite project.

The United States has been maneuvered into its current negotiations with Panama by the blackmail tactics of Panama, aided and abetted by communist conspiratorial forces and by successive administrations in Washington. In this situation whatever bargaining advantage still rests with the United States is further weakened by its virtual dependence upon a satisfactory settlement with Panama and by the pressure being exerted by the Panamanian government for a speedy termination of the current treaty negotiations due to the political climate in Panama. In all the negotiations which the United States has carried on with Panama since 1936 it has never, except on a few slight occasions, required any reciprocal concessions by Panama. All that Panama seems to be expected to offer is a cessation of demonstrations and mob action against the United States, which it seems to be able to turn on and off at will. In addition, in the propaganda campaign for a sea-level canal among special interest groups in the United States, Panama has been supplied with a lever which it is shrewdly using to maximum advantage. These are Panama's only negotiating assets. Hence, the conditions for reciprocally satisfactory negotiation are lacking, and for this reason the current negotiations are stalemated. To put them on a proper basis it is necessary that the United States recover its position of bargaining strength and that Panama be made conscious of its international obligations as an avowedly responsible member of the American and international community.

CONCLUSIONS

The United States therefore should:

(1) *Terminate immediately its present negotiations with Panama while holding Panama to strict accountability for respecting and enforcing its treaty obligations for the maintenance of law and order;*

(2) *Withdraw any and all arrangements for shared management of the Canal.* Panama does not possess the skilled managerial and operating personnel required to handle the Canal. Moreover, as a country of mercurial politics it lacks the stable government necessary to discharge this responsibility to world commerce. Since 1930 Panama has undergone five unconstitutional changes of heads of state. Little comfort can be gained from examining the backgrounds of opposition leaders in Panama today or the extent of communist influence among the youth of that country.

(3) *Reassert its position of sovereign control over the Canal and the Canal Zone, which has been dangerously weakened by action of Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson.* As a symbol of its sovereign control it should allow only the United States flag to be flown in the Zone. The successes which the communists have already achieved in extending the area of their control, as notably in the case of Cuba, render it imperative that the United States maintain all its treaty rights, power, and authority over the Canal.

(4) *Insist upon Panamanian recognition of the full force and validity of the 1903 Treaty allowing, however, an adjustment of the annuity provided in that treaty;*

(5) *As a necessary condition to the resumption of treaty negotiations, require that Panama agree to a revocation of certain major concessions made to her in the treaties of 1936 and 1955, which appear in perspective to have been only stepping stones to ultimate conquest of the Canal from the United States;*

(6) *Insist upon receiving from Panama in perpetuity the entire watershed of the Chagres River, thus enabling the United States, within the terms of the Treaty of 1903, to proceed with the modernization of the Canal and the enlargement of its traffic capacity with a secure water supply.* It is important to note that the United States did not insist upon receiving a canal zone wider than ten miles in 1903 because it was given in the Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty the right of eminent domain in Panama for all necessary canal purposes. The recommendation that the Canal Zone should be widened to include the entire watershed of the Chagres River was made initially by General Clarence R. Edwards while commanding the United States Army in the Canal Zone in 1915–1917. The United States surrendered the right of eminent domain in Panama in the Treaty of 1936 but now needs control over the entire Chagres River basin outside the Zone for the operation of the Canal. Only in this way can it prevent the burning of timber on the headwaters of the Chagres River by irresponsible *campesinos* and the resulting soil erosion which limits the water available for canal operations. The advantages to Panama from this additional grant can and should be convincingly demonstrated to Panamanians by their own political leaders.

Panama owes her national existence to the Canal enterprise, and from it she has derived, and will derive as long as the United States remains in sovereign control, tremendous economic benefits, which have given her one of the highest standards of living in all Latin America.

(7) *Abandon plans for the digging of a new canal, whether by nuclear or by conventional methods.* The Governor of the Canal Zone reported in 1931: "Considering the low cost of providing water for additional lockages by pumping, it is apparent that the ultimate capacity of the Panama Canal with locks is unlimited and may be increased to any amount desired by constructing additional locks and installing the necessary pumping equipment," thus ultimately envisaging a third, perhaps a fourth, and even a fifth set of locks.

A sea-level canal project derives advantages from its glamorous appeal and from the grandiose vision it creates of a Panama strait comparable to the Straits of Magellan. But it should be emphasized that the term sea-level canal is a misnomer; because of the differential in tides on the Pacific and the Caribbean sides of the Isthmus, with maximum ranges of 22 feet on the Pacific and only about 22 inches on the Caribbean, even a so-called sea-level canal would necessarily have to be a tidal-lock canal. The regulating works for tidal control, as well as the high dikes required to divert flood waters in a sea-level canal, would make such a canal as vulnerable to nuclear attack in wartime as the present lock canal, in fact more so because of the greater length and depth of the cut which will be necessary.

There is no substantial, evidential support for the assertion that a sea-level canal would require fewer supporting facilities and administrative procedures than the present Canal. On the contrary it seems highly probable that since a sea-level canal would be more susceptible to slides and will present unprecedentedly large maintenance problems it will require larger supporting facilities and administrative staffs. Moreover, the expense of digging a new canal at any site different from that of the existing Canal must take into consideration the following costs, among others:

a. Purchase of the right-of-way;

b. Indemnity of Panama for leaving the present site;

c. Purchase price for real estate at the new site; and

d. Construction at the new site of new facilities which are already constructed and being used at the existing Canal, including harbors and docks, drydocks, shops, fueling and oil storage facilities, industrial plants, storehouses, towns with water, fuel, and electric current, roads, parks, schools, police stations, dams, reservoirs, electric power plants, telephone systems, sanitation systems, hospitals, defense installations, and many others.

TERMINAL LAKE-THIRD LOCKS PLAN

(8) *Proceed with the improvement of the existing Canal in accordance with the Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan in order to provide necessary additional transit capacity in the Canal.* This plan grew out of wartime experience after 1941 which disclosed the following as principal Canal problems:

a. The traffic bottleneck at Pedro Miguel locks and lack of a summit-level traffic reservoir at the Pacific end.

b. Double handling of vessels at the separated Pacific locks.

c. Effects of fog in Gaillard Cut on Canal capacity and operations.

d. Lockage surges in the Gaillard Cut caused by operation of the Pedro Miguel Locks.

e. Limited operating range of the water level in Gatún Lake (87–82 feet).

f. Navigational hazards in Gaillard Cut due to its narrow width (300 feet minimum bottom width).

g. Inadequate dimensions of the locks for the largest vessels (110 feet by 1,000 feet by 41 feet).

To overcome these difficulties the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan was proposed and was authoritatively recognized as supplying the best operational canal practicable of achievement. It called for elimination of Pedro Miguel Locks, the consolidation of all Pacific locks near Miraflores, the creation of a summit-level anchorage in the Pacific end of the Canal to match that at Gatún, and elevating the summit water level to its optimum height of 92 feet. It will thus provide summit-level navigation from Gatún to Miraflores with obvious operational benefits including reduced transit time for vessels and an anchorage area immediately north of the Miraflores locks. This plan, as contrasted with the sea-level plan, will not empty Gatún Lake but will raise it from 85 to 92 feet and will provide ample water supply for the operation of the Canal for many years to come.

This plan was recommended by the Governor of the Canal Zone to the Secretary of War for comprehensive investigation, was supported by maritime interests, and won the support of the President as a post-war project. The Governor of the Canal Zone, however, in his report to the Secretary of War warned that there remained advocates of a sea-level canal who would oppose "unjustifiably" any major improvement of the existing Canal on the grounds that it would delay the adoption of their sea-level scheme.

The advent of the atomic bomb near the end of World War II generated a new concern for Canal security.

As a result, the new Governor of the Canal Zone secured authorization to conduct a comprehensive investigation of the means of increasing the capacity "and security" of the Panama Canal to meet the needs of interoceanic commerce "and national defense", including a restudy of the 1939 Third Locks Project (Public Law 280, 79th Congress). In the hearings he approved the terminal lake proposal in principle as the proper form for modernizing the existing Canal.

The advocates of a sea-level route, according to their own statements, used "security" as their rallying cry and, ignoring money costs, tried to push through their scheme, which, in its modern form, called for the building of a sea-level canal near the approximate route of the present Canal and crossing it several times, a tidal lock, many miles of dams for flood control reservoirs on both sides of the projected canal, and four diversion channels.

There was a determined drive by those who would benefit to secure its authorization, including the manufacturers of heavy earth-moving machinery, dredging combines, contractors, and a limited group of engineers. But their proposal failed to receive Presidential approval and was not accepted by the Congress.

It was estimated at that time that the digging of a sea-level canal along the existing route would involve channel excavation of approximately one billion cubic yards of material. By comparison the total channel excavation for the present Canal, including the usable excavation performed by the French, was approximately 275 million cubic yards or only one-fourth as much. Questions were raised at the time by nuclear warfare experts whether a sea-level canal would actually prove to be less vulnerable to atomic attack than a summit-level canal.

In 1957 the House of Representatives authorized the appointment of an independent Board of Consultants on Isthmian Canal Studies to investigate plans for the operation and improvement of the Panama Canal. This Board, initially composed of six experts drawn from private life, presented its report in June 1960 (86th Congress, 2d Session, *House Report No. 1960*). The Board estimated the cost of the Terminal Lake-Third Locks project, on which $75 million had been spent between 1940 and 1942 and which had been shown by World War II experience to be necessary, at almost $1,021 million. This estimate was extravagant, however, because it was based upon locks of excessive dimensions, 200 feet by 1500 feet by 55 feet whereas the original Third-Locks Project called for locks of 140 feet by 1200 feet by 50 feet. The Board estimated the initial cost of a sea-level canal with regulating structures at $2,537 million, not including diplomatic costs, which would undoubtedly be huge.

They concluded that the present Canal, if modernized in accordance with the "consolidated third-locks" design in order to accommodate vessels with a beam of 132 feet, "will have fully adequate capacity to meet the demands of traffic beyond the year 2000," taking into consideration a report by the Stanford Research Institute that commercial freight traffic through the Canal would more than double in tonnage by the year 2000.

With reference to the proposal of a sea-level canal, the Board reported that the fixed charges of such a canal are "very high and would commence with the start of the enormous construction job. If started now, these fixed charges would commence decades before the volume of traffic, even with increased rates, could absorb them. Hence a subsidy would be required to meet a heavy deficit over a period of many years. . . . We are doubtful," they added, "if any reasonable plan to construct a sea-level canal in the Canal Zone could be carried through without serious danger of a long interruption to traffic at the time of cutover from the present lock canal." The Board was also "extremely doubtful of the stability of the slopes resulting from the construction of a sea-level canal." "In our opinion," they concluded, "slides of the first magnitude could easily result from the use of such slopes." As a further objection, they pointed out, the differential in tides on the Atlantic and the Pacific "would at times cause currents in the channel up to 4.5 knots in a sea-level canal without tidal-regulating structures. This flow, combined with currents caused by flood and intermingling of fresh and salt water, would produce currents up to 7 knots in certain places."

The Terminal Lake-Third Locks proposal makes possible a maximum utilization of all the work done thus far on the Panama Canal, including the Third Locks project between 1940 and 1942 and the continuing work of widening and deepening the channel, which has been going forward since 1960. All that remains is to construct larger locks in the present Canal. This proposal, calling only for an enlargement of existing facilities within the Canal Zone, does not require a new treaty with Panama but is covered by existing treaties—a paramount consideration because of current diplomatic difficulties with Panama.

The canal facility that is required at Panama is a two-way ship channel across the Isthmus with a traffic reservoir and ample lock capacity at both ends of the canal. The two-way ship channel is complete except for about three miles in Gaillard Cut, and the reservoirs and lock capacity will be provided under the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan. This plan will necessitate a minimal additional expense, will require no new treaty negotiations, and will enable the Canal to accommodate all but approximately two percent of the vessels in world shipping well into the twenty-first century.

Objection to this simple, obvious, and economic solution has been raised that it would be only an interim solution, but all transportation systems are interim solutions. What is needed is one based upon the realities of the problem of economic transit across the American Isthmus. The evidence is conclusive that a lake-lock canal can be justified on a business basis whereas a sea-level project cannot be. If the time should ever come when a modernized Panama Canal with a two-way ship channel in the summit level equipped with ample lock capacity at each end becomes insufficient, then something more could be done. In any event, such a time is so far away that it should not be allowed to influence current decisions.

* * * * *

We now have a fine canal.

We know it will work.

We know how to operate it.

We know how to enlarge it from time to time as necessity requires.

We have a treaty with Panama which enables us to operate it and control it, though this treaty is now being abrogated by executive fiat.

We are losing control of the Panama Canal through a policy of retreat and through our obsession with the construction of a canal of sea-level design which weakens our bargaining position.

If we cannot control the Canal which we now own, we may be forced entirely out of the canal business in Central America.

If this happens, who will control this priceless interoceanic utility? Who will operate it to serve the needs of world commerce?

PUBLIC LAW 88-609, 88TH CONGRESS, S. 2701, SEPT. 22, 1964, 78 STAT. 990.

An act to provide for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to appoint a Commission to be composed of five men from private life, to make a full and complete investigation and study, including necessary on-site surveys, and considering national defense, foreign relations, intercoastal shipping, interoceanic shipping, and such other matters as they may determine to be important, for the purpose of determining the feasibility of, and the most suitable site for, the construction of a sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; the best means of constructing such a canal, whether by conventional or nuclear excavation, and the estimated cost thereof. The President shall designate as Chairman one of the members of the Commission.

SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized to utilize the facilities of any department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the United States Government, and to obtain such services as it deems necessary in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

SEC. 3. The Commission shall report to the President for transmittal to Congress on July 31, 1965, with respect to its progress, and each year thereafter until the completion of its duties. The President shall submit such recommendations to the Congress as he deems advisable. The Commission shall continue until the President determines that its duties are completed, but not later than June 30, 1968.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, not to exceed $17,500,000.

Approved September 22, 1964.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

House Report No. 1706 (Comm. on Merchant Marine & Fisheries).

Senate Report No. 968 (Comm. on Commerce).

Congressional Record, Vol. 110 (1964): Mar. 30: Considered and passed Senate. Aug. 12: Considered in House. Sept. 1: Considered and passed House, amended. Sept. 8: Senate concurred in House amendments.

H.R. 6786

A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission Act of 1967".

SEC. 2. (a) A commission is hereby created, to be known as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), and to be composed of eleven members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows: One member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Army; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Navy; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Air Force; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers (retired) of the United States Army; and seven members from civil life, four of whom shall be persons learned and skilled in the science of engineering. The President shall designate one of the members from civil life as Chairman, and shall fill all vacancies on the Commission in the same manner as original appointments are made. The Commission shall cease to exist upon the completion of its work hereunder.

(b) The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $30,000 per annum, and the other members shall receive compensation at the rate of $28,500 per annum, each; but the members appointed from the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall receive only such compensation, in addition to their pay and allowances, as will make their total compensation from the United States $28,500 each.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized and directed to make and conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of all problems involved or arising in connection with plans or proposals for—

(1) an increase in the capacity and operational efficiency of the present Panama Canal through the adaptation of the third locks project (53 Stat. 1409) to provide a summit-level terminal lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with that in the Atlantic end, or by other modification or design of the existing facilities;

(2) the construction of a new Panama Canal of sea level design, or any modification thereof;

(3) the construction and ownership, by the United States, of another canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans;

(4) the operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal and of any other canal or canals which may be recommended by the Commission;

(5) treaty and territorial rights which may be deemed essential hereunder; and

(6) estimates of the respective costs of the undertakings herein enumerated.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of conducting all inquiries and investigations deemed necessary by the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Commission is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Commission is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other officer, of the Commission, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Commission may deem relevant or material for the purposes herein named. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress, not later than two years after the date of the enactment hereof, a final report containing the results and conclusions of its investigations and studies hereunder, with recommendations; and may, in its discretion, submit interim reports to the President and the Congress concerning the progress of its work. Such final report shall contain—

(1) the recommendations of the Commission with respect to the Panama Canal, and to any new interoceanic canal or canals which the Commission may consider feasible or desirable for the United States to construct, own, maintain, and operate;

(2) the estimates of the Commission as regards the approximate cost of carrying out its recommendations; and like estimates of cost as to the respective proposals and plans considered by the Commission and embraced in its final report; and

(3) such information as the Commission may have been able to obtain with respect to the necessity for the acquisition, by the United States, of new, or additional, rights, privileges, and concessions, by means of treaties or agreements with foreign nations, before there may be made the execution of any plans or projects recommended by the Commission.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall, without regard to the civil service laws, appoint a secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission and shall receive compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 7. The Commission is hereby authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such engineers, surveyors, experts, or advisers deemed by the Commission necessary hereunder, as limited by the provisions in title 5, United States Code, section 55a; and may make expenditures, in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, for travel and subsistence expenses of members of the Commission and its employees while away from their homes or regular places of business; for rent of quarters at the seat of government, or elsewhere; for personal services at the seat of government, or elsewhere; and for printing and binding necessary for the efficient and adequate functions of the Commission hereunder. All expenses of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Commission, or such other official of the Commission as the Commission may designate.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

SEC. 9. The Act entitled "An Act to provide for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans" (Public Law 88–609, 78 Stat. 990), is hereby repealed.

PANAMA CANAL ISSUES AND TREATY TALKS

Early in January 1964 a crisis in U.S.-Panamanian relations, which had been brewing for some time, suddenly assumed major proportions, when violence erupted at the Panama Canal Zone. Ostensibly, the cause of the disturbance involved the raising of the flags of the United States of America and the Republic of Panama in front of the Balboa High School in the Zone. The incident, however, had its tap root deep in the problems related to U.S. control and operations of the Panama Canal, and the status of the Canal Zone, which had been the focal point of bilateral relations between the two countries for over 60 years.

Because the Canal looms large in the complex network of world commerce and vitally influences the relations of the United States not only with Panama, but also with other countries of Latin America, effective ways of dealing with the major stresses within U.S.-Panamanian relations must be developed.

The United States has agreed, at Panama's insistence, to negotiate new treaty arrangements. These will deal with the issues of sovereignty over the Canal Zone, continued operation and administration of the Panama Canal, its economic benefits for the Republic of Panama, and the possibilities of a new sea-level canal. The challenging task of finding common grounds of agreement between the United States and Panama will demand a high measure of statesmanship on the part of the leaders of those countries.

The following report is a study of basic issues that now divide the United States and Panama and that are highlighted in current negotiations. Since the United States must be concerned with present and future canal requirements, with the welfare of Panama and the demands of world commerce, and with its own security and that of the western hemisphere, it seeks broad-based agreements that will not jeopardize these interests.

Among the key Isthmian canal questions are:

How can Panama's insistence on sovereignty over the Panama Canal and Canal Zone be reconciled with the U.S. claim that Panama has neither the resources nor capacity to manage, operate, and defend the Canal efficiently?

Should the present Canal be improved or should a new canal be built in Panama to handle the increased navigation and traffic demands that are expected to reach critical proportions early in the next century?

If a new canal is constructed should it be by conventional or nuclear means?

If nuclear excavation is chosen, what arrangements would be necessary in light of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty?

What compensation should Panama receive for either an improved or a new canal facility?

If agreement cannot be reached with Panama, should the United States build a new canal across Colombia or at some other location?

All these questions are subject to debate. Differences of opinion may be found within the United States and within Panama.

Because the interests at stake are so important and the progress of negotiations has been so limited, the Center for Strategic Studies invited a group of practicing experts, with diverse views on Panama's situation, to make an independent investigation of the issues and to draw up conclusions, which they feel would help resolve the unsettled questions.

The Panel, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Joseph S. Farland, found it necessary to include both a majority and a minority report in its final document in order to give a fair representation of the views held by the Panel members. Some of the conclusions have also been divided between majority and minority viewpoints. It is intended that the material presented within the study should provide scope for criticism from those who are concerned with the stimulation of progress in Panama-U.S. relations.

A special note of appreciation is due to Jeremiah O'Leary and Sheldon Z. Kaplan for their assistance in preparation of the report.

ARLEIGH BURKE,
Director.

MEMBERS OF THE PANEL

Joseph S. Farland, Chairman, U.S. Ambassador to Dominican Republic, 1957–1960; to Panama, 1960–1963.

Major General William A. Carter, USA (Ret.), Deputy Director, Project Analysis Division, Inter-American Development Bank; Governor of the Canal Zone, 1960–1962.

Jules Davids, Professor of American Diplomatic History, Georgetown University.

Donald Marquand Dozer, Professor of Latin American History, University of California, Santa Barbara, California; State Department, Division of Research for American Republics and the Historical Division, 1944–1956.

Eleanor Lansing Dulles, Professor of Government, Georgetown University; State Department, 1942–1962.

Victor C. Folsom, Vice President and General Counsel, United Fruit Company.

Major General K. D. Nichols, USA (Ret.), Consulting engineer; District Engineer, Manhattan District, 1942–1947; General Manager, A.E.C., 1953–1955.

Covey T. Oliver, Professor of International Law, University of Pennsylvania; U.S. Ambassador to Colombia, 1964–1966.

Vice Admiral T. G. W. Settle, USN (Ret.), Formerly Commander, Amphibious Forces, U.S. Pacific Fleet; service in Caribbean, Asiatic and European waters, including transportation, shipping and navigational affairs.

CONCLUSIONS OF THE PANEL [1]

For over sixty years, from November 18, 1903 to September 24, 1965, from Theodore Roosevelt's administration through the aftermath of the riots of 1964, U.S. policy toward Panama and the Panama Canal was based upon three major concepts: a) that the United States has sovereignty within the Canal Zone; b) that the rights obtained were held in perpetuity; and c) that the Canal tolls if at all possible would not be increased.

President Johnson's joint announcement with the President of Panama on September 24, 1965 publicly altered this basic policy position. By this statement, the Johnson administration agreed to abrogate the 1903 treaty, to relinquish its rights of sovereignty over the Zone, to place a term upon the contractual arrangements and tacitly to increase tolls.

With the exception of Dr. Dozer and Vice Admiral Settle, whose views will be found in the Minority Report, the members of the Panel have not directed their attention toward the merit of this policy change, but rather, because it was a Presidential announcement, believe that the position is now established as a fait accompli. Consequently, it is within this frame of reference that the following observations and conclusions are set forth:

1. The negotiation of new arrangements between the Republic of Panama and the United States were delayed by both parties in varying degrees during the initial phases of the talks. Delays were in part caused by the 1964 transition to a new administration in the Republic of Panama, the new administration's attempt to find financial backing for construction of a new canal independent of the United States, and its subsequent unsuccessful attempts to obtain support from other Latin American governments for an increase in Canal tolls. The United States was responsible for delays caused by a fruitless argument over semantics and by inadequate staffing during the early months of the talks. Although these delays, with the exception of Panama's search for support of toll increases, took place prior to the spring of 1965, they cause the loss of valuable negotiating time.

2. There is now an urgent need for the U.S. and Panamanian negotiators to reach agreement on the terms of the new treaties. This urgency is political, resulting primarily from pressures within the Republic of Panama. Whereas it will be decades before the present Canal becomes technically and economically obsolete, the unresolved Canal issues are certain to become increasingly acute in Panamanian politics, especially with Panamanian national elections scheduled for May, 1968, and with campaigns starting a full year in advance. Unsettled Canal issues could thereby lead to further deterioration of relations between the United States and Panama.

3. The negotiating approach of the two governments should continue to be the simultaneous consideration of the three treaties: a) the base-rights and status-of-forces agreement; b) a replacement for the 1903 treaty together with its amendments; and c) an option to build a new canal or improve the present one. The three treaties under negotiation ought to be completed and submitted for legislative approval in each nation by the fall of 1967, even though this step may exclude waiting for the completion of all details of the engineering and economic studies now under way.

4. The security of the United States and the security of the western hemisphere demand that the defense of the present and any future Isthmian Canal shall continue to rest with the United States for the duration of the final treaty agreements that are negotiated.

5. Although a new or improved canal facility across the Isthmus will be needed early in the next century because of increased user demands and changes in shipbuilding technology, the design and time of construction should be left flexible in the treaties.

6. Though the Republic of Panama seems technically to be the best place for a future canal facility, the United States should not abandon the right to approach other countries for possible canal location in the event that future political conditions exclude the project from Panama.

7. The U.S. nuclear testing program related to canal excavation technology is proceeding too slowly if such a technique is to be developed in time for competitive consideration with conventional excavation techniques. If new negotiations among signatories of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty are required to permit adequate testing, they should be initiated at once. For the present, the United States should not hamper its testing program by making its interpretation of the treaty unnecessarily strict.

8. Panama should receive added economic benefits from the present or any alternative canal within its borders. Any increase should be based upon an equitable allocation of financial return from canal operations. Though the economic impact on users must be the primary concern when formulating the increase, the United States and other users must fully consider that Panama's principal natural resource it its strategic location for canal purposes, and that canal tolls have not been permanently raised since the canal was placed in operation.

9. The past failure of the U.S. government to make a persuasive case for the benefits Panama and other Latin American nations receive from U.S. operation of the Canal has laid a basis for persistent criticism of the United States. Therefore, the present U.S. administration should immediately take measures to impress upon the people of the hemisphere the multiple benefits received by them from successful U.S. operation of the Canal.

COMMENTARY ON MAJORITY REPORT—PANAMA CANAL ISSUES AND TREATY TALKS, CENTER FOR STRATEGIC STUDIES, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 1967

PAGE 4, LINES 5 TO 8

"How can Panama's insistence on sovereignty over the Panama Canal and Canal Zone be reconciled with the U.S. claim that Panama has neither the resources nor capacity to manage, operate, and defend the Canal efficiently?"

Comment

This is the first in a series of "key Isthmian Canal questions" listed in the Preface of the booklet on *Panama Canal Issues and Treaty Talks*. The Preface, as is a whole, is not directed toward inquiring into the merits of the cession of Canal Zone sovereignty by the United States to Panama but toward acceptance of the September 24, 1965, announcement that the proposed new treaty would recognize Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone. The canal sovereignty question should not be subject to debate and the quoted statement, in effect, shows the fallacy in the Panamanian contention.

Moreover, as used, the term "sovereignty" is an over simplication, for the meaning of the 1903 Treaty as written is so clear that there is no doubt at all. What is really indicated is cession back to Panama of the Canal Zone, which signifies separation of the Canal Zone Government from the Panama Canal Company—an inherent impossibility.

PAGE 7, PARAGRAPH 3

". . . the members of the Panel have not directed their attention toward the merit of this policy change (Joint statement of September 24, 1965), but rather, because it was a Presidential announcement, believe that the position is now established as a *fait accompli.*"

Comment

No Presidential statement purporting to abrogate a duly ratified treaty and to cede a Constitutionally acquired territorial possession of the United States is a *fait accompli* but only the expression of the President and the advisers on whom he depended. The Senate is a part of the treaty making department of our government and the Congress is the ultimate authority in matters of foreign policy and implementing appropriations. U.S. sovereignty in perpetuity over the Canal

---

[1] Some other conclusions prepared by a Panel minority from its different analysis of Canal issues and treaty talks will be found in Part Two.

Zone was acquired by treaty pursuant to law authorizing the acquisition of its control in perpetuity and the Congress has not authorized its cession either to Panama or to any other country or agency. It would be just as logical to contend that a *fait accompli* would be created by a mere agreement between the Presidents of the United States and Mexico for the cession of our great Southwest back to Mexico. Any such proposed treaty to be effected would have to be ratified by the U.S. Senate; and implemented by the Congress for any appropriations involved.

PAGE 8, PARAGRAPH 3

"3. The negotiating approach of the two governments should continue to be the simultaneous consideration of the three treaties: (a) the base-rights and status-of-forces agreement; (b) a replacement for the 1903 treaty together with its amendments; and (c) an option to build a new canal or improve the present one."

Comment

The linking of these three treaties is unfortunate, for it weakens our bargaining position. The major improvement of the existing canal is authorized by existing treaty provision and does not require the negotiation of a new one. A new canal of sea level design, either in the Canal Zone or in Panama, is not covered by existing treaty and would require the negotiation of a new one to determine the specific conditions for its construction.

We should not allow current obsession with the idea of a canal at sea level and an administrative policy of surrender to cause the United States to lose control of the Canal Zone, which is so indispensable for the protection and defense of the present one. To illustrate, in January 1964 the mob, had it not been restrained, could have sabotaged or destroyed the canal itself. Moreover, as the Panama Canal is the greatest symbol of power and prestige of the United States throughout Latin-America and a key target for Red conquest of the Caribbean, the surrender of the Canal Zone could actuate a series of revolutions in the Western Hemisphere. Also, its loss would make a serious impact on other focal strategic areas: Southeast Asia, Suez Canal-Red Sea route to the Indian Ocean, Southern Africa and the sea lanes around the Cape of Good Hope.

PAGE 9, PARAGRAPH 8, LINES 1 TO 4

"8. Panama should receive added economic benefits from the present or any alternative canal within its borders. Any increase should be based upon an *equitable allocation* of financial return from canal operations."

Comment

More than $100,000,000 annually through purchases and employment are now injected into Panama's economy from Canal Zone sources. What is meant by "equitable allocation." The Panama Canal, under law, is required to operate on a self-sustaining basis. As any increase of benefits to Panama from Canal sources would have to be borne by users who pay tolls or by U.S. taxpayers, the Canal should be disassociated from any welfare program from Panama and operated on a strict business-like basis, in which event, as at present, that country is substantially rewarded.

PAGE 9, PARAGRAPH 8, LINES 6 TO 8

". . . users must fully consider that Panama's principal *natural resource* is its strategic location for canal purposes. . . ."

Comment

Brigands and highwaymen through history have habitually ganged up at the crossroads of commerce. As to Panama's "principal natural resource" being its strategic location, this is also its greatest danger, for its territory is coveted by predatory powers bent on world domination. Panama's security as a free country depends absolutely on the presence of the United States in the Canal Zone. Our negotiators ought to stress this fact and not commit a grave diplomatic blunder because of a lack of realistic thinking by our own government. Panamanian negotiators have, in large measure, accepted and presented the arguments and slogans of the mob. Our own negotiators should present the realism of wise and objective statesmen and not allow themselves to be brainwashed.

PAGE 7 LINE 19

". . . United States as the sole guarantor of these provisions (Hay-Pauncefote Treaty)."

Comment

This should be strengthened by adding: "which responsibility for the 'regulation and management' of an interoceanic canal the United States assumed as a mandate for civilization and under which mandate our country, at its own expense, constructed the Canal and has ever since maintained and operated it."

PAGE 10, LAST SENTENCE

"For the rejection of the sea level plan at that time (1906) the new Chief Engineer, John F. Stevens, was partly responsible, because he found no advocate of a sea level canal among the engineering force on the Isthmus. . . ."

Comment

Historically, this statement is misleading as well as inaccurate. Stevens arrived at his conclusions as to type of canal after personal examination in the field and study, and not because he found no sea level advocates in the Canal engineering force. This is what President Theodore Roosevelt stated in his February 19, 1906 message to the Congress: ". . . and I call especial attention to the fact that the chief engineer (Stevens) who will be mainly responsible for the success of this mighty engineering feat, and who has therefore a peculiar personal interest in judging aright, is emphatically and earnestly in favor of the lock-canal project and against the sea-level project." In view of this statement by Theodore Roosevelt, the characterization of Stevens as a seeker of unanimity among engineers of the canal construction force is a slur on one of the greatest construction engineers that our country ever produced. For additional information on the contributions of Stevens, see my statement in the *Congressional Record* of May 29, 1956, on "John F. Stevens: Basic Architect of the Panama Canal."

It should be added that Stevens supported the lock type canal in opposition to the majority of the 1905–6 International Board of Consulting Engineers appointed by President Roosevelt to consider the type of canal and had recommended a sea level project. His views were supported by the U.S. Isthmian Canal Commission and Secretary of War, William H. Taft.

PAGE 13, PARAGRAPH 2

"The administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt clearly changed this stand (of Secretary Hughes) when in 1936 it adjusted the annuity paid to Panama from the original $250,000 to $430,000 to compensate for devaluation of the U.S. dollar; eliminated the U.S. guarantee of Panama's independence; and gave up its right to intervene in Panama's internal affairs."

Comment

In the light of later events and probably more important, the United States in this same treaty (1936) surrendered the 1903 Treaty right to acquire lands and other property within the cities of Panama and Colon and adjacent areas for canal purposes by the "exercise of the right of eminent domain." Had it not been for this right in the 1903 Treaty it is likely that the Canal Zone territory would have been wider than it is.

PAGE 13, PARAGRAPH 3, LINES 3 TO 7

"At the same time (1955), the United States turned over approximately $25 million worth of land together with its improvements including railroad terminals in the cities of Panama and Colon, and, by the same agreement, was relieved of its treaty responsibilities for sanitation in those two cities."

Comment

The 1955 Treaty contemplated the liquidation of the Panama Railroad but the House of Representatives stepped into the situation, and, by an independent investigation, saved the main line of the railroad. Now, there is a railroad without its designed terminal yards and passenger stations. The effort of Panama to collect its own garbage in Panama City and Colon has been a dismal failure and accumulations of garbage in these cities have served as food supply for an increased rat population which has been invading the Canal Zone, and thus has arisen a grave menace to health and sanitation.

In the debate in the Senate during ratification of the 1955 Treaty, the following statement was made by the leading proponent of that treaty: "Since 1936, it has become obvious that Panama is perfectly capable of maintaining adequate sanitary standards in the same cities (Panama and Colon), and in the pending treaty the United States relinquishes that right." The naivete of this view was recognized at the time by informed students of the Canal familiar with the history of Isthmian sanitation.

PAGE 14, LINES 5 TO 8

"The proposal (Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan) fell into conflict with a renewed interest in the possibility of a sea level canal stimulated by war time development of atomic energy. And in the postwar period, the 'battle of the levels' was reopened."

Comment

This brief paragraph is not an adequate description of this important chapter of canal history. Moreover, it fails to mention the 1947 Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, which under an exaggerated interpretation of the "security" and "national defense" factors in the statute as the controlling considerations, recommended only a Sea Level Project in the Canal Zone. The 1947 report failed to receive Presidential approval and, though transmitted to the Congress, this body took no action on its recommendations. A comprehensive discussion of the 1947 report will be found in my statement to the House in the *Congressional Record* of June 7, 1962, and on pp. 177–200 of Ho. Doc. No. 474, 89th Congress, under the title of "Isthmian Canal Policy—An Evaluation."

PAGE 14, LINES 16 TO 18

"The *ultimate* solution of the basic problem is probably a sea level canal; but its construction should await a traffic volume that can support the large cost."

Comment

This statement is accurately quoted from par. 15 of Ho. Rept. No. 1960, 86th Congress, but out of context. Significant words in the statement are: (1) "ultimate", which means the most distant; (2) "probably", which indicates uncertainty; and (3) "a", which suggests some other location than the Canal Zone. Omitted in the paragraph is any mention of this report's statements in par. 16 of its doubts "if any reasonable plan to construct a sea-level canal in the Canal Zone could be carried through without serious danger of a long interruption to traffic at the time of cut over from the present lock canal;" also its opinion that "slides of the first magnitude could easily result . . . in the short period of unwatering." In addition, this board stressed in par. 13 that "its (sea level canal's) fixed charges are very high, and would commence at the start of the enormous construction job." In the light of the qualifying statements the unqualified advocacy of a sea level project is hardly realistic. It may be added that the above quoted par. 15 is the principal quotation from the 1960 Report used in current sea level propaganda. It conflicts so much with other information in that report that it seems to have been inserted as an after thought. That report with its conflicting statements has the effect of nullifying any firm position.

PAGE 14, LINES 22 TO 24

". . . sea level design seems to have won the support of engineers most closely associated with today's canal operations."

Comment

The engineers referred to are employees carrying out their instructions. In spite of this, some of them have criticized the sea level plan and, as engineers, have privately expressed their preference for the terminal lake proposal as the obvious, economic solution. In addition, experienced, independent engineers, geologists, nuclear physicists, and navigators, including some of the highest eminence, are opposed to the Sea Level Project.

PAGE 15, FIRST FULL PARAGRAPH, LINES 1 TO 3

"But Panama has concentrated more on regaining the rights of sovereignty over the Zone than in obtaining ultimate nationalization of the Canal."

Comment

One of the banner signs displayed in radical Panamanian demonstrations was "The Canal is Ours." It is not possible to separate the question of sovereignty over the Canal Zone and ownership of the Canal any more than it is possible to separate the heart from the body. The conflict between the citizens of Panama and the United States arose because loyal U.S. civilian employees in the Canal Zone understood the dangers and could not be beguiled by official double talk of those temporarily in power in our government who, for reasons best known to themselves, have encouraged Panamanian radicals and attacked our position in the Canal Zone.

PAGE 15, LAST SENTENCE

". . . Under Secretary of State Livingston T. Merchant was dispatched to Panama in late November (1959) and, while there, reaffirmed, but did not define, Panama's 'titular sovereignty' over the Zone."

Comment

This action taken by Secretary Merchant under instructions, was a key step in one of the most disgraceful episodes in American history in which the United States allowed itself to be intimidated by Panamanian mobs and was so recognized at the time. I repeatedly tried to have the State Department define "titular sovereignty" but it has steadily refused to do so and by this refusal encouraged further violence. For a discusion of "titular sovereignty—origin and definition," see p. 346 of Ho. Doc. No. 474, 89th Congress, and for an exchange of letters on this subject with the State Department see pp. 387–98 of the same document. The evasions revealed in this exchange are pusillanimous and disgusting.

PAGE 18, LINES 11 TO 14

"The United States also had certain grievances it wished resolved, among them the conveyance of lands next to the U.S. Embassy residence, which had been agreed to in the 1955 treaty."

Comment

In view of the magnitude of the subject under consideration, this is a minor consideration, that hardly deserves mention. Our country in the 1936 and 1955 treaties had given away its bargaining powers and in the September 24, 1965, Presidential announcement, the Executive had indicated its willingness to surrender to major Panamanian demands before the negotiations started. Nor have our negotiators met those demands with equitable counterdemands, such as the extension of the Canal Zone to include the entire watershed of the Chagres River.

PAGE 19 LAST 3 PARAGRAPHS: "RIOT OF 1964"

"'By the fall of 1963,' Johnson Administration sources have stated, 'we were ready to fly flags together at seventeen locations, carefully selected because we realized that this was a very serious and emotional issues. We excluded all schools because we thought that we would have a particularly difficult problem there. We decided that the way to satisfy our obligation to the Panamanians was to fly no flag at all at schools. And this we did. We took down the American flag at Balboa High School during the Christmas vacation in 1963, and when the United States students returned there was no flag flying." [1]

"On the morning of January 7, the students at Balboa High School protested by raising the U.S. flag in front of their school building. Zone authorities took it down. After their first class, students raised it again, and surrounded the flag pole, this time with the support of their parents. The flag, lowered for the night was again raised by the students on January 8 in defiance of a public request from the Zone Governor.

"On January 9, 1964, these students, encouraged by their parents, again defied the Governor's request and again flew the U.S. flag outside the high school. In retaliation, a group of Panamanian students marched into the Zone and tried to raise their flag in front of the school. In the ensuing scuffle the Panamanian flag was torn. The Panamanian students then fled from the Zone, destroying property on the way. This was the spark that set off an explosion that had worldwide repercussions. Large crowds formed at the Border of the Zone and serious rioting broke out in Panama City and Colon. The violence continued until January 12, at times becoming a pitched battle between Panamanian citizens and U.S. troops. The Guardia Nacional did not attempt to maintain order. Some 20 Panamainian and four U.S. soldiers were killed in the disturbances. The U.S. troops were not allowed to fire until they had sustained several casualties, whereupon Army marksmen started to return fire from their positions within the Zone against snipers firing into the Zone."

Comment

Much that is confusing has been written about the 1964 flag incident at the Balboa High School but seldom have the following facts been set forth. This was an American High School, on American soil, with normal patriotic American students, who thought they had the right to fly the U.S. flag as is done in schools throughout the United States and were infuriated at the supine action of the governing authority of the Zone.

The mob assaults that followed were not caused by the actions of the patriotic students but these were seized upon by radical elements in Panama as an incident to justify what had long been planned in Panama in the way of an attack against the Canal Zone and the treaty rights of the United States. The Panama Government deliberately failed to use its National Guard to maintain order thereby forcing U.S. Armed Forces to defend the lives of our citizens and the Canal.

Instead of being condemned in the press of the United States, these students should have been praised. Were it not for their stand the people of the United States would probably never have learned about what was transpiring concerning the Panama Canal until too late to prevent the planned surrenders at Panama.

In viewing the flag incident it should not be overlooked that it occurred on U.S. territory and not Panamanian. Students from Panama were invaders of the Canal Zone and not the reverse. The mass news media editorial treatment given the Balboa High School students in the United States was in stark contrast to that given many subversive demonstrations in our country and it required many addresses in the Congress by informed members and many articles in periodicals of limited circulation to set the record straight. See my address, "Panama Canal: Focus of Power Politics" and supporting documentation on pp. 305–44 of Ho. Doc. No. 474, 89th Congress, for an extensive discussion of the 1964 mob assault on the Canal Zone.

PAGE 20, LAST PARAGRAPH, FIRST SENTENCE

"Meanwhile, the National Bar Association of Panama requested the International Commission of Jurists to investigate complaints that the United States had violated the Universal Declaration of Human Rights."

Comment

The facts set forth in the above sentence and the rest of the paragraph are correctly stated but what is not stated is that the Canal Zone is a territorial possession of the United States and that disorders within such territories are domestic concerns of the United States.

Notwithstanding this fact, U.S. authorities cooperated fully with the International Commission of Jurists requested by the National Bar Association of Panama. Its report wholly rejected as baseless the charges by Panama that the United States was the aggressor with respect to the mob assaults and upheld the United States.

PAGE 21, LINES 5 TO 12

"The April 3, (1964) agreement had been interpreted by Panama as an agreement by the United States to negotiate a new treaty to replace that of 1903. . . . Panama's view is that the present negotiations began on April 3, 1964; but the United States continued to argue against this point until December 18, 1964."

Comment

For clarity and completeness there should be added the following: "at which time the President, upon the recommendation of his advisers, yielded to Panamanian demands as to what the new treaty should provide."

PAGE 21, LAST PARAGRAPH, LINES 1 AND 2

"The U.S. Government, meanwhile, undertook an extensive review of its interoceanic canal policy."

Comment

I know of no agency in our government qualified to undertake such review. Since the 1964 riots we have had a plague of amateur canal builders and policy makers who, have been motivated wholly by policies of appeasement and who have completely ignored realistic facts and considerations. The President has relied on their findings and recommendations and thus has acquiesced for the surrender of practically all of our indispensable rights as regards the Canal Zone and Canal.

PAGE 22, LINES 9 TO 11

"He (the President) also said that the United States was prepared to negotiate a new treaty with Panama for the existing Canal that would replace the Treaty of 1903."

Comment

This should be qualified by inserting the fact that in so doing the President reversed his earlier position announced on March 16, 1964, before the Organization of American States when he made clear that our Government will always do its best to improve relations with Panama but that under no circumstances will it agree to pre-commitments to renegotiate the 1903 Treaty as the price for resumption of relations with Panama.

---

[1] Joseph A. Califano, Jr., at that time Special Assistant to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense, as quoted in *The Panama Canal,* The Hammarskjold Forms, 1965, p. 51.

PARAGRAPH 22, LAST PARAGRAPH

"On September 24, 1965, Johnson and Marco A. Robles, the new president of Panama, issued joint and simultaneous statements in Washington and Panama City on general areas of agreement thus far reached in the three treaties under negotiations. President Johnson's statement included the (5) following points:

"One: The 1903 Treaty will be abrogated.

"Two: The new treaty will effectively recognize Panama's sovereignty over the area of the present Canal Zone.

"Three: The new treaty will terminate after a specific number of years or on the date of the opening of the sea level canal whichever occurs first.

"Four: A primary objective of the new treaty will be to provide for an appropriate political, economic and social integration of the area used in the canal operation with the rest of the Republic of Panama. Both countries recognize there is need for an orderly transition to avoid abrupt and possibly harmful dislocations. We also recognize that certain changes should be made over a period of time. The new canal administration will be empowered to make such changes in accordance with guidelines in the new treaty.

"Five: Both governments recognize the important responsibility they have to be fair and helpful to the employees of all nationalities who are serving so efficiently and well in the operation of the canal. Appropriate arrangements will be made to ensure that the rights and interests of these employees are safeguarded.

"In addition he said:

" 'The present canal and any new canal which may be constructed in the future shall be open at all times to the vessels of all nations on a non-discriminatory basis. The tolls would be reasonable in the light of the contribution of the Republic of Panama and the United States of America and of the interest of world commerce.' "

Comment

The joint statement of September 25, 1965, therein quoted meant a complete and abject surrender to Panama of our indispensable sovereignty and authority with respect to the Panama Canal in favor of a dual governmental and managerial setup in an area of endless bloody revolution and political instability. It was obviously the work of inexperienced theorists whose idealism was superior to their judgment.

It is indeed unfortunate that Panamanian policies with respect to these subjects emanate from Red inspired mobs and heedless radicals rather than from objective and realistic Panamanian sources.

PAGE 23, LAST PARAGRAPH, LAST SENTENCE

"The negotiators found it necessary to consult their governments more frequently and in more detail on their respective positions."

Comment

The inference to be derived from this statement is that as the magnitude and complexity of the problems dawned upon the negotiators, their uncertainty and lack of confidence increased.

PAGE 25, PARAGRAPH 3

"The first treaty proposed concerns abrogating the 1903 treaty, as subsequently adjusted, and its replacement with a new treaty for continued operation and improvements of the existing Canal on terms that are more acceptable to Panama and yet provide for the protection of U.S. investments and interests in the Isthmus and continued efficiency of operation of the Canal at reasonable tolls."

Comments

The continued operation and improvement of the existing canal are authorized by existing treaty under conditions of exclusive responsibility—an obligation assumed under the 1901 Treaty with Great Britian and pursuant to law (Spooner Act of 1902). Experience has shown that this responsibility could not have been met by the United States except with full sovereignty over the Zone. To say the least, it is naive to think that U.S. investments and interests on the Isthmus can be protected and the canal can be efficiently operated with less authority than we now have. This is so because of the inherent situation involved. The Canal Zone cannot be governed satisfactorily by a coalition government and the Canal cannot be operated efficiently under dual management. Moreover, if we go so far as to cede our sovereignty over the Zone to Panama, consent to a dual management these concessions will in nowise mitigate the efforts and demands of Panama that the United States must thereupon surrender all of its authority with respect to the canal enterprise and leave the Isthmus entirely. If the excessive demands of Panama now being acquiesced in by our government can be made effective, then emboldened Panama will soon demand and bring about our complete abandonment of the Canal with resulting chaos. How can our responsible officials assume the role of statesmen when they are so blind, so heedless, and oblivious to what all experience teaches.

PAGE 25, LAST SENTENCE

"This (Base Rights Agreement) has been the least troublesome of the three pacts to the two nations . . ."

Comment

This statement is an over simplification and reflects ignorance. In 1947, despite the approval of a Defense Base Treaty with the United States by the Executive Branch of the Panamanian Government, the National Assembly of Panama, after mobs threatened to hang those who should vote for the treaty, unanimously rejected it causing the United States to evacuate a number of bases in Panama that had been maintained by the United States for the protection and defense of both Panama and the Canal, among them the Air Base at Rio Hato. Recent experience in NATO countries shows that Defense Base treaties are only valid at the sufferance of the host country and our government has been derelict and weak in its surrenders at Panama.

PAGE 28 LINES 8 TO 9

". . . hemispheric problems related to extremist subversion . . ."

Comment

What is the meaning of the term "extremist subversion?" The only subversion involved is that of the world revolutionary movement known as the international communist conspiracy, for which Castro's Cuba has served as a training ground for waging so-called "wars of national liberation" throughout the Americas, including Isthmian countries. The use of the indicated term has evidently been made to confuse the Panama situation by the use of brave rhetoric to efface the fact that the proposed surrender of our rights at Panama could have the undoubted effect of promoting in that country and other parts of Latin America the self same evils of "extremist subversion" in the Western Hemisphere.

PAGE 29, LINES 6 TO 10

"The Panamanians feel the present situation makes them second-class citizens in their own country. The U.S. negotiators wish to accede to Panamanian objectives, but only to the extent that they are compatible with U.S. vital interests of international security and commerce."

Comment

This statement is nonsense, without fact and without foundation. It indicates approval by our brainwashed negotiators of radical and unrealistic Panamanian demands. What are "second class citizens" of Panama? The Canal Zone is not a part of their country but a territorial possession of the United States, with exclusive and indispensable sovereignty granted under treaty and ownership by purchase from individual property owners for the efficient and equitable operation of the Panama Canal.

International security and interoceanic commerce will not be protected by such surrenders and it is not best for Panama that these radical demands become valid. The Panamanian argument might be all right if the Canal enterprise were only commercial; but it is far more than commercial in character. It is one of the great military and transportation keys in the world strategy. As the world at this time is completely out of joint and aggressive revolutionary power is striving to destroy the Free World, it is the quintessence of stupidity for our government to ignore these realistic facts and its solemn responsibility to resist the unreasonable insistence of jingo agitators of Panama. Certainly, the thousands of Panamanians who are employed in the operation of the Canal at higher wages than they ever knew can hardly be called second class citizens.

PAGE 29, LINES 14 AND 15

". . . again raised to $1,930,000 in the Treaty of 1955, which remains the annual payment Panama receives today."

Comment

This statement is incomplete and therefore misleading. There should be added thereto the fact that of the $1,930,000 annuity received by Panama, $1,500,000 is borne by the State Department budget. This separation was brought about by action of the Congress so as not to burden interoceanic commerce by increased tolls. As to the annuity to Panama we can be as liberal as the net income of the canal permits; but any increased annuity would have to be borne in large measure by our already over burdened tax payers or users of the Canal who have to pay tolls. Moreover, if tolls were substantially increased such action would have the undoubted effect of reducing the total shipping using the Canal.

PAGE 29, LINES 16 TO 22

"Panama, fortified by a declaration of the Panamanian Institute of International Law, contends the annuity is not a just and adequate compensation for the use of her greatest natural resource—narrow terrain and geographical position. Panama asserts that this resource is used by the United States to operate a commercial enterprise and for military bases of primary importance to the United States."

Comment

This statement does not mention the more than $100,000,000 that the Panamanian economy receives annually from U.S. sources in the Canal Zone. It is true that the canal enterprise is a business type of activity but, in line with good business methods, it is operated as a self-sustaining basis. As for military bases in Panama, these are important not only to the United States but as well to all of Latin America, including Panama. If it were not for the presence of the United States on the Isthmus, Panama would not and could not exist as a free nation. Moreover, it has a history of centuries of exploitation of travelers at that strategic crossroads that was interrupted at the time of U.S. acquisition of the Canal Zone. Panama must not permit itself to assume the role of a brigand to extort unreasonable revenues from a nation that as long as it is on the Isthmus would fight to the death any attempt to destroy Panamanian independence.

Whether Panamanian radicals realize or are altogether heedless of this tremendous fact, the citizens of the United States are mindful of it. The people of our country have always held Panama and its people in affectionate esteem but their impatience is mounting because of unreasonable and unrealistic demands stemming largely from communist influence now being voiced by demagogic and self-seeking politicians clothed with brief authority. Such demands, if agreed upon, would surely divest our government of all authority and contact with the canal enterprise and cause the destruction of Panama itself. There are, indeed, none so blind as those who will not see; and in this category may well be included our own negotiators in the present situation.

PAGE 30, LINES 2 TO 5

". . . it has been said that the United States considers the present rate of payment too low and would agree to a substantial increase".

Comment

The present annuity to Panama is $1,930,000 of which, as previously stated, $1,500,000 is borne by the State Department budget and $430,000 by canal revenues. The annuity now paid to Panama traces back to the $250,000 annuity paid by the Panama Railroad, which obligation was assumed in the the 1903 Treaty. Its increase to $430,000 was a justified adjustment incident to U.S. devaluation of the gold dollar.

The greatest economic benefit to Panama of the presence of the U.S. in the Canal Zone is the more than $100,000,000 from canal sources annually spent in the Republic, and other contributions which results in the highest per capita income in all Latin America. To repeat, any further increase in the annuity would have to be provided either by raising tolls or by the U.S. Taxpayer. Moreover, under the Panama Canal Reorganization Act of 1950 (Public Law 841, 81st Congress), the canal enterprise is required to operate on a self-sustaining basis. Thus, it should be kept entirely separate from any welfare programs for the Republic of Panama.

PAGE 30, LINES 16 TO 18

"But any solution to the revenue question, from the U.S. viewpoint, is dependent upon Panama's acceptance of what the United States considers 'reasonable' tolls."

Comment

The calculation of tolls is necessarily fixed by law enacted by our Congress and Panama has no legal authority to deal with such matters. In this connection, the point should be emphasized that the Panama Canal does not exist for service as a welfare agency for Panama but for interoceanic commerce of all nations. Why should the Department of State presume to undo by treaty as regards tolls what the Congress, after extensive investigation, established by law?

PAGE 30, LAST SENTENCE

"The United States is willing to permit the Panamanians to share in responsibility for the management of the existing canal for the rest of its lifetime, but it is basic current U.S. policy to retain final and unimpaired responsibility for the operation and protection of the existing canal."

Comment

This is a direct violation of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with Great Britain under which the United States assumed full responsibility for the construction of an Isthmian Canal as well as for the "exclusive right of providing for (its) regulation and management . ." Also, the 1922 Treaty with Colombia recognized such responsibility as vested "entirely and absolutely" in the United States and not in Panama. The question arises how can the United States have a "current" U.S. Policy that conflicts not only with law but also with important canal treaties with Great Britain and Colombia.

The joint administration of the Panama Canal enterprise with Panama would present an impossible situation of chaotic complexity—management without capitalization and responsibility without authority. As a matter of fact the new treaties now being proposed are altogether in conflict with what has been U.S. policy in that it would dilute and finally destroy the authority of the United States with respect to the Canal.

PAGE 31, LINES 4 TO 10

"In regard to a new canal, the United States proposes a new eleven (11) member canal authority that would give Panama two members until final amortization and three thereafter. The United States would have three members. Three seats would be filled by the nations making the most use of the Canal and three other places would be occupied by representatives of the interests who finance construction. The last would be dropped after amortization, leaving the authority at nine."

Comment

Would a troika of conflicting interests work in managing a great interoceanic canal? Any such body would be a focus of contention with inevitable complications. Moreover, as a back door toward so-called internationalization it would be in clear violation of treaties with Great Britain and Colombia.

PAGE 33, LINES 15 TO 16

"The United States . . . in 1955 handed over one of its big hotels to Panama."

Comment

This was the Washington Hotel in Colon. It degenerated in service, finally failed under Panamanian control, and was recently offered for sale. Also, in the 1955 Treaty the United States gave Panama the two terminal passenger stations and freight yards of the Panama Railroad in Panama City and Colon. Today, they are not used, show the effects of long neglect and Panama no longer receives tax revenues from the Panama Canal Company on those properties.

PAGE 35, LAST PARAGRAPH, LINES 1 TO 4

"A number of informed people in both the United States and Panama would agree that settlement of the differences that stem from the 1903 treaty is the first order of business for the negotiators on each side."

Comment

This involves the question of sovereignty in perpetuity and implies a willingness on the part of the U.S. negotiators to surrender our present treaty rights. As to agreeing that such surrenders are the first order of business there are many informed and experienced persons who completely disagree. Nor should it be overlooked that along with the advantages of the geographical location of Panama there are also its perils, for this area of endemic revolution is coveted by predatory powers. As long as the United States is sovereign of the Canal Zone under present treaty provisions, Panama is secure. Thus, in the last analysis, the sovereignty and perpetuity clauses in the 1903 Treaty are best for Panama because it brought about the building of the canal and its operation and maintenance and conferred on Panama independence and great economic betterment. In addition the perpetuity provision precludes the United States from abandoning the existing Canal and this is undoubtedly for the best interests of Panama because it guarantees its perpetual maintenance and operation of the canal by our country. Thus the independence and economic betterment of Panama are perpetually assured. It is, indeed, difficult to understand why this aspect of the situation has never seemed to dawn on Panamanian political leaders.

PAGE 37, LINE 6 FROM BOTTOM

". . . how a new canal should be built . . ."

Comment

Under Public Law 88–609, the study group thereby formed was authorized only to determine the feasibility of a sea-level canal. Hence, the quoted expression should read "how a new canal of sea level design should be built." An extensive discussion of the legislative history of the above indicated law can be found on pp. 428–516 of House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, in two of my addresses on the "Interoceanic Canal Problem: Inquiry or Coverup?"

PAGE 38, LINE 5 FROM BOTTOM

". . . and a sea-level canal built by conventional means at the present site, and modernization of the present canal."

Comment

This represents the resurrection of the perennial issue of type of canal but the term, "modernization" is not defined, leaving uncertain what is meant. Nor is its consideration authorized under Public Law 88–609.

PAGE 41, LINES 13 AND 14

". . . when and by what means an interoceanic canal should be excavated."

Comment

The type of Canal meant is an "interoceanic canal of sea-level design."

PAGE 41, LAST PARAGRAPH, FIRST SENTENCE

"The agreement (U.S.-Panama, February 15, 1966, on Route 17) requires the participation of Panamanian officials in the exploration and provision by the United States to Panama of data and conclusions from the surveys."

Comment

There is no provision in Public Law 88–609 authorizing such participation by Panama and the question arises as to what extent is this participation being used to divest the United States of its sovereign rights in the Canal Zone.

PAGE 47, LINES 9 AND 10

"Although it is probable that advance estimates for conventional construction would come close to actual costs . . ."

Comment

The construction of the Panama Canal within the estimates of cost was a source of pride among its builders. More recent experience in the United States, however, shows that the actual cost of large government engineering projects has almost invariably exceeded cost estimates. Thus, the statement is hardly realistic and is misleading.

PAGE 48, LINES 18 TO 21

". . . final decisions will have to be made between 1970 and 1985 whether to build a new canal or merely to improve the existing one, because in either case a ten to fifteen year lead time is needed."

Comment

This obviously refers to the question of building a new canal of sea-level design or the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing high level lake-lock canal. Competent engineers have estimated that the latter would require far less time for construction than the former, far less money, and obviate the necessity for a new treaty.

PAGE 48, LINES 22 AND 23

"As to a sea-level canal, it is assumed that the operating costs would be less than a lock canal."

Comment

This assumption neglects to take into consideration the following:

(a) The large fixed charges for construction.

(b) The huge indemnity required and the greatly increased annuity for the new treaty necessary for a canal at sea-level.

(c) The problem of maintenance which is completely unprecedented in the Isthmian area and which some engineers have warned could be insuperable.

The majority of the panel, evidently relying on data furnished by our responsible authority, utterly ignores the undoubted fact that great slides would attend the deepening of the present or any other cut which would be required by the sea level design. Based on what occurred in the building of the present canal, it is inevitable that any cut for the sea-level project would be attended by slides of first magnitude, thus imposing a vastly increased expenditure over that presented by sea-level advocates.

PAGE 52, NEXT TO LAST PARAGRAPH, LAST SENTENCE

"In addition to the growth in maritime commerce, there is now a trend toward larger ships, as noted earlier, which cannot go through the present canal."

Comment

The present canal, if it had been properly modernized, would be adequate for all commercial vessels except those of the very largest tonnage. As regards the last, there are already supertankers of 250,000 gross tons planned. The economics of super sized vessels is such that they are designed without regards to savings by canal transit and sail around the Cape of Good Hope or through the Straits of Magellan. The Navy long ago eliminated transit of the Panama Canal in ship design because, in war, any type of canal can be destroyed.

PAGE 57, LAST SIX LINES

". . . if nuclear excavation is excluded, a sea level canal at any site may be ruled out by economic considerations. The result of this conclusion might be great pressure to expand the present canal facilities by means of new and larger locks, and to augment the water supply by pumping sea water. . . ."

Comment

As to the ruling out of a canal at sea-level, former Canal Zone Governor Jay J. Morrow, a distinguished engineer and man of fine vision, once wrote that "the sea-level project is a hardy perennial, and apparently there will always be someone to argue for it, no matter how often the impossibility of realizing any such scheme within practicable limits of time and cost may be demonstrated." (Ho. Doc. No. 474, 89th Congress, p. 430.)

With regard to the capacity of the present high-level lake-lock canal, former Canal Zone Governor Harry Burgess, a far visioned man and able engineer, made this significant statement: "Considering the low cost of providing water for additional lockages by pumping, it is apparent that the ultimate capacity of the Panama Canal with locks is unlimited, and may be increased to any amount desired by constructing additional locks and installing the necessary pumping equipment." (Ho. Dec. No. 139, 72nd Congress, p. 31.) The cost of such pumping of water into Gatun Lake was estimated at $250.00 per transit, which is inconsequential.

PAGES 61 TO 63

"Pressures in Panama

"The tendency in some circles is to describe the objectives of Panama as 'aspirations' while the objectives of the United States are referred to as "interests." Both nations avowedly have aspirations as well as interests in this or another Panama Canal, but the issue is a more emotional one to Panama. The Panamanians are affected by the day-to-day existence of the Canal much more personally than are most citizens of the United States.

"Panama's team of negotiators and the Robles administration are forced to carry on the discussions with the United States in a domestic political climate that is highly volatile and sensitive to the reactions of its political opponents of all philosophies.

"No Panamanian government could hope to survive a treaty that could be labeled a 'sell-out' to the United States. Political opponents of the incumbent administration can be expected to attack any draft treaties that the Robles government reaches agreement upon with the United States. This is one of the reasons why the negotiations have been conducted in secrecy and why even tentative agreements are not disclosed except in the most general way.

"It is of great importance to the status of negotiations that Panama has scheduled national elections in May 1968. Since campaigning for the presidency and other offices begins a full year in advance of the voting in Panama, the Robles government is growing more anxious to reach final settlement with the United States before the campaigning reaches the usual fever heat.

"Robles cannot succeed himself, but his moderate coalition party will face a tough fight from the popular leader of the opposition party, Arnulfo Arias. The Robles coalition has not nominated a candidate, but Arias may be the standard-bearer of the opposition. Robles can be expected to press hard for agreement with the United States before the 1968 voting. How he handles the question of ratification probably is a matter of timing.

"Assuming that most of Panama's aspirations regarding the existing Canal can be satisfied by the United States and tentative agreement is reached by the negotiators before the fall of 1967, Robles probably will call his legislative assembly late in the year, his party probably campaigning on the basis of pacts it can label "triumphs," and obtain ratification after the victory they would expect as an aftermath of the canal agreements.

"Robles' problem is to find a formula with the United States that neither the opposition nor agitators can use as a signal for another outburst of violence in the streets, high schools, and universities.

"To be sure, no agreement between the United States and Panama is going to silence the extreme elements in Panama's body politic. An anti-U.S. plank is traditional in Panamanian political platforms and will probably remain so.

"There are a number of people in the United States who believe that this anti-U.S. sentiment and much of what passes today for nationalism in Panama is part of a long-standing communist plan to wrest control of the Panama Canal, as well as of other strategic waterways of the world, from the hands of the so-called imperialist nations. This plan seems to be aimed at lining up Latin American nations in a bloc in support of Panama against the United States, as was done with the Arab states against England and France in the Suez Crisis of 1956.

"There are others in the United States who feel that a distinction should be made between indigenous nationalism and anti-U.S. harassment aided and abetted by the international communist movement. This group would be inclined to believe that the communist power in Panama lies more in its ability to aggravate a given state of political dissatisfaction than actually to create one, and that the danger there from communism rests on its potential ability to move effectively into a given leadership vacuum, similar to that created in Santo Domingo during the Dominican Republic crisis of 1965.

"Informed sources say that the number of communist organizers in Panama is between fifty and one hundred, and though badly splintered at present, their influence could become wider than this small number would indicate. Some of them recently launched a campaign against U.S. military presence in Panama. The communist efforts are concentrated on the sentiments of ultranationalists, and purposely play down the financial and employment benefits that many Panamanians receive from U.S. military operations. These communist efforts could have serious consequences if and when the new base rights and status-of-forces agreement comes up for ratification in the Panamanian Assembly. There is no doubt, however, that the historical tradition of opposition to the United States has contributed much more to the present impasse than anything the communists have done or may do. For example, Panamanian texts used in elementary schools show the United States as an oppressor and even the Catholic bishops jointly signed a declaration [2] which protested U.S. 'sovereignty' in the Zone, while deploring the use of force as well as enjoining against communism.

"This combination of local conditions indicates that time is running out for the present Panamanian government, but the United States can take no comfort from an impasse, particularly one that might bring down the Robles government. Robles, it must be remembered, campaigned and won his presidency on a campaign promise to solve the Canal problems with the United States in his term of office. If he does not succeed, the opposition will get a tremendous boost."

Comment

This entire section indicates that the purposes of the negotiations are to prevent the overthrow of the present Administration in Panama, to bring about its victory in 1968, and to placate Panamanian mobs. The Panama Canal certainly should not be used as a pawn in Panamanian politics and it would not have become one if our responsible officials, especially those in the State Department, had asserted our just rights with requisite frankness. This section is really a description of one of the most deplorable situations in United States diplomatic history. Nothing could be more futile than to try to adjust U.S. canal policy to the vagaries of Panamanian volatility, to satiate the insatiable, or to deal with the canal enterprise as a purely welfare agency of the Panamanian Government.

PAGES 63 TO 65

"Disposition of Congress

"Panama has its Assembly, and the United States has its Congress. Both legislative bodies will be called upon to approve new treaties, which may be agreed upon by the negotiators. Consequently, each negotiating team must be keenly aware of the other's legislative frame of reference.

"The U.S. Congress maintains close surveillance over U.S.-Panamanian relations through committee responsibilities for foreign affairs, for the merchant marine, for the armed services, for commerce, and for appropriations. All these involve U.S. activities dealing with the Canal, its operation and defense. Through briefings furnished from time to time by U.S. officials, appropriate committees of Congress are kept in touch with significant developments on Canal matters.

"Congressional sentiment on the basic objective of U.S. policy is clear: the United States must continue to defend the Canal and maintain it as an efficient crossroads for marine commerce. This is regarded not as a matter of U.S.-Panamanian policy alone, but as one affecting the inter-American defense and communications systems. Since it is generally agreed that the present lock Canal will eventually become inadequate, it is recognized that either the present Canal will have to be modernized or that a new canal will have to be constructed in its stead. The Congress is not convinced that the major responsibilities of implementing either plan could be carried out by Panama. Here, the aspiration of Panama is considered to far exceed the realities.

---

[2] Dr. Isais Batista Ballesteros, *El Drama de Panamá y América*, Panamá, 1965, p. 310.

"There is some cleavage in U.S. Congressional opinion on how the basic U.S. objectives can best be attained in connection with the Panama Canal. The present administration in the United States did clear the terms stated in the three draft treaties handed to Panama wih some key members of Congress in earlier stages of the negotiations. The party structure in Congress, however, underwent significant changes in November 1966, and there has been a rise in guns-or-butter sentiment in Washington that already has been felt in economy measures.

"Also there is a group on Capitol Hill, which has support from at least two national veterans organizations, that sees no need for a sea-level canal and warns against the concessions to Panama that would be involved in the three treaties. This group cannot be disregarded; its influence may be enhanced by the recent changes in composition of the U.S. Congress. Despite the fact that the negotiators and their respective governments favor a sea-level canal, this group feels the only reasonable and economic course is to improve the lock-lake design of the present facility. Though this alternative plays little part in the current negotiations between Panama and the United States, it is being given consideration by the study groups concerned with the economic aspects of alternatives to the present Canal.

"In sum, a set of treaties that might have easily passed through the Senate to ratification a year ago might well face heavier going if submitted today. It is also significant that, although there is articulate opposition in the Senate and House to scrapping the 1903 treaty with Panama, this is not balanced by legislators who feel as strongly the other way. The majority leadership of Congress, however, could probably be persuaded as to the need for a sea-level canal and would be prepared to make certain concessions on some of the irritating points of difference between the United States and Panama. These concessions could concern some form of sovereignty, wage scales, terms of employment, joint operation of the Canal and increased U.S. payments. But they would not include yielding prime U.S. rights and responsibility for operation and defense of the Canal complex."

Comment

This section undertakes to summarize the attitude of the Congress as regards the proposed treaties, which it states were cleared with key members of the Congress. The treaties were not cleared with some of the best informed leaders in the Congress on the canal question, who were altogether ignored.

The section states also that the majority leadership would probably make concessions to Panama on sovereignty but would not yield prime U.S. rights and responsibility for operation and defense. In the very nature of the situation, this statement is self-contradictory for where there is responsibility there must be authority of adequate character. No enterprise such as the Panama Canal can function under a dual management and control and many members of the Congress recognize the truth of this fact as the result of various ill-fated attempts to establish coalition governments following World War II. It must be said now, as it was said of old, that one cannot serve two masters.

PAGE 64, LINES 3 TO 6

"The U.S. Congress maintains close surveillance over U.S.-Panamanian relations through committees responsible for foreign affairs, for the merchant marine, for the armed services, for commerce, and for appropriations."

Comment

Though administrative officials have briefed various committees, they all speak with one voice reflecting so-called official views usually prepared to support pre-determined objectives. In this way, the Congress has been denied information of vital importance that often vitiates the views presented.

PAGE 65, NEXT TO LAST PARAGRAPH

"Some Panamanian and U.S. officials have shown signs of uneasiness at the slow pace of the negotiations, . . . Both nations well recall the riots of January 1964 and appear to believe the same thing could happen again if the negotiations are not successfully concluded before the Panamanian election campaign gets into high gear."

Comment

The reasons for the 1964 riots were the failure of our high officials during recent years to clarify and make definite U.S. canal policies and the naive effort to stop minor violence with a succession of surrenders, all of which, as was foreseen and predicted, culminated in the January 1964 mob assault on the Canal Zone.

As to whether completing the negotiations before the Panamanian election campaign starts will avoid violence, a leading opposition candidate for the Presidency of Panama has publicly warned that no treaty negotiated by the present administration will be approved by the People of Panama. To emphasize that possibility, we have the example of the rejection in 1947 of the Defense Base Treaty. On that occasion, the mob surrounded the Capitol of Panama, and threatened to hang all members of the Assembly who approved the treaty; and in fear they voted unanimously its rejection amid scenes of unbelievable terror.

PAGE 65, LINES 4 TO 3 FROM BOTTOM

"'If this thing isn't settled fairly soon we may all be hanging from lamp posts,' says one Panamanian official."

Comment

This is no place to quote such an alarmist statement, for the only purpose served is to create fear as the basis for diplomatic action. We are asked to share authority over the Canal with this type of mob-dominated Panamanian leadership. If we had continued our policy of just, wise and realistic motivation, mob violence could not have entered the picture.

PAGE 66, LINES 1 TO 3

"Violence, once turned on by whatever source, would be difficult to limit and the mobs are as likely to seek out Panamanian leaders as they are to seek targets in the Canal Zone."

Comment

Informed persons have long recognized that the Panama route is the best site for a canal and look upon other sites in Panama as political diversions. Moreover, the present canal has enormous facilities constructed over many decades, excellent port facilities, protected anchorages, and a sanitary policy that has been eminently successful. A plan that proposes to abandon such investments and advantages in cavalier manner is highly extravagant, utterly unrealistic, and criminally stupid.

PAGE 66, LINES 16 TO 20

"They (U.S. and Panamanian officials) are aware that the United States has not yet solved the problems of the technology of nuclear excavation and has no agreement with other signatories of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty that would permit atomic excavation even if it were certified as technically feasible."

Comment

In addition, there are distinguished nuclear physicists who view such excavation as "insanity." Certainly, before attempting so vast a project as an inter-oceanic canal there ought to be some experience elsewhere. In any event, a change in the Test Ban Treaty would be difficult, if not altogether impossible to obtain.

PAGE 66, THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM BOTTOM

"The United States Government knows full well that all the nations of Latin America are watching closely to see what kind of treatment is accorded Panama in the current treaty negotiations."

Comments

The Panamanian Government has carried on a systematic campaign of arousing the support of other Latin countries but, so far as known, the Government of the United States has not met this campaign with forthright public statements but, by its silence, has encouraged such efforts.

In the case of Colombia, the sovereign of the Isthmus before the independence of Panama, that country has been collecting documents on the Panama Canal in the United States over a period of years. This is most significant.

PAGE 67, LAST PARAGRAPH

"The Government of the Republic of Panama will continue to promote the extension to other countries of the Central American Isthmus of the indirect benefits of . . . a new Panama Canal Treaty. . . . This objective is pursued . . . as evidence of a regional feeling . . ., etc."

Comment

This quotation is a vague statement by the Foreign Minister of Panama, suggesting that Panama wishes to extend benefits of the Canal to the entire Central American Isthmus, and in utter disregard of the costs to users of the canal in way of tolls and the American taxpayer. As it is nothing but bombast, this quotation does not merit repeating in any worthwhile study. The canal should be, and must be, operated to serve all the world and not only a part of it.

PAGES 88 AND 89

"A. The Choco Development Project"

Comment

This section of the appendix contains useful information about the Choco Project but does not evaluate it from the marine operational standpoint. In a statement to the House on February 1, 1967, I commented at length on its navigational features emphasizing how the plan for its construction is an application of the lake-lock principle used in the construction of the Panama Canal.

ATTEMPT TO LEGISLATE ON HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION BY EXECUTIVE LETTER MISFIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works recently held extensive hearings on the administration of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965—with the major part of the testimony being devoted to the outdoor advertising control provisions of the act.

More than 100 persons either testified before the subcommittee or filed statements for the record. The majority of these people were spokesmen for interests other than the outdoor advertising industry. Nearly all of them recommended or conceded the need for substantial amendments of the act, to make it realistic and workable.

Following the subcommittee hearings, Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd wrote to the conscientious and respected chairman of the subcommittee, JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, with regard to certain questions raised at the hearings. Chairman KLUCZYNSKI released the text of this letter to the press and commented that:

> The Secretary believes that the decisions he announces herein provide the basis for reaching agreements with a number of the States for implementation of the Act.

To avoid any misunderstanding by my colleagues, the public or the State highway departments which will suffer severe penalties if they do not carry out the provisions of the act, I want to make it clear that this is not the effect of Mr. Boyd's letter. In my opinion, it does not solve most of the major problems which were clearly presented at the hearings.

Mr. Boyd's letter relates only to certain problems of outdoor advertising control in zoned or unzoned commercial or industrial areas and barely touches the surface of those problems. It seems quite obvious that the purposes of the letter are merely to lessen the heat of congressional examination of the Highway Beautification Act and to lead the States to believe that the major problems are solved and that there will be no change in the law, in order to coerce them into entering into agreements with the Secretary.

By its own terms, Mr. Boyd's letter demonstrates the unwillingness of the administration to abide by the directions of the Congress. All the letter really purports to do is to commit the administration to conform with the expressed will and intent of the Congress regarding the administration of one phase of the law relating to designation of zoned areas.

The letter itself and the urging of it upon the committee as a solution to the "principal points of concern" is further evidence of heavyhanded White House lobbying to prevent the Congress from exercising its will. This is the same kind of lobbying which occurred in 1965 and which resulted in enactment of the unwise and unworkable Highway Beautification Act.

A close reading of Mr. Boyd's carefully worded letter reveals that it contains no real commitments and no real solutions to the problems it discusses. It ignores numerous other problems.

In his letter Mr. Boyd notes that "We are fully prepared to accept State determinations with respect to zoned commercial or industrial areas."

This is no great concession on the part of the Secretary in view of the fact that the law already requires zoning acts of the States to be accepted for the purpose of the act. It should also be noted that this statement applies only to zoned areas and ignores the fact that in many areas in many States a zoning authority does not exist or is not exercised and that many bona fide commercial or industrial areas are not legally "zoned." It also does not accept local zoning decisions based upon "customary use" relating to billboards within such zoned areas which is the principal point at issue.

Concerning unzoned commercial and industrial areas, Mr. Boyd states:

> We shall be happy to request the guidance and suggestions of the several States with respect to designating these areas.

The letter contains no commitment on the part of the Secretary to accept or follow the guidelines and suggestions of the several States. Mr. Boyd comments that the only absolute requirement would be the existence of at least one commercial activity in any such area. He does not comment upon such troublesome and controversial problems as the distance from a commercial activity which would be considered a commercial or industrial area, or whether the commercial or industrial area would be considered as including both sides or only one side of the road, or what would be the effect of a part-time commercial or industrial enterprise or the temporary closure or abandonment of a commercial or industrial enterprise. There is no suggestion that the State's definition of what constitutes a commercial or industrial activity will be accepted.

With regard to the determination of what constitutes "customary use" in zoned commercial and industrial areas, Mr. Boyd states:

> We shall be glad to look to the States for certification that either the State authority or a local zoning authority has made such a determination.

Mr. Boyd does not indicate what kind of certification would be required nor the extent to which the Secretary of Transportation would look behind or "second guess" the certifications. There is no assurance that local zoning decisions in such areas will be accepted.

Mr. Boyd goes on to say:

> With respect to unzoned areas, we will recognize local practice on customary use as mutually agreed to by State and Federal agencies.

The law already requires mutual agreement between the States and the Secretary on this subject and this is one of the reasons why we are having trouble with the administration of the law. The requirements of the administration have been so unreasonable that of this date no State has been able to enter into an agreement with the Secretary. "Mutually agreed" to this date has meant "federally dictated agreement" and there is no assurance that this would be changed.

With regard to the last point discussed in Mr. Boyd's letter, it is said—

> What is determined in good faith by a bona fide local or state zoning authority as "customary use" will be an acceptable basis for standards as to size, spacing and lighting in the commercial and industrial areas within the geographical jurisdiction of that state or local authority.

This obviously reserves to the Secretary of Transportation the right of decision as to whether a zoning authority has acted in good faith. It should also be noted that Mr. Boyd says determinations by a local or State zoning authority will be "an acceptable basis for standards." He does not say that such determinations will be accepted by the Secretary as the applicable standards. Thus, we are right back where we started—negotiating to reach an agreement satisfactory to the Secretary as to what standards will be applied.

Furthermore, no "bona fide local or State zoning authority" exists in much of the rural areas of the Nation, so this language of Mr. Boyd's letter, even if it meant anything, would have little application to unzoned commercial and industrial areas.

In addition to the vagueness and ambiguity of Mr. Boyd's letter, with respect to the subject which he discusses, the letter does not even address itself to many of the major problems. Some of those major problems are:

First. The equity and wisdom of penalizing States 10 percent of their Federal aid highway construction funds apportioned after January 1, 1968, if they will not or cannot comply with federally dictated standards of highway beautification;

Second. The question of when States must enter into agreements with the Secretary to implement the law in order to avoid loss of Federal aid highway funds, since inability of the Secretary to provide reasonable and acceptable standards makes the January 1, 1968, date completely unrealistic;

Third. What, if anything, the Congress is going to do to provide or require payment of just compensation for the removal of signs erected in good faith after October 22, 1965;

Fourth. The questionable benefits to be gained by virtually eliminating off-premise outdoor advertising signs in areas adjacent to the rural part of the 202,000-mile Federal-aid primary system—the routes of which were required by Federal law to be selected on the basis of traffic service, not scenic value;

Fifth. The economic and social impact of depriving thousands of roadside businesses and natural attractions of their most effective form of advertising—roadside signs;

Sixth. The needs of motorists for travel information heretofore provided by outdoor advertising signs;

Seventh. The problem of "on-premise" signs which admittedly constitute the biggest problem of ugly, garish roadside cluttering; and

Eighth. What those States which entered into an agreement under the 1958 act will have to do to receive the prescribed bonus payments in view of the requirement that the States maintain the control required under the agreement or the control required by the 1965 act, "whichever control is stricter."

Most of the discussion and controversy about the Highway Beautification Act has related to the provisions for control of outdoor advertising. We should not overlook the fact, however, that many unresolved problems exist with respect to the other titles of the act. Some of the problems I discussed earlier in connection with outdoor advertising are equally troublesome under title II of the act, which provides for control of junkyards.

Title III, which relates to landscaping and scenic enhancement, also has problem areas. For example, this provision authorizes the use of Federal funds to pay 100 percent of the cost of "landscape and roadside development within the highway right-of-way and for acquisition of interests in and improvement of strips of land necessary for the restoration, preservation and enhancement of scenic beauty adjacent to such highways." Despite the fact that this provision is a part of the Highway Beautification Act, the procedures established for its implementation assigned the highest priority to the acquisition of strips of land outside the highway right-of-way. The second priority is assigned to the improvement of such strips of land outside the highway right-of-way. The lowest priority is given to projects for landscaping and roadside development on the right-of-way of Federal-aid highways, and it appears that these projects can be undertaken only if the State highway department submits a written statement to the effect that State law does not permit the acquisition of interests in adjacent strips of land.

Mr. Speaker, considering all of these circumstances—the poorly conceived provisions of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 and the unacceptable manner of its administration to date—it seems to me that the Congress is faced with three alternatives:

First, refuse to authorize funds for fiscal year 1968 and future fiscal years, so as to hold the program in abeyance at least for the time being.

Second, amend the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 to include clearly and precisely those arrangements and understandings which can be reached with the Secretary of Transportation if such arrangements and understandings can be reached in enough of the problem areas to make the law workable.

Third, attempt by Congress itself to completely rewrite the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 to provide a good and workable law. A number of approaches could be used to attain the objective of beautifying our highways. These might include the designation of scenic areas adjacent to Federal-aid primary highways or perhaps providing for a limited amount of outdoor advertising to give the motoring public badly needed information with respect to food, lodging, motor vehicle services and repair facilities and scenic, recreational, and natural attractions.

On the subject of the "scenic areas" approach, administration witnesses at the hearings expressed the view that there would be great difficulty in defining scenic areas for the purpose of billboard or junkyard control; however, the administration apparently had no difficulty in defining, or I would call it overdefining, such areas for the purpose of the acquisition of interest in strips of land adjacent to the highway necessary for the restoration, preservation and enhancement of scenic beauty under title III of the act. The Bureau of Public Roads, in its "Instruction Manual" for preparation and submission for the 1967 estimate of the cost of carrying out the provisions of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, included the following identification of such strips:

> Normally, any such strip would be expected to include or be outlined by some natural feature that would contribute to the general appearance of the highway or to the interest and natural scenic view of road users. Obvious cases would be a strip of sizeable timber or interesting natural shrubs, vines, etc., along the highway, a rock outcropping, a lake, a valley or mountain of size and type to attract attention, a stream bed providing the attraction of flowing water in nearby view, or a pastoral scene looking out over a wide expanse of open land, likely in agricultural use, or a narrow land area between a highway and a water course or shore.

In its consideration of which alternative to choose, the Congress has the responsibility to examine the highway beautification program in light of the many other Federal problems and programs. We are involved in a war in South Vietnam. A war has just broken out in the Middle East. According to our respected colleague, WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, a deficit of $29 billion is possible in fiscal year 1968. The House, because of spending pressures, many of which are domestic, increased the national debt ceiling by $6 billion early this year. However, only yesterday, the House voted down the administration's request for an additional $29 billion increase in the debt ceiling. Since the administration will not accept the responsibility, it appears that the Congress must decide which of our Federal programs are least essential in order that the most essential programs can be carried out effectively. Congress must set necessary priorities. In my own opinion, highway beautification has a lower priority than some other urgently important programs, such as the highway construction program.

I would not presume to predict what course of action the Congress will take with respect to the Highway Beautification Act. I will remind my colleagues, however, that the temper of the House has been clearly revealed by its recent actions regarding the national debt ceiling and appropriations. For example, the administration requested $40 million for fiscal year 1968 for the rent supplement program. The Committee on Appropriations reported a bill recommending an appropriation of $10 million; however, the bill, as passed by the House, appropriated no money for the rent supplement program.

With respect to the Teachers Corps program, the administration requested $12.5 million as a supplementary appropriation for fiscal year 1967. The House-passed bill would have appropriated nothing. The Senate-passed bill appropriated $10 million; but in conference this was reduced to $3.8 million and with the stipulation that none of it can actually be expended until the enactment of the authorizations for the Teachers Corps program for fiscal year 1968.

With respect to the demonstration cities program, the House took the following action:

[In millions]

Administration requests for appropriation:	*As passed by the House*
Model cities program ($400 million)	$150
Planning grants ($12 million)	12
Urban renewal program ($250 million)	75
Total ($662 million)	237

This constitutes a reduction of $425 million, or about 65-percent reduction from the administration request.

In view of this, how can a conscientious House of Representatives vote as the administration demands, to not cross a "t" or dot an "i" in the highway beautification program, for which it is asking for an increase from $80 million to $160 million in 1968 and $220 million in 1969, and an estimated $2 to $3 billion for a 10-year program as presently constituted.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone into this matter at some length because I think it would be a disservice to the American public to allow the impression to be created that Secretary Boyd's letter to Chairman KLUCZYNSKI is any substantial contribution toward a solution of the many problems concerning the implementation and administration of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. Mr. Boyd's letter does not solve the major problems. There are no easy solutions to these problems. In 1965 an unwise and unworkable bill was forced upon a reluctant House by brutal lobbying tactics of the White House. I hope that mistake will not be repeated. I firmly believe that an acceptable bill can be written, but I do not believe that it can be done overnight or by enacting slogans or by accepting letters, promises, or understandings in lieu of clear and precise statutory language. Such assurances would not bind a new administration and not necessarily this one, based upon past performance under this program. The minority on the Public Works Committee has given its support toward any and all efforts to write a good and adequate highway beautification act, but administration pressure, reminiscent of 1965, is undercutting congressional efforts.

Under unanimous consent I place the text of Mr. Boyd's letter following my remarks so that my colleagues can read it and assess its value for themselves:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN KLUCZYNSKI,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Roads,
House Public Works Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The recent hearings before your subcommittee have helped us to understand the feelings of your committee. We hope they may have produced commensurate insight into our thinking. Surely none of us are infallible. We earnestly want to administer the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 faithfully, and to do so in complete fidelity to Congressional intent. To this end, the hearings may have been productive of an improved climate of mutual understanding. Since practically all of the previous misunderstanding revolved around the divergent interpretations of exactly what was meant in Title I of the bill, let me reiterate the following four points which should demonstrate our total interest and concern in administering the law as the Congress would want it administered:

1. As the law directs, we are fully prepared to accept state determinations with respect to zoned commercial and industrial areas.

2. Concerning unzoned commercial and industrial areas, we shall be happy to request the guidance and suggestions of the several states with respect to designating these areas. The only absolute requirement upon which

we would have to insist would be the existence of at least one commercial activity in any such area. Surely this could not be considered unreasonable.

3. With regard to the determination of what constitutes "customary use" in the zoned commercial and industrial areas, we shall be glad to look to the states for certification that either the state authority or a bona fide local zoning authority has made such a determination. With respect to unzoned areas, we will recognize local practice on customary use as mutually agreed to by State and Federal agencies. It will be our policy to assume the good faith of the several states in this regard.

The only exception to the above would be a situation in which a state or local authority might attempt to circumvent the law by zoning an areas as "commercial" for billboard purposes only. We think you will agree that this is a reasonable position, since we know that the Congress does not wish for the law to be deliberately evaded by subterfuge.

4. What is determined in good faith by a bona fide local or state zoning authority as "customary use" will be an acceptable basis for standards as to size, spacing and lighting in the commercial and industrial areas within the geographical jurisdiction of that state or local authority.

I believe that this memorandum addresses itself substantially to the principal points of concern expressed by members of your subcommittee with respect to the administration of the Act. We would be very glad to have your concurrence with this basic understanding.

Sincerely,

ALAN S. BOYD.

MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of urgent importance I would like to offer this comment on the Middle East.

Israel troops were forced to obtain by military action the security on land and water which supposedly had been guaranteed by a variety of formal and informal international diplomatic commitments.

Now it becomes important that the United States, which did not intervene militarily in the Middle East crisis, not intervene diplomatically in a way which will return Israel to the same vulnerability to terrorism with which she has been forced to live during the 19 years of her nationhood.

Pressure should not now be put on Israel by any major power to relinquish certain lands which will be of continuing geopolitical significance to the city of Jerusalem, the Jordan River, the Gulf of Aqaba, and the maintenance of bargaining rights for uninterrupted use of the Suez Canal.

It is my belief the Government of Israel will prove herself to be a magnanimous victor, but this magnanimity must be allowed to be voluntary.

The inadequacy of the United Nations in the Middle East in averting war suggests that outside interests should not, except as they may be invited to do so, intrude in the deliberations to recover truly durable peace in this troubled area.

COMMUNIST-FLAG SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that the Department of Defense has for the first time declassified information about Communist-flag shipping to North Vietnam. As I know this is a subject of great interest, I hasten to bring this information to the attention of my colleagues and the American people. In sum, during the past 24 months, between June 1965 and May 1967, a total of 619 Communist-flag ships—267 Soviet, 94 East European, 258 Chinese—arrived in North Vietnam, with 54 of that number being Soviet tankers.

While I regret that it is not possible to give further data on these vessels, the volume of this traffic, however, tells the story dramatically. So, too, does the fact that during the same period 210 free-world-flag ships delivered goods for the benefit of the war machine of the Hanoi regime. This new information has been made available only because of the insistence of our distinguished colleague from South Carolina, Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. It should leave little doubt as to why many in Congress have called for action to stop this seaborne source of supply to the enemy. With over 10,000 American lives lost in Vietnam, it is incredibly tragic that all that has been done so far about this vital lifeline of the North Vietnamese is to collect shipping statistics. I would further suggest that the ardent proponents of increased East-West trade should note carefully the sharp rise in the amount of assistance from the Soviet Union to North Vietnam in recent months. This fact further belies Moscow's official pronouncements of concern over escalation of the war in Vietnam for it is clear that they have been doing just that.

Mr. Speaker, as one who has been following the problem of shipping to North Vietnam for many months and who has constantly been prodding the administration to at least take effective action to eliminate free-world-flag ships from this traffic, I can only say that I feel that the matter has been left to drift too long. When, I ask, is effective action going to be taken?

The statistics follow:

Merchant shipping to North Vietnam, June 1965 to May 1967

Date of arrival	Free world	U.S.S.R.	East European	Chinese	Total
June 1965	23	6	5	9	43
July	20	7	4	8	39
August	12	7	3	15	37
September	11	3	3	8	25
October	15	4	4	11	34
November	14	7	6	16	43
December	13	10	4	14	41
January 1966	18	9	5	15	47
February	12	10	1	14	37
March	6	12	4	13	35
April	7	11	2	11	31
May	6	9	5	5	25
June	5	12	3	9	29
July	1	13	3	9	26
August	3	11	1	7	22
September	4	7	5	10	26
October	2	8	7	13	30
November	6	9	3	14	32
December	4	11	6	15	36
January 1967	6	16	5	11	38
February	5	25	4	10	44
March	3	24	5	12	44
April	5	18	4	9	36
May	9	18	2	10	39
Total	210	267	94	258	829

FREEMAN FARM POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, the man who guided the Democrats through the last election with his "slip, slide, and duck" directions on farm policy, is lending further "valuable" assistance to his party.

On May 17, he gathered some 200 State committeemen of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service to Washington. These and 100,000 others are full- or part-time workers for the taxpayers, being on the Federal payroll.

In his propaganda to this group on behalf of the Great Society, Mr. Freeman had some unkind words to say about anyone in the Congress who dares to oppose his programs, which are driving more farmers to the wall than under any previous Secretary in history. Now it is interesting to determine just what name Mr. Freeman called the leaders of most of America's farm groups and Members of Congress. The press reported at the time that Mr. Freeman called us demagogs. This is a pretty bad word. However, in the copy of the speech which I recently received from the Department of Agriculture, we have been reduced to "demigods."

Mr. Freeman said:

> If the anti-farm program demagogs (or demi-gods)—and read the Congressional Record almost any day and you will find a lot of them in there—if they are permitted to make these wild statements and criticisms that aren't based on the facts or reason, why the farm programs we have will be destroyed.

Mr. Freeman also said:

> And this is where we get the apprehension and why I feel some apprehension.

The "wild" facts that Freeman objects to seeing published—this objecting to seeing facts of performance published is a phobia among the Great Society leaders—are the facts that more people are leaving the farm, dairymen are going out of business, parity is at a low of 72, farmers unjustly are getting blamed for high prices, and the cost of farming keeps going up while farm income keeps shrinking. And, Freeman is doing very little to reverse this trend.

Freeman himself said in his May 17 pep talk to ASCS State leaders:

> Farmers are worried, and of course they should be, because there aren't very many farmers any more and their political power is less than it used to be. This is a reason for insecurity.

Freeman went on to say:

> Now, the downturn of farm income, farm prices, since last August has triggered some of this insecurity and concern, and understandably so. Farm prices have dropped about 10 percent.

In bidding the ASCS to go forth and do battle on behalf of the "New Era" as he now prefers to call it—since the Great Society has virtually ruined agriculture—Freeman was in effect making 100,000 tax-paid propagandists—to sell the people on costly farm programs paid for by their own tax dollars.

It is really time for a "New Era" in America—not the warmed-up programs of the 1930's as espoused by the Secretary, but an era where farmers can farm their land, grow crops for the market, and not have a Big Brother leaning over their shoulders. The "Old Era" of the Freemanized farm has proven that it is the worst thing since crickets for the American farmer.

LOWER DEBT LIMIT MEANS FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I did considerable study and soul searching before voting yesterday against increasing the national debt limit to $365 billion. I want to make clear at the outset that my vote had absolutely nothing to do with U.S. policies in Southeast Asia. My vote against increasing the debt limit was a vote for sound fiscal management, nothing more, nothing less.

Since becoming a Member of this House 2 years ago, I have repeatedly expressed my concern over what I consider unsound fiscal policies. In 1965, in 1966, and again this year, soaring prices and inflation constitute our foremost domestic problem. Every family in America is affected, particularly lower and middle-income families and retirees living on fixed incomes.

I have backed up my expressions of concern by voting against those Federal programs which I felt could be deferred or eliminated, for there can be no doubt that the principal factor in our inflationary spirit is the vast increase in Federal spending. In the 89th Congress I voted against more than $24 billion in unnecessary spending. Since the 90th Congress convened, I have voted against more than $3 billion in unnecessary appropriations.

Yet, the administration has continued to insist upon funds for programs which are clearly deferrable, such as $5 billion for a civilian supersonic transport and recent release of more than $2 billion for public works, and at the same time has made only timorous requests for funds for truly vital programs such as aid to education, job training, and the various antipoverty efforts.

If we are to meet the cost of our commitments in Vietnam and still carry on needed domestic programs without the repressive across-the-board tax increase the administration apparently intends to request, the answer is simple: reduce nonessential spending.

Mr. Speaker, that was the sole reason for my vote against the debt limit increase: to convince the administration that it must take a long, hard look at its budget and to establish realistic priorities.

I want to serve notice now that I will not support a general tax increase and that I will continue to vote against every spending measure with "fat" in it until a policy of sound fiscal management is adopted and implemented.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS ACHIEVEMENT AT HUNTERS POINT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, last fall I told the Congress of the excellent work "youth for service," a Neighborhood Youth Corps project in San Francisco, performed during the disturbance at Hunters Point. Those young people, in the face of great personal danger, helped greatly in restoring the peace during those tense October days. This summer I am happy to report again about Neighborhood Youth Corps achievement at Hunters Point. This time the story is about 23 young men who have escaped from the ranks of the unemployed and unemployable.

For the past 5 months, just a few blocks from the area of last year's riots, the Neighborhood Youth Corps has been conducting activities at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. The young men assigned to the shipyard for work training and experience have just completed the program. They were part of a larger group of 185 young men and women enrolled in a project sponsored by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission as part of the department of labor's youth employment program administered by the bureau of work programs.

The success story of these school dropouts, recruited from areas of concentrated poverty in San Francisco, is helping to put an end to the myth that disadvantaged young people cannot become productive citizens, capable of handling skilled jobs.

After only 5 months of training, all 23, who had no previous machine shop experience, have passed the civil service examination and qualified as machinist helpers. Seven already have full-time jobs, earning $2.87 an hour; the other 16 continue to further their training in the Neighborhood Youth Corps and will be taken on full time as openings occur. Of the seven, three are employed as machinist helpers, two as laborers, one as a trainee in the drafting department, and another as an assistant in the electrical department.

These successes are the result of the imagination and dedication of men in the industrial relations office of the shipyard and the public utilities commission's water department. Impressed with the waste of human resources in the area, they devised a program that carried the concept of work experience into the field of prevocational training.

The Navy has become so involved in the project that the shipyard commandant, Adm. J. H. McQuilken, not only helped draw up the plans together with James K. Carr, the public utilities commission's general manager, but stills drops into the training section from time to time to see how the new recruits are getting along. He also made possible the release of stored Navy equipment for use in the shop, and freed a room for basic education classes.

The plan combines 32 hours of machine shop training and work on the job. To help the boys learn faster, Navy machinists created a complete machine shop with machine tools, work benches, tool storage cabinets, training aids, and kits of personal handtools. There the enrollees made rough dies, which the skilled Navy craftsmen milled down to size. During another phase of training the boys worked side by side with the men who carefully explained each step of the process as they worked. During this period general industrial discipline, safety and manual dexterity were emphasized.

Shop head E. W. Miller called this phase "eminently successful." He cited the excellent safety record, the type and quality of the work pieces produced, the excellent housekeeping practices, and the desire and enthusiasm of the students to advance.

To provide the trainees with a better background in basic English and mathematics, a professor from the University of California at Berkeley was brought in. Whenever possible the subject matter was related to the work experience. The young men also learned to handle the types of questions given in the Federal employment examinations. So good was rapport between the teacher and the students that these high school dropouts requested and received an additional 2 to 3 hours of classes a week.

But perhaps the most important benefit the boys gained from the program was their acquaintance with the Navy craftsmen. They showed the boys the value of craftsmanship ad instilled in them pride for a job well done.

The enthusiasm and sympathy of men like Oscar Ortiz, tool and die maker, played an equally import part in the program's success. Oritz and his wife, a San Francisco schoolteacher, devoted many hours of their own time to help some of the young men with language and other academic problems. They practically "adopted" one youth from Central America who spoke no English when he entered the program.

The implications are obvious: Given the opportunity for a Neighborhood Youth Corps "experience"—a combination of good training, work experience, remedial education, and personal guidance and concern—high school dropouts who may be ripe for further rebellion can become productive skilled workers, able to compete successfully in the job market.

THE OBLIGATION TO SPEAK OUT AND THE RIGHT TO DISSENT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, a group of 51 lawyers in our city of San Francisco recently issued jointly what I consider to be an outstanding statement in the belief, as they stated at the time, "that the critical issues of the day call for renewed dedication to the principles of a free democratic society."

Among the signers of the statement were the president of the San Francisco Bar Association, Mr. Vincent Cullinan; a past president, Mr. Brent M. Abel, as well as top San Francisco leaders in both major political parties.

I should like to enter this highly significant statement in the RECORD at this time in order to share its thoughtful and articulately stated contents with my colleagues. The statement is entitled "The Obligation To Speak and the Right To Dissent."

The undersigned members of the bar believe the time has come for this nation to reaffirm its determination to exist as a free democratic society, where the right to discuss, to dissent, and lawfully to protest in support of one's convictions is nurtured and respected. If this principle of democratic self government is to exist in any meaningful sense at all, it must exist in times of stress and crisis as well as in times of ease and consensus; it must exist and be exercised before fateful decisions are made so as to influence those decisions; and it must protect unpopular as well as popular expressions of opinion.

We state these principles because we hear with increasing frequency the charge, either in so many words or in substance, that any dissent or protest from our present policies in Vietnam "gives aid and comfort to the enemy" and impedes the conduct of the war. Such charges can have only one purpose—or at least only one effect—to reduce debate, to limit discussion, to frighten the people from a legitimate expression of their views on the critical issues upon which the very life of our nation may depend.

As lawyers we deplore any intimidation of lawful protest or debate. We do not profess to know the answers to the critical problems with which we are confronted in the area of foreign aiffairs. In varying degrees, some of us are hawks and some of us are doves. But we are all convinced that the one sure way not to arrive at a wise course, which has the informed support of the people, is to stifle debate and to insulate our national policies from all dissent.

Sound policies do not need to be shielded from debate; they thrive on it. And unsound policies do not achieve merit by being insulated from public discussion. Until our nation's leaders ask for and obtain the necessary constitutional authority to silence discussion and dissent, let it not be demanded or expected that we conduct our affairs as if such a step had been taken. In support of these views, we suggest the following considerations:

First: Those who would discourage free expression of opinions and orderly dissent always assert that they personally favor freedom of speech; that they fully subscribe to the right of the people peacefully to assemble, to protest, and to exercise the rights of free men in a democratic society. They explain however, that our adversaries do not understand our concept of democracy and may not fully appreciate that our national policies evolve from a process of free discussion and interchange of views. Accordingly, such adversaries may mistake discussion and debate for lack of resolution or patriotism. These fair weather disciples of democracy proceed then to their inevitable conclusion: we must run our democratic institutions in a way which will fool the opposition. We must adopt the very form of decision-making against which we are said to be fighting, i.e. totalitarian thought control by political leaders. One can scarcely conceive of a better way to win a battle and lose a war. If we are to embrace this philosophy, let us make no pretense of loving liberty; let us simply concede that we surrender to that which we deplore, and take our censorship pure, without the base alloy of hypocrisy.

Second: Legitimate debate and orderly protest—and that is all we are talking about—are needed for the benefit of our own nation's leaders. Our government is based on a consensus of the governed. It is important that, in determining that consensus, our leaders have an opportunity to measure the real feelings of the people. Yet, with increasing frequency we hear views expressed privately, with the comment that the speaker would prefer not to state such views publicly. This nation can ill afford to allow such feelings to gain currency. Once we embark upon a course of stifling discussion, whether by outright censorship, by intimidation or by innuendo, we deprive our leaders of what they need most: guidelines from the millions of people they are called upon to lead; a measurement of their temper and resolution; empathy with their desires.

In short, to stifle debate is to deprive democracy of its strongest weapon—the informed consensus of an enlightened people on a course of conduct, communicated to its leaders. And in that debate, responsible criticism can be more constructive than indifference or unthinking approval.

Third: Once we countenance intimidation of debate and dissent regarding our national policies, where do we draw the line? Our progress in degeneracy from a freedom loving, informed and concerned people, interested in the affairs of state, proceeds at an alarming rate. More and more of us wash our hands of the whole business. And when we do that, we get what we deserve—policies dictated by military and political minds shielded from the views of the people. Once those who peacefully march in protest have been dispersed, how long will we tolerate the opinion polls showing any degree of dissent?

And once the polls have been eliminated or emasculated, how can we justify allowing our senators and congressmen to make speeches in the halls of Congress criticizing the policies being pursued? As we ride to and fro upon this tiger of intimidation, we will find it increasingly difficult to dismount.

Fourth: The most difficult argument is that by any dissent or discussion we are "letting down'" our young men in Vietnam. But are we? If these young men (and many of us were in similar straits not too long ago or have sons who face these perils) are not fighting for democracy, the right to "speak out," and to live as free men, what are they fighting for? More than that, what of the fate of the thousands of troops—and perhaps millions—who will follow?

Fifth: There are two ways to answer arguments with which we do not agree in respect of the Vietnam situation. The first is by seeking to discredit our adversary. Doves are accused of "giving every aid and comfort to the enemy that they can"; certain hawks are accused of advocating escalation of combat for others despite their own failure to enlist in World War II. It is apparent that such replies do not really answer arguments but are directed mainly at dissuading the proponent from even making them.

The second approach is to consider arguments on their merits, dispassionately and without rancor, advancing such opposing contentions as one has.

It may be that both approaches are within the technical limits of free speech; but we firmly believe that only the latter is truly consistent with a democratic form of government, and with the policy underlying the constitutional guarantees. The first approach smothers discussion and discourages inquiry. The second approach promotes critical analysis and encourages understanding. The issues this country faces today are so serious and complex that we can ill afford to choose the former.

Perhaps the only way out is ever increasing escalation. But the American public is entitled to consider and freely debate the possible consequences before they occur (e.g., bombing of China, land warfare on the Asian continent) and the alternatives, if any, while they exist (e.g. disengagement, Gavin-type defense zones, insistence on SEATO participation, negotiations, etc.). If out of such debate and discussions and affirmation and dissent, comes a sounder policy and a course of action which ends the conflict sooner and with less human suffering, then it is for the common good, both for those who now endure the hardships of war and for those who may be spared them in the future.

As lawyers, we have watched this great nation during the past several months begin to descend incontinently, fecklessly, the stairway which leads to a dark chamber—the end of rational debate, dispassionate discussion, and legitimate protest We believe we, and our fellow citizens, have an obligation to speak up and speak out on the grave issues of the day; and the right to do so without fear or recrimination. We believe our newspapers, our columnists, and our representatives should say so, plainly and unequivocally. And we subscribe to the incisive observation of Dante that "the hottest places in Hades are reserved for those who, in a period of moral crisis, maintain their neutrality."

The statement is signed by the following San Francisco members of the bar: Brent M. Abel, Arthur R. Albretch, Philip H. Angell, Richard J. Archer, John P. Austin, John B. Bates, Peter H.

Behr, John L. Bradley, William M. Brinton, Miles A. Cobb.

William K. Coblentz, Vincent Cullinan, William I. Edlund, Donald P. Falconer, James B. Frankel, Pembroke Gochnauer, Lawrence Goldberg, A. Crawford Greene, Jr., Joseph R. Grodin, John N. Hauser, Lauffer T. Hayes.

Louis H. Heilbron, Henry W. Howard, Raymond W. Ickes, Edward E. Kallgren, Charles W. Kenady, Jr., Roger Kent, Marshall W. Krause, George E. Link, Joseph Martin, Jr., Clark W. Maser, Graham B. Moody, Jr., Albert J. Moorman.

Clarence E. Musto, William D. McKee, Robert Ohlbach, Jack H. Olive, Girvan Peck, Atherton Phleger, Edward W. Rosston, William W. Schwarzer, Leonard M. Sperry, Jr., Hart H. Spiegel, Robert G. Sproul, Jr., David Strain, James F. Thacher, Peter N. Teige, James L. Tipton, Gary J. Torre, Gordon M. Weber, Max Weingarten.

WHAT IS THE NEXT STEP IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the cease-fire resolution that the United Nations has so ably brought forth in the Middle East crisis has given Israel and the Arab nations the tool by which hostilities can stop and negotiations for settlement can begin. This of course depends on the acceptance of the cease-fire by all the Arab States.

The stunning success of Israel's valiant army has removed the military threat to its borders. Israel has agreed to abide by the U.N. cease-fire resolution if the Arab nations do likewise. It is reasonable to believe they will do so. Now that we are at this point in the Middle East crisis, what is the next step?

Israel must, by some means, realize a condition of permanent peace. At this time and this place in history, the world must recognize that permanent peace must come to the Middle East.

Little will be availed, even in the wake of Israel's remarkable victories, if the Arab nations do not acknowledge the existence of the sovereign rights of the Israeli State. The Arab world must accept the permanancy of the State of Israel. All other points of dispute over the past 20 years, other than this one, can be negotiated. There must be no attempt on our part or on the part of the United Nations to urge a withdrawal of Israeli forces from any occupied points until the permanancy of the State of Israel has been accepted by all the Arab nations. The United Nation's lack of capacity to maintain peace in the Middle East has made it abundantly clear that it will be unable to do so in the future if Israel's sovereignty is not recognized by the entire world.

Now that the military effort is almost over, we must help Israel and her Arab neighbors find a way to lasting peace. There is reason to hope for success toward this end because these nations inherently complement each other rather than compete with each other. Israel and the Arab nations have given to the world an enriched cultural inheritance; their land is the cradle of the religious beliefs that have given meaning to man's existence since the world's history began. The political, social, and economic costs of maintaining a permanent military force are high for any nation, and particularly for those nations of the Middle East. Israel and the Arab countries can—and must be encouraged to—work together so that the life of each citizen of each nation can be enriched and that the economic and cultural gains of the countries will flourish.

The Arab nations would be wise to immediately accept the permanancy of the State of Israel so that both sides could get on with the settlement of the other points of dispute. The avowed Arab point of view has been that they have been at war with Israel since 1948. As long as this point of view is permitted to exist, there can be no security for Israel or for the world.

GIANT AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS CONTINUE TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST INDEPENDENT GARAGES

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years I have been very much concerned with the monopolistic practices of two giants of American industry. I refer to General Motors and the Ford Motor Co., in the sale of captive parts manufactured only by or for General Motors and Ford and supplied only to franchised dealers of their automobiles. By such practices they are denying the independent repair shop owners the needed equipment to compete with them in this country of free enterprise.

My investigation into this matter reveals that the independent garage owner must purchase automobile body parts from franchised dealers for work his customers ask him to perform on their car which has been damaged in an accident. This system makes it most difficult for the independent garageman to compete since the franchised dealer is granted discounts on these parts by the manufacturer, but they are not passed on to the independent because Ford and General Motors will not permit their franchised dealers to do so.

We are nearing the 80 million figure of registered passenger vehicles in the United States, in addition to 15 million trucks and buses which travel on our streets and highways. As we all know, there are thousands of automobile accidents daily in this country. Nearly all of the cars involved in these accidents are in need of body replacement parts or the repair and straightening of such things as fenders, bumpers, and door panels.

According to the May 1966 issue of the National Automobile Dealers Association magazine, which is the official spokesman for the franchised automobile dealers, only 34 percent of the repair work could be handled by the dealer repair shops. This, of course, throws a whopping 66 percent of automobile body repair work on the shoulders of the independent garage repair shops. There are approximately 250,000 independents engaged in this field. They employ a large force of skilled repairmen to work on our cars.

The report of the 1963 census of business, published by the Bureau of the Census, shows that auto repair garages had receipts totaling $9,032,057,000 and that they paid to their employees $1,913,440,000 in wages. Their total employment figure at that time was 472,441. You can readily see from these official statistics that these small businessmen are indeed a very important element in the economy of this Nation. I am sure that the next business census will show a very substantial increase in the importance of this industry to the American public. By way of comparison, I note from the same source that there were 28,621 franchised passenger car dealers in the United States dealing in domestic made vehicles. A great many of these maintain automobile body repair shops; however, it is quite obvious that they are limited in the number of repair jobs which they can handle.

The purpose of my remarks here today is to bring to your attention the wholly unfair advantage which these two automotive giants have granted their franchised dealers at the expense of a major portion of the automobile repair industry. The one notable exception to this intolerable practice is Chrysler Corp., which agreed in 1965 to grant a 12-percent discount to your local repairman, thereby permitting competition in the spirit of free enterprise. Chrysler, by this action, clearly noted the importance of independent garagemen to the motoring public. I regret I cannot say the same about their two major competitors.

My attention has been focused on the efforts of the Independent Garage Owners of America, representing 250,000 automobile repair shops in the 50 States. This association has been attempting to encourage price equity by General Motors and Ford. Thus far they have made no headway. Neither firm has deigned to hold any discussions with them, I am told. The IGOA, in an attempt to obtain some corrective action, has launched a campaign entitled "Get Reforms in Purchasing Equity." You will notice the use of the first letter of each word in this campaign spell out the word gripe. How appropriate. Representatives of the association have indicated that their sole objective is to obtain the same parts cost advantage as that given to new car dealers by the manufacurers. It would seem that this is a most reasonable goal. Chrysler has done so and finds it good business in that it provides many additional sources of proper repair service to the purchasers of their products.

The basic national policy of this Government is to encourage competition, to reduce and eliminate monopolies and to provide purchasers with alternate sources of supplies and services. Our economy is increasingly dependent upon automotive transportation. Repair parts are vital to the functioning of our automobiles. There is no competition in the production of automobile body parts and certain other parts as well. They are distributed only by the manufacturer.

In the executive branch, the Federal Trade Commission is keenly aware of this subject and is currently conducting investigations into pricing practices of Ford and General Motors. The legislative branch is also knowledgeable concerning these practices. Congressional committees interested in maintaining competition in interstate commerce have heard testimony from witnesses representing the automotive repair industry. Many individual Members of Congress have heard from their constituents as well as from people in the industry concerning this problem. They ask, "What has happened to the spirit of the laws of this land which state there shall be free and open competition? Why do we permit monopolistic practices to continue when the statutes say there shall be none?" They say the big corporations are getting bigger, and the small businessmen are not getting a fair deal.

I am told that for many years General Motors and Ford have given their franchised dealers a discount of 25 to 30 percent from suggested retail list price on various sheetmetal replacement parts such as hoods, door panels, trunk lids, and so forth. They do not give this profit margin to independent garages. Now, suppose you are involved in an accident which results in a damaged fender that must be replaced.

The insurance carrier will ask you to obtain two or three estimates. Your first impulse is to have your favorite garageman do the job. He gives you an estimate of $75 for a new fender, plus a charge of $20 for labor, resulting in a total cost of $95. Your second estimate is obtained from the dealer from whom your car was purchased. Remembering the dealer is allowed up to 25- to 30-percent discount, he may charge you from $64.75 for the fender, representing actual cost to him, up to the suggested retail price of $75, plus whatever labor costs he tacks on in addition. Obviously you can see who has the upper hand in getting your repair job. In this same vein, I have heard of some instances of rebates to insurance companies when they insist on repair work being performed by the franchised dealer. If this is a widespread practice, it may be necessary to inquire further into the matter.

Apropos to the subject of my remarks, I noted with much interest some statements made by James M. Roche, president of General Motors Corp., in a speech before the 1966 annual convention, of the Automotive Service Industry Association. He said:

> One important invigorating element in our industry (automotive) is competition. No industry is more competitive. In our industry competition is a way of life. It is a part of the free enterprise system. And in America free enterprise means freedom to succeed through service. There is no room in this business for those who do not subscribe to this philosophy. Competition and growth also bring challenges. One of our major challenges at the present time is service.

How commendable Mr. Roche's remarks are. How correct he is when he says that free enterprise means freedom to succeed through service. How apt his analysis of the automotive industry as a part of the free enterprise system but how wrong he is when he says that competition is a way of life when applied to the practices of his own firm with respect to the Nation's independent garagemen. It is my hope that in the near future both General Motors and Ford will see fit to join their competitors, the Chrysler Corp., and make available to the Nation's independent garagemen the same discounts which are offered to their franchised dealers.

The Congress and the Federal Trade Commission have been examining this problem for a number of years. The time has arrived when corrective action must be taken. This could best be accomplished by voluntary action on the part of these two firms. In the absence of such voluntary action, it is clear the time has arrived when the Federal Government has a clear duty to act to preserve competitive forces within the automotive repair industry.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with much concern to the discussion on the floor on June 5 regarding automobile liability insurance policies and the great and immediate need for public hearings on the controversy. This matter has been the subject of many congressional remarks during the past few months.

Serious charges have been directed against the auto insurance industry. Many insurance companies are claiming financial difficulties because of the increasing number of automobile accidents. My colleagues, Mr. Cahill from New Jersey and Mr. Green from Pennsylvania, have wisely called for "a broad examination by Congress of the auto insurance business."

The rising cost of auto insurance premiums, the complaints of policyholders that policies are unwarrantedly canceled in many instances, and the alleged discriminatory practices of some insurance companies are very disturbing. Equally disturbing are statements from some insurance companies that the increasing number of auto accidents and settlement costs are causing them severe financial difficulties. With some 83 million automobiles on the road—and this number is ever increasing—it is time that this controversy is brought into the open and fully debated.

I believe that the Congress has a responsibility to provide a forum where this confused issue can be heard; where a good, hard look can be taken at what is happening in this country where a situation exists in which more than $8 billion in auto insurance premiums is written annually and over $4 billion is paid in claims, and where many accusations are made on both sides concerning the cause of skyrocketing costs of automobile insurance.

My colleagues, Mr. Cahill and Mr. Green, should be commended for initiating this discussion. We need to get all the facts and we need to find a course of action that will provide a fair and equitable solution to this problem so that adequate protection can be afforded the public.

TRIBUTE TO DR. EDWARD G. LATCH, CHAPLAIN

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Herlong] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in this tribute to our beloved Chaplain, Dr. Edward G. Latch, on the completion of his 26 years in the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church here in Washington. It has been my good fortune to have been a member of his congregation for the past few years and I have constantly been inspired, not only by the quality of his messages, but by this great man himself.

We are going to miss him at Metropolitan, but we in the House of Representatives are ever so fortunate that we will continue to be blessed by his services to us.

I know he has carried a heavy load for the past year with his ministry as well as his studies here in the House of Representatives, but one could not detect it from the quality of the services he rendered at either place. Always with a smile, a kind thought, a pleasant word, a friendly sense of humor, and with all a deep Christian character—we could not have done better in our selection of a Chaplain.

I am delighted for him and his dear wife that the personal physical demands upon them will be lessened and that they will be able to spend more time together in the years to come.

SETTLEMENT OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM THROUGH THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **MINK**. Mr. Speaker, the president of our very active United Nations Association in Honolulu, Mrs. Fern McQuesten, has commended to my attention a thoughtful article in the May 20, 1967, Honolulu Star-Bulletin, by Editor William Ewing. Mr. Ewing has carefully analyzed the desirability of the administration's taking the initiative in seeking a settlement of the war in Vietnam through the Security Council of the United Nations, and I heartily concur with the opinion of our U.N Association that his very logical summary should receive wider dissemination. In order to share Mr. Ewing's reasoned position with my colleagues, I insert the complete text of his article at this point in the RECORD:

THERE'S ALWAYS THE U.N.

(By William Ewing)

As the American death toll in the Vietnamese conflict passed the 10,000 mark this week, the Administration was reported officially to be considering an appeal to the United Nations Security Council to seek a settlement.

This figure of 10,000 American dead is high, in terms of earlier wars. In one way it only emphasizes the diminutive size, by comparison, of past conflicts. The combined total of American deaths in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War and the Spanish-American War, all historically major conflicts, did not equal the number already killed in Vietnam.

The reason is that more men are involved and the capacity to kill is greater. One man with a machinegun possesses greater destructive power than a whole regiment of flintlocks in 1776.

Official confirmation that the United States is considering an appeal to the Security Council came Thursday from Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Mr. Rusk spoke to reporters after appearing at a closed meeting of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Such a move was urged twice on the Senate floor this week by the Majority Leader, Senator Mike Mansfield. At a news conference Thursday President Johnson would say merely that he could not comment on the subject at that time.

There are reasons in principle why the conflict, an undeclared war, should be laid before the Security Council. There are also the practical reasons which made critics say 22 years ago when the United Nations was founded at San Francisco that it would serve very well for keeping small countries in line, but its Charter provisions could never be enforced against a big country such as the United States or the Soviet Union.

It was because of the unwillingness of the United States and the Soviet Union to place their fates in the hands of lesser nations who would serve on the Security Council with them that the veto was devised. All decisions of the Security Council must be unanimous, so that a single dissent can render it powerless to act.

The United States, then, in a strictly practical sense does not have to fear having the Security Council consider the Vietnam war. If we do not like the proposal it produces we can veto it. The state of world opinion being what it is today, the proposal almost certainly would require us to halt unconditionally the bombing of North Vietnam.

The Administration could reject this, along with any other recommendations the Council might make. But the Administration hardly wishes to place itself in the position of renouncing a settlement, any settlement, which it had deliberately sought. It would seem to be an act of bad faith. Thus, should the United States turn to the Security Council, it would be almost bound to accept what the Security Council recommended.

On the other hand, there are two very good reasons in favor of placing the issue before the Security Council.

One is that put forth by Senator Mansfield and by others who urge restraint on the President. They fear the war is on the verge of getting out of hand. As one of them, Senator Cooper of Kentucky, has said, we may be nearing the point at which any possibility of negotiation will be foreclosed. After that the decision as to whether to end the war might not rest with us but with the enemy and the enemy's supporters.

The other reason is simply one of face-saving. It may be that the Administration has begun to recognize that bombing North Vietnam has not diluted the North Vietnamese will to fight. It has been two years and three months since the bombing was begun for the announced purpose of halting infiltration into the South. Today infiltration is greater than ever before.

In all their own propaganda and pronouncements, the North Vietnamese have put first priority on an "unconditional" halt to the bombing. The President has repeatedly offered to halt the bombing for something—"almost anything"—in return. Hanoi has said as repeatedly "No." "You stop the bombing," Hanoi has said in effect. "Then we will decide whether we will talk. There will be no such thing as conditioning one on the other."

It would be most difficult for the Administration, having resisted this position for so long, to retreat at this point and thus admit that the lives of men lost meanwhile had been spent in vain. In other words, if the Administration was right in the past it is right now, and if it is wrong now it has been wrong in the past.

The admission of error would sting less deep if it were to come in the guise of a United Nations proposal.

That the Administration is less warlike than it was a year or six months ago seems demonstrable—in the President's pronouncement, in Secretary McNamara's statement this week that no new troop transfers to Vietnam are in the immediate offing, and in the now vague, but discernible, movements to place the issue before the United Nations.

THE OPEN SPACE LAND PROGRAM

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to increase and broaden the open space land program, which is designed to assist local communities in preserving and developing land for park and recreation purposes, for scenic beauty, or for historic value.

This legislation was originally introduced by my good friend and colleague, the Honorable JAMES G. O'HARA, a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

As Congressman O'HARA has pointed out in his statement on behalf of this bill, too many Americans do not have the opportunity to enjoy outdoor recreation. President Johnson has urged prompt action to solve this problem, and I agree that it is truly vital.

In the past 20 years, the use of National and State parks has increased nearly threefold, and in the coming decade it is estimated that recreation demands will outstrip population growth by at least 2 to 1. The need for a planned program to alleviate this problem is becoming more and more obvious.

The open space land program is the only Federal program which is designed specifically to help local communities solve this growing problem. Just this week, two open space grants totaling more than $222,000 were made to help expand existing park areas in my congressional district.

Congressman O'HARA's legislation, which my bill duplicates, would double the funds authorized under the open space program for land acquisition and development. It would also liberalize the present law and diversify the type of facilities which would be constructed.

If Americans of the 1970's and 1980's are to have the opportunity to enjoy the great outdoors, this Congress must take action now to make certain that there will be enough land and facilities available. Not only must we have national parks and forests, but we must have playgrounds, neighborhood and regional parks, baseball diamonds, swimming pools, beaches, tennis courts, and other facilities.

I urge my colleagues to give careful thought to this problem, and to support this or other legislation designed to accomplish the purposes I have outlined here.

GROUP TO HELP REHABILITATE JOB CORPSMEN

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the additional problems in removing the young men and women from an environment to the Job Corps to a substantial job is that the process is entirely too abrupt for some youths to accept. Recently, an article appeared in the Chicago Tribune relating the formation of a private nonprofit organization called Joint Action in Community Service, Inc. This volunteer organization will have the primary aim of helping Job Corps graduates stay employed and solve personal problems when they return to their local communities. The article points out that at present, the organization is oriented to the Roman Catholic and Protestant faiths, but it will be broadened to include all faiths, social service agencies, and other interested organizations.

I encourage each of my colleagues to read of this worthwhile news and I include this article in the RECORD:

GROUP TO HELP REHABILITATE JOB CORPSMEN

(By William Kling)

WASHINGTON, May 4—Creation was disclosed today of a private, nonprofit organization which has received a $214,500 contract, signed Jan. 20, from the war on poverty to help job corps graduates stay employed and solve personal problems.

Called Joint Action in Community Service, Inc., the organization hopes to mobilize as many as 80,000 volunteers from church agencies, service clubs, business associations, and other groups across the nation during the next year to assist job corps trainees when they return to local communities.

SEEK CHURCH, COMPANY AID

Roger L. Burgess, the group's executive director, said additional funds to promote the program will be sought from church agencies and large companies.

At present, the organization is primarily oriented to the Roman Catholic and Protestant faiths, Burgess said, but it will be broadened to include all faiths, social service agencies, and other interested organizations, working within existing structures without setting up any new network for the program.

Burgess said about 160,000 trainees will have completed training in job corps camps by mid-1968, with each corpsman costing the taxpayers $5,850 for 2,100 hours of training and instruction.

CITES REFUGEE PROGRAMS

A member of the board of directors of the group, Thomas D. Hinton, also a director of the National Catholic Community service, said the jobs group "will mobilize, increase, and channel the interest of the community in the job corps graduate on a person-to-person basis."

"It will work if we use the same effort we used to resettle the Hungarian refugees 10 years ago and, more recently to resettle the Cuban refugees," Hinton said.

The deputy director of the organization will be J. Daniel Culhane, for 20 years the Washington national representative of Boys' Clubs of America.

The Rev. Marshall Earl Hodge, former director of the Methodist inner city parish in Kansas City, Mo., will be director of the Great Lakes region, which oversees Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. He will begin work Monday in Chicago.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON SOME MAJOR ISSUES FACING OUR NATION

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I mailed questionnaires to every home in my congressional district, for the third consecutive year, to help determine my constituents' viewpoints on some of the major issues facing our Nation today.

Nearly 12,000 persons, or about 10 percent of those polled, responded to this opinion survey.

Of particular interest were the replies to my question: "Which course of action would you prefer in Vietnam." Slightly more than half voted to expand our military efforts; 27 percent would continue our military efforts at the present level, and 22 percent favored a reduction of military efforts.

Overwhelming majorities were given to proposed increases in social security benefits and to a proposed amendment to abolish the electoral college and provide for direct, popular election of the President and Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, I am having the complete results of my questionnaire survey printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues can see the thinking of my constituents in Michigan's 15th Congressional District on a few of the important issues that must be decided by this Congress:

APRIL 1967

DEAR FRIENDS: Recently, I mailed questionnaires to every home in the 15th Congressional District, for the third consecutive year, to help determine my constituents' viewpoints on some of the major issues facing our nation today.

Nearly 12,000 persons responded to this public opinion poll. Following is a breakdown of the replies to each of the questions which were asked:

1. Do you favor increasing minimum social security payments for retirees, from $44 a month to $70, as proposed by President Johnson?

Total replies	11,618
Yes (75 percent)	8,735
No (25 percent)	2,883

If so, which of the following methods would you prefer to finance the higher payments?

(a) Increasing the withholding payments from paychecks.

(b) Taking the money from general Federal revenues.

Total replies	9,433
(a) (37 percent)	3,521
(b) (63 percent)	5,912

2. Which course of action would you prefer in Vietnam?

(a) Continue our military efforts at the present level.

(b) Expand our military efforts.

(c) Reduce our military efforts.

Total replies	11,206
(a) (27 percent)	3,026
(b) (51 percent)	5,763
(c) (22 percent)	2,417

3. Do you favor a temporary increase in income taxes to finance rising military expenditures in Vietnam?

Total replies	10,272
Yes (28 percent)	2,924
No (72 percent)	7,348

If not, which domestic programs would you reduce?

(a) Federal aid to education or job training programs.

(b) Federal subsidies for agriculture and business.

(c) Federally financed public works programs.

Total replies	12,077
(a) (20 percent)	2,496
(b) (43 percent)	5,225
(c) (37 percent)	4,356

4. The Nation's Selective Service System (military draft) is in need of revision. Would you favor any of the following changes?

(a) Eliminate deferments for educational or occupational reasons.

(b) Increase pay and fringe benefits for volunteers.

(c) Adopt a blind drawing (lottery) system to select draftees.

Total replies	[1] 13,009
(a) (34 percent)	4,362
(b) (38 percent)	4,937
(c) (28 percent)	3,710

[1] Some persons checked more than one answer.

5. Would you favor outlawing all wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping (bugging)?

Total replies	8,391
Yes (34 percent)	3,821
No (66 percent)	5,570

Would you rather permit them only in cases of national security?

Total replies	8,376
Yes (74 percent)	6,206
No (26 percent)	2,170

6. Do you favor increasing federal aid to municipal, county and state police for salaries, equipment and training?

Total replies	10,766
Yes (51 percent)	5,496
No (49 percent)	5,270

7. Do you favor amending the U.S. Constitution to abolish the Electoral College and provide for direct, popular election of the President and Vice President?

Total replies	11,599
Yes (81 percent)	9,357
No (19 percent)	2,242

More than 500 persons who returned questionnaires also included written comments on some of the questions, and on other issues. Each of these persons will receive an individual answer. Since it would not be possible, however, to acknowledge each of the questionnaires, I am using this Newsletter to report on the results, and to briefly outline my viewpoints on the questions.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

I firmly believe that Social Security payments for retirees should be increased to help offset the sharp increase in living costs during recent years. Retirees and others on fixed incomes are the hardest hit by higher living costs. In order to keep the Social Security System on a sound economic basis, we must increase contributions if we are to increase benefits.

WAR IN VIETNAM

Surprisingly, 51% of those who responded to the poll voted to expand our military efforts in Viet Nam. President Johnson has avoided drastic escalation of the conflict to avoid the possibility of bringing on a world-wide nuclear war. I support his "middle-of-the-road" policy, in which he has consistently sought a negotiated peace, while continuing to exert military pressure. In this way, we are demonstrating that the United States is determined to carry out its commitments to the people of South Viet Nam.

FINANCING THE WAR

Not surprisingly, 72 per cent are opposed to an income tax increase to finance the war. Of the three alternate proposals, I agree with the majority view that Federal subsidies are the most likely area to cut government spending. I am particularly interested in the possibility of reducing such subsidies as those given corporate farmers, and those given magazine publishers who profit by low mailing rates.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

President Johnson has proposed a number of changes in the draft law which coincide with the questionnaire results. More than a third of the responses favored elimination of educational or occupational deferments. An even higher percentage favored increased pay and other benefits for volunteers. Both of these changes have been proposed. A minority of the replies favored a blind drawing (lottery) system to select draftees. This is not included in the President's plan. I believe that a total overhaul of our Selective Service System is needed, and in general I support most of the changes proposed by the President.

WIRETAPPING AND BUGGING

The poll results show that a majority would permit wire-tapping and electronic eavesdropping (bugging) only in cases involving national security. Many, however, would favor such practices in the war against crime. Electronic "snooping" can be a valuable weapon in the war on crime when used with proper safeguards. However, it poses a serious threat to the individual's right to privacy, which I consider one of our most basic freedoms. I will carefully examine any legislation dealing with this matter, and support only those which would provide rigid controls and safeguards.

FEDERAL AID TO POLICE

Surprisingly, nearly half of those who replied were not in favor of increasing Federal aid to local, county and state police departments. The growing crime rate calls for quick and drastic action. Local officials sorely need Federal funds to recruit and train capable people and properly equip them for the fight against crime. I am supporting several bills which would throw the resources of the Federal government behind this vital program.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE

An overwhelming majority favor a proposal to abolish the Electoral College through Constitutional amendment, and to substitute direct, popular election of the President and Vice-President. The Electoral College plan was drafted by the founders of our nation in a day when transportation and communication were real problems. Modern technology has solved these problems, and seemingly eliminated the principal reasons for the awkward Electoral College system.

William D. Ford,
Member of Congress.

THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, in his recent message to this Congress on aid for the aged, pointed out that one of the tests of a truly great civilization is the compassion and respect shown to its elder citizens.

Two years ago, the 89th Congress adopted the Older Americans Act of 1965, which was coauthored by two of our departed colleagues—the late Senator Patrick V. McNamara, of Michigan, and the late Congressman John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, I am proud to recall that I was among the cosponsors of this legislation in the House.

Today, I am introducing a bill to amend the Older Americans Act, to intensify this Nation's program to bring dignity and purpose to the lives of our senior citizens. This legislation was originally offered in the Senate by the Honorable Harrison A. Williams, of New Jersey, and in the House by my good friend and colleague, the Honorable Carl Perkins, of Kentucky, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

This legislation, which I am happy to introduce and support, would extend the grant provisions of the Older Americans Act through 1972, and increase the funding levels above those now authorized. The appropriations for State grants would total $10,550,000 for fiscal 1968, with $6,400,000 the same year for research, demonstration, and training grants.

The increased funding levels will permit continuation of projects already funded, and will enable the States to fund up to 300 new programs. Continuation and expansion of research, demonstration, and training projects will also be made possible.

Recent research has indicated that many older persons suffer from lack of proper nutrition, particularly those with low incomes who have inadequate money to maintain a proper diet. This in turn leads to poor health and greater dependency on relatives, friends, or private agencies.

Money allocated under the proposed amendments would be partially to conduct further research and establish pilot programs into ways of educating older persons in the need for proper nutrition, and ways of making meals available to needy senior citizens.

Other funds would develop more ways to permit older persons to take active roles in community activity, and utilize their talents.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of this Congress will lend support to this legislation.

WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL SPEAKS OUT AGAINST TAX-EXEMPT BOND EVILS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Annunzio] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the growing problems of our economy is the use and misuse of tax-exempt industrial development bonds which are issued by State or local governments.

These bonds have become a haven for the rich who can invest millions of dollars without paying a penny of taxes on the income received from these investments. This means that those with lower incomes in our Nation must pay an increased tax burden in order to make up for the money lost to the Federal Government via the tax-exempt bond route.

Commercial banks have also found that investments in tax-exempt bonds are an artful and entirely legal tax dodge. I have noted in recent years that the commercial banking system of our Nation has continued to invest more and more funds in these tax-exempt bonds and less and less money in loans to small businessmen.

The commercial banking system was not established as a closed end investment club with limited tax liability. However, the system is gravitating toward such an arrangement.

When Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee earlier this year, he expressed a great deal of concern over the use of tax-exempt bonds but stated that the Board was without authority to take action to correct this situation. If corrective legislation is sent to Congress by the administration, it must come through the Secretary of the Treasury.

I have introduced two bills in the 90th Congress, H.R. 9161 and H.R. 9162, which would correct the tax-exempt bond problem. A number of my colleagues have introduced similar bills, including the distinguished gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss and Mr. Zablocki], who were the original designers of the legislation I have introduced.

The editorial columns of the June 7 edition of the Washington Post carried a commendable editorial dealing with the problem of tax-exempt bonds. The editorial strongly urges the lifting of the tax exemption from industrial development bonds not only because of the tax exemption but because "the industrial bonds are a subsidy to private industry which Congress would never be willing to grant through annual appropriations."

Yesterday this body refused to increase the ceiling on the national debt. Therefore, I am asking those who voted against the increase of this ceiling to come out in strong support of legislation to remove the tax exemption from municipal bonds so that their vote against an increased debt ceiling can be justified. These Members have declared that they are unhappy over the amount of the public debt. Passage of my legislation would have an immediate and far-reaching effect toward reducing greatly the amount of that debt. We have chosen a course of action in this body with which I personally do not agree but nevertheless it is the majority decision of the House of Representatives. We must then decide how we will travel along that course. Removal of the tax exemption on municipal bonds should be our first undertaking.

The editorial from the Washington Post follows:

On Tax-Exempt Bonds

The bipartisan sponsorship of legislation that would lift the Federal tax exemption from the "industrial development" bonds, issued by state and local governments to finance private enterprises, raises a broader and more controversial question. Should the Federal Government be granting subsidies to states and cities by exempting their general bond issues—the so-called "municipals"—from income taxes?

It is charged that the use of industrial development bonds results in unfair competition and the migration of industry to disadvantageous locations. These objections may be substantive. But even if they are without merit, the tax exemption on industrial development bonds should be withdrawn because it is a subsidy to private industry which Congress would never be willing to grant through annual appropriations.

The larger issues of lifting the tax exemption from municipals has for long involved a question of constitutionality. Although the 16th Amendment empowers the Government to levy a tax on income "from whatever source derived," municipals were specifically exempted in the first Income Tax Act. Indeed, it is doubtful that the 16th Amendment could have been passed without prior congressional assurance that the exemption would be inviolate. But since then the precedent has been weakened, notably by the Supreme Court decisions that empowered the Federal Government to tax the income of state employees and conferred the same right on state and local governments to tax Federal employees. As a consequence, the Attorney General's office has long inclined toward the view that the Supreme Court would not strike down an effort to eliminate the tax exemption on municipals.

But the substantive case against tax exemption is economic. It is true that the exemption of municipals permits the financing of socially desirable projects—such as schools, waterworks and hospitals—at a lower interest cost to the borrowers. What is overlooked is that such exemptions entail the granting of Federal subsidies in a most inefficient manner.

David J. Ott and Allan H. Meltzer, in a brilliant analysis prepared for The Brookings Institution—*Federal Tax Treatment of States and Local Securities*, conclude that the loss of revenues by the Treasury exceeds the savings that state and local governments realize by virtue of tax exemption. Moreover, this method of granting Federal subsidies favors governments with high credit ratings and at the same time implicitly penalizes those which prefer higher taxes to larger debts. It would be far better, both from the vantage point of equity and efficiency, if equivalent benefits were conferred upon state and local governments by Federal grants.

The other objections to exemption are that it violates the principle of equity in personal taxation and leads to the misallocation of capital. Persons with equal incomes should bear equal tax liabilities. By purchasing municipals, very wealthy persons are relieved of tax liability. And because of the attractiveness of the tax shelter, capital is diverted from riskier enterprises where it would earn higher returns and in the process create much more income and employment.

Six efforts have been made to convince Congress that exemption ought to be abolished in the interests of economic efficiency and equity in taxation. All foundered because of the obvious political opposition which is still formidable. Nevertheless Congress, which is about to grapple with other issues in intergovernmental finance, should take a new look at this old problem.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE NEAR EAST

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Once again the whirlwind of crisis has struck the globe, bringing with it this time war in the Near East. While it appears that there is now some hope that this war may shortly be brought to an end, we would be remiss in our duty if we did not seek to understand and benefit from the experiences of this unfortunate episode.

The seeds of recurring conflict were sown in the soil of that area many years ago. Have not the two previous wars waged in the Near East borne out this contention? Certainly, we could not have expected that the difficulties would vanish. The specter of unrest and war hung as an ever-present sword of Damocles over the area, threatening at any given moment to fall upon the hapless humanity that quivered beneath it. Everyone must have realized this.

What are the causes of this unrest? We must have been aware of the more than 1,300,000 Palestinian refugees living in appalling squalor, unable to find remunerative employment, forced to live—in too many cases—in the dismal confines of tents and shacks. Large numbers have been unable to be resettled even if they chose to move voluntarily; many faced a life of illness, undernourishment, and illiteracy. These have been a people without hope. That might be difficult for most Americans to understand. That has always been a difficult thing for us to comprehend. Perhaps that is one of our tragic failures as a nation—allowing our own affluence to breed a blind and selfish unconcern for the needs of our fellow man.

I am saying, of course, that we have not done enough to ward off this cause of discontent. In fiscal year 1965 this country contributed $24,700,000 to some 1,300,000 Near East refugees. That amounts to a little more than $18 per person for 1 year. Could one find a better gage for disaster? Can one justifiably expect less than bitter frustration, resentment, and war?

One cannot deny that an overriding cause of the present hostilities is the intense desire of the Arab nations to dislodge Israel from the area. Reams have been written on this subject, I do not intend to dwell on this, but rather, I will submit that additional causes can be cited.

First, too little has been done to improve the terrible conditions of the refugees, and, second, we—and, I speak now of the world community—have failed to turn swords into plowshares, mainly because of the impotence of world peacekeeping forces. We now know, only too well, that the United Nations should have been strengthened to handle the impending crisis.

It is sadly ironic that many nations, including ourselves and the Soviet Union, have not balked in their deliveries of war materiel to the Near East. The military hardware appears to be generously spread around and, I might add, indiscriminately used. Has this policy of indiscriminate military aid and sales not fanned the flames of war, rather than help maintain the peace?

Conversely, in 20 years we have contributed less than a billion dollars to the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine in the Near East. In all fairness, I will admit that others are contributing a lesser amount. However, we should focus on our own commitment. What, realistically, has less than $1 billion accomplished? At best, it has maintained the tragic status quo. Certainly, it did little to ward off impending tragedy. We have been warned repeatedly that it was only a matter of time before nationalism went on a rampage in the Near East—nationalism girded with the wrath of discontent and desperation.

One of our greatest hopes for settling the present hostilities, bettering the conditions of the people, and preserving the peace, lies with the United Nations. Why have we not placed a greater faith in that world body? Where were we when the crying need for greater financial assistance to that body's administrative and operational machinery was issued? Why have we not furthered the cause of those who seek to strengthen the peacekeeping forces of the United Nations? Our policies, instead, would appear to be deliberately aimed at undermining the power and influence of U.N. collective peacekeeping activities.

In that regard, I recently introduced House Concurrent Resolution 225, a measure proposing steps the United States should take to put the United Nations peacekeeping forces on a more permanent footing. I wish to stress to those present, Mr. Speaker, that no fewer than 62 Members have introduced similar proposals, thereby attesting to the wide acceptance of the basic aims of the proposal. In my opinion, the passage of this proposal would be a meaningful and positive step toward creation of an effective instrument for preserving peace in our increasingly troubled world. I sincerely believe that awareness and acceptance of this proposition will be enhanced as we view the ravages of war once again inflicting losses on the progress of men.

I would also suggest to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, another possible cause for the present war: Vietnam. The present difficulty can be viewed as a diversionary tactic designed to involve us in yet another war. It would be to our adversaries' advantage to tie us down further. There is great resentment for our highly unpopular war in Vietnam. Ernesto "Che" Guevara is not alone in his call for "two, three, or four Vietnams" in Latin America and elsewhere.

By our flying in the face of world opinion over our involvement in the Vietnamese civil war, we may, indeed, have opened up a Pandora's box of violent societal upheavals. It may well be that our present involvement in Vietnam is but a prelude to a rash of political and social tumult.

It will be charged, of course, that I am engaging in an exercise in futility, or existing in an unreal dream world in calling for the fulfillment of the original aims of the United Nations Charter. As an answer, I say that the dismal picture of events over the last 10 years lead me to the conviction that my hope is not much worse than the nightmare the world is presently engaged in—or, the nightmare that we will face if we do not exert a greater effort to eliminate those sad conditions that allow for conflagrations such as the present one in the Near East.

But it is now rather late to ponder over what might have been done to avoid the present situation. The hard facts are, nations in the Near East are engaged in bloody battle this week. There are certain realities that cannot be overlooked. In the first place, we must help to solve this conflict, so that we may get on with the job of solving the real world problems of underdevelopment, over population, illiteracy, hunger, and disease, and strengthening the forces of international law and order.

The United Nations resolution calling for a cease-fire and a cessation of hostilities must be quickly observed by all parties. Next, Israel, having clearly established herself as a sovereign, independent, and viable state, must be guaranteed her present status in the world community. There are those who will extoll the fiction of her nonexistence. I do not adhere to that doctrine. Israel is a fact, as is presently being emphasized with force, and she fully intends to remain in existence. Our policy should be to support the preservation of the political independence and territorial integrity of all the nations of the Near East, including Israel.

I would strongly counsel that we not let ourselves be swept along with the tide of nationalism without the utmost caution, for we know the dangers it looses upon mankind. An international solution to this conflict should be our goal. Multilateral action under United Nations leadership holds out the greatest hope. As we know, that world body has passed a cease-fire resolution. Let us stand firmly and resolutely behind that resolution, and, once it is fully effectuated, let us proceed with steps to achieve a permanent solution to the problems of the area.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, I wish to stress to those present that my words are meant to carry with them a hope for our troubled world. The fervent hope that we are finally beginning to realize that our interest—indeed, our very survival—depend very much upon a common understanding that the peace and prosperity of the world demands a world community dedicated not to "saving the face" of any one nation or group of nations, but to saving the lives and bettering the conditions of that preponderant mass of world citizenry cringing beneath the specter of another world war loosed amongst them.

SIX CHURCH REPRESENTATIVES DEPLORE CONGRESSIONAL DRAFT ACTION

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished group of churchmen released a statement last week pointing out that "Congress did not adequately discharge its responsibility" in regard to fully reviewing our military manpower situation during action on the extension of the Selective Service Act.

They feel that the military draft should not "now be forgotten for another 4 years", and urge an early and thorough review both by Congress and by private groups.

I concur in the feeling that we might tend to wash our hands of legislative consideration in this matter once the extension of time has been authorized. We should certainly examine fully the entire manpower situation and explore thoroughly whether or not there are alternatives to the draft. The most feasible continuation of these efforts under present circumstances are, of course, forays into the area of attracting volunteers. Successful procedures toward this goal could bring about an end to the need for the draft and end the problems that arise therefrom.

The statement is as follows:

Six Church Representatives Deplore Congressional Draft Action

The Congress had a major responsibility this year to make a fundamental review of the military manpower situation and to reexamine the foreign policy which requires a standing army in excess of 3 million men.

We can only conclude after witnessing the way in which the legislation was handled in Committee and on the floor, especially in the House of Representatives, that Congress did not adequately discharge its responsibility.

The operation of the military draft is now literally a matter of life or death for thousands of young Americans. It has been described as discriminatory along racial, economic, and social lines. Yet almost nothing was done to make its operation more equitable. Even proposals to shorten the four year extension were turned aside, though the pace of events in the United States and around the world is so rapid that each Congress should have an opportunity to review it at least once during its two year session.

There is moral ferment among the younger generation about participation in war. A number of religious and other groups urged expansion of the conscientious objector provision to include the sincere, non-religious objector to all wars and the sincere objector to participation in particular wars. Yet Congress, instead of moving ahead, turned back the clock on conscientious objectors. The House Committee at first proposed inducting all C.O.s into the military forces before assigning them to civilian work, but decided even before bringing the bill to the floor that this could not be sustained. The Congress did, however, remove from the law a constructive provision which had been in operation since 1940 which enabled the Department of Justice to review the sometimes arbitrary decisions on C.O.s by local Selective Service Boards. The fact that under this appeal procedure local boards were reversed and C.O. claims sustained in two-thirds of the cases indicates that it was of substantial importance from the standpoint of justice and should have been continued. In a positive step, the Congress removed the requirement that a conscientious objector must believe in a "Supreme Being."

We do not believe the military draft should now be forgotten for another four years. We urge the reexamination of its operation by citizen groups looking toward Congressional reconsideration at an early date. We urge that such review recognize that the draft is used to implement a particular foreign policy and that any thoroughgoing examination of the draft must take a very critical look at U.S. military commitments around the world and the entire conduct of U.S. international relations in the nuclear-space age.

John H. Eberly,
Washington Representative, Church of the Brethren.
Robert E. Jones,
Director, Washington Office, Department of Social Responsibility, Unitarian Universalist Association.
Lewis I. Maddocks,
Director, Washington Office, Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ.
Edward F. Snyder,
Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation.
John W. Turnbull,
Associate Director, Washington Office, National Council of Churches.
Herman Will, Jr.,
Associate General Secretary, Methodist Board of Christian Social Concerns.

[Titles and organizations for identification only.]

OUR COMMITMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Anderson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the United States was not called upon to redeem our commitments to the defense or to the preservation of peace in the Middle East by using military force. No American soldiers were landed in that troubled area. Israel defended itself singlehandedly and most competently.

But let us not forget that we have very strong commitments relative to the peace arrangements and conferences that lie ahead. We must be alert to insure that Israel's rights are not dissipated. The goal must be a permanent peace instead of the patchwork arrangements of the past which proved so dismally ineffective.

Nor let us forget that the interests of the United States will be furthered by a secure Israel for three specific reasons:

First, we have a commitment to justice.

Second, Israel has alined itself with the United States in a reasonable and responsible manner.

Third, if a stable and just peace cannot be brought to that explosive area, the world will continually be faced with the prospect of even more serious confrontations which could lead to a third world war.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR FREE LABOR DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, most of our attention these days is on the Near East and the Far East, but as we all know, we must continue our efforts to maintain peace in other parts of the world, especially among our good neighbors in Latin America.

The American Institute for Free Labor Development, an organization of U.S. business and labor leaders, has now become "the largest institution for adult and worker education in the Western Hemisphere," according to its administrator, William C. Doherty, Jr.

Mr. Doherty said recently that more than 60,000 workers from 20 Latin American countries have attended AIFLD-sponsored education and training programs designed to help them build their own free and democratic trade unions. He made this statement as he was interviewed on the AFL–CIO public service program, Labor News Conference, heard on the Mutual Broadcasting System.

George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, is president of the AIFLD, and J. Peter Grace, of the well-known shipping firm, is chairman of the board.

Since all of us, I feel certain, are interested in the work being done by AIFLD in Latin America, not only in education, but also in housing, education, and health, I have asked unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the text of the Doherty interview be printed in the RECORD:

LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE

(Program 6, series 7, Tuesday, May 30, 1967)

Subject: Unions and Latin American Progress.

Guest: William C. Doherty, Jr., Administrator of the American Institute for Free Labor Development.

Panel: Virginia Pruett, Latin American columnist for the Washington Daily News and the North American Newspaper Alliance; Neil Gilbride, Washington correspondent for the Associated Press.

Moderator: Harry W. Flannery.

FLANNERY. Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL–CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL–CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is William C. Doherty, Jr., administrator of the American Institute for Free Labor Development.

The primary goal of the American Institute for Free Labor Development is to help workers—in Latin America build free and democratic trade unions as a sound basis for social and economic progress. Here to question Mr. Doherty about work of this labor-management-government organization are Virginia Pruett, Latin American columnist for the Washington Daily News and the North American Newspaper Alliance, and Neil Gilbride, Washington correspondent for the Associated Press. Your moderator, Harry W. Flannery.

And now, Miss Pruett, I believe you have the first question?

PRUETT. Mr. Doherty, in doing any kind of interview, I like to begin at the beginning. Since we need to know what this institution is, and we need to know why it was founded, will you tell us, first of all, a little bit about the situation that called for the founding of the Institute for Free Labor Development?

DOHERTY. Miss Pruett, I would be more than happy to do that. Actually, the American Institute for Free Labor Development will be celebrating its fifth anniversary next Friday—June 2.

It was founded back in 1962, I think, as a response to President Kennedy's call for a great "Alliance for Progress" in Latin America. This was labor's response as to what we could do to help in Latin America—namely, help the unions of Latin America become stronger and more viable institutions that would lead to better working conditions, and better wages, and social development for the workers of Latin America.

I think the unique aspect of the Institute is that we were able to convince both the American business community and the United States government to join with us in this venture. Today, I am happy to report, some 70 major U.S. corporations contribute annually to the non-profit corporation that we have set up for the purpose of bringing this assistance to the workers of Latin America.

And, of course, the government of the United States, through the Agency for International Development, as a participating agency in the Alliance for Progress, has been of significant help to us.

In fact, the major part of our funds now come from the Agency for International Development—to help establish educational institutions in Latin America—but, even more than that, bringing assistance in the social field.

We are building credit unions. We have rural cooperatives that we have established. We have worker banks. The American Institute for Free Labor Development is now the largest builder of worker-sponsored low-cost housing in Latin America. We have already completed housing programs in nine different countries. Our first big project was in Mexico City.

If any of the listening audience get a chance to go down there, as you leave the airport in downtown Mexico City and travel into the center of town, you pass the John F. Kennedy Housing Project, which presently houses over 20,000 people who formerly lived in the slums of Mexico. This project, named after our late President, was financed by the AFL–CIO with a $10 million loan over a 20-year period at an interest rate of 5½%, for these workers in Mexico—workers who never would have had decent housing had it not been for this type of international assistance.

To sum up, the American Institute for Free Labor Development is an organization that is cooperating with the free trade unions—that is, the non-communist, non-fascist, non-totalitarian trade unions of Latin America—to help build a better society.

FLANNERY. Mr. Doherty, why do AID and the AFL–CIO have to assist with housing in Latin America? Can't they take care of the housing themselves, as we do in this country?

DOHERTY. Well, hopefully, someday they will be able to. You have to remember that we euphemistically refer to most of the countries of Latin America as "developing societies." In order to be able to resolve the housing needs of a people, you have to have the resources—that means technical capability as well as financial capability.

Housing is based upon long-term mortgage financing. It requires the investment of literally billions of dollars. I think you know, Mr. Flannery, that even in the United States, we do not have all the easy solutions to the very complicated problems associated with housing. We, as a matter of fact, don't go into Latin America hoping to give them all the answers. But, we think that we can help them generate savings programs and help them come in with newer, and better, and more efficient ways of building, and try to get people into the type of programs that will provide low-cost housing.

The interest rates, for example, in Mexico City, when we first went down there, were in the neighborhood of 18 to 20 percent. Could you imagine how an American worker, with an average income—and after all, our incomes, as workers, are the highest in the world—would ever be in a house, if they had to pay 18 percent annual interest to amortize a mortgage payment. So, we have had to create conditions of security that will enable workers to pay a decent rate of interest in order to get their homes.

GILBRIDE. Mr. Doherty, in addition to helping other people in the United States' Alliance for Progress program, what is the self-interest of the trade union movement in this country in being active in South America? Do you get more members out of this?

DOHERTY. Absolutely none, Mr. Gilbride. I think that I here best quote the dean of the American trade union movement, and our leader, President George Meany of the AFL–CIO, who, incidentally is also the president of the American Institute for Free Labor Development. He has many times publicly announced to the workers of the United States that we do not realize one cent of income from our investments overseas. We are doing this primarily, because it is good. Primarily, because it is something the American trade union movement should be doing.

We happen to believe that the word "solidarity," and the word "fraternity," are very important words in the association of nations and the association of peoples throughout the world. We are trying to help our friends.

Secondly, President Meany has pointed out to American trade union audiences—and all over the world, as a matter of fact—on many occasions, that hunger in any part of the world could possibly lead to hunger and privation in the United States. When workers are suffering in one part of the world, it could lead to our going to their level. We would prefer to bring them up to our level, and then together, march ahead toward a better world.

GILBRIDE. What about the corporations? I understand there are some very large corporations cooperating with you in this program. What is their self-interest—again, beyond this business of helping other people?

DOHERTY. I will be very frank, Mr. Gilbride. I think that in 1959, when Fidel Castro took over Cuba and more than $1 billion worth of corporate investments in that country were confiscated, this threw the fear of Our Lord into many U.S. corporations that had investments in other parts of Latin America.

It is generally estimated that U.S. investment in Latin America is in excess of $9 billion today. And I think that in their own self-interest, the U.S. corporations realized that they would have to do something to prevent additional Fidel Castroes from going in and taking over in Latin America.

PRUETT. You say that you are helping the democratic free trade union movement. We understand there is another type of movement in Latin America. We know a great deal about the subversion that is being fanned-out from Cuba throughout Latin America. Has this missed you, or have there been some confrontations as you have attempted to develop a democratic society?

DOHERTY. Miss Pruett, we are in daily confrontation, in varying degrees, with the attempts of Fidel Castro, or Mao Tse-tung, or Mr. Brezhnev, because as you know, there are three currents of communism in Latin America, and these three currents find their way into the labor movement.

For example, in Montevideo, Uruguay, the communists are so strong and so deeply penetrated into the labor movement that at a given moment's notice, they are capable of shutting the country down with a general strike in behalf of Soviet foreign policy. And of course, we are working with the patriotic unions of Uruguay, that don't like the idea that a foreign nation can, if it chooses to do so, close their country down. We have physical confrontation, as well as confrontation on an intellectual basis, with these communist leaders throughout the continent.

Pruett. When you say physical confrontations, what do you mean? Fist fights?

Doherty. No, not fist fights. But the communists do use the threat of physical violence as a means of trying to scare democrats.

For example, we have a school in downtown Montevideo, Uruguay, where student-workers attend classes. On more than one occasion, these students have been beaten up by communist thugs, on their way to or from class. Our school itself has had bombs and "Molotov cocktails" thrown at it. This is physical and it is violent.

I think it is well known that the communists have guerrillas, who are active not only in the rural areas of Venezuela, but in downtown Caracas. They make it a habit to try to identify a store or a business enterprise as American, and then throw a bomb at it. There are now guerrillas active in Bolivia, and Guatemala and Colombia. It would seem that just recently, the Peruvians have been able to handle their problem of guerrillas. But, the communists do use violence in Latin America.

Gilbride. Mr. Doherty, this leads to another question. There have been numerous published reports, I am sure you are aware of them, that your organization and others in the labor movement have been used by the Central Intelligence Agency to channel funds to counter this sort of thing in a more-or-less clandestine, or underground, way. Is there any truth to these reports?

Doherty. As far as the American Institute for Free Labor Development is concerned, these charges are not only phoney, but I think that many of the people who have originated them have done so because they feel that to associate us with the Central Intelligence Agency will, in some way, mitigate the success of our activities.

Now, I am not accusing them of having unpatriotic political motivations, but many of the people who made these charges know very well that the American Institute for Free Labor Development is an open-book operation.

Our finances are examined annually by the General Accounting Office and by the Congress of the United States.

Every single penny that comes into the organization, and every single penny that goes out of the organization, is a matter of audited public accounting.

It is just a phony charge.

Pruett. Will you give us some idea of the scope—a few figures—countries, how many people, that sort of thing—of your work?

Doherty. In terms of our activities?

Pruett. Yes.

Doherty. Well, for example, despite the fact that our fifth anniversary is just now coming up, we have probably become the largest institution for adult and worker education in the Western Hemisphere.

We have had in excess of 60,000 students attend our programs in 20 different countries of Latin America.

We have, in each of the major countries—13 now, to be exact—in the capital city, establish what we call a "residential institute." Trade union leaders come in from the provinces of their respective countries and actually spend up to three months in residence with their fellow trade union leaders, studying the subjects of modern trade unionism—democracy, collective bargaining, the history of the labor movement, and the whole variety of subjects that are necessary to understand in order to have a decent, clean and progressive trade union movement.

Then the better graduates from these residential centers come to the United States, where we have a training center. It's in Front Royal, Virginia—some 70 miles from the city of Washington—in the Shenandoah Valley. We now have had more than 500 trade union leaders from Latin America come to the United States, spend three months with us, and then travel all around the United States seeing the American worker, and his union, and the American people, at work. They go to California, Michigan, Texas and also, of course, up to New York. They get up as far north as Niagara Falls.

When these people go back to their respective countries, we think they do a bang-up job—not of trying to establish American-type institutions—we are not asking that at all. Despite the charges of our enemies, we are not imperialistic at all. But, a bang-up job of establishing institutions that best fit their needs. We think it is important that they learn that our American trade union movement was not handed to us on a silver platter—that there was a lot of blood—and, literally, sweat and tears, that went into building the American trade union movement. We still have many issues that haven't been resolved in this country in the field of race relations, in the field of better wages, in the field of better housing. We like to think that once they understand that we are in a continuing revolution, then their social revolution will become stronger, as a result of what they have learned here.

Flannery. Mr. Doherty, two questions. What are these people taught? And, what indication do you have of the success of your efforts when these people go back to their unions?

Doherty. Mr. Flannery, starting here then, in the United States, at the Institute, which I told you we have at Front Royal, Virginia. We just graduated a class of some 23 trade unionists from 14 different island areas of the Caribbean—all the way from Aruba, Curacao, Surinam and Guyana on the South, to Jamaica, Bermuda, Nassau up in the north. These people spent some 12 weeks here in the United States. The idea of the program—and we call this the "advanced teacher training institute"—is to enable these young trade unionists to become teachers, so that when they get back to their respective countries and island areas, they will be able, in turn, to hold classes on the very subject matter that we were covering.

We have found this to be a very successful approach, because you get the multiplier effect of teaching one man, who in turn goes out and teaches many others.

During the first week that they are here, we have two very prominent professors—Ph.D's in Education from George Washington University—who teach these people the techniques of modern adult education—the psychology of teaching adults, how to use visual aids, classroom techniques and so on.

They go from that right into the subject matter, upon which they all prepare outlines to use in their teaching when they return. Subjects such as Democracy versus Totalitarianism.

And here, by the way, I would like to point out that we do not teach sterile anticommunism. We are anti-communist, but we are also anti- any form of totalitarianism, whether it be fascist, or militarist or gangster-like. We believe in legitimate, solid democratic organizations. So we study a democracy and how it works—the pitfalls of the totalitarians, and how to keep your union from falling into their hands.

They study the history of the labor movement. They study collective bargaining. They study labor legislation. They study social security and all of the benefits that should be provided to workers through social security programs. In other words, they study the whole gamut of what a trade union can do to make the community a better place to live.

Gilbride. Mr. Doherty, several related questions here. In the first place, how are these people selected from South America to come to your Institute? Are their expenses entirely paid during the course at the Institute? And, do they receive any kind of remuneration when they return to their own country?

Doherty. That is a very, very interesting question, Mr. Gilbride, because it goes to the very heart of our work.

These people are selected by their own unions. Unless the people who come to the United States—and, as a matter of fact, in the training program locally—unless these people have the support of their own labor union, we will not accept them into our programs.

We feel that it would be very presumptuous for us, as Americans, to go down into Latin America and try to tell these people who should receive this type of training. They must be endorsed by their own people.

Following that, they receive their training from us. Then the students who do better—the students who show a real desire to go out and work in this field—are then given what we call a nine-month "internship," whereby we provide to them, through their union, the equivalent of the wages that they would have made if they go back to the work place. For the textile worker, the textile worker's wage, for instance. For a miner or cab driver, then, whatever their wage might be. In other words, the same wage they would have earned had they continued.

Gilbride. Let me follow up with just one more question. Do you exercise any kind of a "blackball," in the sense that there are some unions down there that you don't want any people from? Do you have any control at all over that?

Doherty. We are not naive. We are a democratic institution, and we are trying to build democratic institutions in Latin America. I would not take a known communist, a known fascist or a known militarist, in my program. I am not saying that we haven't had them, because we are not perfect. But we don't want people who follow a totalitarian line in our organization.

Gilbride. Have you had any occasion, when you have had to say "no" to a given student?

Doherty. None that I can recall offhand, simply because we have confidence in the organization's ability to select the proper people.

Flannery. Mr. Doherty, a large part of Latin America—most of it—is agricultural. What are you doing with the rural workers—the campesinos?

Doherty. This, of course, is one of the major problems confronting Latin America today, in terms of its development. And, it is a very complicated problem, I might add.

Not only is a large portion of Latin America agricultural, but, despite this fact, it is not producing the amount of food that it needs to continue to exist at a decent level of nutrition. So, something has to be done, not only to help improve the conditions of these impoverished masses, but we have to help make them more productive in the agricultural field, if we are to help these nations really develop.

I will give you an example. One of the richest valleys in all of Latin America is the central valley of Chile. Chile is now approaching eight million population. Chile, in the last two years, has had a tremendous boom in terms of rising copper prices and increased foreign earnings. As a matter of fact, their payments deficit has improved tremendously. But Chile must import food—despite this tremendously rich agricultural sector. So we have got to find ways and means of convincing our Latin friends that a nation, to be truly strong and truly able to provide for its people, has to put as much emphasis on agriculture as it does on industry.

To be more specific, Mr. Flannery—and I know time is running short—we are down there helping these workers organize themselves into unions, so that they can form producer-cooperatives and consumer-cooperatives. We are providing them with technical assistance—better seed, better fertilizer. We show them how to make use of modern irrigation and farming methods, with the hope that increased production will lead to increased earnings and a better way of life for these agricultural people.

PRUETT. How do you measure the results of the leadership program? Do you have situations where unions have changed to a democratic leadership from some other?

DOHERTY. Measuring the results of an education program are always, at best, difficult. How does Harvard University measure its results? It looks at where its graduates are. We look at where our graduates are, and we find that some 85 percent of the people who have graduated from our institutes are not only still in the labor movement, but they are now in positions of greater leadership and greater influence. We think that this is about the best way we can measure our results. And, we are happy with them thus far.

GILBRIDE. You have been in business now, five years, Mr. Doherty. Do you see this program as going on indefinitely, or is your job just about complete?

DOHERTY. Well, we like to say that we are trying to work ourselves out of a job. Actually, when we can convince, for example, the trade union movement of Brazil to join with us in helping the trade union movement in Bolivia, and the Brazilians no longer need our assistance or even want our assistance, then we will have been successful, in terms of our work in Brazil. We are trying to work ourselves out of a job.

FLANNERY. The Latin American Common Market could be an advantage to your operations, could it not?

DOHERTY. We are taking a very active role in the Common Market. We do not look upon the Common Market as being a panacea for all of the social and economic ills of Latin America. But we do feel that the Common Market—although it is going to be a long haul—15 years as it is presently programmed—will bring some of the benefits of an expanding economy—greater purchasing power—and improve the lot of the working man—much as it has done in Europe, and is already starting to do in Central America.

We want to make sure, though, that the labor movement has a voice in the Common Market. And that it not become only another way of making more money for the rich while the poor get poorer.

PRUETT. One question. Did the American trade union movement have help on this order when it was getting started? Did the British help us in any way?

DOHERTY. Not in a material sense, because the trade union movements in Great Britain and in the United States developed in a parallel fashion, at roughly the same time in history.

The whole concept of international trade union solidarity, therefore, had not really developed to a point where the nations of one country could substantially help the workers of another country.

FLANNERY. Thank you, Miss Pruett, and thank you, Mr. Gilbride and Mr. Doherty. Today's Labor News Conference guest was William C. Doherty, Jr., administrator of the American Institute for Free Labor Development. Representing the press were Neil Gilbride, Washington correspondent for the Associated Press, and Virginia Pruett, Latin American columnist for the Washington Daily News and the North American Newspaper Alliance. This is your moderator, Harry W. Flannery, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL-CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Radio Network.

AIR DISASTERS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, some time ago it was my sad duty to advise this body that air disasters would be the inevitable result of Mr. Halaby's high-handed and arrogant efforts in stripping the San Antonio vital military and civil aviation complex of its air traffic control center. Since that time, I have received many reports of near-collisions and equipment irregularities arising from the operation of the Houston ARTC Center. Many of these near-disasters are directly related to the technical difficulties in remoting radar information into the Houston center. These remoting problems were known prior to the establishment of the Houston center, but were ignored in the face of Mr. Halaby's obstinate determination to deprive the San Antonio area of the air safety standards commensurate with the heavy concentration of air defense activity.

Now, in addition to the near-collisions and other safety irregularities occurring as a result of the relocation of the traffic control center from San Antonio to Houston, a disaster has occurred just as I predicted it would occur. On January 31, 1967, a DC-6 aircraft crashed and was destroyed, taking the lives of the crew as the aircraft was approaching the San Antonio International Airport. It appears that this accident may be directly attributable to a breakdown in communication within the FAA and the failure to provide the pilot of the aircraft with accurate weather information upon which he could base his decision. The weather information which was forwarded to the pilot from the Houston center was outdated and inaccurate. This condition could not have existed had the traffic control center been located in San Antonio.

As you may know, the relationship of a traffic control center to the individual airports under its jurisdiction is a vital and intimate one. It is particularly so in the San Antonio area, and the excellent safety record enjoyed by San Antonio prior to the closure of the San Antonio ARTC Center is eloquent testimony to the wisdom of the Federal Aviation Agency, which in 1959 selected San Antonio as the site for the establishment of the prototype of the new and modern Air Route Traffic Control Center.

San Antonio's air safety record at that time was unblemished and bear in mind that the San Antonio Center had not only the responsibility for International Airport, but had responsibility for a complex of military airports in the area.

Bear in mind the detailed justification prepared by the FAA and transmitted to this Congress to support the establishment of a new prototype center in San Antonio in 1959 and bear in mind that when the FAA appeared before the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in the spring of 1961, there was no reference to the closing of the San Antonio Center. There were no funds requested for the establishment of a new Center in Houston. There were funds requested for the equipment and staffing of the new ARTC Center in New Orleans to be used in a $3 million edifice just completed at that time, and consider most carefully this fact: within 1 week following the budget hearings, Mr. Halaby, the FAA Administrator, made an oral offer to the Chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee to transfer the San Antonio ARTC Center to Houston at a basic cost of 8 million dollars. This $8 million was not in the proposed budget. Mr. Halaby blandly pointed out that the FAA would merely reprogram some of the funds which were not yet appropriated but which had been laboriously justified a short week before. Mr. Halaby also advised the Chairman that he would similarly abandon the $5 million New Orleans ARTC Center, which had just been constructed and which was at that time being equipped and staffed. This facility was also to be transferred to Houston. The cost associated with this move was similarly to be obtained by reprograming the funds which Congress had not yet appropriated.

There is an interesting parallel today in the situation involving NASA and its budget. It now appears that we of Congress have been duped by NASA over these many long years during which we tended to believe everything they told us. We have listened to and believed those pleas concerning "austerity budgets." We suddenly see, however, that NASA is able to absorb $75 million to cover the Apollo loss. Did we appropriate $75 million too much last year?

The actions of Mr. Halaby in arbitrarily closing the San Antonio Center in 1961 without bothering to justify to Congress or to anyone is remarkably similar to the actions of NASA, and, I am afraid, many other Government agencies who feel that it is not necessary to be honest with the Congress, or the public, in the use of public funds.

I assure you, gentlemen, this is only one example of the gross mismanagement foisted upon the FAA by Mr. Halaby, and some of the momentum carries on today.

Yes, the air safety record of San Antonio has been blemished and there will be further disasters in that area. The accident at San Antonio on February 3, 1967, need not have happened. It would not have happened if Mr. Halaby had not tampered with air safety in the area, but it will happen again unless the errors associated with the closing of the San Antonio ARTC Center are corrected.

PUBLIC TELEVISION: A NATIONAL RESOURCE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lester Markel, associate editor of the New York Times, published an excellent article on June 5, 1967, in which he outlined many benefits that could accrue from the establishment of public TV.

There seems to be a fear that establishment of public television would become a propaganda outlet for the Federal Government. I think that this article effectively helps to abate that fear.

For the benefit of our colleagues and other readers of the Record who may not have seen this article, I insert it at this point in the Record:

Public Television: A "National Resource"

(By Lester Markel)

The bill for Public (educational or noncommercial) Television has been passed by the Senate with dispatch and emphatic endorsement. In the House the going is likely to be much rougher. Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of the parties that are deeply concerned—the educational broadcasters, the devoted listeners, the public at large. For this is, as Senator Percy put it, "milestone legislation" representing "a strong national commitment to the development of a vital national resource."

The case for Public Television is simply stated. Television can be a potent force in achieving a better-informed public opinion and in advancing the cultural state of the nation. Commercial television has not done the job and it is not likely to do so, for the very reason that it is commercial.

GAPS IN COMMERCIAL TV

The news broadcasts comprise, for the most part, a headline service; often they supply drama, but they lack depth. The cultural contributions are sporadic, even though at times they are of high order. But the most telling count in the indictment is that of timing; the evening, the important hours, for the most part, add up to a desert area with few oases.

In all three areas—information, culture and program time—Public Television can fill the gaps.

In the information area, Public Television can perform the urgent assignment of presenting the news in an understandable way, providing news in perspective, news in the broadest sense, including significant trends as well as the spot events. In addition, it can present well-ordered and well-moderated debates on the pressing issues of the day.

OPENING NEW VISTAS

In the cultural area, Public Television can open new vistas; it can provide programs on a consistent basis, supplying more theater, more music, more art, more discussion on books—more philosophy if you will. None of these proposals rules out entertainment; the suggestion is only that entertainment be provided on a higher level.

The effort should be local as well as national. It is, of course, highly desirable to present great drama, grand opera, grander art; but it is also highly useful to tap the resources of communities and universities, to explain the newest show at the art center, and to cooperate with the local libraries in indicating the joys of reading.

Above all, Public Television can provide prime stuff in prime time—programs that have high quality without being "highbrow"—good entertainment as well as good talk; footnotes as well as headlines.

But these arguments will not prevail unless two handicaps are overcome: public apathy and Congressional doubt.

The approach to the public has been vague and confused. There has been no convincing demonstration that Public Television can do a genuine job both of enlightenment and of entertainment. Most of the talk has been of techniques rather than content. Admittedly, conduits are essential, but the nature of the flow through the conduits is of prime importance. Thoreau's warning of the past still applies: "We are in great haste to construct a magnetic telegraph from Maine to Texas. But Maine and Texas may have nothing to communicate."

FACING UP TO DOUBTS

The Congress must be educated to the importance of Public Television and to the vital need of assuring its independence. At the moment Congress pays lip service to the concept, but it has a basic fear that a Government-supported medium of communication will be used for propaganda purposes. This is a deep fear, but it is unfounded; B.B.C. is a prime example of how the task can be independently performed. Such doubts cannot be ducked (it has been proposed, for example, that public funds shall not be used for news); they must be squarely faced.

Public Television in the true sense requires an annual expenditure of more than a quarter-billion dollars. Private funds are surely desirable, but the greater part of the moneys will have to come from the Federal Government. This is a small price to pay for so large an achievement.

THE BIG STEP UP

There is a potent argument for appropriating public funds for these purposes. The Federal Government has long recognized the need for education in the schools and colleges; the principle applies equally to adult education, which Public Television virtually is. A Public Broadcasting Act can be compared with the Land Grant Act of 1862; both can be considered momentous steps toward mass higher education.

There is, in sum, much good will toward the idea of Public Television; there is the conviction that something should be done; there are many brave and vague pronouncements. But more than good will, acquiescence and kind words are needed. There must be agreement on objectives, harmony of action and cold cash.

For through Public Television we shall be able to achieve, possibly not an enlightened majority, but surely a much larger enlightened minority—and thus will the state of the Union be notably advanced.

SUPPORT OF FOOD STAMP PROGRAM WITHOUT COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Howard] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that enactment of H.R. 1318, containing the amendments by the House Committee on Agriculture, would have the effect of terminating the food stamp program in most States.

I urge passage of the bill as originally introduced by the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan] and I support continuation of the program and elimination of the committee amendments.

The Governor of the State of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes, has written the members of the New Jersey delegation expressing opposition to the 20-percent State matching provision and I include the Governor's letter in the Record at this point:

Dear Jim: I have recently been advised that an amendment placed on House Bill 1318, now pending before Congress, would require each State to pay twenty percent of the cost of the bonus food stamps distributed in such state under the Food Stamp Program. Under present Federal law, 100% of the costs of the bonus food stamps is paid by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In New Jersey, this program has been broadly accepted and supported by business, labor, public and voluntary health and social agencies. It is significant that as of June 1, 1966, New Jersey had initiated its first Food Stamp Program in Mercer County. As of June 1, 1967, the program will be operating in 8 counties, namely, Mercer, Salem, Camden, Bergen, Atlantic, Ocean, Passaic and Union. Monthly over 30,000 low income persons in New Jersey are already receiving benefits from the Food Stamp Program. Warren, Cape May, Middlesex and Hudson counties have indicated that they are ready to begin the program as soon as so designated by the President.

It is our firm opinion that the State and the respective County Governments are already expending their maximum amounts to operate the Food Stamp Program. If the above amendment placed on House Bill 1318 is enacted into law, it would cost New Jersey over $1,000,000 annually to operate the program in the next fiscal year. In that event, we would surely not be able to expand the program; we would probably find it necessary to curtail the present program; and, we might be forced to discontinue the program entirely in New Jersey.

On behalf of the citizens of New Jersey, we are requesting that you do your utmost to defeat that provision in House Bill 1318 which would require States to pay 20% of the cost of all bonus coupons distributed in such state under the Food Stamp Program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Sincerely yours,

Richard J. Hughes,
Governor.

ON COMMITMENT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, much has been said on the floor of this chamber about the commitment of the gallant men and women of the Teacher Corps. Today I want to talk about our American commitment to them, to the men and women who have helped them, and to the children they have helped.

One year ago, almost a thousand college graduates—the three-quarters of the Teacher Corps who are teacher-trainees—signed up for 2 years on what Assistant Dean Leon Osview of Temple University recently told us is a "special" and a "tough job."

Said Dean Osview:

> We say to [the members of the Teacher Corps], We know it is a tough job, a rough job, and we know there are lots of easier ways to get an M.A. . . . So, in return for that, there is a little stipend, you will starve a little, but you will work 67 hours a week rather than 37 hours, but you will get enough to get by on.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of this great body: Is this a fair statement today? Will Teacher Corps men and women get enough to get by on? Will this body finally come to grips with the issue of the Teacher Corps? Will we come to grips in time to show America's thanks and our commitment to these thousand men and women who committed years of their lives to helping America help its children of poverty? Or will we instead continue to becloud the Teacher Corps, wrangle over the petty details of pay scales, or the semantics of local control, until time runs out for the Teacher Corps—and we have rejected, indeed sold out on, the commitment of a thousand Americans who care deeply about reaching out from the schools to the minds of the poor?

Already the men and women of the Teacher Corps have learned to mistrust us. Once we authorized and did not appropriate. Three times we delayed funding beyond the possible time limits of reasonable expectation. Once we have enjoined these men and women from doing exactly what they were hired by local schools to do: to enter local classrooms. Now we have appropriated funds to continue their program through the summer, but we have put these funds in escrow so that corpsmen and their universities, schools, and their poverty communities cannot count on a Teacher Corps beyond the end of the month.

Ladies and gentlemen, the good and patient men and women of the Teacher Corps are losing patience. Already serious attrition has begun. In the past few weeks, we have lost 100 teacher-interns of the Teacher Corps. By June 30, if the Corps is not authorized, we can expect to lose far more.

The loss of every one of these men and women is a loss to this Nation of what Mayor Lindsay of New York 6 months ago called a much-needed infusion of genuine commitment and imaginative talent to the schools.

But it is not only a loss of human resources and a loss of honor. It is also a loss of hard dollars and cents. Each man and woman who leaves the Corps because he can no longer see beyond June 30 through the congressional smokescreen is costing this Nation $7,500. These beginning teachers are not yet eligible for teacher certification. They are in the midst of their training. More than likely—although 81 percent of them have told us they wish to remain in poverty school teaching—they will be forced to leave the field for want of the university training demanded by our schools.

And what of the training centers? What of the 50 universities across this Nation which have long since needed to plan for the second year, long since needed to commit staff for a second year, long since needed to know whether to count on Teacher Corps training funds for next year—or to make up their minds to try to go it alone with what most of them believe is a better way to train teachers. Some of them—like Antioch, Temple, Trinity, Catholic University, Texas A. & I. Hampton, and USC—have already said they will defer payment. In other words, they have agreed to pick up the tab for the Congress. But they have told us they cannot do it for long.

Why are a few of the universities still willing to gamble on the Teacher Corps? NEA's own teacher education and professional standards director, Don Davies, said something recently which may explain their commitment:

> I see as the Teacher Corps role the need for reformation of teacher education . . . If we don't change things in the next ten years, we will have failed . . . What Teacher Corps can do, is tune in to what young people are saying and thinking. Here is our first potential for reformation of teacher education.

Another, according to Mr. Davies, is the university or school collaboration which is the heart of the Teacher Corps. "Not until both assume a responsibility in teacher education," Davies pointed out, "will teacher education make sense."

But I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that the very schools which have joined together with the universities of this Nation to work out their Corps programs for the summer and fall are now unable—at this late date in time—to finalize their budgets and their plans.

In short, Mr. Chairman, close to a thousand men and women who care have planned on a Teacher Corps. Thousands more who care have planned and hoped to join it. Many hundreds of schools and school systems which believe in it have planned and hoped on a Teacher Corps. And half-a-hundred universities who see the Teacher Corps as the only way we have now to move from the ivory tower into the schoolroom have planned and hoped on a Teacher Corps.

If authorization for the Teacher Corps runs out on June 30, these thousands of Americans who pioneered the Teacher Corps will go back to business as usual—with the poignantly personal conviction that a practical and gutsy effort to reach and teach our children of poverty is not wanted at this time.

The quarter of a million schoolchildren in city slums and rural depressed areas who this year were touched by Teacher Corps men and women will miss them in the fall. But the remainder of America's 8 million children of poverty will not. For them, next year will bring school as usual with the same old strangeness and boredom and distance from their lives.

THE NEED FOR DAY-CARE CENTERS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, today I am cosponsoring a bill introduced by my distinguished and esteemed colleague, Mrs. Patsy Mink, which provides for Federal assistance through grants to the States to augment the educational and cultural services in public and private nonprofit child day-care centers. This bill is designed to follow up on child education programs established by the historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965. Early childhood education has been recognized to be of great importance by both of these acts.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in light of the large and growing number of working mothers and the need to improve the education of children in day-care centers, Congress should provide funds to supplement the care that children receive in these centers. Such assistance would remove the concern of working mothers who may fear that they are jeopardizing their children's education by working.

The bill will be especially important for families with incomes above the $3,000 poverty line whose children do not qualify for the Headstart program. Of course, lines must be drawn somewhere, but with working mothers there may be a disincentive to work if it will put the family income above $3,000 so that their children will be unable to benefit from the Headstart program. The supplements which this bill provides will remove whatever disincentive effect there may be by improving the educational services of the day-care centers.

Mr. Speaker, considering the growing number of working mothers and their children's need for improved education, I hope that Congress will consider and pass this significant bill during the present session.

IMPORT AND EXPORT AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Ullman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce legislation which will provide the Congress and the American business community with a concise, up-to-date accounting of the import and export of agricultural commodities.

My learned colleague, Mr. Sparkman, is presenting a similar bill today in the U.S. Senate in conjunction with the "Report of the Senate Small Business Committee on Livestock Exports." I recommend to the Members of the House this excellent document on the potentials and problems of livestock exports.

The tremendous strides of the past decade in the technology of packaging and handling of perishables, and the ever expanding productivity of the American farmer, promise increasing development of worldwide markets for our agricultural goods. Although the details are not yet available, the Kennedy Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade recently concluded in Geneva, had as one of its goals the lowering of agricultural trade barriers. The demand for American farm products is great. In just the area of livestock exports, officials of the six-nation European Economic Community predict that their demand for imported beef may be as high as 1 million metric tons per year by 1970.

One of the difficulties encountered by the Senate committee in preparing their report was the availability of periodic, current, and easily understood data on the export and import of meats and other farm products. Pertinent data on the U.S. role in the international trade of agricultural commodities is difficult to find, and when available, this data is dispersed throughout a myriad of sources.

The legislation I am presenting today is designed to correct this deficiency.

Our bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare a single, comprehensive reference work on the import and export of agricultural commodities. The publications will be made available February 1 of each year for perusal by the Congress and other interested parties.

Among other features, the act requires that the Secretary of Agriculture prepare reports on the quantity and dollar value of agricultural imports and exports; the transportation, insurance, and other handling charges incident to their shipment; and the methods of financing the sales and purchase of these products. The balance-of-payments effect of agricultural trade will be presented in the document.

Additional data will enable the reader to compare current imports and exports with volumes in other years. The Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office will supervise the statistical analysis in reference to accepted accounting procedures and international trade reporting practices.

Senator Sparkman and I submit that this legislation will collect in a convenient, packaged and usable form, information which will be of great value to the Congress and the public in the preparation of tariff policies consonant with the expanding international trade of agricultural products.

CONGRESSMAN HANLEY AWARDED HONORARY DEGREE FROM LE MOYNE COLLEGE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday afternoon, one of our colleagues and my close personal friend, Jim Hanley, was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by Le Moyne College, in Syracuse, N.Y.

Having known and worked with Jim during the past 3 years, I was particularly gratified to see his efforts on behalf of New York's 34th Congressional District formally recognized.

It was a fitting tribute to his diligence and determination as a Member of Congress.

The text of the citation follows:

Citation for Honorary Degree

That statesman serves his country best who is a man of the people. Congressman James M. Hanley is such a man. Chosen by his fellow citizens in 1964 and again in 1966 to represent their interests, he has continued to demonstrate concern for the individual and sympathy and understanding for his constituents' needs.

Rising from humble station, James M. Hanley showed early interest in the affairs of his community. As he has moved to higher elective office that interest has not waned. His dedication to fairness in business and politics is the result of an unquestioned sincerity shaped on the forge of self-achievement. That he speaks from the perspective of experience and deep spiritual values is attested by the recognition he has received.

James M. Hanley has made his presence, his thinking, and his hopes known and respected in the swirling complexity of our Federal Government. His words find adherence by the men whose decisions direct a nation, who recognize in them the clear language of common sense.

In honoring the Representative of the 34th District in Congress, Le Moyne College cites the notable career of an able legislator to the continued benefit of the people. It recognizes the trust placed in him by his Congressional colleagues as witnessed by appointments normally reserved for those with long tenure. It recognizes a truly Christian concern for his fellowman, reflected as elsewhere in an abiding interest in the education of youth. It is grateful for his support of the work of this College as a worthy member of the community he represents.

Wherefore by these presents, we the Trustees of Le Moyne College, authorized to that purpose by the authority of the State of New York, bear witness that James M. Hanley has been advanced by us to the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws and endowed with all the rights and privileges pertaining thereunto.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I take pleasure in introducing a companion bill to H.R. 10390 and 10391. This bill amends certain provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 to conform with recent court decisions.

The Internal Security Act of 1950 has kept Communist activities in this country at a minimum by exposing those individuals and organizations seeking to do away with our democratic form of government and substituting in its place a Communist dictatorship. However, in October of 1966 the Supreme Court of the United States held certain provisions of this act to be unconstitutional and the circuit court of appeals in March of 1967 held other portions of the act to be unconstitutional. The Attorney General chose not to appeal the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals in Communist Party of the United States against United States. Therefore, we must assume that that judgment of the circuit court is binding.

Since the Internal Security Act has been weakened by these court decisions, activities of the Communist Party in America have increased. Unless we implement the Internal Security Act by new legislation we will see many months and years of increased Communist activity in the United States at all levels, and particularly among the youth of our country.

As a Member of Congress I feel that the Communist Party of the United States and its members should be exposed to the American people, and this bill does just that. Your children and mine, when they go away to college, will have an opportunity to know the kind of people who are behind these groups on campuses and what type of organization it is. They will not then foolishly and without warning join an organization controlled by the Communist Party. We owe it to your youth to inform them of those people who would overthrow our government.

Due to recent international events it is obvious that the Communist international conspiracy is full steam ahead in the Middle East, South America, and Southeast Asia, and with no law to control it, it will soon be going full steam ahead in the United States. Since we Americans believe in freedom of speech, freedom to assemble, and freedom not to incriminate ourselves, I believe the way to control Communists in a democracy is by exposure after hearings by the Subversive Activities Control Board with the right of appeal to the Federal courts. I do not believe that we can ask our young men to die in Vietnam fighting Communists and Communist organizations such as the Vietcong and allow their counterparts in America to create riots and havoc on our university campuses and the streets of our cities without exposure.

I believe this bill is so important that all of us in Congress should ask our appropriate committees to conduct hearings on these bills as soon as possible and report to the floor for passage so that there will be time for them to be reported to the Senate, passed, and signed by the President this year. As a Congressman I believe that we would all be derelict in our duties unless we implement the Internal Security Act now. Another year could be too late.

RESOLUTION ON MIDDLE EAST BY THE MADISON CLUB

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of a resolution on the crisis in the Middle East which was unanimously adopted at a meeting attended by hundreds of constituents in the 12th District of New York. This resolution, which was adopted on June 5 by the members of the Madison Club, Inc., of the County of Kings, city and State of New York, and residents of the 41st Assembly District of the State of New York, was forwarded to me by Assemblyman Stanley Steingut.

I wish to inform my good friend Stanley Steingut and all those who attended the meeting that I support their resolution. I include the text of the resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION BY THE MADISON CLUB, INC

Be it resolved: That we, the members of the Madison Club, Inc., of the County of Kings, City and State of New York, and the residents represented at a meeting of the 41st Assembly District, of the State of New York, do hereby urge the Government of the United States, through its President and Members of Congress, and any and all other duly authorized representatives of our Government to take all necessary steps to effectuate a firm and unequivocal position in the enforcement of the commitments of the United States as heretofore stated by our President, guaranteeing the territorial sovereignty and integrity of all nations in the Mid-East, as well as our Country's re-affirmation of all the principles that the Gulf of Aqaba is an international waterway which must be re-opened to ships of all nations including Israel.

OPEN SPACES LAND PROGRAM

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate that very little of the countryside is left in any American city. Most urban areas have failed to plan adequately for future recreation needs. Enclaves of open space, green gardens, and public playgrounds are the exception rather than the rule.

The recreation demands of this century are creating an outdoor recreation crisis which is particularly acute in our growing urban areas. A large part of our existing recreation facilities are located in rural areas, out of reach of many of our urban dwellers. Our outdoor recreation problem in the urban-suburban areas is complicated by the increasing difficulty of obtaining land for parks. Our available land is rapidly disappearing.

There is only one Federal program—open spaces—which is designed particularly to help meet the recreation needs of areas with higher densities of population. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has made some very worthwhile grants under the open space land program to aid in the acquisition of predominantly undeveloped land in both Alameda and Santa Clara Counties in the Ninth District of California.

However, the existing programs do not go far enough in meeting the needs of our population in the 1970's and beyond. We must do more for our urban-suburban dwellers who may not be able to get away to visit a national park or a national seashore. We need to be moving ahead with a comprehensive program to help local communities do a better job of acquiring and equipping recreation areas in urban areas.

In order to achieve these crucial results, I am today introducing legislation which would increase and broaden the open spaces land program to more effectively preserve and develop open land for park and recreation purposes.

BILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in five of our Southwestern States—Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas—there are over 3.5 million Spanish surname people who in the 1960 census represented 12 percent of the total population of that area. There are 26 counties in four Southwestern States in which 50 percent or more of the population is Spanish surname. In addition to the various economic factors operating in the lives of the Spanish surname people, social and cultural discrimination has been a deterrent to their rightful achievement in our society.

If the language barrier did not prevent these proud citizens from higher economic and educational achievement, our country would benefit from their rich and full Spanish heritage. It has been estimated that there are more than two million American schoolchildren who do not speak English as a native language. Little headway, unfortunately, has been made in finding adequate and constructive solutions to this unique and perplexing educational situation.

I am, therefore, introducing today a measure to establish a Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act to provide the assistance necessary to allow the children and their parents to whom English is a second language the opportunity to participate more fully in the life of this Nation. This bill would provide for $5 million is 1968, $10 million in 1969, and $15 million in 1970 and the succeeding fiscal year to allow the Commissioner of Education to make grants to local educational agencies to improve the quality and quantity of bilingual educational instruction in America. The measure would also provide funds for special bilingual and bicultural educational research and demonstration projects including intensive preschool, Headstart-type programs specifically designed to orient and prepare non-English-speaking children for smoother transition to and more rapid advancement in the elementary education environment. In addition, this bill would provide for the establishment by the Commissioner of Education in the Office of Education of an Advisory Committee on Increasing Educational Opportunity for Bilingual Children who would advise the Commissioner on the applications for grants and in the preparation for general regulations in the development of criteria for approval of applications.

THE CEASE-FIRE AND ITS HOPE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, word that the United Arab Republic has agreed to a cease-fire this afternoon must be met with the prayerful hope that this may be the long-awaited first step to a lasting reconciliation of differences which led to the current Middle Eastern crisis.

That day of settlement may yet be a long time in coming but at least the world has been led back from the near brink of a major, perhaps ultimate, conflict which must at all costs be avoided.

In the effort to restore peace to the Middle East, the world has noted and is gratified by the dispatch with which the United Nations seized the initiative to bring about a halt to the conflict. The tireless efforts of that body and its members over recent days have demonstrated that positive gains can be made if the will and desire for accomplishment are present.

United Nation's achievement of a cease-fire in the Middle East contrasts sharply with the inability of the U.N. to grasp any initiative in the effort to restore peace to Southeast Asia.

The air that pervades the United Nations on Vietnam seemingly is that the decision for peace or continued war rests on the United States alone. Admittedly, we could give up and come home but that would not solve the question of the political and territorial integrity of South Vietnam.

United Nation's discussion on Vietnam also seems bogged down on just which side is the aggressor. This question, though not answered in the Middle East, did not prevent action in the United Nations. And by this action, the U.N. has demonstrated that it is still a body with a capability which can be employed and employed effectively. A forcefulness of spirit, international cooperation, albeit spurred by the fear of major power confrontation, has moved the United Nations to action in the Middle East.

Why then, in view of this positive approach to the settlement of an international dispute, cannot this spirit in the U.N. be directed to and instilled in an effort to bring a halt to the fighting in Vietnam.

It seems to me a momentum has been created in the Middle East which should be carried forward into Southeast Asia, an area where world peace remains ominously threatened. All nations today are much more keenly aware of the need to find other than armed solutions to international differences.

It is my hope that the United Nations will seize upon this opportunity created by the Middle East dispute to seek new initiatives to bring about a cease-fire in Vietnam in order to bring the disputants to the negotiating table.

The United Nations efforts have been feeble in the past.

There are many obstacles in a Vietnam settlement not present in the Arab-Israel dispute.

The difficulties are greater.

Chances for success are slimmer.

Yet the effort must be made. It must be made to insure the peace of the world and its very preservation.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the signers of the Middle East policy statement drawn up by my eminent colleague from New York, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, I feel strongly that Israel's freedom and security must not again be placed in jeopardy. There should not remain a question or a doubt on the part of the Arab League as to the existence and validity of Israel's statehood.

There should also be no question that Israel ships have a right to free access of passage through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba. The evidence is clear that in the past Israel has had no desire to employ its vessels of commerce as a belligerent force, and it is only right that she be entitled to the same respect from her neighbors.

The United States has a strong commitment to the State of Israel that peace be secured and maintained in the Middle East. We must seek for the future a completely new era of mutual respect and trust, the beginning of which can only be guaranteed by the free world and the United Nations. I would suggest that the United Nations begin now with all diligence to work out a settlement that would assure a just and enduring peace in the Middle East. It is a situation that will no longer tolerate being swept under a rug of indecision or indifference.

Finally, we should make it clear to all concerned that the United States will stand by its affirmation assuring Israel her freedom, integrity, and independence.

MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BRASCO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I rise under the umbrella of cautious optimism to salute the brave and most efficient Israel Army which is fighting in behalf of freedom and democracy in the Middle East. I also wish to pay tribute to the diplomatic skill of President Johnson who was able to get the cooperation of all powers in bringing about the unanimous passage by the Security Council of the cease-fire resolution.

However, we must recognize that this is only the first step. The persistent terroristic border raids on Israel, the Gulf of Aqaba, are but surface specifics of the historic Israel-Arab controversy. Unfortunately, despite Israel's willingness, there has been too little effort devoted to attempt to find peaceful solutions to the fundamental problems that have constantly threatened peace in the Middle East.

Once a cease-fire is in effect, every step must be taken to insure that there is no repetition of events that daily threatened Israel's existence. There must be assurances that Israel's right to live and trade will never again be brought into question. I believe this can only be done by insisting that—

First. The cease-fire does not mean a truce that may be broken from day to day as it has been in the past. Rather, there must be direct negotiations between Arab nations and Israel. Only by such direct negotiations will the Arab world rid itself of the delusion that Israel does not exist.

Second. Israel, who has fought violently and victoriously, must be permitted to define defensible borders, including the unification of Jerusalem.

Third. Israel must be unequivocally guaranteed access to the Gulf of Aqaba. This can only be done if Sharm el-Sheikh is controlled by a U.N. peacekeeping force.

Fourth. The Suez Canal, which is not only an Israeli problem but a world problem, must not be allowed to be closed at the whim of one irresponsible nation. To this end, the canal should be internationalized by turning over its control and operation to the U.N., and the revenues derived therefrom, over and above the cost of operation, can be used to defray expenses of U.N. operations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that only when these conditions are met can there be a meaningful and lasting peace in the Middle East.

THE GROWING SUCCESS OF THE JOB CORPS PROGRAM

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, when the Camp Kilmer Job Corps was established at Edison, N.J., about 2 years ago, many community and industrial leaders adopted a let's-wait-and-see attitude toward the untried but promising program. Kilmer has weathered many storms in its first years and is now accepted and admired by the residents of Middlesex County as a pioneer project in the war on poverty.

The letter below, from Edward J. Gerrity, Jr., senior vice president of International Telephone & Telegraph, to Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, indicates how the growing success of the Job Corps program has been transmitted to responsible members of the business community. I am sure my colleagues will be interested in sharing Mr. Gerrity's thoughts.

The letter follows:

INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE &
TELEGRAPH CORP.,
New York, N.Y., April 28, 1967.

Mr. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: While Mr. Geneen is in Europe, I thought I would take this opportunity to answer your April 21st telegram to him regarding our continued interest in the Job Corps.

As you know, the lead paragraphs of the April 19th Wall Street Journal story—"New Allies for LBJ"—were based on a radio commercial we have been running on station WGMS in Washington, D.C. This commercial has been running for several weeks now and it is only one part of a very comprehensive community relations program we have instituted in support of the Job Corps. Our other activities include open house activities at Kilmer for the press and congressional representatives and a very vigorous publicity program designed to get this success story across to the public.

A few days ago, Mr. Geneen received a letter from Mr. Jay Wells, who was appointed last year by President Johnson to the Business Leaders Advisory Group to assist the Office of Economic Opportunity. I would like to quote two paragraphs from the letter because I think they sum up the current attitude towards the urban Job Corps training centers:

"I took some people down to Camp Kilmer yesterday who represented the Hospital Association of New York, with a view toward hiring a large number of the boys to work in New York City hospitals. The hospital people were quite skeptical about the whole idea, but you would be amazed at how they changed after they saw the facilities, and the quality of the boys being turned out.

"We all well know the early problems you had with the Camp, and I understand that you were very much concerned about it. As far as I am concerned, you can stop worrying about it right now."

I remember very well the adverse publicity surrounding the initial efforts of OEO's Job Corps program. At the time, we were involved at Kilmer, but the pressure we experienced was probably infinitesimal compared to the burden you carried.

Those problems, some real and some imaginary, have been largely resolved and the success of the program is surely evident by the growing numbers of Job Corps graduates who are taking a productive place in our society.

You may look forward to receiving our complete support of your program and I'm sure Mr. Geneen will write to you directly upon his return.

Sincerely,

NED GERRITY.

EXTENSION OF THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in looking back on the 89th

Congress, it is difficult to decide which action will have the greatest long-run impact for the people of our Nation.

The 89th Congress certainly recognized the needs of America's young. It enacted the far-reaching Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act, which, taken together, represent a giant step forward in our Federal investment in the future of the younger generation.

And the 89th Congress also recognized the problems of the older American. Two landmark pieces of legislation were passed to assist our senior citizens—medicare and the Older Americans Act.

Medicare has helped to ease the burden of hospital and doctor bills for those over 65.

The Older Americans Act created the Administration on Aging to serve as the focal point within the Federal Government in all matters of concern to older persons. It is the traffic center of ideas and has the responsibility for stimulating the most effective use of existing resources and programs in developing services and opportunities for senior citizens.

The Older Americans Act also established three grant programs which are designed to encourage the development of programs on aging at State and local levels, to conduct research into the problems of senior citizens and to train professional and technical personnel to work in the field of aging.

An important start in assisting older Americans has been made under the act. By the end of the year, between 800 and 1,100 local projects will have been approved. Thirty-nine research projects, dealing with various problems of older citizens, are underway. Fifty-one States and territories have established agencies to develop and administer State plans to assist the aging. Forty-three State plans have been approved by the Administration on Aging.

The promising beginning made under the Older Americans Act is a fitting tribute to the memory of two of our late colleagues who were early and vigorous advocates of the legislation and whose advocacy made its passage possible—Representative John Fogarty, of Rhode Island, and Senator Pat McNamara, of Michigan.

But only a beginning has been made. If the Older Americans Act is to be the success envisioned by Senator McNamara and Congressman Fogarty, it must be continued and expanded. Today, I am joining a number of my colleagues, including the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], in sponsoring the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967, authorizing continuation of the program through 1972 and increasing the authorized appropriation level. The amendments would also add a major new program to develop nutritional services to test new methods and ways to meet the nutritional needs of older people.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Older Americans Act Amendments will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

MEDICAL DEVICE SAFETY ACT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the administration, I am today introducing the proposed Medical Device Safety Act of 1967. Under consent to extend my remarks, I include herewith for the RECORD a fact sheet prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(Prepared by U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

FACT SHEET: MEDICAL DEVICE SAFETY ACT OF 1967

NEED

Revolutionary advances in the development of medical devices have taken place since the original enactment of regulatory legislation in this field nearly 30 years ago.

These achievements in medical technology have introduced a broad array of devices that are new, not only in purpose and usefulness, but often in the very materials used in their manufacture.

Surgical implants, contact lenses, artificial kidneys, and nylon arteries are examples of the significant advances that have taken place in recent years. The current progress in the development of artificial hearts is still another momentous forward step.

This research and innovation must be encouraged to insure the further development of life-saving devices. At the same time, the patient as well as the physician is entitled to the assurance that a particular device has been adequately tested and proved safe, reliable, and effective. In the case of devices, such assurance cannot be given under existing law. At the present time, physicians and medical device purchasing personnel must rely almost entirely on a manufacturer's representations as to the vital information about a new medical device. This involves a description of the materials in the device, expected parts obsolescence, breakdown and servicing rates, and other technical data. No Federal law requires advanced proof of safety, reliability, and effectiveness before a device reaches the market. Action can be taken only after injury has occurred or the Government can develop other proof that the device is not safe, reliable, and effective. Appropriate legislation, with sufficient safeguards to protect research, innovation and development, should be introduced now to close this gap.

PROPOSAL

The Medical Device Safety Act of 1967, in effect, divides medical devices into three classes; first, those devices which would be safe when manufactured under standards (e.g.: bone pins, catheters, X-ray equipment, and diathermy machines); second, those devices, such as artificial kidneys and other organ substitutes, that would go through a clearance procedure before being put on the market; third, common patient-care devices not requiring any regulation.

Standard-setting authority

To protect the public health and safety, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to establish mandatory standards relating to the composition, properties, or performance of a medical device or class of medical devices. Diagnostic devices would be specifically excluded from the standard-setting authority.

In the development of the standard, "the Secretary shall to the optimum extent consult" with appropriate Federal agencies concerned with standard-setting, with other standard-setting organizations, and with nongovernmental experts. The proposal calls for conferences, work-shops, and other means by which nongovernmental experts could fully participate in the development of the standard.

Any person who would be adversely affected by a standard could require the referral of the matter to an independent advisory committee of experts nominated by the National Academy of Sciences, for a report and recommendations.

The right to a hearing and to court review would be available to anyone affected by a standard.

It is expected that such standards would be modified periodically to keep pace with advances in scientific and clinical knowledge.

Premarket clearance

The proposal calls for the premarket clearance of a device (other than diagnostic and veterinary devices) if (1) the device is not generally recognized by qualified experts as safe, reliable and effective *and* "(2) such device (A) is intended to be secured or otherwise placed, in whole or in part, within the human body or into a body cavity, or directly in contact with mucous membrane, and is intended to be left in the body or such cavity, or in such direct contact, permanently, indefinitely, or for a substantial period or periods (as determined in accordance with regulations issued after notice and opportunity to present views), or (B) is intended to be used for subjecting the human body to ionizing radiation, electromagnetic, electric, or magnetic energy (including, but not limited to, diathermy, laser, defibrillator, and electroshock instrumentation), or heat, cold, or physical or ultrasonic energy, or is intended for physical or radio- or electronic or electric communication in either direction with any part of the human body or with a device placed within or connected with the human body, or (C) is a device which the Secretry, by special order made on the basis of a finding (for reasons stated in the order) that there is probable cause to believe that the device is not effective for its use or intended use or that it is not safe for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in its labeling, has declared to be subject to the requirements of this subsection with respect to such use or intended use. . . ." (See "exemptions" below.)

Any person who would be adversely affected by the premarket clearance procedure could require the referral of the matter to an independent advisory committee of experts nominated by the National Academy of Sciences, for a report and recommendations.

The right to a hearing and to court review would be available to the applicant for premarket clearance.

The proposal would require the establishment, to the extent practicable, of a list of devices that are found to be generally recognized by experts as safe, reliable, and effective for use, and hence not subject to premarket clearance.

Exemptions

(1) There would be a broad exemption from regulation for devices under clinical investigation. No notice of the investigation would have to be given until the development of the device has reached a point at which separate groups of investigators working with a sponsor are following essentially the same plan in developing data required to support an application for premarket clearance. At that point, a plan of investigation would have to be submitted by the sponsor to FDA. In determining the need for and the adequacy of the plan, there would be opportunity for consultation with appropriate non-FDA experts.

(2) Devices complying with standards established under the proposal would be exempt from preclearance, if the standard covers all relevant aspects.

(3) The Secretary would also be authorized to exempt from preclearance those devices for which it is feasible to establish an adequate standard within a reasonable time.

(4) Custom-made prescription devices would not be subject to preclearance.

(5) Custom-made devices made to the specifications of a licensed practitioner for his use would be excluded from preclearance.

Other provisions

The proposal would require the maintenance of current good manufacturing practice by device manufacturers. It would also provide for registration of device manufacturers, inspection, and appropriate record keeping as to experience had with a device which is subject to a standard or which has been approved for the market.

The preclearance requirement of the law would become generally effective a year after the month of enactment. However, in the case of devices already on the market when the bill becomes law, the preclearance requirement would become generally effective 2½ years after the month of enactment, and the Department could further postpone the effective date in the case of a particular device for up to an additional 2½ years if necessary for completion of the required scientific research.

The law would be administered by the Food and Drug Administration with advice, on general policy matters, of an Advisory Council on Devices and in consultation with other governmental agencies.

THE ELECTRIC POWER RELIABILITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill recommended by the Federal Power Commission, and supported by the President, which is designed to enhance the reliability and efficiency of electric bulk power systems.

We all are familiar with the blackout which occurred 1½ years ago in the Northeast, the one which we had just a few days ago in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and many other significant outages of electric power supply that have occurred in recent years.

Our committee has been active in examining into the causes for these failures and in efforts to see how this situation may be remedied and recurrence may be avoided.

The Federal Power Commission recommendation is particularly timely.

I include the letter of transmittal to the Speaker from Chairman Lee C. White, of the Federal Power Commission, together with a brief explanation of the bill, in the Record at this point:

Federal Power Commission,
Office of the Chairman,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1967.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: The Federal Power Commission transmits herewith for consideration by the appropriate committee twenty copies of a draft bill, the proposed Electric Power Reliability Act, which would add a new Part IV to the Federal Power Act. The bill is designed to assist the electric utility industry to meet both the challenges and opportunities of a dynamic technology which confront America's pluralistic power industry.

The President's message to Congress on consumer protection of February 16, 1967, referred to recent power failures, as well as to the possibility of improvement in electric service. As the President stated:

"Power systems must be carefully planned, coordinated, and strengthened to protect the customer against cascading power failures."

The electric industry today has achieved impressive technological progress. Its generators are of immense capacity and its extra-high voltage transmission lines can move large blocks of power over great distances. These improvements have not only made power supply more reliable, but reduced its cost as well. Yet more must be done.

Study of the power industry's occasional failures leads us to propose the Electric Power Reliability Act. We believe it will provide a sound basis for improving our Nation's electric service. Experience has shown that carefully coordinated planning and operation can secure maximum reliability and efficiency without excessive cost. The Electric Power Reliability Act would (1) call for the establishment of regional planning organizations to ensure that plans for bulk power facilities are adequate, (2) authorize the Federal Power Commission to establish planning and operating standards to enhance reliability, (3) provide for Commission review and approval of extra-high voltage transmission lines and abandonment of bulk power services, and (4) authorize the Commission to require interconnections between bulk power generating utilities.

The electric utility industry, acting voluntarily, has made substantial progress toward the goals of adequate interconnection and coordination. As the President noted in his message on consumer protection:

"Much of this effort is already being voluntarily undertaken by America's great electric power industry. For example, in recognition of the importance of coordination 23 utilities in an eight-state area recently announced the formation of a regional council."

The Electric Power Reliability Act would assist in beneficial undertakings such as this, and would secure similar benefits in areas where progress has been less rapid.

The key to improved coordination under the proposed bill would be the regional councils. The expanding technology of the electric power industry, entailing as it does the use of giant generators and extra-high-voltage transmission lines, has made it imperative that coordination in planning and operation cover a wider area than the service territory of any one utility or small power pool. Effective coordination requires a high degree of cooperation among systems, on a regional scale. The establishment of regional electric power councils throughout the Nation is essential to enable institutions of the power industry, consisting of 3,600 separate utilities, to keep pace with and implement the developing power-system technology. It is equally clear that all segments of the industry—the investor-owned utility companies, the municipal systems, the rural electric cooperatives, and the Federal and State power agencies—must join together in forward-looking cooperation to plan and build safe and reliable systems. Each system must consider as part of its public service responsibility, the needs and desires, the strengths and weaknesses, of its neighbors throughout a broad region. The Electric Power Reliability Act would promote, encourage, and facilitate joint planning for the common good.

The Electric Power Reliability Act would strengthen coordination of the systems making up our pluralistic electric utility industry by adding a new Part IV to the Federal Power Act. The new Part IV would rely heavily on more active coordination of planning by utilities, through the mechanism of regional councils. The Federal Power Commission would be instructed to promote meaningful coordination on a regional scale and to provide a public presence in the work of the regional councils. The bill further provides inducements, including Federal eminent domain, rights-of-way across federally owned lands, and immunity from certain antitrust actions.

The Commission would be authorized to develop, in consultation with experts drawn from the entire industry, planning and operating standards to enhance power reliability. These standards could, for example, embrace criteria for programs of automatic load-shedding in emergencies, and for evaluating the adequacy of existing and proposed transmission systems. They could be nationwide in their application, or could be tailored to the individual requirements of a particular region.

Transmission systems constructed for enhanced reliability must have a proper regard for the public interest in wise land use, including the preservation of scenic and historic areas. The proposed bill includes a procedure for consultation of responsible local, State and Federal agencies concerned with land use, and requires the Commission to defer to their views when it can do so consistently with the objectives of the Electric Power Reliability Act.

The subject matter of the proposed Act is complex, and the responsibilities it would assign are weighty. Much groundwork would have to be laid following its enactment, and the benefits stemming from the planning it would promote would not all be immediate or spectacular. However, as befits a statute that promises long-term benefits, it has been planned and drafted over a long period. The present bill reflects the Commission's intensive studies in the National Power Survey and its investigations of the Northeast Power Failure of November, 1965. That investigation began with the preparation of the initial report on the Northeast failure, issued in December 1965, and has been usefully supplemented from time to time with studies of power failures in other parts of the Nation. The Commission has drawn upon the ideas of many experts in formulating its own views reflected in this bill. We have had the benefit of Congressional studies of these matters.

The Commission's final report on the Northeast Power Failure and related studies is in the final stages of preparation and printing and should be available for release shortly. We believe that the report will be of assistance to Congress in considering the proposed Act, as well as indicating guidelines for putting it into effect.

We believe this legislation would be in the public interest. We regard it as a sound and workable plan for assuring to all Americans not only freedom from the danger and inconvenience of power failures and shortages, but all the fullest advantage that can be gained from the widespread employment of the technology which our power industry has developed. Enactment of this measure will strengthen the Nation's ability to meet the challenge of providing the American power consumer with the most reliable and most efficient service possible.

In his statement commenting on the cascading power failure of last Monday which affected over 15 million people in a four-state area, the President expressed the hope that the legislation we are proposing would be considered promptly and favorably by the Congress. We share the President's sense of urgency about this legislation and are appreciative of the continuing interest demonstrated by the President and the Congress in this vital area of reliability of electric power service since the Northeast Power Failure of November, 1965.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the enactment of this bill would be in accord with the program of the President.

Respectfully,

LEE C. WHITE,
Chairman.

THE ELECTRIC POWER RELIABILITY ACT OF 1967—A SHORT EXPLANATION

The proposed Electric Power Reliability Act of 1967, submitted to Congress by the Federal Power Commission on June 8, 1967, with the support of the President, is designed to enhance the reliability and efficiency of electric bulk power systems. It would do so by creating new mechanisms for coordination among utilities, by assuring that all utility systems are given a chance to take advantage of new technology, and by reviewing proposals to build extra-high-voltage transmission lines to determine whether they are in the public interest. Extra-high-voltage lines are those that transmit power at more than 200,000 volts (200 kilovolts).

The FPC bill would apply equally to all bulk power systems in the country, whether owned by private investors, local or State agencies, the Federal government, or members of a cooperative. A bulk power system comprises facilities which generate power and deliver it to distribution lines, but not the distribution lines or distribution facilities themselves.

Under the bill the electric systems would establish regional councils to coordinate planning for further interconnection and construction of bulk power supply facilities. The councils would review existing facilities and proposed additions, and would propose further plans. Every system in a region would be a member of, or be represented on the regional council. The FPC would have non-voting representatives on each council. Although the FPC would pass on their basic organization to insure fairness, the councils would function independently. As a council formulated a plan for its region, it would submit it to the FPC for approval. If the Commission found a plan to be consistent with the objectives of the Act, limited immunity from antitrust suits could be granted, provided the Commission found the impact on competition insubstantial or clearly outweighed by other public interest factors. Regional councils would conduct studies designed to further reliability of service, and could propose reliability standards for issuance by the FPC as mandatory requirements.

The building of extra-high-voltage lines receives special attention in the FPC bill. All proposals to build these lines would be filed with the Commission. Public notice of the proposal would be published and served on appropriate regional councils, Federal, State and local agencies and other interested persons. After six months, construction on a project could begin unless the Commission disapproved or suspended the proposal. If the proponent intended to take advantage of the Federal eminent domain powers the bill offers, suspension would be automatic. Suspension would be for an initial period of up to a year, but could be extended if the Commission recommended specific modification or scheduled a formal hearing. Projects found, after opportunity for hearing, to be inconsistent with the objectives of the Act could not be constructed. The Commission could allow construction to go forward immediately where it determines that an emergency exists.

Any issues of land use, including preservation of scenic or historic sites, would be specially considered. Responsible Federal, State and local agencies would have the opportunity to file comments, and the Commission would defer to their views on local land-use questions unless doing so would be inconsistent with the objectives of the Act.

Other provisions of the bill would allow the Commission to require interconnections and energy exchanges between utilities where the public interest so required. The Commission already has this power where a complaint is filed with it, but under the new legislation it could initiate such action itself. The bill would require FPC approval before a utility could abandon a bulk power service to another utility system. The bill would also empower the FPC to set up a National Electric Studies Committee with a broad mandate to investigate major reliability, planning and operation problems and stimulate scientific interest in solving them.

SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the White House has just made available the text of an exchange of letters between the President and Senator MANSFIELD on the situation in the Middle East.

The President's letter gives an excellent and up-to-date account of the situation as it stands at this moment.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD the two letters, together with a copy of a resolution presented to the Security Council today.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT:

As I said this morning, it would be a great help to me, and I think to the Senate as a whole if we could have your own current views on the situation in the Middle East. That situation has developed so rapidly in recent days, and the issues before us there are of such great importance, that the Senate would be grateful, I am sure, to have your own present assessment.

Sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

JUNE 8, 1967.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: I am delighted to respond to your note with a brief statement on the current situation as we see it. I entirely share your view that it is good for the President and the Senate to be in close touch on this matter.

Our most urgent present concern is to find a way to bring the fighting in the Middle East to an end. We are deeply concerned that there has not yet been an effective response to the two unanimous votes by which the U.N. Security Council has called for a cease-fire. While the representative of Israel agreed to comply if other parties also agreed, only Jordan, among the Arab States, has agreed to the cease-fire.

Ambassador Goldberg, on my instructions, has requested the immediate convening of another Security Council session, to deal with the current situation, and we have presented a Resolution whose text I attach.

The fighting has already brought the suffering and pain that comes with all such conflict. These losses have included the lives of Americans engaged in the work of peaceful communication on the high seas. On this matter we have found it necessary to make a prompt and firm protest to the Israel Government which, to its credit, had already acknowledged its responsibility and had apologized. This tragic episode will underline for all Americans the correctness of our own urgent concern that the fighting should stop at once.

So we continue to believe that a cease-fire is the urgent first step required to bring about peace in that troubled part of the world. At the same time we know, of course, that a cease-fire will be only a beginning and that many more fundamental questions must be tackled promptly if the area is to enjoy genuine stability. Our new Resolution begins to deal with some of these questions.

Let me emphasize that the U.S. continues to be guided by the same basic policies which have been followed by this Administration and three previous Administrations. These policies have always included a consistent effort on our part to maintain good relations with all the peoples of the area in spite of the difficulties caused by some of their leaders. This remains our policy despite the unhappy rupture of relations which has been declared by several Arab states.

We hope that the individual states in the Middle East will now find new ways to work out their differences with each other by the means of peace, and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. We look beyond the current conflict to a new era of greater stability which will permit all the peoples of the area to enjoy the fruits of lasting peace. Our full efforts will be directed to this end.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

P.S.—While this letter was in the typewriter I learned of the announcement, by the President of the Security Council, that the United Arab Republic accepts the cease-fire resolutions subject only to acceptance by Israel. Thus we seem at the edge of progress in the directions this letter indicates. You can be sure that this Government will continue its work for peace, especially in the Security Council where Ambassador Goldberg has done such brilliant and productive work in the last days.

U.S. RESOLUTION OF JUNE 8, 1967

The Security Council—

Recalling its resolution 233 and 234:

Recalling that in the latter resolution the Council demanded that the Governments concerned should as a first step cease fire and discontinue military operations at 2000 hours GMT of 7 June 1967.

Noting that Israel and Jordan have indicated their mutual acceptance of the Council's demand for a cease-fire, and that Israel has expressed with respect to all parties its acceptance of the cease-fire provided the other parties accept.

Noting further with deep concern that other parties to the conflict have not yet agreed to a cease-fire,

1. Calls for scrupulous compliance by Israel and Jordan with the agreement they have reached on a cease-fire,

2. Insists that all the other parties concerned immediately comply with the Council's repeated demands for a cease-fire and cessation of all military activity as a first urgent step toward the establishment of a stable peace in the Middle East,

3. Calls for discussions promptly thereafter among the parties concerned, using such third party or United Nations assistance as they may wish, looking toward the establishment of viable arrangements encompassing the withdrawal and disengagement of armed personnel, the renunciation of force regardless of its nature, the maintenance of vital international rights, and the establishment of a stable and durable peace in the Middle East,

4. Requests the President of the Security Council and the Secretary Council and the

Secretary General to take immediate steps to secure compliance with the cease-fire and to report to the Council thereon within 24 hours.

5. Also requests the Secretary General to provide such assistance as may be required in facilitating the discussions called for in paragraph 3.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE RALLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Addabbo] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it has been a heartwarming experience today to witness the great numbers of people who have journeyed to Washington to voice their support for the nation of Israel. It was especially gratifying to me to have thousands of my constituents participate in this peaceful and dignified demonstration. These good people stood in the sweltering heat in Lafayette Park, fully composed and in serious deliberations. Perhaps their prayers, as our prayers and hopes, have been heard and have resulted in the wonderful news of Egypt's acceptance of the cease-fire. It is my continued prayer and hope that the remaining Arab States will join in the cease-fire so that Israel and the Arab nations may sit down and negotiate a lasting and complete peace treaty.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief and fervent hope that the United States will support Israel in its just requests, and that no pressure will be brought that will in any way detract from the needs of Israel. We should have learned from the mistakes of 1956 and should insure that they are not repeated.

Again, we must continue to stand by our unrelenting commitments for the protection of the free nation's integrity and long-sought peaceful coexistence in the Middle East, the least of which being the unquestioned free access to and use of the Gulf of Aqaba and needed access to the Suez Canal.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Kornegay (at the request of Mr. Galifianakis), for today, from 1 p.m. to 3:30 p.m., on account of official business.

Mrs. Sullivan for an indefinite period on account of speaking at a consumer forum in St. Louis on committee business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Cramer, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Chamberlain (at the request of Mr Railsback), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Michel (at the request of Mr. Railsback), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bell (at the request of Mr. Railsback), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hall (at the request of Mr. Railsback), for 60 minutes, on Monday, June 12; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Talcott (at the request of Mr. Railsback), for 10 minutes, on June 12; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Pollock (at the request of Mr. Railsback), for 1 hour, on June 19; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Addabbo (at the request of Mr. Brinkley), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Saylor to include extraneous matter in the remarks he made in Committee today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Railsback) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McClory.

Mr. Grover.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Brinkley) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Casey.

Mr. McCarthy in two instances.

Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

Mr. Farbstein.

Mr. Eilberg.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Product Safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 12, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

819. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the 19th Annual Report of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 202(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

820. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1730 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the uniform or badge of the letter-carrier branch of the postal service to be worn in theatrical, television, or motion-picture productions under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

821. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

822. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Power Commission Act to facilitate the provision of reliable, abundant and economical electric power supply, by strengthening existing mechanisms for coordination of electric utility systems and encouraging the installation and use of the products of advancing technology with due regard for the proper conservation of scenic and other natural resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS: Committee of Conference. S. 1432. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 346). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1006. A bill to provide an increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 7043. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Department under which the United States Coast Guard is operating to cause the vessel *Northwind*, owned by Wallace P. Smith, Jr., of Centreville, Md., to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges; with amendment (Rept. No. 348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 10659. A bill to amend section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act to modernize certain restrictions upon the application and scope of the exemption provided therein; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 10660. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. Gerald R. Ford, Mr. Arends, Mr. Laird, Mr. Rhodes of Arizona, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Utt, Mr. Betts, Mr. Schneebeli, Mr. Collier, Mr. Broyhill of Virginia, Mr. Battin, Mr. Conable and Mr. Bush):

H.R. 10661. A bill to make permanent the existing temporary public debt limit of $336 billion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 10662. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.R. 10663. A bill to restrict imports of dairy products; to the Committee and Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 10664. A bill to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 10665. A bill relating to the conservation of natural resources upon lands of the United States and amending certain provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Acts and the Mineral Leasing Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 10666. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 10667. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in order to establish in the Public Health Service the position of Chief Veterinary Officer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 10668. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the western district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10669. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 10670. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 10671. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of flue-cured tobacco acreage allotments and acreage-poundage quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 10672. A bill to prohibit electronic surveillance by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 10673. A bill to amend title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 10674. A bill to designate the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore as the Virgil I. Grissom National Lakeshore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 10675. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 10676. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H.R. 10677. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on honey and honey products and to impose import limitations on honey and honey products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 10678. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to facilitate the formulation of sound tariff policies with respect to agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 10679. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 10680. A bill to establish cooperative extension services in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 10681. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 relating to the registration of Communist organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Messrs. QUIE, GOODELL, AYRES, BELL, GURNEY, ERLENBORN, DELLENBACK, ESCH, ESHLEMAN, STEIGER of Wisconsin, FRELINGHUYSEN, DON H. CLAUSEN, REINECKE, and SMITH of Oklahoma:

H.R. 10682. A bill to mesh the combined efforts of government at all levels with private endeavors to provide jobs and dignity for the poor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 10683. A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 10684. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $3,600 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 10685. A bill to permit the administrative adjustment of certain wheat acreage allotment reductions resulting from action taken by farmers prior to 1965 in good faith reliance upon representations or advice of authorized representatives of the Secretarys of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 10686. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 10687. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 10688. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 10689. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 10690. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 10691. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 10692. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 10693. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 10694. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 10695. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 10696. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 10697. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 10698. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H.R. 10699. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H.R. 10700. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 10701. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 10702. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZION:

H.R. 10703. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota

H.R. 10704. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 10705. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 10706. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 10707. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 10708. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 10709. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 10710. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 10711. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 10712. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 10713. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 10714. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 to authorize Federal grants under the open-space land program for the development and redevelopment of existing open-space land and for the acquisition of outdoor and indoor recreational buildings, centers, facilities, and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10715. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 10716. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 to authorize Federal grants under the open-space land program for the development and redevelopment of existing open-space land and for the acquisition of outdoor and indoor recreational buildings, centers, facilities, and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10717. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 10718. A bill to provide for the uniform application of the position classification and general schedule pay rate provisions of title 5, United States Code, to all employees of the Selective Service System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself, Mr. Wilson, Mr. White, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Gross, and Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina):

H.R. 10719. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for acquisition of career status by certain individuals serving in positions in the competitive service under temporary appointments pending establishment of registers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. O'Hara of Michigan, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Meeds, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Esch, and Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin):

H.R. 10720. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, to provide grants to State and local governments for the development of comprehensive manpower development and utilization plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10721. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to facilitate the provision of a reliable abundant and economical electric power supply, by strengthening existing mechanisms for coordination of electric utility systems and encouraging the installation and use of the products of advancing technology with due regard for the proper conservation of scenic and other natural resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 10722. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to facilitate the provision of a reliable, abundant and economical electric power supply, by strengthening existing mechanisms for coordination of electric utility systems and encouraging the installation and use of the products of advancing technology with due regard for the proper conservation of scenic and other natural resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 10723. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 10724. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain leases or permits issued by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 10725. A bill to amend the Act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for certain members of the police force of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 10726. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of medical devices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10727. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to facilitate the provision of a reliable, abundant and economical electric power supply, by strengthening existing mechanisms for coordination of electric utility systems and encouraging the installation and use of the products of advancing technology with due regard for the proper conservation of scenic and other natural resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 10728. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Sac and Fox Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 10729. A bill to amend title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to establish more effective criteria for a finding of serious injury to domestic industry as a result of concessions granted under trade agreements, to make mandatory the findings of the Tariff Commission with respect to the necessity for tariff adjustment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS (for himself, Mr. Dent, Mr. Hawkins, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Meeds, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Bell, and Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin):

H.R. 10730. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10731. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 10732. A bill to render the assertion of land claims by the United States based upon accretion or avulsion subject to legal and equitable defenses to which private persons asserting such claims would be subject; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TUNNEY (for himself, Mr. Charles H. Wilson and Mr. Steiger of Arizona):

H.R. 10733. A bill to render the assertion of land claims by the United States based upon accretion or avulsion subject to legal and equitable defenses to which private persons asserting such claims would be subject; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.J. Res. 613. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period comprising the first full week in October of each year as Spring Garden Planting Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.J. Res. 614. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 369. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself and Mr. Rhodes of Arizona):

H. Res. 505. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Resolution 406; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 506. Resolution providing for the distribution of the United States Code Annotated or the Federal Code Annotated to Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

225. By the Speaker: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the enforcement of the guidelines issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

226. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to royalties derived from mineral production received by the Federal Government from the Continental Shelf off the southern boundary of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

227. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to an increase in the amount of the personal and dependent exemptions under the Federal Income Tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 10734. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth B. Borgnino; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 10735. A bill for the relief of Kwong Kwok Bun (also known as Raymond Kwong) and his wife, Virginia Juvier Kwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 10736. A bill for the relief of Ofelia De Veyra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 10737. A bill for the relief of the late John Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

101. Mr. **HOSMER** presented a petition of certain residents of the 32d Congressional District of California, who request enactment by Congress of legislation to amend the medicare provisions of the Social Security Act to allow the recipients of the benefits thereunder to obtain health care from doctors of chiropractic and receive the same benefit payments and privileges as are now given the other licensed practitioners of the healing arts and sciences, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1967

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 8, 1967)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Dr. James Roy Smith, minister, Mount Olivet Methodist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

In this historic place, Almighty God, we pause a moment to ask Thy blessing ere we begin our day's work. Make us aware that Thou hast entrusted to this august body the power of decision concerning the great issues of our day.

Create within them the awareness that without Thee they are not equal to the task. Make them mindful that the basis upon which they should govern is in accordance with the principles of justice, truth, and honor. Remind them constantly that Thou are the source of truth; Thou art the fount of justice; Thou art the standard of honor; in Thee is to be found their help.

Eternal God, who art the source of all need, the rule of all action, be especially with the Members of the Senate this day. Give them wisdom for their thinking, patience for their problems, understanding for their dealing in human relations, courage for their decisions, and satisfaction for their work. Deliver them from any cowardice that turns its back on new truth, from any complacency that is content with half-truth, and from any pride that thinks it knows all the truth. Make them aware that they best serve their country and their people by keeping themselves close to Thee. Help them to live above the clamor of the crowd, so that they may hear Thy "still, small voice" and follow its message. May this be their guide today and every day.

In Thy name we pray. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 7, 1967, was approved.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the pending business is H.R. 2508. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ERVIN obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield me 2 or 3 minutes under the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield to the Senator as much time as he requires.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. DOMINICK, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Eugene M. Becker, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William J. Porter, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Korea;

Covey T. Oliver, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Benigno C. Hernandez, of New Mexico, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Paraguay; and

James E. Hoofnagle, of Virginia, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 17 general and flag officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Gen. Kenneth B. Hobson (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list, in the grade of general;

Lt. Gen. Herbert B. Thatcher (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, Lt. Gen. Charles B. Westover (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, and Lt. Gen. Paul S. Emrick (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Lt. Gen. Thomas P. Gerrity (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general while so serving;

Maj. Gen. Robert G. Ruegg, Regular Air Force, Maj. Gen. John C. Meyer, Regular Air Force, Maj. Gen. Jack J. Catton, Regular Air Force, Maj. Gen. John W. O'Neill, Regular Air Force, and Maj. Gen. Earl C. Hedlund, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general while so serving;

Maj. Gen. Claire Elwood Hutchin, Jr., Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general while so serving;

Ralph K. Rottet, Robert E. Cushman, Jr., and Richard G. Weede, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving;

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Joe Hodson, U.S. Army, for appointment as the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general, Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Joseph Fuller, U.S. Army, for appointment as the Assistant Judge Advocate General, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general, Army of the United States; and

Vice Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in addition, I report also 2,757 appointments in the Marine Corps in the grade of colonel and below. Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

William L. Atwater and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alexander B. Trowbridge, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Alexander B. Trowbridge, whose nomination we are now considering, has strong roots in the State of Florida, that I have the honor to represent in part.

Sandy Trowbridge, as he is known to his friends, spent much of his boyhood in Winter Park, Fla., as his father, Prof. Buell Trowbridge, served on the faculty at Rollins College, Florida, from 1933 to 1943, when he left to serve in World War II.

Sandy Trowbridge at the age of 37 has been a Marine Corps officer in Korea, president and division manager of Esso Standard Oil Co. of Puerto Rico, and Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic and International Business from May 6, 1965, until his appointment by President Johnson as Acting Secretary of Commerce on January 18, 1967. He is a cum laude graduate of Princeton, and now resides in the District of Columbia with his wife, the former Nancy Horst of Greenwich, Conn., and their three children.

Recently Sandy Trowbridge wrote an article, which will shortly appear in the Rollins College alumni magazine, relative to his concern over what he terms the "troublesome element", the attitudes of undergraduate age students toward business as a career and a profession. I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point as I feel it gives an insight to the man who will officially become the Secretary of Commerce, and I am sure will carry forward with the excellent job he has been doing as Acting Secretary.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ARTICLE BY ALEXANDER B. TROWBRIDGE, ACTING SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

As we look at the future of our private enterprise system, there is a particularly troublesome element which concerns me. I am concerned as a citizen in his mid thirties, as a person from the business community, and as a public servant.

This "troublesome element" is the growing body of evidence concerning the attitudes of undergraduate age students toward business as a career and a profession. It is from this group of young people in the colleges and universities that tomorrow's managers and executives must emerge. As our economy grows and becomes more complex in every way, the capacity of our private enterprise system to meet new demands will largely depend on the constant inflow of an imaginative, skilled and well-motivated managerial group.

Evidence is mounting that our new generation of students is looking with less and less enthusiasm toward a career in business life. A February 1966 article in Fortune Magazine sounded the warning. From campus surveys and talks with corporate recruiting officers, it was reported that the current crop of undergraduates and graduates is strongly seeking some sort of "social purpose" in its choice of careers, and it often finds business lacking in this measurement. To quote from Fortune,

"They measure business subjectively; how does business' purpose in society connect with my purpose in life? . . . The theme 'I'm concerned with doing something significant' ran through every discussion. 'Business and the sale of products are what made the United States what it is. But what I'd like to do is improve the lot of people.'"

Where does this attitude come from? To mention a few sources, we can cite the following:

These are postwar generations, whose earliest memories include the Korean War and who have matured in a time of constant international tension, and of steady economic expansion at home.

They are more internationally minded, and they have generally had enough money personally to at least meet basic needs.

They receive relatively little academic exposure to modern business developments. Business history, as part of general economics training, tends to emphasize what business has done badly in the past, rather than the positive contributions.

They are in an era where the spotlight is on social problems, civil rights movements and what is called the "revolution of rising expectations."

They are highly influenced by the call to service of the late President Kennedy, who recognized their responsiveness to such a call by the formation of the Peace Corps.

Don't get me wrong. I think this kind of response to domestic and international problems is healthy and commendable. We need all kinds of intelligence and sacrifice to cope with the social, political and economic problems we face at home and abroad.

But my real point is that the private sector has a very real "social purpose" of its own, and that a young person looking for "something significant" as a career should not assume that he won't find it in business.

The Fortune article points out, however, that *"They are in rebellion against the cliche, which business leaders like to expound, that they are a national asset. They think that the idea takes away their individuality, that they are being served up wholesale to some cause they don't acknowledge and don't sympathize with."*

Therefore, it seems to me that leadership in the business community, and, I'll add leadership in the labor movement as well, should look at itself and try to think through its approach to some of our current national problems. Perhaps we do use too many cliches, and we don't always appear to match action with words. Perhaps we can recognize that this source of new managerial talent we need will be attracted to private enterprise careers only if they can see some connection between company or union actions and their concept of the general needs of our society.

It might be useful to pinpoint areas where this test could apply. We cannot ignore the context in which we live: Vietnam, a booming economy, high capacity utilization of production facilities, almost full employment, some shortages of skills and commodities, balance of payments factors, minority group demands for higher standards, pockets of poverty, international tensions and widening discrepancies in economic development—the whole spectrum of pressures which affect our present and future.

Looking at these areas, we should ask ourselves how we stand and how we act on certain key issues which are central to the question of "what are our attitudes toward the world as it exists?"

First: how do business and labor look at government? Does leadership sit back and view from afar, or does it involve itself? As a suggested answer, I'd like to quote from a speech by Carl Reistle, Board Chairman of Humble Oil and Refining Company.

"I am concerned with management's understanding of the need to take more effective action in the field of government relations.

"I believe it is imperative that we participate to a greater degree and in a more enlightened manner, in public affairs. . . . Most of us have a long way to go in this matter of participating in public affairs and in developing sound relations with government. We should make our voices heard in government places, but it should be more of a unified voice and not sound so much like discordance from a Tower of Babel.

"One of the first things we must do is to stop talking about THE government. It is not THE government. It is OUR Government. Whatever type or quality of government, we have, it is OURS; we are responsible for its being what it is and if we don't like some part of it, we have the obligation to work at the proper time and in the proper ways to change it. But regardless of our personal likes or dislikes, it is OUR government—so let's approach it in a more businesslike way."

Second: how do business and labor look at their community? Do we look beyond the fences surrounding the plant or the entrance door of the office? I know the pressures of everyday activity, and it is hard to find time to get concerned with local community problems. I have the feeling that the leadership of Los Angeles was too preoccupied with daily pressures to worry about the Watts area—until that area erupted in hatred and destruction. If any lesson comes from that still troubled section, it is that local business and labor leadership must look beyond the office door or factory fence. The unwritten practices of job discrimination, whether in company management or union councils, can appear to be "realistic", but in reality will only breed trouble. The way to deal with potential explosions is to stamp out the sputtering fuse, not to clean up after the blast takes place. The problem of racial discrimination is one that must be solved—and lasting solutions will come only from community concern and local action.

Third: how do business and labor look at the academic world? I think that in this area labor has generally been more active and more successful than business. Business particularly is not getting its story across in the academic treatment of economics. But both will lose in the long run unless training in the theory and practice of economics is revitalized and expanded. Business relies too heavily on the Schools of Business Administration, and its real concern should extend to the full student body of any institution of learning. In addition, business has numerous opportunities to support private groups which promote youthful participation in basic economic activity—from Boy Scout fund raising programs to organizations like Junior Achievement. Junior Achievement helps youngsters create some productive enterprise by providing adult consultants to help them get started. It is a fundamental business education effort, and the results have been outstanding.

The key here is again—attitude. Show a youngster that you, as a business or labor leader, are really concerned in his future, and you will someday have that youngster eager (and better prepared) to join your team.

Fourth: how do business and labor look at the law of supply and demand? Do they consider this law as a basic framework for economic activity, or as a hunting license to obtain unrestricted power regardless of who might be affected? It is clear to me that management of both labor and business cannot overlook the broad economic context in which they operate. Today we face clear and present inflationary pressures. High productive levels are near full capacity. Labor in all forms is in heavy demand. The upward push on prices and wages is clear. But labor and business management, before they over react to these factors, will do well to ponder the damages to the general economy created by inflation. Before they add to the fires that feed inflation, a second look toward moderation would be the wiser course of action.

Fifth: how do business and labor look at the many problems of so-called "public interest?" By these problems I mean questions of the growing pollution of our air and water, the choking of our highways and the horrible toll of traffic accidents, the inadequacy of housing facilities for some levels of our population, the provision of public schools and community services, or the vitality of our local political leadership. Are these problems where business and labor abdicate any interest, leaving them to "someone in government" to solve? I submit that the solutions of government, although perhaps well intentioned, will not be the best solutions if they are developed only by government people talking to government people. Unless your voices are loud and clear, and your willingness to participate is clearly shown, then you have no clear basis on which to criticize the end results. If you act—if you get involved—you can influence the outcome.

These then are what we might consider some "wider dimensions of better business." We have developed a fantastically successful method of producing and distributing the products of a developed economy. We have made mistakes, learned from them, and developed better ways as a result. We want to keep this system alive, dynamic and responsive to the inevitable changes which our future will bring.

But no plan, theory or program can be implemented without people—people with curiosity and open minds, with a taste for adventure and innovation, with combinations of eagerness and patience, and with the ability to distinguish between what is vital and what is secondary. These people are needed in all sectors of our national life, and the future of the private enterprise system will depend heavily on business and labor gaining an adequate share of the available pool of such talent. To attract them, leadership must examine the image and the reality which these young candidates see.

By an honest appraisal of these factors (and there are others that could be added), our private enterprise leadership can do what any good manager should be doing—and that is to provide for the steady infusion of better qualified replacements in his own job.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Environmental Science Services Administration which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, without the time being applied to the bill or the amendments, that there be a quorum call.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection. it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF NIGER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is honored today to have visiting it, and our country, five Members of the National Assembly of Niger. They are here to visit various parts of the continental United States and Puerto Rico, and I should like at this time to introduce these five outstanding parliamentarians.

The Honorable Ary Tanimoune, a former distinguished Ambassador to the United States, who is the First Vice President of the National Assembly.

The Honorable Anadou Hassane, a former delegate to the United Nations, who is the Second Vice President of the National Assembly.

The Honorable Diallo Abdourhamane Boubacar, a Deputy.

The Honorable Djibrim Moussa, a Deputy.

The Honorable Khamed Moussa Ag Ahmadou, a Deputy.

We are delighted, gentlemen, that it was possible for you to visit this country and this body. I am only sorry that because so many Members of the Senate are in committee at the present time, they are not on the floor. But it does give me great pleasure, and I consider it a privilege to have the opportunity, to introduce to the Senate these distinguished fellow parliamentarians from Niger, a country which achieved independence only in recent years, but has made great progress toward and has shown a stability which other countries could well follow.

(The distinguished visitors rose in their places and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished manager of the bill for yielding to me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is honored to have the distinguished representatives as its guests in the Senate today.

RECESS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess until 10:13 a.m.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time? What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I understood, under the unanimous-consent agreement, that the majority leader and the minority leader were controlling the time. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts has 1 hour at his disposal.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would like to review for the benefit of the Senate the highlights of the minority views which were expressed by the members of the Committee on the Judiciary who signed the minority views. The minority views were signed by myself, Mr. DODD, Mr. HART, and Mr. TYDINGS. Although Mr. BAYH did not sign the minority views, he did vote for the substitute in the Committee on the Judiciary.

At this time I wish to review somewhat briefly the principal areas of concern that were expressed by that minority and discuss why we feel the substitute measure not only is in the best interest of the Congress, but also would comply most directly with the constitutional mandate that has been established in series of cases in recent years.

Mr. President, one of the matters which is of greatest concern to members of the committee who filed the dissent is the procedure followed in development of this legislation. I think it was clear from the limited debate we had 2 days ago that there is considerable difference in the interpretation of a number of the important provisions of the legislation. There is even a substantial difference between the interpretations by the bill's supporters, such as the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

There are a number of questions which have not been answered either in the House or in the Senate. There have been a number of inconsistent interpretations that have been placed on the legislation in the House of Representatives. In many instances the interpretation which has been placed upon the language in the House of Representatives does not conform to the interpretation placed upon the language in the Senate. I feel this is somewhat understandable, recognizing the very limited amount of consideration the legislation has received in both Houses, in spite of the fact that the legislation is important, dramatic, and significant.

History is quite clear with regard to the fundamental principle established by the Constitution in article I, section 2, and in article I, section 4, that the Congress has a central role on the question of the selection of men and women who shall make up the Congress. I think that the history is quite impressive of the development of the principles of equality of districts, compactness, and contiguity, certainly from the end of the Civil War to the end of the First World War.

In the legislation developed during this period it is extremely clear that in a number of instances the election of Members of the House of Representatives did not exactly follow, as we might have hoped, the procedures that had been established by the Congress with respect to its desire to recognize the fundamental, important, and significant principles surrounding the right to fair representation in Congress.

Then, we find a period from the late 1920's and virtually up to the 1950's when a number of these significant criteria were left out of the legislation establishing the procedures for election of Members of the House of Representatives. In the early 1950's the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. CELLER, began to wrestle and grapple with the problem, and began to introduce legislation and hold hearings on the subject of congressional districting. Unfortunately the legislation that passed the House of Representatives is not true to the principles he fought for with such foresight.

During the present decade we find that the Supreme Court has spoken most forcefully with respect to this matter, beginning with Wesberry against Sanders in 1964, which itself drew upon the Baker against Carr case of 1962. What strikes me is the fact that the only hearings in the House on this legislation were limited to 2 days of hearings held 1 month after the Wesberry case without any benefit of the court interpretations of Wesberry. We do know that the courts have been extremely active in the redistricting field. The appendix to the minority report, which is not a complete list, cites 22 cases. But in the 3 years and 3 months since Wesberry, no hearings have been held in the House of Representatives in spite of the many landmark cases in the courts.

In the Senate, the only hearings ever conducted took place one day last year when two Representatives appeared to ask the Judiciary Committee to amend the bill in two respects. Chairman CELLER filed a statement in opposition to the amendment. There have been no hearings in either House this year.

When we consider the attention that the framers of the Constitution gave to the question of equality of representation, when we consider the attention Congress has given this subject over the years, and when we consider the impact of the Supreme Court's decisions, particularly in recent times, it seems to me that the Senate cannot act without giving this problem more time and attention than it has given it so far. We should examine the full implications of this legislation. We should consider the interpretations which have been given to it both on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives, particularly in light of the fact that the House was under a 2-hour debate rule which precluded any amendments, so that the House had, in effect, to take it or leave it.

I think that we in this body have a serious and independent responsibility on this matter. While the principle of comity may have a proper application in some cases, I do not think this is one of them.

Much has been said on the floor of the Senate about the dramatic effect of this measure on the House of Representatives. It has been argued that the Senate, on the basis of comity, should be willing to go along with the judgment of the House, and be willing to surrender, in effect, its best judgment.

I reject that argument. Those who are going to be represented by Congressmen in their respective congressional districts are also our constituents, and they are entitled to our judgment on this matter which so closely affects their representation in Congress. They are also entitled to our judgment on the vital constitutional questions which are before us.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would indicate at this time that if we cannot clarify this bill on the floor, a motion to recommit the bill for hearings will be made during the course of the debate. I think that the case for this procedure is a convincing one. But I am hopeful that we will have some clarification of a number of these questions during the debate this morning, and thus will be able to act on the matter without undue delay.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, H.R. 2508, which we consider today——

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Does the Senator ask me to yield to him for a question or comment?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. For a statement.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thought the Senator from Massachusetts understood that.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from New York for a statement?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, H.R. 2508, which we consider today——

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. How much time does the Senator from New York want?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. How much time does the Senator from Massachusetts want to yield to me?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Twelve minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. President, H.R. 2508, which we consider today, is an anomalous proposal—in fact, one could say, an anachronism. It is anomalous because it is defended as a constructive development of statutory standards for the size and shape of congressional districts, when in fact it is ambiguous and confusing and, if anything, inconsistent with principles of sound apportionment.

It can be called anachronistic because there was a day—before Wesberry against Sanders was decided—when it would have been very much to the point. Then there were States where the largest congressional district was 352 percent more populous than the smallest. Again a disparity of that magnitude, the fight for fair congressional districting which Congressman CELLER began over 15 years ago was relevant and progressive. But events—decisions of the Supreme Court—have changed things, and now the fight for 35 percent is yesterday's fight.

What the Supreme Court did in Wesberry was declare:

> As nearly as it practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's.

And that declaration was found to be constitutionally required by the language of article I, section 2.

Overnight, the lonely and losing battle led by Chairman CELLER was won. Fair apportionment became a legal reality of the highest order—a matter of constitutional right. The legislative context changed accordingly. A statute requiring fair apportionment—or even nearly fair apportionment—became unnecessary. Indeed, any statute which would permit apportionment that does not meet the Supreme Court's standard became impermissible.

The Court's decision took hold. Under its mandate, State after State—some under court order and some not—has redrawn its congressional district lines to reduce population variations among the districts to reasonable dimensions. Only four States still have variations exceeding 35 percent.

Yet we stand on the Senate floor today debating a measure which apparently might permit States to retain variations of up to 35 percent. The Supreme Court has already struck down districting schemes where the variations were 21.9 and 22.9 percent, respectively, and it is seriously argued in the Congress of the United States that we can enact legislation which would overrule a principle of constitutional law and permit larger variations than the Supreme Court has already disallowed.

If H.R. 2508 means—as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]—for whom I have the greatest respect and regard—said it did 2 days ago on the Senate floor, and as others have said—that States are free to draw district lines allowing variations of up to 35 percent for the 1968 and 1970 elections, it is patently unconstitutional. If it means, as Chairman CELLER has suggested, only that no State shall exceed a variation of 35 percent, but that all districting schemes within the 35 percent are still totally subject to case-by-case review, then the legislation is valid, harmless and, in fact, pointless, since the Supreme Court has clearly already set a ceiling of far less than 35 percent.

Indeed, one of the particularly disturbing aspects of this proposed legislation is that its proponents do not agree among themselves on what it means. In the House, Congressman CELLER says it is not binding upon the courts, and in this body, Senator ERVIN contends that it will free the States to do as they wish up to the 35-percent ceiling. That is certainly an unsatisfactory way to legislate. If we do not adopt the limiting and clarifying amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts, we should, at the very least, recommit the bill for hearings in an effort to get its proponents to agree on what it is they are trying to accomplish.

Let me make clear that I personally do not regard the language of the bill as ambiguous. On its face, it seems clear to me that its meaning is that ascribed by Congressman CELLER. It simply says:

> The district with the largest population . . . shall not exceed by more than 35 percentum the district with the smallest population.

That says to me that all Congress is doing is enacting an outside limit, and that the power of the courts to review for their constitutionality schemes meeting the statutory standard is unchanged.

But I point out that there is a difference of opinion among proponents of the bill as to what the meaning of the legislation is, and I think that is extremely unsatisfactory.

Why, more particularly, am I concerned about the enactment of a 35-percent standard? The answer is that it invites litigation. It invites delay. It invites those who oppose application of the rule in Wesberry to use the statute and the remarks of some Members of Congress in debate as an excuse to avoid as long as possible any need to conform with the rule of substantial equality in population.

Consider the possibilities if H.R. 2508 is enacted in its present form:

State A still has a variation of 95.1 percent between its largest and smallest districts. Instead of waiting to be sued, it redistricts down to a variation of 35 percent, and then defends its action by pointing to H.R. 2508, or, more particularly, to those parts of the floor debate which seem to sustain the position that a 35-percent variation would now be permitted. If H.R. 2508 were not law, it might have redistricted at the outset in accordance with Wesberry. But with a 35-percent standard in the law, State A can, if it wishes, engage in a full-fledged litigative test of what the standard has done to Wesberry. The matter would probably go to the Supreme Court, and in the meantime State A would be home free at least for the 1968 election.

State B, with a court order to reapportion already outstanding, comes into court and says the court should vacate its order because State B's population variation is only 34.5 percent. Litigation ensues, the matter probably goes on up through the appellate process, and State B ends up being free to continue on, business as usual, at least through the 1968 election.

State C, with a variation of 34 percent but not subject to any court order, defends against new litigation brought against it by pointing to the 35-percent umbrella. Again, the question of the effect of the statute on the Wesberry rule could keep the case in the courts for years.

State D, with a variation of 5 percent among its districts, enacts legislation raising the variation to 35 percent, and defends against challenges to the validity of that action by pointing to the 35-percent standard. The same long appellate process is the next series of events here, too.

I believe firmly that every one of these States would lose in the Supreme Court when the matter was finally decided, but the delay and confusion in the meantime are intolerable.

By contrast, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts is a constructive application of the rule of Wesberry. It says that districts "shall contain substantially equal numbers of persons," and then lists standards—"contiguity, compactness, extraordinary natural boundaries, and the maintenance of the integrity of political subdivision lines"—which can justify a variation of up to 10 percent. This, I believe, is a sensible statement of congressional policy, one which aids the courts rather than confusing matters and inviting litigation. This, I believe, is a proposal which accords with the tradition of congressional concern for fair apportionment that was reflected in the statutes of 1872, 1901, and 1911, and in the battle which Congressman CELLER began many years ago. This, I believe, is a proposal which is neither anomalous nor anachronistic.

H.R. 2508 invites delay and litigation on another score as well. It says compactness of districts is to be judged by what "the State finds practicable." It will undoubtedly be argued in case after case that the Federal courts are thereby deprived of jurisdiction to decide whether States have gerrymandered their districts. I doubt whether the Supreme Court would hold ultimately that this language is explicit enough to remove a matter from the jurisdiction of the Federal courts. Again, however, the point is that delay and evasion of established constitutional principles prohibiting gerrymandering is invited. This is unfortunate, and the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts would clarify the matter by removing the offending language from the bill.

Let me add a word about the political realities which are also behind H.R. 2508. Existing apportionment patterns—both in terms of population variations and the way in which district lines are drawn—cause underrepresentation of the latest immigrants to our great cities: Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, and other groups who have moved to our inner cities in large numbers in recent years. Court-supervised adherence to the principles of equal representation all across our Nation would probably increase significantly the number of Congressmen who are closer to and more responsive to the interests of large urban minority groups. Delay in achieving fair apportionment will perpetuate this underrepresentation. Yet one of the most frustrating and explosive problems of the urban ghetto dweller—and particularly the ghetto Negro—today is his sense of powerlessness, his sense that he cannot communicate with those who govern him, his sense that no one is listening. To the extent that we delay his achieving representation that is constitutionally his right, we do a deep and grave injustice.

"Justice delayed is justice denied." The delay in fair apportionment of congressional districts which will be the inevitable result of H.R. 2508 has a human counterpart. The confusion and litigation which H.R. 2508 will surely spawn is of far more than abstract significance—it will cause a delay in the realization of a constitutional right for millions of Americans. We must not work such an injustice.

On examination, then, there is very little to say for H.R. 2508. That, no doubt, is the reason why it has received such extraordinary legislative treatment: no hearings this year in either body, debate in the House limited to 2 hours under a closed rule, consideration by a hastily appointed special subcommittee which met and reported the bill in the course of an afternoon. And that in turn is the reason why the public is generally unaware of the significance of this matter. But some newspapers have noticed it, and it is worth noting that H.R. 2508 has been criticized not only by the New York Times, the New York Post, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, but by more conservative papers as well—the entire Scripps-Howard chain, the Detroit News, the Knoxville, Tenn., Journal, the Nashville Tennessean, and many others.

It is in that context that I urge the Senate to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts. That is the responsible course of action for this body today.

Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I think this is an extremely important matter. It is a struggle that was carried on for many years by Representative CELLER. The Department of Justice was deeply concerned about the matter, too, and it was ultimately taken to the Supreme Court of the United States. The battle seemed to have been won. We seemed to be moving in the direction of one man, one vote not only in local but in congressional elections. The Supreme Court made it quite clear in which direction we should move.

This bill is a step backward, a step in retreat. It seems to me there is no adequate explanation of why we should take this step in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Is the Senator aware that Herbert Wechsler, a professor at Columbia University Law School, and also Robert McKay, dean of the New York University Law School, have filed letters commenting on the legislation which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] has introduced into the RECORD?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

These scholars filed comments on the provisions of H.R. 2508, and pointed out its defects, along the lines stated by the Senator from New York. What would the Senator from New York say as to the standing generally of these professors in the field of constitutional law?

Mr. **KENNEDY** of New York. They are very highly regarded as being among the most eminent constitutional scholars in the State of New York and the country, and they are recognized as such. Professor McKay is the author of a leading book on reapportionment.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. The Senator from New York, in the last part of his comments, referred to the fact that the whole trend has been toward providing greater equality of opportunity for voting and having one's vote count. I assume he was referring to such measures as the Voting Rights Act, for example, which insures the right to vote regardless of race, and the Senator's own amendment, which was upheld as constitutional by the Supreme Court, assuring the right of suffrage to Spanish-speaking voters? Also, through the joint efforts of the Congress and the Supreme Court, the poll tax has been struck down in recent years, thus ending economic discrimination in voting.

As I understand it, one of the points made by the Senator from New York is that the whole trend is moving in the direction of guaranteeing the value of one's vote. Certainly the Supreme Court has moved in that direction, and the Congress has a history of concern in this area, beginning with the years after the Civil War, and running up to the present.

I wonder if the Senator from New York is as troubled as I am that H.R. 2508 may, in effect, defer this constitutional right for another 4 years.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of New York. We have been moving in the direction to which the Senator referred. Legislation in the Congress has been moving in that direction and confirming that the individual has the right to vote, the right to be heard. The courts of the United States have upheld that right. Up to the passage of this legislation, that has been the trend in this country over the past 7 years. This legislation is a step backward. The whole idea has been that each man has one vote, and that he has a right to be heard; that his vote is going to mean as much in his district as in any other district, and that there is going to be equality. This legislation is a step backward. It means that a man's vote in one district can mean 35 percent more than in another district.

What possible argument can be made for that step? Should not we in the Senate and in the legislative branch be moving toward a standard under which everybody has his votes counted equally? Instead of moving in that direction, which has been the trend in this country over the past 6 or more years, and which has been the trend in the legislative branch and the judicial branch, if we pass this legislation we will be moving entirely in the other direction. Whose interests are we trying to protect in the Senate? Whom are we trying to defend? That is what I think is so important.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. I ask the Senator from New York whether he is equally as confused as I am on reading the language of the debate in the House of Representatives, as compared with that in the Senate. What, for example, would be the effect of the 35-percent provision in H.R. 2508? We have had statements here by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, as well as the Senator from Nebraska, as to the effect of this provision, and especially as to the effect it would have on court orders that were pending. We know there are many court orders pending, in a great number of States. The question would be whether this legislation would, in effect, nullify those court orders.

After reading the record of the floor discussion of the past few days, it would seem to me to be the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from North Carolina that the effect of this measure would be to state that the pending court orders would not be enforceable as such, to require that the State redistrict. I should say that the Senator from Nebraska admits that he has some doubts as to validity in the Supreme Court of this interpretation.

However, in reading the debate in the House of Representatives, I noted a question that was propounded by Representative BRADEMAS, as follows:

> The State of Indiana is presently under court order to revise the Congressional districts that were in effect for the 1966 Congressional elections. What effect would this legislation have on the State of Indiana?

Here is Chairman CELLER's reply:

> As I understand it, the court has ruled that the redistricting was not lawful and therefore your state must now redistrict * * *. Under those circumstances, the state would have to be redistricted and the redistricting would be done either by the state legislature or by the courts. Either one or the other must act, because the present lines have been declared illegal by the court.

Would the Senator from New York therefore agree that there is substantial confusion about the interpretation of H.R. 2508 with regard to its effect on court orders, when we find such great discrepancies between the interpretation put on it by the distinguished floor manager of this bill, the Senator from Nebraska, who has been extremely interested in it, and that of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. Is this not the kind of confusion that is of concern to the Senator from New York?

Mr. **KENNEDY** of New York. Yes, I think that there is a serious problem as to the interpretation of this proposed legislation, without question. It will mean a great deal of litigation in the courts. It will take many years of litigation to make a decision in each one of the cases, where there is a variation of 35 percent between one district and another district in a particular State.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. If the Senator will yield on that point, I think he has touched upon one of the most significant reasons for the support of the amendment which is now pending. It has been suggested in the earlier debate that the effect of H.R. 2508 would be to clarify for the Members of the House of Representatives whether, on the one hand, they would have to be redistricted, or would not have to be redistricted. Yet it would certainly appear to me that what we would really be doing is inviting a large number of public conflicts, court suits, and possibly successive redistrictings by the several legislatures, if this current legislation passes.

It is my belief that the amendment which is before us now would establish a very clear criterion in its requirements of equality, compactness, and contiguity, and its ceiling of 10-percent variation; and therefore, when we are talking about clarity, when we are talking about predictability, the pending amendment would actually provide for Members of the House of Representatives a much clearer standard by which to judge their own futures, insofar as the need for redistricting in their States is concerned.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of New York. I agree with the Senator. I think that passage of H.R. 2508, as it stands, would be to invite litigation in the courts and legislation in the various State legislatures across the country, and it would permit very inequitable and unfair systems to be reestablished, at least for a period of years, in congressional districting throughout the United States.

There cannot possibly be an argument in favor of permitting that kind of distinction between one district and another. There cannot be an argument in favor of it on the basis of equity and fairness to our citizens.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. How would the Senator respond to the point, which has been propounded by those who favor H.R. 2508, that this legislation is really transitory in nature, to bridge a gap that has existed for so many years, and all we are really doing is deferring until the 1972 election, the full effect of the Wesberry case and the other cases on districting; in other words that this is permissible because it is only a temporary action?

I wonder whether the Senator from New York would agree with me that the Swan against Adams case is very persuasive. In that case, which arose in Florida, the Supreme Court refused to permit the use of an admittedly unconstitutional 1965 districting plan for another 3 years, and ordered Florida to redistrict for the 1966 election. Does the Senator agree that this case really shows the importance that the U.S. Supreme Court places upon immediate fulfillment of the terms of its constitutional rulings?

Mr. **KENNEDY** of New York. I think that is true. The Supreme Court does place great stress upon it, if I may say so to the Senator from Massachusetts.

There really has not been any great difficulty for the States in meeting the standards established by the Supreme Court. The State legislatures have been able to do it over the past 6 years. There is no reason why it cannot also be done in our congressional districts. There is no reason why, in our congressional districts, we should not, as closely as possible, meet the standard of one-man, one-vote. This proposal takes us away from that. It is said that it is too difficult for the States, and it is going to take them another 4, 5, 6, or 7 years to do it. They should have done it years ago. Finally, the Supreme Court stepped in and did the job; and to try to intervene and delay the matter further is most unfair.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired. Does the Senator yield himself further time?

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. How much time do I have remaining?

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senator has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Is it the position, therefore, of the Senator from New York that by deferring the effectiveness of past Supreme Court decisions, we are in effect rewarding those States which have not acted to comply with the constitutional mandate?

Mr. **KENNEDY** of New York. Without any question. But it has been easy for the States to act, and they have been able to act, under other Supreme Court decisions affecting reapportionment of State legislatures. They have been able to act at the local level. The State of Georgia, the State involved in Wesberry, was able to act to reapportion its legislature from 203 percent down to 38 percent, and although that figure is probably not low enough, it demonstrates what can be done. Other States have been able to act over the past 4 or 5 years to achieve very much smaller deviations. It has made a major difference, enabling people to look to their State capitals and legislatures, rather than to Washington, all this time.

Many States have been able to rectify the situation in reapportioning at the State and local level, and there cannot be any argument, it seems to me, why, for congressional districts, we should wait for 10 years, except for the fact that it would affect people in Congress, in the House of Representatives. In effect, they are saying, "Now, this affects us, and we are going to pass special legislation permitting this delay."

It does not seem to me there is any adequate reason or explanation why the delay should take place.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator for his observations on this legislation. I think they are extremely important and helpful, especially since he was the Attorney General of the United States who argued the case on the Georgia redistricting bill, and has considerable experience in this area.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. **ERVIN**. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **ERVIN**. Mr. President, my good friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], said that Georgia had no trouble in redistricting under the one-man, one-vote decision.

It did redistrict, but when it redistricted it had a variation of 38.2 percent between the largest district and the smallest district in the State. They did not seem to be able to get under the one-man, one-vote rule.

I was rather intrigued by the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] to the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] that those who favor the pending measure ought to agree on the interpretations of all of the provisions of the bill. When the Supreme Court handed down the one-man, one-vote decision, in every case the Supreme Court was unable to agree on what the meaning of the Constitution was.

The suggestion was that the Supreme Court will not tolerate a delay in the one-man, one-vote ruling for 4 years.

The Supreme Court delayed for 175 years in even handing down a decision on this point. So, a tribunal which would delay for 175 years ought to have enough patience to allow a little congressional delay of 4 years, I would think.

The substitute would be a good bill to support if one believed that the affairs of Congress should be run by a judicial oligarchy. However, the purpose of the original bill was to set some definite congressional standards.

The substitute on page 2 provides that instead of allowing the States to determine what is reasonable compactness, that power will be delegated to the court. Then it provides in line 12 that each State shall have a substantially equal number of people in each district.

There is no definition of what that means. It leaves that to the court to determine.

Then it provides that there can be reasonable deviations in order to take into consideration the factors of contiguity, extraordinary national boundaries and the maintenance of the integrity of political subdivision lines, but only if such criteria are uniformally applied.

How can we apply uniform criteria to something that is not uniform?

There is no political subdivision in the United States that is identical in either State, size, or population. We have to treat them all uniformally. So, there is more uncertainty.

If the Constitution requires one man, one vote, then I would have to say that the substitute measure is unconstitutional because it allows a variation of 10 percent. That would allow one man to have a vote worth 110 percent and another man to have a vote that is worth only 90 percent.

That illustrates the absurdity of this ruling and is why Justice Frankfurter said that the Supreme Court ought never to have entered this political thicket. That is why Justices Harlan and Clark and Stewart said that there is nothing in the Constitution that requires the election of Representatives on a one-man, one-vote basis.

My friends, the Senators from Massachusetts and New York, share my admiration for Representative CELLER.

Representative CELLER had this to say with respect to the pending measure. He said that there must be some compactness. He said that he has been working on this for years trying to get congressional standards established.

He voted for the pending measure, and he spoke for it. His committee reported it. He had this to say:

> When we contemplate the history of this legislation and the difficulties we have had in getting anything through, we have to recognize that we have to give something and that we cannot in one fell swoop say, "It must be 10 percent."
>
> I sort of feel, if I may use the term, like Sisyphus in the Greek mythology, who was trying to push a boulder up over a steep hill. Every time he got near the top of the hill, the boulder would fall upon him and down he would go with the huge rock. I have been trying and trying to get a bill through for 20 years, and I am now near the top. I hope, with the help of Members, I can push this boulder over the hill. I think I can, because we have a reasonable proposition.
>
> Again I say we cannot satisfy everyone, but I believe, in a measure, we can go reasonably far enough to satisfy most of the Members of the House.
>
> I hope the bill will pass.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **ERVIN**. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. **ERVIN**. Mr. President, the pending measure passed the House by a vote of 289 to 63.

Under the substitute bill, there are 45 States that have more than one Representative. Thirty-three of those States would have to redistrict under the substitute measure prior to the primaries next spring.

This demonstrates that it would compound more confusion than ever if we were to pass the substitute bill.

It would require the calling back of legislatures which have adjourned.

For that reason, the substitute ought to be voted down.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina referred to the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Representative CELLER. The first comment I would make on that is that Chairman CELLER strongly opposed some of the changes made by the full House committee and adopted by the House, particularly the language which weakened the compactness provision. My second point would be that the bill we are considering is substantially different from that passed by the House in important respects.

The most important change in the bill was the change from 30 to 35 percent. I believe that to be a most significant change from the House bill, although I also feel that 30 percent would be unreasonable and unjustified.

Mr. CELLER's opposition to the present compactness language speaks for itself;

certainly the Senator from Massachusetts need not comment on it.

In the comments that have been made with regard to the substitute amendment, the question has been raised as to whether the proposal establishes standards that can be applied effectively and equitably.

I feel that these standards are not only clear but clearly constitutional. They draw heavily on the language of the Supreme Court which is direct and precise. They therefore set a quite clear standard for drafting or drawing up congressional districts.

In the case of *Swann* v. *Adams*, 385 U.S. 440, for example, it was stated:

> *De minimus* deviations are unavoidable, but variations of 30% * * * and 40% * * * can hardly be deemed *de minimus* and none of our cases suggests that differences of this magnitude will be approved without a satisfactory explanation grounded on acceptable state policy. On the contrary, the *Reynolds* opinion limited the allowable deviations to those minor variations which "are based on legitimate considerations incident to the effectuation of a rational state policy." 377 U.S. 533, 579.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

I continue to read from the case of Swann against Adams:

> Thus that opinion went on to indicate that variations from a pure population standard might be justified by such state policy considerations as the integrity of political subdivisions, the maintenance of compactness and contiguity in legislative districts or the recognition of natural or historical boundary lines. Likewise, in *Roman* v. *Sincock*, 377 U.S. 695, 710, the Court stated that the Constitution permits "such minor deviations only as may occur in recognizing certain factors that are free from any taint of arbitrariness or discrimination." [*Swann* v. *Adams*, 385 U.S. 440, 444 (1967)].

Those cases establish standards that, I think, are readily employable. I wonder in how many instances in the United States Code the word "reasonable" is used, and is interpreted by the courts? And I note that H.R. 2508 uses the word, too.

I feel it would be helpful for us, in the light of recent court opinions, to establish the kind of standards which will enable us to fulfill our responsibility under the Constitution.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

May I ask the distinguished occupant of the chair how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the call of the quorum not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment (No. 202).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time allotted to the proponents of the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts. The Chair informs the Senator from Massachusetts that the Senator from North Carolina has yielded back the remainder of his time on the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nineteen minutes. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would like to suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I hate to object, but I am constrained to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina has yielded back all his time; is that correct?

Mr. ERVIN. I yielded back the remainder of my time on the amendment; yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. On the amendment itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has yielded back his time on the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask that we have a quorum call, a live quorum. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighteen minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. To whom will the time for a live quorum be charged?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for the quorum will be charged to the time the Senator has left.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. So that it will not depend upon the will of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask for a quorum call and allow 5 minutes for that purpose.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, if a live quorum is requested and it takes more than the 18 minutes remaining to the Senator from Massachusetts to establish a quorum, will not the additional time be charged to the time on the bill to achieve the live quorum?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, could I ask for a live quorum to be charged to the time on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator could not. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the Senator from Massachusetts does not have control of time on the bill. He controls only the time on the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senator that if he needs more than 5 minutes to accomplish what he has asked, I will give him time on the bill. I believe some of the time is allocated to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum call has been asked for. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I ask for a live quorum.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 129 Leg.]

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hartke
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Lousiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is necessarily absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOSS in the chair) A quorum is present.

All time on the amendment of the

Senator from Massachusetts has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] and 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I spoke the day before yesterday on this bill and on the proposal by the senior Senator from Massachusetts to amend and change the provisions of section 2 to reduce from 35 to 10 percent the permissible variation between the largest and smallest congressional districts in a State.

I have supported this substitute amendment because I thoroughly agree with the principle which supports it—that is, that the Constitution, good judgment, and equity require that the Federal House of Representatives be apportioned as nearly as practicable according to the concept of one man, one vote.

I intend to vote for the amendment of the senior Senator from Massachusetts. In the event the amendment fails—and I very much hope it does not fail—I intend to propose to the Senate a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to hold hearings and to report to the Senate not later than September 8. This motion will be cosponsored by my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

The purpose of this move, in the event the amendment fails, will be to point out the fact—and to give the Senate an opportunity to act on the fact—that we have not had hearings, nor have we had an opportunity or a forum for those who have contrary views to be heard and to make their record.

Since March 1964, a month after the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in Wesberry against Sanders, in both the House and the Senate there has been only 1 day of hearings. And on that day only two Congressmen testified on this vitally important legislation.

This is no indictment or criticism of the membership or of any committee of either House of Congress, except that I believe it points up the fact that there has been insufficient consideration of the substantial conflict, disagreement, and variation of viewpoints in this matter. it does not require much discussion to demonstrate that a matter of this supreme importance should be the subject of extended committee hearings and further debate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I intend to join the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in respect of this amendment, for this reason: Justice delayed is justice denied, and that is the situation we face here.

I believe that the additional element of negating so much that the courts have done, if we pass this bill and seek a new confrontation with the Supreme Court, which in my judgment cannot possibly go along with the 35 percent variation, represents the case for supporting the proposed amendment.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator from New York.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask that I be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, one of the arguments on which the Senator from Nebraska most heavily relied on Tuesday was that 33 States will have to redistrict under amendment No. 202. But the fact is that 5 of these States are over 35 percent and will have to redistrict, even under the loosest interpretation of the committee bill. Nine of these States, are already under court order to redistrict and will have to comply by 1968 even under H.R. 2508, as interpreted by Mr. CELLER. There is a court challenge pending in one more of these States, with a variation over the 21.9 percent level invalidated by the Supreme Court, and the State officials have recognized that they will have to redistrict whatever we do. In another State with an even higher variance, a court suit is imminent. Thus, half of the States referred to by the Senator will probably have to redistrict before the 1968 election no matter what we do. If one-half have to redistrict, why should not the other half have to do so?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield for a question.

Mr. GORE. If all must redistrict to meet a requirement of the Constitution, is that a logical argument against compliance?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Absolutely not. As the question of the Senator from Tennessee suggests, those of us who will support this amendment feel there should be compliance, and it should not be delayed.

Mr. President, if we consider H.R. 2508 on the basis of its merit, we are faced with a measure by which some seek to defer constitutional rights that have been clearly articulated by the Constitution and Supreme Court decisions. And we do not know what will happen in 1968 or in 1970. Perhaps the House of Representatives and the Senate might change so dramatically by that time that we would decide to defer the matter for 4 years more or 6 years more. This is and would be a dilatory tactic, and I feel the amendment which I have introduced would bring to bear the best judgment of the Senate to see that there is compliance with the Supreme Court decisions.

I feel that with the amendment that is before us today, we would not only do a great deal to eliminate the litigation, but that we would also discourage gerrymandering of congressional districts. As I have said, I feel that with the passage of H.R. 2508 we would, in effect be inviting a number of court suits, because it has been so widely and differently interpreted here and in the House of Representatives. But we also would be inviting gerrymandering by many States. States might think that they would be permitted to gerrymander as long as they complied with the 35-percent rule.

I believe, contrary to what has been suggested, that the amendment would provide predictability for the House of Representatives, since they would know upon the passage of this legislation whether they will have to redistrict or not.

It is clear, concise, and takes into consideration the vital facts of compactness, contiguity, and the variation between the highest and lowest districts, and brings to bear an immediacy which those of us who support this approach feel is of the utmost importance.

In light of these facts, I urge the Senate to accept the amendment.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I have had an opportunity to hear the Senator from Massachusetts explain his position before the Senate as well as in the Committee on the Judiciary.

Is the Senator at all concerned about the equity of the position in which we find ourselves, where certain States, Michigan and Maryland—two States that I recall—have been forced to and have, indeed, reapportioned down to less than 5 percent at some considerable inconvenience, and yet by the passage of a 35-percent tolerance, we would be subjecting other States to an entirely different set of circumstances?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). All time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the minority yield me 2 minutes on the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts may be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. There are, of course, two other States, Tennessee and North Carolina, which are in the process of compliance at or below the 5-percent level, and it does seem to me a number of other States are attempting to do what they can to comply. But H.R. 2508 would reward those States that have not addressed themselves to the problem by deferring their obligation to comply for 4 years more, if interpreted as some suggest. Other States have complied and will comply and this compliance should be recognized. We certainly should not defer compliance for a substantial period of time for those who have already lagged behind.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] (No. 202). The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr.

Gruening], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] is necessarily absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 130 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Baker
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dodd
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Smith
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—39

Allott
Anderson
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Curtis
Dirksen
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Hartke
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Montoya
Murphy
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—17

Aiken
Bartlett
Dominick
Eastland
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
McCarthy
McClellan
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Pell
Randolph
Tower

So the amendment of Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts (No. 202) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is not open to amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not a question of amendment. The proceedings have been very noisy. I wanted to make a motion to reconsider.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state his point of order.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Must a Senator who makes that motion be on the prevailing side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He must have voted with the prevailing side.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to reconsider. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Chair restore the Senate to order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish to make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. A parliamentary inquiry? I understand this is a motion to reconsider. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. So a "yea" vote would be a vote to reconsider the previous vote. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. And a "nay" vote would be a vote to oppose reconsideration of the previous vote. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. So, as I understand it, Senators who supported the amendment we just voted on would vote "nay" in order to maintain their previous vote. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is an interpretation which each Senator will have to make for himself.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan] would vote yea.

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote yea and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote nay.

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote nay and the Senator from South Carolina would vote yea.

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote yea and the Senator from West Virginia would vote nay.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] is necessarily absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 43, as follows:

[No. 131 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Allott
Anderson
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Curtis
Dirksen
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Hansen
Hartke

Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Montoya
Murphy
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—43

Baker
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dodd
Gore
Griffin
Harris
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Smith
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—19

Aiken
Bartlett
Dominick
Eastland
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hollings
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
McCarthy
McClellan
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Pell
Randolph
Scott
Tower

So the motion to reconsider was rejected.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 2508) was read the third time.

Several Senators asked for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senate will be in order. Do the majority leader and the minority leader yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** I yield back the remainder of my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does the minority leader yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. President.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** All remaining time having been yielded back, and the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

Mr. **KUCHEL.** I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] is necessarily absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 132 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dodd
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hartke
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—25

Bennett
Brooke
Byrd, Va.
Curtis
Dirksen
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Murphy
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—18

Aiken
Bartlett
Dominick
Eastland
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hollings
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
McCarthy
McClellan
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Pell
Randolph
Tower

So the bill (H.R. 2508) was passed.

Mr. **ERVIN.** Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Eastland, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Dirksen, and Mr. Hruska conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, the Senate is most grateful to the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr Ervin] for the splendid cooperation and outstanding manner exhibited by his handling of this measure. Although the formula contained in the bill reported by the committee was modified, that fact in no way negates the tireless efforts of Senator Ervin in attempting to resolve a very serious problem that has arisen concerning the establishment of guidelines in connection with congressional apportionment. We thank Senator Ervin for his efforts, for his devotion, and for his splendid cooperation.

We also thank the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] for bringing forth an amendment which contained a more acceptable formula. In doing so, he demonstrated his vast appreciation of the problems involved. His able presentation assured its success. He, along with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Baker], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and others, is to be commended for demonstrating the immense propriety of the formula advocated. Others too played a vital role in the discussion of this measure. I refer particularly to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and of course to the able and distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen]. The entire Senate demonstrated a high degree of cooperation in disposing of this measure and for this we are deeply grateful.

Mr. **SPONG.** Mr. President, I wish at this time to state the reasons for my opposition to the amendment offered by Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts to H.R. 2508 and for my vote against this legislation as amended.

First, I would like to make clear my support for the general purpose of this legislation—the establishment by Congress of standards governing the creation of congressional districts. From the beginning Congress has had this responsibility, however infrequently it has met its charge over the years. Because Congress neglected this responsibility the Federal courts in a series of recent rulings have set standards for congressional districts and have brought about the redistricting of many of our States, including my own State of Virginia. Under these circumstances it is incumbent on Congress that it act in setting standards for congressional districts.

Second, I believe that the Congress, in setting standards for congressional redistricting, must adopt criteria that are fair and reasonable, and as consonant as possible with the concept of equitable representation.

As reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, H.R. 2508 provided temporary criteria to govern the congressional districts for the 91st and 92d Congresses and permanent criteria to cover the 93d and subsequent Congresses. The temporary criteria provided that within a State the district with the largest population could not exceed by more than 35 percent the district with the smallest population. I believe that a variance of 35 percent is far too great to pass either the test of fairness or of constitutionality.

Under the permanent criteria established under H.R. 2508, the allowable population variance between the largest and smallest district within a State was 10 percent. Senator KENNEDY's amendment established immediately the permissible population variance within a State at the 10-percent figure. I am not offended by the setting of a limit of 10 percent on the population variance between congressional districts within a State, in fact I find it a reasonable and obtainable figure.

My objection to this amendment does not imply any unfairness or unreasonableness to this figure. I object because it penalizes Virginia and other States in a like situation. In 1965, Virginia, under court order, reorganized its congressional districts so that presently there is only a variance of 11.2 percent between the population of the largest and smallest district. This redistricting was done in good faith and within limits acceptable to the Federal courts. Moreover, the people of Virginia have been satisfied with its fairness.

Under H.R. 2508 as amended the Virginia General Assembly may have to redistrict the State before the next congressional election to eliminate a discrepancy of only 1.2 percent between the largest and the smallest district in population in order to meet the figure of 10 percent. I believe this is an unreasonable requirement that punishes a State that has in good faith achieved a reasonable and legally acceptable population equivalence between its congressional districts. This is especially unfair since Virginia will have to redistrict again after the 1970 census. It is because of this unfairness and not out of any disregard for the concept of equality of representation that I voted against the Kennedy amendment and H.R. 2508 as amended.

H.R. 2508 as amended now goes to conference with the House and it is my hope that the conferees will report to the Senate legislation that provides for a population variance percentage that meets the tests of fairness and legality and yet does not punish Virginia or other States that have in good faith established substantial equality between the population of their congressional districts.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished majority leader whether there will be a change in the program as announced yesterday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, it had been anticipated that we would take up the U.S. information and exchange program and also the bill having to do with the public election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands. However, because of unforeseen circumstances involving the Senators most interested in these measures, it will not be advisable to do so at this time.

It would be hoped that we could take up both measures on Monday next.

It is the intention of the leadership this afternoon to call up H.R. 6431, a bill to amend the public health laws relating to mental health; to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes, and H.R. 4717, an act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of Memphis State University.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock Monday morning next.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that will abrogate the previous order to adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is correct.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH LAWS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 284, H.R. 6431.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6431) to amend the public health laws relating to mental health, to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the pending bill simply extends our programs for the construction of mental health centers without any changes in the program except for one minor change. That change is merely that the definition of the term construction is amended to permit the acquisition of existing buildings in the case of community mental health centers. For example, if there is already a building that would serve well the purpose of a community mental health center, a new building does not have to be built. The existing building can be taken over.

There is no other change. The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and was passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 353 to 0.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished chairman of the committee for bringing up the bill at this time for the purpose of extending, expanding, and improving the mental health centers.

Our State has taken advantage of this program. The program has been working nicely. I hope that the pending measure will be of advantage to many States in addition to our own State.

I commend the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his kind remarks. If there is no further question, I ask for third reading.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 6431) was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS OWNED BY THE UNITED STATES TO THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 283, H.R. 4717.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be read by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4717) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "constituting", to insert "a portion of"; and on page 2, line 2, after the word "containing", to strike out "146" and insert "129".

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am grateful for the action of the committee in recommending this bill. I call to the attention of the Senate its very meritorious character.

In its present form, the bill provides for a transfer to the Memphis State University of 129 acres together with improvements thereon. The need for this is pressing. Memphis State University has had a very rapid growth. It is now an institution of some 15,000 students, with promise that it will be a much larger university year by year. Indeed, it is destined, in my view, to become the largest university in the entire Midsouth. It serves primarily Tennesseans, but to a great extent it is becoming a regional institution, serving the youth of surrounding States, and is attracting students also from abroad. It is crowded on its present campus. The need for expansion—and room for expansion—is urgent.

It so happens that an adjacent veterans facility is no longer adequate for hospitalization, and the veterans hospital has been replaced by a new structure which is soon to be dedicated. The bill provides that 129 acres of the 146 acres involved in the veterans facility be transferred, without cost. These 129 acres were contributed to the Federal Government by the city of Memphis and the State of Tennessee, originally.

This leaves some few acres now owned by the Veterans' Administration which will be disposed of by the usual procedure of the disposition of surplus Government property. I take it that in due course, Memphis State University will acquire this additional small acreage if it is needed.

The justification for this bill, which makes an exception to the usual procedures for the disposition of surplus property, is a matter of time. The area for expansion is needed immediately. Therefore, my distinguished junior colleague and I joined in the introduction of this bill early in the session. I consider it a matter of particular pride that this was the first bill in which Senator BAKER and I joined in cosponsorship. I am pleased that the matter has come to this point of passage. I am grateful for the consideration the committee has given and the Senate is now giving to this measure.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished senior colleague for his kind remarks about our cosponsorship of this bill. I wish to state for the information of the Senate and for the RECORD my gratitude to my senior colleague. I think he has viewed this matter in the best interests not only of the Memphis State University and Shelby County, but also of all the people of Tennessee and the southeastern part of the country.

Testimony given before the committee was sound and well received. The committee report is self-explanatory. The reconveyance of this property, which the bill recites—and the committee report provides the reconveyance of this property which was first conveyed by a local governing unit to the United States—will substantially enhance prospects for the future growth of this great university system. It is a matter that is very meritorious on that basis and certainly promotes increased educational opportunity for a greater number of Americans not only in Tennessee but throughout the entire area.

Mr. President, I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 4717 as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 4717) was read the third time and passed.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, covering the first quarter of 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings by revising procedures relating to the default of guaranteed housing loans in the State of Illinois, Veterans' Administration, dated June 1967 (with an accompanying report; to the Committee on Government Operations.

LEGISLATION TO PERMIT THE WEARING OF THE BADGE OR UNIFORM OF THE LETTER CARRIER UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1730 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the uniform or badge of the letter-carrier branch of the postal service be worn in theatrical, television, or motion-picture productions under certain circumstances (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 67

"A concurrent resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States and the Louisiana congressional delegation with respect to an increase in the amount of the personal and dependent exemptions under the Federal income tax

"Whereas, the amount allowed under the Federal Income Tax as a deduction for personal and dependent exemptions has been fixed at $600 per person for a number of years, and

"Whereas, during recent years there has been a continuous increase in the cost of living, as reflected by the Consumer Price Index and, in fact, said Consumer Price Index has risen more than ten points since 1961, and approximately one-half of such increase has occurred during the last two years, and

"Whereas, the effects of inflation are being felt more and more by the citizens and taxpayers of Louisiana, and some much needed relief therefrom could be granted to the citizens of this great Nation through an increase in the amount of the personal and dependents exemptions under the Federal Income Tax,

"Therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana, the House thereof concurring, that the Congress of the United States and the Louisiana Congressional Delegation are hereby memorialized, urged and requested to make such steps as are necessary to enact legislation to increase the amount allowed under the Federal Income Tax as a deduction for personal and dependent exemptions from $600 per person to $1,000 per person.

"Be it further resolved that certified copies of this Resolution shall be transmitted without delay to the presiding officers of the two houses of the United States Congress and to each member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 61

"A concurrent resolution to urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide that the State of Louisiana shall receive from year to year an amount equal to 37½ per centum of the royalties derived from mineral production received by the Federal government from the area lying between the southern boundary of the State of Louisiana and the southern extremity of the continental shelf of the United States.

"Whereas, a controversy exists between the state of Louisiana and the government of the United States concerning the ownership of certain offshore areas, but the ownership of lands beyond the southern boundary of the state of Louisiana and the southern extremity of the continental shelf is not in contest, and

"Whereas, the United States receives royalties and other revenues deriving from mineral production in this undisputed area, and

"Whereas, the mineral operations from which these royalties are derived are greatly dependent upon and, in fact, in large measure would be impossible without many valuable services and facilities furnished by the state of Louisiana and its people including but not limited to fresh water necessary for drilling operations, port and harbor facilities and the labor of personnel engaged in the hazardous occupation of seeking and extracting mineral resources, and

"Whereas, the health, welfare, safety, recreation and other requirements of persons employed in the operations from which these revenues are derived, and the education of their children, are matters of great concern and expense to the state of Louisiana, and

"Whereas, under existing federal law a portion of the royalties and other revenues received from mineral production on inland areas are remitted to the several states in which the lands from which production is had are located, and

"Whereas, these royalties and revenues are remitted to the several states in large measure, in consideration for the valuable services and facilities furnished by the states to the mineral production industry, and

"Whereas, the state of Louisiana furnishes similar and perhaps even greater services to the offshore mineral production industry, and

"Whereas, it is only just and equitable that the state of Louisiana receive a portion of the royalties and other revenues in partial compensation for the invaluable services, personnel, raw materials and facilities which it provides, and without which these offshore drilling operations would be rendered immeasurably more difficult and far less profitable than is now the case.

"Therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana, the House of Representatives thereof concurring herein, that the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully urged and requested to take such steps as are necessary in the immediate future to enact legislation providing that the state of Louisiana shall receive from year to year an amount equal to 37½ per centum of the royalties hereafter received each year by the United States from mineral production in that area lying between the southern boundary of the state of Louisiana and the southern extremity of the continental shelf of the United States, said royalties being those over and above those funds now held in escrow pending settlement of the 'tidelands' dispute between the state of Louisiana and the United States.

"Be It Further Resolved that certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution shall be transmitted without delay to the presiding officers of the two houses of the United States Congress and to each member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 75

"A concurrent resolution to urge and request that the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, take such action as may be calculated to prevent the disruption of the educational program in the public schools of Louisiana which can be expected to result from the precipitous enforcement of the guidelines issued by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

"Whereas, Drastic and sudden changes in the administration and operation of the public schools of Louisiana which will follow as a consequence of the guidelines issued by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and of the subsequent Court decrees upholding and enforcing the said guidelines, and

"Whereas, The enforcement of the aforementioned guidelines is even now jeopardizing the recruitment of qualified teachers for the public schools of Louisiana, and

"Whereas, Much damage to teacher morale has resulted from the announcement that existing contracts negotiated in good faith between school boards and public school teachers are to be abrogated as a consequence of recent Court decisions, and

"Whereas, Many competent and dedicated teachers can be expected to resign or retire as a result of the uncertainties and disruption attendant upon the enforcement of the aforementioned guidelines, and a sufficient number of competent replacements cannot be found, and

"Whereas, The objective of the public school system is to provide the best possible education for all students, and

"Whereas, The attainment of this objective will be thwarted as a result of the enforcement by the Courts of the guidelines issued by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and

"Whereas, The damage to and disruption of the public school system will have an adverse effect upon the quality of education offered all students, including those whom the guidelines seek to benefit,

"Therefore be it resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana, the House of Representatives concurring herein, That the Legislature of Louisiana does urge and request of the President, the Congress of the United States, and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that appropriate action be taken to modify the guidelines of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, particularly in such respects as may prevent the sudden and serious loss of large numbers of qualified teachers in the public school system of Louisiana and the attendant damage to the education of the children of this state, and

"Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of the Senate shall transmit, without delay, copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each of the two Houses in Congress, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to each member of the Louisiana Delegation in Congress."

A telegram, in the nature of a petition, praying for the Government to honor its commitments to the State of Israel, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 1566. A bill to amend sections 3 and 4 of the act approved September 22, 1964 (78 Stat. 990), providing for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans (Rept. No. 295).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 88. A joint resolution authorizing the operation of an amateur radio station by participants in the XII World Boy Scout Jamboree at Farragut State Park, Idaho, August 1 through August 9, 1967 (Rept. No. 296).

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 135); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Ninetieth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 1924. A bill for the relief of Antonio Costanzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1925. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Martinez Serrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1926. A bill to provide that section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 shall not apply to candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, U.S. Senator and Representatives, and Governor of any State; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. PASTORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF (for himself, Mr. Moss and Mr. MCGEE):

S. 1927. A bill to pay the States for a portion of the expenses incurred by them in providing workmen's compensation benefits on account of claims for or on behalf of individuals who, as a result of employment in the mining, handling, or processing of uranium, suffer injury, disablement, or death from the effects of radiation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. METCALF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 1928. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nasser Javadpour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1929. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Legislative Evaluation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. RIBICOFF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1930. A bill to enable the Secretary of State to make such changes in the higher ranking personnel of the Department of State as he deems advisable; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S.J. Res. 89. A joint resolution designating July 1, 1967, as "Tom Sawyer Day, U.S.A."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Missouri when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 135) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JACKSON, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO PROVIDE THAT SECTION 315 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 SHALL NOT APPLY TO CANDIDATES FOR OFFICES OF PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, U.S. SENATOR, REPRESENTATIVE, AND GOVERNOR OF ANY STATE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, during the consideration of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, a number of Senators raised the question about modifying section 315 of the Communications Act, the so-called equal time provision, so as to require broadcasters to provide free time to candidates for political office.

My subcommittee has held extensive hearings on this subject on numerous occasions. Except for the temporary suspension of section 315 in 1960 with respect to presidential and vice-presidential candidates, the Congress has not enacted legislation on this point.

In 1963 I introduced a bill that would suspend section 315 insofar as the candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, U.S. Senator or House of Representatives, and the Governor of any State. Needless to say, there were not sufficient votes to pass this legislation.

In view of the renewed interest in this subject, I am today reintroducing a bill which would exempt from the application of section 315 the candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, and the Governor of any State.

In 1963 I invited the Governors of the 50 States to submit their views in connection with the committee's consideration of this legislation. Almost everyone who commented was in favor of modifying section 315 so as to remove the shackles from the broadcasters.

I intend to offer the same invitation to the Governors this year when hearings are scheduled.

I know that there are those who have strong feelings on the equal time provision. I hope that they will make their views known to the committee when hearings are held. It is my intention to afford every person who makes a request an opportunity to appear personally or to submit his view for the record.

I ask that the editorial that appeared in the June 4, 1967, issue of the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD at this point and I direct your attention to the last paragraph which reads as follows:

> In our view, a renewed drive ought to be made to repeal Section 315 this year before the 1968 campaigns begins to heat up. It has not made television and radio available to candidates on an equitable basis; it has merely denied free broadcasts to all alike. This is the negation of enlightened policy. The least Congress could do would be to allow broadcasters to schedule serious political discussion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 1967]

SECTION 315 AGAIN

While Congress is discussing the problem of campaign financing, it should address itself once more to Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act. This is the arbitrary and unworkable provision which requires a broadcaster, if he gives free time on television or radio to the major political candidates, to give equal time to fringe candidates whom no one wishes to hear. A well intended but mischievous restriction has deprived the country of much meaningful discussion over the air.

In 1960 Section 315 was temporarily suspended with respect to presidential and vice presidential candidates so as to permit the Kennedy-Nixon debates. As a result, the major networks gave eight hours and six minutes of prime free time to each of the major parties. Four years later there was no suspension of Section 315. As a result, the Republicans got only 51 minutes of free time on the major networks and the Democrats only 27 minutes.

Senators Clark and Gore have taken the lead in advocating that Congress require broadcasters to provide free time to candidates for office as a condition of renewal of their licenses. The record suggests, however, that a large amount of free time would be given to candidates voluntarily if Congress merely permitted the broadcasters to do it, under a general principle of fairness. They cannot do it while in the strait-jacket which the present law fastens upon them.

In our view, a renewed drive ought to be made to repeal Section 315 this year before the 1968 campaigns begin to heat up. It has not made television and radio available to candidates on an equitable basis; it has merely denied free broadcasts to all alike. This is the negation of enlightened policy. The least Congress could do would be to allow broadcasters to schedule serious political discussion.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am hopeful that Congress will see fit to enact legislation on this issue in this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAKER in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1926) to provide that section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 shall not apply to candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, U.S. Senator and Representatives, and Governor of any State, introduced by Mr. PASTORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

BILL TO REIMBURSE THE STATES HALF THE COST OF CLAIMS UNDER WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAWS FROM OR ON BEHALF OF INDIVIDUALS SUSPECTED OF HAVING SUFFERED INJURY, DISABILITY, OR DEATH FROM THE EFFECT OF URANIUM RADIATION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to reimburse the States from Federal funds half the cost of claims that may arise under their respective workmen's compensation laws from or on behalf of those who have suffered injury, disability, or death from the effect of overexposure to uranium radiation.

I do so with the knowledge that we are already too late in moving to solve a problem which at first sight seems to be a peculiar mix, having in it mutually exclusive elements. For it involves the imperative need for a material with a vital bearing on our security and defense; the safety and well-being of the brave and industrious men who are mining it for the Nation; and an uncoordinated approach by State governments concerned, resulting largely from an insufficient realization of the gravity of the situation as it exists, lack of uniformity in laws governing workmen's compensation and paucity of funds at the disposal of States. My bill is the end product of serious thought on how to reconcile these various elements and come to grips with the problem by drawing attention to its existence.

The provisions of the bill are simple enough: it authorizes the Secretary of Labor to pay to each State from funds appropriated for the purpose of the bill, an amount equal to one-half of the expenditure incurred by the State in payment of compensation, under its workmen's compensation law, an account of injuries, disabilities, or deaths which are sustained by workmen who are or were employed in the mining, handling, or processing of uranium, and which are caused by or result from uranium radiation. He shall do so in prescribed installments with the discretion to make such adjustments in regard to advance payment or overpayment as circumstances warrant. The authority, as at present envisioned in my bill, will extend up to a period of 10 years.

Behind this bill are some interesting facts regarding the nature and growth of the uranium mining industry—an industry that will decide and sustain the extent of our supremacy in the nuclear field—and the human problems that are the inevitable concomitants of that growth.

This country recognized the value of uranium-vanadium as early as the turn of the century and mines were opened in the Uravan Mineral belt portion of the Colorado Plateau in western Colorado and eastern Utah. At that time, the main importance of the ore was as a ceramic coloring agent and for radium found in association with uranium. Stiff foreign competition forced closure of most of these mines by the time depression set in.

With the discovery of the importance of uranium for nuclear power, the mining of the ore assumed a tremendous importance and many private entrepreneurs enthusiastically made the necessary investments to meet the rapidly rising demand. The AEC, which is almost the only buyer of the metal, started with a modest purchase of 232,000 pounds of U_3O_8 in 1948, but the requirements rocketed in geometric progression, registering an alltime high of 35½ million pounds in 1961 and leveling off in the range of 20 million pounds in recent years.

As of 1966, there were 621 uranium mines, of which 275 were in Colorado and 173 in Utah. The balance were distributed among New Mexico, Wyoming, Montana, and other States. They produced a total of 4.4 million tons of ore, or 19.6 million pounds of U_3O_8. Not all these mines are underground mines—which, more than the open-pit category, contribute to the dangers of overexposure to radiation. But the number of these underground mines is sufficiently large—533 out of a total of 621—with a production ratio of 3 to 1 in relation to the open-pit variety both in regard to the ore and U_3O_8—to justify our concern. And this concern increases when we remember that as of 1966, 2,545 men were engaged in working the underground mines, as against 359 in the open pit. It is as well that we bear these figures in mind while assessing the dimension of the problem of exposure of the uranium miners to radiation.

I need not unduly belabor the obvious hazards from radiation that working in underground uranium mines entails. These hazards are no novel or recent discovery but have been known to exist at least from the middle of the last century when first accounts of widespread lung cancer among miners of uranium in the Erz Mountains in both Bohemia and Saxony in Europe were published. The culprits that cause the contamination in the uranium mines have since been shown to be the radioactive radon gas and two of its daughters—which are again the result of decay of uranium mineral.

The dangers of the impact of radon and its two daughters on workers, especially those working in the underground mines, have been the subject of detailed study and there have been continual efforts to improve the working conditions so these dangers are minimized, if not eliminated. Federal agencies have promoted such studies by giving financial support to States undertaking them. An example that readily comes to mind is the study initiated by the Colorado Department of Occupational Health in 1951. The AEC, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the U.S. Bureau of Mines, together with the States, helped to develop techniques of measuring the concentrations and exposures, methods to lower radon daughter concentrations, and improved ventilation practices.

In the past 10 years, there have been a number of meetings and conferences at which the nature of the problems involved and corrective action have been discussed. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held a series of hearings in 1959 and 1960 and these did much to widen the general understanding of what we are up against. I may here mention the hearings held in 1956 by the House Subcommittee on Mine Safety, of which I had the honor to be chairman: For the first time, this committee put on record comprehensive expert testimony on the various aspects relating to safety of metallic and nonmetallic mines, including a distinct forewarning by many of the witnesses on the adverse, and often fatal, effects of overexposure to radon gas.

The subcommittee came to the unanimous recommendation that the overall subject deserved further study. I take some pride in the thought that the Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act passed by the Congress last year was perhaps the culmination of a process that the Subcommittee on Mine Safety had started 11 years ago.

Thus, knowledge of the possibility of the danger to which uranium mineworkers had for long been exposing themselves is not new. What is new is the acute uneasiness induced by the feeling that we might have allowed their cases to suffer by default, by not insisting earlier than now on the preventive measures that have time and again been shown to be necessary, and by not making adequate provision for compensating them for such injury or disability as may be the direct or indirect result of their occupation.

Some of the facts that have lately come to light are frightening enough: Estimates of persons already affected by overexposure vary from 1,000 to 2,000. Such estimates cannot but be rough, as there may be a long latent period—up to 20 years—between commencement of exposure and the appearance of the symptoms. This is a further complication in grappling with the problem.

The U.S. Public Health Service found in one group of uranium miners an incidence of lung cancer deaths nearly seven times that expected from the rest of the population. The study also showed that the men who had been most exposed to radiation in the mines had a death rate from lung cancer 46 times the rate that could be expected. The U.S. Public Health Service also checked the atmospheric concentrations of radon and its decay products in the uranium mines and mills operating in the Colorado Plateau. Of 400 samples taken in 75 mines, it was found that the radon concentrations ranged between 20 and 230 times the level determined as safe by the International Commission on Radiation Protection.

No elaborate arguments are, therefore, needed to make this problem a prime concern and to turn on it the immediate attention of the Federal and State Governments, as well as business and industries associated with uranium mining, and the general public. My bill, which can certainly stand all the improvements and refinements that my colleagues may suggest, is intended as a convenient starting point for focusing public attention on this problem by means of hearings, and any further studies that they may trigger.

To give an approximate idea of the financial implication of the expected prevalence of the disease arising from exposure, I need only mention the estimate prepared by the firm of Woodward & Fondiller, Inc., of New York, on behalf of the Colorado Industrial Mining Commission. The commission had hired the firm to make a study of the probability of the total claims by cancer-stricken miners or their widows which would be filed as a result of lack of protection against radon gas in underground uranium mining. The conclusion of the firm was that the Commission could expect to face $8½ million in claims for compensation. This is in one single State. The burden that would fall on the other States where the mines are under operation is not likely to be lighter in proportion, and my bill is by way of an advance offer of help to those governments, lest, daunted by the enormity of the burden, they should shirk their responsibility to the miners who have sacrificed so much for our security and defense.

Of course, I realize that merely providing for the sharing of the financial obligations between the Federal and State Governments is not the ultimate solution to the problem which we face. Our primary aim should continue to be to devise as foolproof a system of safeguards against contamination as is humanly remembering, of course, that our knowledge of the causes of lung cancer still has many gaps that only further scientific research can fill. It is in this context that I raise a few questions and make a few suggestions for future inquiries and remedial action. In doing so, I proceed from specific measures to policy areas.

First, in order to make possible a continuous and precise assessment of the deleterious effect of radon gas on workers, there seems to be a need to compile and publish periodically reports of all accidents or incidents falling under this category. The more comprehensive these reports are, the more helpful they will be in devising effective preventive measures. I point in passing to the vague suspicion in some quarters that the authorities and those who operate the mines and mills are somehow shy of coming out promptly with such reports. After all, accidents do happen despite one's best will, and we must all realize that what is involved is nothing less than the interest of defense and the Nation as a whole, and our collective obligation to insure the safety of those who are contributing to it.

Second, there should be a review of hospital facilities available near areas where the mines are located. The question is not merely whether they are adequate in relation to number of miners. What is crying for close study is the whole range of the suitability of equipment, existence of well-planned medical programs to handle emergencies as they arise, training of doctors and nurses in those hospitals for the treatment of radioactive contamination and the dovetailing of these plans and programs with the provision made by the employers for medical care for the workers.

Third, one of the elementary precautions against the occupational hazard of exposure to radiation is the satisfactory ventilation arrangements in underground mines. In fact, I find it mentioned in the proceedings of the Second United Nations Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, Geneva, 1958, that ventilation costing only 1 percent of the operating cost of the mine could totally eliminate radiation hazards in underground mines. At the same time, it should not be beyond our technological ingenuity to develop suitable respiratory masks that would protect the miners from contamination.

Fourth, we should not overlook an important corollary to the problem of air and water pollution that is engaging so much of our attention. That is the possible contamination of air in the vicinity of these mines by the radioactive particles attaching themselves to dust and other extraneous material and escaping to outside surface while being still active. Similarly, untreated mine wastes flowing into streams and rivers could pose a grave danger to the general population. I cannot emphasize too strongly the need to anticipate and evaluate these possibilities and guard against them.

Fifth, I am not quite sure what the powers and responsibilities of the Federal Radiation Council are in respect to formulating standards and safeguards, and what is more important, enforcing them. The Council does not seem to have any authority to impose sanctions or discipline on errant mines. Indeed, its guidelines do not seem to be binding even on agencies dealing with, or otherwise regulating, uranium and atomic industry, such as AEC, Department of Defense, and the Department of Labor; for, in one of the memorandums relating to the establishment of the Federal Radiation Council and the formulation of standards and guides, it is stated that "the guides may be exceeded only after the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the matter has carefully considered the reason for doing so. It may be that enforcement and the power to impose standards on the mining industry is the real crux of the matter. If there are objections to entrusting this task to the Federal Radiation Council, one suggestion that could be explored is the establishment of an interagency authority composed of representatives of AEC, Public Health Service, Department of Defense, Department of Labor, and Department of the Interior to:

Keep the uranium mining industry under continuing study, with particular reference to the safety and well-being of miners;

Evolve suitable safety standards and to review the existing ones from time to time;

Study the extent and adequacy of enforcement of these standards by the agency or department concerned and suggest possible action to make supervision and enforcement more effective; and

Coordinate the policies in this area and the working of the different agencies and departments in relation to them.

One of the sanctions could be that the agencies or departments would transact business only with those mines which scrupulously adhere to, and implement, the standards prescribed.

The need for coordination becomes the more obvious when we take up one simple aspect of worker protection; the permissible level of radiation in underground mines. The Secretary of Labor promulgated on May 5 the maximum permissible level of exposure under the Walsh-Healey Act as 0.3 WL working level. This differs in approach from the prevailing standards of the USA Standard Institute. The level set by the Secretary of Labor adopts a new approach in that it places limits on the exposure of the individual miner rather than on the concentrations of radon and radon daughters in the mine atmosphere. It has been challenged as arbitrary and impracticable, the most interesting demurrer being from the Chairman of AEC, Mr. James T. Ramey, himself, according to whom even a 1 WL standard will be difficult to achieve in many mines. I only refer to this to stress the necessity for continuous exchange of information and coordination, and setting up the means to bring it about.

While on the subject of coordination and trimming of the present policies and procedures, I call attention to what appears to me to be a dispersal of authority and discretion even in regard to the laying down of safety standards. Under the Walsh-Healey Act passed in the 1930's, the Secretary of Labor has been authorized to do this for mines whose production is purchased by government whereas under the Metallic and Nonmetallic Mines Safety Act passed last year, the Secretary of the Interior can set safety standards for all the mines, regardless of whether government has any dealings with them or not. There seems to be some possibility of integration here, so authority and discretion neither overlap or cancel each other out.

Even with effective safeguards and standards, there will be problems. Mindful of the prolonged latent stages of growth of the disease, and the knowledge that some of the miners carry the disease within them today without being aware of it, priority should be given a system of identification of the affected cases and maintenance of records on individuals, wherever they may be, who have had anything to do with underground uranium mining at any time in the past. The record system should:

Provide for monitoring and recording of occupational radiation exposures by employers in accordance with established criteria;

Call for the review of employer practices and procedures by the States; and

Assure the reporting of exposure information to a central repository and preserving the employer records.

In other words, there should be a uniform recordkeeping system to cover each worker throughout his working lifetime, wherever he may work. Legislation introduced by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] and by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price], would supplement my bill in its most important aspect.

Finally, and also relevent to the problem, is the fact that the content and operation of the workmen's compensation laws of the various States seem to be in need of improvement and a reasonable measure of uniformity in their provisions. They are diverse in coverage, numerical exemptions, time limits for filing claims, admissibility of medical and death benefits and methods of adjudication of claims. The language of the statutes dealing with radiation injury is in several cases ambiguous and uncertain. Some of the improvements that suggest themselves on a reading of the different statutes are:

The laws should cover all radiation injuries that may arise out of and in the course of employment.

Medical benefits should be extended to pay for all the consequences of disability.

The time limit for treatment should be removed. As long as an injured employee is suffering from an occupational disease, he should be able to receive the necessary medical treatment without limitations as to either time or amount of money.

The statute of limitations should be extended to a more realistic period of time. Perhaps the 7-year period as enacted in Oregon would provide a reasonable guide to other States.

Above all else, there should be uniformity within the States as to compensation, medical benefits, and statute of limitations.

What I have said here is only a brief and understandably hurried survey of the various aspects and implications of the problem, that are closely allied to my bill. They are suggestions for further thought and inquiry, to the end that we fail to do nothing that must be done to meet our obligation to the uranium miners and save them from becoming the hidden casualties of the nuclear age.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1927) to pay the States for a portion of the expenses incurred by them in providing workmen's compensation benefits on account of claims for or on behalf of individuals who, as a result of employment in the mining, handling, or processing of uranium, suffer injury, disablement, or death from the effects of radiation, introduced by Mr. Metcalf (for himself and Mr. Moss), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1927

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for purposes of this Act, the term—

(a) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor;

(b) "workmen's compensation law" means a State law or plan which provides for the payment of compensation for loss resulting from the injury, disablement, or death of workmen through an accident, casualty, or disease, which is work-related; and

(c) "calendar quarter" means a three-month period commencing January 1, April 1, July 1, or October 1 of any calendar year.

Sec. 2. (a) From the funds appropriated for carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall pay to each State, which has in effect a workmen's compensation law, for each calendar quarter during the forty-calendar-quarter period which commences with the first calendar quarter which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act, an amount equal to one-half of the total amounts expended by the State during such calendar quarter in providing payment of compensation, under such law, on account of injuries, disablements, or deaths which are sustained by workmen who are or were employed in the mining, handling, or processing of uranium, and which are caused by or result from radiation.

(b) Amounts payable to a State under subsection (a) may be made in such installments and at such time or times as the Secretary shall determine and may be made by way of reimbursement or in advance on the basis of estimates by the Secretary. Any payments to which a State is entitled under this Act for any calendar quarter shall be reduced or increased to the extent necessary to adjust any overpayment or underpayment which the Secretary determines was made under this Act to such State for any prior quarter and with respect to which adjustment has not previously been made under this subsection.

Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON LEGISLATIVE EVALUATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Commission on Legislative Evaluation.

This bill is aimed at correcting a serious imbalance in our system of government.

I am speaking of the virtual monopoly the executive branch exercises over the Congress with regard to information relating to program evaluation.

This is the information that tells us how well—or how poorly—our programs are working out. It tells us what needs revision and how it might be revised. It is essential to the operation of an effective and modern government that is responsive to the people and the times. And at the present moment, such information is not available to the Congress.

This problem is reaching critical proportions. In recent years Congress has enacted hundreds of programs costing billions of dollars. But once a bill is passed, the Congress often loses control over the program. The result is that the Congress is denied access to adequate knowledge about the day-to-day operation of the program.

Congressional committees can maintain some control through their oversight function. Only last year, the majority leader, in a letter to Senate committee chairmen, called for a "concentrated exercise of the oversight function" and for a "major reexamination of new and old Government programs."

But the congressional committee has its limitations. The press of legislative business and the resulting demands on the time of both the members and the staff do not allow for the continuous scientific and systematic evaluation our Federal programs require if they are to be effective.

For that kind of information Congress must rely almost entirely on the executive branch and the agencies that administer our programs. They have the staff, the resources, the time, the techniques, and the knowledge in the new and vital field of evaluation research.

But the fundamental question is: Are the executive agencies objective in reporting the results of their evaluations?

The record indicates they are not always objective. Any administrator is hard put to resist the temptation to overplay his success and underplay his failures.

Clearly, the Congress needs help.

I believe the Congress needs an independent agency to assist it with its oversight functions. Congress needs a reliable source to which it can regularly turn for an evaluation of the programs that it passes.

I propose that we set up an Office of Legislative Evaluation, which will function as an arm of Congress. To do this, I am introducing a bill to establish a Commission on Legislative Evaluation, which would make a thorough study of how best to establish such a scientific evaluation system.

The Commission would be composed of nine members and would be chaired by the Comptroller General of the United States, who heads the General Accounting Office. The Chairman would appoint an executive director.

Under the terms of the bill, the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives each would appoint four Commission members. Their appointments would include two Members of their respective legislative bodies and two qualified private citizens.

The Comptroller General would report back to the Congress no later than July 1, 1968, with the findings and recommendations of the Commission. I would hope that his report would provide the information and recommendations to allow the Congress to establish—in the near future—a full-scale Office of Legislative Evaluation.

Some have suggested that this Office be placed in GAO. But the recommendation as to the location of the Office of Legislative Evaluation should be made by the Commission.

There is no question, however, that the success of GAO in auditing the financial aspects of Federal programs could serve as the model—and the goal—for the study group.

GAO was set up in 1922 as an arm of the Congress. In its 45 years, GAO has raised the level of financial honesty in the Federal Government. There is no longer any serious problem of Federal money being stolen.

Money does, however, get wasted—and that is the situation we must correct.

An Office of Legislative Evaluation would contain teams of independent, nonpartisan experts who would use the most advanced techniques to review the progress of Federal programs toward well-defined goals.

The information developed by the team would be made available to all Members of Congress.

The Congress itself has recognized the need for such an agency. The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, under the able leadership of the senior Senator from Oklahoma, stressed the importance of Congress equipping itself with the new techniques and knowledge used by the executive branch and the need to utilize the resources of an independent agency, such as the GAO, in the process.

Mr. President, there are many reasons why an Office of Legislative Evaluation is important to our Nation. It would break the information monopoly of the executive branch and help restore the Congress to its rightful role as a full and equal partner in our Government. It would assist congressional committees in conducting hearings by providing them with accurate and relevant information upon which to base public discussions. And it would lead to greater public confidence in our National Government.

In the last analysis, the executive branch too would benefit from a stronger, better informed Congress that is capable of taking positive and creative initiatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1929) for the establishment of a Commission on Legislative Evaluation, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1929

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Legislative Evaluation Act of 1967."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. In the pursuit of its constitutional functions it is the duty of the Congress to evaluate the results of the programs it authorizes and appropriates funds for. The development of new techniques for the evaluation of governmental programs offers Congress the opportunity to improve its methods of evaluation in order to more effectively and efficiently carry out its responsibilities.

At the present time the Congress lacks information concerning these new techniques and the ways they may be applied to measure the performance of Federal programs. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this bill to provide Congress with knowledge of new systems of evaluation and recommendations for their use in the legislative process.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a Commission on Legislative Evaluation. (Hereinafter referred to as the "Commission.") The Chairman of the Commission shall be the Comptroller General of the United States. After consultation with the members of the Commission the Chairman shall appoint an Executive Director who shall be compensated at a rate to be fixed by the Chairman not to exceed the rate set for GS-18 in the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code.

MEMBERSHIP OF COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of nine members as follows:

(1) The Comptroller General of the United States;

(2) Four appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) With respect to members of the Commission appointed from the House of Representatives and the Senate there shall be a Representative and a Senator from the majority party and one each from the minority party.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of Commission business.

(e) Members of the Commission appointed from private life shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties of the Commission. Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress. All members of the Commission shall receive compensation for travel, subsistence and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall conduct a thorough study and investigation of—

(1) the state of the art of evaluational research;

(2) the use, by Federal agencies, of evaluating systems designed to measure the results of Federal programs; and

(3) the feasibility of developing and establishing, in the General Accounting Office, a system of evaluation of the results of Federal programs, including the selection of criteria for such a system.

(b) The Commission shall consult with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in the conduct of such study.

(c) The Commission shall report to the Congress the results of such study and investigation together with its recommendations, as soon as practicable, but not later than July 1, 1968. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days after the date of submission of its final report.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) In order to carry out its functions under this Act, the Commission is authorized—

(1) to enter into contracts or other agreements with Federal agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys;

(2) to obtain and use such information of Federal agencies as it deems necessary.

(3) The Commission may employ and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out the

functions of the Commission but no individual so appointed shall receive compensation in excess of the rate authorized for GS-18 by section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(b) Federal agencies are authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission such information as it requires to carry out its functions under this Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

SEC. 6. The General Accounting Office shall provide administrative and clerical services to the Commission on a reimbursable basis.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 7. As used in this Act—

(a) the term "Federal agency" means any executive department, independent commission, board, bureau, office, agency, or other establishment of the Government, including any independent regulatory commission or board and the municipal government of the District of Columbia, but does not include the legislative branch of the Government or the Supreme Court of the United States.

(b) the term "Federal programs" means all programs and activities of the executive branch of the United States Government except the activities of (i) any agency engaged in the collection or evaluation of national security information and (ii) any agency engaged in fiscal operations.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not to exceed $2,000,000 in any one fiscal year, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO TOM SAWYER DAY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, youngsters in 40 countries are today reading the adventures of Tom Sawyer. For generations of American boys and girls, Tom Sawyer has joined the ranks of the immortal. He is far from perfect. He was no superman. Yet his spirit has brought tears of joy and sadness to untold millions.

Our Nation owes a great debt of gratitude to Samuel L. Clemens, whose brilliant talent as Mark Twain created Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn. We in Missouri are very proud that through their adventures, the town of Hannibal is known throughout the world.

In 1830, just 15 years old, Hannibal had only 30 citizens. Yet by 1840, there were 1,034 citizens including the family of Judge John M. Clemens.

Hannibal had become a manufacturing center, a vital transshipment point for northern Missouri and St. Joseph.

> The rich prairie soil back of Hannibal, from the time it was broken by the plow, began to funnel wheat, hemp, and tobacco into its wharves.

One historian records. Hannibal's economic destiny was bound to the great Mississippi River.

It was along this river that many of the adventures of Tom Sawyer took place. Yet, Sam Clemens was born in the little village of Florida in Monroe County, Mo., so that the lore of Mark Twain spreads throughout northeast Missouri. At Florida itself, there is the Mark Twain Birthplace Memorial Shrine which houses the two-room frame cottage where Sam Clemens was born, as well as many of his personal belongings.

In Hannibal, there is the house where Sam Clemens grew up and the famous white fence about which he wrote in "Tom Sawyer":

> Tom appeared on the sidewalk with a bucket of whitewash and a long handled brush. He surveyed the fence, and all gladness left him and a deep melancholy settled down upon his spirit. Thirty yards of board fence nine feet high. Life to him seemed hollow, and existence but a burden.

Youngsters and adults alike continue to admire the way in which Tom turned that job of fence whitewashing into a profitable operation. As Clemens wrote in "Tom Sawyer":

> Work consists of whatever a body is obliged to do. Play consists of whatever a body is not obliged to do.

Among the other reminders of Mark Twain lore in Hannibal is the Becky Thatcher home, and the lighthouse on Cardiff Hill.

Today, Hannibal and the 16 counties of northeast Missouri are on the move. Along with the historic spirit of Mark Twain is the vibrant spirit of economic growth.

The many thousands of visitors to Hannibal and Mark Twain land will soon be able to enjoy one of the biggest manmade reservoirs in the midwest. The Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir now in the early stages of construction by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will symbolize the greatness of northeast Missouri.

Hannibal is on the verge of a period of major development. Last week, it was my privilege to speak at the dedication of the new Federal office building and post office in Hannibal. This building represents the vital relationship between the Mark Twain region and the Federal Government. Also last week, details were released about the new automated Universal Atlas Cement plant about 10 miles south of Hannibal. Run by a division of United States Steel, it is the largest of its kind in the Western Hemisphere.

So, for the visitor and for the local citizens, the immortal spirit of Tom Sawyer is being joined by a vibrant new spirit of progress. Both are essential.

I firmly believe that as the new comes, we should make more effort to recognize the importance of an historic past.

There is nothing more American than Tom Sawyer. Tom and his friends did more to capture for history the early life of the Mississippi than anybody else.

There is no greater 19th-century American author than Mark Twain. His contribution is unique beyond words. His legacy is the joyous laughter of all generations.

In this troubled and turbulent time of world crisis, people sorely need some laughter. I recommend a quiet evening with Mark Twain. Every generation must discover for itself how conditions in the United States have changed in the last 100 years. I recommend Mark Twain. Yet, reading is not enough. We Americans must see to believe. And I can guarantee you that Tom Sawyer, Huck Finn, and Becky Thatcher will come alive for any visitor to Hannibal, Florida, and northeast Missouri.

Mr. President, it is a great honor to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution designating July 1, 1967, as Tom Sawyer Day, U.S.A. I respectfully request that this joint resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 89) designating July 1, 1967, as Tom Sawyer Day, U.S.A., introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That July 1, 1967, is hereby designated Tom Sawyer Day, U.S.A., in honor of the American author, Samuel L. Clemens, born in Florida, Missouri, on November 30, 1835, who, under the pseudonym, Mark Twain, gave to America an illustrious literature and brought laughter and happiness to a careworn world.
>
> The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation setting aside such day as a public occasion and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies in schools, churches, and other suitable places.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. This joint resolution honors Samuel L. Clemens, who "gave to America an illustrious literature and brought laughter and happiness to a careworn world."

It invites all Americans "to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies in schools, churches, and other suitable places."

Mr. President, I firmly believe that more should be done in our Nation to give full honor and recognition to Mark Twain and I believe this joint resolution is an important first step. In Hannibal, July 1 will be a happy day of celebration. Many will travel there from the surrounding States. I hope other communities around the country will also choose to make this a day of recognition for Mark Twain and Tom Sawyer and for the living spirit of early Mississippi River days.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO AMOUNT TO BE DEDUCTED FROM PAYMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF CERTAIN FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 208

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator DOMINICK and myself, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 382 and ask that it be printed and appropriately referred. This amendment would extend for 1 year the authorization under titles I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide for the educational needs of Indian children attending schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

By way of reminder, Mr. President, when Congress last year approved the ESEA it limited grants to BIA schools to only 1 year, despite the fact that other provisions of the act carried the blessing of a 2-year authorization. Congress did so, however, not because it does not value the importance of Indian education carried on by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, nor because it is unsympathetic to the fact that Indian children, more than most other children, require an increasingly better education if they are to assume their rightful place in our society. Rather, the reasoning behind the 1-year authorization was that Congress, recognizing fully, if belatedly, its responsibility for better education for all American Indians, wanted an additional year to study all aspects of Indian education more fully, including the possibility of transferring Indian education from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Some of that work has been completed while other aspects of the study are either continuing or soon will begin.

Nevertheless, the important fact remains that unless Congress acts immediately to extend this authorization for 1 additional year, 89–10 funds for BIA schools will be cut off effective July 1, 1967, and countless worthwhile and needed educational programs will be curtailed, some long before they will have made any worthwhile contribution to the education of Indian children. Many if not most of the programs made possible through ESEA are just getting off the ground, particularly with regard to the BIA schools, which were excluded from the original act and which did not receive any funds for fiscal year 1967 until after November 9, 1966, the date Congress finally passed the necessary appropriations bill. Even if the BIA schools had been prepared to initiate effective educational programs immediately, an assumption that is at best doubtful, they could not have been operational for more than 6 months, hardly sufficient time to make a dent in the educational problems that have confronted Indian children and perplexed educators for more than half a century.

I need not remind my colleagues that Indians are in every way disadvantaged Americans. They remain at the very bottom of the economic ladder, they have the highest rate of unemployment, they live in the poorest housing and they suffer chronic poverty.

The reason for this national tragedy is obvious to all who care to look: poor education. Indian adults under 45 years of age average less than an eighth-grade education, compared to the average for all Americans of approximately 12 years of school. Also, even today more than 50 percent of the Indians who attend school—and no one knows for sure how many Indians are not being educated—drop out before they complete the 12th grade. This figure is almost twice the national average of 28 percent.

As one might logically suspect, many of the new programs in BIA schools being funded under titles I, II, and III of ESEA are directed at improving education generally and at encouraging Indian children, in large part through the acquisition of the educational skills that lead to success in school and in life, to stay in school.

It would be a tragic mistake, therefore, not to extend for another year the right of BIA schools to receive some funds from the ESEA. We should not—cannot—let these programs lapse. I respectfully and urgently ask my fellow Senators to approve this needed and worthwhile amendment immediately.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to say that I have spent countless hours during my years in public office studying the problem of Indian education. It interests me not only as an Arizonan but also as one who is very much concerned with the health and welfare of all Americans, particularly our native Americans. We cannot afford—educationally, economically, or morally—to turn our backs on the fact that the American Indian has for too long been neglected, and no more so than educationally. And I will speak to that problem in greater detail in the near future.

Meanwhile, however, Congress can make a beginning. It can pass this amendment to permit BIA schools to share the fruits of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1789) to authorize demonstration projects designed to help young adult criminal offenders through the services of members of VISTA and the Teacher Corps or other qualified teachers.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. HILL in the chair) announced that on today, June 8, 1967, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 65. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Alberto Rojas-Machado;

S. 130. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria Yolanda Rafaela Miranda y Monteagudo;

S. 131. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Valdes-Rodriguez;

S. 133. An act for the relief of Dr. Hector Jesus Sanchez-Hernandez;

S. 134. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael A. Penalver;

S. 135. An act for the relief of Dr. Hilario Anido-Fraguio;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Dr. Ramon Baez Hernandez;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Dr. Anselmo S. Alvarez-Gomez;

S. 173. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis G. Dediot;

S. 175. An act for the relief of Dr. Sherif Shafey;

S. 439. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Jacinto Nobo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo); and

S. 501. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernando O. Garcia-Hernandez.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS TO BE HELD ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE BILLS

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate District Committee will hold hearings June 12 on H.R. 8718 and S. 1218. Hearings will begin at 10 a.m. in room 6226, New Senate Office Building.

The purpose of H.R. 8718 and S. 1218 is to increase both the annual Federal payment and the ceiling on the borrowing authority for the District of Columbia.

S. 1218 is identical to legislation passed by the Senate during the 89th Congress. It would provide an automatic formula for determining both the Federal payment and the ceiling on the borrowing authority.

H.R. 8718, which was passed by the House on June 1, would increase the current Federal payment authorization by $10 million annually and would increase the borrowing authority under a formula to be effective for 3 years.

TREASURE HOUSE ON THE PRAIRIE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in 1945, a group of Abilene, Kans., citizens decided that something should be done to honor the town's most famous son, Dwight D. Eisenhower. This was just at the conclusion of the European phase of World War II.

In July of that year, the State of Kansas granted a nonprofit corporation charter to the Eisenhower Foundation Organized To Promote Citizenship and To Honor Veterans of American Wars, Inc. This was the beginning of the establishment of the Eisenhower Center.

In 1950, Harry Darby, a Kansas City industrialist, a former Member of this body, and one of President Eisenhower's closest friends, volunteered his services to bring into being the Eisenhower Center. Harry Darby, as every Member of the Senate who served with him knows, is a man of action, and therefore, the program was started immediately and the project completed.

Presently, hundreds of thousands of visitors annually, from every State in the Union and many foreign countries, visit the Eisenhower Museum, the Eisenhower Library, the Eisenhower home, and the Eisenhower Chapel.

In the May issue of the Reader's Digest appeared a most interesting article on the Eisenhower Center, entitled "Treasure House on the Prairie," by Ben Hibbs, a former Kansan.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURE HOUSE ON THE PRAIRIE

(By Ben Hibbs)

"He showed the capacity for making great nations march together more truly united than they have ever been before."

These words, inscribed on a simple brass plaque, are Winston Churchill's description of his friend and comrade-in-arms, General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower. That plaque, on exhibit today in the Eisenhower Museum at Abilene, Kan., explains why the museum contains such a valuable historically interesting and often fabulously beautiful collection of items from all over the world. From kings and prime ministers, organizations and individuals, the flow of gifts in gratitude to the American who made "great nations march together" has continued throughout General Eisenhower's public life. And Ike has always taken the position that all of these things belong not to him but to the nation.

Lesson in Democracy: The Eisenhower Center had its inception in the late spring of 1945, just as the European phase of World War II was ending. A group of Abilene citizens decided that something should be done to honor the town's most famous son. Ike gave his consent—on condition that whatever was done should be in honor of all American veterans and of the entire Eisenhower family.

In July of that year, the state of Kansas granted a nonprofit-corporation charter to The Eisenhower Foundation Organized to Promote Citizenship and to Honor Veterans of American Wars, Inc. In spite of the impressive title and some worthy plans, however, the Foundation began with no money and no property. Then, in September of 1946, Ike's mother died (his father had passed away four years earlier), and the Eisenhower brothers deeded the modest clapboard house that had been their old family home, and its contents, to the Foundation.

Although the house has been structurally reinforced to withstand the tread of millions of feet, visitors find everything just as the General's mother left it: the furniture, the carpets, the pictures, the dishes and kitchen utensils—even her potted plants in the bay window have somehow been kept alive all these years. It is a typically midwestern, middle-class home of the early years of this century, and Ike calls it "one of America's little lessons in democracy."

"Here we were," he explains, "a poor family who didn't know we were poor. We lived on the wrong side of the tracks, yet we had everything that counts. We had love and discipline and proper moral guidance, and the priceless opportunities that our kind of democracy offers its youth—the opportunity of education and the opportunity to rise above humble beginnings."

Grateful Gifts: Although the acquisition of the Eisenhower home gave the Center a much-needed impetus, there was still no place to house the General's constantly growing collection of mementos, trophies, medals and other items. Campaigns to raise money had brought in thousands of contributions, but most were small; there was far too little in the kitty to build the kind of museum that was needed.

Then, in 1950, Harry Darby, a Kansas City industrialist, former U.S. Senator and one of Ike's closest friends, volunteered his services to what was now called the Eisenhower Center. A big, genial man, wise in the ways of finance, Darby started by making a substantial personal contribution. Then he went to his many friends in the nation's business community. Soon a half-million dollars had been raised. The museum, a Kansas-limestone building located just a block from the Eisenhower homestead, was opened to the public in 1954.

Later, during President Eisenhower's second term, Darby set about raising funds for a library so that Ike's Presidential papers could also be housed at the Center. The Kansas legislature appropriated $275,000; the balance, an estimated $2,750,000, came from personal contributions. The Center's other major structure, a beautiful little chapel called the Place of Meditation, was completed in 1966.

Today the entire Eisenhower Center—which includes 13 acres of land with a landscaped mall and five dedicatory pylons on a raised plaza—has been turned over to the National Archives for maintenance and operation. But, with the exception of the one appropriation from the State of Kansas, its construction was financed entirely through personal gifts from the people of a grateful nation.

Persian Peacock. Visitors—some 115,000 from every state in the Union and many foreign countries last year—usually spend most of their time in the museum, where more than 4000 items are on display. The west wing is devoted largely to Ike's early life and his military career, the east wing to his White House years. At least two or three hours are needed for even a casual inspection of the items on display.

Perhaps the most beautiful exhibit is a pair of 3500-year-old gold chalices which were found in the archeological excavations of Mycenae, Greece. They were given to Ike by the Greek nation, and are worth between a half-million and a million dollars.

Another particularly valuable item is an Order of Victory medal given the General by the Russians in 1945. It is set with 91 diamonds and five large rubies. (Only two such medals have ever been awarded to non-Russians; the other one went to Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery.) A later Russian gift is a handsome malachite jewel box, which Premier Khrushchev gave to Mrs. Eisenhower in 1959.

Among several jeweled ceremonial swords, perhaps the finest is from Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands, given to the General in gratitude for the liberation of her country from the Nazis. Another, set with 738 diamonds, 217 emeralds and one huge ruby, was given by King Mohammed V of Morocco.

The Shah of Iran was a particularly generous giver of handsome art objects. Among them is a large, office-size desk, every square inch of which is covered with a mosaic of gold and ivory and other precious materials. Also from Iran is a lovely desk set about 15 inches high, containing an inkwell and pens; rising from the base is a peacock completely covered with deep-blue Persian turquoises. One day a woman sat on the floor in front of the peacock desk set for at least a half hour. Finally, Earl Endacott, the curator of the museum, asked her if she was ill. "No," she said. "It's just that this is the most beautiful thing I have ever seen."

Mission Fulfilled. At one end of the museum's Presidential room, fenced off by a wooden rail, are a fine Sheraton table and ten Chippendale chairs, all dating back 150 to 200 years. It was around this table, sitting on these chairs, that General Eisenhower and his associates, in the early months of 1944, hammered out the plans for the Normandy invasion.

One of the most popular exhibits in the Center is housed in a separate glass-walled pavilion near the museum building. It is the olive-drab Army Cadillac used by the General in England and then during the campaign in Western Europe. After the war, a friend, William E. Robinson, found the old car in an Army storage depot and had it reconditioned. With 96,000 miles on the odometer, it still ticks along smoothly on the occasions when it is gassed up to participate in parades.

Throughout the museum are numerous items of a personal nature; the camera and well-worn map case which Ike carried in World War II; his first dress uniform; one of the original short "Eisenhower jackets"; some of his own paintings; his military commissions, beginning with the certificate designating him a second lieutenant; photographs running all the way back to high-school days; his handwritten letter to Sen. Joseph L. Bristow of Kansas asking for an appointment to West Point—and many other exhibits which, taken together, tell the life story of a famous American.

Various documents of historic significance are on display, but one which particularly catches the eye is a copy of General Eisenhower's announcement of victory in Europe, in his own cramped longhand. Addressed to the Combined Chiefs of Staff of the Allied Expeditionary Force, it says, with dramatic simplicity: "The mission of this Allied Force was fulfilled at 3 a.m., local time, May 7, 1945. *Eisenhower*"

Papers for Posterity. The Presidential library, opened to researchers in November 1966, contains 13 million pieces of paper relating to the Eisenhower Presidential years and his earlier public career. Any reputable person who wishes to do bona fide research—historians, students, journalists—can get permission to read and copy any of the documents, except for a limited number of classified papers.

Most of the space in the Eisenhower library is devoted to these vast files of documents and to reading rooms for researchers, and thus is not open to sightseers. Even so, the library is well worth a visit. Prominent architects have called the vaulted lobby one of the most beautiful in the world. Its walls and also the walls of the corridors are paneled with Laredo Chiaro marble from Italy, and the floors are paved with Roman travertine.

On the second floor is a public gallery of exhibits—paintings, historic documents and interesting items given by nations and individuals. There is also a handsome little auditorium seating 165 persons, where color slides, accompanied by a narrative soundtrack, tell the story of the Center and of the Eisenhower family.

A fitting close to any visitor's trip to the Center is an inspection of the pylons at the east end of the mall. The inscription on one of them says: "From this modest home on these acres came one destined to lead in battle the mightiest array of fighting forces ever to wage war in freedom's cause. The victory secure, as President he led the effort to ensure a continuing peace for all the world."

THE CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the Mideast today is in danger—but there is also hope. The fighting is not over. The war still takes its awful toll. The Arab nations, save only Jordan, still defy the cease-fire. But Israel has passed from her hour of maximum danger. She has already won victories for the ages. Throughout this country—and all over the world—men are moved and impressed by the bravery of Israel's people—for the last 4 days—as for the 20 years before.

Now the time has truly come, as Abba Eban has said, to look not backward to belligerency, but forward to peace. After all the sufferings of the Second World War; after the struggle for independence; after 20 years of crisis and threat, and after the third war in a generation—after all this, and out of this greatest of efforts must come a genuine and secure peace, a just and lasting peace, for this brave nation of Israel.

To achieve a just and secure peace in the Near East, there are five basic requirements.

First. There must be an unequivocal recognition, on the part of all countries in the Near East, that Israel is a nation and that she exists and will continue to exist. Israel's borders and her commerce are equal in dignity to those of any country in the world. She has a permanent right to exist and grow and prosper. This is no longer open to doubt—and it can never again be open to question.

Second. Israel has earned the right to the final peace settlement which has been denied her for 20 years—we cannot and will not be satisfied with just a military armistice. And that settlement will require direct negotiations between the parties—between Israel and her neighbors. In that final settlement with her neighbors, and through binding and enforcible arrangements with other nations—including the United States—Israel's borders must be guaranteed beyond doubt. There should be no room for any to again miscalculate Israel's own strength and purpose—or our determination that Israel shall survive.

Third. Israel's access to all international waterways must also be guaranteed; not just for this year; not just after a war; but for next year and the year after, and as long as freedom of the seas lasts for any other nation: Israel has a right not only to use her port of Eilat—she also has a right to free transit through the Suez Canal. The right to use Suez was promised by the agreements of 1949, by the United Nations in 1951, and by the understanding of 1956. The time has come for those promises to be kept.

Fourth. This period of trial is not yet ended. Until it is ended—until a final peace settlement is secured—we should supply Israel with whatever food or economic assistance she requires. I have urged the Secretary of State to furnish such assistance—and he has assured me that it will be provided.

Fifth. Let us also hold out our hand of friendship to the Arab peoples—so long living in poverty and disease and misery, so long the tools of irresponsible propaganda, so long the greatest losers from the military adventures of their leaders. Israel must live, after all, among many times her number of Arabs; within a few decades, the Arab peoples will number 200 millions of people. Thus lasting peace in the Near East—like lasting peace elsewhere—depends on mutual understanding across borders and among all the people of the region. If Israel, which has sacrificed so much, can still appeal to the Arab peoples—as General Dayan did yesterday—in a spirit of friendship and brotherhood, surely we who have suffered nothing in this war can generously do the same. This should be a time, not for recriminations, but for understanding; not for reprisals, but for a new and expanded commitment to a better life for all the people of the Near East.

And let us also take this attitude toward the United Nations. The U.N. has not been as effective in this crisis as we would have hoped. But it has performed great and valuable services in the past—and it is still our best hope for the future. This war broke out because the U.N. was not effective enough. Therefore, rather than condemn it, we would do better to strengthen it, to develop ways to improve its machinery, to make it a more effective force for peace. Only in this way can we hope to avoid war—to settle disputes peacefully—and thus serve the truest interest of the United States—of Israel—and of the whole world.

Certainly all of us who watched its proceedings Tuesday night saw what an effective forum it was to mobilize the attention and concern of the world—most notably in the speech of Abba Eban. But the U.N. can and should be able to do much more. As the world grows smaller, the problems of one become the problems of all—and thus only in the U.N. can we ultimately hope to solve our differences.

We have seen also, in these days, the need, the deep importance, of cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union. With the Soviets too, there is no room for recrimination and hostility; for the peace of all the world, including the Near East, depends on real peace between our two nations.

The tragic mistake of today—when Israel forces attacked a U.S. ship—must alert us all, if further alert were needed, to the danger of the world we live in; 100 million Americans—and untold millions of others throughout the world—would die within the first 24 hours of a nuclear exchange between the global powers. And as Chairman Khrushchev once said, "The survivors would envy the dead." These are the stakes for which the world plays—not just for ourselves, but more important for our children and our children's children, now and yet unborn.

So let us join in a determination that all this conflict and sacrifice shall not have been in vain; that Israel shall find new and lasting security in peace with her neighbors; and that all of us will work to make the desert bloom: not just in Israel, but in the entire Near East; not just for Jews, but for all the children of Islam and Christianity as well.

This is not yet a time to rejoice. There are still grave dangers—for the Near East and for world peace. So let us remember, as President Kennedy said, that—

> If we cannot now end our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal.

But let me add again: If we are mortal men—we are also moral men. And therefore, we share a responsibility with all humanity—to the survivors, to those who remained from history's greatest example of man's capacity for senseless cruelty to his fellow man. For the world to fail these survivors now would be—in the deepest sense—against the national interest of the United States; against our heritage as free men; and against our basic morality.

But it is in fulfillment of our responsibility to them, and to the principles of justice and humanity which they stood for, that we will keep faith with our common heritage—and with those who have so gallantly fought and died to defend it.

FDA CENSORSHIP

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I have on several occasions spoken out against the bureaucratic chaos at the Food and Drug Administration. Recently, a strong editorial appeared in the Journal of Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics which takes the FDA to task for attempting to be the sole arbiter of drug dosages and the great censor of medical literature.

Generally our medical journals do not contain such strong editorial criticisms. Perhaps this is but one indication of the feeling the medical profession is developing toward the FDA.

Along this same line, there is a growing sentiment that medical decisionmaking should be taken from the FDA and placed in the hands of an institution composed of medical experts. A recent article appearing in Science magazine recommends the creation of an "institution for scientific judgment," which appears to be one plausible alternative to the FDA bureaucracy.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics, May–June 1967]

FDA Censorship

(By Walter Modell, M.D., New York, N.Y., department of pharmacology, Cornell University Medical College)

This Journal has avoided criticizing the FDA for its weaknesses and its failings because we have felt that it is charged with a virtually impossible job. Certain recent actions of the FDA, however, violate basic principles of science and education, and here the Editor feels that in the interest of the public and of medicine he must speak.

The FDA has now taken the stand that in this country it is the sole arbiter of drug dosage and that its pronouncements on this subject in drug package stuffers are inviolate. In this vein it has already acted to prevent authors from publishing articles citing dosages which do not coincide with those appearing in current FDA-approved package stuffers. Mr. William Goodrich of the Legal Department of the FDA has stated that publishers, authors, and editors who have written, approved, and published drug dosages which deviate from those recommended by the FDA are liable for damages to the patient and to the pharmaceutical manufacturer as well.[1]

Already one expert has withdrawn an article on an anthelmintic because he would rather not publish at all than submit to this FDA censorship and thereby make it appear that he approved of the FDA-recommended dosage. In the latest edition of Conn's *Current Therapy* a paragraph was inserted at the last moment on a front page advising readers to examine the most recent FDA-approved package stuffer before following the recommendations of this well-known and highly regarded, annually revised work on therapy. Now, as a result, Conn's *Current Therapy* is no more current than the current FDA stuffers. How current they are likely to be is best indicated by the FDA's notorious procrastination, a characteristic which hardly qualifies it for early alerting on drug hazards, safe dosage, and drug utility.

The new FDA posture seems to be connected with its new drug evaluation program. When the FDA announces that a drug is not only safe but also effective in a given dosage range, this announcement, the FDA holds, now has official stature. The FDA indicated that it is striving for a single published source of all information on dosage, contraindications, dangers, and so forth, which will supersede all other works and to which all doctors will have to turn like Holy Writ when they seek help on drugs. When this comes to pass no writing on therapy will be more expert than that of the group of nonexperts in the FDA who pass on the contents of drug package stuffers.

---

[1] Because of damage to the good name of the manufacturer.

The implications of this unprecedented FDA program are shattering. Absolute freedom of dialogue and communication has long been accepted as essential to all scientific progress and to medical progress as well. It has been established as essential to the safe and effective use of drugs. Differences in opinion and practice are aired publicly in order to gain knowledge and understanding from discrepant views and observations. Such symposia form the most stimulating educational instruments of the medical press. Now, the FDA has begun to discourage, to hobble, to stifle, to castrate such publications.

In the case of every single drug, the determination of actual efficacy, proper dosage, and safe use requires substantial experience by the expert as well as by the general practitioner. It is held by many that it takes about five years before a definitive statement can be made about a new drug. This implies that there must be free and unrestricted expression of opinion and publication of experience wth drugs already officially described and delimited in FDA stuffers if progress is to be made in therapeutics and if egregious errors, one way or the other, by the FDA, are to be promptly published and rectified.

If the medical press must keep its profane hands off dosage, what resources does the FDA have for the writing of its Bible? The FDA can use the information supplied by the manufacturer, can let contracts for information, or can set dosage by fiat.

No matter how much good work went into collecting it, the FDA must hold all information from drug manufacturers suspect. Since the FDA has not always attracted the best talent, information it gets from contactees will not necessarily be of the highest order. Anyhow, good, bad, or indifferent, the FDA cannot cover the field because it simply does not have the funds for it. It will, therefore, have to be by fiat that the FDA will regulate drug use and drug dosage. Here it will have the support of the Arabian philosopher Al-Ghazali who said of pharmacology, "Whoever researches in such matters knows of necessity that this knowledge is attained only by Divine inspiration and by assistance from God most high." We remind the FDA that Al-Ghazali lived in the eleventh century.

Even with the best of intentions and the best of men, as long as they will not tolerate, to say nothing of encourage, public challenge, FDA operations cannot help but become dictatorial. And this can lead in only one direction—backward! When the nonexpert in-group of the FDA threatens to become the dictator of American medicine, we believe it will lead medicine from its present eminence to its ultimate decline at a time in scientific understanding when we have every right to hope for even greater things. The best we can expect now is therapeutic nihilism.

What is the American physician who has something new to say about drugs to do?

What are American publishers to do with writings of scientists and specialists from nonconforming parts of the world who write on drug dosage? Will we have to smuggle foreign publications?

Where may a physician publicly disagree with the FDA on matters of dosage? Once the precedent of censorship is established, who is to say where it will end? With drug dosage, or with new uses for old drugs, or with new reactions to old drugs? There is a real and present danger of being suffocated by the stuffer.

In this country, physicians will be reduced to collecting package stuffers to keep us up to date. This will occupy much of the time they might otherwise have spent in reading, for the stuffers are so disparate in size, shape, and the way they unfold that they defy all known filing systems. It has been said that their physical characteristics are determined by the amount of empty space in the package which the stuffer has to fill in order to prevent rattling. Also there is no simple way of procuring stuffers except by buying a full package of each drug, whether one needs it or not. The shelves of the doctor's library, the traditional symbol of his learned profession, will now be filled with versions of the FDA Bible and packages of drugs sine stuffers.

What will the reaction of the scientific community be to this censorship? Will those assisting the FDA, but not of it, accept this interference with free scientific discourse? How will the National Academy of Sciences view this meddling with scientific discourse?

The public is protected by existing legislation against irresponsible errors by publishers, editors, and authors. Who will protect the public against the FDA? Will Mr. Goodrich stipulate that the FDA will be legally responsible for adverse reactions to FDA-approved dosage of drugs and for reactions which do not appear on stuffers?

To hold scientists and physicians in jeopardy if they dare disagree publicly with the FDA is against all the canons of science and scholarship. In our opinion, it is in the worst interests of our nation's *health*, it is a barrier to *education*, and it is for no one's *welfare*. The new policy comes strangely from an agency of the United States Department of *Health, Education and Welfare*.

[From Science, May 12, 1967]

Proposal for an Institution for Scientific Judgment

(By Arthur Kantrowitz)

Federal support of science and technology has created an establishment whose power for the performance of applied research and for the training of people to do this work is now immense and growing rapidly. It is my view that, at the present time, the most significant task in the application of science to social problems is no longer the actual doing of applied research or even the training of people to do this work, but the making of the great decisions which determine the rate and directions of progress. The federal government has had to make decisions on questions which have an important scientific component—that is, which involve areas of science so new that no unanimity has been achieved in the scientific community and so important that the decisions inevitably have important political and perhaps moral implications. I refer to these as mixed decisions. Historical examples of mixed decisions are, the World War II decision to build an atom bomb; the German decision (a blunder I think) to build ballistic missiles during World War II; the U.S. decision not to use our ballistic missile capabilities to launch a satellite until after the Russians had beat us to it; the current decision to direct our primary space effort toward beating the Russians to the moon. These decisions all involved technologies so new that debatable extrapolation of hard scientific fact was required. All these decisions were of great political and sometimes moral importance. We now face a variety of mixed decisions—in connection, for example, with control of our physical environment, with the relationship of weapons technology to disarmament, and so on. The enormous gains that can be foreseen from the application of modern technology to medical problems will present us with a variety of great mixed decisions whose importance may well be as great as the historic mixed decisions mentioned above. These decisions must be made before unanimity exists in the scientific community. The problem of communicating with a divided scientific community is and will remain one of the most difficult aspects of making mixed decisions. I should like to discuss the procedures employed in the Executive Branch for achieving this communication, and how, in my opinion, they may be improved.

The essential input from the scientific community to decision making is via the scientific advisory committee. Without going into detail about this process, I would like to make three points. First, in seeking scientific advice on questions of great social importance we must recognize that the moral responsibility which many scientists feel very deeply can easily affect their judgment as to the state of scientific fact when the scientific facts are not yet crystal clear. Second, the selection of scientific committees has always been beset by the dilemma that one must choose between those who have gone deeply into the subjects under discussion, and, accordingly, will have preconceived ideas about what the outcome should be, and those who are perhaps unprejudiced but relatively uninformed on the subjects under discussion. Finally, scientific advisory committees have, in many cases, played an influential role in decision making without taking public responsibility for their judgments. In the making of mixed decisions the validity of the scientific input has frequently been brought under question.

I have three recommendations, directed toward institutionalizing the scientific advisory function with a view toward increasing the presumptive validity of the scientific input.

1) Separate the scientific from the political and moral components of a mixed decision.

It has occasionally been maintained that scientific and nonscientific components of a mixed decision are generally inseparable. It is, of course, true that a final political decision cannot be separated from scientific information on which it must be based. The reverse is not true; a scientific question which logically can be phrased as anticipating the results of an experiment can always be separated from any political considerations.[1] Thus, the question "Should we build a hydrogen bomb?" is not a purely scientific question. A related scientific question, "Can we build a hydrogen bomb?" could in principle be answered by an experiment.

Scientific objectivity is very difficult to achieve and is a precious component of wise mixed decisions. I do not believe it is possible for scientists to have deeply held moral and political views about a question and simultaneously maintain complete objectivity concerning its scientific components. In the past, scientific advisory committees have frequently developed close relationships with the officials who have final decisions to make. They have frequently advised political figures about what final decisions they should reach, not only about the scientific components of a decision but about the moral and political implications as well. The close relationship may be valuable; however, it does point up a need for an alternative source of scientific judgment which shall forgo taking any moral or political stands and seek to achieve maximum objectivity.

2) Separation of judge and advocate.

To my mind there is no solution of the problem, discussed above, of combining the highest level of expertise with lack of prejudice except the solution arrived at centuries ago in the similar legal problem. If one insists only on expertise in advocates and expects them to marshal the arguments for one side of a question, one can call on the services of people who have gone most deeply into a particular subject and who have in the course of this work arrived at a point of view. Such advocates, in addition to presenting their side of the case, can be very useful in criticizing the cases made by opposing advocates. The requirement of the judges, on the other hand, is simply that they must clearly understand the rules of scientific evidence, have no intellectual or other commitments regarding the matters before them, and, finally, have the mature judgment needed to weigh the evidence presented. Thus, it is almost inevitable that a scientific judge would have earned his distinction in areas other than those in which he could qualify as unprejudiced.

---

[1] It is true that there are important questions which are best answered by scientists yet which are not scientific questions, according to this definition. An example of this sort of question is the relative competence of scientific groups which might be important in a decision as to where to locate a major scientific facility. In many cases, however, the essential information which the political community requires from the scientific community is a considered and unbiased statement of the currently available scientific facts. It is to such cases that this communication is addressed.

It has occasionally been suggested that the advocates should present their points of view directly to the political leaders who have decisions to make. This procedure suffers from the grave difficulty that political leaders will not be able to spend the time necessary to understand scientific debates in sufficient depth to distinguish the relative validity of positions taken by sophisticated advocates. The scientific judge would differ from the political leader sitting in judgment on scientific questions in that his scientific background should enable him to more quickly assess the evidence presented by opposing advocates and to participate in something analogous to a cross-examination procedure. He would, on the other hand, not be expected to have the deep acquaintance with the field that would be required of the advocates.

Scientists are traditionally advocates, and judicial functions in small-scale science have never had an importance comparable to that of advocacy. An experiment can always overturn anyone's judgment on a scientific question. However, the judicial function becomes important in large-scale science and technology when we must anticipate the results of experiments which cannot be performed without the expenditure of great amounts of money or time. This increase in the importance of the judicial function requires the development of a group of distinguished people who will devote themselves to scientific judgment. The point has been frequently made that a scientist needs to keep actively engaged in creative work in order to maintain his expertise. I submit, however, that if a mature scientist is deeply involved in finding the truth between the claims and counterclaims of sophisticated advocates, his education will be continuously improved by the advocates and his thinking will be continuously stretched in the effort to reach wise judgments. Communication from the judges to the scientific community and the public is an essential part of maintaining their expertise and reputation. A provision for publication of judgments, suggested below, will help accomplish this.

The problems of selecting people to serve as judges and advocates will, of course, be the most difficult matter in reaching wise decisions under this scheme, as under any other. It would be very important that everything possible be done to elevate the positions of advocates and especially of judges so as to attract people whose wisdom would match the importance of the judgments they must make.

3) The scientific judgments reached should be published.

In many cases the opinions of scientific advisory committees have not been made available to the public for reasons other than considerations of national security. The existence of such privileged information makes it very difficult for the public to assess the degree to which a mixed decision is based on political grounds.

I propose that the opinions of scientific judges reached after hearing opposing advocates be published, within the limits of national security. The publication of these judgments would serve two purposes. First, it would provide the whole political community with a statement of scientific facts as currently seen by unbiased judges after a process in which opposing points of view have been heard and cross-examined. Hopefully, these opinions would acquire sufficient presumptive validity to provide an improved base on which political decisions could be reached. Second, the publication of opinions reached by scientific judges would inevitably increase their personal involvement and, thus, could help to attract distinguished scientists to serve in the decision-making process.

A grave difficulty is the traditional conservatism of scientists, even those who have exhibited great imagination and daring in their own work. I have no formula to offer to overcome this bias other than in insistence that the advocates of novel approaches be heard. It is important that they be cross-examined by skeptical experts and that the judges feel a responsibility for not rendering negative judgments on inadequate evidence. It is actually very difficult to offer rigorous proof that something cannot be done, and usually the most that can be said is, "I cannot see how to do it." Scientific judges whose opinions would be published should be more accountable for errors in judgment. It is very important that this type of formal procedure not be allowed to interfere with the small-scale creative science which must precede any major decision making. This work has always been pursued, with wide opportunity for initiative, in a kind of private-enterprise, laissez-faire system in which I firmly believe. When large-scale funding is required we must restrict the number of approaches that are made, and the question can be asked, Would the formalization of institutions for scientific judgment result in harmful restrictions on initiative? However, scientific advisory procedures that now exist have also been guilty in this respect, and more formalization of these procedures could be designed to control the narrowing of the number of alternatives pursued simultaneously as a project grows in size.

EXPERIMENTAL INSTITUTION

Congressional review of important scientific programs requires an independent source of scientific judgment. It would be valuable if the Congress could acquire that judgment in a manner different from the procedures which have been developed in the Executive Branch. I propose that the Congress create, on an experimental basis, an institution for scientific judgment. The scientific questions referred to the institution by the Congress should relate directly to forthcoming major congressional decisions. The future of such an institution would depend on the degree to which political and scientific communities would accept its initial judgments in comparison with the judgments arrived at through existing procedures. It seems to me possible that a relatively modest start could be made toward developing an institution which, in the course of time, could achieve a much higher level of presumptive validity in communication of the Congress with the scientific community than now exists. Such an institution could be invaluable in providing an improved scientific basis for future mixed decisions of the Congress.

NOTE.—The author is director of Avco Everett Research Laboratory, Everett, Massachusetts, and vice president and director of Avco Corporation, New York, N.Y. This article is adapted from a proposal presented 16 March 1967 to the Subcommittee on Government Research, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON EXPRESSES CONCERN OVER DEPRIVATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have risen during every meeting of the Senate to express my concern for this body's appalling inaction with respect to the five human rights treaties presently pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think it would be in order to present today some of the statements which President Johnson has made, in addition to the statements of his spokesmen, assuring us that the President favors Senate consent to ratification.

On December 17, 1963, Mr. Johnson addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations:

> I think that you and I and our countries and this Organization can—and must—do something about these conditions . . . . I am speaking of a higher standard of living to be inspired by these United Nations. It will not be achieved through some hopeful resolution of this Assembly, but . . . through a recommitment of all our members, rich and poor, and strong and weak, whatever their location or ideology, to the basic principles of human welfare and human dignity. In this effort, the United States will do its full share.

In his June 1965 speech at Howard University, the President put it even more vividly:

> In every corner of every continent men charged with hope contend with ancient ways in the pursuit of justice. They reach for the newest of weapons to realize the oldest of dreams—that each may walk in freedom and pride, stretching his talents, enjoying the fruits of the earth.

In his San Francisco speech commemorating the 20th anniversary of the United Nations, President Johnson expressed both his personal view and that of a great majority of the American people that—

> The world must finish once and for all the myth of inequality of races and peoples, with the scandal of discrimination, with the shocking violation of human rights and the cynical violation of political rights.

In May of 1966, the President of the United States addressed a gathering of African ambassadors:

> The foreign policy of the United States is rooted in its life at home. We will not permit human rights to be restricted in our own country. And we will not support policies abroad which are based on the rule of minorities or the discredited notion that men are unequal before the law. We will not live by a double standard—professing abroad what we do not practice at home, or venerating at home what we ignore abroad.

There are numerous other statements by our President, but I believe that these few examples will serve to show my colleagues that the President of the United States must certainly deplore our failure to ratify the Conventions on Slavery, Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, Genocide, and Freedom of Association.

I further believe that the overwhelming majority of the Senate membership deplores this failure as well. But the Senate alone, not the President and not the State Department, has the exclusive means of righting this wrong by ratifying the human rights conventions.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS IN WYOMING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, among the programs carrying on as part of the war on poverty are the many community action programs across the Nation which aim at uplifting the disadvantaged, from preschool children to fathers who need training and work. Their scope is wide, indeed, but their task important. Certainly, the program has not been without its critics. But that, too, is proper, since it is often criticism which gives birth to improvement and to renewed vigor in human affairs and undertakings.

Because CAP projects are as varied as the needs of the poor are varied, they cannot all be described adequately in a few words. But the director and assistant director of one community action program in my State have written me a concise report, Mr. President, on what their program has done and what they yet hope to accomplish. It contains no bombshells, only a detailing of day-to-day work with the poor and an explanation of projects which are helping the poor. I ask unanimous consent that the report by Mrs. Jeanne Gillgannon, director, and Mrs. Nancy Anest, assistant director, of the Community Action Committee of the Laramie County Council of Community Service, Inc., of Cheyenne, Wyo., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY ACTION COMMITTEE
OF THE LARAMIE COUNTY COUNCIL
OF COMMUNITY SERVICE, INC.,
June 2, 1967.

Hon. GALE MCGEE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Community Action Programs throughout the country are as varied as the needs of the poor are varied. Therefore, we would like to explain what Community Action of Laramie County has done and hopes to do.

Our agency opened July 15, 1966 and of the six staff members hired, three were residents of the areas to be served. Within one week these staff members and several volunteers began a door-to-door survey in the target areas of Cheyenne and Laramie County in order to involve the people in community action and to determine their priority needs.

In the meantime the Director began mobilizing existing community resources and informing the community of the conditions and problems which were becoming more apparent as the survey progressed. For example as a result of the survey the community became aware that 3,500 Laramie County residents were either going to bed hungry or, at best, not getting adequate diets. Therefore, the Salvation Army, in coordination with School District #1, established a Community Pantry which meets this need.

Interviewing the poor on a one-to-one basis proved also to be the means of referring countless persons to existing agencies equipped to provide needed services. For example, during the month of October, 21 referrals were made to Salvation Army, 18 referrals to County Health Unit and 10 referrals to the Welfare Department.

Due to the original involvement of the poor and monthly newsletter sent from this agency to the target area residents in both English and Spanish, many referrals continue to be made monthly through office intake.

The survey results pointed out unemployment as a priority need and this was confirmed at rally meetings attended by target area residents. By November 1, 1966 a proposal was submitted, along with an application for Conduct and Administration grant, for a Nelson Amendment County Beautification and Betterment Project. The Conduct and Administration proposal was funded in the amount of $31,300 which enabled operation of this agency to continue for an additional 11 months. On March 8, 1967 the Nelson Amendment Beautification and Betterment Project was funded in the amount of $84,772. This project has made employment available for 32 disadvantaged men who, in coordination with the City of Cheyenne, are beautifying recreational areas of Laramie County.

In the fall the crew will be cut to 16 men who will work inside constructing picnic tables and other equipment to be used in the city park areas.

Through the U.S. Department of Labor our agency is in the process of filling 20 on-the-job training slots. Not only will disadvantaged persons be earning a living, they will also be learning a trade during the training period which will enable them to secure permanent employment.

On December 15, 1966 application for summer Head Start Child Development Centers were submitted in coordination with School Districts #1 and #7. Because of a budget cut of over 25% School District #7 declined the program. Funding for the School District #1 Center has been approved and will provide 150 deprived children with educational and environmental experiences, as well as dental and medical care, which will enable them to start school on a more equal basis with their peers.

During the day-to-day operation of this agency, area residents coming in the office often needed a service we were unable to provide—legal aid. To be sure this need was a real one, a sampling survey was made into the target areas during the month of January. From among those interviewed 97% had a need for legal aid either presently or within the past five years. With the approval of the Laramie County Bar Association a proposal for Legal Services was submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity and as you know the announcement of approval was made May 25, 1967.

On-going services of this agency are used-clothing distribution for the needy and transportation for those needing to go to a physician or a hospital. Staff members provide transportation and the community provides used clothing, making emergency help to the target area residents possible. All people have problems in living and since target area residents are no exception, our agency offers counseling in this field. A representative from the Southeast Wyoming Mental Health Center counsels staff members eight hours a week and they, in turn, counsel area residents.

Our goal is to help the poor help themselves in a permanent way. We feel that although these are first steps, we have made considerable progress the past ten months. In the future we plan to submit a report to you periodically in order that you might know just what Community Action is doing in Laramie County.

Sincerely,
JEANNE C. GILLGANNON,
Director.
MRS. NANCY ANEST,
Assistant Director.

THE DODD CENSURE RESOLUTION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, during the course of the last few days, many of the Nation's newspapers, as well as individual journalists and commentators, have had the opportunity to study the various charges surrounding the proposed censure of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, TOM DODD.

As one who believes strongly that TOM DODD is innocent of any wrongdoing that would require such a reprimand, I am pleased and encouraged at many of the results of the obviously exhaustive studies undertaken by members of our news media.

Before the Senate begins deliberation next Tuesday on the censure recommendation against TOM DODD, I would hope that as many Senators as possible might have the opportunity to read and ponder some of the excellent points raised in the following editorial comments.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POINT OF VIEW

(By Jim Dull, radio station WELI, New Haven, Conn., May 19, 1967)

The last-minute postponement of the debate on the censure of Senator Thomas Dodd has given him a valuable additional three weeks to get his side of the story across to the American people. This time is valuable because at long last Dodd has realized that he must break silence * * * and outline his defense to the nation in his own way. During the long months of his silence, the charges, the columns by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson, the hearings themselves, and the distorted reporting of the case have created an impression of guilt which has engulfed much of the Senate.

* * * * *

Senator Russell Long has proved to be an effective Senate spokesman on Dodd's behalf, pointing out that Dodd has violated no law and no rule of the Senate, but Dodd is his own most effective spokesman. * * *

In reality of course, this case is no partisan issue. To stand accused is not to stand convicted, and even conviction is subject to overturn on appeal. What is at issue is the legal and moral nature of testimonials, whether Dodd followed the prescribed regulations in receiving proceeds from them, and in using those proceeds for personal expenses.

By law and by previously accepted ethics, testimonials were both legal and ethical and indeed many members of Congress and many other Americans . . . retired workers, athletes, civic leaders long benefited from them across the country. By definition and by law the testimonial is for the purpose of honoring the individual for whom it is held and the proceeds are his personal gift, nontaxable, his to use as he chooses.

There has never been anything wrong with the idea of testimonials. Probably no one ever questioned them. Few people can possibly have been confused over the destination or the use of the funds or gifts that have been presented at testimonials. In the light of the Dodd case, we may now come to think that when testimonials are being held for a political figure that additional information is needed, but no such requirement has ever been in existence.

A major question that remains in the Dodd case is whether the affairs held for him qualified under the tax law and were bona fide testimonials. For if they did qualify, it is difficult to see how there is much of a case against him. For while a thing may be legal but ethically questionable, its legality does effect the degree to which we must consider it questionable.

Furthermore, if we want to question the ethics of something that is perfectly legal, in all justice we must have a commonly accepted yardstick. No such yardstick exists in the Senate or elsewhere. Indeed if there is any ethical yardstick at all, it is in the long existence and large number of testimonials that have long been held in this country for people from all walks of life. In short, the testimonial has been a accepted and even honorable practice.

So I find it difficult to see what is so wrong with the conduct of a testimonial for a political figure when testimonials for anyone else are apparently alright. What, then, is needed to brand such an affair as a testimonial? As far as I can determine, under existing law, all you need to do is call it a testimonial to make it one. Many people might contend that this isn't quite enough, that it ought to be made more specific, but until it is, anyone who has benefited from the previous situation can hardly be held to be illegal or unethical. Yet none of this was explored . . . in the public hearings. No question of the nature of testimonials, no examination of the law as it pertains to testimonials, no examination of the number of testimonials held in the nation, or indeed in Connecticut in any year was offered as a defense, or even as a foundation by the Ethics Committee or its counsel. In retrospect such omission becomes absolutely incredible. By what standard did the Ethics Committee make its judgment? It never substantiated itself. * * *

Regarding the double billing, to believe the testimony of an impugned witness whose word was the only evidence against Dodd in this matter is just fantastic. Yet the Committee did. I, for one, most certainly did not, and do not.

Yet large segments of the public and the press, and obviously the entire Ethics Committee believe that what Dodd did was wrong. Perhaps in discovering the effective use of testimonials by a Senator, we assumed that something must be wrong, without stopping to ask whether indeed anything was wrong. I have yet to hear a reasonable explanation of what is so wrong with the testimonial concept. I have heard no complaints from local and state contributors privately or publicly about any testimonial for anybody in the last several years. Not one complaint has come into this station by anyone saying he was duped in the Dodd affairs or in testimonials for other community figures. So what is the problem? What is wrong with the testimonial?

Yet Dodd is in a fight for his political life because he followed fully accepted ethical and legal practices, practices that had never disturbed anyone before. Now, at *this* time, to call such practices unethical doesn't make them so by any means. . . .

The law may later determine that Dodd committed some violations, but no such information is yet available. Yet in a public mood that is politically . . . vicious, Dodd is the victim of as effective a campaign of character assassination as this nation has seen in a long time. The Senate stands in the middle of this mood. Like a reed blowing in the wind and flattened to the ground by it. This is a mood that Dodd came to understand clearly in recent weeks and which, almost too late he has moved vigorously to change. For when we can start getting U.S. Senators on such insubstantial matters, the Nation may be in more danger than Senator Dodd, and the haunting question arises . . . who will be next?

Editorial Comment

(By Jim Dull, radio station WELI, New Haven, Conn., week of May 21, 1967)

The postponement of the debate on censure changes against Senator Thomas Todd comes as a welcome break for Dodd, who has realized that he had better break his relative silence and take his case to the American people.

• • • • •

The pace of his defense has now quickened and he is now committed to talking publicly about the charges and his defense. He has already spoken before the Senate, on TV appearances. There is some evidence that his efforts have caused some people to take a second look at the case, to reexamine the facts and the implications of the case.

In recent days, he has made more people aware of the fact that he has broken no law and no rule of the Senate, that whatever he has done is being judged in retrospect. The effective voice of Senator Russell Long has come to his defense, and a new organization has been formed to stimulate further examination of the matter.

Further, the additional time provides more of an opportunity for the Internal Revenue Service to make its judgment on the legality of the use of funds from the various functions.

All Americans lose when a Senator is disgraced by censure, and the American people owe it to themselves as well as to the individual Senator to double check all the facts, both the attack and the defense, before making an irrevocable decision. This, the postponement now makes more likely.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, June 1, 1967]

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Dodd and His Ex-Staffers

The case of Tom Dodd is simmering just now on the back of the Senate stove, while the senator prepares his defense against the pending resolution of censure. It is as good a time as any to inquire: What ever became of the four civic guardians who got him into this mess? They ought not to be ignored.

To be sure, their cases are quite separate. Dodd has to be judged on his own conduct, wholly apart from the conduct of James P. Boyd, Marjorie Carpenter, Terry Golden, and Michael O'Hare. But I have written a good deal about the Dodd case as such, and may be coming back to it when the Senate takes it up on June 13. My own feeling, after a careful review of the Ethics Committee record, is that Dodd probably should be acquitted under the rule of reasonable doubt; but a verdict of guilty could be almost as well defended. For the moment, so much for Dodd.

What about the sticky-fingered four? Boyd went to work for Dodd in 1958 and rose to be his top administrative aide. Mrs. Carpenter, who was to become the Lady Macbeth of this affair, came on the staff in July 1961 as the senator's personal secretary. Jim and Marj got to be chums. From the record:

Q. You had a social relationship with Mr. Boyd since 1963, have you not?

Mrs. Carpenter. Yes, sir.

Q. And he is important to you?

Mrs. Carpenter. Yes, sir.

In December 1964, Dodd fired both of them for "grave misconduct no senator could have tolerated." Over a period of the next several months, the two were overcome by shame at Dodd's abuse of his high position. They obtained a duplicate key from a girl still working in the office. They got in touch with those pillars of public virtue, Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson. And over the weekend of June 12–13, 1965, when they began lugging the papers away, their strength was as the strength of ten, because their hearts were pure.

"I felt I had a public duty," Boyd told the ethics committee. He took no pleasure out of what he did. To expose the senator "caused me a great deal of pain." He had, in fact, "loved the senator like a father." But Jack Anderson was whispering in one ear and Marjorie was whispering in the other. So, "I entered the senator's office for the purpose of removing documents, copying them, returning them, and making them available to the public and to the authorities."

Did he suffer any qualms of conscience? No, indeed. "I believe that never at any time in my life did I more deeply demonstrate my belief in Americanism and in the support of the integrity of our free institutions than in those days."

Meanwhile, late in summer 1965, little birds began to whisper in the senator's ear. He was thunderstruck. Someone, he said, is stealing my files. He turned to his faithful bookkeeper, young Master O'Hare, and asked for his thoughts on the matter. Ain't nobody here but us chickens, boss, the guileless youth replied. Well, said Dodd, let us change the locks anyhow. And this O'Hare arranged, thoughtfully preserving a spare key for himself. Whereupon, he and his honeybun, Miss Golden, joined the paper safari.

Senator John Stennis, D-Miss., asked Boyd if he had considered that his acts might be a violation of criminal law. Boyd said he thought there was such a possibility, yes, sir, but he was doing "what I thought to be the right thing to do, and therefore it could not be illegal if it was morally right." And anyhow, "I just thought when all considerations were weighed, that this offense would not be prosecuted."

How right he has proved to be! The reporter who inquires of the local district attorney's office finds that no charges of any sort have been filed against the four. At the Department of Justice, the official word is that the department "is still considering the case." The inference one draws from a Justice spokesman is that it may be tough to find a charge that will stick. The documents, after all, were not exactly stolen; they were only taken for a joy-ride and returned. The four conspirators made no personal profit. Boyd and Mrs. Carpenter clearly effected an unauthorized entry, but was it an illegal entry?

These are nice questions for lawyers to ponder. The rest of us, sitting in the press gallery, can only reflect upon the irony of justice that sees a senator on trial for his political life, and his betrayers sauntering scot-free about Washington, full of purity, sweetness and light.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, May 18, 1967]

The Dodd Case

The curious case of Sen. Thomas Dodd, D-Conn., is scheduled to come before the Senate next week.

A sifting of the facts reveals Dodd has been exonerated of the major charges brought against him, that the actions of which he now stands accused violate neither law nor Senate rule, and that the major findings so far are more damaging to his accusers than to him. Yet, amazingly, the Senate Ethics Committee recommends he be censured.

When the Dodd case first came to light, it was alleged he had received opulent gifts from a public relations man named Gen. Julius Klein, that he was running errands for Klein, getting favors for him, etc. There were big headlines about these accusations, stirred principally by columnists Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson.

It turns out there was nothing to these charges. The chief evidence of Dodd's alleged indebtedness to Klein, the gift of a so-called "Persian rug," vanished into thin air when it developed the "rug" was a piece of cotton cloth about 8''x12'', worth approximately $2. This charge was a baseless smear and conclusively shown to be such.

The Klein matter was therefore quietly dropped and the anti-Dodd brigade simply moved on to indict the senator on something else. The charges ultimately arrived at were that Dodd had "double-billed" the Senate and private groups for various trips he had made, and used funds from testimonial dinners to meet various of his personal expenses.

These charges are as tenuous as the allegations about Klein. On the record established by the Senate Ethics Committee, the double-billing episodes—seven in the course of seven years—were chiefly traceable not to Dodd himself but to one of his accusers! The double-billing was done by the very bookkeeper in Dodd's office who was purloining the senator's documents at night and turning them over to Drew Pearson.

This same man also committed other curious acts, including double payment of Dodd's bills, which at a minimum raise serious questions about his competence. Yet the charge that Dodd was craftily ordering his staff to engage in such practices—denied by other bookkeepers in Dodd's employ—rests on the unsupported word of this very man himself.

This leaves only the testimonial dinners, about which no donor complained, concerning which countless donors said they understood that helping Dodd meet personal expenses out of pocket was the purpose of their contributions, and respecting which there is no law or Senate rule to the contrary. Dodd is in effect arraigned for trial on ex post facto charges—for alleged violation of rules which the Senate is only now thinking about adopting.

The facts of record to date reveal no grounds for censuring Sen. Dodd. We can only hope his colleagues will give him a full and fair hearing when the matter comes to the Senate floor.

[From Our Sunday Visitor, Apr. 16, 1967]

The Trial of Senator Dodd

(By Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

No one in recent years has been tried and convicted by the press like Senator Thomas Dodd of Connecticut. The *New York Times* has attacked him with its editorials, with its news reports, and with its columnists. Scores of publications have linked "Adam Clayton Powell, Senator Dodd, and the ambitious Bobby Baker," to quote the *Saturday Evening Post*. There is no more effective way of condemning a man than by identifying him with two other men who have already been judged guilty. (Newspapers that have supported Dodd's views on foreign policy have generally refrained from passing judgment on him, but those newspapers that have considered his opposition to Communism too strong have been quick to pronounce him guilty before he has a hearing.)

The best of people are influenced by what they read and hear. A fair trial is impossible if people are prejudiced in advance against the accused because he has been convicted in the press. The Supreme Court has repeatedly granted protection to those accused by the press of criminal offenses. Even a confessed murderer is given this protection. But there is no such protection for Senator Dodd, nor will he have the right of appeal. His judges are senators, and many of their constituents will cry out if he is not found guilty. If he is not convicted, the press will howl from coast to coast.

TWO-FOLD CHARGES

What are the charges against him? The charges are twofold: (1) billing both the government and private groups for the same trip; (2) using campaign funds for personal use. The man who made the charges is Michael O'Hare, the former chief assistant to Senator Dodd, who was fired for incompetency. Concerning the double billing, it is an automatic practice to bill the government for trips taken on committee business; it is also customary to bill private groups for transportation on speaking engagements. In the latter case the government should not have been billed. The errors were made by O'Hare himself.

Out of more than 200 trips in the past six years, a total of seven involved double billing. Mr. O'Hare also made errors by not billing the government for trips when he should have. He neglected to bill the government for 21 business trips by Senator Dodd to Connecticut. If these errors were subtracted from the others, Senator Dodd would owe the government a balance of $384.24. That is hardly a sum to make front page news all over the country month after month, especially since there is no indication of willful fraud.

The other charge, that Senator Dodd enriched himself with campaign contributions, is equally misleading. Thomas Dodd had been very successful as a lawyer, but he spent all the assets he had in campaigning for Congress in 1956 and 1958. When he did get elected, in 1958, he was $150,000 in debt because of his campaign expenses. The expenditures had been necessary because the State Democratic Committee in Connecticut has never contributed to any of his campaigns. With six children to put through college and with homes in Connecticut and Washington to maintain, it was impossible for him to pay off his debts.

Friends of Senator Dodd were aware of the crushing financial burden he was carrying. They got together, without any encouragement from him, and arranged for testimonial dinners in his honor to help pay off his debts. By 1965, six years later, his debts were finally paid off. His entire net worth today, including the equity in his homes and his automobile, is $24,601, plus a life insurance policy.

Had he remained in private practice he would be worth at least ten times that amount. Senator Dodd has given many years to public service, including those as a judge at the Nuremburg trials. As chairman of the *Senate Internal Security Subcommittee* he has been the most effective member in Congress against the spread of Communism.

STOLEN EVIDENCE

Senator Dodd, whom I have known for many years, had aged 10 years in the past 12 months. There is no better way of discouraging leading citizens from serving their country than by slandering them in the press. What concerns me is not the careless use of funds that Senator Dodd may or may not have made. What concerns me is that all the evidence against him was stolen from his private files. On seven different occasions his senate office was broken into by former employees who had been discharged. They violated both Federal and District laws by breaking in. They did this to supply information for Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson and the documents were copied by Anderson's secretary.

The burglars stole classified documents, they stole private correspondence of the President, of the State Department, and of other senators. They stole personal letters of Dodd to his wife. It was by interpreting these stolen documents in his own fashion that Pearson attacked Senator Dodd in 90 different columns.

[From the Danbury (Conn.) Advertiser, May 30, 1967]

Senator Dodd

(By Paul Baker)

Thousands of words have already been written about the Senator Thomas Dodd case . . . and more thousands will be written in the days and weeks to come. Some are holding their words awaiting the outcome of the Senate's action on the proposed censure.

We're not attorneys . . . we're not politicians . . . we're just part of that great mass called "the guy on the street." As we looked at that television screen . . . we did not see the eyes of a sinister, crooked politician as some would have us believe. We did not hear the voice of a double-talking phoney as others would have us believe. As Tom Dodd explained his side of the story . . . we listened, and listened . . . and wondered. We wondered how a man whose record as an American was so great could now be so maligned. We wondered what motive there is behind the move to so totally destroy him.

We are among the many who agree that Senator Dodd is guilty of using extremely poor judgment in the selection of his staff. He is guilty of not keeping a closer eye on his own store. He is guilty of misjudging his fellow man . . . and woman.

We honestly cannot see why so much fuss has been made about Senator Dodd's use of testimonial funds. All of us have attended testimonials, political and otherwise, many of them right here in Danbury, and for candidates of both parties on major and minor levels. We're quite sure none of us has ever told the recipient how he must use the money . . . and none of us was forced to attend these testimonials. It's absolutely amazing that so much has been made of testimonial contributions . . . but even more amazing that there are those who find fault with a person using his gifts in the way he best sees fit.

It is even more unfortunate that there are those members of the fourth estate who operate under the principle . . . there's more readership in tearing down than building. There's more sensationalism in attack rather than commend.

It is difficult to understand why more has not been made of the removal of information from a Senator's files. One can easily think of the tragic consequences such brazen acts could have. It would seem the investigation could better be turned into the office than against the man.

Unfortunately, it has been said many times that the action against Senator Dodd would not have come this far but for the Adam Clayton Powell case . . . that something had to be done to Dodd in view of the finding against the New York representative. We hope that men of the United States Congress would be intelligent enough to weigh each and every case on its own merits.

One influential Connecticut radio station has called for Senator Dodd's resignation immediately, saying this would be the ideal time to do so. We can't imagine any conclusion to be gained from Mr. Dodd's resignation other than an admission of guilt, and we're more than a little disappointed with the New Haven spokesman.

We don't know what the Connecticut voters will do in 1970. We're of the opinion that Tom Dodd would win easily tomorrow . . . and probably will in 1970, whether they try to block his nomination or not.

Most of the elections are decided by the so called "guy on the street . . . the little man." And the guy on the street is still with Senator Dodd.

(At this point, Mr. BAKER assumed the chair.)

WHO WAS RIGHT?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, recent events in the Middle East will have served one useful purpose if they opened the eyes of some people in this country to the importance of preserving a healthy, vigorous domestic oil producing industry.

Whatever problems we have had in meeting this Middle Eastern challenge, it takes little imagination to picture how much more acute those problems would be if we had to depend on the Arab nations for the oil that fuels our industrial machine, our cars, trucks, and trains, our homes, and our military forces—including the troops in Vietnam. Without our domestic petroleum industry to rise to this emergency, we would be in the midst of a desperate crisis at this hour.

We can be thankful for the oil and gas conservation programs that have been faithfully carried on in this country, despite criticism that was misguided and often sadly misinformed. We can be thankful that our governmental leaders were not distracted by those who preached the glories of cheap foreign oil, and who said it would be economically wise to let our domestic producing industry go into a slump and depend upon that cheap foreign oil. How cheap would that foreign oil be today if the price of it were our Nation's security? How cheap would it be if we had to go to the brink of World War III and perhaps beyond to obtain the petroleum that supplies 73 per cent of the Nation's energy? How much of a bargain would this foreign oil be to the American people if the supply depended upon how the heads of those distant governments happened to feel—at the moment—toward our country, its policies, and its people?

The Nation's much-maligned 400,000 stripper wells, which individually produce small quantities but collectively account for one-fifth of the total domestic crude oil output, can be appreciated for their true worth today. They may not pour out oil like some of those fabulous wells of the Middle East, but at least those humble stripper wells are here. No American has to grovel before some foreign potentate to obtain the energy that these wells pump into our economy.

The oil import program—how often that has come under attack, and how shortsighted such attacks are shown to be today. Now even those who refused to see before cannot deny the fact so plainly written in the headlines and the news bulletins of this hour. It would have been senseless folly—it would have been close to national suicide—had we let our domestic oil producing industry be washed away by a flood of that so-called cheap foreign oil. It would have been national idiocy to put ourselves at the mercy of the whims of distant foreign governments for the oil that is indispensable to fuel the industry and transportation of America, to lift its planes into the air, and to carry its fleet across the seas.

The defenders of the program of import controls—as a measure of national security—have had to talk and talk, explain and explain, to try to get across to skeptics the reasons it is essential to preserve a healthy domestic oil producing industry. Now we can stop explaining. Now we do not have to justify this program to anyone. World events are explaining and justifying and vindicating this program in far more vivid and persuasive language than we could ever command.

Only last April there was a sharp debate in this Congress over the tax policies that are essential to the discovery and development of the Nation's oil and gas reserves. The critics of these tax policies were unable to see how percentage depletion served the national interest. They preferred to describe it as an example of favoritism, of special privilege.

Now we can see that this provision is, indeed, a measure of special privilege. But the privileged who are served by it are the American people—all of them. For thanks to the effect of percentage depletion in encouraging the exploration for and development of oil reserves over the years, our country is privileged today to declare its independence of any foreign power for its oil and gas supplies. We do not have to submit to foreign blackmail for our oil, nor cower under foreign threats. Yes, indeed, percentage depletion is a matter of favoritism. It has made ours a favored nation—a strong nation—secure in the oil supplies vital to its economy, its defense, and its independence in foreign relations.

There is a saying: "History teaches us that history teaches us nothing." I hope this saying will prove wrong in the aftermath of our current experience. We have had previous lessons from history about the importance of preserving and maintaining a domestic petroleum industry. We had such a lesson on a small scale in World War I, and on a massive scale in World War II. We had it again in the Korean episode and anew in the 1956 Suez crisis. If we did not learn from those experiences, let us all learn from this one.

Our textbook is the daily newspaper, our classroom is the world. Let us ponder the instruction that is coming to us—and especially that most vital and impressive lesson that is being pounded into our minds: America's economic strength, its military supremacy, its freedom, its influence in the world, depend heavily upon the vigor of its domestic oil producing industry. And so let us cherish that industry for what it is worth to our Nation. Let us follow intelligent and enlightened policies, just policies, to keep this industry strong—and to make it even stronger and more vigorous and active than it is today. If we recognize the true importance of this industry, and act in accordance with this recognition, we can face our world problems with greater confidence than would otherwise be possible. For we will know that we cannot be bowed or broken by anybody's threat to deprive us of the oil that moves America.

FOR PERMANENT PEACE IN THE MIDEAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make some remarks in connection with the situation in the Mideast which is now approaching a new phase in which the policy of the United States will be critically important. Before I make those remarks I wish to join with all of my fellow Americans in expressing deep sorrow over the tragic error which resulted in the bombing of a U.S. Navy communications ship off of Sinai this morning, with a reported loss of four American lives and 53 wounded.

The Government of Israel has already stated that this was an erroneous attack by Israel forces. The Government of Israel has apologized. I am sure that it will do everything that one would expect by way of compensation and other appropriate measures.

The incident is one of those tragic fallouts of the dreadful situation in the Middle East, and the terrible pressure placed on pilots and naval people in that area.

Mr. President, I must say that it is a great tribute to the valor of the troops of Israel that this morning I have heard Senator after Senator say that while they were terribly dismayed and saddened by this accident, they understood how it could take place under the terrible stress which the forces of Israel have been under in these last few weeks.

This does not in any way change the very serious nature of what has occurred. As I have mentioned, there is a sense of sorrow in the heart of each of us that incidents of this type are the fallouts of war, a war begun in the Middle East by the aggressive actions of President Nasser, which had such tragic results not only to his own people but also with respect to innocent bystanders of the United Nations Emergency Force and now, most tragically, the U.S. Navy.

From the latest reports, Israel seems to be gaining through battle—forced on them by United Arab Republic aggression—relief from the mortal danger to its very existence—relief it was unable to get through diplomatic means or through the councils of nations. Surrounded, outnumbered and fighting alone, the Israelis are apparently defeating armies that swore to their extermination but a few days ago. Their valiant fight for survival has won the admiration of the world.

Fighting apparently still rages on almost all fronts and the resolutions adopted by the Security Council calling for a cease-fire on all sides has yet to be completely effective. Israel has indicated its acceptance if the United Arab Republic and other Arab States accepted it, too. Apparently, only Jordan has accepted so far. The urgings of Nasser and the Arab propagandists to continue fighting as the battle rages closer to population centers is unhappily reminiscent of the frantic orders issued to a crumbling Germany during the closing days of World War II. For the sake of those who have not yet fallen, I pray that the cease-fire resolution will be embraced immediately by all concerned. Israel accepted contingent on the other belligerents accepting and stopping the shooting at them.

But the most encouraging aspect of the Security Council cease-fire resolution is the unanimity of its adoption and its support by the Soviet Union which, with Israel's military victories mounting, has ignored frantic endeavors by the Arabs to involve the Soviets through intervention or by a direct confrontation with the United States. The propaganda lie—propagated in the United Arab Republic—that the United States and British planes have been involved in fighting alongside the Israeli forces is completely untrue and is transparently an effort to influence Soviet intervention, just as it is an excuse to the Arab masses, who instead of feasting on the fruits of victory are tasting the bitter gall of defeat.

The horizon is not unclouded. The war rages on as most Arab states resist complying with the U.N. cease-fire resolution. In addition, the new Arab propaganda theme that their defeat has been the result of United States and British military intervention bodes ill for the future. It is causing riots and destruction and burning of United States and other consulate embassies and libraries and endangering United States and other foreign nationals. It undoubtedly could serve as a reason for the Arabs to renew their blood feud with Israel, even after the evidences of today's battles have been overgrown. This was the case after 1956. Let us do our utmost to see that the errors of the past are not repeated.

A third cause for concern is the posture assumed by the U.S.S.R. in endorsing the cease-fire resolution. The Soviet Union, rather than filling the role of an evenhanded seeker of peace—as has been the case of the United States—has utilized the occasion of the Security Council's adoption of the cease-fire resolution to renew its unfounded accusations of aggression by Israel backed by the United States and the United Kingdom. By thus continuing to give encouragement to these canards, it keeps the waters muddied, tends to discourage the Arabs from accepting the opportunity of the U.N. cease-fire request, and lays a base for the riots and for future renewal of the Arab blood feud with the Israelis. What the Soviets should be doing to demonstrate their real desire for peace is to persuade their friends among the Arab nations to comply with the U.N. cease-fire request and then to come to the conference table for a final peace solution.

Nevertheless, notwithstanding this very unwise and uncalled for action by the Soviet Union, the United States, despite temporary termination of diplomatic relations with Arab nations, will probably still be the determining factor in the titantic struggle to achieve a lasting peace in the Middle East. What we must seek as a principal objective is more than an armistice. Rather it is a permanent peace where Arabs and Israelis can live and prosper side by side, and the elimination of the threat of conflagration in this area which has been with the world for the past 20 years.

U.S. objectives at this time must be clear both to the American people and to the rest of the world. This time, let us do something concrete for a permanent peace and not allow what is won at such cost to be lost at the negotiating table—or by perfidy—and let us work with the other nations who will work with us for these objectives, encouraging the holdouts but not waiting for them.

Mr. President, I believe in friendship with the Arab people but I do not believe in being dragged down by their hatred or their frustrations which could prevent us from doing what needs to be done in the Near East.

The objectives which should serve as our guide must now be stated. I outline them as I see them—and assure the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] that I shall not be long in doing so:

First. The Arabs and Israelis must join together and negotiate together a permanent peace to succeed any truce or armistice situation. This is critically important. This is the most important thing I have to say today. In the peace-seeking effort, the good offices of the United States—and I hope and pray also of the Soviet Union—acting with others, should be utilized to bring the parties together and to effect an equitable settlement.

Mr. President, I cannot emphasize too strongly the urgency of having the Soviet Union participate.

Vital to such a settlement must be the elimination of all factors which have been the basis for conflict, including the propaganda which, over the years, has kept emotions for war at a high pitch.

Second. There must be an end to the arms race fostered by the U.S.S.R. which has done so much to exacerbate Near East tensions.

Third. The final status, location and settlement of the Palestine-Arab refugees, long the most nettling issue in the Near East, must be established. The United States, which has been the mainstay of UNWRRA—as the U.S.S.R. has contributed nothing—has an opportunity to play a major role in the Arab refugee problem.

Fourth. There must be guarantees of the integrity of the states of the Near East, including the securing of a means effectively to control and fix responsibility for irregular military activities, such as guerrilla raids, which inflict harm upon persons or property.

Fifth. Guarantees must be secured, and a clear means for enforcing them instituted, to provide free and innocent passage of the ships of all nations through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

Sixth. Blockades, boycotts, and any other interdiction of free and peaceful commerce among nations in the Near East and between them and other nations outside the area must be prohibited.

Seventh. Safeguards should be obtained against the destruction of, and outrages to, the persons and property of foreign nationals and states, their diplomatic and consular establishments, and their citizens engaged in peaceful and normal pursuits.

Eighth. Finally, let us at long last begin a major economic development of the Near East region, one of the poorest and socially most depressed in the world, and let us work with those in the region who will work with us and other nations—including the Soviet Union, if it will—really to accomplish something.

It will take a long time to accomplish all of this, of course, and there is much hatred and frustration to surmount, but the sooner we set our course on the right road, the better.

I urge that our Government pursue these objectives within and outside the United Nations and with all nations similarly minded, as being in the highest national interest of the United States.

We must learn from the lessons of perfidy taught by President Nasser a decade ago. At that time, under world pressures, Israel pulled back from positions it had gained through bloody fighting, only to see the assurances it had received as to its security and freedom to use the Suez Canal and the Strait of Tiran outraged and denied.

A final observation. On May 23, President Johnson clearly stated to the Nation and to the world the policy of the United States with respect to the maintenance of the freedom of innocent passage through the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba. His statement of that day justifiably received the endorsement of Members from both sides of the aisle, as indicated by the addresses of the distinguished majority and minority leaders the next day, and the support of the overwhelming majority of Americans. Unfortunately, some subsequent injudicious statements by State Department spokesmen had cast doubts on U.S. policy and intentions. However, I commend the President for having set the record straight and setting that misunderstanding to rest.

We have the right to assume that the policy of the United States is the policy enunciated by the United States on May 23. As one Senator, I say that that policy, if implemented, is perfectly satisfactory. I feel certain that the United States remains in favor of an armistice, or a cease-fire, but I also feel certain that the overwhelming majority of Americans want, at long last, the implementation of the conditions for a permanent peace in the Near East.

Mr. President, we just will not go through everything we have gone through this week and last week, and then accept a continuation of the situation which immediately preceded the present crisis—a situation of a frustration, hatred, belligerence, of denial of the free use of international waters, of threats and intimidation, of guerrilla raids, boycotts, and blockades.

I say, there must be an end to it.

The valor of the Israel Army has given us an opening. Let us not be in any rush to decide this matter. For all we know, if a really good job is done in the Near East—and the Russians know it—it may have a profound effect upon what is happening in Vietnam as well, but we cannot have any "package deal."

Let the United States stand resolute in meeting this challenge at long last, and strike a real blow for peace. This is where it can be done. This is where we have an ally that knows how to look after itself. This is the time to capitalize on the positive elements in the situation in the interests of world peace.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar reported earlier today.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate consider the nomination of the Ambassador to Paraguay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Benigno C. Hernandez, of New Mexico, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senate has before it the President's nomination of Ben Hernandez, a fellow New Mexican, as Ambassador to Paraguay. The nominee is fully capable of carrying out his duties in that post and carrying them out well.

While he does not have formal diplomatic experience, Mr. Hernandez has proven himself a citizen deeply concerned about the course of human affairs. He has many assets in his favor—the most important of which is to do a good job for the United States. Mr. Hernandez, who is of Latin descent, has full command of the Spanish language and a keen interest in the problems of these people.

As we all know so well in this time of strained relations and broken alliances in various parts of the world, the mastery of communication is the highest order of diplomacy. Toward that end Ben Hernandez comes to this body with outstanding recommendations. I knew well Benigno C. Hernandez, the nominee's father, who served two terms in Congress. I commend the President for giving Mr. Hernandez and other Americans of Spanish and Mexican descent the opportunity of serving their country and urge my fellow colleagues to voice their approval today of the President's fine judgment.

AN OUTSTANDING NOMINATION

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to say a word on behalf of my fellow New Mexican, Ben C. Hernandez, who has been nominated by the President as our next Ambassador to Paraguay. He is eminently well qualified for the position, and I speak from a personal knowledge of this man over a period of years.

We have turned the corner in our diplomatic efforts in recent years. Gone are the days when ambassadorships were granted piecemeal to parties with minimal qualifications.

As America's role has grown in the world, we have realized that our diplomats must match the nations they are accredited to. They must know the language and be "simpatico" to their hosts. By not observing this rule in the past, we made enemies and estranged people from the very beginning. This was useless damage that could have been prevented.

Latin America has begun to assume particular importance in recent years as the geopolitical wheel of the world has turned in a great arc. New realities have replaced old ones. New philosophies and generations face us from south of the border. They demand fairer treatment, understanding, and an effort on our part to reach out and empathize with their desires. This we are endeavoring to do.

Now I will turn to the nation of Paraguay. Landlocked, settled by a proud people who are eager to exploit their resources, it is led by Alfredo Stroessner, a national leader who demands a first-class representative of this country to deal with.

Again, I wish to make reference to the fact that new and rightful emphasis is being placed upon giving representatives of all the diverse groups in our society a chance to use their natural gifts on behalf of America in an overseas capacity.

Mr. Hernandez is of Spanish-speaking descent. How horrified so many of us were a few years ago to read that our ambassadors to given nations had no knowledge of the language and habits of the people. Mr. Hernandez, a lifelong student of Latin affairs, is one of the best qualified men in the entire Spanish-speaking community of this country.

Although not a formally trained diplomat, his life experience more than makes up for this. A graduate of DePaul University in Chicago, he has been an outstanding lawyer in New Mexico for years. Active in civic affairs, he is a key figure with the Albuquerque Citizens Committee.

While the practice of law has qualified him as an expert counselor and negotiator, his leadership of the ACC city government reform has made of him an astute analyst and political observer.

Speaking, reading, and understanding the Spanish language, he was chosen during World War II to train Latin American armed forces. This deepened his Latin American interests.

His charming wife, also fluent in Spanish, trained as a social worker here in Washington at Catholic University. She is an asset to him in every way, and would grace any embassy as a representative of the United States.

His interests are manifold, reflecting his ability to reach into many fields constructively. A member of Albuquerque's Urban Renewal Authority, he is a former chairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

A former member of the New Mexico Board of Finance, he is also a director of the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce and the Bataan Memorial Hospital.

On the national scene his advice and expertise are sought after. He is now a member of the National Advisory Committee to the Office of Economic Opportunity. In addition, he is on the Upward Bound Committee and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare's Committee on Rehabilitation.

I could go on and on, for Ben C. Hernandez has truly accomplished much for himself, others, and our country. No community can have enough men of his stripe. Paraguay and our national service will be richer for his contributions. Albuquerque and New Mexico will miss his presence, ability, and constructive thought.

A man who puts country and performance above petty considerations of all kinds, he is the best type of "new" ambassador our country should send forth to the vital nations of the south.

We can do no less. I sincerely hope that Ben C. Hernandez of Albuquerque will soon be our new Ambassador to Paraguay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Covey T. Oliver, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William J. Porter, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration en bloc of certain nominations on the calendar which have been reported favorably by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to their consideration.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of Foreign Service officers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE UPPER GREAT LAKES REGIONAL COMMISSION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission offers new hope for a life of progress and opportunity for the residents of the northern sections of our three States.

Plans for an Upper Great Lakes Commission to bring all the resources of our three States and the Federal Government to bear on the special problems of the north date from the highly successful Land and People Conference which was held in Duluth in September 1963. I was fortunate in being able to persuade the late President Kennedy to keynote that conference.

After the delegates to the Duluth Conference suggested the idea of a permanent commission, we returned to Washington and prepared the necessary legislation. First, I offered this concept as an amendment to the Appalachia bill. We finally succeeded in enacting it as an amendment to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Since then, the President has appointed a Federal Cochairman, the necessary organizational work has been done, and the Commission, at long last, is ready to begin work.

I think it is helpful to review the goals we had in mind in enacting this legislation. They were lofty goals. We wanted to correct the historic economic problems which have plagued our northern areas; to develop the northland as a land of opportunity for those who live there and as a treasured place to visit for millions more, and to enable this vast section to become a full partner in the economic progress of our States and our Nation.

Now the Commission must decide precisely how to work toward these lofty goals.

PROCEDURE IS SUGGESTED

It would seem to me that the Commission would want to first, define the principal problems and opportunities which confront the north; second, determine the best way to meet these challenges; third, mobilize all existing local, State, and Federal programs and agencies which are available to work on these problems; and, fourth, recommend new legislation, both at the State and Federal level, to accomplish what cannot be done under existing law.

Most of all, I feel I should emphasize that the program of the Upper Great Lakes Commission should be an action program, not a study program. The north has been studied to death. Its residents, who have faced a host of economic problems ever since the turn of the century, have a pretty good idea what needs to be done.

Action should never be taken, of course, without careful deliberation. But the wealth of available material should enable the Commission to make this preliminary study period quite brief.

For instance, our State has spent the last 6 years or so developing a comprehensive statewide plan, with a special section on recreational development. The Northwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission and the Wolf River Planning Commission have done considerable planning and could be of major assistance.

It would seem that what the north now needs, rather than prolonged study and extensive research, is a review of the great amount of excellent data and planning recommendations already completed, and then a bold, action program designed to show results.

Because of my lifelong involvement in northern Wisconsin and because of my role in preparing and enacting the legislation to establish the Upper Great Lakes Commission, I feel a special responsibility to spell out my own views on what the problems are and what solutions are available.

PROBLEMS ARE APPARENT

The surface problems of the north are quite obvious. In much of the region, population is declining. Expressed in its simplest terms, this means that the north spends a great deal of its time and money educating its children, only to lose them to the larger cities farther south.

Unemployment, while not critical in some parts of the region, is nevertheless a much more serious problem in the north than elsewhere.

Even more serious is underemployment—capable people working at jobs beneath their abilities, others working at wage scales well below what they might earn for comparable work elsewhere.

Small businesses face many similar problems—low business volumes and low profit margins.

Beneath these surface problems lie deep-seated, long-term economic problems.

The north's original resource was timber. It was virtually destroyed through reckless misuse early in this century. We learned a great deal from this tragic experience, and the land is now largely reforested, but the economic problems caused by that squandering of a basic resource and the destruction of the economy which resulted still trouble us today.

Next, we naively thought that "the plow would follow the axe," and we turned whole sections of the deforested north over to farming. Much of the land was unsuited for this purpose, and we still face a tremendous number of problems related to agriculture in the north.

Another great resource was iron ore. With this resource, the north has made a mighty contribution to the industrial growth of our Nation and has helped to win two World Wars. But the old iron ore resource is dwindling. Wisconsin's mines have closed, causing substantial unemployment and dislocation. New technologies offer new hope, but it is doubtful if iron ore mining will ever again play the dominant role in the economy of the north which it has played in some years past. This has a great effect on the closely related railroad industry.

Another important resource for the north is its fish. Here again, major economic problems have been experienced, largely because of the destruction of the lake trout fishery by the sea lamprey.

HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

This brief review of the problems of the north—which is spelled out in full detail in the plans and studies I referred to earlier—points to fairly obvious steps which must be taken to make this region a full partner in our general economic progress.

The program is substantially the same as that which I laid down at the Commission's first meeting on April 11, 1966. I am happy to note that some of the principles and suggestions are already being reflected in the various State programs.

The hope for the north rests in carefully planned development in three areas: recreation, agriculture, and private industry.

The task of this Commission is not only to help organize and promote such development but to make certain that this time it is coordinated, so that we do not accomplish one form of development at the expense of others. No one form of development will accomplish what we hope to accomplish for the north. We need all three, and they must be carefully balanced.

Considering the nationwide economic trend, I think that recreation offers tremendous potential advantages to the north. Tourism and recreation already is big business in Wisconsin. It puts from three-quarters of a billion to a billion dollars a year into our State economy.

We are fortunate to have a number of excellent projects all designed and ready to go to provide a tremendous assist to our northern recreational economy.

The enactment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore bill would give northern Wisconsin one truly outstanding, nationally known park which would attract many hundreds of thousands of tourists and generate millions of dollars a year in new income. It is strategically located within easy driving distance of our three States. This bill is at the decisive stage. I hope the Upper Great Lakes Commission will work for its prompt enactment.

The creation of a St. Croix National Scenic Riverway, and the inclusion of the Wolf River in a new national wild rivers system, would give northern Wisconsin two more outstanding recreational attractions. These three bills could pass yet this year, with the enthusiastic support of the Upper Great Lakes Commission, and I urge the Commission to give these programs high priority.

Also ready for final action by the Congress this year is the National Hiking Trail bill, which includes—for study purposes—a North Country Trail, crossing all three of our States. This bill also would seem to merit priority action by the commission.

The three individual States should also develop their own hiking trail systems, to provide at very low cost the kind of recreational opportunity which is becoming increasingly popular with the American public.

SMALL CRAFT HARBORS

The Wisconsin Department of Resource Development, in 1964 and 1965, prepared comprehensive plans for development of small craft harbors of refuge on Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, Green Bay, and the Mississippi River. It was contemplated that Federal funds would pay half the cost, State motor fuel taxes one-fourth, and local government one-fourth. These harbors would provide a great assist to the development of recreational boating in the north, and would give a number of our communities a facility around which to base expanded tourist development. I hope the Commission will review these detailed plans and make recommendations relating to them.

Sport fishing offers tremendous potential for expansion in northern Wisconsin. The return of the lake trout in Lake Superior, and the stocking of cohoe salmon, give us an opportunity to stimulate a vigorous sport fishery in Lakes Michigan and Superior. I hope the Commission will explore ways to take advantage of this new opportunity.

Needless to say, we will never win the economic dividends of recreational development if we destroy the water resources on which so much of our tourist industry is based. Therefore, I hope the Upper Great Lakes Commission will give serious attention to joint, interstate action to meet the water pollution problem.

A revitalization of the entire transportation system of the North should be undertaken. Long-range plans can include truck highways and major airport improvements. More immediate and less costly short-range plans should include access roads, scenic roads, improvement of smaller airports in many places. The point is that the whole transport system needs to be updated and upgraded.

THE NELSON AMENDMENT

Wherever possible, I think the Commission would be wise to take advantage of existing programs which can be expanded or used more effectively to help this area.

For example, the program which is called the Nelson amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act provides Federal funds to hire chronically unemployed adults on conservation and beautification projects. Last year two projects totaling nearly $1 million were carried out in Wisconsin under this program. Imaginatively used, it offers the prospect of immediate employment for northern Wisconsin residents plus valuable work in improving the recreational facilities to attract more tourists.

Nelson amendment workers could carry out some of the programs of stream improvement, for instance, which have been requested by a number of town boards in the area. This could protect a basic resource, improve fishing, and stimulate the tourist industry.

RECREATION AND INDUSTRY

The need for coordinated action is shown by the fact that a number of projects affect both recreational and industrial development.

For instance, before many of the small communities in this region can be properly developed for either recreation or industry, they should install suitable water and sewer facilities. Zoning ordinances also are vital. Comprehensive community planning is needed.

At a statewide conference which I organized in Ashland last June, it was agreed that such basic planning and community involvement projects must be carefully considered well in advance of any sudden burst of recreational or industrial development. If this is not done, some of our most scenic rural areas and most charming small communities could be spoiled and their potential for further growth seriously damaged. The Upper Great Lakes Commission can be very helpful in guiding our communities in this kind of planning, and advise them in obtaining the basic facilities needed for a better future.

Another matter which affects both recreational and industrial development is the matter of capital and credit. We need imaginative new sources of financing if we are to carry out the recreational and industrial expansion which is anticipated. I have submitted legislation to provide new sources of low-cost, long-term Federal loans for the resort industry. The Commission might want to review the financial assistance now available from the Farmers Home Administration, the Economic Development Administration, and other State and Federal programs to see how these programs could be of even greater benefit to the north and what new programs are needed.

In connection with this, pilot programs should be started which will prove the benefits of lake renewal. The push of population for more recreational areas necessitates our being a step ahead of the demand.

ASSETS OF THE NORTH

Our hope for the industrial development to the north seems to rest on recruiting or developing those industries which need abundant quantities of the resources we have there—fresh water, land, and forest products.

The U.S. Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, our No. 1 national research center, should be a valuable ally to the Commission in probing this new frontier.

The Commission might want to set up a special committee on the forest products industry, to seek ways to bring about quick economic expansion in this industry which spreads all across the northern sections of the three States and which involves a large number of workers.

This is an industry where special training programs, assistance in obtaining capital, or suggestions for new products could have an immediate stimulating effect.

In connection with that, the Commission should examine closely the possibilities and economic feasibility of timber stand improvement and inventory.

Finally, we must give our major attention to agriculture, which is still one of the basic elements of the economy and always will be.

In an area with special soil and climate problems, expert technical assistance such as can be provided by State and Federal agencies is especially valuable. Soil surveys, pasture improvement projects, assistance in setting up marketing procedures, and similar projects offer special hope to the marginal farmer of the north.

PLANT MATERIALS CENTER

I would also strongly urge that a plant materials center be established in the upper Great Lakes region. These centers, under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, develop plants which are adapted to the climate and soil conditions of a particular area. These plants, in turn, are used for stabilizing sand dunes, roadbanks and streambanks as well as for a wide variety of conservation measures. Research activity at these centers involves both adapting existing plants to the climatic and soil conditions of the area and developing and breeding new species of plants which can survive in a given environment.

A plant material center would work in close cooperation with State experiment stations and State conservation departments. At the present time, there is not a plant materials center producing plants for the climate and soil conditions encountered in the Upper Great Lakes States. The development of such a center is consistent with the development of the recreational and outdoor resources of the region.

In order to complete the necessary resource inventory of the upper Great Lakes region, I hope that the Commission give strong support to increased soil survey activity in the area. Soil surveys provide valuable information regarding uses of soil for urban development, for zoning, for taxation, for agriculture, for forestry and for handling sewage from household septic tanks.

In Wisconsin, a strong program of cooperation between the Soil Conservation Service and the Soil Survey Division of the Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey is evolving. In Washburn County, for example, the SCS is doing the bulk of the survey while the State survey is concentrating on detailed surveying and research around lakes to determine the effects of development and use. Such a cooperative program will undoubtedly produce a complete inventory of the soil resources of that particular county.

A WISE INVESTMENT

Finally, let me say something about the particular cost of these and other proposals which will come before the Commission.

Our States and our Nation suffer if vast areas are allowed to remain in an economic state where they perform far below their potential. Some sections of the northland must now be subsidized in one way or another by other sections of the State. The continued drain of talented young people from these vast rural areas to our already crowded cities is not good for anyone.

We must quickly take the steps necessary to preserve and develop our rural areas as a pleasant and rewarding place to live, to work, and to play. These areas represent the future of our State and Nation, because they are the areas where the greatest growth of the future must occur. We must see to it that that growth and development is carefully planned and creatively channeled—for the sake of the people who now live in those areas, for the greater number who will live there in the future and for all our citizens.

It is my sincere desire, as a citizen of Wisconsin and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Great Lakes Problems of the Great Lakes Conference of Senators, to cooperate to the fullest extent possible with the Commission, I am sure that my Senate colleagues from the Midwest sincerely desire to do so also.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues of the upper Great Lakes today in exploring some of the programs that we hope the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission will be implementing in the coming session. I am especially grateful to have the opportunity to discuss this subject with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

As chairman of the Subcommittee of the Great Lakes Conference of Senators which handles the Upper Great Lakes Commission, he has been a forceful and articulate spokesman in championing the cause of the Great Lakes. As former Governor of the State of Wisconsin and now as Senator, he has worked hard to bring into reality the concept of regional planning that is embodied in the Upper Great Lakes Commission. I know he was gratified when title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 was signed into law, for this is a plan he has worked very hard to bring into being.

As Senators from the Upper Great Lakes Commission, we, of course, are concerned with the programs that the Commission will be submitting to Congress later in this session. We included and supported title V in the bill for the express purpose of fostering regional planning. Even before the bill was signed into law, we petitioned the Secretary of Commerce to designate the upper Great Lakes area as a regional commission under title V of the act. We did this because we realized the uniqueness of the area and its suitability for designation as a regional commission. We also realized that only by a concerted effort on the part of the Federal Government could this area achieve its potential.

In discussing this matter with my fellow Senators, we have all come to the conclusion that the time has now come for action. The Commission's own record shows that there are 761 studies—State, Federal, and private studies—dealing with this area. We do not need more studies. We know what has to be done. The time has come to do it.

I am heartened by the specific suggestions that have been offered thus far by my distinguished colleagues, and I would like to request some programs that would be particularly appropriate with respect to Minnesota.

First of all, we need a massive effort to improve the transportation facilities. In this I include roads, expressways, airports, and increased use of the Great Lakes themselves.

I urge that the Commission undertake construction of a range highway in the State of Minnesota. This road would link the entire iron range of the State. It would go from Ely, Minn., to Cohasset, connecting the cities of Virginia, Hibbing, and the other industrial cities of the area.

This is most important, since copper-nickel mining will soon begin near Ely, and the other sities involved are constructing taconite plants. In order to promote this development, it is necessary to have an adequate road system to handle industrial traffic and reach the existing and potential recreational facilities of the area.

One of the continuing problems in the region is the absence of adequate highway facilities to transport agricultural products from western Minnesota and the Dakotas to Duluth. I hope the regional development program will include a good highway from Fargo to Duluth, to help in the development of the Duluth port. In addition, we need new farm-to-market roads, improvement of U.S. Highway 2 across the northern part of Minnesota, development of access roads to our many recreational areas, and establishment of a roadside park system.

Just as road construction is important, we also must work to create new airports and improve the ones we have already. Only by making the northern area more accessible to industry and tourists can we improve the region. We must also consider the role that the Port of Duluth can play in the development of the region. We must look to the possibility of expanding the port facilities so that the port can truly take its place as one of the great ports in the world.

The timber industry and the commercial fishing industry played an important role in the economy of the region back in the 1940's, but this role has declined, and we must look to revitalizing these two great industries.

We must make sure this region fully develops its potential as a tourist area. I have already mentioned the improvement of the roads. We must do this, and we have to create more recreational areas and improve the ones we already have.

We must see to it that we develop industries to diversify the economy, in addition to the further strengthening of the taconite industry. This includes research into the further treatment of low-grade ores. We must also see to it that this related economic development is aided by trained manpower through the development of more vocational-educational schools to serve these fledgling industries.

In addition to these items, we cannot forge some of our already basic concerns. We must guarantee adequate health facilities for the area. We must protect our natural beauty by seeing to it that we continue to fight water pollution and promote local beautification projects. These things we must do.

I have only mentioned a few of the things which I hope that the Commission will undertake. As Senators of this area, we know that this development can take place. We solicit the help of the Commission and the Congress in bringing the upper Great Lakes region into the real economic life of this Nation.

"NOT BACKWARD TO BELLIGERENCY BUT FORWARD TO PEACE"

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week Israel's distinguished Foreign Minister, Mr. Abba Eban, delivered before the U.N. Security Council a speech which, in my opinion, history will rank among the great classics of statesmanship.

Mr. Eban began his presentation by outlining the many dangers that confronted Israel on all its frontiers at the point where the current hostilities began. Let me quote a few of the key passages from this portion of his eloquent address:

> An army, greater than any force ever assembled in Sinai, had massed against Israel's southern frontier. Egypt had dismissed the United Nations forces which symbolized the international interest in the maintenance of peace in our region. Nasser had provocatively brought five infantry divisions and two armoured divisions up to our very gates—80,000 men and 900 tanks were poised to move . . .
>
> There was peril for Israel wherever it looked. Its manpower had been hastily mobilized. Its economy and commerce were beating with feeble pulse. Its streets were dark and empty. There was an apocalyptic air of approaching peril. And Israel faced this danger alone . . .
>
> Now there could be no doubt about what was intended for us. With my very ears I heard President Nasser's speech on 28 May. He said:
>
> "We intend to open a general assault against Israel. This will be total war. Our basic aim is the destruction of Israel."

Nasser is now reaping the fruits of the aggression he has practiced and the larger aggression he had planned against Israel. The amazing victories scored by the Israel forces in recent days have not merely insured the survival of Israel—they have served the cause of all freedom-loving nations by putting an end, once and for all, to Nasser's anti-Western regime, to his pro-Soviet intrigues, to his meddling and subversion in other African countries, to his hate-mongering propaganda, to his unbridled expansionism.

Foreign Minister Eban in his statement to the U.N. Security Council did not call for vengeance. Nor did he cry "Woe to the vanquished." Instead, he appealed to Israel's Arab neighbors for peace.

> Israel in recent days has proved its steadfastness and vigor—

He said.

> It is now willing to demonstrate its instinct for peace. Let us build a new system of relationships from the wreckage of the old. Let us discern across the darkness the vision of a better and a brighter dawn.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record the full text of Foreign Minister Aba Eban's historic statement before the U.N. Security Council.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Not Backward to Belligerency but Forward to Peace

(Text of the address by Israel's Foreign Minister, Mr. Abba Eban, in the United Nations Security Council on June 6, 1967.)

Mr. President: I have just come from Jerusalem to tell the Security Council that Israel, by its independent effort and sacrifice, has passed from serious danger to successful resistance.

Two days ago Israel's condition caused much concern across the humane and friendly world. Israel had reached a sombre hour. Let me try to evoke the point at which our fortunes stood.

An army, greater than any force ever assembled in Sinai, had massed against Israel's southern frontier. Egypt had dismissed the United Nations forces which symbolized the international interest in the maintenance of peace in our region. Nasser had provocatively brought five infantry divisions and two armoured divisions up to our very gates; 80,000 men and 900 tanks were poised to move.

PLAN TO ENCIRCLE ISRAEL

A special striking force comprising an armoured division with at least 200 tanks, was concentrated against Elath at the Negev's southern tip. Here was a clear design to cut the southern Negev off from the main body of our State. For Egypt had openly proclaimed that Elath did not form part of Israel and had predicted that Israel itself would soon expire. The proclamation was empty; the prediction now lies in ruin. While the main brunt of the hostile threat was focussed on the southern front, an alarming plan of encirclement was under way. With Egypt's initiative and guidance, Israel was already being strangled in its maritime approaches to the whole eastern half of the world. For sixteen years, Israel had been illicitly denied passage in the Suez Canal, despite the Security Council's decision of 1 September 1961. And now the creative enterprise of ten patient years which had opened an international route across the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba had been suddenly and arbitrarily choked. Israel was and is breathing with only a single lung.

Jordan had been intimidated against its better interest into joining a defence pact. It is not a defence pact at all: It is an aggressive pact, of which I saw the consequences with my own eyes yesterday in the shells falling upon institutions of health and culture in the City of Jerusalem. Every house and street in Jerusalem came into the range of fire as a result of Jordan's adherence to this pact; So also did the crowded, and pathetically narrow coastal strip in which so much of Israel's life and population is concentrated.

Iraqi troops reinforced Jordanian units in areas immediately facing vital and vulnerable Israel communication centres. Expeditionary forces from Algeria and Kuwait had reached Egyptian territory. Nearly all the Egyptian forces which had been attempting the conquest of the Yemen had been transferred to the coming assault upon Israel. Syrian units, including artillery, overlooked the Israeli villages in the Jordan Valley. Terrorist troops came regularly into our territory to kill, plunder and set off explosions; The most recent occasion was five days ago.

PERIL CONFRONTED ISRAEL ALL AROUND

In short, there was peril for Israel wherever it looked. Its manpower had been hastily mobilized. Its economy and commerce were beating with feeble pulse. Its streets were dark and empty. There was an apocalyptic air of approaching peril. And Israel faced this danger alone.

But not entirely alone. We were buoyed up by an unforgettable surge of public sympathy across the world. Friendly Governments expressed the rather ominous hope that Israel would manage "to live". But the dominant theme of our condition was danger and solitude.

Now there could be no doubt about what was intended for us. With my very ears I heard President Nasser's speech on 28 May. He said:

"We intend to open a general assault against Israel. This will be total war. Our basic aim is the destruction of Israel."

On 2 June, the Egyptian Commander in Sinai, General Murtagi, published his order of the day, calling on his troops to wage a war of destruction against Israel. Here, then, was a systematic, overt, proclaimed design at politicide, the murder of a State.

The policy, the arms, the men had all been brought together. And the State thus threatened with collective assassination was itself the last sanctuary of people which had seen six million of its sons exterminated by a more powerful dictator two decades before.

BLOCKADE COULD NOT BE PASSIVELY SUFFERED

The question then widely asked in Israel and across the world was whether we had not already gone beyond the utmost point of danger. Was there any precedent in world history, for example, for a nation passively to suffer the blockade of its only southern port, involving nearly all its vital fuel, when such acts of war, legally and internationally have always invited resistance? This was a most unusual patience. It existed because we had acceded to the suggestion of some of the maritime States that we give them scope to concert their efforts in order to find an international solution which would ensure the maintenance of free passage in the Gulf of Aqaba for ships of all nations and of all flags.

As we pursued this avenue of international solution we wished the world to have no doubt about our readiness to exhaust every prospect, however fragile, of a diplomatic solution. And some of the prospects that were suggested were very fragile indeed.

ISRAEL'S MARGIN OF SECURITY DIMINISHED

But as time went on there was no doubt that our margin of general security was becoming smaller and smaller. Thus, on the morning of 5 June, when Egyptian forces engaged us by air and land, bombarding the villages of Kissufim, Nahal-Oz and Ein Hashelosha we knew that our limit of safety had been reached and perhaps passed. In accordance with its inherent right of self-defence as formulated in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, Israel responded defensively in full strength. Never in the history of nations has armed force been used in a more righteous or compelling cause.

Even when engaged with Egyptian forces we still hoped to contain the conflict. Egypt was overtly bent on our destruction but we still hoped that others would not join the aggression. Prime Minister Eshkol, who for weeks had carried the heavy burden of calculation and decision, published and conveyed a message to other neighbouring States proclaiming:

"We shall not attack any country unless it opens war on us. Even now, when the mortars speak, we have not given up our quest for peace. We strive to repel all menace of terrorism and any danger of aggression to ensure our security and our legitimate rights."

ISRAEL HAD NO DESIRE TO EXPAND CONFLICT

In accordance with this policy of attempting to contain the conflict, I yesterday invited General Bull, the Chairman of the Truce Supervision Organization, to inform the heads of the Jordanian State that Israel had no desire to expand the conflict beyond the unfortunate dimensions that it had already assumed and that if Israel were not attacked by Jordan, it would not attack and would act only in self-defence. It reached my ears that this message had been duly and faithfully conveyed and received. Nevertheless, Jordan decided to join the Egyptian posture against Israel and opened artillery attacks across the whole frontier, including Jerusalem. Those attacks are still in progress.

To the appeal of Prime Minister Eshkol to avoid any further extension of the conflict, Syria answered at 12:20 yesterday morning by bombing Megiddo from the air and bombing Deganya at 12:40 with artillery fire and kibbutz Ein Hamifrats and Koordani with long-range guns. But Jordan embarked on a much more total assault by artillery and aircraft along the entire front with special emphasis on Jerusalem, to whose dangerous and noble ordeal yesterday I can bear personal witness.

HEAVY BOMBARDMENT OF ISRAEL'S CAPITAL, JERUSALEM

There has been bombing of houses; There has been a hit on the great new National Museum of Art; There has been a hit on the University and on Shaare Tsedek, the first hospital ever to have been established outside the ancient walls. Is this not an act of vandalism that deserves the condemnation of all mankind? And in the Knesset Building, whose construction had been movingly celebrated by the entire democratic world ten months ago, the Israeli Cabinet and Parliament met under heavy gunfire, whose echoes mingled at the end of our meeting with Hatikvah, the anthem of hope.

Thus throughout the day and night of June 5, Jordan which we had expressly invited to abstain from needless slaughter became, to our surprise, and still remains, the most intense of all the belligerents; Death and injury, as so often in history, stalk Jerusalem's streets.

When the approaching Egytian aircraft appeared on our radar screens, soon to be followed by artillery attacks on our villages near the Gaza Strip, I instructed Ambassador Rafael to inform the Security Council, in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter. I know that that involved arousing you, Mr. President, at a most uncongenial hour of the night, but we felt that the Security Council should be most urgently seized.

ISRAEL DISCONCERTED BY U.N. ROLE

I should, however, be less than frank if I were to conceal the fact that the Government and people of Israel have been disconcerted by some aspects of the United Nations role in this conflict. The sudden withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force was not accompanied, as it should have been, by due international consultations on the consequences of that withdrawal. Moreover, Israeli interests were affected. They were not adequately explored. No attempt was made, little time given, to help Israel surmount grave prejudice to its vital interests consequent on that withdrawal. After all, a new confrontation of forces suddenly arose. It suddenly had to be met. And at Sharm el-Sheikh at the entrance to the Strait of Tiran, legality walked out and blockade walked in. The peace of the world trembled. The United Nations had somehow been put into a position of leaving Sinai safe for belligerency.

It is not a question of sovereignty that is here involved. The United Nations has a right to ask that when it assumes a function, the termination of that function shall not take place in conditions that would lead to anti-Charter situations. I do not raise this point in order to linger upon that which is past; but because of Israel's general attitude to the peace-keeping functions of this Organization. I confess that my own attitude and those of my colleagues and of my fellow-citizens to the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations have been traumatically affected by this experience.

The United Nations Emergency Force rendered distinguished service. Nothing became it less than the manner of its departure. All gratitude and appreciation is owed to the individuals who sustained its action. If in the course of the recent combats United Nations personnel have fallen dead or wounded then I join my voice in an expression of the most sincere regret.

FUTURE U.N. ROLE PROBLEMATIC

The problem of the future role of a United Nations presence in conflicts such as these is much debated. We must ask ourselves a question that has arisen as a result of this experience. People in our country and in many countries ask: What is the use of a United Nations presence if it is, in effect, an umbrella which is taken away as soon as it begins to rain?

Surely, then, future arrangements for peace-keeping must depend more on the agreement and implementation by the parties themselves than on machinery which is totally at the mercy of the host country, so totally at its mercy as to be the instrument of its policies, whatever those policies may be.

We have lived through three dramatic weeks. Those weeks have brought into clear view the main elements of tension, and also the chief promise of relaxed tension in the future. The first link in the chain was the series of sabotage acts emanating from Syria. In October last year, the Security Council was already seized of this problem. A majority of its member States found it possible and necessary to draw attention to the Syrian Government's responsibility for altering that situation. Scarcely a day passed without a mine, a bomb, a hand-grenade or a mortar exploding on Israel's soil, sometimes with lethal or crippling effects; always with an unsettling psychological influence. In general, fourteen or fifteen such incidents would accumulate before a response was considered necessary. And this ceaseless accumulation of terrorist incidents in the name of what was called "popular war", together with responses which in the long run sometimes became inevitable, were for a long period the main focus of tension in the Middle East.

But then there came a graver source of tension in mid-May, when abnormal troop concentrations were observed in the Sinai Peninsula. For the ten years of relative stability beginning with March 1957 and ending with May 1967, the Sinai Desert had been free of Egyptian troops. In other words, a natural geographic barrier, a largely uninhabited space, separated the main forces of the two sides. It is true that in terms of sovereignty and law, any State has a right to put its armies in any part of its territory that it chooses. This, however, is not a legal question: It is a political and a security question. Experience in many parts of the world, not least in our own, demonstrates that massive armies in close proximity to each other, against a background of a doctrine of belligerency and accompanying threats by one army to annihilate the other create an inflammatory situation.

We were puzzled in Israel by the relative lack of preoccupation on the part of friendly Governments and international agencies with this intense concentration which found its reflection in precautionary concentrations on our side. My Government proposed, at least two weeks ago, the concept of a parallel and reciprocal reduction of forces on both sides of the frontier. We elicited no response and certainly no action.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAY CLOSED

To these grave sources of tension—the sabotage and terrorist movement, emanating mostly from Syria, and the heavy troop concentrations accompanied by dire, apocalyptic threats in Sinai—there was added in the third week of May the most electric shock of all. This was the closure of the international waterway consisting of the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba. It is not difficult to understand why this incident had a more drastic impact than others. In 1957 the maritime nations, within the framework of the United Nations General Assembly, correctly enunciated the doctrine of free and innocent passage through the Strait. Now, when that doctrine was proclaimed—and incidentally, not challenged by the Egyptian representative at that time—it was little more than an abstract principle for the maritime world. For Israel it was a great but still unfulfilled prospect. It was not yet a reality. But during the ten years in which we and the other States of the maritime community have relied upon that doctrine and upon established usage, the principle has become a reality, consecrated by hundreds of sailings under dozens of flags and the establishment of a whole complex of commerce and industry and communication. A new dimension has been added to the map of the world's communications. On that dimension we have constructed Israel's bridge toward the friendly States of Asia and Africa, a network of relationships which is the chief pride of Israel in the second decade of its independence.

All this, then, had grown up as an effective usage under the United Nations flag. Does Mr. Nasser really think that he can come upon the scene in ten minutes and cancel the established legal usage and interests of ten years?

There was in this wanton act a quality of malice. For surely the closing of the Strait of Tiran gave no benefit whatever to Egypt except the perverse joy of inflicting injury on others. It was an anarchic act, because it showed a total disregard for the law of nations, the application of which in this specific case had not been challenged for ten years. And it was an act of arrogance, because there are other nations in Asia and East Africa that trade with the Port of Elath, as they have every right to do, through the Strait of Tiran and across the Gulf of Aqaba. Other sovereign States from Japan to Ethiopia, from Thailand to Uganda, from Cambodia to Madagascar, have a sovereign right to decide for themselves whether they wish or do not wish to trade with Israel. These countries are not colonies of Cairo. They can trade with Israel or not trade with Israel as they wish, and President Nasser is not the policeman of other African and Asian States.

Here then was a wanton intervention in the sovereign rights of other States in the eastern half of the world to decide for themselves whether or not they wish to establish trade relations with either or both of the two ports at the head of the Gulf of Aqaba.

A BLOCKADE IS AN ACT OF WAR

When we examine the implications of this act, we have no cause to wonder that the international shock was great. There was another reason too for that shock. Blockades have traditionally been regarded, in the pre-Charter parlance, as acts of war. To blockade, after all, is to attempt strangulation—and sovereign States are entitled not to have their trade strangled. To understand how the State of Israel felt, one has merely to look around this table and imagine, for example, a foreign Power forcibly closing New York or Montreal, Boston, or Marseilles, Toulon or Copenhagen, Rio or Tokyo or Bombay harbour. How would your Governments react? What would you do? How long would you wait?

But Israel waited because of its confidence that the other maritime Powers and countries interested in this new trading pattern would concert their influence in order to re-establish a legal situation and to liquidate this blockade. We concerted action with them not because Israel's national interest was here abdicated. There will not be—there cannot be—an Israel without Elath. We cannot be expected to return to a dwarfed stature, with our face to the Mediterranean alone. In law and in history, peace and blockades have never coexisted. How could it be expected that the blockade of Elath and a relaxation of tension in the Middle East could ever be brought into harmony?

THREE MAIN ELEMENTS OF TENSION

These then were the three main elements in the tension: the sabotage movement; the blockade of the port; and, perhaps more imminent than anything else, this vast and purposeful encirclement movement, against the background of an authorized presidential statement announcing that the objective of the encirclement was to bring about the destruction and the annihilation of a sovereign State.

These acts taken together—the blockade, the dismissal of the United Nations force, and the heavy concentration in Sinai—effectively disrupted the *status quo* which had ensured a relative stability on the Egyptian-Israeli frontier for ten years. I do not use the words "relative stability" lightly, for while those elements of the Egyptian-Israeli relationship existed there was not one single incident of violence between Egypt and Israel for ten years. But suddenly this pattern of mutually accepted stablity was smashed to smithereens. It is now the task of the Governments concerned to elaborate the new conditions of their coexistence. I think that much of this work should be done directly by these Governments themselves. Surely, after what has happened we must have better assurance than before, for Israel and the Middle East of peaceful coexistence. The question is whether there is any reason to believe that such a new era may yet come to pass. If I am sanguine on this point, it is because of a conviction that men and nations do behave wisely once they have exhausted all other alternatives. Surely the other alternatives of war and belligerency have now been exhausted. And what has anybody gained from them? But in order that the new system of interstate relationships may flourish in the Middle East, it is important that certain principles be applied above and beyond the cease-fire to which the Security Council has given its unanimous support.

ISRAEL WELCOMES APPEAL FOR CEASE-FIRE

Let me then say here that Israel welcomes the appeal for the cease-fire as formulated in this resolution. But I must point out that the implementation depends on the absolute and sincere acceptance and co-operation of the other parties, which, in our view, are responsible for the present situation. And in conveying this resolution to my colleagues, I must at this moment point out that these other Governments have not used the opportunity yet to clarify their intentions.

I have said that the situation to be constructed after cease-fire must depend on certain principles. The first of these principles surely must be the acceptance of Israel's Statehood and the total elimination of the fiction of its non-existence. It would seem to me that after 3,000 years the time has arrived to accept Israel's nationhood as a fact. Here is the only State in the international community which has the same territory, speaks the same language and upholds the same faith as it did 3,000 years ago.

And if, as everybody knows to be the fact, the universal conscience was in the last week or two most violently shaken at the prospect of danger to Israel, it was not only because there seemed to be a danger to a State. It was also, because the State was Israel, with all that this ancient name evokes, teaches, symbolizes and inspires. How grotesque would be an international community which found room for 127 sovereign units and which did not acknowledge the sovereignty of that people which had given nationhood its deepest significance and its most enduring grace.

ISRAEL'S SUCCESSFUL RESISTANCE EVOKES RELIEF

No wonder, then, that when danger threatened we could hear a roar of indignation sweep across the world. No wonder that men in progressive movements and members of the scientific and humanistic cultures joined together in sounding an alarm bell about an issue that vitally affected the human conscience. And no wonder that a deep and universal sense of satisfaction and relief has accompanied the news of Israel's gallant and successful resistance.

But the central point remains the need to secure an authentic recognition by our neighbours of Israel's deep roots in the Middle Eastern reality. There is an intellectual tragedy in the failure of Arab leaders to come to grips, however reluctantly, with the depth and authenticity of Israel's roots in the life, the history, the spiritual experience and the culture of the Middle East.

This, then, is the first axiom. A much more conscious and uninhibited acceptance of Israel's Statehood is an axiom requiring no demonstration. There will never be a Middle East without an independent and sovereign State of Israel in its midst.

The second principle must be that of the peaceful settlement of disputes. The resolution now adopted falls within the concept of the peaceful settlement of disputes. I have already said that much could be done if the Governments of the area would embark much more on direct contacts. They must find their way to each other. After all, when there is conflict between them they come together face to face. Why should they not come together face to face to solve the conflict? On some occasions it would not be a bad idea to have the solution before, and therefore instead of, the conflict.

NOT BACKWARD TO BELLIGERENCY—BUT FORWARD TO PEACE

When the Council discusses what is to happen after the cease-fire, we hear many formulae: back to 1956, back to 1948—I understand our neighbours would wish to turn the clock back to 1947. The fact is, however, that most clocks move forward and not backward. This should be the case with the clock of Middle Eastern peace. Not backward to belligerency, but forward to peace.

The point was well made this evening by the representative from Argentina, who said: "The cease-fire must be followed immediately by the most energetic efforts to find a just and true peace in the Middle East." In a similar sense, the representative of Canada warned us against merely reproducing the old positions of conflict, without attempting to settle the underlying issues of Arab-Israeli coexistence. After all, many things in recent days have been mixed up with each other. Few things are what they were. And in order to create harmonious combinations of relationships, it is inevitable that the States should come together in negotiation.

Another factor in the harmony that we would like to see in the Middle East relates to external Powers. From these, and especially from the greatest amongst them, the small States of the Middle East—and most of them are small—ask for a rigorous support, not for individual States, but for specific principles; not to be for one State against other States, but to be for peace against war, for free commerce against belligerency, for the pacific settlement of disputes against violent irredentist threats; in other words, to exercise an even-handed support for the integrity and independence of States and for the rights of States under the Charter of the United Nations and other sources of international law.

There are no two categories of States. The United Arab Republic, Iraq, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon—not one of these has a single ounce or milligram of Statehood which does not adhere in equal measures to Israel itself.

BALANCED ATTITUDE REQUIRED FROM OTHER STATES

It is important that States outside our region apply a balanced attitude. They should not exploit temporary tensions and divergencies in the issues of global conflict. They should not seek to win gains by inflaming fleeting passions and they should strive to make a balanced distribution of their friendship amongst the States of the Middle East.

Now whether all the speeches of all the great Powers this evening meet this criterion, everybody, of course, can judge for himself. I do not propose to answer in detail all the observations of the representative of the Soviet Union. I had the advantage of hearing the same things in identical language a few days ago from his colleague, the Soviet Ambassador in Israel. I must confess that I was no more convinced this evening than I was the day before yesterday about the validity of this most vehement and one-sided denunciation. But surely world opinion, before whose tribunal this debate unrolls, can solve this question by posing certain problems to itself. Who was it that attempted to destroy a neighbouring State in 1948, Israel or its neighbours? Who now closes an international waterway to the port of a neighbouring State, Israel or the United Arab Republic? Does Israel refuse to negotiate a peace settlement with the Arab States, or do they refuse to do so with it? Who disrupted the 1957 pattern of stability, Israel or Egypt? Did troops of Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon, Kuwait and Algeria surround Israel in this menacing confrontation, or has any distinguished representative seen some vast Israeli colossus surrounding the area between Morocco and Kuwait?

I raise these points of elementary logic. Of course, a great Power can take refuge in its power from the exigencies of logic. All of us in our youth presumably recounted La Fontaine's fable, *La raison du plus fort est toujours la meilleure*. But here, after all, there is nobody who is more or less strong than others; we sit here around the table on the concept of sovereign equality. But I think we have an equal duty to bring substantive proof for any denunciation that we make, each of the other.

These are grave times. And yet they may have fortunate issue. This could be the case if those who decided three weeks ago, to disrupt the status quo would ask themselves what the benefits have been. As he looks around him at the arena of battle, at the wreckage of planes and tanks, at the collapse of intoxicated hopes, might not an Egyptian ruler ponder whether anything was achieved by that disruption? What has it brought but strife, conflict with other powerful interests, and the stern criticism of progressive men throughout the world?

Israel in recent days has proved its steadfastness and vigour. It is now willing to demonstrate its instinct for peace. Let us build a new system of relationships from the wreckage of the old. Let us discern across the darkness the vision of a better and a brighter dawn.

DEATH IN THE LINE OF DUTY OF PAUL SCHUTZER, LIFE PHOTOGRAPHER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke of the tragic death of my friend of many years—Ted Yates. Today I speak of another of the tragic losses in the Near East conflict—the death of Paul Schutzer, veteran Life magazine photographer. Mr. Schutzer was a native New Yorker, and his wife Bernice and their two young children presently live in New Rochelle.

Mr. Schutzer was traveling with an armored column across the Gaza strip when the half-track he was on suffered a direct hit. He had not only volunteered to go to Israel, but insisted he would go anyway if Life did not assign him. During the more than 10 years he had been with Life magazine, he covered the Lebanon crisis, the building of the Berlin wall, the Algerian war, and the Iran earthquake, and spent 24 hours in a Cuban jail in 1961 and 2 months in Vietnam in 1965. His death is a tragic loss to his family, his many friends, his profession, and to the public it serves.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the deaths of Ted Yates and Paul Schutzer, published in the New York Times of June 7, 1967:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. TV AIDE AND PHOTOGRAPHER ARE KILLED IN MIDEAST FIGHTING

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL, June 6.—Two American newsmen have been killed in the Middle East fighting, one in Israel and the other on the Jordanian side, it was reported today.

Ted Yates of the National Broadcasting Corporation, a television producer-director, died today of wounds he received in the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem yesterday.

Mr. Yates was leading a crew of five from NBC in filming a documentary of the fighting when he was hit in the head by a bullet.

Paul Schutzer of New Rochelle, N.Y., a Time-Life photographer, was shot and killed covering a battle in the Negev yesterday, an Israeli Army spokesman confirmed.

According to the Time-Life bureau in Paris, a Life reporter, Michael Mok, cabled that a 57-mm recoilless rifle shell had hit the halftrack in which he and Mr. Schutzer were riding. The vehicle caught fire, but Mr. Mok escaped.

YATES HAD NARROW ESCAPES

Mr. Yates, a Marine combat correspondent during the war in Korea, had covered many combat zones and had had several narrow escapes during his career as a producer of television documentaries.

NBC recalled yesterday that he had been fired upon by North Vietnamese in Laos, stoned by Communists in Sumatra, expelled from Cambodia and caught between rioting students and a bayonet charge by a palace guard in Java. During that charge his driver was bayoneted in the mouth.

A newspaper reporter who like Mr. Yates covered the events following the United States intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965 said that the tall, slender, good-looking producer seemed to have an affinity "for going wherever surprise trouble would develop."

He said that Mr. Yates was at an intersection-checkpoint when a Miami Herald reporter and photographer were machine-gunned and badly wounded by United States Marines.

He also was on hand when Dominican rebels fired on six United States marines who had taken a wrong turn. Two of the marines were killed and a third was fatally wounded.

Mr. Yates' colleagues said he was just inside the lobby of the Intercontinental Hotel in the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem Monday when machine-gun fire hit the hotel. They reported that the others had dived for cover but that Mr. Yates had remained standing to watch what was going on. He suffered serious head wounds.

The producer-director, who also was a writer, narrator and reporter, headed a five-man NBC team that had been preparing a documentary on the Middle East situation for the last 10 days. He went from Amman, Jordan, to Jerusalem early Monday.

Regarded as one of the most talented producers in television, Mr. Yates had won many awards. In 1965 he received the George Polk Award for his reporting on Vietnam and the following year an Overseas Press Club citation for his coverage in the Dominican Republic.

Recently he and Robert Rogers of NBC were cited by the Overseas Press Club for their news special, "The Undeclared War," on the social and political unrest in Guatemala, Colombia and Peru.

Mr. Yates was born in Sheridan, Wyo., on Oct. 1, 1930. When he was 18, his back was broken as he was thrown while working as a rodeo rider.

After a year at the University of Virginia, he joined NBC but became a marine the following year. He returned to NBC in 1952 as a White House correspondenent and producer of an NBC-TV program. "Your President's Week."

He is survived by his wife, the former Mary Olberg of La Crosse, Wis., and three sons, Eames Hamilton, 10; Frederick Langdon, 8, and Angus Forbes, 6. They lived in Washington.

SCHUTZER'S COURAGE CITED

Mr. Schutzer had, in the word of a newspaperman friend, "almost too much courage." The friend said that despite the photographer's years of experience he never tired of accepting dangerous and arduous assignments.

A spokesman for Life magazine said that he not only had volunteered to cover the Middle Eastern crisis but had insisted that he would go in any case if Life did not assign him.

He was in one of the leading armored half-tracks of an Israeli armored column counter-attacking Monday across the Gaza Strip toward the town of Gaza when it was hit by a burst from an antitank weapon and broke into flames.

Mr. Schutzer was born in Brooklyn July 11, 1930, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Hyman Schutzer. His father is a lawyer. The son's interest in photography began at the age of 10 when he found a broken camera in a neighbor's wastebasket, taped it together and began taking pictures.

After studying at the Cooper Union Art School and then for a time at the Law School of Long Island University, Mr. Schutzer decided he wanted to be a photographer.

After freelance work he joined Life in Washington, in 1956 as its youngest staff photographer. His first assignment was a Long Island hurricane. Three years later he was badly injured while covering Hurricane Audrey at Lake Charles, La.

HE WORKED IN LEBANON

In 1958 he was a member of a Life team in Lebanon during the crisis that brought the landing of United States troops.

The following year he was awarded the grand prize, first and second prizes and two honorable mentions in a competition among White House photographers. That year he also won the News Photographer of the Year Award sponsored by the University of Missouri and the Encyclopedia Britannica and the best in show award in U.S. Camera Magazine's Washington exhibit.

He traveled with President Eisenhower in the United States and abroad and covered President Kennedy's 1960 campaign.

With Paris as his base from July, 1961, he covered many assignments. He photographed the building of the Berlin wall and the Algerian war, and was the first reporter-photographer allowed to travel on a Polaris nuclear submarine.

Twice in 1961 he went to Cuba during the United States-Cuban crisis after the unsuccessful invasion attempt and he spent 24 hours in jail there.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on June 5, 1967, the unsteady peace in the Middle East melted beneath the fires of open warfare. As one observer wrote, "peace in the Middle East, and perhaps in the world, was at the mercy of an incident," ever since the Egyptians mobilized along the Israel border—without the buffer of a United Nations Emergency Force—and blockaded the Gulf of Aqaba illegally.

All of us have followed troop movements and advancing fronts in the minute detail offered by television and newspaper coverage. Once again we have been witness to the human tragedy of war. Once again we are reminded of the pain and suffering and destruction brought by war.

We have all been witness to a young nation's "finest day"—and to the victories of the days that followed. With dedication, courage, and heart, the Israel people have fought a remarkable fight. To Nasser's cry for "total war and the destruction of Israel," the Israelis replied with stunning military success. Against adversaries of far greater numbers, they brought unmatched skill and competence. They had no choice but to oppose Egypt's Nasser and those in league with him. For they were surrounded on three sides by sworn enemies. They were cut off by the ships of a bellicose Egypt. The Israelis fought to preserve the very life of their state.

This was the situation immediately preceding hostilities. It must be viewed against a background filled with conflict and tensions that have roots deep in the history, culture, and geography of the Middle East. The influence of an outside power playing upon these dissonant chords whenever possible must also be noted. For this has been the policy of the Soviet Union since 1955, following the first arms deal with Egypt and the Soviet agreement to help build the Aswan Dam. In all, the Soviet Union has encouraged the Arab countries to act more independently of the Western powers, by furnishing them with almost $3 billion worth of military and related assistance. Soviet intentions are clear: To gain dominant political influence in the Middle East. In the words of Britain's Foreign Minister, George Brown, the most modern Soviet arms are in the Middle East "for the purpose of changing the global balance of power."

Since the time of Peter the Great, Russia has tried to control this area. Geopoliticians have pointed out time and again that the Middle East is the land bridge between three continents: Europe, Asia, and Africa. Its geographical position and economic importance give this area special strategic importance. If one strong power controls the Middle East, that power is in a position to dominate three continents. In 1827, the Duke of Wellington warned against "an untoward event threatening to disturb the balance of power" in the area. Today we know that it has been Israel—and her existence alone—which has kept the Middle East out of the sphere of Soviet domination.

And it would seem that Russia, like the other powers, realized the seriousness of the situation—that hostilities in the Middle East held the seed for what could have been world holocaust. We have recently learned that the Middle East crisis was the subject of an exchange of letters between President Johnson and Chairman Kosygin. It is to be hoped that the Soviet Union will have both the wisdom and the constructive influence to help in the herculean task of bringing permanent peace and stability to the Middle East. This is Israel's goal, and that of the United States. But we must realize that it lies at the end of a long, rough road. The first step toward that goal has been taken.

On June 6 the Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution calling for an immediate cease-fire and an end to all military activities in the Middle East. Let us hope that the cease-fire will soon be fully implemented, and that it will serve as a prelude to stable peace.

A few hours ago, we learned to our shock of the tragic loss of life on board the U.S.S. *Liberty*—the subject of armed attack.

This tragedy is compelling evidence of the pressing need to bring the violence to an end. We are dangerously near the precipice of total war. We must seek all possible ways to end this tragic war.

And we must work for a permanent settlement in the Middle East—one that will prevent war from erupting again. A permanent settlement, it seems to me, must contain at least two elements:

First, Israel and her neighbors must sign a peace treaty recognizing the permanent nationhood of Israel and guaranteeing all the world's shipping through the Suez Canal, the Strait of Tiran, and the Gulf of Aqaba.

Second, the major powers must guarantee the rights and borders agreed to in the peace treaty, and, working together, they must control arms shipments into the Middle East.

The armistice agreements Israel signed with Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan in 1949 provided for a peace treaty to follow. But 19 years have passed. There have been tensions, turmoil and bloodshed—but no peace treaty. The current hostilities are witness to the dire consequences of this lack. At last there must be written guarantees that the Arab nations will no longer try to erase Israel from the face of the map, just as there must be provisions guaranteeing to Israel the same free use of international waters enjoyed by other maritime powers.

Must the same lesson in international relations be learned over and over again? Once every 10 years war has come to the Middle East, and there have been multitudes of unfortunate, even tragic incidents in between. The Arab nations, in their defeat, must at last recognize the futility of Nasser's pledge for "the destruction of Israel," and inscribe for the protection of future generations a pledge to acknowledge and accept the existence of their neighbor.

Certainly there are lessons to be learned from this tragic war by the rest of the world, and by the United Nations. Can anyone describe the sense of frustration that overwhelmed us when we watched the Security Council meetings on television? The same propaganda laced with the same arguments ground into our ears day after day. And could anyone have guessed that the United Nations Emergency Force would be withdrawn before consultation with the body that established it? We must question with Israel's Foreign Minister, "What is the purpose of the United Nations if it is as an umbrella taken away when it starts to rain?"

The U.N. stood by helplessly in an hour of crisis. But the world can still try to help it assume its responsibility in establishing peace. It is my hope that the U.N. members, both large and small, will recognize that the Middle East—the land bridge between three continents—is a concern of all. It is also my hope that the U.N.—moving forward to help the Middle East establish a framework for peace and stability—will go far to strengthen itself, and to give the world reason to have confidence in its future.

The President has appointed a committee headed by McGeorge Bundy—the very able and knowledgeable former assistant to two Presidents—to help work out the details for implementing the cease-fire and the negotiations for a permanent peace to follow. The appointment of this committee indicates our Nation's strong commitment to work within as well as outside the United Nations for lasting peace.

Let us hope that the Soviet Union will also lend the influence that remains hers in the Middle East to what must be a concentrated effort by all nations to bring permanent stability to this area. It may be hoped that the Soviet Union fully recognizes what consequences may come from fishing in already troubled waters that are not her own.

The present tragedy of war must be turned into a golden opportunity for peace. But let none mistake the magnitude of the problems to be surmounted. A victorious nation will rightfully make demands that will serve to guarantee her national sovereignty. And the thorny refugee problem will have to be squarely met.

To at last cut through the problems that have torn and kept this area asunder will take unflagging courage and patience. But the rewards will well be worth the lengthy perseverance.

When there is permanent peace and stability in the Middle East, Israelis, and Arabs can finally direct the weight of their energies and resources to constructive activity, instead of preparations for war. They can cooperate in regional projects so crucial to a developing area, as they work together in peace for a better life.

For permanent peace—God's most precious gift—must be our goal.

AWARDS TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, all too often are the able men and women of the Federal service taken for granted, and their acts of dedication, self-sacrifice, and even of heroism accepted as the norm. This fact may be basically flattering, yet it also is very gratifying when formal recognition is given to their acts of dedication, heroism, and outstanding service to the public.

Such recognition is being accorded by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall to 29 outstanding employees of the Department of the Interior who are receiving the Department's highest honor, the Distinguished Service Award, and to seven others who are being presented with Valor Awards for acts of bravery at the risk of their own lives.

As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I am personally proud of these fine men and women, and of the outstanding service they have rendered our country. I extend the Interior Committee's congratulations to each and every one of them.

Of particular interest to me personally is the Distinguished Service Award being accorded three members of Secretary Udall's immediate staff. They are Robert McConnell, congressional liaison officer; Orren Beaty, Jr., assistant to the Secretary; and Mrs. Anna K. Life, executive assistant to the Secretary.

Both Bob McConnell and Orren Beaty are veterans of Capitol Hill. Orren was administrative assistant to Secretary Udall when he was a Representative from Arizona. Bob is well and favorably known to many Members of the Senate and of the House. He served as top aid with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, and was administrative assistant to the late Representative A. M. Fernandez, of New Mexico.

Secretary Udall did well to choose these public servants as his aids in the Department. To them, I extend special congratulations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Secretary Udall's release announcing these awards be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AWARDS FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE AND VALOR GIVEN INTERIOR DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall today presented the Department's highest honor, the Distinguished Service Award, to 29 outstanding employees and Valor Awards to 7 others for acts of bravery at the risk of their own lives.

Following are the winners of Valor Awards:

Officer Carl R. Holmberg of the U.S. Park Police, National Park Service, for rescuing a woman who had jumped into the icy waters of the Tidal Basin in Washington, D.C., February 7, 1967. Officer Holmberg lives at 3303 M St., S.E., Washington, D.C.

Roger Huntington of Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas, and Richard R. Faltonson, Chevlon Ranger Station, P.O. Box 790, Winslow, Arizona, for saving Mrs. Linda Ferguson and Miss May Conwell from asphyxiation August 1, 1966, at Candle, Alaska. The men, who were employed by the Bureau of Land Management, descended a deep shaft used as a meat cache to reach the women, who had gone below to inspect the food following a fire at a surface structure over the shaft. Huntington and Faltonson brought the women to the surface by rope sling and restored their breathing by applying mouth-to-mouth resuscitation they had learned in their BLM training.

Rangers Gary N. Brown, David W. Huson, and Frederick T. Anderson, all employed by the National Park Service at Yosemite National Park, Calif., for exceptionally hazardous rescue operations on three different occasions in saving the lives of injured or stranded mountain climbers at the park. Those rescued were Barry Miller, Santa Rosa, Calif., and Ralph Kahn, Ashbury, Calif., May 15, 1965; Robert Plapp and Donald Cross, Stone Island, Enterprise, Fla., June 10, 1965; and Joe Paint, Johnstown, Pa., and Peter D. Spoecker, Berkeley, Calif., June 24, 1965.

John R. Norlin, 5007 Mountain View Drive, Tillamook, Ore., for rescuing two children from the Pacific Ocean at Cape Meares, Ore., July 16, 1966. Mr. Norlin, employed at the Tillamook office of the Bureau of Land Management, also is credited with helping Don Morse of Vancouver, Wash., reach shore after Mr. Morse became exhausted while attempting to rescue the children, Scott Culp and Patricia Huff of Tillamook.

Among the recipients of Distinguished Service Awards were three members of Secretary Udall's immediate staff: Orren Beaty, Jr., Assistant to the Secretary, 1784 Profit Rd., Vienna, Va.; Robert C. McConnell, Assistant to the Secretary for Congressional Liaison, 9210 Manchester Rd., Silver Spring, Md.; and Mrs. Anna K. Life, Executive Assistant to the Secretary, 2223 N. Military Rd., Arlington, Va.

Other Distinguished Service Award recipients today were:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AREA

Washington, D.C.

Virgil P. Wallace, Division of Investigations, 2500 Wisconsin Ave., NW.

Bethesda, Md.

C. Gordon Fredine, National Park Service, 5921 Anniston Rd.

Silver Spring, Md.

George W. Toman, Bonneville Power Administration, 9921 Georgia Ave.

Hyattsville, Md.

Sumner M. Anderson, Bureau of Mines, 2417 Sheridan St.

Annandale, Va.

Clark L. Gumm, Bureau of Land Management, 6706 Capstan Dr.

Arlington, Va.

Clarence P. Montgomery, National Park Service, 3130 N. Inglewood St.

Reston, Va.

William C. Everhart, National Park Service, 11443 Waterview Cluster.

T. Reed Scollon, Bureau of Mines, 11427 Hook Rd.

Springfield, Va.

Edward A. Hummel, National Park Service, 6605 Spring Rd.

OTHER AREAS

San Mateo, Calif.

Leo J. Diederich, National Park Service, 1536 Brandywine Rd.

Yucaipa, Calif.

John B. Piccolo, Bureau of Land Management, 32693 Yucaipa Blvd. (posthumously to Mrs. John B. Piccolo).

Atlanta, Ga.

William T. Davis, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, 3126 Peachtree Dr., N.E.

Thornton, Idaho

George D. Marler, National Park Service.

Omaha, Nebr.

Fred C. Fagergren, National Park Service, 5027 Evans St.

Albuquerque, N. Mex.

John C. Gatlin, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, 2220 Gold Ave., S.E.

Anadarko, Okla.

Robert L. Meshew, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1009 London Dr. (posthumously to Mrs. Robert L. Meshew).

Holdenville, Okla.

Howard C. Walkingstick, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 122 Moore Country Club Dr.

Tulsa, Okla.

Floyd E. Conway, Southwestern Power Administration, 3423 E. 13th St.

Portland, Oreg.

James F. Doyle, Bureau of Land Management, 211 S.E. 55th Ave.

Robert P. Walters, Bonneville Power Administration, 2425 N.E. Everett St.

Broomall, Pa.

Allen T. Edmunds, National Park Service, 364 Marple Rd.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

John C. Holtz, Bureau of Mines, 505 Clemson Dr.

Scranton, Pa.

Lawrence H. Harrison, Bureau of Mines, 1704 Sanderson Ave. (posthumously to Mrs. Lawrence H. Harrison).

Salt Lake City, Utah

Ballard H. Clemmons, Jr., Bureau of Mines, 1925 Yalecrest Ave.

Robert D. Nielson, Bureau of Land Management, 3648 Fortuna Circle.

Vancouver, Wash.

Henry R. Richmond, Bonneville Power Administration, 7007 E. Corregidor Rd.

THE NEED FOR A PERMANENT SETTLEMENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, during the past few days, the years of tension between Israel and the Arab nations and the days of tension since Egypt's closing of the Gulf of Aqaba have erupted into military conflict.

Throughout this conflict, our first concern has been, as it should be, an attempt to bring the fighting to an end.

As we think now about a cease-fire agreement and a resolution of this difficulty, it occurs to me that there is a rare opportunity before us. I do not know how soon we will actually be able to help bring negotiation between Israel and the Arab nations, but in that process we must seek diligently for a permanent political settlement.

For nearly 20 years the status quo in the Middle East has been temporary and not permanent. It is obvious that this has not been a satisfactory solution, as it could not be. We have had an important part to play in the establishment of the Israel democracy, and although we have rightly avoided the military conflict which has taken place there, we cannot avoid our responsibility for its political complications.

I am certain that the President of the United States and his advisers are giving the future of the Middle East very deep and serious consideration at this time. Let me just offer several observations about the necessities of future negotiations as I see them:

First. In any cease-fire which is established, there must be no return to a quasi-permanent supervised military standoff between Israel and the Arab nations.

Second. We must reinforce our historic commitment to the existence and permanence of the State of Israel and attempt to bring about a recognition by all parties of the political realities.

Third. Our role should be to promote direct political negotiations between Israel and the Arab nations, recognizing that these nations must work out their own future boundaries and establish a realistic, written political agreement, and hopefully the settlement of the broader problems of the Middle East, such as refugee settlement, water, navigation, and the rest.

Fourth. When an agreement has been reached, it must be our responsibility to recognize it promptly and support it internationally.

Mr. President, I have no illusions about the difficulties that confront us in the months and perhaps years that a permanent settlement in the Middle East will require. But we have had adequate evidence in the past few days of the insufficiency of temporary expediencies in the Middle East. Too much is at stake to allow it to happen again.

ISRAEL HAS A RIGHT TO PEACEFUL EXISTENCE AS A NATION AND TO MAINTAIN INTEGRITY OF TERRITORY—UNITED NATIONS CEASE-FIRE IS PREREQUISITE TO NEGOTIATIONS ON LONG-RANGE PLAN FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, for the third time in 20 years there is armed conflict between Israel and the Arab States, creating another international crisis.

It is my opinion that there is no doubt about the right of Israel to exist as a nation, to maintain its own government, and certainly to secure its own territory—but not to expand territorial claims through aggressive actions.

And, under the May 1950 agreement participated in by the United States, Great Britain, and France to guarantee the integrity of the Arab and Israel borders, the Government of our country has responsible obligations to fulfill. There are some who differ with me in this belief, but it is my judgment that the United States has been acting responsibly on both the direct diplomatic relations front and in the United Nations. While negotiating for cease-fire agreements and the end of armed hostilities, we have not acted in the role of neutral as much as in the role of a nonbelligerent—and there is a distinct difference between neutrality and nonbelligerency. No citizen in high office in the United States has been heard to disown our obligations under the May 1950 tripartite declaration in which we were a participant. And neither has any high officer of Government spoken belligerently nor has any U.S. official urged or committed any act of belligerency.

Perhaps the reported effectiveness of the Israeli armed forces and the calm but firm and generally reasonable diplomatic response of the Israeli Government have made the actions and pronouncements by officials of our Government easier to fashion and to develop. And likewise the reported defaults and defeats of important segments of the Arab world have had some sobering influence on the Soviets. But in either event, and as a possible consequence of both of these conditions, I hope that direct and potentially serious big nation confrontations have been avoided. There has been a breathing space in which it was possible to develop unanimity within the Security Council of the United Nations for a condition of cease-fire. Obviously, nothing could be resolved of a lasting nature—other than the deaths in battle and among innocent noncombatants—until there is a complete cease-fire in fact and there are sincere negotiations after the shooting has stopped on all fronts in the Middle East—and this now seems to be imminent.

In my judgment, there is no question but that Israel has earned the moral right to live at peace as a nation. Historically and legally there is no doubt that the Israelis have a duly constituted government and a territorial sovereignty which they have a right to protect. And they have an equal right to utilize international navigable waterways as do other nations in the course of and in pursuit of foreign commerce and in their national security interests.

It is not nearly as pertinent to point accusing fingers at the aggressors or the alleged aggressors as it is to continue to perfect a complete cease-fire in truth and in fact. Then, as I have said, must come the negotiations—in which the United States should demonstrate a leadership role, but certainly not unilaterally, for assurance of the territorial integrity and the national integrity of the State of Israel, as well as those of its Arabic neighbors.

THE 31ST INFANTRY (DIXIE) DIVISION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on Saturday, at Camp Shelby, Miss., the 31st Infantry—Dixie—Division will pass in review at the midway point of their summer field training. Regretfully, this may be the last appearance of this famous National Guard division which is scheduled to be eliminated under the Defense Department plan to reorganize the National Guard and Reserve Forces.

The history of the 31st Division is one of supreme excellence in training and in combat. Although organized as a National Guard division only 50 years ago, some of its subordinate units go back to the early days of State militia and their history is filled with valor, dedication, and superior performance.

One such unit is the 155th Infantry Regiment, once the 1st Mississippi Rifles, which was conspicuous in the Mexican War. It was the Mississippi Rifles under the command of Col. Jefferson Davis that turned the tide at Buena Vista and routed the enemy forces with one simple command, "Stand fast Mississippians." That order of Jefferson Davis is now emblazoned upon the regimental insignia and for over a hundred years has been an inspiration to the men who have trained and fought in the tradition of their forefathers.

Excellence is a tradition in the 31st Division, and no National Guard or Reserve division has excelled its record. Year after year the regular Army evaluators have given it a grade of "superior," the highest that can be obtained.

In the seven-State 3d Army areas, the Dixie Division won the trophy for excellence and training 4 out of 5 years the trophy was presented.

The first Legion of Merit awarded by the Department of the Army to a National Guard division commander for attaining excellence in training and readiness was awarded to Maj. Gen. Claude Clayton, commander of the division from November 1962 to March 1965.

On Saturday, the Legion of Merit will be awarded to General Clayton's successor, Brig. Gen. Victor L. McDearman, who maintained and continued to build the standards of excellence attained by General Clayton and his predecessors which have included a long line of competent, dedicated general officers, among them Lt. Gen. A. G. Paxton, retired, and Maj. Gen. John Persons.

In its recent history, the 31st Division as a unit has participated in every major war, except the war in Vietnam, and its men now stand ready for the call to duty if their services should be required.

In World War II, the 31st Division was a vital part of the American Expeditionary Forces and served as a training base in Europe, furnishing many of the men supplied to the frontlines of that war.

In World War II, the 31st Division fought through the jungle islands of the Pacific in the war against Japan.

In the Korean war, when the 31st Division went into Federal service in January 1951 it was the largest single civilian component ever inducted into Federal service by the U.S. Government on one order. At that time, 10,570 volunteer National Guardsmen were ordered to war duty. Although the division did not go overseas as a unit, many of the officers and men of the division saw combat in Korea, and their record was outstanding. Many of the noncomissioned officers were commissioned, and they provided leadership in the hardest battles and in some of the most critical times of that conflict.

If the Defense Department insists upon its plan to disestablish the 31st Division, a great military unit will have passed into retirement, but the spirit and tradition of this division will live forever. Wherever Mississippi National Guardsmen and other American fighting men are sent, the battlefield on which they fight will echo the spirit, dedication, ability, and devotion of those who have made such qualities a living tradition.

Whatever orders are given them, whatever mission is assigned to them, the members of the Mississippi National Guard will accept as true soldiers and as Americans, but they want a place to serve. The security of the Nation demands that they have a place to serve, for we need their training and ability, but most of all we need their spirit and dedication and determination. For the sake of our common defense, we must keep these men in the National Guard and Reserve program.

The plan of the Defense Department to reorganize the Reserves in such a way that the services of those men will be lost is untimely and unwise.

Under the Defense Department plan, the Mississippi National Guard would lose 40 percent of its lieutenants, more than 30 percent of its captains, nearly 50 percent of its majors, and 25 percent of its top ranking noncommissioned officers. These men must be kept in an active mission so that they can continue their training.

Mr. President, we must see to it, when the 31st Infantry—Dixie—Division passes in review for perhaps the last time on Saturday, that the officers and men of that division are not passed over in their desire to serve their country.

We need these men, and we must keep them ready, as they and their predecessors were ready nearly two centuries ago, to stand fast for their country against all foes.

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC SUPPORTS THE PROPOSED FIREARMS CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the question has been raised whether or not the American public supports the proposed firearms control legislation. There is no question as to the response of the public to measures introduced by me in this session of Congress.

Overwhelmingly, the public supports the legislation I have introduced and which is now before this Congress.

Evidence of this support is clearly expressed in the most representative media of public support, the editorials of the outstanding newspapers of this country.

Immediately after I introduced my firearms legislation early this year—S. 1 and amendment No. 90—the American public proclaimed its support of that legislation.

I will not belabor that issue at this time. However, for the benefit of my colleagues as they consider the proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent that a sampling of editorials from such outstanding newspapers as the New York Times, the Scranton Times, the Chicago Sun Times, the Cleveland Press, the Detroit Free Press, the San Francisco Examiner and Chronicle, the Minneapolis Star, the Baltimore Sun, the Louisville Times, and several others be spread on the Record at this point. The intent of the public is clear, the public wants more effective Federal control over the sale of firearms.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier Journal, Jan. 20, 1967]

Another Try for Gun Controls

In his State of the Union message, President Johnson again asked for "strict" gun-control laws. Senator Dodd of Connecticut has introduced, as Senate Bill 1, a measure that would restrict the mail-order traffic in handguns, prohibit the sale of handguns by federally licensed dealers to persons under 21 and prohibit the sale of rifles and shotguns to persons under 18. The bill also would apply other restraints to the wide-open, suicidal traffic in firearms in this country.

This is similar to the bill that Senator Dodd sponsored in the last Congress. In three consecutive Congresses the Senator has attempted to place reasonable controls on the traffic in firearms. The gun lobby, with an assist from an apathetic public, succeeded in stifling these bills.

The purpose of the Dodd Bill is to make it more difficult for criminals, drug addicts, juveniles and others who are likely to misuse them, to obtain firearms. This kind of legislation has been endorsed repeatedly by the American Bar Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Association of Citizen Crime Commissions and leading law enforcement authorities. Public opinion polls have revealed that 70 per cent of the American people favor strict gun controls. Yet time and again Congress has been intimidated by a shrill minority.

In introducing the bill, Senator Dodd said:

"All a person need do to buy a mail-order gun is fill out a magazine coupon with his name and address, enclose as little as $5 or $6, and drop it in the mail. It is so simple, children can do it. And they do it. Hardened criminals can do it. And they do it."

During 1966, 59 per cent of the country's murders were committed with a gun. The evidence is overwhelming that the ready availability of firearms contributed to the number of crimes committed with guns. States with gun controls have lower gun crime rates than states that do not have controls. In the three and a half years that Congress has temporized, nearly 20,000 Americans have been murdered by guns, rifles, shotguns and handguns.

How high must the toll be to persuade Congress to act?

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Salt Lake Times, Jan. 6, 1967]

Pressure Group Blocks U.S. Gun Legislation

More than three years after the wave of public revulsion and concern that followed the assassination of President Kennedy, the United States remains without a meaningful firearms-control law.

Passage of such legislation has been hampered, a January Reader's Digest article "We Need a Firearms-Control Law—Now!" reveals, by the opposition of the National Rifle Association, which bases its objection on the false assumption that controls would violate the Constitutional right of Americans to bear arms. This 750,000-member pressure group, says author Alan Barth, "has persistently mobilized its membership to thwart every genuinely effective attempt at firearms control during the past 30-odd years."

The need for control of firearms is demonstrated by statistics that read like wartime casualty lists; more than 100,000 U.S. civilians were shot during 1966; 17,000 of them died. About half of the 10,000 annual U.S. murders are by gunshot, and guns figure in some 25,000 cases of aggravated assault and about 60,000 robberies each year.

"Firearms fatalities can be reduced by firearms control," Barth writes. Cities with gun-control laws have lower homicide rates than those without them. New York City, for example, which outlaws concealed weapons, had 5.4 homicides per 100,000 population in one year, while in Dallas, which has no controls, 13.4 citizens per 100,000 were shot.

Yet when a bill for strong national gun controls was introduced by Sen. Thomas Dodd of Connecticut, the National Rifle Association mounted a massive campaign to defeat it. Says the Digest article:

"The NRA has managed to imbue members with the quite mistaken notion that efforts at effective regulation conflict with the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution." But the Supreme Court has ruled that "the right to bear arms" is not an absolute right, but rather one which must have "some reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well-regulated militia."

The assassin of President Kennedy obviously did not come under this qualification. Nor did the madman who killed 13 innocent victims from his sniper's nest atop a University of Texas tower. Nor did the gunman who killed two strangers in New York City's Bryant Park—with a rifle he had purchased one hour earlier.

"There is nothing in the Administration firearms bill," says the Digest, "that would keep responsible, law-abiding adults from buying firearms—whether for sporting purposes, for target shooting, for self-protection or for the simple pleasure of collecting guns. It would cause serious inconvenience only to felons, juveniles, habitual drunkards, drug addicts and the mentally ill."

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, Nov. 30, 1966]

Killers Abroad—Senseless Murders Underscore Need for a Curb on Firearms

The senseless shooting of helpless women in a Mesa, Arizona beauty parlor has revived interest in legislation designed to make it more difficult for irresponsible persons to get their hands on guns.

Despite public concern and the widespread support proposed legislation of this type has received, no measure has made significant headway in Congress. The most comprehensive bill on the subject, that sponsored by Senator Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut, seems to have lost momentum with the political difficulties in which the Senator finds himself growing out of the use of campaign funds.

This, we think, is unfortunate. For the Dodd bill does have much to recommend it, and should stand or fall on its own merits. It would prohibit all mail order sales of hand guns, regulate the sale of rifles and shotguns through a system of affidavit controls and curb the importation of surplus military weapons. It also would bar the sale of shotguns to persons under 21 years of age and the sale of all firearms to those under 18.

It has been estimated that more than 18,000 persons die of gunshot wounds every year in the United States. This is an appalling toll. To what degree it could be cut down by the operation of a law patterned along the lines of the Dodd bill nobody, of course, can say. It does seem reasonable to assume, however, that if it were more difficult to obtain a firearm fewer dangerous people than now have access to them could arm themselves. So that some improvement in the gunshot death rate would be a reasonable expectation. That is a gain not to be discounted if it is not inconsistent with the right of responsible people to bear arms and defend their homes against marauders.

The subject, we think, needs further exploration.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Times, Jan. 14, 1967]

Proper Controls Over Firearms

A powerful lobby operating as the National Rifle Association managed to keep bottled up in a Senate committee last year a bill to control the interstate sale of firearms.

The bill, authored by Sen. Thomas J. Dodd, D-Conn., would cover even the sale of shotguns and rifles, primarily used for sport. In that regard, at least, the Dodd bill is far too broad. But he says he's going to reintroduce it.

A more temperate measure, sponsored by Sen. Roman L. Hruska, R-Neb., has the same objectives—restrictions on the multimillion-dollar mail order firearms business and the sale of war surplus weapons such as machine guns and hand grenades, as well as a wide variety of ammunition. We don't believe the constitutional right of citizens to bear arms was ever intended to be limitless in scope, to countenance a lucrative racket, or encourage insurrection.

No sensible person would deny a good citizen the right to walk into a store and buy a rifle or shotgun or a pistol. But he should identify himself.

In short, there is a need for proper controls over the interstate mail order business of selling weapons; in fact a strong argument can be presented in support of a federal law banning it entirely. Of course, it still wouldn't prevent armed assault, murder and robbery. But it might curb violent crimes. Who's against that?

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, Dec. 27, 1966]

Dodd Will Try Again

Sen. Thomas J. Dodd, D-Conn., has passed the word. He'll reintroduce his firearms control bill as soon as the 90th Congress convenes, and press for its passage.

The Senator's tenacity is admirable. He has been pushing the legislation for six years without success.

In substance, the Dodd proposals would help prevent firearms from falling into the hands of irresponsible persons, persons with criminal records, the mentally deranged, narcotic addicts and juveniles.

It is not a panacea for the gun problem. But it would erect useful legal barriers to guns getting into the hands of the wrong people. It should be passed and signed into law.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Bulletin, Jan. 17, 1967]

Legislation for Control of Mail Order Guns: Attempt No. 3

A central question arises now that Senator Dodd has a re-introduced legislation to control the mail order gun traffic.

In his third attempt in more than three years, has the senator given away at all to the National Rifle Association and to his conservative colleagues on the judiciary committee who persist in dubbing the senator's efforts as unreasonable?

The American Bar Association and the groups which have supported this legislation should examine carefully the latest Dodd bill and speak up about its merits and its importance to all citizens.

The senator seems to have backed from the blanket prohibitions urged by the administration. As introduced in 1965, the administration-drafted bill would have prohibited persons from obtaining firearms by mail order. The new Dodd bill doesn't go this far, although it should if recent opinion polls by Dr. George Gallup are a guide to the public's wish for more strictness in gun sales.

Briefly, the new bill provides for regulating the interstate sale of sporting rifles and shotguns through affidavits intended to establish the purchaser's fitness to use the guns. Licensed dealers wouldn't be allowed to sell rifles and shotguns to persons under 18 and no handguns to anyone younger than 21.

However, what seem to be the bill's weakest provision would "prohibit the sale by federally licensed dealers of all firearms, other than rifles and shotguns, to non-residents of the licensee's state of business." This language seems to mean that a person who lives in New York can write to Virginia, say, for the rifle or shotgun of his choice. New York has the most stringent gun control law, and, as of last summer, Virginia had none.

Thus it appears that Senator Dodd has ignored one of his own meticulous findings, namely, that in states with effective gun control laws, the gun murder rates are below the national average and far below the rates of states with little or no firearms sales regulation.

The case for strong federal legislation over mail-order guns is based on impressive information, like the latest grim figures on gun-committed murders. It is these facts and not side-tracking arguments from powerful lobbyists that should convince a majority on the judiciary and commerce committees that if guns of all sorts were made significantly less available, this country would be a safer place.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 8, 1967]

Stranger Than Fiction

In the litany of the gun lobby, nothing is more sacred than the assertion that New York City, with its stringent "Sullivan Law" controlling handguns, has more crime per capita than any other community in the country. A quite typical letter, published on this page just the other day, declared, for example:

"The majority of people who advocate extreme gun control measures feel that tighter gun control will be the only answer to a reduction in the ever-rising crime rate. If this is true, then the state with the most restrictive form of gun control should exhibit the lowest, or at least a diminished crime rate. The State of New York has the most restrictive measures at this time. No comment should have to be made with reference to its crime rate."

Well, interestingly enough, the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia had a comment to make in reference to this matter. It ought to be very illuminating to the gun lobbyists. "Although there are certainly many crimes in New York City committed with handguns," the Commission report observes, "the relative number of such crimes is substantially less than in the District of Columbia. While the District of Columbia had a handgun murder rate of 9.1 per 100,000 population in fiscal 1966, New York City had a rate of 1.7; the handgun assault rate was 79.8 in the District and 20.0 in New York City; and the handgun robbery rate was 141.7 in the District and 45.4 in New York City.

The conclusion to which the Crime Commission came on the basis of these facts is that the District should have a rigid handgun licensing law. It is perhaps too much to ask the gun lobbyists to employ in response to the facts the same logic which they have hitherto applied to their own fiction. But responsible citizens, concerned for the safety of their families, will recognize that the pistol—a weapon designed essentially for the killing or maiming of human beings—ought to be taken out of general circulation and limited, with a few exceptions, to the military and the agencies of law enforcement. A great many lives will be saved when this is done.

[From the Enid (Okla.) News, Jan. 20, 1967]

Senator Dodd . . . A Persistent Man

"If you don't succeed at first, try, try again." All of us have heard this old saying since childhood but few have practiced it more faithfully than Senator Dodd of Connecticut. Dodd is a persistent man.

For the fourth straight year he has introduced a bill in the United States Senate to control the flow of firearms in interstate trade and through the mails. Although there are a number of sportsmen groups who differ with this view, we think, it is a good bill and a sound one, as were others of Senator Dodd.

The so called "sportsmen" groups and individuals opposed to this legislation usually cite the Second Amendment guarantee of the right to bear arms. Our thinking is that these arguments are invalid. The Second Amendment pertains only to the right of the states to maintain an organized militia, which they do through their National Guard units. There is nothing in the Dodd bill that would deprive legitimate sportsmen from the purchase, ownership and use of guns.

The Dodd measure aims at making it more difficult for criminals, madmen, hate groups, and juvenile thugs to obtain lethal weapons.

The bill, in brief, would do these things:

It would require that firms dealing in the interstate sale of firearms obtain a federal license—$25 initially, $10 annual renewal.

They would not be permitted to sell handguns (pistols) to customers under 21, or rifles and shotguns to buyers under 18.

They could not sell firearms other than rifles and shotguns to non-residents of the state in which they operate their business.

They would be required to confirm the identity and the age of their customers.

The bill would also limit the importation and sale of certain heavy types of military-surplus and foreign-made firearms.

Unfortunately this will not deprive organized crime of a supply of weapons. But, at least, it would make it more difficult for punks, mental incompetents, and extremist zealots to acquire guns which they can use to intimidate or to kill.

As Senator Dodd says:

"In the three and one-half years during which Congress did nothing to prevent wanton killing with firearms, nearly 20,000 Americans were murdered by guns, rifles and shotguns as well as handguns.

"All a person need do to buy a mail order gun is fill out a magazine coupon with his name and address, enclose as little as $5 or $6, and drop it in the mail.

"It is so simple, children can do it. And they do it.

"Madmen can do it. And they do it.

"Hardened criminals can do it. And they do it."

The way we see it, sportsmen have nothing to fear from Senator Dodd's legislation on control of firearms. In fact, sportsmen should be among its prime supporters.

[From the Pawtucket (R.I.) Times, Jan. 19, 1967]

Another Try for a Gun Control Law

Gun control legislation can be expected to come up for action during this session of the 90th Congress, but this is a far cry from saying that the disgraceful and barbaric problem that has long plagued this nation is about to be solved.

Connecticut's Sen. Thomas J. Dodd has reintroduced his bill that a committee last year shot full of holes before sending it to the Senate floor where it didn't even come up for a vote. His latest action, of course, will be the signal for the National Rifle Association to drag out the same old arguments and start screeming the same old complaints. Proponents of the Dodd bill have a fight on their hands, for the pressure that the NRA can and will exert before this issue is resolved is beyond belief. The fact that President Johnson has endorsed strict control of the sale of firearms, and that Senators Robert and Edward Kennedy are among seven cosponsors thus far, and that the measure is supported by lawyer and police chief groups and by citizen crime commissioners—all this will find the NRA undaunted. Its lobby will be out with all rifles blasting away, and don't think the battle will be anything but a fierce one.

The Dodd bill—formally known as "S-1"—has a long and booby-trapped path ahead of it. As it now stands, it puts restrictions on interstate sales of handguns, rifles and shotguns, but by the time it limps from committee, it can be expected to be watered down—to just what extent will determine its adequacy to free the nation of a menace that creates modern "civilization" with the caveman era.

A key provision of the bill would prohibit a federally-licensed dealer from selling firearms if "state and local law at the place of sale" is violated. The ultimate answer to the present, unfettered sale of firearms may be to clamp down at the state level, with every firearm sale made only after a formal request by the buyer, and a check with local police. Today, buying a rifle—and the lethal ammunition to load it with—is as casual and perfunctory as buying a quart of milk or a television set. But it is not enough merely to squelch interstate trafficking in firearms. It is of no consolation that someone committed a murder with a weapon he bought within the boundaries of the state where he resides.

Buying pistols and revolvers is more controlled, but a state-to-state review of the adequacy of present procedures for handguns could well result in tightening up where necessary.

With the individual states and the federal government working as a team, deadly weapons could, at least in large part, be placed in the hands only of persons of stability and good character. Yes—and the NRA will remind us of this—gangsters will somehow get firearms, but to contend that bill shouldn't be passed because it will be only 90%, or 95% or 99% effective is ridiculous.

And let's not haul out the stale and asinine argument about impinging on freedoms. You register your car . . . you register your dog . . . you seek a permit to add a dormer to your home . . . you take out licenses to hunt and fish—why all the feverish protests against applying for a permit for a weapon when the only purpose is to make a concerted effort to keep them from persons unfit to own them?

[From the Asheville, (N.C.), Citizen, Jan. 1, 1967]

United States Needs Gun Control Law To Halt Rising Crime Wave

The 90th Congress should enact a strong Federal gun control law before the wave of killings in this country gets any bigger. A Federal gun control act won't stop all the murders in the U.S., but it will reduce their number.

As the Reader's Digest points out, more than 100,000 U.S. civilians were shot in 1966. Over 17,000 of these shootings proved fatal. In addition guns play a part each year in some 60,000 robberies and 25,000 aggravated assaults.

One of the most terrible examples occurred last summer when a University of Texas student killed his wife and mother with a gun, then shot 31 people from a campus tower. *He had bought one of the weapons he used at a local store just an hour before it was put to use.* The mass killing in an Arizona beauty shop later in the year provided another example of what terrible damage a mixed-up young man can do with a gun.

Some states and municipalities have effective gun control laws, and the results are apparent in a reduced rate of murders and shootings. For example, in New York City, which has such a law, the homicide rate in 1962 was 5.4 per 100,000 population, while in Dallas, which has no gun ordinance, the rate was 13.4 per 100,000—more than twice as high.

The urgent need now is for a Federal law because so much of the traffic in guns is interstate in nature, and persons wanting to buy guns can do so either through the mails or by driving to another state where controls are lax or nonexistent.

The legislation proposed by Senator Dodd in the 89th Congress, which failed to pass, would have done three important things:

Cut off the flood of guns coming into this country from abroad by requiring strict registration and licensing of importers. More than 1 million foreign guns—many of them surplus weapons from Iron Curtain countries—are brought into the U.S. each year and sold to practically anyone who wants them.

Provide that guns can be shipped across state lines only by one licensed dealer to another. Dealers would have to keep accurate records of all sales and purchases, and the license fee would be high enough so that it would not be worthwhile for individuals to try to qualify as dealers.

Permit retail sales of hand guns only to a resident of the state where the purchase is made and then only if he or she is eligible under state and local law to purchase the weapon.

Such a bill would not inconvenience the individual householder or sportsman except that he might have to wait a few days for local police to check his identity. It would keep dealers from making unrestricted sales of guns to criminals, juveniles, habitual drug addicts and persons who are mentally ill.

This act would not violate the Second Amendment to the Constitution which states that, "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." The Supreme Court has already ruled that the right to bear arms must have a "reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well-regulated militia." It is not a basic right that belongs to known criminals, to juveniles and to drug addicts.

In its effort to pass gun control legislation Congress will run square into one of the strongest lobbies in the U.S.—the 750,000-member National Rifle Association, which has consistently fought effective Federal gun controls. But the handwriting is on the wall. America is one of the few advanced nations which permits the unregulated sale of firearms, and its rising rate of murders, shootings, and robberies is at least in part due to this fact. The American people ought to back Congress in passing an effective Federal gun-control bill in 1967.

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Call, Jan. 17, 1967]

Mail-Order Gun Sales

In the absence of federal controls for which President Johnson once again is asking, a child who can write his name and address can fill in a coupon, put it in an envelope with $5 or $6 and wind up with a gun. So can any adult, regardless of what he may have done with weapons before or contemplates doing.

There was widespread support at the last two sessions of Congress for legislation that would have controlled this mail order sale of guns in interstate traffic. Each time, however, the gun lobby supported by well-intentioned sportsmen managed to block it.

Now, however, Sen. Thomas J. Dodd and the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency are bolstering their case with new arguments:

Since the legislation was first introduced in 1963, they point out, 20,000 Americans have been murdered with guns and many thousands shot down.

The gun murder rate in states with effective gun controls has been much lower than the national average of 59 per cent. In New York, with the toughest law, the rate is 32 per cent. In New Jersey and Pennsylvania, it is 39 per cent and 43 per cent, respectively. Montana, Texas and Nebraska, with few controls or none at all show a rate of 68, 69 and 70 per cent.

No one suggests for a moment that the proposed legislation will wipe out gun murders, armed robbery or mass killings. It wouldn't take gun away from sportsmen, collectors, farmers or anyone else with justifiable reasons for owning them. Nor would it prevent them from buying or trading.

The sponsors expect, however, that the controls on mail order sales they are proposing in this legislation will make it more difficult for juveniles, criminals and madmen to get their hands on weapons. So far as they meet this objective, new and tougher national laws are justified. The soaring crime rate suggests that a little more red tape is a small enough price for those entitled to guns to pay for buying them from mail order houses outside their own states.

[From the Chester (Pa.) Delaware County Times, Jan. 16, 1967]

Gun Law Needed

Many big guns oppose national gun legislation.

As a result, no federal gun controls have been enacted since the 1930s. The United States remains one of the few major countries in the world which does not require some kind of a permit for possession of a gun.

The President's state of the union message again pledged efforts to correct this delinquency. "We will recommend strict controls on the sale of firearms," he said.

Sen. Thomas J. Dodd (D-Conn.) immediately announced he would again submit gun control legislation. In past years, it has never even cleared the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Dodd's bill, assuming it would follow the pattern of previous efforts would:

Prohibit the mail-order sale of hand guns.

Regulate the mail-order sale of rifles and shotguns by requiring an affidavit from the purchaser.

Restrict over-the-counter sales of rifles and shotguns to nonresidents of the state.

Prohibit the sale of hand guns to any persons under 21 and the sale of rifles and shotguns to persons under 18, subject to any state laws.

Restrict imports to stop the flow of military-surplus weapons now making up a large part of the mail-order traffic.

Why is such a bill so violently opposed? Why is it possible for almost anyone, even a hoodlum, a mental defective or a child, to purchase a gun with the greatest of ease?

Key opposition to gun legislation comes from the gun lobby, described by Carl Bakal in his book, "The Right to Bear Arms," as "a strong and seemingly strange alliance between the munitions industry, conservation and wildlife organizations, rifle associations, gun clubs, vendors of sporting goods and others."

The National Rifle Association (NRA), for example, has some 700,000 members and has boasted it "can flood Congress with more than 500,000 pieces of mail virtually overnight against any proposed gun legislation."

We have little doubt that the public supports gun controls. A Gallup Poll showed that 73 per cent would favor a law requiring a police permit to purchase a gun.

The problem lies in getting the citizens to support this legislation as actively and vocally as opponents decry it.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Jan. 17, 1967]

Senate Should Act Now To Adopt Gun Controls

Whatever else he is, Senator Dodd of Connecticut is a persistent man. He is convinced that the unregulated sale of firearms is a major factor in the national toll of 50 gun-deaths a day (15 of them murders) and the 85,000 annual felonies (robbery, assault, rape) in which guns are used. So, for the fourth straight year, he has introduced a bill to control the flow of firearms in interstate trade and through the mails.

Weary of noting that this bill is a sound one, as were the others. Such an expression of support normally draws long protests from representatives of so-called "sportsmen" groups and from individuals who cite the Second Amendment guarantee of the right to bear arms.

Both arguments are invalid. The Second Amendment pertains only to the right of the states to maintain an organized militia, which they do through their National Guard units. There is nothing in the Dodd bill that would deprive legitimate sportsmen from the purchase, ownership, and use of guns.

The measure aims at making it more difficult for criminals, madmen, late groups, and juvenile thugs to obtain lethal weapons.

The bill, in brief, would do these things:

It would require that firms dealing in the interstate sale of firearms obtain a federal license—$25 initially, $10 annual renewal.

They would not be permitted to sell handguns (pistols) to customers under 21, or rifles and shotguns to buyers under 18.

They could not sell firearms other than rifles and shotguns to nonresidents of the state in which they operate their businesses.

They would be required to confirm the identify and the age of their customers.

The bill would also limit the importation and sale of certain heavy types of military-surplus and foreign-made firearms.

Actually, the Dodd proposal, considerably watered down over years of debate, may be too weak to achieve effective results. Certainly, it will not deprive organized crime of a supply of weapons. But, at least, it would make it more difficult for punks, mental incompetents, and extremist zealots to acquire guns which they can use to intimidate or to kill.

As Senator Dodd says:

"In the three and one-half years during which Congress did nothing to prevent wanton killing with firearms, nearly 20,000 Americans were murdered by guns, rifles and shotguns as well as handguns.

"All a person need do to buy a mail order gun is fill out a magazine coupon with his name and address, enclose as little as $5 or $6, and drop it in the mail.

"It is so simple, children can do it. And they do it.

"Madmen can do it. And they do it.

"Hardened criminals can do it. And they do it."

Opponents of federal firearms control frequently refer to the ineffectiveness of similar regulations in states that have adopted control standards, notably New York, with its strict Sullivan law. The figures they quote are apparently mythical, perhaps unintentionally. During the last four years, the national average of gun-murder rates was 59 per cent. In New York, the average was 32 per cent.

We dislike to "crusade" on this issue. Some of us were brought up on octagonal-barrel rifles and 12-gauge shotguns. We shot our first wild rabbit when we were nine years old and, during the years, enjoyed the thrill of downing a flushed quail or a high-flying dove. But we always ate the game we killed . . . and it was never human.

Sportsmen have nothing to fear from firearms regulation. Sportsmen should be its prime supporters.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) News, Jan. 19, 1967]

Another Shot at Gun Control

A good many Americans applauded President Johnson's pledge for a renewed attack on crime in his State of the Union message.

Mr. Johnson again asked Congress for "strict" gun control laws to help mount the attack on crime.

There was no great public outcry against this request. On the contrary, most Americans would be in favor of such legislation and that would include nearly every policeman in the Nation.

But gun control legislation introduced by Sen. Thomas J. Dodd (D., Conn.) has been bypassed by three consecutive Congresses. Most of the opposition has come from the powerful lobby of the National Rifle Association.

Sen. Dodd has reintroduced his bill for stricter controls on interstate gun shipments. Will our legislators chicken out again?

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Jan. 27, 1967]

Arming U.S. Guerrillas? It's Easy

Faced with a four-year prison sentence for violating the federal firearms act, the leader of the right-wing Minutemen, Robert DePugh, has urged members to go underground and operate in complete secrecy.

Secret training without membership rosters or a visible line of command has marked the organization's mode of operations all along. The purpose of the Minutemen, according to a Senate subcommittee, is "to develop a vast underground guerrilla army." The committee's forebodings and Mr. DePugh's remarks about resisting and exposing the Communist influence could be dismissed out of hand except for the unfortunate ease with which the Minutemen can arm themselves heavily.

An agent hired by the subcommittee who infiltrated the Minutemen reported he had received training in weaponry and that he had no trouble in buying a Russian-made mortar, a Finnish mortar, a bazooka, a rifle with grenade launcher, rifle grenades, and mortar and bazooka ammunition. The large supply and availability of these arms for civilians are bound to interest the superpatriots and to heighten the activities of far-right, self-styled militia groups.

The Constitution rightly allows these organizations a place in the political spectrum. But to help to prevent their becoming armed political bodies, Congress should enact Senate Bill 1 that provides for effective control over interstate shipment of firearms and for assistance to the states in enforcing firearms control laws.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Tribune, Jan. 21, 1967]

Gun Control Act Badly Needed—Now

Congress will mostly likely be asked to take effective measures to control the sale of guns by legislation at this session. Most of the attempts in this direction have been turned down because of the bitter opposition of the sellers and of sportsmen.

President Johnson's mention of the matter in his recent state of the Union message has given impetus to the renewed attempt to do something about this important matter.

The proposed bill has strong backing of Law Enforcement organizations and Crime Commissions, but unfortunately it is also bitterly opposed.

If the bill as proposed can not be passed as now contemplated, we think that one of the items which ought to have no opposition is the one that would ban the sale of rifles by mail order houses. That would at least reduce the number of irresponsible persons who need only the cost of a rifle to have one delivered to their doors by the mailman.

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette, Jan. 14, 1967]

Gun Controls

It will be interesting to see what happens in Congress this year to legislation for control of instate traffic in mail-order guns.

The legislation has been introduced—for the third successive year—by Sen. Thomas J. Dodd, Connecticut Democrat, chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

From his long service on the subcommittee, the Senator became convinced of the need to control the sales of guns to criminals, drug addicts, the mentally ill and others likely to misuse them. His legislation was originally introduced on Aug. 2, 1963, four months before the late President Kennedy was assassinated with a mail order foreign military rifle.

President Johnson later sent a more inclusive version of the same legislation to Congress, but that died in the legislative rush last October. The President, in his State of Union message last week, again asked Congress for "strict" gun control laws.

The legislation has been endorsed by such groups as the American Bar Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Association of Citizen Crime Commissions and some leading law enforcement authorities.

Members of these groups evidently do not share the fears of other organizations that Federal control laws would hamper those who want to acquire guns legitimately for sports, hunting and protection. The thought has been expressed that such legislation could lead to eventual complete control of firearms by the government. One organization fears this could lead to confiscation of guns if the Communists ever take over our government.

We hope Congress overlooks such unfounded fears and enacts laws to control interstate traffic in mail order guns.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) News, Jan. 24, 1967]

Spare Us Such Friends

Robert DePugh, the self-ordained defender of the United States against Communist invasion, is appealing a prison sentence for violation of the U.S. Firearms Act and charging a massive conspiracy in official circles to crush his Minutemen organization.

It is ironic that the conviction of Mr. DePugh and two of his lieutenants should come at a time when there continues to be strong pressure for tighter control over the sale of firearms in the United States. Those efforts are directed at the sale of handguns and rifles, particularly by mail, and were triggered in the aftermath to President Kennedy's assassination with a mail-order weapon.

It was no hunting rifle that put Mr. DePugh and his associates at odds with the law and their prosecution poses no new threat to the legitimate owner of weapons. The Minutemen's arsenal included machine guns, weapons with silencers and other rapid-firing weapons not generally considered essential to the outdoor pursuits of civilian sportsmen.

Mr. DePugh claims the Minutemen were armed and trained to resist the threat of Communist invaders, who would seek to capture a country whose institutions they have long been trying to subvert. His own organization showed no unwillingness to subvert what laws it chose in its self-anointed role as the defender of freedom.

To allow the amassing of incredibly destructive weapons by such organizations is to invite violence and chaos from any group that equates communism with anything at variance with its own rigid philosophy.

It is against the law to advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government. It also must remain outside the law for any self-styled patriot to set up his own private army to defend United States against whomever he personally chooses to label an enemy.

The nation's laws properly seek to save us from such defenders.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Jan. 8, 1967]

Guns for Everybody?

Evidently a lot of people in Chicago have been taking instructions in marksmanship, or there has been just a lot more shooting than ever before. Perhaps the National Rifle Association could provide us with the correct answer. Whatever the reason, there were 510 homicides in Chicago in 1966, compared with only 395 the year before.

Of last year's total, 255 homicides were committed with guns. Again guns were the deadliest of all weapons used by the killers. Of about 5,000 stabbings, only about 100 resulted in death. These figures conform to the yearly expectation. Police homicide Comdr. Francis J. Flanagan said that if somebody assaults you with a gun, there's one chance in seven or eight that you'll be killed. If you're stabbed or cut, there's only one chance in 50 that you'll be killed. Guns, then are seven to eight times more deadly than knives, and as usual accounted in 1966 for about half the city's homicides. Knives or "cutting instruments," as the police report says) accounted for only a quarter of the homicides, and the remaining quarter were accomplished with a variety of weapons, including fists and feet.

A 14-year-old boy in Orange, Tex., used a variety of weapons—a knife, a bow and arrow, a 22-caliber pistol—to kill his father and two women and seriously wound another person on New Year's Day. The serious wound was inflicted with knife. The arrow evidently didn't dispatch the father. The killer shot repeatedly into all the victim's bodies with the pistol.

In Lansing, Mich., also on New Year's Day, the score was 100 per cent—two victims, a sheriff's deputy and a gasoline station attendant, dead of gunshot wounds inflicted in an apparent holdup.

On the last day of 1966, in Chicago, a family friend came calling on a home in the 1800 block of N. Rockwell, blasted away, and left a 34-year-old man and a 17-year-old boy dead of gunshot wounds.

These were—on the face of them—felonious homicides. But what about hunters?

what about private citizens who keep guns for their own protection? Don't they have their rights? In Newport, N.J., on New Year's Eve, a hunter was killed accidentally by a shotgun blast at close range while hunting with a friend. And in Chicago on the same day a West Side citizen reported a robbery attempt and then mistakenly shot the two police officers who came to investigate it. The officers were lucky—they were not seriously hurt—but it does make you think, doesn't it?

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) World, Jan. 24, 1967]

Gun Control Fuss

One of the pet targets of opponents of Federal regulation of firearms sales is New York's so-called "Sullivan Law," which imposes stringent controls over gun registration and licensing.

The argument follows the line that despite the Sullivan Law, New York City is crime-ridden, that the restrictions do not preclude the purchase or use of firearms and that, in particular, criminals do not and will not pay it any heed.

To a point, this argument has logic, for it is axiomatic that a person with criminal tendencies is not going to follow the law in order to obtain the implements of his trade. But the argument laid forth by the National Rifle Assn., among other anti-gun control groups, that New York has more crime "per capita" than anywhere else in the country despite the law, does not hold water.

The President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia, for instance, reports that the per capita commission of "handgun crimes" in the nation's capital is far and away higher than in New York City where the Sullivan Law prevails.

Citing official statistics, the Crime Commission reports:

The District of Columbia handgun crime rate of 9.1 per 100,000 population last year was much worse than the 1.7 rate for New York. The handgun assault rate in Washington was 79.8 as against 20 in New York and the robbery rate in D.C. was 141.7 per 100,000 population as compared with 45.4 in New York City.

We do not insist that these figures are necessarily pertinent to the argument, except to the point that there seems to be more crime in an area without a Sullivan Law than in the area where the strict regulation exists. The conclusion we reach from the figures is that those who condemn the Sullivan Law as "ineffective" do not have the stuff to back up their claims.

What seems to be missing in the controversy is a recognition of the fact that a great percentage of murders are committed by otherwise "law-abiding" citizens—many of them first-felony offenders. With the Sullivan Law on the books these people would not have a gun in their possession when passion overtakes them.

The present Congress will undoubtedly look into gun control legislation again, and we still believe there is far more reason for enactment than rejection.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Jan. 24, 1967]

Gun Sale Control Overdue

Homicides account for only a fifth as many deaths annually as motor vehicle accidents, and of the former about 60 per cent involve the use of guns.

But compared to the number of persons owning or driving vehicles, the percentage of violent deaths involving guns is fantastically higher.

Yet, it seems perfectly obvious that almost nothing is done to control the use of firearms among civilians, while a tremendous effort is exerted in patrolling the highways and hounding the speed-limit violator.

Sen. Thomas Dodd, D-Conn., again has introduced legislation that would require stricter federal supervision of firearm sale and closer accounting on those to whom weapons are sold. He did so in 1964, 1965 and 1966, and since his last attempt rifles and shotguns were possessed by more than 60 per cent of children, known criminals and mentally unbalanced individuals involved in homicides.

States with effective gun controls have far lower gun murder rates than those without safeguards. It is still possible in many areas for a child, or hardened criminal, to fill out a name and address, enclose a few dollars and obtain a lethal weapon through the mails.

President Johnson asked, in his State of the Union address, for "strict control on the sale of firearms." The proposal supported by Sen. Dodd would cause no more than an inconvenience to sportsmen and would not prevent their purchasing, transporting and using weapons. It would behoove them—and they have been the principal opponents—to support curbs this year. The continuing record will make later remedy more than an "inconvenience."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1967]

The Fight Against Crime

President Johnson's special message on crime outlines the first coordinated program for Federal-local action to combat lawlessness in all its phases. It is designed to make Washington a financial partner in the modernization of city and state police forces and of their approach to crime control, but its range is far broader than more law at the end of a nightstick.

Safety on the streets was a major issue in the 1964 and 1966 election campaigns—an issue central to the "white backlash" against civil rights. By way of restoring perspective, the President stresses that relatively few major crimes of violence are interracial and that the incidence of crime is highest among teenagers.

Eliminating the slums, improving schools and providing jobs are the priorities in the Johnson list of crime preventives, just as they are in the still unreleased report of the National Crime Commission. The proposals the President sent to Congress yesterday for increased Federal aid to deprived youth are steps in the same general direction.

But correcting society's failures is a long-term undertaking that must be accompanied by an overhaul of the whole system of criminal justice, correction and rehabilitation. The Johnson recommendations for Federal grants to encourage new techniques in these areas should help make American communities safer without the creation of a vast Federal police apparatus.

The President renews his plea for Federal legislation to limit the sale of guns by mail or over the counter, but too many loopholes would still be left in this traffic in lethal weapons. Mr. Johnson rightly notes that further delay in putting effective restraints on gun sales is "unconscionable." The difficulty is that there remains little sign of any top-level disposition to tackle the lobby that keeps open this highroad to murder and armed assault.

The message's sections on organized crime are also weak. The President acknowledges the Federal responsibility for dealing with crime syndicates that ignore state lines, but he is vague in defining the new weapons the Justice Department will be given to intensify its attack on gangster penetration so insidious that in some localities it has become a form of government within the government.

The President calls for outlawing all wiretapping and bugging, public as well as private, except in cases involving national security. We have long favored a total ban on taps for industrial or other private uses, but the case is far less plain for complete prohibition against the use of wiretaps by law-enforcement agencies. Before jumping to the conclusion that only such an absolute ban will work, Congress ought at least await publication of the National Crime Commission report, which apparently reflects a variety of views on this difficult and troublesome problem of protesting both the right of the individual to privacy and the right of society to self-defense.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 14, 1967]

An Act of Simple Prudence

Until the report of the President's National Crime Commission is released, it is pretty hard to judge how well Mr. Johnson's anti-crime program matches the commission's recommendations.

It is also hard to judge whether the program's proposed grants to local governments will be well-directed enough to bring about any real improvement in ways of combating crime. That is something Congress will have to try to determine.

There are, however, a number of recommendations in the President's message on crime which to be effective involve no Federal appropriations, and the merits of which ought not to be too hard to determine.

One of them is the President's renewed request for a firearms control law. If the past can be relied on. This proposal will please those people who believe that guns are of themselves evil—and anger those who see in any limitation on firearms an abridgement of the Constitutional right to bear arms.

This right, however, actually was designed to insure an armed militia of access to weapons, and not to make easy the acquiring of a private arsenal by anybody who wants one. As things stand now, in most states, anyone of any age can, by mail or otherwise, acquire pistols, rifles, even machine guns and bazookas.

Now a firearms control law which, among other things, would prohibit indiscriminate mail order sales is not going to put any serious crimp in crime, for a law is a thing criminals excel at breaking. Nor, as Mr. Johnson suggests, is firearms control any "panacea for the danger of human irrationality and violence."

It would be, however, "an act of simple prudence" in an age that has left the image of the frontiersman gunslinger far behind. Surely it ought to be possible to limit the freewheeling traffic in firearms without at the same time harassing, for instance, the fellow who wants to shoot woodchucks on his day off.

[From the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal, Feb. 9, 1967]

Will Stir Controversy

President Johnson's proposals to combat the nation's growing crime wave are certain to stir congressional controversy.

He has asked for at least $50 million. Mostly for grants of 60 to 90 per cent to be used to help states and cities to help themselves in efforts to uproot crime.

Implicit in that federal aid program is the establishment of federal standards for local governments to meet—and the threat of more federal control.

Nor has Congress forgotten Johnson's veto of a 1966 bill which extended police powers in dealing with suspected criminals and material witnesses in the District of Columbia.

Also certain to produce a storm is the President's proposal to crack down on mail order sales of firearms, although there is a manifest need to curb the indiscriminate peddling of such weapons.

One Johnson recommendation which should have widespread approval is that to outlaw all wiretapping, public and private, and all wilful invasions of privacy by electronic devices, except in the national interest.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) News, Feb. 7, 1967]

Enough Tired Arguments; Bring on Firearms Controls

No doubt the gun lobbies will roll out heavy verbal artillery to kill President Johnson's proposal for gun-control legislation.

Firearm buyers and sellers, by making more noise than their deadly weapons the past four years, have kept badly needed gun bills from enactment. They've cried foul all over the lot. "Commies under the rug—mustn't let them take over." "Right to bear arms—all good Americans must be prepared." "Just a friendly hobby—why not pick on rock hounds?—a person can kill with a rock, too."

Baloney!

Firearms, the kind that killed President Kennedy, still are being shipped through the mails to everyone who can meet the catalog price. Anyone bent on crime or vengeance can set up shop with no questions asked. This dangerous hardware is spreading across the country.

The President's proposals are reasonable: To limit mail-order sales of guns. To prohibit over-the-counter sales of firearms, other than rifles and shotguns, to any person not residing in the state in which the federal licensee does business. To curb import of non-sport weapons.

Sportsmen still can shoot. Hobbyists still can save. Dealers still can sell. Gun controls merely move death a fingertip away from the irresponsible. And isn't that desirable with weapons so easy to carry and discharge, so sure and final?

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 28, 1967]

Firearms Control

Advocates of gun-control legislation, though perhaps more numerous than those who oppose such legislation, have lacked the means to make themselves heard. Now it may be possible to remedy this defect. A group of leading citizens, including J. Millard Tawes, Maryland's former governor, have founded an organization in Washington to be known as the National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy.

The Johnson Administration's bill to restrict mail-order and over-the-counter sales of firearms, similar to the measure defeated last year, offers a common-sense approach to gun control. It would create effective regulations while doing little, if anything, to deny sportsmen the right "to keep and bear arms" for hunting purposes. Maryland and some other states have laws to regulate the over-the-counter sales of guns, but until the Federal Government acts the nation will have no regulatory policy worth the name.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Feb. 23, 1967]

Private Armies

Twenty Negroes, members of the Black Panther Party, carrying rifles, shotguns and sidearms, marched through the airport Tuesday as a bodyguard for the arriving widow of Malcolm X, slain Black Muslim leader.

As a spectacle, it was a non-Aryan reminder of Hitler's stormtroopers. It was also a reminder of the deficiencies of state and federal laws governing the purchase and display of deadly weapons.

Without infringement on the rights of sportsmen and the right of householders to possess weapons to guard their homes, these laws can be beefed up, and must be beefed up.

Last November Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch listed the weaponry seized from California paramilitary groups in the past two years: 800,000 rounds of ammunition, 400 machine guns, 200 rifles and pistols, 10 anti-tank guns and mortars, 80 hand grenades, 60 land mines and 1500 pounds of explosives.

"Much of this armament was returned to its owners because it is not illegal—even if some of the weapons could blow the steel door off a bank vault," Lynch said.

The ultra-right wing Minutemen, from whom some of these weapons have been seized, profess to be preparing to put down a Communist invasion or domestic uprising. The Black Panthers profess to be ready for anything that might block their Black Nationalism goals.

More stringent arms controls may not be the full answer. Certainly one would have to go deeper into the social conditions that give rise to such anti-democratic phenomena.

The duty of maintaining law and order and protecting individuals who have been threatened, or wish to think they have, rests with constituted law enforcement bodies. These duties cannot be shared with private armies, all claiming that the law is what they say it is.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald Sunday Telegram, Feb. 1, 1967]

Gun Fans Have a Novel Plan To Cure the "Crime Situation"

One of our letter writers from Bath accuses us of "consistently and persistently" airing our views on legislation aimed at placing restraints on the traffic in guns, and he sends in an editorial from the "American Rifleman" magazine published by the National Rifle Association, one of the most powerful of Washington lobbies, which fights gun laws at the same time it receives subsidies from the Federal Government.

The editorial article is too long to publish, but we were intrigued by the title—"The Right to Arms for Self Defense"—and the emotional assumption conveyed that with the "crime situation" what it is everyone ought to own a handgun and be ready to use it in his or her defense. The NRA even quotes from state constitutions, most of them written a century or so ago, to show that legislators of that period intended that people should have the right, and exercise it, to protect their homes with firearms. We thought we detected, too, a slap at contemporary police forces for their alleged failure to defend the law-abiding citizen.

We will grant that there are rare cases in which a brave householder or storekeeper defends his premises with a gun, but there are also cases in which the citizen loses his life to a criminal who is either quicker on the draw or enjoying some other advantage. But when the NRA tries to show that insidious forces (it calls them "big-city voices") are trying to take away the citizen's right to own firearms, it is setting up a straw man to be knocked down with its claim of the unrestrained right to traffic in, distribute, and possess firearms.

A bill just offered in the New York legislature is aimed only at the indiscriminate sale of rifles and shotguns, while the Dodd bill only bars the importation of certain weapons, limits purchases by teenagers, and most importantly abolishes mail-order interstate sale of handguns. Polls show that most Americans favor these controls; it is time they were legislated into law.

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Journal, Feb. 10, 1967]

An Act of Simple Prudence

"To pass strict firearms control laws at every level of government is an act of simple prudence and a measure of a civilized society."

Those words of President Johnson in his message on effective ways of combating the scourge of crime in America give a strong push to Senate Bill No. 1 in the 90th Congress.

When Connecticut Sen. Dodd last month renewed the effort he began in 1963 for adoption of reasonable controls with the laudable purpose of denying firearms to those likely to misuse them, he spoke dramatically of the tragic effects of Congress' failure to act:

"In the three and a half years in which Congress did nothing to prevent wanton killing with firearms, nearly 20,000 Americans were murdered by guns, rifles and shotguns as well as handguns.

"All a person need to do to buy a mail order gun is fill out a magazine coupon with his name and address, enclose as little as $5 or $6, and drop it in the mail.

"It is so simple, children can do it. And they do.

"Madmen can do it. And they do.

"Hardened criminals can do it. And they do."

President Johnson, supporting the objectives of the Dodd legislation, recommends Congress clamp down on the mail order gun business, prohibit over-the-counter sales of handguns to nonresidents of a state, ban rifle and shotgun sales to persons under 18 and curb imports of surplus military firearms and other guns not suitable for sporting purposes, bazookas and anti-tank weapons, for example.

The suggested regulations governing out-of-state purchases in person could be made stronger with restrictions on sales of rifles and shotguns. A New Jersey resident still could dodge this state's controls by buying a rifle in a neighboring state.

A mandatory federal provision that an out-of-state buyer produce a purchase permit if his state required one would close a loophole through which an undesirable person could slip to acquire a gun. Both the proposed national legislation and New Jersey's sensible law adopted last year would be made more meaningful.

Under the New Jersey law, a would-be purchaser has to obtain an identification card from the police of his community. As a prerequisite, he first must be fingerprinted and investigated.

The ban on mail order sales also would add to the effectiveness of this state's attempt to keep guns away from those unfit to have them.

Anticipating the objections of the diehard opposition in and out of Congress, President Johnson repeats what has been said many times previously. The legislation is "no panacea for the danger of human irrationality and violence . . . but it will help to keep lethal weapons out of the wrong hands."

Further delay is, as Mr. Johnson says, unconscionable.

[From the Erie (Pa.) News, Feb. 8, 1967]

Weapons: Plus, Minus

President Johnson this week asked Congress for a declaration of war on crime.

He asked for some new weapons to fight the battle—and he asked that a significant tool in crime-fighting be taken away from law enforcement agencies.

The President urged the passage of a gun control act. This would be a significant step, of course. We have consistently supported such a measure.

Despite opposition from many sincerely motivated groups toward any limitations on the sale or ownership of firearms, it is quite obvious that not everyone should be permitted to buy or possess a gun.

It is equally obvious that some of these people would get them anyway, in spite of appropriate legislation. But the point is that a gun control law would keep firearms out of a number of dangerous hands, at least, and this would be beneficial.

Any restrictions at all quite naturally will create some instances of inconvenience and unfairness to some persons who purchase firearms for legitimate uses. However, we think this is a price worth paying to gain the benefits involved.

The proposed law would place restrictions on mail order gun buying, over-the-counter sales of hand guns to non-residents, the sale of guns to persons under 18 (or 21 for hand guns), and the importation of firearms not suitable for sport.

These restrictions are reasonable, in fact almost minimal. Johnson noted that the legislation would be "no panacea" for criminal violence, but he quite properly stated it would "help to keep lethal weapons out of the wrong hands."

The President wants to eliminate all wiretapping and electronic snooping, however. And just as the gun control law would aid the fight against crime, a ban on all forms of eavesdropping will help crime itself.

Used improperly, of course, wiretapping and other forms of "bugging" would be more dangerous than the proposed ban. We believe such tools should be available for the use of the appropriate law enforcement agencies, under proper supervision and under strict limitation.

The President said the ban would apply in all cases except where the security of the nation is at stake.

This would be a vague standard indeed. Unless effective tools are provided in the fight against crime, we believe, the nation's security definitely is in jeopardy.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch, Feb. 15, 1967]

HOPE FOR GUN CONTROL

The odds on enactment of a federal gun control law improved considerably this week with the announcement that Speaker John McCormack has sent the proposal to the House Judiciary committee.

In previous sessions gun control bills were sent to the Ways and Means committee where they languished quietly.

Judiciary Committee Chairman Emanuel Celler is sponsoring the bill himself and said he would hold early hearings. He also predicted that a gun control proposal will reach the floor of the House.

The need for some degree of federal gun control is compelling.

Firearms, like cars are a source of pleasure to qualified and responsible users.

But guns are deadly in the hands of criminals, psychopaths and unqualified youngsters.

The ultimate responsibility rests with the states. But the states are in no position to enforce effective controls until the interstate sale of guns is restricted.

Minnesota law, for instance, prevents the sale of a gun to a youth under 18 without parental consent. But any youngster with $13 in his pocket can send away for a cheap and dangerous pearl-handled 22 caliber revolver.

St. Paul has a gun registration law. But it is ineffective because anyone can buy a gun by mail or by going to a store outside the city limits.

Restricting the interstate sale of firearms is a minimum requirement for keeping deadly weapons out of the hands of unqualified and irresponsible hands.

If Congress succeeds in passing at least that much of a gun control law the states will be in a position to enact more effective controls.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, Feb. 6, 1967]

PARTNERS AGAINST CRIME

President Johnson's basic message to Congress on crime—that greater effort must be made to combat it—will draw no disagreement.

"It is our duty to seek its cure with every means at our command," said the President, in submitting his recommendations to Congress.

He asked $50 million for this year and $300 million for next year to help finance planning and research projects in the anticrime campaign. State and local governments would be expected to contribute an additional $283 million to the program.

There is need for more scientific, centralized research on crime control and dissemination of the information to state and local governments. Police training is generally inadequate.

There is need, too, for tighter gun laws. The President's proposals for limiting mail-order sales of firearms, restricting over-the-counter purchases by persons under 21 and curbing imports of nonsporting weapons do not seem unreasonable. Any law-abiding householder should be able to acquire and keep a weapon but it's absurd to continue a system under which a maniac can walk in off the street and buy a murder arsenal with no limitation other than the amount of money in his pocket.

But Mr. Johnson's second main regulatory proposal, to outlaw wiretapping except in investigations involving national security, is too broad.

Professional criminals, especially those operating in interstate rackets, use every available scientific device to ply their trade. Why should responsible agents of law enforcement be deprived of a valuable weapon?

Wiretapping, it seems to us, could be properly controlled by a requirement limiting its use to certain types of investigations under authority of a court order, in the same manner that searches of homes or places of business are governed. There is no real difference between a seizure of physical evidence and the interception of oral evidence.

Recent cries of alarm about wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping have been exaggerated, in our judgment. Most of the abuses have come through the activities of private investigators. These should be and can be prohibited.

New regulations and new research programs can be helpful in the crime fight but they represent only a small part of the solution.

Crime will be reduced mainly through the efforts of the police officer. He must be better educated, better equipped, better paid, better directed—and more numerous.

The task, then, will continue to rest principally upon the state and local governments. These governments, generally, have responded too slowly and inefficiently to the challenge of rising crime.

With a coordinated partnership of Federal, state and local agencies, the crime trend can be reversed. It must be, or government fails its most fundamental responsibility—to assure the safety of the law-abiding citizen.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times, Feb. 15, 1967]

SHOULD PASS FIREARMS BILL

President Johnson in his State of the Union message once more emphasized the need for federal controls on the traffic in firearms, particularly the sale of weapons by mail-order houses. He made further reference to the issue in his recent message to Congress on crime, although he was not as specific as he was when he discussed the fight on crime last year. At that time Mr. Johnson urged a federal ban on the mail-order sales of all firearms, including handguns, shotguns and rifles.

The President's utterances have served to hold the spotlight on the gun problem. It now remains to be seen whether Congress during this year's session will heed his exhortations or will again surrender to the firearms lobby.

Sen. Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut, reintroduced his bill for controls on interstate traffic in firearms soon after President Johnson's State of the Union speech. The senator once more observed that "all a person need do to buy a mail order gun is to fill out a magazine coupon with his name and address, enclose as little as $5 or $6 and drop it in the mail." President Johnson in similar vein had reminded Congress that "Lee Oswald sent for and received a rifle through the United States mail" and used it in the assassination of President Kennedy.

Carl Bakal, the author of a recently published book "The Right to Bear Arms," has pointed out that about 1,800 of the 6,000 firearms homicides recorded in this country in 1965 were accounted for by shotguns and rifles.

This and other evidence should influence Congress to assert its power by at least putting a halt to mail-order sales of firearms. The Dodd bill has been kicked around too long by our national lawmakers, some of whom apparently have been taken in by the "right to bear arms" nonsense that has been indulged in by the gun lobby.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat & Chronicle, Feb. 21, 1967]

PATS AND POTSHOTS

Abortion: The angry debate over whether to change the state's archaic 84-year-old abortion law seems to this newspaper to obscure the key point. This is that the reforms under consideration are purely permissive; force is not involved, and authorization for abortion could come only from panels of physicians certified by the State Health Department. How can there be more humane approach?

Gun controls: Another angry debate which seems pointless to us is over whether to set up a registration law for firearms. Sportsmen's clubs oppose this violently. Yet it would merely give authorities some small help in keeping guns from criminals and from the mentally ill. It wouldn't stop anybody else from buying a gun. We register everything now from our automobiles to our poodles. Why not guns?

Refuse disposal: Councilman William J. Malley has introduced legislation that's just a lot of rubbish! . . . and it should make everybody happy. City Council approved it unanimously. It authorizes the City Manager to hire engineers to study the city's present and future system of refuse disposal. Right now we burn it and pollute the air. Tip to the engineers: How about studying the European system whereby waste and garbage are packaged and treated and usable for fuel?

[From the Beaver Falls (Pa.) News-Tribune, Feb. 20, 1967]

OTHER VOICES—AN ACT OF SIMPLE PRUDENCE

Until the report of the President's National Crime Commission is released, it is pretty hard to judge how well Mr. Johnson's anticrime program matches the commission's recommendations.

It is also hard to judge whether the program's proposed grants to local governments will be well-directed enough to bring about any real improvement in ways of combating crime. That is something Congress will have to try to determine.

There are, however, a number of recommendations in the President's message on crime which to be effective involve no Federal appropriations, and the merits of which ought not to be too hard to determine.

One of them is the President's renewed request for a firearms control law. If the past can be relied on, this proposal will please those people who believe that guns are of themselves evil—and anger those who see in any limitation on firearms an abridgement of the Constitutional right to bear arms.

This right, however, actually was designed to insure an armed militia of access to weapons, and not to make easy the acquiring of a private arsenal by anybody who wants one. As things stand now, in most states, anyone of any age can, by mail or otherwise, acquire pistols, rifles, even machine guns and bazookas.

Now a firearms control law which, among other things, would prohibit indiscriminate mail order sales is not going to put any serious crimp in crime, for a law is a thing criminals excel at breaking. Nor, as Mr. Johnson suggests, is firearms control any "panacea for the danger of human irrationality and violence."

It would be, however, "an act of simple prudence" in an age that has left the image of the frontiersman gunslinger far behind Surely it ought to be possible to limit the freewheeling traffic in firearms without at the same time harassing, for instance, the fellow who wants to shoot woodchucks on his day off.

—Wall Street Journal

[From the Waukegan (Ill.) News-Sun, Feb. 28, 1967]

The "Right" To Bear Arms

Everytime state or federal law makers propose bills to regulate the use of firearms, there is an outraged cry among gun zealots who say a constitutional right is being infringed.

They point, as does a letter to the editor today, to the Second Amendment of the Constitution which says: "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be abridged." However, gun control opponents ignore the part about "a well-regulated militia" and merely cite the section about "the right of the people."

Historically, the founding fathers believed the United States could protect itself chiefly through a system of locally organized militiamen or citizen-soldiers. So in 1791 when the Bill of Rights was adopted, American pioneers were given the right to keep and bear arms as a means of protecting the country against domestic disorder and foreign danger. Yet, times change. In the 20th Century, we have the armed forces and various law enforcement agencies doing the job of the 18th Century minutemen. So the essential intent of the Second Amendment really is no longer meaningful.

Further, because the amendment was devised within the framework of a militia, nothing in it says the usage of guns for "personal" pleasure cannot be controlled or regulated by either the state or federal governments. In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court has held that state and federal lawmakers may pass laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed weapons, requiring the registration of firearms and limiting the sale of firearms for other than military use.

If the framers of the Constitution had wanted to guarantee all citizens the right to bear arms without restriction, they would have worded the Second Amendment in much the same manner as the First Amendment which unequivocally states "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech." Thus, liberty of expression is given a broad, explicit and forceful guarantee against governmental interference that is denied the freedom to bear arms. And those who seek to equate the right to pack a pistol with the right to give a street-corner speech are befogging the issue with legalistic inaccuracy.

The state and federal government has every "right" to regulate the use of firearms. Those who argue that gun controls damage their constitutional rights should re-read the Constitution.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Home News, Feb. 14, 1967]

How To Cut Gun Murders

On Thursday, Sen. Thomas Dodd of Connecticut discussed on the Senate floor several new points in support of his gun control bill.

Sen. Dodd effectively disposed of some of the arguments used by opponents of gun control.

Dodd effectively demolished the Philadelphia argument. In New Jersey and elsewhere, the cry has been raised that Philadelphia's 1965 gun ordinance has been ineffective. Dodd shows that gun murders in Philadelphia decreased 5 per cent in the first half of last year.

Dodd quoted the Philadelphia Crime Commission as saying, "In the first full year of its life, the firearms ordinance made it impossible for 73 convicted criminals to purchase rifles and shotguns locally." And no one knows, of course, how many criminals did not try to buy guns, knowing they would be refused.

Dodd spoke of the "doomsday" philosophy of the gun people who claimed the New Jersey gun control law would end hunting in the Garden State. Dodd's answer to this was "The sale of hunting licenses and the bag of deer (in New Jersey) in 1966 surpassed the record in 1965 when the law regulating the sale of rifles and shotguns was not in existence."

A favorite argument of the anti-control people is that the Sullivan Law, strictly regulating guns, is ineffective in New York.

In New York, gun murders make up 32 per cent of the total murders committed. The national average is 57 per cent. How can anyone say this is an ineffective law? And many, many of the murders committed in New York are proved to be with weapons obtained by their users through mail order, a type of transaction which would be illegal under the Dodd bill.

In states with no gun control, or minimal gun-control legislation, the percentage of murders by gun skyrockets. In Louisiana, the figure is 62 per cent. In Texas, the figure is 69 per cent. And Montana tops them all with a 70 per cent figure.

Local gun controls do make a dent in gun crime. And if they can be supplemented with the federal control of the Dodd bill, gun crime will be effectively and substantially decreased.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Home News, Feb. 22, 1967]

Strict Firearm Control Urged

"The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society," the monumental report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, made public recently, includes an enlightening chapter on control of firearms, and a series of formal recommendations in this field.

The President's Commission recommends:

1. Federal and state governments should enact legislation outlawing transportation and private possession of military-type firearms such as bazookas, machine guns, mortars and anti-tank guns.

2. States should enact laws prohibiting certain categories of persons, such as habitual drunkards, drug addicts, mental incompetents, persons with a history of mental disturbance, and persons convicted of certain offenses, from buying, owning, or possessing firearms.

3. Each state should require the registration of all handguns, rifles and shotguns. If, after five years, some states still have not enacted such laws, Congress should pass a federal firearms registration act applicable to those states.

4. Each state should require a person to obtain a permit before he can either possess or carry a handgun. Through licensing provisions, federal law should prohibit mail order and other interstate sales of handguns and should regulate such sales of rifles and shotguns.

Those are the solemn and considered recommendations of the distinguished President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice.

Atty. Gen. Nicholas Katzenbach headed the commission. Members of the commission included the president of Yale University, the publisher of the Los Angeles Times, the attorney general of California, the San Francisco chief of police, the president of the League of Women Voters of the United States, the executive director of the National Urban League, former New York Mayor Robert F. Wagner, and many outstanding attorneys.

Their recommendations should be followed, soon.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Feb. 27, 1967]

Controlling the Sale of Guns

The statistics are almost as frightening as the muzzle of a gun: During 1965, according to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement, 5,600 murders, 34,700 aggravated assaults, and the vast majority of the 64,800 armed robberies in the country were committed by means of firearms.

Most of the criminals behind those guns were able to purchase their weapons at retail outlets or through mail order channels with little if any difficulty. There are laws at the federal, state and local levels regulating the sale of firearms, but these laws are so diverse that it is a relatively simple matter to circumvent them.

Unfortunately, any attempt to tighten the regulations on the sale of firearms runs headlong into an emotional roadblock manned by the National Rifle Association and other groups representing hunters, gun collectors and citizens who seek to buy weapons for personal protection. They argue that firearms are dangerous only if misused, and that the proper legal remedy is to punish the illegal use of guns, not to prevent their ownership.

But it is not enough to punish after the illegal act, as the victims of gun-bearing criminals can testify. The sale of those guns must be regulated so that firearms can be kept out of the hands of those who would use them for criminal purposes.

Citizens who are hunters, gun collectors, or who desire weapons for self-protection would not be harmed by proposed legislation to ban the sale of bazookas, machine guns or mortars. Neither would they be harmed by laws requiring the registration of all firearms or prohibiting the mail order sale of handguns. Such laws would benefit the citizenry as a whole, and harm only the criminals.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) News, Feb. 28, 1967]

Philadelphia Points Way on Gun Control Crusade

"The laws affecting the availability of firearms to the general public should serve the overall public interest and not just the convenience of particular groups."

Those are the words of James V. Bennett, retired director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, in announcing the formation of a citizens' committee to alert the Nation's attention to the need for tighter firearms controls.

The new committee, which should provide some needed firepower against the big guns of the National Rifle Assn. and sportsmen's lobbies, will be known as the National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy.

The committee might begin its work by quoting Ephraim R. Gomberg, executive vice president of the Crime Commission of Philadelphia, who told members of the New York State Legislature the other day that Philadelphia's gun-control ordinance has helped to reduce crime here. New York is considering a similar gun-control bill that would also include the registration of all firearms.

Gomberg noted that in 1966 some 114 individuals were denied permits to buy guns because most of them had been convicted of other serious crimes.

There are those who will scoff at Gomberg's assertion. Most of the scoffers will be among the opponents of gun controls.

But Gomberg cited significant figures. Crime here dropped 6.4 percent last year while the national average increased. Homicides dropped by 13.2 percent compared with 1965.

Homicides in which guns were used declined by 23.7 percent as compared with 1965.

The role of gun controls in these statistics cannot be proven scientifically but the figures should be of interest not only to New York State's legislators but to members of Congress who will soon consider legislation for interstate sale of guns.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Feb. 14, 1967]

GUN LAWS LONG OVERDUE

To national and state legislators who in the past would neither pass nor acknowledge the need for effective gun control legislation, a few bits of recent news may be of interest.

On the hour and day of the third anniversary of the assassination of President Kennedy, a television news reporter walked into a Dallas gun shop, bought a rifle identical to the one used by the president's assassin and then strolled the streets of the Texas city, with gun and ammunition in hand, without being stopped or questioned.

Another reporter purchased a 20-mm antitank gun in a Phoenix, Ariz., store, received instructions in its use, test-fired it and then had it sent to New York City.

In Cleveland, a reporter for the Cuyahoga Community College newspaper, the Commuter, visited several gun shops and again proved that weapons purchase is an easy matter, no questions asked.

At one store he made a down payment on a high-powered rifle without producing identification, proof of age or verification of the name, address and telephone number he gave the salesman.

In the United States Senate last week, the gun control law asked for by President Johnson was introduced by Sen. Thomas J. Dodd, D-Conn., author of a similar bill which died in committee last year.

Sen. Dodd made a telling point when he presented statistics showing that in states with intelligent gun control laws, murder by gun is much less frequent than in those states with no controls or ineffective controls.

At both levels of government, federal and state, it is now past time for enactment of effective gun laws.

[From the Chester (Pa.) Delaware County Times, Feb. 16, 1967]

SEVEN-FOOT RABBIT GUN

For those three or four people who haven't yet made up their minds on the issue of stronger regulations on the purchase of guns, the National Broadcasting Company is preparing a documentary which will be shown Sunday, March 19, at 6:30 p.m.

There have been some interesting incidents as the network sent reporters to see how difficult it is to secure a weapon.

One walked into a Dallas gun shop less than a mile from the Kennedy assassination site on the third anniversary of the President's death and bought the identical model of rifle his assassin had used.

The reporter also purchased ammunition and carried both openly through the downtown streets.

"No one even paid attention," he said.

Another reporter purchased a 7-foot-long, 20 mm. antitank gun in Phoenix, Ariz.

"What do you want to do with it?" the owner asked.

"I want to hunt rabbits," explained the reporter.

The gun uses shells as big as most rabbits, but the reporter was sold the gun and instructed in its use. He fired it against a nearby mountain, then sent it to NBC in New York where its arrival stunned the documentary's producer.

In New York, an NBC page was sent to a store where Nazi armbands are sold right next to the gun counter. The page bought a rifle on the pretext that he was a hunter, then purchased the Nazi armband.

No questions were asked.

We think plenty of questions should be asked. Our favorite is, How much longer before Congress has the courage to enact legislation, as requested by the President to provide "strict control on the sale of firearms"?

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, Feb. 20, 1967]

SENATOR DODD'S GUN BILL

Atlanta strengthened its regulation of gun sales recently. But even if the city managed to enforce the new law effectively it alone could not do the job needed.

Mail order sales continue unabated, and a city ordinance cannot stop this source of cheap weaponry.

Other areas nearby also will remain sources of weapons.

We are pleased to see that Sen. Thomas J. Dodd of Connecticut is pursuing his gun control legislation for the nation, for local ordinances are not enough.

Sen. Dodd introduced an administration-sponored gun control law at the last session of Congress. It hit strong opposition and never came to the floor.

Now the senator has introduced his bill again. He seems optimistic. "The time-worn myths of the gun lobby have been laid to rest," he says.

His bill would prohibit interstate mail order sales of pistols, rifles and shotguns to individuals; provide for federal licensing of all firearms dealers, manufacturers and importers; and require identification from purchasers of firearms from licensed dealers, with no sales of pistols to anyone under 21 and no sales of rifles and shotguns to anyone under 18.

It also would bombard the bazooka market, stringently controlling sales of heavily destructive devices such as bazookas and antitank guns.

All of this is mere common sense. The only trouble is that some frantic groups in the country have lobbied heavily against reasonable gun control legislation and Congress has bowed to them.

We hope Sen. Dodd is successful this time. Georgians in Congress should give him a hand for the safety of their constituents.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Feb. 13, 1967]

THE HIGH COST OF CRIME

President Johnson last week proposed a constructive anti-crime plan. New and laudable were his proposed right-of-privacy bill and the use of federal seed money to encourage comprehensive community law enforcement and crime prevention programs. Not so new, but also laudable, were his proposed curbs on firearms sales.

Mr. Johnson is the first president to endorse an end to wiretapping and electronic snooping. Technically, no new law should be necessary. A 1934 law prohibits the interception of telephone conversations. But widespread confusion and abuse justify new clarifying legislation.

The right of privacy is the "right most valued by civilized men," said the President, quoting Justice Brandeis, and adding: "It is the first right denied by a totalitarian system. . . . It is a hallmark of a free society."

The revelations about government snooping by Sen. Edward V. Long of Missouri and the recent charges against the Detroit Police Department show how threatened this right has become.

The President would make an exception to his wiretapping ban where the security of the nation is at stake. This needs clarification. Few would object to the electronic bugging of enemy espionage agents. But who is to decide what is a security threat?

The proposed system of grants to local law enforcement programs has received undue criticism.

Mr. Johnson is asking for a $50 million appropriation the first year, a $300 million appropriation the second year and more later. To show the type of comprehensive programs which would receive federal matching funds under this program, he gave an example:

"The Crime Commission recommends that drunkenness should be regarded as a criminal offense only when it is accompanied by disorderly conduct. Today, one-third of all arrests are for drunkenness. Two million arrests for drunkenness burden the police, clog the lower courts and crowd places of detention. If, instead of treating drunkenness as an ordinary crime, local authorities chose to create a civil detoxication program, the consequences of that choice would be felt throughout the law enforcement and corrections system."

The amount of money involved, compared with the $4 billion the nation now spends on law enforcement and correction, would not endanger a federal takeover of the police function. The Detroit police budget this year, for instance, is $45.5 million. Michigan's Department of Correction's budget is $23.7 million. The state police is costing $21.9 million. The President's proposal would make each agency eligible for a few million dollars in federal funds if it designed some such new, comprehensive programs.

It would be easier to get enthusiastic about the President's firearms control proposals if they weren't similar to restrictions recommended two years ago which were ambushed by the gun lobby.

He asked Congress to prohibit the mail order sale of firearms except between federally licensed retailers, to prohibit over-the-counter sales of handguns to out-of-state residents, to prohibit the sale of handguns to any person under 21 and rifle and shotgun sales to anyone under 18, and to curb the import of surplus military firearms.

The genuine sportsman would have no difficulty buying firearms under these restraints. Still, the National Rifle Association said the similar 1965 bill would eliminate the "private ownership of all guns." If the gun lobby's aim in the field were no more accurate than its press releases. Bambi wouldn't have anything to worry about. We've been misled by such camouflage long enough. It's time to pass an effective law.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal-Star, Feb. 17, 1967]

GUN CONTROL: LET'S TRY AGAIN

Any maniac, malcontent or thief can buy a gun in Illinois as easily as he can a bottle of soda pop.

He need only walk into the local gun store and choose his weapon. Or, if he's looking for Army surplus and foreign models, he can buy at bargain prices a pistol, rifle or Army bazooka through the mail.

In a recent study, Chicago police were able to trace the destination of 4,000 mail-order weapons. They found to their dismay that 23 per cent of them had gone to purchasers with criminal records ranging from murder to sexual molestation.

It is time that reasonable and effective gun controls were established. By reasonable, we don't mean insufferable. Rather, gun sales should be controlled in the same manner as drug sales—with prudence.

And by effective gun controls, we mean a two-pronged attack involving the state and federal government. They need each other because the state governs across the counter sales while Washington watches mail-order traffic.

Sen. Thomas Dodd of Connecticut already has introduced a bill restricting mail-order sales in handguns and, to some extent, rifles. The bill prohibits the sale of rifles and shotguns to persons under 18 and the sale of handguns by federally licensed dealers to persons under 21. Dodd obviously is soft-pedaling the issue of rifle sales since he doesn't want to unduly rile riflemen associations which have lobbied and killed three previous bills.

Dodd's proposal deserves passage. It would allow states like Illinois to frame regulations that could not be circumvented by a coupon and five-cent stamp.

On the state level, Rep. Paul Elward plans to introduce legislation within the next two weeks regulating across the counter sale of handguns, but again, not rifles, thereby leaving duck and deer hunters wholly free to pursue their hobbies.

Elward explains that under his bill a person must get a permit from police before purchasing small arms. The permit can be denied if the citizen is a convicted felon, narcotics addict, under 18 or was released from a mental institution within five years.

In our crowded society, a strong case can be made for tougher legislation at both the state and national level. However, the modest proposal of Dodd and Elward are realistic beginnings. In the world of practical politics, anything more stringent would be gunned down for sure.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, Feb. 15, 1967]

Gun Law Sponsor Questions Objectivity of the N.R.A.

The Voice of the People contains a letter today from a correspondent critical of attempts being made on the federal level to regulate the traffic in firearms. One of his complaints is that the National Rifle Association has been unfairly tagged as opposed to all gun legislation.

Following President Johnson's message on crime, it is appropriate to quote from the statement of Sen. Thomas Dodd of Connecticut, who has reintroduced previously legislation on guns, and in line with the requests of the President.

Sen. Dodd said his bill would bar the mail-order sale of handguns, rifles and shotguns to individuals, bar over-the-counter sale of handguns to non-residents of a state, identify the age of all firearm purchasers and prohibit sale of handguns to anyone under 21, license all dealers, importers and manufacturers, and bar the importation of all military surplus weapons.

It is also apropos to note what Sen. Dodd said about the NRA when he introduced similar legislation in the 89th Congress. The analysis of that bill by the NRA and widely distributed, he said, contains distortions, half truths, and untruths, and admitted this when NRA representatives were called to testify before a congressional subcommittee. Moreover, said Sen. Dodd, the NRA refused to correct the misstatements and false impressions when called upon to do so.

If the Senator is right, one is forced to ask if the NRA is really willing to see any sort of legislation adopted to curb the traffic in firearms.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Feb. 11, 1967]

A New Program of Federal Aid To Fight Crime

At the heart of President Johnson's message on crime is the recognition that dealing with crime is largely a local problem. What he proposes is federal aid to help local and state governments wage a more effective battle against law breakers.

While acknowledging the social causes of crime, the message insists that we cannot afford to wait until our social ills are cured, that we cannot delay a generation, that we must do something now to cope with violence and criminality. We can begin by attacking the defects in our police, court and correctional systems. (The latest figures on the increase in burglaries, assauts and forcible rapes in suburban Jefferson County leave no room for complacency about local police protection.)

The program the President has put before Congress would begin by providing money on a $9-to-$1 matching basis to help localities develop plans for modernizing their law enforcement and correctional systems. Later, Washington would put up 60 per cent of the cost of programs of police training, of operating communications systems, and of developing new approaches to rehabilitation and other innovations. Research projects proposed by colleges or public agencies would be eligible for full federal financing; and the construction of modern crime laboratories, community correction centers and police academies could receive 50 per cent federal support.

The President's message, however, ranged beyond proposals for improving local law enforcement, although his other recommendations would affect it directly and indirectly. He renewed his plea for regulation of the scandalous traffic in firearms. Specifically, he called for Congress to prohibit certain mail-order sales of firearms, to forbid the sale of handguns to those under 21 and of shotguns and rifles as well to those under 18. This is the least that should be done, and the failure of Congress to do this much would be, as the President put it, "unconscionable."

The President also asked Congress to end the interstate commerce in electronic bugs and eavesdropping equipment and to pass a new law prohibiting wiretapping in all instances but those involving the national security. Whether the proposed new law would prove more effective than the one we have now must await further elaboration, but the idea of stopping the interstate commerce in bugging equipment has much merit. However, this section of the message addresses itself more to the right of privacy than to the battle against crime.

One might debate the details of the crime message, but it does offer hope, in its tone and substance, that at last we may get a coordinated program of crime prevention, national in scope.

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Independent, Feb. 19, 1967]

Congress Should Approve New Bill To Curb Mail Order Gun Sales

For the third time Sen. Thomas Dodd has introduced legislation to regulate the interstate sale of firearms.

Anything from handguns to anti-tank weapons may now be bought by mail by merely filling in a coupon and sending in the dough.

As usual, the Dodd proposal will find a strong group of gun and allied interests trying to fan the anger of hunters, sportsmen and collectors into all-out opposition to an affidavit provision for interstate purchase of rifles and shotguns.

The Charlotte Observer notes, "Much of the bill's intent and some of its provisions were badly distorted by people claiming everything from a violation of constitutional rights to a Communist conspiracy to disarm Americans.

"Few of the rabid opponents of interstate regulation will hold still long enough for a rational discussion of the content of the bill. That makes it more imperative that members of Congress do so."

First, the Dodd proposal applies only to guns sold in interstate commerce or by federally licensed dealers—not local sales. It is aimed mostly at mail order traffic.

There is nothing in the bill prohibiting sportsmen from buying, transporting or using their firearms. It does not prevent gun collectors from pursuing their hobby.

What the bill will do, as briefed by The Charlotte Observer, are these things:

Prohibit the interestate commercial sale of handguns by federally licensed dealers to non-licensees.

Regulate the interstate sale of sporting rifles and shotguns through an affidavit provision.

Prohibit the sale of handguns by federally licensed dealers to persons under 21 years of age and prohibit the sale of rifles and shotguns to persons under 18 years of age.

Prohibit the sale by federally licensed dealers of all firearms other than rifles and shotguns to non-residents of the licensee's state of business.

Prohibit the sale of any firearm by a federally licensed dealer in violation of state and local law at the place of sale.

Require that federal firearms dealers be licensed at a rate of $25 initially with a $10 annual renewal fee.

Set up standards in order to obtain a federal license to manufacture, import or deal in firearms.

Require that federal licensees ascertain the identity and age of purchasers of firearms.

Limit the importation of military surplus firearms and certain foreign made firearms.

What would such legislation hope to achieve?

It would be more difficult for children or mentally unstable adults to order firearms by mail.

It would, hopefully, reduce the human carnage attributable to firearms in the wrong hands: 5,015 persons murdered in 1966 and 35,000 more wounded.

True, autos also kill a lot of people. But there's organized effort to reduce the toll. People are trying. Why shouldn't they try to cut the firearms toll?

Nobody is trying to disarm law abiding, reputable citizens but only to make it more difficult for the other kind to get their hands on lethal weapons.

It is time for Congress to approve these long overdue safeguards.

[From the Greenville (Ohio) Advocate, Feb. 25, 1967]

It's Their Opinion—An Act of Simple Prudence

Until the report of the President's National Crime Commission is released, it is pretty hard to judge how well Mr. Johnson's anticrime program matches the commission's recommendations.

It is also hard to judge whether the program's proposed grants to local governments will be well-directed enough to bring about any real improvement in ways of combating crime. That is something Congress will have to try to determine.

There are, however, a number of recommendations in the President's message on crime which to be effective involve no Federal appropriations, and the merits of which ought not to be too hard to determine.

One of them is the President's renewed request for a firearms control law. If the past can be relied on, this proposal will please those people who believe that guns are of themselves evil—and anger those who see in any limitation on firearms an abridgement of the Constitutional right to bear arms.

This right, however, actually was designed to insure an armed militia of access to weapons, and not to make easy the acquiring of a private arsenal by anybody who wants one. As things stand now, in most states, anyone of any age can, by mail or otherwise, acquire pistols, rifles, even machine guns and bazookas.

Now a firearm control law which, among other things, would prohibit indiscriminate mail order sales is not going to put any serious crimp in crime, for a law is a thing criminals excel at breaking. Nor, as Mr. Johnson suggests, is firearms control any "panacea for the danger of human irrationality and violence."

It would be, however, "an act of simple prudence" in an age that has left the image of the frontiersman gunslinger far behind. Surely it ought to be possible to limit the freewheeling traffic in firearms without at the same time harassing, for instance, the fellow who wants to shoot woodchucks on his day off.—The Wall Street Journal, Cleveland, Ohio.

[From the Waukegan (Ill.) News-Sun]

Another Gunman Gone Wild

The 18-year-old boy who used a mail-order rifle in a terrifying shooting rampage at Chicago's Waller High School is the latest example of why guns are too easy to get.

We hope it will spur efforts in Springfield to apply some reasonable restrictions to the purchase and ownership of firearms, forbidding their possession by juveniles, felons convicted within the past five years, narcotic addicts and the mentally ill.

The Waller incident shows something else: No state law can be effective so long as the federal government allows unhampered interstate traffic in guns, so long as kids and kooks are only a catalogue coupon away from a deadly weapon. We hope the lesson of Waller is not lost on Illinois congressmen as they consider a modest mail-order gun control measure already introduced on Capitol Hill.

At Waller, students miraculously escaped injury. In the Texas Tower slaughter last year, people were not so lucky. There are about 5,600 homicides committed with firearms each year. Although new laws can stop only some of them, that is sufficient cause for trying.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Mar. 20, 1967]

Why Should City Boys Have Guns?

(An editorial in the Washington Post)

Police in Rockford, Ill., have charged a 17-year-old youth with the execution-style murders of two 14-year-old boys who were lined up against a wall and shot in the back of the head recently. The accused youth has a .22-caliber rifle.

A couple of months ago he was acquitted in another shooting case, the victim that time being a 15-year-old who had been hit in the arm by a sniper's bullet.

What do the people of Rockford expect a young fellow to do with a .22-caliber rifle? It's not much fun having a gun if you can't use it.

Rockford, in recent decades, has grown very considerably. It is now a pronouncedly industrial community of about 140,000 with very little left in its vicinity in the way of woodland and wildlife. There was a time, to be sure, when a rifle was indispensable to anyone living in Illinois for protection against savages and for filling the family larder with game. And there was a time even more recently when youngsters could reasonably use a rifle to shoot rabbits or squirrels or the like.

Today, however, there isn't much left for a kid to shoot at but other kids. Tell a fellow that he can't take potshots at his schoolmates and you might almost as well tell him that he can't have a gun at all until he gets a little older and a little more responsible—or that he can have a gun only under circumstances so rigidly restricted as to cut down on his fun slightly.

Perhaps this isn't such a bad idea when you come to think about it. Perhaps it would be socially more desirable to protect the lives of juveniles generally than to protect the pleasure of a handful of young hunters. Shooting is great sport, to be sure. But maybe it ought to be confined to those old enough and trustworthy enough to engage in it responsibly.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot, Feb. 16, 1967]

The Gun Law, Again

Senate Bill No. 1 the Administration's proposed legislation for firearms control is the No. 1 target of the National Rifle Association, which bushwhacked it last year. But in the House the bill's chances of reaching the floor this session were enhanced when it went to the friendly Judiciary Committee this week instead of the Ways and Means Committee.

The bill, under study six years by the Justice Department, would:

Outlaw interstate shipment of firearms except between licensed dealers, virtually ending private mail-order purchases.

Restrict over-the-counter sales of guns to residents of the state in which the sale is made.

Make 21 the minimum age for purchasing pistols or revolvers and 18 the minimum for rifles or shotguns, and outlaw imports of firearms except for hunting weapons, which would be restricted.

The uniform restrictions over interstate traffic in firearms would enable the states and localities to deal with the gun problem within their own borders. Mail deliveries may circumvent local safeguards. (Tidewater's cities have ordinances regulating the purchase of pistols but do not have restrictions on the sale of rifles and shotguns. Virginia is the only state without some form of gun-control law. A firearms-control bill, sponsored by Delegate Marion G. Galland of Alexandria, nearly passed the House of Delegates in 1964 but failed to get out of committee in 1966.)

The lobbyists evoke the American right to bear arms; but the gun law seeks only some assurance that the right is not abused by minors, criminals, or maniacs. If some persons are reluctant to register in purchasing a gun then the likelihood is that society is the safer for the lack of those customers. In 1965 there were 5,600 murders, 45,000 armed robberies, and 34,790 aggravated assaults with guns. That ought to be ammunition enough to answer the National Rifle Association, and pass the gun law.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press, Feb. 15, 1967]

Gun Controls Are Needed

As part of his war on crime, President Johnson wants Congress to impose certain restrictions on the sale and shipment of firearms. And Sen. Thomas Dodd has the figures to prove the necessity of federal controls.

In 1965, the senator reports, there were 5,600 murders, 45,000 armed robberies and 34,700 aggravated assaults committed with guns. In the first nine months of 1966 almost 60 per cent of all murders were committed with guns. Aggravated assaults with guns rose by 22 per cent over the corresponding period in 1965. Armed robbery increased by 10 per cent.

Firearms fanciers and sportsmen's groups argue that murder can be done with knives and other weapons as well as with guns. But they hardly can deny that it is easier with a gun. Further, against a knife or similar weapon an unarmed person does have some chance of thwarting his attacker; against a gun he has almost no chance.

We never have been able to understand the sportsman's opposition to gun control legislation, since there has not been any determined effort in this control to prevent the sale or purchase of firearms for legitimate uses. Nor is there any such attempt being made in the new legislation before Congress.

The present bill would prohibit interstate mail order sales of all types of guns. It would prohibit across-the-counter sale of handguns to nonresidents of a given state. It would require the licensing of all dealers, importers and manufacturers in firearms and would restrict sales of handguns to those who have reached 21 and of rifles and shotguns to those 18 and older.

The underlying purpose of this bill is not to usurp the authority of the states to control firearms, but to implement state laws. It does no good for a state to require the registering of handguns if such weapons may be sold freely through the mails. Some will contend, of course, that prohibiting the sale of guns to nonresidents and setting age limits are violations of states' rights. But in a great many instances, guns bought in one state are intended for illegal use in another. Residents of a state with effective gun control laws are not safe if a bordering state permits easy traffic in firearms.

Philadelphia has a rigid gun control ordinance which makes it impossible for convicted felons to purchase firearms there. The Philadelphia Crime Commission reports that one such person who was refused permission to buy a gun went outside the city, purchased one and returned and killed his wife.

Opponents of gun control legislation have been saying for years that farmers are strongly opposed to such laws. But a poll conducted by the Prairie Farmer in Indiana and Illinois and just released refutes this argument. That poll shows that 55 per cent of the farmers queried are in favor of more stringent measures to control the possession and use of firearms and only 32 per cent are against them (13 per cent were undecided).

The proposed legislation is aimed only at keeping firearms out of the hands of criminals, narcotics addicts, the mentally deranged and others who are not to be trusted with lethal weapons. No one is suggesting that stronger gun controls will end all crimes of violence. But the experience of states and countries with strong gun control laws indicates beyond any reasonable doubt that such laws are effective. It doesn't make much sense to talk about waging war against crime while we continue to make it easy for criminals to obtain the weapons with which to carry on that war.

[From the Greensburg (Pa.) Tribune-Review, Feb. 16, 1967]

Again: Gun Control

Administration backing may succeed, this time around, in giving the needed push to a law placing gun sales under reasonable control. If Congress finally enacts such a law this year, the reactions of many Americans will be: It's about time.

Legislative effort to halt the indiscriminate sale of guns, from pistols to machine guns and even bazookas, has been under way for years. There was widespread public sentiment for such legislation even before the murder of President Kennedy with a mail order rifle. Since then there has been a rise in the popular support of federal law to regulate sales to lessen the danger of guns falling into the hands of criminals, juveniles and psychopaths. But this far the powerful gun lobby has been able to block legislation.

The arguments commonly heard against gun control legislation are not very persuasive. The "constitutional right to bear arms" argument ignores the fact that this right was originally predicated on the need for "a well-regulated militia"—a need long since superseded by our mammoth national defense complex. It is obvious that, as the gun lobby keeps reminding us, no reasonable law is going to keep a man from getting a gun if he wants one badly enough. The point of legislation is that it would at least make it harder for those with records as criminals or psychopaths to buy and own guns, and that it would help keep them out of the hands of youngsters.

Whatever legislation is enacted should not unduly interfere with sportsmen, ranchers and others who have legitimate need for guns. Their rights ought to be safeguarded. That can be done while still limiting the access to guns among those who want them for antisocial purposes.

The argument that people are killed with knives and sticks and stones as well as guns simply doesn't hold water.

The fact of the matter is studies have demonstrated time and time again that most murders are committed in the heat of passion, and while it is surely possible to kill someone with a stone or a club under such circumstances it is a much more difficult assignment than the simple act of pulling a trigger.

A great many arguments are put forth by the gun lobby, none of which hold up under close examination.

But quite possibly the most ridiculous was the one used several years ago when someone got the bright idea that to ban the sale of firearms might possibly increase juvenile delinquency since various groups were sponsoring classes for youngsters on the proper handling of firearms.

There is a great and urgent need for a "tough" gun law in this country and we hope the present Congress will show more courage when dealing with the problem than did its predecessors.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah), Tribune, Mar. 9, 1967]

New Lobby Pushes for Moderate Gun Controls

A lobby headed by James V. Bennett, former director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, has been organized to press for reasonable firearms control legislation at all levels of government. Although Bennett has explained that the group is not committed to any particular measure, it is seeking to generate public support behind the general crime control legislation requested last month by President Johnson.

The new organization, the National Council for Responsible Firearms Policy, has explained that it recognizes and respects the right of responsible, law-abiding persons to buy, keep and bear arms in accordance with safe standards. But it points to the danger of present regulations which permit guns to fall into the hands of criminals and other potentially dangerous individuals.

President Johnson this year is asking for a ban on some mail order sales and shipments of handguns, except between federally-licensed firms. He wants to bar over-the-counter sales of handguns to out of state customers and all persons under 21 years old. He also would make it unlawful for persons under 18 to buy rifles and shotguns.

Mr. Johnson has been criticized by the New York Times and some individuals for "bowing" to the gun lobby and not repeating his 1966 request for a ban against mail order sales of rifles and shotguns as well as pistols. Although FBI statistics are quoted as showing that 30 per cent, or 1,800, of the nation's 6,000 firearms homicides in 1965, were accounted for by shotguns and rifles, many of these were accidental or suicidal and therefore not directly related to the rising crime

Sportsmen are mostly law-abiding and stable citizens who often cross state lines both in hunting and purchasing of firearms and ammunition. The 1966 administration bill might have worked a hardship rate.

Joining Mr. Bennett in the national council are Federal Judge David Bazelon, famed phychiatrist Karl Menninger, editor Erwin D. Canaham, author Cleveland Armory, Mayor John Lindsay of New York and other prominent Americans.

As long as serious crimes in which firearms are used, continue to increase, the need for tighter controls will be evident. Sportsmen would be wise to support moderate legislation to forestall laws which might indeed work an unreasonable hardship on law-abiding gun fanciers.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News, Mar. 1, 1967]

Another Gun Bill

The administration's new gun control bill, introduced last week by Sen. Dodd, will please neither the weapon faddists who think government should keep hands off entirely nor the nervous who would rigidly restrict all gun sales.

To others, it seems a reasonable compromise. With a few changes.

The bill would prohibit importing all military surplus handguns and would regulate all other imported firearms. (This has the happy advantage, to Sen. Dodd, of protecting gun manufacturers in his home state of Connecticut.)

Also prohibited would be over-the-counter sales of handguns to non-residents of a given state. Federally-licensed dealers would require identification and age of all prospective purchasers, with the aim of keeping weapons out of the hands of juveniles, criminals and incompetents. Dealers, importers, and manufacturers would be licensed.

All this seems reasonable enough. The item needing further study is the probation on interstate mail order sale of handguns, rifles and shotguns to individuals.

In the first place, these three weapons should not be lumped together. The handgun is the principal mischief-maker, and deserves the most attention. Regulations on handguns should be strict, and already are more rigid than those of other weapons.

In the second place, a law against mail order sales of rifles and shotguns would put the Western Kansan, for example, at an unreasonable disadvantage by comparison with a Chicagoan. In larger areas, a competitive market creates low prices and also offers a wide choice. Hunters and guns fanciers in less populated areas should ont be penalized by a mail order ban because they can't shop easily.

In sum, the bill deserves support. If it succeeds in stopping indiscriminate sales of handguns, it will be a step forward.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Mar. 24, 1967]

A Bargain in Guns

If the members of Congress or the Illinois Legislature are still undecided on how to vote on the gun control bills now before them, let them ponder this case for a moment:

Last September, a 17-year-old Chicagoan named Donald Ayen ordered a carbine from the Military Firearms Co. of Los Angeles. It was delivered by mail. His mother signed for it when it arrived.

On Wednesday, Ayen (now 18) took that gun with him to Waller High School. He shot up the place. Through no fault of his own or the gun or the people who sold it to him, nobody was hurt. The slaughter could have been fierce.

There was no law to keep that gun out of that boy's hands, nor the two other mail-order guns found in his home, nor the 1,050 rounds of ammunition that he took to school with him. There should have been a law, but there never will be if certain powerful forces in this country have their way.

Those forces must be considered when you and your lawmakers ponder the case of Donold Ayen. He must be punished, but pitied, too. He was a victim of a society that delivers a gun to him, free and unencumbered, and encourages him to use it. The spirit of the vigilante in this country is firmly rooted in history and pervasive in its influence. It was dubious even when it ruled the frontier. It is catastrophic when it rules a modern society. You can't shoot a gun in any direction, these days, without running the risk of hitting somebody or something.

Yet, that is the spirit of the opposition to the gun bills now being considered in Springfield and Washington. No citizen, says the National Rifle Assn., should be limited in the purchase and possession of guns, in any number. He needs those guns, it says, for sport and for self-protection. What it ignores is that the bills would not take the sportsman's gun away from him, or deny him the right to buy more; and that the police—the professionals whom we employ to protect us—regard with dismay the universality of the gun in our society, its unrestricted currency among individuals, and its use by amateurs in what is almost exclusively a police job.

Too often, of course—in fact with a frequency that is appalling—the gun kills not the burglar but the innocent. Recently in Chicago the burglar got away but his intended victim shot the two police officers who came to investigate. Only luck saved them from death. Others have not been so lucky. There is a host of mourners for relatives and friends shot in the dead of night by gun-toting householders in the mistaken belief that they were burglars. Yearly in the United States the melancholy roll of dead gun victims, in murder, suicide and accident, stretches to more than 17,000 names. That is the equivalent of well more than an army division. The number killed by guns purposely or accidentally in the United States this century, in fact, totals more than the nation has lost in all its wars. Americans are a violent people who must be restrained.

Law is intended for the restraint of violence. The bills before Congress and the Legislature are not severe—not nearly as severe as needed—but they would serve the purposes of placing some limits upon what is now an almost unlimited traffic in death. The congressional bill would prohibit the interstate sale of guns to individuals; the major Illinois bill would require their registration. That's not much but it is that much. In return for a little possible inconvenience to some sportsmen and gun collectors, it would save untold lives. That's a real bargain, anywhere.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American, Mar. 14, 1967]

Guns and Senseless Slayings

"I wish they would put pressure on (people who are selling) the guns that are floating around. It's terrible." This is what one Chicago area mother thinks, and for agonizing reasons. She is Mrs. Leonard Morris of Oak Lawn, whose son, Richard, 16, was slain Sunday night in a bizarre shooting. He was killed after an argument with an acquaintance, who said he pulled the trigger of a revolver thinking the shell chamber was empty.

Such senseless slayings happen all too frequently, and for a variety of reasons. But one of the reasons is the easy accessibility of guns. Two Chicago's American reporters found that almost any type of weapons, from cannons to derringers, can be ordered thru the mails or purchased in counter sales.

Previous efforts to pass a gun registration bill have been defeated in the Illinois General Assembly because of the organized opposition of gun and sportsmen's groups, which maintain the law would infringe on their constitutional right to bear arms. People wounded or killed by weapons are also having their rights violated, of course.

But we don't see how such a law will interfere with anyone's hunting or target practice. A license is required to hunt, after all, just as it is to drive a car or get married.

Under a new gun control bill introduced in the Illinois House by Rep. Paul F. Elward (D., Chicago), anyone 18 or over could possess a gun unless he is a narcotic addict, a convicted felon, or had been treated for a mental illness in the last five years. Since few criminals register their guns, a felony charge could be placed against them for carrying an unregistered weapon.

The gun lobby has reacted with an almost feverish passion against such a law. Now, for the first time, however, a citizens committee has been formed in Chicago to present the case for a control bill. As for some of the arguments against this legislation, we doubt if they would impress Mrs. Morris or the many other victims who have suffered cruelly, and in far too many instances, needlessly.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times, Mar. 25, 1967]

As to Guns, Ann Landers Isn't Alone

One of our letter writers today says he is undecided whether supporters of a federal firearms control law "are Communists, Communist sympathizers, or just poor misguided souls who support it out of ignorance."

It may help him make up his mind to recall that in 1965 the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association endorsed such a bill overwhelmingly.

He may have missed the pertinent question by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover: "Automobiles and dogs are licensed—why not guns"?

He may have forgotten Mr. Hoover's more extended statement in 1963:

"Of the 7,261 murders on which details were reported under the Uniform Crime Reporting Program last year, 54 per cent of the victims were killed with guns, the vast majority of which were handguns. In 18 states which have bare minimum control laws over firearms, 65 per cent of the murders were committed with guns. Many states have restrictions in varying degrees; however, in 7 states which require a permit, or the equivalent thereof, to purchase a handgun, 42 per cent of the murders were attributed to firearms as compared to 58 per cent for the other 43 states. Further, in two states which have stringent laws on the control of firearms, the figures for 1962 showed 32 per cent of the murders were by gun."

James V. Bennett, former director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, has said: "Many serious crimes could be avoided if it were made much more difficult for guns to come into the possession of the unstable, the embittered and the hostile."

We find it hard to believe that our letter writer would seriously suggest that the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (the National Crime Commission) was made up of Communists. Communist sympathizers or poor misguided souls.

That commission reported in February this year:

"The increasing violence in the nation demands that governments at all levels strengthen control of possession and sale of the firearms that contribute to that violence. Additional laws requiring registration of firearms and permits for those who possess or carry them, prohibiting their sale to and possession by certain potentially dangerous persons, and preventing transportation and sale of military-type weapons are needed. Such restrictions would not need to interfere with legitimate sporting or antique collecting interests."

Ann Landers, it seems to us, is in good company.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Journal, Mar. 25, 1967]

Guns for Anyone

"My 13-year-old son isn't old enough to buy cigarettes or liquor, or to drive an automobile, and yet I discover he can buy guns and ammunition," a mother complained to us recently. "Why isn't there a law to control this?" she demanded.

The question was interesting, and so we scurried to the law books in search of an answer.

Oregon law does ban the sale of firearms and ammunition to anyone under age 14. So the dealers who peddled rifle and shells to her son were in violation of the law and risked loss of their state license. But this law isn't well enforced, we gather.

In pursuing the statutes, we noted the state has several controls upon the sale of pistols, revolvers, and other guns that can be concealed upon the person. But there are hardly any restrictions upon the sale of rifles and shotguns.

Dealers must be licensed to sell handguns. They aren't permitted to display such weapons openly. They must register the sale of every handgun with local police agencies. And there's a relatively vague statute calling for a 24-hour waiting period between order and delivery, intended as a cooling off period. But the law on this is ambiguous, and isn't easily enforced.

There aren't any meaningful restrictions upon the sale of rifles, however. They aren't numbered or registered.

State gun control laws are easily circumvented, anyway, because of the lack of federal legislation. Many thousands of guns are sold each year by mail order. Anyone can obtain a gun in this manner, including criminals, nuts, and children. And local police aren't notified about such sales.

Congress should, at the very least, require registration of all mail order guns and the notification of local police agencies about all such sales.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Journal Herald, Mar. 30, 1967]

Gun Control Law

Ohio legislators ought to make up their minds to push through an improved firearms law this session.

It won't be easy. Sportsmen's groups and gun hobbyists mount a well-organized opposition whenever the subject comes up. That is why the Stokes bill, on which hearings began yesterday, is not given much of a chance. It provides for small-arms registration and exempts rifles and shotguns, which make up most of the sporting arms but it is due for diehard opposition nevertheless.

The Journal Herald said as long ago as 1961 that a registration law was needed. It's needed even more now.

Crime is up alarmingly. The country has been flooded in recent years with cheap, easy-to-buy weapons, many of them foreign imports. Meanwhile new and necessary restraints to protect individual rights have made police work more difficult.

It simply is time to take some positive steps to give police some new tools. No one suggests firearms legislation will be a panacea. Nor will it, as opponents persistently suggest, deny a law-abiding citizen the privilege of bearing arms for legitimate reasons. All it will do is prevent crimes and help catch criminals.

If we are serious about this war on crime, some such steps are needed. The gun people would do well to quit crying and join in the effort for reasonable and effective legislation.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 18, 1967]

Gunning for Firearms

There are certain laws, designed to protect human life and reduce suffering, which cry out for passage. All the dictates of wisdom, morality, and good citizenship demand their enactment. Yet some of these laws are extraordinarily hard to pass because of the organized opposition of groups who put their own pleasure above the common welfare.

Such a law is that aimed at federal control of firearms. There cannot be the slightest doubt that the extent of firearms ownership, the ease with which these instruments of death can be gotten, the thoughtless way in which they are so often used are one of the major black marks on American civilization. Every dictate of intelligence, every shred of moral concern for one's fellow man, every consideration for a safer, more peaceful, more law-abiding nation dictates the passage of control legislation.

But this year, as during the past several years, organized opposition, spending hundreds of thousands of dollars, using the services of public relations firms, is seeking to influence the American people against adequate measures for the latter's own protection. Leading this fight for a frontier mentality is the National Rifle Association, which is one of the most strongly organized and richly bankrolled self-pleading groups in the country.

Against the huge sums spent by the NRA there stands the newly set up and poverty-stricken National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy. This group has sought, without success, to obtain backing from one of America's huge foundations. Quite frankly, we believe that some such foundation as, say, the Ford or the Carnegie could put money behind this council with as fully great benefit to the American people as such foundations obtain from the placement of funds elsewhere.

We do not advocate the utter removal of all firearms from private hands. But we do believe that every single gun must be strictly registered and controlled, that the possession of an unauthorized gun must bring heavy criminal penalties, that their sale must be severely limited, and that ownership be restricted to those with a legitimate need for them. As everyone knows, the constitutional right to bear arms has already been subjected to necessary controls for the common good.

Despite the efforts of those wishing to throw dust in the public eye, the American people must realize that the crime and the violence which soil national life demand immediate federal firearms control legislation.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, April 11, 1967]

Gun Control Needed

The National Rifle Association keeps feeding us with propaganda aimed at turning us away from any effective legislation to curb the sale and use of guns within the United States.

The NRA is for some form of gun control (at least so it says) but it insists that such controls protect the right of the people to buy guns and use them. And naturally, the NRA tells us that most guns are used for sport and other recreational activities. It suggests the criminals will not be hurt by gun controls, only sportsmen.

But when we have examined the statistics we can shed few tears for the NRA. Last year alone, 5,600 murders, 34,000 assaults and the majority of 88,000 armed robberies were carried out with firearms.

The Rifle Association is quite aware of these figures but merely answers that the murders, assaults and robberies could just as well be committed with some other weapon. They're right, but it doesn't answer the question as to why there shouldn't be steps taken to make it more difficult to obtain guns for other than peaceful purposes.

President Johnson and many responsible civic groups want a gun control law because there is too much needless and wanton slaughter through the misuse of firearms. The proposals before Congress are not intended to harm sportsmen or rifle clubs.

It is merely suggested that gun purchases by mail be banned and that all guns be registered with the police. What is wrong with this suggestion? Whose freedom is being threatened by such registration. It is no more difficult than the registration of automobiles, or the purchasing of drivers licenses, or a hunting or fishing license.

It has been suggested in several quarters that one of the major reasons why the NRA is opposed to gun control is that it is heavily dependent on the advertising revenue from gun manufacturers which use the Association's journal. We find this crass reasoning hard to believe. We hope it isn't so. This because gun control is an urgent requirement in our country today.

It would be helpful if the NRA supported the control legislation. But if it refuses, then the Government should go ahead anyway. The victims of misused firearms here in the U.S. far outnumber the number of soldiers killed in Vietnam. It's got to be stopped.

[From the Woonsocket (R.I.) Call, Apr. 13, 1967]

Time for Action on Gun Legislation

Putting federal restrictions on the sale of firearms will not eliminate crimes committed with guns. No one has said it would. But can anyone deny that it ought to help? And has anyone come up with a valid reason for not passing such legislation? A bill which would curb the promiscuous sale of firearms has been filed by Senator Dodd. Thus far it has gotten exactly nowhere.

The most vigorous opponent of the proposed law has been the National Rifle Association, which contends the Constitution gives the public the right to "bear arms." That contention has never been tested in court. Further, nobody wants to keep guns from honest, qualified sportsmen.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy was invited to speak before the national convention of the NRA in Washington last Sunday to tell why he supports the Dodd bill. However, the session was suddenly cancelled and the merits of the bill were discussed behind closed doors before the association's directors.

Why all the secrecy? Why not let all the NRA members know just what the legislation is all about so they can make up their own minds?

Senator Kennedy later cited figures to show that in a three-year period, 1,000 of the 4,000 persons who ordered guns from only two Chicago mail-order houses had criminal records; that in 1965 alone, guns were used in 5,600 murders, 34,700 assaults and most of the 68,400 armed robberies.

Of course a curb on gun sales would not have eliminated these cases. But if it prevented one murder it might be well worth it. Such a curb would not apply to those who legitimately need or want a gun.

It's about time to stop all this bickering about gun legislation and get some action. The prime purpose of a gun is to kill and for that reason alone firearms ought to be properly controlled.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Apr. 26, 1967]

For Better Control of Firearms

State Sen. W. Russell Arrington, the Republican majority leader, has introduced three sensible bills to regulate the sale and possession of firearms and to promote the safe handling of firearms. His legislation, along with the stop-and-frisk bill also pending in the General Assembly, would be a great aid to the police in the suppression of crime.

One of Sen. Arrington's bills would require gun owners to register with the Illinois department of safety. For a $2 fee a person qualified to own a gun could obtain an identification card entitling him to acquire or possess an unlimited number of firearms. He would be required to display the card at every sale of a gun or at any time he is in possession of a gun.

The registration requirement would enable the department of public safety to investigate the background and qualifications of an applicant. Identification cards would be denied to convicted felons, dope addicts, the mentally ill and retarded, and juveniles adjudged delinquent or who do not have the written consent of their parents or guardians.

An important advantage of the Arrington measure is that it would make effective in Illinois a provision of the federal firearms act of 1938. This law prohibits the mail order shipment of firearms in violation of any state law that requires a person to obtain a permit before acquiring a firearm. Mail order sales are a principal source of guns for criminals and irresponsible persons. Under the proposed legislation, an Illinois resident could not buy a gun thru the mails legally unless he had a permit from the public safety department.

Another bill in the package is intended to promote gun handling safety among juveniles. It would authorize the state department of conservation, in cooperation with public and private agencies, to conduct safety courses in each of the department's law enforcement districts. This feature should be attractive to the National Rifle Association, which proclaims that one of its purposes is "to educate and train citizens of good repute in the safe and efficient handling of small arms."

The Arrington legislation differs from another bill sponsored by a group of House Democrats. The Democratic bill would require the registration of guns, rather than gun owners. Every gun owner would have to pay a fee of $2 for each firearm registration. Because gun purchasers would not have to have a permit to own a gun, the federal firearms act would not apply.

The Democratic bill requires a separate application, investigation, and registration of every gun. For this reason it would be much more difficult to enforce than a law regulating gun owners.

Better controls over the firearms traffic are long overdue. It is now ridiculously easy for criminals, insane persons, dope addicts, and children to obtain guns and use them against innocent people. Murders by firearms in the United States in 1965 totaled 4,760. In the same year, 34,700 aggravated assaults were committed by means of firearms, and so were most of the year's 68,400 armed robberies.

Law enforcement officers murdered during 1965 totaled 278. All but 10 of them were killed with guns. Stricter controls of firearms have been advocated by the American Bar association, the chiefs of police thruout the United States, the National Association of Citizens Crime Commissions, and the public as recorded in public opinion polls.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Apr. 14, 1967]

Gun Laws on the Books

In a letter sketching a few pertinent facts about gun control legislation, Representative Curtis of Webster Grove is critical of the Justice Department and the Internal Revenue Service for failing to enforce fully laws now on the books. No doubt Mr. Curtis is justified, and the point is interesting because a good many persons supporting legislation to control firearms apparently are not aware that there already is a considerable body of law, federal, state and local.

This is not to say there are no gaps or deficiencies; there are. For example, last week Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen of the IRS testified before a House subcommittee that in the year ended last February some 5000 persons who gave a residence address in the city or county of St. Louis bought firearms, mainly handguns, in Illinois, and that of the total about 200 purchasers had records of felony convictions.

The reason is that Missouri has, and has had for many years, a requirement that a permit must be obtained to purchase a concealable weapon, whether bought by mail or in person. It is one of only about six states with reasonably good laws in this field. Illinois has some similar municipal laws but no state law requiring a permit. So it is simple, and legal, for a St. Louisan without a criminal record to go to Alton or Belleville.

Although it is undoubtedly true that stricter enforcement of present laws would curb firearms traffic in some degree, additional restrictions are needed. A federal statute similar to the Missouri law would be extremely helpful, since the main need is for a way to prevent criminals, juveniles and mentally unbalanced persons from obtaining mail-order handguns.

Legislation stopping this traffic ought to be relatively simple for Congress to enact; although it would not go as far as may eventually be desirable it would get at a root problem and would go a long way toward ending an abuse that has properly caused most public concern.

[From the Elmira (N.Y.) Star-Gazette Sunday Telegram, Apr. 14, 1967]

Slaughter by Gun and Vehicle

Appearing before the House Judiciary subcommittee, Author Carl Bakal put some spine-chilling figures into the record.

"Twice every hour in the U.S.," he said, "a person loses his life from firearms through murder, suicide or fatal accident. This year between 19,000 and 20,000 American civilians will die by gunfire—about four times the number of Americans killed in combat in Vietnam during all of 1966."

He called the record "unconscionable in a civilized society."

Even more unconscionable is the record of Americans killed and hurt in American traffic—and the cost of this slaughter and maiming. Last year's traffic toll was 2½ times the number the writer estimates will die by gunfire in 1967.

Life is held cheap, indeed, when such slaughter is tolerated year after year, whether it be by firearm or motor vehicle.

Demonstrators turn out to protect the execution of a policeman's slayer in California, to demonstrate (or worse) over the ejection of a patron from a business place or to lay the groundwork for a seething riot because a driver has been arrested as a drunk.

There are no demonstrations for the death toll that exceeds by many times the number of young men killed or wounded in Vietnam.

If war is savage and bloodshed is hideous in Vietnam—and they are—murder, maiming and suicide by motor vehicle and by firearm on the scale so grimly set forth in annual figures call for remedy.

That remedy won't come until the figures are given proper perspective and the American people demand a reduction of the carnage.

That demand seems far in the future.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, Apr. 7, 1967]

For Better Gun Control

Sen. Frank J. Lausche is reported to be thinking of buying a gun to protect his home. No, he has not been threatened but evidently he is considering the possibility, based on crime news, that he might have to use one sometime. He told the Senate Judiciary subcommittee at a recent meeting that "When a wife dare not open her door the time has come when we must start thinking of innocent victims of crime as well as the rights of suspects."

It is no secret, of course, that doors in most Youngstown homes are kept locked both day and night.

There has been considerable debate over gun-control regulations in Congress. J. Edgar Hoover, chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, said in a recent statement that gun control would help very much in the war on crime. "We are convinced," he said, "that a great deal of crime could be prevented if the federal government registered weapons that are now sold over the counter without any control in every major city."

Under an ordinance passed by Youngstown City Council in 1952, and amended, all persons in this city licensed to deal in "deadly weapons" are required to report to the chief of police every sale, gift or loan made under authority of the license.

The President's Crime Commission has asked for stricter gun control laws and its appeal reflects the thinking of citizens everywhere in the country. No responsible citizen—Senator Lausche for example—would mind registration or any other regulation because he doesn't intend to use the weapon in criminal pursuits.

FBI reports shows that violent crimes were up some 11 percent last year over figures for the preceding year. About half the murders and nonfatal assaults are committed by criminals using guns.

The Crime Commission recommended that in the absence of laws enacted by the states themselves, Congress should take action. This would not interfere with those having legal uses for such weapons. It might be one form of deterrent for those who use guns illegally.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Apr. 29, 1967]

Revealing Gun Control Statistics

Two years ago Philadelphia enacted one of the strictest firearms-control ordinances of any city in the nation. Among other things, the ordinance requires that prospective rifle and shotgun owners be fingerprinted and photographed by the police. It also forbids the sale of deadly weapons to habitual drunks, narcotics addicts and persons convicted of violent crime.

Gun addicts and firearms dealers asserted at the time, and have ever since, that the ordinance is so rigid it's unenforcetable. Maybe so. Perhaps there is no direct correlation—but the fact is that homicides declined in Philadelphia by 13.2 per cent in 1966 over the previous year and all serious crimes dropped by 6.4 per cent. While this was happening in Philadelphia, the FBI reported that serious crime increased 11 per cent in the United States in the same year—and very few communities have firearms-control comparable to Philadelphia.

SOME SIGNIFICANT FIGURES

One statistic from Philadelphia is particularly revealing in 1966, under the ordinance, the police denied weapon permits to 144 applicants. Among the 144, according to police, were 30 convicted burglars, 10 robbers, 13 people convicted of aggravated assault and battery, a narcotics addict, three rapists, and 13 persons convicted of assault with intent to kill.

Opponents of the legislation are right about one thing. The ordinance is not as effective as it might be. It is not, because it can be circumvented by mail-order sales and by purchasing firearms in surrounding counties. These loopholes would be closed by proposed federal legislation, which the gun-lobby is hysterically fighting. The same point can be made about New York's Sullivan law. The gun lobby propagandizes against the Sullivan Law ceaselessly. It contends that it is not effective—which it is, relatively—and yet at the same time opposes legislation that would make it more effective.

This year, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice concluded after a lengthy study: "Government regulation to prevent those with criminal purposes from purchasing firearms cannot be effective as long as mail-order sales and retail sales to persons living outside the seller's state are not controlled. . . . A truly effective system of regulation requires a meshing of state and federal action." The report might have added—and local action in the absence of state regulation.

[From the Rutland (Vt.) Herald, Apr. 24, 1967]

Gun Control Effects

One of the most common objections to gun control legislation is that it does nothing to keep firearms away from the criminal element but amounts only to intolerable harassment of sportsmen, and other law-abiding citizens.

That's one argument. Another is that such legislation is "Communist-inspired" and part of a thinly veiled plot to disarm the nation's patriots in preparation for a Communist take-over. These and other arguments advanced by the National Rifle Association have been effective in discouraging adoption of gun registration laws, despite evidence of strong public opinion in support of controls, particularly since President Kennedy's assassination.

The effect of a new gun registration ordinance in the City of Philadelphia appears to disprove at least some of the opposition claims. The ordinance was adopted following a wave of crimes involving the use of firearms capped by the murder of a police officer. The officer was not shot by some hardened criminal but by a 46-year-old housewife after she had been evicted from a bar for annoying the customers.

Philadelphia's new ordinance might have been expected to have little effect because it exempted registration of firearms already in the owner's possession and there was no control over sales outside the city limits where there were plenty of places to purchase guns of all types without registration.

Nevertheless during the first 18 months of its operation the ordinance is given credit for having prevented 110 convicted criminals from purchasing guns locally. The number of murders during the first nine months of 1966 dropped 17 per cent in Philadelphia while the number nationally was increasing nine per cent. At the same time murders in Phoenix, Ariz., rose 32 per cent and in Houston, Texas, 59 per cent where there are no gun controls.

Philadelphia's limited experience is indicative that much more positive results might have been obtained if all firearms had been registered, not just new purchases, and if the controls had been general in the area and not confined to the city limits.

[From the Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune, Apr. 7, 1967]

Death At the Roadside

First reports of a shooting death in a Western state the other night indicate that the victim was shot in a roadside argument over his failure to dim his truck headlights. The incident again calls attention to an important, though rarely stressed point in favor of proposed federal gun control legislation.

Opponents will be quick to note that nothing in the proposed law would have specifically averted this incident; the pistol used would be as readily available under the law as at present. That is true. It also is true that in the heat of argument death might have been inflicted with some other weapon—a tire iron, say.

Still, an intangible but nevertheless significant point should be given consideration—the likelihood that putting a federal gun control law on the books would make private gun-toting less popular than it now is. Enactment of such a law would move us a step further from the frontier climate that made it necessary and acceptable for every man to carry a gun for self-protection. We no longer live in that kind of society. It is high time for a change in our social climate—for a general adjustment to the concept that only the police in pursuance of their lawful duty have the right to turn a gun on another man.

There are other arguments, some better, in favor of reasonable gun control legislation along the lines now proposed by the administration and supported by the Justice Department, the National Bar Association, the National Crime Commission and the National Association of Police Chiefs. But it is worth considering that, had there not been a gun handy, that man slain at roadside would probably be alive.

[From the Appleton (Wis.) Post-Crescent, Apr. 28, 1967]

The Philadelphia Gun Law

Despite the emphasis it received after the assassination of President Kennedy, the nation is no closer to resolving the difficult question of whether there is a means to regulate the sales of weapons. One criticism of the idea is that such laws really would not solve anything because persons bound toward a crime would get a weapon in any event.

Would a gun law work? Carl Bakal, author of the controversial book *The Right to Bear Arms,* reports that it would in a recent article in *Saturday Review*. He bases his opinion on an ordinance passed after two stormy civic debates in Philadelphia.

As it was passed, the Philadelphia ordinance was related only to new gun purchases. Those applying for gun permits must furnish photographs, fingerprints, and a registration number. The Police Department is empowered to reject permits sought by those under 18, those convicted of crimes of violence, drug addicts and habitual drunkards, the mentally ill and those "not of good moral character or those without proper reason for acquiring a firearm."

During the first 18 months the ordinance was in effect, 139 persons of 5,034 who sought to buy guns were denied permits. Of this total, 110 were persons with criminal records. Bakal draws significance from the fact that, during the first nine months of 1966, the number of murders in Philadelphia dropped 17 per cent below the total for the same months of 1965 and that the Philadelphia total compared to a national increase of nine per cent for the same period.

The drive for the Philadelphia ordinance dated from a series of 1964 killings which was climaxed by the murder of a city detective by a woman who pulled a revolver out of her purse after she had been thrown out of a bar. But the first City Hall effort for an ordinance was a disaster.

More than 300 gun buffs and dealers turned out for a public hearing. The ordinance faced the familiar charges that it was unconstitutional and that it could even be a communist plot because the forces of evil could use gun registration lists to disarm loyal citizens. As is often the case, there was little testimony from proponents of such an ordinance.

"We've had a President slain and now a fine detective killed, and I still don't get one letter. Where does the public stand? Where are all the goodie-goodies?" complained City Council President Paul D'Ortona who has sponsored the ordinance.

A few months later, the proponents were heard. They included business, labor, religious and civic organizations.

A similar law since has been passed in New Jersey, but Bakal admits there is no way to get around loopholes provided by scattered local or state legislation. In fact, a suburban Philadelphia gun dealer ran advertisements announcing he could guarantee weapon sales to anyone. One Philadelphian, denied a city police permit, bought a pistol outside the city limits without any problem.

He used it to kill his wife.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Apr. 4, 1967]

Kennedy Takes on the Gun Lobby

Senator Edward M. Kennedy had the right instinct when he insisted on going directly to the directors of the National Rifle Association and presenting the case for rational curbs on the traffic in firearms in this country. The NRA has been the main obstacle to passing such legislation. Senator Kennedy was under no illusion that the NRA will not continue to oppose it. He told its directors that Congress will approve gun-control legislation "with the assistance of your members or in spite of them."

We hope he is right. He did not exaggerate the need for legislation when he told the NRA directors: "Something must be done, some steps must be taken, to reduce the chance of death and injury by guns in the hands of the young, the unstable and the lawless."

A MODEST REFORM

Senator Kennedy has more than an academic interest in the problem. His brother, President John F. Kennedy, was assassinated with a $19.95 mail-order rifle. J. Edger Hoover once said: "Automobiles and dogs are licensed—why not guns?" Why not indeed? Yet the proposed federal legislation does not require licensing and registration. It is aimed chiefly at mail-order distribution of firearms.

The bill, which is backed by the Johnson administration would prohibit certain mail-order sales and shipments of firearms except between federal licensees; in addition, it would prohibit over-the-counter sales of arms other than rifles and shotguns to anyone who does not reside in the state where the licensee does business; it would forbid federal licensees from selling handguns to anyone under 21 and rifles and shotguns to anyone under 18. It also would curb imports of surplus foreign military flearms not suitable for sport.

If anything, the proposed legislation errs on the side of permissiveness. The President's Crime Commission favors the registration of all handguns, rifles and shotguns. It recommended that each state enact such legislation—but, if at the end of five years, some states have not acted, then Congress should pass a federal firearms registration law.

Nevertheless, the proposed federal bill, as it stands, would be a big help in imposing reasonable restraints upon the sale and distribution of firearms. We sincerely hope that Senator Kennedy is right when he says that Congress is ready to act at last. Perhaps, finally, a majority of Congress is tired of the wild illogic of those who oppose any and all restrictions on the gun traffic in this country.

[From the Middletown (N.Y.) Times Herald-Record, Apr. 18, 1967]

GUN LAWS: MIDDLE GROUND

Perhaps nothing points up the difference between the constitutionally guaranteed right to bear arms and the need for some restraints than last week's incident in Highland Falls.

Two boys, 12 and 14, were injured by a home-made bomb in a bottle that exploded in their faces.

It developed that they had acquired an extensive arsenal of firecrackers, cherry bombs, and bullets.

"These torpedoes are the most fiendish devices made," directions from one mail-order chemical house ran. "You can lay one on top of a door where it rolls off when the door is opened, and it will explode on contact with the floor. If you toss one over a row of lockers in a gym, it will appear as if someone else was responsible for the explosion."

Highland Falls' new mayor, King J. Weyant, promptly called on Governor Rockefeller to press for effective controls.

The Highland Falls episode does not stand in the mainstream of debate over gun legislation, but it does serve to illustrate the dangers of uncontrolled access to death-dealing materiel.

The problem of control boils down to finding middle ground between extremists who want every weapon and piece of ammunition sold under strictest regulation, and those who want virtually no limitation on arms traffic.

We hold that a middle ground does exist.

We believe that mail-order arms traffic should be subject to controls that require local police to be informed of every sale and; that require a purchaser to be of legal age, a non-felon, mentally sound, and, if a veteran, recipient of an honorable discharge.

Large-bore weapons like bazookas and mortars simply should not be sold at all.

As for state regulations, we believe rifles and shotguns sold over the counter should be registered in a way that will allow a check to determine if purchasers meet minimum standards for ownership.

If the sportsmen's group doesn't lend its support to basic and sensible control legislation, it may find itself on the wrong end of severe regulations.

The new president of the National Rifle Association seems to be perfectly aware of this point. His sensible remarks on Page 55 of today's newspaper suggest that the NRA is moving strongly toward middle ground on gun control legislation.

A blind "No" attitude on all curbs is unrealistic, unwise, and outside the public interest.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1967]

GUN CONTROL NEEDED

The leadership of the National Rifle Association showed something less than robust confidence in its position on gun control when it refused the other day to permit Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts to address the delegates to its annual convention. He was only allowed to speak to a closed meeting of the association's board of directors.

The sad truth is that although the N.R.A. presents itself as an organization of rank-and-file sportsmen, it is heavily dependent upon gun manufacturers and dealers for advertising revenue in its journal and is opposing anything that might interfere with their profitable business.

In his remarks, Senator Kennedy had much the better of the argument, which is not surprising since his case is irrefutable. He pointed out that in this decade the number of civilians killed by firearms at home is many times the number of soldiers killed in Vietnam. In 1965 alone, 5,600 murders, 34,000 assaults and most of the 68,000 armed robberies were committed with guns.

It is easy to argue that these crimes could have been carried out by other means. But advocates of gun-control legislation are making an effort to reduce the toll of death and suffering; they are not offering a panacea. Because a gun is easily concealed, readily available, and achieves its purpose immediately, it is the favorite weapon of the jealous lover, the excitable adolescent and the demented crank. No other weapon can make that claim.

The needless slaughter from misused guns makes it imperative to ban the sale of firearms through the mails and to require the registration of guns with the police. This would be no greater hardship for sportsmen than a driver's license is for automobile owners. We trust that Congress will enact gun-control legislation this year with or without the cooperation of the National Rifle Association.

[From the New York World Journal Tribune, Apr. 11, 1967]

SHOOTING AT BIRDS

Bullets zinged from an upper-story window on W. 85th St. One tore through a building superintendent's jacket. That was a lucky fluke. But another killed a 43-year-old passerby.

Tracing the fatal bullet's path, police arrested an unemployed laborer who said he had been shooting at birds. Police said they found a .22-caliber rifle and ammunition in his closet and quoted the suspect as saying he'd bought the rifle only two hours earlier "somewhere on 42nd St."

The bumper slogans tell us that guns don't kill people, people do. But all too often they do it with guns, which can be acquired all too easily, no questions asked.

To say that—and to re-endorse President Johnson's gun control legislation—is to invite a barrage of criticism from sportsmen and members of gun clubs.

Let's give them their due. Let's concede they are right when they argue that criminals and screwballs would still, in many cases, find guns regardless of legal restrictions. Let's concede that even the Sullivan law isn't completely successful in keeping pistols out of illicit hands. And let's agree that no firearms legislation should be so indiscriminately severe as to deny guns to individuals who want them for legitimate purposes, including practice and recreation.

Having conceded all that, we still think it is highly necessary to enact laws restricting the flow of guns, setting strict licensing and accountability requirements for wholesale and retail dealers, and demanding reasonable assurance that the purchaser is sane and law-abiding and is buying the weapon for a legitimate purpose.

The senseless incident on W. 85th St. is one more reason for Congress to adopt the President's gun-control recommendations at this session.

[From the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press, Apr. 4, 1967]

GUN SALES

The shooting rampage of a Chicago high school youth with a mail order rifle a while back is just another of many reminders that more stringent firearms control legislation is badly needed in this country. Fortunately, nobody was maimed or killed in the Chicago incident, but the danger of easy accessibility to guns by irresponsible people again was emphasized.

By coincidence, and without knowing about the Chicago shooting, Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark was testifying in Washington at about the same time in favor of legislation concerning firearms. He pointed out that the use of guns in crime in cities with tough control laws is "significantly less" than in cities without such laws. At the same time, the attorney general took a common sense view of the entire firearms problem when he said that the administration's control proposals "will certainly not eliminate guns as a weapon for crime, but will reduce guns" for that purpose. He also said that the present bill "doesn't affect present ownership of guns . . . for self-protection or sport."

Opponents of gun control bills like to minimize the criminal use of guns by citing that guns are involved in only three per cent of major U.S. crimes, but this figure appears almost meaningless when broken down to show that it includes car thefts and other frequent but less serious crimes than homicide.

We believe statistics that tell the story more completely and accurately are to be found in an article by Alan Barth in the January issue of the Reader's Digest. It cites statistics that look more like wartime casualty lists to the effect that more than 100,000 civilians were shot during 1966, and 17,000 of them died. About half of the 10,000 annual U.S. murders are by gunshot, and guns figure in some 25,000 causes of aggravated assault and about 60,000 robberies a year. Mr. Barth's figures also back Atty. Gen. Clark's reference to less criminal use of firearms in cities which have controls than in those that do not. For example, New York City, which outlaws concealed weapons, had 5.4 homicides per 100,000 population in one year, while Dallas, with no controls, had 13.4 homicides by gunshot per 100,000 in the same period.

In advocating some type of gun control we wish to make it clear that we have no wish to take guns away from hunters, sportsmen and other legitimate users of firearms. Neither are we so naive as to believe that controls will prevent criminals from securing them. But proper control laws will make it much more difficult for criminals, dope addicts, mentally unstable, juveniles and other irresponsible persons from having free access to guns.

The tragedy is that there is no significant reason that the United States remains without adequate gun control legislation. An impartial observer can simultaneously agree with the objectives of the pending legislation intended to control gun sales to the younger element and also agree with those who oppose the strong and unnecessary restrictions of the bill.

The public's safety would be made more secure if the warring factions would resolve their unreasonable differences.

[From the Harrison (N.Y.) Independent, Apr. 6, 1967]

UNLICENSED GUNS EXPECTED TO KILL 10,000 IN 1967

Of all the disturbing statistics reported recently, perhaps the most shocking are those which apply to acts of violence—both physical and legislative acts. Figures show that we are the most violent nation in the world, with 17,000 persons predicted to die of gun wounds in 1967 (roughly two per hour). More shocking, nearly all of the 100 million guns which will inflict these wounds are unlicensed. But instead of passing legislation which would provide stricter gun control, 77 bills have died in Congress and another 1,000 similar measures have been defeated in various state legislatures.

This hardly seems a likely climate in which to plead the cause of guns as "protection" for law-abiding citizens. Undoubtedly, acts of heroism are performed by persons who have guns and handle them wisely and well. But how many more weapons are procured by persons who have no intention of using small arms in self-defense?

It is relatively easy in our country for lethal weapons to fall into the hands of ex-convicts, drunkards, mentally deranged persons and minors who have no concept of the right and wrong way of bearing arms. A recent NBC television documentary, "Whose Right to Bear Arms?" illustrated just how simple the procurement of weapons is. It showed how a reporter could purchase a gun identical to the one purchased by Lee Harvey Oswald in 1963—in Dallas, and on the third anniversary of President Kennedy's assassination. It showed a man buying an antitank gun, parking it in an open truck in front of a police station and finally shipping it to New York. It showed a 12-year-old unwrapping a rifle he had purchased through the mail.

It is one thing to say that guns have repeatedly "freed and defended" our nation. They have—when used by trained military personnel against a declared enemy.

Unfortunately, most of the victims of today's homicides are not declared enemies but persons known well by their assailants. According to New York City Police Commissioner, Howard R. Leary, either friends, neighbors or relatives are the prime targets of today's killings, most of which take place in residences.

According to a recent Gallup survey, 70% of all Americans are in favor of stricter gun laws. Also, 73% favor registration of shotguns and rifles, and 85% would approve registration of hand guns.

Why, with this overwhelming public sentiment and the statistics on violence which have been cited has no legislation been passed to control the sale and possession of guns?

Much of the pressure against passage of such legislation has been brought to bear by the National Rifle Association, a 750,000 member group which operates on a $4.5 million budget annually and carries on a continuous lobby against stricter gun laws. Defining itself as an organization devoted exclusively to "charitable, educational and recreational purposes" (and, as such, tax-exempt) the NRA in monthly bulletins to its members, urges them to bring pressures on all legislative bodies which seek to pass stricter gun laws. Some of the letters reportedly contain threats of political reprisals to those who don't comply; often, they are abusive.

The ultimate solution to crime of violence lies in rooting out the causes of such actions within mankind himself. But as an interim measure, the safest way to cut down the crime rate would seem to be the passage of stricter gun laws. If "free and open discussion" is the order of the day, let it be aimed at securing the passage of such legislation. While it will not root out the problem of violence, effective legislation will at least give those who do not know how to handle arms one less means for their aggression.

[From the Boyertown (Pa.) Times, Apr. 13, 1967]

GUN LEGISLATION NOW

Congress ought not let pressure being brought upon its members by the National Rifle Assn. delay enactment of legislation this year to ban the sale of firearms through the mails and to require the registration of guns with the police.

Although the N.R.A. claims to be an organization of rank-and-file sportsmen, it is heavily dependent upon gun manufacturers and dealers for advertising revenue in its magazine. It therefore opposes anything that might interfere with this profitable business. To establish a system in which police know who owns what gun (by its serial number) would work no more an imposition on a sportsman than vehicle registration does on the car owner.

We say "amen" to last week's statement by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts that gun legislation will be enacted this year with or without the cooperation of the N.R.A.

The senator's arguments were compelling. He pointed out that in this decade the number of civilians killed by firearms at home is many times the number of soldiers killed in Vietnam. In 1965 alone 5,600 murders, 34,000 assaults, and most of the 68,000 armed robberies were committed with guns.

These crimes, of course, could have been carried out by other means. However, the drafters of gun control legislation have no illusions that they can eliminate this toll of death and suffering. They want merely to reduce it.

Hardened criminals will in any case manage to obtain weapons, but we can make it more difficult for them. We can also make it a little easier for police to trace a crime through the history of the gun used.

More important, however, we can, before a crime is committed make things more difficult for the jealous lover, the excitable adolescent and the demented crank. Their first choice is almost always a gun, because it's easily concealed, readily available, and it achieves its purpose immediately. No other weapon fills that bill so effectively.

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Record, April 3, 1967]

CURRENT COMMENT—GUNS ARE EASY TO GET

(Boston Herald)

Caroll E. Medler, a father of two, was shot and killed recently in his Stoneham, Mass., home. He is one of the projected 17,000 Americans who will be killed with guns this year at a rate of one every half hour. Contributing to this carnage is the ease of obtaining guns. There is, therefore, in Sen. Edward Kennedy's words, "a crucial and critical need" for effective firearms control legislation. Since President John F. Kennedy's assassination with a mail order carbine, 77 such pieces of legislation have been introduced in Congress. Yet, despite the support of an overwhelming majority of the general public and the pleas of government and police officials, the legislation has been ambushed each time by forces led by the National Rifle Association.

This 800,000-member organization, with assets of $8 million, says it speaks for the 30 million sportsmen and others who use their guns legally and properly. Although it agrees that firearms should be kept from those who would use them improperly, the NRA maintains that none of the measures so far advanced has sufficiently protected the constitutional right of citizens "to keep and bear arms."

The organization therefore threw an adequate portion of its $4.5 million operating budget into an "educational" campaign to kill Sen. Thomas Dodd's latest gun control measure. When asked what finally stopped the bill Sen. Edward Kennedy told an NBC News reporter: "I doubt if I've seen a force which has been so effective in opposing and obstructing legislation as the National Rifle Association."

The NRA, it should be noted, is a tax-exempt organization, despite an Internal Revenue Service prohibition against tax-exempt groups "carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation." In this case, the propaganda has effectively prevented legislation which is favored by nine out of 10 police chiefs, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, and 67 per cent of all citizens according to a Gallup poll.

It is legislation which is remembered whenever an assassination or mass killing occurs, but is forgotten when the votes are taken in Congress. For legislators to decry "crime in the streets" and "the spiraling crime rate" while allowing guns to be purchased as easily as chewing gum is nothing short of hypocrisy. The congressmen this year should match their words with action.

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express, Apr. 7, 1967]

GUN LAWS ARE NEEDED

Virtually all of the emotionally charged and irrational arguments common to such issues have been summoned by foes of federal legislation to control the sale and movement of guns. Congressmen favoring reasonable control measures have been barraged by abusive letters, wires and phone calls.

They have been called Communist dupes, Socialists and addle-headed do-gooders. They have been characterized as determined to end the use of guns for sports and hobbies. Sen. Edward Kennedy, speaking to officials of the National Rifle Association a few days ago, was strongly critical of those who are obscuring the issue with "ridiculous and cruel" charges and irrational arguments.

Mr. Kennedy—as a brother of the slain President—has a personal knowledge of the necessity for some means of gun ownership registry and limitations which would increase restrictions on the sale of weapons to the mentally unfit or the criminal society. It wouldn't entirely prevent such persons from possessing guns, but it would make acquisition more difficult.

Americans must register their automobiles with governmental agencies. Are guns any less lethal? Does the registry of automobiles restrict their use for business or pleasure? The argument against gun registration doesn't make sense. No one who wants to own a weapon for legitimate purposes would be denied that right.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) News, Apr. 5, 1967]

INFORMED SPEAKER

"Something must be done," said the senator, "to reduce the chance of death and injury by guns in the hands of the young, the unstable and the lawless."

The senator was attacking what he called the "negative response" by the National Rifle Association toward what the public majority considers reasonable firearm control laws.

"Regardless of the efforts of the opponents of gun legislation," added the legislator, "we in Congress have our responsibilities to the people. We intend to meet them. And the choice is yours (NRA) whether we will meet these responsibilities with the assistance of your members or in spite of them."

The senator knows the dangers of a gun in the wrong hands. He should. He is Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass).

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, April 8, 1967]

The Gun Men Ride Again

The National Rifle Assn. is meeting in Washington. It'll come as news to nobody when it adopts its usual resolution opposing gun-control legislation and advocating unlimited traffic in rifles, shotguns, pistols and revolvers.

Its leadership, in fact, even before opening its sessions, demonstrated how adamant, unheeding and insensitive it is. It wouldn't let Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) speak before the full convention and allowed him to speak only at a closed meeting of the association's directors. Kennedy and his family have of course suffered as much as anybody can from the use of firearms, and the directors may have feared that his appearance before the delegates would remind them of what misery rifles can accomplish.

Instead of facing the issues, the association will no doubt continue its efforts to mislead its membership and the public. Its position parallels that of Rep. Bob Casey (D-Tex.), who claimed before a congressional committee this week that proposed gun laws would not effectively curb crime and that they would penalize only the sportsman and the homeowner. He proposed instead that penalties should be made very severe for the illegal use of guns.

What Casey and the rifle association do not point out is that the proposed federal legislation (like the bills in the Illinois Legislature) would not deny any good citizen the privilege of buying or keeping guns. It would only establish rules for their purchase and possession. Whether the proposed federal and state laws would curb crime remains to be seen, but the overwhelming evidence is that they would, by limiting the availability of lethal weapons and providing for their registration. As for penalties for the illegal use of guns—that is already penalized, in laws providing heavier sentences for armed robbery than for larceny. The real illogic of the association's position, however, lies just here—it would give a man unlimited access to guns, and then punish him for using them, after he has already done his dirty work. The logical course would be to keep the gun out of wrong hands in the first place.

Fundamentally, what the rifle association and its followers would ignore, if permitted to do so, is the terrible purpose and effectiveness of the gun. The gun was made to shoot. Its projectiles can kill, and often do. The case is as simple as that.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) News, April 24, 1967]

New Name for DAR?

Maybe they should re-name the organization the Daughters of the American Resolution.

The DAR is at it again—passing resolutions, that is.

Washington has been virtually buried under a blizzard of resolutions churned out by the dear things in a veritable frenzy of indignation at their annual encampment.

Among the subjects that have aroused the ire of the DAR is that of restrictions on the sale of guns. In this they join the Far Right and the National Rifle Association who are certain such controls are part of a plot to disarm America for the Communist takeover only they believe in.

Like other opponents of gun controls, the DAR would be among the first to pass a resolution supporting local police. Yet police officials are among the staunchest advocates of gun controls.

For those who believe we should try to keep guns out of the hands of nuts and casual criminals, the DAR opposition should be encouraging. With the DAR for an enemy who needs friends?

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, April 17, 1967]

Imposition?

It seems pretty plain that the District of Columbia is not going to get much help in solving its crime problem from its overlords in the House District Committee. Having adopted a sort of crime control measure of their own invention last year—which President Johnson was obliged to veto because of its patent unconstitutionality—the leading solons of that body have evidently made up their minds that if they can't have their own way, they won't let the President have his.

The presidential heresy brought under the fiercest fire at a District Committee hearing on Monday was the idea of restricting the purchase and possession of firearms. Mr. Johnson's 10-point crime bill would forbid minors, chronic alcoholics and the mentally ill, as well as felons and drug addicts who are covered by existing legislation, to buy or own any firearm, and would require a license for buying or owning a pistol. But Rep. Basil Whitener, who comes from a place called Gastonia, North Carolina (pop. 47,000), says, "Even in the placid community where I come from, I wouldn't want to go without having a weapon in my home, and I wouldn't want to have to swear out any affidavits for a license to buy one." He said also that the President's proposal "would prevent the homeowner and sportsmen from owning a gun."

This frontier fervor may go big in Gastonia. But it ought to be given some relation to the facts of life. Of course, the President's proposal would not prevent any law-abiding, sane and reputable adult from owning a gun—or a whole arsenal of guns if he wanted to subject his family to the risks involved in having such dangerous playthings lying around the house. And despite the Congressman's surprising antipathy to affidavits and licenses, he "swore out" an affidavit and procured a license when he got married, when he obtained a permit to operate an automobile, when he went hunting, when he was admitted to the bar and when he took his oath as a member of Congress. None of these formalities demeaned him in any way.

Is it really too much to ask responsibile homeowners and sportsmen to identify themselves before letting them own weapons of a kind which last year killed about 18,000 of their fellow-citizens?

[From the Atlantic City (N.J.) Jersey Times, Apr. 14, 1967]

Sills, State Attorney General, Pressing for Nationwide Control of Firearms Sales

New Jersey is trying to spread its policy of controlling the sale of firearms across the nation.

Attorney General Arthur J. Sills recently told members of a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in Washington that federal and out-of-state control of the sale of firearms is very necessary because citizens are frightened by the increase in the volume and intensity of crime throughout the nation.

They fear guns in the hands of the unfit, such as criminals, drug addicts, mental defectives, habitual drunkards, and juveniles, he declared.

New Jersey stands alone among all states in enacting reasonable gun controls into law, despite bitter opposition of the gun lobby and its obstructionist activities over the years, Attorney General Sills said.

CITES CASES

"In September of last year," he noted, "one New Jerseyan filed an application and indicated he had no criminal record and had no mental disabilities. Upon investigation, he was found to be under the care of a psychiatrist. Four months after his application was denied, he was arrested for assault with intent to rape.

"In March of this year, another individual, using a fictitious name, made application and gave police duty as his reason for needing firearms. His fingerprints disclosed that he had been convicted on four occasions, three times for larceny and once for atrocious assault and battery."

RECORDS OF ARRESTS

After the New Jersey weapons control law took effect last Aug. 2, the State Police received 33,084 fingerprints, the attorney general disclosed. Of this total, 2,300, or 7.1 percent, revealed criminal arrest records.

As of Feb. 15 this year, 26,133 of the applications had been processed. Of this total, 540 were denied. The attorney general said criminal records were the reason for 75 percent of the denials with mental illnesses, alcoholism, and other incapacities next in order of reasons for denial.

[From the New York World Journal Tribune, Apr. 3, 1967]

Under the Gun

The policeman's job, always hazardous, is getting more so. The mere attempt to question an individual about a stolen car led to the shooting of three detectives in Bedford-Stuyvesant—an incident that brought an expression of justifiable dismay from Commissioner Leary.

Assaults on policemen have risen sharply this year. Counting the Brooklyn incident, six have been shot—and all within a matter of a few weeks.

It is fashionable to blame the Supreme Court for all the mounting problems of law enforcement, but that's not entirely the case. There is no restriction, nor should there ever be, on the policeman's right to use all necessary force in self-defense.

The trouble is the element of surprise—the unguarded moment in which he can be shot before he even realizes the threat to his safety.

Certainly, as Leary says, this "points up the need for some new regulations restricting the sale and transfer of firearms."

Once again the Legislature has evaded the issue, so it is all the more urgent that Congress serve the public—and the police—by passing the legislation recommended by President Johnson.

No amount of legislation can be a cure-all, but that's a hollow excuse for not making it as difficult as possible for criminals, hooligans and psychos to get their hands on guns and ammo. As they now can do just about anywhere, no questions asked.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, Apr. 16, 1967]

Congress Should Act on Gun Control

Hearings are underway before a House committee on the Administration's too long stalemated gun control bill. It would end the mail order traffic in firearms insofar as shipment of these weapons to private individuals is concerned. It would set age minimums for over-the-counter purchases of guns from federally licensed dealers—21 for the buyer of a handgun, 18 for the buyer of a shotgun or rifle. It would bar importation, with certain exceptions, of foreign military surplus firearms.

As usual, those who have a special—and sometimes vested—interest in the sale and use of firearms want to insure that if any new gun legislation is passed it will be as unrestrictive as possible. All sorts of alternative proposals are before Congress, certain of them not objectionable in themselves as far as they go, but others clearly diversionary.

If anything, the need is for stronger legislation to regulate the gun traffic, and that will one day surely include registration of ownership. The present federal gun laws are weak. State and local gun laws are chaotic, and for the most part ineffectual. The United States is a virtual armed camp, with guns within easy reach of almost anybody, without sensible check. It is a condition that is intolerable in its casualness and which undoubtedly contributes to violent crime.

It should be remembered that there is a vast difference between regulating certain aspects of gun sales and denying citizens legitimate ownership of weapons. The proposed federal regulations may cause individuals a bit more inconvenience in buying guns, and that's about all.

Every reasonable cognizance should be taken of the legitimate requirements of sportsmen and collectors and marksmen. There is not now, nor should there be, any attempt to deprive them—or, for that matter, law-abiding citizens who feel they need weapons for protection of themselves and their families—of firearms. But the criminal laxity toward guns should end.

In the context of a most serious problem, the Administration's proposals are far from being unreasonable. Perhaps they can be improved. But it is time for the federal government to tighten up in the first instance, and thereafter for the states to do their part.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Twin City Sentinel, Apr. 18, 1967]

GUNS AND AFFIDAVITS

"Even in the placid community where I come from, I wouldn't want to go without having a weapon in my home, and I wouldn't want to have to swear out any affidavits for a license to buy one."

Thus did Rep. Basil Whitener of Gastonia, chairman of the House District Committee, dismiss the gun control section of President Johnson's 10-point crime bill for the District of Columbia. And thus too have the critics of every form of gun control dismissed every other effort to reduce the flow of guns into the wrong hands.

President Johnson's bill would in fact do nothing like what Rep. Whitener foresees. It would ban sales of firearms to minors, chronic alcoholics, mentally ill persons, felons and drug addicts. The law-abiding citizen would encounter only minor inconvenience in purchasing a gun.

The debate in Washington is not unlike the debate that preceded Philadelphia's adoption of a strong gun control. There, according to an article in the current Saturday Review, the National Rifle Association inspired a pressure campaign that some partisans extended to include harassing phone calls for public officials at odd hours, which led to the initial defeat of the ordinance. But a series of crimes involving the use of firearms led the city fathers to reconsider their stand and adopt a strict ordinance covering the sale of all firearms.

So what has happened? In the first nine months of 1965—before the adoption of the ordinance—Philadelphia had 158 murders. In the comparable portion of 1966, there were 131—a decline of 17 per cent. During this same period the national murder rate rose by 9 per cent. And in Houston and Phoenix, two of the most wide-open towns in America on gun ownership, the murder rate rose by 59 and 32 per cent respectively. This sample is too small to be conclusive, but it is at least a hopeful sign.

Thus, the Philadelphia ordinance would appear to be helping in that city's effort to control crime.

And who has been penalized by the gun control law? The records show that of the 139 people (out of 5,034) turned down on applications for gun ownership in 18 months, 110 were ex-convicts. There were several murderers and two rapists in the list of applicants who were not able to buy firearms because of the new regulation.

We would not argue, not for a moment, that Philadelphia is on the verge of becoming a crime-free paradise or that gun control legislation is a panacea for the eradication of crime. Nor would we deny that there has been a lot of empty rhetoric in the arguments for gun control legislation, and a lot of loose talk that has frightened legitimate sportsmen.

But it is a demonstrable fact that reasonable, but strict, firearms control laws can contribute to the effort to prevent crime. Guns have a place, an honored place, in American life. But their proper place is not in the hands of people who are readily identifiable as irresponsible members of society.

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) News & Observer, Apr. 4, 1967]

WITH—OR IN SPITE OF

The unbending opposition of the National Rifle Association to even the most elementary kind of gun control legislation has undoubtedly done much to hinder congressional efforts to write any proscriptions into law. There are signs, however, that the NRA, which should have been in the forefront of those insisting that use of firearms be restricted to the responsible and competent, will henceforth be ignored in its opposition by a Congress and a nation weary of delay.

Evidence that this is so came Sunday when Sen. Edward Kennedy told the NRA's Board of Directors: "Regardless of the efforts of opponents of gun legislation, we in Congress have our responsibilities to the people. We intend to meet them. And the choice is yours whether we will meet them with the assistance of your members or in spite of them."

Thousands of Americans are slain every year because of the remarkable ease with which firearms are available in this country to criminals, the unbalanced and those who are simply incapable of handling the weapons. President Johnson has called for controls to help stem the senseless carnage. That call has met affirmative support from U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, the National Association of Police Chiefs, the National Bar Association, and the National Crime Commission. In attempting to provide the kind of protection and regulation the public deserves, Congress must no longer let the NRA's strange negativism on this matter counterbalance the more widespread support which gun control has thankfully attracted.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 27, 1967]

DON'T SHOOT!

Senator Joseph D. Tydings has introduced a bill which would require any person seeking to purchase or to possess a handgun in the District of Columbia to secure a license by demonstrating a need for the weapon. At present, as the Senator asserts "almost anyone can purchase a handgun by filling out a form and waiting 48 hours." And anyone at all—punk, hoodlum, drug addict, drunkard or lunatic—can order one by mail for a few bucks. The Senator's bill would forbid the purchase or possession of handguns by persons in these categories.

Mr. Tydings noted that his bill does not apply to the purchase of rifles or shotguns and thus "hunters and sportsmen will not be inconvenienced." How nice for them! But the fact is that a great many other people are going to be inconvenienced and, indeed, seriously endangered by the ease with which criminals, posing as hunters and sportsmen, can get hold of rifles and shotguns.

It was mildly interesting as a coincidence that just as the Tydings bill was introduced, D.C. Police Chief John Layton was urging that the cruising cars of all his supervisory sergeants be equipped with shotguns. Why? Because of the ease with which shotguns may be obtained here, without any questions asked, by anyone at all who feels like blasting away at a policeman.

We think the remedy for the shotgun danger lies not so much in escalating the armory of the police as in eliminating the armory of the criminal. Is it really a serious inconvenience for a bona fide sportsman to acquire a permit to possess a rifle or shotgun just as he now acquires a permit if he wants to operate an automobile or get married or practice medicine or keep a dog around the house? Guns do kill people—at least when they are in the hands of thugs, nuts and other irresponsibles. Are sportsmen really fearful that they cannot pass a simple test of responsibility when they want to purchase a firearm?

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Post-Standard, Apr. 8, 1967]

GUNS LAW EMPHASIS

A Marine Corps veteran of Vietnam with five combat ribbons, including the Purple Heart for being wounded in action, was passing through a Greenwich Village street in New York when he saw a fellow serviceman in trouble with two youths.

Sgt. Michael Kroll went to his aid. One of the youths pulled a sawed-off shotgun from beneath his coat and shot Kroll dead.

Another argument for legislation to make it more difficult for hoodlums to get their hands on firearms.

Incidentally, the number of Americans killed by guns at home is many times the number lost in the Vietnam war.

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune, Apr. 27, 1967]

PHILADELPHIA'S GUN LAW

There is a familiar reason, or excuse, given for the enactment of many federal laws: The states and cities failed to do anything about a problem, so the federal government had to act.

In the case of gun-control legislation, it may be necessary to reverse this pattern. An average of 50 Americans are killed each day by firearms; 750,000 have died since 1900. Congress has failed to pass any laws to restrict the sale of guns, so the states and cities may have to act.

One city, Philadelphia, did so two years ago. It enacted an ordinance that requires prospective purchasers of rifles or shotguns to be fingerprinted and photographed by the police. These weapons may not be sold to habitual drunks, narcotics addicts or persons convicted of violent crimes. The ordinance imposes a $300 fine, 90 days in jail or both for possession of an unregistered rifle or shotgun.

The results are interesting, if not conclusive. Philadelphia police report that homicides have declined by 13.2 per cent and all serious crimes by 6.4 per cent since the ordinance was passed. This is no proof of a cause-and-effect relationship. But Philadelphia's experience should provide the basis for a cool re-examination of the familiar arguments that gun regulations won't stop crime.

Philadelphia's reduced crime rates suggest that if guns are not so easy to come by, they may not be used so often for the wrong purposes.

Opponents of gun-control regulations argue that you can't stop a criminal from getting a gun if he wants one. This is true. The Philadelphian who is really determined to shoot someone may find a gun seller who will take a chance on ignoring the law. Or he can simply go out of town to buy a gun.

But who can say that all, or even most, crimes are planned logically? Isn't there a good chance that the easy availability of a weapon may be the decisive factor in the commission of an impetuous holdup or attempted holdup, for example?

Statistics on homicides-by-gun strongly suggest the importance of easily available firearms. Only about 20 per cent of gunshot deaths are committed by criminals. Generally law-abiding citizens, many of them overcome by anger or jealousy, account for the other 80 per cent. How often would such anger or jealousy remain at homicidal level through the process of police fingerprinting and photographing, if these steps were necessary to get the gun to commit the crime?

And surely there must be some relationship between the easy availability of guns and the careless handling of such weapons that results in hundreds of accidental deaths each year.

Congress has not been shocked into action. Neither the assassination of President Kennedy nor Charles Whitman's one-man massacre at the University of Texas was sufficient to bring about a federal gun-control law.

Perhaps the experience of Philadelphia may prompt other cities and states to take the initiative in efforts to reduce violent crimes and gunshot accidents.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 29, 1967]

GUNS, GUNS, GUNS, GUNS

Both Congress and the Illinois Legislature are considering gun-control bills. As their members debate with themselves and each other the merits of the legislation, they should study with particular concentration and meditation a story that came out of San Francisco the other day. It shows what can happen in a nation, and within states, that exercise little or no control over the traffic in deadly weapons.

A former Chicagoan named William Thoresen III was arrested on multiple charges involving guns and ammunition. His arsenal was not so much inventoried as weighed, and it came to many tons. As a sample, federal agents listed 50 machineguns, 30 submachineguns, flame throwers, cannon, rifles, shotguns, side arms, bayonets, and thousands of rounds of ammunition. Thoresen likes guns, and so does his wife, who was also arrested. "I just collect cannons as ornaments," he said. "Every lawn ought to have one."

If the reports are correct, Thoresen did violate some laws in the accumulation of his fearsome arsenal. Various laws prohibit the sale of automatic weapons and of others obviously not intended for sport or self protection. But some of the weapons in the collection—rifles, shotguns, revolvers and pistols—can in most places be bought without question, or can be ordered by mail.

These are in the main the weapons that would be controlled by the bills now pending in Washington and Springfield. They are the weapons that are almost universally available, to anybody, whether he can or should be trusted with a gun or not. If he cannot get it in his home town, he can visit the next town down the road, or he can order it from the obliging mail-order houses.

And these weapons—the hand-guns and the rifles and the shotguns—are those which the gun lobby, principally the National Rifle Assn. and its affiliates, claims should be available without limit or restraint, in any numbers, to the private citizen.

The perils of this inane availability are self evident in such cases as that of Mr. and Mrs. Thoresen. Even though they themselves might never use the guns in crime, their collection is nevertheless a menace to society. It could be stolen at any time and so find its way into the underworld, for use by burglars and murderers. Only law, and its strict enforcement, can prevent such dangers before they materialize. There ought to be a law, and there will be if Congress and the Legislature do their duty.

[From the Chula Vista (Calif.) Star-News, Apr. 23, 1967]

INVITATION TO DEATH

Last December, after an irate husband had shot to death his wife and her lover in a Chula Vista rendezvous, we commented about about how such crimes of passion are fostered by the easy access to firearms in California.

Last week, Chula Vista had a tragedy of even more staggering dimensions. Found shot to death in her tenderly cared for home was a 33-year-old mother and her 10-year-old son. Also shot—and miraculously now recovering—were two tiny daughters, 2½ and 1. The mother obviously went berserk, killed herself and tried to kill all her children. She and her husband had had a family fight.

Found in the house was a veritable arsenal—two revolvers she had used in the killings, plus two other pistols, three rifles and several knives (also used).

Would this terrible tragedy have taken place if the firearms hadn't been so near at hand? If licensing laws were stricter, would the mother have gone out, filled out a questionnaire about her proposed uses for a gun, submited to a police inquiry about her background, waited for the gun several days until clearance was obtained, then done the same say, a week later? We will never know, but we seriously doubt it.

One thing we don't doubt: that the failure of our state and federal governments to adopt far more severe gun restrictions is taking an increasing mounting toll of lives. The figures are plain; states and countries with the tightest gun restrictions are also those with the fewest number of homicides and suicides.

[From the Cleveland Press, Apr. 14, 1967]

A PUBLIC DISGRACE

"This case is a prime example of the dangerous traffic in guns that goes on in our city and state. The unlicensed transfer and uncontrolled sale of dangerous weapons is a public disgrace."

This remark was made this week by Common Pleas Judge Harry T. Marshall upon sentencing William Harvey, 38, to life imprisonment for killing a man in a bar.

Harvey testified that he was carrying the gun with intent to sell it when he went into the bar for the drinks that led to the death of one man, the wounding of a second—and a tragic future for Harvey and his family of five children.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Home News, Apr. 19, 1967]

GUN BILL IN TROUBLE

Washington sources report that despite impressive evidence produced before a House Judiciary subcommittee, the administration's gun control legislation has little chance for adoption in this congressional session.

It is almost unbelievable that the Congress can close its eyes to the evidence which has been placed before it.

Only the other day, for instance, author Carl Bakal told the subcommittee that gunfire here at home will in 1967 kill four times as many Americans as were killed in all of last year in the Vietnamese war. Guns will take between 19,000 and 20,000 lives here at home this year, with two lives being lost every hour from firearms, through murder, suicide or fatal accident.

New Jersey's legislators in Washington have not actively taken the field in support of the gun control legislation, though the Garden State boasts the finest such legislation in the nation, legislation which to be truly effective needs the back-up support of federal legislation curbing mail order gun sales.

Gun control legislation has been a major project of the Democratic administration of Gov. Hughes, with Atty. Gen. Sills carrying the burden of the work. We would hope that Gov. Hughes would use his influence with Sen. Harrison Williams and with the Democratic members of the House to get them to rally behind the administration's gun control legislation. And we would hope that liberal Republicans of the caliber of Sen. Clifford Case would give strong support to the gun control program at the federal level, a program that can save thousands of American lives.

[From the Bloomington (Ill.) Pantagraph, Apr. 14, 1967]

FIREARMS CONTROL DUE

Among the more controversial issues of our time is that of firearms control which was given impetus by the assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy with a mail order gun.

Strong organizational pressure is brought to bear against any move to limit and-or control firearms. Those who make no protest because they must register their automobiles, scream as if their last liberty were being snatched away if they are ever compelled to register firearms. They oppose limiting or denying the right to purchase firearms. Yet by licensing we can deny a man the privilege of driving his car.

There are those on the other side who would deny to anyone outside the armed forces and law enforcement agencies the privilege or right to carry arms. And so the two forces tangle, usually beclouding the issues and preventing any sensible firearms legislation.

Firearms control probably should be at the federal level because 50 differing state laws could create confusion. Federal law can at least prevent direct interstate shipment of mail order guns. However, the principles set forth by identical Illinois House and Senate bills get at the core of the issue.

House Bill 602 and Senate Bill 476 amend the present firearms statute to prevent the unlawful sale of firearms knowingly to any person who has been committed to a mental institution within the last five years, or is mentally retarded.

The existing statute prevents sale to persons under 18, to narcotic addicts or to those who have been convicted of a felony within five years. The revision would apply to individuals as well as to dealers who sell one or more guns.

Probably more controversial is the provision that all guns be registered. We favor this, knowing that it would not prevent possession and transfer of guns to persons unqualified under the statute. But it might help. Traffic laws don't prevent all accidents. They probably reduce the number considerably.

The legislation should be approved and given a fair chance to prove itself.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, Apr. 20, 1967]

GUN CONTROL NEEDED

The leadership of the National Rifle Association showed something less than robust confidence in its position on gun control when it refused the other day to permit Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts to address the delegates to its annual convention. He was only allowed to speak to a closed meeting of the association's board of directors.

The sad truth is that although the N.R.A. presents itself as an organization of rank-and-file sportsmen, it is heavily dependent upon gun manufacturers and dealers for advertising revenue in its journal and is opposing anything that might interfere with their profitable business.

In his remarks, Senator Kennedy had much the better of the argument, which is not surprising since his case is irrefutable. He pointed out that in this decade the number of civilians killed by firearms at home is many times the number of soldiers killed in Vietnam. In 1965 alone, 5600 murders, 34,000 assaults and most of the 68,000 armed robberies were committed with guns.

It is easy to argue that these crimes could have been carried out by other means. But advocates of gun-control legislation are making an effort to reduce the toll of death and suffering; they are not offering a panacea. Because a gun is easily concealed, readily available, and achieves its purpose immediately, it is the favorite weapon of the jealous lover, the excitable adolescent and the demented crank. No other weapon can make that claim.

The needless slaughter from misused guns makes it imperative to ban the sale of firearms through the mails and to require the registration of guns with the police. This would be no greater hardship for sportsmen than a driver's license is for automobile owners.

[From the Carlisle (Pa.) Sentinel,
Apr. 6, 1967]

DEATH AT THE ROADSIDE

First reports of a shooting death in a western state the other night indicate that the victim was shot in a roadside argument over his failure to dim his truck headlights. The incident again calls attention to an important—though rarely stressed—point in favor of proposed federal gun control legislation.

Opponents will be quick to note that nothing in the proposed law would have specifically averted this incident. The pistol used would be as readily available under the law as at present. That is true. It also is true that in the heat of argument death might have been inflicted with some other weapon—a tire iron, say.

Still, an intangible but nevertheless significant point should be given consideration—the likelihood that putting a federal gun control law on the books would make private gun-toting less popular than it now is. Enactment of such a law would move us a step further from the frontier climate that made it necessary and acceptable for every man to carry a gun for self-protection. We no longer live in that kind of society. It is high time for a change in our social climate—for a general adjustment to the concept that only the police in pursuance of their lawful duty have the right to turn a gun on another man.

There are other arguments in favor of reasonable gun control legislation along the lines now proposed by the Administration and supported by the Justice Department, the National Bar Association, the National Crime Commission and the National Association of Police Chiefs. But it is worth considering that had there not been a gun handy that man slain at the roadside would probably be alive.

HOSTILITIES BETWEEN ISRAEL AND ARAB NATIONS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I regret that I was not present during the entire time while the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who has just concluded his statement, was speaking concerning the conflict between the Israel and Arab nations. Our Government, in a measure, has been extremely fortunate within the last 2 weeks.

First, the Israelis, with great valor, have coped with the challenge that was directed at them by Nasser and his colleagues. They indicated a will to survive. In my opinion, heroism unequaled except in a few instances in the history of the world has been demonstrated by those fearless fighters of the Israel nation, in seeking to preserve themselves.

Second, this morning the very frightening news came over the airwaves that a U.S. research ship in the Mediterranean was torpedoed. It was not known by whom the torpedo was fired. The immediate inference was that it was either by a state of the Arab nations or by Red Russia. Tragically, four young men of the United States suffered death, and 53 bodily injury.

I shudder to think, however, how ominous and dangerous would have been the situation if the mistaken firing were upon a ship of Russia, and Russia refused to accept the explanation that it was a legitimate mistake.

The Israelis, through devotion to their cause, have solved the problem, with respect to the fighting, by themselves. Having in mind what happened in 1957 and fearing that there might be a repetition of it in 1967, extreme caution should be exercised by the United States so that there will not be reimposed upon the Israel nation conditions that will bring about in the future the same troublesome problem confronting it today.

The Israel nation, according to all indications, has defended itself and repelled the attack which had been threatened against it by the Arab leaders, especially Nasser, stating that Israel would be thrown into the Mediterranean and delivered to oblivion as far as history was concerned.

But the problem is not yet solved. What will be the structure of conditions among the nations in the Middle East and the nations of Great Britain, France, Russia, and other leading nations after the firing has stopped?

In reading the statement of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I observed his gratitude to the United Nations that a cease-fire resolution was unanimously adopted. Commendation should be given to the Israelis for their declaration that they would comply with the order provided there was an indication to a similar effect on the part of Nasser and his cohorts. The Arabs have refused to abide by the request of the United Nations.

I assume that the firing will come to an end, but when it does, a serious problem confronting our country and other countries will arise. I have certain thoughts about what ought to be done. I do not claim any positiveness of judgment. My thoughts have been reached by deliberation; yet I do not want to claim that they are impeccable and infallible.

These are the conclusions that I have reached:

No. 1. The Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran must be declared to be international waters, open for navigation to all innocent, moving ships of all the nations of the world.

No. 2. In connection with the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba, no action should be taken by the United States or by any other nation that will in any respect weaken the position achieved by the Israelis in the occupation of the lands immediately contiguous to their state, except with the granting of full and adequate guarantees developed by the United Nations or by any combination of nations, including the United States, that the entry to and exit from Eilat shall be open to all the nations of the world.

No. 3. The existence of Israel as an established nation, entitled to occupy the land upon which they now live, should become accepted as a fact by all nations and all peoples of the world. Completely refuted must be the repeated declarations that the Israeli will be thrown into the sea and assigned to permanent historic oblivion.

They have demonstrated great success in the building of Israel. Their achievements in the development of their economy, and in persuading what was dead and sterile land to produce food and vegetation, constitute one of the most remarkable accomplishments by any nation in modern history, if not in the entire history of the world.

The territorial security of Israel should be accepted. The United Nations—or if not the United Nations, a combination of nations—should provide security forces to insure that trespasses against peace shall not recur in the future as they have in the past. Such security forces should be placed in that area to demonstrate and declare to the Arab nations that the existence of Israel must be accepted as an actual, permanent, and living fact.

No. 4. What shall happen to the Suez Canal? Shall the Israel nation be barred from its use? I have views upon this subject which may be challengeable. I cannot speak with any degree of certainty upon the issue, but in my opinion, the Suez Canal should be declared to be a waterway freely available for innocent use by all the nations of the world. To achieve that end, it may be necessary to place the Suez Canal under some form of international control and operation.

The query then immediately arises: What shall be done with the Panama Canal? Shall it be declared to be an international seaway, open to innocent passage by all peoples of the world?

My own belief is that if the Suez Canal is put under the control of an international agency, it would inevitably follow, to be consistent, the Panama Canal likewise would have to be so placed. That statement will be challenged, I know, but the subject is worthy of thorough exploration. I believe that every nation in the world should be concerned about the maintenance of the principle of freedom of the seas for the open and general use of all nations of the world.

We come, then, to a further problem that is involved in the area: Should the United States begin directing and dictating what the settlement should be? Mr. President, my answer is "No." If we dictate what the settlement should be, we cannot escape the responsibility of eventually securing the settlement, as made under our dictation.

We cannot tell the Israeli to get out of the land contiguous to the Tiran Strait. The matter should be left to the contesting parties for decision. If, however, outside dictation should enter the controversy, that outside intervention should not be by the United States alone, but by the United Nations; and if the United Nations does not get into it, then by a combination of nations.

Peace seems to lie ahead, but many problems must yet be solved. Those problems should be solved in a manner that will assure that there will not be a repetition of what happened in 1957 and in

1967, but on the basis that there shall be permanent peace in the area.

The question has arisen, Mr. President: What shall happen to Jerusalem, especially that portion of it which is now in the Jordanian nation? I am not prepared to speak on that subject. I do know that the prong or knob of Jordan which extends into the body of Israel has been a very delicate problem. One cannot help feeling moved by the picture, in the morning newspaper, showing Jewish youth pleading, praying, and crying at the Wailing Wall, which they feel was theirs 1,500 to 2,000 years ago.

I conclude, Mr. President, by expressing my deep faith and joy in the valor that has been exhibited by the youth of Israel. My prayer is that similar valor and patriotism may be found in full measure in our American youth.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have listened with great interest to the Senator's speech, which to me was thoughtful and perceptive.

The Senator is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do not wish to go into the details of what the Senator has stated at this particular time. There are issues upon which he himself reserves decision.

I am grateful that the Senator from Ohio feels, whatever may be the pain and anguish—and there will be a great deal—that this will be the time to come to grips with and settle the problem in the Middle East, if we can, so that we will not have another truce or cease-fire and lay it over and let the rest of the world be exacerbated time and time again by what happens there, including the laceration of the miserable and unhappy millions of people in the Near East.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the Senator express his views on the subject.

Unless the United Nations, or a combination of nations, devote themselves jointly to the preservation of peace and the insurance of the continued life of those nations in the Middle East, we might as well expect a repetition in the future of what has now happened.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In conclusion—and I have said this to the Senator from New York—I am glad to see that he has found a bit of relaxation from the tension through which he has lived in the last week.

I could not help expressing admiration for him because it was apparent that in the problem confronting our country and Israel, the Senator from New York gave of himself deeply in work and worry and effort to produce a result that would be helpful to the world.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much.

"STOP BOMBING," SAY BUSINESSMEN

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, even though the crisis in the Middle East has absorbed public attention in recent days, the war in Vietnam still maintains its persistent vexations and dangers.

Opposition to our Vietnam policy has included a variety of statements by organized groups, often in paid advertisements as well as in statements directed to the President. The groups have included churchmen, professors, students, lawyers, scientists, architects, and ad hoc groups of citizens.

Significantly, some of these are groups which traditionally have taken no public position on matters outside their range of professional interest. Certainly this has been the case with businessmen. But recently, and significantly, a delegation of five business leaders, four of them corporate presidents and one a board chairman, personally came to Washington to deliver an appeal on behalf of some 300 similar businessmen protesting our Vietnam policy. Subsequently their appeal appeared as a five-column advertisement in the New York Times of May 28. More than half of the signers are presidents or board chairmen of their companies.

Mr. President, because of the unusual significance of this occurrence, which reflects the growing alienation of responsible leaders of the country from our current policy, I ask that an article from the Washington Star describing their mission in presenting the appeal to the White House, and the text of the advertisement, complete with names and identifications, may appear in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Businessmen Hit Viet Policy, Support Thant

More than 300 business leaders from throughout the country today expressed opposition to the Johnson administration's policies in Vietnam and called for increased U.S. initiatives to end the war.

"We believe that this war is against our national and world interests on moral and practical grounds," they said in a letter addressed to President Johnson and signed by business executives from 26 states and the District of Columbia.

"Whatever may have been the reason for past involvement, the U.S. is now in a situation in which the risks we are running and the price we are paying seem to us to be out of proportion to any possible benefit that can be reasonably foreseen for the South Vietnamese, for the U.S. and for the free world," the letter stated.

BACK THANT PLAN

The businessmen called on the government to follow the three-step solution proposed earlier this year by United Nations Secretary General U Thant—a halt of the bombing, de-escalation of military activities and negotiation with all parties involved in the hostilities.

Their letter recalled a speech by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, in which he said:

"Neither conscience nor sanity itself suggests that the U.S. could be or should be a global gendarme . . . Certainly we have no charter to rescue floundering regimes who have brought violence upon themselves by deliberately refusing to meet the legitimate expectations of their citizenry."

The businessmen said, "We agree with the secretary. We believe his words are applicable to the Vietnamese situation today."

More than half of the signers of the letter are company presidents or board chairmen and more than half have served in the armed forces, their spokesmen said.

FIVE-MAN DELEGATION

The letter was brought to Washington by a five-man delegation, and was delivered to Donald Ropa, a staff member of the National Security Council. Representing the signers were:

William F. Fischer Jr., of Philadelphia, president of the Fischer Machine Co.

Henry E. Niles, of Baltimore, board chairman of the Baltimore Life Insurance Co.

Ervin A. Salk, of Chicago, president of Salk, Ward and Salk, a mortgage brokerage firm, and a former member of the staff of Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur during the U.S. occupation of Japan.

Lee B. Thomas Jr., of Louisville, president of the Vermont American Corp., manufacturer of machine tools.

Sidney Unger, of New York, founder and president of the Kord Manufacturing Co., manufacturer of electric fans and heaters.

Stop the War, Mr. President—We Business Executives Believe, on Moral and Practical Grounds, That the War in Vietnam Is Not in Our National or World Interest

(Note.—Over 300 business executives—more than half presidents or chairmen of their companies—signed the following open letter:)

The President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: We, the undersigned American business executives, most of whom have served at least once in the Armed Services of the United States, protest against escalation of the war in Vietnam. We believe this war is against our national interest and world interest. We feel this on moral and practical grounds.

Whatever may have been the reasons for past involvement, the United States is now in a situation in which the risks we are running and the price we are paying seem to us to be out of proportion to any possible benefit that can reasonably be foreseen for the South Vietnamese, for the United States, or for the Free World.

Secretary McNamara in his speech in Montreal on May 18, 1966, said:

"But neither conscience nor sanity, itself, suggests that the United States is, should, or could be the Global Gendarme . . .

"The United States has no mandate from on high to police the world, and no inclination to do so . . .

"Certainly we have no charter to rescue floundering regimes who have brought violence on themselves by deliberately refusing to meet the legitimate expectations of their citizenry."

We agree with the Secretary. We believe his words are applicable to the Vietnamese situation today.

We urge you, Mr. President, to follow the suggestions of Secretary-General U Thant, which seem to us to be reasonable and constructive. They were:—stop the bombing, deescalate military activity in South Vietnam, negotiate with all parties which are now fighting. Our opponents are not likely to be impressed by our words of wishing a peaceful settlement until we suit our actions to our words. Such actions have risk, but are less dangerous than continuing along the present course.

Respectfully,

(Signers signed as individuals and not in their official capacities. Affiliation is given for identification only.)

Thomas B. Adams, President Adams Security Co., Boston, Mass.; B. Aisenberg, President Rosedale Engin. Co., Bronx,. N.Y.; B. L. Aldrich, Owner A & A Remodeling Co., Denver, Colo.; Benedict S. Alper, Brookline, Mass.; Henry Arian, Owner Henry Arian, San Francisco, Calif.; Ralph B. Atkinson, President Ferrorint Corp. Monterey, California 93940; Bradford Bachrach, President Bachrach, Inc., Newton, Mass.; Erwin H. Baker, Adv. Sales Mgr. R. R. Bowker Co., New York, N.Y.; Lisle Baker, Jr., Exec. Vice-Pres. Courier-Journal & Louisville Times, Louisville, Ky.; Leslie L. Balassa, President Barrington Industries, Inc., Providence, R.I.; S. Morgan Barber, President West Credit Corp., Pasadena, Calif.; Harold J. Barnhard, President Packease-Servease Corp., Buchanan, N.Y.; Lewis W. Barton, President Lewis W. Barton Co., Haddonfield, N.J.; Cyril Bath, President Cyril Bath Co., Solon, Ohio; George E. Beggs, Jr., President Leeds & Northrup, Philadelphia, Pa.; Harold K. Bell, President Bell Realty & Inves. Co., Yonkers, N.Y.; Nelson Bengston, President Bengston & Co., Inc., N.Y., N.Y.; J. Malvern Benjamin, President Bionic Instruments, Inc., Bala Cynwyd, Pa.; Raymond L. Benoit, Manager Hollingshead Co., Moorestown, N.J.

Chase H. Benson, Ret. (Formerly V.P.) Pilot Life Ins. Co., Greensboro, N.C.; Henry A. Berg, President Direct Mail Envelope Co., N.Y., N.Y.; Bernhard H. Berger, President Phila. Pension Planning Corp., Jenkintown, Pa.; Edmund C. Berkeley, President Berkeley Enterprises, Newtonville, Mass.; Harold Berliner, President Berliner & McGinnis, Inc., Nevada City, Calif.; William L. Berlinghof, Jr., President Woodmont Products, Inc., Huntingdon Valley, Pa.; Irving Berman, Owner Berman Realty, Falls Church, Va.; Nat Bernard, Sales Mgr. Counsel Bernard Associates, Roslyn, N.Y.; Robert L. Berney, Treasurer Hamburger's, Baltimore, Md.; Karl Bernhard, Partner Bernhard Studios, N.Y., N.Y.; Daniel J. Bernstein, Member New York Stock Exch., Scarsdale, N.Y.; Peter L. Bernstein, President Bernstein-Macaulay, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Harold Berry, Vice-President Fisher-New Center Co., Detroit, Mich.; Paul H. Berwald, Vice-President Consolidated Retail Stores, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.; Moreland N. Blaine, President Blaine Drug Co., Mitchell, N.Y.; Alan H. Blank, Executive Central States Theater Corp., Des Moines, Iowa; Max Bollock, Millbrae, Calif.

Don A. Brennan, Director Market Development Automatic Retailers of Am., Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.; Moylan E. Brown, Rockville, Md.; William C. Brown, Vice-President Pioneer Hi-Bred Corn Co., Des Moines, Iowa; Stimson Bullitt, President King Broadcasting Co., Seattle, Wash.; Benjamin J. Buttenwieser, New York, N.Y.; Richard E. Bye, Vice-President R. R. Bowker Co., N.Y., N.Y.; Henry B. Cabot, Boston, Mass.; G. Cheston Carey, Chairman of Board Carey Machinery & Sup. Co., Baltimore, Md.; Chester F. Carlson, Consultant Xerox Corp., Pittsford, N.Y.; Sam Carsman, President Ferndale Cooperate, Inc., Ferndale, Mich.; Ralph Carson, President Carson/Roberts/Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; Martin P. Carter, Partner Irving Weber Associates, Inc.; New York, N.Y.; P. M. Casady, President Casady Engineering Associates, Gardena, Calif.; Simon Casady, Secretary Pioneer Hi-Bred Co., Des Moines, Iowa; Nathan Chalnick, President Chase Cleaners, Birmingham, Mich.

Ernest R. Chanes, President Consolidated Water Conditioning Corp., N.Y.; Robert A. Childers, President Childers Manufacturing Co., Houston, Texas; Bronson Clark, Past VP Gilford Instrument Lab. Co., Oberlin, Ohio; W. F. Cody, President Cody's Books, Inc., Berkeley, Calif.; Sylvan Cohen, President Cohen's Quality Shop, Alexandria, Va.; Wallace T. Collett, Vice-President Servomation Corp., Cincinnati, Ohio; Randolph P. Compton, Investment Banker Scarsdale, N.Y.; William A. Crow, President W. A. Crow & Associates Houston, Tex.; Thomas B. Darlington, President J. J. White, Inc., Browns Mills, N.J.; Laurence Dawson, President Larry Dawson Productions, San Francisco, Calif.; Herbert A. Davis, Partner Chase & Davis, Baltimore, Md.; David E. Diener, President Diener, Hauser, Greenthal Co., Inc., N.Y.; Douglas Dobson, President The Dobson-Evans Co., Columbus, Ohio; Leo A. Drey, Owner Pioneer Forest, St. Louis, Mo.; Melvin Dubin, President Slant/Fin Corp., Greenvale, N.Y.; Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of Board First Security Corp., Salt Lake City, Utah; Wilbur E. Eckstein, President American Commission Paper Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Lee Eiseman, Jr., General Manager Arundel Distributors, Baltimore, Md.; Henry W. Eisner, President S. A. Levyne Co., Baltimore, Md.

Norman Eisner, President, Lincoln Graphic Arts, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Lynn M. Elling, C.L.U., General Agent, Lincoln National Life Ins. Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; Armin Elmendorf, President, Elmendorf Research, Inc., Palo Alto, Calif.; Sandy Elster, President, Elster's Sales, Los Angeles, Calif.; M. R. Emrich, Chairman of Exec. Com., International Shops, Inc., Denver, Colo.; Jacob Epstein, President, Cumberland Furniture Co., New York, N.Y.; Julius Epstein, President, Worth Electric Supply Co., Houston, Texas; Michael C. Erlanger, Chairman of Board, Erlanger Mills, Inc., Redding, Conn.; J. Morris Evans, Vice-President, Philadelphia Quartz Co., Wyncote, Pa.; George J. Feigenbaum, President, Filmore, Inc., Arlington, Va.; E. A. Feldman, M. C. Feldman Co., New York, N.Y.; James E. Fenn, Vice-President, Plymouth Rubber Co., Inc., Canton, Mass.; Stanley Feuer, Vice-President, Feuer Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.; William F. Fischer, Jr., President, Fischer Machine Co., Phila., Pa.; Joseph Floret, St. Louis, Mo.; Raymond L. Fontaine, President, Fontaine & Bean, Inc., Sacramento, Calif; Louis J. Frank, President, L. J. Frank Corp., San Francisco, Calif.

William Stix Friedman, President, Burns, Stix Friedman Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Robert C. Garretson, New York, N.Y.; Otto E. Geppert, Chicago, Ill.; George C. Gibson, Jr., Associate, VanZandt & Emrich, Inc., Louisville, Ky.; Saul R. Gilford, President, Gilford Instrument Lab. Co., Oberlin, Ohio; Mort Glankoff, New York, N.Y.; Morris Gleicher, President, M. G. Advertising Co., Inc., Detroit, Mich.; David A. Goldberg, Owner, David A. Goldberg & Son, New Haven, Conn.; Jack Gomperts, President, Calagrex, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; Arnold Goodman, Owner, Prop. Management-Insurance, Racine, Wisc.; Jack Gordon, President, Washington Fed. Savings & Loan Assoc., Miami Beach, Fla.; Harry Gorsky, Vice-President, Manfred Hunter & Co., Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; S. Norman Gourse, President, Gorsart Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.; Harold Greene, President, Potomac Employment Agency, Inc., Arlington, Va.; Myron J. Greenfield, President, Tom Fields, Ltd., Northvale, N.J.

Jerome Grossman, President, Massachusetts Envelope Co., Boston, Mass.; G. Stanley Grumman, President, G. S. Grumman & Associates, Inc., Boston, Mass.; Richard Haber, Berkeley, Calif.; T. Walter Hardy, Jr., President, The Hardy Salt Co., St. Louis, Mo.; William H. Harlan, Jr., President, Manchester Bank, St. Louis, Mo.; Sidney Harman, President, Jervis Corp., Hicksville, N.Y.; Thomas B. Harvey, President, Thomas B. Harvey Leather Co., Camden, N.J.; J. V. Hawley, Jr., Vice-President, Katz Newspaper Sales, San Francisco, Calif.; Timothy Haworth, General Partner, Edward N. Hay & Associates, Philadelphia, Pa.; Clarence E. Heller, Partner, Schwabacher & Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Al Henselyn, Vice-President, Processed Foods, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; David B. Hill, Jr., President, Davis B. Hill & Assoc., Inc., Penndel, Pa.; Ezra Himelfarb, Partner, Himelfarb Bros., Baltimore, Md.; Ira Hirschmann, President, Ira Hirschmann Co., New York, N.Y.; Harold K. Hochschild, New York, N.Y.; Sidney Hollander, Sr., Past Pres., Md. Pharmaceutical Co., Baltimore, Md.; Sidney Hollander, Jr., Partner, Sidney Hollander Associates, Baltimore, Md.; Irving Hollingshead, Owner, Hollingshead Co., Moorestown, N.J.; Proctor W. Houghton, President, Philip A. Houghton, Inc., Boston, Mass.; Raymond W. Ickes, President, American President Lines, Ltd., San Francisco, Calif.; Philip Isely, Owner & Manager, The Builders Foundation, Denver, Colo.

Edward J. Jahoda, President, Andrews Paper & Chemical Co., Pt. Washington, N.Y.; Frank Jaros, President, Allied Compositions Company, Maspeth, New York; Theodore Jones, President, WCRB–WCRQ–WCRX, Boston, Mass.; Frederick A. Kaufman, President, Certified Business Forms, Inc., Newton, Mass.; Harold A. Kaufman, Vice-President, Kaufman Luggage Co., Hartford, Conn.; Edward M. Keating, President, Ramparts Magazine, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; Paul J. Kermiet, Owner, Square Dance Record Roundup, Denver, Colorado; Nolan K. Kerschner, President, Kerschner Construction Co., Norwalk, Conn.; Samuel Kipnis, Dupont Plaza Hotel, Miami, Fla.; Samuel E. Kirk, Retired Builder, West Grove, Pa.; Edward E. Klein, President, Edward E. Klein, Assoc., Pleasantville, N.Y.; Alan E. Kligerman, Senior Partner, Sugar-Lo Co., Atlantic City, N.J.; Arthur S. Kling, Chairman of Board, Kling Co., Louisville, Ky.; D. B. Krimgold, Bethesda, Md.; Edward Krischer, President, Hospi-Video Services, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; Shepard Kurnit, President, Delehanty Kurnit & Geller, Inc., N.Y.; Edward Lamb, Chairman & President, Lamb Enterprises, Inc., Toledo, Ohio; William F. Lathom, Washington, D.C.; Irving F. Laucks, Past President, I. F. Laucks, Inc., Seattle, Wash.; Donald R. Lefever, Merchandiser, Greenbelt Consumer Serv. Co., Inc., Beltsville, Md.; George Leopold, President, Leopold Homes, Incorporated, Meadowbrook, Pennsylvania.

Herbert M. Levengard, Owner, District Housing Co., Washington, D.C.; Jack L. Levin, Partner, Shecter & Levin Adv. Agency, Baltimore, Md.; Lester S. Levy, Chairman, Exec. Com. (Ret.), Men's Hats, Inc., Baltimore, Md.; A. Barton Lewis, President, A. Barton Lewis Co., Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.; Norman S. Lezin, President, A. K. Salz Tannery, Inc., Santa Cruz, Calif.; Ernest N. Long, Gen'l. Supt., DePue Warehouse Co., San Francisco, Calif.; William A. Longshore, Partner, I. Reifsnyder Sons Co., Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.; Graeme Lorimer, Director, Girard Trust Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.; Emanuel D. Lowenstein, Philadelphia, Pa.; Albert Lutzky, President, Martha Washington Laundry, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Philip Macht, President, Welsh Construction Co., Baltimore, Md.; David B. Mackenzie, Manager, Geology Dept., Denver

Research Center, Marathon Oil Co., Littleton, Colo.; Marvin L. Madeson, Treasurer, ITT Aetna Finance Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Herbert D. Magidson, President, Metric Products, Inc., Culver City, Calif.; J. J. Mallon, President, Midwest Mutual Insurance Co., Des Moines, Iowa; Lafayette Marsh, Owner, John P. Marsh Co., Chicago, Ill.; Louis R. Matlack, President, Geo. D. Wetherill Co., Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

William Mazer, President, Hudson Pulp & Paper Corp., New York, N.Y.; Joseph E. McDowell, President, Servomation Corp., New York, N.Y.; George R. McCoy, C.L.U., McCoy & Harper, Chicago, Ill.; Malcolm McWhorter, Vice-President, Vidar Corp., Mt. View, Calif.; Paul M. Merner, President, Merner Lumber Co., Palo Alto, Calif.; Sidney S. Metzner, Vice-President, Maryland Metals, Inc., Hagerstown, Md.; Sidney Meyer, President, Sidney Meyer Advertising, Los Angeles, Calif.; J. A. Migel, Charlestown, Rhode Island; Morris Milgram, President, Planned Communities, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.; Leon Miller, President, United Bindery, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Sidney M. Miller, President, L. V. Myles, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Sol Millman, Owner, National Monogram Co., Detroit, Mich.; Harry E. Milton (Ret.), Former Pres., Milton Savex Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Maurice F. Mogulescu, President, Designs For Business, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Irwin Mohr, Vice-President, Witte Hardware Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Peter B. Moore, President, LDJ, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.; David A. Moreines, President, Triplex Machine Tool Corp., Long Island City, N.Y.; Ernest Morgan, President, Antioch Book Plate Co., Yellow Springs, Ohio; Marlin W. Morgan, Vice-President, Baltimore Life Ins. Co., Baltimore, Md.; Elliott Morganstern, Secretary, Nor Jay Co., Cleveland, Ohio; William Morris, Malibu, Calif.; Jacob M. Moses, General Counsel, Sun Life Ins. Co. of Am., Baltimore, Md.

Morris J. Moskovitz, President Ched-MJM Supermarkets, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Howard H. Murphy, Bus. Mgr. Afro-American, Baltimore, Md.; Herbert L. Myers, President Climax Dental Supply Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Jack Nadel, President Jack Nadel, Inc., Culver City, Calif.; L. Melvin Nelson, Hotel Owner North Shore Hotel Co., Evanston, Ill.; Nat Newmark, President J. Newmark & Sons, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Henry E. Niles, Chairman of Board Baltimore Life Ins. Co., Baltimore, Md.; Martin Oram, President Cardwright, Inc., Rockville, Md.; Earl D. Osborn, Business Exec. New York, N.Y.; R. Wilson Oster, Financial Vice-Pres. U.S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co., Baltimore, Md.; Seniel Ostrow, President Sealy Mattress Co. of S. Calif., Los Angeles, Calif.; John B. Paine, Jr., Trustee Boston, Mass.; Stanley I. Panitz, President Stanley I. Panitz, Inc., Baltimore, Md.; Augustin H. Parker, Chairman of the Board Old Colony Trust Co., Boston, Mass.; William A. Passano, President Williams & Wilkins Co., Baltimore, Md.; Harry J. Patton, Owner Patton Photography, Baltimore, Md.; Seymour Pecarsky, President Decatur Drugs, Inc., Washington, D.C.; George T. Peck New York, N.Y.; John Brittain Pendergast, Jr., Vice-Pres. Southern Cross Industries, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.

Miles Pennybacker, President Voltarc Tubes, Inc., Fairfield, Conn.; Robert B. Perry, President Washington Trust Co., Westerly, R.I.; Gerard Piel, President Scientific American, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Stanley K. Platt, President Platt, Tschudy & Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; William M. Plymat, President Preferred Risk Mutual Insur. Co., Des Moines, Iowa; Frank Pollatsek, Exec. Director Neighborhood Cleaners Assoc., New York, N.Y.; Donald S. Pratt, Owner, Donald S. Pratt Greenhouses, Avondale, Pa.; Rolf Quarck, President Chemtan Co., Inc., Exeter, N.H.; William G. Raoul, President Cavalier Corp., Chattanooga, Tenn.; Earl S. Rappaport, C.L.U. The Rappaport Agency, Chicago, Ill.; Eugene Rappaport, C.L.U. The Rappaport Agency, Chicago, Ill.; Rodney Rehfeld Baltimore, Md.; Stuart Reiner, President Teca Corp., White Plains, N.Y.; Joseph Rempell, President Grace Cleaners, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Delbert E. Replogle, Chairman of Board Molecular Dielectrics, Inc., Clifton, N.J.; L. Victor Riches, President Riches Research, Inc., Los Altos, Calif.; Leon P. Ried, President Ried Heat. & Home Improve. Co., Baltimore, Md.

Jack Roberts, Exec. Vice-President, Carson/Roberts/Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; Dudley Robinson, President, A. R. Barnes & Co., Skokie, Ill.; Ralph A. Rose, Vice-President, Turnpike Press, Annandale, Va.; James M. Rosenblum, Louisville, Ky.; Robert M. Rothauser, President, East House Enterprises, Inc., N.Y.; Florence Rothauser, Vice-President, East House Enterprises, Inc., N.Y.; Joel Rothman, Secretary-Treasurer, Advance Printing Co., Inc., N.Y.; Joseph Rous, President, R. J. Rous, Inc., Chicago, Ill.; Robert H. Rowes, Vice-President, League Life Insurance Co., Detroit, Mich.; Mel Rubin, Chairman of Board, Shaller-Rubin Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.; Richard A. Russell, President, Northeast Leasing, Inc., Boston, Mass.; R. D. Russell, Assoc. Research Dir., Marathon Oil Company, Littleton, Colo.; Arnold Sabaroff, Vice-President, Max Sabaroff & Co., Inc., Detroit, Mich.; John Saemann, San Francisco, Calif.; Erwin A. Salk, President, Salk, Ward & Salk, Inc.; F. Porter Sargent, Owner, Porter Sargent Pub., Boston, Mass.; Hrand Saxenian, President, Hrand Saxenian Associates, Concord, Mass.; Ezra L. Schacht, President, Lightguard Elec. Manuf. Co., Houston, Texas; Edward J. Schadler, Partner, American Piano Supply Co., Clifton, N.J.; Philip J. Scharper, Vice-President, Sheed & Ward, Inc., N.Y., N.Y.

Julius Schatsky, President, J. S. Realty, Inc., Baltimore, Md.; Martin L. Scheiner, President, Electronics for Medicine, Inc., White Plains, N.Y.; Jess G. Schiffmann, President, Atlantic Furniture Products Co., Baltimore, Md.; Harry S. Scott, Jr., President, Harry S. Scott, Inc., Baltimore, Md.; William Seitz, Director, N.Y. School of Drycleaning, N.Y., N.Y.; Joseph J. Seldin, President, Blythe-Pennington, Ltd., New York, N.Y.; John W. Seybold, President, Rocappi, Inc., Swarthmore, Pa.; Milton G. Shaller, New York, N.Y.; Jos. R. Shannon, Chm. of Board, Shannon & Co., Houston, Texas; Myron E. Sharpe, President, International Arts & Science Press, White Plains, N.Y.; T. Kite Sharpless, Vice-President, Marketing, Technitrol Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.; Jack S. Sherman, President, Allied Trailers Sales, Inc., Brandywine, Md.; Malcolm Sherman, President, Mal Sherman, Inc., Baltimore, Md.; Robert Siegel, President, Arrow Photo Service, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Dr. B. A. Silard, Dir. & Ret. Pres., Photovolt Corp., New York, N.Y.; Harold Silverman, President, Maid-Rite Novelty Corp., N.Y., N.Y.; Sol Silverman, President, Silbro Products Corp., Long Island City, N.Y.; Charles G. Simpson, Gen'l. Mgr., Phila. Gas Works, Phila., Pa.

Sidney Slayton, President, Slayton Cleaners, New York, N.Y.; Peter Smith, Owner, Peter Smith, Publishers, Magnolia, Mass.; N. L. Smokler, Builder, Ferndale, Mich.; Robert J. Snyder, Lyntex Corp., Rye, N.Y.; Martin Solow, President, Solow-Wexton, Inc., N.Y., N.Y.; George C. Sparks, President, Sparks Corp., Harleysville, Pa.; William E. Spaulding, Former, Chm. of Board, Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, Mass.; George Spencer, President, Observer Publishing Co., Washington, D.C.; Walter A. Spiro, President, Lavenson Bureau of Adv., Philadelphia, Pa.; Armand C. Stainaker, St. Louis, Mo.; C. Maxwell Stanley, President, Stanley Consultants, Inc., Muscatine, Iowa; Dale I. Steele, President, National Instrument Lab., Inc., Rockville, Md.; Robert A. Steinberg, Secretary-Treasurer, Equip. Leasing Corp. of Am., Inc., Baltimore, Md.; Arthur L. Stern, Owner, Arthur L. Stern Co., South Orange, N.J.; Robert D. Stern, Exec. Vice-Pres., U.S. Shoe Corp., Cincinnati, Ohio; D. Ian Thiermann, President, Johnson & Thiermann, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; Lee B. Thomas, Jr., President, Vermont American Corp., Louisville, Ky.

Donald A. Thompson, President, Arthur Thompson & Co., Baltimore, Md.; Susumu Togaskai, President, Mutual Supply Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Sidney H. Tomlinson, Jr., Vice-Pres., Tomlinson Furniture Co., High Point, N.C.; Richard Travis, Partner, Travis Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.; Hardy W. Trolander, President, Yellow Springs Instrument Co., Yellow Springs, Ohio; Sidney Unger, President, Kord Manuf. Co., Bronx, N.Y.; A. J. Union, Sec. & Vice-Pres., Union Bros., Inc., Baltimore, Md.; Robert Vanderbeek, President, League Life Ins. Co., Detroit, Mich.; John L. Vollbrecht, Owner, John L. Volbrecht Co., Chicago, Ill.; J. H. Voorsanger, San Francisco, Calif.; Robert B. Wallace, President, Wallace By-Cross Hatcheries, Inc., Doylestown, Pa.; Ira D. Wallach, President, Gottesman & Co., New York, N.Y.; Arthur W. Wang, President, Hill & Wang, New York, N.Y.; Robert M. Way, Owner-Manager, Robert M. Way Greenhouse, Kennett Sq., Pa.; Irving Weber, President, Irving Weber Associates, N.Y., N.Y.; R. Wehmeyer, General Agent, Lincoln Nat. Life Insur. Co., Denver, Colo.

Herman S. Weinstein, Owner, Weinstein Educational Services, Washington, D.C.; Eugene J. Weisberg, Exec. Vice-Pres., Denver, Colo.; Bernard S. Weiss, Controller, Gimbel Bros., Philadelphia, Pa.; Milton M. Weiss, Executive, New Rochelle, N.Y.; Max Wender, President, Wender Presses, Inc., Detroit, Mich.; Mack R. Wetmore, President, Wetmore & Co., Houston, Tex.; Barclay White, Chairman, Barclay White Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Theodore Wilentz, Treasurer, Corinth Brooks, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Harold Willens, President, Factory Equip. & Supply Co., Los Angeles, Calif.; Henry J. Wineberg, Evanston, Ill.; Ellis A. Wohlner, Staff Actuary, League Life Insur. Co., Detroit, Mich.; Thomas Yoseloff, President, A. S. Barnes & Co., Inc., Cranbury, N.J.; Floyd Yudelson, Los Angeles, Calif.; Louis Zemel, Treasurer, Powder Hill Ski Area Cabana Club, Middlefield, Conn.; Arthur L. Zigas, Partner, Wald & Zigas, New York, N.Y.; Wallace Zuckermann, President, Zuckermann Harpsichords, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Initially this letter was drafted for signature only by executives who had served in the Armed Forces of the United States, but other executives, many of whom had served the Government in other capacities, desired to sign. More than half of the signers have served in the Armed Forces.

This advertisement was paid for by a group of its signers.

A PERMANENT PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the world has experienced grave concern during these past few days as a result of the warfare which has broken out in the Middle East.

Hopefully, the action which has been taken by the United Nations Security Council in agreeing on a cease-fire will yet be heeded by all of the participants in the fighting and will provide some measure of time in which to mount a full diplomatic campaign to secure a genuine and lasting peace among the nations of the Middle East. This is not only important for the peoples of the Middle East, but it is also important for all other nations whose interests are integrally involved with the peace and progress of that historic area where many Eastern and Western civilizations had their origins and where diverse economic, cultural, and religious ideologies meet and all too frequently clash.

I am pleased by the Security Council's unanimous action in adopting a cease-fire resolution. I am also pleased that Israel has formally announced its willingness to abide by the cease-fire at such time as the Arab countries do likewise. All of the Middle East belligerents should be urged to act quickly to conform with the cease-fire resolution, thus ceasing their battling and turning their energies and resources to the resolving of basic disagreements in a more constructive manner.

At this moment, it is apparent that President Nasser of Egypt may have suffered a stunning setback. This is not to be regretted. He has played the role of troublemaker in the Middle East far too long, and his bellicose threats and belligerent actions in blockading the Gulf of Aqaba have entitled him to the oblivion to which, hopefully, his own people may yet soon relegate him. One may sincerely regret, however, the predicament of some of the lesser Arab nations which were misled by Nasser, down the primrose path, in his quest for personal power and aggrandizement. Nasser has oftentimes in the past caused trouble among the Arab countries themselves. He has repeatedly played footsie with the Russians and has displayed his contemptuous arrogance toward the United States, a country which more than once has played the Good Samaritan toward Egypt and its people. It was not uncharacteristic of the man, that he would attempt to enlarge the war into a possible worldwide conflagration by spreading malicious lies about the intervention of American and British airpower. This is a desperate attempt to explain to his bewildered people the stunning setbacks visited upon the Egyptian armies in the Sinai Peninsula. As we have seen, these charges have been so utterly false that even the Soviet Union has thus far shown no disposition to repeat them. By this trickery, however, Nasser has succeeded in causing other Arab nations, such as Lebanon, with heretofore strong friendship ties to our country, to sever diplomatic relations with the United States.

It is difficult to make predictions as to the future course of events in the Middle East. The situation is presently fluid. However, one fact is clear: the longer hostilities in the Middle East continue, the more dangerous are the potentialities for our own Nation. We must continue to pursue every diplomatic effort possible to secure the peace, and we must also continue to work within the context of the United Nations where possible. Israel's willingness to accept a cease-fire is to be commended, but she cannot be expected to stop shooting until there is a reciprocal willingness evidenced by the Egyptians and their followers.

It is important, meanwhile, that the other countries of the world, including the United States and Russia, use the utmost caution and restraint in speech and action involving the opposing forces. They must also use their influence in every proper way, to quickly bring an end to the fighting.

In the interest of future world peace, nonetheless, it must be recognized by all, that, as a part of any future settlement of differences between Israel and Egypt, Israel's right of free passage through the Suez Canal and the Strait of Tiran must be firmly and permanently established, and her shipping must be permanently secured from hostile threat and attack by her Egyptian neighbor, who has openly avowed her destruction. I do not say, nor do I imply, that the United States should attempt to dictate the terms of such settlement. This must be worked out in the proper forums and by the proper parties, prominent among which are the present belligerents themselves. Once and for all, the questions of international waters must be resolved. Statements which simply delay a solution will only provide the seeds for a future conflict which could engulf the great powers in world war III.

Past agreements under which Israel could enjoy passage of her ships through the Suez Canal have not been lived up to, and Israel's difficulties in commercial usage of the waters of the Suez Canal and the Strait of Tiran do not make a pretty record. There has been undoubted abuse, by Egypt, of Israel's rights as a sovereign nation to enter into free commercial relations with other nations.

From 1948, the Egyptian Government has permitted ships with consignments to Israel to travel through the Suez Canal to Israel only following Egyptian determination that the cargo was acceptable to them as "nonstrategic." Under such a policy, a shipment of shirts, for example, might be allowed to proceed, but a shipment of oil surely would not.

From 1948 to 1956, ships sailing for Israel bearing "nonstrategic goods," as determined by the Egyptians, could pass through the Strait of Tiran. Ships with Israel-consigned strategic items could not pass.

However, from 1956 onward, under United Nations control, the Strait of Tiran has been open to shipments to Israel with no denial of free access to those waters.

To emphasize: Since 1948, the Suez Canal has been closed to shipment to Israel except those shipments which Egypt predetermined as being, under its own arbitrary designation, "nonstrategic."

It is interesting to note the great contrast to Egypt's Suez Canal policy, in relation to Israel, shown by the policy of Turkey in the Straits connecting the Mediterranean Sea and the Black Sea. Turkey's policy on the Bosporus has been an open one. It does require that any warship which passes through the waters from the Mediterranean to the Black Sea provide 1 week's notice and receive Turkey's clearance for passage on a certain day. This was the case recently when the U.S.S.R. sent ships through just last week. Turkey publicized this pending passage and it was accomplished without hindrance. But Turkey does not deny passage to ships of maritime nations in the manner that Egypt does to Israel shipping in the Suez Canal. A bit of history is of interest and importance at this point.

I call attention to the convention of October 29, 1888, between Great Britain, Turkey, and other powers respecting the free navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal. That convention, entered into by Turkey, which then controlled Egypt, stated:

> The Suez Maritime Canal shall always be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to every vessel of commerce or of war, without distinction of flag.

Mr. President, in a letter to Prime Minister Menzies, of Australia, on September 9, 1956, President Nasser himself stated that in nationalizing the canal, the Government of Egypt, "stated unequivocally that it considers itself bound by the 1888 convention guaranteeing the freedom of passage through the Suez Canal."

However, as events have shown, President Nasser has not been disposed to act in accordance with his own interpretation of the 1888 convention guaranteeing freedom of passage through the Suez Canal.

While the United Nations must be the principal forum in which these delicate matters are dealt with, the United States should not shrink from its responsibility as a nation which seeks to promote the interests of peace, to insist, once the belligerents have stopped fighting, that the full rights of Israel as a sovereign power must be recognized and respected.

As a sovereign power, Israel has a right to unrestricted access to international waterways for her shipping. She is a sovereign state with all the perquisites of any other sovereign state, and this time she must be guaranteed the integrity and security of her boundaries and the freedom of her ships to go and come in the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

If at all possible, there must also be a feasible and workable limitation on the conventional arms race in the Middle East, and the Soviet Union has the responsibility to do her part in establishing such a limitation. Hopefully, too, some headway can be made in the Arab refugee problems, which have long been the source of deep irritation.

Mr. President, all Americans join in the hope that, although difficult days lie ahead, the worst may very soon be in the past, as far as the Middle East is concerned. Let us hope that out of the past few days of destructive warfare will emerge a new and enlightened spirit of cooperation among all the countries of the Middle East and that the great powers of the world will cooperate in working for a just and lasting peace between Israel and the Arab countries. It must be a true peace settlement rather than a mere truce, and only a just peace, which recognizes the sovereignty and the rights of all the countries involved, can ever be a lasting peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the convention respecting the free navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal, arrived at in Constantinople on October 29, 1888. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the letter written by President Nasser on September 9, 1956, to Prime Minister Menzies.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONVENTION RESPECTING THE FREE NAVIGATION OF THE SUEZ MARITIME CANAL, CONSTANTINOPLE, OCTOBER 29, 1888 [1]

Convention between Great Britain, Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Russia, Spain, and Turkey, respecting the Free Navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal

In the name of Almighty God,

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Empress of India; His Majesty the German Emperor, King of Prussia; His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, King of Bohemia, etc., and Apostolic King of Hungary; His Majesty the King of Spain, and in His Name the Queen Regent of the Kingdom; the President of the French Republic; His Majesty the King of Italy; His Majesty the King of the Netherlands, Grand Duke of Luxemburg, etc.; His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias; and His Majesty the Emperor of the Ottomans, being desirous of establishing, by a Conventional Act, a definitive system intended to guarantee, at all times and to all the Powers, the free use of the Suez Maritime Canal, and thus to complete the system under which the navigation of this canal has been placed by the Firman of His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, dated February 22, 1866 (2 Zilkadé, 1282), and sanctioning the Concessions of His Highness the Khedive, have appointed as their plenipotentiaries, to wit:

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Empress of India, the Right Honorable Sir William Arthur White, Her Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary;

His Majesty the German Emperor, King of Prussia, His Excellency Joseph de Radowitz, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary;

His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, King of Bohemia, etc., and Apostolic King of Hungary, His Excellency Baron Henri de Calice, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary;

His Majesty the King of Spain and in His Name the Queen Regent of the Kingdom, Mr. Miguel Florez y Garcia, His Charge d'Affaires;

The President of the French Republic, His Excellency Gustave Louis Lannes, Count de Montebello, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of France;

His Majesty the King of Italy, His Excellency Baron Albert Blanc, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary;

His Majesty the King of the Netherlands, Grand Duke of Luxemburg, etc., Mr. Gustave Keun, His Chargé d'Affaires;

His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, His Excellency Alexandre de Nélidow, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary;

His Majesty the Emperor of the Ottomans, Mehemmed Saïd Pasha, His Minister of Foreign Affairs;

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:—

Art. I. The Suez Maritime Canal shall always be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to every vessel of commerce or of war, without distinction of flag.

The Canal shall never be subject to the exercise of the right of blockade.

Art. II. The High Contracting Parties, recognizing that the Fresh-Water Canal is indispensable to the Maritime Canal, take cognizance of the engagements of His Highness the Khedive towards the Universal Suez Canal Company as regards the Fresh-Water Canal; which engagements are stipulated in a Convention dated March 18, 1863, containing a preamble and four Articles.

They undertake not to interfere in any way with security of that Canal and its branches, the working of which shall not be the object of any attempt at obstruction.

Art. III. The High Contracting Parties likewise undertake to respect the equipment, establishments, buildings and work of the Maritime Canal and of the Fresh-Water Canal.

Art. IV. The Maritime Canal remaining open in time of war as a free passage, even to ships of war of the belligerents, under the terms of Article I of the present Treaty, the High Contracting Parties agree that no right of war, act of hostility or act having for its purpose to interfere with the free navigation of the Canal, shall be committed in the Canal and its ports of access, or within a radius of 3 nautical miles from those ports, even though the Ottoman Empire should be one of the belligerent Powers.

* * * * *

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT NASSER TO PRIME MINISTER MENZIES, SEPTEMBER 9 [1]

CAIRO,
September 9, 1956.

YOUR EXCELLENCY:

I have received your letter of September 7, 1956 relating to the meetings held between us and the Committee headed by you and representing 18 of the Governments which participated in the London Conference on the Suez Canal. Your Committee will recall that during those meetings, I took up various basic points and commented upon them.

You have referred to the 18 Countries as representing over 90% of the users of the Canal. Beside this being distinctly a statistical exaggeration, our understanding of the term "users of the Canal" includes those Countries which, even though they have no ships passing through the Canal, use the Canal for the passage of the bulk of their foreign trade. An illustration of this would be such Countries as Australia, Thailand, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Ethiopia and the Sudan. Furthermore the principle of sovereignty, the right of ownership and the dignity of nations are all deeply involved in this problem.

At least in appearance, the starting point of the present crisis was July 26, 1956 when, in the exercise of one of its prerogatives, the Government of Egypt nationalized the Company which bore the name of "The Universal Maritime Company of the Suez Canal". That the Government of Egypt was fully entitled to nationalize that Egyptian Company cannot be seriously contested.

In nationalizing that Company the Government of Egypt stated unequivocally that its considers itself bound by the 1888 Convention guaranteeing the freedom of passage through the Suez Canal[,] and its readiness to give full and equitable compensation to the shareholders.

* * * * *

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I repeat to the Senator from West Virginia what I said to the Senator from Ohio.

I cannot tell the Senator how much I welcome the fact that the Senator is interested in dealing with the problem and that he is thoughtful about it. Whatever may be the nuances, naturally we would have different views of finite phases of the problem.

We simply must all determine that this is it. We have had it and we can finally do something. That includes the Palestinian and Arab refugees and any of the nettling problems involved there.

Israel is not going to like this. We know that. There are some things that Israel may have to do which it finds especially distasteful, especially after such an enormous victory at arms.

We must, however, bring about an end to this situation, if we can, in this terribly benighted area of the world and put that area of the world on a more decent road.

We may be unable to do this, but we certainly should not sell out now for small potatoes, as we had to do in 1956 and 1957. We have had the taste of dust in our mouths since then. We are the people that called them off.

I think at that time that was done with some understanding that it had to be done. President Eisenhower had to carry out that program. However, it worked out very badly.

I am very pleased that the Senator and so many other Senators have a deep feeling on the matter and will do everything they can to help.

The Israelites have surely helped us to see that we should not make those mistakes again.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his remarks. I appreciate his support of the statement I am making.

I share his deep feeling. There must be a peace treaty and a peace settlement this time, and not a mere truce. We will have to reach a solution once and for all for this great problem. Otherwise, it will continue to plague the Middle East and the world and threaten to engulf our own country and other great nations of the world in a future possible nuclear holocaust.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

---

[1] Translation by the Department of State from the French text in *British and Foreign State Papers, 1887–1888*, vol. 79, pp. 18–22.

[1] Suez Committee Document SC/D/33.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate today, until 6 p.m. Friday, June 9, 1967, all committees be permitted to file reports together with minority, individual, and supplemental views, if desired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF U.S. INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 224, S. 1030. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1030) to amend further section 1011 of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

That section 1011 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

And, in lieu thereof to insert:

That the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, is further amended as follows:

Sec. 1. Section 501 of such Act is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "No such material shall be disseminated in the United States: *Provided*, That the Director of the United States Information Agency shall maintain a complete file in the English language of all such material disseminated abroad in the name of the United States Government, which file shall be open to public inspection, and upon request shall be available to Members of Congress."

On page 2, after line 7, to insert:

Sec. 2. Section 1011 of such Act is amended as follows:

And on page 3, after line 8, to strike out:

(5) In subsection (d) by adding the words "heretofore or hereafter" after the words "Foreign currencies", by striking out "after June 30, 1955,", and by substituting the word "fund" for "special account".

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(5) By striking out subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(d) Foreign currencies heretofore or hereafter available from conversions made pursuant to the obligation of informational media guaranties may be sold, in accordance with Treasury Department regulations, for dollars which shall be deposited in the fund and shall be available for payments under new guaranties. Such currencies shall be available only as may be provided for by the Congress in appropriation Acts."

So as to make the bill read:

S. 1030

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, is further amended as follows:

Sec. 1. Section 501 of such Act is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "No such material shall be disseminated in the United States; *Provided*, That the Director of the United States Information Agency shall maintain a complete file in the English language of all such material disseminated abroad in the name of the United States Government, which file shall be open to public inspection, and upon request shall be available to Members of Congress."

Sec. 2. Section 1011 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) by striking out ", in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of section 413 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media" and inserting in lieu thereof "of convertibility to dollars of foreign currencies resulting from the sale or licensing abroad of American informational and educational materials which he determines to be".

(2) By changing the first comma of the proviso in subsection (a) to a period and striking out everything thereafter.

(3) by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof: "There is hereby established an informational media guaranty fund which shall be available without fiscal year limitation for payments under informational media guaranties. The fund shall consist of all dollar amounts available for guaranties hereunder and other assets on hand and hereafter derived from the program, and shall assume the liabilities and other obligations pertaining thereto."

(4) By striking out subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "Obligations for guaranty contracts under this section shall be recorded against the funds heretofore or hereafter available for such guaranty contracts in an amount not less than 50 per centum of the contractual liability therefor."

(5) By striking out subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(d) Foreign currencies heretofore or hereafter available from conversions made pursuant to the obligation of informational media guaranties may be sold, in accordance with Treasury Department regulations, for dollars which shall be deposited in the fund and shall be available for payments under new guaranties. Such currencies shall be available only as may be provided for by the Congress in appropriation Acts."

(6) By striking out subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"The Director shall establish a schedule of fees for the issuance of guaranty contracts, or amendments thereto, and all fees collected shall be deposited in the fund and shall be available for payments under informational media guaranties."

(7) By striking out subsection (g) in its entirety and by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (g).

(8) By striking out the newly designated subsection (g)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation such amounts as may be necessary to bring the United States dollar balance of the fund to $10,000,000 and to restore any impairment to the authorized capital of the fund."

(9) In the newly designated subsection (g)(2) by striking out the words "and interest accrued on notes" and substituting the word "fund" for "special acocunt".

(10) By striking out the first sentence of the newly designated subsection (g)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel all notes issued or assumed by the Director for purposes of payments under informational media guaranties, and sums owing and unpaid thereon, including interest to the time of cancellation."

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. MONDAY, JUNE 12

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 12, 1967, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 8 (legislative day of June 6), 1967:

In the Navy

The following-named officers of the line of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Maurice H. Rindskopf
James D. Ramage
William E. Kuntz
Daniel K. Weitzenfeld
William H. House
Norbert Frankenberger
Albert H. Clancy, Jr.
James C. Longino, Jr.
Vincent P. Healey
Allen A. Bergner
Thomas B. Owen
Robert R. Crutchfield
Walter D. Gaddis
Ralph E. Cook
David F. Welch
Jerome H. King, Jr.
Douglas C. Plate
Martin D. Carmody
William J. Moran
James B. Osborn
John B. Davis, Jr.
Parker B. Armstrong
Jack M. James
Michael U. Moore
William R. McClendon
Leo B. McCuddin
Sam H. Moore
William M. Harnish
Leslie H. Sell
Thomas R. McClellan
James C. Donaldson, Jr.
Tazewell T. Shepard, Jr.
Kenneth C. Wallace
John K. Beling
George C. Talley, Jr.
Shannon D. Cramer, Jr.
Robert E. Adamson, Jr.
William W. Behrens, Jr.

In the Air Force

The following Air Force officer for appointment as permanent professor, U.S. Air Force Academy, under the provisions of section 9333(b), title 10, United States Code.

Kinevan, Marcos E., FR17625.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains (Medical)

Dryden, Richie S., FV3164232.
Lubin, Arnold N., FV3127368.
Thorshov, Jon R., FV3164230.
Torrance, Philip M., II, FV3126791.

To be first lieutenant (Medical)

Legett, John A., FV3187355.

To be captains (Dental)

Aslanis, James T., FV3089170.
Olesen, Harold P., FV3142021.
Townsend, Herbert K., Jr., FV3142644.

To be first lieutenants (Dental)

Albright, Laurence W., FV3187436.
Gleason, Robert W., FV3164435.
Jochetz, Calvin L., FV3187972.
Megela, John, Jr., FV3166801.

The following Air Force officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be major

Johnson, Hubert D., Jr., FV409669.

To be captains

Abbott, Donald L., FV3025344.
Ackerlund, Walter E., FV3085517.
Ackermann, Carl A., FV3101088.
Adams, Marvin A., FV2206684.
Agnew, William Y., Jr., FV3102226.
Allen, William C., Jr., FV3082065.
Alley, James R., FV3040121.
Anderson, George G., FV3081908.
Askew, Glenn W., Jr., FV3094921.
Aukland, Arne O., FV3101411.
Ayers, Thomas C., FV3082211.
Babineaux, Thayer L., FV3054314.
Bach, Shirley J., FV3060944.
Baker, Cecil R., VF3101181.
Baker, William L., Jr., FV2211146.
Ballard, Willie C., FV3094816.
Baltes, Roland H., FV3094549.
Barbezat, Donald G., FV3094140.
Barlow, Charles R., Jr., FV3086011.
Barney, Joseph P., FV2227047.
Barnhart, William C., FV3087071.
Bartelt, Donald J., FV3093134.
Bateman, Hilton L., FV3101346.
Batton, Lelia R., FV3101792.
Baulch, William N., FV3101395.
Bayles, James E., FV3102177.
Beatty, Robert J., FV3034917.
Behnke, Roland F., FV3040652.
Belanger, Norbert C., FV3096914.
Bennett, Cyril A., FV3087179.
Bennett, Edgar C., FV2209451.
Bennett, Laverne L., FV3082126.
Bennington, Raymond O., FV3094925.
Berkman, William A., FV3022038.
Berry, Alan B., FV3064496.
Berry, George D., FV3102225.
Bezyack, Martin, FV3094011.
Binder, John, FV3082067.
Bisgrove, Donald G., FV3025273.
Blalock, Gerald D., FV3038699.
Blankenship, Hershal E., FV3096582.
Block, Thomas A., FV3102167.
Bohinc, Stanley A., FV3084569.
Bowers, Robert N., FV3082460.
Bowling, James E., FV3082378.
Bowman, Emerson W., FV3101106.
Bracken, Gerald C., FV3041181.
Broadbent, Arthur, Jr., FV3006377.
Brock, Alton C., FV3087906.
Brooks, Frank B., FV3082214.
Broussard, Whitney J., FV3028056.
Brown, Charles A., FV3031383.
Brown, Dwight E., FV3086900.
Broyles, Gene T., FV3101353.
Bryant, Jackie D., FV3020654.
Bryant, Lynwood C., FV3082215.
Buckenmaier, Chester C., Jr., FV3086712.
Bullock, Thomas L., Jr., FV3085457.
Burchard, Thomas E., FV3082216.
Burgess, Donnie W., FV3102101.
Burnett, James R., FV3069224.
Canale, Richard A., FV3101611.
Cantey, John A., Jr., FV3074447.
Capone, Frank, FV3082217.
Cason, James E., FV3051666.
Caton, Philip E., FV3069286.
Cikotas, Bronius, FV3085421.
Claiborne, Jerry A., FV3086397.
Clare, Fred E., FV3046303.
Clark, Roy D., FV3101069.
Clarke, Gregory A., FV3086952.
Coleman, Archie B., FV3027720.
Colliflower, Lawrence H., FV3025314.
Coughlin, Francis J., FV3101429.
Cowan, Kenneth W., FV2235516.
Cowart, Erwin H., FV3101119.
Cox, Richard E., FV2206892.
Cupples, Leland J., FV3093651.
Currie, James F., FV3094071.
Dart, Gerald W., FV3094943.
Daughtrey, Robert N., FV3056891.
Davis, Richard C., FV3050219.
Davis, William M., Jr., FV3101206.
Dealing, Donald W., FV3064837.
Deitz, Donald J., FV3082438.
Dejong, Fred H., FV3082142.
Dejong, John E., FV3097712.
Dennis, Robert N., FV3101358.
Dennison, M. Glenn, FV3068834.
Denson, Hunter E., Jr., FV3039446.
Dillinger, Royal K., FV3094745.
Dobrowolski, Robert W., FV2205921.
Doying, John C., FV2225591.
Dreher, Richard F., FV3093546.
Dwyer, Jerome F., Jr., FV3086773.
Ebeltoft, Allen M., FV3082097.
Edberg, Helmer F., FV3082440.
Edens, Robert H., FV3082380.
Egbert, Daniel J., FV3102216.
Elam, Edward T., FV3082381.
Epler, Elmer D., FV3031670.
Erni, Walter A., FV3081538.
Evanoff, Jon, FV2237777.
Evans, Claire J., FV3102141.
Evans, Hector F., Jr., FV3101370.
Evers, Harry O., Jr., FV3101625.
Everson, Dale E., FV3081544.
Ewing, John R., FV3086938.
Farley, John W., III, FV3020903.
Fero, Richard G., FV3057727.
Flaniken, Bevoly C., Jr., FV3082025.
Fleisher, John C., FV3082282.
Fogg, Norman D., FV3056701.
Fossum, David K., FV3082218.
Fox, James E., Sr., FV2227786.
Fox, Terrance M., FV3101632.
Frederick, William V., FV3052419.
Frey, Daniel E., Jr., FV3102237.
Fry, Frederick M., FV3101365.
Fuchs, Leslie E., FV3085326.
Gale, William C., FV3065128.
Gates, Thomas R., FV3067908.
Gehlsen, Barbara J., FV3101795.
Gerchman, Carl F., FV2219511.
Giandolfi, Antonio V., FV3087113.
Giger, Joachim J., FV3101228.
Gilbertson, Richard J., FV3082300.
Giles, George W., FV3101515.
Gille, Robert E., Jr., FV2210141.
Giuliani, Robert L., FV3101809.
Goggin, Francis C., Jr., FV2204701.
Goodman, David G., FV3006892.
Goolsby, John K., FV2207034.
Graham, Ralph T., FV3101232.
Gray, Jimmie C., FV2204506.
Griffin, Richard C., FV3094937.
Griffith, Ruth A., FV3101473.
Guinn, Charles J., FV3095062.
Gunderson, Darrel W., FV3082444.
Gustafson, Bernard G., FV2206553.
Gustafson, Kermit M., FV3081800.
Gwirtz, Eugene H., FV3034882.
Haas, William C., FV3093654.
Hake, Alan T., FV3082072.
Hall, Franklin D., FV3055000.
Hamaker, Constance E., FV3060511.
Hamilton, Leon N., Jr., FV3101506.
Hammar, John M., FV3056709.
Hansen, Alfred W., FV3081926.
Hanson, Paul W., FV3102232.
Harkness, Clarence W., FV3101648.
Hastings, Robert A., FV3082237.
Hatch, Thomas N., FV3082404.
Hatlestad, Buryl V., FV3082101.
Hawk, Duane T., FV2211544.
Hawkins, Edgar L., FV2228218.
Hayden, Charles R., FV3041174.
Hayman, Clyde A., FV3082102.
Heinrich, Raymond D., FV3081999.
Heitz, Richard H., FV3087963.
Henry, Roger L., FV3081954.
Hensley, Taft N., FV3026916.
Henwood, Thomas A., FV3082103.
Herring, Thomas D., FV3082238.
Hershey, Terry L., FV3084545.
Hibbs, Ray, Jr., FV3102108.
Hibschle, William J., FV3101656.
Hill, William C., FV3101242.
Hillsman, William C., FV3126972.
Hines, Walter E., III, FV3087032.
Hodge, Donald L., FV3050634.
Hollod, Ronald E., FV3093657.
Holman, Paul J., FV3101398.
Holowka, Orest, FV3101216.
Hood, Arthur C., FV3082251.
Hoon, Bruce R., FV3052619.
Hope, Delbert E., FV3102109.
Horianopoulos, Emmanuel, FV3101661.
Hoskins, John H., FV3102196.
Hosterman, Robert G., FV3071350.
Howard, Russell G., III, FV3093658.
Hudson, Gerald E., FV3033942.
Hurd, Calvin L., FV3101664.
Irish, Donald L., FV3082252.
Irvin, William T., FV3102247.
Irwin, Donald E., FV3082060.
Jackson, Russell N., FV3101403.
Jakus, Lawrence M., FV3082107.
Janson, Donald G., FV3023147.
Jennings, Gary D., FV3025750.
Jensen, Renaldo M., FV3083559.
Joh, Raymond A., Jr., FV2226151.
Johnson, John E., FV3082466.
Johnson, Odell M., FV3101231.
Johnson, Richard K., FV3082313.
Johnson, Richard M., FV3082240.
Johnson, Robert L., FV3082467.
Johnston, Bobby J., FV3101669.
Jones, Donald E., FV3098766.
Jones, James A., FV3101342.
Jones, Lafayette M., III, FV3102112.
Jones, Robert M., FV2222549.
Jones, Theodore W., FV3101256.
Jones, Walter G., FV3101261.
Joyce, Robert T., FV3042869.
Jurasas, Edward R., FV3102170.
Kearns, Joseph T., Jr., FV3085847.
Keeney, Richard K., FV3101702.
Keller, Charles E., FV3101410.
Kelley, Jerry C., FV3071988.
Kelly, Donald R., FV3101263.
Kelly, Frank J., Jr., FV3082314.
Kerley, David N., FV2228055.
Kessler, Melvin J., FV3101705.
Kestler, Joseph D., FV3082076.
Kiffer, Thomas G., FV3087195.
Kinch, Lawrence W., FV3082220.
King, Jack H., FV3101269.
Knox, Edward L., FV3082302.
Kollas, Samuel H., FV3101418.
Kreipe, Robert R., FV3082055.
Kurtz, William M., FV3058067.
Lafaille, Leland J., FV3022087.
Lasco, Gerald B., FV3029763.
Latham, Whitt L., FV3102113.
Lauer, Albert T., FV3101710.
Leach, Ray D., FV3088276.
Learmonth, James A., FV3082332.
Lee, John D., FV2206559.
Lehnert, Richard A., FV3027891.
Lemon, Samuel G., FV3081878.
Lennon, Frank J., FV3041547.
Lerandeau, Robert P., FV2207543.
Lesieutre, Jean M., FV3082029.
Lewis, Donald A., FV3101267.
Lewis, Harold L., FV3101192.
Lilley, Robert D., FV3035407.
Loucks, George B., FV3053859.
Ludwig, Karl T., FV3085528.
Luna, Donald A., FV3102149.
Lynch, Robert E., FV3022481.
Lynn, Robert S., FV3005900.
Maddux, Eugene H., FV3093468.
Mahaffey, Kenneth E., FV3093198.
Malinski, William L., FV3084912.
Manz, Joe E., Jr., FV3093327.
Marciniak, John J., FV2304570.
Martin, John D., FV3101721.
Maruca, Ralph J., Jr., FV3086733.
Maule, David W., FV3005220.

Maxwell, Joseph, FV2204570.
May, Daniel S., Jr., FV1857288.
Mayo, Richard G., FV3101301.
McAndrews, John A., Jr., FV3082489.
McCarron, Thomas J., FV3086322.
McCarville, John E., FV3082138.
McNaughton, Charles R., FV3095078.
McNeeley, Billie W., FV3101270.
Mercer, Marvern M., FV3066870.
Meyer, Richard F., FV3082408.
Meyer, Rodger T., FV3094650.
Miles, Donald F., FV3102238.
Miller, Jerry P., FV3073141.
Miller, Richard J., Jr., FV3024594.
Miller, Russell F., Jr., FV3082171.
Mills, Calvin E., FV3097937.
Milnes, Eugene S., FV3082316.
Mitchell, George R., FV3101528.
Mitchell, Morton R., III, FV3081930.
Modicut, Joseph S., FV3019125.
Molina, Ivan A., FV3102231.
Mongeau, Albert G., FV3093941.
Moore, Robert W., FV3082372.
Moore, William E., FV3081761.
Mullaly, Robert L., FV3039077.
Musick, Allen B., Jr., FV3082409.
Needham, Herbert C., FV3059143.
Nelson, Arlen K., FV3096418.
Newell, Thomas C., FV3084281.
Norris, James D., FV3101450.
Novakovic, Michael, FV3052109.
O'Connor, Hugh R., FV2205939.
O'Connor, Richard L., FV3027179.
O'Lear, George W., FV2205491.
O'Reilly, Patrick E., FV3093553.
Osborn, Phillip W., FV3102214.
Otto, Joseph, IV, FV3082360.
Page, Aaron, FV3082082.
Palmer, Paul T., FV3082141.
Parent, Frederick D., Jr., FV3101452.
Parsons, David A., FV3101536.
Patterson, Arza D., FV3086670.
Pekarek, Bert E., FV3039332.
Pepe, Paul A., FV3095266.
Perkins, Glendon W., FV3101454.
Peters, Martin E., FV3056932.
Peters, Roger A., FV3101455.
Pflieger, David H., FV3094430.
Phillips, Gregory W., FV3101456.
Piatt, Dean R., FV3082144.
Pillman, Joseph G., FV2216661.
Piroli, Theodore A., FV3082412.
Poltorak, Gerald S., FV2206304.
Powell, Robert L., FV3081934.
Prater, Ronald F., FV3055494.
Pratt, Brent P., FV3101459.
Quint, Jerome L., FV3056991.
Rafloski, Richard J., FV3009472.
Randall, William V., FV2253048.
Reed, Charles W., FV3052565.
Reid, Robert D., FV3102234.
Reilly, James H., FV3066407.
Reynolds, Edward E., Jr., FV3081961.
Rice, Norman L., FV1908009.
Richard Newman H., Jr., FV3085714.
Richards, Don T., FV3007627.
Richardson, David K., FV3081788.
Richie, Donald J., FV3080057.
Rider, Fred E., FV3101466.
Roach, James H., FV3101548.
Roberts, Franklin D., FV3082036.
Robinson, David L., FV3102081.
Rockett, Alton C., Jr., FV3016295.
Rodriguez, Charlie, FV3101550.
Rogers, Edward C., FV3082266.
Rogers, Harry K., Jr., FV2217630.
Ross, Edwin C., FV3081789.
Rosten, Donald L., FV3081790.
Rountree, William W., III, FV3101470.
Rung, Richard A., FV2224251.
Rutan, Richard G., FV3102082.
Ryan, William P., Jr., FV3037309.
Saltsman, Leo F., FV3036859.
Sanders, James W., FV3057696.
Sassone, Antonio M. R. G., FV3082383.
Satterwhite, Thomas H., FV2209642.
Saunders, Paul A., Jr., FV3102124.
Schiller, Scott G., Jr., FV3082062.
Schmenk, Donald L., FV3081881.
Schneider, Charles A., FV5502739.
Schofield, Donald W., FV3101558.
Schuler, John W., FV3101751.
Scott, Thomas W., FV3095016.
Scrimshaw, Roy A., Jr., FV3101753.
Scruton, Donald M., FV2225331.
Secker, Willia S., Jr., FV3082347.
Semones, Gary I., FV3101562.
Sharp, Childs W., Jr., FV3005116.
Sheedy, John D., FV3021899.
Shehi, Louis W., FV3094861.
Shields, Floyd M., FV3101203.
Shook, Howard W., FV3057816.
Shortridge, Richard G., FV3101485.
Silbernick, Kenneth J., FV3102084.
Simcoe, Leland R., FV3101568.
Simmons, Sherwin B., FV3102160.
Simons, Charles B., FV3049121.
Sinclair, John S., FV3101756.
Skinner, Clarence P., FV3101612.
Skojec, Paul J., FV3101305.
Sliffe, Donald A., FV3101306.
Sloan, Byron E., FV3081481.
Spink, William A., FV3082118.
Spring, Rolland K., Jr., FV3101758.
Stanley, Oliver H., FV3044404.
Stark, Joseph M., FV3102128.
Starnes, Arthur J., FV3085283.
Staud, John J., Jr., FV3082230.
Steege, Herbert F., Jr., FV3082057.
Steinmetz, Lyle R., FV2209567.
Stejskal, David L., FV3086371.
Stephens, Wade T., Jr., FV3101493.
Stevens, Dana, Jr., FV2219054.
Stevenson, Richard C., FV3095115.
Stiles, Roger E., FV3049275.
Stokes, Johnny A., Jr., FV2207821.
Stouffer, J. P., FV3101760.
Strauss, Richard E., FV3101494.
Strickland, Kenneth F., Jr., FV3008647.
Strider, James W. V., FV3102161.
Strnad, Charles F., FV3081767.
Stromatt, Traebor C., FV3095050.
Stroud, Raleigh E., FV3101579.
Sullivan, Edwin N., FV3102087.
Swiney, Joseph A., FV3082231.
Taylor, Henry J., FV3101497.
Taylor, John T., FV3081043.
Terrill, Thomas F., FV3101312.
Thomas, Donald S., FV3102201.
Thomas, George, FV3069209.
Thompson, Victor M., FV2206538.
Thompson, Vincent B., FV3025243.
Tillotson, Don W., FV3038449.
Tinsley, Carl O., FV3082311.
Todd, Dean G., FV3037312.
Treadaway, Charles B., FV3082120.
Trecartin, William, FV3081906.
Turner, Jerry W., FV3101315.
Usher, Howard C., Jr., FV3082151.
Vail, Carleton H., Jr., FV3081813.
Vannest, David F., FV3082038.
Vellenga, Curtis J., FV2223363.
Venanzi, Edward G., FV1937764.
Villines, Leroy C., FV3065761.
Vollmar, Emil K., FV1912254.
Volpel, John W., FV5507243.
Wade, Richard A., FV3082271.
Wade, Richard L., FV3037719.
Waldron, Charles S., FV3093116.
Waldron, Larry D., FV3082427.
Walker, Charles W., FV3095477.
Wallace, Donald M., FV3102088.
Wallace, Ellis E., FV3083306.
Wanek, Frank A., FV3056680.
Watkins, Ralph D., FV3036454.
Watson, Richard E., FV3101776.
Weaver, Samuel R., FV3082018.
Weber, Donald J., FV3101590.
Weekley, Robert A., FV3048853.
Weeks, Michael W., FV3102130.
Weers, Richard R., FV3101591.
Weidkamp, Larry L., FV3087400.
Weigand, John C., FV3082088.
Weintraub, Marvin, FV2227965.
Weishaar, Loren A., FV3101780.
Welker. Fredrick C., II, FV3102241.
West, James C., FV3086270.
Westmoreland, Robert L., Jr., FV3101593.
White, Robert H., FV3101783.
Wiley, James R., FV3101595.
Williams, John D., Jr., FV3026476.
Williams, Ronald R., FV3082364.
Wilson, Frederic W., FV3081883.
Wilson, John B., FV3033925.
Wolff, Warren A., FV3086645.
Wright, Ivan C., FV3087376.
Wright, Richard W., FV3082122.
Yurkovich, Daniel T., FV3081907.

To be first lieutenants

Achey, Dale A., FV3115625.
Adamchak, Thomas C., FV3107423.
Ahlstedt, Walter K., FV3107708.
Alba, Michael S., FV3122578.
Alexander, Richard A., FV3108235.
Allen, Maxie W., FV3099763.
Allison. Kent V., FV3119492.
Allsbrook, John W., Jr., FV3119279.
Ambre, William A., FV3122446.
Anderson, Carlton E., FV3122447.
Andrews, Merle F., FV3116633.
Anibal, Edward F., Jr., FV3122150.
Arnold, James R., FV3122449.
Arnold, Richard W., FV3121748.
Arnsdorff, Alton G., Jr., FV3120516.
Asbill, Morris W., Jr., FV3118824.
Ashby, Lawrence E., FV3122663.
Atteberry, Glen A. T. U., FV3115873.
Austin, William F., III, FV3109050.
Baggs, John T., Jr., FV3107692.
Bail, Charles E., II, FV3128148.
Baker, Charles S., FV3118782.
Baker, Donald E., FV3116703.
Baker, Earl D., FV3116704.
Baker, John A., FV3116705.
Bassett. Louis C., Jr., FV3116909.
Bauer, Richard H., FV3122584.
Bayley, Harry P., FV3109228.
Beamer, Samuel C., FV3122457.
Bear, Sherman W., FV3118428.
Beatty, James F., Jr., FV3107733.
Beaumont, Lincoln S., Jr., FV3120834.
Bell, James R., FV3108620.
Bell, Lee D., FV3128235.
Benedict, Gary A., FV3116798.
Berger, James R., FV3119242.
Berube, Paul J., FV3108788.
Bewley, Ronald L., FV3122643.
Bielstein, John C., FV3065716.
Bird, Robert E., FV3121997.
Birk, Peter K., FV3116932.
Black, Robert E., FV3131137.
Blakemore, Philip D., FV3122589.
Bloomberg, Elliot L., FV3116672.
Boldrick, Michael R., FV3120863.
Bornn, Marc L., FV3108942.
Boston, Dennis A., FV3107792.
Boswell, Homer D., FV3116768.
Brick, John E., FV3108627.
Bristol, William E., FV3116613.
Brodak, John W., FV3108628.
Brooks, Ronald B., FV3122361.
Brooks, William E., FV3120468.
Brown, Frank D., FV3107379.
Bunten, Edward D., FV3122362.
Burgess, Gerry R., FV3128159.
Burke, Billy E., FV3121249.
Burley, Joseph T., FV3108371.
Burmeister, Edwin, FV3120731.
Burmeister, Gail M., FV3122114.
Bushey, James W., FV3107123.
Butcher, Stanley R., FV3121253.
Byrd, William B., Jr., FV3109195.
Callaghan, John M., FV3122464.
Callis, William C., FV3128607.
Candray, Arnold J., FV3107693.
Cardwell, Richard L., FV3116896.
Carlile, Billy R., FV3109478.
Carpenter, Philip C., FV3107873.
Carter, Charles R., FV3107124.
Carter, Stephen B., FV3108388.
Carter, William E., FV3118518.
Casey, William E., Jr., FV3121794.
Cello, Gregory J., FV3116828.
Chancellor, James J., FV3128455.
Chaney, Eugene S., FV3130770.
Ching, Thomas T. Y., FV3120086.
Chrisman, Kenneth L., FV3120744.
Clark, Hurshal S., FV3128535.
Claudy, Philip R., FV3108152.
Clegg, Donald H., FV3116954.
Clement, Bryan B., FV3128375.
Cloud, Rex E., FV3107950.

Coble, Don C., FV3122710.
Coleman, Cooper V., FV3128457.
Coleman, Donald F., FV3122469.
Colley, Jack, FV3116584.
Comeau, Charles L., FV3121350.
Connelly, Peter J., FV3121672.
Cooke, Paul M. T., Jr., FV3118844.
Copley, Don W., Sr., FV3118845.
Corley, Thomas L. FV3108245.
Costantino, James D., FV3116604.
Cote, Ronald A., FV3104114.
Cottrell, Leah R., FV3108671.
Coupland, Hoyt D., FV3121107.
Crawford, Thomas J., FV3115863.
Crenshaw, Jerry R., FV3122470.
Croissant, Leroy E., FV3122471.
Crone, Gene H., FV3122368.
Cross, Frank A., III, FV3120543.
Crowder, Philip R., FV3128303.
Crowell, Charles C., FV3128597.
Culp, Aubrey M., FV3108520.
Cummings, Melvyn D., FV3121377.
Cummings, Peter, FV3107183.
Currier, Robert D., FV3122211.
Currier, Thomas J., FV3107184.
Custard, Randal D. FV3115844.
Custis, Joseph E., FV3094040.
Dahlman, James G. FV3095484.
Darlington, Clare R., FV3128538.
Davenport, Cecil O., FV3132383.
Davis, Richard E., FV3120757.
Davisson, Dean C., FV3109333.
Degen, Thomas E. FV3108633.
Delgado, Jose A., FV3118617.
Deslucamatteoni, DA., FV3109067.
Dinley, James E., II, FV3122371.
Dodge, William R., FV3107249.
Dotson, Patrick S., Jr., FV3120756.
Dumas, Charles J., FV3121460.
Dunda, Peter P., FV3121090.
Dunker, Edward H. M., FV3041537.
Dunlap, Royce E., FV3118389.
Earl, Joseph D., FV3127991.
Easton, Gary N., FV3109481.
Ebbinga, Herman G., FV3122170.
Ebert, James J., FV3109162.
Edwards, John P., Jr., FV3120461.
Eikelbarner, John F., II, FV3122171.
Eilerts, Richard D., FV3127993.
Eisenach, Clifford W., FV3122375.
Emigholz, Nicholas W., FV3128306.
England, Don L., FV3117005.
Eppig, Carl C., FV3122250.
Erts, Thomas F., FV3116756.
Fedak, William A., FV3121298.
Feighery, Daniel J., FV3121245.
Ferguson, Gordon S., FV3122172.
Fetter, Jerry A., FV3122651.
Finley, Theodore R., FV3108000.
Flanagan, Euge F., Jr., FV3128386.
Flowers, Ronald N., FV3108252.
Flynt, James L., FV3107609.
Fontana, Charles J., FV3122378.
Forbes, Lee J., FV3108749.
Ford, James P., FV3120775.
Foreback, Raymond L., FV3119459.
Foreman, Alling C., FV3107610.
Foreman, Mary J., FV3120393.
Fortmayer, Carroll J., FV3100889.
Foster, Duane L., FV3107830.
Franco, Guillermo A., FV3122081.
Frasher, Edgar W., FV3118959.
Freeman, Harold R., FV3117010.
Freilino, John E., FV3127896.
Freshcorn, Frederick L., Jr., FV3120779.
Gaiser, Carl E., FV3109045.
Gallacci, Norman G., FV3122483.
Gallegos, Benito H., FV3121255.
Gash, Thomas L., Jr., FV3107083.
Gasser, Gordon A., FV3107782.
Gaston, Thomas D., FV3119358.
Gates, James L., FV3121257.
Gates, William J., FV3107459.
Gawrilow, George, FV3100406.
Gibbs, Vann B., Jr., FV3127902.
Girty, Everett R., FV3118587.
Gist, Tommy E., FV3109484.
Goodwin, Lewis R., FV3118733.
Graf, Ronald O., FV3128255.
Grand, Charles A., FV3120407.
Granger, Dennis L., FV3120785.
Greenwell, Jerome E., FV3108639.
Greer, Charles W., FV3120734.
Grewe, Gerald H., FV3121557.
Griffin, Arthur M., FV3108799.
Gross, Philip C., FV3117016.
Gulbrandsen, Robe A., FV3117017.
Guptill, Roy N., FV3116818.
Guthridge, Robert B., FV3118522.
Guy, David C., FV3109397.
Guzalak, John P., FV3106191.
Gwilliam, George W., FV3117018.
Hakenen, Carl A., Jr., FV3108446.
Hamp, Carl R., FV3120793.
Handley, Edwin D., Jr., FV3121525.
Hanna, Mark A., FV3107550.
Hansen, Neil P. H., FV3121356.
Hara, Tooru, FV3107668.
Hardman, James D., FV3128551.
Harmon, David S., FV3066177.
Harper, Richar B., Jr., FV3121841.
Harris, Frederick B., FV3109176.
Haug, Gunter, FV3108841.
Heck, David A., FV3109399.
Heidinger, Karl C., FV3128552.
Hendl, Richard G., FV3131312.
Hendley, Edwar C., Jr., FV3107105.
Henn, Charles L., FV3119460.
Henrichson, Charl H., FV3128394.
Herrin, Bilyl R., FV3118737.
Hicks, Jackson L., FV3127910.
Hodges, Don W., FV3107506.
Holloway, Robert J., FV3119363.
Hopkins, Carroll E., FV3120593.
Hopkins, Laymon R., FV3121280.
Horton, William R., Jr., FV3041412.
Hosford, Gary B., FB3121425.
House, Jerry R., FV3080703.
Howard, Russell, Jr., FV3119200.
Howell, Thomas H., FV3109402.
Howen, Robert D., FV3120801.
Huffines, Billy W., FV3121488.
Huggins, Hoyt W., FV3120800.
Humes, Edward E., FV3120916.
Hunsicker, David E., FV3121552.
Hyatt, George R., III, FV3119051.
Hyeknudsen, Carl, Jr., FV3109131.
Irwin, Jon K., FV3120596.
Jacobson Edwin C., FV3128008.
Janicke Gerald J., FV3128481.
Jenkins, Charles W., FV3108164.
Jones, Sanford L., Jr., FV3127919.
Justiana, William P., FV3122742.
Kameen, Anthony J., FV3107331.
Kane, Robert W., FV3121574.
Keegan, Dennis F., FV3128636.
Kellum, Ralph C., FV3121843.
Kelly, Wilfred L., FV3121517.
Kemp, Jay D., FV3121527.
Kennedy, John E., FV3122083.
Kerr, James R., FV3107258.
Kline, Norman H. G., FV3121584.
Knight, James E., FV3107620.
Knight, Larry D., FV3128486.
Knops, John H., FV3083485.
Koeppel, Ronald W., FV3120346.
Krahenbuhl, David W., FV3119431.
Kreisinger, Robert H., Jr., FV3121306.
Lambert, Edgar G., FV3121504.
Lanier, Eugene B., FV3108613.
Large, Charles C., FV3108688.
Large, Robert W., FV3106919.
Law, Richard F., FV3118667.
Lawrence, David J., FV3128487.
Layciak, Stephen G., FV3128268.
Lazorchak, Michael P., FV3118493.
Lee, James A., FV3108497.
Leeser, Leonard C., FV3116749.
Lefevre, William H., FV3122511.
Lett, Hector K., FV3117044.
Lewis, William W., FV3120617.
Lindell, Chad Q., FV3099465.
Lindley, Theodore T., FV3105744.
Lloyd, Carrington M., Jr., FV3117047.
Lombardi, Donato A., Jr., FV3128402.
Lommatzsch, Jerry C., FV3122401.
Lutkenhouse, Joel J., FV3121846.
Maney, Joe L., FV3122117.
Mangina, Joseph A., FV3105709.
Manley, Patrick J., FV3128024.
Manske, Charles J., FV3128683.
Manuel, Jerry B., FV3128191.
Marland, William M., FV3122655.
Marshall, Phillip W., Jr., FV3122745.
Martin, James E., FV3119207.
Martin, Raymond C., FV3121537.
Mathews, Wilford D., Jr., FV3117054.
Maury, James R., FV3122016.
Maxey, William R., FV3107386.
McCarson, Tillman D., Jr., FV3122137.
McCleery, Philip E., FV3121639.
McCombs, James C., FV3120835.
McDonald, James R., FV3128334.
McGehee, Charlie R., FV3128491.
McGonagle, Joseph T., FV3108809.
McGraw, Thomas F., FV3122239.
McKay, Hugh G., FV3120836.
McKee, Robert C., FV3120837.
McKinley, James D., FV3109028.
McLaughlin, John R., FV3109408.
McLemore, Colby F., FV3128563.
McMullin, Melvin C., Jr., FV3128026.
McWilliams, Stanl W., FV3107387.
Meade, Ted A., FV3121923.
Meehan, Dallace L., FV3121550.
Meinhart, Robert R., FV3122805.
Mennuti, Edward J., FV3128642.
Meyer, Roland E., FV3107810.
Miaskowski, Robert F., FV3108476.
Miller, Richard B., FV3119213.
Mitchell, Lyndon B., II, FV3121908.
Moats Wilton B., Jr., FV3121655.
Monroe, Michael M., FV5706834.
Montgomery, Walter R., Jr., FV3119053.
Moore, James T., FV3128029.
Moreland, Huey H., FV3108221.
Morrell, Ralph J., FV3122468.
Moss, Howard T., FV3106856.
Muench, David L., FV3107509.
Muhr, William R., FV3099643.
Mulkey, Bruce K., FV3121666.
Murray, Robert K., FV3122281.
Nagle, John F., FV3080231.
Namenuk, Boris V., FV3121130.
Nameth, Maxie S., FV3118310.
Nanjo, James T., FV3128409.
Nesejt, Charles R., FV3122636.
Newton, Murray L., FV3128650.
Nobbs, Robert A., FV3118315.
Noon, Milford L., Jr., FV3120860.
Nordman, Vernon H. D., FV3120861.
Odom, James B., FV3128573.
Oleary, John R., FV3107934.
Oley, Frank A., Jr., FV3119263.
Olsen, Ben, FV3108854.
Olsen, John P., FV3120644.
O'Neal, Quentin F., Jr., FV3118319.
Osik, Robert J., FV3121685.
Pacino, James L., FV3107238.
Palladino, Gennaro, FV3120868.
Panka, Emerance M., FV3061197.
Pappadakis, Constantine J., FV3118324.
Parise, Robert D., FV3118593.
Pass, Ronald I., FV3108165.
Pearson, Kent S., FV3128339.
Penas, Clark R., FV3105575.
Perkins, Sheppard E., Jr., FV3121696.
Perry, Lawrence R., FV3122699.
Peters, John D., FV3128198.
Pethtel, Kermit B., Jr., FV3120875.
Phillips, Henry M., FV3105620.
Pickard, George W., FV3121371.
Pierre, Elizabeth, FV3121372.
Pignone, Richard, FV3118337.
Pinder, Clark S., FV3107511.
Pittman, Kenneth W., FV3121375.
Plate, Gary K., FV3120483.
Ponti, Robert J., FV3109349.
Porter, Carlos A., FV3120882.
Postman, Robert J., FV3109032.
Powell, William S. FV3128341.
Price, Donald S., FV3121056.
Price, Karl V., FV3107513.
Pyle, Richard A., FV3122295.
Raborn, Robert E., Jr., FV3122660.
Ratliff, Earl R., FV3109463.
Rede, Hector, FV3122532.
Reeser, Robert B., FV3122747.
Reinman, Robert A., FV3108897.
Rex, David A., FV3122300.
Reynolds, Bobby D., FV3121737.
Riccio, Louis M., FV3118502.
Rich, Gerald P., FV3081641.

Richwine, Barton W., Jr., FV3121708.
Rios, Robert C., FV3122536.
Robinson, Stephen R., FV3121400.
Rogers, Bruce W., FV3108815.
Rogers, Harvey W., FV3119084.
Rogers, James R., FV3127945.
Rohrbough, Stephen W., FV3118910.
Rolka, Thomas A., FV3128664.
Rosborough, Donald L., FV3107847.
Roswold, Robert C., FV3120895.
Rothrock, James G., FV3107098.
Roy, Paul R., FV3122198.
Rubenson, George C., Jr., FV3122541.
Runkle, Richard K., Jr., FV3109322.
Rusbuldt, Robert P., Jr., FV3120900.
Russell, Robert B., FV3107539.
Salvadore, John J., FV3118613.
Sampson, Michael D., FV3116788.
Sanchez, Paul M., FV3099840.
Sanford, Lash G., Jr., FV3109180.
Sawyer, Donald W., Jr., FV3096979.
Scarbrough, Leon T., Jr., FV3107134.
Schmidt, Eldon E., FV3128043.
Schneider, Marvin L., FV3118912.
Scott, William S., FV3118340.
Seibold, Ronald R., FV3120678.
Shafer, Ronald L., FV3118341.
Shelok, Thomas C., FV3122026.
Shipman, Robert L., FV3127948.
Siebert, Frederick W., Jr., FV3121141.
Sikes, Joseph R., FV3122422.
Silverbush, Edward, FV3121026.
Simonsen, Thomas J., FV3107201.
Singler, Cletus E., FV3122675.
Sinicrope, Albert N., FV3121423.
Sisk, Jerome M., FV3127949.
Skinner, Rondall E., FV3107722.
Smiley, William A., FV3128208.
Smith, Clayton N., FV3109566.
Smith, Howard O., FV3132242.
Smith, James R., FV3118348.
Smith, Robert B., FV3107325.
Smith, Ronald L., FV3121148.
Sobol, Rostyslaw, FV3107419.
Solomon, Ernest S., FV3121149.
Sourk, Kenneth A., FV3108144.
Steele, Robert A., FV3116969.
Stein, Bernard M., FV3122763.
Stewart, Edmund B., FV3098799.
Stockton, Robert S., FV3122053.
Story, Leland S., FV3100029.
Stroup, James L., FV3107967.
Sturm, William J., FV3133067.
Stutts, George F., FV3108274.
Sunderman, Dewayne O., FV3108024.
Swain, Walter B., FV3120994.
Swan, Richard C., FV3128042.
Sweginnis, Robert W., FV3109008.
Swennes, David O., FV3127958.
Tagaras, Michael T., FV3122638.
Tanner, Robert W., FV3127959.
Thalberg, William J., FV3116809.
Thompson, Harold D., FV3120771.
Thompson, Huel R., FV3121182.
Thompson, Richard B., FV3118791.
Tinsley, James A., Jr., FV3094619.
Todd, Gale B., FV2278064.
Tollstrup, Deon J., FV3122552.
Travis, Kenneth H., FV3122431.
Trent, Michael J., FV3122553.
Turman, Robert E., FV3122068.
Turner, David C., FV3128589.
Turner, Dion W., FV3119039.
Vanhorn, Harry, Jr., FV3106582.
Vaughan, David W., FV3100534.
Vaughan, Leon T., III, FV3106831.
Vogan, Arthur W., FV3095994.
Walker, James H., FV3108535.
Warren, Edward E., FV3121180.
Waterhouse, Edgar W., FV3116817.
Watson, Howell N., Jr., FV3118693.
Webb, Stuart A., FV3118376.
Wehmhoner, Martin C., Jr., FV3105230.
Wellacher, Lester A., FV3118361.
Welch, Gary G., FV3132086.
Wells, Donald M., FV3122334.
Wells, Joseph E., FV3116819.
Wenzel, Edwin H., FV3121184.
Wert, Larry I., FV3107917.
Wesley, Harold W., FV3058612.
Westbrook, Bruce M., FV3128515.
Westerberg, Alfred, Jr., FV3109540.
Wettestad, Warner T., FV3121467.
Whittenberger, Steven J., FV3107970.
Williams, Douglas D., FV3119236.
Williams, Grant L., FV3108784.
Wilson, George E., FV3128360.
Winslow, Patrick A., FV3128592.
Wojciechowski, William A., FV3128144.
Woldstad, Chris G., FV3119384.
Wong, Wendell M. Y., FV3120104.
Wormser, Owen H., FV3122680.
Yarbrough, Donald E., FV3120797.
Yocum, Allen, FV3122108.
Yokom, Gerald G., FV3121477.
York, Michael L., FV3120535.
Youd, Henry S., FV3121479.
Young, Billie N., FV3121197.
Young, James B., FV3118375.
Young, Leroy C., FV3119579.
Young, Walter H. W., FV3107046.
Zerumsky, Adolph G., Jr., FV3116826.
Ziemer, Thomas F., FV3122566.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 8 (legislative day of June 6), 1967:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Alexander B. Trowbridge, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce.

IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The nominations beginning Terry C. de la Moriniere, to be lieutenant, and ending Dennis L. Graves, to be ensign, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 16, 1967.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Covey T. Oliver, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Lincoln Gordon.

William J. Porter, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea.

Benigno C. Hernandez, of New Mexico, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay, vice William P. Snow.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 1, consular officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James E. Hoofnagle, of Virginia.
Samuel S. Westerfield, Junior, of the District of Columbia.

For Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consular officers of the United States of America:

Bruce M. Lancaster, of Mississippi.
Donald L. Woolf, of California.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Dr. Donald K. McIntyre, of Pennsylvania.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Thomas T. Turqman, of the District of Columbia.

For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 6 to class 5 and to be also consular officers of the United States of America:

Kenneth Allen Hartung, of New York.
Robert William Smith, of California.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Wilbur I. Wright, of Michigan.

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consular officer of the United States of America:

William T. Breer, of California.

For promotion from a Foreign Service officer of class 8 to class 7 and to be also a consular officer of the United States of America:

Miss Sandra L. Vogelgesang, of Ohio.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, consular officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Wat T. Cluverius IV, of Illinois.
John H. Foley, of Arizona.
Peter Edward Jones, of Maryland.
Thomas E. McNamara, of New York.
L. Ivar Nelson, of Missouri.
Thomas E. O'Connor, of Ohio.
James L. Russell, of California.
Roger S. Russell, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Michael D. Sternberg, of New York.
George E. Tuttle, Jr., of New Jersey.
Robert L. Watkins, of Louisiana.
Curtin Winsor, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Richard C. Wolf, of New Mexico.
Toby T. Zettler, of Ohio.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, consular officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Ward Davis Barmon, of New York.
William J. A. Barnes, of Massachusetts.
Richard M. Bash, of Oklahoma.
Martin D. Branning, of Virginia.
Miss Joan E. Brosius, of Massachusetts.
James B. Corey, of Michigan.
Stanley T. Escudero, of Florida.
Miss Dorothy M. Feeney, of Massachusetts.
Robert S. Gelbard, of New York.
Miss Stephanie K. Gerard, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Natalie W. Hull, of Georgia.
Roger A. Long, of Maryland.
C. Anthony Love, of New Jersey.
Roger A. McGuire, of Ohio.
Gary R. Nank, of Ohio.
Harold T. Nelson, Jr., of Nebraska.
William H. Poole, of Massachusetts.
Robert C. Reis, Jr., of Missouri.
Miss Ellen L. Robbins, of Illinois.
Basin Scarlis, of the District of Columbia.
E. Michael Southwick, of California.
Lawrence M. Thomas, of Tennessee.
Robert A. Tsukayama, of Hawaii.
Miss Carol E. Wilder, of Georgia.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:

Joseph A. Minott, Jr., of Oregon.
Philip F. O'Connor, of the District of Columbia.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consular officers and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Barry E. Ballow, of California.
Donald G. Besom, Jr., of Nebraska.
Stanton H. Burnett, of New York.
William E. Cavan, of California.
Joseph A. Di Stefano, of the District of Columbia.
Jack J. Fieldhouse, of Maryland.
Alan L. Gilbert, of the District of Columbia.
Charles A. Johnson, of Virginia.
John Hoare Kerr, of West Virginia.
Warren T. Lutz, of New York.
Yale W. Richmond, of Virginia.
Duncan N. Scott, Jr., of Texas.
Conrad S. Spohnholz, of Indiana.
Angus MacLean Thuermer, of Virginia.
Hoyt N. Ware, of Georgia.
Richard S. Welch, of Maryland.
Ciro N. Whited, of California.
Herman Zivetz, of California.

Foreign Service Reserve officer to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Bruno B. A. Luzzatto, of the District of Columbia.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:

Miss Mary J. Ahlert, of California.
Harry M. Carter, Jr., of Virginia.

Paul M. Hooper, of Texas.
John F. Howley, of New York.
George B. Kettenhofen, of California.
Miss Grace E. Mentag, of Indiana.
Miss Diana E. Morris, of Florida.
Miss Patricia M. Parrish, of Florida.
Miss Nancy J. Ruckert, of New Jersey.
Miss Wendy Anne Sidener, of New York.
Miss Barbara Smith, of Oregon.
Howard F. Williams, of Georgia.
George E. Wilson, of Michigan.
Vincent P. Wolff, of Florida.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Urges United States To Support Permanent Solutions for Permanent Israel-Arab Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, while the outbreak of violence in the Mideast has been most disturbing, there are definite indications today that many of the causes of this outbreak may now be removed.

The existence of a viable State of Israel as a permanent member of the community of nations must be fully recognized. Indeed, the State of Israel has demonstrated progress which may serve as an example for many other nations of the world.

In my recent visit to the Mideast, I had occasion to discuss the subject of Arab-Israel relations with a number of persons in Israel as well as in neighboring Jordan. It appeared that a substantial portion of the Jordanian population is ready to recognize the permanent status of Israel and to develop long-range and cordial relations of mutual respect.

It would not be a solution to the problem for us to acquiesce in any temporary or makeshift arrangements which would leave unsolved problems in the Mideast area. This view also applies to the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal. Certainly, complete access to these waters must be granted to the State of Israel without any restrictions.

The awkward and anomalous action which has permitted access to Israel through Jordan but has prevented passage to Jordan from Israel is another objectionable condition which our Nation must help to resolve on a permanent basis.

While the action of Secretary General U Thant in withdrawing U.N. Emergency Forces from Egypt was precipitate and ill advised, the attitudes displayed more recently by members of the United Nations Security Council suggest a strong desire for multinational cooperation in behalf of permanent solutions to the problems of the Middle East. We must, by all means possible, encourage such multinational cooperation and action. This in turn can provide the essential element of permanence to the Middle East countries.

Mr. Speaker, many loyal and dedicated Americans of the Jewish faith residing in the 12th District of Illinois as well as countless thousands who recognize the justice of the mission and the cause of the State of Israel have expressed their concern for this young state and its future. The concern thus expressed has been both reasonable and objective, and I have been greatly assisted in recent days by numerous communications and individual conferences with leaders of the Jewish community in my congressional district. I am grateful for their assistance, and am proud to have provided support and cooperation in their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that under the steady hand and wise guidance of our Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern Affairs Lucius Battle, we may help the State of Israel to achieve its goals of an honorable peace together with the recognition and respect to which a sovereign nation is entitled.

Mr. Speaker, I will watch the progress of events during these coming days and will stand ready to lend my support to the appropriate decisionmaking of our executive department.

European Christian Democratic Youth Representatives Visit Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I had the privilege of addressing several leaders of European Christian Democratic Youth organizations. The young political leaders' visit to the Nation's Capital was sponsored by the American Council of Young Political Leaders, and was, in my opinion, most profitable and enlightening for all concerned.

The exchange of questions and answers covered subjects currently affecting the entire world, as well as individual countries and cities. Much of the discussion focused on the United States, about which these young persons were already very knowledgeable.

They included: Fritz Koenig, Kurt Sörö and Walter Heinzinger, of Austria; Willy Laevaert and Leo Teugels, of Belgium; Mr. and Mrs. Bruno Coiraton, of France; Lothar Kraft, of Germany; Jean Spautz of Luxembourg; Piet Van Engelen and Rob Vermaas, of The Netherlands; Angelo Sferrazza, Alfredo De Poi, L. Faragui, Miss Gabriella Geniola, and Mrs. Franca Fagotti, of Italy; and Santiago Guillon, also of France.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend both the American Council of Young Political Leaders and the young persons I met with here for the valuable, encouraging work they are doing. I know my colleagues, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD]—who also met with the group—feel the same way.

Israel Struck Blow for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the kaleidoscope of events in the past week in the Mideast finds many of us without complete facts.

One thing is clear, however: the Israel forces accomplished the seeming impossible, and in doing it alone, struck a great blow for freedom, not only for Israel, but for the entire world.

My thoughts are summed up in the following letter to a constituent in my district:

JUNE 8, 1967.

Mr. ALFRED W. LEVY,
President, Huntington Hebrew Congregation,
Huntington, N.Y.

DEAR MR. LEVY: I was very pleased that you and Mr. Kaufman were able to visit with me at my Washington office today to discuss the problems of the Mid-East generally, and Israel in particular, as well as the important part which America must, and I am sure, will play in protecting the territorial integrity and international rights of this valiant little country now and in the future.

The events of the past week have moved swiftly, and our early fears and apprehensions have turned to admiration and pride in the historic military victories of an oppressed, outnumbered, but courageous little nation.

In the past several years, America's Middle East policy has been steeped in paradox. We have given 245 million dollars in military aid to the Arab nations—but not with my vote! We have fed Nasser's armies with U.S. tax subsidized wheat—but not with my vote! We gave 9 billion dollars in aid to ungrateful India to see her turn her back on Israel and the United States.

And the day before hostilities began, Americans with U.S. jet aircraft were training Jordan's pilots.

The inconsistency and wishy-washy semantic flip-flop from "neutral" to "interested belligerent" was a most unsatisfactory diplomatic posture for a country pledged to stem aggression and stand for freedom. How much in contrast have been the stately and confident pronouncements by Abba Eban.

It is time for our Government and all Americans to rally behind the Israeli, who have accomplished more in one week in the cause of freedom and to check the advance of Fascist and Communist aggression than most nations in a generation.

I opposed American intervention in the 1956 Suez Crisis and its policy of roll-back, and do hope our Government this time will do all possible to use these great military victories as a base for negotiation for a lasting settlement predicated on equity, justice, and freedom.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

James R. Grover, Jr.,
Representative in Congress.

The Mideast Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, tonight, in my home town of Buffalo, a large turnout of persons of all faiths is expected at a special service of concern for the State of Israel in Temple Beth Zion, an exciting new architectural masterpiece.

I would like to propose that the Congress authorize the Secretary of Defense to negotiate a contract for the military services of Israel's Gen. Moshe Dayan when, as seems certain, he soon winds up his current assignment.

But I will instead take time to express my views on the situation in the Middle East—past, present, and future.

Aggression against Israel began 20 years ago when the Arab world set out to flaunt the will of the United Nations and destroy the newly authorized State. Against the expressed decision of the world body, the seven Arab States launched a broad attack on the Jewish communities in the Holy Land. Only a stout and noble defense thwarted their plan.

An armistice was rushed through when the Arab armies were in hasty retreat, but it never matured into a treaty. The pressure off, the Arab States balked at accepting the status quo. Unfortunately, the great powers did not frankly face up to the issue. Arab plans for vengeance were discounted as domestic propaganda. Arab arms purchases were increased and accepted under the guise of bringing stability to the area. Foreign aid was extended to the Arab States without compelling them to integrate into their economies those Arabs who had taken flight at Arab urging.

Encouraged by international indecision, the Arabs began to organize terrorist infiltration of Israel. War was planned. Russian arms were built up in the Sinai Peninsula. In 1956, Israel defended its very existence during the Sinai campaign.

Her swift victory offered the world another chance to face the larger issues. Pledges were made. The Suez Canal would be an open waterway. Plans would be effected to provide for the disposition of the Arabs who remained in the camps. Israel was guaranteed access to the East through the Straits of Tiran. Pledges were made, but they were not followed out. The Suez Canal remained closed. Aid continued to the so-called refugees without any effective redeployment of these people. The Arab world again was encouraged to dream the ugly dreams of vengeance. She found a source of encouragement and military aid in the Soviet Union. The Russians dispatched jet aircraft, missiles, tanks, and armor in vast numbers.

In Cairo 3 years ago, a concerted strategy for the destruction of Israel was devised. These bitter seeds have borne fruit. Today Israel is defending herself and our ideals.

It is my opinion that when these hostilities come to an end the United States must take the lead in mobilizing an international effort to create viable instrumentalities for a stable Middle East peace and to establish the principle of freedom of international waters in the area. A cease-fire will be meaningless unless it includes the requirement of peace negotiations. Israel cannot bargain away her rights without assurances of security.

This great Nation, dedicated to peace and law, must be in the forefront in creating the conditions which will make direct peace negotiations possible.

Marguerite Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Cervantes wrote in Don Quixote:

> He is a good man . . . and a true Christian every inch of him.

I rise today to pay tribute to a woman whom that immortal passage describes perfectly.

Mrs. Marguerite Justice, who resides at 4300 South Kenwood Avenue in Los Angeles, has made an outstanding contribution to her community, State, and Nation, and therefore deserves our commendation.

Marguerite Justice, whose husband is with the Northrop Corp., in Hawthorne, Calif., is a prominent member of the congregation of St. Mark's Methodist Church in Los Angeles. In July 1965, Mrs. Justice volunteered to take charge of the church's youth fellowship program. Because of her leadership, St. Mark's today provides a vitally significant program of activities for the young people of Washington and Morningside High Schools. In an era when so few young people are exposed to sensitive adult advice and guidance, Mrs. Justice has sought to fill the void. She has arranged dances, beach and ice skating parties, youth conferences, theater outings, and tours of municipal buildings and art museums.

Marguerite Justice is not only concerned about young people; she is doing something constructive in their behalf. Unlike so many of our citizens, who merely criticize the younger generation, Mrs. Justice has succeeded in making religion a relevant and central force in their lives.

Her sincere and selfless commitment to her fellowman has materially improved the quality of life in our community. She is an inspiration to others because she practices each day those Christian principles she seeks to instill in the young.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in saluting Marguerite Justice and the fine work she is doing.

Results of Public Opinion Survey in 21st Texas District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent questionnaires to all the people whose names appeared on the 1966 poll lists in the district I represent. The responses were most gratifying. Replies were received from about 20 percent, which I understand is an unusually high ratio of returns. It is believed the results represent a fairly accurate cross section of public opinion on the topics covered.

I am indebted to my constituents for making this survey such a success. The returns included thousands of interesting and constructive comments on a variety of subjects. These people are understandably concerned about the constant growth of big government in Washington at the expense of local self-government. They want some brakes applied.

The questions and the results of the tabulation follow:

1. Vietnam. Which course do you favor in Vietnam? (Choose one—a, b, or c).

	Percent
a. Withdrawal	5.5
b. Take whatever military action that may be necessary to achieve a decisive victory	83.4
c. Keep up present military and peace efforts in hopes the Communists will negotiate	8.7

(Note.—A few of the answers suggested a cessation of bombing in North Vietnam.)

2. Inflation. In fighting inflation, which of the following do you consider more desirable?

	Percent
a. A 6-percent increase in income taxes	6.4
b. A reduction in nondefense spending	91.1

3. Social security. Do you favor increasing Social Security taxes in order to provide increased Social Security benefits?

	Percent
Yes	21.3
No	73.7

4. Medicare. Do you favor the President's desire to extend medicare to an additional 1.5 million under age of 65 who are disabled, with an increase in tax to pay for it?

	Percent
Yes	16.8
No	73.2

5. Minimum income. Are you in favor of having Government guarantee a minimum annual income (of about $3,000) for all, whether they work or not?

	Percent
Yes	1.8
No	97.0

6. Open housing. Do you believe homeowners should have the right to sell or rent their property to whomever they choose, regardless of race?

	Percent
Yes	89.3
No	9.4

7. Jury selection. Do you favor the President's other civil rights provision, giving the Federal Government jurisdiction over selection of juries in State courts to assure nondiscriminatory jury selections?

	Percent
Yes	7.7
No	87.3

8. Labor unions. Some say labor unions which cover whole industries are actually monopolies and should come under antitrust laws. Do you agree?

	Percent
Yes	81.8
No	7.6

9. Apportionment. Do you favor allowing any State that desires, the right to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population?

	Percent
Yes	45.6
No	33.9

10. Rent subsidies. Do you favor the President's rent subsidy program, under which low income tenants are required to pay no more than 25 percent of monthly income on rentals, with Federal Government paying the balance?

	Percent
Yes	5.7
No	90.2

11. Poverty. Do you feel the "War on Poverty" has been worth the money?

	Percent
Yes	6.0
No	87.5

12. School prayer. Do you favor, on a voluntary basis, Bible reading and prayer in public schools?

	Percent
Yes	92.2
No	5.3

13. Right-to-work. Do you favor repeal of Sec. 14b of Taft-Hartley Act, which permits States to have "right to work" laws?

	Percent
Yes	22.2
No	66.3

14. Do you feel that, considering the costs and results, the Great Society programs have been justified?

	Percent
Yes	6.1
No	84.0

Hell Is Truth Seen Too Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that "hell is truth seen too late." I am truly thankful that the people of this country are not going through the agonizing experience today of having many truths about their domestic petroleum industry brought home to them in this agonizing way.

Yet this would be their predicament if the Congress and the administration had listened to some professed prophets and pundits. I am referring to those who have been claiming for years that import restrictions on petroleum were some kind of sham—not at all justified by national security considerations. These people were completely unconvinced by arguments that it was imperative to keep up a strong and healthy domestic oil producing industry. They saw no need for it when there is such an abundance of oil in the Middle East. They felt it was in the national interest to avail ourselves of that lower priced Middle Eastern crude oil—even if this meant letting our own domestic oil producing industry go into a decline.

Had we listened to these people, and followed their advice, they and all the American people, every last man, woman, and child in our country would know the full ugly significance of that proverb: "hell is truth seen too late."

These same pundits mocked at the oil conservation laws as some kind of elaborate fakery, and even voiced suspicions about the real purpose of Interstate Oil Compact Commission. They deplored our admittedly costly domestic conservation efforts, when there was that bargain priced Middle Eastern oil available for the taking.

And if the majority of Congress had listened to this line of argument, we would all be agreeing this day that "hell is truth seen too late."

Percentage depletion has also been condemned, roundly condemned, by some vocal individuals on the grounds that it is senseless to give this kind of encouragement to high-risk oil exploration in the United States when we know there is an abundance of oil in the Middle East. Why look for oil where it is hard and costly to find, why have tax provisions that make it possible for our domestic producers to keep up the high-risk research, when there is so much readily available in those oil-rich Middle Eastern lands?

Had we followed the reasoning of depletion's critics, today we in this Congress would be saying to ourselves, and to our constituents: "hell is truth seen too late."

Mr. Speaker, those of us who come from the oil-producing States have been warning for years that our country could not, that it dare not, let its domestic oil-producing industry decline as a result of misguided or shortsighted governmental policies. Often our words were mocked. Often our arguments were ridiculed. And though we have prevailed at some points—in justifying percentage depletion, in curbing a completely overwhelming flood of imports, in upholding conservation policies that prevent both economic and physical waste, it has been a tough, uphill battle all the way.

It is small comfort to us that it took a tragedy such as is now going on in the Middle East to bring home the truth that we have been trying to express to doubting listeners. But we do derive some consolation from the fact that many of our warnings were heeded and that the Nation did not take the fatal course of totally abandoning its domestic producing industry for the lure of bargain-basement oil from the Arab States. Had the Nation done this, we would be facing paralysis today, hunger, the loss of our crops, the immobilization of our defense forces. And the critics of oil import restrictions, of the conservation program, of percentage depletion would be face to face with the bitter knowledge that their mistakes in judgment had helped to bring this tragedy on their country. I am glad for their sake, as well as for all of ours, that this never happened, and that none of us has to experience the awful hell of truth seen too late.

Remarks of the Honorable William T. Murphy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to include into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by Representative MURPHY of Illinois upon his return from Israel as the representative of Speaker MCCORMACK to the dedication of the Israel Knesset—Parliament—on August 28, 1966. I think it is singularly appropriate at this time of crisis in the Middle East that the Members of the House have the benefit of Representative MURPHY's statement giving the history and general background of the creation of the State of Israel.

The statement follows:

In August of last year it was my privilege to be the personal representative of the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives at the dedication of the new Knesset Building in Jerusalem. This was an occasion of extraordinary significance because the dedication was attended by Parliamentary leaders of forty-one nations throughout the world.

The State of Israel is a parliamentary democracy in which supreme authority is vested in the Knesset, the representative assembly.

The Knesset is a single chamber, 120 member legislature, elected for a four year term by universal suffrage under proportional representation.

During my eight-day tour of Israel, I had ample time to reflect on the great history of this Nation once called Canaan and later Palestine.

It was here that Jewish history began four thousand years ago. In 66 A.D. the Jews revolted against Rome and four years later the Roman General Titus captured Jerusalem, burned the city and destroyed the Temple. This was the beginning of the dispersion of the Jews, known as the "Diaspora" that has lasted almost two thousand years.

The Modern State of Israel had its beginning with the First Zionist Congress which met at Basle, Switzerland in 1897, and gave public voice to the right of the Jewish people to national restoration in their land.

This right was acknowledged by the "Balfour Declaration" made by the British Foreign Minister on November 2, 1917 and confirmed in the "Mandate for Palestine" of the League of Nations July 24, 1922.

This accorded international validity to the historical connection between the Jewish people and the land of Israel, and to their right to re-establish their National Home.

On November 29, 1947, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution calling for the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine.

On May 15, 1948, the date of the termination of the "British Mandate for Palestine", the "National Council" representing the Jewish people in Palestine, proclaimed the establishment of a Jewish State to be known as the "State of Israel", and also proclaimed that "The State of Israel will be open to Jewish immigration and the ingathering of exiles".

Israel is a country slightly larger than New Jersey. It has a varied topography which includes the hilly and mountainous area of Gallilee in the north, the coastal plain and Judean hills in the center and the Negev desert in the south.

The principal cities are Jerusalem and Tel Aviv. Jerusalem, the capital of Israel, lies west and adjacent to the biblical city of Jerusalem which lies in Jordan. Tel Aviv, originally a suburb of the ancient City of Jaffe, is the largest city and cultural center of Israel. This country has three major seaports, in Haifa in the north, and Ashdod in the south both on the Mediterranean Sea, and Eilat on the Red Sea.

It has a population over two and one-half million people; about 89% of these are jews and 11% non-Jews mostly Arabs. Judaism is the principal religion.

Literacy in this country is very high, approaching 90% for Jews and 50% for Arabs.

Israel has been making great progress since it became a State in 1948. It has been growing at a rate exceeding that of almost any other country in the world.

Its present Gross National Product is about three and one-half billion dollars or fourteen hundred dollars per capita.

Agriculture forms an important sector of the economy.

The main crops are citrus fruits which are exported in considerable quantity, and food stuff, such as vegetables, barley, wheat, and poultry products. However, she has to import grain, sugar, and meat which she does not produce in sufficient quantities for domestic consumption.

Industry has greatly expanded in Israel. Diamond cutting, textiles, potash, phosphates, rubber goods, are produced in quantity. Several of these diamonds, textiles and minerals, are exported.

Exports reached a total of four hundred and thirty million dollars in 1965 while imports that year came to eight hundred and thirty-five million dollars.

Since its independence Israel has received well over one billion dollars of United States Government Aid.

It also receives large sums annually from German reparation payments, private contributions from world Jewish organizations, and various loan funds for investment purposes.

The large Histadrut Labor Confederation acts as a roof organization for most of the country's labor unions. Cooperative enterprises find an important place in agriculture life, while government investment also assists many of the new industries.

Israel's precarious position, in a state of Armistice and not real peace with its neighbors, requires a large outlay for defense.

Universal military training for boys and girls provides a means of social integration as well as a preparation for defense.

The three major problems facing the State of Israel are her relations with her neighbors, water shortage, and assimilation of the Oriental Jews into the social and economic life of the community.

With reference to her neighbors, the armies of Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq invaded Israel a few hours after the proclamation of its independence. This action by the Arab military was aimed at the surpression of the National Liberation Movement in Palestine.

After seven months of intermittent fighting, during the first half of 1949, separate General Armistice Agreements were concluded between Israel and Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria.

These Agreements are still in effect but there has been sporadic incidents in the northeast with Syria in the last year. The present relationship with her Arab neighbors affects the stability of the Middle East and has worldwide implications.

Insofar as the water shortage is concerned, nearly nine tenths of the proven water resources are in regular use. Most of the ground water and springs are already utilized. Strict economy and an efficient control over water use are, therefore, necessary. Recent progress in the desalination of sea and brackish water encourages the hope that the cost may become more acceptable for general utilization.

Speaking of the problem of assimilation, it has been the Western Jews from Europe with their great heritage of intellectual, scientific, and commercial achievements, who have guided Israel's growth so far. Against this dynamic background the cultural gap has become great between the settlers from the West and those from the East namely from Asia and Africa, because the Oriental Jews have lower incomes, larger families, a lower standard of living, and less education.

This, then, is a brief sketch of Israel today. It is an interesting place to be and to observe. Though its problems are great, one senses that the reserves of strength and courage are there for the maintenance of a free democracy and religious freedom in the Near East.

Postmaster Lambert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on May 18 the Deputy Postmaster General, Hon. Frederick C. Belan, came to Philadelphia to attend a testimonial dinner for Postmaster Anthony I. Lambert, whom he described as "one of our finest postmasters."

The city of Philadelphia is proud indeed of the man who directs its postal service. He takes his place in an illustrious line of civil servants to fill his post that began with Benjamin Franklin. I know that he applies to his profession much of the strength and vision that Franklin brought to his Nation's service.

Anthony I. Lambert began his career with the Philadelphia post office in 1920, and served well in a variety of administrative assignments before he was appointed to his present office in 1961 by President John F. Kennedy.

A total familiarity with postal affairs and postal people has helped him to cope with the extensive changes in the nature of the postal service that have occurred over the past 6 years. The rapidly expanding volume of mail has dictated the adoption of new ways to handle the workload. Postmaster Lambert has been accorded special recognition by the Postmaster General for a smooth transition from manual to mechanized operation and for his very efficient administration of the Nation's fifth largest post office. President Lyndon B. Johnson has taken note of the simplicity and effectiveness of his proposal to precancel postal cards; its application on a nationwide scale saves $2 million every year. The Direct Mail Advertising Association has twice named him Postmaster of the Year.

More than a capable executive, Anthony I. Lambert is a friendly and sympathetic human being. He demonstrates a genuine concern for the problems of 12,000 postal men and women, and has consistently maintained an open office door and an attentive ear. He has earned the Special Award of Merit of the Philadelphia Citizens Selection Committee for outstanding service in the career development of Negro employees, the 4–8–2 Square Club has honored him for a "sincere and active interest in the problems of his fellow citizens," and the President's Committee for Employment of the Handicapped has conferred an Employer's Merit Award for selective placement in useful employment of handicapped employees. His support of the 1967 Allied Jewish Appeal has won him praise "for humanitarian service to the Jewish community."

An active citizen of Philadelphia, the postmaster has successfully chaired the Federal employees division of three United Fund torch drives and is a member of the fund's board of trustees. He serves with the executive committee of the March of Dimes, the board of governors of the Heart Association and the Philadelphia Hero Scholarship Fund. Among the mementos on his office wall are a statement of appreciation for his participation in the Variety Club's Old Newsboys Day and the American Legion's citation for meritorious service, presented by the post office's Lt. Wilbur B. Small Post No. 690.

He works with the Federal Executive Board to actively involve Federal agencies in the community's problems and has twice served as president of the Federal Business Association. He has just completed a term as president of the Pennsylvania chapter of the National Association of Postmasters.

The Treasury Department's Minute Man Flag will wave again over the Philadelphia general post office after a successful drive to enroll nine out of 10 employees in the payroll savings plan for the purchase of U.S. savings bonds. His desk displays a beautiful silver medallion as a personal recognition by the Treasury Department "for patriotic service" last year.

On May 18 I was privileged to be present when a thousand of Mr. Lambert's friends assembled to pay him tribute. John P. Cain, president of branch 35, National Association of Postal Supervisors, and the evening's host, presented a certificate of appreciation from Philadelphia's supervisors and credited the city's superior service to "an experienced postal supervisor at the top."

Regional Director James J. Doherty praised him for recent savings of more than a half-million dollars by putting into practice suggestions offered by Philadelphia employees. Philadelphia County council of the American Legion lauded his services to the community.

Then the Deputy Postmaster General conferred upon Mr. Lambert the title postmaster and regional adviser, an honor that will permit him to contribute his more than four decades of postal experience to the development of programs for the future of the postal service.

Mr. Belen, in discussing his Department's plans, said:

> We will be leaning heavily upon men like Tony Lambert. The last 6 years of his career are a prologue for him. He is a career man who has moved to the top of his profession. He has made great contributions to the postal service; he will make many more.

Chairman Teague Says Lessons of History Warn Against Yielding to Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague and chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], recently delivered an outstanding address on our commitment in Vietnam, placing America's fight against aggression and communism in Southeast Asia in historical perspective.

Excerpts from this address were reprinted in a recent issue of V.F.W. magazine, the publication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in Vietnam, I am inserting these excerpts from Chairman TEAGUE's address in the RECORD.

The excerpts follow:

THE WAY OUT OF VIETNAM—"WIN OUR WAY OUT"

I support—on principle—the position of the Johnson administration on Vietnam.

I have some reservations about the way the war is being conducted. I feel we should step *up* our military effort in Vietnam, not decrease it. I believe we should do everything within our power to bring this dismal and degrading war to a quick and successful conclusion.

I say this advisedly and from experience. I hate war with all my heart. I have been a soldier—I have seen it close up—and anyone who has had that experience must hate everything about war.

I wish with all my being that there were an easy, cheap and honorable way to get out of Vietnam. There simply is no such thing. The only way we can get our soldiers out of Vietnam is to *win* our way out—fight our way out—bomb our way out.

And—despite all the agonized protests of the peaceniks and the bearded pickets—I never came across a single soldier in Vietnam who did not wholeheartedly agree with this point of view.

I talked with a lot of our fighting men—from General Westmoreland to the cooks in the field messes—the whole spectrum of our military commitment. They all hated the war. That's natural and normal. But even though they hated what they were doing—*every single one of them agreed that what they were doing was right and unavoidable.* Everyone to whom I spoke had faith in the righteousness of our cause, and the absolute necessity of victory.

And—at the risk of sounding intolerant—I want to say that I am far more inclined to accept their testimony than to accept the testimony of a bunch of bearded pickets in front of the White House.

My view on Vietnam is this:

We are there because we have a moral commitment there. That's point one. The United States of America is one of the few nations left in the world capable of feeling the force of having a moral commitment toward those weaker than ourselves. And I am proud of that. I wouldn't want it to be any other way.

But even more compelling is the global reason for our being there.

The battle against Communist tyranny in Southeast Asia and all the world is being fought today in Vietnam. We are not looking for temporary results, we are looking for permanent results. We are engaged in a battle to stop Chinese Communism just as cold as we have stopped Russian Communism in the Western world.

Vietnam is not an isolated battleground. It happens to be the place where we have drawn a line in the sand and have said we will not retreat one step further. It happens to be the place where we have decided to fight for the freedom of the entire East.

One thing is for sure: If the United States were to be so shortsighted as to abandon the fight, we would unwillingly and helplessly witness the spread of Communist despotism in ever widening circles throughout all Asia to a point where the freedom and the security of the entire world were threatened. If we were to abandon our crusade in Vietnam we would see the entire balance of power tilt irrevocably against us.

If we win our struggle—and I am sure we shall win—South Vietnam will become a successful bastion of democracy in the Asiatic orbit, just as South Korea has become—and we don't have a more successful product of our international policy of idealistic self-interest than South Korea.

Surely we have learned by this time—in such bitter classrooms as Munich and Yalta—that peace cannot be bought cheaply and whenever we attempt to buy peace foolishly at a basement bargain price, we end up by paying a price we cannot afford to pay.

The most frustrating point about Vietnam is that this is a war we could win any time we wanted to if we were only willing to take the steps necessary for victory. I am not a bloodthirsty man, or a vengeful man, or even a reckless man—but I cannot agree with the policy of fighting a limited war when that policy is extending the hostilities and costing the lives of our young men in uniform

I am *not* talking about atomic bombing. We can win without that.

I *am* talking about giving our military commanders the authority to go out and demolish every worthwhile target in North Vietnam—air bases, hydroelectric power plants, the works.

With ordinary, conventional weapons we could close up the port of Haiphong as tight as a drum and stop the flow of war material by doing so.

If we were to do this—and I sincerely hope we do—the Communists would come running to the peace conference and we would be calling the shots at the negotiating table. That is the only way we can effect a meaningful peace.

As of now, the government of North Vietnam and the Viet Cong are convinced that the United States has neither the patience nor fortitude to carry the war to a successful conclusion. They are convinced that the Americans will-to-resist will collapse—and they overestimate the influence and the validity of the loud-mouthed minority which opposes and derides our efforts and our intentions in Vietnam.

These oppositionists are, in fact, prolonging the war. The Communists read all the publicity they create and are actually convinced that we are poised on the brink of an enormous political division on the war which will make our continued effort impossible.

We may not take the bearded pickets seriously, but the enemy does.

As a result of this, Ho Chi Minh has shown absolutely no sincerity in his mouthings about peace talks. He has not budged an inch from his insistence that we must withdraw our troops before such talks can begin. If we yielded to such a proposal we would be absolutely *through* as a world power. Every non-committed nation in the world would immediately look eastward for protection and support, since we would have proved ourselves morally independable and militarily incapable of subduing a third-rate power in a minor war.

We are sick of the war. We have had enough of it and we are a peaceful people. The rest of the world is sick of war. Every day we continue to fight in Vietnam gives our enemies, even in friendly nations, the opportunity to attack us and to misinterpret our intentions. The faster we put an end to the whole depressing—but necessary—business the better, not only for us, but for both the North and the South Vietnamese and for the rest of the free world.

If we agreed to stop our bombing of North Vietnam, they would interpret this as weakness and would achieve a military build-up which would make our efforts at negotiation futile. If we step up our bombing and make it impossible for North Vietnam to continue the war, we can then sit down and put our feet under the same table with the Communists, serene in the knowledge that we are bargaining from a position of strength, not weakness.

Our role in Vietnam is not sinful. It is heroic. We are fighting for the freedom of humankind. We are making enormous sacrifices for an unselfish principle. Our position is worthy not of scorn but of pride. And it's about time that more Americans treated this ordeal with the respect it deserves.